Nuclear constriction segregates mobile nuclear proteins away from chromatin
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ABSTRACT As a cell squeezes its nucleus through adjacent tissue, penetrates a basement membrane, or enters a small blood capillary, chromatin density and nuclear factors could in principle be physically perturbed. Here, in cancer cell migration through rigid micropores and in passive pulling into micropipettes, local compaction of chromatin is observed coincident with depletion of mobile factors. Heterochromatin/euchromatin was previously estimated from molecular mobility measurements to occupy a volume fraction $f$ of roughly two-thirds of the nuclear volume, but based on the relative intensity of DNA and histones in several cancer cell lines drawn into narrow constrictions, $f$ can easily increase locally to nearly 100%. By contrast, mobile proteins in the nucleus, including a dozen that function as DNA repair proteins (e.g., BRCA1, 53BP1) or nucleases (e.g., Cas9, FokI), are depleted within the constriction, approaching 0%. Such losses—compounded by the occasional rupture of the nuclear envelope—can have important functional consequences. Studies of a nuclease that targets a locus in chromosomes-i indeed show that constricted migration delays DNA damage.

INTRODUCTION Cells in vivo move through three-dimensional (3D) tissue in many situations. They squeeze into wounds during healing (Clark et al., 1982) and into vessel-adjacent matrix during angiogenesis (Lamalice et al., 2007). Leukocytes migrate through capillaries only 2–3 μm in diameter and contort into sites of injury in response to inflammatory cues (Luster et al., 2005). Embryogenesis requires both progenitor and committed cells to crawl and reposition themselves in developing organs (Kurosaka and Kashina, 2008). Cancer cells invade nearby tissue, penetrate basement membrane barriers, and even enter distant capillary beds during tumor metastasis (Liotta et al., 1991).

As the largest and stiffest organelle (Dahl et al., 2008), the nucleus has long been speculated to sterically limit a cell’s ability to migrate through small, stiff pores in tissue matrix (Lichtman, 1970). In migration through 3D fibrous matrix, the nucleus has been described as a “piston” (Petrie et al., 2014), even though pistons are usually considered rigid. Softening the nucleus by lamin-A knockdown indeed enhances the rate of migration through small constrictions for normal human primary cells as well as cancer lines (Shin et al., 2013; Harada et al., 2014). In studying 3D migration, it therefore makes sense to focus on the nucleus—in particular, how its extreme distortion during transit affects chromatin organization and nuclear factors.

Constricted migration of dendritic cells and some cancer lines has been recently reported to cause nuclear envelope rupture, exchange of nucleocytoplasmic proteins, and local enrichments of green fluorescent protein (GFP)–53BP1 suggestive of DNA damage (Denais et al., 2016; Raab et al., 2016). Although many standard markers of breaks need to be examined in such migration, we show here that 53BP1 and other DNA repair factors are frequently heterogeneous within the migrating nucleus and some can even be lost from the nucleus. Loss of 53BP1, which can delay DNA repair, occurs in many tumors of different tissue and cell types—more consistently than either the activation of the repair kinase ATM or appearance of the phosphorylated-histone marker of double-strand breaks γH2AX.
and such loss of 53BP1 typically occurs early in carcinogenesis (Ward et al., 2003; Nuciforo et al., 2007). Furthermore, recent study of cancer lines shows that ~20% of migrating cells exhibit new GFP-53BP1 enrichments absent nuclear rupture (Denais et al., 2016; Raab et al., 2016), which implicates processes other than rupture. Here we show that rupture-free squeeze-out of mobile nuclear proteins from a chromatin-rich constriction always occurs within the nucleus, whereas rupture is less frequent. As a functional test, we use an inducible FokI endonuclease model to show that protein squeeze-out—combined with protein mislocalization during rupture—can inhibit DNA damage by a targeted nuclease, consistent with calculations using a phase-separating nucleus model of constricted cell migration.

RESULTS

Unavoidable segregation and occasional rupture

GFP-53BP1 is usually diffuse in the nucleoplasm, consistent with nucleoplasmic mobility (Bekker-Jensen et al., 2005; Pryde et al., 2005). However, during hours-long migration through a 3-μm Transwell, as the nucleus contorts to enter or exit a pore, GFP-53BP1 is less intense within the pore than either DNA or mCherry-histone H2B, which are both enriched in the pore (Figure 1, A and B). Similarly, endogenous 53BP1 (immunostained) and the additional DNA repair factors GFP-Ku70 and -Ku80 (Supplemental Figure S1), all in the mobile phase (Supplemental Table S1), show less intensity within the 3-μm pore than does chromatin, which is an immobile solid phase according to fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP; Pajerowski et al., 2007). A homogeneously distributed, nucleus localized construct like that used in Raab et al. (2016) is also seen to be less intense within 3-μm pores than with the compacted DNA within the same pores (Figure 1, A and B), although such a separation of mobile molecules from immobile ones does not occur within 8-μm pores. Similar results are obtained regardless of whether the mobile molecule is excluded from nucleoli (53BP1 in Supplemental Figure S1) or not (YFP-NLS [yellow fluorescent protein tagged nuclear localization sequence] in Figure 1A). These observations begin to suggest that chromatin is squeezed (like a sponge) as the nucleus is pulled into a small constriction, and this squeezing thereby excludes, and hence depletes, mobile nucleoplasmic factors from the pore.

Protein size or charge could be important, but protein molecular weights vary by sixfold, and charges likely vary from highly anionic to weakly anionic as the isoelectric point (pl) varies from pl = 4.6 for 53BP1 to pl = 5.8 for Ku70 (Supplemental Table S1). To assess the possible effects of local electrostatics, we measured the level of acetylated histone H3 and also found that it was enriched within the 3-μm pores like DNA and histone-H2B (Supplemental Figure S2). In addition to segregation within the nucleus of the mobile proteins, nuclei sometimes rupture during Transwell migration, causing H2B-mCherry, GFP-53BP1, and GFP-Ku70, as well as GFP-Ku80, to leak at least for a few hours into the cytoplasm before ultimately relocating in the nucleus (Figure 1, C and D).

Micropipettes have a Transwell-like, cylindrical pore geometry that is well suited to visualizing nuclear mechanics within detached cells whose F-actin cytoskeletons have been disassembled via latrunculin A treatment (Pajerowski et al., 2007). We therefore examined nuclear factor segregation in this reductionist context. Aspiration of many cells shows that GFP-53BP1 always segregates away from the chromatin that condenses within the entrance of a small, 3-μm micropipette (Figure 2A). Of note, segregation of the protein is evident from minute time scales to hour time scales, as is relevant to migration through a Transwell (Figure 1C). These observations begin to suggest a time- and motility-independent mechanism that segregates mobile molecules away from immobile ones.

The various constructs used in migration studies of Figure 1 were imaged in aspiration using smaller or larger micropipette diameters. GFP-53BP1, Ku70, and Ku80 are all strongly excluded from small pipettes (Figure 2Bii), and the YFP-NLS construct is likewise excluded from 3- but not 8-μm pipettes (Figure 2Bii). As with migration through pores, histone-H2B is also not excluded from 3-μm pipettes (Figure 2Biii).

More than a dozen mobile nuclear proteins were expressed as GFP constructs (Supplemental Table S1) and imaged during aspiration. Whereas DNA in all of these cells condensed at the entrance for small pipettes (Figure 2Cii), all mobile proteins indeed segregated like GFP-53BP1, as quantified by the ratio of each protein’s intensity inside the pipette entrance to its intensity outside the pipette (Figure 2Cii). Protein molecular weights vary by sixfold, and protein charges likely vary from highly anionic to cationic as the isolectric points vary from pl = 4.6 for 53BP1 to pl = 7.8 for dCas9 (Supplemental Table S1). Upstream DNA damage-response factors such as MRE11 and RPA1 (Hass et al., 2012), as well as downstream factors such as BRCA1 (Li and Yu, 2013), Ku70, and Ku80, all diminish within an ~3-μm pore. The mobile proteins studied also include a transcription factor (RelA), an epigenetic factor (Sir6), and the gene-editing nuclease Cas9. Chromatin condensation near the entrance of the constriction—as signified by the intensity ratios for histone H2B and heterochromatin protein HP1α (Figure 2D) in addition to DNA (Figure 2C)—is also quantitatively similar to that observed during Transwell migration. Among all of the aspirated cells, 90–95% exhibit this squeeze-out behavior with compressed DNA (Supplemental Figure S3), and the exceptions appear within statistical uncertainty of doing the same. Segregation is thus an inevitable effect of nuclear squeezing.

Segregation is also highly sensitive to pore diameter. Protein intensity ratios decrease with decreasing pipette diameter. Of importance, the protein ratio decreases to zero—signifying total squeeze-out—at an extrapolated critical diameter of ~2 μm (Figure 2C). At that same critical diameter, the DNA intensity ratio should also level off as the chromatin becomes maximally compacted inside the pipette; such a plateau is indeed suggested by the increasingly shallow fit lines between statistically significant DNA ratio data points. In the opposite limit, since both the DNA and protein intensity ratios approach 1.0 above a threshold pipette diameter of ~5 μm, the DNA and protein flow almost equally into such large pores. It is unsurprising, then, that Transwell pores and pipettes with large diameters (~8 μm) do not cause significant condensation of DNA in the pore, nor do they induce segregation of YFP-NLS (Figure 1A). The DNA and protein intensity ratios finally reach 1 at diameter of ~10 μm (Figure 2C). Furthermore, these ratios exhibit the negative linear correlation that one would expect given that chromatin occupies a solid volume fraction f of the nucleus, whereas mobile proteins occupy the free volume 1−f (Figure 2E).

Whereas segregation always occurs within a constricted nucleus, large extension into a 3-μm micropipette sometimes also gives rise to rupture like that of the segregated GFP-53BP1 (Figures 2A and 3A), which leaks over hours (Figure 3B). Rupture and loss of histone-H2B is twofold to threefold less likely than loss of the mobile factors (Figure 3A), consistent with strong binding of H2B to DNA. For other cancer cell types, a physically unavoidable steric exclusion mechanism would be expected to and indeed does apply to GFP-53BP1 segregation and loss in rupture upon aspiration (Figure 3C): these other cell types include the mouse liver cancer line EC4 and wild-type and lamin-A–knockdown A549 cells. The latter results hint
FIGURE 1: Migration through small pores compacts the chromatin and causes local depletion of mobile nuclear proteins plus occasional nuclear rupture. (A) Schematics illustrate that as a cell nucleus squeezes into a small pore, its chromatin becomes compact, and the opposite occurs with mobile proteins. Confocal sections of fixed cells show the same as a nucleus squeezes into a 3-μm pore, with mobile proteins such as GFP-53BP1 and YFP-NLS-MS2 decreasing in density within the small pore (representative of ≥20 cells/protein). Pore exits show similar differences. Large pores of 8 μm show no such DNA compaction or protein depletion. Intensity profiles for DNA and protein are each normalized to the highest values along the dashed arrows shown in the XZ slices (bar, 5 μm). (B) Segregation of mobile proteins, including endogenous 53BP1, away from chromatin is evident at both the entrance and exit of 3-μm pores. Because DNA is enriched inside the pore, its intensity ratio tends above 1; the same applies for histone-H2B. Conversely, mobile proteins accumulate outside the pore, so their intensity ratios fall consistently below 1. Segregation does not occur in 8-μm pores (≥20 cells/group, at least three experiments). (C) Live imaging of H2B-mCherry–overexpressing U2OS cells reveals nuclear rupture—with leakage of H2B into the cytoplasm—followed by nuclear relocation over hours (representative of at least three experiments). (D) At the top and bottom of a Transwell membrane, GFP-53BP1, -Ku70, and -Ku80 localize in the nucleus. For cells exiting 3-μm pores, rupture is sometimes evident with mobile proteins in the cytoplasm based on GFP proteins outside the boundary of lamin-B (red) and/or the DNA edge (blue) (≥9 exiting cells/group, ≥100 top cells/group; *p < 0.05). The percentage of cells with mislocalized GFP protein is likewise significantly greater for exiting cells than for cells that fully migrated to the bottom (≥35 bottom cells/group; **p < 0.05).
FIGURE 2: Pulling nuclei into small micropipettes consistently compacts the chromatin and causes complementary protein segregation. (A) Cells used for aspiration are deadhered and treated with latrunculin A to depolymerize the cytoskeleton. When a cell and nucleus are then aspirated into a 3-μm pipette, chromatin intensity increases at the pipette entrance and mobile GFP-53BP1 decreases, sometimes leaking or rupturing out of the nucleus. Intensity profiles are shown along the dashed arrows (representative of at least three experiments). (B) Segregation of other mobile GFP proteins contrasts with a DNA-like profile for histone-H2B. (C) All other mobile proteins studied—including repair, transcription, and epigenetic factors, as well as a nuclease—also segregate upon aspiration into ~3-μm pipettes (~3 cells/group). Segregation is sensitive to pipette size: protein intensity ratio decays with decreasing diameter, vanishing at an extrapolated critical diameter of ~2 μm. Below this critical value, the DNA intensity ratio plateaus as DNA reaches maximum compaction inside the pipette. Unfilled data points fall between 3.0 and 3.7 μm in diameter; their average is indicated by a filled black square. Solid gray lines are fits between filled points with statistically different intensity ratios, and dashed gray lines are extrapolations or fits between points that are not statistically different. YFP-NLS-MS2 was added after the fits but confirms expectations. Red dashed lines show the intensity ratio limits for small and large pipette diameter. (D) Chromatin-bound proteins do not segregate from DNA in ~3-μm pipettes (~4 cells/group). (E) A negative linear correlation between protein intensity ratio and DNA intensity ratio is consistent with chromatin occupying a solid volume fraction f of the nucleus while mobile proteins occupy the free volume 1 – f (see Image analysis in Materials and Methods). Data from C were binned according to average pipette diameter.
_Segregation and rupture occur in various cell types, and lower pressure is required to rupture nuclei with lower lamin-A—_ at more rupture events with low lamin-A, which prompted a careful examination of rupture as a function of aspiration stress and time course. That lower pressure is required for rupture of lamin-A–knockdown nuclei (Figure 3D) indicates a protective role for lamin-A even on the time scale of minutes-long aspiration. Combined with exclusion from the pore, these findings are all consistent with squeeze-out and overall loss of mobile factors from the DNA compressed into the pore.

**Nucleosome inhibition by chromatin constriction**

Loss of mobile factors during constricted migration should have functional consequences for the cell, such as the delay of DNA damage by nucleases. To investigate this effect, we used a U2OS subline that was engineered to have on/off-inducible DNA damage in ~200 sites in one p-arm locus of chromosome 1 (Figure 4A; Shanbhag et al., 2010; Tang et al., 2013). Cleavage of this locus—by the mCherry-FokI nuclease construct—is induced by the addition of tamoxifen, which translocates the FokI construct into the nucleus (through dimerization), along with Shield1, a stabilizing ligand that prevents FokI degradation. Even in two-dimensional (2D) culture, this density of nucleosome FokI per total DNA by a similar amount suggests that their effects should also be similar. Indeed, through both of these mechanisms, constricted migration should dampen FokI nuclease activity on the specially engineered chromosome 1 locus.

Once FokI nuclease has been activated—by high (1 μM) tamoxifen and high (1 μM) Shield1—to cleave the chromosome 1 locus, the percentage of U2OS nuclei with mCherry-positive foci decreases over 24 h even as the nuclease remains abundant within the nucleus (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentration from high to low (0.1 μM) to zero slows this decay (Figure 5, A–C, and Supplemental Figure S4). Reducing the tamoxifen concentra...
FIGURE 4: FokI nuclease is confirmed to enact on/off-inducible damage at a specific locus on chromosome 1 and also to segregate/mislocalize during Transwell migration. (A) A lac operator transgene integrated into the p-end of chromosome 1 in the U2OS line. Expression of the integrated mCherry-Lac repressor-FokI construct can be stably induced with 4-OHT (tamoxifen) and Shield-1 to create DNA breaks. FokI intensity correlates with γH2AX intensity, and the area of GFP-53BP1 at the damaged site is linearly correlated to γH2AX focus area. (B) A comet assay is sensitive enough to detect induced DNA breaks: the mean centroid distance is higher for FokI-activated cells (>175 nuclei/group; at least three experiments). (C, D) FRAP shows that both nucleoplasmic and chromatin-bound mCherry-FokI are mobile, with half-lives of 6 s and >2 min, respectively. The former is thus much more mobile, and it indeed segregates outside a micropipette in D during aspiration (>4 cells/group; at least three experiments). (E, F) Migration through 3-μm Transwell pores also causes FokI to segregate and mislocalize, as seen in migrated cells that have been fixed for confocal imaging. Intensity profiles are shown along the dashed arrows (>10 cells/group; at least three experiments).
H2AX, among many targets, generates γH2AX (Shanbhag et al., 2010)—but the inhibition has zero effect on the number of cells with mCherry-FokI foci (Figure 5D). Although segregation of repair factors (Figure 1) could conceivably lead to differences in percentage of foci-positive cells among migrated and nonmigrated populations, burnout of the engineered locus is clearly limited by nuclease activity rather than DNA repair. When induced cells are placed on top of a Transwell membrane, constricted migration to the bottom delays burnout of the locus, with almost 50% more mCherry-positive FokI nuclease foci than on top (Figure 5E). The first possible explanation that we considered was that damage impedes migration, but nuclease induction has no effect on the percentage of cells that migrate (Figure 5F). However, FokI does segregate in constrictions (Figure 4D), draining the nucleoplasmic pool available for exchange with FokI foci (Figure 4C). Indeed, the photobleach-corrected intensity of a FokI focus decreases by ~30% (≥6 cells) within minutes inside a 3-μm constriction (Figure 5G), which coincides with the exchange rate shown by the FRAP experiments (Figure 4C). We considered the possibility that compacted chromatin in the constriction at the specially engineered locus would accumulate (or deplete) core histones. However, histone-H2B remains nearly unperturbed by the FokI locus and nearly constant in intensity (Supplemental Figure S5, 2Biii) even though small changes with this histone will be difficult to resolve because it binds adjacent unaffected chromosomes, which contribute a high background. In two-dimensional cultures, even a temporary decrease in nucleoplasmic FokI can delay burnout considerably (Figure 5, B and C). Segregation and mislocalization of mobile nuclear factors away from chromatin could therefore explain how constricted migration inhibits highly targeted nuclease activity.

**DISCUSSION**

Migration of immune cells through narrow channels with square cross sections has been seen to draw in the DNA (Thiam et al., 2016), and an increase in nuclear rupture with channel width particularly after lamin-A knockdown (Denais et al., 2016; Raab et al., 2016) could relate somehow to the chromatin compaction in cancer cells shown here in circular pores to hit a steric limit. A first, simple model for squeeze-out of mobile nuclear factors explains the segregation data well and provides a mechanistic basis for our hypothesis that severe constriction can impede targeted nuclease activity. Chromatin has already been

Inhibition of the DNA damage response using an inhibitor of ATM kinase (Hickson et al., 2004) significantly decreases the number of γH2AX foci—which is expected, since ATM phosphorylation of
Constriction of the nucleus in invasive migration is predicted to inhibit nuclease activity
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**A** Schematic illustrates chromatin compaction and key model parameters. In the model, the cell (shown here in side view) is treated as a cylinder with a cylindrical nucleus of radius \(R_n\) and length \(L_n\). The nucleus consists of a solid chromatins mesh (blue) intermixed with a fluid of mobile nuclear proteins (green). When the nucleus is constricted, the chromatin squeezes out the protein fluid, as pictured, and the nuclear radius and length change by factors of \(\Lambda_r\) and \(\Lambda_z\), respectively. The model closely predicts the observed correlations between solid-fluid volume fractions and pipette diameter (compare with Figure 2C). Top, data points show the experimentally measured DNA intensity ratios for pipettes of different sizes. The blue curve reports the solid volume fraction \(f\) predicted by the theory, which relates to pipette size according to a power law. Bottom, data points give the protein intensity ratios measured using different-sized pipettes. The green curve is the predicted fluid volume fraction given by the same power law that determines the solid volume fraction in the top plot. At the critical pore size at which the fluid volume fraction vanishes, all of the fluid is squeezed away from the chromatin. We use this critical pore size to estimate the solid volume fraction of the undeformed nucleus to be \(f_0 = 0.58\). (C) Damage, repair, and net damage density rates vary with the volume fraction \(f\) of the solid chromatin mesh, which increases upon constriction. These curves assume no added nuclease. The net rate is the difference between the damage and repair rates; it gives the number of un repaired breaks per unit time, and the fitting used here shows those un repaired breaks that lead to apoptosis. The arrows indicate the volume fractions corresponding to 8-, 5-, and 3-μm pores. (D) Higher nuclear FokI concentrations yield a higher percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h and, correspondingly, more burnout over 24 h. Gray points show experimental data. The percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h is proportional to the concentration of nuclease \(c_n/c_0\), the bottom-right data point, representing the estimated from mobility measurements to occupy roughly \(f_0 = 65%\) of the nuclear volume of a couple of adherent types of cells in static culture (Bancaud et al., 2009), so that the free volume for diffusion of mobile factors is \((1 – f_0) = 35%\). Our data show that a 3- to 4-μm constriction increases the local density of chromatin by a factor of \(~1.3\) (Figures 1B and 2B). Hence, inside the pore, \(f_{\text{constricted}} = 84%\), which causes the free volume there to decrease to \((1 – f_{\text{constricted}}) = 16%\). It follows that mobile factors should deplete in the constriction to \((1 – f_{\text{constricted}})/(1 – f_0) = 45%\) of their original abundance, which is in reasonable agreement with 3- to 4-μm pore and pipette measurements (Figures 1B and 2C).

**Calculating squeeze-out and physical inhibition of nuclease attack**

A more complete calculation uses the full range of pore size data (Figure 2C) to ultimately predict how much of the reduction in burnout of the locus in chromosome 1 (Figure 5E) occurs because of nuclease exclusion from the constriction (Figure 4, D and E) versus rupture into the cytoplasm.

**FIGURE 6:** Elastic nucleus model of cell migration recapitulates mobile protein segregation and predicts that constriction can lower a cell’s mutation rate by inhibiting nuclease activity. (A) Schematic illustrates chromatin compaction and key model parameters. In the model, the cell (shown here in side view) is treated as a cylinder with a cylindrical nucleus of radius \(R_n\) and length \(L_n\). The nucleus consists of a solid chromatin mesh (blue) intermixed with a fluid of mobile nuclear proteins (green). When the nucleus is constricted, the chromatin squeezes out the protein fluid, as pictured, and the nuclear radius and length change by factors of \(\Lambda_r\) and \(\Lambda_z\), respectively. (B) The model closely predicts the observed correlations between solid-fluid volume fractions and pipette diameter (compare with Figure 2C). Top, data points show the experimentally measured DNA intensity ratios for pipettes of different sizes. The blue curve reports the solid volume fraction \(f\) predicted by the theory, which relates to pipette size according to a power law. Bottom, data points give the protein intensity ratios measured using different-sized pipettes. The green curve is the predicted fluid volume fraction given by the same power law that determines the solid volume fraction in the top plot. At the critical pore size at which the fluid volume fraction vanishes, all of the fluid is squeezed away from the chromatin. We use this critical pore size to estimate the solid volume fraction of the undeformed nucleus to be \(f_0 = 0.58\). (C) Damage, repair, and net damage density rates vary with the volume fraction \(f\) of the solid chromatin mesh, which increases upon constriction. These curves assume no added nuclease. The net rate is the difference between the damage and repair rates; it gives the number of un repaired breaks per unit time, and the fitting used here shows those un repaired breaks that lead to apoptosis. The arrows indicate the volume fractions corresponding to 8-, 5-, and 3-μm pores. (D) Higher nuclear FokI concentrations yield a higher percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h and, correspondingly, more burnout over 24 h. Gray points show experimental data. The percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h is proportional to the concentration of nuclease \(c_n/c_0\), the bottom-right data point, representing the highest \(c_n/c_0\) is used to estimate a proportionality constant in this model. The dark red curve shows the predicted burnout (i.e., change in percentage of FokI-positive cells) between 0 and 24 h, which increases in magnitude with percentage of FokI-positive cells at 0 h—and, by extension, with nuclease concentration. (E) Constricted migration delays burnout of the FokI-cleaved locus on chromosome 1 (compare with Figure 5E). We use the control bar, which reports the measured percentage of FokI-positive cells on top of the Transwell membrane after 24 h, to estimate the cells’ nuclear FokI concentration. The total height of the migrated bar amounts to the measured percentage of FokI-positive cells on the bottom of the Transwell membrane after 24 h; the light pink portion gives the control value, the medium red portion shows the increase in foci-positive cells due to squeeze-out of FokI during the cells’ 3-h-long migration through the 3-μm pores, and the dark red portion shows the increase in foci-positive cells due to mislocalization of FokI after migration-induced nuclear rupture. The model requires that FokI take \(~2.2\) h after rupture to relocalize to the nucleus in order to account for the specific observed increase in foci-positive cells after migration. The medium and dark red portions of the bar indicate that squeeze-out and rupture both play important roles in the difference in burnout observed between migrated and unmigrated cells.
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**Figure 6:** Elastic nucleus model of cell migration recapitulates mobile protein segregation and predicts that constriction can lower a cell’s mutation rate by inhibiting nuclease activity. (A) Schematic illustrates chromatin compaction and key model parameters. In the model, the cell (shown here in side view) is treated as a cylinder with a cylindrical nucleus of radius \(R_n\) and length \(L_n\). The nucleus consists of a solid chromatin mesh (blue) intermixed with a fluid of mobile nuclear proteins (green). When the nucleus is constricted, the chromatin squeezes out the protein fluid, as pictured, and the nuclear radius and length change by factors of \(\Lambda_r\) and \(\Lambda_z\), respectively. (B) The model closely predicts the observed correlations between solid-fluid volume fractions and pipette diameter (compare with Figure 2C). Top, data points show the experimentally measured DNA intensity ratios for pipettes of different sizes. The blue curve reports the solid volume fraction \(f\) predicted by the theory, which relates to pipette size according to a power law. Bottom, data points give the protein intensity ratios measured using different-sized pipettes. The green curve is the predicted fluid volume fraction given by the same power law that determines the solid volume fraction in the top plot. At the critical pore size at which the fluid volume fraction vanishes, all of the fluid is squeezed away from the chromatin. We use this critical pore size to estimate the solid volume fraction of the undeformed nucleus to be \(f_0 = 0.58\). (C) Damage, repair, and net damage density rates vary with the volume fraction \(f\) of the solid chromatin mesh, which increases upon constriction. These curves assume no added nuclease. The net rate is the difference between the damage and repair rates; it gives the number of un repaired breaks per unit time, and the fitting used here shows those un repaired breaks that lead to apoptosis. The arrows indicate the volume fractions corresponding to 8-, 5-, and 3-μm pores. (D) Higher nuclear FokI concentrations yield a higher percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h and, correspondingly, more burnout over 24 h. Gray points show experimental data. The percentage of FokI foci-positive cells at 0 h is proportional to the concentration of nuclease \(c_n/c_0\), the bottom-right data point, representing the highest \(c_n/c_0\) is used to estimate a proportionality constant in this model. The dark red curve shows the predicted burnout (i.e., change in percentage of FokI-positive cells) between 0 and 24 h, which increases in magnitude with percentage of FokI-positive cells at 0 h—and, by extension, with nuclease concentration. (E) Constricted migration delays burnout of the FokI-cleaved locus on chromosome 1 (compare with Figure 5E). We use the control bar, which reports the measured percentage of FokI-positive cells on top of the Transwell membrane after 24 h, to estimate the cells’ nuclear FokI concentration. The total height of the migrated bar amounts to the measured percentage of FokI-positive cells on top of the Transwell membrane after 24 h; the light pink portion gives the control value, the medium red portion shows the increase in foci-positive cells due to squeeze-out of FokI during the cells’ 3-h-long migration through the 3-μm pores, and the dark red portion shows the increase in foci-positive cells due to mislocalization of FokI after migration-induced nuclear rupture. The model requires that FokI take \(~2.2\) h after rupture to relocalize to the nucleus in order to account for the specific observed increase in foci-positive cells after migration. The medium and dark red portions of the bar indicate that squeeze-out and rupture both play important roles in the difference in burnout observed between migrated and unmigrated cells.
where \( \Lambda_s \) is the ratio of constricted to original nuclear radius and \( \Lambda_z \) is the ratio of constricted to original nuclear length (Figure 6A). \( \Lambda_z \) is related to \( \Lambda_s \) by a power law, \( \Lambda_z = 1/\Lambda_s^\alpha \), \( 0 \leq \alpha \leq 2 \), which is exact in the small-deformation limit. We fit to the DNA intensity data in Figure 2 to obtain \( \alpha = 1.7 \). Using this power-law, we fit to the protein intensity data to estimate the critical pore diameter of 1.6 \( \mu \)m at which all the fluid is squeezed out. We use these to estimate the initial solid volume fraction, \( f_0 = 58\% \) (Figure 6B).

Our model incorporates \( f \) into a net damage density rate, \( k_{n}\), which is the difference between a damage density rate, \( k_d \), and a repair density rate, \( k_r \), and, as such, defines the number of unrepair ed DNA breaks per unit volume per unit time for a given cell (Figure 6C). The first term, \( k_{dz} \) is just the sum of a basal damage density rate and an induced damage density rate:

\[
k_{dz} = k_{dz0} f + \frac{c_d}{c_0} (1-f) \tag{2}
\]

where \( k_{dz0} \) is a rate constant, \( c_d \) is the concentration of damage factor (i.e., nuclease) within the nucleus's mobile protein fluid, and \( c_0 \) is a constant to be fitted. The repair term, \( k_r \), is derived from a Langmuir adsorption model—an equilibrium model that considers the adsorption and desorption rates of repair molecules from break sites. We use this model to predict the fraction of break sites \( f \) that adsorb a repair molecule during the time interval \( \delta t \), which is set by a desorption rate parameter. The net damage density rate \( k_n \) is \( k_d - k_r \) then becomes

\[
k_n = k_d (1-f) \tag{3}
\]

with \( k_d \) given by Eq. 2. We fit the model parameters by setting \( c_d \) = 0 and comparing to apoptosis rates in rigid-pore migration experiments without added nuclease (Harada et al., 2014). We have assumed that the apoptosis rate is proportional to DNA damage; more detailed observations of DNA damage would allow us to improve our estimate of the parameters and estimate a proportionality constant. Equation 3 is strictly a function of the solid volume fraction \( f \) and, by extension, of the nuclear deformation.

When there is no added nuclease (\( c_d = 0 \)), an increase in nuclear deformation—and, with it, an increase in \( f \)—raises the net damage rate, as the squeezed-out repair molecules become unavailable to fix DNA breaks (Figure 6B). However, in the presence of added nuclease, deformation causes that nuclease to segregate and so inhibits its ability to inflict damage. If there is a large concentration of nuclease, then the decrease in damage during migration is more significant than the decrease in repair rate, so migration leads to appreciably less net damage. The relationship between nuclease concentration and corresponding damage (Figure 6D) shows that higher nuclease concentrations lead to a faster burnout rate, and the curve predicted by the model closely matches experimental data. The model ultimately predicts that squeeze-out of FokI accounts for more than half of the observed delay in burnout (i.e., increase in percentage of FokI foci-positive cells) after Transwell migration; the other half can be explained by nuclear rupture-induced FokI mislocalization (Figures 5E and 6E).

This predictive model provides insight into how an unavoidable physical consequence of constricted migration—namely, the squeeze-out of mobile nuclear proteins because of chromatin compaction—can have important functional consequences for the cell. Squeeze-out inhibits the net activity of the targeted nuclease. Similar segregation could also effectively separate the cell’s repair factors from DNA damage sites in the constrictions, thereby causing elevated damage in migrating cells independent of nuclear envelope rupture.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Cell culture**

U2OS human osteosarcoma cells were cultured in DMEM high-glucose (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO). Approximately 250 lac operator repeats (~9 kb per repeat) were integrated into the p-end of chromosome 1 of U2OS cells. Induction medium consisting of 4-hydroxytamoxifen (Sigma-Aldrich) and Shield1 ligand (Takara, Kusatsu, Japan) was then used to activate the integrated FokI-lac repressor-mCherry construct and induce DNA breaks, as described previously (Shanbhag et al., 2010). A separate stable cell line of U2OS expressing YFP-NLS-MS2 was used and also described previously (Janicki et al., 2004). Where used, protein overexpression was achieved by 24-h transfection with Lipofectamine 2000 (Life Technologies). Most of the expression plasmids were donated from various research groups, except for mApple-Fibrillarin and H2B-GFP, which were gifts from Michael Davidson (Florida State University; plasmid 54900; Addgene, Cambridge, MA) and Geoff Wahl (Salk Institute; Kanda et al., 1998; plasmid 11680, Addgene), respectively. EC4 mouse liver cancer cells and A549 human lung cancer epithelial cells were cultured in supplemented DMEM high-glucose—with 1% MEM Non-Essential Amino Acids (Life Technologies)—and supplemented Ham’s F12 medium (Life Technologies), respectively.

**Transwell migration**

Cells were plated on top of a Transwell membrane (Corning, Corning, NY) at a density of 300,000 cells/cm² and allowed to migrate to the bottom over the course of 24 h.

**Immunostaining and imaging**

Cells were fixed in 4% formaldehyde (Sigma-Aldrich) for 15 min before undergoing 10-min permeabilization by 0.25% Triton-X (Sigma-Aldrich), 30-min blocking by 5% bovine serum albumin (BSA; Sigma-Aldrich), and overnight incubation in primary antibodies. The antibodies used include lamin-A/C (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Dallas, TX, and Cell Signaling, Danvers, MA), lamin-B (Santa Cruz Biotechnology), γH2AX (Millipore, Billerica, MA), 53BP1 (Abcam, Cambridge, UK), and acetylated histone H3 (K9 + K14 + K18 + K23 + K27; Abcam). The cells were then incubated in secondary antibodies (ThermoFisher, Waltham, MA) for 1.5 h, and their nuclei were stained with 8 μM Hoechst 33342 (ThermoFisher) for 15 min. Finally, the cells were mounted with Prolong Gold antifade reagent (Life Technologies). Epifluorescence imaging was done using an Olympus IX71—with a 40x/0.6 numerical aperture (NA) objective—and a digital electron-multiplying charge-coupled device (EMCCD) camera (Cascade; Photometrics, Tucson, AZ). Confocal imaging was done on a Leica TCS SP8 system equipped with either a 63x/1.4 NA objective or a 40x/0.9 NA objective.
oil-immersion or a 40×/1.2 NA water-immersion objective. ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012) and MATLAB were used to quantify the resulting images.

**Micropipette aspiration**

In preparation for aspiration, cells were 1) detached using 0.05% trypsin–ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid (Life Technologies), 2) incubated in 0.2 μg/ml latrunculin A (Sigma-Aldrich) and 8 μM Hoechst 33342 (ThermoFisher) for 30 min at 37°C as described previously (Pajerowski et al., 2007), and 3) resuspended in phosphate-buffered saline with 1% BSA and 0.2 μg/ml latrunculin A. During aspiration, epifluorescence imaging was done using a Nikon TE300—with a 60×/1.25 NA oil-immersion objective—and a digital EMCCD camera (Cascade, Photometrics). The resulting images were quantified in ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012).

**Image analysis**

During micropipette aspiration, the portion of the nucleus outside the pipette extends across a greater depth than does the portion inside. Thus, because epifluorescence signal is cumulative along the optical axis (z per Figure 1A), more photons are collected outside the pipette than inside, which artificially decreases the inside-to-outside intensity ratio. To correct for this effect, one can introduce a geometric factor . The chromatin’s solid volume fraction f can then be written in terms of a as \( f = \frac{(1 - 1/\alpha f x)}{1 - 1/\alpha f x} \), where \( \alpha f x \) is the DNA intensity ratio and x is its maximum value. Similarly, the fluid volume fraction \( \rho \) can be expressed as \( \rho = \frac{(1 - 1/\alpha f y)}{1 - 1/\alpha f y} \), where \( \alpha f y \) is the protein intensity ratio with maximum value y. Plugging these expressions into the relation \( \rho = 1 - f \), it is straightforward to solve for \( \alpha f \) as a function of \( \alpha f x \) and protein intensity ratios to prove that negatively linearly correlated irrespective of the exact value of the geometric factor a. All plots with error bars are representative of mean ± SEM, and all statistical tests were done with a Student’s t test.

**Comet assay**

Alkaline comet assays were performed according to manufacturer’s protocol (Cell Biolabs, San Diego, CA).
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