A small-molecule inhibitor of the BRCA2-RAD51 interaction modulates RAD51 assembly and potentiates DNA damage-induced cell death

Duncan E. Scott[1,4,+], Nicola J. Francis-Newton[2,+], May E. Marsh[3,5], Anthony G. Coyne[1], Gerhard Fischer[3,6], Tommaso Moschetti[3,7], Andrew R. Bayly[1,8], Timothy D. Sharpe[3,9], Kalina T. Haas[2], Lorraine Barber[2], Chiara R. Valenzano[1,10], Rajavel Srinivasan[1,11], David J. Huggins[2,12], Matthias Ehebauer[3,13], Alessandro Esposito[2], Luca Pellegrini[3], Trevor Perrior[14], Grahame McKenzie[2,15], Tom L. Blundell[3], Marko Hyvönen*[3], John Skidmore*,[¶,1,4], Ashok R. Venkitaraman*[2], Chris Abell*[1]

[1] Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 1EW, UK.

[2] Medical Research Council Cancer Unit, University of Cambridge, Hutchison/MRC Research Centre, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 0XZ, UK

[3] Department of Biochemistry, University of Cambridge, 80 Tennis Court Road, Cambridge CB2 1GA, UK

[+] Joint first authors

*Correspondence to:

CA and JS (chemistry), ca26@cam.ac.uk, js930@cam.ac.uk

ARV (biology): arv22@mrc-cu.cam.ac.uk

MH (biochemistry), mh256@cam.ac.uk

¶ Lead contact

[4] Current address: The ALBORADA Drug Discovery Institute, Island Research Building, Hills Road, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK, CB2 0AH

[5] Current address: Paul Scherrer Institut, Villigen PSI, Switzerland

[6] Current address: Boehringer Ingelheim RCV, Doktor-Boehringer-Gasse 5-11, 1121 Vienna, Austria

[7] Current address: Illumina Cambridge Ltd, Illumina Centre, Granta Park, Great Abington, Cambridge,

CB21 6GP, UK

[8] Current address: Vertex, 86-88 Jubilee Avenue, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RW

[9] Current address: Biophysics Facility, Biozentrum, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

[10] Current address: Astex Pharmaceuticals, 436 Cambridge Science Park, Milton Road, Cambridge,

CB4 0QA, U.K.

[11] Current address: School of Pharmaceutical Science and Technology, Health Science Platform,

Tianjin University, 92 Weijin Road, Nankai District, Tianjin 300072; People's Republic of China

[12] Current address: Department of Physiology and Biophysics, Weill Cornell Medical College, USA

[13] Current address: Ipsen Bioinnovation, Oxford

[14] Domainex, Chesterford Research Park, Little Chesterford, Saffron Walden, Essex, CB10 1XL, UK

[15] PhoreMost Ltd., Babraham Research Campus, Cambridge CB22 3AT, UK

SUMMARY

BRCA2 controls RAD51 recombinase during homologous DNA recombination (HDR) through eight

evolutionarily-conserved BRC repeats, which individually engage RAD51 via the motif Phe-x-x-Ala. Using

structure-guided molecular design, templated on a monomeric thermostable chimera between human

RAD51 and archaeal RadA, we identify CAM833, a 529 Da orthosteric inhibitor of RAD51:BRC with a K_d

of 366 nM. The quinoline of CAM833 occupies a hotspot, the Phe-binding pocket on RAD51 and the

methyl of the substituted α-methylbenzyl group occupies the Ala-binding pocket. In cells, CAM833

diminishes formation of damage-induced RAD51 nuclear foci; inhibits RAD51 molecular clustering,

suppressing extended RAD51 filament assembly; potentiates cytotoxicity by ionising radiation,

augmenting *4N* cell-cycle arrest and apoptotic cell death and works with poly-ADP ribose polymerase

(PARP)1 inhibitors to suppress growth in BRCA2-wildtype cells. Thus, chemical inhibition of the protein-

protein interaction between BRCA2 and RAD51 disrupts HDR and potentiates DNA damage-induced cell

death, with implications for cancer therapy.

Key words: RAD51, homologous recombination, BRCA2, DNA repair, structure-guided drug discovery,

protein-protein interaction inhibition

INTRODUCTION

The tumour suppressor protein, BRCA2, is essential for error-free repair of DNA double-stranded breaks

(DSBs) by homologous DNA recombination (HDR) in human cells (Venkitaraman, 2014). BRCA2 acts

during HDR to control the recombination enzyme, RAD51, a eukaryal protein evolutionarily conserved as

RecA in eubacteria, and RADA in archaea (West, 2003). RAD51 executes the DNA strand exchange

reactions that lead to HDR by assembling, in a sequential and highly regulated manner, as helical

nucleoprotein filaments on single-stranded (ss) or double-stranded (ds) DNA substrates. The presynaptic

RAD51 filament on ssDNA mediates strand invasion and homologous pairing with a duplex DNA template

to execute strand exchange, the core biochemical event necessary for HDR.

Human BRCA2 contains two distinct regions that bind directly to RAD51. First, BRCA2 contains eight

BRC repeats, evolutionarily-conserved motifs of 26 residues each, whose sequence and spacing within

an ~1,100 residue segment encoded by *BRCA2* exon 11 is conserved amongst mammalian orthologues

(Bignell et al., 1997). Each of the eight human BRC repeats exhibits a varying affinity for RAD51 *in vitro*

(Wong et al., 1997). Second, the carboxyl (C-)terminus of BRCA2 contains a RAD51-binding region

spanning ~90 residues, which is distinct in sequence from the BRC repeats (Davies and Pellegrini, 2007;

Esashi et al., 2007).

The interactions between BRCA2 and RAD51 control key steps essential for HDR. The BRC repeat-

RAD51 interaction differentially regulates RAD51 assembly on DNA substrates *in vitro*, promoting

assembly of the RAD51-ssDNA filament, whilst concurrently inhibiting the RAD51-dsDNA interaction

(Carreira et al., 2009; Shivji et al., 2009). These opposing activities of the BRC repeats ensure that

RAD51 assembly on its DNA substrates occurs in the correct order to promote strand exchange.

Moreover, the C-terminal RAD51-binding region of BRCA2 stabilizes oligomeric assemblies of RAD51 *in*

vitro in biochemical assays using purified proteins (Davies and Pellegrini, 2007; Esashi et al., 2007), and

is required for the elongation of RAD51 filaments at cellular sites of DNA damage visualized by single-

molecule localization microscopy (Haas et al., 2018).

Of the eight BRC repeats in human BRCA2, BRC4 exhibits the highest affinity for RAD51 (Carreira and

Kowalczykowski, 2011; Cole et al., 2017; Wong et al., 1997). The crystallographic structure of a complex

between a BRC4 peptide and the core catalytic domain of RAD51 shows that the BRC4 sequence FHTA

(human BRCA2 residues 1524-1527) engages with hydrophobic pockets on the RAD51 surface that

accommodate the Phe and Ala residues (Pellegrini et al., 2002). An analogous FxxA motif in the RAD51

protein mediates oligomerization in the absence of DNA (Brouwer et al., 2018; Conway et al., 2004; Shin

et al., 2003), and has recently been shown using electron cryo-micoscopy to form the inter-subunit

interface in functionally relevant DNA-bound assemblies of RAD51 (Short et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017).

In vitro, BRC4 peptides promote the strand selectivity of RAD51-DNA interactions at sub-stoichiometric

concentrations relative to RAD51 (Carreira et al., 2009; Shivji et al., 2009). However, BRC4 peptides

disrupt RAD51 oligomerization *in vitro* (Davies et al., 2001), and when overexpressed in cells, can inhibit

the recruitment of RAD51 into DNA damage-induced foci by blocking the RAD51-RAD51 interaction

(Chen et al., 1999a).

The central importance of the BRC repeat-RAD51 interaction to HDR has prompted the identification of

small-molecule and peptidic inhibitors that might have therapeutic value for cancer treatment. Most

reported inhibitors target the interaction between RAD51 and DNA (Budke et al., 2012a, 2012b; Huang

and Mazin, 2014; Huang et al., 2011; Ishida et al., 2009; Normand et al., 2014; Takaku et al., 2011).

Recently described cell penetrating antibodies also operate through a similar mechanism (Pastushok et

al., 2019; Turchick et al., 2017, 2019). Inhibitors that suppress the D-loop activity of RAD51 have also

been reported (Budke et al., 2019; Lv et al., 2016), although several optimized versions also exhibit DNA-

intercalating activity (Budke et al., 2019). On the other hand, reports of small molecules and peptides

have been published that claim to disrupt the interaction between RAD51 and the BRC repeats, or

between RAD51 multimers (Bagnolini et al., 2020; Falchi et al., 2017; Nomme et al., 2010; Roberti et al.,

2019; Trenner et al., 2018; Vydyam et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2013, 2015; Ward et al. 2017). However, the

lack of specific structural information concerning the interaction of these inhibitors with RAD51 has

impeded the precise exploration of structure-activity relationships, and the efficient development of more

potent compounds.

Here, we report the discovery, using a structure-led fragment-based approach, of CAM833, a potent

chemical inhibitor of the RAD51-BRC repeat interaction and RAD51 oligomerization. We show using X-

ray crystallography that CAM833 engages the Phe- and Ala- binding pockets on RAD51 to block its

interaction with BRC repeats. We confirm that CAM833 potentiates cellular sensitivity to DNA damage

induced by ionizing radiation, and suppresses the assembly of RAD51 into damage-induced filaments,

as visualized by single-molecule localization microscopy. Our findings provide a well characterized

chemical tool compound to dissect biochemical events during HDR, and a potential lead for the

development of new cancer therapeutics.

RESULTS

A monomeric thermostable chimera of human RAD51 and archaeal RADA recapitulates structural

features of the human RAD51-BRC interaction

Structure-based approaches to identify modulators of the BRCA2–RAD51 interaction have been impeded

by the lack of a monomeric unliganded form of *Hs*RAD51. We have previously described the development

of molecular surrogate systems for RAD51 based on an archaeal ortholog, RadA from *Pyrococcus*

furiosus (Moschetti et al., 2016). In brief, we were able to produce the C-terminal ATPase domain of

RadA as a stable monomeric protein, and by careful mutagenesis, to convert the surface of the protein

to resemble human RAD51, with the ability to bind the BRCA2 BRC4 repeat with high affinity. Of note,

we used the previously described constructs HumRadA2 for initial biophysics work and HumRadA22F

for crystallography (Moschetti et al., 2016). In parallel, we also generated a chimeric RAD51

(ChimRAD51) that fuses the central part of the human RAD51 ATPase domain with two flanking

sequences from archaeal RadA and used this in our primary screening assay and for biophysical

screening. The binding of ChimRAD51 to the BRC4 peptide was characterized using a fluorescence

polarization (FP) assay and by isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC), yielding comparable K_d values of 4

and 6 nM, respectively validating the use of this protein for subsequent ligand affinity measurements

(Moschetti et al., 2016). These surrogates provide robust platforms for structure-guided lead discovery

via fragment screening, the biophysical characterization and validation of inhibitors, and for X-ray

crystallography.

The three-dimensional structure of the C-terminal ATPase domain of RAD51 in complex with a BRC4

peptide has been determined by X-ray crystallography (Pellegrini et al., 2002). This structure shows that

the BRC repeat binds in a bi-dentate fashion in which BRC4, via its FxxA motif, engages with a self-

association site on RAD51, and then wraps around the protein to interact through a less-conserved LFDE

motif with a second site on the RAD51 surface (Figure 1A). Cryo-EM structures of RAD51 filaments

bound to DNA (Short et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017) confirm that in self-association, the FxxA motif of one

RAD51 interacts similarly with the two small "Phe" and "Ala" pockets on an adjacent protein unit, with the

C-terminal segment of the oligomerization epitope binding to a hydrophobic groove in the opposite

direction to that where the LFDE epitope of BRC4 binds. Earlier work has compared the relative affinities

of the different human BRC repeats for RAD51 (*eg.* (Wong et al., 1997)), and has demonstrated that both

the FxxA and LFDE motifs in multiple BRC repeats contribute to both permissive and inhibitory

interactions with RAD51 (Rajendra and Venkitaraman, 2010). In order to determine which of these two

motifs might be most appropriate to develop inhibitors against, we measured the affinities of two peptides

corresponding to N- and C-terminal epitopes of BRC4 using our FP assay. The N-terminal "FxxA" half of

the BRC4 repeat showed clear binding to RAD51 and competition of full-length BRC4 repeat with a K_d of

36 μM. This compares favorably with our previous analysis of the affinities of tetra-peptides derived from

the BRC4 FxxA epitope (which has the sequence FHTA) which bound to humanized RadA with 200-300

μM affinity (Scott et al., 2016). The C-terminal half of BRC4 (LFDE peptide) showed very weak, if any,

inhibition of BRC4 binding, at up to 1 mM concentration (Figure 1C), suggesting that the LFDE motif

makes a minimal contribution on its own to this interaction, even though its mutation in the context of the

entire BRC4 peptide can reduce RAD51 binding (Rajendra and Venkitaraman, 2010). We also tested the

ability of RAD51 to bind its own oligomerization peptide (OP) epitope and determined a K_d of 18 μM for

this interaction, demonstrating how additional binding energy can be derived from the interactions which

the C-terminal part of the oligomerization peptide makes (Figure 1C).

The design and development of CAM833, a small molecule inhibitor of the interaction between

BRCA2 and RAD51

Using the surrogate RAD51 systems described above and a combination of fragment-based drug

discovery (Blundell et al., 2002; Coyne et al., 2010) and structure-guided drug design, we have optimized

fragment hit molecules to generate high-affinity inhibitors of the RAD51–BRC-repeat interaction with a

clearly defined orthosteric inhibition mechanism (Figure 2).

Initially, we carried out a biophysical fragment-screen against a previously-described humanized version

of *Pf*RadA HumRadA2 (also known as MAYSAM; (Moschetti et al., 2016; Scott et al., 2013)) leading to

the discovery of a range of bicyclic aromatic and heteroaromatic fragment hits, binding exclusively into

the Phe pocket at the FxxA site of RAD51 (Scott et al., 2013). Investigation of the structure-activity

relationships (SAR) around these hits showed that naphthyl derivatives, particularly when substituted

with polar groups, were able to bind to the Phe pocket with reasonable activity and ligand efficiency. For

example, 2-hydroxynaphthalene (**2**) bound to the HumRadA2 protein with a K_d of 460 μM as measured

by ITC (Scott et al., 2013), whereas 3-amino-2-naphthoic acid (**3**) (Figure 2A) bound with a Kd of 1.36

mM (Supplementary figure S1). Crystallographic analysis of these fragments shows that the naphthyl

rings bind in the same orientation as the aromatic side chain of phenylalanine in the FxxA motif of

oligomerization peptide or BRC repeats (Figure 2B) (Scott et al., 2016).

In parallel, we explored the SAR of a series of *N*-acetylated tetrapeptides based on the FxxA epitope of

BRC4 (Scott et al., 2016). This work established that the Ac-FHTA-NH$_2$ tetrapeptide (**1**) binds to

HumRadA2 with a K_d of 280 μM as determined by ITC.

Based on an overlay of the X-ray crystal structures of **1** and the naphthyl fragments 2-

hydroxynaphthalene (**2**) and 3-amino-2-naphthoic acid (**3**) (figure 2B) we designed compound **4** in which

the Phe of FHTA has been replaced by a rigid naphthyl-based amino acid, designed to more completely

fill this pocket, and the threonine has been replaced by a proline in order to restrict the conformation of

the peptide. The latter modification is known to provide a modest potency increase from the tetrapeptide

structure activity relationship studies (Scott et al., 2016), with the benefit of removing two H-bond donors

from the structure, a change likely to be associated with an increase in cell permeability. Gratifyingly, the

merged compound **4** was found to have improved K_d of 3 μM against HumRadA2 as determined by ITC

(Supplementary figure S1), a considerable increase in potency compared to the native peptide. We

determined an X-ray crystal structure of **4** bound to the HumRadA2 protein and this was found to interact

in the predicted fashion, with a modest distortion of the peptide backbone in order to accommodate the

more rigid left-hand-side (orientation as in Figure 2) (Figure 2C).

Recognizing that the peptidic nature of **4** was likely to lead to poor pharmacokinetics and low permeability

(clogP as calculated with ChemDraw 16 -0.96 and tPSA 172 $Å^2$), we sought to reduce the size and

polarity of our compounds whilst introducing groups capable of forming additional interactions with the

protein surface. This led to the design of compound **5** in which three polar elements judged unnecessary

were removed: firstly, the His residue which makes no key interactions in the tetrapeptide-protein crystal

structure was cut back to an alanine; secondly, we removed the amino group from the terminal

naphthoate unit. Finally, the terminal Ala amide was replaced with an α-methylbenzylamino group that

maintains the methyl group important for binding into the Ala pocket whilst replacing the terminal-amide

with a lipophilic phenyl ring, inspired by the relatively non-polar nature of this region of the protein surface.

Overall, compound **5** has only two intact amino acids and greatly reduced polarity (clogP 4.08, tPSA =

78.5). Compound **5** has a K_d of 220 nM vs HumRadA2 by ITC (Supplementary figure S2) – a 10-fold

potency increase. By this stage we had developed the more thoroughly humanized form of the protein

ChimRAD51 which was subsequently used for our primary FP screening assays (Moschetti et al., 2016).

We determined the K_d of **5** against ChimRAD51 to be 1.9 μM by ITC and 27 μM (n=20) as measured by

FP. The reduced level of potency against this more humanized system was mirrored in data with the

original naphth-2-ol fragment (**2**) which we found to have a K_d of 3.3 mM for ChimRAD51 versus 460 μM

for HumRadA2.

Compound **5** was too insoluble in aqueous media to profile in cell-based assays. Accordingly, we made

modifications designed to increase polarity, whilst avoiding the introduction of further hydrogen-bond

donors likely to reduce permeability. We replaced the naphthyl ring with a quinoline, converted the Ala

residue into a Gly and introduced a 4-methoxy substituent on the right-hand phenyl ring, leading to **6**.

Compound **6** has a clogP of 2.76 and an improved FP K_d of 8.0 μM (n=22) against ChimRAD51. Two

independent X-ray structures of **6** demonstrated that this compound was still bound to the FxxA site with

the quinoline accessing the Phe pocket in a similar orientation to the naphthyl in compound **4** albeit with

a shifted binding mode discussed in more detail below (Supplementary figure S3).

More detailed exploration of the SAR around **6** led to the discovery of **CAM833** with a 6-fluoro substituent

on the quinoline and a 2-chloro group on the phenyl leading to a further increase in affinity. CAM833 has

a K_d against the ChimRAD51 protein of 350 nM (n=8) as measured by FP (Figure 2E) and 366 nM by

ITC (Figure 2F). The lipophilicity associated with these groups was balanced by the introduction of a

trans-4-hydroxyl substituent on the proline ring serving to maintain solubility (clogP of CAM833 is 2.73,

and tPSA 120 $Å^2$).

As a biochemical test of CAM833, we evaluated its ability to disrupt full-length RAD51 oligomers. Using

dynamic light scattering, we observe a shift of the average particle size from ~40 nm for oligomeric RAD51

to ~5 nm particles (corresponding closely to the size of a RAD51 monomer) in the presence of excess of

CAM833 (Supplementary figure S4).

The X-ray crystal structures of **6** and CAM833 bound to HumRadA22F (the fully humanized RadA

surrogate used for crystallography (Moschetti et al., 2016); Figure 2D, G, Figure S3) revealed an altered

binding-mode compared to the lead compound **4** (Figure 2C). In this new binding mode, a shift of the

backbone of CAM833 allows the NH of the right-hand benzyl amide to form a hydrogen bond to Val200$_{189}$

(subscript number refers to the equivalent human RAD51 residue, which differs from the surrogate protein

residue numbering) via a bridging water-molecule rather than directly to the protein backbone

(Supplementary figure S5). We attribute this to the truncation of the His residue back to a Gly, a change

that can be tracked in the X-ray structures of intermediates from the optimization bound to HumRadA22F

(data not shown).

Overall, examination of the structures reveals the source of the potency increases between the

tetrapeptide **1** and CAM833. The phenyl ring of CAM833 sits flat on the protein surface with the *ortho*-

chlorine atom sitting in a groove leading from this surface with both making beneficial hydrophobic

interactions. The quinoline more completely fills the Phe pocket and the 6-fluoro substituent binds into a

hydrophobic sub-pocket which has opened up due to minor movements in the residues lining the pocket

(Figure 2D and 2G). We determined selectivity and developability data for CAM833 in order to support

its use as a validated chemical probe for the RAD51-BRCA-2 protein-protein interaction. Briefly, CAM833

is metabolically stable, does not significantly inhibit CYP450 enzymes, shows moderate solubility and

permeability and has no significant off-target interactions when screened at 10 µM in the Cerep

ExpresSPanel and has mouse pharmacokinetic data suitable for *in vivo* investigation (Supplementary

Table S1).

Figure 2. Development of CAM833. (A) Merging of 3-amino-2-naphthoic acid (**3**) with FHPA tetrapeptide
(**1**) to yield **4**. Trimming of the naphthyl and histidine group and replacement of terminal amide with phenyl
group yields **5**. Increase of polarity by replacing naphthyl with quinoline and adding methoxy group the
phenyl ring results in **6**. Further optimization leads to CAM833. (B) Overlaid crystal structures of
HumRadA1 in complex with 2-naphthol (**2**, PDB: 4B32, pink), 3-amino-2-naphthoic acid (**3**, PDB:6TV3,
dark red) and FHTA tetrapeptide (**1**, PDB: 4B3B, yellow). (C) Structure of **4** (PDB: 6TWE, deep purple)

in complex with HumRadA1 overlaid with FHTA peptide (PDB: 4B3B, yellow). (D) Structure of CAM833
(orange, PDB: 6TW9) in complex with HumRadA22F. Side view of CAM833 complex with HumRadA22F
showing partially cut surface of the protein and interaction of the fluoroquinoline ring with the Phe-pocket
and the chloro-phenyl group binding into the oligomerization groove. (E) Competition of BRC4 peptide
binding to ChimRAD51 using FP assay with CAM833. Three independent measurements (triplicate
technical repeats) of the same binding are shown in three different colours. (F) Isothermal titration
calorimetric measurement of direct binding of CAM833 to ChimRAD51. The baseline corrected
thermogram is shown above with X- and Y-axes above and left of the graph. The solid squares depict
integrated heats for each titration point and solid line the fit to single-site binding mode with corresponding
X- and Y-axes below and to left of the graph. (F) Refined $2F_oF_c$ electron density is shown for the ligand,
contoured at 1σ.

CAM833 causes a concentration-dependent decrease in RAD51 foci accompanied by increased

DNA damage.

The assembly of RAD51 into microscopic foci at cellular sites of DNA damage is competitively inhibited

by the over-expression of BRC repeat peptides (Chen et al., 1999a). Indeed, structural studies using X-

ray crystallography (Brouwer et al., 2018; Pellegrini et al., 2002; Shin et al., 2003) as well as electron

cryo-microscopy (Short et al., 2016; Xu et al., 2017) show that RAD51 assembly is mediated by protomer-

protomer contacts that structurally mimic the RAD51-BRC repeat interaction. Because it interrupts these

contacts *in vitro*, CAM833 is expected to suppress the function of RAD51 and prevent the formation of

RAD51 foci in cells exposed to DNA damage.

We tested this prediction by monitoring RAD51 foci formation after the exposure of A549 non-small cell

lung carcinoma (NSCLC) cells to ionising radiation (IR), using a robust cell-based assay based on high

content microscopy with the Cellomics ArrayScan V^{TI}, to objectively enumerate RAD51 foci

(Jeyasekharan et al., 2013). IR-induced DNA breakage was monitored in the same experiment by

enumerating foci containing γH2AX, a phosphorylated form of histone H2AX that is formed at DNA breaks

(Rogakou et al., 1998).

Notably, CAM833 inhibited RAD51 foci formation 6 h after exposure to 3 Gy IR, in a concentration-

dependent manner with an IC_{50} of 6 µM (Figure 3A and 3B, plotted as mean ± SEM, *n*=27). No RAD51

foci were detected at ~50 µM CAM833, corresponding to a maximal level of inhibition. Furthermore, 50

µM CAM833 increased γH2AX foci formation 24 h after exposure by approximately 4-fold compared to

control-treated cells (Figure 3C), suggestive of the persistence of unrepaired DNA damage. These

findings are consistent with prior results in cells over-expressing BRC peptides (Chen et al., 1999b), and

provide evidence that CAM833 engages its target in the cellular milieu to suppress RAD51 assembly and

inhibit DNA repair by HDR.

Figure 3. CAM833 causes a concentration-dependent decrease in RAD51 foci and subsequent
increase in DNA damage. (A) Images from the Cellomics Arrayscan HCS microscope depicting A549
cells treated with CAM833 (50 µM) or DMSO controls with or without ionising radiation (3 Gy). Briefly,
cells were co-stained with Hoechst-33342 to identify nuclei and anti-RAD51 antibody to detect RAD51
foci. The final column shows the Hoechst-stained cells with computationally identified nuclei outlined
with green, and RAD51 foci with red, respectively. (B) An IC_{50} curve calculated from the images collected
using the Cellomics HCS microscope as shown in 3A. A549 cells were treated with CAM833, exposed
to 3 Gy ionizing radiation (IR) and fixed after 6 hours incubation. CAM833 inhibits the formation of IR
induced RAD51 foci in A549 cells with an IC_{50} of 6 µM. Percent inhibition on the y-axis was plotted against
CAM833 concentration (as $\log_{10}M$) on the x. Plots show mean ± SEM. (C) Cells treated by the same
method were stained and counted for γ-H2AX foci 24 hrs after exposure. Each pair of bars corresponds
to cells exposed to one of five different concentrations (lowest, 3.125 µM on the right, to highest, 50 µM,
on the left) of CAM833 alone (0 Gy), or CAM833 plus 3 Gy IR (3 Gy). Bars depict the mean values of the
fold change in γ-H2AX foci number over control cells treated with DMSO alone, ±SEM. CAM833 causes
a concentration-dependent increase in unresolved DNA damage after 24 hours.

CAM833 inhibits RAD51 molecular clustering after DNA damage.

We have recently visualized the assembly of RAD51 molecules on DNA substrates at cellular sites of

DNA damage using single-molecule localization microscopy (SMLM) by direct stochastic optical

reconstruction (d-STORM) (Haas et al., 2018). Clusters of approximately 5-10 RAD51 molecules are first

recruited to DNA damage sites 0.5-1 h after damage induction, which progressively extend into filaments

>200 nm in length 3-5 h afterwards. SMLM shows that RAD51 clustering is suppressed by the over-

expression of BRC repeat peptides, indicative of its dependence on protomer-protomer contacts that

structurally mimic the RAD51-BRC repeat interaction inhibited *in vitro* by CAM833.

Therefore, to test the effect of CAM833 on RAD51 clustering we used SMLM on patient-derived EUFA423

cells (Figure 4A) bearing compound heterozygosity for the cancer-associated *BRCA2* truncating alleles

7691*ins*AT and 9000*ins*A (Haas et al., 2018; Howlett et al., 2002). We developed, as isogenic controls,

EUFA423 cells complemented by the expression of full-length BRCA2 (EUFA423+BRCA2) (Hattori et al.,

2011). We enumerated the number of RAD51 molecules detected by SMLM in clusters induced by the

exposure of EUFA423 cells or EUFA423+ BRCA2 controls (Figure 4A) to 3 Gy IR, in the presence or

absence of 25 µM CAM833, using a suite of bespoke image analysis algorithms that we have recently

reported (Haas et al., 2018). As expected, the accumulation of RAD51 molecules in damage-induced

clusters is significantly reduced in BRCA2-deficient EUFA423 cells compared to EUFA423+BRCA2

controls (Figure 4B) (Hattori et al., 2011). Notably, addition of 25 µM CAM833 significantly reduces

RAD51 accumulation in damage-induced foci to a further extent in both cell types, providing additional

evidence that CAM833 inhibits RAD51 protomer-protomer contacts during filament assembly.

The inhibitory effects of CAM833 are clearly observed by visualization of damage-induced RAD51

clusters as two-dimensional Voronoi polygons scaled to the maximum molecular density (Figure 4C). The

compound effectively suppresses RAD51 clustering in both cell types, and in particular, prevents the

formation of elongated filaments in control EUFA423+ BRCA2 cells. Example dSTORM pixel images

(Figure 4D) further illustrate these effects, providing multiple lines of evidence for CAM833 target

engagement and mechanism of action in cells.

**Figure 4. CAM833 inhibits RAD51 molecular clustering at DNA damage sites visualized by
SMLM.** (A) Diagrammatic representation of the bi-allelic truncating mutations (red and orange) affecting
BRCA2 in the patient-derived cell line EUFA423, and their functional complementation by full-length
BRCA2 (green) in EUFA423+BRCA2 cells. Black vertical lines depict the approximate positions of the
BRC repeats. (B) Distribution of the number of RAD51 molecules contained within damage-induced

clusters in EUFA423 or EUFA423+BRCA2 cells, without or with exposure to 25 μM CAM833, 3h after
exposure to 3 Gy ionising radiation. Plots show the mean (purple line) ± standard error, as well as the
median (purple dot) of the distributions. *** and n.s. indicates p-values lower than 10^{-5} and not
significant differences, respectively. (C) Representative SMLM images of RAD51, represented as 2D
Voronoi polygons. The colour of the polygons shows molecular densities normalized to the maximum
value. Scale bar: 500 nm. (D) High magnification SMLM images of damage-induced RAD51 filaments
in EUFA423+BRCA2 cells (DMSO-control left-hand panels), and their suppression by CAM833 (right-
hand panels), under the same experimental conditions, at higher magnification. Scale bar, 200 nm.
Images are shown either at low-resolution (LR) or super-resolved (SR).

CAM833 potentiates radiation-induced cell cycle arrest and increases apoptosis over time

Genetic inactivation of RAD51 enhances cellular sensitivity to ionising radiation, accompanied by cell

cycle arrest at the G2 checkpoint for DNA damage (Sonoda et al., 1998; Su et al., 2008). We

hypothesized that similar effects would be triggered by the exposure of cells to CAM833. Indeed, when

HCT116 colon carcinoma cells exposed to 20 μM CAM833 and 3 Gy IR were cell-cycle profiled by flow

cytometry 4-72 h after exposure, we observed that treatment with CAM833 causes an increase in the

percentage of cells with 4N DNA four hours after irradiation. Over time, there is a drop in the

percentage of cells with 4N DNA in both treated and control groups. However, whereas in the control

the percentage of cells in the apoptotic subG1 fraction remains below 5% throughout, in the compound-

treated cells this rises progressively to peak at 15% at 48 hours (Figure 5A). Thus, these results

suggest that treatment with CAM833 increases the progression of G2/M-arrested cells into apoptosis,

as opposed to recovery.

Figure 5. CAM833 potentiates radiation-induced cell cycle arrest with 4N DNA content and increased
apoptosis over time. (A) Cell cycle analysis of HCT116 cells over a 72-hour time course after treatment
with 20 µM CAM833 or DMSO control, combined with exposure to 3 Gy ionizing radiation. (B) plots the
dose-response curves for growth inhibition of HCT-116 cells combining 0 (blue circles) or 3 Gy (green
squares) of IR with different doses of CAM833 shown as $\log_{10}$M. Growth was measured after 96 hours
using the sulforhodamine B cell proliferation assay. Each plotted value represents the mean percent
growth inhibition ± SEM compared to control cells exposed to DMSO plus the indicated IR dose.

CAM833 causes a dose-dependent growth inhibition which is enhanced when combined with

ionising radiation

Consistent with these results, we find that CAM833 suppresses, in a concentration-dependent manner,

the growth of multiple cancer-derived human cell lines (Supplementary Table 2). For instance, CAM833

alone inhibits the growth of HCT116 colon carcinoma cells with an average GI_{50} value of 38 μM

(geometrical mean, n=18, SD 6.6 μM) after 96 h exposure. Moreover, our results suggest that CAM833

enhances cellular sensitivity to agents such as IR that induce DNA breakage normally repaired through

RAD51-dependent HDR. Thus, when combined with 3 Gy IR, CAM833 suppresses the growth of HCT116

cells with a GI_{50} of 14 μM (geometrical mean, n= 18, SD, 6.2 μM), a concentration more than 2-fold lower

than the GI_{50} for CAM833 alone (Figure 5B).

These findings prompted us to compare the effects of CAM833 with those of Carboplatin, a DNA cross-

linking agent used in the clinic to sensitise cancers to therapeutic radiation (Clamon et al., 1999). We first

exposed cells to a fixed 10 μM dose of either CAM833 or carboplatin, before treatment with 0-3 Gy IR,

and compared cell growth using the sulforhodamine B cell proliferation assay 96 h afterwards (Figure

6A). Whereas carboplatin alone is more growth-suppressive than CAM833 alone, combination with

increasing doses of IR potentiates the effects of CAM833 but not carboplatin (Figure 6A). The

concentration-response curves (Figures 6B, 6C) showing the effect of combining 0-3 Gy IR with different

concentrations of either carboplatin or CAM833 reflect a complex, dose-dependent response to the

combined effects of CAM833 with IR, leading to changes in the observed IC_{50} (Figure 6D). IR at 1-2 Gy

sharply potentiates the growth-inhibitory effects of 5×10^{-5} to 5×10^{-4}M doses of CAM833. IR at 3 Gy has a

smaller effect, across a wider dose range of CAM833. These differences could arise from biological

factors such as variations in the amount or type of IR-induced DNA lesions, and/or the relative

contribution of HDR to their repair. Collectively, these findings suggest the potential utility of CAM833 as

a radio-sensitizer.

Figure. 6. **Low-dose ionising radiation potentiates the effects of CAM833 but not carboplatin.** (A)
Cell growth after exposure to increasing levels of ionizing radiation in the presence of a fixed dose (10
μM) of either Carboplatin or CAM833. Bars depict percent growth compared to control cells exposed to
DMSO plus the indicated IR dose, represented as the mean ± SEM. Values < 100 indicate growth
inhibition. (B) and (C) plot dose-response curves for growth inhibition combining 0 (green circles), 1 Gy
(orange squares), 2 Gy (red triangles) or 3 Gy (blue triangles) of IR with different doses of carboplatin
(B) or CAM833 (C) shown as $\log_{10}$M. In B-C, each plotted value represents the mean percent growth
inhibition ± SEM compared to control cells exposed to DMSO plus the indicated IR dose. (D) shows the
observed changes in IC_{50} (expressed in μM) for growth inhibition derived from the curves in (B) and
(C). These data are representative of 3 independent experiments.

CAM833 potentiates PARP1 inhibition in cells wildtype for BRCA2

Cells deficient in RAD51-mediated HDR through the inactivation of tumour suppressor genes like *BRCA1*

or *BRCA2* exhibit hypersensitivity to poly-ADP ribose polymerase 1 (PARP1) inhibitors (Bryant et al.,

2005; Farmer et al., 2005). We therefore tested whether CAM833 could potentiate the growth inhibitory

effects of PARP1 inhibition by the inhibitor AZD2461 (Jaspers et al., 2013) in cells wildtype for BRCA2

(Figure 7). To this end, we determined dose-response curves for growth inhibition in cells exposed to

different doses of AZD2461 combined with a fixed dose of either 10 µM (Figure 7A) or 20 µM (Figure

7B) of CAM833. While CAM833 alone had little effect (blue triangles), its combination with AZD2461

potentiated the growth-suppressive effects of PARP1 inhibition in a dose-dependent manner.

Reciprocally, we also measured the dose-response curves for growth inhibition in cells exposed to

different doses of CAM833 combined with a fixed dose of either 0.1 µM (Figure 7C) or 1 µM (Figure 7D)

of AZD2461. These doses of AZD2461 have little effect when administered alone (blue diamonds), but

again, their combination with CAM833 potentiates growth suppression by PARP1 inhibition in cells wild-

type for BRCA2.

Figure 7. CAM833 potentiates the growth suppressive effect of PARP1 inhibition in BRCA2 wild-type cells. (A) and (B) show the dose-response curves for growth inhibition in HCT116 cells exposed to different doses of AZD2461 plotted as $\log_{10}$M combined with a fixed dose of either 10 µM (A) or 20 µM (B) of CAM833. Control experiments in which vehicle (DMSO) was added in place of AZD2461 are plotted in blue. Growth was measured 96 h after compound exposure using the SRB assay, and is depicted as the mean percent inhibition ± SEM compared to controls. (C) and (D) show reciprocal dose-response curves for growth inhibition after exposure to different doses of CAM833 plotted as $\log_{10}$M combined with a fixed dose of either 0.1 µM (C) or 1 µM (D) of AZD2461. Control experiments in which vehicle (DMSO) was added in place of CAM833 are plotted in blue. Measurements and plots are as in the previous panels.

DISCUSSION

We report here the discovery of CAM833, a sub-micromolar chemical inhibitor of the regulatory protein-

protein interaction between the RAD51 recombinase and the BRC repeat motifs of the tumour suppressor

BRCA2. Using structure determination by X-ray crystallography, we show that CAM833 engages with

two hydrophobic pockets on the surface of RAD51 that normally accommodate conserved hydrophobic

side chains from the BRC repeats of BRCA2, thereby directly competing with the RAD51:BRCA2

interaction. These pockets also normally mediate RAD51 multimerization on DNA substrates during the

process that leads to HDR, by accommodating corresponding hydrophobic residues from an adjacent

RAD51 protomer to form the protomer-protomer interface. Consistent with these structural

considerations, we show that CAM833 suppresses the assembly of RAD51 into damage-induced

filaments visualized by single-molecule localization microscopy. Moreover, we present multiple lines of

evidence suggesting that CAM833 potentiates growth inhibition, cell cycle arrest and cytotoxicity induced

by DNA damage, consistent with its predicted ability to suppress DNA repair by HDR. Our findings have

several important implications.

CAM833 is a well-characterized, selective chemical probe molecule which should prove valuable for

further elucidating the biology of the RAD51-BRCA2 protein-protein interaction and the associated HDR

pathways. Moreover, CAM833 is a chemically tractable starting point for the further, structure-guided

development of optimized inhibitory compounds with the potential for development into a drug compound

suitable for clinical studies. The development of this molecule through an innovative strategy of combining

a fragment hit with a peptide lead compound reveals what is likely to be a generally-applicable strategy

for the development of inhibitors of protein-protein interactions featuring a continuous peptide epitope

(Scott et al., 2016).

Our work exemplifies a strategy to modulate the activity of RAD51 during HDR through two of its key

regulatory protein-protein interactions. The first of these interactions is between RAD51 and the BRC

repeats of BRCA2, which is essential to target RAD51 to cellular sites of DNA damage, and may also

regulate RAD51 assembly on DNA substrates at these sites. The second interaction blocked by CAM833

is between RAD51 protomers, which occurs at the same structural motif engaged by the BRC repeats,

and enables RAD51 assembly by multimerization. Our findings provide several lines of evidence that

CAM833 acts in cells to engage RAD51 and block the protein-protein interactions that lead to its

multimerization at sites of DNA damage. We find using SMLM by d-STORM that CAM833 suppresses

the molecular clustering of RAD51 at damage sites, and prevents the extension of these clusters into

extended RAD51 filaments, providing evidence for target engagement and the proposed mechanism of

action. The mechanism of CAM833 action via the inhibition of RAD51-mediated HDR is further supported

by our finding that the compound sensitizes cells with wildtype BRCA2 to the growth inhibitory effects of

the PARP1 inhibitor, AZD2461. In the context of wildtype BRCA2, PARP1 inhibition alone is usually

ineffective. While these results further support the cellular mechanism underlying CAM833 action, we are

skeptical that systemic inhibition of RAD51 combined with the systemic effects of PARP1 inhibition has

therapeutic potential owing to the likelihood of dose-limiting mechanism-related toxicity in normal tissues.

However, CAM833 also potentiates the cellular effects of ionizing radiation, a potent inducer of DNA

breakage. When combined with IR, CAM833 sensitizes cells to IR-induced cell cycle arrest at the G2/M

phase of the cell cycle, and enhances cell death by apoptosis. Collectively, these findings provide

evidence supporting the further development of small-molecule inhibitors of the regulatory protein-protein

interactions of RAD51 for cancer therapy through radiosensitisation.

SIGNIFICANCE

Protein-protein interactions that mediate intracellular reactions leading to the repair of damaged DNA

are an important target for anti-cancer drug discovery. Here, we report using structure-guided lead

discovery the development of a potent orthosteric inhibitor, CAM833, of the protein-protein interaction

between the BRCA2 tumour suppressor and the RAD51 recombinase, which is critical for the error-free

repair of DNA breakage by homologous DNA recombination. The significance of our work is three-fold.

First, it exemplifies a strategy for the development of inhibitors that target protein-protein interactions

wherein a contiguous series of amino acids interact with a protein surface, by merging a peptidic

inhibitor derived from those amino acids with chemical fragment hits identified by biophysical and

crystallographic screening. Second, we demonstrate using single-molecule localization ("super-

resolution") microscopy that CAM833 inhibits RAD51 molecular clustering to prevent the assembly of

extended RAD51 filaments at sites of DNA damage, validating target engagement, and demonstrating

a unique mechanism of action. Finally, we show that CAM833 inhibits the cellular response to DNA

damage, potentiating in BRCA2 wild-type cells the cytotoxic effects both of ionizing radiation or of

PARP1 inhibitors, opening future avenues for anti-cancer drug development.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Dr Adrian Schreyer for developing a database for data management and Dr Tara Pukala and

Prof Carol Robinson for taking part in the early stages of this project. We are grateful for Diamond Light

Source for access to beamlines I02, I04 and I24 (proposals mx315 and mx7141) and ESRF for access

beamline ID14-4. We thank the X-ray crystallographic and Biophysics facilities at the Department of

Biochemistry for support and access. This work was funded by the Wellcome Trust Translational Award

(080083/Z/06/Z) and Seeding Drug Discovery Award (91050/Z/10/Z) and we acknowledge the support

of their Seeding Drug Discovery team, in particularly Dr Sarah Hardy and Prof Chas Bountra, for useful

discussions. This work was also funded by Medical Research Council (MRC) Programme grants

MC_UU_12022/1 and MC_UU_12022/8 to ARV, and a research grant from Astex Pharmaceuticals. We

thank WuXi AppTec for Pharmacokinetic and cell-line sensitivity data and Cyprotex for ADMET data.

Author contributions:

Experimental investigations in Figs. 1, 2 were carried out by DES, TPS, AGC, GF, CV, TM, ARB, MEM,

RS, DH, AH, ME, TP and JS; in Figs. 3, 5, 6 & 7, by NJF-N and LB; and in Fig. 4, by KH and AE. TLB,

ARV, CA, MH, LP, GM, JS and TP conceptualised the project, supervised the experimental work, and

analysed the results. DES, NJF-N, JS, MH, CA and ARV wrote the manuscript with input from all the

authors. Each corresponding author supervised and is responsible for distinct aspects of this multi-

disciplinary project. Chemistry was led by JS and CA; biochemistry and structural biology by MH; and

microscopy, cell genetics and cell biology by ARV.

Declarations

521   AV, LP and TB are inventors on a patent WO2004035621 - Use of crystal structure of human RAD51-

522   BRCA2 repeat complex in screening for anti tumour agents.

References

Adams, P.D., Afonine, P. V, Bunkóczi, G., Chen, V.B., Davis, I.W., Echols, N., Headd, J.J., Hung, L.-
W., Kapral, G.J., Grosse-Kunstleve, R.W., et al. (2010). PHENIX: a comprehensive Python-based
system for macromolecular structure solution. Acta Crystallogr. D. Biol. Crystallogr. *66*, 213–221.

Bagnolini, G., Milano, D., Manerba, M., Schipani, F., Ortega, J.A., Gioia, D., Falchi, F., Balboni, A.,
Farabegoli, F., De Franco, F., et al. (2020). Synthetic Lethality in Pancreatic Cancer: Discovery of a
New RAD51-BRCA2 Small Molecule Disruptor That Inhibits Homologous Recombination and
Synergizes with Olaparib. J. Med. Chem. *63*, 2588–2619.

Bignell, G., Micklem, G., Stratton, M.R., Ashworth, A., and Wooster, R. (1997). The BRC repeats are
conserved in mammalian BRCA2 proteins. Hum. Mol. Genet. *6*, 53–58.

Blundell, T.L., Jhoti, H., and Abell, C. (2002). High-throughput crystallography for lead discovery in drug
design. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. *1*, 45–54.

Brouwer, I., Moschetti, T., Candelli, A., Garcin, E.B., Modesti, M., Pellegrini, L., Wuite, G.J., and
Peterman, E.J. (2018). Two distinct conformational states define the interaction of human RAD51- ATP
with single-stranded DNA. EMBO J. *37*, e98162.

Bryant, H.E., Schultz, N., Thomas, H.D., Parker, K.M., Flower, D., Lopez, E., Kyle, S., Meuth, M.,
Curtin, N.J., and Helleday, T. (2005). Specific killing of BRCA2-deficient tumours with inhibitors of
poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase. Nature *434*, 913–917.

Budke, B., Kalin, J.H., Pawlowski, M., Zelivianskaia, A.S., Wu, M., Kozikowski, A.P., and Connell, P.P.
(2012a). An Optimized RAD51 Inhibitor That Disrupts Homologous Recombination without Requiring
Michael Acceptor Reactivity. J. Med. Chem. *1*.

Budke, B., Logan, H.L., Kalin, J.H., Zelivianskaia, A.S., Cameron McGuire, W., Miller, L.L., Stark, J.M.,
Kozikowski, A.P., Bishop, D.K., and Connell, P.P. (2012b). RI-1: a chemical inhibitor of RAD51 that
disrupts homologous recombination in human cells. Nucleic Acids Res. *40*, 7347–7357.

Budke, B., Tueckmantel, W., Miles, K., Kozikowski, A.P., and Connell, P.P. (2019). Optimization of
Drug Candidates That Inhibit the D-Loop Activity of RAD51. ChemMedChem *14*, 1031–1040.

Carreira, A., and Kowalczykowski, S.C. (2011). Two classes of BRC repeats in BRCA2 promote RAD51
nucleoprotein filament function by distinct mechanisms. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. *108*, 10448–10453.

Carreira, A., Hilario, J., Amitani, I., Baskin, R.J., Shivji, M.K.K., Venkitaraman, A.R., and
Kowalczykowski, S.C. (2009). The BRC repeats of BRCA2 modulate the DNA-binding selectivity of
RAD51. Cell *136*, 1032–1043.

Chen, C.-F., Chen, P.-L., Zhong, Q., Sharp, Z.D., and Lee, W.-H. (1999a). Expression of BRC Repeats
in Breast Cancer Cells Disrupts the BRCA2-Rad51 Complex and Leads to Radiation Hypersensitivity
and Loss of G 2 /M Checkpoint Control. J. Biol. Chem. *274*, 32931–32935.

Chen, G., Yuan, S.S.F., Liu, W., Xu, Y., Trujillo, K., Song, B., Cong, F., Goff, S.P., Wu, Y., Arlinghaus,
R., et al. (1999b). Radiation-induced assembly of Rad51 and Rad52 recombination complex requires
ATM and c-Abl. J. Biol. Chem. *274*, 12748–12752.

Clamon, G., Herndon, J., Cooper, R., Chang, A.Y., Rosenman, J., and Green, M.R. (1999).
Radiosensitization With Carboplatin for Patients With Unresectable Stage III Non–Small-Cell Lung

Cancer: A Phase III Trial of the Cancer and Leukemia Group B and the Eastern Cooperative Oncology
Group. J. Clin. Oncol. *17*, 4–4.

Cole, D.J., Janecek, M., Stokes, J.E., Rossmann, M., Faver, J.C., McKenzie, G.J., Venkitaraman, A.R.,
Hyvönen, M., Spring, D.R., Huggins, D.J., et al. (2017). Computationally-guided optimization of small-
molecule inhibitors of the Aurora A kinase–TPX2 protein–protein interaction. Chem. Commun. *53*,
9372–9375.

Conway, A.B., Lynch, T.W., Zhang, Y., Fortin, G.S., Fung, C.W., Symington, L.S., and Rice, P. a
(2004). Crystal structure of a Rad51 filament. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *11*, 791–796.

Coyne, A.G., Scott, D.E., and Abell, C. (2010). Drugging challenging targets using fragment-based
approaches. Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol. *14*, 299–307.

Davies, O.R., and Pellegrini, L. (2007). Interaction with the BRCA2 C terminus protects RAD51–DNA
filaments from disassembly by BRC repeats. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *14*, 475–483.

Davies, A.A., Masson, J.Y., McIlwraith, M.J., Stasiak, A.Z., Stasiak, A., Venkitaraman, A.R., and West,
S.C. (2001). Role of BRCA2 in control of the RAD51 recombination and DNA repair protein. Mol. Cell 7,
273–282.

Esashi, F., Galkin, V.E., Yu, X., Egelman, E.H., and West, S.C. (2007). Stabilization of RAD51
nucleoprotein filaments by the C-terminal region of BRCA2. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *14*, 468–474.

Falchi, F., Giacomini, E., Masini, T., Boutard, N., Di Ianni, L., Manerba, M., Farabegoli, F., Rossini, L.,
Robertson, J., Minucci, S., et al. (2017). Synthetic Lethality Triggered by Combining Olaparib with
BRCA2–Rad51 Disruptors. ACS Chem. Biol. *12*, 2491–2497.

Farmer, H., McCabe, N., Lord, C.J., Tutt, A.N.J., Johnson, D.A., Richardson, T.B., Santarosa, M.,
Dillon, K.J., Hickson, I., Knights, C., et al. (2005). Targeting the DNA repair defect in BRCA mutant cells
as a therapeutic strategy. Nature *434*, 917–921.

Haas, K.T., Lee, M., Esposito, A., and Venkitaraman, A.R. (2018). Single-molecule localization
microscopy reveals molecular transactions during RAD51 filament assembly at cellular DNA damage
sites. Nucleic Acids Res. *46*, 2398–2416.

Hattori, H., Skoulidis, F., Russell, P., and Venkitaraman, A.R. (2011). Context Dependence of
Checkpoint Kinase 1 as a Therapeutic Target for Pancreatic Cancers Deficient in the BRCA2 Tumor
Suppressor. Mol. Cancer Ther. *10*, 670–678.

Howlett, N.G., Taniguchi, T., Olson, S., Cox, B., Waisfisz, Q., De Die-Smulders, C., Persky, N.,
Grompe, M., Joenje, H., Pals, G., et al. (2002). Biallelic inactivation of BRCA2 in Fanconi anemia.
Science *297*, 606–609.

Huang, F., and Mazin, A. V. (2014). A Small Molecule Inhibitor of Human RAD51 Potentiates Breast
Cancer Cell Killing by Therapeutic Agents in Mouse Xenografts. PLoS One *9*, e100993.

Huang, F., Motlekar, N.A., Burgwin, C.M., Napper, A.D., Diamond, S.L., and Mazin, A. V. (2011).
Identification of specific inhibitors of human RAD51 recombinase using high-throughput screening. ACS
Chem. Biol. *6*, 628–635.

Ishida, T., Takizawa, Y., Kainuma, T., Inoue, J., Mikawa, T., Shibata, T., Suzuki, H., Tashiro, S., and
Kurumizaka, H. (2009). DIDS, a chemical compound that inhibits RAD51-mediated homologous pairing
and strand exchange. Nucleic Acids Res. *37*, 3367–3376.

Jaspers, J.E., Kersbergen, A., Boon, U., Sol, W., van Deemter, L., Zander, S.A., Drost, R., Wientjens,
E., Ji, J., Aly, A., et al. (2013). Loss of 53BP1 Causes PARP Inhibitor Resistance in Brca1 -Mutated
Mouse Mammary Tumors. Cancer Discov. *3*, 68–81.

Jeyasekharan, A.D., Liu, Y., Hattori, H., Pisupati, V., Jonsdottir, A.B., Rajendra, E., Lee, M.,
Sundaramoorthy, E., Schlachter, S., Kaminski, C.F., et al. (2013). A cancer-associated BRCA2
mutation reveals masked nuclear export signals controlling localization. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *20*,

1191–1198.

Kabsch, W. (2010). XDS. Acta Crystallogr. Sect. D Biol. Crystallogr. *66*, 125–132.

Lv, W., Budke, B., Pawlowski, M., Connell, P.P., and Kozikowski, A.P. (2016). Development of Small
Molecules that Specifically Inhibit the D-loop Activity of RAD51. J. Med. Chem. *59*, 4511–4525.

Moschetti, T., Sharpe, T., Fischer, G., Marsh, M.E., Ng, H.K., Morgan, M., Scott, D.E., Blundell, T.L., R.
Venkitaraman, A., Skidmore, J., et al. (2016). Engineering Archeal Surrogate Systems for the
Development of Protein–Protein Interaction Inhibitors against Human RAD51. J. Mol. Biol. *428*, 4589–
4607.

Nomme, J., Renodon-Cornière, A., Asanomi, Y., Sakaguchi, K., Stasiak, A.Z., Stasiak, A., Norden, B.,
Tran, V., and Takahashi, M. (2010). Design of potent inhibitors of human RAD51 recombinase based
on BRC motifs of BRCA2 protein: modeling and experimental validation of a chimera peptide. J. Med.
Chem. *53*, 5782–5791.

Normand, A., Rivière, E., and Renodon-Cornière, A. (2014). Identification and characterization of
human Rad51 inhibitors by screening of an existing drug library. Biochem. Pharmacol. *91*, 293–300.

Pastushok, L., Fu, Y., Lin, L., Luo, Y., DeCoteau, J.F., Lee, K., and Geyer, C.R. (2019). A Novel Cell-
Penetrating Antibody Fragment Inhibits the DNA Repair Protein RAD51. Sci. Rep. *9*, 11227.

Pellegrini, L., Yu, D.S., Lo, T., Anand, S., Lee, M., Blundell, T.L., and Venkitaraman, A.R. (2002).
Insights into DNA recombination from the structure of a RAD51-BRCA2 complex. Nature *420*, 287–293.

Rajendra, E., and Venkitaraman, A.R. (2010). Two modules in the BRC repeats of BRCA2 mediate
structural and functional interactions with the RAD51 recombinase. Nucleic Acids Res. *38*, 82–96.

Roberti, M., Schipani, F., Bagnolini, G., Milano, D., Giacomini, E., Falchi, F., Balboni, A., Manerba, M.,
Farabegoli, F., De Franco, F., et al. (2019). Rad51/BRCA2 disruptors inhibit homologous recombination
and synergize with olaparib in pancreatic cancer cells. Eur. J. Med. Chem. *165*, 80–92.

Rogakou, E.P., Pilch, D.R., Orr, A.H., Ivanova, V.S., and Bonner, W.M. (1998). DNA Double-stranded
Breaks Induce Histone H2AX Phosphorylation on Serine 139. J. Biol. Chem. *273*, 5858–5868.

Scott, D.E., Ehebauer, M.T., Pukala, T., Marsh, M., Blundell, T.L., Venkitaraman, A.R., Abell, C., and
Hyvönen, M. (2013). Using a fragment-based approach to target protein-protein interactions.
Chembiochem *14*, 332–342.

Scott, D.E., Marsh, M., Blundell, T.L., Abell, C., and Hyvönen, M. (2016). Structure-activity relationship
of the peptide binding-motif mediating the BRCA2:RAD51 protein-protein interaction. FEBS Lett. *590*,
1094–1102.

Shin, D.S., Pellegrini, L., Daniels, D.S., Yelent, B., Craig, L., Bates, D., Yu, D.S., Shivji, M.K., Hitomi,
C., Arvai, A.S., et al. (2003). Full-length archaeal Rad51 structure and mutants: mechanisms for RAD51
assembly and control by BRCA2. EMBO J. *22*, 4566–4576.

Shivji, M.K.K., Mukund, S.R., Rajendra, E., Chen, S., Short, J.M., Savill, J., Klenerman, D., and
Venkitaraman, A.R. (2009). The BRC repeats of human BRCA2 differentially regulate RAD51 binding
on single- versus double-stranded DNA to stimulate strand exchange. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.
106, 13254–13259.

Short, J.M., Liu, Y., Chen, S., Soni, N., Madhusudhan, M.S., Shivji, M.K.K., and Venkitaraman, A.R.
(2016). High-resolution structure of the presynaptic RAD51 filament on single-stranded DNA by
electron cryo-microscopy. Nucleic Acids Res. *44*, 9017–9030.

Sonoda, E., Sasaki, M.S., Buerstedde, J.M., Bezzubova, O., Shinohara, A., Ogawa, H., Takata, M.,
Yamaguchi-Iwai, Y., and Takeda, S. (1998). Rad51-deficient vertebrate cells accumulate chromosomal
breaks prior to cell death. EMBO J. *17*, 598–608.

Su, X., Bernal, J.A., and Venkitaraman, A.R. (2008). Cell-cycle coordination between DNA replication
and recombination revealed by a vertebrate N-end rule degron-Rad51. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *15*, 1049–

1058.

Takaku, M., Kainuma, T., Ishida-Takaku, T., Ishigami, S., Suzuki, H., Tashiro, S., van Soest, R.W.M.,
Nakao, Y., and Kurumizaka, H. (2011). Halenaquinone, a chemical compound that specifically inhibits
the secondary DNA binding of RAD51. Genes to Cells *16*, 427–436.

Trenner, A., Godau, J., and Sartori, A.A. (2018). A Short BRCA2-Derived Cell-Penetrating Peptide
Targets RAD51 Function and Confers Hypersensitivity toward PARP Inhibition. *17*, 1392–1405.

Turchick, A., Hegan, D.C., Jensen, R.B., and Glazer, P.M. (2017). A cell-penetrating antibody inhibits
human RAD51 via direct binding. Nucleic Acids Res. *45*, 11782–11799.

Turchick, A., Liu, Y., Zhao, W., Cohen, I., and Glazer, P.M. (2019). Synthetic lethality of a cell-
penetrating anti-RAD51 antibody in PTEN-deficient melanoma and glioma cells. Oncotarget *10*, 1272–
1283.

Venkitaraman, A.R. (2014). Tumour Suppressor Mechanisms in the Control of Chromosome Stability:
Insights from BRCA2. Mol. Cells *37*, 95–99.

Vonrhein, C., Flensburg, C., Keller, P., Sharff, A., Smart, O., Paciorek, W., Womack, T., and Bricogne,
G. (2011). Data processing and analysis with the autoPROC toolbox. Acta Crystallogr. Sect. D Biol.
Crystallogr. *67*, 293–302.

Vydyam, P., Dutta, D., Sutram, N., Bhattacharyya, S., and Bhattacharyya, M.K. (2019). A small-
molecule inhibitor of the DNA recombinase Rad51 from Plasmodium falciparum synergizes with the
antimalarial drugs artemisinin and chloroquine. J. Biol. Chem. *294*, 8171–8183.

Wang, Z.X. (1995). An exact mathematical expression for describing competitive binding of two
different ligands to a protein molecule. FEBS Lett. *360*, 111–114.

Ward, A., Dong, L., Harris, J.M., Khanna, K.K., Al-Ejeh, F., Fairlie, D.P., Wiegmans, A.P., and Liu, L.
(2017). Quinazolinone derivatives as inhibitors of homologous recombinase RAD51. Bioorg. Med.
Chem. Lett. *27*, 3096–3100.

West, S.C. (2003). Molecular views of recombination proteins and their control. Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.
4, 435–445.

Wong, A.K.C., Pero, R., Ormonde, P.A., Tavtigian, S. V., and Bartel, P.L. (1997). RAD51 Interacts with
the Evolutionarily Conserved BRC Motifs in the Human Breast Cancer Susceptibility Gene brca2. J.
Biol. Chem. *272*, 31941–31944.

Xu, J., Zhao, L., Xu, Y., Zhao, W., Sung, P., and Wang, H. (2017). Cryo-EM structures of human
RAD51 recombinase filaments during catalysis of DNA-strand exchange. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *24*, 40–
46.

Zhu, J., Zhou, L., Wu, G., Konig, H., Lin, X., Li, G., Qiu, X.-L., Chen, C.-F., Hu, C.-M., Goldblatt, E., et
al. (2013). A novel small molecule RAD51 inactivator overcomes imatinib-resistance in chronic myeloid
leukaemia. EMBO Mol. Med. 1–13.

Zhu, J., Chen, H., Guo, X.E., Qiu, X., Hu, C., Chamberlin, A.R., and Lee, W. (2015). Synthesis,
molecular modeling, and biological evaluation of novel RAD51 inhibitors. Eur. J. Med. Chem. *96*, 196–
208.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemical synthesis

See supplementary data for synthetic methods for all compounds.

ITC

ITC was performed using a Microcal ITC-200 instrument at 25 °C. Experiments typically involved titrating

a 10-fold excess of ligand in the injection syringe against the protein ([HumRadA2] = 60 µM or

[ChimRAD51] = 20 µM) in either 200 mM Tris buffer at pH 7.5 and 100 mM NaCl (HumRadA2) or 20 mM

potassium phosphate at pH 8.0 and 192 mM KCl (ChimRAD51). Titrations were typically performed with

5-10% DMSO and care was taken to ensure that the DMSO concentrations in the protein and ligand

solutions were well matched. The raw ITC data were fitted using a single-site binding model in Microcal

ITC LLC data analysis program in the Origin 7.0 package.

FP assay

Fluorescence Polarisation (FP) competition experiments were performed as described in (Moschetti et

al., 2016).In brief, binding of 10 nM Alexa Fluor 488-labelled BRC4 peptide to 50 nM ChimRAD51 protein

(giving approximately 80-90 % saturation of binding) was competed with increasing concentration of

inhibitor and the resulting competitive binding isotherms were measured and fitted using the expression

described by (Wang, 1995).

X-ray crystallography

Crystallisation and structure determination was done as described in (Moschetti et al., 2016). Ligands

were soaked into HumRadA1 or HumRadA22F crystals in the presence of cryo-protectant typically

overnight and crystals cryo-cooled in liquid N_2. Diffraction data was collected at Diamond and ESRF

synchrotrons and processed with XDS or autoproc (Kabsch, 2010; Vonrhein et al., 2011). Structures

were solved by molecular replacement using corresponding apo structures and ligands fitted into the

emerging density after brief refinement and complex structures refined to completion using phenix.refine

or autoBuster (Adams et al., 2010). All crystallographic statistics are shown in Table S2 and coordinates

and structure factors deposited in the Protein Data Bank under accession numbers 6TV4, 6TWR, 6TW4

and 6TW9.

Cell culture

HCT116 colon carcinoma cells and A549 lung adenocarcinoma cells were obtained from ATCC and

supplied mycoplasma free. HCT116 cells were maintained in McCoy's 5A (1x) + Glutamax-I growth

medium (Gibco, 36600-021) supplemented with fetal bovine serum (FBS, Gibco Life Technologies,

10270-106) at a final concentration of 10%. A549 cells were cultured in Dulbecco Modified Eagle medium

(DMEM) (1x) +Glutamax-I (Gibco Life Technologies, 31966-021) with 10% FBS. All cells were grown at

37 °C/ 5 % CO_2 in a humidified environment and all the assays were performed using these culturing

conditions.

Immunofluorescent visualisation of RAD51 foci/γH2AX foci in A549 cells using the Cellomics

Arrayscan V^{ti} high content microscopy

A549 cells were seeded at 15000 cells/well in 100 μl (1.5×10^5 cells/ml) in Nunc 96-well plates (cat#

167008) and grown overnight prior to the drug treatment. Compounds were added to cells such that the

final DMSO concentration did not exceed 1% v/v. Following compound addition, cells were exposed with

specified levels of ionising radiation using the Xstrahl RS225 X-ray generator. After incubation with the

compound for 6 hours, the medium was removed by aspiration and the cells washed twice in 1xPBS.

Cells were fixed using fixative solution (4% formaldehyde diluted in PBS) pre-warmed to 37°C for 10 min

at room temperature. Cells were then washed twice in 100 μl 1x PBS at room temperature. Cells were

then incubated in 100μl permeabilisation buffer for 5 minutes at room temperature after which they were

incubated with 100μl of blocking buffer (2% BSA (w/v), 0.2% Tween v/v, 0.1% TritonX-100 (v/v) in PBS)

for 90 minutes at room temperature. Cells were subsequently incubated with 50 μl of mouse polyclonal

anti-RAD51 Antibody (Abnova, cat # H00005888-B01P) diluted 1:200 in blocking solution for 2 h at room

temperature. Cells were washed in 100 μl wash buffer at room temperature (0.2% Tween (v/v), 0.1%

Triton X-100 (v/v) in 1x PBS) then incubated in 50 μl Alexa Fluor 488 labelled anti-mouse secondary

antibody (1:500) and Hoechst 33342 (10 mg/ml stock) counterstain at 1:1000 in blocking solution for 60

minutes at room temperature. Finally, cells were washed twice in wash buffer and then twice in PBS and

then stored in 100 µl in PBS with a light protective seal at 4 °C until read on the Cellomics Arrayscan V^{ti}

using a spot detector protocol. The number of cells analysed was 800 and the parameter used for analysis

was Total Spot Area.

For detection of γH2AX foci in A549 cells, 10,000 cells/well ($1x10^5$ cells/ml) were seeded in 100 µl and

left to grow overnight before treatment with compound. Cells were subsequently exposed to compounds

and either 3 Gy ionising radiation or mock treated (left on the bench at room temperature). Staining

protocol was identical as for RAD51 foci but anti-phospho γH2AX primary mouse monocolonal antibody

was used (Milipore, cat#05-636) at 1:2000 dilution.

SRB growth inhibition assay

Adherent cell lines (HCT116 and A549 cells) were seeded into flat-bottomed tissue culture 96-well plates

in a volume of 150 µL of growth medium. HCT116 cells were seeded at 750 cells per well and A549 cells

were seeded at 1000 cells per well. After 24 hours, compounds dissolved in DMSO were diluted in growth

medium and were added to cells such that the final DMSO concentration was 1% (v/v) and the final

volume in the well was 200 µL. Cells were then incubated in the presence of compound for 96 hours

before fixation.

Medium was removed from cells and 100 µL of cold 1% (v/v) trichloroacetic acid was added for 30

minutes at 4 degrees. The plates were washed three times in tap water and left to dry at room

temperature. The fixed cells were stained in a 0.057% sulphorodamine B/1% acetic acid solution (w/v)

and incubated at room temperature with agitation for 30 minutes after which the dye was removed and

the plates washed in 1% (v/v) acetic acid and left to dry. The dye was then solubilised in 10 mM Tris

solution (pH8) and incubated for 30 minutes under agitation. The plates were then read on a PHERAstar

plus plate reader (BMG Labtech) using the fluorescence intensity module (540-590 nm). Growth inhibition

was calculated relative to DMSO controls and GI_{50} values were calculated using Graphpad Prism.

For the PARP inhibitor experiments, the SRB method was used as described above to measure growth

inhibition with the exception that cells were seeded into 150 µl medium and then a combination of either

25 µl of CAM833, AZD2461 or DMSO was added to give a total volume of 200ul in the well.

Flow cytometry

Propidium iodide staining solution (PI solution) was used at the following final concentrations: 200 ug/ml

RNAase A (Sigma Aldrich, cat# 10109169001), 0.1% Triton-X 100 and 20 ug/ml of propidium iodide

solution diluted in 1x PBS. HCT116 cells were grown in 6-well plates in a total volume of 2 ml and treated

with either test compound or DMSO control for the designated time. After treatment, medium was

collected from the cells which were then washed in 1x PBS then removed from the plastic by the addition

of in 500 µl Trypsin/EDTA until cells were monodispersed. The trypsin was neutralised by the removed

media and the cell suspension was spun at 1000 rpm for 5 minutes. Cells were then washed a further

time in ice cold 1xPBS and spun at 1000 rpm for 5 minutes. Cells were then fixed in 4.5ml 70% ice cold

ethanol and 0.5 ml ice cold 1xPBS. Cells were left in fixing solution overnight at 4 ˚C until processing.

Cells were spun at 1000 rpm for 5 mins and then washed in 1xPBS, re-suspended in 0.5-1 ml of the PI

solution at incubated in the dark for 2 hours at room temperature. Cells were then counted and analysed

using a Becton Dickinson LSR II cytometer and FCS Express software.

Super-resolution microscopy

Single Molecule Localization Microscopy (SMLM) was achieved by direct Stochastic Optical

Reconstruction Microscopy (d-STORM) as described (Haas et al., 2018). Briefly, samples were prepared

for one colour 2D d-STORM utilizing a buffer containing 100 mM MEA-HCL (Sigma, M6500), 10%

glucose (Sigma), 0.5 mg/ml glucose oxidase (Sigma, G2133) and 40 µg/ml catalase (Sigma, C100) in

water at pH 7.5. Samples were imaged by direct STORM at room temperature in sealed 8-well ibidi µ-

slides utilizing an inverted N-STROM microscope (Nikon Ti, Japan) equipped with an Apochromat

100x/1.49 NA oil immersion objective. Samples were let to equilibrate for at least 30 minutes before

imaging to minimize thermal drift. Images were then acquired with highly inclined illumination and focus

was maintained by hardware autofocusing (Nikon Perfect Focus System). AlexaFluor647 was first

pumped in its dark state using the 640 nm laser line at maximum power (~150 mW) and then imaged

continuously with a power density of ~3 kW/cm^2. Data were acquired in 'streaming mode' with a field-of-

view (FOV) of 256x256 pixels (160 nm pixel size), at 65 frames per second for 25,000 frames with an

EMCCD camera (iXon Ultra DU897, Andor). The sparsity of single molecules per frame was controlled

using ~0.6 mW of the 405 nm laser. Images of AlexaFluor647 were acquired with a Quad Band Set for

TIRF applications (Chroma, TRF89901, ET – 405/488/561/640 nm) and the ET645/75 m emission filter

(Chroma).

Cluster data analysis

Single   molecule   data   was   analysed   using   the   Grafeo   program   available   at

https://github.com/inatamara/Grafeo-dSTORM-analysis- , as described in (Haas et al., 2018). Briefly, all

localizations with fewer than 1,000 detected photons or localization precision lower than 20 nm were

discarded. Next, the data was filtered using 2D Voronoi diagrams, setting the minimum density (an

inverse of Voronoi polygon VP size) to $5*10^{-5}$ nm^{-2}. Finally, small isolated detections were supressed by

thresholding univariate distance distribution function – a detection was rejected if it had less than 20

neighbours at the distance ≤100 nm. Next, two-dimensional Delaunay triangulation (DT) was computed.

Localizations were assigned to discreet clusters, connected components, by removing all DT edges

larger than 20 nm. All segmented connected components having less than 3 localizations were discarded.

The number of RAD51 molecules inside a cluster was estimated by dividing the number of localization

within a cluster by the expected number of localization obtained from isolated secondary antibodies used

to label RAD51.

Statistical tests

Simultaneous comparisons of the median values of multiple groups were performed using the Kruskal-

Wallis test at the significance level alpha of 0.05 and familywise error rate was corrected by adjusting p-

values using the Tukey-Kramer method.