Full Title: Meiotic DSB repair DNA synthesis tracts in *Arabidopsis thaliana*

Short Title: SPO11-dependent meiotic DNA synthesis.

Authors: Miguel Hernández Sánchez-Rebato[1&], Veit Schubert[2], Charles I. White[1]*

Affiliations:

[1] Institut de Génétique, Reproduction et Développement, CNRS UMR 6293, INSERM U1103,

Université Clermont Auvergne, 28, place Henri Dunant,

63001 Clermont-Ferrand, France.

[2] Leibniz Institute of Plant Genetics and Crop Plant Research (IPK) Gatersleben, D-06466

Seeland, Germany

[&]Current address: Centro de Biología Molecular Severo Ochoa,

Calle Nicolás Cabrera 1, 28049 Madrid, Spain

* Corresponding author.

E-mail: charles.white@cnrs.fr

Keywords: Meiosis, Recombination, DNA synthesis, DSB repair, SPO11

Abstract

We report here the successful labelling of meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis in the flowering plant, *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Incorporation of the thymidine analogue, EdU, enables visualisation of the footprints of recombinational repair of programmed meiotic DNA double-strand breaks (DSB), with ~400 discrete, SPO11-dependent, EdU-labelled chromosomal foci clearly visible at pachytene and later stages of meiosis. This number equates well with previous estimations of 200-300 DNA double-strand breaks per meiosis in Arabidopsis, confirming the power of this approach to detect the repair of most or all SPO11-dependent meiotic DSB repair recombination. The chromosomal distribution of these DNA-synthesis foci accords with that of early recombination markers and MLH1, which marks Class I crossover sites, colocalises with the EdU foci. Arabidopsis

It is currently estimated that ~10 cross-overs (CO) and an equivalent number of non-cross-overs (NCO) occur in each Arabidopsis male meiosis. Thus, at least 90% of meiotic recombination events, and very probably more, have not previously been accessible for analysis. Visual examination of the patterns of the foci on the synapsed pachytene chromosomes corresponds well with expectations from the different mechanisms of meiotic recombination and notably, no evidence for long Break-Induced Replication DNA synthesis tracts was found. Labelling of meiotic prophase I, SPO11-dependent DNA synthesis holds great promise for further understanding of the molecular mechanisms of meiotic recombination, at the heart of reproduction and evolution of eukaryotes.

Author Summary

Sexual reproduction involves the fusion of two cells, one from each parent. To maintain a stable chromosome complement across generations, these specialized reproductive cells must be produced through a specialized cell division called meiosis. Meiosis halves the chromosome complement of gametes and recombines the parental genetic contributions in each gamete, generating the genetic variation that drives evolution. The complex mechanisms of meiotic recombination have been intensely studied for many years and we now know that it involves the repair of programmed chromosomal breaks through recombination with intact template DNA sequences on another chromatid. At the molecular level, this is known to involve new DNA synthesis at the sites of repair/recombination and we report here the successful identification and characterisation of this DNA neo-synthesis during meiosis in the flowering plant, Arabidopsis. Both the characteristics and numbers of these DNA synthesis tracts accord with expectations from theory and earlier studies. Potentially applicable to studies in many organisms, this approach provides indelible footprints in the chromosomes and has the great advantage of freeing researchers from dependence on indirect methods involving detection of proteins involved in these dynamic processes.

Introduction

Meiosis is the specialised cell division that halves chromosome numbers during the production of gametes, essential for the maintenance of stable ploidy across generations in sexually-reproducing organisms. In contrast to mitosis, in which duplication of the genome is followed by a single cellular division, meiosis involves one round of DNA replication followed by two rounds of division. Separating sister chromatids to opposite poles, the second meiotic division is, in broad terms, analogous to mitosis. Balanced chromosomal segregation during the first division however requires that homologous chromosomes recognise each other, pair and orient themselves on the spindle so that the two members of each pair move to opposite poles during anaphase. This is ensured by the programmed induction of homologous recombination through the induction and repair of DNA double-strand breaks (DSB) during the first meiotic prophase.

This programmed, highly regulated process of DNA damage and repair is essential for proper meiotic chromosome alignment and segregation and thus fertility in eukaryotes, with some known exceptions, notably *Drosophila* and *C. elegans* (see review by [1]). Following the programmed induction of DSB by the SPO11 complex, the cleaved DNA ends are resected to produce 3'-ssDNA overhangs, onto which the recombinases DMC1 and RAD51 are loaded to form presynaptic nucleoprotein filaments. These presynaptic nucleofilaments are the active molecular species in the search for, and invasion of an intact homologous DNA template, the first steps of DNA repair via homologous recombination. DNA synthesis then extends the invading 3' end across the template and the joint-molecule intermediate structures are further processed to yield the two main products of HR-mediated DSB repair: gene

conversions associated with reciprocal exchange of their flanking sequences (crossovers, CO),

or not (non-crossovers, NCO).

DNA synthesis is thus inherent to DSB repair via homologous recombination. In the

1960s, studies based on incorporation of H3-thymidine and C14-thymidine into newly

synthesised DNA gave evidence for meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis in the plants *Lilium*

longiflorum and *Trillium erectum*, the amphibian *Triturum viridescens*, mice and humans [2–

6]. These early studies have since been extended to show association of DNA synthesis with

pachytene recombination nodules in *Drosophila* female meiosis and with the synaptonemal

complex in mouse spermatocytes [7,8].

Labelling with 5-bromo-2′ -deoxyuridine (BrdU) in budding yeast has been used to

confirm the presence of SPO11-dependent meiotic prophase DNA synthesis [9]. The authors

characterized both single-molecule BrdU tracts at a recombination hotspot and the timing of

their appearance in relation to other meiotic features. Observation of SPO11-dependent,

BrdU labelling pattern has also been described in *Tetrahymena* [10] but, to our knowledge,

no further data has been published in other organisms. In Arabidopsis, incorporation of BrdU

or 5-ethynyl-2′- deoxyuridine (EdU) during pre-meiotic S-phase has been used to establish

the meiotic timeline of meiosis in Arabidopsis pollen mother cells (PMC) [11–13]. There are

thus far no reports of labelling non-S-Phase DNA synthesis during Arabidopsis meiosis.

The induction of synchronous meiosis in populations of cells has been key to a number

of major advances in understanding of the molecular processes that make up the meiotic

division [14–18]. However, such direct approaches have not been available in other

organisms and this has resulted in significant gaps in understanding. A clear example of this is

seen in the flowering plant, *A. thaliana*. Estimations of numbers of SPO11-induced DSB in

Arabidopsis pollen mother cells (PMC, male meiosis) are ~200-300 per meiosis. Of these, ~10

yield inter-homologue CO and another 10 have been shown to give inter-homologue NCO

[19,20]. Thus, the repair outcome of at least 90% of meiotic DSB in Arabidopsis is not known.

The situation is strikingly different in budding yeast with 66 NCO plus 90.5 CO estimated per

meiosis, the sum of which is very close to the estimated 140-170 meiotic DSB. Similarly in

mouse, 273 NCO plus 27 CO sum close to the estimated 200-400 meiotic DSB [21–24].

Detection of recombination-associated DNA synthesis tracts offers an attractive path to

understand the mechanisms underlying these "invisible" meiotic recombination events in

Arabidopsis and potentially in other organisms. We present here the successful labelling of

SPO11-dependent, meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis by EdU incorporation in Arabidopsis

PMC.

Results

EdU labelling of DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis

In Arabidopsis, while each inflorescence contains flower buds bearing PMC at different

pre-meiotic and meiotic stages, the PMC of the anthers of a given flower bud are nearly

synchronous [25,26]. Along with the sequence of cytologically distinguishable meiotic stages

in the buds of a given inflorescence, in practice it is relatively straightforward to classify PMC

subpopulations within the meiotic timeline.

Timelines of Arabidopsis male meiosis concord that pre-meiotic G2 phase lasts 7-10

hours and that pollen mother cells advance from the beginning of leptotene to the end of

pachytene in 19 to 21 hours [11–13,27](summarized in Figure 1). Subsequent stages of

meiosis are considerably faster, with post-pachytene meiosis estimated to take from 2.7 to 9

hours. Given that meiotic DSB formation begins at the onset of prophase I (early leptotene)

and continues for a few hours [28], any meiotic prophase I DSB-repair DNA synthesis should

occur at least 7-10 hours after the end of pre-meiotic S-phase. We thus decided to incubate

the inflorescences with the nucleoside analogue for a 24-hour pulse to entirely cover the

prophase I DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis window. Given the relative synchrony of

progression through meiosis of the PMC from a given flower bud, the easily identifiable

appearance of S-phase labelling and the possibility to easily situate subpopulations of meiotic

cells in the temporal meiotic sequence, it seemed reasonable to expect that we would be

able to exclude S-phase labelled meioses, and thus focus our analyses on those labelled

during Prophase I.

Notwithstanding the current absence of direct evidence of the timing of occurrence of

meiotic recombination intermediates in Arabidopsis, DAPI staining and immunolocalisation of

meiotic proteins implicated in early invasion intermediates (RAD51/DMC1), joint molecules

(MSH4, early HEI10) and resolution (MLH1, late HEI10) give a clear picture of the progression

of key events through meiotic prophase I. In pachytene, when synapsis is complete, mean

numbers of MLH1 foci correspond to the number of Class I crossovers (~90% of total CO),

measured by counting of chiasmata at metaphase I. In analogy to organisms for which

recombination intermediates can be tracked directly, it is reasonable to assume that most

recombination events are either resolved or close to resolution at pachytene in Arabidopsis.

As summarised in Figure 1 , inflorescences were thus incubated with EdU for 24 hours to

ensure coverage of the window of DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis through prophase I

up to the end of pachytene. Pachytene cells observed at the end of the 24-hour pulse would

have traversed prophase I up to that point in the presence of the analogue. As mentioned

above, nuclei with pre-meiotic S-phase labelling were easily identified and excluded from the

analysis.

Non-replicative DNA synthesis tracts are present from pachytene until the end of meiosis

Early prophase I meiocytes, including cells in leptotene and zygotene, showed complete

or extensive EdU labelling of their chromosomes (Figure 2a). This replicative labelling

confirms, as expected, that they had passed through pre-meiotic S-Phase during the EdU

pulse [11–13,29,30]. Furthermore, nuclei with partial replicative labelling of DAPI-dense, late

replicating heterochromatic regions were observed, as expected for cells that were in

mid/late S-phase at the beginning of the EdU pulse (second row of Figure 2a) [30–33].

In striking contrast, pachytene nuclei showed faint, discrete foci of a considerably

smaller size (Figure 2a Pachytene, see also Figure 4a and Figure S1). These foci are very faint

through the microscope eyepiece, but are clearly visible when the images are processed. This

difference in labelling intensity between S-phase and prophase EdU incorporation is not

unexpected, considering that the latter would correspond to DNA synthesis tracts of tens to a

few thousands of base pairs, while replicative DNA synthesis would range from megabase-

long late-replicating regions to the whole genome (4C ≈ 520 Mb in these prophase I nuclei)

[34]. We note also the presence of labelled mitochondria in these images, confirming their

replication during pre-meiotic G2 and/or meiotic prophase I cells. These labelled

mitochondria, clearly visible from pachytene on, are also present at earlier stages, but are not

readily visible due to the very strong fluorescence of the S-phase replicative nuclear labelling

(Figure 2).

The EdU foci observed in pachytene cells appear well-distributed across the

chromosomes, but are less present in DAPI-dense, heterochromatic regions (Figure 2a

Pachytene, Figure 4a). Furthermore, given the tighter-packed DNA in these regions, the

observed lesser density of EdU foci is presumably an underestimation. This pattern of foci

concords with genetic crossover mapping, studies of meiotic DSB (SPO11-oligo sequencing)

and immunofluorescence studies of the distributions of early recombination proteins, all of

which show meiotic recombination to follow a relatively even distribution across the

Arabidopsis genome, with the exception of (heterochromatic) centromeric regions which

have significantly lower densities of SPO11-oligos and crossovers [34–36].

As summarised in Figure 1, based on published timelines [11–13,27] and our own

measurements, a meiocyte observed at the telophase II/tetrad stage would have been at

leptotene/zygotene at the beginning of the 24-hour EdU pulse. We had thus good reason to

expect that prophase I EdU foci would be observable in all meiotic stages up to the end of

meiosis. This was indeed the case, with EdU foci visible from pachytene to the end of meiosis

(telophase II/tetrad Figure 2). Meiotic chromosomes condense progressively as they traverse

prophase I, evolving from a mass of hardly-distinguishable thin fibres at early leptotene to

thick synapsed fibres in pachytene and to individualised dense bivalents with a more

polygonal shape at metaphase I. This condensation produces significant shortening of the

chromosomes and results in changes of the visual character of the EdU signals. While most

EdU foci at pachytene appear as discrete spots, they merge into larger patches at diplotene

and this continues through diakinesis, up to the greatest condensation at metaphase I (Figure

2, diplotene-metaphase I). Furthermore, heterochromatic, centromeric regions become

more easily identifiable when bivalents individualize at diakinesis and the relatively low

density of EdU signals in these regions becomes clearly visible. This is even more pronounced

at metaphase I, with clear visual differentiation between the centromeric and

pericentromeric regions of the two homologous chromosomes of each bivalent. Finally, the

EdU signals are observed throughout the second meiotic division, changing their appearance

with evolving chromosome condensation and shape in a way similar to that seen during the

first meiotic division (Figure 2, prophase II-tetrad).

Prophase I DNA synthesis is SPO11-dependent

Meiotic recombination is initiated by the induction of DNA DSB by the SPO11 complex at

the beginning of meiotic prophase I. To verify that the discrete non-replicative DNA synthesis

tracts observed at pachytene and subsequent stages originate from SPO11-dependent

meiotic DSB repair, we carried out this analysis in parallel in *spo11-1* mutant plants [37]

(Figure 3). Pachytene images were analysed with the IMARIS software package (Bitplane AG,

Oxford Instruments, UK) *Spots* function. EdU foci were selected based on diameter and mean

intensity in the EdU channel, and filtered to retain only those colocalising with chromosome

fibres (mean intensity cutoff in the DAPI channel). A high-cut filter of mean intensity in the

EdU channel was also applied to filter out the much-brighter organellar foci.

WT pachytenes show 409.5 ± 7.96 EdU foci per nucleus (mean ± SEM; n = 45 nuclei;

Figure 2, Figure S1), with counts ranging from 323 to 510 (plus one outlier with 263). Ten of

the 45 image stacks analysed were acquired via 3D-SIM, for comparison with the Zeiss LSM

800/Airyscan confocal image stacks and to confirm that we were not missing foci. WT cells

imaged with 3D-SIM had a mean 400.6 ± 14.74 EdU foci (n = 10) while those imaged with the

confocal microscope had a mean of 412.1 ± 9.38 EdU foci (n = 35). Hence, no significant

difference was observed between both imaging systems (unpaired t-test; p = 0.55) (Figure 4).

In *spo11-1* plants, 39.2 ± 2.83 EdU foci per cell (mean ± SEM; n = 35 cells; Figures 3, 4)

were detected in zygotene/pachytene nuclei. Thus, some EdU foci were detected in *spo11-1*

meioses, but in significantly lower numbers and, in general, considerably smaller and weaker

than the foci in the WT. A similar signature could be observed in *spo11-1* cells at subsequent

meiotic stages (Figure 3, diakinesis to Telophase II), with some EdU foci detected but in much

lower numbers. This ~10-fold reduction in mean numbers of foci with respect to the WT is

highly significant (unpaired t-test; p < 0.0001) and confirms the SPO11-dependence of the

great majority of the observed pachytene EdU foci. That the expected S-phase EdU labelling

was observed in early prophase I *spo11-1* PMC nuclei (Figure 3, early PI, mid PI, second row)

and organellar EdU labelling was comparable in *spo11-1* and WT meioses (Figures 2, 3),

confirms that the EdU labelling pulse worked as expected in both WT and *spo11-1* plants.

In interpreting these numbers it is important to note that although Arabidopsis *spo11*

meiosis does complete and produce (mostly inviable) pollen, chromosome pairing and

synapsis are very severely reduced in *spo11* meiosis and the zygotene/pachytene stages are

only identifiable by their characteristic chromosome condensation and their temporal

positioning [37]. Thus, *spo11-1* PMC at leptotene can be differentiated from the zygotene-

like state by the condensation of the chromosomes (thickness of the fibres) and the

clustering of DAPI-dense regions. Also, *spo11-1* zygotene/pachytene-like cells that do not

show S-phase EdU labelling are in a more advanced state that those that do show it, as they

would have completed S-phase at the beginning of the pulse (Figure 3a, mid PI, third row vs

second row). Identification of later meiotic stages in *spo11-1* meioses presents no difficulties

(Figure 3).

Prophase I DNA synthesis patterns mirror meiotic recombination features

Meiotic recombination models predict different patterns of DNA synthesis tracts

depending on how recombination intermediates are formed and resolved. Non-crossover

events generated by either synthesis-dependent strand annealing (SDSA) or dHJ dissolution

recombination, both expected to produce DNA synthesis tracts in only one of the two

implicated chromatids and thus in only one of the homologous chromosomes in

interhomologue recombination. On the other hand, dHJ resolution resulting in either

crossover or non-crossover products would generate DNA synthesis tracts in both

participating chromatids - and both chromosomes in interhomologue events.

The expected patterns of resulting EdU foci are shown schematically in Figure 5a and

examples of segments of the synaptonemal complex (SC) from SIM pachytene micrographs

are shown in Figure 5b. The paired, homologous chromosomes are clearly distinguishable in

these images, permitting a first analysis of different patterns of EdU foci. No obvious bias is

visible in the disposition of Individual EdU foci in these images. Foci are seen at both the

internal (facing the homologous chromosome) and external faces of the paired chromosomes

in the SC fibre, as well as in the middle of the SC (Figure 5).

Differences can however be seen when EdU foci are analysed with respect to adjacent

foci, with three clear configurations of pairs of foci, examples of which are circled on the

images shown in Figure 5b:

Class (1) isolated individual foci located on one of the two homologues (one SC lateral

axis; Fig. 5b, white circle).

Class (2) "pairs" of foci on one of the two homologues (one SC lateral axis; Fig. 5b,

green circle).

Class (3) "pairs" of foci on the two homologues (both SC lateral axes; Fig. 5b, yellow

circle).

Further examples of these patterns can be found in the pachytene images of Figure S2.

Finally, we note the absence of the long labelling tracts expected from BIR

recombination, implying that such events are either rare or "short", or both, in Arabidopsis

meiosis.

Prophase I DNA synthesis colocalize with class I crossovers

As the SPO11-dependent, meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis foci result from

recombinational repair of meiotic DSB, genetic crossovers should co-localize with a subset of

these EdU foci. Class I CO are detectable cytologically in Arabidopsis by the immunolocalization

of proteins such as MLH1.

Combining labelling of EdU tracts with immunolocalization of MLH1 (Figure 6) gave 7.86

± 0.24 (mean ± SEM; n = 29) MLH1 foci per WT pachytene, as expected [38]. 95.6% (n=228) of

all MLH1 foci colocalized with an EdU focus and the remaining 4.4% were adjacent to one.

Although this conclusion must be tempered due to the high number of EdU foci in these

images, Arabidopsis Class I CO are thus physically associated with the prophase I DNA synthesis

tracts at this level of resolution.

Discussion

Identification of meiotic DNA repair-associated DNA synthesis tracts

We present here the labelling and characterisation of SPO11-dependent, meiotic

prophase I DNA synthesis tracts through incorporation of the thymidine analogue EdU in

pollen mother cells of Arabidopsis plants. By labelling DNA synthesis associated with the

repair of meiotic DSB, this approach holds great promise for the future understanding of

recombination patterns and mechanisms, notably for studies of NCO and sister-chromatid

exchange (SCE) recombination. For practical reasons, molecular and genetic studies of

meiotic recombination have essentially been focussed on events implicating the transfer of

DNA sequence polymorphisms between the two recombining DNA molecules. The necessary

presence of such polymorphism has, for instance, complicated significantly the analysis of the

roles of meiotic SCE [39–46] and while EdU labelling has recently been applied to analysis of

meiotic sister-chromatid CO in *C. elegans* (Almanzar *et al*, 2021; Toraason *et al*, 2021;

Billmyre & Hughes, 2021), this approach does not appear adapted to the study of NCO.

Detection of NCO events in Arabidopsis has been elusive. Mapping NCO genome-wide by

sequencing Arabidopsis tetrads has estimated NCO numbers to be of the same order as CO,

~10 events per meiosis, with gene conversion tracts ranging between a few tens to a few

hundreds of bp [19,20,50,51]. Notwithstanding this (surprisingly) low number of NCO,

numbers of CO are in agreement with chiasmata counting and immunolocalisation of CO

markers. Thus, given the 200-300 DSB per meiosis in the these cells, the repair of at least 90%

(and very possibly >98% [52] of meiotic DSB in Arabidopsis is not accessible to analysis with

current methods. In this work, we present the development of meiotic prophase DNA

synthesis labelling as a means to fully characterise meiotic DSB-repair in Arabidopsis

meiocytes.

Initial tests showed that incubating inflorescence stems for 24 hours in EdU solution

resulted in two clear sub-populations of meiocytes, distinguishable by their meiotic stage and

pattern of EdU labelling. The first consists of late G2 + early prophase I cells (leptotene,

zygotene) whose chromosomes show very strong EdU signals, either genome-wide or in large

patches. These patterns are consistent with those expected from pre-meiotic S-phase

replicative EdU incorporation:

I) This extensive EdU labelling is observed in meioses of both wild-type and *spo11* mutant

plants.

II) The extensive and intense fluorescent signals are similar to those observed in previous

reports of EdU/BrdU incorporation during pre-meiotic replication [11–13,29].

III) Extrapolating from published meiotic timelines and our own studies, PMC in pre-

meiotic S-phase at the beginning of the pulse are expected to advance at most to

leptotene-zygotene during the 24 hour EdU pulse (see Figure 1).

IV) The signal in partially labelled early prophase I cells corresponds principally to late-

replicating, DAPI-dense, heterochromatic regions, in accordance to expectations for cells

in late S-phase at the beginning of the EdU pulse.

The second population of EdU-labelled meiocytes includes cells at meiotic stages from

pachytene to the end of meiosis (tetrads), whose chromosomes show much fainter, discrete

EdU labelling. Clearly resolving into individual foci at the stages in which the chromosomes

are less condensed, these foci group into "patches" as chromosome condensation proceeds

post-prophase I. These foci have a number of characteristics which permit their identification

with confidence as meiotic DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis tracts:

I) These discrete EdU-label foci are SPO11-dependent, analogously to earlier

observations in yeast [9], confirming with high confidence that they result from EdU

incorporation at DNA synthesis tracts associated to meiotic DSB repair. Some EdU foci are

observed in *spo11-1* meioses, although at considerably lower numbers than in the wild type

(39 versus 410 per meiosis respectively). While some of these may come from mistaken

assignation of organellar DNA foci, we note that some crossing-over is detected in

Arabidopsis *spo11* plants, RAD51 foci are detected in Arabidopsis *spo11* meiosis and DMC1

foci in rice meioses [37,53–55]. Furthermore, given that both meiotic Arabidopsis SPO11

proteins are needed for normal meiotic DSB induction, some leakage may occur in plants

lacking one or the two SPO11 proteins [54,56–59]. Alternatively, they may correspond to

SPO11-independent breakage of mechanical, chemical or enzymatic origin. If so, that they do

produce DNA neo-synthesis tracts argues for their repair by HR rather than End Joining.

II) The SPO11-dependent foci are seen at later meiotic stages than those with replicative

labelling and these nuclei had thus completed S-phase prior to the beginning of the pulse.

Given the known timing of meiosis in these cells, meiotic DSB repair DNA synthesis will have

occurred during the EdU pulse in these cells [9,13,14,38,60]. We note that while present in

considerably lower numbers than in the wild type (39 versus 410 per meiosis, respectively),

there are some EdU foci in *spo11-1* meioses.

III) The discrete EdU foci observed at pachytene and later stages are both much less

intense and smaller in size than the generalised labelling in leptotene-zygotene nuclei. This is

expected given the predicted size of DNA synthesis tracts associated to recombination events

(few bases to some kilobases of DNA), with respect to replicative labelling (megabases to the

full genome).

IV) The numbers of EdU foci measured at pachytene concord with published estimations

of numbers of meiotic DSB and HR intermediates in Arabidopsis. A mean of 409.5 ± 7.96

(mean ± SEM; n = 45 meioses) DNA repair-associated DNA synthesis foci were observed in

WT pachytenes. This number is a little higher than estimations of meiotic DSB numbers

through immunolocalisation of early recombination proteins in Arabidopsis (RAD51 in most

cases). Reported numbers of RAD51 foci per Arabidopsis meiosis range from 90 to 250 per

meiosis, and compare well with a recent report of 239 ± 30 (mean ± SD) prophase I SPO11-1

foci [56]. Given the limitations of immunodetection and that the recruitment/release of these

proteins at DSB/recombination sites is dynamic, these numbers presumably under-estimate

the true values. Notably, a recent report using a STED super-resolution microscope found

more than 1000 RAD51 foci per PMC meiosis [52]. Thus, the mean of 409.5 DNA repair-

associated synthesis tracts per meiosis reported here is probably closer to the true value than

that of protein-immunodetection approaches. It is of course necessary to take into account

the fact that resolution of dHJ recombination intermediates is expected to result in patches

of neo-synthesized DNA on both implicated chromatids, resulting in two foci from a single

recombination event. Such events are however estimated to represent ~5% or less of meiotic

DSB repair events in Arabidopsis and so are not expected to impact significantly the

estimations of total events.

V) DAPI-dense heterochromatic, centromeric regions have a visibly lower density of

SPO11-dependent EdU foci in pachytene/diplotene and beyond (particularly noticeable at

diakinesis/MI). This concords with SPO11-oligo mapping of meiotic DSB patterns in

Arabidopsis PMC, which shows that centromeric regions have a much lower density of DSB

than the rest of the chromosome [34,36] .

VI) Combining labelling of EdU tracts with immunolocalization of MLH1 confirms that, as

expected, Class I CO are physically associated with the prophase I DSB repair DNA synthesis

tracts (Figure 6).

383   Meiotic DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis tracts mirror meiotic recombination

384   features

As presented in Figure 7, different mechanisms of recombinational repair of meiotic DSB

will result in different patterns of DNA synthesis tracts associated to an HR event. The most

obvious difference is that DNA synthesis is expected to be found on only the recipient

chromatid, which carried the initiating DSB (Figure 7f), or on both the recipient and donor

chromatids (Figure 7g, h). SDSA and dHJ dissolution mechanisms would lead to the former

and dHJ resolution to the latter. A special case is the BIR mechanism, which is expected to

result in a long DNA synthesis tract, potentially extending all the way to the end of the

recipient chromatid (Figure 7c).

Visual inspection of the pachytene images clearly shows different configurations of the

EdU foci, which we have arbitrarily divided into 3 classes suggestive of the DNA synthesis

patterns expected at sites of recombination:

Class (1) isolated individual foci located on one of the two homologues (one lateral axis)

(Fig. 5b, Fig. S2). Only the initially broken chromatid (recipient) will bear (EdU-substituted)

neosynthesized DNA tracts in repair via SDSA (Fig. 7a, b, f) and dHJ dissolution (Fig. 7a, d, e, f)

recombination.

Resolution of double Holiday junction (dHJ) intermediates (Fig7d) can give rise to gene

conversions, accompanied (Fig. 7g) or not (Fig. 7h) by a CO. In both cases, this can lead to the

presence of neo-synthesized DNA on both the donor and recipient chromatids. These events

would thus be expected to result in paired DNA synthesis tracts on the two participating

chromatids: either on one chromosome (Class (2) - one lateral axis) for sister chromatid

events, or on both homologues (Class (3) - both lateral axes).

Class (2) are thus "pairs" of foci on one of the two homologues (one SC lateral axis),

which could result from recombination between sister chromatids through the dHJ resolution

pathway.

Class (3) are "pairs" of foci on the two homologues (both lateral axes), which could result

from recombination between homologues through the dHJ resolution pathway.

We find no evidence for long DNA synthesis tracts indicative of BIR recombination in our

images. Thus, either BIR replication tracts are not distinguishably longer than other DSB

repair-DNA synthesis, or the BIR mechanism is a minor (or non-) contributor to DSB repair in

Arabidopsis meiosis. In this context, we note that an earlier effort to detect mitotic BIR repair

in bleomycin-treated *Vicia faba* root tips described asymetric interstitial G2-phase EdU

labelling of interstitial tandem-repeat regions, although no extended labelling tracts out to

the end of the chromatid were observed [61].

Inference of the recombination pathways underlying the 3 classes of foci of course

remains speculative in the absence of molecular analyses of the EdU tracts themselves. FISH

on extended DNA fibres was used in an earlier study in yeast to determine the lengths and

positioning of BrdU-substituted DNA synthesis tracts with respect to DSB hotspots [9]. They

observed two main classes of tracts: tracts that extended from the DSB towards only one side

of the DSB and tracts that extended on both sides. These two classes correspond to the tracts

expected in single DNA molecules that took part in CO events in the first case and NCO

events via SDSA in the second, which were further validated studying their dynamics in

recombination mutants. We have previously carried out DNA combing plus fibre FISH in

Arabidopsis [62], but the lack of strong meiotic DSB hotspots with a precisely localised DSB

site complicates the possible use of this approach in Arabidopsis meiosis. Rather, we are

actively developing an approach based on the direct detection of EdU-substituted DNA tracts

by Nanopore sequencing. It is hoped that this approach will permit unambiguous

characterisation of the principal meiotic recombination products and underlying mechanisms

in Arabidopsis, as well as of more complex events.

Materials and Methods

Plant material and growing conditions

Standard conditions were used for growth of wild-type *A. thaliana Col-0* and *spo11*-1-2
[37] plants. Seeds were sown on soil substrate (Klasmann-Deilmann GmbH TS3 FIN 416GF,
Geeste, Germany), stratified for 2-4 days at 4°C and grown in climate chambers at 23°C and
60% relative humidity, under a daily cycle of 16 hours of light (110-140 µmol m^{-2} s^{-1}) and 8
hours of darkness.

Meiotic chromosome preparation by spreading

Meiosis was analysed following the chromosome spreading method of Ross et al. [63],
with minor modifications. Inflorescences were collected in 3:1 ethanol:glacial acetic acid
fixative solution and left overnight at room temperature. The fixative was then substituted
with fresh fixative solution and the tubes were transferred to 4°C. This step was repeated the
following 2-3 days. At this point, fixed inflorescences can be stored at 4°C for further use or
prepared for microscopy.

A number of fixed inflorescences were selected, deposited in a glass dissection well with
3:1 fixative solution and dissected under a stereomicroscope into individual flower buds,
discarding open flowers and buds with pollen (yellow anthers). The flower buds were then
washed 3 x 2 minutes in citrate buffer and the buffer replaced with 500 µl of digestion
enzyme mix (0.3% w/v cellulase from *Trichoderma* sp. (Sigma-Aldrich), 0.3% w/v pectolyase
from *Aspergillus japonicus* (Sigma) and 0.3% w/v cytohelicase from *Helix pomatia* (Duchefa
Biochemie) in citrate buffer). The flower buds were incubated in the digestion mix for 2 hours
at 37°C and the digestion stopped by adding a greater volume of ice-cold citrate buffer. The

well was placed under the stereomicroscope and a single flower bud with a small volume of

liquid was transferred to a slide with a Pasteur pipette. The flower bud was macerated with a

needle, a 10µl drop of ice-cold 60% glacial acetic acid was added and the slide incubated for

one minute on a hot plate at 45°C while gently moving the drop with a flat needle. After the

incubation, an extra 10 µl of ice-cold 60% glacial acetic acid were added, followed by 100 µl

of 3:1 fixative - first circling and flooding the drop and then mixing with the drop by

vigorously pipetting the last microliters. The liquid was drained by tilting the slide, which was

then further washed with another 100 µl of 3:1 fixative, drained and left to air dry at room

temperature.

To visualize the chromosomes, the slides were stained in Vectashield antifade mounting

medium with 1.5 µg/ml DAPI (# H-1200, Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA, USA), by

putting a drop on a coverslip which was then placed on a slide and gently squashed by thumb

pressure. Spreads were analysed with a Zeiss AxioImager Z1 microscope with a 100×/1.40 Oil

Plan-Apochromat objective and the Zeiss ZEN2Blue software (Carl Zeiss GmbH)in the channel

for blue fluorescence (Zeiss #49 HE filter).

EdU labelling and cytological detection

Among the different thymidine analogues commonly used to label *in vivo* DNA synthesis,

5-Ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine (EdU) has a number of advantages and has been preferred by the

Arabidopsis community in recent studies labelling DNA synthesis [12,29,30,64–67]. EdU can

be detected in intact double-strand DNA and this antibody-free technique simplifies the

protocol and offers better reproducibility.

EdU (#Ab146186, Abcam, UK) working solutions were prepared at 10mM in 1×PBS

buffer. Arabidopsis stems with apical inflorescences were submerged in water to avoid the

introduction of air bubbles (submerging only the stem segment to be cut, without wetting

the inflorescences) and cut obliquely 4-5cm below the inflorescence. Care was taken to make

the cleanest cut possible in order to avoid crushing vascular tissues. Open flowers and big

leaves (if present) were removed to avoid crowding the tube and minimize the risk of

exhausting the solution due to excessive transpiration. The inflorescences were incubated in

800µl of 10mM EdU in a 2ml eppendorf tube for 24 hours, under the same growing

conditions as the plants. To avoid tight packing, a maximum of four or five inflorescence

stems were incubated in one tube. After 24 hours the inflorescences were removed from the

EdU solution and fixed in 3:1 ethanol:glacial acetic acid solution.

Chromosome spreads were prepared as previously described and visualised under the

microscope to identify those slides with meiocytes at the desired meiotic stages. The slides

were first incubated in 4T (4×SSC, 0.5% v/v Tween 20) in a Coplin jar until the coverslips

detached, followed by 30' without coverslips in fresh 4T. The Click-iT reaction mix (Invitrogen

Click-iT plus Alexa-fluor 647 kit, Thermo-Fisher Scientific) to label EdU with the fluorochrome

was prepared following the manufacturer's instructions. Before labelling, the slides were

washed for 5 minutes with 1×PBS. A 30µl drop of Click-iT reagent was placed on a 32x24mm

piece of parafilm and the inverted slides were placed on top of the mix on the parafilm. The

slides were incubated with the mix for 30 minutes at 37°C in a dark moist chamber, washed

for 5 minutes with 1×PBS in a Coplin jar in the dark and mounted in Vectashield + DAPI for

microscopy.

Pictures were taken using a Zeiss LSM800 confocal microscope applying the Airyscan

module and selecting the presets for each specific dye. EdU foci were quantified semi-

automatically using the IMARIS software *Spots* tool (Bitplane AG, Oxford Instruments, UK),

adding intensity filters for both channels to specifically selected visually detectable EdU foci

that co-localised with the DAPI fluorescence of the chromosomes. To analyze the chromatin

and EdU signal ultrastructure, we applied super-resolution spatial structured illumination

microscopy (3D-SIM) using a 63×/1.40 Oil Plan-Apochromat objective of an Elyra PS.1

microscope system and the ZENBlack software (Carl Zeiss GmbH) [68]. Maximum intensity

projections were calculated from 3D-SIM image stacks. Zoom-in sections were presented as

single slices to indicate the subnuclear chromatin structures at the super-resolution level.

Detection of MLH1 and EdU

For the detection of MLH1 and neo-synthesized DNA tracts with incorporated EdU, the

protocol for the immunolocalization of MLH1 [69] was adapted to include the Click-iT EdU

labelling. Chromosome spreads were prepared as previously described and visualized under

the microscope to identify those slides with meiocytes at the desired stages. The slides were

incubated in a Coplin jar with 100% ethanol to detach the coverslip and washed with 1×PBST

(0.1% Triton X-100 in 1×PBS. Another glass staining jar was filled with tri-sodium citrate

buffer pH7 and heated to boiling point in a microwave. The slides were placed in the heated

tri-sodium citrate solution for 45 seconds, after which they were returned to room

temperature 1×PBST.

The rabbit anti-MLH1 primary antibodies (kindly provided by Mathilde Grelon, INRAe

Versailles [38]) was prepared at 1/200 in 1×PBST + 1% BSA. A 45µl drop was placed on a

32x24mm piece of parafilm and the inverted slide place on this. The slides were incubated for

2 days at 4°C in a dark moist chamber, after which they were washed 3 x 5 minutes with

1×PBST. The secondary antibodies (goat anti-rabbit Alexa fluor 488) was prepared at 1/100

1×in PBST + 1% BSA, and 45µl were used per slide. Slides were incubated 30 minutes at 37°C

in a dark moist chamber, after which they were washed 2 x 5 minutes in 1×PBST, followed by

one wash with 1×PBS. The Click-iT reaction was then performed as described above and the

slide was mounted in Vectashield + DAPI mounting medium for microscopy. Counting of

MLH1 foci and co-localization with EdU foci was carried out by visual inspection of images

taken using the Zeiss LSM800 confocal microscope plus the Airyscan module.

538 Acknowledgements

We thank the members of the recombination group and especially Olivier Da Ines,

Jérémy Verbeke and Floriane Chéron for their help and suggestions. Mathilde Grelon kindly

sent us the anti-MLH1 antiserum.

This work was supported by a European Marie Sklodowska Curie Actions Innovative

Training Network grant (EU H2020-MSCA-ITN-2017-765212) to CIW, the Centre National de

Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale

(Inserm) and the Université Clermont Auvergne. The funders had no role in study design,

data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

References

1.   Arter M, Keeney S. Divergence and conservation of the meiotic recombination

machinery. Nat Rev Genet. 2023 [cited 6 Feb 2024]. doi:10.1038/s41576-023-00669-8

2.   Hotta Y, Stern H. Transient phosphorylation of deoxyribosides and regulation of

deoxyribonucleic acid synthesis. J Biophys Biochem Cytol. 1961/11/01 ed. 1961;11:

311–9. doi:10.1083/jcb.11.2.311

3.   Lima-De-Faria A, German J, Ghatnekar M, McGovern J, Anderson L. In vitro labelling of

human meiotic chromosomes with H3-thymidine. Hereditas. 1968;60: 249–261.

doi:10.1111/j.1601-5223.1968.tb02205.x

4.   Mukherjee AB, Cohen MM. DNA Synthesis during Meiotic Prophase in Male Mice.

Nature. 1968;219: 489–490. doi:10.1038/219489a0

5.   Prensky W. Uptake of thymine-methy6H3 by pachytene chromosomes of Lilium

longiflorum. Genetics. 1962;47: 977.

6.   Wimber DE, Prensky W. Autoradiography with Meiotic Chromosomes of the Male Newt

(Triturus Viridescens) Using H3-Thymidine. Genetics. 1963/12/01 ed. 1963;48: 1731–8.

doi:10.1093/genetics/48.12.1731

7.   Carpenter AT. EM autoradiographic evidence that DNA synthesis occurs at

recombination nodules during meiosis in Drosophila melanogaster females.

Chromosoma. 1981/01/01 ed. 1981;83: 59–80. doi:10.1007/BF00286016

8.   Moses MJ, Dresser ME, Poorman PA. Composition and role of the synaptonemal

570  complex. Symp Soc Exp Biol. 1984/01/01 ed. 1984;38: 245–70.

571 9. Terasawa M, Ogawa H, Tsukamoto Y, Shinohara M, Shirahige K, Kleckner N, et al.

572  Meiotic recombination-related DNA synthesis and its implications for cross-over and

573  non-cross-over recombinant formation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2007/03/27 ed.

574  2007;104: 5965–70. doi:10.1073/pnas.0611490104

575 10. Loidl J, Lukaszewicz A, Howard-Till RA, Koestler T. The Tetrahymena meiotic

576  chromosome bouquet is organized by centromeres and promotes interhomolog

577  recombination. J Cell Sci. 2012/09/15 ed. 2012;125: 5873–80. doi:10.1242/jcs.112664

578 11. Armstrong SJ, Franklin FCH, Jones GH. A meiotic time-course for Arabidopsis thaliana.

579  Sex Plant Reprod. 2003;16: 141–149. doi:10.1007/s00497-003-0186-4

580 12. Stronghill PE, Azimi W, Hasenkampf CA. A novel method to follow meiotic progression

581  in Arabidopsis using confocal microscopy and 5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine labeling. Plant

582  Methods. 2014;10: 33. doi:10.1186/1746-4811-10-33

583 13. Sanchez-Moran E, Santos J-L, Jones GH, Franklin FCH. ASY1 mediates AtDMC1-

584  dependent interhomolog recombination during meiosis in Arabidopsis. Gene Dev.

585  2007;21: 2220–2233. doi:10.1101/gad.439007

586 14. Allers T, Lichten M. Differential Timing and Control of Noncrossover and Crossover

587  Recombination during Meiosis. Cell. 2001;106: 47–57. doi:10.1016/s0092-

588  8674(01)00416-0

589 15. Börner GV, Hochwagen A, MacQueen AJ. Meiosis in budding yeast. Rothstein R, editor.

590  GENETICS. 2023;225: iyad125. doi:10.1093/genetics/iyad125

591 16. Collins I, Newlon CS. Meiosis-specific formation of joint DNA molecules containing

sequences from homologous chromosomes. Cell. 1994;76: 65–75. doi:10.1016/0092-

8674(94)90173-2

17. Hunter N, Kleckner N. The Single-End Invasion: An Asymmetric Intermediate at the

Double-Strand Break to Double-Holliday Junction Transition of Meiotic Recombination.

Cell. 2001;106: 59–70. doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(01)00430-5

18. Schwacha A, Kleckner N. Identification of joint molecules that form frequently between

homologs but rarely between sister chromatids during yeast meiosis. Cell. 1994;76: 51–

63. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(94)90172-4

19. Wijnker E, James GV, Ding J, Becker F, Klasen JR, Rawat V, et al. The genomic landscape

of meiotic crossovers and gene conversions in Arabidopsis thaliana. eLife. 2013;2:

e01426. doi:10.7554/elife.01426

20. Lu P, Han X, Qi J, Yang J, Wijeratne AJ, Li T, et al. Analysis of Arabidopsis genome-wide

variations before and after meiosis and meiotic recombination by resequencing

Landsberg erecta and all four products of a single meiosis. 2012;22: 508–518.

doi:10.1101/gr.127522.111

21. Li R, Bitoun E, Altemose N, Davies RW, Davies B, Myers SR. A high-resolution map of

non-crossover events reveals impacts of genetic diversity on mammalian meiotic

recombination. Nat Commun. 2019;10: 3900. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11675-y

22. Serrentino M-EM, Borde VV. The spatial regulation of meiotic recombination hotspots:

are all DSB hotspots crossover hotspots? Experimental cell research. 2012;318: 1347–

1352. doi:10.1016/j.yexcr.2012.03.025

23. Chakraborty P, Pankajam AV, Lin G, Dutta A, Krishnaprasad GN, Tekkedil MM, et al.

Modulating Crossover Frequency and Interference for Obligate Crossovers in

Saccharomyces cerevisiae Meiosis. G3 (Bethesda). 2017;7: 1511–1524.

doi:10.1534/g3.117.040071

24. Mancera E, Bourgon R, Brozzi A, Huber W, Steinmetz LM. High-resolution mapping of

meiotic crossovers and non-crossovers in yeast. Nature. 2008;454: 479–485.

doi:10.1038/nature07135

25. Valuchova S, Mikulkova P, Pecinkova J, Klimova J, Krumnikl M, Bainar P, et al. Imaging

plant germline differentiation within Arabidopsis flowers by light sheet microscopy.

eLife. 2020;9: 3645–19. doi:10.7554/elife.52546

26. Rossig C, Lievre LL, Pilkington SM, Brownfield L. A simple and rapid method for imaging

male meiotic cells in anthers of model and non-model plant species. Plant Reprod.

2021;34: 37–46. doi:10.1007/s00497-021-00404-5

27. Prusicki MA, Keizer EM, Rosmalen RP van, Komaki S, Seifert F, Müller K, et al. Live cell

imaging of meiosis in Arabidopsis thaliana. eLife. 2019;8: e42834.

doi:10.7554/elife.42834

28. Kurzbauer M-T, Uanschou C, Chen D, Schlögelhofer P. The recombinases DMC1 and

RAD51 are functionally and spatially separated during meiosis in Arabidopsis. Plant Cell.

2012;24: 2058–2070. doi:10.1105/tpc.112.098459

29. Singh G, Da Ines O, Gallego ME, White CI. Analysis of the impact of the absence of

RAD51 strand exchange activity in Arabidopsis meiosis. PLoS ONE. 2017;12: e0183006-

16. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0183006

30. Varas J, Graumann K, Osman K, Pradillo M, Evans DE, Santos JL, et al. Absence of SUN1

and SUN2 proteins in Arabidopsis thaliana leads to a delay in meiotic progression and

defects in synapsis and recombination. Plant J. 2015;81: 329–346.

doi:10.1111/tpj.12730

31. Concia L, Brooks AM, Wheeler E, Zynda GJ, Wear EE, LeBlanc C, et al. Genome-Wide

Analysis of the Arabidopsis Replication Timing Program. PLANT PHYSIOLOGY. 2018;176:

2166–2185. doi:10.1104/pp.17.01537

32. Da Ines O, White CI. Centromere Associations in Meiotic Chromosome Pairing. Annual

review of genetics. 2015;49: 95–114. doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-112414-055107

33. Koornneef M, Fransz P, Jong H de. Cytogenetic tools for Arabidopsis thaliana.

Chromosom Res. 2003;11: 183–194. doi:10.1023/a:1022827624082

34. Naish M, Alonge M, Wlodzimierz P, Tock AJ, Abramson BW, Schmücker A, et al. The

genetic and epigenetic landscape of the Arabidopsis centromeres. Science. 2021;374:

eabi7489. doi:10.1126/science.abi7489

35. Rowan BA, Heavens D, Feuerborn TR, Tock AJ, Henderson IR, Weigel D. An Ultra High-

Density Arabidopsis thaliana Crossover Map That Refines the Influences of Structural

Variation and Epigenetic Features. Genetics. 2019;213: genetics.302406.2019.

doi:10.1534/genetics.119.302406

36. Choi K, Zhao X, Tock AJ, Lambing C, Underwood CJ, Hardcastle TJ, et al. Nucleosomes

and DNA methylation shape meiotic DSB frequency in Arabidopsis thaliana transposons

and gene regulatory regions. Genome research. 2018;28: 532–546.

doi:10.1101/gr.225599.117

37. Grelon M, Vezon D, Gendrot G, Pelletier G. AtSPO11-1 is necessary for efficient meiotic

recombination in plants. EMBO J. 2001;20: 589–600. doi:10.1093/emboj/20.3.589

38. Chelysheva L, Grandont L, Vrielynck N, le Guin S, Mercier R, Grelon M. An Easy Protocol

for Studying Chromatin and Recombination Protein Dynamics during

Arabidopsisthaliana Meiosis: Immunodetection of Cohesins, Histones and MLH1.

Cytogenetic and Genome Research. 2010;129: 143–153. doi:10.1159/000314096

39. Schwacha A, Kleckner N. Interhomolog Bias during Meiotic Recombination: Meiotic

Functions Promote a Highly Differentiated Interhomolog-Only Pathway. Cell. 1997;90:

1123–1135. doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80378-5

40. Goldfarb T, Lichten M. Frequent and efficient use of the sister chromatid for DNA

double-strand break repair during budding yeast meiosis. PLoS biology. 2010;8:

e1000520. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000520

41. Oh SD, Lao JP, Hwang PY-H, Taylor AF, Smith GR, Hunter N. BLM Ortholog, Sgs1,

Prevents Aberrant Crossing-over by Suppressing Formation of Multichromatid Joint

Molecules. Cell. 2007;130: 259–272. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2007.05.035

42. Oh SD, Lao JP, Taylor AF, Smith GR, Hunter N. RecQ Helicase, Sgs1, and XPF Family

Endonuclease, Mus81-Mms4, Resolve Aberrant Joint Molecules during Meiotic

Recombination. Molecular Cell. 2008;31: 324–336. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2008.07.006

43. Jackson JA, Fink GR. Meiotic recombination between duplicated genetic elements in

Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Genetics. 1985;109: 303–332.

doi:10.1093/genetics/109.2.303

44. Haber JE, Thorburn PC, Rogers D. Meiotic and mitotic behaviour of dicentric

chromosomes in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Genetics. 1984;106: 185–205.

doi:10.1093/genetics/106.2.185

45. Webber HA, Howard L, Bickel SE. The cohesion protein ORD is required for homologue

bias during meiotic recombination. The Journal of Cell Biology. 2004;164: 819–829.

doi:10.1083/jcb.200310077

46. Cole F, Baudat F, Grey C, Keeney S, De Massy B, Jasin M. Mouse tetrad analysis provides

insights into recombination mechanisms and hotspot evolutionary dynamics. Nat

Genet. 2014;46: 1072–1080. doi:10.1038/ng.3068

47. Almanzar DE, Gordon SG, Rog O. Meiotic sister chromatid exchanges are rare in C.

elegans. Current Biology. 2021;31: 1499-1507.e3. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2020.11.018

48. Toraason E, Horacek A, Clark C, Glover ML, Adler VL, Premkumar T, et al. Meiotic DNA

break repair can utilize homolog-independent chromatid templates in C. elegans.

Current Biology. 2021;31: 1508-1514.e5. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2021.03.008

49. Billmyre KK, Hughes SE. Meiosis: The elusive sister chromatid repair. Current Biology.

2021;31: R454–R456. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2021.03.093

50. Yang S, Yuan Y, Wang L, Li J, Wang W, Liu H, et al. Great majority of recombination

events in Arabidopsis are gene conversion events. Proceedings of the National

Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2012;109: 20992–20997.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1211827110

51. Drouaud J, Khademian H, Giraut L, Zanni V, Bellalou S, Henderson IR, et al. Contrasted

patterns of crossover and non-crossover at Arabidopsis thaliana meiotic recombination

hotspots. Hong Ma, editor. PLoS Genetics. 2013;9: e1003922.

doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003922

52. Sims J, Schlögelhofer P, Kurzbauer M-T. From Microscopy to Nanoscopy: Defining an

Arabidopsis thaliana Meiotic Atlas at the Nanometer Scale. Front Plant Sci. 2021;12:

672914. doi:10.3389/fpls.2021.672914

53. Fayos I, Meunier AC, Vernet A, Navarro-Sanz S, Portefaix M, Lartaud M, et al.

Assessment of the roles of SPO11-2 and SPO11-4 in meiosis in rice using CRISPR/Cas9

mutagenesis. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2020;71: 7046–7058.

doi:10.1093/jxb/eraa391

54. Stacey NJ, Kuromori T, Azumi Y, Roberts G, Breuer C, Wada T, et al. Arabidopsis SPO11-

2 functions with SPO11-1 in meiotic recombination. The Plant Journal. 2006;48: 206–

216. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2006.02867.x

55. Sims J, Copenhaver GP, Schlögelhofer P. Meiotic DNA Repair in the Nucleolus Employs a

Nonhomologous End-Joining Mechanism. The Plant Cell. 2019;31: 2259–2275.

doi:10.1105/tpc.19.00367

56. Vrielynck N, Schneider K, Rodriguez M, Sims J, Chambon A, Hurel A, et al. Conservation

and divergence of meiotic DNA double strand break forming mechanisms in

Arabidopsis thaliana. Nucleic Acids Res. 2021. doi:10.1093/nar/gkab715

57. Sprink T, Hartung F. Heterologous Complementation of SPO11-1 and -2 Depends on the

Splicing Pattern. IJMS. 2021;22: 9346. doi:10.3390/ijms22179346

58. Vrielynck N, Chambon A, Vezon D, Pereira L, Chelysheva L, Muyt AD, et al. A DNA

topoisomerase VI–like complex initiates meiotic recombination. Science (New York,

NY). 2016;351: 939–943. doi:10.1126/science.aad5196

59. Hartung F, Wurz-Wildersinn R, Fuchs J, Schubert I, Suer S, Puchta H. The catalytically

active tyrosine residues of both SPO11-1 and SPO11-2 are required for meiotic double-

strand break induction in Arabidopsis. The Plant cell. 2007;19: 3090–3099.

doi:10.1105/tpc.107.054817

60. Alonso-Ramos P, Álvarez-Melo D, Strouhalova K, Pascual-Silva C, Garside GB, Arter M,

et al. The Cdc14 Phosphatase Controls Resolution of Recombination Intermediates and

Crossover Formation during Meiosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2021;22: 9811.

doi:10.3390/ijms22189811

61. Schubert I, Schubert V, Fuchs J. No Evidence for "Break-Induced Replication" in a Higher

Plant – But Break-Induced Conversion May Occur. Front Plant Sci. 2011;2: 8.

doi:10.3389/fpls.2011.00008

62. Vannier J-B, Depeiges A, White C, Gallego ME. Two roles for Rad50 in telomere

maintenance. The EMBO Journal. 2006;25: 4577–4585. doi:10.1038/sj.emboj.7601345

63. Ross KJ, Fransz P, Jones GH. A light microscopic atlas of meiosis in Arabidopsis thaliana.

Chromosom Res : Int J Mol, Supramol Evol Asp Chromosom Biol. 1996;4: 507–16.

doi:10.1007/bf02261778

64. Dvořáčková M, Raposo B, Matula P, Fuchs J, Schubert V, Peška V, et al. Replication of

ribosomal DNA in Arabidopsis occurs both inside and outside the nucleolus during S

phase progression. J Cell Sci. 2017;131: jcs202416. doi:10.1242/jcs.202416

65. Lambing C, Osman K, Nuntasoontorn K, West A, Higgins JD, Copenhaver GP, et al.

Arabidopsis PCH2 Mediates Meiotic Chromosome Remodeling and Maturation of

Crossovers. PLoS Genet. 2015;11: e1005372. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1005372

66. Vanstraelen M, Baloban M, Ines OD, Cultrone A, Lammens T, Boudolf V, et al. APC/C-

CCS52A complexes control meristem maintenance in the Arabidopsis root. Proceedings

of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 2009;106:

11806–11811. doi:10.1073/pnas.0901193106

67. Amiard S, Charbonnel C, Allain E, Depeiges A, White CI, Gallego ME. Distinct roles of the

ATR kinase and the Mre11-Rad50-Nbs1 complex in the maintenance of chromosomal

stability in Arabidopsis. THE PLANT CELL. 2010;22: 3020–3033.

doi:10.1105/tpc.110.078527

68. Weisshart K, Fuchs J, Schubert V. Structured Illumination Microscopy (SIM) and

Photoactivated Localization Microscopy (PALM) to Analyze the Abundance and

Distribution of RNA Polymerase II Molecules on Flow-sorted Arabidopsis Nuclei. BIO-

PROTOCOL. 2016;6. doi:10.21769/BioProtoc.1725

69. Chelysheva LA, Grandont L, Grelon M. Immunolocalization of Meiotic Proteins in

Brassicaceae: Method 1. In: Pawlowski WP, Grelon M, Armstrong S, editors. Plant

Meiosis: Methods and Protocols. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press; 2013. pp. 93–101.

doi:10.1007/978-1-62703-333-6_9

Figure Legends

Figure 1. EdU labelling strategy and timeline of Arabidopsis **male meiosis.** Pollen mother cell nuclei were fixed and isolated at the end of a 24-hour pulse of EdU incorporporation. Cells which traversed all or part of the pre-meiotic S-phase during the pulse will show replicative EdU incorporation and be at G2/leptotene/zygotene stages at the end of the pulse, with some overlap into early pachytene. Fully pachytene nuclei (mid-late pachytene) will not show replicative labeling, but will have traversed the leptotene and zygotene stages in the presence of EdU. Any EdU incorporation in these (or later) nuclei will be due to non-S-Phase DNA synthesis.

Figure 2. DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis tracts are detected from pachytene up to the end of meiosis. a) Meiosis I and b) meiosis II stages in *A. thaliana* wildtype. S-phase, replicative DNA labelling is seen at early G2/letotene and zygotene stages, while clear, discrete foci of EdU substituted DNA are visible in the chromosomes at later stages from pachytene onwards. Rectangles indicate the enlarged regions presented in the zooms. Non-chromosomal EdU foci correspond to labelling of mitochondrial genome replication. 3µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image (1µm for the zooms). Images were taken with the confocal microscope + Airyscan module.

Figure 3. DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis is SPO11- dependent.

a) Meiosis I and b) meiosis II stages in *A. thaliana* spo11-1 mutants. As for WT meiosis (Figure 2), replicative S-phase labelling is seen at early stages, corresponding to G2/leptotene and zygotene. As expected, a striking reduction in numbers of EdU foci (compared to WT) is observed in spo11-1 mutants at stages from mid-prophase I onwards (corresponding to pachytene and later stages). Rectangles indicate the enlarged regions presented in the zooms. Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. 3µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image (1µm for the zooms).

Figure 4. Concordance of numbers of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci and

estimated DSB numbers.

a) Representative images of wild-type pachytene and *spo11-1* pachytene-like meiotic stages. The

merged DAPI (blue) plus EdU (orange) images are accompanied by the computer-generated images of

the scored EdU foci (white, right panels). EdU foci colocalising with chromosome fibres were retained

for counting and mean intensity used to exclude the much-brighter organellar foci (see text). The

Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. 3µm scale bars are shown at the

bottom left of each image. b) Numbers of EdU foci on the chromosomes quantified with Imaris

software show clearly the SPO11-dependence of these DNA synthesis tracts and that their numbers

correspond to expectations from DSB counting in PMC. The mean number of foci/nucleus and

number of nuclei counted are shown above the graph.

Figure 5. Ultrastructure of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci on the synaptonemal

complex (SC) during pachytene.

a) Expected configurations of DNA synthesis tracts resulting from different mechanisms of

homologous recombinational repair of meiotic DSB: Synthesis-Dependent Strand Annealing (SDSA),

double-Holliday Junction (dHJ), Gene Conversion ± Crossover (GC±CO) and Break-Induced Replication

(BIR). b) Examples of segments of pachytene SC. Isolated individual foci (one SC lateral axis, white

circle) and pairs of foci on one homologue (one SC lateral axis, green circle) or the two homologues

(both SC lateral axes, yellow circle) are highlighted. The images represent a single slice of 3D-SIM

image stacks. 0.5µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image.

Figure 6. Class I crossovers (CO) colocalize with prophase I DNA synthesis tracts.

a) Wild-type pachytene cell showing DAPI staining (blue), prophase I DNA synthesis tracts (EdU,

orange) and Class 1 CO (MLH1, green). **b)** Examples of colocalising and adjacent MLH1 and EdU foci.

The quantification (right) shows that 95.6% of MLH1 foci co-localize with EdU tracts, and the

remainder are adjacent to one. a) is a confocal image and b) a single slice of a 3D-SIM image stack.

Scale bars are 1µm in (a) and 0.1µm in (b).

Figure 7. Recombination mechanisms and DNA synthesis tracts.

Following resection and invasion of the donor chromatid (a), DNA neo-synthesis tracts resulting from

repair of DSB are expected to be found only on the recipient chromatid in gene conversions (f)

resulting from SDSA (b) or dHJ dissolution (e) pathways. A special case of this is the BIR pathway (c),

which will result in a long synthesis tract, potentially extending all the way to the end of the recipient

chromatid. DNA synthesis tracts are expected to be found on both the recipient and donor

chromatids in gene conversions, associated (g) or not (h) to a CO, resulting from resolution of the dHJ

intermediate (d).

Supplemental Figure Legends

Figure S1. Discrete foci of EdU substituted DNA are visible in pachytene chromosomes of

Arabidopsis PMC.

Examples of prophase I DNA labelling in pachtene nuclei of wildtype PMC. Each row is the same

nucleus, imaged with DAPI fluorescence (white, left), EdU (orange, middle) and the merged image

(right). Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. 2µm scale bars are included

at the bottom left of each image.

Figure S2. Distribution of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci on paired pachytene

chromosomes from two different cells.

Zoomed regions from SIM (a) and Confocal (b) images of meiotic pachytenes, showing the distribution

of EdU-labelled meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis foci (a)red, b) orange) on the DAPI-stained

chromosome fibres (white) of the synaptonemal complexes. 0.5µm scale bars are included at the

bottom left of each image.

Figure 1

Figure 1. EdU labelling strategy and timeline of _Arabidopsis_ male meiosis. Pollen mother cell nuclei were fixed and isolated at the end of a 24-hour pulse of EdU incorpororation. Cells which traversed all or part of the pre-meiotic S-phase during the pulse will show replicative EdU incorporation and be at G2/leptotene/zygotene stages at the end of the pulse, with some overlap into early pachytene. Fully pachytene nuclei (mid-late pachytene) will not show replicative labeling, but will have traversed the leptotene and zygotene stages in the presence of EdU. Any EdU incorporation in these (or later) nuclei will be due to non-S-Phase DNA synthesis.

Figure 2

a)

Figure 2

b)

Figure 2. DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis tracts are detected from pachytene up to the end of meiosis.
a) Meiosis I and b) meiosis II stages in *A. thaliana* wildtype. S-phase, replicative DNA labelling is seen at early G2/letotene and zygotene stages, while clear, discrete foci of EdU substituted DNA are visible in the chromosomes at later stages from pachytene onwards. Rectangles indicate the enlarged regions presented in the zooms. Non-chromosomal EdU foci correspond to labelling of mitochondrial genome replication. 3µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image (1µm for the zooms). Images were taken with the confocal microscope + Airyscan module.

Figure 3

a)

Figure 3

Figure 3. DSB repair-associated DNA synthesis is SPO11-dependent.
a) Meiosis I and b) meiosis II stages in *A. thaliana* spo11-1 mutants. As for WT meiosis (Figure 2), replicative S-phase labelling is seen at early stages, corresponding to G2/leptotene and zygotene. As expected, a striking reduction in numbers of EdU foci (compared to WT) is observed in spo11-1 mutants at stages from mid-prophase I onwards (corresponding to pachytene and later stages). Rectangles indicate the enlarged regions presented in the zooms. Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. 3µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image (1µm for the zooms).

Figure 4

Figure 4. Concordance of numbers of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci and estimated DSB numbers.
a) Representative images of wild-type pachytene and spo11-1 pachytene-like meiotic stages. The merged DAPI (blue) plus EdU (orange) images are accompanied by the computer-generated images of the scored EdU foci (white, right panels). EdU foci colocalising with chromosome fibres were retained for counting and mean intensity used to exclude the much-brighter organellar foci (see text). The Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. 3µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image. b) Numbers of EdU foci on the chromosomes quantified with Imaris software show clearly the SPO11-dependence of these DNA synthesis tracts and that their numbers correspond to expectations from DSB counting in PMC. The mean number of foci/nucleus and number of nuclei counted are shown above the graph.

Figure 5

a)

b)

Figure 5. Ultrastructure of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci on the synaptonemal complex (SC) during pachytene. a) Expected configurations of DNA synthesis tracts resulting from different mechanisms of homologous recombinational repair of meiotic DSB: Synthesis-Dependent Strand Annealing (SDSA), double-Holliday Junction (dHJ), Gene Conversion ± Crossover (GC±CO) and Break-Induced Replication (BIR). b) Examples of segments of pachytene SC. Isolated individual foci (one SC lateral axis, white circle) and pairs of foci on one homologue (one SC lateral axis, green circle) or the two homologues (both SC lateral axes, yellow circle) are highlighted. The images represent a single slice of 3D-SIM image stacks. 0.5µm scale bars are shown at the bottom left of each image.

Figure 6

Figure 6. Class I crossovers (CO) colocalize with prophase I DNA synthesis tracts.
a) Wild-type pachytene cell showing DAPI staining (blue), prophase I DNA synthesis tracts (EdU, orange) and Class 1 CO (MLH1, green). b) Examples of colocalising and adjacent MLH1 and EdU foci. The quantification (right) shows that 95.6% of MLH1 foci co-localize with EdU tracts, and the remainder are adjacent to one. a) is a confocal image and b) a single slice of a 3D-SIM image stack. Scale bars are 1μm in (a) and 0.1μm in (b).

Figure 7

(a)

Invasion of donor and synthesis from invading 3' end

Recipient chromatid

Donor chromatid

Second-end capture

Bubble migration

(b)

SDSA intermediate

(d)

Double Holliday junction intermediate

(c)

BIR

Break-induced replication in recipient chromatid

dHJ dissolution

(e)

Hemi-catenae intermediate

(f)

Gene conversion

Neo-synthesis only in recipient chromatid

Gene conversion or conversion + CO

(g)

(h)

Neo-synthesis in both donor and recipient chromatids

Figure 7. Recombination mechanisms and DNA synthesis tracts.
Following resection and invasion of the donor chromatid (a), DNA neo-synthesis tracts resulting from repair of DSB are expected to be found only on the recipient chromatid in gene conversions (f) resulting from SDSA (b) or dHJ dissolution (e) pathways. A special case of this is the BIR pathway (c), which will result in a long synthesis tract, potentially extending all the way to the end of the recipient chromatid. DNA synthesis tracts are expected to be found on both the recipient and donor chromatids in gene conversions, associated (g) or not (h) to a CO, resulting from resolution of the dHJ intermediate (d).

Supplemental Figure S1

Supplemental Figure S1. Discrete foci of EdU substituted DNA are visible in pachytene chromosomes of Arabidopsis PMC.
Examples of prophase I DNA labelling in pachtene nuclei of wildtype PMC. Each row is the same nucleus, imaged with DAPI fluorescence (white, left), EdU (orange, middle) and the merged image (right). Images taken with the confocal microscope with Airyscan module. $2\mu m$ scale bars are included at the bottom left of each image.

Supplemental Figure S2

a)

Supplemental Figure S2

b)

Supplemental Figure S2. Distribution of SPO11-dependent, meiotic DNA synthesis foci on paired pachytene chromosomes from two different cells.
Zoomed regions from SIM (a) and Confocal (b) images of meiotic pachytenes, showing the distribution of EdU-labelled meiotic prophase I DNA synthesis foci (a)red, b) orange) on the DAPI-stained chromosome fibres (white) of the synaptonemal complexes. 0.5μm scale bars are included at the bottom left of each image.