1

7 The extra-terminal domain drives the role of BET proteins in transcription

Iwona Pasionek[1,†], John B. Ridenour[1,†], Agnieszka Machowska[1,†], Magdalena Donczew[1],

Michael T. Kinter[2], Kevin A. Boyd[1], Rafal Donczew[1,3,*]

[1] Cell Cycle and Cancer Biology Research Program, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation,

Oklahoma City, OK, 73104, USA.

[2] Aging and Metabolism Research Program, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation,

Oklahoma City, OK, 73104, USA.

[3] Department of Cell Biology, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, Oklahoma City,

OK, 73104, USA.

[†] These authors contributed equally to this work.

[*] To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: 405-271-7437; Email: rafal-

donczew@omrf.org.

Abstract

BET proteins facilitate the transcription of most eukaryotic genes, yet the specific mechanisms underlying their function remain incompletely understood. As chromatin readers, BET proteins use tandem bromodomains to recognize acetylated lysine residues on histones and other protein partners. However, recent evidence indicates that bromodomain activity alone does not account for the full spectrum of BET protein functions, underscoring the importance of additional conserved domains. Here, we systematically evaluated all conserved domains of BET proteins and identified the extra-terminal (ET) domain as essential for cell viability, genome-wide transcription, and BET chromatin occupancy. Moreover, we demonstrate that the ET domain exerts these effects by acting as a central hub for interactions with multiple transcriptional regulators. Our findings advance the current understanding of BET protein biology and reveal potential mechanisms by which cells can evade bromodomain inhibition under pathological conditions.

Introduction

Bromodomains (BDs) are reader modules that recognize acetylated lysine residues on histones and other protein targets[1]. Members of the bromodomain and extra-terminal domain (BET) family are conserved chromatin readers that play central roles in transcription regulation[2–5]. Consistent with this function, BET proteins have been implicated in sustaining pathological transcriptional programs across various human diseases[6,7]. Pharmacological inhibition of BET bromodomains represents a promising therapeutic strategy for cancer and other disorders; however, resistance to BD inhibitors frequently emerges, highlighting the need for alternative approaches to target BET proteins[8–12]. However, a comprehensive model describing how BET proteins regulate transcription remains elusive.

All three mammalian BET proteins expressed in somatic tissues (BRD2, BRD3, and BRD4) contribute to gene transcription, but BRD4 functions as the dominant BET factor, with primary roles in transcription elongation[3–5,13,14]. Budding yeast encode two BET proteins (Bdf1 and Bdf2, referred to here as Bdf1/2), at least one of which is required for viability. Bdf1/2 make overlapping contributions to transcription; however, similar to BRD4 in mammalian cells, yeast cells rely predominantly on Bdf1[2,15]. Mechanistically, Bdf1/2 support both the initiation and elongation phases of transcription[2]. Notably, mammalian BET proteins have also been

implicated in transcription initiation, indicating that BET-dependent transcriptional functions are

broadly conserved across eukaryotic lineages[4,14,16].

According to the canonical model, the tandem BDs serve as the primary module supporting BET

protein function[1,8,17]. The multiply acetylated N-terminal tail of histone H4 is a preferred target of

most BET BDs, including both BDs of Bdf1[14,18,19]. However, we previously showed that rapid

depletion of H4 acetylation results in only an ~50% reduction in Bdf1 chromatin occupancy[2].

Consistent with this observation, yeast cells remain viable in the absence of acetylated residues

on the H4 tail[20]; Bdf1 is recruited to immobilized promoter DNA even in the absence of

nucleosomes[15,21]; a Bdf1 mutant with inactivated BDs suppresses the temperature sensitivity

caused by *BDF1* deletion[18]; and chemical inhibition of BET BDs in mammalian cells neither fully

displaces BET proteins from chromatin nor abolishes their function[4,5,16,22]. Together, these

findings indicate that BET-mediated transcriptional regulation involves additional, yet poorly

understood mechanisms that do not depend on BD activity.

BET proteins exhibit a modular architecture composed of conserved structured regions (BDs,

motif B, and the extra-terminal (ET) domain) and conserved unstructured regions [the N- and C-

terminal phosphorylation sites (NPS and CPS) and the basic interaction domain (BID)],

interspersed with additional unstructured regions lacking sequence conservation (**Fig. 1A**).

Although the functions of non-BD domains have not been comprehensively examined, existing

evidence suggests that they play important roles. For instance, the ET domain of mammalian

BET proteins serves as an interaction hub for multiple protein partners[17,23–25], and these

interactions have been proposed to contribute to BRD4-mediated transcriptional regulation,

BRD4 chromatin recruitment, and the survival of certain cancer cell lines[22,23,26–29]. However, the

in vivo significance of the ET domain for BET protein function remains unresolved. In addition,

phosphorylation within the NPS and CPS regions has been implicated in enhancing BET

association with chromatin and protein partners[10,11,30]. Finally, motif B and the BID have been

biochemically shown to promote BET protein dimerization[31].

Here, we delineated the contributions of the conserved domains of BET proteins to cell viability,

transcription, BET chromatin association, and the recruitment and/or maintenance of partner

proteins. Our key findings establish the ET domain as essential for BET protein function in living

cells and enable us to propose a revised model of BET-mediated transcriptional regulation.

Results

The BET protein ET domain is essential for cell survival

Prior yeast genetic studies established that the BDs and NPS/CPS regions of BET proteins

contribute to cell viability, but the functional significance of the remaining conserved domains

has not been defined[18,32]. We previously demonstrated that although Bdf1 and Bdf2 have

redundant roles in transcription, Bdf1 functions as the dominant BET protein in yeast[2].

Accordingly, we selected Bdf1 as our model BET factor. We generated a comprehensive

collection of *BDF1* variants containing deletions or targeted mutations across all conserved BET

domains. When previous work suggested functional overlap, we included combinatorial

perturbations affecting more than one domain. Because intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs)

have been implicated in BRD4 function in mammalian cells, we also constructed a *BDF1* variant

with truncations in IDRs that do not overlap with the conserved unstructured NPS, CPS, or BID

regions[33]. For the BDs and NPS/CPS regions, we introduced targeted mutations in residues

required for BD function or in serine residues with documented phosphorylation,

respectively[18,32]. As a comparison, we also generated a phosphomimetic *BDF1* variant in which

all phosphorylated serines were substituted with glutamate. In total, we constructed eighteen

BDF1 variants (**Fig. 1B**). To facilitate stable expression in yeast cells, we cloned *BDF1* variants

or unmodified *BDF1* into a minichromosomal plasmid pRS315 under the control of endogenous

BDF1 promoter and 3' untranslated region (**Table S1**).

Fig. 1. **The BET protein ET domain is essential for viability.** (**A**) Conserved domain
organization of BET proteins. BD – bromodomain, A/B – motifs A/B, BID – basic interaction
domain, ET – extra-terminal domain, NPS/CPS – N/C-terminal phosphorylation sites, CTM – C-
terminal motif (BRD4 long isoform only). (**B**) *BDF1* variants constructed in this work. Ability to
support growth in the absence of endogenous *BDF1/2* is indicated. (**C**) Sequence alignment of
the ET domain of BRD4 (top) and Bdf1 (bottom). Four conserved acidic residues important for
interactions between BRD4 and protein partners are marked. Bdf1 coordinates are shown below
the arrows. (**D**) Schematic representation of the experimental strategy for viability and genomic
(SLAM-seq and ChEC-seq) assays. Experiments were performed in strains in which
endogenous Bdf1/2 carried auxin-inducible degron (AID) tags and unmodified *BDF1* or *BDF1*
variants were expressed from the *TRP1* locus. Endogenous Bdf1/2 were depleted by the
addition of 3-indoleacetic acid (IAA). (**E-F**) Growth assays comparing the fitness of a control
strain expressing unmodified *BDF1* (WT) to strains expressing *BDF1* variants after 15 h
exposure to IAA (long-term loss of endogenous Bdf1/2). Black markers indicate mean
generation time. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals (*n* = 3).

We performed a complementation assay in a strain dependent solely on *BDF1* expressed from

a minichromosomal plasmid, as endogenous *BDF1/2* were deleted. To test whether each *BDF1*

variant could support viability, we attempted to replace the plasmid carrying unmodified *BDF1*

and the URA3 marker with plasmids encoding the *BDF1* variants, selecting for viable

transformants on medium containing 5-fluoroorotic acid (5-FOA), which counterselects URA3-

containing cells. Five *BDF1* variants failed to support viability: the double BD-deletion and BD-

mutation variants, the variants lacking both NPS and CPS regions or carrying serine-to-alanine

substitutions across both regions, and the variant lacking the ET domain (**Fig. 1B**). Proper

expression of these *BDF1* variants was validated in experiments described below. In summary,

although prior studies established *in vivo* requirements for the BDs and NPS/CPS regions of

BET proteins in yeast[18,32], our findings reveal for the first time that the ET domain is essential for

cell viability.

A conserved stretch of acidic residues in the ET domain is required for its function

A conserved cluster of acidic residues located between the second and third helices of the ET

domain has been shown to mediate BRD4 interactions with several protein partners[23–25]. To

assess the *in vivo* significance of this region in Bdf1, we generated six additional *BDF1* variants

in which different numbers of four conserved acidic residues (amino acids 567, 569, 571, and

573) were substituted with alanine (**Figs. 1C and S1A**). Using the complementation assay

described above, we found that mutation of three or more of these acidic residues is lethal in

yeast, demonstrating that this region of the ET domain is essential for its function. For

subsequent experiments, we selected a representative set of ET-domain mutants consisting of

a single substitution (D571A; mET(1)), a double substitution (D571A, D573A; mET(2)), and a

quadruple substitution (mET(4)) (**Figs. 1C and S1A**).

To support subsequent experiments, we integrated all *BDF1* variants, along with an unmodified

BDF1 control, into the TRP1 locus of a strain in which endogenous Bdf1/2 carry auxin-inducible

degron (AID) tags (RDY73; Bdf1/2-AID strain) (**Figs. 1D, and Tables S1 and S2**)[2]. In this

system, each *BDF1* variant is constitutively expressed from an ectopic locus under the control of

the endogenous *BDF1* promoter and 3′ untranslated region, while endogenous Bdf1/2 can be

rapidly depleted upon addition of 3-indoleacetic acid (IAA)[2]. Importantly, integration of an

additional unmodified *BDF1* copy did not affect cell viability, and the *BDF1* variants were

expressed at endogenous or modestly elevated levels, both in the presence and absence of

endogenous Bdf1/2 (**Fig. S1B-D**). We did not detect expression of variants containing the BD2

deletion (ΔBD2, ΔBD1/2) or the deletion of the N-terminal unstructured region (ΔIDRs),

suggesting that the antibody used recognizes epitopes located within these regions of Bdf1.

Nevertheless, expression of the ΔBD2, ΔBD1/2, and ΔIDRs variants is supported by normal

growth rates (ΔBD2 and ΔIDRs variants) and by the modest transcriptional changes observed in

cells that rely on these *BDF1* variants, as described below.

The complementation assay identified the BET protein domains required for viability. To extend

these findings, we quantified growth-rate defects associated with each *BDF1* mutation. Yeast

cells were cultivated in the presence of IAA, forcing dependence on the Bdf1 variants as

endogenous Bdf1/2 were depleted, and generation times were calculated after ~15 hours of

growth (**Fig. 1D**). First, strains harboring *BDF1* variants that failed to support viability in the

complementation assay displayed complete growth inhibition, validating our earlier results.

Second, whereas a single point mutation in the ET domain was well tolerated, mutation of only

two conserved acidic residues caused a severe growth defect. By contrast, deletion or mutation

of a single BD did not impair growth (**Fig. 1E**). Third, we found that CPS, but not NPS, deletion

or mutation modestly slowed growth. Notably, the NPS/CPS phosphomimetic Bdf1 variant fully

supported viability, suggesting that BET proteins function optimally in a fully phosphorylated

state and that their phosphorylation may not be dynamically regulated under normal growth

conditions (**Fig. 1F**). Fourth, combined loss of the B/BID regions substantially impaired growth,

consistent with their proposed role in promoting BET dimerization[31]. Finally, truncation of the

Bdf1 IDRs did not affect viability, indicating that the large, unstructured N-terminal region of BET

proteins does not play a major biological role (**Fig. 1F**). As an additional validation, we observed

similar growth rates across all viable strains relying solely on *BDF1* variants expressed from

minichromosomal plasmids (**Fig. S1E and Table S2**). Collectively, these assays define the

contributions of all conserved BET protein domains to yeast viability and identify a critical

functional region within the ET domain.

The ET domain is essential for genome-wide transcription

The essential function of BET proteins is to sustain global transcriptional programs[2–5]. To define

the contribution of each conserved BET domain to genome-wide transcription, we analyzed our

collection of strains expressing *BDF1* variants in the background of endogenous Bdf1/2 fused to

AID tags (**Fig. 1D and Table S2**). We previously confirmed that introducing an additional

unmodified copy of *BDF1* does not compromise viability and that Bdf1 protein levels are

comparable when expressed from an ectopic versus endogenous locus (**Fig. S1B-D**). We

further validated that this additional *BDF1* copy does not substantially alter baseline

transcription and largely rescues the transcriptional defects caused by depletion of endogenous

Bdf1/2 (**Figs. S2A-B**). Finally, to assess whether any *BDF1* variants exert dominant-negative

effects in the presence of endogenous Bdf1/2, we examined growth phenotypes and found that

the two strains harboring variants with combined deletion or mutation of both NPS/CPS regions

displayed pronounced slow-growth phenotypes (**Fig. S2C**).

In contrast to the growth assay, where cells had to rely on mutant Bdf1 variants for several

generations, here we depleted endogenous Bdf1/2 for 25 minutes, followed immediately by 4-

minute labeling of newly synthesized RNA with 4-thiouracil to facilitate quantification using

SLAM-seq[34] (**Fig. 1D**). This approach allowed us to track direct consequences of Bdf1

mutations, including lethal mutations, with minimized bias from indirect effects that accumulate

during extended exposure to adverse genetic variants. We performed three replicate

experiments for all strains with (IAA) or without (dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO)) depletion of

endogenous Bdf1/2 (**Table S3**). Variability in RNA levels between replicates in the final dataset

(see Materials and Methods) was <30–40% for most genes (**Figs. S3A-B and Table S3**). We

quantified transcriptional changes associated with perturbations in BET protein domains by

comparing strains expressing *BDF1* variants to the strain expressing unmodified *BDF1* following

depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2 (IAA treatment) (**Table S3**). To identify dominant-negative

effects, we compared strains expressing *BDF1* variants without depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2

to the Bdf1/2-AID parental strain (DMSO treatment), which lacks an additional *BDF1* copy (**Fig.**

S3C and Table S3). Consistent with the growth assay (**Fig. S2C**), strains expressing *BDF1*

variants with mutations or deletions in both NPS/CPS regions (mNPS/CPS and ∆NPS/CPS)

exhibited substantial transcriptional deviations (median change > 2-fold) in the presence of

endogenous Bdf1/2. We observed a similar dominant-negative phenotype for the strain

expressing the CPS deletion variant (∆CPS). Consequently, we excluded ∆CPS, mNPS/CPS

and ∆NPS/CPS strains from further analysis and experiments.

We aligned the transcriptional changes measured following depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2

with those observed upon loss of Bdf1/2 in the Bdf1/2-AID strain. Surprisingly, only *BDF1*

variants lacking the ET domain or carrying mutations in all four conserved acidic residues of the

ET domain (hereafter referred to as the ET domain mutation) produced substantial

transcriptional defects (median decreases of 3.6-fold and 2.6-fold, respectively). By contrast,

deletion or mutation of both BDs resulted in relatively modest transcriptional changes (median

decreases of 1.5-fold and 1.4-fold, respectively) (**Figs. 2A and S4A**). Notably, the

transcriptional defects caused by loss of ET domain function were comparable to those resulting

from loss of Bdf1/2 in the Bdf1/2-AID strain (median decrease of 3.7-fold). Analysis of

transcriptional changes at the level of individual genes and across previously defined major

gene classes further confirmed that loss of ET domain function closely phenocopies the loss of

BET proteins[35] (**Figs. 2B-C, S4B and Table S3)**. Perturbations in other domains produced only

minor effects on genome-wide transcription, with the exception of the CPS mutation and the

combined deletion of the B/BID regions, both of which caused moderate decreases (median

decreases of 1.7-fold and 1.6-fold, respectively) (**Fig. S4A**).

Fig. 2. **The ET domain is required for transcription of most genes.** (**A**) Log2 changes in

transcription due to selected *BDF1* mutations measured by SLAM-seq after depleting

endogenous Bdf1/2 for 25 min (*n* = 4,836). Results of depletion of Bdf1/2 in the absence of

additional copy of *BDF1* are shown in the first sample from the left. Results for additional *BDF1*

variants are shown in **Fig. S4A**. (**B**) Heatmap representation of selected results from (**A**). Genes

are divided into previously defined major yeast gene classes (CR – coactivator-redundant,

TFIID – TFIID-dependent)[35] (*n* = 4,560). (**C**) Comparison of selected results from (**A**). Pearson

correlation coefficient (r) is shown (*n* = 4,836). (**D**) Log2 changes in transcription due to *BDF1*

mutations after depleting endogenous Bdf1/2 for 3 h (*n* = 4,457). Results of depletion of Bdf1/2

in the absence of additional copy of *BDF1* are shown in the first sample from the left. (**E**)

Volcano plot comparing the ability of the ET domain to rescue transcriptional changes following

Bdf1/2 loss (log2 fold change over control strain) with associated *p*-values (*n* = 4,715).

Thresholds used: fold change – 1.5-fold; *p*-value – 0.05 (Welch's t-test). (**F**) Comparison of ET

domain-mediated rescue of transcription following Bdf1/2 loss (y-axis, log2 fold change over

control strain) with gene dependence on Bdf1/2 (x-axis, log2 scale). Pearson correlation

coefficient (r) is shown (*n* = 4,715). (**G**) Growth assay comparing the fitness of the Bdf1/2-AID

strain and the ET domain overexpressing strain during endogenous Bdf1/2 depletion. Samples
were taken 1.5 and 3 h after DMSO or IAA addition, and growth delay was calculated by
comparing generation times of IAA-treated and DMSO-treated cells. Black markers indicate
mean growth delay. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval (n = 5). Results of a Welch's
t-test are shown (** – p-value < 0.01).
274

A modest change in transcription following BD inactivation was unexpected given the lethal

phenotype associated with this mutation. We observed a similar discrepancy for deletion of the

B/BID regions and mutation of two conserved acidic residues in the ET domain, both of which

produced severe growth defects yet only minor transcriptional changes. To validate these

findings, we extended the depletion period of endogenous Bdf1/2 to 3 hours to assess the

accumulation of indirect effects on transcription. After 3 hours of IAA treatment, the Bdf1/2-AID

strain exhibited a near-complete loss of genome-wide transcription (median decrease of 51-fold)

(**Fig. 2D and Table S3**). In contrast, BD1/2 mutation, ET domain double mutation, and B/BID

deletion resulted in more modest median decreases of 2.9-fold, 2.5-fold, and 2.3-fold,

respectively. Compared to the rapid depletion experiment (**Figs. 2A and S4A**), these results

indicate that the viability defects associated with BD1/2 mutation, the ET domain double

mutation, or B/BID deletion arise primarily from indirect transcriptional dysfunction.

Nevertheless, the indirect effects observed after 3 hours of IAA treatment were substantially

stronger for the ET domain quadruple mutation (median decrease of 22.3-fold), consistent with

trends observed following 25-minute depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2. In comparison, mutation

of individual bromodomains did not appreciably affect transcription after prolonged IAA

treatment, consistent with the minimal viability defects associated with these *BDF1* variants.

Based on our findings, we hypothesized that the ET domain can at least partially compensate

for the loss of BET proteins. To test this hypothesis, we overexpressed the ET domain in the

Bdf1/2-AID strain (**Fig. S4C**) and quantified transcriptional changes following 25 minutes of

induced Bdf1/2 depletion. First, we observed that very few genes exhibited substantial

transcriptional changes as a result of ET domain overexpression in the presence of endogenous

Bdf1/2 (**Fig. S4D-E and Table S3**). Next, we compared transcriptional responses to Bdf1/2 loss

between the ET domain overexpressing strain and the parental Bdf1/2-AID strain. We found that

the ET domain compensated for the loss of BET proteins at many genes, with 455 genes

showing statistically significant transcriptional rescue (**Fig. 2E and Table S3**). Notably, this

effect was most pronounced at strongly Bdf1/2-dependent genes (**Fig. 2F**). Consistent with

these observations, the ET domain partially rescued the growth phenotype associated with BET

protein loss, although prolonged exposure to IAA ultimately remained lethal (**Fig. 2G**). In

summary, these results reveal a surprisingly small direct contribution of the BDs to transcription

and demonstrate that the ET domain is a dominant BET protein domain in transcriptional

regulation.

The ET domain facilitates BET protein recruitment to chromatin

To modulate transcription, BET proteins first need to be recruited to gene regulatory elements.

Experiments in both yeast and mammalian cells have shown that BD function does not fully

account for BET protein chromatin occupancy[2,4,15,16,22]. To identify BET protein domains that

contribute to Bdf1 recruitment to chromatin, we modified selected yeast strains used in the

SLAM-seq experiments by inserting a micrococcal nuclease (MNase) coding sequence before

the stop codon of *BDF1* variants to facilitate ChEC-seq analysis (**Tables S1 and S2**)[36]. We

previously found that ChEC-seq complements and outperforms ChIP-seq for mapping BET

protein chromatin occupancy in yeast[2]. First, we validated that ectopically expressed Bdf1-

MNase supports normal growth in the presence of AID-tagged endogenous *BDF1*/2 (**Fig. S5A**).

We also confirmed that ectopically expressed Bdf1-MNase displays a chromatin-binding pattern

highly similar to that of Bdf1-MNase expressed from the endogenous locus, both in the

presence and absence of endogenous Bdf1/2 (**Fig. S5B**). As in the SLAM-seq assays, sample

collection was preceded by a 25-minute depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2 to minimize

confounding effects from endogenous BET proteins. All experiments were performed in three

biological replicates, and the replicate datasets were highly consistent (**Fig. S5C**).

To evaluate the impact of targeted mutations in BET protein domains on Bdf1 recruitment, we

compared data collected from strains expressing *BDF1* variants to that from the control strain

expressing unmodified *BDF1* in the context of endogenous Bdf1/2 depletion (IAA treatment)

(**Table S4**). Consistent with the major impact of the ET domain on transcription, we found that

this domain broadly contributed to *Bdf1* chromatin occupancy (**Figs. 3A-C**). Surprisingly, at

most gene promoters, the contribution of the ET domain to Bdf1 occupancy exceeded that of

the BDs. Notably, deletion of the BDs or the ET domain produced very similar effects (**Figs. 3D**

and S6A-C). Among other domains, perturbations in the CPS domain and the B/BID regions

also affected Bdf1 recruitment, indicating that BET protein phosphorylation and dimerization

both contribute to establishing genome-wide BET occupancy (**Fig. S6D-F**). None of the

examined mutations caused substantial redistribution of Bdf1 to new loci. Next, we compared

changes in Bdf1 promoter recruitment resulting from mutation of the BDs or the ET domain with

levels of histone H4 lysine 12 acetylation (H4K12ac), a preferred target of Bdf1 BDs[19]. As

expected, changes in Bdf1 recruitment due to BD mutation showed a modest correlation with H4K12ac levels, consistent with prior findings that BD inhibitors preferentially evict BET proteins from loci with high H4 acetylation, such as super enhancers[4]. In contrast, the effects of the ET domain on Bdf1 occupancy were independent of promoter acetylation levels (**Fig. 3E**). Finally, we observed only a weak correlation between changes in Bdf1 recruitment and transcriptional output (**Fig. S6G**), consistent with the previously reported lack of correlation between baseline Bdf1 promoter occupancy and transcription[2]. In summary, we revealed that the ET domain, not the BDs, is the primary contributor to the BET protein chromatin occupancy.

Fig. 3. **The ET domain has a major role in facilitating BET protein recruitment to chromatin.** (**A**) Genome browser snapshot showing the binding patterns of unmodified Bdf1 (WT) and Bdf1 variants with mutations in the BDs or the ET domain as determined by ChEC-seq. Data for the first 100,000 bases of chromosome III are shown. (**B**) Overlap of Bdf1-bound promoters for the indicated experiments. (**C**) Occupancy of unmodified Bdf1 and Bdf1 variants with mutations in the BDs or the ET domain around the transcription start sites (TSS) of 3,388 genes whose promoters are bound by unmodified Bdf1. Genes are sorted by the TSS signal (+/- 200 bp) in the WT experiment. (**D**) Comparison of log2 changes in Bdf1 occupancy due to mutation or deletion of the BDs or the ET domain. Bdf1 occupancy was calculated as the sum of signal within the (-100, 100) bp window around the Bdf1 promoter peak summit. Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is shown (n = 3,388). (**E**) Comparison of H4K12ac level at promoters [2] and log2 changes in Bdf1 occupancy due to mutations in the BDs or the ET domain. Pearson correlation coefficient (r) is shown.

The ET domain supports TFIID recruitment to gene promoters.

Both yeast and mammalian BET proteins have been linked to the coactivator TFIID, which regulates transcription initiation[2,14,15]. Our prior work demonstrated that Bdf1/2 are required for transcription initiation, and that loss of Bdf1/2 modestly decreases TFIID promoter occupancy[2]. Building on this background and our new findings, we hypothesized that a major function of the ET domain in transcription regulation is to facilitate TFIID recruitment. To test this hypothesis, we applied ChEC-seq to quantify changes in TFIID occupancy in cells relying solely on Bdf1 variants after rapid depletion of endogenous Bdf1/2. We inserted an MNase coding sequence into the TFIID subunit Taf1 in three strains previously used in the SLAM-seq assays: the control strain carrying an unmodified additional copy of *BDF1*, and strains carrying *BDF1* variants with mutations in the ET domain or the BDs (mET(4) and mBD1/2, respectively). After depleting endogenous Bdf1/2, we quantified changes in Taf1 recruitment by comparing strains expressing *BDF1* variants to the control strain. Experiments were performed in three biological replicates, and the replicate datasets were highly reproducible (**Fig. S7A**). We found that both the ET domain and the BDs contributed to TFIID recruitment to promoters; however, the ET domain contributed more prominently at most loci (**Fig. 4A-B**). Next, we compared changes in TFIID occupancy resulting from Bdf1 mutations with changes in transcription and observed only a modest correlation (**Fig. S7B**). Consistent with this finding, we previously reported that transcription is uncoupled from baseline TFIID promoter occupancy, and that changes in TFIID occupancy due to complete loss of BET proteins do not correlate with transcriptional output[2,35]. In summary, our results demonstrate that the ET domain plays a major role in TFIID recruitment to gene promoters.

Fig. 4. **The ET domain facilitates recruitment of TFIID to promoters.** (**A**) Genome browser
snapshot showing Taf1 (TFIID) binding pattern in the context of unmodified Bdf1 or Bdf1
variants with mutations in the BDs or the ET domain as determined by ChEC-seq. Data for the
first 100,000 bases of chromosome III are shown. (**B**) Taf1 occupancy around TSS of 3,103
genes whose promoters are bound by Taf1[2], in the context of unmodified Bdf1 or Bdf1 variants
with mutations in the BDs or the ET domain. Genes are sorted by the signal around TSS (+/-
200 bp) in the WT experiment.

The ET domain engages its targets using a conserved mechanism

Results described thus far show that the ET domain is a primary functional module of Bdf1 and

that its impact on transcription is at least partially explained by its role in facilitating TFIID

recruitment. Consistent with the latter finding, the ET domain of BRD4 has been proposed to

modulate transcription by mediating interactions with protein partners[17,22,23]. However, only a

limited number of interactions involving the ET domain of mammalian BET proteins have been

experimentally validated, and it remains unknown how many factors associate with the ET

domain or what the functional consequences of those interactions are. To begin addressing

these questions, we used chromatin mass spectrometry (chromatin-MS) to identify candidate

factors – beyond TFIID – that may depend on Bdf1/2 for recruitment to chromatin. We obtained

reliable data for 724 of 2399 yeast nuclear proteins and found that 78 exhibited decreased

chromatin association following rapid Bdf1/2 depletion. As validation of our approach, this list

included two TFIID subunits. Notably, we also identified additional proteins implicated in

transcription regulation, including Bur1/CDK9, Spt6, the PAF1 complex (PAF1C) subunit Rtf1,

subunits of the RSC, INO80, and ISW2 chromatin remodeling complexes, and several factors

involved in mRNA processing (**Figs. 5A and S8A and Table S5**).

Based on proteomic and structural biology studies, the BRD4 ET domain has been proposed to

recognize two consensus motifs – Φ[+]Φ[+] or (Φ/[+])ΦΦ[+](Φ/[+]), where Φ is M, L, V, I, or F

and [+] is K or R – referred to here as ET-interacting motifs (ETMs)[17,24,25]. Screening the yeast

nuclear proteome revealed 2418 ETMs in 1253 proteins, including 60 of the 78 proteins

identified in our chromatin-MS experiment (**Fig. 5B and Table S6**). Given this large number of

putative interactors, we used AlphaFold2 to model interactions between the Bdf1 ET domain

and candidate ETMs[37]. As an initial validation of this approach, we modeled the BRD4 ET

domain with selected partner peptides and observed strong similarity between the predicted

structures and published experimental structures, including formation of an interfacial β-sheet

involving the unstructured loop between the α2 and α3 helices of the ET domain, which adopts

a β-strand configuration when bound to partner peptides (**Fig. S8B-C**). Modeling the Bdf1 ET

domain with the same peptides similarly produced structures consistent with experimental data,

including conditional interfacial β-sheet formation, suggesting a conserved mode of interaction

(**Fig. S8D**). We next folded the Bdf1 ET domain with each of the 2418 ETMs identified in yeast

nuclear proteins using two implementations of AlphaFold2 and scored models using multiple

confidence metrics and interfacial β-sheet establishment (see Materials and Methods) (**Table

S7**). To test whether our approach could identify bona fide ET domain interactors, we focused

on the TFIID subunit Taf7, a confirmed Bdf1-interacting partner. The interaction was previously

mapped to the N-terminal 100 amino acids of Taf7[15]. Within this region, we identified four

putative ETMs, each ranking highly in accessibility and model confidence (**Figs. 5C and S8E-F

and Table S7**). Structural models of these four ETMs in complex with the Bdf1 ET domain were

well supported and showed conditional interfacial β-sheet formation (**Figs. 5D and S9A**). Using

a yeast two-hybrid system, we tested whether the Bdf1-Taf7 interaction is mediated by the ET

domain and by ETMs in the Taf7 N-terminal region. We found that the Bdf1 ET domain interacts

with Taf7 and that this interaction was abolished either by mutating the ET domain or by

substituting basic residues with alanine in all four Taf7 ETMs (**Fig. 5E**). Based on these results,

together with the observation that conditional β-sheet formation correlates with higher model

confidence (**Fig. S9B-C**), we defined 770 high-confidence ETMs (AlphaFold RSA ≥ 0.24 and

FoldScore = 1) present in 596 nuclear proteins (**Table S7**). This high-confidence ETM-

containing set was enriched for proteins previously associated with Bdf1 function (**Fig. S9D**).

Taken together, these findings provide a mechanistic basis for Bdf1-dependent recruitment of

TFIID, demonstrate that the ET domains of yeast and mammalian BET proteins engage their

targets using a conserved interaction mechanism, and validate our approach for systematically

identifying and characterizing interacting partners of the BET protein ET domain.

Fig. 5. **The ET domain of yeast and mammalian BET proteins uses the same mechanism**
to engage its targets. (**A**) Volcano plot comparing –log10 *p*-value and log2 change in
abundance for chromatin-associated proteins following Bdf1/2 depletion. Data for reliably
detected nuclear proteins are shown (*n* = 724). (**B**) Schematic representation of the
experimental strategy for identifying high-confidence ET-interacting motifs (ETMs) in *S.*
cerevisiae nuclear proteins. (**C**) Functional domains of Taf7. Interaction with Bdf1 was
previously mapped to the unstructured N-terminal region of Taf7 [15] , which contains four high-
confidence ETMs (detail). The TAFII55 region mediates interaction with Taf1 and is conserved
across Taf7 homologs in other eukaryotes. The predicted C-terminal coiled-coil domain is poorly
characterized. Other regions of Taf7 are largely unstructured. (**D**) AlphaFold2 (AF2) predicted
structures for the Bdf1 ET domain in association with four putative ETMs in the Bdf1-interaction
region of Taf7. Confidence metrics (ipSAE, pDockQ2, and LIS) and the number of interfacial
contacts supporting structural predictions are shown. (**E**) Y2H analysis of the interaction
between the Bdf1 ET domain and Taf7. Plasmids expressing the Bdf1 ET domain (WT or mut),
Taf7 (WT or mut), or empty vector (EV) were co-transformed into the host strain. Cells were
serially diluted, spotted on indicated media, and imaged after three days of growth (*n* = 3). ET
mut – ET domain with four conserved acidic residues substituted with alanine. Taf7 mut – Taf7

with basic residues in the four ETMs in the N-terminal region (first 101 amino acids[15])
substituted with alanine.

Multiple interactions mediated by the ET domain contribute to gene transcription

To further define the mechanistic basis by which the ET domain regulates transcription, we

selected the TFIID subunit Taf7 and several additional regulatory factors for detailed analysis.

Specifically, we focused on Bur1/CDK9, Spt6, the PAF1C subunit Rtf1, two conserved mRNA-

processing factors (Rat1/XRN2 and Rna14/CSTF3), and Pob3, a subunit of the histone

chaperone FACT. Each of these proteins contains at least one high-confidence ETM (**Fig. S10**

and Table S7), and all except Pob3 showed decreased chromatin association following Bdf1/2

depletion in our chromatin-MS experiment (**Fig. 5A**). Notably, both FACT subunits Pob3 and

Spt16 were previously identified as putative Bdf1-associated proteins by mass spectrometry[18],

and CDK9, FACT, SPT6, PAF1C, XRN2 and CSTF3 have been linked to BET proteins in

mammalian cells[5,13,22,38]. However, the mechanistic basis of an association involving BET

proteins and any of these factors except CDK9 has not been established.

We first used parallel reaction monitoring mass spectrometry (PRM-MS), a highly quantitative

MS method that targets predefined peptides[39], to measure changes in chromatin association of

Bur1, FACT, Spt6, PAF1C, Rat1, and Rna14 following Bdf1/2 depletion. Because Rtf1 could not

be reliably detected by PRM-MS, we instead quantified changes in Paf1, the major subunit of

PAF1C. For all factors tested, we observed an approximately 50% loss of chromatin

association, without a corresponding decrease in total protein levels (**Fig. 6A and Table S5**).

Second, we used a yeast two-hybrid system to test interactions between predicted high-

confidence ETMs in Bur1, Pob3, and Spt6 (**Fig. S10 and Table S7**) and the ET domain of Bdf1.

We found that the Bdf1 ET domain interacted with all predicted targets and that, with the

exception of one Pob3 ETM, these interactions were abolished by mutation of either the ET

domain or the ETMs (**Fig. S11A**). Based on these results, we generated yeast strains stably

expressing variants of Taf7, Bur1, Spt6, or Pob3 in which all identified ETMs were mutated by

substituting lysine or arginine residues with alanine. All ETM-mutant strains exhibited moderate

growth defects, indicating the functional importance of ET-mediated interactions with the

analyzed factors (**Fig. 6B**). Next, we applied SLAM-seq to determine whether ETM-mutant

strains display alterations in transcriptional programs (**Table S3**). In the case of the Taf7 and

Bur1 mutant strains, we observed downregulation of large subsets of genes (**Fig. 6C**).

Conversely, we detected upregulation of many genes in the the Pob3 and Spt6 mutant strains

(**Fig. 6C**), suggesting that the interactions between BET proteins and FACT or Spt6 are

important for reducing and/or fine-tuning the transcription of certain genes. Consistent with this

interpretation, prior studies reported increased coding transcription of subsets of genes upon

impaired FACT or Spt6 function[40–42]. Importantly, across all ETM-mutant strains, the subsets of

genes that passed the significance threshold overlapped with genes that are strongly sensitive

to Bdf1/2 loss (**Fig. S11B**). In summary, our findings demonstrate that ET domain–mediated

interactions of BET proteins support chromatin occupancy of multiple partner proteins and

enable optimal transcription of target genes.

Fig. 6. The ET domain modulates transcription by recruiting key regulatory factors. (**A**)
Abundance of selected proteins in chromatin-enriched fractions (top panel) or whole cell extract
(bottom panel) following Bdf1/2 depletion as determined by parallel reaction monitoring mass
spectrometry. Central lines indicate mean protein abundance. Error bars represent standard
deviation of the mean (*n* = 6). Results of a Welch's t-test are shown (* – *p*-value < 0.05, ** – *p*-
value < 0.01, ns – not significant). (**B**) Growth assays comparing the fitness of strains
expressing variants of indicated proteins carrying targeted ETM mutations to control strains
expressing a wild-type variant of the protein from the same genomic locus. Black markers
indicate mean generation times. Error bars represent 95% confidence interval (*n* = 5). Results of
a Welch's t-test are shown (* – *p*-value < 0.05, ** – *p*-value < 0.01, *** – *p*-value < 0.001). (**C**)

Volcano plots showing log2 change in transcription due to mutation of ETMs in indicated proteins (n = 4,498). The numbers of genes showing significant up- or down-regulation are indicated. Thresholds used: fold change – 1.5-fold; p-value – 0.05 (Welch's t-test).

Discussion

Discovery of specific inhibitors of BET BDs brought the promise of effective treatments for cancer and other diseases. However, the clinical application of BD inhibitors has faced significant challenges due to emerging resistance, cellular heterogeneity, and an incomplete understanding of BET protein biology. In this work, we used a highly versatile yeast model system to define the contributions of all conserved BET protein domains to cell viability, gene transcription, and BET chromatin occupancy. We found that the ET domain, rather than the BDs, constitutes the primary functional module of BET proteins. These results both complement and challenge existing models of BET-mediated transcription, reconcile conflicting observations from prior studies, and suggest new directions for future research.

Many studies have reported BET protein recruitment and function that persist despite BD inhibition[5,10–12,22]. Through genetic analysis, we identified five BET protein domains essential for cell viability, including the BDs, the ET domain, and the phosphorylated NPS/CPS regions. Although the requirement for at least one BD and for the NPS/CPS regions was previously established[18,32], our work is the first to demonstrate that the ET domain is essential for cell survival. Consistent with the viability defects, we found that the ET domain makes major contributions to global transcription and to BET protein recruitment to chromatin, exceeding the contributions of the BDs. In addition, guided by prior studies[23–25], we identified conserved acidic residues required for ET domain function *in vivo*. The ET domain has been proposed as a feasible drug target for modulating aberrant transcription in human disease[17,28,29]. Structural information for the ET domain in complex with selected peptide ligands is available, and our data show that the mechanistic basis of ET-mediated interactions is conserved between yeast and mammals. Thus, the yeast model system can serve as a valuable platform to evaluate the ability of small-molecule inhibitors to disrupt ET domain function. Importantly, relative sensitivity of cancer cells to BD inhibition or BET protein degradation differs depending on the tissue of origin and other characteristics, suggesting a possibility of tailored therapeutic approaches[4,8,10]. Altogether, our findings provide a framework and rationale for developing approaches to

modulate BET protein activity by targeting the ET domain either in place of, or in combination

with, BD inhibition.

Other phenotypes we observed for Bdf1 mutants also complement and extend prior studies.

Motif B and the BID were shown to facilitate BRD4 dimerization in biochemical assays, and

deletion of motif B caused dissociation of BRD2 from chromatin[31,43]. We observed a significant

growth phenotype correlated with changes in Bdf1 recruitment and, to a lesser extent, changes

in transcription resulting from deletion of the B/BID regions. Together with prior studies, these

findings indicate that BET proteins function as dimers, and future work should address how

dimerization modulates BET protein recruitment and activity. For example, an important

regulatory layer may arise from the relative ability of BET proteins to form homo- and

heterodimers. Phosphorylation of BET proteins in the NPS and CPS regions has been linked

with resistance to BD inhibition, interactions with protein partners, and the propensity of BET

proteins to dimerize[10,11,30,31]. It was proposed that NPS/CPS phosphorylation may act as a

switch that modulates BET protein dimerization and affinity for distinct partners[30,31]. In contrast,

our finding that a phosphomimetic *BDF1* variant supports normal growth and causes only mild

changes in transcription and Bdf1 chromatin occupancy suggests that dynamic regulation of

BET protein phosphorylation is not required for BET protein function. Moreover, prior work

proposed distinct roles for the NPS and CPS regions, with NPS phosphorylation linked to BD

activity and CPS phosphorylation suggested to influence ET domain function[10,30]. We found that

mutation or deletion of NPS did not impair BET protein function, mutation or deletion of CPS

was detrimental, and simultaneous perturbation of both regions was lethal. Based on these

observations, we propose that phosphorylation of the NPS and CPS regions supports the same

functional role or roles of BET proteins. Nevertheless, the biological significance of BET protein

phosphorylation remains unresolved and warrants further investigation.

Two recent studies provided mechanistic explanations for BD-independent functions of

mammalian BET proteins in transcription[5,22]. Zheng *et al.*[5] demonstrated that the C-terminal

fragment specific to the long isoform of BRD4 can independently promote the release of paused

RNA polymerase II (Pol II) through interaction with CDK9/CCNT1 (the P-TEFb complex) and

can rescue transcription of a subset of genes following depletion of endogenous BRD4. Yeast

lack an equivalent of the long BRD4 isoform, and transcription in yeast does not involve a

regulated Pol II pause-and-release mechanism. Our experiments demonstrated that the Bdf1

ET domain interacts with the CDK9 homolog Bur1, and that mutation of Bur1 ETMs impairs cell

growth and transcription of a subset of genes. As additional validation, we previously reported

defects in Pol II processivity at many of the same genes following Bdf1/2 depletion[2]. Taken

together, these observations support a conserved association between BET proteins and

Bur1/CDK9 in yeast and mammals, even though the mechanistic basis of the interaction differs.

In yeast, the roles of BET proteins in transcription initiation and elongation are mediated

primarily by a single Bdf1 isoform and likely by the same functional domain, the ET domain. In

mammalian cells, evolutionary acquisition of the long BRD4 isoform may reflect the need to

separate BRD4 functions in transcription elongation from other activities also mediated by the

short BRD4 isoform, which may be shared with BRD2 and BRD3[14,17,23]. Why such functional

separation became advantageous in the context of more complex gene regulatory networks

remains an important question for future investigation.

Zhang *et al.*[22] reported that BRD4 activates transcription at estrogen receptor binding sites

through BD-independent associations with SPT5, SPT6, and PAF1C. Consistent with this

finding, we observed that Bdf1/2 depletion reduces chromatin association of Spt6 and PAF1C.

Spt5, Spt6, and PAF1C subunits each contain high-confidence ETMs, and mutation of Spt6

ETMs resulted in growth defects and dysregulated transcription at many Bdf1/2-dependent

genes. Zhang *et al.*[22] also showed that association with the transcriptional coactivator Mediator

contributes to BD-independent BRD4 recruitment. Importantly, the mechanistic basis of the

established association between BET proteins and Mediator remains unresolved. Because

several Mediator subunits are present in our high-confidence ETM list, it is plausible that BET

proteins directly interact with Mediator via the ET domain. Finally, although Bdf1/2 depletion

modestly reduces Mediator chromatin occupancy[2], Bdf1 chromatin association may also be

regulated by interactions with Mediator, consistent with the substantial loss of Bdf1 chromatin

occupancy observed upon ET domain mutation.

In summary, we provided evidence that the ET domain has a critical role in transcription by

serving as a hub for interactions with multiple protein partners, including the transcription

coactivator TFIID, Bur1/CDK9, and the histone chaperones Spt6 and FACT. Our analysis

indicates that the repertoire of direct ET domain interactors is likely substantially larger. The

experimental framework described here can be applied to identify and functionally characterize

ET domain interactions with additional transcription regulators in both yeast and mammalian

cells. We propose that multiple protein-protein interactions mediated by the ET domain facilitate

recruitment of diverse components of the transcription machinery, as well as recruitment of BET

proteins themselves. Importantly, this model is consistent with current views of transcription regulation based on the formation of transcriptional condensates through transient interactions among multivalent proteins, and with the propensity of BET proteins to promote condensate formation at gene regulatory elements[44,45].

Despite fundamental and clinical relevance, many aspects of the biology of BET proteins remain poorly understood. We revealed critical roles of the BET protein ET domain in sustaining global transcription and facilitating BET protein recruitment to chromatin. Our findings provide a new mechanistic explanation for the failure of BD inhibitors to abolish BET protein chromatin occupancy and function in clinical settings and suggest directions for future investigations toward a comprehensive model of the complex roles of BET proteins in transcription regulation.

Limitations of the study

First, the experiments described in this study were carried out under optimal growth conditions (rich medium, 30°C). As such, it remains to be determined if the contributions of distinct BET protein domains to transcription vary depending on the nutrient availability, stress, or external signaling cues. Second, although prior evidence suggests that Bdf1 is the primary BET protein in yeast cells[2,15], we cannot exclude the possibility that Bdf2 plays important and non-redundant roles in transcription that are not addressed by our experiments. For example, Bdf2 may be necessary for gene activation rather than steady-state transcription, analogous to proposed roles for BRD2 and BRD3 in mammalian cells [46]. Consistent with this idea, our recent study identified the *BDF2* promoter as a target of numerous sequence-specific transcription factors, the *BDF2* gene was shown to be regulated by two distinct RNA degradation mechanisms in response to environmental conditions, and Bdf2 was among a small subset of yeast proteins with an unusually short half-life, suggesting dynamic regulation of *BDF2* expression transcriptionally, post-transcriptionally, and post-translationally[47–49]. Finally, there is a possibility that small amounts of endogenous Bdf1/2 remaining after depletion using the AID system may have contributed to confounding effects in our experiments, potentially biasing our interpretation. However, we consider this unlikely, as we observed highly similar results between growth retardation experiments based on Bdf1/2 depletion and *BDF1/2* gene deletion, in which growth was supported by *BDF1* variants expressed from minichromosomal plasmids.

Materials and Methods

Yeast cell growth

All *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* strains used in this study are listed in Table S2. For strain construction, *S. cerevisiae* strains were grown in YPD medium (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% glucose, 20 µg/ml adenine sulfate) or in synthetic complete (SC) media (0.17% yeast nitrogen base without ammonium sulfate or amino acids [BD Difco], 0.5% ammonium sulfate, 40 µg/ml adenine sulfate, 0.6 mg/ml amino acid dropout mix, supplemented with 2 µg/ml uracil and 0.01% other amino acids to complement auxotrophic markers) at 30°C. Standard amino acid dropout mix contains 2 g each of Tyr, Ser, Val, Ile, Phe, Asp, and Pro and 4 g each of Arg, Thr, Lys, and Met. 1.5% Bacto-agar (BD Difco) was added to medium as required for growth on solid media. For complementation assays, *S. cerevisiae* strains were grown in SC medium lacking Leu to select for cells carrying a minichromosomal plasmid with *BDF1* variants and plated onto medium containing 5-fluoroorotic acid (5-FOA) to shuffle out the wild-type *BDF1* plasmid carrying the URA3 marker. For genomic and growth assays, *S. cerevisiae* cells were grown in YPD medium at 30°C with shaking. *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* cells were grown in YE medium (0.5% yeast extract, 3% glucose) at 30°C with shaking. In experiments involving degron-mediated depletion of target proteins, cells were treated with 1 mM IAA dissolved in DMSO, or with DMSO alone, for 25 min or 3 h to induce protein degradation, followed by protocol-specific steps. For SLAM-seq and ChEC-seq experiments, *S. cerevisiae* cells were collected between an OD600 of 0.5 and 0.7, and *S. pombe* cells were collected at an OD600 of 1.0. For growth assays, cells were grown from an OD600 of 0.0001–0.0005 for 15 h with or without addition of IAA or DMSO. A minimum of five biological replicates were collected for growth assays using strains expressing *BDF1* variants from a minichromosomal plasmid. Three biological replicates were collected for all other experiments unless otherwise indicated.

Plasmid and strain construction

Plasmids and *S. cerevisiae* strains were constructed using standard methods and are described in **Tables S1 and S2**, respectively. Previously described plasmids or strains were used as indicated[36,50–52]. Proteins were chromosomally tagged by yeast transformation and homologous recombination of PCR-amplified DNA. For ChEC-seq experiments, proteins were tagged with 3xFLAG-MNase::TRP1 or 3xFLAG-MNase::HYG using pGZ110[36] or pMD75 (this work) plasmids, respectively.

ET domain overexpression

The gene fragment encoding the Bdf1 ET domain was cloned into the pMD1 plasmid under the

control of the *GPM1* promoter and the *BDF1* terminator and placed in frame with the *RPL25*

nuclear localization signal and a 3xV5 epitope. The resulting plasmid pJR15 was integrated into

the *TRP1* locus of strain RDY73 (Bdf1/2-AID) to generate strain RDY388.

Western blot analysis

A 1 ml fraction of culture was collected and pelleted from strains after treatment with IAA or

DMSO, washed with 500 µl water, and resuspended in 100 µl of yeast whole cell extract buffer

(60 mM Tris-HCl [pH 6.8], 10% glycerol, 2% SDS, 5% 2-mercaptoethanol, 0.0025%

bromophenol blue). After heating at 95°C for 5 min, samples were centrifuged at 21,000 × g for

5 min and analyzed by SDS-PAGE and western blot. Protein signals were visualized using the

Odyssey DLx scanner (Li-Cor) and quantified using the Odyssey Empiria Studio program (Li-

Cor). Fluorescent signal from total protein staining (Li-Cor Total Protein Stain workflow) was

used to normalize signals for target proteins.

SLAM-seq

SLAM-seq was performed as previously described[34]. Briefly, following DMSO or IAA treatment,

S. cerevisiae cultures were treated with 5 mM 4-thiouracil (4tU) in DMSO or with DMSO alone

for 4 min. Cells were immediately fixed in cold methanol on dry ice and stored at –80°C. The

OD600 at the time of collection was ~0.7. *S. pombe* cultures were treated with 4tU and collected

using the same procedure. Three biological replicates were collected for all experiments. RNA

purification and DNase I treatment were performed using the Quick-RNA Fungal/Bacterial

Miniprep kit (Zymo Research) according to the manufacturer's recommendations under

reducing conditions, as described. Five micrograms of total RNA was used for alkylation. A total

of 200 ng of alkylated RNA was used to construct 3′ mRNA sequencing libraries. Libraries were

sequenced on a NovaSeq 6000 (Illumina) at the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation

(OMRF) Clinical Genomics Center (Oklahoma City, OK, USA).

SLAM-seq data analysis

Data (paired-end 150 bp reads) were analyzed as previously described[34]. Preprocessing and

processing steps were implemented as a Snakemake workflow

(https://github.com/DonczewLab/SLAM-Seq_Analysis). Briefly, reads were preprocessed using

fastp (version 0.23.2)[53] and bbduk (BBMap version 39.06)

(https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap/). Reads were then aligned and processed using SLAM-

DUNK (version 0.4.3)[54]. Total read counts were defined as the number of reads remaining after

alignment and filtering in SLAM-DUNK. T>C read counts were defined as the number of reads

containing ≥2 T>C conversions. Genes with zero T>C read counts in one or more replicate

samples among all 25 min depletion experiments were excluded. Normalization and differential

expression analyses were performed on T>C read counts using DESeq2 (version 1.38.3)[55].

Normalization factors were calculated using total read counts for 25 min depletion experiments.

Because large changes in total read counts were expected after 3 h depletion, spike-in read

counts were used for normalization in those experiments. Genes that did not meet DESeq2

criteria for fold-change and/or *p*-value calculation were excluded from downstream analyses.

ChEC-seq

ChEC-seq was performed as previously described with minor modifications[2,56,57]. Briefly, 50 ml

S. cerevisiae cultures were pelleted at 2000 × g for 3 min. Cells were resuspended in 1 ml of

Buffer A (15 mM Tris-HCl [pH 7.5], 80 mM KCl, 0.1 mM EGTA, 0.2 mM spermine [Millipore

Sigma], 0.3 mM spermidine [Millipore Sigma], 1X protease inhibitors [2 µg/ml aprotinin, 1 µg/ml

pepstatin A, 1 µg/ml leupeptin, 2 mM PMSF]), transferred to a 1.5 ml microcentrifuge tube, and

pelleted at 1500 × g for 30 s. Cells were washed twice with 1 ml of Buffer A and resuspended in

570 µl of Buffer A. Thirty microliters of 2% digitonin (Millipore Sigma) was added to a final

concentration of 0.1%, and cells were permeabilized for 5 min at 30°C with shaking (900 rpm).

Samples were incubated with 0.2 mM CaCl2 for 5 min at 30°C with shaking. A 100 µl fraction of

the suspension was mixed with 100 µl of Stop Solution (400 mM NaCl, 20 mM EDTA, 4 mM

EGTA). Samples were then incubated with 0.4 mg/ml Proteinase K (Thermo Fisher Scientific)

for 30 min at 55°C. DNA was purified using the ChIP DNA Clean and Concentrator kit (Zymo

Research) and eluted in 30 µl of elution buffer. Samples were treated with 0.3 mg/ml RNase A

(Thermo Fisher Scientific) for 20 min at 37°C. Thirty microliters of Sera-Mag Speedbeads

(Cytiva), prepared as described (dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.x54v9p7b1g3e/v2), were

added, and samples were incubated for 10 min at room temperature. Supernatants were

transferred to a new tube, and the volume was adjusted to 175 µl (10 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0).

DNA was purified again using the ChIP DNA Clean and Concentrator kit and eluted in 30 µl of

Elution Buffer. Libraries were prepared using the Next Ultra II DNA Library Prep kit (New

England Biolabs) as described[58] and sequenced on a NovaSeq 6000 at the OMRF Clinical

Genomics Center.

ChEC-seq data analysis

Data (paired-end 150 bp reads) were analyzed as previously described with minor

modifications[2,56]. Initial preprocessing and processing steps were implemented as a Snakemake

workflow (https://github.com/DonczewLab/ChEC-Seq_Analysis). Briefly, reads were

preprocessed using bbduk (BBMap version 39.06) (https://sourceforge.net/projects/bbmap/) and

aligned using Bowtie 2 (version 2.5.0)[59]. BAM files were generated, sorted, and indexed using

Samtools (version 1.18)[60]. Genome coverage was calculated and normalized by counts per

million (CPM) using deepTools2 (version 3.5.4)[61]. Average genome coverage across replicates

was calculated using BEDTools (version 2.30.0)[62] and bedGraphToBigWig[63]. SAM files for *S.*

cerevisiae were converted to tag directories using the HOMER[64] 'makeTagDirectory' tool. Peaks

were called using the HOMER 'findPeaks' tool with optional arguments set to '-o auto -C 0 L 2 F

2', using the free MNase dataset as a control[2]. These settings apply a default false discovery

rate (FDR; 0.1%) and require peaks to be enriched twofold over the control and twofold over the

local background. Resulting peak files were converted to BED format using the 'pos2bed.pl'

program. For each peak, the summit was defined as the midpoint between the peak borders.

For promoter assignment, the list of annotated ORF sequences (excluding entries classified as

'dubious' or 'pseudogene') was downloaded from the SGD website

(https://www.yeastgenome.org). Data for 5888 genes were merged with TSS positions[65]. If TSS

annotation was missing, the TSS was manually assigned at −100 bp relative to the start codon.

At this stage, biological replicates were averaged for each sample. Peaks were assigned to

promoters if their summit was located between −300 and +100 bp relative to the TSS. When

more than one peak mapped to a promoter, the peak closest to the TSS was used. Promoters

bound in at least two out of four replicate experiments were included in the final list. To quantify

log2 changes in promoter occupancy, signal per promoter was calculated as the sum of

normalized reads within a 200 bp window centered on the promoter peak summit.

ET-interacting motif discovery

Putative ET-interacting motifs (ETMs) were identified using SLiMSearch (version 4) [66]. The

previously described ETMs $\Phi[+]\Phi[+]$ and $(\Phi/[+])\Phi\Phi[+](\Phi/[+])$, where Φ is M, L, V, I, or F and [+]

is K or R[17], were used as input to query the *S. cerevisiae* proteome. ETMs were limited to those

present in nuclear proteins based on evidence in AllianceMine[67]. Overlapping and/or adjacent

ETMs were collapsed. Disorder propensity and accessibility were calculated in SLiMSearch

using IUPred2A[68] and AlphaFold RSA[69], respectively.

Structural predictions

Initial folding experiments involving characterized BRD4-interacting peptides and the BRD4 ET

domain or the Bdf1 ET domain were performed using a locally installed instance of AlphaFold2

(version 2.3.2)[37,70]. Experimental structures were obtained from the Protein Data Bank (PDB)[71].

ChimeraX (version 1.10.1)[72] was used to visualize structures and calculate structural similarity

and interfacial contacts. Similarity between experimental and predicted structures was

calculated as root mean square deviation (RMSD). Contacts were calculated as the number of

interfacial residue pairs ≤ 4.0 Å apart with a maximum predicted aligned error (PAE) ≤ 5.0 Å.

ETMs in nuclear proteins (n = 2418) were folded with the Bdf1 ET domain using two

implementations of AlphaFold2 : the locally installed AlphaFold2 instance (as above) and

ColabFold Batch (version 1.5.5)[73] run on Google Colaboratory. Eight amino acids N-terminal

and eight amino acids C-terminal to each ETM were included in folding experiments.

Confidence metrics were calculated using the ipSAE program (version 3)[74]. Cutoffs of PAE ≤ 10

Å and distance ≤ 10 Å were used to compute ipSAE scores. Combined ipSAE confidence was

calculated as the unweighted z-score average (scaled 0-1) across ipSAE scores of the top-

ranked AlphaFold2 and ColabFold models. Combined pDockQ2 confidence was calculated as

the unweighted z-score average (scaled 0-1) across pDockQ2 scores of the top-ranked

AlphaFold2 and ColabFold models. The DSSP program (version 4.5.6)[75] was used to assign

secondary structure elements (i.e., interfacial β-sheet establishment) in predicted structures.

FoldScore was calculated based on conditional interfacial β-sheet establishment across top-

ranked AlphaFold2 and ColabFold models: a FoldScore of 1 indicates that interfacial β-sheets

with the same orientation were assigned in both models; a FoldScore of 0.5 indicates that

interfacial β-sheets with different orientations were assigned in the two models or that an

interfacial β-sheet was assigned in only one model; and a FoldScore of 0 indicates that an

interfacial β-sheet was not assigned in either model.

Chromatin mass spectrometry

Chromatin-enriched fractions and whole cell extract were collected using chromatin-enriched

fractionation (ChEF) as previously described, with modifications[76]. Briefly, *S. cerevisiae* was

grown in 200 ml YPD medium at 30°C with shaking at 220 rpm to an OD600 of ~0.5 and split

into two 100 ml cultures. Cultures were treated with IAA or DMSO for 25 min. Cells were

pelleted at 2000 × g for 3 min, washed once with sterile water, and stored at –80°C. The OD600

at the time of collection was ~0.7. A minimum of five biological replicates were collected. Cells

were resuspended in 1 ml ChEF buffer 1 [76] supplemented with 1X phosphatase inhibitors (Apex

Biotechnology), 1X deacetylase inhibitors (Apex Biotechnology), and 1X protease inhibitors (see

above). Cells were combined with 1.5 ml disruption beads and processed in a Mini-Beadbeater-
24 (Biospec Products) at 3800 rpm for 30 s followed by incubation on ice for 2 min, repeated 10
times. Cell lysate was recovered as previously described[77] and cleared twice by centrifugation
at 500 × g for 5 min at 4°C. A fraction of the cleared lysate represented whole cell extract. The
remaining lysate was processed as described previously[76], except that ChEF buffer 2 was
supplemented with 1X phosphatase inhibitors, 1X deacetylase inhibitors, and 1X protease
inhibitors. Chromatin-enriched fractions were resuspended in 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5).
834
A total of 15 pmoles of bovine serum albumin (BSA) was added to 100 µg of total protein from
chromatin-enriched fractions or 200 µg of total protein from whole cell extracts as an internal
standard. Samples were processed as previously described[78]. Samples from chromatin-
enriched fractions were analyzed using a Q Exactive Plus mass spectrometer system
(ThermoFisher Scientific) in data-independent acquisition (DIA) mode with a 20 m/z window.
Samples from whole cell extracts were analyzed using an Exploris 480 mass spectrometer
system (ThermoFisher Scientific) in DIA mode with a 10 m/z window. Data were analyzed using
DIA-NN (version 1.9.2)[79] searching against the *S. cerevisiae* UniProt protein database
(downloaded from ENA/EMBL, accession GCA_000146045.2).
844
Parallel reaction monitoring mass spectrometry
Whole cell extracts and chromatin-enriched fractions were collected as described above. A total
of 14 pmoles of BSA was added to 60 µg of total protein from chromatin-enriched fractions or
100 µg of total protein from whole cell extracts as an internal standard. Samples were
processed as previously described[78] and analyzed using a Stellar mass spectrometer system
(ThermoFisher Scientific) in PRM mode with a resolution of 1.2 Da and a scan rate of 67
kDa/sec. Data were processed using Skyline (version 25.1)[80] to identify and integrate
chromatographic peaks for a defined set of validated peptides. Retention times were calibrated
using BSA and trypsin peptides. Protein abundance was calculated as the geometric mean of a
minimum of two monitored peptides normalized to the BSA internal standard and expressed as
pmol per 10 µg of total protein.
856
857   **Yeast two-hybrid analysis**
858   Yeast two-hybrid experiments were performed using the Matchmaker Gold Y2H system (Takara
859   Bio) based on the manufacturer's recommendations with modifications. Briefly, the *S. cerevisiae*
860   strain Y2HGold was co-transformed with *TRP1*-marked Gal4-BD and *LEU2*-marked Gal4-AD

plasmids, pGBKT7 and pGADT7, respectively. Co-transformed strains were cultured in SC-Leu-Trp medium at 30°C overnight, adjusted to an OD600 of 1, and serially diluted tenfold. Five microliters of each dilution was spotted onto SC-Leu-Trp, SC-Leu-Trp-His, or SC-Leu-Trp-His plates supplemented with 2 mM 3-Amino-1,2,4-triazole (3-AT, MilliporeSigma). Plates were incubated at 30°C and imaged daily for a minimum of four days.

Acknowledgments

We thank Linda Thompson, Dean Dawson, Christopher Sansam and Karen Arndt for helpful comments, Steven Hahn for plasmids, and Stephen Buratowski for anti-Bdf1 antibody. We thank the OMRF Research Computing Services, Clinical Genomics Center, and Center for Biomedical Data Sciences for contributions to this work.

Funding

National Science Foundation grant 2346844 (RD).

National Institutes of Health grant R35GM160259 (RD).

National Institutes of Health grant P20GM103636 (Project 2, RD).

Oklahoma Center for Adult Stem Cell Research grant 231012 (RD).

National Institutes of Health grant P30GM149376 (Bioinformatics and Pathway Core, KB).

Author contributions

Conceptualization: JR, MD, RD

Methodology: JR, MD, MK, KB, RD

Investigation: IP, JR, AM, MD, MK, RD

Visualization: IP, JR, AM, RD

Supervision: JR, MD, RD

Writing—original draft: RD

Writing—review & editing: JR, MD, RD

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data and materials availability

All data are available in the main text or the supplementary materials. SLAM-seq and ChEC-seq datasets have been deposited in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) under accession

number GSE313013. Raw datasets from DIA and PRM mass spectrometry experiments have been deposited in the Zenodo repository (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17966389). Reference genome assemblies and annotations for *S. cerevisiae* strain S288C (version R64-3-1) and *S. pombe* strain 972h- (version ASM294v2) were retrieved from the NCBI Datasets repository (GCF 000146045.2 and GCF 000002945.1, respectively). BED files for *S. cerevisiae* and *S. pombe* used in SLAM-DUNK were retrieved from the Zenodo repository (https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10714018).

References

1. Filippakopoulos, P. *et al.* Histone Recognition and Large-Scale Structural Analysis of the Human Bromodomain Family. *Cell* **149**, 214–231 (2012).

2. Donczew, R. & Hahn, S. BET family members Bdf1/2 modulate global transcription initiation and elongation in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Elife* **10**, e69619 (2021).

3. Muhar, M. *et al.* SLAM-seq defines direct gene-regulatory functions of the BRD4-MYC axis. *Science* **360**, 800–805 (2018).

4. Winter, G. E. *et al.* BET Bromodomain Proteins Function as Master Transcription Elongation Factors Independent of CDK9 Recruitment. *Molecular Cell* **67**, 5-18.e19 (2017).

5. Zheng, B. *et al.* Distinct layers of BRD4-PTEFb reveal bromodomain-independent function in transcriptional regulation. *Molecular Cell* **83**, 2896-2910.e4 (2023).

6. Fujisawa, T. & Filippakopoulos, P. Functions of bromodomain-containing proteins and their roles in homeostasis and cancer. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* **18**, 246–262 (2017).

7. Wang, N., Wu, R., Tang, D. & Kang, R. The BET family in immunity and disease. *Signal Transduction and Targeted Therapy* **6**, 1–22 (2021).

8. Filippakopoulos, P. *et al.* Selective inhibition of BET bromodomains. *Nature* **468**, 1067–1073 (2010).

9. Nicodeme, E. *et al.* Suppression of inflammation by a synthetic histone mimic. *Nature* **468**, 1119–1123 (2010).

10. Shu, S. *et al.* Response and resistance to BET bromodomain inhibitors in triple-negative

breast cancer. *Nature* **529**, 413–417 (2016).

11. Calder, J., Nagelberg, A., Luu, J., Lu, D. & Lockwood, W. W. Resistance to BET inhibitors in

lung adenocarcinoma is mediated by casein kinase phosphorylation of BRD4. *Oncogenesis*

10, 27 (2021).

12. Sun, Y. *et al.* Epigenetic heterogeneity promotes acquired resistance to BET bromodomain

inhibition in ovarian cancer. *Am J Cancer Res* **11**, 3021–3038 (2021).

13. Arnold, M., Bressin, A., Jasnovidova, O., Meierhofer, D. & Mayer, A. A BRD4-mediated

elongation control point primes transcribing RNA polymerase II for 3'-processing and

termination. *Mol Cell* S1097-2765(21)00506–2 (2021) doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2021.06.026.

14. Zheng, B. *et al.* BRD2 bridges TFIID and MOF-H4K16ac-containing nucleosomes to

promote transcriptional initiation. *Molecular Cell* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2025.12.010

(2025) doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2025.12.010.

15. Matangkasombut, O., Buratowski, R. M., Swilling, N. W. & Buratowski, S. Bromodomain

factor 1 corresponds to a missing piece of yeast TFIID. *Genes Dev.* **14**, 951–962 (2000).

16. Kanno, T. *et al.* BRD4 assists elongation of both coding and enhancer RNAs by interacting

with acetylated histones. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **21**, 1047–1057 (2014).

17. Lambert, J.-P. *et al.* Interactome Rewiring Following Pharmacological Targeting of BET

Bromodomains. *Mol Cell* **73**, 621-638.e17 (2019).

18. Matangkasombut, O. & Buratowski, S. Different sensitivities of bromodomain factors 1 and 2

to histone H4 acetylation. *Mol. Cell* **11**, 353–363 (2003).

19. Slaughter, M. J. *et al.* HDAC inhibition results in widespread alteration of the histone

acetylation landscape and BRD4 targeting to gene bodies. *Cell Rep* **34**, 108638 (2021).

20. Kayne, P. S. *et al.* Extremely conserved histone H4 N terminus is dispensable for growth but

essential for repressing the silent mating loci in yeast. *Cell* **55**, 27–39 (1988).

21. Ranish, J. A. *et al.* The study of macromolecular complexes by quantitative proteomics. *Nat.*

Genet. **33**, 349–355 (2003).

22. Zhang, S. & Roeder, R. G. Resistance of estrogen receptor function to BET bromodomain

inhibition is mediated by transcriptional coactivator cooperativity. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 1–15

(2024) doi:10.1038/s41594-024-01384-6.

23. Rahman, S. *et al.* The Brd4 extraterminal domain confers transcription activation

independent of pTEFb by recruiting multiple proteins, including NSD3. *Mol Cell Biol* **31**,

2641–2652 (2011).

24. Zhang, Q. *et al.* Structural Mechanism of Transcriptional Regulator NSD3 Recognition by

the ET Domain of BRD4. *Structure* **24**, 1201–1208 (2016).

25. Konuma, T. *et al.* Structural Mechanism of the Oxygenase JMJD6 Recognition by the

Extraterminal (ET) Domain of BRD4. *Sci Rep* **7**, 16272 (2017).

26. Alerasool, N., Leng, H., Lin, Z.-Y., Gingras, A.-C. & Taipale, M. Identification and functional

characterization of transcriptional activators in human cells. *Molecular Cell* **82**, 677-695.e7

(2022).

27. Trojanowski, J. *et al.* Transcription activation is enhanced by multivalent interactions

independent of phase separation. *Molecular Cell* **82**, 1878-1893.e10 (2022).

28. Xing, E. *et al.* Development of Murine Leukemia Virus Integrase-Derived Peptides That Bind

Brd4 Extra-Terminal Domain as Candidates for Suppression of Acute Myeloid Leukemia.

ACS Pharmacol. Transl. Sci. **4**, 1628–1638 (2021).

29. Huang, Q. *et al.* Peptide Inhibitor Targeting the Extraterminal Domain in BRD4 Potently

Suppresses Breast Cancer Both In Vitro and In Vivo. *J. Med. Chem.* **67**, 6658–6672 (2024).

30. Wu, S.-Y., Lee, A.-Y., Lai, H.-T., Zhang, H. & Chiang, C.-M. Phospho switch triggers Brd4

chromatin binding and activator recruitment for gene-specific targeting. *Mol Cell* **49**, 843–

857 (2013).

31. Malvezzi, F. *et al.* Phosphorylation-dependent BRD4 dimerization and implications for

therapeutic inhibition of BET family proteins. *Commun Biol* **4**, 1–13 (2021).

32. Sawa, C. *et al.* Bromodomain factor 1 (Bdf1) is phosphorylated by protein kinase CK2. *Mol.*

Cell. Biol. **24**, 4734–4742 (2004).

33. Han, X. *et al.* Roles of the BRD4 short isoform in phase separation and active gene

transcription. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **27**, 333–341 (2020).

34. Ridenour, J. B. & Donczew, R. An end-to-end workflow to study newly synthesized mRNA

following rapid protein depletion in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *BMC Methods* **1**, 8 (2024).

35. Donczew, R., Warfield, L., Pacheco, D., Erijman, A. & Hahn, S. Two roles for the yeast

transcription coactivator SAGA and a set of genes redundantly regulated by TFIID and

SAGA. *eLife* **9**, e50109 (2020).

36. Zentner, G. E., Kasinathan, S., Xin, B., Rohs, R. & Henikoff, S. ChEC-seq kinetics

discriminates transcription factor binding sites by DNA sequence and shape in vivo. *Nature*

Communications **6**, 8733 (2015).

37. Jumper, J. *et al.* Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature* **596**,

583–589 (2021).

38. Zhou, D. *et al.* FACT subunit SUPT16H associates with BRD4 and contributes to silencing

of interferon signaling. *Nucleic Acids Res* **50**, 8700–8718 (2022).

39. Peterson, A. C., Russell, J. D., Bailey, D. J., Westphall, M. S. & Coon, J. J. Parallel Reaction

Monitoring for High Resolution and High Mass Accuracy Quantitative, Targeted Proteomics

*. *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics* **11**, 1475–1488 (2012).

40. True, J. D. *et al.* The Modifier of Transcription 1 (Mot1) ATPase and Spt16 Histone

Chaperone Co-regulate Transcription through Preinitiation Complex Assembly and

Nucleosome Organization*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **291**, 15307–15319 (2016).

41. Viktorovskaya, O. *et al.* Essential histone chaperones collaborate to regulate transcription

and chromatin integrity. *Genes Dev.* **35**, 698–712 (2021).

42. Connell, Z., Parnell, T. J., McCullough, L. L., Hill, C. P. & Formosa, T. The interaction

between the Spt6-tSH2 domain and Rpb1 affects multiple functions of RNA Polymerase II.

Nucleic Acids Res **50**, 784–802 (2022).

43. Garcia-Gutierrez, P., Mundi, M. & Garcia-Dominguez, M. Association of bromodomain BET

proteins with chromatin requires dimerization through the conserved motif B. *Journal of Cell*

Science **125**, 3671–3680 (2012).

44. Stortz, M., Presman, D. M. & Levi, V. Transcriptional condensates: a blessing or a curse for

gene regulation? *Commun Biol* **7**, 1–10 (2024).

45. Sabari, B. R. *et al.* Coactivator condensation at super-enhancers links phase separation and

gene control. *Science* **361**, (2018).

46. Gilan, O. *et al.* Selective targeting of BD1 and BD2 of the BET proteins in cancer and

immunoinflammation. *Science* **368**, 387–394 (2020).

47. Christiano, R., Nagaraj, N., Fröhlich, F. & Walther, T. C. Global Proteome Turnover

Analyses of the Yeasts *S. cerevisiae* and *S. pombe*. *Cell Reports* **9**, 1959–1965 (2014).

48. Mahendrawada, L., Warfield, L., Donczew, R. & Hahn, S. Low overlap of transcription factor

DNA binding and regulatory targets. *Nature* **642**, 796–804 (2025).

49. Roy, K. & Chanfreau, G. Stress-Induced Nuclear RNA Degradation Pathways Regulate

Yeast Bromodomain Factor 2 to Promote Cell Survival. *PLOS Genetics* **10**, e1004661

(2014).

50. Brachmann, C. B. *et al.* Designer deletion strains derived from Saccharomyces cerevisiae

S288C: a useful set of strains and plasmids for PCR-mediated gene disruption and other

applications. *Yeast* **14**, 115–132 (1998).

51. Warfield, L. *et al.* Transcription of Nearly All Yeast RNA Polymerase II-Transcribed Genes Is

Dependent on Transcription Factor TFIID. *Mol Cell* **68**, 118-129.e5 (2017).

52. Sikorski, R. S. & Hieter, P. A system of shuttle vectors and yeast host strains designed for

efficient manipulation of DNA in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics* **122**, 19–27 (1989).

53. Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y. & Gu, J. fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ preprocessor.

Bioinformatics **34**, i884–i890 (2018).

54. Neumann, T. *et al.* Quantification of experimentally induced nucleotide conversions in high-

throughput sequencing datasets. *BMC Bioinformatics* **20**, 258 (2019).

55. Love, M. I., Huber, W. & Anders, S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for

RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biology* **15**, 550 (2014).

56. Mahendrawada, L., Warfield, L., Donczew, R. & Hahn, S. Low overlap of transcription factor

DNA binding and regulatory targets. *Nature* 1–9 (2025) doi:10.1038/s41586-025-08916-0.

57. Warfield, L., Donczew, R., Mahendrawada, L. & Hahn, S. Yeast Mediator facilitates

transcription initiation at most promoters via a Tail-independent mechanism. *Molecular Cell*

82, 4033-4048.e7 (2022).

58. Möller, M., Ridenour, J. B., Wright, D. F., Martin, F. A. & Freitag, M. H4K20me3 is important

for Ash1-mediated H3K36me3 and transcriptional silencing in facultative heterochromatin in

a fungal pathogen. *PLOS Genetics* **19**, e1010945 (2023).

59. Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S. L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nature Methods*

9, 357–359 (2012).

60. Danecek, P. *et al.* Twelve years of SAMtools and BCFtools. *Gigascience* **10**, giab008

(2021).

61. Ramírez, F. *et al.* deepTools2: a next generation web server for deep-sequencing data

analysis. *Nucleic Acids Research* **44**, W160–W165 (2016).

62. Quinlan, A. R. & Hall, I. M. BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic

features. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 841–842 (2010).

63. Kent, W. J., Zweig, A. S., Barber, G., Hinrichs, A. S. & Karolchik, D. BigWig and BigBed:

enabling browsing of large distributed datasets. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 2204–2207 (2010).

64. Heinz, S. *et al.* Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors prime cis-

regulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Mol Cell* **38**, 576–589

(2010).

65. Park, D., Morris, A. R., Battenhouse, A. & Iyer, V. R. Simultaneous mapping of transcript

ends at single-nucleotide resolution and identification of widespread promoter-associated

non-coding RNA governed by TATA elements. *Nucleic Acids Res* **42**, 3736–3749 (2014).

66. Krystkowiak, I. & Davey, N. E. SLiMSearch: a framework for proteome-wide discovery and

annotation of functional modules in intrinsically disordered regions. *Nucleic Acids Research*

45, W464–W469 (2017).

67. The Alliance of Genome Resources Consortium. Updates to the Alliance of Genome

Resources central infrastructure. *Genetics* **227**, iyae049 (2024).

68. Mészáros, B., Erdős, G. & Dosztányi, Z. IUPred2A: context-dependent prediction of protein

disorder as a function of redox state and protein binding. *Nucleic Acids Res* **46**, W329–

W337 (2018).

69. Piovesan, D., Monzon, A. M. & Tosatto, S. C. E. Intrinsic protein disorder and conditional

folding in AlphaFoldDB. *Protein Science* **31**, e4466 (2022).

70. Evans, R. *et al.* Protein complex prediction with AlphaFold-Multimer. 2021.10.04.463034

Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2021.10.04.463034 (2022).

71. Berman, H. M. *et al.* The Protein Data Bank. *Nucleic Acids Res* **28**, 235–242 (2000).

72. Meng, E. C. *et al.* UCSF ChimeraX: Tools for structure building and analysis. *Protein*

Science **32**, e4792 (2023).

73. Mirdita, M. *et al.* ColabFold: making protein folding accessible to all. *Nat Methods* **19**, 679–

682 (2022).

74. Dunbrack, R. L. Rēs ipSAE loquunt: What's wrong with AlphaFold's ipTM score and how to

fix it. 2025.02.10.637595 Preprint at https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.02.10.637595 (2025).

75. Hekkelman, M. L., Salmoral, D. Á., Perrakis, A. & Joosten, R. P. DSSP 4: FAIR annotation

of protein secondary structure. *Protein Science* **34**, e70208 (2025).

76. Cuevas-Bermúdez, A., Garrido-Godino, A. I. & Navarro, F. A novel yeast chromatin-

enriched fractions purification approach, yChEFs, for the chromatin-associated protein

analysis used for chromatin-associated and RNA-dependent chromatin-associated

proteome studies from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Gene Reports* **16**, 100450 (2019).

77. de Jonge, W. J., Brok, M., Kemmeren, P. & Holstege, F. C. P. An Optimized Chromatin

Immunoprecipitation Protocol for Quantification of Protein-DNA Interactions. *STAR*

Protocols **1**, 100020 (2020).

78. Rindler, P. M., Plafker, S. M., Szweda, L. I. & Kinter, M. High Dietary Fat Selectively

Increases Catalase Expression within Cardiac Mitochondria *. *Journal of Biological*

Chemistry **288**, 1979–1990 (2013).

79. Demichev, V., Messner, C. B., Vernardis, S. I., Lilley, K. S. & Ralser, M. DIA-NN: neural

networks and interference correction enable deep proteome coverage in high throughput.

Nat Methods **17**, 41–44 (2020).

80. Pino, L. K. *et al.* The Skyline ecosystem: Informatics for quantitative mass spectrometry

proteomics. *Mass Spectrometry Reviews* **39**, 229–244 (2020).

81. Lin, Y.-J. *et al.* Solution structure of the extraterminal domain of the bromodomain-

containing protein BRD4. *Protein Science* **17**, 2174–2179 (2008).

82. Wang, Y. *et al.* Coiled-coil networking shapes cell molecular machinery. *MBoC* **23**, 3911–

3922 (2012).

1095

1096

1097