Pat1 promotes processing body assembly by enhancing the phase separation of the DEAD-box ATPase Dhh1 and RNA

Ruchika Sachdev[1], Maria Hondele[1], Miriam Linsenmeier[1], Pascal Vallotton[1], Christopher F. Mugler[1,2,3], Paolo Arosio[1], and Karsten Weis [1, 4]

[1] ETH Zurich, 8093 Zurich, Switzerland

[2] University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley CA, 94720, USA

[3] Current address: Amyris Inc. 5885 Hollis Street, Emeryville, 94608, California, USA

[4] To whom correspondence should be addressed

Email: karsten.weis@bc.biol.ethz.ch

Competing interests:

The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Abstract

Processing bodies (PBs) are cytoplasmic mRNP granules that assemble via liquid-liquid phase

separation and are implicated in the decay or storage of mRNAs. How PB assembly is regulated in cells

remains unclear. We recently identified the ATPase activity of the DEAD-box protein Dhh1 as a key

regulator of PB dynamics and demonstrated that Not1, an activator of the Dhh1 ATPase and member

of the CCR4-NOT deadenylase complex inhibits PB assembly *in vivo* [Mugler et al., 2016]. Here, we

show that the PB component Pat1 antagonizes Not1 and promotes PB assembly via its direct

interaction with Dhh1. Intriguingly, *in vivo* PB dynamics can be recapitulated *in vitro*, since Pat1

enhances the phase separation of Dhh1 and RNA into liquid droplets, whereas Not1 reverses Pat1-

Dhh1-RNA condensation. Overall, our results uncover a function of Pat1 in promoting the

multimerization of Dhh1 on mRNA, thereby aiding the assembly of large multivalent mRNP granules

that are PBs.

Introduction

Cells are often subjected to severe environmental fluctuations such as nutrient deficiency,

temperature changes or osmotic shock. To cope with stresses, a variety of mechanisms have evolved

allowing cells to respond acutely and survive. These include changes in the gene expression program,

which are often driven by robust transcriptional responses. Yet cells must also inactivate old mRNAs

that may interfere with adaptation to the new condition, and therefore, post-transcriptional regulation

and RNA turnover are critical to enable rapid changes in gene expression (Ashe et al., 2000; Mager and

Ferreira, 1993).

The post-transcriptional fate of eukaryotic mRNAs is tightly linked to the complement of proteins that

associate with it to form mRNPs (messenger ribonucleoproteins). For example, the presence of the m^7

G cap structure at the 5' end is crucial for eIF4E binding, while Pab1 binds the 3' poly-A tail, both of

which protect the mRNA against degradation and promote translation initiation. On the other hand,

mRNA turnover is thought to initiate via deadenylation by the Ccr4/Pop2/Not1 complex (Muhlrad and

Parker 1992; Meyer et al., 2004; Sheth and Parker, 2004), followed by cap removal by the decapping

enzyme Dcp1/2 and 5'-3' degradation of the transcript by the exonuclease Xrn1 (Coller and Parker

2004; Larimer and Stevens, 1990). Thus, the processes of mRNA translation and decay are coupled and

act antagonistically (Radakrishnan et al., 2016; Beelman and Parker, 1994; Schwartz and Parker, 1999;

Schwartz and Parker, 2000; Sun et al,. 2012; Hu et al., 2009; Chan et al., 2018)

The balance between mRNA translation and decay is not only temporally but also spatially controlled.

For instance in yeast, upon glucose starvation, the majority of cellular translation halts and

untranslated mRNA as well as many factors of the RNA decay machinery concentrate in large

cytoplasmic mRNP granules, so called processing bodies [PBs] (Brengues et al., 2005; Sheth and Parker,

2003; Teixeira et al., 2005). PBs contain major components of the 5'-3' RNA decay pathway, e.g. Dcp1/2

and Xrn1, as well as activators of decapping - namely, the DEAD-box ATPase Dhh1, Pat1, Edc3 and the

Lsm1-7 complex. PBs presumably form around mRNAs sequestered away from active translation, and

in support of this, inhibition of translation initiation leads to induction of PBs (Frank and Anderson,

2008; Chan et al., 2018; Teixeira et al., 2005; Lui et al., 2010). On the contrary, inhibition of translation

elongation, for example by the drug cycloheximide which traps mRNA on ribosomes, and prevents

their influx into PBs, has the opposite effect and leads to PB disassembly (Texeria et al., 2005; Mugler

et al., 2016).

In consequence, PBs have been implicated in a variety of post-transcriptional processes such as

translational repression (Holmes et al., 2004; Coller and Parker, 2005), mRNA decay (Sheth and Parker,

2003; Cougot et al., 2004; Mugler et al., 2016), mRNA storage (Brengues et al., 2005; Bhattacharya et

al., 2006), and in higher eukaryotes, micro RNA-mediated repression (Liu et al., 2005; Pillai et al., 2005).

PBs and related mRNP granules such as stress granules, P granules in germ cells, neuronal granules etc.

form in a number of different species from yeast to mammals, and in a variety of cell types and

biological contexts, suggesting that these structures are crucial for cellular function or survival (Barbee

et al., 2006; Seydoux and Braun, 2006). Indeed, there is evidence that PBs can be essential for cell

survival under stress. For instance, cells unable to form PBs show a drastic loss in viability in stationary

phase (Ramachandran et al., 2011; Shah et al., 2013). However, the precise role of PBs in the regulation

of gene expression is a matter of debate and in order to understand PB function it is critical to examine

how PBs assemble and are regulated.

Numerous recent studies have shown that PBs are dynamic, membraneless organelles that assemble

from a variety of multivalent but weak RNA-protein, protein-protein and RNA-RNA interactions; a

phenomenon called liquid-liquid phase separation [LLPS]. The resulting granules are liquid-like,

spherical, dynamic and are dissolved by the alcohol 1,6-hexanediol, all key features of LLPS (Decker et

al., 2007; Fromm et al., 2012, 2014; Guo and Shorter, 2015; Mugler et al., 2016; Kroschwald et al.,

2015).

Although PB formation occurs via a plethora of multivalent protein-RNA interactions in a redundant

fashion (Rao and Parker, 2017), there are key players whose deletion drastically attenuates PB

assembly (Decker et al., 2007; Pilkington and Parker, 2007; Scheller et al., 2007). One such component

is the highly abundant DEAD-box ATPase Dhh1 (DDX6 in humans). Dhh1 is an enhancer of decapping

and is involved in the translational repression of mRNAs (Carroll et al., 2011; Coller and Parker,

2005; Fischer and Weis, 2002, Coller and Parker 2001). We recently showed that Dhh1 undergoes

phase separation *in vitro*, and controls PB dynamics *in vivo* via its RNA-stimulated ATPase activity

whereas the ATPase activator Not1 dissolves Dhh1 droplets *in vitro* and inhibits PB formation *in vivo*.

However, whether additional factors assist Dhh1 in promoting PB formation remains to be determined

and is the focus of this study.

One such candidate is the eukaryotic PB component Pat1, an evolutionarily conserved multi-domain

RNA binding protein that, like Dhh1, functions in both translational repression and mRNA decay

(Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Teixeira and Parker, 2007). In yeast, Pat1 acts as a scaffold that brings

together repression and decay factors (Dhh1, Edc3, Lsm1-7, Dcp1/2 etc.) via direct and/or indirect

interactions with mRNPs (Nissan et al., 2010). Dhh1 for example directly binds acidic residues in the N-

terminal domain of Pat1, an interaction that is conserved across species (Sharif et al., 2013; Conti;

Ozgur and Stoecklin, 2013). Deletion of *PAT1* in yeast alters the localization of PB components, whereas

its overexpression induces the formation of constitutive PBs even in unstressed cells (Pilkington and

Parker, 2007; Coller and Parker, 2005). Furthermore, it was shown that phosphorylation of Pat1 by the

cAMP-dependent protein kinase A (PKA) inhibits PB formation, and cells expressing a phospho-mimetic

mutant of Pat1 are defective in PB assembly (Ramachandran et al., 2011). However, the mechanism

by which Pat1 regulates PB assembly is unclear.

Here, we demonstrate that Pat1 promotes PB formation via Dhh1, and we show that the interaction

between Pat1 and Dhh1 is critical for robust PB assembly *in vivo*. Using a liquid phase separation assay

we can recapitulate this function of Pat1 *in vitro* as addition of recombinant Pat1, but not of a Pat1

variant that cannot bind Dhh1, enhances phase separation of Dhh1 and RNA. Overall, our *in vivo* and

in vitro data suggests that during stress Pat1 antagonizes the inhibitory effect of Not1 on PB assembly

and promotes the multimerization of Dhh1 on mRNA, leading to the formation of PBs.

Results

Constitutive PB formation upon Pat1 overexpression is Dhh1 dependent

The PB components Pat1 and Dhh1 were each previously shown to be required for PB formation in

yeast (Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Ramachandran et al., 2011; Mugler et al., 2016; Rao et al., 2017).

To understand the relationship between Pat1 and Dhh1 in the regulation of PB assembly, we took

advantage of the observation that overexpression of Pat1 leads to constitutive PB formation (Coller

and Parker 2005). This allowed us to characterize their respective regulatory contributions without

external influences such as nutrient starvation signals. As expected, Pat1 overexpression from its

endogenous locus using the galactose promoter in the presence of Dhh1 led to the formation of

constitutive PBs, as visualized by co-localization of Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry foci (Figure 1A). No

foci were formed when Pat1 was not overexpressed or when we overexpressed the human influenza

hemagglutinin (HA) tag alone (Figure 1- figure supplement 1A). Notably, when Pat1 was overexpressed

in cells that lack Dhh1, a drastic reduction in the number of PBs was observed, as visualized by the

bona fide PB marker Edc3-GFP and its co-localization with Dcp2-mCherry (Figure 1A, B). This

demonstrates that formation of constitutive PBs upon Pat1 overexpression requires Dhh1.

Pat1 and Dhh1 interaction is essential for PB assembly

Pat1 is an 88 kDa protein that consists of an N-terminal un-structured domain (Pat1-N) followed by a

proline-rich stretch plus middle domain and a C-terminal globular fold (Pat1-C). The N-terminal domain

of Pat1 directly binds Dhh1's RecA2 core via a conserved DETF motif (Sharif et al., 2013; Ozgur and

Stoecklin, 2013). Furthermore, Pat1's C-terminus harbors two serine residues that are phosphorylated

by the cAMP-dependent protein kinase A (PKA) negatively regulating the interaction with Dhh1 and PB

formation (Ramachandran et al., 2011).

In order to understand how these Pat1 domains influence liquid-liquid phase separation and PB

assembly, we wanted to characterize various Pat1 mutants both *in vivo* and *in vitro*. Unfortunately, we

were unable to recombinantly express functional, full-length Pat1. Based on published crystal

structures and *in vitro* interaction studies, we therefore developed a minimal Pat1 construct

encompassing both N- and C-terminal domains that we refer to as Pat1-NC [amino acids: 5-79 (N) and

456-787 (C) connected with a $(GGS)_4$ linker] (Figure 1C). The N-terminal fragment of Pat1 (amino acids

5-79) was crystallized and shown to directly bind to Dhh1 (Sharif et al., 2013) whereas the C-terminus

of Pat1 (amino acids 456-787) contains the PKA phosphorylation sites and mediates the interaction

with the LSM-complex and RNA (Sharif and Conti, 2013, Fourati et al., 2014, Charenton et al., 2017,

Ramachandran et al., 2011, Pilkington and Parker, 2008).

To investigate whether this *PAT1-NC* construct is functional *in vivo* and behaves similar to wild-type

Pat1, we took advantage of the temperature-sensitive growth defect of a *PAT1* deletion mutant

(Fourati et al., 2014). Like full-length Pat1, expression of the *PAT1-NC* construct fully restored growth

of *pat1Δ* cells at 37° C (Figure 1- figure supplement 1B and 1C). In addition, we also tested if the

expression of *PAT1-NC* is able to rescue the synthetic lethality that was observed in *pat1Δ edc3Δ scd6Δ*

cells (Fourati et al., 2014). The expression of *PAT1-NC* rescued the growth phenotype of *pat1Δ edc3Δ*

scd6Δ cells at 37°C to a similar extent as achieved by wild-type *PAT1* (Figure 1- figure supplement 1D).

Furthermore, cells expressing the *PAT1-NC* construct when starved of glucose induced PBs to a similar

level as wild-type *PAT1* (Figure 1D, E) indicating full functionality *in vivo.* The PBs in the *PAT1-NC*

expressing cells rapidly dissolved upon re-addition of glucose demonstrating that they are reversible

and dynamic rather than anomalous granules (Figure 1D). In addition, Pat1-NC-GFP itself localized to

PBs upon stress in a reversible manner (Figure 1- figure supplement 1E). Finally, when we

overexpressed Pat1-NC using a GAL promoter, robust PBs were induced in the absence of stress (Figure

1F, G). Taken together our data suggest that the *PAT1-NC* construct is fully functional *in vivo.*

We next examined whether Pat1-NC can interact with Dhh1 *in vitro*, and as expected, Pat1-NC

displayed strong binding to full-length Dhh1 in a GST pull down assay (Figure 2A). However, this

interaction was completely abolished for a Pat1-NC variant in which the N-terminal DETF motif was

mutated to four alanines [Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$, see supplemental table S2B for a list of all mutants used in this

study] (Figure 2A).

We next investigated the effect of the *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* mutant in the context of the full-length protein on

PB formation *in vivo*. While cells expressing *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* showed a mild growth defect compared to the

wild type *PAT1*, they grew significantly better than *pat1Δ* cells, indicating that this protein is at least

partially functional (Figure 2- figure supplement 1A). To examine whether the interaction between

Pat1 and Dhh1 is required for PB formation, we monitored PB assembly upon stress in the absence of

glucose in wild-type (*PAT1*) or the *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* background. As expected, the number of PBs was

drastically reduced in the complete absence of Pat1, as visualized by Dhh1-GFP (Figure 2- figure

supplement 1B). Importantly, *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* expressing cells also demonstrated a drastic reduction in PB

number compared to cells expressing *PAT1* (Figure 2B, C) and the Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$-GFP protein itself showed

a significant defect in localizing to PBs (Figure 2D, E).

To assure that the Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ mutant is stably expressed we checked its protein levels using Western

blotting and observed that the mutant expresses to similar levels as wild-type Pat1 (Figure 2- figure

supplement 1C). Moreover, in the Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ mutant cells, the expression levels of Dhh1 were

comparable to the Dhh1 levels in cells harboring a wild-type copy of Pat1 (Figure 2- figure supplement

1D). This demonstrates that the defect in PB formation in cells expressing the Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ binding

mutant is specifically due to impaired Pat1 function.

We were unable to overexpress the *Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$* mutant in yeast. In order to investigate PB formation

independently of carbon starvation stress, we therefore treated cells with the drug hippuristanol,

which inhibits the eukaryotic translation initiation factor eIF4A (Bordeleau, M.E., et al., 2006). In

consequence, hippuristanol prevents translation initiation and robustly induces PB formation within

minutes in cells expressing wild-type *PAT1* (Chan et al., 2018) [Figure 2F, Video 1]. Cells expressing

pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ however, did not show PB formation until 2hrs after hippuristanol addition (Figure 2F and

Video 2).

It cannot be excluded that the Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ mutant might interfere with the binding of Pat1 to some

other factor with a role in PB formation in addition to Dhh1. We therefore also employed a

complementary approach wherein we examined mutants on Dhh1 that impair interaction with Pat1.

Two such Dhh1 mutants have been described: Dhh1 Mut3A (Dhh1$^{S292D\,N294D}$) and Dhh1 Mut3B

(Dhh1^{R295D}) that partially or completely abolish binding to Pat1, respectively (Sharif et al., 2013). Cells

expressing either wild-type Dhh1, Dhh1$^{S292D\,N294D}$, Dhh1^{R295D} or lacking Dhh1 altogether were starved of

glucose and PB assembly was assessed. Whereas the Dhh1 variants expressed as well as wild-type

Dhh1 (Figure 3- figure supplement 1), we observed a drastic reduction in the number of PBs in both

Dhh1$^{S292D\,N294D}$, Dhh1^{R295D} cells (Figure 3A, B), and as published before also in *dhh1Δ* cells (Figure 3A, B,

Mugler et al., 2016). The Dhh1^{R295D} had a more severe PB formation defect compared to the

Dhh1$^{S292D\,N294D}$ aligning with the *in vitro* binding abilities of these Dhh1 mutants to Pat1 (Sharif et al.,

2013).

To test PB formation independently of carbon starvation stress in these Pat1-binding mutants of Dhh1,

we used the drug hippuristanol as before. Dhh1 wild-type cells when treated with hippuristanol formed

PBs within minutes as judged by the co-localization of Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry foci (Figure 3 C, D

and video 3). However, both the Dhh1^{S292DN294D} and Dhh1^{R295D} mutants did not form robust PBs until 3

hours of hippuristanol treatment exhibiting a phenotype similar to *dhh1Δ* cells (Figure 3 C, D and videos

4, 5, 6). Taken together, our data reveal that the Pat1-Dhh1 interaction is pivotal for robust PB

assembly.

Pat1 phosphorylation status influences RNA binding

Pat1 is a target of the cAMP-dependent protein kinase A (PKA) and phosphorylation of two serines

(amino acids 456/457) in the C-terminus of Pat1 under glucose-rich conditions was previously shown

to negatively regulate PB formation (Ramachandran et al., 2011). In agreement with the published

literature, cells expressing the *pat1^{EE}* mutant showed a defect in PB formation (Figure 4- figure

supplement 1A, B and Ramachandran et al., 2011). To better understand how Pat1 phosphorylation

controls PB assembly, we sought to characterize the influence of the phosphorylation status of Pat1

on PB formation in the absence of stress. Overexpression of *PAT1$^{WT/SS}$* (WT= wild-type) and *pat1^{AA}* (non-

phosphorylatable) led to constitutive PB formation as visualized by Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry

positive foci. However, upon overexpression of *pat1^{EE}* (phospho-mimetic)*,* foci number was reduced

(Figure 4 A, B). The Pat1^{EE}-GFP mutant was expressed as well as wild-type Pat1-GFP and had no effect

on Dhh1 expression (Figure 2- figure supplement 1C and 1D) emphasizing that the phospho-mimetic

mutant specifically impairs Pat1 function.

Pull-down experiments from cell extracts previously suggested that PKA-dependent phosphorylation

of Pat1 diminishes its interaction with Dhh1 (Ramachandran et al., 2011). To test whether this effect

is direct, we performed pull-down assays with the recombinant Pat1-NC protein and the Pat1-NC^{EE}

variant. However, in this assay there was no significant difference in Dhh1 binding between Pat1-NC

and Pat1-NC^{EE} (Figure 2A). Since the strong DETF binding site in Pat1-N might mask any weaker

interaction in Pat1-C, we also tested for direct binding of Pat1-C to Dhh1 but were unable to detect

any interaction (Figure 4C), indicating that the DETF-motif in Pat1-N provides the major interaction

surface for Dhh1.

Pat1-C was previously shown to bind RNA (Pilkington and Parker, 2008; Chowdhury et al., 2014). We

therefore tested whether RNA binding is regulated by PKA-dependent phoshphorylation by performing

RNA oligo gel shift assays using recombinant proteins. Whereas wild-type Pat1-C robustly binds the

RNA oligo and shifts it to higher molecular weight in a native PAGE gel, Pat1^{EE} displayed a significantly

reduced RNA shift (quantified in Figure 4D). Taken together, our *in vivo* and *in vitro* results on the

phospho-mimetic Pat1^{EE} mutant suggest that in addition to Pat1-Dhh1 binding, also the interaction

between Pat1 and RNA is important for PB formation.

Pat1 and Not1 act antagonistically *in vivo*

Our lab previously showed that Not1 promotes PB disassembly by activating the ATPase activity of

Dhh1, and cells expressing a Not1 mutant that cannot bind to Dhh1 (*not1$^{9X-Dhh1}$*) form constitutive PBs

in non-stressed cells. Yet these PBs are less intense and fewer in number than those formed upon

glucose starvation (Mugler et al., 2016), indicating that additional mechanisms prevent PB formation

in glucose-replete conditions.

Since in glucose-rich media PB assembly is also inhibited by the PKA-dependent phosphorylation of

Pat1 (Ramachandran et al., 2011), we wanted to test whether expression of the non-phosphorylatable

pat1^{AA} variant enhances PB formation in the *not1$^{9X-Dhh1}$* strain background. While expression of *pat1^{AA}*

alone was not sufficient to induce constitutive PBs as observed before (Ramachandran et al., 2011 and

Figure 4- figure supplement 1A, B), expression of *pat1^{AA}* in the presence of *not1$^{9X-Dhh1}$* significantly

increased the number of constitutive PBs compared to cells expressing *not1$^{9X-Dhh1}$* alone (Figure 5A and

B). Yet, these PBs are still not as bright and numerous as in stressed wild-type cells. Interestingly, PB

intensity strongly increased when these strains were further treated with hippuristanol, a drug that

blocks initiation and liberates mRNA molecules from polysomes. The percentage of large PBs was

highest in the *pat1^AA^ + not1^9X-Dhh1^* strain, followed by the *not1^9X-Dhh1^* and then *pat1^AA^* (Figure 5A, B).

Overall, this suggests that there are at least three determinants that act cooperatively to enhance the

formation of PBs: (a) direct interactions between Pat1-Dhh1 and Pat1-RNA; (b) lack of Not1 binding to

Dhh1 and in consequence low Dhh1 ATPase activity (Mugler et al., 2016); and (c) the availability of PB

client mRNAs that are not engaged in translation. Furthermore, our results suggest that Pat1 and Not1

act antagonistically on PB dynamics. Whereas Pat1 binding to Dhh1 enhances the assembly of PBs, the

interaction of Not1 with Dhh1 promotes PB disassembly, likely through activation of the ATPase

activity of Dhh1.

Pat1 promotes PB assembly by enhancing the phase separation of Dhh1 and RNA

At least two mechanisms of how Pat1 promotes PB formation via Dhh1 could be envisioned: first, Pat1

could slow the ATPase cycle of Dhh1, for example by preventing Not1 binding and/or inhibiting ATP

hydrolysis, second, Pat1 could directly promote oligomerization and condensation of Dhh1 on RNA.

To test the first hypothesis, we used an *in vitro* ATPase assay using purified protein components in

which Not1 robustly stimulates the ATPase activity of Dhh1 (Mugler et al., 2016). However, we did not

observe a significant inhibition of the Not1-stimulated ATPase activity upon addition of Pat1-NC (Figure

6- figure supplement 1A), suggesting that Pat1 does not directly interfere with the mechanism of

ATPase activation.

We had previously shown that PB dynamics are regulated by the ATPase activity of Dhh1 (Carroll et al.,

2011; Mugler et al., 2016). To test Pat1's effect on the Dhh1 ATPase cycle *in vivo,* we therefore also

examined the turnover of PBs that form upon Pat1 overexpression. The drug cycloheximide (CHX) traps

mRNAs on polysomes and thereby stops the supply of new RNA clients to PBs. Since active Dhh1

constantly releases mRNA molecules from PBs, a lack of mRNA influx eventually leads to their

disassembly and in consequence the catalytic dead mutant of Dhh1 that is locked in the ATP- state

(Dhh1^DQAD^) inhibits PB disassembly and was shown to have negligible turnover rates (Mugler et al.,

2016; Kroschwald et al., 2015). We observed that PBs formed upon Pat1 overexpression were more

dynamic than PBs formed in the presence of Dhh1[DQAD] and their dis-assembly kinetics was comparable

to PBs formed upon stress in a wild-type *DHH1* background (Figure 6- figure supplement 1B, C and

Videos 7, 8, 9). Thus, overall, our *in vitro* and *in vivo* findings are not consistent with the conclusion

that Pat1 blocks the ATPase activation of Dhh1.

The second hypothesis is that Pat1 promotes higher-order mRNP assembly by directly or indirectly

promoting Dhh1 oligomerization, thereby acting as a scaffold and providing additional protein-protein

or protein-RNA interactions (Coller and Parker, 2005; Roy and Parker, 2017). We have previously

shown that recombinant Dhh1 can undergo liquid-liquid phase separation (LLPS) in the presence of

RNA and ATP, and that these Dhh1 droplets can recapitulate aspects of *in vivo* PB dynamics. (Mugler

et al., 2016). We therefore utilized this *in vitro* system to test Pat1's impact on the phase separation

behavior of Dhh1.

Dhh1 droplets were assembled from purified components as described previously (Mugler et al.,

2016). Interestingly, while no LLPS of Pat1-NC alone was detected (Figure 6- figure supplement 2A),

addition of increasing concentrations of wild-type Pat1-NC strongly enhanced the LLPS of Dhh1 in the

presence of ATP and RNA as judged by an increase in the area * intensity of Dhh1 droplets (Figure 6A).

Furthermore, Pat1-NC itself enriched in Dhh1 droplets, suggesting that Pat1 and Dhh1 co-oligomerize

with RNA to form a composite phase-separated compartment (Figure 6A).

In order to test if the enhancement in phase separation of Dhh1 via Pat1 is RNA-dependent, we

perfomed this experiment also in the absence of RNA. Interestingly, we did not observe any Dhh1

droplets upon addition of increasing concentrations of Pat1-NC when RNA was omitted from the

reaction (Figure 6- figure supplement 2B) suggesting that under these *in vitro* conditions RNA plays a

critical role in the Pat1-promoted enhancement of Dhh1 oligomerization and higher-order phase

separation. Consistent with this, the Pat1-N- terminus alone which cannot bind to RNA also does not

enhance the phase separation of Dhh1 even in the presence of RNA and ATP (Figure 6- figure

supplement 2C).

Overall, our *in vitro* data suggests that a combination of both the Pat1-N (binding to Dhh1) and Pat1-C

(binding to RNA) is critically required to enhance the phase separation of Dhh1 and promote higher-

order oligomeric mRNP structures akin to *in vivo* PBs.

To test the specificity of LLPS stimulation, we tested the Pat1$^{4A\text{-}Dhh1}$ (Dhh1 binding) and Pat1^{EE} (phospho-

mimetic) mutants both of which drastically reduce PB formation *in vivo* (see Figure 2B, 4A, B and Figure

4- figure supplement 1A). Consistent with the *in vivo* results, Dhh1-RNA droplet formation was either not

at all or only mildly stimulated upon addition of these Pat1 variants (Figure 6A).

We previously demonstrated that the MIF4G domain of Not1 prevents formation of Dhh1-RNA

droplets, presumably by activating the ATPase cycle of Dhh1 (Mugler et al., 2016). We therefore next

analyzed whether the Pat1-Dhh1 droplets are still responsive to Not1. Similar to what we observed *in*

vivo (Figure 5), Not1^{MIF4G} also diminishes formation Dhh1 droplets in the presence of Pat1 *in vitro*

(Figure 6B).

Taken together our results suggest that Pat1 enhances the multivalency of protein-protein and

protein-RNA interactions in a Dhh1-Pat1 mRNP and in consequence promotes the formation of higher-

order, liquid-like mRNP droplets akin to *in vivo* PBs.

In vitro* phase separated droplets mimic the stoichiometry of PB components *in vivo

To examine how well our *in vitro* droplets resemble *in vivo* PBs we investigated the stoichiometric ratio

of Dhh1:Pat1 in these granules. In order to determine the stoichiometry *in vivo,* we measured the

number of PBs and the fluorescence intensity of GFP-tagged Dhh1 and Pat1 in these foci. Briefly, we

glucose starved both Pat1-GFP and Dhh1-GFP expressing cells to induce PBs (Figure 7- figure

supplement 1A) and used the single particle tracking software Diatrack to count the number and

intensity of PBs in an unbiased and automated manner in each strain [Vallotton et al., 2013].

Surprisingly, despite the fact that the cellular concentration of Pat1 is ten-times lower than Dhh1

(Figure 7- figure supplement 1B), the ratio of the two PB components was approximately 2:1+/-0.18

(Dhh1:Pat1) after 0.5-4 hours of starvation (Figure 7A). Extended starvation resulted in enhanced Dhh1

recruitment to PBs until reaching a Dhh1:Pat1 ratio of 2.5:1+/- 0.23, suggesting that PB composition

matures over time (Figure 7A).

In order to determine the stoichiometry of Pat1 and Dhh1 droplets *in vitro*, we imaged Dhh1-mCherry

and Pat1-GFP droplets with a confocal microscope (Figure 7- figure supplement 1C). The protein

concentration of both Dhh1 and Pat1 in the droplet was calculated from a standard curve determined

from values measured for different concentrations of the respective soluble fluorophores (Figure 7B).

Remarkably, we found a stoichiometric ratio of 2.7:1 +/- 0.13 of Dhh1 to Pat1 in the *in vitro* phase-

separated droplets, closely resembling the Dhh1:Pat1 ratio of mature PBs *in vivo* (Figure 7B).

Thus, while other mRNA decay factors also contribute to PB formation *in vivo*, our data demonstrate

that with a minimal number of constituents, namely Dhh1, RNA, ATP and Pat1 higher-order dynamic

liquid droplets can be formed *in vitro*. The *in vitro* droplets recapitulate various properties of PBs

formed *in vivo* such as (a) the stoichiometry of PB components, and (b) the dynamics of Pat1-

stimulated assembly and Not1-stimulated disassembly of *in vivo* PBs identifying Pat1 as an important

player in PB formation promoting LLPS via Dhh1.

Discussion

Tug-of-war model between Pat1 and Not1 to regulate PB dynamics

The ability of proteins and RNA to undergo liquid-liquid phase separation (LLPS) has emerged as an

essential fundamental biological process allowing cells to organize and concentrate their cellular

components without the use of membranes. Yet, how these membraneless organelles assemble, are

kept dynamic and are regulated remains enigmatic. One such cellular phase-separated compartment

is the PB and our results presented here together with our prior work (Mugler et al., 2016) identify and

characterize both positive and negative regulators of PB assembly and provides novel insight into the

regulation of membraneless organelle formation.

Overall, our work uncovers a function of Pat1 as an enhancer of PB formation that acts via Dhh1 and

counteracts the inhibitory function of Not1. Based on our results, we propose that there are at least

three inputs that cooperatively regulate PB dynamics *in vivo* (Figure 7C). First, the availability of mRNA

clients acting as seeding substrates to initiate PB formation. mRNA availability is inversely proportional

to the translation status, which is regulated by different stress responses and the metabolic state of

the cell (Figure 2C). Second, the activity of cAMP-dependent PKA negatively regulates PB assembly in

nutrient-rich conditions, at least in part through phosphorylation of Pat1. However, since expression

of non-phosphorylatable Pat1^{AA} at endogenous levels (in contrast to overexpression) is not sufficient

to induce PBs, Pat1 availability appears to be limiting (Figure 5, 4A, and Figure 4- figure supplement 1A

and Ramachandran et al., 2011). Third, activation of the Dhh1 ATPase cycle by the CCR4-Not1

deadenylation complex stimulates mRNA release and negatively regulates PB assembly. It is of note

that Not1 itself might also be subject to post-translational regulation, in response to metabolic state

and/or cell cycle stages of the cell (Mugler et al., 2016; Braun et al., 2014).

In this model, a tug-of-war between Pat1 and Not1 regulates PB assembly and disassembly: whereas

a tight Pat1-Dhh1 interaction in the presence of RNA clients, promotes PB formation, Not1, induces PB

turnover via stimulating the ATPase activity of the DEAD box ATPase Dhh1 (Figure 7C). Remarkably,

our *in vivo* findings are corroborated *in vitro* wherein, Pat1 enhances the LLPS of Dhh1 and RNA, a step

critical for the assembly of large mRNP granules, and by contrast, Not1 reverses the LLPS of Pat1-Dhh1-

RNA droplets (Figure 6 and 7C). Furthermore, the observed stoichiometry of Dhh1 and Pat1 in PBs is

recapitulated in our *in vitro* phase separation assay (Figure 7A, B).

The interaction between Pat1 and Dhh1 is critical for PB assembly

Inducing PB formation by Pat1 overexpression or hippuristanol treatment allowed us to dissect distinct

mechanisms that govern PB assembly and characterize the crucial role of the Pat1-Dhh1 interaction in

this process. The benefit of these modes of PB formation are that they bypass the characteristic

stresses associated with PB formation, such as nutrient starvation, that might have more widespread

and confounding effects on translation, mRNA degradation, or on the regulation of other PB

components.

Our experiments reveal that Pat1 functions in PB formation through Dhh1 since PB induction by Pat1

overexpression is strictly dependent on the presence of Dhh1 (Figure 1A). Furthermore, a mutant in

the DETF motif in the N-terminus of Pat1 mediating direct binding to Dhh1 (Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$ variant) and

mutants of Dhh1 that abolish Pat1 binding fail to promote PB assembly (Figure 2). These results were

further confirmed using the drug hippuristanol that inhibits translation initiation wherein PBs were

induced in wild-type cells but not in cells expressing the Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$ mutant, and the Dhh1 mutants that

abolish Pat1 binding (Dhh1^{R295D} and Dhh1^{S292DN294D}) [Figure 2F, 3C and Chan et al., 2018]. This suggests

that high mRNA load alone is inadequate for PB formation and that a direct physical interaction

between Pat1 and Dhh1 is obligatory as well. Since the DETF motif in Pat1 is conserved across evolution

and was suggested to regulate PB assembly in human cells as well (Sharif et al., 2013; Ozgur and

Stoecklin, 2013), the Pat1-Dhh1 interaction likely plays a critical role in PB formation across species.

Our results seem to be at odds with a previous publication, which suggests that Pat1 acts

independently of Dhh1 to promote PB formation (Coller and Parker 2005). However, in this study Pat1

was overexpressed from a plasmid, in the presence of the endogenous copy. When recapitulating

these conditions, we observed that PB components mislocalize to the nucleus [observed by DAPI and

a nuclear rim marker, see Figure 7- figure supplement 2A, B] and it is possible that in the absence of

additional organelle markers, this nuclear accumulation was misinterpreted as PB formation.

Pat1 enhances the LLPS of Dhh1, thereby promoting PB formation

How does Pat1 enhance PB formation? One hypothesis is that Pat1 directly counteracts the Not1-

stimulated ATPase activation of Dhh1, but we do not favor such a model since i) Pat1 does not inhibit

Dhh1's ATPase activity at physiological protein ratios *in vitro* (Figure 6- figure supplement 1A), ii)

Not1^{MIF4G} dissolves Pat1-Dhh1 condensates, while droplets formed from catalytic-dead Dhh1^{DQAD} are

Not1-resistant (Figure 6 and Mugler et al., 2016)*,* and iii) *in vivo*, PBs formed upon Pat1 overexpression

are much more dynamic than those formed from Dhh1^{DQAD} (Figure 7- figure supplement 1B).

Instead, our data are consistent with a model in which Pat1 promotes PB assembly by directly

enhancing the LLPS of Dhh1. DDX6, the human homolog of Dhh1 can oligomerize (Lange et al., 2012),

and given the fact that both DDX6 and Dhh1 are found in molar excess over mRNA, we propose that

Pat1 functions as a scaffold, providing additional multivalent interactions with Dhh1 and RNA, thereby

aiding in the fusion of Dhh1 LLPS droplets and promoting assembly of microscopically-detectable

mRNP condensates (Figure 6). Interestingly, both functional binding to Dhh1 in Pat1-N and RNA-

binding in Pat1-C are required for this mechanism as individually mutations in each of the domains

alter PB assembly *in vivo* and fail to enhance Dhh1's phase separation *in vitro*. Rather, Pat1-N alone

diminishes the extent of LLPS (Figure 6- figure supplement 2C). It is interesting to note that Pat1-N was

previously shown to interfere with the ability of Dhh1 to interact with RNA (Sharif et al., 2013) and we

thus speculate that Pat1-N might outcompete RNA from Dhh1, and in the absence of the C-terminal

Pat1 RNA-binding site destabilize droplets. This might explain why RNA-binding by Pat1's C-terminus

that is under the regulation of PKA (Figure 4A, B, Figure 4- figure supplement 1A) is critical for LLPS and

PB assembly. *In vivo*, we find that the Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$ (Dhh1 binding mutant) and Pat1^{EE} (phospho-mimetic

mutant) not only have a drastically reduced number of PBs, but also much lower intensity (reduced by

7 and 8 fold respectively, Figure 7- figure supplement 2C) compared to Pat1 wild-type PBs.

Our recent findings also show that the un-structured poly-Q rich C-terminal tail of Dhh1 is required for

PB formation *in vivo* and Dhh1 LLPS *in vitro* (Hondele et al., *submitted*). Thus, Pat1 might potentially

enhance Dhh1 multimerization via the low complexity tails of Dhh1. Structural studies will now be

needed to clarify how Pat1 facilitates oligomerization and PB formation of the Dhh1-Pat1- RNA

complex.

The emerging importance of liquid-liquid phase separation in diverse aspects of cell biology and the

power of *in vitro* reconstitution systems

As non-membrane bound organelles, it is of interest to understand how cells assemble large RNP

granules and regulate their dynamics. PBs are prominent membraneless cellular compartments, which

have been shown to be not only involved in numerous aspects of mRNA turnover, but also crucial for

survival under various cellular stresses. With an *in vitro* phase separation tool in hand that faithfully

reconstitutes certain aspects of PB formation, we are now in a position to dissect how PBs form and

characterize their biophysical behavior. This will aid us not only in elucidating key components of PB

formation, but also help us elucidate the function of PBs in regulating mRNA turnover.

At this stage, our in *vitro* systems are limited to Dhh1, Pat1, Not1 and RNA and for the sake of simplicity;

we present a model only depicting the role of Pat1 and Dhh1 in PB formation (Figure 7C). However, it

is important to note that several additional PB components have been characterized. For example, this

includes Ecd3, members of the Lsm1-7 complex, or Dcp2 that play crucial roles either alone or together

with Pat1 and Dhh1 in PB assembly. Both Edc3 and Lsm4 contain low complexity-domains that were

shown to be critical for PB formation *in vivo*, and it was recently demonstrated a threshold

concentration of low-complexity domain containing proteins is required for robust PB assembly

(Protter et al., 2018). In addition, it was previously shown that both Pat1 (C-terminus) and the Lsm1-

7 complex individually have low RNA binding ability but a reconstituted Lsm1-7-Pat1-C complex

displays an enhanced ability to bind RNA (Chowdhury et al., 2014). This might suggest that *in vivo* the

Pat1-C-terminus functions together with the Lsm1-7 complex to bind RNA and enhance PB formation.

Furthermore, it cannot be excluded that direct binding of Dcp2 to the C-terminus of Pat1 also regulates

PB assembly and RNA turnover (Fourati et al., 2014). It will thus be critical to examine additional PB

components in future experiments and to evaluate how they function together with Pat1 and Dhh1 in

order to understand the complex interplay of various inputs that regulate PB assembly and dynamics.

Nonetheless, based on our data and the aforementioned literature evidence we propose that Pat1

provides a central PB scaffold and participates in an intricate network of protein-protein and protein-

RNA interactions that promote PB assembly and influence RNA turnover rates *in vivo*.

The physical basis of LLPS has attracted a great deal of attention recently, at least in part because of

the critical role that proper mRNP assembly plays in pathological neurodegenerative diseases and

stress responses (Ramaswami et al., 2013; Alberti and Hyman 2016; Patel et al., 2015; Aguzzi and

Altmeyer, 2016; Hyman et al., 2014). An important challenge is to understand how these granules are

kept dynamic and functional under some conditions whereas the formation of solidified and aberrant

aggregates are triggered under others. Robust *in vitro* reconstitution systems that can recapitulate

mRNP granule assembly, dynamics and stoichiometry will be invaluable in addressing these research

questions and increase our understanding of the molecular mechanism of how cells age and deal with

stress.

Materials and methods

Key Resources Table				
Reagent type (species) or resource	**Designation**	**Source or reference**	**Identifiers**	**Additional information**
strain, strain background (Yeast: *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*)	W303	SGD:https://www.yeastgenome.org/strain/S000203491	KWY XYZ	MATa/MATα {leu2-3,112 trp1-1 can1-100 ura3-1 ade2-1 his3-11,15} [phi+]
strain, strain background (*Escherichia coli*)	*E.Coli* DH5α	Thermo Fisher Scientific	18258012	
strain, strain background (*Escherichia coli*)	*E.Coli* BL21 star (DE3)	Thermo Fisher Scientific	C601003	
genetic reagent ()				Please see table S1, S2A
antibody	mouse-anti-GFP	Roche	Cat# 11814460001, RRID: AB_390913	Western blot: 1:1000
antibody	rabbit-anti-Hxk1	US Biological	Cat# H2035-01, RRID:	Western blot: 1:3000

			AB_26294 57, Salem, MA	
antibody	IRdye 680RD goat-anti-rabbit	LI-COR Biosciences	Cat# 926–68071, RRID: AB_10956 166	Western blot: 1:5000
antibody	IRdye 800 donkey-anti-mouse	LI-COR Biosciences	Cat# 926–32212, RRID: AB_62184 7	Western blot: 1:10000
antibody	Rabbit-anti-Dhh1	in house	#100	Western blot: 1:5000
recombinan t DNA reagent				Please see table S2B
chemical compound, drug	hippuristanol	kind gift from Junichi Tanaka, University of the Ryukyus	hippurista nol	10uM in DMSO
chemical compound, drug	cycloheximide	Sigma-Aldrich, CH	CAS Number 66 -81-9	50ug/ml in DMSO
software, algorithm	Diatrack	http://www.diatrack.org/	Diatrack	used for counting PB number and intensity
software	fiji/imagej	NIH	https://fiji. sc/	adjusting brightness, contrast and making final figures

The details regarding all the yeast strains used in this study are in Supplementary table S1.

Supplementary table S2A contains all the plasmids used in this study. Table Supplementary S2B

contains the mutants used in this study and Table S2C describes the entire DNA oligos used for this

manuscript.

Construction of yeast strains and plasmids

S. cerevisiae strains used in this study are derivatives of W303 and are described in table S1. ORF

deletion strains and C-terminal epitope tagging of ORFs was done by PCR-based homologous

recombination, as previously described (Longtine et al., 1998). Plasmids for this study are described

in table S2A. Mutations in Pat1 were generated by introducing the mutation in the primer used to

amplify the respective Pat1 regions and stitched together with the selection marker from the plasmid

(table S2B). Mutations in Dhh1 and Not1 were generated as in Mugler et al., 2016. Primer sequences

for strain construction are listed in table S2C.

Overexpression of Pat1 wild-type and mutants

The samples were grown overnight in synthetic media containing 2% raffinose, diluted to OD_{600} = 0.05

or 0.1 the following day, and grown to mid-log phase (OD_{600}=0.3–0.4). The culture was split into two

and to one-half galactose was added to 2% final concentration and the corresponding protein induced

for 2-3 hours. The cells in both raffinose and galactose were imaged using a wide-field fluorescence

microscope.

PB induction and disassembly kinetics

PBs were induced via glucose starvation stress. Samples were grown overnight in synthetic media

containing 2% glucose, diluted to OD_{600} = 0.05 or 0.1 the following day, and grown to mid-log phase

(OD_{600}= 0.3–0.8). Cells were harvested by centrifugation and washed in ¼ volume of fresh synthetic

media +/− 2% glucose, then harvested again and re-suspended in 1 volume of fresh synthetic media

+/− 2% glucose and grown 30 min at 30°C. Cells were then transferred onto Concanavalin A-treated

MatTek dishes (MatTek Corp., Ashland, MA) and visualized at room temperature. For cycloheximide

experiments, final concentration of 50ug/mL (Sigma-Aldrich, CH) were used to examine PB disassembly

kinetics. For PB induction and to determine the kinetics of PB assembly we used hippuristanol (a

generous gift of Junichi Tanaka, University of the Ryukyus) at a final concentration of 10μM.

Wide-field fluorescence microscopy

Cells were transferred onto Concanavalin A-treated MatTek dishes (MatTek Corp., Ashland, MA) and

visualized at room temperature. Microscopy was performed using an inverted epi-fluoresence

microscope (Nikon Ti) equipped with a Spectra X LED light source and a Hamamatsu Flash 4.0 sCMOS

camera using a 100x Plan-Apo objective NA 1.4 and the NIS Elements software. Representative images

were processed using ImageJ software. Brightness and contrast were adjusted to the same values for

images belonging to the same experiment and were chosen to cover the whole range of signal

intensities. Image processing for PB analysis was performed using Diatrack 3.05 particle tracking

software (Vallotton et al., 2013) as described below.

Automated image analysis for PB quantification

In order to quantify PB formation in live cells, we used an automated image analysis in a manner similar

to Mugler et al., 2016. First, PBs were counted using Diatrack 3.05 particle tracking software using local

intensity maxima detection, followed by particle selection by intensity thresholding and particle

selection by contrast thresholding with a value of 5% (Vallotton et al., 2017). To speed up the analysis,

we renamed all our images in a form that can be recognized as a time-lapse sequence by Diatrack, and

placed them all in a single directory, such that they all will be analyzed using exactly the same image

analysis parameters. Renaming and copying was done by a custom script (supplementary code 1),

which also performed cell segmentation using a method adapted from (Hadjidemetriou et al., 2014).

Briefly, the method first detects all edges using a Laplacian edge detection step, and then traces

normals to those edges in a systematic manner. These normals tend to meet at the cell centre where

the high density of normals is detected, serving as seeds to reconstruct genuine cells. Our script thus

counts cells and reports their number for each image - information which is output to an excel table.

The results from Diatrack PB counting are imported from a text file into that table, and the number of

PB is divided by the number of cells for each image.

Protein purification

Dhh1 and Not1 were purified as described previously (Mugler et al., 2016). V5-Pat1-C, GST-Pat1-N and

GST-Pat1-NC constructs as described in Supplementary table S2A were cloned into pETM-CN vectors.

These expression vectors were transformed into chemically competent *E. coli* BL21 DE3 under the

selection of ampicillin and chloramphenicol. Pre-cultures were grown in LB at 37°C over-night, and

diluted 1:100 into rich medium the next morning. Cells were grown at 37°C to an OD_{600} of 0.6 and

induced with 200 mM IPTG (final concentration). Cells were then grown overnight at 18°C, harvested

and resuspended in 30 mL lysis buffer (500mM (Pat1-C, Pat1-N) or 300 mM NaCl (Pat1-NC), 25 mM

Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 10 mM imidazole, protease inhibitors, 10% glycerol) per cell pellet from 2 L of culture.

After cell lysis by EmulsiFlex (Avestin Inc, Ottawa, CA), the 6xHis tagged proteins were affinity extracted

with Ni^{2+} sepharose in small columns, dialyzed into storage buffer (MH200G (Pat1-C, Pat1-N): 200 mM

NaCl, 25 mM Tris pH 7.5 (RT), 10% glycerol, 2 mM DTT), MH300G (Pat1-NC): same with 300mM NaCl)

with simultaneous protease cleavage of the His-tag and GST-tag (unless required for pull-down assays)

and further purified by size exclusion with a Superdex 200 column on an AEKTA purifier (both GE Life

Sciences, Marlborough, MA) in storage buffer. Protein expression levels, His eluates and gel filtration

fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE. Clean Superdex elution fractions were pooled, concentrated

using Millipore Amicon Centrifugation units and snap frozen as ~ 20 µl aliquots in siliconized tubes in

liquid nitrogen.

ATPase assays

ATPase assays were performed according as described (Montpetit et al., 2011) with the following

modifications: final concentration 2 µM Dhh1-mCherry was mixed with 0.5 µM Not1 and Pat1-mCherry

(1 and 3µM) as indicated and protein volumes equalized with storage buffer (MH200G). 2 µL 10x

ATPase buffer (300 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 1 M NaCl, 20 mM MgCl$_2$), 4 µL 10 mg/ml polyU (unless

indicated otherwise), RNase inhibitors, 13.3 µL 60% glycerol, 2.7 µL 10 mg/mL BSA, were added to a

final volume of 36 µL. Reactions were set up in triplicate in a 96-well NUNC plate. The assay was

initiated by the addition of 40 µL of a master mix containing 1x ATPase buffer, 2.5 mM ATP (from a

100 mM stock in 0.5 M HEPES-KOH pH 7.5), 1 mM DTT, 6 mM phosphoenolpyruvate, 1.2 mM NADH

(from a 12 mM stock in 25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5) and 125–250 units / mL PK/LDH. NADH absorption

was monitored with a CLARIOstar plate reader (BMG Labtech, Ortenberg, Germany) at 340 nm in 30 s

intervals for 400 cycles.

In vitro **liquid droplet reconstitution assay**

Reactions were pipetted in 384-well microscopy plates (Brooks 384 well ClearBottom Matriplate, low

glass). Proteins were diluted to 50 µM (Dhh1) or 100 µM (Not1, Pat1) stocks with storage buffer and

mixed as droplets at the side of the well; volumes were equalized to 5 μl with storage buffer. Next, a

master mix of 12.5 μl 150 mM KCl buffer (150 mM KCl, 30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.4, 2 mM $MgCl_2$), 2μl

ATP reconstitution mix (40 mM ATP, 40 mM $MgCl_2$, 200 mM creatine phosphate, 70 U/mL creatine

kinase), 2.5 μl 2mg/ml polyU (in H_2O) as an RNA analog, 1 μl 1M HEPES-KOH pH 6.4 buffer and 2 ml

10mg/ml BSA were added and mixed by pipetting, the droplets still at the side of the well, since this

later on produced more equal droplet distribution. First imaging was performed after 20 minutes

incubation at room temperature; just prior to imaging, droplets were spun down at 100 g for 1

minute. For subsequent analysis, plates were stored in the fridge. Pictures displayed were recorded

after 1 hour incubation.

Stoichiometry analysis of Dhh1 and Pat1 in PBs *in vivo*

In order to estimate the relative amount of Dhh1 to that of Pat1 in PBs *in vivo*, we labelled both proteins

with eYGFP in two separate strains, and imaged them in exactly the same conditions after inducing

carbon (glucose) starvation stress for indicated times (Figure 6A). Using exactly the same endogenous

probe for both proteins allowed us to deduce ratios of abundances directly from ratios of intensities

(no spectral corrections are necessary). We then measured the intensity of the 10 brightest PBs as a

function of time and in both cases took the median intensity value as representative of the more visible

PBs (at least 10 PBs were present in every image for both strains and at each time point). Finally, we

divided the median value obtained for Dhh1 by that for Pat1 and plotted that ratio as a function of

time post-stress.

Stoichiometry of Dhh1 and Pat1 in phase-separated *in vitro* droplets

For the analysis of the *in vitro* phase transition of Dhh1 in the presence of Pat1, 2 μM mCherry-tagged

Dhh1 and 4 μM GFP-tagged Pat1-NC were added to 0.1 mg/mL polyU and 5 mM ATP in 150 mM KCl,

30 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.4 and 2 mM $MgCl_2$. After 1 hour incubation, the phase-separated droplets

were imaged in both the mCherry and the GFP channel by confocal fluorescence microscopy (Leica TCS

SP8) with a 63x NA 1.4 oil objective (Leica). The protein concentration was evaluated from the

563 fluorescence intensity via a standard curve obtained by measuring a series of samples at different

564 known concentrations for each fluorophore. The size distributions were obtained by analyzing the

565 images obtained by fluorescence microscopy with an in-house code written in Matlab.

GST pull-down assays

25 µl of 100 µM recombinant purified GST Pat1-NC was bound to 30 µl GST-slurry (Sigma), and one

aliquot of GST-beads was included without added Pat1-NC as negative control. Reactions were

incubated for 30mins rotating at 4°C and washed 4-times with wash buffer (300 mM NaCl, 10 mM Tris

pH 7.5, 0.05 % NP40). 4 µl 250 µM Dhh1 was added in 500 µl wash buffer and incubated rotating at

4°C for 1 hour. Reactions were washed 5-times, proteins eluted by boiling with 4x SDS loading buffer

and separated on a 12% acrylamide gel and stained with Coomassie. For V5-pulldown assays, the bait

(15 µl 100 µM Pat1-C construct) was bound to 15 ml V5-slurry (Sigma), the bait 3 µl 200 µM Dhh1-

mCherry, and incubation / wash buffers as above with salt concentration as indicated in the blot. Final

washes were only performed three times.

Native PAGE

Proteins were diluted to 20 µM. 0, 2 or 4 µl of protein solution was filled to 4 µl with storage buffer

(200mM NaCl, 25mM Tris pH 7.5, 10% glycerol, 2 mM DTT). Proteins were mixed with a master mix

containing per reaction 2 µl 10x ATPase buffer (300 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 1 M NaCl, 20 mM MgCl2),

0.3 µl Cy5-labeled *in vitro* transcribed RNA oligo (29nt, 1.1 µg/µl), 2 µl 2.5M NaCl, 13.7 µl H2O and 3 µl

60% glycerol. Reactions were incubated on ice for 20 min and separated on a precast Bis-Tris Native

gradient Gel (Invitrogen) in 1x running buffer (50 mM Bis-Tris 50 mM Tricine pH 6.8) at 100V 4C for

about 2.5hrs.

Growth curve and spotting assays

Overnight yeast cultures were grown in permissive conditions in SCD media. Growth curves were

acquired using CLARIOstar automated plate reader (BMG Labtech, Ortenberg, Germany) at 30°C in 24-

well plastic dishes (Thermo Fisher) from overnight pre-cultures diluted 1:125 in the specified synthetic

liquid media. For spotting assays on plates the indicated strains were grown overnight at 25°C to

saturation. Next day equal number of ODs for each strain was spotted (with a 1:10 series dilution) on

YPD plates and incubated at 25°C, 30°C and 37°C for 2-3 overnights.

Western blotting

For Western blot analysis, roughly 5 OD_{600} units of log growing cells were harvested and treated with

0.1M NaOH for 15 mins at room temperature. The samples were vortexed in between and finally

centrifuged to remove the NaOH. SDS sample buffer was added and homogenates were boiled.

Proteins were resolved by 4–12% Bolt Bis-Tris SDS PAGE (Thermo Fischer, Waltham, MA), then

transferred to nitrocellulose membrane (GE Life Sciences, Marlborough, MA). Membranes were

blocked in PBS with 5% non-fat milk, followed by incubation with primary antibody overnight.

Membranes were washed four times with PBS with 0.1% Tween-20 (PBS-T) and incubated with

secondary antibody for 45 min. Membranes were imaged and protein bands quantified using an

infrared imaging system (Odyssey; LI-COR Biosciences, Lincoln, NE). The following primary antibodies

were used for detection of tagged proteins at the indicated dilutions: rabbit-anti-Dhh1 (1:5000) as

described in (Fischer and Weis, 2002), (Weis Lab ETH Zurich Cat# Weis_001, RRID:AB_2629458),

mouse-anti-GFP (1:1000) (Roche Cat# 11814460001, RRID:AB_390913), and rabbit-anti-Hxk1 (1:3000)

(US Biological Cat# H2035-01, RRID:AB_2629457, Salem, MA). IRdye 680RD goat-anti-rabbit (LI-COR

Biosciences Cat# 926–68071, RRID:AB_10956166) and IRdye 800 donkey-anti-mouse (LI-COR

Biosciences Cat# 926–32212, RRID:AB_621847) were used as secondary antibodies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Justine Kusch and the ETHZ ScopeM facility for technical assistance with

confocal microscopy, Elisa Dultz, Carmen Weber, Stephanie Heinrich, Mostafa Zedan, Sarah Khawaja

Evgeny Onishchenko, Annemarie Kralt and Jan Nagler for their critical reading of this manuscript and

members of the Weis lab for helpful discussions and comments. We would like to thank Bram Hofland

for assisting in cloning of yeast constructs. We would also like to thank the Séraphin lab for sharing

their yeast strains. M.H. was supported by a Human Frontier Science Program (HFSP) postdoctoral

fellowship (LT000914/2015) and an ETH postdoctoral fellowship (FEL-37-14-2). This work was

supported by NIH/NIGMS (R01GM058065 and R01GM101257 to K.W.) and the Swiss National Science

Foundation (SNF 31003A_159731 and 31003A_179275 to K.W.).

Figure legends

Figure 1. (A) Overexpression (OE) of Pat1 leads to constitutive PB formation but only in the presence

of Dhh1. Cells co-expressing the indicated PB components were grown in synthetic complete (SC)

raffinose media to exponential growth phase after which Pat1 was overexpressed via addition of

galactose. Cells in both raffinose and galactose were observed by fluorescence microscopy. In all Pat1

OE strains the endogenous promoter of Pat1 was replaced by the galactose 1-10 promoter (*p-GAL-*

PAT1). Scale bar: 5µm. (B) Quantification of images in A depicting number of PBs/cell. N=3 biological

replicates with >800 cells/replicate. Error bars: SEM. (C) **Pat1-NC (AA 5-79 + 456-587) is functional *in***

***vivo*.** Cartoon of the Pat1-NC construct (see text for details). **(D) *PAT1-NC* induces PB formation upon**

stress *in vivo*. Cells co-expressing the indicated the PB components in *PAT1* full length or *PAT1-NC*

background were grown in synthetic complete (SCD) media to exponential growth phase then shifted

to glucose-rich or glucose-starvation conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence

microscopy. PBs induced in the *PAT1-NC* background were dissolved by addition of 2% glucose

demonstrating reversibility. Scale bar: 5µm. (E) Quantification of images shown in A depicting number

of PBs/cell. Bars: SEM. N=3 biological replicates with >800 cells/replicate. **(F) *PAT1-NC* (AA 5-79 + 456-**

587) OE leads to constitutive PB induction. *p(GAL)-PAT1* or *p(GAL)-PAT1-NC* cells expressing Dhh1-

GFP were grown in SC raffinose media to exponential growth phase after which Pat1 OE was induced

with galactose. Scale bar: 5µm. (G) Graph depicts Dhh1 PBs/cell, SEM. N= 3 biological replicates with

>800 cells/replicate. [Diatrack 3.05 and cell segmentation using in house Matlab code was used for the

quantification of PB and cell numbers respectively for all the experiments shown in the manuscript].

Figure 1- figure Supplement 1. (A) Controls for the Pat1 OE, relating to Figure 1. Upper panel: *PAT1* (endogenous promoter) cells expressing Dhh1-GFP were grown in (SC) raffinose media to exponential growth phase after which galactose was added and cells were imaged by fluorescence microscopy. Lower Panel: *p(GAL)-HA pat1Δ* (Hemagglutinin tag) OE does not lead to constitutive PB formation. Scale bar: 5µm. **(B) *PAT1-NC* rescues the *pat1Δ* growth phenotype**. *PAT1, pat1Δ* and *PAT1-NC* cells were grown overnight in SCD media to saturation and the next day the different strains were inoculated to OD 0.1 in SCD. Absorbance based growth measurements were recorded for 24 hours. The growth curve depicts O.D. 600 nm versus time. **(C) *PAT1-NC* rescues the thermosensitive growth phenotype of *pat1Δ*.** Cells expressing *PAT1-NC, PAT1* and cells lacking *PAT1* were grown to saturation in SCD media overnight and the next day spotted on YPD plates at the indicated temperatures. Growth was monitored after 2-3 days of incubation. The phenotype was confirmed with three biological replicates. **(D) *PAT1-NC* fully rescues the growth phenotype in *pat1Δ edc3Δ scd6Δ* cells at 37°C.** Cells expressing *PAT1 edc3Δ scd6Δ*, *pat1Δ edc3Δ scd6Δ* and *PAT1-NC edc3Δ scd6Δ* were grown to saturation in SCD media overnight and the next day spotted on YPD plates at the indicated temperatures. Growth was monitored after 2-3 days of incubation. The phenotype was confirmed with three biological replicates. **(E) Pat1-NC localizes to PBs upon stress *in vivo*.** Cells co-expressing Pat1-NC-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry as an additional PB marker were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase then shifted to glucose-rich or glucose-starvation conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence microscopy. After visualization 2% final concentration of glucose was added for one hour to demonstrate reversibility and dissolution of Pat1-NC PBs. Scale bar: 5µm.

Figure 2. (A) Recombinant Pat1-NC$^{4A-Dhh1}$ is defective for Dhh1 binding. GST pull-down with GST-Pat1-NC and mutants thereof as matrix-bound bait and Dhh1 as prey. After 1h of binding at 4°C, the samples were washed 5 times with a buffer containing 300 mM NaCl and visualized by Coomassie staining after separation on a 12 % acrylamide gel. **(B) Expression of *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* (Dhh1 binding mutant) leads to a drastic reduction in PB formation.** Cells co-expressing the indicated PB components in the *PAT1* or *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* background were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase, then shifted to glucose-

rich or glucose-starvation conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence microscopy. Scale

bar: 5µm. (C) Quantification of images in B depicting number of PBs/cell, (Dhh1-GFP PBs co-localizing

with Dcp2-mCherry) are shown, three biological replicates, bars: SEM. **(D) Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$-GFP mutant is**

defective for PB localization. Cells expressing either Pat1-GFP or the Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$-GFP mutant were

grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase then shifted to glucose-rich or glucose-starvation

conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence microscopy. Scale bar: 5µm. (E) Quantification

of images shown in D depicting number of PBs/cell. N= 3 biological replicates with >500 cells/replicate.

Error bars: SEM. (F) *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* **mutant is defective in PB formation upon hippuristanol treatment.**

Cells expressing either *PAT1* or the *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase

after which they were treated with 10uM hippuristanol for 2hrs. The kinetics of PB formation was

monitored using Dhh1-GFP and its co-localization with Dcp2-mCherry. Quantification of PBs/cell is

depicted. Stills from the live imaging time course are shown. N= 2 biological replicates, two technical

replicates each with >300 cells/replicate, SD.

Figure 2- figure Supplement 1. (A) *pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$* **mutant has a slight growth defect.** *PAT1*, *pat1Δ* and

pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$ cells were grown overnight in SCD media to saturation and the next day the different strains

were inoculated to OD 0.1 and growth curves were recorded for 24 hours. The growth curve depicts

O.D. 600 nm versus time. **(B)** *pat1Δ* **abolishes PB formation.** Cells expressing Dhh1-GFP in *pat1Δ or*

PAT1 strains were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase then shifted to glucose-rich or

glucose-starvation conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence microscopy. The graph

depicts the number of PBs/cell. N=2 biological replicates, 300 cells per replicate, SD. **(C) Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$ and**

Pat1^{EE} are expressed to similar levels as wild-type Pat1. Pat1-GFP, Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$–GFP and Pat1^{EE}-GFP

expressing cells were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase and protein levels were

measured using Western blot with an anti-GFP antibody. Hexokinase was used as a loading control.

The graph depicts the expression levels of different Pat1 mutants normalized to the loading control.

N=2 biological replicates. SD shown. **(D) Dhh1 expression in different Pat1 mutants is comparable to**

Dhh1 expression in wild-type Pat1. Pat1-GFP, Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1}$–GFP and Pat1^{EE}-GFP expressing cells were

grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase and Dhh1 protein levels were measured using

Western blot with an anti-Dhh1 antibody. A non-specific band detected by the antibody was used as

an internal control. The graph depicts the expression levels of Dhh1 in Pat1 mutants normalized to the

internal control. N=2 biological replicates. SD shown.

Figure 3: (A) Expression of two distinct Pat1 binding mutants, Dhh1^{R295D} and Dhh1^{S292DN294D}, leads to

a drastic reduction in PB formation. Cells co-expressing the indicated PB components in either Dhh1,

Dhh1^{R295D} or Dhh1^{S292DN294D} cells were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase, then shifted

to glucose-rich or glucose-starvation conditions for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence

microscopy. Scale bar: 5µm. (B) Quantification of images in A depicting number of Dhh1 positive and

Dcp2 positive PBs/cell; N= 4 biological replicates with >300 cells/replicate, SEM. (C) **Dhh1^{R295D} and**

Dhh1^{S292DN294D} mutants are defective in PB formation upon hippuristanol treatment. Cells expressing

either *Dhh1,* Dhh1^{R295D}, Dhh1^{S292DN294D} or *dhh1Δ*, were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase

after which they were treated with 10uM hippuristanol for 3hrs. The kinetics of PB formation was

monitored using Dhh1-GFP and its co-localization with Dcp2-mCherry. (D) Quantification of PBs/cell.

Stills from the live imaging time course are shown. N= 3 biological replicates with >300 cells/replicate,

SEM.

Figure 3- figure supplement 1: Dhh1 mutants that abolish Pat1 binding are expressed at similar levels

to wild-type Dhh1. Dhh1-GFP, Dhh1^{R295D}–GFP and Dhh11^{S292DN294D}-GFP expressing cells were grown in

SCD media to exponential growth phase and protein levels were measured using Western blot with an

anti-GFP antibody. Hexokinase was used as a loading control. The graph depicts the expression levels

of different Dhh1 mutants normalized to the loading control. N=2 biological replicates. SD shown.

Figure 4. (A, B) Overexpression (OE) of *p(GAL)-PAT1^{WT}*(wild-type) and *p(GAL)-pat1^{AA}* (non-

phosphorylatable) leads to constitutive PB formation but OE of *p(GAL)-pat1^{EE}* (phospho-mimetic)

does not. Cells co-expressing the indicated PB components were grown in SC raffinose media to

exponential growth phase after which OE of different Pat1 alleles was induced by galactose addition.

Cells were imaged using fluorescence microscopy. Quantification of images shown in C depicting number of PBs/cell. Scale bar: 5µm, SEM. N=3 biological replicates with >800 cells/replicate. (C) **Pat1-C-terminal domain does not bind Dhh1.** V5 pull-down with V5-Pat1-C and V5-Pat1-C^{EE} as matrix-bound bait and Dhh1-mCherry as prey. After 1h of binding at 4°C, the samples were washed 4 times with a buffer containing NaCl as indicated and visualized by Coomassie staining after separation on a 12 % acrylamide gel. **(D) Pat1-C^{EE} weakens the interaction with RNA compared to Pat1-C.** Recombinant Pat1-C (WT) and Pat1-C^{EE} were incubated with a Cy5-labeld 29nt RNA oligo in the presence of 300mM NaCl and separated on a NativePage gradient gel. The fluorescence of the oligo was detected by LI-COR imaging. Reactions were performed in triplicate and the intensity of the upper shifted RNA oligo band was quantified. Equal input of the Pat1-C proteins was verified by acrylamide PAGE and Coomassie staining. Error bars: SD.

Figure 4- figure supplement 1. (A) *PAT1* and *pat1*^{AA} lead to PB induction upon stress, which is drastically reduced in the *pat1*^{EE} background. (A) Cells expressing the indicated GFP-PB markers (in the *PAT1*$^{WT/SS}$, *pat1*^{AA} and *pat1*^{EE} backgrounds) were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase then shifted to glucose-rich (left panel) or glucose-starvation conditions (right panel) for 30 minutes and observed by fluorescence microscopy. Scale bar: 5µm. (B) Quantification of images shown in A depicting PBs/cell. Bars: SEM, N= 3 biological replicates with >800 cells/replicate.

Figure 5. (A) *not1*$^{9X-Dhh1}$ (Dhh1 binding mutant) combined with *pat1*^{AA} (non-phosphorylatable Pat1) enhances constitutive PB formation. Cells expressing either *not1*$^{9X-Dhh1}$ or *pat1*^{AA} or the combination of both mutants were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase and PBs visualized by fluorescence microscopy using Dcp2-mCherry as a *bona fide* PB marker. Scale bar: 5µm. (B) The graph depicts the number of Dcp2 positive PBs/cell. N= 3 biological replicates with >500 cells visualized in each replicate, bars: SEM.

Figure 6. Pat1 WT but not Pat1$^{4A-Dhh1/EE}$ mutant enhances the phase separation of Dhh1 and RNA *in vitro*. (A) 4 µM Dhh1-mCherry was mixed with 3.2 mM ATP and 0.2 mg/ml polyU as RNA-analog in a

150mM KCl buffer. Pat1-NC-GFP and mutants thereof were added in increasing concentrations, as

indicated. mCherry and GFP intensities are scaled identically in all images displayed. Representative

images, scale bar 25 µm. Quantification of the droplet intensity multiplied by area (mCherry and GFP

channels separately normalized to Dhh1 alone and Pat1 4µM respectively) of three technical replicates

of the reactions displayed in Figure 5A, mean and standard deviation. **(B) Not1 prevents droplet**

formation also in the presence of Pat1. Proteins were mixed as indicated, and droplet formation

induced by addition of low salt buffer, ATP and polyU. Scale bar 25 mM, quantification (intensity

multiplied by area) of two biological replicates (one to three technical replicates each), mean and

standard deviation.

Figure 6- figure supplement 1. (A) Pat1 does not inhibit the Not1^{MIF4G}-stimulatd ATPase activity of

Dhh1. ATPase reactions were performed under saturating concentrations of polyU using a Not1^{MIF4G}

concentration that stimulates Dhh1 to 0.75 V_{max}. Pat1 was added to either 2- and 6-fold excess over

Not1. Three biological replicates (each of three technical replicates); mean and standard deviation of

k_{cat} values. The values are corrected for blank (that is Pat1 alone or Not1 alone). P values are obtained

from a two-tailed t-test. **(B) Pat1 OE PBs are more dynamic than the Dhh1^{DQAD} PBs.** Cells expressing

Dcp2-mCherry in the *p(GAL)-PAT1* OE strain were grown in (SC) raffinose to exponential growth phase

after which galactose was added to 2% final concentration for 2hrs to induce PBs. Then the cells were

treated with 50µg/ml cycloheximide (CHX) and disappearance of Dcp2-mCherry PBs per cell was

monitored for 90 minutes by fluorescence microscopy. In order to study PB dynamics in the *DHH1* and

dhh1 ^{DQAD} background cells were grown as described before except PBs were induced by carbon

starvation and their disassembly monitored by CHX. Each time point shows a representative image. (C)

The graph shows the foci number per cell measurements for Dcp2-mCherry normalized to 1 to account

for differences in PB formation under different PB induction conditions. Scale bar: 5µm. N=2 biological

replicates with >200 cells counted per experiments. Error bars: SD.

Figure 6- figure supplement 2. (A) Pat1 by itself does not phase separate *in vitro*. Reactions are

performed in the presence of ATP and polyU at indicated protein concentrations. N= three technical

replicates. (B) **Enhancement of Dhh1's phase separation by Pat1 is RNA-dependent**. Reactions are performed in the presence of ATP but absence of polyU at indicated protein concentrations. N= three technical replicates (C) **Pat1-N terminus does not enhance the phase separation of Dhh1.** Reactions are performed in the presence of ATP and polyU at indicated protein concentrations. Quantification (intensity multiplied by area of droplets) of three technical replicates, mean and standard deviation.

Figure 7. Stoichiometry of Pat1 and Dhh1 in PBs *in vivo* and in liquid droplets *in vitro*. (A) Pat1-GFP and Dhh1-GFP expressing cells were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase and then shifted to SC (minus glucose) for the indicated time points. PB formation was visualized by fluorescence microscopy. Graph depicts the ratio of Dhh1: Pat1 in PBs *in vivo*. N= 3 biological replicates, SEM. (B) Calibration curves to determine the protein concentration of Dhh1-mCherry and Pat1-NC-GFP within the droplets: the fluorescence intensity of homogeneous solutions of the respective proteins was measured at different protein concentrations (blue circles). The unknown protein concentration was determined by linear fitting of this calibration curve (violet circle). Confocal fluorescence microscopy images of phase-separated droplets of Dhh1-mCherry in the absence and presence of Pat1-GFP are shown. Scale bar: 20μM. **(C) Tug-of-war model between Pat1 and Not1 to regulate PB dynamics.** Model depicting three inputs that cooperatively regulate PB formation. The solid black arrows on the left show interaction between the Pat1 N-terminus with the RecA2 core of Dhh1, Pat1 C-terminus with RNA, Dhh1 interaction with RNA and potential Dhh1-Dhh1 interactions via low-complexity unstructured tails. The dotted grey arrows on the right demonstrate multivalent interactions in a PB driven by the LLPS of Dhh1 and RNA (a process enhanced by Pat1). Colors: green: inputs that promote PB assembly, red factors that negatively regulate PB formation. Violet: Dhh1, light green: Pat1-NC, blue: RNA.

Figure 7- figure supplement 1. (A) Images of the Pat1-GFP and Dhh1-GFP stoichiometry. Cells expressing Pat1-GFP and Dhh1-GFP were grown in SCD media to exponential growth phase then shifted to glucose-starvation conditions for different time points as indicated and PBs were imaged by

fluorescence microscopy. Images are representative for each times. Scale: 5μM. (B) Dhh1-GFP and

Pat1-GFP expressing cells (used for imaging in A) were grown in SCD media to exponential growth

phase and protein levels were measured using Western blot with an anti-GFP antibody. Hexokinase

was used as a loading control. The graph depicts the expression levels of Dhh1 and Pat1 normalized to

the loading control. (C) **Size distributions of *in vitro* assembled Dhh1 and Pat1 LLPS droplets** (relating

to Figure 6B). In presence of Pat1, the droplet size increases and the size distribution shifts to larger

radii. Moreover, the number of droplets decreases, thereby indicating that the droplets have higher

propensity to fuse in presence of Pat1. Scale bar: 20μm.

Figure 7- figure supplement 2. OE of Pat1 in the presence of the endogenous copy of Pat1 [*p-PAT1*

+p(GAL)-*PAT1*] leads to the nuclear localization of PB components. (A) Cells expressing Dhh1-GFP [*p-*

PAT1 +p(GAL)-*PAT1* background] were grown in SC raffinose media to exponential growth phase after

which Pat1 OE was induced with galactose. Localization of Dhh1-GFP to the nucleus was confirmed by

co-localization with DAPI staining after 2hrs of *PAT1* or *pat1^{AA}* OE. White arrows depict the co-

localization of Dhh1-GFP and DAPI. Scale bar: 5μm. N= 2 biological replicates. (B) HDEL Td tomato was

used as a marker of the nuclear rim, scale bar: 5μm. **(C) PBs formed in *pat1^{4A-Dhh1}* and *pat1^{EE}* expressing**

cells are less intense than PBs formed in *PAT1* wild-type cells. Graph showing the average intensity

of PBs (obtained from Figure 2B and S3).

Supplementary file 1: is the supplementary table 1, which contains details regarding all the yeast

strains used in this study.

Supplementary file 2: Supplementary table S2A contains all the plasmids used in this study. Table

Supplementary S2B contains the mutants used in this study and Table S2C describes the entire DNA

oligos used for this manuscript.

Source code File 1: contains the MATLAB script to count the yeast cell number in an automated

manner.

	Video legends

Video 1: **Hippuristanol induces PBs in cells expressing wild-type *PAT1*.** The video depicts PB formation

(Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells expressing wild-type *PAT1* upon hippuristanol

treatment. (2hrs video, 5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a single plane.

Video 2: **Hippuristanol fails to induce PBs in cells expressing *pat1^{4A-Dhh1}* mutant.** The video depicts

failure to form PBs (Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells expressing *pat1^{4A-Dhh1}* upon

hippuristanol treatment. (2hrs video, 5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a single

plane.

Video 3: **Hippuristanol induces PBs in cells expressing wild-type *Dhh1*.** The video depicts PB formation

(Dhh1-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells expressing wild-type Dhh1 upon hippuristanol

treatment. (3hrs video, 5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a single plane.

Video 4: **Hippuristanol does not induce PBs in cells expressing the Dhh1^{S292DN294D} mutant.** The video

depicts PB formation (Dhh1^{S292DN294D}-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells expressing

Dhh1^{S292DN294D} mutant wild- upon hippuristanol treatment. (3hrs video, 5 min intervals; video played

at 7 fps). Each frame is a single plane.

Video 5: **Hippuristanol fails to induce PBs in cells expressing the Dhh1^{R295D} mutant.** The video depicts

PB formation (Dhh1^{R295D}-GFP and Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells expressing Dhh1^{R295D} mutant

wild- upon hippuristanol treatment. (3hrs video, 5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is

a single plane.

Video 6: ***dhh1Δ* cells do not form PBs upon hippuristanol treatment.** The video depicts PB formation

(Dcp2-mCherry co-localization) in cells lacking *dhh1* upon hippuristanol treatment. (3hrs video, 5 min

intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a single plane.

Video 7: **Cycloheximide treatment causes wild-type PB disassembly.** Dcp2-mCherry expressing cells

in the *DHH1* background were grown in (SC) raffinose media to exponential growth phase, after which

galactose was added to 2% final concentration for 2hrs and then starved for 30 mins to allow PBs to

form. The cells were then treated with 50 μg/mL cycloheximide for 90 mins and disappearance of foci

was monitored using fluorescence microscopy. (5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a

single plane.

Video 8: **Cycloheximide treatment causes Pat1 OE PB disassembly albeit faster than PB disassembly**

in cells expressing *dhh1*^{*DQAD*}. Cells expressing Dcp2-mCherry in the *p(GAL)-PAT1* OE strain were grown

in (SC) raffinose to exponential growth phase, after which galactose was added to 2% final

concentration for 2hrs to allow PBs to form. Thereafter, the cells were treated with 50μg/mL

cycloheximide (CHX) for 90 mins and disappearance of foci was monitored using fluorescence

microscopy. (5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a single plane.

Video 9: **Cycloheximide treatment of *dhh1*^{*DQAD*} PBs.** Dcp2-mCherry expressing cells in the *dhh1*^{*DQAD*}

mutant background were grown in (SC) raffinose to exponential growth phase, after which galactose

was added to 2% final concentration for 2hrs. The cells were then carbon starved for 30 mins to allow

PBs to form after which, 50 μg/mL cycloheximide was added and disappearance of foci was monitored

for 90 mins using fluorescence microscopy. (5 min intervals; video played at 7 fps). Each frame is a

single plane.

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE S1

Yeast strains in this study

Strain #	Genotype
KWY165	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1*
KWY276	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1::DHH1-GFP-HisMX6*

KWY1972	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6
KWY1973	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1::DHH1-HisMX6 GFP dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6
KWY2226	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1Δ::KanMX6
KWY3238	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::KanMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6 pDHH1-GFP-URA3
KWY3239	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::KanMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6 pDHH1^{DQAD}-GFP-URA3
KWY3280	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1-GFP-HisMX6
KWY4901	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::KanMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6 pDHH1^{5X-Not}-GFP-URA3
KWY5157	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP dhh1Δ::KanMX6
KWY5221	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 pDHH1 GFP-URA3
KWY5224	MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 pDHH1^{DQAD}-GFP-URA3

KWY5227	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 pDHH1^{RNA3X}-GFP-URA3*
KWY5230	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 pDHH1$^{DQAD/RNA3X}$-GFP-URA3*
KWY5601	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1-HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY5603	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1 AA::HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY5609	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1 EE-HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY5915	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 edc3::EDC3-mcherry::HisMX6 pDHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY5917	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 edc3::EDC3-mcherry::HisMX6 pDHH1^{DQAD}-GFP-URA3*
KWY5933	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mcherry::HisMX6 pDHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY5935	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1Δ::TRP pat1Δ::KanMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mcherry::HisMX6 pDHH1^{DQAD}-GFP-URA3*
KWY5943	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT14A-HisMX6*

KWY5978	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1:: PAT1-HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3 pGAL-PAT1-3XV5-LEU2*
KWY5980	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1:: PAT1-HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3 pGAL-PAT1AA-3XV5-LEU2*
KWY5983	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1:: PAT1-HisMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3 pGAL-PAT1EE-3XV5-LEU2*
KWY6003	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1Δ::KanMX6 dhh1Δ::TRP pDHH1^{5X-Not}-GFP-URA3*
KWY6056	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT14A-HismX6 dhh1Δ::TRP pDHH1^{DQAD}-GFP-URA3*
KWY6058	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT14A-HismX6 dhh1Δ::TRP pDHH1-GFP-URA3*
KWY6180	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pGAL-PAT1 3X HA::KanMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP::URA3*
KWY6279	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1-HisMX6 edc3::EDC3 GFP-URA3*
KWY6403	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1Δ::pGAL-3X HA::KanMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP URA3*

KWY6467	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1AA-HisMX6 edc3::EDC3 GFP-URA3*
KWY6469	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1AA-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2 GFP-URA3*
KWY6471	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1-HisMX6 dcp2::DCp2 GFP-URA3*
KWY6478	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1EE-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2 GFP-URA3*
KWY6480	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1EE-HisMX6 edc3::EDC3 GFP-URA3*
KWY6544	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 trp1-1 leu2-3, 112Δ::CG-LEU2-NOT1$^{9X-Dhh1}$-TAP not1Δ::TRP1 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*
KWY6604	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1Δ::TRP dhh1::DHH1 GFP URA3*
KWY6637	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6 pGAL-PAT1AA-3XV5-LEU2*
KWY6643	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pGAL-PAT1-3X HA::KanmX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP: URA3 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*
KWY6692	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pGAL-PAT1 EE-3X-HA::KanMX6 dhh1::DHH1 GFP::URA3 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*

KWY6836	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pGAL-PAT1 3XHA::URA3 dhh1Δ::KanMX6 edc3::EDC3 GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*
KWY7370	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::p-GAL- PAT1 NC-3X-HA-HYG dhh1::DHH1 GFP-URA3*
KWY7420	*MAT alpha ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pGAL-PAT1 3XHA::KanMX6 dhh1::DHH1 RNA3X GFP-HismX6*
KWY7481	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT14A GFP-URA3*
KWY7484	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1 NC-HYG dhh1::DHH1 GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*
KWY7554	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT14A GFP-URA3 dcp2::DCP2 mcherry-KanMX6*
KWY7557	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1N-C GFP-HismX6*
KWY7562	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::PAT1N-C GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2 mcherry-NatMX6*
KWY7890	*MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1::dhh1^{DQAD}-GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6*

KWY8378	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 trp1-1 leu2-3, 112Δ::CG-LEU2-NOT1$^{9X-Dhh1}$-TAP not1Δ::TRP1 pat1::PAT1AA-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6
KWY8622	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 edc3::NatMX6 scd6::KanMX6
KWY8624	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 pat1::HISMX6 edc3::NatMX6 scd6::KanMX6
KWY8633	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1::dhh1^{R295D}-GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6
KWY8638	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 dhh1:: dhh1^{S292DN294D}-GFP-HisMX6 dcp2::DCP2-mCherry-NatMX6
KWY8753	MAT a ade2-1 can1-100 GAL phi+ his3-11,15 ura3-1 leu2-3, 112 trp1-1 edc3::NatMX6 scd6::KanMX6 pat1::PAT1-NC-GFP::HisMX6

860 <u>SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE S2</u>

861 A) Plasmids used in this study

Plasmid #	Description
pKW2312	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1-GFP
pKW2313	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1^{DQAD}-GFP
pKW2867	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1^{3X-RNA}-GFP
pKW3040	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1$^{DQAD/3X-RNA}$-GFP
pKW3333	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1^{5X-Not}-GFP

pKW3477	pRS316 P(DHH1)-DHH1$^{DQAD/3X-RNA}$-6xHis-PP7CP
pKW3570	pFA6a-yEGFP-HIS3MX
pKW3756	pNH605-PGAL-Pat1 WT (XbaI)-3X V5
pKW3757	pNH605-PGAL- Pat1^{AA} (XbaI)-3X V5
pKW3758	pNH605-PGAL- Pat1^{EE} (XbaI)-3X V5
pKW3631	pETMCN_HisV5_Dhh1-mCherry
pKW3688	pETMCN_His_Dhh1-mCherry
pKW3641	pETMCN_HisV5_Pat1-C
pKW3702	pETMCN_HisV5_ Pat1-C^{EE}
pKW3920	pETMCN_HisTEVGST3C_Pat1-N [5-79]
pKW4225	pETMCN_GST-Pat1-NC-mCherry
pKW4356	pETMCN_GST-Pat1-NC-GFP
pKW4357	pETMCN_GST- Pat1-NC$^{4A-Dhh1}$-GFP
pKW4358	pETMCN_GST- Pat1-NC^{EE}-GFP

863   **B) Dhh1, Pat1 and Not1 mutants used in this study**

Mutant Protein	Mutation(s)
Dhh1^{DQAD}	E195Q
Dhh1$^{Q-motif}$	F66R, Q73A
Dhh1^{3X-RNA}	R322A, S340A, R370A
Dhh1^{5X-Not}	R55E, F62E, Q282E, N284E, R335E
Dhh1$^{DQAD/3X-RNA}$	E195Q, R322A, S340A, R370A

Dhh1^{5X-Not/3X-RNA}	R55E, F62E, Q282E, N284E, R322A, R335E, S340A, R370A
Dhh1^{R295D} (Mut3B)	R295D
Dhh1^{S292DN294D} (Mut3A)	S292D, N294D
Not1^{9X-Dhh1}	F791A, N795A, K804A, E823R, N834A, Y835A, K962A, F967A, E970A
Pat1^{AA}	S456A S457A
Pat1^{EE}	S456E S457E
Pat1^{4A-Dhh1}	D39A E40A T41A F42A
Pat1-N	Pat1-N (5-79)
Pat1-N-C	Pat1 N (5-79)- (GGS)4- C- (456-787)

865   C) Oligos used in this study

Oligo #	Sequence	Description
CH393	tgttcattattcatcatggaccaagccgataaaatgttatctcgt	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer E195Q for Dhh1^{DQAD} mutant
CH394	acgagataacatttttatcggcttggtccatgatgaataatgaaca	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer E195Q for Dhh1^{DQAD} mutant
CH574	atggttttttcaaaaccggcttcttcaatacccattaacagctctcttttcaaataaaaatc	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer F62E for Dhh1^{5X-Not} mutant
CH575	cttaaatacaaagggtaatactttttgaagatttttatttgaaagaagagctgttaatgggtatttttt	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer R55E for Dhh1^{5X-Not} mutant
CH576	gattttttatttgaaaagagagctgttaatgggtattgaagaagccggttttgaaaaaccat	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer F62E for Dhh1^{5X-Not} mutant

CH577	aaaaatacccattaacagctcttctttcaaataaaaatcttc aaaagtattaccctttgtatttaag	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer R55E for Dhh1[5X-Not] mutant
CH578	cacggttagtagaattacaaaaaataatggcttgctcaatt tcaagcttagagaataaagtatttaaacaatgtagc	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer Q282E and N284E for Dhh1[5X-Not] mutant
CH579	gctacattgtttaaatactttattctctaagcttgaaattgag caagccattattttttgtaattctactaaccgtg	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer Q282E and N284E for Dhh1[5X-Not] mutant
CH580	atcggagcagaccaatgtttcaaccttaccttgacgaaatt cgtgg	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer R335E for Dhh1[5X-Not] mutant
CH581	ccacgaatttcgtcaaggtaaggttgaaacattggtctgctc cgat	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer R335E for Dhh1[5X-Not] mutant
Ch849	atcaaattcccctcttctgatgcttaattgccccgattgcagc ctgttattgatactatt	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 AA and EE, pringle fw
CH853	taaaaaataagggagaaaaaaaaatacatgcgtaagtac attaaaattacaggaaaaatc gaattcgagctcgtttaaac	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 AA and EE , pringle rev
CH854	attaccgttgttgaacgcgtaagcagctcttcttctttgctta ga	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 AA, rev
CH855	tctaagcaaagaagaagagctgcttacgcgttcaacaacg gtaat	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 AA, fw
CH856	attaccgttgttgaacgcgtattcttctcttcttctttgcttag a	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 EE, rev

CH857	tct aag caa aga aga aga gaa gaa tac gcg ttc aac aac ggt aat	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 EE, fw
CH858	ttaattaacccgggggatccg ttactttagttctgatatttcaccatcgcgatacaccaaccccc ataac	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 EE, rev
CH944	aacttcttcaagtcctgcttgtcccaggagggttcaggga	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 4A GFP tagged, fw
CH945	aac ctg aac att atc acc agc agc agc agc gttcaaatagtcgttctc	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 4A GFP tagged, rev
CH946	gaacgactatttgaac gct gct gct gct ggtgataatgttcaggttgg	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 4A GFP tagged, fw
CH1035	tttcatggcgatgccacctggtcagtcacaaccccagtat cggatccccgggttaattaa	Dhh1, fw; C-terminal GFP tagging
CH1036	gcgtatctcaccacagtagttattttttcttagatattct gaattcgagctcgtttaaac	Dhh1 rev; C-terminal GFP tagging
CH1037	ttcagggtctaatgaattattaagcattttgcataggaag cggatccccgggttaattaa	Dcp2, fw; C-terminal mcherry tagging
CH1038	catttacagtgtgtctataaaacgtataacacttattcttga attcgagctcgtttaaac	Dcp2, rev; C-terminal mcherry tagging
CH1039	tgatcttttcgtcactgacgggtccctgctattagatttgcgg atccccgggttaattaa	Edc3, C- terminal mcherry, fw
CH1040	tatacgtatgtatccagtttaggctaaagtaattcttggtga attcgagctcgtttaaac	Edc3, C- terminal mcherry, rev

CH1116	gaggagaacgactatttgaac gct gct gct gct ggtgataatgttcaggtt	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 4A GFP tagged, fw (pringle)
CH1117	aacctgaacattatcacc agc agc agc agc gttcaaatagtcgttctcctc	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 4A GFP tagged, rev (pringle)
CH1550	ttccccattttatcaaaaatcatcctgccaccattttgtccaa ggatcgcactatcgccc gaattcgagctcgtttaaac	Pgal-Pat1 tagging: fw
CH1551	ttcaaagtccagaggaccatcccgcgcattaccgctattttc taacccaaagaaggacat gcactgagcagcgtaatctg	Pgal-Pat1 tagging: rev
CH1768	aaaataagggagaaaaaaaaatacatgcgtaagtacatt aaaattacaggaaaaatctta gcactgagcagcgtaatctg	K/O Pat1 in Pgal-3HA-Pat1: rev
CH1879	aaggttttaaccggaagtaagagcagcaagaagcactagc agaacgcggccgccagctgaa	Pat1, fw; C-terminal GFP tagging
CH1878	tacatgcgtaagtacattaaaattacaggaaaaatcttatg aattcgagctcgtttaaac	Pat1, rev; C-terminal GFP tagging
UC1943	ctcttgcgttactatggtggtattattgatgctaatacgggcg cataggccactagtggatc	For pat1 delete, rev
UC1942	aaggttttaaccggaagtaagagcagcaagaagcactagc agaacgcggccgccagctgaa	For pat1 delete, fw
CH2394	ttccccattttatcaaaaatcatcctgccaccattttgtccaa ggatcgcactatcgccctcactatagggagaccggca	Pgal-Pat1 tagging: fw
CH2395	ttcaaagtccagaggaccatcccgcgcattaccgctattttc taacccaaagaaggacat cattttgagatccgggtttt	Pgal-Pat1 tagging: rev

CH2762	gggttagaaaatagcggtaatgcgcgggatggtcctctgg	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, fw
CH2768	tcgcttatttagaagtggcgcgttacttaagctcgagcataa cgtttaggaa	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, rev
CH2769	cgttatgctcgagcttaagtaacgcgccacttctaaataag cgaatttctta	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, fw
CH2790	ttaaagccttcgagcgtcccaaaaccttctcaagcaaggttt tcagtataat	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, rev
CH2791	taaaaaataagggagaaaaaaaaatacatgcgtaagtac attaaaattacaggaaaaatcttaaagccttcgagcgtccc aa	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, rev
CH2766	gacgtcccggactatgcaggatcctatccatatgacgttcc agattacgctgctcagtgcgggttagaaaatagcggtaa	For Pat1 NC HYG (pgal OE), fw
CH3005	gtacaccttgaaggaagcaaaggttttaaccggaagtaag agcagcaagaagcactagca gggttagaaaatagcggtaa	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC, fw
CH3054	gggttagaaaatagcggtaatgcgcgggatggtcctctgg	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, fw
CH3060	catgttaattaacccgggggatccgcttaagctcgagcataa cgtttaggaac	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, rev
CH3061	gttcctaaacgttatgctcgagcttaagcggatccccgggtt aattaacatg	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, fw
Ch3062	gaattcgagctcgtttaaactggatggcggcgttagtatcg aatcgacagca	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, rev

CH3058	gtacaccttgaaggaagcaaaggtttttaaccggaagtaag agcagcaagaagcactagcagggttagaaaatagcggta a	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, fw (pringle)
CH3063	taaaaaataagggagaaaaaaaaatacatgcgtaagtac attaaaattacaggaaaaatcgaattcgagctcgtttaaac t	For stitch PCRs to make Pat1 NC GFP tagged, rev (pringle)
CH4227	cgccattcgcataataacttatcccaggcctaaaatacgac aagaaagaaaatagtagtaatgggttccatcaataataa	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP and Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, fw (pringle)
CH4228	ttttcttggctagtaattcgacatcgttagtagaattacaaa aaa	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{R295D} Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP, Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, rev
CH4229	tttttttgtaattctactaacgatgtcgaattactagccaaga aaa	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP and Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, rev
CH4231	acgattagatcacaaaaaaagcgtatctcaccacagtagtt atttttttcttagatattctgaattcgagctcgtttaaac	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP, Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, rev (pringle)
CH4232	ttttcttggctagtaattcgacacgatcagtatcattacaaa aaataatggcttgat	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, rev
CH4233	atcaagccattattttttgtaatgatactgatcgt gtcgaattactagccaagaaaa	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, fw

CH4234	ttaattaacccgggggatccgatactggggttgtgactgacc aggtggcatcgccatgaaatgttc	For stitch PCRs to make Dhh1^{S292DN294D}(Mut3A)-GFP and Dhh1^{R295D}(Mut3A)-GFP tagged, rev
US5021	ttcgtacattggtctgcgccgatttattgacccgt	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer S340A for Dhh1^{3X-RNA} mutant
US5022	acgggtcaataaatcggcgcagaccaatgtacgaa	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer S340A for Dhh1^{3X-RNA} mutant
US5023	ccaaaacggcagaaacatatttacatgctattggtagatcc ggtagg	DHH1, fw; mutagenic primer R370A for Dhh1^{3X-RNA} mutant
US5024	cctaccggatctaccaatagcatgtaaatatgtttctgccgt tttgg	DHH1, rev; mutagenic primer R370A for Dhh1^{3X-RNA} mutant
UC6097	atcccaggcctaaaatacgacaagaaagaaaatagtagt a*atgggttccatcaataataa*	DHH1; fw; For integrating *DHH1* mutants into *dhh1Δ* strains
UC6098	tatctcaccacagtagttattttttcttagatattct*ttaatac tggggttgtgactgac*	DHH1; rv; For integrating *DHH1* mutants into *dhh1Δ* strains

References

Aguzzi, A., & Altmeyer, M. (2016). Phase Separation: Linking Cellular Compartmentalization to Disease.

Trends Cell Biol, 26(7), 547-558. doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2016.03.004

Alberti, S., & Hyman, A. A. (2016). Are aberrant phase transitions a driver of cellular aging? *Bioessays,*

38(10), 959-968. doi:10.1002/bies.201600042

Ashe, M. P., De Long, S. K., & Sachs, A. B. (2000). Glucose depletion rapidly inhibits translation initiation

in yeast. *Mol Biol Cell, 11*(3), 833-848. doi:10.1091/mbc.11.3.833

Barbee, S. A., Estes, P. S., Cziko, A. M., Hillebrand, J., Luedeman, R. A., Coller, J. M., . . . Ramaswami, M.

(2006). Staufen- and FMRP-containing neuronal RNPs are structurally and functionally related to

somatic P bodies. *Neuron, 52*(6), 997-1009. doi:10.1016/j.neuron.2006.10.028

Beelman, C. A., & Parker, R. (1994). Differential effects of translational inhibition in cis and in trans on

the decay of the unstable yeast MFA2 mRNA. *J Biol Chem, 269*(13), 9687-9692.

Bhattacharyya, S. N., Habermacher, R., Martine, U., Closs, E. I., & Filipowicz, W. (2006). Relief of

microRNA-mediated translational repression in human cells subjected to stress. *Cell, 125*(6), 1111-

1124. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.04.031

Bordeleau, M. E., Mori, A., Oberer, M., Lindqvist, L., Chard, L. S., Higa, T., . . . Pelletier, J. (2006).

Functional characterization of IRESes by an inhibitor of the RNA helicase eIF4A. *Nat Chem Biol, 2*(4),

213-220. doi:10.1038/nchembio776

Braun, K. A., Vaga, S., Dombek, K. M., Fang, F., Palmisano, S., Aebersold, R., & Young, E. T. (2014).

Phosphoproteomic analysis identifies proteins involved in transcription-coupled mRNA decay as

targets of Snf1 signaling. *Sci Signal, 7*(333), ra64. doi:10.1126/scisignal.2005000

Carroll, J. S., Munchel, S. E., & Weis, K. (2011). The DExD/H box ATPase Dhh1 functions in translational

repression, mRNA decay, and processing body dynamics. *J Cell Biol, 194*(4), 527-537.

doi:10.1083/jcb.201007151

Chan, L. Y., Mugler, C. F., Heinrich, S., Vallotton, P., & Weis, K. (2018). Non-invasive measurement of

mRNA decay reveals translation initiation as the major determinant of mRNA stability. *Elife. In press.*

Chowdhury, A., Kalurupalle, S., & Tharun, S. (2014). Pat1 contributes to the RNA binding activity of the

Lsm1-7-Pat1 complex. *Rna, 20*(9), 1465-1475. doi:10.1261/rna.045252.114

Coller, J. M., Tucker, M., Sheth, U., Valencia-Sanchez, M. A., & Parker, R. (2001). The DEAD box helicase,

Dhh1p, functions in mRNA decapping and interacts with both the decapping and deadenylase

complexes. *Rna, 7*(12), 1717-1727.

Coller, J., & Parker, R. (2004). Eukaryotic mRNA decapping. *Annu Rev Biochem, 73*, 861-890.

doi:10.1146/annurev.biochem.73.011303.074032

Coller, J., & Parker, R. (2005). General translational repression by activators of mRNA decapping. *Cell,*

122(6), 875-886. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2005.07.012

Charenton, C., Gaudon-Plesse, C., Fourati, Z., Taverniti, V., Back, R., Kolesnikova, O., . . . Graille, M.

(2017). A unique surface on Pat1 C-terminal domain directly interacts with Dcp2 decapping enzyme

and Xrn1 5'-3' mRNA exonuclease in yeast. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 114*(45), E9493-e9501.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1711680114

Cougot, N., Bhattacharyya, S. N., Tapia-Arancibia, L., Bordonne, R., Filipowicz, W., Bertrand, E., & Rage,

F. (2008). Dendrites of mammalian neurons contain specialized P-body-like structures that respond to

neuronal activation. *J Neurosci, 28*(51), 13793-13804. doi:10.1523/jneurosci.4155-08.2008

Decker, C. J., Teixeira, D., & Parker, R. (2007). Edc3p and a glutamine/asparagine-rich domain of Lsm4p

function in processing body assembly in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *J Cell Biol, 179*(3), 437-449.

doi:10.1083/jcb.200704147

Ernoult-Lange, M., Baconnais, S., Harper, M., Minshall, N., Souquere, S., Boudier, T., . . . Weil, D. (2012).

Multiple binding of repressed mRNAs by the P-body protein Rck/p54. *Rna, 18*(9), 1702-1715.

doi:10.1261/rna.034314.112

Fischer, N., & Weis, K. (2002). The DEAD box protein Dhh1 stimulates the decapping enzyme Dcp1.

Embo j, 21(11), 2788-2797. doi:10.1093/emboj/21.11.2788

Fourati, Z., Kolesnikova, O., Back, R., Keller, J., Charenton, C., Taverniti, V., . . . Graille, M. (2014). The

C-terminal domain from S. cerevisiae Pat1 displays two conserved regions involved in decapping factor

recruitment. *PLoS One, 9*(5), e96828. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0096828

Franks, T. M., & Lykke-Andersen, J. (2008). The control of mRNA decapping and P-body formation. *Mol*

Cell, 32(5), 605-615. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2008.11.001

Fromm, S. A., Kamenz, J., Noldeke, E. R., Neu, A., Zocher, G., & Sprangers, R. (2014). In vitro

reconstitution of a cellular phase-transition process that involves the mRNA decapping machinery.

Angew Chem Int Ed Engl, 53(28), 7354-7359. doi:10.1002/anie.201402885

Fromm, S. A., Truffault, V., Kamenz, J., Braun, J. E., Hoffmann, N. A., Izaurralde, E., & Sprangers, R.

(2012). The structural basis of Edc3- and Scd6-mediated activation of the Dcp1:Dcp2 mRNA decapping

complex. *Embo j, 31*(2), 279-290. doi:10.1038/emboj.2011.408

Guo, L., & Shorter, J. (2015). It's Raining Liquids: RNA Tunes Viscoelasticity and Dynamics of

Membraneless Organelles. *Mol Cell, 60*(2), 189-192. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2015.10.006

Hadjidemetriou, S., Gabrielli, B., Pike, T., Stevens, F., Mele, K., & Vallotton, P. (2014). *Detection and*

Tracking of Cell Divisions in Phase Contrast Video Microscopy. Paper presented at the Third MICCAI

Worshop on Microscopic Image Analysis with Applications in Biology.

Holmes, L. E., Campbell, S. G., De Long, S. K., Sachs, A. B., & Ashe, M. P. (2004). Loss of translational

control in yeast compromised for the major mRNA decay pathway. *Mol Cell Biol, 24*(7), 2998-3010.

Hu, W., Sweet, T. J., Chamnongpol, S., Baker, K. E., & Coller, J. (2009). Co-translational mRNA decay in

Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Nature, 461*(7261), 225-229. doi:10.1038/nature08265

Hyman, A. A., Weber, C. A., & Julicher, F. (2014). Liquid-liquid phase separation in biology. *Annu Rev*

Cell Dev Biol, 30, 39-58. doi:10.1146/annurev-cellbio-100913-013325

Kroschwald, S., Maharana, S., Mateju, D., Malinovska, L., Nuske, E., Poser, I., . . . Alberti, S. (2015).

Promiscuous interactions and protein disaggregases determine the material state of stress-inducible

RNP granules. *Elife, 4*, e06807. doi:10.7554/eLife.06807

Larimer, F. W., & Stevens, A. (1990). Disruption of the gene XRN1, coding for a 5'----3' exoribonuclease,

restricts yeast cell growth. *Gene, 95*(1), 85-90.

Longtine, M. S., McKenzie, A., 3rd, Demarini, D. J., Shah, N. G., Wach, A., Brachat, A., . . . Pringle, J. R.

(1998). Additional modules for versatile and economical PCR-based gene deletion and modification in

Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Yeast, 14*(10), 953-961. doi:10.1002/(sici)1097-
0061(199807)14:10<953::Aid-yea293>3.0.Co;2-u

Lui, J., Castelli, L. M., Pizzinga, M., Simpson, C. E., Hoyle, N. P., Bailey, K. L., . . . Ashe, M. P. (2014).
Granules harboring translationally active mRNAs provide a platform for P-body formation following
stress. *Cell Rep, 9*(3), 944-954. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2014.09.040

Mager, W. H., & Ferreira, P. M. (1993). Stress response of yeast. *Biochem J, 290 (Pt 1)*, 1-13.

Montpetit, B., Thomsen, N. D., Helmke, K. J., Seeliger, M. A., Berger, J. M., & Weis, K. (2011). A
conserved mechanism of DEAD-box ATPase activation by nucleoporins and InsP6 in mRNA export.
Nature, 472(7342), 238-242. doi:10.1038/nature09862

Mugler, C. F., Hondele, M., Heinrich, S., Sachdev, R., Vallotton, P., Koek, A. Y., . . . Weis, K. (2016).
ATPase activity of the DEAD-box protein Dhh1 controls processing body formation. *Elife, 5*.
doi:10.7554/eLife.18746

Muhlrad, D., & Parker, R. (1992). Mutations affecting stability and deadenylation of the yeast MFA2
transcript. *Genes Dev, 6*(11), 2100-2111.

Nissan, T., Rajyaguru, P., She, M., Song, H., & Parker, R. (2010). Decapping activators in Saccharomyces
cerevisiae act by multiple mechanisms. *Mol Cell, 39*(5), 773-783. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2010.08.025

Ozgur, S., & Stoecklin, G. (2013). Role of Rck-Pat1b binding in assembly of processing-bodies. *RNA Biol,*
10(4), 528-539. doi:10.4161/rna.24086

Patel, A., Lee, H. O., Jawerth, L., Maharana, S., Jahnel, M., Hein, M. Y., . . . Alberti, S. (2015). A Liquid-
to-Solid Phase Transition of the ALS Protein FUS Accelerated by Disease Mutation. *Cell, 162*(5), 1066-
1077. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2015.07.047

Pilkington, G. R., & Parker, R. (2008). Pat1 contains distinct functional domains that promote P-body
assembly and activation of decapping. *Mol Cell Biol, 28*(4), 1298-1312. doi:10.1128/mcb.00936-07

Pillai, R. S. (2005). MicroRNA function: multiple mechanisms for a tiny RNA? *Rna, 11*(12), 1753-1761.

doi:10.1261/rna.2248605

Protter, D. S. W., Rao, B. S., Van Treeck, B., Lin, Y., Mizoue, L., Rosen, M. K., & Parker, R. (2018).

Intrinsically Disordered Regions Can Contribute Promiscuous Interactions to RNP Granule Assembly.

Cell Rep, 22(6), 1401-1412. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2018.01.036

Radhakrishnan, A., Chen, Y. H., Martin, S., Alhusaini, N., Green, R., & Coller, J. (2016). The DEAD-Box

Protein Dhh1p Couples mRNA Decay and Translation by Monitoring Codon Optimality. *Cell, 167*(1),

122-132.e129. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.08.053

Ramachandran, V., Shah, K. H., & Herman, P. K. (2011). The cAMP-dependent protein kinase signaling

pathway is a key regulator of P body foci formation. *Mol Cell, 43*(6), 973-981.

doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.06.032

Ramaswami, M., Taylor, J. P., & Parker, R. (2013). Altered ribostasis: RNA-protein granules in

degenerative disorders. *Cell, 154*(4), 727-736. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.07.038

Rao, B. S., & Parker, R. (2017). Numerous interactions act redundantly to assemble a tunable size of P

bodies in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 114*(45), E9569-e9578.

doi:10.1073/pnas.1712396114

Scheller, N., Resa-Infante, P., de la Luna, S., Galao, R. P., Albrecht, M., Kaestner, L., . . . Diez, J. (2007).

Identification of PatL1, a human homolog to yeast P body component Pat1. *Biochim Biophys Acta,*

1773(12), 1786-1792. doi:10.1016/j.bbamcr.2007.08.009

Schwartz, D. C., & Parker, R. (1999). Mutations in translation initiation factors lead to increased rates

of deadenylation and decapping of mRNAs in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Mol Cell Biol, 19*(8), 5247-

5256.

Schwartz, D. C., & Parker, R. (2000). mRNA decapping in yeast requires dissociation of the cap binding

protein, eukaryotic translation initiation factor 4E. *Mol Cell Biol, 20*(21), 7933-7942.

Seydoux, G., & Braun, R. E. (2006). Pathway to totipotency: lessons from germ cells. *Cell, 127*(5), 891-

904. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.11.016

Shah, K. H., Zhang, B., Ramachandran, V., & Herman, P. K. (2013). Processing body and stress granule

assembly occur by independent and differentially regulated pathways in Saccharomyces cerevisiae.

Genetics, 193(1), 109-123. doi:10.1534/genetics.112.146993

Sharif, H., Ozgur, S., Sharma, K., Basquin, C., Urlaub, H., & Conti, E. (2013). Structural analysis of the

yeast Dhh1-Pat1 complex reveals how Dhh1 engages Pat1, Edc3 and RNA in mutually exclusive

interactions. *Nucleic Acids Res, 41*(17), 8377-8390. doi:10.1093/nar/gkt600

Sheth, U., & Parker, R. (2003). Decapping and decay of messenger RNA occur in cytoplasmic processing

bodies. *Science, 300*(5620), 805-808. doi:10.1126/science.1082320

Sun, M., Schwalb, B., Schulz, D., Pirkl, N., Etzold, S., Lariviere, L., . . . Cramer, P. (2012). Comparative

dynamic transcriptome analysis (cDTA) reveals mutual feedback between mRNA synthesis and

degradation. *Genome Res, 22*(7), 1350-1359. doi:10.1101/gr.130161.111

Teixeira, D., Sheth, U., Valencia-Sanchez, M. A., Brengues, M., & Parker, R. (2005). Processing bodies

require RNA for assembly and contain nontranslating mRNAs. *Rna, 11*(4), 371-382.

doi:10.1261/rna.7258505

Tucker, M., Staples, R. R., Valencia-Sanchez, M. A., Muhlrad, D., & Parker, R. (2002). Ccr4p is the

catalytic subunit of a Ccr4p/Pop2p/Notp mRNA deadenylase complex in Saccharomyces cerevisiae.

Embo j, 21(6), 1427-1436. doi:10.1093/emboj/21.6.1427

Vallotton, P., van Oijen, A. M., Whitchurch, C. B., Gelfand, V., Yeo, L., Tsiavaliaris, G., . . . Grunwald, D.

(2017). Diatrack particle tracking software: Review of applications and performance evaluation. *Traffic,*

18(12), 840-852. doi:10.1111/tra.12530

1015

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

A.

(+) glucose: Dcp2-mCherry

B.

(+) glucose

(+) glucose +HIP

Figure 6

Figure 7

A.

2.5:1 +/-0.23

2:1 +/-0.18

Dhh1/ Pat1 *in vivo* in PBs

time of glucose starvation (hours)

B. Stoichiometry of Dhh1/Pat1 in *in vitro* LLPS droplets

Dhh1-mCherry

Intensity [-]

Dhh1-mCherry concentration (uM)

2 μM Dhh1, 5 mM ATP, 0.1 mg/ml pU

Dhh1-GFP(A206K)
same GFP as Pat1-GFP

Intensity [-]

Pat1-NC-GFP concentration (uM)

2 μM Dhh1, 5 mM ATP, 0.1 mg/ml pU + 4uM Pat1-NC

Dhh1:Pat1 in *in vitro* droplets= 2.7:1+/- 0.13

C. Tug of war model between Pat1 and Not1 to promote PB assembly and Disassembly respectively

Stress

Translation

① mRNA clients

Dhh1

RNA

C   N

N

PAT1

C

② PAT1   AA

PKA

③ Dhh1   ATP

Not1

Enhanced LLPS of
Dhh1 and RNA

P-Body

loading control (HXK)

Dhh1 levels normalised to loading control

A.

B.

A.

B.

(-) RNA

C.

A.

B.

C.