1 Regulation of eIF2 α Phosphorylation by MAPKs Influences Polysome Stability and 2 Protein Translation

3

4 Sana Parveen^{1,#}, Haripriya Parthasarathy^{1,#}, Dhiviya Vedagiri^{1,2}, Divya Gupta¹, Hitha

5 Gopalan Nair¹, and Krishnan Harinivas Harshan^{1,2*}

6

7 Affiliations: ¹CSIR-Centre for Cellular and Molecular Biology, Hyderabad-500007,

8 India

9 ²Academy of Scientific and Innovative Research (AcSIR), Ghaziabad-201002, India

10

11 [#]Equal Contributors

12 *Correspondence: hkrishnan@ccmb.res.in

13

14 Running title – MAPKs are central to protein translation regulation

15

16

17

18 Key words: Translation, p38 MAPK, ERK1/2, eIF2 α , Mnk1/2, Polysome, Integrated

19 stress response

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **ABSTRACT**

28 Regulation of protein translation occurs primarily at the level of initiation and is
 29 mediated by multiple signaling pathways, majorly mechanistic target of rapamycin
 30 complex 1 (mTORC1), mitogen-activated protein kinases (MAPKs), and the
 31 eukaryotic translation initiation factor eIF2. While mTORC1 and eIF2 α influence the
 32 polysome stability, MAPKs influence the phosphorylation of the cap-binding protein
 33 eIF4E and are known to influence translation of only a small set of mRNAs. Here, we
 34 demonstrate that p38 MAPK and ERK1/2 regulate translation through integrated
 35 stress response (ISR) pathways. Dual inhibition (dual-Mi) of p38 MAPK and ERK1/2
 36 caused substantial phosphorylation of eIF2 α in a synergistic manner, resulting in
 37 near-absolute collapse of polysomes. This regulation was independent of Mnk1/2, a
 38 well-studied mediator of translation regulation by the MAPKs. Dual-Mi-induced
 39 polysome dissociation was far more striking than that caused by sodium arsenite, a
 40 strong inducer of ISR. Interestingly, induction of ISR caused increased p38
 41 phosphorylation, and its inhibition resulted in stronger polysome dissociation,
 42 indicating the importance of p38 in the translation activities. Thus, our studies
 43 demonstrate a major, unidentified role for ERK1/2 and more particularly p38 MAPK
 44 in the maintenance of homeostasis of polysome association and translation
 45 activities.

46 **INTRODUCTION**

47 Protein translation is a major regulatory event in gene expression in eukaryotes.
 48 Initiation is often the target for translation regulation and is achieved either by
 49 limiting the cap complex assembly or through preventing the recycling of pre-
 50 initiation complex (PIC) (1). Regulation is achieved through three major signal
 51 pathways, viz. mechanistic target of rapamycin complex 1 (mTORC1), initiation

52 factor eIF2 and MAPK-eIF4E pathways. While alterations in the activities of
 53 mTORC1 and eIF2 directly impact polysome assembly, those in the eukaryotic
 54 translation initiation factor (eIF4E) do not appear to be globally consequential. eIF4E,
 55 the cap binding protein associates with eIF4G and eIF4A to form eIF4F complex
 56 whose formation is influenced by eIF4E availability (2). eIF4E is phosphorylated at
 57 S209 by MAPK interacting kinases Mnk1 and Mnk2 (3,4) that are regulated by two
 58 mitogen activated protein kinases (MAPKs), viz. extracellular signal regulated
 59 kinases (ERK1/2) and p38 MAPK (hereafter referred to as p38) (5,6). Even as the
 60 role of phosphorylation on the affinity of eIF4E for the cap is contradicted (7),
 61 phosphorylated eIF4E has transforming and oncogenic potentials (8-10). eIF4E
 62 overexpression is reported in large cases of cancers (11). It is proposed that eIF4F
 63 complex with phosphorylated eIF4E can translate certain transcripts that are
 64 excluded by the complex with unphosphorylated eIF4E (9,12,13). eIF4E
 65 phosphorylation was also well demonstrated to influence the translation of
 66 specialised mRNAs including those of I κ B α that mediates type I IFN production (14).

67 mTOR is a S/T kinase that assembles into one of the two distinct complexes
 68 (mTORC1/mTORC2) (15,16). mTORC1 is a key regulatory hub for various cellular
 69 and physiological activities such as translation and autophagy (17,18). mTORC1
 70 regulates protein translation through at least two major substrates, eIF4E binding
 71 protein (4EBP) and the ribosome S6 kinase, p70 S6K (19,20). mTORC1-mediated
 72 multi-site phosphorylation of 4EBP1 releases eIF4E from sequestration facilitating its
 73 availability for binding to 5' caps of mature mRNAs. In spite of its perceivable key
 74 role in translation, mTORC1 inhibition does not result in total inhibition of translation
 75 activities (21-23). Studies in the past have identified several mRNAs that respond to
 76 mTORC1 activity. mRNAs with a 5' terminal oligopyrimidine (5' TOP) element are

77 particularly vulnerable to translation inhibition caused by mTORC1 inhibitors such as
78 rapamycin, Torin1 and pp242 (21,22,24,25).

79 eIF2, a heterotrimeric complex formed by the association of α , β , and γ subunits, is a
80 critical component of the ternary complex with Met-tRNA^{Met} and GTP (eIF2-TC).

81 eIF2-TC binds to the 40S ribosome to form 43S PIC (26,27). Of these, eIF2 α is the
82 regulatory subunit that upon phosphorylation at S52 leads to the inhibition of GDP
83 exchange with GTP after the hydrolysis of the bound GTP. eIF2 α is phosphorylated
84 by integrated stress response (ISR) kinases HRI, GCN2, PKR, and PERK (26-28).
85 Of the known pathways, eIF2 α phosphorylation has the most significant impact on
86 translation as this leads to the most severe translation inhibition (28).

87 Despite having their distinct spheres of regulation, there has not been any major
88 understanding on how these pathways influence each other under specific stimuli
89 barring a few reports (29). Certain degree of cross-activation of mTORC1 by ERK
90 through p90 ribosomal S6 kinase- mediated phosphorylation of RAPTOR is reported
91 (30). Partial dephosphorylation of eIF4E upon mTORC1 inhibition is also reported
92 (31). Studies also cite certain amount of cross-talk between mTORC1 and eIF2 α
93 during autophagy (32). Interestingly, none of these pathways appear to wield a
94 dominant role over the other. A recent study in fact reported that about 90% of the
95 proteins affected by ISR induced by distinct signals are common barring a small
96 subset of unique proteins (29). This also suggests the existence of alternate
97 pathways to ensure basal translation activities under most of the conditions. Here,
98 we report that co-inhibition of p38 MAPK and ERK1/2 resulted in dose-dependent
99 phosphorylation of eIF2 α indicative of ISR, strong dissociation of polysomes, and
100 inhibition of translation. Both cap-dependent and cap-independent pathways were
101 suppressed under these conditions. eIF2 α phosphorylation by sodium arsenite

induced p38 MAPK, which was critical in maintaining basal translation activities. Mnk1/2 inhibition failed to bring about similar effects indicating the involvement of alternate pathways downstream of the MAPKs leading up to eIF2 α phosphorylation. Interestingly, Mnk1/2 inhibition activated Akt that could possibly have contributed to the stabilization of translation activities under this condition. Our studies demonstrate a dominant role for p38 and ERK1/2 in the regulation of protein translation, through eIF2 α phosphorylation.

Experimental procedures

Cell culture, inhibitors, and antibodies

All the cell lines were cultured in DMEM supplemented with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum, penicillin-streptomycin and NEAA. Sodium arsenite, U0126, p38 MAPK inhibitor VIII, Akt-1/2 inhibitor VIII, and ETP-45835 were procured from Merck Millipore and Torin1 was purchased from Tocris Bioscience. All the primary antibodies except β -Tubulin and GAPDH (Thermo Fisher Scientific) were purchased from Cell Signaling Technology. HRP-conjugated secondary antibodies were from Jackson ImmunoResearch.

Inhibitor treatments and immunoblotting

Cells were grown to 70-80% confluency, harvested, and lysed in NP-40 lysis buffer (33). Inhibitions were performed in most cases for 1- hour unless otherwise mentioned. Actively growing cells were treated with either vehicle or inhibitor-containing media before lysis. All the inhibitors were diluted in fresh DMEM right before the experiments. Protein concentration was estimated by BCA method (G Biosciences). Equal quantities of protein lysates were separated by SDS-PAGE,

transferred to an activated PVDF membrane, and immunoblotting was performed as mentioned elsewhere (33). β -Tubulin and GAPDH were used as loading controls.

Polysome preparation and profiling

Reagents for polysome analysis were purchased from Sigma and MP chemicals. Polysome profiles of the inhibited cells were analyzed as described earlier (33). Cells were grown in 150 cm² flasks till 70% confluency and inhibition studies were performed for 1- hour. Following the inhibition, the cells were harvested and washed twice with ice-cold 1 $\times$ PBS containing 100 μ g/mL cycloheximide. The lysates were prepared in polysome lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-Cl pH 8.0, 140 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.5 mM DTT, 1% Triton X-100, 1 $\times$ protease inhibitor, 0.5 mg/mL heparin, 100 μ g/mL cycloheximide, 100 units of RNasin/mL) and crude RNA concentrations were spectrophotometrically measured. 175 μ g of crude RNA lysates were layered on 11 mL of 10-50% linear sucrose gradients (20 mM Tris-Cl pH 8.0, 140 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.5 mM DTT, 100 μ g/mL cycloheximide, 10mM PMSF, and 10-50% sucrose) and the resulting gradients were centrifuged in SW-41 Ti rotor (Beckman Coulter) at 35,000 r.p.m. at 4°C for 3- hours. The samples were fractionated using Teledyne ISCO fraction collector system with a constant monitoring of absorbance at 254 nm to generate Polysome profiles.

Luciferase assay

Cells were seeded in 6 well plate format and grown till 70% confluency and the luciferase reporter plasmids were transfected using Lipofectamine 3000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific). One hour prior to harvesting, the transfected cells were treated with the specific inhibitors. Cells were harvested 10- hours post-transfection and the

luciferase reads were quantified using Dual-Luciferase reagents (Promega) as per manufacturer's protocol on EnSpire multimode plate reader (Perkin Elmer).

OPP Assay

Total protein synthesis was quantified with the help of OPP-incorporation assay based on Click-iT™ chemistry using the Click-iT™ Plus OPP-Alexa Fluor™ 488 protein synthesis assay kit (Life Technologies). The assay was carried out in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. Briefly, Huh7.5 cells were seeded in 8-well chamber slides (Lab-Tek) up to ~80% confluency, and subsequently treated with either DMSO, p38 MAPK inhibitor VIII, U0126 or both for 1- hour. Post-treatment, the cells were treated with 20 µM OPP for 30 minutes at 37°C, followed by fixing with 3.7% formaldehyde and permeabilization with 0.5% Triton X-100 in PBS. Click-iT reaction was carried out with Alexa Fluor 488-picolyl azide for 30 minutes followed by nuclear staining using NuclearMask™ Blue stain. Stained cells were imaged using AxioImager Z2 microscope using Alexa Fluor-488 and DAPI filters for detection. Threshold level was set using OPP-untreated cells. Images were captured at 20x magnification. Image analysis was done using FIJI. Mean whole-cell fluorescence of ~90 individual cells per sample from each set was measured after background subtraction from individual fields. Data is represented as mean fluorescence intensity.

Cell viability assays

Cell viability assays for treatments were carried out using MTT or trypan blue exclusion assay. For all assays, cells were seeded till ~80% confluency and treated with the pharmaceutical compound as mentioned. Vehicle- or inhibitor-treated cells were trypsinized and mixed in 1:1 ratio with 0.4% trypan blue and counted using

Neubauer chamber to determine the cell count. For MTT assay, media containing MTT (final concentration of 0.5 mg/mL) was added to cells post treatment and incubated at 37°C for 3.5- hours. Formazan crystals formed were dissolved in 500 μ L DMSO with mild agitation for 30 minutes. The assay readout was measured as absorbance at 440 nm, with a reference reading at 650 nm.

Statistical Analysis

Data from three independent experiments were used for statistical analysis using two-tailed Student's *t*-test for viability and dual-luciferase assays and represented graphically as Mean $\pm$ SEM. One-way ANOVA was used for OPP assay analysis and plotted as median with interquartile range. *, ** and *** indicate *p*-values < 0.05, 0.005 and 0.0005, respectively.

RESULTS

p38 MAPK and ERK1/2 dual inhibition inhibit eIF4E phosphorylation in a dose-dependent manner

p38 and ERK1/2, two major MAPKs regulate the phosphorylation of eIF4E through phosphorylating and activating Mnk1/2 (3,5,34,35). However, there is little mechanistic evidence on their synergistic regulation of eIF4E and subsequent impact on translation. We addressed this question by comparing eIF4E phosphorylation status under conditions of individual and simultaneous inhibitions of both MAPKs. First, we compared the degree of inhibition in Huh7.5 cells upon three combinations of p38 MAPK inhibitor VIII (p38i) and U0126 (ERK1/2i), viz. 12.5/25 μ M, 25/50 μ M and 50/100 μ M concentrations. The status of eIF4E phosphorylation after 1- hour inhibition was analyzed as the measure of inhibition. A gradual and dose-dependent dephosphorylation of Mnk1 and eIF4E was observed and total dephosphorylation

was achieved at the combination of 50/100 μ M concentrations (Figure 1A). However, cell viability was only modestly impacted by the treatments (Figure 1B). Total dephosphorylation of eIF4E was also achieved in MCF7 cells (Figure 1C). Next, we studied if the dual MAPK inhibition (dual-Mi) had any synergistic effect on eIF4E phosphorylation. Torin1, a potent mTOR inhibitor has been shown previously to affect translation. Torin1 treatment (750 nM) for 1- hour was done alongside MAPK inhibitions, to compare the effects of each treatment on MAPK substrate phosphorylation. Inhibition of mTORC1 was confirmed by the dephosphorylation of its substrates 4EBP1 and ULK1 (Figure 4A). As demonstrated in Figure 1D, the dual inhibition in Huh7.5 cells resulted in much stronger inhibition of Mnk1 and eIF4E than the individual inhibitions did, suggesting that p38 and ERK1/2 synergistically regulate eIF4E phosphorylation. No significant change was observed in the sample inhibited with Torin1, confirming the specificity of the treatments. Similar results were observed in MCF7 and HeLa cells (Figure S1 A & B, respectively)

Dual-Mi at high concentrations causes near-absolute collapse of polysomes and severe suppression of global translation

In order to characterize the effect of dual-Mi on global translation, polysome profiles in Huh7.5 cells treated with individual inhibitors or both (at 50/100 μ M for p38 MAPK inhibitor VIII/U0126 respectively) were mapped. It may be noted that these concentrations were consciously chosen in this study so that the translation activities could be studied under conditions of complete inhibition of the MAPKs. Surprisingly, 1- hour dual-Mi in Huh7.5 cells caused near-absolute collapse of polysome peaks with corresponding accumulation of 80S, suggesting a global inhibition of translation activities (Figure 2A). No polysome peaks were visible under this condition, reminiscent of translation arrest caused by puromycin treatment (36). In comparison

to dual-Mi, individual inhibitions brought about only modest effects on the polysome peaks (Figure 2B). The magnitude of polysome dissociation by dual-Mi was remarkably higher than those caused by eIF2 α phosphorylation by various methods ((26,28) and Figure 6B) and mTORC1 inhibition by Torin1 (Figure 2C). Severe impact of dual-Mi on polysome association was observed in MCF7 cells as well (Figure S2A). Moderate collapse of polysomes was visible at a lower concentration of 25/50 μ M (Figure S2B), once again underlining the specificity of the response to the inhibitions. The results demonstrated that the concurrent loss of activity of the two MAPKs severely inhibits polysome assembly and possibly translation.

We next quantified the translation activities during dual-Mi in Huh7.5 cells by labelling the nascent polypeptides using O-propargyl-puromycin (OPP) incorporation assay. Cells were treated with p38 or ERK1/2 inhibitor or both of them for 1- hour and were labeled with OPP for 30 minutes. Subsequently, they were analyzed by fluorescence microscopy to quantify protein synthesis. As demonstrated in Figure 2D, appreciable fluorescence was detected throughout cytoplasm accompanied by several bright foci in control cells indicating active translation. Both p38 and ERK1/2 inhibitions decreased the incorporation of OPP, evident from both lower intensity fluorescence and reduced number of bright foci, implying lower translation rates. The strongest inhibition of OPP incorporation was detected in dual-Mi treated cells indicating very low levels of translation in them. Quantitative analysis of fluorescence intensities revealed approximate intensity drop of 50% in samples treated with either of the inhibitors and about 75% drop in dual-Mi samples, confirming strong inhibition of translation activities in these cells (Figure 2E), substantiating the polysome dissociation. These results also demonstrate that p38 and ERK1/2 are crucial guardians of eukaryotic translation.

Mnk1/2 inhibition and eIF4E dephosphorylation do not recapitulate the polysome collapse caused by dual-Mi

Though Mnk1/2 double KO mice did not display any translation and growth defect, studies have demonstrated Mnk1/2 as key molecules in the phosphorylation of eIF4E (12). We studied if the effects on translation during dual-Mi are channelled through Mnk1/2. Mnk1/2 inhibitor ETP-45835 brought about eIF4E dephosphorylation in a dose-dependent manner (Figure 3A). In agreement with previous reports, polysome profiles of Mnk1/2 inhibited cells did not demonstrate any appreciable level of polysome dissociation (Figure 3B) in contrast to dual-Mi treatment (Figure 2A). These results indicate the participation of other signal pathways regulating polysome assembly and translation during dual-Mi treatment.

Dual-Mi causes moderate inhibition of mTORC1 activity

Since eIF4E dephosphorylation caused no significant impact on the polysome assembly, we studied the involvement of the other known pathways in coordinating the polysome dissociation by dual-Mi. mTORC1 pathway is a well-known regulator of translation and its inhibition causes significant depletion of polysomes and loss in translation activities ((22) and Figure 2C). We analyzed whether dual-Mi causes mTORC1 inhibition. Huh7.5 cells displayed moderate inhibition of mTORC1 activity, evident from the dephosphorylation of 4EBP1 and ULK1, two important substrates of mTORC1 (Figure 4A). Dose-dependence of the inhibition demonstrated the specificity of this observation (Figure 4B). Individually, ERK1/2 inhibition induced a stronger mTORC1 inhibition than p38 inhibition (Figure 4A). Torin1, an mTOR inhibitor, caused severe inhibition of mTORC1 activity. The degree of mTORC1 inactivation was less remarkable in MCF7 and HeLa cells (Figure S3 A & B,

respectively), indicating that this effect on mTORC1 activity is cell-specific and hence may not be contributing to the polysome dissociation by dual-Mi.

Dual-Mi induces strong eIF2 α phosphorylation in a dose-dependent manner

Next, we tested the effect of dual-Mi on eIF2 α phosphorylation. Huh7.5 cells subjected to dual-Mi were analyzed for the status of eIF2 α phosphorylation. Individually, p38 inhibition caused a moderate eIF2 α phosphorylation while ERK1/2 inhibition caused a stronger phosphorylation (Figure 5A). Interestingly, dual-Mi brought about a much stronger phosphorylation than the individual inhibitions, indicating that the two MAPKs regulate eIF2 α independent of each other. These results also suggested that eIF2 α phosphorylation through ISR could be a critical event behind the polysome dissociation during dual-Mi. A dose-dependent phosphorylation of eIF2 α in response to varying concentrations of dual-Mi confirmed the specificity of the response (Figure 5B). eIF2 α phosphorylation was consistently observed in MCF7 and HeLa cells as well (Figure S4 A & B respectively). Our results demonstrate that p38 and ERK1/2 are important players in the regulation of eIF2 α phosphorylation and in the translation activities. Mnk1/2 inhibition could not recapitulate eIF2 α phosphorylation (Figure 5C), ruling out its participation in the translation suppression associated with dual-Mi.

Activation of p38 upon stress is pivotal for the maintenance of low-level translation during eIF2 α phosphorylation

The role of p38 as a key molecule facilitating stress response is well documented (37). We investigated the role of the two MAPKs in response to stress induced by general translation inhibitor sodium arsenite. Arsenite activates ISR kinases HRI, PKR, PERK and GCN that phosphorylate eIF2 α (38-41). Treatment of Huh7.5 cells

with 40 μ M arsenite induced strong eIF2 α phosphorylation as expected. Interestingly, p38, but not ERK1/2 was phosphorylated by the treatments (Figure 6A), indicating its crucial role in the cell survival upon translation attenuation during ISR. Similar results were observed in MCF7 cells (Figure 6A). Intriguingly, stress-induced p38 phosphorylation did not cause Mnk1/2 and eIF4E phosphorylation (Figure 6A), indicating the involvement of other mechanisms in the regulation of eIF4E phosphorylation by p38 under conditions that promote it. Sodium arsenite did not affect mTORC1 substrates in both Huh7.5 and MCF7 cells, ruling out the possibility of mTORC1 participating in ISR (Figure S5 A & B, respectively). Polysome analysis of arsenite treated cells showed a drop in translation as expected (Figure 6B). Despite a strong collapse of the heavy polysomes, lighter polysomes were intact. As indicated earlier, this polysome dissociation was less remarkable than that by dual-Mi, indicating the stronger translation inhibitory effects by the latter (Figures 2A & 6B).

Translation arrest is a general response to ISR and our results suggest that p38 activation is a probable feedback mechanism to sustain translation. In order to characterize the role of activated p38 upon ISR, we treated Huh7.5 cells with arsenite along with p38 inhibitor for 1- hour. This would, in principle, disallow the activation of p38 during ISR and hence could be an ideal set up to study the role of p38 in translation during ISR. Independently, p38 inhibition induced eIF2 α phosphorylation similar in magnitude as arsenite did and their combined treatment did not further induce it (Figure 6C). Quite interestingly and as hypothesized, inhibition of p38 in cells treated with arsenite caused more severe polysome collapse as compared with arsenite treatment alone (Figure 6D). This result indicates that p38 activation is a crucial and remedial consequence to ISR in the maintenance of

minimal translation activity required for the synthesis of necessary proteins. Our results demonstrate that activation of p38 is crucial in sustenance of translation upon ISR induction.

Both cap-dependent and independent translations are inhibited by dual-Mi

Even though the default mode of translation is 5'-cap-dependent, cap-independent translation is promoted under several physiological conditions of stress (42). Even under eIF2 α phosphorylation mediated translational arrest, a set of mRNAs are translated actively. To verify whether dual-Mi suppresses cap-independent translation, we used a bicistronic luciferase assay where translation of *Renilla* luciferase (Rluc) is cap-dependent whereas that of firefly luciferase (Fluc) is driven by HCV or EMCV IRES (Figure 7A) (43). Cells transfected with either of these vectors were subjected to dual-Mi and translation efficiencies were measured through luciferase activities. Interestingly, both Fluc and Rluc activities from HCV IRES construct were inhibited by approximately 60% after 1- hour of inhibition, indicating that dual-Mi mediated translation arrest inhibits both cap-dependent and cap-independent translation (Figure 7B). Inhibitions of similar magnitude from EMCV IRES construct confirmed the above observation (Figure 7C). A conventional analysis based on F/R ratio would not identify these inhibitions as both cap-dependent and independent translations were impacted similarly. These results are in agreement with the severe translation arrest described in previous section and indicate that concurrent inhibition of p38 and ERK1/2 affects translation machinery as a whole.

eIF2 α phosphorylation is reversed during long-term dual-Mi

The profound loss in polysome assembly and translation inhibition during dual-Mi for 1- hour did not appear to affect the cellular viability. Long-term dual-Mi significantly inhibited cell viability as anticipated (Figure 8A), but, a considerable population of cells remained active at the end of the treatment. We investigated if the ISR is reversed during the long-term dual-Mi (24- hours) in Huh7.5 cells. eIF4E remained inhibited throughout the inhibition period, confirming the sustained inhibition of the MAPKs (Figure 8B). Interestingly, eIF2 α remained phosphorylated until 12- hours post treatment and subsequently returned to the basal levels (Figure 8B), indicating that the ISR was reversed by 24- hours. Since Akt is an important regulator in cell survival (44), we studied its phosphorylation. The surviving cells indeed displayed higher phosphorylation of Akt from 4- hours of treatment onwards and gradually increased until 24- hours (Figure 8C). These results demonstrate that despite a severe inhibition of translation activities by dual-Mi, a significant fraction of the cells recover from this inhibition over a period time and we speculate that Akt could be an important player in this survival.

Mnk1/2 inhibition promotes Akt phosphorylation

While investigating the potential mechanism of activation of Akt phosphorylation during the prolonged dual-Mi, we noticed that Mnk1/2 inhibition for 1- hour resulted in higher S473 Akt phosphorylation in a dose-dependent manner (Figure 8D) indicating that Mnk1/2 inhibition is inducing mTORC2. As in the case of Mnk1/2 (Figure 5C), the concurrent inhibitions of Akt and Mnk1/2 failed to make any change in the phosphorylation status of eIF2 α (Figure 8E), ruling out the involvement of Akt during

dual-Mi. However, it is compelling to suggest that Akt phosphorylation during prolonged dual-Mi could be important in the survival of the cells.

DISCUSSION

Being a complex process, translation is often studied from single-pathway perspectives. Recent advancements in RNA deep sequencing and ribosome profiling has revolutionized the field by enabling identification of the transcripts that are regulated by distinct signal pathways at multiple stages of the process. However, the cross talks between major pathways involved in the translation regulation need deeper understanding. A recent comprehensive report explained cross-talk between mTORC1 and eIF2 α pathways (29). Another report suggests that upon DNA damage, mTORC1 may regulate eIF2 α phosphorylation via PERK and GCN2, to promote cell migration (45). Yet another study proposes that HRI-mediated ISR may inhibit mTORC1 activity in the liver to mitigate ineffective erythropoiesis (46). In these contexts, our study reveals a central role of p38 and ERK1/2, two MAPKs that have been shown to influence translation initiation by phosphorylating eIF4E. Our study identifies a novel mechanism of regulation where p38 and ERK1/2 regulate eIF2 α phosphorylation and hence ISR. The impact of dual inhibition was profound and achieved near-total polysome dissociation that is not detected in any other individual conditions including mTOR inhibition and eIF2 α phosphorylation by known agents. Clearly, the two molecules synergistically regulated eIF2 α . Even as this study has not identified the specific kinase that mediates eIF2 α phosphorylation, it helps in characterizing a major mechanism that has not been reported before.

Our studies underline the importance of p38 in maintaining the translation homeostasis upon stress (47). p38, but not ERK1/2, was activated upon arsenite

treatment, indicating that the former is important in conditions of ISR. Interestingly, p38 phosphorylation did not lead to eIF4E phosphorylation suggesting the requirement of other factors in the regulation of the cap-binding protein. Additionally, ERK1/2 inhibition caused more noticeable dephosphorylation of eIF4E in all cell lines tested, implying the stronger influence by this MAPK. Although p38 activation upon arsenite treatment has been documented previously (48,49), our interests were to investigate its role in maintenance of translation under conditions of arsenite toxicity. Treatment of cells with arsenite and p38i simultaneously revealed a further depletion of polysomes, lending additional proof to its activation status under conditions of arsenite stress. Interestingly,

The most studied target of the two MAPKs in translation regulation is Mnk1/2. Previous studies have looked very closely at the role of Mnk1/2 and eIF4E phosphorylation in translation and their impact on global translation was less than appealing (50,51). Neither Mnk1/2 double knockout nor specific inhibitors have identified any significant impact on polysome assembly (12,52). Our studies using Mnk1/2 inhibitor are in total agreement with this. Importantly, Mnk1/2 inhibition did not bring about eIF2 α phosphorylation unlike dual-Mi did, thereby excluding its participation in the mechanism we describe. It would be interesting to characterize the involvement of the other known downstream targets of MAPKs, RSK and MAPKAPKs under similar conditions.

Despite playing a major role, eIF2 α phosphorylation alone cannot be implicated in the magnitude of translation arrest by dual-Mi. That is because eIF2 α phosphorylation by various agents does not trigger such collapse in polysome assembly as in dual-Mi as demonstrated by our study and others (38,53,54). Thus dual-Mi appears to involve additional pathways and enforce a consolidated effect on

translation. mTORC1 does not appear to be a key player in this as it was not inhibited consistently across cell types during dual-Mi.

We considered whether Akt phosphorylation upon Mnk1/2 inhibition protects eIF2 α from phosphorylation. However dual inhibition of Mnk1/2 and Akt failed to notice any change. Interestingly, dual-Mi prevented Akt phosphorylation for long duration further strengthening the possibility of Akt phosphorylation in the process. However, appearance of phospho-Akt from 4- hours onwards indicated its possible role in the diminishing effects of dual-Mi and revival of the cells. As an upstream effector of the mTOR pathway that senses nutrient and oxygen deprivation and as a pro-survival signal, activation of Akt is an intriguing observation that suggests a possible feedback mechanism that initiates at later time points in dual-Mi.

Specificity and universal appeal of our findings were strengthened by the consistency of the observations across three distinct cell lines. The original objective of this study was to investigate the impact of total dephosphorylation of eIF4E on the polysome association and hence we consciously chose higher concentrations of MAPK inhibitors. eIF2 α phosphorylation, the key finding in this study, was induced even at lower concentrations of inhibitors and followed a dose-dependency indicating the specificity of their effect. In addition, the cell viability was only moderate at 1-hour inhibition when most of our studies were performed.

Dual-Mi had prolonged effect on eIF2 α phosphorylation. The inhibitors caused phosphorylation as long as 12- hours indicating that feedback mechanisms to neutralize ISR were not effective. One major question is how the cells are able to sustain without crashing during a severe translational repression. Quite clearly, a set of proteins critical for survival were being translated despite very low translation

activities. It would be interesting to identify such proteins and the mechanisms that allow their translation. Activation of cap-independent mechanism is quite well accepted under conditions of translation suppression by mTORC1 inhibition (55). However, since dual-Mi caused severe suppression of cap-independent translation as well, the translating proteins are less likely to use this mode of translation. ERK1/2 activation promotes cell survival and proliferation in response to growth stimuli by driving the expression of pro-survival proteins. Response of p38 to stress stimuli depends more on the kinetics of its activation and can thus be either pro-survival or pro-apoptotic (56). Comparing our long duration dual-Mi observations to current understandings of MAPK signalling, it is possible that this cross-talk between MAPKs in general is allowing cells to remain viable despite seemingly negligible amounts of translation in the presence of high levels of eIF2 α phosphorylation.

All MAPKs are known to respond to ER-stress in a myriad of ways, from transcriptionally upregulating pro-survival molecules, to stemming apoptotic signals, and seem to behave differently in different cell lines. p38 activation during ER-stress has been shown to cause switch from autophagy to apoptosis, mediated by PERK and eIF2 α (57). MEK-ERK signalling has also been shown to be necessary for combating amino-acid deprivation in hepatocytes through GCN2 activation (58). These studies primarily see MAPK activation as a response to ISR that help combat the stress. Our studies also demonstrate that p38 is critical in the basal translation activities during stress. However, we also demonstrate that inhibition of these MAPKs can cause severe ISR. From our studies, p38 appears to be more critical to the balance in translation activities. Though inhibition of either of the two MAPKs caused eIF2 α phosphorylation, only p38, not ERK1/2, was activated upon ISR induction. Since p38 inhibition causes ISR and eIF2 α phosphorylation, we speculate

that the subsequent feedback phosphorylation of p38 could be critical in limiting the ISR and stabilizing translation. Thus p38 seems to be a critical molecule in the post-ISR rescue of translation activities. Additionally, p38 could also be critical in maintaining the low translation activities during ISR.

Author contributions

S.P., H.P., and K.H.H., conceived the study. S.P., H.P., D.V., D.G., and H.G.N performed the experiments. S.P., H.P., and K.H.H., analyzed the results. K.H.H wrote the manuscript while S.P., and H.P., edited it.

Acknowledgement

We thank Rupesh Balaji for assisting in polysome profiling. Special thanks to Mohan Singh for logistical assistance for several experiments. HCV-IRES and EMCV-IRES constructs were kind gifts from Dr. Saumitra Das.

Funding

This work was supported by funding from Department of Biotechnology, Govt. of India (BT/PR21356/MED/30/1779/2016). S.P, H.P and D.G received fellowships from Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, Govt. of India.

REFERENCES

1. Gebauer, F., and Hentze, M. W. (2004) Molecular mechanisms of translational control. *Nature reviews. Molecular cell biology* **5**, 827-835
2. Duncan, R., Milburn, S. C., and Hershey, J. W. (1987) Regulated phosphorylation and low abundance of HeLa cell initiation factor eIF-4F suggest a role in translational control. Heat shock effects on eIF-4F. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **262**, 380-388
3. Pyronnet, S., Imataka, H., Gingras, A. C., Fukunaga, R., Hunter, T., and Sonenberg, N. (1999) Human eukaryotic translation initiation factor 4G (eIF4G) recruits mnk1 to phosphorylate eIF4E. *The EMBO journal* **18**, 270-279
4. Joshi, B., Cai, A. L., Keiper, B. D., Minich, W. B., Mendez, R., Beach, C. M., Stepinski, J., Stolarski, R., Darzynkiewicz, E., and Rhoads, R. E. (1995) Phosphorylation of eukaryotic protein synthesis initiation factor 4E at Ser-209. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **270**, 14597-14603
5. Waskiewicz, A. J., Flynn, A., Proud, C. G., and Cooper, J. A. (1997) Mitogen-activated protein kinases activate the serine/threonine kinases Mnk1 and Mnk2. *The EMBO journal* **16**, 1909-1920

- 497 6. Morley, S. J. (1997) Intracellular signalling pathways regulating initiation factor eIF4E
498 phosphorylation during the activation of cell growth. *Biochemical Society transactions* **25**,
499 503-509
- 500 7. Scheper, G. C., and Proud, C. G. (2002) Does phosphorylation of the cap-binding protein
501 eIF4E play a role in translation initiation? *European journal of biochemistry* **269**, 5350-5359
- 502 8. Lazaris-Karatzas, A., Montine, K. S., and Sonenberg, N. (1990) Malignant transformation by a
503 eukaryotic initiation factor subunit that binds to mRNA 5' cap. *Nature* **345**, 544-547
- 504 9. Furic, L., Rong, L., Larsson, O., Koumakpayi, I. H., Yoshida, K., Brueschke, A., Petroulakis, E.,
505 Robichaud, N., Pollak, M., Gaboury, L. A., Pandolfi, P. P., Saad, F., and Sonenberg, N. (2010)
506 eIF4E phosphorylation promotes tumorigenesis and is associated with prostate cancer
507 progression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
508 *America* **107**, 14134-14139
- 509 10. Topisirovic, I., Ruiz-Gutierrez, M., and Borden, K. L. (2004) Phosphorylation of the eukaryotic
510 translation initiation factor eIF4E contributes to its transformation and mRNA transport
511 activities. *Cancer research* **64**, 8639-8642
- 512 11. Carroll, M., and Borden, K. L. (2013) The oncogene eIF4E: using biochemical insights to target
513 cancer. *J Interferon Cytokine Res* **33**, 227-238
- 514 12. Ueda, T., Watanabe-Fukunaga, R., Fukuyama, H., Nagata, S., and Fukunaga, R. (2004) Mnk2
515 and Mnk1 are essential for constitutive and inducible phosphorylation of eukaryotic
516 initiation factor 4E but not for cell growth or development. *Mol Cell Biol* **24**, 6539-6549
- 517 13. Siddiqui, N., and Sonenberg, N. (2015) Signalling to eIF4E in cancer. *Biochemical Society*
518 *transactions* **43**, 763-772
- 519 14. Herdy, B., Jaramillo, M., Svitkin, Y. V., Rosenfeld, A. B., Kobayashi, M., Walsh, D., Alain, T.,
520 Sean, P., Robichaud, N., Topisirovic, I., Furic, L., Dowling, R. J. O., Sylvestre, A., Rong, L.,
521 Colina, R., Costa-Mattioli, M., Fritz, J. H., Olivier, M., Brown, E., Mohr, I., and Sonenberg, N.
522 (2012) Translational control of the activation of transcription factor NF-kappaB and
523 production of type I interferon by phosphorylation of the translation factor eIF4E. *Nat*
524 *Immunol* **13**, 543-550
- 525 15. Brown, E. J., Albers, M. W., Shin, T. B., Ichikawa, K., Keith, C. T., Lane, W. S., and Schreiber, S.
526 L. (1994) A mammalian protein targeted by G1-arresting rapamycin-receptor complex.
527 *Nature* **369**, 756-758
- 528 16. Sabatini, D. M., Erdjument-Bromage, H., Lui, M., Tempst, P., and Snyder, S. H. (1994) RAFT1:
529 a mammalian protein that binds to FKBP12 in a rapamycin-dependent fashion and is
530 homologous to yeast TORs. *Cell* **78**, 35-43
- 531 17. Saxton, R. A., and Sabatini, D. M. (2017) mTOR Signaling in Growth, Metabolism, and
532 Disease. *Cell* **168**, 960-976
- 533 18. Wullschlegel, S., Loewith, R., and Hall, M. N. (2006) TOR signaling in growth and metabolism.
534 *Cell* **124**, 471-484
- 535 19. Hay, N., and Sonenberg, N. (2004) Upstream and downstream of mTOR. *Genes &*
536 *development* **18**, 1926-1945
- 537 20. Wang, X., and Proud, C. G. (2011) mTORC1 signaling: what we still don't know. *Journal of*
538 *molecular cell biology* **3**, 206-220
- 539 21. Jefferies, H. B., Reinhard, C., Kozma, S. C., and Thomas, G. (1994) Rapamycin selectively
540 represses translation of the "polypyrimidine tract" mRNA family. *Proceedings of the National*
541 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **91**, 4441-4445
- 542 22. Thoreen, C. C., Chantranupong, L., Keys, H. R., Wang, T., Gray, N. S., and Sabatini, D. M.
543 (2012) A unifying model for mTORC1-mediated regulation of mRNA translation. *Nature* **485**,
544 109-113
- 545 23. Hsieh, A. C., Costa, M., Zollo, O., Davis, C., Feldman, M. E., Testa, J. R., Meyuhas, O., Shokat,
546 K. M., and Ruggero, D. (2010) Genetic dissection of the oncogenic mTOR pathway reveals
547 druggable addiction to translational control via 4EBP-eIF4E. *Cancer cell* **17**, 249-261

- 548 24. Thoreen, C. C., Kang, S. A., Chang, J. W., Liu, Q., Zhang, J., Gao, Y., Reichling, L. J., Sim, T.,
549 Sabatini, D. M., and Gray, N. S. (2009) An ATP-competitive mammalian target of rapamycin
550 inhibitor reveals rapamycin-resistant functions of mTORC1. *The Journal of biological*
551 *chemistry* **284**, 8023-8032
- 552 25. Hsieh, A. C., Liu, Y., Edlind, M. P., Ingolia, N. T., Janes, M. R., Sher, A., Shi, E. Y., Stumpf, C. R.,
553 Christensen, C., Bonham, M. J., Wang, S., Ren, P., Martin, M., Jessen, K., Feldman, M. E.,
554 Weissman, J. S., Shokat, K. M., Rommel, C., and Ruggero, D. (2012) The translational
555 landscape of mTOR signalling steers cancer initiation and metastasis. *Nature* **485**, 55-61
- 556 26. Hinnebusch, A. G. (2014) The scanning mechanism of eukaryotic translation initiation.
557 *Annual review of biochemistry* **83**, 779-812
- 558 27. Jackson, R. J., Hellen, C. U., and Pestova, T. V. (2010) The mechanism of eukaryotic
559 translation initiation and principles of its regulation. *Nature reviews. Molecular cell biology*
560 **11**, 113-127
- 561 28. Andreev, D. E., O'Connor, P. B., Fahey, C., Kenny, E. M., Terenin, I. M., Dmitriev, S. E.,
562 Cormican, P., Morris, D. W., Shatsky, I. N., and Baranov, P. V. (2015) Translation of 5' leaders
563 is pervasive in genes resistant to eIF2 repression. *eLife* **4**, e03971
- 564 29. Klann, K., Tascher, G., and Munch, C. (2020) Functional Translatome Proteomics Reveal
565 Converging and Dose-Dependent Regulation by mTORC1 and eIF2alpha. *Mol Cell* **77**, 913-925
566 e914
- 567 30. Carriere, A., Romeo, Y., Acosta-Jaquez, H. A., Moreau, J., Bonneil, E., Thibault, P., Fingar, D.
568 C., and Roux, P. P. (2011) ERK1/2 phosphorylate Raptor to promote Ras-dependent
569 activation of mTOR complex 1 (mTORC1). *The Journal of biological chemistry* **286**, 567-577
- 570 31. Joubert, P. E., Stapleford, K., Guivel-Benhassine, F., Vignuzzi, M., Schwartz, O., and Albert, M.
571 L. (2015) Inhibition of mTORC1 Enhances the Translation of Chikungunya Proteins via the
572 Activation of the Mnk/eIF4E Pathway. *PLoS pathogens* **11**, e1005091
- 573 32. Wengrod, J. C., and Gardner, L. B. (2015) Cellular adaptation to nutrient deprivation:
574 crosstalk between the mTORC1 and eIF2alpha signaling pathways and implications for
575 autophagy. *Cell Cycle* **14**, 2571-2577
- 576 33. George, A., Panda, S., Kudmulwar, D., Chhatbar, S. P., Nayak, S. C., and Krishnan, H. H. (2012)
577 Hepatitis C virus NS5A binds to the mRNA cap-binding eukaryotic translation initiation 4F
578 (eIF4F) complex and up-regulates host translation initiation machinery through eIF4E-
579 binding protein 1 inactivation. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **287**, 5042-5058
- 580 34. Wang, X., Flynn, A., Waskiewicz, A. J., Webb, B. L., Vries, R. G., Baines, I. A., Cooper, J. A., and
581 Proud, C. G. (1998) The phosphorylation of eukaryotic initiation factor eIF4E in response to
582 phorbol esters, cell stresses, and cytokines is mediated by distinct MAP kinase pathways. *The*
583 *Journal of biological chemistry* **273**, 9373-9377
- 584 35. Waskiewicz, A. J., Johnson, J. C., Penn, B., Mahalingam, M., Kimball, S. R., and Cooper, J. A.
585 (1999) Phosphorylation of the cap-binding protein eukaryotic translation initiation factor 4E
586 by protein kinase Mnk1 in vivo. *Mol Cell Biol* **19**, 1871-1880
- 587 36. Blobel, G., and Sabatini, D. (1971) Dissociation of mammalian polyribosomes into subunits
588 by puromycin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
589 *America* **68**, 390-394
- 590 37. Whitmarsh, A. J. (2010) A central role for p38 MAPK in the early transcriptional response to
591 stress. *BMC Biol* **8**, 47
- 592 38. McEwen, E., Kedersha, N., Song, B., Scheuner, D., Gilks, N., Han, A., Chen, J. J., Anderson, P.,
593 and Kaufman, R. J. (2005) Heme-regulated inhibitor kinase-mediated phosphorylation of
594 eukaryotic translation initiation factor 2 inhibits translation, induces stress granule
595 formation, and mediates survival upon arsenite exposure. *The Journal of biological chemistry*
596 **280**, 16925-16933
- 597 39. Brostrom, C. O., Prostko, C. R., Kaufman, R. J., and Brostrom, M. A. (1996) Inhibition of
598 translational initiation by activators of the glucose-regulated stress protein and heat shock

protein stress response systems. Role of the interferon-inducible double-stranded RNA-activated eukaryotic initiation factor 2alpha kinase. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **271**, 24995-25002

40. Sun, H., Yang, Y., Shao, H., Sun, W., Gu, M., Wang, H., Jiang, L., Qu, L., Sun, D., and Gao, Y. (2017) Sodium Arsenite-Induced Learning and Memory Impairment Is Associated with Endoplasmic Reticulum Stress-Mediated Apoptosis in Rat Hippocampus. *Frontiers in Molecular Neuroscience* **10**

41. Taniuchi, S., Miyake, M., Tsugawa, K., Oyadomari, M., and Oyadomari, S. (2016) Integrated stress response of vertebrates is regulated by four eIF2α kinases. *Scientific reports* **6**, 32886

42. Holcik, M., and Sonenberg, N. (2005) Translational control in stress and apoptosis. *Nature reviews. Molecular cell biology* **6**, 318-327

43. Pudi, R., Srinivasan, P., and Das, S. (2004) La protein binding at the GCAC site near the initiator AUG facilitates the ribosomal assembly on the hepatitis C virus RNA to influence internal ribosome entry site-mediated translation. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **279**, 29879-29888

44. Hemmings, B. A., and Restuccia, D. F. (2012) PI3K-PKB/Akt pathway. *Cold Spring Harbor perspectives in biology* **4**, a011189

45. Harvey, R. F., Poyry, T. A. A., Stoneley, M., and Willis, A. E. (2019) Signaling from mTOR to eIF2alpha mediates cell migration in response to the chemotherapeutic doxorubicin. *Sci Signal* **12**

46. Zhang, S., Macias-Garcia, A., Velazquez, J., Paltrinieri, E., Kaufman, R. J., and Chen, J. J. (2018) HRI coordinates translation by eIF2αp and mTORC1 to mitigate ineffective erythropoiesis in mice during iron deficiency. *Blood* **131**, 450-461

47. Akkari, L., Gregoire, D., Floc'h, N., Moreau, M., Hernandez, C., Simonin, Y., Rosenberg, A. R., Lassus, P., and Hibner, U. (2012) Hepatitis C viral protein NS5A induces EMT and participates in oncogenic transformation of primary hepatocyte precursors. *J Hepatol* **57**, 1021-1028

48. Elbirt, K. K., Whitmarsh, A. J., Davis, R. J., and Bonkovsky, H. L. (1998) Mechanism of sodium arsenite-mediated induction of heme oxygenase-1 in hepatoma cells. Role of mitogen-activated protein kinases. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **273**, 8922-8931

49. Kim, J. Y., Choi, J. A., Kim, T. H., Yoo, Y. D., Kim, J. I., Lee, Y. J., Yoo, S. Y., Cho, C. K., Lee, Y. S., and Lee, S. J. (2002) Involvement of p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase in the cell growth inhibition by sodium arsenite. *Journal of cellular physiology* **190**, 29-37

50. McKendrick, L., Morley, S. J., Pain, V. M., Jagus, R., and Joshi, B. (2001) Phosphorylation of eukaryotic initiation factor 4E (eIF4E) at Ser209 is not required for protein synthesis in vitro and in vivo. *European journal of biochemistry* **268**, 5375-5385

51. Bianchini, A., Loiarro, M., Bielli, P., Busà, R., Paronetto, M. P., Loreni, F., Geremia, R., and Sette, C. (2008) Phosphorylation of eIF4E by MNKs supports protein synthesis, cell cycle progression and proliferation in prostate cancer cells. *Carcinogenesis* **29**, 2279-2288

52. Grzmil, M., Morin, P., Jr., Lino, M. M., Merlo, A., Frank, S., Wang, Y., Moncayo, G., and Hemmings, B. A. (2011) MAP kinase-interacting kinase 1 regulates SMAD2-dependent TGF-beta signaling pathway in human glioblastoma. *Cancer research* **71**, 2392-2402

53. Baird, T. D., Palam, L. R., Fusakio, M. E., Willy, J. A., Davis, C. M., McClintick, J. N., Anthony, T. G., and Wek, R. C. (2014) Selective mRNA translation during eIF2 phosphorylation induces expression of IBTKα. *Molecular biology of the cell* **25**, 1686-1697

54. Romero, A. M., Ramos-Alonso, L., Alepuz, P., Puig, S., and Martinez-Pastor, M. T. (2020) Global translational repression induced by iron deficiency in yeast depends on the Gcn2/eIF2alpha pathway. *Scientific reports* **10**, 233

55. Muranen, T., Selfors, L. M., Worster, D. T., Iwanicki, M. P., Song, L., Morales, F. C., Gao, S., Mills, G. B., and Brugge, J. S. (2012) Inhibition of PI3K/mTOR leads to adaptive resistance in matrix-attached cancer cells. *Cancer cell* **21**, 227-239

- 649 56. Darling, N. J., and Cook, S. J. (2014) The role of MAPK signalling pathways in the response to
650 endoplasmic reticulum stress. *Biochimica et biophysica acta* **1843**, 2150-2163
- 651 57. Jiang, Q., Li, F., Shi, K., Wu, P., An, J., Yang, Y., and Xu, C. (2014) Involvement of p38 in signal
652 switching from autophagy to apoptosis via the PERK/eIF2 α /ATF4 axis in selenite-treated NB4
653 cells. *Cell Death & Disease* **5**, e1270-e1270
- 654 58. Thiaville, M. M., Pan, Y. X., Gjymishka, A., Zhong, C., Kaufman, R. J., and Kilberg, M. S. (2008)
655 MEK signaling is required for phosphorylation of eIF2 α following amino acid limitation of
656 HepG2 human hepatoma cells. *The Journal of biological chemistry* **283**, 10848-10857

657

658

659

660

661

662

663

664

665

666

667

668

669

670

671

672

673

674

675

676

677

678 Figure 1

679

680

681

682

683

684

685 Figure 2

686

687

688 Figure 3

689

690

691

692

693

694

695

696

697

698

699

700

701

702

Figure 4

718 Figure 5

719

720

721

722

723

724

725 Figure 6

726

727

728

729

730 Figure 7

731

732

733 Figure 8

734

LEGENDS

Figure 1. p38 and ERK1/2 MAPK co-inhibition causes dose dependent

decrease in eIF4E phosphorylation. (A) Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation

and expression status of Mnk1 and eIF4E from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with

12.5/25, 25/50, or 50/100 μ M of dual-MAPK inhibitors (Dual-Mi) for 1- hour along

with DMSO vehicle control. **(B)** Huh7.5 cell viability was measured upon treatment

with DMSO vehicle or different concentrations of inhibitors for 1- hour using trypan

blue exclusion method. Graph is representative of 3 independent experiments. The

statistical significance was calculated using two tailed, paired Student's *t* test where

n.s. represents non-significant. **(C)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and

expression of eIF4E from MCF7 cells upon similar treatment as in (A). **(D)**

Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of ERK1/2, Mnk1, and

eIF4E from Huh7.5 cells treated with DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i

(50 μ M), ERK1/2i (100 μ M), or Dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i). Lanes 1 and 3 are

independent vehicle controls for Torin1 and MAPK inhibitors, respectively. p38i-p38

MAPK inhibitor VIII, ERK1/2i-U0126, Dual-Mi-p38i+ERK1/2i.

Figure 2. p38 and ERK1/2 MAPK dual inhibition severely affects polysome

stability and suppresses translation. (A-C) Polysome profiles of Huh7.5 cells

treated with DMSO vehicle control or specific inhibitor(s) for 1- hour. Polysome

profile analyses were performed after density gradient ultracentrifugation of the

corresponding cytosolic extract. Free ribosomal subunits (40S and 60S), monosome

(80S) and the polyribosomes were fractionated by measuring the absorbance at 254

nm. Each graph shows treatment-curve overlaid on the vehicle control. **(A)** From

dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i) treatment. **(B)** From p38i (50 μ M) and ERK1/2i

(100 μ M) individual treatments. **(C)** From Torin1 (750 nM) treatment. **(D)**

Representative images from OPP-incorporation assay for assessing protein synthesis in DMSO, p38i (50 μ M), ERK1/2i (100 μ M) and dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i), performed in Huh7.5 cells. AlexaFluor 488 conjugated-OPP (green) was used to determine level of nascent protein synthesis. NuclearMask Blue (blue) was used to stain the nucleus. Images were captured at 20 $\times$ magnification and the scale bar represents 20 μ m length. **(E)** Quantitative analysis of OPP-incorporation depicted as violin plots. Data represented is from ~90 cells as 3 independent experimental setups and is represented with median values and minimum and maximum quartiles, and *p*-value was calculated using one-way ANOVA; *** represents *p* < 0.0005.

Figure 3. Polysome collapse caused by dual-Mi is independent of Mnk1/2 inhibition and eIF4E dephosphorylation. **(A)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of eIF4E from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with 5, 10, 20 or 50 μ M of Mnk1 for 1- hour along with water vehicle control. **(B)** Polysome profiles from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with vehicle or Mnk1 (50 μ M) for 1- hour. Free ribosomal subunits (40S and 60S), monosome (80S) and the polysomes were fractionated by measuring the absorbance at 254 nm after density gradient centrifugation of corresponding cytosolic extracts. The graph shows treatment-curve overlaid on the vehicle. Mnk1 - ETP-45835

Figure 4. Dual-Mi causes moderate inhibition of mTORC1 activity in Huh7.5.

(A) Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1 from Huh7.5 cells treated with DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μ M), ERK1/2i (100 μ M), or Dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour. **(B)** Immunoblot depicting phosphorylation and expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1

from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with 12.5/25, 25/50, or 50/100 μ M of p38i/ERK1/2i dual-MAPK inhibitors for 1- hour along with DMSO vehicle control.

Figure 5. p38 and ERK1/2 MAPKs synergistically regulate eIF2 α

phosphorylation independent of its common downstream kinase Mnk1/2. (A)

Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation status of eIF2 α from Huh7.5 cells treated with DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μ M), ERK1/2i (100 μ M) or Dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i /ERK1/2i) for 1- hour. **(B)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of eIF2 α from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with 12.5/25, 25/50, or 50/100 μ M of Dual-Mi for 1- hour along with DMSO vehicle control. **(C)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation of eIF4E and eIF2 α from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with 5, 10, 20 or 50 μ M of Mnk1 for 1- hour along with water vehicle control.

Figure 6. Arsenite induced p38 MAPK activation is critical for polysome

stability. (A) Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of eIF2 α ,

p38 MAPK, ERK1/2, Mnk1 and eIF4E from Huh7.5 and MCF7 cells upon treatment with vehicle or sodium arsenite (40 μ M) for 1- hour. **(B)** Polysome profiles from

Huh7.5 cells treated with vehicle or sodium arsenite (40 μ M) for 1- hour. Free ribosomal subunits (40S and 60S), monosome (80S) and the polyribosomes were

fractionated by measuring the absorbance at 254 nm after density gradient

centrifugation of corresponding cytosolic extracts. The graph shows treatment-curve

overlaid on that of the vehicle. **(C)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and

expression status of eIF2 α and p38 MAPK upon treatment with vehicle, sodium

arsenite (40 μ M), p38i (50 μ M) or both (40/50 μ M sodium arsenite/p38i) for 1- hour.

(D) Polysome profiles from Huh7.5 cells treated with vehicle, sodium arsenite (40

μ M), or both (40/50 μ M sodium arsenite/p38i) for 1- hour. Free ribosomal subunits

(40S and 60S), monosome (80S) and the ribosomes were fractionated by measuring the absorbance at 254 nm after density gradient centrifugation of corresponding cytosolic extracts. The graph shows treatment-curve overlaid on the vehicle. AsO₂-Sodium arsenite.

Figure 7. Dual-Mi inhibits both cap-dependent and cap-independent

translation. (A) Schematic representation of dual-luciferase reporter construct where HCV/EMCV IRES elements are sandwiched between *Renilla* (Rluc) and Firefly (Fluc) luciferase genes. **(B and C)** Luciferase assay in Huh7.5 lysates transfected with HCV **(B)** and EMCV **(C)** dual-luciferase reporter plasmids for 9-hours and further treatment either with vehicle or dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour. Relative change in luciferase activity was calculated by normalizing Fluc/Rluc reading of inhibitor treated cells with its corresponding vehicle control. *p*-value was calculated using two tailed, paired Student's *t*-test; * represents *p* < 0.05. F/R ratio of each treatment is represented below each graph.

Figure 8. Chronic inhibition of p38 and ERK1/2 MAPK results in activation of

alternate cell survival pathways to support cell sustenance. (A) Viability of Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with DMSO vehicle control or dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1-, 2-, 4-, 12- or 24- hours using MTT assay. Graph is representative of three independent experiments. *p*-value was calculated using two tailed, paired Student's *t*-test; where *** represents *p* < 0.0005 and n.s. represents non-significant. **(B)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of eIF2 α , eIF4E from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with DMSO vehicle control or dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1-, 2-, 4-, 12- or 24- hours. **(C)** Those of Akt from the same treatment as in (B). **(D)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of Akt from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with 5, 10, 20 or 50 μ M of Mnki for 1

hour along with water vehicle control. **(E)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of eIF4E, Akt and eIF2 α from Huh7.5 cells upon treatment with vehicle, Mnki (10 μ M), Akti (5 μ M) or both (10/5 μ M Mnki/Akti), Akti-Akt inhibitor VIII.

Supplementary information

Figure S1

Supplementary Figure S1. p38 and ERK1/2 MAPK synergistically regulates

eIF4E phosphorylation across multiple cell lines. (S1A) Immunoblots depicting

phosphorylation and expression status of ERK1/2, Mnk1 and eIF4E from MCF7 cells

treated with DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μ M), ERK1/2i (100 μ M)

or Dual-Mi (50/100 μ M p38i/ERK1/2i). (S1B) Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation

and expression status of ERK1/2, Mnk1, and eIF4E from HeLa cells treated as

mentioned in (S1A).

Figure S2

Supplementary Figure S2. p38 and ERK1/2 dual inhibition causes polysomal

collapse in MCF7 cells. (S2A) MCF7 cells were subjected to dual-Mi (50/100 μM

p38i/ERK1/2i) or to DMSO treatment for 1- hour and polysome profiling was

performed. **(S2B)** Polysome profile of the cells subjected to similar treatment but at

lower concentrations of the inhibitors (25/50 μM p38i/ERK1/2i). Free ribosomal

subunits (40S and 60S), monosome (80S) and the polysomes were fractionated by

measuring the absorbance at 254 nm. Each graph shows treatment-curve overlaid

on the vehicle control.

Figure S3

891

892

893 **Supplementary Figure S3. Regulation of mTORC1 pathway by p38 and ERK1/2**

894 **MAPKs is contextual. (S3A)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and

895 expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1 from MCF7 cells treated with DMSO vehicle

896 control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μM), ERK1/2i (100 μM) or Dual-Mi (50/100 μM

897 p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour. **(S3B)** Immunoblots demonstrating phosphorylation and

898 expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1 from HeLa cells treated with DMSO vehicle

899 control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μM), ERK1/2i (100 μM) or Dual-Mi (50/100 μM

900 p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour.

901

902

903

904

Figure S4

906

907

908 **Supplementary Figure S4. p38 and ERK1/2 dual-MAPK inhibition activates ISR**
 909 **signalling. (S4A)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and expression status of
 910 eIF2α from MCF7 cells treated with DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50
 911 μM), ERK1/2i (50 μM) or Dual-Mi (50/50 μM p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour. **(S4B)**
 912 Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation status of eIF2α from HeLa cells treated with
 913 DMSO vehicle control, Torin1 (750 nM), p38i (50 μM), ERK1/2i (100 μM) or Dual-Mi
 914 (50/100 μM p38i/ERK1/2i) for 1- hour.

915

916

917

918

919

920

921

Figure S5

Supplementary Figure S5 mTORC1 pathway was unaffected during sodium

arsenite induced ISR. (S5A) Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and

expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1 from vehicle or sodium arsenite (40 μM)

treated Huh7.5 cells for 1- hour. **(S5B)** Immunoblots depicting phosphorylation and

expression status of 4EBP1 and ULK1 from vehicle or sodium arsenite (40 μM)

treated MCF7 cells for 1- hour.