A point mutation in the nucleotide exchange factor eIF2B constitutively activates the integrated stress response by allosteric modulation

Lan Wang^{1,2,#}, Morgane Boone^{1,2,#}, Rosalie E Lawrence^{1,2}, Adam Frost^{2,3}, Peter Walter^{1,2,*}, and Michael Schoof^{1,2,*}

¹Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA.

²Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of California at San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA.

³Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA, USA.

These authors contributed equally

* Correspondence: peter@walterlab.ucsf.edu; michael@walterlab.ucsf.edu

Abstract

In eukaryotic cells, stressors reprogram the cellular proteome by activating the integrated stress response (ISR). In its canonical form, stress-sensing kinases phosphorylate the eukaryotic translation initiation factor eIF2 (eIF2-P), which ultimately leads to reduced levels of ternary complex required for initiation of mRNA translation. Translational control is primarily exerted through a conformational switch in eIF2's nucleotide exchange factor, eIF2B, which shifts from its active A-State conformation to its inhibited I-State conformation upon eIF2-P binding, resulting in reduced nucleotide exchange on eIF2. Here, we show functionally and structurally how a single histidine to aspartate point mutation in eIF2B's β subunit (H160D) mimics the effects of eIF2-P binding by promoting an I-State like conformation, resulting in eIF2-P independent activation of the ISR. These findings corroborate our previously proposed (Schoof et al. 2021) A/I-State model of allosteric ISR regulation.

Introduction

Coping with cellular stressors, manifesting as either intrinsic cues or environmental insults, is key to preserving cellular and organismal health. One strategy is to activate the integrated stress response (ISR), a conserved eukaryotic signaling network that reprograms translation towards damage mitigation and recovery, or apoptosis when stress is irremediable (Costa-Mattioli and Walter 2020). The ISR integrates diverse stresses through at least four stress-sensing

kinases – PERK, HRI, GCN2, PKR, and perhaps MARK2, via phosphorylation of a single serine, S51 of the α subunit of the translation initiation factor eIF2 (Hinnebusch 2005; Guo et al. 2020; Dey et al. 2005; Shi et al. 1998; Lu et al. 2021). eIF2 is a central player in translation initiation, mediating start codon recognition on the mRNA and delivery of the initiator methionine. Phosphorylation of eIF2 disrupts this process and leads to a precipitous drop in global protein synthesis. Conversely, the translation of a subset of stress-responsive mRNAs, such as ATF4, generally repressed by the presence of 5' UTR upstream open reading frames (uORFs), is induced (Harding et al. 2000). The alternative translation program that is thus set in motion drives the cell's return to homeostasis. While the ISR is inherently cytoprotective, its dysregulation has been documented in multiple disease states. Specifically, the ISR has been linked to neurodegenerative diseases (Atkin et al. 2008; Ma et al. 2013), brain-injury induced dementia (Chou et al. 2017; Sen et al. 2017), aging (Krukowski et al. 2020), diabetes (Abdulkarim et al. 2015; Harding et al. 2001), and cancer (Nguyen et al. 2018; Koromilas et al. 1992).

Mechanistically, it is the level of ternary complex (TC) that determines the regulation of translation initiation by the ISR. The TC consists of eIF2 (heterotrimer composed of an α , β , and γ subunit, containing a GTPase domain in its γ subunit), the initiator tRNA loaded with methionine (Met-tRNAⁱ), and GTP (Algire, Maag, and Lorsch 2005). Once the TC associates with the 40S ribosomal subunit, additional initiation factors, and the 5' methylguanine cap of the mRNA, the pre-

initiation complex scans the mRNA for a start codon. Recognition of the start codon leads to GTP hydrolysis and triggers the release of eIF2 now bound to GDP (as reviewed in (Hinnebusch, Ivanov, and Sonenberg 2016)). The large ribosomal subunit joins and the assembled 80S ribosome proceeds with elongation of the polypeptide chain. Crucially, for every round of cap-dependent translation initiation, eIF2 requires GDP-to-GTP exchange, catalyzed by its dedicated guanine nucleotide exchange factor (GEF), eIF2B. Failure to complete this step impacts the cellular concentration of the TC, which impairs the translation of most mRNAs. At the same time, lower TC concentrations can induce the translation of specific stress-responsive ORFs, some of which are regulated by uORFs (Harding et al. 2000; Lu, Harding, and Ron 2004; Vattam and Wek 2004). Thus, the ISR regulates translation by tuning the available pool of TC.

Given its central role in controlling TC levels and mRNA translation, many eIF2B mutations result in an aberrant ISR and severe disease, such as Vanishing White Matter Disease (VWMD) (Leegwater et al. 2001; van der Knaap et al. 2002). Molecularly, eIF2B is a large, heterodecameric complex composed of two copies each of an α , β , γ , δ , and ϵ subunit (Kashiwagi et al. 2016; Tsai et al. 2018; Zyryanova et al. 2018; Wortham et al. 2014; Gordiyenko et al. 2014). It has long been established that phosphorylation of eIF2 (eIF2-P) converts eIF2 from an eIF2B substrate to an eIF2B inhibitor, leading to a reduction in GEF activity and ISR activation (Siekierka, Mauser, and Ochoa 1982; Matts, Levin, and London 1983; Konieczny and Safer 1983; Salimans et al. 1984; Rowlands, Panniers, and Henshaw 1988). Earlier atomic-resolution snapshots of the eIF2-bound and eIF2-P-bound human eIF2B complexes suggested steric hindrance to be the predominant mechanism for inhibition, given the proposed overlap of binding sites (Kenner et al. 2019; Kashiwagi et al. 2019; Adomavicius et al. 2019; Gordiyenko, Llcer, and Ramakrishnan 2019; Bogorad, Lin, and Marintchev 2017). However, we and others recently discovered that binding of the inhibitor eIF2-P to a distinct binding site — located on the face of the eIF2B complex opposite of the substrate-binding site — allosterically switches eIF2B from its active ‘A-State’ (which can readily engage eIF2 and catalyze nucleotide exchange) to an inhibited ‘I-State’ (Schoof et al. 2021; Zyryanova et al. 2021).

The multi-subunit composition of eIF2B also lends itself to regulation at the level of complex assembly.

The decameric holoenzyme is built from two eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ tetramers and one eIF2B α_2 dimer (Tsai et al. 2018). The eIF2B ϵ subunit harbors the enzyme’s catalytic center but only contains a small part of the binding surface of eIF2. Two of four interfaces between eIF2 and eIF2B (IF1 and IF2) reside in eIF2B ϵ . Thus, poor substrate-binding severely limits eIF2B ϵ ’s catalytic activity. The substrate-binding surface is increased upon addition of more subunits (a third interface, IF3 in eIF2B β). Yet, even when embedded in the eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ tetramer subcomplex, the specific enzyme activity (k_{cat}/K_M) of eIF2B ϵ is ~100-fold lower compared to the fully assembled eIF2B($\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$) $_2$ decamer (tetramer $k_{cat}/K_M = 0.07 \text{ min}^{-1}\mu\text{M}^{-1}$, decamer $k_{cat}/K_M = 7.24 \text{ min}^{-1}\mu\text{M}^{-1}$), in which the substrate-interacting surface is further extended by bridging the two-fold symmetric interface formed between the two tetrameric subcomplexes (a fourth interface, IF4 in eIF2B δ') (Schoof et al. 2021; Kenner et al. 2019; Kashiwagi et al. 2019).

eIF2B activity, assembly-state, and conformation are all modulated by the ISR inhibitor, ISRIB. This small molecule binds in a deep groove spanning across the symmetry interface of the two eIF2B tetramers and enhances its GEF activity (Sekine et al. 2015; Sidrauski et al. 2013; Sidrauski et al. 2015; Tsai et al. 2018; Zyryanova et al. 2018). ISRIB exerts these effects by acting on both eIF2B assembly and conformation (Schoof et al. 2021). When eIF2B α_2 levels are low, pharmacological dimerization of tetrameric subcomplexes by ISRIB rescues eIF2B function (Schoof et al. 2021). When eIF2B α_2 levels are saturating and eIF2B decamers are therefore fully assembled, ISRIB binding stabilizes eIF2B in the active ‘A-State’, reducing its affinity for the inhibitor eIF2-P (Schoof et al. 2021; Zyryanova et al. 2021).

Given these insights, we here revisit previous observations concerning a histidine to aspartate point mutation in eIF2B β (β H160D) that straddles the junction of the β - β' and β - δ' interface (the ‘ notation indicates that the subunit resides in the adjoining, second tetramer in eIF2B) (Tsai et al. 2018). We formerly observed that this missense mutation blocked ISRIB-driven assembly of eIF2B tetramers into octamers *in vitro*, underlining the importance of the H160 residue in stabilizing the octamer (Tsai et al. 2018). However, whether the change to aspartic acid, predicted to be repulsed by the apposed D450 in δ' , precluded decameric assembly or activated the ISR, remained unknown. Here, we show that the β H160D mutation does not affect decameric holoenzyme

Figure 1: The eIF2B β H160D mutation prevents octamer assembly but not decamer assembly. (A-D) Characterization by analytical ultracentrifugation (sedimentation velocity) of (A) 500 nM eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ +/- 1 μ M ISRIB, (B) 500 nM eIF2B $\beta^{H160D}\delta\gamma\epsilon$ +/- 1 μ M ISRIB, (C) 500 nM eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ +/- 500 nM eIF2B α_2 , and (D) 500 nM eIF2B $\beta^{H160D}\delta\gamma\epsilon$ +/- 500 nM eIF2B α_2 . The eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ tetramer sediments with a sedimentation coefficient of ~8 S, the eIF2B($\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$)₂ octamer at ~12 S, and the eIF2B($\alpha\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$)₂ decamer at ~14 S. (E-F) FRET signal (E_{592}/E_{516}) measured after 1 h of eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers incubation with (E) ISRIB or (F) eIF2B α_2 . WT and β H160D eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers at 50 nM throughout. For (E-F), representative replicate averaging four technical replicates are shown. Biological replicates: n = 3. All error bars and '±' designations are s.e.m.

formation when all subunits are present. However, this mutation stabilizes eIF2B in an inactive conformation reminiscent of the inhibited 'I-State', normally promoted by eIF2-P binding. Concomitantly, cells with this mutation constitutively activate the ISR, even in absence of stress and eIF2-P. These results validate the A/I-State model of eIF2B and ISR regulation a conformational change in eIF2B is sufficient to impair its enzymatic function and activate the ISR.

Results

The eIF2B β H160D mutation does not block decamer assembly in vitro

To dissect the regulation of eIF2B assembly and activity, we purified human eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ tetramers both with and without the β H160D mutation. We first performed sedimentation velocity experiments to assess the assembly state of eIF2B. Consistent with our previous observations (Tsai et al. 2018), WT eIF2B tetramers readily assembled into octamers in the presence of ISRIB, whereas β H160D tetramers did

not (Figure 1A-B). In contrast, we found that assembly into the fully decameric holoenzyme by addition of the eIF2B α_2 dimer was not compromised (Figure 1C-D).

To confirm that the β H160D mutation does not impair decamer assembly, we utilized an orthogonal, previously established Förster resonance energy transfer (FRET) assay to assess eIF2B's assembly state (Schoof et al. 2021). In this system, the C-terminus of eIF2B β is tagged with mNeonGreen as the FRET donor and the C-terminus of eIF2B δ with mScarlet-i as the FRET acceptor. Both WT and β H160D tetramers were purified with these fluorescent tags (and hereafter are denoted eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F). A titration of ISRIB readily assembled WT eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers into octamers ($EC_{50} = 170 \pm 25$ nM) but did not promote β H160D eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F assembly into octamers, even at the highest concentrations tested (Figure 1E). By contrast and in agreement with the analytical ultracentrifugation data in Figure 1A-D, titration of eIF2B α_2 assembled both WT ($EC_{50} = 29 \pm 3$ nM) and β H160D ($EC_{50} = 33 \pm 3$ nM) eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers into decamers with comparable efficiency (Figure 1F).

The eIF2B β H160D decamer is impaired in GEF activity

These properties are reminiscent of eIF2B's behavior in the presence of its inhibitor eIF2-P. In the inhibited decameric conformation (I-State) induced by eIF2-P binding, ISRIB binding to eIF2B is impaired (Schoof, et al. 2021; Zyryanova et al. 2021). We next asked whether the β H160D mutation impacts eIF2B's enzymatic activity. To this end, we monitored eIF2B's GEF activity using a BODIPY-FL-GDP nucleotide exchange assay. Both WT and β H160D tetramers exhibited comparably low enzymatic activity. The activity was robustly enhanced in WT octamers assembled from tetramers with ISRIB but, as expected, ISRIB had no impact on β H160D tetramer activity (Figure 2A). Intriguingly, β H160D decamers were less active than WT decamers ($t_{1/2} = 23.6 \pm 0.8$ min vs. 9.3 ± 1.0 min, respectively) (Figure 2B). To

understand how the β H160D mutation impaired eIF2B's GEF activity, we next performed nucleotide exchange assays of WT and β H160D decamer activity at varying eIF2 concentrations. We measured the initial velocity of these reactions and fit the data to the Michaelis-Menten model of enzyme kinetics to determine the V_{max} and the K_M of the nucleotide loading reaction (Figure 2C, Figure 2 – figure supplement 1). The V_{max} (and consequently also the k_{cat}) was significantly diminished by ~three-fold for β H160D decamers when compared to WT decamers (WT $V_{max} = 1.86 \pm 0.13$ pmol / min; β H160D $V_{max} = 0.66 \pm 0.03$ pmol / min, two-sided t-test $p = 0.0045$) suggesting that the β H160D mutation limits the intrinsic enzymatic activity of eIF2B (Figure 2D). In contrast, we could not detect a significant difference in measured K_M (WT $K_M = 0.36 \pm 0.06$ μ M, β H160D $K_M = 0.19 \pm 0.04$ μ M, two-sided t-test $p = 0.07$).

Impaired substrate binding in decameric eIF2B results from the β H160D mutation

The absence of a clear difference in K_M was puzzling, as we suspected the β H160D decamer to adopt an inhibited conformation reminiscent of the I-State, where both intrinsic enzymatic activity and binding of eIF2 are compromised (Schoof et al. 2021). We therefore directly assessed binding affinities of eIF2B's substrate (eIF2) and inhibitor (eIF2-P), using surface plasmon resonance (SPR) to measure binding to WT decamers, β H160D decamers, and WT tetramers. eIF2 association with WT and β H160D decamers was monophasic, but dissociation was notably biphasic irrespective of eIF2 concentration, with a fast phase and a slow phase (Figure 3A-B). Although the rate constants k_a , k_d fast, and k_d slow were broadly comparable, eIF2 binding to WT vs. β H160D decamers differed in the percentage of fast phase dissociation events (WT = 29%; β H160D = 67%) (Figure 3A-B, Table

Figure 2: The β H160D mutation impairs nucleotide exchange by the eIF2B holoenzyme. (A-B) GEF activity of eIF2B as assessed by BODIPY-FL-GDP exchange on eIF2 using (A) eIF2B tetramer (100 nM) and (B) eIF2B decamer (10 nM). For (A), ISRIB only stimulates eIF2B guanine nucleotide exchange (GEF) activity for the WT tetramer ($t_{1/2} = 31.1 \pm 1.47$ min). In (B), the β H160D decamer has lower GEF activity ($t_{1/2} = 23.57 \pm 0.82$ min) than WT decamer ($t_{1/2} = 9.28 \pm 0.96$ min)). (C) Michaelis-Menten fit of the initial velocity of eIF2B-catalyzed nucleotide exchange as a function of eIF2 concentration (10 nM eIF2B decamer throughout). (D) Kinetic parameters of the Michaelis-Menten fit. β H160D decamers have ~3-fold reduced intrinsic enzymatic activity (WT $V_{max} = 1.86 \pm 0.13$ pmol/min; β H160D $V_{max} = 0.66 \pm 0.03$ pmol/min; two-sided t-test $p = 0.0045$) and turnover number (WT $k_{cat} = 4.70 \pm 0.52$ min^{-1} ; β H160D $k_{cat} = 1.65 \pm 0.10$ min^{-1} ; two-sided t-test $p = 0.0045$). The K_M is not significantly different (WT $K_M = 0.36$ μ M ± 0.09 μ M; β H160D $K_M = 0.18 \pm 0.03$ μ M; two-sided t-test $p = 0.07$). Biological replicates: $n = 2$ for (A), and $n = 3$ for (B-D). All error bars and ' $\pm$ ' designations are s.e.m.

Figure 3: Substrate (eIF2) binding to eIF2B is compromised by the βH160D mutation. (A-F) SPR of immobilized (A and D) WT eIF2B decamer, (B and E) βH160D eIF2B decamer, and (C and F) WT eIF2B tetramer binding to 2-fold titrations of (A-C) eIF2 or (D-F) eIF2-P. For WT eIF2B decamer and βH160D eIF2B decamer, eIF2B α was Avi-tagged and biotinylated. For WT eIF2B tetramer, eIF2B β was Avi-tagged and biotinylated. Binding was modeled as one-phase association for (A-E), two-phase dissociation for (A-B), and one-phase dissociation for (C-E). (G) SPR of immobilized WT eIF2B decamer and βH160D eIF2B decamer was performed with eIF2 at 62.5 nM throughout and varied association time from 5-480 s. The dissociation kinetics were then modeled (individual traces shown in Figure 3 – figure supplement 1) and from this data percent fast phase dissociation was plotted as a function of association time with a single exponential fit. WT $t_{1/2} = 10.4 \text{ s}$; $\beta\text{H160D } t_{1/2} = 20.7 \text{ s}$. Percent fast phase dissociation is always higher for βH160D decamers vs. WT decamers and reaches an equilibrium at ~55% fast phase dissociation for βH160D decamers and ~11% fast phase dissociation for WT decamers. (H) Model reaction scheme of eIF2 engagement with eIF2B. k_1 , k_{-1} , and k_{-2} each are comparable for WT and βH160D decamers but $\text{WT } k_2 > \beta\text{H160D } k_2$. Based on the SPR data in Figure 3 A-C, $k_1 \sim 7.0 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ and $k_{-1} \sim 0.12 \text{ s}^{-1}$. k_{-2} is calculated under the assumption that slow phase dissociation represents the combination of k_{-1} and k_{-2} dissociation. k_{-1} is fast phase dissociation, so $k_{-1} = k_{d \text{ fast}}$. Hence from $k_{-1} * k_{-2} = k_{d \text{ slow}}$ we get that $0.12 \text{ s}^{-1} * k_{-2} = 5.3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$. Therefore $k_{-2} \sim 0.044 \text{ s}^{-1}$. (I) Free energy profile of eIF2 engagement with eIF2B either in the WT (black) or βH160D (black then red) context. Initial 3 interface engagement is energetically the same for either WT or βH160D , but engagement with the 4th interface is disfavored in the βH160D mutant. The free energy profile is drawn at sub saturating conditions. Given the percent fast phase vs slow phase dissociation at equilibrium in Figure 1G we know that for WT, $[\text{eIF2} \bullet \text{eIF2B}_{(\text{IF1-IF4})}] / [\text{eIF2} \bullet \text{eIF2B}_{(\text{IF1-IF3})}] \sim 8$ while for βH160D $[\text{eIF2} \bullet \text{eIF2B}_{(\text{IF1-IF4})}] / [\text{eIF2} \bullet \text{eIF2B}_{(\text{IF1-IF3})}] \sim 1$. For (G), $n = 3$ biological replicates. All error bars and '±' designations are s.e.m.

1). Thus, a larger fraction of substrate molecules dissociates rapidly from βH160D compared to WT decamers. Since the K_M is only equal to the K_D when the dissociation rate constant k_d is much larger than the k_{cat} , this measurement can resolve the paradox of a similar K_M but different dissociation behavior.

In contrast to eIF2's interaction with decameric eIF2B, binding to WT tetramers could be modeled using one phase association and dissociation. Indeed, eIF2 dissociation from tetrameric eIF2B can be thought of as being 100% fast phase as the dissociation constant was indistinguishable from the fast phase dissociation

	eIF2 binding			eIF2-P binding		
	WT decamer	β H160D decamer	WT tetramer	WT decamer	β H160D decamer	WT tetramer
k_a (M ⁻¹ s ⁻¹)	7.0 x 10 ⁵	8.6 x 10 ⁵	1.5 x 10 ⁶	1.1 x 10 ⁶	2.1 x 10 ⁶	No binding
k_d (s ⁻¹)	slow: 4.2 x 10 ⁻³ fast: 0.12	slow: 5.3 x 10 ⁻³ fast: 0.12	0.12	1.5 x 10 ⁻²	1.7 x 10 ⁻²	No binding
K_D (nM)	slow: 6.0 fast: 170	slow: 6.1 fast: 140	80	14	8.1	No binding
% slow dissociation	71	33	0	NA	NA	No binding
% fast dissociation	29	67	100	NA	NA	No binding

Table 1.

constant for both WT and β H160D ($k_d = 0.12$ s⁻¹) (Figure 3C). The fraction of eIF2 molecules that dissociate from decamers with fast phase kinetics may therefore only be engaging eIF2B through interfaces 1-3 (interfaces 1 and 2 in eIF2B ϵ and interface 3 in eIF2B β). In contrast, the eIF2 molecules that dissociate with slow phase kinetics may additionally contact interface 4 in eIF2B δ' , reaching across the central symmetry interface (Schoof et al. 2021). This explanation would be consistent with identical dissociation constants for tetramer dissociation and fast phase dissociation from the decamers. For eIF2-binding, the β H160D decamers can therefore be thought of as more like isolated tetramers. That is, eIF2 readily associates but then is likely to dissociate too rapidly for efficient catalysis.

We further interrogated the biphasic dissociation behavior of eIF2 from WT and β H160D decamers by varying the time allowed for eIF2 binding to eIF2B (Figure 3 – figure supplement 1A-B). For both WT and β H160D we observed an exponential decrease in the percentage of fast phase dissociation, which within two minutes plateaued at ~11% fast phase dissociation for eIF2 binding to WT and at ~55% fast phase dissociation for eIF2 binding to β H160D decamers (Figure 3G). These data argue that at equilibrium the fast phase dissociation plays a small part in the engagement between eIF2 and WT eIF2B but plays a significant part in substrate engagement with β H160D decamers. This kinetic behavior can be explained by a model posing stepwise engagement between eIF2 and eIF2B in a process that first entails engagement of 3 interaction interfaces (IF1-3), followed by a second, slower step that engages the fourth interaction interface (IF4; Figure 3H-I). In this model, the β H160D mutation does not affect the on/off rates of eIF2 engagement with eIF2B through interfaces 1-3, but slows the on-rate (k_2 in Figure 3H-I) of converting from 3 interface engagement to 4

interface engagement. Such a mechanism can explain the accumulation of the “intermediate” fast phase dissociation species.

We next assessed eIF2-P binding to the immobilized eIF2B species. For both WT and β H160D decamer binding, this interaction could be modeled using one-phase association and dissociation kinetics. The overall affinity of eIF2-P for both species was largely comparable (WT $K_D = 14$ nM; β H160D $K_D = 8.1$ nM) (Figure 3D-E). As expected owing to the absence of the dimeric eIF2B α subunit, which constitutes part of the eIF2-P binding site, we observed no noticeable eIF2-P binding to WT tetramers (Figure 3F).

From these results, we conclude that the β H160D decamer shares a number of properties with the eIF2-P-bound decamer: 1) reduced intrinsic GEF activity, 2) impaired substrate binding, and 3) insensitivity to ISRIB. Owing to these similarities, we wondered whether the β H160D mutation mimics eIF2-P binding and shifts eIF2B into an I-State or ‘I-State like’ conformation. To assess this notion, we determined the structure of the β H160D eIF2B decamer using single-particle cryo-EM.

The β H160D mutation shifts eIF2B into an inhibited conformation

We prepared the β H160D decamer by combining β H160D tetramers and eIF2B α_2 and subjected the sample to cryo-EM imaging. After 2D and 3D classification, we generated a single consensus structure of the β H160D decamer at 2.8 Å resolution (Table 2, Figure 4 - figure supplement 1) with most side chains clearly resolved (Figure 4A, Figure 4 –

Figure 4: Overall architecture of eIF2B^{βH160D}. (A) Atomic model of eIF2B^{βH160D} decamer (yellow) superimposed into the cryo-EM map (grey), showing the overall structure of the molecule. (B) Overlay of the eIF2B^{βH160D} structure to the eIF2B-eIF2 structure (PDB ID: 6O81) shows a 3.5° hinge movement between the two eIF2B halves. eIF2B^{βH160D} is shown in gold; eIF2B in the eIF2B-eIF2 structure in blue; eIF2 in red.

figure supplement 1E-F). This map allowed us to build an atomic model of how the β H160D substitution alters the conformation of the eIF2B decamer. By superimposing the β H160D decamer structure and our previously published A-State structure (eIF2B-eIF2 complex, PDB ID: 6O81), we observed a significant difference in their overall architecture: the two tetramer halves of the β H160D decamer underwent a rocking motion that changed the angle between them by approximately 3.5° (Figure 4B). This rocking motion repositions the two tetramer halves comparable to the I-State structure (eIF2B-eIF2 α P complex, PDB ID: 6O9Z), although not reaching the 6° angle observed for the eIF2-P-inhibited decamer (Figure 4 – figure supplement 2). This observation validates our hypothesis that the β H160D mutation shifts eIF2B from the active conformation towards an inhibited conformation.

We next examined changes to the ISRIB-binding pocket. Comparing the β H160D decamer to A-State (eIF2-bound eIF2B) and I-State (eIF2 α -P-bound eIF2B) structures, we noticed that its ISRIB binding pocket was 3.3 Å wider in its long dimension than that of the A-State (Figure 5A), again reminiscent of the I-State (Figure 5C). The widening of the binding pocket can explain why ISRIB fails to assemble β H160D tetramers into octamers or affect GEF activity.

Zooming in on the tetramer-tetramer interface, we examined a polar interaction in the WT eIF2B A-State

decamer that stabilizes the dimerization interface between β H160 and δ' D450 (Figure 5B). In the β H160D eIF2B decamer, this attractive interaction was broken due to charge repulsion between the two aspartic acids (Figure 5B). This repulsion pushed the short loop bearing β D160 back, a movement that propagates across the entire tetramer, resulting in the rocking motion observed in Figure 4B. This explains how the β H160D amino acid change in eIF2B remodels the dimerization interface to widen the ISRIB binding pocket and induce an I-State like conformation.

To further examine the long-range effect of this interface mutation, we looked at the critical interfaces for substrate (eIF2) binding provided by eIF2B β and eIF2B δ . An overlay of the β H160D decamer structure with the eIF2B-eIF2 complex structure revealed that the substrate eIF2 α binding pocket was widened by 2.9 Å (Figure 5F). As established before (Schoof et al. 2021), a similar pocket widening is observed in the I-State structure of eIF2B (2.6 Å induced by eIF2 α -P binding). This widening is predicted to prevent eIF2 from engaging the fourth binding site on eIF2B δ' and hence turns the decameric eIF2B into conjoined tetramers such that only three of the four eIF2-eIF2B binding interfaces remain readily accessible to eIF2 binding. Our structural observations, therefore, explain the decrease in eIF2 binding and reduction in GEF activity of the β H160D decamer. The remaining portion of slow phase dissociation of eIF2 from

Figure 5: The β H160D mutation conformationally diminishes eIF2B activity. (A) Overlay of the eIF2B β H160D structure to the eIF2B-eIF2 structure showing a ~ 3 Å lengthening of the ISRIB-binding pocket in the eIF2B β H160D structure. The pocket lengthening is measured between eIF2B δ and eIF2B δ' L482; the 'prime' indicates the subunit of the opposing tetramer. ISRIB is shown in stick representation. (B) A rotated view of panel (A) showing that in the eIF2B β H160D structure, β D160 repulses δ' D450 (indicated by a double arrow). This repulsion then leads to the rearrangement of the loops in eIF2B β (indicated by single arrows). (C) Overlay of the eIF2B β H160D structure to the eIF2B-eIF2 α -P structure showing the similar dimensions of the ISRIB binding pockets. (D) Zoom out of the overlay in panels (A), (B), and (F). (E) Zoom out of the overlay in panel (C) and (G). (F) Overlay of the eIF2-bound eIF2B to eIF2B β H160D showing the 2.9 Å widening of the eIF2 α binding pocket induced by the β H160D mutation. The pocket widening is measured between eIF2B β E139 and eIF2B δ' R250. (G) Overlay of the eIF2 α -P-bound eIF2B to eIF2B β H160D showing the similar dimensions of the eIF2 α -P binding pockets. Protein molecules are colored as in Figure 4. ISRIB is colored in CPK.

β H160D decamers, though, indicates that engagement with all 4 interfaces, while disfavored, is not impossible as is the case with the pure tetrameric species). By contrast, the inhibitor (eIF2 α -P) binding site (Figure 5G) was not changed significantly compared to the eIF2B-eIF2 α -P complex structure. This observation is consistent with the similar binding affinities measured for eIF2-P towards the β H160D decamer and the WT decamer. We conclude that the β H160D mutation shifts the eIF2B decamer into a conformation closely resembling the I-State.

eIF2B β H160D mutation leads to stress-independent ISR activation

Given that the eIF2B β H160D mutation biases eIF2B's conformation towards an I-State like conformation, we predicted that expression of eIF2B β H160D in cells would lead to constitutive ISR activation. To test this notion, we introduced the β H160D mutation into the

genome of HEK293FTR cells by editing the endogenous eIF2B β gene (*EIF2B2*). Using CRISPR/Cas9 technology, we obtained two such lines. One cell line yielded a homozygous clone in which all alleles were edited (line β H160D #1). The other was a heterozygous clone containing one edited allele while the remaining alleles were knocked out through CRISPR/Cas9-induced frameshift mutations (line β H160D #2). Critically, both β H160D cell lines

Figure 6: The βH160D mutation spontaneously activates the ISR in cells. (A) Western blot of WT vs *EIF2B2*^{H160D} HEK293FT cell lines (βH160D (#1) and βH160D (#2)) treated with and without stress (10 nM thapsigargin (Tg)) or ISRIB (200 nM) for 1 h. eIF2B subunit levels do not differ between cell lines. ATF4 is constitutively produced in the βH160D cell lines (lanes 5 and 9, compare to lane 1), and its induction is ISRIB-insensitive (lanes 6, 8, 10, 12, compare with lane 4). α-tubulin serves as a loading control. (B) RT-qPCR for *ATF4* and *ATF4* transcriptional targets in untreated WT vs. βH160D cell lines. Transcript levels were normalized to *GAPDH* signal and fold changes were calculated with WT level set to 1. While there is no difference in *ATF4* transcript level, the *ATF4* target genes *DDIT3* (CHOP), *ASNS*, and *CARS* are significantly transcriptionally upregulated in the βH160D lines (one-way ANOVA with Dunnett post-hoc tests). (C) Puromycin incorporation assay for new protein synthesis. Left panel: representative blot of cell lysates treated with a 10 min puromycin pulse and blotted for puromycin (new protein synthesis) or tubulin (loading control). Right panel: quantification of puromycin incorporation. The puromycin signal is normalized to tubulin levels and set at 100% for WT. Both βH160D cells show a reduction of basal protein translation (one-way ANOVA with Dunnett post-hoc test, *p* = 0.0026 for WT vs βH160D (#1) and *p* = 0.0288 for WT vs βH160D (#2)). (D) Growth curves showing that βH160D cells grow slower than WT cells (WT doubling time = 25.7 h, s.e.m. = 3.6 h; βH160D doubling time = 38.4 h, s.e.m. = 3.5 h). All error bars and '±' designations are s.e.m. For (B, D) *n* = 3 biological replicates. For (C), *n* = 3 biological replicates, each of which was the average of 3 technical replicate transfers. * *p* < 0.05, ** *p* < 0.01, *** *p* < 0.001, **** *p* < 0.0001.

showed eIF2Bβ and eIF2Bε protein levels comparable to the unedited parental cells, demonstrating that the mutation does not destabilize eIF2Bβ or other complex members and that compensatory mechanisms must normalize the gene dosage imbalance in clone #2 (Figure 6A) (Wortham et al. 2016). We observed constitutive, low-level activation of the ISR in both clones, exemplified by elevated levels of ATF4 in the absence of stress (Figure 6A). ATF4 induction was still responsive to induced stress with thapsigargin but could not be alleviated by ISRIB treatment in the βH160D lines, both in the absence or presence of stressor (Figure 6A). ATF4 is translationally upregulated during the ISR and, accordingly, ATF4 mRNA levels remained unchanged between WT and the two βH160D clones (Figure 6B). However, as expected, key ATF4 transcriptional targets (such as

DDIT3, *ASNS*, and *CARS*) were upregulated in βH160D cells, confirming that increased ATF4 mRNA translation leads to production of active ATF4, which in turn activates transcription of its downstream stress-responsive genes (Figure 6B).

The second hallmark of an active ISR is the general inhibition of translation initiation and, hence, a reduction in protein synthesis. To monitor protein synthesis, we treated WT and βH160D cells with puromycin and assessed puromycin incorporation in nascent polypeptide chains by immunoblotting. Both βH160D cell lines displayed significantly reduced levels of basal protein synthesis (βH160D #1 cells: 47 ± 9.0%; βH160D #2 cells: 69% ± 7.3%, both compared to WT), again consistent with constitutive activation of the ISR (Figure 6C, Figure 6 – figure supplement 1). Phenotypically, the constitutive ISR activation was

accompanied by slow cell growth: cell doubling time increased from 25.7 ± 3.6 h for WT cells to 38.4 ± 3.5 h for β H160D #1 cells (Figure 6D).

Discussion

Here, we show that a single engineered H to D mutation in eIF2B β alters the conformation of the eIF2B decamer, resulting in altered dissociation kinetics of substrate eIF2, a $\sim$ three-fold reduction of intrinsic enzymatic activity, and resistance to ISRIB rescue. In cells, this hypomorphic mutation culminates in a constitutively activated low-level ISR. The structural, biochemical, and cellular changes resulting from the β H160D mutation are evocative of the Inhibitor (eIF2-P) bound state of eIF2B ('I-State'). In conjunction with our prior assessment of changes in eIF2B induced by eIF2 α -P binding, these orthogonal data underscore how the conformational changes brought about by eIF2 α -P binding govern ISR activation (A/I-State model) and that even the presence of eIF2 α -P is dispensable as long as an I-State or I-State like conformation is maintained.

eIF2B is a far more dynamic complex than we realized just a year ago. Small molecules (ISRIB and its derivatives), the natural substrate (eIF2), and viral proteins (SFSV NSs) can stabilize eIF2B in its active A-State (Kashiwagi et al. 2021; Schoof, Wang, et al. 2021; Schoof et al. 2021; Zyryanova et al. 2021). Conversely, binding of the inhibitor (eIF2-P) can compete with these molecules by shifting the decamer to the inhibited I-State (Schoof et al. 2021; Zyryanova et al. 2021). Although the conformational displacements induced by β H160D are in many aspects similar to those of the eIF2-P bound I-State when compared to the A-State, they are not identical. While the cryo-EM data show a comparable widening of the eIF2 α binding pocket, the movement of the β -solenoid in eIF2B ϵ is less pronounced in β H160D decamers than in the eIF2-P bound I-State (Figure 4 – figure supplement 2), likely because the rocking motion induced by β H160D originates near the ISRIB pocket, not from the eIF2-P binding site. In addition, despite extensive classification calculations, we did not recover single-particle images of the β H160D complex belonging to the A-State. This observation argues against the idea that the β H160D structure is a mixture of A-State and I-State structures. Hence acknowledging both similarities and differences to the

I-State, we refer to the conformation induced by β H160D as 'I-State like'.

The conformational changes brought about by eIF2-P binding result in a specific enzymatic activity (quantified in the specificity constant k_{cat}/K_M) that is approximately 2 orders of magnitude reduced from that of the A-State (Schoof et al. 2021). By comparison, the β H160D mutation causes the specificity constant to drop by only $\sim$ 2 fold (Figure 2). Nevertheless, despite the comparatively small change in eIF2B activity, the mutation induces constitutive ISR activation, suggesting that cells are sensitive to small fluctuations in eIF2B GEF activity. These numbers also tell us that there is still potential for more robust ISR activation. Indeed, treating β H160D cells with relatively low amounts (10 nM) of an eIF2-P inducing stressor like thapsigargin further enhances ATF4 translation (Figure 6A). The latter result also suggests that the mutation is compatible with even more potent inhibition mediated by eIF2-P binding. This conclusion is further supported by our 3D reconstructions and the SPR studies, which show that the β H160D mutation does not appreciably affect eIF2-P binding.

We demonstrate that both intrinsic enzymatic activity and substrate (eIF2) binding are affected in the I-State like β H160D decamer. It remains unclear how the conformational changes in either this structure or that in the eIF2-P bound I-State (Schoof et al. 2021) engender a reduced k_{cat} , especially given that β H160 is located far from the catalytic center. Non-ideal positioning of substrate molecules that still engage an I-State or I-State like decamer may explain the reduced rate of nucleotide exchange. Further speculation regarding the mechanism is limited by a lack of structural data for certain critical regions. The eIF2B ϵ catalytic domain is absent from all but the substrate (eIF2) bound structures. The eIF2B ϵ linker, a known regulatory region connecting the catalytic domain to the core of eIF2B ϵ , is similarly unresolved, as are the poorly understood C-terminal solenoid "ear domains" of eIF2B γ (Welsh and Proud 1993). The conformation and positioning of these and other regions may be affected during the ISR and play roles in regulation of eIF2B's activity that warrant further examination. With the recent discovery that eIF2B can directly read out and respond to sugar phosphate levels, there may be a host of functions and mechanisms of regulation for eIF2B still to be uncovered (Hao et al. 2021).

Our SPR data (Figure 3) demonstrate that the effects of the β H160D mutation on substrate (eIF2) binding

result from changes to the relative proportion of rapidly dissociating eIF2 molecules. Substrate association, however, remains unaffected. The biphasic dissociation behavior, usually observed for multivalent ligands due to avidity effects, is not entirely unexpected. Substrate-bound structures of eIF2B decamer previously revealed four binding interfaces (IF1-IF4) between eIF2 and eIF2B. Hence, it is possible that stochastic partial binding occurs for a fraction of substrate molecules when the IF4 interface is too distant from IF3 for both to be engaged by eIF2. eIF2 α -P binding (or the β H160D mutation) pulls IF4 away from IF3, increasing the probability of this partially engaged binding mode, thus reducing the substrate binding affinity. Notably, though, the biphasic dissociation is not observed for inhibitor (eIF2-P) binding, where both association and dissociation can be fit to monophasic models. This observation suggests greater conformational flexibility along the combinatorial eIF2 binding surfaces than along the eIF2-P binding surfaces.

The β H160 residue is highly conserved amongst eukaryotes. To date, no variation has been reported at this position in the human genome. However, the mechanism by which the β H160D mutation impacts eIF2B activity raises the possibility that certain VWMD mutations may likewise compromise eIF2B function through alteration of conformational state. The disease-associated β E213G mutation (ClinVar VCV000004336), for example, localized near the ISRIB pocket and far away from the catalytic center, reportedly does not affect complex association but substantially reduces GEF activity (Li et al. 2004). Understanding the precise mechanism of eIF2B inactivation in individual VWMD patients may be critical for patient stratification and proper treatment. Although ISRIB is unable to rescue the β H160D defect, it is plausible that other analogs (or molecules acting at a different site) with higher affinities than ISRIB may be able to overcome the charge repulsion and restore the A-State conformation, demonstrating the importance of continued endeavors to uncover molecules and strategies to inhibit or activate the ISR orthogonally.

Materials and Methods

Cloning

eIF2B2 (encoding eIF2B β) and eIF2B4 (encoding eIF2B δ) had previously been inserted into sites 1 and

2 of pACYCDuet-1 and then further edited to include mNeonGreen and a (GGGGS)₂ linker at the C-terminus of eIF2B2 and mScarlet-i and a (GGGGS)₂ linker at the C-terminus of eIF2B4 (pMS029). In-Fusion HD cloning was used to edit this plasmid further and insert the H160D mutation into eIF2B2 (pMS114).

For CRISPR editing of the *EIF2B2* gene, guide RNAs were designed using the Benchling CRISPR gRNA Design Tool, selecting the guide with the best on-target and off-target scores, and the H160D mutation within 10 bp of the cut site. Cloning of the guide into the guide expression plasmid (MLM3636, with human U6 promoter) was done as previously described (Kwart et al. 2017). In brief, the guide RNA sequence was synthesized as single stranded DNA oligos (C005_F and C005_R) that were first annealed at 2 μ M in 1x annealing buffer (40 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 20 mM MgCl₂, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA pH 8.0), for 5 min at 95°C followed by gradual decrease of -0.1°C/s to 25°C. The MLM3636 plasmid was digested using BsmBI (NEB) in NEB Buffer 3.1 for 2 h at 55°C, and the 2.2 kb backbone was isolated from a 0.8% agarose gel with 1x SYBR Safe, and purified using the NucleoSpin Gel and PCR cleanup kit (Macherey Nagel). Backbone and annealed guide template were ligated for 1 h at room temperature using T4 DNA Ligase (NEB), 100 ng backbone, 100 nM guide template, and 1x T4 DNA Ligase buffer (NEB).

Purification of human eIF2B subcomplexes

Human eIF2B α_2 (pJT075), Avi-tagged eIF2B α_2 (pMS026), WT eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ (pJT073 and pJT074 co-expression), eIF2B $\beta^{H160D}\gamma\delta\epsilon$ (pJT102 and pJT074), Avi-tagged eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ (pMS001 and pJT074 co-expression), WT eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers (pMS029 and pJT074 co-expression), and β H160D eIF2B $\beta\delta\gamma\epsilon$ -F tetramers (pMS114 and pJT074 co-expression) were purified as previously described (Tsai et al. 2018; Schoof et al. 2021).

Purification of heterotrimeric human eIF2

Human eIF2 was purified as previously described (Wong et al. 2018). This material was a generous gift of Calico Life Sciences LLC.

Analytical ultracentrifugation

Analytical ultracentrifugation (sedimentation velocity) experiments were performed as previously described using the ProteomeLab XL-I system (Beckman Coulter) (Tsai et al. 2018). In brief, samples were

loaded into cells in a buffer of 20 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.5, 150 mM KCl, 1 mM TCEP, and 5 mM MgCl₂. A buffer only reference control was also loaded. Samples were then centrifuged in an AN-50 Ti rotor at 40,000 rpm at 20°C and 280 nm absorbance was monitored. Subsequent data analysis was conducted with Sedfit using a non-model-based continuous c(s) distribution.

In vitro FRET assays

In vitro FRET assays were performed as previously described (Schoof et al. 2021).

Guanine nucleotide exchange assay

In vitro detection of GDP binding to eIF2 was performed as described previously (Schoof et al. 2021). As before, we first monitored the loading of fluorescent BODIPY-FL-GDP to eIF2. Purified human eIF2 (100 nM) was incubated with 100 nM BODIPY-FL-GDP (Thermo Fisher Scientific) in assay buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM TCEP, and 1 mg/ml BSA) to a volume of 18 μ l in 384 square-well black-walled, clear-bottom polystyrene assay plates (Corning). For the assay buffer, TCEP and BSA were always freshly added the day of the experiment. For the tetramer GEF assays, a 10X GEF mix was prepared containing 1 μ M eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ tetramer (WT or β H160D), 2% N-methyl-2-pyrrolidone (NMP), and with or without 10 μ M ISRIB, again in assay buffer. For the assay, 2 μ l of the 10x GEF mix was spiked into the eIF2::BODIPY-FL-GDP mix, bringing the final concentrations to 100 nM tetramer, 0.2% NMP and with or without 1 μ M ISRIB. Fluorescence intensity was recorded every 10 s for 40 s prior to the 10X GEF mix spike, and after the spike for 60 min, using a Clariostar PLUS (BMG LabTech) plate reader (excitation wavelength: 477 nm, bandwidth 14 nm; emission wavelength: 525 nm, bandwidth: 30 nm).

For assays with eIF2B decamers (WT or β H160D), decamers were first assembled by combining eIF2B $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$ tetramer (WT or β H160D) with eIF2B α_2 dimer in a 1:1 molar ratio (a 2-fold excess of eIF2B α_2 dimer compared to the number of eIF2B($\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$)₂ octamers) at room temperature for at least 30 min. The 10X GEF mix for decamer assays contained 100 nM eIF2B($\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$)₂ decamer (WT or β H160D) in assay buffer. The ensuing steps were performed as described for the GEF assays with tetramers. Immediately after the loading assay, in the same wells, we spiked in unlabeled GDP to 1 mM to measure

unloading, again recording fluorescence intensities every 10s for 60 min as before. These data were fit to a first-order exponential. For clarity, datapoints were averaged at 1 min intervals and then plotted as single datapoints in Figure 2.

Michaelis-Menten kinetics

The Michaelis-Menten kinetic analysis of eIF2B($\alpha\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon$)₂ decamer (WT or β H160D) GEF activity was performed as described previously, with some minor modifications (Schoof et al. 2021). Briefly, BODIPY-FL-GDP loading assays were performed as described above, keeping final decamer concentrations at 10 nM, but varying substrate concentration from 0 nM to 4 μ M. BODIPY-FL-GDP concentration was kept at 2 μ M final. The initial velocity was determined by a linear fit to timepoints acquired at 5 s intervals from 50 to 200 s after addition of decamer. To convert fluorescence intensities to pmol substrate, the gain in signal after 60 min was plotted against eIF2 concentration for the 31.5 nM – 1 μ M concentrations. $V_{\max}$ and K_M were determined by fitting the initial velocities as a function of eIF2 concentration to the Michaelis–Menten equation in GraphPad Prism 9. For statistical comparisons of $V_{\max}$ and K_M , we used a two-sided t-test with $\alpha = 0.05$, comparing $V_{\max}$ or K_M derived from the individual fit of each replicate experiment.

Affinity determination and variable association analysis by surface plasmon resonance

eIF2 and eIF2-P affinity determination experiments were performed on a Biacore T200 instrument (Cytiva Life Sciences) by capturing the biotinylated WT eIF2B decamer, β H160D eIF2B decamer, and WT eIF2B tetramer at ~50nM on a Biotin CAPture Series S sensor chip (Cytiva Life Sciences) to achieve maximum response (R_{max}) of under ~150 response units (RUs) upon eIF2 or eIF2-P binding. eIF2-P was prepared by mixing 5 μ M eIF2 in 50-fold excess of 100 nM PERK kinase and with 1 mM ATP. The mixture was incubated at room temperature for 60 min before incubation on ice until dilution into the titration series. 2-fold serial dilutions of purified eIF2 or eIF2-P were flowed over the captured eIF2B complexes at 30 μ l / min for 60 seconds followed by 600 seconds of dissociation flow. Following each cycle, the chip surface was regenerated with 3 M guanidine hydrochloride. A running buffer of 20 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, and 1 mM TCEP was used throughout. The resulting sensorgrams were fit in GraphPad Prism 8.0.

Association was fit for all species using the association then dissociation model. For eIF2-P binding this model was used to fit dissociation as well. For eIF2 binding, dissociation was fit using the two phase decay model. For eIF2 binding to WT tetramer the data could be modeled with one phase association, one phase dissociation kinetics by setting the percent fast phase dissociation to 100%. For variable association experiments, WT and β H160D eIF2B decamer was immobilized as described above. A solution containing 62.5 nM eIF2 was flowed over the captured eIF2B for 5-480 s at 30 μ l / min to reach the equilibrium of % fast phase dissociation vs % slow phase dissociation. Association was followed by 480 seconds of dissociation flow. The dissociation phase was then fit in GraphPad Prism 8.0 using the two phase decay model as described above.

Generation of endogenous β H160D cells

Editing of the *EIF2B2* gene to introduce the H160D mutation in HEK293F_{IP}-In TRex (HEK293F_{TR}) cells was performed using CRISPR-Cas9 according to a previously published protocol, with some minor modifications (Kwart et al. 2017). Cells were seeded at 250,000 cells/well of a 12-well plate and grown for 24 h prior to transfection with a PAGE-purified, phosphorothioate-protected single-stranded oligonucleotide donor (ssODN) for homologous recombination (C015) (Renaud et al. 2016), a plasmid containing Cas9-GFP, and a plasmid encoding the guide RNA (MLM3636-C005). The 100 nt ssODN was designed to simultaneously introduce the H160D missense mutation (CAC to GAC), to add a silent XbaI restriction site at L156 (TCTGGA to TCTAGA), and to block re-digestion by Cas9 after recombination. Transfection was done with Xtreme Gene9 reagent according to the manufacturer's protocol, using a 3:1 ratio of reagent (μ l) to DNA (μ g). Reagent-only and pCas9-GFP controls were included. Two days post transfection, cells were trypsinized, washed twice in ice-cold filter-sterilized FACS buffer (25 mM HEPES pH 7.0, 2 mM EDTA, 0.5% v/v fetal bovine serum, in 1x PBS), and resuspended in FACS buffer with 400 ng/ml 7-AAD viability dye (Invitrogen) at around 1 million cells/ml in filter-capped FACS tubes. Single GFP⁺, 7-AAD⁻ cells were sorted into recovery medium (a 1:1 mix of conditioned medium, and fresh medium with 20% fetal bovine serum, 2 mM L-Glutamine, 1 mM sodium pyruvate, and 1x non-essential amino acids) in single wells of 96-well plates using the Sony SH800 cell sorter. The survival rate was around 2% after 2-3 weeks. Surviving clones were expanded and first

screened for correct editing by PCR and XbaI restriction digest. For this, genomic DNA was isolated using the PureLink Genomic DNA mini kit (Invitrogen), and a 473 bp fragment of the *EIF2B2* gene was amplified by PCR using 300 nM forward and reverse primers (C001_F and C001_R), 300 μ M dNTPs, 1x HF buffer, 100 ng genomic DNA / 100 μ l reaction and 2 U/100 μ l reaction of KAPA HiFi polymerase for 3 min at 95°C; and 30 cycles of 98°C for 20 s, 68.9°C for 15 s, 72°C for 15 s, prior to cooling at 4°C. PCR reactions were purified using NucleoSpin Gel and PCR cleanup kit (Macherey Nagel), and HighPrep PCR Cleanup beads (MagBio Genomics) using the manufacturer's instructions. Cleaned up products were digested using XbaI restriction enzyme (NEB) in 1x CutSmart buffer and run on a 1.5% agarose gel with 1x SYBR Safe (Invitrogen) and 100 bp DNA ladder (Promega). Clones with an XbaI restriction site were then deep sequenced to confirm correct editing and zygosity. For this, the *EIF2B2* gene was amplified by PCR using 300 nM forward and reverse primers (C034_F and C034_R), 300 μ M dNTPs, 1x HF buffer, 100 ng genomic DNA / 100 μ l reaction and 2 U/100 μ l reaction of KAPA HiFi polymerase for 3 min at 95°C; and 30 cycles of 98°C for 20 s, 64.9°C for 15 s, 72°C for 15 s, prior to cooling at 4°C. The 196 bp product was purified from a 1.5% agarose gel with 1x SYBR Safe using NucleoSpin Gel and PCR cleanup kit (Macherey Nagel), and HighPrep PCR Cleanup beads (MagBio Genomics) using the manufacturer's instructions. A subsequent second PCR added the Illumina P5/P7 sequences and barcode for deep sequencing. For this, we used 15 ng purified PCR product per 100 μ l reaction, 300 nM forward and reverse primer (C036_F_bcx, and C036_R), and 1x KAPA HiFi HotStart mix, for 3 min at 95°C, and 8 cycles of 20 s at 98°C, 15 s at 63.7°C, and 15 s at 72°C prior to cooling on ice. PCR reactions were purified using HighPrep beads (MagBio Genomics), and amplicon quality and size distribution was checked by chip electrophoresis (BioAnalyzer High Sensitivity kit, Agilent). Samples were then sequenced on an Illumina MiSeq (150 bp paired-end), and results were analyzed with CRISPResso (Pinello et al. 2016). All cell lines were negative for mycoplasma contamination.

Western Blotting

Cells were seeded at 400,000 cells/well of a 6-well plate and grown at 37°C and 5% CO₂ for 24 h. For drug treatment, we used 10 nM thapsigargin (Tg) (Invitrogen) and 200 nM ISRIB (made in-house) for 1 h, ensuring the final DMSO concentration was 0.1%

across all conditions. For the protein synthesis assay, puromycin was added to a final concentration of 10 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ for 10 min. Plates were put on ice, cells were washed once with ice-cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), and then lysed in 150 μl ice-cold lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 1% v/v Triton X-100, 10% v/v glycerol, 1x cOmplete protease inhibitor cocktail [Roche], and 1x PhosSTOP [Roche]). Cells were scraped off, collected in an eppendorf tube, and put on a rotator for 30 min at 4°C. Debris was pelleted at 12,000 g for 20 min at 4°C, and supernatant was removed to a new tube on ice. Protein concentration was measured using the bicinchonic acid (BCA) assay. Within an experiment, total protein concentration was normalized to the least concentrated sample (typically all values were within ~10%). A 5x Laemmli loading buffer (250 mM Tris-HCl pH 6.8, 30% glycerol, 0.25% bromophenol blue, 10% SDS, 5% β -mercaptoethanol) was added to each sample to 1x, and samples were denatured at 95°C for 12 min, then cooled on ice. Wells of AnyKd Mini-PROTEAN TGX precast protein gels (Bio-Rad) were loaded with equal amounts of total protein (around 10 μg), in between Precision Plus Dual Color protein ladder (BioRad). After electrophoresis, proteins were transferred onto a nitrocellulose membrane, and then blocked for 2 h at room temperature in PBS with 0.1% Tween (PBS-T) + 3% milk (blocking buffer) while rocking. Primary antibody staining was performed with gentle agitation at 4°C overnight using the conditions outlined in Table 3. After washing four times in blocking buffer, secondary antibody staining was performed for 1 h at room temperature using anti-rabbit HRP or anti-mouse HRP secondary antibodies (Promega, 1:10,000) in blocking buffer. Membranes were washed 3x in blocking buffer and then 1x in PBS-T without milk. Membranes were developed with SuperSignal West Dura or Femto (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Developed membranes were imaged on a LI-COR Odyssey gel imager for 0.5–10 min depending on band intensity.

RT-qPCR

Cells were seeded at 400,000 cells/well of a 12-well plate and grown at 37°C and 5% CO₂ for 24 h. The day of RNA extraction, medium was removed, and cells were lysed in 350 μl TriZOL reagent (Invitrogen). All further handling was done in a fume hood decontaminated for the presence of RNases using RNase ZAP (Invitrogen). Total RNA was isolated using the DirectZOL RNA miniprep kit (Zymo Research), including an on-column DNase digest,

according to the manufacturer's instructions. RNA concentration was measured using Nanodrop. cDNA was synthesized using 600 ng input total RNA per 40 μl reaction with the iScript cDNA Synthesis Kit (BioRad), cycling for 5 min at 25°C, 20 min at 46°C, and 1 min at 95°C. Samples were cooled and diluted 1/5 in Rnase-free water. qPCR reactions were set up with final 1x iQ SYBR Green supermix (BioRad), 400 nM each of Fw and Rev QPCR primers (see Table 4), 1/5 of the diluted cDNA reaction, and RNase-free water. No-template and no-reverse transcription reactions were included as controls. Reactions were run in triplicates as 10 μl reactions in 384-well plates on a BioRad CFX384 Thermocycler, for 3 min at 95°C, and then 40 cycles of 95°C for 10 s and 60°C for 30 s, ending with heating from 55°C to 95°C in 0.5°C increments for melting curve generation. C_qs and melting curves were calculated by the BioRad software. C_q values of technical replicates were averaged, and values were calculated with the $\Delta\Delta\text{Ct}$ method using *GAPDH* for reference gene normalization. Graph points reflect fold changes compared to WT vehicle, with bars being the mean $\pm$ s.e.m. Statistical analysis was done using GraphPad Prism 9 on log-transformed values with ordinary one-way ANOVA and Dunnett's post-hoc test.

Sample preparation for cryo-electron microscopy

Decameric eIF2 β^{H160D} was prepared by incubating 16 μM eIF2 β^{H160D} $\gamma\delta\epsilon$ with 8.32 μM eIF2 α_2 in a final solution containing 20 mM HEPES-KOH, 200 mM KCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, and 1 mM TCEP. This 8 μM eIF2B($\alpha\beta^{\text{H160D}}$ $\gamma\delta\epsilon$)₂ sample was further diluted to 750 nM. For grid freezing, a 3 μl aliquot of the sample was applied onto the Quantifoil R 1.2/1/3 400 mesh Gold grid and we waited for 30 s. A 0.5 μl aliquot of 0.1–0.2% Nonidet P-40 substitute was added immediately before blotting. The entire blotting procedure was performed using Vitrobot (FEI) at 10 °C and 100% humidity.

Electron microscopy data collection

Cryo-EM data was collected on a Titan Krios transmission electron microscope operating at 300 keV. Micrographs were acquired using a Gatan K3 direct electron detector. The total dose was 67 e⁻/Å², and 117 frames were recorded during a 5.9 s exposure. Data was collected at 105,000 x nominal magnification (0.835 Å/pixel at the specimen level), with a nominal defocus range of -0.6 to -2.0 μm .

Image processing

The micrograph frames were aligned using MotionCor2 (Zheng et al. 2017). The contrast transfer function (CTF) parameters were estimated with GCTF (Zhang 2016). For the decameric eIF2B^{BH160D}, Particles were picked in Cryosparc v2.15 using the apo eIF2B (EMDB: 23209) as a template (Punjani et al. 2017; Schoof et al. 2021). Particles were extracted using an 80-pixel box size and classified in 2D. Classes that showed clear protein features were selected and extracted for ab initio reconstruction, followed by homogenous refinement. Particles belonging to the best class were then re-extracted with a pixel size of 2.09 Å, and then subjected to homogeneous refinement, yielding a reconstruction of 4.25 Å. These particles were subjected to another round of heterogeneous refinement followed by homogeneous refinement to generate a consensus reconstruction consisting of the best particles. These particles were re-extracted at a pixel size of 0.835 Å. Then, CTF refinement was performed to correct for the per-particle CTF as well as beam tilt. A final round of nonuniform refinement yielded the final structure of 2.8 Å.

Atomic model building, refinement, and visualization

For the decameric eIF2B^{BH160D}, the previously published apo eIF2B model (PDB ID: 7L70) was used as a starting model (Schoof et al. 2021). Each subunit was docked into the EM density individually and then subjected to rigid body refinement in Phenix (Adams et al. 2010). The models were then manually adjusted in Coot and then refined in phenix.real_space_refine using global minimization, secondary structure restraints, Ramachandran restraints, and local grid search (Emsley and Cowtan 2004). Then iterative cycles of manual rebuilding in Coot and phenix.real_space_refine were performed. The final model statistics were tabulated using Molprobtity (Chen et al. 2010). Distances were calculated from the atomic models using UCSF Chimera (Pettersen et al. 2004). Molecular graphics and analyses were performed with the UCSF Chimera package. UCSF Chimera is developed by the Resource for Biocomputing, Visualization, and Informatics and is supported by NIGMS P41-GM103311. The atomic model is deposited into PDB under the accession code XXXX. The EM map is deposited into EMDDB under the accession code EMD-XXXXX.

Acknowledgements

We thank the Walter lab for helpful discussions throughout this project; Geeta Narlikar for input on enzyme kinetics; Calico for a generous gift of purified eIF2 heterotrimer; and Z Yu and D Bulkley of the UCSF Center for Advanced Cryo-EM facility, which is supported by NIH grants S10OD021741 and S10OD020054 and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI); We also thank the QB3 shared cluster for computational support and Hehua and Quixote for inspiration and emotional support.

Funding

This work was supported by generous support from Calico Life Sciences LLC (to PW); a generous gift from The George and Judy Marcus Family Foundation (To PW); the Belgian-American Educational Foundation (BAEF) Postdoctoral Fellowship (to MB), the Damon Runyon Cancer Research Foundation Postdoctoral fellowship (to LW); the Jane Coffin Child Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowship (to RL); a Chan Zuckerberg Biohub Investigator award and an HHMI Faculty Scholar grant (AF). PW is an Investigator of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

Author contributions

Conception and design: M Schoof, M Boone, L Wang, P Walter. Analysis and interpretation of data: M Schoof, M Boone, L Wang, P Walter. Acquisition of data: M Schoof, M Boone, L Wang, R Lawrence. Writing (original draft): M Schoof, L Wang, and M Boone. Writing (review and editing): M Schoof, M Boone, L Wang, R Lawrence, A Frost, P Walter.

Conflict of interest statement

PW is an inventor on U.S. Patent 9708247 held by the Regents of the University of California that describes ISRIB and its analogs. Rights to the invention have been licensed by UCSF to Calico. For the remaining authors, no competing financial interests exist.

References

- Abdulkarim, B., M. Nicolino, M. Igoillo-Esteve, M. Daures, S. Romero, A. Philippi, V. Senée, M. Lopes, D. A. Cunha, H. P. Harding, C. Derbois, N. Bendelac, A. T. Hattersley, D. L. Eizirik, D. Ron, M. Cnop, and C. Julier. 2015. 'A Missense Mutation in PPP1R15B Causes a Syndrome Including Diabetes, Short Stature, and Microcephaly', *Diabetes*, 64: 3951-62.
- Adams, P. D., P. V. Afonine, G. Bunkóczi, V. B. Chen, I. W. Davis, N. Echols, J. J. Headd, L. W. Hung, G. J. Kapral, R. W. Grosse-Kunstleve, A. J. McCoy, N. W. Moriarty, R. Oeffner,

- R. J. Read, D. C. Richardson, J. S. Richardson, T. C. Terwilliger, and P. H. Zwart. 2010. 'PHENIX: a comprehensive Python-based system for macromolecular structure solution', *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*, 66: 213-21.
- Adomavicius, T., M. Guaita, Y. Zhou, M. D. Jennings, Z. Latif, A. M. Roseman, and G. D. Pavitt. 2019. 'The structural basis of translational control by eIF2 phosphorylation', *Nat Commun*, 10: 2136.
- Algire, M. A., D. Maag, and J. R. Lorsch. 2005. 'Pi release from eIF2, not GTP hydrolysis, is the step controlled by start-site selection during eukaryotic translation initiation', *Mol Cell*, 20: 251-62.
- Atkin, J. D., M. A. Farg, A. K. Walker, C. McLean, D. Tomas, and M. K. Horne. 2008. 'Endoplasmic reticulum stress and induction of the unfolded protein response in human sporadic amyotrophic lateral sclerosis', *Neurobiol Dis*, 30: 400-7.
- Bogorad, A. M., K. Y. Lin, and A. Marintchev. 2017. 'Novel mechanisms of eIF2B action and regulation by eIF2α phosphorylation', *Nucleic Acids Res*, 45: 11962-79.
- Chen, Y. B., W. B. Arendall, 3rd, J. J. Headd, D. A. Keedy, R. M. Immormino, G. J. Kapral, L. W. Murray, J. S. Richardson, and D. C. Richardson. 2010. 'MolProbity: all-atom structure validation for macromolecular crystallography', *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*, 66: 12-21.
- Chou, A., K. Krukowski, T. Jopson, P. J. Zhu, M. Costa-Mattioli, P. Walter, and S. Rosi. 2017. 'Inhibition of the integrated stress response reverses cognitive deficits after traumatic brain injury', *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 114: E6420-e26.
- Costa-Mattioli, M., and P. Walter. 2020. 'The integrated stress response: From mechanism to disease', *Science*, 368.
- Dey, M., C. Cao, A. C. Dar, T. Tamura, K. Ozato, F. Sicheri, and T. E. Dever. 2005. 'Mechanistic link between PKR dimerization, autophosphorylation, and eIF2α substrate recognition', *Cell*, 122: 901-13.
- Emsley, P., and K. Cowtan. 2004. 'Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics', *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*, 60: 2126-32.
- Gordiyenko, Y., J. L. Llácer, and V. Ramakrishnan. 2019. 'Structural basis for the inhibition of translation through eIF2α phosphorylation', *Nat Commun*, 10: 2640.
- Gordiyenko, Y., C. Schmidt, M. D. Jennings, D. Matak-Vinkovic, G. D. Pavitt, and C. V. Robinson. 2014. 'eIF2B is a decameric guanine nucleotide exchange factor with a γ2ε2 tetrameric core', *Nat Commun*, 5: 3902.
- Guo, X., G. Aviles, Y. Liu, R. Tian, B. A. Unger, Y. T. Lin, A. P. Wiita, K. Xu, M. A. Correia, and M. Kampmann. 2020. 'Mitochondrial stress is relayed to the cytosol by an OMA1-DELE1-HRI pathway', *Nature*, 579: 427-32.
- Hao, Q., J. M. Heo, B. P. Nocek, K. G. Hicks, V. S. Stoll, C. Remarcik, S. Hackett, L. LeBon, R. Jain, D. Eaton, J. Rutter, Y. L. Wong, and C. Sidrauski. 2021. 'Sugar phosphate activation of the stress sensor eIF2B', *Nat Commun*, 12: 3440.
- Harding, H. P., I. Novoa, Y. Zhang, H. Zeng, R. Wek, M. Schapira, and D. Ron. 2000. 'Regulated translation initiation controls stress-induced gene expression in mammalian cells', *Mol Cell*, 6: 1099-108.
- Harding, H. P., H. Zeng, Y. Zhang, R. Jungries, P. Chung, H. Plesken, D. D. Sabatini, and D. Ron. 2001. 'Diabetes mellitus and exocrine pancreatic dysfunction in perk-/- mice reveals a role for translational control in secretory cell survival', *Mol Cell*, 7: 1153-63.
- Hinnebusch, A. G. 2005. 'Translational regulation of GCN4 and the general amino acid control of yeast', *Annu Rev Microbiol*, 59: 407-50.
- Hinnebusch, A. G., I. P. Ivanov, and N. Sonenberg. 2016. 'Translational control by 5'-untranslated regions of eukaryotic mRNAs', *Science*, 352: 1413-6.
- Kashiwagi, K., M. Takahashi, M. Nishimoto, T. B. Hiyama, T. Higo, T. Umehara, K. Sakamoto, T. Ito, and S. Yokoyama. 2016. 'Crystal structure of eukaryotic translation initiation factor 2B', *Nature*, 531: 122-5.
- Kashiwagi, K., T. Yokoyama, M. Nishimoto, M. Takahashi, A. Sakamoto, M. Yonemochi, M. Shirouzu, and T. Ito. 2019. 'Structural basis for eIF2B inhibition in integrated stress response', *Science*, 364: 495-99.
- Kashiwagi, Kazuhiro, Yuichi Shichino, Tatsuya Osaki, Ayako Sakamoto, Madoka Nishimoto, Mari Takahashi, Mari Mito, Friedemann Weber, Yoshiho Ikeuchi, Shintaro Iwasaki, and Takuhiro Ito. 2021. 'eIF2B-capturing viral protein NSs suppresses the integrated stress response', *bioRxiv*: 2021.06.07.447466.
- Kenner, L. R., A. A. Anand, H. C. Nguyen, A. G. Myasnikov, C. J. Klose, L. A. McGeever, J. C. Tsai, L. E. Miller-Vedam, P. Walter, and A. Frost. 2019. 'eIF2B-catalyzed nucleotide exchange and phosphoregulation by the integrated stress response', *Science*, 364: 491-95.
- Konieczny, A., and B. Safer. 1983. 'Purification of the eukaryotic initiation factor 2-eukaryotic initiation factor 2B complex and characterization of its guanine nucleotide exchange activity during protein synthesis initiation', *J Biol Chem*, 258: 3402-8.
- Koromilas, A. E., S. Roy, G. N. Barber, M. G. Katze, and N. Sonenberg. 1992. 'Malignant transformation by a mutant of the IFN-inducible dsRNA-dependent protein kinase', *Science*, 257: 1685-9.
- Krukowski, K., A. Nolan, E. S. Frias, M. Boone, G. Ureta, K. Grue, M. S. Paladini, E. Elizarraras, L. Delgado, S. Bernal, P. Walter, and S. Rosi. 2020. 'Small molecule cognitive enhancer reverses age-related memory decline in mice', *Elife*, 9: e62048.
- Kwart, D., D. Paquet, S. Teo, and M. Tessier-Lavigne. 2017. 'Precise and efficient scarless genome editing in stem cells using CORRECT', *Nat Protoc*, 12: 329-54.
- Leegwater, P. A., G. Vermeulen, A. A. Konst, S. Naidu, J. Mulders, A. Visser, P. Kersbergen, D. Mobach, D. Fonds, C. G. van Berkel, R. J. Lemmers, R. R. Frants, C. B. Oudejans, R. B. Schutgens, J. C. Pronk, and M. S. van der Knaap. 2001. 'Subunits of the translation initiation factor eIF2B are mutant in leukoencephalopathy with vanishing white matter', *Nat Genet*, 29: 383-8.
- Li, W., X. Wang, M. S. Van Der Knaap, and C. G. Proud. 2004. 'Mutations linked to leukoencephalopathy with vanishing white matter impair the function of the eukaryotic initiation factor 2B complex in diverse ways', *Mol Cell Biol*, 24: 3295-306.
- Lu, P. D., H. P. Harding, and D. Ron. 2004. 'Translation reinitiation at alternative open reading frames regulates gene expression in an integrated stress response', *J Cell Biol*, 167: 27-33.
- Lu, Y. N., S. Kavianpour, T. Zhang, X. Zhang, D. Nguyen, R. Thombre, L. He, and J. Wang. 2021. 'MARK2 phosphorylates eIF2α in response to proteotoxic stress', *PLoS Biol*, 19: e3001096.
- Ma, T., M. A. Trinh, A. J. Wexler, C. Bourbon, E. Gatti, P. Pierre, D. R. Cavener, and E. Klann. 2013. 'Suppression of eIF2α kinases alleviates Alzheimer's disease-related plasticity and memory deficits', *Nat Neurosci*, 16: 1299-305.
- Matts, R. L., D. H. Levin, and I. M. London. 1983. 'Effect of phosphorylation of the alpha-subunit of eukaryotic initiation factor 2 on the function of reversing factor in the initiation of protein synthesis', *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 80: 2559-63.
- Nguyen, H. G., C. S. Conn, Y. Kye, L. Xue, C. M. Forester, J. E. Cowan, A. C. Hsieh, J. T. Cunningham, C. Truillet, F. Tameire, M. J. Evans, C. P. Evans, J. C. Yang, B. Hann, C. Koumenis, P. Walter, P. R. Carroll, and D. Ruggero. 2018. 'Development of a stress response therapy targeting aggressive prostate cancer', *Sci Transl Med*, 10: eaar2036.

- Pettersen, E. F., T. D. Goddard, C. C. Huang, G. S. Couch, D. M. Greenblatt, E. C. Meng, and T. E. Ferrin. 2004. 'UCSF Chimera--a visualization system for exploratory research and analysis', *J Comput Chem*, 25: 1605-12.
- Pinello, L., M. C. Canver, M. D. Hoban, S. H. Orkin, D. B. Kohn, D. E. Bauer, and G. C. Yuan. 2016. 'Analyzing CRISPR genome-editing experiments with CRISPResso', *Nat Biotechnol*, 34: 695-7.
- Punjani, A., J. L. Rubinstein, D. J. Fleet, and M. A. Brubaker. 2017. 'cryoSPARC: algorithms for rapid unsupervised cryo-EM structure determination', *Nat Methods*, 14: 290-96.
- Renaud, J. B., C. Boix, M. Charpentier, A. De Cian, J. Cochenne, E. Duvernois-Berthet, L. Perrouault, L. Tesson, J. Edouard, R. Thinard, Y. Cherifi, S. Menoret, S. Fontanière, N. de Crozé, A. Fraichard, F. Sohm, I. Anegon, J. P. Concordet, and C. Giovannangeli. 2016. 'Improved Genome Editing Efficiency and Flexibility Using Modified Oligonucleotides with TALEN and CRISPR-Cas9 Nucleases', *Cell Rep*, 14: 2263-72.
- Rowlands, A. G., R. Panniers, and E. C. Henshaw. 1988. 'The catalytic mechanism of guanine nucleotide exchange factor action and competitive inhibition by phosphorylated eukaryotic initiation factor 2', *J Biol Chem*, 263: 5526-33.
- Salimans, M., H. Goumans, H. Ames, R. Benne, and H. O. Voorma. 1984. 'Regulation of protein synthesis in eukaryotes. Mode of action of eRF, an eIF-2-recycling factor from rabbit reticulocytes involved in GDP/GTP exchange', *Eur J Biochem*, 145: 91-8.
- Schoof, M., M. Boone, L. Wang, R. Lawrence, A. Frost, and P. Walter. 2021. 'eIF2B conformation and assembly state regulate the integrated stress response', *Elife*, 10: e65703.
- Schoof, M., L. Wang, J.Z. Cogan, R.E. Lawrence, M Boone, J.D. Wuerth, A. Frost, and P. Walter. 2021. 'Viral Evasion of the Integrated Stress Response Through Antagonistic eIF2-P Mimicry', *bioRxiv*: 2021.06.07.447473.
- Sekine, Y., A. Zyryanova, A. Crespillo-Casado, P. M. Fischer, H. P. Harding, and D. Ron. 2015. 'Stress responses. Mutations in a translation initiation factor identify the target of a memory-enhancing compound', *Science*, 348: 1027-30.
- Sen, T., R. Gupta, H. Kaiser, and N. Sen. 2017. 'Activation of PERK Elicits Memory Impairment through Inactivation of CREB and Downregulation of PSD95 After Traumatic Brain Injury', *J Neurosci*, 37: 5900-11.
- Shi, Y., K. M. Vattam, R. Sood, J. An, J. Liang, L. Stramm, and R. C. Wek. 1998. 'Identification and characterization of pancreatic eukaryotic initiation factor 2 alpha-subunit kinase, PEK, involved in translational control', *Mol Cell Biol*, 18: 7499-509.
- Sidrauski, C., D. Acosta-Alvear, A. Khoutorsky, P. Vedantham, B. R. Hearn, H. Li, K. Gamache, C. M. Gallagher, K. K. Ang, C. Wilson, V. Okreglak, A. Ashkenazi, B. Hann, K. Nader, M. R. Arkin, A. R. Renslo, N. Sonenberg, and P. Walter. 2013. 'Pharmacological brake-release of mRNA translation enhances cognitive memory', *Elife*, 2: e00498.
- Sidrauski, C., J. C. Tsai, M. Kampmann, B. R. Hearn, P. Vedantham, P. Jaishankar, M. Sokabe, A. S. Mendez, B. W. Newton, E. L. Tang, E. Verschuere, J. R. Johnson, N. J. Krogan, C. S. Fraser, J. S. Weissman, A. R. Renslo, and P. Walter. 2015. 'Pharmacological dimerization and activation of the exchange factor eIF2B antagonizes the integrated stress response', *Elife*, 4: e07314.
- Siekierka, J., L. Mauser, and S. Ochoa. 1982. 'Mechanism of polypeptide chain initiation in eukaryotes and its control by phosphorylation of the alpha subunit of initiation factor 2', *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 79: 2537-40.
- Tsai, J. C., L. E. Miller-Vedam, A. A. Anand, P. Jaishankar, H. C. Nguyen, A. R. Renslo, A. Frost, and P. Walter. 2018. 'Structure of the nucleotide exchange factor eIF2B reveals mechanism of memory-enhancing molecule', *Science*, 359: eaaq0939.
- van der Knaap, M. S., P. A. Leegwater, A. A. Konst, A. Visser, S. Naidu, C. B. Oudejans, R. B. Schutgens, and J. C. Pronk. 2002. 'Mutations in each of the five subunits of translation initiation factor eIF2B can cause leukoencephalopathy with vanishing white matter', *Ann Neurol*, 51: 264-70.
- Vattem, K. M., and R. C. Wek. 2004. 'Reinitiation involving upstream ORFs regulates ATF4 mRNA translation in mammalian cells', *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 101: 11269-74.
- Welsh, G. I., and C. G. Proud. 1993. 'Glycogen synthase kinase-3 is rapidly inactivated in response to insulin and phosphorylates eukaryotic initiation factor eIF-2B', *Biochem J*, 294 (Pt 3): 625-9.
- Wong, Y. L., L. LeBon, R. Edalji, H. B. Lim, C. Sun, and C. Sidrauski. 2018. 'The small molecule ISRIB rescues the stability and activity of Vanishing White Matter Disease eIF2B mutant complexes', *Elife*, 7: e32733.
- Wortham, N. C., M. Martinez, Y. Gordiyenko, C. V. Robinson, and C. G. Proud. 2014. 'Analysis of the subunit organization of the eIF2B complex reveals new insights into its structure and regulation', *Faseb j*, 28: 2225-37.
- Wortham, N. C., J. D. Stewart, S. Harris, M. J. Coldwell, and C. G. Proud. 2016. 'Stoichiometry of the eIF2B complex is maintained by mutual stabilization of subunits', *Biochem J*, 473: 571-80.
- Zhang, K. 2016. 'Gctf: Real-time CTF determination and correction', *J Struct Biol*, 193: 1-12.
- Zheng, S. Q., E. Palovcak, J. P. Armache, K. A. Verba, Y. Cheng, and D. A. Agard. 2017. 'MotionCor2: anisotropic correction of beam-induced motion for improved cryo-electron microscopy', *Nat Methods*, 14: 331-32.
- Zyryanova, A. F., K. Kashiwagi, C. Rato, H. P. Harding, A. Crespillo-Casado, L. A. Perera, A. Sakamoto, M. Nishimoto, M. Yonemochi, M. Shirouzu, T. Ito, and D. Ron. 2021. 'ISRIB Blunts the Integrated Stress Response by Allosterically Antagonising the Inhibitory Effect of Phosphorylated eIF2 on eIF2B', *Mol Cell*, 81: 88-103.e6.
- Zyryanova, A. F., F. Weis, A. Faille, A. A. Alard, A. Crespillo-Casado, Y. Sekine, H. P. Harding, F. Allen, L. Parts, C. Fromont, P. M. Fischer, A. J. Warren, and D. Ron. 2018. 'Binding of ISRIB reveals a regulatory site in the nucleotide exchange factor eIF2B', *Science*, 359: 1533-36.

Supplementary Figures & Tables

Figure 4 – figure supplement 1: Cryo-EM data analysis of the eIF2B^{BH160D} structure. (A) Representative micrograph showing the quality of data used for the final reconstruction of the eIF2B^{BH160D} structure. (B) Data processing scheme of the eIF2B^{BH160D} structure. (C) Fourier shell correlation (FSC) plots of the 3D reconstructions of eIF2B^{BH160D} unmasked (dark blue), masked (orange). (D) Orientation angle distribution of the eIF2B^{BH160D} reconstruction. (E) Local resolution map of the eIF2B^{BH160D} structure. (F) Electron microscopy maps of different regions of the eIF2B^{BH160D} structure showing the quality of the data and the fit of the model.

Figure 4 – figure supplement 2: Structure overlay of the A and I state models. Overlay of the A-state model (eIF2-eIF2B complex, PDB ID: 6O81) (blue), the I-State model (eIF2α-P-eIF2B complex, PDB ID: 6O9Z) (green) and the I-State like model (eIF2B^{βH160D}) (yellow) showing the rocking motion between the two tetrameric halves. The inset shows a zoom-in view of the β-solenoid domain (residues 342 to 466) of eIF2Bε. Compared to the βH160D mutation, eIF2α-P binding causes a greater rocking motion in eIF2B.

Figure 6 – figure supplement 1: Cells with the βH160D mutation in the endogenous *EIF2B2* gene show reduced protein translation. Cells were treated for 10 min with puromycin and cell extracts analyzed by polyacrylamide electrophoresis followed by blotting and probing with anti-puromycin (new protein synthesis) or anti-tubulin (loading control) antibodies. Each puromycin incorporation blot represents an independent biological replicate loaded in triplicate to correct for efficiency variations during protein transfer. Equal total protein amounts were loaded in each lane.

Table 2

Structure	eIF2B ^{BH160D} (PDB ID: XXXX)
Data collection	
Microscope	Titan Krios
Voltage (keV)	300
Nominal magnification	105000x
Exposure navigation	Image shift
Electron dose (e ⁻ Å ⁻²)	67
Dose rate (e ⁻ /pixel/sec)	8
Detector	K3 summit
Pixel size (Å)	0.835
Defocus range (µm)	0.6-2.0
Micrographs	2269
Reconstruction	
Total extracted particles (no.)	1419483
Final particles (no.)	170244
Symmetry imposed	C1
FSC average resolution, masked (Å)	2.8
FSC average resolution, unmasked (Å)	3.8
Applied B-factor (Å)	81.7
Reconstruction package	Cryosparc 2.15
Refinement	
Protein residues	3234
Ligands	0
RMSD Bond lengths (Å)	0.004
RMSD Bond angles (°)	0.937
Ramachandran outliers (%)	0.19
Ramachandran allowed (%)	3.72
Ramachandran favored (%)	96.09
Poor rotamers (%)	8.29
CaBLAM outliers (%)	1.86
Molprobrity score	2.44
Clash score (all atoms)	10.55
B-factors (protein)	97.66
B-factors (ligands)	N/A
EMRinger Score	2.62
Refinement package	Phenix 1.17.1-3660-000

Table 3

Antibody target	Host	Dilution	Manufacturer	Cat. number	Blocking Conditions
eIF2B β	Rabbit	1/1,000	ProteinTech	11034-1-AP	PBS-T + 3% milk
eIF2B ϵ	Mouse	1/1,000	Santa Cruz Biotechnology	sc-55558	PBS-T + 3% milk
ATF4	Rabbit	1/1,000	Cell Signaling	11815S	PBS-T + 3% milk
α -tubulin	Mouse	1/1,000	Cell Signaling	3873T	PBS-T + 3% milk
Puromycin	Mouse	1/10,000	Millipore	MABE343	PBS-T + 3% milk

Table 4

Oligo	Sequence	Target gene
B002_F	TGCACCACCAACTGCTTAGC	GAPDH
B002_R	GGCATGGACTGTGGTCATGAG	GAPDH
D006_F	ATGACCGAAATGAGCTTCCTG	ATF4
D006_R	GCTGGAGAACCCATGAGGT	ATF4
D007_F	GGAAACAGAGTGGTCATTCCC	DDIT3 (CHOP)
D007_R	CTGCTTGAGCCGTTTCATTCTC	DDIT3 (CHOP)
D070_F	GGAAGACAGCCCCGATTTACT	ASNS
D070_R	AGCACGAACTGTTGTAATGTCA	ASNS
D073_F	CCATGCAGACTCCACCTTTAC	CARS
D073_R	GCAATACCACGTCACCTTTTC	CARS
C001_F	ACTTTAAGCACATTAACCCCTG	EIF2B2
C001_R	ACTTGATCTTCTCAGTGTCTC	EIF2B2
C015	†*G*CAAAACCGTTCTTACAGAAGGGACAATGGAGAACATTGCAGCCCAGGCTCTAGAGCACATT GACTCCAATGAGGTGATCATGACCATTGGCTTCTCCCGAACAGT	NA (ssODN)
C034_F	CGCGTAATGTGTGTTTGTGA	
C034_R	GCCTCTACTGTTCTGGGAGAA	
C036_F_bc $\times$	CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATAACGAGAT xxxxxx GTGACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTGCTCTTCCGATCT CGCGTAATGTGTGTTTGTGA	
C036_R	AATGATACGGCGACCACCGAGATCTACACTCTTCCCTACACGA	
C005_F	acaccgGGAGCACATTCACTCCAATGg	
C005_R	aaaacCATTGGAGTGAATGTGCTCCcg	

* phosphorothioate bond.

x = barcode nucleotide, different for each clone