The plant-specific DDR factor SOG1 increases chromatin mobility in response to DNA damage

Anis Meschichi¹, Svenja Reeck², Adrien Sicard¹, Frédéric Pontvianne³, Stefanie Rosa^{1#}

¹ Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Plant Biology Department, Uppsala, Sweden.

² John Innes Centre, Norwich Research Park, Norwich NR4 7UH, United Kingdom

³ CNRS, Laboratoire Génome et Développement des Plantes (LGDP), Université de Perpignan Via Domitia, Perpignan, France

corresponding author: stefanie.rosa@slu.se

SUMMARY

Homologous recombination (HR) is a conservative DNA repair pathway in which intact homologous sequences are used as a template for repair. How the homology search happens in the crowded space of the cell nucleus is, however, still poorly understood. Here, we measured global chromosome and double-strand break (DSB) site mobility in *Arabidopsis thaliana*, using *lacO/LacI* lines and two GFP-tagged HR reporters. We observed an increase in global chromatin mobility upon the induction of DNA damage, specifically at the S/G2 phases of the cell cycle. DSB sites showed remarkably high mobility levels at the early HR stage, with a subsequent drastic decrease in mobility associated with the relocation of DSBs to the nucleus periphery. Importantly, the increase in mobility was lost in *sog1-1* mutant, a central transcription factor of the DNA damage response in plants. Our results indicate that repair mechanisms actively regulate chromatin mobility upon DNA damage, implying an important role for this process during the early steps of the DNA damage response.

Keywords: Arabidopsis/ chromatin mobility/ DNA damage/ SOG1

INTRODUCTION

Genome integrity is constantly threatened by internal and external stressors. Therefore, in response to DNA damage, eukaryotic evolved elaborate DNA-damage response (DDR) systems that comprise DNA-damage signaling processes and DNA repair¹. Among the different types of DNA damage, double-strand breaks (DSBs) are particularly harmful for cells, leading potentially to chromosome rearrangements or loss of entire chromosome arms². DSBs can be repaired by two main pathways,

nonhomologous end joining (NHEJ) and homologous recombination (HR) (Jackson, 2002; West et al., 2004). NHEJ is achieved by stabilization and re-ligation of broken DNA ends, often with loss or mutation of bases. HR is a more complex and more conservative mechanism in which intact homologous sequences are used as a template for repair. HR most commonly occurs in S/G2 phases of the cell cycle in eukaryotic cells when sister chromatids are present, although homologous donor templates present elsewhere in the genome can also be used³⁻⁵. Despite the vast knowledge about the molecular players involved in DNA repair via HR, the mechanisms behind the search and recognition of homologous sequences (“homology search”) is still not well understood. In yeast, large-scale movements of DSBs have been identified following DSB induction⁶⁻⁹. Yet, the precise functions of these movements still remains poorly understood.

Plants are subject to particularly high levels of DNA damage resulting from dependence on sunlight for energy and exposure to environmental stresses (Rounds and Larsen, 2008). Moreover, plant development is mostly postembryonic with a late germline differentiation. It is, therefore, particularly interesting to understand the mechanisms that allow these organisms to cope with the constant assaults to their genome integrity. Indeed, plants have evolved a distinct DDR master regulator - SUPPRESSOR OF GAMMA RESPONSE 1 (SOG1). This transcription factor initiates a repair response by inducing genes involved in cell cycle arrest and repair, as well as in programmed stem-cell death in response to DNA damage¹⁰⁻¹². While the molecular processes involved in DDR pathway have been extensively characterized also in plants, little has been done to address how chromatin mobility changes in response to DNA damage and in particular to DSBs. Here, we have used locus tagging systems and HR reporter lines to study chromatin mobility upon genotoxic stress with the DSB-inducer agent zeocin. We observed that in the presence of DSBs, both damaged and potentially undamaged loci increase the volume that they explore within the nuclear space. We showed that this increase in chromatin mobility occurs specifically during the G2 phase of the cell cycle and depends on the plant-specific DDR master regulator SOG1, implying an important role for chromatin mobility during the early steps of the DNA damage response.

60 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

61 To measure chromatin mobility in plant cells we used the *lacO/LacI*-GFP locus-tagging system^{13,14}
 62 (Fig. 1A) and quantified foci mobility using a mean square displacement (MSD) analysis. This
 63 analysis robustly measures the mobility of diffusing, fluorescently tagged chromosomal loci and
 64 provides kinetic parameters describing loci motion^{15,16}. We first tested our setup by measuring
 65 “steady-state” chromatin mobility levels for cells in the division versus differentiation zones of the
 66 *Arabidopsis thaliana* (*Arabidopsis*) root (Fig. 1B). Measurements of histone exchange dynamics had
 67 previously shown that cells at the division zone have a more dynamic chromatin state as compared
 68 to differentiated cells^{17,18}. Consistently, we observed that chromatin mobility is also higher in cells
 69 from the division zone compared to cells from the differentiation zone (Fig. 1C). The radius of
 70 constrain (R_c), which indicates the nuclear volume within which a fluorescent spot can move, was
 71 also significantly higher in cells from the division zone (Fig. 1C). These results confirmed that our
 72 setup is suitable to unpick differences in chromatin mobility between cells. In *Arabidopsis* root,
 73 differences in nucleus size are often evident, not only between nuclei from the division and
 74 differentiated zones but also within the meristem itself. As such, we thought to verify if our MSD
 75 measurements would be affected by differences in nucleus size. Within the meristematic region from
 76 the root, cells have the same ploidy level (diploid), but nuclei of atrichoblast cells are considerably
 77 bigger than that of trichoblast cells (Fig. 1D). Nevertheless, these two cell types show the same
 78 chromatin mobility and radius of constraint (Fig. 1E), ruling out that the nuclear volume *per se* could
 79 affect overall chromatin mobility levels.

80 Because HR requires pairing of the broken DNA molecule with a homologous intact template, we
 81 tested whether *Arabidopsis* cells actively regulate the chromatin mobility in response to DSBs to
 82 promote conservative repair mechanisms. We induced DNA damage by incubating 6d-old seedlings
 83 with the DSB inducer zeocin for 24h (Fig. 2A). This treatment led to the upregulation of the DDR
 84 responsive genes PARP2, RAD51 and BRCA1, indicating that the HR was effectively stimulated
 85 (Supplementary Fig. 1A). This provided us with a system to induce different levels of DNA damage
 86 and repair mechanisms. We further focused our analysis on cells within the division zone since

previous studies showed that the principal actors of HR, RAD51 and RAD54 are mainly expressed in these cells^{19,20}. MSD analysis revealed that *lacO/LacI* foci mobility was not changed upon low concentrations or shorter times of zeocin incubation but increased significantly with high concentrations of zeocin for 24h (Fig. 2B, Supplementary Fig. 2A B). Importantly, the effect seen at the higher concentration was not due to DNA damage-induced programmed cell death as tested by PI staining (Supplementary Fig. 3). Only stem cells and their early descendants, which are known to be highly sensitive to DNA damage²¹, showed PI-positive cells but not the epidermal cells used in our chromatin mobility analysis. We also tested other DSB inducer chemicals, namely mitomycin C (MMC). A similar increase in chromatin mobility was observed in response to MMC treatment (Supplementary Fig. 4), showing that this is a general response to DSB induction.

In order to verify if the increase in chromatin mobility observed upon zeocin treatment was specific for the particular *lacO* insertion site (line112) or a response at the global chromatin level, we analyzed additional *lacO/LacI* lines with insertions at different chromosomal locations (Fig. 2C). In control conditions, line 26 shows the same chromatin mobility as line 112, whereas line 107 showed significantly lower chromatin mobility and Rc (Supplementary Fig. 5). The lower mobility in line 107 could be linked to the transgene insertion at the subtelomeric region which are known to physically interact at the nucleolar periphery in *Arabidopsis*^{22–24} (Fig. 2C). Upon treatment with high zeocin concentration, all lines showed a significant increase in chromatin mobility and Rc (Fig. 2D and E), indicating that chromatin mobility increases globally in the nucleus in response to DNA damage. We also tested whether these results could be an artefact of the *lacO/LacI* system itself. For that, we performed the same experiments using another locus tagging system - the ANCHOR system (ParB-*parS*)²⁵ (Fig. 2F). The ANCHOR line showed a similar increase in chromatin mobility (Fig. 2G).

Existing evidence in several systems show that cell cycle arrest upon DNA damage is often used by cells to facilitate DNA repair before cell division^{26–28}. Since DNA content and cohesion differ in different cell cycle phases, we sought to test if changes in cell cycle dynamics (i.e. the proportion of cells in different cell cycle phases) could explain the increased chromatin mobility observed in

114 response to DNA damage. To test this hypothesis, we crossed the *lacO/LacI* (line 112) with the S/G2
 115 reporter CDT1a::RFP²⁹ (Fig. 3A, B). To first verify that this setup was working as expected, we
 116 quantified the ratio of cells in S/G2 in root epidermal cells treated with Hydroxyurea (HU), a drug
 117 known to block cells in S phase^{30,31}. Indeed, we observed that there was a higher proportion of cells
 118 in S/G2 in HU samples (Fig. 3C). Consistent with previous studies³², treatment with 10μM zeocin
 119 significantly increased the number of cells in G2/S (Fig. 3C). However, with the highest concentration
 120 of zeocin (170μM), the ratio of cells in S/G2 phase decreased to half in comparison with control
 121 conditions (Fig. 3C), suggesting an accumulation of cells in G1. Thus, it became important to
 122 determine if G1 cells had different chromatin mobility compared to S/G2 cells. MSD analysis revealed
 123 that cells in the S/G2 phase (CDT1a-RFP positive cells) showed lower chromatin mobility than G1
 124 cells (Fig. 3D). Similarly, HU-treated cells, showed lower chromatin mobility, most likely due to cells
 125 being arrested in the S/G2 phase (Fig. 3E). These results revealed that an accumulation of cells in
 126 G1, could potentially explain the increased mobility observed in response to DSBs. If this is the case,
 127 we hypothesized that we should not see differences when comparing cells at the same stage of the
 128 cell cycle with or without zeocin. We, therefore, measured the chromatin mobility specifically at G1
 129 and S/G2, in control conditions and upon treatment with different concentrations of zeocin. We
 130 observed a significant increase in chromatin mobility in cells at S/G2 after zeocin treatment, whereas
 131 cells in G1 did not show any significant change (Fig. 3F and G). We concluded that the increased
 132 mobility observed in response to DNA damage at high zeocin concentrations (170μM) could be both
 133 a result of an accumulation of cells in G1 and a specific increase in chromatin mobility at S/G2 phase.
 134 This observation is consistent with the idea that HR is particularly relevant in G2 when sister
 135 chromatids have been synthesized and suggests that increased chromatin mobility may be important
 136 during this stage.

137

138 In yeast, as in plants, studies have shown that HR is executed mainly during S/G2 phases of the cell
 139 cycle^{26,33}. Because the increase in mobility upon zeocin treatment was specific to S/G2, we decided
 140 to investigate the mobility of DSBs during HR. Homologous recombination is divided into two main

141 phases: the presynaptic phase, which includes 5'-end resection and homology search, and the
 142 synaptic phase, which includes the strand invasion for homologous strand pairing (Fig. 4A)³⁴. The
 143 two main actors of HR, RAD51 and RAD54, function respectively in the initiation of the strand
 144 invasion and at the strand exchange reaction that finalizes the repair³⁵. We wanted to investigate
 145 how the increase in chromatin mobility is placed in relation to these two phases. By performing an
 146 eight-hour time course experiment on RAD51-GFP and RAD54-YFP lines after induction of damage
 147 with 10 μ M zeocin, we were able to visualize the appearance of foci with accumulations of these
 148 proteins in the nucleus. This revealed that RAD51-GFP foci were formed approximately 1h30min
 149 after DSB induction, whereas RAD54-YFP foci appeared later, at around 5h after treatment (Fig.
 150 4B). From this experiment, we could confirm that RAD51 interacts first with DSBs, while RAD54
 151 comes in later. To investigate the mobility of foci tagged with these proteins, we treated RAD51-GFP
 152 and RAD54-YFP plants with 10 μ M zeocin, (Fig. 4C). The MSD analysis revealed that only RAD51
 153 showed significantly higher mobility than *lacO/LacI* foci (Fig.4D), showing that high mobility levels
 154 seem to happen at early HR stages. Previous studies have shown that RAD54 foci relocate to the
 155 nuclear periphery after γ -irradiation^{32,33}. Therefore, our MSD results for RAD54 may correspond to a
 156 mixture of foci located at the nuclear periphery and non-periphery. To test if RAD54 at the different
 157 nuclear compartments behaved differently, we determined the MSD for RAD54 foci at these two
 158 nuclear locations (Fig.4E). The results showed that non-peripheral RAD54 foci have much higher
 159 mobility than the foci at the periphery (Fig.4F), revealing that RAD54 foci can, depending on their
 160 location, have mobilities similar to those of RAD51. Moreover, these results highlighted that large
 161 changes in chromatin mobility occur during the repair process – a strong increase in DSB mobility is
 162 observed in the early HR phase, with a subsequent drastic drop in mobility associated with the
 163 relocation of DSBs to the nuclear periphery. This relocation to the nucleus periphery has been
 164 associated with different possible roles - to bring homologous sequences together, thereby reducing
 165 the 3D search to a 2D scale³⁶; or due to the fact that the repair machinery may specifically interact
 166 with nucleopores³⁷.

Tracking chromatin movement, using DNA labelling tools and HR reporter lines, showed an increase in mobility upon DNA damage. Next, we wanted to determine whether the increase in mobility was actively regulated by the DDR pathway. For that we quantified *lacO/LacI* (line 112) mobility in *sog1-1* mutant, in which DDR is abolished. MSD analysis in *sog1-1* mutant revealed no increase in mobility upon treatment with high zeocin concentration, indicating that the increase of mobility seen in the WT (SOG1+/+ progeny from the F1) was dependent on SOG1 and thus on DDR activation (Fig. 5A, B). However, it is important to rule out that the lack of response to zeocin treatment was not due to a change in the cell cycle dynamics in this mutant. Indeed, in *sog1-1* the cell cycle arrest upon DNA damage is compromised^{32,38,39} and a loss of G1-arrested cells could potentially explain the results observed. We used EdU staining to check if, under our zeocin treatment conditions, *sog1-1* cells were not being arrested in G1 (Fig. 5C-E; Supplementary Fig. 7). The results showed that also in *sog1-1* there is a substantial reduction in EdU staining upon zeocin treatment, indicating that cells are also being accumulated at G1 although to a less extent than in the WT. We therefore decided to further analyse the chromatin mobility in G1 and S/G2 in *sog1-1* mutant. Given the complexity of this line, with several T-DNA insertions, instead of crossing it with CDT1a::RFP reporter we used nuclear area as a proxy for cell cycle stage taking as a reference CDT1 labelling (Supplementary Fig. 8). This analysis revealed that in *sog1-1* at both G1 and S/G2 stages of the cell cycle there is no increase in mobility upon zeocin treatment (Fig. 5F-H). These results demonstrate that SOG1 is required for the increase in chromatin mobility induced by zeocin treatment indicating that this phenomenon is actively regulated during the early steps of the response to DNA damage and not a physical by-product from extensive DNA “fragmentation”.

189

Our analysis of chromatin movement has revealed that an increase in chromatin mobility occurs in response to DSBs in Arabidopsis. Similar responses have been observed in yeast and animal cells, pointing towards a general mechanism of response to DSBs across kingdoms^{6,40–42}. The actual function of such increase in mobility has not been fully uncovered but some studies support the idea it may increase the probability of an encounter between the break and the repair template^{43,44}.

Despite the DNA repair machinery being highly conserved between eukaryotes, some of the important animal regulators, such as the tumor suppressor p53, have not been found in plants. Its function is instead served by the plant-specific DDR master regulator SOG1. Interestingly, we have been able to show that in plants the increase in chromatin mobility is dependent on SOG1 function. These results suggest that the increase in chromatin mobility, was conserved in evolution, as a response to DNA damage through the action of different molecular players. Further studies are now required to determine the mechanisms downstream of SOG1.

202

203 MATERIAL AND METHODS

204 Plant lines and growth conditions

Mutants and transgenic lines used in this study come from the following sources: *sog1-1*¹⁰, RAD51-GFP¹⁹, RAD54-eYFP⁴⁵, Cytrap line²⁹, *lacO/LacI* lines¹³, ANCHOR line²⁵. All mutants and transgenic lines are in Columbia background.

To visualize S/G2 cells, *lacO/LacI* line 112 was crossed to Cytrap line, and the resulting F₂ plants were selected on MS plates containing 50 mg/L of kanamycin (Sigma-Aldrich, catalogue number K1377). Because the G2/M-marker CYCB1;1 is strongly expressed during DNA damage⁴⁶, the selected F₂ were screened only for LacI-GFP and CDT1a-RFP.

Seeds were sterilized in 5% v/v sodium hypochlorite for 5 min and rinsed three times in sterile distilled water. Seeds were stratified at 4°C for 48 h in the darkness. Seeds were then plated on Murashige and Skoog (MS) medium and then grown in 16 hours light at 25°C in vertically oriented Petri dishes. The roots were observed after 6 to 7d of incubation, depending on the experiment.

216

217 Genotoxic treatment

To induce DNA damage response, 5- to 6-day-old seedlings were transferred in MS medium without or with 100 µM mitomycin C (MMC); 2, 10, 50, 100 or 170 µM zeocin or 10 mM hydroxyurea (HU)

220 and treated for 2h, 6h, or 24h. Each chemical was obtained respectively from Fisher Scientific
221 (catalogue number 2980501), Invitrogen (catalogue number R25001) and Sigma-Aldrich (catalogue
222 number H8627-1G).

223

224 **Microscopy**

225 For root staining with propidium iodide (PI) 6 to 7-d-old seedlings were mounted in water between
226 slide and coverslip and sealed with 0.12-mm-thick SecureSeal Adhesive tape (Grace Bio-Labs) to
227 reduce drift drying during imaging.

228 For EdU staining, samples were imaged using a Zeiss LSM800 inverted microscope, with a 63x
229 water-immersion objective (1.20 NA) and Microscopy Camera AxioCam 503 mono; Alexa499 were
230 detected using a 488nm excitation filter by collecting the signal between 505-550 nm. For DAPI, an
231 excitation filter 335-383nm was used, and the signal was detected between 420-470 nm

232

233 **Mean square displacement**

234 For all MSD experiments, time-lapse imaging was performed every 6 s, taking a Z-stack of 3 μm
235 spread through 1 μm slices for 5 min, with a 512 $\times$ 512 pixels format with a 1-2 $\times$ zoom factor. All
236 images were analyzed using Fiji software (NIH, Bethesda, MD, <http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/>) (Sage et al.
237 2005) and with the plugin SpotTracker 2D (obtained from [http://bigwww.epfl](http://bigwww.epfl.ch/sage/soft/spottracker)
238 [.ch/sage/soft/spottracker](http://bigwww.epfl.ch/sage/soft/spottracker)). Images were analyzed as described in Meschichi *et al.*, 2021.

239

240 **Expression Analysis Using Real-Time RT-PCR (qPCR)**

241 Seedlings grown for 7 d were harvested, and total RNA was extracted using the Trizol reagent
242 (Invitrogen). A total of 1 μg of RNA was treated with TURBO DNase (Life Technologies) and used
243 for cDNA synthesis (Superscript IV; Life Technologies). The resulting cDNA was diluted 10 times

and used for quantitative PCR using a Bio-Rad iCycler Thermal Cycler iQ5 Multicolor Real-Time and HOT FIREPol® EvaGreen® qPCR Mix Plus (Solis Biodyne). For data normalization, the data were first normalized to the PP2A2 reference gene, and the values from two independent samples were normalized to the average Delta Ct value Col-0 level or control condition ($2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ Method). The final values presented are given as the mean $\pm$ SD from three independent samples. Minus RT (no reverse transcriptase control) controls were set up to make sure the values reflect the level of RNA and not DNA contamination. The standard Student's t-test was used to determine the statistical significance of the results. The primers used are listed in Supplementary Tables 2.

EdU labelling

Five-day-old seedlings were grown on solid medium containing 20 μ M EdU, followed by a 1h incubation in EdU and 170uM zeocin. Roots were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) for 30 min, and washed three times with 1 $\times$ PBS. The roots were transferred to slide and covered by a glass cover slip, then squashed, and immediately deepen in liquid nitrogen for few seconds. The cover slips were removed and the roots were left to dry at room temperature for 30 min. The samples were washed with PBS + BSA (Bovine Serum Albumin) 3% (w/v), and incubated with a ClickIt Buffer (PBS 1X pH7.4, CuSO4 100mM, Ascorbate 1M, Alexia fluor azide, 2uM) solution in the dark for 15 minutes. Samples were washed once in 1X PBS + BSA 3%, followed by DAPI staining for 15 minutes in the dark. Samples were washed twice with PBS 1X pH 7.4 and mounted in vectashield (Vector Laboratories).

Statistical analysis

For statistical analysis, we used the GraphPad Prism 8.3 software. Data set were tested for normality using the Shapiro–Wilk test. Statistical significance was determined by using the standard student t-test (two-tailed) and one-way ANOVA (multiple comparisons with Bonferroni correction. All

269 experiments were performed in several nuclei as mentioned in figure legends and in Supplementary
270 Table 3.

271

272

273 **COMPETING INTEREST STATEMENT**

274 ANCHOR system is the property of NeoVirTech SAS, Toulouse, France. Any request of use should
275 be addressed to contact@neovirtech.com.

276

277 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

278 We thank Susan Gasser and Anais Cheblal for the SpotTracking and Excel Macro, Charles White
279 for RAD51-GFP line, Anne Britt for the *sog1-1* mutant, Sashihiro Matstunaga for RAD54-eYFP line,
280 Masaaki Umeda and Shiori Aki for the Cytrap line and Confocal Microscopy Platform from SLU,
281 Uppsala, Sweden. We thank Marion Orsucci for help with the statistical analysis. We thank Lauriane
282 Simon for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by the Swedish Research Council
283 (Vetenskapsrådet) grant number 2018-04101. We would like to thank COST ACTION CA16212
284 INDEPTH for the inputs and comments.

285

286 **AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**

287 AM, SR, FP and AS designed the experiments. AM and SvR performed the experiments. AM, SR,
288 FP and AS analyzed the data. All authors contributed to writing the article and approved the
289 submitted version. AM and SR were supported by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet) grant
290 number 2018-04101. FP is supported by the "Laboratoires d'Excellences (LABEX)" TULIP (ANR-10-
291 LABX-41)" and/or by the "École Universitaire de Recherche (EUR)" TULIP-GS (ANR-18-EURE-
292 0019).

293 REFERENCES

- 294 1. Yoshiyama, K. O., Sakaguchi, K. & Kimura, S. DNA damage response in plants: Conserved and
295 variable response compared to animals. *Biology (Basel)*. **2**, 1338–1356 (2013).
- 296 2. van Gent, D. C., Hoeijmakers, J. H. J. & Kanaar, R. Chromosomal stability and the DNA double-
297 stranded break connection. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **2**, 196–206 (2001).
- 298 3. Johnson, R. D. & Jasin, M. Sister chromatid gene conversion is a prominent double-strand break
299 repair pathway in mammalian cells. *EMBO J.* **19**, 3398–3407 (2000).
- 300 4. Goldfarb, T. & Lichten, M. Frequent and efficient use of the sister chromatid for DNA double-strand
301 break repair during budding yeast meiosis. *PLoS Biol.* **8**, 10–12 (2010).
- 302 5. Li, X. & Heyer, W. D. Homologous recombination in DNA repair and DNA damage tolerance. *Cell*
303 *Res.* **18**, 99–113 (2008).
- 304 6. Dion, V., Kalck, V., Horigome, C., Towbin, B. D. & Gasser, S. M. Increased mobility of double-strand
305 breaks requires Mec1, Rad9 and the homologous recombination machinery. *Nat. Cell Biol.* (2012).
306 doi:10.1038/ncb2465
- 307 7. Oza, P., Jaspersen, S. L., Miele, A., Dekker, J. & Peterson, C. L. Mechanisms that regulate
308 localization of a DNA double-strand break to the nuclear periphery-supplemental. *Genes Dev.* **23**,
309 912–927 (2009).
- 310 8. Ryu, T. *et al.* Heterochromatic breaks move to the nuclear periphery to continue recombinational
311 repair. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **17**, 1401–1411 (2015).
- 312 9. Schrank, B. R. *et al.* Nuclear ARP2/3 drives DNA break clustering for homology-directed repair.
313 *Nature* **559**, 61–66 (2018).
- 314 10. Yoshiyama, K., Conklin, P. A., Huefner, N. D. & Britt, A. B. Suppressor of gamma response 1 (SOG1)
315 encodes a putative transcription factor governing multiple responses to DNA damage. *Proc. Natl.*
316 *Acad. Sci.* (2009). doi:10.1073/pnas.0810304106
- 317 11. Yoshiyama, K. O. *et al.* ATM-mediated phosphorylation of SOG1 is essential for the DNA damage
318 response in Arabidopsis. *EMBO Rep.* (2013). doi:10.1038/embor.2013.112
- 319 12. Bourbousse, C., Vegesna, N. & Law, J. A. SOG1 activator and MYB3R repressors regulate a
320 complex DNA damage network in Arabidopsis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **115**, E12453–E12462 (2018).
- 321 13. Matzke, A. J. M., Watanabe, K., van der Winden, J., Naumann, U. & Matzke, M. High frequency, cell
322 type-specific visualization of fluorescent-tagged genomic sites in interphase and mitotic cells of living
323 Arabidopsis plants. *Plant Methods* (2010). doi:10.1186/1746-4811-6-2
- 324 14. Matzke, A. J. M., Lin, W. & Matzke, M. Evidence That Ion-Based Signaling Initiating at the Cell
325 Surface Can Potentially Influence Chromatin Dynamics and Chromatin-Bound Proteins in the
326 Nucleus. **10**, 1–16 (2019).
- 327 15. Horigome, C., Dion, V., Seeber, A., Gehlen, L. R. & Gasser, S. M. Visualizing the Spatiotemporal
328 Dynamics of DNA Damage in Budding Yeast. *Methods Protoc.* **1292**, 77 (2015).
- 329 16. Meschichi, A. & Rosa, S. Visualizing and Measuring Single Locus Dynamics in Arabidopsis thaliana.
330 in *Arabidopsis Protocols* (eds. Sanchez-Serrano, J. J. & Salinas, J.) 213–224 (Springer US, 2021).
331 doi:10.1007/978-1-0716-0880-7_10
- 332 17. Rosa, S. *et al.* Cell Differentiation and Development in Arabidopsis Are Associated with Changes in
333 Histone Dynamics at the Single-Cell Level. *Plant Cell* **26**, 1–14 (2014).
- 334 18. Arai, R. *et al.* Reduction in chromosome mobility accompanies nuclear organization during early
335 embryogenesis in Caenorhabditis elegans. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 3631 (2017).
- 336 19. Da Ines, O. *et al.* Meiotic Recombination in Arabidopsis Is Catalysed by DMC1, with RAD51 Playing a
337 Supporting Role. *PLoS Genet.* (2013). doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1003787
- 338 20. Hirakawa, T., Hasegawa, J., White, C. I. & Matsunaga, S. RAD54 forms DNA repair foci in response

- 339 to DNA damage in living plant cells. *Plant J.* **90**, 372–382 (2017).
- 340 21. Fulcher, N. & Sablowski, R. Hypersensitivity to DNA damage in plant stem cell niches. *Proc. Natl.*
341 *Acad. Sci.* **106**, 20984–20988 (2009).
- 342 22. Armstrong, S. J., Franklin, F. C. & Jones, G. H. Nucleolus-associated telomere clustering and pairing
343 precede meiotic chromosome synapsis in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *J. Cell Sci.* **114**, 4207–17 (2001).
- 344 23. Fransz, P., de Jong, J. H., Lysak, M., Castiglione, M. R. & Schubert, I. Interphase chromosomes in
345 *Arabidopsis* are organized as well defined chromocenters from which euchromatin loops emanate.
346 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **99**, 14584–14589 (2002).
- 347 24. Pontvianne, F. *et al.* Identification of Nucleolus-Associated Chromatin Domains Reveals a Role for
348 the Nucleolus in 3D Organization of the *A. thaliana* Genome. *Cell Rep.* **16**, 1574–1587 (2016).
- 349 25. Meschichi, A. *et al.* ANCHOR: A Technical Approach to Monitor Single-Copy Locus Localization in
350 *Planta*. *Front. Plant Sci.* **12**, (2021).
- 351 26. Weimer, A. K. *et al.* The plant-specific CDKB1-CYCB1 complex mediates homologous recombination
352 repair in *Arabidopsis*. *EMBO J.* **35**, 2068–2086 (2016).
- 353 27. Kostyrko, K., Bosshard, S., Urban, Z. & Mermod, N. A role for homologous recombination proteins in
354 cell cycle regulation. *Cell Cycle* **14**, 2853–2861 (2015).
- 355 28. Pellegata, N. S., Antoniono, R. J., Redpath, J. L. & Stanbridge, E. J. DNA damage and p53-mediated
356 cell cycle arrest: A reevaluation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **93**, 15209–15214 (1996).
- 357 29. Yin, K. *et al.* A dual-color marker system for in vivo visualization of cell cycle progression in
358 *Arabidopsis*. *Plant J.* **80**, 541–552 (2014).
- 359 30. Singh, A. & Xu, Y.-J. The Cell Killing Mechanisms of Hydroxyurea. *Genes (Basel)*. **7**, 99 (2016).
- 360 31. Cools, T., Iantcheva, A., Maes, S., Van den Daele, H. & De Veylder, L. A replication stress-induced
361 synchronization method for *Arabidopsis thaliana* root meristems. *Plant J.* **64**, 705–714 (2010).
- 362 32. Chen, P. *et al.* *Arabidopsis* R1R2R3-Myb proteins are essential for inhibiting cell division in response
363 to DNA damage. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 635 (2017).
- 364 33. Ferreira, M. G. Two modes of DNA double-strand break repair are reciprocally regulated through the
365 fission yeast cell cycle. *Genes Dev.* **18**, 2249–2254 (2004).
- 366 34. Wright, W. D., Shah, S. S. & Heyer, W.-D. Homologous recombination and the repair of DNA double-
367 strand breaks. *J. Biol. Chem.* **293**, 10524–10535 (2018).
- 368 35. Solinger, J. A. & Heyer, W.-D. Rad54 protein stimulates the postsynaptic phase of Rad51 protein-
369 mediated DNA strand exchange. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **98**, 8447–8453 (2001).
- 370 36. Seeber, A. & Gasser, S. M. Chromatin organization and dynamics in double-strand break repair.
371 *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **43**, 9–16 (2017).
- 372 37. Nagai, S. *et al.* Functional Targeting of DNA Damage to a Nuclear Pore-Associated SUMO-
373 Dependent Ubiquitin Ligase. *Science (80-.)*. **322**, 597–602 (2008).
- 374 38. Mahapatra, K. & Roy, S. SOG1 transcription factor promotes the onset of endoreduplication under
375 salinity stress in *Arabidopsis*. *Sci. Rep.* **11**, 1–26 (2021).
- 376 39. Yi, D. *et al.* The *Arabidopsis* SIAMESE-RELATED cyclin-dependent Kinase Inhibitors SMR5 and
377 SMR7 Regulate the DNA damage checkpoint in response to reactive oxygen species. *Plant Cell* **26**,
378 296–309 (2014).
- 379 40. Dimitrova, N., Chen, Y.-C. M., Spector, D. L. & de Lange, T. 53BP1 promotes non-homologous end
380 joining of telomeres by increasing chromatin mobility. *Nature* **456**, 524–528 (2008).
- 381 41. Miné-Hattab, J. & Rothstein, R. Increased chromosome mobility facilitates homology search during
382 recombination. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **14**, 510–517 (2012).
- 383 42. Krawczyk, P. M. *et al.* Chromatin mobility is increased at sites of DNA double-strand breaks. *J. Cell*

384 *Sci.* **125**, 2127–2133 (2012).

385 43. Gehlen, L. R., Gasser, S. M. & Dion, V. How broken DNA finds its template for repair: A
386 computational approach. *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* 20–29 (2011). doi:10.1143/PTPS.191.20

387 44. Barzel, A. & Kupiec, M. Finding a match: How do homologous sequences get together for
388 recombination? *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **9**, 27–37 (2008).

389 45. Hirakawa, T. & Matsunaga, S. Characterization of DNA Repair Foci in Root Cells of Arabidopsis in
390 Response to DNA Damage. *Front. Plant Sci.* **10**, (2019).

391 46. Culligan, K. M., Robertson, C. E., Foreman, J., Doerner, P. & Britt, A. B. ATR and ATM play both
392 distinct and additive roles in response to ionizing radiation. *Plant J.* **48**, 947–961 (2006).

393

Figure 1: MSD analysis of *lacO* foci in different cell types in *Arabidopsis thaliana* root. (A) Schematic representation of the *lacO*/LacI system. A *lacO* repeat array was integrated into chromosome 5 (line112) and detected by expression of the LacI protein fused to GFP. The image on the right corresponds to z-projected images from root epidermal nuclei expressing the referred construct. Scale bar, 10µm (B) Representative images of the *Arabidopsis* root epidermal cells in division (left image) and differentiation zone (right image) showing nuclear signal with *lacO*/LacI foci (cyan). Propidium iodide (PI) staining (magenta). Scale bar, 10µm. (C) MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in the division (n=116 nuclei) and differentiated zone (n=21 nuclei). 3D stacks were taken at 6sec intervals for 5min. The radius of constraint was calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means ± SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001. (D) Left: Representative images of atrichoblast (A) and trichoblast (T) in the division zone showing nuclear signal with *lacO*/LacI foci (cyan). Propidium iodide (PI) staining (magenta). Scale bar, 10µm. Right: Histogram of nuclear areas (µm²) from atrichoblast and trichoblast cells. Atrichoblast (n = 53 nuclei); red, Trichoblast (n = 57 nuclei); orange. (E) Left: MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in the atrichoblast (n=36 nuclei) and trichoblast (n=61 nuclei). Right: Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means ± SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001.

Figure 2: Chromatin mobility increases upon high DNA damage levels. (A) Scheme illustrating the experimental setup. (B) MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI line 112 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in different zeocin concentrations. 10µM (n=97 nuclei); 170µM (n=93 nuclei). Radius of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means ± SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05). (C) Chromosomal positions of *lacO*/LacI lines as reported previously^{13,14}. Line 26 and line 107 are respectively inserted in chromosomes 2 and 3. The ANCHOR construct is inserted in chromosome 5. The NORs are marked as black circles and the centromeres as light grey circles. (D) MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI line 107 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in control conditions and zeocin treated plants with 170µM. Control (n=53 nuclei), 170µM (n=48 nuclei). Bottom: Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, *P < 0.05. (E) MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI line 26 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon zeocin. Control (n=52 nuclei), 170µM (n=52 nuclei). Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, *P < 0.05. (F) Left: Schematic representation of the ANCHOR system. *parS*-*ParB*:GFP interactions and oligomerization along the flanking genomic region. *ParB*-GFP can directly bind to *parS* sequence as a dimer and along the flanking genomic region. Right: Representative image of epidermis nuclei in the division zone. Scale bar, 5µm. (G) MSD analysis of ANCHOR line based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon zeocin treatment. Control (n=54 nuclei), 170µM (n=22 nuclei). Radii of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, *P < 0.05.

Figure 3: Chromatin mobility increases specifically during in S/G2 phases in response to DNA damage. (A) Schematic representation of cell cycle progression with the CDT1-RFP signal displayed in cell in S/G2. (B) Representative images of nuclei from *lacO*/LacI line 112 crossed with CDT1-RFP, *lacO*/LacI (cyan) CDT1-RFP (magenta). Stars represent cells in S-G2. Scale bar, 10µm. (C) Percentage of S/G2 cells per root in control conditions and upon 10µM hydroxyurea, 10µM and 170µM Zeocin. (D-H) MSD curves and corresponding Rc histograms for: (D) MSD measurements of nuclei in G1 (n=62 nuclei) and S/G2 phase (n=67 nuclei); (E) *lacO*/LacI lines based on time lapse experiments of nuclei upon 10µM HU treatment phase (n=28 nuclei); (F) S/G2 cells upon different zeocin concentration (10µM (n=60 nuclei); 170µM (n=49 nuclei)); (G) G1 cells upon different zeocin concentration (10µM (n=35 nuclei); 170µM (n=50 nuclei)); Values represent means ± SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05 **P < 0.01 ***P < 0.001. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05)

Figure 4: DSB mobility is higher at early HR. (A) Schematic representation of the critical steps of homologous recombination. Rad51 (purple) assemble onto the single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) formed after exonucleation of DNA double-strand break (DSB) ends to form a filament, which is known as the presynaptic filament. After searching for DNA homologous sequence, the presynaptic filament binds the DNA template to form the synaptic structure with RAD54. The ssDNA invades the homologous region in the duplex to form a DNA joint, known as the displacement (D)-loop promoted by Rad54 (green). (B) Time-lapse experiment of the formation of RAD51-GFP and RAD54-YFP foci in *Arabidopsis* nuclei, which was imaged every 30min after zeocin treatment. Timeline of RAD51 and RAD54 foci formation for 8h. Error bars indicate the standard error.

At least four roots were counted for each group. (C) Representative images of root epidermal cells showing foci formation in RAD51-GFP and RAD54-YFP plants after 10 μ M zeocin treatment for 48h. Propidium iodide (PI) staining (red). Scale bar, 10 μ m. (D) MSD analysis of RAD51 (n=64 nuclei) and RAD54 (n=64 nuclei) foci and *lacO/LacI* (line112) (n=109 nuclei) plants upon 10 μ M zeocin. Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. (E) Representative images of root epidermal nuclei with RAD54 foci located on the nuclear periphery (p) and non-periphery (n). Scale bar, 5 μ m. (F) MSD analysis of RAD54 foci in the periphery (n=24 nuclei) and non-periphery (n=30 nuclei) upon 10 μ M zeocin. Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05)

Figure 5: SOG1 is required for the increased chromatin mobility. (A) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* (Control (n=83 nuclei); 170 μ M zeocin (n=91 nuclei)). (B) MSD analysis of SOG1+/+ *lacO/LacI* progeny from crossing with *sog1-1* (Control (n=59 nuclei); 170 μ M zeocin(n=29 nuclei)). Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, *P < 0.05. For all MSD curves, values represent means $\pm$ SEM. (C) Simplified schematic representations of the protocols corresponding to the EdU labelling experiment. (D) Schematic representation of cell cycle progression with the EdU signal displayed in cell in S/G2. (E) Proportion of EdU-I labelled cells in one root tip in Col-0 and *sog1-1* in control conditions and zeocin treated plants with 170 μ M. (F) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* nuclei in G1 phase (Control (n=23 nuclei); 170 μ M zeocin (n=25 nuclei)). (G) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* nuclei in S/G2 phase (Control (n=10 nuclei); 170 μ M zeocin (n=12 nuclei)). (H) Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05).

Figure S1: Zeocin induces expression of DDR genes in a dose-dependent manner. Expression analysis of DDR responsive genes RAD51, BRCA1 and PARB1 in 7-day-old seedlings treated with different zeocin concentrations. Two to three independent biological replicates were performed. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05 **P < 0.01 ***P < 0.001.

Figure S2: Chromatin mobility increases in treatment with a high zeocin concentration. (A-B) MSD curves and corresponding Rc histograms for: (A) *lacO/LacI* line 112 in control conditions and upon treatment with different zeocin concentrations (10 μ M n=97; 50 μ M n=111; 100 μ M n=29; and 170 μ M n=93 nuclei); (B) *lacO/LacI* line 112 in control conditions and different time zeocin treatment (2h n=39; 6h n=45; and 24h n=20); Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05)

Figure S3: Genotoxic stress upon zeocin induces cell death in QC but not in epidermal cells from the division zone. Representative images of roots stained with PI, which marks the outline of living cells but enters dead cells, from epidermal cells in division zone and stem cell niche (QCs and Initials) from 7 days old Col-0 seedling after 24 h of zeocin treatment compared to non-treated samples (Control). Scale bar, 20 μ m.

Figure S4: Chromatin mobility increase upon MMC treatment. MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon MMC. Radii of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Control n=32; 100 μ M n=30 nuclei. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05.

Figure S5: Chromatin mobility for additional *lacO/LacI* lines in control conditions. MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 (n=116 nuclei) compared to lines 26 (n=52 nuclei) and 107 (n=53 nuclei). Radii of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05

496

497

498 **Figure S6: Quantitative analysis of EdU incorporation on *Arabidopsis thaliana* roots.** DAPI-stained
499 (DNA) and EdU-labelled cells from the meristem region after roots were incubated for 6h in EdU. Asterisk
500 indicate cells showing EdU signal. Scale bar 10 μ m.

501

502 **Figure S7: Nucleus area in S/G2 versus G1 cells.** (A) Nuclear area quantification in nuclei with and without
503 CDT1 signal. Nuclei from epidermal trichoblast root cells from *lacO/LacI* lines were measured from optical
504 slices obtained from confocal microscopy imaging. (B) Frequency distribution in percent for the nuclear area
505 (μ m²) for nuclei with (dark gray) and without (light gray) CDT1 signal. Each curve was fitted by a Gaussian
506 function (CDT1- in purple; CDT1+ in green). The median value of CDT1-/+ distribution has been used as
507 thresholds to determine cells in G1 or S/G2 phase. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P <
508 0.001.

509

510 **Supplementary Table 1: Primers used in this study.**

511

Figure 1: MSD analysis of *lacO* foci in different cell types in *Arabidopsis thaliana* root. (A) Schematic representation of the *lacO*/LacI system. A *lacO* repeat array was integrated into chromosome 5 (line112) and detected by expression of the LacI protein fused to GFP. The image on the right corresponds to z-projected images from root epidermal nuclei expressing the referred construct. Scale bar, 10 μm (B) Representative images of the *Arabidopsis* root epidermal cells in division (left image) and differentiation zone (right image) showing nuclear signal with *lacO*/LacI foci (cyan). Propidium iodide (PI) staining (magenta). Scale bar, 10 μm . (C) MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in the division (n=116 nuclei) and differentiated zone (n=21 nuclei). 3D stacks were taken at 6sec intervals for 5min. The radius of constraint was calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001. (D) Left: Representative images of atrichoblast (A) and trichoblast (T) in the division zone showing nuclear signal with *lacO*/LacI foci (cyan). Propidium iodide (PI) staining (magenta). Scale bar, 10 μm . Right: Histogram of nuclear areas (μm^2) from atrichoblast and trichoblast cells. Atrichoblast (n = 53 nuclei); red, Trichoblast (n = 57 nuclei); orange. (E) Left: MSD analysis of *lacO*/LacI lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in the atrichoblast (n=36 nuclei) and trichoblast (n=61 nuclei). Right: Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001.

Figure 2: Chromatin mobility increases upon high DNA damage levels. (A) Scheme illustrating the experimental setup. (B) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in different zeocin concentrations. 10 μM (n=97 nuclei); 170 μM (n=93 nuclei). Radius of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction ($p < 0.05$). (C) Chromosomal positions of *lacO/LacI* lines as reported previously^{9,10}. Line 26 and line 107 are respectively inserted in chromosomes 2 and 3. The ANCHOR construct is inserted in chromosome 5. The NORs are marked as black circles and the centromeres as light grey circles. (D) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 107 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei in control conditions and zeocin treated plants with 170 μM . Control (n=53 nuclei), 170 μM (n=48 nuclei). Bottom: Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, * $P < 0.05$. (E) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 26 based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon zeocin. Control (n=52 nuclei), 170 μM (n=52 nuclei). Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, * $P < 0.05$. (F) Left: Schematic representation of the ANCHOR system. *parS*-ParB:GFP interactions and oligomerization along the flanking genomic region. ParB-GFP can directly bind to *parS* sequence as a dimer and along the flanking genomic region. Right: Representative image of epidermis nuclei in the division zone. Scale bar, 5 μm . (G) MSD analysis of ANCHOR line based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon zeocin treatment. Control (n=54 nuclei), 170 μM (n=22 nuclei). Radii of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, * $P < 0.05$.

Figure 3: Chromatin mobility increases specifically during in S/G2 phases in response to DNA damage. (A) Schematic representation of cell cycle progression with the CDT1-RFP signal displayed in cell in S/G2. (B) Representative images of nuclei from *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with CDT1-RFP, *lacO/LacI* (cyan) CDT1-RFP (magenta). Stars represent cells in S-G2. Scale bar, 10µm. (C) Percentage of S/G2 cells per root in control conditions and upon 10µM hydroxyurea, 10µM and 170µM Zeocin. (d-h) MSD curves and corresponding Rc histograms for: (D) MSD measurements of nuclei in G1 (n=62 nuclei) and S/G2 phase (n=67 nuclei); (E) *lacO/LacI* lines based on time lapse experiments of nuclei upon 10µM HU treatment phase (n=28 nuclei); (F) S/G2 cells upon different zeocin concentration (10µM (n=60 nuclei); 170µM (n=49 nuclei)); (G) G1 cells upon different zeocin concentration (10µM (n=35 nuclei); 170µM (n=50 nuclei)); Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05 **P < 0.01 ***P < 0.001. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05)

Figure 4: DSB mobility is higher at early HR. (A) Schematic representation of the critical steps of homologous recombination. Rad51 (purple) assemble onto the single-stranded DNA (ssDNA) formed after exonucleation of DNA double-strand break (DSB) ends to form a filament, which is known as the presynaptic filament. After searching for DNA homologous sequence, the presynaptic filament binds the DNA template to form the synaptic structure with RAD54. The ssDNA invades the homologous region in the duplex to form a DNA joint, known as the displacement (D)-loop promoted by Rad54 (green). (B) Time-lapse experiment of the formation of RAD51-GFP and RAD54-YFP foci in Arabidopsis nuclei, which was imaged every 30min after zeocin treatment. Timeline of RAD51 and RAD54 foci formation for 8h. Error bars indicate the standard error. At least four roots were counted for each group. (C) Representative images of root epidermal cells showing foci formation in RAD51-GFP and RAD54-YFP plants after 10µM zeocin treatment for 48h. Propidium iodide (PI) staining (red). Scale bar, 10µm. (D) MSD analysis of RAD51 (n=64 nuclei) and RAD54 (n=64 nuclei) foci and *lacO/LacI* (line112) (n=109 nuclei) plants upon 10µM zeocin. Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. (E) Representative images of root epidermal nuclei with RAD54 foci located on the nuclear periphery (p) and non-periphery (n). Scale bar, 5µm (F) MSD analysis of RAD54 foci in the periphery (n=24 nuclei) and non-periphery (n=30 nuclei) upon 10µM zeocin. Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction ($p < 0.05$).

Figure 5: SOG1 is required for the increased chromatin mobility. (A) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* (Control (n=83 nuclei); 170μM zeocin (n=91 nuclei)). (B) MSD analysis of SOG1(+/-) *lacO/LacI* progeny from crossing with *sog1-1* (Control (n=59 nuclei); 170μM zeocin (n=29 nuclei)). Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Student t-test, *P < 0.05. For all MSD curves, values represent means ± SEM. (C) Simplified schematic representations of the protocols corresponding to the EdU labelling experiment. (D) Schematic representation of cell cycle progression with the EdU signal displayed in cell in S/G2. (E) Proportion of EdU labelled cells in one root tip in Col-0 and *sog1-1* in control conditions and zeocin treated plants with 170μM. (F) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* nuclei in G1 phase (Control (n=23 nuclei); 170μM zeocin (n=25 nuclei)). (G) MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 crossed with *sog1-1* nuclei in S/G2 phase (Control (n=10 nuclei); 170μM zeocin (n=12 nuclei)). (H) Radius of constraint calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means ± SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction (p < 0.05).

A

Figure S1: Zeocin induces expression of DDR genes in a dose-dependent manner. Expression analysis of DDR responsive genes RAD51, BRCA1 and PARB1 in 7-day-old seedlings treated with different zeocin concentrations. Two to three independent biological replicates were performed. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, * $P < 0.05$ ** $P < 0.01$ *** $P < 0.001$.

A

B

Figure S2: Chromatin mobility increases in treatment with a high zeocin concentration. (A-B) MSD curves and corresponding Rc histograms for: (A) *lacO/LacI* line 112 in control conditions and upon treatment with different zeocin concentrations (10 μM n=97; 50 μM n=111; 100 μM n=29; and 170 μM n=93 nuclei); (B) *lacO/LacI* line 112 in control conditions and different time zeocin treatment (2h n=39; 6h n=45; and 24h n=20); Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Letters indicate one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni's correction ($p < 0.05$)

Figure S3: Genotoxic stress upon zeocin induces cell death in QC but not in epidermal cells from the division zone. Representative images of roots stained with PI, which marks the outline of living cells but enters dead cells, from epidermal cells in division zone and stem cell niche (QCs and Initials) from 7 days old Col-0 seedling after 24 h of zeocin treatment compared to non-treated samples (Control). Scale bar, 20 μ m.

Figure S4: Chromatin mobility increase upon MMC treatment. MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* lines based on time-lapse experiments of nuclei upon MMC. Radii of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Control n=32; 100 μM n=30 nuclei. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05.

Figure S5: Chromatin mobility for additional *lacO/LacI* lines in control conditions. MSD analysis of *lacO/LacI* line 112 (n=116 nuclei) compared to lines 26 (n=52 nuclei) and 107 (n=53 nuclei). Radii of constraint were calculated from MSD curves. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, *P < 0.05.

Figure S6: Quantitative analysis of EdU incorporation on *Arabidopsis thaliana* roots. DAPI-stained (DNA) and EdU-labelled cells from the meristem region after roots were incubated for 6h in EdU. Asterisk indicate cells showing EdU signal. Scale bar 10 μ m.

Figure S7: Nucleus area in S/G2 versus G1 cells. (A) Nuclear area quantification in nuclei with and without CDT1 signal. Nuclei from epidermal trichoblast root cells from *lacO/LacI* lines were measured from optical slices obtained from confocal microscopy imaging. (B) Frequency distribution in percent for the nuclear area (μm^2) for nuclei with (dark gray) and without (light gray) CDT1 signal. Each curve was fitted by a Gaussian function (CDT1- in purple; CDT1+ in green). The median value of CDT1-/+ distribution has been used as thresholds to determine cells in G1 or S/G2 phase. Values represent means $\pm$ SEM. Student t-test, ***P < 0.001.

Supplementary Table 1: Primers Used in This Study

qPCR	
RAD51-F	GCGCAAGTAGATGGTTCAGC
RAD51-R	TTCCTCAACGCCAACCTTGT
PARP2-F	GGTACGCTAAACCGCAAACC
PARP2-R	GGGTTTCTTCTCTTTCGCTTAAA
BRCA1-F	ACGAAGTCCCACCGAGAAAC
BRCA1-R	TCCATGCGGTTGTGTAGCTT
PP2A-F	TAACGTGGCCAAAATGATGC
PP2A-R	GTTCTCCACAACCGCTTGGT

Genotyping	
sog1 dCAPS F	CTCCCAGGACCAACCAAGTGAG
sog1 dCAPS R	GATTCCGATCAGGATTTTGCTAG