


# ATP Hydrolysis by the SNF2 Domain of Dnmt5 Is Coupled to Both Specific Recognition and Modification of Hemimethylated DNA

## Graphical Abstract



## Authors

Phillip A. Dumesic, Caitlin I. Stoddard, Sandra Catania, Geeta J. Narlikar, Hiten D. Madhani

## Correspondence

geeta.narlikar@ucsf.edu (G.J.N.),  
hitenmadhani@gmail.com (H.D.M.)

## In Brief

Dumesic et al. discover coupling between the SNF2 ATPase and DNA methyltransferase domains of the CpG methyltransferase Dnmt5. Recognition of preferred substrates by the DNMT domain stimulates SNF2 domain ATP hydrolysis, which itself is required for DNA methyltransferase activity. ATPase coupling may underlie the exquisite specificity of Dnmt5's maintenance DNA methylation.

## Highlights

- Maintenance DNA methylation by Dnmt5 requires ATP hydrolysis by its SNF2 domain
- Hemimethylated DNA substrates preferentially stimulate Dnmt5 ATPase
- Mutation of Dnmt5 SNF2 domain decouples ATPase from DNA methyltransferase activity
- Stabilization of active DNMT domain conformation stimulates SNF2 ATPase



## Article

# ATP Hydrolysis by the SNF2 Domain of Dnmt5 Is Coupled to Both Specific Recognition and Modification of Hemimethylated DNA

Phillip A. Dumesic,<sup>1</sup> Caitlin I. Stoddard,<sup>1</sup> Sandra Catania,<sup>1</sup> Geeta J. Narlikar,<sup>1,\*</sup> and Hiten D. Madhani<sup>1,2,3,\*</sup><sup>1</sup>Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA<sup>2</sup>Chan-Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA 94158, USA<sup>3</sup>Lead Contact\*Correspondence: [geeta.narlikar@ucsf.edu](mailto:geeta.narlikar@ucsf.edu) (G.J.N.), [hitenmadhani@gmail.com](mailto:hitenmadhani@gmail.com) (H.D.M.)<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2020.04.029>

## SUMMARY

*C. neoformans* Dnmt5 is an unusually specific maintenance-type CpG methyltransferase (DNMT) that mediates long-term epigenome evolution. It harbors a DNMT domain and SNF2 ATPase domain. We find that the SNF2 domain couples substrate specificity to an ATPase step essential for DNA methylation. Coupling occurs independent of nucleosomes. Hemimethylated DNA preferentially stimulates ATPase activity, and mutating Dnmt5's ATP-binding pocket disproportionately reduces ATPase stimulation by hemimethylated versus unmethylated substrates. Engineered DNA substrates that stabilize a reaction intermediate by mimicking a "flipped-out" conformation of the target cytosine bypass the SNF2 domain's requirement for hemimethylation. This result implies that ATP hydrolysis by the SNF2 domain is coupled to the DNMT domain conformational changes induced by preferred substrates. These findings establish a new role for a SNF2 ATPase: controlling an adjoined enzymatic domain's substrate recognition and catalysis. We speculate that this coupling contributes to the exquisite specificity of Dnmt5 via mechanisms related to kinetic proof-reading.

## INTRODUCTION

Methylation of the C5 position of cytosine (5mC) in eukaryotic genomes marks DNA sites in a potentially heritable manner. 5mC is present at repetitive elements and transposons, where it silences these elements for genome defense (Law and Jacobsen, 2010; Suzuki and Bird, 2008). Methylation is also found in the bodies of active genes, where its purpose is less clear (Feng et al., 2010; Huff and Zilberman, 2014; Schübeler, 2015; Zemach et al., 2010). In vertebrates, cytosine methylation is more widespread and occurs primarily at CG sites, both in gene bodies and intergenic regulatory regions. It is required for mammalian development and can enforce long-term transcriptional repression of targeted genes; for instance, during X chromosome inactivation, genomic imprinting, transposon suppression, and lineage-specific gene silencing (Jaenisch and Bird, 2003; Li et al., 1993; Smith and Meissner, 2013; Velasco et al., 2010).

An important aspect of cytosine methylation is its potential to enable the inheritance of gene silencing after loss of the initiating signal (Jones and Liang, 2009). In the simplest model, 5mC is maintained over cell divisions by a "maintenance" DNA methyltransferase that acts preferentially on hemimethylated CG sites produced during DNA replication (Holliday and Pugh, 1975; Riggs, 1975). In contrast, an "establishment" DNA methyltrans-

ferase deposits the initial 5mC mark *de novo* on an unmethylated CG template. Mammals encode DNA methyltransferases that broadly fall into these two classes. DNMT1 is widely expressed, is recruited to chromatin during DNA replication, and shows a kinetic preference for activity on hemimethylated as opposed to unmethylated substrates (Jeltsch and Jurkowska, 2016). In contrast, DNMT3A and DNMT3B exhibit equivalent activities on unmethylated and hemimethylated substrates and are highly expressed in embryonic periods during which DNA methylation patterns are established.

Despite these general trends, high-resolution DNA methylation data have suggested that the segregation of roles between DNMT3A/B and DNMT1 might not be absolute: both enzyme classes appear to play a measurable role in DNA methylation establishment as well as maintenance (Arand et al., 2012; Jeltsch and Jurkowska, 2014; Jones and Liang, 2009; Riggs and Xiong, 2004). These results are consistent with the fact that the DNMT1 *in vitro* catalytic preference for hemimethylated sites is only 30- to 40-fold, seemingly insufficient for DNMT1 to preserve 5mC marks in a maintenance-only fashion, since this would require faithful replication of each of the 56 million CG sites in the human genome as either unmethylated or hemimethylated (Jeltsch, 2006; Jeltsch and Jurkowska, 2014). Therefore, ongoing *de novo* DNA methylation has been suggested to explain the stability of many 5mC marks. These findings highlight how the enzymological properties



of an organism's DNA methyltransferases might impose restrictions on how long the 5mC mark can be epigenetically inherited after loss of the mark's initiating signal.

In this regard, our recent studies of the Dnmt5 family of eukaryotic cytosine methyltransferases are relevant. In this family—which is represented in fungi as well as in chlorophyte algae and stramenopiles—the DNMT domain is embedded in a multi-domain architecture that includes a C-terminal SNF2 helicase-like domain (Iyer et al., 2011; Ponger and Li, 2005). Loss-of-function genomic studies revealed that Dnmt5 family methyltransferases are responsible for cytosine methylation at CG sites and, in some organisms, represent the sole enzyme responsible for CG methylation (Huff and Zilberman, 2014). Our recent characterization of Dnmt5 in one such organism, the yeast *Cryptococcus neoformans*, revealed that the purified enzyme is an exquisitely specific maintenance-type methyltransferase *in vitro*, with no detectable *de novo* activity. Consistent with this observation, Dnmt5 was unable to restore 5mC landscapes when deleted from and subsequently reintroduced into a *C. neoformans* strain. Phylogenetic and functional analyses revealed that a species ancestral to *Cryptococcus* encoded a second DNA methyltransferase that possesses *de novo* methyltransferase activity (DnmtX), but this gene was lost 50–150 million years ago. Further work demonstrated that cytosine methylation has been maintained for millions of years since this loss through a process analogous to Darwinian evolution in which methylation persistence requires epigenetic inheritance, rare random 5mC losses and gains, and natural selection (Catania et al., 2020).

Here, we biochemically characterize *C. neoformans* Dnmt5 and uncover functional coupling between its SNF2 and DNMT domains that may contribute to its unusually high specificity for hemimethylated substrates. We find that ATP hydrolysis by the SNF2 domain is essential for DNA methyltransferase activity by the DNMT domain. Non-hydrolyzable nucleotide analogs perturb Dnmt5's affinity for DNA substrates and block DNA methylation activity. Strikingly, engineered DNA substrates predicted to stabilize the DNMT domain at intermediate steps of the cytosine methylation pre-catalytic pathway are sufficient to fully stimulate ATPase activity. These results demonstrate that SNF2-mediated ATP hydrolysis is both a response to recognition of a hemimethylated CG substrate and also itself required for productive substrate methylation. We discuss the possibility that these properties allow kinetic proof-reading to enhance Dnmt5's specificity for its preferred substrates. More generally, these results reveal a previously undescribed role for a SNF2 ATPase in a DNA modification enzyme.

## RESULTS


### Dnmt5 Is an ATP-Dependent Cytosine Methyltransferase with High Specificity for Hemimethylated Substrates

Dnmt5 proteins have unique architecture among DNA methyltransferase families: they contain a highly diverged DNMT domain followed by a RING domain and a C-terminal region with SNF2 family homology (Huff and Zilberman, 2014; Iyer et al., 2011; Ponger and Li, 2005) (Figure 1A). Dnmt5 orthologs mediate CG methylation in diverse eukaryotes, including the yeast *C. neoformans*, where Dnmt5 is the organism's sole DNA

methyltransferase. Initial characterization of Dnmt5 in this system revealed that it has a strong *in vivo* and *in vitro* preference for action on hemimethylated, but not unmethylated, DNA substrates and that it requires ATP addition to the reaction (Catania et al., 2020). The unusual specificity profile of this enzyme motivated us to examine the regulation of its activity *in vitro* and to interrogate the role of its SNF2 domain.

We expressed the *C. neoformans* Dnmt5 protein in *S. cerevisiae* and isolated it to >90% purity (Figure S1A). Its DNA methyltransferase activity was tested under multiple turnover conditions using 60-bp double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) substrates whose three CG motifs were uniformly unmethylated, hemimethylated, or symmetrically methylated (Figure 1B). Confirming our prior results, in the absence of ATP, no activity was observed on any substrate. When ATP was added, activity was observed on hemimethylated substrates but not on unmethylated or symmetrically methylated substrates (Figure 1C). The rate of methylation was comparable to that of the well-studied maintenance methyltransferase DNMT1 (Pradhan et al., 1999) (Figure 1D). Importantly, when Dnmt5 was expressed and purified from its native host *C. neoformans*, instead of from the orthologous system *S. cerevisiae*, protein yields were substantially lower, but the enzyme exhibited comparable qualitative and quantitative properties, confirming that its observed substrate preferences and ATP dependence were not an artifact of its expression system (Figures S1A–S1D).

Given its lack of activity on unmethylated DNA substrates, we tested Dnmt5 under conditions that might provoke a latent *de novo* methyltransferase activity. First, since the Dnmt5 chromo-domain has been shown to recognize trimethylation of histone H3 at lysine 9 (Catania et al., 2020), we tested Dnmt5 activity in the presence of peptides corresponding to the histone H3 N-terminal tail, with or without K9 trimethylation. When saturating concentrations of either peptide were present, reaction rates on hemimethylated substrates were comparable, and activity remained undetectable on unmethylated DNA (Figure 1E). Second, since DNMT1 activity on unmethylated CG motifs can be stimulated by nearby methylation marks (Tollefsbol and Hutchison, 1997), we tested whether the addition of unmethylated CG sites would increase Dnmt5's methylation of a DNA substrate containing a single hemimethylated CG site (Figures S1E and S1F). Such a result would indicate unveiled *de novo* activity. In fact, addition of these unmethylated CG sites did not affect Dnmt5's initial methylation rate, nor did it affect the endpoint quantity of methyl marks that were deposited (at 4 h—a time point at which the methylation reaction was empirically found to have ceased, perhaps owing to Dnmt5 inhibition from ATP depletion or SAH accumulation). Third, we tested whether Dnmt5 activity on unmethylated DNA substrates could be detected under multiple turnover conditions after reactions of longer duration (4 h) and increased concentration of the methyl donor S-[methyl-<sup>3</sup>H]-adenosyl-L-methionine (SAM; 8  $\mu$ M). Tritium incorporation into the hemimethylated substrate was  $\sim$ 1,200-fold greater than background level, as assessed in a reaction containing substrate DNA and <sup>3</sup>H-SAM but no enzyme (Figure 1F). Tritium incorporation into the unmethylated substrate, however, was indistinguishable from background. Finally, we examined Dnmt5 under single-turnover conditions in the presence of mononucleosomal



**Figure 1. Dnmt5 Is an ATP-Dependent DNA Methyltransferase with High Specificity for Hemimethylated Substrates**

(A) Protein domains in *C. neoformans* Dnmt5.

(B) dsDNA substrates used in methyltransferase experiments. Each 60-bp substrate contains three CG sites that are uniformly unmethylated, hemimethylated, or symmetrically methylated.

(C) Example DNA methylation kinetics using 30 nM Dnmt5 and 5 μM each of the DNA substrates in (B), with or without 1 mM ATP.


(D) Average initial rates of Dnmt5 DNMT activity, in the presence or absence of 1 mM ATP. ND, no detectable activity. Error bars represent SD; n = 4–5.

(E) Average initial rates of Dnmt5 DNMT activity in the presence or absence of 1 mM ATP and 5 μM histone tail peptides H3K9me0 or H3K9me3. ND, no detectable activity. Error bars represent SD; n = 2–4.

(F) DNMT activity of Dnmt5 (100 nM) on DNA substrates (5 μM) that were either unmethylated or hemimethylated. Measurement taken at 4 h time point when reaction had ceased to progress. Background signal was measured in a reaction with unmethylated DNA but no enzyme. Graph represents average and SD; n = 3.

(G) DNMT activity of Dnmt5 (150 nM) on nucleosomal substrates (50 nM). Measurement taken at 4 h time point when reaction had ceased to progress. For each substrate, DNA is a 227-bp sequence composed of a Widom 601 nucleosome-positioning sequence flanked by 40-bp linker sequences. Linkers each contain two CG sites that are either hemimethylated or unmethylated; the Widom 601 sequence is entirely unmethylated. Nucleosomes are either wild type (H3K9me0) or MLA (H3K9me3). Graph represents average and SD; n = 4.

See also Figure S1.



(legend on next page)

substrates designed to more faithfully mimic the chromatin context of *in vivo* Dnmt5 activity. We reconstituted mononucleosomes that were flanked on either side by 40-bp linker DNA containing two CG sites, which were either unmethylated or hemimethylated (Figure 1G). We also generated analogous mononucleosomes that were modified using methyl-lysine analog technology to contain a histone mark associated with heterochromatic sites of Dnmt5 activity *in vivo* (denoted H3K9me3). The dynamic range of DNA methylation in these nucleosomal assays was less than that observed in the aforementioned multiple-turnover assays with non-nucleosomal DNA substrates, but the qualitative results were equivalent. Namely, Dnmt5 was active on nucleosomal substrates containing hemimethylated DNA but not on those containing unmethylated DNA. Furthermore, the H3K9me3 mark did not provoke Dnmt5 activity on unmethylated substrates (Figure 1G).

### Dnmt5 ATPase Activity Is Sensitive to DNA Substrate Methylation and Is Required for Cytosine Methylation

We next investigated the nature of ATP's requirement in DNA methylation by Dnmt5. When Dnmt5 was incubated with hemimethylated DNA, both  $Mg^{2+}$  and ATP were required for DNA methylation activity (Figure 2A). Dnmt5 was not active in the presence of ADP or any nucleotide analog tested, including non-hydrolyzable ATP analogs such as AMP-PNP (Figure 2B). Furthermore, AMP-PNP added to reactions containing Dnmt5 and ATP was able to compete with ATP and block DNA methylation (Figure S2A). These results suggested that ATP hydrolysis might be required for methyltransferase activity, a potential role for Dnmt5's SNF2 family domain. This domain belongs to a subfamily of RING-finger-containing SNF2 domains, which are present in Rad5, Rad16, HLTF, and SHPRH (Flaus et al., 2006; Huff and Zilberman, 2014).

To test whether Dnmt5 hydrolyzes ATP, we performed an NADH-coupled ATPase assay using full-length Dnmt5. Dnmt5 exhibited a basal ATPase activity of approximately  $1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ , which was stimulated  $\sim 2$ -fold by saturating concentrations of unmethylated dsDNA (Figure 2C). We next tested whether methylated DNA would differentially stimulate ATPase activity. We incubated Dnmt5 with saturating concentrations of 60-bp dsDNA substrates whose three CG sites were uniformly unmethylated, methylated, or symmetrically methylated (Figure 2C). Hemimethylated DNA was most stimulatory ( $\sim 9$ -fold), whereas symmetrically methylated DNA was intermediate ( $\sim 4$ -fold) and unmethylated DNA least stimulatory ( $\sim 2$ -fold). The efficacy

with which unmethylated DNA substrates stimulated ATPase activity did not depend on the presence of the CG motif and varied slightly as DNA length was altered (Figures S2B and S2C). In contrast, the efficacy of hemimethylated substrates did not vary with their number of CG sites or length and was universally greater than that of unmethylated DNA (Figure S2D).

Using the same DNA substrates, we next measured the ATPase kinetic parameters ( $K_M^{\text{app,ATP}}$  and  $k_{\text{cat}}^{\text{ATPase}}$  [ $K_M$ , Michaelis-Menten constant;  $k_{\text{cat}}$ , catalytic rate constant]). The parameters differed as a function of the DNA substrate, with hemimethylated DNA effecting significantly greater  $K_M^{\text{app,ATP}}$  ( $6.2 \mu\text{M}$  versus  $0.9 \mu\text{M}$ ) and  $k_{\text{cat}}^{\text{ATPase}}$  ( $11.1 \text{ min}^{-1}$  versus  $2.4 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ) than did unmethylated DNA (Figure 2C). These findings indicate that the methylation state of the DNA substrate bound to Dnmt5 promotes an altered conformation—and, in turn, activity—of its SNF2 domain's nucleotide-binding pocket.


To confirm the SNF2 domain's role in ATPase activity, we mutated a region expected to play a role in binding ATP: its Walker A motif (K1469A mutation; Figure 2D). In the presence of unmethylated DNA, the K1469A mutation increased  $K_M^{\text{app,ATP}}$  but had no effect on  $k_{\text{cat}}^{\text{ATPase}}$ , as expected (Figure 2E). Surprisingly, the mutation had a different effect on ATPase activity in the setting of hemimethylated DNA, where no tested concentration of ATP could fully rescue Dnmt5(K1469A) ATPase activity (Figure 2F). This result suggests a unique conformation of the SNF2 domain in the presence of hemimethylated DNA, in which the K1469 residue plays an additional role beyond simply ATP binding. We reasoned that this additional role could involve coupling ATP hydrolysis to productive recognition of the hemimethylated substrate by the DNMT domain. Therefore, we tested the methyltransferase activity of Dnmt5(K1469A). Strikingly, Dnmt5(K1469A) showed no detectable methyltransferase activity even at 1 mM ATP, a concentration at which its ATPase rate on hemimethylated substrates is readily detected (Figures 2F and 2G). Together, these results demonstrate that the SNF2 domain is responsive to DNA substrate methylation state, confirm that this domain is required for DNA methylation, and suggest that the K1469A mutation decouples ATPase activity from DNA methyltransferase activity.

### Dnmt5 Binds DNA Substrates with a Preference for Hemimethylation, and Its Affinity Is Modulated by Nucleotide Binding

We next assessed DNA substrate binding by Dnmt5 to determine whether this function is regulated by the ATP hydrolysis

**Figure 2. SNF2-Mediated ATPase Activity by Dnmt5 Is Sensitive to DNA Substrate Methylation and Is Required for DNA Methyltransferase Activity**

- (A) Example DNA methylation kinetics using 30 nM Dnmt5 and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  hemimethylated DNA substrate in the presence or absence of  $Mg^{2+}$  and ATP (1 mM).  
(B) Example DNA methylation kinetics using 30 nM Dnmt5 and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  hemimethylated DNA substrate in the presence of 1 mM nucleotide or analog: ATP, ADP, ADP beryllium fluoride (ADP-BF), AMP-PCP, AMP-PNP, or sodium orthovanadate (NaOV).  
(C) Left: average rates of ATPase activity in the presence of 40 nM Dnmt5 and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  of the DNA substrates pictured. Data are normalized to ATPase rate in the absence of DNA ( $1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). Error represents SD;  $n = 4$ . Right: kinetic parameters of Dnmt5 ATPase activity measured in the presence of saturating amounts of unmethylated or hemimethylated DNA. Error represents SE;  $n = 2-4$ .  
(D) Mutation of a putative ATP-binding residue in Dnmt5.  
(E and F) Initial ATPase rates of 40 nM Dnmt5 or Dnmt5(K1469A) were determined at varying ATP concentrations in the presence of fixed, saturating concentrations of 80 bp unmethylated (E) or 60 bp hemimethylated (F) DNA substrates. Error represents SD (graph) and SE (kinetic parameters);  $n = 4$ .  
(G) Example DNA methylation kinetics using 30 nM Dnmt5 or Dnmt5(K1469A) and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  of the DNA substrates described in (C).  
See also Figure S2.



**Figure 3. Nucleotide Binding Modulates the DNA Affinity of Dnmt5**

(A) Schematic illustrating the Dnmt5(345–747) truncation.

(B and C) EMSA assessing binding of 0–67 nM Dnmt5(345–747) (B) or full-length Dnmt5 (C) to 1 nM labeled unmethylated or hemimethylated 60 bp dsDNA, using the same DNA substrates described in Figure 1B.  $K_D$  values represent average and SD;  $n = 3–5$ .

(D) Screen of nucleotide analogs for effects on Dnmt5 DNA binding. Dnmt5 (10 nM) was incubated with labeled hemimethylated DNA in the presence of nucleotide or analog (1 mM), and fraction probe bound was measured by EMSA. Graph represents average and SD;  $n = 4$ .

(legend continued on next page)

cycle of the SNF2 domain. To establish a baseline for DNMT domain binding to DNA, we purified a maltose-binding protein (MBP)-fused, truncated form of Dnmt5 containing only the DNMT domain (residues 345–747) and assessed its ability to bind DNA using an electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) (Figure 3A). When incubated with Cy5-labeled, 60-bp DNA substrates equivalent to those used in the prior methyltransferase reactions, Dnmt5(345–747) bound unmethylated and hemimethylated DNA with similar affinity (dissociation constant,  $K_D$ , ~7 nM) (Figure 3B). Under the same conditions, DNA binding by an MBP-fused Dnmt5 truncation containing only the N-terminal chromodomain (residues 1–150) was not quantifiable, confirming that the MBP tag was not responsible for DNA binding (Figure S3A). DNA binding could be competed by excess concentrations of unlabeled DNA (Figure S3B). As expected, Dnmt5(345–747), which lacks the SNF2 domain, did not exhibit DNA methyltransferase activity (Figure S3C).

To test whether the Dnmt5 N- and C-terminal regions (peripheral to the DNMT domain) influence DNA binding (Figure 3A), we performed EMSAs using full-length Dnmt5. Unlike Dnmt5(345–747), full-length Dnmt5 bound DNA differentially depending on methylation state (Figure 3C). The  $K_D$  of Dnmt5 for unmethylated and hemimethylated DNA was  $20 \pm 5$  nM and  $<1$  nM, respectively, the latter being an upper bound due to limitations of our assay. Dnmt5 binding to labeled DNA could be competed with excess concentrations of unmethylated or hemimethylated unlabeled DNA, confirming assay specificity (Figure S3D).

A simple interpretation of the aforementioned results is that the N- and/or C-terminal domains present in full-length Dnmt5 alter the DNMT domain's conformation so as to influence its affinity for DNA substrates. We hypothesized that the SNF2 domain plays such a role and, therefore, tested whether manipulation of the SNF2 domain via nucleotides or nucleotide analogs would affect the ability of full-length Dnmt5 to bind hemimethylated DNA. Relative to the apo state, the addition of ADP, ATP, AMP-PCP, and AMP-PNP reduced Dnmt5 affinity for hemimethylated DNA, with AMP-PNP having the largest effect (Figure 3D). We validated these effects by performing quantitative EMSA experiments (Figure 3E). Similar effects of nucleotides and analogs were observed in the context of Dnmt5 binding to unmethylated DNA (Figure S3E). Dissociation constants measured by EMSA in the presence of ATP were concordant with  $K_M^{\text{app,DNA}}$  values for the same DNA substrates as measured by ATPase assay (Figure 3F). Importantly, nucleotides had no effect on DNA binding by Dnmt5(345–747), as expected, because this truncation does not contain the SNF2 domain or its nucleotide-binding site (Figure S3F). These results indicate that the nucleotide-bound state of Dnmt5 influences its DNA-binding ability, demonstrating a coupling between its SNF2 and DNMT domains.

### Dnmt5 ATPase Activity Is Responsive to CG Base Manipulations

The selective responsiveness of Dnmt5 ATPase activity to hemimethylated DNA suggested that ATPase activity is coupled to detection of optimal substrates for the methyltransferase activity of Dnmt5. We therefore sought to more specifically define the DNA features that stimulate ATPase activity, with a focus on the hemimethylated CG site itself.

We generated 60 bp dsDNA substrates that contain a single CG site that was either unmethylated (CG/CG) or hemimethylated (mCG/CG) (Figure 4A). Each base in the mCG/CG motif, except the methylated cytosine, was then individually mutated to thymine (Figure 4B). To reduce the potential effects of mismatched bases, we also created a mutated substrate in which two alterations were made (mCA/TG). Each mutation of the hemimethylated CG motif substantially reduced its ability to stimulate ATPase activity, even with the substrates present at saturating concentrations (Figure 4C). Therefore, unlike unmethylated DNA, which stimulates ATPase activity to the same modest extent in the presence or absence of CG motifs (Figure S2C), hemimethylated DNA requires the intact CG motif for its full effect.


The sensitivity of ATPase activity to the CG motif is consistent with the idea that the SNF2 domain is coupled to hemimethylated CG detection by the DNMT domain, a protein fold able to make multiple contacts to a CG motif and to undergo activating conformational rearrangements when its preferred substrate is present (Matje et al., 2011; 2013; Song et al., 2012). Specifically, the paradigmatic cytosine methyltransferase M.HhaI has been found to follow a precatalytic pathway in which it (1) binds its DNA substrate; (2) destabilizes the target cytosine, causing it to flip out of the DNA helix; and (3) undergoes a conformational rearrangement to close its catalytic loop, creating a “closed” active site capable of methylation (Matje et al., 2011; Roberts and Cheng, 1998; Sankpal and Rao, 2002). We hypothesized that these or analogous DNMT domain conformations in Dnmt5 may be coupled to its ATPase activity. Stabilizing such conformations would therefore be expected to activate the ATPase, bypassing its requirement for a hemimethylated substrate.

First, we tested the effect of SAM on Dnmt5 in the context of unmethylated DNA, since SAM is known to stabilize a flipped-cytosine conformation of M.HhaI bound to its DNA substrate (Klimasauskas et al., 1998). The SAM addition had no effect on the ATPase activity of Dnmt5, however (Figure S4A). We next utilized a more potent approach by manipulating the strength of the hydrogen-bonding potential of the target cytosine. Weakening this interaction by mutating the parental strand guanine is known to increase the methylation activities of M.HhaI and DNMT1, presumably because it decreases the energetic cost of cytosine flipping and accelerates this step (Bashtrykov et al., 2012; Renbaum and Razin, 1995; Smith et al., 1991). This was not the case for

(E) EMSA assessing binding of 0–50 nM full-length Dnmt5 to 1 nM labeled hemimethylated DNA in the presence of nucleotide or analog (1 mM).  $K_D$  values represent average and SD;  $n = 3$ .

(F) Initial ATPase rates of 30 nM Dnmt5 were determined at varying concentrations of unmethylated or hemimethylated DNA substrates in the presence of fixed, saturating concentrations of ATP. Error represents SD (graph) and SE ( $K_M^{\text{app,DNA}}$ );  $n = 3$ .

See also Figure S3.



**Figure 4. Dnmt5 ATPase Activity Is Stimulated by DNA Substrates Predicted to Stabilize Intermediate Steps of the Cytosine Methylation Precatalytic Pathway**

(A) DNA substrates to assess effects of CG site manipulation. Each 60 bp dsDNA substrate contains one CG site that is either unmethylated or hemimethylated.

(B) Schematics of CG site mutant hemimethylated DNA substrates. Red indicates base mutation.

(C) Average rates of ATPase activity in the presence of 40 nM Dnmt5 and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  of the DNA substrates described in (A) and (B). Data are normalized to ATPase rate in the absence of DNA ( $1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). Error represents SD;  $n = 4$ .

(D) Schematics of abasic DNA substrates. Red indicates base mutation. X indicates abasic site.

(E) EMSA assessing binding of full-length Dnmt5 (0–67 nM) to 1 nM labeled unmethylated or abasic site DNA.

(F) Average rates of ATPase activity in the presence of 40 nM Dnmt5 and 5  $\mu\text{M}$  of the DNA substrates described in (A) and (D). Data are normalized to ATPase rate in the absence of DNA ( $1 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ). Error represents SD;  $n = 3$ –4.

(G) Initial ATPase rates of 30 nM Dnmt5 were determined at varying concentrations of DNA substrate (unmethylated, hemimethylated, or abasic site) in the presence of fixed, saturating concentrations of ATP. Error represents SD;  $n = 3$ .

(H) Hypothetical model of ATPase stimulation by an intermediate step in the cytosine methylation precatalytic pathway. The inactive Dnmt5 enzyme ( $E^0$ ) binds DNA (D), leading to conformational changes that include cytosine flipping and activation loop closure. The resulting  $E^a \cdot D$  complex is competent for ATPase activity, resulting in an increased population of  $E^a$ , an active enzyme capable of DNA methylation. Each forward step may be sensitive to the methylation state of the DNA substrate, conferring selectivity for maintenance DNA methylation. ATP-independent resampling may also confer selectivity via mechanisms related to kinetic proofreading. See [Discussion](#) for details.

See also [Figure S4](#).

Dnmt5, as mutation of one or both guanines in the unmethylated CG/CG motif did not increase ATPase activity (Figure S4B) or allow methyltransferase activity (Figure S4C). These results suggest that the base-flipping mechanism used by Dnmt5 may be rather distinct from those of M.HhaI and DNMT1.

Finally, we considered the possibility that our mutational analyses were confounded by the fact that we had manipulated the parental strand guanine, a residue that appeared to be particularly critical for the stimulation of ATPase activity (Figure 4C). Indeed, targeted replacement of the parental strand guanine with an abasic site (in which the base is absent but the phosphate backbone and ribose ring remain) completely abrogated the ability of a hemimethylated substrate to stimulate ATPase activity and DNA methylation (abasic site indicated as “X”; Figures S4C and S4D). Thus, to avoid manipulating the parental strand guanine, we drew from extensive literature demonstrating that replacing the target cytosine itself with an abasic site increases DNMT domain affinity for its substrate while stabilizing the “closed” catalytic loop conformation (Matje et al., 2011, 2013; O’Gara et al., 1998). These findings have been attributed to the fact that absence of the target cytosine obviates the energetic cost of base flipping.

We predicted that such an abasic substrate would bind with increased affinity to Dnmt5 and stabilize its DNMT domain in a “closed” catalytic loop conformation analogous to the intermediate step of the cytosine methylation precatalytic pathway. We generated 60 bp unmethylated dsDNA substrates in which either the Watson or Crick strand target cytosine was replaced by an abasic site (Figure 4D). As assessed by EMSA, the abasic substrate bound full-length Dnmt5 with 5-fold greater affinity than did the unmethylated substrate, consistent with the idea that this substrate engages the DNMT domain (Figure 4E). We next tested the ability of saturating concentrations of abasic DNA substrates to induce SNF2 domain ATPase activity. Remarkably, each abasic substrate, despite lacking a methylation mark, stimulated ATPase activity to the same extent as did the hemimethylated CG substrate (Figure 4F). Finally, we measured  $k_{\text{cat}}$  and  $K_M^{\text{app,DNA}}$  for each DNA substrate using an ATPase assay. The abasic substrate recapitulated the effects of the hemimethylated substrate: decreased  $K_M^{\text{app,DNA}}$  and increased  $k_{\text{cat}}$ , as compared to unmethylated DNA (Figure 4G). These results implicate the DNMT domain and its precatalytic conformational changes as inputs to SNF2-mediated ATPase activity.

## DISCUSSION

Our recent work indicates that Dnmt5 is an exceptionally specific maintenance methyltransferase both *in vitro* and *in vivo*. We therefore biochemically characterized its regulation and found this enzyme to exhibit a novel DNA methylation mechanism in which its methyltransferase activity is coupled to the ATP hydrolysis activity of a SNF2 domain encoded on the same polypeptide. ATPase activity is responsive to hemimethylated CG motifs and potentially regulated by DNMT domain conformational changes during the precatalytic pathway of DNA methylation. In the following text, we discuss the possibility that the coupling of DNMT activity to a seemingly needless expenditure of ATP enables increased Dnmt5 substrate specificity.

## Dnmt5 Is a Cytosine Methyltransferase with High Specificity for Hemimethylated DNA

The present findings extend our prior work demonstrating that Dnmt5 possesses extraordinary specificity for hemimethylated substrates. We detect no Dnmt5 *in vitro* methyltransferase activity on unmethylated CG sites in a variety of substrates, including nucleosomal substrates that mimic the H3K9me3-decorated heterochromatin at the *in vivo* regions of Dnmt5 activity. Using DNA methylation assays under multiple-turnover conditions, we estimate ~1,000-fold as a lower bound of Dnmt5’s preference for hemimethylated DNA, which is probably a substantial underestimate of the true value given that Dnmt5 activity slows over the reaction course (likely owing to ATP depletion and enzyme inhibition by the reaction product SAH). Dnmt5’s specificity does not appear to require processive action, since it is observed using substrates containing only a single CG site.

Importantly, we measured specificity in the context of saturating levels of DNA substrates, and it might be enhanced still further *in vivo* by Dnmt5’s binding affinity preference for hemimethylated DNA. The demonstrated recognition of H3K9 methylation by the Dnmt5 chromodomain could contribute additional specificity by favoring Dnmt5 localization at heterochromatic regions enriched in hemimethylated CG sites, as could the previously demonstrated roles of Uhrf1 and Swi6 in the Dnmt5 methylation system (Catania et al., 2020). Although exact definitions of substrate specificity in DNA methyltransferases are challenging (Jeltsch, 2006), our observations indicate that Dnmt5 exhibits substantially more specificity than does the paradigmatic maintenance DNA methyltransferase DNMT1, which has a 20- to 40-fold preference for hemimethylated DNA *in vitro*. Dnmt5, therefore, appears unusually well equipped to faithfully maintain 5mC marks, in a purely epigenetic fashion, over long timescales (Catania et al., 2020; Jeltsch and Jurkowska, 2014).

## Dnmt5 ATP Hydrolysis Is Stimulated by Hemimethylated Substrates and Is Necessary for Methyltransferase Activity

The Dnmt5 family of DNA methyltransferases is characterized by the presence of a SNF2 helicase-like domain (Iyer et al., 2011; Ponger and Li, 2005), but the role of this domain has not been investigated. Using nucleotide analogs and Dnmt5 mutagenesis, our present results demonstrate that SNF2-mediated ATP hydrolysis by Dnmt5 is strictly required for its DNA methyltransferase activity.

SNF2 homologs have long been implicated in DNA methylation. Lsh and DDM1 are required for DNA methylation in mouse and *Arabidopsis*, respectively (Dennis et al., 2001; Jeddalo et al., 1999; Vongs et al., 1993). The role of these factors appears distinct from that of Dnmt5, however. Lsh and DDM1 are thought to remodel nucleosomes in order to overcome the nucleosome’s inhibitory effect on DNA methylation (Brzeski and Jerzmanowski, 2003; Felle et al., 2011; Ren et al., 2015; Zemach et al., 2013). Indeed, the requirement for DDM1 *in vivo* can be suppressed by additional mutations (such as loss of histone H1) that impede nucleosome compaction (Zemach et al., 2013). In contrast, the Dnmt5 SNF2 domain is absolutely required for DNA methylation, even in non-nucleosomal contexts. Furthermore, Dnmt5 belongs to a subfamily of SNF2 domains (with Rad5, HLTF, and SHPRH)

that has not been associated with nucleosome-remodeling activity (Huff and Zilberman, 2014; Unk et al., 2010), and it encodes alterations of several DNA-binding motifs (e.g., Ib, Ic, IIa, and IVa) that are broadly conserved in bona fide SNF2 family chromatin remodelers (Data S1). What, then, is the purpose of ATP hydrolysis by Dnmt5, an expenditure of energy not fundamentally required for the transfer of a methyl group from SAM to cytosine?

Several lines of evidence suggest that the conformation of Dnmt5's SNF2 ATPase is coupled to the detection of preferred DNA substrates by its DNMT domain. First, the catalytic parameters of SNF2-mediated ATP hydrolysis are significantly different in the presence of different DNA substrates. Specifically, the  $K_M^{\text{app,ATP}}$  and  $k_{\text{cat}}^{\text{ATPase}}$  are higher in the presence of hemimethylated substrate than in the presence of unmethylated substrate. Second, a Walker A site mutation (K1469A) has different effects on SNF2 activity in the presence of hemimethylated versus unmethylated substrates. In the presence of unmethylated DNA, the effect of this mutation can be completely rescued by high concentrations of ATP, consistent with a role for K1469 solely in ATP binding. In contrast, in the presence of hemimethylated DNA, high ATP concentrations do not fully rescue SNF2 ATPase activity, and DNA methyltransferase activity is absent, despite detectable ATPase activity. Therefore, the K1469 residue, uniquely in the setting of hemimethylated substrate, appears to play an additional role, perhaps acting to couple ATP hydrolysis to productive DNA methylation. Third, nucleotide binding by the SNF2 domain impacts the affinity of the DNMT domain for DNA. Fourth, SNF2 ATPase activity can be stimulated by engineered abasic DNA substrates designed to specifically engage the DNMT domain and stabilize its active conformation.

Together, these results highlight an interdomain communication within Dnmt5 that is critically required for DNMT activity. Although structural information will ultimately be required to fully understand the basis of the coupling, a simple interpretation is that protein allostery plays a major role (as opposed to interdomain communication transmitted through conformational change of the DNA substrate itself). This conclusion is supported by our finding that very subtle manipulations of the mCG/CG target site are sufficient to modulate SNF2 ATPase activity throughout its full dynamic range (e.g., Figures 4C and S4D), whereas changes in DNA substrate length, sequence, and CG site number/location have minimal effect. Furthermore, a Dnmt5 fragment consisting of only the SNF2 domain does not exhibit DNA-stimulated ATP hydrolysis, nor does it bind DNA under conditions in which the DNMT domain readily does (Figures S4E–S4G). Another important question for future study is to more precisely define each aspect of DNMT domain conformational change—from cytosine flipping and pre-catalytic rearrangements to methyltransfer and product release—that stimulates (or requires) ATPase activity. Efforts have, thus far, been challenged by the high sensitivity of Dnmt5 to changes in the CG motif: methyltransferase activity is detectable only in the presence of the unaltered mCG/CG sequence (Figure S4C).

### ATP Hydrolysis as a Means for Cytosine Methyltransferase Specificity

Our observations are consistent with a model in which ATPase activity provides an opportunity for Dnmt5 to adopt an active

conformation ( $E^a$  in Figure 4H) that is competent for DNA methylation. Several aspects of this model could contribute to Dnmt5's preference for maintenance DNA methylation. First, Dnmt5 binds substrates with a preference for hemimethylated versus unmethylated DNA. Second, analogous to the behavior of “cognate” substrates in the well-studied M.HhaI system, hemimethylated DNA substrates may more readily enable conformational changes such as target cytosine flipping and DNMT domain activation loop closure, thereby leading to ATPase activity and adoption of the activated enzyme state  $E^a$  (Matje et al., 2013). In support of this idea, we find maximal rates of ATP hydrolysis in the presence of hemimethylated substrates, an effect that can be mimicked by abasic substrates designed to induce activating conformational changes of the DNMT domain. Third, after ATP hydrolysis, additional specificity may be provided by any chemical steps of DNA methylation or product release that themselves are sensitive to DNA substrate methylation state.

An additional potential mechanism of specificity is suggested by our observation that not every ATP hydrolysis event leads to productive DNA methylation. Specifically, we found that the increased ability of hemimethylated substrates to stimulate ATPase activity ( $\sim 4$ -fold  $k_{\text{cat}}^{\text{ATPase}}$  difference versus unmethylated substrates) is not sufficient to explain the difference in DNA methyltransferase activity on these same two substrates ( $>1,000$ -fold). Such a discordance would not be possible if every ATPase hydrolysis event were linked to a productive DNA methylation event. This result, taken together with our finding that AMP-PNP reduces Dnmt5's DNA affinity by  $>100$ -fold, raises the possibility of substrate ejection during the ATP hydrolysis cycle (Figure 4H). In such a model, ATP hydrolysis provides an extra, irreversible step between substrate binding and reaction completion. Dissociation of the enzyme-substrate complex during the hydrolysis cycle, if occurring preferentially for unmethylated substrates, would provide additional substrate specificity, since this discard step is thermodynamically driven out from the productive methylation pathway by virtue of ATP hydrolysis (Burgess and Guthrie, 1993; Hopfield, 1974; Ninio, 1975; Yarus, 1992a, 1992b). Our proposed model thus shares conceptual elements with classical models of kinetic proofreading.

Importantly, formal demonstration of a kinetic proofreading model for Dnmt5 awaits further kinetic studies as well as the development of substantially more sensitive assays that can measure the rate of DNA methylation on “non-cognate” unmethylated DNA substrates. The latter is important for addressing the possibility that a portion of the ATP hydrolysis that we observe in the context of unmethylated DNA is not engaged in proofreading but rather “off-pathway” and fundamentally incapable of promoting DNA methylation (Yarus, 1992a). Despite these caveats, we note that kinetic proofreading principles have been invoked for many other helicase-related enzymes, both inside and outside the SNF2 family (Narlikar, 2010; Staley and Guthrie, 1998).

For instance, the innate immune receptor RIG-I is a DEXD/H family RNA helicase whose specific recognition of blunt-ended 5'ppp dsRNA leads to its oligomerization and triggers the innate immune response (Brisse and Ly, 2019). Just as the Dnmt5 ATPase domain neighbors a DNMT domain with high affinity for a hemimethylated CG motif, the RIG-I ATPase domain

neighbors a “repressor domain” that has high affinity for the 5’ppp RNA end motif. Like we observe for Dnmt5, parts of the RIG-I ATP binding and hydrolysis cycle are associated with reduced affinity for its nucleic acid substrates, providing an opportunity for kinetic proofreading (Devarkar et al., 2018; Lässig et al., 2015; Louber et al., 2015; Rawling et al., 2014). In clear contrast to Dnmt5, however, there appears to be minimal conformational coupling between the neighboring domains in RIG-I. Specifically, RIG-I’s ATPase activity is not selectively responsive to the presence of the 5’ppp motif (Rawling et al., 2014), nor does ATP binding by the helicase domain affect the repressor domain’s affinity for 5’ppp (Devarkar et al., 2018). Thus, whereas the Dnmt5 ATPase acts to regulate a neighboring catalytic domain, ATP hydrolysis by the RIG-I helicase appears important primarily for RNA binding and translocation by the helicase domain itself.

To our knowledge, Dnmt5 represents the first example of a reaction mechanism in which ATP hydrolysis is coupled to cytosine methylation. We find that the principal requirement of the Dnmt5 SNF2 domain is not nucleosome remodeling. Instead, we propose that ATP hydrolysis acts in concert with precatalytic events at the DNMT domain to provide an opportunity for increased substrate specificity. Admittedly, the idea that ATP hydrolysis contributes to DNMT substrate specificity (as opposed to only methyltransferase activity per se) is, at present, challenging to test directly, because of the complete lack of detectable DNMT activity upon ATP withdrawal or K1469A mutation. Surmounting this challenge will likely require the creation of more subtle Dnmt5 mutants based on atomic-resolution structures of Dnmt5 in its various states. Nevertheless, our model may help explain the remarkable ability of *C. neoformans* Dnmt5 to mediate epigenome evolution of million-year timescales in the absence of a *de novo* methyltransferase (Catania et al., 2020).

## STAR★METHODS

Detailed methods are provided in the online version of this paper and include the following:

- KEY RESOURCES TABLE
- RESOURCE AVAILABILITY
  - Lead Contact
  - Materials Availability
  - Data and Code Availability
- EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS
- METHOD DETAILS
  - Protein expression and purification
  - DNA methyltransferase assay
  - Electrophoretic mobility shift assay
  - Generation of nucleosome substrates
  - NADH-coupled ATPase assay
  - Protein domain identification and alignment
- QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2020.04.029>.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank C. Chio, D. Elnatan, K. Kay, L. Pack, J. Reuter, K. Verba, members of the Madhani and Narlikar laboratories for helpful discussions, and N. Nguyen for media preparation. This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (H.D.M. and G.J.N.). H.D.M. is a Chan-Zuckerberg Biohub Investigator.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

P.A.D., C.I.S., G.J.N., and H.D.M. designed the study. P.A.D. and C.I.S. performed recombinant protein expression and purification. P.A.D. performed methyltransferase, ATPase, and EMSA assays. C.I.S. prepared nucleosomal substrates. S.C. generated the *C. neoformans* strain. P.A.D., G.J.N., and H.D.M. wrote the manuscript. All authors contributed to editing the manuscript.

## DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no competing interests.

Received: January 5, 2020

Revised: March 23, 2020

Accepted: March 24, 2020

Published: May 20, 2020

## SUPPORTING CITATIONS

The following references appear in the Supplemental Information: Fairman-Williams et al. (2010); Dürr et al. (2005).

## REFERENCES

- Arand, J., Spieler, D., Karius, T., Branco, M.R., Meilinger, D., Meissner, A., Jenuwein, T., Xu, G., Leonhardt, H., Wolf, V., and Walter, J. (2012). In vivo control of CpG and non-CpG DNA methylation by DNA methyltransferases. *PLoS Genet.* 8, e1002750.
- Bashtrykov, P., Ragozin, S., and Jeltsch, A. (2012). Mechanistic details of the DNA recognition by the Dnmt1 DNA methyltransferase. *FEBS Lett.* 586, 1821–1823.
- Brise, M., and Ly, H. (2019). Comparative Structure and Function Analysis of the RIG-I-Like Receptors: RIG-I and MDA5. *Front. Immunol.* 10, 1586.
- Brzeski, J., and Jerzmanowski, A. (2003). Deficient in DNA methylation 1 (DDM1) defines a novel family of chromatin-remodeling factors. *J. Biol. Chem.* 278, 823–828.
- Burgess, S.M., and Guthrie, C. (1993). Beat the clock: paradigms for NTPases in the maintenance of biological fidelity. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 18, 381–384.
- Canzio, D., Chang, E.Y., Shankar, S., Kuchenbecker, K.M., Simon, M.D., Madhani, H.D., Narlikar, G.J., and Al-Sady, B. (2011). Chromodomain-mediated oligomerization of HP1 suggests a nucleosome-bridging mechanism for heterochromatin assembly. *Mol. Cell* 41, 67–81.
- Catania, S., Dumesic, P.A., Pimentel, H., Nasif, A., Stoddard, C.I., Burke, J.E., Diedrich, J.K., Cooke, S., Shea, T., Gienger, E., et al. (2020). Evolutionary Persistence of DNA Methylation for Millions of Years after Ancient Loss of a *De Novo* Methyltransferase. *Cell* 180, 263–277.e20.
- Dennis, K., Fan, T., Geiman, T., Yan, Q., and Muegge, K. (2001). Lsh, a member of the SNF2 family, is required for genome-wide methylation. *Genes Dev.* 15, 2940–2944.
- Devarkar, S.C., Schweibenz, B., Wang, C., Marcotrigiano, J., and Patel, S.S. (2018). RIG-I Uses an ATPase-Powered Translocation-Throttling Mechanism for Kinetic Proofreading of RNAs and Oligomerization. *Mol. Cell* 72, 355–368.e4.
- Dürr, H., Körner, C., Müller, M., Hickmann, V., and Hopfner, K.-P. (2005). X-ray structures of the *Sulfolobus solfataricus* SWI2/SNF2 ATPase core and its complex with DNA. *Cell* 121, 363–373.

- Fairman-Williams, M.E., Guenther, U.-P., and Jankowsky, E. (2010). SF1 and SF2 helicases: family matters. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* 20, 313–324.
- Felle, M., Hoffmeister, H., Rothhammer, J., Fuchs, A., Exler, J.H., and Längst, G. (2011). Nucleosomes protect DNA from DNA methylation in vivo and in vitro. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 39, 6956–6969.
- Feng, S., Cokus, S.J., Zhang, X., Chen, P.-Y., Bostick, M., Goll, M.G., Hetzel, J., Jain, J., Strauss, S.H., Halpern, M.E., et al. (2010). Conservation and divergence of methylation patterning in plants and animals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 107, 8689–8694.
- Flaus, A., Martin, D.M.A., Barton, G.J., and Owen-Hughes, T. (2006). Identification of multiple distinct Snf2 subfamilies with conserved structural motifs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 34, 2887–2905.
- Holliday, R., and Pugh, J.E. (1975). DNA modification mechanisms and gene activity during development. *Science* 187, 226–232.
- Hopfield, J.J. (1974). Kinetic proofreading: a new mechanism for reducing errors in biosynthetic processes requiring high specificity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 71, 4135–4139.
- Huff, J.T., and Zilberman, D. (2014). Dnmt1-independent CG methylation contributes to nucleosome positioning in diverse eukaryotes. *Cell* 156, 1286–1297.
- Iyer, L.M., Abhiman, S., and Aravind, L. (2011). Natural history of eukaryotic DNA methylation systems. *Prog. Mol. Biol. Transl. Sci.* 101, 25–104.
- Jaenisch, R., and Bird, A. (2003). Epigenetic regulation of gene expression: how the genome integrates intrinsic and environmental signals. *Nat. Genet.* 33 (Suppl.), 245–254.
- Jeddeloh, J.A., Stokes, T.L., and Richards, E.J. (1999). Maintenance of genomic methylation requires a SWI2/SNF2-like protein. *Nat. Genet.* 22, 94–97.
- Jeltsch, A. (2006). On the enzymatic properties of Dnmt1: specificity, processivity, mechanism of linear diffusion and allosteric regulation of the enzyme. *Epigenetics* 1, 63–66.
- Jeltsch, A., and Jurkowska, R.Z. (2014). New concepts in DNA methylation. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 39, 310–318.
- Jeltsch, A., and Jurkowska, R.Z. (2016). Allosteric control of mammalian DNA methyltransferases - a new regulatory paradigm. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 44, 8556–8575.
- Jones, P.A., and Liang, G. (2009). Rethinking how DNA methylation patterns are maintained. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 10, 805–811.
- Klimasauskas, S., Szyperski, T., Serva, S., and Wüthrich, K. (1998). Dynamic modes of the flipped-out cytosine during HhaI methyltransferase-DNA interactions in solution. *EMBO J.* 17, 317–324.
- Lässig, C., Matheisl, S., Sparrer, K.M.J., de Oliveira Mann, C.C., Moldt, M., Patel, J.R., Goldeck, M., Hartmann, G., García-Sastre, A., Hornung, V., et al. (2015). ATP Hydrolysis by the Viral RNA Sensor RIG-I Prevents Unintentional Recognition of self-RNA. *Elife* 4, e10859.
- Law, J.A., and Jacobsen, S.E. (2010). Establishing, maintaining and modifying DNA methylation patterns in plants and animals. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 11, 204–220.
- Li, E., Beard, C., and Jaenisch, R. (1993). Role for DNA methylation in genomic imprinting. *Nature* 366, 362–365.
- Li, M., Hays, F.A., Roe-Zurz, Z., Vuong, L., Kelly, L., Ho, C.-M., Robbins, R.M., Pieper, U., O'Connell, J.D., 3rd, Miercke, L.J.W., et al. (2009). Selecting optimum eukaryotic integral membrane proteins for structure determination by rapid expression and solubilization screening. *J. Mol. Biol.* 385, 820–830.
- Lindsley, J.E., and Wang, J.C. (1993). On the coupling between ATP usage and DNA transport by yeast DNA topoisomerase II. *J. Biol. Chem.* 268, 8096–8104.
- Louber, J., Brunel, J., Uchikawa, E., Cusack, S., and Gerlier, D. (2015). Kinetic Discrimination of Self/Non-Self RNA by the ATPase Activity of RIG-I and MDA5. *BMC Biol.* 13, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-015-0166-9>.
- Matje, D.M., Coughlin, D.F., Connolly, B.A., Dahlquist, F.W., and Reich, N.O. (2011). Determinants of precatalytic conformational transitions in the DNA cytosine methyltransferase M.HhaI. *Biochemistry* 50, 1465–1473.
- Matje, D.M., Zhou, H., Smith, D.A., Neely, R.K., Dryden, D.T.F., Jones, A.C., Dahlquist, F.W., and Reich, N.O. (2013). Enzyme-promoted base flipping controls DNA methylation fidelity. *Biochemistry* 52, 1677–1685.
- Narlikar, G.J. (2010). A proposal for kinetic proof reading by ISWI family chromatin remodeling motors. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* 14, 660–665.
- Ninio, J. (1975). Kinetic amplification of enzyme discrimination. *Biochimie* 57, 587–595.
- O'Gara, M., Horton, J.R., Roberts, R.J., and Cheng, X. (1998). Structures of HhaI methyltransferase complexed with substrates containing mismatches at the target base. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 5, 872–877.
- Pagano, J.M., Clingman, C.C., and Ryder, S.P. (2011). Quantitative approaches to monitor protein-nucleic acid interactions using fluorescent probes. *RNA* 17, 14–20.
- Ponger, L., and Li, W.-H. (2005). Evolutionary diversification of DNA methyltransferases in eukaryotic genomes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 22, 1119–1128.
- Pradhan, S., Bacolla, A., Wells, R.D., and Roberts, R.J. (1999). Recombinant human DNA (cytosine-5) methyltransferase. I. Expression, purification, and comparison of de novo and maintenance methylation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 33002–33010.
- Rawling, D.C., Kohlway, A.S., Luo, D., Ding, S.C., and Pyle, A.M. (2014). The RIG-I ATPase core has evolved a functional requirement for allosteric stabilization by the Pincer domain. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 42, 11601–11611.
- Ren, J., Briones, V., Barbour, S., Yu, W., Han, Y., Terashima, M., and Muegge, K. (2015). The ATP binding site of the chromatin remodeling homolog Lsh is required for nucleosome density and de novo DNA methylation at repeat sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 43, 1444–1455.
- Renbaum, P., and Razin, A. (1995). Interaction of M.SssI and M.HhaI with single-base mismatched oligodeoxynucleotide duplexes. *Gene* 157, 177–179.
- Riggs, A.D. (1975). X inactivation, differentiation, and DNA methylation. *Cytogenet. Cell Genet.* 14, 9–25.
- Riggs, A.D., and Xiong, Z. (2004). Methylation and epigenetic fidelity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 101, 4–5.
- Roberts, R.J., and Cheng, X. (1998). Base flipping. *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* 67, 181–198.
- Sankpal, U.T., and Rao, D.N. (2002). Structure, function, and mechanism of HhaI DNA methyltransferases. *Crit. Rev. Biochem. Mol. Biol.* 37, 167–197.
- Schneider, C.A., Rasband, W.S., and Eliceiri, K.W. (2012). NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. *Nat. Methods* 9, 671–675.
- Schübeler, D. (2015). Function and information content of DNA methylation. *Nature* 517, 321–326.
- Schultz, J., Milpetz, F., Bork, P., and Ponting, C.P. (1998). SMART, a simple modular architecture research tool: identification of signaling domains. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 95, 5857–5864.
- Sievers, F., Wilm, A., Dineen, D., Gibson, T.J., Karplus, K., Li, W., Lopez, R., McWilliam, H., Remmert, M., Söding, J., et al. (2011). Fast, scalable generation of high-quality protein multiple sequence alignments using Clustal Omega. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 7, 539.
- Simon, M.D. (2010). Installation of site-specific methylation into histones using methyl lysine analogs. *Curr. Protoc. Mol. Biol. Chapter 21*. Unit 21.18.1–10. 90, 21.18.1–21.18.10.
- Smith, Z.D., and Meissner, A. (2013). DNA methylation: roles in mammalian development. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 14, 204–220.
- Smith, S.S., Kan, J.L., Baker, D.J., Kaplan, B.E., and Dembek, P. (1991). Recognition of unusual DNA structures by human DNA (cytosine-5)methyltransferase. *J. Mol. Biol.* 217, 39–51.
- Song, J., Teplova, M., Ishibe-Murakami, S., and Patel, D.J. (2012). Structure-based mechanistic insights into DNMT1-mediated maintenance DNA methylation. *Science* 335, 709–712.
- Staley, J.P., and Guthrie, C. (1998). Mechanical devices of the spliceosome: motors, clocks, springs, and things. *Cell* 92, 315–326.
- Suzuki, M.M., and Bird, A. (2008). DNA methylation landscapes: provocative insights from epigenomics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 9, 465–476.

Tollefsbol, T.O., and Hutchison, C.A., 3rd (1997). Control of methylation spreading in synthetic DNA sequences by the murine DNA methyltransferase. *J. Mol. Biol.* **269**, 494–504.

Unk, I., Hajdú, I., Blastyák, A., and Haracska, L. (2010). Role of yeast Rad5 and its human orthologs, HLTf and SHPRH in DNA damage tolerance. *DNA Repair (Amst.)* **9**, 257–267.

Velasco, G., Hubé, F., Rollin, J., Neuillet, D., Philippe, C., Bouzinba-Segard, H., Galvani, A., Viegas-Péquignot, E., and Francastel, C. (2010). Dnmt3b recruitment through E2F6 transcriptional repressor mediates germ-line gene silencing in murine somatic tissues. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 9281–9286.

Vongs, A., Kakutani, T., Martienssen, R.A., and Richards, E.J. (1993). *Arabidopsis thaliana* DNA methylation mutants. *Science* **260**, 1926–1928.

Yarus, M. (1992a). Proofreading, NTPases and translation: constraints on accurate biochemistry. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **17**, 130–133.

Yarus, M. (1992b). Proofreading, NTPases and translation: successful increase in specificity. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **17**, 171–174.

Zemach, A., McDaniel, I.E., Silva, P., and Zilberman, D. (2010). Genome-wide evolutionary analysis of eukaryotic DNA methylation. *Science* **328**, 916–919.

Zemach, A., Kim, M.Y., Hsieh, P.-H., Coleman-Derr, D., Eshed-Williams, L., Thao, K., Harmer, S.L., and Zilberman, D. (2013). The *Arabidopsis* nucleosome remodeler DDM1 allows DNA methyltransferases to access H1-containing heterochromatin. *Cell* **153**, 193–205.

## STAR★METHODS

## KEY RESOURCES TABLE

| REAGENT or RESOURCE                                                                               | SOURCE                  | IDENTIFIER       |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Bacterial and Virus Strains                                                                       |                         |                  |
| <i>E. coli</i> BL21 (DE3) pLysS                                                                   | Promega                 | Cat#L1195        |
| Chemicals, Peptides, and Recombinant Proteins                                                     |                         |                  |
| 3xFLAG peptide                                                                                    | Millipore-Sigma         | Cat#F4799        |
| H3K9me0 peptide (ARTKQTARKSTGGKA)                                                                 | Peptide 2.0             | N/A              |
| H3K9me3 peptide (ARTKQTARKme3STGGKA)                                                              | Peptide 2.0             | N/A              |
| H3K9me0 nucleosome (unmethylated DNA)                                                             | This study              | N/A              |
| H3K9me0 nucleosome (hemimethylated DNA)                                                           | This study              | N/A              |
| H3K9me3 nucleosome (unmethylated DNA)                                                             | This study              | N/A              |
| H3K9me3 nucleosome (hemimethylated DNA)                                                           | This study              | N/A              |
| (2-bromoethyl)-trimethylammonium bromide                                                          | Aldrich                 | Cat#117196       |
| S-[methyl- <sup>3</sup> H]-adenosyl-L-methionine                                                  | Perkin Elmer            | Cat#NET155H250UC |
| Experimental Models: Organisms/Strains                                                            |                         |                  |
| <i>C. neoformans</i> NeoR-pGAL7-2xFLAG-Dnmt5                                                      | Catania et al., 2020    | CM1844           |
| <i>S. cerevisiae</i> JEL1 ( $\alpha$ leu2 trip1 ura3-52 prb1-1122 pep4 $\Delta$ his3::PGAL1-GAL4) | Lindsley and Wang, 1993 | N/A              |
| Oligonucleotides                                                                                  |                         |                  |
| DNA substrates                                                                                    | This paper              | Table S1         |
| Recombinant DNA                                                                                   |                         |                  |
| 83v-Dnmt5-10xHis                                                                                  | Catania et al., 2020    | BHM2244          |
| 83v-Dnmt5(K1469A)-10xHis                                                                          | This study              | BHM2251          |
| pMAL-Dnmt5(345-747)                                                                               | This study              | BHM2250          |
| pMAL-Dnmt5(1400-2377)                                                                             | This study              | BHM2290          |
| pMAL-Dnmt5(1-150-W87A,Y90A)                                                                       | Catania et al., 2020    | BHM2192          |
| Pet3a-H2A ( <i>Xenopus laevis</i> )                                                               | Canzio et al., 2011     | N/A              |
| Pet3a-H2B ( <i>Xenopus laevis</i> )                                                               | Canzio et al., 2011     | N/A              |
| Pet3a-H3 ( <i>Xenopus laevis</i> )                                                                | Canzio et al., 2011     | N/A              |
| Pet3a-H3-K9C ( <i>Xenopus laevis</i> )                                                            | Canzio et al., 2011     | N/A              |
| Pet3a-H4 ( <i>Xenopus laevis</i> )                                                                | Canzio et al., 2011     | N/A              |
| Software and Algorithms                                                                           |                         |                  |
| Prism 6                                                                                           | Graphpad                | N/A              |

## RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

## Lead Contact

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Hiten D. Madhani ([hitenmadhani@gmail.com](mailto:hitenmadhani@gmail.com)).

## Materials Availability

All reagents generated in this study are available without restriction.

**Data and Code Availability**

No large-scale data or code was generated for this study.

**EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS**

Full-length Dnmt5 protein was purified from its host organism (*C. neoformans* strain H99) or after recombinant expression in *S. cerevisiae* strain JEL1. Fragments encoding the Dnmt5 DNA methyltransferase domain (345–747) or SNF2 domain (1400–2377) was expressed and purified from *E. coli* strain BL21(DE3).

**METHOD DETAILS****Protein expression and purification**

Protein constructs were purified from *E. coli*, *C. neoformans*, or *S. cerevisiae*. For the former, a codon-optimized DNA sequence encoding the DNA methyltransferase domain of *C. neoformans* Dnmt5 (residues 345–747) was cloned into the pMAL vector. The *E. coli* strain BL21(DE3) was transformed, grown to  $OD_{600} = 0.8$  in 2x YT medium, then induced with 1 mM IPTG overnight at 18°C. Recombinant MBP-Dnmt5(345–747)-6xHis was purified using Ni-NTA agarose resin (QIAGEN) and measured by  $A_{280}$  ( $\epsilon = 139,790 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$ ). Recombinant MBP-Dnmt5(1400–2377)-6xHis was expressed and purified as above, and measured by  $A_{280}$  ( $\epsilon = 170,830 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$ ).

Full-length Dnmt5 was purified from *C. neoformans* using a strain in which the endogenous *DNMT5* gene was tagged (2xFLAG) and its promoter replaced by a galactose-inducible promoter (pGAL7) (Catania et al., 2020). This strain was grown at 30°C to  $OD_{600} = 2.0$  in 4 L YPAG medium (1% yeast extract, 2% Bacto-peptone, 2% galactose, 0.015% L-tryptophan, 0.004% adenine), at which point the cells were harvested, resuspended in TAP buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH7.9, 0.1 mM EDTA, 0.5 mM EGTA, 2 mM  $MgCl_2$ , 20% glycerol, 0.1% Tween-20, 300 mM KCl, 1 mM DTT, 1x EDTA-free Complete protease inhibitor (CPI; Roche)), snap frozen, then lysed using a coffee grinder (3 min) and mortar and pestle (30 min). Lysate was resuspended in TAP buffer and centrifuged at  $27,000 \times g$  for 40 min at 4°C, after which it was incubated in batch format with anti-FLAG M2 affinity resin (Sigma) for 4 hr. The resin was washed three times with TAP buffer totaling 1 hr. Tagged protein was eluted by three washes at 4°C in FLAG elution buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH7.9, 2 mM  $MgCl_2$ , 20% glycerol, 300 mM KCl, 1 mM DTT, 1x CPI, 0.4 mg/ml 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma)) totaling 1 hr. The eluted protein was dialyzed against storage buffer (50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.9, 150 mM KCl, 10% glycerol, 2 mM  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol) and then concentrated in a 100k MWCO centrifugal filter (Amicon). Protein concentration was determined by  $A_{280}$  ( $\epsilon = 308,450 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$ ).

For expression in *S. cerevisiae*, full-length *C. neoformans* cDNA encoding Dnmt5-10xHis was cloned into the 83v vector (Li et al., 2009), and used to transform the *S. cerevisiae* strain JEL1 (Lindsley and Wang, 1993). Starter cultures were grown overnight in SC -his medium with 2% glucose, then used to inoculate 2 L cultures of YPGL medium (1x YEP, 1.7% lactic acid, 3% glycerol, 0.12% glucose, 0.15 mM adenine) to a starting  $OD_{600}$  of 0.03. After growth at 30°C to an  $OD_{600}$  of 1.0, expression was induced by addition of 2% galactose. After 6 hr of continued growth at 30°C, cells were harvested, washed once in 1x TBS (50 mM Tris-Cl pH 7.6, 150 mM NaCl), and snap frozen. Frozen cells were lysed in a ball mill (6x 3 min at 15 Hz), resuspended in Ni-NTA lysis buffer (50 mM  $NaH_2PO_4$  pH 8, 300 mM NaCl, 10% glycerol, 10 mM imidazole, 2 mM  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol, 0.02% NP40, 1x CPI), and centrifuged  $20,000 \times g$  for 30 min at 4°C. Lysate was bound to Ni-NTA resin in batch format for 2 hr at 4°C. The resin was washed in column format using 5 bed volumes Ni-NTA buffer followed by 10 bed volumes Ni-NTA wash buffer (same as Ni-NTA lysis buffer except 20 mM imidazole). Bound protein was eluted with 4 bed volumes Ni-NTA elution buffer (same as Ni-NTA lysis buffer except 300 mM imidazole and no NP40). Eluted protein was dialyzed against storage buffer and applied to a HiTrap Q HP anion exchange column (GE Life sciences) pre-equilibrated in buffer A (50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.9, 150 mM KCl, 10% glycerol, 2 mM  $\beta$ -mercaptoethanol). Fractions were collected across a 150–1000 mM KCl gradient, and those containing Dnmt5 were pooled, concentrated, dialyzed against storage buffer, and frozen. Protein concentration was determined by  $A_{280}$  ( $\epsilon = 308,450 \text{ cm}^{-1} \text{ M}^{-1}$ ).

**DNA methyltransferase assay**

DNA oligonucleotide substrates were synthesized by IDT (Coralville, IA) (Table S1). In most cases, DNA methylation was performed in multiple turnover conditions by incubating 30 nM recombinant Dnmt5 in DNMT reaction buffer (50 mM Tris pH 8, 25 mM NaCl, 10% glycerol, and 2 mM DTT) with 5  $\mu$ M DNA substrate. When indicated, ATP and  $MgCl_2$  were added at 1 mM, and histone tail peptides were added at 5  $\mu$ M. Reactions were initiated at 23°C by addition of 4  $\mu$ M  $^3H$ -SAM (Perkin Elmer). Aliquots were removed at indicated time points and quenched in a solution of 10 mM SAM in 10 mM  $H_2SO_4$ . The quenched solution was pipetted onto DE81 filter paper (Whatman) and air-dried for 15 min. Filter papers were then washed three times in 200 mM ammonium bicarbonate (5 min each), once with water (5 min), then rinsed twice in ethanol and dried for 20 min. Filters were added to scintillation fluid (Bio-Safe NA, Research Products International Corp.) and  $^3H$  was detected in an LS 6500 scintillation counter (Perkin Elmer).

**Electrophoretic mobility shift assay**

DNA oligonucleotides labeled with 5' Cy5 were synthesized by IDT (Coralville, IA) (Table S1) and annealed in annealing buffer (20 mM Tris pH 8, 1 mM EDTA, 50 mM NaCl), after which they were purified by polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. Recombinant Dnmt5 was incubated with labeled DNA probe (1–3 nM in a solution of 16 mM HEPES-KOH pH7.9, 8% glycerol, 40 mM KCl, 0.02% NP40, 1.6 mM

DTT) for 20 min at 23°C, and then resolved in a polyacrylamide gel (4.5% acrylamide:bis 29:1 (Bio-Rad), 1% glycerol, 1x TBE) at 4°C. Preparations of Dnmt5 from *C. neoformans* and *S. cerevisiae* were independently assessed to confirm similar substrate binding preferences. Reported  $K_D$  values were determined using Dnmt5 protein expressed from *C. neoformans*. To assess the effects of nucleotide analogs on DNA binding, the analogs were mixed with equal concentration  $MgCl_2$  and then added to DNA binding reactions at a final concentration of 1 mM. Gels were imaged using a Typhoon 9400 Imager (Amersham) and densitometry was performed using ImageJ (Schneider et al., 2012).

### Generation of nucleosome substrates

DNA for nucleosome substrates was generated by PCR and corresponded to the Widom 601 nucleosome positioning sequence (147 bp) flanked on either side by a 40 bp linker sequence. Linkers each contained two CG sites that were either hemimethylated or unmethylated as dictated by the use of PCR primers containing 5mC (Table S1); the Widom 601 sequence was entirely unmethylated. Amplified DNA was ethanol precipitated and resolved in a 5% acrylamide gel. A gel slice containing the product was cut out, sheared by passing through a syringe, then incubated in TE buffer overnight at 23°C with rocking to extract DNA; soluble DNA was purified by ethanol precipitation.

Mononucleosomes were assembled using purified reconstituted histone octamer generated with recombinant bacterially expressed histones from *Xenopus laevis*. For H3K9me3 nucleosomes, H3 histones were modified using methyl lysine analog (MLA) technology before reconstitution into octamer (Simon, 2010). Optimal ratios of DNA:octamer:dimer for nucleosome assembly were determined empirically by varying octamer:dimer in small-scale assembly reactions. Nucleosomes were reconstituted by salt dialysis over 36–48 hours, purified over 10%–30% glycerol gradients using ultracentrifugation, and concentrated before use.

### NADH-coupled ATPase assay

ATPase activity was assessed by incubating recombinant Dnmt5 (30–60 nM) in ATPase reaction buffer (50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.9, 75 mM KCl, 5% glycerol, 2 mM DTT, 2 mM phosphoenolpyruvate, 0.18 mM NADH, 0.5 mM ATP, 5 mM  $MgCl_2$ , 10 U/ml pyruvate kinase (Sigma), and 10 U/ml lactate dehydrogenase (EMD Millipore)). DNA substrates were added typically at 5  $\mu$ M in 80  $\mu$ L reactions in 384 well non-stick clear bottom plates (Corning 3655). Preparations of Dnmt5 from *C. neoformans* and *S. cerevisiae* were independently assessed to confirm similar ATPase properties. Reactions were monitored in a Spectramax M5e plate reader (Molecular Devices) for absorbance at 340 nm and 420 nm over 30 min at 23°C. To assess rate, the difference between A340 and A420 was plotted versus time.

### Protein domain identification and alignment

Identification of the Dnmt5 gene in *C. neoformans* was based on annotations of the *var. grubii* H99 genome by the Broad Institute (Cambridge, MA). Dnmt5 protein domains were identified using SMART (Schultz et al., 1998), and its primary sequence was compared to related proteins using Clustal Omega (Sievers et al., 2011) (Data S1).

## QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

DNA methylation assays were generally performed in multiple turnover conditions, with background signal determined using reactions lacking Dnmt5 enzyme. Owing to noisiness at near-background signal levels, a reaction was considered to yield measurable signal only when its signal was greater than 2-fold above background cpm at every time point. Serial dilution experiments verified that  $^3H$  detection was linear to the background signal level. Background signal was typically 50–100 cpm, whereas signal for productive reactions ranged from  $\sim$ 1,000 to  $\sim$ 100,000. For productive reactions, rates were calculated over the first 15–20 min where reaction progress was linear and  $< 10\%$  of available hemimethylated sites had been acted upon. These rate values were divided by Dnmt5 concentration to obtain  $k_{obs}$ . Separate experiments with varying DNA concentration were performed to confirm that each DNA substrate was present at saturating concentration. Linear fit of rate data was performed using Prism 6 (Graphpad Software).

ATPase assays were generally performed under multiple turnover conditions, and the initial linear portion of the curve was fit to determine reaction rate using Prism 6 (GraphPad Software). Separate experiments with varying DNA concentration were performed to confirm that each DNA substrate was present at saturating concentration. For measurement of  $K_m^{app,ATP}$  and  $K_m^{app,DNA}$ , ATP or DNA concentration was varied in the presence of saturating amounts of DNA or ATP, respectively, and plots of rate versus concentration were fitted to the Michaelis-Menten equation using Prism 6 (Graphpad Software).

For EMSA DNA-binding assays, dissociation constants were determined from plots of fraction probe bound versus Dnmt5 concentration by fitting the equation

$$Y = b + (m - b) * \frac{R + X + Kd - \sqrt{(R + X + Kd)^2 - (4 * R * X)}}{2R}$$

using Prism 6 (GraphPad Software) (Pagano et al., 2011). In this equation,  $b$  represents base signal (0, for 0% probe bound),  $m$  represents maximum signal (100, for 100% probe bound),  $R$  represents labeled probe concentration,  $X$  represents protein concentration, and  $Y$  represents percent probe bound, which was determined by quantifying the level of unbound probe.

In all experiments, N value represents number of independently prepared reactions. N value for each experiment and error bar definitions are indicated in each Figure legend. ATPase and methyltransferase kinetic parameters were confirmed across multiple independent purified protein preparations.