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A robust analytical workflow for single-particle trajectories is presented. β-polymer modeling predicts chromatin expansion at double-strand breaks. Altered nucleosome interaction drives break extrusion from a chromatin domain. Effects of local chromatin are distinct from actin-driven nuclear oscillation.
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SUMMARY
Chromatin moves with subdiffusive and spatially constrained dynamics within the cell nucleus. Here, we use single-locus tracking by time-lapse fluorescence microscopy to uncover information regarding the forces that influence chromatin movement following the induction of a persistent DNA double-strand break (DSB). Using improved time-lapse imaging regimens, we monitor trajectories of tagged DNA loci at a high temporal resolution, which allows us to extract biophysical parameters through robust statistical analysis. Polymer modeling based on these parameters predicts chromatin domain expansion near a DSB and damage extrusion from the domain. Both phenomena are confirmed by live imaging in budding yeast. Calculation of the anomalous exponent of locus movement allows us to differentiate forces imposed on the nucleus through the actin cytoskeleton from those that arise from INO80 remodeler-dependent changes in nucleosome organization. Our analytical approach can be applied to high-density single-locus trajectories obtained in any cell type.

INTRODUCTION
Ever since the first live imaging of chromatin dynamics by single-particle tracking (Marshall et al., 1997), much effort has been invested into understanding the regulation and biological function of DNA movement. Unlike the directional separation of sister chromatids in mitosis, the interphase movement of chromatin is stochastic, yet it is modulated by ATP levels, suggesting that DNA dynamics are influenced by enzymatic events (Heun et al., 2001; Levi et al., 2005; Marshall et al., 1997; Seeber et al., 2013). Indeed, the majority of chromatin movement monitored in eukaryotic nuclei is subdiffusive (Albert et al., 2013; Amitai et al., 2015; Dion and Gasser, 2013; Weber et al., 2012), being restricted to volumes significantly smaller than that of the nucleus, arguing that internal forces constrain chromatin movement (Gartenberg et al., 2004; Bystricky, 2015; Chubb et al., 2002; Marshall, 2002). In budding yeast, such constraint has been altered by either the ablation of sister chromatid cohesion (Dion et al., 2013), the targeting of nucleosome remodelers (Neumann et al., 2012), or the elimination of anchorage sites that tether yeast chromosomes to nuclear substructures, such as the inner nuclear membrane protein Esc1 (Gartenberg et al., 2004), nuclear pores (Horigome et al., 2014), or the spindle pole body (Strecker et al., 2016; Verdaasdonk et al., 2013).

Chromatin movement is thought to facilitate gene induction by allowing distant enhancers and promoters to interact (Amitai and Holcman, 2013a; Beil and Felsenfeld, 1999; Dillon et al., 1997; Ptashne, 1986) or to facilitate the long-range search for sequence homology during DNA double-strand break repair (Agmon et al., 2013; Dion and Gasser, 2013; Miné-Hattab and Rothenstein, 2012). More generally, the accessibility of DNA sequence for recognition by either proteins or nucleic acid may benefit from chromatin mobility. As an example, a fluorescently tagged locus with a persistent double-strand break (DSB) in budding yeast, shows greater movement than the same locus undamaged (Dion et al., 2012; Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012). The drivers of this increased mobility and their impact on repair are debated (Dion et al., 2012; Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012; Strecker et al., 2016; Verdaasdonk et al., 2013), yet the fact that increased movement depends on the type of damage incurred (Dion et al., 2012, 2013) and on a kinase-mediated DNA damage checkpoint response (Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012; Seeber et al., 2013; Strecker et al., 2016) argues for physiological relevance.

In mammals as well, the chromatin context of a DSB and the preference of the locus for repair by end joining or ectopic recombination influence whether or not a locus will show enhanced movement following damage induction (Aten et al., 2004; Cho et al., 2014; Jakob et al., 2009; Krawczyk et al., 2012; Kruhlak et al., 2006; Lottersberger et al., 2015; Nelms et al., 1998; Roukos et al., 2013; Soutoglou et al., 2007; Tsouroula et al., 2016).
Radiation-induced foci and uncapped telomeres both show enhanced movement in mammalian cells (Dimitrova et al., 2008; Lottersberger et al., 2015), and in both mammals and flies it was shown that DSBs that occur in heterochromatin must move out of the heterochromatic compartment in order to be repaired by recombination (Chiolo et al., 2011; Jakob et al., 2011; Ryu et al., 2015; Tsouroula et al., 2016). What changes occur on a biophysical level to allow such movements are unclear, but possible triggers could be changes in local chromatin structure, the release of constraints imposed by non-chromatin anchorage sites, or active, motor-driven transport.

To date, the analysis applied to single-particle trajectories (SPTs) of tagged chromatin loci has been inadequate to distinguish between these possibilities. Here, we present a framework for statistical analysis of SPTs over time that allows us to extract a more comprehensive set of biophysical parameters and relate them to polymer models (Amitai and Holcman, 2013b; Amitai et al., 2015). We then use simulations based on the β-polymer model to predict chromatin behavior. Our experimental system is the well-characterized HO endonuclease-induced DSB in budding yeast (Dion et al., 2012; Horigome et al., 2014; Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012; Nagai et al., 2008), which allows us to monitor locus dynamics before and after DSB induction. Polymer modeling predicts that chromatin around a break will expand and that this will drive extrusion of the damage from its local chromatin domain. We confirm chromatin expansion at an induced DSB using quantitative, super-resolution structured illumination microscopy (SIM). Moreover, we demonstrate a significant increase in the anomalous exponent of movement, α, at a DSB in the rDNA, as it shifts from the nucleolus for recombination-mediated repair (Torres-Rosell et al., 2007).

Our approach consists of two parts. First, we extract from single-locus trajectories an ensemble of four statistical parameters derived from polymer model analysis. These parameters provide independent information about the nature of locus movement, allowing us to characterize the origin of the forces acting on chromatin. We then construct a polymer model and simulate chromatin behavior, using empirically extracted biophysical parameters. This analytical approach and predictive modeling enable a biophysical definition of chromatin dynamics and provide a paradigm for the analysis of chromatin movement in other species. In yeast, we show that changes in local chromatin structure at a break can lead to altered dynamics that can affect longer-range aspects of chromatin organization.

RESULTS

We use a well-characterized budding yeast strain that carries a galactose-inducible HO gene, which encodes the Homothallic switching endonuclease that, in turn, introduces a double-strand break specifically and uniquely at the MAT locus on Chr III (Table S1). Cleavage efficiency is measured for each experiment by qPCR (Table S2). We visualize the locus by tracking a fluorescent LacI-GFP protein bound to an array of lac operators (lacO) that is inserted near the cut site (Figure 1A). In addition, we have tagged the nuclear pores with a separate red fluorochrome (Nup49-Ruby2), which is both brighter than traditional fluorophores and more photostable (Lee et al., 2013). This allows us to use less light to stimulate the fluorochrome, minimizing light-induced damage despite longer acquisition times. Our imaging regimens do not activate the DNA damage response and cells continue to divide after light exposure (Figure S1). The labeling of the nuclear perimeter with Nup49-Ruby2 allows us to align acquired trajectories with respect to the nuclear center, to correct for translational movement.

Previous studies of chromatin dynamics performed SPTs with imaging intervals of 1.5 s for 200 frames (Dion et al., 2012; Neumann et al., 2012; Strecker et al., 2016), 10 s for 80 frames (Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012), 30 s for 20 frames (Verdaasdonk et al., 2013), 100 ms for 300 frames (Spichal et al., 2016), and 15~400 ms for 300 frames (Hajjoul et al., 2013). Without sufficient time points, statistically significant information cannot always be extracted from SPTs. In addition, chromatin motion may show different properties when imaged at different timescales (Amitai et al., 2015; Hajjoul et al., 2013; Levi et al., 2005). We addressed these caveats by acquiring 3D images at two timescales and generating more frames than had previously been published. Namely, 750 or 500 3D stacks of images were obtained for each time-lapse movie at Δt = 80 ms (10 ms per z-slice × 8) or Δt = 300 ms (30 ms per z-slice × 8), respectively (Figure 1A). By selecting a small cropped region on the EM-CCD chip and synchronizing the Piezo z-stage, we could stream acquisitions just above the camera chip readout rate (~9 ms). We simultaneously captured the two fluorophores, i.e., the LacI-GFP at MAT and the perinuclear Nup49-Ruby2, and by coupling a EM-CCD camera with 3D deconvolution by Huygens Professional, we could use very-low-light conditions over extended periods of capture. It is important to note that DNA shows significantly less movement in S-phase yeast cells than in G1-phase cells (Dion et al., 2013; Heun et al., 2001); thus, reliable data cannot be extracted from tracking a field of asynchronous yeast cells. Single cells must be selected and the data triaged after determining the cell-cycle stage of each imaged cell. In this study, we selected only small budded S-phase cells for spot tracking.

To extract information from these SPTs we introduce four statistical quantities that can be computed from the data (numerical code to compute the four parameters is accessible at http://biowetmetrics.org/ in the “Nuclear Organization section”). For clarity, and to make this method accessible to a general audience, the majority of the equations defining these parameters are in the Supplemental Information. Their extraction is key to our analysis, because these parameters provide independent, complementary information on first- and second-moment statistics. Each has been studied separately elsewhere and are described below.

1. The length of constraint L_C is defined as the SD of the locus position with respect to its mean averaged over time. This parameter provides estimation for the apparent radius of the volume explored by a finite trajectory. For a trajectory containing N_p points, where R_p(kΔt) is the position of a locus at a time t, L_C is obtained from the empirical estimation:

\[ L_C = \sqrt{\text{Var}(R_p)} = \frac{1}{N_p} \sum_{k=1}^{N_p} (R_p(k\Delta t) - \langle R_p \rangle)^2. \]  

(Equation 1)
It characterizes the confinement of a locus, which in other studies has been reported as the radius of confinement ($R_{\text{conf}}$—not to be confused with $R_c$). The $R_{\text{conf}}$ is computed from the asymptotic plateau of a mean square displacement (MSD) curves and is therefore limited to trajectories that plateau. This is strongly influenced by the length of image acquisition. The advantage of computing $L_C$ is that it gives a robust estimate of the volume $V = 4/3 \pi L_C^3$ occupied by the trajectory and can be used on any kind of trajectory, as it does not require a plateau (see Supplemental Information).

2. The anomalous exponent $\alpha$ is computed from the auto-correlation (AC, Supplemental Information Equation 11) function behavior for small increments.

Figure 1. Extraction of Biophysical Parameters of DSB Dynamics Using Two Imaging Regimens

(A) Schematics of the experimental system and description of extracted biophysical parameters. See text and Supplemental Information for definition of length of constraint ($L_C$), effective spring coefficient ($k_c$), the anomalous exponent $\alpha$ reflecting an auto-correlation function, and the $D_c$ (diffusion coefficient).

(B) Upper-left quadrant: MAT locus trajectories during 60 s ($\Delta t = 80$ ms). Other quadrants contain the extracted parameters $L_C$, $k_c$, and $\alpha$ of cut (red) and uncut (blue) MAT loci. Above the panel, the p value of a Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test is indicated. White bar, distribution mean. Strains used are GA-8862/8863 (Table S1).

(C) As in (B) but for $\Delta t = 300$ ms during 120 s. For extracted parameters, see Table 1 and Figure S2. Cut efficiencies and nuclei scored are in Table S2.

(D) Monitoring movement at different timescales corresponds to studying the polymer on different scales. The time resolution determines the scale of chromatin dynamics monitored; at a short time resolution (80 ms, pink circle), we observed a smaller element of the chromatin movement than with 300 ms resolution (green circle). Panels present parameters $L_C$, $k_c$, and $\alpha$ from 80- and 300-ms imaging regimens for an intact locus (see Figures S1 and S2).
Table 1. Biophysical Parameters Extracted from SPTs before and after DSB Induction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Uncut Locus</th>
<th>Cut Locus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Δt = 80 ms</td>
<td>Lc</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.03 μm</td>
<td>0.23 ± 0.03 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of constraint</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.14</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomalous exponent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective spring coefficient</td>
<td>kc</td>
<td>139 ± 63 kBT/μm²</td>
<td>41 ± 11 kBT/μm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent diffusion constant</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>14.3 ± 7.5 × 10⁻⁸ μm²/s</td>
<td>27.8 ± 10.8 × 10⁻⁸ μm²/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δt = 300 ms</td>
<td>Lc</td>
<td>0.16 ± 0.04 μm</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.05 μm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of constraint</td>
<td>α</td>
<td>0.66 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anomalous exponent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective spring coefficient</td>
<td>kc</td>
<td>89 ± 40 kBT/μm²</td>
<td>54 ± 22 kBT/μm²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparent diffusion constant</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.1 × 10⁻⁸ μm²/s</td>
<td>3.9 ± 1.6 × 10⁻⁸ μm²/s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yeast strains, conditions of imaging, and cut induction are as in Figures 1B and 1C.

\( C(t) = \langle (R_c(t+\tau) - R_c(\tau))^2 \rangle = t^\alpha \), It indicates the nature of the locus motion; i.e., \( \alpha = 1 \) describes normal diffusion, while \( \alpha < 1 \) is subdiffusive (constrained) and \( \alpha > 1 \) is superdiffusive (directed) movement (Kepten et al., 2013; Dion and Gasser, 2013). In practice, we estimated \( \alpha \) by fitting the first six points of the AC function of an SPT by a power law \( t^\alpha \), as described in the Supplemental Information. Every time point affects the initial slope of the AC function (or the MSD); thus, movies with more time points will ultimately provide the more accurate approximation of \( \alpha \), and a more robust representation of the data.

3. The effective spring coefficient \( k_c \). An external force acting on a chromatin locus can be modeled as a spring force applied on a single monomer belonging to a polymer. This force affects the entire polymer motion and can be recovered from the first-order moment statistics of single-locus trajectories. The spring force acting at position \( x_n \) and measured at position \( x_m \) is represented by \( F = -k_c \cdot (x_m - x_n) \), and the spring constant \( k_c \) allows us to estimate the effect of local tethering interactions around the locus of interest (Amitai et al., 2015) (see Supplemental Information, Equation 17). This tethering can arise from interactions of the locus with other chromosomes or nuclear substructures, such as the nucleolus or nuclear envelope. While these interactions cannot be measured directly they can be inferred from SPTs.

4. The effective diffusion coefficient \( D_c \) reflects the second-order statistical properties of a trajectory. This diffusion coefficient accounts for local crowding that may vary along the trajectory. The estimation procedure is described in the Supplemental Information.

These four parameters are complementary (monitoring first- and second-order moment statistics) and provide an advantage over those extracted previously, which were generally limited to determination of the radius of confinement \( R_{conL} \) and/or the diffusion coefficient. We use them to characterize the underlying motion of the monitored locus. In summary, the confinement of a locus is measured by \( L_c \), its velocity is \( D_c \), forces acting on a locus is given by \( k_c \), and, importantly, the nature of the motion is described by \( \alpha \).

**Induction of a DSB Alters the Biophysical Parameters of a Chromatin Locus**

Consistent with previous results that monitored the dynamics of induced DSBs in yeast (Dion et al., 2012; Miné-Hattab and Rothstein, 2012), we find that \( L_c \) increases significantly after break induction in both timescales from \( L_{uncut \ 80ms} = 0.13 ± 0.03 \ μm \) to \( L_{cut \ 80ms} = 0.23 ± 0.03 \ μm \) and \( L_{uncut \ 300ms} = 0.16 ± 0.04 \ μm \) to \( L_{cut \ 300ms} = 0.21 ± 0.05 \ μm \) (Figures 1B and 1C, summarized in Table 1). Comparing the \( L_c \) values for unbroken loci tracked at \( Δt = 80\)–versus 300-\( t \)-intervals, we find that the 300-ms trajectories have a higher \( L_c \). The 300-ms-interval movies are 120 s long and the 80-ms movies are 60 s long, consistent with the notion that \( L_c \) scales with the time during which the locus has explored its surroundings.

The increase in movement upon break induction could reflect the loss of constraint (either from reduced contacts between nucleosomes or reduced interaction with a less mobile nuclear substructure), or stem from an increased external force acting on the nucleus. Yeast chromosomes reversibly interact with nuclear envelope structures (e.g., pores or the spindle pole body [SPB] (Taddei and Gasser, 2012). Such interactions not only constrain movement, but could enhance it, if the nucleus experiences forces leading to rotation or oscillation. To quantify the strength of tethering interactions at the site of a DSB, we approximate the confining tethering force using the classical harmonic potential approximation (Amitai et al., 2015). A binding force is generically parabolic (see Supplemental Information); thus, a tethering force is characterized by a strength \( k \) acting on a single monomer \( R_n : U = (1/2)k[R_n - \mu]^2 \), where \( \mu \) is the position of the interaction. Reduction of tethering forces should result in increased mobility (Amitai et al., 2015). Based on these modeling predictions, we extracted the effective spring coefficient \( k_c \) (Equation 17, Supplemental Information), which measures the averaged external forces affecting the observed locus. We find that \( k_c \) decreases significantly for both timescales from \( k_{uncut \ 80ms} = 135 ± 61 \ k_BT/\mu m² \) to \( k_{cut \ 80ms} = 41 ± 11 \ k_BT/\mu m² \) and \( k_{uncut \ 300ms} = 89 ± 40 \ k_BT/\mu m² \).
to $k_c^{\text{cut 300ms}} = 54 \pm 22 \text{ k}_9 \text{T}/\mu \text{m}^2$ (Figures 1B and 1C). This decay suggests that there is a local reduction in interactions around the region of the break. This could increase the territory the spot explores, as reflected in the increase of the length $L_c$.

Upon cut induction, we also find a small but significant increase in the anomalous exponent $\alpha$ where $\alpha^{\text{uncut 80ms}} = 0.48 \pm 0.14$ increases to $\alpha^{\text{cut 80ms}} = 0.52 \pm 0.07$ and $\alpha^{\text{uncut 300ms}} = 0.66 \pm 0.08$ increases to $\alpha^{\text{cut 300ms}} = 0.70 \pm 0.08$ (Figures 1B and 1C). Surprisingly, we found that the anomalous exponent $\alpha$ is consistently higher at $\Delta t = 300\mu\text{s}$ ($\alpha^{\text{uncut 80ms}} = 0.48$ versus $\alpha^{\text{uncut 300ms}} = 0.66$), even without DSB induction. This difference could arise from the fact that by choosing a time step we implicitly establish a cutoff below which locus dynamics are no longer influenced by the long-range chromatin properties. Vice versa, at larger intervals (e.g., $\Delta t = 300\mu\text{s}$), the more subtle changes in chromatin dynamics that occur on shorter timescales ($\Delta t = 80\mu\text{s}$) may be averaged out (see scheme, Figure 1D). Thus, rapid image acquisition allows us to observe fluctuations of polymer structure at the level of short genomic distances, while larger time intervals reveals local fluctuations of chromatin at larger genomic scales. This also provides an explanation of why we observe an increase in the diffusion coefficient after cleavage for the $\Delta t = 80\mu\text{s}$ trajectories ($D^{\text{uncut 80ms}} = 15.4 \pm 7.7 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ versus $D^{\text{cut 80ms}} = 27.8 \pm 10.8 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$), but not for the $\Delta t = 300\mu\text{s}$ trajectories ($D^{\text{uncut 300ms}} = 3.9 \pm 1.1 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$ versus $D^{\text{cut 300ms}} = 3.9 \pm 1.6 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$; Equation 13, Supplemental Information; Figure S2, Table 1).

Effect of Actin Depolymerization on Chromatin Dynamics

Since the increase in the anomalous exponent $\alpha$ upon DSB induction was small ($\alpha^{\text{uncut 80ms}} = 0.46$ versus $\alpha^{\text{cut 80ms}} = 0.52$) and because $\alpha$ increased with longer imaging intervals, we hypothesized that external forces might act on the nucleus that could mask changes in $\alpha$. While our tracking regimen corrects for translational movement, it cannot account for nuclear rotation or precession. As a simple proof of principle that $\alpha$ increases when an oscillating force is applied to the polymer, we simulated a Rouse polymer ($\alpha = 0.5$) with oscillation period $\omega$ (Supplemental Information; Figure S3). We find that when $\omega = 0.04$, $\alpha$ increases from 0.5 to 0.7 (Figure 2A), suggesting that nuclear rotation/precession would increase $\alpha$ and could, therefore, mask changes in this parameter. This simulation was performed for a Rouse polymer, yet simulation of other polymer models would yield the same qualitative behavior.

Next, we tested whether this effect occurs in vivo. Recent work has implicated the cytoskeleton (Lottersberger et al., 2015; Spichal et al., 2016) and KASH proteins, which anchor inner nuclear membrane-spanning SUN domain proteins to the cytoskeleton (Starr and Fridolfsson, 2010) in chromatin movement (Chung et al., 2015; Lottersberger et al., 2015; Spichal et al., 2016). Given that in budding yeast, subcellular organelles are more commonly positioned by actin filaments, rather than by microtubules (MTs), we hypothesized that actin filaments connected to the nuclear envelope could be a source of nuclear rotation, which would, in turn, increase $\alpha$, as shown by our numerical simulations. To test this hypothesis, we fluorescently labeled the SPB, a structure embedded in the nuclear envelope, by tagging Spc29 with Ruby2. Movement of the SPB reflects that of the entire nucleus (Figure 2B). A 1-hr exposure to 25 $\mu\text{m}$ of the sponge toxin Latrunculin A (LatA) was sufficient to completely depolymerize actin filaments in yeast (Figure S4). By analyzing SPB trajectories, we found that $\alpha$ decreases significantly upon LatA treatment, from $\alpha^{\text{DMSO}} = 0.37 \pm 0.16$ to $\alpha^{\text{LatA}} = 0.26 \pm 0.15$ (Figure 2B), suggesting that actin filaments indeed contribute to nuclear rotation/precession. The values for $k_c$, $D_\alpha$, and $L_c$ were not significantly reduced after LatA treatment (Figures 2B and S3A). A simple explanation for this phenomenon could be that the nucleus rocks back and forth in the x and y planes, with only the frequency of this motion being reduced by LatA. In this case, the total area scanned by the SPB remains the same, while $\alpha$, which characterizes its motion, decreases upon actin depolymerization. The fact the second dynamical parameter ($D_\alpha$) does not change suggests that the frequency of the nuclear precession is large compared to the imaging time step (80 fs). Indeed, given that $\alpha$ is a dynamic parameter computed over the first six time points, it incorporates motion up to 0.48 $\mu\text{s}$. This is illustrated in Figure 2A, where the gap between the curves is larger at longer times.

To see whether nuclear oscillation is necessary for the dynamic changes in chromatin following induction of a DSB, we tracked DSB mobility after treatment with LatA. As observed for the SPB, LatA treatment reduces $L_c$ in the uncult condition ($L_c^{\text{uncut No drug 80ms}} = 0.13 \pm 0.03 \mu\text{m}$ versus $L_c^{\text{uncut LatA 80ms}} = 0.08 \pm 0.03 \mu\text{m}$). Upon cleavage, however, this value increases to $L_c^{\text{cut LatA 80ms}} = 0.15 \pm 0.06 \mu\text{m}$, showing approximately the same fold increase as we observed at a break without LatA (Figure 2C). Thus, the DSB-induced increase in movement is not a result of actin filament-driven dynamics. The spring constant $k_c$ follows the same trend upon LatA exposure (Figure S8B). In other words, tethering forces are released following break induction even in the presence of LatA. Interestingly, the diffusion coefficient of the DSB does not change upon LatA treatment, which we attribute to the timescale of the nuclear oscillations, as explained in the previous paragraph.

We note that the anomalous exponent $\alpha$ decreases strongly upon LatA treatment ($\alpha^{\text{uncut No drug 80ms}} = 0.48 \pm 0.14$ to $\alpha^{\text{cut LatA 80ms}} = 0.30 \pm 0.14$), consistent with the suggestion that actin polymerization indirectly influences the underlying nature of chromatin movement (Spichal et al., 2016). Importantly, however, $\alpha$ again increases strongly from $\alpha^{\text{uncut LatA 80ms}} = 0.30 \pm 0.14$ to $\alpha^{\text{cut LatA 80ms}} = 0.46 \pm 0.14$, upon induction of a DSB, despite the presence of LatA (Figure 2D). The same highly significant change was observed for the $\Delta t = 300$-ms regimen (Figure S5C). Thus, the change in locus dynamics at a DSB is not actin-filament dependent, even though basal chromatin movement is influenced by actin-driven nuclear rotation. Importantly, we show that changes in $\alpha$ can be masked by such oscillations.

Effect of Microtubule Depolymerization on Chromatin Dynamics

Early work had shown that MT depolymerization by Nocodazole in yeast increased chromatin dynamics (Marshall et al., 1997), as it releases centromeres from their attachment to the SPB (Bystricky et al., 2004). In contrast, recent work in a mammalian system showed the opposite effect: MT depolymerization...
decreased uncapped telomere movement (Lottersberger et al., 2015). Therefore, we revisited this question in yeast to access how MT depolymerization affects chromatin movement. We exposed yeast cells to 50 μM Nocodazole for 1 hr, which is sufficient to arrest cells in G2/M phase due to activation of the spindle assembly checkpoint, and subjected the lacO-tagged MAT locus to time-lapse imaging, in the presence and absence of a DSB. Interestingly, MT depolymerization (in contrast to actin depolymerization) increased both $L_c$ and $\alpha$ and reduced tethering forces ($k_c$) at $\Delta t = 80$ ms (Figure 3). Following DSB induction, however, there was no further change in movement, with the exception of a marginal decrease in $L_c$ and increase in $k_c$. Thus, MT depolymerization appears to increase chromatin movement to such an extent that a further increase due to local chromatin changes is not detectable. We attribute the increased chromatin dynamics upon Nocodazole treatment to the depolymerization of the MTs that hold yeast centromeres to the SPB. In mammals, this effect would not be observed since there are no direct MT connection from centrosome to kinetochore in interphase cells. Rather, it was proposed that the effect of Nocodazole in mammalian cells, i.e., the loss of increased chromatin movement after DNA damage (Lottersberger et al., 2015), stems from the loss of the link between cytoplasmic MT and either the nucleoskeleton or chromatin through the LINC complex (Linker of Nucleoskeleton and Cytoskeleton, (Tapley and Starr, 2013)), thus being more similar to the effects of LatA in yeast. Complicating this interpretation is
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the fact that Nocodazole may induce cohesin cleavage in HeLa cells (Nakajima et al., 2007), an event that increases chromatin movement in yeast (Dion et al., 2013).

In summary, chromatin dynamics in yeast and mammalian cells showed opposite effects of MT depolymerization: in yeast, MTs can constrain chromatin movement, while actin filaments drive nuclear rotation. Removal of nuclear rotation/precession with LatA-created conditions under which changes in SPT pa-
parameters were more apparent, while centromere release in yeast seemed to mask enhanced DSB mobility. In contrast, using MSD analysis in mammalian cells MTs and dynein appeared to drive chromatin movement, an effect that was enhanced during the DNA damage response (Lottersberger et al., 2015). Actin depolymerization had no reported effect.

A Polymer Model Predicts Chromatin Expansion at a DSB
Post-translational modifications on histones and repair/signaling proteins recruited to DSBs are extensive and occur rapidly at DSBs. These include histone acetylation, ubiquitination, and phosphorylation, as well as histone variant exchange and nucleosome eviction by nucleosome remodelers (Smeenk and van At-tikum, 2013). Given the large change in \( \alpha \) at the site of a DSB once nuclear oscillations were removed (cut\_LatA = 0.30 to cut\_LatA = 0.46), we next explored the consequence of this change on chromatin structure, using a generalized polymer model called the \( \beta \)-polymer model (Amitai and Holcman, 2013b). This model allows for local interactions between monomers to be calculated from a given anomalous exponent by the relationship \( \alpha = 1 - 1/\beta \) (see Supplemental Information). In other words, this polymer model allows us to explore the effects of a changing anomalous

\[ \text{Length of constant } L_n \text{ [\mu m]} \]

\[ \text{WT } \Delta t = 80 \text{ ms: MAT locus} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncut</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Uncut + Noc</th>
<th>Cut + Noc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMSO</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.13 \pm 0.03 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.23 \pm 0.03 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.20 \pm 0.04 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.18 \pm 0.07 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocodazole</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.13 \pm 0.03 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.23 \pm 0.03 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.20 \pm 0.04 )</td>
<td>( \langle L_0 \rangle = 0.18 \pm 0.07 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Anomalous exponent } \alpha \]

\[ \text{WT } \Delta t = 80 \text{ ms: MAT locus} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncut</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Uncut + Noc</th>
<th>Cut + Noc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMSO</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.48 \pm 0.14 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.52 \pm 0.07 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.58 \pm 0.09 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.54 \pm 0.11 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocodazole</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.48 \pm 0.14 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.52 \pm 0.07 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.58 \pm 0.09 )</td>
<td>( \langle \alpha \rangle = 0.54 \pm 0.11 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Effective spring constant (Kc)} \]

\[ \text{WT } \Delta t = 80 \text{ ms: MAT locus} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncut</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Uncut + Noc</th>
<th>Cut + Noc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncut</td>
<td>( \langle K_c \rangle = 135 \pm 61 )</td>
<td>( \langle K_c \rangle = 41 \pm 11 )</td>
<td>( \langle K_c \rangle = 56 \pm 31 )</td>
<td>( \langle K_c \rangle = 88 \pm 60 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Diffusion coefficient (Dc)} \]

\[ \text{WT } \Delta t = 80 \text{ ms: MAT locus} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uncut</th>
<th>Cut</th>
<th>Uncut + Noc</th>
<th>Cut + Noc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uncut</td>
<td>( \langle D_c \rangle = 15.4 \pm 7.7 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>( \langle D_c \rangle = 27.8 \pm 10.8 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>( \langle D_c \rangle = 17.6 \pm 5 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
<td>( \langle D_c \rangle = 12.2 \pm 4.8 \times 10^{-3} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Nocodazole Increases Chromatin Mobility, and There Is No Further Increase af-ter Break Induction

(A–D) The Lc (A) and \( \alpha \) (B) values for MAT, derived from \( \Delta t = 80 \text{ ms} \) imaging regimen before and after 2 hr DSB induction are given. Strains are as in Figure 1. Where indicated, 50 \( \mu \text{M} \) Nocodazole was added for the last hour of HO induction. Corresponding \( k_c \) (C) and \( D_c \) (D) values are calculated from the same dataset. Cut efficiencies are in Table S2. *p ≤ 0.05 and **p ≤ 0.01.
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\[ V_{\text{cut}} = 0.090 \pm 0.086 \mu \text{m}^3 \] (Figure 4C; Table S4). This striking increase (+20%) confirms the pre-
diction of the \( \beta \)-polymer model and corresponds to an increase in \( \alpha \) from 0.33 to 0.45.

\[ \text{Nucleosome Remodeler INO80 Drives Increased } \alpha \text{ Independent of Actin Dynamics} \]

If decompaction is truly a reflection of altered nucleosome packing, then we should be able to modulate it by eliminating the recruitment of the INO80 remodeler, which is recruited to damage in an Arp8-dependent manner. Loss of INO80 recruit-
ment reduces nucleosome eviction at DSBs and attenuates the
Figure 4. Polymer Simulations Predict Chromatin Expansion at a DSB, which Is Confirmed Experimentally with Structured Illumination Microscopy

(A) The β-polymer model allows for the interactions between all monomers to be controlled and measured in simulations. The strength of interaction of all monomers with any other monomer decays with distance. Anomalous diffusion α is related to β by α = 1 − 1/β.

(B) β-polymers where the inter-monomer interactions are modified, with β values corresponding to α values obtained from biological experiments (β = 1.5 gives α = 0.33, and β = 2 gives α = 0.5). The radius of gyration Rg (yellow) measures the degree of compaction. Balls (blue) represent the monomers of radius 0.3.

(C) Experimental system used to acquire and analyze SIM images of the MAT locus (left), and an example image showing a G1- and S-phase focus (middle), cumulative distribution function of the 3D volume of spots ± cleavage in wild-type (WT), strain GA-8067 (right). Cells were synchronized with α-factor to obtain G1.
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enhanced chromatin dynamics provoked by a DSB (Neumann et al., 2012; Seeber et al., 2013; Strecker et al., 2016). Arp8 is an integral component of the INO80 remodeler that is required for its nucleosome remodeling activity (van Attikum et al., 2007). Interestingly, cells lacking Arp8 have strong recombination defects (Agmon et al., 2013; Strecker et al., 2016) but only mild defects in checkpoint activation or resection (Chen et al., 2012; van Attikum et al., 2007). With this in mind, we tracked locus mobility in an arp8Δ strain, before and after DSB induction. Confirming previous reports (Neumann et al., 2012; Strecker et al., 2016), we find that Arp8 is required for increased mobility at the DSB: neither the Lc, α, Dc, nor kLc changed after cut induction (Figures 4D and S6).

Based on our interpretation of α as an indirect indicator of condensation state (Figure 4A), we monitored locus volume using super-resolution microscopy in the arp8Δ strain. The DSB and its surrounding chromatin not only failed to increase spot volume in the absence of Arp8, but volumes were slightly reduced (Figure 4E). This links chromatin expansion at the break to the remodeling activity of INO80 and suggests that INO80 may function at breaks to open chromatin facilitating recruitment of repair proteins (van Attikum et al., 2007).

**Increasing α at a DSB Can Provoke Extrusion of Damage from a Chromatin Domain**

Our data argue that chromatin expands at a DSB, presumably resulting from a reduction in local forces between monomers (nucleosomes) near the break. Experimentally, we know that DSBs trigger changes in chromatin organization and that they can move from one nuclear sub-compartment to another (Chioloi et al., 2011; Horigome et al., 2014; Jakob et al., 2011; Ryu et al., 2015; Torres-Rosell et al., 2007), yet it is not known how these are related, i.e., whether changes in chromatin at the site of a break affect the long-range architecture of a chromatin domain or a chromosome. Here, we used numerical simulations to ask what happens to the overall structure of a polymer if we reduce the intrinsic interactions of a single monomer, i.e., of a nucleosome near a DSB. The simulations further allow us to modulate the strength of interactions between all monomers, enabling us to test a range of situations that involve changes in specific inter-nucleosomal interactions, mimicking a controlled spread of decondensation from the site of damage.

To account for changes in the chromatin structure and to avoid interpenetration of the chromosome, we added repulsion interactions between each monomer (i.e., Lennard-Jones or LJ interactions) to the β-polymer model (see Figure S7 and Table S3). We considered a polymer of length n = 33, with a coefficient β = 1.5, where all monomers are highly connected (Figure 5A). We note that with the addition of LJ-interaction forces, the relationship between the exponent of the model and the measured anomalous exponent α = 1 − 1/β, no longer holds, and the numerically estimated α for a self-avoiding polymer with β = 1.5 for a given monomer is α = 0.52.

We then simulated the effect of a DSB on chromatin organization by reducing interactions of the middle monomer n = 17 (red monomer), such that longer-range connections are lost, and only nearest neighbor contacts remain (green monomers, Figure 5B). Surprisingly, this modification had a dramatic effect on the global structure of the polymer with the middle monomer being extruded to the periphery of the globular chromatin domain (Figure 5B). If we mimic the spreading of decondensation by removal of local forces acting on the two neighbors of the middle monomer (n = 16, 18), the effect is even more pronounced (Figure 5C). In analogy to the documented behavior of a DSB in heterochromatin, we find that the more condensed the polymer is, the more pronounced the extrusion effect will be. Moreover, the extrusion is stable as long as the reduced interactions persist: once shifted, the extruded monomer stays at the periphery of the chromatin domain (Figure S8).

We next simulated the effect of extrusion on movement by following the displacement of either an unmodified monomer (n = 10) or the break-mimicking modified monomer (n = 17) (Figure 5D). While the unmodified monomer does not change its position significantly, the modified monomer is highly mobile. To quantify this effect, we plot the average distance of each monomer from the center of mass (cm) of the polymer (Figure 5E). Before extrusion, the middle monomer was closest to the cm (see Figure 5A), but as forces are reduced on this monomer it moves further away (Figure 5E). Finally, we analyzed α for each monomer during the extrusion process. We find that when the interactions are removed from the middle and two neighbor monomers (Figure 5C), α increases sharply from 0.52 to 0.88 (Figure 5F). This is consistent with our empirical observations of increased α upon DSB induction and local chromatin expansion at the break. This polymer modeling suggests that expansion at the site of the break, reflected as increased α, is sufficient to shift a DSB to the periphery of its local chromatin domain.

Previous work has shown that DSBs that occur in heterochromatin or in the nucleolus must move out of these domains to be repaired by the recombination machinery (Chioloi et al., 2011; Ryu et al., 2015; Torres-Rosell et al., 2007; Tsouroula et al., 2016). To see whether this extrusion correlates with reduced forces at the break (i.e., increased α), we monitored the dynamics of an inducible I-SceI cut site integrated into the yeast rDNA with an adjacent tetO array, which is visualized by expressing TetR-mRFP (Torres-Rosell et al., 2007). The yeast strain further expressed a YFP-tagged Rad52, which is largely excluded from the nucleolus, and a plasmid-borne galactose-inducible I-SceIendonuclease, as well as constitutively expressed Nucleolar protein 1 (NOP1)-CFP. Rad52-YFP only co-localizes with the TetR-mRFP array when the locus has been extruded from the nucleolus (Figure 5G). To create the break, we induced I-SceI for 2 hr. To avoid interference by nuclear
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oscillation, we included 25 μm LatA during the last hour of cut induction. Dual acquisition (Δt = 80 ms) of TetR-mRFP and Rad52-YFP signals was performed in S-phase cells, where we track three conditions: first, an uncut locus (found within the nucleolus), second, a cut locus (I-SceI is expressed but the array remains within the nucleolus and no Rad52-YFP is bound), and, third, the cut locus that is relocated outside the nucleolus and bound by Rad52-YFP. We find that after break induction Lc increases from $L_c^{\text{uncut}} = 0.08 \pm 0.05 \mu m$ to $L_c^{\text{cut(outside)}} = 0.11 \pm 0.03 \mu m$ and $L_c^{\text{cut(outside)}} = 0.12 \pm 0.05 \mu m$ (Figure 5H). Importantly, we find that $\alpha$ increases very strongly both upon cleavage and again upon relocation from the nucleolus ($\alpha^{\text{uncut}} = 0.24 \pm 0.1 \mu m$ to $\alpha^{\text{cut(outside)}} = 0.38 \pm 0.12 \mu m$ and $\alpha^{\text{cut(outside)}} = 0.57 \pm 0.11 \mu m$). This increase in $\alpha$ likely reflects changes in the contacts at the site of break, further supported by the decrease $k_c$ (Figure S9). It suggests that chromatin surrounding a break, extruded from the nucleolus, is more decondensed than a break within the nucleolus, consistent with a requirement for relocation for Rad52 binding (Torres-Rosell et al., 2007).

Intriguingly, in the absence of LatA the $L_c$ shows the opposite trend: the uncut locus was more dynamic than the cut one (Figure S9). While surprising, we note that the rDNA is segregated from the rest of the nucleus and is attached to the inner nuclear membrane opposite of the SPB by an inner nuclear membrane complex called CLIP (Mekhail and Moazed, 2010) (Figure 6). We hypothesize that the nucleolus to the effects of nuclear precession more than internal loci, and thus an uncut rDNA locus, which is more tightly linked to the nuclear envelope, may be more influenced by cytoskeletal dynamics. After DSB induction, the shift of the locus to the nucleoplasm should reduce nuclear envelope association and Lc or the length of its trajectory within a given time frame may be reduced. Regardless of trajectory length, we found that $\alpha$ increases from $\alpha^{\text{uncut}} = 0.38 \pm 0.06 \mu m$ to $\alpha^{\text{cut(outside)}} = 0.53 \pm 0.16 \mu m$, both in the presence and absence of LatA.

Our experimental data thus recapitulate the predicted behavior of the β-polymer model of chromatin surrounding a DSB. The reduction of contacts at the site of a break, observed as domain expansion or an increase in $\alpha$, reflect a local change in chromatin architecture that allows extrusion to occur. Notably, once chromatin at a DSB has acquired these characteristics, either through the actions of chromatin remodelers such as INO80 (Neumann et al., 2012), or by ubiquitination or SUMOylation of break associated nucleosomes (Horigome et al., 2016; Ryu et al., 2015; Torres-Rosell et al., 2007), break extrusion could occur without a requirement for active translocation. While we do not exclude that directed motion might also occur, the increase in $\alpha$ that leads to extrusion could simply result from reorganization to a minimal energy configuration of the polymer. This biological mechanism may also play a role in other processes that require locus repositioning, for instance, during transcriptional activation.

**DISCUSSION**

Polymer modeling is a powerful tool to analyze changes in chromatin structure. The choice of polymer model that best recapitulates the behavior of chromatin is open and highly debated. Here, we make the case for a family of polymer models called the β-polymer (Amitai and Holcman, 2013b), as it has the advantage of being able to account for changes in locus dynamics when movement is characterized by variable values for the anomalous exponent $\alpha$. In addition, we show here that image sampling rate and external forces acting on the nucleus, such as actin filament-driven nuclear oscillation, can strongly affect the results obtained from SPT analysis. These can obscure the underlying properties of chromatin motion and must be taken into account in live cell chromatin dynamics.

Previous studies of chromatin locus dynamics have relied largely on MSD analysis, which monitors the volume of sampled nuclear space, without shedding light on the nature of the forces acting on the locus in question (reviewed in Dion and Gasser, 2013). In contrast, the analysis workflow presented here dissects the velocity of a locus into external forces acting on the chromatin fiber and internal interactions along the chromatin fiber. The four parameters we extract ($\alpha$, Lc, Kc, and Dc) contain different information and are largely independent of each other (described in Figures S10A and S10B). By incorporating these experimentally extracted values into polymer models we have predicted that chromatin will decompact at a DSB and that this should lead to the extrusion of the damage from its local chromatin domain. We confirmed both these predictions in yeast by live imaging of an inducible site-specific DSB, either at MAT or in the rDNA array. Consistently, an earlier study modeled human Chr 11 using the expression-dependent Dynamic Loop Model (Zhang and Heerme, 2014), in which loops create
centromere detachment, could alter chromatin dynamics as predicted by statistical polymer modeling and experimental results. Our study does not rule out that loss of an extrinsic tether, such as centromere detachment, could alter chromatin dynamics as reported by others (Strecker et al., 2016). However, our results make it unlikely that such changes are the only driving force behind enhanced break movement. Rather, we argue that the expansion of chromatin at the site of the break due to histone modifications and/or eviction (Smeenk and van Attikum, 2013) enhances \( z \) and drives increased movement. While these may be enhanced or altered by events like centromere detachment, in our hands, MT depolymerization and centromere detachment (Bystricky et al., 2004) prior to DSB induction, masks any other increase in mobility. We note that it is crucial for all experimental studies of chromatin dynamics to take into account the effects of nuclear precession, to triage image stacks by cell-cycle stage, and to monitor cleavage efficiency. Without these controls, results are likely to be misleading.

We also present here a quantitative 3D-SIM technique that monitors of locus volume, and we show that expansion following a DSB requires the INO80 chromatin remodeling complex. Other remodelers, such as the BAF complex (Swi/Snf or Rsc in yeast) may serve a similar role (Seeber et al., 2014). Importantly, the targeting of INO80 to an uncut locus similarly increases locus dynamics (Neumann et al., 2012), without changing local transcription activity, supporting the notion that the shifting or removal of nucleosomes increases long-range locus dynamics. This has profound implications concerning the impact of local histone modifications on the compaction and spatial behavior of larger chromatin domains. The relevance of our observations is made clear by two recent studies in which a global decompaction of chromatin was observed in response to UV-induced DNA damage in mammalian cells (Adam et al., 2016) and in response to histone degradation in yeast (Hauer et al., 2017). Both studies reinforce and extend the models we simulated here.

As mentioned previously, \( \beta \)-polymer models can only be used when the anomalous exponent is in the range of 0–0.5. This limits their application to constrained, sub-diffusive movement and means that they cannot be used to study directed motion. Nonetheless, most DNA movement has been shown to be subdiffusive (Albert et al., 2013; Amitai et al., 2015; Dion and Gasser, 2013; Weber et al., 2010, 2012). The \( \beta \)-polymer models do not account for possible impact of local heterogeneous crowding on the polymer. On the other hand, by adding other interactions, such as polymer bending or Lennard-Jones forces, we have been able to account accurately for the chromatin dynamics monitored by fluorescent SPTs. We note that movement arising from nuclear rotation/precession leads to an increase in the anomalous exponent \( z \), with or without a DSB. Finally, we show that the problem of additive motion can be circumvented by measuring the dynamics of the locus at different timescales.

New microscopes that allow for 3D imaging without the use of moving stages such as the aberration-corrected multi-focal microscope (Abrahamsson et al., 2013) or a double-helix point spread function microscope (Backlund et al., 2014) will expand the impact of high resolution chromatin locus tracking in the near future, providing even larger datasets that are appropriate for analysis by the \( \beta \)-polymer model presented here.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Yeast Growth Conditions**

Yeast strains used in this study are in Table S1. Yeast cultures were grown 30°C, and imaging was performed at 25°C. Strains were either W303 background or JKM179, as described in Table S1. The Ruby2 fluorophore plasmid was acquired from Lee et al. (2013). For DSB live-tracking experiments, yeast were grown at 30°C on YPAD prior to dilution into synthetic media containing 3% glycerol and 2% lactate (SCLG) for several generations prior to the addition of 2% galactose to induce expression of HO. Unless otherwise indicated, 2-hr induction of HO was used, and the efficiency of endonuclease cleavage at MAT was determined by quantitative PCR with TaqMan probes as previously described, and qPCR values were normalized to the SMC2 locus (van Attikum et al., 2007). Cutting efficiencies are summarized in Table S2. See Supplemental Experimental Procedures for details.

**Microscopy**

Live microscopy used a Nikon Eclipse Ti microscope, two EM-CCD Cascade II (Photometrics) cameras, an ASI MS-2000 Z-piezo stage, and a PlanApo x 100,
numerical aperture (NA) 1.45 total internal reflection fluorescence microscope oil objective and Visiview software. Fluorophores were excited at 561 (Ruby2, mCherry), 515 (YFP), and 491 (GFP) nm. GFP and mCherry/Ruby2 fluorescence were acquired simultaneously on separate cameras. A Semrock FF01-617/73-25 filter was used to capture the mCherry/Ruby2 signal on camera 1, and a Semrock FF02-525/40-25 filter was used to capture the GFP signal on camera 2. Time-lapse series were conducted taking eight optical slices per stack either every 80 ms for 1 min or 300 ms for 2 min. Each optical slice received either a 10-ms exposure for the 80-ms intervals or 30 ms for the 300-ms intervals. Nuclear volumes are based on an average haploid nuclear radius of 0.9 μm. Time-lapse image stacks were analyzed as in Dion et al. (2012), using a custom-made ImageJ (Fiji) plug-in, to extract coordinates of locus position from the movies. For structured illumination microscopy, and other specifics of staining and foci selection, see Supplemental Experimental Procedures. Spot tracking was carried out with the Fiji plugin Spot Tracker 2D (Neumann et al., 2012).

**Extraction of Parameters, Modeling, and Simulations with Rouse Polymer**

The extraction of biophysical parameters from the image stacks and their mathematical derivation are described in Supplemental Experimental Procedures. A Rouse polymer is a collection of monomers moving with a random Brownian motion coupled to a spring force originating from the nearest neighbors. We use other polymer models by adding interactions such as bending elasticity, which accounts for the persistence length of the polymer and Lennard-Jones forces (LJ), describing self-avoidance of each monomer pairs.

**Error Propagation and Statistical Significance**

Significance between α, Kc, Lc, and Dc values was tested using the non-parametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) test. p values are either indicated above the figure panels or by asterisks, where *p ≤ 0.05, **p ≤ 0.01, ***p ≤ 0.001, respectively. Error bars on graphs represent the SE unless otherwise stated. LacI-GFP spot size was shown to be normally distributed and then tested for differences using a two-tailed Student’s t test (Graph Pad). Significance cut off was p < 0.05.

**The Polymer Model**

To account for the chromatin dynamics, we use the generalized polymer model called the β-polymer model (Amitai and Holcman, 2013b), which accounts for anomalous diffusive behavior with α in the range of 0–0.5, as measured for a yeast in vivo chromatin locus (Hajjoul et al., 2013). We use β-polymer model where all monomers are connected through a quadratic potential defined by

\[ U_p(R_1, R_2, \beta) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{m=1}^{N-1} A_m R_m R_m \]

with coefficients

\[ A_n = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \epsilon_{i,j} n_{i,j} \]

\[ \epsilon_{i,j} = 4s \int \frac{\rho \rho}{2N} \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho}{N} \right) \cos \left( \frac{m - 1}{2} \frac{\rho}{N} \right) \]

and

\[ \rho = 4s \int \frac{\rho \rho}{2N} \cos \left( \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho}{N} \right) \]

In such a model, the strength of interaction \( A_n \) decays with the distance \( |j - m| \) along the chain. By definition, \( 1 < \beta < 2 \) (Amitai and Holcman, 2013b) and the Rouse polymer is recovered for \( \beta = 2 \), for which only nearest neighbors are connected.
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