This is the author's version (manuscript) of the work that was accepted for publication in Nature. The Version of Record is available online at 10.1038/s41586-023-05926-8

Establishment and Function of Chromatin Architecture at Eukaryotic Chromosome Replication Origins

Erika Chacin¹, Karl-Uwe Reusswig², Jessica Furtmeier¹, Priyanka Bansal¹, Leonhard Karl², Boris Pfander^{2,3,4}, Philipp Korber¹ and Christoph F. Kurat^{1*}

15

Affiliations

¹ Biomedical Center Munich (BMC), Division of Molecular Biology, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, Martinsried, Germany

20 ² Max Planck Institute of Biochemistry, DNA Replication and Genome Integrity, Martinsried, Germany

³ Genome Maintenance Mechanisms in Health and Disease, Institute of Aerospace Medicine, German Aerospace Center (DLR), Cologne, Germany

⁴ Institute of Genome Stability in Aging and Disease, CECAD, University of Cologne, Medical Faculty, Cologne, Germany

25

30

* Correspondence

Christoph.kurat@bmc.med.lmu.de

The Origin Recognition Complex (ORC) is essential for the initiation of eukaryotic chromosome replication as it loads the replicative helicase, the minichromosome maintenance (MCM) complex, at replication origins¹ **.**

5 **These origins display a stereotypic chromatin structure. They are nucleosome** depleted at ORC binding sites and flanked by regularly spaced nucleosome arrays^{2,3}. **Although discovered over a decade ago, we still do not know how this chromatin struture is established and if it matters for replication.**

Here we show that ORC has an essential role in generating the origin chromatin 10 **structure. By genome-wide biochemical reconstitution we screened ~ 400 individual origins and 17 purified chromatin factors from budding yeast and found that ORC establishes both nucleosome depletion over origins as well as flanking nucleosome arrays by orchestrating the four chromatin remodelers INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1**. **The importance of ORC's chromatin organizing activity was underscored by ORC mutations that maintained classical** ¹⁵ **MCM loader but lost array generation activity. These mutations were lethal** *in vivo***.**

Our results demonstrate that ORC, besides its canonical role as MCM loader, has a second essential function as master regulator of chromatin structure at replication origins, which is critical for chromosome replication.

20

Main:

In budding yeast, origins contain specific DNA domains, the autonomous replicating sequences (ARS), which bear the ARS-consensus sequence (ACS), a conserved 11 base pair motif 5 sessential for ORC binding⁴. Budding yeast uses \sim 400 confirmed core origins equally distributed across its 16 chromosomes while replicating its \sim 12 mega base pair-sized genome^{2,5–7}. In multicellular eukaryotes, due to a lack of conserved ORC binding sites, it has proven difficult to map origins of replication, but it is estimated that timely replication of human genomes involves \sim 30.000 origins⁸. Eukaryotic genomes are packaged into nucleosomes, the basic units of chromatin⁹. 10 Interestingly, yeast origins are symmetrically flanked by arrays of regularly-spaced nucleosomes, while the ACS element lies in an A-T-rich nucleosome-free region $(NFR)^{2,3}$ (Fig. 1a).

It was suggested that ORC has a role in the establishment of these arrays as mutants defective in DNA binding showed disruption of this chromatin structure at origins^{2,3}. However, the molecular basis by which ORC achieves this remains unknown.

15 To tackle these questions and to obtain a detailed mechanistic understanding of chromatin structure establishment at origins, we chose an *in vitro* reconstitution approach. While reconstitutions using single origins were undertaken before^{$2,10-12$}, although not for our specific question, we wished to go beyond a single origin model and leverage the advantage of comparing many origins in parallel. This way, confounding effects due to individual variation average out 20 and consistent trends among many origins become apparent. This global approach has been highly successful, both for *in vivo* mapping as well as *in vitro* reconstitution approaches, for example, regarding yeast promoter architectures^{13–16}. However, it was not applied to the reconstitution of replication origins so far. Here we set out to biochemically reconstitute origin chromatin with purified components on a global scale.

ORC works in conjunction with chromatin remodelers

We first asked if the origin flanking DNA sequences have sufficient intrinsic information to position nucleosomes, especially arrays.

To uncover general principles beyond individual origins, we generated a plasmid library 5 containing most budding yeast origins as the DNA templates (~ 400 individual origins) and used purified histones and salt gradient dialysis for chromatin assembly (SGD-chromatin) onto those plasmids. Nucleosome positions were determined by limited digestion with micrococcal nuclease (MNase) coupled to high-throughput sequencing $(MNase-seq)^{14}$ (Fig. 1b, c). A composite plot of SGD chromatin at all origins aligned to their ACS element (Fig. 1d) did not show intrinsic 10 formation of phased arrays as *in vivo* (Fig. 1a), but an NFR-like region over the ACSs. The latter was expected as origins are A-T-rich sequences, which are known to exclude nucleosomes^{2,5,17}.

We next tested if ORC can set up phased arrays, as previously suggested^{2,3,10}. Purified ORC (Fig. 1e) on its own added to SGD chromatin could not form phased arrays at origins (Fig. 1f), likely because nucleosomes could not be mobilized under these physiological temperature and 15 ionic strength conditions. Therefore, we hypothesized that other chromatin factors, like histone chaperones and ATP-dependent chromatin remodelers, that help to transfer/mobilize histone octamers, had to be involved. We performed an unbiased biochemical screen. We purified most histone chaperones and chromatin remodelers from yeast (9 histone chaperones (Asf1, CAF-1, HIR, FACT, Nap1, Nhp6, Spt6, Rtt106 and Vps75; Extended Data Fig. 1a) as well as 8 chromatin 20 remodelers (INO80, ISW1a, ISW2, Chd1, Fun30, RSC, SWI/SNF and SWR1; Extended Data Fig. 1b) as well as and tested them in our assay. As with ORC, none of the 17 tested chromatin factors could form regular arrays at origins on their own (Extended Data Figs. 2, 3).

Thus, we next asked if ORC might function together with one of these chromatin factors and assayed all 17 together with ORC. Remarkably, of all the tested chromatin factors, only the chromatin remodelers INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1 could generate *in vivo*-like nucleosome arrays in the presence of ORC (Fig. 1g, h and Extended Data Figs. 4, 5), similar to those at gene 5 promoters, where sequence-specific "barriers" operate together with chromatin remodelers in array phasing $14,15$.

Together, from our *in vitro* screen we learned that ORC in conjunction with positioning remodelers INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 or Chd1 has an essential role in arranging the chromatin landscape at origins. Our data further suggest that these four chromatin remodelers might operate 10 redundantly *in vivo*.

Chromatin remodellers operate redundantly

To study this, we made use of a quadruple mutant¹⁸ where the gene encoding the noncatalytic Arp8 subunit of INO80 was deleted on top of a *isw1* \triangle *isw2* \triangle *chd1* \triangle triple remodeler 15 mutant¹⁹ ($\alpha r \beta \Delta$ *isw1* Δ *isw2* Δ *chd1* Δ (QKO), Extended Data Fig. 6a). Eliminating the catalytic subunit Ino80 would not be viable in this triple mutant background. We also tested the respective single deletion mutants and determined chromatin profiles at origins *in vivo*. In support of our hypothesis, the single remodeller deletion mutants had little effect (Extended Data Fig. 7), whereas the QKO mutant showed a significant reduction of nucleosomal arrays at origins compared to wild 20 type (Fig. 2a).

We next asked if the chromatin defects in the QKO mutant might influence DNA synthesis. We followed bulk S phase progression after pheromone arrest/release by flow cytometry. We observed a severe replication phenotype of the QKO mutant compared to wild type where most

cells arrested the cell cycle with G1 DNA content and did not even enter S phase (Fig. 2b). These *in vivo* experiments suggest that accurate nucleosome positioning around origins might be critical for chromosome replication. However, given that a QKO mutant shows significant global defects in chromatin composition¹⁸, it is impossible, at this point, to exclude indirect effects on DNA 5 synthesis by e. g. transcriptional dysregulation.

Orc1 bears ORC´s chromatin function

We learned from our *in vitro* experiments that INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1 cannot operate without ORC at origins. For INO80, this is in contrast to promoter regions, where INO80 is able to properly position $+1$ nucleosomes and generate rudimentary arrays on its own^{14,15}. We reasoned that, instead of eliminating chromatin remodelers, finding regions in ORC responsible for its function in chromatin organization would locally disrupt chromatin architecture at origins and possible defects in replication would be a direct consequence.

The Orc1 subunit is known to associate with chromatin. It bears a bromo-adjacent homology domain (BAH) that can interact with nucleosomes^{20,21} (Fig. 2c) and an intrinsically disordered region (IDR) of unknown function²². IDRs are inherently flexible and we speculated that this feature might be important to interact with INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 or Chd1. Finally, Orc1 has a AAA⁺-ATPase domain (Fig. 2c), where ATP binding is essential for DNA association and function as the helicase loader²³. The role of ATP hydrolysis, however, is less clear. We therefore 20 hypothesized that ATP hydrolysis by Orc1 might be important for ORC´s function to organize chromatin at origins.

We generated mutants lacking the BAH (*orc1*-BAH²⁴) or the IDR domains (*orc1*-IDR) as well as a Walker B ATP-hydrolysis point mutant in the AAA⁺-ATPase domain (*orc1*-Walker B²⁵).

Whereas *orc1*-BAH did not show a growth phenotype under optimal conditions, elimination of the IDR showed a growth defect (Extended Data Fig. 6b). Upon induction of replication stress using hydroxyurea (HU), both mutations resulted in slow growth, where *orc1*-IDR was more affected than *orc1*-BAH (Extended Data Fig. 6c). Elimination of both (*orc1*-BAH-IDR) resulted in lethality 5 (Fig. 2d). In contrast, an *orc1*-Walker B mutation on its own is lethal consistent with previous results²⁵ (Fig. 2d). We separately studied the viable and lethal mutations in detail. We first asked if the viable BAH- or IDR-mutations influenced origin-adjacent nucleosome positioning as well as DNA synthesis. Consistent with the growth assay, *orc1*-BAH did not show defects in nucleosome positioning at origins (Fig. 2e) and had very minor replication defects (Fig. 2f). In 10 contrast, *orc1*-IDR mutants showed a mild but robust reduction of nucleosome occupancy (Fig. 2e), which was accompanied with a replication phenotype, with a delay in S phase entry combined with a significant fraction of cells arrested with G1 DNA content (Fig. 2f). This was similar to the QKO experiment (Fig. 2b), although less pronounced. Together, our *in vivo* analyses show that the IDR domain of Orc1 is important for nucleosome positioning at origins and for chromosome 15 replication, whereas the BAH domain seems less involved. However, both domains together are required for viability, as was the ability of Orc1 to hydrolyze ATP.

ORC´s chromatin function is essential

We next aimed to determine the molecular basis of the lethal phenotypes of the *orc1*-BAH-20 IDR and the *orc1*-Walker B mutants. We hypothesized that they are caused by the disruption of chromatin structure at origins. Alternatively, Orc1 mutant proteins might influence ORC complex formation, ORC-DNA binding or loading of the motor of the replicative helicase, the MCM complex. To test these possibilities, we went back to *in vitro* systems and firstly expressed and

purified ORC complexes. Neither mutation impaired ORC complex formation (Fig. 3a). Thus, we next investigated ORC-DNA binding and MCM loading^{12,26,27} (Fig. 3b). ORC-DNA binding and MCM loading were similar for ORC wild type (WT) and mutants (Fig. 3c), with the exception of the Orc1-Walker B mutant, which showed reduced MCM loading (lane 4). This might be due to δ defects in reiterate MCM loading, as previously suggested²⁸. We next tested the effects of these mutant ORC complexes in combination with INO80 on the reconstitution of regular arrays at origins. Consistent with our *in vivo* results, Orc1-BAH mutant complexes had little effect, whereas Orc1-IDR mutants displayed a significant reduction in array generation (Fig. 3d). The observed defects were more pronounced compared to the *in vivo* scenario (Fig. 2e), likely because of a 10 partial functional redundancy with other factors. Interestingly and in line with our hypothesis, nucleosome architecture was completely disrupted using an Orc1-Walker B mutant complex (Fig. 3d), comparable to reconstitutions without ORC or without remodelers (Fig. 1f and Extended Data Figs. 2, 4). Similar results as for reconstitutions with INO80 were obtained with ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1 (Extended Data Fig. 8), although to a lesser extent, suggesting that INO80 might be the 15 major chromatin remodeler at origins.

We next analyzed the second lethal scenario, the *orc1*-BAH-IDR mutation (Fig. 2d). Complex formation (Fig. 3e), DNA binding and MCM loading (Fig. 3f) were not affected. Consistent with our hypothesis, array reconstruction with the Orc1-BAH-IDR mutant complex and INO80 was equally disrupted as with the Orc1-Walker B mutation (Fig. 3g). Again, other 20 remodelers showed similar results (Extended Data Fig. 9). Our *in vitro* results confirmed our hypothesis that cell death of both *orc1*-BAH-IDR and *orc1*-Walker B mutants is caused by disrupted chromatin structure at origins of replication rather than problems in MCM loading.

Discussion

In summary, we propose that ORC has a second essential function beside its canonical role as the MCM loader. ORC is a master regulator of origin-adjacent chromatin architecture and this is an essential function for chromosome replication (Fig. 3h). ORC cannot do this alone – it must 5 collaborate with chromatin remodelers, like INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 or Chd1.

The Orc1 subunit is critical for ORC´s chromatin function. The BAH and IDR domains operate redundantly, whereas ATP hydrolysis by the AAA⁺-ATPase domain is essential. All these three domains are highly conserved, therefore it is very likely that ORC´s chromatin function broadly applies across species^{21,29-32}. We speculate that the BAH domain binds origin-flanking 10 nucleosomes, which might be important for the accurate positioning of ORC at the ACS, consistent with previous results²¹. We further speculate that the flexibility of the IDR might be important for facilitating ORC/remodeler interactions.

An involvement of ATP hydrolysis by the Orc1 AAA⁺-ATPase domain is surprising, given that general regulatory factors at gene promoters act as "phasers" without enzymatic activity^{14,15}. 15 It is possible that ORC uses ATP hydrolysis to actively manipulate chromatin structure. Supporting this idea, recent work showed that ORC can evict $H2A-H2B$ dimers³³.

Orc1 was identified in a global screen for nucleosome depletion factors, together with general regulatory factors, like Reb1 or Abf1, that are known to participate in nucleosome organization³⁴. It was proposed that such factors deplete nucleosomes due to special properties of 20 their DNA binding domain and thereby effective binding competition with the histone octamer, similar to pioneer factors³⁵. Our results add a new aspect to this discussion. The Orc1-BAH-IDR mutant complex was not impaired in DNA binding (Fig. 3f). It could still increase nucleosome depletion over the ACS compared to SGD chromatin, although less so than the WT ORC complex

(Fig. 3g vs. Fig. 1h), but could not direct the generation of nucleosomal arrays anymore. This strongly argues that the nucleosome organizing activity may mainly rely on the DNA binding domain with regard to nucleosome depletion, but requires additional properties with regard to array generation. These likely include interactions with remodelers and, in the case of ORC, an ATPase 5 activity.

Our result that chromatin architecture at origins is essential for cell viability may seem unexpected at first sight, given that chromatin per se is a major barrier to replication $11,12,36$. However, even though nucleosomes are repressive for transcription³⁷, proper nucleosome 10 positioning at gene starts and in gene bodies is instrumental for transcription start site selection and suppression of cryptic transcription^{38–41}. Analogously, we propose that well-positioned nucleosomes flanking replication origins might cause activated helicases to pause, to allow for complete and accurate assembly of the replication machinery in order to start bidirectional replication in a synchronous manner.

Fig. 1

Fig. 3

Legends to Figures:

Fig. 1: ORC is a master regulator of chromatin structure at origins of replication.

- 5 **a)** Composite plot of MNase-seq data of ~ 300 replication origins from wild type cells *in vivo* aligned to the ORC binding sites ACS (ARS-Consensus Sequence). Grey circles: Nucleosomes.
	- **b)** Outline of the chromatin reconstitution assay.
- **c)** Bulk nucleosome spacing of *in vitro* assembled SGD chromatin was determined by 10 partial MNase digestion. After digestion, proteins were removed and the nucleosomal DNA fragments were resolved through 1% agarose and stained with ethidium bromide.
	- **d)** Composite plot of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin aligned as in **a)**.
	- **e)** SDS-PAGE analysis of purified ORC.
- **f)** Composite plot of MNase -seq data aligned as in **a)** of SGD chromatin incubated with 15 ORC.
	- **g)** SDS-PAGE analysis of purified INO80, ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1.
	- **h)** Composite plots of MNase-seq data aligned as in **a)** of SGD chromatin incubated with ORC plus either INO80 or ISW1a or ISW2 or Chd1.

²⁰ **Fig. 2: Orc1 is important for ORC´s chromatin function** *in vivo***.**

- **a)** Composite plots of MNase-seq *in vivo* data aligned as in Fig. 1A of wild type cells versus of a quadruple mutant (QKO), deleted for *ARP8*, *ISW1*, *ISW2* and *CHD1*.
- **b)** Wild type and QKO cells were synchronized in G1 phase with alpha-factor. After release, S phase progression was monitored using flow cytometry. 1C and 2C indicate 25 non-replicated or replicated DNA, respectively.

- **c)** Domain organization of Orc1 subunit of ORC, highlighting the bromo-adjacent homology domain (BAH), the intrinsically disordered region (IDR) and the AAA⁺-ATPase domain.
- **d)** Representative results of tetrad dissections from *ORC1/orc1-*BAH-IDR *and ORC1/orc1-* 5 Walker B heterozygotes. Red circles indicate positions of spores bearing *orc1* mutations.
	- **e)** Composite plots of MNase-seq *in vivo* data aligned as in Fig. 1a of *ORC1* wild type compared to *orc1* mutants as indicated. Similar results were obtained with three independent replicates.
	- **f)** Flow cytometry analyses as in Fig. 2b with the same strains as in **e)**.

10

Fig. 3: Lethal phenotypes of Orc1 mutations are associated with disrupted chromatin architecture at origins

- **a)** SDS-PAGE analysis of ORCs with Orc1 mutants as indicated.
- **b)** Outline of the assay of the ORC-DNA binding assay and the MCM loading assay. Saltstable association of Mcm2-7 subunits is indicative of productive MCM loading^{26,27}.
	- **c)** Silver-stained gels of the assays described in **b)** with ORC wild type (WT) and ORCs with Orc1 mutants.
- **d)** Composite plots of MNase-seq data aligned as in Fig. 1a of SGD chromatin incubated with INO80 and ORC wild type (grey background) or ORCs with mutant Orc1 as 20 indicated. Wedge on top indicates cell viability of mutants bearing the respective *orc1* mutations.
	- **e)** SDS-PAGE analysis of purified ORC with the Orc1-BAH-IDR mutant.
- **f)** Silver-stained gels of the assays described in **b)** with ORC wild type or ORC with the Orc1-BAH-IDR mutant.
- **g)** Composite plot of MNase-seq data aligned as in **a)** of SGD chromatin incubated with indicated ORC variants.
- 5 **h)** Model of ORC function in chromatin organization at replication origins. See text for details.

Main References

- 1. Bell, S. P. & Labib, K. Chromosome duplication in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genetics* 10 **203**, 1027–1067 (2016).
	- 2. Eaton, M. L., Galani, K., Kang, S., Bell, S. P. & MacAlpine, D. M. Conserved nucleosome positioning defines replication origins. *Genes Dev.* **24**, 748–753 (2010).
	- 3. Berbenetz, N. M., Nislow, C. & Brown, G. W. Diversity of Eukaryotic DNA replication origins revealed by Genome-wide analysis of chromatin structure. *PLoS Genet.* **6**, (2010).
- 15 4. Broach, J. R. *et al.* Localization and sequence analysis of yeast origins of DNA replication. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* **47**, 1165–1173 (1983).
	- 5. Nieduszynski, C. A., Knox, Y. & Donaldson, A. D. Genome-wide identification of replication origins in yeast by comparative genomics. *Genes Dev.* **20**, 1874–1879 (2006).
- 6. Xu, W., Aparicio, J. G., Aparicio, O. M. & Tavaré, S. Genome-wide mapping of ORC and 20 Mcm2p binding sites on tiling arrays and identification of essential ARS consensus sequences in S. cerevisiae. *BMC Genomics* **7**, 1–16 (2006).
	- 7. Liachko, I., Youngblood, R. A., Keich, U. & Dunham, M. J. High-resolution mapping, characterization, and optimization of autonomously replicating sequences in yeast. *Genome Res.* **23**, 698–704 (2013).
- 25 8. Akerman, I. *et al.* A predictable conserved DNA base composition signature defines human core DNA replication origins. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1–15 (2020).
	- 9. Kornberg, R. D. & Lorch, Y. Twenty-five years of the nucleosome, fundamental particle of the eukaryote chromosome. *Cell* **98**, 285–294 (1999).
- 10. Lipford, J. R. & Bell, S. P. Nucleosomes Positioned by ORC Facilitate the Initiation of 30 DNA Replication. *Mol. Cell* **7**, 21–30 (2001).
	- 11. Azmi, I. F. *et al.* Nucleosomes influence multiple steps during replication initiation. *Elife* **6**, 1–23 (2017).
	- 12. Kurat, C. F., Yeeles, J. T. P., Patel, H., Early, A. & Diffley, J. F. X. Chromatin Controls DNA Replication Origin Selection, Lagging-Strand Synthesis, and Replication Fork

Rates. *Mol. Cell* **65**, 117–130 (2017).

- 13. Yuan, G. C. *et al.* Molecular biology: Genome-scale identification of nucleosome positions in S. cerevisiae. *Science (80-.).* **309**, 626–630 (2005).
- 14. Krietenstein, N. *et al.* Genomic Nucleosome Organization Reconstituted with Pure 5 Proteins. *Cell* **167**, 709–721 (2016).
	- 15. Oberbeckmann, E. *et al.* Genome information processing by the INO80 chromatin remodeler positions nucleosomes. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, (2021).
	- 16. Rossi, M. J. *et al.* A high-resolution protein architecture of the budding yeast genome. *Nature* **592**, 309–314 (2021).
- 10 17. Barnes, T. & Korber, P. The active mechanism of nucleosome depletion by Poly(da:dt) tracts in vivo. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **22**, 1–20 (2021).
	- 18. Singh, A. K., Schauer, T., Pfaller, L., Straub, T. & Mueller-Planitz, F. The biogenesis and function of nucleosome arrays. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1–15 (2021).
- 19. Tsukiyama, T., Palmer, J., Landel, C. C., Shiloach, J. & Wu, C. Characterization of the 15 imitation switch subfamily of ATP-dependent chromatin-remodeling factors in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Genes Dev.* **13**, 686–697 (1999).
	- 20. De Ioannes, P. *et al.* Structure and function of the Orc1 BAH-nucleosome complex. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1–11 (2019).
- 21. Müller, P. *et al.* The conserved bromo-adjacent homology domain of yeast Orc1 functions 20 in the selection of DNA replication origins within chromatin. *Genes Dev.* **24**, 1418–1433 (2010).
	- 22. Mészáros, B., Erdös, G. & Dosztányi, Z. IUPred2A: Context-dependent prediction of protein disorder as a function of redox state and protein binding. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, 329–337 (2018).
- 25 23. Klemm, R. D., Austin, R. J. & Bell, S. P. Coordinate binding of ATP and origin DNA regulates the ATPase activity of the origin recognition complex. *Cell* **88**, 493–502 (1997).
	- 24. Callebaut, I., Courvalin, J. C. & Mornon, J. P. The BAH (bromo-adjacent homology) domain: A link between DNA methylation, replication and transcriptional regulation. *FEBS Lett.* **446**, 189–193 (1999).
- 30 25. Klemm, R. D. & Bell, S. P. ATP bound to the origin recognition complex is important for preRC formation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **98**, 8361–8367 (2001).
	- 26. Evrin, C. *et al.* A double-hexameric MCM2-7 complex is loaded onto origin DNA during licensing of eukaryotic DNA replication. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 20240– 20245 (2009).
- 35 27. Remus, D. *et al.* Concerted Loading of Mcm2-7 Double Hexamers around DNA during DNA Replication Origin Licensing. *Cell* **139**, 719–730 (2009).
	- 28. Bowers, J. L., Randell, J. C. W., Chen, S. & Bell, S. P. ATP hydrolysis by ORC catalyzes reiterative Mcm2-7 assembly at a defined origin of replication. *Mol. Cell* **16**, 967–978 (2004).

- 29. Bell, S. P., Mitchell, J., Leber, J., Kobayashi, R. & Stillman, B. The multidomain structure of Orc1 p reveals similarity to regulators of DNA replication and transcriptional silencing. *Cell* **83**, 563–568 (1995).
- 30. Gavin, K. A., Hidaka, M. & Stillman, B. Conserved initiator proteins in eukaryotes. 5 *Science (80-.).* **270**, 1667–1671 (1995).
	- 31. Parker, M. W. *et al.* A new class of disordered elements controls DNA replication through initiator self-assembly. *Elife* **8**, 1–35 (2019).
- 32. Jaremko, M. J., On, K. F., Thomas, D. R., Stillman, B. & Joshua-Tor, L. The dynamic nature of the human origin recognition complex revealed through five cryoem structures. 10 *Elife* **9**, 1–19 (2020).
	- 33. Li, S. *et al.* ORC binds and remodels nucleosomes to specify MCM loading onto DNA. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.08.17.456647.
	- 34. Yan, C., Chen, H. & Bai, L. Systematic Study of Nucleosome-Displacing Factors in Budding Yeast. *Mol. Cell* **71**, 294–305 (2018).
- 15 35. Donovan, B. T., Chen, H., Jipa, C., Bai, L. & Poirier, M. G. Dissociation rate compensation mechanism for budding yeast pioneer transcription factors. *Elife* **8**, 1–24 (2019).
	- 36. Devbhandari, S., Jiang, J., Kumar, C., Whitehouse, I. & Remus, D. Chromatin Constrains the Initiation and Elongation of DNA Replication. *Mol. Cell* **65**, 131–141 (2017).
- 20 37. Lorch, Y., LaPointe, J. W. & Kornberg, R. D. Nucleosomes inhibit the initiation of transcription but allow chain elongation with the displacement of histones. *Cell* **49**, 203– 210 (1987).
- 38. Smolle, M. *et al.* Chromatin remodelers Isw1 and Chd1 maintain chromatin structure during transcription by preventing histone exchange. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **19**, 884–892 25 (2012).
	- 39. Nagai, S., Davis, R. E., Mattei, P. J., Eagen, K. P. & Kornberg, R. D. Chromatin potentiates transcription. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **114**, 1536–1541 (2017).
	- 40. Kubik, S. *et al.* Opposing chromatin remodelers control transcription initiation frequency and start site selection. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **26**, 744–754 (2019).
- 30 41. Kornberg, R. D. & Lorch, Y. Primary Role of the Nucleosome. *Mol. Cell* **79**, 371–375 (2020).

Methods

Strains

5 Yeast strains were generated using standard genetic techniques. A list of strains used in this study can be found in Extended Data Table 1.

Origin plasmid library

10 The yeast origin plasmid library was generated using the *S. cerevisiae* genomic library (pGP546) from Open Biosystems⁴². A list of confirmed ARS available in OriDB⁴³ was used to select plasmids containing an origin of replication located at least 1000 bp away from the border between plasmid backbone and yeast genomic insert. In this way, a smaller *E.coli* clone collection containing 357 ARS was generated and stored as glycerol stocks in 96-well plates. The library was 15 expanded as previously described⁴⁴.

SGD chromatin assembly

Chromatin was assembled by salt gradient dialysis (SGD) as previously described $14,15$. 20 Briefly, 10 µg of origin plasmid library DNA were combined with *Drosophila* embryo histone octamers in 100 µL SGD buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 2 M NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 20 µg BSA, 0.05 % IGEPAL CA630) to a saturated assembly degree^{44,45}. Samples were placed in Slide-A-Lyzer devices (Thermo-Fisher) in 300 mL high salt buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 2 M NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.05 % IGEPAL CA630, 14.3 mM β-mercaptoethanol). This was dialyzed against 3 25 L low salt buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.05 % IGEPAL CA630, 1.4 mM β-mercaptoethanol), using a peristaltic pump at 7.5 rpm, 30 ˚C for 16 h. Chromatin was then dialyzed for 1 h with 1 L low salt buffer at 30 $^{\circ}$ C and stored at 4 $^{\circ}$ C.

30

35

Protein expression and purification

The embryonic *D. melanogaster* histone octamers, INO80, ISW1a, RSC, Fun30, Asf1, CAF-1, FACT, Nap1, and Nhp6 were expressed and purified as previously described^{12,45-53}.

ORC expression and purification

Codon optimized wild-type ORC was purified from ySD-ORC as described before with modifications⁵⁴. Cells were grown in YP media + 2 % raffinose at 30 °C with shaking until reaching a density of \sim 2-4 x 10⁷ cells/mL. Cells were arrested with 100 ng/mL α -factor (GenScript) for 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ h and protein expression was induced by the addition of 2 % galactose for 2 $\frac{1}{2}$ h at 30 °C. Cells 40 were collected by centrifugation, washed in lysis buffer without protease inhibitors (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 300 mM KCl, 0.05 % NP-40, 2 mM β-mercaptoethanol, 10 % glycerol), resuspended in an equal volume of 2X lysis buffer plus protease inhibitors (cOmplete (Roche), 0.2 mM PMSF (Roth), 1 µM pepstatin A (Genaxxon), 1 µg/mL aprotinin (Genaxxon), and 2 µM leupeptin (Genaxxon)) and frozen in liquid nitrogen in a dropwise manner. The frozen cells were 45 crushed using a Freezer Mill (SPEX SamplePrep 6875 Freezer/Mill) (6 cycles for 2 min, crushing rate 15). To purify ORC, the frozen powder was thawed and resuspended in an equal volume of

lysis buffer plus protease inhibitors. Insoluble material was cleared by ultracentrifugation (235,000 g, 1 h, 4 °C), the supernatant was then collected and supplemented with $2 \text{ mM } CaCl_2$ before binding to 1 mL pre-washed calmodulin affinity resin (Agilent) in batch for 1 h at 4 ˚C. This was then transferred into a disposable column (Bio-Rad) and washed with lysis buffer containing 2 mM 5 CaCl₂ (100 CV). ORC was eluted in 6 CV of lysis buffer containing 1 mM EDTA and 2 mM EGTA; pooled, concentrated (Amicon Ultra centrifugal filter units, MWCO 30 kDa, Millipore) and further purified using a Superdex 200 Increase 10/300 GL column (Cytiva) in elution buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 200 mM KOAc, 0.05 % NP-40, 2 mM β-mercaptoethanol, 10 % glycerol). Fractions containing ORC were pooled, concentrated and stored in aliquots at - 80 ˚C.

10

Orc1 mutants' expression and purification

Codon optimized versions of ORC containing a mutated Orc1 (BAH, IDR, Walker B, and BAH-IDR) were chromosomally integrated and the expression of all subunits was under the 15 control of a GAL1/10 promoter. The endogenous Orc1 allele was tagged with a 3xFLAG to remove the complexes containing WT Orc1 subunits. The purification of the mutants was done as for SD-ORC but with the following additional purification step: pooled fractions from the calmodulin affinity resin step were applied to 0.5 mL pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel (Sigma) and the eluted fractions were then concentrated before proceeding to the size exclusion purification step 20 as described above.

ISW2 expression and purification

Cells were grown in 6 L YPD to saturation, collected and resuspended in an equal volume of 25 2X lysis buffer with protease inhibitors (lysis buffer (1X): 25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 300 mM KCl, $2 \text{ mM } MgCl_2$, 0.02% NP-40, 1 mM DTT, 100 mM EDTA, 20% glycerol). Cells were frozen in liquid nitrogen in a dropwise manner, thawed and crushed using a Freezer Mill. The frozen cell powder was thawed, resuspended in an equal volume of lysis buffer with protease inhibitors and the insoluble material was removed by ultracentrifugation (235,000 g, 1 h, 4 ˚C). The supernatant 30 containing Isw2-TAP was incubated with 1 mL of pre-washed IgG Sepharose 6 Fast Flow resin (VWR) in batch for 2 h at 4 $^{\circ}$ C. This was applied to a disposable column, washed with 100 CV wash buffer (same as lysis buffer but containing 100 mM KCl) and the resin was incubated in 1 mL wash buffer containing 0.1 mg/mL TEV protease for 16 h while rotating at 4 ˚C. ISW2 was eluted in 8 CV lysis buffer and the peak fractions were pooled, mixed with 3 volumes of wash 35 buffer and supplemented with 2 mM CaCl2. This was then incubated with 1 mL pre-washed calmodulin affinity resin for 1 h at 4 ˚C, transferred to a disposable column, washed with 75 CV of wash buffer containing 2 mM CaCl2, and eluted in 10 CV of elution buffer (wash buffer containing 2 mM EDTA and 3 mM EGTA). The fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and concentrated using a Vivaspin 20 (100 kDa MWCO Polyethersulfone, Merck).

40

Chd1 expression and purification

ΔNC-Chd1 was expressed and purified as described previously with modifications⁵⁵. Insoluble material was cleared by centrifugation $(235,000 \text{ g}, 1 \text{ h}, 4 \degree \text{C})$ and the supernatant was 45 incubated with 1 mL pre-washed Ni-NTA agarose in batch for 1 h at 4 ˚C. This was transferred to a disposable column, washed with 25 CV of lysis buffer, 50 CV of lysis buffer containing 25 mM

imidazole and eluted 10 CV with lysis buffer containing 400 mM imidazole. Peak fractions were pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of 25 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 250 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT and 10% glycerol. Chd1 was further purified in a Mono Q 5/50 GL column and eluted with a 20 CV gradient from 50 mM to 1 M NaCl (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 1 mM DTT, 10 % glycerol). Peak fractions 5 were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and applied to a Superdex 200 Increase 10/300 GL column using a buffer containing 50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 250 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT and 10 % glycerol. Fractions containing Chd1 were pooled and stored at -80 ˚C.

SWI/SNF expression and purification

SWI/SNF was purified as described previously with modifications⁵⁶. 6 L of cells were grown in YPD to saturation. Cells were collected and crushed in a Freezer Mill as described above. The cell powder was thawed and resuspend in an equal volume of lysis buffer (40 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 350 mM KCl, 0.1 % NP-40, 10 % glycerol) plus protease inhibitors, centrifuged at 235,000 15 g for 1 h at 4 ˚C and the supernatant was incubated with pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel in batch for 1 h at 4 ˚C. This was transferred into a disposable column, washed with 100 CV of lysis buffer and 50 CV of wash buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.2, 150 mM NaCl, 0.5 mM EDTA, 1 mM DTT, 0.1 % NP-40, 10 % glycerol). SWI/SNF was eluted in 1 CV of wash buffer with 0.5 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma), followed by 2 CV of wash buffer with 0.25 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide. 20 Fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of wash salt containing 40 % glycerol.

SWR1 expression and purification

25 The yeast powder was thawed and resuspended in 2 volumes of lysis buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 500 mM KCl, 1 mM EDTA pH 8.0, 4 mM MgCl₂, 0.05 % NP-40, 10% glycerol) plus protease inhibitors. The lysate was centrifuged at 136,000 g for 2 h at 4 ˚C and the supernatant was incubated with 1.5 mL of pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel in batch for 1 ½ h at 4 ˚C. This was transferred into a disposable column, washed with 100 CV of lysis buffer and 25 CV of 30 wash buffer $(25 \text{ mM HEPES-KOH pH } 7.6, 150 \text{ mM KCl}, 1 \text{ mM EDTA pH } 8.0, 4 \text{ mM MgCl}_2$, 0.05 % NP-40, 10% glycerol). SWR1 was eluted in 1 CV of wash buffer with 0.5 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma), followed by 2 CV of wash buffer with 0.25 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide. Fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of 25 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.6, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA pH 8.0, 1 mM DTT and 40% glycerol.

35

10

HIR expression and purification

The frozen cell powder was slowly thawed and resuspended in 1 volume of lysis buffer (30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 300 mM KCl, 0.5 mM EDTA, 0.1 % NP-40, 10% glycerol) containing 40 protease inhibitors and centrifuged at 235,000 g, 1 h, 4 ˚C. The supernatant was then incubated with pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel in batch for 1 h at 4 °C. This was transferred into a disposable column, washed with 100 CV of lysis buffer and 50 CV of wash buffer (30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM KCl, 0.1 % NP-40, 10% glycerol). HIR was eluted in 1 CV of wash buffer with 0.5 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma), followed by 2 CV of wash buffer with 0.25 mg/mL 45 3xFLAG peptide. Fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of 30

Spt6 expression and purification

6 L of cells were grown in YPD, collected and lysed with a Freezer Mill as described above. The frozen powder was slowly thawed and resuspended in an equal volume of lysis buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.2, 0.5 M KOAc, 0.1 % NP-40, 1 mM EDTA and 10 % glycerol) containing protease inhibitors. The insoluble material was cleared by centrifugation (235,000 g, 1 h, 4 ˚C) and the 10 supernatant was incubated with 1.5 mL pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel in batch for 1 h at 4 ˚C. This was transferred into a disposable column, washed with 100 CV of lysis buffer and 25 CV of wash buffer (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1 % NP-40, 1 mM EDTA, 10 % glycerol). Spt6 was eluted in 1 CV of wash buffer with 0.5 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma), followed by 2 CV of wash buffer with 0.25 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide. Eluted fractions were 15 analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled, and further purified with a Mono Q 5/50 GL column using a 20 CV gradient from 100 mM to 1 M NaCl (10 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 0.1 % NP-40, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM DTT and 10 % glycerol).

Rtt106 expression and purification

Cells were grown in 2 L of YP + 2 % raffinose to 5 x $10⁷$ cells/mL at 30 °C and protein expression was induced by addition of 2 % galactose for 3 h. Cells were collected and crushed in a Freezer Mill. The thawed powder was resuspended in 1 volume of lysis buffer (30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 300 mM NaCl, 0.5 mM EDTA, 0.1 % NP-40, 10% glycerol) containing protease 25 inhibitors and centrifuged (235,000 g, 1 h, 4 ˚C). The supernatant was then incubated with 1.5 mL pre-washed anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel in batch for 1 h at 4 ˚C. This was transferred into a disposable column, washed with 100 CV of lysis buffer and 50 CV of wash buffer (30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM NaCl, 0.1 % NP-40, 10% glycerol). Rtt106 was eluted in 1 CV of wash buffer with 0.5 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide (Sigma), followed by 2 CV of wash buffer with 0.25 30 mg/mL 3xFLAG peptide. Fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of 30 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.5, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 0.1% NP-40, 1 mM DTT and 40 % glycerol.

Vps75 expression and purification

2 L of BL21 (DE3) CodonPlus-RIL cells with a Vps75-His₆ expression plasmid were grown at 37 °C to $OD_{600} = 0.8$. Protein expression was induced with 0.8 mM IPTG incubated for 16 h at 20 ˚C. Cells were collected by centrifugation, washed, resuspended in 2 mL of lysis buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 100 mM NaCl and protease inhibitors) per g of cells and supplemented 40 with 16 U DNAse I, 30 µg/mL RNase A and 0.5 mM DTT. The cells were sonicated (10 min (1 s on, 2 s off, 38 % amplitude)) and centrifuged (235,000 g, 1 h, 4 ˚C). The supernatant was incubated with 1.5 mL pre-washed Ni-NTA resin for 1 h while rotating at 4 $^{\circ}$ C. This was then applied to a disposable column and washed with 25 CV of lysis buffer without protease inhibitors, followed by 50 CV of wash buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 100 mM NaCl and 25 mM imidazole). 45 Vps75 was eluted with 10 x 1 mL elution buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 100 mM NaCl and 400 mM imidazole). Fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and dialyzed against 2 L of

5

20

20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6 and 100 mM NaCl. Vps75 was further purified in a Mono Q 5/50 GL column with a 20 CV gradient from 100 mM to 1 M NaCl (HEPES-KOH pH 7.6 and 2 mM DTT). Peak fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, pooled and applied to a Superdex 200 Increase 10/300 GL column equilibrated with 20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 500 mM NaCl and 1 5 mM EDTA.

In vitro **remodeling assay and MNase-seq**

10 The assay was done as previously described with modifications^{15,44}. The following concentrations of chromatin factors were used: 30 nM ORC, Orc1 mutants (BAH, IDR, Walker B, BAH-IDR); 20 nM INO80, Chd1; 10 nM ISW1a, ISW2, Fun30, RSC, SWI/SNF, SWR1, Asf1, CAF1, FACT, HIR, Nap1, Nhp6, Spt6, Rtt106, Vps75. The reactions were started by the addition of the SGD chromatin, incubated for 2 h at 30 ˚C and stopped by addition of 0.2 U apyrase (NEB), 15 incubated at 30 ˚C for 20 min. To generate mostly mononucleosomal DNA, the reactions were incubated with 100 U MNase (Sigma-Aldrich) and 1.5 mM CaCl₂ for 5 min at 30 °C. The digest was stopped by the addition of 10 mM EDTA and 0.5 % SDS. This was followed by a proteinase K treatment for 1 h at 37 ˚C and ethanol precipitation. Samples were run in 1.5 % agarose gels for 1.5 h at 110 V constant in 1X TAE (40 mM Tris, 20 mM acetic acid, 1 mM EDTA), 20 mononucleosomal DNA was excised and purified.

The sequencing libraries were prepared as previously described^{15,44} by using 10-50 ng mononucleosomal DNA. The samples were diluted to 10 nM, pooled according to the sequencing reads \sim 5 million reads/sample), and quantified via BioAnalyzer (Agilent). The pool was sequenced either on an Illumina HiSeq 1500 in 50 bp single-end mode or on an Illumina NextSeq 25 1000 in 60 bp paired-end mode (Laboratory for Functional Genome Analysis, LAFUGA, LMU Munich).

Nuclei isolation and MNase-seq

30 A 500 mL YPDA culture was incubated at 30 °C for 16-20 h until reaching $OD_{600} = 0.6-1.0$ (measured with a GENESYS 20 Visible Spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher)). The cells were collected by centrifugation and the nuclei isolation was performed as previously described with modifications44,57. Spheroblasts were generated by incubation with zymolyase (MP Biomedicals zymolyase 100T) in 1 M sorbitol, washed and resuspended in a Ficoll solution (18 % Ficoll Type 35 400 (Sigma-Aldrich), 20 mM KH_2PO_4 , 1 mM $MgCl_2$, 0.25 mM EGTA pH 8.0, 0.25 mM EDTA pH 8.0). This was then aliquoted and centrifuged for 30 min at 22,550 g 4 $^{\circ}$ C. The nuclei pellets were frozen in a dry ice/ethanol bath and stored at - 80 °C.

The nuclei was digested with MNase (Sigma-Aldrich) in MNase buffer (150 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 14 mM CaCl₂, 2 mM EDTA, 2 mM EGTA and 50 mM β-mercaptoethanol) 40 to get an 80 % mono- / 20 % di- nucleosome distribution. The reaction was stopped by addition of 10 mM EDTA and 0.5 % SDS. The DNA was purified by Proteinase K digestion, phenolchloroform extraction, ethanol precipitation, RNAse A digestion and isopropanol precipitation. The samples were run in a 1.5 % agarose gel, the mononucleosomal DNA was cut out and purified using the PureLink Quick Gel Extraction kit (Invitrogen).

45 Sequencing libraries were prepared with the NEBNext® Ultra™ II DNA Library Prep Kit for Illumina (NEB). The amplified DNA was run in a 1.5 % agarose gel, cut out, purified and the concentration was measured with the Qubit dsDNA HS Assay Kit (Fisher Scientific). Samples

were then diluted to 10 nM, pooled according to sequencing reads $($ \sim 5 million reads/sample) and quantified via BioAnalyzer (Agilent). The pool was sequenced on an Illumina NextSeq 1000 in 60 bp paired-end mode (Laboratory for Functional Genome Analysis, LAFUGA, LMU Munich).

5 **ORC binding and MCM loading assays**

The ORC binding and loading assays were done as described before with modifications^{26,27}. A linear 2.8 kb fragment of yeast DNA containing an ARS1 sequence was bound at one end to magnetic beads via a biotin-streptavidin linkage. For testing the ORC binding to DNA, a 40 µL 10 reaction was carried out by incubating together 500 ng DNA beads, 30 nM ORC and 5 mM ATP in loading buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 10 mM MgOAc, 90 mM KOAc, 1 mM DTT, 0.1 % NP-40 and 5 % glycerol). The reaction was incubated for 90 min at 30 °C, 1250 rpm. The beads were washed twice with 400 µL low salt buffer (45 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.6, 5 mM MgOAc, 300 mM KOAc, 0.02 % NP-40 and 10 % glycerol) and incubated with 860 gel units MNase (NEB) 15 in low salt buffer containing 5 mM CaCl₂ for 5 min at 37 °C, 1250 rpm. The supernatant was analyzed in a SDS-PAGE and silver stained.

For the loading assay the DNA beads were incubated with ORC as described for the ORC binding assay, but with the addition of 80 nM Cdc6 and 50 nM Cdt1•Mcm2-7. The beads were washed twice with 400 µL low salt buffer, twice in 400 µL high salt buffer (45 mM HEPES-KOH 20 pH 7.6, 5 mM MgOAc, 500 mM NaCl, 0.02 % NP-40 and 10 % glycerol) and one 400 µL wash in low salt buffer. The beads were incubated with MNase as above and the supernatant was analyzed in an SDS-PAGE and silver stained.

25 **Flow cytometry**

Samples were processed as previously described⁵⁸. Briefly, yeast cells were harvested by centrifugation and permeabilized with 70 % ethanol on ice for at least 1 h, followed by treatment with RNase A and Proteinase K. Finally, cells were stained with 0.5 µM SYTOX green and 30 measured on a MACSquant analyzer (Miltenyi Biotec).

Data processing

35 The data processing of the MNase-seq data was done as described before with modifications⁴⁴. Sequencing reads were mapped to the *S. cerevisiae* SacCer3 (R64-1-1 build) using Bowtie2 (version $2.3.5.1$)⁵⁹ and reads aligning to multiple sites were removed. This was then imported into R Studio by using GenomicAlignments⁶⁰. For the single-end data, reads were shifted by 73 bp and extended to 50-60 bp, while for the paired-end data, reads with a fragment length 40 between 139 and 191 bp were selected and extended to 60 bp. The coverage was calculated and aligned to a list of ACS sites⁶¹. The signal was normalized per ARS in a 2000 bp window centered at the ACS motif.

Data and code availability statements

Data available on request from the authors.

5

Methods References

- 42. Jones, G. M. *et al.* A systematic library for comprehensive overexpression screens in 10 Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Nat. Methods* **5**, 239–241 (2008).
	- 43. Siow, C. C., Nieduszynska, S. R., Müller, C. A. & Nieduszynski, C. A. OriDB, the DNA replication origin database updated and extended. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **40**, 682–686 (2012).
	- 44. Oberbeckmann, E. *et al.* Ruler elements in chromatin remodelers set nucleosome array spacing and phasing. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1–17 (2021).
- 15 45. Krietenstein, N., Wippo, C. J., Lieleg, C. & Korber, P. Genome-wide in vitro reconstitution of yeast chromatin with in vivo-like nucleosome positioning. *Methods Enzymol.* **513**, 205– 232 (2012).
	- 46. Simon, R. H. & Felsenfeld, G. A new procedure for purifying histone pairs H2A + H2B and H3 + H4 from chromatin using hydroxylapatite. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **6**, 689–696 (1979).
- 20 47. Shen, X. Preparation and Analysis of the INO80 Complex. *Methods Enzymol.* **377**, 401– 412 (2004).
	- 48. Vary, J. C., Fazzio, T. G. & Tsukiyama, T. Assembly of Yeast Chromatin Using ISWI Complexes. *Methods Enzymol.* **375**, 88–102 (2003).
- 49. Wittmeyer, J., Saha, A. & Cairns, B. DNA Translocation and Nucleosome Remodeling 25 Assays by the RSC Chromatin Remodeling Complex. *Methods Enzymol.* **377**, 322–343 (2004).
	- 50. Bantele, S. C. S., Ferreira, P., Gritenaite, D., Boos, D. & Pfander, B. Targeting of the Fun30 nucleosome remodeller by the Dpb11 scaffold facilitates cell cycle-regulated DNA end resection. *Elife* **6**, 1–21 (2017).
- 30 51. Biswas, D., Yu, Y., Prall, M., Formosa, T. & Stillman, D. J. The Yeast FACT Complex Has a Role in Transcriptional Initiation. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **25**, 5812–5822 (2005).
	- 52. Ruone, S., Rhoades, A. R. & Formosa, T. Multiple Nhp6 Molecules Are Required to Recruit Spt16-Pob3 to Form yFACT Complexes and to Reorganize Nucleosomes. *J. Biol. Chem.* **278**, 45288–45295 (2003).
- 35 53. Chacin, E. *et al.* A CDK-regulated chromatin segregase promoting chromosome replication. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 1–12 (2021).
	- 54. Frigola, J., Remus, D., Mehanna, A. & Diffley, J. F. X. ATPase-dependent quality control of DNA replication origin licensing. *Nature* **495**, 339–343 (2013).
- 55. Lieleg, C. *et al.* Nucleosome Spacing Generated by ISWI and CHD1 Remodelers Is 40 Constant Regardless of Nucleosome Density. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **35**, 1588–1605 (2015).
- 56. Dechassa, M. L. *et al.* Architecture of the SWI / SNF-Nucleosome Complex. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **28**, 6010–6021 (2008).
- 57. Almer, A. & Hörz, W. Nuclease hypersensitive regions with adjacent positioned nucleosomes mark the gene boundaries of the PHO5/PHO3 locus in yeast. *EMBO J.* **5**, 5 2681–2687 (1986).
	- 58. Reusswig, K.-U. *et al.* Unscheduled DNA replication in G1 causes genome instability through head-to-tail replication fork collisions. *bioRxiv* (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.09.06.459115.
- 59. Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S. L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat. Methods* 10 **9**, 357–359 (2012).
	- 60. Lawrence, M. *et al.* Software for Computing and Annotating Genomic Ranges. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **9**, 1–10 (2013).
- 61. Soriano, I., Morafraile, E. C., Vázquez, E., Antequera, F. & Segurado, M. Different nucleosomal architectures at early and late replicating origins in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. 15 *BMC Genomics* **15**, 1–15 (2014).

Acknowledgments:

20

We would like to thank Helmut Blum and Stefan Krebs from LAFUGA (Laboratory for Functional Genome Analysis) for high-throughput sequencing and Tobias Straub for help with bioinformatic analyses. We thank Elisa Oberbeckmann for her support during the initial phases of the project, Eva Kocar and Garp Linder for help in purifying some proteins. We are grateful to 25 Silvia Härtel for growing cells and preparing powder for protein preparations. We thank John Diffley for strains and plasmids and Ashish Sigh and Felix Müller-Planitz for strains and sharing unpublished results. We finally thank Julia Kurat for critical input and for carefully reading the manuscript.

Funding: This work was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German 30 Research Foundation) – Project-ID 213249687 – SFB 1064 to C.F.K., P.K. and B.P..; PF794/5-1 to B.P.. Work in the B.P. lab is supported by the Max-Planck Gesellschaft.

Author contributions: E.C. was setting up the assay, purified most proteins, did all the *in vitro* work and prepared the Figures; K-U.R. performed flow cytometry analyses; J.F. generated all the *in vivo orc1* mutations; L.K. purified and characterized Fun30; P.B. made the expression strain and purified Spt6; C.F.K. designed the story and wrote the paper. P.K., B.P. and C.F.K. 5 secured funding, analyzed the data and contributing intellectually to the paper and all authors were involved in editing.

Competing interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Extended Data for

Establishment and Function of Chromatin Architecture at Eukaryotic Chromosome Replication Origins

Erika Chacin, Karl-Uwe Reusswig, Jessica Furtmeier, Priyanka Bansal, Leonhard Karl, Boris Pfander, Philipp 10 Korber and Christoph F. Kurat*

*Correspondence to: Christoph.kurat@bmc.med.lmu.de

5

15

20

25 **This PDF file includes:**

Materials and Methods Extended Data Fig. 1-9 Extended Data Table 1-2

Extended Data Figures

Histone chaperones \mathbf{a}

b **Chromatin remodelers**

Extended Data Fig. 1. Purified chromatin factors used in the *in vitro* **screen**

SDS-PAGE analyses of purified histone chaperones **a)** and chromatin remodelers **b)**.

SGD chromatin ✔ Histone chaperone

Extended Data Fig. 2. Influence of histone chaperones on nucleosome positioning at origins

5 Composite plots of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin incubated with the indicated histone chaperones aligned as in Fig. 1a. All experiments were repeated three times with different protein preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

Extended Data Fig. 3. Influence of chromatin remodelers on nucleosome positioning at origins

Composite plots aligned as in Fig. 1a of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin incubated with the indicated chromatin remodelers aligned as in Fig. 1a. All experiments were repeated three times 10 with different protein preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

SGD chromatin ✔ Histone chaperone + ORC

5 **Extended Data Fig. 4. Influence of histone chaperones in combination with ORC on nucleosome positioning at origins**

Composite plots aligned as in Fig. 1a of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin incubated with including indicated histone chaperones plus ORC. All experiments were repeated three times with different protein preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

5

10

15

20

Extended Data Fig. 5. Influence of Fun30, RSC, SWI/SNF and SWR1 plus ORC on nucleosome positioning at origins

Composite plots aligned as in Fig. 1a of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin including indicated chromatin remodelers plus ORC. All experiments were repeated three times with different protein 25 preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

Extended Data Fig. 6. Influence of QKO and viable *orc1* **mutations on cell growth**

 Spot dilution assays (10-fold serial dilutions) with the indicated yeast strains. HU: hydroxyurea (100 mM). Assays were repeated at least three times.

Extended Data Fig. 7. Effect of single remodeler deletion mutations on chromatin at origins *in vivo*

Composite plots aligned to the ACS as in Fig. 1a of MNase-seq data of *in vivo* chromatin of wild type versus indicated deletion mutants. All experiments were repeated three times independently.

Extended Data Fig. 8. Orc1 mutations influence nucleosome positioning at origins to different degrees

Composite plots of MNase-seq data of SGD chromatin incubated with ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1 in 5 the presence of wild type ORC or with Orc1-BAH, Orc1-IDR and Orc1-Walker B mutant complexes, as indicated. All data were aligned as in Fig. 1a and all experiments were repeated three times with different protein preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

5

Extended Data Fig. 9. Orc1-Walker B and Orc1-BAH-IDR mutations have a similar defect in chromatin organization at origins

15 Composite plots of MNase -seq data of SDG chromatin assembled with ISW1a, ISW2 and Chd1 in the presence of wild type ORC or the indicated Orc1-Walker B or with Orc1-BAH-IDR mutant complexes. All data were aligned as in Fig. 1a and all experiments were repeated three times with different protein preparations. SGD (Salt Gradient Dialysis).

Extended Data Table 1. Strain list

Extended Data Table 2. DNA constructs

5

All the codon optimized sequences contain one 5′ AscI site, one 3′ XhoI site, and encode an Nterminal CBP tag and a Pgk1 terminator sequence.

