Published in final edited form as:

Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol. 2010 October ; 45(5): 331–350. doi:10.3109/10409238.2010.496772.

Ribonucleoprotein multimers and their functions

Franziska Bleichert¹ and Susan J. Baserga^{1,2,3}

¹ Department of Genetics, Yale University, New Haven, USA

² Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, New Haven, USA

³ Department of Therapeutic Radiology, Yale University, New Haven, USA

Abstract

Ribonucleoproteins (RNPs) play key roles in many cellular processes and often function as RNP enzymes. Similar to proteins, some of these RNPs exist and function as multimers, either monomeric or heteromeric. While in some cases the mechanistic function of multimerization is well understood, the functional consequences of multimerization of other RNPs remain enigmatic. In this review we will discuss the function and organization of small RNPs that exist as stable multimers, including RNPs catalyzing RNA chemical modifications, telomerase RNP, and RNPs involved in pre-mRNA splicing.

Keywords

ribonucleoprotein; multimerization; box C/D sRNP; box C/D snoRNP; telomerase; U4/U6 di-snRNP; U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP; U11/U12 di-snRNP

Introduction

Estimates are that 35% of all cellular proteins are oligomers, with the average oligomerization state being a tetramer (Ali et al., 2005). Oligomerization plays an important role in the function of proteins and, in particular, of enzymes, and can provide several functional advantages. First, oligomerization can be used as a means to control the function of proteins, including activation or inactivation dependent on the oligomeric state as well as enabling allosteric regulation and cooperativity between subunits. Second, oligomerization of proteins provides multivalency and can increase the binding strength for substrates. Third, oligomerization can create new active sites at interfaces between individual subunits. Fourth, oligomerization can stabilize protein structures, especially in hyperthermophilic organisms (Ali et al., 2005).

While the formation of oligomeric complexes is a characteristic of many proteins, RNA-protein complexes can oligomerize as well. Similar to proteins, ribonucleoproteins (RNPs) can form homomeric or heteromeric oligomers. RNP multimerization can occur via RNA-RNA, RNA-protein and/or protein-protein interactions, with the multimerization state being determined by the number of RNA molecules within the RNP. In this review we will focus on small RNPs that stably accumulate as multimers, including RNPs that guide methylation of cellular RNAs, RNPs that extend telomeres, and RNPs that contribute to pre-mRNA splicing.

Corresponding author: Susan J. Baserga, 333 Cedar Street, SHM-C114A, P.O. box 208024, New Haven, CT 06520, phone: 203-785-4618, susan.baserga@yale.edu.

Declaration of interest: The authors report no declarations of interest.

Dimeric Box C/D s(no)RNPs

Functions of box C/D s(no)RNPs

Nucleotides in ribosomal RNA (rRNA) and other RNAs are post-transcriptionally altered, leading to as many as 200 modifications in the human ribosome that cluster in phylogenetically conserved and functionally critical regions (Decatur and Fournier, 2002). While individual modifications are not essential, collectively they have been shown to be important for rRNA folding, ribosome stability, and optimal translation of mRNAs (King et al., 2003; Liang et al., 2007). In archaea and eukaryotes, these chemical modifications are performed by small ribonucleoproteins (sRNPs in archaea) and small nucleolar ribonucleoproteins (snoRNPs in eukaryotes), respectively. They can occur as two different types: pseudouridylation, catalyzed by box H/ACA s(no)RNPs (Ganot et al., 1997; Ni et al., 1997), and 2'-O-ribose methylations, catalyzed by box C/D s(no)RNPs (Cavaille et al., 1996; Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1996; Omer et al., 2000; Tycowski et al., 1996). The nucleotide to be modified is dictated by base pairing of the RNA component of the s(no)RNP with the substrate RNA. Because of these base pairing events, s(no)RNPs are also thought of as chaperones which facilitate optimal rRNA folding (Steitz and Tycowski, 1995). While the majority of snoRNPs act as RNP enzymes to catalyze chemical rRNA modifications, a subset of them, however, does not function in this way but is instead directly required for the cleavage events that process rRNA precursors during ribosome biogenesis (Matera et al., 2007). One example is the U3 snoRNP, a box C/D snoRNP which is a central component of the SSU processome/90S pre-ribosome (Dragon et al., 2002; Grandi et al., 2002). In addition to rRNA, archaeal tRNAs and eukaryotic snRNAs and a few mRNAs are also substrates of s(no)RNPs (Huttenhofer et al., 2001; Jady and Kiss, 2001; Kishore and Stamm, 2006a; Kishore and Stamm, 2006b; Omer et al., 2000; Tycowski et al., 1998; Vitali et al., 2005; Ziesche et al., 2004).

In the following paragraphs we will focus on the organization of box C/D s(no)RNPs because an archaeal box C/D sRNP has recently been shown to be a di-sRNP (Bleichert et al., 2009). Currently, no evidence exist that box H/ACA s(no)RNPs undergo multimerization, hence we will not discuss them. For a recent review on box H/ACA s(no)RNPs see (Kiss et al., 2010).

Box C/D s(no)RNP components

Methylation guide box C/D s(no)RNPs consist of a small box C/D s(no)RNA, characterized by the conserved box C, C', D, and D' sequence elements with the consensus sequences of RUGAUGA (boxes C and C') and CUGA (boxes D and D') (Figure 1A) (Gaspin et al., 2000; Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1996; Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1998; Omer et al., 2000; Tyc and Steitz, 1989). The RNA also contains guide sequences between boxes C and D' and between boxes C' and D that base pair to substrate RNAs and thereby confer specificity to the methylation event. The conserved boxes fold into k-turn (box C/D motif) or k-loop (box C'/D' motif) structures and nucleate the binding of the box C/D core proteins, which are common to all box C/D s(no)RNPs (Klein et al., 2001; Nolvos et al., 2005; Watkins et al., 2000). In archaea, these proteins include L7Ae, Nop5, and fibrillarin, and in eukaryotes, they are 15.5K, Nop56, Nop58, and fibrillarin. Fibrillarin, the methyltransferase in box C/D s(no)RNPs, methylates the target nucleotide base paired to the fifth nucleotide upstream of boxes D or D' using S-adenosylmethionine (SAM) as the methyl group donor (Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1996; Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1998; Omer et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2000). The methylation of RNA stabilizes RNA structures by increasing base stacking interactions, by stabilizing the C3'-endo sugar pucker, and by providing protection against hydrolysis (Ishitani et al., 2008).

The initial model for archaeal box C/D sRNP architecture

In contrast to eukaryotic box C/D snoRNPs, the archaeal complexes can be reconstituted *in vitro*, first demonstrated by Omer et al., which has greatly facilitated biochemical and structural

studies of the RNP and its components (Omer et al., 2002). L7Ae is the first protein that binds to the sRNA, specifically to the k-turn and k-loop structures formed by boxes C/D and C'/D', respectively, suggesting that one sRNA is bound by two L7Ae proteins in the sRNP. Mutational studies of conserved nucleotides in the C/D and C'/D' motifs confirmed the stoichiometry of RNA and protein in the sRNA-L7Ae complex, with mutations in the C/D motif abolishing L7Ae binding to this motif but not the C'/D' motif and vice versa (Omer et al., 2006; Omer et al., 2002; Rashid et al., 2003; Singh et al., 2008; Tran et al., 2003). Following L7Ae binding to the sRNA, Nop5 associates with the box C/D sRNA-L7Ae complex, which forms a composite binding platform for Nop5 (Omer et al., 2002; Ye et al., 2009). Interestingly, a similar topology is observed in the ternary complex of human 15.5K, Prp31, and a U4 snRNA fragment (Liu et al., 2007). The third protein, fibrillarin, does not bind the sRNA or L7Ae directly, but instead directly interacts with Nop5 (Rashid et al., 2003; Tran et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2006). A crystal structure of the Nop5-fibrillarin complex showed that Nop5 homodimerizes via an extensive coiled-coil domain to form a Nop5-fibrillarin heterotetramer (Aittaleb et al., 2003; Oruganti et al., 2007). The homodimerization of Nop5 was confirmed in solution and has been suggested to be important for communication between the C/D and C'/D' motifs (Rashid et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2006).

These results provided a framework for the initial model of archaeal box C/D sRNP architecture (Aittaleb et al., 2003; Reichow et al., 2007; Tran et al., 2003). Archaeal box C/D sRNPs were suggested to contain one box C/D sRNA and two copies of L7Ae, Nop5, and fibrillarin (Figure 1B). One set of the core proteins associates with each of the C/D and C'/D' motifs of the sRNA, where the distance between the motifs is bridged by the homodimerized coiled-coil domains of two Nop5 proteins. While this bipartite organization of box C/D sRNPs, which we will refer to as the mono-sRNP model, is consistent with a variety of biochemical data on various RNA and box C/D protein mutants, it also fails to explain some experimental observations: 1) A guide:substrate RNA duplex cannot be easily accommodated by the mono-sRNP model. The estimated length of the guide:substrate RNA duplex, which is typically 10–12 bp in archaea, is too short to span the distance mandated by the dimerized Nop5 coiled-coil domains (Ye et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2006); 2) In the mono-sRNP model, the catalytic sites of the RNP enzyme are too far from their site of action. The active site of fibrillarin, the methyltransferase, is not positioned in proximity to the nucleotide it modifies. To resolve these controversies, we sought to establish an accurate architectural model of methylation guide sRNPs based on the structure of enzymatically active box C/D sRNPs containing the full-length sRNA.

The di-sRNP model for archaeal box C/D sRNPs

We determined the first structure of a catalytically active box C/D sRNP containing full-length sRNA and all core protein components by electron microscopy and single particle analysis at 27Å resolution (Bleichert et al., 2009). Unexpectedly, this structure showed that the *Methanocaldococcus jannaschii* sR8 sRNP is a dimeric RNP, containing two sRNA molecules and four sets of each protein component. Docking of crystal structures and direct localization of fibrillarin and the N-terminal domain of Nop5 provided a new model with a dimeric box C/D sRNP architecture (Figures 1C and 1D). Similar to the mono-sRNP model, each sRNA associates with two sets of each core protein, L7Ae, Nop5, and fibrillarin, each set assembling on the C/D and C'/D' motifs, respectively. However, in contrast to the proposed organization in the mono-sRNP, the guide sequences of the sRNA do not follow the direction of the Nop5 coiled-coil domain but connect two different Nop5-fibrillarin heterotetramers in the structure, resulting in two independent interfaces that stabilize the di-sRNP: the sRNA interface and the Nop5 interface. Thus, dimerization (from the perspective of the sRNAs) is mediated by coiled-coil domain dimerization of two Nop5 proteins on either side of the sRNP. Currently it is not possible to assign a direction to the sRNAs or to differentiate the D and D' guide sequences due to the low resolution of the EM reconstruction.

The di-sRNP model derived from the EM structure resolves one of the clashes that the mono-sRNP model has with existing experimental results, but not the other. Because in the di-sRNP model the directionality of the dimerized Nop5 coiled-coil domains and the sRNA guide sequences are independent of each other, the guide:substrate RNA duplex should be easily accommodated. However, in the di-sRNP model the active sites of the fibrillarin catalytic subunits remain far from the guide sequences of the sRNAs. This suggests that substrate RNA binding induces conformational changes in the sRNP which brings the active site of the fibrillarin methyltransferase to the nucleotide to be methylated. Interestingly, crystal structures of Nop5 and fibrillarin from different archaeal species have revealed alternate conformations of Nop5 and fibrillarin, suggesting possible conformational changes in the context of the RNP that would be important for the catalysis of 2'-O-ribose methylation (Aittaleb et al., 2003; Oruganti et al., 2007; Ye et al., 2009). Hinge motions of the fibrillarin-binding N-terminus of Nop5 with respect to the coiled-coil domain of Nop5 could move fibrillarin inwards and position it atop the substrate RNA nucleotide to be methylated.

Recently, a partial box C/D sRNP containing all core sRNP proteins and an RNA containing only the C/D motif and a D guide sequence instead of a full-length sRNA was crystallized (Ye et al., 2009). This structure was interpreted in light of the mono-sRNP model. However, it is also consistent with the di-sRNP model. The organization of L7Ae, Nop5 and fibrillarin with respect to the C/D motif in the sRNA in this partial sRNP is similar to what is predicted from the EM structure of the fully assembled complex (Bleichert et al., 2009; Ye et al., 2009). Because the sRNA fragment used for RNP crystallization lacks the important C'/D' motif required for di-sRNP assembly, it would not be expected to assemble into the di-sRNP. We have tested this experimentally with a similar partial RNA construct and found it does not form di-sRNPs (F.B. and S.J.B. manuscript submitted). Hence, while the crystal structure provides detailed high-resolution information on the interaction surfaces between the protein components and between the proteins and the C/D motif of the sRNA, it does not reveal how the guide sequences would be oriented in the context of the fully assembled sRNP. Thus, high resolution structural information on the oligomeric state of box C/D sRNPs awaits a crystal structure of a fully assembled and catalytically active complex.

In addition to providing the first structure of an box C/D sRNP containing the full-length sRNA, the EM structure and the derived di-sRNP model also explain the reduction in catalytic activity of sRNPs assembled with mutant sRNA lacking either a functional C/D or C'/D' motif (similar to the one used for partial box C/D sRNP crystallization discussed above) and also mutant Nop5 protein components (Omer et al., 2006; Omer et al., 2002; Rashid et al., 2003; Tran et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2006). Interpretation of these results in light of the di-sRNP model suggest that the decrease in catalytic activity is caused by a lack of efficient di-sRNP assembly. Indeed, Nop5 coiled-coil domain mutants and sRNAs containing mutations in the conserved sequence elements that interfere with L7Ae binding assemble into RNPs that are distinct from the di-sRNP (F.B. and S.J.B manuscript submitted; Bleichert et al., 2009). This altered RNP structure likely interferes with the correct positioning of the guide:substrate RNA duplex with respect to the active site of fibrillarin.

Catalytically active box C/D sRNPs have been previously successfully assembled with RNA and protein components from other archaeal species as well, and biochemical studies aimed at deciphering the requirement for certain protein or RNA elements for sRNP assembly and enzymatic activity mostly yielded similar results (Clouet d'Orval et al., 2001; Omer et al., 2002; Rashid et al., 2003; Singh et al., 2004; Tran et al., 2003). In addition, all common box C/D proteins are highly conserved between archaeal species, and crystal structures of homologous proteins or protein complexes revealed a similar topology (Aittaleb et al., 2003; Oruganti et al., 2007; Ye et al., 2009). Taken together, this indicates that box C/D sRNPs from different archaeal species likely have a common 3D structure. We propose that this is the di-

sRNP that we have observed with an *M. jannaschii* sRNP. Future analysis of sRNPs from different archaeal species will be necessary to test this hypothesis.

Di-sRNPs in archaea *in vivo*

Although archaeal box C/D sRNPs have been extensively studied *in vitro*, information on their composition *in vivo* is limited. This is due to the extreme growth conditions (i.e. high temperatures and anaerobic environment) of these organisms and the limited genetic tools available to manipulate protein expression. The results of a few *in vivo* studies with archaeal box C/D sRNPs, however, are consistent with a di-sRNP structure of these complexes. For example, in *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius* cell extracts, Nop5 and fibrillarin migrated between 10–50S in glycerol gradients (Omer et al., 2000). While the lower end of this broad peak is in agreement with an archaeal box C/D di-sRNP, the larger complexes most likely reflect the association of box C/D sRNPs with pre-ribosomal RNAs. Isolation of these heterogeneous complexes and determination of their composition will be crucial to establish that the di-sRNP as observed *in vitro* is formed *in vivo* as well. On the other hand, it has been suggested that archaeal box C/D sRNPs may only assemble transiently during ribosome biogenesis (Ciammaruconi et al., 2008). To what extent these contradictory interpretations reflect different experimental approaches remains uncertain.

The prospect of eukaryotic box C/D di-snoRNPs

The components and the methylation function of box C/D s(no)RNPs are more or less conserved between archaea and eukaryotes, yet eukaryotic box C/D snoRNPs have so far not been successfully reconstituted from individual components *in vitro*. This has greatly impeded structural studies of these macromolecules. Nevertheless, biochemical studies indicate that profound differences exist in the predicted RNP organization and functional RNP characteristics between the two kingdoms: 1) while in archaea boxes C' and D' are identical to boxes C and D, these sequence elements are more degenerate in eukaryotes and often not identical in sequence to the boxes C and D (Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1996; Kiss-Laszlo et al., 1998; Omer et al., 2000); 2) in archaea, the length of the spacer sequences between boxes C and D' and boxes C' and D, which harbor the guide sequences, is well conserved and constrained to about 12 nucleotides, whereas in eukaryotes these spacer sequences are usually longer and can contain more than one hundred nucleotides (Tran et al., 2005); and 3) biochemical studies suggest differences in the organization of the archaeal and eukaryotic complexes. While all archaeal core proteins assemble symmetrically onto both the C/D and C'/D' motifs, the eukaryotic protein assemble asymmetrically (Cahill et al., 2002; Szewczak et al., 2002; Szewczak et al., 2005).

Crosslinking studies of box C/D snoRNAs containing a photoactivatable 4-thiouridine at different positions, which assembled into snoRNPs in *Xenopus* oocytes, demonstrated that Nop58 directly associates with the C/D motif, whereas Nop56 associates with the C'/D' motif. Fibrillarin, the methyltransferase, can be crosslinked to both motifs (Cahill et al., 2002). In addition to the asymmetric assembly of Nop58 and Nop56, the L7Ae homolog, 15.5K, only binds to the terminal C/D motif but not the internal C'/D' motif (Szewczak et al., 2002; Szewczak et al., 2005). Consistent with this asymmetric arrangement of Nop56, Nop58, and 15.5K in the RNP, only 15.5K and Nop58 are required for snoRNA stability *in vivo*, but not Nop56 (Lafontaine and Tollervey, 1999; Lafontaine and Tollervey, 2000; Watkins et al., 2000). Interestingly, Nop58 and Nop56, despite being highly homologous to each other and to archaeal Nop5, are both essential proteins in eukaryotes, indicating distinct functions of these proteins within the RNP (Gautier et al., 1997). However, Nop58 and Nop56 most likely still form heterodimers within the RNP since they interact weakly with each other in the yeast-two-hybrid assay and since both proteins are able to associate with an RNA that contains the

C/D motif but lacks the C'/D' motif (Boulon et al., 2008; Watkins et al., 2002; Watkins et al., 1998).

Taken together, these results suggest a pseudosymmetric architecture of eukaryotic box C/D snoRNPs when compared to their archaeal counterparts. But is the dimeric organization of archaeal box C/D sRNPs conserved in eukaryotes as a di-snoRNP? While results of studies of eukaryotic box C/D snoRNPs to date are consistent with either a mono- and di-snoRNP architecture, we favor the di-snoRNP model (Figures 1E and 1F). Interestingly, in *Euglena*, box C/D snoRNPs sediment between 250–600 kDa in glycerol gradients, a size that is more compatible with a di-snoRNP than with a mono-snoRNP (Russell et al., 2006). More careful sizing of these RNPs will be necessary to better discriminate between these possibilities. Eukaryotic scaRNPs (small Cajal body RNPs) often contain box C/D and box H/ACA hybrid RNAs, and hence function as 2'-O-ribose methylases and pseudouridylases of snRNAs (Darzacq et al., 2002; Jady and Kiss, 2001). It will be interesting to see how the H/ACA RNP influences box C/D RNP architecture, mono- or di-snoRNP, and vice versa. A full understanding of the architectural differences between archaeal and eukaryotic box C/D RNPs and their functional consequences awaits detailed, high-resolution information on their structures with investigation of how disruption of the structure affect the function of these RNP enzymes.

Why a di-s(no)RNP?

The dimeric structure of box C/D sRNPs raises questions regarding the advantages that a di-sRNP may provide over a conventional mono-sRNP. While the answer to this question is yet unknown, we can speculate about several different possibilities. Many archaeal organisms are extremophiles. Interestingly, the number of 2'-O-ribose methylations, and of predicted box C/D sRNAs, increases with higher optimal growth temperature of the organism (Dennis et al., 2001). A dimeric sRNP structure may provide advantages in these conditions and increase the stability of box C/D sRNPs. In addition to complex stability, a di-sRNP structure could have other advantages *in vivo*. Because the di-sRNP has twice the number of sRNAs, it also has twice the number of guide sequences that a mono-sRNP would. This doubles the local concentration of substrates base paired to the guide sequences and could provide a kinetic advantage, especially if enzymatic activity were allosterically regulated. Besides their primary function of catalyzing 2'-O-ribose methylations, box C/D s(no)RNPs also participate in RNA folding, particularly of the pre-ribosomal RNA (pre-rRNA). Four guide sequences in a di-sRNP could also be advantageous in facilitating rRNA folding, since the number of regions of rRNA base paired to the sRNP would increase. One intriguing possibility is that di-s(no)RNPs could contain two different s(no)RNAs and, hence, contain four different guide sequences that base pair to completely different regions in the rRNA, thereby bringing these regions into close proximity. However, this scenario also presents a challenge to cells, as they would need to control the pairing of different sRNAs in a di-sRNP to favor functionally valuable combinations. Whether this is indeed the case remains to be addressed in future studies.

Is the telomerase a di-RNP?

The function of telomerase

With each cell division, the ends of eukaryotic chromosomes shorten due to the inability of conventional DNA polymerases to replicate the far ends of linear chromosomes, the telomeres (Olovnikov, 1973; Watson, 1972). To overcome this “end-replication problem” and to maintain chromosome termini, telomerase, a specialized ribonucleoprotein enzyme, elongates the ends of the linear eukaryotic chromosomes by adding tandem repeats of G-rich sequences to the 3' end of one strand of telomeres (Greider and Blackburn, 1985; Greider and Blackburn, 1987). While a telomerase-based mechanism to counteract telomere erosion is prevalent in eukaryotes,

alternative telomerase-independent ways exist. *Drosophila*, for example, uses a retrotransposition mechanism to add repeat sequences to its chromosome ends (reviewed in Mason et al., 2008). The repeat sequences added at telomeres by telomerase (TTAGGG in vertebrates, TTGGGG in *Tetrahymena*) are recognized by specific telomere-binding proteins, forming specialized nucleoprotein structures (reviewed in Linger and Price, 2009; Palm and de Lange, 2008). Besides regulating telomerase activity and, hence telomere length, telomere-binding proteins also distinguish natural chromosome ends from double-strand DNA breaks, thereby repressing DNA damage response and recombination. Thus, telomeres and telomere maintenance are essential for chromosome integrity and genome stability.

Telomerase was first discovered by Greider and Blackburn in the ciliate *Tetrahymena thermophila* in 1985, who subsequently showed that this enzyme contained an integral RNA component that is essential for telomerase catalytic activity (Greider and Blackburn, 1985; Greider and Blackburn, 1987). Together with Jack Szostak, they received the 2009 Nobel Prize in Physiology and Medicine for their discovery. Research over the past decades identified the telomerase enzyme in other eukaryotes as well, including other ciliates, yeast, vertebrates and plants (for review see Autexier and Lue, 2006). A common feature of all telomerases is that the core enzyme components sufficient for enzymatic activity *in vitro* are telomerase RNA and telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT), with the RNA providing the template for DNA synthesis by TERT (Beattie et al., 1998; Collins and Gandhi, 1998; Feng et al., 1995; Greider and Blackburn, 1989; Lingner et al., 1997; Nakamura et al., 1997; Singer and Gottschling, 1994; Weinrich et al., 1997; Wenz et al., 2001; Zappulla et al., 2005). *In vivo*, optimal telomerase activity requires accessory proteins that are associated with the core enzyme to form the telomerase holoenzyme (Bianchi et al., 2004; Chai et al., 2002; Chandra et al., 2001; Chen and Greider, 2004; Collins et al., 1995; Friedman et al., 2003; Harrington et al., 1997; Lingner and Cech, 1996; Mitchell et al., 1999; Nakayama et al., 1997; Nugent et al., 1996; Seto et al., 1999; Stellwagen et al., 2003; Taggart et al., 2002; Ting et al., 2005). These proteins mediate and regulate telomerase RNP assembly and stability, telomerase subcellular localization, telomerase association with telomeres, and enzyme processivity. While in unicellular eukaryotes telomerase is continuously expressed to ensure indefinite propagation, in multicellular organisms, including humans, telomerase is expressed in germline cells and certain stem cells but is undetectable in somatic cells (Counter et al., 1992; Meyerson et al., 1997; Wright et al., 1996). Hence, telomeres of mortal somatic cells shorten with consecutive divisions, which contributes to replicative ageing, providing a protective mechanism against cell immortalization and indefinite cell proliferation.

Because of the importance of telomerase in maintaining genomic stability and because of its connection to cell proliferation it is not surprising that dysregulation of telomerase expression or activity contributes to the pathogenesis of human diseases (Calado and Young, 2009). Most cancer cells, for instance, reactivate or upregulate telomerase to prevent cellular senescence and to allow continuous cell proliferation (Artandi and DePinho, 2010). On the other hand, Dyskeratosis congenita is a genetic disorder that is associated with insufficient telomerase activity (reviewed in Freed et al., 2010 and Walne and Dokal, 2009).

In the following part of this review we will briefly discuss the organization of the core telomerase RNP, specifically focusing on the controversy about its multimerization properties and the resulting implications for the mechanism of telomerase action.

Telomerase components

Telomerase RNA—Cloning of the core telomerase components from different species allowed reconstitution of this enzyme from recombinant components *in vitro*, helping to delineate the role of each component in RNP assembly and catalysis. The telomerase RNAs vary greatly in sequence and length among eukaryotes, ranging from ~150 nucleotides in

ciliates to >1kb in yeast. However, secondary structure determination of telomerase RNAs by phylogenetic comparison predicts common features that have subsequently been shown to be important for telomerase function (Chappell and Lundblad, 2004; Chen et al., 2000; Dandjinou et al., 2004; Lai et al., 2002; Lai et al., 2003; Lin et al., 2004; Mitchell and Collins, 2000; Romero and Blackburn, 1991; Zappulla and Cech, 2004). These include the template region, 5' boundary elements, a central pseudoknot structure, additional domains that bind TERT and are critical for catalysis (trans-activation domain), and species-specific domains. The latter regulates telomerase RNA processing, RNP assembly, localization, and stability *in vivo* but is dispensable for catalytic activity *in vitro*, e.g. the box H/ACA domain in vertebrates and the Sm-protein binding domain in yeast (for review see Theimer and Feigon, 2006). Besides providing the template for telomeric DNA repeat synthesis and binding sites for the TERT protein, telomerase RNA also participates in regulating catalytic activity and processivity of the enzyme (e.g. Bachand and Autexier, 2001; Chen and Greider, 2003; Comolli et al., 2002; Lai et al., 2003; Licht and Collins, 1999; Moriarty et al., 2004; e.g. Prescott and Blackburn, 1997b; Roy et al., 1998; Tzfati et al., 2000).

Telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT)—TERT contains a central reverse transcriptase (RT) domain that is essential but not sufficient for telomerase RNP assembly and activity (Figure 2A). Mutations in predicted active site residues in the RT motifs abolish telomerase activity both *in vivo* and *in vitro*, suggesting TERT is the catalytic subunit of the telomerase RNP (Bryan et al., 1998; Lingner et al., 1997; Nakamura et al., 1997). Additionally, TERT can catalyze RNA- and template-independent DNA synthesis *in vitro* using its intrinsic terminal transferase activity, though the physiological importance of this activity is unknown (Lue et al., 2005). Flanking the central RT domain of TERT proteins are the N-terminal and C-terminal domains, respectively, both of which confer telomerase-specific properties to the reverse transcriptase (Figure 2A). The N-terminal domain of TERT contains motifs conserved among ciliates, yeast, and humans (for review see Autexier and Lue, 2006; Xia et al., 2000). Two different domains mediate telomerase RNA binding, although the regions of the RNA bound to TERT differs among species (Bryan et al., 2000b; Friedman and Cech, 1999; Friedman et al., 2003; Lai et al., 2001; Moriarty et al., 2002). The C-terminal domain of TERT is important for nucleotide and repeat addition processivity of telomerase (Hossain et al., 2002; Huard et al., 2003; Peng et al., 2001). The latter has also been shown to be influenced by the N-terminus of TERT (Moriarty et al., 2004). Interestingly, both termini of TERT have been implicated to promote telomerase multimerization (discussed below) (Arai et al., 2002; Beattie et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2002). In addition to RNA binding, TERT also has affinity for DNA which seems important for stabilizing the association of the RNA template with the DNA primer during catalysis and allows efficient telomeric DNA elongation (Bryan et al., 2000a; Finger and Bryan, 2008; Hossain et al., 2002; Wyatt et al., 2007).

Structural studies of core telomerase components

To fully understand how different parts of telomerase RNA and TERT mechanistically contribute to telomerase activity, structural information is necessary. While a structure of the core telomerase RNP is not yet available, significant progress has been made towards this goal by the determination of structures of telomerase subunits. RNA structures were determined by NMR and encompass regions of the CR4-CR5 domain and the conserved pseudoknot of human telomerase as well as helix II of *Tetrahymena thermophila* telomerase RNA which serves as the 5' template boundary element (Kim et al., 2008; Leeper et al., 2003; Leeper and Varani, 2005; Qiao and Cech, 2008; Richards et al., 2006; Theimer et al., 2005; Theimer et al., 2007). These structures provide a framework for interpretation of a variety of biochemical observation with mutationally altered telomerase components (reviewed in Sekaran et al., 2010 and Theimer and Feigon, 2006).

In addition, two different fragments of the N-terminal domain of *Tetrahymena thermophila* TERT, the far N-terminal domain (TEN) and the telomerase RNA binding domain (TRBD), have been crystallized (Figure 2A) (Jacobs et al., 2006; Rouda and Skordalakes, 2007). The TEN domain represents a novel protein fold and is suggested to contact telomeric DNA in a sequence specific manner, rationalizing the importance of this domain in telomerase activity (Jacobs et al., 2006). The TRBD RNA binding pocket is formed by the highly conserved T and CP motifs, and the structure suggests that it can bind both single and double stranded nucleic acids (Rouda and Skordalakes, 2007). Yet, the most striking advancement in understanding TERT function comes from the crystal structure of full-length TERT from the red flour beetle, *Tribolium castaneum* (Gillis et al., 2008). Surprisingly, this structure revealed a ring-like arrangement of the different TERT domains, mediated by extensive interactions between the N-terminal TRBD domain and the C-terminal domain. In comparison to viral reverse transcriptases, RNA polymerases and some DNA polymerases, the TERT RT domain provides fingers and palm, and the TERT C-terminus corresponds to thumb. The central ring contains the active site of TERT and is 26 Å wide, large enough to accommodate a DNA-RNA duplex. Indeed, in subsequent co-crystals of TERT and an RNA-DNA hybrid, the RNA-DNA duplex passes through the hole and the 3' end of the telomeric DNA primer is placed at the active site (Mitchell et al., 2010). Future structures of the complete telomerase core enzyme will undoubtedly bring more mechanistic insight into telomerase function and the associated conformational changes that must occur during nucleotide addition and telomerase translocation.

Evidence for telomerase multimerization

Research over the past 20+ years has indicated that telomerase may function as a dimer. Certainly, the evidence for telomerase multimerization is compelling in some species. However, at the same time there is also some disagreement as to whether telomerase is a dimer or monomer, even in a single species. To what extent these discrepancies reflect different experimental approaches and conditions remains to be determined. In the following paragraphs we will discuss both the functional as well as physical evidence for and against telomerase RNP dimerization.

Functional evidence for telomerase multimerization—The first indication that telomerase may function as a multimer *in vivo* came from seminal observations by Prescott and Blackburn that certain mutations in the template region of the telomerase RNA rendered the yeast telomerase RNP inactive in the absence but not in the presence of wild type telomerase RNA (Prescott and Blackburn, 1997a; Prescott and Blackburn, 1997b). The efficient co-purification of two DNA oligonucleotides complementary to the template region of telomerase RNA, one of which served as biotinylated bait, supported the conclusion that, in yeast, two telomerase RNAs function in a single complex. Therefore, telomerase could be a dimer (Prescott and Blackburn, 1997a). Subsequent studies with human telomerase yielded similar results. Truncated human telomerase RNAs that assemble into inactive RNPs were able to template DNA synthesis in the presence of wild type telomerase RNA (Tesmer et al., 1999). Alternatively, two different inactive RNAs were able to functionally interact, restoring telomerase activity (Ly et al., 2003). Analogously, two different inactive TERT proteins could complement each other's function when co-expressed *in vivo* or *in vitro* (Beattie et al., 2001). Moreover, some RNA or TERT mutants can also negatively affect the activity of wild type components of telomerase (Arai et al., 2002; Wenz et al., 2001).

Biochemical sizing of ciliate telomerase RNPs—In addition to the functional evidence for telomerase multimerization, sizing of telomerase RNPs provided direct biochemical evidence that the active telomerase complex from multiple species is a dimer (Table 1). Gel filtration chromatography of ciliate telomerases from *Euplotes crassus* and *Euplotes*

aediculatus yielded a molecular weight that is consistent with a dimeric RNP architecture (Aigner et al., 2003; Fouche et al., 2006; Greene and Shippen, 1998; Wang et al., 2002). Intriguingly, *Euplotes crassus* telomerase can be found in differently sized complexes with distinct biochemical characteristics depending on the developmental stage of the organism, ranging from 280–400 kDa in vegetative cells up to >5 MDa in cells undergoing macronuclear development (Greene and Shippen, 1998). While the exact composition or oligomeric state of these different RNPs is unknown, they all contain at least two active sites as judged by co-purification of regular DNA primers with biotinylated DNA primers complementary to the template region of telomerase RNA (Wang et al., 2002). Unlike *Euplotes* species, *Tetrahymena thermophila* telomerase behaved as a monomer by gel filtration chromatography and was not able to bind two DNA primers simultaneously, making it likely that it contains only one active site (Bryan et al., 2003).

Biochemical sizing of human telomerase RNPs and determination of the copy number of telomerase RNAs per telomerase—Sizing of the human telomerase RNP directly from cell lysates and after purification revealed that, while human telomerase can exist as a large holoenzyme *in vivo* with a molecular weight of at least 1000 kDa, purification of this enzyme resulted in dissociation of probably loosely associated components, leaving an enzymatically active core telomerase complex of 550–650 kDa (Cohen et al., 2007; Schnapp et al., 1998; Wenz et al., 2001). This core RNP enzyme is composed of telomerase RNA, TERT, and dyskerin, a protein required for RNP assembly and stability (Cohen et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 1999). Co-assembling telomerase RNPs with wild type and mutant RNAs allowed quantification of the RNA content of these RNPs after purification, revealing directly for the first time two telomerase RNAs per RNP (Wenz et al., 2001). Thus, the human core telomerase RNP is likely composed of each of two copies of RNA, TERT, and dyskerin, which account for the observed molecular weight.

Telomerase dimerization is not obligate for function—While there is much evidence that telomerase can be found and can function as a dimer in yeast and humans, recent biochemical results suggest that telomerase multimerization may not be obligate. First, genetic and biochemical studies of some yeast telomerase RNA or TERT mutants indicated that telomerase may also exist as a monomer under some conditions (Friedman et al., 2003; Livengood et al., 2002). Moreover, reconstituted catalytically active human telomerase was recently found to be a monomer, containing one TERT and one RNA, by two color coincidence detection analysis, a single molecule fluorescence assay (Alves et al., 2008). Thus, besides the apparent disparities in multimerization states between telomerases from diverse ciliate species, i.e. a dimer in *Euplotes sp.* and a monomer in *Tetrahymena thermophila*, differences in multimerization states can also exist in a single species (i.e. humans). Resolving these apparent inconsistencies and determining the potential functional consequences of different telomerase multimerization states *in vivo* is an important goal for future studies.

How is dimerization accomplished in the telomerase RNP?—With the experimental evidence pointing towards telomerase being able to function as a dimer in several species, questions arise as to how dimerization is achieved and how components are organized within dimeric RNPs. Dimerization could occur via protein-protein interaction, RNA-RNA interaction, or by a combination of both. Here we will discuss these possibilities with respect to the current knowledge of TERT and telomerase RNA oligomerization.

Human TERT can oligomerize both *in vitro* and *in vivo* in the absence of telomerase RNA (Arai et al., 2002; Beattie et al., 2001; Moriarty et al., 2002). The interaction domains have been mapped to amino acids 301–538 in the N-terminal region and amino acids 914–1132 in the C-terminal region of human TERT, suggesting a head-to-tail association of TERT molecules (Arai et al., 2002). A second domain in the N-terminus, amino acids 1–200, has also

been suggested to directly interact with the remainder of human TERT (Moriarty et al., 2004). Likewise, *Euplotes crassus* TERT forms oligomers *in vitro* (Wang et al., 2002). In addition to the head-to-tail association observed with human TERT, *Euplotes crassus* TERT is able to associate in a head-to-head and head-to-tail fashion as well. This substantiates the hypothesis that telomerase dimerization could be mediated by association of two TERT proteins in these organisms. Interestingly, however, *Tribolium castaneum* TERT, the structure of which was determined by X-ray crystallography, is a monomer in solution, possibly indicating that the telomerase RNP may be also a monomer in this organism. Furthermore, the structure of *Tribolium* TERT shows that the N- and C-termini of the same molecule interact with each other to form a ring-like structure (Gillis et al., 2008). Importantly, the amino acid residues involved in this ring formation reside in regions that correspond to the N (amino acids 301-538) - and C-terminal (amino acids 914-1132) fragments of human TERT that have been suggested to mediate oligomerization (Arai et al., 2002). Whether the observed head-to-tail association of human TERT reflects a similar ring formation or true TERT dimerization remains to be determined.

In addition to TERT oligomerization, telomerase RNA oligomerization could mediate RNP dimerization. Indeed, human telomerase RNA can dimerize *in vitro* in the absence of TERT by forming an intermolecular pseudoknot, and mutations in telomerase RNA that prevent intramolecular pseudoknot formation, but allow trans-pseudoknot formation, assemble into active RNPs (Ly et al., 2003). Although this suggests that this interaction is biologically relevant, an intermolecular pseudoknot is not absolutely required for telomerase activity (Chen and Greider, 2005). A second region that can promote dimerization is the J7b/8a loop near the 3' end of telomerase RNA, connecting the H/ACA and CR7 domains (Ren et al., 2003). Interestingly, the Dyskeratosis congenita mutation C408G in the adjacent CR7 domain reduces dimerization of telomerase RNA *in vitro* (Ren et al., 2003). In contrast to human and *Euplotes* telomerase RNA or TERT, *Tetrahymena thermophila* telomerase components do not oligomerize, which is consistent with a monomeric telomerase RNP in this organism (Bryan et al., 2003). Taken together, at this point it is not well understood how telomerase di-RNP formation is achieved. Structures of the core telomerase RNP will be crucial for understanding how telomerase RNA interacts with TERT and whether and how multimerization is achieved.

The functional significance of telomerase multimerization

Adding telomeric repeats to chromosome ends by telomerase requires annealing of the single stranded 3' telomeric DNA primer to the 3' region of the template sequence of telomerase RNA (Figure 2B). Telomerase then elongates this primer until the template boundary at the 5' end of the telomerase RNA template region is reached. Processive activity of telomerase requires translocation and reannealing of the newly synthesized telomeric sequence with the 3' end of the telomerase RNA template region, initiating synthesis of the next repeat. Since a telomerase RNP monomer can complete such cycles, how could a dimerization of telomerase contribute to its function?

Several models of how a telomerase dimer may function have been proposed. The first model is the parallel extension model. This model suggest that the two active sites of dimeric telomerase function simultaneously, extending two different DNA strands (Ly et al., 2003; Prescott and Blackburn, 1997a; Wenz et al., 2001). The different DNA strands could be sister chromatids or telomeres from different chromosomes (Prescott and Blackburn, 1997a). In a second model, the template switching model, the two protomers in a telomerase dimer work cooperatively together to extend a single DNA substrate (Ly et al., 2003; Wenz et al., 2001). The active sites do not function at the same time but sequentially, associated with the transfer of the DNA substrate from one RNA template region to the other during telomerase translocation after addition of a telomeric repeat is complete. This could explain the observation

that wild type and mutant telomere repeat sequences are interdispersed in some organisms upon co-expression of telomerase RNAs with different template sequences (Prescott and Blackburn, 1997b; Yu and Blackburn, 1991). However, recent studies with mutant pseudoknot telomerase RNAs that assemble in obligate telomerase dimers which can only utilize one of the template sequences suggests that template switching is not essential for processive DNA synthesis (Rivera and Blackburn, 2004). Thirdly, the anchor site model proposes that the same protomer in a telomerase dimer is catalytically active at all times, whereas the other is inactive but instead binds to telomeric DNA 5' to the DNA primer site via an anchor site in TERT, thereby stabilizing the association of the DNA primer with the template RNA (Collins and Greider, 1993; Hammond et al., 1997; Jacobs et al., 2006; Kelleher et al., 2002; Wenz et al., 2001). Maintaining the anchor site interaction with DNA during translocation could prevent telomerase dissociation from the telomere and contribute to repeat addition processivity of telomerase. These models are not mutually exclusive.

Multimeric snRNPs in pre-mRNA splicing

The coding regions of eukaryotic pre-mRNAs, exons, are interrupted by non-coding regions, introns, that need to be excised for faithful translation of mRNAs into proteins by ribosomes. The removal of intronic sequences and subsequent ligation of exons occurs as two transesterification reactions, catalyzed by the spliceosome, a highly dynamic macromolecular machine containing five different small nuclear RNAs (snRNAs) and as many as 300 protein factors (reviewed in Jurica and Moore, 2003; Smith et al., 2008; Wachtel and Manley, 2009; Wahl et al., 2009). The snRNAs and their RNA-protein complexes, snRNPs, perform key functions during splicing and dynamically interact with each other through an intricate network of RNA-RNA or RNA-protein interactions. First, the U1 snRNP recognizes the 5' splice site by snRNA-mRNA base pairing whereas the U2 snRNP associates with the branch point in the intron to be excised forming the pre-spliceosome, or complex A. Subsequently, U4, U5, and U6 snRNPs are recruited together as a preformed complex, the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP, which is assembled of the U4/U6 di-snRNP and the U5 mono-snRNP (Figure 3). Activation of this complex B results in formation of the catalytic center for the first transesterification reaction and requires substantial structural rearrangements. The RNA-RNA base pairing interactions between the U4 and U6 snRNAs in the di-snRNP and in the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP are unwound, allowing U6 snRNA to base pair with the U2 snRNA and with the 5' splice site of the pre-mRNA. The U1 and U4 snRNAs dissociate from the splicing machinery prior to the first splicing reaction, which results in cleavage at the 5' splice site and lariat formation of the intron. Alignment of the two exons by U5 snRNA ensures that both exons are joined and ligated during the second step of splicing.

While the vast majority of pre-mRNAs are spliced by the major spliceosome described above, a fraction of pre-mRNAs (< 1%) contain introns with non-canonical consensus sequences that are removed by a second spliceosome, the minor spliceosome (reviewed in Patel and Steitz, 2003; reviewed in Tarn and Steitz, 1997). While the U5 snRNA is part of both types of spliceosomes, the other snRNAs of the major spliceosome are replaced by snRNAs of analogous functions, namely U11 (for U1), U12 (for U2), U4atac, and U6atac snRNAs. In contrast, many protein factors are shared between both types of spliceosome (Schneider et al., 2002; Will et al., 1999), and it is thought that catalysis in the minor spliceosome occurs by a similar mechanism to that in the major spliceosome. Interestingly, one of the main differences between minor and major spliceosome snRNPs is that, in contrast to U1 and U2 snRNPs, U11 and U12 snRNPs associate with the pre-mRNA as a preformed complex, a dimeric RNP (Wassarman and Steitz, 1992b).

In this last section we will discuss the composition and multimerization of the dimeric and trimeric splicing snRNPs and how multimerization is thought to contribute to the function of

these RNPs. We will focus on the U4/U6 di-snRNP and U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP of the major spliceosome, but similar principles govern the assembly and function of the analogous RNPs in the minor spliceosome, namely U4atac/U6atac di-snRNP and U4atac/U6atac.U5 tri-snRNP (Schneider et al., 2002). The U11/U12 di-snRNP is specific to the minor spliceosome, replacing the U1 and U2 snRNPs found in the major spliceosome.

U4 and U6 snRNPs dimerize to form a U4/U6 di-snRNP

The U4/U6 di-snRNP is composed of both the U4 snRNP and U6 snRNP monparticles, and hence contains the snRNAs and protein components of both snRNPs (Figure 4).

The U4 snRNA associates with seven Sm proteins and, in humans, five specific U4 proteins to form the U4 snRNP. Two key elements in the U4 snRNA are crucial for recruitment of these proteins: 1) the Sm binding site in the 3' region of the U4 snRNA is bound by the Sm proteins SmB/B', D1, D2, D3, E, F, and G, forming a heptameric ring encircling the RNA (Kambach et al., 1999; Urlaub et al., 2001); 2) the 5' stem loop in the U4 snRNA is bound by 15.5K (Snu13 in yeast), which is a prerequisite for binding of all remaining U4-specific proteins (Nottrott et al., 1999; Nottrott et al., 2002). The crystal structure of the U4 5' stem-loop bound to 15.5K demonstrated that 15.5K recognizes an RNA structural motif known as the k-turn motif. Together, the U4 snRNA-15.5K complex provides a composite binding platform for another U4-specific protein, hPrp31 (Liu et al., 2007; Makarova et al., 2002). Interestingly, 15.5K/Snu13 is also a component of box C/D sRNPs, and Nop56 and Nop58 are homologous to hPrp31, suggesting a common evolutionary ancestor of these proteins and a similar arrangement of these proteins in box C/D sRNPs as found in the U4 snRNP (Watkins et al., 2000).

hPrp3, hPrp4, and the cyclophillin hCypH are also components of the U4 mono-snRNP and of the U4/U6 di-snRNP. They form a stable, RNA-independent heteromeric complex with each other (Horowitz et al., 1997; Teigelkamp et al., 1998). In this complex, hPrp4 directly interacts with both hPrp3 and hCypH (Gonzalez-Santos et al., 2002; Teigelkamp et al., 1998). In yeast, Prp4 also directly interacts with Prp3, but no cyclophillin has been reported to be involved in splicing (Ayadi et al., 1998). At this point it is not well understood how Prp3, Prp4, and hCypH are recruited to the U4 snRNAs. However, association with the U4 snRNA can occur independently of Prp31 but requires 15.5K and the 5' region of the U4 snRNA (Bordonne et al., 1990; Nottrott et al., 2002; Xu et al., 1990).

The U6 snRNP has been purified from yeast and contains the U6 snRNA, seven Sm-like proteins, Lsm2-8, and Prp24 (Stevens et al., 2001). Lsm2-8 bind to the 3' region of the U6 snRNA, and form a heptameric ring similar to the related Sm proteins found in U1, U2, U4, and U5 snRNPs (Achsel et al., 1999; Karaduman et al., 2008; Mayes et al., 1999; Salgado-Garrido et al., 1999). Prp24 has been shown to directly contact the U6 snRNA and interacts with several Lsm proteins (Fromont-Racine et al., 2000; Karaduman et al., 2006; Rader and Guthrie, 2002; Vidal et al., 1999). An important function of Prp24 is to promote U4/U6 di-snRNP formation (see discussion below).

Although U4 and U6 snRNPs exist as mono-snRNPs within cells, they assemble into higher-order complexes: U4 and U6 snRNPs dimerize to form the U4/U6-di-snRNP, which is subsequently joined by the U5 snRNP to form the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP, prior to their incorporation into the spliceosome. Heterodimer formation of U4 and U6 snRNPs is mediated by intermolecular base pairing between their respective snRNA components, resulting in two U4-U6 helices that are arranged in a Y-shaped structure (Bringmann et al., 1984; Hashimoto and Steitz, 1984; Rinke et al., 1985). The U6 snRNP components, Prp24 and the Lsm proteins, are essential for U4-U6 snRNP dimerization as they facilitate the annealing of U4 and U6 snRNAs (Achsel et al., 1999; Ghetti et al., 1995; Jandrositz and Guthrie, 1995; Rader and

Guthrie, 2002; Raghunathan and Guthrie, 1998b). Interestingly, Prp24 is not a stable component of the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP or of spliceosomes, suggesting that it acts as a chaperone during U4/U6 di-snRNP assembly and then dissociates (Bell et al., 2002). In addition to direct RNA-RNA interactions, RNA-protein interactions may also contribute to U4/U6 di-snRNP stability. Accordingly, Prp3, a U4-specific protein, could be crosslinked to the U6 snRNA in U4/U6 RNA duplex (Nottrott et al., 2002). There is no evidence for protein-protein interactions between the U4 and U6 mono-snRNPs, suggesting that their dimerization is primarily mediated by RNA-RNA interactions.

U5 snRNP associates with the U4/U6 di-snRNP to form the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP

Before incorporation into the spliceosome, the U4/U6 di-snRNP associates with the U5 snRNP to form the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. The U5 snRNP is the largest of the three snRNPs and is composed of the U5 snRNA, and seven Sm proteins as well as eight U5-specific proteins (Bach et al., 1989; Fabrizio et al., 1994; Stevens et al., 2001). Four of them, Prp8, Brr2, Snu114, and the 40K (not present in yeast) protein form a stable complex in the absence of RNA, in which Prp8, the largest protein in the U5 snRNP, interacts directly with all the other proteins (Achsel et al., 1998; Liu et al., 2006; Pena et al., 2007). Importantly, mutations in Prp8 that weaken the interaction with Brr2 and Snu114 have been linked to retinitis pigmentosa (Pena et al., 2007). In addition, Prp8 also interacts with Prp6 and can be crosslinked to the U5 snRNA, underlining its central role in the U5 snRNP (Dix et al., 1998; Liu et al., 2006).

In contrast to U4-U6 snRNP dimerization, U5 snRNP association with the U4/U6 di-snRNP is mediated by protein-protein interactions (Figure 3). No direct interactions between the U5 snRNA and either the U4 or U6 snRNAs have been reported. Specifically, the U5-specific protein Prp6 directly interacts with the U4-specific proteins Prp3 and Prp31, acting as a bridge between the U4/U6 di-snRNP and the U5 snRNP (Liu et al., 2006; Makarova et al., 2002). Similar to mutations in Prp8, mutations in Prp31 have been linked to retinitis pigmentosa, and these mutations weaken the interaction of Prp31 with Prp6 (Liu et al., 2007). Snu66, which is independently recruited to the tri-snRNP, also acts as a bridge by associating with Prp3, Prp6, and the U5-protein Brr2 (Liu et al., 2006). One of the proteins found in the U5 snRNP, CD2BP2, is not found in the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP but dissociates during tri-snRNP assembly (Laggerbauer et al., 2005). Since CD2BP2 directly interacts with Prp6, which is a central component of the U4/U6 - U5 interface in the tri-snRNP, it could regulate their association (Laggerbauer et al., 2005).

What is the role of U4, U6, and U5 snRNP multimerization in RNA splicing?

U4, U5, and U6 snRNAs associate with the pre-mRNA together in the tri-snRNP. While the U5 and U6 snRNAs remain associated with the mRNA and the spliceosome during both catalytic steps, the U4 snRNA and associated U4-specific proteins are released prior to the first splicing reaction, suggesting that major structural rearrangements in the tri-snRNP and in the spliceosome occur before catalysis (Wahl et al., 2009). The release of the U4 snRNP requires that the helices formed by the U4 and U6 snRNAs are unwound, which is performed by the helicase Brr2 and is controlled by Snu114 and Prp8 (Kuhn et al., 1999; Raghunathan and Guthrie, 1998a). The U6 snRNA subsequently interacts with the U2 snRNA and replaces the U1 snRNA at the 5' splice site, positioning it at the heart of the catalytic site of the spliceosome (Datta and Weiner, 1991; Madhani and Guthrie, 1992; Sawa and Abelson, 1992; Sawa and Shimura, 1992; Sun and Manley, 1995; Wassarman and Steitz, 1992a; Wu and Manley, 1991). The U6 snRNA is thought to play a key role during catalysis, coordinating a divalent metal ion and either independently or together with proteins catalysing the transesterification reaction (Huppler et al., 2002; Sashital et al., 2004; Valadkhan and Manley, 2001; Wachtel and Manley, 2009; Yean et al., 2000). Thus, U4-U6 snRNA base pairing as observed in the U4/U6 di-snRNP and U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP is incompatible with catalysis, suggesting that the

U4 snRNA acts as a chaperone, masking functionally critical regions of the U6 snRNA until it is certain that splice sites are accurately recognized. In addition, snRNP multimerization assists spliceosome assembly by forming stable multi-molecular subcomplexes that are recruited to splice sites. Similar principles are observed in the assembly of other macromolecular machines, e.g. pre-ribosomal complexes that mature ribosomal RNAs (Staley and Woolford, 2009).

The U11/U12 di-snRNP of the minor spliceosome

Splice sites of minor spliceosome introns, also called U12-type introns, differ in 5' splice site and branch site consensus sequences from the major spliceosome introns, the U2-type introns (Burge et al., 1998). While the 5' splice site and branch point of U2-type introns are independently recognized by U1 and U2 snRNPs, respectively, the corresponding sequences in U12-type introns are recognized cooperatively by the U11 and U12 snRNAs and associated proteins, which bind as a preformed complex, the U11/U12 di-snRNP (Frilander and Steitz, 1999; Wassarman and Steitz, 1992b).

Purification of the 18S U11/U12 di-snRNP revealed that it contains both U11 and U12 snRNAs, protein components that are shared with the U2 snRNP, including the Sm proteins and the SF3b but not SF3a complex, and unique proteins not found in either U1 or U2 snRNPs (Table 2) (Will et al., 2004; Will et al., 2001; Will et al., 1999). Interestingly, no U1 snRNP-specific proteins seem to be components of the U11/U12 di-snRNP but have been replaced by four novel U11-specific proteins, underlining differences in 5' splice site recognition between minor and major spliceosomes. One of the U11-specific proteins, U11-48K, directly interacts with the 5' splice site via a zinc-finger domain and has been proposed to stabilize U11-5' splice site base pairing (Tidow et al., 2009; Turunen et al., 2008). SF3b, which stabilizes U2 snRNA branch point interactions in the major spliceosome, may fulfill a similar function in the minor spliceosome, stabilizing the U12 snRNA interaction with the branch point (Gozani et al., 1996; Will et al., 2004). EM reconstructions of isolated SF3b and U11/U12 di-snRNPs revealed different conformations of SF3b which may correspond to snapshots during branch point recognition (Golas et al., 2003; Golas et al., 2005). One of the U11/U12-specific proteins, 65K, has been shown to directly bind the U12 snRNA (Benecke et al., 2005). Currently it is not clear, however, which other protein directly contact the U12 snRNA or how the U11 snRNA associates with proteins in the complex.

Early studies on U11/U12 di-snRNPs indicated that dimerization is likely mediated by protein-protein interactions rather than by RNA-RNA base pairing because the complex dissociates with increasing salt concentration (Wassarman and Steitz, 1992b). The U11/U12-65K protein seems to play a central role in bridging U11 and U12 snRNPs, since it binds to the U12 snRNA and also directly interacts with the U11 snRNP protein U11-59K (Benecke et al., 2005). Whether additional protein-protein or RNA-protein interactions exist between U11 and U12 snRNP components remains a subject for future studies.

Why do U11 and U12 snRNPs function as U11/U12 di-snRNPs while the analogous components of the major spliceosome, the U1 and U2 snRNPs, function as mono-snRNPs? In the major spliceosome, SR proteins as well as Prp5 bridge the 5' splice site and the branch point, and hence the U1 and U2 snRNPs (Wu and Maniatis, 1993; Xu et al., 2004). Prp5, however, is not part of the minor spliceosome, suggesting a distinct mechanism of intron bridging. Instead, dimerization of U11 and U12 snRNPs may replace Prp5 and directly contribute to intron bridging and accurate pairing of splice sites (Frilander and Steitz, 1999; Will et al., 2004). Since the U11 snRNP associates with proteins distinct from those found in the U1 snRNP of the major spliceosome, the U11/U12 di-snRNP may also provide a target for independent regulation of splicing of U12-type introns. However, the mechanisms may differ between species because the U11 snRNA associated proteins are not conserved in *Drosophila*,

indicating quite divergent mechanisms of U11/U12 snRNP dimerization, intron bridging, and 5' splice site recognition between different eukaryotes (Schneider et al., 2004).

Conclusions

The examples in this review illustrate that RNP multimerization is a prevalent form of RNP organization. Most likely many more multimeric RNPs exist and remain to be discovered. However, except for the U4/U6 di-snRNP involved in pre-mRNP splicing, we do not completely understand what advantages multimerization brings to RNP function. While models have been proposed for both dimeric box C/D s(no)RNPs and telomerase RNP functions, additional experiments are necessary to validate them.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NIH grant GM52581 to S.J.B. and a Boehringer Ingelheim Fond PhD scholarship to F.B.

References

1. Achsel T, Ahrens K, Brahms H, Teigelkamp S, Luhrmann R. The human U5-220kD protein (hPrp8) forms a stable RNA-free complex with several U5-specific proteins, including an RNA unwindase, a homologue of ribosomal elongation factor EF-2, and a novel WD-40 protein. *Mol Cell Biol* 1998;18:6756–6766. [PubMed: 9774689]
2. Achsel T, Brahms H, Kastner B, Bachi A, Wilm M, Luhrmann R. A doughnut-shaped heteromer of human Sm-like proteins binds to the 3'-end of U6 snRNA, thereby facilitating U4/U6 duplex formation in vitro. *EMBO J* 1999;18:5789–5802. [PubMed: 10523320]
3. Aigner S, Postberg J, Lipps HJ, Cech TR. The Euplotes La motif protein p43 has properties of a telomerase-specific subunit. *Biochemistry* 2003;42:5736–5747. [PubMed: 12741831]
4. Aittaleb M, Rashid R, Chen Q, Palmer JR, Daniels CJ, Li H. Structure and function of archaeal box C/D sRNP core proteins. *Nat Struct Biol* 2003;10:256–263. [PubMed: 12598892]
5. Ali MH, Taylor CM, Grigoryan G, Allen KN, Imperiali B, Keating AE. Design of a heterospecific, tetrameric, 21-residue miniprotein with mixed alpha/beta structure. *Structure* 2005;13:225–234. [PubMed: 15698566]
6. Alves D, Li H, Codrington R, Orte A, Ren X, Klenerman D, Balasubramanian S. Single-molecule analysis of human telomerase monomer. *Nat Chem Biol* 2008;4:287–289. [PubMed: 18391947]
7. Arai K, Masutomi K, Khurts S, Kaneko S, Kobayashi K, Murakami S. Two independent regions of human telomerase reverse transcriptase are important for its oligomerization and telomerase activity. *J Biol Chem* 2002;277:8538–8544. [PubMed: 11751869]
8. Artandi SE, DePinho RA. Telomeres and telomerase in cancer. *Carcinogenesis* 2010;31:9–18. [PubMed: 19887512]
9. Autexier C, Lue NF. The structure and function of telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Annu Rev Biochem* 2006;75:493–517. [PubMed: 16756500]
10. Ayadi L, Callebaut I, Saguez C, Villa T, Mornon JP, Banroques J. Functional and structural characterization of the prp3 binding domain of the yeast prp4 splicing factor. *J Mol Biol* 1998;284:673–687. [PubMed: 9826507]
11. Bach M, Winkelmann G, Luhrmann R. 20S small nuclear ribonucleoprotein U5 shows a surprisingly complex protein composition. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1989;86:6038–6042. [PubMed: 2527369]
12. Bachand F, Autexier C. Functional regions of human telomerase reverse transcriptase and human telomerase RNA required for telomerase activity and RNA-protein interactions. *Mol Cell Biol* 2001;21:1888–1897. [PubMed: 11238925]
13. Beattie TL, Zhou W, Robinson MO, Harrington L. Reconstitution of human telomerase activity in vitro. *Curr Biol* 1998;8:177–180. [PubMed: 9443919]
14. Beattie TL, Zhou W, Robinson MO, Harrington L. Functional multimerization of the human telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell Biol* 2001;21:6151–6160. [PubMed: 11509658]

15. Bell M, Schreiner S, Damianov A, Reddy R, Bindereif A. p110, a novel human U6 snRNP protein and U4/U6 snRNP recycling factor. *EMBO J* 2002;21:2724–2735. [PubMed: 12032085]
16. Benecke H, Luhrmann R, Will CL. The U11/U12 snRNP 65K protein acts as a molecular bridge, binding the U12 snRNA and U11-59K protein. *EMBO J* 2005;24:3057–3069. [PubMed: 16096647]
17. Bianchi A, Negri S, Shore D. Delivery of yeast telomerase to a DNA break depends on the recruitment functions of Cdc13 and Est1. *Mol Cell* 2004;16:139–146. [PubMed: 15469829]
18. Bleichert F, Gagnon KT, Brown BA 2nd, Maxwell ES, Leschziner AE, Unger VM, Baserga SJ. A dimeric structure for archaeal box C/D small ribonucleoproteins. *Science* 2009;325:1384–1387. [PubMed: 19745151]
19. Bordonne R, Banroques J, Abelson J, Guthrie C. Domains of yeast U4 spliceosomal RNA required for PRP4 protein binding, snRNP-snRNP interactions, and pre-mRNA splicing in vivo. *Genes Dev* 1990;4:1185–1196. [PubMed: 2145195]
20. Boulon S, Marmier-Gourrier N, Pradet-Balade B, Wurth L, Verheggen C, Jady BE, Rothe B, Pescia C, Robert MC, Kiss T, et al. The Hsp90 chaperone controls the biogenesis of L7Ae RNPs through conserved machinery. *J Cell Biol* 2008;180:579–595. [PubMed: 18268104]
21. Bringmann P, Appel B, Rinke J, Reuter R, Theissen H, Luhrmann R. Evidence for the existence of snRNAs U4 and U6 in a single ribonucleoprotein complex and for their association by intermolecular base pairing. *EMBO J* 1984;3:1357–1363. [PubMed: 6204860]
22. Bryan TM, Goodrich KJ, Cech TR. A mutant of Tetrahymena telomerase reverse transcriptase with increased processivity. *J Biol Chem* 2000a;275:24199–24207. [PubMed: 10807925]
23. Bryan TM, Goodrich KJ, Cech TR. Telomerase RNA bound by protein motifs specific to telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell* 2000b;6:493–499. [PubMed: 10983995]
24. Bryan TM, Goodrich KJ, Cech TR. Tetrahymena telomerase is active as a monomer. *Mol Biol Cell* 2003;14:4794–4804. [PubMed: 13679509]
25. Bryan TM, Sperger JM, Chapman KB, Cech TR. Telomerase reverse transcriptase genes identified in Tetrahymena thermophila and Oxytricha trifallax. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1998;95:8479–8484. [PubMed: 9671703]
26. Burge CB, Padgett RA, Sharp PA. Evolutionary fates and origins of U12-type introns. *Mol Cell* 1998;2:773–785. [PubMed: 9885565]
27. Cahill NM, Friend K, Speckmann W, Li ZH, Terns RM, Terns MP, Steitz JA. Site-specific cross-linking analyses reveal an asymmetric protein distribution for a box C/D snoRNP. *EMBO J* 2002;21:3816–3828. [PubMed: 12110593]
28. Calado RT, Young NS. Telomere diseases. *N Engl J Med* 2009;361:2353–2365. [PubMed: 20007561]
29. Cavaille J, Nicoloso M, Bachellerie JP. Targeted ribose methylation of RNA in vivo directed by tailored antisense RNA guides. *Nature* 1996;383:732–735. [PubMed: 8878486]
30. Chai W, Ford LP, Lenertz L, Wright WE, Shay JW. Human Ku70/80 associates physically with telomerase through interaction with hTERT. *J Biol Chem* 2002;277:47242–47247. [PubMed: 12377759]
31. Chandra A, Hughes TR, Nugent CI, Lundblad V. Cdc13 both positively and negatively regulates telomere replication. *Genes Dev* 2001;15:404–414. [PubMed: 11230149]
32. Chappell AS, Lundblad V. Structural elements required for association of the Saccharomyces cerevisiae telomerase RNA with the Est2 reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell Biol* 2004;24:7720–7736. [PubMed: 15314178]
33. Chen JL, Blasco MA, Greider CW. Secondary structure of vertebrate telomerase RNA. *Cell* 2000;100:503–514. [PubMed: 10721988]
34. Chen JL, Greider CW. Determinants in mammalian telomerase RNA that mediate enzyme processivity and cross-species incompatibility. *EMBO J* 2003;22:304–314. [PubMed: 12514136]
35. Chen JL, Greider CW. Telomerase RNA structure and function: implications for dyskeratosis congenita. *Trends Biochem Sci* 2004;29:183–192. [PubMed: 15082312]
36. Chen JL, Greider CW. Functional analysis of the pseudoknot structure in human telomerase RNA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2005;102:8080–8085. discussion 8077–8089. [PubMed: 15849264]

37. Ciammaruconi A, Gorini S, Londei P. A bifunctional archaeal protein that is a component of 30S ribosomal subunits and interacts with C/D box small RNAs. *Archaea* 2008;2:151–158. [PubMed: 19054741]
38. Clouet d'Orval B, Bortolin ML, Gaspin C, Bachellerie JP. Box C/D RNA guides for the ribose methylation of archaeal tRNAs. The tRNA^{Trp} intron guides the formation of two ribose-methylated nucleosides in the mature tRNA^{Trp}. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2001;29:4518–4529. [PubMed: 11713301]
39. Cohen SB, Graham ME, Lovrecz GO, Bache N, Robinson PJ, Reddel RR. Protein composition of catalytically active human telomerase from immortal cells. *Science* 2007;315:1850–1853. [PubMed: 17395830]
40. Collins K, Gandhi L. The reverse transcriptase component of the *Tetrahymena* telomerase ribonucleoprotein complex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1998;95:8485–8490. [PubMed: 9671704]
41. Collins K, Greider CW. *Tetrahymena* telomerase catalyzes nucleolytic cleavage and nonprocessive elongation. *Genes Dev* 1993;7:1364–1376. [PubMed: 8330740]
42. Collins K, Kobayashi R, Greider CW. Purification of *Tetrahymena* telomerase and cloning of genes encoding the two protein components of the enzyme. *Cell* 1995;81:677–686. [PubMed: 7774009]
43. Comolli LR, Smirnov I, Xu L, Blackburn EH, James TL. A molecular switch underlies a human telomerase disease. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2002;99:16998–17003. [PubMed: 12482936]
44. Counter CM, Avilion AA, LeFeuvre CE, Stewart NG, Greider CW, Harley CB, Bacchetti S. Telomere shortening associated with chromosome instability is arrested in immortal cells which express telomerase activity. *EMBO J* 1992;11:1921–1929. [PubMed: 1582420]
45. Dandjinou AT, Levesque N, Larose S, Lucier JF, Abou Elela S, Wellinger RJ. A phylogenetically based secondary structure for the yeast telomerase RNA. *Curr Biol* 2004;14:1148–1158. [PubMed: 15242611]
46. Darzacq X, Jady BE, Verheggen C, Kiss AM, Bertrand E, Kiss T. Cajal body-specific small nuclear RNAs: a novel class of 2'-O-methylation and pseudouridylation guide RNAs. *EMBO J* 2002;21:2746–2756. [PubMed: 12032087]
47. Datta B, Weiner AM. Genetic evidence for base pairing between U2 and U6 snRNA in mammalian mRNA splicing. *Nature* 1991;352:821–824. [PubMed: 1831879]
48. Decatur WA, Fournier MJ. rRNA modifications and ribosome function. *Trends Biochem Sci* 2002;27:344–351. [PubMed: 12114023]
49. Dennis PP, Omer A, Lowe T. A guided tour: small RNA function in Archaea. *Mol Microbiol* 2001;40:509–519. [PubMed: 11359559]
50. Dix I, Russell CS, O'Keefe RT, Newman AJ, Beggs JD. Protein-RNA interactions in the U5 snRNP of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *RNA* 1998;4:1239–1250. [PubMed: 9769098]
51. Dragon F, Gallagher JE, Compagnone-Post PA, Mitchell BM, Porwancher KA, Wehner KA, Wormsley S, Settlege RE, Shabanowitz J, Osheim Y, et al. A large nucleolar U3 ribonucleoprotein required for 18S ribosomal RNA biogenesis. *Nature* 2002;417:967–970. [PubMed: 12068309]
52. Fabrizio P, Esser S, Kastner B, Luhrmann R. Isolation of *S. cerevisiae* snRNPs: comparison of U1 and U4/U6.U5 to their human counterparts. *Science* 1994;264:261–265. [PubMed: 8146658]
53. Feng J, Funk WD, Wang SS, Weinrich SL, Avilion AA, Chiu CP, Adams RR, Chang E, Allsopp RC, Yu J, et al. The RNA component of human telomerase. *Science* 1995;269:1236–1241. [PubMed: 7544491]
54. Finger SN, Bryan TM. Multiple DNA-binding sites in *Tetrahymena* telomerase. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2008;36:1260–1272. [PubMed: 18174223]
55. Fouche N, Moon IK, Keppler BR, Griffith JD, Jarstfer MB. Electron microscopic visualization of telomerase from *Euplotes aediculatus* bound to a model telomere DNA. *Biochemistry* 2006;45:9624–9631. [PubMed: 16878997]
56. Freed EF, Bleichert F, Dutca LM, Baserga SJ. When ribosomes go bad: diseases of ribosome biogenesis. *Mol Biosyst* 2010;6:481–493. [PubMed: 20174677]
57. Friedman KL, Cech TR. Essential functions of amino-terminal domains in the yeast telomerase catalytic subunit revealed by selection for viable mutants. *Genes Dev* 1999;13:2863–2874. [PubMed: 10557213]

58. Friedman KL, Heit JJ, Long DM, Cech TR. N-terminal domain of yeast telomerase reverse transcriptase: recruitment of Est3p to the telomerase complex. *Mol Biol Cell* 2003;14:1–13. [PubMed: 12529422]
59. Frilander MJ, Steitz JA. Initial recognition of U12-dependent introns requires both U11/5' splice-site and U12/branchpoint interactions. *Genes Dev* 1999;13:851–863. [PubMed: 10197985]
60. Fromont-Racine M, Mayes AE, Brunet-Simon A, Rain JC, Colley A, Dix I, Decourty L, Joly N, Ricard F, Beggs JD, Legrain P. Genome-wide protein interaction screens reveal functional networks involving Sm-like proteins. *Yeast* 2000;17:95–110. [PubMed: 10900456]
62. Ganot P, Bortolin ML, Kiss T. Site-specific pseudouridine formation in preribosomal RNA is guided by small nucleolar RNAs. *Cell* 1997;89:799–809. [PubMed: 9182768]
63. Gaspin C, Cavaille J, Erauso G, Bachellerie JP. Archaeal homologs of eukaryotic methylation guide small nucleolar RNAs: lessons from the *Pyrococcus* genomes. *J Mol Biol* 2000;297:895–906. [PubMed: 10736225]
64. Gautier T, Berges T, Tollervey D, Hurt E. Nucleolar KKE/D repeat proteins Nop56p and Nop58p interact with Nop1p and are required for ribosome biogenesis. *Mol Cell Biol* 1997;17:7088–7098. [PubMed: 9372940]
65. Ghetti A, Company M, Abelson J. Specificity of Prp24 binding to RNA: a role for Prp24 in the dynamic interaction of U4 and U6 snRNAs. *RNA* 1995;1:132–145. [PubMed: 7585243]
66. Gillis AJ, Schuller AP, Skordalakes E. Structure of the *Tribolium castaneum* telomerase catalytic subunit TERT. *Nature* 2008;455:633–637. [PubMed: 18758444]
67. Golas MM, Sander B, Will CL, Luhrmann R, Stark H. Molecular architecture of the multiprotein splicing factor SF3b. *Science* 2003;300:980–984. [PubMed: 12738865]
68. Golas MM, Sander B, Will CL, Luhrmann R, Stark H. Major conformational change in the complex SF3b upon integration into the spliceosomal U11/U12 di-snRNP as revealed by electron cryomicroscopy. *Mol Cell* 2005;17:869–883. [PubMed: 15780942]
69. Gonzalez-Santos JM, Wang A, Jones J, Ushida C, Liu J, Hu J. Central region of the human splicing factor Hprp3p interacts with Hprp4p. *J Biol Chem* 2002;277:23764–23772. [PubMed: 11971898]
70. Gozani O, Feld R, Reed R. Evidence that sequence-independent binding of highly conserved U2 snRNP proteins upstream of the branch site is required for assembly of spliceosomal complex A. *Genes Dev* 1996;10:233–243. [PubMed: 8566756]
71. Grandi P, Rybin V, Bassler J, Petfalski E, Strauss D, Marzioch M, Schafer T, Kuster B, Tschochner H, Tollervey D, et al. 90S pre-ribosomes include the 35S pre-rRNA, the U3 snoRNP, and 40S subunit processing factors but predominantly lack 60S synthesis factors. *Mol Cell* 2002;10:105–115. [PubMed: 12150911]
72. Greene EC, Shippen DE. Developmentally programmed assembly of higher order telomerase complexes with distinct biochemical and structural properties. *Genes Dev* 1998;12:2921–2931. [PubMed: 9744868]
73. Greider CW, Blackburn EH. Identification of a specific telomere terminal transferase activity in *Tetrahymena* extracts. *Cell* 1985;43:405–413. [PubMed: 3907856]
74. Greider CW, Blackburn EH. The telomere terminal transferase of *Tetrahymena* is a ribonucleoprotein enzyme with two kinds of primer specificity. *Cell* 1987;51:887–898. [PubMed: 3319189]
75. Greider CW, Blackburn EH. A telomeric sequence in the RNA of *Tetrahymena* telomerase required for telomere repeat synthesis. *Nature* 1989;337:331–337. [PubMed: 2463488]
76. Hammond PW, Lively TN, Cech TR. The anchor site of telomerase from *Euplotes aediculatus* revealed by photo-cross-linking to single- and double-stranded DNA primers. *Mol Cell Biol* 1997;17:296–308. [PubMed: 8972210]
77. Harrington L, McPhail T, Mar V, Zhou W, Oulton R, Bass MB, Arruda I, Robinson MO. A mammalian telomerase-associated protein. *Science* 1997;275:973–977. [PubMed: 9020079]
78. Hashimoto C, Steitz JA. U4 and U6 RNAs coexist in a single small nuclear ribonucleoprotein particle. *Nucleic Acids Res* 1984;12:3283–3293. [PubMed: 6201826]
79. Horowitz DS, Kobayashi R, Krainer AR. A new cyclophilin and the human homologues of yeast Prp3 and Prp4 form a complex associated with U4/U6 snRNPs. *RNA* 1997;3:1374–1387. [PubMed: 9404889]

80. Hossain S, Singh S, Lue NF. Functional analysis of the C-terminal extension of telomerase reverse transcriptase. A putative “thumb” domain. *J Biol Chem* 2002;277:36174–36180. [PubMed: 12151386]
81. Huard S, Moriarty TJ, Autexier C. The C terminus of the human telomerase reverse transcriptase is a determinant of enzyme processivity. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2003;31:4059–4070. [PubMed: 12853623]
82. Huppler A, Nikstad LJ, Allmann AM, Brow DA, Butcher SE. Metal binding and base ionization in the U6 RNA intramolecular stem-loop structure. *Nat Struct Biol* 2002;9:431–435. [PubMed: 11992125]
83. Huttenhofer A, Kieffmann M, Meier-Ewert S, O’Brien J, Lehrach H, Bachellerie JP, Brosius J. RNomics: an experimental approach that identifies 201 candidates for novel, small, non-messenger RNAs in mouse. *EMBO J* 2001;20:2943–2953. [PubMed: 11387227]
84. Ishitani R, Yokoyama S, Nureki O. Structure, dynamics, and function of RNA modification enzymes. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2008;18:330–339. [PubMed: 18539024]
85. Jacobs SA, Podell ER, Cech TR. Crystal structure of the essential N-terminal domain of telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2006;13:218–225. [PubMed: 16462747]
86. Jady BE, Kiss T. A small nucleolar guide RNA functions both in 2'-O-ribose methylation and pseudouridylation of the U5 spliceosomal RNA. *EMBO J* 2001;20:541–551. [PubMed: 11157760]
87. Jandrositz A, Guthrie C. Evidence for a Prp24 binding site in U6 snRNA and in a putative intermediate in the annealing of U6 and U4 snRNAs. *EMBO J* 1995;14:820–832. [PubMed: 7882985]
88. Jurica MS, Moore MJ. Pre-mRNA splicing: awash in a sea of proteins. *Mol Cell* 2003;12:5–14. [PubMed: 12887888]
89. Kambach C, Walke S, Young R, Avis JM, de la Fortelle E, Raker VA, Luhrmann R, Li J, Nagai K. Crystal structures of two Sm protein complexes and their implications for the assembly of the spliceosomal snRNPs. *Cell* 1999;96:375–387. [PubMed: 10025403]
90. Karaduman R, Dube P, Stark H, Fabrizio P, Kastner B, Luhrmann R. Structure of yeast U6 snRNPs: arrangement of Prp24p and the LSm complex as revealed by electron microscopy. *RNA* 2008;14:2528–2537. [PubMed: 18971323]
91. Karaduman R, Fabrizio P, Hartmuth K, Urlaub H, Luhrmann R. RNA structure and RNA-protein interactions in purified yeast U6 snRNPs. *J Mol Biol* 2006;356:1248–1262. [PubMed: 16410014]
92. Kelleher C, Teixeira MT, Forstemann K, Lingner J. Telomerase: biochemical considerations for enzyme and substrate. *Trends Biochem Sci* 2002;27:572–579. [PubMed: 12417133]
93. Kim NK, Zhang Q, Zhou J, Theimer CA, Peterson RD, Feigon J. Solution structure and dynamics of the wild-type pseudoknot of human telomerase RNA. *J Mol Biol* 2008;384:1249–1261. [PubMed: 18950640]
94. King TH, Liu B, McCully RR, Fournier MJ. Ribosome structure and activity are altered in cells lacking snoRNPs that form pseudouridines in the peptidyl transferase center. *Mol Cell* 2003;11:425–435. [PubMed: 12620230]
95. Kishore S, Stamm S. Regulation of alternative splicing by snoRNAs. *Cold Spring Harb Symp Quant Biol* 2006a;71:329–334. [PubMed: 17381313]
96. Kishore S, Stamm S. The snoRNA HBII-52 regulates alternative splicing of the serotonin receptor 2C. *Science* 2006b;311:230–232. [PubMed: 16357227]
97. Kiss-Laszlo Z, Henry Y, Bachellerie JP, Caizergues-Ferrer M, Kiss T. Site-specific ribose methylation of preribosomal RNA: a novel function for small nucleolar RNAs. *Cell* 1996;85:1077–1088. [PubMed: 8674114]
98. Kiss-Laszlo Z, Henry Y, Kiss T. Sequence and structural elements of methylation guide snoRNAs essential for site-specific ribose methylation of pre-rRNA. *EMBO J* 1998;17:797–807. [PubMed: 9451004]
99. Kiss T, Fayet-Lebaron E, Jady BE. Box H/ACA Small Ribonucleoproteins. *Mol Cell* 2010;37:597–606. [PubMed: 20227365]
100. Klein DJ, Schmeing TM, Moore PB, Steitz TA. The kink-turn: a new RNA secondary structure motif. *EMBO J* 2001;20:4214–4221. [PubMed: 11483524]
101. Kuhn AN, Li Z, Brow DA. Splicing factor Prp8 governs U4/U6 RNA unwinding during activation of the spliceosome. *Mol Cell* 1999;3:65–75. [PubMed: 10024880]

102. Lafontaine DL, Tollervey D. Nop58p is a common component of the box C+D snoRNPs that is required for snoRNA stability. *RNA* 1999;5:455–467. [PubMed: 10094313]
103. Lafontaine DL, Tollervey D. Synthesis and assembly of the box C+D small nucleolar RNPs. *Mol Cell Biol* 2000;20:2650–2659. [PubMed: 10733567]
104. Lagerbauer B, Liu S, Makarov E, Vornlocher HP, Makarova O, Ingelfinger D, Achsel T, Luhrmann R. The human U5 snRNP 52K protein (CD2BP2) interacts with U5-102K (hPrp6), a U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP bridging protein, but dissociates upon tri-snRNP formation. *RNA* 2005;11:598–608. [PubMed: 15840814]
105. Lai CK, Miller MC, Collins K. Template boundary definition in *Tetrahymena* telomerase. *Genes Dev* 2002;16:415–420. [PubMed: 11850404]
106. Lai CK, Miller MC, Collins K. Roles for RNA in telomerase nucleotide and repeat addition processivity. *Mol Cell* 2003;11:1673–1683. [PubMed: 12820978]
107. Lai CK, Mitchell JR, Collins K. RNA binding domain of telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell Biol* 2001;21:990–1000. [PubMed: 11158287]
108. Leeper T, Leulliot N, Varani G. The solution structure of an essential stem-loop of human telomerase RNA. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2003;31:2614–2621. [PubMed: 12736311]
109. Leeper TC, Varani G. The structure of an enzyme-activating fragment of human telomerase RNA. *RNA* 2005;11:394–403. [PubMed: 15703438]
110. Liang XH, Liu Q, Fournier MJ. rRNA modifications in an intersubunit bridge of the ribosome strongly affect both ribosome biogenesis and activity. *Mol Cell* 2007;28:965–977. [PubMed: 18158895]
111. Licht JD, Collins K. Telomerase RNA function in recombinant *Tetrahymena* telomerase. *Genes Dev* 1999;13:1116–1125. [PubMed: 10323863]
112. Lin J, Ly H, Hussain A, Abraham M, Pearl S, Tzfati Y, Parslow TG, Blackburn EH. A universal telomerase RNA core structure includes structured motifs required for binding the telomerase reverse transcriptase protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101:14713–14718. [PubMed: 15371596]
113. Linger BR, Price CM. Conservation of telomere protein complexes: shuffling through evolution. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* 2009;44:434–446. [PubMed: 19839711]
114. Lingner J, Cech TR. Purification of telomerase from *Euplotes aediculatus*: requirement of a primer 3' overhang. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1996;93:10712–10717. [PubMed: 8855245]
115. Lingner J, Hughes TR, Shevchenko A, Mann M, Lundblad V, Cech TR. Reverse transcriptase motifs in the catalytic subunit of telomerase. *Science* 1997;276:561–567. [PubMed: 9110970]
116. Liu S, Li P, Dybkov O, Nottrott S, Hartmuth K, Luhrmann R, Carlomagno T, Wahl MC. Binding of the human Prp31 Nop domain to a composite RNA-protein platform in U4 snRNP. *Science* 2007;316:115–120. [PubMed: 17412961]
117. Liu S, Rauhut R, Vornlocher HP, Luhrmann R. The network of protein-protein interactions within the human U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. *RNA* 2006;12:1418–1430. [PubMed: 16723661]
118. Livengood AJ, Zaug AJ, Cech TR. Essential regions of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* telomerase RNA: separate elements for Est1p and Est2p interaction. *Mol Cell Biol* 2002;22:2366–2374. [PubMed: 11884619]
119. Lue NF, Bosoy D, Moriarty TJ, Autexier C, Altman B, Leng S. Telomerase can act as a template- and RNA-independent terminal transferase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2005;102:9778–9783. [PubMed: 15994230]
120. Ly H, Xu L, Rivera MA, Parslow TG, Blackburn EH. A role for a novel 'trans-pseudoknot' RNA-RNA interaction in the functional dimerization of human telomerase. *Genes Dev* 2003;17:1078–1083. [PubMed: 12730131]
121. Madhani HD, Guthrie C. A novel base-pairing interaction between U2 and U6 snRNAs suggests a mechanism for the catalytic activation of the spliceosome. *Cell* 1992;71:803–817. [PubMed: 1423631]
122. Makarova OV, Makarov EM, Liu S, Vornlocher HP, Luhrmann R. Protein 61K, encoded by a gene (PRPF31) linked to autosomal dominant retinitis pigmentosa, is required for U4/U6*U5 tri-snRNP formation and pre-mRNA splicing. *EMBO J* 2002;21:1148–1157. [PubMed: 11867543]

123. Mason JM, Frydrychova RC, Biessmann H. Drosophila telomeres: an exception providing new insights. *Bioessays* 2008;30:25–37. [PubMed: 18081009]
124. Matera AG, Terns RM, Terns MP. Non-coding RNAs: lessons from the small nuclear and small nucleolar RNAs. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2007;8:209–220. [PubMed: 17318225]
125. Mayes AE, Verdone L, Legrain P, Beggs JD. Characterization of Sm-like proteins in yeast and their association with U6 snRNA. *EMBO J* 1999;18:4321–4331. [PubMed: 10428970]
126. Meyerson M, Counter CM, Eaton EN, Ellisen LW, Steiner P, Caddle SD, Ziaugra L, Beijersbergen RL, Davidoff MJ, Liu Q, et al. hEST2, the putative human telomerase catalytic subunit gene, is up-regulated in tumor cells and during immortalization. *Cell* 1997;90:785–795. [PubMed: 9288757]
127. Mitchell JR, Collins K. Human telomerase activation requires two independent interactions between telomerase RNA and telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell* 2000;6:361–371. [PubMed: 10983983]
128. Mitchell JR, Wood E, Collins K. A telomerase component is defective in the human disease dyskeratosis congenita. *Nature* 1999;402:551–555. [PubMed: 10591218]
129. Mitchell M, Gillis A, Futahashi M, Fujiwara H, Skordalakes E. Structural basis for telomerase catalytic subunit TERT binding to RNA template and telomeric DNA. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2010;17:513–518. [PubMed: 20357774]
130. Moriarty TJ, Huard S, Dupuis S, Autexier C. Functional multimerization of human telomerase requires an RNA interaction domain in the N terminus of the catalytic subunit. *Mol Cell Biol* 2002;22:1253–1265. [PubMed: 11809815]
131. Moriarty TJ, Marie-Egyptienne DT, Autexier C. Functional organization of repeat addition processivity and DNA synthesis determinants in the human telomerase multimer. *Mol Cell Biol* 2004;24:3720–3733. [PubMed: 15082768]
132. Nakamura TM, Morin GB, Chapman KB, Weinrich SL, Andrews WH, Lingner J, Harley CB, Cech TR. Telomerase catalytic subunit homologs from fission yeast and human. *Science* 1997;277:955–959. [PubMed: 9252327]
133. Nakayama J, Saito M, Nakamura H, Matsuura A, Ishikawa F. TLP1: a gene encoding a protein component of mammalian telomerase is a novel member of WD repeats family. *Cell* 1997;88:875–884. [PubMed: 9118230]
134. Ni J, Tien AL, Fournier MJ. Small nucleolar RNAs direct site-specific synthesis of pseudouridine in ribosomal RNA. *Cell* 1997;89:565–573. [PubMed: 9160748]
135. Noliros S, Carpousis AJ, Clouet-d'Orval B. The K-loop, a general feature of the *Pyrococcus* C/D guide RNAs, is an RNA structural motif related to the K-turn. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2005;33:6507–6514. [PubMed: 16293637]
136. Nottrott S, Hartmuth K, Fabrizio P, Urlaub H, Vidovic I, Ficner R, Luhrmann R. Functional interaction of a novel 15.5kD [U4/U6.U5] tri-snRNP protein with the 5' stem-loop of U4 snRNA. *EMBO J* 1999;18:6119–6133. [PubMed: 10545122]
137. Nottrott S, Urlaub H, Luhrmann R. Hierarchical, clustered protein interactions with U4/U6 snRNA: a biochemical role for U4/U6 proteins. *EMBO J* 2002;21:5527–5538. [PubMed: 12374753]
138. Nugent CI, Hughes TR, Lue NF, Lundblad V. Cdc13p: a single-strand telomeric DNA-binding protein with a dual role in yeast telomere maintenance. *Science* 1996;274:249–252. [PubMed: 8824190]
139. Olovnikov AM. A theory of marginotomy. The incomplete copying of template margin in enzymic synthesis of polynucleotides and biological significance of the phenomenon. *J Theor Biol* 1973;41:181–190. [PubMed: 4754905]
140. Omer AD, Lowe TM, Russell AG, Ebhardt H, Eddy SR, Dennis PP. Homologs of small nucleolar RNAs in Archaea. *Science* 2000;288:517–522. [PubMed: 10775111]
141. Omer AD, Zago M, Chang A, Dennis PP. Probing the structure and function of an archaeal C/D-box methylation guide sRNA. *RNA* 2006;12:1708–1720. [PubMed: 16861619]
142. Omer AD, Ziesche S, Ebhardt H, Dennis PP. In vitro reconstitution and activity of a C/D box methylation guide ribonucleoprotein complex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2002;99:5289–5294. [PubMed: 11959980]

143. Oruganti S, Zhang Y, Li H, Robinson H, Terns MP, Terns RM, Yang W, Li H. Alternative conformations of the archaeal Nop56/58-fibrillarin complex imply flexibility in box C/D RNPs. *J Mol Biol* 2007;371:1141–1150. [PubMed: 17617422]
144. Palm W, de Lange T. How shelterin protects mammalian telomeres. *Annu Rev Genet* 2008;42:301–334. [PubMed: 18680434]
145. Patel AA, Steitz JA. Splicing double: insights from the second spliceosome. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2003;4:960–970. [PubMed: 14685174]
146. Pena V, Liu S, Bujnicki JM, Luhrmann R, Wahl MC. Structure of a multipartite protein-protein interaction domain in splicing factor prp8 and its link to retinitis pigmentosa. *Mol Cell* 2007;25:615–624. [PubMed: 17317632]
147. Peng Y, Mian IS, Lue NF. Analysis of telomerase processivity: mechanistic similarity to HIV-1 reverse transcriptase and role in telomere maintenance. *Mol Cell* 2001;7:1201–1211. [PubMed: 11430823]
148. Prescott J, Blackburn EH. Functionally interacting telomerase RNAs in the yeast telomerase complex. *Genes Dev* 1997a;11:2790–2800. [PubMed: 9353249]
149. Prescott J, Blackburn EH. Telomerase RNA mutations in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* alter telomerase action and reveal nonprocessivity in vivo and in vitro. *Genes Dev* 1997b;11:528–540. [PubMed: 9042865]
150. Qiao F, Cech TR. Triple-helix structure in telomerase RNA contributes to catalysis. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2008;15:634–640. [PubMed: 18500353]
151. Rader SD, Guthrie C. A conserved Lsm-interaction motif in Prp24 required for efficient U4/U6 di-snRNP formation. *RNA* 2002;8:1378–1392. [PubMed: 12458792]
152. Raghunathan PL, Guthrie C. RNA unwinding in U4/U6 snRNPs requires ATP hydrolysis and the DEIH-box splicing factor Brr2. *Curr Biol* 1998a;8:847–855. [PubMed: 9705931]
153. Raghunathan PL, Guthrie C. A spliceosomal recycling factor that reanneals U4 and U6 small nuclear ribonucleoprotein particles. *Science* 1998b;279:857–860. [PubMed: 9452384]
154. Rashid R, Aittaleb M, Chen Q, Spiegel K, Demeler B, Li H. Functional requirement for symmetric assembly of archaeal box C/D small ribonucleoprotein particles. *J Mol Biol* 2003;333:295–306. [PubMed: 14529617]
155. Reichow SL, Hamma T, Ferre-D'Amare AR, Varani G. The structure and function of small nucleolar ribonucleoproteins. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2007;35:1452–1464. [PubMed: 17284456]
156. Ren X, Gavory G, Li H, Ying L, Klenerman D, Balasubramanian S. Identification of a new RNA:RNA interaction site for human telomerase RNA (hTR): structural implications for hTR accumulation and a dyskeratosis congenita point mutation. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2003;31:6509–6515. [PubMed: 14602909]
157. Richards RJ, Theimer CA, Finger LD, Feigon J. Structure of the *Tetrahymena thermophila* telomerase RNA helix II template boundary element. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2006;34:816–825. [PubMed: 16452301]
158. Rinke J, Appel B, Digweed M, Luhrmann R. Localization of a base-paired interaction between small nuclear RNAs U4 and U6 in intact U4/U6 ribonucleoprotein particles by psoralen cross-linking. *J Mol Biol* 1985;185:721–731. [PubMed: 2932555]
159. Rivera MA, Blackburn EH. Processive utilization of the human telomerase template: lack of a requirement for template switching. *J Biol Chem* 2004;279:53770–53781. [PubMed: 15456773]
160. Romero DP, Blackburn EH. A conserved secondary structure for telomerase RNA. *Cell* 1991;67:343–353. [PubMed: 1840508]
161. Rouda S, Skordalakes E. Structure of the RNA-binding domain of telomerase: implications for RNA recognition and binding. *Structure* 2007;15:1403–1412. [PubMed: 17997966]
162. Roy J, Fulton TB, Blackburn EH. Specific telomerase RNA residues distant from the template are essential for telomerase function. *Genes Dev* 1998;12:3286–3300. [PubMed: 9784502]
163. Russell AG, Schnare MN, Gray MW. A large collection of compact box C/D snoRNAs and their isoforms in *Euglena gracilis*: structural, functional and evolutionary insights. *J Mol Biol* 2006;357:1548–1565. [PubMed: 16497322]

164. Salgado-Garrido J, Bragado-Nilsson E, Kandels-Lewis S, Seraphin B. Sm and Sm-like proteins assemble in two related complexes of deep evolutionary origin. *EMBO J* 1999;18:3451–3462. [PubMed: 10369684]
165. Sashital DG, Cornilescu G, McManus CJ, Brow DA, Butcher SE. U2-U6 RNA folding reveals a group II intron-like domain and a four-helix junction. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2004;11:1237–1242. [PubMed: 15543154]
166. Sawa H, Abelson J. Evidence for a base-pairing interaction between U6 small nuclear RNA and 5' splice site during the splicing reaction in yeast. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1992;89:11269–11273. [PubMed: 1333604]
167. Sawa H, Shimura Y. Association of U6 snRNA with the 5'-splice site region of pre-mRNA in the spliceosome. *Genes Dev* 1992;6:244–254. [PubMed: 1310665]
168. Schnapp G, Rodi HP, Rettig WJ, Schnapp A, Damm K. One-step affinity purification protocol for human telomerase. *Nucleic Acids Res* 1998;26:3311–3313. [PubMed: 9628936]
169. Schneider C, Will CL, Brosius J, Frilander MJ, Luhrmann R. Identification of an evolutionarily divergent U11 small nuclear ribonucleoprotein particle in *Drosophila*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101:9584–9589. [PubMed: 15210936]
170. Schneider C, Will CL, Makarova OV, Makarov EM, Luhrmann R. Human U4/U6.U5 and U4atac/U6atac.U5 tri-snRNPs exhibit similar protein compositions. *Mol Cell Biol* 2002;22:3219–3229. [PubMed: 11971955]
171. Sekaran VG, Soares J, Jarstfer MB. Structures of telomerase subunits provide functional insights. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 2010;1804:1190–1201. [PubMed: 19665593]
172. Seto AG, Zaug AJ, Sobel SG, Wolin SL, Cech TR. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* telomerase is an Sm small nuclear ribonucleoprotein particle. *Nature* 1999;401:177–180. [PubMed: 10490028]
173. Singer MS, Gottschling DE. TLC1: template RNA component of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* telomerase. *Science* 1994;266:404–409. [PubMed: 7545955]
174. Singh SK, Gurha P, Gupta R. Dynamic guide-target interactions contribute to sequential 2'-O-methylation by a unique archaeal dual guide box C/D sRNP. *RNA* 2008;14:1411–1423. [PubMed: 18515549]
175. Singh SK, Gurha P, Tran EJ, Maxwell ES, Gupta R. Sequential 2'-O-methylation of archaeal pre-tRNA^{Trp} nucleotides is guided by the intron-encoded but trans-acting box C/D ribonucleoprotein of pre-tRNA. *J Biol Chem* 2004;279:47661–47671. [PubMed: 15347671]
176. Smith DJ, Query CC, Konarska MM. "Nought may endure but mutability": spliceosome dynamics and the regulation of splicing. *Mol Cell* 2008;30:657–666. [PubMed: 18570869]
177. Staley JP, Woolford JL Jr. Assembly of ribosomes and spliceosomes: complex ribonucleoprotein machines. *Curr Opin Cell Biol* 2009;21:109–118. [PubMed: 19167202]
178. Steitz JA, Tycowski KT. Small RNA chaperones for ribosome biogenesis. *Science* 1995;270:1626–1627. [PubMed: 7502072]
179. Stellwagen AE, Haimberger ZW, Veatch JR, Gottschling DE. Ku interacts with telomerase RNA to promote telomere addition at native and broken chromosome ends. *Genes Dev* 2003;17:2384–2395. [PubMed: 12975323]
180. Stevens SW, Barta I, Ge HY, Moore RE, Young MK, Lee TD, Abelson J. Biochemical and genetic analyses of the U5, U6, and U4/U6 x U5 small nuclear ribonucleoproteins from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *RNA* 2001;7:1543–1553. [PubMed: 11720284]
181. Sun JS, Manley JL. A novel U2-U6 snRNA structure is necessary for mammalian mRNA splicing. *Genes Dev* 1995;9:843–854. [PubMed: 7705661]
182. Suryadi J, Tran EJ, Maxwell ES, Brown BA 2nd. The crystal structure of the *Methanocaldococcus jannaschii* multifunctional L7Ae RNA-binding protein reveals an induced-fit interaction with the box C/D RNAs. *Biochemistry* 2005;44:9657–9672. [PubMed: 16008351]
183. Szewczak LB, DeGregorio SJ, Strobel SA, Steitz JA. Exclusive interaction of the 15.5 kD protein with the terminal box C/D motif of a methylation guide snoRNP. *Chem Biol* 2002;9:1095–1107. [PubMed: 12401494]
184. Szewczak LB, Gabrielsen JS, Degregorio SJ, Strobel SA, Steitz JA. Molecular basis for RNA kink-turn recognition by the h15.5K small RNP protein. *RNA* 2005;11:1407–1419. [PubMed: 16120832]

185. Taggart AK, Teng SC, Zakian VA. Est1p as a cell cycle-regulated activator of telomere-bound telomerase. *Science* 2002;297:1023–1026. [PubMed: 12169735]
186. Tarn WY, Steitz JA. Pre-mRNA splicing: the discovery of a new spliceosome doubles the challenge. *Trends Biochem Sci* 1997;22:132–137. [PubMed: 9149533]
187. Teigelkamp S, Achsel T, Mundt C, Gothel SF, Cronshagen U, Lane WS, Marahiel M, Luhrmann R. The 20kD protein of human [U4/U6.U5] tri-snRNPs is a novel cyclophilin that forms a complex with the U4/U6-specific 60kD and 90kD proteins. *RNA* 1998;4:127–141. [PubMed: 9570313]
188. Tesmer VM, Ford LP, Holt SE, Frank BC, Yi X, Aisner DL, Ouellette M, Shay JW, Wright WE. Two inactive fragments of the integral RNA cooperate to assemble active telomerase with the human protein catalytic subunit (hTERT) in vitro. *Mol Cell Biol* 1999;19:6207–6216. [PubMed: 10454567]
189. Theimer CA, Blois CA, Feigon J. Structure of the human telomerase RNA pseudoknot reveals conserved tertiary interactions essential for function. *Mol Cell* 2005;17:671–682. [PubMed: 15749017]
190. Theimer CA, Feigon J. Structure and function of telomerase RNA. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2006;16:307–318. [PubMed: 16713250]
191. Theimer CA, Jady BE, Chim N, Richard P, Breece KE, Kiss T, Feigon J. Structural and functional characterization of human telomerase RNA processing and cajal body localization signals. *Mol Cell* 2007;27:869–881. [PubMed: 17889661]
192. Tidow H, Andreeva A, Rutherford TJ, Fersht AR. Solution structure of the U11-48K CHHC zinc-finger domain that specifically binds the 5' splice site of U12-type introns. *Structure* 2009;17:294–302. [PubMed: 19217400]
193. Ting NS, Yu Y, Pohorelic B, Lees-Miller SP, Beattie TL. Human Ku70/80 interacts directly with hTR, the RNA component of human telomerase. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2005;33:2090–2098. [PubMed: 15824061]
194. Tran E, Zhang X, Lackey L, Maxwell ES. Conserved spacing between the box C/D and C'/D' RNPs of the archaeal box C/D sRNP complex is required for efficient 2'-O-methylation of target RNAs. *RNA* 2005;11:285–293. [PubMed: 15661846]
195. Tran EJ, Zhang X, Maxwell ES. Efficient RNA 2'-O-methylation requires juxtaposed and symmetrically assembled archaeal box C/D and C'/D' RNPs. *EMBO J* 2003;22:3930–3940. [PubMed: 12881427]
196. Turunen JJ, Will CL, Grote M, Luhrmann R, Frilander MJ. The U11-48K protein contacts the 5' splice site of U12-type introns and the U11-59K protein. *Mol Cell Biol* 2008;28:3548–3560. [PubMed: 18347052]
197. Tyc K, Steitz JA. U3, U8 and U13 comprise a new class of mammalian snRNPs localized in the cell nucleolus. *EMBO J* 1989;8:3113–3119. [PubMed: 2531075]
198. Tycowski KT, Smith CM, Shu MD, Steitz JA. A small nucleolar RNA requirement for site-specific ribose methylation of rRNA in *Xenopus*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1996;93:14480–14485. [PubMed: 8962077]
199. Tycowski KT, You ZH, Graham PJ, Steitz JA. Modification of U6 spliceosomal RNA is guided by other small RNAs. *Mol Cell* 1998;2:629–638. [PubMed: 9844635]
200. Tzfati Y, Fulton TB, Roy J, Blackburn EH. Template boundary in a yeast telomerase specified by RNA structure. *Science* 2000;288:863–867. [PubMed: 10797010]
201. Urlaub H, Raker VA, Kostka S, Luhrmann R. Sm protein-Sm site RNA interactions within the inner ring of the spliceosomal snRNP core structure. *EMBO J* 2001;20:187–196. [PubMed: 11226169]
202. Valadkhan S, Manley JL. Splicing-related catalysis by protein-free snRNAs. *Nature* 2001;413:701–707. [PubMed: 11607023]
203. Vidal VP, Verdone L, Mayes AE, Beggs JD. Characterization of U6 snRNA-protein interactions. *RNA* 1999;5:1470–1481. [PubMed: 10580475]
204. Vitali P, Basyuk E, Le Meur E, Bertrand E, Muscatelli F, Cavaille J, Huttenhofer A. ADAR2-mediated editing of RNA substrates in the nucleolus is inhibited by C/D small nucleolar RNAs. *J Cell Biol* 2005;169:745–753. [PubMed: 15939761]
205. Wachtel C, Manley JL. Splicing of mRNA precursors: the role of RNAs and proteins in catalysis. *Mol Biosyst* 2009;5:311–316. [PubMed: 19396366]

206. Wahl MC, Will CL, Luhrmann R. The spliceosome: design principles of a dynamic RNP machine. *Cell* 2009;136:701–718. [PubMed: 19239890]
207. Walne AJ, Dokal I. Advances in the understanding of dyskeratosis congenita. *Br J Haematol* 2009;145:164–172. [PubMed: 19208095]
208. Wang H, Boisvert D, Kim KK, Kim R, Kim SH. Crystal structure of a fibrillarin homologue from *Methanococcus jannaschii*, a hyperthermophile, at 1.6 Å resolution. *EMBO J* 2000;19:317–323. [PubMed: 10654930]
209. Wang L, Dean SR, Shippen DE. Oligomerization of the telomerase reverse transcriptase from *Euplotes crassus*. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2002;30:4032–4039. [PubMed: 12235387]
210. Wassarman DA, Steitz JA. Interactions of small nuclear RNA's with precursor messenger RNA during in vitro splicing. *Science* 1992a;257:1918–1925. [PubMed: 1411506]
211. Wassarman KM, Steitz JA. The low-abundance U11 and U12 small nuclear ribonucleoproteins (snRNPs) interact to form a two-snRNP complex. *Mol Cell Biol* 1992b;12:1276–1285. [PubMed: 1372090]
212. Watkins NJ, Dickmanns A, Luhrmann R. Conserved stem II of the box C/D motif is essential for nucleolar localization and is required, along with the 15.5K protein, for the hierarchical assembly of the box C/D snoRNP. *Mol Cell Biol* 2002;22:8342–8352. [PubMed: 12417735]
213. Watkins NJ, Newman DR, Kuhn JF, Maxwell ES. In vitro assembly of the mouse U14 snoRNP core complex and identification of a 65-kDa box C/D-binding protein. *RNA* 1998;4:582–593. [PubMed: 9582099]
214. Watkins NJ, Segault V, Charpentier B, Nottrott S, Fabrizio P, Bachi A, Wilm M, Rosbash M, Branlant C, Luhrmann R. A common core RNP structure shared between the small nucleolar box C/D RNPs and the spliceosomal U4 snRNP. *Cell* 2000;103:457–466. [PubMed: 11081632]
215. Watson JD. Origin of concatemeric T7 DNA. *Nat New Biol* 1972;239:197–201. [PubMed: 4507727]
216. Weinrich SL, Pruzan R, Ma L, Ouellette M, Tesmer VM, Holt SE, Bodnar AG, Lichtsteiner S, Kim NW, Trager JB, et al. Reconstitution of human telomerase with the template RNA component hTR and the catalytic protein subunit hTERT. *Nat Genet* 1997;17:498–502. [PubMed: 9398860]
217. Wenz C, Enenkel B, Amacker M, Kelleher C, Damm K, Lingner J. Human telomerase contains two cooperating telomerase RNA molecules. *EMBO J* 2001;20:3526–3534. [PubMed: 11432839]
218. Will CL, Schneider C, Hossbach M, Urlaub H, Rauhut R, Elbashir S, Tuschl T, Luhrmann R. The human 18S U11/U12 snRNP contains a set of novel proteins not found in the U2-dependent spliceosome. *RNA* 2004;10:929–941. [PubMed: 15146077]
219. Will CL, Schneider C, MacMillan AM, Katopodis NF, Neubauer G, Wilm M, Luhrmann R, Query CC. A novel U2 and U11/U12 snRNP protein that associates with the pre-mRNA branch site. *EMBO J* 2001;20:4536–4546. [PubMed: 11500380]
220. Will CL, Schneider C, Reed R, Luhrmann R. Identification of both shared and distinct proteins in the major and minor spliceosomes. *Science* 1999;284:2003–2005. [PubMed: 10373121]
221. Wright WE, Piatyszek MA, Rainey WE, Byrd W, Shay JW. Telomerase activity in human germline and embryonic tissues and cells. *Dev Genet* 1996;18:173–179. [PubMed: 8934879]
222. Wu JA, Manley JL. Base pairing between U2 and U6 snRNAs is necessary for splicing of a mammalian pre-mRNA. *Nature* 1991;352:818–821. [PubMed: 1831878]
223. Wu JY, Maniatis T. Specific interactions between proteins implicated in splice site selection and regulated alternative splicing. *Cell* 1993;75:1061–1070. [PubMed: 8261509]
224. Wyatt HD, Lobb DA, Beattie TL. Characterization of physical and functional anchor site interactions in human telomerase. *Mol Cell Biol* 2007;27:3226–3240. [PubMed: 17296728]
225. Xia J, Peng Y, Mian IS, Lue NF. Identification of functionally important domains in the N-terminal region of telomerase reverse transcriptase. *Mol Cell Biol* 2000;20:5196–5207. [PubMed: 10866675]
226. Xu Y, Petersen-Bjorn S, Friesen JD. The PRP4 (RNA4) protein of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is associated with the 5' portion of the U4 small nuclear RNA. *Mol Cell Biol* 1990;10:1217–1225. [PubMed: 2154681]
227. Xu YZ, Newnham CM, Kameoka S, Huang T, Konarska MM, Query CC. Prp5 bridges U1 and U2 snRNPs and enables stable U2 snRNP association with intron RNA. *EMBO J* 2004;23:376–385. [PubMed: 14713954]

228. Ye K, Jia R, Lin J, Ju M, Peng J, Xu A, Zhang L. Structural organization of box C/D RNA-guided RNA methyltransferase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2009;106:13808–13813. [PubMed: 19666563]
229. Yean SL, Wuenschell G, Termini J, Lin RJ. Metal-ion coordination by U6 small nuclear RNA contributes to catalysis in the spliceosome. *Nature* 2000;408:881–884. [PubMed: 11130730]
230. Yu GL, Blackburn EH. Developmentally programmed healing of chromosomes by telomerase in *Tetrahymena*. *Cell* 1991;67:823–832. [PubMed: 1934071]
231. Zappulla DC, Cech TR. Yeast telomerase RNA: a flexible scaffold for protein subunits. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2004;101:10024–10029. [PubMed: 15226497]
232. Zappulla DC, Goodrich K, Cech TR. A miniature yeast telomerase RNA functions in vivo and reconstitutes activity in vitro. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2005;12:1072–1077. [PubMed: 16299517]
233. Zhang X, Champion EA, Tran EJ, Brown BA 2nd, Baserga SJ, Maxwell ES. The coiled-coil domain of the Nop56/58 core protein is dispensable for sRNP assembly but is critical for archaeal box C/D sRNP-guided nucleotide methylation. *RNA* 2006;12:1092–1103. [PubMed: 16601205]
234. Ziesche SM, Omer AD, Dennis PP. RNA-guided nucleotide modification of ribosomal and non-ribosomal RNAs in Archaea. *Mol Microbiol* 2004;54:980–993. [PubMed: 15522081]

Figure 1.

Architecture of box C/D s(no)RNPs. **A**) Box C/D s(no)RNAs contain conserved sequences, named boxes C, D, C', and D'. The spacer sequences between boxes C and D' as well as between boxes C' and D contain guide sequences that are complementary to the substrate RNAs targeted for methylation. The 5' and 3' sequences usually form a terminal stem. **B**) Conventional mono-sRNP model for archaeal box C/D sRNPs. According to this model, archaeal box C/D sRNPs are composed of one sRNA molecule and two copies of each of the three archaeal box C/D core proteins, assembled symmetrically on the sRNA. **C**) Di-sRNP model of archaeal box C/D sRNP architecture. According to this structure-based model, archaeal box C/D sRNPs contain two RNA molecules and four sets of each core protein. Colors are: grey - RNA, yellow - L7Ae, blue - Nop5, orange - fibrillarin. **D**) EM structure of a *M. jannaschii* box C/D sRNP (EMD-1636, Bleichert et al., 2009) with fitted crystal structures of core proteins (PDB 2nnw, Oruganti et al., 2007; PDB 1xbi, Suryadi et al., 2005). Figures 1A–D are reprinted from (Bleichert et al., 2009). **E**) and **F**) Asymmetric assembly models of eukaryotic box C/D mono- and di-snoRNP architecture, respectively. Colors are: grey - RNA, yellow - 15.5K/Snu13, light blue - Nop56, dark blue - Nop58, orange - fibrillarin. A color version of this figure is available online.

Figure 2. Telomerase RNP function. **A)** Domain organization of telomerase reverse transcriptase (TERT). **B)** Repeat addition cycle for telomerase. Telomerase RNA base pairs to 3' single stranded overhangs of chromosome ends and TERT reverse transcribes the template sequence into the telomeric DNA. Once the template boundary is reached, telomerase can translocate and catalyze the addition of another telomere repeat, which involves realignment of the 3' template sequence of telomerase RNA with the newly synthesized repeat sequence. A color version of this figure is available online.

Figure 3.

Assembly and recycling of U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP during pre-mRNA splicing. The U4/U6 di-snRNP is formed by association of the U4 and U6 snRNPs through base pairing of their snRNA components. Subsequently, the U5 snRNP joins to form the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. Recruitment of the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNPs into the spliceosome results in formation of the B complex. Activation of the spliceosome requires structural rearrangements that result in release of the U4 snRNP and the U6 snRNA associated Lsm2-8 proteins. After splicing is completed, U5 and U6 snRNPs are recycled, joining the U4 snRNP to form U4/U6 di-snRNPs and U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNPs, respectively. A color version of this figure is available online.

Figure 4. Composition of the human U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. U4/U6 di-snRNP (orange) and U5 snRNP (blue) associate to form the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. Proteins specific to the tri-snRNP that are not found in the U4/U6 di-snRNP or U5 snRNP are shown in yellow. Protein-protein interactions within and between RNPs are indicated by solid lines. Known snRNA-protein interactions are indicated by arrows. The U4 and U6 snRNAs are base paired in both the U4/U6 di-snRNP and the U4/U6.U5 tri-snRNP. Proteins are conserved in yeast except for 27K, 40K, and hCypH. A color version of this figure is available online.

Table 1

Summary of experimental size measurements of telomerase from different species.

Species	Multimerization state	Measured molecular weight or S value	Source of telomerase	Method used	References
<u>Ciliates:</u>					
<i>Tetrahymena thermophila</i>	monomer	180–220 kDa	recombinant	gel filtration chromatography	(Bryan et al., 2003)
<i>Euplores crassus</i>	dimer or higher order complex	280–400 kDa, 550 kDa, 1.6 MDa, >5 MDa ^a	macronuclear extract	gel filtration chromatography	(Greene and Shippen, 1998; Wang et al., 2002)
<i>Euplores aediculatus</i>	monomer	11.5–12.5S or 230 kDa	affinity-purified ^b or nuclear extract	glycerol gradient centrifugation	(Lingner and Cech, 1996)
	dimer	450–500 kDa	nuclear extract	gel filtration chromatography	(Aigner et al., 2003)
	dimer	400 kDa	affinity-purified ^b	gel filtration chromatography and EM images	(Fouche et al., 2006)
<u>Vertebrates:</u>					
human	dimer	550 kDa 1000 kDa	affinity-purified nuclear extract	glycerol gradient centrifugation	(Schnapp et al., 1998)
	dimer	600 kDa	recombinant or affinity-purified	gel filtration chromatography	(Wenz et al., 2001)
	dimer	650–670 kDa	whole-cell lysate or affinity-purified ^c	glycerol gradient centrifugation	(Cohen et al., 2007)
	monomer	277 kDa	recombinant	single-molecule fluorescence two-color coincidence analysis	(Alves et al., 2008)

^aThe size of the telomerase is developmentally regulated, with the 280 kDa complex found in the vegetative stage of the life cycle, and the larger complexes found during macronuclear development. The oligomeric state and composition of the larger complexes is unknown.

^bAffinity-purified telomerase also contains p43 besides TERT (p123 in *E. aediculatus*).

^cAffinity-purified telomerase also contains the protein dyskerin besides TERT.

Table 2

Protein composition of the 18S U11/U12 di-snRNP (Will et al., 2004; Will et al., 2001; Will et al., 1999).

<u>Proteins shared with U2 snRNP or major spliceosome:</u>
Sm proteins (SmB/B', D1, D2, D3, E, F, G)
SF3b155
SF3b145
SF3b130
SF3b49
SF3b14a (p14)
SF3b14b
SF3b10
Prp43
YB-1
Urp (U2AF35-related protein 2)
<u>U11/U12 di-snRNP-specific proteins:</u>
U11/U12-65K
U11/U12-31K (MADP1)
U11/U12-20K
<u>12S U11-snRNP proteins:</u>
Sm proteins (SmB/B', D1, D2, D3, E, F, G)
U11-59K (ES18)
U11-48K
U11-35K
U11-25K
9G8