


Cryo-EM of Ribosomal 80S Complexes with Termination Factors Reveals the Translocated Cricket Paralysis Virus IRES

Graphical Abstract



Authors

Margarita Muhs, Tarek Hilal, ..., Tatyana V. Pestova, Christian M.T. Spahn

Correspondence

christian.spahn@charite.de

In Brief

The unusual mechanism by which CrPV IGR IRES initiates protein synthesis includes a pseudo-translocation step. Here, cryoelectron microscopy reveals the state of the CrPV IGR IRES on the ribosome after translocation, providing insight into the RNA-based mechanism of internal translation initiation.

Highlights

- The CrPV IRES is directly visualized in the post-translocated state
- During pseudo-translocation, the IRES undergoes a pronounced conformational change
- Factors eRF1 and eRF1/eRF3 are visualized on the ribosome in a minimal system
- eRF1 alone can adopt the active conformation on the ribosome

Accession Numbers

4d5n
4d5l
4d5y
4d5z
4d61
4d66
4d67
4d68



Cryo-EM of Ribosomal 80S Complexes with Termination Factors Reveals the Translocated Cricket Paralysis Virus IRES

Margarita Muhs,^{1,6} Tarek Hilal,^{1,6} Thorsten Mielke,^{1,2} Maxim A. Skabkin,³ Karissa Y. Sanbonmatsu,^{4,5} Tatyana V. Pestova,³ and Christian M.T. Spahn^{1,*}

¹Institut für Medizinische Physik und Biophysik, Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Charitéplatz 1, 10117 Berlin, Germany

²UltraStrukturNetzwerk, Max Planck Institute for Molecular Genetics, 14195 Berlin, Germany

³Department of Cell Biology, SUNY Downstate Medical Center, Brooklyn, NY 11203, USA

⁴Theoretical Biology and Biophysics Group, Theoretical Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory, Los Alamos, NM 87545, USA

⁵New Mexico Consortium, 4200 West Jemez Road, Suite 301, Los Alamos, NM 87544, USA

⁶Co-first author

*Correspondence: christian.spahn@charite.de

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2014.12.016>

SUMMARY

The cricket paralysis virus (CrPV) uses an internal ribosomal entry site (IRES) to hijack the ribosome. In a remarkable RNA-based mechanism involving neither initiation factor nor initiator tRNA, the CrPV IRES jumpstarts translation in the elongation phase from the ribosomal A site. Here, we present cryoelectron microscopy (cryo-EM) maps of 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP and 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complexes, revealing a previously unseen binding state of the IRES and directly rationalizing that an eEF2-dependent translocation of the IRES is required to allow the first A-site occupation. During this unusual translocation event, the IRES undergoes a pronounced conformational change to a more stretched conformation. At the same time, our structural analysis provides information about the binding modes of eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP and eRF1 in a minimal system. It shows that neither eRF3 nor ABCE1 are required for the active conformation of eRF1 at the intersection between eukaryotic termination and recycling.

INTRODUCTION

During protein synthesis, the information encoded in mRNA is translated into a polypeptide chain by the ribosome. The translation process is subdivided into four phases: initiation, elongation, termination, and recycling. During initiation, functionally competent ribosomes are assembled on the messenger RNA (mRNA) with initiator transfer RNA (tRNA Met-tRNA^{Met}) positioned in the ribosomal P site and base-paired with the AUG codon of the mRNA. Canonical translation initiation in eukaryotes requires at least 12 initiation factors and a cap structure at the 5' end of the mRNA (Aitken and Lorsch, 2012; Hinnebusch and Lorsch, 2012; Jackson et al., 2010). However, alternative pathways of in-

ternal initiation exist that are cap and end independent and require a reduced set of initiation factors (Jackson et al., 2010). Internal initiation is driven by structured RNA elements present in the 5' untranslated region (UTR) of the mRNAs, which are known as internal ribosome entry sites (IRESs). Internal initiation via IRES elements is used by many viruses.

IRESs can be classified into four major types depending on their secondary structure, factor requirements, and initiation site (Jackson et al., 2010). A particularly simple mechanism of translation initiation is used by type IV IRESs present in the intergenic region (IGR) of the genome of dicistroviruses, such as Cricket paralysis virus (CrPV) (Wilson et al., 2000a). The IGR IRESs assemble functionally active 80S ribosomes without any initiation factor, initiator tRNA, and AUG start codon, but jumpstart translation directly in the elongation phase from the A site (Pestova and Hellen, 2003; Sasaki and Nakashima, 2000; Wilson et al., 2000b). All IGR IRESs characterized so far share a highly conserved secondary structure comprising three domains, each characterized by a pseudoknot element (PK I–PK III) (Figure 1A; Kanamori and Nakashima, 2001; Pflugsten et al., 2007). The first sense codon present at the 3' edge of the PK I structure is alanine-encoding GCU.

To fulfill their functional tasks, members of the IGR IRES family adopt a complex tertiary fold to facilitate specific interactions with the 40S subunit and the 80S ribosome in the intersubunit space (Schüler et al., 2006; Spahn et al., 2004). Domains 1 and 2 of the IGR IRES—containing PK II and PK III, respectively—tightly bind the 40S subunit and fold independently of domain 3 and can therefore be combined into a ribosome-binding domain (Costantino and Kieft, 2005; Jan and Sarnow, 2002; Nishiyama et al., 2003). The CrPV IRES structure has been derived independently by X-ray crystallography (Pflugsten et al., 2006; Costantino et al., 2008) and by cryoelectron microscopy (cryo-EM)-based de novo RNA modeling (Schüler et al., 2006). Crucial for the recruitment of the 40S subunit are the two RNA stem loops SL2.1 and SL2.3 of domain 2 of the IGR IRES (Jan and Sarnow, 2002) interacting with ribosomal proteins eS25 (rpS25; for a new nomenclature of ribosomal protein names, see Ban et al., 2014) and uS7 (rpS5), respectively, at




Figure 1. eEF2-Dependent Association of eRF1 and eRF1/eRF3 with 80S Ribosomal Complexes Assembled on CrPV-STOP mRNA

(A) Secondary structure of the CrPV IRES with the first Ala codon mutated to a UAA stop codon (in red). Blue circles indicate the positions of toe-prints (B) caused by the contacts of the IRES with the 40S and 60S ribosomal subunits.

(B) Toe-printing analysis of binding of eRF1 and eRF3 to 80S ribosomal complexes assembled on CrPV-STOP mRNA, depending on the presence of eEF2. Toe-prints corresponding to the pre-translocated ribosomal complexes (+14–15 nts from the CCU codon) are indicated by a black arrow. Toe-prints corresponding to the eRF1- or eRF1/eRF3-associated post-translocated ribosomal complexes (+18–19 nts from the CCU codon) are indicated by a red arrow. The +4 nt toe-print shift in post-translocated complexes includes the +2 nt shift due to the presence of eRF1 (Alkalaeva et al., 2006). Additional toe-prints caused by the contacts of the IRES with

the head of the 40S subunit (Landry et al., 2009; Muhs et al., 2011; Schüler et al., 2006). Domain 3 containing PK I, in turn, is responsible for placing the start of the coding sequence into the ribosomal decoding center. A part of PK I mimics a tRNA anticodon stem loop (ASL) undergoing codon-anticodon interactions with a mRNA triplet (Costantino et al., 2008).

In the current model of IGR IRES-mediated translation (for review, see Thompson, 2012), the first Ala-tRNA is brought to the ribosome as a ternary complex with elongation factor 1A (eEF1A) and GTP once the binary 80S•IRES complex has been assembled from a 40S•IRES complex and a 60S subunit. Subsequently, the tRNA is translocated from the A site into the P site by elongation factor 2 (eEF2). However, while initial toe-print analysis (Jan et al., 2003; Pestova and Hellen, 2003; Wilson et al., 2000b) suggested that PK I is positioned in the ribosomal P site and the first GCU codon in the ribosomal A site, cryo-EM reconstructions of binary 80S•CrPV IRES complexes depicted the apical part of PK I in the A site overlapping with the ASL of an A site tRNA and forming A site-specific interactions with helices h18 and h34 of 18S rRNA (Schüler et al., 2006). Moreover, very recent cryo-EM reconstructions revealed that the apical part of PK I mimics tRNA/mRNA interaction in the decoding center of the A site (Fernández et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2014).

Thus, it follows that the PK I has to be moved out of the A site before the first Ala-tRNA containing ternary complex can decode the GCU codon (Schüler et al., 2006; Fernández et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2014). Indeed, it has been shown that stable binding of the first tRNA to 80S•CrPV IRES complexes requires not only eEF1A, but also eEF2 (Yamamoto et al., 2007; Fernández et al., 2014). During this combined event, toe-printing indicates a movement of the 80S ribosome relative to the CrPV IRES RNA by 6 nucleotides (Jan et al., 2003), consistent with a movement of PK I (domain 3) of the IRES from the A site to the E site via the P site. The need for an initial eEF2-dependent translocation of the CrPV IRES preceding the first tRNA binding has been recently re-emphasized by the finding that the binary 80S•CrPV IRES complex coexists in ribosome states with classical and rotated subunit rearrangements and therefore functionally mimics an elongation pre-translocational (PRE) state (Fernández et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2014). However, structural information about a potential post-translocational (POST) state of the CrPV IRES remains elusive.

Here, we have used a minimal system to study binding of release factor eRF1 to the ribosome using a stop codon-containing CrPV IRES (CrPV-STOP) mRNA. In agreement with a previous study (Jan et al., 2003), we see eEF2-dependent binding of eRF1 and also of eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP. Interestingly, our visualization of these complexes using cryo-EM shows the IRES in a POST state and directly rationalizes the need for an unusual eEF2-dependent translocation of the CrPV IRES as a prerequisite for binding of A site ligands during internal initiation. At the same time, our structural analysis provides information about the binding modes of eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP and

the 40S subunit (at AA₆₁₆₁₋₆₁₆₂) and with the 60S subunit (U₆₂₁₇ and G₆₁₈₃) are consistent with previous reports (Wilson et al., 2000b; Pestova and Hellen, 2003) and are shown in blue.




Figure 2. Cryo-EM Maps of the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP and 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 Termination Complexes

(A and B) Cryo-EM maps of the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP (A) and 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 (B) termination complexes. In vitro termination complexes were prepared on CrPV-STOP mRNA (green). Upper panel displays the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP and the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 complexes, with 40S subunit shown in yellow, 60S subunit in blue, eRF1 in hot pink, and eRF3 in red. Middle and bottom panels display the corresponding 40S and 60S subunits with docked ligand models, respectively. Ribosomal RNA is shown in yellow or blue and ribosomal proteins in gray or orange for the 40S and 60S subunit, respectively. Landmarks of the 40S subunit are the head (h) and the body (b) domains. Landmarks of the 60S subunit: central protuberance (CP), the L1 stalk (L1), and the stalk base (SB). See also Figure S1.

eRF1 and suggests how a conformational change of eRF1 links the eukaryotic termination and recycling phases (Pisarev et al., 2010).

RESULTS

The Binding of eRF1 to 80S-CrPV-STOP Is Dependent on eEF2 Action

Direct structural investigations of CrPV IRES translocation is difficult because binary 80S-CrPV IRES complexes are present

predominantly in the PRE state, and eEF2-dependent translocation may be followed by a spontaneous back-translocation unless the achieved POST state is stabilized by an A site ligand. In the presence of the canonical aminoacyl-tRNA ligand, however, not one, but two, eEF2-dependent translocation events can occur, moving the aminoacyl-tRNA further from the A site to the P site. Interestingly, a modified CrPV IRES with the first alanine codon mutated to a stop codon (CrPV-STOP) allows the binding of eukaryotic release factor 1 (eRF1). In this case, a change of the toe-print by +4 nucleotides was observed, but the binding of eRF1 was nevertheless dependent on eEF2 (Jan et al., 2003). We reasoned that in this system eRF1 contacts the stop codon in the ribosomal A site of a translocated CrPV-STOP and, in contrast to a tRNA molecule, cannot be translocated to the P site of the ribosome. Thus, eRF1 as an A site ligand can be used to disentangle a possible first IRES translocation step from a second one.

To test this hypothesis, we assembled 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 and 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complexes in vitro and analyzed the complexes by means of toe-printing and cryo-EM experiments. In order to obtain the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complex, ribosomal subunits were first incubated with CrPV-STOP mRNA and eEF2 in the presence of GTP followed by addition of preformed eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complex. For the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 complex, ribosomal subunits were incubated with eEF2, eRF1, and GTP, simultaneously. Complex formation was monitored by toe-printing in situ (Figure 1B). Toe-printing is a method to determine the position of the ribosome on mRNA and involves primer extension by reverse transcriptase. The reverse transcriptase is blocked by the bound ribosome resulting in a cDNA, whose specific length indicates the 3' border of the ribosome-bound mRNA sequence. Incubation of 80S-CrPV-STOP complexes with eRF1 or with eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP ternary complex resulted in a shift of the toe-print signal by +4 nt from +14–15 to +18–19 (Figure 1B, lanes 8 and 10), indicating that the position of the ribosome on the CrPV-STOP RNA has changed. Importantly, the change in the toe-print signal was dependent on the presence of eEF2, in excellent agreement with previous studies (Jan et al., 2003; Yamamoto et al., 2007).

CrPV-STOP IRES Is Fully Translocated by eEF2

The resulting 80S-CrPV-STOP complexes were analyzed by multiparticle cryo-EM (Loerke et al., 2010) in order to overcome the expected substoichiometric occupancy of the factors and the overall heterogeneity of the samples (Figure S1). The final reconstructions of the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP and 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1 complexes were obtained from 64,902 (10% of total number) and 109,596 particle images (22% of total number), respectively. The resolution was determined to 8.9 Å for the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complex and 8.7 Å for the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1, according to the FSC curve using the 0.5 cutoff criterion (Figure S1). Both maps exhibit strong densities for the factors as well as the CrPV-STOP IRES (Figure 2). The conformation of the present 80S complexes does not show intersubunit rotation or 40S subunit rolling and is similar overall to the POST state of the mammalian 80S ribosome (Budkevich et al., 2014).




Figure 3. Post-Translocational State of the CrPV IGR IRES and Its Interactions with the 40S Subunit

(A) Extracted densities for CrPV IRES and ribosomal 40S subunit are shown for the PRE (left) (Schüler et al., 2006) and POST translocational state from the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex (right).

(B) Close-up view of the apical tip of PK I (green). Interactions to conserved nucleotides G1639, C1249, C1701, and G1207 are depicted (red), as well as interactions to h24 and h44.

(C) Interactions of loop L3.2 of CrPV IRES (green) with the ribosomal protein uS7 and helix 23b.

See also Figure S2.

The subnanometer resolution of our maps facilitated the analysis of interactions between release factors, CrPV IRES, and the 80S ribosome. For an interpretation in molecular terms, we docked our previous cryo-EM-based homology model of the human 80S ribosome (Budkevich et al., 2014), which was generated on the basis of *S. cerevisiae* 80S (Ben-Shem et al., 2011) and *T. thermophila* 40S and 60S X-ray structures (Klinge et al., 2011; Rabl et al., 2011). eRF3 was modeled based on the homology with its archaeal eEF1A ortholog (aEF1 α) from the aEF1 α /aRF1 complex (Kobayashi et al., 2012) and eRF1 by docking individual domains of the human factor (Mantsyzov et al., 2010; Song et al., 2000) into the cryo-EM density. The CrPV-STOP

IRES has been modeled based on the previously published X-ray structure for domain 3 (Zhu et al., 2011) and cryo-EM model for domains 1 and 2 (Schüler et al., 2006). During the preparation of our manuscript, a cryo-EM structure of a 80S·CrPV IRES at high resolution was published (Fernández et al., 2014), presenting a refined CrPV IRES model. However, the root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) calculation for domains 1 and 2 between the recent structure (Fernández et al., 2014) and the previous model (Schüler et al., 2006) resulted in a value of only 2.9 Å, indicating a high degree of similarity between both models. Only the SL2.1 of domain 2 has been modeled in a slightly different conformation in both studies (Figure S2).

Comparison of the present complexes with the previous binary 80S·IRES structures (Fernández et al., 2014; Schüler et al., 2006) reveals a previously unseen binding state of the IRES in the presence of release factors (Figure 3A). The CrPV-STOP IRES density in both of our complexes is indistinguishable in terms of location and conformation. Therefore, the following interpretations concerning the IRES are based on the reconstruction of the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex but are also valid for the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP complex. As predicted from the toe-printing analysis, the PK I element has been translocated by eEF2 to the P site, leading to a POST state (Figure 4A). The 60S alignment of the PRE (Fernández et al., 2014) and POST state IRES complexes indicates a shift of the PK I by 22 Å, which is comparable to the distance between ASL of the A and P site-bound tRNAs (Budkevich et al., 2011) (Figure 4B). Moreover, like a tRNA ASL being translocated from the A to the P site, the PK I undergoes a rotational movement. Accordingly, the apical part of the PK I mimics an ASL-codon duplex not only in the A site of the PRE state, but also in the present P site of the POST state like in the crystal structure of the PK I element bound to the bacterial 70S ribosome (Zhu et al., 2011).

However, our cryo-EM analysis clearly shows that not only has the PK I element been translocated, but the ribosome-binding domain (domains 1 and 2) moves as a rigid body by ~25 Å toward the E site region (Figures 4A and 4B). While the lateral movement of the ribosome binding domain and PK I is comparable, the ribosome binding domain cannot undergo the same rotational movement as PK I because this would lead to a steric clash with the 40S subunit. As a consequence, the IRES changes its conformation, and PK I undergoes a rotation relative to domains 1 and 2 of ~50° around the linker region (U6171-C6172) between domains 1 and 3 (Figure 4C). Overall, the IRES undergoes a transformation from a bent conformation in the PRE state to a more stretched conformation in the POST state.

Interactions of the Translocated CrPV IRES with the 80S Ribosome

In the POST state, contacts between the PK I element and the 18S rRNA at positions around nucleotides C1249, G1639, C1701, and G1207 can be observed (Figure 3B). Interestingly, all these interactions have been found in the X-ray structure of the isolated PK I element bound to the bacterial ribosome (Zhu et al., 2011), indicating that the P site occupation in the bacterial complex corresponds to our present POST state of the IRES and not to the initial PRE state. In addition, we see contacts of PK I to h30, h24, as well as h44 (nt 1,827–1,829 [1,495–1,497 in *E. coli*])




Figure 4. Comparison of the POST State IRES with tRNA Positions and with PRE State IRES

(A) Superposition of the PRE state IRES (left) (Fernández et al., 2014) and POST state IRES in the 80S•CrPV-STOP•eRF1 complex (right) with positions of canonical bound tRNAs (Budkevich et al., 2011) after 60S alignment. The CrPV IRES is colored according to the domain organization: domain 1, blue; domain 2, gold; domain 3, green. The first codon of the open reading frame is depicted in red.

(B) Superposition of the PRE state IRES (gray) (Fernández et al., 2014) with the POST state IRES after corresponding 60S alignment.

(C) Superposition of the PRE (gray) and POST state IRES after alignment of the corresponding ribosome-binding domains (domains 1 and 2).

of the 18S rRNA. As a consequence of the translocation event, the IRES loses the PRE state contacts (Fernández et al., 2014; Schüller et al., 2006) to the central protuberance of the 60S subunit and to the head of the 40S subunit. Also, the stem loops SL2.1 and 2.3 of CrPV IRES domain 2 have lost their contacts with uS7 and eS25, respectively, at the head of the 40S subunit and are solvent exposed. Both elements have been shown to play a crucial role for IRES-driven translation initiation, and their interactions with the 40S head provide binding affinity (Jan and Sarnow, 2002; Nishiyama et al., 2003).

Instead, with SL2.1 of the PRE state IRES, protein uS7 interacts with the POST state IRES via loop L3.2 of domain 3 (Figure 3C). The contact seems to exist in the context of an interaction with helix 23b at the 40S body. The same site of the ribosome is occupied by the anticodon-stem loop (ASL) of E site-bound tRNA in the bacterial termination (Jin et al., 2010) as well as in the mammalian POST complex (Budkevich et al., 2014). In the PRE state 80S•CrPV IRES structures (Fernández et al., 2014; Schüller et al., 2006), the density assigned to L3.2 was fragmented, and in the crystal structures of domain 3 bound to the P site of the bacterial ribosome (Zhu et al., 2011) the loop was disordered, revealing a dynamic, flexible state of this IRES part. However, in our present structures the solid density at the contact site between L3.2 and the 40S subunit indicates a potential ordering of the loop caused by interactions with the ribosome (Figure 3C).

The interactions of the IRES and the 60S subunit are confined to interactions of IRES domain 1 with the L1 stalk. Like in the binary 80S•IRES structure (Fernández et al., 2014; Schüller et al.,

2006), the internal loop L1.1 interacts with rpL1 and 28S rRNA helices 76–78 of the L1 stalk. This highly mobile element of the 60S subunit is part of the E site. The L1 stalk can swing in and out to facilitate interactions with tRNA in P/E or E/E states and is known to exist in at least three conformational states, i.e., closed, open, and an intermediate half-open state (Cornish et al., 2009). In both POST state IRES complexes, we find the L1 stalk in a more open position than in PRE state IRES complexes (Fernández et al., 2014; Schüller et al., 2006) (Figure 5A) or in the canonical POST state with P/P- and E/E-tRNAs (Budkevich et al., 2014) (Figure 5B) and in an even more outward position than in the ribosome with a vacant E site (Becker et al., 2011). This extended outward position is apparently required to adapt the POST state IRES. During IRES translocation, the L1 stalk moves by ~ 13 Å. Remarkably, comparison of the canonical 80S complex carrying classical P/P and E/E tRNAs (canonical POST) (Budkevich et al., 2014) with canonical PRE complex carrying hybrid A/P and P/E tRNAs (rotated PRE) (Budkevich et al., 2011) reveals a similar shift of ~ 15 Å for the L1 position (Figure 5B). Accordingly, despite the dramatic overall difference in the L1 stalk position caused by IRES binding (46 Å between canonical POST and IRES-bound POST), the relative movement of the L1 stalk during the translocation step is preserved.

The 80S•CrPV-STOP•eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP Complex Is Structurally Related to the Mammalian Decoding Complex

The POST state 80S•CrPV-STOP complex allows stable binding of eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP or eRF1. The structure of the 80S•CrPV-STOP•eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP complex is overall similar to a previous structure of an equivalent canonical termination complex (des Georges et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2012) in terms of ribosome conformation and the binding sites of eRF1 and eRF3. Accordingly, the 80S•CrPV-STOP•eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP complex faithfully represents a canonical termination complex. The POST state CrPV-STOP IRES with a P site ASL mimic and the stop codon in the ribosomal decoding center are sufficient for stop codon recognition by eRF1. Thus, the CrPV-STOP construct can be used as a tool to study termination factor binding in a minimal system.

Comparison between the present 80S•CrPV-STOP•eRF1•eRF3•GMPPNP complex and our recent cryo-EM map of the mammalian decoding complex (Budkevich et al., 2014) reveals striking similarities. Domains N and M of eRF1 mimic the tRNA in the A/T state, and eRF3 resembles eEF1A (Figure S3). The M domain of eRF1 overlaps with the acceptor stem of the A/T tRNA and even appears to mimic the 3'-CCA end of the tRNA (Figure 6A). The GGQ motif (aa 183–185) of eRF1's M domain is in a similar position to C75 of the A/T tRNA (Budkevich et al., 2014), and both elements appear to interact with a homologous region of domain 2 (aa 441–442) of eRF3 or eEF1A, respectively (Figure 6C).

Furthermore, the M domain of eRF1 interacts with ribosomal protein uS12, localized at the shoulder of the 40S (Figure 6D). An analogous contact with nucleotide 68 in the acceptor stem of the A/T tRNA is present in bacterial (Schmeing et al., 2009) and mammalian decoding complexes (Figure 6D). Moreover, a mammalian specific interaction between the C-terminal end of




Figure 5. Interaction of the POST State IRES with the L1 Stalk and Comparison of L1 Positions in Different Ribosomal States

(A) Depiction of three distinct L1 positions during translocation of the IRES; distance measurements were made between axes of mass centers. From the unrotated PRE state (purple) to the rotated PRE state (yellow) (both from Fernández et al., 2014), L1 moves 14 Å toward the E site. Upon translocation to the POST state (green), a movement of another 13 Å can be observed.

(B) Comparison of the L1 stalk position in rotated 80S·CrPV IGR IRES complex (yellow) (Fernández et al., 2014) and 80S·CrPV-STOP (POST) complex (green) with corresponding canonical complexes (Budkevich et al., 2014).

uS12 and the translational GTPase factor can be observed in both systems. Domain C of eRF1 is interacting with the stalk base (H43/H44) of the 28S rRNA at the 60S subunit and with eS31 at the head of the 40S via the characteristic mini-domain of eRF1 (Figure 6E). The eS31 interaction seems to be unique for eRF1, as it could not be observed for Dom34 in the Dom34/Hbs1 complex (Becker et al., 2011) or A/T tRNA in the decoding complex (Budkevich et al., 2014) because both are lacking a similar domain. Mutational analysis indicated that the mini-domain influences the specificity of eRF1 for certain stop codons during stop codon recognition (Mantsyzov et al., 2010), which may explain its exclusive presence in eRF1.

The mammalian decoding complex with a GMPPNP stalled ternary complex has been visualized in two substates, i.e., a codon sampling state and a codon recognition state (Budkevich et al., 2014). A smaller rotational movement of the ternary complex was found to have an influence on the exact position of eEF1A, leading to full interactions with the functionally important sarcin-ricin loop (SRL, H95 of 28S rRNA) of the ribosome's GTPase associated center only in the codon-recognition state. eRF3 seems to be closer to the codon recognition state, and we observe interactions to the 60S subunit, in particular the SRL, via the G domain (Figure 6F) as well as to h5, h14, and uS12 of the 40S subunit incorporating the helical insertion and domain 2.

Structure of the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 Complex

In the context of our minimal system, we were able to directly visualize eRF1 within the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex in the absence of eRF3. This state of eRF1 resembles an important

stage between eRF1 delivery to the ribosome by eRF3 and the recycling step mediated by ABCE1. In current models of termination, the structure of this intermediate is unclear (Becker et al., 2012; Preis et al., 2014). When compared with the eRF3 bound state, the orientation of the M domain of eRF1 is dramatically changed and rotates by nearly 150°, orienting the GGQ motif at the tip of the long $\alpha 5$ helix toward the peptidyl transferase center (PTC) on the 60S subunit (Figure 7A). eRF1 in its catalytically active state has been proposed to adopt a similar conformation as its homolog Dom34 within the Dom34/Rli1 complex involved in mRNA decay (Franckenberg et al., 2012). Indeed, both factors adopt a similar, but not identical, orientation. Domain C of eRF1 overlaps nicely with domain C of Dom34, whereas domains N and M of eRF1 are rotated around domain C by an additional $\sim 18^\circ$. As a result, the GGQ motif of eRF1 is positioned more closely to the PTC. It appears that the presence of a stop codon in the A site and an ASL mimic in the P site is requisite and sufficient for the binding and accommodation of eRF1 to the ribosome. Thus, eRF1 requires neither eRF3 nor ABCE1 to adopt its catalytically active conformation on the ribosome, bringing the GGQ motif close to its substrate in the PTC.

Despite the lack of sequence homology, in bacterial termination complexes a similar orientation of domain 3 comprising the extended $\alpha 7$ helix with GGQ motif of RF1 or RF2 has been observed (Figure S4) (Jin et al., 2010; Korostelev et al., 2008; Laurberg et al., 2008; Weixlbaumer et al., 2008). Consistent with this observation, several ribosomal contacts of the M domain of eRF1 are preserved between bacteria and eukaryotes. The M domain appears to make extensive




Figure 6. The 80S-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP Complex Strongly Resembles the Eukaryotic Decoding Complex

(A) Superposition of the A/T tRNA model (gray) (Budkevich et al., 2014) with the eRF1 model (pink) from the 80S-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complex. The GGQ motif at the tip of the long $\alpha 5$ helix is colored in yellow.

(B) Interactions of the N domain of eRF1 with the stop codon of CrPV IRES mRNA (green) via the TASNIKS motif (yellow). The UAA stop codon is shown in red.

(C) GGQ motif of eRF1 contacts domain 2 of eRF3 (red) in context with h5 of the 18S rRNA. Furthermore, eRF1 contacts h14 of the 18S rRNA via its $\alpha 5$ helix, interaction not seen in the decoding complex.

(D) Ribosomal protein uS12 positioned at the shoulder of the 40S forms a network of interactions, including domains 2 and 3 of eRF3 as well as M domain of eRF1 at the position that would overlap with nt 68 of the A/T tRNA.

(E) eRF1-specific contact of the minidomain of eRF1 with eukaryotic-specific ribosomal protein eS31 at the head of the 40S.

(F) eRF3 contacts the SRL via its helical expansion of SW I region as well as via a eukaryotic insertion around Glu324-Lys325.

See also Figure S3.

interactions in the PTC with conserved nucleotides A4508, U4398, and C4465 of the 28S rRNA (human numbering, corresponding residues in *E. coli* are A2602, U2492, and C2558, respectively) (Figure 7B). The presence of these evolutionary preserved interactions corroborates that eRF1 bound to the present 80S-IRES complex is in a biologically relevant intermediate state of the pathway of eukaryotic translation termination/recycling.

In addition, we see several interactions between domain M of eRF1 and the ribosome, which have not been described for bacterial termination complexes (Figure 7B). Two of these eukaryotic-specific contacts appear to involve H71 of the 28S rRNA, around G3761 and C3758 and Ser253 and Ala226 of the M domain, respectively. Further eukaryotic-specific contacts seem to exist around G4367 of H89 and Tyr197 of the long $\alpha 5$ helix of domain M and, less obviously, between the G4158 region of H80 and the GGQ motif of eRF1.

In the bacterial system, residues 1,913–1,915 in the loop of H69 of 23S rRNA have been shown to play a crucial role in

stabilizing the rearrangements of the switch loop of RF1/2 required for proper positioning of the extended $\alpha 7$ helix and docking of the GGQ motif in the PTC (Korostelev et al., 2008; Laurberg et al., 2008; Weixlbaumer et al., 2008). However, these events are strongly interdependent with the recognition of the stop codon and subsequent molecular rearrangements in A1492–1493 of h44 of the 16S rRNA. As far as the stop codon is recognized, A1492 flips out from its position, whereas A1493 remains stacked within h44. The gap caused by the flipping out of A1492 is filled by A1913 of 23S rRNA, which stacks on A1493 (Korostelev et al., 2008; Laurberg et al., 2008; Weixlbaumer et al., 2008). We do not observe such an interaction in our maps, suggesting a different mode of stop codon recognition in eukaryotes. However, higher resolution will be required to interpret the changes in the decoding center in detail.

Due to a rotation of the C domain of eRF1 by $\sim 39^\circ$, the contact formed by the minidomain of the factor and eS31 at the head of the 40S, as seen in the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP structure, is disrupted. Furthermore, a contact not present in the 80S-CrPV-STOP-eRF1-eRF3-GMPPNP complex is formed between the tip of the SRL and Ser295 of eRF1 (Figure 7C). Interestingly, a similar interaction was described for the mammalian decoding complex between the T loop of the A/T tRNA and the SRL (Budkevich et al., 2014) (Figure S3), but not in the homologous bacterial system.




Figure 7. Ribosomal Contacts of eRF1 in the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 Complex

(A) eRF1 conformation in the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF3·eRF1·GMPPNP (left) and the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex (right). As a marker, the canonical P site-bound tRNA is shown in green. The eRF1 model is colored according to its domain organization: N domain in pink, M domain in yellow, and C domain in green with the minidomain in blue.

(B) The M domain of eRF1 is positioned in the PTC on the 60S subunit and forms conserved (red) as well as unique (yellow) ribosomal contacts.

(C) In the 80S·eRF1 complex, the tip of the SRL interacts with the C domain of eRF1, which is analogous to the eukaryote-specific interaction involving the T loop of A/T tRNA seen in the decoding complex (Budkevich et al., 2014).

See also Figure S4.

DISCUSSION

The Mechanism of IGR IRES Facilitated Internal Initiation

IRES-containing viral RNAs are capable of initiating translation with a strongly reduced set of initiation factors (Wilson et al., 2000b). In the case of the CrPV IGR IRES family, neither cellular initiation factors nor initiator Met-tRNA are needed for synthesis of viral gene products by the host. IGR IRESs start translation from the A site and only need elongation factor eEF2 to assemble elongation-competent 80S ribosomes from 40S and 60S subunits. Initial biochemical studies suggested that after subunit association, the IRES occupies the ribosomal P site and sets the translation frame so that the first codon is positioned in the A site. In contrast, we present here cryo-EM maps of 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP and 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complexes directly showing that an eEF2-dependent translocation resulting in a POST state of the IRES is required to allow the first A site occupation.

Our finding is in excellent agreement with previous structural studies (Schüler et al., 2006; Fernández et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2014) demonstrating that in the binary 80S·CrPV IRES complex, domain 3 of the CrPV IRES is placed between the ribosomal A and P sites with the apical part of the PK I element mimicking an ASL of an A site-bound tRNA. Consequently, domain 3 has to move completely out of the A site to allow the decoding of

the first codon at the 3' edge of the IRES structure (Schüler et al., 2006) and, in line with previous experiments showing that binding of the first aa-tRNA·eEF1A·GTP ternary complex requires the action of eEF2 (Yamamoto et al., 2007), an initial eEF2-dependent translocation of the IRES on binary 80S·IRES complex has been suggested (Fernández et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2014). Our present cryo-EM maps show that the action of eEF2 leads to the movement of the entire CrPV IRES molecule toward the ribosomal E site, resulting in the POST state with the apical part of the PK I structure mimicking the ASL of a tRNA in the P/P state (Figure 4A).

It appears that during the translocation reaction the IRES becomes more loosely bound. In particular, the two important stem loops, SL2.1 and 2.3 of CrPV IRES domain 2, no longer interact with the ribosome in the POST state. However, it has been shown previously by mutagenesis studies that a major part of the binding energy of the IRES for the ribosome is derived by the SL2.1 and 2.3 interactions with uS7 and eS25, respectively (Jan and Sarnow, 2002). Therefore, the PRE state may be energetically preferred over the POST complex, and it is therefore very likely that after translocation and dissociation of eEF2·GDP the A site has to be occupied by a ligand in order to stabilize the POST complex and to prevent spontaneous back-translocation of the IRES. A short lifetime of the translocated binary 80S·CrPV IRES complex could be the reason why it has been difficult to detect this state and why the presence of release factors is needed to shift the toe-print signal (Figure 1B, lane 4 versus lanes 8–10). We note that during our multiparticle processing we obtained a subpopulation of the binary 80S·IGR-IRES complex in the PRE, but not in the POST, state.

The question arises as to why the IGR IRES family employs not the more simple mechanism with direct P site binding of the PK I structure and only one unusual translocation (Pestova and Hellen, 2003; Wilson et al., 2000b), but a more complicated one with two unusual translocation events. A possible reason may be that during internal initiation the need for a high binding affinity to efficiently recruit the translational apparatus has to be balanced with the need to dissociate the IRES again during downstream events. It may be more efficient to partition the energetic penalty for IRES dissociation into two translocation steps, or even three, when we consider the translocation of the first elongation complex with two tRNAs in A and P sites and the IRES possibly still interacting in the ribosomal E site.

A second factor may be the general task of translation initiation to thread the open reading frame into the mRNA entry tunnel of the 40S subunit. The CrPV IRES (Spahn et al., 2004) and also the unrelated HCV IRES (Spahn et al., 2001) as well as the canonical initiation factors eIF1 and eIF1A (Passmore et al., 2007) all induce a similar conformational change in the ribosomal 40S subunit to open the latch of the mRNA entry tunnel for inserting the mRNA. In this context, initial positioning of the PK I element into the A site places the neighboring first sense codon directly into the opened mRNA entry tunnel, and after closing the latch, the upstream part of the mRNA will be stably bound. In the case of P site location, however, the coupling to mRNA insertion into the entry tunnel would be less direct due to the flexible

character of the single stranded RNA. Thus, the initial PK I positioning into the A site rather than the P site appears advantageous in the context of mRNA loading.

Eukaryotic Translation Termination

Eukaryotic translation termination is mediated by two release factors: eRF1 and eRF3. The position of the release factors in our 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP complex as well as the overall conformation of the complex is essentially the same compared to the canonical termination complex (des Georges et al., 2014; Taylor et al., 2012). We can therefore conclude that using the CrPV-STOP RNA as a tool to study termination factor binding in a simplified minimal system is a valid approach. It follows that domain 3 of the CrPV IRES resembles the ASL of a P site tRNA sufficiently well and that the presence of the IRES does not alter the termination complex in a major way.

The minimal system allowed us to analyze eRF1 binding in the absence of eRF3 and to visualize the factor in a state in the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex. This complex mimics the intermediate state of the eukaryotic termination process that arises after binding of eRF1·eRF3·GTP, decoding of the stop codon, GTP hydrolysis, and subsequent dissociation of eRF3·GDP, leaving eRF1 bound to the ribosome alone. In the next step, the hydrolysis of peptidyl tRNA is induced by eRF1 followed by release of the peptide chain and recycling of the post-termination complex. Our complex reveals major rearrangements in eRF1 providing structural insights into the active conformation of eRF1. Accordingly, the M domain of the factor is reoriented compared to its position when bound to eRF3 positioning the GGQ motif into the peptidyl transferase center. The adopted conformation of the factor and its ribosomal contact sites suggest an idea where eRF1 combines features of a eukaryotic A/T and A/A tRNA in one molecule by mimicking the A/T elbow region and the A/A acceptor stem, respectively.

Taking into account that the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex has been prepared without addition of eRF3, the presence of a stop codon in the ribosomal A site and the ASL in the P site are sufficient for eRF1 to adopt the active conformation regardless of the presence and activity of eRF3. The results are in good agreement with biochemical studies showing that eRF1 can mediate peptide hydrolysis *in vitro* alone (Alkalaeva et al., 2006). The established role of eRF3 is to facilitate efficient binding of eRF1 to ribosomal pre-termination complexes. However, the finding that eRF1 can adopt the active conformation on the ribosome without additional factors suggests that eRF3 may have an additional function to prevent eRF1 from initiating premature translation termination and recycling. Regarding the cellular levels (Ghaemmghami et al., 2003) of eRF1, eRF3, GDP and GTP, it is reasonable to presume that eRF1 within the cell is found predominantly as ternary complex with eRF3 and GTP. It is tempting to speculate that eRF3, like the homologous elongation factor EF-Tu/eEF1A, may be involved in enhancing the accuracy of termination by separating codon recognition from peptidyl-hydrolysis via interposed GTPase activation and eRF1 accommodation steps.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Cryo-EM of Mammalian Termination Complexes

Mammalian termination complexes were prepared with isolated ribosomal subunits from RRL and *in vitro* transcribed CrPV-STOP RNA. Translocation was achieved by incubation with eEF2·GTP. In case of 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1, the release factor was added directly to the translocation reaction; for the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3 sample, a preformed eRF1·eRF3·GMPPNP complex was used. Micrographs were recorded with a FEI Tecnai G2 Polara electron microscope, and multiparticle refinement was carried out with SPIDER as described previously (Loerke et al., 2010; Penczek et al., 2006a, 2006b). Further details can be found in the Supplemental Experimental Procedures.

Modeling

Modeling of the translocated CrPV IRES was done based on the pre-translocated CrPV IRES (Schüler et al., 2006) and a crystal structure of PK I (Zhu et al., 2011) by MDfit (Ratje et al., 2010), COOT (Emsley and Cowtan, 2004), and ERRASER (Chou et al., 2013). The initial structural model for eRF1 was built by domain-wise rigid-body fitting (Mantsyzov et al., 2010; Song et al., 2000) accompanied by MDfit (Ratje et al., 2010; Whitford et al., 2011), COOT, and CNS (Brünger et al., 1998). eRF3 was modeled based on homology to aEF1a (Kelley and Sternberg, 2009; Kobayashi et al., 2012; Tung and Sanbonmatsu, 2004) and yeast eRF3 (Kong et al., 2004).

ACCESSION NUMBERS

The electron density maps of mammalian termination complexes were deposited in the Electron Microscopy Data Bank (European Molecular Biology Laboratory-European Bioinformatics Institute, Cambridge, UK) with the accession numbers EMD-2810 and EMD-2813. Models for the mammalian release factors and the post-translocated CrPV-IRES have been deposited in the Protein Data Bank database with PDB IDs 4d5n, 4d5l, 4d5y, and 4d5z (eRF1 complex) and 4d61, 4d66, 4d67, and 4d68 (eRF1/eRF3 complex).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes Supplemental Experimental Procedures and four figures and can be found with this article online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2014.12.016>.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

M.M. carried out sample preparation, data acquisition, image processing, structure determination, and interpretation of the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1 complex. T.H. carried out sample preparation, image processing, structure determination, and interpretation of the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3 complex. T.V.P. and M.A.S. purified factors and ribosomal subunits and performed toe-print analysis. T.M. was responsible for electron microscopy in general and data acquisition of the 80S·CrPV-STOP·eRF1·eRF3 sample. M.A.S. purified all factors and ribosomal subunits. K.Y.S. made MDfit simulations for the CrPV IRES and the eRF1 structure. T.H. built molecular model for eRF3 and refined molecular models for eRF1 and the CrPV IRES. T.V.P. performed toe-printing analysis. T.V.P. and C.M.T.S. designed the study. T.V.P., M.M., and T.H. prepared the figures. M.M., T.H., T.V.P., K.Y.S., and C.M.T.S. interpreted results and wrote the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank L. Yu. Frolova for eRF1 and eRF3 expression vectors and E. Alkalaeva for constructing the transcription vector for CrPV-STOP mRNA. This work was supported by Senatverwaltung für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kultur Berlin (UltraStructureNetwork, Anwenderzentrum), HFSP grant RGP0062/2012 to C.M.T.S., T.V.P., and K.S., and NIH grant GM80623 to T.V.P.

Received: July 25, 2014
 Revised: September 29, 2014
 Accepted: December 5, 2014
 Published: January 15, 2015

REFERENCES

- Aitken, C.E., and Lorsch, J.R. (2012). A mechanistic overview of translation initiation in eukaryotes. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **19**, 568–576.
- Alkalaeva, E.Z., Pisarev, A.V., Frolova, L.Y., Kisselev, L.L., and Pestova, T.V. (2006). In vitro reconstitution of eukaryotic translation reveals cooperativity between release factors eRF1 and eRF3. *Cell* **125**, 1125–1136.
- Ban, N., Beckmann, R., Cate, J.H., Dinman, J.D., Dragon, F., Ellis, S.R., Lafontaine, D.L., Lindahl, L., Lijias, A., Lipton, J.M., et al. (2014). A new system for naming ribosomal proteins. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **24**, 165–169.
- Becker, T., Armache, J.-P., Jarasch, A., Anger, A.M., Villa, E., Sieber, H., Motaal, B.A., Mielke, T., Berninghausen, O., and Beckmann, R. (2011). Structure of the no-go mRNA decay complex Dom34-Hbs1 bound to a stalled 80S ribosome. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **18**, 715–720.
- Becker, T., Franckenberg, S., Wickles, S., Shoemaker, C.J., Anger, A.M., Armache, J.-P., Sieber, H., Ungewickell, C., Berninghausen, O., Daberkow, I., et al. (2012). Structural basis of highly conserved ribosome recycling in eukaryotes and archaea. *Nature* **482**, 501–506.
- Ben-Shem, A., Garreau de Loubresse, N., Melnikov, S., Jenner, L., Yusupova, G., and Yusupov, M. (2011). The structure of the eukaryotic ribosome at 3.0 Å resolution. *Science* **334**, 1524–1529.
- Brünger, A.T., Adams, P.D., Clore, G.M., DeLano, W.L., Gros, P., Grosse-Kunstleve, R.W., Jiang, J.S., Kuszewski, J., Nilges, M., Pannu, N.S., et al. (1998). Crystallography & NMR system: A new software suite for macromolecular structure determination. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **54**, 905–921.
- Budkevich, T., Giesebrecht, J., Altman, R.B., Munro, J.B., Mielke, T., Nierhaus, K.H., Blanchard, S.C., and Spahn, C.M.T. (2011). Structure and dynamics of the mammalian ribosomal pretranslocation complex. *Mol. Cell* **44**, 214–224.
- Budkevich, T.V., Giesebrecht, J., Behrmann, E., Loerke, J., Ramrath, D.J.F., Mielke, T., Ismer, J., Hildebrand, P.W., Tung, C.-S., Nierhaus, K.H., et al. (2014). Regulation of the Mammalian Elongation Cycle by Subunit Rolling: A Eukaryotic-Specific Ribosome Rearrangement. *Cell* **158**, 121–131.
- Chou, F.-C., Sripakdeevong, P., Dibrov, S.M., Hermann, T., and Das, R. (2013). Correcting pervasive errors in RNA crystallography through enumerative structure prediction. *Nat. Methods* **10**, 74–76.
- Cornish, P.V., Ermolenko, D.N., Staple, D.W., Hoang, L., Hickerson, R.P., Noller, H.F., and Ha, T. (2009). Following movement of the L1 stalk between three functional states in single ribosomes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 2571–2576.
- Costantino, D., and Kieft, J.S. (2005). A preformed compact ribosome-binding domain in the cricket paralysis-like virus IRES RNAs. *RNA* **11**, 332–343.
- Costantino, D.A., Pflugsten, J.S., Rambo, R.P., and Kieft, J.S. (2008). tRNA-mRNA mimicry drives translation initiation from a viral IRES. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **15**, 57–64.
- des Georges, A., Hashem, Y., Unbehaun, A., Grassucci, R.A., Taylor, D., Hellen, C.U.T., Pestova, T.V., and Frank, J. (2014). Structure of the mammalian ribosomal pre-termination complex associated with eRF1.eRF3.GDPNP. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **42**, 3409–3418.
- Emsley, P., and Cowtan, K. (2004). Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **60**, 2126–2132.
- Fernández, I.S., Bai, X.C., Murshudov, G., Scheres, S.H.W., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2014). Initiation of translation by cricket paralysis virus IRES requires its translocation in the ribosome. *Cell* **157**, 823–831.
- Franckenberg, S., Becker, T., and Beckmann, R. (2012). Structural view on recycling of archaeal and eukaryotic ribosomes after canonical termination and ribosome rescue. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **22**, 786–796.
- Ghaemmaghami, S., Huh, W.-K., Bower, K., Howson, R.W., Belle, A., Dephoure, N., O’Shea, E.K., and Weissman, J.S. (2003). Global analysis of protein expression in yeast. *Nature* **425**, 737–741.
- Hinnebusch, A.G., and Lorsch, J.R. (2012). The mechanism of eukaryotic translation initiation: new insights and challenges. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **4**, 4.
- Jackson, R.J., Hellen, C.U.T., and Pestova, T.V. (2010). The mechanism of eukaryotic translation initiation and principles of its regulation. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **11**, 113–127.
- Jan, E., and Sarnow, P. (2002). Factorless ribosome assembly on the internal ribosome entry site of cricket paralysis virus. *J. Mol. Biol.* **324**, 889–902.
- Jan, E., Kinzy, T.G., and Sarnow, P. (2003). Divergent tRNA-like element supports initiation, elongation, and termination of protein biosynthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 15410–15415.
- Jin, H., Kelley, A.C., Loakes, D., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2010). Structure of the 70S ribosome bound to release factor 2 and a substrate analog provides insights into catalysis of peptide release. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **107**, 8593–8598.
- Kanamori, Y., and Nakashima, N. (2001). A tertiary structure model of the internal ribosome entry site (IRES) for methionine-independent initiation of translation. *RNA* **7**, 266–274.
- Kelley, L.A., and Sternberg, M.J. (2009). Protein structure prediction on the Web: a case study using the Phyre server. *Nat. Protoc.* **4**, 363–371.
- Klinge, S., Voigts-Hoffmann, F., Leibundgut, M., Arpagaus, S., and Ban, N. (2011). Crystal structure of the eukaryotic 60S ribosomal subunit in complex with initiation factor 6. *Science* **334**, 941–948.
- Kobayashi, K., Saito, K., Ishitani, R., Ito, K., and Nureki, O. (2012). Structural basis for translation termination by archaeal RF1 and GTP-bound EF1 α complex. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **40**, 9319–9328.
- Koh, C.S., Briot, A.F., Grigorieff, N., and Korostelev, A.A. (2014). Taura syndrome virus IRES initiates translation by binding its tRNA-mRNA-like structural element in the ribosomal decoding center. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **111**, 9139–9144.
- Kong, C., Ito, K., Walsh, M.A., Wada, M., Liu, Y., Kumar, S., Barford, D., Nakamura, Y., and Song, H. (2004). Crystal structure and functional analysis of the eukaryotic class II release factor eRF3 from *S. pombe*. *Mol. Cell* **14**, 233–245.
- Korostelev, A., Asahara, H., Lancaster, L., Laurberg, M., Hirschi, A., Zhu, J., Trakhanov, S., Scott, W.G., and Noller, H.F. (2008). Crystal structure of a translation termination complex formed with release factor RF2. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 19684–19689.
- Landry, D.M., Hertz, M.I., and Thompson, S.R. (2009). RPS25 is essential for translation initiation by the Dicistroviridae and hepatitis C viral IRESs. *Genes Dev.* **23**, 2753–2764.
- Laurberg, M., Asahara, H., Korostelev, A., Zhu, J., Trakhanov, S., and Noller, H.F. (2008). Structural basis for translation termination on the 70S ribosome. *Nature* **454**, 852–857.
- Loerke, J., Giesebrecht, J., and Spahn, C.M.T. (2010). Multiparticle cryo-EM of ribosomes. *Methods Enzymol.* **483**, 161–177.
- Mantsyzov, A.B., Ivanova, E.V., Birdsall, B., Alkalaeva, E.Z., Kryuchkova, P.N., Kelly, G., Frolova, L.Y., and Polshakov, V.I. (2010). NMR solution structure and function of the C-terminal domain of eukaryotic class 1 polypeptide chain release factor. *FEBS J.* **277**, 2611–2627.
- Muhs, M., Yamamoto, H., Ismer, J., Takaku, H., Nashimoto, M., Uchiyama, T., Nakashima, N., Mielke, T., Hildebrand, P.W., Nierhaus, K.H., and Spahn, C.M. (2011). Structural basis for the binding of IRES RNAs to the head of the ribosomal 40S subunit. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **39**, 5264–5275.
- Nishiyama, T., Yamamoto, H., Shibuya, N., Hatakeyama, Y., Hachimori, A., Uchiyama, T., and Nakashima, N. (2003). Structural elements in the internal ribosome entry site of *Plautia stali* intestine virus responsible for binding with ribosomes. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **31**, 2434–2442.
- Passmore, L.A., Schmeing, T.M., Maag, D., Applefield, D.J., Acker, M.G., Algire, M.A., Lorsch, J.R., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2007). The eukaryotic translation initiation factors eIF1 and eIF1A induce an open conformation of the 40S ribosome. *Mol. Cell* **26**, 41–50.

- Penczek, P.A., Yang, C., Frank, J., and Spahn, C.M. (2006a). Estimation of variance in single-particle reconstruction using the bootstrap technique. *J. Struct. Biol.* *154*, 168–183.
- Penczek, P.A., Frank, J., and Spahn, C.M. (2006b). A method of focused classification, based on the bootstrap 3D variance analysis, and its application to EF-G-dependent translocation. *J. Struct. Biol.* *154*, 184–194.
- Pestova, T.V., and Hellen, C.U.T. (2003). Translation elongation after assembly of ribosomes on the Cricket paralysis virus internal ribosomal entry site without initiation factors or initiator tRNA. *Genes Dev.* *17*, 181–186.
- Pfingsten, J.S., Costantino, D.A., and Kieft, J.S. (2006). Structural basis for ribosome recruitment and manipulation by a viral IRES RNA. *Science* *314*, 1450–1454.
- Pfingsten, J.S., Costantino, D.A., and Kieft, J.S. (2007). Conservation and diversity among the three-dimensional folds of the Dicistroviridae intergenic region IRESes. *J. Mol. Biol.* *370*, 856–869.
- Pisarev, A.V., Skabkin, M.A., Pisareva, V.P., Skabkina, O.V., Rakotondrafara, A.M., Hentze, M.W., Hellen, C.U., and Pestova, T.V. (2010). The role of ABCE1 in eukaryotic posttermination ribosomal recycling. *Mol. Cell* *37*, 196–210.
- Preis, A., Heuer, A., Barrio-Garcia, C., Hauser, A., Eyler, D.E., Berninghausen, O., Green, R., Becker, T., and Beckmann, R. (2014). Cryoelectron microscopic structures of eukaryotic translation termination complexes containing eRF1-eRF3 or eRF1-ABCE1. *Cell Rep.* *8*, 59–65.
- Rabl, J., Leibundgut, M., Ataide, S.F., Haag, A., and Ban, N. (2011). Crystal structure of the eukaryotic 40S ribosomal subunit in complex with initiation factor 1. *Science* *331*, 730–736.
- Ratje, A.H., Loerke, J., Mikolajka, A., Brünner, M., Hildebrand, P.W., Starosta, A.L., Dönhöfer, A., Connell, S.R., Fucini, P., Mielke, T., et al. (2010). Head swivel on the ribosome facilitates translocation by means of intra-subunit tRNA hybrid sites. *Nature* *468*, 713–716.
- Sasaki, J., and Nakashima, N. (2000). Methionine-independent initiation of translation in the capsid protein of an insect RNA virus. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *97*, 1512–1515.
- Schmeing, T.M., Voorhees, R.M., Kelley, A.C., Gao, Y.-G., Murphy, F.V., 4th, Weir, J.R., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2009). The crystal structure of the ribosome bound to EF-Tu and aminoacyl-tRNA. *Science* *326*, 688–694.
- Schüler, M., Connell, S.R., Lescoute, A., Giesebrecht, J., Dabrowski, M., Schroeer, B., Mielke, T., Penczek, P.A., Westhof, E., and Spahn, C.M. (2006). Structure of the ribosome-bound cricket paralysis virus IRES RNA. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* *13*, 1092–1096.
- Song, H., Mugnier, P., Das, A.K., Webb, H.M., Evans, D.R., Tuite, M.F., Hemmings, B.A., and Barford, D. (2000). The crystal structure of human eukaryotic release factor eRF1—mechanism of stop codon recognition and peptidyl-tRNA hydrolysis. *Cell* *100*, 311–321.
- Spahn, C.M., Kieft, J.S., Grassucci, R.A., Penczek, P.A., Zhou, K., Doudna, J.A., and Frank, J. (2001). Hepatitis C virus IRES RNA-induced changes in the conformation of the 40s ribosomal subunit. *Science* *291*, 1959–1962.
- Spahn, C.M.T., Jan, E., Mulder, A., Grassucci, R.A., Sarnow, P., and Frank, J. (2004). Cryo-EM visualization of a viral internal ribosome entry site bound to human ribosomes: the IRES functions as an RNA-based translation factor. *Cell* *118*, 465–475.
- Taylor, D., Unbehaun, A., Li, W., Das, S., Lei, J., Liao, H.Y., Grassucci, R.A., Pestova, T.V., and Frank, J. (2012). Cryo-EM structure of the mammalian eukaryotic release factor eRF1-eRF3-associated termination complex. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *109*, 18413–18418.
- Thompson, S.R. (2012). Tricks an IRES uses to enslave ribosomes. *Trends Microbiol.* *20*, 558–566.
- Tung, C.-S., and Sanbonmatsu, K.Y. (2004). Atomic model of the *Thermus thermophilus* 70S ribosome developed in silico. *Biophys. J.* *87*, 2714–2722.
- Weixlbaumer, A., Jin, H., Neubauer, C., Voorhees, R.M., Petry, S., Kelley, A.C., and Ramakrishnan, V. (2008). Insights into translational termination from the structure of RF2 bound to the ribosome. *Science* *322*, 953–956.
- Whitford, P.C., Ahmed, A., Yu, Y., Hennelly, S.P., Tama, F., Spahn, C.M.T., Onuchic, J.N., and Sanbonmatsu, K.Y. (2011). Excited states of ribosome translocation revealed through integrative molecular modeling. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *108*, 18943–18948.
- Wilson, J.E., Powell, M.J., Hoover, S.E., and Sarnow, P. (2000a). Naturally occurring dicistronic cricket paralysis virus RNA is regulated by two internal ribosome entry sites. *Mol. Cell Biol.* *20*, 4990–4999.
- Wilson, J.E., Pestova, T.V., Hellen, C.U., and Sarnow, P. (2000b). Initiation of protein synthesis from the A site of the ribosome. *Cell* *102*, 511–520.
- Yamamoto, H., Nakashima, N., Ikeda, Y., and Uchiumi, T. (2007). Binding mode of the first aminoacyl-tRNA in translation initiation mediated by Plautia stali intestine virus internal ribosome entry site. *J. Biol. Chem.* *282*, 7770–7776.
- Zhu, J., Korostelev, A., Costantino, D.A., Donohue, J.P., Noller, H.F., and Kieft, J.S. (2011). Crystal structures of complexes containing domains from two viral internal ribosome entry site (IRES) RNAs bound to the 70S ribosome. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* *108*, 1839–1844.