

## Cas3-Derived Target DNA Degradation Fragments Fuel Primed CRISPR Adaptation

Künne, Tim; Kieper, Sebastian N.; Bannenberg, Jasper W.; Vogel, Anne I M; Miellet, Willem R.; Klein, Misha; Depken, Martin; Suarez-Diez, Maria; Brouns, Stan J J

**DOI**

[10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.011)

**Publication date**

2016

**Document Version**

Accepted author manuscript

**Published in**

Molecular Cell

**Citation (APA)**

Künne, T., Kieper, S. N., Bannenberg, J. W., Vogel, A. I. M., Miellet, W. R., Klein, M., Depken, M., Suarez-Diez, M., & Brouns, S. J. J. (2016). Cas3-Derived Target DNA Degradation Fragments Fuel Primed CRISPR Adaptation. *Molecular Cell*, 63(5), 852-864. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2016.07.011>

**Important note**

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).  
Please check the document version above.

**Copyright**

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

**Takedown policy**

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.  
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 *Classification:* BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES: Microbiology

2 **Cas3-derived target DNA degradation fragments fuel primed CRISPR**  
3 **adaptation**

4 Tim Künne<sup>1</sup>, Sebastian N. Kieper<sup>1</sup>, Jasper W. Bannenberg<sup>1</sup>, Anne I.M. Vogel<sup>1,4</sup>, Willem R. Miellet<sup>1</sup>, Misha Klein<sup>2</sup>,  
5 Martin Depken<sup>2</sup>, Maria Suarez-Diez<sup>3</sup>, Stan J.J. Brouns<sup>1,2\*</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Laboratory of Microbiology, Wageningen University, 6708 WE Wageningen, Netherlands.

7 <sup>2</sup>Kavli Institute of Nanoscience and Department of BioNanoscience, Delft University of Technology, 2629 HZ,  
8 Delft, The Netherlands

9 <sup>3</sup>Laboratory of Systems and Synthetic Biology, Wageningen University, 6708 WE Wageningen, Netherlands.

10 <sup>4</sup>Current address: Department of Biotechnology, NTNU, N-7491 Trondheim, Norway

11 *\*Corresponding author:* Brouns, S.J.J. ([stanbrouns@gmail.com](mailto:stanbrouns@gmail.com), +31 15 278 3920)

12 Keywords: CRISPR-Cas; Priming; Interference; adaptive immunity; Phage resistance; Cascade; Cas1; Cas2; Cas3;

13 Spacer acquisition

## 14 **Summary**

15 Prokaryotes use a mechanism called priming to update their CRISPR immunological memory to rapidly counter  
16 revisiting, mutated viruses and plasmids. Here we have determined how new spacers are produced and  
17 selected for integration into the CRISPR array during priming. We show that Cas3 couples CRISPR interference  
18 to adaptation by producing DNA breakdown products that fuel the spacer integration process in a two-step,  
19 PAM-associated manner. The helicase-nuclease Cas3 pre-processes target DNA into fragments of around 30-  
20 100 nt enriched for thymine-stretches in their 3' ends. The Cas1-2 complex further processes these fragments  
21 and integrates them sequence specifically into CRISPR repeats by coupling of a 3' cytosine of the fragment. Our  
22 results highlight that the selection of PAM-compliant spacers during priming is enhanced by the combined  
23 sequence specificities of Cas3 and the Cas1-2 complex leading to an increased propensity of integrating  
24 functional CTT-containing spacers.

25

## 26 Introduction

27 Priming is a mechanism by which immune systems provide an improved immune response to parasite  
28 exposure. In vertebrates, priming of adaptive immunity can occur upon first contact of a T or B cell with a  
29 specific antigen and causes epigenetic changes as well as cell differentiation into effector T or B cells, producing  
30 high levels of antibodies (Bevington et al., 2016). More recently, immune priming has been observed in  
31 invertebrates, where it provides increased resistance to previously encountered pathogens (Kurtz and Franz,  
32 2003; Schmid-Hempel, 2005). In plants, priming refers to a state in which the plant can activate its defense  
33 responses more rapidly and strongly when challenged by pathogenic microbes, insects, or environmental stress  
34 (Conrath et al., 2015). In microbes, priming is a mechanism in which cells can update their immunological  
35 memory to provide protection against previously encountered but slightly changed viruses or conjugative  
36 plasmids (Datsenko et al., 2012; Li et al., 2014; Richter et al., 2014; Swarts et al., 2012; Vorontsova et al., 2015).  
37 Microbial adaptive immune systems do this by integrating short fragments of invader DNA sequences (called  
38 spacers) into Clusters of Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR). These spacers are  
39 transcribed and processed into small CRISPR RNAs and guide Cas (CRISPR-associated) surveillance complexes  
40 such as Cascade, Cas9, Cpf1, Csm and Cmr to their DNA or RNA target sequences, resulting in target cleavage  
41 and neutralization of the invading threat (Carter and Wiedenheft, 2015; Charpentier et al., 2015; Makarova et  
42 al., 2015; Marraffini, 2015; Reeks et al., 2013).

43 For many years, the acquisition of new spacers was the least understood process in CRISPR-Cas defense, but  
44 recent advances have begun to change this (Amitai and Sorek, 2016; Fineran and Charpentier, 2012; Heler et  
45 al., 2014; Sternberg et al., 2016). In the Type I-E system of *E. coli*, Cas1 and Cas2 form a complex that binds,  
46 processes and integrates DNA fragments into the CRISPR array to form spacers (Arslan et al., 2014; Nunez et al.,  
47 2014; Nunez et al., 2015b; Rollie et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2015). Apart from priming, spacers can also be  
48 acquired in a naïve manner. During naïve acquisition the host acquires spacers from an invading DNA element  
49 that has not been catalogued in the CRISPR array yet. This process is dependent on DNA replication of the  
50 invading DNA element (Levy et al., 2015) and requires only *cas1* and *cas2* genes (Yosef et al., 2012). In type I  
51 CRISPR-Cas systems, primed acquisition makes use of pre-existing spacers that partially match an invading DNA  
52 element. Therefore, primed acquisition of spacers is important to rapidly counter invaders that escape  
53 immunity by mutating their target site (Cady et al., 2012; Datsenko et al., 2012; Fineran et al., 2014; Semenova



54 et al., 2011; Xue et al., 2015). Priming allows new spacers from such an ‘escaper’ to be rapidly acquired, leading  
55 to renewed immunity. Priming is especially advantageous for a host because the process quickly generates a  
56 population of bacteria with different spacers against the same virus, efficiently driving the virus extinct (van  
57 Houte et al., 2016). In addition to Cas1-2, all remaining Cas proteins are required for priming, including the  
58 crRNA effector complex Cascade and the nuclease-helicase Cas3 (Datsenko et al., 2012; Richter et al., 2014).  
59 Despite knowing the genetic requirements for priming, the exact role of these proteins during priming remains  
60 unknown. Several models that explain parts of the priming process have been proposed.

61 In the Cascade-sliding model, Cascade moves along the DNA until a PAM is encountered, which marks  
62 the DNA for acquisition of a new spacer (Datsenko et al., 2012). A second model was proposed in which a  
63 Cas1:Cas2-3 complex translocates away from the primed protospacer marked by the crRNA-effector complex  
64 until a new PAM is encountered (Richter et al., 2014). This new site is then used to acquire a new spacer from.  
65 Recently, supporting evidence for this hypothesis has been obtained. Single molecule studies have suggested  
66 that Cascade bound to a priming protospacer recruits Cas1-2, which in turn recruit a nuclease inactive Cas3  
67 (Redding et al., 2015). A complex of Cas1-3 may then translocate along the DNA to select new spacers. While  
68 these models describe the biochemistry and movement of the proteins involved in priming, it has remained  
69 unknown how actual DNA fragments from an invading element are obtained to drive the priming process. We  
70 have previously put forward a model in which we propose that DNA breakdown products of Cas3 provide the  
71 positive feedback needed to fuel the priming process (Swarts et al., 2012). Similar models were proposed for  
72 priming in I-B and I-F systems (Li et al., 2014; Vorontsova et al., 2015). In line with that hypothesis, it has  
73 recently been suggested that during naïve acquisition spacer precursors are generated during DNA repair at  
74 double stranded breaks (Levy et al., 2015). These breaks are frequently formed at stalled replication forks  
75 during DNA replication and are repaired by the RecBCD complex. RecBCD unwinds the DNA strands with its  
76 helicase activity, while degrading the subsequent single stranded stretches using exonuclease activity. The  
77 resulting DNA oligomers have been proposed to form precursors for Cas1-2 to produce new spacers. Similar to  
78 RecBCD, Cas3 is also a nuclease-helicase that degrades dsDNA by unwinding, with the difference that Cas3 has  
79 been shown to degrade one strand at a time (Gong et al., 2014; Huo et al., 2014; Mulepati and Bailey, 2013;  
80 Sinkunas et al., 2013; Westra et al., 2012). This leads to the hypothesis that Cas3 also produces substrates for  
81 Cas1-2 mediated spacer acquisition during priming.

82 Here we have tested that hypothesis and prove that plasmid degradation products produced by Cas3  
83 are bound by the Cas1-2 complex, processed into new spacers and integrated into the CRISPR array. The  
84 cleavage frequency and cleavage specificity of Cas3 facilitate the production of functional spacer precursor  
85 molecules that meet all requirements of new spacers. To achieve this, Cas3 produces fragments that are in the  
86 range of the length of a spacer (30-100 nt). Furthermore the cleavage specificity of Cas3 leads to an enrichment  
87 of PAM sequences in the 3' end of these fragments, which enhances the selection of productive spacer  
88 precursors by Cas1-2. Our results demonstrate that the DNA degradation fragments produced by Cas3 are the  
89 direct link between CRISPR interference and adaptation that make the priming mechanism so robust.

## 90 **Results**

91 Previous studies have shown that direct interference in Type I CRISPR-Cas systems (*i.e.* the breakdown of  
92 Cascade-flagged invading DNA by Cas3) is relatively sensitive to mutations in the PAM and seed sequence of  
93 the protospacer (Kunne et al., 2014; Semenova et al., 2011; Wiedenheft et al., 2011; Xue et al., 2015). Priming  
94 on the other hand is an extremely robust process capable of dealing with highly mutated targets with up to 13  
95 mutations. Priming is influenced by a complex combination of the number of mutations in a target, the position  
96 of these mutations, and the nucleotide identity of the mutation. Furthermore, the degree of tolerance of  
97 mutations in a protospacer during interference and priming depends on the spacer choice (Xue et al., 2015).

### 98 **Timing of plasmid loss and spacer acquisition reveals distinct underlying processes**

99 In order to find the molecular explanation for why some mutants with equal numbers of mutations show  
100 priming while others do not, we performed detailed analysis of a selected set of target mutants obtained  
101 previously (Fineran et al., 2014). From the available list we chose the *bona fide* target (WT) and 30 mutants  
102 carrying an interference permissive PAM (*i.e.* 5'-CTT-3'). The mutants had between 2 and 5 effective mutations  
103 (*i.e.* mutations outside the kinked positions, 6, 12, 18, 24, 30 (Fineran et al., 2014; Jackson et al., 2014;  
104 Mulepati et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2014)) (Figure S1). We used *E. coli* strain KD263 with inducible expression of  
105 *cas3* and *cascade-cas1-2* genes (Shmakov et al., 2014) to test both direct interference and priming in a plasmid  
106 loss setup. Plasmid loss curves of individual mutants (Figure S2) showed four distinct behaviors that led us to  
107 classify these target mutants into four groups: mutants capable of only direct interference (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup>), mutants  
108 capable of direct interference and priming (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup>), mutants capable of only priming (D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup>), and mutants

109 incapable of both direct interference and priming (D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup>) (Figure 1A, B). As expected, rapid plasmid loss was  
110 observed for the *bona fide* target, but also for five mutant targets. These target variants (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup>) showed plasmid  
111 loss within 2 hours post induction (hpi), reaching complete loss after 3 hpi (Figure 1B bottom left cluster), and  
112 did not incorporate new spacers. The D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup> group of mutants showed a slower decrease in plasmid abundance  
113 (starting ~3 hpi) and this decrease was accompanied by incorporation of new spacers 4 hpi (Figure 1B bottom  
114 right cluster). The D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup> group of mutants showed more strongly delayed plasmid loss (>5 hpi), and this loss was  
115 preceded or directly accompanied by spacer acquisition (Figure 1B top right cluster). Therefore, these mutants  
116 could not be cleared from the cells by direct interference initially, but after primed spacer acquisition the  
117 plasmid was rapidly lost. No spacer incorporation was observed for D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup> targets and these variants did not show  
118 any plasmid loss within 48 hpi, similar to a non-target plasmid (Figure 1B top left cluster). This group  
119 exemplifies that no naïve acquisition had occurred within 48 h in our experimental setup and that all spacer  
120 integration events observed in P<sup>+</sup> groups were due to priming. To validate that spacer acquisition occurred by  
121 priming, we sequenced the newly incorporated spacers for a representative set of clones, especially including  
122 mutants with late acquisition. We did indeed observe the 9:1 strand bias of new spacers that is typical for  
123 priming (Datsenko et al., 2012; Savitskaya et al., 2013; Swarts et al., 2012). Taken together, we found that  
124 priming is facilitated by slow or delayed direct interference (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup>), but that it does not strictly require direct  
125 interference as exemplified by the D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup> group.

#### 126 **Moderate direct interference activity facilitates the priming process**

127 To verify that rapid plasmid loss indeed results from direct interference, we performed plasmid transformation  
128 assays of the target plasmid set into *E. coli* KD263 and compared the transformation efficiency to a co-  
129 transformed control plasmid (Almendros and Mojica, 2015). While the *bona fide* target plasmid exhibited a  
130 relative transformation efficiency that was 512x lower than the control plasmid (1/512), also mutants with up  
131 to two effective mutations gave rise to strongly decreased transformation efficiencies (1/16 to 1/512) (Figure  
132 1C). This means that these target variants still triggered an efficient direct interference response. Triple  
133 mutants showed a range of relative transformation efficiencies from full direct interference (*i.e.* 1/512) to no  
134 direct interference (~1), suggesting a dominant role for the position of the mutations in the protospacer.  
135 Mutants with 4 or 5 effective mutations transformed as efficient as the reference plasmid and displayed no  
136 direct interference. When we mapped the classification of all the mutants onto the relative transformation

137 efficiency data, the same trend was observed that target variants with the highest direct interference showed  
138 no priming. Instead, intermediate levels of direct interference lead to rapid spacer acquisition, while low levels  
139 or the absence of direct interference lead to delayed spacer acquisition. This also confirms that late plasmid  
140 loss in the D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup> group is indeed not caused by direct interference with the original spacer, but by primed spacer  
141 acquisition followed by direct interference.

#### 142 **Pairing at the middle position of each segment is important for direct interference**

143 The average number of effective mutations in a protospacer increases gradually over the groups D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup>, D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup>, D<sup>-</sup>  
144 P<sup>+</sup>, and D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup> (Figure S1). While D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup> and D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup> had either 2 or 3 effective mutations, the D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup> mutants had 3 or 4  
145 mutations and the D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup> mutants carried 3 or 5 effective mutations in the protospacer. In order to quantify how  
146 significant the shifts in the average number of mutations are, we used empirical bootstrapping to test against  
147 the hypothesis that the classification does not depend on the number of mutations. Our analysis showed that  
148 the D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup> and D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup> groups have significantly fewer mutations than would be expected if the classification did not  
149 correlate with the number of mutations (>95% and >68% confidence respectively), while D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup> has significantly  
150 more mutations (>95% confidence) (Figure S3A). We next looked in detail at the number of mutations in each  
151 segment, and the position of mutations in each five-nucleotide segment. As has been observed for the seed  
152 sequence (Semenova et al., 2011; Wiedenheft et al., 2011), this showed a significantly lower than average  
153 number of mutations in segment 1 for D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup> and D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup> groups (both 95% confidence, Figure S3B). Surprisingly,  
154 the analysis also revealed that groups showing direct interference (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup>, D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup>) had no mutations at the third  
155 position of each segment (significantly lower than expected, 95% confidence), whereas D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>+</sup> and D<sup>-</sup>P<sup>-</sup> groups  
156 were enriched for mutations at this position (>68% and >95% confidence respectively, Figure S3C). This  
157 observation therefore suggests that pairing of the middle nucleotide of the segment is somehow important for  
158 direct interference. The third nucleotide of each segment could represent a tipping point in the directional  
159 pairing of the crRNA to the DNA. This may occur during canonical, PAM-dependent target DNA binding, which  
160 leads to R-loop locking, efficient Cas3 recruitment and target DNA degradation (Blosser et al., 2015; Huo et al.,  
161 2014; Rutkauskas et al., 2015).

#### 162 **Cascade-plasmid binding is required for interference and priming**

163 To determine the biochemical basis of priming, we first asked the question what determines if a mutant target  
164 can prime or not, and we hypothesized that the affinity of Cascade for a target plasmid would determine its  
165 fate. To test this, we performed plasmid based mobility shift assays with purified Cascade complexes (Kunne et  
166 al., 2015). While the *bona fide* target and most of the mutant targets were bound to completion at increasing  
167 Cascade concentrations, some mutant target plasmids were only partially bound (Table S3), as has been  
168 observed before (Hochstrasser et al., 2014). By calculating an affinity ratio (Amplitude/ $K_d$ ) and using it as an  
169 index for the binding strength, we were able to directly compare the binding properties of all target mutants  
170 (Figure 2A). The results show that the *bona fide* target plasmid had the highest affinity ratio ( $0.31 \text{ nM}^{-1}$ ), while  
171 the mutants cover a range of ratios ranging from very weak binding ( $>0.008 \text{ nM}^{-1}$ ) to almost the same levels as  
172 the *bona fide* target ( $<0.1 \text{ nM}^{-1}$ ).  $D^-P^-$  mutants all cluster together with low ratios ( $<0.02 \text{ nM}^{-1}$ ), and 5 out of 8  
173 show no measurable Cascade binding. This suggests that a minimal level of target plasmid binding by Cascade is  
174 required for both direct interference and priming. However, the affinity ratio alone does not predict direct  
175 interference and/or priming behavior of a target plasmid.

#### 176 **Cas3 DNA cleavage activity determines plasmid fate**

177 Next, we analyzed if the catalytic rate of target DNA degradation by Cas3 would be related to direct  
178 interference and priming. Target DNA degradation is required for direct interference and might be required for  
179 priming as well, since all *cas* genes are required for priming in *E. coli* (Datsenko et al., 2012). To test this, we  
180 performed Cas3 activity assays with the same panel of target plasmids (Figure 2B, Figure S4). This showed that  
181 there is a strong dependence between plasmid fate and Cas3 activity. Mutants capable of only direct  
182 interference ( $D^+P^-$ ) display 5 to 10 times higher activity than priming mutant classes ( $D^+P^+$ ,  $D^-P^+$ ), while stable  
183 mutants ( $D^-P^-$ ) show the lowest Cas3 activity. Furthermore,  $D^+P^+$  mutants show a higher average activity than  $D^-$   
184  $P^+$  mutants, although there is overlap between the two groups. The difference between the Cascade affinity  
185 and the Cas3 activity plots shows that Cas3 activity is not a simple reflection of Cascade affinity, but is likely  
186 influenced by other factors such as conformational differences or the dynamics of Cascade binding. Taken  
187 together, there is a link between the Cas3 activity on a target, and target plasmid fate. Direct interference  
188 requires the highest Cas3 activity, while priming requires a level of target degradation and occurs at a broad  
189 range of intermediate or low Cas3 activities. Finally, it is striking that higher Cas3 activities seem to result in  
190 faster priming ( $D^+P^+$  vs  $D^-P^+$ ), while very high Cas3 activities ( $D^+P^-$ ) do not lead to priming.

191 **Cas3 produces degradation fragments of near-spacer length**

192 After establishing a connection between plasmid degradation (direct interference) and primed spacer  
193 acquisition, we sought to analyze whether the degradation fragments created by Cas3 could serve as spacer  
194 precursors. To this end, we performed Cascade-mediated plasmid degradation assays with Cas3 and plasmids  
195 containing the *bona fide* target or M4 target. Agarose gel electrophoresis showed that both target plasmids  
196 were degraded into similar sized products smaller than 300 nt. Further biochemical analysis of the products  
197 revealed that the products were of double stranded nature and contained phosphates at their 5' end (Figure  
198 S5A, B). Based on the unidirectional unwinding and single stranded DNA cleavage mechanism of Cas3 (Gong et  
199 al., 2014; Huo et al., 2014; Mulepati and Bailey, 2013; Sinkunas et al., 2013; Westra et al., 2012), we had  
200 expected to find single stranded DNA. However, it appeared that complementary fragments had re-annealed to  
201 form duplexes, most likely generating annealed products with both 3' and 5' overhangs.

202 In order to determine the exact cleavage patterns of target plasmids by Cas3, we isolated DNA  
203 cleavage products from gel and sequenced them using the Illumina MiSeq platform. Analysis of the length of  
204 the DNA degradation products from the *bona fide* and M4 target revealed that the majority of fragments from  
205 the target strand had a size of around 30-70 nt (Figure 3B, Figure S6A). The non-target strand displayed a  
206 shifted distribution with most fragments being 60-100 nt long. Instead of cleaving the target DNA randomly,  
207 Cas3 produces fragments with a distinct length profile. Furthermore, the length of the main fraction, especially  
208 in the target strand, is close to the length of a spacer molecule (*i.e.* 32/33 nucleotides), supporting the idea that  
209 these fragments might be used as spacer precursor molecules.

210 **Cas3 cleavage is sequence specific for thymine stretches**

211 In order to see if Cas3 cleaves the target DNA in a sequence specific manner, we analyzed the region  
212 encompassing the cleavage site. This revealed a preference for Cas3 to cleave in thymine-rich sequences for  
213 both the *bona fide* and the M4 target, preferably cleaving 3' of a T nucleotide (Figure 3C,D and Figure S6B). The  
214 same pattern was also observed for single stranded m13mp8 DNA cleaved in the absence of Cascade,  
215 indicating that T-dependent cleavage specificity is an inherent feature of the HD domain of Cas3. The cleavage  
216 specificity of Cas3 leaves one or multiple T nucleotides on the 3' ends of DNA degradation products. This  
217 enriches the 3' ends of the fragments for NTT sequences, including the PAM sequence CTT. A considerable

218 proportion of degradation fragments therefore satisfies the requirement of Cas1-2 for having CTT sequences in  
219 the 3' ends of spacer precursors in order for these to be correctly integrated into the CRISPR array (Shipman et  
220 al., 2016; Wang et al., 2015). Interestingly, C/T-associated cleavage has previously been shown for  
221 *Streptococcus thermophilus* Cas3 cleaving oligo nucleotides (Sinkunas et al., 2013), suggesting that this cleavage  
222 specificity may be common for HD-domains of Cas3 proteins.

### 223 **Cas1-2 integrate Cas3-derived degradation fragments**

224 To find out if Cas3 degradation products can indeed serve as spacer precursors, we reconstituted spacer  
225 integration *in vitro* using purified Cas proteins. Two types of spacer integration assays were performed (Figure  
226 4A): the first assay used all Cas proteins simultaneously (Cascade, Cas3, Cas1-2) to degrade a target plasmid  
227 and integrate the resulting fragments into a plasmid carrying a leader and single CRISPR repeat (pCRISPR). The  
228 second assay used DNA degradation products from a separate Cascade-Cas3 reaction. These products were  
229 incubated with Cas1-2 and pCRISPR, as described (Nunez et al., 2015b). We noticed a pronounced Cas1-2-  
230 dependent shift of the degradation fragments in the gel, suggesting the fragments are bound by Cas1-2 (Figure  
231 4B, left panel). Interestingly, when Cas1-2 was present in the reaction we observed twice as much nicking of  
232 plasmid pCRISPR, suggesting half site integration of DNA fragments into pCRISPR had occurred (Figure 4B, right  
233 panel) (Nunez et al., 2015b). The same pCRISPR nicking activity was observed using purified Cas3 degradation  
234 products (integration assay 2) indicating the integration reaction was not dependent on Cascade or Cas3.

235 To verify that spacer half-site integration had taken place and not just pCRISPR nicking, we gel-isolated  
236 the nicked pCRISPR band for PCR analysis. Since we did not know the sequence of the integrated fragments, we  
237 selected three primer pairs that would amplify frequently incorporated spacers from the plasmid *in vivo*  
238 (Fineran et al., 2014). Two of the three tested primers gave a PCR product of the expected size and we chose  
239 one of the primers for more detailed analysis. It has previously been shown that the first half-site integration  
240 may occur at the boundary of the leader and repeat in the sense strand (*i.e.* site 1), or at the penultimate base  
241 of the repeat in the antisense strand (*i.e.* site 2) (Nunez et al., 2015b; Rollie et al., 2015). Furthermore,  
242 fragments can be integrated in two different orientations. We performed PCR amplification reactions to test  
243 for all four different situations (Figure 5A). This showed that integration of Cas3-derived degradation products  
244 occurs sequence specifically at both site 1 and site 2, and in both orientations (Figure 5B).

## 245 **Integration of fragments in the repeat is nucleotide and position specific**

246 In order to obtain more insight into the accuracy of integration, we sequenced 48 clones for each of the four  
247 primer sets. The results confirm that fragments from the target and non-target strands are integrated at both  
248 site 1 and site 2 of the repeat. Integration is very specific to the correct positions in the repeat. At site 1, 94% of  
249 the integrated fragments were coupled correctly to the first nucleotide of the sense strand of the repeat, while  
250 at site 2, 73% of integrated fragments were coupled correctly to the penultimate nucleotide of the antisense  
251 strand of the repeat, replacing the last nucleotide of the repeat in the process (Figure 6A). In line with previous  
252 findings (Nunez et al., 2015b; Rollie et al., 2015), both integration sites show a preference for coupling  
253 incoming C nucleotides; 49% and 55% for site 1 and site 2 respectively (Figure 6A). Considering that Cas3 DNA  
254 degradation fragments have T nucleotides on their 3' ends, this suggests that precursors have been pre-  
255 processed by Cas1-2 before integration, as has been demonstrated for artificial substrates (Wang et al., 2015).  
256 The majority of the integration amplicons had a length of only 20 to 40 nucleotides (Figure 6B), indicating that  
257 the integration reaction prefers short to long substrates. Altogether, we show that the integration of PAM-  
258 containing spacers in the repeat during priming is enhanced by the combined sequence specificities of two Cas  
259 enzymes: (1) Cas3 which leaves thymines in the 3'-end of DNA fragments, enriching the fragment ends for CTT,  
260 and (2) Cas1-2 which prefer CTT carrying substrates and process and couple the 3' cytosine specifically to both  
261 integration sites of the repeat.

262

## 263 **Discussion**

264 A remaining gap in our understanding of Type I CRISPR-Cas mechanisms is how new spacers are selected and  
265 processed before being incorporated into the CRISPR array. In this work we demonstrate that Cas3 produces  
266 spacer precursors for primed adaptation of the CRISPR array. These spacer precursors are 30-100 nt long  
267 partially double stranded DNA molecules formed by fragmentation of the target DNA. Cas3 DNA degradation  
268 fragments fulfill all criteria for spacer precursors that can be deduced from recent studies of the Cas1-2  
269 complex (Figure 7). Ideal spacer precursors in *E. coli* are partially double stranded duplexes of at least 35  
270 nucleotides containing splayed single stranded 3' ends with a CTT PAM sequence on one of the 3' overhangs  
271 (Nunez et al., 2015a; Rollie et al., 2015; Shipman et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2015). We have shown that Cas3



272 DNA degradation products are mainly double stranded *in vitro*. This is most likely due to re-annealing of the  
273 single stranded products that are produced by the nuclease-helicase activity of Cas3. It is possible that *in vivo*  
274 other proteins are involved in the formation of duplexes after degradation. In fact, it has been shown that Cas1  
275 from *Sulfolobus solfataricus* can facilitate the annealing of oligonucleotides (Han and Krauss, 2009). These re-  
276 annealed duplexes likely contain a mix of 3' and 5' overhangs, because the two DNA strands of the target are  
277 degraded independently. This also results in slightly shorter fragments for the target strand. Despite these  
278 differences in fragment size, both strands are cleaved by Cas3 with the same specificity, enriching the 3' ends  
279 of the fragments for stretches of thymines. Contrary to the CTT requirements for spacer integration, it is known  
280 that Cascade tolerates five different PAM sequences (*i.e.* CTT, CTA, CCT, CTC, CAT) for direct interference  
281 (Fineran et al., 2014; Leenay et al., 2016). However, the vast majority of new spacers (97%) resulting from  
282 primed acquisition carry CTT PAM sequences (Shmakov et al., 2014). This further supports the idea that spacer  
283 precursors with CTT-ends are selected non-randomly by the Cas1-2 complex from pools of Cas3 breakdown  
284 fragments and further trimmed to a 3' C (Wang et al., 2015). These are then coupled to the repeat by  
285 nucleophilic attack of the 3'-OH (Nunez et al., 2014; Rollie et al., 2015). The T-dependent target DNA cleavage  
286 specificity of Cas3 further enhances the production of precursors that fit the requirements of new spacers by  
287 creating a pool of DNA fragments with the correct size and correct 3' ends. The interference phase of CRISPR  
288 immunity is therefore effectively coupled to the adaptation phase, providing positive feedback about the  
289 presence of an invader.

290 It was previously reported that a dinucleotide motif (AA) at the 3' end of a spacer increases the  
291 efficiency of naïve spacer acquisition (Yosef et al., 2013). We did not observe this motif at the expected  
292 distance from the end in the Cas3 DNA degradation fragments, suggesting that Cas3 does not take the AA motif  
293 into account when generating spacer precursors.

294 We found that the integration reaction is very precise for the two correct integration sites in the  
295 repeat (site 1 and site 2), and we observed that the integrated fragments most often were the result of a 3'  
296 cytosine coupling reaction. *In vivo*, however, only the integration of a CTT-containing fragment at site 2 would  
297 lead to a functional spacer targeting a protospacer with PAM (Figure 7), while half site integrations initiating at  
298 site 1 would result in 'flipped' spacers (Shmakov et al., 2014). Using a selective PCR strategy, we detected  
299 primed spacer acquisition events at both integration sites, and we identified that DNA fragments from both the

300 target and non-target strand of the plasmid could be used for integration. In Type I-E CRISPR-Cas systems,  
301 primed spacer acquisitions display a typical 9:1 strand bias for the acquisition of spacers targeting the same  
302 strand of DNA as the spacer causing priming (Datsenko et al., 2012; Swarts et al., 2012). This suggests that *in*  
303 *vivo*, other factors might be involved in further increasing the accuracy of functional spacer integration. This  
304 includes the formation of supercomplexes between various Cas proteins (*i.e.* Cascade, Cas3, Cas1-2) (Plagens et  
305 al., 2012; Redding et al., 2015; Richter et al., 2014), and the involvement of non-Cas host proteins such as PriA,  
306 RecG and IHF (Ivancic-Bace et al., 2015; Nunez et al., 2016). IHF ensures that the first integration event takes  
307 place at the leader-proximal end of the repeat (site 1) and would be involved in ensuring that the PAM cytosine  
308 gets integrated at the leader-distal end (site 2). Supercomplex formation during precursor generation may lead  
309 to the selection of fragments from the target strand containing a CTT PAM at the 3' end. Although the length of  
310 the observed integration amplicons is centered around 20-40 nt, we also find amplicons of up to 100 nt. *In vivo*,  
311 *E. coli* integrates fragments of 33 nt length. We speculate that trimming of the precursor to 33 nt length occurs  
312 after half-site integration and before formation of the stable integration intermediate (Figure 7). Despite the  
313 mechanisms that lower erroneous integration of new spacers, it is likely that natural selection of functional  
314 spacers *in vivo* also plays a role in the spacers that end up being part of the first population of bacteria  
315 following a priming event.

316 It was surprising that that the *bona fide* target and several D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>-</sup> mutants did not show priming despite  
317 providing Cas3 degradation products. Furthermore, the degradation fragments of the *bona fide* target were  
318 very similar to the fragments of the M4 target (D<sup>+</sup>P<sup>+</sup>), which cannot explain the difference in priming behavior.  
319 We propose that these targets are degraded and cured from the cell too rapidly, giving the acquisition  
320 machinery insufficient time to generate new spacers. However, a low level of spacer integration might be  
321 taking place at undetectable levels even for the *bona fide* target, as has been observed previously (Swarts et  
322 al., 2012; Xue et al., 2015). In this case, cells with additional spacers do not have a selective growth advantage  
323 over cells without new spacers as the plasmid is already effectively cleared from cells without new spacers.  
324 Mutant targets with intermediate levels of direct interference however, are replicated and subject to  
325 interference over a longer time period, thereby providing more precursors, more time for spacer acquisition to  
326 occur, and therefore a greater selective growth advantage. Low levels of direct interference lead to a slow  
327 priming response due to the scarcity of spacer precursor molecules. While this paper was under review,

328 another study showed that perfectly matching protospacers with canonical PAMs can indeed stimulate priming  
329 and that plasmid targeting is the stimulating factor (Semenova et al., 2016). In line with our findings, the  
330 authors further propose that priming is usually not observed with fully matching protospacers because these  
331 targets are degraded too rapidly.

### 332 **Cut-paste spacer acquisition**

333 We have shown that priming reuses target DNA breakdown products as precursors for new spacers, providing  
334 support for a cut and paste mechanism of spacer selection (Wang et al., 2015). Compatible models have  
335 recently been proposed for naïve spacer acquisition (Levy et al., 2015). It was shown that CRISPR adaptation is  
336 linked to double stranded DNA breaks that form at stalled DNA replication forks. Invading genetic elements  
337 often go through a phase of active DNA replication when they enter a host cell, and a replication dependent  
338 mechanism therefore helps the host to primarily select spacers from the invading element. The RecBCD  
339 complex is key in this process as it repairs double stranded breaks by first chewing back the ends of the DNA  
340 creating fragments of tens to thousands of nucleotides (Amitai and Sorek, 2016). These fragments are thought  
341 to reanneal and serve as precursors for new spacers. Other studies have shown the direct involvement of  
342 crRNA-effector complexes in spacer selection. In the Type I-F CRISPR-Cas system of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*  
343 the Csy complex is required for naïve spacer acquisition (Vorontsova et al., 2015). Also Cas9 in Type II systems  
344 has a direct role in spacer acquisition (Heler et al., 2015; Wei et al., 2015). Both systems incorporate spacers  
345 very specifically from canonical PAM sites, suggesting that the Csy complex and Cas9 are directly involved in  
346 PAM recognition during spacer sampling.

### 347 **Mutations in the protospacer**

348 In this study we have focused on the effect of mutations in the protospacer on direct interference and priming,  
349 while maintaining the dominant interference permissive PAM CTT. Apart from underscoring the importance of  
350 the number of mutations and existence of a seed sequence (Semenova et al., 2011; Kunne, 2014 #298;  
351 Wiedenheft et al., 2011; Xue et al., 2015), we uncover that for direct interference pairing of the middle  
352 nucleotide in each 5-nucleotide segment of the protospacer is disproportionately important, and may  
353 represent a tipping point in the binding of a target. None of the 30 mutants showing direct interference carried  
354 mutations at these middle positions. Also in a previously obtained list of approximately 3,300 triple mutants

355 showing direct interference (Fineran et al., 2014), mutations at this position were underrepresented (Figure  
356 S3D). This suggests that pairing at the middle position of each segment may be important for continuation of  
357 the directional zipping process. This process starts at the PAM and leads to the formation of a canonical locked  
358 R-loop, which is required for Cas3 recruitment and target DNA degradation (Blosser et al., 2015; Redding et al.,  
359 2015; Rutkauskas et al., 2015; Szczelkun et al., 2014). We stress that we have used variants with CTT PAMs  
360 only, which can be engaged by Cascade in the canonical PAM-dependent binding mode (Blosser et al., 2015;  
361 Hayes et al., 2016; Redding et al., 2015; Rutkauskas et al., 2015), and can also trigger priming. It has become  
362 clear, however, that targets with mutations in the PAM display a broad spectrum of distinct characteristics  
363 depending on the chosen PAM, including a range of efficiencies of direct interference (Westra et al., 2013) and  
364 the reluctance to trigger efficient Cas3 target DNA degradation (Blosser et al., 2015; Hochstrasser et al., 2014;  
365 Mulepati and Bailey, 2013; Redding et al., 2015; Rutkauskas et al., 2015; Xue et al., 2015). In many cases these  
366 PAMs still support the priming process (Datsenko et al., 2012; Fineran et al., 2014; Xue et al., 2015). Targets  
367 with highly disfavored PAMs (Hayes et al., 2016) are likely engaged in the non-canonical PAM-independent  
368 binding mode (Blosser et al., 2015) and may require recruitment and translocation events of Cas1-2 and Cas3  
369 proteins to initiate the target degradation needed to acquire new spacers.

## 370 **Conclusion**

371 The findings presented here, showcase the intricate PAM-interplay of all Cas proteins in type I systems to  
372 update the CRISPR memory when receiving positive feedback about the presence of an invader. The robustness  
373 of priming is achieved by three components that co-evolved to work with PAM sequences: Cas3 producing  
374 spacer precursors enriched for correct PAM ends, Cas1-2 selecting PAM-compliant spacer precursors and  
375 Cascade efficiently recognizing targets with PAMs. This process stimulates the buildup of multiple spacers  
376 against an invader, preventing the formation of escape mutants (Datsenko et al., 2012; Richter et al., 2014;  
377 Swarts et al., 2012). When the original spacer triggers sufficiently strong interference, priming acquisition does  
378 not frequently occur. This prevents the unnecessary buildup of spacers and keeps the CRISPR array from  
379 getting too long. Any subsequent reduction in effectivity of the immune response by further mutations of the  
380 invader will in turn allow priming acquisition, restoring immunity.

## 381 **Experimental procedures**

382 **Transformation and plasmid loss assay.** Both assays were carried out in *E. coli* KD263 cells, which have  
383 inducible *cas* gene expression. Expression was induced with 0.2 % L-arabinose and 0.5 mM IPTG where  
384 appropriate. Briefly: Transformation efficiency was assessed by comparing CFUs of target plasmid  
385 transformations to CFUs of a control plasmid. Plasmid loss was assessed by loss of fluorescence in colonies and  
386 spacer acquisition was determined by PCR of the CRISPR array. For details see *Transformation assay, Plasmid*  
387 *loss assay* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures.**

388 **Protein purification.** All proteins were expressed in BL21-AI cells. Cascade was purified as described earlier  
389 (Jore et al., 2011). MBP-Cas3 was purified as described in (Mulepati and Bailey, 2013). The Cas1-2 complex was  
390 purified similar to Cascade using affinity chromatography (see *protein purification* in **Supplemental**  
391 **Experimental Procedures**)

392 **EMSA assays.** Purified Cascade complex was incubated with plasmid at a range of molar ratios (1:1-100:1,  
393 Cascade:DNA). After electrophoresis, protein-bound and unbound DNA was quantified and the affinity  
394 calculated. For details, see *EMSA assays* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures.**

395 **Cas3 DNA degradation assays.** Cas3 DNA degradation activity was routinely tested by incubating 500 nM Cas3  
396 with 4 nM M13mp8 single stranded circular DNA. Plasmid-based assays were performed by incubating 70 nM  
397 Cas3 with 70 nM Cascade, 3.5 nM plasmid DNA. For details and activity quantification see *Cas3 DNA*  
398 *degradation assays* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures.**

399 **Statistical testing.** We used a version of the empirical bootstrap method (Dekking, 2005) to test our data  
400 against the null hypothesis that observed behaviors ( $D \pm P \pm$ ) do not correlate with a particular sequence  
401 property. For details see *Statistical testing against the null hypothesis* in **Supplemental Experimental**  
402 **Procedures.**

403 **In vitro acquisition assays.** Two types of assays were performed. 1) Cas3 plasmid DNA degradation assays were  
404 carried out as described above, the reaction products were incubated with Cas1-2 and pWUR869 in buffer R for  
405 60 min. 2) Target plasmid, Cascade, Cas3, Cas1-2 and pWUR869 were incubated in buffer R for 60 min. For  
406 details see Figure 5A and *In vitro acquisition assay* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures.**

407 **Next generation sequencing.** Plasmid degradation assays were performed as previously described. Three  
408 different targets were chosen: *bona fide* target plasmid (pWUR836) or M4 target plasmid (pWUR853) with 0.13

409 mM ATP and the m13mp8 assay as described above. Degradation fragments were processed for Illumina MiSeq  
410 sequencing (see *NGS library construction* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures**). Sequencing data was  
411 deposited at the European Nucleotide Archive under the accession number PRJEB13999. For details on data  
412 processing, see *NGS Data analysis* in **Supplemental Experimental Procedures**.

## 413 **Author contributions**

414 T.K. and S.J.J.B. designed research; T.K., S.N.K., J.W.B., A.I.M.V., W.R.M performed research; T.K., M.S.-D.,  
415 S.N.K, M.K., M.D. and S.J.J.B. analyzed data; and T.K. and S.J.J.B. wrote the paper with input from all authors.

## 416 **Acknowledgements**

417 This work was financially supported by an LS6 ERC starting grant (639707) and NWO VIDI grant to S.J.J.B.  
418 (864.11.005). S.J.J.B and M.D. were supported by a TU Delft start up grant. This work was supported by the  
419 Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO/OCW), as part of the Frontiers in Nanoscience program.  
420 We thank Sebastian Hornung for depositing the DNA sequencing dataset.

## 421 **References**

- 422 Almendros, C., and Mojica, F.J. (2015). Exploring CRISPR Interference by Transformation with Plasmid  
423 Mixtures: Identification of Target Interference Motifs in *Escherichia coli*. *Methods in molecular biology* *1311*,  
424 161-170.
- 425 Amitai, G., and Sorek, R. (2016). CRISPR-Cas adaptation: insights into the mechanism of action. *Nature*  
426 *reviews. Microbiology* *14*, 67-76.
- 427 Arslan, Z., Hermanns, V., Wurm, R., Wagner, R., and Pul, U. (2014). Detection and characterization of spacer  
428 integration intermediates in type I-E CRISPR-Cas system. *Nucleic Acids Res* *42*, 7884-7893.
- 429 Bevington, S.L., Cauchy, P., Piper, J., Bertrand, E., Lalli, N., Jarvis, R.C., Gilding, L.N., Ott, S., Bonifer, C., and  
430 Cockerill, P.N. (2016). Inducible chromatin priming is associated with the establishment of immunological  
431 memory in T cells. *EMBO J* *35*, 515-535.
- 432 Blosser, T.R., Loeff, L., Westra, E.R., Vlot, M., Kunne, T., Sobota, M., Dekker, C., Brouns, S.J., and Joo, C.  
433 (2015). Two distinct DNA binding modes guide dual roles of a CRISPR-Cas protein complex. *Mol Cell* *58*, 60-70.
- 434 Cady, K.C., Bondy-Denomy, J., Heussler, G.E., Davidson, A.R., and O'Toole, G.A. (2012). The CRISPR/Cas  
435 adaptive immune system of *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* mediates resistance to naturally occurring and  
436 engineered phages. *Journal of bacteriology* *194*, 5728-5738.
- 437 Carter, J., and Wiedenheft, B. (2015). SnapShot: CRISPR-RNA-guided adaptive immune systems. *Cell* *163*,  
438 260-260 e261.
- 439 Charpentier, E., Richter, H., van der Oost, J., and White, M.F. (2015). Biogenesis pathways of RNA guides in  
440 archaeal and bacterial CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity. *FEMS Microbiol Rev* *39*, 428-441.
- 441 Conrath, U., Beckers, G.J., Langenbach, C.J., and Jaskiewicz, M.R. (2015). Priming for enhanced defense.  
442 *Annual review of phytopathology* *53*, 97-119.
- 443 Datsenko, K.A., Pougach, K., Tikhonov, A., Wanner, B.L., Severinov, K., and Semenova, E. (2012). Molecular  
444 memory of prior infections activates the CRISPR/Cas adaptive bacterial immunity system. *Nature*  
445 *Communications* *3*, 945.
- 446 Dekking, M. (2005). *A modern introduction to probability and statistics : understanding why and how* (London:  
447 Springer).
- 448 Fineran, P.C., and Charpentier, E. (2012). Memory of viral infections by CRISPR-Cas adaptive immune systems:  
449 acquisition of new information. *Virology* *434*, 202-209.
- 450 Fineran, P.C., Gerritzen, M.J., Suarez-Diez, M., Kunne, T., Boekhorst, J., van Hijum, S.A., Staals, R.H., and  
451 Brouns, S.J. (2014). Degenerate target sites mediate rapid primed CRISPR adaptation. *Proceedings of the*  
452 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *111*, E1629-1638.

453 Gong, B., Shin, M., Sun, J., Jung, C.H., Bolt, E.L., van der Oost, J., and Kim, J.S. (2014). Molecular insights into  
454 DNA interference by CRISPR-associated nuclease-helicase Cas3. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
455 *Sciences of the United States of America* *111*, 16359-16364.

456 Han, D., and Krauss, G. (2009). Characterization of the endonuclease SSO2001 from *Sulfolobus solfataricus* P2.  
457 *FEBS Letters* *583*, 771-776.

458 Hayes, R.P., Xiao, Y., Ding, F., van Erp, P.B., Rajashankar, K., Bailey, S., Wiedenheft, B., and Ke, A. (2016).  
459 Structural basis for promiscuous PAM recognition in type I-E Cascade from *E. coli*. *Nature* *530*, 499-503.

460 Heler, R., Marraffini, L.A., and Bikard, D. (2014). Adapting to new threats: the generation of memory by  
461 CRISPR-Cas immune systems. *Mol Microbiol* *93*, 1-9.

462 Heler, R., Samai, P., Modell, J.W., Weiner, C., Goldberg, G.W., Bikard, D., and Marraffini, L.A. (2015). Cas9  
463 specifies functional viral targets during CRISPR-Cas adaptation. *Nature* *519*, 199-202.

464 Hochstrasser, M.L., Taylor, D.W., Bhat, P., Guegler, C.K., Sternberg, S.H., Nogales, E., and Doudna, J.A.  
465 (2014). CasA mediates Cas3-catalyzed target degradation during CRISPR RNA-guided interference. *Proceedings*  
466 *of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *111*, 6618-6623.

467 Huo, Y., Nam, K.H., Ding, F., Lee, H., Wu, L., Xiao, Y., Farchione, M.D., Jr., Zhou, S., Rajashankar, K., Kurinov,  
468 I., *et al.* (2014). Structures of CRISPR Cas3 offer mechanistic insights into Cascade-activated DNA unwinding  
469 and degradation. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* *21*, 771-777.

470 Ivancic-Bace, I., Cass, S.D., Wearne, S.J., and Bolt, E.L. (2015). Different genome stability proteins underpin  
471 primed and naive adaptation in *E. coli* CRISPR-Cas immunity. *Nucleic Acids Res* *43*, 10821-10830.

472 Jackson, R.N., Golden, S.M., van Erp, P.B., Carter, J., Westra, E.R., Brouns, S.J., van der Oost, J., Terwilliger,  
473 T.C., Read, R.J., and Wiedenheft, B. (2014). Structural biology. Crystal structure of the CRISPR RNA-guided  
474 surveillance complex from *Escherichia coli*. *Science* *345*, 1473-1479.

475 Jore, M.M., Lundgren, M., van Duijn, E., Bultema, J.B., Westra, E.R., Waghmare, S.P., Wiedenheft, B., Pul, Ü.,  
476 Wurm, R., and Wagner, R. (2011). Structural basis for CRISPR RNA-guided DNA recognition by Cascade. *Nature*  
477 *structural & molecular biology* *18*, 529-536.

478 Kunne, T., Swarts, D.C., and Brouns, S.J. (2014). Planting the seed: target recognition of short guide RNAs.  
479 *Trends Microbiol* *22*, 74-83.

480 Kunne, T., Westra, E.R., and Brouns, S.J. (2015). Electrophoretic Mobility Shift Assay of DNA and CRISPR-Cas  
481 Ribonucleoprotein Complexes. *Methods in molecular biology* *1311*, 171-184.

482 Kurtz, J., and Franz, K. (2003). Innate defence: evidence for memory in invertebrate immunity. *Nature* *425*,  
483 37-38.

484 Leenay, R.T., Maksimchuk, K.R., Slotkowski, R.A., Agrawal, R.N., Gomaa, A.A., Briner, A.E., Barrangou, R., and  
485 Beisel, C.L. (2016). Identifying and Visualizing Functional PAM Diversity across CRISPR-Cas Systems. *Mol Cell*  
486 *62*, 137-147.

487 Levy, A., Goren, M.G., Yosef, I., Auster, O., Manor, M., Amitai, G., Edgar, R., Qimron, U., and Sorek, R. (2015).  
488 CRISPR adaptation biases explain preference for acquisition of foreign DNA. *Nature* *520*, 505-510.

489 Li, M., Wang, R., Zhao, D., and Xiang, H. (2014). Adaptation of the *Haloarcula hispanica* CRISPR-Cas system to  
490 a purified virus strictly requires a priming process. *Nucleic Acids Res* *42*, 2483-2492.

491 Makarova, K.S., Wolf, Y.I., Alkhnbashi, O.S., Costa, F., Shah, S.A., Saunders, S.J., Barrangou, R., Brouns, S.J.,  
492 Charpentier, E., Haft, D.H., *et al.* (2015). An updated evolutionary classification of CRISPR-Cas systems. *Nature*  
493 *reviews. Microbiology* *13*, 722-736.

494 Marraffini, L.A. (2015). CRISPR-Cas immunity in prokaryotes. *Nature* *526*, 55-61.

495 Mulepati, S., and Bailey, S. (2013). In Vitro Reconstitution of an *Escherichia coli* RNA-guided Immune System  
496 Reveals Unidirectional, ATP-dependent Degradation of DNA Target. *The Journal of biological chemistry* *288*,  
497 22184-22192.

498 Mulepati, S., Heroux, A., and Bailey, S. (2014). Structural biology. Crystal structure of a CRISPR RNA-guided  
499 surveillance complex bound to a ssDNA target. *Science* *345*, 1479-1484.

500 Nunez, J.K., Bai, L., Harrington, L.B., Hinder, T.L., and Doudna, J.A. (2016). CRISPR Immunological Memory  
501 Requires a Host Factor for Specificity. *Mol Cell* *62*, 824-833.

502 Nunez, J.K., Harrington, L.B., Kranzusch, P.J., Engelman, A.N., and Doudna, J.A. (2015a). Foreign DNA capture  
503 during CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity. *Nature* *527*, 535-538.

504 Nunez, J.K., Kranzusch, P.J., Noeske, J., Wright, A.V., Davies, C.W., and Doudna, J.A. (2014). Cas1-Cas2  
505 complex formation mediates spacer acquisition during CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* *21*,  
506 528-534.

507 Nunez, J.K., Lee, A.S., Engelman, A., and Doudna, J.A. (2015b). Integrase-mediated spacer acquisition during  
508 CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity. *Nature* *519*, 193-198.

509 Plagens, A., Tjaden, B., Hagemann, A., Randau, L., and Hensel, R. (2012). Characterization of the CRISPR/Cas  
510 subtype I-A system of the hyperthermophilic crenarchaeon *Thermoproteus tenax*. *J Bacteriol* *194*, 2491-2500.

511 Redding, S., Sternberg, S.H., Marshall, M., Gibb, B., Bhat, P., Guegler, C.K., Wiedenheft, B., Doudna, J.A., and  
512 Greene, E.C. (2015). Surveillance and Processing of Foreign DNA by the *Escherichia coli* CRISPR-Cas System.  
513 *Cell* *163*, 854-865.

514 Reeks, J., Naismith, J.H., and White, M.F. (2013). CRISPR interference: a structural perspective. *The*  
515 *Biochemical journal* *453*, 155-166.

516 Richter, C., Dy, R.L., McKenzie, R.E., Watson, B.N., Taylor, C., Chang, J.T., McNeil, M.B., Staals, R.H., and  
517 Fineran, P.C. (2014). Priming in the Type I-F CRISPR-Cas system triggers strand-independent spacer  
518 acquisition, bi-directionally from the primed protospacer. *Nucleic Acids Res* *42*, 8516-8526.

519 Rollie, C., Schneider, S., Brinkmann, A.S., Bolt, E.L., and White, M.F. (2015). Intrinsic sequence specificity of  
520 the Cas1 integrase directs new spacer acquisition. *eLife* *4*.

521 Rutkauskas, M., Sinkunas, T., Songailiene, I., Tikhomirova, M.S., Siksnys, V., and Seidel, R. (2015). Directional  
522 R-Loop Formation by the CRISPR-Cas Surveillance Complex Cascade Provides Efficient Off-Target Site  
523 Rejection. *Cell reports* *10*, 1534-1543.

524 Savitskaya, E., Semenova, E., Dedkov, V., Metlitskaya, A., and Severinov, K. (2013). High-throughput analysis  
525 of type IE CRISPR/Cas spacer acquisition in *E. coli*. *RNA biology* *10*, 0--1.  
526 Schmid-Hempel, P. (2005). Evolutionary ecology of insect immune defenses. *Annual review of entomology* *50*,  
527 529-551.  
528 Semenova, E., Jore, M.M., Datsenko, K.A., Semenova, A., Westra, E.R., Wanner, B., van der Oost, J., Brouns,  
529 S.J., and Severinov, K. (2011). Interference by clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeat  
530 (CRISPR) RNA is governed by a seed sequence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *108*, 10098-  
531 10103.  
532 Semenova, E., Savitskaya, E., Musharova, O., Strotskaya, A., Vorontsova, D., Datsenko, K.A., Logacheva,  
533 M.D., and Severinov, K. (2016). Highly efficient primed spacer acquisition from targets destroyed by the  
534 *Escherichia coli* type I-E CRISPR-Cas interfering complex. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of*  
535 *the United States of America*. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1602639113  
536 Shipman, S.L., Nivala, J., Macklis, J.D., and Church, G.M. (2016). Molecular recordings by directed CRISPR  
537 spacer acquisition. *Science*. DOI: 10.1126/science.aaf1175  
538 Shmakov, S., Savitskaya, E., Semenova, E., Logacheva, M.D., Datsenko, K.A., and Severinov, K. (2014).  
539 Pervasive generation of oppositely oriented spacers during CRISPR adaptation. *Nucleic Acids Res* *42*, 5907-  
540 5916.  
541 Sinkunas, T., Gasiunas, G., Waghmare, S.P., Dickman, M.J., Barrangou, R., Horvath, P., and Siksnys, V.  
542 (2013). In vitro reconstitution of Cascade-mediated CRISPR immunity in *Streptococcus thermophilus*. *Embo*  
543 *Journal* *32*, 385-394.  
544 Sternberg, S.H., Richter, H., Charpentier, E., and Qimron, U. (2016). Adaptation in CRISPR-Cas Systems. *Mol*  
545 *Cell* *61*, 797-808.  
546 Swarts, D.C., Mosterd, C., van Passel, M.W., and Brouns, S.J. (2012). CRISPR interference directs strand  
547 specific spacer acquisition. *PloS one* *7*, e35888.  
548 Szczelkun, M.D., Tikhomirova, M.S., Sinkunas, T., Gasiunas, G., Karvelis, T., Pschera, P., Siksnys, V., and  
549 Seidel, R. (2014). Direct observation of R-loop formation by single RNA-guided Cas9 and Cascade effector  
550 complexes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *111*, 9798-9803.  
551 van Houte, S., Ekroth, A.K., Broniewski, J.M., Chabas, H., Ashby, B., Bondy-Denomy, J., Gandon, S., Boots, M.,  
552 Paterson, S., Buckling, A., *et al.* (2016). The diversity-generating benefits of a prokaryotic adaptive immune  
553 system. *Nature* *532*, 385-388.  
554 Vorontsova, D., Datsenko, K.A., Medvedeva, S., Bondy-Denomy, J., Savitskaya, E.E., Pougach, K., Logacheva,  
555 M., Wiedenheft, B., Davidson, A.R., Severinov, K., *et al.* (2015). Foreign DNA acquisition by the I-F CRISPR-Cas  
556 system requires all components of the interference machinery. *Nucleic Acids Res* *43*, 10848-10860.  
557 Wang, J., Li, J., Zhao, H., Sheng, G., Wang, M., Yin, M., and Wang, Y. (2015). Structural and Mechanistic Basis  
558 of PAM-Dependent Spacer Acquisition in CRISPR-Cas Systems. *Cell* *163*, 840-853.  
559 Wei, Y., Terns, R.M., and Terns, M.P. (2015). Cas9 function and host genome sampling in Type II-A CRISPR-  
560 Cas adaptation. *Genes Dev* *29*, 356-361.  
561 Westra, E.R., Semenova, E., Datsenko, K.A., Jackson, R.N., Wiedenheft, B., Severinov, K., and Brouns, S.J.  
562 (2013). Type I-E CRISPR-Cas Systems Discriminate Target from Non-Target DNA through Base Pairing-  
563 Independent PAM Recognition. *PLoS Genet* *9*, e1003742.  
564 Westra, E.R., van Erp, P.B., Kunne, T., Wong, S.P., Staals, R.H., Seegers, C.L., Bollen, S., Jore, M.M.,  
565 Semenova, E., Severinov, K., *et al.* (2012). CRISPR immunity relies on the consecutive binding and degradation  
566 of negatively supercoiled invader DNA by Cascade and Cas3. *Mol Cell* *46*, 595-605.  
567 Wiedenheft, B., van Duijn, E., Bultema, J.B., Waghmare, S.P., Zhou, K., Barendregt, A., Westphal, W., Heck,  
568 A.J., Boekema, E.J., and Dickman, M.J. (2011). RNA-guided complex from a bacterial immune system enhances  
569 target recognition through seed sequence interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* *108*,  
570 10092-10097.  
571 Xue, C., Seetharam, A.S., Musharova, O., Severinov, K., SJ, J.B., Severin, A.J., and Sashital, D.G. (2015).  
572 CRISPR interference and priming varies with individual spacer sequences. *Nucleic Acids Res* *43*, 10831-10847.  
573 Yosef, I., Goren, M.G., and Qimron, U. (2012). Proteins and DNA elements essential for the CRISPR adaptation  
574 process in *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleic acids research* *40*, 5569-5576.  
575 Yosef, I., Shitrit, D., Goren, M.G., Burstein, D., Pupko, T., and Qimron, U. (2013). DNA motifs determining the  
576 efficiency of adaptation into the *Escherichia coli* CRISPR array. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*  
577 *of the United States of America* *110*, 14396-14401.  
578 Zhao, H., Sheng, G., Wang, J., Wang, M., Bunkoczi, G., Gong, W., Wei, Z., and Wang, Y. (2014). Crystal  
579 structure of the RNA-guided immune surveillance Cascade complex in *Escherichia coli*. *Nature* *515*, 147-150.

580

## 581 **Figures**

582 **Figure 1: Plasmid loss and transformation assay.** Plasmid loss was assessed by plating cells and scoring for the

583 GFP signal at various time points after induction of *cas* genes. Individual assays can be seen in Figure S2. The

584 *bona fide* target is abbreviated as WT. A) Example curves and CRISPR PCR of four different types of plasmid



585 behaviors that were observed: Rapid plasmid loss without spacer integration ( $D^+P^-$ ), delayed plasmid loss and  
586 spacer integration ( $D^+P^+$ ), strongly delayed plasmid loss and spacer integration ( $D^-P^+$ ), and no plasmid loss with  
587 no spacer integration ( $D^-P^-$ ). B) Summary of plasmid behavior of all mutants, showing timing of first plasmid loss  
588 and time of first observable spacer integration. C) The relative transformation efficiency is plotted for all  
589 mutant plasmids (fold change compared to co-transformed non-target plasmid, log2 scale). Bars are color  
590 coded based on plasmid behavior classification. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean of  
591 triplicate experiments. The positions of mutations are indicated schematically for each mutant (Pos1: Bottom,  
592 Pos32: Top). Open ovals represent mutations on positions 6, 12, 18, 24, 30. Closed ovals represent mutations  
593 outside of those positions (effective mutations). The amount of effective mutations is indicated above or below  
594 the schematic. For a more detailed overview of the mutations, see Figure S1.

595 **Figure 2: EMSA and Cas3 activity assay.** A) Electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) of the mutant plasmid  
596 set. The affinity ratio (Amplitude/ $K_d$ ) is plotted for each mutant (see Table S3 for more details). Mutants are  
597 separated by the previously made plasmid behavior classification. The mean and standard deviation for each  
598 group are indicated. The *bona fide* target is abbreviated as WT. B) Cas3 DNA degradation activity assay of  
599 mutant plasmid set. The initial Cas3 DNA cleavage rate [%/min] is plotted for each mutant. Mutants are  
600 classified according to previously identified plasmid behavior. The mean and standard deviation for each group  
601 are indicated. Individual gels for all activity assays can be found in Figure S4.

602 **Figure 3: Next generation sequencing analysis of Cas3 DNA degradation products.** A) Left: Schematic of R-loop  
603 formed by binding of Cascade to dsDNA target. Right: Schematic showing the four distinct Cas3 cleavage sites  
604 in dsDNA target. B) Length distribution of Cas3 DNA degradation fragments of M4 target. C) Heat map of  
605 nucleotide frequencies around cleavage sites. The cleavage site is between position -1 and 1. Positions  
606 indicated in black are on the fragments, positions indicated in grey are outside of fragments. D) Heat map of  
607 dinucleotide frequencies around cleavage sites. Abundance of dinucleotides was measured in a shifting frame  
608 within 4 nucleotides around the cleavage sites.

609 **Figure 4: *In vitro* spacer acquisition assays.** A) Illustration of the three types of assays performed. In the oligo  
610 assay, pCRISPR is incubated with Cas1-2 and a spacer oligo (BG7415/6), leading to half site integration. In assay  
611 1, pTarget and pCRISPR are incubated with Cascade, Cas3 and Cas1-2 for simultaneous degradation of pTarget

612 and half site integration into pCRISPR. In assay 2, pTarget is incubated with Cascade and Cas3 and the resulting  
613 DNA degradation products are then separately incubated with pCRISPR and Cas1-2. B) Gel electrophoresis of  
614 integration assay 1. The *bona fide* target is abbreviated as WT. Left gel, untreated; right gel, Proteinase K  
615 treated. Cas1-2 presence causes upwards shift of DNA. Original plasmids are supercoiled (SC), half site  
616 integration causes nicking of pCRISPR, resulting in the open circular conformation (OC).

617 **Figure 5: Half site integration PCR.** A) Illustration of the half site integration PCR. Primer sets are chosen to  
618 show integration into site 1 (leader-proximal repeat end) and site 2 (leader distal repeat end), and to see both  
619 possible orientations of the integrated spacer. Primer sequences were chosen based on frequently  
620 incorporated spacers (hotspots) *in vivo* (Fineran et al., 2014). B) Gel electrophoresis of half site integration PCR  
621 based on integration assay 2 (left) and oligo assay (right). PCR products representing integrations are indicated  
622 with an arrow. PCR products were specific to reactions containing all components. Lower running PCR products  
623 are primer dimers (verified by sequencing).

624 **Figure 6: Sequencing analysis of spacer integration.** A) Frequencies of exact integration locations for  
625 integration at site 1 (grey bars) and site 2 (black bars) as determined by sequencing. X-axis gives the backbone  
626 nucleotide to which the spacer is coupled. Frequencies of coupled spacer nucleotides are indicated for the 2  
627 canonical insertion locations. B) Top: Schematic of integrated fragment and method of length determination.  
628 Bottom: Length of the integration amplicon for site 1 and site 2.

629 **Figure 7: Model of primed spacer acquisition.** Cleavage of a targeted plasmid during direct interference by  
630 Cascade and Cas3. Cleavage products are near-spacer length and reanneal to form duplexes with 5' and/or 3'  
631 overhangs. The fragments are enriched for NTT sequences on their 3' ends. A fraction of the duplexes fulfills  
632 spacer precursor requirements: 3' overhangs, CTT at one 3' end and a 33 nt distance between the C and the  
633 opposite 3' overhang. Cas1-2 binds spacer precursors with a preference for ideal duplexes as described above  
634 (Nunez et al., 2015a; Wang et al., 2015). The precursor is processed by Cas1-2 to a length of 33 nt with 3'  
635 cytosine. In parallel to processing, 3' ends of the precursor perform a Cas1-2 catalyzed nucleophilic attack on  
636 the two integration sites of the repeat (Nunez et al., 2015b; Rollie et al., 2015). Integration at the leader-repeat  
637 junction occurs first (Nunez et al., 2016), subsequently the PAM derived 3' cytosine is integrated to assure  
638 correct orientation and production of a functional spacer. A Stable spacer integration intermediate is formed

639 (Arslan et al., 2014). The gaps are filled in and repaired by the endogenous DNA repair systems, including DNA  
640 polymerase I (Ivancic-Bace et al., 2015).

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3







Figure 4



**A**

Half site integration PCR



**B**






Figure6







Figure 7












## Supplemental Information




**Figure S1: Overview of Protospacer8 mutants.** 30 mutants of protospacer8 containing either 3 or 5 total mutations were used throughout the study. Mutations on positions 6, 12, 18, 24, 30 (empty circles) are not participating in base-pairing and are therefore not considered as effective mutations. Types of mutations are indicated by colored symbols. Mutants are separated into categories based on their behavior in plasmid loss assays (see also Figure 1B).

























**Figure S2. Related to Figure 1: Individual plasmid loss assays.** Panels for each plasmid mutant with (top to bottom): Sequence with indicated mutations, plasmid loss curves from 0 h to 24 h or 48 h, duplicate of CRISPR PCR showing spacer acquisition. The bottom bands in the PCR gels represent the unextended array, higher bands represent the array with an extra spacer. Error bars in plasmid loss graphs represent the standard deviation of replicate experiments. The *bona fide* target is abbreviated as WT.

**A****B**


**C****D**

**Figure S3: Statistical pattern analysis of 30 mutants set.** Three properties were analyzed separately for each group of plasmid behavior. The average of each behavioral group is indicated by the yellow vertical line. To test if the plasmid behavior depends on a certain property, for each property a distribution was made based on empirical bootstrapping of the whole set of 30 mutants (blue line). The 95% and 68% confidence intervals of each distribution are indicated by the light and dark grey boxes respectively. A) Average number of effective mutations. B) Average number of mutations in segment 1. C) Average number of mutations on position 3 within all segments combined. D) Average number of mutations on position 3 within all segments combined but the analysis was performed on a previously published large dataset (Fineran et al., 2014). From this dataset, mutants with 3 mutations (all canonical PAM) were analyzed. The average of the direct interference group is indicated by the red square.




**Figure S4. Related to Figure 2B. Representative gels of Cas3 activity assays.** Individual gels for each mutant showing Cas3 plasmid degradation reactions at time points 0, 1, 10, 30 minutes. Vertical black lines indicate removal of 3 gel lanes with irrelevant samples. Supercoiled plasmid is indicated with an asterisk, gel lanes above are linearized and nicked plasmids, which are not considered in quantification.

A









B



**Figure S5. Related to Figure 3: Biochemical analysis of Cas3 DNA degradation fragments.** A)  $^{32}\text{P}$  PNK labeling of degradation fragments from *bona fide* target plasmid, M4 target plasmid and m13mp8 single stranded plasmid. Forward reaction can only label non-phosphorylated 5' ends, exchange reaction can label both phosphorylated and non-phosphorylated 5' ends. Non-phosphorylated PCR product for reference. B) dsDNase incubation with degradation fragments of *bona fide* target plasmid and M4 target plasmid. dsDNase is a double stranded DNA specific endonuclease with no activity on single stranded DNA.



**A****B**

**Figure S6. Related to Figure 3: Next generation sequencing analysis of Cas3 DNA degradation products.** A) Length distribution bar charts for Cas3 DNA degradation products of *bona fide* target plasmid, M4 target plasmid and m13mp8 single stranded plasmid. B) Heat maps of nucleotide frequencies around cleavage sites for *bona fide* target plasmid, M4 target plasmid and m13mp8 single stranded plasmid. 5' and 3' cut sites are displayed separately for both target and non-target strand. The cleavage site is between position -1 and 1. Positions indicated in black are on the fragments, positions indicated in grey are outside of fragments.

## Supplemental Tables

**Table S1: Oligo nucleotides used in this study**

Name	Sequence	Description
BG4556	ATCCCGGGATGACCTGGCTTCCCCTT	Cas1 fw (SmaI)
BG4557	AGTGAGCTCTCAAACAGGTAATAAAGACACC	Cas2 rv (SacI)
BG5301	AAGGTTGGTGGGTTGTTTTATGG	CRISPR leader forward primer
BG5302	GGATCGTCACCCTCAGCAGCG	M13_g8 spacer reverse primer
BG6170	CACTCTTCCCTACACGACGCTCTCCGATCTG CCTAA	NGS PE 5' Adapter 3
BG6174	CACTCTTCCCTACACGACGCTCTCCGATCTG ATCTG	NGS PE 5' Adapter 7
BG6176	CACTCTTCCCTACACGACGCTCTCCGATCTC TGATC	NGS PE 5' Adapter 9
BG6179	AATGATACGGCGACCACCGAGATCTACACTCT TCCCTACACGACGC	NGS PE 5' Adapter extension primer
BG6180	GTGACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTGCTCTCCGATC TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTVN	NGS PE 3' Tail primer 1
BG6183	CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATAACGAGATGCCTAAGT GACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTG	NGS PE 3' Tail primer 2.3
BG6187	CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATAACGAGATGATCTGGT GACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTG	NGS PE 3' Tail primer 2.7
BG6189	CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATAACGAGATCTGATCGT GACTGGAGTTCAGACGTGTG	NGS PE 3' Tail primer 2.9
BG6713	GCTCTGCTGAAGCCAGTT	Reverse S437 hot spot pBR322
BG6714	GATCCTCTAGAGTCGACCT	Reverse S429 hot spot bb
BG6715	GCTAGTTGAACGGATCCAT	Reverse S416 hot spot GFP
BG7213	CGCTGCTGCGAAATTTGAAC	pWUR477 single repeat fw
BG7214	AACTCTGCGTGAGCGTATCG	pWUR477 single repeat rv
BG7215	ATCCGTTCAACTAGCAGACC	GFP hotspot nested forward
BG7216	GGTCTGCTAGTTGAACGGAT	GFP hotspot nested reverse
BG7415	CAATTTACTACTCGTTCTGGTGTTCCTCGTCAG GG	Protospacer 35 forward
BG7416	ACGAGAAACACCAGAACGAGTAGTAAATTGG GCTT	Protospacer 35 reverse
BG7522	CTGCGCTAGTAGACGAGTC	pWUR477 behind array reverse

**Table S2: Plasmids used in this study**

Plasmid	Description (positions of all mutations)	Name in paper	source
pWUR835	pGFP-UV Amp	-	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR836	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 WT	pTarget <i>bona fide</i>	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR837	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 3, 24	pTarget M14	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR838	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 10, 11, 25	pTarget M12	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR839	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 4, 16	pTarget M30	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR840	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 2, 3, 4	pTarget M17	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR841	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 3, 7, 19	pTarget M26	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR842	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 4, 8, 26	pTarget M23	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR843	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 2, 10, 16	pTarget M16	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR844	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 2, 18, 22	pTarget M9	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR845	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 10, 14, 17	pTarget M5	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR846	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 11, 16, 17	pTarget M7	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR847	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 11, 22, 32	pTarget M1	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR848	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 5, 6, 25	pTarget M2	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR850	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 2, 8, 26	pTarget M10	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR851	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 19, 27, 32	pTarget M27	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR852	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 12, 17, 31	pTarget M3	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR853	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 6, 7, 32	pTarget M4	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR854	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 10, 15, 18, 29	pTarget M25	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR855	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 16, 19, 25, 29	pTarget M13	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR856	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 4, 19, 27, 28	pTarget M20	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR857	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 2, 12, 23, 26, 27	pTarget M11	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR859	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 3, 8, 10, 11, 22	pTarget M29	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR860	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 3, 15, 20, 25, 26	pTarget M18	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR859	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 3, 9, 13, 22, 26	pTarget M19	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR860	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 5, 6, 8, 24, 31	pTarget M8	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR861	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 4, 5, 6, 15, 24	pTarget M24	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR862	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 1, 2, 9, 14, 21	pTarget M22	(Fineran et al., 2014)

pWUR863	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 6, 22, 27, 31, 32	pTarget M28	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR864	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 12, 13, 23, 24, 30	pTarget M6	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR866	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 3, 9, 12, 16, 32	pTarget M21	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR867	pGFP-UV Km protospacer8 mutant pos. 17, 27, 28, 29, 30	pTarget M15	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR868	pGFP-UV Km non-target	pTarget NT	(Fineran et al., 2014)
pWUR748	pMAT11-MBP-Cas3		(Mulepati and Bailey, 2013)
pWUR868	pACYC poly spacer8 CRISPR array		This study
pWUR514	<i>cse2</i> with Strep-tag II (N-term)- <i>cas7-cas5-cas6e</i> in pET52b		(Jore et al., 2011)
pWUR408	<i>cse1</i> in pRSF-1b, no tags		(Brouns et al., 2008)
pWUR477	pACYC with artificial CRISPR array		(Brouns et al., 2008)
pWUR872	pWUR477 with only one repeat	pCRISPR	This study
pWUR871	Cas1-Cas2 operon with Strep-tag II (N-term) in pET52b		This study

**Table S3. Related to Figure2A: EMSA data from regression analysis**

<b>Plasmid</b>	<b>Amplitude</b>	<b>Kd (nM)</b>	<b>Amplitude/Kd</b>
<i>bona fide</i> (WT)	1.0 ± 0.01	7.6 ± 0.8	1.31E-01
M1	0.85 ± 0.01	23.6 ± 2.0	3.59E-02
M2	0.92 ± 0.04	23.6 ± 4.6	3.92E-02
M3	0.99 ± 0.02	18.5 ± 2.7	5.35E-02
M4	1.02 ± 0.04	16.4 ± 3.34	6.23E-02
M5	0.87 ± 0.03	34.3 ± 5.3	2.54E-02
M6	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M7	0.69 ± 0.01	31.6 ± 2.7	2.17E-02
M8	0.65 ± 0.01	17.4 ± 2.0	3.71E-02
M9	0.94 ± 0.03	24.8 ± 4.7	3.78E-02
M10	1.05 ± 0.05	23.4 ± 5.3	4.50E-02
M11	0.39 ± 0.02	22.1 ± 6.0	1.77E-02
M12	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M13	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M14	1.2 ± 0.13	360 ± 79.4	3.46E-03
M15	0.46 ± 0.01	4.4 ± 0.4	1.04E-01
M16	0.78 ± 0.02	46.3 ± 6.7	1.69E-02
M17	1.19 ± 0.02	152.6 ± 10.0	7.79E-03
M18	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M19	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M20	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M21	0.0	--	0.00E+00
M22	0.94 ± 0.01	55.9 ± 2.7	1.69E-02
M23	0.69 ± 0.02	54.1 ± 5.3	1.27E-02
M24	0.9 ± 0.03	22.4 ± 4.0	4.03E-02
M25	0.31 ± 0.01	34.6 ± 6.0	9.02E-03
M26	0.93 ± 0.03	79.4 ± 8.7	1.17E-02
M27	0.74 ± 0.02	20.7 ± 2.7	3.59E-02
M28	1.04 ± 0.04	17.4 ± 3.3	5.97E-02
M29	0.4 ± 0.02	74.2 ± 18.0	5.40E-03
M30	0.0	--	0.00E+00

**Table S4. Related to Figure 3: NGS data processing and mapping**

Sample name	Total number of reads	Reads mapping to NT strand	Reads mapping to NT strand (%)	Reads mapping to T strand	Reads mapping to T strand (%)
<i>bona fide</i> (WT)	215218	57217	26.6	158001	73.4
M4	101327	23334	23	77993	77
M13mp8	46205	46109	>0.99	96	<0.01

**Table S5. Related to Figure 3: NGS data processing for cleavage sites**

Sample name	Non-target strand (NT)			Target strand (T)		
	# Distinct Fragments	# Distinct Start	# Distinct End	# Distinct Fragments	# Distinct Start	# Distinct End
<i>bona fide</i> (WT)	8777	1381	1479	7448	1318	1151
M4	4432	971	1076	4784	1029	920
M13mp8	12243	3737	2620			

## Supplemental Experimental Procedures

**Bacterial Strains and Growth Conditions.** *Escherichia coli* strain KD263 was obtained from (Shmakov et al., 2014). *E. coli* strains were grown at 37 °C in Luria Broth (LB; 5 g/L NaCl, 5 g/L yeast extract, and 10 g/L tryptone) at 180 rpm or on LB-agar plates containing 1.5% (wt/vol) agar. When required, medium was supplemented with the following: ampicillin (Amp; 100 µg/mL), chloramphenicol (Cm; 34 µg/mL), or kanamycin (Km; 50 µg/mL). Bacterial growth was measured at 600 nm (OD<sub>600</sub>).

**Molecular Biology and DNA Sequencing.** All oligonucleotides are listed in Table S1. All plasmids are listed in Table S2. All strains and plasmids were confirmed by PCR and sequencing (GATC-Biotech). Plasmids were prepared using GeneJET Plasmid Miniprep Kits (Thermo Scientific). DNA from PCR and agarose gels was purified using the DNA Clean and Concentrator and Gel DNA Recovery Kit (Zymo Research). The library of pGFPuv sp8 mutants was available from a previous study (Fineran et al., 2014). pMAT MBP-Cas3 was a kind gift from Scott Bailey lab (Mulepati and Bailey, 2013).

**Transformation assay.** Transformation assays were carried out in *E. coli* KD263. Cells were grown to OD<sub>600</sub> ~0.4, induced with 0.2% L-arabinose and 0.5 mM IPTG and allowed to grow for 1h. Cells were then made chemically competent for heat shock transformation using the RuCl<sub>2</sub> method. Cells were co-transformed with 10 ng target plasmid (pWUR836-868, Kan<sup>R</sup>) and 10 ng control plasmid (pWUR835, Amp<sup>R</sup>) simultaneously (Almendros and Mojica, 2015). Dilutions of transformants were then plated on LBA plates with Amp and LBA plates with Kan. The transformation efficiency of mutated target plasmids was normalized against the transformation efficiency of the control plasmid.

**Plasmid loss assay.** *E. coli* KD263 cells were transformed with the target plasmids (pWUR836-868) by heat shock. Individual colonies were picked in triplicate and grown overnight in 5 ml LB supplemented with 2% glucose to repress *cas* gene expression. The next day, cultures were transferred 1:100 into induced medium (0.2% L-Arabinose, 0.5 mM IPTG) and plasmid loss was monitored. Samples were taken every hour until 5h, and then again at 24h and 48h. Dilutions were plated on non-selective plates and plasmid loss was counted based on loss of fluorescence using a Syngene G-box imager. Plasmid-free colonies were screened for spacer integration by colony PCR using DreamTaq Green DNA polymerase (Thermo Scientific). Acquisition of spacers was detected by PCR using primers BG5301 and BG5302. PCR products were visualized on 2% agarose gels and stained with SYBR-safe (Invitrogen). PCR products were sequenced using Sanger sequencing at GATC (Konstantz, Germany) using primer BG5301.

**EMSA assays.** Purified Cascade complex with spacer8 crRNA was incubated with plasmid at a range of molar ratios (1:1-100:1, Cascade:DNA) in buffer A (20 mM HEPES pH7.5, 75 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT) for 30 min. Reactions were run on 1% native agarose gels for 18h at 22 mA in 8 mM sodium-borate buffer. Gels were post stained with SYBR Safe (Invitrogen). Shifted (Cascade bound DNA) and unshifted (free DNA) bands were quantified using the GeneTools software (Syngene) and total Cascade concentration (X) was plotted against the fraction of bound DNA (Y). The curves were fitted with the following formula:  $Y = (\text{amplitude} * X) / (K_d + X)$  (van Erp et al., 2015). The amplitude is the maximum fraction of bound DNA. Since the amplitude is not always 1, we cannot directly compare  $K_d$  values, instead the 'affinity ratio' was calculated as:  $\text{amplitude} / K_d$  (i.e. normalizing the  $K_d$  against the variable amplitude).

**Cas3 DNA degradation assays.** Cas3 DNA degradation activity was routinely tested by incubating 500 nM Cas3 with 4 nM M13mp8 single stranded circular DNA in buffer R (5 mM HEPES, pH8, 60 mM KCl) supplemented with 100 µM Ni<sup>2+</sup> at 37 °C for 1 h. Plasmid-based assays were performed by incubating 70 nM Cas3 with 70 nM Cascade, 3.5 nM plasmid DNA in buffer R (+ 10 µM CoCl<sub>2</sub>, 10 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 2 mM ATP) at 37 °C for 10-60 minutes unless indicated otherwise. For quantifying Cas3 activity, assays were run at normal conditions and samples were taken at 0 min, 1 min, 10 min and 30 min. Samples were immediately quenched with 6x DNA loading dye (Thermo scientific) on ice. Samples were run on agarose gels and supercoiled plasmid bands were quantified using the GeneTools software (Syngene). The DNA degradation was plotted (X: time [min]; Y: Intact Plasmid [%]) and the initial activity of Cas3 [%/min] calculated from the initial slope of the curve.

**Protein purification.** The Cas1-2 operon was PCR amplified with primers BG4556/7 and cloned into pET52b (SmaI/SacI) to make pWUR871. The Cas1-2 complex was purified using the N-terminal StrepII tag on Cas1. Briefly, cells were grown to an OD<sub>600</sub> of 0.4, cooled on ice for 30 minutes and induced with 0.5 mM IPTG and 0.2% l-arabinose. Protein was expressed at 20 °C overnight. Cells were collected by centrifugation and lysed in buffer L (20mM HEPES pH 7.5, 75mM NaCl, 1mM DTT, 5% glycerol, 0.1% Triton X100) using a Stansted pressure cell homogenizer. The lysate was cleared by centrifugation and filtration. The cleared lysate was



incubated with Strep-tactin beads (IBA) for 30 minutes at 4 °C and loaded into a gravity column. The column was washed with buffer A (20mM HEPES pH 7.5, 300mM NaCl, 1mM DTT, 5% glycerol) and the proteins eluted in buffer B (20mM HEPES pH 7.5, 75mM NaCl, 1mM DTT, 5% glycerol, 2.5 mM biotin). The presence and purity of the Cas1-2 complex was checked via Tris-tricine SDS PAGE (10-20%). The final complex was snap frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C.

**Degradation product analysis.** To test if Cas3 produces single- or double-stranded DNA products, the reaction products of the plasmid based assay were incubated with dsDNase (Thermo Scientific) according to manufacturer's protocol. dsDNase exclusively degrades double-stranded DNA. Products were run on a 5% denaturing PAGE gel and visualized using Sybr-Gold (Thermo Scientific). To determine the phosphorylation state of the degradation products, the products were <sup>32</sup>P labelled with T4 PNK (Thermo) using the forward and exchange reaction according to the manufacturer's protocol. Labelled DNA was run on an 8% PAGE gel and visualized using a phosphor imaging screen (GE healthcare) and a Personal molecular imager (Bio-Rad).

**Statistical testing against the null hypothesis.** To establish the confidence with which the null hypothesis can be disregarded, we construct randomized mock behavioral groups by repeatedly ( $10^5$  times, resulting in an accuracy in the significance intervals of about  $1/\sqrt{10^5} \gg 0.3\%$ ) drawing a random selection (allowing repetitions) of sequences from the complete set of 31 protospacers (including the *bona fide* spacer). The average property of interest is then calculated for the generated mock behavioral groups, giving histograms showing the distribution over the mock sets. The above procedure is performed for the total number of effective mismatches, and the number of mutations within segment 1, and the number of mutations on position 3 within all segments combined.

**In vitro acquisition assay.** Component concentrations for assay 1 and 2 were as follows: 70 nM Cascade, 70 nM Cas3, 300 nM Cas1-2, 3.5 nM target plasmid, 5 nM pWUR869 (pCRISPR). Reaction products of both assays were run on a 1.8% TAE-agarose gel. To verify half-site integration of spacers in the CRISPR array as described in (Nunez et al., 2015), nicked pWUR869 was isolated from gel and analyzed by PCR. PCR was performed with forward primer BG5301 (site2) or BG7522 (site1) and reverse primers BG7415/6 (control) or BG6713-15 (3 hotspots) or BG7215/6 (fw/rv of hotspot3). These primers match spacers that are frequently incorporated *in vivo* (Fineran et al., 2014). To verify and analyze integration, PCR products were cloned into a pGEMT-easy vector (Promega) and individual clones were sequenced.

**NGS library construction.** Degradation products were gel purified using the Zymoclean Gel DNA Recovery Kit (Zymo Research), cutting out DNA up to ~500bp. DNA was then poly-A tailed with TdT (Invitrogen) according to manufacturer's protocol (approximately 100 nt tails). Tailed DNA was purified using the DNA Clean and Concentrator Kit (Zymo Research). Subsequently, tailed products were 5' phosphorylated with T4-PNK (Thermo Scientific). Next, the DNA was heated to 95°C to separate DNA strands and a barcoded ssDNA adapter (BG6170/4/6) was ligated to the 5' end of the products. Unincorporated adapters were removed using the DNA Clean and Concentrator Kit (Zymo Research). PCR amplification was performed with BG6179 and BG6180. A second round of PCR amplification was performed with BG6179 and BG6183/7/9 (barcoded). PCR products were purified and sent to the Imagif, Centre for Molecular Genetics, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, France for sequencing (paired-end, 2x250nt). Based on the procedure outlined above, a fraction of degradation fragments smaller than 50 nucleotides was purified with lower yields during the initial agarose gel extraction, and could be less populated in the size distribution shown in Fig 3B/S6A.

**NGS Data analysis.** Samples were de-multiplexed using their barcodes. All pair-end reads were mapped to their originating sequences (pWUR836/853, m13mp8) using BLAST and allowing for up to one mismatch. Reads for which both ends could not be aligned to the reference sequence were discarded. For the cleavage sites, distinct start/end positions were analyzed independently (see Table S4 and Table S5 for details). For the duplets a sliding window around the cut point was used. For the duplets the following positions were considered: (-2,-1), (-1,1) and (1,2). In this notation the cut point is between -1 and 1, positive positions are inside the considered fragment and negative positions are outside. Enrichment analysis was performed using a hypergeometric probability distribution to model the background probability density associated to the originating sequence. R packages stats (R-Development-Core-Team, 2008) and ggplot2 (Wickham, 2009) were used for these computations and to generate corresponding graphics.

## Supplemental References

- Almendros, C., and Mojica, F.J. (2015). Exploring CRISPR Interference by Transformation with Plasmid Mixtures: Identification of Target Interference Motifs in *Escherichia coli*. *Methods in molecular biology* *1311*, 161-170.
- Brouns, S.J.J., Jore, M.M., Lundgren, M., Westra, E.R., Slijkhuis, R.J.H., Snijders, A.P.L., Dickman, M.J., Makarova, K.S., Koonin, E.V., and van der Oost, J. (2008). Small CRISPR RNAs Guide Antiviral Defense in Prokaryotes. *Science* *321*, 960-964.
- Fineran, P.C., Gerritzen, M.J., Suarez-Diez, M., Kunne, T., Boekhorst, J., van Hijum, S.A., Staals, R.H., and Brouns, S.J. (2014). Degenerate target sites mediate rapid primed CRISPR adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* *111*, E1629-1638.
- Jore, M.M., Lundgren, M., van Duijn, E., Bultema, J.B., Westra, E.R., Waghmare, S.P., Wiedenheft, B., Pul, Ü., Wurm, R., and Wagner, R. (2011). Structural basis for CRISPR RNA-guided DNA recognition by Cascade. *Nature structural & molecular biology* *18*, 529-536.
- Mulepati, S., and Bailey, S. (2013). In Vitro Reconstitution of an *Escherichia coli* RNA-guided Immune System Reveals Unidirectional, ATP-dependent Degradation of DNA Target. *The Journal of biological chemistry* *288*, 22184-22192.
- Nunez, J.K., Lee, A.S., Engelman, A., and Doudna, J.A. (2015). Integrase-mediated spacer acquisition during CRISPR-Cas adaptive immunity. *Nature* *519*, 193-198.
- R-Development-Core-Team (2008). R: A language and environment for statistical computing (Vienna).
- Shmakov, S., Savitskaya, E., Semenova, E., Logacheva, M.D., Datsenko, K.A., and Severinov, K. (2014). Pervasive generation of oppositely oriented spacers during CRISPR adaptation. *Nucleic Acids Res* *42*, 5907-5916.
- van Erp, P.B., Jackson, R.N., Carter, J., Golden, S.M., Bailey, S., and Wiedenheft, B. (2015). Mechanism of CRISPR-RNA guided recognition of DNA targets in *Escherichia coli*. *Nucleic Acids Res* *43*, 8381-8391.
- Wickham, H. (2009). *Ggplot2 : elegant graphics for data analysis* (New York: Springer).