## RESEARCH



# Solution conformational differences between conventional and CENP-A nucleosomes are accentuated by reversible deformation under high pressure

Kushol Gupta · Nikolina Sekulić · Praveen Kumar Allu · Nicklas Sapp · Qingqiu Huang · Kathryn Sarachan · Mikkel Christensen · Reidar Lund · Susan Krueger · Joseph E. Curtis · Richard E. Gillilan · Gregory D. Van Duyne · Ben E. Black

Received: 28 January 2025 / Revised: 19 May 2025 / Accepted: 22 May 2025  $\ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$  The Author(s) 2025

Abstract Solution-based interrogation of the physical nature of nucleosomes has its roots in X-ray and neutron scattering experiments, including those that provided the initial observation that DNA wraps around core histones. In this study, we performed a comprehensive small-angle scattering study to compare canonical nucleosomes with variant centromeric nucleosomes harboring the histone variant, CENP-A. We used nucleosome core particles (NCPs) assembled on an artificial positioning sequence (Widom 601) and compared these to those assembled on a natural  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA from human centromeres. We

Responsible Editor: Bungo Akiyoshi

Kushol Gupta and Nikolina Sekulić are co-first author.

**Supplementary Information** The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10577-025-09769-z.

K. Gupta (⊠) · N. Sekulić · P. K. Allu · N. Sapp ·
K. Sarachan · G. D. Van Duyne · B. E. Black (⊠)
Department of Biochemistry & Biophysics, Perelman
School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 422 Curie
Boulevard, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6059, USA
e-mail: kgupta@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

B. E. Black e-mail: blackbe@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

#### N. Sekulić (🖂)

Norwegian Centre for Molecular Biosciences and Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway e-mail: nikolina.sekulic@medisin.uio.no establish the native solution properties of octameric H3 and CENP-A NCPs using analytical ultracentrifugation (AUC), small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS), and contrast variation small-angle neutron scattering (CV-SANS). Using high-pressure SAXS (HP-SAXS), we discovered that both histone and DNA sequence have an impact on the stability of octameric nucleosomes in solution under high pressure (300 MPa), with evidence of reversible unwrapping in these experimental conditions. Both canonical nucleosomes harboring conventional histone H3 and their centromeric counterparts harboring CENP-A have a substantial increase in their radius of gyration, but this increase is much less prominent for centromeric nucleosomes. More broadly for chromosome-related research, we note that as HP-SAXS methodologies expand in their utility, we anticipate this will provide a powerful solution-based approach to study nucleosomes and higher-order chromatin complexes.

Present Address:

N. Sekulić

Department of Molecular Medicine, Institute of Basic Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

Q. Huang · R. E. Gillilan Cornell High Energy Synchrotron Source, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA **Keywords** Centromeres · Analytical ultracentrifugation · Small-angle X-ray scattering · Small-angle neutron scattering · Nucleosome · Highpressure

## Introduction

Just as the canonical nucleosome is the fundamental unit of chromatin, the specialized nucleosome harboring the histone H3 variant CENP-A is, in general, the defining unit of chromatin at the portion of the centromere that serves as the foundation of the mitotic kinetochore (Earnshaw and Rothfield 1985; Kixmoeller et al. 2020; Palmer et al. 1987; Yatskevich et al. 2023). The roles of the centromere also include serving as the final location of sister chromatin cohesion until anaphase onset, and as the site for enrichment in early mitosis of the chromosome passenger complex where it functions to monitor the presence and quality of spindle microtubule attachments to the kinetochore (Broad and DeLuca 2020; Carmena et al. 2012). Outside of mitosis, CENP-A nucleosomes serve to epigenetically maintain the location of the centromere. Throughout the cell cycle, CENP-A nucleosomes bind to a sixteen-subunit protein complex called the constitutive centromere-associated network (CCAN) (Foltz et al. 2006; Okada et al. 2006). A CENP-A nucleosome with maximal wrapping of ~1.7 turns of DNA, similar to conventional nucleosomes, is evident in structural analyses of reconstituted CENP-A nucleosome/CCAN complexes (Yatskevich et al. 2022) and in the context of their natural counterparts at the

Present Address:

K. Sarachan

College of Arts & Sciences, Wilson College, Chambersburg, PA 17201, USA

M. Christensen · R. Lund Department of Chemistry, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

S. Krueger · J. E. Curtis Center for Neutron Research, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-6102, USA

S. Krueger

Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-2115, USA centromeres of intact human chromosomes (Kixmoeller et al. 2025).

Methods like X-ray crystallography and cryoelectron microscopy have provided fundamental insights into the atomic structure of the CENP-A nucleosomes and its assemblies at high resolution (Ali-Ahmad et al. 2019; Allu et al. 2019; Arimura et al. 2014; Ariyoshi et al. 2021; Boopathi et al. 2020; Chittori et al. 2018; Jiang et al. 2023; Tachiwana et al. 2011b; Takizawa et al. 2020; Yatskevich et al. 2022; Zhou et al. 2019, 2022). However, these approaches are limited by their ability to observe only ordered components in experimental densities, and the use of artificial environments that include buffer excipients, grid environments, and sample vitrification/freezing. These high-resolution methods provide a static view of atomic structure, hence limiting insights into intrinsic flexibility and ensembleaveraged dynamic properties such as histone tails, conformational changes, and interdomain flexibility. These constraints limit the scope of insights into other distinguishing physical features of CENP-A nucleosomes that could impact their essential functions at the centromere. In a highly complementary way, solution-based studies have revealed that CENP-A/H4 tetramers and CENP-A nucleosomes have rigid histone cores (Black et al. 2007, 2004; Sekulic et al. 2010) and loose superhelical DNA termini (Conde e Silva et al. 2007; Falk et al. 2015; Hasson et al. 2013).

Since the 1970 s, small-angle scattering (SAS) has served as an invaluable complementary tool for structural biology that has bridged the gap between atomic-level structure and solution behavior (Mohammed et al. 2024; Weiss 2017). The angular-dependent decay in scattering intensity provides rich modelindependent information about macromolecular size, shape, and flexibility in solution, and with the availability of experimental and *ab initio* atomic structures, a rigorous test of solution structure. Contrast variation methods have been particularly powerful in a way not possible with other solution methods like FRET due to their spatial resolution of global structure, the ability to resolve complex mixtures by isotopic substitution, and the absence of a requirement for site specific covalent attachments (Ashkar et al. 2018). The first studies of nucleosomes using SAS arrived in the 1970s (Baldwin et al. 1975; Finch and Klug 1976; Hjelm et al. 1977; Olins and Olins 1974; Stuhrmann and Duee 1975; Woodcock et al. 1976), when neutron contrast variation (Krueger 2022) experiments were first employed to distinguish between the protein and DNA components of the nucleosome, as they exist in complex. These early studies revealed fundamental properties of chromatin and nucleosomes, such as the size, shape, and quaternary arrangement. Canonical small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) and neutron scattering (SANS) experiments during this era contributed to the initial development of the solenoidal (Finch and Klug 1976) and "beads-on-a-string" (Olins and Olins 1974; Woodcock et al. 1976) models of chromatin structure. These studies also established the now well-known structural feature of DNA wrapping around an inner histone octamer in mononucleosomes (Hjelm et al. 1977). Advancements in deuterium labeling techniques in the mid-1970s and 1980s enabled subsequent higher-resolution SANS studies, offering deeper insights into nucleosome assembly and component interactions (Baldwin et al. 1975; Moore 1982). Similarly, the advent of synchrotron SAXS in the 1990 s improved signal-to-noise ratios, enabling more detailed investigations into chromatin flexibility and conformational changes in response to factors such as salt concentration (Hansen et al. 2017; Joti et al. 2012; Maeshima et al. 2016; Nishino et al. 2012). Over the past two decades, integrative approaches combining SAXS with high-resolution structural modeling methods have driven further advances in understanding. These approaches have allowed detailed investigations into the effects of histone variants (Sugiyama et al. 2015; Tachiwana et al. 2011a), nucleosome interactors (Yang et al. 2011), post-translational modifications (PTMs) (Brehove et al. 2015), and DNA sequence (Yang et al. 2011) on nucleosome structure. X-ray scattering has also contributed insights into nucleosome dynamics, remodeling processes, and the organization of higher-order chromatin assemblies (Newman et al. 2012; Sundaramoorthy et al. 2017; Tokuda et al. 2018; Yang et al. 2011). However, despite the early successes of SANS with contrast variation (CV-SANS) in nucleosome studies, relatively few such studies have been published since over the past 30 years. This is surprising given the utility of contrast variation and significant advancements in neutron reactor sources, detector technology, data analysis techniques, and the availability of high-resolution atomic structures through this time (Ashkar et al. 2018). While SANS has found increasing applications in the biological realm (Ashkar et al. 2018), most contrast variation studies performed during this period have focused on other large assemblies or specific protein-DNA interactions, leaving nucleosome-specific applications still relatively underexplored.

In this study, we revisit these canonical applications of SAS, including contrast variation SANS (CV-SANS), and introduce the emerging state-of-the-art approach of high-pressure small-angle X-ray scattering (HP-SAXS) to investigate the structural properties of nucleosome core particles (NCPs), with a focus on centromeric chromatin. We examine how differences in protein composition and DNA sequence influence NCP structure and dynamics in solution. Specifically, we compare canonical H3.1 histone octamers with centromeric histone octamers, in which the canonical H3.1 is replaced by the variant centromeric histone CENP-A (approximately ~63% sequence identity in the histone core but highly divergent histone tails). These octamers are assembled on two different and well-studied DNA sequences: the strong-positioning Widom DNA (601) sequence (Lowary and Widom 1998) and an AT-rich  $\alpha$ -satellite sequence derived from centromeric DNA(Harp et al. 1996). Using SAXS and SANS, we demonstrate that NCPs containing CENP-A and  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA exhibit a measurably larger spatial extent and evidence of flexibility compared to canonical H3 NCPs, in agreement with prior studies. Analytical ultracentrifugation (AUC) studies of  $\alpha$ -satellite NCPs confirm their octameric stoichiometry and reveal physical polydispersity specific to the combination of CENP-A histones and  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA. To further probe these differences, we employ HP-SAXS and discover a reversible sensitivity of  $\alpha$ -satellite NCPs to pressure, highlighting structural and dynamic properties specific to nucleosome composition.

#### Results

Small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) reveals differences in the spatial extent of nucleosomes assembled with different histone and DNA sequences

For our SAXS experiments, we reconstituted the canonical H3.1 and CENP-A-derived histone octamers on either the well-studied strong positioning Widom 601 sequence (Lowary and Widom 1998) (H3-601 and CENP-A-601, respectively) or on native  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA (Harp et al. 1996) (H3- $\alpha$ Sat or



Contrast Variation Small-Angle X-ray and Neutron Scattering

Fig. 1 SAXS and SANS measurements reveal subtle dynamic changes between NCPs conferred by histone and DNA composition. A. Guinier Plots. Guinier plot analyses ( $\ln I(q)$  vs.  $q^2$ ) of SAXS data (dots) for NCPs, with residuals from the fitted lines shown below (colors). Monodispersity is evidenced by linearity in the Guinier region of the scattering data and agreement of the I<sub>0</sub> and R<sub>g</sub> values determined with inverse Fourier transform analysis by the programs GNOM (Table 1). Guinier analyses were performed where  $qR_g \le 1.2$ . **B**. Difference P(r). C. Normalized Kratky Plots. D. FoxS Fitting. The recorded X-ray intensity for H3-601 (green line) is shown as a function of q ( $q = 4\pi \sin\theta/\lambda$ , where 2 $\theta$  is the scattering angle) on a Kratky plot  $(Iq^2 vs q)$ , to emphasize the features in the middle q regime associated with conformational changes in solution. Parameters derived from SAXS analyses are summarized in Table 1. Show as a solid black line is the fit calculated intensity profile from the H3-601 atomistic model obtained using the program FoxS<sup>65</sup>, with the  $\chi^2$  associated with the fitting provided. Similar analyses are provided in panels C-E for CENP-A-601 (C, light red, versus the CENP-A-601 model), H3- $\alpha$ Sat (D, cyan, versus the H3-601 model), and CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat (E, cyan, versus the CENP-A-601 model). Relative to the H3-601 model fit, the other three particles examined show differing levels of discrepancy at the ~0.1 and ~0.16 q peak features, and larger  $R_{\sigma}$  values, indicating modest differences in solution conformation. E. DENSS analysis of synchrotron SAXS data. Shown in orthogonal views for each of the four particles examined by SAXS are *ab initio* electron density reconstructions, docked with the corresponding H3 or CENP-A nucleosome model. Asterisks denote spatial discrepancies between the experimental volumes and idealized models that correlate strongly to changes in DNA end positioning. Electron density is colored with five contour levels of density rendered with these respective colors:  $15\sigma$  (red),  $10\sigma$  (green),  $5\sigma$  (cyan),  $2.5\sigma$  (blue), and  $-0.7\sigma$  (blue). The sigma ( $\sigma$ ) level denotes the standard deviation above the average electron density value of the generated volume. Supplemental Fig. 7 provides the reconstructions without atomic models docked. F. Schematic of Stuhrmann Plot contrast variation profiles for different idealized structures. In each case, higher scattering density in the composite particle is indicated by darker shading. The x-intercept at zero provides the  $R_{\sigma}$  at infinite contrast ( $R_{c}$ ). In profiles where the slope is positive ( $\alpha > 0$ ), the higher density component is located on the periphery of the composite particle, whereas negative slopes ( $\alpha < 0$ ) indicated the opposite. For non-linear profiles (where  $\beta \neq 0$ ), the two components are askew relative to the center of mass, as illustrated. G. Stuhrmann Plot analysis  $(R_g^2 \text{ vs } \Delta \rho^{-1})$  for the H3-601 particle is shown (dark red), with four SANS data points and one SAXS data point fit with the Stuhrmann equation. Shown for each data point are the errors associated with classical Guinier fitting (see Table 2). Provided in the panel are the numerical parameters derived from the fitting of the Stuhrmann equation, including the  $R_c$ <sup>2</sup> from the fitting. Similar analyses are provided in panels for CA-601 (green, four SANS data points and one SAXS data point), H3-αSat (cyan, five SANS data points and one SAXS data point), and CA-αSat (light red, five SANS data points and one SAXS data point), with the H3-601 Stuhrmann result shown as a dotted dark red line for comparison. Relative to H3-601, the other three particles have slightly increased spatial extent, as indicated by a modest upwards translation along the y-axis. All four particles have very similar determined  $R_{\alpha}$  values, and positive  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  terms, indicate very similar gross compositional distributions of the protein and DNA components in these experimental conditions. All numerical parameters derived from these analyses and additional supporting measures are also provided in Supplemental Figs. 2-5 and Supplemental Tables 1,2, and 4

CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat, respectively) to determine their structural properties in solution. The strong positioning on Widom 601 is thought to be due to dinucleotide pair combinations that accommodate the deformations in DNA path conferred by histone DNA wrapping (Lowary and Widom 1998). It is reasonable to expect that while the overall path of DNA wrapping will be largely similar in Widom 601 and natural DNA sequences (Allu et al. 2019; Vasudevan et al. 2010; Wang et al. 2021), there could nonetheless be DNA sequence-dependent deviations in localized structure and dynamics, such as with the positioning of the DNA ends. We first probed the structural properties of these reconstituted NCPs in solution using smallangle X-ray scattering (SAXS), a technique that is very sensitive to changes in macromolecular conformation in solution. Preliminary measurements were performed on a rotating anode X-ray source to optimize buffer and concentration ranges and to eliminate any effects of interparticle interference, which can undermine structural interpretation, and quality control on particles performed using PAGE analyses (see Supplemental Fig. 1 and Methods). Final synchrotron data were recorded at multiple concentrations in the range of 0.5 mg/mL -1.2 mg/mL.

Two fundamental measures that can be made in a model-independent fashion using SAS are the radius of gyration ( $R_g$ ) and the maximum dimension ( $D_{max}$ ).  $R_g$  refers to a mass-weighted average distance from the center of mass, while  $D_{max}$  is a single length describing the largest distance between any two points in a scattering volume. Hence, two objects can maintain the same average spread of mass from the center ( $R_g$ ) but still differ in their furthest extent ( $D_{max}$ ). Together these are discerning parameters useful in the detection of events like DNA unwrapping, histone core compaction, and overall shifts in mass distribution in NCPs. Here, classical Guinier analyses indicated particles free of self-association or aggregation (Fig. 1A), and together these measurements

# es (2025) 33:11

		Guinier			GNOM	· •			
Sample	Conc. <sup>a</sup> (mg/mL)	qR <sub>g</sub>	$R_{g}(Å)$	I <sub>0</sub>	q (Å <sup>-1</sup> )	$R_{g}(A)$	I <sub>0</sub>	D <sub>max</sub> (Å)	T.E. <sup>b</sup>
ALS SIBYLS H3—601	1.5	0.46–1.16	$41.2 \pm 2.1$	544 ±21.3	0.011 < q	41.9 ±0.17	541 ± 2.5	118	0.80
	1.1	0.56-1.10	$41.2 \pm 3.8$	535 ± 14.7	0.011 < q	$42.0\pm0.19$	$542 \pm 4.3$	118	0.87
	0.8	0.47–1.24	$42.1 \pm 3.8$	$531 \pm 14.2$	0.011 < q < 0.19	$42.2\pm0.17$	539 ± 3.5	125	0.81
	0.5	0.87-1.28	$40.1 \pm 1.4$	$492 \pm 8.5$	0.011 < q < 0.19	$41.6 \pm 0.09$	$512 \pm 1.8$	118	0.97
ALS SIBYLS									
CENP- A-601	1.5	0.48–1.19	$42.1 \pm 1.9$	$601 \pm 18.5$	0.011 < q <0.19	$42.9 \pm 0.28$	$601 \pm 3.8$	135	0.73
	1.1	0.47–1.18	$41.9 \pm 1.9$	$598 \pm 26.9$	0.011 < q <0.19	$42.4 \pm 0.19$	$600 \pm 4.1$	128	0.74
	0.8	0.46-1.12	$41.3\pm0.5$	$587 \pm 14.6$	0.011 < q <0.19	$42.2 \pm 0.17$	$590 \pm 3.2$	140	0.77
	0.5	0.87–1.29	$40.3 \pm 1.3$	$553 \pm 11.4$	0.022 < q < 0.20	$41.2 \pm 0.11$	$572 \pm 2.3$	122	0.94
Cornell CHESS									
H3-α-sat	Conc. <sup>a</sup> (mg/mL)	$qR_g$	$R_{g}(A)$	$I_0 (cm^{-1})$	$q\;(\mathring{A}^{-1})$	$R_{g}(A)$	$I_0 (cm^{-1})$	D <sub>max</sub> (Å)	T.E
Ambient (0.1013 MPa)	1.2	0.51–1.21	$42.1 \pm 0.2$	$0.12 \pm 0.0003$	0.014 < q <0.190	$42.2 \pm 0.17$	$0.12 \pm 0.0003$	126	0.94
	1.0	0.53–1.19	$41.7 \pm 0.2$	$0.10 \pm 0.0003$	0.014 < q <0.195	$41.7 \pm 0.07$	$0.10 \pm 0.0003$	126	0.95
	0.8	0.50–1.19	$42.2\pm0.2$	$0.08 \pm 0.0003$	0.012 < q <0.188	$42.2\pm0.08$	$0.08 \pm 0.0003$	126	0.86
5 MPa	1.2	0.55–1.24	$45.7\pm0.1$	$0.14 \pm 0.0002$	0.012 < q <0.188	$43.3 \pm 0.37$	$0.13 \pm 0.0010$	134	0.85
100 MPa	1.2	0.42–1.33	$42.6\pm0.7$	$0.10 \pm 0.0012$	0.010 < q <0.188	$42.0\pm0.37$	$0.13 \pm 0.0010$	132	0.92
200 MPa	1.2	0.53–1.33	$39.2\pm0.9$	$0.07 \pm 0.0012$	0.014 < q <0.204	$40.8 \pm 0.44$	$0.08 \pm 0.0007$	120	0.85
300 MPa	1.2	1.22–2.67	$136.7 \pm 0.8$	$0.68 \pm 0.0108$	0.009 < q <0.059	$146.5 \pm 2.9$	$0.77 \pm 0.0300$	453	0.88
Return to 0 MPa	1.2	0.59–1.33	$51.9 \pm 0.9$	$0.15 \pm 0.0020$	0.015 < q <0.170	$47.0 \pm 0.38$	$0.14 \pm 0.0011$	152	0.80
Return to 300 MPa	1.2	1.28–2.12	$142.8 \pm 1.8$	$0.80 \pm 0.0200$	0.009 < q <0.059	$148.3 \pm 3.1$	$0.80 \pm 0.0200$	479	0.84
2nd Return to 0 MPa	1.2	0.58-1.27	$54.4 \pm 0.9$	$0.16 \pm 0.0020$	0.011 < q <0.153	$50.7 \pm 0.51$	$0.15 \pm 0.0013$	157	0.84
CENP-A-α-sat									
Ambient (0.1013 MPa)	1.2	0.52-1.20	$44.4 \pm 0.2$	$0.15 \pm 0.0003$	0.013 < q <0.180	$43.7 \pm 0.14$	$0.15 \pm 0.0003$	155	0.84
	1.0	0.46-1.21	$44.7 \pm 0.2$	$0.13 \pm 0.0003$	0.010 < q <0.180	$43.7 \pm 0.13$	$0.13 \pm 0.0003$	152	0.69

 Table 1
 Table of extended parameters derived from small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) analysis

 Table 1 (continued)

		Guinier		GNOM	
	0.8	0.46–1.23 43.7 $\pm$ 0.2	$0.10 \pm 0.0003$	0.011 < q <0.183	$43.5 \pm 0.13  0.10 \pm 0.0003  150 \qquad 0.86$
5 MPa	1.2	$0.54-1.27$ $46.5 \pm 0.6$	$0.19 \pm 0.0020$	0.011 < q <0.172	$45.9 \pm 0.63  0.19 \pm 0.0014  162 \qquad 0.79$
100 MPa	1.2	$0.41-1.30$ $44.4 \pm 0.6$	$0.15 \pm 0.0014$	0.011 < q <0.180	$43.2 \pm 0.32  0.15 \pm 0.0014  130 \qquad 0.86$
200 MPa	1.2	$0.51-1.25$ $46.6 \pm 1.1$	$0.11 \pm 0.0018$	0.009 < q <0.172	$46.6 \pm 0.75  0.11 \pm 0.0013  157 \qquad 0.81$
300 MPa	1.2	$0.75-1.92$ $83.1 \pm 0.9$	$0.22 \pm 0.0036$	0.009 < q <0.096	$83.4 \pm 0.79$ 0.21 $\pm 0.0030$ 239 0.87
Return to 0 MPa	1.2	$0.62-1.24$ $48.6 \pm 0.8$	$0.20 \pm 0.0023$	0.011 < q <0.164	$45.7 \pm 0.23  0.20 \pm 0.0014  135 \qquad 0.89$
Return to 300 MPa	1.2	0.73–1.82 82.1 $\pm$ 1.1	$0.21 \pm 0.0039$	0.009 < q < 0.098	$84.7 \pm 1.04  0.21 \pm 0.0040  238 \qquad 0.83$
2nd Return to 0 MPa	1.2	$0.56-1.28$ $49.8 \pm 0.7$	$0.22 \pm 0.0021$	0.009 < q <0.160	$46.3 \pm 0.23  0.21 \pm 0.0011  139 \qquad 0.89$

a.Determined using Bradford protein assay

b.Total Estimate figure as determined using GNOM

yielded structural parameters from SAXS consistent with prior literature reports on canonical particles (Hjelm et al. 1977; Sugiyama et al. 2014, 2015; Yang et al. 2011) (Table 1). We find that H3 and CENP-A NCPs assembled on 601 sequences have similar radii of gyration ( $R_g \sim 41$  Å-42 Å). An indirect Fourier transform of the data (in reciprocal space) allows us to measure the distance between pairs of atoms in real space (P(r)). While both 601 particles show a very similar P(r) profiles, difference analysis (Fig. 1B) reveals a shift in interatomic vectors away from the middle of the distribution when the CENP-A-601 particle is compared to the H3-601 particle. The larger maximum dimensions (D<sub>max</sub>) determined (~ 122 Å-140 Å) for CENP-A-601 coincides with a decrease in interatomic vectors between ~60 Å-100 Å and the overall slight increase in  $\boldsymbol{D}_{max}$  when compared to H3-601 (D<sub>max</sub> ~ 118 Å–125 Å) (Table 1). On  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA, the R<sub>g</sub> of H3 on  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA is more like those observed for 601 NCPs. In contrast, CENP-A nucleosomes on  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA show significantly larger spatial extents ( $R_g = ~43 \text{ Å} - 45 \text{ Å}$ ) (Table 1). Interestingly, both the H3 and CENP-A  $\alpha$ -satellite NCPs have larger maximum dimensions (~ 126 and 155 Å, respectively) with CENP-A showing the largest interatomic distances observed.

Normalized Kratky representations of the primary data  $[(qR_g)^2 \times I(q)/I_0)$  vs  $qR_g]$  (Receveur-Brechot

and Durand 2012) were employed to facilitate direct comparison in a model-independent fashion, placing emphasis on the length scales in the middle q regime  $(\sim 0.05 \text{ Å}^{-1} < q < 0.2 \text{ Å}^{-1})$  that are most strongly correlated to changes in macromolecular conformation, and for overall insight into the compactness and overall shape. The normalized Kratky profiles for H3-601 and CENP-A-601 are shown in Fig. 1C. In both cases, a lower primary peak feature is observed where  $qR_{\rho} \sim 1.7$  (Putnam et al. 2007; Receveur-Brechot and Durand 2012), consistent with globular/compact particles and a properly determined R<sub>g</sub> from Guinier analysis, followed by a second smaller peak feature at ~4  $qR_g$  before a return to a baseline intensity, all indicating a well-folded and compact macromolecule. In this comparison, only modest differences can be discerned in the middle q regime in a pairwise comparison. In contrast, after the lower primary peak feature at ~1.7  $qR_g$ , the profiles for  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA NCPs vary upward as a function of  $qR_{\rho}$  with no return to baseline at higher q values, consistent with the increased Rg and Dmax values observed and indicative of flexibility and disorder in solution (Rambo and Tainer 2011).

To more precisely relate the observed solution properties obtained from these preparations to canonical atomic structures, we also generated all-atom models of both H3-601 and CENP-A-601 using molecular dynamics. Our H3-601 model is derived from the PDB 3LZ0 crystal structure (Vasudevan et al. 2010), with unresolved histone tails (comprising about  $\sim 30\%$ of the total protein mass in a nucleosome core particle) modeled as collapsed random coils (see Methods). Similarly, the CENP-A model was constructed using the PDB 3AN2 atomic structure (Tachiwana et al. 2011a) as a template for the protein component. Full atomic coordinates for the models including histone tails and correct DNA sequence were built manually and models were minimized (see Methods). To compare our experimental scattering results to these models, we employed the Debye relationship (Debye 1915). However, the proper interpretation of experimental intensity profiles and their reconciliation with atomistic models of composite particles like protein-DNA complexes requires accurate predictions of the hydration layers and excluded solvent (Knight and Hub 2015; Svergun et al. 1995a) due to differences in the scattering length densities (SLDs) between protein and DNA in X-rays, as well as nonuniform hydration layers (Poitevin et al. 2011) which contribute to the overall X-ray scattering. To address these considerations, the program WAXSiS (Knight and Hub 2015) was employed to explicitly calculate the hydration layer via molecular dynamics simulation. These fits were compared to calculations performed with a more common implicit solvent model where the boundary layer is an adjustable parameter in the fitting (FoxS (Schneidman-Duhovny et al. 2016)). Using both algorithms, general agreement was observed between our atomistic models on 601 DNA and the corresponding solution scattering from 601 and α-satellite DNA containing particles, using standard Kratky plots ( $Iq^2 vs q$ ) to again place focus on middle q features (Fig. 1Dand Supplemental Fig. 2). The H3-601 particle was concordant with a canonical atomic model across scattering angles where  $q_{max} < 0.3 \text{ Å}^{-1}$ , whereas with the CENP-A-601 particle, only fine discrepancies were readily apparent, mapping primarily to peak features at ~0.1 q (corresponding to a length scale of ~63 Å, where  $d = 2\pi/q$ ,). In contrast, direct comparison of our respective canonical models to  $\alpha$ -satellite NCP data shows less concordance in middle q. While the H3- $\alpha$ Sat particle fit is somewhat concordant ( $\chi^2 =$ 0.95) with modest discrepancy most apparent near the ~0.16 q peak feature (corresponding to a length scale of ~39.3 Å), CENP-A- $\alpha$ -Sat data shows the poorest correlations overall, with the CENP-A-601 atomic model poorly matching across nearly all of the middle q regime ( $\chi^2 = 3.27$ ).

To further visualize the changes in canonical structure detected, ab initio modeling approaches were applied using the SAXS data to generate low-resolution particle envelopes of the solution average ensemble. The algorithm DENSS (Grant 2018b) allows for the reconstruction of the electron density of particles at low resolution, allowing for a real space assessment of available atomic models. We applied this algorithm to data from the four particles and the results are shown in Fig. 1E. The molecular envelopes were generated with no symmetry restraints, as to not bias the shapes derived (see Methods). Consistent with direct fitting of the experimental profiles, strong spatial correlation was observed for the H3-601 particle when the structure is docked into the calculated volume. The strongest density contours in this reconstruction correlate well with the DNA component of the models, consistent with the dominance of the DNA signal in the X-ray measurements. Relative to this result, the DENSS calculation for the CENP-A-601 particle yielded a particle shape with greater oblate character and more apparent asymmetry. Docking of the CENP-A-601 model into this SAXS-derived volume is suggestive of differences in the DNA ends of the particle, consistent with prior reports of DNA entry/ exit behavior (Conde e Silva et al. 2007), greater micrococcal nuclease sensitivity of these regions (Bloom and Carbon 1982; Falk et al. 2015; Hasson et al. 2013) and the atomic structure of CENP-A-601 (Ali-Ahmad et al. 2019; Tachiwana et al. 2011a) where these regions are entirely disordered and unresolved in the electron density. Ab initio reconstructions of H3- $\alpha$ Sat show reasonable spatial correlation with the H3-601 canonical model, and like the CENP-A-601 result, indicate asymmetry corresponding to the positioning of DNA ends when docked. The CENP-AaSat shows the greatest spatial discrepancy versus a docked canonical model, consistent with significant displacement of both DNA ends. Together, these data indicate that SAXS on NCPs in solution captures dynamic features resulting from the unique combination of histone and DNA sequences reflecting quaternary arrangements that do not coincide well with canonical models. Differences between CENP-A and H3-containing nucleosomes are consistent with flexible DNA ends previously observed by micrococcal nuclease digestion, X-ray crystallography, and cryo-electron microscopy, and are most pronounced in the CENP-A derived species.

Contrast variation small-angle neutron scattering (CV-SANS) measures the gross compositional distribution of NCPs

A strength of the SAXS approach in studying NCPs is the higher scattering power of the DNA component in X-rays and higher signal-to-noise across larger scattering angles, making it very well suited to detect differences in DNA conformation. While it is possible to entirely contrast away the protein contribution of composite particles in X-rays using excipients such as glycerol or sucrose (Chen et al. 2014; Mauney et al. 2021, 2018), such approaches limit insights attained by contrast variation to the DNA component only, as it exists in the complex via a relatively narrow window for contrast variation. Hence, SAXS alone is limited in its ability to discern the properties of the protein component of these assemblies. Contrast variation studies using small-angle neutron scattering (CV-SANS) provide a powerful complement to the X-ray approach and can provide a wider range of accessible contrast using specific mixtures of H<sub>2</sub>O and D<sub>2</sub>O. Due to the negative scattering density of H<sub>2</sub>O ( $-0.56 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Å}^{-2}$ ) compared to the positive scattering density of its isotope D<sub>2</sub>O (6.67  $\times 10^{-6}$  Å<sup>-2</sup>), it is possible to adjust the neutron scattering of an aqueous solution by mixing H<sub>2</sub>O and D<sub>2</sub>O in different ratios so that the scattering of the solution completely coincides with that of the protein  $(\sim 2-2.5 \times 10^{-6} \text{ Å}^{-2})$  or DNA component (~ 1.8–2.0  $\times 10^{-6}$  Å<sup>-2</sup>). If the solution matches the neutron scattering density of the protein, all the scattering collected will come from the DNA component and vice versa. While typically weaker in signal-to-noise for particles of the size of a nucleosome, this approach is sensitive to both composition and spatial extent and provides a direct determination of the distribution of component parts, as they relate to each other in the larger assembly. In contrast to the measurements initially made in the 1970s, more modern technology provided the opportunity to better capture intensity profiles at contrast points normally afflicted with strong incoherent scattering, thus increasing signalto-noise and allowing a wider accessible q range.

Neutron scattering data were recorded at four to five different contrast points  $(\Delta \rho)$  for each of the

four particles (Table 2). Despite the implementation of more modern technology, attempts to capture data at calculated protein or DNA-only contrasts points were limited by strong incoherent scatter at the low sample concentrations used (see Methods). Using the recorded intensities at zero angle  $(I_0)$  by SANS, calculated masses (Kuzmanovic et al. 2003) for each of the four NCPs, all samples were consistent with octameric preparations, and experimental total match points were readily determined (Supplemental Fig. 3 and Supplemental Table 1). Monodispersity was again confirmed by classical Guinier analyses (Table 2 and Supplemental Figs. 4&5). Using both the available SAXS and SANS data combined, the dependence of  $R_g$  with the contrast of the individual components and their relative positions within the composite particle was determined using classical Stuhrmann analysis:

$$R_g^2 = R_c^2 + \frac{\alpha}{\Delta\rho} - \frac{\beta}{\Delta\rho^2}$$
(1)

where  $R_c$  is the radius of gyration ( $R_o$ ) at infinite contrast (Fig. 1F). In the Stuhrmann plots derived for all four NCPs, hyperbolic relationships were apparent, within the error of the determination (Fig. 1G and Supplemental Table 3), generally consistent with canonical measurements made in 1977 and more recent reports for H3-derived nucleosomes (Hjelm et al. 1977; Sugiyama et al. 2014, 2015). The positive term for  $\alpha$  correlates with known structure where the DNA (the denser component) lies at the periphery of the complex, distal from the center-of-mass (Hjelm et al. 1977). The large terms for  $\beta$  describes the relative distribution of scattering length densities within the particle. Distinguishing more recent SANS studies and our studies from the original measurements from 1977 is the ability to model the  $\beta$  term, yielding hyperbolic rather than linear fits in the Stuhrmann plots. In all four cases, similar R<sub>c</sub> values (R<sub>g</sub> at infinite contrast) are derived, indicating that within the error associated with this approach, all four NCPs assume a similar spatial extent and gross quaternary structure in these solution conditions. The determined  $\alpha$  parameter, which describes the distribution of scattering densities relative to the center of mass, is the smallest for the CENP-A-aSat particle, suggesting the greatest changes in the denser DNA component. The term  $\beta$  derived from this fitting relates to

the separation of the mass centers of the two components. In our analysis, the determined values for  $\beta$  are the largest for the CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat, suggesting a more asymmetric positioning of the protein and DNA components relative to the center of mass when compared to canonical models. These results are consistent with the more flexible DNA in CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat sample.

Independent of atomic models, we were readily able to reconcile these contrast variation datasets with empirical core-shell cylinder models using global fitting methods as in employed in the program SASVIEW (Doucet 2017) (Supplemental Figs. 6–7 and Supplemental Table 4). Using the experimentally determined SLDs and fixing the radius of the DNA wrap, global fits to the SAXS and SANS data together to this model provided a determination of cylinder radius and length. In this analysis, similar radii (18.1 Å to 19.5 Å) were obtained. Notably, the fit length of the cylinder for the canonical H3-601 particle (59.5  $\text{\AA} \pm 2.8 \text{\AA}$ ) was markedly smaller than those determined for the other three particles (ranging from 68.6 Å  $\pm$  0.3 Å to 74.3 Å  $\pm$  0.2 Å). The length of the cylinder in this model corresponds well with the nucleosome gyre, which is the path of the DNA as it wraps around the histone protein core, on its smallest dimension. The increase in this fit parameter suggests that the particle gyre is wider in the other three particles, again suggesting a less compact particle in solution. Like with the SAXS data, it is also possible to directly test atomic models against SANS data using the Debye relationship (as implemented in the program CRYSON (Svergun et al. 1995b)), free of the consideration of solvent boundaries, and with the experimentally determined SLDs from our contrast variation data (Supplemental Figs. 6-7 and Table 2). Direct fitting reveals general concordance for most of the experimental data recorded, with the greatest discrepancies observed at the 20%  $D_2O$  (dominated by DNA) and the 70%  $D_2O$  contrast points (dominated by protein, and which were most difficult to capture and fit due to high incoherent scattering). While these results reaffirm composition distribution and the general consistency of canonical structural models to the solution scattering profiles, the SANS data lacks the resolution of our SAXS measurements needed to discern finer changes in DNA conformation, illustrating the complementarity of the two approaches.

Sedimentation velocity experiments indicate higher physical polydispersity of CENP-A containing nucleosomes

Polydispersity in a macromolecular complex can arise from differences in molecular composition (compositional polydispersity) or from variations in particle size, shape, or conformation among structurally similar species (physical polydispersity). Since  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA occurs naturally and harbors both H3 and CENP-A in chromatin, we further focused our investigation on the differences between H3 and CENP-A nucleosomes in the context of  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA while H3-601 was used as a reference where needed. To further explore biophysical differences between CENP-A and canonical nucleosomes and to confirm stoichiometry, mass and shape using an orthogonal approach we employed different modalities of analytical ultracentrifugation. To examine the possibility of dissociation of these nucleosomes into hexosomes (Kato et al. 2017), tetrasomes (Sollner-Webb et al. 1976), or other lower-order species, we performed sedimentation equilibrium analysis (SE-AUC), which can provide very precise determinations of molecular weight, independent of any shape effects. Using a mass-averaged partial buoyant density  $(\nu_{bar})$  from known composition and global fitting across multiple rotor speeds and concentrations with strict mass conservation, the masses derived closely matched those expected for DNA-wrapped histone octamers (Fig. 2A and Supplemental Tables 3&5). At these low rotor speeds, both  $\alpha$ -Sat particles had determined buoyant masses consistent with octameric NCPs, confirming that the differences observed by SAXS do not correlate to differences in composition (mass and stoichiometry). In agreement with these results and our SAXS analysis, dynamic light scattering (DLS) measurements of the  $\alpha$ -Sat particles yielded particle diameters derived from the application of the Stokes–Einstein equation (Einstein 1905) that were generally consistent with the known structure of canonical nucleosome particles and indicative of preparations of high compositional homogeneity (Fig. 2B).

Having confirmed the compositional homogeneity of particles on a biophysical level, we next interrogated the solution properties of these particles using sedimentation velocity analytical ultracentrifugation (SV-AUC). The experiment is performed at higher



**s**<sub>20,w</sub>

Fig. 2 Solution properties of nucleosomes assembled on natural  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA probed by analytical ultracentrifugation. **A&B**. Sedimentation equilibrium analytical ultracentrifugation (SE-AUC). Top panels show radial absorbance data (symbols) collected at three denoted rotor speeds fitted to singlespecies model (lines); lower panels show residuals from the model fit. With both particles, a singles species fit consistent with a DNA-wrapped octameric nucleosome was determined. Expected masses and calculated partial buoyant densities are provided in Supplemental Table 3, and masses derived from this analysis are shown in Supplemental Table 5. **C**. Sedi-

mentation velocity analytical ultracentrifugation (SV-AUC). Van Holde-Weischet analysis of SV-AUC data from H3-601 (green), H3- $\alpha$ Sat (cyan), and CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat (light red) NCPs at 25 °C. Results were normalized for s<sub>20,w</sub>. Vertical profiles distinguish homogenous species from sloping distributions which indicated heterogeneity. **D**. Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) of  $\alpha$ -satellite NCPs. Panel shows the distribution of particles of H3- $\alpha$ Sat (cyan) and CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat (light red) as a function of hydrodynamic radius, normalized for volume. The measured radius for the H3- $\alpha$ Sat particle was 43.2 Å vs an effective radius of 50.8 Å for CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat

			Guinier			GNOM	GNOM			
Sample	% D <sub>2</sub> O	Conc (mg/mL)	$\overline{qR_g}$	$R_{g}(A)$	$I_0(cm^{-1})$	$\overline{R_{g}}(\text{\AA})$	$I_0 (cm^{-1})$	D <sub>max</sub> (Å)	T.E	$\chi^2$
ORNL CG-3										
H3—601	0%	1.0	0.57-1.34	$48.3 \pm 3.0$	$0.15 \pm 0.006$	45.5	0.14	135	0.860	1.7
	20%	1.9	0.40-1.28	$38.6 \pm 2.9$	$0.08 \pm 0.003$	42.9	0.08	102	0.777	3.1
	80%	1.0	0.23-1.26	$34.1 \pm 3.2$	$0.04 \pm 0.002$	37.3	0.04	91	0.878	0.9
	90%	1.0	0.53-1.31	$34.6 \pm 1.4$	$0.08 \pm 0.002$	33.9	0.08	90	0.932	3.1
CENP-A—601	0%	1.0	0.47-1.40	$42.5\pm2.1$	$0.13 \pm 0.004$	41.9	0.13	110	0.994	1.2
	20%	2.4	0.49-1.41	$41.6 \pm 1.9$	$0.12 \pm 0.003$	46.3	0.12	132	0.826	3.1
	80%	1.0	0.44-1.54	$37.3 \pm 2.6$	$0.04 \pm 0.002$	38.1	0.04	119	0.900	0.6
	90%	1.0	0.38-1.26	$34.7 \pm 1.5$	$0.08 \pm 0.002$	35.9	0.08	110	0.996	0.7
NIST NG-3										
H3—αSat	0%	0.8	0.45-1.25	$44.3 \pm 2.4$	$0.11 \pm 0.004$	40.0	0.11	119	0.967	1.0
	20%	0.8	0.41-1.29	$41.2 \pm 1.8$	$0.08 \pm 0.002$	42.1	0.08	129	0.938	0.9
	70%	2.0	0.29-1.28	$34.2 \pm 1.8$	$0.02 \pm 0.001$	43.1	0.03	108	0.505	6.8
	80%	0.8	0.50-1.23	$32.9 \pm 1.6$	$0.03 \pm 0.001$	34.5	0.03	96	0.917	2.0
	90%	0.7	0.37-1.27	$38.2 \pm 1.5$	$0.08 \pm 0.002$	34.1	0.07	103	0.893	0.9
CENP-A—αSat	0%	0.7	0.66 -1.35	$38.1 \pm 2.9$	$0.09 \pm 0.005$	39.9	0.09	110	0.976	0.9
	20%	0.7	0.59–1.39	$44.4 \pm 5.8$	$0.05 \pm 0.005$	44.7	0.05	117	0.970	0.9
	70%	2.0	0.44-1.33	$30.0\pm1.7$	$0.04 \pm 0.001$	32.0	0.04	106	0.949	1.4
	80%	0.7	0.67-1.24	$40.7\pm5.4$	$0.03 \pm 0.003$	39.1	0.04	116	0.974	0.8
	90%	0.8	0.32-1.30	$34.4 \pm 1.3$	$0.08 \pm 0.002$	37.3	0.04	107	0.701	0.8

 Table 2
 Parameters derived from Small-angle Neutron Scattering (SANS) analysis

rotor speeds (and hence g forces) and in conditions known to be optimal for nucleosome integrity (e.g. low ionic strength, ambient temperature). The sedimentation coefficient is a hydrodynamic parameter that is sensitive to the size, shape, and density of particles in solution (Svedberg and Pedersen 1940). A model-independent van Holde-Weischet analysis (Vanholde and Weischet 1978) was employed to evaluate the monodispersity of these particles with minimal diffusion effects. The sedimentation properties observed by SV-AUC for the H3-601 particle agreed well with its atomic structure ( $s_{20 w}$  of 11.7  $\pm 0.9$  for H3-601, representative of three independent trials, versus a calculated value of 10.9)(Fig. 2C). Similarly, H3 histone octamer wrapped in  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA displayed vertical profile by this analysis indicative of monodispersity ( $s_{20,w}$  of 11.2  $\pm$  0.2, representative of three independent trials). However, while the average s value obtained was similar (s<sub>20,w</sub> of 10.9  $\pm$  0.2), the CENP-A-aSat particles displayed more polydispersity as evidenced by broader s distributions relative to the other particles assessed. Taken together with our SAS analyses, these data further indicate that the differences in solution properties observed by SAXS and AUC map not to differences in stoichiometry but physical differences in shape.

The reversible assembly of NCPs under high pressure

While physical polydispersity for CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat NCPs in these SV-AUC experiments relative to other NCPs is apparent, that property was less pronounced in other complementary measures. A factor that distinguishes SV-AUC from these other methods employed is the occurrence of hydrostatic pressure under conditions of high centrifugal force. At the bottom of a SV-AUC cell at 40,000 RPM, calculated pressures upwards of ~1.7 MPa are predicted (Schuck 2016) (whereas standard atmospheric pressure is ~0.1 MPa). It has already been shown that histone octamers in isolation are sensitive to hydrostatic pressure (Scarlata et al. 1989; Silva et al. 1993). To more directly investigate the possibility that pressure can affect NCP structure in

solution, we turned to the high-pressure SAXS (HP-SAXS) resource at the Cornell High Energy Synchrotron Source (XBio Beamline) (Gillilan 2022a). Hydrostatic pressure, when systematically applied, is a robust and powerful tool to explore reversible changes in macromolecular structure without the need for chemical excipients or mutations (Silva et al. 2014). Here, the goal was to better understand the differences in NCP structure and stability on authentic  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA for H3 and CENP-A nucleosomes as a function of applied pressure.

We first examined the pressure-induced changes in H3- $\alpha$ Sat structure at room temperature in 100 MPa increments, starting at 5 MPa and arriving at 300 MPa, followed by cycling between the two extremes (Fig. 3A). At each pressure, the samples were allowed to equilibrate for five minutes before SAXS data collection. The structural properties obtained from this analysis are summarized in Table 1 and the primary data shown in Fig. 3B. As pressure was incrementally applied, changes in Rg and Dmax were readily observed. Concomitant with the increases in  $R_{\scriptscriptstyle \sigma}$ and D<sub>max</sub>, dimensionless Kratky plot analysis shows a steady transition away from a compact macromolecule to a more distended polymer as pressure increased, suggestive of unwrapping and disassembly of the NCP (Fig. 3C, Table 1). To visualize these changes in shape, we performed ab initio electron density calculations using the program DENSS at each condition of pressure for both particles and a canonical model manually docked in to illustrate discrepancies in structure (Fig. 3D and Supplemental Fig. 7). In the H3- $\alpha$ Sat particles, the oblate ellipsoidal character of the initial particles at ambient pressure are modestly retained up to 200 MPa. The simplest interpretation of these data is that the progressive unwrapping of the DNA ends of the NCPs increases the spatial extent along the plane perpendicular to the short axis of rotation. At 300 MPa the particles undergo a dramatic shift to larger  $R_{\rm g}$  and  $D_{\rm max}$  values, indicating a more dramatic unfolding (Fig. 4 & Table 1). DENSS calculations were not employed at the most extreme pressures (300 MPa) because of the conditions where  $q_{min} > \pi/D_{max}$ , where  $R_g$  is too large relative to q<sub>min</sub>, truncating the Guinier region, and the Kratky profiles indicating a significant degree of flexibility/unfolded character. Pressure cycling directly between 300 and 5 MPa was performed at the same time intervals and compared to the initial scattering profiles. Strikingly, the particle reverted to nearly its initial state, although the recovered  $R_g$  and  $D_{max}$  were always slighter higher for both particles, suggestive of hysteresis behavior: the "swelling" observed can be attributed to pressure-induced hydration effects, where interatomic contacts were replaced with water molecules, causing incorrect reassembly and folding (Silva et al. 2014). This is further supported by the disparities observed in P(r) analysis from the same data, including ( $D_{max}$ ) (Table 1).

CENP-A nucleosomes also reversibly disassemble under pressure but display different properties at the most extreme pressures

Using the same pressure method, we next examined the CENP-A- $\alpha$ Sat particle (Fig. 4A). In contrast to the H3 result, we observe somewhat larger increases in R<sub>g</sub> and D<sub>max</sub> when pressure was applied through 200 MPa (Fig. 4B&C), consistent with the unwrapping of the DNA. However, at 300 MPa the CENP-A particle adopts a much more compact structure than H3 nucleosomes (Fig. 4D). Yet surprisingly, normalized Kratky plot analysis indicates the transition to an entirely unfolded polymer at 300 MPa. Because of the lack of contrast, we cannot directly distinguish unfolded protein from unfolded nucleic acid, although in X-rays, it is expected that nucleic acid will dominate the signal. This contrasts with the H3- $\alpha$ Sat result where some evidence of globularity is retained (Fig. 3C). In agreement with these observations, DENSS analysis of the CENP-A-aSat particle data displays a more dramatic transition to a prolate ellipsoid form as pressure is increased (Fig. 4F). For both particles, the observed  $I_0$  at the final pressure cycle back to the 5 MPa measurement condition suggests that sample mass was preserved throughout the experiment.

#### Discussion

Our experiments revealed several similarities and differences between the solution behavior of conventional nucleosomes and their centromeric counterparts. SAXS and SANS performed at ambient pressure provide a view, albeit at lower resolution than



crystallography or cryo-EM, of a generally shared NCP architecture in solution. Differences, potentially attributable to pressures under centrifugal force that exceed ambient pressure by more than an order of magnitude, are measurable via AUC between nucleosome types. NCP distortions under very high pressure (two additional orders of magnitude higher than in the AUC) lead to the most pronounced differences between nucleosomes containing the canonical histones versus histones where CENP-A replaces conventional histone H3.

The high degree of reversibility of NCP distortion at high pressures is very surprising and will stimulate further use HP-SAXS for studies of a Fig. 3 High-Pressure SAXS reveals reversible deformation of H3 NCPs assembled with  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA. A. High pressure strategy (grey line and closed circle) is shown, with recorded R<sub>g</sub> as determined by GNOM analysis at each pressure point shown as a cyan closed triangle. B. Pressure-dependent SAXS profiles from H3-αSat, scaled arbitrarily along the y-axis. C. Normalized Kratky Plot analysis, showing the changes in the particle structure as a function of pressure, with the black arrow showing the trend with pressure. At the highest pressure, the particle retains some degree of folded character. D.DENSS analysis of  $\alpha$ -satellite NCPs as a function of pressure. Shown in orthogonal views are DENSS reconstructions of H3-aSAT at different pressures, showing an oblate ellipsoidal character preserved through to the highest pressure. For reference, a canonical H3-601 atomic model is shown. Rg and Dmax as determined by GNOM analysis are provided for each pressure point (Table 1). Asterisks denote spatial discrepancies between the experimental volumes and idealized models that correlate strongly to changes in DNA end positioning. Electron density is colored with five contour levels of density rendered with these respective colors:  $15\sigma$  (red),  $10\sigma$  (green),  $5\sigma$  (cyan), 2.5 $\sigma$  (blue), and  $-0.7\sigma$  (blue). The sigma ( $\sigma$ ) level denotes the standard deviation above the average electron density value of the generated volume. Where denoted, "0 MPa" refers to measurements made at ambient pressures (0.1013 MPa)) Supplemental Fig. 8 provides the reconstructions without atomic models docked

variety of types of nucleosomes (and perhaps other chromatin complexes). The increase in  $R_g$  and D<sub>max</sub> with increasing pressure correlates with a type of deformation and denaturation of the particle that is to be expected, but the ability of the particles to return to almost their original 3D shape indicates that the NCPs are robust, energetically optimized protein-DNA structures with a stable and self-directed structure. Of note, the magnitude of R<sub>o</sub>s observed at 300 MPa is similar to the magnitude observed by salt-induced dissociation of nucleosomes previously reported by time-resolved SAXS (TR-SAXS) measurements on NCPs, where protein signal was contrasted away with 50% sucrose and disassembly is monitored (Chen et al. 2017, 2014). The  $R_g$  and  $D_{max}$  observed for the H3- $\alpha$ Sat particle at this extreme is entirely consistent with what would be calculated for a fully extended 147 bp B-form DNA using Flory's Law (Caillet and Claverie 1974) ( $R_g$  of ~144 Å,  $D_{max}$ of ~500 Å). While our experiments do not leverage sucrose for total protein matching, we still expect the signal to still be dominated by the DNA scattering ( $\Delta \rho_{DNA}$  of 220 e<sup>-</sup>/nm<sup>3</sup> vs  $\Delta \rho_{protein}$  of 90  $e^{-/nm^3}$ ). The difference in high pressure-induced deformation at 300 MPa between H3 NCPs and CENP-A NCPs has two seemingly contradictory findings: CENP-A has a more extended shape but smaller  $R_g$  and  $D_{max}$ . A potential explanation is that CENP-A NCPs completely but reversibly dissociate some histone subunits at very high pressures, while H3 NCPs remain octameric at high pressures.

High pressure studies are directly relevant to considerations of deep-sea life. Deep-sea life comprises a major percentage of the planet's total biomass (Bar-On et al. 2018), and includes species of prokaryotes and archaea with chromatinlike assemblies (Henneman et al. 2018; Takai and Horikoshi 1999; Yamaguchi et al. 2012) and eukaryotes that have adapted their chromatin to function at extreme temperatures (both near 0 °C and exceeding 50 °C), pressures, and ionic strength (dissolved salts upwards of ~1 M)(Gage and Tyler 1991). Little is known about this aspect of deepsea life on a biochemical, biophysical, and structural level, and such insights would inform our broader understanding of chromatin structure and dynamics across all species of life. HP-SAXS is uniquely poised to directly interrogate the physical properties of these biological assemblies in nativelike conditions (Gillilan 2022b). The pressures achievable at the Cornell CHESS SAXS resource well exceed those pressures encountered by deep sea life at up to ~10 km depths (~ 100 MPa), providing the opportunity to probe the stability, disassembly, and reassembly of chromatin and chromatin-like structures as was performed here in this study, and to determine how nature has evolved these assemblies to persist in extreme conditions.

In closing, we highlight that nucleosomes in a chromosome undergoing biological processes are encountering forces that may (or are known to) distort and dissociate them. These include DNA metabolic processes (replication and transcription), chromatin disassembly and remodeling by ATPases, spindle forces at cell division, nuclear deformation in tissues under mechanical stress, and more. The methodologies and findings described in this study provide further approaches and understanding into this challenging aspect of chromosome studies.



◄Fig. 4 High-Pressure SAXS of CENP-A NCPs assembled with a-satellite DNA reveals distinct behaviors upon reversible deformation relative to H3 NCPs. A. Pressure-dependent SAXS profiles from CENP-A-aSat, scaled arbitrarily along the y-axis. B&C. Variation in  $R_{\rm g}$  and maximum dimension as a function of pressure for H3-aSat (light red) and CENP-A-aSat (cyan). D. Stacked bar graph showing the reversible behavior under pressure for two iterations of changes in pressure from 300 to 5 MPa. H3-αSat particles (shown in cyan) show a greater change in spatial extent versus the CENP-AaSat particle (light red). E. Normalized Kratky Plot analysis, showing the changes in the particle structure as a function of pressure. At the highest pressure and unlike the H3- $\alpha$ SAT particle, CENP-A-aSat particle loses all folded character. **F.** DENSS analysis of CENP-A- $\alpha$ -Sat NCPs as a function of pressure. Shown in orthogonal views are DENSS reconstructions of CENP-A-αSAT at different pressures. For reference, a canonical H3-601 atomic model is shown. A transition from an oblate to elongated prolate particle is observed. Rg and Dmax as determined by GNOM analysis are provided for each pressure point (Table 1). Asterisks denote spatial discrepancies between the experimental volumes and idealized models that correlate strongly to changes in DNA end positioning. Electron density is colored with five contour levels of density rendered with these respective colors:  $15\sigma$  (red),  $10\sigma$  (green),  $5\sigma$  (cyan), 2.5 $\sigma$  (blue), and -0.7 $\sigma$  (blue). The sigma ( $\sigma$ ) level denotes the standard deviation above the average electron density value of the generated volume. Where denoted, "0 MPa" refers to measurements made at ambient pressures (0.1013 MPa). Supplemental Fig. 8 provides the reconstructions without atomic models docked

#### Methods

Preparation of reconstituted mononucleosomes

Reconstituted mononucleosomes were prepared as previously described using recombinant histones and DNAs (Sekulic and Black 2016). The following DNA sequences were used:

DNA	Sequence
601 (Widom)	ATCAGAATCCCGGTGCCGAGG CCGCTCAATTGGTCGTAGACA GCTCTAGCACCGCTTAAACGC ACGTACGCGCTGTCCCCCGCG TTTTAACCGCCAAGGGATTA CTCCCTAGTCTCCAGGCACGT GTCAGATATATACATCGAT
α-satellite (Harp et al. 1996)	ATCAATATCCACCTGCAGATT CTACCAAAAGTGTATTTGGAA ACTGCTCCATCAAAAGGCATG TTCAGCTCTGTGAGTGAAACT CCATCATCACAAAGAATATTC TGAGAATGCTTCCGTTTGCCT TTTATATGAACTTCCTGAT

Reconstituted nucleosomes were uniformly positioned on sequences by thermal shifting (heating at 55 °C for two hours). After this, nucleosomes were separated from free DNA, nucleosomes with alternative positions on the DNA and higher-order aggregates using 5% preparative native gel electrophoresis (PrepCell 491, (37 mm diameter ×7 cm height), Bio-Rad, Hercules, California, USA). The histone composition and stoichiometry were verified with 2D-PAGE (Supplemental Fig. 1). Finally, samples were dialyzed into 20 mM potassium cacodylate pH 7.0 and 1 mM EDTA for all SANS experiments or 20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, and 1 mM DTT for all other biophysical analyses described herein. Sample concentrations were determined using Bradford Assay (Bradford 1976) and by measuring absorbance at 260 nm (DNA) in clean nucleosome samples.

Dynamic light scattering

Samples at 0.3 mg/mL concentration were analyzed using a Nanobrook Omni particle sizer (Brookhaven Instruments Corporation, Holtsville, NY, USA). Data were recorded at 25 °C in polystyrene 1-cm cells using a standard diode laser at 640 nm, with scattering recorded at an angle of 90°. Three scans were recorded for each sample and hydrodynamic radii (Stokes radii,  $R_s$ ) were calculated using the BIC Particle Solutions software v3.6.0.7122.

Sedimentation equilibrium (SE) and sedimentation velocity (SV) analytical ultracentrifugation

Analytical ultracentrifugation experiments were performed with an XL-A analytical ultracentrifuge or Optima (Beckman-Coulter, Indianapolis, IN, USA) and a TiAn60 rotor with six-channel (for SE) or twochannel (for SV) charcoal-filled epon centerpieces and quartz or sapphire windows. SE data were collected at 4 °C with detection at 260 nm for three sample concentrations. SE analyses were carried out using global fits to data acquired at multiple speeds for each concentration with strict mass conservation using the program SEDPHAT (25). Error estimates for masses derived with mass-averaged partial specific volumes ( $v_{bar}$ ) were determined from a 1,000-iteration Monte Carlo simulation. A partial specific volume value for the different particles examined were calculated by the program MuLCH (Whitten et al. 2008a) based on chemical composition.

Complete SV profiles were recorded on samples  $(OD_{260nm} \text{ of } 0.5-1.0)$  every 30 s at 260 nm for 50–200 boundaries at 26,000 rpm. Selected boundaries from the dataset were analyzed using the program SEDFIT to generate van Holde-Weischet plots. Solvent density was determined gravimetrically at room temperature (d = 1.01 g/mL ±0.01 g/mL), and a viscosity of  $\eta$ = 0.001 poise was used in all analyses.

#### Experimental considerations for SAXS analysis

Several experimental considerations were made and optimized for this study. The intensity of scatter from a particle can be expressed as:

$$I(q) \propto \frac{N}{V} V_{\text{particle}}^2 (\Delta \rho)^2 FF(q) S(q)$$
(1)

where  $\frac{N}{V}$  is the number of proteins per unit volume (concentration),  $V_{\text{particle}}$  is the volume of the individual particle,  $\Delta \rho$  the contrast, FF(q) is the form factor, or scattering component from a single particle rotationally averaged, and S(q) is the interparticle structure factor.

Because of the relatively electron-rich nucleic acid component comprising the bulk of this particle's mass and exterior and the particles relatively large size, we found that relatively low sample concentrations of particle (~ 0.75 mg/mL-1.5 mg/mL) provided measurable scatter at both synchrotron sources and with a rotating anode X-ray source, and with experimental neutron sources, as intensity of scattering varies as the square of volume (Eq. 1)). The added benefit of working with samples at these relatively dilute concentrations is the minimization of any potential interparticle interference (*S*(*q*)) that could confound structural analysis.

#### Small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS) data collection

X-ray scattering data were measured on at two different synchrotron sources: beamline CHEX at the Cornell University High Energy Synchrotron Source (Acerbo et al. 2015; Skou et al. 2014) (CHESS Ithaca, NY) and beamline SIBYLS at the Advanced Light Source (Hura et al. 2009). Data were also recorded using a rotating anode SAXS instrument as described previously. In all cases, the forward scattering from the samples studied was recorded on a CCD or multiwire detector and circularly averaged to yield one-dimensional intensity profiles as a function of q ( $q = 4\pi \sin\theta/\lambda$ , where 2 $\theta$  is the scattering angle). Samples were centrifuged at 10,000  $\times$ g for three min at 4 °C prior to 0.5 s – 20 s X-ray exposures at 20 °C. Scattering from a matching buffer solution was subtracted from the data and corrected for the incident intensity of X-rays. Replicate exposures were examined carefully for evidence of radiation damage by Guinier analysis and Kratky plot analysis. Silver behenate powder was used to locate the beam center and to calibrate the sample-to-detector distance. All the preparations analyzed were monodisperse, as evidenced by linearity in the Guinier region of the scattering data (where  $qR_g \le 1.2$ ) and agreement of the I<sub>0</sub> and R<sub>g</sub> values determined with inverse Fourier transform analyses using the program GNOM (Svergun 1992). Experimental details unique to each X-ray source are provided in Supplemental Methods.

Small-angle neutron scattering (SANS) data collection

Neutron scattering data were measured at two different research reactor locations: beamline NG-3 of the National Institutes of Standards and Technology (NIST) Center for Neutron Research (Glinka et al. 1998), and beamline CG-3 of the Oak Ridge National Laboratories High Flux Isotope Reactor (HFIR) (Heller et al. 2008). Experimental details unique to each beamline are provided in Supplemental Methods. Samples were prepared by dialysis at 4 °C against matching buffers (20 mM potassium cacodylate pH 7.0 and 1 mM EDTA) containing 0%, 20%, 70%, 80%, or 95% D<sub>2</sub>O for a minimum of three hours across a 6-8 kD cutoff membrane (D-tube dialyzer (Novagen)). Samples were centrifuged at  $10,000 \times g$ for three min at 4 °C and then loaded into Hellma quartz cylindrical cells (outer diameter of 22 mm) with either 2-mm (for 95% and 80% D<sub>2</sub>O) or 1-mm pathlengths (70%, 20%, and 0% D<sub>2</sub>O). Before and during the experiment the samples were maintained at 6 °C. Sample concentrations for the SANS measurements were determined by Bradford analysis and are shown in Table 2. At both locations, scattering neutrons were detected with a two-dimensional positionsensitive detector and data reductions are performed using beamline-specific software. Raw counts were normalized for incident intensity and corrected for empty cell counts, ambient room background counts, and non-uniform detector response. Data were placed on an absolute scale and radially averaged to produce one-dimensional scattered intensity I(q) versus q profiles. Data collection times varied from 0.5 to 5 h depending on the instrument configuration, sample concentration, and amount of D<sub>2</sub>O present in the sample. Multiple sample-to-detector distances were employed, and data were merged to create the final scattering profile for data analysis. At both locations, a wavelength of 6 Å and with a spread of 0.15 was employed. We observed good agreement between R<sub>g</sub> and I<sub>0</sub> determined from inverse Fourier analysis using GNOM and that determined by classical Guinier analysis (Guinier 1939). The program MuLCH (Whitten et al. 2008b) was used to calculate theoretical contrast and to initially analyze contrast variation data, assuming  $\sim 50\%$  proton exchange based on previously reported hydrogen-deuterium mass spectrometry studies (Sekulic et al. 2010). Stuhrmann plot analyses were performed manually using Origin version 2024b (Originlab Corp., Northampton, MA, USA). All of the preparations analyzed were monodisperse, as evidenced by linearity of  $sqrt(I_0/c)$  versus fractional D<sub>2</sub>O plots (See Supplemental Fig. 3) and by comparison of the linear Guinier region of the scattering data with the  $I_0$  and  $R_{g}$  values determined with inverse Fourier transform analysis by the programs GNOM (Semenyuk and Svergun 1991) (Table 2). Additional experimental details specific to each location are provided in Supplemental Methods.

Molecular mass calculations from contrast variation SANS data

The scattered intensities from the protein-DNA complexes were decomposed into the scattering from their components,  $I_{PROT}(q)$  and  $I_{RNA}(q)$ , using the equation (Kuzmanovic et al. 2003):

$$I(q) = \Delta \rho_{PROT^{2}} I_{PROT}(q) + \Delta \rho_{PROT} \Delta \rho_{DNA} I_{PROT-DNA}(q) + \Delta \rho_{PROT^{2}} I_{DNA}(q)$$
(2)

where  $\Delta \rho = (\rho - \rho_s)$  is the contrast, or the difference between the scattering length density of the molecule ( $\rho$ ) and the solvent ( $\rho_s$ ). The cross-term, I<sub>PROTDNA</sub>(q), represents the interference function between the protein and DNA components. The known quantities in Eq. 1 are  $\Delta \rho_{PROT}$  and  $\Delta \rho_{RNA}$  and the unknowns are  $I_{PROT}(q)$ ,  $I_{DNA}(q)$ , and  $I_{PROTDNA}(q)$ . Since measurements were made at four-five different contrasts, or  $D_2O/H_2O$  buffer conditions, there is sufficient information to solve for the three unknown component intensities from the set of simultaneous equations for I(q) at each contrast:

$$\left[\frac{I(0)}{n}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{|\Delta\rho PROT|}{N_a d_{prot}} MW_{PROT} + \frac{|\Delta\rho DNA|}{N_a d_{DNA}} MW_{DNA}$$
(3)

where  $N_a$  is Avogadro's number,  $\Delta \rho$  is the calculated net scattering length density, and d is the mass density, where  $d_{prot} = 1.35$  g/cm<sup>3</sup> and  $d_{DNA} = 1.69$  g/cm<sup>3</sup>. The I<sub>0</sub> values in absolute units (cm<sup>-1</sup>) obtained from the GNOM analysis of the data for each D<sub>2</sub>O/H<sub>2</sub>O buffer are used with the measured number densities to solve the set of simultaneous equations for these two unknowns to obtain the MW values for the protein and DNA components (MW<sub>PROT</sub> and MW<sub>DNA</sub>) separately in the nucleosome particle, where the total MW value is then the sum of the two component MW values. Our contrast calculations assume 50% of acidic proteins accessible by solvent (Sekulic et al. 2010).

#### Molecular modeling

Complete atomistic models of the canonical nucleosome are derived from the crystal structure of canonical nucleosome on the 145 bp long Widom 601 sequence (PDB ID 3LZ0 (Vasudevan et al. 2010)). The model the CENP-A nucleosome was derived from the crystal structure of CENP-A nucleosome on the 147 bp engineered palindromic  $\alpha$ -satellite DNA (PDB ID 3AN2). For modeling, the DNA sequence was mutated to the 145 bp Widom 601 sequence. Missing sequences at the N and C-termini of the respective histone components were modelled as unstructured coils with known amino acid sequences. The NAMD (Phillips et al. 2020) program employing CHARMM43 forcefields was used to perform molecular dynamics. The resulting model was gradually relaxed by energy minimization and subsequent simulation in a box of water. Tails alone were relaxed further in vacuo for 1000 fs to collapse their position. The models shown were rendered using the program PyMOL 2.5.2 Molecular Graphics System (Schrodinger, LLC, New Your, NY). Hullrad (Fleming and Fleming 2018) and WinHYDRPRO (Garcia De La Torre et al. 2000) were used to calculate the predicted hydrodynamic properties of these atomic models.

# High pressure small-angle X-ray scattering (HP-SAXS)

HP-SAXS experiments were conducted on beamline ID7 A1 at the Cornell High Energy Synchrotron Source (CHESS) using a hydrostatic pressure cell with a maximum operating pressure of 400 MPa (Acerbo et al. 2015; Skou et al. 2014). Samples were prepared at a concentration of 1.2 mg/mL and centrifuged at 10,000 × g for three minutes at 4 °C prior to measurement. The sample (40  $\mu$ L) was filled into a disposable acrylic polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) sample cell and sealed with high-vacuum grease (Dow Corning, Midland, MI, USA), which acted as a freely moving piston to equilibrate the sample to the surrounding pressure medium (water). The HP-SAXS cell design has been described in the literature (Rai et al. 2021).

Hydrostatic pressure cycles were performed at 25 °C and between ambient pressure (0.1013 MPa, labelled "0 MPa" in figures) to 300 MPa in increments of 100 MPa. At each pressure, the sample was allowed to equilibrate for five minutes before collecting the SAXS data. The beam was blocked during equilibration to prevent radiation damage. For individual measurements, the sample was exposed for a total of 10 s (10 exposures of 1 s each). The matched buffer blanks were measured at identical pressures for proper background subtraction. The photon energy of the X-ray beam was 14.09 keV (0.8788 Å) at  $1.6 \times 10^{11}$  photons/second with a standard beam size (250  $\mu$ m × 250  $\mu$ m). The data were collected using an EIGER X 4 M detector (DECTRIS, Switzerland) with a pixel size of 75  $\mu$ m × 75  $\mu$ m and an active area of 155.2 × 162.5 mm. The sample-to-detector distance was 1.772 m, with the SAXS detector covering a collected q range of 0.0083 Å<sup>-1</sup> < q < 0.6925 Å<sup>-1</sup>. The wavevector is defined as  $q = (4\pi/\lambda) \sin \theta$ , where  $2\theta$  is the scattering angle and  $\lambda$  is the wavelength of the incident radiation (Table 1). All data were reduced and analyzed using the program RAW (Hopkins 2024).

*Ab initio* electron density reconstruction using DENSS

DENSS (Grant 2018a) was used to calculate the abinitio electron density directly from GNOM (Svergun 1992) outputs, as implemented in the program RAW. Twenty reconstructions of electron density were performed in the slow mode with default parameters and subsequently averaged and refined with no symmetry restraints. Reconstructions were visualized using either UCSF ChimeraX (Meng et al. 2023), or PyMOL 2.5.2 Molecular Graphics System (DeLano n.d.) (Schrodinger, LLC, New Your, NY) with five contour levels of density rendered with these respective colors:  $15\sigma$  (red),  $10\sigma$  (green),  $5\sigma$  (cyan),  $2.5\sigma$ (blue), and  $-0.7\sigma$  (blue). The sigma ( $\sigma$ ) level denotes the standard deviation above the average electron density value of the generated volume. DENSS calculations were not employed at the most extreme pressures (300 MPa) because of the conditions where  $q_{min} > \pi/D_{max}$ , where  $R_g$  is too large relative to  $q_{min}$ , truncating the Guinier region, and the Kratky profiles indicating a high degree of flexibility/unfolded character, all which would lead to inaccurate results.

Acknowledgements We thank Steven Stayrook (Penn), and Qian Shuo and Sai Pengali (ORNL) for their technical assistance. We thank Jochen Hub (Georg-August-University, Germany) for adjustments made to the WAXIS server to accommodate our structural models. We also thank Thomas Grant (University of Buffalo) for helpful discussions regarding the application of DENSS.

Author contributions Conceptualization: Kushol Gupta, Nikolina Sekulić, Gregory D. Van Duyne, Ben E. Black; Methodology: Kushol Gupta, Nikolina Sekulić, Susan Krueger, Joseph Curtis, Richard E. Gillilan, Reidar Lund; Formal analysis and investigation: Kushol Gupta, Nikolina Sekulić, Praveen Kumar Allu, Nicklas Sapp, Qingqiu Huang, Kathryn Sarachan, Mikkel Christensen, Susan Krueger; Writing—original draft preparation: Kushol Gupta, Nikolina Sekulic, Ben E. Black; Writing—review and editing: Kushol Gupta, Nikolina Sekulić, Praveen Kumar Allu, Nicklas Sapp, Qingqiu Huang, Kathryn Sarachan, Susan Krueger, Joseph Curtis, Richard E. Gillilan, Reidar Lund, Gregory D. Van Duyne, Ben E. Black; Funding acquisition: Gregory D. Van Duyne, Ben E. Black. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

**Funding** This work was supported by NIH grant GM130302 (B.E.B.). K.G. additionally acknowledges support of the Johnson Research Foundation. N.S. was supported by a American Cancer Society Postdoctoral Fellowship while at UPenn and by NCMBM and Norwegian Research Council grants 187615 and 325528 while at NCMBM. M.C. was funded by NCMBM collaborative funding. Analytical ultracentrifugation, SAXS, and dynamic light scattering were performed at the Johnson Foundation Structural

Biology and Biophysics Core at the Perelman School of Medicine (Philadelphia, PA) with the support of an NIH High-End Instrumentation Grant (S10-OD030413). A portion of this research used resources at the High Flux Isotope Reactor, a DOE Office of Science User Facility operated by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. This work also utilized facilities supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Agreement No. DMR-1508249. We acknowledge the support of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, U.S. Department of Commerce, in also providing neutron research facilities used in this work. Certain commercial equipment, instruments, or materials (or suppliers, or software are identified in this paper to foster understanding. Such identification does not imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor does it imply that the materials or equipment identified are necessarily the best available for the purpose. Parts of this work were conducted at the Advanced Light Source (ALS), a national user facility operated by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory on behalf of the Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences, through the Integrated Diffraction Analysis Technologies (IDAT) program, supported by DOE Office of Biological and Environmental Research. Additional support comes from the National Institute of Health project ALS-ENABLE (P30 GM124169) and a High-End Instrumentation Grant S10OD018483. This work is based in part on research conducted at the Center for High-Energy X-ray Sciences (CHEXS), which is supported by the National Science Foundation (BIO, ENG and MPS Directorates) under award DMR-2342336, and the Macromolecular Diffraction at CHESS (MacCHESS) facility, which is supported by award 1-P30-GM124166 from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, and the National Institutes of Health.

**Data availability** Several structure coordinates available in the PDB database were used in the present studies, which can be located under accession numbers: PDB ID 3LZ0 (Kato et al. 2011) and PDB ID 3AN2 (Tachiwana et al. 2011), X-ray and Neutron scattering profiles will be made available at the SASDB upon publication. All other data will be made available upon request.

#### Declarations

Ethical approval Not Applicable.

Consent to participate Not Applicable.

Consent for publication Not Applicable.

**Competing interests** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated

otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

#### References

- Acerbo AS, Cook MJ, Gillilan RE (2015) Upgrade of Mac-CHESS facility for X-ray scattering of biological macromolecules in solution. J Synchrotron Radiat 22:180–186
- Ali-Ahmad A, Bilokapic S, Schafer IB, Halic M, Sekulic N (2019) CENP-C unwraps the human CENP-A nucleosome through the H2A C-terminal tail. EMBO Rep 20:e48913
- Allu PK, Dawicki-McKenna JM, Van Eeuwen T, Slavin M, Braitbard M, Xu C, Kalisman N, Murakami K, Black BE (2019) Structure of the human core centromeric nucleosome complex. Curr Biol 29:2625-2639 e2625
- Arimura Y, Shirayama K, Horikoshi N, Fujita R, Taguchi H, Kagawa W, Fukagawa T, Almouzni G, Kurumizaka H (2014) Crystal structure and stable property of the cancer-associated heterotypic nucleosome containing CENP-A and H3.3. Sci Rep 4:7115
- Ariyoshi M, Makino F, Watanabe R, Nakagawa R, Kato T, Namba K, Arimura Y, Fujita R, Kurumizaka H, Okumura EI, Hara M, Fukagawa T (2021) Cryo-EM structure of the CENP-A nucleosome in complex with phosphorylated CENP-C. EMBO J 40:e105671
- Ashkar R, Bilheux HZ, Bordallo H, Briber R, Callaway DJE, Cheng X, Chu XQ, Curtis JE, Dadmun M, Fenimore P, Fushman D, Gabel F, Gupta K, Herberle F, Heinrich F, Hong L, Katsaras J, Kelman Z, Kharlampieva E, Kneller GR, Kovalevsky A, Krueger S, Langan P, Lieberman R, Liu Y, Losche M, Lyman E, Mao Y, Marino J, Mattos C, Meilleur F, Moody P, Nickels JD, O'Dell WB, O'Neill H, Perez-Salas U, Peters J, Petridis L, Sokolov AP, Stanley C, Wagner N, Weinrich M, Weiss K, Wymore T, Zhang Y, Smith JC (2018) Neutron scattering in the biological sciences: progress and prospects. Acta Crystallogr D Struct Biol 74:1129–1168
- Baldwin JP, Boseley PG, Bradbury EM, Ibel K (1975) The subunit structure of the eukaryotic chromosome. Nature 253:245–249
- Bar-On YM, Phillips R, Milo R (2018) The biomass distribution on Earth. Proc Natl Acad Sci 115:6506–6511
- Black BE, Foltz DR, Chakravarthy S, Luger K, Woods VL Jr, Cleveland DW (2004) Structural determinants for generating centromeric chromatin. Nature 430:578–582
- Black BE, Brock MA, Bédard S, Woods VL Jr, Cleveland DW (2007) An epigenetic mark generated by the incorporation of CENP-A into centromeric nucleosomes. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 104:5008–5013
- Bloom KS, Carbon J (1982) Yeast centromere DNA is in a unique and highly ordered structure in chromosomes and small circular minichromosomes. Cell 29:305–317
- Boopathi R, Danev R, Khoshouei M, Kale S, Nahata S, Ramos L, Angelov D, Dimitrov S, Hamiche A, Petosa C, Bednar

J (2020) Phase-plate cryo-EM structure of the Widom 601 CENP-A nucleosome core particle reveals differential flexibility of the DNA ends. Nucleic Acids Res 48:5735–5748

- Bradford MM (1976) A rapid and sensitive method for the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein utilizing the principle of protein-dye binding. Anal Biochem 72:248–254
- Brehove MS, Wang T, North J, Luo Y, Ottesen J, Luger K, Poirier MG (2015) Histone phosphorylation combined with acetylation dramatically increase nucleosome accessibility. Biophys J 108:75a
- Broad AJ, DeLuca JG (2020) The right place at the right time: Aurora B kinase localization to centromeres and kinetochores. Essays Biochem 64:299–311
- Caillet J, Claverie P (1974) Differences of nucleotide stacking patterns in a crystal and in binary complexes— the case of adenine. Biopolymers 13:601–614
- Carmena M, Wheelock M, Funabiki H, Earnshaw WC (2012) The chromosomal passenger complex (CPC): from easy rider to the godfather of mitosis. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 13:789–803
- Chen Y, Tokuda JM, Topping T, Sutton JL, Meisburger SP, Pabit SA, Gloss LM, Pollack L (2014) Revealing transient structures of nucleosomes as DNA unwinds. Nucleic Acids Res 42:8767–8776
- Chen Y, Tokuda JM, Topping T, Meisburger SP, Pabit SA, Gloss LM, Pollack L (2017) Asymmetric unwrapping of nucleosomal DNA propagates asymmetric opening and dissociation of the histone core. Proc Natl Acad Sci 114:334–339
- Chittori S, Hong J, Saunders H, Feng H, Ghirlando R, Kelly AE, Bai Y, Subramaniam S (2018) Structural mechanisms of centromeric nucleosome recognition by the kinetochore protein CENP-N. Science 359:339–343
- Conde e Silva N, Black BE, Sivolob A, Filipski J, Cleveland DW, Prunell A (2007) CENP-A-containing nucleosomes: easier disassembly versus exclusive centromeric localization. J Mol Biol 370:555–573
- De La Garcia Torre J, Huertas ML, Carrasco B (2000) Calculation of hydrodynamic properties of globular proteins from their atomic-level structure. Biophys J 78:719–730
- Debye P (1915) Zerstreuung von Röntgenstrahlen. Ann Phys 351:809–823
- DeLano WL (n.d.) The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 1.2r3pre, Schrödinger, LLC
- Doucet M, Cho JH, Alina G, Bakker J, Bouwman W, Butler P, Campbell K, Gonzales M, Heenan R, Jackson A, Juhas P, King S, Kienzle P, Krzywon J, Markvardsen A, Nielsen T, O'Driscoll L, Potrzebowski W, Ferraz Leal R, ... Washington A, SasView version 4.1, 2017).
- Earnshaw WC, Rothfield N (1985) Identification of a family of human centromere proteins using autoimmune sera from patients with scleroderma. Chromosoma 91:313–321
- Einstein A (1905) Über die von der molekularkinetischen Theorie der Wärme geforderte Bewegung von in ruhenden Flüssigkeiten suspendierten Teilchen. Ann Phys 322:549–560
- Falk SJ, Guo LY, Sekulic N, Smoak EM, Mani T, Logsdon GA, Gupta K, Jansen LE, Van Duyne GD, Vinogradov SA, Lampson MA, Black BE (2015) Chromosomes. CENP-C reshapes and stabilizes CENP-A nucleosomes at the centromere. Science 348:699–703

- Finch JT, Klug A (1976) Solenoidal model for superstructure in chromatin. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 73:1897–1901
- Fleming PJ, Fleming KG (2018) HullRad: fast calculations of folded and disordered protein and nucleic acid hydrodynamic properties. Biophys J 114:856–869
- Foltz DR, Jansen LE, Black BE, Bailey AO, Yates JR 3rd, Cleveland DW (2006) The human CENP-A centromeric nucleosome-associated complex. Nat Cell Biol 8:458–469
- Gage JD, Tyler PA (1991) The physical environment of the deep sea, in Gage JD, Tyler PA (eds) Deep-sea biology: a natural history of organisms at the deep-sea floor, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 9–30
- Gillilan RE (2022b) High-pressure SAXS, deep life, and extreme biophysics. Methods Enzymol 677:323–355
- Gillilan RE (2022a) Chapter eleven high-pressure SAXS, deep life, and extreme biophysics, in Tainer JA (ed) Methods in Enzymology, Academic Press, pp 323–355
- Glinka CJ, Barker JG, Hammouda B, Krueger S, Moyer JJ, Orts WJ (1998) The 30 m small-angle neutron scattering instruments at the National Institute of Standards and Technology. J Appl Crystallogr 31:430–445
- Grant TD (2018a) Ab initio electron density determination directly from solution scattering data. Nat Methods 15:191–193
- Guinier A (1939) La diffraction des rayons X aux très petits angles : application à l'étude de phénomènes ultramicroscopiques. Ann Phys 11:161–237
- Hansen JC, Connolly M, McDonald CJ, Pan A, Pryamkova A, Ray K, Seidel E, Tamura S, Rogge R, Maeshima K (2017) The 10-nm chromatin fiber and its relationship to interphase chromosome organization. Biochem Soc Trans 46:67–76
- Harp JM, Uberbacher EC, Roberson AE, Palmer EL, Gewiess A, Bunick GJ (1996) X-ray diffraction analysis of crystals containing twofold symmetric nucleosome core particles. Acta Crystallogr Sect D 52:283–288
- Hasson D, Panchenko T, Salimian KJ, Salman MU, Sekulic N, Alonso A, Warburton PE, Black BE (2013) The octamer is the major form of CENP-A nucleosomes at human centromeres. Nat Struct Mol Biol 20:687–695
- Heller WT, Lynn GW, Urban VS, Weiss K, Myles DAA (2008) The bio-SANS small-angle neutron scattering instrument at Oak Ridge national laboratory. Neutron News 19:22–23
- Henneman B, van Emmerik C, van Ingen H, Dame RT (2018) Structure and function of archaeal histones. PLoS Genet 14:e1007582
- Hjelm RP, Kneale GG, Sauau P, Baldwin JP, Bradbury EM, Ibel K (1977) Small angle neutron scattering studies of chromatin subunits in solution. Cell 10:139–151
- Hopkins JB (2024) BioXTAS RAW 2: new developments for a free open-source program for small-angle scattering data reduction and analysis. J Appl Crystallogr 57:194–208
- Hura GL, Menon AL, Hammel M, Rambo RP, Poole FL 2nd, Tsutakawa SE, Jenney FE Jr, Classen S, Frankel KA, Hopkins RC, Yang SJ, Scott JW, Dillard BD, Adams MW, Tainer JA (2009) Robust, high-throughput solution structural analyses by small angle X-ray scattering (SAXS). Nat Methods 6:606–612
- Jiang H, Ariyoshi M, Hori T, Watanabe R, Makino F, Namba K, Fukagawa T (2023) The cryo-EM structure of the

CENP-A nucleosome in complex with ggKNL2. EMBO J 42:e111965

- Joti Y, Hikima T, Nishino Y, Kamada F, Hihara S, Takata H, Ishikawa T, Maeshima K (2012) Chromosomes without a 30-nm chromatin fiber. Nucleus 3:404–410
- Kato D, Osakabe A, Arimura Y, Mizukami Y, Horikoshi N, Saikusa K, Akashi S, Nishimura Y, Park SY, Nogami J, Maehara K, Ohkawa Y, Matsumoto A, Kono H, Inoue R, Sugiyama M, Kurumizaka H (2017) Crystal structure of the overlapping dinucleosome composed of hexasome and octasome. Science 356:205–208
- Kixmoeller K, Allu PK, Black BE (2020) The centromere comes into focus: from CENP-A nucleosomes to kinetochore connections with the spindle. Open Biol 10:200051
- Kixmoeller K, Tarasovetc EV, Mer E, Chang YW, Black BE (2025) Centromeric chromatin clearings demarcate the site of kinetochore formation. Cell 188:1280-1296 e1219
- Knight CJ, Hub JS (2015) WAXSiS: a web server for the calculation of SAXS/WAXS curves based on explicitsolvent molecular dynamics. Nucleic Acids Res 43:W225-230
- Krueger S (2022) Small-angle neutron scattering contrast variation studies of biological complexes: Challenges and triumphs. Curr Opin Struct Biol 74:102375
- Kuzmanovic DA, Elashvili I, Wick C, O'Connell C, Krueger S (2003) Bacteriophage MS2: molecular weight and spatial distribution of the protein and RNA components by small-angle neutron scattering and virus counting. Structure 11:1339–1348
- Lowary PT, Widom J (1998) New DNA sequence rules for high affinity binding to histone octamer and sequencedirected nucleosome positioning. J Mol Biol 276:19–42
- Maeshima K, Rogge R, Tamura S, Joti Y, Hikima T, Szerlong H, Krause C, Herman J, Seidel E, DeLuca J, Ishikawa T, Hansen JC (2016) Nucleosomal arrays self-assemble into supramolecular globular structures lacking 30-nm fibers. Embo j 35:1115–1132
- Mauney AW, Tokuda JM, Gloss LM, Gonzalez O, Pollack L (2018) Local DNA sequence controls asymmetry of DNA unwrapping from nucleosome core particles. Biophys J 115:773–781
- Mauney AW, Muthurajan UM, Luger K, Pollack L (2021) Solution structure(s) of trinucleosomes from contrast variation SAXS. Nucleic Acids Res 49:5028–5037
- Meng EC, Goddard TD, Pettersen EF, Couch GS, Pearson ZJ, Morris JH, Ferrin TE (2023) UCSF ChimeraX: tools for structure building and analysis. Protein Sci 32:e4792
- Mohammed ASA, Soloviov D, Jeffries CM (2024) Perspectives on solution-based small angle X-ray scattering for protein and biological macromolecule structural biology. Phys Chem Chem Phys 26:25268–25286
- Moore PB (1982) 8. Small-angle scattering techniques for the study of biological macromolecules and macromolecular aggregates, in Ehrenstein G, Lecar H (eds) Methods in Experimental Physics, Academic Press, pp 337–390
- Newman ER, Kneale GG, Ravelli RBG, Karuppasamy M, Karimi Nejadasl F, Taylor IA, McGeehan JE (2012) Large multimeric assemblies of nucleosome assembly protein and histones revealed by small-angle X-ray scattering and electron microscopy\*. J Biol Chem 287:26657–26665

- Nishino Y, Eltsov M, Joti Y, Ito K, Takata H, Takahashi Y, Hihara S, Frangakis AS, Imamoto N, Ishikawa T, Maeshima K (2012) Human mitotic chromosomes consist predominantly of irregularly folded nucleosome fibres without a 30-nm chromatin structure. Embo j 31:1644–1653
- Okada M, Cheeseman IM, Hori T, Okawa K, McLeod IX, Yates JR 3rd, Desai A, Fukagawa T (2006) The CENP-H-I complex is required for the efficient incorporation of newly synthesized CENP-A into centromeres. Nat Cell Biol 8:446–457
- Olins AL, Olins DE (1974) Spheroid chromatin units (v bodies). Science 183:330–332
- Palmer DK, O'Day K, Wener MH, Andrews BS, Margolis RL (1987) A 17-kD centromere protein (CENP-A) copurifies with nucleosome core particles and with histones. J Cell Biol 104:805–815
- Phillips JC, Hardy DJ, Maia JDC, Stone JE, Ribeiro JV, Bernardi RC, Buch R, Fiorin G, Hénin J, Jiang W, McGreevy R, Melo MCR, Radak BK, Skeel RD, Singharoy A, Wang Y, Roux B, Aksimentiev A, Luthey-Schulten Z, Kalé LV, Schulten K, Chipot C, Tajkhorshid E (2020) Scalable molecular dynamics on CPU and GPU architectures with NAMD. J Chem Phys 153
- Poitevin F, Orland H, Doniach S, Koehl P, Delarue M (2011) AquaSAXS: a web server for computation and fitting of SAXS profiles with non-uniformally hydrated atomic models. Nucleic Acids Res 39:W184–W189
- Putnam CD, Hammel M, Hura GL, Tainer JA (2007) X-ray solution scattering (SAXS) combined with crystallography and computation: defining accurate macromolecular structures, conformations and assemblies in solution. Q Rev Biophys 40:191–285
- Rai DK, Gillilan RE, Huang Q, Miller R, Ting E, Lazarev A, Tate MW, Gruner SM (2021) High-pressure small-angle X-ray scattering cell for biological solutions and soft materials. J Appl Crystallogr 54:111–122
- Rambo RP, Tainer JA (2011) Characterizing flexible and intrinsically unstructured biological macromolecules by SAS using the Porod-Debye law. Biopolymers 95:559–571
- Receveur-Brechot V, Durand D (2012) How random are intrinsically disordered proteins? a small angle scattering perspective. Curr Protein Pept Sci 13:55–75
- Scarlata SF, Ropp T, Royer CA (1989) Histone subunit interactions as investigated by high pressure. Biochemistry 28:6637–6641
- Schneidman-Duhovny D, Hammel M, Tainer JA, Sali A (2016) FoXS, FoXSDock and MultiFoXS: Single-state and multi-state structural modeling of proteins and their complexes based on SAXS profiles. Nucleic Acids Res 44:W424-429
- Schuck P (2016) Sedimentation velocity analytical ultracentrifugation: discrete species and size-distributions of macromolecules and particles, ed 1st, CRC Press, Boca Raton
- Sekulic N, Black BE (2016) Preparation of recombinant centromeric nucleosomes and formation of complexes with nonhistone centromere proteins. Methods Enzymol 573:67–96
- Sekulic N, Bassett EA, Rogers DJ, Black BE (2010) The structure of (CENP-A-H4)(2) reveals physical features that mark centromeres. Nature 467:347–351

- Semenyuk AV, Svergun DI (1991) Gnom a program package for small-angle scattering data-processing. J App Crys 24:537–540
- Silva JL, Villas-boas M, Clegg RM (1993) Pressure Studies on Protein-Dna Interactions. In: Winter R, Jonas J (eds) High Pressure Chemistry, Biochemistry and Materials Science. Springer, Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp 579–602
- Silva JL, Oliveira AC, Vieira TCRG, de Oliveira GAP, Suarez MC, Foguel D (2014) High-pressure chemical biology and biotechnology. Chem Rev 114:7239–7267
- Skou S, Gillilan RE, Ando N (2014) Synchrotron-based smallangle X-ray scattering of proteins in solution. Nat Protoc 9:1727–1739
- Sollner-Webb B, Camerini-Otero RD, Felsenfeld G (1976) Chromatin structure as probed by nucleases and proteases: evidence for the central role of histones H3 and H4. Cell 9:179–193
- Stuhrmann HB, Duee ED (1975) The determination of the scattering density distribution of polydisperse solutions by contrast variation: a neutron scattering study of ferritin. J Appl Crystallogr 8:538–542
- Sugiyama M, Arimura Y, Shirayama K, Fujita R, Oba Y, Sato N, Inoue R, Oda T, Sato M, Heenan Richard K, Kurumizaka H (2014) Distinct features of the histone core structure in nucleosomes containing the histone H2A.B Variant. Biophys J 106:2206–2213
- Sugiyama M, Horikoshi N, Suzuki Y, Taguchi H, Kujirai T, Inoue R, Oba Y, Sato N, Martel A, Porcar L, Kurumizaka H (2015) Solution structure of variant H2A.Z.1 nucleosome investigated by small-angle X-ray and neutron scatterings. Biochem Biophys Rep 4:28–32
- Sundaramoorthy R, Hughes AL, Singh V, Wiechens N, Ryan DP, El-Mkami H, Petoukhov M, Svergun DI, Treutlein B, Quack S, Fischer M, Michaelis J, Böttcher B, Norman DG, Owen-Hughes T (2017) Structural reorganization of the chromatin remodeling enzyme Chd1 upon engagement with nucleosomes. eLife 6:e22510
- Svedberg T, Pedersen K (1940) The Ultracentrifuge. Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Svergun D (1992) Determination of the regularization parameter in indirect-transform methods using perceptual criteria. J Appl Crystallogr 25:495–503
- Svergun D, Barberato C, Koch MHJ (1995a) CRYSOL a program to evaluate X-ray solution scattering of biological macromolecules from atomic coordinates. J Appl Crystallogr 28:768–773
- Tachiwana H, Kagawa W, Shiga T, Osakabe A, Miya Y, Saito K, Hayashi-Takanaka Y, Oda T, Sato M, Park S-Y, Kimura H, Kurumizaka H (2011a) Crystal structure of the human centromeric nucleosome containing CENP-A. Nature 476:232–235
- Takai K, Horikoshi K (1999) Genetic diversity of archaea in deep-sea hydrothermal vent environments. Genetics 152:1285–1297
- Takizawa Y, Ho CH, Tachiwana H, Matsunami H, Kobayashi W, Suzuki M, Arimura Y, Hori T, Fukagawa T, Ohi MD, Wolf M, Kurumizaka H (2020) Cryo-EM structures of centromeric tri-nucleosomes containing a central CENPa nucleosome. Structure 28:44-53 e44

- Tokuda JM, Ren R, Levendosky RF, Tay RJ, Yan M, Pollack L, Bowman GD (2018) The ATPase motor of the Chd1 chromatin remodeler stimulates DNA unwrapping from the nucleosome. Nucleic Acids Res 46:4978–4990
- Vanholde KE, Weischet WO (1978) Boundary analysis of sedimentation-velocity experiments with monodisperse and paucidisperse solutes. Biopolymers 17:1387–1403
- Vasudevan D, Chua EYD, Davey CA (2010) Crystal structures of nucleosome core particles containing the "601" strong positioning sequence. J Mol Biol 403:1–10
- Wang H, Xiong L, Cramer P (2021) Structures and implications of TBP-nucleosome complexes. Proc Natl Acad Sci 118:e2108859118
- Weiss TM (2017) Small angle scattering: historical perspective and future outlook. Adv Exp Med Biol 1009:1–10
- Whitten AE, Cai S, Trewhella J (2008a) MULCh: modules for the analysis of small-angle neutron contrast variation data from biomolecular assemblies. J Appl Crystallogr 41:222–226
- Whitten AE, Cai SZ, Trewhella J (2008b) modules for the analysis of small-angle neutron contrast variation data from biomolecular assemblies. J Appl Crystallogr 41:222–226
- Woodcock CLF, Safer JP, Stanchfield JE (1976) Structural repeating units in chromatin: I. Evidence for their general occurrence. Exp Cell Res 97:101–110
- Yamaguchi M, Mori Y, Kozuka Y, Okada H, Uematsu K, Tame A, Furukawa H, Maruyama T, Worman COD, Yokoyama K (2012) Prokaryote or eukaryote? a unique microorganism from the deep sea. J Electron Microsc 61:423–431
- Yang C, van der Woerd MJ, Muthurajan UM, Hansen JC, Luger K (2011) Biophysical analysis and small-angle X-ray scattering-derived structures of MeCP2–nucleosome complexes. Nucleic Acids Res 39:4122–4135
- Yatskevich S, Muir KW, Bellini D, Zhang Z, Yang J, Tischer T, Predin M, Dendooven T, McLaughlin SH, Barford D (2022) Structure of the human inner kinetochore bound to a centromeric CENP-A nucleosome. Science 376:844–852
- Yatskevich S, Barford D, Muir KW (2023) Conserved and divergent mechanisms of inner kinetochore assembly onto centromeric chromatin. Curr Opin Struct Biol 81:102638
- Zhou BR, Yadav KNS, Borgnia M, Hong J, Cao B, Olins AL, Olins DE, Bai Y, Zhang P (2019) Atomic resolution cryo-EM structure of a native-like CENP-A nucleosome aided by an antibody fragment. Nat Commun 10:2301
- Zhou K, Gebala M, Woods D, Sundararajan K, Edwards G, Krzizike D, Wereszczynski J, Straight AF, Luger K (2022) CENP-N promotes the compaction of centromeric chromatin. Nat Struct Mol Biol 29:403–413

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.