

Review

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Cell Insight

journal homepage: www.journals.elsevier.com/cell-insight

# Regulation and function of the cGAS-MITA/STING axis in health and disease

### Zhi-Dong Zhang<sup>a,b,c,e</sup>, Bo Zhong<sup>a,b,c,d,e,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Medical Research Institute, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430071, China

<sup>b</sup> Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430071, China

<sup>c</sup> Frontier Science Center for Immunology and Metabolism, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430071, China

<sup>d</sup> Department of Virology, College of Life Sciences, Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430072, China

e Wuhan Research Center for Infectious Diseases and Cancer, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Wuhan, 430071, China

#### ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: cGAS MITA/STING Innate immunity Autoimmune diseases Cancer

#### ABSTRACT

The innate immune systems detect pathogens via pattern-recognition receptors including nucleic acid sensors and non-nucleic acid sensors. Cyclic guanosine monophosphate-adenosine monophosphate (cGAMP) synthase (cGAS, also known as MB21D1) is a cytosolic DNA sensor that recognizes double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) and catalyzes the synthesis of 2',3'-cGAMP. Subsequently, 2',3'-cGAMP binds to the adaptor protein mediator of IRF3 activation (MITA, also known as STING, MPYS, ERIS, and TMEM173) to activate downstream signaling cascades. The cGAS-MITA/STING signaling critically mediates immune responses against DNA viruses, retroviruses, bacteria, and protozoan parasites. In addition, recent discoveries have extended our understanding of the roles of the cGAS-MITA/STING pathway in autoimmune diseases and cancers. Here, we summarize the identification and activation of cGAS and MITA/STING, present the updated functions and regulatory mechanisms of cGAS-MITA/STING signaling and provide a comprehensive understanding of the cGAS-MITA/STING axis in autoimmune diseases and cancers.

#### Introduction

The innate immunity plays a vital role in defense against the invasion of pathogenic micro-organisms and the maintenance of immune homeostasis. Innate immune cells recognize the structurally conserved components of pathogenic microorganisms called pathogen-associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) by pattern-recognition receptors (PRRs). Subsequently, PRRs activate downstream signaling pathways and elicit anti-microbial immune responses or pro-inflammatory responses. For example, pathogen-derived RNA is detected by the cytosolic RNA sensors retinoic acid-inducible gene (RIG-I)-like receptors (RLRs) (Hu & Shu, 2018). Upon binding to dsRNA or 5' triphosphorylated ssRNA, RIG-I undergoes conformational change to recruit and elicit the oligomerization and activation of the mitochondrial antiviral signaling protein (MAVS, also known as VISA, IPS-1, and Cardif) (Kawai et al., 2005; Meylan et al., 2005; Seth et al., 2005; Xu et al., 2005). Activated MAVS further induces the expression of type I IFNs and pro-inflammatory cytokines via the activation of transcription factors IRF3 and NF-kB. To date, multiple cytosolic DNA sensors detecting pathogen DNA have been identified (Chiu et al., 2009; Li, Shu, et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2013; Takaoka et al., 2007; Unterholzner et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2011).

Specifically, the cyclic guanosine monophosphate-adenosine monophosphate (cGAMP) synthase (cGAS) detects dsDNA and catalyzes the synthesis of 2',3'-cGAMP which binds to the adaptor protein mediator of IRF3 activation (MITA, also known as STING, MPYS, ERIS, and TMEM173) and activates signaling cascades leading to the induction of type I IFNs and pro-inflammatory cytokines (Li, Wu, et al., 2013; Sun et al., 2013). Accordingly, knockout of cGAS or MITA significantly inhibits the production of type I IFNs after HSV-1 infection, and mice deficient in cGAS or MITA are hypersensitive to HSV-1 infection (Ishikawa et al., 2009; Li, Wu, et al., 2013). In addition to the antimicrobial functions of cGAS and MITA, emerging studies have broadened their roles in autoimmune diseases and cancers. Here, we review the recent advances in activation and regulation of the cGAS-MITA signaling pathway and summarize the updated roles of the cGAS-MITA signaling axis in autoimmune diseases and cancers.

#### An overview of the cGAS-MITA/STING signaling pathway

Structure, localization, and activation of MITA/STING

Because the MAVS-deficient MEFs respond normally to cytoplasmic

\* Corresponding author. Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery, Medical Research Institute, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, 430071, China. *E-mail address:* zhongbo@whu.edu.cn (B. Zhong).

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cellin.2021.100001

Received 24 September 2021; Received in revised form 18 November 2021; Accepted 6 December 2021 Available online 5 January 2022

2772-8927/© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier B.V. on behalf of Wuhan University. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).



DNA challenge (Sun et al., 2006), it is believed that there exist other adaptor proteins mediating intracellular DNA- and DNA virus-triggered signaling. In 2008–2009, four groups have independently identified a key adaptor protein that mediates DNA virus-triggered and cytoplasmic DNA-induced signal transduction and has been named as MITA (Zhong et al., 2008), STING (Ishikawa & Barber, 2008), MPYS (Jin et al., 2008), and ERIS (Sun et al., 2009). The phosphorylation of IRF3 and the production of type I IFNs are almost completely inhibited after DNA virus infection or DNA transfection in MITA-knockout cells and the MITA-deficient mice exhibit hypersensitivity to HSV-1 infection compared to the wild-type controls, indicating that MITA plays an indispensable role in cytosolic DNA-induced immune responses (Ishikawa et al., 2009).

The human and the murine MITA consist of 379 or 378 amino acid residues respectively and share with 81% homology. MITA consists of 4 transmembrane (TM) domains at the N-terminus responsible for its membrane localization, a cytoplasmic ligand-binding domain (LBD), and a flexible C-terminal domain (CTD) that is responsible for downstream TBK1 interaction (Burdette & Vance, 2013; Yin et al., 2012). The LBD domain exists as a dimer that displays the butterfly shape and is capable of binding cyclic di-nucleotide (CDN) such as s c-di-GMP, c-di-AMP, and 2',3'-cGAMP (Burdette et al., 2011; Huang et al., 2012; Whiteley et al., 2019; Yin et al., 2012; Zhang, Bai, & Chen, 2020). The binding of CDN in the LBD domain induces the conformational changes of the LBD domain and a 180° rotation in relation to the TM domain for the ordering of the CTD of MITA and the oligomerization of MITA, which promotes the recruitment of TBK1 to activate IRF3 and NF-KB (de Oliveira Mann et al., 2019; Morehouse et al., 2020; Shang et al., 2019; Wu et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2019, 2020c; Zhao et al., 2019).

MITA is strictly regulated in uninfected cells. On one hand, the Ca<sup>2+</sup> sensor stromal interaction molecule 1 (STIM1) and TOLLIP interact with MITA to retain and stabilize it in the ER membrane, respectively (Pokatayev et al., 2020; Srikanth et al., 2019). On the other hand, the unfolded protein response (UPR) effector IRE1 promotes MITA trafficking from ER to lysosomes for degradation, which is partially mediated by the SREBP2-SCAP complex and the lysosomal membrane protein Niemann-Pick type C1 (NPC1) (Chu et al., 2021; Pokatayev et al., 2020). The binding of CDNs to MITA disrupts the STIM1-MITA interactions and initiates the translocation of MITA from ER to the Golgi apparatus via the ER-Golgi intermediate compartment (ERGIC). In such a process, iRhom2 interacts with MITA and recruits the Sec5/TRAP $\beta$ /Sec61 $\beta$  complexes to facilitate the translocation to ERGIC (Luo et al., 2016) and STEEP promotes ER membrane curvature to reinforce SEC24C-mediated MITA ER exit via COPII vesicles (Gui et al., 2019; Zhang, Nandakumar, et al., 2020). Meanwhile, the Surface 4 integral membrane protein (SURF4) interacts with sectional MITA at the Golgi apparatus to promote the encapsulation of MITA into COPI vesicles, which retrieves MITA from the Golgi apparatus back to the ER to counteract the activation process of MITA (Deng et al., 2020). At the Golgi apparatus, MITA undergoes palmitoylation, which promotes the recruitment of TANK binding kinase 1 (TBK1) (Kwon & Bakhoum, 2020). Fang and colleagues have recently reported a mechanistic understanding of MITA activation at the Golgi apparatus (Fang et al., 2021). Sulfated Glycosaminoglycans (sGAGs), a kind of linear acidic polysaccharides, can bind to MITA at the Golgi apparatus, leading to the polymerization of MITA and the recruitment of TBK1. Afterward, TBK1 phosphorylates the C-terminal domains of MITA to recruit IRF3 for activation. Phosphorylated IRF3 binds to the nuclear shuttle protein Karyopherin alpha 2 (KPNA2) and is translocated to the nucleus to induce transcription of an array of downstream genes (Cai et al., 2020). In parallel, MITA also activates the IKK complex to mediate the activation of NF-kB and the induction of NF-kB-driven inflammatory genes (Chen, Sun, & Chen, 2016). In addition, the active MITA-containing ERGIC serves as a membrane source for LC3 lipidation, which is a key step for autophagosome biogenesis dependent on WIPI2 and ATG5 but independent of the ULK and VPS34-Beclin kinase complexes (Gui et al., 2019). MITA-mediated activation of autophagy is

important for the clearance of DNA and viruses in the cytosol and such a process is independent of the recruitment of TBK1. Afterward, MITA is to perinuclear compartments and transported undergoes lysosome-mediated degradation to terminate hyperimmune responses (Kwon & Bakhoum, 2020). Alternatively, the overactivated MITA by excessive CDNs forms a puzzle-shaped membranous structure (known as MITA-TBK1-CDN sponge) to constrain MITA and TBK1 and prevent innate immunity from overactivation in a manner dependent on microtubules (Yu et al., 2021). Consistently, MITA<sup>E336G/E337G</sup> loses the condensation ability and thereby exhibits enhanced antiviral activity in cells. Therefore, the location of MITA is tightly controlled temporally and spatially which balances the quality and quantity of innate immune signaling in the absence and presence of viral infections.

#### Structure and activation of cGAS

Multiple cytosolic DNA sensors have been identified including DAI, RNA polymerase III, IFI16, and DDX41 (Chiu et al., 2009; Takaoka et al., 2007; Unterholzner et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2011). However, it is still elusive how cytosolic DNA induces the expression of type I IFNs through distinct but functionally overlapped sensors. In 2013, by biochemical fractionation from cytosolic extracts of the murine fibrosarcoma cell line L929 cells and quantitative mass spectrometry assays, Dr. Zhijian Chen's group has identified a cytosolic DNA sensor cGAS (Sun et al., 2013) which directly binds to DNA and catalyzes the synthesis of cGAMP to induce type I IFNs in a manner dependent on MITA.

As a nucleotidyltransferase (NTase), human cGAS consists of 507 amino acids and is composed of a poorly conserved N-terminal domain (amino acid residues 1-160), a highly conserved C-terminal NTase (160-330) domain, and a Mab21 (213-513) domain (Li, Zhang, et al., 2013; Wu et al., 2014). cGAS contains three DNA-binding sites (site A, B and C) at its C-terminus that are important for its activation (Li, Shu, et al., 2013; Xie et al., 2019; Zhang, Wu, et al., 2014). The positively charged patches (such as K407 and K411) in these sites of cGAS mediate the cGAS-DNA binding and mutations of the key residues in any of the three DNA-binding sites of cGAS dampen the enzymatic activity of cGAS and the induction of type I IFNs in cells (Li, Shu, et al., 2013; Xie et al., 2019; Zhang, Wu, et al., 2014). Structural analysis of human cGAS demonstrates that the K187 and L195 of hcGAS in site A interfere with the binding of DNA to cGAS (Zhou et al., 2018). Interestingly, murine cGAS has much higher enzymatic activity than hcGAS and mcGAS contains N172 and R180 that correspond to K187 and L195 of hcGAS (Zhou et al., 2018). Furthermore, mutation of these two sites (hcGAS<sup>K187N/L195R</sup>) significantly increases the enzymatic activity of hcGAS to a comparable level of the activity of mcGAS. These biochemical and structural studies have elegantly revealed the mechanism of DNA binding to cGAS.

The binding of DNA to cGAS results in the formation of a 2 cGAS:2 DNA complex, which efficiently catalyzes ATP and GTP into 2',3'-cGAMP (Fig. 1). The length of DNA for sufficient cGAS activation is  $\sim$ 45 bp and longer DNA would recruit cGAS dimers to form ladder-like networks with DNA and efficiently promote the synthesis of 2',3'-cGAMP by cGAS (Andreeva et al., 2017; Kranzusch et al., 2013). Consistent with this notion, short DNA (20 bp) barely activates cGAS in vivo and in vitro, though it binds to cGAS and induces the formation of cGAS dimers (Andreeva et al., 2017). The binding of DNA induces liquid phase separation of cGAS and thereby the cGAS-DNA complex is encapsulated in liquid droplets (Fig. 1), in which the activated cGAS catalyzes the synthesis of 2',3'-cGAMP in a manner dependently on  $Zn^{2+}$  and the concentration of cGAS and DNA (Du & Chen, 2018). Recently, Mn<sup>2+</sup> is reported to be indispensable for the activation of cGAS (Wang et al., 2018). Structural evidence shows that Mn<sup>2+</sup> activates monomeric cGAS in the absence of DNA and also synergizes with dsDNA for the activation of cGAS (Hooy et al., 2020; Zhao, Ma, et al., 2020). Collectively, these available data have clearly demonstrated the step-wise and ion-mediated activation of cGAS.



**Fig. 1. The cGAS-MITA/STING pathway.** The accumulation of cytosolic DNA is a mark of pathogen invasion. Cytosolic DNA sourced from DNA virus, damaged mitochondria, or reverse transcription of retroelements is detected by cGAS, leading to the formation of cGAS-DNA liquid droplets, in which cGAS, ATP, and GTP are concentrated to initiate the synthesis of cGAMP. MITA subsequently binds to cGAMP and undergoes dimerization and polymerization. Polymerized MITA encapsulated in SEC24C- mediated COPII vesicles translocates from the ER to Golgi via ERGIC, where MITA triggers autophagosome formation via LC3 lipidation, which leads to the clearance of cytosolic DNA and pathogens. At the Golgi apparatus, MITA undergoes palmitoylation and binds to sGAGs, which contributes to the recruitment of TBK1 and autophosphorylation of TBK1. TBK1 phosphorylates the C-terminal domains of MITA to recruit IRF3, after that IRF3 also is phosphorylated by TBK1 and translocates to the nucleus in a KPNA2-dependent manner, mediating the expression of type I IFNs. Moreover, MITA also activates NF-kB to mediate the expression of inflammatory genes. After the translocation process, MITA would be targeted to the lysosome for degradation and retrieve from Golgi back to the ER to avoid hyperactivation. cGAMP, 2',3'-cyclic GMP-AMP; sGAG, sulfated glycosaminoglycans; IFN, interferon.

#### Localization of cGAS

It has been proposed that cGAS is a cytoplasmic protein to sense cytosolic DNA by biochemical and confocal immunofluorescent assays (Sun et al., 2013). However, recent studies have suggested that cGAS also localizes in the plasma membrane and the nucleus. cGAS interacts with phosphoinositide through its N terminal domain and thereby resides on the plasma membrane to distinct self- and viral DNA in resting murine and human phagocytes (Barnett et al., 2019). Upon binding to DNA, cGAS disassociates from phosphoinositide and translocates from the cell surface to cytoplasm, which facilitates liquid droplet formation as well as signaling transduction. cGAS has been observed in the nucleus when overexpressed in normal human fibroblasts and keratinocytes (Orzalli et al., 2015). Treatment of genotoxic agents, including etoposide, H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub>, and camptothecin, induces DNA damage, which leads to the translocation of cGAS from the cytosol to the nucleus (Liu, Zhang, Wu, et al., 2018). In the nucleus, cGAS is recruited to the double-stranded breaks and interacts with PARP1 to suppress homologous recombination, thereby promoting the accumulation of DNA damages and cell death (Liu, Zhang, Wu, et al., 2018; Ray Chaudhuri & Nussenzweig, 2017).

During mitosis, cGAS is post-translationally regulated and rapidly translocates from the cytoplasm to chromosomes where cGAS is sequestered and inhibited (discussed below). These studies collectively demonstrate that cGAS is localized in the nucleus and plasma membrane under specific conditions. More quantitative studies of the cellular distribution of cGAS are required in future investigations.

#### cGAS-mediated sensing of pathogenic microorganisms

Because cGAS binds to DNA irrespective of its sequences, cGAS could be activated by all pathogenic microorganisms that produce dsDNA or ssDNA during infections and replication. Multiple studies showed that DNA viruses, including herpes simplex virus 1 (HSV-1) and HSV-2, adenoviruses, murine gammaherpesvirus 68, vaccinia virus, human papillomavirus (HPV), cytomegalovirus, and papillomavirus, are sensed by cytoplasmic cGAS to initiate immune responses (Fig. 1) (Lam et al., 2014; Schoggins et al., 2014; Sun et al., 2013; Tan et al., 2018). Consistently, cGAS knockout mice are unable to produce type I interferons and inflammatory cytokines and, thus, are susceptible to these viral pathogens. In addition, retroviruses including HIV-1 and HIV-2, murine leukemia virus (MLV), and simian immunodeficiency virus (SIV) can activate cGAS-mediated immune responses in a manner dependently on the reverse-transcribed viral cDNA (Gao et al., 2013; Lahaye et al., 2013; Sumner et al., 2020) (Fig. 1). Several RNA viruses also indirectly stimulate the cGAS-MITA pathway by inducing mitochondrial DNA release (Fig. 1) (Aguirre et al., 2017; Moriyama et al., 2019). Compared to the wild-type mice or cells, the cGAS knockout mice or cells exhibit impaired production of type I IFNs after infections of *Plasmodium* (Gallego-Marin et al., 2018; Hahn et al., 2018) and various intracellular bacteria, including *Listeria monocytogenes* (Nandakumar et al., 2019), *Chlamydia trachomatis* (Zhang, Yeruva, et al., 2014), and *Francisella tularensis* (*F. novicida*) (Man et al., 2015) (Fig. 1). These findings together suggest that cGAS senses a broad spectrum of invading microorganisms.

#### Regulation of the cGAS-MITA/STING signaling pathway

To avoid harmful pathology caused by aberrant cGAS-MITA-mediated innate inflammatory responses, the immune system has evolved comprehensive and multi-level mechanisms to tightly regulate the cGAS-MITA signaling pathway, including (1) homeostatic regulation of cGAS activation; (2) transcriptional regulation of cGAS and MITA; and (3) posttranslational modifications (PTMs) of cGAS and MITA.

# Homeostatic regulation of cGAS activation by controlling the availability of self-DNA

Under normal conditions, mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) is encased within the outer and inner mitochondrial membrane and thus inaccessible to cGAS (Zierhut & Funabiki, 2020). Intrinsic apoptosis in a manner of activation of Bak and Bax leads to mitochondrial damage, ultimately resulting in the release of mtDNA. Yet, this cytoplasmic mtDNA does not lead to the activation of cGAS, as apoptosome complex blocks the cGAS-MITA pathway via proteolytic cleavage of cGAS (White et al., 2014). Alternatively, damaged mitochondria are immediately cleared in selective degradation of a process termed mitophagy that avoids the activation of cGAS (Sliter et al., 2018). Recently, one report demonstrates that apoptotic cells generate extrachromosomal circular DNA (eccDNA) that could trigger MITA-mediated immune responses (Wang et al., 2021). Whether this process involves cGAS-mediated cGAMP production is unknown.

The nuclear envelope (NE) provides a physical barrier that separates cytosolic cGAS from chromosomal DNA. However, the NE is disassembled during cell division, thereby making chromosomal DNA accessible to cGAS. Some key mechanisms to ensure the nonresponsiveness of cGAS to chromosomal DNA have been characterized. First, binding to the nucleosome of cGAS during cell mitosis locks cGAS into a monomeric state, and such a steric hindrance inhibits spurious activation of cGAS by chromosomal DNA (Boyer et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2020; Kujirai et al., 2020; Michalski et al., 2020; Pathare et al., 2020; Zhao, Xu, et al., 2020). Second, barrier-to-autointegration factor 1 (BAF) outcompetes cGAS for DNA binding during mitosis, which prohibits the formation of cGAS-DNA complexes (Guey et al., 2020). Third, circular RNA antagonist for cGAS (cia-cGAS) harbors a stronger binding affinity to nuclear cGAS than chromosomal-DNA, consequently restraining cGAS-mediated production of type I IFNs in long-term hematopoietic stem cells (LT-HSCs) (Xia et al., 2018). A fourth mechanism has been proposed by two recent reports (Li et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2020). During mitosis, Aurora kinase B and cyclin-dependent kinase 1 (CDK1) selectively phosphorylate cGAS, which significantly prohibits its activity. Together, these findings suggest that cGAS activation by chromosomal or mitochondrial self-DNA is limited under unperturbed conditions.

The endogenous retroelements-derived DNA also activates cGASmediated immune responses (Zierhut & Funabiki, 2020). Human endogenous retroviruses (HERVs) sourcing from exogenous retroviruses that successfully integrate themselves into the host genome are inherited by successive generations (Ishak et al., 2018). Multiple reverse transcription events of HERVs make reverse-transcribed cDNA accessible to cGAS. DNase enzymes, including DNase I (Ahn & Barber, 2014), DNase II (Rodero et al., 2017), and exonuclease 1(Trex1) (Stetson et al., 2008), are responsible for clearing retroelements-derived DNA, thereby limiting the engagement between self-DNA and cGAS.

Moreover, the binding of cGAS to DNA involves extensive ionic interactions between the positively charged surface of cGAS and the negatively charged DNA (Du & Chen, 2018). Such interactions are susceptible to the cytosolic salt concentration, which may be responsible for limiting the spurious activation of cGAS by self-DNA below a certain threshold. Overall, it appears that vertebrates have evolved a series of precise regulatory elements to prevent self-DNA-mediated spontaneous activation of cGAS. Future studies are necessary to establish the mechanistic basis of homeostatic cGAS regulation by self-DNA and the signaling consequences.

#### Transcriptional regulation of cGAS and MITA/STING

It has been reported that cGAS is induced by type I IFNs through JAK-STAT-axis in both human and mouse macrophages (Ma et al., 2015). However, this positive feedback induction of cGAS by type I IFNs is contrary to the observations that MITA inhibits the activation of JAK1-STAT1 signaling cascades by inducing phosphorylation of SHP1 and SHP2 (Dong et al., 2015). Moreover, NCOA3 is an epigenetic factor maintaining the transcriptional levels of *cGAS* expression, and miR25/93 targets NCOA3 to repression of cGAS in hypoxic tumor cells (Wu et al., 2017). In several human colorectal cancer and melanoma cell lines, *cGAS* expression is also silenced via the epigenetic hypermethylation process, which could be overturned by treating with the demethylation agent (Xia et al., 2016b, 2016c).

Similar to cGAS expression, MITA expression at the transcriptional level is also inhibited in many cancer cell lines (Xia et al., 2016b, 2016c). In addition, a recent study shows that mutation or loss of LKB1, an omnipresently expressed master serine/threonine kinase, results in significant silencing of MITA expression, which is partially mediated by epigenetic silencing enzymes such as DNMT1 and EZH2 (Kitajima et al., 2019). Human and murine primary hepatocytes do not express MITA, which might be responsible for the impaired immune responses to Hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection (Thomsen et al., 2016). In addition, the P-body protein LSm14A was reported to regulate pre-mRNA processing of *MITA* (Liu et al., 2016). In *Lsm14a<sup>-/-</sup>* DCs, mRNA of *MITA* but not *cGAS*, *TBK1*, or *IRF3* is remarkably reduced, suggesting that LSm14A is indispensable for maintaining the mRNA level of *MITA*. These studies have demonstrated epigenetic and post-transcriptional regulation of cGAS and MITA.

#### Post-translational modification of cGAS

PTMs of cGAS and MITA, including polyubiquitination, phosphorylation, acetylation, SUMOylation, glutamylation, and palmitoylation have been shown to extensively regulate the cGAS-MITA signaling pathway during the resting state and viral infection (Table 1).

In resting cells, tubulin tyrosine ligase-like 6 (TTLL6) and TTLL4 catalyze polyglutamylation and monoglutamylation of cGAS, resulting in inhibition of its DNA-binding ability and synthase activity, respectively (Xia, Ye, et al., 2016). cGAS also undergoes acetylation at K384, K394, or K414, which keeps cGAS inactive without DNA challenges, though the enzyme responsible for this process is unknown (Dai et al., 2019). During mitosis (as described above), cyclin-dependent kinase 1 (CDK1) and mitotic kinases, including Aurora kinase B (AurB), phosphorylates cGAS to block its ability of self-DNA detection, which helps to prevent auto-immunity (Li et al., 2021; Zhong et al., 2020). PPP6C constitutively dephosphorylates mcGAS in un-infected cells at S420, impairing its ability to bind to GTP and thereby leading to its inactivation (Li & Shu, 2020). Moreover, cGAS is constitutively ubiquitinated at K271 and undergoes degradation in resting cells. TRIM38 catalyzes SUMOylation of cGAS at

#### Table 1

Post-translational modifications of cGAS and MITA/STING.

Signal subsitional seriessubsitional seriessubsitional seriessubsitional seriesGASReling edlaRIMSSubsitional seriesReling edlaMange al cul201INMARIMSMonolequinationKassSee al cul201INMASubsitional seriesKassSee al cul201RIMSSubsitional seriesKassSee al cul201RIMSSubsitional seriesKassMarge al cul201RIMSSubsitional seriesKassMarge al cul201RIMSRemoral of Kasinked polyubiquinationMarge al cul201Marge al cul201RIMSRemoral of Kasinked polyubiquinationKassMarge al cul201RIMSRemoral of Kasinked polyubiquinationRIMSMarge al cul201RIMSRemoral of Kasinked polyubiquinationRIMSMarge al cul201RIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSKasinder polyubiquinationRIMSRimsRimsRIMSKasinder polyubiquinationRIMSRimsRimsRIMSKasinder polyubiquinationRIMSRimsRimsRIMSKasinder polyubiquinationRIMSRimsRimsRIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSRimsRimsRimsRimsRimsRIMSRims<	Protein	Occurring contexts	Enzyme	Modification	Residues	Refs				
constructionRetring cellsRingsSUMOylationK231 (mouse K217)He of al (200)USP29Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationMouse K217Janget ed. (200)RINCKMonoubiquitationK175K175/K1684Wanget ed. (201)RINCKMonoubiquitationK175/K1684Wanget ed. (201)RINCKK27-linked polybiquitationK175/K1684Wanget ed. (201)LISP21Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationK144Cles. (Reg. ed. (201)LISP14Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationK144Cles. (Reg. ed. (201)LISP14Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationState ed. (201)LISP14Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationState ed. (201)LISP14Removal of K48-linked polybiquitationN.D.Las ed. (201)LISP14K37-linked polybiquitationK150Wanget ed. (2010)LISP14REMOVALK38-linked polybiquitationK144Las ed. (2010)LISP14REMOVALK38-linked polybiquitationN.D.Las ed. (2010)LISP14REMOVALK38-linked polybiquitationN.D.Las ed. (2010)LISP14REMOVALK38-linked polybiquitationN.D.Las ed. (2010)LISP14REMOVALREMOVALK38-linked polybiquitationN.D.Las ed. (201	Signaling activ	Signaling activation								
ControlUserpoolPersonal of K48-linked polyhiquitinationMose K271Zhang et al. (2020)Simulated cellsRINKSMonoobiquitinationR335So et al. (2018)RINKSMonoobiquitinationR479 (mose K404)Het al. (2016)RINKSSUMOylotionK479 (mose K404)Het al. (2016)RINKSRINKSMonoobiquitinationK479 (mose K404)Het al. (2016)USP29Removal of K48-linked polybuiquitinationK414Chen, Meng, et al. (2016)USP29Removal of K48-linked polybuiquitinationE302Xi, Ye, et al. (2016)CCP5Removal of robylgitumylationE302Xi, Ye, et al. (2016)CCP5Removal of polygitumylationE302Xi, Ye, et al. (2016)KATSActerylationK11Loo et al. (2016)KATSActerylationK11Loo et al. (2016)KATSActerylationK12K11/K15/K22/K236MITABersisRemoval of K48-linked polyabiquitinationK12MITAResting cellsNilkK63-linked polyabiquitinationK12MITAResting cellsK63-linked polyabiquitinationK12Chen et al. (2016)MITAResting cellsK63-linked polyabiquitinationK12K12K12 <t< td=""><td>cGAS</td><td>Resting cells</td><td>TRIM38</td><td>SUMOvlation</td><td>K231 (mouse K217)</td><td>Hu et al. (2016)</td></t<>	cGAS	Resting cells	TRIM38	SUMOvlation	K231 (mouse K217)	Hu et al. (2016)				
Stimulated edls         TRM56         Monobleginianton         N.D.         Society         Society           RNCK         Monobleginianton         N.D.         RNCK         Monobleginianton           RNL         RND138         SUMOylation         R173/X384         Wage et al. (2017)           RNPT BS         R27-linked polybleginianton         Mones R271         Zhang, Raj, Raj, And Chen (2020)           USP14         Removal of (K48-linked polybleginianton         Kal4         Chen, Menes, et al. (2016)           KATS         Receipadin (K48-linked polybleginianton         Kal4         Chen, Menes, et al. (2016)           KATS         Receipadin (K48-linked polybleginianton         Kal4         Chen, Menes, et al. (2016)           MITA         Resting cells         BIRSS         Removal of K48-linked polybleginianton         Kal5         Kal7           MITA         Resting cells         RIRF         R27-linked polybleginianton         KL50         Clin (La) (2016)           MITA         RRFE         R31-linked polybleginianton         KL204/R236/K28/R38         Ni et al. (2016)           MITA         RRFE         R71-linked polybleginianton         KL204/R236/K28/R38         Ni et al. (2016)           MITA         RRFE         RST-linked polybleginianton         KL204/R236/K28/R438         N			USP29	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	Mouse K271	Zhang et al. (2020)				
Resting cells         RNCK         Monobligationation         N.D.         Sever al. (2018)           TRMS N         SUMOption         K479 (mouse K47)         Wang et al. (2016)           USP2 N         Reversiol of (K48-linked polybidguitantion         Mouse K271         Zaman et al. (2016)           USP2 N         Reversiol of (K48-linked polybidguitantion         E144         Chen, Mang, et al. (2016)           USP3 N         Reversiol of (K48-linked polybidguitantion         E144         Chen, Mang, et al. (2016)           CCP5 N         Reversion of polygitamylation         E144         Chen, Mang, et al. (2016)           KATS C         Accylation         N.D.         Del et al. (2016)           KATS C         Accylation         N.D.         Del et al. (2016)           KATS C         Accylation         N.D.         Del et al. (2016)           KATS C         Reversion (K48-linked polybidguitination         N.D.         Del et al. (2017)           TRIMSS C         Schlaked polybidguitination         N.D.         Del et al. (2017)           TRIMSS C         Schlaked polybidguitination         N.D.         Del et al. (2017)           TRIMSS C         Schlaked polybidguitination         N.D.         Del et al. (2017)           TRIMSS C         Schlaked polybidguitination         N.D. </td <td></td> <td>Stimulated cells</td> <td>TRIM56</td> <td>Monoubiquitination</td> <td>K335</td> <td>Seo et al. (2018)</td>		Stimulated cells	TRIM56	Monoubiquitination	K335	Seo et al. (2018)				
RMTA         REMINS         SUMO/aloin         K173 K38         Hue al. (2016)           NUTA         REMINS         K271 (Kol Polyhidipittination)         KURG K21         Zinag, Bal, and Chen (2020)           USP12         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Zinag, Bal, and Chen (2020)           USP14         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Zinag, Bal, and Chen (2020)           USP14         Remoral of romoglutamylation         S222         Kun (Kol Cal)         Zinag, Bal, and Chen (2020)           USP14         Remoral of romoglutamylation         Kun (Kol Cal)         Zinag, Bal, and Chen (2020)           HUTA         Resting cells         RESTS         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Zinag, Bal, (2014)           MUTA         Resting cells         RESTS         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Xun (Kol Cal)           MUTA         Resting cells         RESTS         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Xun (Kol Cal)           MUTA         Resting cells         RESTS         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Xun (Kol Cal)           RUTA         Remoral of K48-linked polyhidipittination         Kun (Kol Cal)         Xun			RINCK	Monoubiquitination	N.D.	Seo et al. (2018)				
NTA         Resting cells         RNP185         K22-linked polyubiquitantion         NTA         Wang et al. (2017)           USP3 P         Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitantion         Mause K231         Chang, Rist, and Chang, et al. (2016)           CCP5         Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitantion         E3022         Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)           MTA         Resting cells         Removal of polytitantylation         E3022         Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)           KAT5         Acceptation         KAT5         Acceptation         NDA         Date al. (2017)           MTA         Resting cells         RNS2         Removal of polytitatination         K157/K55/K22/K320         Wang et al. (2014)           MTA         Resting cells         RNS2         Resting colls         No.         L2014)           MUL1         K23-linked polytubiquitination         K157/K55/K22/K320         Wang et al. (2012)           TRMS5         K3-linked polytubiquitination         K150         Lang et al. (2014)           NUL1         K3-linked polytubiquitination         K34/K23/K289/K330         Lang et al. (2015)           RNP155         K3-linked polytubiquitination         K34/K24/K23/K289/K330         Lang et al. (2016)           USP30         Removal of K48-linked polytubiquitination         K34/K24/K150/K224/K235			TRIM38	SUMOvlation	K479 (mouse K464)	Hu et al. (2016)				
MITA         USP29         Removal of K49 linked polyubipatinationa         Meia K211         Zame, Bai, and Cine (2020)           NUTA         Removal of monoglutumylation         E48 linked polyubipatinationa         Meia K211         Cone, Meng, et al. (2016)           NUTA         Resting cells         Removal of monoglutumylation         E292         Nix, Y, et al. (2016)           NUTA         Resting cells         Resting cells         Resting cells         Song et al. (2016)           NUTA         Resting cells         RUTA         Acelylation         ND.         ND.         Not et al. (2016)           NUTA         Resting cells         RUTA         Cone al. (2016)         ND.			RNF185	K27-linked polyubiquitination	K173/K384	Wang et al. (2017)				
MITA         Removal of Y49-linked polyubiquitantion         FAI         Come Meng, et al. (2016)           MITA         Removal of polygitranylation         E302         Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)           MITA         Resting cells         GCG6         Removal of polygitranylation         E302         Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)           MITA         Resting cells         GCG6         Rescription         ND.         Link Coll           MITA         Resting cells         GCG6         Rescription         KIS         GCG6         Generotion (48)           MITA         Resting cells         GCG6         Rescription (48)         KIS         GCG6         Generotion (48)           MITA         Resting cells         GCG6         RATE         CAP         KIS         GCG6         KIS         KIS         GCG6         KIS         KIS <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>USP29</td><td>Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination</td><td>Mouse K271</td><td>Zhang, Bai, and Chen (2020)</td></t<>			USP29	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	Mouse K271	Zhang, Bai, and Chen (2020)				
MITACCPsRemoval of nonoglutanylationE022Xin, Ye, et al. (2016)MITAResting cellsCCPsRemoval of ApolyglutanylationE372Xin, Ye, et al. (2016)MITAResting cellsEIT3SSRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Date al. (2016)MITAResting cellsEIT3SSRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Date al. (2016)MITAKaVISKAVISKaVISIK48-linked polyubiquitinationK150(Qin et al., 2014)MITAKaVISIKK3KK3KK48-linked polyubiquitinationK150K224/K236Xinag et al. (2017)TILMSSKS3-linked polyubiquitinationK224/K236/K289/K238Ni et al. (2017)TSUK56K234/K286Zhang et al. (2016)TILMSSKS3-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K24/K280Zhang et al. (2016)K24/K236Zhang et al. (2016)REVTAKS3-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)K234/K280Zhang et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lan et al. (2016)K24/K280Zhang et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lan et al. (2016)K04K04USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lan et al. (2016)K04USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lan et al. (2016)K04K100REMOVAI of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK246K04K04K04K111REMOVAI of K48-linked polyubiquit			USP14	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	K414	Chen, Meng, et al. (2016)				
MITA         Removal of poly2iptiany/ation         E272         Xi, Ye, et al. (2016)           MITA         Renting ellis         GCP6         Generylation         ND.         Date ct. (2020)           MITA         Renting ellis         ETSS         Renoval of K48-linked polyabiputination         ND.         Loo et al. (2016)           Stimulated eells         RFR26         K11-linked polyabiputination         K159         Wang et al. (2016)           MUL         K53-linked polyabiputination         K159         Wang et al. (2016)           MUL         K53-linked polyabiputination         K23/K150/K224/K236         Mang et al. (2016)           TRIM5         K53-linked polyabiputination         K23/K150/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2016)           TRIM5         K53-linked polyabiputination         K23/K150/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2016)           USF20         REmoval of K48-linked polyabiputination         K33/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2016)           USF20         Removal of K48-linked polyabiputiputination         K34         Zhang et al. (2016)           USF20         Removal of K48-linked polyabiputiputination         K34         Zhang et al. (2016)           USF20         Removal of K48-linked polyabiputiputination         K34         Zhang et al. (2016)           USF20         Removal of K			CCP5	Removal of monoglutamylation	E302	Xia. Ye. et al. (2016)				
MTA         Acetylation         K47X (55/K62/K83)         Song et al. (2020)           MTA         Resting cells         EFR355         Removal of K48-linked polyabiquitnation         N.D.         Date et al. (2016)           MTA         Resting cells         EFR355         Removal of K48-linked polyabiquitnation         K159         (0)m et al. (2016)           MTA         RNF26         K11-linked polyabiquitnation         K159         Wang et al. (2017)           MTMA         K53-linked polyabiquitnation         K23/K236/K236/K236         Wang et al. (2017)           TRIM50         K53-linked polyabiquitnation         K23/K236/K239/K238         Wi et al. (2016)           RNF115         K53-linked polyabiquitnation         K20/K150/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2020)           RNF115         K63-linked polyabiquitnation         K20/K150/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2012)           RNF115         K63-linked polyabiquitnation         K20/K150/K224/K236         Zhang et al. (2016)           USP20         Removal of K48-linked polyabiquitnation         K234         Zhang et al. (2016)           USP44         Removal of K48-linked polyabiquitnation         K247         Ga et al. (2020)           USP44         Removal of K48-linked polyabiquitnation         K2347         Gao et al. (2020)           USP44 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>CCP6</td><td>Removal of polyglutamylation</td><td>E272</td><td>Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)</td></td<>			CCP6	Removal of polyglutamylation	E272	Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)				
MITAResting cellsHEAC3descretylationN.D.DescretionDescret			KAT5	Acetvlation	K47/K56/K62/K83	Song et al. (2020)				
MTAReting cellsEFR3SRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Los et al. (2016)Stimulated cellsMFRK27-linked polyubiquitinationK159(Øin et al., 2014)MULK63-linked polyubiquitinationK150/K224/K236Wang et al. (2017)TKMSCK53-linked polyubiquitinationK150/K224/K236Taschife et al. (2017)TKMSCK63-linked polyubiquitinationK150/K224/K236Taschife et al. (2017)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2020)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2020)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2020)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK38Hu et al. (2016)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK38Line et al. (2016)RNTISK53-linked polyubiquitinationK34Zhang et al. (2020)GYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK24K347Gio et al. (2020)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Gio et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2020)TBRIPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2020)TBRIPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2021)TBRIPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2020)TBRIPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2020)TBRIPhosphorylationS36Gao et al. (2020)TBRIPhosphorylationS36			HDAC3	deacetylation	N.D.	Dai et al. $(2019)$				
Sitmulated cellsRNP26K11-linked polyubiquifnationK150(Qin et al. 2014)AMFRK27-linked polyubiquifnationK137/K150/K224/K236Wine et al. (2014)MUL1K63-linked polyubiquifnationK137/K150/K224/K236Wine et al. (2017)TRIM56K63-linked polyubiquifnationK130K130/K130/K224/K236Zinecliad et al. (2010)TRIM56K63-linked polyubiquifnationK204/K236/K238Hi et al. (2016)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquifnationK204/K236Zineg et al. (2020e)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquifnationK204/K236Zineg et al. (2020e)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquifnationN.D.Zineg et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquifnationN.D.Zineg et al. (2016)USP30Removal of K48-linked polyubiquifnationN.D.Lao et al. (2016)USP30Removal of K48-linked polyubiquifnationK347Goo et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquifnationK347Goo et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquifnationK347Goo et al. (2020)USP30Resing cellsDisphorylationK347Goo et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationK345Mang et al. (2016)TBK1PhosphorylationN.D.Li et al. (2016)TBK1PhosphorylationK345Mang et al. (2016)TBK1PhosphorylationK345Mang et al. (2016)TBK1PhosphorylationS365Li al. (S1016)TBK1Phosphorylation <t< td=""><td>MITA</td><td>Resting cells</td><td>EIF3S5</td><td>Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination</td><td>N.D.</td><td>Luo et al. <math>(2016)</math></td></t<>	MITA	Resting cells	EIF3S5	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	N.D.	Luo et al. $(2016)$				
AMRR BAMRRK22 Inked polyubiquitinationK137 /K15 0/K224 /K236Wang et al. (2014)MUL MULLK63 linked polyubiquitinationK224 /K236 /K236 /K236 /K338Ni et al. (2017)TKM56K63 linked polyubiquitinationK15 0Tscilida et al. (2010)TKM37K63 linked polyubiquitinationK20 /K156 /K224 /K236Zhang et al. (2012)TKM38K63 linked polyubiquitinationK20 /K156 /K224 /K236Zhang et al. (2016)TKM38SUMOylationK338Hie et al. (2016)TKM38SUMOylationK338Hie et al. (2016)CKLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)CKLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Loe et al. (2016)CKLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2021)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Cao et al. (2021)DTUD5Removal of K57-linked polyubiqu		Stimulated cells	RNF26	K11-linked polyubiauitination	K150	(Oin et al 2014)				
MUL1K63-linked polyubiquitinationK224/R236/K289/K338Ni et al. (2017)TRM56K63-linked polyubiquitinationK150Tsuchida et al. (2010)TRM52K63-linked polyubiquitinationK150K20/K150/K224/K236RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K289Zhang et al. (2012)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K289Zhang et al. (2016)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Luo et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang et al. (2020)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK247Cau et al. (2021)CSKPhosphorylationK246Zhang et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationK246Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS36Zhang et al. (2020)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhang et al. (2016)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS005 (mouse S291)Ziong et al. (2020)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS02Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS105 (mouse S291)Sia et al. (2016)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS105 (mouse S291)Sia et al. (2016)Signating inhibitiCPhosphorylationS1		otimulated cens	AMFR	K27-linked polyubiquitination	K137/K150/K224/K236	Wang et al $(2014)$				
TRIM56K63-linked polyubiquitinationK150Tschild et al. (2010)TRIM52K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2012)RV115K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K250/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2012)TRIM58SUMOylationK38Hu et al. (2016)TRIM58SUMOylationK38Hu et al. (2016)CYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)CYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lou et al. (2016)CYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lou et al. (2016)CYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK246Zhang et al. (2020)CYLDCSKPhosphorylationK247Cau et al. (2020)LSF4Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK246Zhang et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationK246Zhang et al. (2020)CGAResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationSa66Zhang et al. (2020)TTLAPolyphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)TTLAPolyphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)NDAcceljationSa66Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLAPolyphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Li et al. (2017)TLAmoneglutamylationS305 (mouse S291)Sci et al. (2015)PMF6DephosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Sci et al. (2016)NDAcceljationS305 (mouse S291)Sci et al. (2016) <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>MUL1</td><td>K63-linked polyubiquitination</td><td>K224/K236/K289/K338</td><td>Ni et al. <math>(2017)</math></td></t<>			MUL1	K63-linked polyubiquitination	K224/K236/K289/K338	Ni et al. $(2017)$				
TRIM32K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K150/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2012)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitinationK20/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2020e)RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.20/K224/K236Zhang et al. (2020e)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lao et al. (2016)EIF355Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lao et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Camog, Tang, et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Camog, et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS365Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Li et al. (2021)TTL4mongutanylationN.D.Li et al. (2021)TTL4mongutanylationS305 (mouse S291)Li et al. (2021)TTL4mongutanylationS305 (mouse S291)Li et al. (2016)PP6CAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)Sin et al. (2016)TTL4mongutanylationN.D.Li et al. (2016)PP6LAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)Sin et al. (2016)MTTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sin et al. (2017)MTTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of			TRIM56	K63-linked polyubiauitination	K150	Tsuchida et al. (2010)				
RNF115K63-linked polyubiquitnationK20/K224/K289Zhong et al. (2020)TKM38SUMO/JationK338Hu et al. (2016)TKM38SUMO/JationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)CKDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitnationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)CKDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitnationN.D.Loo et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationN.D.Loo et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK296Zhang et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK247Gao et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK246Cance et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK347Gao et al. (2020)NDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK347Gao et al. (2020)DTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitnationK347Gao et al. (2020)NDPhosphorylationK346Kang et al. (2020)NDPhosphorylationK345Kang et al. (2020)Signaling inhibitorCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)CGA5Resting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationK345Kia Ye, et al. (2016)TL14monoglutamylationK345Kia Ye, et al. (2016)Kia Ye, et al. (2016)MTAStimulated cellsACTPhosphorylationK384Sin et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D. </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>TRIM32</td> <td>K63-linked polyubiquitination</td> <td>K20/K150/K224/K236</td> <td>Zhang et al. <math>(2012)</math></td>			TRIM32	K63-linked polyubiquitination	K20/K150/K224/K236	Zhang et al. $(2012)$				
InterfaceTRIM38SUMOylationK338Hur et al. (2016)USP20Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2016)Linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lang et al. (2016)EIF3S5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lang et al. (2018)EIF3S5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lao et al. (2021)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang, Tang, et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK246Cao et al. (2021)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK246Mukaj et al. (2016)NDPhosphorylationY445Gao et al. (2020)NDPhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2020)NDPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)Signaling inhibitorITIL4monoglutamylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)Signaling inhibitorITIL4monoglutamylationS305 (mouse S420)Li ad. (2016)TIL4monoglutamylationS305 (mouse S420)Li ad. (2016)TIL4PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)So et al. (2021)NDAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)So et al. (2021)MTAResting cellsNDAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)So et al. (2017)NDAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)So et al. (2017)Simulated cellsSimulated cellsSimulated cellsSimulated cellsSimulated cellsSimulated cellsSimulat			RNF115	K63-linked polyubiquitination	K20/K224/K289	Zhong et al. $(2020e)$				
Image: Note of the section of the s			TRIM38	SUMOvlation	K338	Hu et al. $(2016)$				
CYLDRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Zhang et al. (2018)EIF350Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lao et al. (2016)EIF350Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lao et al. (2016)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zinang, Tang, et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Guo et al. (2021)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Guo et al. (2020)Difter ConstructionEGFRPhosphorylationS266Zinang et al. (2020)Signaling inhi/TEKIPhosphorylationCBK OPIMukai et al. (2020)Signaling inhi/FastPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)Signaling inhi/PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Ziong et al. (2020)TTL4PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Ziong et al. (2020)TTL4polyglutamylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPF6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li et al. (2021)MTAResting cellsN.D.AcrylationS435 (mouse S420)Li et al. (2021)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K62-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2016)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K62-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K62-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MTAResting cells <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>USP20</td><td>Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination</td><td>ND</td><td>Zhang et al. <math>(2016)</math></td></td<>			USP20	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	ND	Zhang et al. $(2016)$				
Image: Figure 1Effection of K48-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Lato et al. (2016)USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang, Tang, et al. (2020)USP45Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang, Tang, et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)EGFRPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)NDPalmitoylationS366Amag et al. (2020)NDPalmitoylationS366Mang et al. (2020)Signaling inhi/FFHosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)CGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)T11L6polyutamylationS305 (mouse S291)Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)T11L6polyutamylationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)T11L6polyutamylationS305 (mouse S420)Li ad Shu (2020)MTAResting cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S420)Li ad Shu (2020)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Mut et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP14Removal of K27			CYLD	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	ND	Zhang et al. (2018)				
USP44Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang, rang, et al. (2020)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK236Zhang, rang, et al. (2021)OTUD5Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Gao et al. (2021)EGRPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)EGRPhosphorylationS266Zhang, rang, et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationC88/C91Mukai et al. (2016)Signaling inhibitorC88/C91Mukai et al. (2016)Zhong et al. (2021)CGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)TTL1ApologhorylationN.D.Li et al. (2021)Li et al. (2021)TTL1ApologhorylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTL1ApologhorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)MTAResting cellsAKTpolyhorylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)MTAResting cellsN.DAcceylationS305 (mouse S291)Sco et al. (2015)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)NDUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2016)MTAKimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Chen et al. (2017)NDUSP13Removal of K27-lin			EIE3S5	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	N D	Luo et al. $(2016)$				
NTAResting cellsRemoval of K48-linked polyubiquitinationK347Gio et al. (2021)CSKPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)CSKPhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2020)TBK1PhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2019)Signaling inhibitonTILIAPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)CGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)TTLIAmonoglutamylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2016)Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLIAmonoglutamylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2017)Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLIAmonoglutamylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)MTAKarmulated cellsAKTPhosphorylationS434/K394/K144Dai et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2016)MTAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Li et al. (2016)MTA<			USP44	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	K236	Zhang Tang et al (2020)				
CSKPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)EGFRPhosphorylationY240/Y245Gao et al. (2020)BG1PhosphorylationY240Y245Wang et al. (2020)BG1PhosphorylationS366Zhang et al. (2016)Signaling inhibitorcGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhang et al. (2020)AurBPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)TTLL4monoglutanylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)PPP6CDephosphorylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)PPP6CDephosphorylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)MITAResting cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)DNA-PKPhosphorylationT68/S213Sun et al. (2017)DNA-PKPhosphorylationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP913Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)DNA-PKPhosphorylationN.D.Ye et al. (2017)DNA-PKPhosphorylationN.D.Ye et al. (2017)DNA-PKPhosphorylationN.D.Ye et al. (2017)DNA-PKPhosphorylation			OTUD5	Removal of K48-linked polyubiquitination	K347	$G_{10}$ et al. (2021)				
International International<			CSK	Phosphorylation	Y240/Y245	Gao et al. (2020)				
Signaling inhibitionTakinProphorylationSa66Zhang et al. (2019)Signaling inhibitionCS8/C91Mukai et al. (2016)Signaling inhibitionCS8/C91Mukai et al. (2016)CGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)AurBPhosphorylationN.D.Li et al. (2021)TTLL4monoglutamylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLL4polyglutamylationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)N.DAcetylationK305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)N.DAcetylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)MITAResting cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Se ot al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)N.DNito-alkylationCBasSitsLi et al. (2016)Hansen et al. (2018)DeprodationVEP1Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Chen et al., 2017)N.DNito-alkylationSitsLi et al. (2016)Hu et al. (2016)MITASimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK49 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016) </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>FGFR</td> <td>Phosphorylation</td> <td>¥245</td> <td>Wang et al. <math>(2020)</math></td>			FGFR	Phosphorylation	¥245	Wang et al. $(2020)$				
International NDPolymitodiaCostMukai et al. (2016)Signaling inhibitionNDKait et al. (2016)cGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationN.D.Li et al. (2021)AurBPhosphorylationKDDE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLL4monoglutamylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPF6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li and et al. (2021)NDAcceylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)NDAcceylationS305 (mouse S420)Li and S400NTTAResting cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)See et al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)VEP14PoephosphorylationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationN.D.VEP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationN.D.VEP14DephosphorylationN.D.N.D.Sun et al. (2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationSissLi et al. (2018)DegradationSENP2DesUMOylationK138K491/Hthe et al. (2016)Harsen et al. (2018)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (			TBK1	Phosphorylation	\$366	Thang et al. $(2019)$				
Signaling inhibition     Item to function     Status     Construction       cGAS     Resting cells     CDK1     Phosphorylation     S305 (mouse S291)     Zhong et al. (2020)       AurB     Phosphorylation     N.D.     Li et al. (2021)       TTLL4     monoglutamylation     E302     Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)       TTLL6     polyglutamylation     E272     Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)       TTLL6     polyglutamylation     S435 (mouse S420)     Li and Shu (2020)       ND     Acetylation     S435 (mouse S420)     Li and Shu (2020)       ND     Acetylation     S305 (mouse S291)     See et al. (2015)       Stimulated cells     AKT     Phosphorylation     S305 (mouse S291)     See et al. (2017)       MITA     Resting cells     USP13     Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitination     N.D.     Sum et al. (2017)       MITA     Stimulated cells     USP13     Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitination     N.D.     Sun et al. (2017)       VD     N.D     Nitro-alkylation     N.D.     Sun et al. (2018)     Sun et al. (2017)       VD     N.D     Nitro-alkylation     N.D.     Ket et al. (2019)       VSP49     Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitination     N.D.     CGen et al. (2017)       N.D.     Nitro-alkylation     CSB (CS1/H16     Hanse			N D	Palmitovlation	C88/C91	Mukai et al. $(2015)$				
GGASResting cellsCDK1PhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Zhong et al. (2020)AurBPhosphorylationN.D.Li et al. (2021)TTLITTLIAmonoglutamylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLIApolyglutamylationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)N.DAcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)N.DAcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Seo et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)DVA-PKPhosphorylationV.D.Sun et al. (2017)Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)DVB-PKN.D.Nitro-alkylationN.D.Chen et al., 2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationC88/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)PM1ADephosphorylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015) <td>Signaling inhi</td> <td>bition</td> <td>11121</td> <td>1 uninto y lution</td> <td>300, 371</td> <td></td>	Signaling inhi	bition	11121	1 uninto y lution	300, 371					
AurBPhosphorylationN.D.Li et al. (2017)TTLL4monoglutamylationE302Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTLL6polyglutamylationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationK335 (mouse \$420)Li at al. (2020)N.DAccetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)Stimulated cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse \$291)Seo et al. (2015)DNA-PKPhosphorylationT68/S213Sun et al. (2020)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)DegradationUSP23Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Li et al. (2018)DegradationLi et al. (2015)Stimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMO	cGAS	Resting cells	CDK1	Phosphorylation	\$305 (mouse \$291)	Zhong et al. (2020)				
Interf TTL14Interf monoglitatinglationE3O2Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTL4monoglitatinglationE3O2Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)TTL46polyglutanglationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)NDAcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)Stimulated cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP49Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)Ye et al. (2019)USP21Removal of K27-k63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2018)PegradationSitmulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationS358Li al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)<			AurB	Phosphorylation	N D	Li et al (2021)				
InterformationInterformationInterformationTTLL6polyglutamylationE272Xia, Ye, et al. (2016)PPP6CDephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Li and Shu (2020)N.DAcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)MITAResting cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2018)DegradationVDPVEP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)DegradationDephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2018)DegradationStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2015)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK275Wang et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationK370Xing et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PUN1/2DephosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)			TTLL4	monoglutamylation	E302	Xia Ye et al $(2016)$				
PPP6CpephosphorylationS435 (mouse S420)Ling 14 getter (2020)N.DAcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)N.DAcetylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)DNA-PKPhosphorylationT68/S213Sun et al. (2020)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP211Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP212Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2018)DegradationUSP13Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP211Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2018)DegradationUSP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2018)DegradationLi et al. (2015)PPM1ADephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK300Xing et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)ULK1Phosphorylation			TTLL6	polyglutamylation	E272	Xia Ye et al $(2016)$				
N.D.AcetylationK384/K394/K414Dai et al. (2019)MITAStimulated cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2020)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)Ye et al. (2019)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationCS8/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)PPM1ADephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK330Xing et al. (2015)RMF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PUN1/2DenborshorylationYia 54Xin oet al. (2013)			PPP6C	Dephosphorylation	S435 (mouse S420)	Li and Shu (2020)				
Stimulated cellsAKTPhosphorylationS305 (mouse S291)Seo et al. (2015)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2020)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2017)USP21Removal of K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationC88/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)PPM1ADephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2015)DegradationStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK150Zhong et al. (2017)MITAK180K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)MITAK180K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)MITAK48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2017) <tr< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>N.D</td><td>Acetylation</td><td>K384/K394/K414</td><td>Dai et al. (2019)</td></tr<>			N.D	Acetylation	K384/K394/K414	Dai et al. (2019)				
MITADNA-PKPhosphorylationT68/S213Sun et al. (2020)MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.N.D.N.D.N.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.N.D.N.D.N.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.N.D.Nitro-alkylationS358Li et al. (2018)DegradationSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK370Xing et al. (2017)NITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK150Zhong et al. (2019)MITAK48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)Ning et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PTPN1/20PENbordorylationYa45Xia et al. (2019)		Stimulated cells	AKT	Phosphorylation	S305 (mouse S291)	Seo et al. (2015)				
MITAResting cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)Stimulated cellsUSP13Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Sun et al. (2017)USP49Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.N.D.Ve et al. (2018)USP13DegradationCS8/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)CGASStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK370Xing et al. (2017)URAVERANP5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2017)ULKPhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PTPN1/2DehosphorylationY45Ya5Ya5			DNA-PK	Phosphorylation	T68/S213	Sun et al. (2020)				
Mitting condOut of the function poly using poly using the function of the function poly using the function of the fun	MITA	Resting cells	USP13	Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitination	ND	Sun et al. $(2017)$				
USP49Removal of K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP49Removal of K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.Ye et al. (2019)USP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.Nitro-alkylationC88/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)PPM1ADephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2015)DegradationcGASStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK150Zhong et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2009)TRIM29TRIM29K48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2013)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)TPIN1/2DenbosphorylationY45Xia et al. (2019)		Stimulated cells	USP13	Removal of K27-linked polyubiquitination	ND	Sun et al. $(2017)$				
OutputDescriptionNoticeNoticeUSP21Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitinationN.D.(Chen et al., 2017)N.D.N.D.Nitro-alkylationC88/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)PPM1ADephosphorylationS358Li et al. (2015)DegradationcGASStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DeSUMOylationK150Zhong et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2009)TRIM29ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)ULK1PhosphorylationY455Xia et al. (2013)		otimulated cens	USP49	Removal of K63-linked polyubiquitination	ND	Ye et al. $(2019)$				
N.D.Nitro-alkylationC88/C91/H16Hansen et al. (2018)DegradationC83Li et al. (2015)DegradationSS58Li et al. (2015)CGASStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK479 (mouse K464)Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK338Hu et al. (2016)MITAStimulated cellsSENP2DesUMOylationK170Xing et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK275Wang et al. (2015)RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2009)TRIM29K48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)TPIN1/20DephosphorylationY245Xia et al. (2019)			USP21	Removal of K27/K63-linked polyubiquitination	N.D.	(Chen et al., 2017)				
PPM1A     Dephosphorylation     S358     Li et al. (2015)       Degradation     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K479 (mouse K464)     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K275     Wang et al. (2015)       RNF5     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K150     Zhong et al. (2009)       TRIM29     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K370     Xing et al. (2017)       ULK1     Phosphorylation     S366     Konno et al. (2013)       PTPN1/2     Dephosphorylation     Y245     Xia et al. (2019)			N.D.	Nitro-alkylation	C88/C91/H16	Hansen et al. (2018)				
Degradation     K479 (mouse K464)     Hu et al. (2016)       CGAS     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K275     Wang et al. (2015)       RNF5     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K150     Zhong et al. (2009)       TRIM29     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K370     Xing et al. (2017)       ULK1     Phosphorylation     S366     Konno et al. (2013)       PTPN1/2     Dephosphorylation     Y245     Xia et al. (2019)			PPM1A	Dephosphorylation	\$358	Li et al. (2015)				
CGAS     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K479 (mouse K464)     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       TRIM30α     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K275     Wang et al. (2015)       RNF5     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K150     Zhong et al. (2009)       TRIM29     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K370     Xing et al. (2017)       ULK1     Phosphorylation     S366     Konno et al. (2013)       TPIN1/2     Dephosphorylation     Y245     Xia et al. (2019)	Degradation			Dephosphoryladon	5555					
MITA     Stimulated cells     SENP2     DeSUMOylation     K338     Hu et al. (2016)       TRIM30α     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K275     Wang et al. (2015)       RNF5     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K150     Zhong et al. (2009)       TRIM29     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K370     Xing et al. (2017)       ULK1     Phosphorylation     S366     Konno et al. (2013)       PTPN1/2     Dephosphorylation     Y245     Yia	cGAS	Stimulated cells	SENP2	DeSUMOvlation	K479 (mouse K464)	Hu et al. (2016)				
TRIM30α     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K275     Wang et al. (2015)       RNF5     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K150     Zhong et al. (2009)       TRIM29     K48-linked polyubiquitination     K370     Xing et al. (2017)       ULK1     Phosphorylation     S366     Konno et al. (2013)       PTPN1/2     Dephosphorylation     Y245     Xia et al. (2019)	MITA	Stimulated cells	SENP2	DeSUMOvlation	K338	Hu et al. (2016)				
RNF5K48-linked polyubiquitinationK150Zhong et al. (2009)TRIM29K48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PTPN1/2DephosphorylationY245Xia et al. (2019)		cons	TRIM30a	K48-linked polyubiquitination	K275	Wang et al. (2015)				
TRIM29K48-linked polyubiquitinationK370Xing et al. (2017)ULK1PhosphorylationS366Konno et al. (2013)PTPN1/2DephosphorylationY245Xia et al. (2019)			RNF5	K48-linked polyubiquitination	K150	Zhong et al. (2009)				
ULK1 Phosphorylation S366 Konno et al. (2013) PTPN1/2 Dephosphorylation Y245 Xia et al. (2019)			TRIM29	K48-linked polyubiquitination	K370	Xing et al. (2017)				
PTPN1/2 Dephosphorylation Y245 Xia et al (2019)			ULK1	Phosphorylation	\$366	Konno et al. (2013)				
			PTPN1/2	Dephosphorylation	Y245	Xia et al. (2019)				

K217, which inhibits K48-linked polyubiquitination of cGAS at K271 through the physical/spatial hindrance, and ultimately stabilizes cGAS (Hu et al., 2016). The deubiquitinase ubiquitin Specific Protease 29 (USP29) constitutively targets cGAS for deubiquitination at K271, thereby stabilizing cGAS in uninfected cells (Zhang, Tang, et al., 2020). However, the E3 ligases that regulate the ubiquitination of homeostatic cGAS remain to be identified.

Viral infection induces a vast number of post-translational modifications of cGAS (Table 1). Cytosolic carboxypeptidase 5 (CCP5) removes the monoglutamylation of cGAS, whereas CCP6 hydrolyzes the polyglutamylation of cGAS, both of which lead to activation of cGAS in response to DNA challenges (Xia, Ye, et al., 2016). The acetylation exerted by lysine acetyltransferase 5 (KAT5) at the N-terminal domain of cGAS is indispensable to initiate the immune responses in stimulated cells, whereas the acetylation of the C-terminal of cGAS blocks the activity of cGAS (Dai et al., 2019; Song et al., 2020), suggesting that the acetylation at different domains of cGAS may lead to a different function of cGAS. Besides, the E3 ubiquitin ligase TRIM14 recruits deubiquitinase USP14 to remove K48-linked ubiquitin chains and thereby inhibits degradation of cGAS by autophagic pathway in HSV-1 infected cells (Chen, Meng, et al., 2016). Interestingly, we have recently reported that HSV-1 infection induces the degradation of cGAS via the proteasomal pathway, which is counteracted by the deubiquitinase USP29 (Zhang, Tang, et al., 2020). It is thus likely that the stability of cGAS after viral infection is controlled by multiple mechanisms.

Two studies revealed that the E3 ubiquitin ligase TRIM56 and RINCK target cGAS for monoubiquitination, thereby positively regulating the synthesis of cGAMP (Liu, Zhang, Cai, et al., 2018; Seo et al., 2018). TRIM38 also specifically catalyzes the SUMOylation of cGAS to prevent the proteasomal degradation of cGAS at the early phase of viral infection. Subsequently, SENP2 de-SUMOylates cGAS at the late phase of infection to shut down the immune responses (Hu et al., 2016), demonstrating an elegant temporal step-wise control of cGAS activity and stability. The kinases AKT and DNA-PK phosphorylate cGAS during infection of DNA

virus, which robustly suppresses its enzymatic activity and fine-tunes immune responses to DNA stimulation (Seo et al., 2015; Sun et al., 2020). Future investigations are required to elucidate whether and how these PTMs function cooperatively or redundantly to regulate the activity and stability of cGAS in a cell-type or stimuli-dependent manner.

#### Post-translational modification of MITA/STING

Resting-state MITA is regulated by ubiquitination and deubiquitination. The K27 linked-polyubiquitin chains are removed by the deubiquitinating enzyme (DUB) ubiquitin-specific protease 13 (USP13), which inhibits the basal activity of MITA in a manner dependent on blocking its recruitment of TBK1 (Sun et al., 2017). Moreover, inactive rhomboid protein 2 (iRhom2) recruits the deubiquitination enzyme EIF3S5 to constitutively deconjugate K48-linked polyubiquitin chains from MITA and prevent its degradation through the proteasomal pathways (Luo et al., 2016). Recently, one report has shown that death-associated protein kinase 3 (DAPK3) stabilizes MITA in resting cells via suppressing its K48-linked poly-ubiquitination and degradation of proteasome pathway (Takahashi et al., 2021). However, the E3 ligases that regulate the ubiquitination of homeostatic MITA have not been identified yet.

Though the binding of cGAMP leads to dimerization of MITA, the full activation of MITA requires various PTMs accompanied by budding off the ER to ERGIC. HSV-1-infection induces K27-linked polyubiquitin of MITA and such a PTM is mediated by AMFR, which provides an anchoring platform for recruiting TBK1 (Wang et al., 2014). It has been shown that TRIM56, TRIM32, and MUL1 catalyze K63-linked ubiquitination of MITA, which promotes the oligomerization and full activation of MITA (Ni et al., 2017; Tsuchida et al., 2010; Zhang et al., 2012). However, studies with TRIM56 and TRIM32 knockout mice suggest that deletion either of them has minimal effect on ubiquitination of MITA after HSV-1 infection (Seo et al., 2018; Yang, Liu, et al., 2017). Whether these two enzymes function redundantly for the ubiquitination of MITA is unknown. More recently, we have demonstrated that knockout of RNF115 impairs HSV-1-induced K63-linked ubiquitination of MITA and the oligomerization of MITA, suggesting that RNF115 is a bona fide E3 ligase for the K63-linked ubiquitination of MITA after HSV-1 infection (Zhang, Xiong, et al., 2020). In contrast, cGAMP- or HSV-1-induced dimerization of MITA is not affected by the knockout of RNF115, indicating that the oligomerization of MITA is followed by cGAMP-mediated dimerization and requires 63-mediated ubiquitination.

The MITA dimers or oligomers bud off the ER and are trafficking to the Golgi apparatus where it undergoes palmitoylation to activate downstream signaling cascades (Mukai et al., 2016). Such a PTM is suppressed by nitro-alkylation modified by endogenously formed nitro-fatty acids in the late phase of viral infection (Hansen et al., 2018; Mukai et al., 2016). Afterward, TBK1 is recruited to and phosphorylates MITA at S366, thereby promoting the recruitment and phosphorylation of IRF3 (Zhang et al., 2019). Consistently, the S366A mutation in MITA was found to be unable to interact with and activate IRF3 in infected cells. However, the MITA<sup>S365A</sup> (an ortholog of hMITA<sup>S366A</sup>) mice do not show hypersensitivity to HSV-1 infection compared to the wild-type mice (Yamashiro et al., 2020; Yum et al., 2021), indicating a TBK1-independent role of MITA for anti-viral immune responses. In this context, MITA also promotes autophagy to clear viral DNA which is believed as a primordial function of MITA (Gui et al., 2019). Other kinases including DAPK3 and CSK are also involved in the phosphorylation and activation of MITA (Gao et al., 2020; Takahashi et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2020). Collectively, these data indicate a sequential multi-step activation of MITA after viral infection, i.e., cGAMP-mediated dimerization, ubiquitination-mediated oligomerization, palmitoylation- and phosphorylation-mediated recruitment of TBK1 and IRF3.

To avoid overwhelming activation of MITA and harmful immune responses, suitable PTMs are essential to tune down the activation of MITA. The E3 ligases RNF5, TRIM $30\alpha$ , and TRIM29 catalyze K48-linked ubiquitination and proteasomal degradation of MITA at the late stage of

viral infection, which is counteracted by USP20, USP44, CYLD, EIF3S5, and OTUD5 (Guo et al., 2021; Luo et al., 2016; Wang et al., 2015; Xing et al., 2017; Xu et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2016, 2018; Zhong et al., 2009). USP49 removes K63-linked polyubiquitination of MITA, thereby negatively regulating the signaling pathway (Ye et al., 2019). Besides, serine/threonine UNC-51-like kinase (ULK1) phosphorylates MITA after the activation of IRF3 and NF-kB during the infection of HSV-1, which finally avoids sustained production of inflammatory cytokines (Konno et al., 2013). Phosphatase PPM1A and PTPN1/2 also act as negative regulators by dephosphorylation of MITA to avert hyperactivation of the MITA-mediated immune responses (Li et al., 2015; Xia et al., 2019). Together, although a mass of enzymes and their corresponding PTMs have been identified to covalently modify MITA (Table 1) during different phases of viral infection, further work in this field is needed to elucidate how different PTMs crosstalk and dynamically regulate the activity and stability of MITA.

#### cGAS-MITA/STING pathway in autoimmune disease

As described above, cGAS is inactive or kept away from self-DNA under homeostatic conditions. Accordingly, dysregulation of such a process would result in constitutively and spontaneously activation of cGAS, which promotes the upregulation of proinflammatory cytokines and induces autoimmune disorders. MITA is kept in ER as monomer under homeostatic conditions. Removal of the ER-retention factors or gain-of-function mutations of MITA would lead to constitutive activation of MITA and auto-inflammatory diseases.

#### DNase and RNase mutations

To identify endogenous DNA sensors, Stetson et al. have identified TREX1 as a sensor of cytosolic DNA (Stetson et al., 2008). However, TREX1 does not trigger activation of IRF3 and the induction of type I IFNs. Rather, the knockout of TREX1 leads to the accumulation of cytosolic DNA and sustained autoantibody production and inflammation. Trex1 is a  $3' \rightarrow 5'$  DNA exonuclease and consists of the N-terminal DNase domain necessary for exonuclease activity and the C-terminal transmembrane helix necessary for ER localization. Accumulative DNA in the cytoplasm from various sources, including occasional leakage of nuclear DNA, the release of mtDNA, and DNA from reverse-transcribed endogenous RNA, can be recognized and digested by TREX1 (Fig. 1). A number of clinical studies reveal that mutations in TREX1 have been identified in autoimmune diseases including Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome (AGS), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), and retinal vasculopathy with cerebral leukodystrophy (RVCL) (Crow & Manel, 2015; Grieves et al., 2015; Hasan et al., 2015; Hemphill et al., 2021; Stetson et al., 2008). These mutations in both N-terminal and C-terminal domain result in loss-of-function of TREX1 and the abnormal accumulation of cytosolic DNA and ultimately constant activation of the cGAS-MITA pathway. Similarly, Trex1-deficient or -mutated (Trex1<sup>D18N/D18N</sup>) mice exhibit the lethal autoimmune phenotype, which can be genetically rescued by depletion of cGAS or MITA (Gao et al., 2015; Morita et al., 2004; Simpson et al., 2020; Stetson et al., 2008; Xiao et al., 2019). These observations suggest that the activation of the cGAS-MITA pathway mediates the autoimmune phenotypes in  $Trex1^{-/-}$  or  $Trex1^{D18N/D18N}$  mice.

Deoxyribonuclease (DNase) II encoded by *DNASE2*, an endonuclease that digests ssDNA and dsDNA in the lysosome, is also related to autoimmune diseases in humans (Hong et al., 2020; Rodero et al., 2017). Biallelic mutations in *DNASE2* result in deficiency of Dnase II endonuclease activity, consequently leading to overproduction of interferons and ISGs in the lymphocytes and monocytes. Similarly, deletion of *cGas*, *Mita*, or *Ifnar1* rescues the lethal autoimmune phenotypes of *DNaseII*<sup>-/-</sup> mice (Ahn et al., 2012; Gao et al., 2015).

Several mutations in ribonuclease H2 (RNase H2) are also identified in patients with AGS syndrome (Gunther et al., 2015; Nishimura et al., 2019). RNase H2 removes RNA/DNA hetero-stranded nucleic acids, such as RNA embedded in double-stranded DNA during DNA replication and R loops formed during transcription structure. Rnaseh2a<sup>G37S</sup> and Rnaseh2a<sup>A174T</sup> are activity-attenuated mutants. The Rnaseh2a<sup>G37S</sup> and Rnaseh2a<sup>A174T</sup> knock-in mice exhibit increased expression of interferons and ISGs and autoimmunity, which can be rescued by deletion of MITA (Mackenzie et al., 2016; Pokatayev et al., 2016). A subset of AGS patients carry mutations in three other genes including SAMHD1, ADAR1, and IFIH1, and exhibits the phenotypes of upregulation of ISGs (Coggins et al., 2020; Oda et al., 2014; Rice et al., 2009, 2012). However, whether such symptom is dependent on cGAS-MITA is unknown. In addition, the gain-of-function mutations of cGAS have not been identified.

#### MITA/STING gain-of-function mutations

In 2014, a clinical study reported the discovery of MITA gain-offunction mutations (MITA N154S and V155M) in six patients exhibiting systemic inflammation, scaling lesions of extremities and cheeks, and interstitial lung disease, which is termed STING-associated vasculopathy with onset in infancy (SAVI) (Liu et al., 2014). Over the past 7 years, other gain-of-function mutations of MITA have been identified, including S102P/F279L, V147L, G166E, C206Y, R281O, R284O, R284G, and R284S (Chia et al., 2016; Konig et al., 2017; Konno et al., 2018; Melki et al., 2017; Motwani et al., 2019a, 2019b; Munoz et al., 2015; Saldanha et al., 2018; Seo et al., 2017). All of the mutant MITA spontaneously dimerize and bud off from the ER to the Golgi apparatus even in the absence of cGAMP. Continuous accumulation of mutant MITA in the Golgi apparatus leads to activation of TBK1 and IRF3, which results in the production of interferons and ISGs. Furthermore, homozygous knock-in mice carrying MITA<sup>N153S</sup> mutation (human MITA N154S ortholog) can not survive gestation, whereas heterozygous MITA<sup>N153S</sup> and MITA<sup>V154M</sup>

(human MITA V155M ortholog) mice develop T cell cytopenia, myeloid cell expansion, spontaneous pulmonary and renal inflammation, similar to SAVI patients (Bennion et al., 2019; Bouis et al., 2019; Warner et al., 2017). MITA<sup>N153S</sup> mice also exhibit defects in lymph-node organogenesis and innate lymphoid cell development (Bennion et al., 2020). However, the overwhelming type I IFN gene expression is not observed in the MITA<sup>N153S</sup> mice, which has been reported in patients with SAVI. In contrast, activation of the functional NF- $\kappa B$  pathway plays a dominant role in the SAVI-like disease of MITA<sup>N153S</sup> mice. The different phenotypes between the SAVI patients and the gain-of-function MITA mutated mice indicate different regulatory mechanisms of human and mouse MITA. One recent study shows that MITA<sup>N153S</sup> mice develop intestinal inflammation in the colon in a manner dependent on the abnormal accumulation of MITA in myeloid cells, suggesting that MITA<sup>N153S</sup> could be the potential target for patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) (Shmuel-Galia et al., 2021). Collectively, these studies indicate that abnormal activation of the MITA pathway contributes to various autoimmune diseases, suggesting that therapeutic targeting of these responses could be beneficial for the treatment of the related diseases.

#### cGAS-MITA/STING pathway in cancer

In recent years, emerging studies have implied the important regulatory function of the cGAS-MITA signaling pathway in tumors. Several small-molecule compounds as agonists for MITA have been developed for clinical trials to test their effects on cancer prevention.

#### Tumor suppressive role

Accumulating evidence has shown that the cGAS-MITA pathway



Fig. 2. Regulation of cGAS-MITA/STING pathway in tumor suppression. In early neoplastic cells, the cGAS-MITA pathway plays a tumor-suppressive role. DNA damage sourced from such as oxidative stress, radiation, CIN, or cisplatin leads to DNA accumulate in the cytoplasm, which activates the cGAS and promotes the synthesis of cGAMP. On one hand, cGAMP binds to MITA to upregulate the expression of type I IFNs and SASP genes in tumors, which in turn mediates tumor-suppressive effects. On the other hand, the cGAS-MITA pathway could mediate the crosstalk between the tumor cells and DCs nearby. Tumor DNA or tumor-derived cGAMP could activate the cGAS-MITA signaling in DCs, finally initiating tumor clearance mediated by immune cells such as CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells or NK cells. CIN, chromosomal instability; cGAMP, 2',3'-cyclic GMP-AMP; IFN, interferon; SASP, senescenceassociated secretory phenotype; DC, dendritic cell; NK cells, natural killer cells. IFN-R, IFN receptor.

plays a tumor-suppressive role (Fig. 2). One of the most important features of cancer cells is chromosomal instability (CIN) that leads to chromosomal missegregation during mitosis, which ultimately promotes the formation of micronuclei (Crasta et al., 2012). The micronuclear envelopes are subject to break up, which causes the accumulation of genomic DNA in the cytoplasm (Harding et al., 2017; Mackenzie et al., 2017). Alternatively, radiotherapies, and chemo-reagents such as cisplatin, and intrinsic DNA damage also lead to the production of cytoplasmic DNA (Ahn et al., 2014; Dou et al., 2017; Harding et al., 2017; Mackenzie et al., 2017). Besides, oxidative stress in cancer cells causes mitochondrial damage by permeabilization of the inner and outer mitochondrial membranes, consequently leading to the release of mtDNA in the cytoplasm (Sansone et al., 2017; Tan et al., 2015). When the DNA in the cytoplasm accumulates above the threshold, it would activate the cGAS-MITA pathway that upregulates the production of type I IFNs to promote the infiltration and activation of immune cells, such as T cells and nature killer (NK) cells to elicit host immune responses (Harlin et al., 2009; Marcus et al., 2018). Moreover, the cGAS-MITA signaling upregulates the senescence-associated secretory phenotype (SASP) genes including inflammatory cytokines, chemokines, growth factors, and proteases, thereby facilitating senescence of cancer cells and tumor clearance (Dou et al., 2017; Kwon & Bakhoum, 2020; Yang, Wang, et al., 2017). Alternatively, tumor-derived DNA or cGAMP that is engulfed by surrounding DCs activates cGAS-MITA signaling and promotes IFN-β production. Subsequently, IFN-B promotes the cross-presentation of  $CD8\alpha^+$  DC subset for activation of tumor antigen-specific  $CD8^+$  T cells (Woo et al., 2014). Consistently, mice that lack IFNAR1 in DCs display significant defects in antigen cross-presentation to CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells (Diamond et al., 2011). DC or tumor-derived IFN- $\beta$  also activates the NK cells in a manner dependent on IFNAR signaling in NK cells (Marcus et al., 2018). Ultimately, activated T cells and NK cells in turn traffic to tumor sites and promote tumor suppression.

Under selective pressure, some surviving cancer cells are prone to harbor cGAS or MITA deficiency. MITA expression has been reported to be undetectable in several cancerous melanomas and colorectal adenocarcinoma cell lines (Xia et al., 2016b, 2016c). Moreover, *KRAS*-driven lung cancers markedly silence MITA expression owing to deficiency of LKB1 (Kitajima et al., 2019). The deficiency of MLH1 that is responsible for regulating exonuclease 1 nuclease activity results in DNA accumulating in the cytosol and activating the cGAS-MITA pathway (Guan et al., 2021). One study demonstrates that cGAS expression is deficient in human defective MMR gene *Mlh1* (dMLH1) cancer lines (Lu et al., 2021), and loss of or impaired cGAS-MITA responses confers defective MMR (dMMR) tumors resistance to immune-checkpoint blockade (ICB) therapy, which suggests that the cGAS-MITA pathway is a potential biomarker for immunotherapy in patients with dMMR cancers.

Considering MITA suppresses tumorigenesis, multiple agonists of MITA have been developed to mimic the activation of the cGAS-MITA pathway for tumor suppression. The agonist of MITA, 5,6-dimethylxanthenone-4 acetic acid (DMXAA), promotes the activation of MITA and destroys the blood vessel walls in tumor tissues, which significantly facilitates the fade of solid tumors in mice (Gao et al., 2014; Zhao et al., 2002). However, clinical trials of treatment DMXAA (also known as ASA404) with non-small cell lung cancer patients are failed in phase III due to tiny therapeutic effects (Lara et al., 2011). It is now clear that DMXAA only binds and activates mouse MITA but not human MITA (Conlon et al., 2013). CDN 3'3'-cGAMP induces the expression of type I interferon in mouse melanoma, liver cancer, and lung cancer cells by activating MITA (Tang et al., 2016). Intraperitoneal injection of 3'3'-cGAMP into Eµ-TCL1 transgenic mice can significantly inhibit the process of chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL). In addition, 2',3'-cGAMP also presents an anti-cancer effect on mouse colon cancer, reducing the size of mouse tumors and prolonging the survival of mice (Yang et al., 2019). Expect for endogenous CDNs, synthetic modified CDNs are well developed. ML RR-S2 CDN (also known as ADU-S100 or MIW815) exhibits significant antitumor efficiency in multiple mouse cancer models and binds human MITA (Corrales et al., 2015). Follow-up clinical trials of ADU-S100 or in combination with checkpoint (CTLA-4 or PD-1) inhibitors are now ongoing to phase I or phase II (Table 2). Other drugs including E7766, BMS-986301, IMSA101, GSK3745417, IMSA101, MK-1454, and SB 11285 are currently undergoing clinical trials and are present in Table 2. Recently, MSA-2 and SR-717, non-nucleotide MITA agonists, were reported to display anti-tumor activity (Chin et al., 2020; Pan et al., 2020). MSA-2 amenable to oral administration induces elevations of IFN- $\beta$  and almost complete tumor regression in MC38 tumor-bearing mice. Intraperitoneal injection of SR-717 exhibits anti-tumor activity in a manner dependent on activating of CD8<sup>+</sup> T cells, NK cells, dendritic cells, and the cross-priming of antigens. However, MSA-2 and SR-717 have not entered into clinical trials yet.

#### Tumor promoting role

Though cGAS and MITA are lowly expressed in tumor cells, high expression of cGAS and MITA has already been reported to be positively correlated with poor prognosis in a small part of patients with colorectal cancer (An et al., 2019). Chronic inflammation induced by MITA-associated SASP may facilitate oncogene-driven senescence suppression (Fig. 3) (Dou et al., 2017; Toso et al., 2014). Moreover, activation of cGAS-MITA, triggered by DNA derived from CIN-generated micronuclei, induces noncanonical NF-kB signaling responses and metastasis in a tumor cell-autonomous manner (Bakhoum et al., 2018). Alternatively, Brain metastatic cancer cells can utilize gap-junctions to transfer cGAMP to astrocytes, activating MITA and downstream inflammatory genes such as IFN- $\alpha$  and TNF, which, in turn, elicits the STAT1 and NF-kB pathways in brain metastatic cancer cells, ultimately promoting tumor growth and chemoresistance (Chen, Boire, et al., 2016). In addition, activation of MITA enhances infiltration of regulatory T cells and enzyme indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase (IOD), consequently mediating tolerance of immune response and inhibition of T cells proliferation (Liang et al., 2015; Munn & Mellor, 2016). MITA agonist is able to upregulate the expression of PD-L1, a protein that inhibits the immune response, which promotes tumor progression (Corrales et al., 2016; Fu et al., 2015). Autophagy mediated by MITA is another inducement of immune evasion and tumor promotion (Pommier et al., 2018; Terai et al., 2018). T cells expressing activated MITA exhibit cytopenia phenotype, indicating that constitutive activation of MITA in T cells leads to dysfunction or exhaustion of T cells (Cerboni et al., 2017; Wu et al., 2019). In this context, one recent report has revealed that MITA possesses IFN-independent activities in T cells, which is responsible for tumor immune evasion by inducing T cell death (Wu et al., 2020), though the mechanism by which MITA induces T cell death is unknown now. It is thus likely that the stage and types of tumors are associated with the tumor-suppressive or promoting roles of the cGAS-MITA pathway. Therefore, several agonists showed impressive potential in antitumor immunity due to the suppressive role of MITA in early tumorigenesis. However, prolonged activation of the cGAS-MITA signaling may negligently inhibit antitumor immunity and drive tumor metastasis, which makes the application of MITA agonists more challenging in the clinic. To conquer this challenge, further work is required to unveil the molecular requirements and regulations that function in tumor progression or suppression via identifying the downstream cascade of the cGAS-MITA pathway.

#### **Concluding remarks**

The discovery of cGAS and MITA has fundamentally advanced the understanding of immune responses mediated by immune-stimulatory DNA. The activation of the cGAS-MITA pathway ensures the sufficient expression of downstream anti-pathogenic genes, whereas excess immune responses lead to tissue damage and immune pathology (Crowl et al., 2017). Thus, it is reasonable that a series of regulatory elements sequentially functions to fine-tune the immune responses in different

#### Table 2

Summary of MITA/STING agonists in clinical trials.

Agent	Cancer type	Phase	Target	NCT number
ASA404	Adult Solid Tumor	I	MITA	NCT00003697
ASA404	Hormone Refractory Metastatic Prostate Cancer	II	MITA	NCT00111618
ASA404 + Paclitaxel + Carboplatin	Non-small Cell Lung Cance	Ι	MITA + microtubule + DNA synthesis	NCT00674102
ASA404 + Paclitaxel + Carboplatin	Locally Advanced and Metastatic NSCLC	I/II	MITA + microtubule + DNA synthesis	NCT00832494
ASA404	Refractory Tumors	Ι	MITA	NCT00856336
ASA404	Solid Tumors	Ι	MITA	NCT00863733
ASA404	Advanced or Recurrent Solid Tumors	Ι	MITA	NCT01285453
ASA404 + Paclitaxel + Carboplatin	Small Cell Lung Cancer	II	MITA + microtubule + DNA synthesis	NCT01057342
ADU-S100	Head and neck cancer	II	MITA	NCT03937141
ADU-S100 $\pm$ ipilimumab	Solid tumors/lymphomas	Ι	MITA $\pm$ CTLA-4	NCT02675439
ADU-S100 + PDR001	Solid tumors/lymphomas	I	MITA + PD1	NCT03172936
E7766	Urinary bladder neoplasms	Ι	MITA	NCT04109092
E7766	Lymphoma/advanced solid tumors	Ι	MITA	NCT04144140
GSK3745417	Neoplasms	Ι	MITA	NCT03843359
MK-1454	Solid tumors/lymphomas	Ι	MITA	NCT03010176
MK-1454 + pembrolizumab	Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma	II	MITA + PD1	NCT04220866
BMS-986301	Solid cancers	I	MITA	NCT03956680
SB 11285	Solid tumor	Ι	MITA	NCT04096638



Fig. 3. Regulation of cGAS-MITA/STING pathway in tumor promotion. The cGAS-MITA pathway exerts its function as a tumor promoter in metastatic tumor cells. Tumors carrying high chromosome instability could promote the formation of micronuclei, which ruptures and release DNA to the cytosol, triggering the activation of the cGAS-MITA signaling. Chronic activation of the pathway promotes the suppression of type I IFNs expression and initiates the upregulation of noncanonical NF-kB signaling, facilitating tumor metastasis. The IDO and proinflammatory cytokines together induce the formation of immunosuppressive TME. Moreover, MITA activation could lead to T cell exhaustion in a manner independently of IFN, which also contributes to the maintenance of immunosuppressive TME. MITA may also promote tumor metastasis via PD-L1 upregulation and autophagy process. In addition, tumors can directly transfer the cGAMP to neighboring cells such as astrocytes by gap junctions, ultimately accelerating the progression of tumor metastasis.

phases of immunostimulatory DNA stimulation or viral infection. Recent studies showed that cGAS and MITA undergo phase condensation during viral infection, which provides deeper insights into the regulation of their activities (Du & Chen, 2018; Minhas & Holehouse, 2021; Xu et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2021). In this context, studies are required to explore how the regulators crosstalk to each other to dynamically adjust the activities of the cGAS-MITA pathway.

The cGAS-MITA pathway plays a vital role in autoimmune diseases and cancers. TREX1 deficiency and MITA mutations, as we know, lead to autoimmune diseases, such as AGS, SLE, RVCL, and SAVI, suggesting that the cGAS-MITA axis can be targeted for therapeutic intervention of these diseases in the future. However, the activation of the cGAS-MITA pathway in cancers is a double-edged sword. Acute immune responses induced by the cGAS-MITA signaling may function as a barrier to early neoplastic progression, while chronic activation of the pathway may induce the formation of an immunosuppressive tumor environment (TME), eventually leading to tumor growth and metastasis. MITA agonists have been developed to enhance tumor immunogenicity. However, it should be cautious that hyperactivation of MITA signaling may inadvertently worsen the pathology of patients with cancers. Thus, further work is necessary to understand the different regulations behind two different outcomes induced by the cGAS-MITA signaling, to ensure careful selection of patients to proceed personalized therapeutic regimen.

#### Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

#### Acknowledgements

Studies in our lab are supported by grants from the National Key Research and Development Program of China (2018TFE0204500 and 2018YFC1004601), Natural Science Foundation of China (32070900), Innovative Research Groups of Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province (2020CFA015), Fundamental Research Funds for Central Universities (2042020kf0207), Medical Science Advancement Program (Basic Medical Sciences) of Wuhan University (TFJC2018004), and the Non-Profit Central Research Institute Fund of Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences (2020-PT320-004).

#### References

- Aguirre, S., Luthra, P., Sanchez-Aparicio, M. T., Maestre, A. M., Patel, J., Lamothe, F., Fredericks, A. C., Tripathi, S., Zhu, T., Pintado-Silva, J., et al. (2017). Dengue virus NS2B protein targets cGAS for degradation and prevents mitochondrial DNA sensing during infection. *Nature Microbiology*, 2, Article 17037.
- Ahn, J., & Barber, G. N. (2014). Self-DNA, STING-dependent signaling and the origins of autoinflammatory disease. Current Opinion in Immunology, 31, 121–126.
- Ahn, J., Gutman, D., Saijo, S., & Barber, G. N. (2012). STING manifests self DNAdependent inflammatory disease. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109, 19386–19391.
- Ahn, J., Xia, T., Konno, H., Konno, K., Ruiz, P., & Barber, G. N. (2014). Inflammationdriven carcinogenesis is mediated through STING. *Nature Communications*, 5, 5166.
- Andreeva, L., Hiller, B., Kostrewa, D., Lassig, C., de Oliveira Mann, C. C., Jan Drexler, D., Maiser, A., Gaidt, M., Leonhardt, H., Hornung, V., et al. (2017). cGAS senses long and HMGB/TFAM-bound U-turn DNA by forming protein-DNA ladders. *Nature*, 549, 394–398.
- An, X., Zhu, Y., Zheng, T., Wang, G., Zhang, M., Li, J., Ji, H., Li, S., Yang, S., Xu, D., et al. (2019). An analysis of the expression and association with immune cell infiltration of the cGAS/STING pathway in pan-cancer. *Molecular Therapy - Nucleic Acids*, 14, 80–89.
- Bakhoum, S. F., Ngo, B., Laughney, A. M., Cavallo, J. A., Murphy, C. J., Ly, P., Shah, P., Sriram, R. K., Watkins, T. B. K., Taunk, N. K., et al. (2018). Chromosomal instability drives metastasis through a cytosolic DNA response. *Nature*, 553, 467–472.
- Barnett, K. C., Coronas-Serna, J. M., Zhou, W., Ernandes, M. J., Cao, A., Kranzusch, P. J., & Kagan, J. C. (2019). Phosphoinositide interactions position cGAS at the plasma membrane to ensure efficient distinction between self- and viral DNA. *Cell*, 176, 1432–1446. e1411.
- Bennion, B. G., Croft, C. A., Ai, T. L., Qian, W., Menos, A. M., Miner, C. A., Fremond, M. L., Doisne, J. M., Andhey, P. S., Platt, D. J., et al. (2020). STING gain-of-function disrupts lymph node organogenesis and innate lymphoid cell development in mice. *Cell Reports*, 31, Article 107771.
- Bennion, B. G., Ingle, H., Ai, T. L., Miner, C. A., Platt, D. J., Smith, A. M., Baldridge, M. T., & Miner, J. J. (2019). A human gain-of-function STING mutation causes immunodeficiency and gammaherpesvirus-induced pulmonary fibrosis in mice. *Journal of Virology*, 93.
- Bouis, D., Kirstetter, P., Arbogast, F., Lamon, D., Delgado, V., Jung, S., Ebel, C., Jacobs, H., Knapp, A. M., Jeremiah, N., et al. (2019). Severe combined immunodeficiency in stimulator of interferon genes (STING) V154M/wild-type mice. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 143, 712–725. e715.
  Boyer, J. A., Spangler, C. J., Strauss, J. D., Cesmat, A. P., Liu, P., McGinty, R. K., &
- Boyer, J. A., Spangler, C. J., Strauss, J. D., Cesmat, A. P., Liu, P., McGinty, R. K., & Zhang, Q. (2020). Structural basis of nucleosome-dependent cGAS inhibition. *Science*, 370, 450–454.
- Burdette, D. L., Monroe, K. M., Sotelo-Troha, K., Iwig, J. S., Eckert, B., Hyodo, M., Hayakawa, Y., & Vance, R. E. (2011). STING is a direct innate immune sensor of cyclic di-GMP. *Nature*, 478, 515–518.
- Burdette, D. L., & Vance, R. E. (2013). STING and the innate immune response to nucleic acids in the cytosol. *Nature Immunology*, 14, 19–26.
- Cai, Z., Jhang, M. X., Tang, Z., Zhang, Q., Ye, J., Xiong, T. C., Zhang, Z. D., & Zhong, B. (2020). USP22 promotes IRF3 nuclear translocation and antiviral responses by deubiquitinating the importin protein KPNA2. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 217.
- Cao, D., Han, X., Fan, X., Xu, R. M., & Zhang, X. (2020). Structural basis for nucleosomemediated inhibition of cGAS activity. *Cell Research*, 30, 1088–1097.
- Cerboni, S., Jeremiah, N., Gentili, M., Gehrmann, U., Conrad, C., Stolzenberg, M. C., Picard, C., Neven, B., Fischer, A., Amigorena, S., et al. (2017). Intrinsic antiproliferative activity of the innate sensor STING in T lymphocytes. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 214, 1769–1785.
- Chen, Q., Boire, A., Jin, X., Valiente, M., Er, E. E., Lopez-Soto, A., Jacob, L., Patwa, R., Shah, H., Xu, K., et al. (2016). Carcinoma-astrocyte gap junctions promote brain metastasis by cGAMP transfer. *Nature*, 533, 493–498.
- Chen, M., Meng, Q., Qin, Y., Liang, P., Tan, P., He, L., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y., Huang, J., Wang, R. F., et al. (2016). TRIM14 inhibits cGAS degradation mediated by selective autophagy receptor p62 to promote innate immune responses. *Molecular Cell*, 64, 105–119.
- Chen, Q., Sun, L., & Chen, Z. J. (2016). Regulation and function of the cGAS-STING pathway of cytosolic DNA sensing. *Nature Immunology*, 17, 1142–1149.

- Chia, J., Eroglu, F. K., Ozen, S., Orhan, D., Montealegre-Sanchez, G., de Jesus, A. A., Goldbach-Mansky, R., & Cowen, E. W. (2016). Failure to thrive, interstitial lung disease, and progressive digital necrosis with onset in infancy. *Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology*, 74, 186–189.
- Chin, E. N., Yu, C., Vartabedian, V. F., Jia, Y., Kumar, M., Gamo, A. M., Vernier, W., Ali, S. H., Kissai, M., Lazar, D. C., et al. (2020). Antitumor activity of a systemic STING-activating non-nucleotide cGAMP mimetic. *Science*, 369, 993–999.
- Chiu, Y. H., Macmillan, J. B., & Chen, Z. J. (2009). RNA polymerase III detects cytosolic DNA and induces type I interferons through the RIG-I pathway. *Cell*, 138, 576–591. Chu, T. T., Tu, X., Yang, K., Wu, J., Repa, J. J., & Yan, N. (2021). Tonic prime-boost of
- STING signalling mediates Niemann-Pick disease type C. Nature, 596, 570–575.
  Coggins, S. A., Mahboubi, B., Schinazi, R. F., & Kim, B. (2020). SAMHD1 functions and human diseases. Viruses, 12.
- Conlon, J., Burdette, D. L., Sharma, S., Bhat, N., Thompson, M., Jiang, Z., Rathinam, V. A., Monks, B., Jin, T., Xiao, T. S., et al. (2013). Mouse, but not human STING, binds and signals in response to the vascular disrupting agent 5,6-dimethylxanthenone-4-acetic acid. *The Journal of Immunology*, 190, 5216–5225.
- Corrales, L., Glickman, L. H., McWhirter, S. M., Kanne, D. B., Sivick, K. E., Katibah, G. E., Woo, S. R., Lemmens, E., Banda, T., Leong, J. J., et al. (2015). Direct activation of STING in the tumor microenvironment leads to potent and systemic tumor regression and immunity. *Cell Reports*, 11, 1018–1030.
- Corrales, L., McWhirter, S. M., Dubensky, T. W., Jr., & Gajewski, T. F. (2016). The host STING pathway at the interface of cancer and immunity. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 126, 2404–2411.
- Crasta, K., Ganem, N. J., Dagher, R., Lantermann, A. B., Ivanova, E. V., Pan, Y., Nezi, L., Protopopov, A., Chowdhury, D., & Pellman, D. (2012). DNA breaks and chromosome pulverization from errors in mitosis. *Nature*, 482, 53–58.
- Crowl, J. T., Gray, E. E., Pestal, K., Volkman, H. E., & Stetson, D. B. (2017). Intracellular nucleic acid detection in autoimmunity. *Annual Review of Immunology*, 35, 313–336.
- Crow, Y. J., & Manel, N. (2015). Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome and the type I interferonopathies. *Nature Reviews Immunology*, 15, 429–440.
- Dai, J., Huang, Y. J., He, X., Zhao, M., Wang, X., Liu, Z. S., Xue, W., Cai, H., Zhan, X. Y., Huang, S. Y., et al. (2019). Acetylation blocks GGAS activity and inhibits self-DNAinduced autoimmunity. *Cell*, 176, 1447–1460. e1414.
- Deng, Z., Chong, Z., Law, C. S., Mukai, K., Ho, F. O., Martinu, T., Backes, B. J., Eckalbar, W. L., Taguchi, T., & Shum, A. K. (2020). A defect in COPI-mediated transport of STING causes immune dysregulation in COPA syndrome. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 217.
- Diamond, M. S., Kinder, M., Matsushita, H., Mashayekhi, M., Dunn, G. P., Archambault, J. M., Lee, H., Arthur, C. D., White, J. M., Kalinke, U., et al. (2011). Type I interferon is selectively required by dendritic cells for immune rejection of tumors. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 208, 1989–2003.
- Dong, G., You, M., Ding, L., Fan, H., Liu, F., Ren, D., & Hou, Y. (2015). STING negatively regulates double-stranded DNA-activated JAK1-STAT1 signaling via SHP-1/2 in B cells. *Molecular Cell*, 38, 441–451.
- Dou, Z., Ghosh, K., Vizioli, M. G., Zhu, J., Sen, P., Wangensteen, K. J., Simithy, J., Lan, Y., Lin, Y., Zhou, Z., et al. (2017). Cytoplasmic chromatin triggers inflammation in senescence and cancer. *Nature*, 550, 402–406.
- Du, M., & Chen, Z. J. (2018). DNA-induced liquid phase condensation of cGAS activates innate immune signaling. *Science*, 361, 704–709.
- Fang, R., Jiang, Q., Guan, Y., Gao, P., Zhang, R., Zhao, Z., & Jiang, Z. (2021). Golgi apparatus-synthesized sulfated glycosaminoglycans mediate polymerization and activation of the cGAMP sensor STING. *Immunity*, 54, 962–975. e968.
  Fu, J., Kanne, D. B., Leong, M., Glickman, L. H., McWhirter, S. M., Lemmens, E.,
- Fu, J., Kanne, D. B., Leong, M., Glickman, L. H., McWhirter, S. M., Lemmens, E., Mechette, K., Leong, J. J., Lauer, P., Liu, W., et al. (2015). STING agonist formulated cancer vaccines can cure established tumors resistant to PD-1 blockade. *Science Translational Medicine*, 7, 283ra252.
- Gallego-Marin, C., Schrum, J. E., Andrade, W. A., Shaffer, S. A., Giraldo, L. F., Lasso, A. M., Kurt-Jones, E. A., Fitzgerald, K. A., & Golenbock, D. T. (2018). Cyclic GMP-AMP synthase is the cytosolic sensor of Plasmodium falciparum genomic DNA and activates type I IFN in malaria. *The Journal of Immunology*, 200, 768–774.
- Gao, P., Hu, M. M., & Shu, H. B. (2020). CSK promotes innate immune response to DNA virus by phosphorylating MITA. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*, 526, 199–205.
- Gao, D., Li, T., Li, X. D., Chen, X., Li, Q. Z., Wight-Carter, M., & Chen, Z. J. (2015). Activation of cyclic GMP-AMP synthase by self-DNA causes autoimmune diseases. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112, E5699–E5705.
- Gao, D., Wu, J., Wu, Y. T., Du, F., Aroh, C., Yan, N., Sun, L., & Chen, Z. J. (2013). Cyclic GMP-AMP synthase is an innate immune sensor of HIV and other retroviruses. *Science*, 341, 903–906.
- Gao, P., Zillinger, T., Wang, W., Ascano, M., Dai, P., Hartmann, G., Tuschl, T., Deng, L., Barchet, W., & Patel, D. J. (2014). Binding-pocket and lid-region substitutions render human STING sensitive to the species-specific drug DMXAA. *Cell Reports, 8*, 1668–1676.
- Grieves, J. L., Fye, J. M., Harvey, S., Grayson, J. M., Hollis, T., & Perrino, F. W. (2015). Exonuclease TREX1 degrades double-stranded DNA to prevent spontaneous lupuslike inflammatory disease. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 112, 5117–5122.
- Guan, J., Lu, C., Jin, Q., Lu, H., Chen, X., Tian, L., Zhang, Y., Ortega, J., Zhang, J., Siteni, S., et al. (2021). MLH1 deficiency-triggered DNA hyperexcision by exonuclease 1 activates the cGAS-STING pathway. *Cancer Cell*, 39, 109–121. e105.
- Guey, B., Wischnewski, M., Decout, A., Makasheva, K., Kaynak, M., Sakar, M. S., Fierz, B., & Ablasser, A. (2020). BAF restricts cGAS on nuclear DNA to prevent innate immune activation. *Science*, 369, 823–828.

#### Z.-D. Zhang, B. Zhong

Gui, X., Yang, H., Li, T., Tan, X., Shi, P., Li, M., Du, F., & Chen, Z. J. (2019). Autophagy induction via STING trafficking is a primordial function of the cGAS pathway. *Nature*, 567, 262–266.

- Gunther, C., Kind, B., Reijns, M. A., Berndt, N., Martinez-Bueno, M., Wolf, C., Tungler, V., Chara, O., Lee, Y. A., Hubner, N., et al. (2015). Defective removal of ribonucleotides from DNA promotes systemic autoimmunity. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 125, 413–424.
- Guo, Y., Jiang, F., Kong, L., Wu, H., Zhang, H., Chen, X., Zhao, J., Cai, B., Li, Y., Ma, C., et al. (2021). OTUD5 promotes innate antiviral and antitumor immunity through deubiquitinating and stabilizing STING. *Cellular and Molecular Immunology*, 18, 1945–1955.
- Hahn, W. O., Butler, N. S., Lindner, S. E., Akilesh, H. M., Sather, D. N., Kappe, S. H., Hamerman, J. A., Gale, M., Jr., Liles, W. C., & Pepper, M. (2018). cGAS-mediated control of blood-stage malaria promotes Plasmodium-specific germinal center responses. *JCI Insight, 3*.
- Hansen, A. L., Buchan, G. J., Ruhl, M., Mukai, K., Salvatore, S. R., Ogawa, E., Andersen, S. D., Iversen, M. B., Thielke, A. L., Gunderstofte, C., et al. (2018). Nitrofatty acids are formed in response to virus infection and are potent inhibitors of STING palmitoylation and signaling. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 115, E7768–E7775.
- Harding, S. M., Benci, J. L., Irianto, J., Discher, D. E., Minn, A. J., & Greenberg, R. A. (2017). Mitotic progression following DNA damage enables pattern recognition within micronuclei. *Nature*, 548, 466–470.
- Harlin, H., Meng, Y., Peterson, A. C., Zha, Y., Tretiakova, M., Slingluff, C., McKee, M., & Gajewski, T. F. (2009). Chemokine expression in melanoma metastases associated with CD8+ T-cell recruitment. *Cancer Research*, 69, 3077–3085.
- Hasan, M., Fermaintt, C. S., Gao, N., Sakai, T., Miyazaki, T., Jiang, S., Li, Q. Z., Atkinson, J. P., Morse, H. C., 3rd, Lehrman, M. A., et al. (2015). Cytosolic nuclease TREX1 regulates oligosaccharyltransferase activity independent of nuclease activity to suppress immune activation. *Immunity*, 43, 463–474.
- Hemphill, W. O., Simpson, S. R., Liu, M., Salsbury, F. R., Jr., Hollis, T., Grayson, J. M., & Perrino, F. W. (2021). TREX1 as a novel immunotherapeutic target. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 12, Article 660184.
- Hong, Y., Capitani, M., Murphy, C., Pandey, S., Cavounidis, A., Takeshita, H., Nanthapisal, S., Yasuda, T., Bader-Meunier, B., McCreary, D., et al. (2020). Janus kinase inhibition for autoinflammation in patients with DNASE2 deficiency. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 145, 701–705. e708.
- Hooy, R. M., Massaccesi, G., Rousseau, K. E., Chattergoon, M. A., & Sohn, J. (2020). Allosteric coupling between Mn2+ and dsDNA controls the catalytic efficiency and fidelity of cGAS. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 48, 4435–4447.
- Huang, Y. H., Liu, X. Y., Du, X. X., Jiang, Z. F., & Su, X. D. (2012). The structural basis for the sensing and binding of cyclic di-GMP by STING. *Nature Structural & Molecular Biology*, 19, 728–730.
- Hu, M. M., & Shu, H. B. (2018). Cytoplasmic mechanisms of recognition and defense of microbial nucleic acids. Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology, 34, 357–379.
- Hu, M. M., Yang, Q., Xie, X. Q., Liao, C. Y., Lin, H., Liu, T. T., Yin, L., & Shu, H. B. (2016). Sumoylation promotes the stability of the DNA sensor cGAS and the adaptor STING to regulate the kinetics of response to DNA virus. *Immunity*, 45, 555–569.
- Ishak, C. A., Classon, M., & De Carvalho, D. D. (2018). Deregulation of retroelements as an emerging therapeutic opportunity in cancer. *Trends Cancer*, 4, 583–597.
- Ishikawa, H., & Barber, G. N. (2008). STING is an endoplasmic reticulum adaptor that facilitates innate immune signalling. *Nature*, 455, 674–678.
- Ishikawa, H., Ma, Z., & Barber, G. N. (2009). STING regulates intracellular DNA-mediated, type I interferon-dependent innate immunity. *Nature*, 461, 788–792.
- Jin, L., Waterman, P. M., Jonscher, K. R., Short, C. M., Reisdorph, N. A., & Cambier, J. C. (2008). MPYS, a novel membrane tetraspanner, is associated with major histocompatibility complex class II and mediates transduction of apoptotic signals. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, 28, 5014–5026.
- Kawai, T., Takahashi, K., Sato, S., Coban, C., Kumar, H., Kato, H., Ishii, K. J., Takeuchi, O., & Akira, S. (2005). IPS-1, an adaptor triggering RIG-I- and Mda5-mediated type I interferon induction. *Nature Immunology*, 6, 981–988.
- Kitajima, S., Ivanova, E., Guo, S., Yoshida, R., Campisi, M., Sundararaman, S. K., Tange, S., Mitsuishi, Y., Thai, T. C., Masuda, S., et al. (2019). Suppression of STING associated with LKB1 loss in KRAS-driven lung cancer. *Cancer Discovery*, 9, 34–45.
- Konig, N., Fiehn, C., Wolf, C., Schuster, M., Cura Costa, E., Tungler, V., Alvarez, H. A., Chara, O., Engel, K., Goldbach-Mansky, R., et al. (2017). Familial chilblain lupus due to a gain-of-function mutation in STING. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, 76, 468–472.
- Konno, H., Chinn, I. K., Hong, D., Orange, J. S., Lupski, J. R., Mendoza, A., Pedroza, L. A., & Barber, G. N. (2018). Pro-inflammation associated with a gain-of-function mutation (R284S) in the innate immune sensor STING. *Cell Reports*, 23, 1112–1123.
- Konno, H., Konno, K., & Barber, G. N. (2013). Cyclic dinucleotides trigger ULK1 (ATG1) phosphorylation of STING to prevent sustained innate immune signaling. *Cell*, 155, 688–698.
- Kranzusch, P. J., Lee, A. S., Berger, J. M., & Doudna, J. A. (2013). Structure of human cGAS reveals a conserved family of second-messenger enzymes in innate immunity. *Cell Reports*, 3, 1362–1368.
- Kujirai, T., Zierhut, C., Takizawa, Y., Kim, R., Negishi, L., Uruma, N., Hirai, S.,
- Funabiki, H., & Kurumizaka, H. (2020). Structural basis for the inhibition of cGAS by nucleosomes. *Science*, *370*, 455–458.
- Kwon, J., & Bakhoum, S. F. (2020). The cytosolic DNA-sensing cGAS-STING pathway in cancer. Cancer Discovery, 10, 26–39.
- Lahaye, X., Satoh, T., Gentili, M., Cerboni, S., Conrad, C., Hurbain, I., El Marjou, A., Lacabaratz, C., Lelievre, J. D., & Manel, N. (2013). The capsids of HIV-1 and HIV-2 determine immune detection of the viral cDNA by the innate sensor cGAS in dendritic cells. *Immunity*, 39, 1132–1142.

- Lam, E., Stein, S., & Falck-Pedersen, E. (2014). Adenovirus detection by the cGAS/STING/ TBK1 DNA sensing cascade. *Journal of Virology*, 88, 974–981.
- Lara, P. N., Jr., Douillard, J. Y., Nakagawa, K., von Pawel, J., McKeage, M. J., Albert, I., Losonczy, G., Reck, M., Heo, D. S., Fan, X., et al. (2011). Randomized phase III placebo-controlled trial of carboplatin and paclitaxel with or without the vascular disrupting agent vadimezan (ASA404) in advanced non-small-cell lung cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 29, 2965–2971.
- Liang, D., Xiao-Feng, H., Guan-Jun, D., Er-Ling, H., Sheng, C., Ting-Ting, W., Qin-Gang, H., Yan-Hong, N., & Ya-Yi, H. (2015). Activated STING enhances Tregs infiltration in the HPV-related carcinogenesis of tongue squamous cells via the c-jun/CCL22 signal. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, 1852, 2494–2503.
- Li, T., Huang, T., Du, M., Chen, X., Du, F., Ren, J., & Chen, Z. J. (2021). Phosphorylation and chromatin tethering prevent cGAS activation during mitosis. *Science*, 371.
- Li, Z., Liu, G., Sun, L., Teng, Y., Guo, X., Jia, J., Sha, J., Yang, X., Chen, D., & Sun, Q. (2015). PPM1A regulates antiviral signaling by antagonizing TBK1-mediated STING phosphorylation and aggregation. *PLoS Pathogens*, 11, Article e1004783.
- Li, M., & Shu, H. B. (2020). Dephosphorylation of cGAS by PPP6C impairs its substrate binding activity and innate antiviral response. *Protein Cell*, 11, 584–599.
- Li, X., Shu, C., Yi, G., Chaton, C. T., Shelton, C. L., Diao, J., Zuo, X., Kao, C. C., Herr, A. B., & Li, P. (2013). Cyclic GMP-AMP synthase is activated by double-stranded DNAinduced oligomerization. *Immunity*, 39, 1019–1031.
- Liu, Y., Jesus, A. A., Marrero, B., Yang, D., Ramsey, S. E., Sanchez, G. A. M., Tenbrock, K., Wittkowski, H., Jones, O. Y., Kuehn, H. S., et al. (2014). Activated STING in a vascular and pulmonary syndrome. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 371, 507–518.
- Liu, T. T., Yang, Q., Li, M., Zhong, B., Ran, Y., Liu, L. L., Yang, Y., Wang, Y. Y., & Shu, H. B. (2016). LSm14A plays a critical role in antiviral immune responses by regulating MITA level in a cell-specific manner. *The Journal of Immunology*, *196*, 5101–5111.
- Liu, Z. S., Zhang, Z. Y., Cai, H., Zhao, M., Mao, J., Dai, J., Xia, T., Zhang, X. M., & Li, T. (2018). RINCK-mediated monoubiquitination of cGAS promotes antiviral innate immune responses. *Cell & Bioscience*, 8, 35.
- Liu, H., Zhang, H., Wu, X., Ma, D., Wu, J., Wang, L., Jiang, Y., Fei, Y., Zhu, C., Tan, R., et al. (2018). Nuclear cGAS suppresses DNA repair and promotes tumorigenesis. *Nature*, 563, 131–136.
- Li, X. D., Wu, J., Gao, D., Wang, H., Sun, L., & Chen, Z. J. (2013). Pivotal roles of cGAScGAMP signaling in antiviral defense and immune adjuvant effects. *Science*, 341, 1390–1394.
- Li, S., Zhang, L., Yao, Q., Li, L., Dong, N., Rong, J., Gao, W., Ding, X., Sun, L., Chen, X., et al. (2013). Pathogen blocks host death receptor signalling by arginine GlcNAcylation of death domains. *Nature*, 501, 242–246.
- Lu, C., Guan, J., Lu, S., Jin, Q., Rousseau, B., Lu, T., Stephens, D., Zhang, H., Zhu, J., Yang, M., et al. (2021). DNA sensing in mismatch repair-deficient tumor cells is essential for anti-tumor immunity. *Cancer Cell*, 39, 96–108. e106.
- Luo, W. W., Li, S., Li, C., Lian, H., Yang, Q., Zhong, B., & Shu, H. B. (2016). iRhom2 is essential for innate immunity to DNA viruses by mediating trafficking and stability of the adaptor STING. *Nature Immunology*, 17, 1057–1066.
- Mackenzie, K. J., Carroll, P., Lettice, L., Tarnauskaite, Z., Reddy, K., Dix, F., Revuelta, A., Abbondati, E., Rigby, R. E., Rabe, B., et al. (2016). Ribonuclease H2 mutations induce a cGAS/STING-dependent innate immune response. *The EMBO Journal*, 35, 831–844.
- Mackenzie, K. J., Carroll, P., Martin, C. A., Murina, O., Fluteau, A., Simpson, D. J., Olova, N., Sutcliffe, H., Rainger, J. K., Leitch, A., et al. (2017). cGAS surveillance of micronuclei links genome instability to innate immunity. *Nature*, 548, 461–465.
- Ma, F., Li, B., Liu, S. Y., Iyer, S. S., Yu, Y., Wu, A., & Cheng, G. (2015). Positive feedback regulation of type I IFN production by the IFN-inducible DNA sensor cGAS. *The Journal of Immunology*, 194, 1545–1554.
- Man, S. M., Karki, R., Malireddi, R. K., Neale, G., Vogel, P., Yamamoto, M., Lamkanfi, M., & Kanneganti, T. D. (2015). The transcription factor IRF1 and guanylate-binding proteins target activation of the AIM2 inflammasome by Francisella infection. *Nature Immunology*, 16, 467–475.
- Marcus, A., Mao, A. J., Lensink-Vasan, M., Wang, L., Vance, R. E., & Raulet, D. H. (2018). Tumor-derived cGAMP triggers a STING-mediated interferon response in non-tumor cells to activate the NK cell response. *Immunity*, 49, 754–763. e754.
- Melki, I., Rose, Y., Uggenti, C., Van Eyck, L., Fremond, M. L., Kitabayashi, N., Rice, G. I., Jenkinson, E. M., Boulai, A., Jeremiah, N., et al. (2017). Disease-associated mutations identify a novel region in human STING necessary for the control of type I interferon signaling. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 140, 543–552. e545.
- Meylan, E., Curran, J., Hofmann, K., Moradpour, D., Binder, M., Bartenschlager, R., & Tschopp, J. (2005). Cardif is an adaptor protein in the RIG-I antiviral pathway and is targeted by hepatitis C virus. *Nature*, 437, 1167–1172.
- Michalski, S., de Oliveira Mann, C. C., Stafford, C. A., Witte, G., Bartho, J., Lammens, K., Hornung, V., & Hopfner, K. P. (2020). Structural basis for sequestration and autoinhibition of cGAS by chromatin. *Nature*, 587, 678–682.
- Minhas, S., & Holehouse, A. S. (2021). Step on the cGAS! Viral inhibition of cGAS phase separation with cytosolic DNA. *Molecular Cell*, 81, 2688–2689.
- Morehouse, B. R., Govande, A. A., Millman, A., Keszei, A. F. A., Lowey, B., Ofir, G., Shao, S., Sorek, R., & Kranzusch, P. J. (2020). STING cyclic dinucleotide sensing originated in bacteria. *Nature*, 586, 429–433.
- Morita, M., Stamp, G., Robins, P., Dulic, A., Rosewell, I., Hrivnak, G., Daly, G., Lindahl, T., & Barnes, D. E. (2004). Gene-targeted mice lacking the Trex1 (DNase III) 3–>5' DNA exonuclease develop inflammatory myocarditis. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, 24, 6719–6727.
- Moriyama, M., Koshiba, T., & Ichinohe, T. (2019). Influenza A virus M2 protein triggers mitochondrial DNA-mediated antiviral immune responses. *Nature Communications*, 10, 4624.
- Motwani, M., Pawaria, S., Bernier, J., Moses, S., Henry, K., Fang, T., Burkly, L., Marshak-Rothstein, A., & Fitzgerald, K. A. (2019). Hierarchy of clinical manifestations in SAVI

#### Z.-D. Zhang, B. Zhong

N153S and V154M mouse models. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 116, 7941–7950.

Motwani, M., Pesiridis, S., & Fitzgerald, K. A. (2019). DNA sensing by the cGAS-STING pathway in health and disease. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, *20*, 657–674.

Mukai, K., Konno, H., Akiba, T., Uemura, T., Waguri, S., Kobayashi, T., Barber, G. N., Arai, H., & Taguchi, T. (2016). Activation of STING requires palmitoylation at the Golgi. *Nature Communications*, 7, Article 11932.

Munn, D. H., & Mellor, A. L. (2016). Ido in the tumor microenvironment: Inflammation, counter-regulation, and tolerance. *Trends in Immunology*, 37, 193–207.

Munoz, J., Rodiere, M., Jeremiah, N., Rieux-Laucat, F., Oojageer, A., Rice, G. I., Rozenberg, F., Crow, Y. J., & Bessis, D. (2015). Stimulator of interferon genesassociated vasculopathy with onset in infancy: A mimic of childhood granulomatosis with polyangiitis. JAMA Dermatology, 151, 872–877.

Nandakumar, R., Tschismarov, R., Meissner, F., Prabakaran, T., Krissanaprasit, A., Farahani, E., Zhang, B. C., Assil, S., Martin, A., Bertrams, W., et al. (2019). Intracellular bacteria engage a STING-TBK1-MVB12b pathway to enable paracrine cGAS-STING signalling. *Nature Microbiology*, 4, 701–713.

Ni, G., Konno, H., & Barber, G. N. (2017). Ubiquitination of STING at lysine 224 controls IRF3 activation. Science Immunology, 2.

Nishimura, T., Baba, M., Ogawa, S., Kojima, K., Takita, T., Crouch, R. J., & Yasukawa, K. (2019). Characterization of six recombinant human RNase H2 bearing Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome causing mutations. *Journal of Biochemistry*, 166, 537–545.

Oda, H., Nakagawa, K., Abe, J., Awaya, T., Funabiki, M., Hijikata, A., Nishikomori, R., Funatsuka, M., Ohshima, Y., Sugawara, Y., et al. (2014). Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome is caused by IFIH1 mutations. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 95, 121–125.

de Oliveira Mann, C. C., Orzalli, M. H., King, D. S., Kagan, J. C., Lee, A. S. Y., & Kranzusch, P. J. (2019). Modular architecture of the STING C-terminal tail allows interferon and NF-kappaB signaling adaptation. *Cell Reports*, 27, 1165–1175. e1165.

Orzalli, M. H., Broekema, N. M., Diner, B. A., Hancks, D. C., Elde, N. C., Cristea, I. M., & Knipe, D. M. (2015). cGAS-mediated stabilization of IF116 promotes innate signaling during herpes simplex virus infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* of the United States of America, 112, E1773–E1781.

Pan, B. S., Perera, S. A., Piesvaux, J. A., Presland, J. P., Schroeder, G. K., Cumming, J. N., Trotter, B. W., Altman, M. D., Buevich, A. V., Cash, B., et al. (2020). An orally available non-nucleotide STING agonist with antitumor activity. *Science*, 369.

Pathare, G. R., Decout, A., Gluck, S., Cavadini, S., Makasheva, K., Hovius, R., Kempf, G., Weiss, J., Kozicka, Z., Guey, B., et al. (2020). Structural mechanism of cGAS inhibition by the nucleosome. *Nature*, 587, 668–672.

Pokatayev, V., Hasin, N., Chon, H., Cerritelli, S. M., Sakhuja, K., Ward, J. M., Morris, H. D., Yan, N., & Crouch, R. J. (2016). RNase H2 catalytic core Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome-related mutant invokes cGAS-STING innate immune-sensing pathway in mice. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 213, 329–336.

Pokatayev, V., Yang, K., Tu, X., Dobbs, N., Wu, J., Kalb, R. G., & Yan, N. (2020). Homeostatic regulation of STING protein at the resting state by stabilizer TOLLIP. *Nature Immunology*, 21, 158–167.

Pommier, A., Anaparthy, N., Memos, N., Kelley, Z. L., Gouronnec, A., Yan, R., Auffray, C., Albrengues, J., Egeblad, M., Iacobuzio-Donahue, C. A., et al. (2018). Unresolved endoplasmic reticulum stress engenders immune-resistant, latent pancreatic cancer metastases. *Science*, 360.

Ray Chaudhuri, A., & Nussenzweig, A. (2017). The multifaceted roles of PARP1 in DNA repair and chromatin remodelling. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 18, 610–621.

Rice, G. I., Bond, J., Asipu, A., Brunette, R. L., Manfield, I. W., Carr, I. M., Fuller, J. C., Jackson, R. M., Lamb, T., Briggs, T. A., et al. (2009). Mutations involved in Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome implicate SAMHD1 as regulator of the innate immune response. *Nature Genetics*, 41, 829–832.

Rice, G. I., Kasher, P. R., Forte, G. M., Mannion, N. M., Greenwood, S. M., Szynkiewicz, M., Dickerson, J. E., Bhaskar, S. S., Zampini, M., Briggs, T. A., et al. (2012). Mutations in ADAR1 cause Aicardi-Goutieres syndrome associated with a type I interferon signature. *Nature Genetics*, 44, 1243–1248.

Rodero, M. P., Tesser, A., Bartok, E., Rice, G. I., Della Mina, E., Depp, M., Beitz, B., Bondet, V., Cagnard, N., Duffy, D., et al. (2017). Type I interferon-mediated autoinflammation due to DNase II deficiency. *Nature Communications*, 8, 2176.

Saldanha, R. G., Balka, K. R., Davidson, S., Wainstein, B. K., Wong, M., Macintosh, R., Loo, C. K. C., Weber, M. A., Kamath, V., Circa, et al. (2018). A mutation outside the dimerization domain causing atypical STING-associated vasculopathy with onset in infancy. *Frontiers in Immunology*, 9, 1535.

Sansone, P., Savini, C., Kurelac, I., Chang, Q., Amato, L. B., Strillacci, A., Stepanova, A., Iommarini, L., Mastroleo, C., Daly, L., et al. (2017). Packaging and transfer of mitochondrial DNA via exosomes regulate escape from dormancy in hormonal therapy-resistant breast cancer. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 114, E9066–E9075.

Schoggins, J. W., MacDuff, D. A., Imanaka, N., Gainey, M. D., Shrestha, B., Eitson, J. L., Mar, K. B., Richardson, R. B., Ratushny, A. V., Litvak, V., et al. (2014). Pan-viral specificity of IFN-induced genes reveals new roles for cGAS in innate immunity. *Nature*, 505, 691–695.

Seo, J., Kang, J. A., Suh, D. I., Park, E. B., Lee, C. R., Choi, S. A., Kim, S. Y., Kim, Y., Park, S. H., Ye, M., et al. (2017). Tofacitinib relieves symptoms of stimulator of interferon genes (STING)-associated vasculopathy with onset in infancy caused by 2 de novo variants in TMEM173. *The Journal of Allergy and Clinical Immunology*, 139, 1396–1399. e1312.

Seo, G. J., Kim, C., Shin, W. J., Sklan, E. H., Eoh, H., & Jung, J. U. (2018). TRIM56mediated monoubiquitination of cGAS for cytosolic DNA sensing. *Nature Communications*, 9, 613. Seo, G. J., Yang, A., Tan, B., Kim, S., Liang, Q., Choi, Y., Yuan, W., Feng, P., Park, H. S., & Jung, J. U. (2015). Akt kinase-mediated checkpoint of cGAS DNA sensing pathway. *Cell Reports*, 13, 440–449.

Seth, R. B., Sun, L., Ea, C. K., & Chen, Z. J. (2005). Identification and characterization of MAVS, a mitochondrial antiviral signaling protein that activates NF-kappaB and IRF 3. *Cell*, 122, 669–682.

Shang, G., Zhang, C., Chen, Z. J., Bai, X. C., & Zhang, X. (2019). Cryo-EM structures of STING reveal its mechanism of activation by cyclic GMP-AMP. *Nature*, 567, 389–393.

Shmuel-Galia, L., Humphries, F., Lei, X., Ceglia, S., Wilson, R., Jiang, Z., Ketelut-Carneiro, N., Foley, S. E., Pechhold, S., Houghton, J., et al. (2021). Dysbiosis exacerbates colitis by promoting ubiquitination and accumulation of the innate immune adaptor STING in myeloid cells. *Immunity*, 54, 1137–1153. e1138.

Simpson, S. R., Rego, S. L., Harvey, S. E., Liu, M., Hemphill, W. O., Venkatadri, R., Sharma, R., Grayson, J. M., & Perrino, F. W. (2020). T cells produce IFN-alpha in the TREX1 D18N model of lupus-like autoimmunity. *The Journal of Immunology*, 204, 348–359.

Sliter, D. A., Martinez, J., Hao, L., Chen, X., Sun, N., Fischer, T. D., Burman, J. L., Li, Y., Zhang, Z., Narendra, D. P., et al. (2018). Parkin and PINK1 mitigate STING-induced inflammation. *Nature*, 561, 258–262.

Song, Z. M., Lin, H., Yi, X. M., Guo, W., Hu, M. M., & Shu, H. B. (2020). KAT5 acetylates cGAS to promote innate immune response to DNA virus. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 117, 21568–21575.

Srikanth, S., Woo, J. S., Wu, B., El-Sherbiny, Y. M., Leung, J., Chupradit, K., Rice, L., Seo, G. J., Calmettes, G., Ramakrishna, C., et al. (2019). The Ca(2+) sensor STIM1 regulates the type I interferon response by retaining the signaling adaptor STING at the endoplasmic reticulum. *Nature Immunology*, 20, 152–162.

Stetson, D. B., Ko, J. S., Heidmann, T., & Medzhitov, R. (2008). Trex1 prevents cellintrinsic initiation of autoimmunity. *Cell*, 134, 587–598.

Sumner, R. P., Harrison, L., Touizer, E., Peacock, T. P., Spencer, M., Zuliani-Alvarez, L., & Towers, G. J. (2020). Disrupting HIV-1 capsid formation causes cGAS sensing of viral DNA. *The EMBO Journal*, 39, Article e103958.

Sun, W., Li, Y., Chen, L., Chen, H., You, F., Zhou, X., Zhou, Y., Zhai, Z., Chen, D., & Jiang, Z. (2009). ERIS, an endoplasmic reticulum IFN stimulator, activates innate immune signaling through dimerization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 106, 8653–8658.

Sun, X., Liu, T., Zhao, J., Xia, H., Xie, J., Guo, Y., Zhong, L., Li, M., Yang, Q., Peng, C., et al. (2020). DNA-PK deficiency potentiates cGAS-mediated antiviral innate immunity. *Nature Communications*, 11, 6182.

Sun, Q., Sun, L., Liu, H. H., Chen, X., Seth, R. B., Forman, J., & Chen, Z. J. (2006). The specific and essential role of MAVS in antiviral innate immune responses. *Immunity*, 24, 633–642.

Sun, L., Wu, J., Du, F., Chen, X., & Chen, Z. J. (2013). Cyclic GMP-AMP synthase is a cytosolic DNA sensor that activates the type I interferon pathway. *Science*, 339, 786–791.

Sun, H., Zhang, Q., Jing, Y. Y., Zhang, M., Wang, H. Y., Cai, Z., Liuyu, T., Zhang, Z. D., Xiong, T. C., Wu, Y., et al. (2017). USP13 negatively regulates antiviral responses by deubiquitinating STING. *Nature Communications*, 8, Article 15534.

Takahashi, M., Lio, C. J., Campeau, A., Steger, M., Ay, F., Mann, M., Gonzalez, D. J., Jain, M., & Sharma, S. (2021). The tumor suppressor kinase DAPK3 drives tumorintrinsic immunity through the STING-IFN-beta pathway. *Nature Immunology*, 22, 485–496.

Takaoka, A., Wang, Z., Choi, M. K., Yanai, H., Negishi, H., Ban, T., Lu, Y., Miyagishi, M., Kodama, T., Honda, K., et al. (2007). DAI (DLM-1/ZBP1) is a cytosolic DNA sensor and an activator of innate immune response. *Nature*, 448, 501–505.

Tan, A. S., Baty, J. W., Dong, L. F., Bezawork-Geleta, A., Endaya, B., Goodwin, J., Bajzikova, M., Kovarova, J., Peterka, M., Yan, B., et al. (2015). Mitochondrial genome acquisition restores respiratory function and tumorigenic potential of cancer cells without mitochondrial DNA. *Cell Metabolism*, 21, 81–94.

Tang, C. H., Zundell, J. A., Ranatunga, S., Lin, C., Nefedova, Y., Del Valle, J. R., & Hu, C. C. (2016). Agonist-mediated activation of STING induces apoptosis in malignant B cells. *Cancer Research*, 76, 2137–2152.

Tan, X., Sun, L., Chen, J., & Chen, Z. J. (2018). Detection of microbial infections through innate immune sensing of nucleic acids. *Annual Review of Microbiology*, 72, 447–478.

Terai, H., Kitajima, S., Potter, D. S., Matsui, Y., Quiceno, L. G., Chen, T., Kim, T. J., Rusan, M., Thai, T. C., Piccioni, F., et al. (2018). ER stress signaling promotes the survival of cancer "persister cells" tolerant to EGFR tyrosine kinase inhibitors. *Cancer Research*, 78, 1044–1057.

Thomsen, M. K., Nandakumar, R., Stadler, D., Malo, A., Valls, R. M., Wang, F., Reinert, L. S., Dagnaes-Hansen, F., Hollensen, A. K., Mikkelsen, J. G., et al. (2016). Lack of immunological DNA sensing in hepatocytes facilitates hepatitis B virus infection. *Hepatology*, 64, 746–759.

Toso, A., Revandkar, A., Di Mitri, D., Guccini, I., Proietti, M., Sarti, M., Pinton, S., Zhang, J., Kalathur, M., Civenni, G., et al. (2014). Enhancing chemotherapy efficacy in Pten-deficient prostate tumors by activating the senescence-associated antitumor immunity. *Cell Reports*, 9, 75–89.

Tsuchida, T., Zou, J., Saitoh, T., Kumar, H., Abe, T., Matsuura, Y., Kawai, T., & Akira, S. (2010). The ubiquitin ligase TRIM56 regulates innate immune responses to intracellular double-stranded DNA. *Immunity*, 33, 765–776.

Unterholzner, L., Keating, S. E., Baran, M., Horan, K. A., Jensen, S. B., Sharma, S., Sirois, C. M., Jin, T., Latz, E., Xiao, T. S., et al. (2010). IFI16 is an innate immune sensor for intracellular DNA. *Nature Immunology*, 11, 997–1004.

Wang, C., Guan, Y., Lv, M., Zhang, R., Guo, Z., Wei, X., Du, X., Yang, J., Li, T., Wan, Y., et al. (2018). Manganese increases the sensitivity of the cGAS-STING pathway for double-stranded DNA and is required for the host defense against DNA viruses. *Immunity*, 48, 675–687. e677.

#### Z.-D. Zhang, B. Zhong

Wang, Y., Lian, Q., Yang, B., Yan, S., Zhou, H., He, L., Lin, G., Lian, Z., Jiang, Z., & Sun, B. (2015). TRIM30alpha is a negative-feedback regulator of the intracellular DNA and DNA virus-triggered response by targeting STING. *PLoS Pathogens*, 11, Article e1005012.

- Wang, Q., Liu, X., Cui, Y., Tang, Y., Chen, W., Li, S., Yu, H., Pan, Y., & Wang, C. (2014). The E3 ubiquitin ligase AMFR and INSIG1 bridge the activation of TBK1 kinase by modifying the adaptor STING. *Immunity*, 41, 919–933.
- Wang, Y., Wang, M., Djekidel, M. N., Chen, H., Liu, D., Alt, F. W., & Zhang, Y. (2021). eccDNAs are apoptotic products with high innate immunostimulatory activity. *Nature*, 599, 308–314.
- Wang, C., Wang, X., Veleeparambil, M., Kessler, P. M., Willard, B., Chattopadhyay, S., & Sen, G. C. (2020). EGR-mediated tyrosine phosphorylation of STING determines its trafficking route and cellular innate immunity functions. *The EMBO Journal, 39*, Article e104106.
- Warner, J. D., Irizarry-Caro, R. A., Bennion, B. G., Ai, T. L., Smith, A. M., Miner, C. A., Sakai, T., Gonugunta, V. K., Wu, J., Platt, D. J., et al. (2017). STING-associated vasculopathy develops independently of IRF3 in mice. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 214, 3279–3292.
- Whiteley, A. T., Eaglesham, J. B., de Oliveira Mann, C. C., Morehouse, B. R., Lowey, B., Nieminen, E. A., Danilchanka, O., King, D. S., Lee, A. S. Y., Mekalanos, J. J., et al. (2019). Bacterial cGAS-like enzymes synthesize diverse nucleotide signals. *Nature*, 567, 194–199.
- White, M. J., McArthur, K., Metcalf, D., Lane, R. M., Cambier, J. C., Herold, M. J., van Delft, M. F., Bedoui, S., Lessene, G., Ritchie, M. E., et al. (2014). Apoptotic caspases suppress mtDNA-induced STING-mediated type I IFN production. *Cell*, 159, 1549–1562.
- Woo, S. R., Fuertes, M. B., Corrales, L., Spranger, S., Furdyna, M. J., Leung, M. Y., Duggan, R., Wang, Y., Barber, G. N., Fitzgerald, K. A., et al. (2014). STING-dependent cytosolic DNA sensing mediates innate immune recognition of immunogenic tumors. *Immunity*, 41, 830–842.
- Wu, J., Chen, Y. J., Dobbs, N., Sakai, T., Liou, J., Miner, J. J., & Yan, N. (2019). STINGmediated disruption of calcium homeostasis chronically activates ER stress and primes T cell death. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 216, 867–883.
- Wu, M. Z., Cheng, W. C., Chen, S. F., Nieh, S., O'Connor, C., Liu, C. L., Tsai, W. W., Wu, C. J., Martin, L., Lin, Y. S., et al. (2017). miR-25/93 mediates hypoxia-induced immunosuppression by repressing cGAS. *Nature Cell Biology*, 19, 1286–1296.
- Wu, J., Dobbs, N., Yang, K., & Yan, N. (2020). Interferon-independent activities of mammalian STING mediate antiviral response and tumor immune evasion. *Immunity*, 53, 115–126. e115.
- Wu, X., Wu, F. H., Wang, X., Wang, L., Siedow, J. N., Zhang, W., & Pei, Z. M. (2014). Molecular evolutionary and structural analysis of the cytosolic DNA sensor cGAS and STING. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 42, 8243–8257.
- Xia, T., Konno, H., Ahn, J., & Barber, G. N. (2016). Deregulation of STING signaling in colorectal carcinoma constrains DNA damage responses and correlates with tumorigenesis. *Cell Reports*, 14, 282–297.
- Xia, T., Konno, H., & Barber, G. N. (2016). Recurrent loss of STING signaling in melanoma correlates with susceptibility to viral oncolysis. *Cancer Research*, 76, 6747–6759.
- Xiao, N., Wei, J., Xu, S., Du, H., Huang, M., Zhang, S., Ye, W., Sun, L., & Chen, Q. (2019). cGAS activation causes lupus-like autoimmune disorders in a TREX1 mutant mouse model. *Journal of Autoimmunity*, 100, 84–94.
- Xia, P., Wang, S., Ye, B., Du, Y., Li, C., Xiong, Z., Qu, Y., & Fan, Z. (2018). A circular RNA protects dormant hematopoietic stem cells from DNA sensor cGAS-mediated exhaustion. *Immunity*, 48, 688–701. e687.
- Xia, P., Ye, B., Wang, S., Zhu, X., Du, Y., Xiong, Z., Tian, Y., & Fan, Z. (2016). Glutamylation of the DNA sensor cGAS regulates its binding and synthase activity in antiviral immunity. *Nature Immunology*, *17*, 369–378.
- Xia, T., Yi, X. M., Wu, X., Shang, J., & Shu, H. B. (2019). PTPN1/2-mediated dephosphorylation of MITA/STING promotes its 20S proteasomal degradation and attenuates innate antiviral response. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116, 20063–20069.
- Xie, W., Lama, L., Adura, C., Tomita, D., Glickman, J. F., Tuschl, T., & Patel, D. J. (2019). Human cGAS catalytic domain has an additional DNA-binding interface that enhances enzymatic activity and liquid-phase condensation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116, 11946–11955.
- Xing, J., Zhang, A., Zhang, H., Wang, J., Li, X. C., Zeng, M. S., & Zhang, Z. (2017). TRIM29 promotes DNA virus infections by inhibiting innate immune response. *Nature Communications*, 8, 945.
- Xu, G., Liu, C., Zhou, S., Li, Q., Feng, Y., Sun, P., Feng, H., Gao, Y., Zhu, J., Luo, X., et al. (2021). Viral tegument proteins restrict cGAS-DNA phase separation to mediate immune evasion. *Molecular Cell*, 81, 2823–2837. e2829.
- Xu, L. G., Wang, Y. Y., Han, K. J., Li, L. Y., Zhai, Z., & Shu, H. B. (2005). VISA is an adapter protein required for virus-triggered IFN-beta signaling. *Molecular Cell*, 19, 727–740.
- Xu, J. Y., Zhang, C., Wang, X., Zhai, L., Ma, Y., Mao, Y., Qian, K., Sun, C., Liu, Z., Jiang, S., et al. (2020). Integrative proteomic characterization of human lung adenocarcinoma. *Cell*, 182, 245–261. e217.
- Yamashiro, L. H., Wilson, S. C., Morrison, H. M., Karalis, V., Chung, J. J., Chen, K. J., Bateup, H. S., Szpara, M. L., Lee, A. Y., Cox, J. S., et al. (2020). Interferonindependent STING signaling promotes resistance to HSV-1 in vivo. *Nature Communications*, 11, 3382.
- Yang, H., Lee, W. S., Kong, S. J., Kim, C. G., Kim, J. H., Chang, S. K., Kim, S., Kim, G., Chon, H. J., & Kim, C. (2019). STING activation reprograms tumor vasculatures and synergizes with VEGFR2 blockade. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 129, 4350–4364.

- Yang, Q., Liu, T. T., Lin, H., Zhang, M., Wei, J., Luo, W. W., Hu, Y. H., Zhong, B., Hu, M. M., & Shu, H. B. (2017). TRIM32-TAX1BP1-dependent selective autophagic degradation of TRIF negatively regulates TLR3/4-mediated innate immune responses. *PLoS Pathogens, 13*, Article e1006600.
- Yang, H., Wang, H., Ren, J., Chen, Q., & Chen, Z. J. (2017). cGAS is essential for cellular senescence. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 114, E4612–E4620.
- Ye, L., Zhang, Q., Liuyu, T., Xu, Z., Zhang, M. X., Luo, M. H., Zeng, W. B., Zhu, Q., Lin, D., & Zhong, B. (2019). USP49 negatively regulates cellular antiviral responses via deconjugating K63-linked ubiquitination of MITA. *PLoS Pathogens*, 15, Article e1007680.
- Yin, Q., Tian, Y., Kabaleeswaran, V., Jiang, X., Tu, D., Eck, M. J., Chen, Z. J., & Wu, H. (2012). Cyclic di-GMP sensing via the innate immune signaling protein STING. *Molecular Cell*, 46, 735–745.
- Yum, S., Li, M., Fang, Y., & Chen, Z. J. (2021). TBK1 recruitment to STING activates both IRF3 and NF-kappaB that mediate immune defense against tumors and viral infections. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 118.
- Yu, X., Zhang, L., Shen, J., Zhai, Y., Jiang, Q., Yi, M., Deng, X., Ruan, Z., Fang, R., Chen, Z., et al. (2021). The STING phase-separator suppresses innate immune signalling. *Nature Cell Biology*, 23, 330–340.
- Zhang, X., Bai, X. C., & Chen, Z. J. (2020). Structures and mechanisms in the cGAS-STING innate immunity pathway. *Immunity*, 53, 43–53.
- Zhang, J., Hu, M. M., Wang, Y. Y., & Shu, H. B. (2012). TRIM32 protein modulates type I interferon induction and cellular antiviral response by targeting MITA/STING protein for K63-linked ubiquitination. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 287, 28646–28655.
- Zhang, B. C., Nandakumar, R., Reinert, L. S., Huang, J., Laustsen, A., Gao, Z. L., Sun, C. L., Jensen, S. B., Troldborg, A., Assil, S., et al. (2020). Author correction: STEEP mediates STING ER exit and activation of signaling. *Nature Immunology*, 21, 1468–1469.
- Zhang, C., Shang, G., Gui, X., Zhang, X., Bai, X. C., & Chen, Z. J. (2019). Structural basis of STING binding with and phosphorylation by TBK1. *Nature*, 567, 394–398.
- Zhang, Q., Tang, Z., An, R., Ye, L., & Zhong, B. (2020). USP29 maintains the stability of cGAS and promotes cellular antiviral responses and autoimmunity. *Cell Research*, 30, 914–927.
- Zhang, L., Wei, N., Cui, Y., Hong, Z., Liu, X., Wang, Q., Li, S., Liu, H., Yu, H., Cai, Y., et al. (2018). The deubiquitinase CYLD is a specific checkpoint of the STING antiviral signaling pathway. *PLoS Pathogens*, 14, Article e1007435.
- Zhang, X., Wu, J., Du, F., Xu, H., Sun, L., Chen, Z., Brautigam, C. A., Zhang, X., & Chen, Z. J. (2014). The cytosolic DNA sensor cGAS forms an oligomeric complex with DNA and undergoes switch-like conformational changes in the activation loop. *Cell Reports*, 6, 421–430.
- Zhang, Z. D., Xiong, T. C., Yao, S. Q., Wei, M. C., Chen, M., Lin, D., & Zhong, B. (2020). RNF115 plays dual roles in innate antiviral responses by catalyzing distinct ubioutination of MAVS and MITA. *Nature Communications*, 11, 5536.
- Zhang, Y., Yeruva, L., Marinov, A., Prantner, D., Wyrick, P. B., Lupashin, V., & Nagarajan, U. M. (2014). The DNA sensor, cyclic GMP-AMP synthase, is essential for induction of IFN-beta during Chlamydia trachomatis infection. *The Journal of Immunology*, 193, 2394–2404.
- Zhang, Z., Yuan, B., Bao, M., Lu, N., Kim, T., & Liu, Y. J. (2011). The helicase DDX41 senses intracellular DNA mediated by the adaptor STING in dendritic cells. *Nature Immunology*, 12, 959–965.
- Zhang, M., Zhang, M. X., Zhang, Q., Zhu, G. F., Yuan, L., Zhang, D. E., Zhu, Q., Yao, J., Shu, H. B., & Zhong, B. (2016). USP18 recruits USP20 to promote innate antiviral response through deubiquitinating STING/MITA. *Cell Research*, 26, 1302–1319.
- Zhao, L., Ching, L. M., Kestell, P., & Baguley, B. C. (2002). The antitumour activity of 5,6dimethylxanthenone-4-acetic acid (DMXAA) in TNF receptor-1 knockout mice. *British Journal of Cancer*, 87, 465–470.
- Zhao, B., Du, F., Xu, P., Shu, C., Sankaran, B., Bell, S. L., Liu, M., Lei, Y., Gao, X., Fu, X., et al. (2019). A conserved PLPLRT/SD motif of STING mediates the recruitment and activation of TBK1. *Nature*, 569, 718–722.
- Zhao, Z., Ma, Z., Wang, B., Guan, Y., Su, X. D., & Jiang, Z. (2020). Mn(2+) directly activates cGAS and structural analysis suggests Mn(2+) induces a noncanonical catalytic synthesis of 2'3'-cGAMP. *Cell Reports*, 32, Article 108053.
- Zhao, B., Xu, P., Rowlett, C. M., Jing, T., Shinde, O., Lei, Y., West, A. P., Liu, W. R., & Li, P. (2020). The molecular basis of tight nuclear tethering and inactivation of cGAS. *Nature*, 587, 673–677.
- Zhong, L., Hu, M. M., Bian, L. J., Liu, Y., Chen, Q., & Shu, H. B. (2020). Phosphorylation of cGAS by CDK1 impairs self-DNA sensing in mitosis. *Cell Discovery*, *6*, 26.
- Zhong, B., Yang, Y., Li, S., Wang, Y. Y., Li, Y., Diao, F., Lei, C., He, X., Zhang, L., Tien, P., et al. (2008). The adaptor protein MITA links virus-sensing receptors to IRF3 transcription factor activation. *Immunity, 29*, 538–550.
- Zhong, B., Zhang, L., Lei, C., Li, Y., Mao, A. P., Yang, Y., Wang, Y. Y., Zhang, X. L., & Shu, H. B. (2009). The ubiquitin ligase RNF5 regulates antiviral responses by mediating degradation of the adaptor protein MITA. *Immunity*, 30, 397–407.
- Zhou, W., Whiteley, A. T., de Oliveira Mann, C. C., Morehouse, B. R., Nowak, R. P., Fischer, E. S., Gray, N. S., Mekalanos, J. J., & Kranzusch, P. J. (2018). Structure of the human cGAS-DNA complex reveals enhanced control of immune surveillance. *Cell*, 174, 300–311. e311.
- Zierhut, C., & Funabiki, H. (2020). Regulation and consequences of cGAS activation by self-DNA. Trends in Cell Biology, 30, 594–605.