

**Identification of genomic differences between laboratory
and commercial strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae***

by

Anthony John Heinrich

B. Biotech. (Hons)

Thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

March 2006

Faculty of Sciences

School of Agriculture, Food and Wine

Discipline of Wine and Horticulture

The University of Adelaide

Table of Contents

Declaration	i
Thesis summary	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Abbreviations	v
CHAPTER 1 Introduction	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.2. SIGNAL TRANSDUCTION PATHWAYS ARE ACTIVATED UNDER STRESSFUL CONDITIONS	2
1.3. THE RESPONSE OF <i>SACCHAROMYCES CEREVISIAE</i> AFTER ENCOUNTERING A STRESSFUL ENVIRONMENT	5
1.3.1. <i>Stress related genes</i>	5
1.3.2. <i>Proteins that are differentially expressed after stress</i>	8
1.3.3. <i>Cell membrane and lipid modifications of yeast under stress</i>	10
1.3.4. <i>Physiological changes to the yeast cell after stress response</i>	11
1.4. COMPARING STRAINS	12
CHAPTER 2 Materials and Methods	15
2.1. PREPARATION OF DNA	15
2.2. COMPARING STRAINS USING AFLP	15
2.3. CLONING OF POLYMORPHIC BANDS	16
2.4. SEQUENCING OF POLYMORPHIC FRAGMENTS	17
2.5. COMPARING POLYMORPHIC FRAGMENTS TO S288C DATABASE	18
2.6. VECTORETTE PCR TO ESTABLISH FULL GENE SEQUENCE	18
2.7. INTERNAL TRANSCRIBED SPACER (ITS) AMPLIFICATION AND RFLP OF RDNA:	19
2.8. SOUTHERN ANALYSIS	19
2.9. METABOLOME FERMENTATIONS AND ANALYSIS BY HIGH PERFORMANCE LIQUID CHROMATGRAPHY (HPLC).....	21
2.10. ISOLATING TOTAL PROTEIN EXTRACTS FROM YEAST	22
2.11. TWO-DIMENSIONAL GEL ELECTROPHORESIS (2D GELS) TO IDENTIFY DIFFERENCES IN YEAST PROTEOMES.....	23
2.11.1. <i>Waite Campus Gels</i>	23
2.11.2. <i>Australian Proteome Analysis Facility (APAF) 2D gels</i>	24
2.11.3. <i>Silver Stain</i>	25
2.11.4. <i>Colloidal Coomassie Staining</i>	25
2.12. WESTERN BLOT ANALYSIS	26
2.13. PROTEIN IDENTIFICATION	28
2.13.1. <i>Matrix-assisted laser desorption ionisation time-of-flight mass spectrometry (MALDI-TOF)</i>	28
2.13.2. <i>Tandem Mass Spectrometry (MS/MS)</i>	29
2.14. RNA EXTRACTIONS	29
2.15. CDNA SYNTHESIS	30
2.16. REAL-TIME QUANTITATIVE PCR.....	31
2.17. CONTINUOUS FERMENTATIONS IN THE PRESENCE OF ETHANOL	32
2.17.1. <i>Yeast strain and media used</i>	32
2.17.2. <i>Continuous fermentation</i>	32

2.18.	MICROARRAY ANALYSIS	33
2.18.1.	<i>RNA purification for cDNA microarray analysis</i>	33
2.18.2.	<i>Microarray cDNA and dye coupling preparation</i>	34
2.18.3.	<i>Data and statistical analysis (bioinformatics)</i>	36
2.19.	NEAR INFRA-RED SPECTROSCOPY (NIRS).....	36
2.19.1.	<i>Anaerobic fermentations</i>	36
2.19.2.	<i>Spectra analysis</i>	37
2.19.3.	<i>Multivariate data analysis</i>	37
 CHAPTER 3 Identifying genome variation in <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> strains.....		38
3.1.	INTRODUCTION	38
3.2.	RESULTS	39
3.2.1.	<i>Phenotypic differences exist between strains</i>	39
3.2.2.	<i>AFLP reveals novel sequences in wine strains</i>	42
3.2.3.	<i>Confirming AWRI 1116 is a progenitor strain of UVAFERM CEG</i>	47
3.3.	DISCUSSION	53
3.4.	CONCLUSION	57
 CHAPTER 4 Comparative proteomics: Identifying differentially expressed proteins between two <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> strains.....		58
4.1.	INTRODUCTION	58
4.2.	RESULTS	60
4.2.1.	<i>Phenotypic differences demonstrate genetic variation in wine strains</i>	60
4.2.1.1.	Plate Assays – tolerance plates.....	60
4.2.1.2.	Metabolic differences exist between laboratory and commercial strains	61
4.2.2.	<i>Proteomic comparison shows protein expression differences between strains</i>	65
4.2.2.1.	Global proteome differences appear minimal between strains	65
4.2.2.2.	Expanding the observed proteome reveals more differences in protein expression	67
4.2.2.3.	Identification of proteins that appear wine strain-specific.....	70
4.2.2.4.	Protein modifications are present in AWRI 838	73
4.3.	DISCUSSION	76
4.4.	CONCLUSION	81
 CHAPTER 5 Characterising the role and function of proteins that are differentially expressed in wine strains.....		83
5.1.	INTRODUCTION	83
5.2.	RESULTS	85
5.2.1.	<i>Confirmation of increased Tdh3p expression in AWRI 838 using Western blot analysis</i>	85
5.2.2.	<i>Real-time PCR suggests post-transcriptional control may exist in wine strains</i>	86
5.2.3.	<i>Replication of 2D gels confirms Shm2p and Tdh3p are expressed more highly in wine strain AWRI 838 than S288C</i>	89
5.2.4.	<i>Further examination of SHM2</i>	90
5.2.4.1.	Near infra-red spectroscopy reveals SHM2 impacts on the metabolome	90
5.2.4.2.	Southern analysis shows multiple alleles are not present in the wine strain genome	93
5.2.4.3.	Sequencing of the SHM2 gene shows seven base substitutions in wine strains	94
5.2.4.4.	Wine strains exhibit differential SHM2 gene expression in varying environmental conditions	97
5.3.	DISCUSSION	99
5.4.	CONCLUSION	105

CHAPTER 6	Acclimatisation of <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> to ethanol in continuous culture	107
6.1.	INTRODUCTION	107
6.2.	RESULTS	109
6.2.1.	6% ethanol inhibits growth in batch culture	109
6.2.2.	6% ethanol effects gene expression in continuous culture conditions.....	111
6.2.3.	Promoter analysis	112
6.3.	DISCUSSION	117
6.4.	CONCLUSION	123
CHAPTER 7	Overall Conclusions and Future Studies	124
Appendix One		
	REAGENTS AND SOLUTIONS USED IN THIS STUDY	128
Appendix Two		
	OLIGONUCLEOTIDE PRIMERS USED IN THIS STUDY	139
Appendix Three		
	STRAINS USED IN THIS STUDY	140
Appendix Four		
	POLYMORPHIC SEQUENCES ISOLATED BY AFLP	141
Appendix Five		
	ISOELECTRIC FOCUSING PROGRAMS FOR DIFFERENT PH STRIPS.....	145
Appendix Six		
	PGEM-T VECTOR USED FOR CLONING OF AFLP POLYMORPHIC FRAGMENTS.....	146
Bibliography	147

Declaration

This work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being available for loan and photocopying.

Anthony John Heinrich

March 2006

Thesis summary

The yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is used in many industrial applications including beer brewing, bread making, and winemaking. Winemaking yeast strains have the ability to convert grape sugars into alcohol and other metabolites consistent with good wine. An exploratory comparative approach was undertaken to identify the genes and corresponding proteins that give wine yeast strains of *S. cerevisiae* their distinctive phenotype, with a focus on studying genes that provide tolerance to ethanol.

A genomic and proteomic approach has been used to identify potential ‘wine specific’ genes. By using amplified fragment length polymorphism (AFLP) techniques, it has been demonstrated that commercial winemaking strains have genetic sequences within their genome that may have arisen from other *Saccharomyces sensu stricto* yeasts. This is the first known report of a wine strain having *Saccharomyces kudriavzevii* genetic sequences encoded within its genome.

To further explore the phenotypic characters distinguishing wine yeast strains from other *S. cerevisiae* strains, a comparative proteomics approach was taken. A proteomics platform using two-dimensional gel electrophoresis (2D gels) has elucidated target proteins for future research, including a glycolytic protein, Tdh3p (glyceraldehyde 3-phosphate dehydrogenase), as well as a one-carbon pool protein, Shm2p (serine hydroxymethyltransferase). The latter protein was characterised

further to determine its possible role and function in wine strains, with results indicating a potential role in wine flavour. It has also been shown that certain wine strains may have different mechanisms for transcription/translation control of *SHM2*.

Using the comparative proteomic approach above, no differences were seen between laboratory strains and wine strains after exposure to an ethanol stress. To ascertain the genes that enable *S. cerevisiae* strains to counteract the high ethanol concentrations encountered during grape juice fermentation, a continuous culture approach was utilised. Ultimately, this will reveal genes that are important to *S. cerevisiae* strains to acclimatise to a high ethanol environment, as opposed to a short-term ethanol stress. The continuous culture approach identified 34 genes that significantly changed expression in the ethanol-containing cultures, suggesting their involvement in ethanol tolerance of *S. cerevisiae*.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my principal supervisor Dr Miguel de Barros Lopes and my co-supervisor Dr Vladimir Jiranek for their guidance and assistance throughout my degree. The work presented would not have been possible without them. I would also like to thank Dr Paul Chambers as a pseudo-supervisor for his help with the ethanol stress studies.

I would like to acknowledge my laboratory colleagues in Dr Shauna Brown, Jenny Bellon and Dr Kate Howell for their friendship and support throughout the past five years. I also thank past and present members of the Molecular team, and indeed everybody at The Australian Wine Research Institute for making my PhD more bearable.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution of all my collaborators, most of which have moved on to other projects after dealing with me: Jelle Lahnstein of the University of Adelaide for his patience with me in developing proteomics at the Waite Campus; Dr Graeme Currie and Kris Ferguson at the University of Melbourne for assistance with mass spectrometry; Derek Van Dyk and Angela Connolly of the Australian Proteome Analysis Facility were instrumental in achieving results with proteomics; and Emmie Heeren from the Technical University of Delft for her help with the ethanol stress, continuous culture fermentations.

I would also like to thank the Cooperative Research Centre for Viticulture for funding the project and for scholarship provision.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the unconditional support of my two best friends, my parents Ray and Judy Heinrich. Simply put, without them the research work would not have been completed and this thesis could not be formulated. I cannot thank them enough for getting me this far in life.

Abbreviations

2D gel	Two-dimensional polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis
AFLP	amplified fragment length polymorphism
APAF	Australian Proteome Analysis Facility
AWRI	Australian Wine Research Institute
cDNA	complementary deoxyribonucleic acid
DIG	digoxigenin
DNA	deoxyribonucleic acid
FBA1	fructose bis-phosphate aldolase
GC-MS	gas chromatography - mass spectrometry
HPLC	high performance liquid chromatography
HSP	heat shock protein
HSTF	heat shock transcription factor
IEF	isoelectric focusing
ITS RFLP	internal transcribed spacer restriction fragment length polymorphism
MALDI-TOF	matrix-assisted laser desorption ionisation time-of-flight spectrometry
MAP	mitogen activated protein
mRNA	messenger ribonucleic acid
MS/MS	tandem mass spectrometry
NIRS	near infra-red spectroscopy
ORF	open reading frame
PCA	principle component analysis

PCR	polymerase chain reaction
PI	isoelectric point
rDNA	ribosomal deoxyribonucleic acid
RNA	ribonucleic acid
RP	ribosomal protein
RPM	revolutions per minute
SAGE	serial analysis of gene expression
SC	synthetic complete
SDS	sodium dodecyl sulphate
SGD	<i>Saccharomyces</i> Genome Database
<i>SHM2</i>	serine hydroxymethyltransferase
<i>SPI1</i>	stationary phase induced
STRE	stress response element
TBS-T	tris buffered saline – Tween 20
<i>TDH3</i>	glyceraldehyde 3-phosphate dehydrogenase
TRIS	tris(hydroxymethyl)aminoethane
WUGSC	Washington University Genome Sequencing Centre
YPD	yeast extract/peptone/dextrose medium