Two Complexes of Spindle Checkpoint Proteins Containing Cdc20 and Mad2 Assemble during Mitosis Independently of the Kinetochore in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*
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Favored models of spindle checkpoint signaling propose that two inhibitory complexes (Mad2-Cdc20 and Mad2-Mad3-Bub3-Cdc20) must be assembled at kinetochores in order to inhibit mitosis. We have directly tested this model in the budding yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. The proteins Mad2, Mad3, Bub3, Cdc20, and Cdc27 in yeast were quantified, and there are sufficient amounts to form stoichiometric inhibitors of Cdc20 and the anaphase-promoting complex. Mad2 is present in two separate complexes in cells arrested in mitosis with nocodazole. There is a small amount of Mad2-Mad3-Bub3-Cdc20 and a much larger amount of a complex that contains Mad2-Cdc20. We use conditional mutants to show that both Mad2 and Mad3 are essential for establishment and maintenance of the spindle checkpoint. Both spindle checkpoint complexes containing Mad2 form in mitosis, not in response to checkpoint activation. The kinetochore is not required to form either complex. We propose that the conversion of Mad1-Mad2 to Cdc20-Mad2, a key step in generating inhibitory checkpoint complexes, is limited to mitosis by the availability of Cdc20 and is kinetochore independent.

The spindle checkpoint is a conserved regulatory system that assures the correct segregation of chromosomes to daughter cells during mitosis (1, 4, 24, 36, 41). The checkpoint inhibits anaphase onset until all chromosomes are attached to the mitotic spindle with bipolar orientation and a functional checkpoint is crucial to prevent aneuploidy (1). Analysis of both meiotic cells and mitotic cells has shown that a single unattached chromosome is sufficient to inhibit anaphase onset (26). Direct demonstration for a role of the kinetochore in the spindle checkpoint has come from laser ablation experiments in higher cells and genetic experiments with *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* that abrogate the spindle checkpoint in the absence of kinetochore function (15, 28, 33). Detailed mapping experiments in yeast have localized spindle checkpoint function to the Ndc80 complex, which is an evolutionarily conserved complex of four proteins within the kinetochore (29, 40). The kinetochore is absolutely required for the spindle checkpoint but the nature of the requirement is mysterious and is a critical unanswered question.

The *MAD1-3, BUB1-3*, and *MPS1* genes that are required for the spindle checkpoint were originally defined in genetic screens using budding yeast, and homologs have been found in virtually all eukaryotic organisms (19, 25, 39). Elegant genetic experiments in budding yeast showed that Cdc20 is the direct target of spindle checkpoint inhibition (21). Cdc20 is a specificity factor for an E3 ubiquitin ligase called the anaphase-promoting complex or cyclosome (APC/C) and regulates the ubiquitylation and subsequent proteolysis of a mitotic inhibitor called securin or Pds1 in budding yeast (36, 41). Securin/Pds1 destruction is a key event for initiating entry into anaphase, and securin/Pds1 proteolysis is inhibited by the spindle checkpoint (1, 4, 41). Interestingly, most of the spindle checkpoint proteins localize to kinetochores that are detached from the mitotic spindle, either in prometaphase or after treatment with microtubule poisons, and the amount of staining diminishes as kinetochores capture microtubules and establish bipolar orientation (8). Recent experiments have demonstrated that the spindle checkpoint proteins dynamically associate with unattached kinetochores with very short half-lives (18, 23, 34).

In vitro assays for APC/C activity have been developed, and soluble inhibitors have been identified (12, 13, 37, 38). Candidate approaches have shown that Mad2 and BubR1 (Mad3 in budding yeast) can inhibit APC/C activity and Mad2 can act synergistically with BubR1 to form a more effective inhibitor (12, 38). Biochemical purification of a mitotic checkpoint complex (MCC) from HeLa cells identified a potent inhibitor of APC/C activity in vitro that is made up of BubR1, hBub3, hMad2, and p55CDC/Cdc20 (37). Recently it has been suggested that BubR1 is a more potent inhibitor of Cdc20-APC/C when tested in combination with Mad2 and Bub3 (41). Therefore, both approaches identified MCC as a potent stoichiometric inhibitor of the APC/C.

Yeast forms MCC (Bub3, Mad2, Mad3, and Cdc20) in nocodazole-treated cells, suggesting that it assembles when kinetochores are detached from microtubules and in response to checkpoint activation (16). Similarly, Mad2 and Cdc20 form two complexes in response to nocodazole treatment, one being MCC and the other a separate complex containing Mad2-Cdc20 (41). MCC is not present in mitotic *Xenopus* egg extracts but is induced to form when sperm and nocodazole are added, suggesting that the assembly is catalyzed by the presence of unattached kinetochores. These observations have led to the dominant model for the role of the kinetochore in...
generating the spindle checkpoint signal (1, 41). Unattached kinetochores are believed to be the site of assembly of inhibitory complexes, primarily MCC and Mad2-Cdc20, and the dynamic nature of kinetochore associations with checkpoint proteins are believed to reflect this assembly process (18, 23, 34).

We have addressed several aspects of this popular model by first quantifying the amount of the individual checkpoint proteins in yeast. We show that Mad2, Mad3, and Bub3 proteins are in excess of both Cdc20 and Cdc27 (a component of the APC/C) and there are sufficient quantities to act as stoichiometric inhibitors. However, we show that there are very small quantities of the MCC in nocodazole-treated cells and most Cdc20 interacts with Mad2 in a separate complex. Despite the small amounts of MCC, it is critical for maintenance of a spindle checkpoint. We show that both complexes containing Mad2 and Cdc20 assemble when cells enter mitosis and assembly does not depend on activating the spindle checkpoint. Finally, we show that neither MCC nor Mad2-Cdc20 assembly requires kinetochores.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strains and media. The strains used for this work are listed in Table 1. Standard yeast medium was used throughout (3). Cells were grown in 30°C unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%. Alpha factor (1 mM) was diluted 15,000-fold unless otherwise stated. The final concentration of glucose, raffinose, and galactose used in the medium was 2%.
amplified from a yeast strain carrying Mad2-13Myc using the primer set MAD2-13MycAAAC-3 and MAD3-13MycTTTATTTTAGAATTCGAGCTCGTTTAAAC-3, and CDC20R1 (5'-TTATATGCTGCTAGATGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTATTATGATACTGCTGTTTAAC-3), and CDC20R1 (5'-TTATATGCTGCTAGATGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTATTATGATACTGCTGTTTAAC-3).

To construct strains carrying 13-Myc-tagged Mad2 and Cdc27, the 13-Myc tagged probe was amplified from the plasmid pFA6a-13Myc-TRP1 and transformed into wild-type yeast strain 2629-1-2. The transformants were selected on complete plates minus TRP1. The primers were used for amplification from yeast strains harboring Mad2 and Mad3 (5'-CAAAGGGGCCCAATAGCACTGCTCGAGGCAAGTAATGTGTG-3') and that for the degron tag confirmed the integration of the gene with a degron tag, the HindIII site (181 nucleotides) for Mad2, and the 3' end of the HindIII site (181 nucleotides) for Mad3R1 (5'-GAGCAATGAACCCAATAACGAAA-3').

The degron tag contains an HA epitope. Expression of the fusion protein was determined by Bradford assay using bovine serum albumin as the standard.

Degron experiment. The cells were grown overnight in YM-1 plus raffinose plus galactose medium containing 0.1 mM copper sulfate at 33°C. To activate the checkpoint 15 µg/ml nocodazole and 25 µg/ml carbenazim was added to cycling cells. After 80% of the cells arrested as large budded cells the proteolysis of the degron-tagged proteins was induced by a shift to growth in prewarmed (37°C) complete medium containing raffinose and galactose, and the cells were allowed to grow at 37°C. Nocodazole (15 µg/ml) and carbenazim (50 µg/ml) was added to the medium to keep the spindle checkpoint signal activated. Samples were collected for western blotting and cell morphology study for every 45 min starting from 0 min after shifting the cells to 37°C.

RESULTS

Quantification and cofractionation of the components of MCC and APC/C. If Mad2 or MCC is a stoichiometric inhibitor of APC/C, then the intracellular levels of Mad2 must be in excess of both Cdc20 and the APC/C. To measure the levels of MCC and APC/C proteins, the endogenous copies of Mad2, Mad3, Bub3, Cdc20, and Cdc27 were tagged at the C terminus of nocodazole (not shown). Therefore, the strains were not starved for spindle checkpoint function. We also determined the benomyl sensitivity of Cdc20-13Myc and Cdc27-13Myc were similar to the wild type with respect to growth onYPD plates containing benomyl. The strain containing Mad2-13Myc was slightly benomyl sensitive but was much more resistant than the mad2 mutant (Fig. 1A). The wild type mad2-13Myc cells were able to arrest in mitosis and retained high viability when grown in the presence of nocodazole (not shown). Therefore, the strains were not compromised for spindle checkpoint function. We also determined the benomyl sensitivity of Cdc20-13Myc and Cdc27-13Myc and in both cases the benomyl sensitivity was similar to that of the wild type (Fig. 1A) suggesting that neither protein is compromised for the spindle checkpoint. Therefore, the introduction of the Myc tag at the C-terminal end of each gene did not eliminate the function of any of the five proteins tested.

To determine the relative stoichiometry of the Myc-tagged proteins, we constructed 13Myc-tagged Mad2 and Mad3 in bacterial expression vectors and purified them to homogeneity from E. coli. The concentration of endogenous Mad2 present in yeast whole-cell extracts was estimated by comparing the intensities of the bands after serial twofold dilutions to known amounts of recombinant Mad2-13Myc protein. (Fig. 1B). Molecular weight is the major variable in quantification experiments using Western blots and probably reflects differential transfer for proteins of different molecular weights (P.T.S and...
A.P., unpublished). Purified recombinant Mad3-13Myc is similar in size to Bub3-13Myc, Cdc20-13Myc, and Cdc27-13Myc and is identical to Mad3-13Myc and was used as standard for quantification of these proteins using serial twofold dilutions as described above (data not shown). The quantification data for all of the proteins are summarized in Fig. 1C and shows that Mad2 is the most abundant of these five proteins. We estimate that the relative amounts of the other components of MCC (Cdc20, Bub3, Mad3) is 2- to 3-fold less and Cdc27, a component of the APC/C, is approximately 10% of that of Mad2. Therefore, the spindle checkpoint proteins are equivalent or in excess of both Cdc20 and the APC/C protein Cdc27, suggesting that the formation of a stoichiometric inhibitor is possible.

We determined the proportion of checkpoint proteins that were assembled into complexes by size exclusion chromatography. Clarified extracts from nocodazole-treated cells express-
ing C-terminal 13Myc-tagged Mad3, Bub3, Cdc20, or Cdc27 were fractionated over a Superose 6 column, and alternate fractions were immunoblotted with anti-Myc antibody. The fractionation profiles, Fig. 1D, demonstrate that Bub3, Mad3, Cdc20, and Cdc27 comigrated as a large multiprotein complex (670 kDa) when extracts were prepared from cells grown in the presence of nocodazole to activate the spindle checkpoint. The fractions from the Mad3-13Myc gel filtration column were probed with anti-Mad2 antibodies prepared against a carboxy-terminal peptide. Mad2 was present in two different peaks, as previously demonstrated (7, 14). In one of the peaks, Mad2 cofractionated with the Bub3, Mad3, Cdc20, and Cdc27 complex, and the other peak corresponded to the monomer or dimer form of Mad2. However, only a small fraction of Cdc20-13Myc, Mad3-13Myc, Bub3-13Myc, and Cdc27-13Myc comigrated with Mad2 in the 670-kDa fraction. This suggests that a small proportion of these proteins form MCC. We did not detect monomer forms of Mad3, Bub3, Cdc20, or Cdc27.

Mad2, Mad3, and Bub3 are constitutively expressed in wild-type yeast cells and Mad3 is continuously associated with Bub3 regardless of cell cycle stage (7, 14, 16). Increased amount of Mad2 has been shown to interact with Mad3 and Bub3 in nocodazole-treated cells (16). The gel filtration profiles of Mad2 in the alpha-factor, hydroxyurea, or nocodazole-treated cells is shown in Fig. 1E. We quantified the Mad2 in both regions and found that approximately 80% of the Mad2 was present in the monomer and 20% in the high-molecular-weight complex in alpha-factor or hydroxyurea-treated cells. In contrast, approximately 50% of Mad2 was in a high-molecular-weight complex in nocodazole-treated cells. Taken together, our data suggest that a Mad2 assembles into one or more larger complexes in response to nocodazole treatment. However, the data suggest that only a small amount of MCC is formed.

**Mad2 and Cdc20 exist as a separate subcomplex independent of MCC.** We used immunoprecipitation to directly measure the association of Mad2 in MCC. If Bub3, Mad3, Cdc20, and Mad2 were a part of a single multiprotein complex (MCC), the amount of Mad2 that coimmunoprecipitated with Bub3-13Myc, Mad3-13Myc, or Cdc20-13Myc should be the same. Whole-cell extracts from cells expressing Mad3-13 Myc, Bub3-13Myc, or Cdc20-13Myc were prepared and Myc-containing proteins were purified by immunoprecipitation. The pellets and the supernatants were probed with anti-Myc and anti-Mad2 antibodies (Fig. 1F). A greater amount of Mad2 coimmunoprecipitated with Cdc20-13Myc than with either Bub3-13Myc or Mad3-13Myc. This was not caused by differential precipitation of the three complexes, as all of the Myc-tagged proteins were quantitatively depleted. These data are consistent with previous observations that there are two separate complexes of Mad2 and Cdc20 and suggest that MCC is much less abundant than Mad2-Cdc20 (1).

We performed sequential immunoprecipitations to separate the two Mad2-containing complexes in spindle checkpoint-activated cells. The design of the experiment is shown in Fig. 2B. Two strains with either a C-terminal protein A (PrA) tag on the endogenous Mad3 (Mad3-PrA) or expressing both Mad3-PrA and Cdc20-13Myc were constructed. Neither strain was benomyl sensitive (Fig. 2A), and the strains were checkpoint proficient. Extracts made from the strains expressing single tags were used as controls for this and subsequent experiments. Mad3-PrA was depleted from extracts prepared from nocodazole-treated cells using agarose beads coupled to human IgG, and Cdc20-13Myc was subsequently isolated from the supernatants using agarose beads coupled to anti-Myc.

The Western blot analysis of the whole-cell extracts, supernatants, and IgG immunoprecipitates probed with anti-PrA and anti-Mad2 antibodies showed that greater than 95% of the Mad3-PrA was removed from the extract with IgG beads (Fig. 2C) and a small fraction of Mad2 copurified with Mad3-PrA (Fig. 2C, lanes 5 and 6), consistent with our previous observation. A small amount of Cdc20 copurified with Mad3-PrA (Fig. 2D, lanes 4 to 6) demonstrating that this complex contains Mad2, Mad3-PrA, and Cdc20-13Myc and therefore is MCC (37).

Cdc20-13Myc was purified from the supernatant by anti-Myc immunoprecipitation using beads, and immunoblots were probed with anti-Myc and anti-Mad2 antibodies (Fig. 2D). Mad2 coimmunoprecipitated with Cdc20-13Myc from Mad3-PrA-depleted extracts (Fig. 2D, lane 9), showing that Mad2 and Cdc20 form a separate complex that does not contain Mad3. The amount of Mad2 that coprecipitated with Cdc20-13Myc from an extract lacking Mad3-PrA was similar to the amount of Mad2 that coprecipitated with Cdc20-13Myc from Mad3-PrA-depleted extract (Fig. 2D, lanes 7 and 9). This confirms that a small fraction of Cdc20-13Myc and Mad2 coprecipitated with Mad3-PrA using IgG and shows that little Cdc20 is associated with MCC compared to the amount in the Mad2-Cdc20 complex.

**MCC is essential for the maintenance of the spindle checkpoint.** The spindle checkpoint is activated when kinetochores are unoccupied and maintained until bipolar attachment of the kinetochore to the spindle is achieved. One possible rationale for the existence of two different complexes of spindle checkpoint proteins is that one complex has a role in establishing the arrest and the other is required to maintain it. We used temperature-inducible degron fusions to construct conditional mad2″ and mad3″ mutants in which we also epitope tagged the mitotic inhibitor Pds1 with 13Myc (10). Pds1 stability is a measure of cells passing from metaphase to anaphase, as the protein levels are high when cells are in metaphase, as in spindle checkpoint-activated cells, and drop precipitously as cells enter anaphase (9).

We grew wild-type, mad2″ and mad3″ cells under permissive conditions for the degron and added nocodazole and carbendazim to the medium until greater than 80% of the cells were arrested as large budded cells, indicative of mitosis. We induced the degradation of Mad2 and Mad3 and assayed for the ability of the cells to stay arrested by monitoring Pds1-13Myc stability. The degron-tagged proteins contained an HA epitope so that we could follow the stability of Mad2 and Mad3. Pds1 levels began to decline as soon as the Mad2 or Mad3 levels dropped (Fig. 3A). The Pds1 levels rise again because cells enter the next cell cycle. This was confirmed by the cytology of the cells that showed that the cells could not maintain the mitotic arrest as the levels of either protein was reduced (Fig. 3B). There was no significant change in Pds1 level of the wild type over time. We conclude that despite the small amount of MCC in the cell it is an important mitotic
inhibitor and that MCC is required for maintenance as well as establishment of the spindle checkpoint. MCC formation is cell cycle regulated and independent of the spindle checkpoint. A key experiment to support the model that an unattached kinetochore serves as a platform of assembly of the mitotic inhibitors is that MCC formation in budding yeast occurs in nocodazole-treated cells but is at very low levels in cells arrested in S phase by hydroxyurea and absent in /H9251-factor-treated cells arrested in G1 (16). This was interpreted to mean that MCC formation was induced by the spindle checkpoint (16). However, there is an alternative explanation. Nocodazole-treated cells are in mitosis, and the hydroxyurea and /H9262-factor-treated cells are not. MCC assembly may reflect cell cycle dependence and not spindle checkpoint activation. We directly tested whether MCC formation responds to unattached kinetochores or assembles in mitosis even when kinetochore-microtubule attachments are not perturbed. We followed MCC production in a strain expressing Mad3-PrA by the association of Mad2 with Mad3-PrA and we included a PGAL1-PDS1-MDB, which is a dominant galactose-inducible Pds1 mutant that has a mutation in the destruction box so that the mutated Pds1 does not turn over (9). Excess expression of the mutant Pds1 causes cells to arrest in mitosis and should not affect kinetochore-microtubule attachments. The strain is benomyl FIG. 2. Cdc20-Mad2 forms a complex independent of Mad3. (A) The benomyl sensitivity of the strains expressing Mad3-PrA (2873) and Mad3-PrA Cdc20-13Myc (2876-2-1) is shown. Serial tenfold dilutions of cells were spotted on YPD and YPD plus benomyl (15 μg/ml) plates. The plates were incubated at 23°C for 4 days and photographed. (B) The flow chart of the sequential immunoprecipitation from yeast whole-cell extract is shown. Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from the extracts using IgG beads, and Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the resulting supernatants using anti-Myc antibody beads. (C) Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from whole-cell extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Mad3-PrA, Cdc20-13Myc (2876-2-1), and Mad3-PrA (2873). Extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Cdc20-13Myc (2819) was used as the control. The whole-cell extracts (lanes 1 to 3), IgG immunoprecipitates (lanes 4 to 6), and supernatants of IgG IP (lanes 7 to 9) were probed with anti-PrA and anti-Mad2 antibodies; 50 μg whole-cell extracts and the supernatants were loaded per lane and the amount of protein loaded in the IP lane was 10-fold more than that loaded in the whole-cell extract lane. (D) Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts using anti-Myc antibody beads. The supernatants of the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts (lanes 1 to 3), anti-Myc immunoprecipitates (lanes 7 to 9), and the supernatants of anti-Myc immunoprecipitations (lanes 10 to 11) were probed with anti-Myc and anti-Mad2 antibodies. The IgG immunoprecipitates were probed with anti-Myc antibodies (lanes 4 to 6) to detect coimmunoprecipitation of Cdc20-13Myc with Mad3-PrA.

MCC formation is cell cycle regulated and independent of the spindle checkpoint. A key experiment to support the model that an unattached kinetochore serves as a platform of assembly of the mitotic inhibitors is that MCC formation in budding yeast occurs in nocodazole-treated cells but is at very low levels in cells arrested in S phase by hydroxyurea and absent in α-factor-treated cells arrested in G1 (16). This was interpreted to mean that MCC formation was induced by the spindle checkpoint (16). However, there is an alternative explanation. Nocodazole-treated cells are in mitosis, and the hydroxyurea and α-factor-treated cells are not. MCC assembly may reflect cell cycle dependence and not spindle checkpoint activation. We directly tested whether MCC formation responds to unattached kinetochores or assemblies in mitosis even when kinetochore attachments are not perturbed. We followed MCC production in a strain expressing Mad3-PrA by the association of Mad2 with Mad3-PrA and we included a PGAL1-PDS1-MDB, which is a dominant galactose-inducible PDS1-MDB, mutant that has a mutation in the destruction box so that the mutated Pds1 does not turn over (9). Excess expression of the mutant Pds1 causes cells to arrest in mitosis and should not affect kinetochore-microtubule attachments. The strain is benomyl benomyl PLC2876-2-1 is shown. Serial tenfold dilutions of cells were spotted on YPD and YPD plus benomyl (15 μg/ml) plates. The plates were incubated at 23°C for 4 days and photographed. (B) The flow chart of the sequential immunoprecipitation from yeast whole-cell extract is shown. Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from the extracts using IgG beads, and Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the resulting supernatants using anti-Myc antibody beads. (C) Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from whole-cell extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Mad3-PrA, Cdc20-13Myc (2876-2-1), and Mad3-PrA (2873). Extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Cdc20-13Myc (2819) was used as the control. The whole-cell extracts (lanes 1 to 3), IgG immunoprecipitates (lanes 4 to 6), and supernatants of IgG IP (lanes 7 to 9) were probed with anti-PrA and anti-Mad2 antibodies; 50 μg whole-cell extracts and the supernatants were loaded per lane and the amount of protein loaded in the IP lane was 10-fold more than that loaded in the whole-cell extract lane. (D) Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts using anti-Myc antibody beads. The supernatants of the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts (lanes 1 to 3), anti-Myc immunoprecipitates (lanes 7 to 9), and the supernatants of anti-Myc immunoprecipitations (lanes 10 to 11) were probed with anti-Myc and anti-Mad2 antibodies. The IgG immunoprecipitates were probed with anti-Myc antibodies (lanes 4 to 6) to detect coimmunoprecipitation of Cdc20-13Myc with Mad3-PrA.

MCC formation is cell cycle regulated and independent of the spindle checkpoint. A key experiment to support the model that an unattached kinetochore serves as a platform of assembly of the mitotic inhibitors is that MCC formation in budding yeast occurs in nocodazole-treated cells but is at very low levels in cells arrested in S phase by hydroxyurea and absent in α-factor-treated cells arrested in G1 (16). This was interpreted to mean that MCC formation was induced by the spindle checkpoint (16). However, there is an alternative explanation. Nocodazole-treated cells are in mitosis, and the hydroxyurea and α-factor-treated cells are not. MCC assembly may reflect cell cycle dependence and not spindle checkpoint activation. We directly tested whether MCC formation responds to unattached kinetochores or assemblies in mitosis even when kinetochore attachments are not perturbed. We followed MCC production in a strain expressing Mad3-PrA by the association of Mad2 with Mad3-PrA and we included a PGAL1-PDS1-MDB, which is a dominant galactose-inducible PDS1-MDB, mutant that has a mutation in the destruction box so that the mutated Pds1 does not turn over (9). Excess expression of the mutant Pds1 causes cells to arrest in mitosis and should not affect kinetochore-microtubule attachments. The strain is benomyl PLC2876-2-1 is shown. Serial tenfold dilutions of cells were spotted on YPD and YPD plus benomyl (15 μg/ml) plates. The plates were incubated at 23°C for 4 days and photographed. (B) The flow chart of the sequential immunoprecipitation from yeast whole-cell extract is shown. Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from the extracts using IgG beads, and Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the resulting supernatants using anti-Myc antibody beads. (C) Mad3-PrA was immunodepleted from whole-cell extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Mad3-PrA, Cdc20-13Myc (2876-2-1), and Mad3-PrA (2873). Extract made from nocodazole-treated cells expressing Cdc20-13Myc (2819) was used as the control. The whole-cell extracts (lanes 1 to 3), IgG immunoprecipitates (lanes 4 to 6), and supernatants of IgG IP (lanes 7 to 9) were probed with anti-PrA and anti-Mad2 antibodies; 50 μg whole-cell extracts and the supernatants were loaded per lane and the amount of protein loaded in the IP lane was 10-fold more than that loaded in the whole-cell extract lane. (D) Cdc20-13Myc was immunoprecipitated from the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts using anti-Myc antibody beads. The supernatants of the Mad3-PrA depleted extracts (lanes 1 to 3), anti-Myc immunoprecipitates (lanes 7 to 9), and the supernatants of anti-Myc immunoprecipitations (lanes 10 to 11) were probed with anti-Myc and anti-Mad2 antibodies. The IgG immunoprecipitates were probed with anti-Myc antibodies (lanes 4 to 6) to detect coimmunoprecipitation of Cdc20-13Myc with Mad3-PrA.
resistant, showing that the spindle checkpoint is intact (Fig. 4A). We grew cells in YM-1, arrested them in hydroxyurea and purified Mad3-PrA using IgG beads and showed they contained a small amount of associated Mad2 (Fig. 4B). We repeated the experiment but added nocodazole to the cells previously arrested in hydroxyurea. Nocodazole did not stimulate the formation of additional MCC in cells previously arrested in hydroxyurea (Fig. 4B). When we induced unattached kinetochores and arrested cells in mitosis by growing them in the presence of nocodazole, we identified significantly more MCC (Fig. 4B) as previously described (16). However, we found equivalent amounts of Mad2 associated with Mad3-PrA in cells grown in the presence of galactose to induce PDS1-MDB (Fig. 4B). Adding nocodazole to cells previously arrested in mitosis with PDS1-MDB did not stimulate formation of additional MCC (Fig. 4C). We conclude that MCC formation in yeast is cell cycle dependent and does not depend on the presence of unattached kinetochores.

One possible caveat is that PDS1-MDB may activate the spindle checkpoint, and therefore the abundant association of MCC would be indicative of the indirect effect of Pds1-MDB on spindle function. We tested this directly as described below (Fig. 5C) and found that PDS1-MDB does not activate the spindle checkpoint.

Mad2 associates with Mad3 and Cdc20 in mitosis in the absence of functional kinetochores. The previous experiments
FIG. 4. Mad3 associates with Mad2 independently of the spindle checkpoint. (A) Benomyl sensitivity of strain 2898-11-3 (Mad3-PrA \( P_{\text{GAL}}\)-\( P_{\text{DS1-MDB}} \)) was checked by spotting 10-fold serial dilutions of the cells on YPD and YPD plus benomyl (15 µg/ml). The photographs were taken after 4 days of incubation of the plates at 23°C. (B) A flow diagram of the experiment is shown. Wild-type cells (2898-11-3) containing \( P_{\text{GAL}}\)-\( P_{\text{DS1-MDB}} \) and Mad3-PrA were grown overnight in YM-1 and raffinose at 30°C. The cells were arrested in S phase with hydroxyurea (200 mM) for 3 h. Following arrest, the culture was divided into several aliquots. An aliquot of the cells were collected (HU). To another aliquot of cells, nocodazole (15 µg/ml) was added. The cells were allowed to grow and collected after 1.5 h (hydroxyurea plus Noc). To arrest cells in M phase by the activation of the spindle checkpoint, an aliquot of hydroxyurea-treated cells were washed three times and released into YM-1 with raffinose and nocodazole. The cells were allowed to grow for 1.5 h and collected (Noc). Another aliquot of cells were treated with hydroxyurea for 2.5 h, galactose was added, and the culture was allowed to grow for 30 min to induce the expression of \( P_{\text{GAL}}\)-\( P_{\text{DS1-MDB}} \). The cells were washed three times, resuspended in YM-1 and raffinose and galactose, and harvested after 1.5 h (Gal). Cells were prepared for flow cytometry, and protein extracts were made from the samples collected. Flow cytometry profiles of the cells collected in different growth conditions is shown. 1C and 2C represent the DNA content of the cells. Mad3-PrA was immunoprecipitated from the whole-cell extracts made from the cells, and the immunoprecipitates were probed with anti-PrA and anti-Mad2 antibodies. (C) A similar experiment except after induction with galactose the culture was divided into two. One set was allowed to grow for 1.5 h in the presence of raffinose and galactose, and samples were collected (Gal [a]). Nocodazole was added to the other half in addition to raffinose and galactose. The cells were allowed to grow and collected after 1.5 h (Gal plus Noc). Flow cytometry and immunoprecipitations were done as described for B. The flow cytometry result is shown in B.
do not rule out a role for the kinetochore in assembling either MCC or the Mad2-Cdc20 complex. Therefore, we tested the requirement of the kinetochore in assembling MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 by using an ndc10-1 mutant so kinetochores can be destroyed in a temperature-dependent fashion (5, 11). The design of the experiment is shown in Fig. 5A. Cells containing ndc10-1, P\textsubscript{GAL1}\textasteriskcentered PDS1-MDB, Mad3-PrA, and Cdc20-13Myc were grown under permissive conditions for ndc10-1 and arrested in G1 using \textalpha-factor. The temperature was raised to 37°C for two hours to inactivate Ndc10. Cells were released from \textalpha-factor in the presence of galactose to induce expression of the ectopic PDS1-MDB, and cells were collected 90 min later, at a time when wild-type cells normally enter anaphase (Fig. 5C).
The efficiency of the synchronization steps was confirmed by flow cytometry and is shown in Fig. 5B. We detected MCC as Mad2 associated with Mad3-PrA, and we identified the independent Mad2-Cdc20 complex by sequential immunoprecipitation (Mad2 associated with Cdc20-13Myc in the supernatant after removing Mad3-PrA) as described in Fig. 2B. Similar amounts of MCC were present in both wild-type and ndc10-1 cells, and Mad2-Cdc20 was also present in both wild-type and ndc10-1 cells (Fig. 5B). This confirms that both Mad2-containing complexes form in mitosis and suggests that the kinetochore is not required for the formation of either checkpoint complex.

It is essential to confirm that kinetochores are completely inactive in the ndc10-1 mutant. We used an exquisitely sensitive assay that takes advantage of the observation that a single kinetochore in capable of inducing a checkpoint signal (26). We tagged the endogenous wild-type Pds1 protein with a 3HA epitope at the PDS1 locus. The Pds1 protein has an intact destruction box and is subject to spindle checkpoint control. During the experiment described above, we released cells from α-factor and grew them in the presence or absence of nocodazole. We assayed the stability of the endogenous Pds1-3HA over time. If even a single kinetochore remained intact in the ndc10-1 mutant, then the Pds1-3HA would remain stable.

In the absence of nocodazole, Pds1-3HA turned over in both wild-type and ndc10-1 cells between 80 and 90 min after release from α-factor. The instability of the endogenous Pds1-3HA in wild-type cells expressing P<sub>GAL</sub>-PDS1-MDB shows that the spindle checkpoint was not activated by ectopic expression of the mutant Pds1. In the presence of nocodazole, endogenous Pds1-3HA was stabilized in wild-type cells because the checkpoint was active, but Pds1-3HA turned over in nocodazole-treated ndc10-1 cells, showing that every kinetochore had been inactivated (Fig. 5C). We conclude that both complexes of Mad2-containing spindle checkpoint proteins, mitotic MCC and Mad2-Cdc20, form in mitosis in the complete absence of kinetochore function, and the role of the kinetochore in spindle checkpoint signaling is independent of complex assembly.

**DISCUSSION**

**MCC is a minor complex in vivo.** We have quantified the spindle checkpoint proteins of the MCC in yeast and shown that they are present in sufficient quantities to act as stoichiometric inhibitors of the APC/C. The two protein complexes that contain Mad2, MCC and Mad2-Cdc20, are present in different quantities in yeast cells, and the minor component is MCC, the most potent in vitro spindle checkpoint inhibitor identified to date. We used conditional mutants to establish a checkpoint arrest and then remove Mad2 and Mad3. These experiments show that both Mad2 and Mad3 are important for maintaining a spindle checkpoint arrest. MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 formation is not induced by the spindle checkpoint rather the complexes forms in cells in mitosis regardless of the state of the spindle. Finally, the formation of both MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 is completely independent of the kinetochore.

The target of the spindle checkpoint is Cdc20 and mutants that prevent Mad2 from interacting with Cdc20 abrogate the signal (21). There are two complexes that form in vivo, Mad2-Cdc20 and MCC, and therefore they are excellent candidates for mitotic inhibitors (12, 37, 38). Cells arrested in mitosis contain both as separable complexes, but the relationship between the two is not clear. One possible explanation is that the two complexes are fundamentally different. It has been proposed that the Mad2-Cdc20 complex sequesters Cdc20 from the APC/C and thereby serves as an inhibitor (1). MCC is thought to act stoichiometrically by binding to the APC/C and inhibiting it directly (37). We found that yeast cells arrested in mitosis with nocodazole contain very small quantities of MCC. Therefore, it is not likely that MCC is a stoichiometric inhibitor of APC/C and the dominant mitotic inhibitor given the small quantity. Despite the small quantity, it is a critical inhibitor because cells are unable to maintain a spindle checkpoint arrest in the absence of Mad3. We interpret this to mean that MCC is required for the maintenance of the spindle checkpoint, although we cannot rule out that there is another pool of Mad3 that is also important for maintenance.

Why is there such a small amount of MCC if it is such a potent inhibitor of the APC/C? One possibility is that MCC is catalytic. Another possibility is that it is a stoichiometric inhibitor of a special pool of APC/C or perhaps only a small fraction of the APC/C is active in the cell.

**Complexes are not induced to form in response to activating the spindle checkpoint.** There are discrepancies in the literature about whether the association of Mad2 and Cdc20 is induced by the spindle checkpoint. MCC forms in yeast cells grown in the presence of nocodazole, is present in low amounts in cells grown in hydroxyurea and is absent from cells arrested in G<sub>1</sub> to α-factor (16). MCC is not present in mitotic extracts of *Xenopus* oocytes and is induced to form after adding sperm and nocodazole to activate the spindle checkpoint (6). In contrast, several earlier studies using mammalian cells showed that Mad2 associated with Cdc20 in response to nocodazole and can be interpreted to mean either formation of MCC or Mad2-Cdc20 (12, 37, 38). Sudakin et al. showed that MCC is present in interphase HeLa cells at a time when there are no mature kinetochores and the checkpoint is silenced and the MCC is active as an in vitro inhibitor of the APC/C (37). Our data clearly show that MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 form in mitosis and levels do not increase in response to checkpoint signals.

What regulates the formation of complexes in mitosis is unclear. Mitotic phosphorylation may play a role but a more likely candidate is the levels of Cdc20 protein. The mRNA expression of Cdc20 is periodic and peaks at the metaphase to anaphase transition in yeast (35). Cdc20 is a substrate of Cdh1, a specificity factor for the APC/C that is active throughout the G<sub>1</sub> phase of the cell cycle (20). Therefore, there is no Cdc20 mRNA in G<sub>1</sub> and the protein is degraded by Cdh1-APC/C. Mad2, Mad3, and Bub3 are constitutively expressed (7, 14, 16). The simplest interpretation of our data is that Cdc20 is limiting for both Mad2-Cdc20 and MCC. Mad2-Cdc20 and MCC cannot be formed in G<sub>1</sub> and the small amount of MCC that is detected in hydroxyurea-arrested cells is expected since cells arrest before the peak in Cdc20 synthesis (35).

Mitosis per se is not sufficient for forming MCC in *Xenopus laevis* because cystostatic factor (CSF)-arrested *Xenopus* egg extracts do not contain MCC even though all of the subunits are present (6). We suspect that this reflects a significant dif-
ference in embryonic systems compared to somatic cells that may reflect the need to keep the spindle checkpoint inactive until the midblastula transition. Perhaps there is an active mechanism to keep the checkpoint inactive during the early embryonic cell divisions. For example, Emi1 is a protein that binds and inhibits Cdc20 from S phase until the early stages of mitosis, and Emi1 is a component of CSF (31, 32). Since both Emi1 and Mad2 bind to the amino terminus of Cdc20, it is likely that Emi1 binding to Cdc20 in CSF-arrested extracts inhibits the formation of MCC.

Kinetochore is not required for formation of the complexes.

A previous report suggested that MCC formation is kinetochore independent (14). Our data confirm the principle conclusions of the previous report but extend the conclusion by two important observations. First, our quantification shows that MCC is present in low quantities in cells and therefore accounts for a very small fraction of inhibited Cdc20. We measured the formation of the independent Mad2-Cdc20 complex, which is much more abundant, and we show that its formation is also kinetochore independent.

It was important to repeat the experiment to test the requirement of the kinetochore in the formation of MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 for three important reasons. The first is that the previous experiment assayed the formation of MCC in kinetochore mutants ndc10-1, spc24-1, and spc25-1 arrested with hydroxyurea (14). Hydroxyurea-treated cells contain very little Cdc20 and hence a very small amount of MCC and are arrested at the start of S phase, well before the onset of anaphase. The second is that the previous experiment used cell synchrony with the temperature-sensitive ndc10-1 mutant arrested in α-factor at the permissive temperature and then released to the cell cycle at the restrictive temperature. The experiment did not account for the time required to inactivate the Ndc10 protein. We have found that it takes two hours to completely eliminate the spindle checkpoint function in our ndc10-1 mutant strains (P. Tavormina, and D. Burke, unpublished observation). Thus, it was impossible to determine if the MCC detected in the previous experiment was formed before cells lost kinetochore function. The third reason is that it is also necessary to determine if the formation of Mad2-Cdc20 is kinetochore dependent and it was not tested previously. We found that there is no role for the kinetochore in the formation of either MCC or Mad2-Cdc20. Our data agree with those of Sudakin et al. (37), who isolated MCC from interphase cells, where there are no kinetochores.

Cdc20 and Mad1 both have similar regions that bind Mad2 (28). Moreover, peptides that correspond to the Mad2 binding domains of Mad1 and Cdc20 induce a similar conformational change to Mad2 (28). Mad1 is required to localize Mad2 to kinetochores and it is believed that Mad1, in the kinetochore, catalyzes a change in Mad2 that promotes association with Cdc20 (17, 28, 37). Our data argue that this cannot be true. Both MCC and Mad2-Cdc20 can form in the complete absence of the kinetochore function although neither is capable of inhibiting APC/C activity. If Mad1 is catalyzing the association between Mad2 and Cdc20 then it is happening somewhere in the cell other than at the kinetochore. Mad1 and Mad2 have been localized to the nuclear pore through interactions with the Nup53 complex of proteins (22). It is possible that Mad2 is exchanged with Cdc20 during transport through the nuclear pore complex, however, this seems unlikely because nup53 mutants are checkpoint proficient.

Unattached kinetochores are clearly at the top of a signal transduction pathway that senses microtubule attachment and in its absence initiates spindle checkpoint signaling. If Mad2-Cdc20 complexes form in the absence of the kinetochore, what is the role of the kinetochore in the spindle checkpoint? More complex models that require the kinetochore as the site of assembly can be envisioned. Perhaps there is some other inhibitor that has not yet been identified, or perhaps there is a core of the MCC or of Mad2-Cdc20 that form in mitosis and there is an exchange of subunits at the kinetochore that convert it to an inhibitor. Alternatively, either or both complexes may get modified, for example by protein kinases, at the kinetochore. Sudakin et al. (37) suggested that the role of the kinetochore is to potentiate the APC/C so that it is responsive to MCC inhibition. We think this is unlikely to account for all of the inhibitory activity, given the small amount of MCC in yeast, but it is possible that one role of the kinetochore is to modulate the activity of the APC/C.

Checkpoint proteins are at kinetochores when the spindle checkpoint is active, and many associate dynamically, with very short half-lives (18, 23, 34). The simple model that the kinetochore is the site of Mad2-Cdc20 assembly is incorrect, but the dynamic nature of these important regulatory proteins is likely to be one of the keys to understanding the molecular details of the spindle checkpoint.
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