Genomic instability is a hallmark of human cancers. Spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC) is a critical cellular mechanism that prevents chromosome missegregation and therefore aneuploidy by blocking premature separation of sister chromatids. Thus, SAC, much like the DNA damage checkpoint, is essential for genome stability. In this study, we report the generation and analysis of mice carrying a Cdc20 allele in which three residues critical for the interaction with Mad2 were mutated to alanine. The mutant Cdc20 protein (AAA-Cdc20) is no longer inhibited by Mad2 in response to SAC activation, leading to the dysfunction of SAC and aneuploidy. The dysfunction could not be rescued by the additional expression of another Cdc20 inhibitor, BubR1. Furthermore, we found that Cdc20\(^{AAA/AAA}\) mice died at late gestation, but Cdc20\(^{+/AAA}\) mice were viable. Importantly, Cdc20\(^{AAA/AAA}\) mice developed spontaneous tumors at highly accelerated rates, indicating that the SAC-mediated inhibition of Cdc20 is an important tumor-suppressing mechanism.

**Introduction**

Genomic instability is a hallmark of human cancers, a prominent form of which is chromosomal instability (CIN). CIN is most likely caused by errors in mitoses during which the duplicated genome is distributed into two daughter cells. Mitosis is composed of several phases: prophase (chromosomes start condensing), prometaphase (chromosomes condensed, removal of the bulk of sister cohesins, and establishment of bipolar spindles), metaphase (sister chromatids aligned in metaphase plate), anaphase/telophase (separation and pulling of sister chromatids), mitotic exit (loss of Cdk1 kinase activity and relaxation of the condensed chromosomes), and cytokinesis (end of mitosis and the formation of two new daughter cells). Genetic studies in yeasts have identified several important mitotic regulators. Key among them is the anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C), a multisubunit E3 ubiquitin ligase (Morgan, 1999; Page and Hieter, 1999). APC/C mediates ubiquitination of protein substrates including cyclin B1 and securin to drive the progression of mitosis. It recognizes its substrates through two adapter proteins, Cdc20 and Cdh1, which contain similar C-terminal substrate-interacting domains composed of seven WD-40 repeats (Hendrickson et al., 2001; Pfleger et al., 2001; Schwab et al., 2001; Harper et al., 2002; Kraft et al., 2005; Diaz-Martinez and Yu, 2007). Destruction boxes or KEN boxes are motifs frequently found in APC/C’s substrates, but other motifs are also possible for the recognition (Harper et al., 2002).

Before anaphase, sister chromatids are held together by cohesion complexes that resist the pulling force generated by the microtubule spindle. It is the dissolution of sister cohesion that allows anaphase to happen. The cohesion complexes are composed of protein subunits encoded by Smc1, Smc3, Scc1/Mcd1, and Scc3 and are thought to form a ring structure that encloses sister chromosomes (Nasmyth, 2005). At the onset of anaphase, the Scc1 subunit of the cohesion complex is cleaved by separase, a CD clan protease of the caspase family (Uhlmann et al., 2000), leading to the opening of the ring and release of sister chromatids. The timing of anaphase is controlled by spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC), an elaborate biochemical mechanism that ensures that sister chromatids are held together by cohesion rings until all of the chromosomes have achieved bivalent spindle attachments. By doing that, SAC prevents chromosome missegregation and aneuploidy. Dysfunctional SAC likely underlies the CIN phenotype observed in cancer cells.

SAC is activated when the kinetochores are not occupied by microtubules or when there is no tension at the kinetochores.
Securin is an inhibitor of separase, and cyclin B1–Cdk1 kinase can phosphorylate separase (Stemmann et al., 2001). Phosphorylation of separase opens up the site for the binding and inhibition by the Cdk1–cyclin B1 complex (Gorr et al., 2005; Boos et al., 2008). Therefore, separase is dually inhibited by securin and phosphorylation when the checkpoint is activated, preventing premature separation of sister chromatids.

(Lew and Burke, 2003; Pinsky and Biggins, 2005). A single lagging chromosome is sufficient to activate SAC and cause an arrest in metaphase (Rieder et al., 1995). The same arrest is induced upon treating cells with spindle microtubule-disrupting agents such as nocodazole or colcemid. SAC activation (Diaz-Martinez and Yu, 2007) results in the inhibition of APC–Cdc20 by Mad2 and BubR1, and thus, the stabilization of securin and cyclin B1. Securin is an inhibitor of separase, and cyclin B1–Cdk1 kinase can phosphorylate separase (Stemmann et al., 2001). Phosphorylation of separase opens up the site for the binding and inhibition by the Cdk1–cyclin B1 complex (Gorr et al., 2005; Boos et al., 2008). Therefore, separase is dually inhibited by securin and phosphorylation when the checkpoint is activated, preventing premature separation of sister chromatids.
These two inhibitory mechanisms are redundant in somatic cell lineages (Mei et al., 2001; Huang et al., 2005, 2008), but the phosphorylation is uniquely required in mouse embryonic germ cells (Huang et al., 2008). Furthermore, the stabilization of cyclin B1 prevents other events necessary for mitotic exit, leading to cell cycle arrest at prometaphase (Morgan, 1999).

Genetic analyses in budding yeasts have clearly demonstrated that the SAC is essential in preventing CIN (Li and Murray, 1991; Yamamoto et al., 1996). The discovery of mutations in BUBR1 and BUB1 in a subset of colon cancer cell lines (Cahill et al., 1998) suggests a weakened spindle checkpoint as the cause of CIN that contributed to the oncogenic process, which was further substantiated by the finding that BUBR1 is mutated in mosaic variegated aneuploidy, a rare human disorder characterized by increased percentage of aneuploid cells (usually >25%) and predisposition to childhood cancers (Hanks et al., 2004). To determine the role of spindle checkpoint in tumorigenesis, a large amount of efforts have gone to the generation and analysis of mice with targeted deletions in various SAC components. Because the spindle checkpoint is essential in mice, the analyses were restricted to heterozygous mice or mice carrying hypomorphic alleles. However, despite the compromises in the hypothesis that the SAC is essential in mice (Michel et al., 2001; Babu et al., 2003; Baker et al., 2004; Dai et al., 2004; Iwanaga et al., 2007). Furthermore, these spindle checkpoint components may have functions outside the checkpoint, and it might be the noncheckpoint-related functions that contribute to tumorigenesis when disrupted. Thus, whether the SAC is an as important tumor-suppressing mechanism as the DNA damage checkpoint is in question.

In this study, we report the generation and analysis of mice carrying a mutant Cdc20 allele (Cdc20AAA) in which the Mad2-binding sites in Cdc20 were mutated. The mutant Cdc20 protein can no longer be inhibited by Mad2 and renders the spindle checkpoint dysfunctional. These mice contain a high percentage of aneuploid cells and develop spontaneous neoplasms at a much increased rate, indicating that the SAC-mediated inhibition of Cdc20 is an important tumor-suppressing mechanism. Furthermore, analysis of the mutant cells revealed that the timing of anaphase depended on Mad2–Cdc20 interaction, and additional expression of BubR1 could not rescue the spindle checkpoint defects caused by AAA-Cdc20.

### Results

#### Genetic disruption of Mad2-mediated inhibition of Cdc20

The motif for Mad2 binding on Cdc20 (Fig. 1 A) has been identified and is homologous to the one used by other Mad2-interacting proteins such as Mad1 (Zhang and Lees, 2001; Luo et al., 2002). We substituted the two charged residues (K129 and R132) and the proline (P137) within the motif with Ala to generate the Cdc20AAA allele in mice via homologous recombination in mouse embryonic stem (ES) cells. The strategy is shown in Fig. 1 B. The targeting construct brought in the mutations along with a floxed neo cassette. The targeted allele, Cdc20AAA-flox-neo, is likely a null allele caused by the presence of the neo cassette (in fact, a truncated protein is expressed from the targeted allele; unpublished data). The point mutant only becomes active upon Cre-mediated loop out of the neo cassette. Thus, the mutation is conditional. We transiently expressed Cre in one of the targeted clones to activate the mutant allele. Sequencing of the Cdc20 cDNA derived from the resulting Cdc20AAA cells demonstrated the expression of the mutant allele.

We injected two Cdc20AAA-flox-neo ES clones into mouse blastocysts for the production of chimeric mice. Both clones gave germline transmission of the AAA-flox-neo allele. Cdc20AAA-flox-neo mice were crossed to a Cre deleter strain to generate Cdc20+/AAA mice. Fig. 1 C shows a Southern blot analysis of AAA-flox-neo and AAA alleles, and Fig. 1 D shows PCR genotyping of a litter derived from the Cdc20AAA to Cdc20+/AAA cross. Cdc20+/AAA mice were healthy and fertile. They did not show obvious signs of premature aging. However, intercrossing of Cdc20AAA mice failed to produce Cdc20AAA/AAA mice (Table I). Examination of embryos showed that Cdc20AAA mice could survive up to embryonic day (E) 12.5. The mutant embryos were smaller than wild-type controls from early stages on (Fig. S1 A). Analysis of apoptosis indicated that the mutants suffered massive apoptotic cell death (Fig. S1 B), which likely caused the lethality.

#### The point mutation in Cdc20 causes functional loss of SAC

To determine the effect of the mutation we introduced into Cdc20 on mitosis at cellular level, we first isolated two independent Cdc20AAA clones through transient Cre expression in Cdc20AAA-flox-neo ES cells. Western blot analysis indicated that the mutation did not interfere with the expression of Cdc20 protein (Fig. 2 A), although the majority of the control cells were found in G2/M and increased their DNA content to >4 N (Fig. 2 B). By 12 h, most of the mutant cells had reached an 8-N DNA content. At this time point for analysis. We found that the mutant cells could not arrest in response to spindle microtubule disruption. By 12 h, although the majority of the control cells were found in G2/M with 4 N DNA content, Cdc20AAA cells continued cell cycle and increased their DNA content to >4 N (Fig. 2 B). By 24 h, most of the mutant cells had reached an 8-N DNA content. At this point, some of the wild-type cells also adapted to the spindle checkpoint and entered cell cycle. The continued cycling by the mutant cells (and the wild-type cells at a later time point) was likely a result of the lack of p53 function in ES cells (Hong and
chores were suggested to activate Mad2 and lack of tension was proposed to activate BubR1 (Zhou et al., 2002a,b; Logarinho et al., 2004). With our AAA-Cdc20 cells, we tested this possibility experimentally. Cdc20+/AAA and wild-type ES cells were treated with taxol, a microtubule stabilizer that activates SAC by preventing the dynamics of microtubules and therefore the generation of tension. Taxol caused marked increases in mitotic indices over time in the control cells but little increases in the mutant cells (Fig. 2 E), indicating that Mad2-mediated inhibition of Cdc20 is also required for the execution of SAC in response to lack of tension across kinetochores.

We derived mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEFs) from E12.5 embryos. Cdc20AAA/AAA MEFs grew noticeably slower than the wild-type control even at early passages (<3; Fig. 3 A), and the growth succumbed to a complete stop as a result of massive cell death as passage number increased (Fig. 3 B). However, the culture could be rescued with immortalization by the expression of SV40 large T antigen, suggesting that the cell death was mediated by Mad2 in the mutant cells. When the number of mitotic cells was counted, we found that the mutant cells did not accumulate in mitosis, whereas the control cells did (Fig. 2 C). Moreover, when the levels of cyclin B1 and securin were analyzed, we found that the mutant cells could not maintain the levels of these two mitotic regulators as the wild-type cells in response to the disruption of microtubules (Fig. 2 D). However, these two proteins did accumulate to some extent before being degraded, suggesting that there is residual spindle checkpoint function in the mutant cells, that the Chfr-mediated prophase checkpoint was at work (Scolnick and Halazonetis, 2000), or both. In agreement with the observation that nocodazole treatment did not cause an increase in mitotic indices in the mutant cells, there was no accumulation of phosphorylated histone H3 in the mutants as in wild-type cells (Fig. 2 D). These data demonstrate that the mutation we had generated in Cdc20 disrupts SAC and is dominant.

It has been suggested that Mad2 and BubR1 are responsive to different kinetochore abnormalities; e.g., unoccupied kinetochores were suggested to activate Mad2 and lack of tension was proposed to activate BubR1 (Zhou et al., 2002a,b; Logarinho et al., 2004). With our AAA-Cdc20 cells, we tested this possibility experimentally. Cdc20+/AAA and wild-type ES cells were treated with taxol, a microtubule stabilizer that activates SAC by preventing the dynamics of microtubules and therefore the generation of tension. Taxol caused marked increases in mitotic indices over time in the control cells but little increases in the mutant cells (Fig. 2 E), indicating that Mad2-mediated inhibition of Cdc20 is also required for the execution of SAC in response to lack of tension across kinetochores.

Figure 2. Cdc20AAA disrupts SAC. (A) Western blot analysis of Cdc20 expression. (B) FACS profiles of the cells treated with 80 nM nocodazole (noc). (C) Mitotic indices of the cells in A. (D) Western blot analysis of the cells treated with nocodazole for various lengths of time. P-H3, phosphorylated histone 3. (E) Mitotic indices of the cells treated with 100 ng/ml taxol.
Interact with Mad2, we tested the interaction between Cdc20 and BubR1 further. The two Cdc20-interacting fragments (Flag tagged at the C termini) of BubR1 were transiently expressed in iMEFs and immunoprecipitated with anti-Flag antibodies. Coprecipitated Cdc20 protein was detected with Western blotting. As shown in Fig. 4 B (1–477), BubR1 could not interact with AAA-Cdc20, whereas 490–679 BubR1 could, supporting the notion that the binding of the N terminus of BubR1 to Cdc20 requires Mad2–Cdc20 interaction. However, the mutant Cdc20 bound 490–679 BubR1 much less efficiently than wild-type Cdc20 (Fig. 4 B), suggesting that Mad2–Cdc20 interaction also plays a role in promoting the binding of BubR1’s C-terminal part to Cdc20.

Next, we tested whether overexpression of BubR1 could compensate for the lost interaction between Mad2 and Cdc20 in the mutant cells. Empty vector or BubR1-expressing vector together with a GFP-expressing plasmid were transfected into iMEFs. Mitotic indices of the transfected (GFP positive) cells were determined before and after 12-h nocodazole treatment. Although additional expression of BubR1 (Fig. 4 C) significantly increased the mitotic indices of wild-type cells even in the asynchronously growing population, it had little impact on the homozygous mutant cells either treated with nocodazole or untreated (Fig. 4 D), suggesting that the inhibition of Cdc20 by BubR1 requires the function of Mad2. In fact, the endogenous level of BubR1 was already noticeably elevated in Cdc20AAA/AAA cells (Fig. 4, A and C), but the SAC was still ineffective. It is unclear at the moment what causes the elevation in BubR1 levels in AAA-Cdc20 homozygous cells.

A recent study demonstrated the presence of two Cdc20-interacting motifs in BubR1 (Davenport et al., 2006). One motif is located at the N terminus (aa 1–477) and the other in the middle (aa 490–679) of BubR1. It was suggested that the N-terminal motif bound Cdc20 in a Mad2-dependent manner, whereas the C-terminal motif bound in a Mad2-independent fashion. With the availability of cells expressing mutant Cdc20 that could not interact with Mad2, we tested the interaction between Cdc20 and BubR1 further. The two Cdc20-interacting fragments (Flag tagged at the C termini) of BubR1 were transiently expressed in iMEFs and immunoprecipitated with anti-Flag antibodies. Coprecipitated Cdc20 protein was detected with Western blotting. As shown in Fig. 4 B (1–477), BubR1 could not interact with AAA-Cdc20, whereas 490–679 BubR1 could, supporting the notion that the binding of the N terminus of BubR1 to Cdc20 requires Mad2–Cdc20 interaction. However, the mutant Cdc20 bound 490–679 BubR1 much less efficiently than wild-type Cdc20 (Fig. 4 B), suggesting that Mad2–Cdc20 interaction also plays a role in promoting the binding of BubR1’s C-terminal part to Cdc20.

To demonstrate that the mutation abolishes the interaction between Cdc20 and Mad2, we treated the iMEFs with nocodazole (to activate the spindle checkpoint) and MG132 (to prevent the mutant cells from leaving mitosis). Cdc20 was immunoprecipitated, and Western blotting was performed to determine whether Mad2 was in the immune complexes. As shown in Fig. 4 A, although Mad2 was clearly present in the immunoprecipitation from wild-type cell lysates, it was absent from the mutant, demonstrating that the mutation we generated indeed disrupted the interaction between Cdc20 and Mad2. However, BubR1 could still interact with the mutant Cdc20, albeit less efficiently, suggesting that the interaction between BubR1 and Cdc20 does not strictly depend on Mad2–Cdc20 interaction.

A recent study demonstrated the presence of two Cdc20-interacting motifs in BubR1 (Davenport et al., 2006). One motif is located at the N terminus (aa 1–477) and the other in the middle (aa 490–679) of BubR1. It was suggested that the N-terminal motif bound Cdc20 in a Mad2-dependent manner, whereas the C-terminal motif bound in a Mad2-independent fashion. With the availability of cells expressing mutant Cdc20 that could not interact with Mad2, we tested the interaction between Cdc20 and BubR1 further. The two Cdc20-interacting fragments (Flag tagged at the C termini) of BubR1 were transiently expressed in iMEFs and immunoprecipitated with anti-Flag antibodies. Coprecipitated Cdc20 protein was detected with Western blotting. As shown in Fig. 4 B (1–477), BubR1 could not interact with AAA-Cdc20, whereas 490–679 BubR1 could, supporting the notion that the binding of the N terminus of BubR1 to Cdc20 requires Mad2–Cdc20 interaction. However, the mutant Cdc20 bound 490–679 BubR1 much less efficiently than wild-type Cdc20 (Fig. 4 B), suggesting that Mad2–Cdc20 interaction also plays a role in promoting the binding of BubR1’s C-terminal part to Cdc20.

Next, we tested whether overexpression of BubR1 could compensate for the lost interaction between Mad2 and Cdc20 in the mutant cells. Empty vector or BubR1-expressing vector together with a GFP-expressing plasmid were transfected into iMEFs. Mitotic indices of the transfected (GFP positive) cells were determined before and after 12-h nocodazole treatment. Although additional expression of BubR1 (Fig. 4 C) significantly increased the mitotic indices of wild-type cells even in the asynchronously growing population, it had little impact on the homozygous mutant cells either treated with nocodazole or untreated (Fig. 4 D), suggesting that the inhibition of Cdc20 by BubR1 requires the function of Mad2. In fact, the endogenous level of BubR1 was already noticeably elevated in Cdc20AAA/AAA cells (Fig. 4, A and C), but the SAC was still ineffective. It is unclear at the moment what causes the elevation in BubR1 levels in AAA-Cdc20 homozygous cells.

by the p53, Rb, or both pathways. When immortalized MEFs (iMEFs) were treated with nocodazole, wild-type cells accumulated in mitosis, but Cdc20AAA/AAA cells failed to do so (Fig. 3 C), indicating that the mutation disrupts SAC in MEFs as well. Similar to the ES cells, Cdc20AAA/AAA iMEFs did not respond to taxol treatment (Fig. 3 D). Cdc20AAA/AAA iMEFs displayed a milder defect in the checkpoint function than the homozygous mutant cells (Fig. 3 C).

To demonstrate that the mutation abolishes the interaction between Cdc20 and Mad2, we treated the iMEFs with nocodazole (to activate the spindle checkpoint) and MG132 (to prevent the mutant cells from leaving mitosis). Cdc20 was immunoprecipitated, and Western blotting was performed to determine whether Mad2 was in the immune complexes. As shown in Fig. 4 A, although Mad2 was clearly present in the immunoprecipitation from wild-type cell lysates, it was absent from the mutant, demonstrating that the mutation we generated indeed disrupted the interaction between Cdc20 and Mad2. However, BubR1 could still interact with the mutant Cdc20, albeit less efficiently, suggesting that the interaction between BubR1 and Cdc20 does not strictly depend on Mad2–Cdc20 interaction.
In the heterozygous cells, additional BubR1 expression was able to improve the checkpoint function to some extent (Fig. 4 D), most likely working through the wild-type Cdc20 protein.

**Abnormal mitoses in MEFs harboring Cdc20^{AAA}**

During normal mitotic divisions, SAC is essential in delaying anaphase until all sister chromatids are aligned at metaphase plate. We analyzed mitoses in asynchronously growing MEFs undisturbed by microtubule-disrupting agents. Microscopic observation indicated that the mitoses were highly abnormal in the mutants (Fig. 5, A and B). In metaphase (when a metaphase plate was clearly visible), the chromosomes in mutant cells were misaligned (Fig. 5 A), and in anaphase, there were lagging chromosomes or chromosome bridges in the mutant cells (Fig. 5 A). Quantitation of the abnormal mitoses are shown in Fig. 5 B. The abnormal mitoses in the mutant MEFs suggested that these cells should become aneuploid. Indeed, as early as passage 3, both heterozygous and homozygous mutant MEFs showed high percentages of cells with abnormal karyotypes, reaching 28% and 52%, respectively, whereas the wild-type cells only showed 5% aneuploidy (Fig. 5 C).

The abnormal mitoses in the mutant cells also suggested that anaphases began prematurely in the mutant. To demonstrate that, we marked the chromosomes of the cells with H2B-GFP carried on a retroviral vector. Unperturbed mitoses starting from nuclear envelop breakdown were monitored with a live cell imaging system. As shown in Fig. 6 A, the mutant cell entered anaphase much quicker than the wild type. 30 mitoses were analyzed, and the result is shown in Fig. 6 B. On average, the mutant entered anaphase ~8–10 min earlier than the control (Fig. 6 B), indicating that Mad2-mediated inhibition of Cdc20 is critical in the timing of anaphase. In agreement with the advancement of anaphase in mutant cells, Cdc20^{AAA/AAA} MEFs contained reduced levels of securin and cyclin B1 (Fig. S2).
wild-type and mutant mice were significantly different with \( P < 0.0001 \). Among 29 tumor samples analyzed histopathologically, four were hepatomas (13.8%) and the rest were lymphomas. Spectrum karyotyping (SKY) analysis of one lymphoma sample demonstrated aneuploidy (2N + 3) in this tumor (Fig. 7D). The tumors developed in wild-type animals were all lymphomas.

**Discussion**

Cancer is thought to be caused by multistep genetic changes that had started in a single cell. Epidemiological and genetic analyses have led to an estimation of the number of mutations needed for malignant transformation to be about six (Armitage and Doll, 1954, 2004; Kinzler and Vogelstein, 1996). Given the mutation rate in humans, it is extremely rare for a single cell to acquire all the necessary mutations. Thus, it has been postulated that destabilizing the genome is necessary for cancer development. A prominent form of genetic instability in cancer is chromosomal. CIN can be gains or losses of whole chromosomes or translocation of chromosome segments. Alterations in chromosome number or aneuploidy are found in nearly all major human...
et al., 2004). Although Mad2-deficient cells are nonviable (Michel et al., 2001), the nonviability could be rescued with the deletion of p53 (Burds et al., 2005). Thus, a complete lack of SAC function does not cause cell lethality by itself. Rather, the cells are eliminated by other protecting mechanisms such as p53-induced apoptosis, perhaps because of the severe aneuploid nature of these cells. However, the SAC is not “all or none.” It can be compromised to certain degrees as indicated by the fact that the mice heterozygous for the essential components are viable despite clear defects in the checkpoint; e.g., not only do the cells derived from these mice arrest less efficiently than wild-type cells in response to microtubule disruption, there were also certain percentages of aneuploid cells present in the adult animals. The percentage of the aneuploid cells could be tolerated as high as >30% (BubR1 hypomorphic mice and our AAA-Cdc20 heterozygous mice). It is unclear at present whether such a high percentage of aneuploidy has any impact on normal physiology of the animals.

Despite the aneuploidy displayed by SAC mutants, only small increases in cancer susceptibility have been reported. For example, tumor incidence was increased (to 6%) in mice tumor types (Mertens et al., 1994). Examples include the loss of chromosome 10 in glioblastomas, often reflecting the inactivation of the tumor suppressor gene PTEN (phosphatase and tensin homologue; Wang et al., 1997) and the gain of chromosome 7 in papillary renal carcinomas, reflecting a duplication of a mutant Met oncogene (Zhuang et al., 1998). However, most of the time, no specific molecular advantages can be associated with a particular gain or loss of a chromosome. In fact, cancer cells display gross abnormalities in their chromosome numbers, most likely as a result of defects in the quality control of sister chromatid separation, including defects in the SAC (for reviews see Chi and Jeang, 2007; Ganem et al., 2007; Weaver and Cleveland, 2007; Storchova and Kuffer, 2008).

A complete lack of SAC is incompatible with viability in higher eukaryotes. Mad2-deficient mice show early embryonic lethality around the blastocyst stage (Dobles et al., 2000). Loss of Mad2 in Caenorhabditis elegans is also incompatible with viability (Kitagawa and Rose, 1999). Other central components of the SAC, Bub1, BubR1, and Mad1, are all essential as well (Basu et al., 1999; Kitagawa and Rose, 1999; Babu et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2004). Although Mad2-deficient cells are nonviable (Michel et al., 2001), the nonviability could be rescued with the deletion of p53 (Burds et al., 2005). Thus, a complete lack of SAC function does not cause cell lethality by itself. Rather, the cells are eliminated by other protecting mechanisms such as p53-induced apoptosis, perhaps because of the severe aneuploid nature of these cells. However, the SAC is not “all or none.” It can be compromised to certain degrees as indicated by the fact that the mice heterozygous for the essential components are viable despite clear defects in the checkpoint; e.g., not only do the cells derived from these mice arrest less efficiently than wild-type cells in response to microtubule disruption, there were also certain percentages of aneuploid cells present in the adult animals. The percentage of the aneuploid cells could be tolerated as high as >30% (BubR1 hypomorphic mice and our AAA-Cdc20 heterozygous mice). It is unclear at present whether such a high percentage of aneuploidy has any impact on normal physiology of the animals.

Despite the aneuploidy displayed by SAC mutants, only small increases in cancer susceptibility have been reported. For example, tumor incidence was increased (to 6%) in mice
incidence (Weaver et al., 2007). Thus, the rate of aneuploidy cannot be the only determinant on the likelihood of tumorigenesis in SAC mutants. Another possibility is that Cdc20 and Bub1 may have functions outside mitosis. Loss (in the case of Bub1) or gain (in the case of AAA-Cdc20) of these functions in combination with aneuploidy may therefore drive the robust tumor development in these mice and potentially explain the difference in the tumor spectra between these two strains. Indeed, Cdc20 was suggested to function in regulating gene expression in mammalian cells (Yoon et al., 2004), and budding yeast CDC20 was found to be able to override G2/M DNA damage checkpoint when overexpressed (Lim and Surana, 1996) and needs to be repressed in S phase to prevent premature mitotic entry (Clarke et al., 2003). Given the fact that AAA-Cdc20 is no longer inhibited by Mad2, this mutant Cdc20 protein might have gained additional functions that help oncogenic transformation. In the case of Bub1, it seems to be required for the induction of cell death when chromosome missegregates (Jeganathan et al., 2007) and may have other unspecified functions that prevent tumorigenesis.

Both Mad2 and BubR1 can bind to Cdc20 directly. The Mad2-binding sites in Cdc20 are conserved in other Mad2-interacting proteins such as Mad1 (Zhang and Lees, 2001; Luo et al., 2002). However, the BubR1-interacting domain in Cdc20 remains ill defined (Luo et al., 2002). Recent studies in budding yeasts suggested that MAD3 (BubR1 in mammals) uses its KEN box to interact with CDC20 and inhibits APC<sup>Cdc20</sup> as a pseudosubstrate (Burton and Solomon, 2007), and it seems that a similar mechanism is used by BubR1 in mammals (Malureanu et al., 2009). One possibility for why both Mad2 and BubR1 are essential SAC components is stoichiometry. In other words, the number of Mad2 or BubR1 molecules is perhaps by themselves with severely reduced BubR1 levels (Baker et al., 2004). Also, 28% of mice heterozygous for Mad2 develop small, self-limiting, late onset (18–19 mo) papillary lung adenocarcinomas (Michel et al., 2001), and mice heterozygous for functional BubR1 or Bub3 are more prone to the development of colorectal (Dai et al., 2004) or lung (Babu et al., 2003; Dai et al., 2004) tumors after treatment with azoxymethane or DMBA (9,10-dimethyl-1,2-benzanthracene), respectively. More recently, mice heterozygous for Mad1 were reported to display a small increase (from 9 to 19%) in the incidence of spontaneous tumors at old ages (Iwanaga et al., 2007), and mice heterozygous for centromere protein E similarly displayed a small increase in tumor incidence (Weaver et al., 2007). These minor tumor phenotypes put the significance of the SAC in preventing the tumorigenesis in question. However, results from Cdc20<sup>+/AAA</sup> (this study) and Bub1-deficient mice (Jeganathan et al., 2007) suggest that the loss of SAC function can be highly tumorigenic. What could be the reason for the differences in the rates of tumor development among various mouse strains with SAC defects? One obvious possibility is the severity of the checkpoint defects and thus the rates of aneuploidy. Indeed, both Cdc20<sup>+/AAA</sup> and Bub1 hypomorphic mice contain high percentages of aneuploid cells (>30% when splenocytes were analyzed). However, mice deficient in Bub3 or doubly heterozygous for Bub3 and Rae1 contain a similarly high percentage of aneuploid cells, and yet, these mice are not tumor prone (Baker et al., 2004, 2006). One might argue that the premature aging process in Bub1-deficient and Bub3<sup>−/−</sup> Rae1<sup>−/−</sup> mice prevented these animals from developing tumors. However, such an argument could not be applied to centromere protein E<sup>−/−</sup> mice, which also display similarly high percentages of aneuploid cells as Cdc20<sup>+/AAA</sup> mice but only have a mild increase in tumor incidence (Weaver et al., 2007). Thus, the rate of aneuploidy cannot be the only determinant on the likelihood of tumorigenesis in SAC mutants. Another possibility is that Cdc20 and Bub1 may have functions outside mitosis. Loss (in the case of Bub1) or gain (in the case of AAA-Cdc20) of these functions in combination with aneuploidy may therefore drive the robust tumor development in these mice and potentially explain the difference in the tumor spectra between these two strains. Indeed, Cdc20 was suggested to function in regulating gene expression in mammalian cells (Yoon et al., 2004), and budding yeast CDC20 was found to be able to override G2/M DNA damage checkpoint when overexpressed (Lim and Surana, 1996) and needs to be repressed in S phase to prevent premature mitotic entry (Clarke et al., 2003). Given the fact that AAA-Cdc20 is no longer inhibited by Mad2, this mutant Cdc20 protein might have gained additional functions that help oncogenic transformation. In the case of Bub1, it seems to be required for the induction of cell death when chromosome missegregates (Jeganathan et al., 2007) and may have other unspecified functions that prevent tumorigenesis.

Both Mad2 and BubR1 can bind to Cdc20 directly. The Mad2-binding sites in Cdc20 are conserved in other Mad2-interacting proteins such as Mad1 (Zhang and Lees, 2001; Luo et al., 2002). However, the BubR1-interacting domain in Cdc20 remains ill defined (Luo et al., 2002). Recent studies in budding yeasts suggested that MAD3 (BubR1 in mammals) uses its KEN box to interact with CDC20 and inhibits APC<sup>Cdc20</sup> as a pseudosubstrate (Burton and Solomon, 2007), and it seems that a similar mechanism is used by BubR1 in mammals (Malureanu et al., 2009). One possibility for why both Mad2 and BubR1 are essential SAC components is stoichiometry. In other words, the number of Mad2 or BubR1 molecules is perhaps by themselves
insufficient to inhibit all APC<sup>Cdc20</sup> complexes. However, our results (Fig. 4 E) indicate that this is unlikely the case. It is more likely that the mitotic checkpoint complex (MCC) containing Mad2, BubR1, Bub3, and Cdc20 blocks the E3 activity of APC<sup>Cdc20</sup> (Sudakin et al., 2001) instead of Mad2 alone or BubR1 in complex with Bub3 (Sudakin et al., 2001), suggesting a synergy between Mad2 and BubR1 in enforcing the checkpoint.
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Due to an error, two lanes in Fig. 4 B were switched. The correct panel appears below.

(B) The two Cdc20-binding domains of BubR1 interact with AAA-Cdc20 differentially. Flag-tagged BubR1 [1–477] or BubR1 [490–679] was transiently expressed in iMEFs from which Cdc20 was immunoprecipitated. The immune complexes were analyzed with Western blotting. Note that the same mouse monoclonal anti-Cdc20 antibodies were used for immunoprecipitation (IP) and Western blotting.