

The unconventional kinetoplastid kinetochore: from discovery toward functional understanding

Bungo Akiyoshi*

Department of Biochemistry, University of Oxford, Oxford, U.K.

Correspondence: Bungo Akiyoshi (bungo.akiyoshi@bioch.ox.ac.uk)



The kinetochore is the macromolecular protein complex that drives chromosome segregation in eukaryotes. Its most fundamental function is to connect centromeric DNA to dynamic spindle microtubules. Studies in popular model eukaryotes have shown that centromere protein (CENP)-A is critical for DNA-binding, whereas the Ndc80 complex is essential for microtubule-binding. Given their conservation in diverse eukaryotes, it was widely believed that all eukaryotes would utilize these components to make up a core of the kinetochore. However, a recent study identified an unconventional type of kinetochore in evolutionarily distant kinetoplastid species, showing that chromosome segregation can be achieved using a distinct set of proteins. Here, I review the discovery of the two kinetochore systems and discuss how their studies contribute to a better understanding of the eukaryotic chromosome segregation machinery.

Introduction

Faithful transmission of genetic information from generation to generation is essential for the survival of all organisms. In eukaryotes, chromosome replication occurs during S phase and duplicated chromosomes are physically connected by the cohesin complex [1] (Figure 1). Chromosome segregation is directed by the kinetochore, the proteinaceous structure that assembles onto the centromeric DNA and interacts with spindle microtubules during mitosis and meiosis [2–5]. In many species, centromeres consist of repetitive sequences that span several kilobases up to megabases [6]. Kinetochores assemble onto a small portion of these sequences and their positional information is epigenetically inherited from generation to generation [7–9]. Microtubules are dynamic polymers that grow and shrink by incorporating or dissociating α -/ β -tubulin subunits at their tips [10]. By interacting with microtubules, kinetochores enable duplicated chromosomes to align at the center of the spindle. Accurate segregation requires sister kinetochores to make bi-oriented attachments to microtubules emanating from opposite poles. Attachment errors must be recognized and corrected prior to anaphase [11]. The spindle checkpoint monitors attachment status and delays the onset of anaphase until all chromosomes form correct bi-oriented attachments [12,13]. Once all chromosomes have achieved bi-orientation, the anaphase promoting complex (APC/C) is activated, leading to the cleavage of cohesin complexes and separation of sister chromatids [14–16].

Given the central role of kinetochores in co-ordinating chromosome segregation, elucidating their molecular mechanism of action is a fundamental issue in cell biology. The most basic kinetochore functions are to bind DNA and dynamic microtubules. What kind of proteins carry out these functions? How did they evolve? Identifying and characterizing the constituent proteins are clearly necessary as the first step to address these questions. Here, I review the discovery of two different kinetochore systems and discuss how their studies will contribute to a better understanding of chromosome segregation machines in eukaryotes. I place emphasis on the unconventional kinetoplastid kinetochore and refer readers to comprehensive reviews on the conventional kinetochore [3,4,17–19].

*Bungo Akiyoshi was awarded the Biochemical Society's 2016 Early Career Research Award (Cells); this article is based on the Award Lecture.

Received: 11 May 2016
Revised: 15 June 2016
Accepted: 21 June 2016

Version of Record published:
19 October 2016




Figure 1. Chromosome segregation.

Chromosome duplication occurs during S phase, linking sister chromatids by cohesion. When cells enter mitosis, a bipolar spindle is assembled and kinetochores start to interact with dynamic microtubules. Once all chromosomes achieve bi-oriented attachments, the spindle checkpoint is satisfied. Subsequent activation of APC/C leads to the destruction of cohesion, segregating sister chromatids away from each other in anaphase.

Conventional kinetochores

Discovery

Centromeres/kinetochores were first recognized cytologically as primary constrictions on each chromosome where spindle microtubules attach [20]. Kinetochores were visualized by electron microscopy [21–23], revealing a trilaminar structure at the periphery of the centromere. Identification of kinetochores was made possible by the discovery of autoimmune sera from patients with scleroderma spectrum disease that stained the centromere regions of chromosomes [24]. Using the sera, the first kinetochores proteins (centromere proteins, CENP-A, B, C) were recognized [25,26]. Their cDNA clones were subsequently isolated and protein sequences revealed [27–29].

Although the first kinetochores proteins were discovered in humans, many additional kinetochores proteins were subsequently identified in budding yeast owing to the power of genetics and its simple centromere structure [30]. For example, biochemical purifications of centromere DNA-binding proteins [31], genetic screens for

mutants that have increased rates of chromosome loss [32,33], one-hybrid [34] and two-hybrid screens [35] all led to the identification of many kinetochore proteins. More recently, affinity purification and mass spectrometry analysis accelerated the identification [36,37].

Increased sensitivity in homology detection algorithms has allowed the identification of homologous proteins in more and more species as the number of sequenced genomes has expanded [38–41]. Genome-wide RNAi screens [42,43] and proteomic analyses of isolated chromosomes [44,45] also identified kinetochore proteins. To date, more than 80 proteins have been identified that at least transiently localize to kinetochore regions, including structural kinetochore proteins (e.g. CENP-A, CCAN, KNL1, Mis12 and Ndc80), regulatory proteins [e.g. Aurora B/chromosomal passenger complex (CPC), Mps1, Plk1, PP1 and PP2A], and spindle checkpoint proteins (e.g. Bub1, Bub3, BubR1/Mad3, Mad1 and Mad2). After identifying proteins that localize at kinetochores, the next crucial step is to reveal their function. Most notably, which proteins bind DNA or microtubules?

Identification of DNA-binding kinetochore proteins

Cloning and sequencing of CENP-A cDNA revealed that it is a histone H3 variant [29,46]. This was a very exciting finding because it not only revealed that CENP-A is a DNA-binding protein but also suggested a possible mechanism for how kinetochore positions could be epigenetically inherited [47,48]. Subsequent studies have shown that CENP-A is essential for kinetochore assembly in various eukaryotes [42,49,50]. Given its importance in kinetochore biology, extensive studies have been performed to better understand the nature and function of CENP-A ([51–54]).

Other proteins that can bind DNA, at least *in vitro*, include CENP-C^{Mif2} [55,56], CENP-U^{Ame1}/CENP-Q^{Okp1} [57], and CENP-T/W/S/X [58–60]. Minor groove DNA-binding motifs are found in some of these proteins: the AT-hook [61] in CENP-C^{Mif2} and CENP-U^{Ame1}/CENP-Q^{Okp1} [56,57,62], and the SPKK motif [63] in CENP-A [64]. However, these short motifs are often poorly conserved even among closely related species, suggesting that they are probably not essential for their functions but may contribute to enhancing their DNA-binding affinity [56]. Regardless, the presence of these short motifs could be indicative of DNA-binding activities for a given protein.

Identification of microtubule-binding kinetochore proteins

Human Ndc80^{HEC} was originally identified in a two-hybrid screen with retinoblastoma protein as bait [65], whereas its yeast homolog was identified in a spindle pole body preparation [66]. Ndc80 interacts with Nuf2, Spc24, and Spc25, which together form a rod-shaped complex [67,68]. All four subunits contain globular domains and extensive coiled-coil regions. Although depletion studies showed that the Ndc80 complex is essential for kinetochore–microtubule attachment [36,69,70], it was not clear whether the complex directly interacts with microtubules or recruits other kinetochore proteins that bind microtubules. It was an *in vitro* microtubule co-sedimentation assay that revealed that the former was the case [71,72]. However, it took nearly a decade since the identification of Ndc80 to assign it a function at the kinetochore. Given its now recognized importance in microtubule-binding, extensive studies have been carried out to mechanistically understand how the Ndc80 complex binds to microtubules ([73–78]).

Kinetochore subcomplexes and hierarchical assembly

Another important aspect of kinetochore research is to understand its design principles. Electron microscopy studies have visualized the overall architecture of kinetochores within cells [79,80] as well as isolated kinetochores [81]. At the molecular level, kinetochores are composed of biochemically stable/isolatable subcomplexes, such as the Ndc80 subcomplex, Mis12 subcomplex, and CCAN [37,82–86]. It is thought that these subcomplexes assemble in a hierarchical manner at the kinetochore [82]. CENP-A is at the base of this hierarchy and recruits CENP-C [52,87], which in turn recruits the Mis12 subcomplex [88,89] as well as CCAN components [90,91]. The KNL1, Mis12, and Ndc80 subcomplexes can form a larger complex called the KMN network that has microtubule-binding activities [71,92]. The relative positions of these subcomplexes within kinetochores have been determined by super-resolution microscopy, revealing the overall protein architecture of kinetochores [93–95].

Structural features

The majority of kinetochore proteins lack obvious functional domains or similarity to other proteins at the primary sequence level. However, structural analyses have revealed common domains in proteins that do not have significant sequence similarity. For example, the RWD domain was found in Spc24, Spc25, CENP-P^{Ctf19}, CENP-O^{Mcm21}, Csm1, Mad1, and KNL1 proteins [67,68,92,96,97], calponin homology domain in Ndc80 and Nuf2 proteins [72,73], and tetratricopeptide repeat domain in Bub1, BubR1, and Mps1 proteins [98,99]. Furthermore, CENP-L^{Iml3} has similarity to the bacterial recombination-associated protein RdgC and TATA-binding protein TBP [100,101], CENP-M folds like a small GTPase [102], the C-terminal dimerization domain of CENP-C^{Mif2} has similarity to the bacterial transcription factor Hth-3 [56], and point centromere-specific Ndc10 has similarity to a bacterial tyrosine recombinase [103,104]. These studies highlight the importance of structural analysis in kinetochore research to reveal distant homology. They also suggest that the highly complicated kinetochores likely originated from a few protein modules aided by gene duplication and functional diversification [105].

How widely are these kinetochore proteins conserved?

Microtubules appear to be utilized for chromosome segregation in all eukaryotes studied thus far, and α -/ β -tubulins are one of the most highly conserved proteins [106–108]. Kinetochore proteins, in contrast, vary to a great extent in primary sequences [109]. Yet, thanks to increased sensitivity in homology search algorithms, we now know that many of the above-mentioned kinetochore proteins are conserved in various eukaryotes [40,62]. CENP-A, CENP-C, and components of the Ndc80 complex are widely found in diverse eukaryotes, suggesting that most eukaryotes utilize these kinetochore proteins to bind DNA or microtubules. However, although CENP-A was thought to be conserved in all eukaryotes, a recent study showed that CENP-A is absent in some holocentric insects [110]. Furthermore, two popular model eukaryotes (*Drosophila melanogaster* and *Caenorhabditis elegans*) appear to have lost the majority of CCAN components [111–114]. Therefore, it has become clear that the repertoire of kinetochore proteins can be dramatically different among eukaryotes despite functional conservation [115].

More extreme cases were found in kinetoplastids, a group of unicellular eukaryotes defined by the presence of kinetoplast which is a large structure in the mitochondrion that contains the mitochondrial DNA [116]. When the genomes of three kinetoplastid species were sequenced (*Trypanosoma brucei*, *Trypanosoma cruzi*, and *Leishmania major*), none of the core structural kinetochore proteins were identified [117–119]. In contrast, components of basic cell cycle machinery were readily identified, including the CDK/cyclin system, the cohesin complex, separase, the condensin complex, Aurora B kinase, Polo-like kinase, MAD2, APC/C, and proteasomes [120]. However, chromosome segregation depends on spindle microtubules [121], and electron microscopy has visualized kinetochore-like electron-dense plaques that appear to form end-on attachments to spindle microtubules in mitotic cells [122–124]. Yet, nothing was known about the identity of kinetochore components in kinetoplastids. Do they have conventional kinetochore proteins that simply diverged too far in primary sequences? Or do they have previously unforeseen types of kinetochore proteins?

Unconventional kinetochores in kinetoplastids

Discovery: personal reflections

My scientific career started in 2003 when I joined Dr Yoshinori Watanabe's group in Tokyo to study how Polo-like kinase modulates kinetochore function to promote meiosis-specific chromosome segregation in fission yeast [125]. I then moved to Dr Sue Biggins' laboratory in Seattle to study mitotic kinetochores using budding yeast. There, I achieved the isolation of native kinetochores for the first time [44,126,127] and obtained a PhD. When I was thinking about projects for my post-doctoral training, I became interested in finding out whether basic kinetochore proteins are conserved in all eukaryotes. After I learned that kinetoplastids do not have any apparent canonical kinetochore components including CENP-A [128,129], I joined the laboratory of Dr Keith Gull in Oxford in November 2010 to identify kinetochore proteins in *T. brucei*. There were no magical antibodies that recognized the centromere regions of its chromosomes, so how could I achieve this goal from scratch? With my expertise in protein purification, I first immunoprecipitated conserved mitotic proteins and performed mass spectrometry to identify interacting proteins [the immunoprecipitation (IP)/mass spectrometry (MS) approach]. Because spindle checkpoint components co-purify with kinetochore proteins in other eukaryotes [130], I first made a YFP fusion for MAD2, the only spindle checkpoint protein homolog identified in *T. brucei*. However,

this protein turned out to localize at basal bodies, having no detectable signal at kinetochores [120]. Consistent with this observation, IP/MS of YFP-MAD2 only led to the identification of another protein that localized to basal bodies (B. Akiyoshi, unpublished data). I then made YFP fusions for various proteins, including AUK1 (Aurora B kinase homolog [131]), CDC20 (activator of the APC/C [132]), and XMAP215 (microtubule-associated protein [133,134]). Again, although IP/MS of these proteins worked and identified interacting proteins, this approach failed to identify any protein that localized at kinetochores (B. Akiyoshi, unpublished data).

Another idea I had in mind was to carry out a YFP-tagging screen. The *T. brucei* genome has approximately 9000 proteins, which means that I should identify kinetochore proteins if I study all of them. This was a simple and straightforward idea, but I did not know where to start. It was before the development of PCR-based tagging methods in the laboratory [135], meaning that I had to make targeting plasmids for each gene [136]. Coincidentally, Dr Christine Clayton's group published a cell cycle transcriptome analysis of different cell cycle stages in March 2011 in *PLoS ONE* [137]. Impressed by the quality of data, I immediately started tagging uncharacterized genes whose transcript levels were up-regulated in either S phase or mitosis. This approach paid off. Examination of only 30 genes identified one corresponding protein that had a characteristic kinetochore localization pattern: formation of dots in the nucleus during S phase, their alignment on mitotic spindles in metaphase, and close association with spindle poles during late anaphase. This was my first 'Eureka!' moment and happened in June 2011. Later I named the protein KKT1 for kinetoplastid kinetochore protein 1. Using KKT1 as bait, I aimed to identify more kinetochore proteins. However, my first IP of YFP-KKT1 completely failed using the same protocol that had worked for those conserved proteins mentioned above (cryolysis using mortar and pestle). It turned out that the YFP-KKT1 signal remained in the detergent-insoluble fraction, so I tried various methods to release it. I eventually found that sonication efficiently solubilized KKT1, and immunoprecipitation from this sample led to the identification of 12 proteins as possible KKT1 interaction partners. YFP-tagging revealed typical kinetochore localization patterns for all of them, which was another moment of big excitement. By continuing the hunt and repeating the IP/MS of these newly identified proteins, I identified 19 proteins by March 2012 (KKT1–19). These proteins all had kinetochore-like localization and their RNAi-mediated knockdowns resulted in chromosome mis-segregation. However, there was a fairly valid criticism I had to face. 'Are they really kinetochore proteins?'

In other eukaryotes, people have used various approaches to examine kinetochore localization such as immunoelectron microscopy [138], chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) [139], chromosome spreads [140], and co-localization with other known kinetochore proteins [36]. I first tried to perform immunoelectron microscopy to examine whether KKT proteins localize at the kinetochore-like electron-dense plaques [124], but it turned out that the fixation condition completely killed the YFP epitope. Then, I switched my effort to a ChIP approach, although it had a different problem. That is, the resolution of previously mapped centromere positions [141] did not allow me to determine which specific DNA fragments should be examined by PCR or Southern blot. I struggled >1 year at this stage. Eventually, deep sequencing of ChIP samples revealed that KKT2 and KKT3 were specifically enriched in the centromere regions, thereby showing that these KKT proteins are bona fide kinetochore proteins. We first submitted the paper to *Nature*, but it was rejected without review as being uninteresting, which happened to be the same reaction to Bill Earnshaw's paper on the discovery of CENP-A, B, C [26,142]. We next submitted it to *Cell* and it was accepted within 1 month [143].

I recently identified one more kinetochore protein, KKT20 [144], so 20 KKT proteins have been identified to date (Figure 2). It is important to mention that there may be more kinetochore proteins still waiting to be identified. For example, proteins that weakly or very transiently interact with KKT proteins may well have been missed in the IP/MS approach. Other methods, such as BioID [145] and genome-wide GFP tagging screen, may identify the rest of kinetochore proteins (if any). Another caveat is that any gene not predicted to encode a protein in the *T. brucei* genome database will remain unidentified. With these caveats in mind, I decided to study these KKT proteins in depth.

Sequence analysis

Initial BLAST and HMMER searches of KKT proteins identified their homologous proteins in both parasitic and free-living kinetoplastids [143]. For most KKT proteins, these searches did not reveal any significant hit outside kinetoplastids. Some KKT proteins had similarity to various proteins due to the presence of the following conserved domains (Figure 2): a BRCT (BRCA1 C terminus) domain in KKT4, an FHA (Forkhead-associated) domain in KKT13, a WD40-like domain in KKT15, and a protein kinase domain in KKT2, KKT3, KKT10, and KKT19. BRCT and FHA are typically protein–protein interaction domains and are

often found in proteins involved in the DNA damage response [146]. WD40 is also a protein–protein interaction domain that is one of the most abundant domains in eukaryotic genomes [146]. *T. brucei* has 190 predicted eukaryotic protein kinases, and comparative kinome analysis suggested that KKT2 and KKT3, despite having characteristic features of active protein kinases, do not have a clear affiliation to any known group or family among eukaryotic kinases [147]. Although KKT10 and KKT19 have been classified as members of the CLK/Lammer subfamily in the CMGC family, they may have adapted to carry out kinetochore functions in kinetoplastids as judged by the significant differences between KKT10/KKT19 and the human or *Arabidopsis* CLK/Lammer kinases [143].

I have also been using various sequence analysis software to try to reveal the function and nature of KKT proteins. This includes multiple sequence alignments to determine conserved regions [148], coiled-coil predictions [149], disordered region predictions [150], motif scans [151,152], secondary structure predictions [153,154], and HHpred [155]. Based on these analyses, I recently identified a highly divergent polo box domain (DPB) in the C-terminal region of KKT2, KKT3, and KKT20 [144]. KKT20 does not have a kinase domain, but has similarity to KKT2 and KKT3 in the central domain, suggesting that these proteins likely share common ancestry and that the ancestor might be PLK. In fact, a simple BLAST search showed that the kinase domains of KKT2 and KKT3 are more similar to that of PLK than other kinases. KKT10 and KKT19 exhibit a high degree of similarity at the protein level, as do KKT17 and KKT18. These results suggest that gene duplication played an important role in the evolution of kinetoplastid kinetochores, as seen for conventional kinetochores.

Predictions of functions

Similar to conventional kinetochores, kinetoplastid kinetochores appear to consist of subcomplexes as judged by the IP/MS results and differential localization patterns [143]. On the basis of IP/MS data, I assigned several putative subcomplexes that could represent functional modules: the KKT14/KKT15 subcomplex, the KKT16/KKT17/KKT18 subcomplex, and the KKT6/KKT7/KKT8/KKT9/KKT10/KKT11/KKT12/KKT19 subcomplex (Figure 2).

Studies of conventional kinetochore proteins have shown that their functions are often manifested in localization patterns [17]. For example, DNA-binding kinetochore components (e.g. CENP-A and CENP-C) are often constitutively localized at centromeres, whereas microtubule-binding components (e.g. Ndc80 and KNL1) localize to kinetochores specifically during M phase. Although the unconventional kinetoplastid kinetochore proteins may not follow the same principle, there is no evidence to believe otherwise. In fact, the observation that components of the putative subcomplexes mentioned above largely follow the same localization pattern supports this possibility (Figure 3). In this sense, the most promising candidates for DNA-binding proteins are KKT2, KKT3, and KKT4.

Which KKT proteins bind DNA?

KKT2 and KKT3 have putative DNA-binding motifs (AT-hook and SPKK) in some, but not all, kinetoplastids. This is reminiscent of conventional DNA-binding kinetochore proteins such as CENP-A and CENP-C (see above), supporting the possibility that KKT2 and KKT3 may bind DNA. Besides these motifs, KKT2 and KKT3 have three domains conserved among kinetoplastids: an N-terminal protein kinase domain, a central domain that has conserved Cys residues, and the C-terminal DPB. Expression of truncated proteins *in vivo* can determine which region(s) is important for kinetochore/centromere localization, which might correspond to their DNA-binding domains (e.g. see [55,156,157] for CENP-C studies). It will be necessary to directly test whether KKT2 and KKT3 have any DNA-binding activity *in vitro* using pure proteins. Isolation of native KKT proteins or subcomplexes from trypanosomes in good quantity or stoichiometry turned out to be difficult, at least in my hands. Therefore, recombinant KKT proteins (full length or truncations) will need to be expressed and purified to carry out *in vitro* assays.

While *in vitro* assays are important to dissect their DNA-binding activities, *in vivo* analyses will be essential to determine their relevance. RNAi-mediated knockdown showed that KKT2 is important for faithful chromosome segregation [143], and a kinome-wide RNAi screen showed that KKT3 is essential for growth [158], suggesting that these homologous proteins likely have non-redundant functions. It will be necessary to examine whether other KKT proteins fail to localize to kinetochores in the absence of KKT2 or KKT3 to determine the localization hierarchy. Although inducible RNAi-mediated knockdown experiments can be easily performed in *T. brucei* [159,160], other methods such as conditional knockdowns [161], conditional knockouts [162], or a protein degradation system [163] may be necessary to achieve better depletion efficiency and observe defects.




Figure 2. Diagram of *T. brucei* KKT proteins.

Identified domains and motifs are shown. Putative subcomplexes are grouped in dotted boxes. Adapted from [143].

Besides putative DNA-binding domains, KKT2 and KKT3 also have a protein kinase domain classified as unique among eukaryotic kinases [147]. What are the substrates of these protein kinases? Considering the absence of centromere-specific histones in kinetoplastids [128,164], KKT2/KKT3 might phosphorylate histones specifically at the centromere and this phosphorylation mark might provide centromere identity. Or they might phosphorylate and recruit other KKT proteins onto the kinetochore. Understanding the functions of KKT2 and KKT3 will be key to elucidating the assembly of kinetoplastid kinetochores.

Which KKT proteins bind microtubules?

Unlike the DNA side, sequence analysis did not reveal any obvious domain implicated in microtubule-binding. In the light of conventional kinetochore research, it will be important to invest efforts to obtain recombinant KKT proteins and perform microtubule co-sedimentation assays. Although tubulins purified from bovine brain are commonly used in sedimentation assays, it may be important to use trypanosome tubulins to detect binding [165,166].

The primary candidates for microtubule-binding kinetochore proteins are the KKT14 and KKT15 proteins whose localization pattern resembles that of Ndc80. It will be crucial to test these and other KKT proteins in a sedimentation assay. Once microtubule-binding proteins are identified, more detailed analyses will need to be carried out to determine whether the mechanism of microtubule-binding is distinct from conventional kinetochore proteins.




Figure 3. Differential localization timings of KKT proteins.

Adapted from [143].

Design principles and regulations

It is also important to reveal the interaction network of KKT proteins. For example, how does the KKT10 kinase localize at kinetochores from S phase and dissociate at the metaphase–anaphase transition? What happens if KKT10 does not dissociate properly? To answer these questions, it will be necessary to reveal which proteins interact with KKT10 and how their interactions are regulated. Numerous phosphorylation sites have been identified on the 20 KKT proteins in my IP/MS analyses (B. Akiyoshi, unpublished data), so it is likely that phosphorylation plays important roles in regulating interactions as in other eukaryotes [167–171]. Although it is challenging to understand the interaction network of 20 proteins, this will be key to gaining insights into the architectural design of kinetoplastid kinetochores.

Aurora B is a highly conserved protein kinase found in all sequenced eukaryotes, including kinetoplastids [172]. It is the catalytic subunit of the CPC that displays dynamic localization patterns during mitosis and regulates various mitotic functions, including kinetochore regulations [173]. As in other eukaryotes, Aurora B localizes to kinetochore regions during prometaphase/metaphase in *T. brucei* ([131] and my unpublished data). Therefore, its kinetochore function might be conserved in kinetoplastids. In line with this possibility, KKT7 has putative-binding motifs for the PP1 phosphatase (RSVTF conserved among kinetoplastids and SILK found in *Leishmania*) that is known to counteract Aurora B activities [174,175].

Aurora B is critical for the destabilization of improper microtubule attachments by phosphorylating kinetochores. It has been proposed that the extent of phosphorylation is dependent on the distance from its substrates, thereby explaining why improper tension-less attachments can be specifically destabilized [176–180]. A key element in this hypothesis is the enrichment of Aurora B at the inner centromere regions, which become physically separated from bi-oriented kinetochores due to microtubule-pulling forces. Indeed, distinct space (~1 μm) has been observed in between metaphase sister kinetochores in various eukaryotes [181], including yeasts [182], humans [183], plants [184], *Cyanidioschyzon merolae* [185], and *Plasmodium* [186]. In contrast, there is no evidence for such space in kinetoplastids. Electron microscopy studies showed that when sister kinetochore pairs interact with microtubules from opposite poles, they have a back-to-back configuration without distinct space between the two structures in *T. brucei*, *T. cruzi*, and *Leishmania* [123,124,187]. The analysis of YFP-tagged KKT proteins in *T. brucei* supports these observations [143], so Aurora B may never be significantly separated from sister kinetochores in kinetoplastids. Understanding their Aurora B regulation might provide novel insights into the mechanism of chromosome bi-orientation. Interestingly, a recent study in budding yeast showed that its chromosomes can bi-orient without the inner centromere localization of Aurora B [188]. These observations imply that there is still a lot to learn about the molecular mechanism of chromosome segregation in eukaryotes.

The spindle checkpoint is a surveillance mechanism that ensures high fidelity chromosome segregation in eukaryotes [13,189]. Although widely conserved among diverse eukaryotes [190,191], the spindle checkpoint is dispensable for the survival of yeasts, flies, and even human cells under certain conditions [192–196]. Indeed, checkpoint-independent mechanisms are also important for the regulation of the APC/C activities [197–201].




Figure 4. Hypothetical models on early eukaryotic history and origin of kinetoplastid kinetochores.

(A) The earliest-branching kinetoplastid hypothesis. In this scenario, LECA may have had KKT kinetochores (i), conventional kinetochores (ii), or unknown type of kinetochores (iii). Conventional and KKT-based kinetochores are shown in blue and red, respectively. Note that this is a highly simplified and non-comprehensive set of possibilities of early eukaryotic history and origins of kinetoplastid kinetochores. (B) The earliest-branching Euglenozoa hypothesis based on their unique cytochrome c biogenesis machinery. In this scenario, either kinetoplastids (i) or euglenids (ii) could be the earliest-branching eukaryotes.

Interestingly, there is no evidence of functional spindle checkpoint or feedback control in kinetoplastids. For example, disruption of mitotic spindles or inhibition of DNA replication do not noticeably delay the onset of anaphase or cytokinesis in *T. brucei* [120,202,203]. Nonetheless, KKT4 and KKT20 co-purified with significant amounts of APC/C components [143,144], and the BRCT domain of a human microcephalin (MCPH1) protein has been shown to interact with the APC/C, at least *in vitro* [204]. Therefore, KKT4 and KKT20 might directly affect the activation/inactivation of the APC/C, regulating anaphase onset in a feedforward manner.

Which organisms have unconventional kinetochores?

Kinetoplastids are a widespread group of unicellular eukaryotes found in diverse environmental conditions, including hydrothermal vents [205–208]. They are defined by the presence of kinetoplast, a large structure in the mitochondrion that contains the mitochondrial DNA [116]. Kinetoplastids can be divided into two subclasses, the early diverging Prokinetoplastina and the Metakinetoplastina [209]. The latter can be further divided into three orders for the bodonid species (Eubodonida, Parabodonida, and Neobodonida) and the trypanosomatids [210]. KKT proteins are found in all sequenced bodonids (*Bodo saltans* and *Trypanoplasma borreli*) [211] and trypanosomatids (e.g. *T. brucei*, *T. cruzi*, *Leishmania*, and *Phytomonas* spp.) [117–119,212]. Furthermore, at least some KKT proteins are present in an early diverging Prokinetoplastina, *Perkinsella* sp. [213], suggesting that KKT proteins are likely a conserved feature of all kinetoplastids (my unpublished data).

Kinetoplastids belong to Euglenozoa, which is a large and diverse group of flagellates [214]. Four lineages are currently known: Kinetoplastids, Euglenids, Diplonemids, and Symbiontids [215]. Genome sequences are available only for kinetoplastids, and it was not known whether KKT proteins are present specifically in kinetoplastids or common among Euglenozoa [143]. Interestingly, examination of *Euglena gracilis* transcriptome [216] revealed clear homologs of conventional kinetochore proteins, including Ndc80, Nuf2, Spc25, and several candidates for CENP-A (based on the presence of longer loop 1 [217]), as well as spindle checkpoint proteins (Mad1, Mad2, and Mad3) (my unpublished data). In contrast, I failed to identify any obvious KKT proteins in

this organism. Although its genome sequence will need to confirm it, these data suggest that *E. gracilis* likely has conventional kinetochore proteins, not KKT proteins. If true, it may be appropriate to re-classify Euglenozoa into two separate groups (see below). It will be interesting to examine whether other Euglenozoa species (e.g. *Diplonema papillatum* [218–220] and *Calkinsia aureus* [221]) utilize conventional or unconventional kinetochore proteins.

Perspectives

Despite the long research on chromosome segregation machinery in eukaryotes, we know little about its evolutionary origins or history. For example, what kind of segregation machinery was used in the last eukaryotic common ancestor (LECA)? The notions that microtubules are used in all eukaryotes studied thus far and that eukaryotes and tubulins likely evolved from Archaea [222–224] suggest that the LECA probably used tubulin-based polymers to drive chromosome segregation. In contrast, there is little trace of prokaryotic traits in kinetochore proteins, making it difficult to reveal what kind of proteins might have been used to bridge between DNA and tubulin-based polymers in this hypothetical eukaryote.

Another difficulty stems from the uncertainty of the position of the root of the eukaryotic tree of life, meaning that we still do not have concrete views about which organisms are the earliest-branching eukaryotes [214,225]. Therefore, it remains unclear whether the unique kinetoplastid kinetochore represents an ancient feature or a derived one. However, among several competing hypotheses [226–228], it has been proposed that Euglenozoa (or species within Euglenozoa) may represent the earliest-branching eukaryotes [229] based on their unique mitochondrial cytochromes *c/c1* and the absence of a recognizable biogenesis apparatus for these proteins [230]. The discovery of unconventional kinetochore proteins in kinetoplastids supports this hypothesis. If kinetoplastids are among the earliest-branching eukaryotes (Figure 4A), then the LECA might have possessed the KKT-based kinetochore (Figure 4Ai). In this scenario, only kinetoplastids have retained them while other eukaryotes have lost them and invented conventional kinetochores. Alternatively, it is equally possible that LECA had conventional kinetochores that have been lost in kinetoplastids (Figure 4Aii). It is also possible that LECA had a hitherto unknown type of kinetochores (Figure 4Aiii). Furthermore, the finding that *Euglena* has conventional kinetochore proteins raises the possibility that kinetoplastids, not *Euglena*, could be the earliest-branching eukaryotes, although other interpretations are also possible (Figure 4B). Genome sequences of other Euglenozoa species might provide further insights into this question.

Regardless of the evolutionary origins, understanding the nature of unconventional kinetochore proteins will likely provide important insights into the fundamental principles of eukaryotic segregation machines. Furthermore, the unique kinetochore proteins represent an ideal drug target against parasitic kinetoplastids [231,232]. Understanding the molecular functions of KKT proteins should therefore contribute to developing specific drugs. Finally, it is worth mentioning that there is no organism known so far that contains both types of kinetochores. Can they coexist in a given organism? Is the conventional kinetochore system more accurate than the unconventional one? Are there as-yet different types of kinetochores to be found? Surely a lot of exciting discoveries will be made in the next few decades in the field of chromosome segregation research.

Abbreviations

APC/C, anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome; CENP, centromere protein; ChIP, chromatin immunoprecipitation; CPC, chromosomal passenger complex; DPB, divergent polo box domain; IP, immunoprecipitation; KKT, kinetoplastid kinetochore; LECA, last eukaryotic common ancestor; MCPH1, microcephalin; MS, mass spectrometry.

Funding

I am supported by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal Society [grant number 098403/Z/12/Z] as well as a Wellcome-Beit Prize Fellowship [grant number 098403/Z/12/A].

Acknowledgements

I thank John Archibald and Julius Lukeš for sharing unpublished *Perkinsela* genome data, and Ellis O'Neill and Rob Field for the predicted protein sequence dataset of *Euglena gracilis*. I also thank Sue Biggins and Gabriele Marcianò for comments on the manuscript.

Competing Interests

The Author declares that there are no competing interests associated with this manuscript.

References

- 1 Nasmyth, K. and Haering, C.H. (2009) Cohesin: its roles and mechanisms. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **43**, 525–558 doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-102108-134233
- 2 McIntosh, J.R., Molodtsov, M.I. and Ataullakhanov, F.I. (2012) Biophysics of mitosis. *Q. Rev. Biophys.* **45**, 147–207 doi:10.1017/S0033583512000017
- 3 Biggins, S. (2013) The composition, functions, and regulation of the budding yeast kinetochore. *Genetics* **194**, 817–846 doi:10.1534/genetics.112.145276
- 4 Cheeseman, I.M. (2014) The kinetochore. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **6**, a015826 doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a015826
- 5 Pesenti, M.E., Weir, J.R. and Musacchio, A. (2016) Progress in the structural and functional characterization of kinetochores. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **37**, 152–163 doi:10.1016/j.sbi.2016.03.003
- 6 Allshire, R.C. and Karpen, G.H. (2008) Epigenetic regulation of centromeric chromatin: old dogs, new tricks? *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **9**, 923–937 doi:10.1038/nrg2466
- 7 Black, B.E. and Cleveland, D.W. (2011) Epigenetic centromere propagation and the nature of CENP-A nucleosomes. *Cell* **144**, 471–479 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.02.002
- 8 Fukagawa, T. and Earnshaw, W.C. (2014) The centromere: chromatin foundation for the kinetochore machinery. *Dev. Cell* **30**, 496–508 doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2014.08.016
- 9 Westhorpe, F.G. and Straight, A.F. (2015) The centromere: epigenetic control of chromosome segregation during mitosis. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.* **7**, a015818 doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a015818
- 10 Desai, A. and Mitchison, T.J. (1997) Microtubule polymerization dynamics. *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* **13**, 83–117 doi:10.1146/annurev.cellbio.13.1.83
- 11 Nicklas, R.B. (1997) How cells get the right chromosomes. *Science* **275**, 632–637 doi:10.1126/science.275.5300.632
- 12 Murray, A.W. (2011) A brief history of error. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **13**, 1178–1182 doi:10.1038/ncb2348
- 13 Musacchio, A. (2015) The molecular biology of spindle assembly checkpoint signaling dynamics. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, R1002–R1018 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.08.051
- 14 Pines, J. (2011) Cubism and the cell cycle: the many faces of the APC/C. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **12**, 427–438 doi:10.1038/nrm3132
- 15 Primorac, I. and Musacchio, A. (2013) Panta rhei: the APC/C at steady state. *J. Cell Biol.* **201**, 177–189 doi:10.1083/jcb.201301130
- 16 Chang, L. and Barford, D. (2014) Insights into the anaphase-promoting complex: a molecular machine that regulates mitosis. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **29**, 1–9 doi:10.1016/j.sbi.2014.08.003
- 17 Cheeseman, I.M. and Desai, A. (2008) Molecular architecture of the kinetochore-microtubule interface. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **9**, 33–46 doi:10.1038/nrm2310
- 18 Santaguida, S. and Musacchio, A. (2009) The life and miracles of kinetochores. *EMBO J.* **28**, 2511–2531 doi:10.1038/emboj.2009.173
- 19 Verdaasdonk, J.S. and Bloom, K. (2011) Centromeres: unique chromatin structures that drive chromosome segregation. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **12**, 320–332 doi:10.1038/nrm3107
- 20 Flemming, W. (1882) *Zellsubstanz, kern und zelltheilung*, F.C.W. Vogel Leipzig
- 21 Luykx, P. (1965) The structure of the kinetochore in meiosis and mitosis in *Urechis* eggs. *Exp. Cell Res.* **39**, 643–657 doi:10.1016/0014-4827(65)90068-6
- 22 Brinkley, B.R. and Stubblefield, E. (1966) The fine structure of the kinetochore of a mammalian cell in vitro. *Chromosoma* **19**, 28–43 doi:10.1007/BF00332792
- 23 Jokelainen, P.T. (1967) The ultrastructure and spatial organization of the metaphase kinetochore in mitotic rat cells. *J. Ultrastruct. Res.* **19**, 19–44 doi:10.1016/S0022-5320(67)80058-3
- 24 Moroi, Y., Peebles, C., Fritzier, M.J., Steigerwald, J. and Tan, E.M. (1980) Autoantibody to centromere (kinetochore) in scleroderma sera. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **77**, 1627–1631 doi:10.1073/pnas.77.3.1627
- 25 Guldner, H.H., Lakomek, H.J. and Bautz, F.A. (1984) Human anti-centromere sera recognise a 19.5 kD non-histone chromosomal protein from HeLa cells. *Clin. Exp. Immunol.* **58**, 13–20 PMID: 6383665
- 26 Earnshaw, W.C. and Rothfield, N. (1985) Identification of a family of human centromere proteins using autoimmune sera from patients with scleroderma. *Chromosoma* **91**, 313–321 doi:10.1007/BF00328227
- 27 Earnshaw, W.C., Sullivan, K.F., Machlin, P.S., Cooke, C.A., Kaiser, D.A., Pollard, T.D. et al. (1987) Molecular cloning of cDNA for CENP-B, the major human centromere autoantigen. *J. Cell Biol.* **104**, 817–829 doi:10.1083/jcb.104.4.817
- 28 Saitoh, H., Tomkiel, J., Cooke, C.A., Ratrie, H., Maurer, M., Rothfield, N.F. et al. (1992) CENP-C, an autoantigen in scleroderma, is a component of the human inner kinetochore plate. *Cell* **70**, 115–125 doi:10.1016/0092-8674(92)90538-N
- 29 Sullivan, K.F., Hechenberger, M. and Masri, K. (1994) Human CENP-A contains a histone H3 related histone fold domain that is required for targeting to the centromere. *J. Cell Biol.* **127**, 581–592 doi:10.1083/jcb.127.3.581
- 30 Clarke, L. and Carbon, J. (1980) Isolation of a yeast centromere and construction of functional small circular chromosomes. *Nature* **287**, 504–509 doi:10.1038/287504a0
- 31 Lechner, J. and Carbon, J. (1991) A 240 kD multisubunit protein complex, CBF3, is a major component of the budding yeast centromere. *Cell* **64**, 717–725 doi:10.1016/0092-8674(91)90501-0
- 32 Maine, G.T., Sinha, P. and Tye, B.K. (1984) Mutants of *S. cerevisiae* defective in the maintenance of minichromosomes. *Genetics* **106**, 365–385 PMID: 6323245
- 33 Spencer, F., Gerring, S.L., Connelly, C. and Hieter, P. (1990) Mitotic chromosome transmission fidelity mutants in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* **124**, 237–249 PMID: 2407610
- 34 Ortiz, J., Stemmann, O., Rank, S. and Lechner, J. (1999) A putative protein complex consisting of Ctf19, Mcm21, and Okp1 represents a missing link in the budding yeast kinetochore. *Genes Dev.* **13**, 1140–1155 doi:10.1101/gad.13.9.1140

- 35 Hofmann, C., Cheeseman, I.M., Goode, B.L., McDonald, K.L., Barnes, G. and Drubin, D.G. (1998) *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* Duo1p and Dam1p, novel proteins involved in mitotic spindle function. *J. Cell Biol.* **143**, 1029–1040 doi:10.1083/jcb.143.4.1029
- 36 Wigge, P.A. and Kilmartin, J.V. (2001) The Ndc80p complex from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* contains conserved centromere components and has a function in chromosome segregation. *J. Cell Biol.* **152**, 349–360 doi:10.1083/jcb.152.2.349
- 37 Cheeseman, I.M., Anderson, S., Jwa, M., Green, E.M., Kang, J.-s., Yates, III, J.R. et al. (2002) Phospho-regulation of kinetochore-microtubule attachments by the Aurora kinase Ipl1p. *Cell* **111**, 163–172 doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(02)00973-X
- 38 Buchwitz, B.J., Ahmad, K., Moore, L.L., Roth, M.B. and Henikoff, S. (1999) Cell division: a histone-H3-like protein in *C. elegans*. *Nature* **401**, 547–548 doi:10.1038/44062
- 39 Goshima, G., Kiyomitsu, T., Yoda, K. and Yanagida, M. (2003) Human centromere chromatin protein hMis12, essential for equal segregation, is independent of CENP-A loading pathway. *J. Cell Biol.* **160**, 25–39 doi:10.1083/jcb.200210005
- 40 Meraldi, P., McAinsh, A.D., Rheinbay, E. and Sorger, P.K. (2006) Phylogenetic and structural analysis of centromeric DNA and kinetochore proteins. *Genome Biol.* **7**, R23 doi:10.1186/gb-2006-7-3-r23
- 41 Schleiffer, A., Maier, M., Litos, G., Lampert, F., Hornung, P., Mechtler, K. et al. (2012) CENP-T proteins are conserved centromere receptors of the Ndc80 complex. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **14**, 604–613 doi:10.1038/ncb2493
- 42 Oegema, K., Desai, A., Rybina, S., Kirkham, M. and Hyman, A.A. (2001) Functional analysis of kinetochore assembly in *Caenorhabditis elegans*. *J. Cell Biol.* **153**, 1209–1226 doi:10.1083/jcb.153.6.1209
- 43 Goshima, G., Wollman, R., Goodwin, S.S., Zhang, N., Scholey, J.M., Vale, R.D. et al. (2007) Genes required for mitotic spindle assembly in *Drosophila* S2 cells. *Science* **316**, 417–421 doi:10.1126/science.1141314
- 44 Akiyoshi, B., Nelson, C.R., Ranish, J.A. and Biggins, S. (2009) Quantitative proteomic analysis of purified yeast kinetochores identifies a PP1 regulatory subunit. *Genes Dev.* **23**, 2887–2899 doi:10.1101/gad.1865909
- 45 Ohta, S., Bukowski-Wills, J.-C., Sanchez-Pulido, L., Alves Fde, L., Wood, L., Chen, Z.A. et al. (2010) The protein composition of mitotic chromosomes determined using multiclassifier combinatorial proteomics. *Cell* **142**, 810–821 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2010.07.047
- 46 Palmer, D.K., O'Day, K., Trong, H.L., Charbonneau, H. and Margolis, R.L. (1991) Purification of the centromere-specific protein CENP-A and demonstration that it is a distinctive histone. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **88**, 3734–3738 doi:10.1073/pnas.88.9.3734
- 47 Earnshaw, W.C. and Migeon, B.R. (1985) Three related centromere proteins are absent from the inactive centromere of a stable isodicentric chromosome. *Chromosoma* **92**, 290–296 doi:10.1007/BF00329812
- 48 Voullaire, L.E., Slater, H.R., Petrovic, V. and Choo, K.H. (1993) A functional marker centromere with no detectable alpha-satellite, satellite III, or CENP-B protein: activation of a latent centromere? *Am. J. Hum. Genet.* **52**, 1153–1163 PMID: 7684888
- 49 Collins, K.A., Castillo, A.R., Tatsutani, S.Y. and Biggins, S. (2005) De novo kinetochore assembly requires the centromeric histone H3 variant. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **16**, 5649–5660 doi:10.1091/mbc.E05-08-0771
- 50 Liu, S.-T., Rattner, J.B., Jablonski, S.A. and Yen, T.J. (2006) Mapping the assembly pathways that specify formation of the trilaminar kinetochore plates in human cells. *J. Cell Biol.* **175**, 41–53 doi:10.1083/jcb.200606020
- 51 Tachiwana, H., Kagawa, W., Shiga, T., Osakabe, A., Miya, Y., Saito, K. et al. (2011) Crystal structure of the human centromeric nucleosome containing CENP-A. *Nature* **476**, 232–235 doi:10.1038/nature10258
- 52 Kato, H., Jiang, J., Zhou, B.-R., Rozendaal, M., Feng, H., Ghirlando, R. et al. (2013) A conserved mechanism for centromeric nucleosome recognition by centromere protein CENP-C. *Science* **340**, 1110–1113 doi:10.1126/science.1235532
- 53 Falk, S.J., Guo, L.Y., Sekulic, N., Smoak, E.M., Mani, T., Logsdon, G.A. et al. (2015) CENP-C reshapes and stabilizes CENP-A nucleosomes at the centromere. *Science* **348**, 699–703 doi:10.1126/science.1259308
- 54 Westhorpe, F.G., Fuller, C.J. and Straight, A.F. (2015) A cell-free CENP-A assembly system defines the chromatin requirements for centromere maintenance. *J. Cell Biol.* **209**, 789–801 doi:10.1083/jcb.201503132
- 55 Sugimoto, K., Yata, H., Muro, Y. and Himeno, M. (1994) Human centromere protein C (CENP-C) is a DNA-binding protein which possesses a novel DNA-binding motif. *J. Biochem.* **116**, 877–881 PMID:7883764
- 56 Cohen, R.L., Espelin, C.W., De Wulf, P., Sorger, P.K., Harrison, S.C. and Simons, K.T. (2008) Structural and functional dissection of Mif2p, a conserved DNA-binding kinetochore protein. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **19**, 4480–4491 doi:10.1091/mbc.E08-03-0297
- 57 Hornung, P., Troc, P., Malvezzi, F., Maier, M., Demianova, Z., Zimniak, T. et al. (2014) A cooperative mechanism drives budding yeast kinetochore assembly downstream of CENP-A. *J. Cell Biol.* **206**, 509–524 doi:10.1083/jcb.201403081
- 58 Hori, T., Amano, M., Suzuki, A., Backer, C.B., Welburn, J.P., Dong, Y. et al. (2008) CCAN makes multiple contacts with centromeric DNA to provide distinct pathways to the outer kinetochore. *Cell* **135**, 1039–1052 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.10.019
- 59 Nishino, T., Takeuchi, K., Gascoigne, K.E., Suzuki, A., Hori, T., Oyama, T. et al. (2012) CENP-T-W-S-X forms a unique centromeric chromatin structure with a histone-like fold. *Cell* **148**, 487–501 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.11.061
- 60 Takeuchi, K., Nishino, T., Mayanagi, K., Horikoshi, N., Osakabe, A., Tachiwana, H. et al. (2014) The centromeric nucleosome-like CENP-T-W-S-X complex induces positive supercoils into DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **42**, 1644–1655 doi:10.1093/nar/gkt1124
- 61 Aravind, L. and Landsman, D. (1998) AT-hook motifs identified in a wide variety of DNA-binding proteins. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **26**, 4413–4421 doi:10.1093/nar/26.19.4413
- 62 Westermann, S. and Schleiffer, A. (2013) Family matters: structural and functional conservation of centromere-associated proteins from yeast to humans. *Trends Cell Biol.* **23**, 260–269 doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2013.01.010
- 63 Suzuki, M. (1989) SPKK, a new nucleic acid-binding unit of protein found in histone. *EMBO J.* **8**, 797–804 PMID:2470589
- 64 Malik, H.S., Vermaak, D. and Henikoff, S. (2002) Recurrent evolution of DNA-binding motifs in the *Drosophila* centromeric histone. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **99**, 1449–1454 doi:10.1073/pnas.032664299
- 65 Chen, Y., Riley, D.J., Chen, P.L. and Lee, W.H. (1997) HEC, a novel nuclear protein rich in leucine heptad repeats specifically involved in mitosis. *Mol. Cell Biol.* **17**, 6049–6056 doi:10.1128/MCB.17.10.6049
- 66 Wigge, P.A., Jensen, O.N., Holmes, S., Souès, S., Mann, M. and Kilmartin, J.V. (1998) Analysis of the *Saccharomyces* spindle pole by matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization (MALDI) mass spectrometry. *J. Cell Biol.* **141**, 967–977 doi:10.1083/jcb.141.4.967

- 67 Ciferri, C., De Luca, J., Monzani, S., Ferrari, K.J., Ristic, D., Wyman, C. et al. (2005) Architecture of the human ndc80-hec1 complex, a critical constituent of the outer kinetochore. *J. Biol. Chem.* **280**, 29088–29095 doi:10.1074/jbc.M504070200
- 68 Wei, R.R., Sorger, P.K. and Harrison, S.C. (2005) Molecular organization of the Ndc80 complex, an essential kinetochore component. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 5363–5367 doi:10.1073/pnas.0501168102
- 69 McClelland, M.L., Kallio, M.J., Barrett-Wilt, G.A., Kestner, C.A., Shabanowitz, J., Hunt, D.F. et al. (2004) The vertebrate Ndc80 complex contains Spc24 and Spc25 homologs, which are required to establish and maintain kinetochore-microtubule attachment. *Curr. Biol.* **14**, 131–137 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2003.12.058
- 70 DeLuca, J.G., Dong, Y., Hergert, P., Strauss, J., Hickey, J.M., Salmon, E.D. et al. (2005) Hec1 and nuf2 are core components of the kinetochore outer plate essential for organizing microtubule attachment sites. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **16**, 519–531 doi:10.1091/mbc.E04-09-0852
- 71 Cheeseman, I.M., Chappie, J.S., Wilson-Kubalek, E.M. and Desai, A. (2006) The conserved KMN network constitutes the core microtubule-binding site of the kinetochore. *Cell* **127**, 983–997 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.09.039
- 72 Wei, R.R., Al-Bassam, J. and Harrison, S.C. (2007) The Ndc80/HEC1 complex is a contact point for kinetochore-microtubule attachment. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **14**, 54–59 doi:10.1038/nsmb1186
- 73 Ciferri, C., Pasqualato, S., Screpanti, E., Varetto, G., Santaguida, S., Dos Reis, G. et al. (2008) Implications for kinetochore-microtubule attachment from the structure of an engineered Ndc80 complex. *Cell* **133**, 427–439 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.03.020
- 74 Powers, A.F., Franck, A.D., Gestaut, D.R., Cooper, J., Graczyk, B., Wei, R.R. et al. (2009) The Ndc80 kinetochore complex forms load-bearing attachments to dynamic microtubule tips via biased diffusion. *Cell* **136**, 865–875 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.12.045
- 75 Alushin, G.M., Ramey, V.H., Pasqualato, S., Ball, D.A., Grigorieff, N., Musacchio, A. et al. (2010) The Ndc80 kinetochore complex forms oligomeric arrays along microtubules. *Nature* **467**, 805–810 doi:10.1038/nature09423
- 76 Sarangapani, K.K., Akiyoshi, B., Duggan, N.M., Biggins, S. and Asbury, C.L. (2013) Phosphoregulation promotes release of kinetochores from dynamic microtubules via multiple mechanisms. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 7282–7287 PMID: 23589891
- 77 Ji, Z., Gao, H. and Yu, H. (2015) Kinetochore attachment sensed by competitive Mps1 and microtubule binding to Ndc80C. *Science* **348**, 1260–1264 doi:10.1126/science.aaa4029
- 78 Hiruma, Y., Sacristan, C., Pachis, S.T., Adamopoulos, A., Kuijt, T., Ubbink, M. et al. (2015) Competition between MPS1 and microtubules at kinetochores regulates spindle checkpoint signaling. *Science* **348**, 1264–1267 doi:10.1126/science.aaa4055
- 79 Dong, Y., Vanden Beeldt, K.J., Meng, X., Khodjakov, A. and McEwen, B.F. (2007) The outer plate in vertebrate kinetochores is a flexible network with multiple microtubule interactions. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **9**, 516–522 doi:10.1038/ncb1576
- 80 McIntosh, J.R., Grishchuk, E.L., Morphew, M.K., Efremov, A.K., Zhudnikov, K., Volkov, V.A. et al. (2008) Fibrils connect microtubule tips with kinetochores: a mechanism to couple tubulin dynamics to chromosome motion. *Cell* **135**, 322–333 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2008.08.038
- 81 Gonen, S., Akiyoshi, B., Iadanza, M.G., Shi, D., Duggan, N., Biggins, S. et al. (2012) The structure of purified kinetochores reveals multiple microtubule-attachment sites. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **19**, 925–929 doi:10.1038/nsmb.2358
- 82 De Wulf, P., McAinsh, A.D. and Sorger, P.K. (2003) Hierarchical assembly of the budding yeast kinetochore from multiple subcomplexes. *Genes Dev.* **17**, 2902–2921 doi:10.1101/gad.1144403
- 83 Pinsky, B.A., Tatsutani, S.Y., Collins, K.A. and Biggins, S. (2003) An Mtw1 complex promotes kinetochore biorientation that is monitored by the Ipl1/Aurora protein kinase. *Dev. Cell* **5**, 735–745 doi:10.1016/S1534-5807(03)00322-8
- 84 Obuse, C., Iwasaki, O., Kiyomitsu, T., Goshima, G., Toyoda, Y. and Yanagida, M. (2004) A conserved Mis12 centromere complex is linked to heterochromatic HP1 and outer kinetochore protein Zwint-1. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **6**, 1135–1141 doi:10.1038/ncb1187
- 85 Foltz, D.R., Jansen, L.E.T., Black, B.E., Bailey, A.O., Yates, J.R. and Cleveland, D.W. (2006) The human CENP-A centromeric nucleosome-associated complex. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **8**, 458–469 doi:10.1038/ncb1397
- 86 Okada, M., Cheeseman, I.M., Hori, T., Okawa, K., McLeod, I.X., Yates, III, J.R. et al. (2006) The CENP-H-I complex is required for the efficient incorporation of newly synthesized CENP-A into centromeres. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **8**, 446–457 doi:10.1038/ncb1396
- 87 Carroll, C.W., Milks, K.J. and Straight, A.F. (2010) Dual recognition of CENP-A nucleosomes is required for centromere assembly. *J. Cell Biol.* **189**, 1143–1155 doi:10.1083/jcb.201001013
- 88 Przewlōka, M.R., Venkei, Z., Bolanos-Garcia, V.M., Debski, J., Dadlez, M. and Glover, D.M. (2011) CENP-C is a structural platform for kinetochore assembly. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, 399–405 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2011.02.005
- 89 Screpanti, E., De Antoni, A., Alushin, G.M., Petrovic, A., Melis, T., Nogales, E. et al. (2011) Direct binding of Cenp-C to the Mis12 complex joins the inner and outer kinetochore. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, 391–398 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.12.039
- 90 Klare, K., Weir, J.R., Basilio, F., Zimniak, T., Massimiliano, L., Ludwigs, N. et al. (2015) CENP-C is a blueprint for constitutive centromere-associated network assembly within human kinetochores. *J. Cell Biol.* **210**, 11–22 doi:10.1083/jcb.201412028
- 91 McKinley, K.L., Sekulic, N., Guo, L.Y., Tsinman, T., Black, B.E. and Cheeseman, I.M. (2015) The CENP-L-N complex forms a critical node in an integrated meshwork of interactions at the centromere-kinetochore interface. *Mol. Cell* **60**, 886–898 doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2015.10.027
- 92 Petrovic, A., Mosalaganti, S., Keller, J., Mattiuzzo, M., Overlack, K., Krenn, V. et al. (2014) Modular assembly of RWD domains on the Mis12 complex underlies outer kinetochore organization. *Mol. Cell* **53**, 591–605 doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2014.01.019
- 93 Joglekar, A.P., Bloom, K. and Salmon, E.D. (2009) In vivo protein architecture of the eukaryotic kinetochore with nanometer scale accuracy. *Curr. Biol.* **19**, 694–699 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2009.02.056
- 94 Wan, X., O'Quinn, R.P., Pierce, H.L., Joglekar, A.P., Gall, W.E., DeLuca, J.G. et al. (2009) Protein architecture of the human kinetochore microtubule attachment site. *Cell* **137**, 672–684 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2009.03.035
- 95 Magidson, V., He, J., Ault, J.G., O'Connell, C.B., Yang, N., Tikhonenko, I. et al. (2016) Unattached kinetochores rather than intrakinetochore tension arrest mitosis in taxol-treated cells. *J. Cell Biol.* **212**, 307–319 doi:10.1083/jcb.201412139
- 96 Schmitzberger, F. and Harrison, S.C. (2012) RWD domain: a recurring module in kinetochore architecture shown by a Ctf19–Mcm21 complex structure. *EMBO Rep.* **13**, 216–222 doi:10.1038/embor.2012.1
- 97 Kim, S., Sun, H., Tomchick, D.R., Yu, H. and Luo, X. (2012) Structure of human Mad1 C-terminal domain reveals its involvement in kinetochore targeting. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **109**, 6549–6554 doi:10.1073/pnas.1118210109
- 98 Bolanos-Garcia, V.M., Kiyomitsu, T., D'Arcy, S., Chirgadze, D.Y., Grossmann, J.G., Matak-Vinkovic, D. et al. (2009) The crystal structure of the N-terminal region of BUB1 provides insight into the mechanism of BUB1 recruitment to kinetochores. *Structure* **17**, 105–116 doi:10.1016/j.str.2008.10.015

- 99 Nijenhuis, W., von Castelmur, E., Littler, D., De Marco, V., Tromer, E., Vleugel, M. et al. (2013) A TPR domain-containing N-terminal module of MPS1 is required for its kinetochore localization by Aurora B. *J. Cell Biol.* **201**, 217–231 doi:10.1083/jcb.201210033
- 100 Guo, Q., Tao, Y., Liu, H., Teng, M. and Li, X. (2013) Structural insights into the role of the Chl4-lml3 complex in kinetochore assembly. *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **69**, 2412–2419 doi:10.1107/S0907444913022397
- 101 Hinshaw, S.M. and Harrison, S.C. (2013) An lml3-Chl4 heterodimer links the core centromere to factors required for accurate chromosome segregation. *Cell Rep.* **5**, 29–36 doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2013.08.036
- 102 Basilio, F., Maffini, S., Weir, J.R., Prumbaum, D., Rojas, A.M., Zimniak, T. et al. (2014) The pseudo GTPase CENP-M drives human kinetochore assembly. *eLife* **3**, e02978 doi:10.7554/eLife.02978
- 103 Cho, U.-S. and Harrison, S.C. (2012) Ndc10 is a platform for inner kinetochore assembly in budding yeast. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **19**, 48–55 doi:10.1038/nsmb.2178
- 104 Perriches, T. and Singleton, M.R. (2012) Structure of yeast kinetochore Ndc10 DNA-binding domain reveals unexpected evolutionary relationship to tyrosine recombinases. *J. Biol. Chem.* **287**, 5173–5179 doi:10.1074/jbc.C111.318501
- 105 Ohno, S. (1970) *Evolution by gene duplication*, Springer-Verlag, New York
- 106 Wickstead, B. and Gull, K. (2011) The evolution of the cytoskeleton. *J. Cell Biol.* **194**, 513–525 doi:10.1083/jcb.201102065
- 107 Drechsler, H. and McAnish, A.D. (2012) Exotic mitotic mechanisms. *Open Biol.* **2**, 120140 doi:10.1098/rsob.120140
- 108 Findeisen, P., Mühlhausen, S., Dempewolf, S., Hertzog, J., Zietlow, A., Carlomagno, T. et al. (2014) Six subgroups and extensive recent duplications characterize the evolution of the eukaryotic tubulin protein family. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **6**, 2274–2288 doi:10.1093/gbe/evu187
- 109 Henikoff, S., Ahmad, K. and Malik, H.S. (2001) The centromere paradox: stable inheritance with rapidly evolving DNA. *Science* **293**, 1098–1102 doi:10.1126/science.1062939
- 110 Drinnenberg, I.A., deYoung, D., Henikoff, S. and Malik, H.S. (2014) Recurrent loss of CenH3 is associated with independent transitions to holocentricity in insects. *eLife* **3**, e03676 doi:10.7554/eLife.03676
- 111 Cheeseman, I.M., Niessen, S., Anderson, S., Hyndman, F., Yates, III, J.R., Oegema, K. et al. (2004) A conserved protein network controls assembly of the outer kinetochore and its ability to sustain tension. *Genes Dev.* **18**, 2255–2268 doi:10.1101/gad.1234104
- 112 Przewlorka, M.R., Zhang, W., Costa, P., Archambault, V., D'Avino, P.P., Lilley, K.S. et al. (2007) Molecular analysis of core kinetochore composition and assembly in *Drosophila melanogaster*. *PLoS ONE* **2**, e478 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000478
- 113 Liu, Y., Petrovic, A., Rombaut, P., Mosalaganti, S., Keller, J., Raunser, S. et al. (2016) Insights from the reconstitution of the divergent outer kinetochore of *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Open Biol.* **6**, 150236 doi:10.1098/rsob.150236
- 114 Richter, M.M., Poznanski, J., Zdziarska, A., Czarnocki-Cieciora, M., Lipinski, Z., Dadlez, M. et al. (2016) Network of protein interactions within the *Drosophila* inner kinetochore. *Open Biol.* **6**, 150238 doi:10.1098/rsob.150238
- 115 Drinnenberg, I.A., Henikoff, S. and Malik, H.S. (2016) Evolutionary turnover of kinetochore proteins: a Ship of Theseus? *Trends Cell Biol.* **26**, 498–510 doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2016.01.005
- 116 Vickerman, K. (1962) The mechanism of cyclical development in trypanosomes of the *Trypanosoma brucei* sub-group: an hypothesis based on ultrastructural observations. *Trans. R. Soc. Trop. Med. Hyg.* **56**, 487–495 doi:10.1016/0035-9203(62)90072-X
- 117 Berriman, M., Ghedin, E., Hertz-Fowler, C., Blandin, G., Renauld, H., Bartholomeu, D.C. et al. (2005) The genome of the African trypanosome *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Science* **309**, 416–422 doi:10.1126/science.1112642
- 118 El-Sayed, N.M., Myler, P.J., Bartholomeu, D.C., Nilsson, D., Aggarwal, G., Tran, A.-N. et al. (2005) The genome sequence of *Trypanosoma cruzi*, etiologic agent of Chagas disease. *Science* **309**, 409–415 doi:10.1126/science.1112631
- 119 Ivens, A.C., Peacock, C.S., Worthey, E.A., Murphy, L., Aggarwal, G., Berriman, M. et al. (2005) The genome of the kinetoplastid parasite, *Leishmania major*. *Science* **309**, 436–442 doi:10.1126/science.1112680
- 120 Akiyoshi, B. and Gull, K. (2013) Evolutionary cell biology of chromosome segregation: insights from trypanosomes. *Open Biol.* **3**, 130023 doi:10.1098/rsob.130023
- 121 Ersfeld, K. and Gull, K. (1997) Partitioning of large and minichromosomes in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Science* **276**, 611–614 doi:10.1126/science.276.5312.611
- 122 Vickerman, K. and Preston, T.M. (1970) Spindle microtubules in the dividing nuclei of trypanosomes. *J. Cell. Sci.* **6**, 365–383 PMID: 5419844
- 123 Solari, A.J. (1980) The 3-dimensional fine structure of the mitotic spindle in *Trypanosoma cruzi*. *Chromosoma* **78**, 239–255 doi:10.1007/BF00328395
- 124 Ogbadanyi, E., Ersfeld, K., Robinson, D., Sherwin, T. and Gull, K. (2000) Architecture of the *Trypanosoma brucei* nucleus during interphase and mitosis. *Chromosoma* **108**, 501–513 doi:10.1007/s004120050402
- 125 Kim, J., Ishiguro, K., Nambu, A., Akiyoshi, B., Yokobayashi, S., Kagami, A. et al. (2015) Meikin is a conserved regulator of meiosis-I-specific kinetochore function. *Nature* **517**, 466–471 doi:10.1038/nature14097
- 126 Akiyoshi, B., Sarangapani, K.K., Powers, A.F., Nelson, C.R., Reichow, S.L., Arellano-Santoyo, H. et al. (2010) Tension directly stabilizes reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments. *Nature* **468**, 576–579 doi:10.1038/nature09594
- 127 Akiyoshi, B. and Biggins, S. (2012) Reconstituting the kinetochore–microtubule interface: what, why, and how. *Chromosoma* **121**, 235–250 doi:10.1007/s00412-012-0362-0
- 128 Lowell, J.E. and Cross, G.A.M. (2004) A variant histone H3 is enriched at telomeres in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *J. Cell Sci.* **117**, 5937–5947 doi:10.1242/jcs.01515
- 129 Talbert, P.B., Bayes, J.J. and Henikoff, S. (2009) Evolution of centromeres and kinetochores: a two-part fugue. In *The kinetochore* (De Wulf, P. and Earnshaw, W.C., eds), pp. 1–37, Springer, New York
- 130 Kiyomitsu, T., Obuse, C. and Yanagida, M. (2007) Human Blinkin/AF15q14 is required for chromosome alignment and the mitotic checkpoint through direct interaction with Bub1 and BubR1. *Dev. Cell* **13**, 663–676 doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2007.09.005
- 131 Li, Z., Lee, J.H., Chu, F., Burlingame, A.L., Günzl, A. and Wang, C.C. (2008) Identification of a novel chromosomal passenger complex and its unique localization during cytokinesis in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *PLoS ONE* **3**, e2354 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0002354
- 132 Herzog, F., Primorac, I., Dube, P., Lenart, P., Sander, B., Mechtler, K. et al. (2009) Structure of the anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome interacting with a mitotic checkpoint complex. *Science* **323**, 1477–1481 doi:10.1126/science.1163300
- 133 Hsu, K.-S. and Toda, T. (2011) Ndc80 internal loop interacts with Dis1/TOG to ensure proper kinetochore-spindle attachment in fission yeast. *Curr. Biol.* **21**, 214–220 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2010.12.048

- 134 Miller, M.P., Asbury, C.L. and Biggins, S. (2016) A TOG protein confers tension sensitivity to kinetochore-microtubule attachments. *Cell* **165**, 1428–1439 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.04.030
- 135 Dean, S., Sunter, J., Wheeler, R.J., Hodgkinson, I., Gluenz, E. and Gull, K. (2015) A toolkit enabling efficient, scalable and reproducible gene tagging in trypanosomatids. *Open Biol.* **5**, 140197 doi:10.1098/rsob.140197
- 136 Kelly, S., Reed, J., Kramer, S., Ellis, L., Webb, H., Sunter, J. et al. (2007) Functional genomics in *Trypanosoma brucei*: a collection of vectors for the expression of tagged proteins from endogenous and ectopic gene loci. *Mol. Biochem. Parasitol.* **154**, 103–109 doi:10.1016/j.molbiopara.2007.03.012
- 137 Archer, S.K., Inchaustegui, D., Queiroz, R. and Clayton, C. (2011) The cell cycle regulated transcriptome of *Trypanosoma brucei*. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e18425 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018425
- 138 Brenner, S., Pepper, D., Berns, M.W., Tan, E. and Brinkley, B.R. (1981) Kinetochore structure, duplication, and distribution in mammalian cells: analysis by human autoantibodies from scleroderma patients. *J. Cell Biol.* **91**, 95–102 doi:10.1083/jcb.91.1.95
- 139 Meluh, P.B. and Koshland, D. (1997) Budding yeast centromere composition and assembly as revealed by in vivo cross-linking. *Genes Dev.* **11**, 3401–3412 doi:10.1101/gad.11.24.3401
- 140 Hayashi, A., Ogawa, H., Kohno, K., Gasser, S.M. and Hiraoka, Y. (1998) Meiotic behaviours of chromosomes and microtubules in budding yeast: relocalization of centromeres and telomeres during meiotic prophase. *Genes Cells* **3**, 587–601 doi:10.1046/j.1365-2443.1998.00215.x
- 141 Obado, S.O., Bot, C., Nilsson, D., Andersson, B. and Kelly, J.M. (2007) Repetitive DNA is associated with centromeric domains in *Trypanosoma brucei* but not *Trypanosoma cruzi*. *Genome Biol.* **8**, R37 doi:10.1186/gb-2007-8-3-r37
- 142 Earnshaw, W.C. (2015) Discovering centromere proteins: from cold White hands to the A, B, C of CENPs. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **16**, 443–449 doi:10.1038/nrm4001
- 143 Akiyoshi, B. and Gull, K. (2014) Discovery of unconventional kinetochores in kinetoplastids. *Cell* **156**, 1247–1258 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.01.049
- 144 Nerusheva, O.O. and Akiyoshi, B. (2016) Divergent polo box domains underpin the unique kinetoplastid kinetochore. *Open Biol.* **6**, 150206 doi:10.1098/rsob.150206
- 145 Morriswood, B., Havlicek, K., Demmel, L., Yavuz, S., Sealey-Cardona, M., Vidilaseris, K. et al. (2013) Novel bilobe components in *Trypanosoma brucei* identified using proximity-dependent biotinylation. *Eukaryotic Cell* **12**, 356–367 doi:10.1128/EC.00326-12
- 146 Reinhardt, H.C. and Yaffe, M.B. (2013) Phospho-Ser/Thr-binding domains: navigating the cell cycle and DNA damage response. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **14**, 563–580 doi:10.1038/nrm3640
- 147 Parsons, M., Worthey, E.A., Ward, P.N. and Mottram, J.C. (2005) Comparative analysis of the kinomes of three pathogenic trypanosomatids: *Leishmania major*, *Trypanosoma brucei* and *Trypanosoma cruzi*. *BMC Genomics* **6**, 127 doi:10.1186/1471-2164-6-127
- 148 Katoh, K. and Standley, D.M. (2013) MAFFT multiple sequence alignment software version 7: improvements in performance and usability. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **30**, 772–780 doi:10.1093/molbev/mst010
- 149 Lupas, A., Van Dyke, M. and Stock, J. (1991) Predicting coiled coils from protein sequences. *Science* **252**, 1162–1164 doi:10.1126/science.252.5009.1162
- 150 Bryson, K., McGuffin, L.J., Marsden, R.L., Ward, J.J., Sodhi, J.S. and Jones, D.T. (2005) Protein structure prediction servers at University College London. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **33**, W36–W38 doi:10.1093/nar/gki410
- 151 Bailey, T.L., Boden, M., Buske, F.A., Frith, M., Grant, C.E., Clementi, L. et al. (2009) MEME suite: tools for motif discovery and searching. *Nucl. Acids Res.* doi:10.1093/nar/gkp335
- 152 Finn, R.D., Coghill, P., Eberhardt, R.Y., Eddy, S.R., Mistry, J., Mitchell, A.L. et al. (2016) The Pfam protein families database: towards a more sustainable future. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, D279–D285 doi:10.1093/nar/gkv1344
- 153 Buchan, D.W.A., Minneci, F., Nugent, T.C.O., Bryson, K. and Jones, D.T. (2013) Scalable web services for the PSIPRED Protein Analysis Workbench. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, W349–W357 doi:10.1093/nar/gkt381
- 154 Drozdetskiy, A., Cole, C., Procter, J. and Barton, G.J. (2015) JPred4: a protein secondary structure prediction server. *Nucl. Acids Res.* **43**, W389–W394 doi:10.1093/nar/gkv332
- 155 Söding, J., Biegert, A. and Lupas, A.N. (2005) The HHpred interactive server for protein homology detection and structure prediction. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **33**, W244–W248 doi:10.1093/nar/gki408
- 156 Yang, C.H., Tomkiel, J., Saitoh, H., Johnson, D.H. and Earnshaw, W.C. (1996) Identification of overlapping DNA-binding and centromere-targeting domains in the human kinetochore protein CENP-C. *Mol. Cell Biol.* **16**, 3576–3586 doi:10.1128/MCB.16.7.3576
- 157 Milks, K.J., Moree, B. and Straight, A.F. (2009) Dissection of CENP-C-directed centromere and kinetochore assembly. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **20**, 4246–4255 doi:10.1091/mbc.E09-05-0378
- 158 Jones, N.G., Thomas, E.B., Brown, E., Dickens, N.J., Hammarton, T.C. and Mottram, J.C. (2014) Regulators of *Trypanosoma brucei* cell cycle progression and differentiation identified using a kinome-wide RNAi screen. *PLoS Pathog.* **10**, e1003886 doi:10.1371/journal.ppat.1003886
- 159 Ngô, H., Tschudi, C., Gull, K. and Ullu, E. (1998) Double-stranded RNA induces mRNA degradation in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 14687–14692 doi:10.1073/pnas.95.25.14687
- 160 Wang, Z., Morris, J.C., Drew, M.E. and Englund, P.T. (2000) Inhibition of *Trypanosoma brucei* gene expression by RNA interference using an integratable vector with opposing T7 promoters. *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 40174–40179 doi:10.1074/jbc.M008405200
- 161 Merritt, C. and Stuart, K. (2013) Identification of essential and non-essential protein kinases by a fusion PCR method for efficient production of transgenic *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Mol. Biochem. Parasitol.* **190**, 44–49 doi:10.1016/j.molbiopara.2013.05.002
- 162 Kim, H.-S., Li, Z., Boothroyd, C. and Cross, G.A.M. (2013) Strategies to construct null and conditional null *Trypanosoma brucei* mutants using Cre-recombinase and loxP. *Mol. Biochem. Parasitol.* **191**, 16–19 doi:10.1016/j.molbiopara.2013.08.001
- 163 Nishimura, K., Fukagawa, T., Takisawa, H., Kakimoto, T. and Kanemaki, M. (2009) An auxin-based degron system for the rapid depletion of proteins in nonplant cells. *Nat. Meth.* **6**, 917–922 doi:10.1038/nmeth.1401
- 164 Siegel, T.N., Hekstra, D.R., Kemp, L.E., Figueiredo, L.M., Lowell, J.E., Fenyó, D. et al. (2009) Four histone variants mark the boundaries of polycistronic transcription units in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *Genes Dev.* **23**, 1063–1076 doi:10.1101/gad.1790409
- 165 MacRae, T.H. and Gull, K. (1990) Purification and assembly in vitro of tubulin from *Trypanosoma brucei brucei*. *Biochem. J.* **265**, 87–93 doi:10.1042/bj2650087
- 166 Widlund, P.O., Podolski, M., Reber, S., Alper, J., Storch, M., Hyman, A.A. et al. (2012) One-step purification of assembly-competent tubulin from diverse eukaryotic sources. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **23**, 4393–4401 doi:10.1091/mbc.E12-06-0444

- 167 Gascoigne, K.E., Takeuchi, K., Suzuki, A., Hori, T., Fukagawa, T. and Cheeseman, I.M. (2011) Induced ectopic kinetochore assembly bypasses the requirement for CENP-A nucleosomes. *Cell* **145**, 410–422 doi:10.1016/j.cell.2011.03.031
- 168 Akiyoshi, B., Nelson, C.R. and Biggins, S. (2013) The Aurora B kinase promotes inner and outer kinetochore interactions in budding yeast. *Genetics* **194**, 785–789 doi:10.1534/genetics.113.150839
- 169 Gascoigne, K.E. and Cheeseman, I.M. (2013) CDK-dependent phosphorylation and nuclear exclusion coordinately control kinetochore assembly state. *J. Cell Biol.* **201**, 23–32 doi:10.1083/jcb.201301006
- 170 Kim, S. and Yu, H. (2015) Multiple assembly mechanisms anchor the KMN spindle checkpoint platform at human mitotic kinetochores. *J. Cell Biol.* **208**, 181–196 doi:10.1083/jcb.201407074
- 171 Rago, F., Gascoigne, K.E. and Cheeseman, I.M. (2015) Distinct organization and regulation of the outer kinetochore KMN network downstream of CENP-C and CENP-T. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, 671–677 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.01.059
- 172 Hocegger, H., Hégarat, N. and Pereira-Leal, J.B. (2013) Aurora at the pole and equator: overlapping functions of Aurora kinases in the mitotic spindle. *Open Biol.* **3**, 120185 doi:10.1098/rsob.120185
- 173 Carmona, M., Wheelock, M., Funabiki, H. and Earnshaw, W.C. (2012) The chromosomal passenger complex (CPC): from easy rider to the godfather of mitosis. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **13**, 789–803 doi:10.1038/nrm3474
- 174 Francisco, L., Wang, W. and Chan, C.S. (1994) Type 1 protein phosphatase acts in opposition to Ipl1 protein kinase in regulating yeast chromosome segregation. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **14**, 4731–4740 doi:10.1128/MCB.14.7.4731
- 175 Liu, D., Vleugel, M., Backer, C.B., Hori, T., Fukagawa, T., Cheeseman, I.M. et al. (2010) Regulated targeting of protein phosphatase 1 to the outer kinetochore by KNL1 opposes Aurora B kinase. *J. Cell Biol.* **188**, 809–820 doi:10.1083/jcb.201001006
- 176 Tanaka, T.U., Rachidi, N., Janke, C., Pereira, G., Galova, M., Schiebel, E. et al. (2002) Evidence that the Ipl1-Sli15 (Aurora kinase-INCENP) complex promotes chromosome bi-orientation by altering kinetochore-spindle pole connections. *Cell* **108**, 317–329 doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(02)00633-5
- 177 Andrews, P.D., Ovechkina, Y., Morrice, N., Wagenbach, M., Duncan, K., Wordeman, L. et al. (2004) Aurora B regulates MCAK at the mitotic centromere. *Dev. Cell* **6**, 253–268 doi:10.1016/S1534-5807(04)00025-5
- 178 Watanabe, Y. (2010) Temporal and spatial regulation of targeting aurora B to the inner centromere. *Cold Spring Harb. Symp. Quant. Biol.* **75**, 419–423 doi:10.1101/sqb.2010.75.035
- 179 Lampson, M.A. and Cheeseman, I.M. (2011) Sensing centromere tension: Aurora B and the regulation of kinetochore function. *Trends Cell Biol.* **21**, 133–140 doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2010.10.007
- 180 Zaytsev, A.V., Segura-Peña, D., Godzi, M., Calderon, A., Ballister, E.R., Stamatov, R. et al. (2016) Bistability of a coupled Aurora B kinase-phosphatase system in cell division. *eLife* **5**, e10644 doi:10.7554/eLife.10644
- 181 Bloom, K.S. (2014) Centromeric heterochromatin: the primordial segregation machine. *Annu. Rev. Genet.* **48**, 457–484 doi:10.1146/annurev-genet-120213-092033
- 182 Goshima, G. and Yanagida, M. (2000) Establishing biorientation occurs with precocious separation of the sister kinetochores, but not the arms, in the early spindle of budding yeast. *Cell* **100**, 619–633 doi:10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80699-6
- 183 Cooke, C.A., Heck, M.M. and Earnshaw, W.C. (1987) The inner centromere protein (INCENP) antigens: movement from inner centromere to midbody during mitosis. *J. Cell Biol.* **105**, 2053–2067 doi:10.1083/jcb.105.5.2053
- 184 Dawe, R.K., Reed, L.M., Yu, H.G., Muszynski, M.G. and Hiatt, E.N. (1999) A maize homolog of mammalian CENPC is a constitutive component of the inner kinetochore. *Plant Cell Online* **11**, 1227–1238 doi:10.1105/tpc.11.7.1227
- 185 Fujiwara, T., Tanaka, K., Kuroiwa, T. and Hirano, T. (2013) Spatiotemporal dynamics of condensins I and II: evolutionary insights from the primitive red alga *Cyanidioschyzon merolae*. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **24**, 2515–2527 doi:10.1091/mbc.E13-04-0208
- 186 Prensier, G. and Slomianny, C. (1986) The karyotype of *Plasmodium falciparum* determined by ultrastructural serial sectioning and 3D reconstruction. *J. Parasitol.* **72**, 731–736 doi:10.2307/3281465
- 187 Ureña, F. (1986) Three-dimensional reconstructions of the mitotic spindle and dense plaques in three species of *Leishmania*. *Z. Parasitenkd.* **72**, 299–306 doi:10.1007/BF00928739
- 188 Campbell, C.S. and Desai, A. (2013) Tension sensing by Aurora B kinase is independent of survivin-based centromere localization. *Nature* **497**, 118–121 doi:10.1038/nature12057
- 189 London, N. and Biggins, S. (2014) Signalling dynamics in the spindle checkpoint response. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **15**, 736–747 doi:10.1038/nrm3888
- 190 Vleugel, M., Hoogendoorn, E., Snel, B. and Kops, G.J.P.L. (2012) Evolution and function of the mitotic checkpoint. *Dev. Cell* **23**, 239–250 doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2012.06.013
- 191 Vicente, J.-J. and Cande, W.Z. (2014) Mad2, Bub3, and Mps1 regulate chromosome segregation and mitotic synchrony in *Giardia intestinalis*, a binucleate protist lacking an anaphase-promoting complex. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **25**, 2774–2787 doi:10.1091/mbc.E14-05-0975
- 192 Li, R. and Murray, A.W. (1991) Feedback control of mitosis in budding yeast. *Cell* **66**, 519–531 doi:10.1016/0092-8674(81)90015-5
- 193 Hoyt, M.A., Totis, L. and Roberts, B.T. (1991) *S. cerevisiae* genes required for cell cycle arrest in response to loss of microtubule function. *Cell* **66**, 507–517 doi:10.1016/0092-8674(81)90014-3
- 194 He, X., Patterson, T.E. and Sazer, S. (1997) The *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* spindle checkpoint protein mad2p blocks anaphase and genetically interacts with the anaphase-promoting complex. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **94**, 7965–7970 doi:10.1073/pnas.94.15.7965
- 195 Buffin, E., Emre, D. and Karess, R.E. (2007) Flies without a spindle checkpoint. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **9**, 565–572 doi:10.1038/ncb1570
- 196 Wild, T., Larsen, M.S.Y., Narita, T., Schou, J., Nilsson, J. and Choudhary, C. (2016) The spindle assembly checkpoint is not essential for viability of human cells with genetically lowered APC/C activity. *Cell Rep.* **14**, 1829–1840 doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2016.01.060
- 197 Craney, A., Kelly, A., Jia, L., Fedrigo, I., Yu, H. and Rape, M. (2016) Control of APC/C-dependent ubiquitin chain elongation by reversible phosphorylation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 1540–1545 doi:10.1073/pnas.1522423113
- 198 Fujimitsu, K., Grimaldi, M. and Yamano, H. (2016) Cyclin dependent kinase 1-dependent activation of APC/C ubiquitin ligase. *Science* doi:10.1126/science.aad3925
- 199 Jia, L., Li, B. and Yu, H. (2016) The Bub1-Plk1 kinase complex promotes spindle checkpoint signalling through Cdc20 phosphorylation. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 10818 doi:10.1038/ncomms10818

- 200 Qiao, R., Weissmann, F., Yamaguchi, M., Brown, N.G., VanderLinden, R., Imre, R. et al. (2016) Mechanism of APC/C^{CDC20} activation by mitotic phosphorylation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, E2570–E2578 doi:10.1073/pnas.1604929113
- 201 Zhang, S., Chang, L., Alfieri, C., Zhang, Z., Yang, J., Maslen, S. et al. (2016) Molecular mechanism of APC/C activation by mitotic phosphorylation. *Nature* **533**, 260–264 doi:10.1038/nature17973
- 202 Ploubidou, A., Robinson, D.R., Docherty, R.C., Ogbadoyi, E.O. and Gull, K. (1999) Evidence for novel cell cycle checkpoints in trypanosomes: kinetoplast segregation and cytokinesis in the absence of mitosis. *J. Cell. Sci.* **112**(Pt 24), 4641–4650 PMID: 10574712
- 203 Gluenz, E., Sharma, R., Carrington, M. and Gull, K. (2008) Functional characterization of cohesin subunit SCC1 in *Trypanosoma brucei* and dissection of mutant phenotypes in two life cycle stages. *Mol. Microbiol.* **69**, 666–680 doi:10.1111/j.1365-2958.2008.06320.x
- 204 Singh, N., Wiltshire, T.D., Thompson, J.R., Mer, G. and Couch, F.J. (2012) Molecular basis for the association of microcephalin (MCPH1) protein with the cell division cycle protein 27 (Cdc27) subunit of the anaphase-promoting complex. *J. Biol. Chem.* **287**, 2854–2862 doi:10.1074/jbc.M111.307868
- 205 Atkins, M.S., Teske, A.P. and Anderson, O.R. (2000) A survey of flagellate diversity at four deep-sea hydrothermal vents in the Eastern Pacific Ocean using structural and molecular approaches. *J. Eukaryot. Microbiol.* **47**, 400–411 doi:10.1111/j.1550-7408.2000.tb00067.x
- 206 López-García, P., Philippe, H., Gail, F. and Moreira, D. (2003) Autochthonous eukaryotic diversity in hydrothermal sediment and experimental microcolonizers at the Mid-Atlantic Ridge. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **100**, 697–702 doi:10.1073/pnas.0235779100
- 207 Flegontov, P., Votýpka, J., Skalický, T., Logacheva, M.D., Penin, A.A., Tanifuji, G. et al. (2013) *Paratrypanosoma* is a novel early-branching trypanosomatid. *Curr. Biol.* **23**, 1787–1793 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2013.07.045
- 208 d'Ávila-Levy, C.M., Boucinha, C., Kostygov, A., Santos, H.L.C., Morelli, K.A., Grybchuk-Ieremenko, A. et al. (2015) Exploring the environmental diversity of kinetoplastid flagellates in the high-throughput DNA sequencing era. *Mem. Inst. Oswaldo Cruz* **110**, 956–965 doi:10.1590/0074-02760150253
- 209 Moreira, D., López-García, P. and Vickerman, K. (2004) An updated view of kinetoplastid phylogeny using environmental sequences and a closer outgroup: proposal for a new classification of the class Kinetoplastea. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* **54**, 1861–1875 doi:10.1099/ijs.0.63081-0
- 210 Simpson, A.G.B., Stevens, J.R. and Lukeš, J. (2006) The evolution and diversity of kinetoplastid flagellates. *Trends Parasitol.* **22**, 168–174 doi:10.1016/j.pt.2006.02.006
- 211 Jackson, A.P., Otto, T.D., Aslett, M., Armstrong, S.D., Bringaud, F., Schlacht, A. et al. (2016) Kinetoplastid phylogenomics reveals the evolutionary innovations associated with the origins of parasitism. *Curr. Biol.* **26**, 161–172 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.11.055
- 212 Porcel, B.M., Deneoud, F., Opperdoes, F., Noel, B., Madoui, M.-A., Hammarton, T.C. et al. (2014) The streamlined genome of *Phytomonas* spp. relative to human pathogenic kinetoplastids reveals a parasite tailored for plants. *PLoS Genet.* **10**, e1004007 doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004007
- 213 Tanifuji, G., Kim, E., Onodera, N.T., Gibeault, R., Dlutek, M., Cawthorn, R.J. et al. (2011) Genomic characterization of *Neoparamoeba pemaquidensis* (Amoebozoa) and its kinetoplastid endosymbiont. *Eukaryotic Cell* **10**, 1143–1146 doi:10.1128/EC.05027-11
- 214 Walker, G., Dorrell, R.G., Schlacht, A. and Dacks, J.B. (2011) Eukaryotic systematics: a user's guide for cell biologists and parasitologists. *Parasitology* **138**, 1638–1663 doi:10.1017/S0031182010001708
- 215 Adl, S.M., Simpson, A.G.B., Lane, C.E., Lukeš, J., Bass, D., Bowser, S.S. et al. (2012) The revised classification of eukaryotes. *J. Eukaryot. Microbiol.* **59**, 429–514 doi:10.1111/j.1550-7408.2012.00644.x
- 216 O'Neill, E.C., Trick, M., Hill, L., Rejzek, M., Dusi, R.G., Hamilton, C.J. et al. (2015) The transcriptome of *Euglena gracilis* reveals unexpected metabolic capabilities for carbohydrate and natural product biochemistry. *Mol. Biosyst.* **11**, 2808–2820 doi:10.1039/C5MB00319A
- 217 Malik, H.S. and Henikoff, S. (2003) Phylogenomics of the nucleosome. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* **10**, 882–891 doi:10.1038/nsb996
- 218 Marande, W., Lukes, J. and Burger, G. (2005) Unique mitochondrial genome structure in diplomonids, the sister group of kinetoplastids. *Eukaryotic Cell* **4**, 1137–1146 doi:10.1128/EC.4.6.1137-1146.2005
- 219 Lukeš, J., Flegontova, O. and Horák, A. (2015) Diplomonids. *Curr. Biol.* **25**, R702–R704 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2015.04.052
- 220 de Vargas, C., Audic, S., Henry, N., Decelle, J., Mahé, F., Logares, R. et al. (2015) Eukaryotic plankton diversity in the sunlit ocean. *Science* **348**, 1261605 doi:10.1126/science.1261605
- 221 Yubuki, N., Edgcomb, V.P., Bernhard, J.M. and Leander, B.S. (2009) Ultrastructure and molecular phylogeny of *Calkinsia aureus*: cellular identity of a novel clade of deep-sea euglenozoans with epibiotic bacteria. *BMC Microbiol.* **9**, 16 doi:10.1186/1471-2180-9-16
- 222 Yutin, N. and Koonin, E.V. (2012) Archaeal origin of tubulin. *Biol. Direct* **7**, 10 doi:10.1186/1745-6150-7-10
- 223 Williams, T.A., Foster, P.G., Cox, C.J. and Embley, T.M. (2013) An archaeal origin of eukaryotes supports only two primary domains of life. *Nature* **504**, 231–236 doi:10.1038/nature12779
- 224 Spang, A., Saw, J.H., Jørgensen, S.L., Zaremba-Niedzwiedzka, K., Martijn, J., Lind, A.E. et al. (2015) Complex archaea that bridge the gap between prokaryotes and eukaryotes. *Nature* **521**, 173–179 doi:10.1038/nature14447
- 225 Embley, T.M. and Martin, W. (2006) Eukaryotic evolution, changes and challenges. *Nature* **440**, 623–630 doi:10.1038/nature04546
- 226 Stechmann, A. and Cavalier-Smith, T. (2002) Rooting the eukaryote tree by using a derived gene fusion. *Science* **297**, 89–91 doi:10.1126/science.1071196
- 227 Rogozin, I.B., Basu, M.K., Csürös, M. and Koonin, E.V. (2009) Analysis of rare genomic changes does not support the unikont-bikont phylogeny and suggests cyanobacterial symbiosis as the point of primary radiation of eukaryotes. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **1**, 99–113 doi:10.1093/gbe/evp011
- 228 Katz, L.A., Grant, J.R., Parfrey, L.W. and Burleigh, J.G. (2012) Turning the crown upside down: gene tree parsimony roots the eukaryotic tree of life. *Syst. Biol.* **61**, 653–660 doi:10.1093/sysbio/sys026
- 229 Cavalier-Smith, T. (2010) Kingdoms Protozoa and Chromista and the eozoan root of the eukaryotic tree. *Biol. Lett.* **6**, 342–345 doi:10.1098/rsbl.2009.0948
- 230 Allen, J.W.A., Jackson, A.P., Rigden, D.J., Willis, A.C., Ferguson, S.J. and Ginger, M.L. (2008) Order within a mosaic distribution of mitochondrial c-type cytochrome biogenesis systems? *FEBS J.* **275**, 2385–2402 doi:10.1111/j.1742-4658.2008.06380.x
- 231 Nishino, M., Choy, J.W., Gushwa, N.N., Osés-Prieto, J.A., Koupparis, K., Burlingame, A.L. et al. (2013) Hypothemycin, a fungal natural product, identifies therapeutic targets in *Trypanosoma brucei*. *elife* **2**, e00712 doi:10.7554/eLife.00712
- 232 Merritt, C., Silva, L.E., Tanner, A.L., Stuart, K. and Pollastri, M.P. (2014) Kinases as druggable targets in trypanosomatid protozoan parasites. *Chem. Rev.* **114**, 11280–11304 doi:10.1021/cr500197d