

THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Comment on "A centrosome-independent role for gamma-TuRC proteins in the spindle assembly checkpoint"

Citation for published version:

Taylor, SS, Hardwick, KG, Sawin, KE, Biggins, S, Piatti, S, Khodjakov, A, Rieder, CL, Salmon, ED & Musacchio, A 2007, 'Comment on "A centrosome-independent role for gamma-TuRC proteins in the spindle assembly checkpoint" Science, vol 316, no. 5827, pp. 982., 10.1126/science.1139484

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

10.1126/science.1139484

Link: Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer

Document Version: Author final version (often known as postprint)

Published In: Science

Publisher Rights Statement: RoMEO green

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Édinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.





NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Science. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2008 December 1

Published in final edited form as: *Science*. 2007 May 18; 316(5827): 982. doi:10.1126/science.1139484.

Comment on "A Centrosome-Independent Role for γ-TuRC Proteins in the Spindle Assembly Checkpoint"

Stephen S. Taylor^{1,*}, Kevin G. Hardwick², Kenneth E. Sawin², Sue Biggins³, Simonetta Piatti⁴, Alexey Khodjakov⁵, Conly L. Rieder⁵, Edward D. Salmon⁶, and Andrea Musacchio^{7,*}

1 Faculty of Life Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

2Wellcome Trust Centre for Cell Biology, Institute of Cell Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK

3Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA

4Department of Biotechnology and Bioscience, University of Milan-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

5Division of Molecular Medicine, Wadsworth Center, New York State Department of Health, Albany, New York, USA

6Department of Biology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

7Department of Experimental Oncology, European Institute of Oncology, Milan, Italy

Abstract

Müller *et al.* (Reports, 27 October 2006, p. 654) showed that inhibition of the γ -tubulin ring complex (γ -TuRC) activates the spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC), which led them to suggest that γ -TuRC proteins play molecular roles in SAC activation. Because γ -TuRC inhibition leads to pleiotropic spindle defects, which are well known to activate kinetochore-derived checkpoint signaling, we believe that this conclusion is premature.

The spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC) is an inhibitory signaling network that delays anaphase onset until all the chromosomes are stably attached to spindle microtubules (MTs) by their kinetochores (1-3). Recently, Müller et al. (4) proposed that, in addition to kinetochores, the SAC is regulated by the γ -tubulin ring complex (γ -TuRC), which is required for MT nucleation at centrosomes and within the spindle (5,6). They showed that RNA interference-mediated inhibition of γ -TuRC has pleiotropic effects on spindle assembly, yielding monopolar spindles or bipolar spindles lacking centrosomes, consistent with previous observations (7,8). This in turn delays mitotic progression in a SAC-dependent manner. The simplest explanation for SAC activation is that inhibition of γ -TuRC induces spindle defects that prevent kinetochores from achieving full MT occupancy and/or coming under tension. However, the authors argue that this simple explanation is not sufficient to explain their observations, stating that γ -TuRC– deficient cells show "abundant microtubule arrays with amphitelic-like chromosome microtubule attachment." Instead, they hypothesize that γ -tubulin is part of a signaling complex that triggers the SAC when γ -TuRC proteins are abrogated. SAC activation in γ -TuRC–deficient cells argues against the hypothesis that γ -tubulin is an activator of the SAC, although in a formal sense, γ -TuRC proteins act as negative regulators of the SAC, as is true of other structural proteins required for spindle assembly. The fact that the SAC is not activated after repression of centrosomin (cnn), which removes γ -tubulin from spindle poles, is consistent with the notion that centrosome integrity is not essential for spindle assembly or timely anaphase onset (9,

^{*}To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: stephen.taylor@manchester.ac.uk (S.S.T.); andrea.musacchio@ifom-ieo-campus.it (A.M.).

10). However, in contrast to the authors' conclusion that γ -tubulin plays a direct role in the SAC, we favor the simple explanation, for two reasons. First, the presence of abundant microtubule arrays is not sufficient to inactivate the SAC. Second, although chromosomes may appear "amphitelic-like," this does not guarantee that all the kinetochores are stably attached to MTs. The following example illustrates these latter two points. Meta-phase cells treated with low doses of taxol or cooled to 23°C display normal bipolar MT arrays in which almost all the kinetochores are attached to microtubules from opposite spindle poles (i.e., "amphitelic-like"), yet in both cases, a SAC-dependent mitotic delay ensues (11,12). Indeed, because a single unattached kinetochore is sufficient to activate the SAC (13), the simplest explanation for the observations of Müller *et al.* is that inhibition of γ -TuRC perturbs spindle assembly and/or MT dynamics, which in turn results in inadequate levels of MT attachment and/or tension at all kinetochores, thereby activating the SAC and delaying mitotic progression.

References

- 1. Cleveland DW, Mao Y, Sullivan KF. Cell 2003;112:407. [PubMed: 12600307]
- 2. Musacchio A, Hardwick KG. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2002;3:731. [PubMed: 12360190]
- 3. Taylor SS, Scott MI, Holland AJ. Chromosome Res 2004;12:599. [PubMed: 15289666]
- Müller H, Fogeron ML, Lehmann V, Lehrach H, Lange BMH. Science 2006;314:654. [PubMed: 17068266]
- 5. Luders J, Patel UK, Stearns T. Nat Cell Biol 2006;8:137. [PubMed: 16378099]
- 6. Mahoney NM, Goshima G, Douglass AD, Vale RD. Curr Biol 2006;16:564. [PubMed: 16546079]
- 7. Colombie N, et al. Mol Biol Cell 2006;17:272. [PubMed: 16236791]
- Raynaud-Messina B, Mazzolini L, Moisand A, Cirinesi AM, Wright M. J Cell Sci 2004;117:5497. [PubMed: 15479719]
- 9. Khodjakov A, Cole RW, Oakley BR, Rieder CL. Curr Biol 2000;10:59. [PubMed: 10662665]
- 10. Megraw TL, Kao LR, Kaufman TC. Curr Biol 2001;11:116. [PubMed: 11231128]
- 11. Shannon KB, Canman JC, Salmon ED. Mol Biol Cell 2002;13:3706. [PubMed: 12388768]
- 12. Waters JC, Chen RH, Murray AW, Salmon ED. J Cell Biol 1998;141:1181. [PubMed: 9606210]
- 13. Rieder CL, Cole RW, Khodjakov A, Sluder G. J Cell Biol 1995;130:941. [PubMed: 7642709]