Centriole triplet microtubules are required for stable centriole formation and inheritance in human cells
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Summary

Centrioles are composed of long-lived microtubules arranged in nine triplets. In unicellular eukaryotes, loss of the noncanonical tubulins, delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin, result in loss of the triplet microtubule structure. However, the contribution of triplet microtubules to mammalian centriole formation and stability is unknown. Here, we report the first characterization of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin null human cells. Centrioles in cells lacking either delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin lack triplet microtubules and fail to undergo centriole maturation. These aberrant centrioles are formed de novo each cell cycle, but are unstable and do not persist to the next cell cycle, leading to a futile cycle of centriole formation and disintegration. Disintegration can be suppressed by paclitaxel treatment. Delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin physically interact, indicating that these tubulins act together to maintain triplet microtubules and that these are necessary for inheritance of centrioles from one cell cycle to the next.
Introduction

The major microtubule organizing center of mammalian cells, the centrosome, is composed of a pair of centrioles with associated appendages and pericentriolar material. The centrioles have a nine-fold symmetry and are formed, in part, of long-lived microtubules, which persist through multiple cell divisions (Kochanski and Borisy, 1990; Balestra et al., 2015). In most organisms, including humans, the centriolar microtubules have a triplet structure, found only in centrioles. This structure consists of a complete A-tubule and associated partial B-tubule attached to the A-tubule wall, and a partial C-tubule attached to the B-tubule wall.

The molecular mechanisms involved in making triplet microtubules are not well-understood, even in the well-characterized somatic centriole cycle of mammalian cells. In these cells centrioles duplicate once per cycle, such that daughter cells receive exactly one pair of centrioles. Centriole duplication is initiated at the G1-S transition when the kinase PLK4 localizes to a single focus on the mother centriole (Sonnen et al., 2012). Subsequently, the cartwheel, formed by SASS6 oligomerization, assembles to template the 9-fold symmetry of the centriole (Guichard et al., 2017; Hilbert et al., 2016). Microtubules are added to the cartwheel underneath a cap of CP110 (Kleylein-Sohn et al., 2007). By G2-M, the triplet microtubules are completely formed (Vorobjev and Chentsov, 1982). Subsequently, the A- and B-tubules elongate to the full ~500 nm length of the centriole, forming a distal compartment with doublet microtubules and marked by POC5 (Azimzadeh et al., 2009). In mitosis, the cartwheel is lost, the newly-formed centriole becomes disengaged from its mother, and acquires pericentriolar material (Vorobjev and Chentsov, 1980; Vorobjev and Chentsov, 1982; Khodjakov and Rieder, 1999; Tsou and Stearns, 2006; Tsou et al., 2009). In G2-M of the following cell cycle, the centriole acquires appendages, marking its maturation into a centriole that can nucleate a cilium (Graser et al., 2007; Guarguaglini et al., 2005).

Members of the tubulin superfamily are critical for centriole formation and function. All eukaryotes have alpha-, beta- and gamma-tubulin, but the tubulin superfamily also includes three less-studied members, delta-tubulin, epsilon-tubulin, and zeta-tubulin. Recent work has shown that these noncanonical tubulins are evolutionarily conserved, making up the ZED tubulin module (Turk et al., 2015). In the unicellular eukaryotes Chlamydomonas, Tetrahymena, Paramecium and Trypanosoma, mutations in delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin result in centrioles that lack triplet microtubules (Dupuis-Williams et al., 2002; Dutcher and Trabuco, 1998; Dutcher et al., 2002; Gadelha et al., 2006; Garreau de Loubresse et al., 2001; Goodenough and StClair, 1975; Ross et al., 2013). Humans and other placental mammals have delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin, but lack zeta-tubulin (Findeisen et al., 2014; Turk et al., 2015). Here, we
show that human cells lacking delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin also lack triplets, that this results in unstable centrioles and initiation of a futile cycle of centriole formation and disintegration, and identify an interaction between delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin.

**Results and Discussion**

To determine the roles of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin in the mammalian centriole cycle, null mutations in TUBD1 and TUBE1 were made using CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing in hTERT RPE-1 human cells. Recent work has established that loss of centrioles in mammalian cells results in a p53-dependent cell-cycle arrest (Bazzi and Anderson, 2014; Lambrus et al., 2015; Wong et al., 2015). We found that homozygous null mutations of delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin could only be isolated in TP53-/- cells, thus all subsequent experiments use RPE1 TP53-/- cells as the control.

Three TUBD1-/- and two TUBE1-/- cell lines were generated (Figure 1A and Figure 3 – supplemental figure 1). The TUBD1-/- lines are all compound heterozygotes bearing, proximal to the cut site, small deletions of less than 20 base pairs on one chromosome and insertion of one base pair on the other, resulting in frameshift and premature stop mutations. The two TUBE1-/- lines are compound heterozygotes bearing large deletions surrounding the cut site, that in each case remove an entire exon and surrounding DNA, including the ATG start site. In all cases, the next available ATG is not in-frame. We conclude that these alleles are likely to be null, or strong loss-of-function mutations.

We next assessed the phenotype of TUBD1-/- and TUBE1-/- cells stably expressing GFP-centrin as a marker of centrioles. Many cells in an asynchronous population had multiple, unpaired centrin foci (Fig. 1B). These foci also labeled with the centriolar proteins CP110 and SASS6 (see Figs 2 and 3). To determine whether these foci are centrioles, and to assess their ultrastructure, we analyzed them using correlative light-electron microscopy. In serial sections of interphase TUBE1-/- (Fig 1B) and TUBD1-/- (Fig 1C) cells, some of the centrin-positive foci corresponded to structures that resemble centrioles, but were narrower and shorter than typical centrioles and lack appendages. They contained a ~80 nm wide central lumen, with luminal content resembling cartwheel architecture that extends throughout the centriole’s length (Fig 1 – supplement 1).

Centrioles in TUBD1-/- and TUBE1-/- cells were of similar diameter: 165 nm +/-15 nm in TUBD1-/- cells (n = 19 centrioles), 164 nm +/-13 nm in TUBE1-/- cells (n = 11 centrioles), compared to 220 nm diameter of the proximal end of typical mammalian cell centrioles (Loncarek et al., 2008; Wang et al., 2015). The reduced diameter of these
aberrant centrioles is consistent with the presence of only singlet microtubules. Indeed, only singlet microtubules were identified in the two cross-sections observed, from 

\[ TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells (Figure 1C). These results demonstrate that cells lacking either delta-} 
\]

\[ \text{tubulin or epsilon-tubulin form defective centrioles that lack normal triplet microtubules.} \]

This is similar to the defects reported for delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin mutants in unicellular eukaryotes.

Centrioles in both tubulin mutants were also shorter than typical, mature centrioles: 230 nm +/-45 nm in \[ TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells (n = 14 centrioles), and 271 nm +/-43 nm in } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells (n = 11 centrioles), compared to approximately 500 nm for typical human cell} \]

\[ \text{centrioles (Paintrand et al., 1992). Newly-formed mammalian centrioles, or} \]

\[ \text{procentrioles, reach their full length by elongation in G2-M, creating a distal} \]

\[ \text{compartment that is a feature of centrioles in some, but not all, organisms. We sought to} \]

\[ \text{determine whether the aberrant centrioles in } TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ and } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells are} \]

\[ \text{capable of elongation and formation of the distal compartment. We analyzed the} \]

\[ \text{ultrastructure of centrioles in a } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ prometaphase cell using correlative light-} \]

\[ \text{electron microscopy (Fig. 2A). These aberrant centrioles (n = 3) exhibited a striking} \]

\[ \text{morphological phenotype, consisting of two electron-dense segments, one of } \approx 50 \text{ nm} \]

\[ \text{and the other of } \approx 200 \text{ nm, connected by singlet microtubules spanning a gap of } \approx 250 \text{ nm. The total length (} \approx 500 \text{ nm) of these structures approximates that of typical mature} \]

\[ \text{mammalian centrioles.} \]

We hypothesized that the aberrant centrioles formed in \[ TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ and } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells} \]

\[ \text{elongate in G2-M, but that only the A-tubule is present and thus able to elongate as a} \]

\[ \text{singlet. In this model, the shorter, distal density might correspond to the CP110 cap,} \]

\[ \text{under which the centriolar microtubules elongate (Kleylein-Sohn et al., 2007). The} \]

\[ \text{longer, } 200 \text{ nm density corresponds to the proximal centriole end containing the} \]

\[ \text{cartwheel, as observed above in interphase cells. A prediction of this model is that the} \]

\[ \text{distance between CP110 and the SASS6 fluorescent labels would increase by about} \]

\[ 200 \text{ nm in mitosis. We found that in } TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ and } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ interphase cells, similar to} \]

\[ \text{control } TP53 \text{-/-} \text{ cells, the centroids of CP110 and SASS6 foci were separated by a} \]

\[ \text{mean distance of } 0.3 \text{ µm, whereas in mitotic cells the foci were separated by a mean} \]

\[ \text{distance of } 0.5 \text{ µm (Fig 2B and 2C). Thus, centrioles in } TUBD1 \text{-/-} \text{ and } TUBE1 \text{-/-} \text{ cells} \]

\[ \text{elongate at the appropriate time in the cell cycle, and have a cap and proximal end} \]

\[ \text{typical of newly-formed centrioles. The lack of electron-dense structure between the} \]

\[ \text{cartwheel and cap might be due to a failure to recruit distal compartment components.} \]

\[ \text{Consistent with this, we found that the distal compartment component POC5 is absent} \]

\[ \text{from these aberrant centrioles (Fig 2D).} \]
Together, these results indicate that the primary centriolar defect in cells lacking delta-
tubulin or epsilon-tubulin is the absence of triplet microtubules. To determine the
consequences of loss of triplet microtubules on the centriole cycle and centrosome
formation, we first determined the distribution of centrioles in asynchronously dividing
cell populations, as determined by staining for the established centriole proteins centrin
and CP110. TP53 -/- control cells had a typical centriole number distribution, with
approximately 50% of cells having two centrioles, corresponding to cells in G1 phase,
and 40% having three to four centrioles, corresponding to cells in S through M phases.
In contrast, in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, approximately 50% of cells had 5 or more
centriole foci, whereas 50% of cells had no detectable foci positive for both centrin and
CP110 (Fig. 3A and 3B). Similar centriole distributions were found in other,
independently derived, TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cell lines. In addition, this phenotype
could be rescued by expression of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin, respectively (Fig 3
– supplement 1A – 1C).

We reasoned that a possible explanation for the centriole distribution in TUBD1 -/- and
TUBE1 -/- cells is that the centriole structures we observed by EM are produced de
novo in each cell cycle, and that these aberrant centrioles are unstable and do not
persist into the next cell cycle. This hypothesis predicts that the aberrant centrioles in
TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells would 1) not be paired, since de novo centrioles only
form in the absence of an existing centriole, 2) lack markers of maturation such as distal
appendages, since they would not persist to the point of acquiring such proteins, 3) fail
to recruit substantial pericentriolar material, since the centriole-centrosome conversion
occurs at entry to the next cell cycle, and 4) would be formed in S phase, and be lost at
some point prior to the subsequent S phase.

In agreement with this hypothesis, the centrioles, as visualized by centrin and CP110
were never observed to be closely apposed, as is typical of wild-type cells (Fig. 3A).
Rather, in interphase they appeared to be distributed within the central region of the cell
(Fig. 3A). The centrioles in asynchronous TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells all lacked
Cep164, a component of the centriolar distal appendage and marker of mature
centrioles that have progressed through at least one cell cycle (Fig. 3C), whereas
approximately 40% of all centrioles were positive for Cep164 in asynchronous control
cells, consistent with the cycle of distal appendage acquisition (Nigg and Stearns,
2011). Lastly, most of the centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells lacked
detectable gamma-tubulin (Fig. 3C), and those that stained positive had less than
centrioles in control cells (Fig 3 – supplement 1D). In addition, we noted that SASS6,
the cartwheel protein that is present in nascent and recently-formed centrioles, but is
lost from centrioles at the mitosis-interphase transition in human cells, was present in
most of the centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, consistent with these centrioles
originating in the observed cell cycle, but not having successfully persisted into the subsequent cell cycle.

To investigate the fate of newly-formed centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, we next tested the cell cycle-dependence of the formation and loss of aberrant centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells (Fig 4A). As in previous experiments, about 50% of TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells in an asynchronous population had centrin and CP110-positive foci corresponding to aberrant centrioles. TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells were analyzed in different cell cycle stages as follows: G0/G1 – synchronized by serum withdrawal, S phase – identified from asynchronous culture by PCNA labeling, G2 – synchronized by the CDK1 inhibitor RO-3306, and M – identified from asynchronous culture by presence of condensed chromatin (Fig. 4A). TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells in G0/G1 mostly lacked centriole structures, whereas cells in S-phase, G2 and mitosis had them. These results indicate that in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, aberrant centrioles are formed in S-phase, persist into mitosis, and are absent in G1. We note that this loss of centriole structure is likely due to a specific event that occurs at the mitosis-interphase transition, rather than simply time since formation, since cells were arrested in G2 for 24 h, which is substantially longer than the normal progression through mitosis to G1, yet the centriole structures persisted (Fig 4A).

To more finely determine the timing of centriole loss in the mitosis-interphase transition, control or TUBE1 -/- cells were synchronized by mitotic shakeoff, and the presence of centriole foci was assessed over time as cells entered G1 (Fig 4B). In control cells, the number of centrioles follows the pattern expected from the centriole duplication cycle. In TUBE1 -/- cells, the majority of mitotic cells had centrioles. By 1 h after shakeoff, the fraction of interphase cells without centrioles had increased to 50%, and this fraction continued to increase at 2 h and 3 h after shakeoff. By 12 h after shakeoff, 56 +/-12% of cells had entered S-phase, and centriole structures began to appear, consistent with de novo centriole formation. Thus, delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin are not required to initiate centriole formation in human cells, but the aberrant centrioles that form in their absence are unstable and disintegrate during progression from M phase to the subsequent G1 phase.

Centrioles formed de novo can persist to form fully mature centrioles (Lambrus et al., 2015; Wong et al., 2015), but have also been reported to be structurally defective (Wang et al., 2015). We tested whether the phenotype we observed is specific to loss of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin, rather than a property of de novo centrioles in general, by assessing whether de novo centrioles formed in the presence of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin would also disintegrate upon cell cycle progression. RPE-1 TP53 -/- cells were treated with centrinone to inhibit PLK4 (Wong et al., 2015), a kinase required for
centriole duplication, for more than 2 weeks to obtain acentriolar cells. Centrinone was then washed out from mitotic cells; by 12 h after shakeoff, 36% of cells had entered S-phase, and centriole structures began to appear, consistent with de novo centriole formation. However, in contrast to TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, these de novo centrioles persisted through the subsequent G1 (Fig 4C). We conclude that centriole instability in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells is due to a specific defect in their structure, and is not a general feature of de novo centrioles, similar to previous reports (La Terra et al., 2005).

We hypothesized that centriole disintegration may result from instability of the centriolar microtubules, perhaps as a result of elongation in G2-M phase. To test this, microtubules were stabilized in G2-M stage TUBE1 -/- cells by addition of the microtubule-stabilizing drug paclitaxel. This treatment did not inhibit centriole elongation (Fig 4 - supplement 1B). Cells were allowed to enter mitosis in the presence of paclitaxel, and subsequently forced out of mitosis using the CDK inhibitor RO-3306. This treatment was sufficient to stabilize centrioles from mutant cells in G1, compared with cells that had not been treated with paclitaxel (Fig 4D and Fig 4 - supplement 1). These stabilized centrioles lose their SASS6 cartwheel and fail to recruit detectable gamma-tubulin (Fig 4 - supplement 1). We conclude that stabilization of the centriolar microtubules in TUBE1 -/- cells stabilizes the centriole structure.

One striking observation of this work is that the phenotypes of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin null mutants are similar. This strongly suggests that the proteins work together to accomplish their function. To test this hypothesis, we assessed the ability of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin to interact by co-expression in human HEK293T cells. Epsilon-tubulin could be immunoprecipitated with delta-tubulin from co-expressing cells, and not from control cells (Fig 5A).

Together, our results show that delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin act together to create or stabilize structural features of centrioles. The most obvious such feature is the triplet microtubules, which define centrioles in most species, and are absent in delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin mutant cells in all organisms which have been examined. This suggests that delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin are required either to form the triplet microtubules, or to stabilize them against depolymerization. The former seems unlikely, since the presence of triplet centriolar microtubules is not strictly correlated with the presence of delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin in evolution (Fig 5B and Fig 5 - Supplemental Table 1). Among the organisms that completely lack the ZED tubulin module, C. elegans lacks triplet microtubules, but both Drosophila and the primitive plant Ginkgo biloba have triplet microtubules in their sperm cells. Since loss of the entire ZED tubulin module must have occurred independently in the dipteran insect and plant lineages, the most
parsimonious interpretation is that triplet microtubule formation itself does not require
delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin, rather than that these two lineages independently
evolved mechanisms of triplet formation in their absence. Thus, we propose that delta-
tubulin and epsilon-tubulin are required for stabilization of the centriolar triplets in most
organisms, such that the centrioles can mature and recruit other proteins. We do not yet
know the molecular basis of this differential requirement for delta-tubulin or epsilon-
tubulins with respect to microtubule triplet stability. However, we note that the few
centriole-bearing organisms that lack delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin have simpler
centriole structures that lack distal appendages, and, to the extent it is possible to tell,
lack a distal compartment that is typical of more complex centrioles.

Why do centrioles disintegrate in delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin mutant cells? We
have shown that in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, aberrant centrioles with elongated
singlet microtubules connecting the proximal and distal centriole segments become
unstable as cells progress through mitosis. This is remarkably similar to the progressive
loss of centrioles described in the original characterization of the epsilon-tubulin mutant
bald-2 by Goodenough and St. Clair (Goodenough and StClair, 1975). In human cells,
Izquierdo, et al. reported that centrioles in CEP295 -/- human cells also become
unstable upon cell cycle progression, due to a failure of centrioles to recruit
pericentriolar material that coincides with loss of the cartwheel during the centriole-to-
centrosome conversion at the end of mitosis (Izquierdo et al., 2014). Although the
phenotypes are outwardly similar to the phenotypes we describe here, CEP295 is
conserved in species lacking delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin (Fu et al., 2015), and
centrioles in Chlamydomonas do not undergo centriole-to-centrosome conversion. We
propose that the post-duplication centriole elongation that creates the distal
compartment of the centriole is a critical time in centriole stability, and that the triplet
microtubules, either directly or through proteins that associate with them, are required to
prevent centriole disassembly subsequent to that step. One possible basis for the
instability is that events at the distal end of the centriole associated with preparing it to
serve as a basal body for a cilium in G1 expose the ends of the centriolar microtubules.
The doublet microtubules normally present at the end would be resistant to
depolymerization in this model, but the singlets found in delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin
mutants might be unstable. In accordance with this possibility, stabilization of centriolar
microtubules with paclitaxel was able to prevent centriole disintegration, even when
both the SASS6 cartwheel and pericentriolar material are lost (Fig 4D and Fig 4 –
supplement 1). Another possibility is that centrioles lacking the normal triplet structure
would likely also lack the A-C linker, which is visible in EM as a bridge between the A-
and C-tubules of adjoining triplets. Perhaps the A-C linker is most important for stability
after the full elongation of the centriolar microtubules. No components of the A-C linker
have been identified, but the *poc1* mutant in Tetrahymena causes partial loss of this linker and results in instability of triplet microtubules (Meehl et al., 2016).

Here we have shown that delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin likely work together in a critical function for centriole structure and function, and that cells lacking delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin undergo a futile cycle of *de novo* centriole formation and disintegration. Our results show that in human cells, delta-tubulin and epsilon-tubulin act to stabilize centriole structures necessary for inheritance of centrioles from one cell cycle to the next, perhaps by stabilizing the main structural feature of centrioles, the triplet microtubules.
Figure legends

Figure 1: Centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells are short and lack triplet microtubules
A) Gene loci for TUBD1 (ch17:59889203-59891260) and TUBE1 (ch6: 11207685-11209742) in control and TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells (GRCh38.p7 Primary Assembly). Dark green boxes: exons, Arrows: translation start site, Red triangle: Cas9 cut site. TUBD1 -/- cells are compound heterozygotes, containing a 8 nt deletion (ch17:59891019-59891026) on one allele, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 49 amino acids, and an insertion at nt 59891024 on the other, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 39 amino acids. The next ATG is not in-frame for either allele. TUBE1 -/- cells are also compound heterozygotes, containing a 266 nt deletion (ch6:112087525-112087790) on one allele, removing exon 2 and resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 8 amino acids, and a 545 nt deletion (ch6:112086987-112087531) on the other allele, removing the first exon and the ATG. The next ATG is not in-frame for either allele. B) Centrioles from TUBE1 -/- cells. Left: DIC image and maximum intensity projection of TUBE1 -/- GFP-centrin cells. Boxed GFP-centrin foci were then analyzed by correlative electron microscopy. Right: electron micrographs of centrioles from boxed foci. Centrioles are numbered and serial sections are adjacent to each other. Scale bar: 250 nm C) Centrioles from TUBD1 -/- cells. Four centrioles are shown, and serial sections are adjacent to each other. For cross-sections from centrioles 1 and 2, a higher magnification image is placed third to show the presence of singlet microtubules (boxed). Arrows indicate singlet microtubules. Scale bar: 250 nm

Figure 1 – figure supplement 1: Comparison to control centrioles
Left: mature mother centriole from wildtype RPE-1 cells. Right: centriole from TUBE1 -/- cell. Scale bar: 250 nm

Figure 2: Centrioles in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells elongate but fail to recruit POC5
A) Correlative light-electron micrographs of centrioles in a prometaphase TUBE1 -/- cell. Centrioles are numbered. Left: DIC image. Boxed centriole in overview corresponds to centriole 1. For centrioles 2 and 3, two serial sections are shown, as marked on figure. For each centriole, the proximal density is located on the left, and the distal density is located on the right. Scale bars: overview, 10 μm; inset: 250 nm. B) CP110 and SASS6 separation distance in interphase and mitotic cells. Images are maximum projections of 250 nm confocal stacks. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-. Scale bars: overview, 5 μm, inset: 500 nm. C) Quantification of CP110 and SASS6 separation distance. For each data point, 36 centrioles were measured. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-. Error bars
represent the SEM. For each cell type, mitotic measurements are significantly different from interphase measurements (two-tailed unpaired t-test, p<0.0001). D) Quantification of the number of centrioles with POC5 localization in mitotic cells. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

**Figure 3: Centriole distribution and composition in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells**

A) Centriole phenotype for TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells. Two cells for each mutant are shown: one with no centrioles and the other with multiple centrioles. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

B) Quantification of centriole number distribution in asynchronous cells, as measured by centrin and CP110 colocalization. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

C) Quantification of the percent of centrin foci that colocalize with indicated centriole markers. SASS6 marks early centrioles but is absent from mature centrioles, TUBG1 (gamma-tubulin) marks maturing centrioles, CEP164 marks completely mature centrioles. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

**Figure 3 – figure supplement 1: Centriole distribution in independently-derived clonal cell lines and rescue of the phenotype**

A) Gene loci for TUBD1 (ch17:59889203-59891260) and TUBE1 (ch6:11207685-11209742) in control and TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells (GRCh38.p7 Primary Assembly). Dark green boxes: exons, Arrows: translation start site, Red triangle: Cas9 cut site. TUBD1 -/- line 2 is a compound heterozygote, containing a 4 nt deletion (ch17:59891023-59891026) on one allele, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 117 amino acids, and an insertion at nt 59891024 on the other, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 39 amino acids. TUBE1 -/- line 3 is a compound heterozygote, containing a 17 nt deletion (ch17:59891015-59891031) on one allele, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 46 amino acids, and an insertion at nt 59891024 on the other, resulting in a frameshift and premature stop after 39 amino acids. TUBE1 -/- line 2 is a compound heterozygote, containing a 1049 nt deletion (ch6:112086549-112087598) on one allele, removing exon 1 and the ATG, and a 329 nt deletion (ch6:112087153-112087482) and 4 nt insertion (CCGA) on the other allele, removing the first exon and the ATG. The next ATG is not in-frame for any mutants.

B) Quantification of centriole number distribution in asynchronous cells for independently-derived TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- clonal cell lines, as measured by centrin and CP110 colocalization. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM.

C) Quantification of centriole number distribution in asynchronous cells for rescue lines, as measured by centrin and CP110 colocalization. Cell line #1 for
each mutant were infected with untagged delta-tubulin or epsilon-tubulin, respectively. The rescue construct also contained monomeric Kusabira Orange kappa (mKOk) under a separate promoter. mKOk-positive cells were counted for each line. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM. D) Centrin and gamma-tubulin colocalization in the indicated cell lines. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

Figure 4: TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells undergo a futile centriole formation/disintegration cycle

A) Centriole presence in TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells is cell-cycle dependent. Quantification of the number of cells at each stage with centrin/CP110-positive centrioles. G0/G1 cells were obtained by serum withdrawal, S-phase by staining for PCNA, G2 by treatment with RO-3306, and mitosis by presence of condensed chromatin. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM. B) Quantification of the number of cells with centrin/CP110-positive centrioles at the indicated times after mitotic shakeoff. Control cells are RPE-1 TP53 -/-.

C) de novo centrioles formed in the presence of TUBE1 do not disintegrate in G1. Quantification of the number of cells with centrin/CP110-positive centrioles after centrinone treatment. RPE1 TP53 -/- cells were treated with centrinone for at least 2 weeks, then centrinone was washed out from mitotic cells. Cells were analyzed in S-phase, 12 hours after washout when 36% of cells had entered S-phase, and in the following G1 after mitotic shakeoff. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM. D) Paclitaxel rescues centriole disintegration phenotype. TUBE1 -/- cells were either treated with paclitaxel or DMSO for 3 h in G2. Mitotic cells from both populations were harvested by mitotic shakeoff, and forced out of mitosis with RO-3306 for 3 h. Cells with micronuclei were analyzed for both conditions, and the percent of cells with indicated numbers of centrin/CP110-positive centrioles are shown. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM.

Figure 4 – figure supplement 1: Aberrant centrioles are stabilized upon treatment with paclitaxel, despite losing SASS6 and pericentriolar material

A) Stabilization of TUBE1 -/- centrioles with paclitaxel treatment. Untreated TUBE1 -/- interphase cells were obtained by allowing cells to grow for 3 h after mitotic shakeoff. DMSO with RO-3306 and paclitaxel with RO-3306 treatments were performed as shown for Fig 4D on TUBE1 -/- cells. Bundled microtubules are present upon paclitaxel treatment, and micronuclei found in cells forced into G1 with RO-3306. In merged
Quantification of CP110 and SASS6 separation distance in mitotic TUBE1 +/- cells treated with paclitaxel. 36 centrioles were measured, and measurements are not significantly different from TUBE1 +/- mitotic cells (compared to Fig 2C by two-tailed unpaired t-test, p=0.62). Error bars represent the SEM. C) SASS6 is lost in stabilized centrioles in TUBE1 +/- cells. Cells were treated with paclitaxel, then forced into G1 with RO-3306 as in Fig 4D. Left: Images of centrioles stained for centrin, CP110, and SASS6. Scale bar: 1 µm. Right: Quantification of percent of cells that lack any centriolar SASS6. Bars represent the mean of three independent experiments with ≥100 cells each, error bars represent the SEM. D) Stabilized centrioles in TUBE1 +/- cells lack gamma-tubulin. TUBE1 +/- cells were either untreated and analyzed at mitosis, or treated with paclitaxel and RO-3306. Scale bars: 5 µm.

Figure 5: TUBD1 and TUBE1 interaction and evolutionary analysis
A) Co-immunoprecipitation of myc-TUBE1 and GFP-TUBD1. Complexes were immunoprecipitated (IP) with GFP-binding protein, and precipitated proteins were detected with anti-GFP and anti-Myc antibodies. B) Evolutionary analysis of the correlation of TUBD1 and TUBE1 presence with centriolar triplet microtubules, in organisms with centrioles. Black boxes represent genera in which the gene or feature is absent.

Figure 5 – figure supplement 1: Expanded evolutionary analysis
Materials and Methods

Cell culture
hTERT RPE-1 TP53 -/- cells were a gift from Meng-Fu Bryan Tsou (Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center) and were cultured in DMEM/F-12 (Corning) supplemented with 10% Cosmic Calf Serum (CCS; HyClone). HEK293T cells were cultured in DMEM (Corning) supplemented with 10% CCS (HyClone). All cells were cultured at 37 °C under 5% CO₂, and were routinely tested for mycoplasma contamination.

Lentivirus production
Recombinant lentiviruses were made by cotransfection of HEK293T cells with the respective transfer vectors, second-generation lentiviral cassettes (packaging vector psPAX2 and envelope vector pMD2.G) using 1 µg/µL polyethylenimine (PEI; Polysciences). The medium was changed 6-8 h after transfection, and viral supernatant was harvested after an additional 48 h.

Generation of TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells and rescue lines
hTERT RPE1 TP53 -/- GFP-centrin cells were made by transduction with mEGFP-centrin2 lentivirus and 8 µg/mL Sequabrene carrier (Sigma-Aldrich). Cells were cloned by limiting dilution into 96-well plates.

TUBD1 -/- cell lines were generated using lentiCRISPRv2 (Addgene plasmid #52961 (Sanjana et al., 2014; Shalem et al., 2014) with the sgRNA sequence CTGCTCTATGAGAGAGAATG. hTERT RPE1 TP53 -/- GFP-centrin cells were transduced with lentivirus and 8 µg/mL Sequabrene for 72 hours, then passaged into medium containing 6 µg/mL puromycin. Puromycin-containing culture medium was replaced daily for 5 days until all cells in uninfected control had died. Puromycin-resistant cells were cloned by limiting dilution into 96-well plates, followed by genotyping and phenotypic analysis.

TUBE1 -/- cell line 1 was generated using pX330 (Addgene plasmid #42230 Cong et al., 2013) with the sgRNA sequence GGGTAGAGACCTGGTCGCCG (pX330-TUBE1). hTERT RPE-1 TP53 -/- cells were transiently co-transfected with pX330-TUBE1 and EGFP-expressing vector pEGFP-N1 (Clontech) at 9:1 ratio using Continuum Transfection Reagent (Gemini Bio-Products). GFP-positive cells were clonally sorted into single wells of 96-well plates by FACS, followed by genotyping and phenotypic analysis. Cells were subsequently transduced with GFP-centrin2 lentivirus for CLEM.
TUBE1 -/- cell line 2 was generated using lentiCRISPRv2 with the sgRNA sequence GCGCACCACCAGT. Transduction and selection were carried out as for TUBD1 -/- cell lines.

Both rescue construct transfer vectors contained opposite orientation promoters: EF-1alpha promoter driving monomeric Kusabira Orange kappa (mKOk) with rabbit beta-globin 3'UTR, as well as mouse PGK promoter driving the rescue construct with WPRE. For the delta-tubulin rescue construct, silent mutations were made in the PAM and surrounding sequence such that it was no longer complementary to the lentiCRISPR sgRNA (C117G and A120T) using QuikChange Lightning Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Agilent). For the epsilon-tubulin rescue construct, full-length TUBE1 cDNA was used.

Using these transfer vectors, lentivirus was produced and TUBD1 -/- and TUBE1 -/- cells, respectively, were transduced. For rescue experiments, cells expressing mKOk were counted.

**Correlative light and electron microscopy**

Correlative light and electron microscopy (CLEM) was performed as described previously (Kong and Loncarek, 2015), using hTERT RPE-1 TP53 -/- TUBD1 -/- and TP53 -/- TUBE1 -/- GFP-centrin cells. Cells in Rose chambers were enclosed in an environmental chamber at 37 °C and imaged on an inverted microscope (Eclipse Ti; Nikon, Tokyo, Japan) equipped with a spinning-disk confocal head (CSUX Spinning Disk; Yokogawa Electric Corporation, Tokyo, Japan). After analysis by live imaging, Rose chambers were perfused with freshly prepared 2.5% glutaraldehyde, and 200-nm thick Z-sections spanning the entire cell were recorded to register the position of centrioles. Cell positions on coverslips were then marked by diamond scribe. Rose chambers were disassembled, and cells were washed in PBS, followed by staining with 2% osmium tetroxide and 1% uranyl acetate. Samples were dehydrated and embedded in Embed 812 resin. The same cells identified by light microscopy were then serially sectioned. The 80 nm-thick serial sections were transferred onto copper slot grids, stained with uranyl acetate and lead citrate, and imaged using a transmission electron microscope (H-7650; Hitachi, Tokyo, Japan).

**Immunofluorescence**

Cells were grown on poly-L-lysine-coated #1.5 glass coverslips. Cells were washed with PBS, then fixed with -20 °C methanol for 15 min. Coverslips were then washed with PBS and blocked with PBS-BT (3% BSA, 0.1% Triton X-100, 0.02% sodium azide in PBS) for 30 min. Coverslips were incubated with primary antibodies diluted in PBS-BT for 1 h, washed with PBS-BT, incubated with secondary antibodies and DAPI diluted in PBS-BT for 1 h, then washed again. Samples were mounted using Mowiol.
(Polysciences) in glycerol containing 1,4,-diazobicycli-[2.2.2]octane (DABCO, Sigma-Aldrich) antifade.

**Antibodies**

Primary antibodies used for immunofluorescence: mouse IgG2b anti centrin3, clone 3e6 (1:1000, Novus Biological), mouse IgG2a anti centrin, clone 20H5 (1:200, EMD Millipore), rabbit anti CP110 (1:200, Proteintech), mouse IgG2b anti SASS6 (1:200, Santa Cruz), mouse IgG1 anti gamma-tubulin, clone GTU-88 (1:1000, Sigma-Aldrich), rabbit anti POC5 (1:500, Bethyl Laboratories), rabbit anti CEP164 (1:500, described previously (Lee et al., 2014), mouse IgG2a anti PCNA (1:500, BioLegend). Primary antibodies used for Western blotting: goat anti GFP (1:500, Rockland), mouse IgG1 anti myc, clone 9e10 (1:100, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank). For immunofluorescence, AlexaFluor conjugated secondary antibodies (Thermo-Fisher) were diluted 1:1000. For Western blotting, IRDye conjugated donkey secondary antibodies (LiCOR) were diluted 1:20,000.

**Drug treatments and mitotic shakeoff**

For cell cycle analyses, *TUBD1*⁻/⁻ or *TUBE1*⁻/⁻ cells were seeded onto coverslips, then synchronized in G0/G1 by serum withdrawal for 24 h, or in G2 with 10 µM RO-3306 for 24 h. Cells were fixed for immunofluorescence and analyzed for centrin/CP110 presence. Mitotic shakeoff was performed on asynchronously growing cells. One pre-shake was performed to improve synchronization. Cells were fixed at indicated times and analyzed for centrin/CP110 presence. For centrinone experiments, hTERT RPE-1 *p53*⁻/⁻ cells were treated with 125 nM centrinone for ≥ 2 weeks, and centrinone-containing medium was replaced on top of cells daily. For centrinone washout, cells were washed twice with PBS, then mitotic shakeoff was performed with centrinone-free medium. A subset of cells were fixed for immunofluorescence 12 h after shakeoff, when cells had entered S-phase. 19 h after shakeoff, a second shakeoff was performed to harvest cells that entered mitosis. Cells were fixed 3 h post-second shakeoff for immunofluorescence, and analyzed for centrin/CP110 presence. For paclitaxel experiments, mitotic cells were removed by shakeoff from an asynchronous population, then 15 µM paclitaxel or DMSO was added to the cells remaining on the dish. For both populations, G2-phase cells were allowed to enter mitosis, and then harvested in mitosis by shakeoff 3 h later. Cells were plated on coverslips and forced to exit mitosis by treatment with 10 µM RO-3306, then fixed for immunofluorescence 3 h later. Cells with micronuclei were analyzed for centrin/CP110 presence in both conditions.

**Immunoprecipitation**

HEK293T cells were co-transfected with GFP-delta-tubulin and myc-epsilon-tubulin, or GFP and myc-epsilon-tubulin using PEI. 48 hours after transfection, cells were
harvested and lysed in lysis buffer (50 mM Hepes pH7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM MgCl2, 0.25 mM GTP, 0.5% Triton X-100, 1 µg/ml each leupeptin, pepstatin, and chymostatin, and 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride). Insoluble material was pelleted, and soluble material was incubated at 4 °C with GFP-binding protein (Rothbauer et al., 2008) coupled to NHS-activated Sepharose 4 Fast Flow resin (GE Healthcare) for 2 h. Beads were pelleted at 500 g for 1 min, washed three times with lysis buffer, then eluted in sample buffer and the eluate was run on SDS-PAGE gels. Western blots were scanned on a LiCOR imager and analyzed using ImageJ.
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### Figure 5 – figure supplement 1: Expanded evolutionary analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genus</th>
<th>TUBD1 accession</th>
<th>TUBE1 accession</th>
<th>Centriolar microtubule reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trichonympha</td>
<td>AB819960</td>
<td>AB819961</td>
<td>(Guichard et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rozella</td>
<td>EPZ31138</td>
<td>EPZ34661</td>
<td>(Held, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caenorhabditis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(Nechipurenko et al., 2017; Serwas et al., 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apis</td>
<td>XP_394700</td>
<td>XP_003250659</td>
<td>(Hoage and Kessel, 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drosophila</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(Gottardo et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homo</td>
<td>NP_057346</td>
<td>NP_057345</td>
<td>(Vorobjev and Chentsov, 1980; Paintrand et al., 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trypanosoma</td>
<td>XP_822372</td>
<td>XP_829157</td>
<td>(McKean et al., 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlamydomonas</td>
<td>XP_001703303</td>
<td>AAB71840</td>
<td>(Ringo, 1967; Li et al., 2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physcomitrella</td>
<td>XP_001784101</td>
<td>XP_001753613</td>
<td>(Doonan et al., 1986)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginkgo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>(Gifford and Lin, 1975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paramecium</td>
<td>XP_001437029</td>
<td>XP_001429943</td>
<td>(Dippell, 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrahymena</td>
<td>XP_001010767</td>
<td>XP_001017563</td>
<td>(Allen, 1969)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>