1

Cryo-ET reveals nucleosome reorganisation in condensed mitotic chromosomes *in vivo*

Shujun Cai[1], Chen Chen[1], Zhi Yang Tan[1], Yinyi Huang[2,†], Jian Shi[1] and Lu Gan[1]*

[1] Department of Biological Sciences and Centre for BioImaging Sciences, National

University of Singapore, Singapore 117543

[2] Temasek Life Sciences Laboratory, National University of Singapore, Singapore

117604

[†] Present address: School of Life Sciences & Chemical Technology, Ngee Ann

Polytechnic, Singapore 599489

* Correspondence: lu@anaphase.org

SUMMARY

Chromosomes condense during mitosis in most eukaryotes. This transformation

involves rearrangements at the nucleosome level and has consequences for

transcription, but the details remain unclear. Here, we use cryo-electron tomography to

determine the 3-D arrangement of nucleosomes and other large nuclear features in

frozen-hydrated fission-yeast cells. Nucleosomes can form irregular clusters in both

interphase and mitotic cells, but they are smaller than expected for Hi-C domains. The

nucleosomes are co-mingled with two features: nucleosome-free pockets and

megadalton-sized "megacomplexes". Compared to interphase, the nucleosomes in

mitotic chromosomes pack into slightly larger clusters. However, nearest-neighbor

distance analysis reveals that mitotic nucleosome clusters have the same internal

packing density as in interphase. Furthermore, mitotic chromosomes contain fewer

megacomplexes. This uneven chromosome condensation helps explain a longstanding

enigma of mitosis: most genes are repressed but a subset is upregulated.

INTRODUCTION

Chromatin structure influences key nuclear activities such as transcription, DNA repair and replication (Dixon et al., 2016). The fundamental unit of chromatin is the nucleosome, which consists of ~147 bp of DNA wrapped around a histone octamer Luger, 1997]. In mammalian cells, 2 - 35 nucleosomes pack into irregular "clutches" (Ricci et al., 2015) and more than 500 nucleosomes (calculated from nucleosome spacing) are thought to associate as topologically associating domains (Dixon et al., 2012). Likewise, in the fission yeast *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*, some 300 - 7,000 nucleosomes are thought to associate as compact globular chromatin bodies called domains (Mizuguchi et al., 2014; Kakui et al., 2017; Tanizawa et al., 2017). These studies suggest that chromatin higher-order structure arises from physical interactions of large groups of nucleosomes.

In mitotic cells, chromosomes condense into discrete structures that can be resolved in a light microscope. The factors involved in condensation have been well characterized (Hirano, 2016) and a number of models have been proposed for the large-scale organisation of chromatin domains (Maeshima and Eltsov, 2008). However, the molecular details of chromatin reorganisation are still unknown. Knowledge of how chromatin condenses in 3-D at the single-nucleosome level is needed to explain the nearly global transcriptional repression that happens to the mitotic cells of most eukaryotes (Struhl, 1998). Likewise, a 3-D model of chromatin could also explain how a subset of genes escape this mitotic repression and get upregulated (Rustici et al.; Oliva et al.; Peng et al.).

Some insights on *in vivo* chromatin organisation were made possible by new

methods, including chromatin-conformation capture (Hi-C), super-resolution

microscopy, and traditional EM of cells stained with DNA-proximal osmium (Beliveau et

al.; Pombo and Dillon, 2015; Ou et al.). However, the resultant models are limited

because these methods rely on population-averaged data, or have low resolution, or

perturb the sample due to the fixation, dehydration and staining. Cryo-EM is a label-free

method to visualize cells in a life-like frozen-hydrated state (McDowall et al., 1986;

Eltsov et al., 2008). Cryo-electron tomography (cryo-ET) goes further and can reveal the

3-D positions of these complexes at ~ 4-nm resolution (Gan and Jensen, 2012). Using

cryo-ET, we previously showed that nucleosomes in picoplankton and budding yeast

pack irregularly, but we did not find evidence for mitotic chromosome compaction (Gan

et al., 2013; Chen et al., 2016).

Fission-yeast mitotic-chromosome condensation resembles human chromosome

condensation in both morphological and Hi-C phenotypes (Hiraoka et al., 1984;

Naumova et al., 2013; Yam et al., 2013; Kakui et al., 2017; Tanizawa et al., 2017). We

have now used cryo-ET to directly visualize chromatin both before and after mitotic

condensation *in vivo* in the fission yeasts *S. pombe* and *S. japonicus*. To obtain

cryotomograms with sufficient contrast to resolve nucleosomes *in vivo*, we imaged cells

that were thinned by cryomicrotomy. To better understand the heterogeneous

complexes in the crowded nucleoplasm, we also took advantage of recent advances in

phase-contrast hardware and image-classification software (Bharat and Scheres, 2016;

Khoshouei et al., 2017). We found that in interphase, nucleosomes frequently associate

as small clusters or short chains. Nucleosome-free pockets and megadalton-sized

"megacomplexes" are interspersed among these nucleosome clusters. In mitosis,

chromosomes condense unevenly and have slightly larger nucleosome clusters. Mitotic

chromosomes also have nucleosome-free pockets, but fewer megacomplexes. These

phenotypes are conserved in both types of fission yeasts and lead to a model that

explains how some genes can be transcriptionally upregulated in mitosis.

RESULTS

S. pombe subcellular structures are revealed at molecular resolution by cryo-ET

To understand how native chromatin organisation differs between interphase and

mitosis, we imaged *S. pombe* cells by cryo-ET of frozen-hydrated sections

(cryosections, ~ 90 - 130 nm nominal thickness). To ensure that the imaged cells had a

known cell-cycle state, we arrested temperature-sensitive *cdc25-22* cells in G2 phase

(Fantes, 1979) and cold-sensitive *nda3-KM311* cells in prometaphase (Hiraoka et al.,

1984). Fluorescence microscopy confirmed that the latter cells have the well-known

mitotic chromosome-condensation phenotype (Fig. 1A, S1). In a typical cryotomogram

of an *S. pombe* cell, we could recognize organelles such as the endoplasmic reticulum,

vesicles, and the nucleus due to their membrane morphologies (Fig. 1B and C). To

further assess the quality of the cryosections and data, we performed subtomogram

averaging of cytoplasmic ribosomes (Fig. S2A, B). The resulting average was similar to

a low-pass-filtered budding-yeast ribosome crystal structure (Fig. S1C) (Ben-Shem et

al., 2011). Therefore, the conformation of large complexes are preserved at the

molecular level.

Interphase chromatin is arranged as loosely packed nucleosomes and irregular

nucleosome clusters

G2-phase cell nuclei are filled with many nucleosome-like granular densities. For the

sake of brevity, herein we call these densities nucleosomes due to their size, shape,

abundance, location, and condensation phenotype all being consistent with

nucleosomes (see below). Even if a minority of these densities are not nucleosomes,

the conclusions we make below are still valid. Nucleosomes frequently associate as

small irregular clusters less than 50-nm wide (Fig. 2B). Chain-like nucleosome

configurations are also abundant (Fig. 2C). *S. pombe* linker DNA is only 7-bp,

corresponding to ~ 2.5 nm (Lantermann et al., 2010), meaning that most nucleosomes

should pack closely with at least two other nucleosomes. These two nucleosomes

correspond to the -1 and +1 positions in the sequence. Because linker DNA is

unresolved in our cryotomograms, we do not know if a cluster contains nucleosomes

from a single or multiple sequences of nucleosomes. The remaining nucleosomes are

not clustered together (Fig. 2D). Efforts to automatically identify nucleosome clusters

with distinct motifs failed due to the irregular nucleosome packing. Small nucleosome-

free "pockets" (< 50 nm) are also abundant (Fig. 2E). Densities much larger than

nucleosomes (> 20 nm) are spread throughout the nucleus (Fig. 2F). These densities

are consistent with being multi-megadalton nuclear assemblies such as pre-ribosomes,

spliceosomes, and transcription preinitiation complexes (Gleizes et al., 2001; Allen and

Taatjes, 2015; Oesterreich et al., 2016); we call these "megacomplexes" for brevity.

Therefore, in interphase, nucleosomes associate as small irregular clusters that co-

mingle with megacomplexes and nucleosome-free pockets.

Condensed mitotic chromosomes contain fewer megacomplexes

Unlike in G2-phase cells, in each cryotomogram of a prometaphase cell we found a

single position that has many features consistent with its being a section through a

condensed chromosome. For example, nucleosome-like densities are abundant within

these positions, but much rarer outside (Fig. 3A-C). Compared to G2-phase cells, in

which abundant megacomplexes are interspersed with the chromatin (Fig. 2A),

megacomplexes are mostly absent from these large contiguous regions in

prometaphase cells (Fig. 3A). These positions are hundreds of nanometers wide,

matching the size of condensed chromosomes seen by fluorescence microscopy (Fig.

1A, S1). If these positions are indeed chromosomes, there should be a large contiguous

volume in the cell with few megacomplexes. To test this hypothesis, we sampled a

larger nuclear volume by cryo-ET of 5 nearly sequential cryosections (summing to ~ 700

nm thick) of the same cell (Fig. S3A). We saw a single megacomplex-poor region in

each of these cryosections, which is consistent with these positions being sections

through one or two of the three fission-yeast chromosomes (Fig. S3B-F). Taken

together, we located mitotic chromosomes and found they have fewer megacomplexes

within.

Mitotic chromosomes condense unevenly and support transcription

In conventional (defocus) cryotomograms, we noticed that most nucleosomes appear

more densely packed in prometaphase cells (Fig. S4). To better understand how

chromatin is organised, we imaged cells by Volta phase contrast cryo-ET (Fig. S5).

Volta cryo-EM data have much more contrast, making it possible to locate and

determine the orientations of smaller protein complexes and to resolve protein

complexes packed to near-crystalline density inside of cells (Engel et al., 2015;

Khoshouei et al., 2017). The Volta cryotomograms confirmed what we learned from

defocus cryo-ET: prometaphase nucleosomes more frequently packed into larger

clusters (Figs. 4A and B, S5). Importantly, we confirmed the presence of some loosely

packed nucleosomes and pockets in prometaphase cells (Figs. 4C and S5B, D),

meaning that condensation is uneven. In summary, mitotic chromosomes consist of

both densely and loosely packed nucleosomes.

The existence of loosely packed nucleosomes in prometaphase cells suggests

that mitotic chromatin is permissive to transcriptional machinery, which is supported by

the observation that some genes are up-regulated during mitosis (Rustici et al., 2004;

Oliva et al., 2005; Peng et al., 2005). However, these earlier studies could not

determine if *S. pombe* undergoes active mitotic RNA polymerase II transcription or if

some stable mRNAs are left over from G2 phase. Phosphorylation of RNA polymerase

II at Serine 2 of the carboxy-terminal domain (CTD) heptamer repeat is a conserved

marker of transcription elongation (Komarnitsky et al., 2000; Harlen and Churchman,

2017). Using immunofluorescence, we confirmed the existence of RNA polymerase II

with phospho-Ser2 CTD, and therefore active transcription, in prometaphase

chromosomes (Fig. S6). To rule out the possibility of abnormal transcriptional activity in

the mutants, we imaged asynchronous wild-type cultures, in which a small minority of

cells was undergoing mitosis. We also detected phospho-Ser2 CTD signal in both early

and late mitotic cells. Therefore, transcription is not shut-down globally in mitotic *S.*

pombe cells.

To analyse the nucleosome rearrangement more objectively, we performed

template matching to find their 3-D positions in Volta cryotomograms. This analysis

showed that nucleosomes formed clusters in both G2-phase and prometaphase cells,

but appear more crowded in the latter (Fig. 5A, B). If chromosomes condense via a

uniform accretion of all nucleosomes, the average nucleosome nearest-neighbor

distance (NND) distribution should shorten. However, the NND distributions of

nucleosome hits in G2-phase and prometaphase cells were indistinguishable (two-tailed

t-test, $p > 0.05$) (Fig. 5C). While mitotic chromatin might not condense by compaction of

nearest-neighbor nucleosomes, they might instead condense from changes in

interactions between groups of nucleosomes. We tested this hypothesis by creating

histograms of 10th NNDs and found that the population shifted to shorter distances in

prometaphase cells (two-tailed t-test, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. 5D), which explains the more-

crowded appearance of prometaphase nucleosomes. Taken together, our analyses

reveal that chromosomes condense by the merging of small nucleosome clusters,

resulting in a closer association between distant nucleosomes (Fig. 5E, F).

As an alternative approach to studying nucleosomes *in vivo*, we performed cryo-

ET on the undigested chromatin from lysates of G2-phase and prometaphase *S. pombe*

cells. Cryotomograms of cell lysis products can reveal more clearly the positions of

nucleosomes (Cai et al., 2017). Subtomogram averages of nucleosome template-

matching hits revealed unambiguous features of mononucleosomes including the

groove between two DNA gyres (Fig. S7), demonstrating that our template-matching

approach can locate most nucleosomes. In the lysates, there are many large

nucleosome-free pockets wider than 50 nm in G2-phase chromatin. In contrast,

prometaphase chromatin remained as more-compact masses with only a few, smaller

pockets (Fig. S8). Therefore, prometaphase chromatin has denser nucleosome packing

both *in vivo* and *in vitro*.

S. japonicus and S. pombe chromosomes condense by similar means

To test whether the formation of larger nucleosome clusters during condensation is

conserved, we imaged *S. japonicus*, a bigger fission yeast that also undergoes mitotic

condensation (Robinow and Hyams, 1989). *S. japonicus* has the same genome size (~

12Mb) as *S. pombe*, but has a nucleus at least 8-fold more voluminous. Because *S.*

japonicus is a less-developed model organism, we used asynchronous wild-type cells.

These cells were frozen, cryosectioned, and subjected to Volta cryo-ET just like for *S.*

pombe. To determine whether a cell was in mitosis or interphase at the time of freezing,

we looked for cells with cytoplasmic microtubules, which exist only in interphase, or

cells with nuclear microtubules, which exist only in mitosis (Yam et al., 2013). We found

densely packed nucleosomes in *S. japonicus* mitotic chromosomes (Fig. S9A-D).

Furthermore, NND and 10th-NND analyses showed that the nucleosome NND

distributions were similar in interphase and mitosis (two-tailed t-test, $p > 0.05$), but that

the 10th-NND distribution was shorter in mitosis (two-tailed t-test, $p < 0.001$) (Fig. S9E,

F). Therefore, the formation of larger nucleosome clusters in mitosis is a conserved

phenotype in fission yeasts.

Dinucleosomes are irregular *in vivo*

The crowded nature of the nucleus makes it unfeasible to manually search for

reproducible nucleosome-packing motifs. We therefore performed reference-free 2-D

class-averaging analysis on di-nucleosomes extracted from our cryotomograms. Our

previous 2-D classification of natural *S. cerevisiae* chromatin *in vitro* showed that

abundant motifs can be found automatically this way (Cai et al., 2017). For example,

pairs of nucleosomes sometimes packed face-to-face *in vitro*, which if present *in vivo*

would limit access to regulatory positions like the acidic patch (Luger et al., 1997).

However, the same analysis of di-nucleosomes in *S. pombe* did not reveal any classes

containing face-to-face-packed nucleosomes (Fig. S10), meaning that such inter-

nucleosome interactions must be extremely rare. Instead, di-nucleosomes were packed

irregularly, including edge-to-edge packing, with ~ 3-nm gaps in between. G2-phase

nucleosomes (Fig. S10A and C) were more irregularly packed in terms of the separation

between candidate nucleosomes than in prometaphase cells (Fig. S10B and D). Taken

together, our 2-D classification analyses did not find evidence of ordered nucleosome

packing *in vivo*.

A subset of nucleosomes may be partially unwrapped

In a rare instances, we were able to resolve densities that resemble linker DNA

spanning two nucleosome-like densities in *S. pombe* G2-phase chromatin (Fig. S11A,

B). Many of these linker-DNA-like densities were much longer than the average ~ 2 nm

expected from MNase-digestion experiments (Fig. S11C-D) and nucleosome-mapping

studies (Lantermann et al., 2010). Furthermore, in the NND analysis, there are a large

number of nucleosome pairs that have NND values greater than 12 nm, i.e., the gaps

between adjacent nucleosomes are wider than 2 nm (Fig. 5C). This inter-nucleosome

gap was absent from tetranucleosomes reconstituted with the same linker DNA length

as *S. pombe* (Ekundayo et al., 2017). One explanation is that the larger inter-

nucleosome separation *in vivo* reflects the high end of the distribution of linker DNA

lengths. Alternatively, some nucleosomes might be partially unwrapped – such as may

be expected of fragile or pre-nucleosomes (Fei et al., 2015; Kubik et al., 2015), resulting

in apparently longer linker DNA (Fig. S11E, F). The possibility of partially unwrapped

nucleosomes led us to test whether the nucleosomes *in vivo* resembled

mononucleosomes. To do this, we performed 2-D and 3-D classification of nucleosome

template-matching hits (Bharat and Scheres, 2016). The 3-D classes taken from the

Volta cryotomograms had the correct size and shape of nucleosomes, but they lacked

the characteristic DNA gyres seen in the side view of the low-pass-filtered crystal

structure of the mononucleosome (Fig. S12) (Luger et al., 1997). This difference might

be due to either the insufficient signal-to-noise ratio of cryo-ET data or the

conformational heterogeneity caused by biological factors such as partial unwrapping or

both.

DISCUSSION

We have directly visualized chromatin in both interphase and mitotic fission-yeast cells

by cryo-ET. The condensation phenotypes are subtle. In both interphase and mitotic

cells, most of the nucleosomes are packed into small irregular clusters. While the

nucleosome clusters are slightly larger in mitosis, the nearest-neighbor distance does

not shorten. In other words, there is no wholesale nucleosome accretion as commonly

depicted in textbooks. The most notable -- yet still subtle -- changes are that mitotic

chromatin contains fewer megacomplexes *in vivo* and that this chromatin remains more

compact than interphase chromatin after being released from lysed cells. We propose a

model of mitotic condensation that incorporates both structural and dynamic principles

that takes into account recently published counter-intuitive Hi-C results (Fig. 6).

Cryo-ET reveals new insights into higher-order chromatin organisation

One of the long-standing goals of structural cell biology is to determine how a chain of

sequential nucleosomes folds within minimally perturbed cells. Such a model requires

the visualization of all the linker-DNA segments, but cryo-ET at present can resolve only

a tiny minority of this DNA *in vivo*. Despite this limitation, the shortness of fission-yeast

linker DNA (Fig. S10) tightly constrains our interpretation of our cryotomograms. Any

given nucleosome density should have at least two adjacent nucleosome densities,

which correspond to the -1 and +1 sequential positions. Each of these adjacent

nucleosomes would be connected via short linker DNAs to another nucleosome,

corresponding to -2 and +2 positions relative to the middle nucleosome. This line of

reasoning fails for nucleosome-depleted positions, but these are in the minority. This

linker-DNA imposed close packing supports our model that nucleosomes form small

clusters and possibly small chains.

Our 2-D and 3-D classification analyses suggest that chromatin structure is

irregular from the level of individual nucleosomes to mitotic chromosomes. Unlike the

crystal structure (Luger et al., 1997), nucleosomes *in vivo* are largely conformationally

heterogeneous. This heterogeneity may arise from interactions with small proteins,

assembly/disassembly intermediates, partial unwrapping, or a combination of all these

factors. Out of these possibilities, the partial unwrapping of *S. pombe* nucleosomes *in*

vivo was predicted nearly a decade ago (Zlatanova et al., 2009). This variability in

nucleosome structure and linker DNA length can then give rise to irregular

oligonucleosome folding (Wong et al., 2007; Collepardo-Guevara and Schlick, 2014).

Furthermore, the rarity of face-to-face nucleosome packing precludes chromatin-fiber

interdigitation by nucleosome stacking as a major folding motif. Irregular chromatin is

therefore a conserved feature in single-celled eukaryotes (Gan et al., 2013; Chen et al.,

2016). A recent study using a new DNA negative-staining method concluded that

chromatin structure is also irregular in mammalian cells (Ou et al., 2017), which is

consistent with earlier EM studies of other mammalian cells (McDowall et al., 1986;

Eltsov et al., 2008; Fussner et al., 2012; Nishino et al., 2012).

Cryo-ET, Hi-C, and live-cell imaging paint a complex picture of chromatin

Hi-C is a "proximity-based" method wherein two DNA segments can be detected if they

are close enough to chemically cross-link (Lieberman-Aiden et al., 2009). In this

interpretation, Hi-C indirectly probes chromatin structure, and is revealing new principles

of chromatin organization in *S. pombe* (Mizuguchi et al., 2014; Kakui et al., 2017;

Tanizawa et al., 2017). A common Hi-C structural feature is the domain (also called

TADs), a contiguous sequence in which nucleosomes are more likely to interact with

other nucleosomes within this sequence than outside. *S. pombe* domains range from

40kb to 1Mb long, corresponding to 300 - 7,000 sequential nucleosomes. If domains are

monolithic globular bodies as universally depicted in the literature, they should be visible

in our cryotomograms as large, densely packed nucleosomes clusters. Such a cluster

would be 7 - 20 nucleosomes wide, assuming a simple cuboid shape; other globular

shapes would be equally large. The nucleosome clusters we saw were generally much

smaller. We propose that small nucleosome clusters, which we see at the single-cell

level by cryo-ET, correspond to different loci in each cell. If these clusters belong to Hi-

C domains, they would sum to the much-larger structure due the effects of population

averaging. As the simplest example, we illustrate how four sequential nucleosomes

could give rise to a Hi-C structure that is larger than what can be found in individual

cells (Fig. S13). Cell-to-cell variation may also explain differences between single-cell

and population-based Hi-C studies (Nagano et al., 2013; Flyamer et al., 2017; Nagano

et al., 2017; Stevens et al., 2017).

Two recent studies unexpectedly reported that short-range Hi-C contacts are less

probable in mitotic *S. pombe* cells than in interphase cells (Kakui et al., 2017; Tanizawa

et al., 2017), echoing a previous study of mitotic human cells (Naumova et al., 2013).

Interestingly, quiescent B cells, which have condensed chromosomes, have lower short-

range Hi-C contact probabilities than active B cells, which have decondensed

chromosomes (Kieffer-Kwon et al., 2017). If Hi-C detections arise solely from

nucleosome-nucleosome proximity, then the nucleosomes should move further apart in

mitosis; we observed the opposite. What else, then, could explain the lower short-range

Hi-C contact frequency in mitotic cells? A recent study found that within compact (160

nm) mammalian chromatin domains, all nucleosome motion is correlated (Nozaki et al.,

2017). We propose that short-range Hi-C contacts in *S. pombe* and some mammalian

cells is also dependent on chromatin dynamics (Hihara et al., 2012; Kakui et al., 2017).

These dynamics slow down in mitotic cells due to the increase in nucleosome cluster

size, and lowers the frequency that crosslinkable groups can interact with each other.

The role of uneven condensation in transcriptional regulation

The strong correlation between mitotic chromosome condensation and transcriptional

repression is well established (Taylor, 1960; Prescott and Bender, 1962). Mechanistic

evidence of mitotic repression came from the observation that mitotic condensation is

coincident with transcription-factor displacement (Martinez-Balbas et al., 1995). Yet,

even though transcription is largely downregulated in mitotic *S. pombe* cells, (Oliva et

al.), many cell-cycle-regulated genes actually get expressed more (Rustici et al.; Oliva

et al.; Peng et al.). In agreement, our immunofluorescence experiments detected

elongating RNA polymerase II in mitotic *S. pombe* chromosomes. We propose that

chromatin structure at multiple size scales permits access to regulatory sequences,

somewhat independently of dynamics. At the mononucleosome level, many chromatin-

regulatory complexes recognize and bind to the nucleosome's face (McGinty and Tan,

2015). Because face-to-face nucleosome stacking is exceptionally rare in mitotic cells,

this critical surface remains available for interactions. At the level of the chromosome,

fewer megacomplexes are interspersed within the densely packed nucleosomes.

However, uneven condensation leaves nucleosome-free positions that could remain

permissive to the occasional passage or assembly of megacomplexes such as

spliceosomes and transcription preinitiation complexes. If uneven chromosome

condensation is highly conserved, the mechanisms proposed here could explain the

recent observations of chromatin accessibility and transcription in mitotic mammalian

cells (Hsiung et al., 2015; Teves et al., 2016; Palozola et al., 2017).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell culture

S. pombe cell culture (Forsburg, 2003), G2-phase arrest (Ducommun et al.) and

prometaphase arrest (Hiraoka et al.) were performed as previously reported. *nda3-*

KM311 cells were grown overnight in yeast-extract supplemented (YES) medium (30

g/L glucose, 5 g/L yeast extract, 225 mg/L adenine, 225 mg/L histidine, 225 mg/L

leucine, 225 mg/L uracil) at 30°C with shaking. When the optical density at 600 nm

(OD_{600}) reached ~ 0.2, the cultures were cooled by incubation in a 20°C shaker. After a

10-hr incubation at this lower temperature, more than 90% of cells were arrested in

prometaphase. *cdc25-22* cells were grown in YES medium at 25°C with shaking

overnight. When the OD_{600} reached ~ 0.2, the cultures were warmed to 36°C in a water

bath and then transferred to a 36°C shaker. After 4 hr, the majority of cells were

arrested at G2 phase. *S. japonicus* cells were grown in YES medium at 30°C with

shaking overnight until mid-log phase (OD_{600} ~ 0.6) (Yam et al.).

Fluorescence microscopy

Cells were stained with 4',6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI) following a published

protocol (Toda et al.). Cells (1 ml) were fixed with 2.5% formaldehyde for 60 min at the

restrictive temperature for mutants. The cells were washed twice by centrifugation at

1500 *x g* for 1 min and resuspension with distilled water. They were pelleted at 1500 *x g*

for 1 min and stained by resuspension in 50 µl PBS, pH 7.4, containing 1 µg/ml DAPI.

Ten µl of the sample was then added to a glass slide and imaged using a PerkinElmer

Ultraview Vox Spinning Disc confocal microscope (PerkinElmer, Waltham, MA). Images

were recorded using a 100x oil-immersion objective.

Immunofluorescence

Log-phase cells (10 ml) were fixed with 3.7% formaldehyde for 90 min at 30°C (or at the

restrictive temperature for arrested mutants). Cells were then pelleted by centrifugation

at 1500 *x g* for 5 min. Cells were then resuspended in 1 ml PEM buffer (0.1 M PIPES

pH 6.95, 2 mM EGTA, 1 mM $MgSO_4$). Cells were washed once with 1 ml PEM this way

and then resuspended in 1 ml PEMS (1.2 M sorbitol in PEM). Next, cells were

spheroplasted for 15 minutes by incubation with lysis-enzyme cocktail (Abcam, cat#

ab206997), diluted 1:1000 in PEMS at 30°C. Cells were washed with PEMS. The pellet

was then resuspended in PEMS with 1% Triton X-100 and incubated at 22°C for 5 min.

Cells were then washed twice with PEM and incubated in PEMBAL (PEM, 1% BSA, 100

mM L-Lysine hydrochloride) at 22°C for 1 hour. Cells were then incubated with rabbit

anti-RNA polymerase II CTD-repeat YSPTSPS (phospho S2) antibody in PEMBAL

(1:1000 dilution) at 22°C for 1 hour. Cells were washed three times with 1 ml PEMBAL

and then incubated with Alexa Fluor 488-coupled donkey anti-rabbit antibodies at 22°C

for 1 hour. Cells were then washed three times with PEM and resuspended in 50 µl of 1

µg/ml DAPI.

Self-pressurized freezing

Self-pressurized freezing was performed based on a previous method, with

modifications (Yakovlev and Downing, 2011). *S. pombe* cells were grown in YES

medium until the OD$_{600}$ reached 0.2 - 0.6. Cells were pelleted by centrifuging at 1500 x

g for 5 min. Concentrated dextran stock (40 kDa, 60% w/v, in YES) was added to the

cell pellet as an extracellular cryoprotectant to a final concentration of 30%. The cells

were then quick-spun to remove air bubbles and then loaded into a copper tube (0.45 /

0.3 mm outer / inner diameters) with a syringe-type filler device (Part 733-1,

Engineering Office M. Wohlwend GmbH). The tube was sealed by crimping both ends

with flat-jaw pliers. The sealed tube was held horizontally, ~ 3 cm above the liquid-

ethane cryogen surface, and then dropped in. The flattened ends of the tube were then

removed with a tube-cutting device under liquid nitrogen.

Vitreous sectioning

Vitreous sectioning was performed as previously described with modifications (Chen et

al., 2016). A perforated- or continuous-carbon grid was coated with 10-nm gold colloids

as fiducials for cryotomographic alignment. Gold solution (5 µl at 5.7 x 10^{12} particles/ml)

in 0.1 mg/ml BSA was applied to the grid and then air-dried. Frozen-hydrated cells were

cut into a 70-nm-thick frozen-hydrated ribbon using a 35° diamond knife (Cryo35,

Diatome, Nidau, Switzerland) in a Leica UC7/FC7 cryo-ultramicrotome (Leica

Microsystems, Vienna, Austria) at -150°C. Once the ribbon was ~ 3 mm long, the

colloidal-gold-coated EM grid was placed underneath the ribbon. To minimize occlusion

by grid bars at high tilt during cryotomographic imaging, the grid as aligned so that the

ribbon was in between and parallel with the grid bars. The ribbon was then attached to

the grid by operating the Crion in "charge" mode for ~ 30 seconds. The grid was stored

in liquid nitrogen until imaging.

Cell lysis

430　Log-phase *S. pombe* cells were pelleted by centrifuging at 1500 *x g* for 5 min and then

431　spheroplasted for 15 minutes by incubation with lysis-enzyme cocktail at either 30°C or

432　at the restrictive temperature for mutants. The spheroplasts were pelleted at 1500 *x g*

433　for 2 min at 22°C and then lysed in 20 µl lysis buffer (50 mM EDTA and a 1:1000

434　dilution of protease inhibitor cocktail, Abcam, cat# ab206997) on ice for 15 min.

Plunge freezing

437　Plunge freezing was done using a Vitrobot Mk IV (Thermo, Waltham, MA) operated at

438　4°C with 80% humidity. *S. pombe* cell lysates (4 µl) were applied to a freshly glow-

439　discharged perforated-carbon grid. The grid was blotted once (blot force: 1, blot time: 3

440　seconds) with filter paper (Whatman #1001055) and then plunged into liquid ethane.

Cryo-electron tomography

Tilt series were collected using FEI TOMO4 on a Titan Krios cryo-TEM (Thermo,

Waltham, MA) operated at 300 KeV and equipped with a field-emission gun, a Volta

phase-plate device, and a Falcon II direct-detection camera. Details of the imaging

parameters are shown in Table S1. Image alignment, CTF compensation, low-pass

filtering, and 3-D reconstruction were all done using the IMOD software package

(Kremer et al., 1996; Mastronarde, 1997; Xiong et al., 2009). Note that Volta

cryotomograms were not CTF compensated. Cryotomograms were visualized as

tomographic slices with 3dmod and as isosurfaces with UCSF Chimera (Pettersen et

al., 2004).

Template matching

Template matching was done using PEET (Heumann, 2016). A manually-selected

subtomogram containing a nucleosome-like particle served as a template. The influence

of the surrounding nucleoplasmic densities were suppressed by the application of a

spherical mask. A search was performed on a grid with a 10-nm spacing within the

nucleus. Template-matching hits within 6 nm were considered as duplicates and the

extra hit was automatically removed. The cross-correlation coefficient cutoff criteria

were the same as in our previous report (Cai et al., 2017). Briefly, the average cross-

correlation coefficients of all template-matching hits was used as an initial cutoff. This

cutoff was then manually adjusted (if needed) to minimize the number of detectable

false positives and false negatives. To further remove false positives from

megacomplexes, another round of template matching was performed using a ribosome-

like density selected within the tomogram as a template. The nucleosome hits that were

within 12.5 nm of these megacomplexes were then removed with a Matlab script

(available on request; Mathworks, Natick, MA).

For dinucleosome template matching, a manually-selected subtomogram of a di-

nucleosome served as a template. A cylindrical mask (15-nm diameter, 22-nm height),

rotated to align with the long axis of the dinucleosome template, was used to suppress

the background surrounding densities. The search grid with a 25-nm spacing was

generated within the nucleus. Owing to the missing-wedge artifact, nucleosomes have

higher resolution in the X-Y plane. Therefore, the angular search was limited only to the

Z axis. Hits within 15 nm were considered as duplicates. The cross-correlation

coefficient cutoff criteria were the same as described above for mononucleosomes.

False positives from megacomplexes fell into their own classes in the subsequent 2-D

classification run (see below) and were removed.

Reference-free 2-D and 3-D classification

Subtomogram classification and 3-D averaging of nucleosomes were done in RELION

1.4 and RELION 2.0 (Scheres, 2012a, b; Bharat et al., 2015; Kimanius et al., 2016),

following the workflow of our previous study (Cai et al., 2017). The template-matching

hit coordinates were imported into RELION and then particles were extracted with a

15.6-nm box and masked with a 13.5-nm-diameter sphere. For 2-D classification, the

number of classes was set to 50 and the resolution of was limited to 3 nm. All

nucleosome-like classes were selected. For 3-D classification, the number of classes

was set to between 10 and 20, and the resolution was limited to 2-3 nm. Two to three

rounds of 3-D classification were performed. False-positive were manually removed in

between rounds.

For di-nucleosome 2-D classification, the box size and the mask diameter were

set to 30 nm and 26 nm, respectively. As a default setting, RELION produces

projections of all densities within the boxes, including the nucleoplasmic densities above

and below dinucleosomes. To include only the dinucleosome densities, a python script

(available on request) was used to generate projections from a 17.5-nm thick

tomographic slice. The resolution of the data was limited to 2 nm to suppress the effects

of high-resolution noise. The number of classes was set to 100, but many of the classes

were very similar and therefore merged.

Nearest-neighbor distance analysis

Nearest-neighbor distance analysis of template-matching hits (Figs. 5 and S9) was

performed as previously described (Cai et al., 2017). The coordinates of the

nucleosome hits were imported into Matlab. NND and 10th NND were calculated using

the Matlab function nearestneighbour.m (custom script available on request).

Statistical analysis

Two-tailed t-tests for NND values were performed in Excel using the TTEST function.

The number of NND values analysed for G2-phase and prometaphase *S. pombe*,

interphase and mitotic *S. japonicus* were 10292, 11835, 9397, 4474, respectively.

Data sharing

A cryotomogram, corresponding to Fig. 4, was deposited in the EMDataBank as EMD-

6846. The tilt series for all cryotomograms presented in this manuscript were deposited

in the Electron Microscopy Public Image Archive as EMPIAR-10125.

Acknowledgements

We thank the CBIS microscopy staff for support and training. We thank Snezhka

Oliferenko for advice on *S. japonicus* culture and manuscript feedback; Mohan

Balasubramanian for feedback and sharing *S. pombe* strains; Kazuhiro Maeshima for

feedback. *S. japonicus* strains were obtained from JapoNet. SC, CC, ZT and LG were

supported by NUS startups R-154-000-515-133, R-154-000-524-651, and D-E12-303-

154-217, R-154-000-558-133, and MOE T2 R-154-000-624-112.

Contributions

S.C - experiments, project design, writing, CC - training, YH - training, ZYT -

experiments, JS - training, LG - project design, writing.

References

Allen, B.L., and Taatjes, D.J. (2015). The Mediator complex: a central integrator of
transcription. Nature reviews Molecular cell biology *16*, 155-166.

Beliveau, B.J., Boettiger, A.N., Avendano, M.S., Jungmann, R., McCole, R.B., Joyce,
E.F., Kim-Kiselak, C., Bantignies, F., Fonseka, C.Y., Erceg, J*., et al.* (2015). Single-
molecule super-resolution imaging of chromosomes and in situ haplotype visualization
using Oligopaint FISH probes. Nature communications *6*, 7147.

Ben-Shem, A., Garreau de Loubresse, N., Melnikov, S., Jenner, L., Yusupova, G., and
Yusupov, M. (2011). The structure of the eukaryotic ribosome at 3.0 A resolution.
Science *334*, 1524-1529.

Bharat, T.A., Russo, C.J., Lowe, J., Passmore, L.A., and Scheres, S.H. (2015).
Advances in Single-Particle Electron Cryomicroscopy Structure Determination applied
to Sub-tomogram Averaging. Structure *23*, 1743-1753.

Bharat, T.A., and Scheres, S.H. (2016). Resolving macromolecular structures from
electron cryo-tomography data using subtomogram averaging in RELION. Nat Protoc
11, 2054-2065.

Cai, S., Song, Y., Chen, C., Shi, J., and Gan, L. (2017). Natural Chromatin Is
Heterogeneous And Self Associates In Vitro. bioRxiv, 139543.

Chen, C., Lim, H.H., Shi, J., Tamura, S., Maeshima, K., Surana, U., and Gan, L. (2016).
Budding yeast chromatin is dispersed in a crowded nucleoplasm in vivo. Molecular
biology of the cell *27*, 3357-3368.

Collepardo-Guevara, R., and Schlick, T. (2014). Chromatin fiber polymorphism triggered
by variations of DNA linker lengths. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
of the United States of America *111*, 8061-8066.

Dixon, J.R., Gorkin, D.U., and Ren, B. (2016). Chromatin Domains: The Unit of
Chromosome Organization. Molecular cell *62*, 668-680.

Dixon, J.R., Selvaraj, S., Yue, F., Kim, A., Li, Y., Shen, Y., Hu, M., Liu, J.S., and Ren, B.

(2012). Topological domains in mammalian genomes identified by analysis of chromatin

interactions. Nature *485*, 376-380.

Ducommun, B., Draetta, G., Young, P., and Beach, D. (1990). Fission yeast cdc25 is a

cell-cycle regulated protein. Biochemical and biophysical research communications *167*,

301-309.

Ekundayo, B., Richmond, T.J., and Schalch, T. (2017). Capturing Structural

Heterogeneity in Chromatin Fibers. Journal of molecular biology *429*, 3031-3042.

Eltsov, M., Maclellan, K.M., Maeshima, K., Frangakis, A.S., and Dubochet, J. (2008).

Analysis of cryo-electron microscopy images does not support the existence of 30-nm

chromatin fibers in mitotic chromosomes in situ. Proceedings of the National Academy

of Sciences of the United States of America *105*, 19732-19737.

Engel, B.D., Schaffer, M., Kuhn Cuellar, L., Villa, E., Plitzko, J.M., and Baumeister, W.

(2015). Native architecture of the Chlamydomonas chloroplast revealed by in situ cryo-

electron tomography. Elife *4*.

Fantes, P. (1979). Epistatic gene interactions in the control of division in fission yeast.

Nature *279*, 428-430.

Fei, J., Torigoe, S.E., Brown, C.R., Khuong, M.T., Kassavetis, G.A., Boeger, H., and

Kadonaga, J.T. (2015). The prenucleosome, a stable conformational isomer of the

nucleosome. Genes & development *29*, 2563-2575.

Flyamer, I.M., Gassler, J., Imakaev, M., Brandao, H.B., Ulianov, S.V., Abdennur, N.,

Razin, S.V., Mirny, L.A., and Tachibana-Konwalski, K. (2017). Single-nucleus Hi-C

reveals unique chromatin reorganization at oocyte-to-zygote transition. Nature *544*, 110-

114.

Forsburg, S.L. (2003). Growth and manipulation of S. pombe. Current Protocols in

Molecular Biology, 13.16. 11-13.16. 17.

Fussner, E., Strauss, M., Djuric, U., Li, R., Ahmed, K., Hart, M., Ellis, J., and Bazett-

Jones, D.P. (2012). Open and closed domains in the mouse genome are configured as

10-nm chromatin fibres. EMBO Rep *13*, 992-996.

Gan, L., and Jensen, G.J. (2012). Electron tomography of cells. Quarterly reviews of

biophysics *45*, 27-56.

Gan, L., Ladinsky, M.S., and Jensen, G.J. (2013). Chromatin in a marine picoeukaryote

is a disordered assemblage of nucleosomes. Chromosoma *122*, 377-386.

Gleizes, P.E., Noaillac-Depeyre, J., Leger-Silvestre, I., Teulieres, F., Dauxois, J.Y.,

Pommet, D., Azum-Gelade, M.C., and Gas, N. (2001). Ultrastructural localization of

rRNA shows defective nuclear export of preribosomes in mutants of the Nup82p

complex. The Journal of cell biology *155*, 923-936.

Harlen, K.M., and Churchman, L.S. (2017). The code and beyond: transcription

regulation by the RNA polymerase II carboxy-terminal domain. Nature reviews

Molecular cell biology *18*, 263-273.

Heumann, J.M. (2016). PEET (University of Colorado Boulder).

Hihara, S., Pack, C.G., Kaizu, K., Tani, T., Hanafusa, T., Nozaki, T., Takemoto, S.,

Yoshimi, T., Yokota, H., Imamoto, N.*, et al.* (2012). Local nucleosome dynamics

facilitate chromatin accessibility in living mammalian cells. Cell reports *2*, 1645-1656.

Hirano, T. (2016). Condensin-Based Chromosome Organization from Bacteria to

Vertebrates. Cell *164*, 847-857.

Hiraoka, Y., Toda, T., and Yanagida, M. (1984). The NDA3 gene of fission yeast

encodes beta-tubulin: a cold-sensitive nda3 mutation reversibly blocks spindle formation

and chromosome movement in mitosis. Cell *39*, 349-358.

Hsiung, C.C., Morrissey, C.S., Udugama, M., Frank, C.L., Keller, C.A., Baek, S.,

Giardine, B., Crawford, G.E., Sung, M.H., Hardison, R.C.*, et al.* (2015). Genome

accessibility is widely preserved and locally modulated during mitosis. Genome Res *25*,
213-225.

Kakui, Y., Rabinowitz, A., Barry, D.J., and Uhlmann, F. (2017). Condensin-mediated
remodeling of the mitotic chromatin landscape in fission yeast. Nat Genet *49*, 1553-
1557.

Khoshouei, M., Radjainia, M., Baumeister, W., and Danev, R. (2017). Cryo-EM structure
of haemoglobin at 3.2 A determined with the Volta phase plate. Nature communications
8, 16099.

Kieffer-Kwon, K.R., Nimura, K., Rao, S.S.P., Xu, J., Jung, S., Pekowska, A., Dose, M.,
Stevens, E., Mathe, E., Dong, P.*, et al.* (2017). Myc Regulates Chromatin
Decompaction and Nuclear Architecture during B Cell Activation. Molecular cell *67*, 566-
578 e510.

Kimanius, D., Forsberg, B.O., Scheres, S.H., and Lindahl, E. (2016). Accelerated cryo-
EM structure determination with parallelisation using GPUs in RELION-2. Elife *5*.

Komarnitsky, P., Cho, E.J., and Buratowski, S. (2000). Different phosphorylated forms
of RNA polymerase II and associated mRNA processing factors during transcription.
Genes & development *14*, 2452-2460.

Kremer, J.R., Mastronarde, D.N., and McIntosh, J.R. (1996). Computer visualization of
three-dimensional image data using IMOD. Journal of structural biology *116*, 71-76.

Kubik, S., Bruzzone, M.J., Jacquet, P., Falcone, J.L., Rougemont, J., and Shore, D.
(2015). Nucleosome Stability Distinguishes Two Different Promoter Types at All Protein-
Coding Genes in Yeast. Molecular cell *60*, 422-434.

Lantermann, A.B., Straub, T., Stralfors, A., Yuan, G.C., Ekwall, K., and Korber, P.
(2010). Schizosaccharomyces pombe genome-wide nucleosome mapping reveals
positioning mechanisms distinct from those of Saccharomyces cerevisiae. Nat Struct
Mol Biol *17*, 251-257.

Lieberman-Aiden, E., van Berkum, N.L., Williams, L., Imakaev, M., Ragoczy, T., Telling,
A., Amit, I., Lajoie, B.R., Sabo, P.J., Dorschner, M.O.*, et al.* (2009). Comprehensive
mapping of long-range interactions reveals folding principles of the human genome.
Science *326*, 289-293.

Luger, K., Mader, A.W., Richmond, R.K., Sargent, D.F., and Richmond, T.J. (1997).
Crystal structure of the nucleosome core particle at 2.8 A resolution. Nature *389*, 251-
260.

Maeshima, K., and Eltsov, M. (2008). Packaging the genome: the structure of mitotic
chromosomes. J Biochem *143*, 145-153.

Martinez-Balbas, M.A., Dey, A., Rabindran, S.K., Ozato, K., and Wu, C. (1995).
Displacement of sequence-specific transcription factors from mitotic chromatin. Cell *83*,
29-38.

Mastronarde, D.N. (1997). Dual-axis tomography: an approach with alignment methods
that preserve resolution. Journal of structural biology *120*, 343-352.

McDowall, A.W., Smith, J.M., and Dubochet, J. (1986). Cryo-electron microscopy of
vitrified chromosomes in situ. EMBO J *5*, 1395-1402.

McGinty, R.K., and Tan, S. (2015). Nucleosome structure and function. Chem Rev *115*,
2255-2273.

Mizuguchi, T., Fudenberg, G., Mehta, S., Belton, J.M., Taneja, N., Folco, H.D.,
FitzGerald, P., Dekker, J., Mirny, L., Barrowman, J.*, et al.* (2014). Cohesin-dependent
globules and heterochromatin shape 3D genome architecture in S. pombe. Nature *516*,
432-435.

Nagano, T., Lubling, Y., Stevens, T.J., Schoenfelder, S., Yaffe, E., Dean, W., Laue,
E.D., Tanay, A., and Fraser, P. (2013). Single-cell Hi-C reveals cell-to-cell variability in
chromosome structure. Nature *502*, 59-64.

Nagano, T., Lubling, Y., Varnai, C., Dudley, C., Leung, W., Baran, Y., Mendelson
Cohen, N., Wingett, S., Fraser, P., and Tanay, A. (2017). Cell-cycle dynamics of
chromosomal organization at single-cell resolution. Nature *547*, 61-67.

Naumova, N., Imakaev, M., Fudenberg, G., Zhan, Y., Lajoie, B.R., Mirny, L.A., and
Dekker, J. (2013). Organization of the mitotic chromosome. Science *342*, 948-953.

Nishino, Y., Eltsov, M., Joti, Y., Ito, K., Takata, H., Takahashi, Y., Hihara, S., Frangakis,
A.S., Imamoto, N., Ishikawa, T.*, et al.* (2012). Human mitotic chromosomes consist
predominantly of irregularly folded nucleosome fibres without a 30-nm chromatin
structure. EMBO J *31*, 1644-1653.

Nozaki, T., Imai, R., Tanbo, M., Nagashima, R., Tamura, S., Tani, T., Joti, Y., Tomita,
M., Hibino, K., Kanemaki, M.T.*, et al.* (2017). Dynamic Organization of Chromatin
Domains Revealed by Super-Resolution Live-Cell Imaging. Molecular cell *67*, 282-293
e287.

Oesterreich, F.C., Herzel, L., Straube, K., Hujer, K., Howard, J., and Neugebauer, K.M.
(2016). Splicing of Nascent RNA Coincides with Intron Exit from RNA Polymerase II.
Cell *165*, 372-381.

Oliva, A., Rosebrock, A., Ferrezuelo, F., Pyne, S., Chen, H., Skiena, S., Futcher, B.,
and Leatherwood, J. (2005). The cell cycle-regulated genes of Schizosaccharomyces
pombe. PLoS Biol *3*, e225.

Ou, H.D., Phan, S., Deerinck, T.J., Thor, A., Ellisman, M.H., and O'Shea, C.C. (2017).
ChromEMT: Visualizing 3D chromatin structure and compaction in interphase and
mitotic cells. Science *357*.

Palozola, K.C., Donahue, G., Liu, H., Grant, G.R., Becker, J.S., Cote, A., Yu, H., Raj, A.,
and Zaret, K.S. (2017). Mitotic transcription and waves of gene reactivation during
mitotic exit. Science *358*, 119-122.

Peng, X., Karuturi, R.K., Miller, L.D., Lin, K., Jia, Y., Kondu, P., Wang, L., Wong, L.S.,
Liu, E.T., Balasubramanian, M.K.*, et al.* (2005). Identification of cell cycle-regulated
genes in fission yeast. Molecular biology of the cell *16*, 1026-1042.

Pettersen, E.F., Goddard, T.D., Huang, C.C., Couch, G.S., Greenblatt, D.M., Meng,
E.C., and Ferrin, T.E. (2004). UCSF Chimera--a visualization system for exploratory
research and analysis. J Comput Chem *25*, 1605-1612.

Pombo, A., and Dillon, N. (2015). Three-dimensional genome architecture: players and
mechanisms. Nature reviews Molecular cell biology *16*, 245-257.

Prescott, D.M., and Bender, M.A. (1962). Synthesis of RNA and protein during mitosis
in mammalian tissue culture cells. Exp Cell Res *26*, 260-268.

Ricci, M.A., Manzo, C., Garcia-Parajo, M.F., Lakadamyali, M., and Cosma, M.P. (2015).
Chromatin fibers are formed by heterogeneous groups of nucleosomes in vivo. Cell *160*,
1145-1158.

Robinow, C.F., and Hyams, J.S. (1989). General Cytology of Fission Yeasts. In
Molecular biology of the fission yeast, A. Nasim, P. Young, and B.F. Johnson, eds. (San
Diego: Academic Press), pp. 273-330.

Rustici, G., Mata, J., Kivinen, K., Lio, P., Penkett, C.J., Burns, G., Hayles, J., Brazma,
A., Nurse, P., and Bahler, J. (2004). Periodic gene expression program of the fission
yeast cell cycle. Nat Genet *36*, 809-817.

Scheres, S.H. (2012a). A Bayesian view on cryo-EM structure determination. Journal of
molecular biology *415*, 406-418.

Scheres, S.H. (2012b). RELION: implementation of a Bayesian approach to cryo-EM
structure determination. Journal of structural biology *180*, 519-530.

Stevens, T.J., Lando, D., Basu, S., Atkinson, L.P., Cao, Y., Lee, S.F., Leeb, M.,
Wohlfahrt, K.J., Boucher, W., O'Shaughnessy-Kirwan, A.*, et al.* (2017). 3D structures of
individual mammalian genomes studied by single-cell Hi-C. Nature *544*, 59-64.

Struhl, K. (1998). Histone acetylation and transcriptional regulatory mechanisms. Genes
& development *12*, 599-606.

Tanizawa, H., Kim, K.D., Iwasaki, O., and Noma, K.I. (2017). Architectural alterations of
the fission yeast genome during the cell cycle. Nat Struct Mol Biol.

Taylor, J.H. (1960). Nucleic acid synthesis in relation to the cell division cycle. Ann N Y
Acad Sci *90*, 409-421.

Teves, S.S., An, L., Hansen, A.S., Xie, L., Darzacq, X., and Tjian, R. (2016). A dynamic
mode of mitotic bookmarking by transcription factors. Elife *5*.

Toda, T., Yamamoto, M., and Yanagida, M. (1981). Sequential alterations in the nuclear
chromatin region during mitosis of the fission yeast Schizosaccharomyces pombe: video
fluorescence microscopy of synchronously growing wild-type and cold-sensitive cdc
mutants by using a DNA-binding fluorescent probe. J Cell Sci *52*, 271-287.

White, C.L., Suto, R.K., and Luger, K. (2001). Structure of the yeast nucleosome core
particle reveals fundamental changes in internucleosome interactions. EMBO J *20*,
5207-5218.

Wong, H., Victor, J.M., and Mozziconacci, J. (2007). An all-atom model of the chromatin
fiber containing linker histones reveals a versatile structure tuned by the nucleosomal
repeat length. PloS one *2*, e877.

Xiong, Q., Morphew, M.K., Schwartz, C.L., Hoenger, A.H., and Mastronarde, D.N.
(2009). CTF determination and correction for low dose tomographic tilt series. Journal of
structural biology *168*, 378-387.

Yakovlev, S., and Downing, K.H. (2011). Freezing in sealed capillaries for preparation of
frozen hydratedsections. J Microsc *244*, 235-247.

Yam, C., Gu, Y., and Oliferenko, S. (2013). Partitioning and remodeling of the
Schizosaccharomyces japonicus mitotic nucleus require chromosome tethers. Current
biology : CB *23*, 2303-2310.

Zlatanova, J., Bishop, T.C., Victor, J.M., Jackson, V., and van Holde, K. (2009). The

nucleosome family: dynamic and growing. Structure *17*, 160-171.

Figure 1. Strategy to study chromosome condensation in *S. pombe*.

(A) Fluorescence images of DAPI-stained G2-phase and prometaphase (P) cells, with

contrast inverted for clarity. (B) Cryotomographic slice (25 nm) of a G2-phase cell. NE:

nuclear envelope; NP: nuclear pore; L: lipid body; ER: endoplasmic reticulum; CM: cell

membrane; CW: cell wall. The wavy features in the upper portion of the cryotomogram

are crevasses from sectioning; the thin parallel lines running from 2 to 8 O'clock are

knife marks. (C) Segmentation of the cryotomographic slice in panel B, showing the

cytological features with the same color scheme as the text labels from panel A.

Figure 2. *S. pombe* G2-phase chromatin consists of irregularly packed

nucleosomes and dispersed megacomplexes.

(A) Cryotomographic slice (10 nm) of an interphase nucleus. Yellow circles: a subset of

megacomplexes. The cyan lines denote the nuclear envelope. (B1 - B4) Four examples

of nucleosome clusters. (C1 - C4) Four examples of nucleosome chains. In panels B

and C, the white dashed lines delineate the approximate boundaries of the nucleosome

clusters. Owing to the close packing and particulate nature of nucleosomes, it is not

possible to annotate the exact "outline" of a nucleosome cluster. It is also not possible to

determine how the nucleosomes are connected by linker DNAs, which generally cannot

be seen. (D1 - D2) Two examples of loosely packed nucleosomes, which are circled.

(E) An example position that has few nucleosomes. (F) An example megacomplex

(circled).

Figure 3. Condensed *S. pombe* mitotic chromosomes contain few

megacomplexes.

(A) Cryotomographic slice (11 nm) of a prometaphase cell. Cyan line: nuclear envelope,

red line: plasma membrane, yellow circles: megacomplexes. The position circled with

the dashed white line is a condensed chromosome. Rectangular boxes are enlarged 6-

fold in panels B and C. (B) An example position with many nucleosome-like densities

forming a cluster, circled with a dashed blue line. (C) An example position without

nucleosome-like densities. Yellow circle: a megacomplex.

Figure 4: Larger nucleosome clusters and loosely packed nucleosomes coexist

within *S. pombe* mitotic condensed chromosomes.

(A) Cryotomographic slice (11 nm) of a nucleus in a prometaphase cell, imaged with

Volta phase contrast. White dashed line: approximate chromosome boundary. Yellow

circles: megacomplexes. The positions in the blue and salmon boxes are enlarged six-

fold in panels B and C, respectively. (B) A position within the mitotic chromosome that

contains many closely packed nucleosomes. (C) A position within the mitotic

chromosome that contains fewer, loosely packed nucleosomes. Blue circles:

nucleosomes.

Figure 5: *S. pombe* nucleosome clusters are larger in prometaphase but have the

same local packing density.

(A and B) Template-matching hits of nucleosome positions (blue spheres) in Volta

cryotomograms of a G2-phase (A) and a prometaphase (B) cell. (C) Nearest-neighbor

distance (NND) analysis of template-matching hits. X-axis: NND, 1-nm bins, Y-axis:

normalized probability. (D) Tenth NND analysis of template-matching hits. The X- and

Y- axes are the same as in panel C. (E and F) Cartoons showing how a small (E) and a

large cluster (F) of nucleosomes (rounded cylinders) could have the same NND, but

different 10th NND. In each panel, the purple and orange nucleosomes are the

respective nearest and 10th-nearest neighbors of the red nucleosome. These cartoons

do not show linker DNA, most of which cannot be seen in the Volta cryotomograms.

Figure 6: Mitotic chromatin is slightly more compact and less dynamic.

(A) Interphase chromatin consists of both small nucleosome clusters and loosely

packed nucleosomes. Blue pills: nucleosome; large gold bodies: megacomplexes.

Megacomplexes (pre-ribosomes, spliceosomes, transcription preinitiation complexes)

are interspersed between the nucleosomes and nucleosome-free pockets. (B) In

condensed mitotic chromosomes, most nucleosomes form large clusters, thereby

excluding or inhibiting the assembly of megacomplexes. Furthermore, chromatin

dynamics (magnitude proportional to the size and number of the curved lines) also

decrease. In both interphase and mitotic chromatin, ordered motifs such as face-to-face

nucleosome-nucleosome interactions are largely absent.

Figure S1: Synchronisation of *S. pombe*.

(A and B) Fluorescence micrographs of DAPI-stained G2-phase (A) and prometaphase

(B) cells. The contrast is inverted for clarity. Arrows point to an example nucleus in each

panel.

Figure S2. Cryotomograms reveal molecular detail *in vivo*.

(A) Cryotomographic slice (25 nm) of a *S. pombe* cytoplasm position that contains many

ribosomes, from the cell shown in Fig. 1B and C. (B) Subtomogram average of

cytoplasmic ribosomes. (C) Crystal structure of *S. cerevisiae* 80S ribosome (PDB 4V88;

(Ben-Shem et al., 2011)), low-pass filtered to 50 Ångstroms resolution. In panels B and

C, the left image is related to the right image by a 90° rotation around the vertical axis,

followed by a 180º rotation around the horizontal axis. Notice that in the orientation

presented on the left, the "beak" motif (arrow) points to the right in both the simulated

density map and the subtomogram average, indicating that the cryotomogram has the

correct handedness. The two maps are not expected to be identical because the

cytoplasmic ribosome map is an average of multiple conformational states.

Figure S3. Serial cryotomography reveals the location of mitotic chromosomes.

(A) A cartoon showing nearly serial cryosections of a cell. Some cryosections were not

imaged due to ice contamination, damage, grid-bar blockage, etc. (B - F)

Cryotomographic slices (10 nm) of nearly serial cryosections from a single

prometaphase cell. Cyan lines delineate the nuclear envelope; there are gaps where the

nuclear envelope densities were ambiguous. Dotted lines: approximate boundaries of

condensed chromosomes. Yellow circles: examples of megacomplexes. For clarity, the

few megacomplexes inside the dotted lines lines are not annotated. Inset: four-fold

enlargements of blue boxes.

Figure S4. An example of nucleosome reorganisation in prometaphase cells.

(A and B) Cryotomographic slices (11 nm) of nuclei in a G2-phase (A) and a

prometaphase (B) cell. The cyan lines denote the nuclear envelope; there are gaps

where the nuclear-envelope densities were ambiguous. Dashed circle in panel B:

approximate outline of a condensed chromosome. (C - F) Six-fold enlargements of

intranuclear positions that are enriched in nucleosomes, from the corresponding boxes

in panels A and B. Red arrowheads point to nucleosomes.

Figure S5. Nucleosome reorganisation is distinguishable in both defocus and

Volta cryotomograms.

(A and C) Cryotomographic slices (10 nm) of positions in G2-phase chromatin imaged

with defocus (A) and Volta (C) phase contrast. (B and D) Cryotomographic slices (10

nm) of positions in prometaphase chromatin imaged with defocus (B) or Volta (D) phase

842   contrast. Dashed circles: densely packed nucleosomes. Dashed squares: loosely-

843   packed nucleosomes.

Figure S6. Transcription is not completely repressed during mitosis.

DIC and fluorescence images of G2-phase, prometaphase and unsynchronized wild

type cells. Left: DIC; Middle: DAPI-stained DNA with inverted contrast; Right:

immunofluorescence of RNA polymerase II C-terminal domain repeat, phosphorylated

at Serine 2 (Pol II CTD S2P). Top to bottom: *cdc25-22* cell arrested in G2 phase, *nda3-*

KM311 cell arrested in prometaphase, unsynchronized cell in interphase,

unsynchronized cell in early mitosis, unsynchronized cell in late mitosis. In the

unsynchronized cultures, the cell-cycle states were determined based on the

chromosome morphology.

Figure S7. Nucleosomes remain clustered in cell lysates.

(A) Cryotomographic slice (11 nm) showing the chromatin released from

unsynchronised *S. pombe* cells. Nucleosomes oriented face-on (orange box) and side-

on (green box) are enlarged 5-fold in panels B and C, respectively. (D and E): Face-

and side-on views of a nucleosome subtomogram average of particles template-

matched from the cryotomogram shown in panel A. Notice that DNA gyres are visible in

the side view.

Figure S8. *S. pombe* prometaphase chromatin is also more compact than G2-

phase chromatin *in vitro*.

(A and B) Cryotomographic slices (30 nm) of chromatin from G2 phase (A) and

prometaphase (B) cell lysates. Dashed circles in panel A: examples of large

nucleosome-free gaps. Blue dotted lines in panel B: boundaries of chromatin mass.

Arrow in panel B: examples of small nucleosome-free gap. (C and D) Four-fold

869   enlargement of blue boxes in panels A and B, respectively. Arrows: nucleosomes.

870   Arrowhead: DNA.

Figure S9. *S. japonicus* **nucleosomes also pack into larger clusters in mitosis.**

(A and B) Volta cryotomographic slices (11 nm) of *S. japonicus* intranuclear positions in

an interphase (A) and a mitotic (B) cell. Dashed circles: nucleosome clusters. Arrow in

panel B: a spindle microtubule. (C and D) Five-fold enlargements of nuclear positions

that have nucleosomes in panels A and B. Nucleosomes are circled in blue. (E)

Nearest-neighbor and (F) tenth nearest-neighbor distance analyses of nucleosome

template-matching hits.

Figure S10. *S. pombe* **nucleosomes do not stack face-to-face in either G2-phase**

or mitotic chromosomes.

(A and C) Two-dimensional classification of dinucleosome template-matching hits in

defocus (A) and Volta (C) cryotomograms of G2-phase cells. (B and D) Two-

dimensional classification of dinucleosome template-matching hits in defocus (B) and

Volta (D) cryotomograms of prometaphase cells. Note that the 2-D classes showing

megacomplexes (false positives) or tri-nucleosomes are not shown. Also note that some

class averages, e.g., upper-left one in panel A, have a weak third density. This

additional density may be from a lower-occupancy nucleosome position or a

nucleosome that was truncated by the tomographic slice because it was not in the same

exact plane as the other two. Scale bar in panel A: 10 nm.

Figure S11. A subset of nucleosomes might be partially unwrapped *in vivo*.

(A and B) Volta cryotomographic slices (10 nm) of a di-nucleosome-like density in a *S.*

pombe G2-phase cell, showing densities consistent with short (A) and long (B) linker

DNA. (C) The chromatin in unsynchronised (left; most cells are in G2-phase) and

prometaphase (right) cells were fixed and then digested with 2 units or 0.1 units of

MNase. DNA bands corresponding to mono- and oligonucleosomes are indicated by

asterisks. (D) Nucleosome-repeat length plot of oligomer band number vs. base pairs.

The monomer and dimer were excluded from the linear regression because the

'nibbling' of linker DNA at the ends would cause an overestimate of the slope and

therefore, the nucleosome repeat length. (E and F) Cartoons showing fully (E) and

partially (F) wrapped di-nucleosomes, drawn to scale for the nucleosome diameter and

DNA length (but not DNA thickness). Red: *S. pombe* linker DNA. For the fully wrapped

nucleosomes, the linker DNA is 2.5 nm (7 bp) long. For the partially wrapped example

(10 bp unwrapped from the end of each nucleosome, the linker DNA becomes 6 nm

long). The upper and lower panels show the extreme examples that minimize (upper) or

maximize (lower) the inter-nucleosome separation for a given linker length. Upper

panels: straight linker DNA. Lower panels: linker DNA bent at an energetically

unfavorable ring angles at the entry/exit site.

Figure S12. 3-D class averages of nucleosome-like densities do not reveal high-

resolution mononucleosome-like features.

(A) A simulated density map of a mononucleosome crystal structure (PDB 1ID3; (White

et al., 2001)), low-pass filtered to 40 Ångstroms resolution. (B and C) Isosurface

renderings of representative 3-D class averages of template-matching hits in the nuclei

of a defocus (B) and a Volta (C) cryotomogram.

Figure S13. Reconciliation of *S. pombe* cryo-ET and Hi-C chromatin models.

The blue, orange, purple and red rounded cylinders represent four sequential

nucleosomes. Black lines indicate the connectivity between nucleosomes. Each column

represents the nucleosomal arrangement of a different cell, at the time of fixation. The

nucleosome pairs that are in physical contact have the potential to form crosslinks that

can result in their detection, which is plotted in the contact matrices in the second row.

Cell-to-cell variation at the time of fixation can result in the populational average shown

in the Hi-C-based contact map (lower half). For clarity, only four nucleosomes are

illustrated, but the concept here scales to clusters containing many more nucleosomes.

927   **Table S1. Cryo-EM and image-analysis specifics.**

EM grid	C-flat 4-2-2, EMS continuous carbon
Microscope	FEI Titan Krios
Energy	300 keV
Gun type	FEG
Camera	Falcon II Direct Detector
Tomography software	Leginon & FEI Tomo
Nominal magnification	8,700, 11000, 18000
Calibrated pixel size	9 Å, 7.3 Å, 4.6 Å
Defocus (nominal)	-8-12 µm
Defocus (fitted)	-9-13 µm
Defocus (nominal, Volta contrast)	-0.5 µm
Cumulative dose	80 - 150 e^- / $Å^2$
Dose fractionation	1 / cosine
Tilt range	±60°
Tilt increment	1° or 2°
Tomogram processing & visualization	IMOD 4.9
Template matching	PEET 1.10 - 1.11
File format conversion	Bsoft 1.8.8
Subtomogram classification & averaging	RELION 1.4, 2.0
Density map visualization	UCSF Chimera 1.11
Figure creation and compositing	Adobe Photoshop and Illustrator CS6, Google sheets

 Table S2. Cryotomogram details

Tomogram ID	Cells	Cell-cycle state, sample type	Figure	Dose	Pixel size (Å)	Defocus † (µm)		DPC/ VPC
						nom	ref	
15Jun11_03	*pombe*	G2, cell	1B, C, S2	103	7.3	12	13-17	DPC
17May10_01	*pombe*	G2, cell	2, S5A, S10A	80	7.3	12	13	DPC
17May09_18	*pombe*	PM, cell	3	80	7.3	12	12	DPC
15Nov16_10	*pombe*	PM, cell	4, 5B, D	100	4.6	0.5		VPC
16Mar19_123	*pombe*	G2, cell	5A, C, S12	100	4.6	0.5		VPC
16Dec21_20	*pombe*	PM, cell	S3B	150	7.3	12	13	DPC
16Dec21_18	*pombe*	PM, cell	S3C	150	7.3	12	13	DPC
16Dec21_13	*pombe*	PM, cell	S3D	150	7.3	12	13	DPC
16Dec21_12	*pombe*	PM, cell	S3E	150	7.3	12	13	DPC
16Dec21_06	*pombe*	PM, cell	S3F	150	7.3	12	13	DPC
15Jun11_07	*pombe*	G2, cell	S4A, C, D	103	7.3	12	13-17	DPC
15May25_02	*pombe*	PM, cell	S4B, E, F	100	7.3	12	10-17	DPC
17May09_13	*pombe*	PM, cell	S5B, S10B	80	7.3	12	13	DPC
17May10_02	*pombe*	G2, cell	S5C, S10C	80	7.3	0.5		VPC

16Dec06_10	*pombe*	PM, cell	S5D	150	7.3	0.5		VPC
16Nov14_05	*pombe*	Unsynchronised, lysate	S7	150	7.3	12	12	DPC
17Jul08_04	*pombe*	G2, lysate	S8A, C	108	7.3	12	14	DPC
17Jul08_01	*pombe*	PM, lysate	S8B, D	100	7.3	12	14	DPC
16Aug12_03	*japo*	Interphase, cell	S9A, C	100	5.8	0.5		VPC
16Jul25_14	*japo*	Mitosis, cell	S9B, D	100	7.3	0.5		VPC
16Dec06_7	*pombe*	PM, cell	S10D	150	7.3	0.5		VPC
15Nov16_09	*pombe*	G2, cell	S11A, B	100	4.6	0.5		VPC

930   Cell type: *pombe* = *S. pombe*; *japo* = *S. Japonicus*, G2 = G2 phase, PM =

931   prometaphase, Dose, in electrons / $Å^2$; † Nominal (nom) and refined (ref) defocus

932   values; DPC = defocus phase contrast; VPC = Volta phase contrast