MCMBP promotes the assembly of the MCM2–7 hetero-hexamers to ensure robust DNA replication in human cells

Yuichiro Saito¹, Venny Santosa¹, Kei-ichiro Ishiguro² and Masato T. Kanemaki^{1,3}

1. Department of Chromosome Science, National Institute of Genetics, Research Organization of Information and Systems (ROIS), Yata 1111, Mishima, Shizuoka 411-8540, Japan
2. Department of Chromosome Biology, Institute of Molecular Embryology and Genetics (IMEG), Kumamoto University, Chuo-ku, Kumamoto 860-0811, Japan.
3. Department of Genetics, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Yata 1111, Mishima, Shizuoka 411-8540, Japan

All correspondence should be addressed to

Masato T. Kanemaki, PhD

E-mail: mkanemak@nig.ac.jp

Phone: (+81) 55 981 5830

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7657-1649>

Running title: MCMBP promotes the assembly of MCM2–7

Key words: DNA replication, Genome instability, MCM2–7, MCMBP and protein complex assembly

Abstract

The MCM2–7 hetero-hexamer is the replicative DNA helicase that plays a central role in eukaryotic DNA replication. In proliferating cells, the expression level of the MCM2–7 hexamer is kept high, which safeguards the integrity of the genome. However, how the MCM2–7 hexamer is assembled in living cells remains unknown. Here, we revealed that the MCM-binding protein (MCMBP) plays a critical role in the assembly of this hexamer in human cells. MCMBP associates with MCM3 which is essential for maintaining the level of the MCM2–7 hexamer. Acute depletion of MCMBP demonstrated that it contributes to MCM2–7 assembly using nascent MCM3. Cells depleted of MCMBP gradually ceased to proliferate because of reduced replication licensing. Under this condition, p53-positive cells exhibited arrest in the G1 phase, whereas p53-null cells entered the S phase and lost their viability because of the accumulation of DNA damage, suggesting that MCMBP is a potential target for killing p53-deficient cancers.

Introduction

The minichromosome maintenance 2–7 (MCM2–7) hexamer is a replicative helicase that plays a central role in eukaryotic DNA replication (Bochman & Schwacha, 2009; Masai, Matsumoto, You, Yoshizawa-Sugata, & Oda, 2010). Its six subunits are evolutionally related to each other and form a hetero-hexamer. In the late M to G1 phase, the MCM2–7 hexamer is loaded onto replication origins bound with ORC1–6, to form pre-replicative complexes (pre-RCs). This reaction, which is also known as licensing, is aided by CDC6 and CDT1. Importantly, the MCM2–7 complex in pre-RCs is inactive as a helicase. Subsequently, upon the activation of two kinases, i.e. S-CDK and

CDC7, MCM2–7 in pre-RCs is converted to the active CDC45-GINS-MCM (CMG) helicase, which becomes the core of the replisome and drives the replication forks in the S phase. The replication forks sometimes stall or collapse when they encounter obstacles of both intra- and extra-cellular origins, leading to the accumulation of ‘replication stress’ (Hills & Diffley, 2014; Zeman & Cimprich, 2014). Failure or incompleteness of DNA replication causes genome instability, potentially resulting in cell death, cancer development or genetic disorder. Moreover, cancer cells experience replication stress intrinsically, which is thought to drive cancer evolution (Hills & Diffley, 2014). After DNA replication, unused MCM2–7 hexamers at dormant origins are removed (Chong, Mahbubani, Khoo, & Blow, 1995; Kubota, Mimura, Nishimoto, Takisawa, & Nojima, 1995; Todorov, Attaran, & Kearsley, 1995). The meeting of two converging forks during replication termination leads to the ubiquitylation of MCM7 in the CMG helicase, which is recognized and extracted by the p97/CDC48 segregase (Maric, Maculins, De Piccoli, & Labib, 2014; Moreno, Bailey, Campion, Herron, & Gambus, 2014). Finally, the MCM subunits released from chromatin are recycled to form a functional MCM2–7 hexamer, for the next round of replication (Sedlackova et al., 2020).

Proliferating cells express high levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer, which is loaded onto origins in 3–10-fold excess over the level used for normal origin firing (Edwards et al., 2002). Only a subset of loaded MCM2–7 hexamers at origins are used for DNA replication, with the remaining complexes creating dormant origins, which are used as a back-up when cells are challenged by replication stress. It has also been proposed that

MCM2–7 in dormant origins works as a roadblock to slow the replication forks, thus safeguarding DNA replication (Sedlackova et al., 2020). In fact, metazoan cells with reduced licensed origins are sensitive to replication stress and DNA damage (Ge, Jackson, & Blow, 2007; Ibarra, Schwob, & Mendez, 2008; Woodward et al., 2006). Moreover, mice expressing a reduced level of MCM2–7 are prone to developing cancers (Kawabata et al., 2011; Kunnev et al., 2010; Pruitt, Bailey, & Freeland, 2007; Shima et al., 2007). The maintenance of a high level of MCM2–7 is important for genome maintenance in proliferating cells. The *MCM* genes are transcriptionally upregulated by E2F following growth stimulation (Leone et al., 1998; Ohtani et al., 1999). However, other than transcriptional activation for the *de novo* synthesis of the MCM subunits, little is known about how they are assembled into the MCM2–7 hexamer and how it is kept at high levels in proliferating cells.

The MCM-binding protein (MCMBP) was identified as a protein that associates with the MCM subunits, with the exception of MCM2, and was proposed to form an alternative MCM–MCMBP complex via the replacement of MCM2 (Sakwe, Nguyen, Athanasopoulos, Shire, & Frappier, 2007). However, overexpressed MCMBP can interact with all MCM subunits with different affinity (Nguyen, Jagannathan, Shire, & Frappier, 2012). MCMBP is highly conserved in eukaryotes, with the exception of its absence in budding yeast, and has an MCM-like domain with no Walker A motifs, suggesting that it shares a common ancestor with the MCM proteins. The reported phenotypes stemming from the loss of MCMBP vary among species. Sister-chromatid cohesion was defective in an ETG1/MCMBP mutant of *Arabidopsis thaliana* (Takahashi

et al., 2010). Defects in the cell cycle and licensing were found in fission yeast after the inactivation of Mcb1/MCMBP (Ding & Forsburg, 2011; Li, Schnick, Hayles, & MacNeill, 2011; Santosa, Martha, Hirose, & Tanaka, 2013). Moreover, MCMBP depletion in *Xenopus* egg extracts yielded a defect in the unloading of MCM2–7 from chromatin in the late S phase (Nishiyama, Frappier, & Mechali, 2011), whereas its depletion in *Trypanosoma brucei* caused defects in gene silencing and DNA replication (Kim, 2019; Kim, Park, Gunzl, & Cross, 2013). In turn, MCMBP depletion in human cells caused nuclear deformation (Jagannathan, Sakwe, Nguyen, & Frappier, 2012). The recent literature reported that MCMBP protects the newly synthesized MCM subunits from degradation and promotes their nuclear transport using a nuclear localization signal (NLS) within MCMBP (Sedlackova et al., 2020).

Here, we report that MCMBP mainly associated with *de novo* synthesized MCM3 (namely, nascent MCM3) under physiological conditions and was essential for the formation of the MCM2–7 hexamer using nascent MCM3. Although the association of MCMBP with MCM3 is required for maintaining the high levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer and, thus, for supporting normal proliferation, the NLS within MCMBP was dispensable, suggesting that the main function of MCMBP lies in the promotion of the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer.

Results

MCM3 associates with MCMBP to form a subcomplex

We initially examined the MCM2–7 complexes in human cells. For this purpose, we prepared soluble and chromatin extracts from human colorectal cancer HCT116 cells (**Figure 1–figure supplement 1a**) and subsequently size-fractionated the extracts using a gel filtration column (**Figure 1a**). In the chromatin extract, all MCM subunits were detected at around 600 kDa (**Figure 1a**, right), suggesting that they form a heterohexamer (Prokhorova & Blow, 2000). In the soluble extract, the MCM2–7 subunits were detected in the similar 600 kDa fractions, but MCM3 was also detected in the fractions of smaller molecules (**Figure 1a**, left). Moreover, MCMBP was also observed in smaller fractions only in the soluble extracts, suggesting that it does not bind to chromatin and may associate with MCM3 in the soluble extract. We further examined the MCM2–7 hexamer in the soluble extract using native PAGE and detected the MCM2–7 hexamer and a subcomplex composed of MCM2/4/6/7, as reported previously (**Figure 1–figure supplement 1b**)(Prokhorova & Blow, 2000). Interestingly, 68% of MCM3 was incorporated into the MCM2–7 hexamer, with the remainder existing as a monomer or in smaller complexes (**Figure 1b, c** and **Figure 1–figure supplement 1c**)(Tamberg et al., 2018). To investigate whether MCM3 associates with MCMBP, a FLAG tag was fused to the endogenous MCM3 protein (**Figure 1–figure supplement 1d**). We carried out FLAG immunoprecipitation from the soluble extract after fractionation for large and small proteins, and found that MCM3 is associated with MCMBP, as well as MCM5, in the smaller fractions, as reported previously (**Figure 1d**)(Prokhorova & Blow, 2000). These results suggest that MCM3 forms a subcomplex with MCMBP.

MCMBP depletion causes loss of MCM3 and MCM5 from the MCM2–7 hexamer

To investigate the effect of MCMBP depletion on the MCM2–7 hexamer, we generated a conditional mutant using the AID2 system (Yesbolatova et al., 2020). The MCMBP protein fused with the mini-AID (mAID) degron was rapidly degraded after the addition of an auxin analogue, 5-Ph-IAA (**Figure 2a, b**). We confirmed that endogenous MCMBP fused with mAID-Clover (MCMBP-mAC) was mainly expressed in the nucleus and became undetectable after the addition of 5-Ph-IAA for 4 h (**Figure 2–figure supplement 1a**). Even without MCMBP, we did not observe a drastic effect on the cell-cycle distribution for up to 3 days (**Figure 2–figure supplement 1b**). However, we found that the expression levels of MCM3 and MCM5 gradually decreased in the soluble extract (**Figure 2c**, soluble). Furthermore, the level of all chromatin-bound MCMs decreased, suggesting a reduced level of the MCM2–7 hexamer in the absence of MCMBP (**Figure 2c**, chromatin). We prepared a soluble extract after MCMBP depletion for 2 days and fractionated it, as shown in **Figure 1a**. We found that MCM3 was lost from the 600 kDa fractions containing the MCM2–7 hexamer and migrated only in smaller fractions (**Figure 2d**). Interestingly, MCM5 was also lost from the 600 kDa fractions. The loss of MCM3 from the MCM2–7 hexamer was confirmed by native PAGE (**Figure 2–figure supplement 1c**), and the level of the MCM2–7 hexamer became half and one-quarter on Days 1 and 2, respectively (**Figure 2–figure supplement 1d**). Considering that the doubling time of HCT116 is about 24 h, the MCMBP-depleted cells might have grown using the MCM2–7 hexamer formed before MCMBP depletion. These results suggest that MCMBP is required for the incorporation of MCM3 and MCM5 into the MCM2–7 hexamer.

Next, we wished to determine whether the association of MCMBP with MCM3 is essential for maintaining the high levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer. For this purpose, we initially identified the interaction domain within MCMBP. The full-length MCMBP (FL) and a mutant lacking the nuclear localization signal (Δ NLS) bound to MCM3 (**Figure 3a, b**). Conversely, a mutant lacking the N terminus of MCMBP (Δ N) lost its association with MCM3. We also found that the middle and C-terminal domains of the protein were necessary for the association, although the expression levels of these truncation mutants were lower than those of the other mutants. Subsequently, we found that the N terminus of MCM3 was bound to MCMBP (**Figure 3–figure supplement 1a, b**).

Next, we introduced an *MCMBP* transgene encoding FL, Δ N and Δ NLS into MCMBP-mAC cells. We depleted endogenous MCMBP-mAC and assessed whether those MCMBP mutants support the retention of MCM3 in the MCM2–7 hexamer. For this purpose, we treated the cells with 5-Ph-IAA for 2 days, prepared soluble extracts and ran a native PAGE. We found that, in cells expressing MCMBP FL and Δ NLS, the level of MCM3 in the MCM2–7 hexamer was maintained (**Figure 3c, d**). Conversely, in the cells expressing MCMBP Δ N, the level of MCM3 was reduced. Subsequently, we analysed cell proliferation after depletion of MCMBP-mAC. Cells with MCMBP-mAC depletion exhibited a gradual slowing of proliferation, which was the same even if MCMBP Δ N was expressed (**Figure 3e**). Conversely, the cells expressing MCMBP FL and Δ NLS proliferated in a manner similar to the controls after MCMBP-mAC depletion. These results indicate that the interaction of MCMBP with MCM3 is essential for

maintaining MCM3 in the MCM2–7 hexamer, which is crucial for normal cell proliferation.

MCMBP promotes the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer using nascent MCM3

In the absence of MCMBP, the level of the MCM2–7 hexamer decreased with time (**Figure 2–figure supplement 1c, d**), suggesting that the formation of the nascent MCM2–7 hexamer was defective. In support of this finding, Sedlackova et al. recently reported that the stabilization and nuclear translocation of the nascent MCM subunits require MCMBP (Sedlackova et al., 2020). Therefore, we reasoned that MCMBP might associate with nascent MCM3 and promote the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer. To monitor nascent MCM3, we introduced a transgene encoding the MCM3 protein fused with a destabilizing domain (DD) into MCMBP-mAC cells (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1a**). The DD-MCM3 protein was degraded in the absence of a DD stabilizing ligand, Shield-1, but was expressed after its addition (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1b**). We added Shield-1 to the cells with or without MCMBP and prepared soluble extracts at 0, 6 and 24 h after its addition. Subsequently, we size-fractionated the extracts and looked at nascent DD-MCM3 (**Figure 4a**). In the cells expressing MCMBP, DD-MCM3 was detected around 160 kDa at 6 h. Subsequently, a new peak emerged around 600 kDa at 24 h, indicating that nascent MCM3 was incorporated, to form the MCM2–7 hexamer. Conversely, in cells with MCMBP depletion, DD-MCM3 was detected around 160 kDa, and the new peak at higher molecular weights was never observed. These observations are consistent with the hypothesis that MCMBP promotes the incorporation of nascent MCM3 into the MCM2–7 hexamer.

204

205 We further tested whether a functional MCM2–7 hexamer is formed with nascent

206 MCM3. To mimic the expression timing of *MCM* genes occurring in the late G1 to S

207 phase (Leone et al., 1998; Ohtani et al., 1999), we initially synchronized the cells at the

208 G1 phase using lovastatin and released them in medium with or without 5-Ph-IAA (0 h)

209 (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1c**). Subsequently, we added Shield-1 (for expressing

210 DD-MCM3) at 14 h, when the cells started to enter the S phase. In the presence and

211 absence of MCMBP, the cells progressed through the S, G2 and M phases similarly and

212 came back to the next G1 phase at 25 h (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1d**). We

213 confirmed that DD-MCM3 was expressed in the S, G2 and next G1 phases (**Figure 4b,**

214 **c** and **Figure 4–figure supplement 1e**), and noted that the expression level of DD-

215 MCM3 was lower in cells with MCMBP depletion (comparison of absence/presence of

216 MCMBP), suggesting that MCMBP protects nascent MCM3 from degradation

217 (Sedlackova et al., 2020). However, nascent DD-MCM3 was still detected in the nucleus

218 (**Figure 4b, c**). In the same condition, we extracted soluble proteins before fixation, and

219 DD-MCM3 binding to chromatin was observed (**Figure 4d, e** and **Figure 4–figure**

220 **supplement 1e**). In cells expressing MCMBP, chromatin-bound DD-MCM3 was

221 detected only in the next G1 phase, showing that DD-MCM3 expressed after the S

222 phase was converted to a functional MCM2–7 hexamer, which bound chromatin in the

223 next G1 phase. Conversely, in cells with depletion of MCMBP, chromatin-bound DD-

224 MCM3 was not detected in the next G1 phase, suggesting a defect in the formation of a

225 functional MCM2–7 hexamer with nascent MCM3. Furthermore, we confirmed that DD-

226 MCM3 did not bind to the other MCM subunits in the absence of MCMBP, as assessed

by IP-immunoblotting (**Figure 4f**) and IP-mass spectrometry analyses (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1f**). Based on these results, we concluded that MCMBP promotes the incorporation of nascent MCM3 into the MCM2–7 hexamer.

Among the six MCM subunits, MCM2 and MCM3 alone contain an NLS (Kimura, Ohtomo, Yamaguchi, Ishii, & Sugimoto, 1996). Recently, MCMBP, which also contains an NLS, was reported to be required for the translocation of nascent MCM4 into the nucleus (Sedlackova et al., 2020). To confirm this observation, we introduced DD-fused MCM4 (MCM4-DD) and induced its expression by adding Shield-1 (**Figure 4–figure supplement 2a**). Consistent with the previous report, MCM4-DD did not accumulate in the nucleus in the absence of MCMBP (**Figure 4–figure supplement 2b**), whereas DD-MCM3 accumulated in the nucleus possibly by using the NLS within MCM3 (**Figure 4–figure supplement 2c**). In the absence of MCMBP, the association of MCM3 and MCM5 with DD-MCM4 was reduced, supporting our notion that MCMBP promotes the incorporation of MCM3 into the MCM2–7 hexamer (**Figure 4–figure supplement 2d**, compare lanes 6 and 8).

MCMBP depletion leads to loss of cell viability in p53-negative cells

The results reported above showed that MCMBP is required for the formation of a functional MCM2–7 by promoting the incorporation of nascent MCM3 (**Figure 4**). Reduced levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer lower DNA replication licensing and promote genome instabilities (Ge et al., 2007; Ibarra et al., 2008; Kawabata et al., 2011; Shima et al., 2007; Woodward et al., 2006). We investigated cell proliferation after MCMBP

depletion and found a gradual slowing of cell growth (**Figure 5a**, – MCMBP p53+/+). In these cells, chromatin-bound MCM2 was downregulated with time (**Figure 5–figure supplement 1a**), and 5-ethynyl-2'-deoxyuridine (EdU) uptake within a fixed period was increased, suggesting increased fork speed (**Figure 5–figure supplement 1b**) (Sedlackova et al., 2020). As expected, the levels of p53 and p21 were increased on Day 5 (**Figure 5–figure supplement 1c**), suggesting that they slowed cell growth because of the cell-cycle checkpoint. In fact, on Day 8, the MCMBP-depleted cells showed a higher G1 population (**Figure 5b**, p53+/+, control). Moreover, the addition of RO-3306, which is a CDK1 inhibitor, did not deplete this G1 population (**Figure 5b**, p53+/+, + RO-3306), supporting the hypothesis that the growth of cells with MCMBP depletion was slowed by the G1 checkpoint. Therefore, we reasoned that the loss of p53 might rescue the growth defect. For this purpose, we deleted the *TP53* gene in the MCMBP-mAC background (p53–/–) and investigated cell growth after MCMBP depletion. Unexpectedly, p53–/– cells with MCMBP depletion still exhibited slowed growth, although they showed a slightly better growth than the p53+/+ cells (**Figure 5a**, – MCMBP). Interestingly, p53–/– cells showed increased G2/M populations after MCMBP depletion (**Figure 5b**, p53–/–, control). This observation implies that p53–/– cells with depletion of MCMBP accumulated more DNA damage than did p53+/+ cells. In fact, p53–/– cells showed a greater number of nuclear 53BP1 foci and higher levels of H2AX phosphorylation than did p53+/+ cells (**Figure 5c** and **Figure 5–figure supplement 1d, e**).

If p53^{-/-} cells with MCMBP depletion enter the S phase and accumulate more DNA damage, and p53^{+/+} cells undergo arrest in the G1 phase, we would expect that the viability of p53^{-/-} cells should decrease more sharply than that of p53^{+/+} cells. To test this hypothesis, we initially depleted MCMBP for 4 or 8 days in the presence of 5-Ph-IAA and subsequently re-expressed MCMBP in medium without 5-Ph-IAA (**Figure 5d**). We found that p53^{-/-} cells showed a pronounced viability loss compared with p53^{+/+} cells (**Figure 5e**). These results indicate that the p53-dependent checkpoint prohibited the cells from entering the S phase and protected genome integrity in the absence of MCMBP.

Discussion

Although a recombinant MCM2–7 hexamer has successfully been reconstructed using an overexpression system based on yeast, insect and human cells (Jenkyn-Bedford et al., 2021; Rzechorzek, Hardwick, Jatikusumo, Chirgadze, & Pellegrini, 2020; Yeeles, Deegan, Janska, Early, & Diffley, 2015), little is known about how the MCM2–7 hexamer is assembled in living cells. In this study, we revealed that MCMBP played a crucial role in the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer in human cells. MCMBP formed a complex with MCM3 via its N-terminal region and promoted the formation of the MCM2–7 hexamer (**Figures 2 and 3**). In the absence of MCMBP, nascent MCM3 did not bind to any other of the MCM proteins, whereas the nascent MCM4 formed an MCM2/4/6/7 complex (**Figure 4 and Figure 4–figure supplement 2**). As a result, the licensing level was gradually reduced as the cells proliferated, and the pre-existing MCM2–7 hexamer was distributed into the two daughter cells. The reduced licensing observed after

MCMBP depletion caused a slow-growth phenotype in cells with and without p53 (Figure 5). However, the p53-negative cells became more sensitive to MCMBP depletion than did the p53-positive cells (discussed below). MCMBP is conserved in many species, including *Trypanosoma*, fission yeast, plants and mammalian cells (Ding & Forsburg, 2011; Kim et al., 2013; Sakwe et al., 2007; Santosa et al., 2013; Takahashi et al., 2010). We expect that the MCMBP homologues in other species might play a similar role in MCM2–7 hexamer assembly. The variable phenotypes of MCMBP mutants observed in these organisms, such as defects in sister-chromatid cohesion, cell cycle and nuclear deformation, might stem from DNA replication with reduced licensing. Budding yeast does not possess an MCMBP orthologue, and Cdt1 strongly associates with the MCM2–7 hexamer before replication licensing and is required for the accumulation of MCM2–7 in the nucleus (Sun et al., 2013; Tanaka & Diffley, 2002). Cdt1 may also help the assembly of the hexamer in this species.

Here, we propose that MCMBP promotes the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer by incorporating MCM3 and MCM5 into the MCM2/4/6/7 subcomplex (Figure 5f). MCMBP may help the assembly of the MCM2–7 hexamer as a chaperone. Previous reports have indicated that overproduction of MCMBP reduces the levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer complex in *Xenopus* egg extracts, fission yeast and *in vitro* using human proteins (Ding & Forsburg, 2011; Kusunoki & Ishimi, 2014; Nishiyama et al., 2011), showing that the amount of MCMBP regulates the equilibrium between the hexamer and the subcomplexes. Therefore, MCMBP may be a molecular chaperone for MCM2–7. Another possibility is that MCMBP co-operates with other chaperones for the assembly

of the MCM2–7 hexamer. MCMBP was reported to associate with a prolyl-isomerase, i.e. FKBP5 (also known as FKBP51)(Taipale et al., 2014), which is involved in protein folding (Pirkl & Buchner, 2001). We found that MCM3 was associated with FKBP5 in an MCMBP-dependent manner (**Figure 4–figure supplement 1f**). These findings indicate that MCMBP assists the binding of FKBP5 to MCM3, resulting in MCM2–7 hexamer assembly. It has been shown that MCM3 binds to Keap1 (Mulvaney et al., 2016; Tamberg et al., 2018), which is a substrate adaptor for a CUL3 E3 ubiquitin ligase. Therefore, MCMBP may also protect nascent MCM3 from degradation via CUL3-Keap1. In fact, the expression of nascent MCM3 was reduced after MCMBP depletion (**Figure 2c**).

MCMBP was originally identified as a protein that binds to multiple MCM subunits, with the exception of MCM2 (Sakwe et al., 2007). Although we found that MCMBP is associated with MCM3, a previous work suggested that human MCMBP mainly binds to MCM3, 5 and 7 when co-expressed with MCM2–7 *in vitro* (Kusunoki & Ishimi, 2014). Thus, our data do not rule out the possibility that MCMBP associates with other MCM subunits. Notably, in the absence of MCMBP, we detected reduced levels of MCM3 and MCM5 (**Figure 2c**) and identified MCM3 in the smaller fractions (**Figure 2d**), which indicated that the other MCM subunits effectively formed an MCM2/4/6/7 subcomplex, even in the absence of MCMBP. MCM5 sharply decreased after MCM3 depletion, indicating that MCM5 becomes unstable once the MCM2–7 hexamer is disrupted (**Figure 2c**).

Among the components of the MCM2–7 hexamer, only MCM2 and MCM3 contain NLS sequences (Kimura et al., 1996). A previous work showed that, in fission yeast, the localization of MCM2–7 in the nucleus requires hexamer formation (Pasion & Forsburg, 1999). In line with this observation, nascent MCM4 did not efficiently translocate into the nucleus when MCM2–7 hexamer formation was disturbed by MCMBP depletion (**Figure 4–figure supplement 2b**). Recently, Sedlackova et al. reported that the nascent MCM subcomplexes are translocated into the nucleus with the help of the NLS signal in MCMBP, and subsequently form the MCM2–7 hexamer (Sedlackova et al., 2020). We found that the NLS within MCMBP was not required for MCM2–7 hexamer formation nor for maintaining cell growth (**Figure 3d, e**). This implies that, in human cells, the MCM2–7 hexamer can form in the cytoplasm, and subsequently translocate into the nucleus. However, it is also possible that MCMBP Δ NLS is associated with the localization of MCM3 in the nucleus and promotes hexamer formation in that cell compartment. In support of this hypothesis, MCMBP Δ NLS was localized both in the cytoplasm and nucleus (**Figure 3–figure supplement 1c**). Our data support the idea that the formation of the MCM2–7 hexamer can take place both in the cytoplasm and the nucleus.

When the loading of the MCM2–7 hexamer onto DNA is reduced by knock down of ORC, Cdc6, Cdt1 or MCM2–7, the ‘licensing checkpoint’ arrests the cell cycle at the G1 phase (McIntosh & Blow, 2012). The licensing checkpoint causes the p53-dependent activation of the CDK inhibitors p21 and p27, whereas the mechanism via which the checkpoint senses the licensing level remains unknown. When MCMBP was depleted for more than 5 days, we found that the cells were arrested in the G1 phase following

the activation of the p53–p21 axis (**Figure 5b** and **Figure 5–figure supplement 1c, e, e**). We observed that the number of 53BP1 foci (indicators of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs)) was slightly, albeit significantly, increased after MCMBP depletion (**Figure 5c** and **Figure 5–figure supplement 1d**, compare MCMBP+ and – in p53+/+, $P = 0.035$). Therefore, we hypothesized that, when cells enter the S phase with reduced levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer, they accumulate small amounts of DSBs. Considering that one DSB alone is sufficient to elicit cell-cycle arrest at the G1 phase (Barlow, Lisby, & Rothstein, 2008), the small number of DSBs generated after reduced licensing might be a mechanism of the licensing checkpoint.

In the absence of p53, cells with MCMBP depletion entered the S phase with reduced levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer, and then lost their viability (**Figure 5g**). A recent article showed that MCMBP accumulates at high levels in cancer cells (Quimbaya et al., 2014), which may be related to the overexpression of MCM2–7 observed in many cancerous tissues (Gonzalez, Tachibana, Laskey, & Coleman, 2005; Tachibana, Gonzalez, & Coleman, 2005). Therefore, MCMBP is a potential target for cancer chemotherapy, to kill p53-deficient cancers by allowing them to enter the S phase with an insufficient number of licensed origins (McIntosh & Blow, 2012), whereas normal cells are temporarily arrested in the G0 or G1 phase.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ms Mayumi Takahashi, Tomoko Suzuki and Shizuoko Endo for technical support. We also thank Drs Yumiko Kurokawa, Yasuto Murayama and Yasushi Saeki

for discussion, and Dr Naoki Tani for the MS analyses. This research was supported by JSPS KAKENHI grants (JP21K15021 to YS; JP20H05396 and JP21H04719 to MTK), a JST CREST grant (JPMJCR21E6 to MTK), a research grant from the Tokyo Biomedical Research Foundation to MTK and the Joint Usage/Research Centre for Developmental Medicine, IMEG, Kumamoto University.

Competing interests

The authors declare that no competing interests exists.

Methods

Cell culture

HCT116 cells (ATCC, #CCL-247) were cultured in McCoy's 5A medium supplemented with 10% FBS (Sigma-Aldrich), 2 mM L-glutamine, 100 U/mL penicillin and 100 µg/mL streptomycin at 37 °C with 5% CO₂. Transfection was carried out as described previously(Yesbolatova et al., 2020). For inducing the degradation of MCMBP fused with mAID-Clover, 5-Ph-IAA (BioAcademia, 30-003) was added to the culture medium at 1 µM. For introducing the expression of DD-fused proteins, Shield-1 (CheminPharma, S1) was added to the culture medium at 1 µM.

Cell lines

All HCT116 cell lines used in this study are listed in **Table 1**. To tag endogenous genes, we transfected a CRISPR plasmid targeting the N- or C-terminus coding region of gene of interest with a donor plasmid(s) to HCT116 cells constitutively expressing

OsTIR1(F74G) as described previously (Saito & Kanemaki, 2021). For generating the MCMBP-mAC cells, we used a CRISPR plasmid targeting the C-terminus coding region of the *MCMBP* gene (target sequence: 5'-GTTTGCCCATTACTCTTCAT-3') and two donors encoding mAID-Clover with a Neo/Hygro selection marker. After the selection in the presence of G418 (700 µg/mL) and hygromycin (100 µg/mL), the clones were isolated and the bi-allelic insertion was confirmed by genomic PCR. Subsequently, the expression of the MCMBP-mAID-Clover protein was confirmed by Western blotting. For introducing MCMBP transgenes, we transfected a plasmid encoding HA-tagged MCMBP (full length or mutants) with a PiggyBac transposon plasmid to the MCMBP-mAC cells. After culturing the cells for a week in the presence of blasticidin S (10 µg/mL), the surviving cells were used. For introducing a MCM transgene fused with the destabilizing domain (DD), we transfected a plasmid encoding DD-tagged MCM3 or MCM4 with a PiggyBac transposon plasmid to the MCMBP-mAC cells. After the selection in the presence of blasticidin S (10 µg/mL), the clones were isolated and the expression was confirmed by Western blotting. For knocking out p53, we transfected a CRISPR plasmid targeting exon 3 of p53 gene (target sequence: 5'-CGGACGATATTGAACAATGG-3') to the MCMBP-mAC cells. Clones were isolated and p53 expression loss was confirmed by Western blotting.

Plasmids

All plasmids used in this study are listed in **Table 2**.

Preparation of cell extracts

HCT116 cells were incubated with ice-cold IP buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH, 150 mM KOAc, 1 mM EDTA, 5% glycerol, 5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 10 mM ATP and protease inhibitor cocktail (Merck, 11873580001)) containing 0.2% Nonidet P(NP)-40 for 2 min on ice. After low-speed centrifugation at 1,200 × *g*, the supernatant was collected, further centrifuged at 16,000 × *g* and used as the soluble extract. The pellet obtained after the initial low-speed centrifugation was incubated in ice-cold IP buffer containing 1% NP-40 and 25–50 U of Benzonase (Merck, 70746) for 30 min on ice. After centrifugation at 16,000 × *g*, the supernatant was collected and used as the chromatin extract.

Gel filtration

Gel filtration was carried out as described previously (Coster, Frigola, Beuron, Morris, & Diffley, 2014). Briefly, gel filtration was performed using a Superose 6 10/300GL column (GE Healthcare) fitted to an AKTA explorer system (GE Healthcare) at a flow speed of 0.25 mL/min at 4 °C. Next, 0.5 mL of soluble and chromatin extracts was applied to the column, which had been pre-equilibrated in gel filtration buffer (40 mM HEPES-KOH, 300 mM KOAc, 5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 0.02% NP-40, 5% glycerol, 5 mM 2-mercaptoethanol and 0.1 mM PMSF). Three fractions were mixed in a tube (e.g. #1–3, #4–6, etc.) and boiled in an SDS sample buffer. The sizes of proteins in the fractions were estimated using thyroglobulin (669 kDa), ferritin (440 kDa), aldolase (158 kDa) and ovalbumin (44 kDa).

Immunoblotting

Proteins were separated using a TGX Stain-Free gel (Bio-Rad, 4568026) or a SuperSep Ace gel (Fujifilm Wako, 197-15011), and transferred onto an Amersham Protran 0.45 μ m NC membrane (Cytiva, 10600003). The membrane was incubated with the primary antibody at 4 °C overnight, and subsequently with the secondary antibody at 25 °C for 1 h. Images were acquired using a ChemiDoc Touch MP imaging system (Bio-Rad). The antibodies used in this study are listed in **Table 3**.

Native PAGE

Proteins extracted as described above were mixed with a loading buffer (20 mM KOAc, 0.006% bromophenol blue and 10% glycerol) and kept on ice. Proteins were separated on a SuperSep Ace gel using the Novex Tris-Glycine Native Running Buffer (Thermo, LC2672). The gel was incubated in a transfer buffer containing 0.05% SDS and subjected to protein transfer as described in the 'Immunoblotting' sub-section.

Immunoprecipitation

Immunoprecipitation was carried out as described previously (Hustedt et al., 2019). To precipitate FLAG-tagged proteins, 15 μ L of an anti-FLAG M2 affinity gel (Sigma-Aldrich, A2220) was added to extracts and incubated at 4 °C for 2 h with rotation. To precipitate HA-tagged proteins, 4 μ g of an HA-tag antibody (MBL, M132-3) was mixed with 20 μ L of Dynabeads Protein G (Invitrogen, #10004D) and subsequently added to extracts. Beads were washed three times with an IP buffer containing 1% NP-40 and boiled in SDS sample buffer. The supernatant was used for immunoblotting.

Measurement of cell proliferation

Cells were plated onto a 6-well plate and cultured in the presence or absence of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. Growth curves were obtained by passaging cells and measuring cell density every 2 days. Relative cell density was calculated by taking the density recorded on Day 0 as 100.

Cell-cycle synchronization

Cell-cycle synchronization was carried out as described previously (Natsume, Kiyomitsu, Saga, & Kanemaki, 2016). Briefly, cells were plated onto a 6-well plate and cultured for 2 days. Lovastatin (LKT Laboratories, M1687) was added to a final concentration of 20 μ M. After 24 h, the cells were washed once with a lovastatin-free medium and then grown in a medium containing 2 mM ($\pm$) mevalonolactone (Sigma-Aldrich, M4667) with or without 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. The cells were collected at 14 h (G1/S), 17 h (S), 21 h (G2) or 25 h (next G1).

Survival assay

Two hundred cells were plated onto a 6-well plate and cultured in the presence or absence of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA for 4 or 8 days. The cells were washed three times with a 5-Ph-IAA-free medium and then grown in fresh medium for 10 days. Colonies were counted after staining with crystal violet.

Microscopy

Cells grown in a poly-D-lysine-coated glass-bottom dish (MATTEK, P35GC-1.5-14-C) were washed with PBS and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde phosphate buffer (Fujifilm Wako, 161-20141) at 4 °C for 1 h. The cells were imaged on a Delta Vision deconvolution microscope (GE Healthcare) after DNA staining with Hoechst 33342 (Invitrogen, H1399). Images were analysed using the Volocity 6.3.1. software. For detecting all or chromatin-bound DD-MCM3, cells were trypsinized and incubated in PBS with or without 0.2% NP-40 for 2 min on ice. After washing with ice-cold PBS, the cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde phosphate buffer at 4 °C for 0.5 h, mounted on a glass slide using CytoSpin 4 (Thermo) and stained with Hoechst 33342. For the formation of 53BP1 foci, the cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde phosphate buffer and incubated with the primary antibody at 25 °C for 2 h. After washing, the cells were incubated with the secondary antibody at 25 °C for 1 h and stained with Hoechst 33342.

Flow cytometry

Cells were plated onto a 6-well plate and cultured in the presence or absence of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. For RO-3306 treatment, RO-3306 (Sigma-Aldrich, SML0569) was added to 9 μ M for 16 h before fixation. The cells were fixed in 70% ethanol, washed with PBS and resuspended in PBS containing 1% BSA, 50 μ g/ml of RNase A and 40 μ g/ml of propidium iodide. For detecting MCM2, cells were incubated in PBS with 0.2% NP-40 for 2 min on ice. After washing with ice-cold PBS, the cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde phosphate buffer and incubated with the primary antibody at 25 °C for 2 h. After washing, the cells were incubated with the secondary antibody at 25 °C for 1 h and resuspended in PBS containing 1% BSA, 50 μ g/ml of RNase A and 40 μ g/ml of

propidium iodide. For detecting DNA synthesis, cells were incubated with 10 μ M EdU for 0.5 h. EdU was visualized using the Click-iT Plus EdU Imaging Kit (Thermo, C10640), according to the manufacturer's instructions. After DNA staining at 37 °C for 0.5 h, the cells were analysed using a BD Accuri C6 flow cytometer (BD Biosciences) and the FCS4 Express Cytometry software (DeNovo Software); 10,000 (for cell cycle) or 50,000 (for detecting MCM2 and DNA synthesis) cells were analysed for each sample.

Mass spectrometry

To purify FLAG-tagged DD-MCM3, 3×10^7 cells were incubated with ice-cold IP buffer containing 1% NP-40 and 150 U of Benzonase for 30 min on ice. After centrifugation at $16,000 \times g$, the supernatant was collected and subjected to the IP experiment. Next, 5 μ g of a FLAG M2 antibody (Sigma-Aldrich) was mixed with 50 μ L of Dynabeads Protein G, and subsequently processed through an extraction step and incubated at 4 °C for 2 h with rotation. Beads were washed three times with an IP buffer containing 1% NP-40. Bound proteins were eluted using IP buffer containing 0.25 mg/mL of 3 $\times$ FLAG peptides (Sigma-Aldrich) at 25 °C for 5 min. The elution step was repeated a total of 3 times and the eluent was collected into a tube. Proteins were precipitated with acetone by centrifugation at $16,000 \times g$, washed with methanol and dissolved in SDS sample buffer. Proteins were run for a few centimetres in SDS-PAGE. Gel bands containing proteins were excised, cut into approximately 1-mm-sized pieces and used for in-gel digestion by trypsinization before mass spectrometry. Proteins in the gel pieces were reduced with DTT (20291, Thermo Fisher Scientific), alkylated with iodoacetamide (90034, Thermo Fisher Scientific) and digested with trypsin and lysyl endopeptidase (Promega, USA) in

a buffer containing 40 mM ammonium bicarbonate, pH 8.0, overnight at 37 °C. The resultant peptides were analysed on an Advance UHPLC system (AMR/Michrom Bioscience) coupled to a Q Exactive mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and the raw mass spectrum was processed using Xcalibur (Thermo Fisher Scientific). The raw LC–MS/MS data were analysed against NCBI non-redundant protein and UniProt using Proteome Discoverer version 1.4 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the Mascot search engine, version 2.5 (Matrix Science). A decoy database comprising either randomized or reversed sequences in the target database was used for false discovery rate (FDR) estimation, and the Percolator algorithm was used to evaluate false positives. Search results were filtered against 1% global FDR for a high confidence level.

References

- Barlow, J. H., Lisby, M., & Rothstein, R. (2008). Differential regulation of the cellular response to DNA double-strand breaks in G1. *Mol Cell*, 30(1), 73-85. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2008.01.016
- Bochman, M. L., & Schwacha, A. (2009). The Mcm complex: unwinding the mechanism of a replicative helicase. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev*, 73(4), 652-683. doi:10.1128/MMBR.00019-09
- Chong, J. P., Mahbubani, H. M., Khoo, C. Y., & Blow, J. J. (1995). Purification of an MCM-containing complex as a component of the DNA replication licensing system. *Nature*, 375(6530), 418-421. doi:10.1038/375418a0
- Coster, G., Frigola, J., Beuron, F., Morris, E. P., & Diffley, J. F. (2014). Origin licensing requires ATP binding and hydrolysis by the MCM replicative helicase. *Mol Cell*, 55(5), 666-677. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2014.06.034
- Ding, L., & Forsburg, S. L. (2011). Schizosaccharomyces pombe minichromosome maintenance-binding protein (MCM-BP) antagonizes MCM helicase. *J Biol Chem*, 286(38), 32918-32930. doi:10.1074/jbc.M111.282541
- Edwards, M. C., Tutter, A. V., Cvetic, C., Gilbert, C. H., Prokhorova, T. A., & Walter, J. C. (2002). MCM2-7 complexes bind chromatin in a distributed pattern surrounding the origin recognition complex in Xenopus egg extracts. *J Biol Chem*, 277(36), 33049-33057. doi:10.1074/jbc.M204438200
- Ge, X. Q., Jackson, D. A., & Blow, J. J. (2007). Dormant origins licensed by excess Mcm2-7 are required for human cells to survive replicative stress. *Genes Dev*, 21(24), 3331-3341. doi:10.1101/gad.457807
- Gonzalez, M. A., Tachibana, K. E., Laskey, R. A., & Coleman, N. (2005). Control of DNA replication and its potential clinical exploitation. *Nat Rev Cancer*, 5(2), 135-141. doi:10.1038/nrc1548
- Hills, S. A., & Diffley, J. F. (2014). DNA replication and oncogene-induced replicative stress. *Curr Biol*, 24(10), R435-444. doi:10.1016/j.cub.2014.04.012
- Hustedt, N., Saito, Y., Zimmermann, M., Alvarez-Quilon, A., Setiawati, D., Adam, S., . . . Durocher, D. (2019). Control of homologous recombination by the HROB-MCM8-MCM9 pathway. *Genes Dev*, 33(19-20), 1397-1415. doi:10.1101/gad.329508.119
- Ibarra, A., Schwob, E., & Mendez, J. (2008). Excess MCM proteins protect human cells from replicative stress by licensing backup origins of replication. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 105(26), 8956-8961. doi:10.1073/pnas.0803978105
- Jagannathan, M., Sakwe, A. M., Nguyen, T., & Frappier, L. (2012). The MCM-associated protein MCM-BP is important for human nuclear morphology. *J Cell Sci*, 125(Pt 1), 133-143. doi:10.1242/jcs.089938
- Jenkyn-Bedford, M., Jones, M. L., Baris, Y., Labib, K. P. M., Cannone, G., Yeeles, J. T. P., & Deegan, T. D. (2021). A conserved mechanism for regulating replisome disassembly in eukaryotes. *Nature*. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04145-3
- Kawabata, T., Luebben, S. W., Yamaguchi, S., Ilves, I., Matise, I., Buske, T., . . . Shima, N. (2011). Stalled fork rescue via dormant replication origins in unchallenged S phase promotes proper chromosome segregation and tumor suppression. *Mol Cell*, 41(5), 543-553. doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2011.02.006

Kim, H. S. (2019). Genome-wide function of MCM-BP in *Trypanosoma brucei* DNA replication and transcription. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 47(2), 634-647. doi:10.1093/nar/gky1088

Kim, H. S., Park, S. H., Gunzl, A., & Cross, G. A. (2013). MCM-BP is required for repression of life-cycle specific genes transcribed by RNA polymerase I in the mammalian infectious form of *Trypanosoma brucei*. *PLoS One*, 8(2), e57001. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0057001

Kimura, H., Ohtomo, T., Yamaguchi, M., Ishii, A., & Sugimoto, K. (1996). Mouse MCM proteins: complex formation and transportation to the nucleus. *Genes Cells*, 1(11), 977-993. doi:10.1046/j.1365-2443.1996.840284.x

Kubota, Y., Mimura, S., Nishimoto, S., Takisawa, H., & Nojima, H. (1995). Identification of the yeast MCM3-related protein as a component of *Xenopus* DNA replication licensing factor. *Cell*, 81(4), 601-609. doi:10.1016/0092-8674(95)90081-0

Kunnev, D., Rusiniak, M. E., Kudla, A., Freeland, A., Cady, G. K., & Pruitt, S. C. (2010). DNA damage response and tumorigenesis in *Mcm2*-deficient mice. *Oncogene*, 29(25), 3630-3638. doi:10.1038/onc.2010.125

Kusunoki, S., & Ishimi, Y. (2014). Interaction of human minichromosome maintenance protein-binding protein with minichromosome maintenance 2-7. *FEBS J*, 281(4), 1057-1067. doi:10.1111/febs.12668

Leone, G., DeGregori, J., Yan, Z., Jakoi, L., Ishida, S., Williams, R. S., & Nevins, J. R. (1998). E2F3 activity is regulated during the cell cycle and is required for the induction of S phase. *Genes Dev*, 12(14), 2120-2130. doi:10.1101/gad.12.14.2120

Li, J. J., Schnick, J., Hayles, J., & MacNeill, S. A. (2011). Purification and functional inactivation of the fission yeast MCM(MCM-BP) complex. *FEBS Lett*, 585(24), 3850-3855. doi:10.1016/j.febslet.2011.10.033

Maric, M., Maculins, T., De Piccoli, G., & Labib, K. (2014). Cdc48 and a ubiquitin ligase drive disassembly of the CMG helicase at the end of DNA replication. *Science*, 346(6208), 1253596. doi:10.1126/science.1253596

Masai, H., Matsumoto, S., You, Z., Yoshizawa-Sugata, N., & Oda, M. (2010). Eukaryotic chromosome DNA replication: where, when, and how? *Annu Rev Biochem*, 79, 89-130. doi:10.1146/annurev.biochem.052308.103205

McIntosh, D., & Blow, J. J. (2012). Dormant origins, the licensing checkpoint, and the response to replicative stresses. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*, 4(10). doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a012955

Moreno, S. P., Bailey, R., Campion, N., Herron, S., & Gambus, A. (2014). Polyubiquitylation drives replisome disassembly at the termination of DNA replication. *Science*, 346(6208), 477-481. doi:10.1126/science.1253585

Mulvaney, K. M., Matson, J. P., Siesser, P. F., Tamir, T. Y., Goldfarb, D., Jacobs, T. M., . . . Major, M. B. (2016). Identification and Characterization of MCM3 as a Kelch-like ECH-associated Protein 1 (KEAP1) Substrate. *J Biol Chem*, 291(45), 23719-23733. doi:10.1074/jbc.M116.729418

Natsume, T., Kiyomitsu, T., Saga, Y., & Kanemaki, M. T. (2016). Rapid Protein Depletion in Human Cells by Auxin-Inducible Degron Tagging with Short Homology Donors. *Cell Rep*, 15(1), 210-218. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2016.03.001

- 647 Nguyen, T., Jagannathan, M., Shire, K., & Frappier, L. (2012). Interactions of the human
648 MCM-BP protein with MCM complex components and Dbf4. *PLoS One*, 7(4),
649 e35931. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0035931
- 650 Nishiyama, A., Frappier, L., & Mechali, M. (2011). MCM-BP regulates unloading of the
651 MCM2-7 helicase in late S phase. *Genes Dev*, 25(2), 165-175.
652 doi:10.1101/gad.614411
- 653 Ohtani, K., Iwanaga, R., Nakamura, M., Ikeda, M., Yabuta, N., Tsuruga, H., & Nojima,
654 H. (1999). Cell growth-regulated expression of mammalian MCM5 and MCM6
655 genes mediated by the transcription factor E2F. *Oncogene*, 18(14), 2299-2309.
656 doi:10.1038/sj.onc.1202544
- 657 Pasion, S. G., & Forsburg, S. L. (1999). Nuclear localization of *Schizosaccharomyces*
658 *pombe* Mcm2/Cdc19p requires MCM complex assembly. *Mol Biol Cell*, 10(12),
659 4043-4057. doi:10.1091/mbc.10.12.4043
- 660 Pirkel, F., & Buchner, J. (2001). Functional analysis of the Hsp90-associated human
661 peptidyl prolyl cis/trans isomerases FKBP51, FKBP52 and Cyp40. *J Mol Biol*,
662 308(4), 795-806. doi:10.1006/jmbi.2001.4595
- 663 Prokhorova, T. A., & Blow, J. J. (2000). Sequential MCM/P1 subcomplex assembly is
664 required to form a heterohexamer with replication licensing activity. *J Biol Chem*,
665 275(4), 2491-2498. doi:10.1074/jbc.275.4.2491
- 666 Pruitt, S. C., Bailey, K. J., & Freeland, A. (2007). Reduced Mcm2 expression results in
667 severe stem/progenitor cell deficiency and cancer. *Stem Cells*, 25(12), 3121-
668 3132. doi:10.1634/stemcells.2007-0483
- 669 Quimbaya, M., Raspe, E., Denecker, G., De Craene, B., Roelandt, R., Declercq, W., . . .
670 Berx, G. (2014). Dereglulation of the replisome factor MCMBP prompts
671 oncogenesis in colorectal carcinomas through chromosomal instability.
672 *Neoplasia*, 16(9), 694-709. doi:10.1016/j.neo.2014.07.011
- 673 Rzechorzek, N. J., Hardwick, S. W., Jatikusumo, V. A., Chirgadze, D. Y., & Pellegrini, L.
674 (2020). CryoEM structures of human CMG-ATPgammS-DNA and CMG-AND-1
675 complexes. *Nucleic Acids Res*, 48(12), 6980-6995. doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa429
- 676 Saito, Y., & Kanemaki, M. T. (2021). Targeted Protein Depletion Using the Auxin-
677 Inducible Degron 2 (AID2) System. *Curr Protoc*, 1(8), e219.
678 doi:10.1002/cpz1.219
- 679 Sakwe, A. M., Nguyen, T., Athanasopoulos, V., Shire, K., & Frappier, L. (2007).
680 Identification and characterization of a novel component of the human
681 minichromosome maintenance complex. *Mol Cell Biol*, 27(8), 3044-3055.
682 doi:10.1128/MCB.02384-06
- 683 Santosa, V., Martha, S., Hirose, N., & Tanaka, K. (2013). The fission yeast
684 minichromosome maintenance (MCM)-binding protein (MCM-BP), Mcb1,
685 regulates MCM function during prereplicative complex formation in DNA
686 replication. *J Biol Chem*, 288(10), 6864-6880. doi:10.1074/jbc.M112.432393
- 687 Sedlackova, H., Rask, M. B., Gupta, R., Choudhary, C., Somyajit, K., & Lukas, J.
688 (2020). Equilibrium between nascent and parental MCM proteins protects
689 replicating genomes. *Nature*, 587(7833), 297-302. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-
690 2842-3
- 691 Shima, N., Alcaraz, A., Liachko, I., Buske, T. R., Andrews, C. A., Munroe, R. J., . . .
692 Schimenti, J. C. (2007). A viable allele of Mcm4 causes chromosome instability

and mammary adenocarcinomas in mice. *Nat Genet*, 39(1), 93-98.
doi:10.1038/ng1936

Sun, J., Evrin, C., Samel, S. A., Fernandez-Cid, A., Riera, A., Kawakami, H., . . . Li, H. (2013). Cryo-EM structure of a helicase loading intermediate containing ORC-Cdc6-Cdt1-MCM2-7 bound to DNA. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*, 20(8), 944-951. doi:10.1038/nsmb.2629

Tachibana, K. E., Gonzalez, M. A., & Coleman, N. (2005). Cell-cycle-dependent regulation of DNA replication and its relevance to cancer pathology. *J Pathol*, 205(2), 123-129. doi:10.1002/path.1708

Taipale, M., Tucker, G., Peng, J., Krykbaeva, I., Lin, Z. Y., Larsen, B., . . . Lindquist, S. (2014). A quantitative chaperone interaction network reveals the architecture of cellular protein homeostasis pathways. *Cell*, 158(2), 434-448. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2014.05.039

Takahashi, N., Quimbaya, M., Schubert, V., Lammens, T., Vandepoele, K., Schubert, I., . . . De Veylder, L. (2010). The MCM-binding protein ETG1 aids sister chromatid cohesion required for postreplicative homologous recombination repair. *PLoS Genet*, 6(1), e1000817. doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1000817

Tamberg, N., Tahk, S., Koit, S., Kristjuhan, K., Kasvandik, S., Kristjuhan, A., & Ilves, I. (2018). Keap1-MCM3 interaction is a potential coordinator of molecular machineries of antioxidant response and genomic DNA replication in metazoa. *Sci Rep*, 8(1), 12136. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-30562-y

Tanaka, S., & Diffley, J. F. (2002). Interdependent nuclear accumulation of budding yeast Cdt1 and Mcm2-7 during G1 phase. *Nat Cell Biol*, 4(3), 198-207. doi:10.1038/ncb757

Todorov, I. T., Attaran, A., & Kearsey, S. E. (1995). BM28, a human member of the MCM2-3-5 family, is displaced from chromatin during DNA replication. *J Cell Biol*, 129(6), 1433-1445. doi:10.1083/jcb.129.6.1433

Woodward, A. M., Gohler, T., Luciani, M. G., Oehlmann, M., Ge, X., Gartner, A., . . . Blow, J. J. (2006). Excess Mcm2-7 license dormant origins of replication that can be used under conditions of replicative stress. *J Cell Biol*, 173(5), 673-683. doi:10.1083/jcb.200602108

Yeeles, J. T., Deegan, T. D., Janska, A., Early, A., & Diffley, J. F. (2015). Regulated eukaryotic DNA replication origin firing with purified proteins. *Nature*, 519(7544), 431-435. doi:10.1038/nature14285

Yesbolatova, A., Saito, Y., Kitamoto, N., Makino-Itou, H., Ajima, R., Nakano, R., . . . Kanemaki, M. T. (2020). The auxin-inducible degron 2 technology provides sharp degradation control in yeast, mammalian cells, and mice. *Nat Commun*, 11(1), 5701. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-19532-z

Zeman, M. K., & Cimprich, K. A. (2014). Causes and consequences of replication stress. *Nat Cell Biol*, 16(1), 2-9. doi:10.1038/ncb2897

a

b

c

d

Figure 1

MCM3 associates with MCMBP in soluble extracts. (a) Size distribution of the MCM proteins extracted from soluble and chromatin extracts. Estimated size (using thyroglobulin, 669 kDa; ferritin, 440 kDa; aldolase, 158 kDa; and ovalbumin, 44 kDa) are indicated on the top. The intensity of each band was quantified using ImageJ and is indicated as a relative value (max = 1.0) in the graphs shown below. (b, c) Native PAGE

for detecting MCM3 in the MCM2–7 hexamer. Proteins were extracted from chromatin and soluble fractions and subjected to native PAGE for immunoblotting with an anti-MCM3 antibody. The intensity of the MCM3 signal was measured using the Image Lab 6.0.1 software (BIO-RAD). The means of the intensities of 3 independent experiments are shown as relative values (total = 100%). The error bar represents the SD. *P* values were determined using one-way ANOVA with Tukey's test. (d) Immunoprecipitation of MCM3 for detecting associating proteins in the large and small fractions. After gel filtration analysis, the indicated fractions (#28–33 or #40–45) were pooled and subjected to immunoprecipitation with an anti-FLAG antibody. Precipitated proteins were analysed by immunoblotting using the indicated antibodies.

Figure 2

Depletion of MCMBP causes a defect in the formation of the MCM2–7 hexamer in

the soluble extracts. (a) Schematic illustration of MCMBP depletion by the AID2

system. Upon 5-Ph-IAA addition, mAID-Clover (mAC)-tagged MCMBP was recognized

by OsTIR1(F74G) for degradation by the proteasome. **(b)** MCMBP-mAC was induced to

degrade by the addition of 1 μM 5-Ph-IAA for 4 h. MCMBP expression was analysed by

immunoblotting. **(c)** Protein levels of soluble- and chromatin-bound MCM2–7 after

MCMBP depletion. Proteins were extracted from soluble and chromatin fractions on

Days 1, 2 and 3 after MCMBP depletion. The intensity of each band was measured

using ImageJ and is indicated as a relative value (Day 0 = 1.0) in the graphs. Data represent the mean $\pm$ SD of 3 independent experiments. (d) Size distribution of the MCM proteins in soluble extracts after MCMBP depletion. Soluble extracts were prepared 2 days after MCMBP depletion and analysed as in Figure 1a. The intensity of each band was quantified using ImageJ and is indicated as a relative value (max in control = 1.0) in the graphs.

Figure 3

The association between MCM3 and MCMBP is required for maintaining the level of the MCM2–7 hexamer and supporting cell proliferation. (a) Illustration of the MCMBP truncations used in this study. NLS, nuclear localization signal; WB, Walker B; AF, arginine finger. (b) Interaction of MCMBP truncations with MCM3. HCT116 cells were transiently transfected with the HA-tagged MCMBP mutants and subjected to immunoprecipitation using an anti-HA antibody. Co-precipitated MCM3 was analysed by immunoblotting. (c) Levels of the MCM2–7 hexamer in cells expressing the MCMBP

mutants. The indicated MCMBP truncations were expressed in MCMBP-mAC cells; subsequently, MCMBP-mAC was depleted before preparation of the soluble extracts. Proteins were separated using native PAGE and detected using the indicated antibodies. Tubulin was used as a loading control. **(d)** The MCM2–7 hexamer in the cells expressing the indicated MCMBP truncation. The intensity of the MCM3 signal within the hexamer was quantified using the Image Lab 6.0.1 software (BIO-RAD). The mean of the intensities of 3 independent experiments is indicated as a relative value (hexamer in control = 1.0). The error bar represents the SD. *P* values were determined using one-way ANOVA with Tukey's test. **(e)** Growth curves were obtained every 2 days after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. Data represent the mean $\pm$ SD of 3 independent experiments (Day 0 = 100).

Figure 4

MCMBP promotes MCM2–7 assembly using nascent MCM3. (a) Size distribution of DD-FLAG-MCM3 in the presence or absence of MCMBP. Proteins were extracted and

analysed by immunoblotting at 6 or 24 h after the addition of 0.5 μ M Shield-1 with or without 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. The intensity of each band was measured using ImageJ and is indicated as a relative value (max in control = 1.0) in the graphs. **(b, c)** Total DD-mScarletI-MCM3 after the addition of 0.5 μ M Shield-1 was detected using a Delta Vision microscope. Circles with a dotted line indicate the nucleus. In the graphs, the central lines are medians. The boxes represent 25th and 75th percentiles, and the whiskers represent 5th and 95th percentiles. $n > 200$ cells per condition. AU, arbitrary units. P values were determined using one-way ANOVA with Turkey's test. **(d, e)** Chromatin-bound DD-mScarletI-MCM3 was visualized after the extraction of soluble proteins. Circles with a dotted line indicate the nucleus. The data were quantified and presented as in panel c. **(f)** Interaction of DD-FLAG-MCM3 with other MCM proteins. After immunoprecipitation using an anti-FLAG antibody, the indicated proteins were detected by immunoblotting.

Figure 5

p53-negative cells lose cell viability after MCMBP depletion. (a) The growth of the indicated cell lines was measured every 2 days after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. Data represent the mean $\pm$ SD of 3 independent experiments (Day 0 = 100). (b) Cell-cycle distribution on Day 8 after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. RO-3306 was added to the culture medium at 16 h before fixation. (c) Quantification of 53BP1 foci on Day 5 after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. In the graphs, the central lines are medians. The boxes represent 25th and 75th percentiles, and the whiskers represent 5th and 95th percentiles. $n > 200$ cells per condition. P values were determined using one-way ANOVA with Turkey's test. (d, e) Cell viability after the temporal depletion of MCMBP was determined using colony formation assay. Two hundred cells were plated and cultured for 4 or 8 days in the presence of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA, and then released into medium without 5-Ph-IAA. The plating efficiency is shown as a relative value (Day 0 =

823 1). Data represent the mean of 3 independent experiments. *P* values were determined
824 using two-way ANOVA with Šídák's test. (**f, g**) Model of MCM2–7 hexamer formation
825 mediated by MCMBP (f) and the phenotypes induced after MCMBP depletion (g).
826

Figure 1–figure supplement 1

(a) Extracts used for the size-fractionation assays. HSP90 and Tubulin were used as soluble protein markers. Histone H2B was used for a chromatin protein marker. (b) All MCM proteins and MCMBP separated using native-PAGE. Proteins in the soluble extracts were subjected to native-PAGE, and the indicated proteins were detected by immunoblotting. (c) MCM3 in the soluble and chromatin extracts were separated by native-PAGE and subjected to immunoblotting. Intensity of MCM3 signal was measured using Image Lab 6.0.1 software (BIO-RAD). (d) The expression of the endogenous and FLAG-tagged MCM3 was confirmed by immunoblotting using the indicated antibodies.

Figure 2–figure supplement 1

(a) Degradation of MCMBP-mAC was monitored by microscopy at 4 h after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. (b) Cell cycle distribution on Days 1, 2, and 3 after the addition of 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA. (c, d) MCM3 in the soluble extract was separated by native-PAGE on Days 1, 2, and 3 days after MCMBP depletion. Intensity of the MCM3 band at the hexamer size was measured using Image Lab 6.0.1 software (BIO-RAD). The mean of intensities of 3 independent experiments were indicated as relative value (hexamer at 0 d = 1.0). Error bar represents SD.

Figure 3–figure supplement 1

(a) Representation of the MCM3 truncates. (b) Interaction of the MCM3 truncates with MCMBP. FLAG-tagged MCM3 truncates were expressed and subjected to immunoprecipitation using FLAG antibody. Co-precipitated MCMBP and MCM2 (as a control) were detected by immunoblotting. (c) Subcellular distribution of the MCMBP mutants were captured using a Delta Vision microscope.

Figure 4–figure supplement 1

(a) Schematic illustration of the DD-MCM3 system. Ectopic expression of DD-(FLAG or mScarlet)-MCM3 was stabilized in the presence of a ligand, Shield-1. Without Shield-1, the fusion protein is degraded. (b) Expression of the DD-MCM3 was confirmed by immunoblotting using anti-MCM3 and -FLAG antibodies. (c) Experimental scheme in

Figure 4b–f. **(d)** Cell cycle progression of the cell used in Figure 4b–f. After releasing from G1 synchronization using lovastatin, 0.5 μ M Shield-1 was added at 14 h for expressing DD-MCM3. **(e)** Expression and chromatin association of DD-MCM3. Synchronized cells were released into medium containing 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA for MCMBP-depletion. DD-MCM3 was expressed by adding Shield-1. Proteins were extracted from soluble and chromatin fractions at 17, 21, or 25 h after release for S, G2, or next G1 phase, respectively, and then analyzed by immunoblotting using anti-FLAG antibodies. **(f)** Mass spectrometry analysis of DD-MCM3-binding proteins with or without MCMBP. The log₂ change of PSM (peptide-spectrum match) of the detected proteins was calculated.

Figure 4—figure supplement 2

(a) The expression of the MCM4-DD was confirmed by immunoblotting using the indicated antibodies. (b, c) Subcellular localization of MCM4-DD (b) and DD-MCM3 (c) with or without 1 μ M of 5-Ph-IAA. In the graphs, center lines are medians. The boxes represent 25th and 75th centiles, and the whiskers represent 5 and 95 percentiles. $n > 100$ cells per condition. AU; arbitrary units. The P values were determined by one-way ANOVA with Turkey's test.

Figure 5–figure supplement 1

(a) Chromatin-bound MCM2 after MCMBP depletion to monitor the levels of replication licensing. Soluble proteins were extracted before staining with anti-MCM2 antibody. The chromatin-bound MCM2 was detected using a BD Accuri C6 flow cytometer. 50,000 cells were analysed for each sample. The *P* values were determined by one-way

ANOVA with Turkey's test. **(b)** EdU incorporation after MCMBP depletion. The MCMBP-mAC cells were treated with 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA for 3 or 5 days, and incubated with 10 μ M EdU for 30 min. After staining the cell using the Click-iT kit, the incorporated EdU was detected by a BD Accuri C6 flow cytometer. 50,000 cells were analysed for each sample. **(c)** The levels of p53 and p21 after MCMBP depletion. The indicated antibodies were used for immunoblotting. **(d)** 53BP1 foci after MCMBP depletion. The MCMBP-mAC cells were treated with 1 μ M 5-Ph-IAA for 5 days, and then immuno-stained with anti-53BP1 antibody. **(e)** The H2AX phosphorylation after MCMBP depletion was detected by immunoblotting using anti- γ H2AX antibody.

Table 1: Cell lines used in this study

Figure	Cell line
Figure 1d	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G Stag-3FLAG-MCM3
Figure 2b-d	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC
Figure 3c-e	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC 2HA-MCMBP FL
Figure 3c-e	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC 2HA-MCMBP Δ N
Figure 3c-e	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC 2HA-MCMBP Δ NLS
Figure 4a, f	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC PiggyBac-EF1-DD-3FLAG-MCM3
Figure 4b-e	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC PiggyBac-EF1-DD-mScarletl-MCM3
Figure 5a-e	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC p53 – / –
Figure4–figure supplement 2a, d	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC PiggyBac-EF1-MCM4-3FLAG-DD
Figure4–figure supplement 2b	HCT116 CMV-OsTIR1F74G MCMBP-mAC PiggyBac-EF1-MCM4-mScarletl-DD

Table 2. Plasmids used in this study

Figure	Plasmid
Figure 1d	MCM3-N-tagging CRISPR in pX330
Figure 1d	Stag-3FLAG-N-MCM3 donor
Figure 2b	MCMBP-C-tagging CRISPR in pX330
Figure 2b	MCMBP-mAC donor
Figure 3a, b	CMV-2HA-MCMBP FL
Figure 3a, b	CMV-2HA-MCMBP Δ N
Figure 3a, b	CMV-2HA-MCMBP Δ NLS
Figure 3a, b	CMV-2HA-MCMBP Δ mid
Figure 3a, b	CMV-2HA-MCMBP Δ C
Figure 3c, d, e	PiggyBac-EF1-2HA-MCMBP FL
Figure 3c, d, e	PiggyBac-EF1-2HA-MCMBP Δ N
Figure 3c, d, e	PiggyBac-EF1-2HA-MCMBP Δ NLS
Figure 4a, f	PiggyBac-EF1-DD-3FLAG-MCM3
Figure 4b-e	PiggyBac-EF1-DD-mScarletl-MCM3
Figure 5a-e	TP53-KO CRISPR in pX330
Figure 3—figure supplement 1a, b	PiggyBac-EF1-3FLAG-MCM3 FL
Figure 3—figure supplement 1a, b	PiggyBac-EF1-3FLAG-MCM3 Δ N
Figure 3—figure supplement 1a, b	PiggyBac-EF1-3FLAG-MCM3 Δ MCM
Figure 3—figure supplement 1a, b	PiggyBac-EF1-3FLAG-MCM3 Δ C
Figure 4—figure supplement 2a, d	PiggyBac-EF1-MCM4-3FLAG-DD
Figure 4—figure supplement 2b	PiggyBac-EF1-MCM4-mScarletl-DD

Table 3. Antibodies used in this study

Antigen	Manufacturer	code	Method(s)	Dilution(s)
MCM2	CST	3619	IB & IF	1:10,000 for IB; 1:1,000 for IF
MCM3	Proteintech	15597-1-AP	IB	1:5,000
MCM4	abcam	ab4459	IB	1:5,000
MCM5	Proteintech	11703-1-AP	IB	1:3,000
MCM6	Proteintech	13347-2-AP	IB	1:5,000
MCM7	Proteintech	11225-1-AP	IB	1:5,000
MCMBP	Proteintech	19573-1-AP	IB	1:5,000
FLAG	SIGMA	F1804	IB	1:10,000
HA	MBL	M132-3	IB	1:5,000
HSP90	Proteintech	60318	IB	1:5,000
Tubulin	BIO-RAD	12004165	IB	1:10,000
histone H2B	abcam	ab1790	IB	1:10,000
p53	MBL	K0181-3	IB	1:5,000
p21	CST	2946	IB	1:3,000
gH2AX	Millipore	05-636	IB	1:3,000

Antigen	Manufacturer	code	Method(s)	Dilution(s)	Detection
anti-rabbit IgG	Abcam	ab216773	IB	1:3,000	IRDye 800CW
anti-mouse IgG	Abcam	ab216772	IB	1:3,000	IRDye 800CW
anti-mouse IgG	BIO-RAD	12004158	IB	1:3,000	StarBright Ble 700
anti-rabbit IgG	BIO-RAD	12004161	IB	1:3,000	StarBright Ble 700
anti-rabbit IgG	life technologies	A-11037	IF	1:500	Alexa Fluor 594
anti-mouse IgG	life technologies	A-21236	IF	1:500	Alexa Fluor 647

IB: Immunoblotting

IF: Immunofluorescence