



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Regulation of cell cycle progression by small ubiquitin-like modifiers

Cuijpers, S.A.G.

Citation

Cuijpers, S. A. G. (2018, April 5). *Regulation of cell cycle progression by small ubiquitin-like modifiers*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/61393>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/61393>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/61393> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Cuijpers, Sabine

Title: Regulation of cell cycle progression by small ubiquitin-like modifiers

Date: 2018-04-05

CHAPTER 2

Guiding mitotic progression by crosstalk between post-translational modifications

Trends in Biochemical Sciences. Accepted for publication

Sabine A.G. Cuijpers¹ and Alfred C.O. Vertegaal¹

¹Department of Molecular Cell Biology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, the Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Cell division is tightly regulated to disentangle copied chromosomes in an orderly manner and prevent loss of genome integrity. During mitosis, transcriptional activity is limited and post-translational modifications (PTMs) are responsible for functional protein regulation. Essential mitotic regulators, including polo-like kinase 1 (PLK1) and cyclin-dependent kinases (CDK) as well as the anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C), are members of the enzymatic machinery responsible for protein modification. Interestingly, communication between PTMs ensures the essential tight and timely control during all consecutive phases of mitosis. Here, we present an overview of current concepts and understanding of crosstalk between PTMs regulating mitotic progression.

REGULATION OF MITOSIS BY CROSSTALK BETWEEN PTMS

Ever since Rudolf Virchow claimed that ‘all cells come from cells’ (*omnis cellula e cellula*) in 1855¹, it has been a challenge to understand the process of cell division. Since cells are the building blocks of all organisms, their capability to divide is essential for organisms to reproduce themselves. For all multicellular organisms, cell division is also crucial for growth and tissue renewal. Although ample elements remain to be discovered, decades of research have significantly increased our knowledge about the cell cycle and enabled categorization of the complex processes during interphase and mitosis. During interphase the cell grows and prepares for replication (G1 phase), chromosomes are replicated (S phase) and the cell expands further and prepares for mitosis (G2 phase). Throughout these phases chromosomes are decondensed and the microtubules are organized in a radial array from the centrosome. During mitosis the sister chromatids are segregated into two nascent cells, ensuring that each daughter cell inherits one complete set of chromosomes. Finally, cell division is completed when the intercellular bridge between the daughter cells is disconnected via abscission during cytokinesis.

As uncontrolled cell proliferation can result in genetic instability and thereby have detrimental effects, the complex process of cell division is tightly controlled. Regulatory proteins strictly monitor progression through the consecutive cell cycle phases and are able to stop cell cycle progression at specific checkpoints when a defect is encountered. To enable timely repair of the identified problem and prevent mitotic catastrophe, a rapid response is essential. Therefore, the cell utilizes the fascinating mechanism of post-translational modifications (PTMs). Modification by a PTM can directly change the function of a target protein, for example through influencing protein activity, changing its localization, inducing a conformational change or affecting its interaction partners. Currently, over 600 different PTM types are categorized in Uniprot and other databases, including non-reversible modifications such as protein cleavage as well as reversible modifications²⁻⁴. Here, we will focus on modification of amino acids by the latter group of PTMs. Amino acids can be modified by chemical groups as well as small proteins, including ubiquitin and the ubiquitin-like family. While chemical modifications (such as phosphorylation) are regulated via single steps (Figure 1A), conjugation of small proteins (including ubiquitin and small ubiquitin-like modifier (SUMO)) to a target occurs through an enzymatic cascade involving an activating E1, conjugating E2 and E3 ligase (Figure 1B). Interestingly, ubiquitin and ubiquitin-like PTMs can modify themselves, resulting in polyPTM chains on the target protein. Two ubiquitin E2s were recently shown to work together and utilize their individual catalytic architecture to enable the formation of polyubiquitin chains⁵. Furthermore, cooperation between different ubiquitin E3 ligases has been reported. The first E3 ligase was found to be responsible for (multi-) monoubiquitylation, while the second E3 ligase modified the conjugated ubiquitin to form polyubiquitin chains on the target protein (E3-E3 tagging cascade)⁶.




Figure 1. Post-translational modifications and their crosstalk principles. (A) Chemical post-translational modification (PTM) of a target protein is regulated via a single step responsible for protein modification and a single step resulting in protein demodification. (B) Modification by small proteins, including ubiquitin-like proteins (Ubl) such as SUMO, occurs via an enzymatic cascade involving specific activating E1s, conjugating E2s and E3 ligases. This process is reversible via PTM specific proteases. (C) Crosstalk between different PTMs is categorized into distinct concepts. Positive crosstalk occurs when the first PTM enhances the second PTM on the same (type 1) or on a different target protein (type 2). Negative crosstalk occurs when the first PTM inhibits the second PTM on a single (type 3) or two distinct target proteins (type 4). (D) Post-translational modifications commonly cluster in unstructured regions of a protein, which can result in positive or negative crosstalk on a single target (type 5). Positive crosstalk leads to co-modification of targets, whereas negative crosstalk results in mutual exclusion of PTMs. (E) Modification of enzymatic machinery can affect their activity and thereby the modification of their substrates, resulting in crosstalk (type 6). (F) Small protein post-translational modifiers, such as SUMO and ubiquitin, can be modified themselves and form mixed chains (type 7). (G) Crosstalk regularly involves proteins containing one or more modular PTM binding domains, each one recognizing a PTM in a non-covalent manner. This can result in communication between PTMs on a single target (type 8) or on distinct proteins (type 10). Proteins containing tandem recognition domains can act as an AND logic gate in cellular signaling (type 9). (H) By combining these post-translational modification concepts and principles, complex crosstalk networks form in a spatial and temporal manner, which are far more complex than single PTM group modifications currently described. Ub: ubiquitylation, P: phosphorylation, S: SUMOylation, M: methylation, A: acetylation.

Box 1. General concepts and types of crosstalk between post-translational modifications

Crosstalk between PTMs is categorized into four distinct concepts based on general principles concerning the relation between both modifications and the target protein(s) involved (Figure 1C). In positive crosstalk the first PTM is required for a second modification on the same (type 1) or a different protein (type 2), for example via the recruitment of a modifying enzyme containing a reader domain for the first PTM or a local priming phosphorylation event. Within negative crosstalk, on the other hand, the first PTM prevents modification of the same (type 3) or a different protein by a second PTM (type 4), for example via direct competition for the same residue or by interfering with a recognition motif for a certain modifying enzyme. The mutually exclusive character of the two latter crosstalk types makes them valuable for the cell to use as an OR logic gate in its signaling pathways.

As these basic principles are applied in various manners, certain types of crosstalk can be distinguished (Figure 1D-G). The most simple crosstalk type takes place between different modifications on a single target (type 5). PTMs commonly cluster in unstructured regions of a protein, which allows for local crosstalk on the target itself. Upon positive crosstalk co-occurrence of multiple modifications can be identified on an individual target, while negative crosstalk results in the observation of mutual exclusivity. The next crosstalk type represents the modification of enzymatic machinery involved in PTM, which affects its activity and thereby the modification of its target proteins (type 6). Whether this crosstalk is considered positive or negative depends on the nature of the modification as well as the modifying enzyme. Although ubiquitylation might negatively influence the activity of a phosphatase, this results in increased phosphorylation levels of its targets and is therefore considered to be positive crosstalk. In addition to the enzymatic machinery, ubiquitin-like PTMs can directly be modified by other modifications themselves (type 7). This crosstalk type results in complex mixed PTM chains with potentially distinct functions. Finally, crosstalk can occur through specific reader proteins. Certain modifying enzymes contain modular binding domains, which recognize a specific PTM on the target protein. Subsequently, the same (type 8) or an adjacent (type 10) protein is modified by a second PTM, for example via SUMO-targeted ubiquitin ligases (STUbLs) like RNF4 and RNF111. This latter crosstalk can also occur via proteins without enzymatic activity, when a reader protein contains tandem modular PTM recognition domains. The reader is thereby able to recognize a combination of distinct PTMs on a single target, which acts as an AND logic gate for protein binding (type 9).

As these crosstalk concepts are generally studied separately, it is important to keep in mind that the actual network of PTMs and their target proteins is far more complex (an indication of the potential crosstalk complexity is represented in Figure 1H). Localization of the modifying enzymes within the cell, or even within a complex, can provide local zones with high levels of crosstalk between certain PTMs. These modifications are therefore able to significantly alter protein functionality and affect cellular processes, although their stoichiometry based on total protein levels might be low. Whether interfering with the modification of an individual protein will result in a phenotype depends on its unique or redundant nature. In the case of protein group modification, interfering with the modification of an individual protein can be compensated for by the modification of another protein in the same group. The current concept illustrating the regulation of these group modifications by a specific PTM could be an oversimplified representation, as it might actually involve multiple PTMs as well as their crosstalk. Although deciphering these crosstalk networks is challenging due to their complexity, it is of fundamental importance for our understanding of biology. The temporal build-up and release of these group modifications further enhances their complexity.

Advances in the field of proteomics have enabled the identification of a plethora of cell cycle regulators as targets for PTMs, including phosphorylation, ubiquitylation and SUMOylation⁷⁻¹². Functional analysis has revealed that these PTMs are able to influence each other through crosstalk (Box 1 and Figure 1C-H), which increases the complexity of the system and expands the ability of PTMs to tightly and timely control the cell cycle.

During mitotic progression each sequential phase and transition requires high level dynamic protein regulation. Since most transcriptional activity is inhibited during mitosis¹³, post-translational modifications are essential for the required regulation of proteins. Complex crosstalk networks interconnect different PTM pathways and provide flexibility in protein state, which is essential all throughout mitosis. Here, we will focus on mitotic regulation by PTMs and illustrate the extent of their crosstalk throughout the sequential mitotic phases.

Prophase: crosstalk regulating chromosome condensation

Accurate chromosome segregation during cell division is facilitated by condensing the chromosomes into compact structures in prophase and maintaining these structures throughout mitosis, which prevents chromosomes from becoming entangled during cytokinesis potentially leading to DNA damage. The fundamental role in chromosome condensation is carried out by two multiprotein complexes, condensin I and condensin II. Both complexes contain the same pair of structural maintenance of chromosome (SMC) subunits SMC2 and SMC4, which are combined with a distinct set of non-SMC subunits. These complexes are able to positively supercoil DNA and thereby condense chromosomes¹⁴. Large-scale phosphoproteomic screens identified numerous cell cycle-regulated phosphorylation events with essential roles during chromosome condensation^{15, 16}.

Functional analysis has revealed how these modifications communicate with other PTMs, for example resulting in crosstalk on condensin II regulating inhibition, establishment and maintenance of chromosome condensation throughout cell cycle progression (Figure 2)¹⁷. In *Drosophila* cells, phosphorylation of the non-SMC condensin II subunit CAP-H2 by casein kinase I α (CK1 α) during interphase provides a phosphodegron motif, which is recognized by the ubiquitin E3 ligase skp1-cullin-F box (SCF)^{slimb} (homolog of the human SCF ^{β -TrCP})¹⁸. Subsequent ubiquitylation results in degradation of the subunit and thereby inhibits condensin II activity in interphase¹⁹. This phosphorylation-dependent ubiquitylation event on condensin II is a textbook example of positive crosstalk (type 8) between two different PTMs by an enzymatic reader containing a specific PTM binding domain. During mitosis, condensin II is activated via phosphorylation of the non-SMC subunit CAP-D3 by cyclin-dependent kinase 1 (CDK1) to establish chromosome condensation²⁰. However, initial activation is insufficient to maintain condensation when CDK1 levels decrease during metaphase-to-anaphase transition, while phosphatases remain active¹⁷. Interestingly, phosphorylation by CDK1 provides its targets with a recognition site (S[pS/T]P) for the polo-box domain (PBD) in polo-like kinase 1 (PLK1)^{21,22}. Initial priming of CAP-D3 by CDK1 therefore results in subsequent phosphorylation of all non-SMC subunits of condensin II by PLK1 at [D/E]x[S/T] motifs. This positive crosstalk (type 10) between PTMs on different subunits of the complex results in hyperactivation of condensin II and thereby ensures continuation of chromosome condensation throughout mitosis²³.




Figure 2. Regulation of chromosome condensation by crosstalk between PTMs. (A) The supercoiling activity of condensin II is inhibited via interplay between phosphorylation and ubiquitylation on the subunit CAP-H2 to prevent chromosome condensation during interphase (positive crosstalk). (B) To establish chromosome condensation, the CAP-D3 subunit of condensin II is phosphorylated by CDK1. (C) The modification by CDK1 primes the complex for recognition and phosphorylation by PLK1, resulting in hyperactivation to maintain chromosome condensation throughout mitosis (positive crosstalk). P: phosphorylation, Ub: ubiquitylation.

Interestingly, the kinase activity of PLK1 itself is controlled via a complex crosstalk network involving the aurora A-bora complex²⁴. Similar to CAP-D3, phosphorylation of bora by CDK1 primes the protein for recognition and subsequently phosphorylation by PLK1 (positive crosstalk type 8). The resulting phosphodegron motif is recognized by the ubiquitin E3 ligase SCF^{B-TrCP}, which subsequently ubiquitylates bora (positive crosstalk type 8)^{25, 26}. As this modification by ubiquitin results in proteasomal degradation and thereby decreases the activity of the aurora A-bora complex, its ability to phosphorylate and thereby activate PLK1 is reduced (negative crosstalk type 6). This complex crosstalk network involving enzymatic readers as well as the modification of enzymatic machinery might provide a negative feedback mechanism to reduce PLK1 activity when required, for example during chromosome decondensation at the end of mitosis.

Recently, histone modifications were identified as additional driving forces in yeast for chromosome hypercondensation in a condensin-independent manner²⁷. Phosphorylation of histone H3 S10 by aurora B recruits the histone deacetylase Hst2p to remove the acetyl group from histone H4 K16, which subsequently enables the histone H4 tail to interact with close nucleosomes and promote chromosome condensation. This phosphorylation dependent-deacetylation event illustrates that chromosome condensation is also regulated by negative crosstalk (type 10) via an enzymatic reader involved in yet another modification, namely acetylation.

Although research efforts have mostly focussed on the functional relevance of phosphorylation events during chromosome condensation, the field has started to unravel the importance of other modifications and their crosstalk during this process of which

several examples are described above. A recent analysis combining all available human SUMO proteomics data revealed that all subunits of both condensin complexes have been identified as SUMO substrates by mass spectrometry²⁸, indicating direct regulation of the condensin complexes by SUMOylation. Although the role for SUMO on most condensin subunits has not been functionally studied, the non-SMC subunit of condensin I Ycs4 (yeast homologue of CAP-D2) was found to be dynamically modified by SUMO during mitosis²⁹. Interestingly, condensin I SUMOylation is dependent on a loss of phosphorylation via the phosphatase Cdc14 (yeast homologue of Cdc14A and Cdc14B), while inactivation of the yeast SUMO protease Smt4 (the functional equivalent of mammalian SENP6 and SENP7) results in condensin localization defects³⁰. Although the exact crosstalk mechanism remains to be discovered, these results suggest a role for negative crosstalk between phosphorylation and SUMOylation in chromosome condensation. As many phosphorylation sites for CAP-D2 were identified surrounding the SUMO acceptor lysines on the C-terminal site of the protein, we speculate that phosphorylation could influence a recognition motif for the SUMO conjugation machinery (crosstalk type 8).

In addition to their regulation by phosphorylation and SUMOylation, recent proteomic studies revealed that both SMC subunits of the condensin complexes are also modified by acetylation, monomethylation and ubiquitylation³¹⁻³⁷. Interestingly, acetylation as well as ubiquitylation of SMC2 K114, K222, K677, K1160 and SMC4 K268 and K607 was identified^{31, 35-38}, suggesting potential negative crosstalk (type 5) between these two PTMs on the condensin subunits. These data indicate important roles for these PTMs in condensin complex regulation. Nevertheless, the functional relevance of these modifications as well as their potential crosstalk currently remains unexplored.

Prometaphase: crosstalk regulating kinetochore complex formation

During prometaphase the nuclear envelop breaks down and microtubules connect to the chromosomal centromeres via kinetochore complexes. Accurate formation of the centromere-kinetochore-microtubule interaction is essential for mitotic progression, as the complex is responsible for chromosome alignment and segregation in subsequent phases. In prometaphase the kinetochore ensures exclusive connection of sister chromatids to opposite spindle poles and monitors inaccurate attachments³⁹⁻⁴¹. As the kinetochore has over 100 potential subunits, various modifying enzymes as well as crosstalk mechanisms are involved in recruitment, assembly and maintenance of this complex structure.

Before the kinetochore can be assembled, the centromeric chromatin has been primed for recruitment of the histone 3 variant CENP-A during late mitosis of the previous division and early G1. Proteomic analysis revealed that centromeric chromatin is modified by distinct PTMs, which have been shown via functional analyses to communicate through crosstalk⁴². Ubiquitylation of histone H2B K120 recruits the Set1 methyltransferase complex, which is then able to methylate histone H3 K4 (positive crosstalk type 10)^{43, 44}. Additional priming by histone H3 K9 acetylation acts as an AND logic gate, resulting in




Figure 3. Regulation of kinetochore complex formation by crosstalk between PTMs. (A) Priming of the centromeric chromatin via positive crosstalk between four different PTMs recruits CENP-A (C-A) to form the inner centromere. **(B)** Modification of CENP-I by the SUMO-targeted ubiquitin ligase RNF4 influences recruitment of various CENP complexes and thereby the constitutive centromere-associated network (CCAN) at the inner kinetochore. **(C)** Negative as well as positive crosstalk between multiple PTMs collectively regulates formation of the outer kinetochore, which is responsible for microtubule binding. Ub: ubiquitylation, M: methylation, A: acetylation, P: phosphorylation, S: SUMOylation, CPC: chromosomal passenger complex, aur B: aurora B, MTs: microtubules.

recruitment of the Mis18 complex via a potential tandem modular PTM recognition domain (positive crosstalk type 9). Subsequent phosphorylation of the Mis18 complex by PLK1 results in CENP-A deposition at the centromeric region^{45–48}. Premature loading of CENP-A is prevented by phosphorylation of CENP-A itself and the Mis18 complex via CDK1^{49, 50}. In contrast to the positive communication between these kinases on condensin II, these data indicate the presence of negative crosstalk (type 5) between CDK1 and PLK1 at the centromeric chromatin. This area between the sister chromatids containing CENP-A and histone H3 as well as the chromosomal passenger complex (CPC), including the kinase aurora B, is referred to as the inner centromere (Figure 3A). CENP-A deposition primes the inner centromere for recruitment of the inner kinetochore, consisting of the constitutive centromere-associated network (CCAN).

Function and characteristics of the CCAN subunits enable their division into subcomplexes, namely CENP-HIKLMN, CENP-OPQRU, CENP-TWSX and CENP-C, which are dynamically assembled together during S phase to form the inner kinetochore (Figure 3B)³⁹. Interestingly, CENP-I is polySUMOylated upon incorrect kinetochore assembly, which has been described to prime the protein for recognition by the SUMO-targeted ubiquitin ligase (STUbL) RNF4 via its SUMO-interaction motifs (SIMs)⁵¹. Subsequent ubiquitylation by this reader protein (positive crosstalk type 8) and proteasomal degradation of CENP-I would explain the observed displacement of CENP-HIK as well as CENP-OPQRU from kinetochores, which inhibits kinetochore assembly and kinetochore-microtubule interaction⁵². Interestingly, kinetochore destabilization upon SUMO-ubiquitin crosstalk is antagonized by the SUMO protease SENP6 (negative crosstalk type 5), which only targets SUMOylated

CENP-I in correctly assembled kinetochores and leaves the inaccurately formed complexes for destruction to ensure proper kinetochore formation^{51, 52}.

Subsequently, CENP-TWSX and CENP-C recruit the outer kinetochore, which directly binds the spindle microtubules during mitosis (Figure 3C). The basis of the outer kinetochore consists of the KMN network, which includes the Knl1 complex (Knl1-Zwint), the Mis12 complex (Mis12-Dsn1-Nnf1-Nsl1) and the Ndc80 complex (Ndc80-Nuf2-Spc24-Spc25). After phosphorylation of the Mis12 complex subunit Dsn1 by aurora B, its ubiquitylation by the CENP-C binding ubiquitin E3 ligase Mub1/Ubr2 and subsequent degradation by the proteasome is prevented (negative crosstalk type 5)⁵³. Upon this phosphorylation-dependent stabilization of Dsn1, the complete Mis12 complex interacts with CENP-C and recruits both the Knl1 and Ndc80 complexes^{54, 55}. Subsequent microtubule binding is regulated by the balance between phosphorylation by aurora B and dephosphorylation by phosphatase such as PP2A of various kinetochore subunits⁵⁶, which will be discussed later. Interestingly, dephosphorylation and thereby inactivation of the kinase itself by PP2A is prevented via aurora B acetylation (positive crosstalk type 5)⁵⁷.

Almost all members of the CCAN subcomplexes have been identified as phosphorylation as well as ubiquitylation targets by mass spectrometry, which could indicate regulation by group modification^{7, 35-37, 58-62}. Several subunits are also modified by other PTMs, including methylation of CENP-C and CENP-H as well as SUMOylation of CENP-C, CENP-I and CENP-R^{34, 51, 63, 64}. These specific modifications on certain CCAN members suggest explicit individual regulation of a particular protein function. Interestingly, several identified SUMO acceptor sites in CENP-C and CENP-R are located in a phosphorylation-dependent SUMOylation motif (KxExpSP)^{65, 66}, indicating potential positive crosstalk (type 8) between these PTMs at the inner kinetochore. Although the field has started to unravel the physiological relevance of these modifications and their crosstalk, as described above for CENP-I, functional studies are essential to improve our understanding of CCAN regulation by crosstalk between PTMs.

Metaphase: crosstalk regulating chromosome alignment

Upon accurate formation of the centromere-kinetochore-microtubule structure, the chromosomes align at the spindle equator during metaphase. However, to accomplish chromosome movement, each chromosome has to be correctly captured by two microtubules from opposing poles. This process of kinetochore-microtubule attachment is controlled by two feedback mechanisms, namely error correction and the spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC), which both involve the chromosomal passenger complex (CPC) located at the inner centromere⁶⁷. The CPC consists of the regulatory subunit aurora B and three non-enzymatic subunits survivin, INCENP and borealin, whose localization is dependent on positive crosstalk⁶⁸. Along the length of the chromosomes where the paired sister chromatids are connected, SUMOylated TOP2A has been reported to recruit the kinase haspin, which results in phosphorylation of histone H3 T3 via positive crosstalk (type 10) on distinct targets via an enzymatic reader (Figure 4A)^{69, 70}. At the outer




Figure 4. Regulation of chromosome alignment by crosstalk between PTMs. (A) Positive crosstalk between SUMOylation and phosphorylation promotes the binding of survivin along the length of the chromosomes (1), while phosphorylation-dependent phosphorylation via an enzymatic reader recruits borealin via Sgo1/2 (2). At the inner centromere, where both histone modifications overlap, the chromosomal passenger complex (CPC) is active (3). **(B)** Incorrect microtubule-kinetochore attachments activate error correction (4) and the spindle assembly checkpoint (5) via aurora B and Mps1 (dashed lines). Upon correct bi-orientation, recruitment of Set1 and phosphatases PP2A and PP1 in combination with the increased kinetochore tension counteracts the activity of these kinases (uninterrupted lines). When Mad2 phosphorylation results in a release of Cdc20 from the mitotic checkpoint complex (MCC), the spindle assembly checkpoint is inactivated and anaphase is initiated via ubiquitylation of APC/C substrates (positive crosstalk). P: phosphorylation, S: SUMOylation, Ub: ubiquitylation, M: methylation.

kinetochore, phosphorylation of the Kn1 complex by the kinase Mps1 recruits the Bub1 complex (Bub1-Bub3-BubR1), which then phosphorylates histone H2A T120 (positive crosstalk type 10)^{70, 71}. While the CPC subunit survivin is recruited to phosphorylated histone H3 T3, borealin interacts via its phosphorylation by CDK1 with the Sgo1 and Sgo2 proteins recruited to phosphorylated H2A T120⁷²⁻⁷⁴. At the inner centromere, where both histone modifications overlap and therefore both CPC subunits are actively recruited, kinase activity of aurora B is initiated^{68, 70}. PolySUMOylation of aurora B promotes its autophosphorylation (positive crosstalk type 6), which then enhances its kinase activity towards its substrates (positive crosstalk type 6)⁷⁵. Phosphorylation of INCENP causes a conformational change in aurora B and thereby fully activates the kinase (positive crosstalk type 10), which is essential for aurora B functionality during metaphase⁷⁶.

Aurora B is subsequently involved in the process of error correction upon the formation of incorrect kinetochore-microtubule attachments. Its phosphorylation of various key

outer kinetochore complexes, including Knl1, Ndc80 and Ska subunits, interferes with their binding to each other as well as to microtubules. When both sister kinetochores are connected to the same spindle pole, inter-kinetochore stretching is minimal and local aurora B activity hereby disrupts centromere-kinetochore interactions. However, when via trial-and-error correct bi-orientation of sister chromosomes is accomplished, increased inter-kinetochore stretching reduces local aurora B activity at the kinetochore region. The balance shift towards dephosphorylation by phosphatases such as PP1 and PP2A promotes the stabilization of correctly bi-orientated kinetochore-microtubule attachments⁷⁷. Interestingly, in yeast reducing the phosphorylated levels of the Ska complex homologue was found to be additionally regulated via a complex crosstalk mechanism (types 10 and 5). Upon recruitment of the methyltransferase Set1 to the kinetochore by ubiquitylation of histone H2B, methylation of the Ska complex inhibits its phosphorylation by aurora B (Figure 4B)^{78, 79}.

Aurora B is also involved in monitoring kinetochore-microtubule interactions via recruitment of spindle assembly checkpoint (SAC) components. During early mitosis, the SAC prevents segregation of duplicated chromosomes until each sister chromatid is properly attached to an appropriate microtubule and aligned at the spindle equator⁵⁶. Unlike the individual and local regulation of kinetochore-microtubule attachments by the process of error correction, the SAC signal is able to extend beyond the kinetochore and prevent mitotic exit upon the recognition of a single incorrect attachment. Until all kinetochore-microtubule interactions are accomplished in a bi-orientated manner, the mitotic checkpoint complex (MCC) stalls mitotic progression. Although the MCC itself is composed of Mad2, Bub3, BubR1 and Cdc20 other proteins are involved in SAC activation, including Mad1, Mps1, Bub1 and the rod-zw10-zw10 (RZZ) complex. Unattached kinetochores recruit Mad1, which is phosphorylated by the kinase Mps1 enabling binding to the MCC subunit Mad2^{80, 81}. A conformational change enables MCC formation upon interaction with Cdc20, which dominantly inhibits the function of the ubiquitin E3 ligase anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C) and thereby the ubiquitylation of its substrates (negative crosstalk type 10)^{80, 82}. Cdc20 was observed to interact with the recently identified ABBA motif, which is present in multiple subunits of the MCC as well as various APC/C substrates⁸³. When all kinetochores are attached properly to opposite spindle poles and aligned at the spindle equator, the MCC is relocated away from the kinetochores and is therefore no longer able to interfere with the interaction between APC/C and its cofactor Cdc20. Interestingly, phosphorylation of Mad2 inhibits its binding to Mad1⁸⁴, which might be involved in inactivating the SAC upon proper microtubule attachment and thereby promote ubiquitylation by the APC/C (positive crosstalk type 10). Additionally, the SAC promoting activity of the kinases aurora B and Mps1 is counteracted by the phosphatases PP1 and PP2A. Dephosphorylation of the Knl1 complex by PP2A, for example, promotes silencing of the SAC via reducing Bub1 complex recruitment and thereby increases APC/C activity (positive crosstalk type 10)⁸⁵.

Throughout metaphase many processes controlling kinetochore-microtubule attachments and thereby chromosome alignment are known to be tightly regulated by phosphorylation. Analysing the available mass spectrometry data revealed that, besides their phosphorylation, each member of the CPC has been identified as a target for ubiquitylation as well as SUMOylation^{35-37, 58, 60, 64, 65, 75, 86-89}. In addition to the crosstalk between SUMOylation and phosphorylation on aurora B described above, ubiquitin potentially competes with SUMO for all CPC subunits (negative crosstalk type 5), as both PTMs have been identified on the same residues in aurora B (K31, K56, K85, K202, K211, K215 and K306), INCENP (K51 and K327), borealin (K183 and K225) and survivin (K78, K90 and K91)^{35-37, 64, 65, 75, 87-89}. Since the stoichiometry of ubiquitylation is generally considerably higher compared to SUMOylation, ubiquitin is expected to outcompete SUMO. Ubiquitin is after all a ubiquitous protein. Other PTMs might also be involved in the communication between modifications on CPC subunits, as INCENP and aurora B can be monomethylated and acetylation was observed on survivin, INCENP and aurora B^{32-34, 57, 90}.

Anaphase: crosstalk regulating chromosome segregation

When all correctly bi-orientated chromosomes are located at the spindle equator and the SAC is inactivated, anaphase is initiated (Figure 5). Throughout this process composition of the centromere and kinetochore changes, regulated by crosstalk between PTMs. Dephosphorylation of histone H3 T3 results in dissociation of survivin from centromeres^{68, 72, 91, 92}. Upon ubiquitylation of aurora B by the ubiquitin E3 ligase cul3-KLHL21, the kinase is removed from chromosomes by Cdc48 and its adaptor proteins Ufd1-Npl4^{93, 94}. Consequently, phosphorylation levels of aurora B substrates in the centromere decrease (negative crosstalk type 6). Subsequent dephosphorylation of INCENP, by Cdc14 in yeast, results in translocation of the CPC from centromeres to the central spindle at metaphase-to-anaphase transition⁹⁵. SUMOylation of Mis18bp1, a subunit of the Mis18 complex at the inner centromere, peaks during mitosis⁹⁶. SUMOylation primes Mis18bp1 for recognition by the STUbL RNF4, resulting in Mis18bp1 ubiquitylation and subsequent degradation by the proteasome (positive crosstalk type 8)⁹⁶. Interestingly, Mis18bp1 is part of a group of mitotic regulators that are co-modified by SUMO and ubiquitin upon inhibition of the proteasome, indicating that RNF4 might regulate the stability of this complete protein cluster by group modification involving crosstalk. Since knockdown of the SUMO E3 ligase PIAS4 as well as the STUbL RNF4 causes chromosome segregation defects^{97, 98}, these enzymes potentially collaborate to SUMOylate and ubiquitylate certain centromere-kinetochore subunits during mitosis to ensure their timely degradation and prevent chromosome segregation errors due to prolonged centromere-kinetochore persistence.

Segregation of chromosomes and thereby anaphase onset is tightly regulated by the anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C), a 1.5-MDa multi-subunit ubiquitin E3 ligase⁹⁹. By assembling branched ubiquitin conjugates containing multiple blocks of K11-linked chains, the APC/C significantly enhances substrate recognition by the proteasome¹⁰⁰.




Figure 5. Regulation of chromosome segregation by crosstalk between PTMs. While ubiquitylation of aurora B results in reduced phosphorylation at the centromere (negative crosstalk) and thereby changes complex composition, SUMO-targeted ubiquitin ligation by RNF4 regulates chromosome segregation via proteasomal degradation of mitotic regulators such as Mis18bp1 (positive crosstalk) (1). Formation and activation of APC/C^{cdc20} via positive crosstalk results in ubiquitylation and degradation of securin and cyclin B, which activates separase to cleave the cohesin complexes between centromeres and thereby facilitate chromosome segregation (2). S: SUMOylation, Ub: ubiquitylation, P: phosphorylation, CPC: chromosomal passenger complex.

A diverse array of mechanisms is employed to ensure degradation of these key mitotic regulators in a robust and timely order. Upon inactivation of the spindle assembly checkpoint, ubiquitylation and dephosphorylation of the released cofactor Cdc20 promotes its interaction with the APC/C¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰⁴. Interestingly, phosphorylation of various core subunits (including APC1, APC3, APC6 and APC8) by mitotic kinases CDK1 and PLK1 promotes the formation of active APC/C^{cdc20} and thereby ubiquitylation of its substrates (positive crosstalk type 6)^{82, 105-107}. For anaphase onset, APC/C^{cdc20} ubiquitylates securin and thereby marks the protein for proteasomal degradation^{82, 108}. During early mitosis, securin inactivates the protease separase by forming a complex. Upon securin degradation, separase is liberated from the complex, but still inactivated by phosphorylation¹⁰⁸. APC/C^{cdc20} also ubiquitylates cyclin B, which results in its proteasomal degradation and subsequently inactivation of CDK1 (negative crosstalk type 6). Whereas CDK1 inactivates separase by phosphorylation during early mitosis, inactivation of CDK1 as a result of cyclin B degradation now enables protein phosphatases to remove the phosphate groups and activate separase⁸². Consequently, separase cleaves the cohesin complexes between centromeres and thereby facilitates chromosome segregation towards spindle poles during anaphase. The simultaneous degradation of securin and cyclin B by the APC/C^{cdc20} thereby couples chromosome segregation with the dissolution of complexes that monitor microtubule attachment during mitotic exit¹⁰⁹. Interestingly, SUMOylation of the platform subunit APC4 increases APC/C activity towards a subset of targets, including kif18B, which promotes timely metaphase-to-anaphase transition via positive crosstalk (type 6) (our unpublished data).

While the cohesin complex is responsible for chromosome cohesion establishment as well as maintenance, in yeast cohesion is additionally conserved by the regulator Pds5¹¹⁰. During mitosis, phosphorylation of the yeast SENP2 homologue Ulp2 by its PLK1

homologue Cdc5 inhibits its deSUMOylation activity (positive crosstalk type 6)¹¹¹. Subsequently, SUMOylation of Pds5 peaks during mitosis and promotes sister chromatin separation¹¹².

Although modification of some APC/C subunits by ubiquitylation or phosphorylation has already been shown to affect complex formation, almost all subunits of the APC/C have been identified as targets for ubiquitylation as well as phosphorylation by now^{15, 35-37, 58-60, 113-116}. Due to this extent, the question arises whether all APC/C subunits are regulated in a similar manner, potentially influencing complex stability by complex group modification. Besides being regulated by the balance between (de)phosphorylation and (de) ubiquitylation, the APC/C is modified by other PTMs. Although SUMOylation of various subunits has been identified upon different treatments^{64, 65}, APC4 is the only subunit modified by SUMO under control conditions (our unpublished data). Furthermore, the subunits APC1, APC4, APC8 and Cdc20 have been found to be monomethylated^{32-34, 117} and acetylation was observed of APC7, APC8, APC10 and APC12^{31, 35, 118}. However, whether these modifications are part of a crosstalk mechanism by influencing the activity of the APC/C and thereby affecting ubiquitylation of its substrates or have other functional relevance, remains to be determined.

Telophase/cytokinesis: crosstalk to complete cell division

After promoting chromosome segregation, a shift in the balance between phosphorylation and dephosphorylation facilitates exit from mitosis (Figure 6A). Various crosstalk mechanisms together regulate inactivation of the kinases CDK1 and Mastl (Greatwall), while activating phosphatases PP1 and PP2A. During late mitosis, the yeast homologue of PLK1 Cdc5 phosphorylates the phosphatase Cdc14, which releases it from its binding partner Cfi/Net1¹¹⁹. Subsequently, Cdc14 is able to dephosphorylate various targets, including Sic1, Swi5 and Cdh1 (negative crosstalk type 6)¹²⁰. As phosphorylation of Sic1 primes the protein for recognition by ubiquitin E3 ligases, ubiquitylation and consequently proteosomal degradation (positive crosstalk type 8), dephosphorylation by Cdc14 stabilizes Sic1 protein levels¹²⁰. Dephosphorylation of Swi5 promotes its transport into the nucleus, where it stimulates Sic1 transcription⁸². Subsequently, the accumulated protein levels of dephosphorylated Sic1 help to inactivate CDK1. Inactivation of CDK1, via dephosphorylated Sic1 and ubiquitin-dependent cyclin B degradation, prevents Cdh1 phosphorylation (negative crosstalk type 10 and 6 respectively)¹²¹. As Cdh1 phosphorylation on distinct sites is responsible for cell cycle-regulated localization as well as preventing its binding to APC/C, dephosphorylation by Cdc14 promotes the replacement of Cdc20 and the APC/C^{cdh1} complex is formed^{108, 120, 122}. Subsequently, this complex ubiquitylates specific substrates, including Cdc20, and thereby promotes their proteosomal degradation (positive crosstalk type 6)¹²³. Decreased CDK1 levels additionally promote PP1 activity, which counteracts phosphorylation of Mastl by CDK1^{124, 125}. The resulting inactivation of Mastl opposes PP2A inactivation by phosphorylation of Arpp-19 (negative crosstalk type 6), which is essential for mitotic exit. Degradation of particular microtubule-, kinetochore-




Figure 6. Regulation of the final stages of cell division by crosstalk between PTMs. (A) Ubiquitylation of cyclin B in combination with phosphorylation of Cdc14 results in inactivation of CDK1 and dephosphorylation of Cdh1 via interconnected crosstalk mechanisms. Subsequently, Cdh1 is able to replace Cdc20 as the APC/C cofactor and phosphatases PP1 and PP2A become activated, promoting progression through the final stages of mitosis. (B) Cytokinesis and abscission is regulated via negative crosstalk by ubiquitin-dependent degradation of mitotic kinases, positive crosstalk via aurora B on centralspindlin as well as direct competition between methylation and acetylation on alpha-tubulin. S: SUMOylation, Ub: ubiquitylation, P: phosphorylation, M: methylation, A: acetylation, aur A: aurora A, aur B: aurora B.

and centromere-related proteins helps mitotic kinases and phosphatases to relocate the CPC to the spindle midzone and regulates the mitotic spindle process during telophase. The central spindle contains bundled plus-ends of antiparallel microtubules that form an organized structure⁶⁸. Although the nuclear envelope already begins to reform and the DNA decondenses during telophase, cell division is not completed until cytokinesis.

Cytokinesis requires the selection of an appropriate abscission site following the assembly and constriction of an equatorial contractile ring consisting of myosin, actin and other cytoskeletal filaments⁶⁸. Through interaction with the CPC containing the active kinase aurora B, various accessory proteins locate to the division site during cytokinesis. Although the mechanistic details of contractile ring constriction and abscission in animal cells are not completely understood^{68, 126, 127}, the process is regulated by crosstalk between PTMs at the abscission site (Figure 6B)^{128, 129}. Ubiquitylation of PLK1 and aurora A by the APC/C^{cdh1} complex targets the kinases for proteasomal degradation in anaphase, which results in decreased substrate phosphorylation (negative crosstalk type 6) and allows formation of a mature spindle midzone^{130, 131}. As discussed above, ubiquitylated aurora B results in removal of the kinase from centromeres. Upon degradation of aurora A, ubiquitylated aurora B relocates to the spindle midzone and guides cytokinesis by phosphorylation of various targets, including centralspindlin (positive crosstalk type 6)⁹⁴. Phosphorylation of this latter protein complex promotes its clustering and accumulation on the plus ends of

antiparallel microtubules^{132, 133}. The spindle midzone matures into the midbody and various proteins involved in microtubule disassembly and abscission are recruited. Interestingly, a rivalry between O-GlcNAcylation and phosphorylation has been observed to regulate the CPC and CDK1 activity to promote accurate cytokinesis (negative crosstalk type 5)¹³⁴. Methylation of dynamic microtubules by the histone methyltransferase Setd2 was reported to regulate cytokinesis¹³⁵. Interestingly, methylation of alpha-tubulin K40 competes with acetylation of the same lysine residue (negative crosstalk type 5). However, the functional relevance of this crosstalk remains to be determined. Finally, various cytokinetic proteins, including anillin (the scaffold protein between actin and myosin), are degraded upon ubiquitylation by the phospho-activated APC/C^{cdh1} complex (positive crosstalk type 6)^{136, 137}. When the cytoplasm is divided by severing the intercellular bridge during abscission, the daughter cells are completely separated and cell division has finished.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mitosis is an essential cellular process that is highly regulated by a variety of post-translational modifications. Due to the abundance of protein modification by mitotic kinases⁷ and the frequently clear effects of phosphate conjugation as a protein activity on-off switch, the role of phosphorylation during mitosis has been well studied. Subsequently, specific ubiquitin E3 ligase complexes were found to be timely regulated to ensure proper mitotic progression by targeting proteins to the proteasome. Recent studies have shown the involvement of other PTMs, including SUMO⁹, in cell cycle progression. However, as the outcome of these modifications on target protein functionality is often less predictable, determining the functional relevance of each modified target protein within the process of mitosis is challenging. Developments in the field of mass spectrometry have enabled significant progress in identifying target proteins in an unbiased and proteome-wide manner^{138, 139}. However, functional analysis will have to reveal the physiological relevance of each modification on each target protein. Within this process, we will have to keep the high levels of crosstalk between PTMs, specifically during mitosis, in mind.

Throughout this review we have discussed the different types of crosstalk and found examples of the diverse ways in which PTMs communicate during mitotic progression. The cell does not simply use a single general crosstalk principle during this essential process, but rather combines them into a complex crosstalk network. Many key mitotic regulators are modifying enzymes themselves, which contain reader domains for specific modifications (types 8 and 10) or whose activity is regulated by other PTMs (type 6). As the role of these important proteins has generally been studied intensively, some of the resulting crosstalk has been identified in the process. On the contrary, our understanding of the role of modifications on PTMs themselves (type 7) or even the presence of mixed

chains during mitosis is very limited. Although the existence and function of single modifications on individual proteins has been and still is investigated extensively, studying multiple modifications and their crosstalk is extremely challenging.

The stoichiometry of certain single modifications, such as SUMOylation, is generally low. Depending on the type of crosstalk involved, the abundance of the co-modified substrate might be even lower. As a result, demonstrating the co-occurrence of PTMs on a protein can be technically difficult. This contrasts with the high stoichiometry of phosphorylation observed during mitosis for CDK1 and CDK2 substrates⁷. Currently, many purification methods rely on protein digestion before purification of modified peptides and identification by mass spectrometry. Although some co-modified peptides can be identified, most crosstalk information will be lost as a result of the low abundance of co-modified peptides amongst the single modified peptides and the fact that most modifications will be present on different peptides due to the distance between communicating PTMs. Top-down mass spectrometry using intact proteins would be needed to address this. Unfortunately, the sensitivity of this technique is limited. The development of novel strategies to purify and identify proteins co-modified by two distinct PTMs will provide new insights into potential substrates of positive crosstalk.

Recently, we developed a methodology to purify co-modified proteins before their digestion for mass spectrometry analysis enabling the identification of many proteins simultaneously modified by ubiquitin and SUMO⁹⁶. As this strategy can be applied to various combinations of small protein PTMs, it could provide more insight into the co-occurrence of certain modifications on proteins. However, the identification of direct competition or crosstalk between PTMs on different proteins is still very challenging as both modifications are not present at the same time or on a single substrate, eliminating the use of these co-modification purification strategies. To get a better overview of these crosstalk mechanisms, new methods are required that are specifically developed to detect these types of communication between PTMs.

Upon the identification of a list of proteins with co-modification by different PTMs, further analyses for each individual substrate will have to determine whether direct crosstalk is involved. These functional experiments are generally challenging due to the complex nature of crosstalk. Ideally, genome editing by CRISPR-Cas9 enables us to mutate the acceptor site of the suspected first modification, while the presence or absence of the second modification could be used as a readout. However, this strategy requires knowledge about the involved proteins, acceptor sites and a potential crosstalk mechanism. Additionally, it is less useful to study direct competition between PTMs on the same acceptor site, promiscuous modifications that will 'jump' to an adjacent acceptor site or redundant PTMs involved in group modification of a certain complex. To study crosstalk involving these modifications, the catalytic domain of the suspected modifying or demodifying enzyme could be fused to the substrate to affect the modification of all surrounding proteins and thereby potentially the whole complex. Although this could be an interesting method to study group modifications and their involvement in crosstalk,

we have to keep in mind that the results are less specific and could be indirect. Finally, it would be useful to be able to distinguish between redundant and non-redundant PTM events. Also, some modifications might act individually, not affect protein functionality at all or only under certain conditions. Although the plethora of hypotheses to test and complex crosstalk networks result in a challenging research area, it also provides lots of opportunities for novel discoveries and the development of new techniques.

The significant role of PTMs and their machinery in cell division has made them interesting novel targets for potential anti-cancer therapies¹⁴⁰⁻¹⁴⁴. Various small molecule inhibitors targeting kinases, as well as proteasome inhibitors targeting the ubiquitin system, are currently already used in the clinic¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁴⁷. Small compounds targeting specific components of the ubiquitin or ubiquitin-like PTM machinery are being developed or already available, including the ubiquitin E1 inhibitor MLN7243, the SUMO E1 inhibitor ML-792 and the NEDD8 E1 inhibitor MLN4924¹⁴⁸⁻¹⁵⁰. Future research will have to reveal how these inhibitors affect the high level of communication between PTMs. Importantly, the potential indirect effects of an inhibitor, specifically targeting a cancer-promoting modification, via crosstalk with other PTMs needs to be investigated. Ongoing detailed functional investigation of PTM crosstalk in mitosis might form a sound basis for translational research, aiming to make use of the reliance of tumor cells on a functioning mitotic machinery. Ultimately, detailed understanding of cell type and tumor type specific dependency on PTM machinery could be exploited in combination therapies to eradicate tumor cells with limited toxicity due to reduced side effects.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The laboratory of A.C.O.V. is supported by the European Research Council (ERC) and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). We would like to apologize to all our colleagues whose important work could not be cited here due to space restrictions.

REFERENCES

1. Virchow,R. Cellular-Pathologie. *Archiv für pathologische Anatomie und Physiologie und für klinische Medizin* 8, 3-39 (1855).
2. The UniProt Consortium UniProt: the universal protein knowledgebase. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 45, D158-D169 (2017).
3. Garavelli,J.S. The RESID Database of Protein Modifications as a resource and annotation tool. *Proteomics.* 4, 1527-1533 (2004).
4. Montecchi-Palazzi,L. *et al.* The PSI-MOD community standard for representation of protein modification data. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 26, 864-866 (2008).
5. Brown,N.G. *et al.* Dual RING E3 Architectures Regulate Multiubiquitination and Ubiquitin Chain Elongation by APC/C. *Cell* 165, 1440-1453 (2016).
6. Scott,D.C. *et al.* Two Distinct Types of E3 Ligases Work in Unison to Regulate Substrate Ubiquitylation. *Cell* 166, 1198-1214 (2016).
7. Olsen,J.V. *et al.* Quantitative phosphoproteomics reveals widespread full phosphorylation site occupancy during mitosis. *Sci. Signal.* 3, ra3 (2010).
8. Gilberto,S. & Peter,M. Dynamic ubiquitin signaling in cell cycle regulation. *J. Cell Biol.* 216, 2259-2271 (2017).
9. Schimmel,J. *et al.* Uncovering SUMOylation Dynamics during Cell-Cycle Progression Reveals FoxM1 as a Key Mitotic SUMO Target Protein. *Mol. Cell* 53, 1053-1066 (2014).
10. Cubenas-Potts,C. *et al.* Identification of SUMO-2/3-modified proteins associated with mitotic chromosomes. *Proteomics.* 15, 763-772 (2015).
11. Carpy,A. *et al.* Absolute proteome and phosphoproteome dynamics during the cell cycle of *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* (Fission Yeast). *Mol. Cell Proteomics.* 13, 1925-1936 (2014).
12. Ly,T. *et al.* Proteomic analysis of cell cycle progression in asynchronous cultures, including mitotic subphases, using PRIMMUS. *Elife.* 6, (2017).
13. Palozola,K.C. *et al.* Mitotic transcription and waves of gene reactivation during mitotic exit. *Science* 358, 119-122 (2017).
14. Thadani,R., Uhlmann,F., & Heeger,S. Condensin, chromatin crossbarring and chromosome condensation. *Curr. Biol.* 22, R1012-R1021 (2012).
15. Hegemann,B. *et al.* Systematic phosphorylation analysis of human mitotic protein complexes. *Sci. Signal.* 4, rs12 (2011).
16. Pagliuca,F.W. *et al.* Quantitative proteomics reveals the basis for the biochemical specificity of the cell-cycle machinery. *Mol. Cell* 43, 406-417 (2011).
17. Bazile,F., St-Pierre,J., & D'Amours,D. Three-step model for condensin activation during mitotic chromosome condensation. *Cell Cycle* 9, 3243-3255 (2010).
18. Nguyen,H.Q. *et al.* *Drosophila* casein kinase I alpha regulates homolog pairing and genome organization by modulating condensin II subunit Cap-H2 levels. *PLoS. Genet.* 11, e1005014 (2015).
19. Buster,D.W. *et al.* SCFSlimb ubiquitin ligase suppresses condensin II-mediated nuclear reorganization by degrading Cap-H2. *J. Cell Biol.* 201, 49-63 (2013).
20. Abe,S. *et al.* The initial phase of chromosome condensation requires Cdk1-mediated phosphorylation of the CAP-D3 subunit of condensin II. *Genes Dev.* 25, 863-874 (2011).
21. Elia,A.E., Cantley,L.C., & Yaffe,M.B. Proteomic screen finds pSer/pThr-binding domain localizing Plk1 to mitotic substrates. *Science* 299, 1228-1231 (2003).
22. Elia,A.E. *et al.* The molecular basis for phosphodependent substrate targeting and regulation of Plks by the Polo-box domain. *Cell* 115, 83-95 (2003).
23. St-Pierre,J. *et al.* Polo kinase regulates mitotic chromosome condensation by hyperactivation of condensin DNA supercoiling activity. *Mol. Cell* 34, 416-426 (2009).
24. Bruinsma,W., Macurek,L., Freire,R., Lindqvist,A., & Medema,R.H. Bora and Aurora-A continue to activate Plk1 in mitosis. *J. Cell Sci.* 127, 801-811 (2014).
25. Chan,E.H., Santamaria,A., Sillje,H.H., & Nigg,E.A. Plk1 regulates mitotic Aurora A function through betaTrCP-dependent degradation of hBora. *Chromosoma* 117, 457-469 (2008).

26. Seki, A. *et al.* Plk1- and beta-TrCP-dependent degradation of Bora controls mitotic progression. *J. Cell Biol.* 181, 65-78 (2008).
27. Wilkins, B.J. *et al.* A cascade of histone modifications induces chromatin condensation in mitosis. *Science* 343, 77-80 (2014).
28. Hendriks, I.A. & Vertegaal, A.C. A comprehensive compilation of SUMO proteomics. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 17, 581-595 (2016).
29. D'Amours, D., Stegmeier, F., & Amon, A. Cdc14 and condensin control the dissolution of cohesin-independent chromosome linkages at repeated DNA. *Cell* 117, 455-469 (2004).
30. Strunnikov, A.V., Aravind, L., & Koonin, E.V. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* SMT4 encodes an evolutionarily conserved protease with a role in chromosome condensation regulation. *Genetics* 158, 95-107 (2001).
31. Weinert, B.T. *et al.* Lysine succinylation is a frequently occurring modification in prokaryotes and eukaryotes and extensively overlaps with acetylation. *Cell Rep.* 4, 842-851 (2013).
32. Wu, Z. *et al.* A chemical proteomics approach for global analysis of lysine monomethylome profiling. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* 14, 329-339 (2015).
33. Olsen, J.B. *et al.* Quantitative Profiling of the Activity of Protein Lysine Methyltransferase SMYD2 Using SILAC-Based Proteomics. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* 15, 892-905 (2016).
34. Larsen, S.C. *et al.* Proteome-wide analysis of arginine monomethylation reveals widespread occurrence in human cells. *Sci. Signal.* 9, rs9 (2016).
35. Mertins, P. *et al.* Integrated proteomic analysis of post-translational modifications by serial enrichment. *Nat. Methods* 10, 634-637 (2013).
36. Kim, W. *et al.* Systematic and quantitative assessment of the ubiquitin-modified proteome. *Mol. Cell* 44, 325-340 (2011).
37. Wagner, S.A. *et al.* A proteome-wide, quantitative survey of in vivo ubiquitylation sites reveals widespread regulatory roles. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* 10, M111 (2011).
38. Choudhary, C. *et al.* Lysine acetylation targets protein complexes and co-regulates major cellular functions. *Science* 325, 834-840 (2009).
39. Nagpal, H. & Fukagawa, T. Kinetochore assembly and function through the cell cycle. *Chromosoma* 125, 645-659 (2016).
40. Fukagawa, T. & Earnshaw, W.C. The centromere: chromatin foundation for the kinetochore machinery. *Dev. Cell* 30, 496-508 (2014).
41. Etamad, B. & Kops, G.J. Attachment issues: kinetochore transformations and spindle checkpoint silencing. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* 39, 101-108 (2016).
42. Bailey, A.O. *et al.* Identification of the Post-translational Modifications Present in Centromeric Chromatin. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* 15, 918-931 (2016).
43. Dover, J. *et al.* Methylation of histone H3 by COMPASS requires ubiquitination of histone H2B by Rad6. *J. Biol. Chem.* 277, 28368-28371 (2002).
44. Sun, Z.W. & Allis, C.D. Ubiquitination of histone H2B regulates H3 methylation and gene silencing in yeast. *Nature* 418, 104-108 (2002).
45. Ohzeki, J. *et al.* Breaking the HAC Barrier: histone H3K9 acetyl/methyl balance regulates CENP-A assembly. *EMBO J.* 31, 2391-2402 (2012).
46. Silva, M.C. *et al.* Cdk activity couples epigenetic centromere inheritance to cell cycle progression. *Dev. Cell* 22, 52-63 (2012).
47. McKinley, K.L. & Cheeseman, I.M. Polo-like kinase 1 licenses CENP-A deposition at centromeres. *Cell* 158, 397-411 (2014).
48. Nardi, I.K., Zasadzinska, E., Stelfox, M.E., Knippler, C.M., & Foltz, D.R. Licensing of Centromeric Chromatin Assembly through the Mis18alpha-Mis18beta Heterotetramer. *Mol. Cell* 61, 774-787 (2016).
49. Pan, D. *et al.* CDK-regulated dimerization of M18BP1 on a Mis18 hexamer is necessary for CENP-A loading. *Elife* 6, e23352, (2017).
50. Yu, Z. *et al.* Dynamic phosphorylation of CENP-A at Ser68 orchestrates its cell-cycle-dependent deposition at centromeres. *Dev. Cell* 32, 68-81 (2015).
51. Mukhopadhyay, D., Arnaoutov, A., & Dasso, M. The SUMO protease SENP6 is essential for inner kinetochore assembly. *J. Cell Biol.* 188, 681-692 (2010).
52. Hickey, C.M., Wilson, N.R., & Hochstrasser, M. Function and regulation of SUMO proteases. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 13, 755-766 (2012).

53. Akiyoshi,B. *et al.* The Mub1/Ubr2 ubiquitin ligase complex regulates the conserved Dsn1 kinetochore protein. *PLoS. Genet.* 9, e1003216 (2013).
54. Kim,S. & Yu,H. Multiple assembly mechanisms anchor the KMN spindle checkpoint platform at human mitotic kinetochores. *J. Cell Biol.* 208, 181-196 (2015).
55. Rago,F., Gascoigne,K.E., & Cheeseman,I.M. Distinct organization and regulation of the outer kinetochore KMN network downstream of CENP-C and CENP-T. *Curr. Biol.* 25, 671-677 (2015).
56. Lampson,M.A. & Cheeseman,I.M. Sensing centromere tension: Aurora B and the regulation of kinetochore function. *Trends Cell Biol.* 21, 133-140 (2011).
57. Mo,F. *et al.* Acetylation of Aurora B by TIP60 ensures accurate chromosomal segregation. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 12, 226-232 (2016).
58. Mertins,P. *et al.* Proteogenomics connects somatic mutations to signalling in breast cancer. *Nature* 534, 55-62 (2016).
59. Tsai,C.F. *et al.* Large-scale determination of absolute phosphorylation stoichiometries in human cells by motif-targeting quantitative proteomics. *Nat. Commun.* 6, 6622 (2015).
60. Sharma,K. *et al.* Ultra-deep human phosphoproteome reveals a distinct regulatory nature of Tyr and Ser/Thr-based signaling. *Cell Rep.* 8, 1583-1594 (2014).
61. Zhou,H. *et al.* Toward a comprehensive characterization of a human cancer cell phosphoproteome. *J. Proteome. Res.* 12, 260-271 (2013).
62. Park,C.H. *et al.* Mammalian Polo-like kinase 1 (Plk1) promotes proper chromosome segregation by phosphorylating and delocalizing the PBIP1.CENP-Q complex from kinetochores. *J. Biol. Chem.* 290, 8569-8581 (2015).
63. Dhayalan,A., Kudithipudi,S., Rathert,P., & Jeltsch,A. Specificity analysis-based identification of new methylation targets of the SET7/9 protein lysine methyltransferase. *Chem. Biol.* 18, 111-120 (2011).
64. Hendriks,I.A. *et al.* Uncovering global SUMOylation signaling networks in a site-specific manner. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 21, 927-936 (2014).
65. Hendriks,I.A. *et al.* Site-specific mapping of the human SUMO proteome reveals co-modification with phosphorylation. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 24, 325-336 (2017).
66. Hietakangas,V. *et al.* PDSM, a motif for phosphorylation-dependent SUMO modification. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 103, 45-50 (2006).
67. Krenn,V. & Musacchio,A. The Aurora B Kinase in Chromosome Bi-Orientation and Spindle Checkpoint Signaling. *Front Oncol.* 5, 225 (2015).
68. Carmena,M., Wheelock,M., Funabiki,H., & Earnshaw,W.C. The chromosomal passenger complex (CPC): from easy rider to the godfather of mitosis. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 13, 789-803 (2012).
69. Yoshida,M.M., Ting,L., Gygi,S.P., & Azuma,Y. SUMOylation of DNA topoisomerase IIalpha regulates histone H3 kinase Haspin and H3 phosphorylation in mitosis. *J. Cell Biol.* 213, 665-678 (2016).
70. Yamagishi,Y., Honda,T., Tanno,Y., & Watanabe,Y. Two histone marks establish the inner centromere and chromosome bi-orientation. *Science* 330, 239-243 (2010).
71. Vleugel,M. *et al.* Sequential multisite phospho-regulation of KNL1-BUB3 interfaces at mitotic kinetochores. *Mol. Cell* 57, 824-835 (2015).
72. Kelly,A.E. *et al.* Survivin reads phosphorylated histone H3 threonine 3 to activate the mitotic kinase Aurora B. *Science* 330, 235-239 (2010).
73. Tsukahara,T., Tanno,Y., & Watanabe,Y. Phosphorylation of the CPC by Cdk1 promotes chromosome bi-orientation. *Nature* 467, 719-723 (2010).
74. Liu,H. *et al.* Mitotic Transcription Installs Sgo1 at Centromeres to Coordinate Chromosome Segregation. *Mol. Cell* 59, 426-436 (2015).
75. Ban,R., Nishida,T., & Urano,T. Mitotic kinase Aurora-B is regulated by SUMO-2/3 conjugation/deconjugation during mitosis. *Genes Cells* 16, 652-669 (2011).
76. Sessa,F. *et al.* Mechanism of Aurora B activation by INCENP and inhibition by hesperadin. *Mol. Cell* 18, 379-391 (2005).
77. Liu,D. *et al.* Regulated targeting of protein phosphatase 1 to the outer kinetochore by KNL1 opposes Aurora B kinase. *J. Cell Biol.* 188, 809-820 (2010).
78. Latham,J.A., Chosed,R.J., Wang,S., & Dent,S.Y. Chromatin signaling to kinetochores: transregulation of Dam1 methylation by histone H2B ubiquitination. *Cell* 146, 709-719 (2011).
79. Zhang,K. *et al.* The Set1 methyltransferase opposes Ipl1 aurora kinase functions in chromosome segregation. *Cell* 122, 723-734 (2005).

80. Luo,X., Tang,Z., Rizo,J., & Yu,H. The Mad2 spindle checkpoint protein undergoes similar major conformational changes upon binding to either Mad1 or Cdc20. *Mol. Cell* 9, 59-71 (2002).
81. Faesen,A.C. *et al.* Basis of catalytic assembly of the mitotic checkpoint complex. *Nature* 542, 498-502 (2017).
82. Peters,J.M. The anaphase-promoting complex: proteolysis in mitosis and beyond. *Mol. Cell* 9, 931-943 (2002).
83. Di,F.B. *et al.* The ABBA motif binds APC/C activators and is shared by APC/C substrates and regulators. *Dev. Cell* 32, 358-372 (2015).
84. Wassmann,K., Liberal,V., & Benezra,R. Mad2 phosphorylation regulates its association with Mad1 and the APC/C. *EMBO J.* 22, 797-806 (2003).
85. Espert,A. *et al.* PP2A-B56 opposes Mps1 phosphorylation of Knl1 and thereby promotes spindle assembly checkpoint silencing. *J. Cell Biol.* 206, 833-842 (2014).
86. Sasai,K., Katayama,H., Hawke,D.H., & Sen,S. Aurora-C Interactions with Survivin and INCENP Reveal Shared and Distinct Features Compared with Aurora-B Chromosome Passenger Protein Complex. *PLoS. One.* 11, e0157305 (2016).
87. Liu,Y. *et al.* The Proapoptotic F-box Protein Fbxl7 Regulates Mitochondrial Function by Mediating the Ubiquitylation and Proteasomal Degradation of Survivin. *J. Biol. Chem.* 290, 11843-11852 (2015).
88. Krupina,K. *et al.* Ubiquitin Receptor Protein UBASH3B Drives Aurora B Recruitment to Mitotic Microtubules. *Dev. Cell* 36, 63-78 (2016).
89. Chen,B.B., Glasser,J.R., Coon,T.A., & Mallampalli,R.K. Skp-cullin-F box E3 ligase component FBXL2 ubiquitinates Aurora B to inhibit tumorigenesis. *Cell Death. Dis.* 4, e759 (2013).
90. Wang,H. *et al.* Acetylation directs survivin nuclear localization to repress STAT3 oncogenic activity. *J. Biol. Chem.* 285, 36129-36137 (2010).
91. Qian,J., Lesage,B., Beullens,M., Van,E.A., & Bollen,M. PP1/Repo-man dephosphorylates mitotic histone H3 at T3 and regulates chromosomal aurora B targeting. *Curr. Biol.* 21, 766-773 (2011).
92. Vagnarelli,P. *et al.* Repo-Man coordinates chromosomal reorganization with nuclear envelope reassembly during mitotic exit. *Dev. Cell* 21, 328-342 (2011).
93. Dobrynin,G. *et al.* Cdc48/p97-Ufd1-Npl4 antagonizes Aurora B during chromosome segregation in HeLa cells. *J. Cell Sci.* 124, 1571-1580 (2011).
94. Maerki,S. *et al.* The Cul3-KLHL21 E3 ubiquitin ligase targets aurora B to midzone microtubules in anaphase and is required for cytokinesis. *J. Cell Biol.* 187, 791-800 (2009).
95. Pereira,G. & Schiebel,E. Separase regulates INCENP-Aurora B anaphase spindle function through Cdc14. *Science* 302, 2120-2124 (2003).
96. Cuijpers,S.A.G., Willemstein,E., & Vertegaal,A.C.O. Converging SUMO and ubiquitin signaling: improved methodology identifies co-modified target proteins. *Mol. Cell Proteomics.* 16, 2281-2295 (2017).
97. Diaz-Martinez,L.A. *et al.* PIASgamma is required for faithful chromosome segregation in human cells. *PLoS One.* 1, e53 (2006).
98. van de Pasch,L.A. *et al.* Centromere binding and a conserved role in chromosome stability for SUMO-dependent ubiquitin ligases. *PLoS One.* 8, e65628 (2013).
99. Peters,J.M. The anaphase promoting complex/cyclosome: a machine designed to destroy. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 7, 644-656 (2006).
100. Meyer,H.J. & Rape,M. Enhanced protein degradation by branched ubiquitin chains. *Cell* 157, 910-921 (2014).
101. Alfieri,C. *et al.* Molecular basis of APC/C regulation by the spindle assembly checkpoint. *Nature* 536, 431-436 (2016).
102. Yamaguchi,M. *et al.* Cryo-EM of Mitotic Checkpoint Complex-Bound APC/C Reveals Reciprocal and Conformational Regulation of Ubiquitin Ligation. *Mol. Cell* 63, 593-607 (2016).
103. Kim,T. *et al.* Kinetochore accelerate or delay APC/C activation by directing Cdc20 to opposing fates. *Genes Dev.* 31, 1089-1094 (2017).
104. Lee,S.J., Rodriguez-Bravo,V., Kim,H., Datta,S., & Foley,E.A. The PP2AB56 phosphatase promotes the association of Cdc20 with APC/C in mitosis. *J. Cell Sci.* 130, 1760-1771 (2017).
105. Qiao,R. *et al.* Mechanism of APC/CCDC20 activation by mitotic phosphorylation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* 113, E2570-E2578 (2016).
106. Zhang,S. *et al.* Molecular mechanism of APC/C activation by mitotic phosphorylation. *Nature* 533, 260-264 (2016).

107. Fujimitsu, K., Grimaldi, M., & Yamano, H. Cyclin-dependent kinase 1-dependent activation of APC/C ubiquitin ligase. *Science* 352, 1121-1124 (2016).
108. Stemmann, O., Zou, H., Gerber, S.A., Gygi, S.P., & Kirschner, M.W. Dual inhibition of sister chromatid separation at metaphase. *Cell* 107, 715-726 (2001).
109. Vazquez-Novelle, M.D. *et al.* Cdk1 inactivation terminates mitotic checkpoint surveillance and stabilizes kinetochore attachments in anaphase. *Curr. Biol.* 24, 638-645 (2014).
110. Hartman, T., Stead, K., Koshland, D., & Guacci, V. Pds5p is an essential chromosomal protein required for both sister chromatid cohesion and condensation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *J. Cell Biol.* 151, 613-626 (2000).
111. Baldwin, M.L., Julius, J.A., Tang, X., Wang, Y., & Bachant, J. The yeast SUMO isopeptidase Smt4/Ulp2 and the polo kinase Cdc5 act in an opposing fashion to regulate sumoylation in mitosis and cohesion at centromeres. *Cell Cycle* 8, 3406-3419 (2009).
112. Stead, K. *et al.* Pds5p regulates the maintenance of sister chromatid cohesion and is sumoylated to promote the dissolution of cohesion. *J. Cell Biol.* 163, 729-741 (2003).
113. Wagner, S.A. *et al.* Proteomic analyses reveal divergent ubiquitylation site patterns in murine tissues. *Mol. Cell Proteomics* 11, 1578-1585 (2012).
114. Carrier, M., Joint, M., Lutz, R., Page, A., & Rochette-Egly, C. Phosphoproteome and Transcriptome of RA-Responsive and RA-Resistant Breast Cancer Cell Lines. *PLoS. One* 11, e0157290 (2016).
115. Robles, M.S., Humphrey, S.J., & Mann, M. Phosphorylation Is a Central Mechanism for Circadian Control of Metabolism and Physiology. *Cell Metab* 25, 118-127 (2017).
116. Williams, G.R. *et al.* Exploring G protein-coupled receptor signaling networks using SILAC-based phosphoproteomics. *Methods* 92, 36-50 (2016).
117. Geoghegan, V., Guo, A., Trudgian, D., Thomas, B., & Acuto, O. Comprehensive identification of arginine methylation in primary T cells reveals regulatory roles in cell signalling. *Nat. Commun.* 6, 6758 (2015).
118. Lundby, A. *et al.* Proteomic analysis of lysine acetylation sites in rat tissues reveals organ specificity and subcellular patterns. *Cell Rep.* 2, 419-431 (2012).
119. Botchkarev, V.V., Jr., Rossio, V., & Yoshida, S. The budding yeast Polo-like kinase Cdc5 is released from the nucleus during anaphase for timely mitotic exit. *Cell Cycle* 13, 3260-3270 (2014).
120. Visintin, R. *et al.* The phosphatase Cdc14 triggers mitotic exit by reversal of Cdk-dependent phosphorylation. *Mol. Cell* 2, 709-718 (1998).
121. Jaspersen, S.L., Charles, J.F., & Morgan, D.O. Inhibitory phosphorylation of the APC regulator Hct1 is controlled by the kinase Cdc28 and the phosphatase Cdc14. *Curr. Biol.* 9, 227-236 (1999).
122. Hockner, S., Neumann-Arnold, L., & Seufert, W. Dual control by Cdk1 phosphorylation of the budding yeast APC/C ubiquitin ligase activator Cdh1. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 27, 2198-2212 (2016).
123. Min, M. & Lindon, C. Substrate targeting by the ubiquitin-proteasome system in mitosis. *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* 23, 482-491 (2012).
124. Rogers, S. *et al.* PP1 initiates the dephosphorylation of MASTL, triggering mitotic exit and bistability in human cells. *J. Cell Sci.* 129, 1340-1354 (2016).
125. Ma, S. *et al.* Greatwall dephosphorylation and inactivation upon mitotic exit is triggered by PP1. *J. Cell Sci.* 129, 1329-1339 (2016).
126. Fededa, J.P. & Gerlich, D.W. Molecular control of animal cell cytokinesis. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 14, 440-447 (2012).
127. Nahse, V., Christ, L., Stenmark, H., & Campsteijn, C. The Abscission Checkpoint: Making It to the Final Cut. *Trends Cell Biol.* 27, 1-11 (2017).
128. Kawajiri, A. *et al.* Functional significance of the specific sites phosphorylated in desmin at cleavage furrow: Aurora-B may phosphorylate and regulate type III intermediate filaments during cytokinesis coordinately with Rho-kinase. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 14, 1489-1500 (2003).
129. Bohnert, K.A. & Gould, K.L. On the cutting edge: post-translational modifications in cytokinesis. *Trends Cell Biol.* 21, 283-292 (2011).
130. Floyd, S., Pines, J., & Lindon, C. APC/C Cdh1 targets aurora kinase to control reorganization of the mitotic spindle at anaphase. *Curr. Biol.* 18, 1649-1658 (2008).
131. Lindon, C. & Pines, J. Ordered proteolysis in anaphase inactivates Plk1 to contribute to proper mitotic exit in human cells. *J. Cell Biol.* 164, 233-241 (2004).
132. Douglas, M.E., Davies, T., Joseph, N., & Mishima, M. Aurora B and 14-3-3 coordinately regulate clustering of centralspindlin during cytokinesis. *Curr. Biol.* 20, 927-933 (2010).

133. White,E.A. & Glotzer,M. Centralspindlin: at the heart of cytokinesis. *Cytoskeleton (Hoboken.)* 69, 882-892 (2012).
134. Wang,Z. *et al.* Extensive crosstalk between O-GlcNAcylation and phosphorylation regulates cytokinesis. *Sci. Signal.* 3, ra2 (2010).
135. Park,I.Y. *et al.* Dual Chromatin and Cytoskeletal Remodeling by SETD2. *Cell* 166, 950-962 (2016).
136. Zhao,W.M. & Fang,G. Anillin is a substrate of anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome (APC/C) that controls spatial contractility of myosin during late cytokinesis. *J. Biol. Chem.* 280, 33516-33524 (2005).
137. Piekny,A.J. & Glotzer,M. Anillin is a scaffold protein that links RhoA, actin, and myosin during cytokinesis. *Curr. Biol.* 18, 30-36 (2008).
138. Olsen,J.V. & Mann,M. Status of large-scale analysis of post-translational modifications by mass spectrometry. *Mol. Cell Proteomics.* 12, 3444-3452 (2013).
139. Doll,S. & Burlingame,A.L. Mass spectrometry-based detection and assignment of protein posttranslational modifications. *ACS Chem. Biol.* 10, 63-71 (2015).
140. Huang,P. *et al.* Selective HDAC inhibition by ACY-241 enhances the activity of paclitaxel in solid tumor models. *Oncotarget.* 8, 2694-2707 (2017).
141. Visconti,R., Della,M.R., & Grieco,D. Cell cycle checkpoint in cancer: a therapeutically targetable double-edged sword. *J. Exp. Clin. Cancer Res.* 35, 153 (2016).
142. Wengner,A.M. *et al.* Novel Mps1 Kinase Inhibitors with Potent Antitumor Activity. *Mol. Cancer Ther.* 15, 583-592 (2016).
143. Dominguez-Brauer,C. *et al.* Targeting Mitosis in Cancer: Emerging Strategies. *Mol. Cell* 60, 524-536 (2015).
144. Pitts,T.M., Davis,S.L., Eckhardt,S.G., & Bradshaw-Pierce,E.L. Targeting nuclear kinases in cancer: development of cell cycle kinase inhibitors. *Pharmacol. Ther.* 142, 258-269 (2014).
145. Asghar,U., Witkiewicz,A.K., Turner,N.C., & Knudsen,E.S. The history and future of targeting cyclin-dependent kinases in cancer therapy. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* 14, 130-146 (2015).
146. Kisselev,A.F., van der Linden,W.A., & Overkleeft,H.S. Proteasome inhibitors: an expanding army attacking a unique target. *Chem. Biol.* 19, 99-115 (2012).
147. Wu,P., Nielsen,T.E., & Clausen,M.H. FDA-approved small-molecule kinase inhibitors. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 36, 422-439 (2015).
148. Soucy,T.A. *et al.* An inhibitor of NEDD8-activating enzyme as a new approach to treat cancer. *Nature* 458, 732-736 (2009).
149. He,X. *et al.* Probing the roles of SUMOylation in cancer cell biology by using a selective SAE inhibitor. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 13, 1164-1171 (2017).
150. Wei,J. *et al.* Varied Role of Ubiquitylation in Generating MHC Class I Peptide Ligands. *J. Immunol.* 198, 3835-3845 (2017).

