Published in final edited form as:

Trends Genet. 2014 April ; 30(4): 150–159. doi:10.1016/j.tig.2014.02.004.

Catch and release: How do kinetochores hook the right microtubules during mitosis?

Krishna K. Sarangapani¹ and Charles L. Asbury^{1,\$}

¹Department of Physiology & Biophysics, University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Abstract

Sport fishermen keep tension on their lines to prevent hooked fish from releasing. A molecular version of this angler's trick, operating at kinetochores, ensures accuracy during mitosis: The mitotic spindle attaches randomly to chromosomes and then correctly bioriented attachments are stabilized due to the tension exerted on them by opposing microtubules. Incorrect attachments, which lack tension, are unstable and release quickly, allowing another chance for biorientation. Stabilization of molecular interactions by tension also occurs in other physiological contexts such as cell adhesion, motility, hemostasis, and tissue morphogenesis. Here we review models for the stabilization of kinetochore attachments with an eye toward emerging models for other force-activated systems. While attention in the mitosis field has focused mainly on one kinase-based mechanism, multiple mechanisms may act together to stabilize properly bioriented kinetochores and some principles governing other tension-sensitive systems may apply to kinetochores as well.

Keywords

Cell division; Mitotic spindle; Meiosis; Chromosome; Biorientation; Aurora B; Tension; Mechanobiology; Mechanosensor; Catch bond

“Esa! Esa! Shame upon on you! You are but the pike, Kenozha, You are not the fish I wanted You are not the King of Fishes!”

– Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, *The Song of Hiawatha*

Tension-dependent stabilization of kinetochore-microtubule attachments

Mitosis research has been guided for over half a century by the idea that mechanical tension signals proper attachment of chromosomes to microtubules of the mitotic spindle and selectively stabilizes these attachments. Chromosomes are coupled to spindle microtubules via kinetochores – multi-protein complexes that form persistent attachments to growing and shortening microtubule tips, thereby harnessing the filaments' dynamics to produce force and movement. Accurate mitosis requires all kinetochores to become properly 'bioriented',

© 2014 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

^{\$}To whom correspondence should be addressed: CLA (casbury@u.washington.edu).

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

with replicated sister chromatids attached to opposite sides of the spindle (or with homologous chromosomes attached to opposite sides during the first meiotic division of gametogenesis). Dietz [1] was the first to recognize that chromosomes repeatedly reorient on the spindle, in a trial and error process that ceases only when proper biorientation is achieved because only this arrangement is stable [2, 3]. Dietz also suggested a possible cause for this differential stability: mechanical tension. Bioriented chromosomes come under tension and their sister kinetochores are stretched apart by opposing spindle forces, whereas incorrectly attached chromosomes are relaxed (Fig. 1a). Direct evidence that tension indeed confers stability to chromosome-spindle attachments came from classic micromanipulation experiments using grasshopper spermatocytes [3]. The idea has since become a central tenet of mitosis research.

An attractive molecular explanation for how tension may stabilize bioriented attachments began to emerge when genetic studies uncovered a kinase, Aurora B, whose activity prevents errors in chromosome segregation [4–7]. Aurora B phosphorylates key microtubule-binding elements within the kinetochore [5, 8–11], reducing their biochemical affinity for [9, 12] and promoting their detachment from microtubules [12–16]. If Aurora B's detachment-promoting activity is directed selectively toward kinetochores lacking tension and suppressed at kinetochores bearing tension then it could explain why only relaxed attachments are unstable *in vivo*. Experiments in a variety of cell types are consistent with this idea (see especially [17–19]) but do not yet provide final proof (see below). Nevertheless, the hypothesis that tension suppresses Aurora B-triggered detachment has become so popular among mitosis researchers that it is difficult to find skepticism about it in current literature.

Meanwhile, numerous instances have been uncovered in other physiological contexts where mechanical tension stabilizes molecular interactions. In some cases force acts via regulation of kinase enzymes [20, 21], as proposed for kinetochores. Other cases involve specialized 'catch bonds' that are directly stabilized by force [22–28]. Force on a protein can also promote or inhibit its proteolytic cleavage [29, 30], or enable its binding to another protein [31–33]. Although our understanding of how tension-activated molecules contribute to cell morphogenesis is far from complete, it is clear that many different schemes have evolved for sensing and responding to mechanical force [34–36].

Here we review current ideas about how tension stabilizes kinetochore-spindle attachments. Key experiments that form the basis of the popular kinase-based model are examined. We also consider alternative mechanisms suggested by work outside the mitosis field and by recent experiments where reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments were directly manipulated *in vitro*. We do not discuss how the 'wait anaphase' (checkpoint) signals generated by kinetochores may be suppressed by tension, a topic already covered in several excellent reviews [37–39].

Evidence for tension-dependent suppression of Aurora B kinase

Aurora B is widely conserved, even across evolutionarily distant eukaryotes [40, 41], and it is clearly important for promoting proper attachments between chromosomes and spindle

microtubules. Mutating it [4, 5], depleting it from dividing cells [6], or inhibiting its activity [6, 42] causes severe chromosome missegregation, though the spindle remains fully capable of attaching and pulling on kinetochores [5–7, 17]. Many pairs of sister kinetochores in Aurora B-deficient cells fail to biorient. Instead, the cells accumulate erroneous attachments where both sisters are bound to microtubules emanating from the same spindle pole [5–7]. In normal cells, such aberrant configurations are short-lived [1–3], but Aurora B deficiency makes them unusually stable [42]. Aurora B phosphorylates key microtubule-binding elements within kinetochores *in vivo*, including the widely-conserved Ndc80 and Knl1 subcomplexes [11, 43, 44] and the yeast Dam1 subcomplex [8]. Phosphorylation [9, 12] and phosphomimetic mutations at Aurora B target sites [15, 16, 44] reduce the biochemical affinity of kinetochore subcomplexes for microtubules [9, 12, 44] and also accelerate detachment of subcomplexes [12, 16] and larger kinetochore assemblies [15] from microtubules *in vitro*. Altogether these data strongly suggest that Aurora B promotes detachment of kinetochores from microtubules and that this activity is somehow restricted *in vivo* to erroneously-attached kinetochores.

The idea that tension might regulate Aurora B arose from studies of yeast engineered to enter mitosis without prior replication of their DNA or without sister chromatid cohesion [7, 45]. The resulting unpaired chromatids cannot biorient, so the spindle exerts little or no tension on them, and they associate with either of the two spindle poles randomly [7]. Upon Aurora B inhibition, however, they associate almost exclusively with the ‘old’ pole – the one leftover from the previous cell cycle (rather than the ‘new’ pole formed *de novo* during the most recent S-phase). Aurora B activity is evidently needed to break their attachments to the old pole, which they inherit from G1. This Aurora B-dependent turnover is reminiscent of the classic observations in insect spermatocytes, where unpaired X chromosomes undergo rapid pole-to-pole movements [46] because they lack the tension normally required for stabilizing chromosome-spindle attachments in these cells [2, 3]. The similarity suggests a unified explanation: Aurora B may promote kinetochore detachment universally – during insect, yeast, and perhaps all eukaryotic cell division – and its activity may be universally inhibited by tension.

The evidence that tension suppresses the detachment-promoting activity of Aurora B, though entirely circumstantial, is compelling. Formally, any property absent from correctly attached kinetochores but shared by unpaired and erroneously attached kinetochores could underlie their differential susceptibility to detachment by Aurora B. Whatever the key difference, it does not depend on precisely *how* kinetochore pairs are linked: Bioriented kinetochore pairs are resistant to Aurora B-dependent turnover regardless of whether they are linked naturally, through replicated sisters bound by cohesion [7], or artificially, through a single ‘dicentric’ DNA molecule or through DNA entanglements (created by inhibiting topoisomerase) [17]. This adaptability again mirrors the situation in insect spermatocytes, where erroneous attachments can be artificially stabilized either by applying tension with a microneedle [3] or by arranging a pair of mal-oriented chromosomes such that they become mechanically interlocked [2]. Incorrect attachments can also be artificially stabilized in *Drosophila* S2 cells by over-expressing NOD, a kinesin-10 motor that localizes on chromosomes. Chromosome-anchored NOD is normally thought to help align chromosomes

at the spindle equator by pushing them away from the poles. NOD overexpression may elevate this polar ejection force and significantly increase tension at kinetochores, thereby suppressing Aurora B and preventing erroneous attachments from releasing. Given the striking similarity of these observations, it seems likely that tension somehow suppresses Aurora B. Notably, however, definitive evidence showing that *direct* application of mechanical tension is sufficient to suppress chromosome reorientation has only been obtained in meiotic grasshopper spermatocytes. Whether reorientation in these particular cells depends on Aurora B has not, to our knowledge, been proven. More generally, it remains unproven whether direct application of mechanical tension is sufficient to inhibit *any* Aurora B-dependent activity.

Is kinetochore phosphorylation sensitive to tension?

Immunostaining with the '3F3' antibody confirms that tension, either from a micromanipulation needle or from normal spindle forces, can inhibit kinetochore phosphorylation [47–49]. 3F3 antibody specifically detects phosphorylated kinetochore proteins [50], but probably not Aurora B substrates. (It recognizes spindle checkpoint proteins phosphorylated either by Plk1 or Mps1 [51–54].) Nevertheless, key ideas that could apply to Aurora B are illustrated by experiments where chromosomes from lysed cells are washed, directly manipulated, and then immunostained with 3F3. Relaxed kinetochores on the washed chromosomes are devoid of 3F3 phosphoepitope, but they can be rephosphorylated by incubation with ATP if a phosphatase inhibitor is also present [49]. Applying tension with a microneedle prevents rephosphorylation. The rephosphorylation of relaxed kinetochores by incubation with ATP shows that the chromosomes retain a complete phosphorylation system, including substrate and kinase. The requirement for phosphatase inhibitor shows that a phosphatase is also retained and does not require tension for its activity. Rather, tension must prevent phosphorylation in this case either by inhibiting the kinase, deforming the substrate, or repositioning the substrate relative to the kinase [49].

To our knowledge, such direct tests of tension sensitivity have not been performed using phosphospecific antibodies against *bona fide* Aurora B substrates. However, antibodies that recognize phosphorylation of several Aurora B substrates, including Ndc80 and Knl1, reveal correlations that are mostly consistent with tension-dependent suppression *in vivo* [11, 44]. High levels of phosphorylation on Ndc80 and Knl1 correlate with unaligned, relaxed chromosomes. Low phosphorylation is seen at metaphase, when most kinetochore pairs are aligned, stretched apart, and probably bioriented. An exception is anaphase, when low tension correlates with low Ndc80 phosphorylation [11], presumably because Aurora B delocalizes from the chromosomes at this time (binding instead to microtubules in the spindle midzone, together with other members of the 'chromosomal passenger complex' [41]). More puzzlingly, in cells treated with nocodazole to depolymerize their microtubules the level of phosphorylation on Ndc80 is low [11], whereas high levels are seen for Knl1 [44]. Tension should be absent after microtubule depolymerization, so the low phosphorylation of Ndc80 is incompatible with a strict model in which Aurora B *always* phosphorylates *all* its targets at relaxed kinetochores.

The spatial separation model for suppression of Aurora B activity

In mitotic animal cells, Aurora B localizes prominently on inner-centromeric chromatin, midway between sister kinetochores. This pattern is the basis for an appealing ‘spatial separation’ model explaining how Aurora B may selectively phosphorylate the kinetochores of relaxed chromosomes: Sister kinetochores on relaxed chromosomes are close enough to the inner centromere to be phosphorylated by Aurora B located there (Fig. 1b). Tension stretches the chromosomes and this deformation spatially separates the kinetochores from centromeric Aurora B, thereby inhibiting their phosphorylation.

Aspects of this model have been tested using a FRET-based biosensor for Aurora B [18, 44]. When the sensor is targeted to kinetochores (by fusion with the kinetochore proteins, Mis12 or Ndc80) its behavior matches the predictions for native kinetochore substrates, reporting high phosphorylation on unaligned kinetochores or after drug treatments that relax the chromosomes (nocodazole, monastrol), and reporting low phosphorylation on kinetochores that are properly aligned and bioriented. If instead the sensor is targeted to centromeres (by fusion with the centromere-targeting domain of CENP-B) then its phosphorylation remains high, even on stretched chromosomes [18]. This observation indicates that the inner-centromeric Aurora B is constitutively active and that proximity of a substrate to this active pool is sufficient to cause its phosphorylation. The data are also nicely consistent with the spatial separation model, but a key question remains: In the normal physiological situation, is the Aurora B at the inner centromere directly responsible for phosphorylation of relaxed kinetochores?

Two recent observations suggest that the Aurora B directly involved in error correction might be distinct from the prominent pool at the inner centromere. First, an antibody that specifically recognizes the phosphorylated active form of Aurora B labels not only the inner-centromeric pool between sister kinetochores, but also the outer kinetochore [11]. The outer-kinetochore population of Aurora B diminishes as kinetochores become properly aligned and less phosphorylated on Ndc80, whereas the inner-centromeric pool remains prominent. The correlation between Ndc80 phosphorylation levels and enrichment of outer-kinetochore Aurora B suggests that this population, rather than the inner-centromeric pool, could be responsible for phosphorylating Ndc80. A second recent observation is that Aurora B supports normal cell growth [55] and accurate chromosome segregation [56] even when its targeting to inner-centromeres is disrupted (by mutations that interfere with the binding of INCENP to the centromere-targeting factor, survivin). Whether inner-centromere localization of Aurora B is *completely* abolished in this case remains uncertain. But if localization at the inner centromere is truly dispensable then tension-dependent stretching of inner-centromeric chromatin cannot be the basis for suppression of Aurora B, and a key assumption of the spatial separation model would be wrong. Clearly, even with impressive advancements in our understanding of Aurora B, we lack a complete picture of how tension confers stability to kinetochore-microtubule attachments.

Mechanically-regulated molecular systems outside of mitosis

The notion that mechanical force can regulate molecular interactions and cellular activities is pervasive in many fields besides mitosis. In a growing number of cases, tension-dependent molecular behaviors have been demonstrated by the application of force directly to purified proteins. What can those of us interested in chromosome segregation learn from studies of other micromechanical systems (and *vice versa*)?

One lesson is that nature has produced a great variety of molecular mechanisms for sensing mechanical force (Figs. 2a – 2e). There are examples where phosphorylation is regulated by force, similar to the proposal for kinetochores, but not necessarily via spatial separation of the kinase from its substrates. Adherent cells, for example, sense their mechanical environment through a series of biochemical events that includes tension-dependent phosphorylation of the focal adhesion protein p130Cas [57]. Tension acts in this case by ‘substrate priming’: The relaxed p130Cas substrate domain is normally resistant to phosphorylation, but becomes susceptible under load (Fig. 2e) [20]. Another phosphoregulatory mechanism occurs in muscle cells, where a kinase domain within the giant elastic protein titin senses mechanical strain and initiates a cascade of downstream biochemical events to control transcription of adaptive genes [58]. Force is transmitted directly through titin kinase itself, causing its activation by pulling an auto-inhibitory domain away from its active (ATP binding) site (Fig. 2d) [21]. More generally, force on a molecule can expose a previously buried ‘cryptic’ binding site for another molecule. Thus stretching of the focal adhesion protein talin activates its binding to vinculin (Fig. 2a) [32], and stretching an F-actin network activates the binding of β -integrin to the actin cross-linking protein, filamin [33]. Of course force can disrupt binding sites as well. The stretching that activates binding of β -integrin to filamin also causes the simultaneous *unbinding* of another filamin-binding protein, FliGAP [33].

Tension-dependent stabilization outside of mitosis

As in mitosis, the concept that force can stabilize load-bearing molecular structures is central to many other areas of biology and the effect has been demonstrated in various molecular systems. Tension-dependent stabilization probably explains how fibrils of collagen, the most abundant structural protein in vertebrates, are preferentially oriented along directions of load transmission [59]. Tension stabilizes collagen fibrils indirectly, by rendering them resistant to cleavage by collagenolytic enzymes [30], possibly because it inhibits the partial unfolding of collagen’s triple-helical structure (Fig. 2c) [60]. Tension can also cause stabilization more directly, via specialized molecular interactions called ‘catch bonds’ (see Box 1) [34, 35]. Catch bonds were first demonstrated in single molecule experiments involving selectins [22], adhesion molecules that support tethering and rolling of leukocytes on vascular endothelium during inflammation. Lifetimes of individual selectin-ligand bonds initially increase and then decrease with tension, giving rise to a biphasic lifetime-vs-force curve [22, 24]. Around the same time it was also discovered that adhesion of fimbriated bacteria to host cells is enhanced by hydrodynamic force [23], in part because a protein at the tip of the fimbria, fimH, forms catch bonds with mannosylated glycoproteins on the host cell surface.

Box 1**A conflagration of catch bonds**

Bell [85] first theorized that force would accelerate the dissociation of receptor-ligand bonds by tilting their energy landscape and lowering the energetic barrier for dissociation. Such interactions are known as ‘slip bonds’, and their lifetime typically decreases exponentially with tension. Later it was proposed that tension could also do the opposite, i.e., prolong bond lifetime, by triggering a conformational change that tightens the ligand binding pocket [86]. This counter-intuitive behavior can be likened to a finger trap gag toy – the harder one pulls, the more stable the interaction becomes. Since the initial discovery that force stabilizes selectin-ligand and fimH-mannose bonds (see Fig. 2b and main text), catch bonds have been found in many other biological contexts. Two prominent examples are the binding of integrin to fibronectin [64], which supports cell adhesion to the extracellular matrix, and the binding of von Willebrand factor via its A1 domain to platelet glycoprotein Ib [31, 63], which initiates blood clotting preferentially in areas of high flow.

Catch bond-like behavior is also common in ATP-powered motor proteins. Many muscle and non-muscle myosins attach to actin filaments more stably when force opposing their motion is applied [25–28]. Opposing force generally prolongs myosin’s attachment lifetime by slowing its release of ADP and thereby preventing it from binding ATP, which is normally required for detachment of myosin from actin. The result is a ‘latch’ effect that allows these myosins to consume less ATP while sustaining loads for long durations (e.g., while maintaining vascular tone). A particularly dramatic example is myosin1b, whose actin-attachment lifetime increases >75-fold in response to small opposing loads (<2 pN) [28]. Similarly, opposing force applied to the kinesin motor domain favors its tight binding to microtubules [87], in this case by *accelerating* its release of ADP (which has the opposite effect on kinesin as on myosin). This tension-dependent stabilization probably helps to coordinate the hand-overhand stepping of kinesin’s twin motor domains over the microtubule lattice [88]. Some of the earliest demonstrations of force-stabilized motor-filament attachments [25] predate the initial discovery of catch bonds. Most have not been described using the term ‘catch bond’, but their similarity is obvious.

Multiple force-sensitive molecules are often combined

A second lesson that mitosis aficionados can learn from studies of other mechanically regulated systems is that multiple tension-controlled molecules often participate together in the same cellular process. Thus, bacterial adhesion is enhanced not only by fimH catch bonds at fimbrial tips [61], but also by mechanically responsive fimA molecules, which form a helical polymer comprising most of the length of the fimbriae. The fimA polymer acts as a near-perfect shock absorber, uncoiling and re-coiling dynamically to maintain the optimal force at the tip (i.e., the force where fimH-mannose bonds are longest-lived) [62]. Likewise, the blood clotting potential of von Willebrand Factor is regulated not only by the catch bonds it forms with platelet glycoproteins [31, 63], but also by a proteolytic cleavage

process that is enhanced by shear forces [29]. Mechano-sensation by adherent cells via integrins is perhaps the most multifaceted example currently known. A dizzying number of force-sensitive molecules participate, including (1) force-activated binding of integrin to actin via filamin [33], (2) force-stabilized binding of integrin to fibronectin [64], (3) force-activated self-assembly of fibronectin [65], (4) force-activated binding of vinculin to talin [32], and possibly, (5) force-dependent regulation of focal adhesion kinase [36]. The cooperation of so many mechanically regulated proteins in one pathway may seem surprising. However, the experimental tools for studying force-sensitive molecules are relatively new. As they become more widespread, coincidence of multiple force sensors in a single pathway may turn out to be the norm rather than an exception.

Kinetochores behave in a catch bond-like manner

Given the diversity of force-sensing mechanisms across biology, it is natural to ask whether selective stabilization of proper kinetochore-microtubule attachments during mitosis relies solely on tension-dependent regulation of Aurora B, as is generally assumed, or whether other tension-dependent effects are also involved. Until recently, addressing this question would have been prohibitively difficult due to the lack of suitable *in vitro* assays for applying precisely-controlled forces to kinetochore-microtubule interactions. Reconstitution of kinetochore-microtubule coupling using recombinant subcomplexes [13, 16] and native kinetochore particles isolated from budding yeast [15, 66] has made direct tests possible for the first time.

One way to study purified kinetochore particles *in vitro* is to link them to polystyrene beads, which serve as artificial cargoes (mimicking the chromosomes) and as handles to apply force (Fig. 3a). Using a servo-controlled laser trap, bead-linked kinetochore particles can be attached to the tips of individual microtubules grown from coverslip-anchored seeds. The particles track with growing and shortening filament tips even when tension is applied continuously with the trap, to mimic the physiological situation. And like kinetochores *in vivo*, the purified particles can maintain their persistent, load-bearing tip attachments through periods of microtubule growth and shortening [15, 66]. To measure the effect of tension on attachment lifetime, the laser trap can be programmed to operate as a force ‘clamp’, applying a chosen level of force for the duration of each event. A large number of events is recorded, and mean attachment lifetimes are calculated at each force by dividing the total observation times by the numbers of detachments. Considering that the purified kinetochore particles lack detectable Aurora B kinase [66], one might expect the lifetime to decrease monotonically with force (like a typical ‘slip bond’; Box 1). However, attachment lifetimes initially increase and then decrease with tension, lending a biphasic shape to the lifetime-vs-force curve (Fig. 3c) [66]. These results indicate the existence of a direct, catch bond-like stabilization mechanism that may act in parallel with Aurora-based phosphoregulation to help ensure mitotic accuracy.

Catch bonds are often described by a two-state kinetic scheme where the bond switches between a weak and a strong state and force favors adoption of the strong state [24, 67, 68]. As force increases from zero, the average bond lifetime initially grows because the bond spends an increasing fraction of time in the strong state. Eventually a critical force is

reached, above which the lifetime decreases because the strong state is overpowered. This same model can describe the behavior of kinetochore-microtubule attachments (Fig. 3b). Microtubule tips switch between two states, growth and shortening. Kinetochore particles detach from growing tips much more slowly than from shortening tips (Fig. 3e) [15, 66], so tip growth corresponds to a strongly attached state. Moreover, tension decreases the likelihood that a growing tip will begin shortening (an event called a ‘catastrophe’) and increases the likelihood that a shortening tip will resume growth (a ‘rescue’), thereby causing the kinetochore-tip attachments to spend more time in the strongly attached state [66]. The resulting lifetime-vs-force relations for both kinetochore particles and catch bonds are well described by mathematically equivalent functions. However, the kinetochore-microtubule system differs from canonical catch bonds in at least one way: Catch bonds typically switch very rapidly between their weakly and strongly bound states, and because the associated conformational changes are subtle, it is not usually possible to directly measure kinetic rates for switching or for detachment specifically from the strongly or weakly bound states. Since microtubule tips *in vitro* switch relatively infrequently between growth and shortening, distinguishing between the two states is straightforward, and the specific kinetic rates can be directly measured [66].

Alternative mechanisms for regulation of kinetochore-spindle attachment stability

The catch bond-like behavior observed using reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments arises because their attachment stability depends on microtubule tip dynamics. This dependence implies more generally that altering microtubule tip dynamics by *any* means could affect kinetochore attachment stability. The core microtubule-binding kinetochore elements, Ndc80 and Dam1, for example, affect tip dynamics in ways that promote microtubule growth [16], which in turn promotes attachment stability. Tip stabilization by Ndc80 and Dam1 is partially reversed by phosphomimetic mutations at Aurora B target sites on these subcomplexes, suggesting that Aurora B may promote kinetochore release not only directly, by accelerating detachment, but also indirectly, by destabilizing kinetochore-attached microtubule tips [15, 16]. Other candidates for affecting attachment stability via this mechanism are microtubule-regulators of the Kinesin-13 [69] and Kinesin-8 families [70], and plus end-binding proteins such as XMAP215 and EB1 [71].

In principle, dividing cells might exploit the interplay between tension, microtubule tip dynamics, and kinetochore attachment stability in interesting ways. Simultaneously promoting catastrophes while inhibiting detachment during assembly, for example, is predicted to shift the lifetime-vs-force curve rightward (Fig. 3c, *red curve*), so that the optimum force—where attachment lifetime is longest—occurs at higher tension. Conversely, inhibiting catastrophes while promoting detachment during assembly would shift the curve leftward. If the rate changes were large enough, then the catch bond effect would be abolished, and lifetime would decrease monotonically with force (Fig. 3c, *blue curve*). We speculate that such shifts in the lifetime-vs-force relation may be biologically important. A leftward shift could allow stable attachment of relaxed kinetochores, perhaps promoting the formation of initial attachments during spindle assembly. A subsequent

rightward shift could selectively destabilize kinetochores that have failed to biorient. A cell could tune the lifetime-vs-force relation for all kinetochores simultaneously, by globally modulating the dynamics of all kinetochore-attached microtubules [72]. The relation for a particular kinetochore could be tuned by post-translational modifications or by local binding of co-factors that alter detachment rates or the dynamics of attached microtubules.

Aurora B on the horizon: New concepts in the light of mechanobiology

As discussed above, current models for how Aurora B promotes accurate chromosome segregation are dominated by two concepts: that Aurora B phosphorylation causes kinetochore detachment from the spindle, and that tension suppresses this activity, possibly by spatially separating centromere-bound kinase from its substrates in the kinetochore. These relatively simple ideas emerged before a complete picture of the kinetochore was available and are probably inadequate to fully explain the dynamics of kinetochore phosphorylation and error correction *in vivo* [11, 56]. We now know that the core kinetochore consists of >80 proteins, arranged in at least eight subcomplexes that assemble hierarchically into a very large structure [73, 74]. Why all this molecular complexity? One possibility is that it enables kinetochores to sense and respond in a sophisticated manner to a variety of mechanical and biochemical cues.

We imagine two alternative mechanisms, besides spatial separation, by which mechanical tension could suppress Aurora B phosphorylation of kinetochores (Figs. 2f and 2g). First, tension could deform the substrates of Aurora B within the kinetochore to render them inaccessible to phosphorylation (or to render them *more* susceptible to dephosphorylation by phosphatases). Consistent with this view, kinetochores exhibit deformations that correlate with their attachment state [75–78] and could affect Aurora B kinase substrate access [39]. Tension-dependent control of substrate access at kinetochores would be similar to the protection of tension-bearing collagen molecules against proteolytic cleavage [30, 59] and to the priming of tension-bearing p130Cas for phosphorylation by Src kinase [20]. A second possibility is that tension on Aurora B itself, or on its activator INCENP, could directly inhibit its kinase activity (Fig. 2g). Aurora B and INCENP bind not only to chromatin and kinetochores (as discussed above), but also to microtubules [79, 80], so they could bear some mechanical load at kinetochore-microtubule attachment sites. Direct mechanical control of Aurora B kinase activity would be similar to the load-dependent activation of titin kinase [21].

Assuming that Aurora B is indeed regulated by tension, how might it work together with the intrinsic catch bond-like behavior of kinetochores? The intrinsic catch bond-like behavior by itself produces only a modest stabilization *in vitro* (at the optimum force the mean attachment lifetime is increased about 3-fold relative to zero force) and the degree to which it will help stabilize biorientation *in vivo* is uncertain (see Box 2). However, if Aurora B phosphorylation has a strong enough effect on the rates of kinetochore detachment and microtubule switching, and if its effects are sufficiently inhibited by tension, then the lifetime-vs-force relation could be substantially sharpened. (Two examples of such sharpening are depicted in Figs. 3f – 3h). Another intriguing possibility is that kinetochores may include canonical catch bonds that are stabilized by force even without changes in

microtubule switching. If canonical catch bonds exist between kinetochores and microtubules, they could have a profound influence on attachment stability (Fig. 2h) [81] and also on chromosome movement [82].

Box 2

How tension-dependent modulation of microtubule tip dynamics could help stabilize biorientation

If both sister kinetochores attach to the tips of microtubules emanating from the same spindle pole (syntelic, Fig. 1a), then opposing spindle forces will not develop and tension on both tip-attachments will be low. Both tip-attachments will tend to remain in the disassembling state and, consequently, both will be weak (Fig. 3e, $k_4 \gg k_3$). Correctly bioriented sister kinetochores will come under tension. In cells such as yeast, where microtubule minus ends are anchored statically at the spindle poles (i.e., in cells without poleward flux), the growth of tips attached to one bioriented sister kinetochore must be balanced by shortening of those attached to the other sister. This balance is probably achieved through tension-dependent modulation of tip dynamics [89–91]. The attachment on the growing side will be dramatically stabilized (Fig. 3e, $k_3 \ll k_4$), and this effect alone will reduce the likelihood relative to the syntelic case that the pair will revert to a singly-attached (‘monotelic’) state. Although the attachment on the shortening side will be weaker than its sister, it may still be moderately stabilized relative to a syntelic attachment, because tension moderately inhibits detachment during shortening (Fig. 3e, k_4 decreases with force). In many cell types a continuous poleward flux of microtubules occurs, driven by traction forces and balanced by disassembly at the poles [92, 93]. In such cells the growth of tips attached to bioriented kinetochores is not a zero-sum game: Poleward flux may allow the simultaneous assembly of tips attached to *both* sisters. In this case, attachments on *both* sides would be dramatically stabilized and the pair would be far less likely to revert to a singly-attached state.

Concluding remarks

In many ways our understanding of how kinetochores ‘catch and hold’ the correct microtubules but release erroneous attachments remains in its infancy. Various lines of evidence suggest that erroneous attachments are selectively eliminated through tension-dependent control of the spatial separation between Aurora B kinase and its kinetochore substrates. Considering the molecular complexity of kinetochores, the importance of mechanical cues during mitosis, and the diversity of force-sensors in other areas of biology, it would not be surprising to find numerous other tension-sensing mechanisms operating at kinetochores as well. Precise mechanical manipulation of reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments should enable direct tests of the popular kinase-based model and facilitate the search for additional tension-sensing mechanisms.

Acknowledgments

We thank Sue Biggins, Jeffrey Ruberti, Jason Stumpff, Linda Wordeman, Erik Yusko, and four anonymous reviewers for their critical reading and helpful comments on this manuscript. We apologize to all those authors

whose work we could not cite due to space limitations. Our work is currently supported by National Institutes of Health Grant RO1GM079373 and Packard Fellowship 2006-30521.

References

1. Dietz R. [Multiple sex chromosomes in Ostracoda cypria, their evolution and division characteristics]. *Chromosoma*. 1958; 9:359–440. [PubMed: 13619004]
2. Nicklas RB. Chromosome segregation mechanisms. *Genetics*. 1974; 78:205–213. [PubMed: 4442702]
3. Nicklas RB, Koch CA. Chromosome micromanipulation. 3. Spindle fiber tension and the reorientation of mal-oriented chromosomes. *J Cell Biol*. 1969; 43:40–50. [PubMed: 5824068]
4. Chan CS, Botstein D. Isolation and characterization of chromosome-gain and increase-in-ploidy mutants in yeast. *Genetics*. 1993; 135:677–691. [PubMed: 8293973]
5. Biggins S, et al. The conserved protein kinase Ipl1 regulates microtubule binding to kinetochores in budding yeast. *Genes Dev*. 1999; 13:532–544. [PubMed: 10072382]
6. Hauf S, et al. The small molecule Hesperadin reveals a role for Aurora B in correcting kinetochore-microtubule attachment and in maintaining the spindle assembly checkpoint. *J Cell Biol*. 2003; 161:281–294. [PubMed: 12707311]
7. Tanaka TU, et al. Evidence that the Ipl1-Sli15 (Aurora kinase-INCENP) complex promotes chromosome bi-orientation by altering kinetochore-spindle pole connections. *Cell*. 2002; 108:317–329. [PubMed: 11853667]
8. Cheeseman IM, et al. Phospho-regulation of kinetochore-microtubule attachments by the Aurora kinase Ipl1p. *Cell*. 2002; 111:163–172. [PubMed: 12408861]
9. Cheeseman IM, et al. The conserved KMN network constitutes the core microtubule-binding site of the kinetochore. *Cell*. 2006; 127:983–997. [PubMed: 17129783]
10. DeLuca JG, et al. Kinetochore microtubule dynamics and attachment stability are regulated by Hec1. *Cell*. 2006; 127:969–982. [PubMed: 17129782]
11. DeLuca KF, et al. Temporal changes in Hec1 phosphorylation control kinetochore-microtubule attachment stability during mitosis. *J Cell Sci*. 2011; 124:622–634. [PubMed: 21266467]
12. Gestaut DR, et al. Phosphoregulation and depolymerization-driven movement of the Dam1 complex do not require ring formation. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2008; 10:407–414. [PubMed: 18364702]
13. Tien JF, et al. Cooperation of the Dam1 and Ndc80 kinetochore complexes enhances microtubule coupling and is regulated by aurora B. *J Cell Biol*. 2010; 189:713–723. [PubMed: 20479468]
14. Alushin GM, et al. Multimodal microtubule binding by the Ndc80 kinetochore complex. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2012; 19:1161–1167. [PubMed: 23085714]
15. Sarangapani KK, et al. Phosphoregulation promotes release of kinetochores from dynamic microtubules via multiple mechanisms. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2013; 110:7282–7287. [PubMed: 23589891]
16. Umbreit NT, et al. The Ndc80 kinetochore complex directly modulates microtubule dynamics. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2012; 109:16113–16118. [PubMed: 22908300]
17. Dewar H, et al. Tension between two kinetochores suffices for their bi-orientation on the mitotic spindle. *Nature*. 2004; 428:93–97. [PubMed: 14961024]
18. Liu D, et al. Sensing chromosome bi-orientation by spatial separation of aurora B kinase from kinetochore substrates. *Science*. 2009; 323:1350–1353. [PubMed: 19150808]
19. Cane S, et al. Elevated polar ejection forces stabilize kinetochore-microtubule attachments. *J Cell Biol*. 2013; 200:203–218. [PubMed: 23337118]
20. Sawada Y, et al. Force sensing by mechanical extension of the Src family kinase substrate p130Cas. *Cell*. 2006; 127:1015–1026. [PubMed: 17129785]
21. Puchner EM, et al. Mechanoenzymatics of titin kinase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2008; 105:13385–13390. [PubMed: 18765796]
22. Marshall BT, et al. Direct observation of catch bonds involving cell-adhesion molecules. *Nature*. 2003; 423:190–193. [PubMed: 12736689]

23. Thomas WE, et al. Bacterial adhesion to target cells enhanced by shear force. *Cell*. 2002; 109:913–923. [PubMed: 12110187]
24. Sarangapani KK, et al. Low force decelerates L-selectin dissociation from P-selectin glycoprotein ligand-1 and endoglycan. *J Biol Chem*. 2004; 279:2291–2298. [PubMed: 14573602]
25. Veigel C, et al. The gated gait of the processive molecular motor, myosin V. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2002; 4:59–65. [PubMed: 11740494]
26. Veigel C, et al. Load-dependent kinetics of force production by smooth muscle myosin measured with optical tweezers. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2003; 5:980–986. [PubMed: 14578909]
27. Guo B, Guilford WH. Mechanics of actomyosin bonds in different nucleotide states are tuned to muscle contraction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2006; 103:9844–9849. [PubMed: 16785439]
28. Laakso JM, et al. Myosin I can act as a molecular force sensor. *Science*. 2008; 321:133–136. [PubMed: 18599791]
29. Zhang X, et al. Mechanoenzymatic cleavage of the ultralarge vascular protein von Willebrand factor. *Science*. 2009; 324:1330–1334. [PubMed: 19498171]
30. Camp RJ, et al. Molecular mechanochemistry: low force switch slows enzymatic cleavage of human type I collagen monomer. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 2011; 133:4073–4078. [PubMed: 21348512]
31. Kim J, et al. A mechanically stabilized receptor-ligand flex-bond important in the vasculature. *Nature*. 2010; 466:992–995. [PubMed: 20725043]
32. del Rio A, et al. Stretching single talin rod molecules activates vinculin binding. *Science*. 2009; 323:638–641. [PubMed: 19179532]
33. Ehrlicher AJ, et al. Mechanical strain in actin networks regulates FilGAP and integrin binding to filamin A. *Nature*. 2011; 478:260–263. [PubMed: 21926999]
34. McEver RP, Zhu C. Rolling cell adhesion. *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol*. 2010; 26:363–396. [PubMed: 19575676]
35. Thomas WE, et al. Biophysics of catch bonds. *Annu Rev Biophys*. 2008; 37:399–416. [PubMed: 18573088]
36. Moore SW, et al. Stretchy proteins on stretchy substrates: the important elements of integrin-mediated rigidity sensing. *Dev Cell*. 2010; 19:194–206. [PubMed: 20708583]
37. Pinsky BA, Biggins S. The spindle checkpoint: tension versus attachment. *Trends Cell Biol*. 2005; 15:486–493. [PubMed: 16084093]
38. Nezi L, Musacchio A. Sister chromatid tension and the spindle assembly checkpoint. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 2009; 21:785–795. [PubMed: 19846287]
39. Maresca TJ, Salmon ED. Welcome to a new kind of tension: translating kinetochore mechanics into a wait-anaphase signal. *J Cell Sci*. 2010; 123:825–835. [PubMed: 20200228]
40. Akiyoshi B, Gull K. Evolutionary cell biology of chromosome segregation: insights from trypanosomes. *Open biology*. 2013; 3:130023. [PubMed: 23635522]
41. Carmena M, Earnshaw WC. The cellular geography of aurora kinases. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 2003; 4:842–854. [PubMed: 14625535]
42. Lampson MA, et al. Correcting improper chromosome-spindle attachments during cell division. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2004; 6:232–237. [PubMed: 14767480]
43. Akiyoshi B, et al. Analysis of Ipl1-mediated phosphorylation of the Ndc80 kinetochore protein in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics*. 2009; 183:1591–1595. [PubMed: 19822728]
44. Welburn JP, et al. Aurora B phosphorylates spatially distinct targets to differentially regulate the kinetochore-microtubule interface. *Mol Cell*. 2010; 38:383–392. [PubMed: 20471944]
45. Biggins S, Murray AW. The budding yeast protein kinase Ipl1/Aurora allows the absence of tension to activate the spindle checkpoint. *Genes Dev*. 2001; 15:3118–3129. [PubMed: 11731476]
46. Nicklas RB. Recurrent pole-to-pole movements of the sex chromosome during prometaphase I in *Melanoplus differentialis* spermatocytes. *Chromosoma*. 1961; 12:97–115. [PubMed: 13728791]
47. Nicklas RB, et al. Kinetochore chemistry is sensitive to tension and may link mitotic forces to a cell cycle checkpoint. *J Cell Biol*. 1995; 130:929–939. [PubMed: 7642708]

48. Li X, Nicklas RB. Tension-sensitive kinetochore phosphorylation and the chromosome distribution checkpoint in praying mantid spermatocytes. *J Cell Sci.* 1997; 110 (Pt 5):537–545. [PubMed: 9092936]
49. Nicklas RB, et al. Tension-sensitive kinetochore phosphorylation in vitro. *J Cell Sci.* 1998; 111 (Pt 21):3189–3196. [PubMed: 9763513]
50. Gorbsky GJ, Ricketts WA. Differential expression of a phosphoepitope at the kinetochores of moving chromosomes. *J Cell Biol.* 1993; 122:1311–1321. [PubMed: 7690762]
51. Daum JR, et al. The 3F3/2 anti-phosphoepitope antibody binds the mitotically phosphorylated anaphase-promoting complex/cyclosome. *Curr Biol.* 2000; 10:R850–852. [PubMed: 11114529]
52. Ahonen LJ, et al. Polo-like kinase 1 creates the tension-sensing 3F3/2 phosphoepitope and modulates the association of spindle-checkpoint proteins at kinetochores. *Curr Biol.* 2005; 15:1078–1089. [PubMed: 15964272]
53. Wong OK, Fang G. Cdk1 phosphorylation of BubR1 controls spindle checkpoint arrest and Plk1-mediated formation of the 3F3/2 epitope. *J Cell Biol.* 2007; 179:611–617. [PubMed: 17998400]
54. Conde C, et al. *Drosophila* Polo regulates the spindle assembly checkpoint through Mps1-dependent BubR1 phosphorylation. *Embo J.* 2013; 32:1761–1777. [PubMed: 23685359]
55. Yue Z, et al. Deconstructing Survivin: comprehensive genetic analysis of Survivin function by conditional knockout in a vertebrate cell line. *J Cell Biol.* 2008; 183:279–296. [PubMed: 18936249]
56. Campbell CS, Desai A. Tension sensing by Aurora B kinase is independent of survivin-based centromere localization. *Nature.* 2013; 497:118–121. [PubMed: 23604256]
57. Tamada M, et al. Activation of a signaling cascade by cytoskeleton stretch. *Dev Cell.* 2004; 7:709–718. [PubMed: 15525532]
58. Lange S, et al. The kinase domain of titin controls muscle gene expression and protein turnover. *Science.* 2005; 308:1599–1603. [PubMed: 15802564]
59. Flynn BP, et al. Highly sensitive single-fibril erosion assay demonstrates mechanochemical switch in native collagen fibrils. *Biomechanics and modeling in mechanobiology.* 2013; 12:291–300. [PubMed: 22584606]
60. Chang SW, et al. Molecular mechanism of force induced stabilization of collagen against enzymatic breakdown. *Biomaterials.* 2012; 33:3852–3859. [PubMed: 22401852]
61. Yakovenko O, et al. FimH forms catch bonds that are enhanced by mechanical force due to allosteric regulation. *J Biol Chem.* 2008; 283:11596–11605. [PubMed: 18292092]
62. Forero M, et al. Uncoiling mechanics of *Escherichia coli* type I fimbriae are optimized for catch bonds. *PLoS biology.* 2006; 4:e298. [PubMed: 16933977]
63. Yago T, et al. Platelet glycoprotein Ibalph forms catch bonds with human WT vWF but not with type 2B von Willebrand disease vWF. *The Journal of clinical investigation.* 2008; 118:3195–3207. [PubMed: 18725999]
64. Kong F, et al. Demonstration of catch bonds between an integrin and its ligand. *J Cell Biol.* 2009; 185:1275–1284. [PubMed: 19564406]
65. Zhong C, et al. Rho-mediated contractility exposes a cryptic site in fibronectin and induces fibronectin matrix assembly. *J Cell Biol.* 1998; 141:539–551. [PubMed: 9548730]
66. Akiyoshi B, et al. Tension directly stabilizes reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments. *Nature.* 2010; 468:576–579. [PubMed: 21107429]
67. Sarangapani KK, et al. Regulation of catch bonds by rate of force application. *J Biol Chem.* 2011; 286:32749–32761. [PubMed: 21775439]
68. Thomas WE. Mechanochemistry of receptor-ligand bonds. *Current opinion in structural biology.* 2009; 19:50–55. [PubMed: 19157853]
69. Moore A, Wordeman L. The mechanism, function and regulation of depolymerizing kinesins during mitosis. *Trends Cell Biol.* 2004; 14:537–546. [PubMed: 15450976]
70. Su X, et al. Move in for the kill: motile microtubule regulators. *Trends Cell Biol.* 2012; 22:567–575. [PubMed: 22959403]
71. Howard J, Hyman AA. Microtubule polymerases and depolymerases. *Curr Opin Cell Biol.* 2007; 19:31–35. [PubMed: 17184986]

72. Kabeche L, Compton DA. Cyclin A regulates kinetochore microtubules to promote faithful chromosome segregation. *Nature*. 2013; 502:110–113. [PubMed: 24013174]
73. Biggins S. The composition, functions, and regulation of the budding yeast kinetochore. *Genetics*. 2013; 194:817–846. [PubMed: 23908374]
74. Takeuchi K, Fukagawa T. Molecular architecture of vertebrate kinetochores. *Exp Cell Res*. 2012; 318:1367–1374. [PubMed: 22391098]
75. Wan X, et al. Protein architecture of the human kinetochore microtubule attachment site. *Cell*. 2009; 137:672–684. [PubMed: 19450515]
76. Maresca TJ, Salmon ED. Intrakinetochore stretch is associated with changes in kinetochore phosphorylation and spindle assembly checkpoint activity. *J Cell Biol*. 2009; 184:373–381. [PubMed: 19193623]
77. Dumont S, et al. Deformations within moving kinetochores reveal different sites of active and passive force generation. *Science*. 2012; 337:355–358. [PubMed: 22722252]
78. Joglekar AP, et al. In vivo protein architecture of the eukaryotic kinetochore with nanometer scale accuracy. *Curr Biol*. 2009; 19:694–699. [PubMed: 19345105]
79. Kang J, et al. Functional cooperation of Dam1, Ipl1, and the inner centromere protein (INCENP)-related protein Sli15 during chromosome segregation. *J Cell Biol*. 2001; 155:763–774. [PubMed: 11724818]
80. Sandall S, et al. A Bir1-Sli15 complex connects centromeres to microtubules and is required to sense kinetochore tension. *Cell*. 2006; 127:1179–1191. [PubMed: 17174893]
81. Cane S, et al. Insights from an erroneous kinetochore-microtubule attachment state. *Bioarchitecture*. 2013; 3:69–76. [PubMed: 23887229]
82. Civelekoglu-Scholey G, et al. Dynamic bonds and polar ejection force distribution explain kinetochore oscillations in PtK1 cells. *J Cell Biol*. 2013; 201:577–593. [PubMed: 23671311]
83. Cimini D, et al. Merotelic kinetochore orientation occurs frequently during early mitosis in mammalian tissue cells and error correction is achieved by two different mechanisms. *J Cell Sci*. 2003; 116:4213–4225. [PubMed: 12953065]
84. Cimini D, et al. Aurora kinase promotes turnover of kinetochore microtubules to reduce chromosome segregation errors. *Curr Biol*. 2006; 16:1711–1718. [PubMed: 16950108]
85. Bell GI. Models for the specific adhesion of cells to cells. *Science*. 1978; 200:618–627. [PubMed: 347575]
86. Dembo M, et al. The reaction-limited kinetics of membrane-to-surface adhesion and detachment. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Containing papers of a Biological character*. Royal Society. 1988; 234:55–83.
87. Uemura S, Ishiwata S. Loading direction regulates the affinity of ADP for kinesin. *Nature structural biology*. 2003; 10:308–311.
88. Asbury CL. Kinesin: world's tiniest biped. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 2005; 17:89–97. [PubMed: 15661524]
89. Skibbens RV, et al. Directional instability of kinetochore motility during chromosome congression and segregation in mitotic newt lung cells: a push-pull mechanism. *J Cell Biol*. 1993; 122:859–875. [PubMed: 8349735]
90. Gardner MK, et al. Tension-dependent regulation of microtubule dynamics at kinetochores can explain metaphase congression in yeast. *Mol Biol Cell*. 2005; 16:3764–3775. [PubMed: 15930123]
91. Franck AD, et al. Tension applied through the Dam1 complex promotes microtubule elongation providing a direct mechanism for length control in mitosis. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2007; 9:832–837. [PubMed: 17572669]
92. Kwok BH, Kapoor TM. Microtubule flux: drivers wanted. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 2007; 19:36–42. [PubMed: 17174541]
93. Mitchison T, et al. Sites of microtubule assembly and disassembly in the mitotic spindle. *Cell*. 1986; 45:515–527. [PubMed: 3708686]

Highlights

- Proper kinetochore-microtubule attachments are selectively stabilized by tension
- Kinetochore stabilization may occur via tension-dependent control of Aurora B kinase
- Tension-sensitive molecular systems are also found in many other cellular contexts
- Principles governing these other tension-sensitive systems may apply to kinetochores

Fig. 1. Tension-dependent error avoidance during mitosis

(a) The accuracy of mitosis depends on trial-and-error and selective stabilization of correctly ‘bioriented’ attachments – i.e., attachments with sister kinetochores attached to microtubules emanating from opposite sides of the mitotic spindle. Bioriented kinetochores come under tension due to forces exerted on them by opposing microtubules, which somehow stabilizes the attachments. Conversely, a lack of tension on incorrectly attached kinetochores fails to stabilize them, so they release quickly, giving another chance for biorientation. For simplicity, we focus here on one type of incorrect attachment, called ‘syntelic’, with both sister kinetochores bound exclusively to microtubules from a single pole. Another incorrect attachment, ‘merotelic’, occurs when a single sister binds microtubules from both poles [83]. Although merotelics are geometrically distinct from syntelics, they may be corrected by similar mechanisms [84]. (b and c) Two models for how tension may stabilize bioriented attachments. (b) Spatial separation model where a pool of Aurora B kinase located in-between the sister kinetochores (i.e., at the inner-centromere) selectively phosphorylates the kinetochores of relaxed chromosomes, weakening their grip on the microtubules and promoting their release. Tension on correctly bioriented chromosomes causes them to stretch, spatially separating their kinetochores from Aurora B and preventing kinase-triggered detachment. Other mechanisms for tension-dependent suppression of Aurora B are also possible (see Figs. 2f and 2g). (c) Catch bond-like model where tension acts directly and independently of phospho-regulation on the kinetochore-microtubule interface, causing it to adopt a more stable configuration (see Fig. 2h).

Fig. 2. Gallery of mechano-sensitive molecules, and models for mechano-sensation at kinetochores

(a) Force exerted on talin exposes a cryptic binding site for vinculin [32]. (b) Force strengthens the fimH-mannose bond by pulling away an auto-inhibitory domain [61]. (c) Force on collagen protects it from proteolytic cleavage [30]. (d) Force activates titin kinase by pulling away an auto-inhibitory domain [21]. (e) Force on p130Cas promotes its phosphorylation by Src kinase [20]. (f – h) Speculative models for how force-dependent deformations could strengthen a kinetochore-microtubule attachment. (f) Kinetochore tension could deform Aurora B substrates, preventing the kinase from weakening their grip on the microtubule. (g) If Aurora B at the kinetochore-microtubule interface bears mechanical load, then the kinase itself could be inhibited by load. (h) Tension can also stabilize the kinetochore-microtubule interface directly [66], perhaps by altering the conformation of the microtubule tip or the kinetochore microtubule-binding elements in a way that strengthens existing bonds or promotes formation of additional bonds.

Fig. 3. Catch bond-like behavior of kinetochore-microtubule attachments, and how it may be regulated

(a) Schematic of laser trap assay. A bead decorated with native kinetochore particles or recombinant kinetochore subcomplexes is attached to the dynamic tip of a coverslip-anchored microtubule. As the microtubule tip grows and shortens, the kinetochore-bead moves with it. During bead movement, the laser trap can be automatically steered to keep a fixed bead-trap distance (Δx), thereby maintaining a constant tensile force on the kinetochore-microtubule interface. (b) A kinetochore-attached microtubule tip can grow (assemble) or shorten (disassemble), with transitions between these states governed by the rates of catastrophe, k_1 , and rescue, k_2 . The kinetochore can detach from either state, with rates k_3 and k_4 . Because k_4 is generally much faster than k_3 , the overall rate of detachment can be reduced by inhibiting catastrophe (k_1) or promoting rescue (k_2). (c) The mean lifetime of reconstituted kinetochore-microtubule attachments initially increases and then decreases with force in a catch bond-like manner (gray curve, adapted from [66]). In principle, the lifetime-vs-force relation could be tuned to selectively stabilize relaxed attachments (blue) or those bearing higher loads (red). (d and e) Force inhibits catastrophe (k_1 , solid gray line), promotes rescue (k_2 , dashed gray), accelerates detachment during growth (k_3 , solid gray), and slows detachment during shortening (k_4 , dashed gray). Simultaneously adjusting the rates of catastrophe and detachment during growth across all forces as shown (blue and red lines in d and e) would shift the lifetime-vs-force relation leftward and rightward (blue and red curves in c). (f – h) Selective phosphorylation of

relaxed kinetochores by Aurora B could accelerate detachment (*green curve* in **h**) or induce catastrophe (*orange curve* in **g**) at kinetochores that bear low forces (e.g., < 4 pN). In either case, the net effect would be to sharpen the lifetime-vs-force curve, increasing its sensitivity to force in the low-force regime where tension prolongs attachment (*green and orange curves* in **f**).