CHARACTERIZING MAJOR KINETOCHORE PROTEINS IN GENUS ZEA
SUPPORTS MEIOTIC DRIVE MODEL OF CENTROMERE EVOLUTION

by

YUN LI

(Under the Direction of R. Kelly Dawe)

ABSTRACT

Centromeric “meiotic drive” is a widely discussed model for explaining centromeric evolution. It posits that long arrays of centromeric DNA acquire protein-binding preferences that allow them to segregate more efficiently to progeny. The major centromeric binding proteins are Centromeric Histone H3 (CENH3) and Centromere Protein C (CENPC). We used maize (*Zea mays*) to test whether there is a correlation between lines with very long arrays of centromeric repeats (CentC) and unique CENH3 or CENPC sequence polymorphisms. We were surprised to find no discernable differences in CENH3 or CENPC protein sequence within the Section *Zea*. However, sequencing and expression data demonstrate clear evidence of polymorphism within the promoter region of a key *Cenpc* gene, and that this polymorphism might possibly affect the relative quantities of two CENPC isoforms. Our data seems to indicate that expression polymorphism can change the profile of centromere binding proteins and influence the abundance of centromeric repeats.

INDEX WORDS: Centromere, Meiotic drive, Kinetochore protein, Centromeric DNA, CENH3, CENPC, epigenetic inheritance, Genus *Zea*
CHARACTERIZING MAJOR KINETOCHORE PROTEINS IN GENUS ZEA
SUPPORTS MEIOTIC DRIVE MODEL OF CENTROMERE EVOLUTION

by

YUN LI

B.S, Nanjing University, P.R.China, 2000

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2009
CHARACTERIZING MAJOR KINETOCHORE PROTEINS IN GENUS ZEA
SUPPORTS MEIOTIC DRIVE MODEL OF CENTROMERE EVOLUTION

by

YUN LI

Major Professor: Kelly Dawe
Committee: John Burke
Katrien Devos

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2009
DEDICATION

To my parents, my husband, and my son
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am indebted to my major professor, Dr. R. Kelly Dawe, for the support, guidance, ideas and encouragements during the entire period of my graduate study for my M.S. at the University of Georgia. To me, Kelly has not only nurtured my growth in science with great enthusiasm and patience, but has also become a big reason of who I am today, with his perspectives and beliefs deeply influenced mine. I would also like to thank my committee members, Dr. John Burke and Dr. Katrien Devos for their valuable suggestions and advice.

I thank the current and previous Dawe lab members: Chris Topp, Yaqing Du, Xuexian Li, Jinghua Shi, Han Zhang, Sarah Rushing, Lisa Kanizay, Brunillis Burgos, Amy Luce, Tom Stahl, Sarah Wolf and Nate Ellis for their selfless support and help over the last four years. I would like to thank Sarah Wolf particularly for her considerable help with verifying PCR results in the promoter regions and RNA. I thank Michael Boyd and the Botany green house staff for taking care of my teosinte plants. The USDA generously provided all the teosinte seeds.

I thank my parents for their endless love and support. I thank my husband for his accompany. I thank all my friends for their friendship during my graduate study in the University of Georgia.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page  

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ............................................................................................................. v  

LIST OF TABLES ....................................................................................................................... viii  

LIST OF FIGURES ....................................................................................................................... ix  

CHAPTER  

1 INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW .....................................................1  

Kinetochore and Centromere ..........................................................................................1  

Purpose of the Study ........................................................................................................4  

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS ...................................................................................6  

Seed Origins ......................................................................................................................6  

Polymerase Chain Reactions ..........................................................................................7  

Sample Collection and Preparation .............................................................................7  

Detecting the Ratio Between *Cenpc1/3* and *Cenpc2* Expression: qRT-PCR Analysis ............................................................................................................7  

CAPS Assay (Cleaved Amplified Polymorphic Sequence) .........................................8  

Sequencing of PCR Products ........................................................................................9  

3 RESULTS ....................................................................................................................10  

Characterization of CENH3 gene in genus *Zea* ........................................................10  

Characterization of three CENPC homologues in the genome of *Zea* .................11  

1) Discovery of CENPC3 in *Zea mays* ....................................................................11  

 vi
2) Confirmation of the CENPC3 cDNA Sequence .................................................................12

3) Test the Conservation of three CENPC Homologues in Genus Zea.................................12

4) Study of the Pomoter Regions in Three CENPC Homologues Unravels Possible
difference of Expression Regulation of All Three Genes ..............................................13

5) Real-time PCR assay uncovers the relative expression ratio between cenpc1/3
and cenpc2 ..................................................................................................................................14

6) PCR results flanking a region near the 3’ end including the 16-nt polymorphic
region and Restriction enzyme digests discovered that Cenpc3 is rarely
expressed in Zea mays B73 ........................................................................................................15

4 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .................................................................................16

REFERENCES ..........................................................................................................................19

APPENDICES ..........................................................................................................................23

A PRIMERS USED IN THIS STUDY ..................................................................................23

B REALTIME PCR DATA ....................................................................................................26

C PCR RESULTS OF PROMOTER STUDY ......................................................................26
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Seed Origins Used in the Study .........................................................................................6
Table 2: All Available CENPC Homologues from EST Libraries ..................................................41
Table 3: Real-time PCR Results ....................................................................................................42
Table 4: Efficiencies of Primers Used in Real-time PCRs ..............................................................43
Table 5: The Information of Primers Used in the Real-time PCRs .................................................44
LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1: CENH3 have Very Dissimilar N-terminal Tails ...........................................................28
Figure 2: CENH3 are Generally Conserved in Genus Zea ..........................................................29
Figure 3: Three CENPC Homologues ..........................................................................................30
Figure 4: PCR results Using Primers Specific to Each of Three Homologues .............................31
Figure 5: The Sequences of CENPC Isoforms ...........................................................................32
Figure 6: Explanation of the 16-nt Polymorphism .....................................................................33
Figure 7: Summary of Promoter Study ......................................................................................34
Figure 8: Cenpc3 is rarely expressed in Zea mays .....................................................................35
Figure 9: NspI restriction enzyme digests confirmed that Cenpc3 is rarely expressed in Zea mays36
Figure 10: The Model Based on Our Study .............................................................................37
Figure 11: Amplification Curves of Real-time PCR ....................................................................38
Figure 12: Melting Curves of Real-time PCR ...........................................................................39
Figure 13: PCR Results of Promoter Study ..............................................................................40
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Kinetochore and Centromere

Proper chromosome segregation during cell division ensures the accurate inheritance of genetic material. The centromeres are loci that allow chromosomes to associate with spindle microtubules and segregate chromosomes to daughter nuclei during cell division. Every chromosome requires a kinetochore, a eukaryotic specific, proteinaceous structure that forms the interface between centromeric DNA and the microtubules that pull the chromosomes to the poles at mitosis and meiosis. It is paradoxical that centromere function and kinetochore proteins are essential and well conserved from yeast to plants to humans (Meraldi et al. 2006) yet centromeric DNA sequences display dramatic plasticity across species (Henikoff 2001).

In humans and most other animals centromeres are exclusively composed of long stretches of short tandem repetitive ‘satellite’ DNA sequences that are the most rapidly evolving components of eukaryotic genomes (Csink and Henikoff, 1998). Plant centromeres contain satellite DNAs comparable to those found in animals, as well as very abundant retrotransposons (Jiang et al. 2003). Both forms of repeat vary substantially in abundance and arrangement, both within and among species (Copenhaver et al. 1999, Cheng et al. 2002, Wu et al. 2004, Zhang 2004, Kato et al. 2004).
In *Zea mays* centromeres contain long arrays of a 156-bp satellite repeat called CentC that range in size from 50-2000kb on different chromosomes. Similarly, the amount of satellite DNA in rice centromeres (CentO) ranges from 60kb to 1900kb on different chromosomes (Cheng et al. 2002). Besides varying in copy number, the sequence of centromeric satellite repeats differs remarkably among organisms, even in closely related species (Malik and Henikoff 2002, Lamb et al. 2004, Jiang et al. 2003, Henikoff and Dalal 2005). For example, the CentO repeats in rice are absent in *Oryza brachyantha*, a species of wild rice that last shared a common ancestor with rice only ~7-9 million years ago (Lee et al. 2005, Dawe 2005). It is suggested that these repeats are crucial for centromere function, considering their specificity to the centromere loci. Centromere composition also shows dramatic variance with respect to Centromeric Retrotransposons (CRs), such as CRRs (in rice) (Cheng et al. 2002) and CRMs (in maize) (Zhong et al. 2002). CRs belong to the Ty3/Gypsy long terminal repeat (LTR) retrotransposon family (Nagaki et al. 2004, Ma and Bennetzen 2006). Highly conserved motifs were found in the LTRs of the CR elements from rice (*Oryza sativa*), maize (*Zea mays*), and *Hordeum vulgare* (barley) (Nagaki et al. 2003a), suggesting they may play a critical role in centromere function.

Whereas centromeric DNAs change rapidly, several proteins specific to the centromere/kinetochore complex display high conservation. Among these are two important inner kinetochore “foundation proteins” that have been shown to interact with centromeric DNAs- Centromeric Histone H3 (CENH3) and Centromeric Protein C (CENPC). CENH3 is a centromere-specific histone H3-like protein that replaces the regular histone H3 and interspersed with blocks of histone H3-containing nucleosomes in centromeric chromatin (Yoda et al. 2000). First discovered in humans as CENP-A (centromeric protein A) (Palmer et al. 1987, 1991), CENH3 has been found in all model eukaryotes (Henikoff et al. 2001). CENH3s are similar to
histone H3 in their histone folding domains but differ in their noncanonical NH2-terminal tails even from each other. Compared to histone H3, CENH3 also has a slightly longer ‘loop 1’ region in the histone fold (Shelby et al. 1997, Malik et al. 2001, Malik et al. 2002). Both diverging regions contact nucleosomal DNA (Vafa and Sullivan 1997), and Malik and Henikoff (2002) provided evidence that the NH2-terminal tail and the loop 1 region were under adaptive evolution and suggested that CENH3 serves as a linker molecule between the rapidly evolving centromeric DNA and the conserved kinetochore proteins (Malik et al. 2002, Dawe et al. 2002). In plants, an interaction between defined centromeric sequences has been demonstrated for maize (Zhong et al. 2002), Arabidopsis (Nagaki et al. 2003a), rice (Nagaki et al. 2004), and sugarcane (Nagaki and Murata 2005).

CENPC has been shown to be necessary to form a functional centromere in human, mouse and chicken (Sullivan et al. 1994, Fukagawa and Brown 1997, Kalitsis et al. 1998). It is also conserved across all eukaryotes though the sequence homology is limited to a mere 23 amino acids (Brown, 1995; Henikoff et al. 2001). In plants, two CENPC homologs were first identified in maize (Dawe et al. 1999). Mammalian and plant CENPC proteins contain adaptively evolving regions that overlap with regions of DNA-binding activity (Talbert et al. 2004). Particularly in grasses, exon pairs 9-10 and 11-12 have been subjected to ancient duplications (Talbert et al. 2004) and bind to centromeric DNA (Du 2008). CENPC is present at centromeres throughout the cell cycle, and is necessary but not sufficient for kinetochore assembly (Fukagawa et al. 1999).

Many observations from animals, plants and yeast indicate that centromeric repeats are dispensable for centromeric function and that epigenetics plays an essential role in mediating centromere function (Henikoff 2001, Choo 2001 and Dawe 2005). The paradox between rapid divergence of centromeric DNA and the conserved kinetochore proteins can be explained by the
“centromeric drive” hypothesis (Malik and Henikoff, 2002). During female meiosis in both plants and animals, centromeres are presumed to compete for access to the single meiotic product that is passed on to the next generation. This process can promote the evolution of selfish repeats that bind tightly to “foundation proteins” and in principle can drive rapid change in the size of repeat arrays (Dawe and Henikoff, 2006). However, in light of the equal likelihood of inheritance of parental chromosomes in Mendelian genetics, centromere drive would be detrimental. A mutation that changes the structure of the foundation protein would disrupt meiotic drive and restore the centromere to a more stable epigenetic state (Dawe and Henikoff, 2006). Therefore, centromeric DNA would be selected for preferential segregation properties while “foundation proteins” would be selected for Mendelian properties. The “centromeric drive” model can explain most of the available data from centromeres. Nevertheless the only strong support to date is the fact finding that both CENH3 and CENPC are both under positive selection. Empirical evidence for preferential segregation of centromeres are lacking and it is not established that either protein binds to specific DNA sequences (Talbert et al. 2002, Malik and Henikoff 2001, Dawe and Henikoff 2006).

**Purpose of the Study**

Direct tests of the centromere drive hypothesis will require genetic tests in a well-developed model system such as maize and its allied species. There are four species in the genus *Zea* divided into two sections. Section *Luxuriantes* consists of the annual *Z. luxurians*, the protected perennial *Z. diploperennis* and its autotetraploid derivative *Z. perennis*. Both *Z. luxurians* and *Z. diploperennis* can be crossed with *Zea mays*. The Section *Zea* is further divided into four subspecies: ssp. *huehuetenangensis*, ssp. *mexicana*, ssp. *parviglumis* and ssp. *mays*.
Z. mays ssp. mays is maize, the domesticated species, and the other three are its wild relatives. Z. mays ssp. parviglumis is generally considered to be the direct progenitor of ssp. mays (Doebley 2004).

If CentC is under positive selection, we expect CentC arrays to be more abundant and consistent among chromosomes. Recent studies have suggested that CentC is indeed very rich in some subspecies of Section Zea, including Z. diploperennis (Lamb, Meyer et al. 2007), Z. luxurians and Z. mays ssp. parviglumis (Shi 2009), but not in Zea mays. Assays were made in F1 individuals that were heterozygous for species of interest and maize (providing a B73 internal control for CentC labeling). It was found that Z. luxurians CentC is strikingly uniform across chromosomes and much more abundant than in B73. Assays of ssp. parviglumis revealed that this subspecies, too, is rich in CentC (Shi 2009). The latter observation was particularly surprising since Z. parviglumis is presumed to be a direct ancestor of maize. These data suggest that centromere drive that promotes rapid change in the size of repeat arrays is actively occurring in some subspecies of Section Zea but not others.

The meiotic drive hypothesis further predicts that variation in centromeric DNA content will be associated with unique inner kinetochore proteins. Here we tested whether maize lines with very long CentC repeat arrays show unique CENH3 or CENPC sequence polymorphisms. We were surprised to find no discernable differences in CENH3 protein sequence within the Section Zea. However, we find clear evidence of sequence polymorphism within the promoter region of a key Cenpc gene (Cenpc3). We argue that the ratio between two different CENPC isoforms, CENPC1/3 and CENPC2 has been altered by promoter mutations, and that the two isoforms have different impacts on the abundance of CentC at centromeres: one isoform promotes centromere drive while the other suppresses it.
CHAPTER 2

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Seed Origins

Plant seeds of maize ancestors were obtained from USDA-ARS (Table 1).

Table 1. Seed origins used in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Accession No.</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z. mays. ssp. mexicana</td>
<td>PI 566685</td>
<td>Mexico, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. mays. ssp. huehuetenangensis</td>
<td>PI 441934</td>
<td>Guatemala, Huehuetenango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. mays. ssp. parviglumis</td>
<td>PI 566687</td>
<td>Mexico, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. luxurians</td>
<td>PI 422162</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. diploperennis</td>
<td>PI 462368</td>
<td>Mexico, Jalisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z. perennis</td>
<td>Ames 21869</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Polymerase Chain Reactions

Polymerase Chain reactions (PCRs) were performed with either Extaq Polymerase (TaKaRa) or AccuTaq (Sigma) in a total of 100μL volume per reaction, which contains Extaq (or Accutaq) 0.5μL, 10Xbuffer 10μL, 2.5μM dNTP 8μL, template (≤500ng/μL) 2μL, 2.5μM forward primer 10μL, 2.5μM reverse primer 10μL and deionized, doubly-distilled water (dd-water) 59.5μL. The reactions were run in the Eppendorf AG 22331 Hamburg machine or Eppendorf Mastercycler personal using the thermocycling conditions below: 95 °C for 3 min for initial penetration and activation of Taq polymerase, followed by 40 thermal cycles of 95 °C for 30 s, 55 °C (Annealing Temperature=(T_m of forward primer + T_m of reverse primer)/2 -5 °C) for 30 s, and 72 °C for 1 min per 1000bp of the amplicon length.

Primer sequences for each reaction are listed in Appendix A.

Sample Collection and Preparation

DNAs were prepared using the DNeasy kit (Qiagen) from approximately 4-week-old leaf tissues. Total RNAs were extracted from approximately 4-week-old leaf tissues using Trizol (Invitrogen) method. Total RNAs were reverse transcribed using the Superscript III first-strand synthesis kit (Invitrogen) with Oligo dT to produce cDNA after DNase treatment. cDNAs were treated by RNaseH before being used in PCR reactions.

Detecting the ratio between Cenpc1/3 and Cenpc2 expression: qRT-PCR Analysis

Quantitative RT-PCRs were used to analyze cDNA expression levels using ubiquitin universal primers as the endogenous control. Real-time PCR was performed on a Roche LightCycler 480 Real-Time PCR System using SYBR Green detection chemistry. Experiments
are average relative quantities from at least two biological replicates. Primer sequences for real-
time reactions are listed in Appendix A.

Real-time PCR and melting analysis were performed on a Roche LightCycler 480 Real-
Time PCR System using SYBR Green detection chemistry. PCR was done in Roche Real-time
PCR plates that contained 15 uL of reaction mixture. Each 15 uL of reaction mixture contained:
0.45uL of each primer in 2.5uM concentration, 2.25 uL of 25mM MgCl₂, 1.5 uL of 2.5uM
dNTP, 1.5uL of 10X PCR Gold Buffer, 1.5 uL of 50% DMSO, 0.15uL AmpliTaq Gold with
GeneAmp Taq, 0.113 SYBR Green, 3.0uL template and 4.09uL deionized, doubly-distilled
water (dd-water).

The thermocycling conditions for amplification were as follows: 95 °C for 10 min for
initial penetration and activation of Taq polymerase, followed by 45 thermal cycles of 95 °C for
10 s, 60 °C for10 s, and 72 °C for 20 s. Fluorescence was measured during each 60 °C stage.
After amplification, the instrument performed a melting analysis by heating the capillary at 95
°C for 5 s, incubating it at 55 °C for 1 min, and then slowly heating it to 97 °C. Fluorescence was
monitored continuously during the melting experiment. To convert melting curves to melting
peaks, the LightCycler software (Roche Molecular Biochemicals) calculated the negative
derivative of each measured fluorescence with respect to the temperature (dF/dT), and then
plotted dF/dT against temperature for the entire melting experiment. Primer sequences for all
reactions are listed in Appendix A.

**Restriction Enzyme Digests**

Restriction enzyme digests were performed in PCR plates that contained 20 uL of
reaction mixture. Each 20 uL of reaction mixture contained: 2ul of buffer, 10uL of PCR product,
1μL of restriction NEB enzyme, 0.2 μL of BSA for NspI and deionized, doubly-distilled water (dd-water) to reach the volume to 20 μL. The mixture was incubated in a PCR machine at 37°C for 1 hour, then 20 min of inactivation at 65°C for NspI.

**Sequencing of PCR products**

100 μL of PCR products were purified using QIAquick PCR purification kit (QIAGEN), diluted to 20ng/μL and sent to AgenCourt Sequencing facility for sequencing.
CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Characterization of CENH3 gene in genus *Zea*

Human CENP-A and its counterparts known as Centromeric H3 (CENH3) in other organisms are known to bind DNA and organize kinetochore assembly (Choo *et al.* 2004). The assembly in most if not all other kinetochore proteins requires the presence of CENH3. For instance CENPC localization depends on the presence of CENH3, but not vice versa (Moore and Roth 2001, Choo *et al.* 2000, Hyman *et al.* 2001, Brinkley *et al.* 2001, Barnes *et al.* 2003). As a direct DNA binding protein CENH3 is a particularly inviting candidate for mediating centromere drive. As first proposed by Henikoff *et al.* (2001) and Malik and Henikoff (2002), mutations in CENH3s could have a profound effect on centromere repeat abundance and centromere drive.

Therefore maize CENH3 was the first candidate for our study. As the most rapidly evolving region of CENH3 is the highly divergent N-terminal tail region (Malik and Henikoff 2002), we chose this region to sequence and analyze (Fig.1). Surprisingly, we found that the N-termini of *Cenh3* genes in maize, *Z. luxurians*, *Z. diploperennis*, *Z. perennis*, *Z. huehuetenangensis*, *Z. parviglumis*, and *Z. mexicana* are very similar at the nucleotide and protein levels (Fig 2).
Characterization of three CENPC homologues in the genomes of *Zea*

1) Discovery of CENPC3 in *Zea mays*

Like CENH3, CENPC is essential for kinetochore activity. It is also conserved across all eukaryotes though sequence homology is limited to a mere 23 amino acids (Brown 1995, Henikoff *et al.* 2001). Besides CENH3, CENPC is the only other kinetochore protein that has been shown to possess definite DNA binding characteristics, although it binds in a sequence-independent manner (Sugimoto *et al.* 1994, Yang *et al.* 1996, Sugimoto *et al.* 1997, Dawe *et al.* 1999). Two CENPC homologues have been identified in maize (*Cenpc1* and *Cenpc2*) and they share 84% homology, with single-nucleotide changes as well as small insertion/deletion polymorphisms throughout the sequence (Dawe *et al.* 1999).

Using the protein sequence of maize *Cenpc1* as a query, we identified three high throughput genomic sequences (And their GenBank accession numbers are AC212807.4, AC191082.3 and AC190975.3). AC212807.4 and AC191082.3 are separately located on chromosome 3 and chromosome 8, and *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc2*. In addition, a previously unknown CENPC gene located on chromosome 1 was also identified. This gene, later named *Cenpc3*, shares some 97% homology with *Cenpc1* in the genomic DNA, with a major insertion in the intron between exon 11 and 12. A comparison of the predicted protein sequence suggested that CENPC3 is similar if not identical to CENPC1. The predicted cDNAs are also nearly identical, with a 16nt-deleton in the 3’ UTR region of *Cenpc1* as the only major difference at the nucleotide level.

In order to find out whether *Cenpc3* also exists in other *Zea* species, we designed several primer pairs that specifically amplify *Cenpc3* genomic DNA and found that *Cenpc3* exists in all *Zea* species, including *Zea luxurians* and *Zea diploperennis.*
To further verify that all three CENPC homologues are present throughout *Zea*, primers that are specific to the genomic DNAs of *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3*, and the cDNAs of *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc2* (Fig. 3A) were designed. PCR results verified that all three homologues are present in the genome (Fig. 3B, Fig. 3C and Fig. 4) and that both *Cenpc1/3* and *Cenpc2* are expressed (Fig. 4) in each species in genus *Zea*.

2) **Confirmation of the *Cenpc3* cDNA sequence**

As described above, comparison of the available sequence suggested that cDNA sequences of *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3* are nearly identical with a 16nt-deletion at the 3’ UTR region in *Cenpc1* as the only major difference at the nucleotide level. As these data were derived from predicted exon/intron junctions and draft sequence, we prepared full-length cDNAs using the 16nt deletion. Sequencing of the full-length cDNAs confirmed that the predicted CENPC3 protein sequence is identical to CENPC1.

Additional sequencing from other *Zea* lines further revealed that the defining 16 nt deletion in *Cenpc1* is unique to maize. The sequences from 3’ UTRs were obtained from PCR products using *Cenpc1*-specific and *Cenpc3*-specific primers flanking the 3’ UTR region (Fig. 3A). In *Z. luxuriants*, *Z. diploperennis*, *Z. perennis*, *Z. ssp. huehuetenangensis* and *Z. ssp. parviglumis*, the *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3* 3’ UTR genomic DNAs are 100% identical and indiscernible (Fig. 6).

3) **Conservation of three CENPC homologues in genus *Zea***

Under the meiotic drive model, mutation of a major kinetochore protein disrupts sequence-specific interactions between centromeric repetitive DNA and kinetochore foundation
proteins, restoring epigenetic inheritance. As our study of CENH3 seems to exclude the possibility that CENH3 plays a major role in this process, we went on to test whether CENPC protein sequences vary among Zea species.

The DNA binding domain of maize CENPC lies between exons 9 and 12 (Du, Topp and Dawe submitted). Primers were designed flanking exon 9-12 of all three homologues and subsequent PCR products from each Zea species were sequenced. As with CENH3, we observed that CENPC1/3 and CENPC2 are nearly invariant among Zea species (Fig. 5).

4) Promoter regions in three CENPC homologues unravels possible difference of expression regulation of all three genes

The fact that maize contains two different isoforms of CENPC raises interesting questions relative to the centromere drive hypothesis. As the two isoforms differ substantially in the exon 9-12 region, it is likely that they differ in their DNA binding characteristics. Furthermore, it is likely that one or the other isoform has a more dominant role in any given tissue, and by extension, it is quite possible that the expression levels vary among Zea species.

Therefore we developed the new hypothesis that differential expression among the three Cenpc genes has impacted the abundance of CentC in Zea. The fact that Z. mays ssp. Parviglumis, Z. luxurians and Z. diploperennis have more abundant CentC may be explained by differences in CENPC isoform abundance in the tissue that produce gametes.

Sequence comparisons reveal that in B73, Cenpc1 and Cenpc3 share no homology upstream of position -193 (Fig. 3A). In order to find out whether such a difference also exists in other Zea species, especially Zea luxurians and Zea diploperennis, primers were designed in the promoter region using Cenpc1 and Cenpc3 sequences of Zea mays. PCR assays were performed
on genomic DNAs of *Z. mays*, *Z. luxurians* and *Z. diploperennis*. Product sizes were compared in the three species as a means to test the sequence conservation in light of major indels (insertions or deletions). As was expected, promoter regions of *Cenpc1* between *Z. mays* and *Z. diploperennis* showed no indel till 2450bp upstream from the start codon (Fig. 7 and Appendix B). However, primers specific to the *Cenpc3* promoter upstream of -193 showed no specific amplification (Appendix B). These data demonstrate a major difference between *Z. mays* B73 and its relatives *Z. luxurians* and *Z. diploperennis* – the *Cenpc3* promoter is not conserved. *Zea mays* B73 has a novel promoter insertion immediately upstream of the start codon that might be expected to dramatically change gene expression.

5) Real-time PCR assay uncovers the relative expression ratio between *cenpc1/3* and *cenpc2*

Our assays of promoter variation prompted us to consider where in the plants the three genes are expressed. Although microarray data are not yet available for maize, we can estimate the expression profile by searching the maize EST and cDNA database (Table 2). The data show that all three homologues are expressed in *Zea mays*. *Cenpc2* seems to be widely distributed throughout all tissues and lines, while *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3* seem to be more tissue-specific and line-specific.

To investigate the effects of *Cenpc3* polymorphism on gene expression, real-time PCR assays were performed using *Cenpc1/Cenpc3*-cDNA-specific primers and *Cenpc2*-specific primers, using cDNAs from 1 month old leaves (Table 3). Since different primers will have different efficiencies (Table 4) according to their position in the gene, their amplicon length, their $T_m$s, etc., four sets of primers were designed in the 5’ end and 3’ end of each gene separately, sharing almost identical $T_m$s and lengths of amplicons. The average C(t) (Cycle
Threshold) of two primer sets were used in comparison (See Appendix C, Table 5). Results reveal that *Cenpc1/3* is expressed at a higher level than *Cenpc2*, ranging from 6.02 ($2^{2.59}$) to 56.89 ($2^{5.83}$) fold more expression using primer pairs near the 5’, and from 5.17 ($2^{2.37}$) to 23.43 ($2^{4.55}$) fold more expression using primer pairs near the 3’. Real-time PCR results using both sets of primers suggest that the ratio of *Cenpc1/3* to *Cenpc2* is quite different between *Z. mays* and *Z. parviglumis* at 8.07 and 36.64, respectively. Some difference was also observed between *Z. mays* and *Z. luxurians* at 2.37 and 5.64, and between *Z. mays* and *Z. diploperennis* at 6.22 and 1.71. These data suggest that the novel *Cenpc3* promoter insertion observed in maize might possibly have altered relative ratio of CENPC isoforms in maize.

We note that these data were collected in vegetative tissue, which is not necessarily relevant to the germ line lineages that produce gametes. More detailed expression profiling in germline tissue will further enrich our understanding of the impact of the *Cenpc3* promoter insertion on the evolution of maize centromeres.

6) **Cenpc3 is rarely expressed in Zea mays B73**

Our PCR assays and subsequent restriction enzyme digests flanking a region containing the 16-nt polymorphic region near the 3’ end confirmed that *Cenpc3* is barely expressed in *Zea mays* (Fig. 8 and Fig. 9).

The line we used for *Zea mexicana* happened to be a heterozygote between *Zea mays* and *Zea mexicana*, and PCR results verified that it shows both the polymorphism of maize *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3* (Fig. 8 and Fig. 9). Sequencing result of its genomic DNA in the 3’ end confirmed that it also has a *Cenpc1* copy from *Zea mexicana*, which contains the 16-nt polymorphic region (Fig. 6).
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The meiotic drive hypothesis has been proposed to be a major force in centromere evolution (Henikoff et al. 2001). Previous studies by Jinghua Shi in the Dawe lab (2009) established that CentC abundance varies dramatically in Zea, with maize having the least CentC of all subspecies. It was proposed that CentC was recently under selection, perhaps by meiotic drive, but that in cultivated maize the dynamics have shifted such that CentC is no longer favored. Following the models of Henikoff and colleagues, we pursued the prediction that major kinetochore proteins CENH3 and CENPC would show similar or corresponding levels of polymorphism.

We find that the single gene encoding maize CENH3 shows no significant divergence among Zea subspecies, suggesting that CENH3 has not participated in centromere drive. However, the story with CENPC is more complex and interesting. New sequence data revealed that there are three genes encoding CENPC, Cenpc1, Cenpc2 and Cenpc3. The two major isoforms of CENPC, CENPC1/3 and CENPC2, sharing 84% homology, differ substantially in the DNA binding domain. Talbert and Henikoff found that CENPC1 and CENPC2 have been subjected to different selective forces since their divergence (Talbert et al. 2004). In contrast, CENPC1 and CENPC3 have diverged very recently and are very similar. Although no
discernable difference could be observed in the coding sequences of CENPC1 and CENPC3, our data show that Cenpc3 displays much less conservation in the promoter region in Zea mays B73. Strikingly, the Cenpc3 promoter in maize B73 differs from the Cenpc3 promoter in all other species.

The above findings prompted us to consider that altering the regulation of CENPC isoforms such that one is expressed at a higher level might have a similar outcome as mutations of protein sequences. If, for instance, CENPC2 is the major isoform in germ lineages of one species, we can imagine that a shift in CENPC1/3 expression could reduce the effective abundance of CENPC2. Although our data do not prove this scenario, they are entirely consistent with it. We show that maize B73 has a novel Cenpc3 promoter that is not present in any other Zea species. In contrast, we found Cenpc1 promoter in maize B73 is much more conserved in Zea. Preliminary expression data from leaves suggest that there is indeed extensive variation in the relative quantities of Cenpc1/3 and Cenpc2 mRNA among Zea allies. PCR assays and subsequent restriction enzyme digests confirmed that Cenpc3 is barely expressed in Zea mays B73. These data supports our model. However, the real-time data remain inconclusive, and as yet do not address the key questions of whether the mRNA levels vary in the tissues that produce gametes. We anticipate that new resources, such as detailed expression profiles in different Zea lines that are likely to be produced in coming years, will help us more thoroughly in addressing this issue.

We also demonstrate that maize B73 Cenpc3 is unique in lacking a 16nt deletion that is present in Cenpc1. The difference between the Zea mays Cenpc1 and Cenpc3 cDNAs could possibly affect the translation level of CENPC homologues and also lead to different ratios of CENPC isoforms. There are numerous examples of mutations in the 3’ UTR regions of genes
that affect translation (Shanping Wang et al. 1997, Bailey-Serres et al. 1999, Rita-Ann Monde et al. 2000) but more solid evidence is needed to make the statement that the 16-nt difference affects translation in maize.

The data described here suggest that two CENPC isoforms are expressed at different levels in the genus Zea, and could possibly indicate that polymorphism in major kinetochore proteins are associated with variation in the abundance of centromeric repeat arrays (Fig. 10). We speculate that by regulating different isoforms of CENPC, meiotic drive has put CentC under selection, reducing the abundance of CentC in cultivated maize, compared to its ancestors.
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APPENDICES

A) PRIMERS USED IN THIS STUDY

Primers for CENH3 amplification (See Figure 1)

CENH3_F2
5’ GCACC(C/A)GGC(C/G)GTGAGGAA 3’
CENH3_F4
5’ AGCC(C/G)AAGAAGAAGCTCCAG 3’
CENH3_R3
3’ TTC CTG ATC TCC CGC AGC GC 5’
CENH3_R4
3’ TAC AGT CCC TGG CCG CCA GC 5’

Primers for sequencing CENPC1 3’ genomic DNAs (See Figure 3A and 3B)

CENPC1_gDNA_specic_F4
5’ AACGCTGGTACTTGGACAAGTGGA 3’
CENPC_cDNA_R9
3’ ATGATAACCTTGACGGCAGGCCA 5’

Primers for sequencing CENPC3 3’ genomic DNAs (See Figure 3A and 3C)

CENPC_3_gDNA_F7 specific
5’ GTAGCTGCTGGCAATCAGGAGTTT 3’
CENPC_cDNA_R9
3’ ATGATAACCTTGACGGCAGGCCA 5’

Primers for sequencing whole CENPC3 cDNAs (See Figure 3A and Figure 6)

CENPC_3_F1_1
5’ ATGGACGCTACCGACCCCCTCT 3’
CENPC_3_R2_specific
3’ AGTACCACATGTGATATGCAATGTCA 5’
(16nt deletion)

Primers to test the conservation of three CENPC homologues in genus Zea (See Figure 5)

CENPC_F41
5’ ACTTCACATGCAGCTGAGGATAGC 3’
CENPC_R552
3’ TCACCAAGGCAATACTCCAAAGGC 5’
Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC1/3 cDNAs (See Figure 4)
F1_AcDNA
5’ TGGCTGGTGGAATCCCTGGAAAT 3’
R1_AcDNA
3’ AAAGCAACAGGTCACAAGGCGT 5’
F2_AcDNA
5’ ACGAGTAGCAGACTCCTCACAA 3’
R2_AcDNA
3’ TGACAAAGCAACAGGTCACAAGGC 5’
F3_AcDNA
5’ ACCTGGAGGTTCTCCTACTTGGTTT 3’
R3_AcDNA
3’ TTTGGTGAGAGTGCTACTCGT

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC2 cDNAs (See Figure 4)
F1_BcDNA
5’ CAGTTATGAGTAGCGCCAA 3’
R1_BcDNA
3’ GGCCAGGAGAGTATGCTTTGAT 5’
F2_BcDNA
5’ GATTCTTCCGAGGTTCTGATGACC 3’
R2_BcDNA
3’ TTGGCGCTACTCATAACTG 5’
F3_BcDNA
5’ ACCGACAGTTATGAGTAGCGCCAA 3’
R3_BcDNA
3’ ACAAGTCACAAAGGCGTGATCCTCT 5’

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC1 promoter regions (See Figure 7)
Cenpc1_promoter_F1_1494
5’ TTACCTGAATTGGCCCATCAAGC 3’
Cenpc1_promoter_R1_2616
3’ AGGGTGATGAACTGACGCTA 5’
3’ TATCCTGTTTGGCAGTGAGTA 5’
Cenpc1_promoter_F3_298 (See Figure 13)
5’ TCCCCTGGAGCGAGTAAATTGT 3’
Cenpc1_promoter_R3_1517 (See Figure 13)
3’ CTTTGATGCCGATAATCATGTA 5’
Cenpc1_promoter_F5_640
3’ GTTAGTGCCTGTGCATGTGTA 5’

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC2 promoter regions (See Figure 7)
Cenpc2_promoter_F1_428
5’ ATACTCAAGCCCTCCAAACCACAT 3’
Cenpc2_promoter_R1_1511
AGGATCAGAAGGCTTAAGGCA 5’
Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC3 promoter regions (See Figure 7)
Cenpc3_promoter_F2_949 (See Figure 13)
5'ATGCGAAGGTGTGAAGCTCTACCA 3'
Cenpc3_promoter_R2_1998 (See Figure 13)
3'TGTTTGAACCTCCGTTCCGGGTAT 5'
Cenpc3_promoter_F3_2684 (See Figure 13)
5'TTAGGGCCTGTGTTGGTTCGTGACT 3'
Cenpc3_promoter_R1_3456 (See Figure 13)
3'CACGGAACGTTGTGAAACGCTGAA 5'

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC1/3 cDNAs in qRT-PCR (See Figure 11, Figure 12, Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5)
Cenpc1+3_realtime_F1_923 specific
5'AGGATGTTATGCATGCTGTTGCGG 3'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_R1_1042 nonspecific
3'AAGTCAAATCGTCACGGCCATCCT 5'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_F2_1989 specific
5'AGTGGCTGGTGAATCCCTGGAAAT 3'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_R2_2114 specific
3'TTGGCACCATTTGTGAGAGTGTA 5'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_F3_443 specific
5'TGAAAGGGTCTGAGGAGCTGGTTA 3'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_R3_596 specific
3'TTACGATCCAGTGCTGGCTGCTTCTCT 5'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_F4_881 specific
5'CGGCTTCCCAAACAGCAACTATGA 3'
Cenpc1+3_realtime_R4_1031 nonspecific
3'TCAGGGCCATCCTTCTCAGCATA 5'

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC2 cDNAs in qRT-PCR (See Figure 11, Figure 12, Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5)
Cenpc2_realtime_F1_1697
5'GATCACGCTTTGTGACTTGTTGCT 3'
Cenpc2_realtime_R1_1880 specific
3'TGTGATAACCGCTGACATACGCTA 5'
Cenpc2_realtime_F2_1693
5’ AGAGGATCACGCCTTGACTTGT 3’
Cenpc2_realtime_R2_1882 specific
3’ AATGTGATACCGCTGCACATACGC 5’
Cenpc2_realtime_F3_1352
5’ ACCGACAGTTATGAGTAGCGCCAA 3’
Cenpc2_realtime_R3_1504
3’ TCCAAAGGACCTCGAGCGTATTCTT 5’
Cenpc2_realtime_F4_1150 specific
5’ CACCTGTCTGTACAATGCACTGT 3’
Cenpc2_realtime_R4_1279 specific
3’ ATATTTCCAGTGCCATGGCTAGATT 5’

Primers for specifically amplifying CENPC1/3 cDNAs in the 3’ ends to show that Cenpc3 was rarely expressed in Zea mays (See Figure 8 and Figure 9)
Cenpc_cDNA_F4_2456
5’ GCCTTGTGACCTGTTGCTTTGTCA 3’
Cenpc_cDNA_R9_2860
3’ ATGATACCTTGACGGCATGAGCCA 3’

B) REALTIME PCR DATA

For supporting data of the real-time results, please refer to Figure 11, Figure 12 and Table 5.

C) PCR RESULTS OF PROMOTER STUDY

For supporting data of promoter studies, please see Figure 13.
Figure 1. CENH3s align in the histone fold domain (HFD) but have dissimilar tails and loop 1 region (Henikoff and Dalal 2005).
Figure 2. Known maize relatives display very little polymorphism in the N-terminus of their CENH3 genes, both at the nucleotide (A) and the protein levels (B).
Figure 3. (A) Three CENPC homologues are aligned to scale. Blocks in the same color stand for sequences with very high homology. Primers used to verify the presence of CENPC1 and CENPC3 have been separately marked with pink (F1 refers to “CENPC 3_gDNA_F7” and R1 refers to “CENPC_cDNA_R9” in Appendix A) and dark green (F2 refers to “CENPC1_gDNA_specific_F4” and R2 refers to “CENPC_cDNA_R9” in Appendix A). Primers used for sequencing whole CENPC3 cDNAs have been marked with light green (F3 refers to “CENPC 3_F1_1” and R3 refers to “CENPC 3_R2_specific” in Appendix A). (B) PCR products, using genomic DNAs of all Zea species and primers F2 (“CENPC1_gDNA_specific_F4” in Appendix A) and R2 (“CENPC_cDNA_R9” in Appendix A), verified Cenpc1 is present in all genomes in genus Zea. (C) PCR products, using genomic DNAs of all Zea species and primers F1 (“CENPC 3_gDNA_F7” in Appendix A) and R1 (“CENPC_cDNA_R9” in Appendix A), verified Cenpc3 is present in all genomes in genus Zea.
Figure 4. (A) Three CENPC homologues are aligned to scale. Blocks in the same color stand for sequences with very high homology. Primers used to verify the presence of CENPC1 and CENPC3 have been separately marked with pink (F1 refers to “F1_AcDNA” and R1 refers to “R1_AcDNA” in Appendix A) and dark green (F2 refers to “F2_BcDNA” and R2 refers to “R2_BcDNA” in Appendix A). (B) PCR products, using genomic DNAs of all Zea species and primers F1 and R1, verified *Cenpc1* is present in all genomes in genus *Zea*. (C) PCR products, using genomic DNAs of all *Zea* species and primers F3 and R3, verified *Cenpc3* is present in all genomes in genus *Zea*. 
Figure 5. The sequences of CENPC isoforms share very high homology in genus *Zea*, both in CENPC1 (Fig. 6A), which shows 99% identify, and in CENPC2 (Fig. 6B), which displays 100% identity between *Z. luxurians* and *Z. mays* and 95% identify between *Z. diploperennis* and *Z. mays*. 
Figure 6. All *Zea* species except *Zea mays* contain the 16nt deletion in the 3’ UTR region in their Cenpc1s (Fig. 7A) and all *Zea* species has the 16nt deletion in 3’ UTR region in their Cenpc3s (Fig. 7B). Polymorphism of the 16-nt region has been illustrated in picture (Fig. 7C) and in table (Fig. 7D).
**Figure 7.** CENPC3 promoter region displays poor conservation between *Z. mays* and *Z. diploperennis* while promoter regions of CENPC1 and CENPC2 are much more conserved.
Figure 8. Cenpc3 is rarely expressed in Zea mays. PCR products were amplified using primer sets Cenpc_cDNA_F4_2456 and Cenpc_cDNA_R9_2860 (see Appendix A), starting from the middle of exon 14 to the end of 3’ region in Cenpc1 and Cenpc3. Lane 1 shows maize Cenpc3-the product with the 16-nt region barely exists in Zea mays while lane 2 and lane 3 serve as controls. Lane 2 shows products of both polymorphisms exist in the Zea mexicana we used, which is a heterozygote between Zea mays and Zea mexicana. Lane3 shows that only the product with the 16-nt region exists in Zea diploperennis, in which Cenpc1 and Cenpc3 both have the 16-nt region.
**Figure 9.** NspI restriction enzyme digests confirmed that *Cenpc3* is rarely expressed in *Zea mays*. PCR products were amplified using Cenpc_cDNA_F4_2456 and Cenpc_cDNA_R9_2860 (see Appendix A) and digested using NspI. Lane 1 shows digest products of *Zea mays cenpc1* was observed while digest products of *Zea mays cenpc3* was barely observed. Lane 2 and lane 3 serve as controls. Lane 2 shows digest products of both polymorphisms exist in the *Zea mexicana* we used, which is a heterozygote between *Zea mays* and *Zea mexicana*. Lane3 shows that only digest product with the 16-nt region was observed in *Zea diploperennis*, in which *Cenpc1* and *Cenpc3* both have the 16-nt region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>polymorphism</th>
<th>gene</th>
<th>NspI Digest product sizes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WITHOUT 16nt-deletion in 3’ UTR</td>
<td><em>Z.mays Cenpc1</em></td>
<td>305bp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With 16nt-deletion in 3’ UTR</td>
<td><strong>All Cenpc3s in genus Zea Cenpc1 in Zea except Z.mays</strong></td>
<td>215bp 105bp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Two CENPC isoforms (CENPC1/3 and CENPC2) are expressed at different levels in the genus Zea between Z. parviglumis (A) and Z. mays (B), and the resulting polymorphism in major kinetochore proteins put the previously abundant CentC repeats under selection, leading to variation in the abundance of centromeric repeat arrays between Z. mays and its ancestors.
Figure 11. Amplification curves of real-time PCR amplifying *Cenpc1/3* using four sets of *cenpc1/3*-specific primers (A) and *Cenpc2* using four sets of *Cenpc2*-specific primers (B) are compared.
Figure 12. Melting curves of real-time PCR amplifying Cenpc1/3 using four sets of cenpc1/3-specific primers (A) and Cenpc2 using four sets of Cenpc2-specific primers (B).
Figure 13. PCR results showing different products in *Z. mays* (1), *Z. luxurians* (2), and *Z. diploperennis* (3), with yellow bands showing the predicted size.
Table 2. All available CENPC homologues have been searched for in available EST libraries and each CENPC homologue is categorized by tissue and which tissue(s) it comes from.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>root and embryo</th>
<th>shoot apical meristem</th>
<th>leaf</th>
<th>endosperm</th>
<th>Mixed male/female</th>
<th>whole pre-mitotic infl.</th>
<th>root tissues</th>
<th>whole pollen shed</th>
<th>tassel</th>
<th>kernel</th>
<th>egg cell</th>
<th>mixed</th>
<th>all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cenpc2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cenpc3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cenpc1-or3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B73</th>
<th>inbred B73</th>
<th>F-352</th>
<th>Ohio43</th>
<th>inbred Mo17</th>
<th>W23</th>
<th>unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cenpc2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cenpc3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cenpc1-or3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The biggest numbers in each category are marked red.*
Table 3. Real-time PCR results show that in most *Zea* species, CENPC1/3 cDNA is more expressed than CENPC2 cDNA, in one-month-old leaves, the ratio of which varies among species in genus *Zea*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>(primers near 5' end)</th>
<th>(primers near 3' end)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΔCt (Ct of Cenpc2 - Ct of Cenpc1/3)</td>
<td>ratio of Cenpc1/3 to Cenpc2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea mays</em> B73</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea mays</em> Mo 17</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea mays</em> B73/Mo 17 X KI3</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Z. mays</em> ssp. huehue</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Z. mays</em> ssp. parvigulmis</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>56.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea luxurians</em></td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zea diploperennis</em></td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>14.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Efficiencies of primers used in real-time PCRs, using *Zea mays* ubiquitin primers as the standard. Efficiencies have been tested using diluted templates by 32 fold, and all primers showed a C(t) value increase around 5 and each primers exhibited almost the same efficiency as before the template dilution.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F1R1</th>
<th>F2R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Cenpc1/3</em> primers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency (%)</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td>105.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Cenpc2</em> primers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency (%)</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>75.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ubiquitin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency (%)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. The information of primers used in the real-time PCR (A) and the Ct value of each reaction (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>Cenpc1/3- F1R1</th>
<th>Cenpc2- F4R4</th>
<th>ubiquitin</th>
<th>Cenpc1/3- F1R1 (normalized)</th>
<th>Cenpc2- F4R4 (normalized)</th>
<th>Δ</th>
<th>2^Δ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zea mays B73</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>20.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo 17</td>
<td>27.01</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B73/Mo 17 X KI3</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>36.48</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>28.03</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z pavillanum</td>
<td>31.19</td>
<td>37.02</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>56.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>26.79</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>17.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>14.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency (%)</td>
<td>89.29</td>
<td>75.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea mays B73</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>29.28</td>
<td>27.22</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mo 17</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>-3.19</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B73/Mo 17 X KI3</td>
<td>30.79</td>
<td>33.16</td>
<td>30.82</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>24.57</td>
<td>27.68</td>
<td>24.79</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>7.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z pavillanum</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>31.76</td>
<td>-3.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>23.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zea xaluzuana</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiency (%)</td>
<td>105.67</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>