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Abstract The nuclear matrix is a structure that persists after removal of chromatin and loosely bound components from the nucleus. It consists of a peripheral lamina-pore complex and an intricate internal fibrogranular structure. Little is known about the molecular structure of this proteinaceous internal network. Our aim is to identify the major proteins of the internal nuclear matrix of HeLa S3 cells. To this end, a cell fraction containing the internal fibrogranular structure was compared with one from which this structure had been selectively dissociated. Protein compositions were quantitatively analyzed after high-resolution two-dimensional gel electrophoresis. We have identified the 21 most abundant polypeptides that are present exclusively in the internal nuclear matrix. Sixteen of these proteins are heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein (hnRNP) proteins. B23 (numatrin) is another abundant protein of the internal nuclear matrix. Our results show that most of the quantitatively major polypeptides of the internal nuclear matrix are proteins involved in RNA metabolism, including packaging and transport of RNA.
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The nuclear matrix (nucleoskeleton, nuclear scaffold) is an operationally defined structure, that persists after extraction of nuclei with detergents, nucleases, and often high-ionic-strength buffers. This structure is thought to play an important role in several nuclear functions, such as organization and replication of the genome [Cook, 1991; De Jong et al., 1990; Getzenberg et al., 1991; Jackson and Cook, 1986; Mirkovitch et al., 1984; Nakayasu and Berezney, 1989], transcription [Jackson and Cook, 1985; Razin and Yarovaya, 1985; Stein et al., 1991; Stein et al., 1994; van Steensel et al., 1995; Wansink et al., 1996] and RNA processing [Blencowe et al., 1994; Zeitlin et al., 1989; Zeng et al., 1994a]. Although it is more than 20 years ago since the nuclear matrix was first described [Berezney and Coffey, 1974], the molecular structure and the precise function of the internal nuclear fibrogranular network are unclear.

The nuclear matrix can be divided into two substructures: (1) the lamina pore complex, and (2) the internal matrix, consisting of a fibrogranular structure and containing residual nucleolar structures. Detailed information is available about the structural proteins of the lamina-pore complex, the lamins [reviewed by Dessev, 1990; Georgatos et al., 1994; Gerace and Burke, 1988; Hutchison et al., 1994; Nigg, 1989]. Much less is known about the composition and structure of the internal nuclear matrix [for reviews, see Fey et al., 1991; Mattern et al., 1996; Stuurman et al., 1992a; Verheijen et al., 1988]. In the past two decades, many investigators have studied the protein composition of nuclear matrices [e.g., Fey et al., 1986; Kallajoki and Osborn, 1994; Kaufmann and Shaper, 1984; Nakayasu and Berezney, 1991; Stuurman et al., 1990; Verheijen et al., 1986]. Although the apparent ultrastructure and the precise protein composition of the nuclear matrix to some extent depend on the isolation procedure and cell type, many proteins of the nuclear matrix are common for most or all cell types [Mattern et al., 1996; Stuurman et al., 1992a]. Many components of the nuclear machineries for transcription, RNA processing, and replication are tightly associated with this structure (see references cited above). However, no systematic analysis...
has been carried out to determine which proteins are the quantitatively major components of the internal matrix. The answer to this question may shed new light on the structure and function of the nuclear matrix.

Evidence has been presented that the internal nuclear matrix contains filamentous structural proteins, some of which may be related to those of the cytoskeleton. Several observations support this view: (1) filamentous actin has been found in neuronal nuclei [Amankwah and Deboni, 1994], (2) intermediate filament-like structures have been observed in the nuclear matrix [He et al., 1990; Jackson and Cook, 1988], and (3) antibodies against the intermediate filament type protein lamin A [Hozák et al., 1995] and against the coiled coil protein NuMA [Zeng et al., 1994] have been shown to decorate at least some of the nuclear matrix fibres. Evidently, these and possibly other proteins that are able to form filamentous structures are present in the internal nuclear matrix. In addition, a structural role for RNA is suggested based on the fact that the structure of the nuclear matrix is affected by treatment with RNase [Belgrader et al., 1991; Fey et al., 1986; He et al., 1990]. In agreement with this view are reports on the presence of hnRNP proteins in the nuclear matrix [e.g., Fey et al., 1986; Verheijen et al., 1986].

The aim of this paper is to identify the quantitatively major proteins of the internal nuclear matrix of HeLa S3 cells. To this end, the protein composition of a cell fraction that contains the internal nuclear fibrogranular structure was compared with a cell fraction from which this structure had been selectively dissociated. Systematic analysis of two-dimensional gels resulted in the identification of the 21 most abundant internal nuclear matrix proteins, including B23 and 16 hnRNP proteins. These proteins together represent about 75% of the total amount of internal nuclear matrix protein. Our results show that the major internal matrix proteins are involved in RNA metabolism.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell Culture

HeLa S3 (human cervix carcinoma) cells were grown as suspension culture in roller bottles at 37°C in 10% CO2-saturated Joklik's modified minimum essential medium (Gibco, Paisly, UK), supplemented with 5% (v/v) heat-inactivated fetal calf serum (Gibco), 2 mM L-glutamine, 100 IU/ml penicillin, and 100 µg/ml streptomycin.

Isolation of Nuclear Matrices and Nuclear Shells

Nuclear matrices were isolated as described by [de Graaf et al., 1992] with some modifications. All incubations were carried out at 0–4°C at a cell density of 5 × 10⁷ cells/ml, unless stated otherwise. Cells were washed twice with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) and collected by centrifugation at 400 g for 5 min. The cells were then extracted for 5 min in CSK100 buffer (10 mM PIPES, pH 6.8, 0.3 M sucrose, 100 mM NaCl, 3 mM MgCl₂, 5 U/ml RNasin (Promega, Madison, WI), 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM PMSF, 1 µg/ml leupeptin), containing 1% (w/v) Triton X-100 plus extra 15 U/ml RNasin. The lysate was subsequently passed 5 times through a 22-gauge needle [Belgrader et al., 1991]. After centrifugation for 5 min at 400 g nuclei were incubated for 30 min in CSK100 buffer, containing 0.5 mM sodium tetraphionate for stabilization of the internal nuclear matrix [Kaufmann et al., 1981; Stuurman et al., 1992]. Nuclei were washed twice with CSK50 buffer (as CSK100 buffer; however, 50 mM NaCl instead of 100 mM) by centrifugation and were then digested at a density of 2 × 10⁸ nuclei/ml in the same buffer containing 500 U/ml RNase-free DNase I (Boehringer, Mannheim, Germany) plus 15 U/ml RNasin for 30 min at 25°C. Subsequently, ammonium sulfate in CSK50 was added dropwise to a final concentration of 0.25 M. After incubation for 15 min, nuclear matrices were pelleted by centrifugation at 1,000 g for 5 min and washed once with CSK50.

Nuclear shells, which are cell fractions without the internal matrix structure [Ludérus et al., 1992], were isolated like nuclear matrices with the following modifications. RNasin and sodium tetraphionate were omitted. Instead, 1 mM dithiothreitol (DTT) was added to all buffers. Additionally, matrices thus obtained were digested with 50 µg/ml RNase A at a density of 1 × 10⁴ matrices/ml in CSK50 buffer for 15 min at 25°C. Subsequently, matrices were extracted for 15 min by addition of NaCl to a final concentration of 2 M and DTT to a final concentration of 40 mM. Nuclear shells were collected by centrifugation at 14,000 g for 20 min and washed once with CSK50.

Electron Microscopy

Suspensions of nuclear matrices and nuclear shells in CSK50 were spotted onto Thermax (Miles Lab, Naperville, IL) coated with Alcian
Blue and were allowed to attach for at least 30 min. Structures were then fixed with 1% glutaraldehyde in CSK50 without leupeptin and RNasin. Preparations were cryoprotected for 30 min with 30% (v/v) N,N-dimethylformamide in PBS [Meissner and Schwarz, 1990], frozen in liquid propane in a KF80 rapid-freeze apparatus [Reichert-Jung, Wien, Austria], and freeze-substituted with 0.5% (w/v) uranylacetate in methanol [Humbel and Muller, 1986]. Subsequently, preparations were embedded in Epon and ultrathin sections were cut parallel to the substratum. The sections were post-stained with 2% (w/v) uranyl acetate and 0.4% (w/v) lead citrate [Wenable and Coggeshall, 1965] for 10 min each and examined in a Philips EM 420 electron microscope at 120 kV.

**Immunopurification of hnRNP Complexes**

hnRNP complexes were immunopurified essentially as described by [Piñol-Roma et al., 1990]. Briefly, HeLa S3 nuclei were disrupted by sonication in immunopurification buffer (10 mM Tris–HCl, pH 7.4, 100 mM NaCl, 2.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.5% (w/v) Triton X-100, 5 µg/ml aprotinin and 2 µg/ml each of leupeptin and pepstatin). The nucleoplasm was collected after centrifugation on a 30% sucrose cushion. This fraction was incubated for 10 min with the hnRNP-C1/C2 antibody 4F4, that had been coupled to protein A Sepharose beads using dimethylpimelidate as described by Harlow and Lane [1988]. The beads, now containing hnRNP complexes, were finally washed 6 times with the immunopurification buffer.

**Western Blotting**

Proteins were separated by one-dimensional sodium dodecyl sulfate–polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS–PAGE) [Laemmli, 1970] or two-dimensional gel electrophoresis (see below) and blotted onto nitrocellulose [Towbin et al., 1979], with the addition of 0.1% SDS to the transfer buffer. Blots were immunostained as described by van Steensel et al. [1995], using the following monoclonal antibodies: 41CC4 against lamins A and C [Burke et al., 1983], 4F4 against hnRNP-C1/C2 [Choi and Dreyfuss, 1984], 4D11 against hnRNP-L [Piñol-Roma et al., 1989], 4B10 against hnRNP-A₁ [Piñol-Roma et al., 1988], 7G12 against hnRNP-I [Ghetti et al., 1992], 10E10 against PABP I [Görlach et al., 1994], F1 against NuMA [Compton et al., 1992], anti-actin (N350, American), against vimentin, RCK106 against keratin 18, and RCK105 against keratin 7 [Ramaekers, 1987]. We also used polyclonal antibodies against SAF-A/hnRNP-U [Fackelmayer et al., 1994], against PAB II [Krause et al., 1994], and against B23 [Wang et al., 1993].

**Two-Dimensional Gel Electrophoresis**

Two-dimensional gel electrophoresis was performed as described by [Celis et al., 1993] with some minor modifications. Samples were freeze-dried before solubilization in lysis buffer. 1% (w/v) CHAPS was added to lysis buffer and the first-dimension gel medium. Isoelectric focusing (IEF) gels contained 2% ampholytes (0.67%, pH 3–10, and 1.33%, pH 5–8; BioRad, Richmond, CA) and were run for 1 h at 200 V, 1.5 h at 400 V and 16 h at 700 V. Nonequilibrium pH gradient electrophoresis (NEPHGE) gels contained 2% ampholytes (0.5% pH 3–10, 0.5% pH 5–8, and 1% pH 7–9; BioRad) and were run for 1 h at 200 V and 4 h at 700 V. For the second dimension, 10% SDS-polyacrylamide gels were used. Gels were silver stained using the method of Heuke- shoven and Dernick [1986], as described by Ra-billoud [1992] with some modifications. Gels were fixed overnight in 40% (v/v) ethanol and 10% (v/v) acetic acid, incubated in sensitizer (30% (v/v) ethanol, 0.5% glutaraldehyde, 0.5 M sodium acetate, 2 g/L sodium thiosulfate pentahydrate) for 2 h, and washed 3 times for 20 min in deionized water. After impregnation of the gels in 2 g/L silver nitrate plus 0.25 ml/L of a 37% formaldehyde solution for 1 h, the gels were washed for 20 s in water and developed for 10 min in 60 g/L sodium carbonate, 0.15 ml/L of 37% formaldehyde, and 10 mg/L sodium thiosulfate pentahydrate. The reaction was stopped by adding 50 g/L Tris and 2% (v/v) acetic acid. The gels were scanned using a Molecular Dynamics (Kent, UK) laser scanner. PDQUEST software (PDI, New York, NY) was used for the quantitative analysis of the gels. Standards for 2-D SDS–PAGE (BioRad) were used for determination of M, and pI. Also, several samples were run precisely as described by Celis et al. [1993]; results were compared to the human keratinocyte two-dimensional gel protein database [Celis et al., 1994]. hnRNP proteins were separated by NEPHGE, using 2% ampholytes pH 3–10, in the first dimension. For the second dimension, 12% SDS-PA gels were used.
Microsequencing

Spots from several Coomassie Blue stained 2-D gels were pooled and loaded on a 15% SDS-polyacrylamide gel together with 20 ng V8 protease (Promega). The protein was digested for 30 min after migration into the stacking gel [Cleveland et al., 1977]. Peptides thus obtained were separated by electrophoresis and electroblotted onto PVDF membrane (Immobilon-PSQ, Millipore, Bedford, MA) using 50 mM Tris and 50 mM boric acid as transfer buffer. The peptides were visualized by staining with 0.1% Coomassie Blue in 50% methanol for 2 min and destaining with 50% methanol. Amino acid sequences were determined with a Procise 494 Protein Sequencer (Perkin-Elmer, Applied Biosystems division, Foster City, CA). The identity of the proteins was determined by submitting the obtained partial sequence to the BLITZ server at the European Bioinformatics Institute (EBI, UK).

RESULTS

Criterium for Identification of Internal Nuclear Matrix Proteins

The first step in the identification of proteins of the internal nuclear matrix is to formulate a criterium to recognize internal matrix proteins. To this end, we compared quantitatively the protein composition of a nuclear fraction containing the internal fibrogranular matrix with a nuclear fraction lacking this internal structure. We refer to these two fractions as nuclear matrices and nuclear shells, respectively [Ludérus et al., 1992]. Proteins present in the first structure and completely lacking in the latter are putative internal matrix proteins.

In order to prepare intact nuclear matrices, isolated nuclei from HeLa S3 cells [Belgrader et al., 1991] were treated with a mild oxidizing agent, 0.5 mM sodium tetrathionate. This agent has been shown to stabilize the internal nuclear matrix structure [Belgrader et al., 1991; Kaufmann et al., 1984; de Graaf et al., 1992; Stuurman et al., 1990] and by addition of RNase [Belgrader et al., 1991; Fey et al., 1986].

The criterium for identification of internal matrix proteins that we have formulated above depends on the notion that the internal matrix is present in nuclear matrix preparations isolated under mild oxidizing conditions and is completely dissociated under conditions we employ for isolation of nuclear shells. To check this, nuclear matrices (Fig. 1A) and nuclear shells (Fig. 1B) were examined by electron microscopy. The internal matrix, consisting of residual nucleolar structures embedded in a fibrogranular network, is clearly visible in the nuclear matrices. The nuclear shells, as expected, were devoid of this internal structure. Note that a considerable amount of residual cytoskeleton is present in both preparations, reflecting the tight association of the nuclear matrix and the cytoskeleton [Capco et al., 1982; Kallajoki and Osborn, 1994].

Protein Composition of Nuclear Matrices Versus Nuclear Shells

The protein composition of nuclear matrices and nuclear shells was determined by two-dimensional gel electrophoresis (Fig. 2). Both IEF and NEPHGE were used as a first dimension to be able to separate acidic as well as basic proteins. For the second dimension we employed SDS–PAGE. Figure 2 shows that the protein composition of nuclear matrices is clearly different from that of nuclear shells. Polypeptides present in nuclear matrices and absent in nuclear shells are likely to be components of the internal nuclear matrix. Subsequently, these proteins were quantitatively analyzed and further characterized.

Considerations Concerning Quantitative Analysis of Two-Dimensional Gels

For a reliable quantitative analysis, staining of the proteins has to be linear in relation to the amount of protein and should be reproducible. We choose the silver staining procedure of Heukeshoven and Dernick [1986] as described by Rabilloud [1992]. The linearity and reproducibility of the silver staining method was tested by running four two-dimensional gels in duplicate,
Internal Nuclear Matrix Proteins

Fig. 1. Ultrastructure of nuclear matrices and nuclear shells. Electron microscopy images of thin sections of nuclear matrices (A) and nuclear shells (B) isolated from HeLa S3 cells. Scale bar = 1 μm.

each of the four gels containing a different total amount of nuclear matrix proteins. All gels were silver stained under identical conditions. For 18 randomly selected proteins, the integrated optical density (OD) values were determined with the aid of PDQUEST software. Figure 3 shows for three of the 18 proteins that the OD linearly increased with increasing amounts of protein, up to a certain amount of nuclear matrix equivalents applied to the gel. For example, for lamin B1, staining was linear up to $2.0 \times 10^6$ nuclear equivalents applied per gel. Up to $1.0 \times 10^6$ nuclear equivalents, the staining of all 18 proteins that we tested was linear. At higher protein loads, staining of abundant proteins showed saturation. Therefore, we applied in all further experiments $1.0 \times 10^6$ nuclear equivalents. Also note that, if this amount is applied, the reproducibility is very good. These results show that the silver staining method can be used in our quantitative analysis.

To compensate for small gel-to-gel variation, e.g., due to errors in application of protein samples, we have normalized OD values of each gel on the basis of protein markers. For this, proteins have been chosen that are present in the same amount in matrices and in shells. Lamins are expected to be present in both preparations, because lamins are structural proteins of the lamina. However, Figure 4 shows that lamins A and C are partially extracted from the nuclear lamina during isolation of shells. Therefore, these two proteins cannot be used for normalization. Lamin B1 and vimentin, the latter being part of the adhering cytoskeletal structure, were quantitatively retained by the shells (Fig. 4). These two proteins have been used as internal standards for normalization of IEF gels. Lamin B1 and vimentin were not resolved well by NEPHGE. Therefore, we have selected another protein for normalization on these gels. We choose a spot, marked with an asterisk (*) in Figure 5, that was well resolved by both IEF and NEPHGE, and was present in the same quantity in matrices and shells after normalization of the IEF gels on the basis of vimentin or lamin B1.

Identification of Internal Nuclear Matrix Proteins by Quantitative Analysis of Two-Dimensional Gels

Silver-stained 2-D gels containing proteins of the two nuclear fractions and run in duplicate, were quantitatively analyzed, matched and compared by using PDQUEST software. With this method, 106 proteins could be detected in gels of
nuclear matrices after IEF, and 91 proteins after NEPHGE. In gels of nuclear shell preparations 50 and 27 proteins were detected with IEF and NEPHGE, respectively. Next, we defined a threshold to decide which proteins are present exclusively in the internal matrix and which are not. We stipulated that if the quantity of a protein in the shell sample is less than 10% of the quantity of that protein in the matrix sample, it is probably an internal matrix protein.

Proteins identified as internal matrix proteins by the criterium formulated above are indicated by filled spots in Figure 5. Proteins present in both nuclear shells and nuclear matrices are represented by open spots. Of the 106 nuclear matrix proteins detected on the IEF gels, 56 were putative internal matrix proteins. Of the 91 proteins detected after NEPHGE, 64 were putative internal matrix proteins. If we changed the 10% threshold to 5% or to 20%, we obtained the same result. Evidently, a well defined set of proteins exists that is lost under conditions that result in selective dissociation of the internal, fibrogranular nuclear matrix.

Most of the proteins that we identified as putative internal matrix proteins on 2-D gels after IEF or after NEPHGE, were present only in minute amounts and were barely visible after

---

**Fig. 2.** Two-dimensional gel electrophoresis of nuclear matrices and nuclear shells. Proteins of nuclear matrices (A, B) and nuclear shells (C, D) were separated by NEPHGE/SDS-PAGE (A, C) and IEF/SDS-PAGE (B, D). Each gel contains proteins from 10⁶ nuclear equivalents. Proteins were detected by silver staining.
silver staining. One should note here that the OD per µg protein after silver staining differs from protein to protein [Gersten et al., 1991]. Therefore, an absolute comparison of amounts of proteins is not possible. For that reason we also used Coomassie Blue staining. Table I lists the 21 most abundant putative internal matrix proteins, as judged by both silver and Coomassie Blue staining. Together, these proteins represent about 75% of the total amount of internal matrix protein, expressed in OD units after silver staining. For comparison, each of these proteins is about equal or more abundant than lamin B1, the least abundant of the three major lamin proteins.

Characterization of Internal Nuclear Matrix Proteins

Figure 5 and Table I indicate which proteins have been identified by immunoblotting, by comigration, by microsequencing and/or by comparison with the protein database of Celis et al. [1994]. The most abundant proteins in our preparations are cytoskeletal proteins (i.e., actin, vimentin, and keratins), identified by immunoblotting. These proteins were present in the same amounts in matrix preparations and in shells. This is in agreement with observations of others who showed that the nuclear matrix in tightly associated with the intermediate fila-
Fig. 5. Identification of peripheral and internal matrix proteins. Schematic representation of 2-D gels (A: NEPHGE; B: IEF) containing nuclear matrix proteins. Proteins that were identified as internal proteins by quantitative analysis (see text) are represented as filled spots (h, hnRNP; B23; PI, poly(A)-binding protein I); proteins present in nuclear shell preparations are represented as open spots (V, vimentin; A, actin; K, keratin; L, lamin). Major internal matrix proteins that have not been identified yet are numbered (see also Table I). The spot used for normalization of NEPHGE gels is labeled with an asterisk (*). Note that the area of spots does not necessarily reflect the relative amount of protein.

hnRNP-Q was also present in nuclear matrix preparations. However, more than 20% of hnRNP-Q remained associated to the nuclear shells. Although some hnRNP-A1 was present in the internal nuclear matrix, most of this protein was not retained by the nuclear matrix under our conditions, as shown by immunoblotting (Fig. 7). SAF-A (scaffold attachment factor A), recently identified as hnRNP-U [Fackelmayer et al., 1994], is an abundant nuclear protein and a constituent of the nuclear matrix [Romig et al., 1992]. We were not certain about the position of this protein on two-dimensional gels, because it did not migrate well in the first dimension gel. Therefore, we have also analyzed nuclear subfractions by one-dimensional SDS-PAGE. Detection of hnRNP-U/SAF-A by immunoblotting showed that 50% is retained by the nuclear matrix and that the protein is completely absent from nuclear shell preparations, like hnRNP-C1/C2 (Fig. 7). Therefore, also hnRNP-U can be considered as an (abundant) internal matrix protein.

We also found another RNA-binding protein among the abundant internal nuclear matrix proteins: poly(A)-binding protein I (PABP I, see Table I and Fig. 5). This protein could be identified by the partial amino acid sequences LYEF (corresponding to residues 27–31) and EAAERA (corresponding to residues 149–154), which we obtained by microsequencing. Its identity was confirmed by immunoblotting and by comparison with the 2-D gel protein database [Celis et al., 1994]. Interestingly, we found that hnRNP-P comigrated with PABP I (Fig. 6). hnRNP-P is indeed able to bind poly(A) [Swanson and Dreyfuss, 1988] and therefore it is probably the same protein as PABP I. PABP I is, however, found to be localized to the cytoplasm [Görlich et al., 1994]. It is possible that it is not a nuclear matrix protein, but is associated to the cytoskeleton.

PAB II is a nuclear poly(A)-binding protein, which is distinct from PABP I by its $M_r$ of 49 kD and amino acid sequence [Wahle, 1993]. We could not identify PAB II unambiguously on two-dimensional gels, so we detected the protein by immunoblotting after one-dimensional SDS-PAGE of nuclear subfractions (Fig. 7). Like hnRNP-C1/C2 and hnRNP-U/SAF-A, the PAB II protein is retained by the nuclear matrix for about 50% and is completely absent in nuclear shells. Therefore, also PAB II can be considered as an internal matrix protein.

We found that also B23 (numatrin, nucleophosmin) is a very abundant internal nuclear matrix protein (Fig. 5; Table I). Previously, this...
**TABLE I. Major Internal Nuclear Matrix Proteins**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spot no.</th>
<th>pI (pH)</th>
<th>M&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt; (kD)</th>
<th>Quantity&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Identification&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Method&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B23</td>
<td>5.8–5.9</td>
<td>34.0–36.0</td>
<td>19.1 (7.9)</td>
<td>B23 (numatrin)</td>
<td>D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hC1/C2</td>
<td>5.8–5.9</td>
<td>37.2–37.6</td>
<td>8.6 (n.d.)</td>
<td>hnRNP-C1/C2</td>
<td>C, D, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hE</td>
<td>6.0–6.1</td>
<td>34.1–39.5</td>
<td>2.7 (4.0)</td>
<td>hnRNP-E</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hK</td>
<td>5.2–5.4</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>4.4 (2.4)</td>
<td>hnRNP-K</td>
<td>C, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hL</td>
<td>6.3–6.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>1.8 (3.6)</td>
<td>hnRNP-L</td>
<td>C, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hU (?)</td>
<td>5.8–5.9</td>
<td>125.9</td>
<td>1.4 (3.1)</td>
<td>hnRNP-U (SAF-A)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>2.4 (0.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPHGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hA1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>0.6 (6.8)</td>
<td>hnRNP-A1</td>
<td>C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hA2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>2.9 (19.4)</td>
<td>hnRNP-A2</td>
<td>C, D, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hB1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>0.6 (2.4)</td>
<td>hnRNP-B1</td>
<td>C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hB2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>1.1 (5.7)</td>
<td>hnRNP-B2</td>
<td>C, D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hI</td>
<td>8.8–9.0</td>
<td>55.4–57.4</td>
<td>6.1 (9.5)</td>
<td>hnRNP-I (PTB)</td>
<td>C, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hM</td>
<td>6.6–7.0</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>1.2 (1.5)</td>
<td>hnRNP-M</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hN</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>2.7 (1.8)</td>
<td>hnRNP-N</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hR</td>
<td>7.7–8.0</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>0.5 (2.3)</td>
<td>hnRNP-R</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hS</td>
<td>9.2–9.4</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>1.0 (6.5)</td>
<td>hnRNP-S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hT</td>
<td>8.5–8.8</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>1.2 (2.4)</td>
<td>hnRNP-T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>1.0 (3.7)</td>
<td>PABP I (hnRNP-P)</td>
<td>C, D, I, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>1.1 (1.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>1.2 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1.7 (1.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Spot indications correspond with Figure 5. The position of hnRNP-U is not certain.

<sup>b</sup>Quantity is expressed relative to the quantity of lamin B1 after silver staining and, between brackets, after Coomassie Blue staining. The quantity of some proteins may be underestimated, due to streaking (n.d. = not determined).

<sup>c</sup>hnRNP, heterogeneous nuclear ribonucleoprotein; SAF-A, scaffold attachment factor A; PTB, polypyrimidine tract binding protein; PABP I, poly(A)-binding protein I.

<sup>d</sup>Methods of identification: C: comigration on 2-D gel; D: comparison with 2-D gel protein database [Celis et al., 1994]; I, immunoblotting; M, microsequencing.

---

The internal nuclear matrix is a fibrogranular structure that is present throughout the nucleoplasm and can be visualized after removal of most chromatin and loosely bound nuclear components. The molecular structure of this fibrogranular network inside the nucleus is still an enigma [Cook, 1988; Jack and Eggert, 1992; Stuurman et al., 1992a]. Many components involved in a variety of nuclear processes, like NuMA protein was found to be associated to the rat liver nuclear matrix [Fields et al., 1986; Nakayasu and Berezney, 1991]. B23 is a nucleolar protein. However, immunolabeling studies have shown that it is also present throughout the nucleoplasm, but at lower concentration (J.M. Bridger, M.E. Kerr, and C.J. Hutchison, personal communication). It is unknown whether B23 is part of the internal fibrogranular matrix.

NuMA (nuclear mitotic apparatus protein) is a nuclear matrix protein [Kallajoki et al., 1991; Lydersen and Pettijohn, 1980]. Considering its abundance, $2 \times 10^5$ copies per cell, and its putative ability to form coiled coil structures, it probably has a structural function [Compton et al., 1992; Yang et al., 1992]. NuMA is a component of a subset of nuclear matrix filaments [Zeng et al., 1994b] and has been shown to be associated with splicing complexes [Zeng et al., 1994a; reviewed by Cleveland, 1995]. Like hnRNP-U, NuMA does not migrate well in focusing gels, so we detected it by immunoblotting after one-dimensional SDS–PAGE (Fig. 7). We found that all NuMA protein is associated with the nuclear matrix preparation. About 50% of this protein remains after dissociation of the internal nuclear matrix and, therefore, may be associated to the nuclear shell. This observation is in agreement with in situ immunolabeling, which shows that NuMA is not only present throughout the nucleoplasm, but is also associated with the periphery of the nucleus [see Figure 2A in Compton et al., 1992].

**DISCUSSION**

The internal nuclear matrix is a fibrogranular structure that is present throughout the nucleoplasm and can be visualized after removal of most chromatin and loosely bound nuclear components. The molecular structure of this fibrogranular network inside the nucleus is still an enigma [Cook, 1988; Jack and Eggert, 1992; Stuurman et al., 1992a]. Many components involved in a variety of nuclear processes, like...
Fig. 6. Comparison of nuclear matrix proteins with hnRNP proteins. Proteins of nuclear matrices (A) and proteins of immunopurified hnRNP complexes (B) were separated simultaneously by NEPHGE/SDS–PAGE and detected by silver staining. hnRNP proteins, present in both preparations, are indicated according to the nomenclature of Piñol-Roma et al. [1988].

Fig. 7. Retention of several internal nuclear matrix proteins by nuclear matrices and shells. Proteins of nuclear subfractions were separated by SDS–PAGE and transferred to nitrocellulose. Blots were immunostained with antibodies against NuMA, SAF-A/hnRNP-U, PAB II, hnRNP-C1/C2, and hnRNP A1. Each lane contains protein from 10⁵ nuclear equivalents. The lanes contain nuclear matrices (M), proteins extracted by DNase digestion and 0.25 M ammonium sulfate (MS), nuclear shells (S), and proteins extracted by RNase digestion, 40 mM DTT, and 2 M NaCl (SS).

replication, transcription, RNA processing and RNA transport, have been shown to bind to the nuclear matrix [reviewed by Berezney, 1991; Getzenberg, 1994; van Driel et al., 1991, 1995; Verheijen et al., 1988]. If the basic structure of the internal nuclear matrix is made up of filamentous proteins, analogous to the cytoskeleton and the nuclear lamina, structural proteins of the internal matrix are expected to be relatively abundant, similar to cytoskeletal proteins and those of the nuclear lamina. However, no systematic analysis has been carried out yet to designate the quantitatively major matrix proteins. To identify proteins that are candidates for structural components of the internal matrix, we set out to analyze the protein composition of the internal nuclear matrix quantitatively.

Here we describe a method that allows us to identify the internal nuclear matrix proteins in HeLa S3 cells. We made use of the fact that it is possible to dissociate the internal nuclear matrix selectively, leaving the nuclear lamina (shell) intact [Belgrader et al., 1991; Kaufmann and Shaper, 1984; de Graaf et al., 1992; Stuurman et al., 1990]. The protein composition of nuclear matrices and of nuclear shells were compared by quantitative two-dimensional gel analysis. Proteins present in intact nuclear matrix preparations and essentially absent (i.e., less than 10% remains) in nuclear shells are probably uniquely present in the internal matrix.

Using this approach, we identified 56 protein spots in IEF gels and 64 in NEPHGE gels that
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relate to proteins exclusively present in preparations that contain the internal nuclear matrix. Most of these proteins are of relatively low abundance. Table I lists the 21 most abundant proteins of the internal matrix, together representing about 75% of the total amount of internal matrix protein. We show that of these 21 proteins 16 are hnRNP proteins and one is B23 (numatrin, nucleophosmin). Four proteins are yet unidentified (Table I).

Most hnRNP proteins were not identified earlier as nuclear matrix proteins. Fey et al. [1986] found that many hnRNP proteins were components of the nuclear matrix, but did not identify them individually. He et al. [1991] showed that antibodies to hnRNP core proteins (the A, B, and C proteins) labeled the granular structures of the internal nuclear matrix, rather than the filaments. Also hnRNP-U (also called SAF-A) has been shown earlier to be a constituent of the nuclear matrix [Romig et al., 1992]. The hnRNP proteins are major components of the nucleus. For example, there are about $1 \times 10^6$ copies of hnRNP-U per nucleus [Romig et al., 1992]. Clearly, hnRNP proteins are the major internal nuclear matrix proteins.

hnRNP proteins are not retained completely in nuclear matrix preparations and different hnRNP proteins are retained to different extents. For instance, most of hnRNP-A1 is solubilized upon treatment of nuclei with DNase I and high salt, whereas more than 50% of hnRNP-C and hnRNP-U are bound to the nuclear matrix. Apparently, there are different pools of hnRNP protein. The function of hnRNP proteins is not completely clear. They are believed to play an important role in the packaging, processing and transport of mRNA [reviewed by Dreyfuss et al., 1993]. For example, hnRNP I has been shown to be the polypyrimidine tract binding protein (PTB) [Ghetti et al., 1992]. Since some hnRNP proteins are able to form filamentous structures under certain conditions [Lothstein et al., 1985; Romig et al., 1992] and some are able to bind DNA, they may also have a role in determining chromatin structure and in the control of gene expression. For instance, hnRNP-U is able to bind scaffold/matrix-associated regions (S/MARs), which are AT-rich sequences by which chromatin loops are attached to the nuclear matrix [Romig et al., 1992; von Kries et al., 1994]. Other hnRNP proteins have been shown to be able to interact with telomeres [Ishikawa et al., 1993]. Finally, hnRNP-K is shown to be a DNA-binding protein and transcriptional activator [Tomonaga and Levens, 1995]. Because the internal nuclear matrix consists mainly of hnRNP proteins, it probably is involved in RNA metabolism.

B23 is a very abundant protein in the internal nuclear matrix (Table I). B23 is a nucleolar phosphoprotein, also called numatrin or nucleophosmin. B23 is enriched in proliferating cells [Feuerstein and Mond, 1987]. It has been reported that there are approximately $6 \times 10^6$ molecules of B23 per HeLa cell [Yung and Chan, 1987]. Like hnRNP proteins, it is involved in RNA processing and transport. Immunoelectron microscopy studies have shown that B23 is localized in the granular regions of nucleoli where ribosomes are assembled [Spector et al., 1984]. The ribonuclease activity of B23 suggests that it plays a role in the processing of preribosomal RNA [Herrera et al., 1995]. Also, it may be involved in ribosome transport and assembly. Borer et al. [1989] found that it shuttles between nucleus and cytoplasm. Recently, the protein has been shown to be present in granules throughout the nucleoplasm in addition to its nucleolar localization [J.M. Bridger, M.E. Kerr, and C.J. Hutchison, personal communication]. These observations indicate that B23, besides in the nucleolar remnants, may also be present in the fibrogranular structures of the nuclear matrix.

The protein composition of the nuclear matrix has been studied by several investigators, using different cell types and matrix isolation methods [e.g., Fey et al., 1986; Kallajoki and Osborn, 1994; Kaufmann and Shaper, 1984; Verheijen et al., 1986]. Stuurman et al. [1990] identified a set of matrix proteins that are found in several cell types and species and called this the minimal matrix. However, a systematic attempt to identify quantitatively a set of proteins that form specifically the fibrogranular internal nuclear matrix has not been made before. Some investigators also find that hnRNPs and B23 are components of the nuclear matrix, like Nakayasu and Berezney [1991], who identified 12 major nuclear matrix proteins, the matrins. Because of differences in matrix isolation and electrophoretic techniques, it is difficult to compare our results with that of others.

We have formulated an objective criterium for the identification of proteins that may be constituents of the internal, fibrogranular nuclear matrix. Although the criterium is simple and
A small amount of actin and keratin 18 (less than 10%) appeared to dissociate under the reducing conditions used to dissociate the internal nuclear matrix. This may indicate that these proteins occur in the internal matrix. Actin is present in the nucleus and may therefore be a component of the nuclear matrix (reviewed by Mattern et al., 1996; Verheijen et al., 1988). However, it is equally possible that these proteins were dissociated from the cytoskeleton that is present in the nuclear matrix preparations and, therefore, are not part of the nuclear matrix. Evidently, the precise localization of putative internal matrix proteins should be confirmed by in situ immunolabeling studies. Despite these potential pitfalls, it is very likely that most, if not all, of the set of most abundant putative internal matrix proteins are really major components of this structure. B23 and hnRNP proteins are genuine major nuclear proteins. Only PABP I and any of the four yet unidentified proteins (Table I) may not be part of the nuclear matrix. Further studies are under way to answer these questions.

What can we conclude from these results about the structure and function of the internal nuclear matrix? We identified 17 of the 21 most abundant internal matrix proteins, B23 and 16 hnRNP proteins. Importantly, these proteins are involved in packaging, processing and transport of RNA [Dreyfuss et al., 1993]. Moreover, about 70% of the nuclear RNA is still present in nuclear matrix preparations, if RNase activity is suppressed during isolation [He et al., 1990; van Eekelen and van Venrooij, 1981]. Also, transcription and RNA processing activity is preserved in the nuclear matrix [Jackson and Cook, 1985; Razin and Yarovsky, 1985; Zeitlin et al., 1989]. Together, these observations support the notion that the internal nuclear matrix is a structure that is strongly committed to RNA metabolism and transport.

Several observations indicate the presence of intermediate filament-like structures in the internal nuclear matrix. Immuno-electron microscopy showed that NuMA and lamin A/C are locally present in intranuclear fibrogranular structures [Hozák et al., 1995; Zeng et al., 1994b]. Although it cannot be ruled out that NuMA and/or other yet unknown matrix proteins constitute a proteinaceous network in the nucleoplasm, it may be that the fibrogranular structure of the nuclear matrix is an aggregate of RNA-protein complexes. The fibrogranular nature of these aggregates either may reflect an intrinsic property of the constituting RNPs or is imposed by the shape of the interchromatin space in which RNA synthesis, processing and transport seem to take place [Cremer et al., 1993; Mattern et al., 1996]. If the fibrogranular structure of the nuclear matrix is merely an aggregate of RNA-protein complexes, the internal nuclear matrix is expected to be absent in nuclei of cells that are not transcriptionally active. Indeed, several agents that inhibit or stimulate transcription induce extensive structural rearrangements in nuclei and nuclear matrices. It is also found that in dormant nuclei, like...
those of avian erythrocytes, the internal nuclear matrix elements are greatly reduced [reviewed by Brasch, 1990]. So, the internal nuclear matrix may not be a structure that organizes the cell nucleus in an active manner. Rather, the internal matrix seems to be shaped by RNA synthesis, processing, and transport.
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