

Partitioning to ordered membrane domains regulates the kinetics of secretory traffic

Reviewed Preprint

Revised by authors after peer review.

About eLife's process

Reviewed preprint version 2

April 30, 2024 (this version)

Reviewed preprint version 1

September 6, 2023

Sent for peer review

May 24, 2023

Posted to preprint server

April 19, 2023

Ivan Castello-Serrano, Fred A. Heberle, Barbara Diaz-Rohrer, Rossana Ippolito, Carolyn R. Shurer, Pablo Lujan, Felix Campelo, Kandice R. Levental , Ilya Levental 

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904 • Department of Chemistry, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996 • Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard • ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain

 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Open_access

 Copyright information

Abstract

The organelles of eukaryotic cells maintain distinct protein and lipid compositions required for their specific functions. The mechanisms by which many of these components are sorted to their specific locations remain unknown. While some motifs mediating subcellular protein localization have been identified, many membrane proteins and most membrane lipids lack known sorting determinants. A putative mechanism for sorting of membrane components is based on membrane domains known as lipid rafts, which are laterally segregated nanoscopic assemblies of specific lipids and proteins. To assess the role of such domains in the secretory pathway, we applied a robust tool for synchronized secretory protein traffic (RUSH, Retention Using Selective Hooks) to protein constructs with defined affinity for raft phases. These constructs consist solely of single-pass transmembrane domains (TMDs) and, lacking other sorting determinants, constitute probes for membrane domain-mediated trafficking. We find that while raft affinity can be sufficient for steady-state PM localization, it is not sufficient for rapid exit from the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), which is instead mediated by a short cytosolic peptide motif. In contrast, we find that Golgi exit kinetics are highly dependent on raft affinity, with raft preferring probes exiting Golgi ~2.5-fold faster than probes with minimal raft affinity. We rationalize these observations with a kinetic model of secretory trafficking, wherein Golgi export can be facilitated by protein association with raft domains. These observations support a role for raft-like membrane domains in the secretory pathway and establish an experimental paradigm for dissecting its underlying machinery.

eLife assessment

In this **important** study, Castello-Serrano and colleagues describe, model and quantify the role of transmembrane domains in protein sorting in the secretory pathway, first at the ER and subsequently at the Golgi. **Convincing** data support the role of a cytoplasmic motif in ER exit, while further experiments are necessary to support a direct connection between the phase partitioning capability of the transmembrane regions and the sorting potential of domains at the Golgi/TGN.

Introduction

Secretory and membrane proteins are synthesized in the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) followed by export of non-ER-resident proteins to the Golgi prior to sorting to their ultimate cellular location (Lippincott-Schwartz et al., 2000). Soluble and transmembrane proteins (TMPs) require somewhat different mechanisms to exit the ER, but both are dependent on the coat protein complex II (COPII), a multi-protein assembly recruited to the ER membrane to sort cargo and facilitate membrane deformation (Otte and Barlowe, 2004; Sato and Nakano, 2007). Cargo proteins are typically recognized for ER exit by binding to COPII subunits via one of several short peptide motifs on their cytoplasmic tails (Barlowe, 2003a; Kuehn et al., 1998). Proteins that lack these motifs can be sorted by binding to motif-containing adaptors (Castillon et al., 2011; di Ronza et al., 2018). COPII mediated ER-to-Golgi transport is believed to proceed via vesicles (Gomez-Navarro et al., 2020; McCaughey and Stephens, 2019); however, recent observations suggest COPII mediates constrictions in continuous membrane structures connecting ER and Golgi membranes (Weigel et al., 2021).

The mechanisms and determinants of secretory and membrane protein sorting through the non-contiguous cisternae of the Golgi apparatus are less well understood. Non-resident proteins of the Golgi flux through distinct sub-compartments from cis-to-trans Golgi via several possible non-exclusive paths, including vesicles that exchange between static cisternae and/or dynamic cisternae that themselves change their composition and function over time (Lujan and Campelo, 2021; Pantazopoulou and Glick, 2019). Post-Golgi sorting generally occurs at the trans-Golgi network (TGN), where exiting proteins are packaged into transport carriers targeted to other organelles (Luini et al., 2008; Lujan et al., 2022; Nishimura et al., 2002; Tan and Gleeson, 2019). These sorting steps are at least partially mediated by clathrin (Ford et al., 2021) and its cargo-binding adapter proteins (Farias et al., 2012; Nishimura et al., 2002; Park and Guo, 2014). In some cases (e.g. mannose-6-phosphate), the principles of sorting are well understood (Puertollano et al., 2001). But for many other TMPs, the specific determinants of their subcellular trafficking itineraries and ultimate steady-state location are unknown. Even more mysterious are the rules for lipid sorting between various membranes, though lipid transfer machineries at membrane contact sites are likely important (Elbaz and Schuldiner, 2011; Mesmin et al., 2013; Phillips and Voeltz, 2016).

In parallel with polymerizing coats and motif-recognizing adapters, a putative scheme for sorting membrane lipids and proteins relies on nanodomains known as lipid rafts (Levental et al., 2020; Simons and Ikonen, 1997). Rafts arise due to the intrinsic capacity of biomembranes to laterally separate into coexisting ordered and disordered domains (Elson et al., 2010). Though still widely debated, recently accumulating evidence has validated many of the key predictions of the lipid raft hypothesis (Levental et al., 2020; Sezgin et al., 2017). One such predictions, indeed the original function for which lipid rafts were proposed, is that rafts facilitate polarized sorting in epithelial cells, assembling lipids and proteins for delivery from the trans-Golgi network to the apical PM (Lafont et al., 1999; Simons and Ikonen, 1997). Rafts have also been implicated in endocytic sorting (Gagescu et al., 2000), with some proteins relying on raft affinity for recycling to the PM after endocytosis (Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2023; Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b).

Key evidence supporting the capacity for biomembranes to form raft domains is provided by studies of plasma membranes isolated from living cells as Giant Plasma Membrane Vesicles (GPMVs). Such GPMVs separate into coexisting ordered and disordered phases that laterally sort membrane components according to their preference for certain membrane environments (Levental and Levental, 2015b). Namely, saturated lipids, glycolipids, GPI-anchored proteins, and selected TMPs co-enrich within a relatively tightly packed lipid phase (termed the “raft phase”) (Sezgin et al., 2012), away from unsaturated phospholipids and most TMPs (Castello-Serrano et

al., 2020 [↗](#); Levental et al., 2011 [↗](#)). GPMVs thus provide a robust tool to quantitatively assess the intrinsic affinity of membrane components for raft-like domains in biomembranes. Importantly, the preference of some TMPs for raft domains is tightly correlated with their subcellular localization, with raft association being necessary and sufficient for PM localization (Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b [↗](#)). For these, loss of raft affinity leads to accumulation in endo-lysosomes and ultimate degradation (Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2023 [↗](#)).

While these observations, among many others (Abrami et al., 2003 [↗](#); Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014a [↗](#); Fabbri et al., 2005 [↗](#); Glebov et al., 2006 [↗](#); Sabharanjak et al., 2002 [↗](#)), suggest that lipid-driven microdomains are involved in endocytosis and recycling, the role of rafts in the secretory pathway remains controversial and poorly understood due in large part to methodological limitations. Classical protocols for measuring raft association have been artifact-prone, non-quantitative, and difficult to interpret, while experiments relying on raft disruption are often pleiotropic (Levental et al., 2020 [↗](#); Munro, 2003 [↗](#)). To circumvent these issues and directly interrogate the role of raft association in secretory traffic, we constructed a panel of minimal TMP probes with defined preferences for raft domains and measured their post-ER trafficking itineraries using RUSH, a robust tool for synchronized secretory traffic (Boncompain et al., 2012 [↗](#)). We observed that raft association is sufficient for the steady-state distribution of some proteins, ER exit kinetics are largely determined by a sorting motif that likely mediates cargo association with COPII machinery. In contrast, raft affinity is sufficient to confer rapid efflux from the Golgi. We rationalize these observations with a kinetic model that generates a quantitative description of temporal transport of secretory cargo as a function of its association with various membrane subdomains. This model reproduces experimental observations and predicts separation of Golgi membranes into coexisting domains. Consistently, we microscopically observe separation of raft from non-raft probes in Golgi compartments and disruption of raft-associated Golgi efflux by inhibition of raft lipid synthesis. These observations reveal a role for lipid-driven domains in Golgi cargo sorting and provide a quantitative description of membrane protein dynamics through the secretory pathway.

Results

ER exit rates are determined more by cytosolic sorting motifs than raft affinity

In previous work, we used protein constructs comprised solely of transmembrane domains (TMDs) to interrogate raft-dependent recycling in the endocytic system (Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2023 [↗](#); Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b [↗](#); Lorent et al., 2017 [↗](#)). The preference of these probes for raft domains can be quantified directly by measuring their partitioning between ordered (raft) and disordered (non-raft) phases of isolated GPMVs (Levental and Levental, 2015a [↗](#); Sezgin et al., 2012 [↗](#)), as shown in **Fig 1A-B** [↗](#). As previously shown (Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b [↗](#); Lorent et al., 2017 [↗](#)), the TMD of a single-pass transmembrane adapter called Linker for Activation of T-cells (LAT) preferentially partitions into the raft phase of GPMVs, away from the non-raft phase lipid marker (F-DiO) (**Fig 1A** [↗](#), left). A model raft-excluded TMD is a 22-Leu construct (i.e. allL) which strongly prefers the non-raft phase (**Fig 1A** [↗](#), right). This behavior can be quantified via the raft partition coefficient ($K_{p,raft}$) defined as the ratio of background-subtracted intensities for various constructs in the raft versus non-raft phases (**Fig 1B** [↗](#)). The LAT TMD (open symbols) retains the raft affinity of full-length LAT, while allL-TMD, either on its own or inserted into full-length LAT (LAT-allL), has very low raft affinity (**Fig 1B** [↗](#)).

To quantitatively assay the effects of raft affinity on the kinetics of secretory trafficking, we inserted these probes into the RUSH system, which allows synchronized release and tracking through the secretory system (**Fig 1C** [↗](#)). This assay is based on the reversible interaction of a target protein (fused to streptavidin-binding peptide, SBP) with a selective “hook”; e.g.,




Figure 1.

Full-length proteins exit the ER faster than TMD-only versions regardless of raft affinity.

(A) Exemplary images of GPMVs from cells expressing raft-prefering LAT-TMD (left) or non-raft-prefering allL-TMD (right). The RFP-tagged TMDs are shown in cyan; magenta shows the disordered phase marker Fast DiO (F-DiO). Bottom row shows fluorescence intensity line scans along white lines shown in cyan images, revealing protein partitioning between raft and non-raft phases. (B) The ratio of intensities in raft versus non-raft phase is the raft partition coefficient ($K_{p,raft}$). LAT-TMD and full-length LAT are enriched in the raft phase while allL-TMD (and full-length LAT with allL-TMD, LAT-allL) are largely depleted from raft phase. SBP-tagging (for RUSH assay) has no effect on raft affinity. Symbols represent 3 independent experiments with >10 GPMVs/experiment. All blue labeled constructs are not statistically different from one another, and each is $p < 0.01$ different from all red constructs. (C) Schematic of RUSH assay. (D) Confocal images of co-transfected LAT-EGFP and LAT-TMD-mRFP at various time points after biotin introduction. Full-length LAT exits ER faster. (E) Fraction of ER-positive cells decreases over time, allowing quantitative estimation of ER exit kinetics ($t_{1/2}$). Symbols represent average $\pm$ st.dev. from >3 independent experiments. Fits represent exponential decays with shading representing 95% confidence intervals. (F) Confocal images of various full-length and TMD-only RUSH constructs (RFP-tagged) at 0 and 60 min after biotin introduction. (G) Quantification of $t_{1/2}$ for ER exit comparing full-length and TMD-only proteins (blue represents raft-enriched proteins, red = raft-depleted; see Table S1 for $K_{p,raft}$ quantifications). Bars represent average $\pm$ st.dev. from 3 independent experiments; * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$. All scale bars correspond to 5 μ m.

streptavidin stably anchored in the ER via a KDEL motif. The strong interaction between the hook and SBP retains the protein of interest (POI) in the ER. Introduction of biotin causes rapid release of the POI, which is then tracked via a fluorescent tag. SBP-tagged versions (i.e. RUSH) of all constructs assayed here had indistinguishable raft affinity from non-SBP versions (RFP-only) (**Fig 1B** [↗](#)).

The isolated TMD of LAT was sufficient to recapitulate the steady-state plasma membrane (PM) localization of its full-length protein (**Fig S1**), consistent with previous reports ([Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b](#) [↗](#); [Lorent et al., 2017](#) [↗](#)). In clear contrast, LAT-TMD did not recapitulate the ER exit kinetics of full-length LAT (**Fig 1D** [↗](#)). 45 mins after biotin addition, LAT had completely exited the ER and was localized almost exclusively to a bright perinuclear region, likely the Golgi. After 90 min, most full-length LAT achieved its steady-state localization at the PM. In contrast, LAT-TMD expressed in the same cell was still in the ER after 90 min and clearly accumulated at the PM only after several hours. Such slow kinetics were a challenge for live-cell imaging, so ER exit was quantified on a population level, by fixing cells at various time points after biotin addition and quantifying the fraction of cells with observable ER localization. The temporal reduction in the fraction of ER-positive cells could be reasonably approximated by a single-exponential fit for all constructs (e.g. **Fig 1E** [↗](#)), revealing that the half-time for ER exit was >4-fold faster for LAT (0.7 h) than for LAT-TMD (3.1 h) (**Fig 1E-G** [↗](#)).

We next tested whether raft affinity affected ER exit kinetics. To this end, we generated a RUSH construct of full-length LAT whose TMD was replaced with one that has minimal raft affinity (LAT-allL, **Fig 1A** [↗](#)). The general kinetics of ER exit of this non-raft LAT were comparable to LAT, with clear Golgi accumulation after 60 min of biotin. Post-Golgi accumulation was prominent at 90 min for both LAT and LAT-allL (the steady state localization of LAT-allL is in endolysosomes, **Fig S1**, as previously explained ([Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2023](#) [↗](#); [Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2014b](#) [↗](#))). In contrast, the isolated allL-TMD had much slower ER exit kinetics (**Fig 1F-G** [↗](#)). This trend was generalizable to several other proteins, with full-length versions having >3-fold faster ER exit kinetics than the TMD-only versions, regardless of their raft affinity (**Fig 1F-G** [↗](#), **Table S1**). It is worth noting that isolated TMDs still exited the ER and reached a steady-state localization after several hours (**Fig S1**), despite no direct interactions with cytosolic trafficking machinery (e.g. COPII or clathrin). Altogether, we conclude that features present in cytosolic domains play a dominant role over TMD-determined raft affinity in ER exit.

LAT has a C-terminal $\Phi\chi\Phi\chi\Phi$ ER exit motif

LAT is comprised of a minimal N-terminal ectodomain (<5 residues), a single-pass TMD, and a largely disordered cytosolic domain (CTD). Since LAT-TMD showed slow ER exit, we inferred that the determinant of rapid ER exit is likely located in the CTD and created a series of C-terminal truncations to locate the signal (**Fig 2A** [↗](#)). The two smaller C-term truncations (Δ Ct1 and Δ Ct2) had no effect on ER exit kinetics, behaving like full-length LAT (**Fig 2B-C** [↗](#)). In contrast, both larger truncations (Δ Ct3 and Δ Ct4) were significantly slower, behaving like LAT-TMD (**Fig 2B-C** [↗](#)). Thus, the motif facilitating fast ER exit of LAT is located within residues 140-185 (**Fig 2A** [↗](#)). We analyzed this fragment for possible COPII binding motifs ([Barlowe, 2003b](#) [↗](#); [Mikros and Diallinas, 2019](#) [↗](#)) and identified ¹⁴⁶AAPSA¹⁵⁰, which corresponds to a $\Phi\chi\Phi\chi\Phi$ motif (Φ = hydrophobic residue, χ = spacer) ([Otsu et al., 2013](#) [↗](#)) (**Fig 2A** [↗](#)-inset). Point mutations in this putative motif confirmed that P148 and A150 were essential for fast ER exit, while other neighboring residues were not (**Fig 2D-E** [↗](#) and **S2A**). We note that both these residues are nearly completely conserved in LAT from 30 species (**Fig 2A** [↗](#) and **S2B**). Finally, inserting this AAPSA motif into LAT-TMD significantly accelerated its ER exit, nearly recapitulating that of full-length LAT (**Fig 2F** [↗](#)). Thus, we conclude that fast ER exit of LAT is mediated by a $\Phi\chi\Phi\chi\Phi$ motif in the cytosolic CTD, which likely mediates COPII association.




Figure 2.

Identification of ER exit motif of LAT.

(A) Schematic of LAT and the truncated versions used here. Inset shows a putative COPII association motif and the evolutionary conservation of residues 144-153 of hLAT. (B) Temporal dependence of the fraction of ER-positive cells for LAT truncations. Deletion of a region comprised of residues 140-185 leads to slow ER exit. (C) Fitted ER exit kinetics for the constructs represented in panel C. Deletion of amino acids 140-185 slows ER exit kinetics by ~4-fold. (D) Temporal dependence of fraction of ER-positive cells with point mutations of $\Phi x \Phi x \Phi$ motif. Mutations of key residues within the motif slow ER exit kinetics. (E) Fitted ER exit kinetics for point mutants in panel D. (F) Insertion of AaPsA motif into LAT-TMD accelerates ER exit kinetics. B&D show a representative experiment with exponential decay fits; points in C,E, and F represent $t_{1/2}$ values of ER exit from fits of independent repeats with >20 cells/experiment. ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$, $^{ns}p > 0.05$.

Raft affinity determines Golgi exit kinetics of LAT

The RUSH system can be adapted to measure exit rates from Golgi by changing the “hook” to Golgin84, a resident protein of cis-Golgi (Diao et al., 2003 [↗](#)). As expected, all RUSH constructs (LAT, LAT-TMD, LAT-allL, allL-TMD) co-transfected with this hook were localized almost exclusively in the Golgi without biotin (Fig 3A [↗](#)). Within 90 min of biotin introduction, LAT exited the Golgi, achieving the expected steady-state PM localization (Fig 3A [↗](#)). LAT-allL was clearly slower, with abundant Golgi signal remaining after 90 min. Tracking the kinetics by quantitative imaging, LAT exited the Golgi ~2.5-fold faster than LAT-allL (Fig 3B-C [↗](#)). Strikingly, the TMD-only versions of these constructs behaved nearly identically to the full-length (Fig 3B-C [↗](#)). LAT-TMD, which has almost no residues that could interact with cytosolic trafficking machinery, had similar Golgi-exit kinetics as full length VSVG (Fig S3), a model transmembrane secretory cargo. The timescale for efflux of VSVG from the Golgi ($t_{1/2} \sim 0.5$ hr) measured here with RUSH is consistent with a previous measurement by an orthogonal method relying on temperature-sensitive transport (Hirschberg et al., 1998 [↗](#)).

To validate these conclusions in a different experimental paradigm, we measured Golgi exit kinetics after a temperature block. It was previously shown that culturing mammalian cells at 15–20°C leads to accumulation of secretory cargo in the Golgi (Milgram and Mains, 1994 [↗](#); Venditti et al., 2019 [↗](#)). To accumulate our probes in the Golgi, we used the ER-RUSH constructs to initially restrict them to the ER (Fig 3D [↗](#), left). Biotin was then added at 17°C for 3 h to release the protein from the ER and allow sufficient time to accumulate in the Golgi. The cells were then shifted to 37°C to synchronize Golgi export. As with Golgi-RUSH, LAT largely exited the Golgi within 90 min, whereas LAT-allL was significantly slower, with notable Golgi accumulation remaining after 2 h (Fig 3D [↗](#)). The kinetics of the temperature-block experiment were similar to Golgi RUSH, with raft-preferring LAT exiting Golgi ~2-fold faster than non-raft LAT-allL. Based on these observations, we conclude that TMD-encoded raft affinity is an essential determinant of Golgi exit kinetics for LAT.

Kinetic model of secretory traffic

We attempted to rationalize our observations of ER and Golgi efflux using a kinetic model wherein the secretory kinetics of a TMP are determined by equilibrium partitioning between coexisting compartments in the ER and Golgi (Fig 4A [↗](#)). In the model, partitioning to an ER-exit compartment (ERex) (analogous to a cellular ER exit site) allows ER efflux with first-order rate constant k_a . Full-length and TMD-only proteins have different partition coefficients into this ERex compartment, represented by two free fit parameters $K_{p,ERex_full}$ and $K_{p,ERex_TMD}$.

Analogously in the Golgi, we model coexisting compartments that enrich raft or non-raft proteins, again with partition coefficients (i.e. $K_{p,raft_LAT}$ and $K_{p,raft_allL}$) describing the ratio of a protein's concentration in the two compartments. These values were set by measurements of $K_{p,raft}$ for the various constructs in GPMVs (Fig 1A-B [↗](#)), with the assumption that raft affinities measured at the PM are representative of those in the Golgi. A first-order rate constant k_b is used to describe the transfer of proteins from the Golgi raft sub-compartment to post-Golgi compartments. This conceptual model can be represented via a series of coupled differential equations describing the temporal evolution of abundance of various constructs in three compartments (ER, Golgi, post-Golgi). We emphasize that this model is highly simplified and does not include many features relevant to trafficking of endogenous proteins. Rather, the goal was to identify the minimal set of features that could describe the secretory behavior of our defined set of probes.

This simple model (four free parameters) was used to simultaneously fit experimental observations of eight independent data sets, i.e. release from the ER or from the Golgi for four different protein constructs (analogous to experiments described in Fig 1 [↗](#) and 3 [↗](#),




Figure 3.

Golgi exit kinetics of LAT are dependent on its association with raft domains.

(A) Representative confocal images of Golgi RUSH experiment show notable Golgi retention of non-raft constructs (LAT-aLL and aLL-TMD) after 90 min of biotin addition, in contrast to raft-preferring LAT and LAT-TMD. (B) Temporal reduction of protein constructs remaining in Golgi after biotin addition (i.e. release from Golgi RUSH), quantified by immunostaining and colocalization with Golgi marker (Giantin, see Fig S4). Symbols represent average $\pm$ st.dev. from 3 independent experiments with >15 cells/experiment. Fits represent exponential decays; shading represents 95% confidence intervals. (C) Golgi exit rates for raft-associated LAT constructs are ~ 2.5 -fold faster than non-raft versions for both full-length and TMD-only. Points represent $t_{1/2}$ values from fits of independent repeats with >20 cells/experiment. $*p < 0.05$, $^{ns}p > 0.05$. (D) Representative confocal images of full-length LAT and LAT-aLL during Golgi temperature block. Addition of biotin at 17°C releases ER-RUSH constructs but traps them in Golgi. Removing temperature block by incubation at 37°C leads to fast PM trafficking of LAT but not non-raft LAT-aLL. (E) Fraction of proteins in Golgi for the constructs shown in D, calculated as in B. Fits represent exponential decays. (inset) Golgi exit kinetics quantified as in C. All scale bars = 5 μ m.




Figure 4.

Kinetic model describing secretory traffic of LAT-based constructs.

(A) Schematic of kinetic model. (B) Global fit of model with four free parameters to ER and Golgi RUSH data for four experimental constructs. (C) Global fit of model with five free parameters (different $K_{p,ERex}$ for LAT and LAT-aLL). (D) Representative confocal images of Golgi RUSH experiments show notable Golgi retention for raft-preferring LAT after 2-day pre-treatment with Myr+ZA. Scale bars = 5 μ m. (E) Temporal dependence of the fraction of protein constructs remaining in Golgi after biotin addition (to release from Golgi RUSH). Symbols represent average $\pm$ st dev from 3 independent experiments with > 15 cells/exp. (F) Golgi exit rate for the raft-probe LAT-TMD is reduced when raft lipid synthesis is inhibited by Myr-ZA treatment. Points represent $t_{1/2}$ values of Golgi exit from fits of independent repeats with >20 cells/experiment. ** $p < 0.01$, $^{ns}p > 0.05$.

respectively). For comparison to the models, experimental datasets were re-measured via live-cell imaging (see Supp Fig 5) to directly quantify relative construct abundance in the ER or Golgi. Model global fits nicely reproduced the general experimental features of all constructs (**Fig 4B**), though with notable divergences. The general shape of both ER and Golgi efflux curves were well described by the model and the specific Golgi efflux kinetics for all four proteins were modeled quite accurately (**Fig 4B**, filled symbols). Consistent with expectation, the fitted ER exit partition coefficient ($K_{p,ERex_full}$) for full-length constructs (i.e. those containing the putative COPII binding motif) was ~20-fold greater than for TMD-only constructs. In contrast, the specific ER release kinetics could not be completely reproduced, with the model underestimating ER efflux rate for both constructs with raft-preferring TMDs, and overestimating those of the non-raft proteins (i.e. allL) (**Fig. 4B**, open symbols).

These fits could not be improved by adding a Golgi-to-ER retrieval path, consistent with none of our constructs possessing a known retrieval motif (i.e. KDEL) (not shown). However, excellent agreement between the model and all experimental observations could be obtained by allowing the ERex partition coefficients of LAT and LAT-allL to independently vary (**Fig 4C**). Put another way, in this 5-parameter fit, the TMD of these constructs was allowed to influence their affinity for the ER exit compartment. The best-fit was obtained when LAT with a wild-type TMD had ~6-fold greater affinity for the ERex than LAT-allL.

The general agreements between the model and observations support the plausibility of an underlying hypothesis that partitioning between coexisting membrane domains could explain the inter-organelle transfer kinetics in our study. A key aspect of the model is that selective Golgi membrane domains are important for Golgi exit kinetics of raft-associated cargo. To test this inference, we used inhibitors to block the production of raft-forming lipids (Lasserre et al., 2008; Levental et al., 2017) and tested their effects on trafficking rates of our probes. Specifically, sphingolipid and cholesterol synthesis were inhibited by treatment with 25 μ M myriocin and 5 μ M Zaragozic acid (MZA), respectively, for 2 days. This treatment was previously shown by us and others to reduce ordered membrane domain stability (Lasserre et al., 2008; Levental et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2023). We observed significantly reduced Golgi exit kinetics of LAT-TMD in MZA-treated cells, evidenced by clear Golgi localization up to 2 h after release of Golgi-RUSH, in contrast to control cells (**Fig 4D**). Quantifying exit kinetics by imaging Golgi residence, we observed that the half-time for Golgi exit was significantly increased (by ~60%) for the raft-preferring TMD but not for the non-raft allL-TMD (**Fig 4E-F**).

Segregation of raft from non-raft proteins in Golgi compartments

To directly image separation between raft and non-raft probes in the Golgi, we co-transfected RUSH versions of LAT-TMD and allL-TMD with the Golgin84-hook to reversibly accumulate both constructs in the Golgi. Their colocalization was then imaged using super-resolved Structured Illumination Microscopy (SIM) (**Fig 5A-B**). Prior to introduction of biotin, the two constructs showed near-perfect colocalization, as expected from their association with the same “hook”. However, 5 minutes after releasing the proteins with biotin, their colocalization was significantly reduced (**Fig 5C**), with areas of LAT-TMD and allL-TMD enrichment apparent within the general morphology of the Golgi (**Fig 5B**). Similar segregation of LAT-TMD from allL-TMD could be observed when both were accumulated in the Golgi via a 20°C temperature block (**Fig 5D**). Notably, such segregation was not observed when LAT-TMD was co-accumulated in the Golgi with either the full-length LAT or with raft-preferring GPI-GFP, which colocalized nearly completely with each other (**Fig 5D**).

To support these observations without relying on temperature modulation, we treated cells with a short-chain Ceramide (D-Ceramide-C6, Cer-C6) which was previously reported to disrupt Golgi organization and post-Golgi transport (Capasso et al., 2017; Duran et al., 2012; van Galen et al., 2014). We combined this treatment with the Golgi-RUSH (Golgin84-hook) constructs to determine the fate of raft- and non-raft probes when their Golgi exit is blocked. Trapping both




Figure 5.

Raft probes segregate from non-raft in Golgi.

(A) Raft vs non-raft probes trapped in Golgi by Golgi-RUSH (i.e. without biotin) and imaged by structured-illumination microscopy (SIM). (B) SIM images of localization of raft vs non-raft probes after 5 minutes of biotin addition to release Golgi RUSH. (C) Quantification of colocalization from SIM images by Pearson's coefficient in A and B. Symbols represent average $\pm$ st. dev. from 3 independent experiments with >15 cells/experiment. (D) Confocal images of cellular localization of co-transfected probes in cells grown at 20°C to accumulate probes in Golgi. (E) Quantification of colocalization under the conditions represented in D. Significances shown are relative to LAT-to-LAT-TMD. (F) Images of cellular localization of co-transfected Golgi-RUSH probes after treatment with biotin or C6-Cer. (G) Quantification of colocalization under the conditions represented in F. Significances shown are relative to - biotin/-Cer. (H) Quantification of raft affinity ($K_{p,raft}$) of TGN46 and ST, representatives of different Golgi sub-compartments. (I) Representative images of raft probes relative to Golgi sub-compartment markers under C6-Cer treatment. (J) Quantification of colocalization of proteins represented in I. Symbols in all quantifications are average $\pm$ st. dev. from 3 independent experiments with >15 cells/experiment. * $p < 0.05$.

constructs in Golgi via RUSH produced very high co-localization, as expected (**Fig 5F**). When the constructs were released with biotin in cells treated with Cer-C6, LAT-TMD and allL-TMD both remained in a perinuclear compartment with the general morphology of the Golgi, but their colocalization was notably reduced, with raft-TMD-rich and -depleted areas visible under confocal imaging (**Fig 5F**). This reduced colocalization was also observed without biotin present, suggesting that Cer-C6 led to a remodeling of the Golgi and associated spatial segregation of raft from non-raft probe proteins, as previously proposed (van Galen et al., 2014).

These observations are consistent with previous reports that proteins can segregate in Golgi (Chen et al., 2017; Patterson et al., 2008). Specifically, TGN46, a resident protein in the vesicular trans-Golgi network (TGN), was shown to physically segregate from a trans-Golgi-resident enzyme Sialyltransferase (ST) under Cer-C6 treatment (van Galen et al., 2014). To determine whether this physical segregation was related to the behavior of our raft domain probes, we co-transfected these Golgi-resident proteins with our probes and imaged them under Cer-C6 treatment. Intriguingly, in Cer-C6-treated cells, the raft probe (LAT-TMD) colocalized well with TGN46 but not with ST (**Fig 5G-H**). Conversely, the non-raft-preferring probe (allL-TMD) colocalized with ST, but not TGN46. These colocalization were consistent with the raft affinity of the Golgi markers evaluated in GPMVs: TGN46 was enriched in the raft phase approximately at parity with LAT-TMD, while ST was depleted from the raft phase (like allL-TMD). These observations support the hypothesis that proteins can segregate in Golgi based on their affinity for distinct membrane domains; however, it is important to emphasize that this segregation does not necessarily imply lateral lipid-driven domains *within* a Golgi cisterna. Reasonable alternative possibilities include separation between cisternae (rather than within), cargo vesicles moving between cisternae, or lateral domains that are mediated by protein assemblies rather than lipids.

Discussion

The central paradigm of membrane protein traffic involves recognition of cargo sorting motifs by adaptor proteins, which then associate with coat-forming machinery to form inter-organelle trafficking intermediates with compositions that are distinct from their source organelles. Our study suggests that lipid-mediated organization also plays a supporting role in this process.

Several short motifs in cargo cytosolic domains have been reported to mediate recognition by the COPII machinery for ER efflux. Originally identified were di-acidic (e.g. DxEx) and di-Leu motifs (Barlowe, 2003b), and more recently other sequences with similar roles were identified (Barlowe, 2003b; Mikros and Diallinas, 2019; Otsu et al., 2013). Our study reveals that a $\Phi\chi\Phi\chi\Phi$ motif mediates fast ER exit of the transmembrane scaffold LAT (**Fig 2**). Notably, constructs missing this motif (including LAT-TMD) still eventually fully exit the ER and reach their steady-state localization, consistent with passive “leakage” from the ER even in the absence of viable COPII interactions.

Although this motif plays a dominant role in determining LAT ER exit kinetics, our observations suggest a minor contribution of lipid interactions with the protein’s TMD. This contribution is revealed in different ER exit kinetics of raft- and nonraft-preferring versions of either full-length or TMD-only constructs (**Fig 1G**). This inference was supported by the kinetic model, which showed the best global fit to experiments when raft-preferring LAT-TMD had a somewhat higher partitioning to ER exit compartments than nonraft LAT-allL (**Fig 4C**). A possible contribution of lipid domains to ER traffic is surprising, as ER cholesterol abundance is believed to be too low to allow formation of ordered lipid domains (van Meer et al., 2008). However, synthetic lipid experiments show that cholesterol concentrations as low as 10 mol% can support liquid-ordered phases (Veatch and Keller, 2002, 2003) and locally high cholesterol concentrations are possible through localized production, recruitment by proteins, and/or diffusion barriers (Prasad et al., 2020). Indeed, enrichment of fluorescent cholesterol at some ER exit sites was recently

reported (Weigel et al., 2021 [↗](#)). We emphasize that our study provides no direct evidence for rafts in the ER and much more extensive characterization would be required to make a convincing claim. However, both our data and model reveal that preferences of certain proteins for ordered membrane regions affect their ER exit rates.

Sorting of protein and lipid cargo in the late secretory pathway is the originally proposed role for raft domains in cells (Simons and Ikonen, 1997 [↗](#)), supported by the Golgi's relatively high levels of cholesterol, sphingomyelin, and glycolipids (Jackson et al., 2016 [↗](#); van Meer et al., 2008 [↗](#)). Segregation of cargo prior to Golgi exit has been microscopically observed (Chen et al., 2017 [↗](#)) and anterograde sorting to the PM is facilitated by palmitoylation (Chum et al., 2016 [↗](#); Ernst et al., 2018 [↗](#)), a post-translational modification that imparts raft affinity to many TMPs (Levental et al., 2010 [↗](#); Lorent et al., 2017 [↗](#)). PM-directed vesicles in yeast are enriched in sterols and sphingolipids relative to the Golgi, supporting a raft-based sorting model (Klemm et al., 2009 [↗](#); Surma et al., 2011 [↗](#)). Similarly, in mammalian cells, sphingomyelin is enriched in certain Golgi-to-PM carriers (Deng et al., 2016 [↗](#); Sundberg et al., 2019 [↗](#)). Our observations are consistent with these results and implicate ordered lipid domains in trafficking of LAT from the Golgi. This conclusion is also consistent with a previously proposed model of transport through the Golgi via rapid partitioning of cargo between two coexisting membrane phases (Patterson et al., 2008 [↗](#)), with the 'phases' in our model representing coexisting ordered and disordered lipid-driven membrane domains.

Full-length LAT and its isolated TMD have similar Golgi efflux kinetics, both of which are approximately 2-fold faster than nonraft analogs (**Fig 3** [↗](#)). This behavior was observed with either RUSH or temperature-block and supported by our kinetic model, which predicts raft-dependent exit from the Golgi (**Fig. 4** [↗](#)). Whether these observations reflect faster movement between cisternae or faster exit at the TGN remains an open question.

Direct visualization of lipid-driven domains remains a challenge, particularly acute in intracellular membranes which are often small and have complex morphologies. Our SIM imaging suggests segregation of raft from nonraft cargo in the Golgi shortly (5 min) after RUSH release (**Fig 5B** [↗](#)), but at this level of resolution, we can only report reduced colocalization, not intra-Golgi protein distributions. Moreover, segregation within a Golgi cisterna would be very difficult to distinguish from cargo moving between cisternae at different rates or exiting via Golgi-proximal vesicles. Perhaps the most striking instance of separation of raft-from nonraft-Golgi is observable after treatment with a short-chain ceramide (C6-cer), which has been reported to disrupt formation of post-Golgi vesicles (Campelo et al., 2017 [↗](#); van Galen et al., 2014 [↗](#)). In these distorted Golgi, we observe selective colocalization of the raft probe with TGN-46, and *vice versa* for nonraft and ST (**Fig 6**).

Collectively, these observations suggest that raft domains play a major role in Golgi-to-PM traffic for certain cargoes and that raft affinity is the dominant determinant of Golgi efflux kinetics for LAT. This protein belongs to a family of transmembrane adaptor proteins (TRAPs) with similar general structures and functions (Chum et al., 2016 [↗](#); Park and Yun, 2009 [↗](#)), suggesting that these observations may be relevant for this class of proteins and perhaps others without motifs for clathrin- and adaptor-mediated sorting. In contrast, rafts may play a more subordinate role in ER exit, perhaps facilitating the sorting of certain cargo proteins and lipids to ER exit sites.

Material and methods

Cell culture

HEK-293NT (HEK) and HeLa cells were purchased from ATCC and cultured in medium containing 89% Eagle's Minimum Essential Medium (EMEM), 10% FCS, and 1% penicillin/streptomycin at 37 °C in humidified 5% CO₂. COS-7 cells were cultured in medium containing the same formulation but with Dulbecco Modified Essential Medium (DMEM) instead of EMEM and under the same conditions. Transfection was done by Lipofectamine 3000 using the protocols provided with the reagents. 4–6 h after transfection, cells were washed with PBS and then incubated with serum-free medium overnight. To synchronize the cells, 1 h before biotin addition, the cells were given full-serum medium. Lipid synthesis inhibitors (25 uM Myriocin and 5 uM Zaragozic Acid) were added for to the medium and given to the cells 2 days before transfection and during the whole experiment. D-Ceramide-C6 was added to the medium alone or in combination with biotin and given to the cells for 4 h, and then cells were fixed.

Plasmids and mutations

All single pass protein constructs from the ER were based on the bicistronic GPI RUSH backbone previously described. We replaced the protein and fluorophore by the amino acid sequence of LAT-TMD, which is NH₂-MEEAILVPCVLGLLLLPILAMLMALCVHCHRLP followed by a short linker (GSGS) and monomeric RFP (mRFP). A full length (LAT, LATallL, LAX) and TMD library (all-TMD, allA8L-TMD, LAT-TMD6Dendo, Tfr-TMD, LAX-TMD, VSVG-TMD, LATDC1-4, P148E, P148S, P148A, A150S, P151S, P151A, A183S) were generated by amplifying the sequence of interest by PCR and subsequent cloning of the mutant sequence into the LAT-TMD RUSH construct with KDEL hook to synchronize from the ER. Several constructs were purchased from Addgene: full length RUSH version of VSVG (#65300). All the single pass RUSH constructs from Golgi were based on the bicistronic VSVG RUSH backbone kindly donated by Jennifer Lippincott-Schwartz lab. We cut the construct with BamHI and EcoRI and replaced the protein with LAT, LATallL, LAT-TMD or all-TMD by amplifying the sequence of interest by PCR. TGN46 and ST plasmids were provided by Felix Campelo lab.

Imaging

Unless specified, imaging was performed on a confocal microscope using appropriate filters for GFP/RFP fluorescence for transfected plasmids. Single-cell tracking live imaging was performed using u-dish Grid-50 glass bottom plates (Ibidi GmbH) to relocate the selected cells at each acquisition after incubating at 37°C in the incubator when not imaging. When needed, cells were fixed using 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA), 10 min at RT. Anti-Giantin (1:1000 Rabbit polyclonal, Abcam ab80864) was used to create Golgi mask.

RUSH expression and chase

In brief, transfected cells with different plasmids containing the RUSH retention system were incubated overnight at 37 °C, and then incubated in the presence of 100 µM biotin (Sigma-Aldrich) to release the cargo proteins. Cells were incubated at 37°C for various chase times and either directly imaged or fixed with PFA as described above.

GPMVs and Kp quants

Cell membranes were stained with 5 µg/ml of FAST-DiO (Invitrogen), green fluorescent lipid dye that strongly partitions to disordered phases (Levental and Levental, 2015b [\[link\]](#)). Following staining, GPMVs were isolated from transfected HEK-293, or HeLa cells as described (Sezgin et al., 2012 [\[link\]](#)) (cell type had no effect on results). Briefly, GPMV formation was induced by 2 mM N-

ethylmaleimide (NEM) in hypotonic buffer containing 100 mM NaCl, 10 mM HEPES, and 2 mM CaCl₂, pH 7.4. To quantify protein partitioning, GPMVs were observed on an inverted epifluorescence microscope (Nikon) at 4°C after treatment with 200 μM DCA to stabilize phase separation; this treatment has been previously demonstrated not to affect raft affinity of various proteins (Zhou et al., 2013). The partition coefficient ($K_{p,raft}$) for each protein construct was calculated from fluorescence intensity of the construct in the raft and non-raft phase for >10 vesicles/trial (e.g. Fig. 1), with multiple independent experiments for each construct.

Conservation analysis

After discarding uncharacterized proteins and taking just the first 100 results from 246 hits in the Blast for LAT sequence extracted from Uniprot database, we have used Unipro Ugene to analyze the results of 30 species with > 80% similarity.

Kinetic model for trafficking of RUSH constructs

Residence fraction data were analyzed globally by numerically solving a first-order, homogeneous system of equations that accounts for intra- and inter-compartment transport. A schematic of the trafficking model is shown in Fig. 4A. Briefly, the ER was modeled with two sub-compartments representing bulk and exit sites, with an intra-ER partition coefficient $K_{p,ERex}$, defined as the ratio of concentrations between the exit and bulk compartments. Similarly, the Golgi was modeled with two sub-compartments representing raft and non-raft sites, with an intra-Golgi partition coefficient $K_{p,raft}$, i.e. the ratio of concentrations between the raft and nonraft compartments. These values are set in the model via measurements of $K_{p,raft}$ in GPMVs (Fig. 1)(Diaz-Rohrer et al., 2023; Lorent et al., 2017). Inter-compartment trafficking from ER to Golgi initiates from ER exit sites and terminates at the Golgi with a rate constant k_a , while unidirectional post-Golgi traffic originating from Golgi raft sites was modeled with a rate constant k_b . In total, the trafficking model for a given construct is a function of two rate constants and two partition coefficients, one of which is fixed experimentally.

Eight data sets representing the ER and Golgi efflux kinetics of LAT, LAT-TMD, AllL-LAT, and AllL-TMD were fit to the trafficking model. We performed a single global analysis (i.e. simultaneous fit of all eight data sets) using k_a , k_b , and two $K_{p,ERex}$ (one for full-length and one for TMD-only) as free fit parameters. A second analysis included a third $K_{p,ERex}$, allowing LAT and LAT-allL to be different.

All analysis was performed with custom code written in Mathematica v.12.2 (Wolfram Research Inc., Champaign, IL). Model parameters were optimized with a Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm implemented in the built-in Mathematica function NonlinearModelFit. The target function for minimization was the sum of squared residuals for the combined data sets, $\chi^2 = \sum_i \sum_j (y_{ij} - \bar{y}_{ij})^2$, where i indexes the eight data sets, j indexes the data points within a data set, y_{ij} is the observed residence fraction, and $\bar{y}_{ij}$ is the predicted residence fraction. To improve the probability of finding the global minimum, the optimization was repeated 10^3 times with different random initial values for the adjustable parameters; the best-fit parameters associated with the overall lowest χ^2 value is reported as the solution. The code for the model is available at doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10478607.

Acknowledgements

We thank members of the Levental lab for their discussions and critical feedback. Funding for this work was provided by the NIH/National Institute of General Medical Sciences (GM124072, GM134949, F32GM145028 to CRS), the Volkswagen Foundation (grant 93091), and the Human Frontiers Science Program (RGP0059/2019). Flow cytometry was performed in the University of

Virginia Flow Cytometry Core, RRID: SCR_017829. All authors have no competing interests. The order of equally contributing authors is arbitrary. P.L. and F.C. acknowledge support from the Government of Spain (RYC-2017-22227, PID2019-106232RB-I00/10.13039/501100011033; Severo Ochoa CEX2019-000910-S), Fundació Cellex, Fundació Mir-Puig, and Generalitat de Catalunya (CERCA, AGAUR).

References

- Abrami L., Liu S., Cosson P., Leppla S.H., van der Goot F.G. (2003) **Anthrax toxin triggers endocytosis of its receptor via a lipid raft-mediated clathrin-dependent process** *J Cell Biol* **160**:321–328
- Barlowe C. (2003) **Molecular recognition of cargo by the COPII complex: a most accommodating coat** *Cell* **114**:395–397
- Barlowe C. (2003) **Signals for COPII-dependent export from the ER: what's the ticket out?** *Trends in cell biology* **13**:295–300
- Boncompain G., Divoux S., Gareil N., de Forges H., Lescure A., Latreche L., Mercanti V., Jollivet F., Raposo G., Perez F. (2012) **Synchronization of secretory protein traffic in populations of cells** *Nat Methods* **9**:493–498
- Campelo F., van Galen J., Turacchio G., Parashuraman S., Kozlov M.M., Garcia-Parajo M.F., Malhotra V. (2017) **Sphingomyelin metabolism controls the shape and function of the Golgi cisternae** *eLife* **6**
- Capasso S. *et al.* (2017) **Sphingolipid metabolic flow controls phosphoinositide turnover at the trans-Golgi network** *EMBO J* **36**:1736–1754
- Castello-Serrano I., Lorent J.H., Ippolito R., Levental K.R., Levental I. (2020) **Myelin-Associated MAL and PLP Are unusual among multipass transmembrane proteins in preferring ordered membrane domains** *J Phys Chem B* **124**:5930–5939
- Castillon G.A., Aguilera-Romero A., Manzano-Lopez J., Epstein S., Kajiwarra K., Funato K., Watanabe R., Riezman H., Muniz M. (2011) **The yeast p24 complex regulates GPI-anchored protein transport and quality control by monitoring anchor remodeling** *Mol Biol Cell* **22**:2924–2936
- Chen Y., Gershlick D.C., Park S.Y., Bonifacino J.S. (2017) **Segregation in the Golgi complex precedes export of endolysosomal proteins in distinct transport carriers** *J Cell Biol* **216**:4141–4151
- Chum T., Glatzova D., Kviclova Z., Malinsky J., Brdicka T., Cebecauer M. (2016) **The role of palmitoylation and transmembrane domain in sorting of transmembrane adaptor proteins** *J Cell Sci* **129**:95–107
- Deng Y., Rivera-Molina F.E., Toomre D.K., Burd C.G. (2016) **Sphingomyelin is sorted at the trans Golgi network into a distinct class of secretory vesicle** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**:6677–6682
- di Ronza A. *et al.* (2018) **CLN8 is an endoplasmic reticulum cargo receptor that regulates lysosome biogenesis** *Nat Cell Biol* **20**:1370–1377
- Diao A., Rahman D., Pappin D.J., Lucocq J., Lowe M. (2003) **The coiled-coil membrane protein golgin-84 is a novel rab effector required for Golgi ribbon formation** *J Cell Biol* **160**:201–212

- Diaz-Rohrer B., Castello-Serrano I., Chan S.H., Wang H., Shurer C.R., Levental K.R., Levental I. (2023) **Rab3 mediates a pathway for endocytic sorting and plasma membrane recycling of ordered microdomains** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **120**
- Diaz-Rohrer B., Levental K.R., Levental I. (2014) **Rafting through traffic: Membrane domains in cellular logistics** *Biochim Biophys Acta-Biomembr* **1838**:3003–3013
- Diaz-Rohrer B.B., Levental K.R., Simons K., Levental I. (2014) **Membrane raft association is a determinant of plasma membrane localization** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**:8500–8505
- Duran J.M. *et al.* (2012) **Sphingomyelin organization is required for vesicle biogenesis at the Golgi complex** *EMBO J* **31**:4535–4546
- Elbaz Y., Schuldiner M. (2011) **Staying in touch: the molecular era of organelle contact sites** *Trends Biochem Sci* **36**:616–623
- Elson E.L., Fried E., Dolbow J.E., Genin G.M. (2010) **Phase separation in biological membranes: integration of theory and experiment** *Annu Rev Biophys* **39**:207–226
- Ernst A.M. *et al.* (2018) **S-Palmitoylation Sorts Membrane Cargo for Anterograde Transport in the Golgi** *Dev Cell* **47**:479–493
- Fabbri M., Di Meglio S., Gagliani M.C., Consonni E., Molteni R., Bender J.R., Tacchetti C., Pardi R. (2005) **Dynamic partitioning into lipid rafts controls the endo-exocytic cycle of the alphaL/beta2 integrin, LFA-1, during leukocyte chemotaxis** *Mol Biol Cell* **16**:5793–5803
- Farias G.G., Cuitino L., Guo X., Ren X., Jarnik M., Mattera R., Bonifacino J.S. (2012) **Signal-mediated, AP-1/clathrin-independent sorting of transmembrane receptors to the somatodendritic domain of hippocampal neurons** *Neuron* **75**:810–823
- Ford C., Parchure A., von Blume J., Burd C.G. (2021) **Cargo sorting at the trans-Golgi network at a glance** *Journal of Cell Science* **134**
- Gagescu R., Demaurex N., Parton R.G., Hunziker W., Huber L.A., Gruenberg J. (2000) **The recycling endosome of Madin-Darby canine kidney cells is a mildly acidic compartment rich in raft components** *Mol Biol Cell* **11**:2775–2791
- Glebov O.O., Bright N.A., Nichols B.J. (2006) **Flotillin-1 defines a clathrin-independent endocytic pathway in mammalian cells** *Nat Cell Biol* **8**:46–54
- Gomez-Navarro N., Melero A., Li X.H., Boulanger J., Kukulski W., Miller E.A. (2020) **Cargo crowding contributes to sorting stringency in COPII vesicles** *J Cell Biol* **219**
- Hirschberg K., Miller C.M., Ellenberg J., Presley J.F., Siggia E.D., Phair R.D., Lippincott-Schwartz J. (1998) **Kinetic analysis of secretory protein traffic and characterization of golgi to plasma membrane transport intermediates in living cells** *J Cell Biol* **143**:1485–1503
- Jackson C.L., Walch L., Verbavatz J.M. (2016) **Lipids and Their Trafficking: An Integral Part of Cellular Organization** *Dev Cell* **39**:139–153
- Klemm R.W. *et al.* (2009) **Segregation of sphingolipids and sterols during formation of secretory vesicles at the trans-Golgi network** *J Cell Biol* **185**:601–612

- Kuehn M.J., Herrmann J.M., Schekman R. (1998) **COPII-cargo interactions direct protein sorting into ER-derived transport vesicles** *Nature* **391**:187–190
- Lafont F., Verkade P., Galli T., Wimmer C., Louvard D., Simons K. (1999) **Raft association of SNAP receptors acting in apical trafficking in Madin–Darby canine kidney cells** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **96**:3734–3738
- Lasserre R. *et al.* (2008) **Raft nanodomains contribute to Akt/PKB plasma membrane recruitment and activation** *Nat Chem Biol* **4**:538–547
- Levental I., Grzybek M., Simons K. (2011) **Raft domains of variable properties and compositions in plasma membrane vesicles** *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **108**:11411–11416
- Levental I., Levental K.R., Heberle F.A. (2020) **Lipid rafts: controversies resolved, mysteries remain** *Trends in cell biology* **30**:341–353
- Levental I., Lingwood D., Grzybek M., Coskun U., Simons K. (2010) **Palmitoylation regulates raft affinity for the majority of integral raft proteins** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **107**:22050–22054
- Levental K.R., Levental I. (2015) **Giant plasma membrane vesicles: models for understanding membrane organization** *Current topics in membranes* **75**:25–57
- Levental K.R., Levental I. (2015) **Isolation of giant plasma membrane vesicles for evaluation of plasma membrane structure and protein partitioning** *Methods in molecular biology* **1232**:65–77
- Levental K.R., Surma M.A., Skinkle A.D., Lorent J.H., Zhou Y., Klose C., Chang J.T., Hancock J.F., Levental I. (2017) **omega-3 polyunsaturated fatty acids direct differentiation of the membrane phenotype in mesenchymal stem cells to potentiate osteogenesis** *Science advances* **3**
- Lippincott-Schwartz J., Roberts T.H., Hirschberg K. (2000) **Secretory protein trafficking and organelle dynamics in living cells** *Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol* **16**:557–589
- Lorent J.H., Diaz-Rohrer B., Lin X., Spring K., Gorfe A.A., Levental K.R., Levental I. (2017) **Structural determinants and functional consequences of protein affinity for membrane rafts** *Nature communications* **8**
- Luini A., Mironov A.A., Polishchuk E.V., Polishchuk R.S. (2008) **Morphogenesis of post-Golgi transport carriers** *Histochem Cell Biol* **129**:153–161
- Lujan P., Campelo F. (2021) **Should I stay or should I go? Golgi membrane spatial organization for protein sorting and retention** *Archives of biochemistry and biophysics* **707**
- Lujan P., Garcia-Cabau C., Wakana Y., Rodilla-Ramírez C., Malhotra V., Salvatella X., Garcia-Parajo M.F., Campelo F. (2022) **Sorting of secretory proteins at the trans-Golgi network by TGN46** *bioRxiv*
- McCaughy J., Stephens D.J. (2019) **ER-to-Golgi Transport: A Sizeable Problem** *Trends Cell Biol* **29**:940–953

- Mesmin B., Bigay J., Moser von Filseck J., Lacas-Gervais S., Drin G., Antonny B. (2013) **A four-step cycle driven by PI(4)P hydrolysis directs sterol/PI(4)P exchange by the ER-Golgi tether OSBP** *Cell* **155**:830–843
- Mikros E., Diallinas G. (2019) **Tales of tails in transporters** *Open Biol* **9**
- Milgram S.L., Mains R.E. (1994) **Differential effects of temperature blockade on the proteolytic processing of three secretory granule-associated proteins** *J Cell Sci* **107**:737–745
- Munro S. (2003) **Lipid rafts: elusive or illusive?** *Cell* **115**:377–388
- Nishimura N., Plutner H., Hahn K., Balch W.E. (2002) **The delta subunit of AP-3 is required for efficient transport of VSV-G from the trans-Golgi network to the cell surface** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **99**:6755–6760
- Otsu W., Kurooka T., Otsuka Y., Sato K., Inaba M. (2013) **A new class of endoplasmic reticulum export signal PhiXPhiXPhi for transmembrane proteins and its selective interaction with Sec24C** *J Biol Chem* **288**:18521–18532
- Otte S., Barlowe C. (2004) **Sorting signals can direct receptor-mediated export of soluble proteins into COPII vesicles** *Nat Cell Biol* **6**:1189–1194
- Pantazopoulou A., Glick B.S. (2019) **A Kinetic View of Membrane Traffic Pathways Can Transcend the Classical View of Golgi Compartments** *Frontiers in cell and developmental biology* **7**
- Park I., Yun Y. (2009) **Transmembrane adaptor proteins positively regulating the activation of lymphocytes** *Immune Netw* **9**:53–57
- Park S.Y., Guo X. (2014) **Adaptor protein complexes and intracellular transport** *Biosci Rep* **34**
- Patterson G.H., Hirschberg K., Polishchuk R.S., Gerlich D., Phair R.D., Lippincott-Schwartz J. (2008) **Transport through the Golgi apparatus by rapid partitioning within a two-phase membrane system** *Cell* **133**:1055–1067
- Phillips M.J., Voeltz G.K. (2016) **Structure and function of ER membrane contact sites with other organelles** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **17**:69–82
- Prasad R., Sliwa-Gonzalez A., Barral Y. (2020) **Mapping bilayer thickness in the ER membrane** *Science advances* **6**
- Puertollano R., Aguilar R.C., Gorshkova I., Crouch R.J., Bonifacio J.S. (2001) **Sorting of Mannose 6-Phosphate Receptors Mediated by the GGAs** *Science* **292**:1712–1716
- Sabharanjak S., Sharma P., Parton R.G., Mayor S. (2002) **GPI-anchored proteins are delivered to recycling endosomes via a distinct cdc42-regulated, clathrin-independent pinocytic pathway** *Dev Cell* **2**:411–423
- Sato K., Nakano A. (2007) **Mechanisms of COPII vesicle formation and protein sorting** *FEBS Lett* **581**:2076–2082
- Sezgin E., Kaiser H.J., Baumgart T., Schuille P., Simons K., Levental I. (2012) **Elucidating membrane structure and protein behavior using giant plasma membrane vesicles** *Nat Protoc* **7**:1042–1051

- Sezgin E., Levental I., Mayor S., Eggeling C. (2017) **The mystery of membrane organization: composition, regulation and roles of lipid rafts** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **18**:361–374
- Simons K., Ikonen E. (1997) **Functional rafts in cell membranes** *Nature* **387**:569–572
- Sundberg E.L., Deng Y., Burd C.G. (2019) **Syndecan-1 Mediates Sorting of Soluble Lipoprotein Lipase with Sphingomyelin-Rich Membrane in the Golgi Apparatus** *Dev Cell*
- Surma M.A., Klose C., Klemm R.W., Ejsing C.S., Simons K. (2011) **Generic sorting of raft lipids into secretory vesicles in yeast** *Traffic* **12**:1139–1147
- Tan J.Z.A., Gleeson P.A. (2019) **Cargo Sorting at the trans-Golgi Network for Shunting into Specific Transport Routes: Role of Arf Small G Proteins and Adaptor Complexes** *Cells* **8**
- van Galen J., Campelo F., Martinez-Alonso E., Scarpa M., Martinez-Menarguez J.A., Malhotra V. (2014) **Sphingomyelin homeostasis is required to form functional enzymatic domains at the trans-Golgi network** *J Cell Biol* **206**:609–618
- van Meer G., Voelker D.R., Feigenson G.W. (2008) **Membrane lipids: where they are and how they behave** *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **9**:112–124
- Veatch S.L., Keller S.L. (2002) **Organization in lipid membranes containing cholesterol** *Phys Rev Lett* **89**
- Veatch S.L., Keller S.L. (2003) **Separation of liquid phases in giant vesicles of ternary mixtures of phospholipids and cholesterol** *Biophys J* **85**:3074–3083
- Venditti R. *et al.* (2019) **The activity of Sac1 across ER-TGN contact sites requires the four-phosphate-adaptor-protein-1** *J Cell Biol* **218**:783–797
- Wang H., Chan S.H., Dey S., Castello-Serrano I., Ditlev J.A., Rosen M.K., Levental K.R., Levental I. (2023) **Coupling of protein condensates to ordered lipid domains determines functional membrane organization** *Science advances in press*
- Weigel A.V. *et al.* (2021) **ER-to-Golgi protein delivery through an interwoven, tubular network extending from ER** *Cell* **184**:2412–2429
- Zhou Y., Maxwell K.N., Sezgin E., Lu M., Liang H., Hancock J.F., Dial E.J., Lichtenberger L.M., Levental I. (2013) **Bile acids modulate signaling by functional perturbation of plasma membrane domains** *J Biol Chem* **288**:35660–35670

Article and author information

Ivan Castello-Serrano

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904

Fred A. Heberle

Department of Chemistry, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN 37996

Barbara Diaz-Rohrer

Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard

Rossana Ippolito

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904

Carolyn R. Shurer

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904

Pablo Lujan

ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain

Felix Campelo

ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fòniques, The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona, Spain

Kandice R. Levental

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904

For correspondence: krl6c@virginia.edu

ORCID iD: [0000-0002-1206-9545](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1206-9545)

Ilya Levental

Department of Molecular Physiology and Biological Physics, Center for Membrane and Cell Physiology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22904

For correspondence: il2sy@virginia.edu

Copyright

© 2023, Castello-Serrano et al.

This article is distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted use and redistribution provided that the original author and source are credited.

Editors

Reviewing Editor

Satyajit Mayor

Marine Biological Laboratory, Woods Hole, United States of America

Senior Editor

Benoît Kornmann

University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom

Joint Public Review:

In their revised manuscript additional experiments have been conducted competently, and the interpretation of experiments regarding exit from the ER are convincing. They collectively indicate that the phase partitioning behaviour of the TMDs do not have a significant effect on exit from the ER; they all exit the ER very slowly unless they carry a short

cytoplasmic domain from LAT which is sufficient to accelerate ER exit. This data is consistent with available literature supporting a role for a ER-exit signal. Along with new experiments in their revision, they have also toned down the assertion that their data rule out a phase partitioning mechanism at the ER.

The authors, however, continue to interpret their experiments regarding Golgi exit of the transmembrane peptides (with luminal and cytoplasmic domains) as conclusive evidence of the role of lipid rafts in exit from the Golgi. This is once again based on correlation of the phase partitioning behaviour of these proteins in GPMVs, phase separated at low temperatures. They argue that this represents very strong evidence that trafficking out of the Golgi is driven by phase separation. The reviewers consider that there are a number of potential issues with the final model that need to be addressed.

We reiterate that:

(1) the phase segregation in the GPMV at low temperatures is dictated by thermodynamics given its composition and the measurement temperature. However at physiological temperatures at which membrane trafficking is taking place these GPMVs will not exhibit phase separation. Hence it is difficult to argue that a sorting mechanism based solely on the partitioning of the synthetic TM constructs into liquid ordered domain detected at low temperatures in GPMVs provide an explanation of the differential kinetics of traffic of the LAT TMD and the allL-TMD constructs, although there is a strong correlation with its phase partitioning behaviour.

(2) The fluctuations of lipid composition resembling lo-domains if persisting at higher temperatures and its conversion into a sorting domain will require a cellular mechanism, that may or may not retain similar properties of these lipidic environments. Additionally, TMDs from TfR/VsVG and GPI prefer different domains in the GPMV assays (Table S1) yet they traffic to the cell surface equally rapidly.

(3) The authors fail to discuss the point raised about the relatively high colocalization of TfR with the GPI probe (seen in Fig 5E) in the Golgi. This is inconsistent with their explanation of traffic correlating with partitioning into distinct domains in the Golgi, since TfR and GPI probes show an opposite preference for lo versus ld domains in cooled GPMVs. TMD-allL and the LAT-allL are segregated from TfR in the Golgi, and end up in a different final destination (ie lysosomes). This could represent yet another membrane specialisation in the Golgi for lysosomal traffic. The segregation that the authors report in the Golgi is therefore not a convincing argument for phase preferences in GPMVs dictating the trafficking behaviour of these molecules towards the plasma membrane.

(4) Despite the authors' claim in their rebuttal that 'we feel that GPMVs are a useful tool for quantifying protein preference for ordered (raft) membrane domains and that this preference is a useful proxy for the raft-associated behavior ... biological membrane with a relevant and measurable cellular outcome, specifically inter-organelle trafficking rates.' - several caveats for these observations need to be addressed before they constitute strong evidence for the raft model of membrane trafficking proposed. Phase partitioning in GPMVs is just another operational definition and while more refined (ie the data is derived from the membrane of interest, ie, the plasma membrane) it is not very different conceptually from quantitative measurements of detergent-insolubility.

(5) Further work is necessary to establish that ordered domains are formed at the Golgi at physiological temperatures, into which these proteins may partition; subsequently, there must be a mechanism that selectively traffics these proteins towards the cell surface.

(6) The authors continue to conflate thermodynamic phase separation mechanisms with the real possibility of the formation of functional sorting domains by cellular mechanisms that likely involve lipidic interactions, adding to the confusion in the literature.

Author response:

The following is the authors' response to the original reviews.

Editor's summary:

This paper by Castello-Serrano et al. addresses the role of lipid rafts in trafficking in the secretory pathway. By performing carefully controlled experiments with synthetic membrane proteins derived from the transmembrane region of LAT, the authors describe, model and quantify the importance of transmembrane domains in the kinetics of trafficking of a protein through the cell. Their data suggest affinity for ordered domains influences the kinetics of exit from the Golgi. Additional microscopy data suggest that lipid-driven partitioning might segregate Golgi membranes into domains. However, the relationship between the partitioning of the synthetic membrane proteins into ordered domains visualised ex vivo in GPMVs, and the domains in the TGN, remain at best correlative. Additional experiments that relate to the existence and nature of domains at the TGN are necessary to provide a direct connection between the phase partitioning capability of the transmembrane regions of membrane proteins and the sorting potential of this phenomenon.

The authors have used the RUSH system to study the traffic of model secretory proteins containing single-pass transmembrane domains that confer defined affinities for liquid ordered (lo) phases in Giant Plasma Membrane derived Vesicles (GPMVs), out of the ER and Golgi. A native protein termed LAT partitioned into these lo-domains, unlike a synthetic model protein termed LAT-allL, which had a substituted transmembrane domain. The authors experiments provide support for the idea that ER exit relies on motifs in the cytosolic tails, but that accelerated Golgi exit is correlated with lo domain partitioning.

Additional experiments provided evidence for segregation of Golgi membranes into coexisting lipid-driven domains that potentially concentrate different proteins. Their inference is that lipid rafts play an important role in Golgi exit. While this is an attractive idea, the experiments described in this manuscript do not provide a convincing argument one way or the other. It does however revive the discussion about the relationship between the potential for phase partitioning and its influence on membrane traffic.

We thank the editors and scientific reviewers for thorough evaluation of our manuscript and for positive feedback. While we agree that our experimental findings present a correlation between trafficking rates and raft affinity, in our view, the synthetic, minimal nature of the transmembrane protein constructs in question makes a strong argument for involvement of membrane domains in their trafficking. These constructs have no known sorting determinants and are unlikely to interact directly with trafficking proteins in cells, since they contain almost no extramembrane amino acids. Yet, the LAT-TMD traffics through Golgi similarly to the full-length LAT protein, but quite different from mutants with lower raft phase affinity. We suggest that these observations can be best rationalized by involvement of raft domains in the trafficking fates and rates of these constructs, providing strong evidence (beyond a simple correlation) for the existence and relevance of such domains.

We have substantially revised the manuscript to address all reviewer comments, including several new experiments and analyses. These revisions have substantially improved the manuscript without changing any of the core conclusions and we are pleased to have this version considered as the “version of record” in eLife.

Below is our point-by-point response to all reviewer comments.

ER exit:

The experiments conducted to identify an ER exit motif in the C-terminal domain of LAT are straightforward and convincing. This is also consistent with available literature. The authors should comment on whether the conservation of the putative COPII association motif (detailed in Fig. 2A) is significantly higher than that of other parts of the C-terminal domain.

Thank you for this suggestion, this information has now been included as Supp Fig 2B. While there are other wellconserved residues of the LAT C-terminus, many regions have relatively low conservation. In contrast, the essential residues of the COPII association motif (P148 and A150) are completely conserved across in LAT across all species analyzed.

One cause of concern is that addition of a short cytoplasmic domain from LAT is sufficient to drive ER exit, and in its absence the synthetic constructs are all very slow. However, the argument presented that specific lo phase partitioning behaviour of the TMDs do not have a significant effect on exit from the ER is a little confusing. This is related to the choice of the allL-TMD as the 'non-lo domain' partitioning comparator. Previous data has shown that longer TMDs (23+) promote ER export (eg. Munro 91, Munro 95, Sharpe 2005). The mechanism for this is not, to my knowledge, known. One could postulate that it has something to do with the very subject of this manuscript- lipid phase partitioning. If this is the case, then a TMD length of 22 might be a poor choice of comparison. A TMD 17 Ls' long would be a more appropriate 'non-raft' cargo. It would be interesting to see a couple of experiments with a cargo like this.


The basis for the claim that raft affinity has relatively minor influence on ER exit kinetics, especially in comparison to the effect of the putative COPII interaction motif, is in Fig 1G. We do observe some differences between constructs and they may be related to raft affinity, however we considered these relatively minor compared to the nearly 4-fold increase in ER efflux induced by COPII motifs.

We have modified the wording in the manuscript to avoid the impression that we have ruled out an effect of raft affinity of ER exit.

We believe that our observations are broadly consistent with those of Munro and colleagues. In both their work and ours, long TMDs were able to exit the ER. In our experiments, this was true for several proteins with long TMDs, either as fulllength or as TMD-only versions (see Fig 1G). We intentionally did not measure shorter synthetic TMDs because these would not have been comparable with the raft-preferring variants, which all require relatively long TMDs, as demonstrated in our previous work^{1,2}. Thus, because our manuscript does not make any claims about the influence of TMD length on trafficking, we did not feel that experiments with shorter non-raft constructs would substantively influence our conclusions.

However, to address reviewer interest, we did complete one set of experiments to test the effect of shortening the TMD on ER exit. We truncated the native LAT TMD by removing 6 residues from the C-terminal end of the TMD (LAT-TMDd6aa). This construct exited the ER similarly to all others we measured, revealing that for this set of constructs, short TMDs did not accumulate in the ER. ER exit of the truncated variant was slightly slower than the full-length LAT-TMD, but somewhat faster than the allL-TMD. These effects are consistent with our previous measurements with showed that this shortened construct has slightly lower raft phase partitioning than the LAT-TMD but higher than allL². While these are interesting observations, a more thorough exploration of the effect of TMD length would be required to make any strong conclusion, so we did not include these data in the final manuscript.

Author response image 1.



Golgi exit:

For the LAT constructs, the kinetics of Golgi exit as shown in Fig. 3B are surprisingly slow. About half of the protein remains in the Golgi at 1 h after biotin addition. Most secretory cargo proteins would have almost completely exited the Golgi by that time, as illustrated by VSVG in Fig. S3. There is a concern that LAT may have some tendency to linger in the Golgi, presumably due to a factor independent of the transmembrane domain, and therefore cannot be viewed as a good model protein. For kinetic modeling in particular, the existence of such an additional factor would be far from ideal. A valuable control would be to examine the Golgi exit kinetics of at least one additional secretory cargo.

We disagree that LAT is an unusual protein with respect to Golgi efflux kinetics. In our experiments, Golgi efflux of VSVG was similar to full-length LAT ($t_{1/2} \sim 45$ min), and both of these were similar to previously reported values³. Especially for the truncated (i.e. TMD) constructs, it is very unlikely that some factor independent of their TMDs affects Golgi exit, as they contain almost no amino acids outside the membrane-embedded TMD.

Practically, it has proven somewhat challenging to produce functional RUSH-Golgi constructs. We attempted the experiment suggested by the reviewer by constructing SBP-tagged versions of several model cargo proteins, but all failed to trap in the Golgi. We speculate that the Golgin84 hook is much more sensitive to the location of the SBP on the cargo, being an integral membrane protein rather than the luminal KDEL-streptavidin hook. This limitation

can likely be overcome by engineering the cargo, but we did not feel that another control cargo protein was essential for the conclusions we presented, thus we did not pursue this direction further.

Comments about the trafficking model

(1) In Figure 1E, the export of LAT-TMD from the ER is fitted to a single-exponential fit that the authors say is "well described". This is unclear and there is perhaps something more complex going on. It appears that there is an initial lag phase and then similar kinetics after that - perhaps the authors can comment on this?

This is a good observation. This effect is explainable by the mechanics of the measurement: in Figs 1 and 2, we measure not ‘fraction of protein in ER’ but ‘fraction of cells positive for ER fluorescence’. This is because the very slow ER exit of the TMD-only constructs present a major challenge for live-cell imaging, so ER exit was quantified on a population level, by fixing cells at various time points after biotin addition and quantifying the fraction of cells with observable ER localization (rather than tracking a single cell over time).

For fitting to the kinetic model (which attempts to describe ‘fraction in ER/Golgi’) we re-measured all constructs by livecell imaging (see Supp Fig 5) to directly quantify relative construct abundance in the ER or Golgi. These data did not have the plateau in Fig 1E, suggesting that this is an artifact of counting “ER positive cells” which would be expected to have a longer lag than “fraction of protein in ER”. Notably however, $t_{1/2}$ measured by both methods was similar, suggesting that the population measurement agrees well with single-cell live imaging.

We have included all these explanations and caveats in the manuscript. We have also changed the wording from “well described” to “reasonably approximated”.

(2) The model for Golgi sorting is also complicated and controversial, and while the authors' intention to not overinterpreting their data in this regard must be respected, this data is in support of the two-phase Golgi export model (Patterson et al PMID:18555781).

The reviewers are correct, our observations and model are consistent with Patterson et al and it was a major oversight that a reference to this foundational work was not included. We have now added a discussion regarding the “two phase model” of Patterson and Lippincott-Schwartz.

Furthermore contrary to the statement in lines 200-202, the kinetics of VSVG exit from the Golgi (Fig. S3) are roughly linear and so are NOT consistent with the previous report by Hirschberg et al.

Regarding kinetics of VSVG, our intention was to claim that the timescale of VSVG efflux from the Golgi was similar to previously reported in Hirschberg, i.e. $t_{1/2}$ roughly between 30-60 minutes. We have clarified this in the text. Minor differences in the details between our observations and Hirschberg are likely attributable to temperature, as those measurements were done at 32°C for the tsVSVG mutant.

Moreover, the kinetics of LAT export from the Golgi (Fig. 3B) appear quite different, more closely approximating exponential decay of the signal. These points should be described accurately and discussed.

Regarding linear versus exponential fits, we agree that the reality of Golgi sorting and efflux is far more complicated than accounted for by either the phenomenological curve fitting in

Figs 1-3 or the modeling in Fig 4. In addition to the possibility of lateral domains within Golgi stacks, there is transport between stacks, retrograde traffic, etc. The fits in Figs 1-3 are not intended to model specifics of transport, but rather to be phenomenological descriptors that allowed us to describe efflux kinetics with one parameter (i.e. $t_{1/2}$). In contrast, the more refined kinetic modeling presented in Figure 4 is designed to test a mechanistic hypothesis (i.e. coexisting membrane domains in Golgi) and describes well the key features of the trafficking data.

Relationship between membrane traffic and domain partitioning:

(1) Phase segregation in the GPMV is dictated by thermodynamics given its composition and the measurement temperature (at low temperatures 4degC). However at physiological temperatures (32-37degC) at which membrane trafficking is taking place these GPMVs are not phase separated. Hence it is difficult to argue that a sorting mechanism based solely on the partitioning of the synthetic LAT-TMD constructs into lo domains detected at low temperatures in GPMVs provide a basis (or its lack) for the differential kinetics of traffic of out of the Golgi (or ER). The mechanism in a living cell to form any lipid based sorting platforms naturally requires further elaboration, and by definition cannot resemble the lo domains generated in GPMVs at low temperatures.

We thank the reviewers for bringing up this important point. GPMVs are a useful tool because they allow direct, quantitative measurements of protein partitioning between coexisting ordered and disordered phases in complex, cell-derived membranes. However, we entirely agree, that GPMVs do not fully represent the native organization of the living cell plasma membrane and we have previously discussed some of the relevant differences^{4,5}. Despite these caveats, many studies have supported the cellular relevance of phase separation in GPMVs and the partitioning of proteins to raft domains therein⁶⁻⁹. Most notably, elegant experiments from several independent labs have shown that fluorescent lipid analogs that partition to Lo domains in GPMVs also show distinct diffusive behaviors in live cells^{6,7}, strongly suggesting the presence of nanoscopic Lo domains in live cells. Similarly, our recent collaborative work with the lab of Sarah Veatch showed excellent agreement between raft preference in GPMVs and protein organization in living immune cells imaged by super-resolution microscopy¹⁰. Further, several labs^{6,7}, including ours¹¹, have reported nice correlations between raft partitioning in GPMVs and detergent resistance, which is a classical (though controversial) assay for raft association.

Based on these points, we feel that GPMVs are a useful tool for quantifying protein preference for ordered (raft) membrane domains and that this preference is a useful proxy for the raft-associated behavior of these probes in living cells. We propose that this approach allows us to overcome a major reason for the historical controversy surrounding the raft field: nonquantitative and unreliable methodologies that prevented consistent definition of which proteins are supposed to be present in lipid rafts and why. Our work directly addresses this limitation by relating quantitative raft affinity measurements in a biological membrane with a relevant and measurable cellular outcome, specifically inter-organelle trafficking rates.

Addressing the point about phase transition temperatures in GPMVs: this is the temperature at which macroscopic domains are observed. Based on physical models of phase separation, it has been proposed that macroscopic phase separation at lower temperatures is consistent sub-microscopic, nanoscale domains at higher temperatures^{8,12}. These smaller domains can potentially be stabilized / functionalized by protein-protein interactions in cells¹³ that may not be present in GPMVs (e.g. because of lack of ATP).

(2) The lipid compositions of each of these membranes - PM, ER and Golgi are drastically different. Each is likely to phase separate at different phase transition temperatures (if at all). The transition temperature is probably even lower for Golgi and the ER membranes

compared to the PM. Hence, if the reported compositions of these compartments are to be taken at face value, the propensity to form phase separated domains at a physiological temperature will be very low. Are ordered domains even formed at the Golgi at physiological temperatures?

It is a good point that the membrane compositions and the resulting physical properties (including any potential phase behavior) will be very different in the PM, ER, and Golgi. Whether ordered domains are present in any of these membranes in living cells remains difficult to directly visualize, especially for non-PM membranes which are not easily accessible by probes, are nanoscopic, and have complex morphologies. However, the fact that raft-preferring probes / proteins share some trafficking characteristics, while very similar non-raft mutants behave differently argues that raft affinity plays a role in subcellular traffic.

(3) The hypothesis of 'lipid rafts' is a very specific idea, related to functional segregation, and the underlying basis for domain formation has been also hotly debated. In this article the authors conflate thermodynamic phase separation mechanisms with the potential formation of functional sorting domains, further adding to the confusion in the literature. To conclude that this segregation is indeed based on lipid environments of varying degrees of lipid order, it would probably be best to look at the heterogeneity of the various membranes directly using probes designed to measure lipid packing, and then look for colocalization of domains of different cargo with these domains.

This is a very good suggestion, and a direction we are currently following. Unfortunately, due to the dynamic nature and small size of putative lateral membrane domains, combined with the interior of a cell being filled with lipophilic environments that overlay each other, directly imaging domains in organellar membranes with lipid packing probes remains extremely difficult with current technology (or at least available to us). We argue that the TMD probes used in this manuscript are a reasonable alternative, as they are fluorescent probes with validated selectivity for membrane compartments with different physical properties.

Ultimately, the features of membrane domains suggested by a variety of techniques – i.e. nanometric, dynamic, relatively similar in composition to the surrounding membrane, potentially diverse/heterogeneous – make them inherently difficult to microscopically visualize. This is one reason why we believe studies like ours, which use a natural model system to directly quantify raft-associated behaviors and relate them to cellular effects (in our case, protein sorting), are a useful direction for this field.

We believe we have been careful in our manuscript to avoid confusing language surrounding lipid rafts, phase separation, etc. Our experiments clearly show that mammalian membranes have the capacity to phase separate, that some proteins preferentially interact with more ordered domains, and that this preference is related to the subcellular trafficking fates and rates of these proteins. We have edited the manuscript to emphasize these claims and avoid the historical controversies and confusions.

(4) In the super-resolution experiments (by SIM- where the enhancement of resolution is around two fold or less compared to optical), the authors are able to discern a segregation of the two types of Golgi-resident cargo that have different preferences for the lo-domains in GPMVs. It should be noted that TMD-allL and the LATallL end up in the late endosome after exit of the Golgi. Previous work from the Bonafacino laboratory (PMID: 28978644) has shown that proteins (such as M6PR) destined to go to the late endosome bud from a different part of the Golgi in vesicular carriers, while those that are destined for the cell surface first (including TfR) bud with tubular vesicular carriers. Thus at the resolution depicted in Fig 5, the segregation seen by the authors could be due to an alternative explanation, that these molecules are present in different areas of the

Golgi for reasons different from phase partitioning. The relatively high colocalization of TfR with the GPI probe in Fig 5E is consistent with this explanation. TfR and GPI prefer different domains in the GPMV assays yet they show a high degree of colocalization and also traffic to the cell surface.

This is a good point. Even at microscopic resolutions beyond the optical diffraction limit, we cannot make any strong claims that the segregation we observe is due to lateral lipid domains and not several reasonable alternatives, including separation between cisternae (rather than within), cargo vesicles moving between cisternae, or lateral domains that are mediated by protein assemblies rather than lipids. We have explicitly included this point in the Discussion: “Our SIM imaging suggests segregation of raft from nonraft cargo in the Golgi shortly (5 min) after RUSH release (Fig 5B), but at this level of resolution, we can only report reduced colocalization, not intra-Golgi protein distributions. Moreover, segregation within a Golgi cisterna would be very difficult to distinguish from cargo moving between cisternae at different rates or exiting via Golgi-proximal vesicles.”

We have also added a similar caveat in the Results section of the manuscript: “These observations support the hypothesis that proteins can segregate in Golgi based on their affinity for distinct membrane domains; however, it is important to emphasize that this segregation does not necessarily imply lateral lipid-driven domains within a Golgi cisterna. Reasonable alternative possibilities include separation between cisternae (rather than within), cargo vesicles moving between cisternae, or lateral domains that are mediated by protein assemblies rather than lipids.”

Finally, while probes with allL TMD do eventually end up in late endosomes (consistent with the Bonifacino lab’s findings which we include), they do so while initially transiting the PM2,11.

Minor concerns:

(1) Generally, the quantitation is high quality from difficult experimental data. Although a lot appears to be manual, it appears appropriately performed and interpreted. There are some claims that are made based on this quantitation, however, where there are no statistics performed. For example, figure 1B. Any quantitation with an accompanying conclusion should be subject to a statistical test. I think the quality of the model fits- this is particularly important.

We appreciate the thoughtful feedback, the quantifications and fits were not trivial, but we believe important. We have added statistical significance to Figure 1B and others where it was missing.

(2) Modulation of lipid levels in Fig 4E shows a significant change for the trafficking rate for the LAT-TMD construct and a not so significant change for all-TMD construct. However, these data are not convincing and appear to depend on a singular data point that appears to lower the mean value. In general, the experiment with the MZA inhibitor (Fig. 4D-F) is hard to interpret because cells will likely be sick after inhibition of sphingolipid and cholesterol synthesis. Moreover, the difference in effects for LAT-TMD and allL-TMD is marginal.

We disagree with this interpretation. Fig 4E shows the average of three experiments and demonstrates clearly that the inhibitors change the Golgi efflux rate of LAT-TMD but not allL-TMD. This is summarized in the t1/2 quantifications of Fig 4F, which show a statistically significant change for LAT-TMD but not allL-TMD. This is not an effect of a singular data point, but rather the trend across the dataset.

Further, the inhibitor conditions were tuned carefully to avoid cells becoming “sick”: at higher concentrations, cells did adopt unusual morphologies and began to detach from the plates. We pursued only lower concentrations, which cells survived for at least 48 hrs and without major morphological changes.

(3) Line 173: 146-AAPSA-152 should read either 146-AAPSA-150 or 146-AAPSAPA-152, depending on what the authors intended.

Thanks for the careful reading, we intended the former and it has been fixed.

(4) What is the actual statistical significance in Fig. 3C and Fig. 3E? There is a single asterisk in each panel of the figure but two asterisks in the legend.

Apologies, a single asterisk representing $p < 0.05$ was intended. It has been fixed.

(5) The code used to calculate the model. is not accessible. It is standard practice to host well-annotated code on Github or similar, and it would be good to have this publicly available.

We have deposited the code on a public repository (doi: 10.5281/zenodo.10478607) and added a note to the Methods.

(1) Lorent, J. H. et al. Structural determinants and functional consequences of protein affinity for membrane ra=s. Nature communications 8, 1219 (2017).PMC5663905

(2) Diaz-Rohrer, B. B., Levental, K. R., Simons, K. & Levental, I. Membrane ra= association is a determinant of plasma membrane localization. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 111, 8500-8505 (2014).PMC4060687

(3) Hirschberg, K. et al. Kine7c analysis of secretory protein traffic and characterization of golgi to plasma membrane transport intermediates in living cells. J Cell Biol 143, 1485-1503 (1998).PMC2132993

(4) Levental, K. R. & Levental, I. Giant plasma membrane vesicles: models for understanding membrane organization. Current topics in membranes 75, 25-57 (2015)

(5) Sezgin, E. et al. Elucidating membrane structure and protein behavior using giant plasma membrane vesicles. Nat Protoc 7, 1042-1051 (2012)

(6) Komura, N. et al. Ra=-based interactions of gangliosides with a GPI-anchored receptor. Nat Chem Biol 12, 402-410 (2016)

(7) Kinoshita, M. et al. Ra=-based sphingomyelin interactions revealed by new fluorescent sphingomyelin analogs. J Cell Biol 216, 1183-1204 (2017).PMC5379944

(8) Stone, M. B., Shelby, S. A., Nunez, M. F., Wissner, K. & Veatch, S. L. Protein sorting by lipid phase-like domains supports emergent signaling function in B lymphocyte plasma membranes. eLife 6 (2017).PMC5373823

(9) Machta, B. B. et al. Conditions that Stabilize Membrane Domains Also Antagonize n-Alcohol Anesthesia. Biophys J 111, 537-545 (2016)

(10) Shelby, S. A., Castello-Serrano, I., Wissner, I., Levental, I. & S., V. Membrane phase separation drives protein organization at BCR clusters. Nat Chem Biol in press (2023)

(11) Diaz-Rohrer, B. et al. Rab3 mediates a pathway for endocytic sorting and plasma membrane recycling of ordered microdomains Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 120, e2207461120

(2023)

(12) Veatch, S. L. et al. Critical fluctuations in plasma membrane vesicles. *ACS Chem Biol* 3, 287-293 (2008)

(13) Wang, H. Y. et al. Coupling of protein condensates to ordered lipid domains determines functional membrane organization. *Science advances* 9, eadf6205 (2023).PMC10132753