ESCRT-III acts in scissioning new peroxisomes from the ER

Authors: Fred D. Mast[1,2], Thurston Herricks[1,2], Kathleen M. Strehler[1,2], Leslie R. Miller[1,2], Ramsey A. Saleem[1,2,†], Richard A. Rachubinski[3], and John D. Aitchison[1,2,3,*].

1. CENTER FOR INFECTIOUS DISEASE RESEARCH, 307 WESTLAKE AVENUE NORTH, SUITE 500, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, 98109-5219, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2. INSTITUTE FOR SYSTEMS BIOLOGY, 401 TERRY AVENUE NORTH, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, 98109-5219, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
3. DEPARTMENT OF CELL BIOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, 5-14 MEDICAL SCIENCES BUILDING, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, T6G 2H7, CANADA

† Current address: AMGEN, 360 BINNEY STREET, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, 02142-1011

Corresponding author:
JOHN D. AITCHISON, PHD
CENTER FOR INFECTIOUS DISEASE RESEARCH
307 WESTLAKE AVENUE NORTH, SUITE 500
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, 98109-5219
TEL: (206) 256-7470
FAX: (206) 256-7229
JOHN.AITCHISON@CIDRESEARCH.ORG

Character count without spaces: 36,651

Keywords: peroxisome biogenesis; ESCRT-III; peroxisomes; preperoxisomal vesicles; ER; peroxin; Snf7; Vps20; Did4; Vps24; Pex3; Pex19

Abbreviations: DOX, doxycycline; DRP, dynamin-related protein; ESCRT, endosomal sorting complexes required for transport; PBD, peroxisome biogenesis disorder; *PEX*, gene encoding a peroxin; PMP, peroxisomal membrane protein; PPV, preperoxisomal vesicle.

Abstract

Dynamic control of peroxisome proliferation is integral to the peroxisome's many functions. A

breakdown in the ability of cells to form peroxisomes is linked to many human health issues,

including defense against infectious agents, cancer, aging, heart disease, obesity and diabetes,

and forms the basis of a spectrum of peroxisomal genetic disorders that cause severe

neuropathologies. The ER serves as a source for preperoxisomal vesicles (PPVs) that mature

into peroxisomes during de novo peroxisome biogenesis and to support growth and division of

existing peroxisomes. However, the mechanism of PPV formation and release from the ER

remains poorly understood. Here we show that the evolutionarily ancient endosomal sorting

complexes required for transport (ESCRT)-III are peroxisome biogenesis factors that function to

cleave PPVs budding from the ER into the cytosol. Using comprehensive morphological and

genetic assays of peroxisome formation and function we find that absence of ESCRT-III proteins

impedes de novo peroxisome formation and results in an aberrant peroxisome population in

vivo. Using a cell-free PPV budding assay we show that ESCRT-III proteins Vps20 and Snf7 are

required to release PPVs from the ER. ESCRT-III is therefore a positive effector of membrane

scission for vesicles budding both away from and towards the cytosol, a finding that has

important implications for the evolutionary timing of emergence of peroxisomes and the rest of

the internal membrane architecture of the eukaryotic cell.

Introduction

Peroxisomes are membrane-bound, spherical organelles that are found across eukaryotes (Smith and Aitchison, 2013). All peroxisomes share common mechanisms guiding their biogenesis, division and protein import. The conserved protein products of *PEX* genes, termed peroxins, mediate the formation and maintenance of peroxisomes (Distel et al., 1996). However, peroxisomes in different organisms host different metabolic pathways and perform diverse functions (Mast et al., 2010). In multicellular organisms, peroxisomes perform both broad and distinct cell-type specific functions; for example, in plants peroxisomes are the sole site for β-oxidation of fatty acids and participate broadly in pathogen defense, however, in stomata they assist in stromal opening, and in mesophyll cells specialized 'leaf' peroxisomes are found tightly juxtaposed to chloroplasts and participate in photorespiration (Kao et al., 2018; Reuman and Weber, 2006). These examples are not exhaustive and peroxisomes perform a variety of other essential and diverse biosynthetic and catabolic processes (Reumann and Bartel, 2016).

Peroxisomes respond dramatically to different stimuli. They are induced in metazoans in response to fats, hypolipidemic agents and non-genotoxic carcinogens, and during development and differentiation (Weller et al., 2003). Peroxisome proliferation is linked to their varied functions including, for example, in response to cirrhosis of the liver (De Craemer et al., 1993), after ischemia in the brain (Young et al., 2015), in developing cardiomyocytes (Colasante et al., 2015), in protecting the auditory canal against sound-induced hearing loss from reactive oxygen species (Delmaghani et al., 2015), in epithelial cells to modulate the innate immune system (Dixit et al., 2010; Odendall et al., 2014), in macrophages to assist in clearance of

microbial pathogens (Di Cara et al., 2017), and as regulatory sites for the mTOR pathway

(Tripathi and Walker, 2016; Zhang et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2015). In many of these examples,

the proliferation of peroxisomes appears to be in response to metabolic need or as part of a

stress response to deal with increased levels of harmful molecules, particularly reactive oxygen

species, produced through insult or injury. Why this response leads to increased numbers of

peroxisomes as opposed to an increase in size is unclear. For example, mice lacking the

peroxisome division protein PEX11β have reduced numbers of larger, functional peroxisomes,

which does not impede metabolic capacity per se, but yet these mice still display many

hallmark phenotypes of peroxisome biogenesis disorder (PBD) patients and die shortly after

birth (Li et al., 2002). In contrast, the link between peroxisome proliferation and the role of

peroxisomes as spatial beacons for integrating and initiating signaling cascades has become

clearer (Mast et al., 2015). Here, changes in peroxisome numbers contribute to tipping the

balance between one signaling response versus another, such as in peroxisome-mediated

innate immune signaling (Odendall et al., 2014) and regulation of the mTOR pathway (Tripathi

and Walker, 2016).

Peroxisome proliferation occurs via two partially redundant mechanisms: the division of

existing peroxisomes through fission, and de novo formation from the ER (Mast et al., 2015;

Smith and Aitchison, 2013). Fission of peroxisomes is comparatively well characterized and

requires the Pex11 family of proteins to elongate and constrict the organelle, permitting GTP-

dependent scission by dynamin-related proteins (DRPs) (Schrader et al., 2016). Peroxisomes

also share division components with other organelles, particularly the mitochondrion (Motley

et al., 2008). In contrast, the mechanism of de novo formation remains poorly understood, and

the identities of many factors involved in this process remain unknown (Agrawal and

Subramani, 2016).

In yeast, biogenesis via fission dominates peroxisome proliferation (Motley and

Hettema, 2007). However, most peroxisomal membrane proteins (PMPs) transit through the ER

on their way to peroxisomes (Hoepfner et al., 2005; Schuldiner et al., 2008; Thoms et al., 2012;

van der Zand et al., 2010). A global analysis of localized protein synthesis also revealed that

many PMPs are likely cotranslated at the ER (Jan et al., 2014). Similar observations of PMP

cotranslation (Kaewsapsak et al., 2017) and transport from ER to peroxisomes made in

substantially divergent species of yeast (Agrawal et al., 2011; Farre et al., 2017; Titorenko and

Rachubinski, 1998), plants (Hu et al., 2012), the excavate pathogen *Trypanosoma brucei* (Bauer

et al., 2017; Guther et al., 2014), and mammalian cells (Kim et al., 2006; Mayerhofer et al.,

2016) highlight the essential and evolutionarily ancient role of the ER in peroxisome biogenesis

in eukaryotic cells.

A vesicular transport pathway transfers proteins and membranes from the ER to

peroxisomes (Agrawal et al., 2016; Agrawal et al., 2011; Lam et al., 2010). This pathway is

essential even when peroxisomes multiply by growth and division, as altering the flux through

this transport pathway alters the numbers of peroxisomes in cells (Mast et al., 2016). Pex3

accumulates initially at an ER subdomain before being released in a preperoxisomal vesicle

(PPV) that buds from the ER (Halbach et al., 2006; Hoepfner et al., 2005; Tam et al., 2005).

Sorting of PMPs through the ER to sites of PPV formation and egress requires both Pex3-

dependent and -independent processes (Fakieh et al., 2013). The ER-shaping reticulon proteins,

through physical interaction with Pex29 and Pex30, assist in regulating Pex3 sorting through the

ER and releasing PPVs (David et al., 2013; Mast et al., 2016). Pex30 and its paralogue, Pex31,

have membrane-shaping capabilities like the reticulon proteins, which may help in defining and

segregating the PPV exit site in the ER (Joshi et al., 2016).

The formation of PPVs requires Pex3 and Pex19, and loss of PPV formation leads to a

cell's inability to form peroxisomes and consequently its eventual loss of the organelle

(Hettema et al., 2000; Hoepfner et al., 2005). Pex19 is a cytosolic protein that interacts with

Pex3 and other PMPs (Agrawal et al., 2017), functioning as a chaperone, and is essential for

budding PPVs from the ER (Lam et al., 2010). At least two classes of PPVs (V1 and V2) have been

characterized (Agrawal et al., 2016; Titorenko et al., 2000; Titorenko and Rachubinski, 2000; van

der Zand et al., 2012); both contain Pex3 but differ in whether they contain or lack docking-

factor or RING finger group proteins of the peroxisomal matrix protein import complex

(peroxisomal importomer) (Agrawal et al., 2016). The separation of these two subcomplexes

could prevent premature assembly of the peroxisomal importomer in the ER and the potential

import of peroxisomal matrix proteins directly into the ER (Agrawal et al., 2016; van der Zand et

al., 2012). While Pex3 and Pex19 are necessary for PPV budding, they are not sufficient for this

process, and evidence suggests additional cytosolic component(s) are required, at least one of

which likely consumes ATP (Agrawal et al., 2011; Lam et al., 2010). DRPs, which function in

peroxisome division, or COPI and COPII vesicle transport pathways, all of which consume GTP,

have repeatedly been shown not to be required for PPV formation (Lam et al., 2010; Motley et

al., 2015; Motley and Hettema, 2007; Perry et al., 2009; South et al., 2000).

Here, we report a novel role for endosomal sorting complexes required for transport

(ESCRT)-III in the de novo biogenesis of peroxisomes. In particular, using a series of

comprehensive morphological and genetic assays of peroxisome formation and function and in

vitro biochemical assays that produce PPVs from the ER, we implicate ESCRT-III as being

essential for the scission of PPVs from the ER.

Results

Genomic screens identify a putative role for ESCRT in peroxisome biogenesis

Screens of an isogenic, arrayed collection of yeast gene deletion strains identified 211 genes

whose disruption led to defects in the cell's ability to form peroxisomes (Saleem et al., 2010).

We reasoned that this dataset held clues to candidates involved in the de novo biogenesis of

peroxisomes and in the formation of PPVs at the ER. Candidates would be expected a priori to

be cytosolic and/or localized to the ER, and to use ATP in their activity. Components of ESCRT

exhibit these characteristics and were enriched in this dataset with a statistically significant

hypergeometric p-value of 0.003 (Saleem et al., 2010).

ESCRT is composed of five subcomplexes, including ESCRT-0, -I, -II, -III (and -III-

associated), and the AAA-ATPase Vps4 complex (Babst et al., 2002a; Babst et al., 2002b; Babst

et al., 1997; Katzmann et al., 2001; Katzmann et al., 2003) (reviewed in (Henne et al., 2011;

Schoneberg et al., 2016)). These five complexes function sequentially to mediate the formation

of intraluminal vesicles and also assist in piecemeal fashion in numerous other cellular activities

like cytokinesis (Carlton and Martin-Serrano, 2007), plasma membrane repair (Jimenez et al.,

2014; Scheffer et al., 2014), autophagosome closure (Lee et al., 2007; Rusten et al., 2007), viral

replication and budding (Garrus et al., 2001), nuclear envelope reformation (Olmos et al., 2015;

Vietri et al., 2015), nuclear pore complex quality surveillance (Webster et al., 2014), neuronal

pruning (Loncle et al., 2015), and microtubule severing (Guizetti et al., 2011) (Henne et al.,

2011; Schoneberg et al., 2016). ESCRT-III, composed of Vps20, Snf7, Vps24 and Did4 in yeast, is

evolutionarily ancient and is the primary effector complex for all these activities (Henne et al.,

2011; Tang et al., 2015). Given this wealth of function, particularly for ESCRT-III, a key

consideration was whether ESCRTs have a direct role in peroxisome biogenesis or exert indirect

effects due to their diversity of activity. In our global screens for peroxisome effectors (Saleem

et al., 2010; Smith et al., 2006), ESCRT deletion strains showed defects in metabolizing fatty acid

carbon sources, a process requiring functional peroxisomes; had altered expression of the

peroxisomal β-oxidation enzyme 3-ketoacyl-CoA thiolase (Pot1); but exhibited only mild or no

peroxisome morphology defects as assessed by high-throughput fluorescence microscopy

(Table S1).

Yeast strains lacking ESCRT-III components exhibit oleic acid-specific growth defects

We used our one-cell doubling evaluation of living arrays of yeast (ODELAY!) platform (Herricks

et al., 2017a) to re-address the role of ESCRT in peroxisome biogenesis by comparing growth on

solid-phase medium containing as the sole carbon source either glucose or oleic acid, which

requires functional peroxisomes for its metabolism (Figs. 1 and S1). Unlike traditional spot-

based assays or assays using optical density measurements at a population level, ODELAY!

provides time-resolved measurements of yeast populations growing from individual cells into

colonies, for an array of up to 96 different strains (Herricks et al., 2017a). ODELAY! therefore

permits standardized analyses of the growth rates and population heterogeneity both within

and between strains measured in parallel across different growth conditions. Strains with

general growth defects have comparable normalized growth rates under both conditions,

whereas condition-specific strains grow more slowly under one condition versus another. We

measured growth rates for all 18 ESCRT deletion strains, 6 peroxin/peroxisome-related control

deletion strains, and 20 randomly selected deletion strains from the yeast deletion library (Fig.

1 A and Table S2).

188   Strain doubling times measured by ODELAY! were normalized, and the mean Z-score for

each deletion strain was compared between the two growth conditions (Fig. 1 A). The *pex19Δ*,

pex13Δ and *pex14Δ* strains, which lack the ability to form peroxisomes (Hettema et al., 2000)

and a functional peroxisomal importomer (Meinecke et al., 2010), or the *pot1Δ* strain lacking

the enzyme that performs the last step of peroxisomal β-oxidation (Igual et al., 1991), revealed

condition-specific growth defects, as they exhibited slightly faster or marginally slower growth

in the presence of glucose but grew 4-5 standard deviations more slowly than the

corresponding wild-type strain *BY4742* in the presence of oleic acid (Fig. 1 A).

196   ESCRT-III deletion strains showed pronounced condition-specific growth defects in the

presence of oleic acid, with *did4Δ* cells registering the slowest doubling rate of all ESCRT

deletions, followed by *vps20Δ*, *snf7Δ* and *ist1Δ*, which is a deletion strain for an ESCRT-III

associated gene (Fig. 1 A). ESCRT-I deletion strains displayed general growth defects, whereas

ESCRT-II deletion strains clustered tightly, in line with their known structural and functional

assembly as a single protein complex, and showed a condition-specific growth defect in oleic

acid, although not as severe as that observed for strains deleted for ESCRT-III components (Fig.

1 A). Other ESCRT deletion strains also had slower, but less severe, doubling times in oleic acid

than ESCRT-III deletion strains, except for the strain lacking the Vps4 regulator Vta1 which, like

the peroxisome inheritance mutants *inp1Δ* and *inp2Δ*, had a faster doubling time than the wild-

type strain under both glucose and oleic acid conditions (Fig. 1 A).

Despite the skew to oleic acid-specific growth defects observed for the majority of

ESCRT deletion strains in the *BY4742* background, the randomly selected gene deletions

revealed no bias in our assay (Fig. 1 A and Table S2). Of note, *sec28Δ*, a strain lacking the ε-COP

subunit of coatomer (Duden et al., 1998), demonstrated a significant growth defect when

grown on medium containing glucose but grew significantly faster than the wild-type strain on

medium containing oleic acid (Fig. 1 A and Table S2). This phenotype could partially result from

the overall slower growth of cells metabolizing oleic acid, which would mask defects in COPI

vesicle trafficking, and also further demonstrates that COPI is not involved in peroxisome

biogenesis. Other deletion strains affecting the secretory pathway, such as *emp46Δ*, lacking a

COPII-associated protein (Sato and Nakano, 2002), or *nyv1Δ*, lacking a v-SNARE of the vacuolar

SNARE complex (Nichols et al., 1997), showed negligible general growth defects (Fig. 1 A and

Table S2). Therefore, general defects in endocytic trafficking do not manifest as condition-

specific defects in the metabolism of the non-fermentable carbon source, oleic acid.

We repeated our ODELAY! analysis in the *W303* strain background and evaluated strains

deleted for the genes *VPS20*, *SNF7*, *DID4* and *VPS24* encoding ESCRT-III components, together

with strains deleted for the genes *IST1* and *VPS25* (Fig. 1 B and Table S2). We observed similar

condition-specific growth defects for the ESCRT-III deletion strains in the presence of oleic acid

in the *W303* strain background as we had observed in the *BY4742* strain background (Fig. 1 A

and Table S2) However, for *vps25Δ*, while oleic acid-specific defects were observed in the

BY4742 strain deleted for *VPS25* (Fig. 1 A), these condition-specific defects were not

reproduced in the *W303* strain deleted for *VPS25*, which displayed general and equivalent

growth defects on both glucose and oleic acid carbon sources (Fig. 1 B). The *ist1Δ* strain, which

showed condition-specific growth defects in *BY4742*, showed negligible growth defects in

W303, where it grew faster than *wild-type* in the presence of glucose and slightly slower than

wild-type in the presence of oleic acid (Fig. 1 B). We therefore conclude that ESCRT-III has a

specific functional role in the metabolism of the non-fermentable carbon source, oleic acid.

Loss of ESCRT-III components results in peroxisomes with aberrant morphologies

To determine if the growth defects observed for ESCRT-III mutants result from defects in

peroxisomes, we used EM to investigate the cellular ultrastructure of cells lacking individual

components of the core ESCRT-III complex under conditions that promote peroxisome

biogenesis (Figs. 2 and S1). Yeast were grown in the presence of oleic acid for 8 h to induce

peroxisome proliferation and peroxisomal membrane expansion (Saleem et al., 2008; Smith et

al., 2002). Under these conditions peroxisomes were readily observed in *wild-type* cells as

orbicular structures delimited by a single lipid bilayer and containing an electron-dense,

paracrystalline matrix (Fig. 2 A). In contrast, peroxisomes were not observed in *vps20Δ* or *snf7Δ*

cells, which instead contained infrequent small vesicular structures of unknown origin, although

often in close apposition to, and possibly contiguous with, ER membranes (Fig. 2, B and C).

Quantification revealed fewer peroxisomes and vesicular-like structures for all deletion strains

of the ESCRT-III complex (Fig. 2 D and Table 1), although peroxisomes similar in size to *wild-type*

peroxisomes were observed in *did4Δ* and *vps24Δ* cells, but at levels 25% and 45%, respectively,

of peroxisomes in *wild-type* cells (Fig. 2, E - I).

ESCRT-III components act as positive effectors of de novo peroxisome assembly

The observed growth and peroxisome morphology defects detected for deletion strains of

ESCRT-III and in particular for *vps20Δ* and *snf7Δ* mutants suggested a role for ESCRT-III in

peroxisome biogenesis. To test this, we used an in vivo peroxisome biogenesis assay in which

tetracycline control of *PEX19* expression permits synchronization of cells for de novo

peroxisome biogenesis without overexpressing peroxins (Fig. 3 A) (Mast et al., 2016). This is a

critical distinction from de novo biogenesis assays that rely on repression and then

overexpression of a peroxin, as it does not lead to mistargeting of the peroxisomal reporter to

the general ER or other organelles. With *PEX19* expressed, *wild-type* cells contained an average

of 10 peroxisomes per cell, as assessed by the punctate localization of peroxisomal Gpd1-GFP

(Fig. 3 A) (Jung et al., 2010). Repression of *PEX19* expression by treatment with doxycycline

(DOX) for 24 h removed peroxisomes from the *wild-type* yeast population, with only ~0.2% of

cells containing on average one peroxisome per cell. Removal of DOX enabled the expression of

PEX19 and initiated de novo biogenesis of peroxisomes (Fig. 3 A). We tracked peroxisome

formation using three-dimensional fluorescence microscopy over 24 h, sampling cells at 0, 4, 8,

12 and 24 h after initiation of de novo peroxisome biogenesis. Quantification of the number of

peroxisomes per cell revealed a population distribution of steady-state peroxisome densities

comparable to those we have measured previously (Fig. 3 B) (Mast et al., 2016).

The assembly of peroxisomes de novo is a dynamical systems process that proceeds

non-linearly following reintroduction of *PEX19* (Fig. 3). In *wild-type* cells, peroxisomes

reappeared in 91% of cells 4 h after induction of *PEX19* and proceeded to overshoot steady-

state levels of peroxisomes 8 h post-induction. By 12 h, the population distribution of

peroxisome levels had dropped below those at steady-state, and by 24 h were still on a

trajectory to return to steady-state levels. The dynamics of de novo peroxisome formation were

strongly influenced by the length of repression of *PEX19* and by the state of cell growth, in

accordance with our previous observations (Mast et al., 2016). These current observations

imply the existence of positive and negative regulators of de novo peroxisome biogenesis.

Strikingly, ESCRT-III mutants displayed severe defects in de novo peroxisome biogenesis.

ESCRT-III mutants had fewer peroxisomes per cell under steady-state conditions and retained

more peroxisomes per cell following DOX repression of *PEX19* (Fig. 3). Upon stimulation of de

novo peroxisome biogenesis, *vps20Δ*, *snf7Δ*, *did4Δ* and *vps24Δ* cells, in order of severity, failed

to produce peroxisomes at rates comparable to that of *wild-type* cells, revealing a defect in the

ability of *vps20Δ* and *snf7Δ* cells especially to form new peroxisomes de novo (Fig. 3).

Pex19 dynamics in *wild-type* cells presaged peroxisome dynamics in these cells, as Pex19

levels returned to steady-state 4 h after release of DOX-induced repression, then leveled off

and dropped slightly at 8 and 12 h, before increasing slightly at 24 h post-induction (Fig. 4). Like

wild-type, ESCRT-III mutants showed no detectable levels of Pex19 following DOX treatment,

but by 4h post-induction Pex19 levels were comparable to those found in *wild-type* cells.

However, Pex19 dynamics were altered in the ESCRT-III mutants as compared to *wild-type* (Fig.

4). We conclude that while Pex19 dynamics were altered in ESCRT-III mutants, ESCRT-III

mutants nonetheless expressed sufficient Pex19 at all times following removal of DOX to rule

out a contribution of altered Pex19 dynamics as the primary explanation for the catastrophic de

novo biogenesis defects observed in these strains.

ESCRT-III functions conditionally downstream of Pex19

The interplay between Pex19 dynamics and peroxisome dynamics and the interruption of that

interplay in ESCRT-III mutants suggested to us the potential for genetic interactions between

Pex19 and ESCRT-III. Genetic interactions can often provide insights into the function of

proteins, order pathways, and reveal coordinated functions (Costanzo et al., 2016; Schuldiner et

al., 2005). Common examples of genetic interactions include epistasis, where two mutants have

phenotypes different from that of *wild-type* and the double mutant shows the phenotype of

one of the single mutants. These "alleviating" interactions suggest that one protein functions

upstream of the other in a linear pathway (Mani et al., 2008). Similarly, synthesis occurs when

the phenotype of a double mutant is more severe than an additive effect of the individual

mutant phenotypes. Common interpretations of this scenario include proteins that function in

parallel biological pathways or form structures that cannot withstand, or 'buffer', the loss of

both components (Dixon et al., 2009). More complex modes of genetic interaction also exist,

including single-nonmonotonic, where a single mutant shows opposing phenotypes in the *wild-*

type and other single mutant backgrounds (Drees et al., 2005). There are no common

interpretations for this scenario, but such an interaction would imply that epistasis exists under

a limiting set of circumstances.

Using ODELAY!, we measured growth rates for the tetracycline-regulated *PEX19*

background strain as well as strains additionally harboring ESCRT-III deletion mutants under

conditions where *PEX19* was differentially expressed. The normalized mean *Z*-scores were

plotted on a phenotypic axis for each ESCRT-III mutant alongside its corresponding phenotype

(Φ) inequalities (Fig. 5) (Drees et al., 2005). This unbiased and quantitative analysis revealed

complex genetic interactions between *PEX19* and ESCRT-III with *did4Δ*, *vps20Δ* and, to a lesser

extent, *snf7Δ* being single-nonmonotonic to *PEX19* depletion. Whereas *vps24Δ*, and potentially

snf7Δ, is epistatic to *PEX19* depletion, *ist1Δ* is double-nonmonotonic with *PEX19* depletion. We

interpret these results to suggest that ESCRT-III functions conditionally downstream of *PEX19*,

i.e. the function of ESCRT-III is contextual and specific to the budding of peroxisomes from the

ER.

Notably, ESCRT-III localized to sites of de novo peroxisome biogenesis. As expected,

Pex3-GFP and Snf7-mCherry puncta rarely overlapped under steady-state control conditions,

but 13.5% of Pex3p-GFP puncta correspondingly colocalized with the Snf7-mCherry signal

following release from DOX treatment to induce de novo peroxisome formation (Fig. 6 A).

Interestingly, Pex3-GFP foci colocalizing with Snf7-mCherry were dimmer and sometimes

elongated, similar in appearance to previous observations of Pex3 in cells repressed for

members of the *DSL1* protein complex (Perry et al., 2009) and for Pex3 that colocalized with

Pex30 and Pex29 in the ER under steady-state conditions (Mast et al., 2016). We were unable to

detect a meaningful fluorescence signal for Vps20-mCherry and Vps24-mCherry under these

conditions; however, Did4-mCherry showed a pattern similar to that of Snf7-mCherry despite

having a very low signal-to-noise ratio (Fig. 6 B). The reduction in colocalization of Did4-

mCherry compared to Snf7-mCherry may be biologically relevant or may reflect the low

fluorescence signal for Did4-mCherry that was measured for these cells.

ESCRT-III is required for the release of preperoxisomal vesicles from the ER

Current models of ESCRT-III function propose that Vps20 is recruited to a membrane first,

initiating activation and polymerization of additional members, especially Snf7, to form spirals

and coils that deform membranes into tubes or cones to achieve membrane scission (Henne et

al., 2011; Schoneberg et al., 2016). Vps24 caps the polymers and stops polymerization, whereas

Did4 is integrated into the polymer to promote its disassembly by recruiting the AAA-ATPase,

Vps4 (Henne et al., 2011; Schoneberg et al., 2016).

We used an in vitro budding assay that reconstitutes the packaging and release of PMPs

from the ER via PPVs (Lam et al., 2010, Mast et al., 2016) to test if ESCRT-III is required for PPV

scission at the ER (Fig. 7). ER membranes were prepared from a *pex19Δ* strain in which Pex3

and other PMPs are trapped in the ER (Agrawal et al., 2016; Agrawal et al., 2011). The release of

Pex3 was stimulated by addition of *wild-type* cytosol and an ATP regeneration system (Lam et

al., 2010) but not by cytosol from *pex19Δ*, *vps20Δ*, or *snf7Δ* cells (Fig. 7 A and C). We also tested

cytosols from other ESCRT and ESCRT-III deletion strains, e.g. *did4Δ* and *vps24Δ*, and found that

their cytosols still promoted the formation of Pex3-containing PPVs but sometimes at levels

significantly less than that produced by *wild-type* cytosol (Figs. 7 A and S2). Defects in budding

were independent of the levels of Pex19 in ESCRT-III mutant strains (Fig. S3). The defect in PPV

budding was also independent of the background yeast strain, as similar results were obtained

using cytosols obtained from deletion strains in the *W303* strain background (Fig. 7 B). Mixing

the 100 k*g* supernatant fraction of cytosols (S100) from *snf7Δ*, *vps20Δ* and *pex19Δ* strains

pairwise in a 1:1 ratio complemented the defect in Pex3 release (Fig. 7, C and D).

Complementation was also achieved by expressing exogenous copies of *VPS20* or *SNF7* in their

respective deletion strains (Fig. 7, E and F). Here, the likely overexpression of *VPS20* led to

enhanced PPV release, whereas the likely overexpression of *SNF7* did not. The production of

PPVs at 4 °C suggested that scission is mechanical and not reliant on ATP-dependent enzymatic

activity (Fig. 7 A – D). It is known that ESCRT-III does not depend on ATP hydrolysis to mediate

membrane scission but rather relies on the AAA-ATPase Vps4 to remove and recycle ESCRT-III

components (Wollert et al., 2009). Accordingly, treatment of the reaction with apyrase to

deplete ATP led to a reduction, but not abrogation, of PPV budding that could be restored to

typical levels by addition of exogenous ATP (Fig. 7 G). Consistent with this observation, PPV

release occurred rapidly upon reaction mixing, followed by further incremental release over

time, suggesting that ATP acts primarily in recycling scission components (Fig. 7 G).

Discussion

ESCRT-III components, particularly Vps20 and Snf7, can be envisaged as "peroxins", as they are

required for peroxisomal membrane biogenesis and peroxisome proliferation (Distel et al.,

1996). Here, we demonstrated that ESCRT-III deletion mutants have condition-specific growth

defects when grown on a non-fermentable carbon source, oleic acid (Fig. 1), the metabolism of

which requires functional peroxisomes. We show that morphologically identifiable peroxisomes

are absent in vps20Δ and snf7Δ cells by EM, while did4Δ and vps24Δ cells have drastically

reduced numbers of peroxisomes (Fig. 2). Our experiments revealed that ESCRT-III components

act as positive effectors of de novo peroxisome biogenesis, as their absence leads to fewer

numbers of peroxisomes at steady-state and inhibits de novo peroxisome formation, and

because they function downstream of Pex19 in this process as assessed by genetic interactions

(Figs. 3 and 5). The ESCRT-III proteins Snf7 and Did4 dynamically localize to sites of de novo

peroxisome biogenesis (Fig. 6), and in cell-free experiments Vps20 and Snf7 are required for the

release of Pex3-containing PPVs from the ER (Fig. 7).

In the genome-wide screens that led us to ESCRT-III and its role in de novo peroxisome

biogenesis, and in our experiments here (Fig. 3), import-competent peroxisomes can be found

at steady-state levels in ESCRT-III deletion mutants. How can this observation be reconciled

with a role for ESCRT-III in scissioning PPVs from the ER? In the case of COPI and COPII, vesicle

scission can occur independently of GTP hydrolysis by simply requiring the assembly of fission-

competent coated vesicles for fission to occur (Adolf et al., 2013). Thus, it is conceivable that a

small proportion of budded PPVs, arrested in a fission-competent state, could be released from

the ER stochastically. Following vesicle release and carrying the full complement of peroxins

necessary for PPV maturation, these PPVs would become mature peroxisomes, and the growth

and division cycle of peroxisome biogenesis could thereafter sustain the peroxisome

population. Furthermore, as demonstrated for peroxisome fission (Motley and Hettema, 2007),

we also cannot exclude a role for peroxisome inheritance factors in partially compensating for

the loss of ESCRT-III. Inp2 is a membrane protein and the receptor for the motor Myo2 that

actively transports peroxisomes from mother cell to bud (Fagarasanu et al., 2006; Fagarasanu et

al., 2009). The presence of Inp2 in a budded vesicle at the ER could be envisaged to be sufficient

to physically pull PPVs off the ER. Consistent with such a scenario is recent evidence showing

preferential Inp2-directed inheritance of young peroxisomes to growing daughter cells (Kumar

et al., 2017). Notwithstanding these possibilities, it is clear that peroxisomes in ESCRT-III

mutants, although import-competent, are nevertheless aberrant and non-functional (Figs. 1, 2

and 3).

The formation of PPVs shares features and characteristics that are fundamental to all

vesicle biogenesis events. These include cargo protein sorting and trafficking to sites of vesicle

formation, the presence of adaptor molecules to guide cargo sorting and to remodel the

membrane to form a budding vesicle, and scission machinery to release the vesicle to the

cytosol (Spang, 2008). However, there are also fundamental differences between classical

vesicle biogenesis and PPV biogenesis. Unlike the vesicles of the secretory pathway, PPVs are

not coated (Titorenko and Rachubinski, 1998). PPVs also do not carry cargo in their matrix and,

although it is still unknown how, must exclude components of the ER matrix. PPVs therefore

share similarities with nascent lipid droplets, and similarities in PPV and lipid droplet formation,

as well as shared components guiding their biogenesis, have recently come to light (Schrul and

Kopito, 2016; Schuldiner and Bohnert, 2017).

Our observations are consistent with a model wherein Vps20 is recruited to sites of PPV

formation, which in turn recruits and activates the polymerization of Snf7 to drive membrane

scission and release of the PPV to the cytosol. Other ESCRT-III proteins like Did4 and Vps24 are

also involved in PPV scission but are not essential for this process, and probably influence the

dynamics of PPV formation and recruit the machinery for disassembly of ESCRT-III at the ER.

Consistent with such a scenario, the *did4Δ* strain displayed severe growth defects in the

presence of oleic acid and showed reduced budding of Pex3-positive PPVs from the ER (Figs. 1

and 7). Both *did4Δ* and *vps24Δ* cells showed delays in de novo peroxisome biogenesis in vivo

(Fig. 3). This observation is consistent with a role for Did4 and Vps24 in recruiting the AAA-

ATPase Vps4 complex to disassemble ESCRT-III polymers and with previous observations that

the amount of cytosolic Snf7 is reduced in *did4Δ* cells because it is trapped in a polymerized

state on membranes (Babst et al., 2002a). However, our observations may also reflect a more

fundamental role for Vps24 and particularly Did4 in shaping the overall topology of the ESCRT-

III polymer to be suitable for PPV scission.

ESCRT-III is typically thought to be involved in vesicle budding *away from* the cytosol

(reverse-topology membrane scission) with or without other ESCRT complexes (subsets of

ESCRT-0, -I and -II) (Henne et al., 2011; Schoneberg et al., 2016). Our data extend ESCRT-III

function to include vesicle budding *into* the cytosol (normal-topology membrane scission).

Consistent with our hypothesis, cryo-EM images of purified ESCRT-III components

demonstrated that ESCRT-III can deform and stabilize membranes for normal-topology scission

(McCullough et al., 2015). While normal-topology membrane scission required mammalian

IST1, our observations rule out a similar role for Ist1 in peroxisome biogenesis, and instead

suggest that it is the core ESCRT-III components that are capable of normal-topology membrane

scission in regard to PPV biogenesis in yeast (Fig. 7). However, there may be species-specific

differences in regard to ESCRT-III function in de novo peroxisome biogenesis, and it will be

important to test the role of ESCRT-III in peroxisome biogenesis in other organisms. At this

time, we also cannot rule out the possibility that ESCRT-III release of PPVs from the ER proceeds

as a reverse-topology scission event. In this hypothetical scenario, dense tubulated matrices of

ER (Nixon-Abell et al., 2016) would serve as a template for ESCRT-III to assemble as a ring

through which a budded PPV could pass and be cleaved. Understanding the molecular

mechanisms of ESCRT-III function in de novo peroxisome biogenesis in greater detail is

undoubtedly a high priority for future research.

ESCRT-III has been implicated in unconventional protein secretion from the ER with its

mode of action unclear (Curwin et al., 2016). It is interesting to note that unconventional

protein secretion has previously been linked to peroxisomes (Manjithaya et al., 2010), and may

more broadly share a common mechanism of egress with PPVs from the ER. Peroxisomes and

ESCRT-III have also been implicated in prospore membrane formation, which requires a supply

of vesicles to be delivered to and to fuse with the growing prospore membrane (Briza et al.,

2002). Rather than attribute a putative metabolic role for peroxisomes in these processes, it is

plausible that the non-classical vesicle secretion pathway that gives rise to peroxisomes, reliant

on peroxins and ESCRT-III, is a general non-coated secretion pathway that is used more broadly

by cells. The expanding role of ESCRT-III in diverse cellular activities, including the formation of

peroxisomes, suggests that this evolutionarily ancient protein complex has had a much greater

influence on sculpting the eukaryotic bauplan than previously realized.

Materials and methods

Yeast strains and plasmids

The yeast strains used in this study are listed in Table S3 and were derived from the parental

strain *BY4742* or the corresponding gene deletion strain library (Invitrogen) (Giaever et al.,

2002), the parental strain *W303a* (Rothstein et al., 1977), or the parental strain *R1158*

(Mnaimneh et al., 2004), as described previously (Mast et al., 2016). Strains harboring genomic

insertions and deletions were isolated following homologous recombination with targeted PCR

fragments delivered via chemical transformation. Correct integration was verified by PCR across

junctions using gene-specific primers. The following plasmids were used for PCR amplification

with appropriate primers as described: pGFP/*SpHIS5* (Dilworth et al., 2001); pProtA/*SpHIS5*

(Aitchison et al., 1995); pCM189/*URA3* (Gari et al., 1997); pBS34/*hph* (mCherry) (Shaner et al.,

2004); and pFA6a-*nat*NT2 and pFA6a-*hph*NT1 (Janke et al., 2004). pCM189-*VPS20* was

assembled by cloning a 666-bp BamHI/NotI fragment encoding full-length *VPS20* into pCM189.

pCM189-*SNF7* was assembled by cloning a 723-bp BamHI/NotI fragment encoding full-length

SNF7 into pCM189.

Yeast media and growth conditions

Yeast strains were grown in YPD medium (1% yeast extract, 2% peptone, 2% glucose) or YPBO

medium (0.5% KP$_i$, pH 6.0, 0.3% yeast extract, 0.5% peptone, 0.5 % Tween 40, 0.15% oleic acid),

as indicated. All cultures were grown at 30°C. When marker selection was required, defined

synthetic medium (SM) supplemented with 2% glucose and the necessary amino acid(s) or drug

was used. Yeast media and growth conditions for specific experiments are listed below.

YPB-oleate medium for use in ODELAY! was prepared as follows. A solution of 300 mg of

methyl-β-cyclodextrin (Sigma)/mL and 10 µL oleic acid/mL was prepared in absolute ethanol for

a total volume of 3 mL. The solution was then placed in a Rotovap for 3 h to remove the

ethanol. The resulting powder was then reconstituted using ultra-pure H$_2$O to a total volume of

3 mL. Meanwhile 15 mL of 1.33% agarose, 2 mL of 10 × YPB medium, and 1 mL of ultra-pure

H$_2$O were melted in boiling water for 18 min. Then 2 mL of the oleate-cyclodextrin solution

were added to the melted medium and vortexed to mix. The YPB-oleate medium was then cast

into molds and allowed to cool as described (Herricks et al., 2017a). YPB-glucose medium was

prepared similarly except 2 mL of 20% glucose were added instead of the oleate-carbon source.

To study peroxisome biogenesis, strains were grown overnight to saturation in YPD medium

and diluted the next morning by dilution into fresh YPD medium to an OD$_{600}$ = 0.2. Cells were

then allowed to reach logarithmic phase (OD$_{600}$ = 0.7-1) before being diluted again in YPD

medium, supplemented with 4 µM DOX, and incubated for 24 h. The logarithmic phase cells

were harvested by centrifugation, washed five times in YPD medium to remove DOX, inoculated

into fresh YPD medium without DOX at an OD$_{600}$ = 0.2, and cultured for an additional 24 h. At 4,

8, and 12 h, OD$_{600}$ measurements were taken, and cultures were diluted as necessary to

maintain logarithmic growth. Localization of ESCRT-III components to sites of peroxisome

biogenesis used a similar growth scheme, but was performed in YPD medium containing 2 μM

DOX and for 18 h.

One-cell doubling evaluation of living arrays of yeast (ODELAY!)

Sensitive, high-density, and multiparametric analysis of cell growth was performed as described

(Herricks et al., 2017a; Herricks et al., 2017b). Briefly, yeast was cultured in YPD medium in 96

well plates at 30˚C overnight. Cultures were diluted to an OD_{600} = 0.09 and allowed to grow for

6 h at 30˚C. The cultures were then washed in YPB medium without a carbon source, diluted to

an OD_{600} = 0.02, and spotted onto YBP-oleate or YPB-glucose agarose medium. The resulting

cultures were then observed using time-lapse microscopy for 48 h with 30 min intervals

between images. All images were collected on a Leica DMI6000 microscope equipped with a

10× 0.3 NA lens using bright field microscopy. MATLAB scripts using the Micro-Manager

interface controlled the image collection process (Edelstein et al., 2014).

Population growth rates were scored against each other using the equation:

$$Z_{mean} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \frac{d_i - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}$$

Where d_i is the ith decile of query population doubling time, μ_i is the mean of the ith decile of

the parental strain's doubling time, and σ_i is the standard deviation of the ith decile of the

parental strain's doubling time. The mean and standard deviation deciles (μ_i and σ_i) were

calculated from 16 separate *wild-type* and 8 separate deletion strain populations containing at

least 200 individuals per replicate. All calculations were performed using MATLAB scripts

(Herricks et al., 2017a).

EM and quantification

Experiments were performed as described (Tam et al., 2003). Strains were cultured in YPBO

medium for 8 h before being fixed and processed for EM. Image analysis to measure cell and

peroxisome profiles was performed in Image J (National Institutes of Health). Stereological

analysis to derive numerical densities of peroxisomes was performed as described (Weibel and

Bolender, 1973).

Fluorescence microscopy and quantification

Experiments were performed as described (Mast et al., 2016). Briefly, 10 fields of view yielding

at least 100 cells per strain per time point for Gpd1-GFP labeled cells and at least 75 cells per

strain per time point for Pex3-GFP/Snf7-mCherry-labeled cells or Pex3-GFP/Did4-mCherry-

labeled cells were acquired in a semi-automated and randomized fashion with bright field or

calcofluor white staining used to establish focus for each strain and time point. Images were

acquired with a 100× 1.4 NA objective (Olympus) on a DeltaVision Elite High Resolution

Microscope (GE Healthcare Life Sciences). Images were deconvolved with the manufacturer's

supplied deconvolution software (softWoRx) and an experimentally determined point spread

function. Images were further processed using Imaris software (Bitplane), and object-based

colocalization analysis (Bolte and Cordelieres, 2006) was performed using the "Spots" function

as described previously (Mast et al., 2016). Experiments were performed in triplicate.

Preparation of yeast whole cell lysates

Yeast whole cell lysates were prepared by denaturation in alkali solution with a reducing agent.

Approximately 1.85×10^8 cells (5 OD_{600} cell units) were harvested by centrifugation at $5,000 \times g$

for 2 min, and resuspended in 240 µL of 1.85 M NaOH to which 7.4% (v/v) of 2-

mercaptoethanol had been freshly added. The cell suspension was incubated on ice for 5 min

and then mixed with an equal volume of 50% TCA by vortexing. After a 5 min incubation on ice,

the precipitated protein was collected by centrifugation at $16,000 \times g$ for 10 min at 4°C. The

pellet was washed once with ice-cold water and resuspended in 50 µL of Magic A (1 M

unbuffered Tris-HCl, 13% SDS) to which 50 µL of Magic B (30% glycerol, 200 mM DTT, 0.25%

bromophenol blue) were added.

Antibodies and antisera

Antibodies to GFP (Sigma), pA-affinity purified rabbit IgG (Mast et al., 2016), and antiserum to

Kar2 (Tam et al., 2005) have been described. Antiserum to Pex19 was raised in guinea pig

against full-length Pex19 lacking the carboxyl-terminal CKQQ farnesylation motif. Pex19[1-338] was

expressed as a fusion protein to glutathione-S-transferase (PEX19-GST), purified from

Escherichia coli lysate on anti-GST Sepharose, liberated by cleavage with thrombin (removed by

addition of benzamidine Sepharose), and concentrated using an Amicon Ultra centrifugal filter.

Antiserum was tested for specificity for Pex19 by immunoblot of whole cell lysates from *wild-*

type, *pex19Δ*, and *PEX19-pA* strains.

In vitro PPV budding assay

Experiments were performed as described (Mast et al., 2016). Permeabilized yeast cells were

prepared from *pex19Δ* cells expressing Pex3-pA or Pex3-GFP from an endogenous promoter.

Cells were grown overnight in 1 L of YPD medium to an OD_{600} of 1. Cells were collected by

centrifugation at $2,000 \times g$ for 7 min at room temperature, resuspended in low glucose medium

(YPD medium containing 0.1% glucose), and incubated for 30 min at 25°C with vigorous shaking.

Cells were harvested by centrifugation and resuspended in spheroplast medium (1% yeast

peptone, 0.1% glucose, 1.4 M sorbitol, 50 mM potassium phosphate, pH 7.5, 50 mM 2-

mercaptoethanol) supplemented with yeast lytic enzyme (Zymo Research) at 1 mg/g of wet cell

pellet, to a final concentration of 8 mL/g of wet cells and incubated for ~40 min at 37°C with

gentle agitation. Spheroplasts were recovered by centrifugation and washed once in recovery

medium (1% yeast peptone, 0.1 % glucose, 1 M sorbitol). Permeabilization was achieved by

osmotic lysis in the presence of osmotic support. The spheroplast pellet was resuspended with

ice-cold spheroplast lysis buffer (100 mM potassium acetate, 200 mM sorbitol, 20 mM HEPES-

KOH, pH 7.2, 2 mM $MgCl_2$) at a concentration of 5 mL/75 OD_{600} unit cell equivalents. The slurry

was pipetted up and down with moderate force 5-10 times and incubated on ice for 20 min to

osmotic equilibration. Permeabilized yeast cells (PYCs) were collected by centrifugation at 3,000

× g for 5 min at 4°C, and the supernatant was thoroughly removed. PYCs were washed twice

with TBPS (115 mM potassium acetate, 2.5 mM magnesium acetate, 0.25 M sorbitol, 1×

cOmplete protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche), 25 mM HEPES, pH 7.2) and resuspended in TBPS

at a concentration of 25 µL/5 OD_{600} unit cell equivalents.

For yeast cytosols, spheroplasts were lysed with ice-cold 20 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.4, at

a concentration of 210 µL per 75 OD_{600} unit cell equivalents. The slurry was pipetted 30 times

with a 1 mL pipet to ensure efficient lysis. The resultant lysate was clarified by centrifugation at

3,000 × g for 5 min at 4°C, and the supernatant was collected and subjected to centrifugation at

100,000 × g for 1 h to produce a 100 kgS supernatant (S100) of yeast cytosol. Protein

concentration was determined by a bicinchoninic acid assay (Pierce) and normalized to 4

mg/mL with addition of 10× transport buffer (250 mM HEPES-KOH, pH 7.2, 1.15 M potassium

acetate, 25 mM MgCl$_2$, 2.5 M sorbitol) and cOmplete protease inhibitor cocktail to 1×

concentration.

577   Reaction conditions were as follows: 100 μL of PYCs, 100 μL of wild-type cytosol, 100 μL

of a 4× ATP regenerating system (4 mM ATP, 0.4 mM GTP, 80 mM creatine phosphate, 4 U

creatine phosphate kinase (Sigma)), and 100 μL of 2× TBPS were mixed on ice. The reaction was

initiated by incubation at room temperature for 90 min, and chilling the samples on ice

terminated the reaction. After the reaction was terminated, the PYCs were pelleted by

centrifugation at 13,000 × g for 5 min at 4°C. To recover PPVs, the supernatant was subjected to

centrifugation at 200,000 × g for 1 h at 4°C. The pellet was resuspended in 2× sample buffer (4%

SDS, 0.15 M Tris-HCl, pH 6.8, 4 mM EDTA, 20% glycerol, 2% 2-mercaptoethanol, 0.02%

bromophenol blue) before being resolved by SDS-PAGE.

586   To complement PPV budding defects, cytosols were mixed 1:1 at 4°C directly before

addition to the reaction. For experiments with apyrase, PYCs and cytosols were incubated

separately with 1 U of apyrase (Sigma) and resuspended in reaction buffer (25 mM HEPES-KOH,

pH 7.2, 115 mM potassium acetate, 2.5 mM MgCl$_2$, 250 mM sorbitol) for 20 min before starting

the reaction. For experiments in which exogenous ATP was added back, only apyrase-treated

PYCs that had been washed once in reaction buffer were used. Alphaview (ProteinSimple) was

used to quantify the chemiluminescence signal with values normalized between the negative

pex19Δ PYCs only control (set to 0), and the positive *wild-type* cytosol plus ATP control (set to

100). Experiments were performed in triplicate.

Online supplemental material

Fig. S1 contains supporting data to show additional electron micrographs of the ESCRT-III

deletion mutants revealing peroxisome morphology defects. Fig. S2 contains supporting data to

show the budding efficiencies of PPVs from reactions containing cytosols isolated from ESCRT

deletion strains. Fig. S3 contains supporting data to show the levels of Pex19 in ESCRT deletion

mutants. Table S1 contains supplemental information summarizing the results of ESCRT

deletion mutants from previous genomic screens for peroxisome function. Table S2 contains

supplemental information on the normalized Z-scores for all strains measured by ODELAY!.

Table S3 contains supplemental information on the genetic background of the yeast strains

used in this study, as well as their origin of derivation.

Acknowledgments

We thank Alexis Kaushansky, Sanjeev Kumar, Maxwell Neal, and the Aitchison laboratory for

helpful discussion and feedback on the manuscript. We gratefully acknowledge the technical

assistance of Elena Savidov.

This work was supported by a Foundation Grant from the Canadian Institutes of Health

Research (CIHR) to R.A.R. and by grants P50 GM076547 and P41 GM109824 from the National

Institutes of Health to J.D.A. F.D.M is a postdoctoral fellow of the CIHR. The support of Ian

Tolmie and Jennifer Black is gratefully acknowledged, and this paper is dedicated to the

memory their son, Dane Tolmie.

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Author contributions: F.D.M., R.A.R, and J.D.A. designed the experiments, analyzed the

results and wrote the manuscript. F.D.M. performed the experiments. R.A.R performed the EM

experiments. T.H. performed the ODELAY! experiments and analysis. K.M.S and L.R.M assisted

with the experiments. R.A.S contributed to the experimental design and analysis. All authors

read and commented on the manuscript.

References

Adolf, F., A. Herrmann, A. Hellwig, R. Beck, B. Brugger, and F.T. Wieland. 2013. Scission of COPI
and COPII vesicles is independent of GTP hydrolysis. *Traffic*. 14:922⬜932.
Agrawal, G., S.N. Fassas, Z.J. Xia, and S. Subramani. 2016. Distinct requirements for intra-ER
sorting and budding of peroxisomal membrane proteins from the ER. *J. Cell Biol*.
212:335⬜348.
Agrawal, G., S. Joshi, and S. Subramani. 2011. Cell-free sorting of peroxisomal membrane
proteins from the endoplasmic reticulum. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 108:9113⬜9118.
Agrawal, G., H.H. Shang, Z.J. Xia, and S. Subramani. 2017. Functional regions of the peroxin
Pex19 necessary for peroxisome biogenesis. *J. Biol. Chem*. 292:11547⬜11560.
Agrawal, G., and S. Subramani. 2016. *De novo* peroxisome biogenesis: Evolving concepts and
conundrums. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*. 1863:892⬜901.
Aitchison, J.D., G. Blobel, and M.P. Rout. 1995. Nup120p: a yeast nucleoporin required for NPC
distribution and mRNA transport. *J. Cell Biol*. 131:1659⬜1675.
Babst, M., D.J. Katzmann, E.J. Estepa-Sabal, T. Meerloo, and S.D. Emr. 2002a. ESCRT-III: an
endosome-associated heterooligomeric protein complex required for MVB sorting. *Dev.*
Cell. 3:271⬜282.
Babst, M., D.J. Katzmann, W.B. Snyder, B. Wendland, and S.D. Emr. 2002b. Endosome-
associated complex, ESCRT-II, recruits transport machinery for protein sorting at the
multivesicular body. *Dev. Cell*. 3:283⬜289.
Babst, M., T.K. Sato, L.M. Banta, and S.D. Emr. 1997. Endosomal transport function in yeast
requires a novel AAA-type ATPase, Vps4p. *EMBO J*. 16:1820⬜1831.
Bauer, S.T., K.E. McQueeney, T. Patel, and M.T. Morris. 2017. Localization of a trypanosome
peroxin to the endoplasmic reticulum. *J. Eukaryot. Microbiol*. 64:97⬜105.
Bolte, S., and F.P. Cordelieres. 2006. A guided tour into subcellular colocalization analysis in
light microscopy. *J. Microsc*. 224:213⬜232.
Briza, P., E. Bogengruber, A. Thur, M. Rutzler, M. Munsterkotter, I.W. Dawes, and M.
Breitenbach. 2002. Systematic analysis of sporulation phenotypes in 624 non-lethal
homozygous deletion strains of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Yeast*. 19:403⬜422.
Carlton, J.G., and J. Martin-Serrano. 2007. Parallels between cytokinesis and retroviral budding:
a role for the ESCRT machinery. *Science*. 316:1908⬜1912.
Colasante, C., J. Chen, B. Ahlemeyer, and E. Baumgart-Vogt. 2015. Peroxisomes in
cardiomyocytes and the peroxisome / peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor-loop.
Thromb. Haemost. 113:452⬜463.
Costanzo, M., B. VanderSluis, E.N. Koch, A. Baryshnikova, C. Pons, G. Tan, W. Wang, M. Usaj, J.
Hanchard, S.D. Lee, et al. 2016. A global genetic interaction network maps a wiring
diagram of cellular function. *Science*. 353.

Curwin, A.J., N. Brouwers, Y.A.M. Alonso, D. Teis, G. Turacchio, S. Parashuraman, P. Ronchi, and
V. Malhotra. 2016. ESCRT-III drives the final stages of CUPS maturation for
unconventional protein secretion. *eLife*. 5.

David, C., J. Koch, S. Oeljeklaus, A. Laernsack, S. Melchior, S. Wiese, A. Schummer, R. Erdmann,
B. Warscheid, and C. Brocard. 2013. A combined approach of quantitative interaction
proteomics and live-cell imaging reveals a regulatory role for endoplasmic reticulum (ER)
reticulon homology proteins in peroxisome biogenesis. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*.
12:2408⬚2425.

De Craemer, D., M. Pauwels, and F. Roels. 1993. Peroxisomes in cirrhosis of the human liver: a
cytochemical, ultrastructural and quantitative study. *Hepatology*. 17:404⬚410.

Delmaghani, S., J. Defourny, A. Aghaie, M. Beurg, D. Dulon, N. Thelen, I. Perfettini, T. Zelles, M.
Aller, A. Meyer, et al. 2015. Hypervulnerability to sound exposure through impaired
adaptive proliferation of peroxisomes. *Cell*. 163:894⬚906.

Di Cara, F., A. Sheshachalam, N.E. Braverman, R.A. Rachubinski, and A.J. Simmonds. 2017.
Peroxisome-mediated metabolism is required for immune response to microbial
infection. *Immunity*. 47:93⬚106.

Dilworth, D.J., A. Suprapto, J.C. Padovan, B.T. Chait, R.W. Wozniak, M.P. Rout, and J.D.
Aitchison. 2001. Nup2p dynamically associates with the distal regions of the yeast
nuclear pore complex. *J. Cell Biol*. 153:1465⬚1478.

Distel, B., R. Erdmann, S.J. Gould, G. Blobel, D.I. Crane, J.M. Cregg, G. Dodt, Y. Fujiki, J.M.
Goodman, W.W. Just, et al. 1996. A unified nomenclature for peroxisome biogenesis
factors. *J. Cell Biol*. 135:1⬚3.

Dixit, E., S. Boulant, Y. Zhang, A.S. Lee, C. Odendall, B. Shum, N. Hacohen, Z.J. Chen, S.P.
Whelan, M. Fransen, et al.. 2010. Peroxisomes are signaling platforms for antiviral
innate immunity. *Cell*. 141:668⬚681.

Dixon, S.J., M. Costanzo, A. Baryshnikova, B. Andrews, and C. Boone. 2009. Systematic mapping
of genetic interaction networks. *Ann. Rev. Genet*. 43:601⬚625.

Drees, B.L., V. Thorsson, G.W. Carter, A.W. Rives, M.Z. Raymond, I. Avila-Campillo, P. Shannon,
and T. Galitski. 2005. Derivation of genetic interaction networks from quantitative
phenotype data. *Genome Biol*. 6:R38.

Duden, R., L. Kajikawa, L. Wuestehube, and R. Schekman. 1998. ε-COP is a structural
component of coatomer that functions to stabilize α-COP. *EMBO J*. 17:985⬚995.

Edelstein, A.D., M.A. Tsuchida, N. Amodaj, H. Pinkard, R.D. Vale, and N. Stuurman. 2014.
Advanced methods of microscope control using μManager software. *J. Biol. Methods*.
1:e10.

Fagarasanu, A., M. Fagarasanu, G.A. Eitzen, J.D. Aitchison, and R.A. Rachubinski. 2006. The
peroxisomal membrane protein Inp2p is the peroxisome-specific receptor for the
myosin V motor Myo2p of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Dev. Cell*. 10:587⬚600.

Fagarasanu, A., F.D. Mast, B. Knoblach, Y. Jin, M.J. Brunner, M.R. Logan, J.N. Glover, G.A. Eitzen,
J.D. Aitchison, L.S. Weisman, et al. 2009. Myosin-driven peroxisome partitioning in *S.
cerevisiae*. *J. Cell Biol*. 186:541⬚554.

Fakieh, M.H., P.J. Drake, J. Lacey, J.M. Munck, A.M. Motley, and E.H. Hettema. 2013. Intra-ER
sorting of the peroxisomal membrane protein Pex3 relies on its luminal domain. *Biol.
Open*. 2:829⬚837.

Farré, J.C., K. Carolino, O.V. Stasyk, O.G. Stasyk, Z. Hodzic, G. Agrawal, A. Till, M. Proietto, J.
Cregg, A.A. Sibirny, et al. 2017. A new yeast peroxin, Pex36, a functional homolog of
mammalian PEX16, functions in the ER-to-peroxisome traffic of peroxisomal membrane
proteins. *J. Mol. Biol*. 429:3743⬚3762.
Gari, E., L. Piedrafita, M. Aldea, and E. Herrero. 1997. A set of vectors with a tetracycline-
regulatable promoter system for modulated gene expression in *Saccharomyces*
cerevisiae. *Yeast*. 13:837⬚848.
Garrus, J.E., U.K. von Schwedler, O.W. Pornillos, S.G. Morham, K.H. Zavitz, H.E. Wang, D.A.
Wettstein, K.M. Stray, M. Cote, R.L. Rich, et al. 2001. Tsg101 and the vacuolar protein
sorting pathway are essential for HIV-1 budding. *Cell*. 107:55⬚65.
Giaever, G., A.M. Chu, L. Ni, C. Connelly, L. Riles, S. Véronneau, S. Dow, A. Lucau-Danila, K.
Anderson, B. André, et al. 2002. Functional profiling of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*
genome. *Nature*. 418:387⬚391.
Guizetti, J., L. Schermelleh, J. Mantler, S. Maar, I. Poser, H. Leonhardt, T. Muller-Reichert, and
D.W. Gerlich. 2011. Cortical constriction during abscission involves helices of ESCRT-III-
dependent filaments. *Science*. 331:1616⬚1620.
Guther, M.L., M.D. Urbaniak, A. Tavendale, A. Prescott, and M.A. Ferguson. 2014. High-
confidence glycosome proteome for procyclic form *Trypanosoma brucei* by epitope-tag
organelle enrichment and SILAC proteomics. *J. Proteome Res*. 13:2796⬚2806.
Halbach, A., C. Landgraf, S. Lorenzen, K. Rosenkranz, R. Volkmer-Engert, R. Erdmann, and H.
Rottensteiner. 2006. Targeting of the tail-anchored peroxisomal membrane proteins
PEX26 and PEX15 occurs through C-terminal PEX19-binding sites. *J. Cell Sci*.
119:2508⬚2517.
Henne, W.M., N.J. Buchkovich, and S.D. Emr. 2011. The ESCRT pathway. *Dev. Cell*. 21:77⬚91.
Herricks, T., D.J. Dilworth, F.D. Mast, S. Li, J.J. Smith, A.V. Ratushny, and J.D. Aitchison. 2017a.
One-cell doubling evaluation by living arrays of yeast, ODELAY! *G3 (Bethesda)*.
7:279⬚288.
Herricks, T., F.D. Mast, S. Li, and J.D. Aitchison. 2017b. ODELAY: A large-scale method for multi-
parameter quantification of yeast growth. *J. Vis. Exp*., e55879.
Hettema, E.H., W. Girzalsky, M. van Den Berg, R. Erdmann, and B. Distel. 2000. *Saccharomyces*
cerevisiae Pex3p and Pex19p are required for proper localization and stability of
peroxisomal membrane proteins. *EMBO J*. 19:223⬚233.
Hoepfner, D., D. Schildknegt, I. Braakman, P. Philippsen, and H.F. Tabak. 2005. Contribution of
the endoplasmic reticulum to peroxisome formation. *Cell*. 122:85⬚95.
Hu, J., A. Baker, B. Bartel, N. Linka, R.T. Mullen, S. Reumann, and B.K. Zolman. 2012. Plant
peroxisomes: biogenesis and function. *Plant Cell*. 24:2279⬚2303.
Igual, J.C., E. Matallana, C. Gonzalez-Bosch, L. Franco, and J.E. Perez-Ortin. 1991. A new glucose-
repressible gene identified from the analysis of chromatin structure in deletion mutants
of yeast *SUC2* locus. *Yeast*. 7:379⬚389.
Jan, C.H., C.C. Williams, and J.S. Weissman. 2014. Principles of ER cotranslational translocation
revealed by proximity-specific ribosome profiling. *Science*. 346:1257521.
Janke, C., M.M. Magiera, N. Rathfelder, C. Taxis, S. Reber, H. Maekawa, A. Moreno-Borchart, G.
Doenges, E. Schwob, E. Schiebel, et al. 2004. A versatile toolbox for PCR-based tagging

of yeast genes: new fluorescent proteins, more markers and promoter substitution
cassettes. *Yeast*. 21:947–962.

Jimenez, A.J., P. Maiuri, J. Lafaurie-Janvore, S. Divoux, M. Piel, and F. Perez. 2014. ESCRT
machinery is required for plasma membrane repair. *Science*. 343:1247136.

Joshi, A.S., X. Huang, V. Choudhary, T.P. Levine, J. Hu, and W.A. Prinz. 2016. A family of
membrane-shaping proteins at ER subdomains regulates pre-peroxisomal vesicle
biogenesis. *J. Cell Biol*. 215:515–529.

Jung, S., M. Marelli, R.A. Rachubinski, D.R. Goodlett, and J.D. Aitchison. 2010. Dynamic changes
in the subcellular distribution of Gpd1p in response to cell stress. *J. Biol. Chem*.
285:6739–6749.

Kaewsapsak, P., D.M. Shechner, W. Mallard, J.L. Rinn, and A.Y. Ting. 2017. Live-cell mapping of
organelle-associated RNAs via proximity biotinylation combined with protein-RNA
crosslinking. *eLife*. 6:e29224.

Katzmann, D.J., M. Babst, and S.D. Emr. 2001. Ubiquitin-dependent sorting into the
multivesicular body pathway requires the function of a conserved endosomal protein
sorting complex, ESCRT-I. *Cell*. 106:145–155.

Katzmann, D.J., C.J. Stefan, M. Babst, and S.D. Emr. 2003. Vps27 recruits ESCRT machinery to
endosomes during MVB sorting. *J. Cell Biol*. 162:413–423.

Kao, Y.T., K.L. Gonzalez, and B. Bartel. 2018. Peroxisome function, biogenesis, and dynamics in
plants. *Plant Physiol*. 176:162–177.

Kim, P.K., R.T. Mullen, U. Schumann, and J. Lippincott-Schwartz. 2006. The origin and
maintenance of mammalian peroxisomes involves a de novo PEX16-dependent pathway
from the ER. *J. Cell Biol*. 173:521–532.

Kumar, S., R. de Boer, and I. van der Klei. 2018. Yeast cells contain a heterogeneous population
of peroxisomes that segregate asymmetrically during cell division. *J. Cell Sci*. In press.

Lam, S.K., N. Yoda, and R. Schekman. 2010. A vesicle carrier that mediates peroxisome protein
traffic from the endoplasmic reticulum. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 107:21523–21528.

Lee, J.A., A. Beigneux, S.T. Ahmad, S.G. Young, and F.B. Gao. 2007. ESCRT-III dysfunction causes
autophagosome accumulation and neurodegeneration. *Curr. Biol*. 17:1561–1567.

Li, X., E. Baumgart, J.C. Morrell, G. Jimenez-Sanchez, D. Valle, and S.J. Gould. 2002. PEX11β
deficiency is lethal and impairs neuronal migration but does not abrogate peroxisome
function. *Mol. Cell. Biol*. 22:4358–4365.

Loncle, N., M. Agromayor, J. Martin-Serrano, and D.W. Williams. 2015. An ESCRT module is
required for neuron pruning. *Sci. Rep*. 5:8461.

Mani, R., R.P. St. Onge, J.L. Hartman IV, G. Giaever, and F.P. Roth. 2008. Defining genetic
interaction. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 105:3461–3466.

Manjithaya, R., C. Anjard, W.F. Loomis, and S. Subramani. 2010. Unconventional secretion of
Pichia pastoris Acb1 is dependent on GRASP protein, peroxisomal functions, and
autophagosome formation. *J. Cell Biol*. 188:537–546.

Mast, F.D., A. Fagarasanu, B. Knoblach, and R.A. Rachubinski. 2010. Peroxisome biogenesis:
something old, something new, something borrowed. *Physiology*. 25:347–356.

Mast, F.D., A. Jamakhandi, R.A. Saleem, D.J. Dilworth, R.S. Rogers, R.A. Rachubinski, and J.D.
Aitchison. 2016. Peroxins Pex30 and Pex29 dynamically associate with reticulons to

regulate peroxisome biogenesis from the endoplasmic reticulum. *J. Biol. Chem.*
291:15408⬜15427.
Mast, F.D., R.A. Rachubinski, and J.D. Aitchison. 2015. Signaling dynamics and peroxisomes.
Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. 35:131⬜136.
Mayerhofer, P.U., M. Bano-Polo, I. Mingarro, and A.E. Johnson. 2016. Human peroxin PEX3 is
co-translationally Integrated into the ER and exits the ER in budding vesicles. *Traffic.*
17:117⬜130.
McCullough, J., A.K. Clippinger, N. Talledge, M.L. Skowyra, M.G. Saunders, T.V. Naismith, L.A.
Colf, P. Afonine, C. Arthur, W.I. Sundquist, et al. 2015. Structure and membrane
remodeling activity of ESCRT-III helical polymers. *Science.* 350:1548⬜1551.
Meinecke, M., C. Cizmowski, W. Schliebs, V. Kruger, S. Beck, R. Wagner, and R. Erdmann. 2010.
The peroxisomal importomer constitutes a large and highly dynamic pore. *Nat. Cell Biol.*
12:273⬜277.
Mnaimneh, S., A.P. Davierwala, J. Haynes, J. Moffat, W.T. Peng, W. Zhang, X. Yang, J. Pootoolal,
G. Chua, A. Lopez, et al. 2004. Exploration of essential gene functions via titratable
promoter alleles. *Cell.* 118:31⬜44.
Motley, A.M., P.C. Galvin, L. Ekal, J.M. Nuttall, and E.H. Hettema. 2015. Reevaluation of the role
of Pex1 and dynamin-related proteins in peroxisome membrane biogenesis. *J. Cell Biol.*
211:1041⬜1056.
Motley, A.M., and E.H. Hettema. 2007. Yeast peroxisomes multiply by growth and division. *J.*
Cell Biol. 178:399⬜410.
Motley, A.M., G.P. Ward, and E.H. Hettema. 2008. Dnm1p-dependent peroxisome fission
requires Caf4p, Mdv1p and Fis1p. *J. Cell Sci.* 121:1633⬜1640.
Nichols, B.J., C. Ungermann, H.R. Pelham, W.T. Wickner, and A. Haas. 1997. Homotypic vacuolar
fusion mediated by t- and v-SNAREs. *Nature.* 387:199⬜202.
Nixon-Abell, J., C.J. Obara, A.V. Weigel, D. Li, W.R. Legant, C.S. Xu, H.A. Pasolli, K. Harvey, H.F.
Hess, E. Betzig, et al. 2016. Increased spatiotemporal resolution reveals highly dynamic
dense tubular matrices in the peripheral ER. *Science.* 354:aaf3928.
Odendall, C., E. Dixit, F. Stavru, H. Bierne, K.M. Franz, A.F. Durbin, S. Boulant, L. Gehrke, P.
Cossart, and J.C. Kagan. 2014. Diverse intracellular pathogens activate type III interferon
expression from peroxisomes. *Nat. Immunol.* 15:717⬜726.
Olmos, Y., L. Hodgson, J. Mantell, P. Verkade, and J.G. Carlton. 2015. ESCRT-III controls nuclear
envelope reformation. *Nature.* 522:236⬜239.
Perry, R.J., F.D. Mast, and R.A. Rachubinski. 2009. Endoplasmic reticulum-associated secretory
proteins Sec20p, Sec39p, and Dsl1p are involved in peroxisome biogenesis. *Euk. Cell.*
8:830⬜843.
Reumann, S., and B. Bartel. 2016. Plant peroxisomes: recent discoveries in functional
complexity, organelle homeostasis, and morphological dynamics. *Curr. Opin. Plant Biol.*
34:17⬜26.
Reumann, S., and A.P. Weber. 2006. Plant peroxisomes respire in the light: some gaps of the
photorespiratory C2 cycle have become filled ⬜ others remain. *Biochem. Biophys. Acta.*
1763:1496⬜1510.
Rothstein, R.J., R.E. Esposito, and M.S. Esposito. 1977. The effect of ochre suppression on
meiosis and ascospore formation in *Saccharomyces. Genetics.* 85:35⬜54.

Rusten, T.E., T. Vaccari, K. Lindmo, L.M. Rodahl, I.P. Nezis, C. Sem-Jacobsen, F. Wendler, J.P.
Vincent, A. Brech, D. Bilder, et al. 2007. ESCRTs and Fab1 regulate distinct steps of
autophagy. *Curr. Biol*. 17:1817⬚1825.
Saleem, R.A., B. Knoblach, F.D. Mast, J.J. Smith, J. Boyle, C.M. Dobson, R. Long-O'Donnell, R.A.
Rachubinski, and J.D. Aitchison. 2008. Genome-wide analysis of signaling networks
regulating fatty acid-induced gene expression and organelle biogenesis. *J. Cell Biol*.
181:281⬚292.
Saleem, R.A., R. Long-O'Donnell, D.J. Dilworth, A.M. Armstrong, A.P. Jamakhandi, Y. Wan, T.A.
Knijnenburg, A. Niemisto, J. Boyle, R.A. Rachubinski, et al. 2010. Genome-wide analysis
of effectors of peroxisome biogenesis. *PLOS ONE*. 5:e11953.
Sato, K., and A. Nakano. 2002. Emp47p and its close homolog Emp46p have a tyrosine-
containing endoplasmic reticulum exit signal and function in glycoprotein secretion in
Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Mol. Biol. Cell*. 13:2518⬚2532.
Scheffer, L.L., S.C. Sreetama, N. Sharma, S. Medikayala, K.J. Brown, A. Defour, and J.K. Jaiswal.
2014. Mechanism of Ca^{2+}-triggered ESCRT assembly and regulation of cell membrane
repair. *Nat. Commun*. 5:5646.
Schoneberg, J., I.H. Lee, J.H. Iwasa, and J.H. Hurley. 2016. Reverse-topology membrane scission
by the ESCRT proteins. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol*. 18:5⬚17.
Schrader, M., J.L. Costello, L.F. Godinho, A.S. Azadi, and M. Islinger. 2016. Proliferation and
fission of peroxisomes - An update. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta*. 1863:971⬚983.
Schrul, B., and R.R. Kopito. 2016. Peroxin-dependent targeting of a lipid-droplet-destined
membrane protein to ER subdomains. *Nat. Cell Biol*. 18:740⬚751.
Schuldiner, M., and M. Bohnert. 2017. A different kind of love - lipid droplet contact sites.
Biochim. Biophys. Acta. 1862:1188⬚1196.
Schuldiner, M., S.R. Collins, N.J. Thompson, V. Denic, A. Bhamidipati, T. Punna, J. Ihmels, B.
Andrews, C. Boone, J.F. Greenblatt, et al. 2005. Exploration of the function and
organization of the yeast early secretory pathway through an epistatic miniarray profile.
Cell. 123:507⬚519.
Schuldiner, M., J. Metz, V. Schmid, V. Denic, M. Rakwalska, H.D. Schmitt, B. Schwappach, and
J.S. Weissman. 2008. The GET complex mediates insertion of tail-anchored proteins into
the ER membrane. *Cell*. 134:634⬚645.
Shaner, N.C., R.E. Campbell, P.A. Steinbach, B.N. Giepmans, A.E. Palmer, and R.Y. Tsien. 2004.
Improved monomeric red, orange and yellow fluorescent proteins derived from
Discosoma sp. red fluorescent protein. *Nat. Biotechnol*. 22:1567⬚1572.
Smith, J.J., and J.D. Aitchison. 2013. Peroxisomes take shape. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol*.
14:803⬚817.
Smith, J.J., M. Marelli, R.H. Christmas, F.J. Vizeacoumar, D.J. Dilworth, T. Ideker, T. Galitski, K.
Dimitrov, R.A. Rachubinski, and J.D. Aitchison. 2002. Transcriptome profiling to identify
genes involved in peroxisome assembly and function. *J. Cell Biol*. 158:259⬚271.
Smith, J.J., Y. Sydorskyy, M. Marelli, D. Hwang, H. Bolouri, R.A. Rachubinski, and J.D. Aitchison.
2006. Expression and functional profiling reveal distinct gene classes involved in fatty
acid metabolism. *Mol. Syst. Biol*. 2:2006 0009.
South, S.T., K.A. Sacksteder, X. Li, Y. Liu, and S.J. Gould. 2000. Inhibitors of COPI and COPII do
not block PEX3-mediated peroxisome synthesis. *J. Cell Biol*. 149:1345⬚1360.

Spang, A. 2008. The life cycle of a transport vesicle. *Cell Mol. Life Sci*. 65:2781◻2789.

Tam, Y.Y.C., A. Fagarasanu, M. Fagarasanu, and R.A. Rachubinski. 2005. Pex3p initiates the
formation of a preperoxisomal compartment from a subdomain of the endoplasmic
reticulum in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *J. Biol. Chem*. 280:34933◻34939.

Tam, Y.Y.C, J.C. Torres-Guzman, F.J. Vizeacoumar, J.J. Smith, M. Marelli, J.D. Aitchison, and R.A.
Rachubinski. 2003. Pex11-related proteins in peroxisome dynamics: a role for the novel
peroxin Pex27p in controlling peroxisome size and number in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*.
Mol. Biol. Cell. 14:4089◻4102.

Tang, S., W.M. Henne, P.P. Borbat, N.J. Buchkovich, J.H. Freed, Y. Mao, J.C. Fromme, and S.D.
Emr. 2015. Structural basis for activation, assembly and membrane binding of ESCRT-III
Snf7 filaments. *eLife*. 4:e12548.

Thoms, S., I. Harms, K.U. Kalies, and J. Gartner. 2012. Peroxisome formation requires the
endoplasmic reticulum channel protein Sec61. *Traffic*. 13:599◻609.

Titorenko, V.I., H. Chan, and R.A. Rachubinski. 2000. Fusion of small peroxisomal vesicles in
vitro reconstructs an early step in the in vivo multistep peroxisome assembly pathway of
Yarrowia lipolytica. *J. Cell Biol*. 148:29◻44.

Titorenko, V.I., and R.A. Rachubinski. 1998. Mutants of the yeast *Yarrowia lipolytica* defective in
protein exit from the endoplasmic reticulum are also defective in peroxisome
biogenesis. *Mol. Cell. Biol*. 18:2789◻2803.

Titorenko, V.I., and R.A. Rachubinski. 2000. Peroxisomal membrane fusion requires two AAA
family ATPases, Pex1p and Pex6p. *J. Cell Biol*. 150:881◻886.

Tripathi, D.N., and C.L. Walker. 2016. The peroxisome as a cell signaling organelle. *Curr. Opin.*
Cell Biol. 39:109◻112.

van der Zand, A., I. Braakman, and H.F. Tabak. 2010. Peroxisomal membrane proteins insert
into the endoplasmic reticulum. *Mol. Biol. Cell*. 21:2057◻2065.

van der Zand, A., J. Gent, I. Braakman, and H.F. Tabak. 2012. Biochemically distinct vesicles from
the endoplasmic reticulum fuse to form peroxisomes. *Cell*. 149:397◻409.

Vietri, M., K.O. Schink, C. Campsteijn, C.S. Wegner, S.W. Schultz, L. Christ, S.B. Thoresen, A.
Brech, C. Raiborg, and H. Stenmark. 2015. Spastin and ESCRT-III coordinate mitotic
spindle disassembly and nuclear envelope sealing. *Nature*. 522:231◻235.

Webster, B.M., P. Colombi, J. Jager, and C.P. Lusk. 2014. Surveillance of nuclear pore complex
assembly by ESCRT-III/Vps4. *Cell*. 159:388◻401.

Weibel, E.R., and R.P. Bolender. 1973. Stereological techniques for electron microscopic
morphometry. *In* Principles and Techniques of Electron Microscopy. M.A. Hayat, editor.
Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, NY. 237◻296.

Weller, S., S.J. Gould, and D. Valle. 2003. Peroxisome biogenesis disorders. *Ann. Rev. Genomics*
Hum. Genet. 4:165◻211.

Wollert, T., C. Wunder, J. Lippincott-Schwartz, and J.H. Hurley. 2009. Membrane scission by the
ESCRT-III complex. *Nature*. 458:172◻177.

Young, J.M., J.W. Nelson, J. Cheng, W. Zhang, S. Mader, C.M. Davis, R.S. Morrison, and N.J.
Alkayed. 2015. Peroxisomal biogenesis in ischemic brain. *Antioxid. Redox Signal*.
22:109◻120.

Zhang, J., J. Kim, A. Alexander, S. Cai, D.N. Tripathi, R. Dere, A.R. Tee, J. Tait-Mulder, A. Di
Nardo, J.M. Han, et al. 2013. A tuberous sclerosis complex signalling node at the

peroxisome regulates mTORC1 and autophagy in response to ROS. *Nat. Cell Biol.*

920   15:1186⬜1196.

921   Zhang, J., D.N. Tripathi, J. Jing, A. Alexander, J. Kim, R.T. Powell, R. Dere, J. Tait-Mulder, J.H. Lee,

922   T.T. Paull, et al. 2015. ATM functions at the peroxisome to induce pexophagy in

923   response to ROS. *Nat. Cell Biol.* 17:1259-1269.

Figure legends

Figure 1. ESCRT-III mutants exhibit oleate-specific growth defects. Doubling times of individual

yeast cells growing into colonies on solid-phase medium containing either glucose or oleic acid

as sole carbon source were measured with ODELAY!. A population-derived *Z*-score and SEM for

each strain are plotted with measurements from glucose-containing medium on the *x*-axis

against measurements from oleic acid-containing medium on the *y*-axis from 8 biological

replicates per growth condition. (A) ODELAY! results for deletion strains derived from the

BY4742 parental strain. (B) ODELAY! results for select ESCRT deletion strains derived from the

W303 parental strain.

Figure 2. ESCRT-III deletion strains have populations of smaller and aberrant peroxisomes. (A)

Wild-type, (B) *vps20Δ* and (C) *snf7Δ* cells were grown in medium containing oleic acid for 8 h to

induce the production of peroxisomes and prepared for EM. Representative cell ultrastructures

and organelle profiles are presented. Arrowheads in (B) and (C) point to aberrant vesicular

structures observed in *vps20Δ* and *snf7Δ* cells. Bar, 1 μm. (D–I) Morphometric analysis of

peroxisomes. For each strain analyzed, the areas of individual peroxisomes were determined

and used to calculate the numerical density of peroxisomes, which is the number of

peroxisomes per μm^3 of cell volume (Weibel and Bolender, 1973). Bar graphs display the

numerical density of peroxisomes (D) and the population distribution of the areas of

peroxisomes (E–I) for *wild-type* and ESCRT-III deletion strains.

Figure 3. ESCRT-III positively regulates de novo peroxisome biogenesis. (A) Genomically

encoded *PEX19* was placed under the control of a tetracycline-repressible tet_{07} promoter to

allow regulatable de novo peroxisome production in *wild-type, vps20Δ, snf7Δ, did4Δ, vps24Δ,*

and *ist1Δ* cells expressing Gpd1-GFP as a peroxisomal marker. Cells were imaged before

(steady-state) and after 24 h incubation with 4 µM DOX. Additional observations were made 4,

8, 12, and 24 h after removal of DOX. Scale bar, 5 µm. (B) The population distributions of

peroxisome densities per cell are depicted at each time point as interquartile box-and-whisker

blots. (C) The mean peroxisome density per strain over a time course of de novo peroxisome

biogenesis was plotted with error bars representing the SEM of 3 biological replicates.

Figure 4. Pex19 dynamics are altered in ESCRT-III deletion mutants during de novo

peroxisome biogenesis. Genomically encoded *PEX19* was placed under the control of a

tetracycline-repressible tet_{07} promoter to allow regulatable de novo peroxisome production in

wild-type, vps20Δ, snf7Δ, did4Δ, vps24Δ and *ist1Δ* cells. Whole cell lysates were prepared from

each strain before (steady-state) and after a 24 h incubation with 4 µM DOX. Additional whole

cell lysates were prepared 4, 8, 12 and 24 h after removal of DOX. Equal amounts of protein

from these whole cell lysates were resolved by SDS-PAGE, transferred to PVDF, and

immunoblotted for Pex19 and Kar2, which was used as a control for protein loading.

Figure 5. ESCRT-III functions conditionally with *PEX19*. Doubling times of individual yeast cells

growing into colonies on solid-phase YEPD medium with and without 4 µM DOX were measured

with ODELAY!. Strains grown in the presence of DOX were precultured for 24 h in the presence

of 4 µM DOX to turn off *PEX19* and deplete Pex19 levels from cells. A population-derived *Z*-

score and SEM for each strain are plotted on a phenotypic axis and summarized as a phenotypic

inequality defining the genetic interaction between the indicated genes from 4 biological

replicates per strain per growth condition.

Figure 6. ESCRT-III components localize to sites of de novo peroxisome biogenesis. (A) Snf7

localizes to sites of de novo peroxisome biogenesis. *Wild-type* cells expressing endogenously

tagged Pex3-GFP and Snf7-mCherry with tetracycline-repressible *PEX19* were imaged before

(control) and 1 h following an 18 h incubation with 2 µM DOX (recovery). Arrowheads point to

areas of colocalization between Pex3-GFP and Snf7-mCherry (see zoom window for

enlargement). For the merged image, calcofluor white staining (cyan) was used to demarcate

cell boundaries. Bar graphs report the percent overlap of Pex3-GFP puncta colocalizing with

Snf7-mCherry puncta with error bars representing the SEM of 3 biological replicates. Scale bar,

5 µm. (B) Same as (A), but with Did4-mCherry instead of Snf7-mCherry.

Figure 7. ESCRT-III is required for PPV budding from the ER. (A) Permeabilized *pex19Δ* yeast

cells (PYCs) containing microsomes and expressing Pex3-pA were incubated with the S100

fraction of cytosol isolated from *wild-type* (lanes 2-4), *vps25Δ* (lane 5), *vps20Δ* (lane 6), *snf7Δ*

(lane 7), *did4Δ* (lane 8), *vps24Δ* (lane 9) or *ist1Δ* (lane 10) for 90 min at room temperature in the

presence of an ATP-regenerating system. Controls included incubating the PYCs alone (lane 1),

with cytosol but no ATP (lane 2), or with cytosol and ATP but at 4°C (lane 3). (B) As in (A), but

with the S100 fraction of cytosol isolated from *W303 wild-type* and deletion strains. (C and D)

Deficiencies in PPV budding are complemented by mixing the S100 fractions of defective

cytosols. PYCs were incubated with *wild-type* (lanes 2-4), *vps20Δ* (lanes 5, 8, and 9), *snf7Δ*

(lanes 6, 8, and 10), and *pex19Δ* (lanes 7, 9, and 10) S100 fractions of cytosol for 90 min at room

temperature in the presence of an ATP-regenerating system. Controls included incubating the

PYCs alone (lane 1), with cytosol but no ATP (lane 2), or with cytosol and ATP but at 4°C (lane 3).

(E and F) *VPS20* and *SNF7* complement deficiencies in PPV budding in their respective deletion

mutants. PYCs were incubated with S100 fractions of cytosol from *wild-type* carrying pCM189

(lane 2), *vps20Δ* carrying pCM189 (lane 3) or pCM189-*VPS20* (lane 4), or *snf7Δ* carrying pCM189

(lane 5) or pCM189-*SNF7* (lane 6). (G) ATP is not required for PPV release but rather to recycle

scission components. PYCs expressing Pex3-GFP and the S100 fraction of cytosol isolated from

wild-type were pretreated with apyrase before starting the reaction (lanes 3 and 5). The

reaction was also sampled at the indicated times (lanes 6-10). For each panel, bar graphs

represent the relative % of PPV release in arbitrary units with error bars representing the SEM

of 3 biological replicates.

Table 1. Average area and numerical density of peroxisomes or vesicular structures in cells of

***wild-type* and ESCRT-III deletion strains**

strain	cell area assayed (μm^2)	peroxisome count	numerical density of peroxisomes[#]	average area of peroxisomes (μm^2)
BY4742	1396.09	421	1.14	0.037
vps20Δ	1125.46	69[*]	0.39[*]	0.005[*]
snf7Δ	1144.83	89[*]	0.34[*]	0.018[*]

did4Δ	820.13	35	0.28	0.040
vps24Δ	933.70	138	0.51	0.044

999   * denotes vesicular structures, as no peroxisomes were observed in these strains.

1000   [#] number of peroxisomes per μm^3 of cell volume (Weibel and Bolender, 1973).

Figure 1
Mast et al., 2018

Figure 2
Mast et al., 2018

ptet₀₇-*PEX19* +/- *ESCRT-III*Δ
Gpd1-GFP calcofluor white

A

wild-type
vps20Δ
snf7Δ
did4Δ
vps24Δ
ist1Δ

steady-state | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 24
hours after release of *PEX19* repression

B

wild-type
vps20Δ
snf7Δ
did4Δ
vps24Δ
ist1Δ

peroxisomes per μm³

hours after release of *PEX19* repression

C

mean peroxisome density (peroxisomes per μm³)

wild-type
ist1Δ
vps24Δ
vps20Δ
snf7Δ
did4Δ

steady-state | 0 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 24
hours after release of *PEX19* repression

Figure 3
Mast et al., 2018

Figure 4
Mast et al., 2018

Figure 5
Mast et al., 2018

A

pTet07-PEX19

Pex3-GFP   Snf7-mCherry   merge

recovery

zoom window   1.   2.   1.   2.   1.   2.

control

% Pex3-GFP foci colocalizng with Snf7-mCherry

control   recovery

B

pTet07-PEX19

Pex3-GFP   Did4-mCherry   merge

recovery

control

% Pex3-GFP foci colocalizng with Snf7-mCherry

control   recovery

Figure 6
Mast et al., 2018

Figure 7
Mast et al., 2018