Nanobody Mediated Macromolecular Crowding Induces Membrane Fission and Remodeling in the African Trypanosome

Authors: Alexander Hempelmann[1], Laura Hartleb[2], Monique van Straaten[1], Hamidreza Hashemi[3], Johan P. Zeelen[1], F. Nina Papavasiliou[3], Markus Engstler[2], C. Erec Stebbins[1†], and Nicola G. Jones[2†]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of Structural Biology of Infection and Immunity, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany.

[2]Department of Cell and Developmental Biology, Theodor-Boveri-Institute, Biocenter, University of Würzburg, Würzburg, Germany.

[3]Division of Immune Diversity, German Cancer Research Center, Heidelberg, Germany.

†Correspondence to: nicola.jones@uni-wuerzburg.de, e.stebbins@dkfz-heidelberg.de

The dense Variant Surface Glycoprotein (VSG) coat of African trypanosomes represents the

primary host-pathogen interface. Antigenic variation prevents clearing of the pathogen by

employing a large repertoire of antigenically distinct VSG genes, thus neutralizing the host's

antibody response. To explore the epitope space of VSGs, we generated anti-VSG nanobodies

and combined high-resolution structural analysis of VSG-nanobody complexes with binding

assays on living cells, revealing that these camelid antibodies bind deeply inside the coat.

One nanobody caused rapid loss of cellular motility, possibly due to blockage of VSG

mobility on the coat, whose rapid endo- and exocytosis is mechanistically linked to *T. brucei*

propulsion and whose density is required for survival. Electron microscopy studies

demonstrated that this loss of motility was accompanied by rapid formation and shedding of

nanovesicles and nanotubes, suggesting that increased protein crowding on the dense

membrane can be a driving force for membrane fission in living cells.

Keywords

African Trypanosome, Host-Pathogen Interaction, Variant Surface Glycoproteins, Immune

Epitope Mapping, Structural Biology, Nanovesicle Formation, Nanotube Formation, Protein

Crowding, Membrane Fission

Introduction

Trypanosoma brucei and related parasites cause African sleeping sickness in humans and Nagana in cattle. A distinguishing feature of these pathogens is a densely packed surface coat that is populated almost entirely by the **V**ariant **S**urface **G**lycoprotein (**VSG**) in the mammalian-infectious forms of the parasite. As *T. brucei* is an extracellular pathogen, the VSG coat is extensively exposed to the immune system and is the primary surface of interaction within the host. It is also highly antigenic, leading quickly to robust antibody mediated responses that are neutralizing (Borst, 2002; Overath et al., 1994). However, parasites possess an extensive genetic repertoire of antigenically distinct VSGs (2000+ genes and pseudogenes), allowing individual parasites to switch the coat to another variant, thus creating a novel surface array to which the immune system is naïve and must readapt. This process of antigenic variation repeats with recurring cycles of parasite clearance, coat switching, and pathogen regrowth (Bangs, 2018).

In addition to antigenic variation, trypanosomes employ another immune evasion mechanism, antibody clearance and subsequent recycling of VSG molecules. This process helps evasion of complement-mediated immune destruction but is only effective at low antibody titer (Engstler et al., 2007; Horn, 2014; Mugnier et al., 2016; Pal et al., 2003). Facilitated by the remarkably high endocytosis rate at the flagellar pocket, anti-VSG antibodies are selectively removed from VSG molecules within minutes (Engstler et al., 2004; Webster et al., 1990). This requires high mobility of the VSG molecules and free lateral diffusion (Bülow et al., 1988; Hartel et al., 2016, 2015).

The VSGs are glycosylated, homodimeric proteins of roughly 60 kDa comprised of two subdomains: a long, rod-like N-terminal domain (NTD) spanning approximately 350 amino acids followed by a C-terminal domain (CTD) of roughly 100 amino acids that attaches to the

glycophosphatidylinositol (GPI) anchor which links the protein to the membrane. The antigenic

region of the protein is considered to be the NTD and, in particular, the upper regions of the NTD

that would be exposed to the immune system in the dense packing of tens of millions of VSG

proteins on the surface (Schwede et al., 2015). The NTDs are composed of a tightly packed three-

helix-bundle decorated with extended insertions that produce top and bottom "lobes" at polar ends

of the rod-like, helical scaffolding.

Despite decades of research, very little is known about the interactions of immune proteins

with the VSG coat. Few studies have mapped any defined natural epitopes and at present no

antibody-VSG co-crystal structures exist. Reviewing multiple indirect studies (involving

monoclonal antibodies, nanobodies, polyclonal antisera, lectins, and proteases), Schwede et al.

propose that contrary to many discussions in published literature, a substantial portion of the N-

terminal domain (ending at the bottom lobe) of the VSGs could be accessible to the immune system

(Schwede et al., 2015).

In order to address this topic, we pursued structural studies of several camelid nanobodies

raised to the VSG coat. These provide both a biologically relevant context (as *T. brucei* related

species cause surra in camelids – (Radwanska et al., 2018)), as well as a system generally amenable

to crystallographic analysis (de Marco, 2011). While camels and llamas have a very similar

immune system to humans and rodents, there are variations. Nanobodies (Nbs) are single chain,

minimal variable region-containing antibody fragments consisting of one protein domain. They

tend to be highly stable and to crystallize very well and thus are useful alternatives to studying

pathogen-immune interactions if the larger mouse and human antibodies are challenging to

crystallize.

Previous studies have shown that high-affinity Nbs can be effectively raised to VSGs (Arbabi-

Ghahroudi, 2017). Addition of such Nbs to AnTat1.1 expressing *T. brucei* was shown to induce

trypanosome lysis even in the absence of the effector Fc domain (Stijlemans et al., 2017). This

effect was described to initiate quick immobilization of trypanosomes, enlargement of the flagellar

pocket and a major blockage of endocytosis. However, the mechanism mediating these phenomena

have remained obscure.

In this study, we used the camelid immune system (Figure S1) to generate a series of

nanobodies to *T. brucei* VSG2 (also known as VSG221 or VSG MITat1.2). X-ray crystallographic

studies reveal that these nanobodies bind not to the upper, exposed surface of the elongated VSG

molecules, but instead as much as 100 Å from the top. Indeed, we find that these nanobodies and

their corresponding camelid antibodies are also able to recognize the intact trypanosome coat on

living cells. These results demonstrate that VSG epitopes buried deeply in the dense surface coat

are in fact accessible to B-cells and secreted antibodies.

Similar to prior reports, this binding can be highly toxic to the parasite (Stijlemans et al., 2011,

2017) and we observed paralysis of the normally highly mobile trypanosomes within minutes of

nanobody addition. This paralysis was linked to a nanobody induced block on VSG diffusion in

the coat. Parasite movement and endo- and exocytosis of the coat are mechanistically linked and

essential for survival in the mammalian host. At the same time, VSG density on the coat is highly

regulated, and significant raising of the density adversely impacts VSG movement in the

membrane (Hartel et al., 2016), making the African trypanosome a unique model system for

studying the effects of protein crowding in living cells. Examination of the parasite by electron

microscopy after Nb binding demonstrated that loss of VSG mobility (and subsequent loss of

cellular motility) was accompanied by rapid formation and shedding of nanovesicles and

nanotubes, suggesting that increased protein crowding on this already dense membrane physically

drives membrane fission – the first example of this phenomenon in living cells.

Results

Production and Crystal Structures of VSG2-Nanobody Complexes

Nanobodies were generated from llamas immunized with the N-terminal domain of VSG2

(Methods). To ensure that the clones were able to bind within surface coats and not only the soluble

form of the VSG, a filtering step of panning the library of B-cell clones against intact UV-

inactivated trypanosomes was added and all clones were scored by flow cytometry analysis as

binding to intact, live trypanosomes. From this we obtained a library of 69 distinct nanobodies

(belonging to 30 different CDR3 groups or B-cell lineages). We initially crystallized three different

clones complexed to VSG2 (NB9$_{VSG2}$, NB11$_{VSG2}$, and NB14$_{VSG2}$, Figure 1, Methods, Figure S2,

Table S1 and S2). Those structures revealed that all the nanobodies bound similarly to the same

epitope region and possessed a highly conserved consensus set of amino acids in the CDR1 and

CDR3 loops that characterized the majority of clones in the library, despite being derived from

independent B-cell lineages (discussed below). To identify other binding modalities, we searched

for clones in our library with the most divergent CDR regions. A few such were identified, and we

crystallized one of these (NB19$_{VSG2}$) which indeed bound in a distinct location on VSG2. However,

unexpectedly, this was not on the top, putative antigenic surface of the molecule, but nearly 100 Å

down from the upper surface at the bottom of the N-terminal domain and adjacent to the postulated

location of the CTD (Bartossek et al., 2017). The overall structure of VSG2 is not significantly

changed from that previously reported (Freymann et al., 1990), aligning with a root-mean-square-

deviation in 1440 atomic positions of 0.5 Å (single monomer).

Nanobodies Bind Deep into the VSG Coat

Three of the nanobodies (NB9$_{VSG2}$, NB11$_{VSG2}$, and NB14$_{VSG2}$) bind in an identical position. The binding site is approximately 60 Å down from the upper lobe of VSG2 and formed by a concave surface on the VSG 3-helix bundle about midway down the length of the rod-like NTD (Figure 1A and B). This is consistent with a hypothesis that nanobodies are more likely to bind concave or convex surfaces than flat ones (Stijlemans et al., 2004). Numerous side chains from the second two helices of the helical bundle make contacts to the nanobodies (residues spanning 100-115 and 280-302 of VSG2), with the primary contacts solvent-facing, predominantly hydrophilic residues (e.g. Q111, T112, A285, E286, T301, and D313) as well as several minor side chain contacts and backbone contacts (Figure 2A). These nanobodies interact with VSG2 through their variable CDR1 and CDR3 loops (without any significant contacts from the CDR2 loop) with a consensus set of side chains (CDR1 residues T28, S30, N31 and CDR3 residues L100, L101, S103, Figure 2, A and C). In contrast, NB19$_{VSG2}$ binds underneath the bottom lobe of VSG2 purely through CDR3 (Figure 2B). The contacts are a mixture of hydrophobic and polar interactions, but with a preponderance of aromatic side chain stacking (π-stacking) interactions involving residues W102, W112, and Y115 of NB19$_{VSG2}$ with the side chains Y375 and Y376 of VSG2.

Nanobody Binding is Detectable on Living Parasites

In order to examine the physiological relevance of these nanobodies and their unexpected binding sites on VSG2, we performed a series of binding experiments to living trypanosomes. Nanobodies harboring a C-terminal hexa-histidine (6xHis) tag were added to trypanosomes expressing different VSGs and the cells analyzed with an anti-tag monoclonal antibody by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS, Methods, Figure 3). Nanobodies NB9$_{VSG2}$, NB11$_{VSG2}$, and NB14$_{VSG2}$ were easily detected as binding to VSG2 expressing cells with several logs

difference in signal (Figure 3A), whereas nanobody NB19$_{VSG2}$ could not be detected. In contrast,

nanobodies did not bind other VSGs (Figure 3, B-D), thereby showing high specificity (NB11$_{VSG2}$

shown as an example). Verifying that the surface accessibility is not only limited to the relatively

small nanobodies, we created a sortaggable variant of the camelid heavy chain IgG2 antibody with

the corresponding NB11$_{VSG2}$ Ig domain and found it can, in fact, bind the live parasite coat (Figure

S3A).

The inability to detect NB19$_{VSG2}$ raised the possibility that the binding we observed in solution

and in the crystal structure was an artifact of using the soluble VSG2 as the antigen for

immunization. A second possibility was that the deep binding we observe in the crystal structure

buries NB19$_{VSG2}$ beyond the reach of IgG antibodies. To distinguish between these two models,

we directly labeled NB19$_{VSG2}$ and other nanobodies with fluorescent moieties. In one case we

chemically conjugated the fluorophore FITC to the proteins (to free amine groups, typically

exposed lysine residues), showing that the nanobodies generally could be detected and also how

they compare to a full anti-VSG2 IgG (Figure 3E). While a small shift in fluorescence intensity

can be observed for NB19$_{VSG2}$-FITC (compared to the non-stained sample, Supplementary Figure

3F), it showed significance in 2-tailed t-test (p= 0.0109, Supplementary Figure 3M). To further

probe binding, we sought to avoid whole-scale labeling of proteins chemically, and turned to a

single, site-specific covalent modification of the Nbs (Figure 3F, Methods). Here, we used the

transpeptidase enzyme sortase to attach peptide-linked 6-Carboxyfluorescein (FAM) to the C-

terminus of the nanobodies (Methods). In this case, all nanobodies showed binding to the living

trypanosomes, although NB19$_{VSG2}$ and NB9$_{VSG2}$ seem to have reduced relative fluorescence

intensity (yet with signal intensity over negative controls, Figure 3F). To buttress the positive

binding result for NB19$_{VSG2}$ by a third independent experiment, we also exposed living

trypanosomes to the nanobodies, thoroughly washed the cells, and then probed them by Western

blot (Figure 3G). All the nanobodies, including $NB19_{VSG2}$, were shown to have bound, whereas an

irrelevant nanobody raised to the *Helicobacter pylori* BabA antigen did not bind VSG2 expressing

trypanosomes.

Probing Nb-VSG2 Interactions

To further examine the interactions of the Nbs with VSG2, we created mutations in the

consensus site of CDR3 of $NB11_{VSG2}$ and two critical contacts to VSG2 from $NB19_{VSG2}$ (Figure

4). We focused on these two because $NB11_{VSG2}$ possess a highly similar consensus binding site to

$NB9_{VSG2}$ and $NB14_{VSG2}$, whereas $NB19_{VSG2}$ differs in the binding location and in sequence to the

others. The alteration of these important contacts led to a disruption of binding to VSG2 as assayed

by gel filtration chromatography. In particular, even single loss-of-contact mutations to the

$NB19_{VSG2}$ interface completely disrupted binding, whereas it required a triple mutant in $NB11_{VSG2}$

to abrogate complex formation, suggesting that the complex was more stable (Figure 4).

Nanobodies to VSG2 Reduce Coat Mobility, Cause Stiffening of the Cell Body and Stall

Parasite Motion

As previous reports had shown Nb-induced interference with trypanosome movement (Stijlemans

et al., 2011), VSG2 expressing wild type cells were treated with saturating amounts of the four

nanobodies. Only treatment with $NB11_{VSG2}$ resulted in reduced cell motility (Figure S4). While at

5 min post addition of $NB11_{VSG2}$ swimming behavior of the parasites remained largely normal

with individual cells actively swimming and changing direction, from 15 min onwards, cell

movement was clearly affected as trajectories became shorter and mostly unidirectional (Figure

5A and Figure S4C). A closer inspection of these trajectories suggested that the parasites were not

motionless, but that translocation was largely due to drift in the sample which is unavoidable in

recordings of this duration. Both swimming speed means and track displacement lengths were

extracted from the acquired data (Figures 5B, S5, and S6). Figure 5B (left panel) shows that the

mean velocity of $NB11_{VSG2}$ treated cells was reduced compared to that of untreated cells, while

$NB9_{VSG2}$, $NB14_{VSG2}$ and $NB19_{VSG2}$ treated cells behaved largely like the control. A comparison of

the track displacement length per second also showed smaller values with a narrower range of

distribution in $NB11_{VSG2}$ treated cells (Figure 5B, right panel).

As productive movement of trypanosomes was hampered under the influence of $NB11_{VSG2}$

(1.7-fold molar excess), the viability of these cells was analyzed in hourly intervals for 8 hours

via flow cytometry (Figures 5C and S7). One hour after $NB11_{VSG2}$ addition at least 80 % of treated

cells were still alive, with the proportion of dead cells increasing continuously up to 8 hours when

about 25 % of cells were still alive (Figure 5C and Table S3). The amount of nanobody used had

a critical impact on cell death (Figure S8, Table S3). A 1:1 molar ratio of $NB11_{VSG2}$ to VSG2

monomer was required and sufficient to induce cell death within 5 h of induction (consistent with

previous reports (Caljon et al., 2012)) with a sharp rise in the number of dead cells observed

between samples with a 0.9- and 1.1-fold excess, whilst higher Nb concentrations did not alter the

kinetics of the cellular response, suggesting that the VSG coat had been saturated with nanobody

(Figure S8B). Based on these results all further experiments were carried out with a saturating 1.7-

fold excess of nanobody to VSG monomer.

We first explored whether nanobody binding might affect VSG diffusion in the cell surface

coat. Fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP) experiments were performed on

immobilized cells whose surface proteins had been fluorescently labeled. VSGs of untreated cells

exhibited a median mobile fraction of 83 % and diffusion coefficient of 0.020 μm^2/s. Addition of

the Nb resulted in a marked reduction of the median mobile fraction to 11 % with the diffusion

coefficient reduced to a median of 0.007 μm^2/s (Figure 5D, left and right graph, respectively).

Hence, binding of NB11$_{VSG2}$ to VSG2 on the cell surface significantly affected the mobility of the

protein in the cell surface coat.

As depicted in Figure 5A, a severe restriction in motility was observed in ensemble

measurements between 5 and 15 min after addition of NB11$_{VSG2}$. This time period was therefore

chosen to acquire high-speed videos of treated and untreated individual cells (Figures 5E and F,

Videos S1 and S2). Nanobody-treated parasites were unable to swim productively. The flagellar

wave initiated at the tip of the flagellum, but did not progress through the whole cell body so that

the typical cellular waveform could not be observed (Bargul et al., 2016). The parasites were partly

paralyzed with increased stiffness and decreased ability to bend the cell body. This observation led

us to inspect the nanobody treated cells by electron microscopy.

NB11$_{VSG2}$ Induces the Formation of Nanovesicles and Nanotubes on the Trypanosome

Surface

Interestingly, scanning electron microscopy (SEM) of NB11$_{VSG2}$ treated VSG2-expressing

cells revealed the formation of nanovesicles and nanotube-like structures as early as 2 minutes

following addition of the nanobody (Figure 6, A and B). Initially, nanovesicles of around 200 nm

diameter originated mainly from the flagellum attachment zone (FAZ), the flagellar tip (FT) and

the posterior pole (PP) of the cell (Figure 6, A and B; Figure S9A, middle and lower inset). In

some parasites, the nanovesicles had formed vesicle chains (Figure 6B). In addition to these

nanovesicles and vesicle chains, nanotubes of slightly smaller diameter, that could be more than

1 μm in length appeared perpendicular to the FAZ (Figure S9A, upper inset). In the vast majority

of cells, nanovesicles and/or nanotubes had been formed after 2 min, while after 5 min all parasites

revealed this phenotype. Vesicles appeared on both sides of the FAZ and frequently at the origin

of the flagellum, the flagellar pocket (FP) (Figure S9, B and C). Likewise, nanotubes were present

in the vicinity of the FP (Figure S9C, left inset). Vesicles in close proximity to the FP tended to be

larger (275 nm) than those appearing at the FAZ (150 - 180 nm). In some trypanosomes, the

nanovesicles appearing alongside the FAZ seemed to fuse (Figure S9C, right inset), or to

redistribute towards the flagellar membrane. However, after 10 min of nanobody incubation,

nanovesicles and nanotubes were still present with roughly the same abundance, and, with very

little indication of a transition of nanovesicular chains to nanotubes suggesting that both structures

form independently (Figure 6C). After 15 min, the number of budding nanovesicles had decreased,

and the nanotubes were greatly elongated, thereby apparently forming bridges between parasites.

Some of the tubes seemed to be under tension (Figure S9D), while others formed catenated

structures.

Occasionally, smaller nanotubes or nanovesicles appeared to branch off the main tube (Figure

S9D, lower inset). The fact that most of the tens of micrometer long tubes were intact, without

showing breakpoints suggests that they are mechanically rather robust. This can be seen when

tubes bend around trypanosomes (Figure S9D, middle inset). These rigid membrane ropes may

well have additionally hampered trypanosome motility, as the parasites can be literally trapped in

a nanotubular network. A closer inspection of the apparent network built from nanotubes revealed

that most intersections in fact are crossings of two tubes without fusion (Figure S10A, upper inset),

while other intersections seemed to represent true membrane fusion (Figure S10A, lower inset).

The presence in nanotubes of nodes of similar size as nanovesicles is first seen after 20 minutes

(Figure S10A, middle inset). The endpoint of our observation window was 25 minutes, when the

nanotubes had formed concatenated or branched networks that are very difficult to trace by SEM

(Figure S10B). However, it seems noteworthy that at this time point nanovesicles also emanated

from the same trypanosome membrane areas as after 2 minutes of nanobody incubation, namely

along the FAZ, at the posterior pole and at the flagellar tip (Figure S10B). Interestingly, when we

looked at control parasites that had undergone the same experimental procedure, but without

exposure to the nanobody, we occasionally also observed nanovesicle formation at the FAZ, the

FT and the FP. Despite most trypanosomes displaying no or few nanovesicles (Figure S10C,

25 min), short nanovesicular chains could be observed in some parasites (Figure S10C, 10 min).

This suggests that the formation of nanovesicles at distinct cell surface subcompartments is a

biologically relevant process that can be triggered in a spectacular manner by anti-VSG nanobodies

(Figure S11).

Nanovesicles and Nanotubes are Coated with VSGs and Bud from the Cell Surface

To obtain more detailed information about the ultrastructure of the nanovesicles and

nanotubes, ultra-thin sections of trypanosomes, treated with nanobody for 15 min, were prepared

for transmission electron microscopy (TEM). The micrographs revealed an intracellular

architecture that was indistinguishable from that found in non-treated parasites. Figure S12A

shows perfect preservation of flagellar pocket structure, including the tight junction at the flagellar

pocket collar, the flagellar pocket matrix and the VSG coat. Frequently, clathrin coated pits were

visible, indicating that the endocytosis machinery was at least structurally not impaired. Circular

and flat endosomal cisternae were present, as well as class 2 clathrin coated vesicles (CCV II),

which are essential for cargo transport to late endosomes (Figure 6D) (Grünfelder et al., 2003).

Likewise, mitochondrion, nucleus, endoplasmic reticulum, acidocalcisomes, glycosomes, Golgi

and the subpellicular microtubule corset did not show any significant alterations (Figures 6E and

S12B). Hence, 15 min post-incubation with nanobodies, the parasite's intracellular architecture

was not impaired. Nevertheless, just as in SEM preparations, nanovesicles and nanotubes were

readily observable in these TEM samples. These vesicles were covered with an electron-dense

layer characteristic of the trypanosome's VSG surface coat, which was confirmed by

immunofluorescence analysis (Figure S13).

Interestingly, nanovesicles were found to be budding into the flagellar pocket. Figure 6D

shows a perfectly spherical budding vesicle, that is decorated with evenly spaced structures. The

inner diameter of this vesicle is 100 nm, and the outer structures have a size of about 20 nm, which

is similar to the size of membrane-embedded VSGs. Note that a clathrin-coated pit is being formed

at the same flagellar pocket. Interestingly, the same cell is shedding nanotubes at the flagellar

attachment zone. These are smaller in diameter than the FP-derived nanovesicles. From the

micrographs, it is not clear how the nanovesicles exit the FP, as the tight junction and flagellar

pocket collar are intact (Figure S12B). Figure 6E shows another example of concomitant formation

of large nanovesicles within the flagellar pocket and nanovesicles/nanotubes at the flagellar

attachment zone. These structures were probably the nanovesicular chains observed in SEM.

Interestingly, the TEM images show that the "vesicles" were not always fully separated by

membrane but had continuous content (Figure 6E, lower inset). In all these vesicles, electron-dense

particles were detected, which were identical with the cytoplasmic ribosomes in size and form

(Figure 6E, lower inset). As the flagellum is free of ribosomes, the segmented nanotubes and free

nanovesicles likely originate from the pellicular plasma membrane and not from the flagellum

(Figure S12D). In contrast, the smooth and long nanotubes observed with SEM after 15 minutes

of treatment, could well originate from the flagellar membrane, as shown in Figure S12C. In this

cell, multiple tubes bud from one flagellum. These are also covered by a VSG-coat, but do not

contain ribosome-like structures. The shedding of the smooth nanotubes must involve significant

mechanical forces, as is suggested by marked membrane deformations, both on the flagellar side

and on the nanotubes (Figure S12C, white arrows). In rare occasions, a nanotube branchpoint was

observed (Figure S12E), but it remains unclear how these branches can form. Figure S12F shows

that the tubes can be bent and deformed, which is in agreement with observations made in SEM

micrographs.

In conclusion, we have established that nanobodies can bind deep within the VSG-coat and

that binding can rapidly affect VSG mobility within the plasma membrane. Interestingly,

nanobody-binding leads to an almost instantaneous formation of nanovesicles and nanotubes on

the parasite cell surface, concomitant with stiffening of the cells and loss of parasite motility. Cell

death occurs significantly later and is probably a consequence of stalled motion, which inevitably

will affect cytokinesis.

Discussion

325
Using the camelid immune system to generate a collection of anti-VSG2 nanobodies, we have

been able to show through structural, biochemical, and cell biological experiments that nanobodies

can bind deeply into the trypanosome surface coat, even to the bottom of the NTD of the VSGs.

Using secondary IgG antibodies to detect the nanobodies, we also demonstrate that antibodies of

the mammalian immune system are able to reach into the densely packed coat of *T. brucei* to a

depth of ~50 Å, but have difficulty reaching further than ~80 Å below the coat surface (Figure

7A). Furthermore, using full camelid antibodies with the same nanobody domain, we show that

the camelid immune system can reach as far as the nanobodies themselves to bind to epitopes

buried as deep as 50 Å.

Our experimental results demonstrate that the antigenic surface of the VSGs extends well

beyond the upper surfaces of these molecules. Such conclusions are consistent with the

observations that the VSGs possess molecular surfaces with relatively high sequence divergence

as well as markedly distinguishing surface properties not only at the "top" of the NTD, but across

the entire molecule (Figure 7B). That the much more highly conserved CTD would be difficult for

antibodies to access (located more than 100 Å below the surface) as shown previously (Schwede

et al., 2011) and in our study, is also in harmony with this model.

We identified one Nb (NB11$_{VSG2}$) that was highly efficient in immobilizing and ultimately

killing cells, a marked motility phenotype which is in accordance with published work (Stijlemans

et al., 2011). In contrast, our work does not support the conclusion that this is due to impaired

endocytosis and hence impaired energy supply. The onset of the motility phenotype was within

minutes of nanobody addition and electron micrographs did not reveal any disruption in the

endomembrane system, including the endosomes. What we observed was a marked reduction in

cell body flexibility and increased stiffness of parts of the cell. This was not caused by paralysis

of the flagellum as it still initiated the beat which was however not propagated over the cell body.

Hence, the trypanosomes did not swim anymore. We hypothesize that the phenotype observed

could be related to the mobility and integrity of the surface coat. We have previously shown that

the VSG coat operates very close to a molecular crowding threshold, where a high lateral mobility

is balanced with the highest possible density of the protein (Hartel et al., 2016). When the VSG

density exceeds this threshold, translational diffusion in the surface coat is severely affected. This

is exactly what might occur in the experiments reported here. Binding of the nanobody increases

the hydrodynamic radius of the VSG dimers which results in a dramatic decrease in the mobile

fraction. Thus, rotational and translational diffusion of the VSGs is confined by steric hindrance.

Thermodynamics in confinement would cause tension within the VSG coat due to pressure forces.

If this were the case, there should be ultrastructural changes in surface topology of the

trypanosomes. Indeed, we observed dramatic changes of the trypanosome cell surface in electron

micrographs.

362   Membrane fission is essential for the life of all cells. Cytokinesis, the generation of organelles

such as the mitochondrion, ER and Golgi, as well as endomembrane trafficking are processes that

all depend on this type of membrane remodeling. Complex machineries involving many proteins

that can form helical scaffolds or constricting rings, as well as shallow membrane insertions, are

thought to control membrane fission (Snead et al., 2017; Campelo and Malhotra, 2012). Classic

examples are the clathrin or COP pathways and the ESCRT machinery. These pathways are well-

controlled in space and time, and they are highly energy-consuming. The total energy of membrane

vesiculation has been estimated to be in the range of several hundred k_BT, which means that

membrane fission requires significant mechanical forces, acting from outside onto the membrane.

This is exemplified by the massive clathrin assembly visible on a coated pit at the flagellar pocket

in Figure S12A.

373   The nanovesicles and nanotubes observed in this work on the trypanosome cell surface did

not show any structural features that differed from the plasma membrane. They were decorated

with an electron dense VSG layer but no additional coats that could be involved in vesicle

formation were detectable. This is not unexpected, as it is very unlikely that the parasites can sense

the nanobody addition, transduce this information and actively secrete a putative extracellular

fission-promoting machinery - all within seconds. Thus, it is most probably not an active cellular

process that drives nanovesicle and nanotube formation.

An attractive, alternative explanation for the phenotype would be protein-protein crowding.

The addition of nanobodies to the extremely dense VSG coat could - within seconds - raise the

protein density on the cell surface above the molecular crowding threshold. In fact, we have shown

that the lateral mobility of the VSG decreases rapidly after nanobody addition, which supports this

assumption. With the binding of nanobodies, mobility of the VSG becomes restricted and the coat

is therefore under tension. Collisions of nanobody-loaded VSGs will generate pressure (on one

side of the plasma membrane). This behavior of a crowded membrane protein has been likened to

that of compressed gas and it has been suggested to provide the pressure force required to initiate

and complete membrane vesiculation and tubulation (Snead et al., 2017). Thus, nanobody-

mediated protein crowding could provide the energy required for membrane fission. No cellular

machineries would be required to overcome the energy barrier. Membrane fission by protein-

protein crowding has been observed before, albeit only in artificial systems and is supported by

modeling approaches (Derganc and Čopič, 2016; Snead et al., 2017).

Our data suggest that this mechanism could also function in the cellular context. Due to its

uniformity, the trypanosome coat with its high density and essential mobility of the VSG is an

ideal model system to study this new mechanism of membrane fission in living cells. The fact that

we find nanotubes and nanovesicles also in untreated cells, albeit only occasionally, suggests that,

at least in trypanosomes, protein crowding-mediated extracellular vesiculation could be a

biologically relevant process. We surmise that by using this passive, density-controlled process,

the parasites can adjust the VSG-coat density, e.g. during cell division or VSG switching. Protein

crowding-mediated membrane shedding may well be effective on other cells with dense protein

coats.

Especially at early time points after addition of nanobodies, vesicle chains of increasing length

were observed. TEM images showed that the chains were not always composed of separated

vesicles but were often segmented, continuous volumes. There are few reports on vesicle chains

in biology. Outer membrane vesicle chains have been reported in *Myxococcus xanthus* (Remis et

al., 2014) and biopearling has been observed in a marine flavobacterium (Fischer et al., 2019).

However, the mechanisms underlying vesicle chain formation have not been studied. As

segmented membrane volumes are detectable already after 2 minutes in nanobody-treated

trypanosomes, we surmise that counteracting mechanical forces interrupt full fission of

nanovesicles. The segmented vesicle chains mainly appear at the FAZ and the flagellar pocket.

These regions continuously experience the forces exerted by the flagellar beat. It is tempting to

speculate that the flagellar force causes interruption of fission events. The protein crowding

pressure on the nascent vesicle could be strong enough to maintain the vesicle curvature. When a

new vesicle forms at the same position of the FAZ it would be connected to the previous one. In

this way, the continuous beat of the flagellum would produce segments of very similar size. After

about 15 minutes of nanobody treatment, the vesicle chains disappear. This is the time point when

the propagation of the flagellar beat is impaired, probably due to membrane tension caused by loss

of membrane through vesiculation. Thus, the force producing the segmented membrane volumes

decreases, resulting in a shift to tubulation. The resulting nanotubes can be tens of micrometers

long, and the wiggling cells entangle themselves in these rope-like structures. It is important to

note that fusion of nanotubes to neighboring parasites has not been observed, suggesting that cell-

cell communication via membrane bridges is not occurring.

In summary, the fast onset of membrane fission at "free" membrane compartments could be

explained by membrane tubulation through protein-protein crowding on the trypanosome cell

surface. Are the nanovesicles in fact exosomes or ectosomes (extracellular vesicles, EVs)?

Exosomes are produced by multivesicular bodies and secreted by exocytosis. This has previously

been observed in fly-stage *T. brucei* procyclic forms (Eliaz et al., 2017). Since we did not find any

changes in the endomembrane architecture, the vesicles formed after nanobody treatment are likely

not exosomes. The formation of extracellular vesicles in trypanosomes was first reported in 2016

(Szempruch et al., 2016). In contrast to our data, this work revealed that EVs were generated by

vesiculation of nanotubes that are highly fusogenic and originate from the flagellar membrane.

Thus, despite morphological similarities, the nanovesicles and nanotubes observed in the present

study are neither exosomes nor ectosomes, but rather the product of membrane fission through

protein-protein crowding. The trypanosome-nanobody system for the first time enables us to

systematically study a highly efficient mechanism by which the crowded protein environment on

the surface of cells causes changes in membrane shape.

REFERENCES

Arbabi-Ghahroudi, M. (2017). Camelid Single-Domain Antibodies: Historical Perspective and Future Outlook. Front Immunol *8*.

Bangs, J.D. (2018). Evolution of Antigenic Variation in African Trypanosomes: Variant Surface Glycoprotein Expression, Structure, and Function. BioEssays *40*, 1800181.

Bargul, J.L., Jung, J., McOdimba, F.A., Omogo, C.O., Adung'a, V.O., Kruger, T., Masiga, D.K., and Engstler, M. (2016). Species-Specific Adaptations of Trypanosome Morphology and Motility to the Mammalian Host. PLoS Pathog *12*, e1005448.

Bartossek, T., Jones, N.G., Schafer, C., Cvitkovic, M., Glogger, M., Mott, H.R., Kuper, J., Brennich, M., Carrington, M., Smith, A.S., et al. (2017). Structural basis for the shielding function of the dynamic trypanosome variant surface glycoprotein coat. Nat Microbiol *2*, 1523–1532.

de Beer, T.A.P., Berka, K., Thornton, J.M., and Laskowski, R.A. (2014). PDBsum additions. Nucleic Acids Res *42*, D292–D296.

Borst, P. (2002). Antigenic variation and allelic exclusion. Cell *109*, 5–8.

Bülow, R., Overath, P., and Davoust, J. (1988). Rapid lateral diffusion of the variant surface glycoprotein in the coat of Trypanosoma brucei. Biochemistry *27*, 2384–2388.

Caljon, G., Stijlemans, B., Saerens, D., Abbeele, J.V.D., Muyldermans, S., Magez, S., and Baetselier, P.D. (2012). Affinity Is an Important Determinant of the Anti-Trypanosome Activity of Nanobodies. PLOS Neglected Tropical Diseases *6*, e1902.

Campelo, F., and Malhotra, V. (2012). Membrane Fission: The Biogenesis of Transport Carriers. Annu. Rev. Biochem. *81*, 407–427.

Derganc, J., and Čopič, A. (2016). Membrane bending by protein crowding is affected by protein lateral confinement. Biochim. Biophys. Acta *1858*, 1152–1159.

Eliaz, D., Kannan, S., Shaked, H., Arvatz, G., Tkacz, I.D., Binder, L., Waldman Ben-Asher, H., Okalang, U., Chikne, V., Cohen-Chalamish, S., et al. (2017). Exosome secretion affects social motility in Trypanosoma brucei. PLoS Pathog *13*, e1006245.

Engstler, M., Thilo, L., Weise, F., Grunfelder, C.G., Schwarz, H., Boshart, M., and Overath, P. (2004). Kinetics of endocytosis and recycling of the GPI-anchored variant surface glycoprotein in Trypanosoma brucei. J Cell Sci *117*, 1105–1115.

Engstler, M., Pfohl, T., Herminghaus, S., Boshart, M., Wiegertjes, G., Heddergott, N., and Overath, P. (2007). Hydrodynamic flow-mediated protein sorting on the cell surface of trypanosomes. Cell *131*, 505–515.

Fischer, T., Schorb, M., Reintjes, G., Kolovou, A., Santarella-Mellwig, R., Markert, S., Rhiel, E.,
Littmann, S., Becher, D., Schweder, T., et al. (2019). Biopearling of Interconnected Outer
Membrane Vesicle Chains by a Marine Flavobacterium. App. Environ. Microbiol. *85*.

Grünfelder, C.G., Engstler, M., Weise, F., Schwarz, H., Stierhof, Y.-D., Morgan, G.W., Field,
M.C., and Overath, P. (2003). Endocytosis of a glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored protein
via clathrin-coated vesicles, sorting by default in endosomes, and exocytosis via RAB11-positive
carriers. Mol. Biol. Cell *14*, 2029–2040.

Hartel, A.J., Glogger, M., Jones, N.G., Abuillan, W., Batram, C., Hermann, A., Fenz, S.F.,
Tanaka, M., and Engstler, M. (2016). N-glycosylation enables high lateral mobility of GPI-
anchored proteins at a molecular crowding threshold. Nat Commun *7*, 12870.

Hartel, A.J.W., Glogger, M., Guigas, G., Jones, N.G., Fenz, S.F., Weiss, M., and Engstler, M.
(2015). The molecular size of the extra-membrane domain influences the diffusion of the GPI-
anchored VSG on the trypanosome plasma membrane. Scientific Reports *5*, 10394.

Horn, D. (2014). Antigenic variation in African trypanosomes. Mol Biochem Parasitol *195*, 123–
129.

de Marco, A. (2011). Biotechnological applications of recombinant single-domain antibody
fragments. Microb Cell Fact *10*, 44.

McNicholas, S., Potterton, E., Wilson, K.S., and Noble, M.E.M. (2011). Presenting your
structures: the CCP4mg molecular-graphics software. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr *67*,
386–394.

Mugnier, M.R., Stebbins, C.E., and Papavasiliou, F.N. (2016). Masters of Disguise: Antigenic
Variation and the VSG Coat in Trypanosoma brucei. PLoS Pathog *12*, e1005784.

Overath, P., Chaudhri, M., Steverding, D., and Ziegelbauer, K. (1994). Invariant surface proteins
in bloodstream forms of Trypanosoma brucei. Parasitology Today *10*, 53–58.

Pal, A., Hall, B.S., Jeffries, T.R., and Field, M.C. (2003). Rab5 and Rab11 mediate transferrin
and anti-variant surface glycoprotein antibody recycling in Trypanosoma brucei. Biochem J *374*,
443–451.

Pettersen, E.F., Goddard, T.D., Huang, C.C., Couch, G.S., Greenblatt, D.M., Meng, E.C., and
Ferrin, T.E. (2004). UCSF Chimera--a visualization system for exploratory research and
analysis. J Comput Chem *25*, 1605–1612.

Radwanska, M., Vereecke, N., Deleeuw, V., Pinto, J., and Magez, S. (2018). Salivarian
Trypanosomosis: A Review of Parasites Involved, Their Global Distribution and Their
Interaction With the Innate and Adaptive Mammalian Host Immune System. Front. Immunol. *9*,
2253.

Remis, J.P., Wei, D., Gorur, A., Zemla, M., Haraga, J., Allen, S., Witkowska, H.E., Costerton,
J.W., Berleman, J.E., and Auer, M. (2014). Bacterial social networks: structure and composition
of Myxococcus xanthus outer membrane vesicle chains. Environ. Microbiol. *16*.

Schwede, A., Jones, N., Engstler, M., and Carrington, M. (2011). The VSG C-terminal domain is
inaccessible to antibodies on live trypanosomes. Mol Biochem Parasitol *175*, 201–204.

Schwede, A., Macleod, O.J., MacGregor, P., and Carrington, M. (2015). How Does the VSG
Coat of Bloodstream Form African Trypanosomes Interact with External Proteins? PLoS Pathog
11, e1005259.

Snead, W.T., Hayden, C.C., Gadok, A.K., Zhao, C., Lafer, E.M., Rangamani, P., and
Stachowiak, J.C. (2017). Membrane fission by protein crowding. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA
114, E3258–E3267.

Stijlemans, B., Conrath, K., Cortez-Retamozo, V., Van Xong, H., Wyns, L., Senter, P., Revets,
H., De Baetselier, P., Muyldermans, S., and Magez, S. (2004). Efficient targeting of conserved
cryptic epitopes of infectious agents by single domain antibodies. African trypanosomes as
paradigm. J. Biol. Chem. *279*, 1256–1261.

Stijlemans, B., Caljon, G., Natesan, S.K.A., Saerens, D., Conrath, K., Pérez-Morga, D., Skepper,
J.N., Nikolaou, A., Brys, L., Pays, E., et al. (2011). High Affinity Nanobodies against the
Trypanosome brucei VSG Are Potent Trypanolytic Agents that Block Endocytosis. PLoS Pathog
7.

Stijlemans, B., De Baetselier, P., Caljon, G., Van Den Abbeele, J., Van Ginderachter, J.A., and
Magez, S. (2017). Nanobodies As Tools to Understand, Diagnose, and Treat African
Trypanosomiasis. Front Immunol *8*.

Szempruch, A.J., Sykes, S.E., Kieft, R., Dennison, L., Becker, A.C., Gartrell, A., Martin, W.J.,
Nakayasu, E.S., Almeida, I.C., Hajduk, S.L., et al. (2016). Extracellular Vesicles from
Trypanosoma brucei Mediate Virulence Factor Transfer and Cause Host Anemia. Cell *164*, 246–
257.

Webster, P., Russo, D.C., and Black, S.J. (1990). The interaction of Trypanosoma brucei with
antibodies to variant surface glycoproteins. J Cell Sci *96 (Pt 2)*, 249–255.

534
535

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURES AND TABLES

Figures 1-15, Table 1-3

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge synchrotron time at the Diamond Light Source (DLS, beamline i03, Neil Paterson and colleagues and the Paul Scherrer Institut, Villingen, Switzerland (SLS, beamline PXIII, Vincent Olieric and colleagues). We thank Steve Schoonooghe, Ema Estevens Romão, and Gholamreza Hassanzadeh Ghassabeh of the Vlaams Instituut voor Biotechnologie (VIB) Nanobody Core facility for working closely with us to produce anti-VSG2 VHH antibodies and donating for experimental controls the antibody to *H. pylori* BabA. We thank Elisabeth Meyer-Natus (Würzburg) for technical assistance with EM sample preparation and data acquisition. We thank Tim Krüger (Würzburg) for assistance with microscopy and Susanne Fenz (Würzburg) for helpful discussions. M.E. is supported by DFG grants EN305, DFG-SPP1726, DFG-GRK2157 and GIF grant I-473-416.13/2018.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

C.E.S., F.N.P., M.E. and N.G.J. conceived, initiated and coordinated the project, M.vS. produced VSG2 for production of nanobodies. M.vS. and A.H. produced and crystallized NB11$_{VSG2}$ and NB14$_{VSG2}$ complexes. A.H. produced and crystallized NB9$_{VSG2}$ and NB19$_{VSG2}$ complexes, all complexes for membrane studies (with M.vS. also producing NB11$_{VSG2}$ and NB14$_{VSG2}$ for the latter), collected the diffraction data and solved all structures. J.Z. aided in crystal preparation and beamline data collection. H.H. and A.H. created sortaggable Nbs and the camelid heavy chain Ig2. H.H., M.vS, and A.H performed anti-His FACs binding experiments. H.H and A.H produced the

FAM and FITC FACS data on live *T. brucei*, while A.H. executed FACS experiments on non-

VSG2 coats. L.H. performed all electron microscopy, parasite movement, coat diffusion, and

toxicity experiments. C.E.S., A.H., N.G.J. and M.E. wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed

the data and approved the final manuscript.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Figure 1. Overall Structures of VSG2-NB Complexes

(A) The four nanobody-VSG2 structures with $NB9_{VSG2}$ (NB9 in light green, top left), $NB11_{VSG2}$ (NB11 in lime green, top right), $NB14_{VSG2}$ (NB14 in green, bottom left) and $NB19_{VSG2}$ (NB19 in gold, bottom right) and VSG2 (dimer shown in cyan/purple) are depicted as ribbon diagrams.

(B) Superposition of VSG2-NB complexes with similar coloring. The Complementarity-Determining Regions (CDR or variable region) are shown in magenta (CDR1), blue (CDR2) and red (CDR3). Structures illustrated with Chimera (Pettersen et al., 2004).

Figure 2. Interactions of Nanobody CDR Variable Loops with VSG2

(A) Close up of the interaction of the CDR3 loop from NB11$_{VSG2}$ (NB11) with VSG2. Side chains from each protein have carbon atoms colored to match the ribbon diagram of the main chain, with atoms of oxygen, nitrogen, and sulfur shown in red, blue, and yellow, respectively. Hydrogen bonds (black bricks) are formed between T28, S30 and N31 (NBs) with T112, Q111 and E286 (VSG2), respectively. Residues L100, L101 and S103 of NB11 were found to form non-covalent (black dots) bonds with K101, M100 and K302 of VSG2. **(B)** Close up of the interaction of the CDR3 loop from NB19 with VSG2. Hydrogen bonds (black bricks) are formed between S101 (NB19) and E379 (VSG2), as well as between Y115 (NB19) and Q345 (VSG2). Residues W102

(NB19) and V386 and K383 were involved in non-covalent interactions. W112 of NB19 interacts

with Y375 of VSG2 in a parallel displaced π-stacking (red bricks) manner. This interaction is

further reinforced by a VSG2 intra-molecule T-shaped π-stacking (green bricks) between Y375

and Y376. **(C)** Sequence alignment and annotation of the four Nbs (numbering is for NB11$_{VSG2}$),

including secondary structural elements is shown together with highlighted regions of the CDR

variable loops (colored as in Figure 1b). Residues that make contacts with VSG2 are shown with

red letters. Structures illustrated with Chimera (Pettersen et al., 2004) and secondary structure with

PDBSum (de Beer et al., 2014).

Figure 3. Binding Assays of Nbs to Live Trypanosomes Different VSG-expressing *T. brucei*

were incubated with various Nbs and visualized in different ways by FACS. **(A)** VSG2-

expressing bloodstream form (BSF) trypanosomes were incubated with C-terminally His-tagged

Nbs and visualized using an anti-His antibody, **(B)** VSG615-expressing BSF trypanosomes

(expressing a metacyclic VSG) were incubated with C-terminally His-tagged Nbs and visualized

using an anti-His antibody, **(C)** VSG531-expressing BSF trypanosomes were incubated with C-

terminally His-tagged Nbs and visualized using an anti-His antibody, **(D)** VSG1954-expressing

BSF trypanosomes (expressing a metacyclic VSG) were incubated with C-terminally His-tagged

Nbs and visualized using an anti-His antibody, **(E)** VSG2-expressing bloodstream form (BSF)

trypanosomes were incubated with FITC-labeled Nbs and visualized through the fluorochrome's

emission, **(F)** VSG2-expressing bloodstream form (BSF) trypanosomes were incubated with Nbs

sortagged with FAM and visualized through the fluorochrome's emission **(G)** VSG2-expressing

bloodstream form (BSF) trypanosomes were incubated with C-terminally His-tagged Nbs,

washed thoroughly, run on an SDS-PAGE gel, and probed with an anti-His antibody. An

irrelevant Nb (BabA, raised to a protein from *H. pylori*) was used as a negative control. The

same cells were probed with an anti-tubulin antibody to provide a gel-loading standard.

Figure 4. Mutations in the V-Loop Regions of Nanobodies Inhibit Complex Formation with

VSG2 . (A) Overview of NB11$_{VSG2}$ and NB19$_{VSG2}$ mutants in relation to their ability to bind VSG2.

NB11$_{VSG2}$ mutants L100A and L103A form a complex with VSG2 (+), while the triple mutant

L100/L101/S103 does not bind (-). For NB19$_{VSG2}$ all single and multiple mutants (E114A, Y115A,

E114/Y115A) fail to form a complex with VSG2 (-). **(B and C)** SDS-PAGE analysis of purified,

mixed VSG2 and nanobodies (wild type and mutant NB11$_{VSG2}$ and NB19$_{VSG2}$) analyzed by gel

filtration chromatography (see Methods). Peak elution fractions are shown and numbered. VSG2

corresponds to the 55 kDa band and nanobodies to the 15 kDa band. Gels were stained with

622   Coomassie blue. **(D and E)** FPLC chromatographs corresponding to the SDS-PAGE gels **(B and**

623   **C)** with corresponding peak numbers from the SDS-PAGE gels shown. The Y-axis displays the

624   UV_{280nm} absorbance (arbitrary units) and the X-axis the elution volume from the column (see

625   Methods).

Figure 5. Nanobodies Reduce VSG Mobility, Paralyze, and Kill Trypanosomes

(A-E) Cells were treated with a 1.7-fold molar excess of Nb to VSG monomer.

(A) NB11$_{VSG2}$ affects cell motility after 15 min of treatment. Individual cells in a population were

tracked for 125 s at 5, 15, 25 and 35 minutes post addition of NB11$_{VSG2}$ and analyzed using the

Imaris x64 software. Cells close to the border of the imaging region were removed by filtering to

simplify the images shown (s. Figure S4C for trajectories of complete data set). Trajectories are

color coded blue (t = 0 s) to red (t = 125 s). Scale bars, 100 μm. **(B)** Comparison of velocities

(track speed mean), left, and track displacement lengths per s, right, of untreated cells and cells

treated with four different nanobodies, NB9$_{VSG2}$, NB11$_{VSG2}$, NB14$_{VSG2}$ and NB19$_{VSG2}$. Data

extracted from trajectories shown in Figure S4 (median with bars representing the 25th and 75th

percentile of data points; see Figures S5 and S6 for scatter dot plots of the data). Both velocity and

track displacement are clearly most affected upon treatment with NB11$_{VSG2}$.

(C) Flow cytometry analysis to determine the extent of cell death over time following treatment

with NB11$_{VSG2}$. Left panel, treated cells, right panel, untreated control cells analyzed in hourly

intervals over a duration of 8 h. Propidium iodide was used as a dead cell marker. Each histogram

is based on 25.000 gated events (Figure S7 shows the gate settings for the Nb treated data set).

(D) The effect of nanobody binding on VSG diffusion was analyzed by fluorescence recovery after

photobleaching (FRAP) experiments on immobilized trypanosomes that were surface labeled with

ATTO 488. Untreated (control) and NB11$_{VSG2}$ treated cells were analyzed (n in brackets). Violin

plots showing the frequency distribution of the mobile fractions, left, and the diffusion coefficient,

right, of the VSG in control and NB11$_{VSG2}$ treated cells (median, solid magenta lines; 25th and

75th percentile, dashed magenta lines). There was a remarkable reduction in mobile fraction of

treated cells, median of 11 %, compared to that of untreated cells, median of 83 %. The median

diffusion coefficient of mobile VSGs following treatment with NB11$_{VSG2}$ was reduced to 0.007

μm^2/s from 0.019 μm^2/s for untreated cells. P values from an unpaired, two-tailed Mann-Whitney

test (**** = P<0.001) are shown in both graphs.

(E, F) Single cell analysis of an NB11$_{VSG2}$ treated **(E)** and an untreated **(F)** trypanosome. The

upper images show the first (left) and last (right) frame of a video (s. Videos S1 and S2) with the

posterior of the cell marked by a yellow cross in the first image and the posterior of every 40th

frame of the sequence marked in the second image. Whereas the flagellar beat generates a

propulsive force in wt cells the Nb treated cells initiate beats without the generation of a propulsive

force. Movement is visualized by tracing the cell shape (cyan lengthwise line through the center

of the cell with a circle marking the posterior) in every 40th frame, bottom row. Bottom left image,

traces at the position of the cell in the video sequence, bottom right images: the same traces

displayed individually to show differences in cell shape and orientation. Scale bars, 5 μm.

Figure 6. Nanobody Treatment Triggers Formation of Nanovesicles and Nanotubes

(A-C) Scanning electron micrographs of trypanosomes treated with a 1.7-fold molar excess of

NB11$_{VSG2}$ compared to VSG monomer present. FT, flagellar tip; FAZ, flagellar attachment zone;

NV, nanovesicle; NT, nanotube; FP, flagellar pocket. Cells treated for only 2 min **(A,B)**

displayed nanovesicles (yellow) as well as some chains of nanovesicles (yellow) with diameters

of around 200 nm. Nanotube-like structures (blue) of slightly smaller diameter and lengths

exceeding 1 μm could also be observed. All structures emanated from around the FAZ, FT and

PP. Cells treated for 10 min **(C)** show an increased and roughly equal abundance of both

nanovesicles and nanotubes suggesting them to be independent structures.

(D,E) TEM images of chemically fixed VSG2 expressing cells treated with a 1.7-fold molar

excess of NB11$_{VSG2}$ compared to VSG2 monomer present. CCVII, clathrin coated vesicle II;

cEC, circular exocytic carrier; FP, flagellar pocket; AC, acidocalcisome; FAZ, flagellar

attachment zone; NT, nanotube; NV, nanovesicle; CCP, clathrin coated pit; ER, endoplasmic

reticulum; CCVI, clathrin coated vesicle I; G, Golgi; MVB, multivesicular body; PFR,

paraflagellar rod; Ax, axoneme; Mt, mitochondrion; R, ribosome. **(D)** Concomitant formation of

a nanovesicle in the flagellar pocket and a nanotube from the proximity of the flagellar

attachment zone (FAZ). Formation of a clathrin coated pit in the FP is also apparent and suggests

the endocytic pathway to be functional. The budding NV has approx. 20 nm thick structures

coating the outer membrane consistent with the length of VSG molecules. **(E)** Concomitant

formation of a nanovesicle in the flagellar pocket and nanotubes from the proximity of the FAZ.

Nanovesicles can form chains with continuous content and contain electron-dense particles that

resemble ribosomes found in the cytoplasm.

Figure 7. Nanobodies Provide a "Molecular Ruler" to Gauge VSG Accessibility

(A) Schematic of the interaction of an anti-His monoclonal IgG antibody with the VSG coat during

FACS experiments. The trypanosome membrane is shown at the bottom with idealized lipids into

which the (dark green) GPI anchor of the C-terminal domain (medium green) inserts. Above that

is a ribbon diagram drawing of a VSG2 dimer (cyan) with a bound Nb (NB9$_{VSG2}$, NB11$_{VSG2}$,

NB14$_{VSG2}$ superimposed in light green, left) or NB19$_{VSG2}$ (yellow, right). The IgG is shown as a

ribbon diagram colored red (PDB ID 5DK3). **(B)** Panel of crystal structures of VSGs drawn as

molecular surfaces colored by relative electrostatic potential (blue is positive/basic, red is

negative/acidic, and white is neutral). RCSB PDB IDs for models used are ILTat1.24 (2VSG),

VSG1 (5LY9), VSG2 (1VSG), VSG13 (6Z8H), VSG3 (6ELC), and VSGsur (6Z7A).

712   Molecular graphics software used: Chimera (Pettersen et al., 2004), CCP4mg (McNicholas et al.,

713   2011), and biorender.com Pro.