The meiotic LINC complex component KASH5 is an activating adaptor for cytoplasmic

dynein

Kirsten E. L. Garner[1]*, Anna Salter[1,2]*, Clinton K. Lau[3], Manickam Gurusaran[4], Cécile

Villemant[1], Elizabeth P. Granger[1], Gavin McNee[1], Philip G. Woodman[1], Owen R. Davies[4],

Brian E. Burke[2]*, and Victoria J. Allan[1,2]*

*: equal contributions

1: School of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, University of

Manchester, The Michael Smith Building, Rumford St, Manchester M13 9PT.

2: A*STAR Institute of Medical Biology, 8A Biomedical Grove, #06-06 Immunos, Singapore

138648.

3: MRC Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Francis Crick Avenue, Cambridge Biomedical

Campus, Cambridge CB2 0QH, UK

4: Wellcome Centre for Cell Biology, Institute of Cell Biology, University of Edinburgh,

Michael Swann Building, Max Born Crescent, Edinburgh EH9 3BF, UK

Present addresses: Brian Burke, A*STAR Skin Research Labs (A*SRL), Biopolis, 8A Biomedical

Grove, #06-06 Immunos, Singapore; Elizabeth Granger, University of Central Lancashire,

Preston, PR1 2HE, UK; Gavin McNee, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham B15

2TT; Anna Salter, Immunocore Ltd, 92 Park Drive, Milton Park, OX14 4RY, UK; Cécile

Villemant, The Automation Partnership, (Cambridge) Limited, York Way, Royston,

Hertfordshire, SG8 5WY, UK

Corresponding author: Viki Allan (viki.allan@manchester.ac.uk), ORCID 0000-0003-4583-
0836

Abstract

Cytoplasmic dynein-driven movement of chromosomes during prophase I of meiosis is essential for synapsis and genetic exchange. Dynein connects to chromosome telomeres via KASH5 and SUN1/2, which span the outer and inner nuclear envelopes, respectively. Here, we show that KASH5 promotes dynein motility in vitro, and cytosolic KASH5 inhibits dynein's interphase functions. KASH5 interacts with either dynein light intermediate chain (DYNC1LI1 or DYNC1LI2) via a conserved linker-helix in the LIC C-terminal, and this region is also needed for dynein's recruitment to other cellular membranes. KASH5's N-terminal EF-hands are essential, as the interaction with dynein is disrupted by mutation of key calcium-binding residues, although it is not regulated by cellular calcium levels. Dynein can be recruited to KASH5 at the nuclear envelope independently of dynactin, while LIS1 is essential for dynactin incorporation into the KASH5-dynein complex. Altogether, we show that the trans-membrane protein KASH5 is an activating adaptor for dynein, and shed light on the hierarchy of assembly of KASH5-dynein-dynactin complexes.

Introduction

To conceive healthy offspring, a paternal sperm and maternal egg must be created, which requires the specialised form of cell division, meiosis. During the long meiotic prophase I, sister chromatids attach to the nuclear envelope via their telomeres, and move along the inner nuclear membrane (INM) to transiently cluster in a 'meiotic bouquet' (Fig. S1 A) which enables the formation of the synaptonemal complex in zygotene (Chikashige et al., 2006; Koszul et al., 2008; Trelles-Sticken et al., 2005). This facilitates synapsis and recombination between homologous chromosomes, which is essential for meiotic progression and the generation of two genetically distinct haploid daughter cells (Hamer et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019). These dynamic chromosome movements require force generated by the microtubule motor cytoplasmic dynein-1 (Burke, 2018; Horn et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2015; Lee and Burke, 2018; Morimoto et al., 2012; Rog and Dernburg, 2015; Sato et al., 2009; Wynne et al., 2012). Crucially, the force must be transmitted from the cytoplasm to the chromosomes on the other side of the nuclear envelope. This is achieved by Linkers of Nucleoplasm and Cytoplasm (LINC complexes) which span the nuclear envelope to physically connect the cytoskeleton and nucleus (Burke, 2018; Lee and Burke, 2018; Sato et al., 2009; Spindler et al., 2019) (Fig. S1 A).

LINC complexes consist of SUN (Sad1, Unc-84) domain proteins that span the INM, binding nuclear lamins and chromatin associated proteins in the nucleoplasm, and interacting with KASH (**K**larsicht, **A**NC-1, **S**yne **H**omology) domain proteins. KASH proteins have large cytosolic domains that bind cytoskeleton-associated proteins and are anchored in the ONM by a C-terminal transmembrane domain (Bone and Starr, 2016; Burke, 2018). Inside the nuclear envelope lumen, the 50-60 amino acid C terminal KASH-domain sequence associates with SUN proteins, restricting the KASH protein localisation to the nuclear membrane (Morimoto et al., 2012; Starr, 2011; Starr and Han, 2002). The meiotic LINC complex contains SUN1 and SUN2, which have largely redundant roles (Ding et al., 2007; Link et al., 2014; Schmitt et al., 2007). They bind to a meiotic telomere complex (Dunce et al., 2018; Shibuya et al., 2014), and to KASH5 in vertebrates, which recruits dynein in the cytoplasm to transmit the mechanical force required for synapsis to telomeres (Horn et al., 2013; Morimoto et al., 2012) (Fig. S1 A). The critical importance of KASH5 during meiosis is exemplified by the *KASH5$^{-/-}$ null* mouse, which is completely sterile due to impaired synapsis

and resulting meiotic arrest (Horn et al., 2013). Human mutations in the transmembrane

domain that cause mistargeting of KASH5 to mitochondria lead to male sterility (Bentebbal

et al., 2021). KASH5 shares sequence homology with the N-terminal region of the protein

encoded by the zebrafish gene *futile cycle* which is required for pronuclear migration

(Dekens et al., 2003; Lindeman and Pelegri, 2012), another dynein-dependent function in

which the female pronucleus uses dynein to migrate towards the male pronucleus along

microtubules nucleated from the male centrosome (Gönczy et al., 1999; Payne et al., 2003;

Reinsch and Karsenti, 1997; Robinson et al., 1999). The KASH protein responsible for

pronuclear migration in mammals is not yet known.

Cytoplasmic dynein-1 (dynein, hereafter) transports a diverse range of cargo to the minus

end of microtubules (Reck-Peterson et al., 2018). It is a large 1.6 MDa holoenzyme

comprised of two heavy chains (DHC: DYNC1H1) containing the globular motor domains,

which are the site of ATP hydrolysis. Its cargo binding tail domain contains the intermediate

chains (ICs: DYNC1I1 and 2) which bind directly to the DHCs; three light chains (LCs), which

bind to the ICs; and two light intermediate chains (LICs: DYNC1LI1 and 2) (Pfister et al.,

2005; Reck-Peterson et al., 2018). The LICs bind to DHC via their N terminal GTPase-like

domain, although they are not thought to exhibit GTPase activity (Schroeder et al., 2014).

The LICs have an unstructured carboxy terminus which protrudes from the motor complex

(Celestino et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2018; Schroeder et al., 2014). While the GTPase-like

domain sequence is highly conserved between LIC1 and 2, there is less homology in the C

terminus apart from two regions of predicted alpha-helix (Celestino et al., 2019; Kumari et

al., 2021b; Lee et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018). As described below, this C-terminal domain

mediates the interaction between dynein and the recently identified activating cargo

adaptors.

Dynein requires the multi-component dynactin complex for function (Feng et al., 2020; Gill

et al., 1991; King et al., 2003; McKenney et al., 2014; Schlager et al., 2014a; Schroer and

Sheetz, 1991), although dynein and dynactin alone interact weakly (Baumbach et al., 2017;

Chowdhury et al., 2015; Jha et al., 2017; Splinter et al., 2012; Urnavicius et al., 2015). A third

component is needed for optimum motility and force generation *in vitro,* the 'activating

adaptors' (Belyy et al., 2016; McKenney et al., 2014; Schlager et al., 2014a), and many have

been identified (for reviews see (Canty and Yildiz, 2020; Olenick and Holzbaur, 2019; Reck-

Peterson et al., 2018)), which promote dynein function in several ways. Firstly, they

strengthen the interaction between dynein and dynactin (Schroeder and Vale, 2016; Splinter

et al., 2012) by forming extensive interactions with both components to generate a

tripartite dynein-dynactin-adaptor (DDA) complex, or complexes with two dyneins per

dynactin and adaptor (D_2DA) (Chowdhury et al., 2015; Grotjahn et al., 2018; Lau et al., 2021;

Lee et al., 2020; Urnavicius et al., 2018; Urnavicius et al., 2015). Secondly, they release the

dynein motor domains from the autoinhibited Phi conformation (Torisawa et al., 2014;

Zhang et al., 2017), helping to align them for microtubule interaction (Chowdhury et al.,

2015; Zhang et al., 2017). Finally, they recruit dynein and dynactin to cargo (for example

(Horgan et al., 2010b; Schroeder and Vale, 2016; Splinter et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2019)).

The assembly and function of dynein adaptor complexes is promoted by the dynein

regulator Lissencephaly-1 (LIS1). LIS1 is needed for many dynein functions (reviewed in

(Markus et al., 2020) and is mutated in the neurodevelopmental disorder, Type-1

lissencephaly (Reiner et al., 1993), which results from defective neural migration and

progenitor proliferation (Hirotsune et al., 1998; Markus et al., 2020). LIS1 enhances the

formation of DDA complexes (Baumbach et al., 2017; Dix et al., 2013) and increases the

frequency, velocity and duration of dynein complex movement (Baumbach et al., 2017; Dix

et al., 2013; Fenton et al., 2021; Gutierrez et al., 2017). Recent mechanistic studies have

shown that LIS1 binding to the dynein motor domain promotes the opening of the Phi

complex ((Elshenawy et al., 2020; Gillies et al., 2022; Htet et al., 2020; Marzo et al., 2020;

Qiu et al., 2019) reviewed in (Canty and Yildiz, 2020; Markus et al., 2020; Olenick and

Holzbaur, 2019)), a conformation that may assemble more readily with adaptors as well as

being more active. This may be how LIS1 increases the proportion of D_2DA complexes

containing two dyneins (Elshenawy et al., 2020; Htet et al., 2020) which generate more

force, move faster and are more processive than single dynein DDA complexes (Elshenawy

et al., 2019; Sladewski et al., 2018; Urnavicius et al., 2018). Furthermore, LIS1 also

contributes to the recruitment of dynein, dynactin and/or adaptors to cellular cargoes

ranging from ribonucleoprotein particles (RNPs) (Dix et al., 2013), to membranes (Lam et al.,

2010), Rab6-positive vesicles (Splinter et al., 2012), the nuclear envelope (Cockell et al.,

2004; Sitaram et al., 2012; Splinter et al., 2012), spindle poles (Sitaram et al., 2012; Wang et

al., 2013) and kinetochores (Dzhindzhev et al., 2005; Siller et al., 2005).

Activating adaptor proteins share little sequence homology, but generally contain a long

coiled coil domain, and a site for cargo binding (Lee et al., 2020; McKenney et al., 2014;

Redwine et al., 2017; Schlager et al., 2014a; Schlager et al., 2014b; Urnavicius et al., 2015).

They all interact with the C-terminal domain of LICs via at least three distinct types of

sequence motif: the CC1 box; the Hook domain; or EF hands (Celestino et al., 2019; Gama et

al., 2017; Lee et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018; Schroeder and Vale, 2016), and the motility of all

three types of DDA complex is promoted by LIS1 (Htet et al., 2020). Other adaptors may not

activate dynein, but still serve to link the motor to cargoes (Olenick and Holzbaur, 2019;

Reck-Peterson et al., 2018). An example is Rab7-interacting lysosomal protein (RILP), which

recruits dynein and dynactin to Rab7 positive late endosomes/lysosomes (Johansson et al.,

2007; Jordens et al., 2001; Scherer et al., 2014; Tan et al., 2011) via its RILP homology

domains, but lacks a long coiled coil. KASH5 is a good candidate to be an activating adaptor,

because it contains an N-terminal EF-hand domain that binds dynein, followed by a long

coiled coil (Horn et al., 2013; Morimoto et al., 2012). However, unlike other activating

adaptors characterised so far, it is a trans-membrane protein.

Mammalian dynein contains either two LIC1 subunits, or two LIC2 subunits (Tynan et al.,

2000a), thus providing the potential for differential interactions with adaptors. However,

both LICs bind to the adaptors Rab11-FIP3 (Celestino et al., 2019; Horgan et al., 2010a;

Horgan et al., 2010b), RILP (Celestino et al., 2019; Scherer et al., 2014), BICD2, spindly,

Hook3, ninein and TRAK1 (Celestino et al., 2019), via the highly conserved helix 1 in the LIC

C-terminus. This shared binding ability suggests that LICs may act redundantly, as has been

reported in the endocytic pathway (Horgan et al., 2010a; Horgan et al., 2010b; Tan et al.,

2011). However, other endocytic functions may be isoform-specific (Bielli et al., 2001; Hunt

et al., 2013; Palmer et al., 2009). Likewise, although LIC1 and 2 act redundantly for some

mitotic functions (Jones et al., 2014; Raaijmakers et al., 2013), isoform-specific functions

and localisations have been reported during mitosis (Horgan et al., 2011; Mahale et al.,

2016a; Mahale et al., 2016b; Palmer et al., 2009; Raaijmakers et al., 2013; Sharma et al.,

2020; Sivaram et al., 2009), at the centrosome (Tynan et al., 2000b), during neuronal

nuclear migration (Goncalves et al., 2019) and cell migration (Even et al., 2019; Schmoranzer

et al., 2009). In addition, mitotic phosphorylation of the LIC1 C-terminal domain may

provide temporal control of adaptor selection (Kumari et al., 2021a). The degree of specific

and shared functions for LICs is an important issue that is not fully resolved.

How the dynein motor interacts with KASH5 to drive the dynamic chromosome movements

essential for meiosis has remained unknown. Here, we reveal the transmembrane protein

KASH5 to be a novel member of the dynein activating adaptor class that interacts with the

LIC helix 1 region. We demonstrate that this region in the LIC is also key for dynein's

function at the Golgi apparatus and throughout the endocytic pathway, with LICs 1 and 2

acting redundantly in these locations. Analysis of the hierarchy of adaptor complex

assembly reveals that dynein can be recruited to KASH5 independently of dynactin, and that

LIS1 is essential for full complex assembly. The interaction between KASH5 and dynein is

disrupted by mutation of the KASH5 EF hand domain, although dynein recruitment to KASH5

in cells is calcium independent. Since defective synapsis can lead to genetic abnormalities

and infertility, the characterisation of the KASH5-dynein interaction is an important step

forward in understanding the complex mechanism of chromosome movement during

meiotic prophase I.

Results

KASH5 forms a complex with dynein, dynactin and LIS1

To investigate the interaction between dynein and KASH5 (Horn et al., 2013; Morimoto et

al., 2012), we generated a stable HeLa cell line in which expression of GFP-KASH5 was

induced by addition of doxycycline. This was used to examine the recruitment of

endogenous dynein to the nuclei of KASH5-expressing cells by immunofluorescence. Since

dynein requires the multi-subunit dynactin complex for function, we also probed for

dynactin components. LIC1 and dynactin p50 were both recruited to KASH5-expressing

nuclei (Fig. 1 A), in addition to dynactin p150 and IC (Horn et al., 2013). In contrast, neither

dynein nor dynactin (Fig. 1 A) were recruited to the nuclei of cells transiently expressing a

different KASH containing protein, nesprin-2α2 (GFP-N2α2).

We confirmed the recruitment of dynein and dynactin to KASH5 biochemically. HeLaM cells

were transiently transfected with GFP-KASH5ΔK (Fig. 1 B) or GFP-N2α2ΔK, which lack their

KASH and transmembrane domains, and so are cytosolic. LIC1, LIC2, IC and p150 all

associated with GFP-KASH5ΔK and not with GFP-N2α2ΔK (Fig. 1 C). The KASH5 N-terminal

166 amino acids (GFP-KASH5ND), containing the EF-hands, were sufficient to pull down

dynein IC and dynactin from cell lysates as efficiently as GFP-KASH5ΔK (Horn et al., 2013),

and the same is true for LIC1 (Fig. 1 D).

LIS1 plays a key role in the assembly of DDA and D_2DA complexes (reviewed in (Canty and

Yildiz, 2020; Markus et al., 2020; Olenick and Holzbaur, 2019), and co-precipitates with

BICD2N along with dynein and dynactin (Splinter et al., 2012). In accordance with previous

biochemical analysis (Horn et al., 2013), GFP-KASH5ΔK pulled down LIS1 as well as dynein

and dynactin, but this complex excluded the dynein adaptor BICD2 (Fig. 1 C).

Immunofluorescence analysis revealed that endogenous LIS1 was detected at the nuclear

envelope in 99.8% of KASH5-expressing cells (Fig. S1 A), whereas the LIS1 and dynein

interactor Nde1 was not, even though it could be detected at the nuclear envelope in late

G2 cells (Fig. 1 A).

Hierarchy of dynein, dynactin and LIS1 recruitment to KASH5

We next sought to identify which dynein subunits mediate the KASH5 interaction, and the

roles played by dynactin and LIS1. We used RNA interference to deplete individual dynein

subunits in the GFP-KASH5 cell line (Fig. S2 A) and assessed the effect on recruitment to

KASH5. Depletion of dynein IC2 (the only form expressed in HeLa cells: (Palmer et al., 2009))

did not prevent dynein recruitment (Fig. 2 A), with 100% of KASH5-positive nuclei being

labelled with anti-LIC1 (Fig. S1 A). Cytosolic levels of LIC1 were reduced following IC2

depletion, making the nuclear envelope pool particularly distinct. This is likely due to a

modest reduction in total dynein levels when IC2 is depleted, as seen by immunoblotting

with anti-LIC1 and 2 (Fig. S2 A). LIS1 recruitment to KASH5 at the nuclear envelope was also

unaffected by depletion of IC2 (Fig. 2 A and S1 B). Strikingly, dynactin was only rarely

detected at the nuclear envelope in IC2-depleted cells using antibodies to p150 or p50 (Fig.

2 A and S2 A), even though p150 was still readily observed at microtubule plus ends. These

data suggest that while the interaction between IC and p150 (Karki and Holzbaur, 1995; King

et al., 2003; Vaughan and Vallee, 1995) is not needed for dynein and LIS1 recruitment to

KASH5, it is essential for the association of dynactin with KASH5.

Since IC2 depletion reduced total cellular dynactin p150 levels by ~25% (Fig. S1 A), we used

a dominant negative approach as another way of testing the effect of disrupting IC2-p150

interactions on recruitment to KASH5, using over-expression of the coiled coil 1 region of

p150 (CC1) (King et al., 2003; Quintyne et al., 1999). Because the stable GFP-KASH5 cell line

was resistant to transient transfection, we co-transfected HeLa cells with GFP-KASH5 and

myc-SUN2 (to ensure efficient localisation of KASH5 to the nuclear envelope) along with

RFP-tagged CC1. Strikingly, while CC1 expression had no effect on dynein or LIS1

recruitment to KASH5, it prevented dynactin accumulation at the nuclear envelope (Fig. 2

B). These data confirm that dynein and LIS1 can associate with KASH5 independently of

dynactin.

As the LICs have recently been recognised as having important interactions with cargo

adaptors, we used RNAi to investigate their involvement in the dynein-KASH5 interaction.

There was no reduction in the proportion of cells with detectable dynein, dynactin or LIS1

recruited to KASH5 after depleting LIC2 alone (Fig. 3 B, D). LIC1 depletion also had very little

effect on dynactin or LIS1 recruitment in a binary scoring assay, but had a variable effect on

dynein intermediate chain, with 80.8 ± 24.3% of cells (n=3 experiments, ±SD) showing IC

signal at the nuclear envelope (Fig. 3 A, D). However, when both LIC1 and LIC2 were

depleted simultaneously, the proportion of cells with detectable dynein and dynactin at the

nuclear envelope was reduced by nearly 75% (Fig. 3 C, D). LIS1 recruitment was also

reduced, but to a lesser extent than dynein or dynactin, with ~60% of KASH5 expressing cells

showing LIS1 signal at the nuclear envelope. We were not able to deplete endogenous LIC1

completely using RNAi (Fig. S2 B) which may explain why in some cells a residual level of

dynein, dynactin and LIS1 remained with KASH5 at the nuclear envelope. In addition, GFP-

KASH5ΔK pull-downs from LIC1 and 2 depleted HeLa cells contained very little dynein and

dynactin (Fig. 3 E). Thus, LIC1 and 2 act redundantly to recruit dynein and LIS1 to KASH5 at

the nuclear envelope, with dynactin being recruited downstream, by a mechanism requiring

the interaction between IC and p150.

We next used RNAi depletion of LIS1 in the GFP-KASH5 cell line to test if it is required for

KASH5 to associate with dynein and dynactin. Interestingly, the proportion of cells with LIC1

detectable at the nuclear envelope was virtually unaffected by LIS1 knock-down (Fig. S1 C,

D) whereas p150 recruitment was seen in only 20% of cells (Fig. S1 C, F). Dynein IC detection

at KASH5-positive nuclei was highly variable between experiments (Fig. S1 C, E), with a

mean of 57.1% of cells scoring positive for IC74 antibody labelling. The discrepancy between

the anti-LIC1 and IC scoring most likely reflects the generally weaker nuclear envelope

labelling seen with the IC74 antibody compared to anti-LIC1 antibodies in control cells. We

interpret these data to mean that LIS1 depletion reduces dynein levels at the nuclear

envelope somewhat, to levels that are still detectable by anti-LIC1 but sometimes not by

IC74. Altogether, these data reveal that LIS1 is vital for the dynactin complex to be recruited

to KASH5 downstream of dynein and suggest that LIS1 may also promote the formation of,

or stabilise, the KASH5-dynein complex.

Dynein LIC1 residues 388-458 are essential for KASH5 binding and for dynein's function on

multiple membrane cargoes

We next wanted to ascertain the LIC1 region responsible for the dynein-KASH5 interaction,

focussing on the C-terminal domain that contains the cargo-binding helix 1 (residues 440-

456) and helix 2 (residues 493-502) (Celestino et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018).

While helix 1 and some preceding amino acids (433-458) forms the minimal region needed

for interaction with Hooks, BICD2 and Spindly (Lee et al., 2018), additional interactions

between LIC1 and Spindly, BICD2 and Hook3 have been seen in helix 2 and the linker region

upstream of helix 1 (Celestino et al., 2019). In contrast, RILP only requires helix 1 (LIC1 440-

455) (Celestino et al., 2019). We generated a series of GFP-tagged human LIC1 constructs

(Fig. 4 A): full length LIC1 (GFP-LIC1-FL: amino acids 1-523); a truncation which contains helix

1 but not helix 2 (GFP-LIC1-CT2: amino acids 1-456); and a construct which terminates

shortly after the Ras-like domain and lacks both helix 1 and 2, as well as the linker

sequences (GFP-LIC1-CT3: amino acids 1-388). We first examined the recruitment of the

different LIC1 truncations to full length KASH5 at the nuclear envelope by

immunofluorescence in HeLaM cells co-expressing HA-KASH5, myc-SUN2 and GFP-LIC1

constructs. Full-length GFP-LIC1 was efficiently recruited to KASH5, as expected (Fig. 4 B).

The mid-length LIC1 CT2 construct was also strongly recruited to the nuclear envelope in

KASH5-SUN2 expressing cells. However, LIC1 1-388 (GFP-LIC1-CT3) was not recruited to KASH5 at all (Fig. 4 B). To verify these findings biochemically, cells depleted of LIC1 and 2 by RNAi were co-transfected with myc-tagged LIC1 truncations and the soluble GFP-KASHND construct. GFP trap immunoprecipitation revealed that while dynein containing FL-LIC1 and LIC1-CT2 was recruited to the KASH5 N-terminal domain, dynein with LIC1-CT3 was not (Fig. 4 C). These results indicate the LIC1 residues 388-456, containing helix 1 and its upstream linker sequence, are essential for the interaction with KASH5.

The importance of the LIC helix 1 in cargo binding prompted us to use these tools to assess the role of the LICs on a variety of endogenous membrane cargoes, for which the adaptors have not been fully defined (see discussion). First, we tested if LIC1 and 2 functioned redundantly in Golgi apparatus positioning, as there is conflicting evidence for the effects of depleting LICs on Golgi apparatus morphology and position (Kumari et al., 2021a; Palmer et al., 2009; Tan et al., 2011). RNAi depletion of LIC1 or 2 individually led to break-up of the Golgi ribbon in ~60% of HeLaM cells, with the Golgi fragments remaining centrally located (Fig. 5 A-C; Fig. S3 A). In contrast, depletion of both LICs simultaneously led to complete fragmentation and scattering of the Golgi apparatus (Fig. 5 B, C), suggesting that the LICs indeed act redundantly in Golgi positioning. This was confirmed by expressing RNAi-resistant LIC1-mKate or LIC2-mKate in cells depleted of both LICs (Fig. 5 D), as either LIC was able to fully restore Golgi apparatus clustering.

The endocytic pathway also relies heavily on dynein activity, which drives the movement of endocytic organelles towards the centrosome (Flores-Rodriguez et al., 2011; Granger et al., 2014; Reck-Peterson et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019). This motility contributes to the sorting of endocytic cargo in the early endosome (Driskell et al., 2007). Depletion of both LICs profoundly altered the distribution of early endosomes, recycling endosomes and lysosomes (Fig. 6 A) while only minimal effects were seen with single depletions (not shown). Moreover, expression of either LIC1-mKate or LIC2-GFP restored the position of early endosomes, recycling endosomes and lysosomes (Fig. 6 B), confirming that LICs act redundantly in the general context of endocytic organelle motility, even though there are isoform-specific roles in SNX tubule dynamics (Hunt et al., 2013). We investigated if the same effects were observed with dynein recruitment to RILP. The presence of either LIC1 or

LIC2 was sufficient to recruit dynein and dynactin to HA-RILP-positive late endosomes,

whereas recruitment of both complexes was significantly reduced when both LICs were

depleted (Fig. S4 A-D).

To examine if the LIC1 region 388-456 that contains helix 1 is needed for Golgi apparatus

positioning and in dynein's endocytic functions, we used the same knock-down and rescue

approach (Figs. 5 E; 6 C, D; S4 E). Both the full length GFP-LIC1 and GFP-LIC1-CT2 rescued

Golgi apparatus, early endosome, and lysosome clustering. In contrast, GFP-LIC1-CT3 did not

restore retrograde transport, with EEA1-positive early endosomes (Fig. 6 C) and LAMP1-

positive late endosomes/lysosomes (Fig. 6 D) remaining localised in the cell periphery, and

the Golgi apparatus being fragmented and scattered (Fig. 5 E). Moreover, GFP-LIC1-CT3 did

not interact with RILP, whereas GFP-LIC1-CT2 or full-length GFP-LIC1 were robustly recruited

to RILP positive organelles (Fig. S4 E).

Altogether, these data provide clear *in cellulo* evidence that the LIC adaptor binding helix 1

is needed for dynein's interaction with KASH5 and RILP, and is also crucial for dynein's

function on the Golgi apparatus, early endosomes and lysosomes. Furthermore, we

demonstrate that LIC1 and LIC2 act redundantly in these situations.

KASH5 is a novel activating dynein adaptor

KASH5 shares key characteristics with other activating dynein adaptors: interaction with LIC

helix 1; ability to recruit dynactin; and presence of an N-terminal dynein binding domain

(containing EF-hands) followed by an extended coiled coil (Horn et al., 2013). In addition,

KASH5's biological function in telomere clustering in prophase of meiosis I (Horn et al.,

2013; Lee et al., 2015) strongly suggest that it recruits active dynein. When expressed out of

its meiotic context, in HeLa cells, we quite often observed clusters of KASH5 and dynein

around discrete points close to or on top of the nucleus (red arrowheads and arrows in Fig.

1 A), suggestive of clustering around the centrosome via active dynein. In addition,

asymmetric distribution of KASH5 in the NE with enrichment towards the MTOC has been

noted (Horn et al., 2013).

Overexpression of activating dynein adaptor proteins lacking their cargo binding domain

disrupts dynein functions by sequestering dynein and preventing its binding to endogenous

adaptors (e.g. (Hoogenraad et al., 2001; Hoogenraad et al., 2003; Horgan et al., 2010a;

Horgan et al., 2010b; Splinter et al., 2012). As KASH5 demonstrates the characteristics of a

cargo adaptor that interacts with LIC helix 1, we hypothesised that it would compete with

other adaptors for binding to dynein. Indeed, overexpression of cytosolic GFP-KASH5ΔK in

HeLaM cells resulted in complete fragmentation of the Golgi apparatus, and redistribution

of lysosomes to the cell periphery; phenotypes indicative of a loss of dynein function (Fig. 7

A). In contrast, expression of a cytoplasmic KASH5 construct lacking its N terminal dynein

binding domain (Fig. 1 B, GFP-KASH5ΔNDΔK (Horn et al., 2013)) had no effect on Golgi

apparatus or lysosome distribution and morphology (Fig. 7 A). The effects of GFP-KASH5ΔK

are therefore due to KASH5 binding and sequestering dynein, preventing its recruitment to

other membrane cargoes. We also tested whether GFP-KASH5ΔK expression had dominant

negative effects on spindle integrity in mitosis, since this is compromised in cells depleted of

both LICs (Jones et al., 2014). Interestingly, neither GFP-KASH5ΔK nor GFP-KASH5ΔNDΔK

expression affected bipolar spindle assembly (Fig. S5 A, B) whereas expression of mCherry-

p50 caused profound defects leading to almost complete loss of bipolar spindles (Fig. S5 C).

Furthermore, although BICD2N expression is highly disruptive for dynein's interphase

function (Hoogenraad et al., 2001; Hoogenraad et al., 2003; Splinter et al., 2012), it had only

minor effects on spindle assembly (Fig. S5 B). These data suggest that there may be cell

cycle regulation of dynein adaptor binding.

We next determined if KASH5 competes with established dynein adaptors for dynein

binding. To test this possibility, we co-transfected HeLaM cells with HA-tagged full-length

KASH5, myc-tagged SUN2 and dominant negative versions of the activating adaptors BICD2

(GFP-BICD2N: (Hoogenraad et al., 2001; Splinter et al., 2012)) and Rab11-FIP3 (GFP-Rab11-

FIP3 I737E, which retains its LIC binding domain but is unable to interact with Rab11 (Wilson

et al., 2005)). Endogenous dynein was recruited to KASH5 at the nuclear envelope in control

cells, but this was prevented when dominant negative dynein adaptors BICD2N and Rab11-

FIP3 I737E were expressed (Fig. 7 B). We investigated if the same was true for dynein

recruitment to RILP, even though RILP is not thought to be able to activate dynein/dynactin

motility (Lee et al., 2020; Reck-Peterson et al., 2018). Dynein was recruited to RILP-positive

organelles following overexpression of HA-tagged RILP (Fig. 7 C). However, when GFP-

BICD2N or GFP-Rab11-FIP3 I737E were co expressed, recruitment of dynein LIC1 to RILP was

abrogated (Fig. 7 C). Taken together, these findings show that established dynein adaptor

proteins compete with KASH5 and RILP for dynein binding.

To test directly if KASH5 could act as an activating adaptor and form motile complexes with

dynein and dynactin, we used single molecule in vitro motility assays consisting of purified

bacterially expressed KASH5 mixed with purified fluorescently-labelled dynein, dynactin and

LIS1. We generated three KASH5 constructs encoding amino acids 1-407, 1-460, 1-507, all of

which contain the N-terminal EF-hand dynein binding domain plus the predicted coiled coil

region (amino acids 166-350), plus a variable amount of the C-terminal domain. SEC-MALS

analysis showed that all three purified proteins formed dimers (shown for KASH5$_{1-460}$ in Fig.

8 B). Of these, KASH5$_{1-460}$ was the most active in preliminary motility assays. Purified dynein,

dynactin and LIS1 alone displayed very little motility (Fig. 8 C). The inclusion of KASH5$_{1-460}$

promoted processive dynein movements (Fig. 8 D), although a lesser number than seen with

purified Hook3$_{1-522}$ (Sf9/baculovirus expressed (Urnavicius et al., 2018)). Importantly, the

velocity of processive dynein movements was the same for KASH5$_{1-460}$ and Hook3$_{1-522}$ (Fig. 8

E). KASH5, a transmembrane protein, is therefore a novel activating dynein adaptor.

KASH5's EF hand is critical for dynein and dynactin complex assembly

A common feature of several dynein adaptor proteins is the presence of an N terminal pair

of EF hands in the dynein-binding domain, as seen in Rab11-FIP3, CRACR2a, Rab45/RASEF

and ninein (Celestino et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Reck-Peterson et al., 2018; Wang et al.,

2019). KASH5 contains two putative EF hands, extending from amino acids 36-103, which

form the bulk of the dynein binding domain (Fig. 1 B, D; 4 C). Sequence alignment of the

KASH5 EF hands with CRACR2a, Rab45, FIP3 and ninein revealed that KASH5, like FIP3 and

ninein, lacks some of the key consensus calcium-binding amino acids (at positions named

X,Y,Z,-X,-Y,-Z), and that these changes were consistent across species (Fig. 9 A). EF hand 1 is

particularly divergent, with only the residue in position X (Grabarek, 2006) matching the

consensus, and with the key position -Z being a glutamine or histidine instead of a

glutamate residue. While EF hand 2 has consensus amino acids in position X, other residues

either do not conform or vary between species. For example, in non-rodent KASH5 EF hand

2, there is aspartate in place of glutamate at -Z, which can result in magnesium binding

(Grabarek, 2006), as suggested for FIP3 (Lee et al., 2020).

This analysis suggested that KASH5 might not be calcium regulated. To determine if the

KASH5 and Rab11-FIP3 interaction with dynein in cells required calcium or not, we

expressed GFP-tagged KASH5 with myc-SUN2 in HeLaM cells, or GFP-Rab11-FIP3 in Vero

cells, and labelled for endogenous LIC1. In control DMSO-treated cells there was robust

recruitment of dynein to KASH5 at the nuclear envelope, and to Rab11-FIP3-positive

recycling endosomes (Fig. S6). This recruitment was not affected by treating cells with the

cell permeable calcium chelator, BAPTA-AM, for 2 hours to deplete intracellular calcium

(Fig. S6). This demonstrates that the KASH5-dynein interaction does not require calcium and

confirms that the Rab11-FIP3-dynein interaction in cells is calcium-independent, as reported

for in vitro assays (Lee et al., 2020).

We wanted to test the importance of KASH5's EF hands in the dynein interaction, even if

calcium was not required. The *fue* mutation in the zebrafish KASH5 homologue, futile cycle

(fue) (Lindeman and Pelegri, 2012), gives zygotes are defective in pronuclear migration and

mitotic spindle assembly (Dekens et al., 2003; Lindeman and Pelegri, 2012). The

corresponding mutation in human KASH5 changes a valine to glutamic acid in EF hand 1

(V54E: Fig. 9 A). We generated KASH5-EF-*fue* constructs to establish how this mutation

affected KASH5-dynein interactions. We also mutated the amino acids in positions X and Y

of both EF hands to alanine (KASH5-EF-AA: D44A; Q46A; D81A; N83A: Fig. 9 A), based on

similar mutations in CRACR2a which ablate its function (Srikanth et al., 2016; Wang et al.,

2019). Lastly, we made two mutants where some KASH5 residues were replaced by those

found in CRACR2a (Fig. 9 A). In KASH5-EF-mod1, four CRACR2a amino acid substitutions

were made: Q46E; Q55D; P87Y and K88L. In KASH5-EF-mod2, nine amino acids in EF hands 1

and 2 and part of the exiting helix were changed to the CRACR2a sequences.

To test the effects of these mutations on KASH5 function, we harnessed the dominant

negative effect of expressing cytosolic KASH5, which causes Golgi fragmentation and

peripheral lysosome distribution (Fig. 5 and 6). In this assay, any mutant that prevents

KASH5 from interacting with dynein would have no effect on organelle morphology when

expressed, as seen with GFP alone (Fig. 9 B). Overexpression of GFP-KASH5ΔK or GFP-

KASH5ΔK-mod1 in HeLaM cells resulted in complete fragmentation of the Golgi apparatus,

and peripheral lysosomes (Fig. 9 C, E, arrows). In contrast, GFP-KASHΔK-EF-*fue* (Fig. 9D),

GFP-KASHΔK-EF-AA (Fig. 9 F) or GFP-KASHΔK-EF-mod2 (Fig. 9 G) had no effect on Golgi

positioning or lysosome distribution, implying that these EF hand mutants were unable to

sequester dynein.

To validate these findings biochemically, we used GFP trap beads to isolate KASH5DK WT or

EF hand mutants from HeLaM cells, and then used antibodies directed against endogenous

IC and dynactin p150 to reveal which KASH5 constructs could form a stable complex with

dynein and dynactin. Unmodified GFP-KASH5ΔK co-precipitated with dynein and dynactin,

as did KASH5-mod1 (Fig. 9 H). However, the dynein and dynactin interaction was lost for the

KASH5-EF-*fue*, EF-AA, or EF-mod2 mutants. Taken together, these findings show that the

KASH5 EF hand is critical for its function with dynein and dynactin, although the interaction

is not calcium-dependent.

Discussion

Infertility will affect approximately 1 in 7 couples trying to conceive and has extraordinarily

detrimental effects on those affected. Despite this, surprisingly little is known about the

multitude of molecular and genetic causes of infertility in both males and females. This is

largely due to the complexity of meiosis, pronuclear migration, and a lack of samples to

study from sterile populations. Cytoplasmic dynein-1 is responsible for generating the

mechanical force required for the dynamic chromosome movements in meiotic prophase I,

which are essential for both meiotic progression and to maintain genetic integrity. KASH5,

the mammalian LINC complex component that spans the nuclear envelope, along with

SUN1/2, to link dynein to telomeres, is essential for synapsis and meiotic progression (Horn

et al., 2013; Morimoto et al., 2012). Here, we identify KASH5 as a novel activating adaptor

for dynein, the first trans-membrane protein with this role. We have mapped an important

dynein-KASH5 interaction domain and shown this to be the region (LIC1 residues 388-458)

containing the alpha-helix that mediates dynein's interaction with a plethora of other cargo

adaptor proteins (Celestino et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018). As such, KASH5

competes with established dynein adaptors—BICD2 and FIP3—for dynein binding.

Expression of a cytosolic truncation of KASH5 inhibits dynein interphase function (Fig. 7), as

seen for other dynein adaptor constructs that cannot bind cargo (Hoogenraad et al., 2001;

Hoogenraad et al., 2003; Horgan et al., 2010a; Horgan et al., 2010b; Splinter et al., 2012).

Our *in vitro* assays (Fig. 8) confirm that KASH5 is an activating dynein adaptor (McKenney et

al., 2014; Schlager et al., 2014a; Schlager et al., 2014b) as KASH5, in the presence of LIS1 and

dynactin, promotes motility of purified dynein molecules (Fig. 8).

In vivo, however, KASH5-dynein-dynactin complexes will not be acting individually. It is

estimated that there are ~80 LINC complexes per telomere (Spindler et al., 2019), providing

an upper limit to the number of points where dynein motors can engage with the

cytoplasmic face of the nuclear envelope. If KASH5 can bind more than one dynein motor

per dynactin (Grotjahn et al., 2018; Urnavicius et al., 2018), then there could be 160 dyneins

per telomere. It is obvious that considerable force must be exerted to move chromosomes

around within the nucleoplasm to promote synapsis, and this could be provided by such an

ensemble of dyneins. Importantly, we find that KASH5 recruits LIS1 as well as dynein and

dynactin, and that LIS1 is needed for dynactin recruitment to KASH5. LIS1 is crucial for

dynein function where high force is needed (Chapman et al., 2019; Markus et al., 2020;

Pandey and Smith, 2011; Reddy et al., 2016; Yi et al., 2011), and has recently been shown to

increase force generation of dynein-dynactin complexes in vitro by promoting the

recruitment of two dynein motors per dynactin (Elshenawy et al., 2020; Htet et al., 2020;

Markus et al., 2020).

LIS1 is thought to promote adaptor binding by opening the dynein phi complex to allow

easier assembly of the dynein/dynactin/adaptor complex (Elshenawy et al., 2020; Gillies et

al., 2022; Htet et al., 2020; Marzo et al., 2020; Qiu et al., 2019). Indeed, in cells, LIS1

enhances dynein and dynactin recruitment to a wide range of cellular cargoes (Cockell et al.,

2004; Dix et al., 2013; Dzhindzhev et al., 2005; Lam et al., 2010; Siller et al., 2005; Sitaram et

al., 2012; Splinter et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2013). Our data suggest that LIS1 is essential for

recruiting dynactin to KASH5 (Fig. S1). Surprisingly, however, LIS1 depletion had much less

effect on dynein recruitment. We also found that interfering with dynein IC-dynactin p150

interactions either by IC2 depletion or by over-expression of p150 CC1, did not prevent

dynein recruitment to KASH5. Based on these data, we propose that the first step in KASH5

adaptor complex assembly is an interaction between the LIC helix 1 and the adaptor. The

subsequent binding of LIS1 then opens the Phi complex. The third step involves recruitment

of the dynactin complex initiated by the IC-p150 interaction, followed by the formation of

extensive contacts between the rest of the dynactin complex and the adaptor (Chowdhury

et al., 2015; Grotjahn et al., 2018; Lau et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2020; Urnavicius et al., 2018;

Urnavicius et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2017). An interesting question is whether dynein's

conformation (phi or open) affects its ability to bind adaptors, or subsequently recruit

dynactin. If so, then LIS1 binding may regulate adaptor complex assembly *per se*. This KASH5

pathway contrasts with the association of dynein with the nuclear envelope at late

G2/prophase, where the recruitment of dynein and dynactin are interdependent

(Raaijmakers et al., 2013). The mechanism of dynein-dynactin-adaptor assembly may

therefore depend on the adaptor and cellular context. While LIS1 does not remain in motile

complexes with dynein and dynactin in vitro (Elshenawy et al., 2020; Htet et al., 2020), it

appears to be a stable component of at least some DDA complexes in vivo because it is

recruited to KASH5 at the nuclear envelope. It is also found along with dynein and dynactin

in KASH5 (Fig. 1; (Horn et al., 2013)) and BICD2 pull-downs (Splinter et al., 2012). It is also

required for dynein-dynactin recruitment to the nuclear envelope in late G2/prophase

(Raaijmakers et al., 2013). Understanding fully the in vivo role of LIS1 in dynein-dynactin-

adaptor function is a key challenge for the future.

KASH5 interacts with LICs via its N-terminal EF-hand domain, like the activating adaptors

FIP3, CRACR2a, Rab45 and ninein (Celestino et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2020; Reck-Peterson et

al., 2018; Wang et al., 2019). EF-hands are known for their regulation by calcium, and

CRACR2a-dynein interactions are calcium-dependent (Wang et al., 2019). However, recent

work has revealed that not all EF hand adaptors bind calcium, and calcium binding does not

necessarily mean that the cellular function of the EF hand is regulated by calcium levels (Lee

et al., 2020; Wang et al., 2019). Similarly, neither KASH5-dynein nor FIP3-dynein interactions

were affected by depleting cells of calcium (Fig. S6), and the KASH5 EF-hands lack key

residues known to be essential for calcium binding (Fig. 9 A). However, the structure of the

KASH5 EF-hand is clearly vital, since mutating the X and Y positions of both EF-hands to

alanine ablated KASH5-dynein interactions (Fig. 9). Similar adverse effects on dynein-KASH5

complex formation following mutation of other residues in KASH5 EF-hands have been

reported in a recent preprint (Agrawal et al., 2022). Importantly, our studies suggest why

the *fue* mutation in the EF-hand (Lindeman and Pelegri, 2012) is detrimental in zebrafish

development (Dekens et al., 2003; Lindeman and Pelegri, 2012), since replicating this

mutation in KASH5 also interferes with its ability to bind dynein. Interestingly, zebrafish *fue*

mutants are defective in pronuclear migration, despite a normal astral microtubule network

(Dekens et al., 2003). Similarly, Zyg12, the *C. elegans* LINC complex KASH-domain protein

that binds dynein LIC via a Hook domain, is needed for both pronuclear migration (Malone

et al., 2003; Minn et al., 2009) and meiotic synapsis (Sato et al., 2009). Whether KASH5 plays

a role in mammalian pro-nuclear migration remains to be determined.

As well as characterising KASH5 as a novel dynein activating adaptor, this study also

provides insight into LIC function in cells. RNAi depletion suggested that either LIC can

recruit dynein to KASH5 in cells (Fig. 3), and we have confirmed this using pull-downs with

GFP-LIC1 (Figs. 4, 9) and by reconstituting KASH5-activated motility of recombinant dynein

containing only LIC2 (Fig. 8). Similarly, we find that LICs 1 and 2 act redundantly for

recruitment of dynein to RILP, and in the positioning of the Golgi apparatus and recycling,

early and late endosomes in cells. We also show that the helix 1-containing region is

essential for all these roles. This is in keeping with roles for Hooks (Christensen et al., 2021)

and BicD2 (Hoogenraad et al., 2001; Hoogenraad et al., 2003; Splinter et al., 2012) at the

Golgi apparatus, and Hooks (Christensen et al., 2021; Guo et al., 2016; Olenick et al., 2019;

Villari et al., 2020), FIP3 (Horgan et al., 2010a; Horgan et al., 2010b) and RILP (Johansson et

al., 2007; Jordens et al., 2001; Scherer et al., 2014; Tan et al., 2011) in endocytic organelle

dynamics, since all of these adaptors can interact with both LICs (Celestino et al., 2019;

Christensen et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2018; Schlager et al., 2014a; Schroeder

et al., 2014; Schroeder and Vale, 2016; Urnavicius et al., 2018), although BicD2 may

preferentially bind LIC1 in vivo (Goncalves et al., 2019). It is important to remember,

however, that as yet there is no molecular explanation for why LIC1 is needed for motility of

SNX8-labelled endosomal tubules whereas LIC2-dynein moves SNX1 and SNX4 tubules (Hunt

et al., 2013).

Other isoform-specific roles for LICs have been described (see introduction), particularly in
mitosis, where it has been proposed that LIC phosphorylation, coupled with Pin1 binding,
may help control which adaptors bind to LIC1 and LIC2 during mitosis (Kumari et al., 2021a;
Kumari et al., 2021b). LIC phosphorylation, notably in the region just upstream of helix 1,
also plays a key role in switching dynein from interphase to mitotic cargos (Addinall et al.,
2001; Dwivedi et al., 2019; Kumari et al., 2021a; Niclas et al., 1996). This may explain why
KASH5 or BICD2N expression had little or no effect on mitotic spindle morphology (Fig. S5),
even though they disrupt dynein's interphase functions. Phosphorylation of the adaptors
themselves could potentially play a part in cell cycle control as well, since mitotic
phosphorylation sites have been identified in, or close to, LIC binding domains in Hooks 1-3,
BICD2 and FIP3 (Collins et al., 2012; Dephoure et al., 2008; Olsen et al., 2010; Wortzel et al.,
2021). We can speculate that KASH5-LIC interactions, while vital in the prolonged prophase
of meiosis I, would not be required, or could be detrimental, once cells enter pro-
metaphase and throughout meiosis II. In support of this idea, we do not see accumulation of
KASH5-containing membranes at mitotic spindle poles in our HeLa cell model. Cell cycle
control of KASH5-LIC interactions will be a key area for future work.
602
603   Altogether, we have shown that KASH5 is a novel trans-membrane member of the dynein
604   activating adaptor protein class, mapped its interaction with dynein LICs, and demonstrated
605   that the KASH5 EF hands are critical for this process. This work also sheds light on order in
606   which dynein-dynactin-adaptor complexes assemble in cells, and the involvement of LIS1 in
607   this process.

Materials and Methods

Antibodies and constructs

The following mouse antibodies were used: dynein IC (IC74, MAB1618, Millipore; RRID:AB_2246059); EEA1 (Clone 14, BD Biosciences; RRID:AB_397830); LAMP1 (Clone H4A3, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank, RRID:AB_2296838; or Abcam, RRID:AB_470708); LIS1 (Sigma-Aldrich L7391; RRID:AB_260418); dynactin p150 (BD Transduction Laboratories 610473; RRID:AB_397845); GFP (Roche 11814460001; RRID:AB_390913); Myc-tag 9B11 (Cell signalling Technology 2276; RRID:AB_331783); GM130 (BD Transduction Laboratories 610822; RRID:AB_398141); transferrin receptor (Clone MEM-189, MA1-19300, ThermoFisher/Zymed; RRID:AB_2536952); and α-tubulin DM1A (Sigma-Aldrich T9026; RRID:AB_477593). The following rabbit antibodies were used: HA-tag (Sigma-Aldrich H6908; RRID:AB_260070); LAMP1 (Cell Signalling D2D11, monoclonal; RRID:AB_2687579); EEA1 (Cell Signalling Technology C45B10, monoclonal; RRID:AB_2096811); LIC1 (Cambridge Bioscience HPA035013, polyclonal; RRID:AB_10600807); LIC2 (Abcam ab178702, polyclonal); Nde1 (Proteintech, 10233-1-AP, polyclonal; RRID:AB_2149877). For Fig. 5 A, chicken anti-LIC1 and rabbit anti-LIC2 (Tan et al., 2011) were kindly provided by Prof. R. Vallee, Columbia University Medical Centre, USA. Secondary antibodies: Licor IRDye secondary antibodies (800CW or 680RD); Alexa Fluor 488, Alexa Fluor 594, Cy3, or Cy5 labelled donkey anti-mouse, -rabbit and -sheep (Jackson Immunoresearch).

Constructs

The following KASH5 constructs in pcDNA 4T/O have been previously described (Horn et al., 2013): GFP-KASH5; GFP-KASH5ΔK; GFP-KASH5ΔNDΔK; GFP-KASH5ΔCDΔK; GFP-KASH5ND, as has a myc-SUN2 construct in pcDNA3.1(-). EF-hand mutants were made using HiFi assembly (New England Biolabs) by linearising GFP-KASH5ΔK using Q5 polymerase with primers 5'GTCATGCGTGACTGGATTGCTG-3' and 5'-CGTGGAGTTGAGTATTTGCTCCTC-3' and inserting synthetic G-block sequences (Integrated DNA Technologies) encoding KASH5 bps 97-319 with the appropriate mutations (see Fig. 9). HA-KASH5ΔK was made by amplifying the KASH5ΔK sequence using forward primer 5'-GCGCGGATCCGACCTGCCCGAGGGCCC-3' and reverse primer 5'-GCGCGAATTCTTATGGATGTCGAGTGACTCTGAGC-3', digesting with BamH1 and EcoRI then ligating into pcDNA3.1 containing the HA tag sequence. For generating a stable cell line, full length GFP-KASH5 was inserted into the doxycyclin-inducible lentiviral

vector pTRIPZ (Open Biosystem, Singapore) after amplification using primers 5'-

GCGCCTCGAGGACCTGCCCGAGGGCCCGGT-3' and 5'-

GCGCACGCGTTCACACTGGAGGGGGCTGGAGG-3' followed by digestion with XhoI and MluI.

Full length nesprin2α2 was amplified from a HeLa cDNA library and inserted into pcDNA3.1

downstream of GFP using XhoI and AflII digestion to give GFP-N2α2. A version lacking the

transmembrane and KASH domain was generated in the same vector to give GFP-N2α2ΔK.

Silently-mutated siRNA resistant full length hLIC1-mKate, hLIC2-mKate and hLIC2-GFP have

been previously described (Jones et al., 2014). RNAi-resistant full length LIC1 and LIC2 and

LIC1 truncations were generated by PCR and restriction digest cloning into pEGFP-C3

(Clontech) and used for rescue experiments. GFP-LIC1-CT2 encodes amino acids 1-456 of

human LIC1 with the addition of the amino acid sequence ADPPDLDN after the LIC1 C-

terminus. GFP-LIC1-CT3 encodes amino acids 1-387 followed by ADPPDLDN. N-terminally

Myc-tagged versions of full length human LIC1, LIC1-CT2 and LIC1-CT3 were generated using

the forward primer 5'-CAGCTGGTACCGCGGCCGTGGGGCGAGTC-3'. The reverse primers

were 5'-TCGAATCTAGACTAAGAAGCTTCTCCTTCCGTAGGAGATG-3' (full length LIC1), 5'-

TCGAATCTAGACTAAGAGCCAGTCTTTTTACTCAACAAAC-3' (LIC1-CT2) and

TCGAATCTAGACTATGGTGGTTGCTTTGCTAAAAGGGAC (LIC1-CT3), with no additional C-

terminal amino acids. PCR products were inserted into pcDNA-3.1 downstream of a myc-tag

sequence using KpnI and XbaI digestion.

Vectors encoding mCherry-chicken p50 and RFP-CC1 have been previously described

(Wozniak et al., 2009). To generate GFP-BICD2N, the DNA sequence encoding amino acids 2-

402 of mouse BICD2 was amplified using forward primer, 5'-

GCGCGAATTCGTCGGCGCCGTCGGAGGAG-3'; reverse primer, 5'-

GCGCGGATCCTCACAGGCGCCGCAGGGCACT-3', then cloned into pEGFP-C1 (Clontech) using

EcoRI and BamHI. Other constructs were generous gifts from the following colleagues:

pMDG2.1-VSV-G and p8.91-Gag-Pol vectors (Apolonia et al., 2015; Zufferey et al., 1997), Dr

M. Malim (King's College London, UK); GFP-Rab11-FIP3 and GFP-Rab11-FIP3 I737E, (Wilson

et al., 2005), Prof. G. Gould (University of Glasgow, UK); pEGFP-C1 containing hRILP (Colucci

et al., 2005), Prof. Cecilia Bucci (University of Salento, Italy); pCB6-HA-RILP, Dr Mark Dodding

(University of Bristol, UK).

Cell lines and transfection

HeLa and hTERT-RPE cells were obtained from ATCC; Vero cells were purchased from

European Collection of Authenticated Cell Cultures. HeLaM cells were kindly provided by Dr

Andrew Peden, University of Sheffield, UK. Mycoplasma testing was routinely performed by

DAPI staining.

HeLa, HeLaM, HEK293T and Vero cells were maintained in DMEM supplemented with 10%

FBS at 8.0% CO_2 and 37°C. To generate cells stably expressing human GFP-KASH5, HeLa cells

were transfected with pTRIPZ-GFP-KASH5, pMDG2.1-VSV-G and p8.91-GAG-POL in a ratio of

4:1:2 to a total of 10 µg of DNA using Lipofectamine 2000 (ThermoFisher) as per the

manufacturer's instructions overnight. Virus was then collected and passed through a 0.45

µm filter before addition to cells for 4 hours. Transduced cells were selected for with fresh

media containing puromycin (3µg/ml). Induction of GFP-KASH5 expression was induced with

doxycycline (500ng/ml) for 16 hours. Transient transfection of HeLaM and Vero cells on #1.5

coverslips was achieved using JetPEI (PolyPlus transfection), using half the manufacturer's

recommended amounts of total DNA and JetPEI. Expression levels were carefully titrated for

each plasmid, in some cases using dilution with carrier DNA (pBluescript SK-II) (Flores-

Rodriguez et al., 2011), to avoid over-expression artefacts. For biochemical analysis, cells

were transfected in 10 cm dishes using either JetPEI or PEI (Sigma 408727). PEI was

dissolved at 1 mg/ml in 150 mM NaCl by incubation at 50°C, sterile filtered and stored in

aliquots at -80°C. Per dish, 16 µg of total DNA was diluted in 200 µl Opti-MEM (Gibco

319850), 48 µl of PEI was added to another 200 µl Opti-MEM, then after 5 min the PEI was

added to the DNA mix and incubated for 30 min at room temperature before adding to the

cells.

Short interfering RNA (siRNA) methods

For depletion of target genes, siRNA transfections used INTERFERin (PolyPlus transfection).

siRNAs targeting the ORF of human LIC1 and LIC2 were obtained from Eurofins MWG

Operon. Oligonucleotides were applied to HeLaM cells at a final concentration of 5-20 nM

(for HeLaM) or 20 nM (for GFP-KASH5 HeLas) per target for 72 hours before analysis by

immunoblot and immunofluorescence. The following sequences were used, synthesised by

Eurofins MWG with dTdT overhangs: LIC1, 5'-AGAUGACAGUGUAGUUGUA-3'; LIC2, 5'-

ACCUCGACUUGUUGUAUAA-3' (Jones et al., 2014; Palmer et al., 2009); LIS1, 5'-

GAACAAGCGAUGCAUGAAG-3' (Lam et al., 2010; Tsai et al., 2005). For IC2, a SMARTpool

(Thermo Scientific Dharmacon) was used consisting of a mixture of four siRNAs: 5'-

GUAAAGCUUUGGACAACUA-3'; 5'-GAUGUUAUGUGGUCACCUA-3'; 5'-

GCAUUUCUGUGGAGGGUAA-3'; 5'-GUGGUUAGUUGUUUGGAUU-3'. Control RNAi

experiments were performed either using siGENOME lamin A/C Control (ThermoFisher

Scientific: Fig. 5 A-C, 6 A, B) or ON-TARGET-plus Non-targeting siRNA #1 (Thermo Scientific

Dharmacon).

For LIC rescue experiments analysed by immunofluorescence, cells were transfected with

scrambled or LIC1 and LIC2 siRNAs for 48 h using INTERFERin (PolyPlus transfection), and

then transfected in fresh media with siRNA-resistant GFP-LIC-FL, GFP-LIC1-CT2 or GFP-LIC1-

CT3 using PEI or JetPEI (Fig. 4 C) with 72 hours total knock-down. In Fig. 3 E, LIC1 and 2-

depleted cells were transfected after 48 hours with the indicated constructs using FuGENE6

and left for a further 24 hours.

Immunoblotting

For validating siRNA knock-down efficiency, lysates were collected 72 hours post siRNA

addition in RIPA lysis buffer (Sigma-Aldrich R0278) supplemented with cOmplete ULTRA

protease inhibitor (Roche 5892791001) and PhosSTOP (Roche PHOSS-RO) phosphatase

inhibitor. A total of 20 µg of protein was loaded per well diluted in denaturing SDS loading

buffer, and protein samples were separated using 12% polyacrylamide gels before being

transferred to PVDF membranes. Membranes were blocked in 1x alpha-casein buffer

(Sigma-Aldrich B6429) diluted in tris-buffered saline (TBS: 20 mM Tris/HCl, pH 7.7, 150 mM

NaCl) for 1 hour at room temperature. Primary antibodies were diluted in 1x alpha-casein

diluted in TBS supplemented with 0.01% Tween-20 (TBST) and incubated at 4°C overnight.

Membranes were washed three times in TBST and incubated with Licor IRDye secondary

antibodies (800CW or 680RD) diluted 1:10,000 in 1x alpha-casein in TBST for 1 hour at room

temperature. Blots were washed three times in TBST and once in water before imaging on a

Licor Odyssey or Odyssey CLx using Image Studio software.

GFP-Trap immunoprecipitation

For LIC truncation experiments, HeLaM cells were depleted of endogenous LIC1 and LIC2 and transiently transfected as described above. Cells were washed with ice cold PBS and lysed in IP lysis buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 10 mM NaCl, 2.5 mM MgCl$_2$, 1 mM DTT, 0.01% digitonin [Calbiochem 300410] and protease inhibitors, 10 µg/ml aprotinin [Sigma A6103], leupeptin [Calbiochem 108976] and pepstatin [Alfa Aesar J60237]) before centrifugation at 17,000 rpm for 30 mins at 4°C in a microcentrifuge. A tenth of the supernatant was taken as an input sample, and the remaining supernatant was rotated at 4°C for 2 hours with ChromoTek GFP-Trap® magnetic agarose beads pre-washed in IP wash buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 10 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT and protease inhibitors). Beads were isolated and washed three times in IP wash buffer and proteins eluted by boiling at 95°C in SDS-PAGE sample buffer before analysis by SDS-PAGE and immunoblotting.

BAPTA-AM treatment

HeLaM cells were grown on uncoated #1.5 glass coverslips and Vero cells were grown on coverslips coated with 1µg/ml Fibronectin (Sigma F0895). Cells were treated with either 10 µM BAPTA-AM (abcam ab120503) or DMSO vehicle control for 2 hours before fixation and immunofluorescence labelling.

Immunofluorescence

HeLaM or Vero cells were grown on #1.5 coverslips at appropriate density. For EEA1 antibody labelling cells were fixed for 20 mins in 3% formaldehyde in PBS at RT. After washing, unreacted formaldehyde was quenched with glycine (0.1 M) and permeabilised in 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS for 10 mins before PBS wash prior to antibody labelling. For mitotic spindle imaging, cells were fixed using formaldehyde/glutaraldehyde in a microtubule-stabilising buffer containing 1% Triton-X100, as previously described in detail (Jones et al., 2014). For all other antibody labelling, cells were fixed in methanol for 10 minutes at -20°C and washed in PBS. Secondary antibodies labelled with Alexa Fluor 488, Alexa Fluor 594, Cy3, or Cy5 were used along with 1 µg/ml DAPI, and samples were mounted in ProLong Gold (Invitrogen). For LIS1 antibody labelling (Baffet et al., 2015), coverslips were washed once in PBS then incubated for 1 min in PHEM buffer (60 mM PIPES, 25 mM HEPES, 10 mM EGTA, 2mM MgCl$_2$, pH 6.9) containing 0.5% Triton X-100. Cells were then transferred to PHEM

buffer supplemented with 3.7% paraformaldehyde for 20 minutes. This was followed by

incubation in 0.2% Triton X-100 in PBS for 5 minutes. Coverslips were rinsed in PBS and

quenched with glycine before labelling.

Imaging and analysis

Fixed HeLaM (Fig. 4; 5 E; 6 C, D; 7 B, C and 9) and Vero cells (Fig. S5 B) were imaged using an

Olympus BX60 or BX50 microscope (Olympus Keymed) with a Plan apochromat 60X 1.4 N.A.

oil immersion objective, CoolLED light source (CoolLED Ltd) or 100W Hg lamp, CoolSNAP ES

CCD camera (Teledyne Photometrics) and MetaVue software (Molecular Devices).

Subsequent image analysis was performed using MetaVue and ImageJ software. The

imaging in Fig. 1-3, 5 A, 7 A and S4 A was performed on a IX71 microscope (Olympus) which

was equipped for optical sectioning by a DeltaVision CORE system (GE Healthcare) with z-

spacing fixed at 0.2 μm. Plan Apochromat 60X 1.4 N.A. or UPlanFl 100X 1.35 N.A. oil

immersion objective lenses (Olympus) were used with a CoolSNAP HQ CCD camera

(Photometrics). Deconvolution was completed using SoftWorX (Applied Precision) and

images are displayed as z-projections.

Line scans were generated using Image J using the plot profile tool, with the lines starting in

the cytoplasm. Data was exported and plotted as graphs in GraphPad Prism. ImageJ was

used to generate inverted greyscale images, merge channels and draw cell outlines, using

contrast-adjusted images as a guide, where needed. Some images were prepared and

annotated using Adobe Photoshop. For phenotype scoring, each experiment was performed

at least three times, and the number of cells manually scored are given in the Figure

legends. Examples of the Golgi apparatus, early endosome and lysosome phenotypes are

shown in Fig. S3. For dynein recruitment to KASH5 in Fig. 3 D and Fig. S2 D, cells were scored

in a binary fashion as to whether dynein or dynactin could be seen at the nuclear envelope.

For these data, statistical tests were not deemed appropriate as there was no variation in

some control conditions, with all cells recruiting dynein/dynactin to KASH5. For other

datasets, the statistical tests used are given in the figure legends. All analysis and graph

preparation of statistics throughout this project was performed in GraphPad Prism 6

(GraphPad Software). For experiments where one condition was compared to a control an

unpaired t-test was used. For experiments where multiple conditions were compared to one

control mean a one- or two-way ANOVA with Dunnett's post-hoc test were used. The p

values are represented using the following method: p≤0.05=*, p≤0.01=**, p≤0.001=*** and

p≤0.0001=****. Figures were assembled using Adobe Illustrator (Adobe) or Affinity

Designer (Serif Europe Ltd).

Recombinant KASH5 protein expression and purification

Constructs of human KASH5 (amino acid residues: 1-407, 1-460 and 1-507) were cloned into

pMAT11 vector (Peranen et al., 1996) for expression with N-terminal TEV-cleavable His_6-

MBP tag. KASH5 constructs were expressed in BL21 (DE3) cells (Novagen), in 2xYT media,

induced with 0.5 mM IPTG for 16 hr at 25°C. Bacterial pellets were harvested, resuspended

in 20mM Tris pH 8.0, 500 mM KCl and lysed using a TS Cell Disruptor (Constant Systems) at

172 MPa. Cellular debris were later removed by centrifugation at 40,000 g. KASH5 fusion

proteins were purified through consecutive Ni-NTA (Qiagen), amylose (NEB), and HiTrap Q

HP (Cytiva) ion exchange chromatography. The N-terminal His_6-MBP tag was cleaved using

TEV protease and the cleaved samples were further purified through HiTrap Q HP (Cytiva)

ion exchange chromatography and size exclusion chromatography (HiLoad 16/600 Superdex

200, Cytiva) in 20 mM HEPES pH 7.5, 150 mM KCl, 2 mM DTT. Purified KASH5 protein

samples were spin concentrated using Amicon® Ultra centrifugal filter device (10,000

NMWL), flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80°C. Purified KASH5 proteins were

analysed using SDS-PAGE and visualised with Coomassie staining. Protein concentrations

were determined using Cary 60 UV spectrophotometer (Agilent) with extinction coefficients

and molecular weights calculated by ProtParam (http://web.expasy.org/protparam/).

Multi-angle light scattering coupled with size exclusion chromatography (SEC-MALS)

The absolute molar masses of KASH5 protein samples were determined by multi-angle light

scattering coupled with size exclusion chromatography (SEC-MALS). KASH5 protein samples

at > 1.5 mg ml^{-1} were loaded onto a Superdex™ 200 Increase 10/300 GL size exclusion

chromatography column (Cytiva) in 20 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM KCl, 2 mM DTT, at

0.5 ml min−1, in line with a DAWN® HELEOS™ II MALS detector (Wyatt Technology) and an

Optilab® T-rEX™ differential refractometer (Wyatt Technology). Differential refractive index

and light scattering data were collected and analysed using ASTRA® 6 software (Wyatt

Technology). Molecular weights and estimated errors were calculated across eluted peaks

by extrapolation from Zimm plots using a dn/dc value of 0.1850 ml g^{-1}. Bovine serum

albumin (ThermoFisher) was used as the calibration standard.

Protein purification

Full length human cytoplasmic dynein-1 (Schlager et al., 2014a) and human LIS1 (Baumbach

et al., 2017) were expressed using the *Sf*9/baculovirus system and purified as previously

described (Baumbach et al., 2017; Schlager et al., 2014a). Pellets from 1 L of Sf9 cell culture

were suspended in 50 ml lysis buffer (50 mM HEPES pH 7.2, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM DTT, 0.1

mM Mg.ATP, 10% Glycerol), supplemented with one cOmplete tablet (Roche) and 1mM

PMSF. Cells were lysed using a Dounce homogeniser at 4°C, then lysate clarified for 45 mins

at 500,000 x *g*. The supernatant was incubated with 1.5 ml pre-equilibrated IgG beads

(Cytiva) for 3 h. Beads were washed with 200 ml lysis buffer. For dynein, beads were then

transferred to a 2 ml tube, adding 10 µM SNAP-Cell TMR-Star dye (New England Biolabs)

and incubating for 1 h at 4°C. Beads for both constructs were then washed with 100 ml TEV

buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.4, 148 mM K-acetate, 2 mM Mg-acetate, 1 mM EGTA, 10%

Glycerol, 0.1 mM Mg.ATP, 1 mM DTT), then transferred again to a 2 ml tube, adding 400 µg

TEV protease and incubating overnight at 4°C. Sample was then concentrated and gel

filtered using a G4000$_{SWXL}$ 7.8/300 column (TOSOH Bioscience) into GF150 buffer (25 mM

HEPES pH 7.2, 150 mM KCl, 1 mM MgCl$_2$, 5 mM DTT, 0.1 mM Mg.ATP) for dynein, or TEV

buffer for Lis1. Peak fractions were concentrated and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen.

Dynactin was purified from frozen porcine brains as previously described (Urnavicius et al.,

2015). Porcine brains were blended with 300 ml homogenisation buffer (35 mM PIPES pH

7.2, 5 mM MgSO$_4$, 1 M KCl, 200 µM EGTA, 100 µM EDTA, 1 mM DTT) supplemented with

four cOmplete tablets and 1mM PMSF until just thawed. The lysate was then clarified in two

steps: 15 mins at 38,400 x *g* at 4°C, then 50 mins at 235,000 x *g* at 4°C. All subsequent steps

were carried out at 4°C The supernatant was then filtered through a GF filter then a 0.45 µm

filter, then loaded onto an SP Sepharose column (Cytiva), equilibrated with SP buffer A (35

mM PIPES pH 7.2, 5 mM MgSO$_4$, 1 mM EGTA, 0.5 mM EDTA, 1 mM DTT, 0.1 mM Mg.ATP).

The resin was then washed until white using 99.5% SP buffer A/0.5% SP buffer B (35 mM

PIPES pH 7.2, 5 mM MgSO$_4$, 1 M KCl, 1 mM EGTA, 0.5 mM EDTA, 1 mM DTT, 0.1 mM

Mg.ATP), then dynactin was eluted using a gradient from 0.5-25% (% SP buffer B). Dynactin-

containing fractions were then filtered through a 0.22 µm filter, then loaded onto a Mono Q

HR 16/60 column (Cytiva), pre-equilibrated with Mono Q buffer A (35 mM PIPES pH 7.2, 5

mM MgSO$_4$, 200 µM EGTA, 100 µM EDTA, 1 mM DTT). This column was washed with 10 CV

Mono Q buffer A, then dynactin eluted using a 15-35% gradient (% Mono Q buffer B, 35 mM

PIPES pH 7.2, 5 mM MgSO$_4$, 1 M KCl, 200 µM EGTA, 100 µM EDTA, 1 mM DTT). Peak

fractions were concentrated and gel filtered using a G4000$_{SW}$ 21.5/600 column (TOSOH

Bioscience) into GF150 buffer, with the peak concentrated and snap-frozen in liquid

nitrogen.

Strep-tagged human Hook3 (1-522) (Urnavicius et al., 2018) was purified using the

*Sf*9/baculovirus system as previously described (Urnavicius et al., 2018). A pellet from 500

ml of Sf9 culture was thawed using 50 ml Strep-tag lysis buffer (30 mM HEPES pH 7.2, 50

mM K-Acetate, 2 mM Mg-Acetate, 1 mM EGTA, 10% Glycerol, 1 mM DTT) plus one

cOmplete tablet and 1 mM PMSF. Cells were then lysed using a Dounce homogeniser, with

the lysate clarified for 20 minutes at 50,000 x *g* at 4°C. Supernatant was filtered using a GF

filter, then flown onto a StrepTrap HP 1 ml column (Cytiva) at 4°C. Washed using 40 CV

Strep-tag lysis buffer, then eluted with 3 mM desthiobiotin. Peak fractions were

concentrated and gel filtered using a Superose 6 10/300 Increase column (Cytiva) into

GF150 buffer. The monodisperse peak was concentrated and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen.

***in vitro* TIRF motility assays**

in vitro TIRF assays were carried out as previously (Urnavicius et al., 2018). Microtubules

were typically prepared the day before the assay. Microtubules were made by mixing 1 µl of

HiLyte Fluor 488 tubulin (2 mg/ml, Cytoskeleton), 2 µl biotinylated tubulin (2 mg/ml,

Cytoskeleton) and 7 µl unlabelled pig tubulin (Schlager et al., 2014a) (6 mg/ml) in BRB80

buffer (80 mM PIPES pH 6.8, 1 mM MgCl$_2$, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM DTT). 10 µl of polymerization

buffer (2× BRB80 buffer, 20% (v/v) DMSO, 2 mM Mg.GTP) was added, then the solution was

incubated at 37°C for 1 h for microtubule polymerization. The sample was diluted with 100

µl of MT buffer (BRB80 supplemented with 40 µM paclitaxel), then centrifuged at 21,000 x *g*

for 9 minutes at room temperature to remove soluble tubulin. The resulting pellet was

gently resuspended in 100 µl of MT buffer, then centrifuged again as above. 50 µl MT buffer

was then added, with the microtubule solution then stored in a light-proof container. Before

usage, and every 5 hours during data collection, microtubule solution was spun again at

21,000 x g for 9 minutes, with the pellet resuspended in the equivalent amount of MT

buffer.

Assay chambers were prepared by applying two strips of double-sided tape on a glass slide,

creating a channel, then placing a piranha-solution-cleaned coverslip on top. The coverslip

was then functionalized using PLL-PEG-Biotin (SuSOS), washed with 50 µl of TIRF buffer (30

mM HEPES pH 7.2, 5 $MgSO_4$, 1 mM EGTA, 2 mM DTT), then incubated with streptavidin (1

mg/ml, New England Biolabs). The chamber was again washed with TIRF buffer, then

incubated with 10 µl of a fresh dilution of microtubules (2 µl of microtubules diluted into 10

µl TIRF-Casein buffer (TIRF buffer supplemented with 50 mM KCl and 1 mg/ml casein)) for 1

min. Chambers were then blocked with 50 µl blocking buffer.

Complexes were prepared mixing 1.5 µl of each component at the following concentrations:

dynein at 0.3 µM, dynactin at 0.3 µM, adaptor at 6 µM, Lis1 at 50 µM. GF150 buffer was

added to a final volume of 6 µl. Complexes were incubated on ice for 15 minutes then

diluted with TIRF-Casein buffer to a final buffer of 15 µl. Four microliters of complex were

added to 16 µl of TIRF-Casein buffer supplemented with an oxygen scavenging system (0.2

mg/ml catalase, Merck; 1.5 mg/ml glucose oxidase, Merck; 0.45% (w/v) glucose) 1% BME, 5

mM Mg.ATP. This mix was flown into the chamber.

The sample was imaged immediately at 23°C using a TIRF microscope (Nikon Eclipse Ti

inverted microscope equipped with a Nikon 100x TIRF oil immersion objective). For each

sample, a microtubule image was acquired using a 488 nm laser. Following this a 500-frame

movie acquired (200 ms exposure, 4.1 fps) using a 561 nm laser. To analyse the data, ImageJ

was used to generate kymographs from the tiff movie stacks. These kymographs were

blinded, then events of similar length were picked to analyse velocity and number of

processive events/µm microtubule/s, using criteria outlined previously (Schlager et al.,

2014a; Urnavicius et al., 2018). Velocity was calculated using pixel size of 105 nm and frame

rate of 235 ms/frame. Three replicates were taken for each sample, with velocities and

number of processive events plotted using GraphPad Prism 7, using ANOVA with Tukey's

multiple comparison to test significance.

Supplementary material

Fig. S1. demonstrates the effect of IC2 and LIS1 depletion on dynein and dynactin

recruitment to KASH5. It also provides an illustration of the meiotic LINC complex and the

role of dynein in meiotic prophase I. Fig. S2 shows immunoblot analysis demonstrating

depletion of targets by RNAi. Fig. S3 depicts Golgi apparatus, early endosome, and lysosome

phenotype categories used for the scoring shown in Figs. 5 and 6. Fig. S4 demonstrates that

LICs act redundantly to recruit dynein and dynactin to RILP-positive late endosomes, and

that dynein recruitment requires helix 1. Fig. S5 shows that the dominant negative

overexpression of KASH5 or BICD2N does not cause a major mitotic spindle assembly defect.

Fig. S6 depicts the effect of BAPTA-AM treatment on dynein recruitment to KASH5 and

Rab11-FIP3. Table S1 documents the full statistical analysis of the effects of LIC1 and LIC2

depletion on Golgi apparatus morphology shown in Fig. 5C.

Acknowledgements

The work in V. Allan's laboratory was funded by the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences

Research Council (BB/N006933/1 and a Ph.D. studentship to E. Granger), the Medical

Research Council (Ph.D. studentship to C. Villemant), and the University of Manchester. A.

Salter was funded by the University of Manchester-A*STAR Research Attachment

Programme (ARAP). We thank Mr Quentin Roebuck for excellent technical assistance. The

Bioimaging Facility microscopes used in this study were purchased with grants from BBSRC,

Wellcome and the University of Manchester Strategic Fund. We would like to thank Drs

Peter March and Graham Wright for their help with microscopy in Manchester and

Singapore, respectively. The work in B. Burke's laboratory was funded by the Singapore

Biomedical Research Council and the Singapore Agency for Science Technology and

Research, A*STAR. Funding for Singapore microscope? We are grateful to Dr Alessandra

Calvi for generating the nesprin2α construct. O. Davies is funded by a Wellcome Senior

Research Fellowship (Grant Number 219413/Z/19/Z). C. Lau is funded by grants from the

Wellcome Trust (WT210711) and the Medical Research Council, UK (MC_UP_A025_1011),

awarded to Dr. Andrew Carter. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC

BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this

submission.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: V. Allan, B. Burke. Funding acquisition: V. Allan, B. Burke. Designed and

performed experiments, and analysed data: A. Salter, K. Garner, V. Allan, C. Villemant, E.

Granger, M. Gurusaran, C. Lau, O. Davies. Generated molecular reagents: G. McNee, C.

Villement, A. Salter, V. Allan, E. Granger. Purified proteins: C. Lau, M. Gurusaran.

Supervision: V. Allan, B. Burke, P. Woodman, O. Davies. Visualization/data presentation: A.

Salter, K. Garner, V. Allan, C. Villemant, E. Granger, M. Gurusaran, C. Lau. Writing the initial

draft: A. Salter, K. Garner, V. Allan. Review & editing: all authors.

 Figure legends

Figure 1. Recruitment of dynein, dynactin and LIS1 to KASH5 in HeLa cells.

(A) A stable HeLa cell line inducibly expressing GFP-KASH5 (green) was labelled with

antibodies against dynein IC and LIC1, dynactin p150 and p50, LIS1 and Nde1 (magenta) and

imaged on a DeltaVision microscope. Images are z-projections of deconvolved image stacks.

The bottom panel shows the transient expression of GFP-N2α2 in green and labelling with

anti-LIC1 in magenta, with undeconvolved wide-field images. Arrowheads point out the

location of centrosomes, full arrows show creases in the nuclear envelope and asterisks

mark cytoplasmic accumulations of GFP-KASH5. Thin white lines on colour merge images

show where a line scan plot was performed, shown on the right. Scale bars = 10 μm. **(B)**

Schematic showing KASH5 and the constructs used. For some experiments, the GFP was

replaced with an HA tag. **(C)** Dynein, dynactin and LIS1 are recruited to KASH5 as shown by

GFP-Trap pull-downs. HeLaM cells were transiently transfected with GFP-KASH5ΔK or GFP-

N2α2ΔK. The pull-downs and inputs (1.5% of total lysate) were probed with antibodies

against GFP, p150, IC, LIC1, LIC2, LIS1, BICD2 and α-tubulin. Molecular weight markers are

shown. **(D)** The KASH5 N-terminal EF-hand domain is sufficient to recruit dynein. Lysates of

HeLaM cells expressing GFP, GFP-KASH5ΔK (GFP-K5ΔK) or GFP-KASH5 N terminus (GFP-

K5ND) were isolated by GFP-trap and probed for LIC1 by immunoblotting. The input is 15%

of the GFP-trap sample.

Figure 2. Dynein and LIS1 recruitment to KASH5 does not require interaction between

dynein IC and dynactin p150.

(A) HeLa cells stably expressing GFP-KASH5 (green) were depleted of IC2 using 20 nM siRNA

for 72 hours and then processed for immunofluorescence with antibodies against LIC1,

dynactin p150 and LIS1 (magenta). White lines on colour merge images show where a line

scan plot was performed, shown on the right. **(B)** HeLa cells were transiently transfected

with GFP-KASH5, RFP-CC1 and myc-SUN2 (CC1 and SUN2: not shown. Cells expressing CC1

are marked with asterisks). Cells were fixed and labelled with antibodies against dynein IC

and LIC1, dynactin p50 and p150, and LIS1 (magenta in merges). Green lines on the GFP-

KASH5 images indicate line scan locations, shown on the right. Images were taken on a

DeltaVision microscope and z-stack projections of deconvolved images are shown. Scale

bars = 10 μm.

1005

Figure 3. Dynein is recruited to KASH5 via either LIC1 or 2.

(A-D) HeLa cells stably expressing GFP-KASH5 (green) were depleted of LIC1 **(A)**, LIC2 **(B)**, or

both LIC1 and 2 **(C)** using 10 nM of each siRNA for 72 hours, then fixed and labelled with

antibodies against IC, dynactin p150 or LIS1 (magenta). Thin white lines show where a line

scan plot was performed on LIC1&2 depleted cells, shown on the right. Images were taken

on a DeltaVision microscope and z-stack projections of deconvolved images are shown.

Scale bars = 10 μm. **(D)** LIC depleted cells were scored in a binary fashion for recruitment of

IC, p150 or LIS1 to KASH5. The mean and standard deviation of each condition is shown. The

experiment was repeated three times, with 300 cells scored for each condition in each

experiment. **(E)** HeLaM cells were depleted with siRNA against both LICs together (10 nM

each), or with control siRNAs. 48 hours into the knockdown, cells were transfected with

either GFP-KASH5ΔK or GFP-N2α2ΔK. The following day cells were lysed and a GFP trap was

performed. Input and pull-downs were immunoblotted with antibodies against GFP, p150,

LIC1, LIC2, IC and α-tubulin. The input was 1.5% of the total cell lysate. Molecular weight

markers are shown on the right.

1021

Figure 4. KASH5-LIC1 interactions require LIC1 helix 1.

(A) Schematic of LIC1 showing the N terminal GTPase-like domain that is highly conserved

between LIC1 and LIC2, and a less well conserved C terminal domain containing two alpha-

helices termed Helix 1 (440-456) and Helix 2 (493-502). Truncated versions of LIC1 were

generated that lacked Helix 2 (LIC1 CT2) or both Helix 1 and Helix 2 (LIC1 CT3). **(B)** HeLaM

cells were depleted of LIC1 and 2 using 5 nM of each siRNA for 48 hours. GFP-tagged LIC

truncation constructs were co-transfected with full-length HA-tagged KASH5 (and myc-

SUN2: not shown) for a further 24 hours, then fixed and labelled with antibodies to HA

(magenta) and imaged by wide-field microscopy. Scale bars = 10 μm. **(C)** HeLaM cells were

depleted of both LICs by siRNAs for 48 hours, then co-transfected with Myc-tagged LIC1

constructs and GFP-KASH5ND or GFP as a control, and incubated for a further 24 hours. Cell

lysates were incubated with GFP-trap beads then analysed by SDS-PAGE and

immunoblotting with antibodies to GFP, myc and IC (IC74) to detect native dynein. The

input is 15% of the GFP-trap sample.

1036

Figure 5. LICs 1 and 2 act redundantly in Golgi apparatus positioning, with helix 1 being

essential.

(A-C) HeLaM cells were depleted of LIC1, LIC2 or both LICs using 5 nM siRNA for each

subunit, then analysed by immunoblotting of lysates with antibodies to LIC1 and 2 (Tan et

al., 2011) **(A)**, or fixed and labelled with antibodies to GM130 and imaged on a DeltaVision

microscope to reveal the Golgi apparatus **(B)**. Z-projections of deconvolved images stacks

are shown. **(C)** Golgi morphology was scored manually as shown in Fig. S3 for 100 cells per

condition, in 3 independent experiments. Statistical analysis was performed using two-way

ANOVA with Tukey's test (see Table S1 for complete results): comparisons vs. control

samples are shown on the graph (p≤0.01=**, p≤0.0001=****). **(D, E)** HeLaM cells were

depleted of both LICs then transfected with RNAi-resistant LIC1-mKate or LIC2-mKate **(D)** or

GFP-LIC1-FL, GFP-LIC1-CT2, GFP-LIC1-CT3 and GFP constructs **(E)**. GM130 labelling was used

to reveal Golgi apparatus morphology (wide-field images: asterisks mark cells expressing the

constructs). Golgi morphology was scored for ~100 cells per experimental condition in three

independent experiments **(E)**. All scale bars = 10 μm.

1052

Figure 6. LICs 1 and 2 act redundantly in endocytic organelle positioning, with helix 1 being

essential.

(A) HeLaM cells were depleted of Lamin A/C or LIC 1 and 2 using 5 nM of each siRNA duplex

and stained for organelle markers (EEA1, early endosomes; LAMP1, lysosomes; TfR,

recycling endosomes). **(B)** LIC-depleted cells were transfected with siRNA-resistant LIC1-

mKate or LIC2-GFP and antibody labelled. The boxed region in the LAMP1 image is shown at

two different focal planes. Asterisks mark transfected cells. **(C, D)** LIC depleted cells were

transfected with GFP-LIC1 FL, CT2, CT3 or GFP. Asterisks mark transfected cells. Control

knockdown cells were not transfected. Cells were labelled with anti-EEA1 **(C)** or anti-LAMP1

(D). All images are wide-field. Scale bars = 10 μm. Early endosome and lysosome position

phenotypes were scored as outlined in Fig. S3, with ~100 cells per condition, repeated in 3

independent experiments.

1065

1066

Figure 7. KASH5 has properties of a dynein adaptor.

(A) HeLaM cells transiently expressing GFP-KASH5ΔK or GFP-KASH5ΔNΔK (which lacks the dynein binding domain) were labelled with GM130 or LAMP1 antibodies (z-stack projections of deconvolved images shown). Cells were scored for phenotypes associated with dynein inhibition: Golgi apparatus scattering, peripheral clustering of lysosomes and enlarged lysosomes. Manual scoring of 100 cells per condition was repeated in three independent experiments, with mean and S.D. shown. An unpaired t-test was performed comparing GFP-KASH5ΔK- and GFP-KASH5ΔNΔK- expressing cells for each phenotype. **** = p≤0.0001, *** = p≤0.001, ** = p≤0.01. **(B, C)** Full length HA-KASH5 **(B)** or HA-RILP **(C)** were expressed alone (top panel, control) or with dominant negative GFP-BICD2N (middle panel), or dominant negative GFP-Rab11-FIP3-I73E (bottom panel) in HeLaM cells. Endogenous dynein was visualised along with HA-KASH5 or HA-RILP using antibodies to LIC1 and HA (wide-field imaging, scale bar = 10 μm). Thin black and white (left panels) or red lines (LIC1 panels) show where line scan plots were performed (right).

1081

Figure 8. KASH5 is an activating adaptor for dynein motility in vitro.

(A) SDS-PAGE and Coomassie blue staining of purified bacterially-expressed KASH5$_{1\text{-}406}$. **(B)** SEC-MALS analysis of KASH5$_{1\text{-}460}$ demonstrating a molecular weight of 101 kDa (predicted dimer molecular weight is 103 kDa). **(C)** Purified baculovirus-expressed recombinant dynein, LIS1 and porcine brain dynactin were combined with and without KASH5$_{1\text{-}460}$ and motility of individual 6-carboxytetramethylrhodamine-labelled dynein molecules was visualised using TIRF microscopy. The activating adaptor Hook3$_{1\text{-}522}$ was used as a positive control. **(D)** The number of processive events per μm microtubule per minute was determined from kymographs in a blinded fashion for all three conditions in three technical replicates, with the mean ± S.D. plotted. The total number of movements analysed were 2066 for Hook3, 339 for KASH5 and 34 for the no addition control. Significance was determined using ANOVA with Tukey's multiple comparison (ns = not significant, * = p≤0.05, **** = p≤0.0001). **(E)** The mean velocity of processive dynein movements from the KASH5$_{1\text{-}406}$ and Hook3$_{1\text{-}522}$ data are plotted (± S.D., n=3 replicates).

1096

Figure 9. KASH5's EF hand is critical for dynein and dynactin complex assembly.

(A) Top: Sequence comparison between human KASH5 and other dynein adaptors

containing EF-hands, and between KASH5 proteins from different species. The EF-hand

consensus sequence is shown, along with position nomenclature (Grabarek, 2006). Bottom:

mutations generated in KASH5 EF-hands (altered amino acids shown in red), along with

published mutations in the calcium-dependent dynein adaptor CRACR2a (Wang et al., 2019).

KASH5 mutant dynein-binding activity is indicated by + or - symbols. **(B-G)** GFP-tagged

KASH5ΔK, GFP-KASHΔK EF-hand mutants, or GFP were expressed in HeLaM cells. Cells were

then fixed and labelled with antibodies to GFP (shown in magenta), GM130 (yellow) and

LAMP1 (cyan) to test if the expressed protein disrupted endogenous dynein function.

Arrows in merged panels indicate peripheral clusters of lysosomes. Wide-field imaging; scale

bar = 10 μm. **(H)** GFP-trap immunoprecipitates from cells expressing the GFP-hKASH5ΔK EF

hand mutants, or GFP-hKASH5ΔK probed with antibodies to GFP, dynein IC and dynactin

p150.

1111

Supplementary Figure 1. Effect of IC2 and LIS1 depletion on dynein and dynactin

recruitment to KASH5.

(A) Illustration depicting how the meiotic LINC complex connects telomeres inside the

nucleus to cytoplasmic dynein in the cytoplasm. Dynein movement begins to drag the

telomeres towards the centrosome (yellow dots) in leptotene of prophase I, leading to the

formation of the chromosome 'bouquet' in zygotene. This movement allows pairing of

homologous chromosomes and the formation of the synaptonemal complex. INM, inner

nuclear membrane; ONM, outer nuclear membrane. **(B)** HeLa cells stably expressing GFP-

KASH5 (green) were depleted of IC2 using 20 nM siRNA for 72 hours and then processed for

immunofluorescence with antibodies against LIC1, dynactin p150 and LIS1. Cells were

scored in a binary fashion for recruitment IC, LIC1 or p150 to KASH5. The mean and standard

deviation is shown for three independent repeats in which 300 cells were scored for each

condition. **(C-F)** HeLa cells stably expressing inducible GFP-KASH5 were depleted of LIS1

using 20 nM siRNA, induced to express GFP-KASH5 and then fixed and labelled. **(C)** Cells

were scored in a binary fashion to determine if cells showed recruitment IC, LIC1 or p150 to

KASH5. The mean and standard deviation is shown for four independent repeats in which

300 cells were scored for each condition. Statistical tests were determined as not being

appropriate for the data in B or C, as there is no variation in some control conditions.

Immunofluorescence images showing GFP-KASH5 in green and antibodies against dynein LIC1 **(D)**, IC **(E)** and dynactin p150 **(F)** in magenta. Images were taken on a DeltaVision microscope followed by deconvolution. Images are Z-stack projections. Thin white lines on colour images are site of line scans which are shown on the right. Scale bar represents 10 μm.

Supplementary Figure 2. Immunoblot analysis demonstrating depletion of targets by RNAi.

(A) HeLa cells stably expressing inducible GFP-KASH5 were depleted of various dynein subunits or LIS1 using 20 nM siRNAs against the following targets: Control (Sc), LIC1, LIC2, LIC1&2, IC2 and LIS1. Representative western blots of cell lysates of knockdown cells are shown. Blots were probed with antibodies against GFP, p150, IC, LIC1, LIC2, LIS1 and α-tubulin followed by fluorescently-labelled secondary antibodies. Molecular weight markers are shown on the right of the blots. The efficiency of knockdowns was analysed by quantification of blots using Image Studio software, with correction for protein loading using the anti-tubulin signal. Experiments were repeated four times alongside immunofluorescence experiments. Error bars represent standard deviations. **(B)** Immunoblotting of HeLaM cells depleted with 5 nM each of LIC1 and LIC2 duplexes, or 20 nM control duplexes, for 72 hours. Blots were probed with antibodies to dynein LIC1, LIC2, IC (IC74) and dynactin p150.

Supplementary Figure 3. Depiction of Golgi apparatus, early endosome, and lysosome phenotype categories.

HeLaM cells were treated with 5 nM LIC1 plus 5 nM LIC2 for 72 hours in total. Cells were fixed after 72 hours and processed for immunofluorescence with antibodies to GM130 (Golgi apparatus), EEA1 (early endosomes) or LAMP1 (lysosomes) and example images of each phenotype collected. A schematic drawing of each category is shown, with representative cells for that category indicated by asterisks in the immunofluorescence panel.

Supplementary Figure 4. LICs act redundantly to recruit dynein and dynactin to RILP-positive late endosomes, and recruitment requires helix 1.

(A-D) Cells were depleted of LICs individually or together for 48 hours using a total of 20 nM

siRNA then transfected with GFP-RILP and fixed 1 day later and labelled for IC **(A)** or

dynactin p150 **(B)**. Control cells (not siRNA treated) were transfected with GFP-RILP.

DeltaVision deconvolved images are shown as z-stack projections. Scale bar = 10 μm. The

percentage of cells with GFP-RILP structures labelled with IC **(C)** or p150 **(D)** was scored (±

S.D.). At least 100 cells were scored in each of three independent experiments. *** =

$P<0.001$, **** = $P<0.0001$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's post-hoc test. **(E)** HeLaM cells

were co-transfected with HA-RILP and GFP-LIC1 full length, CT2 or CT3. Wide-field images

are shown; scale bar = 10 μm.

1171

Supplementary Figure 5. The dominant negative overexpression of KASH5 or BICD2N does

not cause a major mitotic spindle assembly defect.

HeLaM cells were transfected with **(A)** GFP-KASH5ΔNΔK, **(B)** GFP-KASH5ΔK, **(C)** GFP-BICD2-N

or **(D)** mcherry-P50. They were fixed using a protocol to maintain mitotic cells on the

coverslips (fix-perm: see methods) and then labelled with antibodies against α-tubulin and

pericentrin. Images were taken on a DeltaVision microscope followed by deconvolution. Z-

stack projections are shown. Scale bar is 10 μm. **(E)** Mitotic HeLaM cells that were

untransfected or transiently expressing the indicated construct were scored depending on

whether the spindle was bipolar or disrupted. The experiment was repeated three times

and 100 cells scored in each condition, and the mean and S.D. are shown. * = $p≤0.05$, *** =

$p≤0.001$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett's post-hoc test.

1183

Supplementary Figure 6. Effect of BAPTA-AM treatment on dynein recruitment to KASH5

and Rab11-FIP3.

Following transient transfection of HeLa M cells with GFP-KASH5-FL **(A)** or Vero cells with

GFP-Rab11-FIP3 **(B)**, cells were treated with either DMSO vehicle control or 10 μM BAPTA-

AM for 2 hours at 37°C. Cells were fixed and labelled with antibodies to endogenous LIC1

and epitope tags. Wide-field images, with boxed regions shown as enlargements in **(B)**.

Scale bar represents 10 μm.

1191

1192 **Table S1. Statistical analysis of the effects of LIC1 and LIC2 depletion on Golgi apparatus**

1193 **morphology.**

1194   The data presented graphically in Figure 5C were analysed by Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's

1195   test. P values: ** ≤ 0.01, **** ≤ 0.0001. Analysis of 100 cells per condition, in each of 3

1196   independent experiments.

References

Addinall, S., P. Mayr, S. Doyle, J. Sheehan, P. Woodman, and V. Allan. 2001. Phosphorylation by cdc2-cyclinB1 kinase releases cytoplasmic dynein from membranes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 276:15939-15944.

Agrawal, R., J.P. Gillies, J. Zang, J. Zhang, S. Garrott, H. Shibuya, J. Nandakumar, and M.E. DeSantis. 2022. The KASH5 protein involved in meiotic chromosomal movements is a novel dynein activating adaptor. *bioRxiv*. doi.org/10.1101/2022.03.11.483947:Posted March 12, 2022.

Apolonia, L., R. Schulz, T. Curk, P. Rocha, C.M. Swanson, T. Schaller, J. Ule, and M.H. Malim. 2015. Promiscuous RNA binding ensures effective encapsidation of APOBEC3 proteins by HIV-1. *PLoS Pathog.* 11:e1004609.

Baffet, A.D., D.J. Hu, and R.B. Vallee. 2015. Cdk1 Activates Pre-mitotic Nuclear Envelope Dynein Recruitment and Apical Nuclear Migration in Neural Stem Cells. *Dev Cell*. 33:703-716.

Baumbach, J., A. Murthy, M.A. McClintock, C.I. Dix, R. Zalyte, H.T. Hoang, and S.L. Bullock. 2017. Lissencephaly-1 is a context-dependent regulator of the human dynein complex. *Elife*. 6.

Belyy, V., M.A. Schlager, H. Foster, A.E. Reimer, A.P. Carter, and A. Yildiz. 2016. The mammalian dynein-dynactin complex is a strong opponent to kinesin in a tug-of-war competition. *Nat Cell Biol*. 18:1018-1024.

Bentebbal, S.A., B.R. Meqbel, A. Salter, V. Allan, B. Burke, and H.F. Horn. 2021. A human infertility-associated KASH5 variant promotes mitochondrial localization. *Sci Rep*. 11:10133.

Bielli, A., P.-O. Thörnqvist, A. Hendrick, R. Finn, K. Fitzgerald, and M. McCaffrey. 2001. The small GTPase Rab4A interacts with the central region of cytoplasmic dynein light intermediate chain-1. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Comm.* 281:1141-1153.

Bone, C.R., and D.A. Starr. 2016. Nuclear migration events throughout development. *J Cell Sci*. 129:1951-1961.

Burke, B. 2018. LINC complexes as regulators of meiosis. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 52:22-29.

Canty, J.T., and A. Yildiz. 2020. Activation and Regulation of Cytoplasmic Dynein. *Trends Biochem Sci*. 45:440-453.

Celestino, R., M.A. Henen, J.B. Gama, C. Carvalho, M. McCabe, D.J. Barbosa, A. Born, P.J.
Nichols, A.X. Carvalho, R. Gassmann, and B. Vogeli. 2019. A transient helix in the
disordered region of dynein light intermediate chain links the motor to structurally
diverse adaptors for cargo transport. *PLoS Biol*. 17:e3000100.

Chapman, D.E., B.J.N. Reddy, B. Huy, M.J. Bovyn, S.J.S. Cruz, Z.M. Al-Shammari, H. Han, W.
Wang, D.S. Smith, and S.P. Gross. 2019. Regulation of in vivo dynein force production
by CDK5 and 14-3-3epsilon and KIAA0528. *Nat Commun*. 10:228.

Chikashige, Y., C. Tsutsumi, M. Yamane, K. Okamasa, T. Haraguchi, and Y. Hiraoka. 2006.
Meiotic proteins bqt1 and bqt2 tether telomeres to form the bouquet arrangement
of chromosomes. *Cell*. 125:59-69.

Chowdhury, S., S.A. Ketcham, T.A. Schroer, and G.C. Lander. 2015. Structural organization of
the dynein-dynactin complex bound to microtubules. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* 22:345-
347.

Christensen, J.R., A.A. Kendrick, J.B. Truong, A. Aguilar-Maldonado, V. Adani, M.
Dzieciatkowska, and S.L. Reck-Peterson. 2021. Cytoplasmic dynein-1 cargo diversity is
mediated by the combinatorial assembly of FTS-Hook-FHIP complexes. *Elife*. 10.

Cockell, M.M., K. Baumer, and P. Gonczy. 2004. lis-1 is required for dynein-dependent cell
division processes in C. elegans embryos. *J Cell Sci*. 117:4571-4582.

Collins, L.L., G. Simon, J. Matheson, C. Wu, M.C. Miller, T. Otani, X. Yu, S. Hayashi, R. Prekeris,
and G.W. Gould. 2012. Rab11-FIP3 is a cell cycle-regulated phosphoprotein. *BMC Cell
Biol*. 13:4.

Colucci, A.M., M.C. Campana, M. Bellopede, and C. Bucci. 2005. The Rab-interacting lysosomal
protein, a Rab7 and Rab34 effector, is capable of self-interaction. *Biochemical and
biophysical research communications*. 334:128-133.

Dekens, M.P.S., F.J. Pelegri, H.-M. Maischein, and C. Nüsslein-Volhard. 2003. The maternal-
effect gene futile cycle is essential for pronuclear congression and mitotic spindle
assembly in the zebrafish zygote. *Development*. 130:3907-3916.

Dephoure, N., C. Zhou, J. Villen, S.A. Beausoleil, C.E. Bakalarski, S.J. Elledge, and S.P. Gygi.
2008. A quantitative atlas of mitotic phosphorylation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*.
105:10762-10767.

Ding, X., R. Xu, J. Yu, T. Xu, Y. Zhuang, and M. Han. 2007. SUN1 is required for telomere
attachment to nuclear envelope and gametogenesis in mice. *Dev Cell*. 12:863-872.

Dix, C., H. Soundararajan, N. Dzhindzhev, F. Begum, B. Suter, H. Ohkura, E. Stephens, and S.
Bullock. 2013. Lissencephaly-1 promotes the recruitment of dynein and dynactin to
transported mRNAs. *J. Cell Biol.* 202:479-494.

Driskell, O., A. Mironov, V. Allan, and P. Woodman. 2007. Dynein is required for receptor
sorting and the morphogenesis of early endosomes. *Nat Cell Biol*. 9:113-120.

Dunce, J.M., A.E. Milburn, M. Gurusaran, I. da Cruz, L.T. Sen, R. Benavente, and O.R. Davies.
2018. Structural basis of meiotic telomere attachment to the nuclear envelope by
MAJIN-TERB2-TERB1. *Nat Commun*. 9:5355.

Dwivedi, D., A. Kumari, S. Rathi, S.V.S. Mylavarapu, and M. Sharma. 2019. The dynein adaptor
Hook2 plays essential roles in mitotic progression and cytokinesis. *J Cell Biol*. 218:871-
894.

Dzhindzhev, N.S., S.L. Rogers, R.D. Vale, and H. Ohkura. 2005. Distinct mechanisms govern the
localisation of Drosophila CLIP-190 to unattached kinetochores and microtubule plus-
ends. *J Cell Sci*. 118:3781-3790.

Elshenawy, M.M., J.T. Canty, L. Oster, L.S. Ferro, Z. Zhou, S.C. Blanchard, and A. Yildiz. 2019.
Cargo adaptors regulate stepping and force generation of mammalian dynein-
dynactin. *Nat Chem Biol*. 15:1093-1101.

Elshenawy, M.M., E. Kusakci, S. Volz, J. Baumbach, S.L. Bullock, and A. Yildiz. 2020. Lis1
activates dynein motility by modulating its pairing with dynactin. *Nat Cell Biol*. 22:570-
578.

Even, I., S. Reidenbach, T. Schlechter, N. Berns, R. Herold, W. Roth, D. Krunic, V. Riechmann,
and I. Hofmann. 2019. DLIC1, but not DLIC2, is upregulated in colon cancer and this
contributes to proliferative overgrowth and migratory characteristics of cancer cells.
FEBS J. 286:803-820.

Feng, Q., A.M. Gicking, and W.O. Hancock. 2020. Dynactin p150 promotes processive motility
of DDB complexes by minimizing diffusional behavior of dynein. *Mol Biol Cell*. 31:782-
792.

Fenton, A.R., T.A. Jongens, and E.L.F. Holzbaur. 2021. Mitochondrial adaptor TRAK2 activates
and functionally links opposing kinesin and dynein motors. *Nat Commun*. 12:4578.

Flores-Rodriguez, N., S. Rogers, D. Kenwright, T. Waigh, P. Woodman, and V. Allan. 2011.
Roles of dynein and dynactin in early endosome dynamics revealed using automated
tracking and global analysis. *PLoS ONE*. 6:e24479.

Gama, J.B., C. Pereira, P.A. Simoes, R. Celestino, R.M. Reis, D.J. Barbosa, H.R. Pires, C.
Carvalho, J. Amorim, A.X. Carvalho, D.K. Cheerambathur, and R. Gassmann. 2017.
Molecular mechanism of dynein recruitment to kinetochores by the Rod-Zw10-Zwilch
complex and Spindly. *J Cell Biol*. 216:943-960.

Gill, S.R., T.A. Schroer, I. Szilak, E.R. Steuer, and M.P. Sheetz. 1991. Dynactin, a conserved,
ubiquitously expressed component of an activator of vesicle motility mediated by
cytoplasmic dynein. *J. Cell Biol.* 115:1639-1650.

Gillies, J.P., J.M. Reimer, E.P. Karasmanis, I. Lahiri, Z.M. Htet, A.E. Leschziner, and S.L. Reck-
Peterson. 2022. Structural Basis for Cytoplasmic Dynein-1 Regulation by Lis1. *eLife*. *In*
press:In press.

Goncalves, J.C., T.J. Dantas, and R.B. Vallee. 2019. Distinct roles for dynein light intermediate
chains in neurogenesis, migration, and terminal somal translocation. *J Cell Biol*.
218:808-819.

Gönczy, P., S. Pichler, M. Kirkham, and A. Hyman. 1999. Cytoplasmic dynein is required for
distinct aspects of MTOC positioning, including centrosome separation, in the one cell
stage *Caenorhabditis elegans* embryo. *J. Cell Biol.* 147:135-150.

Grabarek, Z. 2006. Structural basis for diversity of the EF-hand calcium-binding proteins. *J Mol*
Biol. 359:509-525.

Granger, E., G. McNee, V. Allan, and P. Woodman. 2014. The role of the cytoskeleton and
molecular motors in endosomal dynamics. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*. 31:20-29.

Grotjahn, D.A., S. Chowdhury, Y. Xu, R.J. McKenney, T.A. Schroer, and G.C. Lander. 2018. Cryo-
electron tomography reveals that dynactin recruits a team of dyneins for processive
motility. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 25:203-207.

Guo, X., G.G. Farias, R. Mattera, and J.S. Bonifacino. 2016. Rab5 and its effector FHF contribute
to neuronal polarity through dynein-dependent retrieval of somatodendritic proteins
from the axon. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 113:E5318-5327.

Gutierrez, P.A., B.E. Ackermann, M. Vershinin, and R.J. McKenney. 2017. Differential effects
of the dynein-regulatory factor Lissencephaly-1 on processive dynein-dynactin
motility. *J Biol Chem*. 292:12245-12255.

Hamer, G., H. Wang, E. Bolcun-Filas, H.J. Cooke, R. Benavente, and C. Hoog. 2008. Progression
of meiotic recombination requires structural maturation of the central element of the
synaptonemal complex. *J Cell Sci*. 121:2445-2451.

Hirotsune, S., M. Fleck, M. Gambello, G. Bix, A. Chen, G. Clark, D. Ledbetter, C. McBain, and
A. Wynshaw-Boris. 1998. Graded reduction of Pafah1b1 (Lis1) activity results in
neuronal migration deffects and early embryonic lethality. *Nat. Genet.* 19:333-339.

Hoogenraad, C., A. Akhmanova, S. Howell, B. Dortland, C. de Zeeuw, R. Willemsen, P. Visser,
F. Grosveld, and N. Galjart. 2001. Mammalian Golgi-associated Bicaudal-D2 functions
in the dynein-dynactin pathway by interacting with these complexes. *EMBO J.*
20:4041-4054.

Hoogenraad, C., P. Wulf, N. Schiefermeier, T. Stepanova, N. Galjart, J. Small, F. Grosveld, C. de
Zeeuw, and A. Akhmanova. 2003. Bicaudal D induces selective dynein-mediated
microtubule minus end-directed transport. *EMBO J.* 22:6004-6015.

Horgan, C.P., S.R. Hanscom, R.S. Jolly, C.E. Futter, and M.W. McCaffrey. 2010a. Rab11-FIP3
binds dynein light intermediate chain 2 and its overexpression fragments the Golgi
complex. *Biochemical and biophysical research communications*. 394:387-392.

Horgan, C.P., S.R. Hanscom, R.S. Jolly, C.E. Futter, and M.W. McCaffrey. 2010b. Rab11-FIP3
links the Rab11 GTPase and cytoplasmic dynein to mediate transport to the
endosomal-recycling compartment. *J Cell Sci*. 123:181-191.

Horgan, C.P., S.R. Hanscom, and M.W. McCaffrey. 2011. Dynein LIC1 localises to the mitotic
spindle and midbody and LIC2 localises to spindle poles during cell division. *Cell Biol.
Int.* doi:10.1042/CBI20100284.

Horn, H., D.I. Kim, G. Wright, E. Wong, C. Stewart, B. Burke, and K. Roux. 2013. A mammalian
KASH domain protein coupling meiotic chromosomes to the cytoskeleton. *J. Cell Biol.*
202:1023-1039.

Htet, Z.M., J.P. Gillies, R.W. Baker, A.E. Leschziner, M.E. DeSantis, and S.L. Reck-Peterson.
2020. LIS1 promotes the formation of activated cytoplasmic dynein-1 complexes. *Nat
Cell Biol*. 22:518-525.

Hunt, S., A. Townley, C. Danson, P.J. Cullen, and D.J. Stephens. 2013. Microtubule motors
mediate endosomal sorting by maintaining functional domain organization. *J. Cell Sci.*
126:2493-2501.

Jha, R., J. Roostalu, N.I. Cade, M. Trokter, and T. Surrey. 2017. Combinatorial regulation of the
balance between dynein microtubule end accumulation and initiation of directed
motility. *EMBO J*. 36:3387-3404.

Johansson, M., N. Rocha, W. Zwart, I. Jordens, L. Janssen, C. Kuijl, V. Olkkonen, and J. Neefjes.
2007. Activation of endosomal dynein motors by stepwise assembly of Rab7-RILP-
p150Glued, ORP1L and the receptor bIII spectrin. *J. Cell Biol.* 176:459-471.

Jones, L., C. Villemant, T. Starborg, A. Salter, G. Goddard, P. Ruane, P. Woodman, N.
Papalopulu, S. Woolner, and V. Allan. 2014. Dynein light intermediate chains maintain
spindle bipolarity by functioning in centriole cohesion. *J. Cell Biol.* 207:499-516.

Jordens, I., M. Fernandez-Borja, M. Marsman, S. Dusseljee, L. Janssen, J. Calafat, H. Janssen,
R. Wubbolts, and J. Neefjes. 2001. The Rab7 effector protein RILP controls lysosomal
transport by inducing the recruitment of dynein-dynactin motors. *Curr. Biol.* 11:1680-
1685.

Karki, S., and E.L.F. Holzbaur. 1995. Affinity chromatography demonstrates a direct binding
between cytoplasmic dynein and the dynactin complex. *J. Biol. Chem.* 270:28806-
28811.

King, S., C. Brown, K. Maier, N. Quintyne, and T. Schroer. 2003. Analysis of the dynein-dynactin
interaction in vitro and in vivo. *Mol. Biol. Cell*. 14:5089-5097.

Koszul, R., K.P. Kim, M. Prentiss, N. Kleckner, and S. Kameoka. 2008. Meiotic chromosomes
move by linkage to dynamic actin cables with transduction of force through the
nuclear envelope. *Cell*. 133:1188-1201.

Kumari, A., C. Kumar, R. Pergu, M. Kumar, S.P. Mahale, N. Wasnik, and S.V.S. Mylavarapu.
2021a. Phosphorylation and Pin1 binding to the LIC1 subunit selectively regulate
mitotic dynein functions. *J Cell Biol*. 220.

Kumari, A., C. Kumar, N. Wasnik, and S.V.S. Mylavarapu. 2021b. Dynein light intermediate
chains as pivotal determinants of dynein multifunctionality. *J Cell Sci*. 134.

Lam, C., M.A. Vergnolle, L. Thorpe, P. Woodman, and V. Allan. 2010. Functional interplay
between LIS1, NDE1 and NDEL1 in dynein-dependent organelle positioning. *J Cell Sci*.
123:202-212.

Lau, C.K., F.J. O'Reilly, B. Santhanam, S.E. Lacey, J. Rappsilber, and A.P. Carter. 2021. Cryo-EM
reveals the complex architecture of dynactin's shoulder region and pointed end.
EMBO J. 40:e106164.

Lee, C.Y., H.F. Horn, C.L. Stewart, B. Burke, E. Bolcun-Filas, J.C. Schimenti, M.E. Dresser, and
R.J. Pezza. 2015. Mechanism and regulation of rapid telomere prophase movements
in mouse meiotic chromosomes. *Cell Rep*. 11:551-563.

Lee, I.G., S.E. Cason, S.S. Alqassim, E.L.F. Holzbaur, and R. Dominguez. 2020. A tunable LIC1-
adaptor interaction modulates dynein activity in a cargo-specific manner. *Nat*
Commun. 11:5695.

Lee, I.G., M.A. Olenick, M. Boczkowska, C. Franzini-Armstrong, E.L.F. Holzbaur, and R.
Dominguez. 2018. A conserved interaction of the dynein light intermediate chain with
dynein-dynactin effectors necessary for processivity. *Nat Commun*. 9:986.

Lee, Y.L., and B. Burke. 2018. LINC complexes and nuclear positioning. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*.
82:67-76.

Lindeman, R.E., and F. Pelegri. 2012. Localized Products of futile cycle/ lrmp Promote
Centrosome-Nucleus Attachment in the Zebrafish Zygote. *Current Biology*. 22:843-
851.

Link, J., M. Leubner, J. Schmitt, E. Gob, R. Benavente, K.T. Jeang, R. Xu, and M. Alsheimer.
2014. Analysis of meiosis in SUN1 deficient mice reveals a distinct role of SUN2 in
mammalian meiotic LINC complex formation and function. *PLoS Genet*. 10:e1004099.

Liu, H., T. Huang, M. Li, M. Li, C. Zhang, J. Jiang, X. Yu, Y. Yin, F. Zhang, G. Lu, M.C. Luo, L.R.
Zhang, J. Li, K. Liu, and Z.J. Chen. 2019. SCRE serves as a unique synaptonemal complex
fastener and is essential for progression of meiosis prophase I in mice. *Nucleic Acids*
Res. 47:5670-5683.

Mahale, S., M. Kumar, A. Sharma, A. Babu, S. Ranjan, C. Sachidanandan, and S.V.S.
Mylavarapu. 2016a. The Light Intermediate Chain 2 Subpopulation of Dynein
Regulates Mitotic Spindle Orientation. *Sci Rep*. 6:22.

Mahale, S.P., A. Sharma, and S.V. Mylavarapu. 2016b. Dynein Light Intermediate Chain 2
Facilitates the Metaphase to Anaphase Transition by Inactivating the Spindle
Assembly Checkpoint. *PLoS One*. 11:e0159646.

Malone, C., L. Misner, N. Le Bot, M.-C. Tsai, J. Campbell, J. Ahringher, and J. White. 2003. The
C. elegans hook protein, ZYG12, mediates the essential attachment between the
centrosome and nucleus. *Cell*. 115:825-836.

Markus, S.M., M.G. Marzo, and R.J. McKenney. 2020. New insights into the mechanism of
dynein motor regulation by lissencephaly-1. *Elife*. 9.

Marzo, M.G., J.M. Griswold, and S.M. Markus. 2020. Pac1/LIS1 stabilizes an uninhibited
conformation of dynein to coordinate its localization and activity. *Nat Cell Biol*. 22:559-
569.

McKenney, R., H. W, M. Tanenbaum, G. Bhabha, and R.D. Vale. 2014. Activation of
cytoplasmic dynein motility by dynactin-cargo adatper complexes. *Science*. 345:337-
341.

Minn, I.L., M.M. Rolls, W. Hanna-Rose, and C.J. Malone. 2009. SUN-1 and ZYG-12, Mediators
of Centrosome–Nucleus Attachment, Are a Functional SUN/KASH Pair in. *Molecular*
biology of the cell. 20:4586-4595.

Morimoto, A., H. Shibuya, X. Zhu, J. Kim, K.i. Ishiguro, M. Han, and Y. Watanabe. 2012. A
conserved KASH domain protein associates with telomeres, SUN1, and dynactin
during mammalian meiosis. *J. Cell Biol.* 198:165-172.

Niclas, J., V.J. Allan, and R.D. Vale. 1996. Cell cycle regulation of dynein association with
membranes modulates microtubule-based organelle transport. *J. Cell Biol.* 133:585-
593.

Olenick, M.A., R. Dominguez, and E.L.F. Holzbaur. 2019. Dynein activator Hook1 is required
for trafficking of BDNF-signaling endosomes in neurons. *J Cell Biol*. 218:220-233.

Olenick, M.A., and E.L.F. Holzbaur. 2019. Dynein activators and adaptors at a glance. *J Cell Sci*.
132.

Olsen, J.V., M. Vermeulen, A. Santamaria, C. Kumar, M.L. Miller, L.J. Jensen, F. Gnad, J. Cox,
T.S. Jensen, E.A. Nigg, S. Brunak, and M. Mann. 2010. Quantitative
phosphoproteomics reveals widespread full phosphorylation site occupancy during
mitosis. *Sci Signal*. 3:ra3.

Palmer, K.J., H. Hughes, and D.J. Stephens. 2009. Specificity of Cytoplasmic Dynein Subunits
in Discrete Membrane Trafficking Steps. *Mol Biol Cell*. 20:2885-2899.

Pandey, J., and D. Smith. 2011. A Cdk5-dependent switch regulates Lis1/Ndel1/dynein-driven
organelle transport in adult neurons. *J. Neurosci.* 31:17207-17219.

Payne, C., V. Rawe, J. Ramalho-Santos, C. Simerly, and G. Schatten. 2003. Preferentially
localized dynein and perinuclear dynactin associate with nuclear pore complex
proteins to mediate genomic union during mammalian fertlization. *J. Cell Sci.*
116:4727-4738.

Peranen, J., M. Rikkonen, M. Hyvonen, and L. Kaariainen. 1996. T7 vectors with modified T7lac
promoter for expression of proteins in Escherichia coli. *Anal Biochem*. 236:371-373.

Pfister, K., E. Fisher, I. GIbbons, T. Hays, E. Holzbaur, J. McIntosh, M. Porter, T. Schroer, K.
Vaughan, G. Witman, S. King, and R. Vallee. 2005. Cytoplasmic dynein nomenclature.
J. Cell Biol. 171:411-413.

Qiu, R., J. Zhang, and X. Xiang. 2019. LIS1 regulates cargo-adapter-mediated activation of
dynein by overcoming its autoinhibition in vivo. *J Cell Biol*. 218:3630-3646.

Quintyne, N., S. Gill, D. Eckley, C. Crego, D. Compton, and T. Schroer. 1999. Dynactin is
required for microtubule anchoring at centrosomes. *J. Cell Biol.* 147:321-334.

Raaijmakers, J., M. Tannenbaum, and R. Medema. 2013. Systematic dissection of dynein
regulators in mitosis. *J. Cell Biol.* 201:201-215.

Reck-Peterson, S.L., W.B. Redwine, R.D. Vale, and A.P. Carter. 2018. The cytoplasmic dynein
transport machinery and its many cargoes. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 19:382-398.

Reddy, B.J., M. Mattson, C.L. Wynne, O. Vadpey, A. Durra, D. Chapman, R.B. Vallee, and S.P.
Gross. 2016. Load-induced enhancement of Dynein force production by LIS1-NudE in
vivo and in vitro. *Nat Commun*. 7:12259.

Redwine, W.B., M.E. DeSantis, I. Hollyer, Z.M. Htet, P.T. Tran, S.K. Swanson, L. Florens, M.P.
Washburn, and S.L. Reck-Peterson. 2017. The human cytoplasmic dynein interactome
reveals novel activators of motility. *Elife*. 6.

Reiner, O., R. Carrozzo, Y. Shen, M. Wehnert, F. Faustinella, W. Dobyns, T. Caskey, and D.
Ledbetter. 1993. Isolation of a Miller-Dieker lissencephaly gene containing a G protein
b-subunit-like repeat. *Nature*. 364:717-721.

Reinsch, S., and E. Karsenti. 1997. Movement of nuclei along microtubules in *Xenopus* egg
extracts. *Curr. Biol.* 7:211-214.

Robinson, J., E. Wojcik, M. Sanders, M. McGrail, and T.S. Hays. 1999. Cytoplasmic dynein is
required for the nuclear attachment and migration of centrosomes duing mitosis in
Drosophila. J Cell Biol. 146:597-608.

Rog, O., and A. Dernburg. 2015. Direct Visualization Reveals Kinetics of Meiotic Chromosome
Synapsis. *Cell Rep.* 10:1639-1645.

Sato, A., B. Isaac, C.M. Phillips, R. Rillo, P.M. Carlton, D.J. Wynne, R.A. Kasad, and A.F.
Dernburg. 2009. Cytoskeletal Forces Span the Nuclear Envelope to Coordinate Meiotic
Chromosome Pairing and Synapsis. *Cell*. 139:907-919.

Scherer, J., J. Yi, and R. Vallee. 2014. PKA-dependent dynein switching from lysosomes to
adenovirus: a novel form of host-virus competition. *J Cell Biol*. 205:163-177.

Schlager, M.A., H. Hoang, L. Urnavicius, S. Bullock, and A.P. Carter. 2014a. In vitro
reconstitution of a highly processive recombinant human dynein complex. *Embo J.*
33:1855-1868.

Schlager, M.A., A. Serra-Marques, I. Grigoriev, L.F. Gumy, M. Esteves da Silva, P.S. Wulf, A.
Akhmanova, and C.C. Hoogenraad. 2014b. Bicaudal d family adaptor proteins control
the velocity of Dynein-based movements. *Cell Rep.* 8:1248-1256.

Schmitt, J., R. Benavente, D. Hodzic, C. Hoog, C.L. Stewart, and M. Alsheimer. 2007.
Transmembrane protein Sun2 is involved in tethering mammalian meiotic telomeres
to the nuclear envelope. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 104:7426-7431.

Schmoranzer, J., J.P. Fawcett, M. Segura, S. Tan, R.B. Vallee, T. Pawson, and G.G. Gundersen.
2009. Par3 and Dynein Associate to Regulate Local Microtubule Dynamics and
Centrosome Orientation during Migration. *Curr Biol.* 19:1065-1074.

Schroeder, C., J. Olstrem, N. Hertz, and R. Vale. 2014. A Ras-like domain in the light
intermediate chain bridges the dynein motor to a cargo-binding region. *eLife.*
3:e03351-03322.

Schroeder, C.M., and R.D. Vale. 2016. Assembly and activation of dynein–dynactin by the
cargo adaptor protein Hook3. *J Cell Biol.* 214:309-318.

Schroer, T.A., and M.P. Sheetz. 1991. Two activators of microtubule-based vesicle transport.
J. Cell Biol. 115:1309-1318.

Sharma, A., S. Dagar, and S.V.S. Mylavarapu. 2020. Transgelin-2 and phosphoregulation of the
LIC2 subunit of dynein govern mitotic spindle orientation. *J Cell Sci.* 133.

Shibuya, H., K. Ishiguro, and Y. Watanabe. 2014. The TRF1-binding protein TERB1 promotes
chromosome movement and telomere rigidity in meiosis. *Nat Cell Biol.* 16:145-156.

Siller, K.H., M. Serr, R. Steward, T.S. Hays, and C.Q. Doe. 2005. Live imaging of Drosophila brain
neuroblasts reveals a role for Lis1/dynactin in spindle assembly and mitotic checkpoint
control. *Mol Biol Cell.* 16:5127-5140.

Sitaram, P., M. Anderson, J. Jodoin, E. Lee, and L. Lee. 2012. Regulation of dynein localization
and centrosome positioning by Lis-1 and asunder during Drosophila spermatogenesis.
Development. 39:2945-2954.

Sivaram, M.V., T.L. Wadzinski, S.D. Redick, T. Manna, and S.J. Doxsey. 2009. Dynein light
intermediate chain 1 is required for progress through the spindle assembly
checkpoint. *Embo J.* 28:902-914.

Sladewski, T.E., N. Billington, M.Y. Ali, C.S. Bookwalter, H. Lu, E.B. Krementsova, T.A. Schroer,
and K.M. Trybus. 2018. Recruitment of two dyneins to an mRNA-dependent Bicaudal
D transport complex. *Elife*. 7.

Spindler, M.C., J. Redolfi, F. Helmprobst, P. Kollmannsberger, C. Stigloher, and R. Benavente.
2019. Electron tomography of mouse LINC complexes at meiotic telomere attachment
sites with and without microtubules. *Commun Biol*. 2:376.

Splinter, D., D. Razafsky, M.A. Schlager, A. Serra-Marques, I. Grigoriev, J. Demmers, N. Keijzer,
K. Jiang, I. Poser, A. Hyman, C.C. Hoogenraad, S. King, and A. Akhmanova. 2012. BICD2,
dynactin and LIS1 cooperate in regulating dynein recruitment to cellular structures.
Mol. Biol. Cell. 23:4226-4241.

Srikanth, S., K.D. Kim, Y. Gao, J.S. Woo, S. Ghosh, G. Calmettes, A. Paz, J. Abramson, M. Jiang,
and Y. Gwack. 2016. A large Rab GTPase encoded by CRACR2A is a component of
subsynaptic vesicles that transmit T cell activation signals. *Sci Signal*. 9:ra31.

Starr, D.A. 2011. KASH and SUN proteins. *Curr Biol*. 21:R414-415.

Starr, D.A., and M. Han. 2002. Role of ANC-1 in tethering nuclei to the actin cytoskeleton.
Science. 298:406-409.

Tan, S., J. Scherer, and R. Vallee. 2011. Recruitment of dynein to late endosomes and
lysosomes through light intermediate chains. *Mol Biol Cell*. 22:467-477.

Torisawa, T., M. Ichikawa, A. Furuta, K. Saito, K. Oiwa, H. Kojima, Y.Y. Toyoshima, and K.a.y.
Furuta. 2014. Autoinhibition and cooperative activation mechanisms of cytoplasmic
dynein. *Nature cell biology*. 16:1118-1124.

Trelles-Sticken, E., C. Adelfalk, J. Loidl, and H. Scherthan. 2005. Meiotic telomere clustering
requires actin for its formation and cohesin for its resolution. *J Cell Biol*. 170:213-223.

Tsai, J.W., Y. Chen, A.R. Kriegstein, and R.B. Vallee. 2005. LIS1 RNA interference blocks neural
stem cell division, morphogenesis, and motility at multiple stages. *J Cell Biol*. 170:935-
945.

Tynan, S.H., M.A. Gee, and R.B. Vallee. 2000a. Distinct but overlapping sites within the
cytoplasmic dynein heavy chain for dimerization and for intermediate chain and light
intermediate chain binding. *J Biol Chem*. 275:32769-32774.

Tynan, S.H., A. Purohit, S.J. Doxsey, and R.B. Vallee. 2000b. Light intermediate chain 1 defines
a functional subfraction of cytoplasmic dynein which binds to pericentrin. *J. Biol.
Chem*. 275:32763-32768.

Urnavicius, L., C.K. Lau, M.M. Elshenawy, E. Morales-Rios, C. Motz, A. Yildiz, and A.P. Carter.
2018. Cryo-EM shows how dynactin recruits two dyneins for faster movement.
Nature. 554:202-206.

Urnavicius, L., K. Zhang, A.G. Diamant, C. Motz, M.A. Schlager, M. Yu, N.A. Patel, C.V.
Robinson, and A.P. Carter. 2015. The structure of the dynactin complex and its
interaction with dynein. *Science*. 347:2630-2630.

Vaughan, K.T., and R.B. Vallee. 1995. Cytoplasmic dynein binds dynactin through a direct
interaction between the intermediate chains and p150Glued. *J. Cell Biol.* 131:1507-
1516.

Villari, G., C. Enrico Bena, M. Del Giudice, N. Gioelli, C. Sandri, C. Camillo, A. Fiorio Pla, C. Bosia,
and G. Serini. 2020. Distinct retrograde microtubule motor sets drive early and late
endosome transport. *EMBO J*. 39:e103661.

Wang, S., S.A. Ketcham, A. Schon, B. Goodman, Y. Wang, J. Yates, 3rd, E. Freire, T.A. Schroer,
and Y. Zheng. 2013. Nudel/NudE and Lis1 promote dynein and dynactin interaction in
the context of spindle morphogenesis. *Mol Biol Cell*. 24:3522-3533.

Wang, Y., W. Huynh, T.D. Skokan, W. Lu, A. Weiss, and R.D. Vale. 2019. CRACR2a is a calcium-
activated dynein adaptor protein that regulates endocytic traffic. *J Cell Biol*. 218:1619-
1633.

Wilson, G.M., A.B. Fielding, G.C. Simon, X. Yu, P.D. Andrews, R.S. Hames, A.M. Frey, A.A.
Peden, G.W. Gould, and R. Prekeris. 2005. The FIP3-Rab11 protein complex regulates
recycling endosome targeting to the cleavage furrow during late cytokinesis. *Mol Biol
Cell*. 16:849-860.

Wortzel, I., G. Maik-Rachline, S.S. Yadav, T. Hanoch, and R. Seger. 2021. Mitotic HOOK3
phosphorylation by ERK1c drives microtubule-dependent Golgi destabilization and
fragmentation. *iScience*. 24:102670.

Wozniak, M., B. Bola, K. Brownhill, Y.-C. Yang, V. Levakova, and V. Allan. 2009. Role of kinesin-
1 and cytoplasmic dynein in endoplasmic reticulum movement in VERO cells. . *J. Cell
Sci.* 122:1979-1989.

Wynne, D., O. Rog, P. Carlton, and A.F. Dernburg. 2012. Dynein-dependent processive
chromsome motions promote homologous pairing in *C. elegans* meiosis. *J. Cell Biol.*
196:47-64.

Yi, J., K. Ori-McKenney, R. McKenny, M. Vershinin, S. Gross, and R. Vallee. 2011. High-
resolution imaging reveals indirect coordination of opposite motors and a role for LIS1
in high-load axonal transport. *J. Cell Bio.* 195:193-201.

Zhang, K., H.E. Foster, A. Rondelet, S.E. Lacey, N. Bahi-Buisson, A.W. Bird, and A.P. Carter.
2017. Cryo-EM Reveals How Human Cytoplasmic Dynein Is Auto-inhibited and
Activated. *Cell*. 169:1303-1314 e1318.

Zhang, Q., S.Y. Ji, K. Busayavalasa, J. Shao, and C. Yu. 2019. Meiosis I progression in
spermatogenesis requires a type of testis-specific 20S core proteasome. *Nat Commun*.
10:3387.

Zufferey, R., D. Nagy, R.J. Mandel, L. Naldini, and D. Trono. 1997. Multiply attenuated lentiviral
vector achieves efficient gene delivery in vivo. *Nat Biotechnol*. 15:871-875.

1587

Garner et al. Figure 1

Garner et al. Figure 2

A IC2 siRNA

B RFP-p150-CC1 expression

Garner et al. Figure 3

Figure 4, Garner et al.

Figure 5, Garner et al.

Figure 6, Garner et al.

Figure 7, Garner et al.

Garner et al. Figure 8

A

80 –
65 –
50 –
40 –
30 –
25 –

15 –

10 –

B

KASH5
1-460

Dimer - 101 kDa

Molecular weight (kDa)

Differential Refractive Index

Elution volume (ml)

C

TMR-dynein/dynactin/Lis1

-ve control   +KASH5   +Hook3

10 s

5 µm

D

Processive events/µm/min

*

****

-ve ctrl   KASH5   Hook3

E

ns

Velocity (µm/s)

KASH5   Hook3

Figure 9, Garner et al.

Garner et al. Supplementary Figure 2

A

Quantification of knockdown efficiency

B

Garner et al. Supplementary Figure 3

Golgi apparatus phenotype scoring

Early endosome and lysosome phenotype scoring

Garner et al. Supplementary Figure 5

Garner et al. Supplementary Figure 6

Table S1. Statistical analysis of the effects of LIC1 and LIC2 depletion on Golgi apparatus morphology.

The data presented graphically in Figure 5C were analysed by Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's test. P values are shown. Analysis of 100 cells per condition, in each of 3 independent experiments.

Ribbon/compact		Broken/extended ribbon		Semi-scattered		Full scattered	
control vs. LIC1	≤ 0.0001	control vs. LIC1	≤ 0.0001	control vs. LIC1	0.9697	control vs. LIC1	>0.9999
control vs. LIC2	≤ 0.0001	control vs. LIC2	≤ 0.0001	control vs. LIC2	0.0735	control vs. LIC2	0.9988
control vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001	control vs. LIC1+2	0.2971	control vs. LIC1+2	0.0012	control vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001
LIC1 vs. LIC2	≤ 0.0001	LIC1 vs. LIC2	≤ 0.0001	LIC1 vs. LIC2	0.1790	LIC1 vs. LIC2	0.9988
LIC1 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001	LIC1 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001	LIC1 vs. LIC1+2	0.0040	LIC1 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001
LIC2 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001	LIC2 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001	LIC2 vs. LIC1+2	0.3715	LIC2 vs. LIC1+2	≤ 0.0001