Title

Proteomic landscape of tunneling nanotubes reveals CD9 and CD81 tetraspanins as key regulators

Roberto Notario Manzano[1,2], Thibault Chaze[3], Eric Rubinstein[4], Mariette Matondo[3], Chiara Zurzolo[1]* & Christel Brou[1]*

[1] Membrane Traffic and Pathogenesis Unit, Department of Cell Biology and Infection, CNRS 18 UMR 3691, Université de Paris, Institut Pasteur, 75015 Paris, France; [2]Sorbonne Université, ED394 - Physiologie, Physiopathologie et Thérapeutique, F-75005 Paris, France; [3]Proteomics Platform, Mass Spectrometry for Biology Unit, CNRS USR 2000, Institut Pasteur, 75015 Paris, France ; [4] Centre d'Immunologie et des Maladies Infectieuses, Inserm, CNRS, Sorbonne Université, CIMI-Paris, 75013 Paris, France

* correspondence : chiara.zurzolo@pasteur.fr; christel.brou@pasteur.fr

Summary

Tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) are open actin- and membrane-based channels, connecting remote cells and allowing direct transfer of cellular material (e.g. vesicles, mRNAs, protein aggregates) from cytoplasm to cytoplasm. Although they are important especially in pathological conditions (e.g., cancers, neurodegenerative diseases), their precise composition and their regulation were still poorly described. Here, using a biochemical approach allowing to separate TNTs from cell bodies and from extracellular vesicles and particles (EVPs), we obtained the full composition of TNTs compared to EVPs. We then focused to two major components of our proteomic data, the CD9 and CD81 tetraspanins, and further investigated their specific roles in TNT formation and function. We show that these two tetraspanins have distinct functions: CD9 participates in the initiation of TNTs, whereas CD81 expression is required to allow the functional transfer of vesicle in the newly formed TNTs, possibly by regulating fusion with the opposing cell.

Introduction

Tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) are thin membranous conduits , supported by F-actin that form continuous cytoplasmic between cells over distances ranging from several hundred nm up to 100 μm [1, 2]. They allow cell-to-cell communication by facilitating the transfer of different cargoes directly from cytoplasm to cytoplasm of the connected cells, including organelles (e.g. lysosomes, mitochondria [3, 4]), micro- or mRNAs, pathogens,

and misfolded/aggregated proteins (e.g., prion proteins, tau or α-synuclein aggregates
[5-7]). TNTs could play major roles in various diseases, including neurodegenerative
diseases or cancers of different types. In addition to cell cultures and tumors explants
[8], TNT-like connections have been shown to exist in the retina and facilitate cellular
material transfer between photoreceptors [9, 10] or pericytes [11], highlighting the
importance of understanding the biology of these protrusions in order to unravel their
possible role(s) *in vivo*. TNT formation is highly dynamic and appears to be regulated by
cellular stresses and actin regulators [12]. Two models have been proposed for TNT
formation. In the first, TNTs would be produced by membrane deformation and
elongation of the protrusion supported by actin polymerization followed by adhesion
and fusion of this protrusion with the opposing cell. Alternatively, TNTs could be formed
by cell dislodgement where adhesion and membrane fusion would be the first steps
before cell bodies separation and elongation of the protrusion by actin polymerization
[12, 13]. However, the mechanism(s) and specific pathways governing TNT formation as
well as the molecular components of TNTs are still not known.
In addition to TNTs, one of the major pathways used by cells to transfer materials over
long distances is through membrane-surrounded vesicles, collectively known as
extracellular vesicles (EVs). EVs are released by all cells, and up taken by distant recipient
cells [14, 15]. They can be formed either by direct budding from the plasma membrane,
or by secretion of intraluminal vesicles of multivesicular compartments (in which case
they are called exosomes). Because of their common functions, their similar diameters,
and because TNTs are fragile and easily broken and therefore can be released in cell
culture supernatants (where EVs are also found), it has been challenging to distinguish
TNTs from EVs in terms of composition [16]. In this regard, two members of the
tetraspanin family, CD9 and CD81, which are well-known and widely used markers for
EVs [17], have been detected in TNTs when overexpressed in T cells [18].
Tetraspanin form a family (with 33 members in mammals) of small four membrane-
spanning domain proteins with two extracellular domains, including a large one
harboring a tetraspanin-specific folding and two short cytoplasmic tails. Tetraspanins
are involved in various cellular processes like migration, adhesion, signaling, pathogen
infection, membrane damage reparation, membrane protrusive activity and cell-cell
fusion [19-22].
Their function is linked at least in part to their ability to interact with other
transmembrane proteins, forming a dynamic network or molecular interactions referred
to as the tetraspanin web or Tetraspanin-enriched microdomains (TEM). Inside this
"web", the tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 directly interact with the Ig domain proteins
CD9P1 (aka EWI-F, encoded by the PTGFRN gene) and EWI-2 (encoded by the IGSF8
gene) [23-26], which have an impact on several fusion processes [27-29]. Whether CD9
and CD81 are also present on TNT from non-T lymphoid cells, and whether they play a
role in the formation or function of TNTs has not been investigated.
With the goal of identifying structural components of TNTs, and possibly specific
markers and regulators of these structures, we established a protocol of TNT isolation
from U2OS cultured cells, allowing to separate TNTs from extracellular vesicles and
particles (EVPs) and from cell bodies. We obtained the full composition of TNTs,
compared to EVPs. As CD9 and CD81 were major components of TNTs, we further
studied their specific roles in TNT formation and ability to transfer cellular material using
human neuronal SH-SY5Y, a well known cell model to study functional TNTs. Our data

indicate that CD9 and CD81 have different functions and regulate two successive steps
of the formation of TNT.
93
94

Results

Purification of TNTs and EVPs

In order to isolate TNTs, we used U2OS cells because they are robustly adherent cells
exhibiting few long protrusions, but are able to grow TNTs and transfer cellular material
through these bridges (Figure S1A, B and [30]). Additionally, we took advantage of the
fact that TNTs are very sensitive to mechanical stress as they are not attached to
substrate [1, 31]. After removal of the cell medium and replacement by a small volume
of PBS, the flasks were vigorously shacken in order to break the TNTs that were then
isolated from the supernatant by ultracentrifugation after elimination of floating cells
by low-speed centrifugations and filtration (see workflow on Figure 1A). When
necessary, extracellular vesicles and particles (EVPs) were directly collected from the
first cell culture supernatant and enriched following a standardized procedure([17, 32-
34] and see Figure 1A).
To validate that our protocol for preparing TNTs vs. EVPs was accurate, we sought to
engeneer cells with fluorescent TNT markers. As shown in Figure S1A, actin
chromobody-GFP (an actin-detecting probe that does not affect actin dynamics [35])
decorated TNTs after stable expression. Endogenous CD9 was present on at least a
fraction of TNTs formed between U2OS cells, and a GFP-CD9 construct also decorated
these structures when stably expressed in these cells (Figure S1B). As a control, cells
stably expressing H2B-GFP (labeling nuclei) were used.
Four independent preparations of TNTs and EVPs from the same cell cultures (Figure
1B), were analyzed. We first validated that the crude preparations (before
ultracentrifugation, Figure 1A) contained particles and measured their size and their
fluorescence using Nano flow-cytometry. As shown in Figure 1C and S1C-E, both EVPs
and TNTs contained particles of similar mean diameter (around 60 nm, Figure S1C, D),
ranging from 40 to more than 100nm. The sizes and concentrations of EVPs and TNTs
were the same in parental and transfected cell lines (Figure S1D, E). Both preparations
contained particles expressing GFP-CD9 (Figure 1C), indicating the presence of
membrane-enclosed particles. A major difference between the two preparations was
the large fraction of particles in the TNT preparation (38%) that beared the actin
chromobody-GFP which was barely detected in EVPs (0.2%). Finally, H2B-GFP was
present in a very minor part of the particles, showing that contaminations with cell
debris or nuclei were limited, and therefore validating our protocol. Western-blot
analysis confirmed such absence of contamination since the Golgi marker GM130 was
detected neither in EVP nor in TNT (Figure 1D). CD9 and CD63 were detected in both
TNT and EVP preparation, whereas tubulin (shown to partially label TNTs on Figure S1A)
was only detected in TNT fraction, which also contained endogenous actin (Figure S1F).
Altogether, these data supported that our protocol allowed differential enrichment of
the fractions in TNTs and EVPs respectively.
136

Analysis of TNTome

To obtain a full and accurate picture of U2OS TNT content (called TNTome), we made 12
independent preparations of TNT fractions (in red in Figure 1A), each starting from about
$20x10^6$ cells, and analyzed them by LC-MS/MS. 1177 proteins were identified in at least
9 preparations (table S1). We first observed that proteins previously described in TNTs,
like actin, Myosin10 [36], ERp29 [30], or N-cadherin [2, 37] were indeed present in
TNTome. Less than 100 nuclear proteins, i.e. less than 8% were found (according to GO
Cellular component analysis), which could result from partial contamination with
cellular debris or dead cells. This is in accordance with nanoFCM results, were H2B-GFP
positive particles were 4% of actin-chromobody-GFP positive ones. The 1177 proteins
have been ranked in 4 quartiles depending on their relative abundancy (average iBAQ),
highlighting the enrichment of specific factors when considering gene ontology (table
S1, Figure 2A). These factors could be structural components of TNTs, but also material
that was circulating or in the process of being transferred at the time when TNTs were
broken   and   purified.   It   could   be   why   mitochondrial   (8%   of   the   total),
lysosomal/endosomal or other vesicle proteins are listed. As highlighted by Proteomap
analysis (Figure 2A), TNTome is rich in RNA-associated proteins (ribosomes, translation
factors, ribonucleoproteins), in accordance with TNTs being able to transfer micro and
mRNAs [38, 39].
A major group of proteins of interest were related to cytoskeleton (15%, i.e. 172
proteins, see table S2, analysis of GO terms, cellular components). As shown by STRING
functional network representation, actin-related proteins were majority (Figure 2B,
orange nodes) compared to microtubule-related (green nodes) or intermediate
filament-related proteins (blue nodes). This was in accordance with the nature of TNTs,
mainly supported by actin cytoskeleton [1]. However, recent work has shown that TNTs,
in addition to actin, could contain microtubules as in some cancers (Figure S1A and [8,
40]), and also cytokeratins like in the case of urothelial cells [41, 42].
When looking at membrane proteins, analysis of the GO terms (cellular components) of
the TNTome classified around 500 proteins as membrane-related, 64 of which being
strictly integral plasma membrane (see table S3 and Figure 2C). Among the latter, N-
cadherin and other cadherin-related proteins (green nodes), as well as known N-
cadherin interactors like α-catenin, were found. We also noticed the presence of various
integrin subunits (orange nodes, including the Integrin β1, whose presence on TNT was
confirmed by immunofluorescence (Figure S2C). However, the TNTome had only a
partial overlap with integrin adhesion complexes ([43], Figure S2A and tab1 of table S4)
and with the consensus adhesome (Figure S2B, tab2 of table S4). In addition very
important proteins of the focal adhesions, like Paxillin, GIT2, Parvins and PINCH1 were
not in the TNTome, making unprobable focal adhesion being isolated in TNT
preparations. We also analyzed whether TNT preparation could be contaminated by
filopodia, another type of protrusions grown by the cells. Despite common proteins
described as core filopodia proteins in U2OS cells (like Myosin10, Integrin α5, TLN1,
FERMT2, MSN, LIMA1), TNTome was devoid of others (Myo15A, TLN2, PARVA,
ITGB1BP1, see [44]), making unlikely an important contamination of TNTs with filopodia
during the preparation. Together, these results suggested that the proteins identified in
TNTome represent a specific composition of these protrusions, and not a pool of other
types of protrusions which could have contaminated the preparation.

We also looked whether the TM proteins of the TNTome were the most abundant TM
proteins of U2OS cells. We compared the rank in TNTome to the protein concentration
[45] or to the level of RNA [46]. Whether some factors are indeed very well expressed
in U2OS cells (for instance Integrin β1, SLC3A2, basigin, CLIC channels) and ranked in the
first quartile of TNTome, others are weakly expressed in U2OS cells (N-cadherin for
instance). In addition, some cell surface proteins are highly expressed in U2OS cells
(according to their corresponding RNA level [46]), but not detected in the TNTome, like
SLC2A11 (Glucose transporter), APP, ITM2C, TNFR. As shown by WB in Figure S2D, we
could detect membrane or membrane-associated proteins in U2OS cell extracts that
were not listed in TNTome, like Integrin β4, α4, EGFR, Cx43, and APP [47]. Likewise,
some proteins of very low abundancy in cells were found in TNTome (CALML5 for
example), maybe reflecting a specific role in TNT formation. We also observed that the
relative abundance of some proteins in TNT fractions compared to WCE (Figure S2E) was
variable. As examples, CD9 and especially ADAM10 seemed to be relatively abundant in
TNTs compared to WCE, whereas Integrin β1 or ANXA2 TNT/WCE ratios were much
lower. Altogether, these data suggested that TNT membrane composition was not just
a fraction of cell surface membrane proteins, but rather that some proteins were
excluded, other more present. This first consolidated our TNT purification procedure,
and second highlighted that specific mechanisms and factors should be at stake to grow
and maintain TNTs.
204
205 Comparison of the content of TNTs and EVPs
206
Because both EVs and TNTs have similar characteristics (membrane-formed, diameter,
ability to transfer material to remote cells), we analyzed their respective composition
when prepared from the same cell cultures, following the full protocol schematized in
Figure 1A, from 4 independent experiments. 961 proteins in total were identified at least
in 3 of the 4 TNT and EVP preparations. When keeping TNT proteins that were also
present in the 1177 list of TNTome (in 9 TNT preparations over the total of 12), a total
of 801 proteins were finally differentially analyzed. Our results showed a different
composition of TNTs and EVPs, although common factors represent 75% of them (see
volcano plot in Figure 2D). Interestingly, 174 proteins were specific for TNTs when
compared to EVPs (see tab1 of table S5). Among the most abundant was the ER
chaperone ERp29, previously shown to be required for the formation of TNTs [30]. When
discarding organelle-associated or translation linked proteins, 89 proteins remained in
this TNT-only list (table S5, tab2, constitutive). 20% of them were involved in
cytoskeleton, including the positive regulator of TNTs Myosin10 [36]. When analyzing
the proteins differentially abundant in TNT vs. EVPs (Figure 2D and table S6), we noticed
the enrichment of TNTs in cytoskeleton-related proteins, especially actin, compared to
EVPs.
The tetraspanins CD9, CD81 and CD63 are classical markers of EVs and were all detected
in TNTs, CD9 and CD81 being among the more abundant transmembrane proteins of
TNTome. CD9 and CD63 were more abundant in EVs than in TNT, and CD81 was present
at similar level in both preparations. Their direct interacting partners CD9P1 and EWI2
(respectively PTGFRN and IGSF8 in Figure 2C) were present in TNTome but more
enriched in EVPs than TNTs. Consistent with the presence of the integrins α3β1 and
α6β1, the tetraspanin CD151 which directly associates with these integrins was also

detected in TNTome [48]. Finally, the presence of CD9, CD81, and CD151 in TNTs was
confirmed by immunofluorescence in U2OS (Figures S1A and S2C).
233
234
235 Regulation of TNT formation by CD9 and CD81
236
To study the role of CD9 and CD81 in the formation of TNTs, we decided to use a cellular
model in which TNT structure and function have already been largely investigated, SH-
SY5Y cells. These human neuronal cells form many TNTs (about 30 % of WT cells are
connected by TNTs), which are easily visualized and distinguished from other
protrusions by fluorescent imaging [2, 7, 49]. Similarly to what we observed in U2OS
cells, CD9, CD81 and CD151 were detected on protrusions connecting SH-SY5Y cells
(Figure 3A, CD9 in green and CD81 in red, yellow arrowheads indicate TNTs and Figure
S2C). Importantly, all protrusions connecting two cells, containing actin and not
attached to the substrate, which correspond to TNTs, beared CD9 and CD81, indicating
that these tetraspanins are good markers for TNTs.
We then knocked-out (KO) CD9 and/or CD81 by infecting SH-SY5Y cells with lentiviral
CRISPR vectors targeting the corresponding genes. Western-blot analysis confirmed the
lack of CD9 and/or CD81 expression in these cells (Figure S3A). CD9 KO cells, but not
CD81 KO cells, showed a significant reduction of the percentage of TNT-connected cells
compared to WT cells (Figure 3B&C). The % of TNT-connected cells was even lower in
the double KO cells (named CD9&CD81 KO hereafter). The role of CD9 in TNT formation
was confirmed by the finding that CD9 stable overexpression (OE) resulted in a
significant increase in the % of TNT-connected cells (Figure 3 D&E). Consistently with KO
result, CD81 stable OE did not change the % of TNT-connected cells. Together these
results showed that CD9 plays a role in the formation or maintenance of TNTs and that
CD81 might play a partially redundant role when CD9 is absent.
258
259 Role of CD9 and CD81 in donor cells for TNT function
260
The next and complementary step was to evaluate the possible influence of CD9 and
CD81 on the functionality of TNTs. TNT functionality is understood as the intrinsic
capacity to allow the transfer of different types of cellular material through the open
channel formed between the cytoplasm of different cells. This was monitored by
quantifying by flow cytometry the transfer of labeled vesicles between two different cell
populations (¨donors¨ for the cells where vesicles were first labeled and ¨acceptors¨ for
the cells that received the vesicles [50]). A similar gating strategy was applied to all
experiments (Figure S4), and the vesicle transfer through any mechanism other than cell
contact-dependent was ruled out in all experiments by analyzing secretion controls,
where the two cell populations were cultured separately (Figure S5). Therefore, the
amount of transferred vesicles occurring mainly through cell-contact-dependent
mechanisms is an indirect way of monitoring TNT functionality that has to be analyzed
with regard to TNT apparent number.
First, we co-cultured WT, CD9 KO, CD81 KO or CD9&CD81 KO donor cells versus WT
acceptor cells expressing GFP (as schematized in Figure 3F). Consistently with the
decrease of the % of cells connected by TNTs, CD9 KO cells showed a significantly
decreased percentage of acceptor cells containing donor's vesicles compared to WT cells

(Figures 3F and S4A). On the other hand, despite having no effect on the number of
TNTs, CD81 KO caused a significant reduction in vesicle transfer to acceptor cells.
CD9&CD81 KO cells showed a further decrease of vesicle transfer, consistent with the
high decrease in the % of TNT-connected cells. Next, we performed a co-culture using
tetraspanin OE cells as donor cells (Figure 3G). CD9 OE as well as CD81 OE significantly
increased vesicle transfer compared to WT cells (Figures 3G and S4B). These data
showed that both CD9 and CD81 in donor cells positively regulate the transfer of vesicles
through TNTs, which could be in the case of CD9, but not CD81, a direct consequence of
an increased number of TNT.
287
288 Pathway of CD9 and CD81 in the regulation of TNTs
289
Knowing that the molecular conformation of CD9 molecules can induce membrane
curvature [51, 52] and that induced clustering of CD9 can be achieved by treating cells
with specific antibodies against this protein [53, 54] that could lead to the formation of
protrusions such as microvilli [55], we postulated that CD9 could be involved in the initial
steps of formation and asked whether promoting CD9 clustering could affect TNT
number and function. Incubation for 2 hours of WT SH-SY5Y cells with an anti-CD9
antibody (CD9 AB), but not a control antibody (CTR AB), caused the presence of CD9 in
patches on the plasma membrane suggesting that CD9 molecules (and CD81) were
incorporated in multimolecular complexes that were clustered together by the
antibodies (Figure 4A). Furthermore, the same antibody treatment for an additional 2
hours after 24 hours of coculture of WT donor and acceptor cells (Figure 4B) lead to an
increase in the % of TNT-connected cells (Figure 4C) that correlated with an increase on
the vesicle transfer (Figure 4D). These data suggested that CD9-enriched sites could
serve as initiation platforms for TNTs or participate in the stability of these structures.
When repeating these experiments on CD81 KO cells, neither CD9 clustering (Figure 4E)
nor the increase of TNT number (Figure 4F&G) was affected by the lack of CD81.
However, this increase in TNTs was not accompanied by an increase in vesicle transfer
(Figure 4H) suggesting that CD9 does not require CD81 to form/stabilize TNTs, but that
if CD81 is not present, TNT functionality is compromised.
To further understand whether CD9 and CD81 have redundant roles or act successively
in the pathway of TNT formation, we knocked-out CD81 in cells over-expressing CD9
(Figure S3B). CD9 OE was associated with an increase of the % of TNT-connected cells,
which was not changed after CD81 KO (Figure 5 A&B), consistent with the fact that CD81
does not play a role in TNT formation, at least in CD9 expressing-cells. However, the
transfer from CD9 OE cells was not sentitive to CD81 KO (Figures 5C and S4C), in contrast
to WT cells (Figure 3F), suggesting that CD9 OE can compensate for the absence of CD81
on vesicle transfer. To determine whether CD81 can replace CD9 in
stimulating/stabilizing TNT, we knocked-out CD9 in CD81 OE cells (Figure S3B). As shown
in Figure 5B, CD9 KO reduced TNT number to the same extent in these CD81 OE cells
than in WT cells (Figure 3C). Consistently with the number of TNTs, the KO of CD9 on
CD81 OE cells significantly decreased the transfer compared to CD81 OE cells (Figures
5C and S4C). Thus, CD81 cannot compensate for CD9 for the formation/stabilization of
TNTs.
All the above results pointed out that both CD9 and CD81 participate in the regulation
of the TNTs, however not being interchangeable, and are in accordance with CD9 in

donor cells acting first in promoting TNT formation, whereas CD81 would act
downstream, both events being needed to give full functionality to TNTs.
327
328

329 ## Discussion
330
331 **The composition of TNTs is unique**
332
Thanks to a newly established procedure in U2OS cells, we were able to reproducibly
isolate a cellular fraction from cell bodies and from EVPs, and analyze their content by
mass spectrometry. The physical characteristics as well as the proteome analysis of this
fraction (called TNTome) suggested that it could be enriched in TNTs with minor
contaminations with other cell protrusions material. Therefore, analysis of the TNTome
could give valuable information on core components, traveling material or regulatory
factors of TNTs. Our results regarding the unique composition of TNTs were in
accordance with those obtained by [16], who used a laser captured microdissection
approach combined with mass spectrometry to reveal the composition of various types
of cellular protrusions in mouse CAD cells, including growth cones, filopodia and TNTs.
Interestingly, among the 190 proteins identified in [16] in 2 samples from hCAD samples
(enriched in TNTs), 101 were also found in TNTome (listed in table S7), mostly
corresponding to the more abundant cellular proteins. It is possible that laser
microdissection allowed a limited amount of material to be purified, and therefore few
membrane proteins were identified [16].
TNTome is rich in membrane-associated proteins, as well as in proteins linked to the
cytoskeleton, in particular related to actin, as it was expected for these structures.
TNTome is also abundant in ribonucleoproteins and translation-related factors (220
proteins, 19%). Some of them (as well as the proteins identified as nuclear in the
databases) could be contaminants coming from cellular debris, however this fraction
should not be more than 10% of the total, based on nanoFCM results. Together with the
fact that TNTs transfer mitochondria and lysosomes, it is possible that TNTs are used as
a route to transfer RNAs alone or tethered to organelles by Annexins (several members
in TNTome, including A11), G3BP1 or CAPRIN1 (both in the first quartile of TNTome, [56-
58]) or that local translation happens along the TNT to fuel it with required material.
Transfer of mRNAs and microRNAs through TNTs has been described [38, 39] and could
be one of the major functions of this kind of communication.
Regarding membrane, beside tetraspanins, cadherins and integrins, some other plasma
membrane TM proteins are of interest. Several amino acids (SLC3A2, SLC1A5 in the first
quartile, SLC1A4 and SLC7A1 in the fourth) and monocarboxylate transporters (SLC16A1
in the second quartile) were found, suggesting together with the presence of
mitochondria and of many metabolic enzymes that active metabolism takes place in
TNTs and may be necessary to generate local ATP to power TNT growth [59]. Of note
SLC1A5 (Gln transporter ASCT2) and the lactate transporter MCT1 (SLC16A1) have been
shown to interact with CD9 in pancreatic cancer stem cells [60] where it promoted their
membrane localization and function. This hypothesis will need further investigation.
Also, of great interest are SLC1A4 (neutral amino acid transporter) and STX7, which are
the only TM proteins uniquely found in TNT and not EVP fraction. As a matter of fact,
our results suggested that TNTs are different in composition and maybe regulation from

EVPs, although they share numerous factors. Further studying TNT proteins not being present in EVPs will possibly allow to identify TNT specific markers.

We focused our attention on tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 to further validate our proteomic approach. Among the structures described to comprise at least one of these factors and that could potentially be contaminants of our TNT preparations, are midbodies. Midbodies have been shown to contain CD9 and its partners CD9-P1 and EWI-2 [61], and these structures could be copurified with TNTs, although in minor amount given the fact that the cells were maintained in serum-free medium for 24 hours before TNTs were harvested. However, no other specific markers of midbodies were detected in our MS data, including CRIK, CEP55, PLK1, PRC1, MKLP1 and 2, although they are expressed in U2OS cells [45, 46]. Of note, only 13 TM proteins are common between TNTome and flemingsome (which has 29), including CD9, CD9P1, EWI2, but also CADHF1 and 4, CD44, Integrin α3. Some of these proteins could have a specific role in both TNTs and midbodies, like CD9 and its associated factors. Alternatively, some of these proteins, relatively abundant on plasma membranes, could be randomly present, independently of the specific structure that is analyzed. In any case, TNT and midbodies have different composition.

Among the cellular structures that depend on tetraspanin-enriched microdomains are also the recently described migrasomes, which are substrate-attached membrane elongated organelles formed on the branch points or the tips of retraction fibers of migrating cells which allow the release and transfer of cellular material in other cells [62]. Although migrasomes have been described to be enriched in and dependent on tetraspanins-enriched microdomains [63, 64], they are fundamentally different from TNTs since they are attached to the substratum (and probably not collected during the procedure of TNT purification), and exhibit specific markers, identified by MS analysis, which are absent from TNTome (TSPAN 4 and 9, NDST1, PIGK, CPQ, EOGT for example, see 65). Altogether, our TNT purification protocol and proteomic analysis have revealed that TNTs have specific composition, and these data open new avenues to understand how TNTs are formed and regulated.

CD9 and CD81 regulate formation of TNTs

TNTome in U2OS revealed that CD9 and CD81 are among the most abundant integral membrane proteins in TNTs (see table S3, tab2), and previous results of overexpression [18] and our data showed that they are also present on TNTs in other cell lines, especially SH-SY5Y cells, making them probable compulsory proteins of TNTs. In addition, given the distance between cells connected by TNTs, one can speculate that, under specific signal, one or several membrane proteins would drive growth of TNTs and stimulate actin polymerization, and/or subsequent membrane fusion with the opposing cell. CD9 and CD81, as part of TEMs, able to bring together additional proteins, were interesting candidates to fulfill these functions. That is why we have analyzed the ability of the tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 to influence the number of TNTs and their functionality understood as the capacity for cargo transfer between cells in a strict cell contact-dependent manner.

Related with the protrusive activity of the membrane and its deformation, which is one mandatory step in the formation of TNTs, the tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 have been shown to induce curvature formation [51, 52] probably because of their inverted cone-

like structure. CD9 promotes the formation of digitation junctions [66] and CD81
promotes microvilli formation and membrane bending [51]. Our results showed that
CD9 is able to increase the % of cells connected by TNTs, therefore CD9 is a positive
regulator of TNT biogenesis or of TNT stability. Clustering of CD9 by antibody treatment
for a short period of time (2 hours) was more than enough to produce a significant
increase in the % of cells connected by TNTs and in the % of acceptor cells that had
received vesicles, thus showing that functional TNTs were induced or stabilized.
In contrast, OE or KO of CD81 did not affect the % of TNT-connected cells at all, indicating
that CD81 does not seem to be involved in the origin of new TNTs. These different roles
in the biogenesis of TNTs could be surprising given the strong colocalization of these
proteins, and their similar structures [52, 67]. However, although we can see how the
single KO of CD9 and CD81 showed different results on the number of TNTs, in the
double KO of CD9 and CD81 the % of TNT-connected cells was decreased to even lower
levels than in the CD9 KO cells. Therefore, this would indicate that CD9 and CD81 may
have partially redundant roles in the biogenesis of TNTs, in accordance also with the
partial functional compensation of CD81 KO by CD9 OE. This is reminiscent of their role
in oocyte fertilization, with both a complementary effect as CD9-/- CD81-/- mouse
oocytes are completely sterile [68, 69], and also partial redundancy as CD81 expression
on CD9-/- mouse oocytes restores fertilization in 50% of cases [70].
Another fundamental process for the formation of functional TNTs is the fusion of the
TNT membrane with the opposing cell to form these open channels [2]. CD9 and CD81
have been shown to be positive regulators of sperm-egg fusion [69] and bone marrow
macrophage fusion-mediated osteoclast formation in the case of CD9 [71], but negative
regulators of cell muscle fusion [27] and multinucleated giant cells formation [72].
Therefore, one possibility is that these tetraspanins participate in the fusion of the TNTs
with the opposing cell. The co-cultures allowing to quantify the cell contact-dependent
transfer of vesicles and therefore the functionality of the TNTs (which is an indirect way
of checking whether these structures are in fact open or closed) showed a positive
correlation between transfer capacity and number of TNTs when acting on CD9 in donor
cells, implying that CD9 is a positive regulator of the whole set of processes of TNT
formation. In contrast, CD81 in donor cells positively regulated the functionality of TNTs
but not the apparent number of TNTs. Therefore CD81 probably does not play a role in
attachment of TNTs to the opposing cell or in TNT stability (in which cases one would
expect less TNTs in CD81 KO cells), or in stabilizing active CD9 (we would not see same
TNT number and transfer in CD9 OE + CD81 KO conditions as in CD9 OE) but rather favors
the fusion of TNTs with the opposing cells.
455
456   **CD9 and CD81 act successively in the formation of TNTs.**
457
All these results together show that although CD9 and CD81 regulate the formation of
TNTs, their respective role could be at different steps of the whole TNT formation
process. CD81 KO in CD9 OE cells had no significant effect on both the % of TNT-
connected cells and vesicle transfer compared to CD9 OE cells. In contrast, KO of CD9 on
CD81 OE cells resulted in a significant decrease in the % of TNT-connected cells and
vesicle transfer compared to CD81 OE alone. These results suggested that CD9 could act
early in initiating the formation and allowing CD81 to subsequently participate in the
fusion of TNTs with the opposing cell. Furthermore, when we treated CD81 KO cells with

anti-CD9 antibodies, we observed the same increase in TNT number that was seen in WT cells, indicating that the TNT-forming capacity of CD9 is independent of CD81 and was induced by antibody treatment. However, vesicle transfer induction was completely blocked in CD81 KO cells, showing that the first steps of TNT formation were not impaired and that it is instead a late step, probably fusion, that is controlled by CD81. Recent work [64] proposed a role for TEM in forming a rigid ring impairing membrane damage to spread. In a similar way, specific CD9/CD81 TEM could somehow protect membrane around the TNT site where fusion with opposing cell will occur. More work in identifying specific TEM composition in TNTs would be needed to address this hypothesis.

In summary, in this study we have shown that TNTs and EVPs are two cellular structures with partially overlapping composition, and that despite being part of both TNTs and EVPs, the tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 are fundamental regulators of TNT formation with complementary roles in the whole process of biogenesis of these structures. TNTome further analysis will be of great help to identify additional protein, as part of the TEM or not, that could participate in TNT formation and regulation.

Acknowledgements : We acknowledge the Center for Translational Science (CRT)-Cytometry and Biomarkers Unit of Technology and Service (CB UTechS), in particular P.H. Commère. Thanks to Dr. S. Charrin for helpful discussion, Dr. S. Lebreton, Ranabir Chakraborty for critical reading of the manuscript, and all the members of the UTRAF unit for their support. We are grateful for financial support to C.Z. from Institut National du Cancer (PLBIO18-103) and Equipe Fondation Recherche Médicale (FRM EQU202103012692). This work was supported by Equipe Fondation Recherche Médicale (FRM-EQU202103012692), and Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR-20-CE13-0032) to C.Z.

Author contributions : Conceptualization: RNM, CB, CZ; methodology: RNM, TC, ER, MM, CB; formal analysis: RNM, TC, CB; writing—original draft: RNM, CB; writing—review and editing: RNM, CB, CZ, ER, TC, MM; funding acquisition: CZ, MM; supervision: CB.

Materials and Methods

Cell lines, lentiviral preparations, plasmids and transfection procedures

U2OS cells were cultured at 37 °C in 5% CO_2 in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (DMEM + Glutamax, + 4.5 g/l Glucose, + Pyruvate, Gibco), plus 10% fetal calf serum (FCS) and 1% penicillin/streptomycin (P/S). U2OS stably expressing H2B-GFP (Addgene 11680) and actin chromobody GFP (pAC-TagGFP from Chromotek) were obtained by transfection with Fugene HD according to manufacturer's instructions, followed by sorting of GFP-positive cells. GFP-CD9 expressing U2OS cells were obtained by lentiviral transduction as below, followed by limiting dilution to obtain a clone. SH-SY5Y human neuroblastoma cells were cultured at 37 °C in 5% CO_2 in RPMI-1640 (Euroclone), plus 10% FCS and 1% P/S.

For the lentiviral preparations, human HEK 293T cells were cultured at 37 °C in 5% CO2 in
DMEM (ThermoFisher), with 10% FCS and 1% P/S. Cells were plated one day before
transfection at a confluency around 70%. Transfection of the different plasmids was made
in a ratio 4:1:4 using lentiviral components pCMVR8,74 (Gag-Pol-Hiv1) and pMDG2 (VSV-
G) vectors and the plasmid of interest respectively using FuGENE HD (Promega) according
to manufacturer's protocol. CRISPR lentiviral plasmids containing the sequences for CD9:
GAATCGGAGCCATAGTCCAA and CD81: AGGAATCCCAGTGCCTGCTG were selected using
the   CRISPR   design   tool   available   at   the   Broad   Institute
(https://portals.broadinstitute.org/gpp/public/analysis-tools/sgrna-design).   The
corresponding guide DNA sequences were cloned into the lentiCRISPRv2 plasmid
(#52961; Addgene) according to the instructions of the Zhang laboratory
(https://www.addgene.org/52961/). The viral particules were collected and concentrated
using LentiX-Concentrator (TakaraBio) after 48 h. To KO CD9 and/or CD81, SH-SY5Y were
plated the day before the infection at a confluency of around 70% and next day the
lentivirus was added to the cells. 24 hours later the medium with the lentiviruses was
removed and cells were selected with RPMI + 1 μg/mL of puromycin for 2 days. After this,
cells were splitted 1:5 and reinfected for 24 hours. After these 24 hours, medium was
replaced with RPMI + 1 μg/mL of puromycin for 10 days changing the medium every 2-3
days. Finally, cells were tested for the absence of expression of CD9 and/or CD81 by
western blot (WB).

To obtain clones that overexpress CD9 or CD81, SH-SY5Y were plated the day before at a
confluency of around 70% and next day cells were transfected with the corresponding
plasmid using Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen) following the manufacture
recommendations and 72 hours post-transfection cells selected with 350 μg/mL of
Hygromicin B (Gibco) for 5 days, changing the medium every 2 days and then with 50
μg/mL of Hygromicin B for 10 days more. The CD9 or CD81 OE clones were obtained by
limiting dilution and tested for expression of CD9 or CD81 by immunofluorescence and
WB.

TNT and EVP preparation
540
Two million U2OS cells were plated in 75 cm2 flasks for 24 hours, next complete medium
was replaced by medium without FCS for an additional 24 hours. For EVP preparation,
conditioned medium was collected, centrifugated twice at 2000g to remove cells,
concentrated 10-fold on Vivaspin 20 (MWCO 10kD, Cytiva), and next submitted to
ultracentrifugation in a Beckman MLS50 rotor at 10,000g for 30 minutes at 4°C.
Supernatant was collected and centrifugated at 100,000g for 70 minutes at 4°C,
resulting pellet was resuspended in PBS and centrifugated again at 100,000g for 70
minutes at 4°C. Pellets were used for Mass Spectrometry, or solubilized in 2x Laemmli
for WB analysis.
For TNT preparation, cell cultures after removing conditioned medium were washed
carefully with PBS, next 2 ml of PBS was added in each flask, which was left on an
oscillating shaker for 5 minutes before being shaked (30 sec horizontally, and 4 times 30
sec by banging them vigorously). PBS from all flasks was drained, collected and
centrifugated twice at 2,000g, and filtered on 0.45 μM syringe filter (Corning) to remove
detached cells, next submitted to ultracentrifugation at 100,000g for 70 minutes at 4°C.
Pellets were used for Mass Spectrometry or WB. After collecting EVPs and TNTs from

cell cultures, cells were harvested in PBS, and cell extracts were prepared in Tris 50 mM
pH 7.4, NaCl 300 mM, MgCl2 5 mM, Triton 1% with protease inhibitors (complete mini,
Roche).
560

Nano-Flow Cytometry

The size and number of exosomes and TNT particles were identified by Nano-Flow
Cytometry (NanoFCM). NanoFCM is applicable when the refractive index of input
samples are the same or similar to that of silica particles. The standard working curve of
scattering light intensity was established using silica standard sphere. EVPs and TNT
particles were isolated from 1 flask of culture following the protocol above except the
ultracentrifugation steps. The particle size distribution of samples was measured based
on the scattering intensity.
569

Mass spectrometry

<u>Digestion of TNT and EVPs samples</u>
Protein pellets were dissolved in urea 8M, Tris 50mM pH 8.0, TCEP (tris(2-
carboxyethyl)phosphine) 5mM and SDS (Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate) 2%. SDS was removed
using a methanol/ chloroform/ water extraction. Briefly, 3V of ice-cold Methanol was
added to the sample then mixed. 2 V of ice-cold chloroform was added and mixed. Then
3Vof ice cold water was added and mix. Sample were spinned for 3 min at 5000g at 4°C.
Proteins at the organic/inorganic interface were kept and washed 3 times in ice cold
methanol. Protein pellet were dissolved in Guanidine 1M, TCEP 5mM, Chloroacetamide
20mM, Tris 50mM pH8.0 and samples were heated 5 min at 90°C before digestion in a
mix of 500 ng of LysC (Promega) at 37°C for 2h. Dilution with Tris 50mM was done before
the addition of trypsin 500 ng (Promega) and digestion at 37°C for 8h. Digestion was
stopped by adding 1% final of formic acid. Peptides were purified using a C18 based
clean up standard protocol done using Bravo AssayMap device
<u>LC-MS/MS analysis of TNT and EVPs.</u>
LC-MS/SM analysis of digested peptides was performed on an Orbitrap Q Exactive Plus
mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bremen) coupled to an EASY-nLC 1200
(Thermo Fisher Scientific). A home-made column was used for peptide separation (C_{18}
50 cm capillary column picotip silica emitter tip (75 µm diameter filled with 1.9 µm
Reprosil-Pur Basic C_{18}-HD resin, (Dr. Maisch GmbH, Ammerbuch-Entringen, Germany)).
It was equilibrated and peptide were loaded in solvent A (0.1 % FA) at 900 bars. Peptides
were separated at 250 nl.min^{-1}. Peptides were eluted using a gradient of solvent B (ACN,
0.1 % FA) from 3% to 22% in 140 min, 22% to 42% in 61 min, 42% to 60% in 15 min (total
length of the chromatographic run was 240 min including high ACN level step and
column regeneration). Mass spectra were acquired in data-dependent acquisition mode
with the XCalibur 2.2 software (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bremen) with automatic
switching between MS and MS/MS scans using a top 10 method. MS spectra were
acquired at a resolution of 70000 (at m/z 400) with a target value of 3×10^6 ions. The
scan range was limited from 400 to 1700 m/z. Peptide fragmentation was performed
using higher-energy collision dissociation (HCD) with the energy set at 26 NCE. Intensity
threshold for ions selection was set at 1×10^6 ions with charge exclusion of z = 1 and z >
7. The MS/MS spectra were acquired at a resolution of 17500 (at m/z 400). Isolation
window was set at 2.0 Th. Dynamic exclusion was employed within 35 s.
603

All Data were searched using MaxQuant (version 1.6.6.0) using the Andromeda search
engine [73] against a human reference proteome (75088 entries, downloaded from
Uniprot the 29th of October 2020).
The following search parameters were applied: carbamidomethylation of cysteines was
set as a fixed modification, oxidation of methionine and protein N-terminal acetylation
were set as variable modifications. The mass tolerances in MS and MS/MS were set to 5
ppm and 20 ppm respectively. Maximum peptide charge was set to 7 and 5 amino acids
were required as minimum peptide length. At least 2 peptides (including 1 unique
peptides) were asked to report a protein identification. A false discovery rate of 1% was
set up for both protein and peptide levels. iBAQ value was calculated. The match
between runs features was allowed for biological replicate only.
615
<u>Data analysis</u>
Quantitative analysis was based on pairwise comparison of protein intensities. Values
were log-transformed (log2). Reverse hits and potential contaminant were removed
from the analysis. Proteins with at least 2 peptides were kept for further statistics.
Intensity values were normalized by median centering within conditions (normalizeD
function of the R package DAPAR [74]). Remaining proteins without any iBAQ value in
one of both conditions have been considered as proteins quantitatively present in a
condition and absent in the other. They have therefore been set aside and considered
as differentially abundant proteins. Next, missing values were imputed using the
impute.MLE function of the R package imp4p (https://rdrr.io/cran/imp4p/man/imp4p-
package.html). Statistical testing was conducted using a limma t-test thanks to the R
package limma [75]. An adaptive Benjamini-Hochberg procedure was applied on the
resulting p-values thanks to the function adjust.p of R package cp4p [76] using the
robust method described in [77] to estimate the proportion of true null hypotheses
among the set of statistical tests. The proteins associated to an adjusted p-value inferior
to a FDR level of 1% have been considered as significantly differentially abundant
proteins.
633
<u>Bioinformatic analysis and data mining</u>
Twelve replicates were done for the discovery of TNT proteins. Nine over 12 were kept
as being part of the TNT. The 1177 resulting proteins were sorting by quartiles according
to their iBAQ value. For each of the 4 lists, proteins composition was depicted using
ProteoMap tool [78]   to visualize their weighted GO organization and protein
contribution for each GO term. Also, a DAVID analysis [79] was done for each quartile
of proteins. Functional charts and cluster were used to describe the dataset. Protein
networks were visualized using STRING [80] and Cytoscape (cytoscape.org).
Resource availability: The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to
the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE[1] partner repository with the dataset
identifier PXD033089.
645
Sample preparation for TNT imaging
SH-SY5Y or U2OS-derived cells were trypsinized and counted, and 100,000 or 30,000
cells respectively were plated on coverslips. After O/N culture, cells were fixed with
specific fixatives to preserve TNT [50], first with Fixative 1 (2% PFA, 0.05%
glutaraldehyde and 0.2 M HEPES in PBS) for 15 min at 37 °C, then with fixative 2 (4%

PFA and 0.2 M HEPES in PBS) for 15 min at 37 °C . After fixation, cells were washed with
PBS and membranes were stained with conjugated wheat germ agglutinin (WGA)-Alexa
Fluor (1:300 in PBS, Invitrogen) or Phalloidin-Texas-red (1:300 in PBS, Invitrogen) and
DAPI (1:1000) (Invitrogen) at room temperature 15 minutes. After gently washing 3
times with PBS, samples were mounted on glass slides with Aqua PolyMount
(Polysciences, Inc.). Every different SH-SY5Y cell type (WT, tetraspanin KO or tetraspanin
OE) was prepared in the exact same conditions.
658

Counting or quantification of the % TNT-connected cells (also term as TNT
counting or TNT number)
With the use of an inverted laser scanning confocal microscope LSM 700 or 900 (Zeiss)
controlled by the Zen software (Zeiss) multiple random Z-stack images of different
points on the samples were acquired. The images were analyzed according to the
morphological criteria of TNTs: structures that connect two distant cells and that are not
attached to the substratum. First slices were excluded from the analysis, and only
connections in the middle and upper stacks were considered. Cells that have TNTs
between them were marked as cells connected by TNTs, and the number of these cells
was compared to the total number of cells in the sample, giving the percentage of cells
connected by TNTs. The analysis was performed using ICY software
(https://icy.bioimageanalysis.org/), by using the "Manual TNT annotation" plugin. In
each experiment, at least 200 or more cells were analyzed in every condition. The
images were adjusted and processed with the ImageJ (https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/) or Icy
softwares.
674

Co-culture assay (DiD transfer assay) and flow cytometry analysis
DiD transfer assays have been described elsewhere [50]. Briefly, the co-culture consisted
in two distinctly labeled cell populations: a first population of cells (donors) was treated
with Vybrant DiD (dialkylcarbocyanine), a lipophilic dye that stains vesicles, at 1:1000
(Thermo Fisher Scientific) in complete medium for 30 min at 37 °C (Life Technologies),
the cells were then trypsinized and mixed in a 1:1 ratio with a different cell population
(acceptors) of different color to distinguish them from donors (usually expressing GFP)
and the co-culture was incubated O/N.
In the case of the co-cultures with KO, OE or OE + KO of CD9 and CD81, 400,000 donor
cells were mixed with 400,000 acceptor cells on 6-well plates for analysis by flow
cytometry. After O/N culture, cells were trypsinized, passed through a cell strainer to
dissociate cellular aggregates and fixed with 2% PFA in PBS. Finally, these cells were
passed through the CytoFLEX S Flow Cytometer (Beckman Coulter) under the control of
the CytoExpert Acquisition software. The data were analyzed with FlowJo software
following a similar strategy for all experiments: first the samples were gated to exclude
cellular debris by plotting the area obtained with the side scatter (SSC-A) and the area
obtained with the forward scatter (FSC-A) obtaining all the cells in the sample. Second,
within this previous gate, the sample was gated to exclude cell doublets, plotting the
width obtained with side scatter (SSC-W) and the area obtained with forward scatter
(FSC-A) thus obtaining the singlets. Finally, within the singlet gate, the co-culture was
gated using GFP and DiD expression, resulting in four quadrants delimiting double-
negative, GFP-positive, DiD-positive and double-positive populations. The % of acceptor

cells receiving DiD-vesicles was obtained by calculating the percentage of acceptor cells
with labeled vesicles out of the total number of acceptor cells.
In the case of the co-culture of the CD9 AB treatment, 50.000 donor cells were co-
cultured with 50.000 acceptor cells on coverslips. Results were analyzed by microscopy
as described above, and results were obtained by semi-quantitative analysis using ICY
software (http://icy.bioimageanalysis.org/) by calculating the percentage of acceptor
cells with labeled vesicles out of the total number of acceptor cells. In each experiment,
at least 100 recipient cells per condition were counted. Image montages were built
afterward in ImageJ software.
In all co-cultures a control of the transfer by secretion was performed. DiD-loaded donor
cells were seeded alone (800,000 cells for flow cytometry and 100,000 cells for
microscopy) and cultured for 24 hours. Next, the supernatant from these cells was
centrifuged and added to the acceptor cells that had been seeded on the previous day
under the same conditions as the donors, these acceptor cells were cultured for an
additional 24 hours and next fixed and analyzed in the same way as above mentioned.
712

CD9 antibody (AB) treatment
Both TNT counting and vesicle transfer in the CD9 AB treatment were done in the same
way as described, with an additional step after 24 hours of coculture consisting in the
incubation of the cells with either Goat anti-rabbit Alexa Fluor 305 (Thermofisher ref:
A21068-) control antibodies (CTR AB) or anti-CD9 (TS9) antibodies at a concentration of
10 μg/μL in RPMI medium without serum or P/S for 2 hours. Subsequently, the cells
were fixed and submitted to immunofluorescence. For cells treated with CTR AB, after
fixation the cells were incubated with anti-CD9 and anti-CD81 antibodies (as described
in the next section). Cells treated with CD9 AB were only further incubated with anti-
CD81 antibodies. Results were acquired by confocal microscopy.
723

Immunofluorescence
For immunofluorescence, 100.000 SH-SY5Y cells or 30,000 U2OS cells were seeded on
glass coverslips and after O/N culture they were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA)
for 15 minutes, quenched with 50 mM NH_4Cl for 10 minutes and blocked in 2% BSA in
PBS for 20 minutes. Primary antibodies used were: mouse anti-CD9 IgG1 (TS9), anti-
CD81 IgG2a (TS81), anti-ITGB1 (β1-vjf, IgG1) or anti-CD151 (TS151, IgG1) were previously
described[25], and all of them were used in 2% BSA in PBS during 1 hour. After 3 washes
of 10 minutes each with PBS, cells were incubated with each corresponding Alexa Fluor-
conjugated secondary antibody (Invitrogen) at 1:1000 in 2% BSA in PBS during 1 hour.
Specifically, the secondary antibodies used were: goat anti-mouse with epitope IgG1
Alexa Fluor 488 for CD9 (Invitrogen ref: A21121) and goat anti-mouse with epitope IgG2a
Alexa Fluor 633 for CD81 (Invitrogen ref: A21136). For the experiments showing the
actin cytoskeleton, cells were labeled with Phalloidin- Rhodamine (Invitrogen) in the
same mix and conditions as the secondary antibodies. Then, cells were washed 3 times
of 10 minutes each with PBS, stained with DAPI and mounted on glass slides with Aqua
PolyMount (Polysciences, Inc.). Images were acquired with a confocal microscope
LSM700 or 900 (Zeiss) and processed with the ImageJ or Icy softwares.
741

Western blot

For Western blot SH-SY5Y cells were lysed with lysis buffer composed of 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 20 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 1% Triton X100 with Roche *cOmplete™* Protease Inhibitor Cocktail. Protein concentration was measured by a Bradford protein assay (Bio-Rad). 20 µg of protein were submitted to PAGE (in non-reducing conditions for tetraspanins and ADAM10) followed by western blot analysis. Primary antibodies used for Western blot were: mouse anti-CD9 IgG1 (TS9, 1:1000), mouse anti-CD81 IgG2a (TS81, 1:1000), mouse anti CD63 (1:1000), mouse anti ADAM10 (11G2, 1:1000)[25, 81], rabbit anti-α-GAPDH (Sigma ref: G9545, 1:1000), rabbit anti-β-actin (Cell Signaling ref: 4967, 1:1000), mouse anti-α-tubulin (Sigma ref: T9026, 1:2000), mouse anti-GM130 (BD transduction Laboratories, ref:610822, 1:1000, rabbit ITGB1, ITGB4, ITGA4 (from integrin Ab Sampler kit, Cell signaling ref: 4749, 1:1000), rabbit anti-EGFR (Cell Signaling ref: 4267, 1:1000), rabbit anti-CX43 (Sigma ref: C6219, 1:3000), mouse anti-ANXA2 (Proteintech ref: 66035,1:2000).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of experiments concerning the TNT counting and the DiD transfer assay are described elsewhere [4]. Briefly, the statistical tests were applied using either a logistic regression model computed using the 'glm' function of R software (https://www.R-project.org/) or a mixed effect logistic regression model using the lmer and lmerTest R packages, applying a pairwise comparison test between groups.

All graphs shown in this study have been made with GraphPad Prism version 9.

Bibliography

1. Rustom, A., Saffrich, R., Markovic, I., Walther, P., and Gerdes, H.-H. (2004). Nanotubular highways for intercellular organelle transport. Science *303*, 1007–1010. 10.1126/science.1093133.

2. Sartori-Rupp, A., Cordero Cervantes, D., Pepe, A., Gousset, K., Delage, E., Corroyer-Dulmont, S., Schmitt, C., Krijnse-Locker, J., and Zurzolo, C. (2019). Correlative cryo-electron microscopy reveals the structure of TNTs in neuronal cells. Nat Commun *10*, 342. 10.1038/s41467-018-08178-7.

3. Abounit, S., Bousset, L., Loria, F., Zhu, S., de Chaumont, F., Pieri, L., Olivo-Marin, J.-C., Melki, R., and Zurzolo, C. (2016). Tunneling nanotubes spread fibrillar α-synuclein by intercellular trafficking of lysosomes. The EMBO Journal *35*, 2120–2138. 10.15252/embj.201593411.

4. Pinto, G., Saenz-de-Santa-Maria, I., Chastagner, P., Perthame, E., Delmas, C., Toulas, C., Moyal-Jonathan-Cohen, E., Brou, C., and Zurzolo, C. (2021). Patient-derived glioblastoma stem cells transfer mitochondria through tunneling nanotubes in tumor organoids. Biochem J *478*, 21–39. 10.1042/BCJ20200710.

5. Vargas, J.Y., Loria, F., Wu, Y.-J., Córdova, G., Nonaka, T., Bellow, S., Syan, S., Hasegawa, M., van Woerden, G.M., Trollet, C., et al. (2019). The Wnt/Ca2+ pathway is involved in interneuronal communication mediated by tunneling nanotubes. The EMBO Journal *38*, e101230. 10.15252/embj.2018101230.

6. Dilsizoglu Senol, A., Samarani, M., Syan, S., Guardia, C.M., Nonaka, T., Liv, N.,
Latour-Lambert, P., Hasegawa, M., Klumperman, J., Bonifacino, J.S., et al.
(2021). α-Synuclein fibrils subvert lysosome structure and function for the
propagation of protein misfolding between cells through tunneling nanotubes.
PLoS Biol *19*, e3001287. 10.1371/journal.pbio.3001287.

7. Chastagner, P., Loria, F., Vargas, J.Y., Tois, J., I Diamond, M., Okafo, G., Brou, C.,
and Zurzolo, C. (2020). Fate and propagation of endogenously formed Tau
aggregates in neuronal cells. EMBO Molecular Medicine *12*, e12025.
10.15252/emmm.202012025.

8. Pinto, G., Brou, C., and Zurzolo, C. (2020). Tunneling Nanotubes: The Fuel of
Tumor Progression? Trends in Cancer *6*, 874–888.
10.1016/j.trecan.2020.04.012.

9. Kalargyrou, A.A., Basche, M., Hare, A., West, E.L., Smith, A.J., Ali, R.R., and
Pearson, R.A. (2021). Nanotube-like processes facilitate material transfer
between photoreceptors. EMBO Rep *22*, e53732. 10.15252/embr.202153732.

10. Ortin-Martinez, A., Yan, N.E., Tsai, E.L.S., Comanita, L., Gurdita, A., Tachibana,
N., Liu, Z.C., Lu, S., Dolati, P., Pokrajac, N.T., et al. (2021). Photoreceptor
nanotubes mediate the in vivo exchange of intracellular material. The EMBO
Journal *40*, e107264. 10.15252/embj.2020107264.

11. Alarcon-Martinez, L., Villafranca-Baughman, D., Quintero, H., Kacerovsky, J.B.,
Dotigny, F., Murai, K.K., Prat, A., Drapeau, P., and Di Polo, A. (2020).
Interpericyte tunnelling nanotubes regulate neurovascular coupling. Nature
585, 91–95. [10.1038/s41586-020-2589-x](10.1038/s41586-020-2589-x).

12. Ljubojevic, N., Henderson, J.M., and Zurzolo, C. (2021). The Ways of Actin: Why
Tunneling Nanotubes Are Unique Cell Protrusions. Trends in Cell Biology *31*,
130–142. [10.1016/j.tcb.2020.11.008](10.1016/j.tcb.2020.11.008).

13. Abounit, S., and Zurzolo, C. (2012). Wiring through tunneling nanotubes--from
electrical signals to organelle transfer. J Cell Sci *125*, 1089–1098.
[10.1242/jcs.083279](10.1242/jcs.083279).

14. Charreau, B. (2021). Secretome and Tunneling Nanotubes: A Multilevel
Network for Long Range Intercellular Communication between Endothelial Cells
and Distant Cells. International Journal of Molecular Sciences *22*, 7971.
10.3390/ijms22157971.

15. van Niel, G., Carter, D.R.F., Clayton, A., Lambert, D.W., Raposo, G., and Vader,
P. (2022). Challenges and directions in studying cell–cell communication by
extracellular vesicles. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol *23*, 369–382. [10.1038/s41580-022-00460-3](10.1038/s41580-022-00460-3)
[00460-3](00460-3).

16. Gousset, K., Gordon, A., Kumar Kannan, S., and Tovar, J. (2019). A novel
Microproteomic Approach Using Laser Capture Microdissection to Study
Cellular Protrusions. International Journal of Molecular Sciences *20*, 1172.
10.3390/ijms20051172.

17. Théry, C., Witwer, K.W., Aikawa, E., Alcaraz, M.J., Anderson, J.D.,
Andriantsitohaina, R., Antoniou, A., Arab, T., Archer, F., Atkin-Smith, G.K., et al.
(2018). Minimal information for studies of extracellular vesicles 2018

(MISEV2018): a position statement of the International Society for Extracellular
Vesicles and update of the MISEV2014 guidelines. Journal of Extracellular
Vesicles *7*, 1535750. 10.1080/20013078.2018.1535750.

18. Lachambre, S., Chopard, C., and Beaumelle, B. (2014). Preliminary
characterisation of nanotubes connecting T-cells and their use by HIV-1. Biol
Cell *106*, 394–404. 10.1111/boc.201400037.

19. Charrin, S., le Naour, F., Silvie, O., Milhiet, P.-E., Boucheix, C., and Rubinstein, E.
(2009). Lateral organization of membrane proteins: tetraspanins spin their web.
Biochem J *420*, 133–154. 10.1042/BJ20082422.

20. Charrin, S., Jouannet, S., Boucheix, C., and Rubinstein, E. (2014). Tetraspanins at
a glance. J Cell Sci *127*, 3641–3648. 10.1242/jcs.154906.

21. Hemler, M.E. (2005). Tetraspanin functions and associated microdomains. Nat
Rev Mol Cell Biol *6*, 801–811. 10.1038/nrm1736.

22. Huang, Y., and Yu, L. (2022). Tetraspanin-enriched microdomains: The building
blocks of migrasomes. Cell Insight *1*, 100003. 10.1016/j.cellin.2021.100003.

23. Stipp, C.S., Orlicky, D., and Hemler, M.E. (2001). FPRP, a major, highly
stoichiometric, highly specific CD81- and CD9-associated protein. J Biol Chem
276, 4853–4862. 10.1074/jbc.M009859200.

24. Stipp, C.S., Kolesnikova, T.V., and Hemler, M.E. (2001). EWI-2 is a major CD9
and CD81 partner and member of a novel Ig protein subfamily. J Biol Chem *276*,
40545–40554. 10.1074/jbc.M107338200.

25. Charrin, S., Le Naour, F., Oualid, M., Billard, M., Faure, G., Hanash, S.M.,
Boucheix, C., and Rubinstein, E. (2001). The major CD9 and CD81 molecular
partner. Identification and characterization of the complexes. J Biol Chem *276*,
14329–14337. 10.1074/jbc.M011297200.

26. Charrin, S., Le Naour, F., Labas, V., Billard, M., Le Caer, J.-P., Emile, J.-F., Petit,
M.-A., Boucheix, C., and Rubinstein, E. (2003). EWI-2 is a new component of the
tetraspanin web in hepatocytes and lymphoid cells. Biochem J *373*, 409–421.
10.1042/BJ20030343.

27. Charrin, S., Latil, M., Soave, S., Polesskaya, A., Chrétien, F., Boucheix, C., and
Rubinstein, E. (2013). Normal muscle regeneration requires tight control of
muscle cell fusion by tetraspanins CD9 and CD81. Nat Commun *4*, 1674.
10.1038/ncomms2675.

28. Cohen, J., Wang, L., Marques, S., Ialy-Radio, C., Barbaux, S., Lefèvre, B., Gourier,
C., and Ziyyat, A. (2022). Oocyte ERM and EWI Proteins Are Involved in Mouse
Fertilization. Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology *10*.

29. Whitaker, E.E., Matheson, N.J., Perlee, S., Munson, P.B., Symeonides, M., and
Thali, M. (2019). EWI-2 Inhibits Cell–Cell Fusion at the HIV-1 Virological
Presynapse. Viruses *11*, 1082. 10.3390/v11121082.

30. Pergu, R., Dagar, S., Kumar, H., Kumar, R., Bhattacharya, J., and Mylavarapu,
S.V.S. (2019). The chaperone ERp29 is required for tunneling nanotube
formation by stabilizing MSec. Journal of Biological Chemistry *294*, 7177–7193.
10.1074/jbc.RA118.005659.

31. Pontes, B., Viana, N.B., Campanati, L., Farina, M., Neto, V.M., and Nussenzveig,
H.M. (2008). Structure and elastic properties of tunneling nanotubes. Eur
Biophys J *37*, 121–129. 10.1007/s00249-007-0184-9.

32. Cocozza, F., Grisard, E., Martin-Jaular, L., Mathieu, M., and Théry, C. (2020).
SnapShot: Extracellular Vesicles. Cell *182*, 262-262.e1.
10.1016/j.cell.2020.04.054.

33. Théry, C., Amigorena, S., Raposo, G., and Clayton, A. (2006). Isolation and
characterization of exosomes from cell culture supernatants and biological
fluids. Curr Protoc Cell Biol *Chapter 3*, Unit 3.22.
10.1002/0471143030.cb0322s30.

34. Alvarez, M.L., Khosroheidari, M., Kanchi Ravi, R., and DiStefano, J.K. (2012).
Comparison of protein, microRNA, and mRNA yields using different methods of
urinary exosome isolation for the discovery of kidney disease biomarkers.
Kidney International *82*, 1024–1032. 10.1038/ki.2012.256.

35. Melak, M., Plessner, M., and Grosse, R. (2017). Actin visualization at a glance.
Journal of Cell Science *130*, 525–530. 10.1242/jcs.189068.

36. Gousset, K., Marzo, L., Commere, P.-H., and Zurzolo, C. (2013). Myo10 is a key
regulator of TNT formation in neuronal cells. Journal of Cell Science *126*, 4424–
4435. 10.1242/jcs.129239.

37. Chang, M., Lee, O.-C., Bu, G., Oh, J., Yunn, N.-O., Ryu, S.H., Kwon, H.-B.,
Kolomeisky, A.B., Shim, S.-H., Doh, J., et al. (2022). Formation of cellular close-
ended tunneling nanotubes through mechanical deformation. Sci Adv *8*,
eabj3995. 10.1126/sciadv.abj3995.

38. Haimovich, G., Dasgupta, S., and Gerst, J.E. (2021). RNA transfer through
tunneling nanotubes. Biochem Soc Trans *49*, 145–160. 10.1042/BST20200113.

39. Kolba, M.D., Dudka, W., Zaręba-Kozioł, M., Kominek, A., Ronchi, P., Turos, L.,
Chroscicki, P., Wlodarczyk, J., Schwab, Y., Klejman, A., et al. (2019). Tunneling
nanotube-mediated intercellular vesicle and protein transfer in the stroma-
provided imatinib resistance in chronic myeloid leukemia cells. Cell Death Dis
10, 1–16. 10.1038/s41419-019-2045-8.

40. Lou, E. (2020). A Ticket to Ride: The Implications of Direct Intercellular
Communication via Tunneling Nanotubes in Peritoneal and Other Invasive
Malignancies. Frontiers in Oncology *10*.

41. Resnik, N., Prezelj, T., De Luca, G.M.R., Manders, E., Polishchuk, R., Veranič, P.,
and Kreft, M.E. (2018). Helical organization of microtubules occurs in a minority
of tunneling membrane nanotubes in normal and cancer urothelial cells. Sci
Rep *8*, 17133. 10.1038/s41598-018-35370-y.

42. Resnik, N., Erman, A., Veranič, P., and Kreft, M.E. (2019). Triple labelling of actin
filaments, intermediate filaments and microtubules for broad application in cell
biology: uncovering the cytoskeletal composition in tunneling nanotubes.
Histochem Cell Biol 152, 311–317. 10.1007/s00418-019-01806-3.

43. Horton, E.R., Byron, A., Askari, J.A., Ng, D.H.J., Millon-Frémillon, A., Robertson,
J., Koper, E.J., Paul, N.R., Warwood, S., Knight, D., et al. (2015). Definition of a

consensus integrin adhesome and its dynamics during adhesion complex
assembly and disassembly. Nat Cell Biol *17*, 1577–1587. 10.1038/ncb3257.

44. Jacquemet, G., Stubb, A., Saup, R., Miihkinen, M., Kremneva, E., Hamidi, H., and Ivaska, J. (2019). Filopodome Mapping Identifies p130Cas as a Mechanosensitive Regulator of Filopodia Stability. Current Biology *29*, 202-216.e7. 10.1016/j.cub.2018.11.053.

45. Beck, M., Schmidt, A., Malmstroem, J., Claassen, M., Ori, A., Szymborska, A., Herzog, F., Rinner, O., Ellenberg, J., and Aebersold, R. (2011). The quantitative proteome of a human cell line. Molecular Systems Biology *7*, 549. 10.1038/msb.2011.82.

46. Lundberg, E., Fagerberg, L., Klevebring, D., Matic, I., Geiger, T., Cox, J., Algenäs, C., Lundeberg, J., Mann, M., and Uhlen, M. (2010). Defining the transcriptome and proteome in three functionally different human cell lines. Mol Syst Biol *6*, 450. 10.1038/msb.2010.106.

47. Jouannet, S., Saint-Pol, J., Fernandez, L., Nguyen, V., Charrin, S., Boucheix, C., Brou, C., Milhiet, P.-E., and Rubinstein, E. (2016). TspanC8 tetraspanins differentially regulate the cleavage of ADAM10 substrates, Notch activation and ADAM10 membrane compartmentalization. Cell Mol Life Sci *73*, 1895–1915. 10.1007/s00018-015-2111-z.

48. Boucheix, C., and Rubinstein, E. (2001). Tetraspanins. Cell Mol Life Sci *58*, 1189–1205. 10.1007/PL00000933.

49. Pepe, A., Pietropaoli, S., Vos, M., Barba-Spaeth, G., and Zurzolo, C. (2022). Tunneling nanotubes provide a route for SARS-CoV-2 spreading. Sci Adv *8*, eabo0171. 10.1126/sciadv.abo0171.

50. Abounit, S., Delage, E., and Zurzolo, C. (2015). Identification and Characterization of Tunneling Nanotubes for Intercellular Trafficking. Current Protocols in Cell Biology *67*, 12.10.1-12.10.21. 10.1002/0471143030.cb1210s67.

51. Bari, R., Guo, Q., Xia, B., Zhang, Y.H., Giesert, E.E., Levy, S., Zheng, J.J., and Zhang, X.A. (2011). Tetraspanins regulate the protrusive activities of cell membrane. Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications *415*, 619–626. 10.1016/j.bbrc.2011.10.121.

52. Umeda, R., Satouh, Y., Takemoto, M., Nakada-Nakura, Y., Liu, K., Yokoyama, T., Shirouzu, M., Iwata, S., Nomura, N., Sato, K., et al. (2020). Structural insights into tetraspanin CD9 function. Nat Commun *11*, 1606. 10.1038/s41467-020-15459-7.

53. Nydegger, S., Khurana, S., Krementsov, D.N., Foti, M., and Thali, M. (2006). Mapping of tetraspanin-enriched microdomains that can function as gateways for HIV-1. Journal of Cell Biology *173*, 795–807. 10.1083/jcb.200508165.

54. Khurana, S., Krementsov, D.N., de Parseval, A., Elder, J.H., Foti, M., and Thali, M. (2007). Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1 and Influenza Virus Exit via Different Membrane Microdomains. J Virol *81*, 12630–12640. 10.1128/JVI.01255-07.

55. Singethan, K., Müller, N., Schubert, S., Lüttge, D., Krementsov, D.N., Khurana, S.R., Krohne, G., Schneider-Schaulies, S., Thali, M., and Schneider-Schaulies, J. (2008). CD9 Clustering and Formation of Microvilli Zippers Between Contacting Cells Regulates Virus-Induced Cell Fusion. Traffic 9, 924–935. 10.1111/j.1600-0854.2008.00737.x.

56. Liao, Y.-C., Fernandopulle, M.S., Wang, G., Choi, H., Hao, L., Drerup, C.M., Patel, R., Qamar, S., Nixon-Abell, J., Shen, Y., et al. (2019). RNA Granules Hitchhike on Lysosomes for Long-Distance Transport, Using Annexin A11 as a Molecular Tether. Cell 179, 147-164.e20. 10.1016/j.cell.2019.08.050.

57. Lesnik, C., Golani-Armon, A., and Arava, Y. (2015). Localized translation near the mitochondrial outer membrane: An update. RNA Biology 12, 801–809. 10.1080/15476286.2015.1058686.

58. Cioni, J.-M., Lin, J.Q., Holtermann, A.V., Koppers, M., Jakobs, M.A.H., Azizi, A., Turner-Bridger, B., Shigeoka, T., Franze, K., Harris, W.A., et al. (2019). Late Endosomes Act as mRNA Translation Platforms and Sustain Mitochondria in Axons. Cell 176, 56-72.e15. 10.1016/j.cell.2018.11.030.

59. Garde, A., Kenny, I.W., Kelley, L.C., Chi, Q., Mutlu, A.S., Wang, M.C., and Sherwood, D.R. (2022). Localized glucose import, glycolytic processing, and mitochondria generate a focused ATP burst to power basement-membrane invasion. Developmental Cell 57, 732-749.e7. 10.1016/j.devcel.2022.02.019.

60. Wang, V.M.-Y., Ferreira, R.M.M., Almagro, J., Evan, T., Legrave, N., Zaw Thin, M., Frith, D., Carvalho, J., Barry, D.J., Snijders, A.P., et al. (2019). CD9 identifies pancreatic cancer stem cells and modulates glutamine metabolism to fuel tumour growth. Nat Cell Biol 21, 1425–1435. 10.1038/s41556-019-0407-1.

61. Addi, C., Presle, A., Frémont, S., Cuvelier, F., Rocancourt, M., Milin, F., Schmutz, S., Chamot-Rooke, J., Douché, T., Duchateau, M., et al. (2020). The Flemmingsome reveals an ESCRT-to-membrane coupling via ALIX/syntenin/syndecan-4 required for completion of cytokinesis. Nat Commun 11, 1941. 10.1038/s41467-020-15205-z.

62. Ma, L., Li, Y., Peng, J., Wu, D., Zhao, X., Cui, Y., Chen, L., Yan, X., Du, Y., and Yu, L. (2015). Discovery of the migrasome, an organelle mediating release of cytoplasmic contents during cell migration. Cell Res 25, 24–38. 10.1038/cr.2014.135.

63. Huang, Y., Zucker, B., Zhang, S., Elias, S., Zhu, Y., Chen, H., Ding, T., Li, Y., Sun, Y., Lou, J., et al. (2019). Migrasome formation is mediated by assembly of micron-scale tetraspanin macrodomains. Nat Cell Biol 21, 991–1002. 10.1038/s41556-019-0367-5.

64. Huang, Y., Zhang, X., Wang, H.-W., and Yu, L. (2022). Assembly of Tetraspanin-enriched macrodomains contains membrane damage to facilitate repair. Nat Cell Biol 24, 825–832. 10.1038/s41556-022-00920-0.

65. Zhao, X., Lei, Y., Zheng, J., Peng, J., Li, Y., Yu, L., and Chen, Y. (2019). Identification of markers for migrasome detection. Cell Discov 5, 1–4. 10.1038/s41421-019-0093-y.

66. Huang, C., Fu, C., Wren, J.D., Wang, X., Zhang, F., Zhang, Y.H., Connel, S.A., Chen, T., and Zhang, X.A. (2018). Tetraspanin-enriched Microdomains Regulate Digitation Junctions. Cell Mol Life Sci 75, 3423–3439. 10.1007/s00018-018-2803-2.

67. Zimmerman, B., Kelly, B., McMillan, B.J., Seegar, T.C.M., Dror, R.O., Kruse, A.C., and Blacklow, S.C. (2016). Crystal Structure of a Full-Length Human Tetraspanin Reveals a Cholesterol-Binding Pocket. Cell *167*, 1041-1051.e11. 10.1016/j.cell.2016.09.056.

68. Rubinstein, E., Ziyyat, A., Prenant, M., Wrobel, E., Wolf, J.-P., Levy, S., Le Naour, F., and Boucheix, C. (2006). Reduced fertility of female mice lacking CD81. Developmental Biology *290*, 351–358. 10.1016/j.ydbio.2005.11.031.

69. Rubinstein, E., Ziyyat, A., Wolf, J.-P., Le Naour, F., and Boucheix, C. (2006). The molecular players of sperm–egg fusion in mammals. Seminars in Cell & Developmental Biology *17*, 254–263. 10.1016/j.semcdb.2006.02.012.

70. Kaji, K., Oda, S., Miyazaki, S., and Kudo, A. (2002). Infertility of CD9-Deficient Mouse Eggs Is Reversed by Mouse CD9, Human CD9, or Mouse CD81; Polyadenylated mRNA Injection Developed for Molecular Analysis of Sperm–Egg Fusion. Developmental Biology *247*, 327–334. 10.1006/dbio.2002.0694.

71. Ishii, M., Iwai, K., Koike, M., Ohshima, S., Kudo-Tanaka, E., Ishii, T., Mima, T., Katada, Y., Miyatake, K., Uchiyama, Y., et al. (2006). RANKL-Induced Expression of Tetraspanin CD9 in Lipid Raft Membrane Microdomain Is Essential for Cell Fusion During Osteoclastogenesis. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research *21*, 965–976. 10.1359/jbmr.060308.

72. Takeda, Y., Tachibana, I., Miyado, K., Kobayashi, M., Miyazaki, T., Funakoshi, T., Kimura, H., Yamane, H., Saito, Y., Goto, H., et al. (2003). Tetraspanins CD9 and CD81 function to prevent the fusion of mononuclear phagocytes. Journal of Cell Biology *161*, 945–956. 10.1083/jcb.200212031.

73. Tyanova, S., Temu, T., and Cox, J. (2016). The MaxQuant computational platform for mass spectrometry-based shotgun proteomics. Nat Protoc *11*, 2301–2319. 10.1038/nprot.2016.136.

74. Wieczorek, S., Combes, F., Lazar, C., Giai Gianetto, Q., Gatto, L., Dorffer, A., Hesse, A.-M., Couté, Y., Ferro, M., Bruley, C., et al. (2017). DAPAR & ProStaR: software to perform statistical analyses in quantitative discovery proteomics. Bioinformatics *33*, 135–136. 10.1093/bioinformatics/btw580.

75. Pounds, S., and Cheng, C. (2006). Robust estimation of the false discovery rate. Bioinformatics *22*, 1979–1987. 10.1093/bioinformatics/btl328.

76. Smyth, G.K. (2004). Linear Models and Empirical Bayes Methods for Assessing Differential Expression in Microarray Experiments. Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology *3*. 10.2202/1544-6115.1027.

77. Giai Gianetto, Q., Combes, F., Ramus, C., Bruley, C., Couté, Y., and Burger, T. (2016). Calibration plot for proteomics: A graphical tool to visually check the assumptions underlying FDR control in quantitative experiments. PROTEOMICS *16*, 29–32. 10.1002/pmic.201500189.

78. Liebermeister, W., Noor, E., Flamholz, A., Davidi, D., Bernhardt, J., and Milo, R.
(2014). Visual account of protein investment in cellular functions. Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences *111*, 8488–8493.
10.1073/pnas.1314810111.
79. Sherman, B.T., Hao, M., Qiu, J., Jiao, X., Baseler, M.W., Lane, H.C., Imamichi, T.,
and Chang, W. (2022). DAVID: a web server for functional enrichment analysis
and functional annotation of gene lists (2021 update). Nucleic Acids Research
50, W216–W221. 10.1093/nar/gkac194.
80. Szklarczyk, D., Gable, A.L., Nastou, K.C., Lyon, D., Kirsch, R., Pyysalo, S.,
Doncheva, N.T., Legeay, M., Fang, T., Bork, P., et al. (2021). The STRING
database in 2021: customizable protein-protein networks, and functional
characterization of user-uploaded gene/measurement sets. Nucleic Acids Res
49, D605–D612. 10.1093/nar/gkaa1074.
81. Arduise, C., Abache, T., Li, L., Billard, M., Chabanon, A., Ludwig, A., Mauduit, P.,
Boucheix, C., Rubinstein, E., and Naour, F.L. (2008). Tetraspanins Regulate
ADAM10-Mediated Cleavage of TNF-α and Epidermal Growth Factor. The
Journal of Immunology *181*, 7002–7013. 10.4049/jimmunol.181.10.7002.

1061
1062

Figure legends

1064
Figure 1: Validation of the purification procedures
A. Workflow for TNT vs. EVP purification. EVPs were purified from cell culture
supernatant, TNTs from remaining attached cell supernatant after shaking.
*indicates the fraction used for nanoFCM analysis.
B. Schematic representation of stable cell lines where green color indicates the
location of GFP-tagged protein: H2B-GFP (nuclear), actin chromobody-GFP (actin
cytoskeleton including TNTs) and GFP-CD9 (cell surface, TNTs, EVPs).
C. Scatter dot plot representing the mean percentage (with SD) of GFP-positive
particles analyzed by nanoFCM. Statistical analysis of 4 independent
experiments (6 for GFP-CD9, oneway Anova with Tukey post hoc correction)
show the following respective p-values (from top): blue*: 0.0252, red**: 0.0089,
red*: 0.0131, black*: 0.0161. Means values are (from left to right): 0.01, 0.3, 4.8,
1.75, 0.17, 37.07, 27.7 and 11.6.
D. Western blot of WCE (20µg, corresponding to around 0.1×10^6 cells), TNT and EVP
fractions (both from $10 \ 10^6$ cells) prepared from the same cells, blotted with CD9,
α-tubulin and GM130 specific antibodies. White lane indicates that intervening
lanes of the same gel (and same exposure) have been spliced out.
1082
1083 Figure 2: Analysis of the TNTome
1084 A. Proteomap of the 1177 proteins of the TNTome, sorted in 4 quartiles depending
1085 on their mean iBAQ. Protein accession and mean iBAQ was used to create
1086 ProteoMap, analyzed according to Gene Ontology.

B. STRING physical association network for the cytoskeleton-related proteins listed in table S2. Color groups were created using Cytoscape. Green are microtubule-related proteins, blue are intermediate filaments, orange are actin-interacting proteins. Blue and pink edges show physical interactions based on databases and experiments respectively.

C. Full STRING functional association network for integral surface membrane proteins of TNTome, based on table S3. Orange are Integrin proteins, red are Ephrin receptors, dark green are Cadherins, light green are Sodium/potassium transporting ATPase ions channels, purple are monocarboxylate and amino acids transporters, and yellow are tetraspanin-related proteins.

D. Volcano plot of the mass spectrometry analysis based on the 4 EVP and TNT preparations, showing the maximum log2(Fold-change) in x-axis measured between TNT and EVP fractions and the corresponding -log10 (p-value) in y-axis. Dashed lines indicate differential analysis quadrants with log2 (Fold-change) =0.58 and false discovery rate FDR = 1%. Common EVP=TNT are non-significantly different (FDR >0.05) with FC>1.5, and FC<1.5. Each quadrant is named above and the number of identified proteins is indicated. Left and right are proteins non overlapping in both fractions: TNT-only and EVP only. Note that in EVP-only fraction, 10 proteins were found in TNTome (based on 12 experiments) and should therefore be removed. For the TNT proteins, only the proteins also present in TNTome have been counted.

Figure 3: Expression of CD9/CD81 in TNTs and effects of their overexpression or invalidation

A. Immunofluorescence of CD9 (green) and CD81 (red) in SH-SY5Y cells. Cells were also stained with phalloidin (magenta) and DAPI (blue) to visualize actin and nuclei. This representative image corresponds to the 4th to 5th slices of a stack comprising 11 slices (1 being at the bottom).

B. Representative images of TNT-connected cells in WT, CD9 KO, CD81 KO and CD9&CD81 KO cells, stained with WGA-488 (green) to label the membrane and DAPI (blue) to label the nuclei.

C. Graph of the % of TNT-connected cells in the different cells, from 3 independent experiments. Mean and standard deviation (SD) are: WT = 31.6 ± 1.25; CD9 KO = 25.2 ± 1.24; CD81 KO = 30.4 ± 1.65; CD9 & CD81 KO = 16.3 ± 4.81. p-values are indicated above the brackets in all graphs.

D. Representative images of TNT-connected cells in WT, CD9 OE and CD81 OE cells, stained as in B. Yellow arrowheads show TNTs and scale bars correspond to 10 µm in A, B and D.

E. Graph of the % of TNT-connected cells in the indicated cells from 3 independent experiments. Mean ± SD are: WT = 29.8 ± 1.11; CD9 OE = 45.3 ± 3.17; CD81 OE = 29.5 ± 0.84.

F. Vesicle transfer assay from donor cells KO of CD9 and CD81, as schematized on the left. Graphs are % of acceptor cells containing DiD vesicles from 3 independent experiments. Mean ± SD are: WT = 32.7 ± 10.25; CD9 KO = 18.4 ± 8; CD81 KO = 19.1 ± 4.86; CD9 & CD81 KO = 10.5 ± 1.52.

G. Vesicle transfer assay from donor cells OE CD9 or CD81, as schematized on the left. Graphs are % of acceptor cells containing DiD vesicles from 3 independent

experiments. Mean ± SD are: WT = 29.3 ± 7.45; CD9 OE = 61.3 ± 20.44; CD81 OE = 55.6 ± 10.31.

Figure 4: CD9 antibody treatment in WT and CD81 KO cells

A. Immunofluorescence of CD9 (green) and CD81 (red) in SH-SY5Y WT cells treated with control antibodies (CTR AB) or with antibodies anti-CD9 (CD9 AB) for 2 hours followed by PFA fixation and incubation with anti-CD81 (for CD9 AB samples) or anti-CD81 + anti-CD9 (for CTR AB samples) and appropriate fluorescent secondary antibodies. This representative image corresponds to the 3th to 4th slices of a stack comprising 12 slices for CTR AB and to the 3th to 4th slices of a stack comprising 11 slices for CD9 AB. Cells were also stained with phalloidin (magenta) and DAPI (blue) to visualize actin and nuclei respectively. The scale bars correspond to 10 μm.

B. Schematic of the antibody treatment experiment. Coculture of WT SH-SY5Y donor cells (DiD in yellow circles to stain the vesicles) and WT GFP-labeled acceptor cells were treated with control antibodies (CTR AB) or with antibodies anti-CD9 (CD9 AB) for an additional 2 hours.

C. Graph of the % of TNT-connected cells in CTR AB or CD9 AB treatment in WT cells. Mean ± SD (N=3) are: CTR AB = 28.8 ± 1.32; CD9 AB = 37.4 ± 0.80.

D. Graph of the % of acceptor cells containing DiD vesicles of the cocultures of WT cells with CTR AB or CD9 AB treatment. Mean ± SD (N=3) are: CTR AB = 27.7 ± 2.48; CD9 AB = 36.8 ± 3.03.

E. Immunofluorescence of CD9 (green) in SH-SY5Y CD81 KO cells treated with control antibodies (CTR AB) or with antibodies anti-CD9 (CD9 AB) for 2 hours followed by PFA fixation and incubation with anti-CD9 (for CTR AB samples) and appropriate fluorescent secondary antibodies. This representative image corresponds to the 3th to 4th slices of a stack comprising 10 slices for CTR AB and to the 5th to 6th slices of a stack comprising 12 slices for CD9 AB. Cells were also stained with phalloidin (magenta) and DAPI (blue) to visualize actin and nuclei respectively. Scale bars are 10 μm.

F. Schematic showing the coculture strategy adapted from B to the antibody treatment in SH-SY5Y CD81 KO cells.

G. Graph of the % of TNT-connected cells in the coculture and antibody treatment described in F. Mean ± SD (N=3): CTR AB = 28.8 ± 0.68; CD9 AB = 43 ± 2.23.

H. Graph of the % of acceptor cells containing DiD vesicles of the experiment schematized in F. Mean ± SD (N=3): CTR AB = 20.6 ± 1.67; CD9 AB = 20.6 ± 2.16

Figure 5: CD9 and CD81 act successively in the formation of TNTs

A. Representative images of WT, CD9 OE, CD9 OE + CD81 KO, CD81 OE and CD81 OE + CD9 KO cells, stained with WGA-488 (green) and DAPI (blue). Yellow arrowheads show TNTs. Scale bars correspond to 10 μm.

B. Graph of the % of TNT-connected cells in the tetraspanin OE + KO cells. Mean ± SD (N=3) are: WT = 28.6 ± 2.05; CD9 OE = 44.2 ± 2.4; CD9 OE + CD81 KO = 48.2 ± 2.16; CD81 OE = 29.5 ± 1.36; CD81 OE + CD9 KO = 20.2 ± 2.09. p-values are above the brackets.

C. Coculture between tetraspanin OE + KO cells used as donors and WT GFP cells used as acceptors, as schematized on the left. The graph shows the % of acceptor cells containing DiD vesicles. Mean ± SD from 3 independent experiments: WT = 26.1 ± 8.94; CD9 OE = 73.8 ± 12.64; CD9 OE + CD81 KO = 87.7 ± 5.11; CD81 OE = 73 ± 14.60; CD81 OE + CD9 KO = 45.4 ± 11.53.

Supplementary tables:

Table S1: the full TNTome (1177 proteins), from 12 independent samples, proteins were conserved when present in more than 9 replicats, ranked in 4 quartiles (from higher to lower mean iBAQ) represented in different colors (orange Q1, green Q2, pink Q3, blue Q4). iBAQ of each sample is indicated for each protein.

Table S2: Cytoskeleton-associated proteins of the TNTome. Proteins identified by GO term analysis (cellular components), except those associated to proteasome, RNA and mitochondria, are ranked according to their quartile assignement (orange Q1, green Q2, pink Q3, blue Q4).

Table S3: Membrane-related proteins identified by GO term analysis (cellular components). Mitochondrial and other organelles membrane proteins have been discarded from GO analysis. Tab 1 lists all membrane and membrane-associated proteins, tab 2 only the integral membrane proteins, ranked according to their quartile assignement (orange Q1, green Q2, pink Q3, blue Q4) and from more abundant to less abundant. Integrins, Ephrin receptors, Cadherins and tetraspanin-related proteins are highlighted respectively in orange, red, dark gree and yellow as indicated in tab2.

Table S4: comparison of TNTome and Integrin adhesion complexes
Tab1 shows the common elements in integrin adhesion complexes (2240 proteins according to Horton et al, 2015) and in TNTome: 765 proteins listed in alphabetical order of the gene name (yellow background). On the right (blue background) are the 413 elements included exclusively in TNTome. Tab2 shows the 26 common elements in consensus adhesome (Horton 2015) and TNTome.

Table S5: TNT-only proteins
Tab1 (total) shows the 174 proteins present in TNT preparations and absent from EVPs. Tab2 (constitutive) shows the 89 TNT-only proteins without proteins described as mitochondrial, nuclear, ER or RNA-related. In yellow background are cytoskeleton-related proteins (20%).

Table S6: overlapping proteins between TNTs and EVPs
Tab1 (TOT TNT>EVP) shows the proteins more abundant in TNTs compared to EVPs, cleaned of nuclear, mitochondrial or RNA-related described proteins in tab2 (TNT>EVP). In yellow background are cytoskeleton-related proteins (29%).

Table S7: Common proteins between TNTome and protrusions from hCAD cells described in *Gousset et al., 2019*. The 190 proteins present in 2 samples of hCAD (mouse

1227   CAD cells treated with H2O2) were converted to their human ortholog, next compared

1228   to the 1177 proteins of table S1.

1229

1230

1231

1232

1233

1234

Figure 1

A

1. Cells cultured in serum-free medium for 24 h.

EVPs

2. Cell supernatant collection, low-speed centrifugation (2x), concentration on Vivaspin (MWCO 10kD), centrifugation at 10,000g to remove cell debris*, ultracentrifugation at 100,000g (2x).

TNTs

3. PBS wash, shaking, supernatant collection, low-speed centrifugation (2x), filtration on 0.45μm*, ultracentrifugation at 100,000g.

*: nanoFCM analysis point

B

WT

H2B-GFP

actin chr-GFP

GFP-CD9

C

EVP   TNT

Percentage of GFP-positive particles

WT   H2B-GFP   Actin chr-GFP   GFP-CD9

D

WCE   TNT   EVP

CD63

CD9

α-tubulin

GM130

1   2   3

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5