The CD4 transmembrane GGXXG and juxtamembrane (C/F)CV+C motifs mediate pMHCII-specific signaling independently of CD4-LCK interactions

Mark S. Lee[1], Peter J. Tuohy[1], Caleb Y. Kim[1], Philip Yost[1], Katrina Lichauco[1], Heather L. Parrish[1], Koenraad Van Doorslaer[1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], and Michael S. Kuhns[1, 3, 4, 5, 6]

[1] Department of Immunobiology, The University of Arizona College of Medicine, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA.

[2] School of Animal and Comparative Biomedical Sciences, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA.

[3] Cancer Biology Graduate Interdisciplinary Program and Genetics Graduate Interdisciplinary Program, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA.

[4] The BIO-5 Institute, The University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85724, USA.

[5] The University of Arizona Cancer Center, Tucson, AZ, USA

[6] The Arizona Center on Aging, The University of Arizona College of Medicine, Tucson, AZ, USA

*Correspondence: vandoorslaer@arizona.edu, mkuhns@email.arizona.edu

Running title: The CD4 GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs are key determinants of pMHCII-specific signaling.

Abstract

33
CD4$^+$ T cell activation is driven by 5-module receptor complexes. The T cell receptor
(TCR) is the receptor module that binds composite surfaces of peptide antigens
embedded within MHCII molecules (pMHCII). It associates with three signaling modules
(CD3$\gamma\varepsilon$, CD3$\delta\varepsilon$, and CD3$\zeta\zeta$) to form TCR-CD3 complexes. CD4 is the coreceptor
module. It reciprocally associates with TCR-CD3-pMHCII assemblies on the outside of a
CD4$^+$ T cells and with the Src kinase, LCK, on the inside. Previously, we reported that
the CD4 transmembrane GGXXG and cytoplasmic juxtamembrane (C/F)CV+C motifs
found in eutherian (placental mammal) CD4 have constituent residues that evolved
under purifying selection (Lee, et al., 2022). Expressing mutants of these motifs
together in T cell hybridomas increased CD4-LCK association but reduced CD3ζ,
ZAP70, and PLCγ1 phosphorylation levels, as well as IL-2 production, in response to
agonist pMHCII. Because these mutants preferentially localized CD4-LCK pairs to non-
raft membrane fractions, one explanation for our results was that they impaired proximal
signaling by sequestering LCK away from TCR-CD3. An alternative hypothesis is that
the mutations directly impacted signaling because the motifs normally play an LCK-
independent role in signaling. The goal of this study was to discriminate between these
possibilities. Using T cell hybridomas, our results indicate that: intracellular CD4-LCK
interactions are not necessary for pMHCII-specific signal initiation; the GGXXG and
(C/F)CV+C motifs are key determinants of CD4-mediated pMHCII-specific signal
amplification; the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs exert their functions independently of
direct CD4-LCK association. These data provide a mechanistic explanation for why
residues within these motifs are under purifying selection in jawed vertebrates. The
results are also important to consider for biomimetic engineering of synthetic receptors.

Introduction

Delineating the mechanistic principles by which multi-module receptors drive complex biological processes is important both for our broad understanding of receptor biology, and for guiding biomimetic engineering of synthetic receptors for therapeutic purposes. For example, the design of conventional single-chain chimeric antigen receptors (CARs) utilized in CAR-T cell therapy was informed by an early 1990's understanding of receptor biology and bears little resemblance to the multi-module receptors that naturally drive T cell responses. These design differences necessitate that conventional CARs integrate with the T cell intracellular signaling machinery differently than their natural counterparts, leading us to posit that fully coopting T cell functions with synthetic receptors requires that they be designed to integrate with the T cell's intracellular signaling machinery in a way that mimics the native receptors (Harris and Kranz, 2016; Kobayashi et al., 2020; Wu et al., 2020). Achieving this goal requires a more complete understanding of the multi-module receptors that mediate antigen-specific T cell activation. In particular, understanding how CD4^{+} T cells respond to antigen is important for informing biomimetic engineering of CARs because recent data show that redirecting CD4^{+} T cells with CARs is important for long-lived therapeutic efficacy (Melenhorst et al., 2022).

CD4^{+} T cells are driven by 5-module receptors that recognize peptide antigens embedded within MHCII (pMHCII). Each naïve CD4^{+} T cell expresses a clonotypic receptor module, called the T cell receptor (TCR), that binds specifically to unique features of composite pMHCII surfaces (Kuhns and Badgandi, 2012; Kuhns and Davis, 2012). The TCR lacks intracellular signaling domains and instead assembles with three

signaling modules (CD3$\gamma\varepsilon$, $\delta\varepsilon$, and $\zeta\zeta$) that have immunoreceptor tyrosine-based

activation motifs (ITAMs), and other motifs, to connect TCR-pMHCII interactions to the

intracellular signaling apparatus. CD4 is the coreceptor module. It binds pMHCII in a

reciprocal fashion with TCR-CD3 on the outside of CD4$^+$ T cells and interacts with the

Src kinase, LCK, via an intracellular CQC zinc clasp motif and helix (Huse et al., 1998;

Kim et al., 2003). According to the TCR signaling paradigm, co-engagement of pMHCII

by TCR-CD3 and CD4 positions LCK and the CD3 ITAMs in the proper spatial proximity

to enable LCK phosphorylation of the CD3 ITAMs to initiate signaling (Rudd, 2021).

However, when we tested this model directly we found that CD4-LCK interactions are

not key determinants of CD3ζ ITAM phosphorylation (pCD3ζ)(Lee et al., 2022). Based

on our work and that of other labs, including a study showing that C-terminally truncated

CD4 lacking the motifs that mediate CD4-LCK interactions can nevertheless drive CD4$^+$

T cell development, proliferation, and T-helper functions, we consider the question of

how intracellular pMHCII-specific CD4$^+$ T cell signaling is initiated to be unresolved

(Glassman et al., 2018; Horkova et al., 2023; Killeen and Littman, 1993; Xu and Littman,

1993).

The answer to this question lies with how the 5 modules of pMHCII receptors

evolved over ~435 million years to refine pMHCII-specific signaling. We have therefore

taken a systems biology approach to computationally analyze data from real world

experiments performed in 99 jawed vertebrate species under a variety of conditions

over the course of evolution. By computationally reconstructing the evolutionary history

of CD4, we identify residues and motifs in the extracellular, transmembrane, and

intracellular domains that are of predicted to be functionally important (Lee et al., 2022).

We then cross-validated these findings using a well-established T cell hybridoma

experimental system ($58\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells) wherein we performed structure-function analysis of

mutants of key motifs to infer their function by evaluating the phenotypes of the mutants

relative to the wildtype (WT). When we mutated the intracellular CQC clasp and IKRLL

helix motifs that are known to mediate CD4-LCK interactions, we observed significant

reductions in CD4-LCK association; yet we did not observe the predicted decrease in

CD3ζ ITAM phosphorylation (pCD3ζ). In contrast, when we mutated the

transmembrane GGXXG motif and cytoplasmic juxtamembrane (C/F)CV+C

palmitoylation motif, we observed an increased frequency of CD4-LCK pairs that were

preferentially localized to detergent soluble membrane domains. We also found

evidence of reduced CD3ζ, ZAP70, and PLCγ1 phosphorylation (pCD3ζ, pZAP70, and

pPLCγ1) compared with WT CD4. The reason that constituent residues of these motifs

evolved under purifying selection therefore appears to be due to reduced signaling in

response to pMHCII when the motifs are altered. We took these data as evidence that

the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs arose in eutherians (placental mammals) to tightly

regulate pMHCII-specific signal initiation and postulated that the mutant CD4 molecules

might sequester LCK away from TCR-CD3 to prevent CD3ζ phosphorylation. An

alternative hypothesis is that the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs impact pCD3ζ levels

independently of CD4-LCK interactions.

In the present study we tested these hypotheses by studying the impact of

GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motif mutants individually, or together, on proximal pMHCII-

specific signaling in C-terminally truncated CD4 molecules (T1). Working with T1

eliminated motifs in the intracellular domain, including those that mediate CD4-LCK

association. As expected from prior work, truncating CD4 relieved CD4-LCK interactions

and reduced IL-2 production. However, there was no impact on the average pCD3ζ

levels or the percent of cells with phosphorylated CD3ζ when compared with WT CD4,

despite significantly reduced levels of CD4-LCK pairs. These data provide further

evidence that the core tenet of the TCR signaling paradigm, wherein CD4 recruits LCK

to CD3 ITAMs initiates signaling, needs revising. Importantly, T1 molecules bearing

mutations in the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs individually or together reduced IL-2

production as well as pCD3ζ levels and other TCR-proximal signaling events. The

simplest interpretation of these data is that the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs are key

determinants of pMHCII-specific signaling on their own, independent of CD4-LCK

interactions.

Results

The goal of this study was to evaluate if the transmembrane GGXXG and

juxtamembrane (C/F)CV+C palmitoylation motifs, which are highly conserved in

eutherians (placental mammals) and contain constituent residues under purifying

selection (**Figure 1**), influence pMHCII-specific proximal signaling on their own rather

than by sequestering CD4-LCK pairs away from membrane rafts. Accordingly, we used

58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridomas transduced to express the 5c.c7 TCR along with either the WT

or mutant CD4 constructs described in **Table 1**. The well-characterized 5c.c7 TCR

recognizes the moth cytochrome c peptide 88-103 (MCC) in the context of mouse

MHCII I-E^k. We used this experimental system because 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells were used in

seminal work to link CD4-LCK association to IL-2 production (Glaichenhaus et al.,

1991). Specifically, mutating or removing the intracellular CQC clasp motif was shown in

that study to reduce both CD4-LCK association and signaling output as measured by IL-

2 production. We confirmed those findings in our recent study (Lee et al., 2022).

WT and T1 equivalently enhance pMHCII-specific proximal signaling. Previously

we reported that the C-terminally truncated mouse CD4 T1 mutant (**Table 1 and Figure**

1 arrow) reduces but does not prevent IL-2 production relative to WT CD4 despite

lacking most of the intracellular domain, including the CQC clasp and IKRLL motifs

shown to mediate CD4-LCK association (Lee et al., 2022). Because T1 maintains both

the transmembrane GGXXG and juxtamembrane (C/F)CV+C motifs, we reasoned that it

had utility for studying the contributions these motifs make to pMHCII-specific signaling

in the absence of CD4-LCK interactions.

Accordingly, we generated 5c.c7$^+$ 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells expressing WT CD4, T1, or T1

combined with our previously reported Δbind mutant that disrupts binding to pMHCII in

the CD4 D1 domain. This T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutant allowed us to eliminate the contributions of

CD4-pMHCII interactions as well as CD4-LCK interactions (**Table 1 and Figure 2 –**

figure supplement 1)(Glassman et al., 2016; Glassman et al., 2018; Parrish et al.,

2015). The goals were to: 1) determine if T1 significantly impairs pMHCII-specific

signaling events, relative to WT, as expected because it lacks the CQC and IKRLL

motifs that mediate CD4-LCK interactions; 2) use T1$^{\Delta bind}$ to establish the baseline above

which pMHCII-dependent assembly of CD4 with TCR-CD3 contributes to signaling. The

T1 mutant produced measurable IL-2 (response magnitude ~61% of WT, **Table 2**) that

was consistently reduced across a range of MCC peptide concentrations compared to

WT, whereas the T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutant did not produce IL-2. We also observed reduced

pMHCII-specific endocytosis for T1 and T1$^{\Delta bind}$ compared to WT (**Figure 2A and Figure**

2 – figure supplement 2). These data indicate that, in our system, extracellular CD4-

pMHCII engagement is essential for IL-2 production while the CD4 intracellular domain

C-terminal of R422 contributes to IL-2 production, but is not absolutely necessary in the

absence of other elements of the intracellular domain.

Next, we evaluated the impact of these mutations on proximal signaling events

measured by flow cytometry in response to antigen presenting cells (APCs) expressing

agonist MCC:I-E^k after background subtraction of signal levels in response to APCs

expressing null Hb:I-E^k (**Figure 2 – figure supplement 3**). Our analysis of five

independently generated pairs of WT and T1 cell lines showed variable difference in

pCD3ζ levels. For three pairs of lines, the T1 response was higher than the WT and for

two it was lower (**Figure 2B**). The averages of the T1 response normalized to the paired

WT controls showed no difference between the population. There were also no

differences for the average percent of T1 cells with response levels to MCC that were

above background responses to the null Hb peptide compared to their paired WT

controls. Similar results were observed for pZAP70 and pPLCγ1 levels (**Figure 2 –**

figure supplement 4). These data, summarized in **Table 2,** provide evidence that CD4-

LCK interactions via the CQC clasp and IKRLL motifs are not key determinants of

pMHCII-specific early signal events in this experimental system.

In comparison, the T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutant significantly reduced pCD3ζ, pZAP70, or

pPLCγ1 levels compared to the T1 control but, interestingly, did not impact the percent

of cells responding to agonist MCC:I-E^k (**Figure 2C and Figure 2 – figure supplement**

5). Because the antibodies used to detect pCD3ζ, pZAP70, and pPLCγ1 recognize

single phosphorylated tyrosines, these data indicate that CD4 enhances the number of

TCR-CD3 complexes per cell with phosphorylated CD3ζ molecules at Y142 (same in

human and mouse), as well as the number of phosphorylated ZAP70 and PLCγ1

molecules per cell, in a manner that is dependent on TCR-CD3 and CD4 co-

engagement of pMHCII but independent of the intracellular domain C-terminal of R422.

A summary of these results can be found in **Table 3**. A key takeaway is that the

average pCD3ζ levels for three independently generated T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutants was 54.86% of

the T1 control (p<0.001). CD3ζ phosphorylation therefore occurs upon TCR

engagement of cognate pMHCII in the absence of CD4-pMHCII interactions, and CD4

engagement of pMHCII increases the number of phosphorylated TCR-CD3 complexes.

Importantly, the pCD3ζ levels observed in the T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutants is subthreshold for IL-2

production at the bulk population level. These results allow us to conclude that pMHCII-

specific baseline pCD3ζ levels achieved in our system in the absence of CD4-pMHCII

interactions are approximate half of that achieved when CD4 can interact with pMHCII

on the outside of the cell. Furthermore, consistent with the kinetic discrimination model

of T cell activation, CD4-pMHCII interactions on the outside of the cell appear to be

essential to push pCD3ζ levels above the threshold level needed for IL-2 production

(Rabinowitz et al., 1996).

The GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs influence IL-2 production independently of

LCK.

Having established that T1 contributes to early pMHCII-specific signaling (e.g. pCD3ζ)

as well as signaling output (i.e. IL-2), we generated 5c.c7$^+$ 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells expressing WT,

T1, or T1 bearing mutants of the GGXXG and/or (C/F)CV+C motifs (**Table 1 and Figure**

3 – figure supplement 1). To study the function of the GGXXG motif alone, we used

our previously described TMD mutant (GGXXG to GVXXL) wherein bulky side chains

replace the glycines that compose a flat surface on the transmembrane helix that could

mediate protein:protein or protein:cholesterol interactions (Fessler, 2016; Parrish et al.,

2015; Song et al., 2014; Teese and Langosch, 2015; Wacker et al., 2013). We called

these mutants T1-TMD. To test the function of the palmitoylation motif, which contains

the core CVRC (418-421) sequence in mouse and humans, we made note of a broader

(C/F)CVRC motif in eutherians wherein the majority of ortholog sequences had CCVRC,

as found in mouse, and a minority had FCVRC as found in humans. Importantly,

position 417 is under purifying selection for all extant CD4 orthologs we analyzed by the

fixed effects likelihood (FEL) method (**Figure 1**), indicating that this residue evolved

under purifying selection due to functional importance (Lee et al., 2022). We therefore

made T1-Palm (3C) mutants wherein we mutated all three cysteines to serines as well

as T1-Palm (2C) mutants where only the core cysteines common to mouse and humans

were mutated to serines. Finally, we made mutants containing both the TMD and Palm

mutants that we called T1-TP(3C) or T1-TP(2C).

To confirm that truncating CD4 relieved CD4-LCK association, and evaluate if the

mutations impacted any residual CD4-LCK interactions that may occur due to

colocalization in particular membrane domains, we performed sucrose gradient analysis

of detergent lysates of WT, T1, T1-TMD, T1-Palm(2C), T1-Palm(3C), T1-TP(2C) and

T1-TP(3C). We observed significantly reduced CD4-LCK association in detergent

resistant membranes (DRMs, aka membrane rafts) and detergent soluble membranes

(DSMs) for T1 compared to WT (**Figure 3 – figure supplement 2**)(Pike, 2006). The

mutants did not impact residual CD4-LCK association in the DRMs or DSMs.

Furthermore, the total LCK signal associated with CD4 was significantly lower for T1

compared with the WT, and the residual association was not impacted by the mutants

(**Table 3 and Figure 3 – figure supplement 3**). We therefore conclude that, in our

experimental system, any functional differences between the T1-TMD, T1-Palm(2C/3C),

or T1-TP(2C/3C) mutants and the T1 control is a function of the motif we are studying in

the absence of direct CD4-LCK interactions.

Next, we measured IL-2 production by WT, T1, and CD4 mutant cells to evaluate

the impact of the mutations on signaling output in response to MCC. Here again, T1

was slightly lower than WT, while the T1-TMD reduced the IL-2 response magnitude

and sensitivity relative to the T1 control (**Figure 3A**). This was expected given our prior

work showing that the TMD mutant reduced IL-2 production driven by a shorter CD4

truncation mutant (CD4T, mutated at R420)(Parrish et al., 2015). Mutating the GGXXG

or (C/F)CV+C motifs individually or together did not impact pMHCII-induced TCR

endocytosis relative to the T1 control, and activation-induced CD4 endocytosis was

inhibited for all truncated CD4 molecules (**Figure 3 – figure supplement 4A and 4B**).

The T1-Palm(2C), T1-TP(2C), T1-Palm(3C), and T1-TP(3C) all reduced IL-2 production

relative to T1, indicating that they also influence the LCK-independent contribution of

CD4 to pMHCII-specific signaling (**Figure 3B**). Of note, the T1-TP(2C) IL-2 response

magnitude was lower than that of T1-Palm(2C) alone, consistent with what we

previously observed with the full-length versions of these CD4 mutants (**Figure 3B**)(Lee

et al., 2022). Furthermore, the T1-Palm(3C) response magnitude was lower than that of

T1-Palm(2C), suggesting that the additional cysteine contributes to signaling. Together,

these data indicate that the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs contribute to the signaling

cascade that leads to pMHCII-specific IL-2 production when CD4 does not directly

interact with LCK via the intracellular CQC clasp and IKRLL motifs. These data do not

tell us where in the signaling pathway the contributions are made.

The CD4 GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs are key determinants of early signaling.

To evaluate if the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs influence early signaling events, we

measured pCD3ζ, pZAP70, and pPLCγ1 levels for four independently generated T1-

TMD lines, three independently generated T1-Palm(2C) lines, and three independently

generated T1-TP(2C) lines relative to their matched T1 controls in response to APCs

expressing MCC:I-E^k (**Figure 4 and Figure 4 – Figure supplement 1 and 2, and**

Table 3). For the T1-TMD, T1-Palm(2C), and T1-TP(2C) mutant lines we observed

lower average levels of pCD3ζ, pZAP70, and pPLCγ1 relative to the T1 controls. These

data indicate that the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs contribute to CD4's ability to

enhance proximal signaling in the absence of CD4-LCK interactions.

Of note, when we considered the average fold change of the means of the

independently generated mutant cell lines relative to their paired T1 controls, we

included the mean of the fold change of the T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutant cells from Figure 2C relative

to their paired T1 controls for comparison (**dotted line, Figure 4B and Figure 4 –**

Figure supplement 1B and 2B). Doing so provides visual boundaries within which to

consider the contribution that CD4 T1, which can bind pMHCII, makes to proximal

signaling in relationship to T1$^{\Delta bind}$ (dotted line) that cannot bind pMHCII. These

boundaries then provide an additional guide for evaluating the impact of the mutations

on proximal signaling. For example, the T1-TMD and T1-Palm(2C) showed reduced

pCD3ζ levels midway between T1 and T1$^{\Delta bind}$, which equated to a reduced contribution

to pCD3ζ levels made by these mutants to ~48% of the contribution to pCD3ζ levels

made by T1, while the T1-TP(2C) contributed ~16% of the pCD3ζ levels contributed by

T1. The double mutant therefore nearly eliminated the contribution made by T1 to

pCD3ζ levels. Although these are relative comparisons, the data further suggest a role

for the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs in contributing to CD4-mediated pMHCII-specific

signaling in the absence of CD4-LCK interactions.

Because we had found that T1$^{\Delta bind}$ cells failed to produce IL-2 in response to high

peptide concentrations in our dose response experiments (**Figure 1A**), whereas the T1-

TP(2C) mutant cells made IL-2 in response to high peptide concentrations (**Figure 3B**),

we found it interesting that the early signaling responses we measured to APCs

expressing high ligand densities of tethered pMHCII were similar between the T1$^{\Delta bind}$

and T1-TP(2C) cells. We therefore evaluated IL-2 production of the T1, T1$^{\Delta bind}$, and T1-

TP(2C) in response to the APCs used in these signaling studies to ask if they followed

the same pattern of responses to high peptide doses in our prior experiments. We found

that the T1-TP(2C) cells made approximately half as much IL-2 as the T1 controls,

whereas IL-2 production by the T1$^{\Delta bind}$ cells was negligible (**Figure 4 – Figure**

supplement 3). These data indicate that the ability of CD4 to interact with pMHCII can

partially overcome the loss of function of the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs at high

ligand densities with respect to a downstream signaling output, such as IL-2 production,

even if the early signaling events measured at 2 minutes after pMHCII-engagement

were similar.

Finally, we considered the percent of responders (i.e., those cells that signaled

above background) for the mutant cell lines. We observed small decreases in

responding T1-TP(2C) cells for pCD3ζ and pZAP70 relative to the control, while pPLCγ1

trended lower for this mutant. These data indicate that mutating the GGXXG and

(C/F)CV+C motifs together in the absence of the intracellular domain can reduce the

number of cells that initiate pMHCII-specific signaling (**Figure 4C and Figure 4 –**

Figure supplement 1C and 2C). We did not observe this phenotype in our prior study

when the intracellular domain was present, suggesting this is unique to the absence of

the intracellular domain (Lee et al., 2022).

We also measured early signaling for three independently generated T1-

Palm(3C) and T1-TP(3C) mutant cell lines compared to their paired T1 controls. For all

lines, pCD3ζ, pZAP70, and pPLCγ1 levels were significantly lower than the controls,

which was reflected in the normalized fold change (**Figure 5A and 5B and Figure 5 –**

figures supplement 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B). The fold change for the T1-TP(3C) levels relative

to the T1 was similar to T1-TP(2C)(**Figure 5B and Figure 5 – figures supplement 1B**

and 2B and Table 3). These data provide further evidence that the GGXXG and

(C/F)CV+C motifs together are key determinants of the LCK-independent contributions

that CD4 makes to amplifying pMHCII-specific proximal signaling.

Finally, the percent responders were lower for pCD3ζ and pZAP70 for T1-TP(3C)

compared to WT (**Figure 5 and Figure 5 – figures supplement 1C and 2C**). These

data are consistent with the idea that, in the absence of the intracellular domain,

mutating these motifs influences initiation of key signaling events. See **Table 3** for a

summary of the data.

Discussion

Our computational reconstruction of CD4 evolution provided access to a subset of

results from experiments that Nature performed over ~435 million years in a greater

variety of jawed vertebrates, in the wild, than could be achieved with mouse or human

samples in the lab (Lee et al., 2022). It allowed us to identify residues that were

selected under purifying selection, and are thus predicted to be functionally significant,

because acquiring a mutation at these residues would affect fitness and results in a

failure to propagate the change to future progeny. Our structure-function analysis of

these residues in $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells, which we continued in this study, provided a second

system to cross-validate the functional significance of particular residues and allowed us

to start providing mechanistic insights into why these residues are important.

The data presented here are not consistent with predictions of the prevailing

model in which CD4 recruits LCK to CD3 ITAMs to initiate signaling. Importantly, this

study builds upon our prior work by showing that while reducing CD4-LCK interactions

reduces pMHCII-specific IL-2 production in our system, either by mutating the CQC

clasp or removing the CD4 intracellular domain entirely, this cannot be attributed to

reductions in $pCD3\zeta$ levels as predicted by the TCR signaling paradigm (Lee et al.,

2022). It is notable that, in the absence of CD4-pMHCII interactions (T1$^{\Delta bind}$ mutant),

$pCD3\zeta$ levels were roughly half of those measured when CD4-pMHCII interactions

occurred (T1 mutant). We take these data together as evidence that there is a threshold

for the number of phosphorylated CD3ζ molecules, and/or the duration of signaling, that

is required to drive IL-2 production in our system. We also conclude that CD4 binding to

pMHCII functions to increase the number of TCR-CD3 complexes per cell that

experience CD3ζ phosphorylation to reach that threshold and/or sustain signaling.

Furthermore, CD4-pMHCII interactions similarly impacts pZAP70 and pPLCγ1 levels,

albeit to a lesser extent for the latter.

A logical extension of these conclusions is that there is a density of agonist

pMHCII below which CD4 binding to pMHCII is essential for signal initiation. This idea is

supported by findings that CD4 is necessary for signal propagation and amplification to

the calcium mobilization step in response to fewer than 25 agonist pMHCII (Irvine et al.,

2002). Attempting to accurately measure the contributions of CD4 to ITAM

phosphorylation, with or without mutant motifs, at very low densities of pMHCII would be

challenging and is technically beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, in this and

our prior publication we did not observe the expected decreases in pCD3ζ levels when

CD4-LCK interactions were reduced by mutating the CQC clasp motif, the IKRLL motif,

or by eliminating the intracellular domain. Furthermore, we found in our prior study that

IL-2 production increased significantly when we mutated the full intracellular helix, the

helix and CQC clasp together, or the IKRLL motif alone. These direct tests of the TCR

signaling paradigm are inconsistent with predictions of the model. As such, they suggest

that the contributions of CD4 to signal initiation and amplification at the early timepoint

we measured are independent of direct CD4-LCK interactions.

Because the combined impact of mutating the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs

reduced pCD3ζ levels to ~16% of the contribution of CD4-pMHCII engagement, even

when direct CD4-LCK interactions were absent, we can conclude that the GGXXG and

(C/F)CV+C motifs are key determinants that help CD4 drive signaling above the

threshold required for IL-2 production. Our data also provide evidence that mutating the

GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs together can reduce the frequency of cells experiencing

CD3ζ and ZAP70 phosphorylation in the absence of the intracellular domain. Given that

palmitoylation is rapidly reversible, these data suggest that the switch-like function of

the palmitoylation motif may influence signal initiation. Interestingly, unlike CD4-pMHCII

interactions, these motifs are not essential for signaling output at high ligand densities

as we observed low levels of IL-2 produced in cells bearing mutants of these motifs with

increasing doses of agonist pMHCII. Binding of CD4 and TCR-CD3 to pMHCII can

therefore amplify pMHCII-specific signaling without the contributions of the GGXXG and

(C/F)CV+C motifs, or motifs in the intracellular domain, albeit at lower levels than if

these motifs are intact. This could be due to the contributions of additional unidentified

motifs in the transmembrane domain, or to the increase in TCR-CD3 dwell time on

pMHCII that is mediated by the CD4 extracellular domain (Glassman et al., 2018).

Given that these motifs were essential for IL-2 production at low ligand densities, a

logical extension of these data is that there is an agonist pMHCII density below which

these motifs are essential for the initiation of early signaling events.

The data from our current study indicate that the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs

do not influence early signaling events by regulating the ability of CD4 to either recruit

LCK to, or sequester it away from, the TCR-CD3 ITAMs as we previously postulated

(Lee et al., 2022). Instead, they work independently of CD4-LCK interactions to

enhance pMHCII-specific signaling. It is tempting to speculate that because these motifs

can regulate CD4 membrane domain localization and, because in other proteins

palmitate moieties can sandwich cholesterol against the flat surface of a GG patch on a

transmembrane domain helix, these motifs may allow CD4 to regulate local

concentration of cholesterol or cholesterol sulfate around TCR-CD3, perhaps by taking

such molecules away from TCR-CD3 to stabilize allosteric changes associated with

signaling (Chen et al., 2022; Fessler, 2016; Gil et al., 2002; Lee et al., 2015; Song et al.,

2014; Swamy et al., 2016; Teese and Langosch, 2015; Wacker et al., 2013; Wang et

al., 2016). These CD4 motifs may also impact the accessibility of ITAMs for LCK

phosphorylation by changing the local membrane environment around TCR-CD3 upon

reciprocal engagement of pMHCII (Aivazian and Stern, 2000; Xu et al., 2008). Finally, it

is worth considering that, in our prior study, we found G402 of the GGXXG motif has

covaried over evolutionary time with L438 of the intracellular helix IKRLL motif that has

inhibitory function, suggesting that the function of these motifs are co-evolving (Lee et

al., 2022). In support of this idea, we reported that the signal enhancing activity of the

GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs together counterbalanced the inhibitory activity of the

IKRLL motif with regards to IL-2 production. It is unclear at this point if this

counterbalancing is simply additive of individual motif functions, or if there is a functional

interplay of the motifs when the intracellular domain of CD4 is present. Delineating the

mechanistic details by which the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs increase signaling on

their own, or when combined, and how their function integrates with those of other

motifs will be the subject of future investigations.

Altogether, the data in this and our preceding study provide direct evidence that

complement indirect results indicating that pMHCII-specific signaling is not initiated, or

dependent on, CD4 recruitment of LCK kinase activity to the CD3 ITAMs (Glassman et

al., 2018; Horkova et al., 2023; Killeen and Littman, 1993; Lee et al., 2022; Xu and

Littman, 1993). Recent work on CD8 suggest that this coreceptor also does not recruit

LCK to phosphorylate CD3 ITAMs (Casas et al., 2014; Wei et al., 2020). In total, these

findings suggest that the TCR signaling paradigm needs revising as it pertains to

coreceptor-LCK interactions. For CD4, the existing evidence suggest that reciprocal

binding of CD4 and TCR-CD3 enables free LCK and FYN to initiate signaling by

phosphorylating the ITAMs and ZAP70 (Glassman et al., 2016; Glassman et al., 2018;

Horkova et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2022; Salmond et al., 2009; van Oers et al., 1996). The

contribution of the current study is in showing the GGXXG and (C/F)CV+C motifs work

together to enhance these early signaling events independently of direct CD4-LCK

interactions.

Finally, it is interesting to consider what the primary purpose of CD4-LCK

interactions via the CQC clasp and IKRLL motifs are if not to recruit LCK kinase activity

to the CD3 ITAMs. Data from two studies suggest that LCK makes a kinase-

independent contribution to pMHCII-specific responses; it is therefore plausible that the

phenotype reported for CD4 when the CQC clasp is mutated is due to relieving the

kinase-independent scaffolding function of LCK (Horkova et al., 2023; Xu and Littman,

1993). In addition, CD4-LCK interaction via the CQC clasp motif and the intracellular

helix will prevent the helix from interacting with other partners, thus mutating the CQC

clasp would favor helix interactions with other putative partners (Lee et al., 2022).

Finally, the CQC clasp is thought to play a role in positioning CD4 in proximity to LAT,

either through direct or indirect interactions, which could contribute to the phenotype of

CQC clasp mutants (Bosselut et al., 1999; Lo et al., 2018; Lo et al., 2019). If CD4-LCK

and CD4-LAT interactions are mutually exclusive, and both require the CQC clasp, then

mutating this motif would have a greater impact than just relieving CD4-LCK interactions

(Bosselut et al., 1999). These questions remain outstanding, as do questions

concerning how the intracellular helix regulates pMHCII-specific signaling.

In closing, the broader implications of the data presented in our current and prior

evolution-structure-function studies provide fertile ground for future directions beyond

those mentioned above. Our approach allows us to identify functionally important

residues/motif and then interrogate basic mechanistic principles of their function that

should hold true across CD4$^+$ T cell subsets since the biochemical and biophysical

bases for interactions between CD4 and its interacting partners (i.e. other proteins or

membrane components) should be the same in 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells as in thymocytes or in

different CD4$^+$ T cells. However, different CD4$^+$ T cell populations will have different

levels of expression of relevant proteins (e.g. interacting partners or modifying

enzymes), and may even have differences in lipid composition, such that the impact of

the motifs we have identified and studied to date may lead to different outcomes in

different CD4$^+$ T cell subsets (http://immpres.co.uk/)(Tuosto and Xu, 2018). For

example, differences in expression of enzymes with switch-like functions, such as those

that add or remove palmitate to the (C/F)CV+C motif, or those that phosphorylate or

dephosphorylate the serines in the intracellular helix that regulate CD4-LCK interactions

and inhibitory activity, may vary between naïve CD4$^+$ T cells, different Th subsets, or

Tregs to differentially tune the activity of these motifs and their impact on pMHCII-

specific signaling. Now that we have identified residues and broader motifs that have

proven to be functionally important *in vivo* over 435 million years of evolution, while also

providing mechanistic insights as to why the residues are important, there is utility in

evaluating the impact of mutant CD4 mice on thymocyte development, naïve CD4$^+$ T

cell activation and differentiation, and the execution of Th and Treg effector functions. In

so doing, we will gain additional insights into why there is a fitness cost if a mutation is

acquired in these residues. Such knowledge will increase our fundamental

understanding of CD4$^+$ T cell biology and will also be critical for biomimetic engineering

of synthetic receptors that can redirect CD4$^+$ T cell activity for therapeutic purposes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Evolutionary analyses

Available CD4 orthologs were identified through reciprocal blast-based searches and

downloaded from GenBank. BLAST may not only identify orthologs, so additional

criteria were used to include putative orthologous CD4 sequences in our analyses:

presence of a domain structure consisting of four extracellular Ig domains followed by a

transmembrane domain and a C-terminal intracellular domain, including the presence of

the LCK binding clasp (CxC). Sequences that were shorter, contained frameshift

mutations, or displayed high sequence variability were excluded from the analysis. For

the current study, teleost fish were considered to be the oldest living species that

contain a CD4 molecule given that a CD4 ortholog was not reported in the elephant

shark (*Callorhinchus milii*), although future analyses of other cartilaginous fishes might

yield more distant orthologs (Venkatesh et al., 2014). The final dataset contained 99

unique CD4 orthologs, ranging from teleost fish to human. These (putative) coding

sequences were translated to amino-acids and aligned using MAFFT (Katoh et al.,

2002). For codon-based analyses, the aligned amino acid sequences were back

translated to nucleotides to maintain codons. The multiple sequence alignments were

further processed to remove all insertions (indels) relative to the mouse CD4 sequence

(NM_013488.3) to maintain consistent numbering of sites. The 5' and 3' regions of the

CD4 molecules were not consistently aligned due to different start codon usage or

extensions of the ICD, respectively. The alignment was edited to start at the codon

(AAG) coding for K48 within mouse CD4. The alignment that includes all 99 CD4

sequences ends at the last cysteine residue that makes up the CQC clasp. For the

mammalian only dataset, the alignment terminates at the mouse CD4 stop codon.

FastTree was used to estimate maximum likelihood trees (Price et al., 2010). For

amino acid-based trees, the Jones-Taylor-Thornton (JTT) model of evolution was

selected, while the General Time-Reversible (GTR) model was used for nucleotide trees

(Jones et al., 1992; Waddell and Steel, 1997). In all conditions, a discrete gamma model

with 20 rate categories was used. A reduced representation tree (based on the amino

acid alignment) is shown in Figure 1A. We used the same JTT model to estimate the

marginal reconstructions of nodes indicated in Figure 1A. Phylogenetic trees and logo

plots were visualized in Geneious and further edited using Adobe Illustrator. Ancestral

sequences were estimated using GRASP (Foley et al., 2020).

Codon-based analysis of selection was performed using the hypothesis testing

fixed effects likelihood (FEL) model as implemented within the phylogenies (HyPhy)

package (version 2.5.14) (MP) (Kosakovsky Pond et al., 2020; Pond et al., 2005; Pond

and Frost, 2005; Weaver et al., 2018). The back-translated codon-based alignments

described above were used for these analyses. FEL uses likelihood ratio tests (LRTs) to

assess a better fit of codons that allowed selection ($p < 0.1$). When calculating values for

all CD4 orthologs included in the initial phylogenetic analysis we analyzed and identified

the sequences within the mammalian clade as the foreground branches on which to test

for evolutionary selection in order to maximize statistical power.

Covariation between protein residues was calculated using the MISTIC2 server.

We calculated 4 different covariation methods (MIp, mFDCA, plmDCA, and

gaussianDCA)(Colell et al., 2018). Protein conservation scores were calculated based

on the protein alignment using the ConSurf Server (Ashkenazy et al., 2016; Ashkenazy

et al., 2010). ConSurf conservation scores are normalized, so that the average score for

all residues is zero, with a standard deviation of one. The lower the score, the more

conserved the protein position. For the purpose of this study, residues were considered

to covary if the MI was larger than 4 and both residues had a ConSurf conservation

score lower than -0.5. Also, pairs with an MI larger than 8 were considered to covary if

the conservation score was below -0.3. Using these criteria, we selected 0.5% of all

possible pairs as recommended (Buslje et al., 2009; Colell et al., 2018).

Statistical analyses and associated raw data for the figures are available on

Dryad (doi:10.5061/dryad.p8cz8w9vw).

Cell lines

$58\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridoma lines were generated from Kuhns Lab stocks of parental $58\alpha^-\beta^-$

T cell hybridoma cells (obtained from Y.H. Chien at Stanford University) by retroviral

transduction and maintained in culture by standard techniques as previously described

(Glassman et al., 2018; Letourneur and Malissen, 1989). $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridomas lack

expression of endogenous TCRα and TCRβ chains, are CD4 negative, make IL-2 in

response to TCR signaling, and are variant of the DO-11.10.7 mouse T cell hybridoma

(Balb/c T cell fused to BW5147 thymoma)(Letourneur and Malissen, 1989). We validate

the cells lines by these characteristics as well as expression of H2-D^d to validate Balb/c

origin. In brief, one day after transduction the cells were cultured in 5μg/ml

puromycin(Invivogen) and 5μg/ml zeocin(ThermoFisher Scientific) in RPMI 1640

(Gibco) supplemented with 5% FBS (Atlanta Biologicals or Omega Scientific), Penicillin-

Streptomycin-Glutamine (Cytiva), 10μg/ml Ciprofloxacin (Sigma), and 50μM beta-2-

mercaptoethanol (ThermoFisher Scientific). The next day drug concentrations were

increased to 10μg/ml puromycin (Invivogen) and 100μg/ml zeocin (ThermoFisher

Scientific) in 10ml in a T25 flask. Aliquot of $1x10^7$ cells were frozen at days 5, 7, and 9.

Cells were thawed from the day 5 freeze and cultured for 3 days in 10μg/ml puromycin

and 100μg/ml zeocin, and maintained below $1x10^6$ cells/ml to use in the functional

assays. Cells used in the functional assays were grown to $0.8x10^6$ cells/ml density and

replicates of three functional assays were performed every other day. If cells exceeded

$1x10^6$ cells/ml at any point in the process they were discarded as they lose reactivity at

high cell densities and a new set of vials was thawed. Typically, two independent WT

and mutant pairs were generated for any given mutant and tested for IL-2 to gain further

confidence in a response phenotype. When cells lines are presented together in a

graph, that indicates that the cell lines (WT and mutants sets) were generated at the

same time from the same parental cell stock.

Given the number of mutant CD4 cell lines generated and handled in this study,

the identity of the transduced CD4 gene was verified by PCR sequencing at the

conclusion of three independent functional assays. $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridomas were lysed

using DirectPCR Tail Lysis Buffer (Viagen Biotech) with proteinase K (SIGMA) for 2

hours at 65°C. Cells were then heated at 95°C for ten minutes. Cell debris was pelleted,

and the supernatants were saved. CD4 was amplified by PCR using Q5 DNA Hot Start

Polymerase (New England BioLabs) in $0.2\mu M$ dNTP, $0.2\mu M$ primer concentration, Q5

Reaction buffer, and water. CD4 was amplified using the following primers:

5' primer: acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctctcttagg

3' primer: ctagcaagcttgtcgactcaagatcttcattagatgagattatggctcttctgc

Product were purified using SpinSmart Nucleic Acid Purification Columns (Thomas

Scientific) and sent to Eton Bioscience for sequencing with the following 5' CD4 primer:

gtctctgaggagcagaag.

The I-E^{k+} M12 cells used as antigen presenting cells (APCs) were previously

reported (Glassman et al., 2018). M12 cells are a murine B cell lymphoma from Balb/c

mice (H2-D^d validated)(Kim et al., 1979). Cells were cultured in RPMI 1640 (Gibco)

supplemented with 5% FBS (Atlanta Biologicals or Omega Scientific), Pencillin-

Streptomycin-Glutamine (Cytiva), $10\mu g/ml$ Ciprofloxacin (Sigma), $50\mu M$ beta-2-

mercaptoethanol (ThermoFisher Scientific), and $5\mu g/mL$ Puromycin (Invivogen) and

$50\mu g/ml$ Zeocin (ThermoFisher). The parental cells are maintained in Kuhns Lab stocks

and were originally obtained from MM Davis stocks (Stanford University).

Parental $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridoma and M12 cells are periodically treated with

Plasmocyn and tested for mycoplasma contamination by PCR using primer sequences

available from ATCC (5' primer sequence: TGCACCATCTGTCACTCTGTTAACCTC; 3'

primer sequence: GGGAGCAAACAGGATTAGATACCCT). All transduced cell lines

used here were grown in ciprofloxacin and generated from parental cells that had tested

negative for mycoplasma.

For retroviral production we used Phoenix-eco cells from the Nolan Lab (ATCC

CRL-3214).

Antibodies

Antibodies	Vendor	Catalog number	RRID
anti-mouse CD4 eFlour 450, clone GK1.5	ThermoFisher Scientific	48-0041-82	AB_10718983
anti-mouse TCRα APC, clone RR8-1	ThermoFisher Scientific	17-5800-82	AB_19853170
anti-mouse CD3ε PE-Cy7, clone 145-2C11	ThermoFisher Scientific	25-0031-82	AB_469572
anti-mouse IL-2, clone JES6-1A12	BioLegend	503702	AB_315292
biotin anti-mouse IL-2, clone JES6-5H4	BioLegend	503804	AB_315298
Streptavidin HRP	BioLegend	405210	
anti-mouse TCRβ PE, clone KJ25	BD Pharmingen	553209	AB_394709
biotin anti-mouse CD4 (Clone RM4-4)	BioLegend	116010	AB_2561504
anti-mouse CD4 APC, clone GK1.5	BioLegend	100412	AB_312697
anti-mouse LCK PE, clone 3A5	Santa Cruz	sc-433	
Cholera Toxin Subunit B Alexa Fluor 488	ThermoFisher Scientific	C22841	
anti-mouse pCD3ζ Alexa Flour 647, clone K25-407.69	BD Phosflow	558489	AB_647152
anti-mouse pZAP70 APC, clone n3kobu5	ThermoFisher Scientific	17-9006-42	AB_2573268
anti-mouse pPLCγ1 PE, clone A17025A	BioLegend	612404	AB_2801120

Flow cytometry

Cell surface expression of CD4 and TCR-CD3 complexes were measured by flow

cytometry. In brief, cells were stained for 30 minutes at 4ºC in FACS buffer (PBS, 2%

FBS, and 0.02% sodium azide) using anti-CD4 (clone GK1.5, eFluor 450 conjugate,

ThermoFisher Scientific), anti-TCRα (anti-Vα11, clone RR8-1, APC conjugate,

ThermoFisher Scientific), anti-CD3ε (145-2C11, ThermoFisher Scientific) and GFP was

detected as a measure of the TCRβ-GFP subunit. Analysis was performed on a Canto II

or LSRII (BD Biosciences) at the Flow Cytometry Shared Resource at the University of

Arizona. Flow cytometry data were analyzed with FlowJo Version 9 software (Becton,

Dickinson & Company).

Functional assays

IL-2 production was measured to quantify pMHCII responses. 5×10^4 transduced 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$

T cell hybridomas were cocultured with 1×10^5 transduced I-E^{k+} M12 cells in triplicate in

a 96 well round bottom plate in RPMI with 5% FBS (Omega Scientific), Pen-Strep+L-

Glutamine (Cytiva), 10ng/ml ciprofloxacin (Sigma), and 50μM beta-2-mercaptoethanol

(Fisher) in the presence of titrating amounts of MCC 88-103 peptide (purchased from

21st Century Biochemicals at >95% purity) starting at 30μM MCC and a 1:3 titration

(Glassman et al., 2018). For experiments with APCs expressing tethered pMHCII, 5×10^4

58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ T cell hybridomas were cultured with 1×10^5 MCC:I-E^{k+} or T102S:I-E^{k+} M12 cells

in triplicate in a 96 well round bottom plate using the same culture conditions as above.

The supernatants were collected and assayed for IL-2 concentration by ELISA after 16

hours of co-culture at 37ºC. Anti-mouse IL-2 (clone JES6-1A12, BioLegend) antibody

was used to capture IL-2 from the supernatants, and biotin anti-mouse IL-2 (clone

JES6-5H4, BioLegend) antibody was used as the secondary antibody. Streptavidin-

HRP (BioLegend) and TMB substrate (BioLegend) were also used.

To assess engagement-induced endocytosis, CD4 surface levels were measured

by flow cytometry 16hrs after coculture with APCs and peptide as described above for

IL-2 quantification. 96 well plates containing cells were washed with ice cold FACs

buffer (PBS, 2%FBS, 0.02% sodium azide), transferred to ice, and Fc receptors were

blocked with Fc block mAb clone 2.4G2 for 15 minutes at 4°C prior to surface staining

for 30 minutes at 4°C with anti-CD4 (clone GK1.5 EF450, Invitrogen) and anti-Vβ3 TCR

clone (clone KJ25, BD Pharmingen) antibodies. Cells were washed with FACS buffer

prior to analysis on a LSRII (BD Biosciences) at the Flow Cytometry Shared Resource

at the University of Arizona. Flow cytometry data were analyzed with FlowJo Version 10

software (Becton, Dickinson & Company). The average of the geometric mean of the

TCR or CD4 signal was taken for the triplicate of the post $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells cocultured with

M12 I-E^{k+} cells at 0μM MCC concentration. Each value of the raw gMFI of TCR or CD4

for cells cultured at 10μM MCC was subtracted from the average gMFI at 0μM. The

values show the change of gMFI from 0μM to 10μM.

Sucrose gradient analysis

Membrane fractionation by sucrose gradient was performed similarly to previously

described methods (Hur et al., 2003; Parrish et al., 2016). For cell lysis, 6x10^7 $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ T

cell hybridomas were harvested and washed 2x using TNE buffer (25mM Tris, 150mM

NaCl, 5mM EDTA). Cells were lysed on ice in 1% Triton-X detergent in TNE in a total

volume of 1mL for 10 minutes and then dounce homogenized 10x. The homogenized

lysate was transferred to 14 x 95mm Ultraclear Ultra Centrifuge tubes (Beckman). The

dounce homogenizer was rinsed with 1.6mL of the 1% lysis buffer, which was then was

added to the Ultracentrifuge tube. 2.5mL of 80% sucrose was added to the centrifuge

tube with lysate and mixed well. Gently, 5mL of 30% sucrose was added to the

centrifuge tubes, creating a 30% sucrose layer above the ~40% sucrose/lysate mixture.

Then, 3mL of 5% sucrose was added gently to the centrifuge tube, creating another

layer. The centrifuge tubes were spun 18 hours at 4°C in a SW40Ti rotor at 36,000rpm.

Analysis of membrane fractions was performed via flow-based fluorophore-linked

immunosorbent assay (FFLISA) as previously described (Parrish et al., 2016). In brief,

88μL of Streptavidin Microspheres 6.0μm (Polysciences) were coated overnight at 4ºC

with 8μg of biotinylated anti-CD4 antibody (clone RM4-4, BioLegend). Prior to

immunoprecipitation (IP), beads were washed with 10mL of FACS buffer (1x PBS,

2%FBS, 0.02% sodium azide) and resuspended in 3.5mL of 0.1% Triton-X 100 lysis

wash buffer in TNE. For each cell line lysed, 10 FACS tubes were prepared with 50μL of

the washed RM4-4 coated beads. Upon completion of the spin, 500μL was carefully

taken off the top of the centrifuge tubes and discarded. Following this, 1mL was

extracted from the top of the tube, carefully as to not disrupt the gradient, and added to

a FACS tube with coated beads and capped. This was repeated for 10 individual

fractions in separate FACS tubes. Following the extraction, lysates were incubated with

the beads for 90 minutes, inverting the tubes to mix every 15 minutes.

Following the immunoprecipitation, FACS tubes were washed 3x using 0.1%

Triton-X lysis wash buffer in TNE. Tubes were then stained using 1μL anti-CD4 (APC

conjugate; clone GK1.5, BioLegend), 1.5μL anti-LCK (PE conjugate, clone 3A5, Santa

Cruz Biotechnology), and 1μL CTxB (AF 488 conjugate, ThermoFisher Scientific,

resuspended as per manufacturer's instructions) for 45 minutes at 4ºC. Following the

stain, tubes were washed using 0.1% Triton-X lysis wash buffer in TNE. Analysis of

beads were performed on a LSRII (BD Biosciences) at the Flow Cytometry Shared

Resource at the University of Arizona. 10^4 events were collected per sample. Flow

cytometry data were analyzed with FlowJo Version 10 software (Becton, Dickinson &

Company).

For FFLISA analysis, raw gMFI values for fraction 1 were subtracted from the

rest of the fractions to account for background, such that the gMFI of fraction 1 is 0. To

normalize the data, the percentage of CD4 within any given fraction (fx) relative to the

total CD4 gMFI (CD4 signal % of total) was calculated by dividing the gMFI signal in a

given fraction (fx) by the sum of the total CD4 gMFI signal [sum(f1:f10)CD4 gMFI] and

multiplying by 100 [e.g. fx % of total = fx CD4 gMFI / Sum(f1:f10)CD4 gMFI x 100]. To

normalize the CTxB and LCK signal in any given fraction relative to the CD4 signal in

that same fraction (CTxB or LCK normalized to CD4) the gMFI of CTxB or LCK in fx

was divided by the CD4 gMFI of that fx and then multiplied by the percentage of CD4

within fx (e.g. Normalized fx LCK = fx LCK gMFI/fx CD4 gMFI x fx CD4% of total CD4

gMFI). Area under the curve (AUC) analysis was performed with GraphPad Prism 9 for

fractions 1-6 to determine the AUC for the detergent resistant membrane (DRM)

domains due to their floating phenotypes, and for fractions 6-10 to determine the AUC

for the detergent soluble membrane (DSM) domains.

Intracellular signaling analysis

M12 cells expressing Hb:I-E^k (null) or MCC:I-E^k (cognate) tethered pMHCII complexes

were labeled with Tag-it Violet according to the manufacturer's instructions (BioLegend).

M12 cells and 58$\alpha^-\beta^-$ cells were then chilled on ice for 30 minutes, 5X10^5 of each cell

type were mixed together in 1.5ml snap cap tubes, and the cells were pelleted at 2000

rpm for 30 second at 4°C to force interactions. The supernatant was removed and the

tubes were transferred to a 37°C water bath for 2 minutes to enable signaling. Fixation

Buffer (BioLegend Inc) was then added for 15 minutes at 37°C. Cells were washed

twice with FACs buffer, pelleted at 350xg for 5 minutes at room temperature,

resuspended in 1mL True-Phos Perm Buffer (BioLegend Inc), and incubated at -20°C

for 16 hours.

Cells were blocked with anti-mouse FcRII mAb clone 2.4G2 hybridoma

supernatants (ATCC) for 30 minutes, pelleted, and stained on ice for 60 minutes with

anti-pCD3ζ (clone K25-407.69, Alexa Fluor 647 conjugate, BD Biosciences) in one

sample tube, or with anti-pZAP70 (clone n3kobu5, APC conjugate, Invitrogen) and anti-

pPLCγ1 (clone A17025A, PE conjugate, BioLegend) in a separate sample tube at the

vendor-recommended concentrations. Finally, cells were washed 2x with FACs buffer at

1000xg for 5 minutes at room temperature and analyzed on a Canto II (BD Biosciences)

at the Flow Cytometry Shared Resource at the University of Arizona or on a BD

Fortessa. 1×10^4 $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ cell:M12 cell couples were collected per sample.

Flow cytometry data were analyzed with FlowJo Verison 10 software (Becton,

Dickinson, & Company) by gating on $58\alpha^-\beta^-$ and M12 cell couples, as described

previously (Glassman et al., 2018). Histograms of the pCD3ζ, pZAP70, or pPLCγ1

intensity for the gated population were then generated and data expressing the gated

populations as numbers of cells within intensity bins was exported from FlowJo into

Microsoft Excel where the number of cells for each bin intensity value for MCC:I-E^k

stimulated cells was subtracted from Hb:I-E^k stimulated cells on a bin-by-bin basis. This

allowed us to enumerate the intensity differences per bin upon stimulation with the

agonist pMHCII over background. Mean intensity and standard error of the mean (SEM)

were calculated based on the background subtracted (MCC:I-E^k-Hb:I-E^k) data. The data

was then transferred to Prism 9 where we performed smoothing analysis with 500

nearest neighbors to smooth the line profile for graphing purposes. Those intensity bins

with positive values were considered to contain cells that had responded to the MCC:I-

E^k stimuli above background.

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analyses of sucrose gradient and functional assays were performed with

GraphPad Prism 9 software as indicated in the figure legends. For each functional

assay (IL-2 production and CD4 endocytosis), each individual experiment (biological

replicate) was performed with triplicate analysis (technical replicates) and each

experiment was repeated three times (3 biological replicates). For sucrose gradient

analysis, 10^4 beads were collected by flow cytometry in each experiment (technical

replicates) and each experiment was performed three times (biological replicates).

Three biological replicates were chosen for each analysis as per convention, and no

power calculations were determined. One-Way ANOVA was performed with a Dunnett's

posttest when all mutants tested in an experiment were compared to a control sample

(e.g. WT). Sidak's posttest were applied when comparing between two specific

samples. These posttests were chosen based on Prism recommendations. Student's

unpaired t-tests (two-tailed) were performed when comparing WT and LL mutant

samples only for phosphorylation analysis.

Constructs

The sequences of 5cc7α, 5cc7βG, CD4 WT and CD4 T1 constructs were previously

described (Lee et al., 2022). Full-length CD3δ, ε, γ, and ζ were encoded on a poly-

cistronic construct as previously described (Holst et al., 2008; Kuhns and Davis, 2007).

The following CD4-T1 constructs: T1-TMD, T1-Palm (2C), T1-Palm (3C), T1-TP (2C),

and T1-TP(3C) were cloned by conventional molecular biology techniques, including

PCR-based mutagenesis where needed, into pUC18 via 5' EcoRI and 3' HindIII. After

sequence verification they were subcloned into pP2 puromycin-resistance MSCV vector

(MCS-IRES-puro) via 5' XhoI and 3' BglII, midi-prepped (Qiagen), and sequence

verified. Mutated codons are shown in bold uppercase letters, while the motif under

interrogation is shown in bold and underlined (any non-mutated codons within the motif

are bold lowercase letters and underlined). The sequences for these constructs are as

follows:

T1-TMD:
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaagggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggcaaaggtgtattaatta
gaggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctcatcatcaat
aaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatctgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtgggtgttcaa
agtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaaggtctctaa
ccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaacctaagggttca
ggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcagtgctgggtt
ttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgcagaggaa
aacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataaagaacaa
agaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctcaagatacc
ccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaagtgaacctg
gtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatgagactgacc
ctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccaggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctgagacagggct
gtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggttttatccagaggggtgaaccaga
cagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctg**ggtGTGtccttcCTC**tttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctctgctgtgtcaggtgcc
ggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag
760
T1-Palm (2C):
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaagggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggcaaaggtgtattaatta
gaggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctcatcatcaat
aaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatctgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtgggtgttcaa
agtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaaggtctctaa
ccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaacctaagggttca

ggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcagtgctgggtt
ttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgcagaggaa
aacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataaagaacaa
agaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctcaagatacc
ccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaagtgaacctg
gtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatgagactgacc
ctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccagggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctgagacagggct
gtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggtttttatccagagggggtgaaccaga
cagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctgggtggctccttcggctttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctc**tgcTCTgtcaggTCC**
cggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag
779
T1-Palm (3C):
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaaggggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggcaaaggtgtattaatta
gaggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctcatcatcaat
aaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatctgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtgggtgttcaa
agtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaaggtctctaa
ccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaacctaagggttca
ggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcagtgctgggtt
ttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgcagaggaa
aacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataaagaacaa
agaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctcaagatacc
ccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaagtgaacctg
gtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatgagactgacc
ctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccagggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctgagacagggct
gtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggtttttatccagagggggtgaaccaga
cagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctgggtggctccttcggctttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctc**TCCTCTgtcaggTC**
Ccggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag
798
T1-TP (2C):
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaaggggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggcaaaggtgtattaatta
gaggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctcatcatcaat
aaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatctgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtgggtgttcaa
agtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaaggtctctaa
ccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaacctaagggttca
ggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcagtgctgggtt
ttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgcagaggaa
aacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataaagaacaa
agaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctcaagatacc
ccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaagtgaacctg
gtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatgagactgacc
ctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccagggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctgagacagggct
gtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggtttttatccagagggggtgaaccaga

cagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctg**ggtGTGtccttcCTC**tttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctc**tgcTCTgtcaggT**
CCcggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag

T1-TP (3C):
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaagggggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggcaaaggtgtattaatta
gaggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctcatcatcaat
aaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatcgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtgggtgttcaa
agtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaaggtctctaa
ccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaacctaagggttca
ggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcagtgctgggtt
ttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgcagaggaa
aacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataaagaacaa
agaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctcaagatacc
ccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaagtgaacctg
gtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatgagactgacc
ctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccagggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctgagacagggct
gtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggtttatccagagggggtgaaccaga
cagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctg**ggtGTGtccttcCTC**tttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctc**TCCTCTgtcagg**
TCCcggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag

The gene of T1$^{\Delta bind}$ was made by cloning the in frame extracellular domain of CD4 that
encodes the Δbind extracellular domain (Parrish et al., 2015) flanked by XhoI and
BamHI into the T1 gene. The gene was sequence verified in pUC 18, subcloned into
pP2 puromycin-resistance MSCV vector (MCS-IRES-puro) via 5' XhoI and 3' BglII, midi-
prepped, and sequence verified. The sequence for the construct is as follows with
mutated codons shown in bold uppercase letters, while the motif under interrogation is
shown in bold and underlined (any non-mutated codons within the motif are bold
lowercase letters and underlined):

T1$^{\Delta bind}$:
acggaattccgctcgagcgccaccatggtgcgagccatctctcttaggcgcttgctgctgctgctgcagctgtcacaac
tcctagctgtcactcaagggaagacgctggtgctggggaaggaagggggaatcagcagaactgccctgcgagagttccc
agaagaagatcacagtcttcacctggaagttctctgaccagaggaagattctggggcagcatggc**GATggtGATTC**
AGATAGCggaggttcgccttcgcagtttgatcgtttgattccaaaaaaggggcatgggagaaaggatcgtttcctctc
atcatcaataaacttaagatggaagactctcagacttatatcgtgagctggagaacaggaaagaggaggtggagttgtg
ggtgttcaaagtgaccttcagtccgggtaccagcctgttgcaagggcagagcctgaccctgaccttggatagcaactctaa
ggtctctaaccccttgacagagtgcaaacacaaaaagggtaaagttgtcagtggttccaaagttctctccatgtccaaccta
agggttcaggacagcgacttctggaactgcaccgtgaccctggaccagaaaaagaactggttcggcatgacactctcag
tgctgggttttcagagcacagctatcacggcctataagagtgagggagagtcagcggagttctccttcccactcaactttgc
agaggaaaacgggtggggagagctgatgtggaaggcagagaaggattctttcttccagccctggatctccttctccataa
agaacaaagaggtgtccgtacaaaagtccaccaaagacctcaagctccagctgaaggaaacgctcccactcaccctc
aagataccccaggtctcgcttcagtttgctggttctggcaacctgactctgactctggacaaagggacactgcatcaggaa
gtgaacctggtggtgatgaaagtggctcagctcaacaatactttgacctgtgaggtgatgggacctacctctcccaagatg
agactgaccctgaagcaggagaaccaggaggccagggtctctgaggagcagaaagtagttcaagtggtggcccctga

gacagggctgtggcagtgtctactgagtgaaggtgataaggtcaagatggactccaggatccaggtttttatccagagggg

tgaaccagacagtgttcctggcttgcgtgctgggtggctccttcggctttctgggtttccttgggctctgcatcctctgctgtgtca

ggtgccggtgataaagatcttgagtcgacaagcttgctag

References

Aivazian, D., and Stern, L.J. (2000). Phosphorylation of T cell receptor zeta is regulated
by a lipid dependent folding transition. Nat Struct Biol *7*, 1023-1026.

Ashkenazy, H., Abadi, S., Martz, E., Chay, O., Mayrose, I., Pupko, T., and Ben-Tal, N.
(2016). ConSurf 2016: an improved methodology to estimate and visualize evolutionary
conservation in macromolecules. Nucleic Acids Res *44*, W344-350.

Ashkenazy, H., Erez, E., Martz, E., Pupko, T., and Ben-Tal, N. (2010). ConSurf 2010:
calculating evolutionary conservation in sequence and structure of proteins and nucleic
acids. Nucleic Acids Res *38*, W529-533.

Bosselut, R., Zhang, W., Ashe, J.M., Kopacz, J.L., Samelson, L.E., and Singer, A.
(1999). Association of the adaptor molecule LAT with CD4 and CD8 coreceptors
identifies a new coreceptor function in T cell receptor signal transduction. J Exp Med
190, 1517-1526.

Buslje, C.M., Santos, J., Delfino, J.M., and Nielsen, M. (2009). Correction for phylogeny,
small number of observations and data redundancy improves the identification of
coevolving amino acid pairs using mutual information. Bioinformatics *25*, 1125-1131.

Casas, J., Brzostek, J., Zarnitsyna, V.I., Hong, J.S., Wei, Q., Hoerter, J.A., Fu, G.,
Ampudia, J., Zamoyska, R., Zhu, C., and Gascoigne, N.R. (2014). Ligand-engaged TCR
is triggered by LCK not associated with CD8 coreceptor. Nat Commun *5*, 5624.

Chen, Y., Zhu, Y., Li, X., Gao, W., Zhen, Z., Dong, Huang, B., Ma, Z., Zhang, A., Song,
X.*, et al.* (2022). Cholesterol inhibits TCR signaling by directly restricting TCR-CD3 core
tunnel motility. Mol Cell.

Colell, E.A., Iserte, J.A., Simonetti, F.L., and Marino-Buslje, C. (2018). MISTIC2:
comprehensive server to study coevolution in protein families. Nucleic Acids Res *46*,
W323-W328.

Fessler, M.B. (2016). The Intracellular Cholesterol Landscape: Dynamic Integrator of
the Immune Response. Trends Immunol *37*, 819-830.

Foley, G., Mora, A., Ross, C.M., Bottoms, S., Sützl, L., Lamprecht, M.L., Zaugg, J.,
Essebier, A., Balderson, B., Newell, R.*, et al.* (2020). Identifying and engineering
ancient variants of enzymes using Graphical Representation of Ancestral Sequence
Predictions (GRASP). bioRxiv, 2019.2012.2030.891457.

Gil, D., Schamel, W.W., Montoya, M., Sanchez-Madrid, F., and Alarcon, B. (2002).
Recruitment of Nck by CD3 epsilon reveals a ligand-induced conformational change
essential for T cell receptor signaling and synapse formation. Cell *109*, 901-912.

Glaichenhaus, N., Shastri, N., Littman, D.R., and Turner, J.M. (1991). Requirement for
association of p56LCK with CD4 in antigen-specific signal transduction in T cells. Cell
64, 511-520.

Glassman, C.R., Parrish, H.L., Deshpande, N.R., and Kuhns, M.S. (2016). The CD4
and CD3deltaepsilon Cytosolic Juxtamembrane Regions Are Proximal within a Compact
TCR-CD3-pMHC-CD4 Macrocomplex. J Immunol *196*, 4713-4722.

Glassman, C.R., Parrish, H.L., Lee, M.S., and Kuhns, M.S. (2018). Reciprocal TCR-
CD3 and CD4 Engagement of a Nucleating pMHCII Stabilizes a Functional Receptor
Macrocomplex. Cell Rep *22*, 1263-1275.

Harris, D.T., and Kranz, D.M. (2016). Adoptive T Cell Therapies: A Comparison of T
Cell Receptors and Chimeric Antigen Receptors. Trends Pharmacol Sci *37*, 220-230.

Holst, J., Wang, H., Eder, K.D., Workman, C.J., Boyd, K.L., Baquet, Z., Singh, H.,
Forbes, K., Chruscinski, A., Smeyne, R.*, et al.* (2008). Scalable signaling mediated by T
cell antigen receptor-CD3 ITAMs ensures effective negative selection and prevents
autoimmunity. Nat Immunol *9*, 658-666.

Horkova, V., Drobek, A., Paprckova, D., Niederlova, V., Prasai, A., Uleri, V., Glatzova,
D., Kraller, M., Cesnekova, M., Janusova, S.*, et al.* (2023). Unique roles of co-receptor-
bound LCK in helper and cytotoxic T cells. Nat Immunol *24*, 174-185.

Hur, E.M., Son, M., Lee, O.H., Choi, Y.B., Park, C., Lee, H., and Yun, Y. (2003). LIME,
a novel transmembrane adaptor protein, associates with p56LCK and mediates T cell
activation. J Exp Med *198*, 1463-1473.

Huse, M., Eck, M.J., and Harrison, S.C. (1998). A Zn2+ ion links the cytoplasmic tail of
CD4 and the N-terminal region of LCK. J Biol Chem *273*, 18729-18733.

Irvine, D.J., Purbhoo, M.A., Krogsgaard, M., and Davis, M.M. (2002). Direct observation
of ligand recognition by T cells. Nature *419*, 845-849.

Jones, D.T., Taylor, W.R., and Thornton, J.M. (1992). The rapid generation of mutation
data matrices from protein sequences. Comput Appl Biosci *8*, 275-282.

Katoh, K., Misawa, K., Kuma, K., and Miyata, T. (2002). MAFFT: a novel method for
rapid multiple sequence alignment based on fast Fourier transform. Nucleic Acids Res
30, 3059-3066.

Killeen, N., and Littman, D.R. (1993). Helper T-cell development in the absence of CD4-
p56LCK association. Nature *364*, 729-732.

Kim, K.J., Kanellopoulos-Langevin, C., Merwin, R.M., Sachs, D.H., and Asofsky, R.
(1979). Establishment and characterization of BALB/c lymphoma lines with B cell
properties. J Immunol *122*, 549-554.

Kim, P.W., Sun, Z.Y., Blacklow, S.C., Wagner, G., and Eck, M.J. (2003). A zinc clasp
structure tethers LCK to T cell coreceptors CD4 and CD8. Science *301*, 1725-1728.

Kobayashi, S., Thelin, M.A., Parrish, H.L., Deshpande, N.R., Lee, M.S., Karimzadeh, A.,
Niewczas, M.A., Serwold, T., and Kuhns, M.S. (2020). A biomimetic five-module
chimeric antigen receptor ((5M)CAR) designed to target and eliminate antigen-specific T
cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *117*, 28950-28959.

Kosakovsky Pond, S.L., Poon, A.F.Y., Velazquez, R., Weaver, S., Hepler, N.L., Murrell,
B., Shank, S.D., Magalis, B.R., Bouvier, D., Nekrutenko, A.*, et al.* (2020). HyPhy 2.5-A
Customizable Platform for Evolutionary Hypothesis Testing Using Phylogenies. Mol Biol
Evol *37*, 295-299.

Kuhns, M.S., and Badgandi, H.B. (2012). Piecing together the family portrait of TCR-
CD3 complexes. Immunol Rev *250*, 120-143.

Kuhns, M.S., and Davis, M.M. (2007). Disruption of extracellular interactions impairs T
cell receptor-CD3 complex stability and signaling. Immunity *26*, 357-369.

Kuhns, M.S., and Davis, M.M. (2012). TCR Signaling Emerges from the Sum of Many
Parts. Frontiers in immunology *3*, 159.

Lee, M.S., Glassman, C.R., Deshpande, N.R., Badgandi, H.B., Parrish, H.L.,
Uttamapinant, C., Stawski, P.S., Ting, A.Y., and Kuhns, M.S. (2015). A Mechanical
Switch Couples T Cell Receptor Triggering to the Cytoplasmic Juxtamembrane Regions
of CD3zetazeta. Immunity *43*, 227-239.

Lee, M.S., Tuohy, P.J., Kim, C.Y., Lichauco, K., Parrish, H.L., Van Doorslaer, K., and
Kuhns, M.S. (2022). Enhancing and inhibitory motifs regulate CD4 activity. eLife *11*,
e79508.

Letourneur, F., and Malissen, B. (1989). Derivation of a T cell hybridoma variant
deprived of functional T cell receptor alpha and beta chain transcripts reveals a
nonfunctional alpha-mRNA of BW5147 origin. Eur J Immunol *19*, 2269-2274.

Lo, W.L., Shah, N.H., Ahsan, N., Horkova, V., Stepanek, O., Salomon, A.R., Kuriyan, J.,
and Weiss, A. (2018). LCK promotes ZAP70-dependent LAT phosphorylation by
bridging ZAP70 to LAT. Nat Immunol *19*, 733-741.

Lo, W.L., Shah, N.H., Rubin, S.A., Zhang, W., Horkova, V., Fallahee, I.R., Stepanek, O.,
Zon, L.I., Kuriyan, J., and Weiss, A. (2019). Slow phosphorylation of a tyrosine residue
in LAT optimizes T cell ligand discrimination. Nat Immunol *20*, 1481-1493.

Melenhorst, J.J., Chen, G.M., Wang, M., Porter, D.L., Chen, C., Collins, M.A., Gao, P.,
Bandyopadhyay, S., Sun, H., Zhao, Z.*, et al.* (2022). Decade-long leukaemia remissions
with persistence of CD4(+) CAR T cells. Nature *602*, 503-509.

Parrish, H.L., Deshpande, N.R., Vasic, J., and Kuhns, M.S. (2016). Functional evidence
for TCR-intrinsic specificity for MHCII. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.

Parrish, H.L., Glassman, C.R., Keenen, M.M., Deshpande, N.R., Bronnimann, M.P., and
Kuhns, M.S. (2015). A Transmembrane Domain GGxxG Motif in CD4 Contributes to Its
LCK-Independent Function but Does Not Mediate CD4 Dimerization. PLoS One *10*,
e0132333.

Pike, L.J. (2006). Rafts defined: a report on the Keystone Symposium on Lipid Rafts
and Cell Function. J Lipid Res *47*, 1597-1598.

Pond, S.L., Frost, S.D., and Muse, S.V. (2005). HyPhy: hypothesis testing using
phylogenies. Bioinformatics *21*, 676-679.

Pond, S.L.K., and Frost, S.D.W. (2005). Not so different after all: A comparison of
methods for detecting amino acid sites under selection. Mol Biol Evol *22*, 1208-1222.

Price, M.N., Dehal, P.S., and Arkin, A.P. (2010). FastTree 2--approximately maximum-
likelihood trees for large alignments. PLoS One *5*, e9490.

Rabinowitz, J.D., Beeson, C., Lyons, D.S., Davis, M.M., and McConnell, H.M. (1996).
Kinetic discrimination in T-cell activation. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *93*, 1401-1405.

Rudd, C.E. (2021). How the Discovery of the CD4/CD8-p56(LCK) Complexes Changed
Immunology and Immunotherapy. Front Cell Dev Biol *9*, 626095.

Salmond, R.J., Filby, A., Qureshi, I., Caserta, S., and Zamoyska, R. (2009). T-cell
receptor proximal signaling via the Src-family kinases, LCK and Fyn, influences T-cell
activation, differentiation, and tolerance. Immunol Rev *228*, 9-22.

Song, Y., Kenworthy, A.K., and Sanders, C.R. (2014). Cholesterol as a co-solvent and a
ligand for membrane proteins. Protein Sci *23*, 1-22.

Swamy, M., Beck-Garcia, K., Beck-Garcia, E., Hartl, F.A., Morath, A., Yousefi, O.S.,
Dopfer, E.P., Molnar, E., Schulze, A.K., Blanco, R.*, et al.* (2016). A Cholesterol-Based
Allostery Model of T Cell Receptor Phosphorylation. Immunity *44*, 1091-1101.

Teese, M.G., and Langosch, D. (2015). Role of GxxxG Motifs in Transmembrane
Domain Interactions. Biochemistry *54*, 5125-5135.

Tuosto, L., and Xu, C. (2018). Editorial: Membrane Lipids in T Cell Functions. Frontiers
in immunology *9*, 1608.

van Oers, N.S., Lowin-Kropf, B., Finlay, D., Connolly, K., and Weiss, A. (1996). alpha
beta T cell development is abolished in mice lacking both LCK and Fyn protein tyrosine
kinases. Immunity *5*, 429-436.

Venkatesh, B., Lee, A.P., Ravi, V., Maurya, A.K., Lian, M.M., Swann, J.B., Ohta, Y.,
Flajnik, M.F., Sutoh, Y., Kasahara, M*., et al.* (2014). Elephant shark genome provides
unique insights into gnathostome evolution. Nature *505*, 174-179.

Wacker, D., Wang, C., Katritch, V., Han, G.W., Huang, X.P., Vardy, E., McCorvy, J.D.,
Jiang, Y., Chu, M., Siu, F.Y*., et al.* (2013). Structural features for functional selectivity at
serotonin receptors. Science *340*, 615-619.

Waddell, P.J., and Steel, M.A. (1997). General time-reversible distances with unequal
rates across sites: mixing gamma and inverse Gaussian distributions with invariant
sites. Mol Phylogenet Evol *8*, 398-414.

Wang, F., Beck-Garcia, K., Zorzin, C., Schamel, W.W., and Davis, M.M. (2016).
Inhibition of T cell receptor signaling by cholesterol sulfate, a naturally occurring
derivative of membrane cholesterol. Nat Immunol *17*, 844-850.

Weaver, S., Shank, S.D., Spielman, S.J., Li, M., Muse, S.V., and Kosakovsky Pond,
S.L. (2018). Datamonkey 2.0: A Modern Web Application for Characterizing Selective
and Other Evolutionary Processes. Mol Biol Evol *35*, 773-777.

Wei, Q., Brzostek, J., Sankaran, S., Casas, J., Hew, L.S., Yap, J., Zhao, X., Wojciech,
L., and Gascoigne, N.R.J. (2020). LCK bound to coreceptor is less active than free LCK.
Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *117*, 15809-15817.

Wu, L., Wei, Q., Brzostek, J., and Gascoigne, N.R.J. (2020). Signaling from T cell
receptors (TCRs) and chimeric antigen receptors (CARs) on T cells. Cell Mol Immunol
17, 600-612.

Xu, C., Gagnon, E., Call, M.E., Schnell, J.R., Schwieters, C.D., Carman, C.V., Chou,
J.J., and Wucherpfennig, K.W. (2008). Regulation of T cell receptor activation by
dynamic membrane binding of the CD3epsilon cytoplasmic tyrosine-based motif. Cell
135, 702-713.

Xu, H., and Littman, D.R. (1993). A kinase-independent function of LCK in potentiating
antigen-specific T cell activation. Cell *74*, 633-643.
1028
1029

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Computational reconstruction of CD4 evolution.
The maximum likelihood phylogenetic tree clusters mammalian CD4 sequences. The tree highlights ancestral reconstructions of CD4 sequences from marsupials (kangaroo silhouette), Atlantogenata (elephant), and Boreoeutheria (wildcat). The logoplot of extant eutherian (Atlantogenata and Boreoeutheria) CD4 sequences show sequence conservation over evolutionary time. In these plots, the height of symbols indicates the relative frequency of each amino acid at that specific position. The mouse CD4 numbering (uniprot) is used as a reference, and residues are color-coded based on sidechain polarity. Evolutionary insertion or deletion events are indicated by dashes (-). Most recent common ancestor (MRCA) sequences are shown at each node in the tree (Node 1-4). As in our previous study (Lee et al., 2022), the ratio of synonymous (dS) and nonsynonymous (dN) substitution rates was calculated. Black dots indicate dN/dS ratios that are significantly below 1 across the entire dataset. Red dots indicate residues under purifying selection in the mammalian only dataset. Previously identified motifs are indicated by boxes, while the intracellular domain helix is shaded gray. The arrow at position 422 indicates where CD4 was truncated (CD4-T1), while TMD and T1-Palm show the mutations studied in this study.

Figure 2. Truncating CD4 does not reduce CD3ζ phosphorylation.
(**A**) Representative IL-2 production is shown in response to a titration of MCC peptide from one experiment (left). Experiments were performed in triplicate and each symbol equals the mean +/- SEM at that peptide concentration. AUC analysis for the dose response is shown as a measure of the response magnitude for the average of three independent experiments performed with one independently generated set of cell lines (center). The average response to a low dose (41nM) of peptide is shown as a measure of sensitivity for three independent experiments performed with one independently generated set of cell lines (right). The data are representative of those obtained with 4 (WT vs T1) or 2 (WT vs T1$^{\Delta bind}$) independently generated sets of cell lines.
(**B**) Phosphorylation intensity of CD3ζ (pCD3ζ) for WT and CD4-T1 (T1) (left), normalized pCD3ζ intensity for WT and T1 (center), and average % responders of pCD3ζ for WT and T1 (right). Five independently generated cell lines (biological replicates) were tested for WT and T1. For phosphorylation intensity, each pair of lines (connected symbols) was tested in three independent experiments. Data were analyzed and collected as in Figure 2 – figure supplement 3. One-way ANOVA was performed with a Dunnett's posttest using GraphPad Prism9. For normalized intensity, all individual mutant cell line values were normalized to their paired control values. Average percent responders are presented. Bars represent the mean +/- SEM. One-way ANOVA with paired comparisons was performed with a Sidak's posttest for specific comparisons of normalized values using GraphPad Prism9. All generated cells lines were considered for the multiple comparisons.
(**C**) Phosphorylation intensity of pCD3ζ for T1 and T1$^{\Delta bind}$ (left), normalized pCD3ζ intensity for T1 and T1$^{\Delta bind}$ (center), and % responders of pCD3ζ for T1 and T1$^{\Delta bind}$ (right) were performed and analyzed as in B, with the exception that the open symbols represent data from a single experiment whereas the closed symbols represent

1076 aggregate data from three independent experiments. Two-tailed t tests were performed
1077 to compare the single T1 vs T1$^{\Delta bind}$ samples as no other samples were collected in
1078 parallel.
1079
Figure 3. The GGXXG and CV+C motifs are key determinants of CD4 function.
(**A, B**) Representative IL-2 production is shown in response to a titration of MCC peptide
from one experiment (left). Experiments were performed in triplicate and each symbol
equals the mean +/- SEM at that peptide concentration. AUC analysis for the dose
response is shown as a measure of the response magnitude for the average of three
independent experiments performed with one independently generated set of cell lines
(center). The average response to a low dose (41nM) of peptide is shown as a measure
of sensitivity for three independent experiments performed with one independently
generated set of cell lines (right). Results are representative of those obtained with at
least three independently generated sets of cell lines. One-way ANOVA was performed
with a Dunnett's posttest for comparisons with WT and T1 samples, and a Sidak's
posttest for comparisons between selected samples.
1092
Figure 4. The GGXXG and CV+C motifs reduce pCD3ζ levels.
(**A**) Phosphorylation intensity of CD3ζ for T1 and T1-TMD (left), T1 and T1-Palm (2C)
(center), and T1 and T1-TP (2C) (right) are shown for independently generated pairs of
(connecting line) T1 and T1-TMD (left), T1 and T1-Palm (2C) (center), and T1 and T1-
TP (2C) (right) cell lines. Each pair of lines (connected closed symbols) was tested in
three independent experiments (technical replicates). The data from those experiments
was aggregated, and the symbols represent the mean intensity of the aggregated
pCD3ζ intensity values. One-way ANOVA was performed with a Dunnett's posttest
using GraphPad Prims 9.
(**B**) Data for each cell line in **A** are shown as the average pCD3ζ intensity for all T1-
TMD (left), T1-Palm (2C) (center), and T1-TP (2C) (right) cell lines normalized to their
paired T1 control. Dotted line is the normalized pCD3ζ intensity for T1$^{\Delta bind}$ as a visual
reference point for the contributions of CD4-pMHCII interactions. Bars represent the
mean +/- SEM. One-way ANOVA was performed with a Sidak's posttest for specific
comparisons using GraphPad Prims 9.
(**C**) The average % responders for phosphorylation of CD3ζ is shown for T1-TMD (left),
T1-Palm (2C) (center), and T1-TP (2C) (right) compared to the average of their paired
T1 control lines.
Bars represent the mean +/- SEM. One-way ANOVA was performed with a Sidak's
posttest for specific comparisons using GraphPad Prims 9.
1113
Figure 5. The (C/F)CVRC motifs reduces proximal TCR-CD3 signaling.
(**A**) Phosphorylation intensity of CD3ζ for T1 and T1-Palm (3C) (left) and T1 and T1-TP
(3C) (right) are shown for independently generated pairs of (connecting lines) T1 and
T1-Palm (3C) (left) and T1 and T1-TP (3C) (right) cell lines. Analysis was performed as
in Figure 4A.
(**B**) Data for each mutant cell line in **A** are shown as the average pCD3ζ intensity values
for T1-Palm (3C) (left) and T1-TP (3C) (right) normalized to their paired T1 controls. The
dotted line represents the normalized phosphorylation CD3ζ intensity for T1$^{\Delta bind}$ as a

visual reference for the contributions of CD4-pMHCII interactions. Analysis was
performed as in Figure 4C.
(**C**) Average % responders for phosphorylation of CD3ζ is shown for T1-Palm (3C) (left)
and T1-TP (3C) (right) are shown compared to the average of their paired T1 control.
Analysis was performed as in Figure 4C.
1127
1128

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

A   pCD3ζ intensity

B   pCD3ζ intensity normalized to T1

C   pCD3ζ % responders

Table 1. Motifs and mutants analyzed in this study.

Motif location/known function	Mutant Names	Mutated Motif	Residue Mutations
C-terminally truncated CD4	T1	Ends at R422	R422 is the last residue
Extracellular D1 C"-strand (binds pMHCII)	T1$^{\Delta bind}$	G<u>K</u>G<u>VLIR</u>	K68D, V70D, L71S, I72D, R73S
TMD/Protein or cholesterol interactions	T1-TMD	G<u>G</u>xx<u>G</u>	G403V, G406L
Juxtamembrane/Palmitoylation	T1-Palm (2C)	<u>C</u>V+<u>C</u>	C418S, C421S
Juxtamembrane/Palmitoylation	T1-Palm (3C)	<u>CC</u>V+<u>C</u>	C471S,C418S, C421S
TMD+Palm/raft localization	T1-TP (2C)	G<u>G</u>xx<u>G</u>, <u>C</u>V+<u>C</u>	G403V, G406L, C418S, C421S
TMD+Palm/raft localization	T1-TP (3C)	G<u>G</u>xx<u>G</u>, <u>CC</u>V+<u>C</u>	G403V, G406L, C417S, C418S, C421S

Table 2. All values presented as percent of WT control (truncation average/WT average x 100) for normalized values.

Mutant Names	IL-2 magnitude	IL-2 sensitivity	Normalized pCD3ζ intensity	Normalized % Responders pCD3ζ	Normalized pZap70 intensity	Normalized % Responders pZap70	Normalized pPlcγ1 intensity	Normalized % Responders pPlcγ1	Lck DRM AUC	Lck Total AUC	Lck DSM AUC	CD4 expression	CD4 endocytosis
WT	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
T1	61.46	13.52	106.30	95.20	106.10	102.20	104.40	112.60	28.81	19.22	16.08	110.09	14.30

Table 3. All values presented as percent of T1 control (mutant average/T1 average x 100) for normalized values.

Mutant Names	IL-2 magnitude	IL-2 sensitivity	Normalized pCD3ζ intensity	Normalized % Responders pCD3ζ	Normalized pZap70 intensity	Normalized % Responders pZap70	Normalized pPlcγ1 intensity	Normalized % Responders pPlcγ1	Lck DRM AUC	Lck Total AUC	Lck DSM AUC	CD4 expression	CD4 endocytosis
T1	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
T1$^{\Delta bind}$	1.53	0.00	54.86	91.39	71.96	111.9	74.32	106.8	ND	ND	ND	73.93	38.71
TMD	53.54	17.05	76.68	94.23	88.36	98.77	88.24	107.40	62.36	92.97	110.94	131.10	3.63
Palm (2C)	57.99	116.07	76.35	94.09	86.17	93.03	92.09	98.09	274.03	139.40	130.91	80.30	-98.00
TP (2C)	33.11	0.19	62.06	85.61	79.79	75.58	82.57	83.34	121.39	113.03	114.98	96.54	47.50
Palm (3C)	27.84	0.19	71.09	94.76	86.32	76.82	80.37	88.62	137.57	94.34	92.07	87.58	6.99
TP (3C)	31.19	45.53	62.49	84.60	80.16	66.92	70.91	82.81	86.84	101.20	102.74	79.59	-54.69