Cell surface localisation of GPI-anchored receptors in *Trypanosoma brucei*

Sourav Banerjee[1*], Nicola Minshall[1*], Alexander D Cook[2,3], Olivia Macleod[1], Helena
Webb[1], Matthew Higgins[2,3] and Mark Carrington[1]

[1] Department of Biochemistry, University of Cambridge, Tennis Court Road,
Cambridge CB2 1QW, UK.

[2] Department of Biochemistry, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1
3QU, UK.

[3]Kavli Institute for Nanoscience Discovery, Dorothy Crowfoot Hodgkin Building,
University of Oxford, South Parks Rd, Oxford, OX1 3QU, UK.

* These authors made equal contributions

24 Correspondence: Mark Carrington: mc115@cam.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Trypanosoma brucei, the causal agent of Human and Animal African trypanosomiasis

proliferates in the extracellular milieu of mammals. It acquires host macromolecular

nutrients, by receptor mediated endocytosis. The best characterised cell surface receptor is

for transferrin (TfR) and it has been reported to be preferentially localised in the flagellar

pocket domain of the plasma membrane, the sole site of endocytosis. In this location the TfR

may be inaccessible to adaptive immune system effectors. The *T. brucei* genome encodes

~15 TfR variants, and here we compared two, the first attached to the plasma membrane by

a single glycosylphosphatidylinositol (GPI)-anchor and the other by two. Transferrin uptake

kinetics were similar and rapid for both. Unexpectedly, initial binding of transferrin occurred

over the whole cell surface suggesting the TfR was not localised solely in the flagellar

pocket. This localisation was confirmed by immunofluorescence assays and was

independent of the number of GPI-anchors. Two other GPI-anchored receptors were

investigated to determine whether localisation to the whole cell surface was a general

property of GPI-anchored receptors. Haptoglobin-haemoglobin uptake assays and

immunofluorescence localisation of complement factor H receptor showed both were also

whole cell surface localised. The mechanisms by which trypanosome receptors are

protected from antibody-mediated attack are more complex than hiding in a pocket.

INTRODUCTION

Trypanosoma brucei proliferates within the bloodstream and tissue spaces of mammals and can maintain a long-term infection lasting in some cases for years. To do this, it must avoid the host adaptive and innate immune response at the same time as acquiring nutrients from the host. The adaptive immune response is overcome through a population survival strategy based on a densely packed surface coat of variant surface glycoprotein (VSG) that undergoes antigenic variation. As the antibody titre against one VSG increases, a small subset of trypanosomes that have switched expression to a different VSG escape until they are recognised in turn and so on in an iterative process (Mugnier et al., 2015). The trypanosome has evolved mechanisms to increase the titre of host immunoglobin required for killing. First, there is rapid endocytosis and degradation of VSG bound antibody (Engstler et al., 2007) and second, a receptor for IgG Fc region (ISG75) (Mikkelsen et al., 2024). How the innate immune system is countered is less well understood (Pinger et al., 2018) but receptors for Complement C3, known as ISG65, and Factor H (FHR) have been identified and characterised (Cook et al., 2024; Macleod et al., 2020, 2022). Acquisition of small molecule nutrients, such as glucose and amino acids, use typical eukaryotic membrane transporters.

Obtaining host macromolecule nutrients poses a more complex problem. First, *T. brucei* has a very wide host range and presumably receptors recognise ligands from a range of host species, this has been shown to be the case for the transferrin (TfR) (Trevor et al., 2019). Second, as the TfR and haptoglobin haemoglobin receptor (HpHbR) (Lane-Serff et al., 2016) bind ligands that have similar dimensions to immunoglobulin molecules then why are host antibodies against receptors not sufficient to clear an infection? Some models to account for this suggested that the VSG coat acts as a barrier preventing immunoglobulin access. However, it was shown that antibodies could penetrate a significant distance into the VSG coat (Hsia et al., 1996) but not to the small plasma membrane proximal VSG domain (Schwede et al., 2011). Both the ligand size and the penetration of antibodies into the VSG coat made it unlikely that receptors were sterically protected from antibody binding. Immunization of mice with recombinant ISG65 or ISG75 did not protect against infection (Ziegelbauer & Overath, 1993). In addition, accessibility of the HpHbR was demonstrated by the ability of a monoclonal antibody drug conjugate to clear infections in a mouse model (MacGregor et al., 2019).

The trypanosome flagellar pocket is an invagination of the plasma membrane at the base of the single flagellum and is the sole site of endo- and exocytosis. The location of the flagellar

pocket at the posterior end of the cell is central to the mechanism of clearance of

immunoglobulin molecules bound to VSG. The forward swimming motion of the

trypanosome exerts a hydrodynamic force on the immunoglobulin that protrudes above the

top of the VSG coat pushing the antibody-VSG complex towards the flagellar pocket and

subsequent endocytosis (Engstler et al., 2007). Since the hydrodynamic flow requires only

binding to a cell surface protein, it is likely to occur with any large ligand bound to a receptor

providing it has free lateral movement in the plane of the membrane. The flagellar pocket is

a discrete domain of the plasma membrane (Gadelha et al., 2009) with several exclusively

localised proteins (Gadelha et al., 2015). At the neck of the pocket, there is a restriction

introduced by close contact between the plasma membranes of the flagellum and pocket as

it emerges onto the cell body. This flagellar pocket collar is maintained by specific proteins

(Bonhivers et al., 2008)(Gadelha et al., 2009). The exclusive localisation of some proteins to

the plasma membrane of the flagellar pocket, others to the cell body, and a range to both,

indicates that there is regulated passage between the two domains of the plasma

membrane.

There is variation in the reported localisation of receptors to different domains of the plasma

membrane. TfR was the first receptor to be identified, it is glycosylphosphatidylinositol (GPI)-

anchored and has been localised to the flagellar pocket and endosomal membrane in some

studies but others suggested it was on the flagellar pocket, cell body plasma membrane and

endosomal membrane (Duncan et al., 2024; Mussmann et al., 2003, 2004; Steverding et al.,

1994a, 1995; Tiengwe et al., 2017). The Complement Factor H receptor (FHR) is a monomer

probably GPI-anchored and is localised to the cell body and flagellar plasma membrane

(Macleod et al., 2020). HpHbR, also probably GPI-anchored, has been localised to the

flagellar pocket (Vanhollebeke et al., 2008). Reporter proteins with a single GPI-anchor are

also present on the cell body plasma membrane (Schwartz et al. 2005). ISG65 and ISG75

are type I transmembrane proteins and localise to the flagellar, cell body, and pocket plasma

membrane as well as the endosome (Leung et al., 2011; Ziegelbauer et al., 1992). The

localisation of receptors to the flagellar pocket has been proposed to protect the cell from

downstream effects of antibody recognition of the receptor but the discovery of new

receptors, such as Complement C3 binding by ISG65 (Macleod et al., 2022) and FHR

(Macleod et al., 2020) that are more abundant and distributed over the cell surface seems to

contradict this argument.

Newly synthesised or recycled proteins are added to the plasma membrane at the flagellar

pocket. Some proteins are retained in the flagellar pocket and have limited or no distribution

over the cell surface (Billington et al., 2023). It is assumed that these proteins have a

retention and/or retrieval signal. For transmembrane proteins a signal could be in the cytoplasm. In contrast, GPI-anchored proteins have no cytoplasmic component and recognition must occur on the external face of the plasma membrane. Any signal for retention has to operate in a background of sequence variation in VSGs which makes short amino acid motifs unlikely. TfR is a heterodimer with the two subunits, ESAG6 and ESAG7, forming a single binding site for monomeric transferrin. ESAG6, but not ESAG7, has a GPI-anchor so the TfR is tethered to the plasma membrane by a single anchor in contrast to VSG dimers and trimers which have a GPI-anchor on each subunit. There is experimental evidence that the signal for TfR concentration in the flagellar pocket is the number of GPI-anchors per molecule, a single anchor leading to a greater retention, and more than one anchor ready to escape to the surface of the cell body (Schwartz et al., 2005; Tiengwe et al., 2017). These experiments manipulated the number of GPI-anchors on TfR, heterodimer with a single anchor on one subunit. Adding an anchor to the second subunit caused a change in localisation to the cell surface and endosome as judged by immunofluorescence. However, conditions that led to a few fold increase in expression of single GPI-anchored TfR, including transferrin shortage and growth at high cell density, resulted in the detection of TfR on the cell body surface (Mussmann et al., 2004). Whether the surface-localized TfR is functional remains unproven (Mussmann et al., 2004; Schwartz et al., 2005).

TfR is encoded by a dispersed gene family with ~15 TfR variants. The experiments here started with a chance observation that one of these encoded a receptor with two GPI-anchors while the others have a single anchor. This was exploited to investigate how the presence of one or two GPI-anchors affected function. We show that the second GPI-anchor has no effect on the kinetics of uptake, or processing of transferrin through the endosome. However, the second anchor resulted in ≥1.5-fold increase in steady state receptor levels. Further, transferrin uptake experiments provided evidence that TfR was present over the entire cell surface and this was supported by immunofluorescence experiments. An analysis of the localisation of two other putatively GPI-anchored proteins showed that all were present over the entire cell surface. These experiments demonstrate that the trypanosome expresses a set of receptors over the entire cell surface inferring that there are effective mechanisms to resist antibody mediated recognition of conserved cell surface proteins.

RESULTS

The BES7 VSG expression site encodes a transferrin receptor with two GPI-anchors

In *T. brucei*, the active VSG gene is transcribed from a bloodstream form expression site (BES) that is telomere proximal. BESs contain up to 12 other co-transcribed expression site associated genes (ESAGs) (Hertz-Fowler et al., 2008; Pays et al., 2001). TfRs are heterodimers encoded by ESAG6 and ESAG7 (Chaudhri et al., 1994; Salmon et al., 1994a) The ESAG6 and 7 subunits share around 80% amino acid identity although ESAG6 has an additional 24 residues at the C-terminus preceding a GPI-anchor addition signal. Different BESs encode variants of ESAG6 and 7 with 90% or more amino acid sequence identity (Maier & Steverding, 2008; Trevor et al., 2019). In *T. brucei* Lister 427, the isolate used in these experiments, there are 15 BESs (Barcons-Simon et al., 2023) and most were sequenced and annotated after transformation associated recombination cloning of telomeres (Hertz-Fowler et al., 2008). In the original annotation, BES7 stands out as it has two copies of ESAG6 but apparently lacked ESAG7 and as such would not be able to make a functional TfR. Here, a fresh analysis of the sequence was performed and indicated that the first 'ESAG6' gene annotated in BES7 actually encoded an ESAG7 with a C-terminal extension and a GPI-anchor typical of an ESAG6. In addition, there was a second ESAG6 gene (ESAG6.2) downstream of the annotated copy (ESAG6.1), the two copies encode proteins with a single difference in 401 residues (M110->V). Phylogenetic analysis of ESAG6 and ESAG7 confirmed that a copy of ESAG7 is indeed present in BES7 along with a single copy of ESAG6 (Figure 1A).

The origin of the GPI-anchor attachment signal in BES7 ESAG7 was investigated by comparing the ESAG7 mRNA sequences from 13 different BESs. This showed that all the ESAG7 genes contained residual coding sequences for GPI-anchor addition but a set of small deletions between nucleotides 985 and 1068 in the ORF resulted in a frameshift leading to a premature stop codon at the C-terminal end effectively removing the GPI-anchor attachment sequence (Figure S1). A comparison of BES7 ESAG6 and 7 showed that the C-terminal 120 amino acid sequences are identical and there was a clear prediction for a GPI-anchor on both using NetGPI 1.1 (Gíslason et al., 2021) (Figure S2).

Cellular TfR protein levels are determined by BES identity and the number of GPI-anchors

ESAG6 and 7 protein levels were examined by western blotting in cell lines expressing VSGs and TfRs from three different BESs: BES3-VSG118, BES1-VSG221 and BES7-VSG224 (Figure 1B). TfRs have several N-linked glycosylation sites and whole cell lysates were treated with PNGaseF to simplify analysis. First, in BES7 cells there was a shift in the apparent molecular weight of ESAG7 from ~30 kDa to ~38 kDa, which is consistent with the

addition of an additional 24 residues present in ESAG6 but not ESAG7 and a GPI-anchor
(Figure 1B), such a change in mobility on the addition of a GPI-anchor to ESAG7 has been
reported previously (Tiengwe et al., 2017). Second, the identity of the active BES affected
both ESAG6 and ESAG7 protein levels, there were increasing levels of expression: BES3 <
BES1 < BES7 (Figure 1B). Lastly, when the BES7 cell line was modified to exchange
VSG224 to VSG221 (see below), this had little effect on TfR expression, suggesting the BES
identity was the dominant determinant rather than the VSG type. The rabbit TfR antiserum
used was raised against the TfR from BES1 (Gerrits et al., 2002) and is the same as used in
most other studies (Mussmann et al., 2003; Tiengwe et al., 2017). The amino acid sequence
identity between BES2 TfR and BES1 TfR is >98% and BES7 TfR is >92% and it is unlikely
that the difference in TfR levels result from differential reactivity of the serum to different
TfRs. Support for the different levels of TfR expression was obtained when the levels of TfR
mRNAs were estimated in the BES3, BES1 and BES7 cell lines using RNAseq (Table S1).
The level of TfR mRNAs were expressed as a ratio (ESAG6+ESAG7):VSG and were
consistent with the differences seen in protein levels (BES3, 0.022 < BES1, 0.038 < BES7,
0.077).
219
We next investigated whether GPI-anchor number contributed to the variation in cellular TfR
levels by making a set of transgenic cell lines (Figure 2A). First, VSG224 in BES7 was
changed to VSG221. Next, the cell line expressing VSG221 from BES7 was modified to alter
the ESAG7 by exchanging the 3' end of the ORF with that from BES1 ESAG7 resulting in
the loss of the GPI-anchor signal. As a control, a second cell line in which the ESAG7 gene
retained the GPI-anchor addition sequence was made. Similar modifications were performed
on cells expressing VSG221 from BES1, cell lines expressing either BES1 ESAG7 modified
with the C-terminal GPI-anchor sequence from BES7 ESAG7 or the endogenous BES1
ESAG7 were made. The result was four cell lines: all expressed VSG221 from either BES1
or BES7 and TfR with or without a GPI-anchor on ESAG7.
230
The cell lines were characterised by western blotting of PNGaseF-treated whole cell lysates
(Figure 2B). The addition of a GPI-anchor signal sequence to ESAG7 resulted in an increase
in both ESAG6 and 7. To estimate this change, whole cell lysates were minimally separated
by SDS-PAGE to collapse the ESAG6 and 7 proteins into a single band prior to western
blotting. Relative quantitation was obtained using a titration curve of the highest TfR
expresser and normalised against SCD6 for loading (Figure 2C). Three biological replicates
were performed and the levels of both TfRs from BES1 is significantly lower (p<0.01), ~3.5
fold, compared to BES7, regardless of GPI-anchor number. The presence of a GPI-anchor
on ESAG7, leading to a double-anchored TfR, significantly increased (p<0.05) the

expression level by approximately 1.9-fold in BES1 and about 1.5-fold in BES7. This

provides strong evidence that the presence of a GPI-anchor on ESAG7 contributes to the

higher cellular expression level of TfR, which could result from increased protein stability,

reported for VSGs, (Bangs et al., 1986; Engstler et al., 2004) or a higher rate of turnover

and/or greater shedding of the single GPI-anchored TfR (Schwartz et al. 2005).

Transferrin uptake kinetics are similar in cells expressing TfRs with either one or two

GPI-anchors

To investigate whether anchor number influenced function, BES7-VSG221 cell lines

expressing single or double GPI-anchored TfR were used. It has already been shown that a

TfR with double GPI-anchors is functional (Tiengwe et al., 2017), here the kinetics of

transferrin binding and uptake by single and double GPI-anchor TfRs were compared. The

experimental approach was similar to that developed to characterise the binding and

endocytosis of VSG antibodies (Engstler et al., 2007). The medium used to culture

trypanosomes contained ~2.5 μM transferrin (Kakuta et al., 1997), Alexa 568 labelled bovine

holo-transferrin (Tf$_{A568}$) was added to cultures, without any other manipulation, to a final

concentration of 0.5 μM (so that 1 in 6 molecules of Tf In the medium is now fluorescent)

and cells were then fixed over a time course from 15 to 600 seconds and imaged by

epifluorescence microscopy (Figure 3A and S3A). The on rate for binding of Tf to TfR is very

rapid (4.5 x 10^5 M^{-1}s^{-1} at pH 7.4 for BES1 TfR and bovine Tf) (Trevor et al., 2019) and

binding will occur to unoccupied receptor almost immediately. At 15 seconds there was

variation between individual cells with Tf$_{A568}$ present on the flagellum, across the cell body

and the flagellar pocket in both cell lines. There was also variation at 60 seconds, Tf$_{A568}$ was

present in the endosomal compartment of most cells, and the cell surface in some cells. At

600 seconds the Tf$_{A568}$ was predominantly within the endosomal compartment. The variation

was also examined by quantifying the fluorescence from individual cells (Figure 3B), this

showed the range of variation and an increase in fluorescence between 15 and 60 seconds

followed by a decrease by 600 seconds. Fluorescence intensity was also determined across

transverse sections of the cell (Figure 3C), this showed some cells with internal signal and

others with two peaks consistent with a cell surface localisation. There was a stronger signal

from cells expressing TfR with two GPI-anchors, consistent with higher expression levels,

but no consistent differences in distribution were seen.

The same Tf$_{A568}$ uptake assay was performed with the BES1-VSG221 cells expressing TfRs

with one or two GPI-anchors (Figure 3D and S3B). There was a reduced binding and uptake

of Tf$_{A568}$ in BES1 cells compared to BES7 cells as might be expected given lower levels of

the receptor. Otherwise, the time course of uptake was similar: at 15 seconds Tf$_{A568}$ was

present on the flagellum and cell body surface as well as the flagellar pocket in both cell

lines, at 60 seconds Tf$_{A568}$ on the cell surface was reduced and some was now present in the

flagellar pocket and endosomal compartments, and by 600 seconds Tf$_{A568}$ was substantially

within endosomal compartments. In both BES7 and BES1 cell lines, fluorescence distribution

patterns across the cells showed variability at 15 and 60 sec (Figure 3E-F), but appeared

more uniform at 600 sec.

Previous studies have shown that some TfRs do not bind canine transferrin (Mussmann et

al., 2003). Canine transferrin has 501/686 amino acid sequence identities with bovine

transferrin (Figure S4A) and it was used as a negative control in the same transferrin binding

and uptake assay above using BES7-VSG221 cells expressing TfR with either one or two

GPI-anchors (Figure S4B). No cell binding or uptake of canine Tf in either cell line was

observed. In addition, a competition assay for binding of fluorescent Tf was performed by

adding 5- or 10-fold excess of unlabelled Tf at the same time (Figure S4C). The signal from

labelled Tf was reduced by the competition indicating saturable binding, consistent with a

receptor mediated process. These findings provide evidence that the binding of bovine

transferrin to the cell surface is receptor dependent. An important point is that fluorescent Tf

was added to cells in culture without any other manipulation as preliminary experiments

indicated that centrifugation, washing and resuspension in medium led to a reduction in

cellular TfR for up to 2 hours (Figure S4D).

Together, these experiments support a model in which the TfR is present on the cell surface,

and endocytosis is a rapid process. The greater Tf binding and uptake in BES7 compared to

BES1 cells provides evidence that TfR abundance limits the amount of Tf endocytosed. The

number of GPI-anchors on the TfR has no obvious influence on Tf uptake but does affect

receptor levels.

The finding that Tf$_{A568}$ was bound over the whole cell surface at early time points in the

uptake assays suggested a similar localisation for the TfR. This is not consistent with some

previous studies that found TfR and other GPI-anchored receptors sequestered in the

flagellar pocket (Duncan et al., 2024; Mussmann et al., 2004; Steverding et al., 1994a, 1995;

Tiengwe et al., 2017; Vanhollebeke et al., 2008) or that expression level determined

localisation (Mussmann et al., 2003). We went on to characterise the cellular localisation of

single and double GPI-anchored TfR along with two other GPI-anchored receptors.

Localisation of the transferrin receptor by immunofluorescence

Previous reports provided evidence that in BES1-VSG221 cells grown in the presence of 10% FBS, the cell surface TfR is located or concentrated within the flagellar pocket and endosome, rather than dispersed on the cell body (Ligtenberg et al., 1994; Mussmann et al., 2003; Salmon et al., 1994a; Tiengwe et al., 2017). In contrast, when cells are treated to increase TfR expression by roughly three to fivefold, for example when grown to high density or in canine serum, TfR localizes on the cell body (Mussmann et al., 2003). To resolve this discrepancy, the localisation of the TfR was investigated using immunofluorescence. Based on the transferrin uptake experiments, we reasoned that the localisation of the TfR would be very dynamic and thus chose to fix the cells in culture without any centrifugation or washing, this approach was supported by preliminary experiments comparing protocols (Figure S5A-B) that showed both the composition of the fixative and absence of a washing step altered the outcome.

Four cell lines, BES1-VSG221 and BES7-VSG221 cells each expressing TfR with one or two GPI-anchors, were investigated. Fixative was added to cells in culture without any other manipulations, the final concentrations were 4% formaldehyde and 0.2% glutaraldehyde and TfR localisation was observed by immunofluorescence after settling cells on microscope slides. Under these experimental conditions, the TfR in all four cell lines had a distribution across the entire cell surface including the flagellar pocket and in internal compartments in some cells (Figure 4A). Fluorescence intensity measurements across transverse sections of both the BES7 1- and 2 GPI cells confirmed that TfR is indeed present on the surface of some cells as seen by two peaks in fluorescence corresponding to the cell periphery in some cells (Figure 4B). As in the Tf uptake experiments, the strength of signal as measured by total fluorescence intensity from individual cells showed that TfR abundance varied between individual cells in populations (Figure 4C and Figure S5C). These measurements also showed that the presence of two GPI-anchors on TfR increased levels by about 1.5-fold compared to the single anchored receptor and that there is a ~3.5-fold higher TfR expression in BES7 compared to BES1 cells regardless of GPI-anchor number. These measurements support the western blot quantitation (Figure 2) and also provide evidence that the immunofluorescence signal does not contain a significant level of non-specific background.

Structured Illumination Microscopy (SIM) was used to obtain more information on TfR localisation in the same four cell lines as above (Figure 5). TfR was present on the cell surface including the flagellar pocket, cell body and flagellum, and in the endosome (single

stack images) (Figure 5A). Three-dimensional reconstruction of the localization of TfR

confirmed that it is distributed across the cell surface and in endosomes (Figure 5B).

These experiments collectively provide strong evidence that TfR is indeed present on the *T.*

brucei cell surface under normal growth conditions and that the localization pattern is

independent of the presence or absence of a GPI-anchor in the ESAG7 subunit.

Cell surface localisation is shared by two other GPI-anchored receptors

The finding that TfR is distributed over the whole cell surface led to an investigation of other

receptors. Two were selected on the basis of being predicted to have one or more GPI-

anchors and a non-expressing negative control being available. The first was the

haptoglobin haemoglobin receptor (HpHbR) for which +/+ and -/- cell lines were used. The

structure of most of HpHbR is known and it is a monomer in solution but two or more

receptors can bind a single ligand (Higgins et al., 2013; Lane-Serff et al., 2014). HpHbR has

a low copy number, 300 to 400 per cell (Vanhollebeke et al., 2008) and, in the absence of a

suitable antibody, a ligand uptake assay was used. The second receptor analysed was the

complement factor H receptor (FHR), this was used after a fortuitous observation that

although it is not expressed when cells are grown in medium containing 10% foetal bovine

serum (Macleod et al., 2020), it is expressed at high levels when the same cells are grown in

medium with 10% rabbit serum replacing the foetal bovine serum. The structure of FHR is

known and it is a monomer with a single GPI-anchor (Macleod et al., 2020).

Alexa 568-labelled HpHb (HpHb$_{A568}$) was used in uptake assays with HpHbR +/+ and -/-

cells as for transferrin uptake (Figure 6A). There was binding of ligand to the cell surface by

15 seconds, uptake into the endosome by 60 seconds, and a location consistent with the

lysosome by 600 seconds. Binding and uptake were not detected in HpHbR -/- cells (Figure

6A). The kinetics of uptake were similar to those for transferrin. Presence of HpHb$_{A568}$ on the

cell surface was confirmed by the fluorescence signal measurement across the cells at 15

seconds, which showed two distinct peaks consistent with peripheral localisation for some

cells (Figure 6B), the noise in the quantification is due to the low copy number of the

receptor. Again, there was variability in binding and uptake of HpHb across the population

(Figure S6).

In trypanosomes cultured in medium containing 10% rabbit serum, expression of the FHR

was readily detected whereas in medium containing foetal bovine serum (FBS) it is not

(Figure 7A). Cells cultured with rabbit serum were used to determine the localisation of FHR

by immunofluorescence following the same procedure used for the transferrin receptor (Figure 7B). The FHR was clearly localised over the entire cell surface. Two controls for specificity of antibody binding were performed: first cells were grown in medium supplemented with foetal bovine serum and second with a no primary antibody control for the cells grown with rabbit serum to control for cell surface immunoglobulin originating from the growth medium. Neither control gave a signal (Figure S7). SIM analysis further provided spatial resolution along with reconfirming the distribution of the FHR across the trypanosome cell surface and flagellum as well as within the flagellar pocket (Figure 7C).

These experiments show that the detection of TfR on the cell surface is part of a general pattern where GPI-anchored receptors are distributed across the cell body plasma membrane.

DISCUSSION

Any pathogen that has evolved to establish and maintain a long-term infection within a mammalian host must be able to acquire nutrients as well as be resistant to both the innate and adaptive immune responses of the host. African trypanosomes have evolved a strategy that is dependent on variant surface glycoprotein (VSG), a superabundant protein that forms a densely packed coat on the cell surface. Low frequency switching to a different VSG allows the population to persist (Mugnier et al., 2015). The VSG coat appears to prevent antibodies, and possibly innate immunity factors, gaining immediate access to the plasma membrane (Schwede et al., 2011). However, such a coat cannot be totally impermeable as trypanosomes require host macromolecules such as transferrin and haptoglobin-haemoglobin which they acquire through receptor mediated endocytosis (Lane-Serff et al., 2014; Salmon et al., 1994b; Steverding et al., 1994b, 1995; Trevor et al., 2019; Vanhollebeke et al., 2008).

Why these receptors do not result in the trypanosomes becoming susceptible to immune recognition and attack is central to understanding the mechanisms of infection (Banerjee et al., 2024). One model proposed that the receptors are sequestered in the flagellar pocket, an invagination of the plasma membrane at the base of the flagellum, and are not accessible to immune effectors. The idea that sequestration in the flagellar pocket allowed receptors to hide from host immune effectors was first challenged by the discovery of invariant surface glycoproteins (ISGs) (Ziegelbauer et al., 1992; Ziegelbauer & Overath, 1992) that were shown to be distributed over the whole cell surface (Macleod et al., 2022; Ziegelbauer & Overath, 1993). Two ISGs were subsequently identified as receptors, one for complement

C3 and another for the Fc region of immunoglobulins (Macleod et al., 2022; Mikkelsen et al.,

2024). Both the ability to access ligands and the structures of the extracellular domains of

both ISGs indicated that they were unlikely to be physically shielded by the VSG coat. The

ISGs are type 1 transmembrane proteins with a large extracellular domain, a single

transmembrane pass and a small cytoplasmic tail. In contrast, VSGs have two or more GPI-

anchors whereas the two characterised nutrient receptors have a single GPI-anchor. Could

this difference in GPI-anchor number result in selective retention of nutrient receptors in the

flagellar pocket (Tiengwe et al., 2017) as it is difficult to envisage a requirement for any

amino acid sequence motifs in the context of variation of VSGs.

Here, we have investigated the distribution of GPI-anchored receptors on the cell surface of

mammalian infective *Trypanosoma brucei*. The main findings are: (1) The majority of TfRs

encoded in the genome have a single GPI-anchor but there is at least one with two GPI-

anchors. (2) The single anchored TfRs probably arose from loss of one anchor as opposed

to gain in the double anchored version. The loss of the GPI-anchor from ESAG7 may

provide a selective advantage possibly reducing exposure to the host adaptive immune

system without affecting transferrin acquisition (Trevor et al., 2019). (3) The steady state

level of TfR varies with the identity of the transcribed BES. (4) Single or double anchored

TfRs bind transferrin, as previously reported (Tiengwe et al., 2017) and result in similar

kinetics of transferrin uptake, with movement from the cell surface to the endosome

occurring within two minutes. The rapid kinetics of uptake indicates the receptor ligand

complex is probably subject to the same hydrodynamic forces as antibody VSG complexes

(Engstler et al., 2007) resulting in a directional movement towards the posterior end of the

cell, the location of the flagellar pocket and endocytosis. (5) Adding a second GPI-anchor to

a TfR resulted in a ~1.5-fold increase in cellular receptor levels. (6) Both single and double

GPI-anchored TfRs are present over the whole cell surface as seen by both transferrin and

antibody binding. (7) Two other GPI-anchored receptors, the HpHbR and FHR, both

probably with a single GPI-anchor, are present over the whole cell surface.

The earlier findings that the TfR, and subsequently the HpHbR, are localised to the flagellar

pocket is an attractive model as it provided an easy explanation for why the receptors did not

result in immune attack. The experiments presented here do not agree with this model and it

is worth discussing the reasons why these experimental differences have arisen. Here the

cells were fixed in culture using formaldehyde and a higher concentration (0.2%) of

glutaraldehyde than in previous reports. In contrast, much of the previous work involved

manipulations of the trypanosomes before determining either transferrin binding or TfR/

HpHbR localisation by immunofluorescence. The most common is centrifugation and

washing prior to fixation for immunofluorescence (Engstler et al., 2004; Roggy & Bangs,

1999; Tiengwe et al., 2017; Vanhollebeke et al., 2008), a process that is slow when

compared to the very rapid endocytosis of surface bound transferrin (Figure 3) and providing

time for the ligand bound receptors to be cleared from the cell surface. This would be even

more apparent if the experimental manipulation reduced the export of new or recycled TfRs

to the cell surface. An example of how protocols determine outcomes is the variation in the

measured half-life of TfR, which ranges from ~40 min to 7 hrs depending on the different

experimental protocols used (Biebinger et al., 2003; Kabiri & Steverding, 2000; Mussmann et

al., 2004; Tiengwe et al., 2017).

The experiments involving transferring BES1-VSG221 cells to medium in which FBS had

been replaced by canine serum (Mussmann et al., 2003) are informative. The BES1 TfR

does not bind canine transferrin and cell proliferation arrested. After ~5 days, proliferating

cells appeared in the culture having switched BES and thus TfR orthologue to one able to

bind canine transferrin (van Luenen et al., 2005). In addition, supplementing the canine

serum based medium with bovine transferrin prevented arrest of proliferation indicating that

it was due to lack of transferrin alone (Mussmann et al., 2004). In contrast to experiments

that wash cells into solutions that do not support growth, the transfer of BES1-VSG221 cells

to medium with canine serum starves the cells of just transferrin. On transfer from FBS to

canine serum, the TfR abundance increased 4 to 5-fold and the receptor was present all

over the cell surface (Mussmann et al., 2003). It is unlikely that the distribution of TfR on the

cell surface results from a retention system being overwhelmed given the variation in TfR

expression observed from different BESs (Figure 1) but is due to an absence of ligand-

mediated uptake. Different TfRs have a wide range of affinities for transferrins (K_D from as

low as 1.4 nM to >5 µM) (Trevor et al., 2019) and there will be an equilibrium with the

relative amounts of TfR on the cell body surface compared with the flagellar pocket and

internal structures that will vary with the identity of the TfR and the identity and concentration

of transferrin.

The experiments here were informed by the kinetics of rapid transferrin uptake (Figure 3 and

as an unpublished observation in (Mussmann et al., 2004) and we did not manipulate the

cells before ligand uptake experiments or prior to fixation for immunolocalization. The result

was clear evidence that TfR is expressed over the whole cell surface and is not restricted to

the flagellar pocket. This was reinforced by the localisation of the HpHbR and FHR, both of

which are monomeric (Lane-Serff et al., 2014; Macleod et al., 2020), contain a single GPI-

anchor, and are also present over the whole cell surface. We also observed variation in TfR

and HpHbR abundance between individual cells, as has been seen previously for TfR

(Duncan et al., 2024; Steverding et al., 1994b), and this suggests sensitivity to the requirements at the individual cell level. Whether this relates to cell cycle stage or any developmental progression remains to be investigated. The expression of the TfR is sensitive to the availability of Fe^{3+} with a several fold increases in mRNA and protein induced by iron chelators (Gilabert Carbajo et al., 2021). Growth in medium dependent on rabbit serum resulted in high levels of expression of the FHR, this could result from a factor in rabbit serum inducing expression or failure to bind ligand.

The findings here still leave the question of how the trypanosome avoids receptor antibody-based clearance by the host immune system? Vaccination of mice with ISGs did not result in any protection (Ziegelbauer & Overath, 1993), this shows that receptors do not have to be sequestered in the flagellar pocket to avoid the host adaptive immune system. The effective killing of trypanosomes by antibody-drug conjugates recognising the HpHbR shows that receptors are accessible (MacGregor et al., 2019), as does inhibition of transferrin binding by Fab fragments (Steverding et al., 1995). It is likely that a combination of processes results in resistance to receptor antibody-mediated killing: first antibodies have to recognise parts of the receptor that are accessible in the VSG coat, this will be affected by the structure of the receptor and how much is occluded by ligand binding, a function of ligand concentrations, host species and receptor K_D. Enough antibody has to be present on the cell surface for long enough to elicit a response. Two factors affect this, first the copy number of the receptor, ISGs are present at 50,000 to 70,000 per cell (Ziegelbauer et al., 1992) (<1% of VSG), TfR at a few thousand, but variable (Steverding et al., 1995), and HpHbR at 300 to 400 (Vanhollebeke et al., 2008). Second, the half time of the receptor antibody complex on the cell body plasma membrane will be short (Steverding et al., 1995) as the hydrodynamic forces rapidly push VSG-antibody complexes toward the flagellar pocket and endocytosis (Engstler et al., 2007). In summary, we provide evidence that GPI-anchored receptors in trypanosomes are not sequestered in the flagellar pocket but are distributed across the cell body and flagellum surface plasma membrane and this leads to re-evaluation of how trypanosomes avoid receptor antibody mediated clearance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell lines

T. brucei Lister427 bloodstream form cell lines were used throughout expressing either VSG221 (MiTat1.2) from BES1, VSG118 (MITat 1.5) from BES3 or VSG224 (MITat 1.3) from

BES7. BES7 expressing cells were as described in Hertz-Fowler *et al.* (Hertz-Fowler et al.,

2008) where BES1 and BES7 were tagged with Puromycin and G418 resistance genes

respectively. Cells were maintained in culture in HMI-11 medium (Hirumi & Hirumi, 1989).

For ligand-uptake assays and immunofluorescence cells were harvested in mid-log phase

(0.5-1x10^6 cells/ml). To allow further modification by (CRISPR)-associated gene 9 (Cas9)

gene editing, BES1 and BES7 expressing cell lines were first modified by transfection with a

construct containing Cas9 and T7 RNA polymerase transgenes (Beneke et al., 2017).

Antibiotic selection was used when appropriate. The primers used to generate the cell lines

are listed in Table S5.

Constructs for ESAG7 +/- GPI attachment site

Constructs are represented schematically in Figure 2A and described in brief below:

BES7 constructs:

The presence of a G418 resistance gene upstream of ESAG7 was utilised to generate the

required constructs from BES7 genomic DNA (Hertz-Fowler et al., 2008). A PacI-EcoRI PCR

fragment from the promoter to the G418 resistance gene start was annealed to an EcoRI-

PacI PCR fragment from the G418 stop codon through to the ESAG7 3' UTR. The resulting

EcoRI site was used to insert a blasticidin resistance open reading frame. The entire

construct was cloned into pGEM-T, allowing the required cassette to be excised by PacI for

transfection into BES7 cells expressing Cas9, alongside suitable sgRNAs to target the

BES7-ESAG7 region, designed by ChopChop (https://chopchop.cbu.uib.no/). This construct

contained the endogenous BES7 ESAG7 including its GPI anchor. To remove the GPI

anchor addition sequences and express an ESAG7 similar to those in the other Lister427

bloodstream expression sites, a SacI-BsrBI fragment was excised and replaced with the

corresponding fragment from BES1 ESAG7. This fragment was generated by RT-PCR from

RNA isolated from BES1 VSG221 cells using standard methods.

BES1 constructs:

A similar approach was used to make ESAG7 modifying constructs from BES1 exploiting a

puromycin resistance gene located between the promoter and the ESAG7 gene in the BES1

expression site (Hertz-Fowler et al., 2008). PacI-BstEII and BstEII-PacI PCR fragments were

generated from genomic DNA, ligated and cloned into pGEM-T. To generate BES1-ESAG7

with a GPI anchor from the BES1 expression site, the distal SacI-PacI fragment was

replaced by a PCR fragment encoding SacI-ESAG7 stop codon (blunt end) from BES7-

ESAG7 DNA and a BES1-ESAG7 3' UTR region from the BES1 site corresponding to the

BES7-ESAG7 stop codon (blunt end) to PacI. Constructs were linearised with PacI and

transfected with sgRNAs targeting the ESAG7 gene in either BES7 or BES1 and

electroporated into BES1 VSG221 cells expressing Cas9. BES7 modified cell lines were

selected with blasticidin and BES1 modified cell lines with puromycin.

Changing the VSG from 224 to 221:

BES7-VSG224 expression was switched to VSG221 by transfection of a linearised plasmid

fragment encoding VSG221, flanked by 5' and 3' VSG221 intergenic regions and a

downstream G418 resistance gene flanked by alpha-beta tubulin intergenic regions.

Sequences targeting the 5' and 3' UTRs of the endogenous VSG224 gene were generated

by PCR from BES7 (TAR153) DNA (a kind gift of Luísa Figueiredo) and cloned via KpnI/XhoI

and SpeI/SacI fragments upstream and downstream of the VSG221-blasticidin expression

cassette. G418 resistant clones were screened for binding to anti-VSG221 antibody through

immunofluorescence assays and confirmed by Western blot analysis.

Protein gel electrophoresis and Western blotting

Protein samples were prepared and analysed by SDS-PAGE and western blotting following

standard methods. Briefly, cells were harvested by centrifugation, washed in serum-free

HMI-9 and resuspended in Protein Sample Buffer (10% glycerol, 2% w/v SDS, 80 mM Tris-

HCl pH 6.8), at a concentration of 2×10^8 cells/ml. Immobilon-P membrane (Millipore) was

used to retain the proteins. The primary antibodies used during western blotting are rabbit

anti-FHR (Macleod et al., 2020) and rabbit anti-TfR (a kind gift of Piet Borst). Polyclonal anti-

VSG221 and anti-SCD6 antibodies were generated from recombinant *E. coli* expressed

proteins, injected into rabbits by standard methods (Covalab). Secondary antibodies used

were Peroxidase-conjugated AffiniPure Goat Anti-Rabbit IgG (H+L) (Jackson

Immunoresearch) and Alexa Fluor 488-Donkey Anti-Rabbit IgG (H+L) (Invitrogen).

Membranes were blocked in Tris-buffered saline (TBS), 0.1% Tween20, 2% w/v Marvel dried

milk and probed in appropriate dilutions of primary and secondary antibodies. Washing steps

were performed with TBS, 0.1% Tween20 and blots were analysed on a BioRad ChemiDoc

system, ensuring signals remained below saturation limits. Quantitation of transferrin

receptor protein level was performed using Fiji-ImageJ software

(https://imagej.net/software/fiji/), with background subtraction and comparison with intensity

measurements taken from a protein dilution series from BES7 expressing cells.

RNAseq

mRNA was sequenced using Illumina paired-end sequencing technology by the Beijing

Genomics Institute. Raw reads were deposited to ENA under the accession number

PRJEB90063. Analysis was perfomed using Galaxy (www.usegalaxy.org) (Afgan et al.,

2018). Reads were quality filtered using Trimmomatic (Bolger et al., 2014). Sequences were

searched for all common Illumina adaptors and the settings used were: LEADING:10

TRAILING:10 SLIDINGWINDOW:5:15 MINLEN:50. mRNA abundance was calculated using

SalmonQuant with default settings and *Trypanosoma brucei* Lister strain 427 2018 v68

reference transcriptome and genomes from TriTrypDB (Aslett et al., 2010).

Ligand uptake

Bovine holo-transferrin (ThermoFisher) was dialyzed against PBS and labelled with Alexa

fluor 568 NHS ester (ThermoFisher) following the manufacturer's protocol. Canine

transferrin was obtained from Abbexa and loaded with iron using a four-fold molar excess of

ammonium iron (III) sulphate in presence of 5 mM sodium bicarbonate followed by dialysis

against 10 mM HEPES pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl as described previously (Trevor et al.,

2019)(Trevor et al., 2019). Canine holo- transferrin was then labelled with Alexa fluor 568

NHS ester (ThermoFisher) as above. The Hp-Hb complex was purified as described (Lane-

Serff et al., 2014) and labelled with Alexa fluor 568 NHS ester (ThermoFisher) following the

manufacturer's protocol.

Mid log-phase cells (~ 6 x 10^5 /ml) were supplemented with 500 nM Alexa 568 labelled ligand

and incubated at 37°C. At time points, cells were fixed by the addition of 8% formaldehyde in

PBS to a final concentration 1% and incubated for 5 min. Cells were further washed with

PBS plus 1% BSA and DNA was stained with Hoechst 33258. Slides were prepared and

images were captured within next within the next 30 min using Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with

X100 objective. Samples in any one experiment were excited with the same intensity and

using the same exposure time. Images were processed using the ZEN Blue software.

Immunofluorescence localisation and microscopy

T. brucei cells were fixed in culture by the addition of one volume of 8% formaldehyde, 0.4%

glutaraldehyde (EM grade TAAB Laboratories Equipment Ltd.) in PBS for 10 min. After

fixation, cells were washed with serum free HMI-9 plus 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA)

twice and immobilized on poly-lysine coated slides for 1 hr. Immobilized cells were treated

with 0.1% triton X-100 (in PBS) for 5 min , washed with PBS and then incubated with PBS,

1% BSA for 10 min. Cells were incubated with the rabbit anti-TfR (1:50) or anti- FHR

(Macleod et al., 2020) (1:50) in PBS, 1% BSA for 1 hr, washed three times with PBS and

then with donkey anti- rabbit Alexa488 (1:800) in PBS, 1% BSA for 1 hr. Cells were washed

three times with PBS and the last wash contained 0.1 µg/ml Hoechst 33258 to stain DNA.

Cells were mounted with anti-fade and were visualized under Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with

X100 objective. In any one experiment, samples were illuminated with same exposure time,

intensity for respective excitation channels. All immunofluorescence experiments were

repeated three to six times with similar results. The images were processed with ZEN Blue

software by adjusting the brightness and contrast with the same changes being made to all

images in any one experiment including the negative controls. Individual cells were manually

outlined to define the whole-cell regions of interest (ROI), and background fluorescence was

measured from cell-free regions within the same field using the ZEN Blue software and it

was subtracted. For each condition, mean fluorescence intensity (arbitrary unit) was

quantified from at least 50-100 cells across the repeated experiments. Mean fluorescence

intensity was measured and background fluorescence intensity was subtracted. ImageJ

software was used to measure the point fluorescence intensity of ligands and receptor

antibodies by drawing a line perpendicular to the long axis of the cell, and the distribution

profile against the distance was plotted. For 3D structured illumination, a Zeiss Elyra7

microscope with X63 objective was used in the Cambridge Advanced Imaging Centre. Slides

were prepared as above and the processing of all images and the 3D reconstruction were

performed with ZEN Blue software only by adjusting the brightness contrast. All raw and

processed images are available at EMBL-EBI BioImage Archive accession S-BIAD2480.

 FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. *T. brucei* transferrin receptor expressed from BES7 contains GPI-anchored
ESAG7.

(A) Phylogenetic tree showing the relationship between ESAG6 and ESAG7 proteins from *T.*
brucei Lister 427 (Hertz-Fowler et al., 2008). The tree was assembled in Geneious Prime
(www.geneious.com) using an alignment by Muscle 5.1 followed by a neighbour joining tree
with 100 bootstraps and no outgroup on residues 1 to 332 of the alignment. BES7 ESAG 6.1
and 7 are shown in red.

(B) Variation in transferrin receptor expression in cell lines expressing VSGs from different
bloodstream form expression sites (BES). BES3-VSG118, BES1-VSG221, BES7-VSG224
cell lines are unmanipulated and the BES7-VSG221 was made after exchanging VSG224 for
VSG221 (see Figure 2A). Cell lysates were treated with PNGaseF and 2×10^6 cells
equivalents were loaded. Western blots were probed with anti-TfR, and then overprobed with
anti-VSG221. ESAG6 and ESAG7 plus GPI-anchor variants are indicated; BES3-VSG118
and BES1-VSG221 cell lysates contain ESAG7 without the GPI anchor. BES3-VSG118 and
BES7-VSG224 cell lysates did not show any VSG221. The presence of VSG221 protein
confirmed the switching of BES7 VSG224 to VSG221. Switching in VSG type did not affect
the expression pattern of native TfR (ESAG6/7 plus GPI) protein. Coomassie blue stained
SDS-PAGE gel to demonstrate loading of samples.

Figure 2. The effect of BES identity and the number of GPI-anchors on the cellular TfR
levels.

(A) Schematic illustrating the production of cell lines. For the addition and removal of ESAG7
GPI-anchor addition sequences, two constructs were used for each of BES1 and BES7. A
description of the construct is provided in the methods. For BES7, the same process was
used, one construct removing the GPI-anchor from ESAG7, the other leaving it intact. For
BES1, integration of one resulted in modification of ESAG7 to add a GPI-anchor, integration
of the second resulted in an unchanged ESAG7 polypeptide sequence. Restriction enzyme
sites used in cloning: P, PacI; E, EcoRI; S, SacI; Bs, BstEII and Bb, BsrBI. The VSG in
BES7-VSG224 cells was switched to VSG221 to remove any VSG-dependent variation. The
targeting construct conferred G418 resistance. (B) Transferrin receptor expression in the
following cell lines: BES7-VSG221 single (1-GPI) and double (2-GPI) GPI-anchored TfR and
BES1-VSG221 single and double GPI-anchored TfR. Cell lysates were treated with
PNGaseF and 2×10^6 cells equivalents were loaded per gel track. A western blot of the
samples was probed with anti-TfR then over probed with anti-VSG221 and anti-SCD6.
ESAG6 and ESAG7 plus GPI-anchor variants are indicated.

(C) TfR quantitation estimates from a minimum of three biological replicates of each cell line,

error bars display the standard deviation for each sample. Samples plus a dilution series

from BES7-221 were minimally separated by SDS-PAGE to compress TfR components to a

single band for analysis after western blotting, probed with anti-TfR and anti-SCD6. Donkey

anti-rabbit Alexa 488 was used as secondary antibody and band intensity was calculated by

ImageJ ensuring that signals taken for each reading were below saturation levels. Relative

quantitation was determined by mapping values to those obtained from a dilution series.

Measurements for SDC6 were used to normalise cell loading with the value for BES1-1GPI

anchor samples given an arbitrary value of 1. Statistical analysis was used a two-tailed

paired t-test, $**p \leq 0.01$; $*p \leq 0.05$.

Figure 3. Transferrin endocytosis is rapid, in both single and double GPI-anchored

cells. Initial binding is to the cell surface and internalization is detected within 60 sec.

Cultures of single (1-GPI) or double (2-GPI) GPI-anchored TfR expressing BES7-VSG221

and BES1-VSG221 cells were supplemented with 500 nM Alexa568 labelled holo- transferrin

(Tf_{A568}) and incubated for 15 sec, 60 sec or 600 sec and fixed by addition of formaldehyde for

5 min. Following washing with PBS containing 1% bovine serum albumin cells were

visualized under Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with X100 objective. Images in all these experimental

time points for both 1- and 2GPI TfR cells were captured with same intensity of excitation

and exposure time.

(A) Images showing the location of bound or endocytosed transferrin in representative cells

in populations and at time points as indicated. Scale bar is 5 µm. Images were processed

with ZEN Blue 3.4 software without any deconvolution. Larger numbers of cells are shown in

Supplementary Figure 3.

(B) The variation between individual cells in transferrin binding and uptake and endocytosis

shown by measurements of total fluorescence intensity of Tf_{A568} in BES7 VSG221 1- and 2-

GPI TfR cells at 15 sec, 60 sec and 600 sec. Measurements were obtained using Zen Blue

3.4 software and normalizing the background fluorescence (Table S2). Scatter plots of

measurements of individual cells are shown for 1-GPI (grey) and 2-GPI (purple) TfRs. The

average and standard deviation are shown for each cell line**.**

(C) Tf_{A568} fluorescence intensity distribution across transverse sections of randomly selected

cells was measured using ImageJ software. The plots are shown for both BES7 1- and 2-

GPI cell lines, showing the pattern of individual cells in different colours at 60 sec and 600

sec.

(D) (E) and (F) Same as (A) (B) and (C) but with BES1-VSG221 1- and 2GPI TfR expressing

cells and Table S3 corresponds to (E).

Figure 4. Immunofluorescence localisation of single and double GPI-anchored transferrin receptors to the entire plasma membrane.

Cell lines expressing VSG221 and either 1- or 2-GPI TfR variants were fixed in culture with final concentrations of 4% formaldehyde and 0.2% glutaraldehyde. Immunofluorescence localisations were performed with rabbit anti-TfR followed by donkey anti-rabbit Alexa 488 (green). Cells were visualized using a Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with X100 objective. Images in all these experimental sets were captured with same intensity of excitation and exposure time.

(A) Localization in cell lines as indicated. Scale bar is 5 μm. Images were processed with ZEN Blue 3.4 software. A larger number of cells is shown in Supp. Figure 5.

(B) Fluorescence distribution across transverse sections of the cells was measured using ImageJ software. Plots are shown for both BES7-VSG221 TfR cell lines, each cell in a different colour.

(C) Mean anti-TfR fluorescence intensity in individual cells of both BES1 VSG221 and BES7 VSG221 1- and 2-GPI TfR cell population was measured using ZEN Blue 3.4 and normalized against the background fluorescence (Table S4). Bar diagram shows the fluorescence intensity of either 1-GPI (grey) or 2-GPI (purple) TfR from individual cells. The columns represent the average and the error bars show the standard deviation.

Figure 5. Localization of single and double GPI-anchored transferrin receptors under 3D structured illumination microscope.

Cells expressing either 1- or 2-GPI-anchored TfR were fixed in culture with final concentrations of 4% formaldehyde and 0.2% glutaraldehyde. Immunofluorescence localisation was performed with rabbit anti-TfR and donkey anti-rabbit Alexa 488. Cells were visualized using a Zeiss Elyra7 microscope with X63 objective. Images in all these experimental sets were captured with same intensity of excitation and exposure time. (A) Localization of TfR in different cell lines as indicated. Scale bar is 5 μm.

(B) 3D projection generated using ZEN Blue 3.4 software example cells from the cell lines as indicated. These images show the localization pattern of TfR on the cell surface as well as within intracellular compartments. X-Y-Z axis is indicated. Scale bar 5 μm.

Figure 6. Haptoglobin-haemoglobin endocytosis assay. Initial binding is to the cell surface followed by rapid endocytosis.

Cells were supplemented with 500 nM Alexa 568 labelled HpHb, incubated for 15 sec, 60 sec or 600 sec and fixed in culture with 1% formaldehyde. Following washing with PBS containing 1% bovine serum albumin. Cells were visualized under Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with

x100 objective. Images in all these experimental time points were captured with same

excitation intensity and exposure time.

(A) Images showing the location of HpHb in +/+ and -/- cells at different time points in

representative cells as indicated. Images were processed with ZEN Blue 3.4 software. Scale

bar is 5 µm. A greater number of cells is shown in Supp. Figure 6.

(B) HpHb fluorescence intensity distribution over transverse section of cells at 15 sec

measured using ImageJ software. Individual cells are shown in different colours.

Figure 7. The complement factor H receptor localises to the cell surface.

The observation that abundant FHR expression occurred in cells grown in rabbit serum but

not in FBS supplemented medium was used to investigate its localisation.

(A) Western blot analysis of FHR expression in *T. brucei* EATRO1125 cells grown in medium

supplemented with either foetal bovine serum or rabbit serum. Cell lysates were not treated

with PNGaseF and $2x10^6$ cells equivalent were loaded. The blot was probed with rabbit anti-

FHR and then overprobed with anti-SCD6 for loading.

(B) Immunofluorescence determination of localisation of FHR in cell lines as indicated. Cells

were fixed in culture with final concentration of 4% formaldehyde and 0.2% glutaraldehyde.

Rabbit anti-FHR antibody was followed by donkey anti-rabbit Alexa 488 secondary antibody.

A set of cells grown in RbS, fixed similarly and stained only with secondary antibody was

used as a control for residual rabbit IgG from the growth medium and cells grown in FBS for

non-expressers. Cells were visualized using a Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with x100 objective.

Scale bar is 5 µm. A larger number of cells is shown in Supp. Figure 7

(C) Localisation of FHR by 3D structured illumination microscopy. Cells fixed as above were

visualised using a Zeiss Elyra7 with x63 objective. Images were processed with ZEN Blue

3.4 software. Two representative cells images showing FHR in white and merged panel with

DNA in blue. Scale bar is 5 µm.

SUPPLEMENTARY FIGURE LEGENDS

Supp Figure 1. Relationship between ESAG7 variants.

A. Clustal W alignment of the nucleotide sequences of ESAG7s showing the translation

termination codon in red. The sequence for GPI-addition is present in all genes but a series

of small deletions between nucleotides 980 and 1080 resulted in a frame shift and a new

stop codon that effectively removed the C-terminal ~50 residues from the open reading

frame.

B. Same alignment but just including ESAG7 from BES1 and BES7 showing the

conservation of the coding potential to the 3' side of the stop codon in BES1 ESAG7

indicating the shorter ESAG7 genes probably arose from a longer BES7-like variant.

Functional stop codons are in red.

Supp Figure 2. Relationship between ESAG 6 and 7.

Clustal W alignment of BES7 ESAG6 and 7 nascent polypeptide sequences. Predicted

processing sites are indicated by yellow highlighting. The N-terminal signal sequence

cleavage site was predicted using SignalP 6.0 and GPI-anchor addition sites by NetGPI 1.1

as detailed below the alignment.

Supp Figure 3. Transferrin endocytosis is rapid, in both single and double GPI-

anchored cells. Initial binding is to the cell surface and internalization is detected

within 60 sec.

Larger fields of cells from the experiments shown in Figure 3. Scale bar is 20 µm.

Supp Figure 4. Controls for specificity of bovine transferrin binding to *T. brucei* BES7

VSG221 transferrin receptors.

(A) Clustal W alignment of the polypeptide sequences of cow and dog transferrin.

(B) Cultures were supplemented with 500 nM Alexa568 labelled canine holo- transferrin and

incubated for 60 sec and fixed in culture by addition of formaldehyde to 1%. Following

washing with PBS containing 1% bovine serum albumin cells were visualized under Zeiss

Axio Imager.Z2 with x100 objective. Images for both BES7 VSG221 1- and 2-GPI TfR cells

were captured with same intensity of excitation and exposure time.

Images showing the absence of any bound or endocytosed canine transferrin in around forty

cells in population of both 1- and 2GPI TfR cells. Scale bar is 20 µm. Images were

processed ZEN Blue 3.4 software. (C) Cultures of single (1-GPI) GPI-anchored TfR

expressing BES7-VSG221 cells were supplemented with either 0.5 µM Tf_{A568} only, 2.5 µM

unlabelled Tf plus 0.5 µM Tf_{A568}, or 5 µM unlabelled Tf plus 0.5 µM Tf_{A568}, and incubated for

15 sec, then fixed by addition of formaldehyde for 5 min. DNA was stained with Hoechst.

Following washing with PBS containing 1% bovine serum albumin cells were visualized

under Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with X100 objective. Larger field views in all these experimental

sets were captured with same intensity of excitation and exposure time. (D) BES7 cells in

late logarithmic phase growth were counted by haemocytometer, harvested by centrifugation

and treated as follows: Left panel: Lane 1 (t=0 FBS): washed briefly in serum-free HMI-9 and

resuspended at 1×10^8 cells/ml in protein sample buffer; Lanes 2-5, washed briefly in serum-

free HMI-9 and resuspended at 1×10^6 cells/ml in HMI-9 + 10% FBS (Lanes 2 and 3) or

HMI-9 + 1% BSA (lanes 4 and 5) for a further 1 or 2 h prior to re-harvesting as described for

lane 1. Right hand panel contains half the samples used for the left side but treated with

PNGaseF prior to resuspension in protein sample buffer. 2 x 10^6 cells/lane were separated

by SDS-PAGE on 15% gels. Western blot analysis was performed with anti-TfR, anti-ISG65

and anti-SDC6 antibodies.

Supp Figure 5. Immunofluorescence localisation of single and double GPI-anchored

transferrin receptors to the entire plasma membrane.

(A) Different fixation protocols for the localisation of single GPI-anchored TfR expressed

from BES7. Cells were fixed in culture with final concentrations of either 4% formaldehyde

plus 0.2% glutaraldehyde, 4% formaldehyde, or washed with (1X PBS+ 1% BSA) then fixed

with 4% formaldehyde plus 0.2% glutaraldehyde. Immunofluorescence localisations were

performed with rabbit anti-TfR followed by donkey anti-rabbit Alexa 488 and DNA was

stained with Hoechst. A Zeiss Axio Imager.Z2 with X100 objective was used to visualise the

cells. Images in all these experimental sets were captured with same intensity of excitation

and exposure time. Scale bar is 5 µm. Images were processed with ZEN Blue 3.4 software.

(B) A larger number of cells is shown for Supp. Figure 5A. Scale bar is 20 µm.

(C) Larger fields of cells from the experiments shown in Figure 4. Scale bar is 20 µm.

Supp Figure 6. Haptoglobin-haemoglobin endocytosis assay. Initial binding is to the

cell surface followed by rapid endocytosis.

Larger fields of cells from the experiments shown in Figure 6. Scale bar is 20 µm.

Supp Figure 7. The complement factor H receptor localises to the cell surface.

Larger fields of cells from the experiments shown in Figure 7B. Scale bar is 20 µm.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank: Luísa Figueiredo for the gift of the cell line expressing VSG224 from

BES7 and a BES7 TAR clone; Piet Borst for the transferrin receptor antibodies; Jay Bangs

for a lot of fun discussions (but no fish); and the Cambridge Advance Imaging Centre for

Super Resolution Microscopy.

FUNDING

MC and MH are Wellcome Investigators (MC, 217138/Z/19/Z; MH, 220797/Z/20/Z). Initial

funding for SB was from the Newton-Bhabha Fund.

References:

Afgan, E., Baker, D., Batut, B., van den Beek, M., Bouvier, D., Cech, M., Chilton, J.,
Clements, D., Coraor, N., Grüning, B. A., Guerler, A., Hillman-Jackson, J., Hiltemann,
S., Jalili, V., Rasche, H., Soranzo, N., Goecks, J., Taylor, J., Nekrutenko, A., &
Blankenberg, D. (2018). The Galaxy platform for accessible, reproducible and
collaborative biomedical analyses: 2018 update. *Nucleic Acids Research*, *46*(W1),
W537–W544. https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky379

Aslett, M., Aurrecoechea, C., Berriman, M., Brestelli, J., Brunk, B. P., Carrington, M.,
Depledge, D. P., Fischer, S., Gajria, B., Gao, X., Gardner, M. J., Gingle, A., Grant, G.,
Harb, O. S., Heiges, M., Hertz-Fowler, C., Houston, R., Innamorato, F., Iodice, J., …
Wang, H. (2010). TriTrypDB: a functional genomic resource for the Trypanosomatidae.
Nucleic Acids Research, *38*(Database issue), D457-62.
https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkp851

Banerjee, S., Minshall, N., Webb, H., & Carrington, M. (2024). How are Trypanosoma brucei
receptors protected from host antibody-mediated attack? *BioEssays : News and*
Reviews in Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology, e2400053.
https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.202400053

Bangs, J. D., Andrews, N. W., Hart, G. W., & Englund, P. T. (1986). Posttranslational
modification and intracellular transport of a trypanosome variant surface glycoprotein.
The Journal of Cell Biology, *103*(1), 255–263. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.103.1.255

Barcons-Simon, A., Carrington, M., & Siegel, T. N. (2023). Decoding the impact of nuclear
organization on antigenic variation in parasites. *Nature Microbiology*, *8*(8), 1408–1418.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-023-01424-9

Beneke, T., Madden, R., Makin, L., Valli, J., Sunter, J., & Gluenz, E. (2017). A CRISPR Cas9
high-throughput genome editing toolkit for kinetoplastids. *Royal Society Open Science*,
4(5), 170095. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170095

Biebinger, S., Helfert, S., Steverding, D., Ansorge, I., & Clayton, C. (2003). Impaired
dimerization and trafficking of ESAG6 lacking a glycosyl-phosphatidylinositol anchor.
Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology, *132*(2), 93–96.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molbiopara.2003.07.005

Billington, K., Halliday, C., Madden, R., Dyer, P., Barker, A. R., Moreira-Leite, F. F.,
Carrington, M., Vaughan, S., Hertz-Fowler, C., Dean, S., Sunter, J. D., Wheeler, R. J., &
Gull, K. (2023). Genome-wide subcellular protein map for the flagellate parasite
Trypanosoma brucei. *Nature Microbiology*, *8*(3), 533–547.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-022-01295-6

Bolger, A. M., Lohse, M., & Usadel, B. (2014). Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, *30*(15), 2114–2120.
https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btu170

Bonhivers, M., Nowacki, S., Landrein, N., & Robinson, D. R. (2008). Biogenesis of the
trypanosome endo-exocytotic organelle is cytoskeleton mediated. *PLoS Biology*, *6*(5),
e105. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0060105

Chaudhri, M., Steverding, D., Kittelberger, D., Tjia, S., & Overath, P. (1994). Expression of a
glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored Trypanosoma brucei transferrin-binding protein
complex in insect cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
States of America, *91*(14), 6443–6447. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.91.14.6443

Cook, A. D., Carrington, M., & Higgins, M. K. (2024). Molecular mechanism of complement
inhibition by the trypanosome receptor ISG65. *ELife*, *12*.
https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.88960

Duncan, S. M., Carbajo, C. G., Nagar, R., Zhong, Q., Breen, C., Ferguson, M. A. J., &
Tiengwe, C. (2024). Generation of a bloodstream form Trypanosoma brucei double
glycosyltransferase null mutant competent in receptor-mediated endocytosis of
transferrin. *PLoS Pathogens*, *20*(6), e1012333.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1012333

Engstler, M., Pfohl, T., Herminghaus, S., Boshart, M., Wiegertjes, G., Heddergott, N., &
Overath, P. (2007). Hydrodynamic flow-mediated protein sorting on the cell surface of
trypanosomes. *Cell*, *131*(3), 505–515. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.08.046

Engstler, M., Thilo, L., Weise, F., Grünfelder, C. G., Schwarz, H., Boshart, M., & Overath, P.
(2004). Kinetics of endocytosis and recycling of the GPI-anchored variant surface
glycoprotein in Trypanosoma brucei. *Journal of Cell Science*, *117*(Pt 7), 1105–1115.
https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.00938

Gadelha, C., Rothery, S., Morphew, M., McIntosh, J. R., Severs, N. J., & Gull, K. (2009).
Membrane domains and flagellar pocket boundaries are influenced by the cytoskeleton
in African trypanosomes. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
United States of America, *106*(41), 17425–17430.
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0909289106

Gadelha, C., Zhang, W., Chamberlain, J. W., Chait, B. T., Wickstead, B., & Field, M. C.
(2015). Architecture of a Host-Parasite Interface: Complex Targeting Mechanisms
Revealed Through Proteomics. *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics : MCP*, *14*(7), 1911–
1926. https://doi.org/10.1074/mcp.M114.047647

Gerrits, H., Mussmann, R., Bitter, W., Kieft, R., & Borst, P. (2002). The physiological
significance of transferrin receptor variations in Trypanosoma brucei. *Molecular and*
Biochemical Parasitology, *119*(2), 237–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-
6851(01)00417-0

Gilabert Carbajo, C., Cornell, L. J., Madbouly, Y., Lai, Z., Yates, P. A., Tinti, M., & Tiengwe, C.
(2021). Novel aspects of iron homeostasis in pathogenic bloodstream form
Trypanosoma brucei. *PLoS Pathogens*, *17*(6), e1009696.
https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1009696

Gíslason, M. H., Nielsen, H., Almagro Armenteros, J. J., & Johansen, A. R. (2021).
Prediction of GPI-anchored proteins with pointer neural networks. *Current Research in*
Biotechnology, *3*, 6–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crbiot.2021.01.001

Hertz-Fowler, C., Figueiredo, L. M., Quail, M. A., Becker, M., Jackson, A., Bason, N., Brooks,
K., Churcher, C., Fahkro, S., Goodhead, I., Heath, P., Kartvelishvili, M., Mungall, K.,
Harris, D., Hauser, H., Sanders, M., Saunders, D., Seeger, K., Sharp, S., … Berriman,
M. (2008). Telomeric expression sites are highly conserved in Trypanosoma brucei.
PloS One, *3*(10), e3527. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0003527

Higgins, M. K., Tkachenko, O., Brown, A., Reed, J., Raper, J., & Carrington, M. (2013). Structure of the trypanosome haptoglobin-hemoglobin receptor and implications for nutrient uptake and innate immunity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *110*(5), 1905–1910. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1214943110

Hirumi, H., & Hirumi, K. (1989). Continuous cultivation of Trypanosoma brucei blood stream forms in a medium containing a low concentration of serum protein without feeder cell layers. *The Journal of Parasitology*, *75*(6), 985–989.

Hsia, R., Beals, T., & Boothroyd, J. C. (1996). Use of chimeric recombinant polypeptides to analyse conformational, surface epitopes on trypanosome variant surface glycoproteins. *Molecular Microbiology*, *19*(1), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2958.1996.351878.x

Kabiri, M., & Steverding, D. (2000). Studies on the recycling of the transferrin receptor in Trypanosoma brucei using an inducible gene expression system. *European Journal of Biochemistry*, *267*(11), 3309–3314. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1432-1327.2000.01361.x

Kakuta, K., Orino, K., Yamamoto, S., & Watanabe, K. (1997). High levels of ferritin and its iron in fetal bovine serum. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology. Part A, Physiology*, *118*(1), 165–169. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0300-9629(96)00403-3

Lane-Serff, H., MacGregor, P., Lowe, E. D., Carrington, M., & Higgins, M. K. (2014). Structural basis for ligand and innate immunity factor uptake by the trypanosome haptoglobin-haemoglobin receptor. *ELife*, *3*, e05553. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.05553

Lane-Serff, H., MacGregor, P., Peacock, L., Macleod, O. J., Kay, C., Gibson, W., Higgins, M. K., & Carrington, M. (2016). Evolutionary diversification of the trypanosome haptoglobin-haemoglobin receptor from an ancestral haemoglobin receptor. *ELife*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.13044

Leung, K. F., Riley, F. S., Carrington, M., & Field, M. C. (2011). Ubiquitylation and developmental regulation of invariant surface protein expression in trypanosomes. *Eukaryotic Cell*, *10*(7), 916–931. https://doi.org/10.1128/EC.05012-11

Ligtenberg, M. J., Bitter, W., Kieft, R., Steverding, D., Janssen, H., Calafat, J., & Borst, P. (1994). Reconstitution of a surface transferrin binding complex in insect form Trypanosoma brucei. *The EMBO Journal*, *13*(11), 2565–2573. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1460-2075.1994.tb06546.x

MacGregor, P., Gonzalez-Munoz, A. L., Jobe, F., Taylor, M. C., Rust, S., Sandercock, A. M., Macleod, O. J. S., Van Bocxlaer, K., Francisco, A. F., D'Hooge, F., Tiberghien, A., Barry, C. S., Howard, P., Higgins, M. K., Vaughan, T. J., Minter, R., & Carrington, M. (2019). A single dose of antibody-drug conjugate cures a stage 1 model of African trypanosomiasis. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases*, *13*(5), e0007373. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pntd.0007373

Macleod, O. J. S., Bart, J.-M., MacGregor, P., Peacock, L., Savill, N. J., Hester, S., Ravel, S., Sunter, J. D., Trevor, C., Rust, S., Vaughan, T. J., Minter, R., Mohammed, S., Gibson, W., Taylor, M. C., Higgins, M. K., & Carrington, M. (2020). A receptor for the complement regulator factor H increases transmission of trypanosomes to tsetse flies. *Nature Communications*, *11*(1), 1326. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15125-y

Macleod, O. J. S., Cook, A. D., Webb, H., Crow, M., Burns, R., Redpath, M., Seisenberger, S., Trevor, C. E., Peacock, L., Schwede, A., Kimblin, N., Francisco, A. F., Pepperl, J., Rust, S., Voorheis, P., Gibson, W., Taylor, M. C., Higgins, M. K., & Carrington, M. (2022). Invariant surface glycoprotein 65 of Trypanosoma brucei is a complement C3 receptor. *Nature Communications*, *13*(1), 5085. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-32728-9

Maier, A., & Steverding, D. (2008). Expression and purification of non-glycosylated Trypanosoma brucei transferrin receptor in insect cells. *Experimental Parasitology*, *120*(2), 205–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exppara.2008.07.004

Mikkelsen, J. H., Stødkilde, K., Jensen, M. P., Hansen, A. G., Wu, Q., Lorentzen, J., Graversen, J. H., Andersen, G. R., Fenton, R. A., Etzerodt, A., Thiel, S., & Andersen, C. B. F. (2024). Trypanosoma brucei Invariant Surface Glycoprotein 75 Is an Immunoglobulin Fc Receptor Inhibiting Complement Activation and Antibody-Mediated Cellular Phagocytosis. *Journal of Immunology (Baltimore, Md. : 1950)*, *212*(8), 1334–1344. https://doi.org/10.4049/jimmunol.2300862

Mugnier, M. R., Cross, G. A. M., & Papavasiliou, F. N. (2015). The in vivo dynamics of antigenic variation in Trypanosoma brucei. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *347*(6229), 1470–1473. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa4502

Mussmann, R., Engstler, M., Gerrits, H., Kieft, R., Toaldo, C. B., Onderwater, J., Koerten, H., van Luenen, H. G. A. M., & Borst, P. (2004). Factors affecting the level and localization of the transferrin receptor in Trypanosoma brucei. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *279*(39), 40690–40698. https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M404697200

Mussmann, R., Janssen, H., Calafat, J., Engstler, M., Ansorge, I., Clayton, C., & Borst, P. (2003). The expression level determines the surface distribution of the transferrin receptor in Trypanosoma brucei. *Molecular Microbiology*, *47*(1), 23–35. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2958.2003.03245.x

Pays, E., Lips, S., Nolan, D., Vanhamme, L., & Pérez-Morga, D. (2001). The VSG expression sites of Trypanosoma brucei: multipurpose tools for the adaptation of the parasite to mammalian hosts. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology*, *114*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-6851(01)00242-0

Pinger, J., Nešić, D., Ali, L., Aresta-Branco, F., Lilic, M., Chowdhury, S., Kim, H.-S., Verdi, J., Raper, J., Ferguson, M. A. J., Papavasiliou, F. N., & Stebbins, C. E. (2018). African trypanosomes evade immune clearance by O-glycosylation of the VSG surface coat. *Nature Microbiology*, *3*(8), 932–938. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-018-0187-6

Redpath, M. B., Windle, H., Nolan, D., Pays, E., Voorheis, H. P., & Carrington, M. (2000). ESAG11, a new VSG expression site-associated gene from Trypanosoma brucei. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology*, *111*(1), 223–228. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-6851(00)00305-4

Roggy, J. L., & Bangs, J. D. (1999). Molecular cloning and biochemical characterization of a VCP homolog in African trypanosomes. *Molecular and Biochemical Parasitology*, *98*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0166-6851(98)00114-5

Salmon, D., Geuskens, M., Hanocq, F., Hanocq-Quertier, J., Nolan, D., Ruben, L., & Pays, E. (1994a). A novel heterodimeric transferrin receptor encoded by a pair of VSG expression site-associated genes in T. brucei. *Cell*, *78*(1), 75–86. https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(94)90574-6

Salmon, D., Geuskens, M., Hanocq, F., Hanocq-Quertier, J., Nolan, D., Ruben, L., & Pays,
E. (1994b). A novel heterodimeric transferrin receptor encoded by a pair of VSG
expression site-associated genes in T. brucei. *Cell*, *78*(1), 75–86.
https://doi.org/10.1016/0092-8674(94)90574-6

Schwartz, K. J., Peck, R. F., Tazeh, N. N., & Bangs, J. D. (2005). GPI valence and the fate of
secretory membrane proteins in African trypanosomes. *Journal of Cell Science*, *118*(Pt
23), 5499–5511. https://doi.org/10.1242/jcs.02667

Schwede, A., Jones, N., Engstler, M., & Carrington, M. (2011). The VSG C-terminal domain
is inaccessible to antibodies on live trypanosomes. *Molecular and Biochemical
Parasitology*, *175*(2), 201–204. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molbiopara.2010.11.004

Steverding, D., Stierhof, Y. D., Chaudhri, M., Ligtenberg, M., Schell, D., Beck-Sickinger, A.
G., & Overath, P. (1994a). ESAG 6 and 7 products of Trypanosoma brucei form a
transferrin binding protein complex. *European Journal of Cell Biology*, *64*(1), 78–87.

Steverding, D., Stierhof, Y. D., Chaudhri, M., Ligtenberg, M., Schell, D., Beck-Sickinger, A.
G., & Overath, P. (1994b). ESAG 6 and 7 products of Trypanosoma brucei form a
transferrin binding protein complex. *European Journal of Cell Biology*, *64*(1), 78–87.

Steverding, D., Stierhof, Y. D., Fuchs, H., Tauber, R., & Overath, P. (1995). Transferrin-
binding protein complex is the receptor for transferrin uptake in Trypanosoma brucei.
The Journal of Cell Biology, *131*(5), 1173–1182. https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.131.5.1173

Tiengwe, C., Bush, P. J., & Bangs, J. D. (2017). Controlling transferrin receptor trafficking
with GPI-valence in bloodstream stage African trypanosomes. *PLoS Pathogens*, *13*(5),
e1006366. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.ppat.1006366

Trevor, C. E., Gonzalez-Munoz, A. L., Macleod, O. J. S., Woodcock, P. G., Rust, S.,
Vaughan, T. J., Garman, E. F., Minter, R., Carrington, M., & Higgins, M. K. (2019).
Structure of the trypanosome transferrin receptor reveals mechanisms of ligand
recognition and immune evasion. *Nature Microbiology*, *4*(12), 2074–2081.
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41564-019-0589-0

van Luenen, H. G. A. M., Kieft, R., Mussmann, R., Engstler, M., ter Riet, B., & Borst, P.
(2005). Trypanosomes change their transferrin receptor expression to allow effective
uptake of host transferrin. *Molecular Microbiology*, *58*(1), 151–165.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2958.2005.04831.x

Vanhollebeke, B., De Muylder, G., Nielsen, M. J., Pays, A., Tebabi, P., Dieu, M., Raes, M.,
Moestrup, S. K., & Pays, E. (2008). A haptoglobin-hemoglobin receptor conveys innate
immunity to Trypanosoma brucei in humans. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, *320*(5876),
677–681. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1156296

Ziegelbauer, K., Multhaup, G., & Overath, P. (1992). Molecular characterization of two
invariant surface glycoproteins specific for the bloodstream stage of Trypanosoma
brucei. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*, *267*(15), 10797–10803.

Ziegelbauer, K., & Overath, P. (1992). Identification of invariant surface glycoproteins in the
bloodstream stage of Trypanosoma brucei. *The Journal of Biological Chemistry*,
267(15), 10791–10796.

Ziegelbauer, K., & Overath, P. (1993). Organization of two invariant surface glycoproteins in
the surface coat of Trypanosoma brucei. *Infection and Immunity*, *61*(11), 4540–4545.
https://doi.org/10.1128/iai.61.11.4540-4545.1993

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

A

ESAG7 ORFs from ~base 840

```
BES11   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCAAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAAGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACTAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGCTGAGCTC
BES2    TTTAAGGATGTCATCCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
BES1    TTTAAGGATGTCATCCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
BES4    TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
BES5    TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
BES7    TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGACGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAGGAGGCTGAGCTC
BES13   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAGGAGAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGTATAGGGAAGAAGGAGGCTGAACTC
BES14   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGGTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGAAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
BES15   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGGTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGACGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAGGAGGCTGAACTC
BES12   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGACTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAAGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGGCTGAGCTC
BES3    TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGTAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAAGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGCTGAGCTC
BES10   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAAGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAGGAGGCTGAACTC
BES17   TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGTAAAAAATGCAGTGGTGAAGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGCTGAGCTC
        ************* ** ********** *** ****** ******* **** ***   * ************************** * ***** ****** **** **** *** ***

BES11   ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTT------GAGGCAATA----------------CAAAAGTATCTAGG-----------TTTTGGTAAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----AAATTCAAC
BES2    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTACCTAGGG---------TCTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATTCAAC
BES1    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAAGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTACCTAGGG---------TCTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATTCAAC
BES4    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTACCTAGGG---------TCTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATTCAAC
BES5    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTACCTAGGG---------TCTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----TAATTCAAC
BES7    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTTATCTGGGAGACCATAAACAGATTGGAGCTGTCAAAGAGAGTGAGTGAACAACCCTCTTTAGGTGAAGAAGAGGAGACGATCCTGAAATCTAAC
BES13   ACTAATGATCAGATTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTATCTAGG----------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATCTAAC
BES14   ACTGATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTATCTAGG----------TTTCTGTGAAATGAAGTAAAAGC-----GAATCTAAC
BES15   ACTAATGATCAGATTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA----------------CAAAAGTATCTAGG----------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATTTAAC
BES12   ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTT------GAGGCAATA----------------CAAAAGTATCTAGG----------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAGC-----GAATTTAAC
BES3    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTT------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTATCTATGG----------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAAC-----GAATCTAAC
BES10   ACTAATGATCAGATTTACGAGGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTATCTAGGG---------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAATC-----GAATCTAAC
BES17   ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTT------GAGGTAATA---------------CAAAAGTATCTATGG---------TTTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAAAC-----GAATCTAAC
        *** ******** ******* *****       ***   ***                ****   *   *            * *   ** **    ** * *         ***   ***

BES11   TATACTGTAGAGCCTGTCTGGGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACGCGGCAGCAATACATTCGAGTGTATCTACCGCTGCACTCTGTTGTTCAGTTTTATTGTTTGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES2    TATACTGCAGAACCGGTCCGGGGACATTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACGCGGCAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTTTTCAGTTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES1    TATACTGCAGAACCGGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGTAGCGGGGTCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTTTTCAGTTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES4    TATACTGCAGAACCGGTCCGGGGACATTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACGCGGCAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTTTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES5    TATACTGCAGAACCGGTCCGGGGACATTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACGCGGCAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTTTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES7    TATACTGCAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGGCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACAGTCGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES13   TATACTGTAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTCTGTTGTTTAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES14   TATACTGCAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTCGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES15   TATACTGCAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGTCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACAGTCGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTGTTCAGTTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES12   TATACTGCAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACTGGAGCGGGGGCCAATGCGGCAGCAATACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES3    TATACTGCAGAGCCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTAACGGGAGCGGGGGCCAACGCGGCAGCAATACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTCGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES10   TATACTGCAGAGCCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTAACGGGAGCGGGGGCCAACGCGGCAGCAATACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTCGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES17   TATACTGCAGAGCCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGTAGCGGGGGCCAACGCGGCAGCAATACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTCGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
        ******* *** ** *** * **** *    * ******* ** ** *   * **** **** *  ***** ****  * ****** ************** **  ** ** ********* ******** ***
```

B

Comparison of ESAG7 from BES1 and BES7

```
        F  K  D  V  I  R  L  F  A  R  F  Q  E  A  K  N  A  V  M  T  K  I  K  T  T  V  D  E  L  T  K  C  I  G  Q  K  E  A  E  L
BES7    TTTAAGGATGTCATTCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGACGAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGACGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAGGAGGCTGAGCTC
BES1    TTTAAGGATGTCATCCGCCTGTTTGCGCGCTTCCAAGAAGCAAAAAATGCAGTGATGAATAAAATAAAAACTACTGTGGATGAATTGGCGAAATGCATAGGGCAGAAAGAGGTTGAGCTC
F1      F  K  D  V  I  R  L  F  A  R  F  Q  E  A  K  N  A  V  M  N  K  I  K  T  T  V  D  E  L  A  K  C  I  G  Q  K  E  V  E  L

        T  N  D  Q  L  Y  E  E  F  I  W  E  T  I  N  R  L  E  L  S  K  R  V  S  E  Q  P  S  L  G  E  E  E  E  T  I  L  K  S  N
BES7    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAGGAATTTATCTGGGAGACCATAAACAGATTGGAGCTGTCAAAGAGAGTGAGTGAACAACCCTCTTTAGGTGAAGAAGAGGAGACGATCCTGAAATCTAAC
BES1    ACTAATGATCAGCTTTACGAAGAATTC------GAGGCAATA---------------CAAAAGTACCTAGGG-------TCTCTGTGAAATGGAGTAAAGGC------GAATTC-AAC
F1      T  N  D  Q  L  Y  E  E  F        E  A  I              Q  K  Y  L  G           S  L  *                             N

        Y  T  A  E  P  V  R  G  P  F  T  G  A  G  A  N  T  V  A  V  Q  S  S  V  S  T  A  A  L  C  C  S  A  L  L  L  G  V  L  *
BES7    TATACTGCAGAACCTGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGGAGCGGGGGCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACAGTCGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTGTTCAGCTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
BES1    TATACTGCAGAACCGGTCCGTGGACCTTTCACGGTAGCGGGGTCCAACACAGTAGCAGTACATTTGAGTGTTTCTACCGCTGCACTTTGTTTTTCAGTTTTATTGTTGGGAGTGCTGTGA
F1      Y  T  A  E  P  V  R  G  P  F  T  V  A  G  S  N  T  V  A  V  H  L  S  V  S  T  A  A  L  C  F  S  V  L  L  L  G  V  L  *
```

Figure S1

```
BES7-6.     MMRFWFVLLALLGKETY--AYENERNALNATAANKVCGLSTYLKGIAHRVNSESAVVTEK     58
BES7-7      -MRFLFVLLALLGKETHANYYENERNALNATAANKVCALSTYLKGIAHRVNSESAVVTEK     59
            *** ***********:    *****************.*********************

BES7-6      LSDLKMRSIQLQLSVMRNRVPSGEKDCKDIRTLLKTVLRNEFTFQQELEEMRSASALAAA     118
BES7-7      LSDLKMRSIQLQLSIMRNRVPSGEKDCKDIRTLLKTVLRNEFTFQQELEEVRNASALAAA     119
            *************:*****************************:*.*******

BES7-6      AAGLAAGRLEEWIFVFAQAADGSSQFCISVGKTIPAEHGDLQECFDGKIGPETLYKIEDS     178
BES7-7      AAGLAAGRLEEWIFVFAQAGGRSSQFCISTGKTGPAEYNNLQECFDGTIGPETLYKIEDS     179
            ******************.. *******.*** ***:.:*******.************

BES7-6.     RVKESAQKSLQLHEVLSSISFGSLGVKNIVEKGENRGCNLMRTADEGLLKDVC-LNRNFT     237
BES7-7      RVKESAKTRLLLHEVLSSISFSSLGAENIRGGNGKDGCNLVRTDNNGILKGGSPTRHNLT     239
            ******:. * **********.***.:**    . : ****:** ::*:**. .   .:*:*

BES7-6      WGGGVLNFGYCVAGNLKIKGGEYGDVSSYDAVRWTEDPSKVSIFKDVIRLFARFQEAKNA     297
BES7-7      WGGGVMNFGSYQNGSMYVEGGEYGDATEYGAVRWTEDPSKVSIFKDVIRLFARFQEAKNA     299
            *****:*** *.: ::******.::.*.******************************

BES7-6      VMTKIKTTVDELTKCIGQKEAELTNDQLYEEFIWETINRLELSKRVSEQPSLGEEEETIL     357
BES7-7      VMTKIKTTVDELTKCIGQKEAELTNDQLYEEFIWETINRLELSKRVSEQPSLGEEEETIL     359
            ************************************************************

BES7-6      KSNYTAEPVRGPFTGAGANTVAVQSSVSTAALCCSALLLGVL     399
BES7-7      KSNYTAEPVRGPFTGAGANTVAVQSSVSTAALCCSALLLGVL     401
            ******************************************

# NetGPI 1.1      Timestamp: 20240925160446
# ID  Seq-length  Pred. GPI-Anchored    Omega-site pos.   Likelihood  Amino-acid
Sequence   399        GPI-Anchored        372                 0.438        G

ESAG6
# SignalP-6.0     Organism: Eukarya Timestamp: 20250215202022
# ID  Prediction   OTHER  SP(Sec/SPI) CS Position
Sequence    SP   0.000369   0.999614    CS pos: 17-18. Pr: 0.9774

ESAG7
# SignalP-6.0     Organism: Eukarya Timestamp: 20250215202326
# ID  Prediction   OTHER  SP(Sec/SPI) CS Position
Sequence    SP   0.000332   0.999656    CS pos: 18-19. Pr: 0.9760
```

Figure S2

Figure S3

A

```
cow    -DPERTVRWCTISTHEANKCASFRENVLRILESGPFVSCVKKTSHMDCIKAISNNEADAV    59
dog    VSPEKTVRWCTVSNHEASKCSSFMENMKTVLENGPFVSCVKRTSYLECIKAIWANEADAV    60
        .**:*******:*.***.**:** **:  :**.********:**::***** ******

cow    TLDGGLVYEAGLKPNNLKPVVAEFHGTKDNPQTHYYAVAVVKKDTDFKLNELRGKKSCHT   119
dog    TLDAGLVFEAGLNPYNLKPVVAEFYGKD--KQTRYYAVAVVKKSSTFNLNQLQGKKSCHT   118
       ***.***:****:* *********:*..   **:*********.: *:**:*:*******

cow    GLGRSAGWNIPMGKLYKELPDPQESIQRAAANFFSASCVPCADQSSFPKLCQLCAGKGTD   179
dog    GLGRSAGWNIPMGLLYWKLPEPRESLQKAASSFFTASCVPCVDRTAFPKLCQLCVGKGTD   178
       ************* ** :**:*:**:*:**:.**:******.*:::*******.*****

cow    KCACSNHEPYFGYSGAFKCLMEGAGDVAFVKHSTVFDNLPNPEDRKNYELLCGDNTRKSV   239
dog    KCACSNHEPYFGYSGAFKCLMEDAGEVAFVKHSTVLENLPNKADLDQYELLCPDNKRKPV   238
       **********************.**:*********:.***  * .:***** **.** *

cow    DNYQECYLAMVPSHAVVARTVGGKEDVIWELLNHAQEHFGKDKPDNFQLFQSPHGKDLLF   299
dog    GEYKQCYLAKVPSHAVVARSVGGKEDLIWELLNQAQEHYGKDKSKVFQLFSSTLGKDLLF   298
       .:*::**** *********:******:******:****:**** . ****.*  ******

cow    KDSADGFLKIPSKMDFELYLGYEYVTALQNLRESKPPDSSKDECM-VKWCAIGHQERTKC   358
dog    KDSAEGFFRIPPKMDTWLYLGYEYVTALRNLREDVRPDTPRDECKKVKWCAVGHHEIAKC   358
       ****:**::** *** ************.****.   **: :***  *****:**:* :**

cow    DRWSGFSGGAIECETAENTEECIAKIMKGEADAMSLDGGYLYIAGKCGLVPVLAENYKTE   418
dog    DEWSVNSEGKIECESAESTEDCIAKIAKGEADAMSLDGGYIYIAGQCGLVPVLAENYKTQ   418
       *.**   * * ****:**.**:*****.***********:****:*************:

cow    DGSCKNTPEKGYLAVAVVKTSDANINWNNLKGKKSCHTAVDRTAGWNIPMGLLYSKINNC   478
dog    GSTCSNTAEEGYLAVAVVKELDKTISWNNLQGRKSCHTAVDRTAGWNIPMGLLYNRINHC   478
       ..:*.** *:*********  * .*.****:*:*******************.:**:*

cow    KFDEFFSAGCAPGSPRNSSLCALCIGSEKGTGKECVPNSNERYYGYTGAFRCLVEKGDVA   538
dog    EFDKFFSQGCAPGSMRNSSLCALCIGSANVPGKECVPNNHERYYGYTGAFRCLVEKGDVA   538
       :**:*** ****** ************* :  *******.:*******************

cow    FVKDQTVIQNTDGNNNEAWAKNLKKENFEVLCKDGTRKPVTDAENCHLARGPNHAVVSRK   598
dog    FVKDQTVLQNTGGKNTEDWAKDLKEEDFELLCPDGQRKSVDKAPECFLAKAPNHAVVSRK   598
       *******:***.*.* * ***:**:*:**:** **.**.* :* :*.**:.*********

cow    DKATCVEKILNKQQDDFGKSVTDCTSNFCLFQSNSKDLLFRDDTKCLASIAK-KTYDSYL   657
dog    DKASCVSKMLLDQQLLFGRNGNDCSGKFCLFHSATKDLLFRDDTQCLAKLPEDTTYKSYL   658
       ***:**.*:* .**  **:.. .**:.:**:.****** :************:** .:*.

cow    GDDYVRAMTNLRQCSTSKLLEACTFHKP   685
dog    GAEYITAVANLRQCSTSKLLEACTFHTS   686
       * :*: *:::****************.
```

Identities
501/686

B

C

0.5 μM Alexa 568 transferrin

Tf   Tf DNA DIC

2.5 μM transferrin
0.5 μM Alexa 568 transferrin

Tf   Tf DNA DIC

5 μM transferrin
0.5 μM Alexa 568 transferrin

Tf   Tf DNA DIC

Figure S4

D

anti-TfR

anti-ISG65

anti-SCD6

Figure S4

0.2% glutaraldehyde, 4% formaldehyde added to culture

anti-TfR   DNA   merge

4% formaldehyde added to culture

anti-TfR   DNA   merge

0.2% glutaraldehyde, 4% formaldehyde added to cells after a single wash

anti-TfR   DNA   merge

A

B

Figure S5

C

Figure S5

Figure S6

Figure S7