Spatial proteomics reveals lipid droplet reorganization in symbiotic *Paramecium*

***bursaria* cells**

Yan-Jun Chen[1], Kamal Md Mostafa[1]*, Chuan-Chih Hsu[2], and Jun-Yi Leu[1,3]*

[1] Institute of Molecular Biology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 11529, Taiwan

[2] Institute of Plant and Microbial Biology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, 11529, Taiwan

[3] Lead Contact

* Correspondence:

Kamal Md Mostafa (mostafa.kamal42@gmail.com)

Jun-Yi Leu (jleu@imb.sinica.edu.tw)

Running title: A spatial proteome of the *Paramecium bursaria*

Keywords: ciliate, endosymbiosis, protein subcellular localization, lipid droplet,

proteomics

Abstract

Endosymbiosis is an important adaptive mechanism allowing organisms to exploit

novel niches. The flexible relationship between the ciliate *Paramecium bursaria* and

green algae represents a model system for studying early endosymbiosis evolution.

However, the mechanisms underlying how *P. bursaria* cells maintain this

endosymbiotic relationship remain unclear. Here, we present a spatial proteomics atlas

of *P. bursaria* cells with or without endosymbionts. We reveal that lipid droplets are

reorganized in symbiotic hosts, with many proteins undergoing subcellular

translocation. Consistent with our proteomics data, we show that the morphology and

localization of lipid droplets changes near endosymbionts in host cells. Perturbing

symbiotic cells with chemical inhibitors of lipid metabolism reduces endosymbiotic

algal stability, revealing an involvement of lipid droplets in the host-endosymbiont

interaction. Our study provides a comprehensive resource on protein localization and

translocation in *P. bursaria* cells and elucidates how those cells remodel an existing

organelle to maintain endosymbiosis.

Introduction

It is now well accepted that the first eukaryotic cell on Earth originated from endosymbiosis between bacterial and archaeal cells (Brueckner and Martin, 2020; Rivera et al., 1998). The establishment of endosymbiosis, representing a close relationship by which one organism (the endosymbiont) lives within another (a host), is often driven by complementation between the abilities of the endosymbiont and host. Consequently, the interacting partners can explore new niches or resources inaccessible to them when living alone (Sudakaran et al., 2017; Wein et al., 2019). Endosymbiosis has played a crucial role during the evolution of eukaryotic cells. In addition to during the formation of early eukaryotes, another endosymbiosis event generated the photosynthetic eukaryotic cell leading to the evolution of algae and plants (de Alda et al., 2014; Douglas, 1998). Since those early events, endosymbiosis has occurred continuously and influenced the evolution of various eukaryotic lineages (Zilber-Rosenberg and Rosenberg, 2008). However, little is known about how endosymbiosis is established initially and maintained.

The rapid increase in genomic data in recent years has facilitated deciphering pathways potentially involved in host-endosymbiont interactions (Hamada et al., 2018; Ishikawa et al., 2016). Nonetheless, only a few of them have been validated experimentally. Ciliates have long been known to harbor various endosymbionts and it has been speculated that such associations enable ciliate populations to dominate in certain marine and freshwater habitats (Esteban et al., 2010). Among ciliates, *Paramecium bursaria* is well known for its endosymbiotic relationship with the green algae *Chlorella spp.*, which has fascinated microbiologists for over a century (Fujishima, 2009). In the wild, most *P. bursaria* cells harbor several hundred algal cells in the cytoplasm, and the endosymbionts can be stably transmitted to daughter cells during cell division (Kodama and Fujishima, 2008). However, symbiotic *P. bursaria*

cells (green cells) can be artificially induced to lose their algal cells and form

aposymbiotic cells (white cells) (Ayala and Weis, 1987). When aposymbiotic *P. bursaria* cells are mixed with free-living chlorella cells, they can quickly reestablish endosymbiosis (Meier and Wiessner, 1988). Such flexibility indicates that the endosymbiotic relationship is still at an early evolutionary stage.

Although *Paramecium* species have long served as model systems for cell biology and studies of endosymbiosis (Long et al., 2023), only a small proportion of their protein-coding genes have been functionally characterized (Gao et al., 2024; Hauser et al., 2000; Jenkins et al., 2021). Even by integrating information on protein domains and sequence homology, potential functions can only be assigned to approximately half of the 15000 protein-coding genes in the *P. bursaria* genome (Cheng et al., 2020). Thus, a systematic approach is required to understand the sheer complexity of ciliate cells.

The emergence of new organelles and the subsequent expansion of the associated protein repertoire is a key feature of eukaryote evolution. Ciliated protozoa represent a lineage characterized by an abundance of unique organelles, and they also possess some of the largest cells and gene families among all existing eukaryotes (Lynch et al., 2022). In *P. bursaria* cells, many organelles have been reported as involved in the process of endosymbiosis, with the cytoplasmic space being extensively rearranged to facilitate hundreds of endosymbiotic algal cells (Fujishima and Kodama, 2012).

Many biological processes are executed in specific organelles or subcellular localizations. Controlling protein abundance and localization enables a cell to regulate these processes accurately. Moreover, cells can remodel or reorganize their organelles to fine-tune their physiology in response to developmental or environmental cues. Dissecting protein abundance and localization under different conditions can facilitate our understanding of a protein's potential function and how cells adjust their physiology.

Recent advances in mass spectrometry-based proteomics have substantially

improved our understanding of the protein landscape in various cell types (Aebersold

and Mann, 2016; Mund et al., 2022). To gain insights into how *P. bursaria* cells

reorganize their subcellular structure to facilitate hundreds of endosymbiotic algae, we

generated spatial proteomics maps of aposymbiotic and endosymbiotic *P. bursaria* cells.

Our data reveal coordinated remodeling of the signaling transduction and lipid transfer

pathways at the level of protein abundance and localization in endosymbiotic cells.

Microscopic analysis further showed that the morphology and localization of lipid

droplets changes close to the endosymbiotic algae. Inhibiting lipid metabolism reduced

endosymbiont stability. Our study not only offers a comprehensive resource of protein

localization and translocation data between two types of ciliate cells, but also reveals

the involvement of lipid droplets in endosymbiosis.

Results and Discussion

A comprehensive spatial proteome map of *Paramecium bursaria* cells with or

without endosymbiotic algae.

Although the cell biology of *P. bursaria* has been studied for decades, its genome was

only decoded recently (Cheng et al., 2020; He et al., 2019). Nonetheless, a considerable

proportion of its encoded proteins are of unknown function. We investigated the spatial

distribution of the *P. bursaria* proteome given that a protein's subcellular localization

can provide information about its function (Su et al., 2007). Moreover, many organelles

are involved in the process of endosymbiosis (Kodama and Fujishima, 2022; Kodama

and Sumita, 2022; Song et al., 2017). Thus, by comparing proteome maps of

aposymbiotic and symbiotic cells, we anticipated gaining insights into how those

organelles are reorganized to facilitate endosymbiosis.

We utilized protein correlation profiling to establish organellar protein

localization (Itzhak et al., 2019). In brief, *P. bursaria* cells were lysed by nitrogen

cavitation, and the cellular organelles were separated by differential centrifugation. We

collected a total of eleven fractions, and the distinct protein patterns displayed by the

individual fractions indicated that our protocol could successfully separate different

cellular compartments (Supplementary Fig. 1a). The collected fractions were

subsequently analyzed by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) through

the data-independent acquisition (DIA) mode, and the resulting data were processed

with Spectronaut for label-free quantitation (LFQ) analysis (Fig. 1a, see Methods for

details). We analyzed three biological replicates for both symbiotic and aposymbiotic

cells. Approximately 95% of identified proteins were shared between replicates, and

most proteins presented a low coefficient of variation (CV) between replicates,

indicative of high data quality (Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. 1b).

To construct spatial proteomics maps, we needed marker proteins of different

cellular compartments for correlation profiling. Consequently, we selected a total of

279 marker proteins based on ortholog localization information from previous studies

and machine-learning algorithms (Supplementary Data 1, see Methods for details)

(Licknack, 2022; Pedregosa et al., 2011). These markers define 13 cellular

compartments, including the cytosol, proteasomes, ribosomes, peroxisomes,

endoplasmic reticulum (ER), Golgi, plasma membrane, nucleus, lipid droplets, basal

bodies, mitochondria, phagolysosomes, and trichocysts. We detected distinct

fractionation profiles for the different cell compartment markers (Fig. 1c and

Supplementary Fig. 2 and 3), indicating that the different compartments had been well

separated.

Next, we used the total proteins (n = 10255) that overlapped between

aposymbiotic and symbiotic cells for spatial proteome characterization. Our mass

spectrometry data were globally normalized and then analyzed using support vector

machine (SVM)-based supervised learning, which computes the probability of a protein

belonging to one of our pre-defined subcellular compartments based on how their

localization correlates with that of the compartment markers (Itzhak et al., 2016). Our

analysis allowed us to classify the subcellular localizations of 5872 and 4840 proteins

in the symbiotic and aposymbiotic cells, respectively, representing about half of the

identified *P. bursaria* proteome (Fig. 2a and 2b and Supplementary Fig. 4).

When we projected the 33-dimension protein profiling dataset (from 33 fractions

of three replicates, Supplementary Fig. 5 and Supplementary Data 2) of classified

proteins into two dimensions by t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding (t-SNE),

we found that the proteins of different cellular compartments formed discrete clusters

(Fig. 2c), indicating that our analysis can clearly distinguish proteins displaying

differential localization patterns. In addition to helping decipher the possible function

of unknown proteins, our comprehensive localization maps allowed us to investigate

the physiological changes that occur during the process of endosymbiosis.

Comparison between our spatial proteome maps and Deeploc prediction.

Since *P. bursaria* cells cannot be manipulated genetically and only a few proteins have

been experimentally characterized based on their cellular localization, it is almost

impossible to experimentally validate our proteomics data systematically. Nonetheless,

a pre-trained protein language model, DeepLoc 2.0, has been demonstrated to predict

protein subcellular localization in several organisms with reasonable accuracy

(Thumuluri et al., 2022). We compared our localization data with the results predicted

by DeepLoc (Supplementary Data 3). A large proportion of the proteins assigned to the

ER and mitochondria in our experiments were consistently predicted by DeepLoc to

localize to those organelles, respectively (Fig. 3a). The majority of nuclear proteins

predicted by DeepLoc were also found in a group mapping to the nucleus. It is worth

noting that the majority of the training data used in developing DeepLoc was obtained

from model eukaryotic organisms evolutionarily distant from *P. bursaria*, which may

influence the accuracy of our DeepLoc predictions. Moreover, approximately one-third

of the *P. bursaria* proteome does not have any reasonable orthologs in databases of

other model organisms.

Interestingly, Deeploc predicted many trichocyst- and phagolysosome-associated

proteins as being extracellular. Trichocysts are secretory organelles found in ciliates and

in some flagellate protists (Pease, 1947). They comprise a cavity and long threads of

trichocyst proteins that can be released extracellularly in response to external stimuli,

such as upon detection of predators (Plattner, 2017). Phagolysosomes are formed by the

fusion of phagosomes with lysosomes after phagocytosis. Although phagolysosomes

are primarily involved in degrading food and debris, they may also be used to degrade

secreted proteins or exosomes engulfed by phagocytosis or endocytosis (Gurung et al.,

2021). Further studies of the "extracellular" nature of trichocyst and phagolysosome

proteins are needed to understand this finding.

Lipid droplets are reorganized in symbiotic cells.

Given that symbiotic *P. bursaria* cells reorganize their cytoplasm to accommodate

hundreds of endosymbiotic algae, we expected that the localization of some proteins

may be altered for this purpose. Comparing the spatial proteome maps between

symbiotic and aposymbiotic cells, we observed a dramatic increase in proteins

localizing to lipid droplets in the symbiotic cells (Fig. 2b). To confirm this observation,

we performed a highly stringent test using movement and reproducibility (MR) scores

(Itzhak et al., 2019), which compared the fractionation profiles from all replicates

between the two types of cells (see Methods for details). Our MR analysis identified

240 proteins for which fractionation profiles and subcellular localization were

significantly altered (false discovery rate (FDR) < 5%) (Supplementary Data 4). Among

them, proteins moving to lipid droplets represented the largest group of translocated

proteins in symbiotic cells (Supplementary Fig. 6), excluding proteins without a

specific localization (i.e., the unknown group). This result is consistent with our spatial

proteome map (Fig. 2), which shows that lipid droplets are significantly reorganized.

Lipid droplets regulate intracellular lipid storage, transport, and metabolism

(Walther and Farese, 2012). They are highly dynamic structures, interacting with

various organelles (including ER, Golgi, mitochondria, lysosomes, and peroxisomes)

to exchange proteins and lipids, and acting as vital hubs of cellular metabolism

(Olzmann and Carvalho, 2019). A gene ontology (GO) analysis of lipid droplet proteins

specifically in symbiotic cells revealed enrichment for many pathways involved in

vesicle trafficking, membrane organization, ion and protein transport, and lipid

metabolism (Fig. 3b and Supplementary Data 5). These pathways are all related to

various functions of lipid droplets, indicating that the functions of lipid droplets may

shift in symbiotic cells.

Compromising lipid metabolism reduces endosymbiosis stability.

Our spatial proteomics data revealed that lipid droplets undergo a dramatic change in

composition in symbiotic cells. Consequently, we stained the cells with the lipid droplet

dye LipidSpot™ to examine them by confocal microscopy. We observed that, in

individual symbiotic cells, hundreds of tiny lipid droplets seemed to interact with the

endosymbiotic algae (Fig. 4a). Next, we applied transmission electron microscopy

(TEM) to examine the relationship between lipid droplets and endosymbiotic algae

more closely. Indeed, the lipid droplets were localized near most algae, with some of

them being directly attached to the perialgal vacuole (PV) membrane surrounding

individual algal cells (Fig. 4b). Together, these observations indicate that the

reorganization of lipid droplets in the symbiotic cells may play a role in the host cells'

interactions with their endosymbionts.

We investigated if lipid droplets are crucial for maintaining endosymbionts by

applying two types of lipid metabolism inhibitors, H89 and T863. H89 blocks protein

kinase A and other kinases, leading to unbalanced lipolysis and lipogenesis (Londos et

al., 2005; Rogne and Taskén, 2014). T863 can reduce triglyceride synthesis and lipid

droplet formation by inhibiting diacylglycerol acyltransferase 1 (DGAT1) (Yen et al.,

2008). We treated symbiotic cells with a mild dose of H89 or T863 that did not influence

host survival. Application of these drugs reduced the numbers of lipid droplets in

symbiotic cells (Fig. 5a), and the treatments negatively influenced the stability of

endosymbionts, with the number of algae in host cells decreasing significantly (Fig. 5b

and 5c).

Previous studies have shown that some parasites induce lipid droplet formation

in the host cell to obtain nutrients or evade immune attack (Roingeard and Melo, 2017).

For example, mammalian cells infected by the protozoan *Toxoplasma* display increased

numbers of lipid droplets (Mota et al., 2014). These newly formed lipid droplets attach

to the parasitophorous vacuole containing *Toxoplasma* cells, allowing the parasites to

utilize the nutrients for their own reproduction (Nolan et al., 2017). Similarly, the lipid

droplets in *P. bursaria* cells may facilitate nutrient uptake from the host by the

endosymbiotic algae. Alternatively, lipid droplets may provide essential components

for generating or maintaining PV membranes. Inside *P. bursaria*, a PV membrane

surrounds each algal cell, and this membranous structure needs to divide and reorganize

each time the algal cells reproduce. If PV structures become compromised, it would

likely result in unstable endosymbiosis. Lastly, lipid droplets may serve as a signal

exchange hub between the host and endosymbionts, with their disruption meaning

impaired communication between the two interacting partners, potentially prompting

digestion of the endosymbionts.

Lipid droplets have been observed to play a crucial role in host-pathogen

interactions. Pathogens, including viruses, bacteria, and eukaryotic parasites, can

manipulate host lipid metabolism and exploit lipid droplets as a nutrient source or as a

platform for viral replication (Roingeard and Melo, 2017). Moreover, lipid droplets

participate in immune responses by regulating the production of lipid-derived signaling

molecules, such as eicosanoids, which influence inflammation and pathogen defense

mechanisms (Roingeard and Melo, 2017). Whether hijacked lipid droplets are

completely remodeled in parasitic relationships, as observed herein for symbiotic *P.*

bursaria cells, remains to be established. Our spatial proteomics data have also shown

that proteins involved in the nitric oxide and cGMP-protein kinase G (PKG) signaling

pathways localized to lipid droplets and increased in abundance in symbiotic cells

(Supplementary Fig. 7). These signaling cascades can regulate many downstream

pathways, influencing intracellular concentrations of cations, lipid transport, and

vesicle trafficking (Kissmehl et al., 1996; Pirayesh et al., 2021). Thus, the role of lipid

droplets is likely more complex in *P. bursaria* cells since their interacting partners form

a mutualistic relationship, and not a pathogen-host interaction.

Methods

Cell culture

P. bursaria cells were cultured in CGM medium (12 mM sodium acetate, 0.5% yeast

extract) with Dryl's buffer (2 mM sodium citrate, 1 mM NaH_2PO_4/Na_2HPO_4 and 1.5

mM $CaCl_2$) and fed with *Chlorogonium* cells every five days. The cell cultures were

kept at 23 °C with a light-to-dark cycle of 12 h:12 h. To obtain aposymbiotic *P. bursaria*

strains, green symbiotic cells were treated with cycloheximide (100 μg/ml) for about

two weeks, as described previously (Kodama et al., 2011). The aposymbiotic cells were

maintained under low-light conditions.

For the inhibitor treatment experiments, symbiotic *P. bursaria* cells were treated

with different concentrations of H89 (Cat. # HY-15979, MedChemExpress, NJ, USA)

or T863 (Cat. # HY-32219, MedChemExpress) to test their viability and growth. We

used 1 μM of H89 and 10 μM of T863 in the final experiment since these drug

concentrations did not have any apparent deleterious effects on *P. bursaria* cells.

Organelle fractionation

P. bursaria cells were harvested from a 10 μm-diameter nylon mesh sieve after

removing cell debris using cheesecloth. The cells were washed on the nylon mesh with

Dryl's solution, before being decanted into 15 ml tubes. Then, the cells were

resuspended in lysis buffer (10 mM HEPES-KOH (pH7.5), 2 mM EDTA-KOH (pH8.0),

2 mM magnesium, 1 mM/2 mM PMSF/SHAM, 250 mM sucrose and 1X protease

inhibitor cocktail) and lysed using a nitrogen cavitation bomb. The cavitation bomb was

pressurized to 300 psi and incubated for 20 min before slowly releasing the pressure.

The lysate was then differentially centrifuged at 300 x *g* for 3 min, 1000 x *g* for

10 min, 3000 x *g* for 10 min, 5000 x *g* for 10 min, 9000 x *g* for 15 min, 12000 x *g* for

15 min, 15000 x *g* for 15 min, 30000 x *g* for 20 min, 79000 x *g* for 43 min, and 120000

x *g* for 45 min. After each centrifugation, the pellet was collected and resuspended in

UTU buffer (6 M urea, 2 M Thiourea, 100 mM Tris, 2.5 mM DTT, 5 mM EDTA-KOH

(pH8.0), 1 mM/2 mM PMSF/SHAM, and 1X protease inhibitor cocktail) and stored at

-80 °C. After the 12000 x *g* centrifugation step, we added acetone to the supernatant to

precipitate the protein overnight at -20 °C. Protein concentration was determined by

Bradford assay.

Sample preparation and LC-MS analysis

Protein digestion in the S-Trap microcolumn was performed according to a previous

report (Chen et al., 2023). In brief, 5 μg of protein in lysis buffer was reduced and

alkylated using 10 mM Tris(2-carboxyethyl) phosphine hydrochloride and 40 mM 2-

chloroacetamide at 45 °C for 15 min. A final concentration of 5.5% (v/v) phosphoric

acid (PA) followed by a six-fold volume of binding buffer (90%, v/v, MeOH in 100 mM

TEAB) was next added to the protein solution. After gentle vortexing, the solution was

loaded into an S-Trap microcolumn. The solution was removed by spinning the column

at 4,000 x g for 1 min. The column was washed three times with 150 μL binding buffer.

Finally, 20 μL of digestion solution containing 200 ng Lys-C and trypsin in 50 mM

TEAB was added to the column and incubated at 47 °C for 2 h. Each digested peptide

was eluted using 40 μL of three buffers consecutively: (1) 50 mM triethylammonium

bicarbonate; (2) 0.2% (v/v) formic acid in H_2O; and (3) 50% (v/v) acetonitrile (standard

elution). Elution solutions were collected in a tube and dried under a vacuum. A total

of 500 ng peptides was loaded into an Evotip and then the Evotip was placed into an

Evosep One system (Evosep Biosystems, Odense, Denmark) coupled to a timsTOF HT

mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonics, MA, USA).

Indexed retention time peptides (iRT) (KI-3002-2, Biognosys, Schlieren,

Switzerland) were dissolved in 50 μl of 0.1% (v/v) formic acid (FA) with 3% (v/v) ACN

to achieve a 10× stock solution. The stock solution was then diluted 10-fold. Dried

peptides were reconstituted in 200 μl of 0.1% (v/v) TFA. Then, 20 μl of samples and 10

μl of 1× iRT solution were loaded onto EvoTips and analyzed using the same Evosep

One system.

Eluting peptides were separated analytically using the 30 SPD method on an

Evosep Performance column (15 cm x 150 μm ID, 1.5 μm, EV1137; Evosep) at 40 °C

within a Captive Spray source (Bruker Daltonics), equipped with a 20 μm emitter (ZDV

Sprayer 20, Bruker Daltonics), followed by dia-PASEF mode analysis. For dia-PASEF,

the instrument firmware was adapted to perform data-independent isolation of multiple

precursor windows within a single TIMS frame. An optimized dia-PASEF scheme was

applied that targeted +2 and +3 ions in a two-window method. Sixteen of these scans

(resulting in 32 windows, each of 25-Da window size) covered an m/z range of 400 to

1200. Each dia-PASEF cycle comprised an MS1 survey frame, followed by 16 dia-

PASEF frames, with this setup resulting in a total cycle time of 1.8 s.

Data-independent acquisition (DIA) analysis

DIA data signal extraction and quantification were performed with an analysis pipeline

in Spectronaut (Biognosys, v18.7, https://biognosys.com/software/spectronaut/) using

a standard setting with Carbamidomethylation (Cys) specified as a fixed modification,

oxidation (Met), and N-terminal acetylations specified as variable modifications. We

selected dynamic retention time prediction with local regression calibration.

Interference correction for the MS and MS2 levels was enabled. The FDR was set to

1% at peptide precursor and protein levels using scrambled decoy generation and a

dynamic library size fraction set at 0.1. MS2-based quantification was used, enabling

local cross-run normalization. Peptide precursor abundances were measured by the sum

of fragment ion peak areas and peptide grouping was performed based on modified

peptides. Protein-level quantification was performed against the spectrum library

generated *in silico* by Spectronaut with standard settings and a stripped peptide

sequence area obtained from the mean precursor area.

Data processing and assessment of proteomics depth

For label-free quantitation (LFQ) maps, Spectronaut already globally normalizes

intensities, hence no further normalization was required. Proteins not identified in all

replicates were removed. Three biological replicates were performed for each cell type.

Proteomic differences were evaluated for statistical significance (P<0.05) by Student's

t-tests and corrected for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg correction.

Normalization (0-1) of each fractionation profile was performed by summing the

intensities across all fractions and dividing each intensity by the profile sum.

Proteomics depth was assessed by counting protein groups or proteins identified

in one or all replicates. Venn diagrams and UpSet plots were generated to evaluate

protein overlap.

Marker protein curation and support vector machine (SVM) analysis

To generate the subcellular compartment marker protein list, first we examined the

marker proteins identified in *Paramecium tetraurelia* by Timothy J. Licknack

(Licknack, 2022) by manually reviewing the literature and InterProScan annotation.

Next, we used OrthoFinder to find the orthologous markers in the *P. bursaria* genome

(Emms and Kelly, 2015). These marker proteins were inspected for their protein

abundance distribution profiles and checked for their deviation from the cluster using a

5-fold cross-validation function provided in Scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011). Only

the marker proteins present in all compared datasets were included, and identical SVM

parameters were used. Classification of unlabeled proteins was performed using SVM.

Based on SVM, we achieved a prediction accuracy (F1-score) of 99.2% for DK2g

(symbiotic) and 97.8% for DK2w (aposymbiotic) cells (Supplementary Fig. 3a). Finally,

we established a list of manually curated proteins defining 13 subcellular compartments

(Cytosol, Proteasome, Ribosome, Peroxisome, ER, Golgi, Plasma membrane, Nucleus,

Lipid droplet, Basal body, Mitochondrion, Phagolysosome, and Trichocyst)

(Supplementary Data 1). To further evaluate the performance of our organelle maps,

their power to predict protein localization was assessed using quality-filtered and

normalized (0-1) data with full replicate coverage.

For supervised classification, the marker proteins covering 13 subcellular

localizations were used by SVM to assign all other proteins to the organellar cluster.

Machine learning was conducted using the functionality-based command provided in

Scikit-learn. SVM enables selection of maker classes, definition of a hold-out test set,

automated hyperparameter optimization and, finally, SVM training and prediction.

During training, the parameters C and gamma of the radial basis function were

optimized via an iterative grid search, employing 5-fold cross-validation. At each grid

point, SVMs were run on each loaded dataset, before identifying the optimum for

summed accuracy across datasets. Finally, we confirmed analytical performance using

Q-Sep (Geladaki et al., 2019), which quantifies the separation between a pair of

predicted protein sets by comparing intra-group and inter-group distances

(Supplementary Fig. 3b and Supplementary Data 6).

For prediction, the SVM was fitted using the training set and 5-fold cross-

validation to convert the raw SVM scores into probabilities. Proteins were then assigned

to the best-fitting organelle model and divided into confidence classes based on the

probability: >0.9, very high confidence; >0.8, high confidence; >0.5, medium

confidence; >0.4, low confidence; <0.4, best guess assignment (Schessner et al., 2023).

For the hold-out test set, a misclassification matrix was derived to calculate global

marker prediction recall (proportion of correctly predicted markers to the total number

of markers), organelle-specific recall (proportion of markers correctly assigned to the

cluster), and organelle-specific precision (ratio of markers correctly assigned to the

number of all markers assigned to the cluster). The harmonic mean of recall and

precision, the F1 score, was used as the primary readout for SVM performance.

Statistics and reproducibility

Each of the final 33 fractions per cell type was comprised of three concatenated 11-

fraction iterations of the experimental procedure. Proteins with a missing value in any

of the 33 data points per cell type were excluded from further analysis. Protein features

were examined according to unsupervised clusters and subcellular compartments using

enrichment analysis. No statistical methods were used to predetermine the sample size.

The experiments were not randomized and the investigators were not blinded to

allocation during experiments and outcome assessment.

t-SNE (t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding) visualization

t-SNE was used to reduce dimensionality and visualize data. For t-SNE, the

preprocessed data were embedded into two dimensions using a perplexity of 60 and

extract gradient calculation for a maximum of 1000 iterations. The computed

coordinates were recorded and used to obtain the two-dimensional data projection

presented herein.

Protein feature annotation and gene ontology (GO) enrichment analysis

For subcellular localization, protein feature annotation was predicted using DeepLoc

2.0 (Thumuluri et al., 2022). GO terms were predicted by InterProScan (Blum et al.,

2021), the String database (Szklarczyk et al., 2023), DeepFRI (Gligorijevic et al., 2021),

and Pannzer 2 (Törönen et al., 2018). Fisher's exact tests were applied to the annotation

terms. The resulting p-values were corrected for multiple hypotheses using Bonferroni

correction, and a cutoff of 5% FDR was applied (Klingelhuber et al., 2024).

Protein subcellular localization shift analysis.

To evaluate the reproducibility of our (0-1)-normalized profiles, we calculated

the inter-profile scatter across replicates. The absolute distance (Manhattan Distance)

for each protein of each replicate profile to the mean profile from all replicates was

calculated, and these distances were averaged to obtain that protein's profile scatter

(Supplementary Data 7). Global profile scatter was then plotted as a density function

for proteins common to all compared maps. The distribution for all profiled proteins

could then be displayed as an additional output, regardless of overlap with the other

examined maps. The greater the proportion of proteins with low scatter, the better the

between-map reproducibility. As a numeric readout, we determined the scatter at a

specified quantile of each distribution (Itzhak et al., 2016; Schessner et al., 2023).

We compared organelle maps from DK2w and DK2g cells. Replicates were

numbered 1-3. Each normalized protein biodistribution profile was obtained across the

six maps. Next, delta profiles were calculated within each cognate pair of untreated and

treated maps by subtracting the (0-1)-normalized profiles from a treated map from the

profiles of its matching control map. For each of the three obtained sets of delta profiles,

a multidimensional outlier test based on the robust Mahalanobis distance was

performed using Scikit-learn (Supplementary Data 8). These distances follow a chi2

distribution and the resulting p-values reflect the probability of observing a given

profile shift (or a greater shift) by chance. The three p-values from the three replicates

were combined for each protein using the Fisher method. The combined p-values were

corrected for multiple testing using the Benjamini-Hochberg false-discovery-rate (FDR)

approach and it was then $-\log(10)$ transformed to obtain a Movement score (M score).

We chose an FDR of 0.05 as our initial stringent cut-off, corresponding to an M score

of 1.3. We also included the requirement that all of the replicate p-values needed to be

<0.1 to filter out proteins with single very small p-values in only one replicate.

We also calculated a reproducibility score (R score) as a further stringency filter.

For each protein, the Pearson correlation of all pairs of delta profiles was calculated

(Rep 1 vs. 2, 1 vs. 3, 2 vs. 3), and the median correlation was designated as the R score

(Supplementary Data 9). Profile shifts with $M > 1.3$ and $R > 0.75$ were considered

significant and reproducible. We also calculated the cosine correlation of each protein

between any replicates and set the criteria of cosine correlation > 0.75 (Supplementary

Data 10) (Itzhak et al., 2016; Schessner et al., 2023).

Confocal microscopy

For lipid droplet staining, *P. bursaria* cells were first fixed with 4% formaldehyde for

10 min and resuspended in 1000X dilution lipid droplet dye LipidSpot™ (Cat. # 70065-

T, Biotium, CA, USA) for 30 mins at room temperature. Imaging was performed using

a ZEISS LSM 780 Upright Confocal Microscope (ZEISS, Oberkochen, Germany).

Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) imaging

P. bursaria cells were collected and fixed in a mixed aldehyde solution containing 2.5%

glutaraldehyde (GA) and 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) in 100 mM sodium cacodylate

buffer (pH 7.2). Fixation was performed using a microwave. Samples were irradiated

at 500W for 1 min, followed by a 30-s pause, and an additional 1-min irradiation under

vacuum (20 in. Hg). This cycle was repeated eight times. After the final microwave

cycle, samples were shaken for 30 min at room temperature, followed by an additional

2 h of shaking before overnight storage at 4 °C.

Following fixation, samples were rinsed in 100 mM sodium cacodylate buffer

(pH 7.2) under microwave conditions of 150W for 1 min, repeated four times, with no

vacuum applied. Post-fixation was performed using 1% osmium tetroxide (OsO_4) in

100 mM sodium cacodylate buffer (pH 7.2). The post-fixation process followed similar

microwave conditions: 450W for 1 min, followed by a 30-s pause, and another 1-min

irradiation under a 20-in. Hg vacuum. This cycle was repeated eight times, with samples

shaken at room temperature for 30 min after each cycle, followed by a final 2-h shaking

period before overnight storage at 4 °C.

After post-fixation, samples were rinsed with distilled water (ddH$_2$O) under

microwave conditions of 150W for 1 min, repeated four times, without a vacuum. En-

bloc staining was performed using 2% uranyl acetate (UA). The staining process was

carried out under microwave irradiation at 450W for 1 min, followed by a 30-s pause,

and another 1-min of irradiation with a vacuum of 20-in. Hg. After staining, samples

were rinsed with ddH$_2$O, with four cycles of microwave irradiation at 150W for 1 min

per cycle, without a vacuum. Samples were then dehydrated through a graded ethanol

series (10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, 90%, and 100%). Each ethanol

step involved microwave irradiation at 200W for 10 s, followed by a pause of 20 s, and

another 10-s irradiation. This process was repeated twice for each ethanol concentration,

without a vacuum.

Following dehydration, resin infiltration was carried out using spurr's resin

without an accelerator. Initially, 5% spurr's resin was applied for 2 days at room

temperature. Samples were then infiltrated through a graded resin series (10% to 100%)

under a vacuum, with shaking every 8 hours. Two changes of 100% spurr's resin

without accelerator were applied at 8-h intervals under a vacuum, followed by three

changes of 100% spurr's resin with the accelerator under the same conditions. Finally,

resin-infiltrated samples were embedded in molds and polymerized in a pre-warmed

oven at 70 °C for 24 hours.

Data availability.

The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited in the ProteomeXchange

Consortium (Deutsch et al., 2023) . The mass

spectrometry proteomics data analyzed in this study are provided as Supplementary

Data. The Source Data file provides other data generated or analyzed in this study. All

supplementary files and Source Data are provided with this article.

Acknowledgments

We thank members of the Leu lab for helpful discussion and comments on the manuscript. We also thank John O'Brien for manuscript editing, the IMB Imaging Core for imaging experiments, and the IPMB Proteomics Core for proteomics experiments. This work was supported by Academia Sinica of Taiwan (grant no. AS-IA-110-L01 and AS-GCS-113-L03) and the National Science and Technology Council of Taiwan (NSTC 113-2326-B-001-002). KMM was supported by an NSTC postdoctoral fellowship (NSTC 113-2811-B-001-065).

Author contributions

JYL conceived the study. YJC, KMM and JYL designed analyses and interpreted results. YJC and CCH performed the experiments. YJC, KMM and CCH performed data analysis. YJC and JYL wrote the paper. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Declaration of interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Application of differential centrifugation to separate subcellular compartments of *P. bursaria* cells.

(a) Workflow of *P. bursaria* subcellular localization mapping by differential centrifugation. *P. bursaria* cells with (DK2g) or without (DK2w) endosymbionts were lysed by nitrogen cavitation and the organelles were separated by differential centrifugation. Organelle fractions were collected and analyzed by DIA-LC/MS.

Protein profiles were generated and used to predict protein localizations using SVM

machine learning. (b) Venn diagrams showing numbers of proteins identified in three

replicate experiments. The final datasets contained 10622 proteins for DK2g cells and

10491 proteins for DK2w cells. (c) Schematic representation of subcellular

compartments in *P. bursaria* and the distribution profile of marker proteins. The

distribution profiles of all of the marker proteins from three replicates were averaged

and are shown for each compartment. The numbers in brackets represent the numbers

of marker proteins for each compartment. Individual profiles are shown in

Supplementary Fig. 2. ER, endoplasmic reticulum.

Figure 2. Subcellular localization maps of symbiotic and aposymbiotic *P. bursaria*

cells.

(a) Proportions of identified proteins in different subcellular compartments. Protein

localization was assigned using SVM-based supervised learning. Proteins that could

not be assigned to a specific compartment were classified into the "unknown" group.

(b) Numbers of identified proteins that were assigned to different subcellular

compartments. (c) t-SNE projections of the proteins assigned to different subcellular

compartments in DK2g and DK2w cells. Proteins are colored according to their

subcellular localization.

Figure 3. Comparative analysis of spatial proteomes and gene ontology (GO)

analysis of symbiotic cell-specific lipid proteins.

(a) Comparison between the results predicted by the pre-trained protein language model,

DeepLoc 2.0, and our subcellular localization maps. Color coding represents different

predicted subcellular localizations, as determined by DeepLoc 2.0. (b) GO analysis of

symbiotic cell-specific lipid droplet proteins. Only GO terms with an enrichment score

> 2 and an adjusted p-value < 0.05 are shown. All of the enriched GO terms belong to

five major categories.

Figure 4. The morphology and localization of lipid droplets are altered in

symbiotic cells.

(a) Lipid droplets in aposymbiotic and symbiotic *P. bursaria* cells. Lipid droplets were

stained using LipidSpot™. The Cy5 channel was used to detect the chlorophyll of

endosymbiotic algal cells. Scale bar, 10 μm. (b) Many lipid droplets are attached to the

perialgal vacuole (PV) membrane of the endosymbionts, as revealed by TEM imaging.

The arrow indicates the PV membrane surrounding individual algal cells. Scale bar, 1

μm; LD, lipid droplet.

Figure 5. Treating symbiotic *P. bursaria* cells with lipid metabolism inhibitors

reduces endosymbiont stability.

(a) Treating symbiotic *P. bursaria* cells with mild doses of lipid metabolism inhibitors

H89 (1 μM) or T863 (10 μM) reduces the number of lipid droplets. Lipid droplets (in

green) were stained using LipidSpot™. (b) H89 or T863 treatment affects the stability

of endosymbiotic algae in *P. bursaria* cells. Scale bar, 10 μm. (c) Numbers of

endosymbiotic algae are significantly reduced after two weeks of treatment. ***, p-

value < 0.001, Mann-Whitney U test.

Supplementary Figure Legends

Supplementary Figure 1. Differential centrifugation consistently separates

different populations of proteins.

(a) SDS-PAGE of subcellular fractions collected from differential centrifugation. (b)

Proteins identified from three replicates exhibit small coefficients of variation (CV) in

terms of their abundance. Only proteins identified in both symbiotic and aposymbiotic

cells were analyzed (n = 10255). The top panel shows the distribution of protein

abundance CV, and the bottom panel shows the cumulative percentage of total protein

abundance CV. The medians of DK2g and DK2w cells are 0.25 and 0.21, respectively.

Supplementary Figure 2. Fractionation distribution profiles of 279 subcellular

compartment marker proteins.

Profiles of each marker protein averaged from three replicates of symbiotic (a) and

aposymbiotic (b) cells are shown.

Supplementary Figure 3. Quality examination of the marker proteins.

(a) Prediction accuracy for marker proteins, as indicated by the F1 score for DK2g and

DK2w cells. Organelle-specific recall indicates the proportion of markers correctly

assigned to the cluster, and organelle-specific precision indicates the ratio of markers

correctly assigned to the number of all markers assigned to the cluster. The F1 score is

derived from the harmonic mean of recall and precision, representing the primary

readout for SVM performance. (b) Q-Sep analysis shows that proteins within the same

subcellular compartment have shorter Q-Sep distances than those between different

compartments.

Supplementary Figure 4. Proteins from the same subcellular compartment show

similar fractionation distribution profiles.

Profiles of each protein averaged from three replicates are shown. The color intensity

indicates the percentage of an individual protein contained in each fraction.

Supplementary Figure 5. Fractionation distribution profiles of all proteins with

predicted subcellular localizations.

Concatenated profiles of each protein from three replicates.

Supplementary Figure 6. Sankey diagram showing how proteins are translocated

to different subcellular compartments under conditions of aposymbiosis (DK2w

cells) and symbiosis (DK2g cells).

The analysis was performed by calculating Movement-Reproducibility (M-R) scores.

Significantly altered map shift (FDR<5%) corresponds to an M score cut-off at 1.3. The

M score is calculated as -log10 of the Benjamini-Hochberg-corrected combination of

p-values derived from three independent chi2 distributions of robust Mahalanobis

distance (see Methods for details). In addition, an R score cut-off of 0.75 was applied,

and only proteins with a p-value <0.1 in three replicates were considered. For this

stringent analysis, only 240 proteins were considered to have a significant profile shift

and altered subcellular compartment localization under the condition of symbiosis.

Among them, lipid droplets represent the largest known group.

Supplementary Figure 7. Proteins involved in nitric oxide signaling and cGMP-

protein kinase G signaling pathways are localized to lipid droplets and increased

in abundance in symbiotic cells.

(a) Protein abundance of several key components in the nitric oxide and cGMP-PKG

signaling pathways are increased in symbiotic cells. *, p-value < 0.05, unpaired

Student's t-test. (b) Model of signal transduction and lipid transport in symbiotic *P.*

bursaria cells. Nitric oxide generated by nitric oxide synthase activates guanylate

cyclase to catalyze GTP into cGMP and regulate the expression of lipocalin, a protein

involved in lipid transport. cGMP then activates protein kinase G to perform

downstream phosphorylation signaling. In addition, cGMP can activate the CNG

channel to regulate the concentration of cations inside and outside cells. Interestingly,

we observed that the phosphodiesterase enzyme in the cGMP signaling pathway was

located in the ER of aposymbiotic cells, but was upregulated and translocated to lipid

droplets in symbiotic cells, indicating functional adjustment of the lipid droplets.

Supplementary Data

Supplementary Data 1: Marker protein list.

Supplementary Data 2: Normalized fractionation profiles.

Supplementary Data 3: DeepLoc-predicted protein localizations.

Supplementary Data 4: Translocated proteins identified using the MR analysis.

Supplementary Data 5: GO analysis of symbiotic cell-specific lipid droplet proteins.

Supplementary Data 6: Q-Sep distances between all pairs of compartments in DK2g and DK2w cells.

Supplementary Data 7: Manhattan distance of each replicate profile.

Supplementary Data 8: Mahalanobis distances of individual protein profiles.

Supplementary Data 9: Pearson correlation of all pairs of delta profiles.

Supplementary Data 10: Cosine correlation of each protein among replicates.

References

Aebersold, R., and Mann, M. (2016). Mass-spectrometric exploration of proteome structure and function. Nature *537*, 347-355.

Ayala, A., and Weis, D.S. (1987). The Effect of Puromycin and Cycloheximide on the Infection of Algae-Free Paramecium-Bursaria by Symbiotic Chlorellae. Journal of Protozoology *34*, 377-381.

Blum, M., Chang, H.Y., Chuguransky, S., Grego, T., Kandasaamy, S., Mitchell, A., Nuka, G., Paysan-Lafosse, T., Qureshi, M., Raj, S.*, et al.* (2021). The InterPro protein families and domains database: 20 years on. Nucleic Acids Res *49*, D344-D354.

Brueckner, J., and Martin, W.F. (2020). Bacterial Genes Outnumber Archaeal Genes in

Eukaryotic Genomes. Genome Biol Evol *12*, 282-292.

Chen, C.W., Tsai, C.F., Lin, M.H., Lin, S.Y., and Hsu, C.C. (2023). Suspension
Trapping-Based Sample Preparation Workflow for In-Depth Plant Phosphoproteomics.
Anal Chem *95*, 12232-12239.

Cheng, Y.H., Liu, C.F., Yu, Y.H., Jhou, Y.T., Fujishima, M., Tsai, I.J., and Leu, J.Y.
(2020). Population genomics reveals genome plasticity in Paramecium bursaria.
submitted.

de Alda, J.A.G.O., Esteban, R., Diago, M.L., and Houmard, J. (2014). The plastid
ancestor originated among one of the major cyanobacterial lineages. Nature
Communications *5*.

Deutsch, E.W., Bandeira, N., Perez-Riverol, Y., Sharma, V., Carver, J.J., Mendoza, L.,
Kundu, D.J., Wang, S.B., Bandla, C., Kamatchinathan, S.*, et al.* (2023). The
ProteomeXchange consortium at 10 years: 2023 update. Nucleic Acids Research *51*,
D1539-D1548.

Douglas, S.E. (1998). Plastid evolution: origins, diversity, trends. Curr Opin Genet Dev
8, 655-661.

Emms, D.M., and Kelly, S. (2015). OrthoFinder: solving fundamental biases in whole
genome comparisons dramatically improves orthogroup inference accuracy. Genome
Biology *16*.

Esteban, G.F., Fenchel, T., and Finlay, B.J. (2010). Mixotrophy in ciliates. Protist *161*,
621-641.

Fujishima, M. (2009). Endosymbionts in Paramecium, Vol 12 (Springer).

Fujishima, M., and Kodama, Y. (2012). Endosymbionts in Paramecium. Eur J Protistol
48, 124-137.

Gao, Y., Solberg, T., Wang, R., Yu, Y., Al-Rasheid, K.A.S., and Gao, F. (2024).
Application of RNA interference and protein localization to investigate housekeeping
and developmentally regulated genes in the emerging model protozoan Paramecium
caudatum. Commun Biol *7*, 204.

Geladaki, A., Britovsek, N.K., Breckels, L.M., Smith, T.S., Vennard, O.L., Mulvey,
C.M., Crook, O.M., Gatto, L., and Lilley, K.S. (2019). Combining LOPIT with
differential ultracentrifugation for high-resolution spatial proteomics. Nature
Communications *10*.

Gligorijevic, V., Renfrew, P.D., Kosciolek, T., Leman, J.K., Berenberg, D., Vatanen, T.,
Chandler, C., Taylor, B.C., Fisk, I.M., Vlamakis, H.*, et al.* (2021). Structure-based
protein function prediction using graph convolutional networks. Nat Commun *12*, 3168.

Gurung, S., Perocheau, D., Touramanidou, L., and Baruteau, J. (2021). The exosome
journey: from biogenesis to uptake and intracellular signalling. Cell Communication
and Signaling *19*.

Hamada, M., Schroder, K., Bathia, J., Kurn, U., Fraune, S., Khalturina, M., Khalturin,
K., Shinzato, C., Satoh, N., and Bosch, T.C.G. (2018). Metabolic co-dependence drives
the evolutionarily ancient Hydra-Chlorella symbiosis. Elife *7*.

Hauser, K., Haynes, W.J., Kung, C., Plattner, H., and Kissmehl, R. (2000). Expression
of the green fluorescent protein in Paramecium tetraurelia. Eur J Cell Biol *79*, 144-149.

He, M., Wang, J.F., Fan, X.P., Liu, X.H., Shi, W.Y., Huang, N., Zhao, F.Q., and Miao,
M. (2019). Genetic basis for the establishment of endosymbiosis in Paramecium. Isme
J *13*, 1360-1369.

Ishikawa, M., Yuyama, I., Shimizu, H., Nozawa, M., Ikeo, K., and Gojobori, T. (2016).
Different Endosymbiotic Interactions in Two Hydra Species Reflect the Evolutionary
History of Endosymbiosis. Genome Biol Evol *8*, 2155-2163.

Itzhak, D.N., Schessner, J.P., and Borner, G.H.H. (2019). Dynamic Organellar Maps for
Spatial Proteomics. Curr Protoc Cell Biol *83*, e81.

Itzhak, D.N., Tyanova, S., Cox, J., and Borner, G.H. (2016). Global, quantitative and
dynamic mapping of protein subcellular localization. Elife *5*.

Jenkins, B.H., Maguire, F., Leonard, G., Eaton, J.D., West, S., Housden, B.E., Milner,
D.S., and Richards, T.A. (2021). Emergent RNA-RNA interactions can promote
stability in a facultative phototrophic endosymbiosis. P Natl Acad Sci USA *118*.

Kissmehl, R., Treptau, T., Hofer, H.W., and Plattner, H. (1996). Protein phosphatase
and kinase activities possibly involved in exocytosis regulation in Paramecium
tetraurelia. Biochemical Journal *317*, 65-76.

Klingelhuber, F., Frendo-Cumbo, S., Omar-Hmeadi, M., Massier, L., Kakimoto, P.,
Taylor, A.J., Couchet, M., Ribicic, S., Wabitsch, M., Messias, A.C.*, et al.* (2024). A
spatiotemporal proteomic map of human adipogenesis. Nat Metab *6*, 861-879.

Kodama, Y., and Fujishima, M. (2008). Cycloheximide induces synchronous swelling
of perialgal vacuoles enclosing symbiotic Chlorella vulgaris and digestion of the algae
in the ciliate Paramecium bursaria. Protist *159*, 483-494.

Kodama, Y., and Fujishima, M. (2022). Endosymbiotic Chlorella variabilis reduces
mitochondrial number in the ciliate Paramecium bursaria. Sci Rep *12*, 8216.

Kodama, Y., Inouye, I., and Fujishima, M. (2011). Symbiotic Chlorella vulgaris of the
ciliate Paramecium bursaria plays an important role in maintaining perialgal vacuole
membrane functions. Protist *162*, 288-303.

Kodama, Y., and Sumita, H. (2022). The ciliate allows budding of symbiotic cells singly
from the digestive vacuole membrane into the cytoplasm during algal reinfection.
Protoplasma *259*, 117-125.

Licknack, T.J. (2022). A spatial proteome of Paramecium tetraurelia (ASU Library:
Arizona State University).

Londos, C., Sztalryd, C., Tansey, J.T., and Kimmel, A.R. (2005). Role of PAT proteins

in lipid metabolism. Biochimie *87*, 45-49.

Long, H.G., Johri, P., Gout, J.F., Ni, J.H., Hao, Y., Licknack, T., Wang, Y.H., Pan, J., Jiménez-Marín, B., and Lynch, M. (2023). Genetics, Genomics, and Evolution. Annual Review of Genetics *57*, 391-410.

Lynch, M., Schavemaker, P.E., Licknack, T.J., Hao, Y., and Pezzano, A. (2022). Evolutionary bioenergetics of ciliates. J Eukaryot Microbiol *69*.

Meier, R., and Wiessner, W. (1988). Infection of algae-free Paramecium bursaria with symbiotic Chlorella sp. Isolated from green paramecia: I. Effect of the incubation period. Eur J Protistol *24*, 69-74.

Mota, L.A.M., Roberto-Neto, J., Monteiro, V.G., Lobato, C.S.S., de Oliveira, M.A., da Cunha, M., D'Avila, H., Seabra, S.H., Bozza, P.T., and DaMatta, R.A. (2014). Culture of mouse peritoneal macrophages with mouse serum induces lipid bodies that associate with the parasitophorous vacuole and decrease their microbicidal capacity against. Mem I Oswaldo Cruz *109*, 767-774.

Mund, A., Brunner, A.D., and Mann, M. (2022). Unbiased spatial proteomics with single-cell resolution in tissues. Molecular Cell *82*, 2335-2349.

Nolan, S.J., Romano, J.D., and Coppens, I. (2017). Host lipid droplets: An important source of lipids salvaged by the intracellular parasite Toxoplasma gondii. PLoS Pathog *13*, e1006362.

Olzmann, J.A., and Carvalho, P. (2019). Dynamics and functions of lipid droplets. Nat Rev Mol Cell Bio *20*, 137-155.

Pease, D.C. (1947). The structure of trichocysts revealed by the electron microscope. J Cell Comp Physiol *29*, 91-94.

Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V.*, et al.* (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J Mach Learn Res *12*, 2825-2830.

Pirayesh, N., Giridhar, M., Ben Khedher, A., Vothknecht, U.C., and Chigri, F. (2021). Organellar calcium signaling in plants: An update. Biochim Biophys Acta Mol Cell Res *1868*, 118948.

Plattner, H. (2017). Trichocysts-Paramecium's Projectile-like Secretory Organelles Reappraisal of their Biogenesis, Composition, Intracellular Transport, and Possible Functions. J Eukaryot Microbiol *64*, 106-133.

Rivera, M.C., Jain, R., Moore, J.E., and Lake, J.A. (1998). Genomic evidence for two functionally distinct gene classes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *95*, 6239-6244.

Rogne, M., and Taskén, K. (2014). Compartmentalization of cAMP Signaling in Adipogenesis, Lipogenesis, and Lipolysis. Hormone and Metabolic Research *46*, 833-840.

Roingeard, P., and Melo, R.C. (2017). Lipid droplet hijacking by intracellular pathogens.

Cell Microbiol *19*.

Schessner, J.P., Albrecht, V., Davies, A.K., Sinitcyn, P., and Borner, G.H.H. (2023).

Deep and fast label-free Dynamic Organellar Mapping. Nat Commun *14*, 5252.

Song, C.H., Murata, K., and Suzaki, T. (2017). Intracellular symbiosis of algae with

possible involvement of mitochondrial dynamics. Scientific Reports *7*.

Su, E.C., Chiu, H.S., Lo, A., Hwang, J.K., Sung, T.Y., and Hsu, W.L. (2007). Protein

subcellular localization prediction based on compartment-specific features and

structure conservation. BMC Bioinformatics *8*, 330.

Sudakaran, S., Kost, C., and Kaltenpoth, M. (2017). Symbiont Acquisition and

Replacement as a Source of Ecological Innovation. Trends Microbiol *25*, 375-390.

Szklarczyk, D., Kirsch, R., Koutrouli, M., Nastou, K., Mehryary, F., Hachilif, R., Gable,

A.L., Fang, T., Doncheva, N.T., Pyysalo, S.*, et al.* (2023). The STRING database in

2023: protein-protein association networks and functional enrichment analyses for any

sequenced genome of interest. Nucleic Acids Research *51*, D638-D646.

Thumuluri, V., Armenteros, J.J.A., Johansen, A.R., Nielsen, H., and Winther, O. (2022).

DeepLoc 2.0: multi-label subcellular localization prediction using protein language

models. Nucleic Acids Research *50*, W228-W234.

Törönen, P., Medlar, A., and Holm, L. (2018). PANNZER2: a rapid functional

annotation web server. Nucleic Acids Research *46*, W84-W88.

Walther, T.C., and Farese, R.V., Jr. (2012). Lipid droplets and cellular lipid metabolism.

Annu Rev Biochem *81*, 687-714.

Wein, T., Romero Picazo, D., Blow, F., Woehle, C., Jami, E., Reusch, T.B.H., Martin,

W.F., and Dagan, T. (2019). Currency, Exchange, and Inheritance in the Evolution of

Symbiosis. Trends Microbiol *27*, 836-849.

Yen, C.L., Stone, S.J., Koliwad, S., Harris, C., and Farese, R.V., Jr. (2008). Thematic

review series: glycerolipids. DGAT enzymes and triacylglycerol biosynthesis. J Lipid

Res *49*, 2283-2301.

Zilber-Rosenberg, I., and Rosenberg, E. (2008). Role of microorganisms in the

evolution of animals and plants: the hologenome theory of evolution. FEMS Microbiol

Rev *32*, 723-735.

Figure 1

a

1. Cell collection

DK2w   DK2g

2. Cell disruption

3. Differential centrifugation

4. LC-MS/MS

5. DIA-based data analysis and SVM classification

b

DK2g (symbiotic)

33 (0.3%)

161 (1.4%)

34 (0.3%)

10622 (95.2%)

112 (1.0%)

141 (1.3%)

58 (0.5%)

DK2w (aposymbiotic)

87 (0.8%)

125 (1.1%)

23 (0.2%)

10491 (94.3%)

179 (1.6%)

166 (1.5%)

60 (0.5%)

c

peroxisome (18)
plasma membrane (13)
basal body (16)
mitochondrion (59)
cytosol (21)
nucleus (33)
lipid droplet (24)

300g 3000g 5000g 9000g 12000g 15000g 30000g 79000g 120000g cytosol

phagolysosome (22)
proteasome (17)
Golgi (7)
ribosome (14)
trichocyst (17)
ER (18)

300g 3000g 5000g 9000g 12000g 15000g 30000g 79000g 120000g cytosol

trichocyst
basal body
Golgi
ER
nuclei
phagolysosome
peroxisome
proteasome
ribosome
lipid droplet
plasma membrane
mitochondrion

Figure 2

a

b

c

Figure 3

a

b

Figure 4

Figure 5

a no treatment   + H89   + T860

b no treatment   + H89   + T860

c

Supplementary Figure 1

Supplementary Figure 2

a DK2g (symbiotic)

b DK2w (aposymbiotic)

Supplementary Figure 3

a

DK2g (symbiotic)

```
Total Accuracy on Training Data: 0.992831541218638
Classification Report for Each Marker:
                                                 precision   recall   f1-score   support

                            basal body rootlet      1.00      1.00      1.00        16
                                       cytosol      1.00      1.00      1.00        21
                                   lipid droplet      1.00      0.92      0.96        24
    membrane Trafficking: Vacuole (Trafficking to PM)  1.00      1.00      1.00        13
                                   mitochondria      1.00      1.00      1.00        59
                                        nuclear      0.97      1.00      0.99        33
                                     peroxisome      1.00      1.00      1.00        18
                                     proteasome      1.00      1.00      1.00        17
                                       ribosome      1.00      1.00      1.00        14
              trafficking: Vacuole (ER Chaperones)      0.95      1.00      0.97        18
              trafficking: Vacuole (Phagolysosomal)     1.00      1.00      1.00        22
         trafficking: Vacuole(Trafficking to CV; Golgi)  1.00      1.00      1.00         7
                                trichocyst matrix      1.00      1.00      1.00        17

                                        accuracy                          0.99       279
                                       macro avg      0.99      0.99      0.99       279
                                    weighted avg      0.99      0.99      0.99       279
```

DK2w (aposymbiotic)

```
Total Accuracy on Training Data: 0.978494623655914
Classification Report for Each Marker:
                                                 precision   recall   f1-score   support

                            basal body rootlet      1.00      1.00      1.00        16
                                       cytosol      1.00      1.00      1.00        21
                                   lipid droplet      0.88      0.88      0.88        24
    membrane Trafficking: Vacuole (Trafficking to PM)  1.00      1.00      1.00        13
                                   mitochondria      1.00      1.00      1.00        59
                                        nuclear      1.00      1.00      1.00        33
                                     peroxisome      0.95      1.00      0.97        18
                                     proteasome      1.00      1.00      1.00        17
                                       ribosome      1.00      1.00      1.00        14
              trafficking: Vacuole (ER Chaperones)      0.95      1.00      0.97        18
              trafficking: Vacuole (Phagolysosomal)     1.00      1.00      1.00        22
         trafficking: Vacuole(Trafficking to CV; Golgi)  0.80      0.57      0.67         7
                                trichocyst matrix      1.00      1.00      1.00        17

                                        accuracy                          0.98       279
                                       macro avg      0.97      0.96      0.96       279
                                    weighted avg      0.98      0.98      0.98       279
```

b

Supplementary Figure 4

DK2g (symbiotic)

DK2w (aposymbiotic)

Supplementary Figure 5

DK2g (symbiotic)

DK2w (aposymbiotic)

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 7

a

b