Contact inhibitory Eph signalling decouples EGFR activity from

vesicular recycling to generate contextual plasticity

Wayne Stallaert[1], Ola Sabet[1], Yannick Brüggemann[1,2], Lisa Baak[1] and Philippe I.H.

Bastiaens[1,2*]

Affiliations

[1]Department of Systemic Cell Biology, Max Planck Institute of Molecular Physiology, Otto-

Hahn-Str.11, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

[2]Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, TU Dortmund, Otto-Hahn-Str. 6, 44227

Dortmund, Germany

*Correspondence to: philippe.bastiaens@mpi-dortmund.mpg.de

Abstract

The ability of cells to adapt their behaviour to growth factors in relation to their

environment is an essential aspect of tissue development and homeostasis. Here we show

that cell-cell contact can change the outcome of EGFR activation by altering its vesicular

trafficking. EGFR promotes Akt-mediated vesicular recycling to maintain its plasma

membrane (PM) abundance during EGF stimulation. This self-sustained vesicular recycling

of EGFR generates a positive feedback that maintains PM Akt signalling and promotes

migration. By decoupling EGFR activation from its vesicular recycling, Eph activity at cell-

cell contacts impedes the positive feedback that maintains PM signalling and traps EGFR in

endosomes. Through this change in the spatial distribution of EGFR activity, cell-cell

contact selectively suppresses migratory PI3K/Akt signalling from the PM, while

preserving proliferative ERK signalling from endosomes. Thus, by altering the vesicular

trafficking of EGFR, the cellular environment can modulate its signalling to generate

diverse outcomes to EGF stimulation.

Introduction

Activation of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) promotes a variety of cellular

responses including cell growth, proliferation, survival, apoptosis, differentiation and

migration (Yarden and Sliwkowski 2001), some of which are functionally opposed. To

select among these diverse outcomes, the cell requires additional contextual information.

This context can be intrinsic (e.g. cell type or cell cycle stage), or extrinsic, in the form of

extracellular signals that provide information about the current (or past) environmental

context. Adaptability to a changing environment requires that extrinsic information be

integrated through mechanisms that can transform the response to subsequent EGF

stimulation.

Vesicular trafficking allows the cell to enact a precise and coordinated response to

extracellular signals by dynamically regulating the spatial distribution of cell surface

receptors between the plasma membrane (PM) and functionally heterogeneous endosomal

compartments (Baumdick et al. 2015). Recycling of unliganded, monomeric EGFR through

the protein tyrosine phosphatase (PTP)-rich perinuclear environment safeguards against

autonomous receptor activation and regulates the cellular responsiveness to both new and

sustained stimuli by maintaining PM receptor abundance (Baumdick et al. 2015). EGF

binding promotes receptor ubiquitination (Sigismund et al. 2013), which re-routes

internalized EGFR to lysosomal degradation (Baumdick et al. 2015). Therefore, at

subsaturating EGF concentrations typically found in human tissue secretions (0.4-20

ng/ml)(Konturek et al. 1989), the cell maintains its sensitivity to persistent stimulation by

continually recycling unliganded, non-ubiquitinated receptors to the PM. Saturating EGF

concentrations (> 50 ng/ml)(Macdonald and Pike 2008), on the other hand, generate a

finite temporal response by progressively depleting PM and total EGFR abundance through

ubiquitin-dependent lysosomal degradation.

Although endocytosis reduces receptor activation and signalling at the PM, many receptors

continue to signal from endosomes following internalization (Villaseñor, Kalaidzidis, and

Zerial 2016; Sorkin and von Zastrow 2009; Daaka et al. 1998; Wouters and Bastiaens 1999;

DeFea et al. 2000; Maminska et al. 2016; Ménard, Parker, and Kermorgant 2014; Sadowski

et al. 2013; Howe et al. 2001; Verma et al. 2015). The signalling repertoire of these

endosomal receptors can differ from that at the PM if biochemical components of the

transduction machinery are not equally accessible in these distinct subcellular

environments. EGFR can continue to activate ERK1/2, for example, by scaffolding

components of this kinase cascade on endosomes (Guglielmo et al. 1994; Teis et al. 2006;

Nada et al. 2009; Fortian and Sorkin 2014; Villaseñor et al. 2015). *De novo* activation of Akt

by endosomal EGFR, on the other hand, is limited by a deficiency of the phosphoinositide

$PI(4,5)P_2$ in endosomal membranes (Matsuda et al. 2001; Haugh and Meyer 2002), which is

phosphorylated to $PI(3,4,5)P_3$ through the EGFR-mediated activation of phosphoinositide 3

kinase (PI3K) and acts as a docking site for Akt and its upstream kinase PDK1.

Consequently, sustained activation of Akt requires a continuous recycling of internalized

receptors to the $PI(4,5)P_2$-rich environment of the PM (Nishimura et al. 2015). Any changes

in EGFR trafficking dynamics which alter the distribution of receptors between the PM and

endosomal compartments might therefore change the signalling response to EGF

stimulation. Furthermore, recent evidence suggests that certain signalling molecules

downstream of cell surface receptors can, in turn, influence vesicular trafficking (Er et al.

2013; Laketa et al. 2014), generating a reciprocal relationship between receptor activation

and vesicular dynamics whose role in shaping the cellular response to stimuli has recently

begun to garner attention (Schmid 2017).

Given the role of trafficking in the regulation of EGFR activation and signalling, changes in

its vesicular dynamics may represent a mechanism through which the environmental

context can influence the cellular response to EGF stimulation. In the current work, we

reveal that cell-cell contact, through the activation of Eph receptors, selectively suppresses

EGF-promoted migratory signalling while preserving its proliferative response by altering

EGFR vesicular trafficking dynamics.

Results

Akt-dependent recycling of EGFR sustains its autocatalytic activation at the PM

In the absence of EGF stimulation, constitutive vesicular recycling of EGFR acts as a safeguard against autonomous receptor activation both by reducing PM abundance and continuously recycling receptors through the PTP-rich perinuclear compartment to dephosphorylate the autocatalytic Y_{845} (Baumdick et al. 2015). We observed that this constitutive recycling of unliganded EGFR is dependent on cellular Akt activity (**Fig. 1a-d**). Endosomal accumulation of EGFR (**Fig. 1a, Supplementary Movie 1**) and a decrease in PM EGFR abundance (**Fig. 1b top**) were observed following pharmacological inhibition of Akt (**Fig. 1b bottom**) in Cos-7 cells. Consistent with a previous report, we found that Akt inhibition traps endocytic EGFR in Rab5-positive early endosomes (**Fig. 1c**)(Er et al. 2013). Conversely, an increase in Akt activation following inhibition of its negative regulator, PP2A, by okadaic acid promoted a coincidental increase in the abundance of PM EGFR (**Fig. 1d**), demonstrating that the PM density of EGFR is positively regulated by Akt activity.

EGF binding increases the probability of EGFR ubiquitination (Sigismund et al. 2013), which redirects liganded, internalized receptors toward the Rab7-positive late endosomal compartment *en route* to degradation in the lysosome, while unliganded, non-ubiquitinated receptors are recycled back to the PM (Baumdick et al. 2015). Since EGFR activation itself increases Akt activity in cells (**Supplementary Fig. 1**), we asked whether the vesicular recycling of unliganded receptors is increased during subsaturating EGF stimulation. By measuring the accumulation of EGFR-paGFP at the PM following photoactivation in endosomes (**Fig. 1e top**), we observed that EGF stimulation increased EGFR recycling (**Fig. 1e bottom**), while Akt inhibition suppressed EGFR recycling both prior to and during EGF stimulation (**Fig. 1e**). Thus, through the activation of Akt, EGFR actively maintains its PM abundance during persistent, subsaturating stimulation by increasing vesicular recycling. Furthermore, by trapping internalized EGFR in Rab5-positive early endosomes, Akt inhibition also impaired the transition of EGFR to Rab7-positive late endosomes (Poteryaev et al. 2009) in EGF-stimulated cells (**Fig. 1c**), leading to a decrease in receptor degradation

(**Fig. 1f**). Therefore, by impeding trafficking from the early endosomal compartment, Akt

regulates both the recycling of unliganded, non-ubquitinated receptors to the PM and the

degradation of liganded, ubiquitinated receptors in the lysosome.

We next investigated how these effects of Akt on EGFR vesicular trafficking influence

receptor response properties during EGF stimulation. By decreasing PM receptor

abundance prior to and during EGF stimulation (**Fig. 1b,e**), pretreatment with an Akt

inhibitor significantly decreased the proportion of phosphorylated receptors at the

autocatalytic Y_{845}, the effector docking site Y_{1068} and the Cbl-mediated ubiquitination

regulatory site Y_{1045} (Baumdick et al. 2015) following 30 min of sustained EGF stimulation

(**Fig. 1g**). At higher EGF concentrations ($\geq$ 50 ng/ml), Akt inhibition also suppresses

receptor degradation (**Fig. 1f**), trapping internalized EGFR in endosomal compartments

accessible to ER-bound PTPs with high activity (Yudushkin et al. 2007; Haj et al. 2002),

further decreasing the proportion of phosphorylated receptors in the entire cell (**Fig. 1g**).

At subsaturating, physiological EGF concentrations, EGFR phosphorylation is propagated at

the PM through the transphosphorylation of unliganded receptors by liganded receptors,

generating an autocatalytic activation of EGFR (Reynolds et al. 2003; Ibach et al. 2015;

Masip et al. 2016, Stanoev et al. 2017). Once unliganded receptors are phosphorylated on

$Y_{845,}$ which stabilizes their active conformation (Baumdick et. al, 2017), autocatalytic

activation can further propagate to additional unliganded EGFR. This autocatalytic

component in EGFR activation increases non-linearly with PM receptor density. We

therefore hypothesized that Akt activity might regulate EGFR autocatalysis by controlling

receptor abundance at the PM. As receptor occupancy increases at higher EGF

concentrations, EGFR phosphorylation becomes less dependent on autocatalysis.

Therefore, to specifically measure the effect of Akt on EGFR autocatalytic activation, we

stimulated cells with increasing, subsaturating concentrations of EGF-Alexa647 (1, 3, 10

and 20 ng/ml) and simultaneously measured EGF binding and EGFR activation (by

translocation of the EGFR phospho-tyrosine binding (PTB) domain) at the PM in individual

cells by time lapse imaging (**Fig. 1h-j**, **Supplementary Fig. 2**). Compared to control cells

(**Fig. 1h**), pretreatment with an Akt inhibitor decreased both EGF binding and EGFR

phosphorylation (**Fig. 1i**), consistent with a reduction in PM receptor abundance prior to

EGF stimulation (**Fig. 1b,e**). Plotting the relationship between the number of liganded

receptors (i.e. EGF-Alexa647 binding) and the extent of EGFR phosphorylation revealed

that phosphorylation increases non-linearly with EGF binding above a certain threshold in

control cells, consistent with an autocatalytic activation (**Fig. 1j**). Pretreatment with an Akt

inhibitor, on the other hand, generated less PM EGFR phosphorylation for equivalent

numbers of liganded receptors by impeding its autocatalytic activation (**Fig. 1j**). Therefore,

by promoting the constitutive recycling of EGFR to maintain its PM density prior to EGF

stimulation (**Fig. 1a-e**), Akt activity fosters the autocatalytic activation of EGFR at

subsaturating EGF concentrations.

Since EGF stimulation itself increases Akt-dependent vesicular recycling (**Fig. 1e**), we

further reasoned that EGFR might self-sustain its activation during persistent,

subsaturating EGF stimulation. To further investigate how Akt-dependent recycling

influences PM EGFR autocatalytic activation during EGF stimulation, measurements of

EGFR phosphorylation and trafficking were obtained by immunofluorescence prior to and

following subsaturating EGF stimulation (20 ng/ml) for 5, 30 and 60 min. Cells were

radially segmented to quantify changes in the spatial distribution of EGFR with time and

visualized using 3D spatial-temporal maps (**Fig. 1k,** Stanoev et al. 2017). By reducing PM

receptor density prior to EGF stimulation (**Fig. 1k, top**), pretreatment with an Akt inhibitor

decreased the proportion of phosphorylated EGFR at the PM after 5 min of EGF stimulation

(**Fig. 1k, bottom**), consistent with reduced EGFR autocatalysis (**Fig. 1j**). By continually

delivering internalized, non-ubiquitinated receptors to the PM to both bind additional EGF

and act as a substrate for autocatalysis, the EGF-induced increase in vesicular recycling

(**Fig. 1e**), maintains a high proportion of phosphorylated receptors at the PM during

sustained stimulation (**Fig. 1k, bottom**). Akt inhibition, on the other hand, by suppressing

the EGF-induced increase in receptor recycling (**Fig. 1e**) also reduced EGFR autocatalytic

activation at the PM at later time points (**Fig. 1k, bottom**) by trapping internalized

receptors in endosomes (**Fig. 1k, top**). Akt promotes vesicular trafficking through the

activation of the Rab5 effector PIKfyve (Er et al. 2013). PIKfyve inhibition led to an

endosomal accumulation of EGFR (**Supplementary Fig. 3a,b**) and decreased PM EGFR

abundance (**Fig. 1k, top**), consistent with a suppression of Akt-dependent recycling.

Decoupling Akt activation from its effect on trafficking by PIKfyve inhibition had

indistinguishable effects from direct Akt inhibition on EGFR phosphorylation and

trafficking (**Fig. 1l**), further validating that Akt activity sustains autocatalytic EGFR

activation at the PM through its effects on vesicular recycling.

Therefore, by stimulating an increase in Akt-dependent recycling, EGFR maintains its

sensitivity to EGF, effectively generating a positive feedback that sustains autocatalytic

EGFR activation at the PM during persistent, subsaturating stimulation (**Fig. 1l**).

Eph receptor activation regulates EGFR vesicular trafficking

The Eph family of receptor tyrosine kinases is activated at points of cell-cell contact

through interactions with membrane bound ephrin ligands presented on the surfaces of

adjacent cells (Pasquale 2010). Eph receptors, such as EphA2, in many ways operate in

functional opposition to EGFR, acting as a tumour suppressor (Miao et al. 2001; Batlle et al.

2005; Merlos-Suárez and Batlle 2008; Cortina et al. 2007; Li et al. 2009; Pasquale 2010;

Boyd, Bartlett, and Lackmann 2013) and mediating contact inhibition of locomotion to

suppress cellular migration and metastasis (Miao et al. 2009; Astin et al. 2010; Li et al.

2012; Lin et al. 2015). Indeed, a functional coupling of EGFR and Eph receptor activity has

recently been shown to regulate EGF-promoted migration (Lin et al. 2015). Since the

activation of Eph receptors decreases cellular Akt activity (**Supplementary Fig. 4a-b**)(Li et

al. 2012), we hypothesized that Eph receptors might regulate the cellular response to the

persistent, subsaturating EGF stimulation typical of pro-migratory signals by altering EGFR

vesicular trafficking.

Stimulation with soluble, clustered ephrinA1-Fc (A1)(Davis et al. 1994; Sabet et al. 2015),

led to Rab5-positive early endosomal accumulation of EGFR (**Fig. 2a-c, Supplementary**

Movie 2) and a reduction in PM EGFR abundance in Cos-7 (**Fig. 2d, Supplementary Fig.**

4c-d), HEK293 (**Supplementary Fig. 4e**), MCF10A (**Supplementary Fig. 4f**) and MDA-MB-

231 cells (**Supplementary Fig. 4g**). EGFR also accumulated in endosomes upon

physiological presentation of ephrinA1 ligand at sites of cell-cell contact (**Supplementary**

Movie 3). Consistent with the delayed endosomal accumulation of EGFR relative to EphA2

(**Fig. 2b,d**), we confirmed that the loss of PM EGFR does not result from the increased

formation of a heterodimer (**Supplementary Fig. 5**) or through the transactivation of

EGFR by EphA2 (**Fig 2e**). To directly assess whether Eph receptors decrease PM EGFR

through an inhibition of Akt-mediated EGFR recycling, we stimulated cells for 15 min with

a subsaturating concentration of EGF to induce EGFR endocytosis and measured the

subsequent recycling of internalized receptors back to the PM after EGF washout (**Fig. 2f**).

In control cells, the PM abundance of EGFR recovered to pre-EGF levels following washout,

while in A1-pretreated cells, EGFR recycling was significantly inhibited (**Fig. 2f**), consistent

with an EphA2-mediated inhibition of Akt-dependent recycling.

Cell-cell contact alters the spatial distribution of EGFR activity

We next assessed whether prior activation of Eph receptors regulates the subsequent

cellular response to EGF by suppressing its vesicular recycling. Similar to the effect of Akt

and PIKfyve inhibition (**Fig. 1k**), A1 pretreatment reduced autocatalytic activation of EGFR

at the PM during persistent, subsaturating EGF stimulation, while preserving EGFR

phosphorylation in endosomes (**Fig. 3a**). Although EGFR can continue to activate some

signalling effectors from endosomal membranes (Villaseñor, Kalaidzidis, and Zerial 2016;

Sorkin and von Zastrow 2009), Akt itself is preferentially activated at the PM

(**Supplementary Fig. 1**)(Haugh and Meyer 2002; Nishimura et al. 2015). By suppressing

the positive feedback that maintains EGFR activation at the PM, A1 pretreatment

selectively inhibited EGF-promoted Akt activation in both Cos-7 and HEK293 cells (**Fig. 3b**

top, Supplementary Fig. 6), while ERK activation, which can continue from endosomal

membranes (**Supplementary Fig. 1c-d**)(Guglielmo et al. 1994; Nada et al. 2009; Villaseñor

et al. 2015), remained intact (**Fig 3b bottom, Supplementary Fig. 6**). To confirm that

EphA2 inhibits EGF-promoted Akt activation by suppressing EGFR recycling and does not

simply reflect the opposed regulation of Akt by EGFR and EphA2 (activation vs inhibition,

respectively), we assessed whether EGFR trafficking was dispensable for the A1-induced

suppression of EGF-promoted Akt activation. Cells were prestimulated with A1 for 30

minutes, followed by treatment with the dynamin inhibitor dynole 34-2 to block

subsequent endocytosis, and then stimulated with EGF. When EGFR endocytosis was

blocked (**Supplementary Fig. 1c**), A1 pretreatment had no effect on EGF-promoted Akt

activation (**Fig. 3c top**), while the negative control analogue, dynole 31-2, which does not

inhibit EGFR endocytosis (**Supplementary Fig. 1c**), had no effect on A1-induced

suppression of EGF-promoted Akt activation (**Fig. 3c bottom**), corroborating that intact

EGFR vesicular trafficking is required for the inhibitory effect of Eph receptors on EGFR

signalling.

Increasing concentrations of A1 progressively inhibited EGF-mediated Akt activation (**Fig.

3d**), suggesting that the amount of ephrinA1:Eph receptor interactions at points of cell-cell

contact might determine the magnitude of Akt activation in response to a given

concentration of EGF. To directly investigate the influence of cell-cell contact on EGFR

signalling, we obtained single cell measurements of Akt and ERK activation in cells with

varying degrees of cell-cell contact (**Fig. 3e,f**). Akt activation decreased with cell-cell

contact both prior to (F = 16.0, p = 0.001, r^2 = 0.432) and following EGF stimulation (F =

21.4, p < 0.001, r^2 = 0.322) (**Fig. 3e**), demonstrating that increasing cell-cell contact reduces

the magnitude of EGF-promoted Akt activation. ERK activation, on the other hand, was

unaffected by cell-cell contact (unstimulated: F = 0.180, p = 0.673, r^2 = 0.003; EGF: F =

0.321, p = 0.575, r^2 = 0.009), with cells generating similar EGF-promoted increases in ERK

activation irrespective of their degree of cell-cell contact (**Fig. 3f**).

To determine whether environmental signals other than cell-cell contact can influence

EGFR signalling through changes in its vesicular trafficking, we investigated the effect of

prior activation of the G protein-coupled receptor Kiss1 (Kiss1R), which, similar to EphA2,

inhibits Akt and acts as a tumour and metastasis suppressor (Navenot, Fujii, and Peiper

2009). Stimulation with the Kiss1R ligand kisspeptin-10 (Kp-10) reduced Akt activity and

decreased PM EGFR abundance (**Fig. 3g**). Similar to the effect of cell-cell contact,

pretreatment with Kp-10 selectively inhibited EGF-promoted Akt activation (**Fig. 3h**),

while preserving ERK activation (**Fig. 3i**). Changes in EGFR vesicular trafficking dynamics,

therefore, provides a general mechanism to generate plasticity in the signalling response to

EGFR activation, through which diverse environmental signals such as cell-cell contact or

soluble stimuli like Kp-10 can influence the cellular response to EGF.

Positive feedback in combination with inhibitory network motifs can convert graded inputs

into switch-like, ultrasensitive signalling responses (Ferrell and Ha 2014). Since Akt is

preferentially activated at the PM (**Supplementary Fig. 1**), the EGF-induced increase in

EGFR vesicular recycling (**Fig. 1e**) should generate a positive feedback for Akt activation

(**Fig. 1l**). While population-based measurements of Akt activation do not demonstrate

ultrasensitivity (**Fig. 3d**, Hill coefficient of 0.975±0.215 for control cells), if cells possess

intrinsic variability in the EGF concentration required to stimulate Akt-dependent

recycling, ultrasensitivity in individual cells will be averaged out at the population level to

produce a graded response (Ferrell and Machleder 1998). To investigate if this positive

feedback can generate a switch-like activation of Akt at the single cell level, we measured

the Akt response in thousands of individual cells by flow cytometry following sustained

stimulation (60 min) with a range of EGF concentrations (0.25-100 ng/ml) (**Fig. 3j-k**).

Additionally, cells were stimulated in suspension to negate the effect of *in situ* cell-cell

contact as an extrinsic source of variability in Akt activation (**Fig. 3e**). At concentrations ≥ 1

ng/ml, EGF stimulation produced a switch-like activation to a high Akt phosphorylation

state in a subpopulation of cells, whose proportion increased with EGF concentration (**Fig.**

3j-k, top). Decoupling EGFR activation from its effect on vesicular recycling by PIKfyve

inhibition (**Fig. 3j-k, middle**) or A1 pretreatment (**Fig. 3j-k, bottom**) did not result in a

global decrease in Akt activation but rather reduced the proportion of cells generating a

high Akt response, consistent with an inhibition of the positive feedback that produces this

switch-like response. Intrinsic cell-to-cell variability in the EGF threshold required to

stimulate Akt-dependent vesicular recycling, therefore, determines the proportion of cells

that transition to a high Akt activity state at a given EGF concentration.

If the transition to a high Akt activity state is dependent on the positive feedback produced

by coupling EGFR activation to vesicular recycling, we should also observe similar cell-to-

cell variability in PM EGF binding during sustained stimulation. We therefore performed

single cell time lapse imaging and quantified PM EGF binding during persistent stimulation

with a subsaturating concentration of EGF-Alexa647 (20 ng/ml) (**Fig. 3l-n**). Cells that

successfully engage Akt-dependent recycling should exhibit a more sustained EGF binding

at the PM during stimulation. Cells were grouped by their rate of loss in PM EGF binding

using k-means clustering into two groups exhibiting a slow (Group 1) or fast (Group 2) loss

of PM EGF during stimulation (**Fig. 3l-m**). While cells of both types were observed in

control and A1 pretreated samples, in control conditions we observed an enrichment of

cells with sustained binding (Group 1; 28%) versus cells pretreated with A1 (10.5%) (**Fig.**

3n). Although the percent of cells generating sustained EGF binding in control cells (**Fig.**

3n) is less than the proportion producing a high Akt response in flow cytometry

experiments (**Fig. 3j-k, top**), *in situ* cell-cell contact during time lapse imaging should

decrease the number of cells stimulating Akt-dependent recycling, consistent with the

observed effect of Eph receptor activation (**Fig. 3j-k, bottom**).

Thus, cells possess intrinsic variability to engage Akt-dependent recycling and preserve PM

EGF binding during sustained stimulation. Eph receptor activation, by decoupling EGFR

activation from its effect on vesicular trafficking, reduces Akt activation within the

population by decreasing the proportion of cells transitioning to a high Akt activity state

during persistent EGF stimulation.

Cell-cell contact changes the cellular outcome of EGF stimulation

EGFR signalling to effectors at the PM generates exploratory cellular behaviours (Chinkers,

McKanna, and Cohen 1979; Ridley and Hall 1992; Chan et al. 1998; Segall et al. 1996; Bailly

et al. 1999; Harms et al. 2005; Yip et al. 2007; El-Sibai et al. 2007) that must be maintained

to induce a persistent migratory response. Given that contact inhibitory Eph receptor

activation selectively suppresses PM signalling during persistent, subsaturating EGF

presentation (**Fig. 3b,e,f**), we investigated if cell-cell contact regulates EGF-promoted

migration by inhibiting Akt-dependent recycling. NIH 3T3 mouse embryonic fibroblast

(MEF) cells were grown on fibronectin in the presence of a silicone barrier that, once

removed, creates a cell-free area into which individual cells can be tracked following

uniform stimulation with EGF. When grown on fibronectin in 2-D cultures, fibroblasts

generate an autonomous, haptotactic migratory response which is enhanced by an EGF-

induced increase in their exporatory behaviour (Li et al. 1999). Following stimulation with

subsaturating EGF concentrations (20 ng/ml), we observed a signficant increase in the

proportion of migratory cells (**Fig. 4a, top, Supplementary Movie 4, Supplementary Fig.**

7), but no change in the average distance travelled by migrating cells (**Fig. 4a, bottom**),

indicating that EGF promotes the transition of individual cells to a migratory state rather

than increasing overall cellular motility. Since ligand binding promotes receptor

ubiquitination and degradation, persistent stimulation with saturating, supraphysiological

EGF concentrations (100 ng/ml) induces a loss in EGF sensitivity with time and thus does

not significantly increase the proportion of migratory cells (**Fig. 4a, top**). Decoupling EGFR

activation from its effect on trafficking through the PIKfyve inhibition or A1 pretreatment

decreased the proportion of migratory cells (**Fig. 4a**), demonstrating that the positive

feedback generated by the EGF-induced increase in Akt-dependent recycling promotes the

transition to a migratory state. We observed further that increasing concentrations of A1

progressively decreased EGF-induced migration (**Fig. 4a**), consistent with its

concentration-dependent effect on EGF-promoted Akt activation (**Fig. 3d**) and suggesting

that the amount of ephrinA1-Eph receptor interactions at points of cell-cell contact may

determine whether a cell initiates a migratory response to EGF. Consistent with this

observation, we found that the number of migratory cells following EGF stimulation was

inversely proportional to cell density (**Fig. 4b**) and that the increase in migration observed

at low densities could be countered by treatment with soluble A1 to mimic Eph receptor

contact inhibitory signalling (**Fig. 4b**). Thus, physiological Eph receptor activation at points

of cell-cell contact suppresses EGF-promoted migration by inhibiting Akt-dependent

vesicular recycling. However, by preserving endosomal ERK activation following EGF

stimulation (**Fig. 3b, bottom**), we found that neither PIKfyve inhibition nor A1

pretreatment led to a reduction in EGF-promoted cell proliferation (**Fig. 4c**). Thus by

altering the spatiotemporal distribution of EGFR activity, contact inhibitory signalling by

Eph receptors determines the cellular outcome to EGF stimulation, biasing cells to a

proliferative instead of a migratory response.

DISCUSSION

In this paper, we demonstrate that cell-cell interactions can generate context-dependent

cellular outcomes to EGF stimulation by modulating EGFR vesicular trafficking dynamics.

Akt-dependent recycling promotes EGFR activation both by enriching the concentration of

potential EGF binding sites at the PM but also by increasing the autocatalytic activation of

unliganded receptors by transphosphorylation. By increasing Akt activity, EGF stimulation

generates a positive feedback that maintains EGFR density at the PM by increasing the

vesicular recycling of non-ubiquitinated receptors during persistent, subsaturating

stimulation (**Fig. 1e**). Saturating, supraphysiological EGF concentrations, on the other hand,

increase the proportion of liganded, ubiquitinated receptors that unidirectionally traffic, in

an Akt-dependent manner, from early to late endosomes to be degraded in lysosomes (**Fig.**

1c,f)(Baumdick et al. 2015), resulting in a depletion of PM EGFR abundance with time.

Chemotaxis requires that cells remain responsive to stimuli for prolonged periods of time

as they migrate toward the chemotactic source. Akt-dependent trafficking, therefore,

determines the concentration range at which EGF produces a migratory response. By

increasing both the vesicular recycling of unliganded, non-ubiquitinated receptors and the

degradation of ubiquitinated receptors, Akt activation maintains cellular sensitivity to

persistent, subsaturating EGF concentrations, while limiting the duration of receptor

activation to saturating concentrations.

Since Akt itself is preferentially activated at the PM (**Supplementary Fig. 1**), the EGF-

promoted increase in vesicular recycling generates a positive feedback that switches cells

to a high Akt activation state (**Fig. 3j-k**). Although Akt has been previously observed on

endosomal membranes through interactions with the early endocytic adaptor protein

APPL1 (Schenck et al. 2008; Ebner et al. 2017), *de novo* activation of Akt by EGFR requires

the production of $PI(3,4,5)P_3$, which is impeded by the low abundance of $PI(4,5)P_2$ in

endosomal membranes (Matsuda et al. 2001; Haugh and Meyer 2002). Although Akt

activation may occur to some extent on endosomal membranes (Jethwa et al. 2015), since

the coupling of active EGFR to Akt activation will be more efficient at the PM, any

perturbations that influence the spatial distribution of EGFR will influence the capacity of

EGFR to activate Akt (**Fig. 3b, Supplementary Fig. 1c**).

We observed that the switch to a high Akt activity state only occurs in a proportion of cells,

which increases with EGF concentration (**Fig. 3j-k**). Population heterogeneity in Akt

activation has been previously attributed to cell-to-cell variation in PI3K expression (Yuan

et al. 2011). Our data suggest that intrinsic variability in the expression of signalling and/or

trafficking effectors may determine, for a given cell, the EGF concentration required to

stimulate Akt-dependent trafficking and engage the positive feedback that produces a high

Akt activity state. Small differences in EGF concentration substantially influence the

proportion of cells generating a high Akt response (e.g. a shift from 5 to 10 ng/ml increases

the proportion of cells from 43 to 85%, respectively, **Fig. 3j-k**). Perhaps it is not

coincidental that the concentration range over which this switch occurs corresponds to the

physiological range of EGF concentrations in human tissue secretions (Konturek et al.

1989). By generating a sharp boundary for Akt activation within the physiological EGF

concentration regime, even slight changes in the threshold of this switch could have

profound implications for tissue dynamics (e.g. initiation of migration).

Eph receptor activation, for example, by suppressing EGFR recycling, decreased the

proportion of cells generating a high Akt response from 85 to 41% in response to 10 ng/ml

EGF (**Fig. 3j-k**). The dependence of Akt activation on EGFR recycling allows the degree of

cell-cell contact, or other environmental stimuli that influence vesicular dynamics, to

regulate proportion of cells generating a migratory response to EGF stimulation. PI3K/Akt

signalling has previously been suggested as the point of convergence for EGFR/EphB2

control of cell migration (Lin et al. 2015); however, the molecular mechanism underlying

this oppositional relationship remained unclear. Our results indicate that Eph receptor

activation inhibits EGF-promoted cell migration by suppressing Akt-dependent recycling,

thus impeding the positive feedback that generates a high Akt response and decreasing the

sensitivity of cells to persistent EGF stimulation necessary to maintain exploratory

behaviour. However, by changing the spatial distribution of active EGFR, Eph receptor

activation selectively suppresses migratory signalling from the PM while leaving

proliferative ERK signalling intact (**Fig. 3b,e-f, Fig. 4**)(Li et al. 2012). This contextual

plasticity generates two distinct cellular outcomes to EGF stimulation that may be

important in physiological settings such as wound healing. At the tissue boundary, cells

with reduced cell-cell contact would increase their exploratory behaviour in response to

EGF released at the site of the wound. Cells located deeper in the tissue, despite extensive

cell-cell contact, would retain their proliferative response to environmental EGF, and

undergo mitosis to fill the vacant space created as exploratory cells migrate to occupy the

wound area.

Our results suggest that the spatial component of the positive feedback generated by Akt-

dependent recycling may also explain how EGF can act as a positional chemotactic cue (e.g.

during *Drosophila* border cell migration)(Duchek and Rørth 2001). Given the small

difference in EGF concentration between the leading edge and the tail of a migrating cell in

a shallow EGF gradient, preferential trafficking of receptors to the PM region of highest

EGFR activity would enhance local signalling (Bailly et al. 2000) to enrich exploratory

behaviour in the direction of the EGF source (Jékely et al. 2005; Arrieumerlou and Meyer

2005), leading to directed movement.

Our observations demonstrate that crosstalk between receptors with opposed functionality

can emerge through changes in vesicular trafficking dynamics rather than relying on direct

interactions between the receptors or their respective effectors. Such a mechanism also

allows different receptors with similar functional roles (e.g. EphA2 and Kiss1R) to alter the

cellular response to stimuli without having to evolve distinct protein interaction domains

to do so. The dependency of EGFR signalling on its vesicular dynamics thus confers a

universal mechanism through which the cell can generate functional plasticity to growth

factor stimulation while preserving specificity in cell-cell communication through the

coexpression of distinct but functionally-related cell surface receptors.

Acknowledgements

The project was partially funded by the European Research Council (ERC AdG 322637) to

P.I.H.B. We would like to thank Dr. Astrid Krämer for critically reading this manuscript, Dr.

Aneta Koseska for assistance in data interpretation and analysis and Dr. Klaus Schuermann

for help with data visualization.

466 Author contributions

467 P.I.H.B. and W.S. conceived the project. W.S. performed and analysed most experiments.

468 O.S. contributed to the migration experiments, Y.B. contributed to the time lapse imaging of

469 EGF binding, L.B. contributed to the ICW and immunoprecipitation experiments. W.S. wrote

470 the manuscript with assistance from P.I.H.B.

472 Competing financial interests

473 The authors declare that no competing interests exist.

Methods

Primary antibodies

Mouse anti-Akt (2920, Cell Signalling Technology (CST), Danvers, MA, USA), mouse anti-Akt-Alexa488 (2917, CST), rabbit anti-phospho-Akt(Ser473) (4060, CST), rabbit anti-phospho-Akt (Ser473)-Alexa647 (4075, CST), mouse anti-HA (9658, Sigma-Aldrich, St.Louis, MO, USA), rabbit anti-EGFR (4267, CST), goat anti-EGFR (AF231, R&D Systems, Minneapolis, MN, USA), mouse anti-phospho-EGFR(Tyr845) (558381, BD Biosciences, Heidelberg, Germany), rabbit anti-phospho-EGFR(Tyr1045) (2237, CST), mouse anti-phospho-EGFR(Tyr1068) (2236, CST), goat anti-EphA2 (R&D Systems), rabbit anti-phospho-Eph(Tyr588/596) (Abcam, Cambridge, UK), mouse anti-ERK1/2 (4696, CST), rabbit anti-phospho-ERK(Thr202/Tyr204) (4370, CST), mouse anti-Rab5 (610724, BD Biosciences), rabbit anti-Rab7 (9367, CST), rabbit anti-phospho-Rb(Ser807/811, CST) mouse anti-tubulin (6074, Sigma-Aldrich)

Secondary antibodies

IRDye 680RD Donkey anti-Mouse (LI-COR Biosciences), IRDye 680RD Donkey anti-Rabbit (LI-COR Biosciences), IRDye 680RD Donkey anti-Goat (LI-COR Biosciences), IRDye 800CW, Donkey anti-Mouse (LI-COR Biosciences), IRDye 800CW Donkey anti-Rabbit (LI-COR Biosciences), IRDye 800CW Donkey anti-Rabbit (LI-COR Biosciences), AlexaFluor 405 goat anti-Mouse (Life Technologies), AlexaFluor 488 donkey anti-Goat (Life Technologies), AlexaFluor 546 donkey anti-rabbit (Life Technologies), AlexaFluor 647 donkey anti-Rabbit (Life Technologies)

Plasmids

Generation of EGFR-mCitrine, EGFR-mCherry, EGFR-paGFP, PTB-mCherry and HA-ubiquitin (Baumdick et al. 2015), and EphA2-mCitrine (Sabet et al. 2015) were previously described. pcDNA3.1-EphA2 was a gift from Tony Pawson.

Reagents

AktVIII (sc-3513, Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Dallas, TX, USA), EGF (AF-100-15, Peprotech,

Hamburg, Germany), okadaic acid (sc-3513, Santa Cruz Biotechnology), YM201636 (13576,

Biomol GmbH, Hamburg, Germany), dynole 31-2 (ab120464, Abcam), dynole 34-2

(ab120463, Abcam), Kisspeptin-10 (445888, Merck Millipore). EGF-Alexa647 was

prepared as previously described (Baumdick et al. 2015). EphrinA1-Fc (602-A1-200) was

preclustered by incubating with chicken Anti-Fc (GW200083F, Sigma-Aldrich) at a ratio of

5:1 at room temperature for at least 30 min.

Cell culture

Cos-7, HEK293 and NIH 3T3 cells were grown in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium

(DMEM) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 2 mM L-glutamine and 1%

non-essential amino acids (NEAA) and maintained at 37°C in 5% CO_2. MCF10A cells were

grown in DMEM/F12 supplemented with 5% horse serum, 20 ng/ml EGF, 500 ng/ml

hydrocortisone, 100 ng/ml cholera toxin and 10 μg/ml insulin and maintained at 37°C in

5% CO_2. MDA-MB-231 cells were grown in Leibowitz medium supplemented with 10%

FBS and 2mM L-glutamine maintained at 37°C in 0% CO_2. When required, transfection of

cells was performed using FUGENE6 (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany) or

Lipofectamine 2000 (Life Technologies, Darmstadt, Germany) according to manufacturer's

protocol. Approximately 16-18 hours prior to an experiment, cells were starved in DMEM

containing 0.5% FBS, 2 mM L-glutamine and 1% NEAA. One hour before stimulation,

starvation media was changed to serum-free DMEM or DMEM without phenol red for live

cell imaging. Unless explicitly stated in the figure legends, all experiments were performed

with Cos-7 cells with endogenous expression of EGFR and Eph receptors.

In-cell westerns (ICW) and on-cell westerns (OCW)

Cells were seeded on black, transparent bottomed 96-well plates (3340, Corning, Hagen,

Germany) coated with poly-L-lysine (P6282, Sigma Aldrich). Cell were fixed with Roti-

Histofix 4% (Carl Roth, Karsruhe, Germany) for 5 min at 37°C. For ICW, cells were

permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100 (v/v) for 5 min at room temperature. For OCW, cells

were not permeabilized. Samples were incubated in Odyssey TBS blocking buffer (LI-COR

Biosciences, Lincoln, NE, USA) for 30 min at room temperature. Primary antibodies were

incubated overnight at 4°C and secondary antibodies (IRDyes, LI-COR Biosciences) were

incubated in the dark for 1 h at room temperature. All wash steps were performed with

TBS (pH 7.4). Intensity measurements were made using the Odyssey Infrared Imaging

System (LI-COR Biosciences). Quantification of the integrated intensity in each well was

performed using the MicroArray Profile plugin (OptiNav Inc., Bellevue, WA, USA) for ImageJ

v1.47 (http://rsbweb.nih.gov/ij/). In each ICW or OCW, 2-4 replicates per conditions were

obtained per experiment, and all data presented represents means ± s.e.m. from at least

three independent experiments.

Immunofluorescence

Cells were cultured on 4-well chambered glass slides (Lab-tek, Thermo Fisher Scientific,

Waltham, MA) and fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde/PBS (w/v) for 10 min at 4°C. To

measure PM EGFR, fixed, non-permeabilized samples were first incubated with primary

antibody directed at an extracellular epitope of EGFR (AF231, R&D Systems, 1:200)

overnight at 4°C followed by secondary antibody for 1 h at room temperature. For all other

immunofluorescence experiments, samples were permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100

(v/v) for 5 min at room temperature prior to incubation with primary antibodies. All wash

steps were performed with TBS (pH 7.4). Fixed samples were imaged in PBS at 25°C. For all

analysis, an initial background subtraction was performed on immunofluorescence images.

To quantify the proportion of EGFR in Rab5 and Rab7 compartments, binary masks were

generated from intensity thresholded images of Rab5 and Rab7 staining. To generate a

mask of Rab5/Rab7 double positive endosomes, the product of their individual masks was

used. The integrated fluorescence intensity of EGFR-mCherry was determined in each of

the endosomal masks and divided by the total integrated EGFR fluorescence intensity of

the cell. All analysis was performed using ImageJ. A cell segmentor tool was developed in-

house in Anaconda Python (Python Software Foundation, version 2.7,

https://www.python.org/) to quantify the spatial distribution of EGFR and pY845-EGFR in

fixed cells. Cells were divided into 6 equally spaced radial bins emanating from the centre

of cell mass.

Confocal imaging

Routinely, cells were cultured for live cell confocal imaging on 4- or 8-well chambered glass

slides (Lab-tek) and transiently transfected as described above. Confocal images were

recorded using an Olympus Fluoview FV1000 confocal microscope (Olympus Life Science

Europa, Hamburg, Germany) or a Leica SP8 confocal microscope (Leica Microsystems,

Wetzlar, Germany).

Olympus Fluoview™ FV100

The Olympus Fluoview™ FV1000 confocal microscope was equipped with a temperature

controlled CO_2 incubation chamber at 37°C (EMBL, Heidelberg, Germany) and a 60x/1.35

NA Oil UPLSApo objective (Olympus, Hamburg, Germany). EphA2-mCitrine and EGFR-

mCherry were excited using a 488 nm Argon-laser (GLG 3135, Showa Optronics, Tokyo,

Japan) and a 561 nm DPSS laser (85-YCA-020-230, Melles Griot, Bensheim, Germany),

respectively. Detection of fluorescence emission was restricted with an Acousto-Optical

Beam Splitter (AOBS) for mCitrine @ 498-551 nm and mCherry @ 575-675 nm. In all cases,

scanning was performed in frame-by-frame sequential mode with 2x frame averaging. The

pinhole was set to 250 μm.

Leica SP8

The Leica TCS SP8 confocal microscope was equipped with an environment-controlled

chamber (LIFE IMAGING SERVICES, Switzerland) maintained at 37°C and a HC PL APO CS2

1.4 NA oil objective (Leica Microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany). Alexa488-conjugated

secondary antibodies, fluorescent fusion proteins containing mCitrine and mCherry, and

EGF-Alexa647 were excited using a 470–670 nm white light laser (white light laser Kit

WLL2, NKT Photonics, Denmark) at 488, 514 and 561 and 647 nm, respectively. PH-Akt-

Cerulean was excited using an Argon Laser at 458 nm. Detection of fluorescence emission

was restricted with an AOBS as follows: Cerulean @ 468-505 nm, Alexa488 @ 498-551 nm,

mCitrine @ 525-570 nm, mCherry @ 570-650 nm and Alexa647 @ 654-754 nm. The

pinhole was set to 250 μm and 12-bit images of 512x512 pixels were acquired in a frame-

by-frame sequential mode.

Analysis of time-lapse confocal imaging

All analysis of live cell imaging data required an initial background subtraction for all

images obtained.

To quantify the proportion of endosomal EGFR-mCherry or EphA2-mCitrine, binary masks

of endosomes were generated from intensity thresholded images. The integrated

fluorescence intensity of EGFR-mCherry and EphA2-mCitrine was determined in their

corresponding endosomal masks and divided by the total integrated fluorescence intensity

of the cell.

Quantification of PM EGF-Alexa647 binding and PTB-mCherry translocation was

performed using the cell segmentation tool described above. To quantify PTB-mCherry

translocation to the PM, the mean intensity of the outermost, PM segment was divided by

the mean nuclear intensity. To determine the proportion of phosphorylated EGFR at the

PM, PM translocated PTB-mCherry was divided by the PM intensity of EGFR-mCitrine.

Photoactivation experiments were carried out at 37°C on a Leica SP8. EGFR-mCherry was

co-expressed to identify and select regions of endosomal EGFR for photoactivation.

Background intensity of EGFR-paGFP prior to photoactivation was measured and

subtracted from post-activation images. Photoactivation of EGFR-paGFP was performed

with the 405nm laser at 90% power. Following photoactivation, fluorescence images of

EGFR-paGFP were acquired every minute for a total of 15 minutes. PM EGFR-paGFP

fluorescence was quantified as the integrated intensity in a 5-pixel ring of the cell

periphery and, after subtracting pre-activation background intensity, was calculated as a

proportion of total EGFR-paGFP intensity.

To measure changes PM EGF-Alexa647 binding with time, binary masks of endosomal EGF-

Alexa647 were generated from intensity thresholded images and PM EGF-Alexa647

intensity was calculated by subtracting endosomal EGF-Alexa647 from total EGF-Alexa647

fluorescence intensity. The percent of PM EGF-Alexa-647 was calculated by dividing PM-

EGF-Alexa647 by total fluorescence intensity. Curves were fit with a one-phase exponential

decay in GraphPad Prism v6 (GraphPad Software, La Jolla, CA, USA) and grouped by their

rates of loss in PM EGF binding using the k-means clustering package in R (www.r-

project.org).

Flow cytometry

Cells were detached using accutase, centrifuged at 200g for 5 min and resuspended in

serum-free DMEM. Cells were fixed with 5% sucrose/Roti-Histofix (w/v) for 15 min at

37°C. Ice-cold methanol was added to 90% (v/v) for 30 min on ice. Cells were rinsed once

with 0.5% BSA/TBS (w/v) and incubated with Odyssey TBS blocking buffer (LI-COR

Biosciences) for 30 min at room temperature. Anti-phospho-Akt(Ser473)-Alexa647 (4075,

Cell Signalling Technology) was added directly to blocking buffer and incubated overnight

at 4°C. Anti-Akt-Alexa488 (2917, Cell Signalling Technology) was added for 2 h prior to

measurement. Samples were analyzed using the LSRII flow cytometer (BD Biosciences).

Alexa488 was excited with a 488nm laser and fluorescence emission was collected using a

505 nm LP dichroic and a 530/30 nm filter. Alexa647 was excited with 633 nm lasers and

fluorescence emission was collected using a 670/40 nm filter. Samples were analyzed using

FlowJo v10 (FlowJo, LLC, Ashland, OR, USA) to obtain single cell intensity measurements of

phospho- and total Akt. Population distributions of log(phospho/total Akt) were fitted with

a single Gaussian or a sum of two Gaussian distributions using GraphPad Prism.

Cell migration

MEF cells were seeded onto fibronectin-coated (F0895, Sigma, 1.25 ug/cm^2) 12 well

culture dishes (83.3921, Sarstedt, Nuembrecht, Germany) containing 2-well Culture-Inserts

(80209, ibidi) to create a cell-free area. Immediately before stimulation, inserts were

removed and cells were incubated with Hoechst to label nuclei. Wide field images were

acquired using an Olympus IX81 inverted microscope (Olympus, Hamburg, Germany)

equipped with a MT20 illumination system, a 4x/0.16 NA air objective and an Orca CCD

camera (Hamamatsu Photonics, Hamamatsu City, Japan). Transmission and fluorescence

images were acquired every 10 min for 16 h. The cell-free area created by the Culture-

Insert was cropped using ImageJ and defined as the migration region. Individual cells were

detected and tracked by their nuclear Hoechst staining as they travelled within the

migration region using the TrackMate ImageJ plugin (Tinevez et al. 2016), and the total

distance of each track was quantified.

Immunoprecipitation (IP) and western blotting

Cells were lysed in TGH (150 mM NaCl, 2 mM EGTA/EDTA, 50 mM HEPES (pH 7.4), 1%

Triton X-100, 10% glycerol, 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, 10 mM N-

ethylmaleimide(NEM)) or RIPA (for immunoprecipitation; 50 mM Tris–HCl (pH 7.5), 150

mM NaCl, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100, 1% Sodium deoxycholate, 0.2% SDS,

2.5 mM sodium pyrophosphate and 10 mM NEM), supplemented with Complete Mini

EDTA-free protease inhibitor (Roche Applied Science, Heidelberg, Germany) and 100 µl

phosphatase inhibitor cocktail 2 and 3 (P5726 and P0044, Sigma Aldrich). Lysates were

sonicated prior to centrifugation at 14 000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C to separate non-soluble

material. For immunoprecipitation, cell lysates were incubated with 50 µl washed Protein

G magnetic beads (10003D, Life Technologies) for 1 h at 4°C to pre-clear the samples from

unspecific binding proteins. Supernatants were incubated with primary antibody alone for

2 h followed by the addition and overnight incubation with Protein G magnetic beads at 4°C

with agitation. SDS–PAGE was performed using the X-cell II mini electrophoresis apparatus

(Life Technologies) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Samples were transferred

to preactivated PVDF membranes (Merck Millipore, Billerica, MA) and incubated with the

respective primary antibodies at 4°C overnight. Detection was performed using species-

specific secondary IR-Dye secondary antibodies (LI-COR Biosciences) and the Odyssey

Infrared Imaging System (LI-COR Biosciences). The integrated intensity of protein bands of

interest was measured using the ImageJ software and signals were normalised by dividing

the intensities of phosphorylated protein by total protein intensities or by dividing

intensities of co-immunoprecipitated proteins by the corresponding immunoprecipitated

protein.

References:

Arrieumerlou, Cécile, and Tobias Meyer. 2005. 'A Local Coupling Model and Compass
Parameter for Eukaryotic Chemotaxis', *Developmental Cell*, 8: 215-27.

Astin, Jonathan W., Jennifer Batson, Shereen Kadir, Jessica Charlet, Raj A. Persad, David
Gillatt, Jon D. Oxley, and Catherine D. Nobes. 2010. 'Competition amongst Eph
receptors regulates contact inhibition of locomotion and invasiveness in prostate cancer
cells', *Nature cell biology*, 12: 1194-204.

Bailly, Maryse, Frank Macaluso, Michael Cammer, Amanda Chan, Jeffrey E. Segall, and John S.
Condeelis. 1999. 'Relationship between Arp2/3 Complex and the Barbed Ends of Actin
Filaments at the Leading Edge of Carcinoma Cells after Epidermal Growth Factor
Stimulation', *The Journal of Cell Biology*, 145: 331-45.

Bailly, Maryse, Jeffrey Wyckoff, Boumediene Bouzahzah, Ross Hammerman, Vonetta
Sylvestre, Michael Cammer, Richard Pestell, and Jeffrey E. Segall. 2000. 'Epidermal
Growth Factor Receptor Distribution during Chemotactic Responses', *Molecular Biology
of the Cell*, 11: 3873-83.

Batlle, Eduard, Julinor Bacani, Harry Begthel, Suzanne Jonkheer, Suzanne Jonkeer, Alexander
Gregorieff, Maaike van de Born, Núria Malats, Elena Sancho, Elles Boon, Tony Pawson,
Steven Gallinger, Steven Pals, and Hans Clevers. 2005. 'EphB receptor activity
suppresses colorectal cancer progression', *Nature*, 435: 1126-30.

Baumdick, Martin, Yannick Brüggemann, Malte Schmick, Georgia Xouri, Ola Sabet, Lloyd
Davis, Jason W. Chin, and Philippe I. H. Bastiaens. 2015. 'EGF-dependent re-routing of
vesicular recycling switches spontaneous phosphorylation suppression to EGFR
signaling', *eLife*, 4.

Baumdick, Martin, Márton Gélleri, Chayasith Uttamapinant, Vàclav Bernek, Jason W. Chin, and
Philippe I.H. Bastiaens. 2017. 'Conformational EGFR sensor based on genetic code
expansion reveals the autocatalytic activation of EGFR'. *Manuscript in preparation*.

Boyd, Andrew W., Perry F. Bartlett, and Martin Lackmann. 2013. 'Therapeutic targeting of EPH
receptors and their ligands', *Nature Reviews Drug Discovery*, 13: 39-62.

Chan, A. Y., S. Raft, M. Bailly, J. B. Wyckoff, J. E. Segall, and J. S. Condeelis. 1998. 'EGF
stimulates an increase in actin nucleation and filament number at the leading edge of the
lamellipod in mammary adenocarcinoma cells', *Journal of Cell Science*, 111 (Pt 2): 199-
211.

Chinkers, M., J. A. McKanna, and S. Cohen. 1979. 'Rapid induction of morphological changes in
human carcinoma cells A-431 by epidermal growth factors', *The Journal of Cell Biology*,
83: 260-65.

Cortina, Carme, Sergio Palomo-Ponce, Mar Iglesias, Juan Fernández-Masip, Ana Vivancos,
Gavin Whissell, Mireia Humà, Nerea Peiró, Lourdes Gallego, Suzanne Jonkheer, Alice
Davy, Josep Lloreta, Elena Sancho, and Eduard Batlle. 2007. 'EphB–ephrin-B
interactions suppress colorectal cancer progression by compartmentalizing tumor cells',
Nature genetics, 39: 1376-83.

Daaka, Yehia, Louis M. Luttrell, Seungkirl Ahn, Gregory J. Rocca, Stephen S. G. Ferguson,
Marc G. Caron, and Robert J. Lefkowitz. 1998. 'Essential role for G protein-coupled
receptor endocytosis in the activation of mitogen-activated protein kinase', *Journal of*
Biological Chemistry, 273: 685-88.

Davis, S., N. W. Gale, T. H. Aldrich, P. C. Maisonpierre, V. Lhotak, T. Pawson, M. Goldfarb,
and G. D. Yancopoulos. 1994. 'Ligands for EPH-related receptor tyrosine kinases that
require membrane attachment or clustering for activity', *Science*, 266: 816-19.

DeFea, K. A., J. Zalevsky, Thoma, O. Déry, R. D. Mullins, and N. W. Bunnett. 2000. 'β-
Arrestin–Dependent Endocytosis of Proteinase-Activated Receptor 2 Is Required for
Intracellular Targeting of Activated Erk1/2', *The Journal of Cell Biology*, 148: 1267-82.

Duchek, Peter, and Pernille Rørth. 2001. 'Guidance of Cell Migration by EGF Receptor
Signaling During Drosophila Oogenesis', *Science*, 291: 131-33.

Ebner, Michael, Iva Lučić, Thomas A. Leonard, and Ivan Yudushkin. 2017. 'PI(3,4,5)P3
Engagement Restricts Akt Activity to Cellular Membranes', *Molecular cell*, 65: 416-
431000000.

El-Sibai, Mirvat, Peri Nalbant, Huan Pang, Rory J. Flinn, Corina Sarmiento, Frank Macaluso,
Michael Cammer, John S. Condeelis, Klaus M. Hahn, and Jonathan M. Backer. 2007.
'Cdc42 is required for EGF-stimulated protrusion and motility in MTLn3 carcinoma
cells', *Journal of Cell Science*, 120: 3465-74.

Er, Ekrem, Michelle C. Mendoza, Ashley M. Mackey, Lucia E. Rameh, and John Blenis. 2013.
'AKT facilitates EGFR trafficking and degradation by phosphorylating and activating
PIKfyve', *Science Signaling*, 6.

Ferrell, James E., Jr, and Sang Ha. 2014. 'Ultrasensitivity part II: multisite phosphorylation,
stoichiometric inhibitors, and positive feedback', *Trends in biochemical sciences*, 39:
556-69.

Ferrell, James E., and Eric M. Machleder. 1998. 'The Biochemical Basis of an All-or-None Cell
Fate Switch in Xenopus Oocytes', *Science*, 280.

Fortian, Arola, and Alexander Sorkin. 2014. 'Live-cell fluorescence imaging reveals high
stoichiometry of Grb2 binding to the EGF receptor sustained during endocytosis', *Journal*
of cell science, 127: 432-44.

Guglielmo, Di G. M., P. C. Baass, W. J. Ou, B. I. Posner, and J. J. Bergeron. 1994.
'Compartmentalization of SHC, GRB2 and mSOS, and hyperphosphorylation of Raf-1 by
EGF but not insulin in liver parenchyma', *The EMBO Journal*, 13: 4269-77.

Haj, Fawaz G., Peter J. Verveer, Anthony Squire, Benjamin G. Neel, and Philippe I. H.
Bastiaens. 2002. 'Imaging Sites of Receptor Dephosphorylation by PTP1B on the Surface
of the Endoplasmic Reticulum', *Science*, 295: 1708-11.

Harms, Brian D., Gina M. Bassi, Alan Horwitz, and Douglas A. Lauffenburger. 2005.
'Directional Persistence of EGF-Induced Cell Migration Is Associated with Stabilization
of Lamellipodial Protrusions', *Biophysical Journal*, 88: 1479-88.

Haugh, Jason M., and Tobias Meyer. 2002. 'Active EGF receptors have limited access to
PtdIns(4,5)P2 in endosomes: implications for phospholipase C and PI 3-kinase signaling',
J. Cell Sci., 115.

Howe, Charles L., Janice S. Valletta, Alex S. Rusnak, and William C. Mobley. 2001. 'NGF
Signaling from Clathrin-Coated Vesicles Evidence that Signaling Endosomes Serve as a
Platform for the Ras-MAPK Pathway', *Neuron*, 32: 801-14.

Ibach, Jenny, Yvonne Radon, Márton Gelléri, Michael H. Sonntag, Luc Brunsveld, Philippe I. H.
Bastiaens, and Peter J. Verveer. 2015. 'Single Particle Tracking Reveals that EGFR
Signaling Activity Is Amplified in Clathrin-Coated Pits', *PLOS ONE*, 10.

Jékely, Gáspár, Hsin-Ho Sung, Carlos M. Luque, and Pernille Rørth. 2005. 'Regulators of
Endocytosis Maintain Localized Receptor Tyrosine Kinase Signaling in Guided
Migration', *Developmental Cell*, 9: 197-207.

Jethwa, Nirmal, Gary H. C. Chung, Marta G. Lete, Alicia Alonso, Richard D. Byrne, Véronique
Calleja, and Banafshé Larijani. 2015. 'Endomembrane PtdIns(3,4,5)P3 activates the
PI3K–Akt pathway', *J Cell Sci*, 128: 3456-65.

Konturek, J. W., W. Bielanski, S. J. Konturek, J. Bogdal, and J. Oleksy. 1989. 'Distribution and
release of epidermal growth factor in man', *Gut*, 30: 1194-200.

Laketa, Vibor, Sirus Zarbakhsh, Alexis Traynor-Kaplan, Aidan Macnamara, Devaraj
Subramanian, Mateusz Putyrski, Rainer Mueller, André Nadler, Matthias Mentel, Julio
Saez-Rodriguez, Rainer Pepperkok, and Carsten Schultz. 2014. 'PIP₃ induces the
recycling of receptor tyrosine kinases', *Science signaling*, 7.

Li, Guo, Xiao-Dan Ji, Hong Gao, Jiang-Sha Zhao, Jun-Feng Xu, Zhi-Jian Sun, Yue-Zhen Deng,
Shuo Shi, Yu-Xiong Feng, Yin-Qiu Zhu, Tao Wang, Jing-Jing Li, and Dong Xie. 2012.
'EphB3 suppresses non-small-cell lung cancer metastasis via a PP2A/RACK1/Akt
signalling complex', *Nature communications*, 3.

Li, J. J., D. P. Liu, G. T. Liu, and D. Xie. 2009. 'EphrinA5 acts as a tumor suppressor in glioma
by negative regulation of epidermal growth factor receptor', *Oncogene*, 28.

Li, Jing, Meei-Lih Lin, Gregory J. Wiepz, Arturo G. Guadarrama, and Paul J. Bertics. 1999. 'Integrin-mediated Migration of Murine B82L Fibroblasts Is Dependent on the Expression of an Intact Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor', *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, 274: 11209-19.

Lin, Benjamin, Taofei Yin, Yi I. Wu, Takanari Inoue, and Andre Levchenko. 2015. 'Interplay between chemotaxis and contact inhibition of locomotion determines exploratory cell migration', *Nature communications*, 6: 6619.

Macdonald, Jennifer L., and Linda J. Pike. 2008. 'Heterogeneity in EGF-binding affinities arises from negative cooperativity in an aggregating system', *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 105: 112-17.

Maminska, A., A. Bartosik, Banach-Or M. owska, I. Pilecka, Jastrz K. bski, D. Zdzalik-Bielecka, I. Castanon, M. Poulain, C. Neyen, Woli L. ska-Nizio, Szyma E. ska, A. Kowalczyk, K. Piwocka, A. Simonsen, H. Stenmark, M. Furthauer, M. Gonzalez-Gaitan, and M. Miaczynska. 2016. 'ESCRT proteins restrict constitutive NF- B signaling by trafficking cytokine receptors', *Science signaling*, 9.

Masip, Martin E., Jan Huebinger, Jens Christmann, Ola Sabet, Frank Wehner, Antonios Konitsiotis, Günther R. Fuhr, and Philippe I. H. Bastiaens. 2016. 'Reversible cryo-arrest for imaging molecules in living cells at high spatial resolution', *Nature methods*, 13: 665-72.

Matsuda, Miho, Hugh F. Paterson, Rosie Rodriguez, Amanda C. Fensome, Moira V. Ellis, Karl Swann, and Matilda Katan. 2001. 'Real Time Fluorescence Imaging of Plcγ Translocation and Its Interaction with the Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor', *The Journal of Cell Biology*, 153: 599-612.

Ménard, Ludovic, Peter J. Parker, and Stéphanie Kermorgant. 2014. 'Receptor tyrosine kinase c-Met controls the cytoskeleton from different endosomes via different pathways', *Nature communications*, 5: 3907.

Merlos-Suárez, Anna, and Eduard Batlle. 2008. 'Eph–ephrin signalling in adult tissues and cancer', *Current Opinion in Cell Biology*, 20: 194-200.

Miao, H., B. R. Wei, D. M. Peehl, Q. Li, T. Alexandrou, J. R. Schelling, J. S. Rhim, J. R. Sedor, E. Burnett, and B. Wang. 2001. 'Activation of EphA receptor tyrosine kinase inhibits the Ras/MAPK pathway', *Nature cell biology*, 3.

Miao, Hui, Da-Qiang Li, Amitava Mukherjee, Hong Guo, Aaron Petty, Jennifer Cutter, James P. Basilion, John Sedor, Jiong Wu, David Danielpour, Andrew E. Sloan, Mark L. Cohen, and Bingcheng Wang. 2009. 'EphA2 mediates ligand-dependent inhibition and ligand-independent promotion of cell migration and invasion via a reciprocal regulatory loop with Akt', *Cancer cell*, 16.

Nada, Shigeyki, Akihiro Hondo, Atsuko Kasai, Masato Koike, Kazunobu Saito, Yasuo Uchiyama, and Masato Okada. 2009. 'The novel lipid raft adaptor p18 controls endosome

dynamics by anchoring the MEK–ERK pathway to late endosomes', *The EMBO Journal*,
28: 477-89.

Navenot, Jean-Marc, Nobutaka Fujii, and Stephen C. Peiper. 2009. 'KiSS1 metastasis suppressor
gene product induces suppression of tyrosine kinase receptor signaling to Akt, tumor
necrosis factor family ligand expression, and apoptosis', *Molecular pharmacology*, 75.

Nishimura, Yukio, Soichi Takiguchi, Shigeru Ito, and Kazuyuki Itoh. 2015. 'EGF‑stimulated
AKT activation is mediated by EGFR recycling via an early endocytic pathway in a
gefitinib‑resistant human lung cancer cell line', *International journal of oncology*, 46.

Pasquale, Elena B. 2010. 'Eph receptors and ephrins in cancer: bidirectional signalling and
beyond', *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 10: 165-80.

Poteryaev, Dmitry, Sunando Datta, Karin Ackema, Marino Zerial, and Anne Spang. 2009.
'Identification of the Switch in Early-to-Late Endosome Transition', *Cell*, 141: 497-508.

Reynolds, Andrew R., Christian Tischer, Peter J. Verveer, Oliver Rocks, and Philippe I. H.
Bastiaens. 2003. 'EGFR activation coupled to inhibition of tyrosine phosphatases causes
lateral signal propagation', *Nature Cell Biology*, 5: 447-53.

Ridley, Anne J., and Alan Hall. 1992. 'The small GTP-binding protein rho regulates the assembly
of focal adhesions and actin stress fibers in response to growth factors', *Cell*, 70: 389-99.

Sabet, Ola, Rabea Stockert, Georgia Xouri, Yannick Brüggemann, Angel Stanoev, and Philippe
I. H. Bastiaens. 2015. 'Ubiquitination switches EphA2 vesicular traffic from a continuous
safeguard to a finite signalling mode', *Nature communications*, 6: 8047.

Sadowski, Łukasz, Kamil Jastrzębski, Yannis Kalaidzidis, Carl-Henrik Heldin, Carina Hellberg,
and Marta Miaczynska. 2013. 'Dynamin Inhibitors Impair Endocytosis and Mitogenic
Signaling of PDGF', *Traffic*, 14: 725-36.

Schenck, Annette, Livia Goto-Silva, Claudio Collinet, Muriel Rhinn, Angelika Giner, Bianca
Habermann, Michael Brand, and Marino Zerial. 2008. 'The Endosomal Protein Appl1
Mediates Akt Substrate Specificity and Cell Survival in Vertebrate Development', *Cell*,
133: 486-97.

Schmid, Sandra L. 2017. 'Reciprocal regulation of signaling and endocytosis: Implications for
the evolving cancer cell', *J Cell Biol*, 216.

Segall, Jeffrey E., Sangeeta Tyerech, Lucia Boselli, Susan Masseling, Joseph Helft, Amanda
Chan, Joan Jones, and John Condeelis. 1996. 'EGF stimulates lamellipod extension in
metastatic mammary adenocarcinoma cells by an actin-dependent mechanism', *Clinical
& Experimental Metastasis*, 14: 61-72.

Sigismund, Sara, Veronica Algisi, Gilda Nappo, Alexia Conte, Roberta Pascolutti, Alessandro
Cuomo, Tiziana Bonaldi, Elisabetta Argenzio, Lisette G. G. C. Verhoef, Elena Maspero,
Fabrizio Bianchi, Fabrizio Capuani, Andrea Ciliberto, Simona Polo, and Pier Fiore. 2013.

'Threshold-controlled ubiquitination of the EGFR directs receptor fate', *The EMBO*
Journal, 32: 2140-57.

Sorkin, Alexander, and Mark von Zastrow. 2009. 'Endocytosis and signalling: intertwining
molecular networks', *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 10: 609-22.

Stanoev, Angel, Amit Mhamane, Klaus C. Schuermann, Hernán Grecco, Sven Fengler, Pedro
Roda-Navarro, Rabea Stockaert, Maitreyi S. Joshi, Yannick Brüggemann, Lisaweta
Roßmannek, Jutta Luig, Aneta Koseska, and Philippe I.H. Bastiaens. 2017.
'Interdependence of EGFR with PTPs on juxtaposed membranes generates a growth
factor sensing network', *In revision.*

Teis, David, Nicole Taub, Robert Kurzbauer, Diana Hilber, Mariana E. de Araujo, Miriam
Erlacher, Martin Offterdinger, Andreas Villunger, Stephan Geley, Georg Bohn, Christoph
Klein, Michael W. Hess, and Lukas A. Huber. 2006. 'p14-MP1-MEK1 signaling
regulates endosomal traffic and cellular proliferation during tissue homeostasis', *The*
Journal of Cell Biology, 175: 861-68.

Tinevez, Jean-Yves, Nick Perry, Johannes Schindelin, Genevieve M. Hoopes, Gregory D.
Reynolds, Emmanuel Laplantine, Sebastian Y. Bednarek, Spencer L. Shorte, and Kevin
W. Eliceiri. 2016. 'TrackMate: an open and extensible platform for single-particle
tracking', *Methods*.

Verma, Nandini, Omer Keinan, Michael Selitrennik, Thomas Karn, Martin Filipits, and Sima
Lev. 2015. 'PYK2 sustains endosomal-derived receptor signalling and enhances
epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition', *Nature communications*, 6: 6064.

Villaseñor, Roberto, Yannis Kalaidzidis, and Marino Zerial. 2016. 'Signal processing by the
endosomal system', *Current Opinion in Cell Biology*, 39: 53-60.

Villaseñor, Roberto, Hidenori Nonaka, Perla Conte-Zerial, Yannis Kalaidzidis, and Marino
Zerial. 2015. 'Regulation of EGFR signal transduction by analogue-to-digital conversion
in endosomes', *eLife*, 4.

Wouters, Fred S., and Philippe Bastiaens. 1999. 'Fluorescence lifetime imaging of receptor
tyrosine kinase activity in cells', *Current Biology*, 9: 1127.

Yarden, Yosef, and Mark X. Sliwkowski. 2001. 'Untangling the ErbB signalling network',
Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology, 2: 127-37.

Yip, Shu-Chin, Mirvat El-Sibai, Salvatore J. Coniglio, Ghassan Mouneimne, Robert J. Eddy,
Beth E. Drees, Paul O. Neilsen, Sumanta Goswami, Marc Symons, John S. Condeelis,
and Jonathan M. Backer. 2007. 'The distinct roles of Ras and Rac in PI 3-kinase-
dependent protrusion during EGF-stimulated cell migration', *Journal of Cell Science*,
120: 3138-46.

907 Yuan, Tina L., Gerburg Wulf, Laura Burga, and Lewis C. Cantley. 2011. 'Cell-to-Cell Variability
908    in PI3K Protein Level Regulates PI3K-AKT Pathway Activity in Cell Populations',
909    *Current Biology*, 21: 173-83.

910 Yudushkin, Ivan A., Andreas Schleifenbaum, Ali Kinkhabwala, Benjamin G. Neel, Carsten
911    Schultz, and Philippe I. H. Bastiaens. 2007. 'Live-Cell Imaging of Enzyme-Substrate
912    Interaction Reveals Spatial Regulation of PTP1B', *Science*, 315: 115-19.
913
914

    Figure Legends:

    Figure 1: Akt-dependent recycling of EGFR sustains its autocatalytic activation at the

    PM. **(a)** Representative images of Cos-7 cells expressing EGFR-mCherry before (top left)

    and after (top right) treatment with the Akt inhibitor AktVIII (10 μM, 1 h) and

    quantification of the increase in endosomal EGFR-mCherry during AktVIII treatment (N =

    6). See also Supplementary Movie 1. **(b)** Quantification of PM EGFR abundance by On-cell

    Western (OCW, top) and Akt activation by In-cell Western (ICW, bottom) following

    treatment with AktVIII for the times indicated. **(c)** Immunofluorescence measurements of

    EGFR intensity in Rab5-, Rab5/Rab7- and Rab7-positive endosomal compartments as a

    proportion of total EGFR intensity in DMSO (control, white, N = 6) and AktVIII (orange, N =

    11) treated conditions, as well as DMSO- (red, N = 9) and AktVIII-pretreated (green, N = 8)

    conditions followed by EGF stimulation (100 ng/ml, 1 h). **(d)** Quantification of PM EGFR

    abundance and Akt activation by OCW and ICW, respectively, following treatment with the

    PP2A inhibitor okadaic acid (OA, 1 μM, 2 h). **(e)** Measurements of EGFR-paGFP recycling to

    the PM following photoactivation in endosomes (top) in control (gray, N = 10), EGF (20

    ng/ml, 15 min, red, N = 6), AktVIII (orange, N = 9) and AktVIII-pretreated, EGF-stimulated

    (green, N = 8). **(f,g)** ICW measurements of total EGFR abundance (f) and phosphorylation

    (g) following EGF stimulation (1-200 ng/ml, 30 min) in DMSO (control, gray) and AktVIII

    (orange) pretreated cells. EGFR phosphorylation was measured using antibodies

    recognizing phosphorylated Y_{845} (g, top), Y_{1068} (g, middle) and Y_{1045} (g, bottom). **(h,i)** Live

    cell measurements of EGF-Alexa647 binding to the PM (green) and PTB-mCherry

    translocation to the PM (magenta) with increasing EGF-Alexa647 concentrations (1, 3, 10

    and 20 ng/ml, as indicated) for 2 min each in control (h, N = 9) and AktVIII-pretreated (i, N

    = 7) cells. **(j)** Comparison of PTB-mCherry translocation for equivalent numbers of

    liganded receptors for data presented in h,i. **(k)** Spatial-temporal maps of EGFR abundance

    (top) and Y_{845} phosphorylation (bottom) obtained by immunofluorescence in radially

    segmented cells (plasma membrane, PM $\rightarrow$ nuclear membrane, NM) prior to and after EGF

    stimulation (20 ng/ml for 5, 30 and 60 min) in control (left), AktVIII- (middle) and

    YM201636- (YM, 200 nM, 1 h) pretreated cells (N = 50-90 cells per condition). **(l)** Spatial

network topology showing positive feedback generated by coupling PM EGFR activity and
Akt-dependent vesicular trafficking. PIKfyve inhibition by YM decouples Akt activation
from its effect on EGFR recycling. All experiments were performed in Cos-7 cells. Data in c
are represented by Tukey boxplots with the mean denoted as a cross and the median as a
line. All other data represents means ± s.e.m. Statistical significance was determined in c
using an ordinary one-way ANOVA with Sidak's multiple corrections *post-hoc* test, in d
using a Student's t test and in f,g using a two-way ANOVA with Sidak's multiple corrections
post-hoc test (***, $p > 0.001$; **, $p > 0.01$; *, $p > 0.05$). Scale bars = 20 μm

Figure 2: Eph receptor activation regulates EGFR vesicular trafficking. (a)

Representative images of Cos-7 cells expressing EGFR-mCherry and EphA2-mCitrine

(green and magenta in merged images, respectively) following stimulation with EphrinA1-

Fc (A1, 2 μg/ml). See Supplementary Movie 2. **(b)** Quantification of endosomal EphA2-

mCitrine and EGFR-mCherry from time-lapse confocal imaging during A1 stimulation (N =

7). **(c)** Immunofluorescence measurements of EGFR intensity in Rab5-, Rab5/Rab7- and

Rab7-positive endosomal compartments as a proportion of total EGFR intensity in control

(white, N = 6) and A1 treated (60 min, magenta, N = 9) **(d)** Quantification of PM EphA2 and

EGFR abundance by OCW during A1 treatment. **(e)** Cos-7 lysates immunoprecipitated (IP)

with anti-EGFR (left) or blotted for total proteins (right) following stimulation with EGF

(100 ng/ml) or A1 for the indicated times. IP was probed with anti-HA (to detect co-

transfected HA-ubiquitin), anti-pY845, anti-pY1068, anti-pY1045 and anti-EGFR. Lysates

were probed with anti phospho-Eph (pEph), anti-EphA2, anti-pY1068, anti-EGFR and anti-

tubulin. Shown are representative blots from three independent experiments. **(f)**

Measurements of EGFR recycling in control (gray) and A1-pretreated cells (green).

PM/total EGFR was quantified by immunofluorescence prior to (pre), after 15 min EGF

stimulation (10 ng/ml) and 15 min following EGF washout (N = 34-40 cells/condition). All

experiments were performed in Cos-7 cells. Data in c are represented by Tukey boxplots

with the mean denoted as a cross and the median as a line. All other data represents means

± s.e.m. Statistical significance was determined in c using an ordinary one-way ANOVA with

Sidak's multiple corrections *post-hoc* test and in d using a two-way ANOVA with Dunnett's

multiple corrections *post-hoc* test. Scale bars = 20 μm

Figure 3: Cell-cell contact alters the spatial distribution of EGFR activity. (a) Spatial-

temporal maps of EGFR abundance (top) and Y_{845} phosphorylation (bottom) in radially

segmented cells (plasma membrane, PM → nuclear membrane, NM) obtained by

immunofluorescence prior to and after EGF stimulation (20 ng/ml for 5, 30 and 60 min) in

control (left) and EphrinA1-Fc (A1, 2 μg/ml, 1 h) pretreated Cos-7 cells (N = 53-90 cells per

condition). Control data previously presented in Figure 1k. **(b)** Quantification of Akt and

ERK activation by ICW in control (gray) and A1-pretreated (1 h, green) Cos-7 cells

following EGF stimulation (1 ng/ml). **(c)** Quantification of Akt activation by ICW in HEK293

cells pretreated for 1 h with vehicle (control, gray) or A1 (green), followed by 30 min

treatment with the dynamin inhibitor dynole 34-2 (100 μM, 30 min, top) or its negative

control analog dynole 31-2 (bottom), then stimulated with EGF (1 ng/ml) for the times

indicated. **(d)** Quantification of EGF-promoted Akt activation by ICW following

pretreatment with increasing concentrations of A1 (0.02, 0.2 and 2 μg/ml, 1 h) in Cos-7

cells. **(e,f)** Single cell measurements of Akt (e) and ERK (f) activation versus cell-cell

contact in 2-D cultures (% cell circumference) in control (gray) and EGF stimulated (20

ng/ml, 1 h, blue) Cos-7 cells. **(g)** Quantification of Akt activation (pink) and PM EGFR

abundance (magenta) in HEK293 cells by ICW and OCW, respectively, following stimulation

with kisspeptin-10 (Kp-10, 100 nM). **(h,i)** Quantification of Akt and ERK activation by ICW

for control (gray) and Kp-10-pretreated (1 h, magenta) HEK293 cells following EGF

stimulation (1 ng/ml). **(j,k)** Single cell measurements of Akt phosphorylation by flow

cytometry in control (top), YM201636- (YM, 200 nM, 1h, middle) and EphrinA1-Fc- (A1, 2

μg/ml, 1h, bottom) pretreated Cos-7 cells following stimulation with the EGF

concentrations indicated (ng/ml, 1 h). (j) Solid lines represent the sum of two Gaussian fits

for data accumulated from at least 10 000 cells per condition in 3-4 independent

experiments. (k) Quantification of Akt activation for increasing concentrations of EGF.

Circle sizes represent the relative proportions of the low (gray) and high (red) Akt activity

populations from the Gaussian distributions derived for each EGF concentration shown in j.

(l) Quantification of PM EGF as a percent of total EGF intensity from time lapse imaging.

Individual Cos-7 cells (thin lines) were clustered by their rate of PM EGF loss into two

distinct groups (1, green; 2, magenta; group mean represented by thick line). (m) Rate of

loss of PM EGF binding for individual cells in each group (mean ± s.d.). All other data

represents means ± s.e.m. Statistical significance was determined using a Student's *t* test.

(n) Percent of cells in group 1 (green) and 2 (magenta) for control and A1-pretreated

conditions.

1012

1013

Figure 4: Cell-cell contact changes the cellular outcome of EGF stimulation. (a) Percent of NIH 3T3 cells initiating a migratory response (top, means ± s.e.m) and the distance travelled by migratory cells (bottom, means ± s.d.) following EGF stimulation. Cells were pretreated with vehicle (control, blue), YM201636 (YM, 200 nM, 1 h, purple), or EphrinA1-Fc (A1, green: 2 μg/ml, 1h, or red: 0.02-2 μg/ml as indicated) followed by EGF stimulation (0-100 ng/ml as indicated) and tracked for 16 h. See Supplementary Movie 4. **(b)** NIH 3T3 cells were seeded at low and high density in a single well, separated by a removable insert. Following pretreatment with vehicle or A1 (2 μg/ml, 1 h), cells were stimulated with EGF (20 ng/ml) and tracked for 16 h (means ± s.e.m). (c) Quantification of retinoblastoma (Rb) phosphorylation by ICW for vehicle- (control, blue), A1- (green) and YM- (magenta) pretreated NIH 3T3 cells following 24 h EGF stimulation at the concentrations indicated (means ± s.e.m). Data in a and b were obtained from least three independent experiments, consisting of at least two replicates per experiment (N = 581 – 1483 cells/condition). Statistical significance in a and b was determined using an ordinary one-way ANOVA with Holm-Sidak's multiple corrections *post-hoc* test.

Figure 1: Akt-dependent recycling of EGFR sustains its autocatalytic activation at the PM.

Figure 2: Eph receptor activation regulates EGFR vesicular trafficking.

Figure 3: Cell-cell contact alters the spatial distribution of EGFR activity.

Figure 4: Cell-cell contact changes the cellular outcome of EGF stimulation.