



Life Science Alliance

LRRK2-phosphorylated Rab10 sequesters Myosin Va with RILPL2 during ciliogenesis blockade

Herschel Dhekne, Izumi Yanatori, Edmundo Vides, Yuriko Sobu, Federico Diez, Francesca Tonelli, and Suzanne Pfeffer

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26508/lsa.202101050>

Corresponding author(s): Suzanne Pfeffer, Stanford University

Review Timeline:

Submission Date:	2021-02-08
Editorial Decision:	2021-02-24
Revision Received:	2021-02-26
Accepted:	2021-03-01

Scientific Editor: Shachi Bhatt

Transaction Report:

(Note: With the exception of the correction of typographical or spelling errors that could be a source of ambiguity, letters and reports are not edited. The original formatting of letters and referee reports may not be reflected in this compilation.)

Please note that the manuscript was previously reviewed at another journal and the reports were taken into account in the decision-making process at Life Science Alliance.

February 24, 2021

RE: Life Science Alliance Manuscript #LSA-2021-01050-T

Dr. Suzanne R. Pfeffer
Stanford University
Dept. of Biochemistry
Stanford University
School of Medicine
Stanford, 279 Campus Drive B400 94305-5307

Dear Dr. Pfeffer,

Thank you for submitting your revised manuscript entitled "LRRK2-phosphorylated Rab10 sequesters Myosin Va with RILPL2 during ciliogenesis blockade". We would be happy to publish your paper in Life Science Alliance pending final revisions necessary to meet our formatting guidelines.

For a brief overview, the manuscript was submitted and peer-reviewed at one of the Life Science Alliance (LSA) partner journals. The authors shared the manuscript and reviewers' comments with the LSA editors, who deemed the manuscript to have sufficient advance and quality to be published in Life Science Alliance.

Along with the points listed below, please also attend to the following,

- please add Keywords, Category, and Summary blurb/Alternate Abstract for your manuscript in our system
- please add Contributions of all Authors in our system
- please upload your main and supplementary figures as single files
- LSA allows supplementary figures, but not EV Figures; please update your callouts for the Supplementary Figures in the manuscript Fig EV1A = Fig S1A; while supplementary figures use the system supplementary Fig S1
- please add an explanation of Panel E in the legend for Figure EV1=S1
- please add callouts for Figures 4D; 7C and D to your main manuscript text
- please add scale bars for Figures 2D, 4B, 9D, EV2A, C, D, EV3B

Please also send in a point-by-point rebuttal to the remaining of the Reviewer 2's concerns.

If you are planning a press release on your work, please inform us immediately to allow informing our production team and scheduling a release date.

To upload the final version of your manuscript, please log in to your account:

<https://lsa.msubmit.net/cgi-bin/main.plex>

You will be guided to complete the submission of your revised manuscript and to fill in all necessary information. Please get in touch in case you do not know or remember your login name.

To avoid unnecessary delays in the acceptance and publication of your paper, please read the

following information carefully.

A. FINAL FILES:

These items are required for acceptance.

-- An editable version of the final text (.DOC or .DOCX) is needed for copyediting (no PDFs).

-- High-resolution figure, supplementary figure and video files uploaded as individual files: See our detailed guidelines for preparing your production-ready images, <https://www.life-science-alliance.org/authors>

-- Summary blurb (enter in submission system): A short text summarizing in a single sentence the study (max. 200 characters including spaces). This text is used in conjunction with the titles of papers, hence should be informative and complementary to the title. It should describe the context and significance of the findings for a general readership; it should be written in the present tense and refer to the work in the third person. Author names should not be mentioned.

B. MANUSCRIPT ORGANIZATION AND FORMATTING:

Full guidelines are available on our Instructions for Authors page, <https://www.life-science-alliance.org/authors>

We encourage our authors to provide original source data, particularly uncropped/-processed electrophoretic blots and spreadsheets for the main figures of the manuscript. If you would like to add source data, we would welcome one PDF/Excel-file per figure for this information. These files will be linked online as supplementary "Source Data" files.

****Submission of a paper that does not conform to Life Science Alliance guidelines will delay the acceptance of your manuscript.****

****It is Life Science Alliance policy that if requested, original data images must be made available to the editors. Failure to provide original images upon request will result in unavoidable delays in publication. Please ensure that you have access to all original data images prior to final submission.****

****The license to publish form must be signed before your manuscript can be sent to production. A link to the electronic license to publish form will be sent to the corresponding author only. Please take a moment to check your funder requirements.****

****Reviews, decision letters, and point-by-point responses associated with peer-review at Life Science Alliance will be published online, alongside the manuscript. If you do want to opt out of having the reviewer reports and your point-by-point responses displayed, please let us know immediately.****

Thank you for your attention to these final processing requirements. Please revise and format the manuscript and upload materials within 7 days.

Thank you for this interesting contribution, we look forward to publishing your paper in Life Science Alliance.

Sincerely,

Shachi Bhatt, Ph.D.
Executive Editor
Life Science Alliance
<https://www.lsjournal.org/>
Tweet @SciBhatt @LSAJournal

Interested in an editorial career? EMBO Solutions is hiring a Scientific Editor to join the international Life Science Alliance team. Find out more here -
https://www.embo.org/documents/jobs/Vacancy_Notice_Scientific_editor_LSA.pdf

Response to Reviewer Comments

Referee #2:

I am sorry that the revisions still have not made the paper interesting enough for me. My major concerns are:

1. The studies of cilia formation as the functional readout are very limited and preliminary and no real mechanism is pursued. The paper focuses on where proteins are in the cell and how they interact etc., but not on how they affect cellular function. Unless one can link the findings to functional consequences, they have limited interest for me.

A major discovery related to pathogenic LRRK2 function is that it completely switches the effector preferences of phosphorylated Rab GTPases. Thus, to understand the role of LRRK2, it is critical to identify phosphoRab binding partners and show what they do. Here we report for the first time, that MyoVa is a pRab10 specific binding protein and binds with submicromolar affinity, tighter than most Rab effector interactions. We show that simple LRRK2 generation of phosphoRab10, which we have shown previously is sufficient to block ciliogenesis (Dhekne et al., eLife 2018;7:e40202), completely redistributes MyoVa in cells, and holds it at the mother centriole for 5-10 minutes, as shown by fluorescence loss in photobleaching. MyoVa is already known to be critical for ciliogenesis and its retardation over the mother centriole will surely contribute to pRab10 cilia blockade. Unfortunately, RILPL1 also participates in cilia blockade so simple depletion of MyoVa would still yield a cilia defect due to the continued presence of pRab10-RILPL1 complexes. We are sorry that the reviewer didn't find this story interesting enough but for cell biologists, the relocalization is completely unexpected, carefully and quantitatively documented and likely highly consequential.

2. The resistance to examining LRRK2 in neurons is surprising. I think that this is necessary for this study to have physiological and disease relevance.

We have shown previously in mutant mouse models (R1441C LRRK2) that cholinergic interneurons of the dorsal striatum show a cilia defect (eLife 2018;7:e40202 doi: [10.7554/eLife.40202](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.40202)) and more recently we have shown that astrocytes show a much more broad ciliation defect across the striatum in 3 LRRK2 mutant lines and PPM1H phosphatase KO animals (watch BioRxiv in the next days). LRRK2 is more abundant in astrocytes than neurons--the phenotype we observe is seen in multiple cell types and is not neuron-specific. This paper already includes 10 figures, 5 movies and 4 supplements. While neurons are surely interesting, the present story does not require additional study of neurons to support all of its conclusions. And even if dopaminergic neurons die in Parkinson's disease, this may have to do with LRRK2-driven loss of cilia in other cell types in the striatum, failing to provide GDNF neuroprotection.

3. Given that there is already a literature showing that mutant LRRK2 affects ciliogenesis and that this depends on Rab10 phosphorylation (as discussed in introduction) and RILP2 and Rab10 have been shown previously to bind Myosin Va, this paper does not add much to the existing literature. That is not true. This paper shows that RILPL2 is more likely to interact and be relocalized by pRab10 binding than by MyoVa binding. That they all bind is trying to tell us something very important. Rab10 doesn't bind to the brain MyoVa isoform and this is the first exploration of this tripartite connection--and it was not known previously that Rab phosphorylation relocalizes RILPL2 with MyoVa to the mother centriole.

4. Likewise, the paper does not show any dependence of RILPL2 for inhibition of cilia formation by mutant LRRK2. This obvious experiment is not reported (despite the suggestion in the previous round

of reviews) - maybe it was done and there was no effect, which gives me even greater cause for concern.

The reviewer appears to have entirely missed Figure 8 where this is documented and quantified. RILPL2 depletion or KO does not affect primary ciliogenesis in mouse embryonic fibroblasts, however, overexpressing RILPL2 in WT or KO MEFs dominantly blocks ciliogenesis and we show that this occurs without apparent blockage of TTBK2 centriolar recruitment but with a decrease in peri-centriolar MyoVa. RILPL2 depletion does not affect the distribution of MyoVa since MyoVa interacts directly with pRab10; RILPL2 is 10X less abundant than MyoVa and 240X less abundant than Rab10.

It is important to note that what a protein does in the absence of Rab10 phosphorylation may be quite different from what a protein does under conditions of Rab10 phosphorylation and inhibitory complex formation—and this is the more important distinction.

5. What happens if they express non-phosphorylatable Rab10 in Rab 10-depleted cells? - they need to find a way of testing the role of the phosphorylation - this was suggested by two reviewers previously and was not done.

We cannot do this--if the reviewer would have read the response to the reviews they would have learned that phospho-mimetic mutants are non-functional as we have carefully documented (Dhekne et al., 2018). Specifically: Wild type pRab8A binds RILPL1 but the TE “phosphomimetic” does not (while the real phospho protein binds tightly) and it and the TA mutant have a non-normal subcellular localization. Wild type pRab10 binds RILPL1 but the TE binds poorly (when again it should bind tightly) and the TA mutant is not membrane associated: Rab8 TE and Rab10 TA are not properly prenylated. None of the mutants can rescue ciliation phenotypes in knockout cells. Thus these are not possible experiments.

We are grateful to the editor of Life Science Alliance for agreeing to publish our story.

March 1, 2021

RE: Life Science Alliance Manuscript #LSA-2021-01050-TR

Dr. Suzanne R. Pfeffer
Stanford University
Dept. of Biochemistry
Stanford University
School of Medicine
Stanford, 279 Campus Drive B400 94305-5307

Dear Dr. Pfeffer,

Thank you for submitting your Research Article entitled "LRRK2-phosphorylated Rab10 sequesters Myosin Va with RILPL2 during ciliogenesis blockade". It is a pleasure to let you know that your manuscript is now accepted for publication in Life Science Alliance. Congratulations on this interesting work.

The final published version of your manuscript will be deposited by us to PubMed Central upon online publication.

Your manuscript will now progress through copyediting and proofing. It is journal policy that authors provide original data upon request.

Reviews, decision letters, and point-by-point responses associated with peer-review at Life Science Alliance will be published online, alongside the manuscript. If you do want to opt out of having the reviewer reports and your point-by-point responses displayed, please let us know immediately.

*****IMPORTANT:** If you will be unreachable at any time, please provide us with the email address of an alternate author. Failure to respond to routine queries may lead to unavoidable delays in publication.***

Scheduling details will be available from our production department. You will receive proofs shortly before the publication date. Only essential corrections can be made at the proof stage so if there are any minor final changes you wish to make to the manuscript, please let the journal office know now.

DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIALS:

Authors are required to distribute freely any materials used in experiments published in Life Science Alliance. Authors are encouraged to deposit materials used in their studies to the appropriate repositories for distribution to researchers.

You can contact the journal office with any questions, contact@life-science-alliance.org

Again, congratulations on a very nice paper. I hope you found the review process to be constructive and are pleased with how the manuscript was handled editorially. We look forward to future exciting submissions from your lab.

Sincerely,

Shachi Bhatt, Ph.D.

Executive Editor

Life Science Alliance

<https://www.lsajournal.org/>

Tweet @SciBhatt @LSAJournal

Interested in an editorial career? EMBO Solutions is hiring a Scientific Editor to join the international Life Science Alliance team. Find out more here -

https://www.embo.org/documents/jobs/Vacancy_Notice_Scientific_editor_LSA.pdf