



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

A new method for post-translationally labeling proteins in live cells for fluorescence imaging and tracking

Citation for published version:

Hinrichsen, M, Lenz, M, Edwards, JM, Miller, OK, Mochrie, SGJ, Swain, PS, Schwarz-Linek, U & Regan, L 2017, 'A new method for post-translationally labeling proteins in live cells for fluorescence imaging and tracking' *Protein engineering, design & selection : PEDS*, vol. 30, no. 12, pp. 771-780. DOI: 10.1093/protein/gzx059

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1093/protein/gzx059](https://doi.org/10.1093/protein/gzx059)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Protein engineering, design & selection : PEDS

Publisher Rights Statement:

© The Author 2017. Published by Oxford University Press. This work has been made available online in accordance with the publisher's policies. This is the author created, accepted version manuscript following peer review and may differ slightly from the final published version. The final published version of this work is available at <https://doi.org/10.1093/protein/gzx059>

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



A New Method for Post-translationally Labeling Proteins in Live Cells for Fluorescence Imaging and Tracking

Hinrichsen, M.¹, Lenz, M.², Edwards, J. M.³, Miller, O. K.³, Mochrie, S. G. J.^{4,5,6}, Swain, P. S.², Schwarz-Linek, U.³, Regan, L.^{1,4,7*}

¹Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, 266 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, CT, 06511, USA; ²Center for Synthetic and Systems Biology, School of Biological Sciences, University of Edinburgh, King's Buildings, Mayfield Road, Edinburgh EH9 3JD, UK; ³Biomedical Sciences Research Complex and School of Biology, University of St Andrews, North Haugh, St Andrews KY16 9ST, UK; ⁴Integrated Graduate Program in Physical and Engineering Biology, Yale University; ⁵Department of Physics, 217 Prospect St, New Haven, CT 06511; ⁶Department of Applied Physics, 15 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06511; ⁷Department of Chemistry, Yale University, 225 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT, 06511, USA. lynne.regan@yale.edu.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed

Abstract We present a novel method to fluorescently label proteins, post-translationally, within live *S. cerevisiae*. The premise underlying this work is that fluorescent protein tags are less disruptive to normal processing and function when they are attached post-translationally, because target proteins are allowed to fold properly and reach their final subcellular location before being labeled. We accomplish this post-translational labeling by expressing the target protein fused to a short peptide tag (SpyTag), which is then covalently labeled *in situ* by controlled expression of an open isopeptide domain (SpyoIPD, a more stable derivative of the SpyCatcher protein) fused to a fluorescent protein (FP). Formation of a covalent bond between SpyTag and SpyoIPD attaches the FP to the target protein. We demonstrate the general applicability of this strategy by labeling several yeast proteins. Importantly, we show that labeling the membrane protein Pma1 in this manner avoids the mislocalization and growth impairment that occur when Pma1 is genetically fused to a fluorescent protein. We also demonstrate that this strategy enables a novel approach to spatiotemporal tracking in single cells and we develop a Bayesian analysis to determine the protein's turnover time from such data.

Introduction Fluorescent labeling is a powerful strategy with which to study the localization and dynamics of proteins in living cells. Most commonly, labeling is achieved by directly fusing a fluorescent protein (FP), such as Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) to the protein of interest. A limitation of this approach, however, is the relatively large size of the fluorescent protein tag (GFP = 27 kDa), which has the potential to interfere with the assembly, localization, and function of the protein to which it is fused. Proteome-wide studies in *S. cerevisiae* found that approximately 30% of proteins cannot tolerate a GFP C-terminal fusion. Plasma membrane transporter proteins are particularly sensitive, with only 46 of the 139 putative transporter proteins exhibiting any plasma membrane fluorescence when fused to GFP, and only 20 of those 139 localizing exclusively to the plasma membrane, endoplasmic reticulum, or Golgi body (Brohée *et al.*, 2010, Huh *et al.*, 2003).

There are several potential strategies for fluorescently labeling proteins of interest in live cells. One of the most popular is to fuse a protein domain that binds a fluorescent small molecule, such as SNAP tag (Keppler *et al.*, 2003), CLIP tag (Gautier *et al.*, 2008), or HaloTag (Los *et al.*, 2008) to the target protein. The small molecule binding domain is still relatively large however (19.4, 20.6, and 33 kDa for SNAP tag, CLIP tag, and HaloTag respectively), and therefore susceptible to the same issues as a direct fluorescent protein fusion. Although these methods have been applied successfully in mammalian cells, they require significant additional manipulations if they are to work in yeast (Lacy *et al.*, 2017). Another labeling approach is to fuse the protein of interest to a short peptide tag that acts as the substrate recognition sequence onto which an enzyme covalently attaches a fluorescent small molecule. Labeling a target

protein in the complex intracellular environment is difficult, however. Lipoic acid ligase is one of the few examples where this strategy has been successful intracellularly, in mammalian cells (Ho and Tirrell, 2016, Uttamapinant *et al.*, 2010). To successfully label target proteins, the exogenous small molecule must be cell permeable, minimally cytotoxic, display negligible off-target binding and it must be easy to ‘wash’ the unreacted label from the cell.

A protein can, in principal, be detected *in vivo* by interaction with a fluorescently labeled protein binding domain – such as a single chain antibody variable fragment (scFV) – that recognizes the native protein (Riedl *et al.*, 2008, Schmidthals *et al.*, 2010). A limitation of this approach, however, is that a new binding domain must be generated for each target protein. A more widely applicable strategy is to tag the protein of interest with a short peptide, and detect the protein of interest by interaction with the fluorescently labeled peptide-binding module. The advantage of this approach is that the same peptide-binding domain pair can be used for different proteins. The disadvantage is that the peptide-binding domain interaction is non-covalent (Pratt *et al.*, 2016). Here we present a new strategy for imaging proteins in live yeast cells that employs an engineered open isopeptide domain (SpyoIPD), a derivative of the SpyCatcher protein (Zakeri *et al.*, 2012). SpyCatcher/SpyTag is a protein-peptide interaction pair that associates and spontaneously forms an intermolecular covalent isopeptide bond and is thus a useful tool for post-translationally linking proteins together. SpyCatcher/SpyTag has been widely used *in vitro* and in bacteria (Veggiani *et al.*, 2014), but never, to our knowledge, within live eukaryotic cells. The SpyoIPD we develop here is more stable than the original SpyCatcher and exhibits greater reactivity

in the yeast cytosol. Our strategy to fluorescently label proteins is to express the target protein fused to SpyTag (13 amino acids) and to separately express SpyolPD fused to an FP. Reaction between the SpyolPD and SpyTag post-translationally labels the protein of interest with the FP, thus allowing visualization. Although the final labeled form of the target protein possesses a relatively large modification, we hypothesized that labeling post-translationally would be less disruptive to native function because the target protein is allowed to properly fold and reach its native localization before being modified.

We demonstrate that this labeling strategy can be used to image a variety of proteins, highlighting the plasma membrane proton pump, Pma1. Pma1 is of particular interest because direct fusion of Pma1 to a fluorescent protein results in its mislocalization to the vacuole, and cells expressing only FP tagged forms of Pma1 exhibit a significant growth defect. We show that labeling Pma1 using SpyolPD/SpyTag results in neither mislocalization nor a growth defect. We also demonstrate how this method can be adapted to temporally track a protein in a particular sub-cellular location, and develop a Bayesian analysis to determine the protein's turnover time from such data.

Materials and Methods

Molecular Biology

The plasmid containing the original SpyCatcher gene (Zakeri, et al., 2012) was obtained from Addgene (Addgene plasmid #35044), EGFP was amplified from the Regan lab vector pPROEX HTa M EGFP-MEEVD (pPROEX HTa M is a modified version of the

pPROEX HTa vector) (Cormack *et al.*, 1996) (Invitrogen) and mCherry was amplified from pNAS1b (Addgene plasmid # 61968) (Sawyer *et al.*, 2014). SpyolPD was generated by site-directed mutagenesis of FbaB-CnaB2-Asp556Ala (Hagan *et al.*, 2010) to introduce the Ile552 to Ala mutation. The original SpyCatcher protein contains the point mutations Glu473Ile and Tyr508Met, but these are not included in the SpyolPD designs. The original SpyCatcher protein also has an additional 2 residues at the C-terminus (Arg-Ser), which are not present in FbaB. Typically, genes were inserted into plasmids using Circular Polymerase Extension Cloning (CPEC) following published procedures (Speltz and Regan, 2013), and unless stated otherwise, tags were attached to inserts through incorporation within PCR primers. Table I lists all oligonucleotides used in this study, and Table II lists all plasmids used.

Constructs for testing SpyolPD reactivity in yeast: His₆ tagged SpyCatcher and SpyolPD were amplified from their bacterial expression vectors (see above) and inserted into p424GAL1 (Mumberg *et al.*, 1994), a yeast shuttle vector containing the strong galactose-inducible GAL1 promoter, a high copy number 2 μ replication origin, and a TRP1 selection marker. The gene encoding EGFP was tagged at the 5' end with a sequence coding for the V5 epitope, and the 3' end with DNA coding for SpyTag, and inserted into pCu415CUP1 (Labbé and Thiele, 1999), a yeast shuttle vector that contains the intermediate strength, copper-inducible CUP1 promoter (Lee *et al.*, 2015), a low copy number CEN replication origin, and a LEU2 selectable marker.

Constructs for Spycatcher/SpyTag imaging in yeast: SpyolPD was attached to the N-terminus of EGFP *via* an 8-residue linker (GGSGSGLQ), and inserted into p424GAL1. The promoter, gene fusion, and CYC1 terminator (CYC1_T) were then amplified from this

vector and inserted into pFA6a-His3MX6 (Longtine *et al.*, 1998), a yeast insertion vector that contains a HIS3 selectable marker. For tagging a protein of interest with SpyTag, oligonucleotides were used to amplify CYC1_T from p424GAL1 and attach a linker (GGSGSGLQ) upstream of CYC1_T. This fragment was inserted into pFA6KanMX6 (Longtine, et al., 1998), a yeast insertion vector with a kanamycin selectable marker (KanR). This construct was then used as a template for making linker-SpyTag (GGSGSGLQAHIVMVDAYKPTK), by amplifying the linker and a portion of the pFA6KanMX6 vector, attaching SpyTag in the process. This product was then inserted back into pFA6KanMX6 Linker (L) to create pFA6KanMX6 SpyTag (LST). mCherry was also inserted into pFA6a-KanMX6 using the same strategy as used for pFA6KanMX6 Linker.

Characterization of SpyCatcher and its variants

NMR: Uniformly ¹⁵N-labelled samples of SpyCatcher and SpyoIPD were produced and purified using established protocols (Hagan, et al., 2010). NMR samples typically contained 0.1 mM protein in phosphate buffered saline, pH 7.4, 2% (v/v) D₂O. ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra were recorded on a Bruker Ascend 700 MHz spectrometer equipped with a Prodigy TCI probe at 22 °C. Spectra were processed with NMRPipe (Delaglio *et al.*, 1995) and analyzed with CCPN Analysis 2 (Vranken *et al.*, 2005).

Differential Scanning Fluorimetry: Fluorescence at 570 nm (excitation 480 nm) of SYPRO® Orange in the presence of 5 μM protein was recorded using a real-time PCR instrument. The samples were heated at a rate of 1 °C per minute, between 25-95 °C. These denaturation transitions are irreversible, so it is inappropriate to calculate a T_m. We show the raw data.

Yeast Strain Construction

Unless noted otherwise, standard techniques and growth media were used for cultivating and genetically manipulating yeast strains (Fink, 2002). Dropout media was prepared using purchased amino acid dropout mixes (Clontech). Table III lists the yeast strains used in this study. All genomic insertions were verified by PCR using primers that anneal outside the insert cassette, and sequencing the resulting PCR products.

Target proteins were tagged at the C-terminus with DNA coding for linker-SpyTag or linker alone in the yeast strain MHY2587 (an Ade⁺ variant of YPH499) by amplifying the desired tag and the KanR selectable marker from the appropriate template vector using primers that also attached 45 bp homology arms. Homology arms were designed so to match the final 45 bp of the target protein and the 45 bp immediately following the stop codon.

To insert SpyoIPD-EGFP, the fusion gene was amplified from vector pFA6His3MX6 – SpyoIPD-EGFP, along with the upstream GAL1 promoter and downstream HIS3 selectable marker. Homology arms were attached that matched a 45 bp sequence 700 bp upstream of the GAL2 gene, and 45 downstream of the GAL2 stop codon.

Yeast strains expressing target proteins fused at the C-terminus to EGFP were obtained from the Yeast EGFP Clone Collection (Thermo Fisher), originally created and described in Huh et al. (Huh, et al., 2003)

SpyoIPD-EGFP Sequence:

```
MSYYHHHHHHDCDIPTTENLYFQGAMVDSATHIKFSKRDIDGKELAGATMELRDSSGK  
TISTWISDGQVKDFYLMPGKYTFVETAAPDGYEVATAITFTVNEQQQVTVNGKATKGD  
AHAVMVAAGGSGSGLQSKGEELFTGVVPILVELDGDVNGHKFSVSGEGEGDATYGKL  
TLKFICTTGKLPVPWPTLVTTLTYGVCFSRYPDHMKQHDFFKSAMPEGYVQERTIFF
```

KDDGNYKTRAEVKFEGDTLVNRIELKGIDFKEDGNILGHKLEYNYNSHNVYIMADKQKN
GIKVNFKIRHNIEDGSVQLADHYQQNTPIGDGPVLSPDNHYLSTQSKLSKDPNEKRDH
MVLLEFVTAAGITHGMDELYK

Linker: GGSGSGLQ

Linker-SpyTag: GGSGSGLQAHIVMVDAYKPTK

Western Blot Analysis:

To assess the *in vivo* activity of SpyCatcher and its variants, yeast colonies were picked and grown overnight in synthetic defined medium (Leu⁻/ Trp⁻) containing 0.1% glucose, 2% galactose, and 100 μM CuSO₄. The next day, cultures were diluted to an OD₆₀₀ of 0.2 into fresh selection medium containing 2% galactose and 100 μM CuSO₄, and grown to an OD₆₀₀ between 1.0 and 2.0 (usually about 20 hours at 30 °C). At this point, 10 OD₆₀₀ equivalents were pelleted, washed once with H₂O, and stored at -80 °C for later analysis.

Yeast pellets (from 10 OD₆₀₀ equivalents) were lysed using the alkali lysis procedure (Kushnirov, 2000) and final pellets were resuspended in 50 μL of 1xSDS-PAGE buffer. Lysate (10 μL) was loaded onto 10% or 15% SDS-PAGE gels, transferred to nitrocellulose, and probed using appropriate primary antibodies. Mouse anti-His₆ (GenScript (Piscataway, NJ), Cat. # A00186-100), and mouse antiV5 (Invitrogen (Carlsbad, CA), Cat. # 46-0705) primary antibodies were each diluted for use 1:1,000 in Tris Buffered Saline with 0.1% Tween (TBST) and 5% w/v nonfat dry milk. For all immunoblots the secondary antibody used was sheep anti-mouse IgG (diluted 1:10,000 in 5% milk/TBST, GE (Little Chalfont, UK), Product code NXA931) conjugated to horse radish peroxidase. Immunoblots were visualized by enhanced chemiluminescence, using

Clarity™ ECL Western Blotting substrate (BioRad) and imaged using a GBox - Chemi 16 Bio Imaging System (Syngene).

Microscopy

For imaging experiments, single colonies were picked and grown overnight in non-inducing His⁻/G418⁺ synthetic defined medium (2% sucrose/1% raffinose). The next day, overnight cultures were diluted to an OD₆₀₀ of 0.05 into fresh His⁻/G418⁺ synthetic defined medium (2% sucrose/1% raffinose), supplemented with the desired concentration of galactose. Cultures were grown 8 hours before imaging.

For pulse-chase experiments, glucose was added to a final concentration of 2% w/v after 8 hours of induction. The OD₆₀₀ was sampled at regular intervals following glucose addition, and kept below 2.0 throughout the experiment by diluting with prewarmed medium (that exactly matched the original growth medium).

Fluorescent images were collected using Olympus IX-71 microscope with a 100× 1.4 NA Plan Apo lens (Olympus) and a CSU-X1 (Andor Technology) confocal spinning-disk confocal system equipped with an iXON-EMCCD camera (Andor Technology).

Microfluidics Experiments

Microfluidic devices were fabricated with polydimethylsiloxane using standard techniques (Crane *et al.*, 2014). Single colonies were inoculated into a liquid culture of synthetic complete medium (2% raffinose, 0.5% galactose) and grown overnight at 30 °C. The following day, cells were loaded into a pre-warmed (30 °C) microfluidic device and incubated in the synthetic complete medium (2% raffinose, 0.25% galactose) for 1h before switching to glucose (0.1%). Throughout the experiment, the device was

perfused with fresh medium at a flow rate of 4 $\mu\text{l}/\text{min}$, controlled by syringe pumps (World Precision Instruments), and temperature was maintained at a constant environment of 30 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ using a temperature controlled incubation chamber (Okolabs).

Time-lapse image acquisition was performed on a Nikon Eclipse Ti inverted microscope, with a 60X 1.4 NA oil immersion objective (Nikon). The experiment was controlled using a custom Matlab script (Mathworks) written for Micromanager (Edelstein *et al.*, 2010). Images were taken in bright-field and fluorescence, using a filter set appropriate for EGFP. Exposure intensities (LED lamp, 4V), exposure times (30ms) and imaging intervals (0.5h^{-1}) were set to avoid photobleaching. Data analysis was performed using image segmentation, cell tracking and data extraction using custom Matlab script (Crane, *et al.*, 2014). To determine the ratio of membrane to cytosol signal, median membrane pixel intensities for each cell were extracted from images using the cell outline generated during cell identification.

Photobleaching

We investigated the possible contribution of photobleaching to fluorescence decay by comparing the fluorescence of cells irradiated multiple times at each time-point to cells irradiated once at each time point. We observed no significant difference in the cellular fluorescence over time between the two sets of cells, indicating that photobleaching does not contribute significantly to the fluorescent decay observed (See Figure S4).

Results

Design of the post-translational imaging strategy

Our method for imaging proteins in living cells is illustrated schematically in Figure 1. The genomic copy of the gene encoding the target protein is tagged at the 3' end with a DNA sequence encoding SpyTag. Although in principle the SpyTag sequence could be placed anywhere in the target protein, for consistency and convenience we typically place SpyTag at the C-terminus. Note that the gene encoding the target protein fused to SpyTag replaces the wild-type copy and is expressed from the target protein's endogenous promoter. SpyoIPD fused to FP is expressed from the GAL1 promoter, addition of galactose induces expression of SpyoIPD-FP, which reacts with SpyTag and covalently labels the target protein with FP. Integrating SpyoIPD-EGFP at the GAL2 locus simultaneously deletes the Gal2 permease, making expression from the GAL1 promoter linear with respect to galactose concentration (Hawkins and Smolke, 2006), and enabling finer control of the intracellular concentration of the SpyoIPD-FP fusion protein.

We first tested whether the original SpyCatcher/SpyTag pair is active in yeast, which had not been previously reported. We created a yeast strain that coexpressed SpyCatcher and SpyTag fused to the C-terminus of EGFP. For this experiment EGFP serves simply as a convenient handle to increase the mass of SpyTag, making it easy to identify in an SDS gel. Because SpyCatcher forms a covalent bond to SpyTag, the conjugate species is resistant to SDS denaturation and can be detected as a higher molecular weight species in a Western Blot. Using this assay, only a small amount of the EGFP-SpyTag-SpyCatcher conjugate was observed (Figure 2D). In addition, despite the strong promoter and high-copy number plasmid used to drive SpyCatcher expression, we never observed unconjugated SpyCatcher in Western Blots. We

hypothesized that SpyCatcher expression and therefore labeling efficiency could be improved by SpyCatcher derivatives with increased structural stability.

SpyoIPD, a more stable derivative of the SpyCatcher protein

The second CnaB domain of streptococcal surface protein FbaB contains a covalent isopeptide bond between a Lys on the N-terminal β -strand and an Asp on the C-terminal β -strand (Hagan, et al., 2010). Splitting this domain gave rise to the SpyCatcher/SpyTag system, where the β -strand containing the Asp residue (SpyTag) is expressed separately from the remainder of the protein (SpyCatcher). SpyTag associates and reacts with SpyCatcher to form the isopeptide bond between the Asp and Lys sidechains in *trans*, so that each β -strand now comes from a separate protein (Zakeri, et al., 2012). We sought to create a more stable derivative of this system by designing an “open” isopeptide domain (SpyoIPD) that retains the C-terminal β -strand that was removed to create SpyCatcher. The reintroduced strand was mutated to remove the reactive Asp (Asp556Ala), and to weaken the interaction between the reintroduced strand and the rest of the protein (Ile552Ala). The goal of this design was to increase the stability of the domain, but not so much that reactivity would be inhibited (see Figures 2A and 2B). ^1H - ^{15}N HSQC NMR spectra show that both SpyCatcher and SpyoIPD are folded in solution, even in the absence of SpyTag (Figure S1). Differential scanning fluorimetry (DSF) analyses, however, indicate that SpyoIPD is more thermally stable than SpyCatcher (Figure 2C).

Testing the *in vivo* activity of SpyoIPD

To compare the *in vivo* activity of SpyolPD with SpyCatcher, we again used the western blot assay described above and compared yeast strains that expressed either SpyolPD or SpyCatcher, together with SpyTag fused to the C-terminus of EGFP. It is clearly evident in Figure 2D that there is greater formation of the EGFP-SpyTag-SpyolPD conjugate than the EGFP-SpyTag-SpyCatcher conjugate. We therefore used SpyolPD in all subsequent imaging applications (Figure 2D).

Fluorescently labeling proteins *in vivo* with SpyolPD

For initial experiments, target proteins were chosen that are abundant, not known to have an inaccessible C-terminus, and which localize to a distinct region of the cell. Here we present data on three proteins from different subcellular compartments: the plasma membrane (Pma1), the nucleus (Htb2), and the bud neck (Cdc12). For each imaging experiment, cells were grown overnight in non-inducing medium, diluted the next day into medium containing galactose, and imaged after an additional 8 hours of growth. All three proteins show a clearly localized signal (Figure 3). When Htb2, a histone protein, is tagged with SpyTag and co-expressed with SpyolPD-EGFP, spheres of fluorescence corresponding to the nucleus are observed, indicating that the majority of SpyolPD-EGFP is bound to Htb2-SpyTag. A similar result is observed when Htb2 is fused directly to EGFP. Cdc12, a component of the septin ring, localizes to the bud neck (Madden and Snyder, 1998) and is also readily visualized by the SpyolPD/SpyTag imaging system. Cells expressing Cdc12-ST and SpyolPD-EGFP produce tight rings of fluorescence around the bud neck - the same localization pattern observed when native Cdc12 is visualized by immunofluorescence in fixed and permeabilized cells (Haarer and Pringle, 1987). A similar pattern is observed in cells expressing Cdc12 directly

fused to EGFP, although approximately 5% of cells expressing the fusion protein show a distorted morphology, indicating that direct fusion to an FP can interfere with normal Cdc12 function. This phenotype is not observed in cells expressing Cdc12-ST and SpyolIPD-EGFP. Pma1, an essential plasma membrane proton pump naturally localizes to the plasma membrane (Mason *et al.*, 2014). Pma1 imaged with the SpyolIPD/SpyTag system produces a ring of fluorescence around the cell periphery, consistent with labeling of Pma1 in the plasma membrane. By contrast, cells expressing Pma1 directly fused to EGFP show strong vacuolar fluorescence (Figure 3 and Figure 4B). For comparison, also shown in Figure 3 is a cell expressing SpyolIPD-EGFP and no SpyTagged protein. A diffuse, non-localized fluorescence is observed.

The effects of different labeling strategies on Pma1 function

Pma1 is an essential plasma membrane proton pump in yeast that is responsible for maintaining cytosolic pH and the membrane potential (Serrano *et al.*, 1986). Pma1 has been proposed to play a role in cell aging (Henderson *et al.*, 2014) and has been used to study protein quality control pathways in the secretory system (Ferreira *et al.*, 2001). Immunofluorescent labeling of epitope-tagged Pma1 in fixed cells shows native Pma1 localizes exclusively to the plasma membrane (Figure 4) (Mason, *et al.*, 2014). By contrast, when Pma1 is directly fused to a fluorescent protein, fluorescence is observed both at the plasma membrane and the vacuole, indicating that this method of labeling Pma1 interferes with normal protein maturation and localization (Figure 4). A yeast strain expressing Pma1 directly fused to an FP also exhibits compromised cell growth (Figure 4). By contrast, cells expressing Pma1-ST and SpyolIPD-EGFP exhibit neither mislocalization to the vacuole nor a growth defect (Figures 3 and 4).

Improving signal to noise when labeling Pma1-SpyTag with SpyolPD-EGFP

We investigated the effect of reducing the concentration of galactose used to induce SpyolPD-EGFP expression on signal to background fluorescence when labeling Pma1-SpyTag. At low concentrations of galactose, the plasma membrane is clearly labeled and well-resolved relative to the cytosolic signal, presumably because the majority of the SpyolPD-EGFP has reacted with Pma1 (Figure 5). Increasing the concentration of galactose increases the intensity of plasma membrane signal, but also increases the diffuse cytosolic background, presumably because the higher expression levels of SpyolPD-EGFP are in excess of Pma1 (Figure 5). A distinctive characteristic of Pma1's spatial distribution is that it is retained by mother cells during cell division, so that little to no Pma1 is inherited by daughter cells. Because of this asymmetric division, the irreversible nature of the SpyolPD-SpyTag interaction and the long half-life of Pma1 (*vide infra*), we predicted that unbound cytosolic signal could be cleared and plasma membrane signal retained if new SpyolPD-EGFP expression were turned off following labeling. Since GAL1 is inhibited by glucose, we performed experiments in which SpyolPD-EGFP expression was first induced with galactose and then shut off with glucose. Samples were imaged at different times after addition of glucose (Figure 5). This strategy increased the ratio of membrane signal to cytosolic background in Pma1-SpyTag expressing yeast. The amount of time required to clear cytosolic signal depends on the concentration of galactose used to induce SpyolPD-EGFP expression, with higher concentrations taking longer to clear (data not shown).

Spatiotemporally tracking Pma1 in living cells:

The labeling strategy that we present can also be used to follow a protein's spatiotemporal dynamics in a single cell. Because the protein of interest is labeled post-translationally, only protein that is present when SpyolIPD-FP is expressed will be labeled. Thus, turning off expression of SpyolIPD-FP allows one to follow the fate of only the protein that was present during the labeling phase. We used this strategy to transiently label Pma1 and thus determine the half-life of Pma1 at the cell membrane. To follow individual cells over many hours, we used a microfluidic device that holds individual mother cells in place, but allows daughter cells to be washed away by medium flow (Crane, et al., 2014). Cells were first grown overnight, in the presence of galactose, to induce expression of SpyolIPD-EGFP and label Pma1-SpyTag. Cells were loaded into the microfluidic device then, and after a short equilibration period, switched to medium containing glucose to inhibit expression of SpyolIPD-EGFP. Cells were tracked for many hours following the switch to glucose-containing medium.

We estimated the half-life of in-membrane PMA1 in two complementary ways. In the first method, we assumed that the total cellular fluorescence of an individual cell expressing Pma1-SpyTag and SpyolIPD-EGFP is comprised of i) fluorescence from SpyolIPD-EGFP covalently bound to Pma1-SpyTag in the membrane; (ii) fluorescence from unreacted cytosolic SpyolIPD-EGFP and (iii) cellular auto-fluorescence. We developed a novel Bayesian analysis that integrates the data across all cells to infer a half-life for the Pma1 in the plasma membrane. Details of this analysis are given in the Supplementary Information. We verified our Bayesian approach with a second *ad hoc* method that requires data from cells expressing Pma1-SpyTag and SpyolIPD-EGFP and also from cells expressing untagged Pma1 and SpyolIPD-EGFP. Comparing the change

in fluorescence intensity over time in the membrane region of these two strains allowed us to extract the signal from Pma1 at the plasma membrane. The two approaches give similar estimates of the in-membrane half-life of Pma1 - 11.5 and 10.2 hours respectively, agreeing with each other and the previously reported half-life of Pma1 of 11 hours, determined by cyclohexamide inhibition of translation (Benito *et al.*, 1991).

Discussion We present a novel method for fluorescently labeling proteins, post-translationally, within living yeast using SpyolPD/SpyTag, a derivative of the SpyCatcher/SpyTag interaction pair. Our method requires only a small modification to the protein of interest and is directly compatible with any FP. A recently introduced method that uses split GFP in labeling has similar strengths, but requires significant engineering and testing to work with different colored fluorescent proteins (Kamiyama *et al.*, 2016). The recent development of the orthogonal SnoopCatcher/SnoopTag covalent interaction pair (Veggiani *et al.*, 2016) also allows for the future extension of this strategy to multicolor labeling. While our method has only been tested in *S. cerevisiae*, it should be compatible with a wide range of model organisms including mammalian systems.

Previous work has used SpyCatcher fused to a fluorescent protein to label proteins fused to SpyTag in the extracellular environment (Bedbrook *et al.*, 2015, Walden *et al.*, 2015) and in fixed and permeabilized cells (Pessino *et al.*, 2017). To our knowledge, however, our work is the first to use this approach to fluorescently label and image proteins within living eukaryotic cells, and to demonstrate that labeling proteins in this manner can be less disruptive to protein function than a direct fluorescent protein fusion.

SpyCatcher/SpyTag is a highly versatile tool for post-translationally linking proteins together in a number of applications (Veggiani, et al., 2014). The more spyoIPD presented here provides a useful derivative for applications that require increased stability and expression. Interestingly, when the original SpyCatcher was fused to EGFP and co-expressed with Pma1-SpyTag, plasma membrane labeling was also observed (data not shown). We speculate that attaching EGFP stabilizes the original SpyCatcher, because this result was unexpected given SpyCatcher's low *in vivo* expression and reactivity when not fused to EGFP (Figure 2D). The availability and different properties of the original SpyCatcher, spyoIPD and SnoopCatcher will allow researchers to choose the variant that is most appropriate for their particular application. Not all the proteins we tested showed clear labelling using spyoIPD-EGFP. We speculate that inaccessibility of the SpyTag is the most likely explanation for this lack of signal, although we did not investigate this idea nor try different tag locations.

The ability to label Pma1 in living cells without vacuolar mislocalization is a significant result. Pma1 is an essential plasma membrane proton pump that plays an important role in a variety of processes (Ferreira, et al., 2001, Henderson, et al., 2014). Prior to this work, the only established method for imaging Pma1 in live cells was *via* a direct fusion to a fluorescent protein, which causes mislocalization to the vacuole and a significant growth defect. The lack of either a growth defect or vacuolar mislocalization supports our hypothesis that the post-translational nature of our labeling that makes it less disruptive, despite the large size of the final label. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that shows fluorescent labeling of Pma1 in live cells in a nondisruptive manner.

Finally, because the method we present involves irreversible covalent labeling, it can be used to study a variety of time-dependent changes, including protein turnover rates, accumulation of post-translational modifications, exchange of protein interaction partners, and the selective labeling of organelles, sub-cellular membraneless compartments and even entire cells in an age dependent manner. Here we show that SpyolPD-EGFP can be used to study protein turnover in individual cells. Traditional biochemical methods for quantifying protein turnover rates use translational inhibitors (e.g. cycloheximide) that block the translation of all proteins in the cell and are therefore generally disruptive to cellular function, or radioactive labels, which require specialized safety protocols. The SpyolPD-EGFP method we present suffers from neither of these limitations, and therefore represents a useful tool for labs interested in studying the turnover of proteins, particularly in individual cells.

Acknowledgements

The yeast vectors and strains we started with were a gift from Mark Hochstrasser. We thank the Hochstrasser lab for valuable advice and gifts of reagents throughout the project. We thank members of the Regan lab for advice and for helpful comments on the manuscript. We thank members of the Swain lab for their advice and technical insights, especially Ivan Clark and Elco Bakker for help with data analysis and numerous discussions.

Funding Information: This work was funded by the Raymond and Beverley Sackler Institute for Biological, Physical, and Engineering sciences [to L. R.] and the National Institute of Health [grant numbers GM118528 and CA209992 to M. H. and L. R.]. Work was also supported by the Medical Research Council [grant number MR/K001485 to U.

S. L. and J. M. E.], a Leverhulme Trust Visiting Professorship [to L. R.], and the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland [to O.K.M.].




Figure 1. Schematic illustration of the labeling strategy. The genomic copy of the gene encoding the target protein (Target, gray) is fused at the 3' end to a sequence encoding the SpyTag (ST, red), replacing the chromosomal copy of the target's gene. Expression is from the target's endogenous promoter. DNA encoding a fusion of SpyIPD (Spy, blue) and FP (FP, green) is integrated at the GAL2 locus. Expression is from the GAL1 promoter (pGAL1, gold)




Figure 2: Design and properties of SpyoIPDs *in vitro* and *in vivo*. A) To improve stability of the SpyCatcher protein (blue rectangle), we re-introduced portions of the C-terminal β -strand (blue thin rectangular ‘overhang’) that was originally removed to make SpyTag. The reactive Asp on this extension was mutated to Ala (D556A) to prevent reaction with the Lys in the SpyCatcher region, and the appended sequence was also mutated (I552A) to weaken its interaction with the rest of the domain, allowing SpyTag (red thin rectangle) to displace the reintroduced β -strand and react. B) Comparison of the C-terminal sequences of SpyTag, SpyCatcher, and SpyoIPD. The Ala that replaces the

isopeptide bond-forming Asp is highlighted in red. The Ala that replaces Leu 552 to weaken binding between SpyCatcher and the reintroduced sequence is highlighted in green. C) Differential scanning fluorimetry traces of SpyCatcher (blue circles) and SpyolPD (red squares). D) Comparison of the *in vivo* activity of SpyCatcher and SpyolPD. SpyTag was expressed as a fusion to EGFP from a medium strength promoter on a low copy number plasmid. An N-terminal V5 epitope was also fused to EGFP to facilitate easy detection. A Western blot, probing for the V5 epitope, is shown. Lanes and bands are as labeled. The lower molecular weight band corresponds to unreacted EGFP-ST (filled triangle), and the higher molecular weight band to the covalent EGFP-ST-SC or EGFP-ST-SpyolPD conjugate (hollow triangle).




Figure 3: A comparison of direct fusion to EGFP with SpyolPD/SpyTag labeling. Brightfield (DIC) and fluorescence (Fluor) images are shown for direct fusions of a target protein to EGFP (EGFP fusion) and for labeling of the target protein using the SpyolPD/SpyTag strategy (SpyolPD/ST). The identity of the target protein is given to the left of the images. The No SpyTag strain expresses SpyolPD-EGFP, but no SpyTagged protein. CDC12: direct fusion to EGFP results in a distorted cell morphology in about 5% of CDC12-EGFP expressing cells.; HTB2: direct fusion to EGFP and the SpyolPD/SpyTag strategy both show the expected labeling of the nucleus; PMA1: direct fusion to EGFP results in significant vacuolar mislocalization.




Figure 4: PMA1 localization and function. A. Immuno-staining of fixed yeast cells (using anti-HA antibodies) in a strain expressing Pma1 fused to the HA peptide. This 'native' Pma1 localizes exclusively to the plasma membrane, with none evident in the vacuole. Reproduced with permission from Mason et al. B. Live cell imaging of yeast expressing a Pma1-EGFP fusion protein, expressed from the endogenous Pma1 promoter. A significant amount of fluorescence is observed in the vacuole in addition to that present at the plasma membrane. C. Comparison of the growth of yeast expressing untagged Pma1 (1), Pma1 C-terminally tagged with mCherry (2), or Pma1 C-terminally tagged with SpyTag (3). Strains are streaked on media containing 2% galactose, so the Pma-ST expressing strain is also expressing SpyolPD-EGFP. For both tagged strains, Pma1 is expressed under control of its native promoter, and the tagged copy of the strain is

the only copy of the protein present. The strain expressing Pma1-mCherry fusion exhibits a significant growth defect, whereas the other two strains grow equally well.




Figure 5: Labeling Pma1-SpyTag using SpyolPD-EGFP: A. Fluorescent images of yeast cells expressing Pma1-SpyTag, in which SpyolPD-EGFP expression is induced by the indicated concentration of galactose. Note that due to the large difference in SpyolPD-EGFP expression levels, it was necessary to image samples with different exposure times (1000 ms for [Gal] = 0%; 200 ms for [Gal] = 0.05%; 200 ms for [Gal] = 0.25%, and 20 ms for [Gal] = 4.0%). B. Yeast expressing Pma1-SpyTag and SpyolPD-EGFP were induced for 8 hours in 0.25% galactose, and then chased for an additional 2 hours with glucose. Glucose inhibits the GAL1 promoter, turning off new synthesis of SpyolPD-EGFP (100 ms exposure). Remaining cytosolic SpyolPD-EGFP either reacts with Pma1-SpyTag, is degraded or is partitioned into the daughter cell. Cytosolic signal is significantly reduced, and the asymmetric segregation of Pma1 is visible, with no plasma membrane signal observed in the budding daughter cell




Figure 6: Using SpyolPD-EGFP to study Pma1 temporal dynamics in single cells. Each trace in the plot corresponds to the total cellular fluorescence versus time for a single yeast cell, with $t = 0$ hours corresponding to the time of glucose addition. Fluorescence decreases over time as SpyolPD-EGFP is cleared from the trapped mother cell through cell division, SpyolPD-EGFP turnover, and Pma1 turnover. See Supplementary Information for a detailed description of how these data are analyzed to calculate the in-membrane half-life of fluorescently labeled Pma1. Inset: The posterior probability for the half-life of Pma1, τ_m , found by integrating the probability corresponding to the surface in Figure S5.

- Bedbrook C.N., Kato M., Kumar S.R., Lakshmanan A., Nath R.D., Sun F., Sternberg P.W., Arnold F.H. and Gradinaru V. (2015) Genetically encoded spy peptide fusion system to detect plasma membrane-localized proteins in vivo. *Chemistry & biology*, **22**, 1108-1121
- Benito B., Moreno E. and Lagunas R. (1991) Half-life of the plasma membrane ATPase and its activating system in resting yeast cells. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Biomembranes*, **1063**, 265-268
- Brohée S., Barriot R., Moreau Y. and André B. (2010) YTPdb: a wiki database of yeast membrane transporters. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Biomembranes*, **1798**, 1908-1912
- Cormack B.P., Valdivia R.H. and Falkow S. (1996) FACS-optimized mutants of the green fluorescent protein (GFP). *Gene*, **173**, 33-38
- Crane M.M., Clark I.B., Bakker E., Smith S. and Swain P.S. (2014) A microfluidic system for studying ageing and dynamic single-cell responses in budding yeast. *PLoS One*, **9**, DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0100042
- Delaglio F., Grzesiek S., Vuister G.W., Zhu G., Pfeifer J. and Bax A. (1995) NMRPipe: A multidimensional spectral processing system based on UNIX pipes. *J Biomol NMR*, **6**, 277-293
- Edelstein A., Amodaj N., Hoover K., Vale R. and Stuurman N. (2010) Computer control of microscopes using μ Manager. *Current Protocols in Molecular Biology*, 14.20.11-14.20.17
- Ferreira T., Mason A.B. and Slayman C.W. (2001) The yeast Pma1 proton pump: a model for understanding the biogenesis of plasma membrane proteins. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, **276**, 29613-29616
- Fink G. (2002) Guide to yeast genetics and molecular and cell biology. *Methods Enzymol*, **350**, 21
- Gautier A., Juillerat A., Heinis C., Corrêa I.R., Kindermann M., Beaufile F. and Johnsson K. (2008) An engineered protein tag for multiprotein labeling in living cells. *Chemistry & Biology*, **15**, 128-136
- Haarer B.K. and Pringle J.R. (1987) Immunofluorescence localization of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* CDC12 gene product to the vicinity of the 10-nm filaments in the mother-bud neck. *Molecular and Cellular Biology*, **7**, 3678-3687
- Hagan R.M., Björnsson R., McMahon S.A., Schomburg B., Braithwaite V., Bühl M., Naismith J.H. and Schwarz-Linek U. (2010) NMR spectroscopic and theoretical analysis of a spontaneously formed Lys-Asp isopeptide bond. *Angewandte Chemie*, **122**, 8599-8603

Hawkins K.M. and Smolke C.D. (2006) The regulatory roles of the galactose permease and kinase in the induction response of the GAL network in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, **281**, 13485-13492

Henderson K.A., Hughes A.L. and Gottschling D.E. (2014) Mother-daughter asymmetry of pH underlies aging and rejuvenation in yeast. *Elife*, **3**, DOI: 10.7554/eLife.03504

Ho S.H. and Tirrell D.A. (2016) Chemoenzymatic Labeling of Proteins for Imaging in Bacterial Cells. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, **138**, 15098-15101

Huh W.-K., Falvo J.V., Gerke L.C., Carroll A.S., Howson R.W., Weissman J.S. and O'Shea E.K. (2003) Global analysis of protein localization in budding yeast. *Nature*, **425**, 686-691

Kamiyama D., Sekine S., Barsi-Rhyne B., Hu J., Chen B., Gilbert L.A., Ishikawa H., Leonetti M.D., Marshall W.F., Weissman J.S. *et al.* (2016) Versatile protein tagging in cells with split fluorescent protein. *Nature communications*, **7**, DOI: 10.1038/ncomms11046

Keppler A., Gendrezig S., Gronemeyer T., Pick H., Vogel H. and Johnsson K. (2003) A general method for the covalent labeling of fusion proteins with small molecules in vivo. *Nature Biotechnology*, **21**, 86-89

Kushnirov V.V. (2000) Rapid and reliable protein extraction from yeast. *Yeast*, **16**, 857-860

Labbé S. and Thiele D.J. (1999) Copper ion inducible and repressible promoter systems in yeast. *Methods in Enzymology*, **306**, 145-153

Lacy M.M., Baddeley D. and Berro J. (2017) Single-molecule imaging of the BAR-domain protein Pil1p reveals filament-end dynamics. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, **28**, 2251-2259

Lee M.E., DeLoache W.C., Cervantes B. and Dueber J.E. (2015) A highly characterized yeast toolkit for modular, multipart assembly. *ACS Synthetic Biology*, **4**, 975-986

Longtine M.S., McKenzie III A., Demarini D.J., Shah N.G., Wach A., Brachat A., Philippsen P. and Pringle J.R. (1998) Additional modules for versatile and economical PCR-based gene deletion and modification in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Yeast*, **14**, 953-961

Los G.V., Encell L.P., McDougall M.G., Hartzell D.D., Karassina N., Zimprich C., Wood M.G., Learish R., Ohana R.F., Urh M. *et al.* (2008) HaloTag: a novel protein labeling technology for cell imaging and protein analysis. *ACS Chemical Biology*, **3**, 373-382

Madden K. and Snyder M. (1998) Cell polarity and morphogenesis in budding yeast. *Annual Reviews in Microbiology*, **52**, 687-744

Mason A.B., Allen K.E. and Slayman C.W. (2014) C-terminal truncations of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* PMA1 H⁺-ATPase have major impacts on protein conformation, trafficking, quality control, and function. *Eukaryotic Cell*, **13**, 43-52

Mumberg D., Müller R. and Funk M. (1994) Regulatable promoters of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*: comparison of transcriptional activity and their use for heterologous expression. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **22**, 5767

Pessino V., Citron Y.R., Feng S. and Huang B. (2017) Covalent protein labeling by SpyTag-SpyCatcher in fixed cells for super-resolution microscopy. *ChemBioChem*, DOI: 10.1002/cbic.201700177

Pratt S.E., Speltz E.B., Mochrie S.G. and Regan L. (2016) Designed Proteins as Novel Imaging Reagents in Living *Escherichia coli*. *ChemBioChem*, **17**, 1652-1657

Riedl J., Crevenna A.H., Kessenbrock K., Yu J.H., Neukirchen D., Bista M., Bradke F., Jenne D., Holak T.A., Werb Z. *et al.* (2008) Lifeact: a versatile marker to visualize F-actin. *Nature methods*, **5**, 605-607

Sawyer N., Gassaway B.M., Haimovich A.D., Isaacs F.J., Rinehart J. and Regan L. (2014) Designed phosphoprotein recognition in *Escherichia coli*. *ACS Chemical Biology*, **9**, 2502-2507

Schmidthals K., Helma J., Zolghadr K., Rothbauer U. and Leonhardt H. (2010) Novel antibody derivatives for proteome and high-content analysis. *Analytical and bioanalytical chemistry*, **397**, 3203-3208

Serrano R., Kielland-Brandt M.C. and Fink G.R. (1986) Yeast plasma membrane ATPase is essential for growth and has homology with (Na⁺⁺ K⁺), K⁺- and Ca²⁺-ATPases. *Nature*, **319**, 689-693

Speltz E.B. and Regan L. (2013) White and green screening with circular polymerase extension cloning for easy and reliable cloning. *Protein Science*, **22**, 859-864

Uttamapinant C., White K.A., Baruah H., Thompson S., Fernández-Suárez M., Puthenveetil S. and Ting A.Y. (2010) A fluorophore ligase for site-specific protein labeling inside living cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **107**, 10914-10919

Veggiani G., Nakamura T., Brenner M.D., Gayet R.V., Yan J., Robinson C.V. and Howarth M. (2016) Programmable polyproteins built using twin peptide superglues. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 1202-1207

Veggiani G., Zakeri B. and Howarth M. (2014) Superglue from bacteria: unbreakable bridges for protein nanotechnology. *Trends in biotechnology*, **32**, 506-512

Vranken W.F., Boucher W., Stevens T.J., Fogh R.H., Pajon A., Llinas P., Ulrich E.L., Markley J.L., Ionides J. and Laue E.D. (2005) The CCPN data model for NMR spectroscopy: Development of a software pipeline. *Proteins*, **59**, 687-696

Walden M., Edwards J.M., Dziewulska A.M., Bergmann R., Saalbach G., Kan S.-Y., Miller O.K., Weckener M., Jackson R.J., Shirran S.L. *et al.* (2015) An internal thioester in a pathogen surface protein mediates covalent host binding. *Elife*, **4**, DOI: 10.7554/eLife.06638

Zakeri B., Fierer J.O., Celik E., Chittock E.C., Schwarz-Linek U., Moy V.T. and Howarth M. (2012) Peptide tag forming a rapid covalent bond to a protein, through engineering a bacterial adhesin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **109**, E690-E697