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An organelle-specific protein landscape identifies novel diseases and molecular mechanisms

Karsten Boldt1,*, Jeroen van Reeuwijk2,*, Qianhao Lu3,4,*, Konstantinos Koutroumpas5,*, Thanh-Minh T. Nguyen2, Yves Texier1,6, Sylvia E.C. van Beersum2, Nicola Horn1, Jason R. Willer7, Dorus A. Mans2, Gerard Dougherty8, Ideke J.C. Lamers2, Karlien L.M. Coene2, Heleen H. Arts2, Matthew J. Betts3,4, Tina Beyer1, Emine Bolat2, Christian Johannes Gloeckner9, Khatera Haidari10, Lisette Hetterschijt11, Daniela Iaconis12, Dagan Jenkins13, Franziska Klose1, Barbara Knapp14, Brooke Latour2, Stef J.F. Letteboer2, Carlo L. Marcelis2, Dragana Mitic15, Manuela Morleo12,16, Machtheld M. Oud2, Moniek Riemersma2, Susan Rix13, Paulien A. Terhal17, Grischa Toedt18, Teunis J.P. van Dam19, Erik de Vrieze11, Yves Texier1,6, Sylvia E.C. van Beersum2, Nicola Horn1, Jason R. Willer7, Dorus A. Mans2, Gerard Dougherty8, Ideke J.C. Lamers2, Karlien L.M. Coene2, Heleen H. Arts2, Matthew J. Betts3,4, Tina Beyer1, Emine Bolat2, Christian Johannes Gloeckner9, Khatera Haidari10, Lisette Hetterschijt11, Daniela Iaconis12, Dagan Jenkins13, Franziska Klose1, Barbara Knapp14, Brooke Latour2, Stef J.F. Letteboer2, Carlo L. Marcelis2, Dragana Mitic15, Manuela Morleo12,16, Machtheld M. Oud2, Moniek Riemersma2, Susan Rix13, Paulien A. Terhal17, Grischa Toedt18, Teunis J.P. van Dam19, Erik de Vrieze11, Yasmin Wissinger1, Ka Man Wu2, UK10K Rare Diseases Group#, Gordana Apic15, Philip L. Beales13, Oliver E. Blacque20, Toby J. Gibson18, Martijn A. Huynen19, Nicholas Katsanis7, Hannie Kremer11, Heymut Omran8, Erwin van Wijk11, Uwe Wolfrum14, Francois Kepes5, Erica E. Davis7, Brunella Franco12,16, Rachel H. Giles10, Marius Ueffing1,*, Robert B. Russell3,4,* & Ronald Roepman2,*

Cellular organelles provide opportunities to relate biological mechanisms to disease. Here we use affinity proteomics, genetics and cell biology to interrogate cilia: poorly understood organelles, where defects cause genetic diseases. Two hundred and seventeen tagged human ciliary proteins create a final landscape of 1,319 proteins, 4,905 interactions and 52 complexes. Reverse tagging, repetition of purifications and statistical analyses, produce a high-resolution network that reveals organelle-specific interactions and complexes not apparent in larger studies, and links vesicle transport, the cytoskeleton, signalling and ubiquitination to ciliary signalling and proteostasis. We observe sub-complexes in exocyst and intraflagellar transport complexes, which we validate biochemically, and by probing structurally predicted, disruptive, genetic variants from ciliary disease patients. The landscape suggests other genetic diseases could be ciliary including 3M syndrome. We show that 3M genes are involved in ciliogenesis, and that patient fibroblasts lack cilia. Overall, this organelle-specific targeting strategy shows considerable promise for Systems Medicine.
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Studies relating genetic variation and biomolecular function are often illuminating, but can be hampered by the overall complexity of diseases. Mutations causing the same diseases are often spread across seemingly disconnected cellular processes, meaning that a near-complete understanding of the cell is necessary for a systematic interrogation of disease mechanisms. Such complexity argues that sub-systems, of reduced complexity, could be used as models to develop systematic approaches to study mechanisms of disease. As genome-reduced systems enable Systems Biology, isolated systems of reduced complexity, such as organelles where dysfunction leads to one or more diseases, can similarly enable Systems Medicine.

Cilia are spatially and temporally isolated from other cell processes and humans depend on cilia to see, hear, smell, breathe, excrete, reproduce and develop. Mutations disrupting them cause several diseases (ciliopathies) including polycystic kidney disease and other rare disorders like Usher (USH), Bardet-Biedl (BBS), Meckel-Gruber (MKS) and Jeune (JATD) syndromes that are of immense recent biological focus. As many as 1 in 1,000 people are affected by ciliopathies that lead to blindness, deafness, heart failure, diabetes, kidney disease, skeletal defects, infertility and/or cognitive impairment. This has led to a renewed interest in cilia and several efforts to understand these complex systems, of reduced complexity, is necessary for a systematic interrogation of disease mechanisms. As genome-reduced systems enable cilia to be like a cell antenna, harbouring critical components of Shh, poorly understood organelles.

Diseases are often spread across seemingly disconnected cellular processes (Fig. 1; Supplementary Fig. 1; Supplementary Data 4). Twenty-four complexes have significant overlaps with known complexes (whether ciliary or not), of which 16 contain canonical gold-standard ciliary components. The remaining 28 are largely novel, of which 15 contain one or more known ciliary proteins. Known complexes include those in ciliary transport (IFT-A and -B, the BBSome and KIF3 complex), organellar organization/transport (the exocyst, dynactin and dynein), centriole/basal-body organization (MKS1) and several other not previously associated with ciliary function (below). Interconnections between ciliary transport and cytoskeleton/centrosome complexes, supports the view that canonical ciliary proteins have roles outside the cilium. We defined core and attachment subunits for most complexes (Supplementary Data 4). For instance, the GTPase RALB and BLOC1S2 are known attachments of the exocyst and IFT-B17,18 complexes, respectively (Fig. 2a,d). Finer structure for complexes is also apparent (Fig. 2), including known exocyst sub-complexes, the known sub-network involving the progression of NPH and RPR proteins (Fig. 2f), and new sub-complexes in IFT-B (below).

Although we did not determine stoichiometries of the complexes, comparison of known protein levels across many cell types shows that they are nevertheless stoichiometrically logical: there are few complex cores where one component has a wildly different abundance from the others. Overall, the median differences in abundances are significantly lower (t-test \( P < 0.0001 \)) when looking at proteins within complexes (23.6 p.p.m.) compared with those between complexes (126 p.p.m.) or involving proteins that were detected in the screen but not in any significant interactions (140 p.p.m.). This suggests that the socioaffinity filtering is effective at removing non-specific components and identifying complexes that are stoichiometrically sensible.

Proteins and complexes essential to ciliary function. Among the newly identified complexes, several involve multiple proteins not previously described to act together. For example, we see the ciliogenesis transcription factor FOXJ1 (Fig. 2g) in a complex with Polo-like kinase 1 and the cilia- and flagella-associated protein 20 (CFAP20). This complex interacts with another
containing the X-box factors, RFX1-3, and HDAC1 and 2. Other proteins co-purified with this complex, for example, forkhead box proteins, TBC1D32/broad minded and CDK20/cell cycle-related kinase, suggesting they act directly on the transcriptional regulation of ciliogenesis, which explains their proposed role in coordination of ciliary assembly. We also see the ciliary protein KIAA0556, recently associated with Joubert syndrome, in coordination of ciliary assembly.

Seventeen ciliary proteins (including six IFT subunits) retrieved subunits of the glucose-induced deficiency (GID) E3 ubiquitin ligase complex, involved in regulating gluconeogenesis, and tagged GID subunits retrieved 18 ciliary proteins, suggesting a ciliary role for this complex. We found that GID complex components localized to the ciliary base in both brain and kidney tissue (Fig. 2d) suggesting a role in cellular energy homeostasis in cilia. A general role for the ubiquitin–proteome system in cilia is also supported by the presence of the anaphase-promoting complex, the proteasome and eight ubiquitin conjugating/modifying enzymes in our network (Fig. 2e); absence of several of these proteins also disrupts ciliogenesis.

Overall 1,008 of the 1,319 proteins found in our landscape are not known to be ciliary, though we expect several of these to play non-ciliary roles. More stringently, 544 non-ciliary proteins are either in a complex and/or a confident interaction (FDR/FPR \( \leq 0.1 \)) with gold-standard proteins (Supplementary Data 5) of which 77 have a siRNA-induced ciliary phenotype and 32 are among 331 novel (out of 371 total) ciliary localized proteins from a recent proteomics study. For 39 there is at least one homozygous missense variant in the UK10K ciliopathies.
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**Figure 1 | Overview of the ciliary landscape.** (a) HEK293T cells stained with the ciliary marker ARL13B (green), the transition zone marker RPGRIP1L (purple), and the axonemal marker acetylated alpha-tubulin (red). Scale bar, 20 μm. In the magnifications the scale bar represents 5 μm. (b) Complexes/proteins identified in this study are depicted by circles and rounded boxes. Rounded boxes show complexes/proteins in the Syscilia gold-standard ciliary proteins. The edge thickness is proportional to the socioaffinity index, and proteins/complexes are coloured according to whether they have ciliary phenotypes. The border thickness is proportional to the number of variants in UK10K ciliopathy patients.

containing the X-box factors, RFX1-3, and HDAC1 and 2. Other proteins co-purified with this complex, for example, forkhead box proteins, TBC1D32/broad minded and CDK20/cell cycle-related kinase, suggesting they act directly on the transcriptional regulation of ciliogenesis, which explains their proposed role in coordination of ciliary assembly. We also see the ciliary protein KIAA0556, recently associated with Joubert syndrome, in complex with kinases ICK and MAK, the latter of which interacts in coordination of ciliary assembly. We also see the ciliary complex with kinases ICK and MAK, the latter of which interacts in coordination of ciliary assembly.

Seventeen ciliary proteins (including six IFT subunits) retrieved subunits of the glucose-induced deficiency (GID) E3 ubiquitin ligase complex, involved in regulating gluconeogenesis, and tagged GID subunits retrieved 18 ciliary proteins, suggesting a ciliary role for this complex. We found that GID complex components localized to the ciliary base in both brain and kidney tissue (Fig. 2d) suggesting a role in cellular energy homeostasis in cilia. A general role for the ubiquitin–proteome system in cilia is also supported by the presence of the anaphase-promoting complex, the proteasome and eight ubiquitin conjugating/modifying enzymes in our network (Fig. 2e); absence of several of these proteins also disrupts ciliogenesis.
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Architecture of intraflagellar transport complexes. Despite an established functional connection related to ciliary transport, we saw no significant direct physical connections between IFT-A and B. This is in broad agreement with what is currently known as, despite some early, and partly indirect, evidence of a physical association\(^\text{26}\), they are not normally seen to interact\(^\text{27}\). There are also comparatively few other proteins that bridge the IFT-A and B complexes. Apart from the known linker LCA5 (ref. 11), the only connection we found between them is NUDC, a WD-repeat, beta-propeller-specific co-chaperone\(^\text{28}\).
purification data, 13/25 proteins that retrieve NUDC (when tagged and overexpressed) contain WD-repeats (Fisher test $P<0.0001$; Supplementary Fig. 5), but only 2/37 proteins retrieved by tagged NUDC contain WD-repeats, which is roughly what one would expect from a chaperonin. Interestingly, when we searched for Gene ontology terms enriched among 52 targets retrieved by NUDC,

- axial, axoneme, centrosome, and ubiquitination processes were significant, suggesting this co-chaperone to be particularly functionally relevant for cilia. The presence of this co-chaperone is not indicative of non-specific chaperone proteins (or other parts of the protein synthesis or maintenance machinery) in our network, as these are effectively filtered by the socioaffinity metric as observed previously. For example, CCT has been proposed to be involved in BBsomes assembly.

We see CCT subunits in 449 purifications, though their promiscuity means that all 16,331 possible interactions are insignificant with just nine marginally significant (FDR/DFDR<0.2) interactions all involving known ciliary proteins, including BBS5 and BBS4.

The IFT-B particle appears to consist of two sub-complexes (Fig. 3), with IFT88 at the interface. These correspond to core (IFT-B1), and peripheral subunits described previously, though with the latter forming a distinct complex (IFT-B2). Sucrose density centrifugation and EPASIS analyses support this finding (Fig. 3; Supplementary Fig. 6; Supplementary Data 6). Additionally, we used structural and interaction information to identify rare IFT-B missense variants (identified by targeted resequencing of severe ciliopathy cases), that might affect interactions in IFT-B (Supplementary Fig. 7) and potentially contribute to disease severity. Six out of 10 predicted interaction targeting variants could be purified from HEK293T cells and compared to wild type (Supplementary Fig. 1; Supplementary Data 7). Three of them specifically affected one sub-complex (Fig. 2a; Supplementary Fig. 8). For example, IFT88 p.R607H, a heterozygous variant in an MKS fetus, leads to a specific loss of IFT-B1, supporting IFT88 as a bridge between IFT-B1/B2, and suggesting that this residue might mediate interactions with IFT-B1. There is no evidence that these variants are recessive or disease-causing alleles. We expect that they are modifiers affecting disease severity (as a result of mutational load), and further tests can establish the impact in the context of causal loci. Regardless of their ultimate genetic meaning, these observations provide additional support that IFT-B forms two sub-complexes.

IFT-B components IFT20 and TRAF3IP1 interact with Dysbindin-1 and BLOC1S2 (Fig. 2a), components of the BLOC-1 complex, involved in the transport of membrane cargos and endosomal trafficking. The association of IFT-B components with perilciliary cytoplasm membrane vesicles in dendrites supports this link, and the IFT involvement in vesicle transport is corroborated by its likely protococytomer origin. Possibly related to this, TTC30B (IFT-B) interacts with 20 functionally diverse transmembrane proteins (Fig. 2a), including the uncharacterized TMEM41B, which shows a ciliary phenotype: siRNA downregulation increases and overexpression decreases ciliary length (Fig. 2a; Supplementary Fig. 9). The lack of functional

---

**Figure 2 | Complexes and networks within the landscape.** (a) Detailed network of IFT-B/2 and MAKICK/KIAA0556; IFT-B is linked to IFT-A by NUDC, and to complex KIF3 by SSA1. The IFT-B protein TTC30B interacts with multiple membrane proteins. One of those, TMEM41B, was further analysed and shows a ciliary length phenotype upon modulation of expression by siRNA knock-down and overexpression. For both, knockdown and overexpression, biological triplicates were analysed and a $t$-test was performed. P values below 0.01 are represented by ** and below 0.001 by ***. Error bars represent the s.e.m. (b) Detailed interaction network of the KIF3 complex and Complex:15, with SLC9A2R2 bridging ciliary processes. (c) Detailed interactions between Dynemin and Dynactin intermediated by the HSF1/HSFAP1/MAPRE2 linker complex. (d) Muskelin/RanBP9/CTLH complex (GID complex in Yeast) network showing core, attachments and links to several other complexes, mediated by RAB8A. Immunofluorescence demonstrates the localization of two GID components, GID8 and MKL1N1 (red arrows in the network) to the ciliary base: MKL1N1 in kidney tubule epithelial cells (anti-MKL1N1, left panel, red); GID8 (right panel, green) in multi-ciliated brain ependymal cells. DAPI staining (blue) marks the nucleus, GT335 co-staining (green or red) marks the cilium. Scale bars represent 10 μm. (e) Complex:21 and 31 containing several ubiquitin conjugating or modifying enzymes in interaction with the GID and exocyst complexes. (f) Elaborated view of the sub-network involving the NPHP1/NPHP4-RPGRIP1/PDE6D/RPGR complex, and its association with the complexes IQ/CALM1, KIF3, COP9 signalosome, and Complex:15. (g) Ciliogenesis transcription factor FOXJ1 stably interacts with PLK1 (Polo-like kinase 1) and CFAP20, and is linked to the FOXJ1/RFX complex and Complex:15.
commonalities among these membrane proteins raises the possibility that they could be IFT-B cargos targeted by TTC30B.

Proteins bridging ciliary complexes. Several proteins appear to link important ciliary complexes or proteins (Fig. 1). For example, SSNA1, potentially in collaboration with LCA5, both have ciliary transport phenotypes and link IFT-B to Dynein and KIF3 complexes. We also see RAB8A interacting with RAB3IP and the TRAPP complex as known, but also with the GID and exocyst complex and the membrane protein stomatin, involved in the formation of membrane protrusions (Fig. 2d), suggesting new roles in membrane protein trafficking. SLCA9A3R2, a scaffold protein not associated with ciliary function but which interacts with seven gold-standard proteins (Fig. 2b), interacts with known partners YAP1 and CTNNB1 plus several proteins involved in Usher syndrome and non-syndromic deafness and the COP9 signalosome (Fig. 2b) that hint at roles in actin attachment/polarization, DNA damage response or proteasomal degradation. Finally, there are several proteins linking complexes to the kinetochore, such as microtubule-associated protein RP/EB family members 1 and 2 (MAPRE1,2) and platelet-activating factor acetylhydrolase IB subunit alpha (PAFAH1B1), which lie between IFT-B, GID and the dynactin and dynein kinetochore/microtubule complexes (Fig. 2c).

Comparison with previous studies. The BioPlex data set, which currently contains 5,087 affinity purifications from HEK293T cells, has 81 of the 217 baits we tagged here. Calculating socioaffinities gives 63,018 confident interactions in BioPlex, of which 421 overlap with our 4,905 interactions (considering the entire BioPlex bait–prey pairs the overlap is 271). Another recent study in HeLa cells involving 1,125

Figure 4 | 3M Syndrome is a ciliopathy. (a) Schematic showing comparison of interactome to disease genes with the top scoring diseases shown (orange denotes known ciliopathies). The three 3M associated proteins are shown right, with the baits that retrieved them, and within the network (below). Matrix relationships are not shown in the table. (b) siRNA down-regulation of these genes in mpkCCD cells reveals that 3M genes are involved in ciliogenesis (knockdown of IFT88, known to affect ciliogenesis, is shown for comparison). (c) Fibroblasts from a 3M patient have fewer cilia than controls. The transition zone marker MKS1 is shown in red, acetylated tubulin in green and nuclear staining with DAPI in blue. Scale bars represent 5 μm. (d) Quantification of differences in ciliated cell count comparing 3M fibroblasts to those transformed with wild-type or mutant (p.H1464P) CUL7 or empty vector. Wild-type CUL7 restored ciliogenesis, while mutant CUL7 did not. (b–d) For all experiments biological triplicates with technical duplicates were performed. Error bars represent the s.e.m.
GFP-tagged proteins coupled to quantitative proteomics identified 31,944 significant protein interactions43 also with a low overlap: 239 common interactions, principally involving the GID, dynactin, CNOT, MCM and exosome complexes (which contain the 28 common baits). The low overlaps highlight the need for specific sub-proteome targeting to uncover interactions of interest as targeting a small subset of baits is insufficient to resolve complexes and interactions fully. The subtleties of architecture that we see in the IFT-B and exocyst complexes are also not apparent in the BioPlex set (and disappear when we simulate fewer baits/repetitions; Supplementary Figs 10 and 11), highlighting the value of repeated reverse tagging to provide high-resolution interactomes.

New ciliopathies emerging from the organellar landscape. The variants affecting IFT-B (above) illustrate how genetic changes can inform mechanistic biology. A natural question is whether this works in reverse: can our ciliary landscape inform clinical genetics? Our interactome (1,319 proteins) overlaps with gene sets from 35 genetic diseases (Fig. 4) of which 11 are known ciliopathies (Supplementary Data 8), and others are ciliopathy related (for example, ‘Deafness’ or ‘Mental Retardation’) and several, including Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Hermansky-Pudlak, Nephrotic and 3M syndromes are potentially new ciliopathies. We did not tag any of the three known 3M syndrome (‘3M complex’44) -associated proteins though two (OBSL1 and CCDC8) are in our landscape, and the third (CUL7) was detected in multiple purifications, but made no confident interactions. siRNA knock-downs (validated by qPCR; Supplementary Fig. 12) reduced ciliated fractions in mpkCCD cells, which could be rescued by co-expressing human orthologs (Fig. 4; Supplementary Fig. 12). Fibroblasts from a skin biopsy of a 3M case (Fig. 13; ciliary length unchanged). Cilia could also be restored by overexpression of wild type, but not mutant CUL7 (Fig. 4). This ciliary phenotype suggests that 3M syndrome is indeed a ciliopathy.

Discussion

The rich landscape including new ciliary-associated proteins, interactions and complexes, when coupled to the growing array of genetic and functional information, will undoubtedly lead to many additional insights into ciliary function and disease. Our organelle-specific interactome also shows considerable power to suggest new genetic diseases (for example, 3M syndrome) likely related to ciliary dysfunction. Identifying novel ciliopathies can have an immediate impact on diagnostics and treatments. For instance, diagnoses can be aided by examining ciliary frequency in young patients’ cells.46

Targeted, repeated, reverse-tagged, TAP-MS proteomics coupled to socioaffinity uncovers physically meaningful interactions not always apparent in high-throughput studies42,43. Moreover, the success of this strategy at uncovering finer sub-structures has certain implications for structural biology. Indeed, since the acceptance of this manuscript a discrete structure for many of our IFT-B2 components has provided additional support for this approach.47 Whole proteome data of this quality could provide unprecedented insights into the architecture of many additional protein complexes. The edgetic48 disease variants affecting specific sub-complexes also show the complementarity of genetic and mechanistic investigations. A larger study of >1,000 disease mutations has shown that many affect protein–protein interactions1 and additional studies like that we have performed here, in concert, for example, with larger complex data sets42, could also illuminate more generally how disease variants impact protein function.

Overall, this study has demonstrated the great complementarity of proteomics and genetics and the power of focussing on a disease-relevant organelle. As such, this work provides a framework for powerful future applications in biomedicine.

Methods

Affinity purifications. To determine the ciliary protein network, we selected a set of 217 proteins, among which 124 are Sycilia gold standard proteins, 91 are ciliopathy-associated proteins, and 80 are proteins with predicted ciliary function. The proteins were overexpressed in HEK293T cells, fused to a SF-TAP tag to enable tandem affinity purification of the associated protein complexes. The cells were lysed and after clearance of the lysate by centrifugation, the lysate was subjected to a two-step purification via the Strept-FLAG tag, followed by elution using the FLAG moiety. Competitive elution was achieved by addition of the FLAG peptide. The eluate was precipitated by methanol–chloroform and then subjected to mass spectrometric analysis.

Mass spectrometry. Following precipitation, SF-TAP-purified complexes were solubilized and proteolytically cleaved using trypsin. The resulting peptide samples were desalted and purified using stage tips before separation on a Dionex RSIC Ion Chip. Eluting peptides were directly infused into an LTQ Orbitrap Velos mass spectrometer. Mascot was used to search the raw spectra against the human SwissProt database for identification of proteins. The Mascot results were post validated by Scaffold which employs the protein prophet algorithm. Identification and label-free quantification for EPASIS and sucrose density centrifugation data was performed with MaxQuant. The peptide and protein false-discovery rates were set to 1% and only unique peptides were used for quantification.

Network and complex delineation. We modified the socioaffinity metric13 to consider protein coverage and to account for the lack of complete proteome tagging. We computed false-positive and false-discovery rates using a gold standard of known interactions and a systematically derived set of negative interactions. We applied a Hierarchical Clique Identification approach to cluster proteins and defined attachments as proteins having at least two significant links to the cluster (without being in the cluster itself).

Sub-complex analysis. For both, sucrose density gradient centrifugation and EPASIS, the SF-TAP tagged bait proteins were stably expressed in HEK293T cells and the complexes were affinity purified by FLAG purification. For sucrose density centrifugation, the complexes were eluted by addition of FLAG peptide, and sub-complexes were separated by a discontinuous gradient and fractionated after centrifugation at 166,000g. (ref. 49). The fractions were precipitated and subjected to label-free mass spectrometric analysis. EPASIS makes use of controlled destabilization of protein–protein interactions by the addition of low concentrations of SDS (Supplementary Fig. 6). The purified complexes were immobilized on FLAG beads. By applying a step gradient, interactions of bait protein and sub-complexes are sequentially destabilized and thereby sub-complexes eluted. Each fraction was subjected to label-free quantification by mass spectrometry before the quantitative data were used to calculate elution profile distances to detect co-cluting sub-complexes.

Affinity purification. In total 217 Strep–FLAG tandem affinity purification (SF-TAP)40 expression constructs were generated (Supplementary Data 1). Bait protein selection was based on the association of proteins with ciliopathies (including mutant vertebrates showing ciliopathy features) or involvement in IFT. In addition, we selected part of our candidate list of ciliary proteins which is a compilation of a subset from the ciliary proteome database8 (type: non-reciprocal; e-value cut-off: 1E – 10; study selection all, ≥ 4 studies) and candidate ciliary proteins resulting from previous studies in our labs. Gateway-adapted cDNA constructs were obtained from the Ultimate ORF clone collection (Thermo Fisher Scientific) or generated by PCR from IMAGE clones (SourceBioScience) or human marathon-ready cDNA (Clontech) as template and cloning using the Gateway cloning system (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer’s procedures followed by sequence verification.

HEK293T cells were grown in DMEM (FAA) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum and 0.5% penicillin/streptomycin. Cells were seeded, grown overnight and then transfected with the corresponding SF-TAP-tagged DNA constructs using PEI reagent (Polysciences) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Forty-eight hours later, cells were harvested in lysis buffer containing 0.3% Nonidet-P40 (NP-40), protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche), and phosphatase inhibitors (50 mM PMSF, 3 mM β-glycerophosphate and 20 mM Na3VO4) in TRIS (10 mM, pH 7.4 and 150 mM NaCl) for 20 min at 4 °C. Cell debris and nuclei were removed by centrifugation at 10,000g for 10 min.
For SF-TAP analysis, the cleared supernatant was incubated for 1 h at 4 °C with Strep-Tactin superflow (IBA). Subsequently, the resin was washed three times in wash buffer (TBS containing 0.1% NP-40 and phosphate buffer, pH 7.4, Sigma-Aldrich). Protein baits were eluted with Strep–elution buffer (2 mM deshiothiotiobin in TBS). For the second purification step, the eluates were transferred to anti-Flag M2 agarose (Sigma-Aldrich) and incubated for 1 h at 4 °C. After washing three times with wash buffer and protein were eluted with FLAG peptide (200 μg mL⁻¹, Sigma-Aldrich) in TBS. After purification, the samples were precipitated with chloroform and methanol and subjected to in-solution tryptic cleavage52. Precipitated protein samples were dissolved in 30 μL 50 mM ammonium bicarbonate (Sigma-Aldrich), supplemented with 2% RapiGest (Waters) and 0.1% TFA. After protein hydrolysis at 60 °C for 10 min, 1 μL 300 mM 2-iodacetamide was added followed by incubation at room temperature for 30 min in the dark. Before overnight incubation at 37 °C, 1 μg of trypsin (Sigma-Aldrich, sequencing grade) was added. The reaction was stopped by addition of trifluoracetic acid to a final concentration of 1%.

**Generation of stable cell lines.** For stable HEK293 cells, cells were cultivated as indicated above and transfected with the corresponding DNA construct using PEI reagen
c
t for 48 h in 96-well plates and incubated during the experimental procedure of TAP and MS analysis. We noted occasionally decreased socioaffinity thresholds and generally better ROC plots (Supplementary Fig. 4), f
t that we obtained very different curves depending on the nature of the protein pairs considered, with decreasing socioaffinity thresholds. Inspection showed that we obtained very
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about the size of the interactome, we are unable to estimate the relative numbers of positives and negatives. For this reason, we took the stringent view of requiring both FPR (that is, fraction of negatives predicted by socioaffinity as positives) and false-discovery rate (FDR, or the fraction of predictions that are false positives) to be below a common threshold (0.1, 0.05, 0.01). Inspection showed that this gave a reasonable sensitivity but also avoided situations of a multitude of interactions involving common values that had FPR values near the threshold. We computed the coverage-weighted to binary (that is, protein present or not) counts for the interactions involving common values that had FPR values near the threshold. We compared the new score:

\[
SA_{FDR}(i, j) = \max_{(k, l) \in FDR(i,j)} SA_{FDR}(k, l) - SA(i, j) - \min_{(k, l) \in FDR(i,j)} SA(k, l)
\]

The new score was computed iteratively starting with the interactions with the highest FDR value. For these interactions there are no protein pairs with higher FDR and the first term in the above equation is zero.

Protein complexes were predicted from the weighted PPI network using Hierarchical Clique Identification (HCI). The algorithm merges proteins in clusters based on their interaction scores using a hierarchical agglomerative clustering (HAC) approach that allows overlapping clusters. HCI starts by considering a weight graph whose edges are derived from the network. In this graph, nodes correspond to clusters and edge weights are measures of similarity (for example, socioaffinity scores). Initially each protein is assigned to a cluster. At each iteration the algorithm selects the clusters to be combined and then updates the weights of the edges between clusters. For the selection of the clusters to be merged, an unweighted network is constructed by combining edges with a weight less than the maximal weight. Then the algorithm mines this network for maximal cliques, that is, cliques that are not contained in larger cliques. The extracted maximal cliques define the set of clusters to be combined. Nodes corresponding to merged clusters are removed from the network and new nodes are introduced for the new clusters. At each iteration, the cluster is combined which is not fully connected with the node. It is clear that only pairs of clusters that form a clique upon merging are connected in the new graph. This may result in the loss of the highest weighted edges of some nodes. This happens for instance when the best neighbour of a node is merged in a cluster, which is not fully connected with the node. To avoid merging of the node based on lower weighted edges, whenever a node loses its highest weighted edges it is removed from the graph. The entire procedure terminates when the graph becomes disconnected when a score threshold is reached, which is the case here.

Except for the score threshold an additional filtering step was used to identify the sub-structure of the predicted complexes, if any. This was achieved by using Dirichlet process mixture (DPM) modeling. DPM is a probability mixture model with an infinite number of components, which are mixed according to a stochastic process called Dirichlet process. DPM has been extensively used for data clustering due to its property that the stochastic process for mixture proportions almost surely produces a finite number of distributions. In DPM a cluster i is described by a parameter distribution \( f_i \), in our case Gaussian. The mixture model has the form \( \eta \sim \sum_i \pi_i f_i(\cdot) \), where \( \pi \) is the mixture proportion of the distribution \( f \). Moreover, the distribution parameters \( \theta \) are drawn from a base distribution \( G_0 \). While the initial number of components \( K \) is finite, DPM ensures a finite number of components by properly selecting the mixture proportions \( \pi \) from a Dirichlet distribution.

For each cluster that was identified in the first step the distance matrix, consisting of the socioaffinity scores for all protein pairs in the node cluster, was constructed. DPM was then used to identify sub-complexes from the distance matrix. Variational inference was used to fit the DPM to the data and to identify the optimal clustering. If the DPM was consisting of a single component then the cluster was left as is. Otherwise, the branch of the dendrogram corresponding to the specific cluster was traced backwards to identify the subclusters that best match the DPM clustering.

**Gene enrichment analyses.** We extracted various gene/protein sets either from Gene Ontology or from Uniprot. From the latter we extracted complexes by identifying canonical gene names within Subunit/Complex descriptions for particular Uniprot accessions, and extracted genes related to generic diseases from specific disease categories (for particular databases). We used a gene set enrichment analysis with the software (Gene Codes), and variants were confirmed by resequencing and visual assessment of chromatograms. Primer sequences and PCR experiments were subjected to label-free quantification by mass spectrometry.

**IFT-B sub-complex analysis.** Sucrose density gradient centrifugation. Sucrose gradients for density centrifugation were prepared in 2 ml centrifugation tubes. 250 μl of each concentration (in 14/16% sucrose) with methyl-chloroform was applied to the tube and overlaid with the pooled eluates from two individual SF-TAP purifications from a HEK293 cell line stably expressing IFT88-SF-TAP. After centrifugation at 166,000 g for 4 h in a swing-out rotor (Beckman TLS65), the gradient was fractionated by pipetting into 125 μl fractions. The fractions were precipitated by methanol-chloroform and subjected to label-free quantification by mass spectrometry.

**EPASIS.** For protein complex destabilization the cleared lysates from HEK293 cells stably expressing IFT88-SF-TAP, respectively, IFT27-SF-TAP were transferred to anti-FLAG M2 agarose (Sigma-Aldrich). After 1 h of incubation, the resin was washed three times using wash buffer (TBS containing 0.1% NP-40 and phosphatase inhibitor cocktails II and III, Sigma-Aldrich). For the SDS-denaturation of the protein complexes, the resin was then incubated 3 min with each concentration of SDS (0.00025, 0.0025, 0.005, 0.01 and 0.1%) in SDS-elution buffer (TBS containing phosphatase inhibitor cocktails II and III) at 4°C. The elution buffer was collected and precipitated by methanol-chloroform for 30 min. After every elution step a single wash step was performed. Subsequently to the SDS gradient, the remaining proteins were eluted from the resin by incubation for 3 min with FLAG peptide (200 μg ml−1; Sigma-Aldrich) in wash buffer. The fractions were subjected to label-free quantification by mass spectrometry.

**Statistical data analysis** was carried out in R environment by calculating the elution profile distance for each protein to the consensus profile for IFT-B1 and IFT-B2 (ref. 31). For each cell line, stably expressing IFT27, IFT88 or SF Control, six replicated EPASIS experiments were performed (108 measurements). Unique peptides with a minimum peptide length of seven amino acids were identified by searching against the ion database and a reversed version of the database where each amino acid was replaced by its reverse. Fragments were identified if they were present in at least 5/6 (83.33%) repeated experiments, resulting in a high confident list of 45 proteins for IFT27 and 19 proteins for IFT88 that were further analysed.

**Protein intensities** for all SDS concentrations of an experiment were combined and a log2 transformed by Pearson correlation coefficient together with its 95% confidence interval. To investigate the safe distance for elution concentration for IFT27 and IFT88, elution correlation scores were calculated. Consensus profiles of known marker protein groups (Supplementary Table 6) were calculated by averaging the normalized cumulative intensities of the protein group per concentration step for all experiments. Elution profile distances (EPD) to consensus profiles were calculated for all detected proteins. A stepwise \((n = 1,000)\) parameter search was performed to estimate the optimal EPD threshold to maximize the specificity and sensitivity to assign known sub-complex members to the consensus profile. To perform nonmetric multidimensional scaling the elution profile distances were averaged across the replicated \((n = 6)\) experiments and Euclidean distances between them calculated. A stable solution was found by using random starts and the best ordination \((\text{stress}: 0.03)\) IFT27; 0.01 IFT88) selected.

**Rare variant discovery in the Scylla cohort.** As part of our ongoing investigation of mutational burden in ciliopathies, we conducted bidirectional Sanger sequencing of coding regions and splice junctions of IFT-B encoding genes (IFT172, IFT88, IFT81, IFT80, IFT74, IFT57, TRAF3IP1, IFT52, IFT46, IFT27, HPS111, RAB13, IFT290 and CLUAP1) in a previously described ciliopathy cohort according to standard methodology. The Duke University Institutional Review Board approved human subjects research, and DNA samples were ascertained following informed consent. PCR products were sequenced with BigDye Terminator v3.1 chemistry on an ABI 3,730 (Applied Biosystems), sequences were analyzed with Mutation Surveyor (Gene Codes), and variants were confirmed by resequencing and visual assessment of chromatograms. Primer sequences and PCR conditions are available upon request.
Identifying disruptive variants at complex interfaces. We selected 10 IF-T variants from the rare variant data set identified in ciliopathy cases (Scyilia cohort) as candidates to affect IFT architecture by an analysis of the structural features known or predicted for these subunits (Supplementary Data 7). We used the Mechismo system and identified two variants at or near the interface (IFT27 p.R131Q and HSPB11 p.T411I) and a third on the surface of HSPB11 (p.R616S) but far away from this interface (and potentially a candidate to bind different proteins). Though there were no other structures on which to confidently model IFT subunit interfaces, the fact that most of the subunits contain WD- or TPR repeats provided the means to use the location of common binding sites in these families to predict variants that might affect the interaction with a protein, even if the specific protein partner is not known. To do this we first defined domains by Pfam and TPRpred and manual refinements were applied to define boundaries for WD-repeat repeats in IFT172, and for TPR repeats in IFT88, and IFT172. We then aligned the sequences automatically coupled to manual editing and identified variants at or near the favourable binding site for WD-repeats (the top-side of the propeller). For TPR repeats, binding site residues were defined by blade-chain to peptide distances within a representative set of TPR repeats (from PDB codes 4n3a, 2lsv, 4buj, 1a17 and 1elr) superimposed and aligned using STAMP. This alignment and a representative average structure showing the binding sites as depicted in Supplementary Fig. 7.

Differential AP-MS to compare variants to wild-type proteins. Protein complex comparison was done essentially as described before. For SILAC labelling, HEK293T cells were grown in SILAC DMEM (PAA) supplemented with 3 mM -glutamine (PAA), 10% dialyzed fetal bovine serum (PAA), 0.55 mM lysine and 0.4 mM arginine. SILAC medium was supplemented with 12C6, 15N4 lysine and 12C6, 15N4 arginine. Heavy SILAC medium was supplemented with either 13C6 lysine and 13C6, 15N4 arginine or 13C6, 15N4 lysine and 13C6, 15N4 arginine. Proline (0.5 mM) was added to all SILAC media to prevent arginine to proline conversion. All amino acids were purchased from Silantes. SF-TAP-tagged protein complexes were purified from HEK293T cells transfected with HEK293T vectors. To this end, HEK293T cells, transiently expressing the SF-TAP-tagged constructs were lysed in lysis buffer containing 0.5% Nonidet-P40, protease inhibitor cocktail and 1% Triton-Superflow beads (IBA) and pre-fractionation using SDS–PAGE and in-gel tryptic cocktail II and III. The protein complexes were eluted by incubation for 10 min in 0.2% starvation medium, or full (10% FCS) medium. All conditions showed ciliated cell growth on selective media. Cells were transfected with transcription vectors (from Sigma-Aldrich E7908). HK2 cells were transfected using TransIT-LT1 transfection reagent (409-10 from Polyplus). The transfection reagent was INTERFERIN (409-10 from Polyplus). A GAL4-based yeast two-hybrid system was used to screen for binary protein–protein interactions. Yeast two-hybrid constructs were generated according to the manufacturer’s instructions using the Gateway cloning technology (Thermo Fisher Scientific) by LR recombination of GAL4-BD Gateway destination vectors with sequence-verified Gateway entry vectors containing the cDNA’s of selected bait proteins. Constructs encoding full-length or fragments of bait proteins fused to a DNA-binding domain (GAL4-BD) were used as baits to screen human oligo-dT primed retinal, brain, kidney and testis cDNA libraries, a bovine primary primed retinal cDNA library (Invitrogen) and a library of human cDNA’s from candidate and known ciliary proteins, fused to a GAL4 activation domain (GAL4-AD) or vice versa. The yeast strain Yp64-4A, which carries the HIS3 (histidine), ADE2 (adename), MEL1 (z-galactosidase) and LacZ (z-galactosidase) reporter genes, was used as a host. Interactions were analysed by assessment of reporter gene activation based on growth of colonies. The interaction of the cleaved lyses was determined by Bradford before equal protein amounts were transferred to Strep-Tactin-Superflow beads (IBA) and incubated for 1 h. The resin was washed three times with wash buffer (TBS containing 0.1% NP-40, phosphatase inhibitor cocktail II and III). The protein complexes were eluted by incubation for 10 min in Strep-elution buffer (IBA). The eluted samples were combined before concentration using 10Kd cut off VivaSpin 500 centrifugal devices (Sartorius Stedim Biotech) and pre-fractionation using SDS–PAGE and in-gel tryptic cleavage.

Yeast two-hybrid system. A GAL4-based yeast two-hybrid system was used to screen for binary protein–protein interactions. Yeast two-hybrid constructs were generated according to the manufacturer’s instructions using the Gateway cloning technology (Thermo Fisher Scientific) by LR recombination of GAL4-BD Gateway destination vectors with sequence-verified Gateway entry vectors containing the cDNA’s of selected bait proteins. Constructs encoding full-length or fragments of bait proteins fused to a DNA-binding domain (GAL4-BD) were used as baits to screen human oligo-dT primed retinal, brain, kidney and testis cDNA libraries, a bovine primary primed retinal cDNA library (Invitrogen) and a library of human cDNA’s from candidate and known ciliary proteins, fused to a GAL4 activation domain (GAL4-AD) or vice versa. The yeast strain Yp64-4A, which carries the HIS3 (histidine), ADE2 (adename), MEL1 (z-galactosidase) and LacZ (z-galactosidase) reporter genes, was used as a host. Interactions were analysed by assessment of reporter gene activation based on growth of colonies. The interaction of the cleaved lyses was determined by Bradford before equal protein amounts were transferred to Strep-Tactin-Superflow beads (IBA) and incubated for 1 h. The resin was washed three times with wash buffer (TBS containing 0.1% NP-40, phosphatase inhibitor cocktail II and III). The protein complexes were eluted by incubation for 10 min in Strep-elution buffer (IBA). The eluted samples were combined before concentration using 10Kd cut off VivaSpin 500 centrifugal devices (Sartorius Stedim Biotech) and pre-fractionation using SDS–PAGE and in-gel tryptic cleavage.

Ciliopathy genetic variants from UK10K data. We downloaded ciliopathy patient data from the European genome-phenome archive (EGA), which consists of variants sequenced from 124 ciliopathy disease samples in 12 disease groups and a healthy population (that is, in Figs 1 and 2). For Supplementary Data 5 we considered only homozygous/heterozygous (labelled) missense mutations with frequencies below 1%. Immunohistochemistry. Unfixed kidneys and brains of 1-month-old Wistar rats were harvested and frozen in melting isopentane. Seven micrometre cryosections were cut and treated with 0.01% Triton in PBS for 20 min and subsequently blocked in blocking buffer (0.1% ovalbumin and 0.5% fish gelatin in PBS). After the blocking step, the cryosections were incubated overnight with the primary rabbit polyclonal antibody targeting GDI (200rf11 (N1C3), Genetex, cat. no. GTX106672; 1:100) or MLN1 (Sigma-Aldrich, cat. no. HPA022817; 1:100) in combination with the mouse anti-ARL13B antibody GT335 (Adipogen, cat. no. AG-20B-0020-C100; 1:1000, diluted in blocking buffer. Alexa Fluor 488- and 568-conjugated secondary antibodies were also diluted 1:500 in blocking buffer and incubated for 1 h in the dark. Staining of cell nuclei was performed with DAPI (1:8,000). Prolong Gold Anti-fade (Molecular Probes) was used for embedding the sections. Pictures were made with a Zeiss Axio Imager Z1 fluorescent microscope (Zeiss), equipped with a 63 × objective lens and an ApoTome slider. Images were processed using Axiovision 4.3 (Zeiss) and Adobe CS4 Photoshop (Adobe Systems). Procedures followed were in accordance with the ethical standards of the responsible committee on animal experimentation.

TMEM41B ciliary phenotype. Cell line used. Human kidney-2 (HK2) cells were cultured in DMEM F-12 5% FBS and supplied with ITS (Sigma, I1884), 100 units per ml penicillin, and 100 mg ml−1 streptomycin. Starvation in HK2 cells was achieved using DMEM F-12 without FBS for 24 h. Cells were grown at 37°C with 5% CO2.

Immunofluorescence. Cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde. Blocking was performed in PBS-0.2% Triton X-100, 10% FBS. For cilia staining cells were fixed for 24 h before fixation. Cilia were labelled with a rabbit anti-ARL13B antibody (Proteintech, cat. no. 17711-1-AP; 1:500), a guinea pig polyclonal anti-RPRGPI1 antibody (SNO40, 1:300), and a monoclonal anti-acetylated tubulin antibody (clone 6-11-B1, Sigma-Aldrich, T6793; 1:1000). Cells were stained with secondary antibodies for 45 min. The following secondary antibodies were used (all from Life Technologies/Thermo Fisher Scientific, Bleiswijk, The Netherlands; all diluted 1:500 in 2% BSA): anti-mouse IgG Alexa Fluor 488, anti-rabbit IgG Alexa Fluor 488, and anti-mouse IgG Alexa Fluor 568. DAPI stained the nucleus.

RNAi. ON-TARGET plus smart pool siRNAs against human TMEM41B and non-targeting control pool from Dharmacon were used at a concentration of 100 nM. The transfection reagent was INTERFERIN (409-10 from Polyplus). Silenced cells were used for IF analyses after 48 h transfections.

3M syndrome proteins and relationship to cilia function. Cell culture. Murine principle collecting duct (mpkCCD) clone 11 cells were grown with DMEM/Ham F12 1:1 vol/vol supplemented with 5 µg ml−1 insulin; 50 nM dexamethasone; 60 mM sodium selenate; 5 µg ml−1 transferrin; 1 mM triiodothyronine (T3); 2 mM glutamine; 10 µg ml−1 epidermal growth factor (EGF); 2% fetal calf serum (FCS); 10% d-glucose; 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.4 and 10 μg ml−1 ciprofloxin at 3% CO2. Human fibroblasts were grown from skin biopsies in DMEM supplemented with 10% FCS; 10% D-glucose; 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.4 and 10 μg ml−1 ciprofloxin at 3% CO2. Human fibroblasts were grown from skin biopsies in DMEM supplemented with 10% FCS; 10% D-glucose; 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.4 and 10 μg ml−1 ciprofloxin at 3% CO2.
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Antibodies and reagents. Antibodies used are mouse anti-CLUL (clone Ab38, Sigma-Aldrich, C1743, diluted 1:500), mouse anti-acetylated tubulin (clone 6-11-B1, Sigma-Aldrich, D6793, diluted 1:20,000), rabbit anti-MKSI (Proteintech 16206-1-AP, at 1:300) and rabbit anti-p38 MAPK Antibody (Cell Signaling, #9212, at 1:1,000).

Plasmid DNA transfection (1 microgram per well in a 6-well plate) was performed with Lipofectamine2000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 11668-019), according to the supplier’s protocol. Opti-MEM (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 31985-062) was used to dilute the plasmids or mutant alleles. Human Wild-type plasmids were a kind gift from Dr Dan Hanson at University of Manchester, UK as previously published. Myc-tagged CUL7, V5-tagged-OBSL1 and CCDC8. Lipofectamine RNAiMax (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 13778-075) was used for siRNA transfection of pooled siRNAs at a total final concentration of 20 nM, according to the supplier’s protocol. Opti-MEM (Thermo Fisher Scientific, 31985-062) was used to dilute the ON-TARGETplus siRNA SMARTpools (Dharmacon). Non-targeting pool siCtrl (D-001810-10), mouse iHO8 (L-058417-00), mouse iM85 (L-058142-01), mouse CUL7 (L-054741-01), mouse Cdc8 (L-056756-07), RT-qPCR. RNA was isolated from cells using RNeasy Mini kit (Qiagen) an reverse transcription was performed using Superscript III (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Quantitative real-time PCR was carried out using Sybr Green (Qiagen) and run in a MyiQ Single-color real-time PCR detection system (Bio-as Laboratories). Data were normalized to Gapdh. The mouse primer sequences (Sigma) used and concomitant annealing temperatures can be provided upon request. The ΔΔCT method was used for statistical analysis to determine gene expression levels.

Western blot. Protein lysates were prepared using RIPA lysis buffer. To correct for protein content BCA protein assay (Pierce) was performed. Anti-MAPK (1:1,000) was used as loading control in combination with Coomassie Blue staining. After SDS-PAGE separation and transfer, the PVDF membranes were blocked in 5% dried skim milk in TBS with 0.5% Tween. The primary antibody (or anti-CUL7 at 1:500) was incubated overnight at 4°C. The secondary swine anti-rabbit and rabbit anti-mouse antibodies which are HRP conjugated (DAKO, dilution 1:2,000) were used for incubation. After washing, the PVDF membranes were incubated in TBS with 0.5% Tween with horseradish peroxidase-conjugated rabbit anti-mouse antibodies (1:300, DAKO, dilution 1:20,000) and rabbit anti-MKS1, 1:300) were performed at 4°C for 60 min in 1% BSA. Primary antibody incubations (mouse anti-acetylated tubulin 1:20,000, rabbit anti-MKS1, 1:300) were performed at 4°C for 60 min in 1% BSA. Goat anti-mouse 488/rabbit 568 Alexa secondary antibody (Thermo Fisher Scientific, dilution 1:500) and DAPI incubations were performed for 2 h at RT. Coverslips were mounted in Fluormount G (Cell Lab, Beckman Coulter). Confocal imaging was performed using Zeiss LSM700 confocal laser microscope and images were processed with the ZEN 2012 software.

Statistics. Values were calculated from normally distributed data sets using a two-tailed Student’s t-test, or one-way ANOVA with Dunnett’s post hoc test, or two-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post hoc tests. Statistical analyses represent the mean of at least three independent experiments; error bars represent s.e.m. or indicated otherwise.

Data availability. Interaction, and complex data are available and is http://landscape. sacolga.org. Additionally, the protein interactions from this publication have been submitted to the IMEx (http://www.imexconsortium.org/) consortium through IntAct (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/intact/) and assigned the identifier IM-25054.
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