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ABSTRACT

Pex11p plays a crucial role in peroxisome fission. Previously, it was shown that a conserved N-terminal amphipathic helix in Pex11p, termed Pex11-Amph, was necessary for peroxisomal fission in vivo while in vitro studies revealed that this region alone was sufficient to bring about tubulation of liposomes with a lipid consistency resembling the peroxisomal membrane. However, molecular details of how Pex11-Amph remodels the peroxisomal membrane remain unknown. Here we have combined in silico, in vitro and in vivo approaches to gain insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying Pex11-Amph activity. Using molecular dynamics simulations, we observe that Pex11-Amph peptides form linear aggregates on a model membrane. Furthermore, we identify mutations that disrupted this aggregation in silico, which also abolished the peptide’s ability to remodel liposomes in vitro, establishing that Pex11p oligomerisation plays a direct role in membrane remodelling. In vivo studies revealed that these mutations resulted in a strong reduction in Pex11 protein levels, indicating that these residues are important for Pex11p function. Taken together, our data demonstrate the power of combining in silico techniques with experimental approaches to investigate the molecular mechanisms underlying Pex11p-dependent membrane remodelling.

1. Introduction

Peroxisomes are membrane-bound cellular organelles that are found in almost all eukaryotes. They perform various metabolic functions, including the β-oxidation of fatty acids and detoxification of reactive oxygen species, especially hydrogen peroxide [1]. Failure in peroxisome formation in human cells results in peroxisomal biogenesis disorders such as conditions of the Zellweger spectrum [2].

Peroxisomes are remarkably diverse and can change dramatically in abundance, size and content in response to numerous cues. Peroxisome numbers are maintained predominantly by fission, a multistep process including peroxisomal membrane elongation, constriction and scission [3]. The Pex11 protein, one of the most abundant peroxisomal membrane proteins, acts directly in peroxisomal fission in plants, yeasts and mammals. It participates in early stages of the cascade by initiating elongation of the peroxisomal membrane prior to fission [4,5]. Following this, members of the dynamin-related protein1 (DRP1) family [6,7], together with Fis1p [8] and Pex11p [9], bring about the final fission step. DRPs belong to a superfamily of large GTPases that regulate membrane structure via oligomerization and GTP-dependent conformational changes [10,11]. DRPs can assemble to form helical structures in vitro [12] and are termed “mechanoenzymes” due to their ability to translate chemical energy into mechanical force [13]. They can be recruited to the required site of action by sensing areas of high membrane curvature [14]. Members of this family involved in peroxisome fission include Drp3A in Arabidopsis thaliana [15], Vps1p and Dnm1p in the yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae [7], Dnm1p in the yeast Hansenula polymorpha and the fungi Penicillium chrysogenum [16,17], and Drp1 in mammals [6,18]. Fis1p is a tail anchored membrane protein that associates with membranes through its C-terminal transmembrane domain. Fis1p interacts with DRPs in yeasts and mammals [19,20] while it was also reported to bind Pex11p [21,22]. Fis1p contributes to fission by recruiting DRPs to organelles and it is also likely to play a role in DRP self-assembly [19,23,24].
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Although the pivotal role of Pex11p in peroxisomal fission is well established, the molecular mechanisms underlying Pex11p-dependent membrane elongation are still not fully understood. Recently Opaliński et al. demonstrated that the N-terminus of P. chrysogenum Pex11p (PcPex11p) contains a conserved amphipathic helix, termed Pex11-Amph, which binds to membranes and alters the shape of liposomes, leading to tubulation. Through the use of mutants, the amphipathic properties of Pex11-Amph were found to be crucial for the function of Pex11p in peroxisome proliferation [4], data that support a model where Pex11-Amph inserts into the peroxisomal membrane to induce membrane curvature. However, details of how Pex11-Amph induces membrane remodelling remain unknown due to the limitations of experimental methods.

In this work, we have used Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulations to investigate the interplay between Pex11-Amph from P. chrysogenum [4] and a model peroxisomal membrane. We used the MARTINI coarse-grained (CG) force field [25], which enabled the use of large system sizes required to observe the collective peptide effect on membrane remodelling [26]. Our CG MD simulations revealed specific aggregation patterns of Pex11-Amph on the model membrane. With this information we were able to design loss-of-function mutant peptides that displayed decreased aggregation profiles in silico. Peptides bearing these mutations displayed a reduced ability to alter the morphology of liposomes in vitro, while we also demonstrate that these residues play an important role in Pex11p function in vivo. Taken together, this work illustrates the power of combining MD simulations with experiments to investigate the molecular mechanisms of membrane remodelling.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Simulation setup

The lipid compositions of the membranes are the same as used by Opaliński et al. [4]. Three different lipid composition model membranes were built up: DOPC (1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine), DOPC/DOPE (1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine) at a ratio of 70:30, and DOPC/DOPE/DOPS (1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phospho-L-serine)/CL (tetra oleoyl-cardiolipin)/PI (phosphatidylinositol) at a ratio of 55:30:5:5:5 - the last mixture mimicking the phospholipid composition of the peroxisomal membrane from the yeast P. chria pastoris. The simulated peptide is the P. chrysogenum Pex11-Amph, with sequence YNAVKKQFFTRKIMRGKFLLEHLKAAA. The secondary structure was assumed to be entirely α-helical. Membrane patches of the composition described above, periodic in the x and y dimensions, were built using the plugin tool [27]. The lipids were described by MARTINI lipid parameters [25,28-31]. For the peptides, the improved MARTINI protein parameters [32] were employed.

2.2. Peptide number and placement

The concentration of peptide in the membrane used in experiments is difficult to know exactly, since part of the peptide will remain in the aqueous phase and only a fraction will partition to the bilayers. Knowing the global concentrations of liposomes and peptides, and assuming a typical partition constant, \( K_p \), of \( 10^4 \) for the binding of cationic alpha-helical peptides to anionic membranes [33], one can estimate the bound peptide fraction as:

\[
X_l = \frac{K_p \gamma_l}{1 + K_p \gamma_l},
\]

in which \( [L] \) is the global phospholipid concentration and \( \gamma_l \) the lipids' molar volume as a bilayer (approximately \( 0.8 \text{ M}^{-1} \) for fluid bilayers) [33]. Using the experimental peptide and lipid concentration from Opaliński et al. [4], of \( 50 \mu\text{M} \) and \( 0.65 \text{ mg/mL} \), respectively, this estimate yielded a bound lipid-to-peptide ratio of 20:1 (lipid concentration conversion to molar units was performed using each of the components' exact molar mass — for DOPC, DOPE, DOPS and CL — or the average molar mass — for PI). The estimate also assumed that the bound ratio was the same for all lipid compositions, which is likely not the case (as zwitterionic membranes will have a weaker charge interaction with the peptides). Simulations at a constant bound ratio were chosen so as to highlight any composition-specific behaviour differences that might otherwise be masked by the use of different concentrations. On attempting to place peptides on a single leaflet at the 20:1 global lipid-to-peptide ratio we found the peptides become impractically crowded. We settled, then, for placing the peptides on a single leaflet at a 40:1 lipid-to-peptide ratio, which locally corresponds to the 20:1 ratio as long as the peptides remain bound to that leaflet.

To place the peptides on the membrane surface but allow time for an optimal orientation to be reached and prevent untimely aggregation the following procedure was developed: the peptides were distributed on a plane in a way to have the desired density without peptide–peptide contacts. This peptide surface was placed above an equilibrated membrane (at an average 2.5 nm distance between backbone beads and the centre of the bilayer) and solvent/lipid contacts were relaxed by a 2000-step steepest descents energy minimization procedure. An equilibration was then carried out to let the peptides rotate and find their most favourable interaction interface with the membrane, for at least 1 μs (although converged rotation could already be attained in the 500 ns scale). During this equilibration peptides were prevented from leaving the membrane by imposing a harmonic potential in x of 500 kJ/mol/nm on each peptide's N and C terminal backbone beads. To prevent lateral diffusion and premature peptide–peptide interactions, the same N and C terminal beads were restrained in x and y movement (with 200 kJ/mol/nm force) for the duration of this adsorption procedure. This set of terminal restraints allows the peptides to rotate around their helical axis, and therefore adopt the most favourable orientation to interact with the bilayer. This initial construction of the system was done at a small scale (~400 lipids and 11 peptides), that was then multiplied to the final size for production. Fig. 1 shows the models of lipids, peptides, and a snapshot of one of the membrane systems for production — which contain around 4000 lipids and 99 peptides, with an initial box size of 38 nm × 38 nm × 16 nm. These membrane systems were then production-run for at least 5.3 μs without any restraints.

2.3. Simulation parameters

All the MD simulations were performed using the GROMACS software package version 4.6 [34]. Periodic boundary conditions in all directions were imposed. The temperature was weakly coupled (coupling time 1.0 ps) to 323 K, using the Berendsen thermostat [35]. The pressure was coupled (coupling time of 1.0 ps and compressibility of \( 3.0 \times 10^{-5} \)), using a semi-isotropic Berendsen barostat, in which the lateral and perpendicular pressures were coupled independently at 1 bar, corresponding to a tension-free state of the membrane. A time step of 20 fs was used. Non-bonded interactions were computed using the “common” set of MARTINI parameters [36], implying switching the Lennard-Jones potentials to zero from 0.9 to 1.2 nm (pair-list update frequency of once per 10 steps) and electrostatics calculated as Coulomb interactions shifted to zero from 0 nm to the same 1.2 nm cutoff.

2.4. MD analysis

Peptide aggregation was initially analysed by counting backbone–backbone contacts at a 0.6 nm distance cutoff. Two peptides are counted as being in contact whenever each contacts at least three backbone beads of the other. The peptides can then be divided into clusters, where a peptide contacts at least one peptide of the remaining cluster. For each peptide pair in contact a contact map can also be drawn up. We used the method described by Fraser et al. [37] to group the contact maps of all the peptide pairs, over the entire trajectory time, with the similarity metric of Jarvis et al. [38]. Since contact map analysis did not yield a clear aggregation mode, focus was then put on analysing the indiscriminate contact counts per residue. This was
performed by tallying all neighbouring residues (within 1.0 nm) of each residue, regardless of the peptide contact status described above. Analyses were performed using in-house Python code, developed with extensive use of the MDAnalysis package [39,40].

2.5. Synthesis of peptides

The peptide arrays corresponding to the amino acids 56–83 of PcPex11p (WT) or PcPex11p bearing the point mutations Phe75, His78 and Leu79 to arginine (FHL-R) were synthesized on amino- modified cellulose membranes (β-alanine membrane) according to SPOT synthesis protocols [41]. The e-Pex11 and Pex11-Φ peptides are described in [4]. The sequences of the peptides used in this study are presented in Table S.1 of the supplementary material. Peptides were resuspended in lipid rehydration buffer (20 mM HEPES, 150 mM NaCl, pH 7.4) prior to use.

2.6. Preparation of SUVs

Small unilamellar vesicles (SUVs) were prepared according to [4] using chloroform solutions of DOPC, DOPE, DOPS, CL, and PI (natural mixture from bovine liver). Lipids were obtained from Avanti Polar Lipids. Liposomes were prepared by mixing the following concentrations of lipids together: DOPC 55 mol%, DOPE 30 mol%, DOPS 5 mol%, CL 5 mol%, PI 5 mol%. A nitrogen stream was used to evaporate the chloroform and the lipid film was stored in vacuum overnight. Following rehydration in lipid rehydration buffer (20 mM HEPES, 150 mM NaCl, pH 7.4), a final concentration of 0.8 mg/ml was obtained. SUVs of desired diameter were produced by extruding the liposomes through a polycarbonate filter (Avestin) with a pore size of 100 nm.

2.7. Peptide binding assay

SUVs and peptides were mixed to a final concentration of 0.65 mg/ml lipids and 50 μM peptides in a volume of 250 μl in lipid rehydration buffer. After incubating the mix for 20 min at room temperature, a sample of 50 μl was taken and pelleted by ultracentrifugation (21 °C, 20 min, 100 000 × g). The pellet was resuspended in 200 μl of lipid rehydration buffer. Equal volumes of the supernatant and pellet fraction were then subjected to a 16% Tricine-Gel along with a sample of the total fraction. Bands were visualized using silver staining (BioRad).

2.8. In vitro peptide-peptide interactions

Wild type (WT) and FHL-R mutant peptides (20, 5 and 1.25 pmoles) were subjected to native gel analysis using the NativePAGE™ system (Invitrogen). Due to the high pI values of the peptides (WT 10.6; FHL-R 11.8), gels were run with reversed polarity. Peptides on the gel were visualized using coomassie blue staining.

2.9. Turbimetric measurements

Measurements were performed as described in [4]. SUV solutions (0.4 mg/ml) were mixed with peptides (0 to 20 μM) in Lipid rehydration buffer. Absorbance was recorded at 400 nm for 1 min at room temperature using a Perkin Elmer Lambda 35 spectrophotometer. Changes in absorbance were plotted against peptide concentration.

2.10. Construction of plasmids and strains

Plasmids and oligonucleotides used in this study are listed in Tables S.2 and S.3 of the supplementary material, respectively. The plasmid pANN0016 bearing PcPex11-GFP along with the triple point mutations phenylalanine (75), histidine (78), leucine (79) to arginine was constructed as follows: a 628 bp DNA fragment, encoding for the N-terminal region of PcPex11p containing the point mutations, complete with HindIII and Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method (Integrated DNA Technologies). The fragment was digested with HindIII and Eco47III and ligated into HindIII-Eco47III restriction sites, was synthesized by the gBlock method.
constructed as follows: a 763 bp fragment encoding PcPex11p WT or PcPex11p FHL-R along with a C-terminal HA tag was amplified from plMO00055 or pANN0016 using primers ANN PR85 and ANN PR86. PCR products were digested with the enzymes HindIII and XbaI and ligated into HindIII-XbaI cut pHIP24-Nia [42] to obtain PAOX-PcPex11-HA (pANN0017) or PAOX-PcPex11FHL-R-HA (pANN0018) plasmids. NsiI was used for linearization of the plasmid prior to transformation into H. polymorpha pex11 cells bearing the peroxisomal marker PMP47-GFP [43]. All integrations were checked by colony PCR.

2.11. Strains and cultivation conditions

The H. polymorpha strains used in this study are listed in Table S.4 of the supplementary material. H. polymorpha cells were grown in batch cultures at 25 °C on mineral media [44] supplemented with 0.25% glucose or 0.5% methanol as carbon source and 0.25% ammonium sulphate or methylammonium chloride as nitrogen source. Leucine, when required, was added to a final concentration of 30 μg/ml. For growth on plates, YPD (1% yeast extract, 1% peptone and 1% glucose) media was supplemented with 2% agar. Resistant transformants were selected using 100 μg/ml zeocin or 100 μg/ml nourseothricin (Werner Bioagents). For cloning purposes, Escherichia coli DH5α was used as the host for propagation of plasmids. Cells were grown at 37 °C in Luria Bertani (LB) medium (1% Bacto tryptone, 0.5% Yeast Extract and 0.5% NaCl) supplemented with ampicillin (100 μg/ml). For growth on agar plates, 2% Agar was added to LB medium.

2.12. Biochemical techniques

Extracts prepared from cells treated with 12.5% trichloroacetic acid (TCA) were prepared for SDS-PAGE and Western blotting as detailed previously [45]. Equal amounts of proteins were loaded per lane. Blots were probed with mouse monoclonal antisera against the HA tag (H9658; Sigma-Aldrich) and rabbit polyclonal antisera against Pyc-1 (Loading control).

2.13. Fluorescence microscopy

All images were acquired at room temperature using a 100 × 1.30 NA Plan Neofluor objective. Wide-field images were taken using a Zeiss Axioscope A1 fluorescence microscope (Carl Zeiss, Sliedrecht, The Netherlands). Images were taken using a Coolsnaps HQ2 digital camera and Micro Manager software. A 470/40 nm bandpass excitation filter, a 495 nm dichromatic mirror and a 525/50 nm bandpass emission filter was used to visualize the GFP signal. The levels of brightfield images were modified in such a way that only the circumference of the cell was visible. This image was subsequently changed in a blue colour to show the cell outline. For quantification of peroxisome numbers, strains were grown in duplicates and at least 100 cells were counted per strain. The number of peroxisomes in cells, made visible by the peroxisomal marker PMP47-GFP, was quantified manually. Significant differences between the groups were determined with a two-tailed unpaired t-test ([https://www.graphpad.com/quickcalcs/ttest1/]). The data represent the mean ± standard error of mean (SEM) of two biological replicates. For significance, p values < 0.05 are considered significant while p values < 0.01 are considered highly significant.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. In silico discussion

Pex11-Amph peptides were added onto three membrane systems: two model membranes composed of either pure DOPC or a DOPC/DOPE mixture, and an anionic DOPC/DOPE/DOPS/CL/PI membrane that mimics the lipid composition of peroxisomal membranes [4]. The initial system configuration is the one depicted in Fig. 1—or analogous in the cases of the DOPC or DOPC/DOPE mixtures. Before the production runs the peptide orientations relative to the membrane were suitably relaxed by following a specific procedure that prevents free lateral diffusion and premature peptide–peptide interactions (see the Materials and Methods). Snapshots obtained after 2.7 μs simulation, together with the cluster size distributions of the peptides for the entire trajectories are shown in Fig. 2–A. We find that the Pex11-Amph
peptides aggregated on each of the three membrane systems. In all cases, aggregates formed, in a roughly linear fashion. Besides a slightly longer aggregate in the case of the charged membrane, there were no major differences in the aggregation behaviour between the three systems. The aggregation patterns were found to be quite stable at the timescale of the simulation, and once the peptides contacted each other they typically remained bound. Peptides remained mostly at the surface level, but more crowded aggregates caused some peptides to bulge out into the aqueous phase. This bulging away from the membrane surface occurred less in the charged membrane than in the other systems, presumably due to the more favourable electrostatic interactions between the cationic peptides and the anionic membrane (see Fig. S.1 in the Supplementary material). If taken to represent membrane affinity, this observation is consistent with the experimental work by Opaliński et al., in which the Pex11-Amph peptide was observed to bind the anionic liposomes most efficiently [4]. In addition to a putative higher affinity, we also observed that the anionic lipids that compose the charged membrane tend to cluster around the peptide aggregates (Fig. 2-B), which has been observed earlier in simulation studies [46]. Again, this is likely a consequence of the peptide–lipid electrostatic interactions, with potential relevance for the Pex11-Amph mechanism of action. Multiple sequence alignment of the amphipathic helix from different species revealed that a number of positive charges in this region are highly conserved among species (Fig. 2-C), suggesting their involvement in a conserved biological function. Given the similar behaviour of the peptide with the different membrane systems it was decided to proceed only with the charged membrane, which is also the most faithful peroxisome membrane mimetic.

The apparently regular peptide organization in the aggregates prompted a contact analysis to determine whether a preferred peptide–peptide binding pattern exists. Contact maps were obtained for all the peptide pairs, over the entire trajectory, and then clustered by similarity. However, peptide pair binding modes proved to be quite diverse, with no clear main aggregation pattern (data not shown). The peptides do bind preferably in a parallel fashion, although at several shifts relative to one another. A less discriminating approach was then chosen, in which the count of neighbouring residues was tallied for each residue (Fig. 3-A). The C-terminal half of the peptide is most involved in self-interaction. The anionic C terminus itself established the most contacts, predominantly with the cationic residues of neighbouring peptides, while residues Phe75, His78 and Leu79 were the most involved in sidechain–sidechain contacts. Interestingly, two of these residues are apolar, suggesting that it is not only charged interactions that rule aggregation.

To gauge the relevance of the binding residues Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in the aggregation process we mutated these residues to either aspartate (FHL-D) or arginine (FHL-R) residues. Runs were also carried out with the C-terminal charge removed — to understand its effect on aggregation but also to be closer to the physiological case where this peptide, being part of a larger protein, has no negative charge at that particular position. The snapshots for peptides after at least 2 μs simulations, and the respective aggregation size analysis are shown in Fig. 3-B. The C-terminus uncharged peptide is able to form linear structures, albeit with a higher number of monomers or low-order aggregates than Pex11-Amph. Nevertheless, the range of aggregation sizes still overlaps with that of the Pex11-Amph peptide. The aspartate mutant displays a strong aggregation profile, but clearly with a different and less ordered aggregation topology than the linear trains. This increase in self-interaction is likely due to the introduction of three anionic charges in a peptide that already has 8 cationic charges. In contrast, mutating the three residues to arginines abolished the linear pattern of aggregation, with the aggregation sizes becoming much smaller — mostly trimers and dimers. This highlights that the aggregation behaviour of Pex11-Amph results from a delicate balance between electrostatic attraction/repulsion and apolar interactions.

3.2. In vitro analysis

Having demonstrated that mutating residues Phe75, His78 and Leu79 to arginines impact on the ability of the Pex11 peptide to
aggregate in silico, we next wanted to assess the behaviour of the Pex11 FHL-R peptide in vitro. First, we determined whether introducing the identified mutations affected the ability of the peptide to bind liposomes with a content mimicking the peroxisomal membrane. This was assessed through the presence of peptide in pelleted liposomes (P in Fig. 4-A). Similar to WT Pex11-Amph, the FHL-R mutant peptide was able to bind liposomes, albeit at a somewhat decreased level (Fig. 4-A). The replacement of apolar residues with the cationic arginine perhaps slightly compromises the capacity of the peptide to bind liposomes, since hydrophobic interactions are disturbed. Alternatively, a reduced affinity of the mutant peptide for liposomes could be a consequence of an excessive cationic density, beyond the ability of the peptide to cluster anionic lipids as observed for WT (Fig. 2-B). Nevertheless, our data indicate that the FHL-R peptide can associate with liposomes.

Next, we investigated whether WT and FHL-R peptides were able to form oligomers using native gel electrophoresis. Fig. 4-B shows that a small amount of the WT peptide could form higher oligomeric structures, as determined by the presence of higher bands in the native gel displayed in Fig. 4-B. This was not observed with the FHL-R peptide. Thus, we conclude that Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in Pex11-Amph are crucial for self-interaction. As demonstrated for several cellular processes, such interactions are essential to induce disturbances in the lipid bilayer [47–50], thereby allowing distension of the membrane prior to an event such as fission.

In order to analyse if aggregation of peptides on the membrane corresponded to their ability to alter the morphology of liposomes, turbidity assays were conducted. The ability of the Pex11-Amph to deform liposomes resembling the peroxisomal membrane was previously tested using such assays [4]. These experiments use increased turbidity as a measure of morphological change in liposomes upon addition of a peptide. We conducted similar turbidity assays using both WT as well as the FHL-R mutant peptide to compare their ability to induce turbidity. A dramatic difference was recorded between the peptides. While the WT peptide could induce turbidity at low concentrations of peptide (~5 μM) and reached maximum activity at around 12.5 μM, the FHL-R mutant peptide elicited a response only when much higher concentrations of peptide were used (Fig. 4-C). Modified Pex11-Amph peptides that are known to cause extensive tubulation (e-Pex11) or a complete loss of function (Pex11-Φ) were used as positive or negative controls, respectively. Two residues were changed to tryptophans in e-Pex11 (I69W and A83W), so that the hydrophobic interface of the helix would become bulkier and better interact with the membrane, whereas Pex11-Φ contained mutations (I69E, I72E and F75E) that reduced binding to the hydrophobic surface [4]. Taken together, this experiment demonstrates that the FHL-R mutant peptide is severely affected in altering liposome morphology.
lates the proliferation of peroxisomes [51]. To further validate our silico and in vitro data and characterize the effect of these mutations on protein function in vivo, we constructed both a WT and a mutant version of PcPex11p bearing arginine mutations at positions Phe75, His78 and Leu79, complete with C-terminal HA tag, for expression in _H. polymorpha_ pex11 cells. The _H. polymorpha_ pex11 strain also produced the peroxisomal membrane protein PMP47 fused to GFP, to allow the analysis of peroxisome abundance by fluorescence microscopy. Quantification of fluorescence microscopy data performed on _pex11_ cells bearing _PcPex11p_ WT revealed an increase in peroxisome numbers relative to the _pex11_ control (Fig. 5-A and B), which was not observed in the strain producing the mutant variant. However, western blot analysis indicated that the mutant protein was present in extremely low amounts (Fig. 5-C), suggesting that mutations to the residues Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in _PcPex11p_ have a destabilizing effect on the protein. It is possible that mutation of these residues interferes with hydrophobic interactions that are necessary to stabilize the protein on the peroxisomal membrane or perhaps these mutations inhibit the targeting of Pex11p to peroxisomes. Both scenarios could lead to protein destabilization and subsequently, protein degradation. While these data do not allow us to conclude that mutating Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in _PcPex11p_ specifically inhibits peroxisomal fission in vivo, they do indicate that these residues are crucial for _PcPex11p_ function in vivo.

### 3.3. In vivo analysis

It has been reported that the production of the WT version of _PcPex11p_ in _H. polymorpha_ cells deleted for _PEX11_ (_Hp pex11_) stimulates the proliferation of peroxisomes [51]. To further validate our _in silico_ and _in vitro_ data and characterize the effect of these mutations on protein function _in vivo_, we constructed both a WT and a mutant version of _PcPex11p_ bearing arginine mutations at positions Phe75, His78 and Leu79, complete with C-terminal HA tag, for expression in _H. polymorpha_ _pex11_ cells. The _H. polymorpha pex11_ strain also produced the peroxisomal membrane protein PMP47 fused to GFP, to allow the analysis of peroxisome abundance by fluorescence microscopy. Quantification of fluorescence microscopy data performed on _pex11_ cells bearing _PcPex11p_ WT revealed an increase in peroxisome numbers relative to the _pex11_ control (Fig. 5-A and B), which was not observed in the strain producing the mutant variant. However, western blot analysis indicated that the mutant protein was present in extremely low amounts (Fig. 5-C), suggesting that mutations to the residues Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in _PcPex11p_ have a destabilizing effect on the protein. It is possible that mutation of these residues interferes with hydrophobic interactions that are necessary to stabilize the protein on the peroxisomal membrane or perhaps these mutations inhibit the targeting of Pex11p to peroxisomes. Both scenarios could lead to protein destabilization and subsequently, protein degradation. While these data do not allow us to conclude that mutating Phe75, His78 and Leu79 in _PcPex11p_ specifically inhibits peroxisomal fission _in vivo_, they do indicate that these residues are crucial for _PcPex11p_ function _in vivo_.

### 4. Concluding remarks

_Pex11_ proteins are responsible for the maintenance of peroxisome populations in plants, yeasts and mammals [52–54]. Understanding _Pex11p_ function in detail becomes relevant in the light of disorders that arise in the absence of this protein [55]. In this work, coarse-grained MD simulations were employed to gain insight into the membrane tubulating activity of _Pex11-Amph_ at the molecular-level. Furthermore, this study establishes a number of MD simulation protocols for minimal bias approaches to simulating high densities of peptides on membranes.

While _Pex11p_ has been implicated in the initial steps of the fission process, how it achieves this is not fully understood. Our MD simulations demonstrate that _Pex11-Amph_ can form oligomers on the peroxisomal membrane while further simulations allowed us to design a non-oligomerizing mutant form of _Pex11-Amph_. Our _in vitro_ data demonstrate that this mutant peptide indeed displays a loss of function, establishing a clear link between _Pex11-Amph_ oligomerization and membrane remodelling. Support for a role for _Pex11p_ oligomerization in peroxisomal fission can be found in several reports. Human _Pex11pβ_ has been shown to oligomerize via an N-terminal amphipathic helix and this interaction was indispensable for membrane curvature [56]. In an independent study, _Pex11pβ_ oligomerization was reported to form patches on the peroxisomal membrane, marking sites for the assembly of the fission machinery, while disturbing _Pex11pβ_ oligomerization resulted in a block in peroxisomal fission [22]. Accumulation of _Pex11p_ on the peroxisomal membrane was also observed in _H. polymorpha_ cells lacking _DNMI_, with _Pex11p_ concentrated at the base of a peroxisomal tubule extending into the bud [57]. Additionally, _Pex11p_ in _S. cerevisiae_...
is also known to interact with itself [58, 59]. Taken together, our data fit a model where Pex11p oligomerization acts as the starting point for peroxisomal fission, which in turn facilitates remodelling of the peroxisomal membrane. Subsequently, additional components of the fission machinery, including Fis1p and DRP family members, are then recruited to the sites of membrane curvature, allowing the final scission step to take place.

The peroxisome membrane contains lipids such as phosphatidylcholine, phosphatidylethanolamine, phosphatidyserine, cardiolipin and phosphatidylinositol [60]. Cardiolipin is well known for its contribution to membrane bending and it has an important role in mitochondrial fission process [61, 62]. Cardiolipin is a dimeric phospholipid with a small acidic head group and four acyl chains, which gives it a conical structure. Due to this property, cardiolipin has been classified as a “high curvature lipid”, since it exerts lateral pressure in a membrane consisting of other phospholipids, promoting membrane curvature. Our simulations further hint that Pex11p-Amph interactions may require Caf4p, Mdv1p and Fis1p – peroxisome abundance in Saccharomyces cerevisiae, J. Cell Sci. 119 (2006) 3994–4001.
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