Published in final edited form as:

Nature. 2014 August 28; 512(7515): 441–444. doi:10.1038/nature13471.

The Get1/2 Transmembrane Complex is an ER Membrane Protein Insertase

Fei Wang, Charlene Chan, Nicholas R. Weir, and Vladimir Denic

Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, Harvard University, Northwest Labs, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

Summary

Hundreds of tail-anchored (TA) proteins, including SNAREs involved in vesicle fusion, are inserted post-translationally into the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) membrane by a dedicated protein targeting pathway^{1–4}. Prior to insertion, the C-terminal transmembrane domains (TMDs) of TA proteins are shielded in the cytosol by the conserved targeting factor Get3 (in yeast; TRC40 in mammals)^{5–7}. The Get3 ER receptor comprises the cytosolic domains of the Get1/2 (WRB/CAML) transmembrane complex, which interact individually with the targeting factor to drive a conformational change that enables substrate release and, as a consequence insertion^{8–11}. Because TA protein insertion is not associated with significant translocation of hydrophilic protein sequences across the membrane, it remains possible that Get1/2 cytosolic domains are sufficient to place Get3 in proximity with the ER lipid bilayer and permit spontaneous insertion to occur^{12,13}. In this study, we used cell reporters and biochemical reconstitution to define mutations in the Get1/2 transmembrane domain that disrupted TA protein insertion without interfering with Get1/2 cytosolic domain function. These mutations reveal a novel Get1/2 insertase function, in the absence of which substrates prefer to stay bound to Get3 despite their proximity to the lipid bilayer; as a consequence, spontaneous TMD insertion is non sequitur. Instead, the Get1/2 transmembrane domain helps release substrates from Get3 by capturing their TMDs and these transmembrane interactions define a *bona fide* pre-integrated intermediate along a facilitated route for tail anchor entry into the lipid bilayer. Our work sheds light on the fundamental point of convergence between co-translational and post-translational ER membrane protein targeting and insertion: a mechanism for reducing the ability of a targeting factor to shield its substrates enables substrate hand over to a TMD-docking site embedded in the ER membrane.

We have previously found that elution of substrates from Get3 immobilized on a resin can be achieved in the absence of any membranes by the addition of an engineered heterodimer of Get1/2 cytosolic domains (miniGet1/2)⁸. At physiological protein concentrations, mini-Get1/2 enabled substrate elution in a manner that was dependent on the interactions of *both* Get1/2 cytosolic domains with Get3. Notably, substrate elution by miniGet1/2 was also

Correspondence: Vladimir Denic, 617-384-7328 (phone), 617-496-5425 (fax), vdenic@mcb.harvard.edu.

Contributions: F.W. performed most of the experiments described in the study. C.C. analyzed Get1 cysteine NEM accessibility. N.R.W. performed cell microscopy experiments. F.W., C.C., N.R.W. and V.D. examined the data. V.D. conceived the project, guided the experiments, and wrote the paper together with F.W. with input from C.C. and N.R.W.

Competing Financial Interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

dependent on the presence of an engineered TA trap derived from Sgt2, a TMD-recognition factor that delivers newly synthesized TA proteins to Get3¹⁴. By chemical crosslinking between Get3 and substrate, we have subsequently found that the TA trap prevents apparent re-binding of substrates to Get3 (Fig. S1a). Thus, in the simplest model for insertion, the only role of the Get1/2 transmembrane domain is to physically link the Get1/2 cytosolic domains so that they can work together to enable “trapping” of substrate tail anchors by the nearby hydrophobic lipid bilayer. A more complex alternative to this spontaneous insertion model is that the Get1/2 transmembrane domain is an insertase that facilitates entry of substrate tail anchors into the lipid bilayer.

The spontaneous insertion model predicts that the insertion of Get3 substrates should be insensitive to genetic perturbations of the Get1/2 transmembrane domain, which mediates complex formation, as long as the function of the Get1/2 cytosolic domains is preserved. To avoid the potential for complex disruption by mutations in the six transmembrane segments (Get1 TM1-3 and Get2 TM1-3), we first engineered a single-chain version of the Get1/2 heterodimer (Get2-1sc) expressed from the endogenous *GET2* promoter in *get1* cells. The resulting protein fusion was functional (Fig. S1b and 1a), as measured using a GFP cell reporter of heat shock factor transcriptional activity¹⁵, which is a good monitor of TA protein aggregation in the cytosol due to compromised Get1/2 function⁶. Get1/2 TMs were replaced with TMs from unrelated ER membrane proteins, either Sec61 β or Ost4 (Fig. S2a). In addition, we mutated an absolutely conserved aspartic acid residue near the middle of Get2 TM3 (D271K) because replacement of this TM severely destabilized Get2-1sc (Fig. S2b and data not shown). All the mutations in the Get1/2 transmembrane domain resulted in the loss of Get2-1sc function as evidenced by elevated heat shock factor activity, with some alleles resulting in more apparent heat shock than others (Fig. 1a).

To more directly measure the impact of transmembrane domain mutations on Get1/2 activity, we first produced radiolabeled Sec22 (a SNARE TA protein that facilitates vesicle fusion in the early secretory system) by *in vitro* translation in a wild-type budding yeast cell extract. Next, we affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 and monitored insertion into ER-derived membranes (microsomes) by glycosylation at a C-terminal glycan attachment site. We observed that loss-of-function mutations in the Get1/2 transmembrane domain also caused a proportional decrease in Sec22 insertion (Fig. 1b and S3a). Chemical crosslinking between Get3 and Sec22 revealed that reduced Sec22 insertion was due to reduced substrate release from Get3 (Fig. 1c and S3b). Even though Sec22 has a relatively hydrophobic TMD that might hinder its release from Get3, another TA protein, Sec61 β , which has a significantly less hydrophobic TMD was similarly compromised by genetic disruptions of the Get1/2 transmembrane domain (Fig. S3c).

Loss of Get1/2 transmembrane domain function would be expected to cause a defect in Get3 substrate release if the ER bilayer were by itself not an efficient “trap” for TMDs delivered into its proximity by Get3 interactions with Get1/2 cytosolic domains. We carried out two stringent tests of this idea by focusing on our strongest loss of function allele, Get2^{TM2m}-1sc, which did not apparently disrupt Get2-1sc ER protein targeting and membrane topology (Supplementary Discussion and Fig. S4 and Fig. S5). First, we took advantage of our previous observation that Get3 interacts more avidly with miniGet1/2 than with either

miniGet1^{CDm}/2 or miniGet1/2^{CDm}, which contain point mutations in Get1 and Get2 cytosolic domains that abolish interactions with Get3⁸. This explains why Get3-Sec22 association with microsomes during a flotation assay depends on its interactions with *both* Get1/2 cytosolic domains⁸: avidity is necessary for targeting complexes to remain membrane-bound in the absence of Get3 re-binding during the three hours in which microsomes float to the top of a density gradient. Consistent with our starting hypothesis, we found that Get3-Sec22 targeting complexes maintained a better association with Get2^{TM2m}-Get1^{sc} microsomes relative to control Get2^{CDm}/Get1 microsomes (Fig. 2a). As a second test, we adapted our TA trap system to work on the surface of membranes by preparing proteoliposomes with three ingredients: a phospholipid mixture that approximated the composition of the ER membrane, trace amounts of a Ni-NTA phospholipid for subsequent tethering of the His₆-tagged TA trap, and Get2^{TM2m}-Get1^{sc} that we affinity purified from yeast in complex with endogenous Get3 (Fig. 2b and S6a). In further support of our hypothesis, we observed that the TA trap increased substrate release from Get2^{TM2m}-Get1^{sc} proteoliposomes (Fig. 2b). Importantly, the TA trap was not able to rescue the substrate release defect of Get2/Get1^{CDm} proteoliposomes (Fig. 2b and S6b). In sum, our data demonstrate that the ER bilayer is by itself not an efficient “trap” for TA proteins delivered to its proximity by Get3 interactions with the cytosolic domains of Get1/2. They also argue that the Get1/2 complex has a distinct insertase function that resides in its transmembrane domain and that can be genetically separated from the function of its cytosolic domains.

We hypothesized that Get1/2 interacts with substrate TMDs to couple the release of TA proteins from Get3 to the subsequent membrane insertion step. To test this idea, we needed a means to stabilize potential Get1/2-substrate interactions during the rapid insertion process. Our solution was to fuse an S-tag to the C-terminus of Sec22 and add S protein, which binds to the S-tag to form a stable tertiary structure¹⁶: S protein selectively blocked insertion of full-length Sec22 with a C-terminal S peptide (Sec22s) (Fig. 3a) without compromising Get1/2's ability to drive release of the road-blocked substrate from Get3 (Fig. 3b). To establish if road-blocked Sec22s forms a defined complex with Get1/2, we monitored by chemical crosslinking the proximity of an engineered single cysteine in the Sec22 TMD (S192C) and single cysteines at a variety of Get1/2 TM positions that do not perturb Get1/2 function *in vivo* (Fig. S7a). When we used bis-maleimido-hexane (BMH), which irreversibly crosslinks reactive thiols that are within 13 Å of one another, we detected crosslinks between Sec22 and several positions that lie along the same face of the Get1 TM1 alpha helix (Fig. 3c and S7b). We also detected several crosslinks between Sec22 and positions on Get1 TM2 and TM3, as well as a substrate-crosslinking position on Get2 TM3 (Fig. S7c). Our data suggest that the road-blocked Sec22 interacts with a composite TMD-docking site that resides near the cytosolic side of the ER membrane, comprises transmembrane regions from both Get1 and Get2, and is aqueous in nature, since BMH only reacts with thiols exposed to an aqueous environment¹⁷.

Three lines of evidence argue that by road-blocking Sec22 we have stabilized a *bona fide* on-pathway (pre-integrated) intermediate. First, we detected no TMD crosslinking to an insertase-defective Get1/2 (Fig. S8a and S8b). Second, as would be predicted for an arrested on-pathway intermediate, S peptide addition following intermediate accumulation efficiently

relieved arrest and resulted in efficient “chasing” to the inserted product (Fig. 4a). Lastly, when we monitored the kinetics of Sec22 TMD crosslinking to two positions on Get1 TM1 during unimpeded integration, we observed the expected rapid and transient intermediate formation (Fig. 4b and Fig. S8c). Importantly, Sbh1 (yeast Sec61 β homolog) followed a similar integration pathway to Sec22 (Fig. S8d and S8e), arguing that we have uncovered a general mechanism for insertion of TA proteins into the ER.

Our work reveals that the Get1/2 transmembrane complex is an insertase that by comparison to the Sec61 protein translocon in the ER membrane provides an essential mechanistic insight into membrane protein insertion in general. Specifically, in the case of co-translational ER membrane protein insertion, the precise mechanism by which the signal recognition particle (SRP) hands over its substrate to a binding site located within the Sec61 channel is not known but it involves SRP GTP hydrolysis and competitive binding between Sec61 and SRP to their overlapping sites near the ribosome exit tunnel^{18,19}. In the case of post-translational TA protein insertion into the ER, we have shown that Get1/2 cytosolic domains collaborate with the Get1/2 transmembrane domain to enable efficient substrate release from Get3. Speculatively, we suggest that substrate hand over between Get3 and Get1/2 creates a facilitated pathway that overcomes the kinetic energy barrier between substrate release from the open conformation of Get3 and the thermodynamically favorable substrate state in which the TMD has partitioned into the lipid bilayer (Fig. 4c). Thus, the Get1/2 insertase mechanism, stripped away of the complexities associated with insertion coupled to co-translational protein translocation, reveals the fundamental molecular logic of membrane protein targeting and insertion: a mechanism for reducing the ability of a targeting factor to shield its substrates enables substrate hand over to a binding site that is membrane-embedded within an insertion machine.

Methods Summary

Standard methods for monitoring Get1/2 function *in vivo* and *in vitro*, as well as *S. cerevisiae* strains and plasmids used in this study are described in detail in the extended Methods.

Protein Engineering

Get1 was linked to Get2 using the sequence ASGAGGSEGGGSEGGTSGAT, previously used to link the subunits of a hexameric AAA⁺ ATPase²⁰. S-protein attachment was achieved by mixing 2 μ L of the appropriate affinity-purified Get3 targeting complexes with 0.4 μ L of S-protein (EMD Millipore) in 8 μ L of insertion buffer (22mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.4, 1.5mM Mg(OAc)₂, 120mM KOAc, 2mM DTT, 14% glycerol, 0.75mM ATP, 25mM creatine phosphate and 330 μ g/ml creatine kinase) for 10 minutes at room temperature. In the experiment shown in Fig. 4a, the S protein road-block was alleviated by the addition of synthetic S peptide (1 μ g/ μ L) (KETAAAKFERQHMDs; Eton Bioscience).

TA Release from Get3

2 μ L of affinity-purified Get3 targeting complex was mixed with 1 μ L of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=80) in 8 μ L of insertion buffer with ATP regenerating system and incubated for 30

minutes at room temperature followed by crosslinking with 0.5mM disuccinimidyl suberate (DSS) (Pierce) at room temperature for 30 minutes. Crosslinking was quenched by incubation with 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4 for 5 minutes at room temperature. Prior to monitoring Sec22 release from Get3 by proteoliposomes (Fig. 2a), we added 0.3 μ g of TA trap, to 1 μ L of proteoliposomes and incubated for 20 minutes at room temperature. In one instance (Fig. S1), membranes were substituted with miniGet1/2 and TA trap (0.1 μ g/ μ L) or mock trap (0.1 μ g/ μ L), as described previously⁸.

TMD Docking to Get1/2

2 μ L of affinity-purified Get3 targeting complex was mixed with 1 μ L of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=80) in 8 μ L of insertion buffer at room temperature followed by crosslinking with 0.2mM bis(maleimido)hexane (BMH) (Pierce) on ice for 60 min. Crosslinking was quenched by incubation with 50 mM DTT for 15 minutes on ice.

Experimental Methods

S. cerevisiae Strain Construction

Deletion strains were constructed in the BY4741 (mating type **a**) and BY4742 (mating type **alpha**) genetic backgrounds²³ by standard PCR-mediated gene knockout. A *3xFLAG::kan* cassette was used to modify the *GET1* gene locus by standard PCR-mediated epitope tagging as described previously⁸.

GET2-1sc—To introduce *GET2-1sc* into the genome, *GET2* ORF was PCR-amplified and fused by overlap extension (OE)-PCR to *GET1FLAG::kan* PCR-amplified from VDY9¹⁴. The overlapping primers were designed to fuse an amino acid linker²⁰ in-frame with the flanking ORFs. The resulting *GET2-1sc* PCR product was targeted to the *GET2* locus. TM/cysteine alleles were introduced into the *GET2-1sc* locus by standard *URA3*-mediated gene knockout followed by gene knock in with the appropriate PCR products. All modifications to the *GET2-1sc* locus were confirmed by sequencing of the genomic DNA.

Heat-Shock Reporter—To introduce the heat-shock reporter into the genome, *P_{CYC1}-4xHSE-GFP::URA3* was PCR-amplified from a vector generously provided by O. Brandman and knocked into the *ura3* locus. The *URA3* marker was subsequently eliminated to enable genetic modifications of *GET1* and *GET2* gene loci by *URA3*-mediated gene knockout.

TA Protein Aggregation Reporter—To tag endogenous Sgt2 with mCherry into the genome, a *URA3* marker was integrated between nucleotides 1809 and 1810 of the *SGT2* coding sequence by standard PCR-mediated gene disruption. The *MCHERRY* gene was then amplified by PCR from a plasmid generously provided by K. Thorn to encode a SGGGSGGGSGGG-mCherry-SGGGPGSGG cassette that was knocked into the *URA3*-disrupted *SGT2* locus.

***TDH3* promoter swap**—To replace the *GET2* promoter driving Get2-1sc expression with the strong *TDH3* promoter, we used a *URA3::P_{TDH3}* cassette generously provided by D. Breslow and standard PCR-mediated promoter replacement.

***GET1cys/GET2cys* Alleles**—To introduce *GET1/2cys* alleles into the genome, cysteine mutations were introduced at the desired positions in the *GET1/2* ORFs by OE-PCR and knocked into the *URA3*-disrupted *GET1FLAG::kan* and *GET2* gene loci, respectively. To facilitate Get1/2 “double cysteine” strain construction, we used synthetic genetic analysis (SGA)²⁴: a mating type strains with *GET1cysFLAG::kan* alleles were crossed to alpha mating type strains containing *Get2cys::nat* alleles and a “magic marker” that enabled haploid selection following diploid sporulation. Notably, heat-shock reporter analysis revealed that marking of the *GET2* locus with the *nat* cassette did not disrupt Get2 function (data not shown).

Primer sequences for all strain constructions are available upon request.

DNA Vector Construction

Bacterial expression vectors—The vectors for bacterial expression of His₆-tagged versions of Get3FLAG, Get4-Get5, Sgt2_N (TA trap), Sgt2_C (mock trap), and miniGet1/2 have been previously described⁸.

***In vitro* expression vectors**—The vector for Sec61β3F4 *in vitro* transcription was a generous gift from R. Hegde. The vector for Sec22opsin *in vitro* transcription was described previously⁶. Sec22 and Sec61β truncations were constructed by PCR with the truncation position determined by the forward and reverse primers. S-tag, scrambled S-tag (encoding TEKAAAEFKHQQRSDM), and cysteine TMD alleles were added during PCR-amplification of Sec22 and Sbh1 to prepare DNA templates for *in vitro* transcription.

Primer sequences for all vector constructions are available upon request.

Recombinant Protein Expression and Purification

His-tagged protein expression from pET vectors in BL21 DE3 *E. coli* cells was induced by IPTG followed by several purification steps as described previously¹⁴.

Flow Cytometry Analysis of Heat Shock Reporter

Single yeast colonies were inoculated into a 96-well plate containing synthetic media and grown overnight at 30°C with shaking. Saturated cultures (average OD₆₀₀ was ~10 after ~16 hours) were back-diluted to OD₆₀₀~0.1 into fresh synthetic media and grown at room temperature for 7 hours. GFP cell fluorescence was measured with the LSRFortessa™ cell analyzer (BD) and quantitated using FlowJo (version10.0) software. To correct for any variation in cell size, cell fluorescence measurements were normalized by scatter.

***In Vitro* Transcription, Translation and TA Insertion into Microsomes**

Capped mRNAs for *in vitro* translation of Sec22 and Sbh1 constructs were *in vitro* transcribed from PCR templates using the mMessage mMachine T7 kit (Ambion) as described previously⁶.

In vitro translation of mRNAs encoding Sec22 and Sbh1 constructs was carried out in the presence of ³⁵S-methionine in wild-type yeast cell extracts supplemented with Get3FLAG and Get4-Get5 as described previously¹⁴. TA protein insertion into microsomes was monitored by glycosylation as described previously¹⁴. Insertion efficiency was determined by phosphorimager analysis using a Typhoon imaging system with ImageQuant TL software (GE).

³⁵S-labelled Sec61β3F4 was produced by coupled *in vitro* transcription and translation in reticulocyte lysates (TNT® SP6 Coupled Reticulocyte Lysate Systems; Promega) supplemented with Get3FLAG (100 ng/μL) and Get4-Get5 (200 ng/μL).

Microsome preparation and TA insertion conditions were described previously⁸. The standard TA insertion time at room temperature was 30 minutes unless otherwise indicated and in the case of insertion of road-blocked substrate in Figure 3c the insertion time was 15 minutes.

Affinity Purification of Get3 Targeting Complexes

Targeting complexes were affinity-purified with anti-FLAG resin and eluted with FLAG peptide as described previously⁸.

Membrane Flotation Analysis

10 μL of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=80) were mixed with either 1 μL of 0.03 μg/μL recombinant Get3FLAG protein (Fig. S4a) or 2 μL of affinity-purified Get3 targeting complex (Fig. 2a) and the final volume was brought up to 24 μL with binding buffer (20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 6.8, 5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 150 mM KOAc, 250 mM sorbitol, and 2 mM ADP). After 20 minutes incubation at room temperature, samples were analyzed by flotation in an Optiprep gradient as described previously⁸.

TEV Protease Protection

1 μL of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=80) were solubilized in microsomes buffer (20 mM HEPES, 150 mM KOAc, 250 mM sorbitol, and 5 mM Mg(OAc)₂) containing 1% Triton X-100 or mock-treated on ice for 30 minutes. Treated microsomes samples were digested overnight with 0.5 μL of TEV protease (Invitrogen, 12575-015) at 4°C with agitation.

Proteoliposome Reconstitution

Large-scale anti-FLAG affinity purification from digitonin-solubilized microsomes was carried out as described previously²⁵. Proteoliposomes were prepared by removal of detergent from purified membrane complexes with SM2 Biobeads (Bio-Rad) in the presence of synthetic phospholipids as described previously²⁵, with one notable modification: 10% 18:1 DGS-NTA(Ni)(Avanti Polar Lipids) was also included to enable subsequent tethering

of His₆-tagged TA trap. The resulting proteoliposomes were resolved from non-membrane-associated material by the membrane flotation assay. The low-density membrane fraction was diluted into 1ml of ice- cold water and spun at 20,000g for 20 min at 4°C. The proteoliposome pellet was resuspended in microsomes buffer.

TA Release from Get3

2 μ L of affinity-purified Get3 targeting complex was mixed with 1 μ L of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=80) or proteoliposomes in 8 μ L of insertion buffer with ATP regenerating system (22 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.4, 1.5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 120 mM KOAc, 2 mM DTT, 14 % glycerol, 0.75 mM ATP, 25 mM creatine phosphate, and 330 μ g/ml creatine kinase). This was followed by crosslinking with 0.5 mM disuccinimidyl suberate (DSS)(Pierce) at room temperature for 30 minutes. Samples were quenched by incubation with 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4 for 5 minutes at room temperature. Prior to monitoring Sec22 release from Get3 by proteoliposomes, we added 0.3 μ g of TA trap, to 1 μ L of proteoliposomes and incubated for 20 minutes at room temperature.

Confocal microscopy

Single yeast colonies were inoculated into synthetic complete media and grown with shaking at 30°C to saturation. Cultures were back-diluted to OD₆₀₀ = 0.2 into fresh synthetic media and grown at 30°C for 5 hours with shaking. Live cells were then adhered to #1.5 22×30 mm coverslips (VWR) coated with Concanavalin A as described previously²⁶ and washed with fresh synthetic complete media prior to imaging. Fluorescence images were acquired on an Eclipse Ti inverted microscope (Nikon) equipped with a CSU-X1-MIL-E laser scanning unit (Yokogawa, Tokyo, Japan) and a 594 nm laser line (Cobolt, Stockholm, Sweden). 512×512 pixel images were acquired with a 500 ms exposure at 16-bit resolution using a Plan Apo 100X/1.45 NA oil immersion objective lens (Nikon) and Metamorph 7.8.1.0 acquisition software (Molecular Devices). Linear contrast adjustment was performed uniformly across each image and identically on each image using ImageJ 1.43u (NIH) and images were cropped around representative cells in Photoshop CS4 (Adobe).

Denaturing Immunoprecipitation

We used yeast wild-type cell extracts supplemented with Get3 (without the FLAG-tag) and Get4-Get5 to *in vitro* translate Sec22s (Fig. S7b) or Sbh1 (Fig. S8e). Following addition of S protein to the extracts, we removed DTT with a spin column, and then added microsomes for 15 minutes (Sec22) or 5 minutes (Sbh1) at room temperature, followed by BMH crosslinking. Samples were quenched, adjusted to 1 % SDS, boiled for 5 min, and then diluted ten-fold with ice-cold immunoprecipitation (IP) buffer (1 % Triton X-100, 50 mM HEPES-NaOH pH 7.4 and 100 mM NaCl). Following immunoprecipitation with anti-FLAG M2 resin (Sigma), samples were eluted with SDS-PAGE loading buffer.

Cysteine Accessibility Assay

4 μ L of microsomes (OD₂₈₀=40) were incubated with 16 μ L of 0.25 mM N-ethylmaleimide (NEM) in 50 mM HEPES-NaOH pH 7.4 for 1 hour at 4°C with agitation. Alkylation was

quenched with 100 μ L of ice-cold microsome buffer (100 mM NaCl, 2 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 50 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.8) containing 5 mM DTT for 10 minutes at 4°C. Membranes were collected by spinning at 20,000g for 15 minutes at 4°C and washed with 50 μ L of microsome buffer. Washed microsomes were resuspended in 10 μ L SDS-containing buffer (1 % SDS, 0.25 mM TCEP, 50 mM HEPES-NaOH pH 7.4) and boiled for 5 minutes. Boiled samples were cooled down to 30°C for 10 minutes before adding 10 μ L of 16 mM 5kDa PEG-maleimide (Nanocs) in 50 mM HEPES-NaOH pH 7.4 and further incubation at 30°C for 1 hour with agitation. Alkylation was quenched with 0.4 μ L of 1M DTT at 30°C for 20 minutes.

The fraction of Get2-1sc PEGylated (fPEG) was determined by ImageJ as Get2-1scPEG/ (Get2-1sc + Get2-1scPEG) after subtracting from each Get2-1scPEG signal the background level observed at that position in the corresponding no cysteine control reaction. The NEM protection factor (NPF) of a given cysteine position was defined as $NPF = fPEG_{(+NEM)} / fPEG_{(-NEM)}$. The corresponding accessibility factor was defined as 1-NPF.

Extended Data

Fig. S1. Get1/2 cytosolic domains and TA trap work together to prevent substrate re-binding to Get3

a. Top: Schematic illustrating how TA trap but not mock trap drives substrate release from Get3 in the presence of miniGet1/2. Bottom: Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated at room temperature for 30 minutes with the indicated concentrations of miniGet1/2 in the presence of either excess TA trap (Sgt2^N) or mock trap (Sgt2^C)⁸ followed by crosslinking as in Fig. 1c.

b. Schematic showing how Get1/2 activity can be monitored *in vivo* using a transcriptional GFP reporter.

Fig. S2. Get1/2 transmembrane domain mutations used in this study

a. Schematic of Get2-1sc and transmembrane swap mutants used in this study. Ost4 TMD ($N_{\text{lumen}}-C_{\text{cyto}}$) containing a mutation that abolishes its interaction with other components of the OST complex was used to replace Get1/2 TMs that have the same topology. Sec61β TMD was used to replace the indicated Get1/2 TMs of opposite topology.

b. ClustalW2 alignment of numbered amino acid sequences corresponding to the Get2 TM3 (G prediction server v1.0) from the indicated fungal homologs (Sc: *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, Cg: *Candida glabrata*, Ss: *Scheffersomyces stipites*, Sp: *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*) and human calcium-modulating cyclophilin ligand (CAML). Aligned positions were color-coded by Jalview and the degree of conservation is shown below as a sequence consensus histogram. * indicates 100% conservation of Get2Sc D271.

Fig. S3. Genetic disruption of Get1/2's transmembrane domain causes a general defect in substrate release from Get3

- a. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes and analyzed by Sec22 insertion analysis as in Fig. 1b.
- b. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes or mock-incubated and analyzed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1c.
- c. Left: The hydrophobicity of the indicated TMD sequences was calculated using the G prediction server v1.0. Right: Affinity-purified Get3-Sec61 β was incubated with the indicated microsomes followed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1c.

Fig. S4. Get3 is efficiently recruited to microsomes with a severe genetic disruption of the Get1/2 transmembrane domain

a. Whole-cell lysates from the indicated yeast strains were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by immunoblotting (IB). Hexokinase (HXK) was used as a loading control.

b. Recombinant Get3FLAG was incubated with the indicated microsomes and analyzed by membrane flotation analysis and immunoblotting (IB) as in Fig. 2a.

Fig. S5. Further *in vivo* and *in vitro* analysis of mutant phenotypes associated with Get2^{TM2-1sc}

a. GFP expression of the heat shock reporter in the indicated strains was measured by flow cytometry analysis as in Fig. 1a.

b. Representative confocal microscopy images of Sgt2mCherry localization in the indicated strains. White arrowheads indicate the presence of cytosolic TA protein aggregates.

c. Equal amounts of microsomes (normalized by OD₂₈₀) were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by immunoblotting (IB).

d. The indicated microsomes were solubilized in Triton X-100 detergent or mock-solubilized on ice for 30 minutes. TEV protease digestion of samples, as indicated, was carried out overnight at 4°C followed by SDS-PAGE analysis and immunoblotting (IB).

e. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes and analyzed by Sec22 insertion analysis as in Fig. 1b.

f. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes or mock-incubated and analyzed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1c.

Fig. S6. Biochemical characterization of Get1/2 transmembrane complexes and proteoliposomes used in Fig. 2b

a. The indicated samples were affinity-purified by anti-FLAG immunoprecipitation (IP) and elution with FLAG peptide, subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis, and visualized by Coomassie Blue staining.

b. Following proteoliposome reconstitution with the indicated affinity-purified proteins, membranes were separated from the rest of the material by flotation analysis followed by centrifugation of the low-density fraction. The resulting purified proteoliposomes were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by Coomassie Blue staining.

Fig. S7. Defining Get1/2 TM Cys positions that interact with TA proteins

- Cells expressing the indicated single-cysteine alleles of Get1 and Get2 from their endogenous genetic loci and the indicated control cells were subjected to heat shock reporter analysis as in Fig. 1a.
- Cell extracts containing Get3-Sec22(S192C) were incubated with S protein followed by the addition of the indicated microsomes for 15 minutes at room temperature and crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 3c. Samples were denatured with SDS (an ionic detergent) and diluted into immunoprecipitation (IP) buffer with Triton X-100 (a non-ionic detergent) prior to pull-down with anti-FLAG resin. Eluted material was subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by immunoblotting (IB) and autoradiography.
- Get3-Sec22(S192C)s was road-blocked with S protein and incubated with the indicated microsomes followed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 3c.

Fig. S8. Insertase-disrupting mutation prevents Get1/2 transmembrane domain interactions with pre-integrated TA proteins

a. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22(S192C)s was road-blocked with S protein and incubated with the indicated microsomes for subsequent crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 3c.

b. N-ethylmaleimide (NEM) alkylation or mock treatment of the indicated microsomes was followed by NEM quenching and membrane solubilization in SDS. The denatured samples were subjected to PEG-maleimide alkylation, as indicated. Alkylation was quenched and samples were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by immunoblotting (IB). Get2-1scPEG indicates the PEGylated form of Get2-1sc. Quantitation revealed that the cysteine accessibility factor of T15C was 0.97 for Get2-1sc and 0.52 for Get2-1_{TM3m}sc. Thus, the lack of Sec22(S192C) crosslinking to Get2-1_{TM3m}sc (T15C) (Fig. S8a) is unlikely due to cysteine inaccessibility.

c. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22(S192C)s was road-blocked with S protein for 10 minutes at room temperature or mock-treated prior to incubation with Get1(T15C) microsomes for the indicated amounts of time. Samples were simultaneously subjected to Sec22 insertion and crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1b and Fig. 3c, respectively. On the right is a kinetic analysis plot of the gel data shown on the left. XL indicates amount of crosslinked product between Get1 and Sec22.

- d. Affinity-purified Get3-Sbh1(L58C)s was incubated with the indicated microsomes at room temperature for 5 minutes. Samples were simultaneously subjected to substrate insertion and crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1b and Fig. 3c, respectively.
- e. Cell extracts containing Get3-Sbh1(L158C)s were incubated with the indicated microsomes for 5 minutes at room temperature and crosslinking/immunoprecipitation (IP) analysis as in Fig. S7b.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank O. Brandman and R. Hegde for reagents, members of the Denic lab for scientific advice, and J. Weissman, A. Murray, B. Stern, and C. Patil for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (RO1GM099943-01).

References

1. Denic V, Dötsch V, Sinning I. Endoplasmic reticulum targeting and insertion of tail-anchored membrane proteins by the GET pathway. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol.* 2013; 5:a013334. [PubMed: 23906715]
2. Denic V. A portrait of the GET pathway as a surprisingly complicated young man. *Trends Biochem Sci.* 2012; 37:411–417. [PubMed: 22951232]
3. Hegde RS, Keenan RJ. Tail-anchored membrane protein insertion into the endoplasmic reticulum. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2011; 12:787–798. [PubMed: 22086371]
4. Chartron JW, Clemons WM Jr, Suloway CJM. The complex process of GETting tail-anchored membrane proteins to the ER. *Curr Opin Struct Biol.* 2012; 22:217–224. [PubMed: 22444563]
5. Stefanovic S, Hegde RS. Identification of a targeting factor for posttranslational membrane protein insertion into the ER. *Cell.* 2007; 128:1147–1159. [PubMed: 17382883]
6. Schuldiner M, et al. The GET complex mediates insertion of tail-anchored proteins into the ER membrane. *Cell.* 2008; 134:634–645. [PubMed: 18724936]
7. Favalaro V, Spasic M, Schwappach B, Dobberstein B. Distinct targeting pathways for the membrane insertion of tail-anchored (TA) proteins. *J Cell Sci.* 2008; 121:1832–1840. [PubMed: 18477612]
8. Wang F, Whynot A, Tung M, Denic V. The mechanism of tail-anchored protein insertion into the ER membrane. *Mol Cell.* 2011; 43:738–750. [PubMed: 21835666]
9. Stefer S, et al. Structural basis for tail-anchored membrane protein biogenesis by the Get3-receptor complex. *Science.* 2011; 333:758–762. [PubMed: 21719644]
10. Mariappan M, et al. The mechanism of membrane-associated steps in tail-anchored protein insertion. *Nature.* 2011; 477:61–66. [PubMed: 21866104]
11. Kubota K, Yamagata A, Sato Y, Goto-Ito S, Fukai S. Get1 stabilizes an open dimer conformation of get3 ATPase by binding two distinct interfaces. *J Mol Biol.* 2012; 422:366–375. [PubMed: 22684149]
12. Borgese N, Fasana E. Targeting pathways of C-tail-anchored proteins. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2011; 1808:937–946. [PubMed: 20646998]
13. Leznicki P, Warwicker J, High S. A biochemical analysis of the constraints of tail-anchored protein biogenesis. *Biochem J.* 2011; 436:719–727. [PubMed: 21466504]
14. Wang F, Brown EC, Mak G, Zhuang J, Denic V. A chaperone cascade sorts proteins for posttranslational membrane insertion into the endoplasmic reticulum. *Mol Cell.* 2010; 40:159–171. [PubMed: 20850366]

15. Brandman O, et al. A ribosome-bound quality control complex triggers degradation of nascent peptides and signals translation stress. *Cell*. 2012; 151:1042–1054. [PubMed: 23178123]
16. Richards FM, Vithayathil PJ. The preparation of subtilisin-modified ribonuclease and the separation of the peptide and protein components. *J Biol Chem*. 1959; 234:1459–1465. [PubMed: 13654398]
17. Li J, et al. Reactions of cysteines substituted in the amphipathic N-terminal tail of a bacterial potassium channel with hydrophilic and hydrophobic maleimides. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99:11605–11610. [PubMed: 12189213]
18. Akopian D, Shen K, Zhang X, Shan S. Signal recognition particle: an essential protein-targeting machine. *Annu Rev Biochem*. 2013; 82:693–721. [PubMed: 23414305]
19. Park E, Rapoport TA. Mechanisms of Sec61/SecY-mediated protein translocation across membranes. *Annu Rev Biophys*. 2012; 41:21–40. [PubMed: 22224601]
20. Martin A, Baker TA, Sauer RT. Rebuilt AAA + motors reveal operating principles for ATP-fuelled machines. *Nature*. 2005; 437:1115–1120. [PubMed: 16237435]
21. Ghaemmaghami S, et al. Global analysis of protein expression in yeast. *Nature*. 2003; 425:737–741. [PubMed: 14562106]
22. Powis K, et al. Get3 is a holdase chaperone and moves to deposition sites for aggregated proteins when membrane targeting is blocked. *J Cell Sci*. 2013; 126:473–483. [PubMed: 23203805]
23. Brachmann CB, et al. Designer deletion strains derived from *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* S288C: a useful set of strains and plasmids for PCR-mediated gene disruption and other applications. *Yeast* Chichester Engl. 1998; 14:115–132.
24. Tong AH, et al. Systematic genetic analysis with ordered arrays of yeast deletion mutants. *Science*. 2001; 294:2364–2368. [PubMed: 11743205]
25. Denic V, Weissman JS. A molecular caliper mechanism for determining very long-chain fatty acid length. *Cell*. 2007; 130:663–677. [PubMed: 17719544]
26. Joglekar AP, Salmon ED, Bloom KS. Counting kinetochore protein numbers in budding yeast using genetically encoded fluorescent proteins. *Methods Cell Biol*. 2008; 85:127–151. [PubMed: 18155462]

Fig. 1. *In vivo* and *in vitro* analysis of loss-of-function mutations in the Get1/2 transmembrane domain

a. The amount of GFP produced by the heat-shock reporter (Fig. S1b) in the indicated strains was determined by flow cytometry analysis and plotted as the average with standard deviation of two independent experiments.

b. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes at room temperature. Samples were resolved by SDS-PAGE and visualized by autoradiography. The positions of unglycosylated and glycosylated Sec22 (gSec22) are indicated. Insertion efficiency is expressed as the percent of Sec22 that is glycosylated.

c. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes or mock-incubated at room temperature followed by crosslinking with DSS (amine-reactive crosslinker). Samples were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by autoradiography. The crosslinked product between Get3 and Sec22 is indicated.

Fig. 2. Get1/2 has a novel insertase function that resides in its transmembrane domain

a. Affinity-purified Get3FLAG-Sec22 was incubated with the indicated microsomes at room temperature. Samples were overlaid with an Optiprep gradient and subjected to ultracentrifugation. Proteins precipitated from the four indicated gradient fractions were resolved by SDS-PAGE and visualized by autoradiography and immunoblotting (IB). Non-glycosylated Sec22 that associated with *GET2-1FLAGsc*, *GET2_{TM2m}-1FLAGsc*, and *GET2^{CDm}/GET1FLAG* microsomes corresponded to 11%, 10% and 2% of the summed Sec22 signal in all the fractions, respectively.

b. Ni-NTA proteoliposomes reconstituted with the indicated mutant Get1/2 transmembrane complexes were incubated with TA trap or mock-incubated followed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1c.

Fig. 3. The Get1/2 transmembrane domain binds a road-blocked TA protein released from Get3

a. Top: Schematic showing attachment of S protein to the S-tag at the C-terminus of a TA protein bound to Get3. Bottom: Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22 or Get3-Sec22s (with S-tag) were incubated with S protein at room temperature or mock-incubated followed by Sec22 insertion analysis with wild-type microsomes as in Fig. 1b.

b. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22s was road-blocked with S protein and incubated with the indicated microsomes or mock-incubated at room temperature followed by crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1c.

c. Left: Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22(S192C)s was road-blocked with S protein and incubated with the indicated microsomes or mock-incubated at room temperature followed by BMH crosslinking on ice. Samples were subjected to SDS-PAGE analysis and visualized by autoradiography. Uncrosslinked Sec22s and a ~60kDa crosslink product between Get1 and Sec22s are indicated. Right: Schematic showing the membrane topology of Get1 with crosslinking positions on TM1 indicated.

Fig. 4. TA protein docking to the Get1/2 transmembrane domain is *en route* a facilitated integration pathway

a. Left: Schematic illustrating two extreme outcomes of the S peptide “chase” experiment. Right: Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22s was split four-ways and subjected to the three stages of the experiment, as indicated, followed by Sec22s insertion analysis with wild-type microsomes as in Fig. 1b.

b. Affinity-purified Get3-Sec22(S192C)s was incubated with Get1(L18C) microsomes at room temperature for the indicated amounts of time. Samples were simultaneously subjected to Sec22 insertion and crosslinking analysis as in Fig. 1b and Fig. 3c, respectively. On the right is a kinetic analysis plot of the gel data shown on the left. XL refers to the crosslinked product between Get1 and Sec22.

c. Working model for the Get1/2 insertase mechanism. The cytosolic domains work together with a membrane-embedded TMD-docking site to afford a coupled mechanism that facilitates substrate release from Get3 and TMD partitioning into the phospholipid bilayer. We speculate that substrate binding to the TMD-docking site reduces the activation energy barrier (dotted line) that is apparently associated with spontaneous insertion of substrates delivered to insertase-defective Get1/2 (solid line). One way in which the TMD-docking site might afford an integration path around the hydrophilic headgroup barrier is in the form of an aqueous pocket lined on one side by phospholipid hydrocarbon chains, and on the other by a composite surface of Get1 and Get2 transmembrane helices.