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ABSTRACT

During phospholipase C-β (PLC-β) signalling in Drosophila photoreceptors, the phosphatidylinositol transfer protein (PITP) RDGB, is required for lipid transfer at endoplasmic reticulum (ER)–plasma membrane (PM) contact sites (MCS). Depletion of RDGB or its mis-localization away from the ER–PM MCS results in multiple defects in photoreceptor function. Previously, the interaction between the FFAT motif of RDGB and the integral ER protein dVAP-A was shown to be essential for accurate localization to ER–PM MCS. Here, we report that the FFAT/dVAP-A interaction alone is insufficient to localize RDGB accurately; this also requires the function of the C-terminal domains, DDHD and LNS2. Mutations in each of these domains results in mis-localization of RDGB leading to loss of function. While the LNS2 domain is necessary, it is not sufficient for the correct localization of RDGB, which also requires the C-terminal DDHD domain. The function of the DDHD domain is mediated through an intramolecular interaction with the LNS2 domain. Thus, interactions between the additional domains in a multi-domain PITP together lead to accurate localization at the MCS and signalling function.
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INTRODUCTION

The close approximation of intracellular membranes without fusion between them is emerging as a theme in cell biology (Gatta and Levine, 2017). Such apposition of membranes, referred to as membrane contact sites (MCS) can occur between multiple cellular organelles; most frequently, the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) which is the largest organelle, makes MCS with other cellular organelles including the plasma membrane (PM) (Cohen et al., 2018). ER-PM contact sites have been described in multiple eukaryotic cells, and are proposed to regulate a range of molecular processes including calcium influx and the distribution and reproduction in any medium provided that the original work is properly attributed.
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INTRODUCTION

The close approximation of intracellular membranes without fusion between them is emerging as a theme in cell biology (Gatta and Levine, 2017). Such apposition of membranes, referred to as membrane contact sites (MCS) can occur between multiple cellular organelles; most frequently, the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) which is the largest organelle, makes MCS with other cellular organelles including the plasma membrane (PM) (Cohen et al., 2018). ER-PM contact sites have been described in multiple eukaryotic cells, and are proposed to regulate a range of molecular processes including calcium influx and the exchange of lipids (Saheki and De Camilli, 2017; Chen et al., 2019).

The transfer of lipids between organelle membranes is a key function proposed for MCS. In the case of ER-PM contact sites, multiple lipids are thought to be transferred including phosphatidylserine (PS), phosphatidylinositol (PI), phosphatidic acid (PA), cholesterol and phosphatidylinositol 4-phosphate (PI4P) (Cockcroft and Raghu, 2018). These transfer activities are performed by several classes of lipid transfer proteins (LTPs). In order to carry out this function effectively, it is essential that these LTPs are accurately localized to ER-PM MCS, and several mechanisms that underlie this localization have been proposed (Alli-Balogun and Levine, 2019). LTPs frequently have multiple domains in addition to a lipid transfer domain. Some of these domains have been proposed to contribute to localization at the MCS but the in vivo function of several others is not clear. One group of LTPs named phosphatidylinositol transfer proteins (PITPs) mediate the specific transfer of PI between compartments. The first PITP identified and cloned was a protein with a single phosphatidylinositol transfer domain (PITPd) (Dickeson et al., 1989). Since then multiple PITPs, with either single or multiple domains have been identified in various species [reviewed in (Carvou et al., 2010)]. Importantly, in multi-domain PITPs, although the essential function of lipid transfer is conserved and restricted to the PITPd, the contribution of the additional domains to the regulation of PITPd activity in vivo is poorly understood.

Drosophila photoreceptors have emerged as an influential model system for the analysis of ER-PM contact sites (Yadav et al., 2016). Photoreceptors are polarized cells whose apical PM, also called rhabdomere, forms contact sites with the sub-microvillar cisternae (SMC), a specialized domain of the photoreceptor ER (Fig. 1A). The apical PM and the SMC are specialized to mediate sensory transduction through G-protein coupled Phospholipase C-β (PLC-β) activation (Raghu et al., 2012). PLC-β activation triggers a series of enzymes whose substrates and products are lipid intermediates of the ‘PIP2 cycle’ (Cockcroft and Raghu, 2016) that are distributed between the apical PM and the SMC. Some of these lipid intermediates such as PI and PA need to be transported between the apical PM and the SMC. Drosophila photoreceptors express a large multidomain protein, Retinal Degeneration B (RDGB) that has a well-annotated PITPd (RDGBPITPd). Loss of function or hypomorphic mutants for rdgB represented by rdgB1 and rdgB2 alleles respectively, show defective electrical responses to light, retinal degeneration and defects in light activated PIP2 turnover. RDGBPITPd has been shown to bind and transfer PI and PA in vitro, and is sufficient to support aspects of RDGB function in vivo (Yadav et al., 2015). Interestingly, the RDGB protein is localized exclusively to the MCS between the apical PM and the SMC (Vihitel et al., 1993) (Fig. 1A), thus offering an excellent in vivo setting to understand the relationship between LTP activity at an ER-PM contact site, and its physiological function. RDGB is a large multidomain protein; in addition to the N-terminal PITPd, the RDGB protein also includes several other domains including an FFAT motif, a DDHD domain and LNS2 domain (Fig. 1B, RDGB). Of these, the interaction of the FFAT motif with the ER integral protein, dVAP-A has been shown to be important for the localization and function of RDGB in vivo (Yadav et al., 2018). However, the...
Fig. 1. See next page for legend.
functions of the two additional C-terminal domains: DDHD and LNS2. These two domains are conserved in many proteins and are important for membrane binding. The DDHD domain is particularly important for binding to PI4P, a phosphoinositide that is enriched in the Golgi apparatus. Studies have shown that the DDHD domain of DDHD2 and p125/Sec23ip; mutations in DDHD2 have been shown to cause defects in Golgi localization and function. The DDHD domain alone can bind to PI4P, suggesting that it may have a similar role in Golgi localization. However, the specific binding sites for PI4P have not been definitively identified.

**RESULTS**

The PITPd and FFAT motif of RDGB is insufficient for accurate localization of RDGB at the ER-PM contact sites

When the PITPd of RDGB is expressed in photoreceptors, it is distributed diffusely in the cell body. In addition, in the context of full-length protein, the FFAT motif has been found to be important for localizing RDGB at the ER-PM junction (Yadav et al., 2018). Hence, we asked if expressing just the portion of RDGB that includes only the FFAT motif (RDGBPITPd-FFAT) would support the function of RDGB in the ER-PM junction.

**Loss of LNS2 domain from RDGB leads to loss of in vivo function**

There are two well annotated domains C-terminal to the FFAT motif in RDGB: DDHD and LNS2. Of these, the LNS2 domain has been shown to have a role in binding to PI4P, which suggests that it may have a similar role in Golgi localization.

**Summary**

In summary, the DDHD and LNS2 domains of RDGB are important for correct localization and function at the ER-PM contact site. The DDHD domain is particularly important for binding to PI4P, while the LNS2 domain may have a role in binding to PI4P as well. These findings suggest that the DDHD and LNS2 domains may have distinct roles in membrane trafficking and function.
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Fig. 2. See next page for legend.
The LNS2 domain is an apical PM binding signal in RDGB

Our in vivo analysis reveals that loss of LNS2 domain severely affects RDGB localization and function at ER-PM MCS. While the integral ER membrane protein dVAP-A has been previously implicated in localizing RDGB to the MCS by interacting with the latter’s FFAT motif, we questioned what additional factors might be contributing for accurate localization of RDGB at the ER-PM MCS. For this we developed a sub cellular fractionation assay and found that in *Drosophila* photoreceptors, RDGB is a membrane associated protein which co-fractionates with the membrane marker, dVAP-A (Fig. 3A,A’). However, when the LNS2 domain is deleted from RDGB, the protein RDGB\(^{\Delta\text{LNS2A}}\) now mainly co-fractionates with the cytosolic protein tubulin. This implies that the LNS2 domain is essential for membrane association of RDGB and its loss from the protein makes RDGB cytosolic (Fig. 3B,B’).

While our sub-cellular fractionation assay reveals that the LNS2 domain is essential for membrane association of RDGB, it does not identify the cellular membrane to which the domain is targeted. To understand this, we cloned the LNS2 domain alone, tagged to GFP (LNS2::GFP) and expressed it in S2R+ cells. Under these conditions, LNS2::GFP was found to localize primarily to the PM with some punctate structures within the cell (Fig. 3C,D,E). To test if the LNS2 domain is also able to localize to the PM in photoreceptors, we expressed LNS2::GFP in wild-type photoreceptors (Fig. 3F). Unlike GFP, which showed a completely diffuse distribution in the photoreceptor cell body, LNS2::GFP was found to be localized very specifically to the rhabdomeres, i.e. the apical PM (Fig. 3G). It is important to note that the photoreceptors of *Drosophila* are highly polarized cells and exhibit strikingly structural differences in the arrangement of its apical versus basolateral PM. While the LNS2 domain associates to the PM in unpolarised S2R+ cells, (similar to what has been reported for the LNS2 domain of Nir2), it localizes exclusively to the apical PM and not the basolateral PM in polarized photoreceptor cells implying underlying mechanisms which allow this preferential binding.

The DDHD domain is required for normal localization and function of RDGB

If the FFAT motif is essential for interaction with the ER (via dVAP-A) and the LNS2 domain with the apical PM at the ER-PM MCS of *Drosophila* photoreceptors, then what is the function of the DDHD domain, present just N-terminal to the LNS2 domain? To determine if this domain is essential for the function of RDGB, we at first checked whether the residues that give the domain its identity and nomenclature are present in RDGB. For this, we aligned the DDHD domain of PA-PLA1 with that of RDGB and determined that all four residues D, D, H and D are indeed also conserved in the DDHD domain of RDGB (Fig. 4A). To check if these conserved residues are functionally important we mutated these four residues each to alanine (Fig. 1B–RDGB\(^{\Delta\text{DDHD}}\)) and expressed this protein in fly photoreceptors (Fig. S3A) and checked for its localization. RDGB\(^{\Delta\text{DDHD}}\) was expressed in wild-type photoreceptors (Fig. S3B) and the amplitudes of the ERG is reduced in rdgB9;GMR>rdgB flies (Fig. 2C, Fig. S2C), although probe levels were found to be unaltered across all genotypes (Fig. S2D). These findings imply that all four residues D, D, H and D are indeed essential to localize the protein RDGBDDHD\(^{\Delta\text{DDHD}}\) to the PM in photoreceptors, and that all four residues D, D, H and D are indeed conserved in the DDHD domain of RDGB and its loss from the protein makes RDGB cytosolic (Fig. 3B,B’).
Fig. 3. See next page for legend.
Fig. 3. The LNS2 domain is an apical PM targeting signal.
(A) Representative immunoblot showing fractionation of RDGB between the membrane and cytosolic fractions from *Drosophila* heads. dVAP-A, an ER integral protein marks the membrane fraction, while the soluble protein tubulin represents the cytosolic fraction. THL, Total Head Lysate; MF, Membrane fraction; CF, Cytosolic fraction (n=3). (A) Quantification showing the relative enrichment of RDGB in membrane and cytosolic fractions. The Y-axis, denoting the relative enrichment, is calculated as the ratio of RDGB in each fraction to the sum total of RDGB in both membrane and cytosolic fractions. (B) Representative immunoblot showing fractionation of RDGB$^{ΔN26}$ between the membrane and cytosolic fractions from *Drosophila* heads. dVAP-A, an ER integral protein represents the membrane fraction, while the soluble protein tubulin represents the cytosolic fraction (n=3). (B) Quantification showing the relative enrichment of RDGB$^{ΔN26}$ in membrane and cytosolic fractions. The Y-axis, denoting the relative enrichment, is calculated as the ratio of RDGB in each fraction to the sum total of RDGB in both membrane and cytosolic fractions. (C) Confocal images of S2R+ cells transfected with pJFRC-GFP or pJFRC-LNS2::GFP. Green represents signal from GFP. The white line indicated the region of the cells selected for the line scan quantified in D. (D) Line scan profiles showing the fluorescence intensity of GFP distributed along the line marked in C. Y-axis is the intensity of fluorescence while X-axis represents the length of the cell in μm. In GFP transfected cells, the fluorescence is distributed uniformly along the width of the cell while in LNS2::GFP, the highest intensity is seen at the PM and in punctate structures in the cytosol. (E) Bar graph showing the distribution of localization patterns of GFP and LNS2::GFP in S2R+ cells (n=30 cells). Y-axis indicates the proportion of cells showing either cytosolic or membrane associated pattern. (F) Western blot of protein extracts made from 1-day-old fly heads of the mentioned genotypes. The blot is probed with antibody to GFP. Tubulin is used as a loading control (n=3). (G) Confocal images of retinae obtained from flies expressing LNS2::GFP, GFP or controls. Transverse sections of an individual ommatidium are shown. Red represents phalloidin which marks the rhabdomeres and green represents immunostaining for GFP. Scale bar=5 μm.

indicating lack of any dominant negative effect of expressing this construct (Fig. 5B,C). Similarly, we found that the PIP$_2$ levels in *rdgB$^B$* photoreceptors reconstituted with RDGBP$^{ΔDDHD-4A}$ were only modestly rescued compared to *rdgB$^B$* (Fig. 4F,G), although probe levels were equivalent in all genotypes (Fig. S3D). These results collectively suggest that the DDHD domain is required for the correct localization and normal function of RDGB.

The DDHD domain interacts with the LNS2 domain

Our in vivo data shows that mutations in the conserved residues of the DDHD domain impact localization and function of the full length protein. To understand the function of the DDHD domain as a whole, we expressed an mCherry tagged version of the DDHD domain in S2R+ cells. We found that DDHD domain showed a diffuse distribution in the majority of cells, while in some cells a few punctate structures were also observed (Fig. 5A,B,C). Since there are now two individual domains, each of which when mutated leads to altered localization and loss of function, how do they contribute to the localization of RDGB? To analyze this, we generated an mCherry::DDHD-LNS2 construct and expressed it in S2R+ cells. In sharp contrast to the diffuse localization of the DDHD domain, mCherry::DDHD-LNS2 was found to have a punctate distribution very close to the PM (Fig. 5D,E,F). Likewise, the primarily PM localization of the isolated LNS2 domain was also altered. These findings suggest that the DDHD domain can modulate the localization of the LNS2 domain when present in cis.

One of the possible ways via which the DDHD domain can modulate the localization of the LNS2 domain is via physical interaction. To understand if indeed this is true, we co-expressed mCherry tagged DDHD domain (mCherry::DDHD) in S2R+ cells along with GFP tagged LNS2 domain (LNS2::GFP). When we immunoprecipitated the DDHD domain using an mCherry antibody, we could detect the LNS2 domain in the pulled down fraction implying physical interaction between these two domains (Fig. 5G,H).

DISCUSSION

The presence of multiple domains in LTPs is hypothesized to enable their correct localization at MCS. These domains are conceptualized as independent units each with a unique property contributing to optimal lipid transfer function at MCS. A similar model has been proposed for the PITPs, a specific group of LTPs that can transfer PI at ER-PM junctions (Kim et al., 2013, 2015). However, in the case of *Drosophila* RDGB, a multidomain PITP, it has been noted that re-expression of just RDGBP$^{ΔPITP}$ which performs lipid transfer in *vitro*, in a null mutant background, is sufficient to rescue key phenotypes in *vivo* suggesting the sufficiency of the RDGBP$^{ΔPITP}$ in supporting RDGB function. A more recent study has however shown that while RDGBP$^{ΔPITP}$ can rescue key phenotypes, it is incapable of supporting lipid turn over during high rates of PLC-β signalling (Yadav et al., 2018), emphasizing the importance of ensuring a sufficiently high concentration of RDGB at the ER-PM contact site in photoreceptors (Fig. 6A,B).

How is RDGB accurately localized such that it can be concentrated at the ER-PM MCS? It has previously been demonstrated (Yadav et al., 2018) that an interaction between the FFAT motif and dVAP-A is essential for the normal localization and function of RDGB. In this study, surprisingly, we found that an RDGB protein with only the PIP$_2$ (for function) and the FFAT motif (for ER anchoring) was (i) mis-localized away from the base of the rhabdomere and (ii) unable to restore RDGB function. These observations imply that additional regions of the RDGB protein, C-terminal to the FFAT motif are functionally important. To the C-terminus of the FFAT motif lies the DDHD and LNS2 domains. We observed that loss of these domains together from full length RDGB led to mis-localization and complete loss of function (Fig. 6C). Additionally, our findings that mutation of the DDHD domain or loss of the LNS2 domain, completely mis-localizes RDGB away from the base of the rhabdomeres and also abrogates RDGB function support a role for each of these domains individually in the localization and function of RDGB. The LNS2 domain when expressed by itself localized to the PM in cultured *Drosophila* cells and specifically to the apical PM in photoreceptors. These data strongly support the function of the LNS2 domain as a PM localization signal. Although previous studies have implicated the LNS2 domain of Nir2, the mammalian ortholog of RDGB, in localization to the PM (Kim et al., 2013, 2015), our data are the first demonstration of the requirement of this domain in supporting physiological function in *vivo*. Interestingly, when expressed in photoreceptors, the LNS2 domain localized only to the apical PM (and not the basolateral PM) suggesting a unique apical domain interaction partner that localizes it here. Studies on Nir2 have suggested the LNS2 domain binds PA (Kim et al., 2013); while we also found that the LNS2 domain of RDGB also binds PA (Fig. S4A–D), this lipid is not unique to or enriched at the apical PM. We also tested the role of the specific glutamic acid (D1128 in Nir2) within the LNS2 domain that has been reported to be required for PA binding and localization of Nir2 (Kim et al., 2013). The equivalent residue in RDGB is D1164 (Fig. S5A). Surprisingly, we found that a D1164A mutant of the LNS2 domain of RDGB was able to bind PA in *vitro*, just as well as wild type (Fig. S5B,C). When this mutation was introduced into the full length RDGB and expressed in *rdgB$^B$* photoreceptors (Fig. S5D), the mutant protein was still able to localize to the MCS similar to the wild type
Fig. 4. See next page for legend.
Fig. 4. The four conserved residues (D, D, H and D) of the DDHD domain are essential to support RDGB function in vivo. (A) Alignment of DDHD domain region of RDGB protein with that from the DDHD1/PA-PLA1 protein. Residues 776 to 905 of RDGB protein are aligned to residues 669 to 854 of PA-PLA1 using Clustalo. The alignment is colour coded using JalView at sequence percent identity of 40% and above. The shades of blue represent identity between 40-100%. (B) Confocal images of retinae obtained from flies expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls. Transverse sections of an individual ommatidium are shown. Red represents phallolidin which marks the rhabdomeres and green represents immunostaining for the RDGB protein. Scale bar=5 µm. (C) Confocal images of retinae obtained from 4-day-old flies exposed to 12 h light/dark cycles, expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls. Transverse sections of an individual ommatidium are shown. Yellow represents phallolidin which marks the rhabdomeres. Scale bar=5 µm. (D) Representative ERG trace of 1-day-old flies expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls. Y-axis represents ERG amplitude in mV, X-axis represents time in seconds. Genotypes studied are indicated. (E) Quantification of the light response from 1-day-old flies expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls. Each point on Y-axis represents mean amplitude ±s.e.m., n=10 flies per genotype (ANOVA followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test, error bars indicate s.e.m.). (F) Representative images of fluorescent deep pseudopupil from 1-day-old flies expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls expressing the PH-PLCζ::GFP probe. (G) Quantification of the fluorescence intensity of the deep pseudopupil from flies expressing RDGBDHD4A and controls. Y-axis denotes the mean intensity (AU Arbitrary Units) ±s.e.m., n=10 flies per genotype (ANOVA followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test, error bars indicate s.e.m.).

(Fig. S5E) and the basal PIP2 levels were also found to be unaffected (Fig. S5F). Thus the signal through which the LNS2 domain interacts specifically with the apical PM remains to be determined.

If the FFAT motif of RDGB mediates its interaction with dVAP-A and the LNS2 domain with the PM, what role does the DDHD domain serve in the protein? Although the DDHD domain was first reported in Nir2 (Lev et al., 1999), its function in this protein has not been described. However, studies of mammalian PA-PLA1 have implicated the DDHD domain in localization and function (Inoue et al., 2012; Klinkenberg et al., 2014) but the mechanism has not been discovered. Our finding that mutation of the D, D, H and D residues of this domain to 4A in full length RDGB led to mis-localization support a role for this domain in the correct localization of RDGB. Interestingly there was a partial rescue (Fig. 4C–G) of retinal degeneration, ERG amplitude and PIP2 levels on rescuing rdgbB with RDGBDHD4A, analysis of a full deletion of the DDHD domain will be informative in establishing the full impact of loss of function in this domain on the activity of the RDGB protein. Surprisingly, and in sharp contrast to the LNS2 domain, when expressed by itself, the DDHD domain did not localize to the PM but showed a diffuse cytosolic distribution (Fig. 5A,B,C). Thus, while the DDHD domain is essential for PM localization of RDGB, this domain in itself is not sufficient and cannot act as a primary membrane-targeting signal.

Interestingly, we found that when co-expressed with the LNS2 domain, the DDHD domain was able to alter the localization of the LNS2 domain and in immunoprecipitation experiments, the DDHD and LNS2 domains were able to physically interact (Fig. 5H). These two findings strongly suggest that the DDHD domain is able to influence the function of the LNS2 domain and it is likely that through this mechanism it influences the localization of RDGB, rather than a direct role in membrane localization (Fig. 6A,C). Interestingly, in the case of mammalian DDHD2, the DDHD domain appears to act in conjunction with the adjacent SAM motif (Inoue et al., 2012). It is noteworthy that the DDHD domain in RDGB interacts with and influences the localization of the LNS2 domain, a domain that binds PA (this study); this has also been shown for the LNS2 domain of Nir2 (Kim et al., 2013).

In summary, our study identifies the C-terminal domains of RDGB that play a key role in its localization and hence function. We define a novel intramolecular interaction between these domains that is required to facilitate accurate localization of RDGB at ER-PM contact sites. More generally, our study provides a framework for understanding the localization of multidomain PTPs at MCS and their function in vivo.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Fly stocks
All fly stocks were maintained at 25°C incubators with no internal illumination. Flies were raised on standard corn meal media containing 1.5% yeast. UAS-Gal4 system was used to drive expression in the transgenic flies.

Molecular biology
BDGP gold clone 09970 containing the rdgB-RA transcript was used as the parent vector for making various constructs of RDGB used for the experiments. The cDNA coding region corresponding to RDGBITPd-FFAT (amino acids 1–473) was subcloned into pUAST-attB by using the restriction enzymes NotI and Xhol (NEB). Similarly, for making RDGBDHD4A-LNS2A the cDNA corresponding to amino acids 1–655 was amplified, and for RDGBDD4A the cDNA corresponding to amino acids 1–1000 was amplified and then individually subcloned in NotI and XhoI digested pUAST-attB. For cloning of rdgBDDH4A-D, mutations were introduced in the rdgB cDNA corresponding to amino acid numbers 776, 872, 894 and 902. Similarly, for cloning rdgBDDH4A-D, mutation was introduced in the rdgB cDNA corresponding to amino acid number 1164. The resulting mutant genes were then subcloned in NotI and XhoI digested pUAST-attB. To clone the LNS2 domain alone, the cDNA of RDGB corresponding to amino acids 947–1259 was subcloned in pJFRC-C::GFP vector using the restriction enzymes BglII and NotI (NEB). A flexible linker of Gly(G)-Ser(S) of the sequence G-G-S-G-G-S-G-G-S-G-S-G was introduced between the LNS2 domain and GFP to allow independent and efficient folding of the two proteins. For cloning of the DDHD domain, the cDNA of RDGB corresponding to amino acids 730–913 was subcloned in BglII and XhoI digested pUAST-attB-mCherry with the flexible linker sequence present between mCherry and the DDHD domain. The DDHD-LNS2 construct was cloned by amplifying the cDNA corresponding to the amino acids 730–1259 of RDGB and tagging it to mCherry in BglII and XhoI digested pUAST-attB-mCherry, with the flexible linker sequence present between the mCherry and the DDHD domain.

Cell culture, transfection and immunofluorescence
S2R+ cells were cultured in Schneider’s insect medium (HiMedia) supplemented with 10% Fetal Bovine Serum and with antibiotics Penicillin and Streptomycin. Cells were transfected using Effectene (Qiagen) as per manufacturer’s protocol. Post 24 h of transfection, cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences) and imaged to observe for GFP or mCherry fluorescence using a 60X 1.4 NA objective, in Olympus FV 3000 microscope.

Western blotting
Heads of one day old flies were homogenised in 2X Laemmli sample buffer, and boiled at 95°C for 5 min. The samples were then run on a SDS-PAGE gel, and transferred on to a nitrocellulose membrane [Hybond-C Extra; (GE
Fig. 5. See next page for legend.
Fig. 5. The DDHD domain physically interacts with the LNS2 domain to regulate the latter’s localization. (A) Confocal images of S2R+ cells transfected with pUAST-mCherry or pUAST-mCherry::DDHD. Red represents mCherry. The white line indicated the region of the cells selected for the line scan quantified. (B) Line scan profiles showing the fluorescence intensity of mCherry distributed along the line marked in A. Y-axis is the intensity of fluorescence while X-axis represents the length of the cell in µm. mCherry is distributed uniformly along the line in A for mCherry and mCherry::DDHD. (C) Bar graph showing the distribution of localization patterns of mCherry and mCherry::DDHD in S2R+ cells (n=30 cells). Y-axis indicates the proportion of cells showing either cytosolic or membrane associated pattern. (D) Confocal images of S2R+ cells transfected with LNS2::GFP, mCherry::DDHD and mCherry::DDHD-LNS2. The cyan lines represent the regions of the cells selected for line scan. (E) Line scan profiles showing the fluorescence intensity of mCherry or GFP distributed along the line marked in D. Y-axis is the intensity of fluorescence while X-axis represents the length of the cell in µm. The fluorescence intensity is distributed uniformly along the line in D for mCherry::DDHD, while it peaks at the PM and punctate structures for LNS2::GFP, and only at punctate structures in mCherry::DDHD-LNS2. (F) Bar graph showing the distribution of localization patterns of mCherry::DDHD, LNS2::GFP and mCherry::DDHD-LNS2 in S2R+ cells (n=30 cells). Y-axis indicates the proportion of cells showing either cytosolic or membrane associated pattern. (G) Cartoon representing co-immunoprecipitation performed to test the interaction of DDHD domain with the LNS2 domain. Tags used for the individual protein domains are shown. Antibody used for the immunoprecipitation is indicated. Potential interactions being probed are shown in dotted lines. (H) Representative immunoblot showing the co-immunoprecipitation of LNS2::GFP with mCherry::DDHD from S2R+ cells transfected with this combination of constructs. IgG control- negative control for immunoprecipitation. **[Illustrations made using BioRender (https://biorender.com/) and Illustrator for combination of constructs. IgG control- negative control for immunoprecipitation.](http://ibs.biocuckoo.org/) (n=3).**

Healthcare, Buckinghamshire, UK), with the help of a semi-dry transfer apparatus (BioRad, California, USA). The membrane was then blocked using 5% Blotto (sc-2325, Santa Cruz Biotechnology, TX, USA) in Phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) with 0.1% Tween 20 (Sigma-Aldrich) (PBST) for 2 h at room temperature (RT). The membrane was then incubated with the respective primary antibody, overnight at 4°C, using the appropriate dilutions [anti-RDGB (lab generated), 1:4000; anti-IVAP-A (kind gift from Dr Girish Ratnaparkhi, IISER Pune), 1:3000; anti-α-tubulin-E7 (DSHB, Iowa, USA), 1:4000; anti-syntaxinA-8C3 (DSHB, Iowa, USA), 1:1000; anti-GFP (sc-9996), 1:2000]. Following this, the membrane was washed in PBST thrice and incubated with the appropriate secondary antibody (Jackson Immunchemochmicals; dilution used: 1:10,000) coupled to horseradish peroxidase, at RT for 2 h. The blots were visualized using ECL (GE Healthcare), and imaged in a LAS4000 instrument.

**Immunostaining**

For immunohistochemistry, retinae of one-day old flies were dissected under bright light in PBS. The samples were then fixed using 4% paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences) in PBS with 1 mg/ml saponin (Sigma Aldrich) for 30 min at RT. Post fixation, samples were washed thrice with PBS having 0.3% Triton X-100 (PBTX) and blocked using 5% Fetal Bovine Serum (ThermoFisher Scientific) in PBTX for 2 h at RT. The samples were then incubated overnight with the appropriate antibody in blocking solution at 4°C [anti-RDGB, (1:300); anti-GFP (1:5000), ab13970 (Abcam Cambridge, UK)]. Samples were then washed thrice with PBTX and incubated with the secondary antibody [Alexa Fluor 633 anti-rat (A21094), anti-chick (A21103), IgG (Molecular Probes)] at 1:300 dilution for 4 h at RT. For staining of the F-actin, Alexa Fluor 568–Phalloidin (Invitrogen, A12380) at 1:2000 dilution was added during incubation with the secondary antibody. Samples were then washed in PBTX thrice and mounted with 70% glycerol in PBS. For assessing retinal degeneration, retinae of 4-day-old flies were dissected and fixed as mentioned above, and incubated with Alexa Fluor 488–Phalloidin (Invitrogen, A12379) at 1:200 dilution for 4 h at RT. The whole-mounted preparations were imaged under 60X 1.4 NA objective, in Olympus FV 3000 microscope.

**Co-immunoprecipitation**

S2R+ cells were co-transfected with mCherry::DDHD and LNS2::GFP for 48 h, and lysed in ice-cold Protein Lysis Buffer [50 mM Tris-Cl, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100, 50 mM NaF, 0.27 M Sucrose, 0.1% β-Mercaptoethanol]. 10% of the lysate was aliquoted to be used as input. The remaining lysate was split into two equal parts. To one part, anti-mCherry antibody (ThermoFisher Scientific PA5-34974), (1.6 ug) was added, and to the other part, a corresponding amount of control IgG (CST, 2729S) was added, and incubated overnight at 4°C. On the next day, Protein-G sepharose beads (GE Healthcare) were spun at 13000X g for 1 min, and then washed with Tris-buffered saline (TBS), twice. The beads were then incubated with 5% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) (HiMedia) in TBS with 0.1%Tween-20 (TBST) for 2 h at 4°C. Equal amounts of blocked beads were then added to each sample, and incubated at 4°C for another 2 h. The immunoprecipitates were then washed twice with TBST containing β-Mercaptoethanol, and 0.1 M EGTA for 5 min. The supernatant was then removed, and the beads were boiled in 2X Laemmli sample buffer for western blotting.

**Sub-cellular fractionation assay**

The assay was performed as described by Sanxaridis et al. (2007) with minor modifications (Sanxaridis et al., 2007). Briefly, snap-frozen Drosophila heads were homogenised in ice-cold homogenisation buffer A (30 mM NaCl, 20 mM HEPES, 5 mM EDTA, pH=7.5). 10% of homogenate, representing the total head lysate, was directly taken for western blotting. The remaining homogenate was centrifuged at 5000 rpm for 5 min at 4°C to remove all chitinous material. The pellet was re-homogenized in the buffer to redeem any remaining membranous component from the cell ghost. This was done twice, post which the homogenate was spun at 100,000X g for 30 min, at 4°C to separate the entire membranous component from the cytosolic fraction. The pellet was reconstituted in buffer A. The re-suspended pellet representing the membrane fraction, and the supernatant representing the cytosolic fraction, were then individually used for doing western blotting.

**Lipid overlay assay**

S2R+ cells were individually transfected with pUAST-attB-mCherry::Spo20, pJFRC-LNS2(RDGB)::GFP and pJFRC-LNS2(RDGB-C164A)::GFP for 48 h, following which cells were lysed with Protein Lysis Buffer (50 mM Tris-Cl, 1 mM EGTA, 1 mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100, 50 mM NaF, 0.27 M Sucrose, 0.1% β-Mercaptoethanol). In parallel, strips made using nitrocellulose membranes [Hybond-C Extra; (GE Healthcare, Buckinghamshire, UK)] were spotted with increasing picomoles of DOPA (1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphate, Avanti Polar Lipids, 840875). The spotted membrane was dried and then blocked using 5% BSA (HiMedia) in TBST for 2 h at RT. Following this, the strips were incubated overnight at 4°C with the remaining cell lysate. Next the membranes were washed extensively five times with 0.1% TBST and then incubated with anti mCherry (Thermo Fisher Scientific PA5-34974, 1:4000) or anti-GFP antibody [sc-9996], 1:2000] at RT for 2 h. The membranes were then probed with the appropriate HRP-conjugated secondary antibody (Jackson Immunchemochmicals; 1:10,000) and binding was detected using ECL (GE Healthcare) in a LAS4000 instrument.

**Liposome binding assay**

Liposomes of the desired composition were made using the phospholipids DOPC (1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine, Avanti Polar Lipids, 850357) and DOPA. The phospholipids were air-dried, resuspended in buffer containing 20 mM HEPES (pH=7.5), 20 mM KCl and 0.2 M sucrose, sonicated, and freeze-thawed using liquid nitrogen. Post thawing, the solution was mixed with buffer containing 20 mM HEPES (pH=7.5) and 100 mM NaCl, and centrifuged at 200, 000X g for 15 min at 4°C. Vesicles were then resuspended in the resuspension buffer containing 20 mM HEPES (pH=7.5), 100 mM NaCl and 10 µg of BSA (HiMedia), and incubated with S2R+ cell lysates expressing mCherry::Spo20 or LNS2::GFP for 30 min on ice. Post incubation, liposomes were pelleted as before and the presence of the protein in the pellet or supernatant fraction was analysed by western blotting.
**Electrophysiology**

Anaesthetised flies were immobilized at the end of a pipette tip by applying a drop of colourless nail polish on the proboscis. For recordings, GC 100F-10 borosilicate glass capillaries (640786, Harvard Apparatus, MA, USA) were pulled to form electrodes and then filled with 0.8% (w/v) NaCl. The reference electrode was placed on the centre of the eye and the ground electrode on the thorax to obtain voltage changes post stimulation. The protocol for recording involved dark adapting the flies for 5 min initially, following which they were shown green flashes of light for 2 s (ten times), and 12 s of recovery time in dark between the two flashes. Voltage changes obtained were amplified using DAM50 amplifier (SYS-DAM50, WPI, FL, USA), and recorded using pCLAMP10.7. Analysis was done using Clampfit 10.7 (Molecular Devices, CA, USA). For analysis, the average of ten recordings was taken per fly.

**Deep pseudopupil imaging**

The imaging is done with flies expressing a single copy of PH-PLCδ::GFP (PH domain of PLCδ, a PIP2 biosensor, tagged to GFP) driven by the transient receptor potential (trp) promoter of flies. Flies were anaesthetised and immobilized at the end of a pipette tip using a drop of colourless nail polish on the proboscis. For recordings, GC 100F-10 borosilicate glass capillaries (640786, Harvard Apparatus, MA, USA) were pulled to form electrodes and then filled with 0.8% (w/v) NaCl. The reference electrode was placed on the centre of the eye and the ground electrode on the thorax to obtain voltage changes post stimulation. The protocol for recording involved dark adapting the flies for 5 min initially, following which they were shown green flashes of light for 2 s (ten times), and 12 s of recovery time in dark between the two flashes. Voltage changes obtained were amplified using DAM50 amplifier (SYS-DAM50, WPI, FL, USA), and recorded using pCLAMP10.7. Analysis was done using Clampfit 10.7 (Molecular Devices, CA, USA). For analysis, the average of ten recordings was taken per fly.
polish. The flies were then placed on the stage of an Olympus IX71 microscope, and the fluorescent pseudopupil focussed using a 10X objective lens. For imaging the deep pseudopupil, the flies were first adapted to red light for 6 min, following which a blue flash of 90 msec was given. The emitted fluorescence was captured, and its intensity was measured using Image J from NIH (Bethesda, MD, USA). Quantification of the fluorescence intensity was done by measuring the intensity values per unit area of the pseudopupil. The values are represented as mean +/- s.e.m.

**Statistical analysis**

Statistical tests were done using unpaired two-tailed t-test or ANOVA, followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test as mentioned in the figure legends. P values are represented as **** for P<0.0001; *** for P<0.001; ** for P<0.01; * for P<0.05; and ns (not significant) for P>0.05.
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