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Wnt regulation: exploring Axin-Disheveled interactions and defining mechanisms by which the SCF E3 ubiquitin ligase is recruited to the destruction complex

Kristina N. Schaefer, Mira I. Pronobis, Clara E. Williams, Sheping Zhang, Lauren Bauer, Dennis Goldfarb, Feng Yan, M. Ben Major, and Mark Peifer

ABSTRACT

Wnt signaling plays key roles in embryonic development and adult stem cell homeostasis and is altered in human cancer. Signaling is turned on and off by regulating stability of the effector β-catenin (β-cat). The multiprotein destruction complex binds and phosphorylates β-cat and transfers it to the SCF-TrCP E3-ubiquitin ligase for ubiquitination and destruction. Wnt signals act through Dishevelled to turn down the destruction complex, stabilizing β-cat. Recent work clarified underlying mechanisms, but important questions remain. We explore β-cat transfer from the destruction complex to the E3 ligase, and test models suggesting Dishevelled and APC2 compete for association with Axin. We find that Slimb/TrCP is a dynamic component of the destruction complex biomolecular condensate, while other E3 proteins are not. Recruitment requires Axin and not APC, and Axin’s RGS domain plays an important role. We find that elevating Dishevelled levels in Drosophila embryos has paradoxical effects, promoting the ability of limiting levels of Axin to turn off Wnt signaling. When we elevate Dishevelled levels, it forms its own cytoplasmic puncta, but these do not recruit Axin. Superresolution imaging in mammalian cells raises the possibility that this may result by promoting Dishevelled:Dishevelled interactions at the expense of Dishevelled: Axin interactions when Dishevelled levels are high.

INTRODUCTION

During embryonic development, cells must choose fate based on their position within the unfolding body plan. One key is cell-cell signaling, by which cells communicate positional information to neighbors and ultimately direct downstream transcriptional programs. A small number of conserved signaling pathways play an inordinately important role in these events in all animals. These include the Hedgehog, Notch, Receptor Tyrosine kinase, BMP/TGFβ, and Wnt pathways, which influence development of most tissues and organs (Basson, 2012). These same signaling pathways regulate tissue stem cells during tissue homeostasis and play critical roles in
most solid tumors. Due to their powerful effects on cell fate and behavior, evolution has shaped dedicated machinery that keeps each signaling pathway definitively off in the absence of ligand.

In the Wnt pathway, signaling is turned on and off by regulating stability of the key effector β-catenin (βcat; reviewed in Nusse and Clevers, 2017). In the absence of Wnt ligands, newly synthesized βcat is rapidly captured by the multiprotein destruction complex (Figure 1A). Within this complex, the protein Axin acts as a scaffold, recruiting multiple partners. Axin and adenomatous polyposis coli (APC) bind βcat and present it to the kinases casein kinase 1 (CK1) and glycogen synthase kinase 3 (GSK3) for phosphorylation of a series of N-terminal serine and threonine residues on βcat.

It has become increasingly clear that the destruction complex is not a simple four-protein entity. Instead, Axin directs assembly of destruction complex proteins into what the field originally described as “puncta.” We now recognize these as examples of supermolecular, nonmembrane bound cellular compartments (reviewed in Gammons and Bienz, 2017; Schaefer and Peifer, 2019), referred to as biomolecular condensates (Banani et al., 2017). Condensate formation is driven by Axin polymerization via its DIX domain, by APC function, and by other multivalent interactions (for example Fagotto et al., 1999; Kishida et al., 1999; Cliffe et al., 2003; Schwarz-Romond et al., 2007a; Faux et al., 2008; Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011; Kunttas-Tatli et al., 2014; Pronobis et al., 2015, 2017; Thorvaldsen et al., 2015).

Ubiquitination by E3 ubiquitin ligases is a key mechanism for regulating protein stability. Once the destruction complex templates βcat phosphorylation, the most N-terminal phosphorylated serine forms part of the core of a recognition motif for a Skp-Cullin-F-box (SCF)-class E3 ubiquitin ligase. This E3 ligase ubiquitinates βcat for proteasomal destruction (Jiang and Struhl, 1998; Stamos and Wei, 2013). SCF-class E3 ligases include Cullin1 (Cul1), Skp1, F-box proteins, and Ring box (RBX) subunits (Figure 1B), which work together to bind substrates and attach multiple ubiquitin moieties (Lee and Diehl, 2014). Cul1 is the scaffold of the complex, at one end binding Rbx1 and its associated E2-Ubiquitin proteins and at the other end binding Skp1. Skp1(SkpA in Drosophila) links Cul1 and the F-box protein—in this case, βTrCP, βTrCP (Slimb in Drosophila) contains the substrate recognition domain of the E3 ligase. The βcat recognition site spans the WD40 repeats on the C-terminal end of βTrCP (Wu et al. 2003). This domain forms a propeller structure with a pocket that binds only to phosphorylated proteins. βTrCP can bind multiple phospho-proteins and thus regulate diverse cell signaling pathways (e.g., Nfxb and Hedgehog signaling). After βTrCP-βcat binding, βcat is poly-ubiquitinated and can now be recognized by the proteasome. While down-regulation of βcat levels via protein degradation is a key function of the destruction complex, our understanding of how βcat is transferred from the complex to the SCF E3 ligase is a key unanswered question.

Two classes of models seem plausible. In the first class of models, the E3 ligase is a physical entity separate from the destruction complex—this would fit with the many roles for the SCFSlimb E3 ligase, which binds and ubiquitinates diverse phospho-proteins, ranging from the Hedgehog effector Ctgli to the centrosome assembly regulator PLK4 (Robertson et al., 2018). However, given the abundance of cellular phosphatases, this model has a potential major problem. Phosphorylated βcat released free from the destruction complex into the cytoplasm would likely be rapidly dephosphorylated, preventing its recognition by the E3 ligase. Consistent with this, earlier work revealed that APC helps prevent βcat dephosphorylation within the destruction complex (Su et al., 2008). In a second class of models, the SCFSlimb E3 ligase might directly dock on or even become part of the destruction complex, either by direct interaction with destruction complex proteins or by using phosphorylated βcat as a bridge. In this model, once βcat is phosphorylated it could be directly transferred to the E3 ligase, thus preventing dephosphorylation of βcat by cellular phosphatases during transit.

In mammalian cells, Wnt signaling is initiated when Wnt ligands interact with complex multicomponent receptors, comprised of Frizzled family members plus LRPS/6 (reviewed in DeBruijne et al., 2017; Nusse and Clevers, 2017). This receptor complex recruits the destruction complex to the plasma membrane via interaction of Axin with the phosphorylated LRPS/6 tail and with the Wnt effector Dishevelled (Dvl in mammals/Dsh in Drosophila). This leads to down-regulation of the destruction complex, reducing the rate of βcat destruction. Current data suggest destruction complex down-regulation occurs via multiple mechanisms (reviewed in MacDonald and He, 2012; Nusse and Clevers, 2017), some rapid and others initiated more slowly. These include direct inhibition of GSK3 by the phosphorylated LRPS/6 tail, inhibition of Axin homo-polymerization by competition with heteropolymerization with Dsh, competition between Dsh and APC2 for access to Axin, targeting Axin for proteolytic destruction, and blockade of βcat transfer to the E3 ligase. In our recent work, we explored the role of Dsh. We found that overall protein levels of Axin, APC2 and Dsh in Drosophila embryos experiencing active Wnt signaling are within a fewfold of one another, suggesting that competition is a plausible mechanism for destruction complex down-regulation (Schaefer et al., 2018). The competition model is also consistent with the effects of elevating Axin levels, which makes the destruction complex more resistant to turn-down (Cliffe et al., 2003; Wang et al., 2016; Schaefer et al., 2018). However, somewhat surprisingly, elevating Dsh levels had only modest consequences on cell fate choices, and Dsh only assembled into Axin puncta in cells receiving Wingless signals (Wg = Drosophila Wnt family member; Cliffe et al., 2003; Schaefer et al., 2018), suggesting that Dsh may need to be “activated” by Wnt signals in order to effectively compete with APC for Axin and thus mediate destruction complex down-regulation. Candidate phosphorylation sites and kinases potentially involved in this activation have been identified (e.g., Bernatik et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Sancho et al., 2013; Bernatik et al., 2014). Intriguingly, when Axin, APC, and Dvl were expressed in mammalian cells, potential competition between APC and Dvl for interaction with Axin was revealed (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2005; Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011). Here we examined in vivo the effects of simultaneously altering levels of Dsh and Axin, testing aspects of the competition model, and combined this with analysis of how Dsh and Axin affect one another’s assembly into puncta in a simple cell culture model, using structured illumination superresolution microscopy.

**RESULTS**

A system to examine whether the destruction complex and the SCFSlimb E3 ligase colocalize

The transfer of phosphorylated βcat from the destruction complex to the E3 ubiquitin ligase to begin βcat degradation is a crucial step...
FIGURE 1: Slimb is recruited into the destruction complex by Axin. (A) Diagram illustrating components of the multiprotein destruction complex. (B) Diagram illustrating the components of the SCF^{βTrCP} E3 ubiquitin ligase. (C–I) SW480 cells transfected with the indicated constructs encoding the Drosophila proteins. (C) Expression of GFP:APC2 is diffuse throughout cytoplasm and nucleus. SW480 cells lack a functional human APC and thus have high levels of βcat. Addition of Drosophila APC2 rescues βcat destruction. (D) Axin:RFP expressed alone forms cytoplasmic puncta due to Axin's polymerization domain. (E) When coexpressed, Axin:RFP recruits GFP:APC2 into Axin puncta. (F) When expressed alone, Slimb:GFP exhibits diffuse localization the cytoplasm and nucleus. (G) When coexpressed, GFP:APC2 and Flg:Axin can robustly recruit RFP:Slimb into puncta. (H, I) Axin:RFP can recruit Slimb:GFP into puncta. Axin:RFP either recruits a fraction of Slimb into puncta, leaving a large cytoplasmic pool of Slimb:GFP (H), or robustly recruits most of Slimb:GFP into puncta (I). Scale bar = 10 µm. Insets are higher magnification images from the same cell.
in Wnt signaling regulation, which remains incompletely understood. One key question in the field involves the mechanism by which βcat is transferred from one complex to the other. Do they each form separate structures within the cytoplasm of the cells, thus relying on either diffusion or some form of protein shuttle to move βcat between them? Or is there a “factory” for βcat destruction, containing the machinery to first phosphorylate βcat and then directly pass it down the assembly line to the E3 ligase? Previous work is more consistent with the latter model, as Axin and APC can communoprecipitate (co-IP) with mammalian βTrCP (Hart et al., 1999; Kitagawa et al., 1999; Liu et al., 1999; Li et al., 2012) and one role of APC is to protect βcat from dephosphorylation before it is ubiquitinated (Su et al., 2008).

We took two different approaches. For our studies, we expressed Drosophila proteins in mammalian cells—conservation of sequence and function means they can rescue βcat destruction in the APC mutant colorectal cell line SW480 (Roberts et al., 2011; Pronobis et al., 2015; Figure 1, C–E). Drosophila APC2 is also half the size of human APC1 and therefore easier to transfected and express in cells. First, we examined recruitment of E3 ligase components using mass spectroscopy. We used affinity-purification mass spectrometry (AP/MS) to pull down Flag-tagged Drosophila APC2 that had been stably expressed in human HEK293T cells. Mass spectroscopy analysis identified the known core components of the destruction complex including βcat, alpha-catenin, GSK3, CK1, Axin1, and Axin2, as well as other proteins previously identified to interact with the destruction complex by mass spectroscopy (e.g., WTX/AMER1, plakoglobin, USP7, and CTBP; Major et al., 2007; Hilger and Mann, 2012; Li et al., 2012). Our list also included a number of components of different E3 ligases, including the three core components of the SCFβTrCP E3 ligase (known destruction complex proteins and components of E3 ligases are summarized in Table 1, while the full mass spectroscopy dataset is presented in Supplemental Table S1). Using the label-free quantification (LFQ) intensity as a measure for quantification, our data were consistent with the following hierarchical order: FBXW11 = βTrCP2 > SKP1 > Cul1. However, the recovery of these proteins was less robust than that of the core destruction complex proteins. βTrCP2 and Skp1 were also identified in previous mass spectroscopy analysis with Axin as a bait, and Skp1 was also identified in APC pull downs (Hilger and Mann, 2012). These data are consistent with the possibility that the SCFβcat E3 ligase is recruited, at least transiently, to the destruction complex.

To further explore βcat transfer to the E3 ligase, we transfected components of the destruction complex and of the E3 ligase into SW480 colorectal cancer cells to determine whether they colocalize, thus suggesting recruitment of the E3 ligase to the destruction complex. To visualize the destruction complex, we tagged Drosophila Axin or APC2 with GFP, RFP, or Flag epitope tags (Roberts et al., 2011; Pronobis et al., 2015). When GFP-tagged APC2 (GFP:APC2) is transfected in cells alone, APC2 is found throughout the cytoplasm (Roberts et al., 2011; Figure 1C). In contrast, when RFP-tagged Axin is transfected alone (Axin:RFP), it forms cytoplasmic puncta due to Axin’s ability to self-polymerize via its DIX domain (Figure 1D; Kishida et al., 1999). Finally, when GFP:APC2 is expressed along with Axin:RFP, GFP:APC2 is recruited into Axin puncta (Roberts et al., 2011; Figure 1E). Previous studies revealed that this APC2-Axin interaction leads to larger, stabilized destruction complexes (Kunttas-Tatli et al., 2014; Pronobis et al., 2015). We note that while we include βcat images in some panels, our goal in this set of experiments was to assess recruitment of E3 ligase proteins to the destruction complex, not assess their impact on restoring βcat destruction to these APC mutant SW480 cells, and thus we did not carry out quantitative analysis of βcat levels.

We next assessed whether Slimb has any specific localization pattern on its own in SW480 cells. We tagged Drosophila Slimb with GFP, RFP, or Flag tags. When Slimb was expressed alone, it was diffusely localized in both the cytoplasm and the nucleus, without obvious enrichment in any subcellular structure (Figure 1F), and Slimb expression alone had no apparent effect on βcat levels. In a few cells, there was slight enrichment of Slimb in puncta near the

### TABLE 1: Proteins identified using affinity-purification MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Log₂(intensity)</th>
<th>Unique peptides</th>
<th>MS/MS counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destruction complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APC</td>
<td>31.67</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTNNB1</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTNNB1</td>
<td>30.24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUP</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMER1</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIN1</td>
<td>26.33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSK3B</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AXIN2</td>
<td>24.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSN1D/E</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 ligase components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM21</td>
<td>27.96</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIM28</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBXW11</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SKP1</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL1</td>
<td>21.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYCBP2</td>
<td>21.53</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL3</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC27</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nucleus, which may be due to the SCF$^{\text{Slimb}}$ E3 ligase's known role in regulating centrosome duplication (Wojcik et al., 2000). This system thus provided a platform to examine whether different components of the SCF$^{\text{Slimb}}$ E3 ligase are recruited to the destruction complex.

**Axin can recruit Slimb into the destruction complex while APC2 does not**

Previous studies revealed that Axin and APC can co-IP with βTrCP (Hart et al., 1999; Kitagawa et al., 1999; Liu et al., 1999; Li et al., 2012), and βTrCP2 was identified in complex with Axin by mass spectrometry (Hilger and Mann, 2012). We first examined whether this interaction was sufficient to recruit the βTrCP homologue Slimb into destruction complex puncta. When we coexpressed both Flag:Axin and GFP:APC2 with an RFP-tagged Slimb, Slimb was robustly recruited to Axin/APC puncta (Figure 1G). However, this did not discriminate whether Axin or APC recruited Slimb.

When APC was first discovered, it was believed to be the scaffold of the destruction complex, as it binds βcat and co-IPs with the kinase GSK3 (Polakis, 1997). However, subsequent work revealed that Axin is the actual destruction complex scaffold, mediating complex assembly by directly binding all core destruction complex components: APC, GSK3, CK1, and βcat (Spink et al., 2000; Liu et al., 2002; Dajani et al., 2003). To define whether APC and/or Axin can recruit Slimb, we coexpressed Axin plus Slimb or APC2 plus Slimb. The ability of Axin to form puncta made examining Slimb recruitment straightforward. Coexpression of RFP-tagged Axin (Axin:RFP) with GFP-tagged Slimb (Slimb:GFP) revealed that Axin robustly recrui-
nts Slimb:GFP into cytoplasmic puncta (Figure 1, H and I and close-up insets; 135/140 cells examined; Table 2). The degree of Slimb:GFP recruitment into Axin:RFP puncta varied from Slimb enrichment in puncta with a remaining cytoplasmic pool (Figure 1H; 94/140 cells; Table 2) to nearly complete recruitment into puncta (Figure 1I; 41/140 cells; Table 2). While Axin puncta number varied from experiment to experiment (e.g., Figure 1, D vs. E; G vs. H), likely due to differences in transfection efficiency, we did not see any systematic variation in Axin puncta number that correlated with Slimb coexpression. Thus Axin has the ability to recruit Slimb.

Since APC2 has no specific localization pattern when expressed on its own (Figure 1C), it is difficult to assess whether APC2 can recruit other proteins. We therefore utilized an APC2 construct containing a mitochondrial localization signal (mito:APC2; Roberts et al., 2012). Mito:APC2 is readily recruited to the mitochondria and remains functional, as evidenced by the reduction of βcat levels in SW480 cells and the ability to rescue Drosophila APC2 mutants (Figure 2A; Roberts et al., 2012). Mito:APC2 can effectively recruit exogenous Axin (Figure 2B; Roberts et al., 2012). We therefore expressed GFP-tagged mito:APC2 with RFP-tagged Slimb to test whether APC2 can recruit Slimb. Mito:APC2 was unable to detectably recruit Slimb (Figure 2C; 0/10 cells examined), consistent with the idea APC2 does not directly interact with this E3 ligase component. This is consistent with previous work demonstrating that co-IP of βTrCP2 and APC required coexpression of Axin (Kitagawa et al., 1999). It is worth noting that since mito:APC can restore destruction of βcat, it must also recruit low levels of endogenous Axin, but these do not appear to be sufficient to efficiently recruit Slimb.

**Recruitment of other SCF$^{\text{Slimb}}$ E3 ligase components by Axin is substantially less robust**

We next explored whether the other SCF$^{\text{Slimb}}$ E3 ligase proteins, SkpA or Cul1, are recruited into the destruction complex. To test this, we coexpressed Axin:RFP with either GFP-tagged Cul1 (GFP:Cul1) or GFP-tagged SkpA (GFP:SkpA). When expressed alone, both SkpA and Cul1 were found throughout the cytoplasm and nucleus (Figure 3, A and B) and did not trigger any obvious reduction in βcat levels. We were surprised to find that while Slimb was robustly recruited to Axin puncta (Figure 1, H and I; Table 2), Cul1 and SkpA were not. For SkpA there was no recruitment in 48/52 cells examined (Figure 3C; Table 2), and for Cul1 we observed no recruitment in 36/42 cells examined (Figure 3D; Table 2). When colocalization was observed for SkpA or Cul1, it was minimal (Figure 3C inset; Table 2). Consistent with previous work with the mammalian homologues, we could co-IP Axin with Slimb (Figure 3, E', lane 2, and F', lane 2), but did not detect robust co-IP of APC2 with Slimb (Figure 3E', lane 3). Similarly, we did not detect co-IP of Axin with either Cul1 or SkpA (Figure 3F', lanes 3 and 4). These data suggest that Axin can recruit Slimb to the destruction complex but is unable to strongly recruit the other components of the E3. We also examined whether Slimb recruitment into Axin puncta stimulated recruitment of other SCF$^{\text{Slimb}}$ E3 ligase proteins. To do so, we coexpressed Axin, Slimb, and SkpA—in this case we saw modest corecruitment of Slimb and SkpA to Axin puncta in a small subset of cases (3/20 cells; Figure 3G and insets); however, 17/20 cells showed no SkpA recruitment. Together these data are consistent with the idea that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proteins examined</th>
<th>No colocalization</th>
<th>Partial colocalization</th>
<th>Complete colocalization</th>
<th>Total number of cells analyzed</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axin + Slimb</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axin + SkpA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axin + Cul1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxinΔRG5 + Slimb</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AxinΔβcat + Slimb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SrtAftRGS + Slimb</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axin + NTerm-Slimb</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axin + CTerm-Slimb</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of Axin's ability to recruit E3 Ligase components. Genes encoding the wild-type or mutant proteins indicated were transfected into SW480 cells. No colocalization, no recruitment of protein into Axin puncta. Partial localization, protein recruited into a subset of puncta with substantial levels remaining in the cytoplasm. Complete colocalization, all Axin puncta have recruited its partner protein into the puncta, and cytoplasmic levels are reduced. Total number of cells analyzed represents cells imaged. The number of experiments equals the number of independent times cells were transfected with the labeled protein combinations.

**TABLE 2:** Summary of Axin's ability to recruit E3 ligase components.
Slimb is robustly recruited to the destruction complex via direct or indirect interaction with Axin, and that other E3 ligase components (SkpA and Cul1) are less robustly recruited. Axin’s RGS domain is required for efficient Slimb recruitment but its βcat-binding domain is not.

Both Axin and Slimb directly bind to βcat, but at different locations on βcat (Xu and Kimelman, 2007). Therefore, some studies suggested that the Axin:Slimb interaction in vivo may not be direct, but instead might be mediated via bridging by βcat (Liu et al., 1999), or at least be enhanced by this (Kitagawa et al., 1999). APC2 is also able to directly bind to βcat. If Axin solely recruits Slimb via a βcat linker, then APC2 should also be able to recruit Slimb, something that is not supported by our data (Figures 2C and 3, E and E`). To further test the hypothesis that Axin recruits Slimb via a βcat bridge, we used an Axin mutant lacking the βcat-binding site (AxinΔβcat:RFP; Figure 4A; Pronobis et al., 2017) and coexpressed it with Slimb. If βcat is essential as a bridge between Slimb and Axin, we would expect this Axin mutant to no longer recruit Slimb into Axin puncta. In contrast, if Axin and Slimb can also interact by another means, then Slimb should still be recruited into the puncta. When AxinΔβcat:RFP was expressed alone, it formed cytoplasmic puncta, consistent with the fact that it still contains Axin’s self-polymerization DIX domain (Figure 4C), though it is unable to target βcat for destruction (Pronobis et al., 2017). Strikingly, when coexpressed with Slimb:GFP, AxinΔβcat:RFP was still able to robustly recruit Slimb:GFP into puncta (Figure 4F; 19/19 cells showed recruitment; Table 2), suggesting that the Axin–Slimb interaction is not solely a result of both proteins binding to βcat.

To further investigate which domain(s) of Axin are required for Slimb recruitment, we used two additional mutants of Axin deleting other domains or regions (Figure 4A; Pronobis et al., 2017): 1) AxinΔRGS:RFP removed the RGS domain, which is one of the Axin:APC interaction sites (Spink et al., 2000), and 2) Start After RGS:RFP, which lacks the N-terminal third of Axin. Both mutants retained the ability to form puncta (Figure 4, D and E; Pronobis et al., 2017). Each RFP-tagged Axin mutant was then coexpressed with GFP-tagged Slimb. Both mutants lacking the RGS domain, AxinΔRGS:RFP and Start After RGS:RFP, were diminished in their ability to robustly recruit GFP:Slimb (Figure 4, G and H; AxinΔRGS = 23/27 cells showed no recruitment; Start After RGS = 7/10 cells showed no recruitment; and in those cells where colocalization was observed, it was partial; Table 2). To test this interaction in another way, we IPed Axin mutants tagged with RFP and assessed if Slimb was co-IPed. Full-length Axin, AxinΔβcat:RFP, and AxinΔDIX:RFP (Axin lacking its self-polymerization domain; Figure 4A) were all able to co-IP Slimb (Figure 4, G and H); AxinΔRGS = 23/27 cells showed no recruitment; Start After RGS = 7/10 cells showed no recruitment; and in those cells where colocalization was observed, it was partial; Table 2). These data suggest that the RGS domain helps mediate the Axin–Slimb interaction.
Slimb recruitment into the destruction complex can be mediated by either the N-terminal or the C-terminal regions of the protein

We similarly asked which part of the multi-domain Slimb protein is required for recruitment. We divided Slimb protein roughly in half, separating the N-terminal F-box, which binds SkpA, from the C-terminal WD40 repeats, which dock substrate (Figure 5A). When expressed alone, both halves localized throughout the cytoplasm and nucleus (Figure 5, B and D). Strikingly, both halves could be recruited to Axin puncta (Figure 5, C, E, and F, arrows in insets), though neither was as robustly recruited as full-length Slimb (the N-terminal half was recruited into Axin puncta in 35/50 cells, and the C-terminal half was recruited into Axin puncta in 34/51 cells, while recruitment of full-length Slimb was seen in 135/140 cells, and partial colocalization [Figure 5F] was more common with the Slimb fragments; Table 2). These data suggest a multipartite binding interaction, consistent with earlier assessment by co-IP (Kitagawa et al., 1999).

Slimb is a dynamic component of the destruction complex

The destruction complex has many of the properties of a biomolecular condensate (Schaefer and Peifer, 2019). One of these is the ability of individual components to rapidly exchange with the cytoplasmic pool—Axin, APC2, and Dsh can all move into and out of puncta (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2005; Kunttas-Tatli et al., 2014; Pronobis et al., 2015). This property can be measured using fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP), in which fluorescently tagged protein components of a protein complex are photo-bleached, and exchange with the unbleached cytoplasmic pool is assessed. FRAP analysis provides an assessment of the mobile fraction (the total amount of protein turnover at the recovery plateau). For example, if there were 100 GFP-tagged proteins in a punctum, and we observed 30% recovery of the total GFP fluorescence, this would suggest that on average 70 proteins remained in the complex and 30 new proteins entered. FRAP also provides an assessment of the half-time of recovery ($t_{1/2}$), the amount of time necessary to replace half of the total recovered fluorescence. This measure provides turnover rate.

Previous analysis revealed that when expressed alone, Axin:RFP is relatively mobile; however, when Axin is coexpressed with APC2, FRAP recovery is less complete and takes significantly longer (Pronobis et al., 2015). These data suggested that APC2 stabilizes Axin assembly into puncta. In contrast,
FIGURE 4: The RGS domain of Axin enhances Slimb recruitment into Axin puncta while the βcat-binding site is not essential. (A) Diagram of different Axin mutant constructs used. (B1, B2) Testing whether Flag-tagged Slimb co-IPs with different RFP-tagged Axin mutants. Axin constructs missing the RGS domain do not co-IP with Slimb. B1 and B2 are independent replicates. Within B1 all blots are from the same gel, with nonrelevant lanes removed. (C–H) Expression in SW480 cells of different Axin mutants, as indicated, alone (C–E) or with Slimb:GFP (F–H). Only AxinΔβcat:RFP is able to robustly recruit Slimb into puncta. Scale bar = 10 µm.

Dsh coexpression increases Axin exchange (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2007b). To gain an understanding of Slimb dynamics in the destruction complex and the effect of APC2 on its dynamics, we first coexpressed Axin:RFP and GFP:Slimb. Slimb behaved as a dynamic component of the destruction complex (Figure 6, A and C). Its recovery plateau was ~50% and it had a t1/2 of ~100 s (Figure 6, D and E). In contrast to Axin, Slimb dynamics were not significantly altered when puncta included both Axin and APC2 (Figure 6, B–E), suggesting that stabilization of Axin by APC2 does not stabilize Slimb in the destruction complex. These data support the idea that Slimb can form a complex with Axin but is readily able to move out of this complex, consistent with the possibility that Slimb shuttles βcat between the destruction complex and the E3 ligase.

Slimb localizes along Axin polymers within destruction complex puncta

To further investigate the Axin:Slimb interaction, we visualized this complex by structured illumination microscopy (SIM), which allows increased resolution. When Axin:RFP is expressed alone, puncta contain small circular polymers of Axin, presumably assembled by DIX domain polymerization, as we and others previously observed (Figure 6, F, G1, and G2 arrows; Pronobis et al., 2015; Thorvaldsen et al., 2015). In contrast, after coexpression of GFP:APC2 with RFP:Axin, APC2 and Axin form intertwined polymers, with an increase in Axin polymer size/complexity (Figure 6, H, H1, arrow, and I; Pronobis et al., 2015). To explore the relationship of Axin and Slimb within the destruction complex, we coexpressed Axin:RFP and Slimb:GFP (Figure 6J). At the level of the whole cell, Slimb and Axin colocalized in puncta (Figure 6J) and the addition of Slimb did not obviously alter average Axin puncta size or number. Unlike what we previously observed with APC2 (Pronobis et al., 2015), Slimb coexpression did not have an obvious effect on Axin polymer structure—Axin continued to form circular polymers along which Slimb and Axin largely colocalized with some variations in intensity (Figure 6, J1 and K, arrows) These data are consistent with the idea that Axin forms a scaffold on which Slimb localizes. Together with the data above, these experiments further our understanding of the mechanisms by which βcat is transferred from the destruction complex to the E3 ligase, thus ensuring its ultimate destruction.

Exploring how Dsh, Axin, and APC cooperate and compete to modulate Wnt signaling in vivo

The data above help illuminate how a functional destruction complex and E3 ligase cooperate to mediate βcat destruction. Wnt signaling can turn down this process, stabilizing βcat and allowing it to enter the nucleus and help activate transcription. We thus next turned to
exploring mechanisms underlying this. Cell fate choice in the Drosophila embryonic epidermis provides one of the best in vivo models for regulation of Wnt signaling. The GAL4-UAS system like -wise offers a superb toolkit to modulate levels of proteins involved in the signaling cascade (Brand and Perrimon, 1993; Duffy, 2002). Using different combinations of GAL4 drivers and UAS constructs allows titration of protein levels over a wide range. We and others have used this system to probe mechanisms underlying the function of the destruction complex and its down-regulation by Wnt signaling.

Coassembly of Axin and APC is critical to build a functional destruction complex in vivo (e.g., Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011). Wnt signaling triggers down-regulation of the destruction complex, and the ability to do so depends on relative Axin levels. Thus, while a three- to fourfold increase in Axin levels is tolerated by the developing embryo (Wang et al., 2016; Schaefer et al., 2018), more substantial increases in Axin levels prevent inactivation of the destruction complex even in cells exposed to the Wnt ligand (Willert et al., 1999; Cliffe et al., 2003; Schaefer et al., 2018). Dsh is a key positive effector of Wnt signaling and its ability to homopolymerize and to heteropolymize with Axin are critical for down-regulating the destruction complex (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2007a,b; Fiedler et al., 2011; Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011). Work in cultured cells suggests Dsh can compete with APC for association with Axin, providing a potential mechanism for Dsh’s role in destruction complex down-regulation (Fiedler et al., 2011; Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011). Surprisingly, in Drosophila embryos elevating Dsh levels sevenfold has only modest effects on viability and cell fate choices (Cliffe et al., 2003; Schaefer et al., 2018), suggesting that Dsh may need to be “activated” by Wnt signaling in order to compete for Axin binding.

Surprisingly, elevating Dsh levels can potentiate the ability of Axin to inhibit Wnt signaling

The simplest versions of the competition hypothesis would predict that elevating Dsh levels would blunt the effects of elevating Axin levels. To test this, we varied the absolute and relative levels of Axin and Dsh. Previous work suggested competition between APC and Dsh for Axin occurs in vivo (Cliffe et al., 2003), but those experiments did not assess relative levels of misexpression and also did not control for the potential quenching effect on Axin overexpression of driving more than one UAS/Gal4 construct in the same embryo. Our recent work provided misexpression tools allowing us to control for both these variables and provide quantitative assessments of relative levels of the two proteins under different conditions (Schaefer et al., 2018). We used a strong maternal GAL4 driver line to create robust, uniform, and early maternal and zygotic expression of one transgene (either a GFP-tagged Axin [Axin:GFP] or a Myc-tagged Dsh [Dsh:Myc]) and expressed the other UAS construct zygotically to allow us to modulate the ratios of
FIGURE 6: Slimb is a dynamic component of the destruction complex, the turnover of which is not affected by coexpression with APC2, and SIM imaging reveals that Slimb is recruited along Axin polymers. (A, B) Slimb:GFP FRAP recovery curves when coexpressed with RFP:Axin (A) or with both RFP:Axin and Flag-tagged APC2. Error bars indicate standard errors out of 10 puncta (1 punctum per cell). (C) Recovery curves are similar after coexpression with Axin or with Axin plus APC2. (D, E) Slimb mobility in puncta is unchanged when expressed with Axin vs. APC2 and Axin and Dsh. We also used a UAS-RFP construct to control for the effects of multiple GAL4 driven transgenes.

We first assessed effects on embryonic viability and cell fate choice. When wild-type embryos secrete cuticle, anterior cells within each segment produce denticles and posterior cells naked cuticle (Figure 7B, middle). Constitutive activation of Wnt signaling converts cells to naked cuticle fates (Figure 7B, left) while inactivating Wnt signaling expands denticle cell fates (Figure 7B, right). We used cell fate scoring criteria that we previously developed to assess this Wnt activation or inactivation (Figure 7C; Schaefer et al., 2018). As we previously found, mild zygotic Axin overexpression (Mat>Axin x Axin; twofold increase in Axin levels; Schaefer et al., 2018; crosses used and cross nomenclature are in Materials and Methods) had little or no effect on embryonic viability (Figure 7A) or cell fate choices, as assessed by cuticle pattern (Figure 7C). In contrast, stronger maternal/zygotic Axin overexpression (Mat>Axin x Axin; ninefold increase in Axin levels; Schaefer et al., 2018) substantially reduced embryonic viability (Figure 7A) and suppressed Wg-dependent cell fates, thus reducing naked cuticle (Figure 7C; Schaefer et al., 2018). In contrast, increasing levels of Dsh sevenfold (Mat>Dsh x Dsh; Schaefer et al., 2018) had only modest effects on embryonic viability (Figure 7A) and cell fate choice (Figure 7C)—expanded naked cuticle is the cell fate expected for a positive Wnt effector.

If Dsh competes with APC for access to Axin, we hypothesized that Dsh overexpression should blunt the effects of Axin overexpression. To make it more likely that Dsh levels would be sufficiently high to effectively compete with Axin, we expressed Dsh maternally and brought Axin in zygotically (Mat>Dsh x Axin). We first Axin. (F–K) SIM of SW480 cells expressing the indicated constructs, which were directly imaged via the fluorescent tag. (F, H, J) SIM images of whole cells. Scale bar = 3 µm. (G1, G2, H1, I, J1, K) Close-up images. Scale bar = 0.5 µm. (G1, G2) Axin expressed alone assembles into tight circular polymers. (H1, I) APC2 coexpression increases the size and complexity of Axin puncta, revealing intertwined polymers of Axin and APC2, as we previously observed (Pronobis et al., 2015). (J1, K) Close-ups of puncta in cells expressing both Slimb:GFP and Axin::RFP. Slimb closely localizes with Axin polymers. J1 is a close-up of a punctum from J; K is from another cell.
examined embryonic viability and effects on cell fate choice, as assessed by examining cuticle phenotypes. Maternal expression of Dsh alone (Mat>Dsh x RFP) had no effect on embryonic viability (Figure 7A) and only modest effects on cell fate choice, reflecting occasional mild activation of Wnt signaling (Figure 7C). However, when we combined maternal expression of Dsh with zygotic expression of Axin (Mat>Dsh x Axin), the result was quite unexpected. This led to essentially complete embryonic lethality (Figure 7A) and strong suppression of Wnt signaling, as assessed by cuticle pattern (Figure 7C), the opposite of what we predicted. In fact, the effect on cell fate choice was as strong or stronger than that seen with high-level maternal and zygotic expression of Axin (Mat>Axin x Axin, Figure 7C). In contrast, the relatively low-level zygotic expression of Axin alone (Mat>RFP x Axin; Figure 7C) did not affect embryonic viability and only occasionally caused mild inhibition of Wnt signaling. This suggested that elevating Dsh levels can potentiate the ability of Axin to inhibit Wnt signaling.

Elevating Dsh levels can enhance the ability of Axin to target Arm for destruction

The direct target of the destruction complex is Armadillo (Arm), the Drosophila homologue of βcat. In wild-type embryos, a single row of cells in each segment expresses the Wnt ligand Wg, which moves across the segment, leading to a graded level of signaling (Figure 8, A and B). All cells have a pool of Arm at the plasma membrane, bound to E-cadherin to function in βcat’s other role in adherens junctions. However, in cells that do not receive Wg signal, the destruction complex captures most of the remaining Arm and targets it for destruction, thus creating a graded distribution of cytoplasmic/nuclear Arm across the segment, with highest levels centering on the Wg-expressing cells and lowest levels at the most distant cells from the Wg source (Figure 8, A and B). To directly assess how altering the relative ratios of Axin and Dsh affect Arm levels, we examined the Arm accumulation in stage 9 embryos, in which Wg signaling is most active. In wild-type embryos, cell rows expressing Wg and Wg-adjacent cell rows have elevated cytoplasmic/nuclear...
Arm levels (Figure 8B, red arrowheads), while cells farthest from Wg-expressing cells have low cytoplasmic/nuclear levels of Arm. We quantified these levels by measuring Arm fluorescence intensity in two groups of cells (as in Schaefer et al., 2018): 1–2 cell rows centered on cells expressing Wg (the Wg stripes) and 1–2 cell rows farthest from the Wg-expressing cells (the interstripes). We quantified both relative Arm levels in stripes (Figure 8A, pink bars, Figure 8B, red arrowheads) versus interstripes (Figure 8A, black arrows; quantification in Figure 8G) and also the difference in levels between these populations (Figure 8A, red arrow; quantification in Figure 8H).

In wild type, this analysis clearly revealed the stabilization of Arm by Wg signaling in stripe versus interstripe cells (Figure 8, B, G, and H). In contrast, high-level expression of Axin (Mat>Axin x Axin) reduced Arm levels in the Wg stripes (Figure 8D) and thus essentially abolished the difference in levels (Figure 8, G and H; \( p < 0.0001 \)), as we previously observed (Schaefer et al., 2018). In contrast, mild zygotic elevation of Axin levels (Mat>RFP x Axin) had little or no effect on Arm levels (Figure 8, C, G, and H). However, the same modest elevation of Axin levels had striking effects in embryos that also overexpressed Dsh (Mat>Dsh x Axin)—Arm levels were reduced in cells receiving Wnt signaling (Figure 8, F and G), thus significantly reducing the difference in Arm accumulation between Wnt-ON and Wnt-OFF cells relative to wild type (Figure 8H; \( p < 0.0001 \)). This resembled the effect of much higher elevation of Axin in embryos not overexpressing Dsh (Figure 8, D, G, and H; Mat>Axin x Axin) and contrasted with the effects of expressing low levels of Axin alone without elevating Dsh levels (Figure 8, C, G, and H; Mat>RFP x Axin). As a control, we verified that elevating Dsh levels alone did not significantly disrupt Arm stabilization in Wnt-ON cells or Arm destruction in Wnt-OFF cells (Figure 8, E, G, and H). Thus, elevating Dsh levels enhances the ability of Axin to target Arm for destruction in cells receiving Wnt signals, contrary to our original hypothesis.

As a final assessment of the effect on Wnt signaling of elevating both Dsh and Axin levels, we examined the expression of the protein encoded by a Wnt target gene, engrailed (en). In a wild-type embryo, the two most posterior rows of cells in each segment express Engrailed (En; Figure 8, I and N), and maintenance of this expression requires Wnt signaling (DiNardo et al., 1988). To assess effects of our perturbations on Wnt target gene expression, we counted the number of rows of En-expressing cells in stage 9 embryos. High-level expression of Axin (Mat>Axin x Axin) significantly reduced En expression (Figure 8, K and N; average 1 row of En-expressing cells per segment, \( p = 0.0004 \); Schaefer et al., 2018). While neither low-level zygotic expression of Axin alone (Mat>RFP x Axin; Figure 8, J and N) nor maternal and zygotic expression of Dsh alone (Mat>Dsh x Dsh; Figure 8, L and N) had a substantial effect on en expression, when we combined maternal expression of Dsh with zygotic expression of Axin (Mat>Dsh x Axin), significantly fewer cells expressed en (Figure 8, M and N; \( p < 0.0001 \)), mimicking the effect of high-level Axin expression (Mat>Axin x Axin; Figure 8, K and M). Thus, whether assessed by embryonic viability, cell fate choice, Arm levels, or the expression of a Wnt target gene, elevating Dsh levels can potentiate the ability of Axin to inhibit Wnt signaling.

Elevating Dsh levels in the embryo does not lead to Axin recruitment into Dsh puncta

We next examined whether altering Dsh levels affects Axin localization. When expressed at levels within a fewfold of endogenous, Axin::GFP accumulates in a segmentally varying pattern of localization, with larger cytoplasmic puncta in Wnt-ON cells (Figure 9B, blue arrows) and smaller membrane-associated puncta in Wnt-OFF cells (Figure 9B, yellow arrows; Schaefer et al., 2018). Axin’s membrane relocalization in Wnt-ON cells requires Dsh (Cliffe et al., 2003). Strikingly, Axin’s segmentally varying pattern was not obviously altered after elevating Dsh levels—Axin::GFP continued to accumulate in large cytoplasmic puncta in Wnt-ON cells and in smaller membrane-associated puncta and in the cytoplasm of Wnt-ON cells (Figure 9H, blue vs. yellow arrows; Mat>Dsh x Axin; compare to Figure 9B). Further, the Dsh puncta that assembled after Dsh::Myc overexpression (Figure 9H, magenta arrows) did not colocalize with the strong Axin puncta in either Wnt-ON or Wnt-OFF cells (Figure 9H, yellow and blue arrows). These data are consistent with the idea that if Dsh is not “activated” by Wnt signaling, it cannot sequester Axin.

Elevating Dsh levels in the embryo triggers Dsh assembly into cytoplasmic puncta

In stage 9 Drosophila embryos, endogenous Dsh accumulates in the cytoplasm of all cells and is somewhat cortically enriched in cells receiving Wnt signals (Figure 9A, red arrows; Schaefer et al., 2018). Intriguingly, when we previously examined whether endogenous Dsh and Axin::GFP colocalize in puncta, we found overlap in localiza-
FIGURE 8: Elevating Dsh levels enhances the ability of Axin to promote Arm destruction and down-regulate the Wnt-target gene En. (A) Diagram illustrating how Wg-signaling affects Arm accumulation. Two body segments are illustrated. Within each segment a single row of cells expresses the Wnt ligand Wg (red bands), and it forms a graded distribution across the segment, stabilizing cytoplasmic/nuclear Arm in cells that receive it (derived from Schaefer et al., 2018). The closer to the cells secreting Wg, the higher the accumulation of Arm in the cytoplasm and nucleus. (B–F) Arm accumulation in Stage 9 embryos, anterior to the left, of the genotypes indicated. Red arrowheads label the rows of Wg-expressing cells. (B) In wild type, Wg stabilizes Arm in a graded manner with highest levels in the cells that express Wg (quantified in G), and thus there is a large difference in levels between Arm stripes and interstripes (H). (C) Low-level zygotic expression of Axin does not substantially alter Arm stabilization by Wg signaling. (D) High-level maternal and
Finally, we examined the effect of elevating either Axin or Dsh levels on localization of APC2. Here, an effect was more apparent. In wild-type embryos, APC2 is cortically enriched in all cells (Figure 9I; McCartney et al., 1999). Elevating levels of Dsh in Mat>Dsh x Dsh embryos did not alter this localization pattern (Figure 9J). Elevating Axin expression led to recruitment of cortical APC2 to Axin puncta in Wnt-OFF cells (Figure 9K, blue arrows), while cortical enrichment of APC2 in Wnt-ON cells remained (Figure 9K, red arrows; Schaeffer et al., 2018). Combining elevating Dsh levels with elevating Axin in Mat>Dsh x Axin embryos appeared to enhance the localization of APC2 to the plasma membrane of Wnt-ON cells (Figure 9L, yellow arrows), without altering APC localization of Axin puncta in Wnt-OFF cells (Figure 9L, blue arrows). Thus elevating Dsh levels may enhance the effects of Axin overexpression on APC2 localization. One speculative possibility is that this could occur because all of the Dsh is assembled into ectopic puncta, thus preventing it from competing with APC2 for access to Axin. This might increase localization of APC2 with Axin near the Wnt receptors in Wnt-ON cells, where Dsh might otherwise displace it, reducing inactivation of the destruction complex. We discuss this and other possibilities in the Discussion.

**SIM imaging suggests relative levels of Axin and Dsh may alter their interactions**

Our earlier work and that of others illustrated the ability of SIM to begin to define the internal structure of the destruction complex, revealing intertwined polymers of Axin and APC or of Axin and Tankyrase when these proteins are expressed in cultured human cells (Prönobis et al., 2015; Thorvaldsen et al., 2015). Like Axin, Dsh forms puncta when expressed in cultured cells. We took a similar approach to better understand the structure of Dsh puncta utilizing SIM. We tagged Dsh at the N-terminus or the C-terminus with either GFP or RFP and transfected these constructs into SW480 cells. When expressed alone, Dsh forms puncta when tagged with fluorescent proteins either at the N- or at the C-termini (Figure 10, A and B)—thus tag localization does not affect the ability of the N-terminal DIX domain to self-polymerize and help drive puncta formation (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2005, 2007a,b; Fiedler et al., 2011). Dsh expression had no apparent effect on levels or localization of βcat. Dsh formed two different categories of puncta in different cells: smaller, more spherical puncta (Figure 10, A and B) or larger, more complex puncta (Figure 10, C and D), potentially due to the level of Dsh expression. We then used SIM to look inside the more complex puncta to see if the Dsh formed an underlying structure within them. When expressed alone, Dsh:RFP in puncta resolved into a loose network of intertwined filaments, potentially representing DIX domain-mediated polymers, (Figure 10D), similar to but more complex than the polymers formed by Axin:RFP expressed alone (Figure 11, A and B; Prönobis et al., 2015). When coexpressed, Dsh:GFP and RFP:Dsh largely coassembled into these filaments (Figure 10, E and F1), suggesting these are not a property of the tag or its location and consistent with the idea that they copolymerize. The complexity of the Dsh polymers resembled the complexity of the intertwined Axin and APC2 cables formed after coexpression (Figure 6, H, H1, and I; Prönobis et al., 2015).

Previous work provided evidence that Dsh and APC compete for access to Axin, and that the Dsh association with Axin inhibits destruction complex function (Cliffe et al., 2003; Schwarz-Romond et al., 2005; Mendoza-Topaz et al., 2011). Both Dsh and Axin can homopolymerize via their DIX domains and can also heteropolymerize (Schwarz-Romond et al., 2005, 2007a,b; Fiedler et al., 2011). Our SW480/SIM system provided an opportunity to explore the Dsh:Axin interaction in vivo at superresolution. Previous studies revealed that Axin and Dsh can colocalize in cytoplasmic puncta when coexpressed in cells (Fagotto et al., 1999; Kishida et al., 1999, 1999; Julius et al., 2000; Fiedler et al., 2011). We thus used SIM to examine puncta formed after coexpression of fluorescently tagged Axin and Dsh does not abolish the graded pattern of Arm accumulation. (F) Combining high-level maternal and yzgotic expression of Dsh with low-level yzgotic expression of Axin substantially reduces the ability of Wg to stabilize Arm. (G) Quantification of mean total Arm levels in two cell rows with high Wg signaling (Wg stripe) vs. two rows of cells farthest from Wg expressing cells (Interstripe). Box and whisker plots. Boxes cover 25th–75th percentiles and whiskers the minimum and maximum. Median = middle line; n = 8 embryos per genotype. A paired t test was used to compare intragroup Arm levels (stripe vs. interstripe within the same embryo). An unpaired t test was used to compare Arm levels in either the stripe or the interstripe between genotypes since Arm levels are independent between groups. Probability that stripe and interstripe values are the same within a genotype: wild type p < 0.0001; Mat>RFP x Axin p < 0.0001; Mat>Axin x Axin p = 0.0002; Mat>Dsh x Dsh p < 0.0001; Mat>Dsh x Axin p < 0.0001. Probability that levels of Arm in the stripe are the same from those in the wild-type stripe: Mat>RFP x Axin p = 0.181; Mat>Axin x Axin p < 0.0001; Mat>Dsh x Dsh p = 0.810; Mat>Dsh x Axin p = 0.0725. Probability that levels of Arm in the interstripe are the same as those in the wild-type interstripe: Mat>RFP x Axin p = 0.0294; Mat>Axin x Axin p < 0.0001; Mat>Dsh x Dsh p = 0.9695; Mat>Dsh x Axin p = 0.3276. (H) Plot of the difference between Arm levels in the Wg stripe vs. interstripe per embryo. Boxes and whiskers as in G; n = 3 stripes from each of 8 embryos. An unpaired t test was used to compare the difference of Arm levels of the Stripe and Interstripe between genotypes. Probability that the difference in Arm levels in the stripe vs. interstripe is the same as that in wild type: Mat>RFP x Axin p = 0.9468; Mat>Axin x Axin p < 0.0001; Mat>Dsh x Dsh p = 0.5169; Mat>Dsh x Axin p < 0.0004. Scale bars 30 µm. In all graphs, ns = nonsignificant; *p < 0.05; **p < 0.005; ***p < 0.0005; ****p < 0.0001.
Dsh. When expressed alone, Axin puncta contain tightly curved Axin polymers (Figure 11, A and B; Pronobis et al., 2015). Interestingly when we coexpressed Dsh and Axin, we found that Axin–Dsh puncta interactions varied across a spectrum, with variation primarily between cells rather than within cells. In some cells, seemingly those with relatively low levels of Dsh expression, strong overlap in localization, with partial “colocalization” of Dsh and Axin, was revealed when puncta were observed at superresolution (Figure 11, C and D; 37/169 cells examined; Table 3A). Puncta in this subset of cells formed donut or pretzel shapes (Figure 11, C1, C2, and D), similar to those seen when Axin is expressed alone (Figure 11, A1 and B).

However, in cells that appeared to have higher levels of Dsh expression, Axin–Dsh puncta interactions were altered. In a subset of these cells, Dsh continued to overlap/colocalize with Axin, but these puncta also had adjacent structures containing lower levels of Axin or no Axin (Figure 11, E, E1, and E2; 42 of 169 cells observed; Table 3A). Finally, in about half of the cells, Dsh and Axin puncta segregated (Figure 11, F–I; 90/169 cells observed; Table 3A). In this category of cells Axin puncta substructure remained largely unchanged, with primarily small, donut-shaped puncta (Figure 11, F1, F2, G, and H1). However, Dsh puncta were larger and more complex (Figure 11, F1, G, and H1), resembling what we saw in cells
Defining mechanisms by which βcat is transferred from the destruction complex to the E3 ubiquitin ligase

Regulating the stability of βcat is the key step in Wnt signaling (Peifer et al., 1994; van Leeuwen et al., 1994). The SCF\textsuperscript{Slimb} E3 ligase was first identified as the relevant E3 regulating βcat levels in 1998 (Jiang and Struhl, 1998; Markawa and Elinson, 1998). It specifically recognizes βcat after its sequential phosphorylation by CK1 and GSK3 (Hart et al., 1999; Kitagawa et al., 1999; Liu et al., 1999), and the most N-terminal phosphoserine is a key part of the binding site for the F-box protein Slimb/βTrCP (Orford et al., 1997; Wu et al., 2003). Phosphatase activity in the cytoplasm can rapidly dephosphorylate this residue, raising the question of how βcat is transferred to the E3 ligase without being dephosphorylated. Earlier work offered two clues. First, βTrCP can co-IP with Axin and APC (Hart et al., 1999; Kitagawa et al., 1999; Liu et al., 1999; Li et al., 2012), suggesting it may associate, at least transiently, with the destruction complex, providing a potential transfer mechanism. Consistent with this, stabilizing Axin using Tankyrase inhibitors led to colocalization of βTrCP and Tankyrase with the destruction complexes that assemble in response (Thorvaldsen et al., 2015). However, it was not clear if this occurred by a direct interaction of βTrCP with destruction complex components via bridging by phosphorylated βcat or occurred because other components of the SCF\textsuperscript{Slimb} E3 ligase were recruited more directly, with βTrCP recruited as a secondary consequence. A second clue emerged from analyses revealing that one role for APC is to prevent dephosphorylation of βcat while it is in the destruction complex, protecting the βTrCP binding site (Su et al., 2008).

Two plausible models were suggested by these data. In the first, the entire SCF\textsuperscript{Slimb} E3 ligase might be recruited to the destruction complex, allowing direct transfer of phosphorylated βcat between expressing higher levels of Dsh alone (Figure 10, D1 and E1). Rather than colocalizing or strongly overlapping with Axin in puncta, we observed complex Dsh structures surrounding (Figure 11, F1 and H1) or docked on (Figure 11G) donut-shaped Axin puncta. In many of these cells, there was little or no colocalization. To further explore the idea that relative levels of Dsh/Axin might be a factor, we varied the ratio of Axin:Dsh DNA used in transfection—while this does not eliminate cell–cell variability, we scored multiple cells that were representative of what we observed on each slide. Consistent with the ratio idea, when Axin:Dsh DNA levels were relatively high, fewer cells had segregation and more had colocalization (Table 3B); however, this should be independently verified in the future by more direct measurements of relative protein levels. Together these data suggest the speculative possibility that altering relative levels of Axin and Dsh might affect homo-oligomerization versus hetero-oligomerization by an as yet unknown mechanism. In vivo, this could provide a potential regulatory mechanism.

DISCUSSION

Wnt signaling plays key roles in development and disease by regulating the stability of its effector βcat. In the absence of Wnt signals, βcat is phosphorylated by the Wnt-regulatory destruction complex, ubiquitinated by an SCF-class E3 ubiquitin ligase, and destroyed by the proteasome. Binding of Wnt ligands to their Frizzled/LRP receptors stabilizes βcat via the cytoplasmic effector Dsh. Here we explore two important questions in the field: Is there a direct transfer of βcat from the destruction complex to the E3 ligase, and how does Dsh interaction with the destruction complex protein Axin regulate destruction complex function?

FIGURE 10: SIM imaging reveals structure inside Dsh puncta. SW480 colorectal cancer cells transfected with the indicated constructs, with fluorescence of the tagged protein imaged directly. (A–E) Whole cells. Scale bars = 10 µm. (D1, D2, E1) Close-ups of puncta. Scale bars = 0.5 µm (A, B) Confocal images of cells transfected with an N-terminal RFP-tagged Dsh (A) or a C-terminal GFP-tagged Dsh (B), stained for βcat. Both constructs form similar-looking puncta, suggesting that tag location has little effect on puncta formation. (C) Representative image of two cells, expressing lower (red arrow) or higher (blue arrow) levels of Dsh. In cells expressing higher levels of Dsh, puncta are larger and less spherical. (D, D1, D2) SIM image of a cell expressing RFP-Dsh, with close-ups of several larger puncta (indicated by boxes). SIM close-ups reveal that many puncta have a complex internal structure of polymers. (E, E1) SIM image of a cell coexpressing RFP:Dsh and Dsh::GFP. In close-ups of puncta, there is intermixing and some colocalization of both versions of tagged Dsh in the tangled polymers.
the two complexes. In a second model, βTrCP could serve as a shuttle, binding to phosphorylated βcat at the destruction complex and shuttling it to a place where the E3 assembled and ubiquitinated βcat.

We explored interactions of the E3 ligase with the destruction complex using cell biological assays in SW480 cells. We observed ready recruitment of the βTrCP homologue Slimb to destruction complex puncta by Axin, but did not observe recruitment by APC2, consistent with earlier assays by co-IP (Kitagawa et al., 1999). Slimb recruitment did not require the βcat-binding site of Axin, making it less likely that recruitment occurs solely via bridging by βcat. However, it was enhanced by the RGS domain of Axin—future work to assess whether this involves a direct interaction or whether an indirect one is warranted. There are conserved residues in the RGS domain.
domain that are not necessary for the APC–Axin interaction, some of which form a pi helix, and it will be interesting to further explore the function of these residues (Spink et al., 2000). Both the region containing the N-terminus plus the F-box of Slimb and that including its WD40 repeats could be separately recruited into Axin puncta, suggesting it may be recruited by multiple interactions—in the case of the WD40 repeats, this could include bridging by phosphorylated βcat. Once again, direct binding assays in vitro would provide further insights, building on earlier assays suggesting a multipartite binding interaction (Kitagawa et al., 1999). Our super-resolution imaging suggests the interaction between Slimb and Axin is intimate, consistent with direct binding. Our FRAP data, on the other hand, reveal that Slimb can come in and out of the complex, similar to the behavior of Axin and APC.

In contrast to the strong recruitment of Slimb to destruction complex puncta, two other core components of the SCFSlimb E3 ligase, Skp1 and Cul1, were not avidly recruited. The occasional recruitment seen could reflect interactions with endogenous βTrCP in the puncta. Coexpression of SkpA or Cul1 with Slimb slightly enhanced recruitment, but this was still not as robust as the recruitment of Slimb itself. Our IP/mass spectroscopy data and earlier work from the Mann lab (Hilger and Mann, 2012) are consistent with the presence of all three core SCFSlimb E3 ligase proteins in the destruction complex, but suggest they may be present at lower levels than core destruction complex proteins. One possibility is that Slimb/βTrCP usually acts as a shuttle, but its presence occasionally recruits the other E3 proteins. Another possibility is that the entire SCFSlimb E3 ligase docks on the destruction complex transiently to accept phosphorylated βcat, ubiquitin it, and then transfer it to the proteasome. Consistent with this possibility, inhibiting Tankyrase not only stimulates association of βTrCP with Axin but also leads to recruitment of the proteasome itself to the destruction complex (Thorvaldsen et al., 2015)—intriguingly, proteasome inhibition reduces destruction complex assembly, though this effect appears to be indirect due to effects on Axin2 levels (Pedersen et al., 2016). Further analyses will be needed to discriminate between these possibilities.

Additional work is also needed to explore how βcat transfer to the E3 ligase is regulated. Direct targeting of βcat to the E3, by fusing the F-box of Slimb with the βcat-binding sites of Tcf4 and E-cadherin, is sufficient to stimulate βcat destruction, independent of the destruction complex (Liu et al., 2004), but in vivo the destruction complex plays a critical role. Several pieces of data are consistent with the idea that transfer of βcat to the E3 ligase is the step regulated by Wnt signaling, rather than phosphorylation of βcat, with APC having an important role (Li et al., 2012; Pronobis et al., 2015). Further exploration of this process will be welcome.

**Dsh and Axin: a complex interaction**

It has been clear for more than two decades that Dsh is a key effector of Wnt signaling (Klingensmith et al., 1994; Noordermeer et al., 1994). However, its precise mechanisms of action are complex and not fully understood. Current data suggest that Dsh is recruited to activated Frizzled receptors via its DEP domain (Tauroiello et al., 2012; Gammons et al., 2016b). Dsh then helps ensure the Wnt-dependent phosphorylation of LRP5/6 (Bilic et al., 2007; Metaclfe et al., 2010), leading to receptor clustering, facilitating Axin recruitment, and thus inhibiting GSK3 (Tama et al., 2004; Stamos et al., 2014). Dsh homo-polymerization, via its DIX domain, and hetero-polymerization with Axin (Fiedler et al., 2011), along with DEP-domain-dependent Dsh cross-linking (Gammons et al., 2016a), are then thought to lead to down-regulation of the destruction complex and thus stabilization of βcat.

Intriguingly, in Drosophila embryos Dsh, Axin, and APC are present at levels within a fewfold of one another (Schaefer et al., 2018). Many current models suggest that relative ratios of these three proteins are critical to the signaling outcome, with APC and Dsh competing to activate or inhibit Axin, respectively. Consistent with this, substantially elevating Axin levels in vivo, using Drosophila embryos as a model, renders the destruction complex immune to down-regulation by Wnt signaling (Willert et al., 1999; Cliffe et al., 2003). Subsequent work revealed that the precise levels of Axin are critical—elevating Axin levels by two- to fourfold has little effect, while elevation

---

### Table 3: (A) Summary of the different types of interactions between Axin and Dsh, including number of cells imaged. Strong overlap in localization, puncta are simple in shape and Axin and Dsh substantially overlap, resulting in yellow puncta. Transition to Separation, Axin and Dsh still exhibit substantial overlap but there are also regions of distinct localization. Segregation, Axin and Dsh proteins no longer appear to overlap although they often dock next to one another. Number of experiments equals the number of independent times cells were transfected with the labeled protein combinations. (B) Degree of colocalization observed at different Axin to Dsh transfection ratios. Ratios reflect Axin and Dsh plasmid concentrations used for transfections. The higher the Axin:Dsh ratio, the more complete the colocalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein combination</th>
<th>Strong overlap in localization</th>
<th>Transition to separation</th>
<th>Segregation</th>
<th>Total number of cells analyzed</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axin + Dsh</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axin:Dsh protein ratio</th>
<th>Strong overlap in localization</th>
<th>Transition to separation</th>
<th>Segregation</th>
<th>Total number of cells analyzed</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Table 3:**

## (A) Summary of the different types of interactions between Axin and Dsh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein combination</th>
<th>Strong overlap in localization</th>
<th>Transition to separation</th>
<th>Segregation</th>
<th>Total number of cells analyzed</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Axin + Dsh</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## (B) Axin to Dsh transfection ratio may affect the degree of protein–protein colocalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axin:Dsh protein ratio</th>
<th>Strong overlap in localization</th>
<th>Transition to separation</th>
<th>Segregation</th>
<th>Total number of cells analyzed</th>
<th>Number of experiments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 to 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
by ninefold is sufficient to constitutively inactivate Wnt signaling (Wehrli et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2016; Schaefer et al., 2018). One might then predict that elevating Dsh levels would have the opposite effect, sequestering Axin and thus stabilizing βcat and activating Wnt signaling. While very high levels of Dsh overexpression can have this effect (Wehrli et al., 2000; Cliffe et al., 2003), we previously were surprised to learn that sevenfold elevation of Dsh levels only had a subtle effect on Wnt signaling and thus had little effect on embryonic viability (Schaefer et al., 2018). Our data further suggested that Dsh is only recruited into Axin puncta in cells that received Wg signal, in which puncta are recruited to the plasma membrane, even though seemingly similar levels of Dsh were present in Wnt-Off cells (Schaefer et al., 2018). This opened the possibility that a Wnt-stimulated activation event, such as Dsh phosphorylation (e.g., Yanagawa et al., 1995; Gonzalez-Sancho et al., 2004), might be required to activate Dsh interaction with Axin and thus Axin inactivation. In this scenario, elevating Dsh levels in cells without this activation event, for example, in Wnt-Off cells, would not alter signaling output.

The simplest versions of the antagonism model, involving competition between formation of Axin/APC versus Axin/Dsh complexes, would also suggest that elevating Dsh levels should alleviate effects of elevating Axin. Here we tested this directly, expressing high levels of Dsh maternally and lower levels of Axin zygotically. We anticipated that elevating Dsh levels would blunt the effects of elevating levels of Axin. Instead, we got a substantial surprise: elevating levels of Dsh enhanced the ability of Axin to resist turn-down by Wnt signaling, thus leading to global activation of the destruction complex and inactivation of Wnt signaling. This was true whether we assessed effects on cell fate choice, Arm levels, or expression of a Wnt-target gene. Intriguingly, our data were also consistent with the possibility that elevating Dsh levels may alter Axin:APC interactions in Wnt-ON cells—this might provide a clue to an underlying mechanism.

What could explain this paradoxical result? Our current data do not provide a definitive answer but do open some intriguing possibilities and new questions. In our view, part of the explanation will be that Wg-dependent “activation” of Dsh is required for it to interact with and thus down-regulate Axin. Consistent with this, Dsh phosphorylation can regulate its ability to homopolymerize (Bernatik et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Sancho et al., 2013). By elevating Dsh levels, we may have exceeded the capacity of this activation system. High levels of “nonactivated” Dsh, while unable to interact with Axin, might still interact with other key proteins involved in destruction complex down-regulation, sequestering them in nonproductive complexes. For example, Dsh can bind CK1 (Peters et al., 1999; Sakanaka et al., 1999; Kishida et al., 2001), which has complex roles in Wnt regulation (Harnoś et al., 2018). With key proteins sequestered, the system might become less able to inactivate the slightly elevated levels of Axin present, thus leading to constitutive activity of the destruction complex. In this speculative scenario, it is not the relative levels of Axin and Dsh that are key but the relative levels of Axin and “active Dsh.”

The results of our SIM experiments may also provide insights. The ability of Axin and Dsh to both homo- and hetero-polymerize means free monomers must make a choice. It is likely this is a regulated choice, though the mechanism of regulation remains unclear. Our SW480 experiments, while overly simple, may provide an illustration of how the homo-/hetero-polymerization balance can shift. In cells in which both Axin and Dsh were expressed at relatively low levels, puncta contained both proteins, and internal structure was consistent with some level of hetero-polymerization. In contrast, when levels of Dsh were significantly higher, Axin and Dsh tended to segregate into separate, adjoining puncta, suggesting the balance was shifted to homo-polymerization, though the polymers retained the ability to dock on one another. If similar events occur on elevating Dsh expression in Drosophila embryos, segregation could allow Axin to remain in functional destruction complexes, even in Wnt-ON cells, while Dsh localized to separate puncta sequestered other Wnt-regulating proteins, potentially explaining how elevating Dsh expression could paradoxically down-regulate Wnt signaling. Elevating Dsh levels may also lead it to preferentially associate with itself, as was suggested by our SIM data in SW480 cells—this could recruit endogenous Dsh away from its normal localization with the destruction complex, thus preventing it from participating in inactivating Axin. Defining the mechanisms that determine the relevant affinities of each protein for itself versus for its partner will be informative. Intriguingly, we observed a similar docking rather than coassembly behavior when we imaged the puncta formed by Axin and those formed by the Arm repeat domain of APC2 (Prontobis et al., 2015)—this may be another example where relative affinities of proteins for themselves versus their binding partners differ.

Very recent work provides important new insights in this regard. Yamanishi et al. (2019) determined the structure of the DIX domains of Dsh and Axin and also measured their relative affinities for one another. Kan et al., (2020: Preprint) used cryo-electron microscopy to solve the structure of Dsh filaments and also measured affinities of DIX domains of Dsh and Axin. Their results contrast, with the first group suggesting Dsh homodimerization is an order of magnitude more favorable than Axin homodimerization, while heterodimerization is intermediate in affinity, and the other suggesting Axin homodimerization is most favorable. Resolution of this will be important, as we assess how Dsh acts to turn down destruction complex activity by heterodimerization. It also is interesting given our in vivo observations that APC may help stabilize Axin homo-polymerization (Prontobis et al., 2015). These data also may help explain our results in SIM, where segregation of Dsh and Axin is favored in some circumstances. Defining the in vivo regulatory mechanisms that modulate homo- and heteropolymerization will be an important goal. Together our results leave us with more questions than answers but suggest that there are important features of Wnt signaling in vivo yet to be uncovered. Further cell biological and biochemical experiments in vivo, combined with new mathematical models of the suspected competition, will be extremely useful.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Fly stocks, embryonic lethality, and cuticles
All fly stocks, crosses, and embryo experiments were performed at 25°C. For this study: y w was used as wild type. The following stocks were obtained from the Bloomington Stock Center: Maternal alpha tubulin GAL4 (referred to as MatGAL4; a stock carrying both of the GAL4 lines in 7062 and 7063), UAS-Axin:GFP (7225), UAS-Dsh:Myc (9453), and UAS-RFP (30556). Embryonic lethality assays and cuticle preparations were as in Wieschaus and Nüsslein-Volhard (Wieschaus and Nüsslein-Volhard, 1986). Inhibition and/or overexpression of Wg signaling was assessed by analyzing embryonic and first instar larval cuticles with the scoring criteria found in Schaefer et al. (2018).

Cross abbreviations (Female x Male):
Mat-RFP x Axin = UAS-RFP/MatGAL4; +/MatGAL4 females x UAS-Axin:GFP males
Mat-Axin x Axin = +/MatGAL4; UAS-Axin:GFP /MatGAL4 females x UAS-Axin:GFP males
Mat-Dsh x Dsh = +/MatGAL4; UAS-Dsh:Myc/MatGAL4 females x UAS-Dsh:Myc males
Mat-Dsh x Axin = +/-MatGAL4; UAS-Dsh:Myc/MatGAL4 females x UAS-Axin:GFP
Mat-Dsh x RFP = +/-MatGAL4; UAS-Dsh:Myc/MatGAL4 females x UAS-RFP males

**Embryo immunostaining and antibodies**

Flies were allowed to lay eggs on apple juice/agar plates with yeast paste for up to 7 h. A paintbrush was then used to collect embryos in 0.1% Triton-X in water and eggs were dechorionated in 50% bleach. After fixation for 20 min in 1:1 heptane to 9% formaldehyde, with 8 mM EGTA added to preserve GFP expression, embryos were devi-tellinized in 1:1 heptane to methanol. Embryos were then washed in methanol followed by 0.1% Triton-X in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), then incubated in blocking buffer (1:1000 normal goat serum [NGS] diluted in 0.1% Triton-X in PBS) for 30 min. Primary antibody incubation occurred overnight at 4°C. Embryos were washed in 0.1% Triton-X in PBS and then incubated in secondary antibody at room temperature for 1 h. Embryos were mounted in Aqua Polycount (Polyscience). Primary antibodies were: Wingless (Wg, Developmental Studies Hybridoma Bank [DSHB]:4D4, 1:1000), Arm (DSHB:N27 A1, 1:75), En (DSHB:4D9, 1:50), APC2 (McCarty et al., 1999; 1:1000), and Dsh (Shimada et al., 2001; 1:4000).

**Assessing effects on En expression**

To determine the transcriptional output of Wg signaling, En expres-
sion was analyzed in stage 9 embryos. En antibody-stained embryos were imaged on a Zeiss LSM 710 or 880 scanning confocal micro-
scope. Images were processed as in Schaefer et al. (2018). Briefly, Fiji (Fiji Is Just ImageJ) was used to generate maximum intensity projections 8 μm thick. The En channel was then thresholded to highlight En-expressing cells. The number of rows of En-expressing cells were counted in three different locations per En stripe in tho-
racic/abdominal stripes 2 through 5. The number of rows of cells per En stripe was then determined by averaging these three values. Embryos were scored blindly. Significance was assessed using a one-
sample t test to analyze the number of rows of En-expressing cells per segment since the known value of rows of En cells per segment is 2 (e.g., DiNardo et al., 1988).

**Quantitative analysis of Arm levels in Wg stripes versus interstripes**

To calculate the absolute levels of Arm accumulation in cells receiv-
ing or not receiving Wg signals, stage 9 embryos were collected and stained as described above. Each genotype was imaged on the same day under the same microscope settings. To calculate the level of Arm accumulation, we chose a boxed region 100 pixels wide × 30 pixels high, spanning the width of the Wg-expressing cells, and measured the mean gray value of Arm using Fiji. Three Wg stripe regions from parasegments 2 to 4 were measured, and the average Arm value minus the background value from a region outside the embryo was defined as the Wg stripe Arm value. In the adjacent interstripe regions, we used the same box size to measure and calculate Interstripe Arm values. We also measured the relative difference in Arm accumulation between the Wg Stripes and the Interstripes. To determine the significance between intragroup values (Stripe vs. Interstripe within the same genotype), a paired t test was used since we were comparing Arm levels within the same embryo. An unpaired t test was used to determine the significance between intergroup values (e.g., Stripe vs. Stripe of different geno-
types) since Arm levels were independent between groups. For multiple comparisons, an ordinary one-way ANOVA followed by Dunnett’s multiple comparisons test were applied.

**Cell culture and transfection**

For all cell culture experiments, the human colorectal cancer cell line, SW480, was used. It was obtained from the Tissue Culture Facility at University of North Carolina's Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center and is ATCC line CCL228. Cells were maintained in L-15 media (Corning) supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated fetal bovine serum and 1× Pen/Strep (Life Technologies) at 37°C with am-
bient CO2 levels. For transfection of Drosophila proteins into SW480 cells, Lipofectamine 2000 (Life Technologies) was used for transient transfection following manufacturer’s instructions. All constructs contained the pCMV-backbone and Drosophila genes were inserted using the pC88/Gateway protocol (Invitrogen) and tagged with GFP, RFP, or Flag as described in Pronobis et al. (2015).

**Cell immunofluorescence and microscopy**

Cells grown on coverslips were collected for immunofluorescence 24 h after transfection. Cells were washed in PBS and then fixed in 4% formaldehyde for 5 min. Cells were then permeabilized with 0.1% Triton-X-100 in PBS for 5 min. After 30 min in block buffer (0.01% NGS in PBS), cells were incubated in primary antibody for 1–2 h, washed with PBS, and then incubated in secondary antibody for 1–2 h. Cells were mounted on microscope slides in Aqua polycount (Polyscience). Primary antibodies used: anti-β-Catenin (BD Transduction, 1:800) and anti-M2-Flag (Sigma, 1:1000). Immunostained cells were imaged on an LSM Pascal microscope (Zeiss), an LSM 710 (Zeiss), or an LSM 880 (Zeiss). All images were processed using Fiji to create maximum intensity projections, and Photoshop CS6 (Adobe, San Jose, CA) was used to adjust input levels so that the signal spanned the entire output grayscale and to adjust brightness and contrast.

**Super-resolution microscopy**

Transiently transfected cells were stained and collected as above. Cells were mounted in Aqua polycount (Polyscience) and coverslips were sealed with nail polish to prevent hardening of the mounting media. Cells were then imaged using a Nikon Structured Illumina-
tion microscope. Images were first processed using the Nikon soft-
ware using the default settings. Images were then further processed using IMARIS software.

**Cell immunoprecipitation and Western blotting**

Cells were collected in lysis buffer (150 mM NaCl, 30 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 1 mM EDTA, 1% TritonX-100, 10% glycerol, 0.5 mM dithiothrei-
tol, and 0.1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, plus proteinase/ 
phosphatase inhibitors [EDTA-free, Thermo Scientific] as in Li et al., 2012) approximately 24 h after transfection. Antibody was added and samples were incubated on a nutator overnight at 4°C. The next day, Protein A-Sepharose beads (Sigma) were added and samples were incubated on a nutator for 2 h at 4°C. After washing in lysis buffer, immuno precipitated proteins were removed from the beads with 2× SDS buffer and run on an 8 or 10% SDS–PAGE gel and trans-
ferred to a nitrocellulose membrane. Westerns were visualized using x-ray film or the Typhoon Imager. Primary antibodies were: anti-GFP (JL-8; Clontech, 1:1000), anti-Flag (Sigma-Aldrich, 1:2000), and anti-
γ-tubulin (Sigma-Aldrich, 1:2000). Secondary antibodies were: IRDye800CW anti-mouse (Licor 1:10,000); HRP–conjugated anti-
mouse (Sigma 1:1000). The resulting Westerns were imaged on a Typhoon using IMARIS software.

**MS**

HEK293T cells were transfected with pCMV-Flag-Drosophila-APC2 and stable cell lines where established using puromycin resistance. Immunoblotting was used to confirm expression. M2 anti-FLAG antibody (Sigma) was used to pull down Flag-APC2. Cells were
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