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SUMMARY

The integrity of the kidney filtration barrier essentially relies on the balanced interplay of podocytes and the glomerular basement membrane (GBM). Here, we show by analysis of in vitro and in vivo models that a loss of the podocyte-specific FERM-domain protein EPB41L5 results in impaired extracellular matrix (ECM) assembly. By using quantitative proteomics analysis of the secretome and matrisome, we demonstrate a shift in ECM composition characterized by diminished deposition of core GBM components, such as LAMA5. Integrin adhesome proteomics reveals that EPB41L5 recruits PDLIM5 and ACTN4 to integrin adhesion complexes (IACs). Consecutively, EPB41L5 knockout podocytes show insufficient maturation of integrin adhesion sites, which translates into impaired force transmission and ECM assembly. These observations build the framework for a model in which EPB41L5 functions as a cell-type-specific regulator of the podocyte adhesome and controls a localized adaptive module in order to prevent podocyte detachment and thereby ensures GBM integrity.

INTRODUCTION

Cell-matrix interactions are essential for a plethora of biological processes ranging from embryogenesis to tumor metastasis (Kechagia et al., 2019; Winograd-Katz et al., 2014). Efficient linkage between extracellular matrix (ECM) components and the intracellular actin cytoskeleton is established by integrin heterodimer receptors. On the cytoplasmic part of these receptors, diverse linker, adaptor, and kinase proteins are recruited, resulting in a multiprotein complex commonly termed the integrin adhesion complex (IAC) or integrin adhesome (Winograd-Katz et al., 2014). Based on the molecular repertoire, IACs enable bidirectional signaling (inside-out, outside-in), influencing intracellular processes as well as interaction with the extracellular milieu. Despite a multitude of studies elucidating the molecular composition and signaling pathways of the IAC in a ligand-dependent manner, knowledge is limited whether and how IACs reciprocally shape their extracellular environment in a cell-type-specific manner.

The integrity of the kidney filtration barrier relies on the interplay of glomerular endothelial cells, specialized epithelial cells (podocytes), and a unique basement membrane (BM) (Grahammer et al., 2013). Within this three-layered filter, the glomerular BM (GBM) is formed by a fusion of initially independent BMs produced by epithelial and endothelial cells during glomerular development and maturation (Chew and Lennon, 2018). The mature GBM is composed of distinct ECM constituents, in which specialized networks of collagen type IV (α3α4α5) and laminin-521 serve as essential scaffold components, as evidenced by genetic diseases and elegant in vivo studies (COL4A3/A4/A5, Alport syndrome; and LAMB2, Pierson syndrome (Chew and Lennon, 2018; Suh and Miner, 2013; Suleiman et al., 2013). Not only hereditary syndromes but also acquired diseases such as diabetic nephropathy or even kidney transplant glomerulopathy affect the integrity of the GBM by altering structure and composition (Zhang et al., 2018). There is still an ongoing debate to what extent the GBM itself impacts the properties of the kidney filtration barrier (Suh and Miner, 2015), but it is clear that its structure...
Figure 1. The podocyte-enriched FERM-domain protein EPB41L5 controls GBM development in vivo and extracellular matrix synthesis in vitro

(A) Schematic illustrating the generation of a podocyte-specific Epb41l5 KO mouse model by using hNPHS2Cre.

(B) Ultrastructural analysis shows impaired BM fusion and altered internal structure of the GBM (red asterisks indicate nodular matrix fragments; red arrows mark splitting of the GBM; black and red arrowheads indicate podocyte and endothelial BM, respectively; FP, foot process; EC, endothelial cell; GBM, glomerular basement membrane).

(C) FP to EC distance quantification shows increased GBM thickness in Epb41l5 KO mice at P0 (each dot indicates one animal; 1–6 glomeruli per individual mouse were analyzed; ***p < 0.001).

(D) Glomeruli from Epb41l5*hNPHS2Cre KO and WT mice were isolated at P21. Western blot analysis for EPB41L5, ACTN4, and TUBA confirms loss of EPB41L5.

(E and F) Immunofluorescence analysis of glomerular COL4A4 expression demonstrates reduced expression levels in KO mice at P21 (each dot indicates 1 individual animal; 21–57 glomeruli per mouse were analyzed; ***p < 0.001; white arrows highlight areas of decreased COL4A4 GBM staining, whereas white arrowheads mark areas with accumulations of COL4A4 staining intensities).

(G–K) 3D reconstruction of matrix networks highlights decreased collagen IV fiber density in cellular-derived matrices from EPB41L5 KO podocytes. Multimodal morphological analysis (including immunofluorescence, scanning electron microscopy, as well as CLEM) of decellularized ECM demonstrates decreased levels (legend continued on next page)
unequivocally provides the basis for efficient podocyte adhesion. Podocytes are post-mitotic cells with only a limited capacity for regeneration and form the outer layer of the kidney filtration barrier by tightly covering glomerular capillaries with specialized cellular protrusions (commonly termed as foot processes). These foot processes establish and maintain podocyte adhesion to the GBM against physical filtration forces relying on a specialized cytoskeleton and adhesion machinery (Lennon et al., 2014b). The relevance of efficient podocyte adhesion is well documented for acquired as well as hereditary forms of glomerulosclerosis (e.g., Itga3 mutations; Nicolaou et al., 2012; Kriedberg et al., 1996). Podocytes are anchored to the GBM by the integrin adhesomes, e.g., by the laminin receptor integrin α3β1 to establish a tight linkage toward the actin cytoskeleton (e.g., via Talin-1 [TLN1], Kindlin-2 [FERMT2] and α-Actinin-4 [ACTN4]). Remarkably, a series of in vivo knockout (KO) models proved the indispensable role of IAC components and revealed their involvement in force sensing and transduction (Kriedberg et al., 1996; Tian et al., 2014; Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018a; Rogg et al., 2021). Furthermore, recent proteomic studies demonstrated a cell-type-specific molecular composition of the podocyte IAC and GBM (Schell et al., 2017; Randles et al., 2020; Byron et al., 2014; Lennon et al., 2014a). However, it still remains unclear whether podocyte-specific components of the IAC contribute to the generation and assembly of the unique GBM and if reciprocal interactions between these two compartments influence the functional integrity of the filtration barrier.

We have recently identified the FERM-domain protein EPB41L5 as a podocyte-specific regulator of integrin adhesion formation by recruiting ARHGEF18 and activating RHOA-ROCK1/2-actomyosin signaling under dynamic conditions (Schell et al., 2017). Based on the analysis of in vivo as well as in vitro systems, we describe here the impact of EPB41L5 on the podocyte secretome, matrisome, and GBM in vivo. Our observations imply that EPB41L5 serves as a modulator of force-dependent IAC maturation by adhesion modulations for ACTN4 and PDLM5, resulting in ECM remodeling and shaping.

RESULTS

The podocyte-enriched FERM-domain protein EPB41L5 controls ECM synthesis in vitro and GBM development in vivo

To preserve the integrity of the glomerular filtration barrier, podocytes rely on a complex machinery to maintain their adhesion to the GBM. We recently identified the FERM-domain protein EPB41L5 as a core component of the podocyte integrin adhesomes (Figure S1; Schell et al., 2017; Rinschen et al., 2018). To explore the functional relevance of EPB41L5 for GBM integrity, we generated a podocyte-specific conditional KO mouse model by using the Epb41l5fl/flhNPHS2Cre allele as previously reported (Figure 1A; Figure S1) (Schell et al., 2017). Ultrastructural analysis of respective Epb41l5 KO animals by transmission electron microscopy (TEM) demonstrated impaired fusion of endothelial and epithelial BM and pathological remodeling of the GBM at post-natal day 0 (P0) and P7 (Figures 1B and 1C; Figure S2), indicating impaired GBM development in vivo. Moreover, loss of EPB41L5 led to a successive depletion of GBM-specific collagen IV (α3/α4/α5) network and to aberrant expression of developmental BM components like LAM1 and collagen IV α1/2 (Figures 1D–1F; Figure S3). To test the specificity and functional relevance of EPB41L5 for ECM synthesis, we analyzed CRISPR-Cas9-genome-edited EPB41L5 KO clones of human immortalized podocytes in vitro. We used two well-characterized EPB41L5 KO clones to synthesize podocyte-derived matrices and combined this method with efficient podocyte decellularization for further downstream applications (Schell et al., 2017; Kaukonen et al., 2017). Immunofluorescence analysis for collagen IV (COL4A2) revealed a decreased assembly of collagen IV fibers and structural alterations characterized by an overall decreased filament density due to the loss of EPB41L5 (Figures 1G and 1H). These observations were further corroborated by scanning electron microscopy, demonstrating a general reduction of ECM network density in respective KO podocytes (Figure 1I and 1J). Moreover, correlating light and electron microscopy (CLEM) of COL4A2 showed localization to the majority of ECM fibers, indirectly validating COL4A2 as a sufficient marker for an altered ECM/cell-derived matrix (CDM) structure (Figure 1K). Analysis of an additional seven individual EPB41L5 KO clones generated from two additional guide RNAs (gRNAs) and EPB41L5 rescue experiments substantiated these findings (Figure 1N; Figure S4).

EPB41L5 differentially impacts protein profiles of the podocyte secretome and matrisome

To characterize EPB41L5-dependent ECM modification on a global and molecular level, we isolated the soluble (conditioned media) and insoluble (CDM) extracellular fraction and performed quantitative mass spectrometry (Figure 2A). By using this approach, we identified 2,155 proteins within the secretome (soluble fraction) and 402 proteins within the matrisome (insoluble fraction). Label-free quantification of secretome proteins and quantitative SILAC (stable isotope labeling with amino acids) based matrisome analysis revealed distinct alterations of the podocyte secretome and matrisome composition due to the loss of EPB41L5 (Figures 2B and 2C; Table S1). Filtering these datasets by using a consensus ECM protein database (The Matrisome Project) not only validated the efficient isolation of ECM proteins of collagen IV network density in EPB41L5 KO matrices (maximum intensity projection of COL4A2 immunofluorescence; boxed areas indicate zoomed-in details; fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT, as indicated by intensity charts).

(L) Quantification of ECM thickness synthesized over 4 and 7 days (scatterplots indicate individual measurements; 15 per genotype at 4 days and 20 at 7 days; ***p < 0.0001).

(M and N) Semiquantitative ECM scoring (grading fibrillar COL4A2 network density and connectivity) demonstrates impaired network integrity due to loss of EPB41L5 (please see STAR Methods for detailed criteria for 5-tier grade ECM scoring and Figure S4 for exemplary images illustrating scoring; quantification for 9 individual CRISPR/Cas9 EPB41L5 KO clones, derived from 3 independent gRNAs, as well as 3 corresponding WT controls; ***p < 0.0001). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.
Figure 2. EPB41L5 differentially impacts protein profiles of the podocyte secretome and matrisome

(A) Schematic depicting the generation of EPB41L5-dependent secretome and matrisome preparations for further quantitative mass spectrometry (MS) analysis. (B and C) Scatterplots indicating detected proteins from MS analysis (2,155 secretome and 402 matrisome proteins). Significantly regulated proteins are highlighted in red (p < 0.01 for secretome proteins and log₂ fold change [FC] > 1 or < -1 in both SILAC-labeled replicates of matrisome proteins; see also Table S1). (D) Heatmaps depicting log₂FC for consensus ECM proteins detected by MS analysis. (E) Detailed analysis of the secretome dataset shows significantly changed patterns for secreted growth factors (e.g., downregulation of CTGF and CYR61) due to the loss of EPB41L5 (red dots indicate p < 0.01). (F) Comparative re-analysis with murine podocyte proteome (Rinschen et al., 2018) confirms the podocyte-specific expression of CTGF (CCN2) and CYR61 (CCN1) in vivo.
but also demonstrated marked regulation of core matrisome proteins (Figure 2D; Naba et al., 2016). Detailed analysis of the secretome dataset indicated alterations in the pattern of secreted growth factors, suggesting a potential involvement of EPB41L5 in intraglomerular signaling processes (Figure 2E). In particular, CYR61 (CCN1) and CTGF (CCN2), two well-known soluble factors affecting endothelial cell functions, were significantly decreased by the loss of EPB41L5 and were identified as specifically expressed by podocytes in vivo (Figure 2F; Brigstock, 2002; Sawai et al., 2007; Toda et al., 2018). Based on these analyses, we reasoned that EPB41L5-dependent changes in the secretory repertoire (e.g., growth factors or matrix-metalloproteinases) might be causative for the observed structural ECM phenotypes. To examine whether soluble factors alter GBM composition after EPB41L5 depletion, we performed indirect and direct co-culture assays with EPB41L5 WT and KO podocytes. However, the presence of EPB41L5 KO podocytes or conditioned medium did not significantly influence the structural ECM phenotype of WT podocytes, and the correlation of secretome and matrisome datasets did not reveal a direct relation for altered abundances of soluble and insoluble ECM proteins on a global level (Figures 2G–2I; Figure S5). Moreover, the application of a broad-spectrum matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) inhibitor did not affect EPB41L5-dependent structural ECM phenotypes. Therefore, we conclude that the observed structural ECM phenotype of EPB41L5 KO podocytes is not mediated by soluble factors.

EPB41L5 facilitates incorporation of secreted proteins into filamentous ECM

We next examined whether cell-inherent defects are causative for the observed changes of the GBM after elimination of EPB41L5. The integrity of the GBM relies on its unique molecular composition of the collagen-IV-linker-laminin complex. Moreover, correct incorporation of laminin-521 and -511 chains appears to be one main determinant for physiological integrin-receptor-mediated GBM signaling in vivo (Suleiman et al., 2013). An analysis of core GBM components within the secretome and matrisome datasets revealed distinct alterations due to the loss of EPB41L5 (Figures 3A–3D). In line with our initial observations of a low filament density CDM in EPB41L5 KO podocytes, further characterization of core components within the collagen-IV-linker-laminin complex demonstrated an almost complete loss of these proteins from the insoluble ECM (CDM) (Figure 3D). Most of these proteins were enriched (e.g., laminin-521 and Nidogen-1/2), unaffected (e.g., Agrin), or only modestly decreased (collagen IV) in the soluble extracellular fraction (secretome) (Figures 3B and 3D; Figure S5). Because the overall secretory capacity of EPB41L5 KO podocytes is unchanged (Figure 3C), these observations imply a defective incorporation of the collagen-IV-linker-laminin complex into insoluble ECM (e.g., filamentous) in EPB41L5 KO podocytes. One potential explanation for this phenomenon is provided by a model of collagen-IV-dependent stabilization of the collagen-IV-linker-laminin complex, for which polymerized collagen IV is required to establish a stable matrix scaffold for further incorporation of laminin-521/-511 by linker proteins (Mouw et al., 2014). As expected, levels of polymerized collagen IV were significantly reduced in KO-derived matrices (Figure 3E). Furthermore, immunofluorescence (IF)-based analysis of wild-type (WT)- and KO-derived matrices for LAMAS and LAMC1 confirmed decreased laminin incorporation into KO-derived matrices and revealed a predominant recruitment of laminin to filamentous collagen IV (Figures 3F and 3G; Figure S6). Based on these observations, the inverse abundance of laminin-521/-511 within the soluble and insoluble ECM fraction (i.e., secretome and matrisome) might be attributed to a defective assembly of collagen IV networks. Together with the observed GBM alterations for collagen IV α3/α4/α5 networks in Epb41l5 KO mice (Figure 1), these data indicate that EPB41L5 serves as a regulator of molecular ECM composition, stabilizing the collagen-IV-linker-laminin complex. Hereditary laminin- and collagenopathies (e.g., Alport syndrome) revealed that podocytes rely on physiological GBM collagen IV and laminin networks (Funk et al., 2018). We reasoned that the EPB41L5-dependent matrisome might influence the functional capacities of podocytes. Therefore, we performed cell adhesion assays to evaluate ECM ligand-to-integrin receptor affinity and binding (Figures 3H–3L). These assays demonstrated overall reduced integrin receptor binding when WT podocytes were exposed to CDMs derived from EPB41L5 KO cells (Figures 3I and 3J). Exogenous enrichment of respective KO CDMs with either non-filamentous collagen I or laminin-521 was sufficient to ameliorate this phenotype (Figures 3K and 3L). This result indicates that a diminished abundance of specific integrin ligands is the underlying mechanism for decreased adhesion properties. Furthermore, podocytes showed an overt morphological simplification on KO CDMs characterized by decreased generation of cellular protrusions, increased myosin II activation levels, and nuclear YAP/TAZ translocation (Figures S6C–S6J). Thus, EPB41L5-dependent ECM remodeling appears to be a prerequisite for efficient and balanced outside-in signaling in podocytes.

EPB41L5 controls IAC function

Integrin receptor function is a major determinant for physiological BM signaling and remodeling (Jayadev et al., 2019; Hohenester and Yurchenco, 2013; Humphrey et al., 2014). ECM synthesis and reorganization is accepted as a continuous and long-lasting biological process. Based on these observations, we reasoned that EPB41L5 might modulate and fine-tune already established IACs, thereby impacting podocyte ECM remodeling. To evaluate integrin function, we performed cell adhesion assays on defined integrin ligands by using EPB41L5 WT
Figure 3. EPB41L5 facilitates incorporation of secreted proteins into filamentous ECM
(A) Schematic depicting the generation of soluble (secretome/conditioned medium [CM]) and insoluble (matrisome/cell-derived matrices [CDMs]) ECM fractions.
(B) Comparative analysis of EPB41L5-dependent secretome and matrisome datasets shows an inverse relationship for core proteins of the GBM (secretome and matrisome samples are adjusted to relative protein content for proteomic analysis).

(legend continued on next page)
and KO podocytes (Figures 4A and 4B). These experiments demonstrated an impaired ligand affinity of EPB41L5 KO podocytes on all tested ligands, but it was even more pronounced for collagen I and collagen IV. Morphometric evaluation of IACs on collagen-IV-coated substrates showed a significant decrease in IAC density with a loss of more matured adhesion classes (Figures 4C–4E). Concomitantly, mean adhesion size and relative distribution of adhesion numbers per size class were overall shifted to smaller adhesions in EPB41L5 KO podocytes (Figures 4F and 4G). Of note, individual adhesion morphology and recruitment of mechano-adapters like Zyxin to already matured adhesion classes were unaffected (Figures 4H and 4I). However, the total level of adhesion-bound Zyxin per cell was drastically decreased in KO podocytes, reflecting the significant loss of matured and force-dependent adhesions (Figures 4J and 4K). These data indicate an intricate interdependency between impaired IAC maturation, reduced ligand binding, and mechano-signaling, which critically relies on EPB41L5 function in podocytes.

**EPB41L5 controls podocyte matrix remodeling by force-dependent adhesion maturation**

Podocytes are constantly exposed to mechano-physical forces such as glomerular filtration and matrix rigidity of the GBM (Endlich et al., 2017). In general, external substrate forces are transmitted by integrin adhesion sites and result in the recruitment of cytoskeletal linker and adaptor proteins. This process leads to reinforcement of integrin-cytoskeleton linkage and initiates adhesion site stabilization and maturation (Kechagia et al., 2019). To examine force-dependent adhesion maturation, we analyzed substrate-rigidity-dependent IAC formation in podocytes. Morphometric analysis of WT and EPB41L5 KO podocytes on either stiff or soft substrates demonstrated an overall impaired adaptation of IACs in KO cells. Not only total adhesion area but also parameters such as adhesion density and IAC size on stiff substrates were decreased in EPB41L5 KO podocytes (Figures 5A–5D). Moreover, the direct measurement of exerted forces using traction force microscopy revealed reduced traction and strain energies in EPB41L5 KO podocytes (Figures 5E and 5F). IACs connect the ECM and the actin cytoskeleton, allowing bidirectional transmission of extra- and intracellular forces (Kechagia et al., 2019). Therefore, we speculated that this impaired transmission of forces by EPB41L5 KO cells might also translate into diminished remodeling of the underlying matrix substratum.

**ACTN4 and PDLIM5 recruitment to the integrin adhesome is promoted by EPB41L5**

To elucidate potential mechanisms for how EPB41L5 modulates IAC maturation, we performed SILAC-based integrin adhesome proteomics. Interestingly, an analysis of this EPB41L5-modulated adhesome showed a marked enrichment of proteins commonly attributed to the cytoskeleton-IAC interface (Figure 6A). Further classification of detected proteins demonstrated that the majority of these enriched proteins are recruited to the adhesome in a myosin-II- and LIM-domain-dependent manner (Schiller et al., 2011; Kuo et al., 2011). EPB41L5 promoted not only the recruitment of well-described mechano-adapters like ZYX but also of ACTN4 and PDLIM5. These observations were further corroborated by IF studies showing decreased differential recruitment levels of ZYX, ACTN4, and PDLIM5 to integrin adhesion sites in an EPB41L5-dependent mode (Figures 4J, 4K, 6B, and 6C). Moreover, modulation of substrate stiffness or titrating actomyosin contractility of podocytes by Y27632 treatment demonstrated that recruitment of PDLIM5 and ACTN4 to IACs occurs in a mechanosensitive mode (Figures 6D and 6E). Recently, we described EPB41L5 as a regulator of the RhoA/ROCK/actomyosin pathway by directly interacting...
with the RhoGEF ARHGEF18 (Schell et al., 2017). Therefore, we asked whether EPB41L5-dependent effects on the adhesome are primarily mediated through signaling or direct protein/complex formation. Endogenous immunoprecipitation studies indicated that EPB41L5 is capable of forming an (indirect) protein complex with PDLIM5 and ACTN4 (Figure S7), whereas other bona fide IAC components such as ZYX or VASP were not detected by this approach. These findings imply that EPB41L5 fine-tunes the IAC composition of podocytes through indirect recruitment of PDLIM5 and ACTN4 in an ARHGEF18/RhoA/
Figure 5. EPB41L5 controls podocyte matrix remodeling by force-dependent adhesion maturation

(A and B) Substrate-stiffness-dependent FA maturation is impaired in EPB41L5 KO podocytes. Substrate-stiffness-induced increase of total adhesion area is reduced in KO podocytes, as demonstrated by quantification of FA area.

(C and D) In line with this observation, adhesion density and concomitantly adhesion size are decreased in EPB41L5 KO podocytes depending on matrix rigidity (cells from 3 independent experiments and >20 cells per experiment, genotype, and substrate were analyzed; *p < 0.05, ****p < 0.0001).

(E and F) Traction force microscopy demonstrates decreased traction forces and strain energy of EPB41L5 KO cells (pseudo-colored force maps, note difference in individual traction scale between WT and KO cells; 27 WT [polled WT1 and WT2] and 24 KO [polled KO1 and KO2] cells were analyzed; ***p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001).

(G) Compaction of collagen fibers by EPB41L5 KO podocytes is reduced on polymerized collagen I gels (white arrows indicate collagen I bundles).

(H–K) Impaired integrin-mediated mechanotransduction in podocytes by KO of FERM2 or inhibition of actomyosin contractility by Y27632 recapitulates ECM phenotypes, as observed in EPB41L5 KO cells (maximum intensity projections are shown; fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT; 3 independent experiments with 2 replicates per experiment and condition were analyzed; ****p < 0.0001). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.
Figure 6. ACTN4 and PDLIM5 recruitment to the integrin adhesome is promoted via EPB41L5

(A) Map of SILAC-based quantitative EPB41L5-dependent integrin adhesome. Myosin-II-dependent adhesome proteins are highlighted by red circles and LIM domains by blue dotted circles.

(B) Recruitment of ACTN4 and PDLIM5 to integrin adhesion sites is impaired due to a deficiency of EPB41L5 (white arrows indicate FAs co-stained with PXN).

(C) FA recruitment of PDLIM5 and ACTN4 was analyzed by fluorescence intensity measurements of individual FAs. PXN staining was used for segmentation of FAs (scatter dots show mean and integrated intensity values for individual cells; 3 independent experiments and 20–30 cells per experiment and condition were analyzed; **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001).

(D and E) ACTN4 and PDLIM5 recruitment to integrin adhesions and the actomyosin cytoskeleton depends on substrate stiffness and actomyosin contractility (podocytes were cultured on soft [1.5-kPa gel] or stiff [glass] substrates for 24 h; 10 μM of the ROCK inhibitor Y27632 or DMSO control was applied for 1 h; yellow arrows indicate recruitment and sarcomere-like pattern of ACTN4 and PDLIM5 at actomyosin filament, and yellow arrowheads indicate recruitment to integrin adhesions; 3 independent experiments and 100 cells per experiment and condition were analyzed; ****p < 0.0001).

(legend continued on next page)
ROCK/actomyosin-dependent manner. To test the impact of this EPB41L5-dependent IAC modulation on ECM regulation, we generated PDLIM5 KO podocytes by CRISPR-Cas9 genome editing (Figure 6F). IF analysis revealed a decreased assembly of collagen IV fibers and structural alterations characterized by overall decreased filament density due to a loss of PDLIM5, which resembled ECM phenotypes also observed in EPB41L5 KO podocytes (Figures 6G and 6H). The pathophysiological relevance of the EPB41L5/PDLIM5/ACTN4 complex for an intact glomerular filtration barrier was further substantiated by mRNA co-expression analysis for various glomerular disease entities, demonstrating pronounced downregulation of these proteins (Figure S7; Table S2; Schell et al., 2017). In line with these findings, we evaluated localization patterns for EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 in well-established mouse models of podocyte disease (Figure 7; Figure S7). Interestingly, an increased recruitment toward regions devoid of slit diaphragms for EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 was noted (Figure 7A). These observations imply a compensatory response and role of the EPB41L5/PDLIM5/ACTN4 complex, which was initiated by IAC and cytoskeletal remodeling in podocyte disease (Figure 7B).

**DISCUSSION**

Despite significant progress in understanding the molecular architecture of the kidney filtration barrier (Schell et al., 2017; Lennon et al., 2014a), the contribution of the integrin adhesome remains unknown.

We observed that the loss of the podocyte-specific adhesome component EPB41L5 resulted in structural GBM abnormalities, including incomplete fusion of the endothelial and podocyte basal membrane during GBM development (Figure 1; Figure S2). The specificity of this phenotype was further validated by a pronounced defect in ECM deposition in vitro, excluding secondary effects such as proteinuria (Figure 1). Mechanistic insight regarding specific modes of BM synthesis in vivo is limited due to experimental accessibility. Therefore, most data are derived from studies using model systems such as Caenorhabditis elegans and Drosophila melanogaster (Hamill et al., 2009; Morrissey and Sherwood, 2015; Ramos-Lewis and Page-McCaw, 2019).

However, it is widely accepted that collagens and laminins are secreted into the extracellular space and self-polymerize into complex networks (Hamill et al., 2009; Chew and Lennon, 2018). Moreover, maturation of the glomerular filtration barrier depends on a major shift in GBM composition, highlighting the complex process of GBM development. Recently, in vitro systems have mapped the global ECM profile and interplay of podocytes and glomerular endothelial cells at the proteome level, illustrating the validity and versatility of CDM models to elucidate certain aspects of GBM biology (Byron et al., 2014). By analyzing secretome and matriosome signatures of WT and EPB41L5 KO podocytes, we detected that two core ECM proteins (collagen IV and laminin-521/-511) showed an inverse correlation between the soluble and insoluble ECM fraction (Figures 2 and 3). Although both proteins showed decreased incorporation into the insoluble ECM, high abundance was detected in the soluble fraction. These observations implied that matrix degradation processes (e.g., by MMPs) might be mediating this phenotype.

Based on a set of co-culturing approaches, we demonstrated that secreted factors did not cause this phenotype (Figures 2 and 3). Instead, our observations demonstrated that the observed ECM phenotype was derived from cell-inherent effects of EPB41L5 controlling ECM assembly rather than secretory or indirect alterations (e.g., para- or autocrine mediated).

As an alternative to a secretion-dependent mode of BM assembly, one current concept proposes that ligand-matrix interactions might initially lead to immobilization of soluble ECM components and further facilitate spatially restricted polymerization as well as stabilization of the initial matrix scaffold (Hamill et al., 2009). Studies using embryonic bodies as model systems contributed to the notion that integrins are directly involved in BM assembly, thereby affecting the compositional architecture of ECM (Li et al., 2017; Aumaillé et al., 2000). Remarkably, previous studies focusing on embryonic gastrulation reported that BMs were less established in Epb41l5 null embryos than in WT control mice (Hirano et al., 2008). Studies in C. elegans demonstrated that integrin heterodimer composition differentially influences matrix deposition required for efficient BM assembly and shaping in vivo (Jayadev et al., 2019). In the context of the GBM, observations in several in vivo KO models targeting specific integrin subunits like Itga3 and Itgb1 imply that cell-adhesion receptors are involved in the process of GBM synthesis and assembly (Pozzi et al., 2008; Kreidberg et al., 1996). These findings are furthermore substantiated by the detection of structural GBM abnormalities in individuals affected by disease-causing ITGA3 mutations (Has et al., 2012). Although these studies clearly establish a critical role for integrins in ECM/GBM assembly, underlying mechanisms and the involvement of specific adhesome components in these processes remain uncharacterized.

Based on the known function of EPB41L5 in IAC formation (Schell et al., 2017; Hirano et al., 2008), we hypothesized that EPB41L5 might affect additional integrin-receptor functions specifically related to ECM assembly. Indeed, a detailed characterization of EB41L5 KO podocytes revealed that the loss of EPB41L5 not only resulted in a diminished integrin affinity toward ECM ligands but also caused decreased integrin adhesion maturation and traction force (Figures 4 and 5). IACs directly connect the surrounding ECM and the intracellular actin cytoskeleton, allowing bidirectional force transmission. In general, this interplay results in progressive integrin adhesion reinforcement, characterized by further recruitment of proteins to the IAC and adhesion site formation (Kechagia et al., 2019). Integrin affinity and adhesion reinforcement rely on Talin-1, Kindlin-2 (FERMT2), and mechanical forces to promote the extended-open conformation of beta-integrins (Sun

(F) Western blot analysis of PDLIM5 CRISPR-Cas9 KO and WT clones confirms loss of PDLIM5 in respective KO podocytes.

(G) COL4A2 immunofluorescence analysis of decellularized ECM demonstrates decreased levels of collagen IV network density in PDLIM5 KO matrices (fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT, as indicated by intensity charts).

(h) Semiquantitative ECM scoring of PDLIM5 CDMs synthesized over 7 days (scatter dots indicate individual WT and KO clones; *p < 0.05). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.
Remarkably, a recent study demonstrated that integrin binding by these adapters and cytoskeletal force are sufficient to enable integrin activation by forces in the low pN range (Li and Springer, 2017; Sun et al., 2019). Adhesome composition-dependent regulation of ultrasensitive integrin activation by physiological forces might represent an essential feature of IACs at podocyte foot processes and explain the profound phenotype caused by the podocyte-specific deletion of Itgb1, Tn1, Fermt2, and Epb41l5 (Kreidberg et al., 1996; Tian et al., 2014; Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018a). We observed similar phenotypes of disturbed ECM assembly and deposition caused by the loss of EPB41L5, when testing this mechanism in the context of ECM assembly, by using FERMT2 KO podocytes and actomyosin inhibition (Figure 5). These findings extend the concept of IACs as sole ligation spots for ECM assembly and integrate force signaling as an additional aspect of podocyte-mediated ECM organization and shaping.

Figure 7. EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 localization is disturbed in podocyte disease
(A) EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 localization is disturbed in murine models of podocyte disease, as demonstrated by immunofluorescence analysis. EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 recruitment is highly increased at regions with FP retraction, as demonstrated by reduced expression of the slit diaphragm marker NPHS1 (orange arrowheads and yellow dashed lines). Regions with unaffected NPHS1 localization showed no increased or slightly decreased EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 recruitment (blue arrowheads). Glomeruli of mice with adriamycin (ADR)-induced glomerulopathy as well as a podocyte-specific genetic focal segmental glomerulosclerosis (FSGS) model (N-WASP podocyte specific KO) were analyzed (boxed regions indicate zoomed-in details). Representative glomeruli at the early phase of podocyte disease were analyzed as indicated by moderate alterations of NPHS1 expression and localization in these glomeruli.
(B) Graphical summary of proposed EPB41L5-mediated functions in homeostasis of podocyte GBM and IAC properties.
Proteomic analysis of EPB41L5-enriched IACs indicated that EPB41L5 facilitates the recruitment of myosin-II-dependent adhesion components such as ACTN4 and PDLIM5, thereby modulating the repertoire of individual IACs (Figure 6). PDLIM5 belongs to the enigma protein subfamily and contains an N-terminal PDZ domain as well as C-terminal LIM-domains, which enable linkage to α-Actinin and other proteins (Verdonschot et al., 2020). More recently, PDLIM5 and α-Actinin have been implicated in force transmission and mechanotransduction signaling at IACs (Elbediwy et al., 2018; Ajeian et al., 2016; Meacci et al., 2016; Feng et al., 2018; Roca-Cusachs et al., 2013). In line with these reports, PDLIM5 recruitment to IACs was EPB41L5- and mechano-dependent in podocytes (Figure 6). Moreover, PDLIM5 KO podocytes resembled ECM phenotypes of EPB41L5 KO cells (Figure 6). Although there is the notion that podocytes as specialized pericyte-like cells are exposed to continuous physical forces, there is only limited knowledge about how podocytes integrate these signals (Endlich et al., 2017). Based on our observations, we propose a model in which EPB41L5 is modulating the repertoire of podocyte IACs, which finally translates into IAC reinforcement and ECM remodeling (Figure 7B), i.e., EPB41L5 stimulates RhoA/actomyosin signaling at IACs by directly interacting with ARHGEF18 (Schell et al., 2017). The impaired integration of collagens and laminins in CDMs from EPB41L5 KO cells can be at least partially attributed to reduced levels of actomyosin contractility and IAC traction (Figure 5). In fact, there is ample evidence for actomyosin-mediated contractile forces in fibrillogenesis of fibronectin. Here, physical stretching of fibronectin leads to a release of cryptic binding sites within the fibronectin molecule, which in turn initiate and facilitate further fibronectin assembly (Lu et al., 2020; Danen et al., 2002). Moreover, the involvement of RhoA in maintaining the BM during embryonic gastrulation has been shown before, highlighting the essential role of epistatic force balance in cell-matrix interactions (Nakaya et al., 2008). Our observations have major implications for glomerular diseases, for which a decreased abundance of adhesion receptors not only results in podocyte detachment but also affects ECM integrity and stability. Actin cytoskeleton reorganization, RhoA/actomyosin activation, and podocyte detachment are frequently observed in podocytes (Elbediwy et al., 2018; Ajeian et al., 2016; Meacci et al., 2016; Feng et al., 2018; Roca-Cusachs et al., 2013). In line with these reports, PDLIM5 recruitment to IACs facilitates the recruitment of myosin-II-dependent adhesion components such as ACTN4 and PDLIM5, thereby modulating the repertoire of individual IACs (Figure 6). PDLIM5 belongs to the enigma protein subfamily and contains an N-terminal PDZ domain as well as C-terminal LIM-domains, which enable linkage to α-Actinin and other proteins (Verdonschot et al., 2020). More recently, PDLIM5 and α-Actinin have been implicated in force transmission and mechanotransduction signaling at IACs (Elbediwy et al., 2018; Ajeian et al., 2016; Meacci et al., 2016; Feng et al., 2018; Roca-Cusachs et al., 2013). In line with these reports, PDLIM5 recruitment to IACs was EPB41L5- and mechano-dependent in podocytes (Figure 6). Moreover, PDLIM5 KO podocytes resembled ECM phenotypes of EPB41L5 KO cells (Figure 6). Although there is the notion that podocytes as specialized pericyte-like cells are exposed to continuous physical forces, there is only limited knowledge about how podocytes integrate these signals (Endlich et al., 2017). Based on our observations, we propose a model in which EPB41L5 is modulating the repertoire of podocyte IACs, which finally translates into IAC reinforcement and ECM remodeling (Figure 7B), i.e., EPB41L5 stimulates RhoA/actomyosin signaling at IACs by directly interacting with ARHGEF18 (Schell et al., 2017). The impaired integration of collagens and laminins in CDMs from EPB41L5 KO cells can be at least partially attributed to reduced levels of actomyosin contractility and IAC traction (Figure 5). In fact, there is ample evidence for actomyosin-mediated contractile forces in fibrillogenesis of fibronectin. Here, physical stretching of fibronectin leads to a release of cryptic binding sites within the fibronectin molecule, which in turn initiate and facilitate further fibronectin assembly (Lu et al., 2020; Danen et al., 2002). Moreover, the involvement of RhoA in maintaining the BM during embryonic gastrulation has been shown before, highlighting the essential role of epistatic force balance in cell-matrix interactions (Nakaya et al., 2008). Our observations have major implications for glomerular diseases, for which a decreased abundance of adhesion receptors not only results in podocyte detachment but also affects ECM integrity and stability. Actin cytoskeleton reorganization, RhoA/actomyosin activation, and podocyte detachment are frequently observed in glomerular disease (Perico et al., 2016; Suleiman et al., 2017). Moreover, very recently, an elegant study introduced podocyte compressive forces toward the GBM as major determinants to counteract filtration pressure and maintain the filtration barrier (Butt et al., 2020). Thus, maladaptation of the adhesome might initiate a self-perpetuating cascade, leading to GBM remodeling and progressive impairment of the filtration barrier integrity in glomerular disease.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antibodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTN4</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>Cat#ab108198; RRID:AB_10858236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHGEF18</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA042689; RRID:AB_10794385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL1</td>
<td>Novus Biologicals</td>
<td>Cat#NB600-408; RRID:AB_343276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL4</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>Cat#ab6586; RRID:AB_305584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL4A2</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>Cat#MAB1910; RRID:AB_2082643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COL4A4</td>
<td>Miner and Sanes, 1994</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTTN</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#3503S; RRID:AB_2115160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA037564; RRID:AB_2675547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5</td>
<td>gen. gift R. Roepman, see Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA037563; RRID:AB_2675546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAG M2</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>Cat#F3165; RRID:AB_259529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAPDH</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>Cat#ab8245; RRID:AB_2107448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMA5</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#AMAb91124; RRID:AB_2665809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMB1</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA004056; RRID:AB_1079226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMB2</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#AMAB91097; RRID:AB_2665799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMC1</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA001909; RRID:AB_1079230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPHS1</td>
<td>PROGEN</td>
<td>Cat#GP-N2; RRID:AB_1542487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pan-ACTN (ACTN1)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>Cat#sc-166524; RRID:AB_2257995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLIM5</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA016740; RRID:AB_1855153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-MLC</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#3671; RRID:AB_330248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-MLC</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#3674; RRID:AB_2147464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PXN</td>
<td>BD Biosciences</td>
<td>Cat#610051; RRID:AB_397463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLN1</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>Cat#T3287; RRID:AB_477572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUBA</td>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>Cat#T9026; RRID:AB_477593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VASP</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#3132; RRID:AB_2213393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT1</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>Cat#ab15249; RRID:AB_301790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAP/TAZ</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#8418; RRID:AB_10950494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZYX</td>
<td>Atlas Antibodies</td>
<td>Cat#HPA004835; RRID:AB_1080771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAG M2 Affinity Agarose Gel</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#A2220; RRID:AB_10063035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor Phalloidin 488</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-12379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor Phalloidin 546</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-22283; RRID:AB_2632953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor 555, donkey anti-rabbit IgG</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-31572; RRID:AB_162543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor 488, goat anti-guinea pig IgG</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-11073; RRID:AB_2534117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor 555, goat anti-mouse IgG1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-21127; RRID:AB_2535769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor 488, goat anti-mouse IgG1</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-21121; RRID:AB_2535764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat anti-rabbit IgG, HRP-linked Antibody</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>Cat#7074; RRID:AB_2099233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goat anti-mouse Immunoglobulins/HRP</td>
<td>Agilent, Dako</td>
<td>Cat#P0447; RRID:AB_2617137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexa Fluor 647, goat anti-guinea pig IgG</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#A-21450; RRID:AB_2735091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPI</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#D21490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### REAGENT or RESOURCE SOURCE IDENTIFIER

#### Biological samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biological samples</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mouse tissue Epb41l5fl/fl*NPHS2Cre</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse tissue Adriamycin nephropathy</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2015</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse tissue N-WASP inducible</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3-Aminopropyl)trimethoxysilane</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#281778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ-Dish 35 mm, high ESS Variety Pack</td>
<td>Ibidi</td>
<td>Cat#81199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ-Dish 35 mm, high Grid-50 Glass Bottom</td>
<td>Ibidi</td>
<td>Cat#81148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ-Slide 2 Well Co-Culture</td>
<td>Ibidi</td>
<td>Cat#81806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ-Slide 8 Well, Collagen IV</td>
<td>Ibidi</td>
<td>Cat#80822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Bis Solution; 2% bis-acrylamide solution</td>
<td>BioRad</td>
<td>Cat#1610142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Acrylamide Solution</td>
<td>BioRad</td>
<td>Cat#1610140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced TC, cell culture dish, 145/20 MM</td>
<td>Greiner BIO-ONE</td>
<td>Cat#639960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced TC, cell culture dish, 35/10 MM</td>
<td>Greiner BIO-ONE</td>
<td>Cat#627960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 111 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 121 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 211 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 221 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 411 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 421 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 511 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biolaminin 521 LN</td>
<td>BioLamina</td>
<td>Cat#LN521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bovine Type I Collagen Solution, PureCol</td>
<td>AdvancedBioMatrix</td>
<td>Cat#5005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collagen IV from human placenta</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#C5533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collagenase, Type 2</td>
<td>Worthington Biochemical</td>
<td>Cat#LS004176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNase I</td>
<td>AppliChem</td>
<td>Cat#A3778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibronectin</td>
<td>Corning</td>
<td>Cat#354008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FluoSpheres Carboxylate-Modified Microspheres, 0.04 μm, red-orange fluorescent (565/580)</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#F8794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gelatin</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#G1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glass Bottom Dish 35 mm</td>
<td>Ibidi</td>
<td>Cat#81218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Ascorbic acid</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#A92902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marimastat</td>
<td>Selleckchem</td>
<td>Cat#S7156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Essential Amino Acids</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#11140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Protein Concentrator PES, 10K MWCO</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#88528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protease from Streptomyces griseus</td>
<td>Sigma-Aldrich</td>
<td>Cat#P6911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfo SANPAH Crosslinker</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#22589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y-27632</td>
<td>Selleckchem</td>
<td>Cat#S1049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Critical commercial assays

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical commercial assays</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pierce BCA Protein Assay Kit</td>
<td>Thermo Fisher Scientific</td>
<td>Cat#23227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deposited data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deposited data</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The LC-MS/MS datasets for proteome profiling of cell conditioned medium (CCM)</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>MassIVE / ProteomeXchange with the identifiers MSV000086766 / PXD023839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LC-MS/MS datasets for proteome profiling of cell-derived matrices (CDM)</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>MassIVE / ProteomeXchange with the identifiers MSV000086766 / PXD023833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The LC-MS/MS datasets for proteome profiling of the adhesome</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>ProteomeXchange Consortium via PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD023821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental models: cell lines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13)</td>
<td>M. Saleem, Bristol University</td>
<td>AB8/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEK293T/17</td>
<td>ATCC</td>
<td>CRL-11268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; non targeting; EPB41L5 wild type (WT) clone 1</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; non targeting; EPB41L5 wild type (WT) clone 2</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; EPB41L5 sgRNA-1; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 1</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; EPB41L5 sgRNA-1; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 2</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; non targeting; FERMT2, wild type (WT)</td>
<td>(Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018a)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; FERMT2 sgRNA-1; FERTM2 knockout (KO)</td>
<td>(Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018a)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 non targeting; EPB41L5 wild type (WT) clone 1</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 non targeting; EPB41L5 wild type (WT) clone 2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-2; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 1</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-2; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-2; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 3</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-3; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 1</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-3; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-3; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 3</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; pLentiCRISPRv2 sgRNA-3; EPB41L5 knockout (KO) clone 4</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; TLCV2 non targeting; PDLIM5 wild type (WT) clone 1</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/ Cas9 modified; TLCV2 non targeting; PDLIM5 wild type (WT) clone 2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REAGENT or RESOURCE</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>IDENTIFIER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 non targeting; PDLIM5 wild type (WT) clone 3</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 sgRNA-1; PDLIM5 knockout (KO) clone 1; “KO-1”</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 sgRNA-2; PDLIM5 knockout (KO) clone 1; “KO-2”</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 sgRNA-2; PDLIM5 knockout (KO) clone 2; “KO-3”</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 sgRNA-2; PDLIM5 knockout (KO) clone 3; “KO-4”</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immortalized human podocytes (AB8/13); CRISPR/Cas9 modified; TLCV2 sgRNA-2; PDLIM5 knockout (KO) clone 4; “KO-5”</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Experimental models: organisms/strains**

- mouse: hNPHS2Cre Moeller et al., 2003 N/A
- mouse: Epb41l5floxflox Schell et al., 2017 N/A

**Oligonucleotides**

Oligonucleotides for Genotyping PCR and sgRNA synthesis, see Table S4

**Recombinant DNA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plasmid</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLCV2</td>
<td>Barger et al., 2019</td>
<td>Addgene plasmid #87360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lentiCRISPRv2</td>
<td>Sanjana et al., 2014</td>
<td>Addgene plasmid #52961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pWPXLd</td>
<td>gift from Didier Trono</td>
<td>Addgene plasmid #12258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5 pcDNA6</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luciferase pcDNA6</td>
<td>Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5-sgRNA2.lentiCRISPRv2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5-sgRNA3.lentiCRISPRv2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLIM5-sgRNA1.TLCV2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDLIM5-sgRNA2.TLCV2</td>
<td>This paper</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFP.pWPXLd</td>
<td>This paper; swap cloning from existing plasmids Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAG.pWPXLd</td>
<td>This paper; swap cloning from existing plasmids Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5.pWPXLd</td>
<td>This paper; swap cloning from existing plasmids Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLAG-EPB41L5.pWPXLd</td>
<td>This paper; swap cloning from existing plasmids Schell et al., 2017</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Software and algorithms**

- Fiji Image Analyzer v1.52: FIJI [https://fiji.sc/](https://fiji.sc/)
- GraphPad Prism 8 Software: GraphPad Software [https://www.graphpad.com/scientific-software/prism/](https://www.graphpad.com/scientific-software/prism/)
- CHOPCHOP version 2&3: Labun et al., 2019 [https://chopchop.cbu.uib.no/](https://chopchop.cbu.uib.no/)
- Nephroseq v4: Applied Systems Biology Core, University of Michigan [https://www.nephroseq.org/index.jsp](https://www.nephroseq.org/index.jsp)
RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact
Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the Lead Contact, Christoph Schell (christoph.schell@uniklinik-freiburg.de).

Materials availability
Plasmids, cell lines, mouse lines and unique/stable reagents newly generated in this study will be made available on reasonable request (Materials Transfer Agreement (MTA) may be required).

Data and code availability
The LC-MS/MS datasets for proteome profiling of cell-derived matrices (CDM) and cell conditioned medium (CCM) have been made publicly available in MassIVE / ProteomeXchange with the identifiers MSV000086766 / PXD023833 (CDM) and MSV000086767 / PXD023839 (CCM), respectively. The mass spectrometry proteomics data of the adhesome have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD023821.

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS

Animals
Generation of podocyte specific {Epb41l5} knockout (KO) mice was previously described (Schell et al., 2017). In short, the well-established {hNPHS2-Cre} mouse line (Moeller et al., 2003) was intercrossed to {Epb41l5} conditional mice to generate a podocyte specific knockout mouse model for {Epb41l5} (the {hNPHS2-Cre} allele was kindly provided by Lawrence Holzman - Renal, Electrolyte and Hypertension Division, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine Philadelphia, PA, USA). Mice were maintained on a SV129 background. Tissue samples from well-established glomerular disease models (Adriamycin (ADR), and {NWASP} knockout mice) were previously described (Schell et al., 2013, 2015). Mice were housed in a SPF facility with free access to chow (Kliba-NAFAG, standard chow - 3807.PM.L15), water and kept at 12 hour day/night cycle. Animals were housed in groups of 3-5 mice after weaning. Age/developmental stage of animals used for respective experiments are stated in the figures, figure legends and Method details (male and female animals showed similar phenotypes and combined analysis is presented). All mouse experiments were performed according to the National Institutes of Health Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals, as well as the German law governing the welfare of animals and were approved by local authorities (Regierungspraesidium Freiburg).

Cell Lines
Human immortalized podocyte cells (from male donor) were previously described in detail and maintained according to described procedures (Saleem et al., 2002; Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018b). For all cell culture experiments, human immortalized podocytes were cultured in RPMI 1640 medium supplemented with Glutamine, 10% FCS, ITS and non-essential amino acids. Podocytes were cultured in RPMI in a cell culture incubator at 33\(^\circ\)C, 95% air 5% CO\(_2\). Humane HEK293T/17 cells were cultured in Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle’s Medium supplemented with Glutamine and 10% FCS. HEK293T/17 cells (from female donor) were cultured in a cell culture incubator at 37\(^\circ\)C, 95% air 5% CO\(_2\). The used human immortalized podocyte cell line was created and received from M. Saleem, Bristol University (Saleem et al., 2002). Authentic HEK293T/17 cells were purchased at ATCC. Therefore no further authentication was performed.

METHOD DETAILS

Experimental Design
Number of independent experiments and total amount of analyzed cells, mice or samples are stated in the figures and/or figure legends. Samples were not randomized or blinded for quantification and analysis.

Glomerular Preparation
Isolation of glomeruli from 3 week old mice was performed based on perfusion with magnetic beads (Dynabead) as previously described in detail (Boerries et al., 2013). Glomeruli were glass-glass homogenized in RIPA lysis buffer (containing 20 mM CHAPS, Protease and Phosphatase inhibitors) and centrifuged at 15000 g for 15 minutes at 4\(^\circ\)C. Protein concentrations were assessed using Pierce BCA Protein Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA) and equal amounts of protein were applied for SDS-PAGE.

Antibodies
Application of antibodies used in this study was described in detail in the respective method sections and in Table S3.
SEM, TEM and CLEM Procedures
Preparation of kidney samples for transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was performed as previously described (Schell et al., 2018). In brief, small pieces of the renal cortex were dissected and cubes of about 2x2x2 mm were cut using razor blades. Samples were transferred into glass vials and immersion fixed using 4% PFA and 1% GA in PBS overnight at 4°C. The tissue was post-fixed in 1% osmium tetroxide in 6,86% saccharose in 0,1M phosphate buffer for 30 min and washed 6 times in 0,1M phosphate buffer. Dehydration was performed by 15 min incubations in 30% ethyl alcohol (EtOH) and 50% EtOH. The tissue was incubated in 1% uranyl acetate in 70% EtOH overnight at 4°C and further dehydrated in increasing concentrations of EtOH and finally aceton. After embedding in Durcupan resin ultrathin sections were cut using a UC7 Ultramicrotome (Leica), collected on Formvar-coated copper grids. Post staining was done for 1 min with 3% Lead Citrate followed by imaging using a Zeiss Leo 912 transmission electron microscope. Embedding, semi-thin sectioning and electron microscopy was performed at the EM core facility of the Department of Nephrology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Freiburg.

For correlative light-electron microscopy (CLEM), immunofluorescence (IF) and scanning electron microscopy (SEM) was performed sequentially. Maximum intensity projections of IF images were correlated to SEM images using Fiji ImageJ v1.51 s software (National Institute of Health (NIH), Bethesda, USA). Preparation of SEM samples was previously described (Schell et al., 2018). Electron microscopy was performed at the EM core facility of the Department of Nephrology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Freiburg.

Histology and Immunofluorescence Staining of Kidney Sections
Immunofluorescence staining of frozen kidney sections was performed as previously described (Schell et al., 2017). In brief, 4 μm sections were fixed in 4% PFA for 3 minutes and blocked with 5% BSA in PBS before primary antibodies were applied. After repetitive washing, sections were incubated with fluorophore-conjugated secondary antibodies. Following antibodies were used: NPHS1 (GP-N2, Progen), COL4 (ab6586, Abcam), LAMB1 (Jeffrey Miner, Washington University in St. Louis; Sasaki et al., 2002), COL4A4 (Jeffrey Miner, Washington University in St. Louis; Miner and Sanes, 1994). For COL4A4 fixation with 100% ethanol and pre-treatment with urea-glycine solution (6 M urea and 0.1 M glycine in ddH2O, pH 3.5) was performed as previously described (Miner and Sanes, 1994). Glomerular COL4A4 expression was quantified using Fiji ImageJ. Tuft areas of NPHS1 positive glomeruli were manually selected and mean fluorescence intensities per tuft area were measured for COL4A4, 21-57 glomeruli per animal were analyzed.

Kidney sections (2 μm) of FFPE tissue were generated as previously described (Schell et al., 2018). Afterward, sections were deparaffinized, rehydrated and underwent heat-induced antigen retrieval (Tris-EDTA buffer pH9, 15 minutes, pressure cooker). Sections were subsequently blocked with 5% BSA in PBS, incubated with primary antibodies and processed for immunofluorescence staining as described above. Following antibodies were used: PDLIM5 (HPA016740, Atlas Antibodies), EPB41L5 (HPA037564, Atlas Antibodies), NPHS1 (GP-N2, Progen), WT1 (ab15249, Abcam). Podocytes per glomeruli were quantified from clearly NPHS1 positive glomeruli at p0 (to ensure analysis of only late capillary lope and mature glomerular developmental states). All glomeruli fulfilling these criteria (9-31 per kidney section and animal) were analyzed. Cells with double positivity for NPHS1 and WT1 were identified as podocytes and podocyte numbers per tuft area and glomerulus were calculated.

Microscopy
Immunofluorescence images were taken with an inverted Zeiss Axio Observer microscope equipped with an ApoTome.2, an Axio- cam 702 mono and Colibri 7 illumination system. In addition an inverted Zeiss Axio Imager microscope was used. 100x, 63x, 40x, 20x and 10x objectives with Zeiss fluorescence filter sets (49 DAPI, 38 GFP, 43 HE dsRed, 50 Cy5) were used for immunofluorescence and 40x and 20x objectives for phase-contrast analysis.

CRISPR/Cas9
For cell culture experiments established EPB41L5 knockout and wild-type podocyte cell lines were used (referred to as KO-1, KO-2, WT-1, WT-2). Generation, validation, and characterization of these cell lines were described before (Schell et al., 2017). In brief, KO cells were generated using CRISPR/Cas9 genome editing technology in human immortalized podocytes. gRNA-1 was subsequently cloned in a CRISPR nuclease vector according to the manufacturer’s instructions (gRNA-1: 5’-GACTTGAATCTCCAGTGCAGGC(AAG)-3’, gene-art, Invitrogen, Karlsruhe, Germany). Single cell clones were validated using Sanger sequencing and western blot analysis. CRISPR/Cas9 genome edited FERMT2 KO podocytes were previously described (Yasuda-Yamahara et al., 2018a). EPB41L5 WT-1 control was generated from crude podocyte cell culture transfected with empty vector. EPB41L5 WT-2 control and FERMT2 WT control was generated from non-mutated podocyte clones.

For generating further EPB41L5 KO and PDLIM5 KO cell lines gRNAs were designed using the web-based platform CHOPCHOP (Labun et al., 2019) (EPB41L5 gRNA-2: 5’- CTTACCAGAACATCCACCCGAGGG-3’, EPB41L5 gRNA-3: 5’-GGACCACAGCATCGTGATGA(TGG)-3’, PDLIM5 gRNA-1: 5’- GATGTCGCCCCCATCTTGAACCCGTTCCGAGCCTAG(TGG)-3’, PDLIM5 gRNA-2: 5’- ATACCTGAAAGCTGCGCTAACCGCAGCTC(AAG)-3’, EPB41L5 gRNAs were further subcloned in a lentisCRISPRv2 plasmid which was a gift from Feng Zhang (Addgene plasmid #52961; http://addgene.org/52961; RRID:Addgene_52961; Sanjana et al., 2014). PDLIM5 gRNAs were further subcloned in a modified lentisCRISPRv2 plasmid (TLCV2) which was a gift from Adam Karpf (Addgene plasmid #87360; http://addgene.org/87360; RRID:Addgene_87360; Barger et al., 2019). Control (WT) clones were generated by using the lentisCRISPRv2 and TLCV2 plasmid without gRNA sequence for each individual gRNA respectively. Human immortalized podocytes were transduced with lentiviral particles and single cell clones were generated. EPB41L5 KO clones were validated by western blot analysis.
**EPB41L5 Expression Constructs**

EGFP, human full length \( \text{EPB41L5} \) and n-terminal FLAG tagged \( \text{EPB41L5} \) were swap-cloned into the pWPXLD plasmid which was a gift from Didier Trono (Addgene plasmid #12258; http://addgene.org/12258; RRID:Addgene_12258). Plasmids were validated by Sanger sequencing. Lentiviral transfection was performed and protein expression was validated by western blot analysis.

**Preparation and Staining of CDMs**

For synthesis of cellular derived matrices (CDMs) podocytes were seeded for 7 or 14 days on gelatin-coated (mainly consisting of collagen I) coverslips on 24 well plates. The podocyte medium was supplemented with 50 \( \mu \)g/ml vitamin C and changed every 24 hours. To analyze the decellularized CDMs cells were removed by an optimized preparation technique as previously described (Kauponen et al., 2017). In brief, cells were incubated with pre-warmed (37°C) extraction buffer (0,5% Triton X-100 and 20 mM NH4OH in PBS) for 3 minutes at room temperature. The cellular debris was diluted and removed by gently washing two times with PBS. Next, DNase I solution (15 U/ml DNase I and 1mM CaCl\(^{2+}\)/MgCl\(^{2+}\) in PBS) was added and incubated for 30 min at 37°C to eliminate residual cellular DNA. After this incubation the enzyme was removed and the CDMs were carefully washed three times with PBS. The resulting decellularized CDMs were used for further analysis. For visualization of native CDMs cells were seeded on collagen IV coated coverslips, CDMs were generated as described above and then fixed without any decellularization procedures.

Immunofluorescence staining of decellularized and native CDMs was performed via fixation with 4% PFA for 20 minutes and further incubation with 50 mM NH4Cl in PBS for 7min. After repetitive washing with PBS, permeabilization with 0,1% Triton X-100 in PBS was performed for 3min. The CDMs were blocked with 5% BSA in PBS for 1 hour and incubated with COL4A2 (MAB1910, Merck KGaA) for 2 hours. After several washing steps the fluorophore-conjugated secondary antibodies were applied for 1 hour.

Immunofluorescence staining of CDMs with LAMA5 (AMAb91124, Atlas Antibodies), LAMC1 (HPA001909, Atlas Antibodies) and COL4 (ab6586, Abcam) was performed after heat-induced antigen retrieval (Tris-EDTA buffer pH9, 30min, steamer). Subsequent staining procedures were performed as described before.

Inhibition studies were performed by adding 1 \( \mu \)M Marimastat in DMSO (Selleckchem, Munich, Germany) or 20 \( \mu \)M Y27632 in DMSO (Selleckchem, Munich, Germany) to the podocyte medium supplemented with 50 \( \mu \)g/ml vitamin C over 7 days of CDM generation. Medium was also changed every 24 hours.

**Quantitative Analysis of CDMs**

CDMs were analyzed by electron microscopy, immunofluorescence staining, western blot and proteomics as stated in the respective method sections. Quantitative analysis of CDMs was based on COL4A2 and DAPI immunofluorescence staining. CDM scores of decellularized CDMs were quantified employing analysis of the fibrillary networks and structures as shown in Figure S4. A semiquantitative score (5-tier grade) was defined: grade 0: one layer of not interacting and no or very short fibers; grade 1: one layer of weak interacting and short fibers; grade 2: 2 layers of interacting fibers and few fiber bundles; grade 3: > 2 layers of interacting fibers and fiber bundles building a thin fiber network; grade 4: multiple layers of strong interacting fibers and fiber bundles building a dense fiber network.

15 high power fields (200x magnification) per sample/replicate were analyzed and the mean score per sample/replicate was calculated. ECM thickness was measured using native CDMs without any decellularization or gelatin coating procedures. Therefore, the focal distance between the top and bottom plain of the CDM/cell sheet was measured using the z stack function of the ZEISS ZEN2 software.

LAMA5 and LAMC1 binding to Collagen IV fibers was quantified using Fiji ImageJ. First, immunofluorescence images were acquired using a 100x objective, z stack and apotome function of the AxioImager microscope. 2 stacks were converted to maximum intensity projections (MIPs) and Collagen IV fibers were selected by thresholding the COL4 or COL4A2 immunofluorescence signal respectively. LAMA5 or LAMC1 positive regions were segmented and within this Collagen IV mask the ratio of Laminin positive to total Collagen IV fiber area was calculated per individual image.

**Cell Adhesion Assay**

Cell adhesion assays were performed on different extracellular matrix components as previously described (Humphries, 2009). Collagen IV (50 \( \mu \)g/ml, collagen from human placenta, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany), collagen I (50 \( \mu \)g/ml, PureCol, Advanced Bio-Matrix, San Diego, USA), fibronectin (50 \( \mu \)g/ml, human fibronectin, Corning Inc., New York, USA) and several laminins (5 \( \mu \)g/ml, Bio-laminin LN, BioLamina, Sundbyberg, Sweden) were used as indicated. Briefly, 24 well cell culture plates were coated according to the manufacturer’s instructions and blocked with heat-denatured BSA (1% in PBS). Cells were trypsinized, counted and equal amounts of cells were seeded for 15 minutes on precoated 24 well cell culture plates. After several washing and fixation in 4% PFA, adherent cells were stained with 0,1% crystal violet in ddH\( _2 \)O for 1 hour. The dye was solubilized, and absorbance was measured at 570nm using a microplate reader.

For cell adhesion assays on CDMs \( \text{EPB41L5} \) WT and KO cells were seeded without any coating or with precoating as indicated (0,2% gelatin (mainly consisting of collagen I) or laminin-521 5 \( \mu \)g/ml) on 24well cell culture plates and CDMs were generated over a period of 7 days. After decellularization cell adhesion assays were performed using equal amounts of WT cells as described above.
Co-Culture Experiments

Co-culture experiments were performed using EPB41L5 WT and KO cells. For free exchange of soluble factors cells were seeded on ibidi μ-slide well co-culture dishes (ibidi GmbH, Gräfelfing, Germany) with EPB41L5 WT and KO cells as recipient or feeder cells. For direct cellular interaction cells were seeded on gelatin-precoated (mainly consisting of collagen I) coverslips on 24 well cell culture plates in various combinations (100% WT, 75% WT + 25% KO, 50% WT + 50% KO, 100% KO). CDMs were generated over a period of 7 days, decellularized and immunofluorescence-stained as described above.

CDM Reseeding Assay

CDMs were generated on 3.5 cm cell culture dishes Advanced TC (Greiner Bio-One International GmbH, Kremsmünster, Austria) without any precoating. Cells were seeded and CDMs were synthesized over a period of 7 days as described before. CDMs were decellularized and WT cells were seeded and incubated for 3 hours. Afterward the dishes were washed with PBS and fixed with 4% PFA. For analyzing Myosin-II-activity, YAP/TAZ nuclear translocation and morphological features immunofluorescence staining was employed as described before. Following antibodies were used: pMLC (#3671, Cell Signaling), pMLC (#3674, Cell Signaling), YAP/TAZ (#8418, Cell Signaling). Fluorescence intensities (gray values) were quantified from images using Fiji ImageJ. For pMLC analysis cell bodies were segmented based on Phalloidin (F-Actin) co-staining. For YAP/TAZ analysis cell nuclei were segmented based on DAPI co-staining.

Western Blot Analysis

Western Blot analysis was performed using whole cell lysates, CDM lysates and CM lysates. Whole cell lysates were generated via scraping the cells in RIPA buffer following denaturation with 2xLaemmli buffer with DTT. CDMs of EPB41L5 WT and KO cells were generated on 10 cm dishes without any precoating over a period of 7 days and subsequently decellularization was performed as described above. CDMs were then scraped in 2xLaemmli buffer with DTT and denatured for 20 min at 70 °C followed by 5 min at 95 °C. For generation of conditioned media (CM), EPB41L5 WT and KO cells were seeded on 14.5 cm Advanced TC dishes (Greiner Bio-One International GmbH, Kremsmünster, Austria) and cultured for 5 days. The medium was supplemented with 50 μg/ml vitamin C and changed every 48 hours. Hereon cells were washed 3 times and subsequently RPMI without FCS and phenol red (supplemented with ITS, non-essential amino acids and vitamin C) was added. CM was harvested after 24 hours, centrifuged (3000 g, 5 min, room temperature), filtered (0.45 μm filter) and then concentrated via Pierce Protein Concentrator columns (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA).

Digestion of generated CDMs was performed using Collagenase (preparation type 2, Worthington Biochemical Corp., Lakewood, USA). In brief, CDMs of EPB41L5 WT and KO cells were generated on 10 cm dishes without any precoating over a period of 7 days and subsequently scraped in HBSS containing 1 mM CaCl₂, MgCl₂, and 1 mg/ml Collagenase. After an incubation of 2 hours at 37 °C while gently shaking, samples were centrifuged (20000 g for 10 min at 4 °C) and denatured for 5 min at 95 °C by adding 2xLaemmli with DTT.

Protein concentration was measured using the Pierce BCA Protein Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, USA) following the manufacturer’s instructions. Equal amounts of protein or equal percentage of totally generated CDMs were loaded for standard SDS-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (SDS-PAGE) or for Coomassie staining. Coomassie staining was performed according to the manufacturer’s instructions (Imperial Protein Stain, Thermo Fisher Scientific).

SDS-PAGE and western blotting was performed using standard procedures. Blots were imaged using the HRP/ECL chemiluminescence method and X-ray films. For western blot validation of PDLIM5 KO podocytes a Chemiluminescence Imager (Intas) was used for digital image acquisition. Densitometry quantification of blot bands was performed using Fiji ImageJ.

Immunoprecipitation

Cells were cultured on 14.5 cm dishes to 90% confluency. Subsequently cells were lysed in Triton X-100 lysis buffer (1% Triton X-100, 20 mM Tris-HCL, 50 mM NaCl, 50 mM NaF, 15 mM Na₃P₂O₇, 1 mM EDTA in ddH₂O, pH 7.4) supplemented with proteinase and phosphatase inhibitors and centrifuged. Supernatants were incubated for 1 hour at 4 °C with Anti-FLAG M2 Affinity Agarose Gel (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany). Subsequently four wash steps with Triton X-100 lysis buffer were performed. Bound proteins were resolved in 2xLaemmli buffer with DTT and denatured at 95 °C for 5 min. Lysates were separated and analyzed by standard SDS-PAGE.

Focal Adhesion Analysis

EPB41L5 WT and KO cells were seeded on collagen IV coated 8 well μ-Slides (ibidi GmbH, Gräfelfing, Germany) for PXN and ZYX analysis or on 50μg/ml collagen IV coated (collagen from human placenta, Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) 3.5 cm glass bottom dishes (ibidi GmbH) for PDLIM5 and ACTN4 analysis. Podocytes were cultivated overnight for achieving steady state condition. Cells were fixed in 4% PFA and subsequently immunofluorescence staining for focal adhesion proteins (PXN, ZYX, PDLIM5 and ACTN4) was applied as described above. Substrate stiffness dependent focal adhesion maturation was analyzed using 3.5 cm μ-dishes ESS 1.5kPa (ibidi GmbH) and 3.5 cm glass bottom dishes (ibidi GmbH). Cell culture dishes were precoated with fibronectin (25 μg/ml, € 8418, Cell Signaling). Fluorescence intensities (gray values) were quantified from images using Fiji ImageJ. For pMLC analysis cell bodies were segmented based on Phalloidin (F-Actin) co-staining. For YAP/TAZ analysis cell nuclei were segmented based on DAPI co-staining.
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human fibronectin, Corning Inc., New York, USA. Cells were incubated overnight before fixation and subsequent immunofluorescence staining was employed as described above. For inhibition studies 10 μM Y27632 in DMSO (Selleckchem, Munich, Germany) was applied for 1 hour. Following antibodies were used: PXN (6105S1, BD Biosciences), ZYX (HPA004835, Atlas Antibodies), ACTN4 (ab108198, Abcam), PDLIM5 (HPA016740, Atlas Antibodies). Analysis of focal adhesions was performed using an image processing macro for Fiji ImageJ as described before (Schell et al., 2018). In brief, individual focal adhesions (FA) were segmented based on PXN immunofluorescence signal. Therefore, images were processed via background subtraction, unsharp masking, binarization and selection of binary FAs. This FA mask was transferred to the unprocessed image and segmented individual FAs were analyzed for morphometric parameters. ZYX, ACTN4 or PDLIM5 intensity of FAs was analyzed by using this PXN based FA mask in PXN co-stained cells. In addition, morphometric parameters of respective cells were measured to calculate FA density and the percentage of FA covered cell area for individual cells. Substrate stiffness dependent FA recruitment of ACTN4 and PDLIM5 was quantified applying a semiquantitative score (3 grades: strong, medium, low) on whole cell level to avoided fluorescence intensity artifacts by substrate gels. 100 cells per condition and replicate were quantified using a fluorescence microscope and 40x objective).

**Traction Force Microscopy**
Traction force microscopy (TFM) was performed as previously described (Plotnikov et al., 2014; Schell et al., 2018). In brief, gels with a Young’s modulus of 16kPa PAA (poly-acrylamide) were prepared on ibidi glass bottom μ-dishes. Gels were crosslinked to 1 mg/ml fibronectin for 4h after gel activation by the SulfO-SANPAH cross-linker. Equal amounts of cells per dish were seeded and cultivated at 37°C for 24 hours before the measurement of forces. Images of respective cells and subcellular beats were recorded before and after removal of the cell. Manipulation of the cells was performed with a micromanipulator (Eppendorf). Image analysis was done as previously described (Plotnikov et al., 2014).

**Collagen Bundling Assay**
PurCol collagen I gels (Advanced BioMatrix, San Diego, USA) were polymerized on 3.5 cm glass bottom dishes (Ibidi GmbH, Gräfelfing, Germany) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. EPB41L5 WT and KO cells were seeded and incubated overnight. Cells were subsequently fixed in 4% PFA and immunofluorescence staining was applied as described before using a COL1 antibody (NB600-408, Novus Biologicals).

**Proteomics Procedures**
For MS analysis of the podocyte secretome, sample generation was performed as described above for conditioned media (CM). After harvesting, CM was supplemented with 10 mM EDTA and 1 mM PMSF. Samples were centrifuged (3000 g, 5 min, 4°C) and filtered (0.22 μm filter). Proteins were precipitated from CM using Trichloroacetic acid (TCA). For label free quantitative proteomic analyses, sample preparation and mass spectrometry analysis (Q-Exactive plus system, Thermo Scientific, Bremen, Germany) were performed as previously reported (Binoissek et al., 2016). LC-MS/MS data analysis was performed as reported before (Binoissek et al., 2016).

For MS analysis of the podocyte matrisome, CDMs were generated according to the protocol described above. SILAC labeling of human immortalized podocytes was performed for 14 days as previously described (Schell et al., 2017). Thereafter SILAC medium supplemented with 50 μg/ml vitamin C was used to generate CDMs without any precoating procedures. After decellularization, CDMs were scraped into RIPA buffer, centrifuged, protein concentration was determined and 6xLaemmli buffer (+DTT) was added followed by denaturation at 70°C for 20 min. Based on SILAC labeling and protein concentration WT and KO samples were mixed 1:1 for MS-analysis.

For MS analysis of the podocyte adhesome, EPB41L5 or Luciferase (as negative control) was transiently expressed in SILAC labeled podocytes by nucleofection (Amaza Nucleofector, Lonza, Switzerland). Podocytes were seeded on cell culture dishes for 24 hours. Isolation of integrin adhesion complexes from podocytes was performed as previously described (Schell et al., 2017; Rogg et al., 2017). MS analysis of SILAC labeled samples was performed as previously described (Schell et al., 2017).

Matrisome and secretome datasets were compared to “The Matrisome Project” database for selection of consensus matrisome components (Hynes and Naba, 2012; Naba et al., 2016).

**QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**
If not stated otherwise in the figure legends, data are expressed as mean ± SEM. Scatter dots indicating individual data points were used for statistical analysis. Violin plots (Figures 4G and 5F) were used to visualize data distribution of FA sizes by means of the probability density of single FAs at different FA size values. In Figure 4G the white dot on the violin plot indicates the median, black bar indicates the interquartile range and whiskers indicate the lower/upper adjacent values (1.5x interquartile range). In Figure 5F lines indicate the median and quartiles. Statistic tests were used based on data distribution and experimental design. The following tests were used for indicated experiments: Unpaired Student’s t test (Figures 4A, 4J, 5I, and 5K), Unpaired t test with Welch’s correction (Figures 1C, 1F, 3G, 5B, 5C, 5D, and 6H), Mann-Whitney-U-test (Figure 5F), ONE-WAY Anova with Tukey’s multiple comparisons test) (Figures 1L, 1M, 1N, 2I, 2J,
or TWO-WAY Anova with Sidak’s multiple comparisons test (Figure 6E, only p values for strong recruitment are shown).

GraphPad Prism 8 software was used for statistical testing. The Nephroseq v4 database (https://www.nephroseq.org) was used for statistical analysis of EPB41L5 expression in human glomerular disease (Table S2). Statistical significance was defined as 
* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001 and **** p < 0.0001, n. s. – non-significant. Number of independent experiments and total amount of analyzed cells, mice or samples are stated in the figures and/or figure legends.
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Supplementary Figure Legends

Supplemental Figure 1. Analysis of \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre mice. Related to Figure 1.

(a) Re-analysis of \textit{in vivo} proteome data sets and comparison with podocyte specific marker proteins validates EBP41L5 as a highly podocyte specific enriched protein (Schell et al., 2017, Rinschen et al., 2018). (b) Correlative light/electron microscopy (CLEM) demonstrates predominant localization of EPB41L5 in the basal compartment of murine podocytes (maximum intensity projections (MIP) of z-stacks are shown; white arrows indicate co-localization; co-staining with NPHS1 marks podocytes). (c-d) Immunofluorescence staining demonstrates loss of EPB41L5 in the podocyte compartment of respective \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre KO mice (NPHS1 was employed as a podocyte specific co-marker). EPB41L5 expression in parietal epithelial cells (PECs) was not affected by podocyte specific deletion of \textit{Epb41l5} (indicated by white arrowheads). (e) PAS staining of glomeruli of \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre KO or WT mice (black arrow indicate GBM thickening; black arrowhead indicates areas of mesangial expansion). (f) Immunofluorescence staining of WT1 and NPHS1 shows no significant (n.s.) loss of WT1 and NPHS1 positive podocytes from glomeruli at p0 (scattered dots indicate individual animals). Data are represented as mean \pm SEM.

Supplemental Figure 2. Electron microscopy analysis of \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre mice. Related to Figure 1.

(a) Ultrastructural analysis employing transmission electron microscopy (SEM) shows impaired BM fusion and accumulation of inhomogeneous ECM material in \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre KO mice at p0 (white box indicates subepithelial ECM accumulation; white arrows indicate GBM invasive cellular protrusions; red arrows mark subepithelial GBM outpocketing; asterisks indicate accumulation of fibrillary ECM structures). (b) Foot process (FP) to endothelial cell (EC) distance was quantified at p0 (scatter dot plots indicate individual glomeruli; 5 WT and 5 KO mice and 1-6 glomeruli per mouse were analyzed; \textdagger\textdagger\textdagger\textdagger p<0.0001). Corresponding mean distance per analyzed mouse is shown in main Figure 1. (c) Fraction of unfused BM (expressed as percentage in relation to total analyzed GBM; scatter dots indicate individual glomeruli; 5 WT and 5 KO mice and 1-6 glomeruli per mouse were analyzed; *p<0.05). (d) Analysis of the glomerular basement membrane (GBM) by TEM revealed pathological remodeling of the GBM and persistence of unfused endothelial and epithelial BMs in \textit{Epb41l5}^{fl/fl}\textasteriskcentered*NPHS2Cre KO mice at p7 (black arrows indicate GBM in WT animals; black arrowheads mark epithelial BM and white arrowheads mark endothelial BM; white asterisks indicate accumulation of fibrillary ECM; red arrow marks subepithelial GBM outpocketing; FP – foot process, EC – endothelial cell). Data are represented as mean \pm SEM.
Supplemental Figure 3. GBM immunofluorescence analysis of Epb41l5^{fl/fl}*NPHS2Cre mice. Related to Figure 1.

(a) Images corresponding to analysis in main Figure 1. Immunofluorescence analysis of COL4A4 was performed in kidneys of Epb41l5^{fl/fl}*NPHS2Cre KO and WT mice at p21 (red arrows indicate areas of decreased COL4A4 staining). (c-f) Immunofluorescence analysis of collagen IV (COL4) and LAMB1 was performed in glomeruli of Epb41l5^{fl/fl}*NPHS2Cre KO and WT mice at p21. The basal podocyte compartment was co-stained with NPHS1 (boxed regions indicate zoomed-in detail; yellow arrows indicate areas of aberrant accumulation of COL4 and LAMB1 in the GBM of Epb41l5^{fl/fl}*NPHS2Cre KO mice. (g-h) Immunofluorescence analysis of glomerular COL4A4 expression demonstrates no significant changes in expression levels in KO mice at p0 (each dot indicates one individual animal; 21-57 glomeruli per mouse were analyzed; n.s. - non-significant). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.

Supplemental Figure 4. ECM analysis and validation of EPB41L5 CRISPR/Cas9 cells. Related to Figure 1.

(a) Exemplary images illustrating scoring of ECM structure employing a semiquantitative score (5-tier grade). Fibrillary ECM was stained by COL4A2 (lower panels show zoomed-in details; intensities were transformed to gold LUT as indicated by intensity chart). (b-e) Western blot analysis of EPB41L5 CRISPR/Cas9 KO and WT clones confirms loss of EPB41L5 in respective KO clones (GAPDH (Glycerinaldehyde-3-phosphat-Dehydrogenase) and alpha-tubulin (TUBA) were employed as a reference housekeeping protein). ECM analysis demonstrates impaired COL4A2 network integrity in all clones. (c) Semiquantitative ECM-scoring demonstrates impaired COL4A2 network integrity due to loss of EPB41L5 after 14 days of CDM synthesis. Corresponding to analysis in Figure 1g-n, EPB41L5 KO podocytes showed no further improvement in COL4 network at 14 days compared to 7 days of CDM synthesis (4 independent replicates per condition were analyzed; ****p<0.0001). (e) Representative images of decellularized CDMs of EPB41L5 WT and KO clones generated from gRNA2 and gRNA3 (fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT as indicated by intensity chart). (f) Western blot analysis of EPB41L5 KO podocytes confirms stable re-expression of EPB41L5 or EGFP (control). (g-h) COL4A2 immunofluorescence analysis of de-cellularized ECM demonstrates increased COL4 network density in matrices of EPB41L5 rescue podocytes (fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT as indicated by intensity charts). Semi-quantitative ECM-scoring of CDMs synthesized over 7 days (scatter dots indicate individual KO+EGFP (pooled KO1+EGFP&KO2+EGFP) and KO+EPB41L5 (pooled KO1+EPB41L5&KO2+EPB41L5) samples; 2 replicates for each genotype were analyzed; ****p<0.0001). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.
Supplemental Figure 5. Analysis of EPB41L5 dependent CDMs. Related to Figure 2&3.

(a) Global correlation analysis for secretome and matrisome datasets indicating no overall or
direct relation of altered soluble and insoluble ECM proteins (a-1 - 299 proteins detected in
both datasets; a-2 - 56 consensus ECM proteins detected in both datasets; pearson`s
correlation coefficient was calculated). (b) Application of the broad spectrum MMP inhibitor
Marimastat does not ameliorate EPB41L5-dependent structural ECM phenotypes
(fluorescence intensities were transformed to gold LUT as indicated by intensity chart; MIPs
of z-stacks are shown). (c) Additional CDM immunofluorescence staining for COL4A2
corresponding to experiments shown in Figure 2g-j. (d) Coomassie blue staining of
unbalanced total protein preparations from conditioned media (CM) or cellular derived
matrices (CDM). (e) Western blot analysis for Cortactin (CTTN) demonstrates successful
enrichment of extracellular proteins in CMs and CDMs with minimal contamination of
intracellular proteins. (f) Western blot quantification of LAMC1 and COL4 levels in CM of
EPB41L5 WT and KO podocytes. Analysis corresponding to Figure 3d (scatter dots indicate
individual CM preparations from WT-1, WT-2, KO-1 and KO-2 clones, *p<0.05; **p<0.01).
Data are represented as mean ± SEM.

Supplemental Figure 6. Functional analysis of EPB41L5 dependent CDMs. Related to
Figure 3.

(a) Immunofluorescence analysis of collagen IV and laminin chains confirms decreased
incorporation of COL4A2 and LAMC1 in filamentous ECM of EPB41L5 KO podocytes
(overview images). Laminin was predominantly detected attached to collagen IV filaments
(boxed regions indicate zoomed-in detail). (b) Quantification of LAMC1 recruitment to
collagen IV fibers (dots indicate analyzed MIPs of 88x66µm micrographs; ***p<0.001). (c-d)
Cell spreading of WT podocytes on EPB41L5 KO and WT CDMs reveals morphological
simplification of WT podocytes on KO CDMs. Cell morphology was visualized by F-actin
(Phalloidin) staining and analyzed by measurement of cell circularities (n=4 independent
experiments and 200 podocytes per group; ****p<0.0001). (e-f) Detailed analysis of spread
WT cells reveals decreased cellular protrusions on KO CDMs (arrowheads indicate filopodia
and lamellipodia, boxed regions indicate zoomed-in details, gamma adjusted MIPs are
shown for better visualization of filopodia). (g-h) Spread WT podocytes show increased
phosphorylated myosin light chain (pMLC) intensity levels on KO CDMs (pMLC depicted in
red, F-actin (Phalloidin) in green; boxed regions indicate zoomed-in details; arrowheads
indicate altered actomyosin filament distribution; 50 cells on WT or KO CDMs were analyzed;
values were normalized to the mean of WT; ****p<0.0001). (i-j) Spread WT podocytes
show increased nuclear YAP/TAZ translocation on KO CDMs (YAP/TAZ shown in red, F-
actin (Phalloidin) in green, cell nucleus (DAPI) in blue; arrowheads indicate cell nuclei; 87
WT and 87 KO cells were analyzed; values were normalized to the mean of WT;
****p<0.0001). Data are represented as mean ± SEM.
Supplemental Figure 7. Analysis of \textit{EPB41L5} dependent IAC function and composition. Related to Figure 5, 6 and 7.

(a) Application of the ROCK inhibitor Y27632 (10 µM) decreases incorporation of LAMC1 and LAMA5 into filamentous collagen IV ECM. Collagen IV fibers were co-stained with COL4A2 and COL4 (MIPs of z-stacks are shown). (b) Western blot analysis of \textit{EPB41L5} WT and KO podocytes demonstrates unaltered expression of PDLIM5 and ACTN4 in KO podocytes (lysates were balanced to protein concentration as validated by TUBA and GAPDH). (c) Immunoprecipitation of EPB41L5 demonstrates association of EPB41L5 with alpha-Actinin (pan-ACTN), ACTN4 and PDLIM5, whereas other adhesion proteins do not interact with this complex (e.g. ZYX, VASP). (d) Expression of \textit{EPB41L5}, \textit{ACTN4} and \textit{PDLIM5} is significantly downregulated in glomerular disease entities like diabetic nephropathy (DN), focal segmental glomerulosclerosis (FSGS), collapsing FSGS (cFSGS) and lupus nephritis. Alterations in minimal change disease (MCD) were not significant. For details and analysis of Nephroseq disease datasets see supplementary table 2. (e) EPB41L5 and PDLIM5 immunofluorescence signal is depleted from glomeruli at advanced disease stages. Glomeruli of mice with Adriamycin (ADR) induced glomerulopathy as well as a podocyte specific genetic FSGS model were analyzed. Advanced glomerular disease stage is indicated by loss of NPHS1 staining.
Supplemental Figure 1

(a) Representative podocyte specific enriched proteins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Rinschen et al.</th>
<th>Schell et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTN4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPB41L5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPHS1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMA5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPHS2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PODXL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHGAP24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAMB2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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