



Published in final edited form as:

Trends Cell Biol. 2016 July ; 26(7): 526–534. doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2016.03.003.

Signaling by cellular protrusions: keeping the conversation private

Michael Buszczak¹, Mayu Inaba^{1,2}, and Yukiko M. Yamashita²

¹ Department of Molecular Biology, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX 75390–9148, USA.

² Life Sciences Institute, Department of Cell and Developmental Biology Medical School, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

Abstract

Information exchange between different cells makes multicellular life possible. Signaling between cells can occur over long distances, as in the case of hormone signaling, or it can take place over short distances between immediately juxtaposed neighbors, as in the case of stem cell-niche signaling. The ability of signal-sending and –receiving cells to communicate with one another in a specific manner is of paramount importance in the proper development and function of tissues. Growing evidence indicates that different cellular protrusions help to achieve specificity in signaling that occurs between distinct cell types. Here, we focus on new roles for cellular protrusions in cell-to-cell communication, drawing special attention to how stem cells use specialized extensions to promote reception of self-renewing signals emanating from the niche.

Keywords

stem cell niche; asymmetric stem cell division; nanotubes; cytonemes

Emerging roles for cellular protrusions in cell-to-cell signaling

The ability of cells to communicate with each other to coordinate their activity (e.g. proliferation, cell fate determination, migration) is of fundamental importance to the formation and operation of multicellular organisms. During tissue development and homeostasis, signaling proteins known as morphogens are produced by, and released from, cells and are then directed towards and received by specified target cells, where they instruct target cells to adopt particular fates or behaviors. Similar signaling specificity is also observed in stem cells niches. Niche cells must instruct stem cells to self-renew, while excluding closely positioned differentiating progeny of stem cells from receiving these same signals. Given the cellular complexity of tissues, a multitude of signal sending and receiving

Correspondence: michael.buszczak@utsouthwestern.edu and yukikomy@umich.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

combinations exist; yet, only a handful of signaling pathways, such as Wnt, Notch, Hedgehog (Hh), Egfr and cytokine pathways are known to regulate these processes. Accordingly, the specificity of cell-cell signaling cannot be achieved simply by choosing a single signaling pathway that is dedicated to a particular cell-cell combination. Although much has been learned about how cells communicate with one another, the mechanisms that ensure the selectivity of these interactions remain poorly understood. For example, while we know how interactions between specific ligands and receptors elicit signaling cascades within the cell, we know less about how the right kinds of cells respond to right kinds of signals in a complex environment.

In recent years, cellular protrusions have emerged as a means by which communication between cells can be conducted in a highly specific manner. Among these specialized protrusions are cytonemes [1-3], tunneling nanotubes (TNTs)[4, 5] and microtubule-based nanotubes (MT-nanotubes)[6]. These protrusions can be distinguished based on their diameter and length, and by cytoskeletal elements involved in their formation, i.e. actin filaments or microtubules (Table 1). Instead of “broadcasting” signals from the source cell to a plethora of cells by simple diffusion, cellular protrusions allow signals to be transmitted from a source cell to target cells in a selective manner over a range of distances. For example, protrusions can form between immediately juxtaposed neighbors to limit signaling to certain cells or between cells positioned far apart (across multiple cells). In both cases, the specificity excludes other cells from engaging in the conversation. Here we review recent progress in our understanding of signaling protrusions and discuss how they may promote specific cell-cell communication in multicellular organisms during development and tissue homeostasis. In particular, we focus on how signaling protrusions mediate short-range signaling as observed in stem cell-niche signaling.

Cytonemes: specialized filopodia promote long range signaling

Multiple types of signaling protrusions with specific functions have been identified to date. These protrusions can be distinguished based on their diameter and length, and by the cytoskeletal elements involved in their formation, i.e. actin filaments or microtubules (Table 1). Among them, cytonemes are actin based thin thread-like (hence the name) structures that typically have a diameter of 0.2 μm and a broad range of lengths that can reach up to 700 μm [7]. Cytonemes can be labeled with both soluble and membrane-bound GFP in living tissue and appear particularly sensitive to fixation, which may explain why they evaded detection for so long.

In general, cytonemes function to transmit signals between two cells that are positioned far away from each other. These long cellular extensions were first observed to protrude from *Drosophila* wing imaginal disc cells, where they promote signaling such as bone morphogenic protein (BMP), fibroblast growth factor (FGF) and Hh that are essential for tissue pattern formation. Since then, cells from a variety of *Drosophila* larval tissues have been shown to form cytonemes or cytoneme-like structures (Figure 1A, Key Figure), including eye imaginal discs, air sac primordium (ASP) in the tracheal system and cells of the abdominal epidermis [2, 7-12]. Early studies found that cytonemes emanating from laterally positioned cells within the wing disc oriented towards the A/P or D/V compartment

boundaries [7]. The directionality of cytoneme orientation suggested that they form in response to a localized source of chemoattractant. Indeed, FGF and Decapentaplegic (Dpp), a BMP family member, both promote cytoneme formation in the wing disc, while cells within different tissues form cytoneme-like structures in response to Notch and Hh [13-14]. Moreover, the formation of cytonemes appears to be specific for distinct signaling pathways [10]. Co-labeling experiments performed in the eye imaginal disc revealed that an EGFR-GFP fusion protein specifically labels a subset of the total population of cytonemes within a given cell. Disruption of EGF signaling or ubiquitous expression of an activated form of EGF ligand (cSpi) led to the formation of short cytonemes extending in all directions. Similarly, over-expression of *dpp* in wing discs and over-expression of Bnl (a *Drosophila* FGF ligand) within cells of the ASP resulted in the formation of short cytonemes in all directions, suggesting that a defined and limited source of ligand promotes directional growth and/or stabilization of cytonemes. Double-labeling experiments using Tkv-GFP and BTL-Cherry fusion proteins provided compelling evidence that different signaling components traffic in and out of cytonemes in a highly regulated manner. However, the basis of this selectivity remains poorly understood.

The formation of cytonemes or cytoneme-like structures has also been observed in vertebrate tissues. For example, a recent study showed the presence of long thin filopodia in chick embryos [15]. Similar to results obtained using *Drosophila*, Sonic Hedgehog (Shh), which plays a critical role in pattern formation during early embryogenesis, formed distinct particles that remained associated with the signal-sending cell through these long thin cytoplasmic protrusions, which often extended across several cell diameters. Live-cell imaging showed that these particles moved along these cytoneme-like extensions in a net anterograde direction. Signal responding cells also formed thin filopodia-like structures that contained specific subsets of Shh co-receptors. These extensions reached out to make contact with those extending from Shh producing cells, suggesting that these protrusions assist with both sending and receiving specific signals over distances of many cell diameters. Cytonemes-like structures have also been observed in other vertebrate systems such as zebrafish and mice. In zebrafish embryos, thin projections, which were generated as a remnant of cell division, connected a significant fraction of epiblast cells, allowing for protein transfer between cells [16]. Also in zebrafish embryos, Wnt8a and its receptor Frizzled localized on specialized filopodia, which likely influenced neural plate pattern formation [17]. Furthermore, in mouse embryos, opposing non-neural ectoderm cells extended thin projections during neural tube closure, forming a bridge between them [18]. These results suggest that specialized filopodia or cytonemes form in different cell types across species.

Besides helping to establish signaling gradients within developing tissues over distances of many cell diameters [19], cellular protrusions have also been implicated in paracrine signaling between stem cells and their supportive niche cells. Work in the *Drosophila* ovary suggests that cap cells, which form the germline stem cell niche, extend cytoneme-like extensions to communicate with their somatic cell neighbors [20]. These extensions appear to mediate transport of Hh ligands from cap cells to a second population of neighboring somatic cells called escort cells. In turn, Hh signal transduction in escort cells helps to promote the maintenance of GSCs. Disruption of actin polymerization, through transgenic

expression of a constitutive form of Diaphanus or myristoylated Wasp within cap cells, results in a loss of these cellular protrusions. Together these results suggest that cap cell cytonemes likely share common features with those first described in *Drosophila* imaginal discs.

More recent work suggests that Lgr4 and Lgr5, markers and important regulators of a number of different stem cell populations in mammals, promote the formation of cytonemes in cell culture. [21]. However, the extent to which Lgr4- and Lgr5-mediated stem cell signaling relies on cytonemes in adult niche cells *in vivo* remains an open question.

MT-nanotubes: Sipping Signals from the Niche

Adult stem cells help to maintain tissue homeostasis. These stem cells often reside in specialized microenvironments, or niches, that specify stem cell identity [22]. Niches produce a variety of signaling molecules and growth factors that keep resident stem cells in an undifferentiated state. Current models suggest that niche signaling is short-range in nature, thus limiting the self-renewal capacity and proliferation of stem cells to a physically confined space. Accordingly, cells produced by stem cell divisions that are displaced outside the niche space will undergo differentiation. Restraining niche signaling in this manner likely prevents over-proliferation of stem cells, thus reducing the likelihood of tumorigenesis [23]. Despite the appeal of these models, stem cell-niche signaling often involves ligand-receptor combinations that, in other contexts, act over relatively long distances. However, little is known about how stem cell-niche signaling is spatially confined such that only stem cells receive self-renewing signals, while non-stem cells are restricted from gaining access to signals emanating from the niche.

Insights into possible mechanisms that underlie the specificity of niche-stem cell signaling have come from the study of model systems. For example, *Drosophila* male germline stem cells (GSCs) reside at the apical tip of the testis, where they attach to a cluster of post-mitotic somatic cells called the hub. Hub cells function as a major component of the stem cell niche by secreting at least two ligands, Upd, a JAK-STAT pathway ligand, and Dpp, a BMP ligand [24]. Although these ligands are thought to diffuse over a long-range in other contexts [25-29], they must act in an extremely short-range (just one cell diameter) in the GSC niche to limit the self-renewal of stem cells to a physically confined space.

Live cell-imaging experiments revealed the presence of thin protrusions that extend from male GSCs and project into the hub cell cluster (Figure 1B)[30]. Similar structures were not readily observed in differentiating GSC progeny. Further analysis showed that these extensions were microtubule-based, and utilized intraflagellar transport (IFT) molecules for their formation [6]. However, they they lacked a 9+0 triplet microtubule structure and tubulin acetylation and did not associate with the basal body, in contrast to primary cilia. Thus these structures appeared to represent a new variant of thin cellular extensions and were named microtubule-based nanotubes (MT-nanotubes) based on their morphology (Table 1). MT-nanotubes can be marked by both GFP- α -tubulin and membrane-bound-GFP, but not by cytoplasmic GFP, suggesting the existence of a diffusion barrier that limits general access to these structures.

MT-nanotubes help GSCs receive niche signals. More specifically, these extensions promote Dpp signaling within GSCs, but do not foster JAK/STAT pathway activity. Similar to cytonemes, GFP-tagged Tkv, the receptor for Dpp, localized to discrete puncta that moved within MT-nanotubes. Co-localization analysis suggested that Dpp, produced by hub cells, associates with the Tkv receptor expressed by GSCs on the surface of MT-nanotubes. However, this finding does not preclude the possibility that ligand-receptor interactions can take place in other areas of the GSC hub cell interface. In addition, the manipulation of the size and frequency of MT-nanotubes, through the modulation of IFT-B components, impacts Dpp signal transduction within GSCs: increasing the thickness of MT-nanotubes increased signaling, as marked by phospho-Mad (pMAD) staining, while decreasing the frequency of MT-nanotubes led to a reduction of pMAD. Genetic manipulation of MT-nanotubes within individual GSCs through clonal analysis indicated that these structures help to maintain functional stem cells. Interestingly, *dpp* over-expression throughout the testis led to ectopic formation of MT-nanotubes in germ cells distant from the hub. This observation suggests that Dpp signaling component(s) may promote the formation and/or stabilization of these structures. This finding raises the question, which comes first, Dpp signaling or MT-nanotube formation. Interestingly, overexpression of a dominant-negative form of Tkv receptor, which retains the extracellular, ligand binding domain but lacks the intracellular domain required for signal transduction, increased MT-nanotube formation [30]. This finding suggests that the ligand-receptor interaction, which normally occurs only at the interface of the hub and GSCs, is sufficient to induce MT-nanotube formation. Once MT-nanotubes are formed, they engage in robust signaling at the surface of MT-nanotubes, reinforcing Dpp signaling in GSCs. However, the field does not clearly know how much Dpp is produced by hub cells and whether this ligand is secreted uniformly across the entire cell surface of hub cells. Keeping in mind the caveats of misinterpreting localization data based on tagged transgenes, the expression of Dpp-GFP suggests that hub cells may produce a limited amount of Dpp that appears to remain inside the hub area. Thus, MT-nanotubes may act like a straw that is used by GSCs to gain greater access to limited, and potentially sequestered, niche signals.

Much work remains to be done in regards to characterizing the form and function of MT-nanotubes. Like cytonemes, it remains unclear how MT-nanotubes are made specific for different signaling pathways and how trafficking in and out of these extensions is regulated. Whether other stem cell populations use similar extensions to gain greater access to niche signals remains an open question. Nonetheless, the discovery of MT-nanotubes opens a new avenue for further understanding how communication between niche cells and stem cells is regulated in an *in vivo* setting.

Tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) in cell-cell communication

First discovered in cultured cells [31], tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) have been mostly investigated in *in vitro* settings, but the use of mosaic/chimeric or transgenic conditions in which only a subpopulation of cells express markers for TNTs has recently allowed for the visualization of TNTs *in vivo* [16, 18, 32, 33]. The relationship between TNTs and other thin protrusions such as cytonemes and MT-nanotubes identified *in vivo* are not well understood. TNTs with various dimensions and molecular components have been reported

[34], and they are roughly classified into two categories: “thin TNTs” are less than 0.7 micrometer in diameter and composed primarily of F-actin, whereas “thick TNTs” are more than 0.7 micrometer in diameter and contains both F-actin and microtubules [34]. Interestingly, a recent study demonstrated that these two kinds of TNTs may be interconvertible, depending on stimulation [35]. Morphological and cytoskeletal characteristics of some TNTs resemble that of cytonemes, whereas other TNTs resemble MT-nanotubes. As our understanding deepens, some of these structures may become united under the same label.

Studies on TNTs clearly demonstrate that they mediate local communication between cells by functioning as a conduit (Figure 1C). TNTs can transfer organelles (e.g. mitochondria, lysosomes) [32, 34-41], endosome vesicles [42] [43] [31], and pathogens (e.g. HIV virus [44], prions[45], and bacteria[34]). TNTs can also mediate the propagation of cell death signals, including the transfer of active caspases [46- 47], and influence membrane potential and calcium signaling [48-50]. Thus, TNTs regulate a broad spectrum of intercellular communication in different contexts.

With regards to stem cell-niche signaling, TNTs appear to mediate transfer of SARA endosomes between osteoblasts and hematopoietic progenitors and regulate Smad signaling within osteoblasts [43]. Although a number of studies have shown that osteoblasts do not serve as the niche for hematopoietic stem cells [51], osteoblasts are known to regulate restricted progenitors. Therefore, osteoblast regulation of hematopoietic progenitor cells may still present an attractive model to study niche-stem cell-like interactions via TNTs in an *in vivo* setting. Furthermore, considering the observation that these structures can extend several cells diameters in length, TNTs may allow certain cells to directly influence stem cell identity and activity at a distance.

Recent studies have provided evidence for the presence of TNTs in mammalian tissues. Visualization of thin protrusions in complex tissues requires mosaic or chimeric labeling, in which only a subset of cells express a marker (such as GFP-tagged protein) that localizes to TNTs in a background of non-expressing cells. By using chimeric mice that have received GFP-marked bone marrow-derived cells, the formation of TNTs was observed in MHC class II+ cells in the corneal stroma [33]. TNT formation increased upon injury, suggesting a role in cell-cell communication during inflammation. In addition, *in vitro* co-culture of cardiomyocytes with human multipotent adipose derived stem cells (hMADS) promoted TNT formation, which correlates with an enhanced ability of hMADS to promote angiogenesis and repair of damaged cardiomyocyte tissue [52]. These studies predict further *in vivo* roles for TNTs.

Primary Cilia in stem cells

Primary cilia represent another type of signaling protrusion [53], mostly studied in the context of a “fluid environment”. Primary cilia extend from cells and either receive humoral factors that have been secreted into the extracellular fluid or sense the flow of the fluid itself (mechano-sensing). In this context, primary cilia do not appear to function in local or contact-dependent signaling. However, primary cilia are found in tissues that contain tightly

packed cells, such as epidermal cells. Since epidermal cells are attached to their neighbors, their primary cilia likely come in contact with adjacent cells. In this context, primary cilia appear to participate in both Shh signaling [54] and Notch signaling [55]. Removal of primary cilia in mouse postnatal epidermal tissues leads to tissue hyperplasia due to expansion of follicular cells, caused by activated Shh signaling [54]. In embryonic epidermal tissue, primary cilia regulate Notch signaling to promote differentiation [55]. Notch3 receptor localizes to the primary cilia in suprabasal cells, where Notch signaling is active. Although the source of Notch ligand(s) has not been determined in this context, the juxtacrine mechanism of Notch signaling indicates that the ligand(s) must be presented by the neighboring cells, and the ligand-receptor interaction likely occurs on the surface of the primary cilia.

A recent study reported that primary cilia also form strong adhesive connections with neighboring cells within a MDCK cell monolayer [56]. This ciliumcilium adhesion is glycoprotein-dependent, but does not appear to involve typical cell adhesion, as it is independent of Ca^{++} . Unlike TNTs, the transfer of material between two cells was not observed along the adhered primary cilia. However, ligand-receptor interactions can occur at the interface of the primary cilia where they adhere to each other, opening the possibility that these structures likely influence local signaling events.

Concluding Remarks

The spectrum of signaling protrusions has expanded in recent years. While models of simple diffusion have dominated the field of cell signaling, the discovery of cytonemes, TNTs and MT-nanotubes suggest that different cells use a number of mechanisms to communicate with one another. Signaling protrusions function over a variety of distances. Long protrusions extending over many cell diameters allow for the specific delivery of ligands from a source to a target without influencing cells in between. Protrusions formed over a shorter distance provide an exclusive surface area on which two adjacent cells can send and receive signals, while preventing their neighbors from listening in on the conversation. Both types of protrusions appear to enhance the specificity of cell-cell communication.

Future studies are required to deepen our understanding on how specialized filopodia and protrusions form and how they regulate signaling between cells (Outstanding Questions). Indeed, morphological and cytoskeletal characteristics between protrusions raises the possibility that different cellular protrusions described to date may be interconvertible depending on physiological context and may not represent fundamentally distinct structures. Indeed some TNTs resemble that of cytonemes, whereas other TNTs resemble MT-nanotubes. For example, cytonemes and TNTs are both dependent on F-actin and both can allow for the trafficking of vesicles. Furthermore, the underlying structure of TNTs can change. For example, a recent study showed that stimulation of PC12 cells by UV-induced damage converts TNTs to microtubule (MT)-TNTs that contain microtubules in addition to actin filaments [35]. These findings suggest the possibility of interconversion, but one must also consider the possibility that variations in particular attributes may simply reflect how protrusions respond to specific stimuli, rather than fundamental differences in their structures and functions. Future studies that comprehensively compare various cellular

protrusions under different conditions may necessitate some renaming and re-categorization of these specialized cellular extensions. As our understanding deepens, some of these structures may become united under the same label. Lastly, it will be important to comprehensively characterize signaling protrusions *in vivo* and *in vitro* to facilitate the understanding of molecular mechanism and biological significance of signaling protrusions in a more cohesive manner.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Buszczak and Yamashita lab members, Sunny Wong for helpful information, and Jose Cabrera for figure illustration. We apologize for not being able to cite all relevant studies due to space limitation. The work in the Buszczak lab is supported by NIA (AG047318). The work in the Yamashita lab is supported by Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

References

1. Kornberg TB. The contrasting roles of primary cilia and cytonemes in Hh signaling. *Dev Biol.* 2014; 394:1–5. [PubMed: 25072627]
2. Kornberg TB, Roy S. Cytonemes as specialized signaling filopodia. *Development.* 2014; 141:729–736. [PubMed: 24496611]
3. Fairchild CL, Barna M. Specialized filopodia: at the ‘tip’ of morphogen transport and vertebrate tissue patterning. *Curr Opin Genet Dev.* 2014; 27:67–73. [PubMed: 24907447]
4. Gerdes HH, Carvalho RN. Intercellular transfer mediated by tunneling nanotubes. *Current opinion in cell biology.* 2008; 20:470–475. [PubMed: 18456488]
5. Sherer NM, Mothes W. Cytonemes and tunneling nanotubules in cell-cell communication and viral pathogenesis. *Trends in cell biology.* 2008; 18:414–420. [PubMed: 18703335]
6. Inaba M, Buszczak M, Yamashita YM. Nanotubes mediate niche-stem-cell signalling in the *Drosophila* testis. *Nature.* 2015
7. Ramirez-Weber FA, Kornberg TB. Cytonemes: cellular processes that project to the principal signaling center in *Drosophila* imaginal discs. *Cell.* 1999; 97:599–607. [PubMed: 10367889]
8. Sato M, Kornberg TB. FGF is an essential mitogen and chemoattractant for the air sacs of the *drosophila* tracheal system. *Developmental cell.* 2002; 3:195–207. [PubMed: 12194851]
9. Hsiung F, Ramirez-Weber FA, Iwaki DD, Kornberg TB. Dependence of *Drosophila* wing imaginal disc cytonemes on Decapentaplegic. *Nature.* 2005; 437:560–563. [PubMed: 16177792]
10. Roy S, Hsiung F, Kornberg TB. Specificity of *Drosophila* cytonemes for distinct signaling pathways. *Science.* 2011; 332:354–358. [PubMed: 21493861]
11. Roy S, Huang H, Liu S, Kornberg TB. Cytoneme-mediated contact-dependent transport of the *Drosophila* decapentaplegic signaling protein. *Science.* 2014; 343:1244624. [PubMed: 24385607]
12. Huang H, Kornberg TB. Myoblast cytonemes mediate Wg signaling from the wing imaginal disc and Delta-Notch signaling to the air sac primordium. *Elife.* 2015; 4:e06114. [PubMed: 25951303]
13. Gradilla AC, Gonzalez E, Seijo I, Andres G, Bischoff M, Gonzalez-Mendez L, Sanchez V, Callejo A, Ibanez C, Guerra M, et al. Exosomes as Hedgehog carriers in cytoneme-mediated transport and secretion. *Nat Commun.* 2014; 5:5649. [PubMed: 25472772]
14. Cohen M, Georgiou M, Stevenson NL, Miodownik M, Baum B. Dynamic filopodia transmit intermittent Delta-Notch signaling to drive pattern refinement during lateral inhibition. *Dev Cell.* 2010; 19:78–89. [PubMed: 20643352]
15. Sanders TA, Llagostera E, Barna M. Specialized filopodia direct long-range transport of SHH during vertebrate tissue patterning. *Nature.* 2013; 497:628–632. [PubMed: 23624372]
16. Caneparo L, Pantazis P, Dempsey W, Fraser SE. Intercellular bridges in vertebrate gastrulation. *PLoS ONE.* 2011; 6:e20230. [PubMed: 21647454]
17. Luz M, Spannll-Muller S, Ozhan G, Kagermeier-Schenk B, Rhinn M, Weidinger G, Brand M. Dynamic association with donor cell filopodia and lipid-modification are essential features of

- Wnt8a during patterning of the zebrafish neuroectoderm. *PLoS ONE*. 2014; 9:e84922. [PubMed: 24427298]
18. Pyrgaki C, Trainor P, Hadjantonakis AK, Niswander L. Dynamic imaging of mammalian neural tube closure. *Dev Biol*. 2010; 344:941–947. [PubMed: 20558153]
 19. Bischoff M, Gradilla AC, Seijo I, Andres G, Rodriguez-Navas C, Gonzalez-Mendez L, Guerrero I. Cytonemes are required for the establishment of a normal Hedgehog morphogen gradient in *Drosophila epithelia*. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2013; 15:1269–1281. [PubMed: 24121526]
 20. Rojas-Rios P, Guerrero I, Gonzalez-Reyes A. Cytoneme-mediated delivery of hedgehog regulates the expression of bone morphogenetic proteins to maintain germline stem cells in *Drosophila*. *PLoS Biol*. 2012; 10:e1001298. [PubMed: 22509132]
 21. Snyder JC, Rochelle LK, Marion S, Lyerly HK, Barak LS, Caron MG. Lgr4 and Lgr5 drive the formation of long actin-rich cytoneme-like membrane protrusions. *J Cell Sci*. 2015; 128:1230–1240. [PubMed: 25653388]
 22. Ohlstein B, Kai T, Decotto E, Spradling A. The stem cell niche: theme and variations. *Curr Opin Cell Biol*. 2004; 16:693–699. [PubMed: 15530783]
 23. Morrison SJ, Spradling AC. Stem cells and niches: mechanisms that promote stem cell maintenance throughout life. *Cell*. 2008; 132:598–611. [PubMed: 18295578]
 24. de Cuevas M, Matunis EL. The stem cell niche: lessons from the *Drosophila testis*. *Development*. 2011; 138:2861–2869. [PubMed: 21693509]
 25. Tulina N, Matunis E. Control of stem cell self-renewal in *Drosophila spermatogenesis* by JAK-STAT signaling. *Science*. 2001; 294:2546–2549. [PubMed: 11752575]
 26. Kiger AA, Jones DL, Schulz C, Rogers MB, Fuller MT. Stem cell self-renewal specified by JAK-STAT activation in response to a support cell cue. *Science*. 2001; 294:2542–2545. [PubMed: 11752574]
 27. Schulz C, Kiger AA, Tazuke SI, Yamashita YM, Pantalena-Filho LC, Jones DL, Wood CG, Fuller MT. A Misexpression Screen Reveals Effects of bag-of-marbles and TGFbeta Class Signaling on the *Drosophila Male Germ-Line Stem Cell Lineage*. *Genetics*. 2004; 167:707–723. [PubMed: 15238523]
 28. Kawase E, Wong MD, Ding BC, Xie T. Gbb/Bmp signaling is essential for maintaining germline stem cells and for repressing bam transcription in the *Drosophila testis*. *Development*. 2004; 131:1365–1375. [PubMed: 14973292]
 29. Shivdasani AA, Ingham PW. Regulation of stem cell maintenance and transit amplifying cell proliferation by tgf-Beta signaling in *Drosophila spermatogenesis*. *Curr Biol*. 2003; 13:2065–2072. [PubMed: 14653996]
 30. Inaba M, Buszczak M, Yamashita YM. Nanotubes mediate niche-stem-cell signalling in the *Drosophila testis*. *Nature*. 2015; 523:329–332. [PubMed: 26131929]
 31. Rustom A, Saffrich R, Markovic I, Walther P, Gerdes HH. Nanotubular highways for intercellular organelle transport. *Science*. 2004; 303:1007–1010. [PubMed: 14963329]
 32. Naphade S, Sharma J, Gaide Chevronnay HP, Shook MA, Yeagy BA, Rocca CJ, Ur SN, Lau AJ, Courtoy PJ, Cherqui S. Brief reports: Lysosomal cross-correction by hematopoietic stem cell-derived macrophages via tunneling nanotubes. *Stem Cells*. 2015; 33:301–309. [PubMed: 25186209]
 33. Chinnery HR, Pearlman E, McMenamin PG. Cutting edge: Membrane nanotubes in vivo: a feature of MHC class II+ cells in the mouse cornea. *J Immunol*. 2008; 180:5779–5783. [PubMed: 18424694]
 34. Onfelt B, Nedvetzki S, Benninger RK, Purbhoo MA, Sowinski S, Hume AN, Seabra MC, Neil MA, French PM, Davis DM. Structurally distinct membrane nanotubes between human macrophages support long-distance vesicular traffic or surfing of bacteria. *Journal of immunology*. 2006; 177:8476–8483.
 35. Wang X, Gerdes HH. Transfer of mitochondria via tunneling nanotubes rescues apoptotic PC12 cells. *Cell death and differentiation*. 2015; 22:1181–1191. [PubMed: 25571977]
 36. Islam MN, Das SR, Emin MT, Wei M, Sun L, Westphalen K, Rowlands DJ, Quadri SK, Bhattacharya S, Bhattacharya J. Mitochondrial transfer from bone-marrow-derived stromal cells to

- pulmonary alveoli protects against acute lung injury. *Nat Med.* 2012; 18:759–765. [PubMed: 22504485]
37. Vallabhaneni KC, Haller H, Dumler I. Vascular smooth muscle cells initiate proliferation of mesenchymal stem cells by mitochondrial transfer via tunneling nanotubes. *Stem Cells Dev.* 2012; 21:3104–3113. [PubMed: 22676452]
 38. Liu K, Ji K, Guo L, Wu W, Lu H, Shan P, Yan C. Mesenchymal stem cells rescue injured endothelial cells in an in vitro ischemia-reperfusion model via tunneling nanotube like structure-mediated mitochondrial transfer. *Microvasc Res.* 2014; 92:10–18. [PubMed: 24486322]
 39. Pasquier J, Guerrouahen BS, Al Thawadi H, Ghiabi P, Maleki M, Abu-Kaoud N, Jacob A, Mirshahi M, Galas L, Raffi S, et al. Preferential transfer of mitochondria from endothelial to cancer cells through tunneling nanotubes modulates chemoresistance. *J Transl Med.* 2013; 11:94. [PubMed: 23574623]
 40. Plotnikov EY, Khryapenkova TG, Galkina SI, Sukhikh GT, Zorov DB. Cytoplasm and organelle transfer between mesenchymal multipotent stromal cells and renal tubular cells in co-culture. *Exp Cell Res.* 2010; 316:2447–2455. [PubMed: 20599955]
 41. Ahmad T, Mukherjee S, Pattnaik B, Kumar M, Singh S, Kumar M, Rehman R, Tiwari BK, Jha KA, Barhanpurkar AP, et al. Miro1 regulates intercellular mitochondrial transport & enhances mesenchymal stem cell rescue efficacy. *EMBO J.* 2014; 33:994–1010. [PubMed: 24431222]
 42. Burtay A, Wagner M, Hodneland E, Skaftnesmo KO, Schoelermann J, Mondragon IR, Espedal H, Golebiewska A, Niclou SP, Bjerkvig R, et al. Intercellular transfer of transferrin receptor by a contact-, Rab8-dependent mechanism involving tunneling nanotubes. *FASEB J.* 2015
 43. Gillette JM, Larochelle A, Dunbar CE, Lippincott-Schwartz J. Intercellular transfer to signalling endosomes regulates an ex vivo bone marrow niche. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2009; 11:303–311. [PubMed: 19198600]
 44. Sowinski S, Jolly C, Berninghausen O, Purbhoo MA, Chauveau A, Kohler K, Oddos S, Eissmann P, Brodsky FM, Hopkins C, et al. Membrane nanotubes physically connect T cells over long distances presenting a novel route for HIV-1 transmission. *Nature cell biology.* 2008; 10:211–219. [PubMed: 18193035]
 45. Gousset K, Schiff E, Langevin C, Marijanovic Z, Caputo A, Browman DT, Chenouard N, de Chaumont F, Martino A, Enninga J, et al. Prions hijack tunnelling nanotubes for intercellular spread. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2009; 11:328–336. [PubMed: 19198598]
 46. Arkwright PD, Luchetti F, Tour J, Roberts C, Ayub R, Morales AP, Rodriguez JJ, Gilmore A, Canonico B, Papa S, et al. Fas stimulation of T lymphocytes promotes rapid intercellular exchange of death signals via membrane nanotubes. *Cell Res.* 2010; 20:72–88. [PubMed: 19770844]
 47. Luchetti F, Canonico B, Arcangeletti M, Guescini M, Cesarini E, Stocchi V, Degli Esposti M, Papa S. Fas signalling promotes intercellular communication in T cells. *PLoS ONE.* 2012; 7:e35766. [PubMed: 22558220]
 48. Watkins SC, Salter RD. Functional connectivity between immune cells mediated by tunneling nanotubules. *Immunity.* 2005; 23:309–318. [PubMed: 16169503]
 49. Wang X, Veruki ML, Bukoreshtliev NV, Hartveit E, Gerdes HH. Animal cells connected by nanotubes can be electrically coupled through interposed gap-junction channels. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2010; 107:17194–17199. [PubMed: 20855598]
 50. Wang X, Bukoreshtliev NV, Gerdes HH. Developing neurons form transient nanotubes facilitating electrical coupling and calcium signaling with distant astrocytes. *PLoS ONE.* 2012; 7:e47429. [PubMed: 23071805]
 51. Morrison SJ, Scadden DT. The bone marrow niche for haematopoietic stem cells. *Nature.* 2014; 505:327–334. [PubMed: 24429631]
 52. Figeac F, Lesault PF, Le Coz O, Damy T, Souktani R, Trebeau C, Schmitt A, Ribot J, Mounier R, Guguin A, et al. Nanotubular crosstalk with distressed cardiomyocytes stimulates the paracrine repair function of mesenchymal stem cells. *Stem Cells.* 2014; 32:216–230. [PubMed: 24115309]
 53. Singla V, Reiter JF. The primary cilium as the cell's antenna: signaling at a sensory organelle. *Science.* 2006; 313:629–633. [PubMed: 16888132]

54. Croyle MJ, Lehman JM, O'Connor AK, Wong SY, Malarkey EB, Iribarne D, Dowdle WE, Schoeb TR, Verney ZM, Athar M, et al. Role of epidermal primary cilia in the homeostasis of skin and hair follicles. *Development*. 2011; 138:1675–1685. [PubMed: 21429982]
55. Ezratty EJ, Stokes N, Chai S, Shah AS, Williams SE, Fuchs E. A role for the primary cilium in Notch signaling and epidermal differentiation during skin development. *Cell*. 2011; 145:1129–1141. [PubMed: 21703454]
56. Ott C, Elia N, Jeong SY, Insinna C, Sengupta P, Lippincott-Schwartz J. Primary cilia utilize glycoprotein-dependent adhesion mechanisms to stabilize long-lasting cilia-cilia contacts. *Cilia*. 2012; 1:3. [PubMed: 23351752]
57. Bischoff M, Gradilla AC, Seijo I, Andres G, Rodriguez-Navas C, Gonzalez-Mendez L, Guerrero I. Cytonemes are required for the establishment of a normal Hedgehog morphogen gradient in *Drosophila* epithelia. *Nature cell biology*. 2013; 15:1269–1281. [PubMed: 24121526]
58. McCoy-Simandle K, Hanna SJ, Cox D. Exosomes and nanotubes: Control of immune cell communication. *The international journal of biochemistry & cell biology*. 2016; 71:44–54. [PubMed: 26704468]
59. Gerdes HH, Rustom A, Wang X. Tunneling nanotubes, an emerging intercellular communication route in development. *Mechanisms of development*. 2013; 130:381–387. [PubMed: 23246917]
60. Antanaviciute I, Rysevaite K, Liutkevicius V, Marandykina A, Rimkute L, Sveikatiene R, Uloza V, Skeberdis VA. Long-distance communication between laryngeal carcinoma cells. *PLoS ONE*. 2014; 9:e99196. [PubMed: 24945745]
61. Hase K, Kimura S, Takatsu H, Ohmae M, Kawano S, Kitamura H, Ito M, Watarai H, Hazelett CC, Yeaman C, et al. M-Sec promotes membrane nanotube formation by interacting with Ral and the exocyst complex. *Nat Cell Biol*. 2009; 11:1427–1432. [PubMed: 19935652]
62. Schiller C, Diakopoulos KN, Rohwedder I, Kremmer E, von Toerne C, Ueffing M, Weidle UH, Ohno H, Weiss EH. LST1 promotes the assembly of a molecular machinery responsible for tunneling nanotube formation. *J Cell Sci*. 2013; 126:767–777. [PubMed: 23239025]

Trends Box

- Cytonemes are specialized filopodia found in diverse tissues that promote signaling between specific cells over varying distances.
- Tunneling nanotubes (TNTs) share some structural similarities with cytonemes, and can traffic diverse cargos such as mitochondria, endosomal vesicles, viruses, and Ca⁺⁺.
- Microtubule-based nanotubes (MT-nanotubes), formed by *Drosophila* germline stem cells, provide an exclusive surface area for productive signaling between niche cells and stem cells.

Outstanding question Box

How many kinds of cellular protrusions exist across diverse tissues and species?

To what extent do cells rely on specialized protrusions to foster specific signaling events over both short and long distances?

Are similar mechanisms involved in the formation of different cellular protrusions?

Are different types of protrusions specific for a certain spectrum of signaling pathways, or do they serve as a general platform for all communication between different cells?

What mechanisms direct components of specific pathways to specific cellular protrusions?




Figure 1. The structure and function of signaling protrusions

A. Cytonemes were originally found in *Drosophila* imaginal discs. Cytonemes transport ligands and receptors such that cells at a distance from one another can directly and specifically communicate within the context of complex tissues. Similar “specialized filopodia” have been discovered in vertebrate embryos.

B. MT-nanotubes are found in *Drosophila* male germline stem cells. MT-nanotubes protrude into the hub cell niche. The BMP ligand (Dpp) produced by hub cells interacts with the receptor Tkv presented on the surface of MT-nanotubes, leading to stem cell-specific activation of Dpp signaling.

C. TNTs are found in various types of cells, mainly in culture. TNTs function as cellular “conduits” between cells to transport mitochondria, vesicles and Ca²⁺, among other factors.

Table 1

Comparison of cellular protrusions

Name	Cytonemes	Tunneling Nanotubes	Microtubule-nanotubes	Primary cilia
Cytoskeletal components	Actin	Actin or Microtubules	Negative for acetylated tubulin	9+0 microtubule organization, positive for acetylated tubulin
Size	0.1~0.4µm in diameter ~700µm in length	<0.7 µm in diameter ~1000 µm in length Microtubule based: >0.7 µm in diameter ~1000 µm in length	~0.3µm in diameter ~6µm in length	~0.25 µm in diameter ~30µm in length
Genes for formation	Diaphanous, shibire, neuroglian, and capricious SCAR/WAVE CP (cpa or cpb) Pico/Lamellipodin	No known universal mechanism. Some TNTs require M-sec, RalA, LST1 and Cdc42	IFT	IFT
Signals and cargo	Dpp, FGF, EGF, Shh	Ca ²⁺ , Mitochondria, endosome, lysosome, virus, prion, bacteria	Dpp	Hh, Wnt
References	[1·3· 57]	[31· 34· 35· 46· 58·62]	[6]	[53]