## **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

# Table of Content



#### **Text for the chapter "Flux through the NPC is robust precisely because all reactions go through the same pore"**

Here we present the model for metabolic control analysis of NPC transport. The nuclear import rate of each particular signaling protein  $x_i$  (with  $y_i$  represented its imported form) through the NPC is described by a reversible kinetic equation incorporating competitive inhibition by other cargo from both sides of the nuclear membrane:

$$
v_{i} = \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{i}}{x_{i}}\right)}{1 + \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}} + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \ k \neq i}}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}}}.
$$

Here  $v_i$  is the transport rate of species  $x_i$  (and hence also of  $y_i$ );  $V_{MAX}$  and the  $K_{xk}$ are constant rate characteristics of transport of species k.

For large *n*, several simplifications apply, i.e. when many other cargo proteins compete for transport and their individual concentrations become small relative to the total cargo concentration. First, the nuclear import rate  $v_i$  becomes linear with respect to  $x_I$  and the corresponding elasticity coefficient, i.e. the log-log dependence of rate on concentration (Burns et al, 1985) approaches 1, whenever the gradient of substance i across the nuclear membrane is sizeable, i.e.  $x_i \gg y_i$ :

$$
v_{i} \approx_{n>1} \frac{V_{MAX}}{1 + \sum_{\substack{k=1 \ k \neq i}}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{i}}{x_{i}}\right)
$$

$$
\varepsilon_{x_{i}}^{v_{i}} \equiv \left(\frac{\partial \ln v_{i}}{\partial \ln x_{i}}\right)_{x_{j}} \approx 1 - \frac{y_{i}}{x_{i} - y_{i}} \approx_{if \ y_{i} << x_{i}} 1
$$

Second, the rate becomes independent of the concentration of any specific other cargo molecule including the already imported forms, causing all cross elasticity coefficients to become zero:

$$
v_{i} = \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{i}}{x_{i}}\right)}{1 + \frac{x_{j}}{K_{x_{j}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \frac{y_{j}}{K_{y_{j}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \approx \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{y_{i}}{x_{i}}\right)}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \approx \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{x_{k}}{K_{z}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{x_{i}}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{x_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}}}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{x_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{y_{k}}{K_{y_{k}}} \cdot \frac{V_{MAX} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}} \cdot \frac{x_{i}}{K_{z}}}{1 +
$$

This shows if there are many active pathways (the condition that *n* be large), all regulatory influences between the pathways have elasticity coefficients that are very close to zero. Consequently, all pathways become independent of each other. Therefore, all the flux control of any path resides completely with its component enzymes:

$$
C_{\text{enzynes pathway i}}^{J_{\text{flux pathway j}}} = 0; \text{ for } j \neq k
$$
  
\n
$$
C_{\text{enzynes pathway i}}^{J_{\text{flux pathway j}}} > 0
$$
  
\nall enzymes in  
\npathway j  
\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{j} C_i^{J_j} = 1
$$

Partly because the NPC import is irreversible but mostly because of the saturation effect itself, the reactions after import that sense the concentration of the imported form, become so-called 'slave enzymes', which only control the concentration of their own imported form in the nucleus but not its flux into the nucleus (Bakker et al, 2000) (Fig. 4B; control by 'output' is small). A possibly important exception to this arises when NR accumulates in the nucleus after import, thereby reducing the amount of NR in the cytosol. The NPC itself has positive control over all fluxes (approximately 0.5 in Fig. 4B). Cytosolic activities of a particular pathway have little, negative control on the flux through any another pathway (cross control by input is small and negative in Fig. 4C). Because they exert negative concentration control on x and y, nuclear processes control other pathway fluxes positively if at all (Fig. 4C, gray line). Because no steady-state flux exchange occurs between pathways, all flux control coefficients within a pathway sum to 1 (dashed line in Fig. 4B). It turns out that even though all pathways run through the same pore, perturbation of any one pathway does not much influence the flux through the other pathways. It only influences the flux through the perturbed pathway itself. Thus, the flux of each pathway is robust precisely because all reactions go through the same pore.

### **Figures**



Imp<sub>total</sub>/Nrtotal

#### **Fig. 1S. Active export of importins rather than active import of the importin-NR complex is advantageous in enhancing the transcriptional response also when there is degradation of NR.**

Three alternative network designs are depicted: (**A)** Passive facilitated diffusion (reversible pore) of NR across the nuclear membrane; (**B)** Active nuclear import (irreversible pump) of importin-NR complex; (**C)** Active export (irreversible pump) of importins from the nucleus. (**D)** Time course of the transcriptional response (ratio *ReNrL*/*Retotal*) at total importin concentration of 0.1×10-12 *nmoles*. The transcriptional response represents the fraction of REs complexed to the NRL. There is a peak of transcriptional response (maximal transcriptional response). **(E)** Maximal transcriptional response (ratio *ReNrL*/*Retotal*) as function of the total concentration of importins (for designs A-C; note the logarithmic importin concentration axis). The transcriptional response is inhibited by high concentrations of importin in models A and B. **(F)**  Sequestration (defined as the ratio *NrLtotalImptotal*/*NrLtotal*) as function of the total concentration of importins (for designs A-C; note the logarithmic importin concentration axis). A high importin concentration leads to a high fraction of the NR fraction being bound to importins, but only in models A and B. In model C active export of importins keeps the NR-importin complex concentration in the nucleus low. Cytoplasmic and nuclear compartment volume, resp.  $1.55 \times 10^{-12}$  L and  $0.45 \times 10^{-12}$  L (Riddick and Macara, 2007), and the total concentrations of NRL and RE were set to realistic values  $(1.31 \times 10^{-7})$ <sup>12</sup> nmoles of NRLs and  $1.67 \times 10^{-12}$  nmoles of Res, respectively, per cell). The rate constants for complex formation of NRs with importins and of NRs with REs were chosen as diffusion-limited ( $k_{\text{association}} = 60 \text{ nM}^{-1} \text{min}^{-1}$ ; resp.  $K_d = 5 \text{ nM}$  and  $K_d = 1 \text{ nM}$ ); nuclear import and nuclear export is described by mass action kinetics with Kappa =  $5.4\times10^{-12}$  [l/min]. Rate equations and additional parameters are given in Table 9 of Supplementary Information. Abbreviations: **NrL** – liganded NR (for example, GR); **Imp**importins, **NrLImp-** liganded NR bound with importins; **Re -** RE for NR on DNA; **ReNrL-** RE on DNA bound with activated NR; **NPC** – nuclear pore complex; **Degr** – degraded NR.

The model is available in JWS Online and can be simulated in a web browser:

http://jjj.biochem.sun.ac.za; http:// jjj.bio.vu.nl; http://jjj.mib.ac.uk (Snoep and Olivier,

2002; Olivier and Snoep, 2004). The model can be found via "author search",

'kolodkin7'. The model can be also accessed directly via:

http://jjj.bio.vu.nl/webMathematica/Examples/run.jsp?modelName=kolodkin7 or at any of the other servers listed above. Please note that values of parameters for nuclear import/ export rates are set for reversible transport. Simulations of receptor (importin) pump require parameter values from Supplementary Table 9.



**Fig. 2S. Time courses of the concentration of the total NR in the nucleus for the six network designs.** Nuclear transport of liganded and unliganded NR in design 6 is fitted to GR case (model for Figure 2 of Supplementary Information). **(A)** Upon 0.005 nM of DEX addition. **(B)** Upon 0.1 nM of DEX addition. **(C)** Upon 1 nM of DEX addition. Rate equations and additional parameters are given in Table 10 of Supplementary Information.

Models can be found via the "author search", 'kolodkin'. Models can be also accessed directly via: http://jjj.bio.vu.nl/webMathematica/Examples/run.jsp?modelName=kolodkinX, with X ranging from 1 to 6 respectively for design 1 to design 6 (at each of the servers listed above). Note: Figure 2D cannot be reproduced with online simulations, which allow determining the net flux of ligand (as a sum of import and export fluxes) but not the time course of import flux alone. Please contact the authors for more details. Figure 2G can be reproduced by populating design 6 model with parameters from Supplementary Table 10.









**Fig. 3S. Nuclear translocation of GR-GFP following exposure to varying concentrations of dexamethasone.** Huh7 were transiently transfected with an overexpression plasmid for GR-GFP and then exposed to **(A)** 0.005 nM **(B)** 0.1 nM or. **(C)** 1 nM of DEX. Nuclear:cytoplasmic localisation of GR is presented graphically in a representative cell, and as the average nuclear localisation over time for at least ten cells (error bars = SEM). Data is representative of three independent experiments.

### **Supplementary Methods**

Huh7 cells, a human hepatoma cell line (a kind gift from Dr Steve Hood, GlaxoSmithKline), were seeded into 8-chambered microscope slides (BD Biosciences, Erembodegem, Belgium) at a concentration of 12,500 cells/well and incubated at 37ºC for 24 hrs in a humidified container for attachment. FuGENE 6-mediated DNA transfections, using 83ng DNA/chamber were performed as described previously [El-Sankary et al, 2001], using serum-free medium for the six-hour transfection period; this was then replaced with fresh, complete medium, containing charcoal-stripped serum, for the remaining culture period. Following 48 hours incubation, cells were visualized using a Zeiss Axiovert LSM510 microscope. Following addition of dexamethasone at the indicated concentration, cell fields were imaged in every 30s for 15 mins, using a 2.6µs pixel time. Total and nuclear fluorescence from at least ten cells for each treatment condition were analysed using ImageJ v1.43.

**Fig. 4S** 





**Fig. 4S. Simulation results for all species in all models of Figure 2** 



**Fig. 5S. Simulation results for all species in all models of Figure 3** 

**Fig. 6S** 



*Fig. 6S. Simulation results for all species in all models of Figure 4 (x and y for n=4)* 

#### **Tables (rate equations and parameters of models)**

## **Table 1**

**Design 1: just the role of NR** 



We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu \text{m}^2 = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{dm}^2$ , Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane)= $3.1 \mu \text{m} = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{dm}$ ; V<sub>nuc</sub>=450  $\mu \text{m}^3$ ,  $V_{\text{out}} = 450 \mu \text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6.10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).

 $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

 $*_{\text{K}_{\text{Ligand diffusion}}=D_{\text{Ligand}}} \times$ *Dist*  $\frac{Area_{nuc}}{2}$  [litre/min= dm<sup>3</sup>/min]=32.5pL/min=32.5·10<sup>-12</sup> L/min.

# **Table 2**







We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu \text{m}^2$  =  $2.8 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{dm}^2$ , Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane) =  $3.1 \mu \text{m}$  =  $3.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{dm}$ ; V<sub>nuc</sub> =  $450 \mu \text{m}^3$ ,  $V_{\text{cytoplasm}} = 1575 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ , and  $V_{\text{cell}} = 2025 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).<br> $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

\* $\kappa_{\text{Ligand diffusion}} = D_{\text{Ligand}} \times$ *Dist*  $\frac{Area_{nuc}}{2}$  [litre/min= dm<sup>3</sup>/min]=32.5pL/min=32.5·10<sup>-12</sup> L/min.

# **Table 3**

**Design 3: NR functioning both as NR in the nucleus and as cytosolic shuttling protein** 





We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85 µm, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75 µm. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) = 280 µm<sup>2</sup>=2.8 10<sup>-8</sup>dm<sup>2</sup>, Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear me  $V_{\text{cytoplasm}} = 1575 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ , and  $V_{\text{cell}} = 2025 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).<br> $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

$$
*_{\text{KLigand diffusion}} = D_{\text{Ligand}} \times \frac{Area_{nuc}}{Dist} \text{ [litre/min=dm}^3/\text{min=32.5pL/min=32.5·10-12 L/min.}
$$
  
\n
$$
*_{\text{KProtein diffusion}} = D_{\text{Protein}} \times \frac{Area_{nuc}}{Dist} \text{ [litre/min=dm}^3/\text{min=5.4·pl/min=5.4·10-12 L/min.}
$$

# **Table 4**







We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu m^2$  =  $2.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$ dm<sup>2</sup>, Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane) =  $3.1 \mu m$  =  $3.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ dm ; V<sub>nuc</sub> = 450  $\mu m^3$ ,  $V_{\text{cytoplasm}} = 1575 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ , and  $V_{\text{cell}} = 2025 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6.10^9 \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).  $D_{\text{Ligand}}$ =36·10<sup>-9</sup>dm<sup>2</sup>/min (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

$$
*_{\text{KLigand diffusion}} = D_{\text{Ligand}} \times \frac{Area_{\text{nuc}}}{Dist} [\text{litre/min} = dm^3/\text{min}] = 32.5 \text{pL/min} = 32.5 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{L/min}.
$$
  

$$
*_{\text{KProtein diffusion}} = D_{\text{Protein}} \times \frac{Area_{\text{nuc}}}{Dist} [\text{litre/min} = dm^3/\text{min}] = 5.4 \text{ pL/min} = 5.4 \cdot 10^{-12} \text{L/min}.
$$

# **Table 5**

**Design 5: NR functioning as NR and imported actively from the cytoplasm** 





We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu \text{m}^2 = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-8} \text{dm}^2$ , Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane)= $3.1 \mu \text{m} = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \text{dm}$ ; V<sub>nuc</sub>=450  $\mu \text{m}^3$ ,  $V_{\text{out}} = 450 \mu \text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).<br> $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

\* $\kappa_{\text{Ligand diffusion}} = D_{\text{Ligand}} \times$ *Dist*  $\frac{Area_{nuc}}{2}$  [litre/min= dm<sup>3</sup>/min]=32.5pL/min=32.5·10<sup>-12</sup> L/min.







We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu m^2 = 2.8 \cdot 10^{-8} dm^2$ , Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane) =  $3.1 \mu m = 3.1 \cdot 10^{-5} dm$ ; V<sub>nuc</sub>=450  $\mu m^3$ ,  $V_{\text{cytoplasm}} = 1575 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ , and  $V_{\text{cell}} = 2025 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6.10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).  $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

 $*_{\text{K}_{\text{Ligand diffusion}}=D_{\text{Ligand}}} \times$ *Dist*  $Area_{nuc}$  [litre/min= dm<sup>3</sup>/min]=32.5pL/min=32.5·10<sup>-12</sup> L/min.

# **Table 7**





## **Table 8 Model for Fig. 4**





# **Table 9**

	<b>Reactions</b>	<b>Parameters</b>
$V_1$	NRL binding importins in the cytoplasm:	$k_{1f}$ = 60 nM <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup> ; $k_{1b}$ = 300 min <sup>-1</sup>
	$(k_{1f} \cdot NrL_c(t) \cdot IMP_c(t) - k_{1b} \cdot NrLIMP_c(t)) \cdot V_{\text{cvt}}$	
	[nmoles/min] Nuclear transport of importins complexed with NR:	reversible pore (black dashed line):
$\mathbf{v}_2$		Kappa <sub>2f</sub> = 5.4 $\times$ 10 <sup>-12</sup> l/min;
	$Kappa_{2f} \cdot NrLIMP_{c} - Kappa_{2b} \cdot NrLIMP_{n}$	Kappa <sub>2b</sub> = $5.4 \times 10^{-12}$ l/min
	[nmoles/min]	
		active import of NrLImp complex (grey
		solid line):
		Kappa <sub>2f</sub> =5.4×10 <sup>-12</sup> l/min;
		Kappa <sub>2b</sub> = $0$ L/min
		active export of IMP (black solid line):
		Kappa <sub>2f</sub> = 5.4 $\times$ 10 <sup>-12</sup> l/min; Kappa <sub>2b</sub> = $5.4 \times 10^{-12}$ l/min
	Nuclear transport of importins:	reversible pore (black dashed line):
$V_3$		Kappa <sub>3f</sub> = $\overline{5.4 \times 10^{-12}}$ l/min;
	$Kappa_{3f} \cdot IMP_{c}(t) - Kappa_{3b} \cdot IMP_{n}(t)$	Kappa <sub>3b</sub> = $5.4 \times 10^{-12}$ l/min
	[nmoles/min]	
		active import of NrLImp complex (grey
		solid line):
		Kappa <sub>3f</sub> = $5.4 \times 10^{-12}$ l/min;
		Kappa <sub>3b</sub> = $5.4 \times 10^{-12}$ l/min
		active export of IMP (black solid line): Kappa <sub>3f</sub> = $0$ l/min;
$V_4$	NRL binding importins in the nucleus:	Kappa <sub>3b</sub> = 5.4 × 10 <sup>-12</sup> l/min k <sub>4f</sub> = 60 nM <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup> ; k <sub>4f</sub> = 300 min <sup>-1</sup>
	$(k_{4f} \cdot NrL_n(t) \cdot IMP_n - k_{4b} \cdot NrLIMP_n(t)) \cdot V_{nuc}$	
	[nmoles/min] Nuclear RE binding NRL:	$k_{5f} = 60$ nM <sup>-1</sup> min <sup>-1</sup> ; $k_{5f} = 60$ min <sup>-1</sup>
$\mathbf{v}_5$		
	$(k_{5f} \cdot NrL_n(t) \cdot \text{Re}_n(t) - k_{5b} \cdot \text{Re} NrL_n(t)) \cdot V_{nuc}$	
	[nmoles/min]	
$V_6$	Degradation of NR after being bound with RE (RE):	$K_{6f} = 0.1$ min <sup>-1</sup>
	$(k_{6f} \cdot \text{Re} NrL_n(t)) \cdot V_{nuc}$ [nmoles/min]	
<b>Balance equations</b>		
$dNrL_c(t)/dt$	$-v_1/V_{\text{cyt}}$ [nM/min]	
$dImp_c(t)/dt$	$(-v_1-v_3)/V_{\rm {cvt}}$ [nM/min]	
dImpNrL <sub>c</sub> (t)/dt	$(+v_1-v_2)/V_{\rm{cvt}}$ [nM/min]	
$dNrL_n(t)/dt$	$(+v_4-v_5)/V_{\text{nuc}}$ [nM/min]	
$dImp_n(t)/dt$	$(+v_3-v_4)/V_{\text{nuc}}$ [nM/min]	
$dImpNrL_n(t)/dt$	$(+v_2+v_4)/V_{\text{nuc}}$ [nM/min]	
dRe <sub>n</sub> /dt	$(-v_5 + v_6)/V_{\text{nuc}}$ [nM/min]	
dReNrL <sub>n</sub> /dt	$(+v_5-v_6)/V_{nuc}$ [nM/min]	
$d$ Degr <sub>n</sub> /dt	$+v_6/V_{\text{nuc}}$ [nM/min]	
	<b>Conserved Moieties</b>	
$DNA_{total} \cdot V_{nuc}$	Re $NrL_n(t) \cdot V_{nuc} + \text{Re}_n(t) \cdot V_{nuc}$ [nmoles/cell]	$DNA_{total} \cdot V_{nuc} = 1000 * 10^9/N_A =$
		$1.67\times10^{-12}$ nmoles (10 <sup>3</sup> molecules/cell)
$NR_{total} \cdot (V_{nuc} + V_{cvt})$	$NrL_n(t)\cdot V_{nuc} + NrL_c(t)\cdot V_{cv} + ReNrL_n(t)\cdot V_{nuc}$	$NR_{total} \cdot (V_{nuc} + V_{cvt}) =$
	+ $NrLIMP_c(t) \cdot V_{cyt}$ + $NrLIMP_n(t) \cdot V_{nuc}$ + $Degr_n$	$1.31 \times 10^{-12}$ nmoles

**Model for Figure 1 of Supplementary Information** 









We describe a spherical cell of radius 7.85  $\mu$ m, with a spherical nucleus of radius 4.75  $\mu$ m. Consequently, Area<sub>nuc</sub> (area of nuclear membrane) =  $280 \mu m^2$  =  $2.8 \cdot 10^{-8}$ dm<sup>2</sup>, Dist (distance between cytoplasmic and nuclear membrane) =  $3.1 \mu m$  =  $3.1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ dm ; V<sub>nuc</sub> = 450  $\mu m^3$ ,  $V_{\text{cytoplasm}} = 1575 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ , and  $V_{\text{cell}} = 2025 \,\mu\text{m}^3$ .

 $D_{\text{Protein}} = 6.10^9 \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (diffusion coefficient for protein (Kholodenko et al, 2000a).  $D_{\text{Ligand}} = 36 \cdot 10^{-9} \text{dm}^2/\text{min}$  (calculated from the Stokes-Einstein equation by comparing with  $D_{\text{Protein}}$ ).

\* $\kappa_{\text{Ligand diffusion}} = D_{\text{Ligand}} \times$ *Dist*  $\frac{Area_{nuc}}{2}$  [litre/min= dm<sup>3</sup>/min]=32.5pL/min=32.5·10<sup>-12</sup> L/min.

#### **SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS**

We have varied parameter values and checked whether the conclusions persisted. Our conclusions were mostly robust for up to five-fold changes in parameter values, but the precise details are given below.

Figure 2: Design 6 is the most advantageous. This conclusion was not affected by at least 5 fold perturbation of any single parameter in the model. The only exception was related to the rate of nuclear import of liganded receptor. If active nuclear import of liganded receptor in design 6 is decreased more then 3 fold, then the advantages of the design 6 comparing with the design 2 almost disappear. This fits well in the context of the main messages of our manuscript. Indeed, an advantageous feature of the design 6 is exactly the active import of ligand into the nucleus achieved by preferential nuclear import of the ligand bound receptor.

Figure 3: Active export of importins prevents sequestration of the receptor in the nucleus by importins. This conclusion was not affected by l0 fold perturbation of any single parameter in the model.

Figure 4: flux through the NPC may be robust even if all pathways run through the same pore. This conclusion was not affected by l0 fold perturbation of any single parameter in the model.



### **Table 11 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS FOR FIG. 2**





30













36





**Table 12 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS FOR FIG. 3**







### **Table 13 SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS FOR FIG. 4**



## **Supplementary References**

- Bakker BM, Mensonides FI, Teusink B, van Hoek P, Michels PA, Westerhoff HV (2000) Compartmentation protects trypanosomes from the dangerous design of glycolysis. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 97: 2087-2092.
- Schmierer B, Tournier AL, Bates PA, Hill CS (2008) Mathematical modeling identifies Smad nucleocytoplasmic shuttling as a dynamic signal-interpreting system. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 105: 6608-6613.