In the format provided by the authors and unedited.

Entry of glucose- and glutamine-derived carbons into the citric acid cycle supports early steps of HIV-1 infection in CD4 T cells

Isabelle Clerc^{1,6}, Daouda Abba Moussa^{1,6}, Zoi Vahlas^{1,6}, Saverio Tardito^{2,3}, Leal Oburoglu¹, Thomas J. Hope⁴, Marc Sitbon¹, Valérie Dardalhon¹, Cédric Mongellaz^{1,7*} and Naomi Taylor^{1,5,7*}

¹Institut de Génétique Moléculaire de Montpellier, University of Montpellier, CNRS, Montpellier, France. ²Cancer Research UK, Beatson Institute, Glasgow, UK. ³Institute of Cancer Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK. ⁴Department of Cell and Molecular Biology, Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA. ⁵Present address: Pediatric Oncology Branch, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA. ⁶These authors contributed equally: Isabelle Clerc, Daouda Abba Moussa, Zoi Vahlas. ⁷These authors jointly supervised this work: Cédric Mongellaz, Naomi Taylor. *e-mail: mongellaz@igmm.cnrs.fr



Supplementary Figure 1. GLUT1 and ASCT2 nutrient transporters are rapidly upregulated following TCR stimulation. (a) Human CD4 T cells were stimulated with α CD3/ α CD28 mAbs and surface expression of early activation markers (CD25 and CD69) as well as the GLUT1 glucose and ASCT2 glutamine transporters were monitored at 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 18, 24, 48 and 72 hours post stimulation. Representative histograms are presented. Control immunofluorescence is shown in grey histograms and specific staining is shown in black line histograms (representative of n=2 biologically independent samples). (b) Expression of CD25 and CD69 activation markers were assessed at 24 and 72h post activation in nutrient-replete conditions (Nutr+) as well as following deprivation of glucose (-GLC) or glutamine (-GLN) at 19h (representative of n=4 biologically independent samples).



Supplementary Figure 2. Impact of nutrient deprivation on CD4 T cell survival, proliferation and HIV-**1** gene expression. (a) CD4 T cells $(1 \times 10^{6} / \text{well})$ were activated for 19h with coated α CD3/ α CD28 mAbs and then transferred to either complete (Nutr+), glucose-deprived (-GLC), glutamine-deprived media (-GLN) or glucose-deprived/galactose-supplemented media (-GLC/+GAL). Viability (monitored by viability dye analysis; top; n=7 individual donors, 1-way ANOVA test) and absolute cell counts (bottom panel; n=5 biologically independent samples, 1-way ANOVA test) were monitored at 24 and 48h. (b) CD4 T cells were labeled with VPD and then activated in the conditions described above. Representative histograms showing proliferation profiles at 72h are presented together with a quantification of the percentages of dividing cells ± SEM (n=4 biologically independent samples, 2-tailed t-test). (c) CD4 T cells were activated as above for 19h and exposed to nutrient deprivation conditions at either 19h or at 48h. In all conditions, cells were infected with single round HIV-1 virion harboring GFP at 24h and GFP reporter expression was evaluated at 72h. Representative dot plots showing percentages of infected cells (top) and histograms showing quantification of means ± SEM are presented (n=4 biologically independent samples; 2-tailed t-test; ***, p=0.0004). (d) CD4 T cells were activated as above and infected at the indicated MOIs. Infection was monitored 48h later as a function of GFP expression. Dot plots showing the percentage of infected cells are presented at different MOIs (left) as well as a quantification of the means ± SEM of GFP⁺ cells relative to control conditions, set at 1 (right; n=4 biologically independent samples performed in technical triplicates; 1-way ANOVA test). *, p<0.05; **, p<0.01; ***p<0.005; ****p<0.0001. All precise p values are indicated in Supplementary Table 3.



Supplementary Figure 3. ¹³C metabolic flux analyses from [U-¹³C₆]glucose and [U-¹³C₅]glutamine into pentose phosphate pathway and TCA cycle intermediates. (a) The presence of pentose phosphate pathway intermediates following TCR stimulation of CD4 T cells under control conditions or following LDH inhibition (LDHi) with the competitive pyruvate analogue oxamate was monitored by HPLC-MS (mean ±SEM, n=2 biologically independent samples performed in technical triplicates). (b) The percentage of α-KG derived from ¹³C glucose carbons in T cells activated in the absence vs presence of oxamate was monitored by HPLC-MS (mean ±SEM, n=2 biologically independent samples performed in technical triplicates; p<0.0001, unpaired t-test, 2-tailed). (c) A simplified representation of the distribution of 13 C carbon atoms derived from glucose (blue dots) and glutamine (red dots) in TCA cycle intermediates. The isotopologues of α -ketoglutarate derived from the 1st and 2nd rounds of the cycle are shown in boxes and isotopologues in other intermediates are indicated.



Supplementary Figure 4. α -KG increases mTOR signaling in activated CD4 T cells under conditions of glutamine deprivation. Naïve (T4_N) and memory (T4_M) CD4 T cells were TCR-stimulated in glutamine deprivation conditions in the absence or presence of cell permeable α -KG (dimethyl ketoglutarate, 3.5mM). S6 phosphorylation (p-S6) was monitored and representative plots are presented with isotype controls (grey histograms) and specific staining (black line, left). The mean percentages of p-S6⁺ cells ± SEM are presented (right; n=7 biologically independent samples; 2-tailed t-test; *, p=0.0119 for T4_N and p=0.0466 for T4_M. Precise p values are indicated in Supplementary Table 3.



Supplementary Figure 5. The impact of α -KG on HIV-1 infection in glutamine-deprived CD4 T cells is not altered by exogenous nucleosides. CD4 T cells activated in glutamine-deprived conditions were cultured in the absence or presence of α -KG and exogenous nucleosides (Nside; 30 μ M). Cells were infected with single round HIV-1 virions and reporter expression was assessed 48h later. Representative histograms are shown (left panels) and quantification \pm SEM of HIV infection is presented (right; n=4 biologically independent samples; 2-tailed t-test). **p=0.0041 for -GLN vs. -GLN+ α -KG and p=0.0016 for -GLN vs. -GLN+ α -KG+Nside.



Supplementary Figure 6. Fusion of HIV-1 virions to CD4 T cells is not modulated by nutrient conditions. (a) Fusion was assessed as a function of cellular uptake of Gag p24. CD4 T cells were activated for 19h, transferred to the indicated nutrient conditions for 5h (24h post activation) and then exposed to virus particles for 2h at 37°C. Cell lysates were subject to immunoblot and probed with anti-p24 and anti-ZAP-70 mAbs. A representative blot is presented (left, of n=6 biologically independent samples) and the level of p24 input virus is shown. The level of p24 relative to ZAP-70 in control conditions (Nutr+) was arbitrarily set to 1 and ratios in the indicated positions are presented (n=6 biologically independent samples, 1-way ANOVA test; ns, non-significant p>0.05). (b) Fusion was assessed using virus containing β -lactamase (BlaM)-Vpr chimeric protein. CD4 T cells were activated as above prior to a 2h incubation with virions containing BlaM-Vpr exhibit blue fluorescence due to cleavage of CCF2. Incubation with ammonium chloride (NH₄CL) was used as a negative control, inhibiting fusion. Percent fusion is presented (n=2 independent experiments from n=1 biologically independent sample). (c) The uncropped western blot shown in panel a is presented with full molecular weight markers. Precise p values are presented in Supplementary Table 3.



Supplementary Figure 7. Gating strategy for flow cytometry analysis of CD4 T cells. (a) Gating strategies showing FSC/SSC profiles, followed by FSC-A/SSC-W profiles for live freshly isolated CD4-selected T cells. For evaluation of naïve and memory CD4 T cells, CD45RA/CD45RO profiles are presented. (b) Representative gating strategies for TCR-stimulated CD4 T cells are presented showing sequential FSC/SSC, SSC-A/SSC-W and SSC/Topro3 profiles followed by HIV-GFP evaluation are presented. The percentages of cells in each gate are indicated. (c) Gating strategies for FACS-sorting of VDP-unlabeled and labeled CD4 T cells as a function of Mitotracker Green staining. Sequential FSC/SSC, SSC-A/SSC-W, FSC-A/FSC-W, and SSC/DAPI profiles are presented followed by sorting of CD4/VDP cells on the basis of Mitotracker Green profiles and evaluation of sorted cells.

List of Antibodies/Reagents

Protein	Ref.	Supplier
α-CD3 purified (clone OKT3)	317302	BioLegend
α -CD28 purified (clone 9.3)		Dr. Carl June
α-hCD3-APC-AF750 (clone UCHT1)	A66329	Beckman Coulter
α-hCD4-PE (clone 13B8.2)	A07751	Beckman Coulter
α-hCD4-BV786 (clone SK3)	563881	Becton Dickinson
α-hCD45RA-FITC (clone ALB-11)	A07786	Beckman Coulter
α-hCD45RO-PC7 (clone UCHL1)	B13648	Beckman Coulter
α-hCD25-APC (clone B1.49.9)	B09684	Beckman Coulter
α-hCD69-PC7 (clone TPI.55.3)	A80710	Beckman Coulter
α -hCD8-purified (clone OKT8)	BE0004-2	BioXcell
α-hCD8-APCeF780 (clone RPA-T8)	47-0088	eBiosciences
α -hCD45RA purified (clone 5H9)	556625	Becton Dickinson
α -hCD45RO purified (clone UCHL1)	555491	Becton Dickinson
α-P-RPS6 (Ser 235/236) (clone 91B2)	2211	Cell Signaling Technology
α-ZAP70 (clone 2F3.2)		Dr A. Weiss
α-HIV p24 (clone 183H125C)	NIH3537	NIH AIDS Reagent Program
GLUT1 RBD-GFP	GLUT1_G100	Metafora Biosystems
ASCT2 RBD-rFc	ASCT2.RBD	Metafora Biosystems
MitoTracker Green	M7514	Molecular Probes/ThermoFisher
MitoSox Red	M36008	Molecular Probes/ThermoFisher
Gene Blazer In Vivo Detection kit	12578134	Molecular Probes/ThermoFisher
1		

Supplementary Table 1. List of antibodies/ reagents. Clones, references and suppliers are indicated.

Sequence	Primers
R/U5	Fwd 5'-GGCTAACTAGGGAACCCACTG-3'
	Rev 5'-CTGCTAGAGATTTTCCACACTGAC-3'
LTR/Gag	Fwd 5'-TGTGTGCCCGTCTGTTGTGT-3'
	Rev 5'-GAGTCCTGCGTCGAGAGAGC-3'
2LTRc	Fwd 5'-GCCTCAATAAAGCTTGCCTTG-3'
	Rev 5'-TCCCAGGCTCAGATCTGGTCTAAC-3'
β2m	Fwd 5'-TGCTGTCTCCATGTTTGATGTATCT-3'
	Rev 5'-TCTCTGCTCCCCACCTCTAAGT-3'

Supplementary Table 2. List of Primers.

Supplementary Table 3. Statistical analyses of data presented in all figures.

Figure 1

0					
Panel	test	n			p value
1d	1d 2-tailed t-test	5	T4 _N vs T4 _M	**	0.0010
1f	2-tailed t-test	5	T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLC	*	0.0130
			T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLN	***	0.0003
			T4 _N -GLC vs T4 _N -GLN	***	0.0004
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLC	**	0.0011
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M -GLC vs T4 _M -GLN	***	0.0002

Figure 2

-					
Panel	test	n			p value
2a	2-tailed t-test	13	T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLC	****	<0.0001
			T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _N -GLC vs T4 _N -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLC	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M -GLC vs T4 _M -GLN		
2b	2-tailed t-test	3	Nutr+ vs Nutr NSide	ns	0.3802
			-GLC vs -GLC NSide	ns	0.5681
			-GLN vs –GLN NSide	**	0.0062
2c	2-tailed t-test	4	Nutr+ vs Nutr NSide	ns	0.1366
			-GLC vs -GLC NSide	ns	0.6402
			-GLN vs -GLN NSide	ns	0.2028

Figure 3

Panel	test	n			p value
3a	2-tailed t-test	8	T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLC	*	0.0142
			T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _N -GLC vs T4 _N -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLC	ns	0.1337
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLN	****	<0.0001
			T4 _M -GLC vs T4 _M -GLN	****	<0.0001
3b GLUT1	2-tailed t-test	7	T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLC	**	0.0011
			T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLN	**	0.0022
			T4 _N -GLC vs T4 _N -GLN	***	0.0004
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLC	ns	0.1857
			$T4_M$ Nutr+ vs $T4_M$ -GLN	****	<0.0001
			$T4_M$ -GLC vs $T4_M$ -GLN	***	0.0002
3b ASCT2	2-tailed t-test	7	T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLC	***	0.0008
			T4 _N Nutr+ vs T4 _N -GLN	**	0.0043
			T4 _N -GLC vs T4 _N -GLN	**	0.0060
			T4 _M Nutr+ vs T4 _M -GLC	ns	0.1027
			$T4_M$ Nutr+ vs $T4_M$ -GLN	ns	0.3138
			$T4_M$ -GLC vs $T4_M$ -GLN	ns	0.1971

3c OCR	2-tailed t-test	5	NS vs Nutr+	*	0.0125
		4	NS vs -GLC	*	0.0257
		4	NS vs -GLN	*	0.0469
		8	Nutr+ vs -GLC	*	0.0100
		8	Nutr+ vs -GLN	**	0.0067
		8	-GLC vs -GLN	**	0.0026
3c ECAR	2-tailed t-test	6	NS vs Nutr+	**	0.0051
		5	NS vs -GLC	*	0.0351
		5	NS vs -GLN	**	0.0048
		9	Nutr+ vs -GLC	**	0.0038
		9	Nutr+ vs -GLN	*	0.0332
		9	-GLC vs -GLN	****	<0.0001
3d	2-tailed t-test	6	NS vs Nutr+	*	0.0243
		5	NS vs -GLC	*	0.0197
		5	NS vs -GLN	*	0.0104
		9	Nutr+ vs -GLC	****	<0.0001
		9	Nutr+ vs -GLN	*	0.0106
		9	-GLC vs -GLN	****	<0.0001

Figure 4

Panel	test	n			p value
4c	2-tailed t-test	4	TCR vs Oxamate	**	0.0067
		4	TCR vs GSKi	*	0.0347
		4	Oxamate vs GSKi	ns	0.6651
4d	1w ANOVA - Tukey	6	TCR vs Oxamate	**	0.0029
			TCR vs Lactate	*	0.0401
			TCR vs TCR Pyr	ns	0.1378
			Oxamate vs Oxamate Pyr	*	0.0149
			Lactate vs Lactate Pyr	*	0.0197
4e RU5	2-tailed t-test	3	T6 TCR vs Oxamate	ns	0.7864
			T6 TCR vs Lactate	ns	0.4168
			T24 TCR vs Oxamate	**	0.0062
			T24 TCR vs Lactate	ns	0.1200
4e LTR Gag	2-tailed t-test	3	T24 TCR vs Oxamate	*	0.0454
			T24 TCR vs Lactate	*	0.0216
4e 2LTRc	2-tailed t-test	3	T24 TCR vs Oxamate	*	0.0251
			T24 TCR vs Lactate	*	0.0243

Figure 5

Panel	test	n			p value
5a	2-tailed t-test	4	-GLC no drug vs oligomycin	***	0.0008
		3	-GLC no drug vs AntA	**	0.0089
		4	-GLN no drug vs oligomycin	ns	0.5807
		3	-GLN no drug vs AntA	ns	0.3965
5c	2-tailed t-test	5	T4 _N -GLN vs T4 _N -GLN aKG	**	0.0059
			T4M-GLN vs T4M-GLN aKG	*	0.0135

5d RU5	2-tailed t-test	6	T6 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.6754
			T6 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.4935
			T6 Nutr+ vs -GLN DMK	ns	0.9338
			T6 -GLN vs -GLN + aKG	ns	0.5999
			T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC	**	0.0081
			T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN	**	0.0022
			T24 -GLN vs -GLN + aKG	**	0.0025
5d LTR Gag	2-tailed t-test	6	T6 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.2768
			T6 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.3478
			T6 Nutr+ vs -GLN DMK	ns	0.4967
			T6 -GLN vs -GLN + aKG	ns	0.7673
			T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC	**	0.0062
			T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN	**	0.0092
			T24 -GLC vs –GLN	*	0.0394
			T24 -GLN vs -GLN + aKG	*	0.0130
5d 2LTRc	2-tailed t-test	6	T24 -GLN vs -GLN + aKG	*	0.0192

Figure 6

Panel	test	n			p value
6a OCR/ECAR	2-tailed t-test	7	$T4_N$ -GLN vs $T4_N$ -GLN inj aKG	***	0.0003
			T4 _N -GLN vs T4 _N -GLN aKG	***	0.0010
			T4 _M -GLN vs T4 _M -GLN inj aKG	***	0.0002
			T4M-GLN vs T4M-GLN aKG	***	0.0002
6a ATP	2-tailed t-test	7	T4 _N -GLN vs T4 _N -GLN inj aKG	***	0.0002
			T4 _N -GLN vs T4 _N -GLN aKG	**	0.0016
			T4 _M -GLN vs T4 _M -GLN inj aKG	****	<0.0001
			T4M-GLN vs T4M-GLN aKG	**	0.0013
6b OCR/ECAR	2-tailed t-test	11	TCR vs Oxamate	****	<0.0001
			TCR vs Lactate	**	0.0014
			Oxamate vs Lactate	**	0.0073
6b ATP	2-tailed t-test	11	TCR vs Oxamate	**	0.0010
			TCR vs Lactate	**	0.0054
			Oxamate vs Lactate	ns	0.6066
6c	2-tailed t-test	4	TCR vs Oxamate	*	0.0222
6d Mitogreen	2-tailed t-test	18	TCR neg vs TCR HIV	****	<0.0001
			TCR neg vs Oxamate neg	****	<0.0001
			Oxamate neg vs Oxamate HIV	****	<0.0001
			TCR HIV vs Oxamate HIV	****	<0.0001
6d Mitosox	2-tailed t-test	15	TCR neg vs TCR HIV	***	0.0008
			TCR neg vs Oxamate neg	***	0.0008
			Oxamate neg vs Oxamate HIV	***	0.0007
			TCR HIV vs Oxamate HIV	***	0.0005
6e	2-tailed t-test	5	TCR neg vs TCR HIV	****	<0.0001
			Oxamate neg vs Oxamate HIV	****	< 0.0001

Figure 7

Panel	test	n			p value
7a	2-tailed t-test	4	Mito Low vs Mito High	**	0.0015
7b infection	2-tailed t-test	6	Mito Low vs Mito High	*	0.0450
7b MFI	2-tailed t-test	6	Mito Low vs Mito High	**	0.0016

Suppl Figure 2

S2a viability 1w-ANOVA Tukey 7 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9834 Image: Construct of the second	Panel	test	n			p value
Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9774 1 124 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0811 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.0930 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9930 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9727 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6779 1 772 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6774 1 772 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6779 1 772 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.5332 1 172 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 1 72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 1 72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 1 772 Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001	S2a viability	1w-ANOVA	7	T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.9834
T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9774 1 T24 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.6811 1 T48 Nutr+ vs GLC ns 0.9930 1 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9771 1 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9727 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7095 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.6779 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.6732 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 1 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 1 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 1 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 1 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0906 1 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0906 1 T72 -GLV vs -GLN ns 0.0906 1 T72 -GLV vs -GLN ns<		Tukey				
Image: Second state of the second state of				T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.9774
T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9930 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9727 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7095 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7095 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.6779 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.6232 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 T22 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 Count T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8667 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9986 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9986 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC rs*** <0.0001				T24 Nutr+ vs GAL	ns	0.6811
T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9727 T48 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.7095 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6779 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8374 Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8741 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.9930
T48 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.7095 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6779 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.5232 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 S2a cell 1w-ANOVA 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 Count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 1w-ANOVA 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 0.8657 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 772 Nutr+ vs -GLN vs T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 0.772 -GLV vs -GLN vs 0.0001 T72 -GLC vs -GLN ns 0.7842 vs 0.0178 T72 -GLC vs -GLN s 0.0016 vs 0.0049 C-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLN ***				T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.9727
T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.6779 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.5232 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8374 S2a cell 1w-ANOVA 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 Count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 ns 0.8741 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 ns 0.8657 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 ns 0.9999 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9996 0.9999 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9901 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ***** <0.0001				T48 Nutr+ vs GAL	ns	0.7095
T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.5232 T72 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.8374 S2a cell 1w-ANOVA 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 Count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 ns 0.8741 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 ns 0.8741 T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 ns 0.8657 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 ns 0.9986 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 ns 0.0001 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 ns 0.0001 T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.0001 ns 0.0906 T72 -GLC vs -GLN ns 0.0178 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN *** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN *** S2b 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLC ** <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC</td> <td>ns</td> <td>0.6779</td>				T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.6779
S2a cell 1w-ANOVA Tukey 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8374 1w-ANOVA count 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 1wey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8761 1wey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1wey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1wey T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8657 1wey T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9998 1wey T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 1wey T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 1wey T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN ***** <0.0001				T72 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.5232
S2a cell count 1w-ANOVA Tukey 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 Image: Count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.7654 Image: Count T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.6547 Image: Count T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9986 Image: Count T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC **** <0.0001				T72 Nutr+ vs GAL	ns	0.8374
S2a cell count 1w-ANOVA Tukey 5 T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.7654 1 124 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 ns 0.8741 1 124 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8741 ns 0.8741 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 ns 0.8657 1 148 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9986 0.9999 1 172 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9996 1 172 Nutr+ vs -GLC ***** <0.0001						
Count Tukey T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.5547 Image: Count T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.8741 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.8657 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC ns 0.9998 Image: Count T48 Nutr+ vs -GLN ns 0.9999 Image: Count T72 Nutr+ vs -GLC ***** <0.0001	S2a cell	1w-ANOVA	5	T24 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.7654
Image: Second	count	Тикеу		T24 Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0 5547
Image: Second				T24 Nutr+ vs GAI	ns	0.8741
T48 Nutr+ vs GLN ns 0.0986 148 Nutr+ vs GLN ns 0.9989 1748 Nutr+ vs GLN ns 0.9999 172 Nutr+ vs GLC ***** <0.0001				T48 Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.8657
T48 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.3900 1 T72 Nutr+ vs GAL ns 0.9999 1 T72 Nutr+ vs GLC **** <0.0001					ne	0.0007
Trian Trian <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>ne</td><td>0.3300</td></th<>					ne	0.3300
172 Nutr+ vs -GLO 40.0001 172 Nutr+ vs -GLN ***** <0.0001					****	<u>-0.0001</u>
172 Nutr+ vs GLN **** <0.0001				$T72 \text{ Nutr} + y_{\text{S}} - GL \text{ N}$	****	<0.0001
Init Nutry vs GL School (1) 172 GLC vs GLN ns 0.0906 172 GLC vs GAL ns 0.7842 172 GLC vs GAL ns 0.7842 172 GLC vs GAL * 0.0178 172 GLN vs GAL * 0.0178 172 GLN vs GAL * 0.0178 172 GLN vs GAL * 0.016 172 GLC vs GLN ** 0.0016 172 GLC vs GLN ** 0.0016 172 GLC vs GLN ** 0.0049 100 GLC vs GLN ** 0.0049 101 GLC vs GAL ns 0.2202 101 GLC vs GAL ns 0.2202 101 GLC vs GAL * 0.0228 102 GLC vs GAL ns 0.2202 103 GLC vs GAL * 0.0228 104 GLC vs GLN vs GAL ns 0.7069 105 GLC 19h vs GLC 48h ns 0.1837 102 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 103 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 103 GAL 19h vs GLN					****	<0.0001
112 'GLC vs 'GLN 113 0.0300 T72 -GLC vs 'GAL ns 0.7842 T72 -GLN vs GAL * 0.0178 S2b 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLC ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 ** 0.0049 - - - - - S2b 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0049 - - - - - - - 0.0049 - - - - - 0.0049 - - - - - 0.0049 - - - - - 0.00202 - - - - - - - S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.1837 -GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 - - - S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.00010					ne	0.0006
112 Collo V3 CAL 113 0.1042 172 Collo V3 CAL * 0.0178 172 Collo V3 GAL * 0.0178 113 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs GAL * 0.016 114 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 114 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0049 115 -GLC vs -GLN ** 0.0049 -GLC vs -GAL ns 0.2202 115 -GLN vs -GAL ns 0.2202 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.00288 116 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 - - - - 117 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 - - - - 118 -GLN 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 - - - 118 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 - - - 118 -GLN 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 - - - - 118 Nutr+ vs -GLN </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ne</td> <td>0.0300</td>					ne	0.0300
S2b 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLC ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0049 - - - - Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0049 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 - - - - - - - S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 - - - - - - S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 - - - - - -					*	0.7042
S2b 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ vs -GLC ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs -GLN ** 0.0016 ** 0.0016 Nutr+ vs GAL ** 0.0049 -GLC vs -GLN ** 0.0088 -GLC vs -GLN ** 0.0028 -GLC vs -GAL ns 0.2202 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0028 S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.1837 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h **** 0.0004 -GLN 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 - - - S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				172 -GEN VS GAL		0.0170
Diamond Violat 1 Nutri vision ** 0.0016 Nutri vision Nutri vision ** 0.0016 Nutri vision Nutri vision ** 0.0049	S2b	2-tailed t-test	4	Nutr+ vs -GLC	**	0.0016
Nutr + vs GAL ** 0.0049 -GLC vs -GLN ** 0.0088 -GLC vs -GAL ns 0.2202 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 -GLC 19h vs -GAL * 0.0049 -GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.7069 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h **** 0.0001 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.4675 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.0010 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h ns 0.0010 -GLN 19h vs -GLN **** 0.0010 -GLN 19h vs -GLN **** 0.00010	02.0		•	Nutr+ vs -GLN	**	0.0016
Image: State of the state				Nutr+ vs GAI	**	0.0049
Size vs of LN state 0.0005 -GLC vs -GAL ns 0.2202 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 Szc 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 Szc 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.1837 -GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 - - - Szd 1w-ANOVA GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 Szd 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC **** 0.00010 Nutr+ vs -GLN Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				-GLC vs -GLN	**	0.0088
Size vs or line Init 0.12202 -GLN vs -GAL * 0.0228 Size 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 Size 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 Size 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC **** Nutr+ vs -GLN **** 0.00010				-GLC vs -GAI	ns	0.2202
S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 0.0004 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 0.0001 S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC **** 0.0010 Nutr+ vs -GLN Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				-GLN vs -GAI	*	0.0228
S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.7069 S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19h vs Nutr+ 48h ns 0.1837 GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 0.0004 GAL 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Tukey Nutr+ vs -GLN ****						0.0220
S2c 2-tailed t-test 4 Nutr+ 19n Vs Nutr+ 48n ns 0.7069 -GLC 19h vs -GLC 48h ns 0.1837 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Tukey Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001	00-		4	Nutry 40b vo Nutry 40b		0.7000
-GLC 19n vs -GLC 48n ns 0.1837 -GLN 19h vs -GLN 48h *** 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Tukey Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001	520	∠-talled t-test	4		ns	0.7069
-GLN 19n VS -GLN 48n MM 0.0004 GAL 19h vs GAL 48h ns 0.4675 S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Tukey Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				-GLC 19h VS -GLC 48h	NS	0.1837
GAL 19N vs GAL 48N ns 0.4675 S2d 1w-ANOVA 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Tukey Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001						0.0004
S2d 1w-ANOVA Tukey 12 Nutr+ vs -GLC *** 0.0010 Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001				GAL 19N VS GAL 48N	ns	0.4675
Nutr+ vs -GLN **** <0.0001	S2d	1w-ANOVA Tukey	12	Nutr+ vs -GLC	***	0.0010
		rukcy		Nutr+ vs -GLN	****	<0.0001
-GLC vs -GLN **** < 0 0001				-GLC vs -GLN	****	<0.0001

Suppl Figure 3

Panel	test	n			p value
S3b	2-tailed t-test	6	CTL vs LDH inhibition	****	<0.0001

Suppl Figure 4

Panel	test	n			p value
S4	2-tailed t-test	7	$T4_N$ -GLN vs $T4_N$ -GLN aKG	*	0.0119
			$T4_{M}$ -GLN vs $T4_{M}$ -GLN aKG	*	0.0466

Suppl Figure 5

Panel	test	n			p value
S5	2-tailed t-test	12	-GLN vs -GLN aKG	****	<0.0001
			-GLN vs -GLN aKG NSide	****	<0.0001

Suppl Figure 6

Panel	test	n			p value
S6a p24	1w-ANOVA	6	Nutr+ vs -GLC	ns	0.8327
-	Tukey				
			Nutr+ vs -GLN	ns	0.9177
			Nutr+ vs –GLN a-KG	ns	0.2397
			Nutr+ vs -GAL	ns	0.1980