

How cytoskeletal crosstalk makes cells move: bridging cell-free and cell studies

James P. Conboy,^{1, a)} Irene Istúriz Petitjean,^{1, a)} Anouk van der Net,^{1, a)} and Gijsje H. Koenderink^{1, a)}
Department of Bionanoscience, Kavli Institute of Nanoscience Delft, Delft University of Technology, 2629 HZ Delft, The Netherlands

(*Electronic mail: G.H.Koenderink@tudelft.nl)

(Dated: 17 January 2024)

Cell migration is a fundamental process for life and is highly dependent on the dynamical and mechanical properties of the cytoskeleton. Intensive physical and biochemical crosstalk between actin, microtubules, and intermediate filaments ensures their coordination to facilitate and enable migration. In this review we discuss the different mechanical aspects that govern cell migration and provide, for each mechanical aspect, a novel perspective by juxtaposing two complementary approaches to the biophysical study of cytoskeletal crosstalk: live-cell studies (often referred to as top-down studies) and cell-free studies (often referred to as bottom-up studies). We summarize the main findings from both experimental approaches, and we provide our perspective on bridging the two perspectives to address the open questions of how cytoskeletal crosstalk governs cell migration and makes cells move.

I. INTRODUCTION

Cell migration is a process that is fundamental for life. It is a major contributor to tissue morphogenesis in developing embryos¹ and drives angiogenesis², bone formation³, tissue repair⁴ and immune surveillance⁵. On the flip side, however, cell migration is also responsible for pathological cell migration during chronic inflammation⁶ and cancer metastasis⁷. Cell migration depends on the mechanical and dynamical properties of the *cytoskeleton*, a network of dynamic biopolymers that self-assemble from small protein building blocks. There are three main cytoskeletal biopolymers: actin filaments, microtubules, and intermediate filaments (Figure 1A). They have markedly different structural, mechanical and dynamical properties.

Actin filaments are double helices with a diameter of ~ 7 nm, made of two strands of globular monomers⁸. The filaments are semiflexible since their thermal persistence length $l_p = \kappa/k_B T$ (where κ is the bending rigidity and $k_B T$ thermal energy) is $\sim 10\mu\text{m}$, of the same order as the filament contour length⁹. Actin filaments have an intrinsic structural polarity with a “barbed end” and a “pointed end”. Polymerization-linked ATP hydrolysis causes treadmilling, where the filaments grow at the barbed end and disassemble from the pointed end¹⁰. Filaments reconstituted from purified actin turn over slowly (one subunit every 3–4 s), but actin turnover in the cell is catalyzed by actin-binding proteins. Typical actin network turnover times are of order seconds in the leading edge of motile cells¹¹ to minutes in the actin cortex¹². Together with myosin motor proteins, actin filaments form networks and bundles that generate contractile forces¹³. *Microtubules* form hollow tubes of 13 protofilaments that are much wider (~ 25 nm)¹⁴ and hence substantially stiffer ($l_p \sim \text{mm}$)¹⁵ than actin filaments. Like actin filaments, microtubules have an intrinsic structural polarity with distinct plus

and minus ends. GTP hydrolysis results in dynamic instability, characterized by alternating phases of microtubule growth and shrinkage¹⁶. In the cell, this process is tightly regulated by accessory proteins that bind at the microtubule tip or lattice. *Intermediate filaments* are homo-/heteropolymers made of rod-shaped proteins that are encoded by more than 70 genes in humans¹⁷. Intermediate filament proteins are expressed in a cell-type-specific manner. Mesenchymal cells for instance express vimentin, whereas epithelial cells express keratins. The IF proteins share a common secondary structure consisting of an alpha-helical rod domain flanked by intrinsically disordered head and tail domains. Intermediate filaments are somewhat thicker (~ 10 nm)¹⁸ than actin filaments, but they are nevertheless much more flexible ($l_p \sim 0.5 - 2\mu\text{m}$, depending on intermediate filament composition and ionic strength^{19–23}) because of their hierarchical rope-like structure. Intermediate filaments are much more stable than actin filaments and microtubules, with slow subunit exchange along their length and annealing and fragmentation on hour time scales in reconstituted systems^{24,25} and in cells^{26,27}.

The physical properties of the cytoskeletal filaments are directly connected to their functions in cell migration. Actin, with its ability to generate protrusive and contractile forces, provides the main driving forces for polymerization-driven *mesenchymal migration* and bleb-based *amoeboid migration*^{28,29}. Meanwhile microtubules play a key role in establishing front-rear polarity and promoting persistent migration, aided by their large persistence length that is much longer than the size of the cell³⁰. Finally, intermediate filaments, with their mechanical resilience, protect the migrating cell and its nucleus from mechanical damage, which is especially important when cells squeeze through confined environments^{31,32}.

There is growing evidence that cell migration requires a dynamic interplay between the three cytoskeletal filament systems that depends on mechanical and signaling crosstalk. In mesenchymal migration, coupling of actin to microtubules and intermediate filaments is for instance essential to polarize the actin cytoskeleton and control force generation³³. Here we review recent insights in the role of cytoskeletal crosstalk in

^{a)}These authors contributed equally to this work.




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic of the three major cytoskeletal filament types and their distinctive physical properties. (b) Fluorescent confocal microscopy image of human melanoma (MV3) cells stained for α -tubulin (green), F-actin (red), and vimentin (magenta). The cell nuclei are shown in blue. (c) An electron microscopy image of an *in vitro* reconstituted three-component cytoskeletal network showing F-actin (red arrows), microtubules (green arrows) and vimentin (magenta arrows). Filaments were pre-polymerized separately at $1 \mu\text{M}$. Actin and microtubules were polymerized in MRB0 buffer (80 mM PIPES pH 6.8, 1 mM EGTA and 4 mM MgCl_2) with 50 mM KCl, 1 mM DTT and 0.5 mM ATP, while vimentin was polymerized in V-buffer (40 mM PIPES pH 7, 1 mM EGTA and 4 mM MgCl_2 , 100 mM KCl, 1 mM DTT). The filaments were combined in MRB80 buffer (with 50 mM KCl, 1 mM DTT and 0.5 mM ATP). Scale bar 100 nm.

cell migration, with a focus on mechanical aspects. For more detailed cell biological insights, we refer the reader to several excellent reviews^{34–38}. We take a mainly experimental perspective and refer the reader to other reviews for more theoretically oriented perspectives^{39,40}. Throughout this review, we confront two opposite experimental approaches to studying the biophysics of cytoskeletal crosstalk: *live cell (top-down)* studies (Figure 1B) versus *cell-free (bottom-up)* studies of simplified model systems reconstituted from component parts (Figure 1C). Live-cell studies have the benefit of physiological relevance, but mechanistic dissection is challenging because of the cell’s compositional complexity. Each cytoskeletal system exhibits enormous compositional diversity with different isoforms and posttranslational modifications⁴¹. Moreover, cytoskeletal coupling is mechanosensitive as a consequence of mechanosensory signalling loops and transcriptional regulation⁴². Cell-free studies provide a powerful approach to complement live-cell studies because they allow for highly controlled experiments from the level of single protein, to filaments, to networks.

Cytoskeletal crosstalk contributes to every aspect of cell migration (Figure 2). We structure the review according to these aspects, from cell deformability, to front-back polarity, contractility, adhesion control in collective cell migration, and finally plasticity, which refers to the ability of cells to adapt their mode of migration to their environment⁴³. We end with a perspective on how connections can be made between cell-

free and live-cell studies to address the many open questions on the role of cytoskeletal crosstalk in cell migration.




FIG. 2. Cytoskeletal crosstalk contributes to every aspect of cell migration including: (1) Cell deformability that governs the ability of cells to migrate through confining environments. Red arrows show deformation caused by the cell migrating through the extracellular matrix. (2) Contractility as a major driver of cell motility. Red arrows show actin-myosin contraction. (3) Front-rear polarity for directional migration. The leader cell is shown in dark blue. (4) Cell-cell adhesions to coordinate collective migration. The leader cell is shown in dark blue. (5) Plasticity, the ability of cells to interconvert between different migration strategies in response to their environment, for example between mesenchymal and nuclear piston modes. Here the nucleus is pulled forwards (dark blue arrow). Black arrows show the direction of migration. Actin (magenta), vimentin (cyan), nucleus (teal), intercellular adhesions (green linkers), plectin (pink linkers) and extracellular matrix fibers (purple).

II. CELL DEFORMABILITY

A. Live-cell studies

Migrating cells must deform their nucleus and cytoskeleton, especially when they move through interstitial tissues that impose significant confinement. Depending on tissue type, cells encounter extracellular matrix (ECM) and interstices between tissues with sizes ranging between 2 and $30 \mu\text{m}$, comparable to their own body and sometimes even nuclear size⁴⁴. Metastasizing cancer cells have to overcome even more severe physical barriers as they intravasate across the endothelium into blood vessels or across epithelial tissues into lymphatic vessels. Cell deformability is therefore an important determinant of cell migration⁴⁵. For many cancer cells, for instance, lower stiffness correlates with higher motility⁴⁶.

Migrating cells experience a complex combination of tensile, compressive and shear deformations of varying amplitude and rate. The effect of these mechanical parameters on cell deformability has been extensively characterized using quantitative biophysical techniques. To study the viscoelastic properties of cells without the impact of cell adhesion, cells can be detached from their substrate and measured in suspension by micropipette aspiration⁴⁷, optical stretching⁴⁸, parallel-plates rheometers⁴⁹, or high-throughput microfluidic methods⁵⁰. These measurements are mostly relevant for amoeboid migration where cells exhibit only weak adhesion to their environment. For mesenchymal migration, it is more relevant to study mechanics on adherent

cells. Whole-cell measurements of adherent cells can be done by monolayer rheology or stretching^{51–53} or by single-cell atomic force microscopy^{54,55}. Localized measurements to resolve the mechanics of specific subcellular regions can be done by magnetic twisting cytometry⁵⁶, atomic force microscopy⁵⁷, optical or magnetic tweezers^{58,59}, or particle tracking microrheology⁶⁰. Some of these methods allow for *in situ* measurements in migrating cells^{61,62}.

The nucleus is the stiffest and largest organelle with a stiffness ranging from 0.1 to 10 kPa, dependent on cell-type⁶³. The main contributors to the rigidity of the nucleus are heterochromatin and the nuclear lamina (also termed the nucleoskeleton), which contains lamin intermediate filaments^{64–66}. Intact nuclei *in situ* have a higher stiffness than isolated nuclei because the nucleus is physically coupled to the cytoskeleton through the LINC complex⁶⁷. Since the nucleus is not only the stiffest but also the largest cellular organelle, it poses a major bottleneck for confined migration⁶⁸. When cells are embedded in collagen networks or microfabricated microchannels, their migration velocity linearly decreases with decreasing pore size until migration is physically blocked when the pore size reaches 10% of the nuclear cross section⁶⁹. Under highly confined conditions, cells can only move if they are able to remove blocking ECM fibers with proteolytic enzymes^{69,70}.

The actin cytoskeleton is often considered the main determinant of cell mechanics. Drug-induced depolymerization of actin filaments indeed significantly softens cells both under non-adherent and adherent conditions^{71,72}. An important contribution of the actin cytoskeleton to cell stiffness comes from contractile forces generated by actin-myosin stress fibers⁷³ and by the actin cortex⁷⁴. Intermediate filaments form dense networks that are mainly perinuclear, so they contribute little to cortical stiffness but strongly affect the cytoplasmic shear modulus⁷⁵ and the resistance of cells to compression⁵⁵. For leukocytes and tumor cells performing 3D migration, the intermediate filament cytoskeleton is a major determinant of cell deformability. Intermediate filament protein deletion or network disruption causes significant cell softening while at the same time enhancing cell migration^{31,76–78}. Microtubules generally do not contribute much to cell stiffness, with drugs that interfere with microtubule polymerization having minor effects on cell mechanics⁷⁹. Recently, though, microtubules were shown to exhibit interesting mechano-responsive properties. Cytoskeletal compression induced by cyclic cell stretching or by confined migration was shown to stabilize deformed microtubules by triggering recruitment of CLASP2⁸⁰. When cells are transferred from rigid 2D substrates to softer 3D hydrogels, the mechanical contribution of microtubules becomes more important because actin stress fibers become less prominent. In cells migrating through collagen gels, microtubules for instance play a crucial role in mechanical support of cellular protrusions⁸¹.

It remains an open question how the interactions between the three cytoskeletal biopolymers influence the mechanics of the composite cytoskeleton. Theoretical models predict that composite networks composed of interpenetrating networks of a rigid and a flexible polymer are substantially stiffer than expected from the sum of the moduli of the sep-

arate networks⁸². Rigid fiber networks by themselves are expected to be soft at low deformation because they deform in a non-affine manner, where the elasticity is governed by fiber bending⁸³. The presence of a background network of flexible polymer suppresses these non-affine bending deformations⁸². Unfortunately this prediction is difficult to directly test in live-cell experiments because it is very challenging to specifically remove one cytoskeletal network without also affecting the others. Microtubule depolymerization is for instance well-known to activate acto-myosin contraction by the release of the microtubule-associated guanine nucleotide exchange factor GEF-H1⁸⁴. At large strains, there is some evidence of mechanical synergy between the cytoskeletal networks. Epithelial cell layers are able to undergo extreme stretching under constant tension (‘active superelasticity’) by strain-softening of the actin cortex followed by re-stiffening thanks to the keratin intermediate filament network⁸⁵. Physical crosslinking between actin and keratin is essential for the maintenance of epithelial stability⁸⁶. The ability of flexible polymers to suppress bending deformations of rigid polymers has the interesting consequence that the rigid polymers are reinforced against compressive loads⁸⁷. Under compressive loading, rigid polymers exhibit an Euler buckling instability at a critical compression force $f_c \sim 10\kappa/L^2$, where L is the polymer length. For microtubules, the critical compression force is only of order 1 pN⁸⁸. In the cell, however, microtubules can bear 100-fold larger compression forces because the surrounding actin and intermediate filament cytoskeleton constrains microtubule buckling^{89,90}. This is consistent with the so-called tensegrity model, which states that cellular shape stability is achieved via a balance between actin filaments and intermediate filaments loaded under tension, and microtubules and thick actin bundles under compression⁹¹.

B. Cell-free studies

Live-cell mechanical measurements can be difficult to interpret in quantitative terms because they are sensitive to the amplitude, type and rate of deformation, geometry of the mechanical probe, the probed location in the cell, and the cell’s extracellular environment⁹². Cell-free studies provide a useful complement because they permit quantitative measurements of the mechanical properties of isolated cytoskeletal components, both at the single filament and at the network level.

At the single filament level, cytoskeletal biopolymers have been bent, stretched, compressed, and twisted using optical and magnetic tweezers^{93–96}, atomic force microscopy^{97,98}, and microfluidic flow devices⁹⁹. Actin filaments and microtubules have a high bending and stretching rigidity, but they break at rather low tensile strains ($\sim 150\%$ strains)^{100,101}. Moreover, actin filaments become more fragile under torsion¹⁰⁰ and microtubules soften upon repeated bending⁹⁹. This fragility is likely related to the fact that actin filaments and microtubules are made of globular subunits. By contrast, intermediate filaments are made of fibrous subunits held together by extensive lateral interactions. Intermediate filaments easily stretch and bend due to their open structure

and they can withstand tensile strains of more than 200% before rupture⁹⁷. Similar to a car's safety belt, intermediate filaments are soft under small and slow deformations but stiff under large and fast deformations⁹³. Recent evidence suggests that different intermediate filament proteins respond differently to tensile loads. When subjected to stretch-relax cycles, keratin filaments elongate with every cycle but keep the same stiffness, whereas vimentin filaments soften with every cycle but always return to the same initial length¹⁰². It appears that vimentin stretches by monomer unfolding¹⁰³, whereas keratin filaments stretch by viscous sliding of subunits¹⁰². It will be interesting to see what further diversity may be generated by co-polymerization of different intermediate filament proteins and by post-translational modifications.

On the network level, mechanical properties of cytoskeletal filaments are most conveniently probed by either bulk rheology or microrheology. In bulk rheology, cytoskeletal networks are sheared between the two parallel plates of a rheometer, providing a read-out of the macroscopic viscoelastic response¹⁰⁴. Microrheology instead probes the localized viscoelastic response of a material by tracking the motion of embedded probe particles, either in response to thermal fluctuations (passive microrheology¹⁰⁵) or to a force applied by optical or magnetic tweezers (active microrheology¹⁰⁶). The mechanical response of cytoskeletal networks is determined by an interplay of the stiffness of the filaments and their interactions.

Actin filaments and microtubules form entangled networks that easily fluidize under shear due to filament disentanglement^{107–109}. Filament crosslinking prevents this fluidization and causes the networks to strain-stiffen. This strain-stiffening response is only moderate for microtubules because of their high rigidity and because shearing causes force-induced unbinding of crosslinks^{106,107}. Actin networks exhibit more pronounced strain-stiffening because their elasticity is affected by the entropic elastic response of the filaments to tensile loading¹¹⁰. Tensile loading reduces the conformational entropy of actin filaments, pulling out bending fluctuations, causing entropic strain-stiffening¹¹¹. Increased crosslink densities shift the onset of strain-stiffening to smaller shear strains because less excess length is stored in bending fluctuations when the crosslinks are more closely spaced¹¹⁰. Some crosslinker proteins (most notably filamin) are so large that their compliance directly contributes to the network response. Crosslinker extensibility increases the rupture strain by postponing the point where the actin filaments experience tensile loading^{112,113}. Bundling of actin filaments, which is common at high concentrations of crosslinker proteins, suppresses entropic elasticity. Bundled actin networks still strain-stiffen¹¹⁰, but by an enthalpic mechanism that involves a transition from soft bending modes at low strains to rigid stretching modes at high strain^{114,115}. Under compression, actin and microtubule networks soften due to filament buckling⁵⁵. For branched actin networks, compressive softening has been shown to be reversible, likely because the buckled filaments are prevented from collapsing by their connections with the network¹¹⁶.

The mechanical properties of intermediate filament net-

works differ in various respects from those of actin and microtubule networks. First, intermediate filaments form strain-stiffening networks even in absence of any crosslinker proteins, as demonstrated for vimentin, neurofilaments, desmin, and keratin^{117,118}. The filaments spontaneously form crosslinks mediated by electrostatic interactions between their disordered C-terminal tails. Upon tail truncation, the networks no longer strain-stiffen^{117,119,120}. The effective crosslink density depends on the concentration of divalent cations such as Mg^{2+} , Ca^{2+} or Zn^{2+} ^{117,118,121,122} and is sensitive to the buffer ionic strength and pH¹²³. For keratins, there are additional hydrophobic interactions between the central rod domains that stiffen the networks²¹. Second, intermediate filament networks have much larger rupture strains than actin and microtubule networks as a consequence of the larger single-filament extensibility. This is reflected in the dependence of the elastic modulus K on the applied shear stress σ . While actin networks only exhibit an entropic strain-stiffening regime where K increases as $\sigma^{\frac{3}{2}}$, intermediate filament networks exhibit an additional enthalpic regime where K increases more weakly, reflecting strain-induced filament alignment¹¹⁷. After yielding, intermediate filament networks can even recover their initial shear modulus, likely by the re-establishment of tail-tail crosslinks^{119,124}.

Recently there has been increasing attention for the mechanical properties of cytoskeletal composites. Reconstitution of composite networks requires careful tuning of the buffer conditions since the different cytoskeletal polymers are traditionally reconstituted in their own optimized buffer conditions. Intermediate filaments are especially sensitive to solution pH and ionic concentrations because they are prone to polymorphism¹²⁵. Until now nearly all studies of composite networks have focused on two-component composites of cytoskeletal filaments co-polymerized in the absence of crosslinkers. At small strains, co-entangled composites (specifically combinations of actin/vimentin¹²⁶, actin/keratin^{127,128}, actin/microtubules¹²⁹, and vimentin/microtubules¹³⁰ have generally been shown to exhibit a simple additive viscoelastic response. However, there is evidence for direct interactions of vimentin filaments with actin filaments¹³¹ as well as microtubules¹³², which could potentially influence the network rheology. These interactions could potentially lead to cell-type specific cytoskeletal crosstalk, since they are mediated by the C-terminal tail of intermediate filaments that shows large length and sequence variations between different intermediate filament proteins. It was furthermore shown that vimentin can impose steric constraints that hamper actin network formation and thus cause network weakening¹³³. At large strains, there is evidence of synergistic enhancement of the mechanical properties in certain cytoskeletal composites. For actin/keratin composites, the strong strain-stiffening response of the keratin network was found to dominate the high-strain response of the composites¹²⁸. For actin/microtubule composites, microtubules were shown to promote strain-stiffening of the actin networks, even at low density^{134,135}. This effect was explained by the ability of rigid microtubules to suppress non-affine bending fluctuations of actin filaments. It will be in-

teresting to explore how these synergies are modified in the presence of crosslinkers. Recent work showed that when actin filaments and microtubules are crosslinked to each other by biotin-streptavidin, the composite is more elastic than when both filaments are independently crosslinked¹³⁶.

To the best of our knowledge, there has so far been only one study of three-component networks combining actin, vimentin and microtubules¹³⁷. It was shown by microrheology that the linear elastic modulus of the composite is dominated by actin, with little contribution from either microtubules or vimentin. Yet vimentin was shown to significantly extend the elastic regime to longer timescales. The authors proposed that the vimentin network that fills in the pore spaces of the actin network¹³⁸ slows stress relaxation by constraining actin reptation. More work is needed to systematically study cytoskeletal composites and to explore the impact of crosslinking with cytolinker proteins such as plectin. Due to their high molecular weight these proteins are difficult to purify. To circumvent this problem, one can engineer proteins that contain only the cytoskeletal binding proteins separated by a spacer¹³⁹. Using this approach, we recently found that crosslinking with a plectin-mimetic crosslinker causes synergistic stiffening of actin-vimentin composites¹⁴⁰.

III. CELL CONTRACTILITY

A. Live-cell studies

The actin cytoskeleton is the engine behind cell migration¹⁴¹. Depending on the extracellular environment, cells can switch between different mechanisms that use actin-based forces in different ways¹⁴². Fibroblasts and other adherent cells perform *mesenchymal migration*, which relies on integrin-based adhesion to the extracellular matrix (ECM). The process occurs via a four-step cycle. First, actin polymerization pushes against the membrane at the leading edge, producing lamellipodia in cells migrating on flat rigid surfaces or pseudopodia in cells migrating in 3D extracellular matrices. Next, the cell generates integrin-based adhesions with the substrate that connect to the contractile machinery of acto-myosin stress fibres. Through a combination of pulling from the front and squeezing from the rear, the cell body moves forward. Finally, old adhesions are detached from the substrate or dissolved at the trailing edge¹⁴³. The contractile forces involved in cell migration have been measured through the traction forces exerted on the substrate. This is usually done by adhering cells to a hydrogel substrate with known mechanical properties, such as polyacrylamide. By measuring the displacements of fluorescent tracer particles incorporated in the gel with fluorescence microscopy, one can computationally infer the traction forces using continuum mechanics models¹⁴⁴. Adherent cells that experience strong confinement utilize a *nuclear piston* mechanism where actin-myosin contraction in front of the nucleus pulls the nucleus forward. Since the nucleus divides the cell in forward and rearward compartments, it acts as a piston that pressurizes the forward compartment and drives forward a cylindrical

lobopodial protrusion¹⁴⁵. Weakly adherent cells such as leukocytes and physically confined fibroblasts and cancer cells perform *amoeboid migration*, characterized by spherical membrane blebs at the leading edge (reviewed in¹⁴⁶). Blebs are created by myosin-driven contraction of the actin cortex underneath the cell membrane, which builds up hydrostatic pressure in the cytoplasm. Local rupture of the actin cortex or its attachment to the membrane causes local membrane delamination, pushing forward a membrane bleb. Over time the actin cortex regrows under the bleb membrane and myosin contraction drives bleb retraction. Confinement can also induce other migration modes that require little substrate adhesion. Cells can move via friction generated by actin flows within the cortex generated by myosin contraction and actin turnover¹⁴⁷, and some tumor cells can still migrate by using active transport of water from the front to the back of the cell to propel themselves forward (*osmotic engine* model¹⁴⁸).

While not being components of the contractile machinery, both microtubules and intermediate filaments are important for regulating cell contraction. Microtubules negatively regulate the assembly and contractility of actin stress fibers by sequestering GEF-H1, an activator of the small GTPase Rho, in an autoinhibited state¹⁴⁹. Microtubule depolymerization by nocodazole releases active GEF-H1, leading to a global increase of contractility as measured by traction force microscopy¹⁵⁰. During both mesenchymal and amoeboid migration, microtubule depolymerization and consequent GEF-H1 is tightly regulated so that actin contractility can be precisely timed and localized in a mechanosensitive manner^{151–153}. Besides biochemical regulation, it is likely that mechanical synergy is also involved in microtubule-based control of actin contractility, since microtubules are able to absorb some of the forces from the contractile actin cytoskeleton⁹¹.

Intermediate filaments likewise regulate actin-based cell contraction by a combination of mechanical synergy and biochemical signaling. In cells migrating on flat surfaces, vimentin has been reported to inhibit stress fiber assembly and contractility through down-regulating GEF-H1 and RhoA¹⁵⁴. Nevertheless, traction force measurements have shown that vimentin-null cells are less contractile than their wild-type counterparts¹³⁸. Taken together with the observation that vimentin filaments orient traction stresses along the front-rear axis, this suggests a mechanical synergy where vimentin helps build up and transmit larger contractile forces¹⁵⁵. Recently it was shown by structured illumination microscopy and electron microscopy that vimentin filaments are closely associated with actin stress fibers, forming meshworks that wrap around stress fibers or co-align with them^{42,138}. Physical coupling between the two systems is dependent on the cytolinker protein plectin¹⁵⁶. Interestingly, it was recently shown that plectin binds vimentin in response to acto-myosin pulling forces¹⁵⁷. The mechanism for this mechanosensitivity is unknown but could involve catch bonding¹⁵⁸. Plectin-mediated coupling of actin and vimentin was recently shown to be essential for cells migrating via the nuclear piston mechanism¹⁵⁷. The vimentin network helps transmit acto-myosin pulling forces to the nucleus, thus enhancing the pressure in the front of the nucleus.

It is not yet known whether intermediate filaments also influence cell migration modes driven by contractile activity of the actin cortex, but recent observations that vimentin and F-actin are associated within the cell cortex suggest this is likely¹³⁸.

B. Cell-free reconstitution studies

There is an extensive body of work using cell-free reconstitution to elucidate the mechanisms by which myosin II motor proteins contract actin networks (reviewed in¹³). The contraction mechanism has been found to depend on the actin network connectivity, which is controlled by filament length and by crosslinking. Well-connected networks of long filaments contract because myosins generate compressive stress that causes the actin filaments to buckle and break¹⁵⁹. By contrast, when the filaments are short, myosins contract the network by polarity sorting, transporting and clustering actin filament plus ends to form polar actin asters¹⁶⁰. In both cases, the length scale of contraction is set by the network connectivity. Global network contraction requires the actin network to be crosslinked above a critical percolation threshold¹⁶¹. However, excessive crosslinking will prevent contraction by making the network too rigid¹⁶². As described above, several cell migration mechanisms rely on myosin-driven contraction of the actin cortex. Recently several groups have been able to reconstitute biomimetic actin cortices by co-encapsulating actin and myosin inside cell-sized lipid vesicles. For weak actin-membrane attachment, the network detaches from the membrane upon contraction¹⁶³. In case of stronger attachment, myosin contraction can cause membrane blebbing¹⁶⁴. Cortical flows that are important for driving amoeboid migration require not only myosin activity, but also network remodeling through actin depolymerization¹⁶⁵. Under particular conditions, crosslinked actin-myosin cortical networks in emulsion droplets have been observed to exhibit cortical flows¹⁶⁶, likely because myosin can promote actin turnover¹⁶⁷. Cell extracts, which contain additional proteins to promote actin turnover, also exhibit cortical flows when encapsulated in emulsion droplets^{168–170}. When these droplets are confined, the myosin-driven cortical flows can propel the droplets forward due to friction with the channel walls, mimicking amoeboid migration of nonadhesive cells¹⁷¹.

So far only few studies have looked at the effect of intermediate filaments or microtubules on contraction of actin-myosin networks. The addition of a vimentin network that interpenetrates an actin network has been shown to promote myosin-driven contraction by increasing the network connectivity¹⁷². Similarly, also the addition of microtubules has been shown to promote uniform macroscopic myosin-driven contraction¹⁷³.

IV. FRONT-REAR POLARIZATION

A. Live-cell studies

Directed cell migration requires the breaking of cell symmetry to generate a cell front and a cell rear along an axis

aligned with the direction of locomotion. Until now, the role of cytoskeletal crosstalk in front-rear polarity has mostly been studied in the context of 2D mesenchymal cell migration¹⁷⁴. It is long known that the microtubule cytoskeleton is essential for maintaining a polarized distribution of actin-based forces with actin polymerization in the front and myosin II-based contraction forces in the cell body and rear¹⁷⁵. Microtubules align along the axis of cell movement with their plus ends oriented towards the leading edge. They appear to stimulate actin-driven cell protrusion by multiple mechanisms. They activate Rac1 and inhibit Rho, therefore promoting actin polymerization and preventing myosin-II-driven contractility at the leading edge. Moreover, actin filaments have been observed to grow directly from microtubule tips toward the leading edge in growth cones of neurons, with the help of protein complexes involving APC and CLIP-170^{176,177}. There is an interesting actin/microtubule reciprocity, though, since the microtubules require guidance along actin stress fibers to reach the leading edge. This guidance requires actin-microtubule crosslinking, for instance by ACF7, Growth Arrest-Specific Proteins (Gas2L1), CLIP-associating proteins (CLASPs) or drebrins (reviewed in³⁴). These proteins target growing microtubule plus ends by binding to EB (end-binding) proteins, and all of them except drebrin also possess a microtubule-lattice-binding domain. When these crosslinkers are depleted from cells, microtubules cease to grow along actin stress fibers and the microtubule array loses its front-rear polarity^{178,179}. Persistent cell migration is strongly hampered as a consequence, not only because actin-based protrusions is misregulated, but also because microtubules fail to reach cortical microtubule stabilizing complexes (CMSCs) that surround focal adhesions¹⁸⁰. Tethering and stabilization of microtubule plus ends by CMSC binding is required for microtubule-dependent focal adhesion turnover, which is essential for migration (reviewed in³⁸). It is not yet clear how these crosstalk mechanisms are modified when cells perform 3D mesenchymal migration, but likely the core mechanisms are shared. One important new factor in 3D migration is that microtubules have a more important mechanical role and are needed to support pseudopodia⁸¹. A second important new factor is that the rigidity of the nucleus hampers migration through small pores. It was recently shown that microtubules anchored to the nucleus play an important role in active transport of MT1-MMP to the cell surface where it drives extracellular matrix proteolysis in front of the nucleus¹⁸¹.

Although intermediate filaments lack intrinsic polarity, they do contribute to directed mesenchymal migration³⁶. When the vimentin network is disassembled using peptides or when vimentin expression is knocked down, cells lose their polarity and lamellipodia appear all around the cell¹⁸². Vimentin forms closely associated parallel arrays with microtubules in migrating cells^{183,184}. Experiments conducted using vimentin-deficient mouse embryonic fibroblasts attached to polarized and non-polarized protein micropatterns demonstrated that the lack of vimentin alters microtubule organization, disrupting cell polarity¹⁸⁵. The two cytoskeletal networks organize in an interdependent manner. The vimentin distribution is polarized by a collaboration between active

motor-driven transport along microtubules and actin-driven retrograde flow¹⁸⁶. Conversely, since the vimentin network is about 10-fold more long-lived than the microtubule network, it can serve as a template for guiding microtubule growth along previous microtubule tracks¹⁵⁵. This provides a feedback mechanism to sustain front-rear polarity. Moreover, the alignment of the vimentin network with the polarity axis mechanically integrates actin-based forces and orients them to promote directional migration¹⁸⁷. This mechanical integration is probably aided by vimentin-microtubule crosslinker proteins such as plectin and APC¹⁸⁸. In addition to this mechanical role, there is growing evidence for signalling functions of intermediate filaments in cell migration (reviewed in³⁵). At the cell periphery, there is for instance Rac-mediated crosstalk between vimentin and actin, where Rac causes vimentin disassembly by phosphorylation of vimentin, promoting actin-driven membrane protrusion¹⁸². Intermediate filaments also regulate focal adhesion clustering and turnover by binding integrins and via biochemical signalling¹⁸⁹.

B. Cell-free reconstitution studies

Several studies have explored how interactions between two different cytoskeletal filament types may contribute to the front-rear polarity of migrating cells. These studies mostly used surface assays where one or both cytoskeletal filaments were surface-anchored to facilitate imaging and control the geometry of interaction. Just a few of these investigated the interplay of intermediate filaments with actin or microtubules. When surface-anchored microtubules are grown in the presence of an entangled vimentin network, they were found to be stabilized against depolymerization by direct interactions with vimentin filaments¹³². Vimentin attachment reduced the catastrophe frequency and induced rescue of depolymerizing microtubules. However, in the absence of crosslinker proteins, these interactions were found to be short and infrequent. It is likely that vimentin-microtubule crosslinkers such as APC and plectin create more drastic effects on vimentin and microtubule polymerization. Interestingly, the vimentin-binding region of APC by itself was shown to promote vimentin polymerization¹⁸⁸, which may perhaps promote vimentin polymerization along microtubules. It was recently shown that actin and vimentin filaments do not interact in the absence of crosslinkers, but when an engineered plectin-mimicking crosslinker was added, actin filaments polymerized along surface-anchored vimentin filaments¹⁴⁰.

A larger set of studies investigated the interplay of microtubules with different actin network structures designed to mimic structures found at front of crawling cells. Branched or densely entangled actin network that mimic the dense actin array in the lamellipodium were shown to act as a steric barrier for microtubule growth¹⁹⁰⁻¹⁹². However, when microtubules were crosslinked to actin by Tau protein, they were able to generate sufficient polymerization force to penetrate dense actin barriers¹⁹². By contrast, when actin was arranged in stiff bundles that mimic actin stress fibers and bundles in filopodia, steric interactions were instead found to promote alignment

and growth of microtubules along the actin bundles^{190,192}. Actin-microtubule crosslinking proteins such as ACF7, Gas2L1, or CLASP2 were shown to promote actin-guided microtubule growth by allowing growing microtubules to be captured by and zippered along the actin bundles^{139,190,192-195}. Conversely, microtubules can also influence actin polymerization. Microtubule-lattice binding crosslinkers can induce guided polymerization of actin filaments along microtubule^{194,196}. Microtubule-tip binding crosslinkers can induce active transport of actin filaments by the growing microtubule tip^{139,197}. Computer simulations and theoretical modeling showed that this transport is driven by the affinity of the cross-linker for the chemically distinct microtubule tip region¹⁹⁷. These interactions may potentially enable growing microtubules to relocate newly nucleated actin filaments to the leading edge of the cell and thus boost migration. Altogether, these studies suggest that coupled polarization of the three cytoskeletal filament systems can at least partly be understood on the basis of a mechanical interplay.

V. COLLECTIVE MIGRATION & INTERCELLULAR ADHESIONS

A. Live-cell studies

Many cell types have the ability to synchronize their movement and perform collective migration. Collective migration is important for organogenesis and wound healing but also contributes to cancer metastasis. Depending on cell type and tissue context, different modes of collective migration can emerge. Epithelial cells tend to move as sheets adhered to the extracellular matrix¹⁹⁸, while cancer cells often migrate as three-dimensional strands or clusters through tissues¹⁹⁹. Remarkably, multi-cellular migrating structures behave similarly to liquid crystalline materials and undergo solid-to-liquid transitions in response to confinement. These jamming/unjamming transitions are linked to cell and nucleus shapes^{200,201} and are determined by molecular interactions that regulate cell-matrix and cell-cell adhesions²⁰²⁻²⁰⁴. Traction force measurements for epithelial and endothelial monolayers have shown that cells within the monolayer tend to migrate in the direction in which the normal stress is greatest and the shear stress least²⁰⁵. This mechanism of collective cell guidance called *plithotaxis* critically relies on mechanical coupling between the cells by cell-cell adhesions. Plithotaxis is regulated by the tumor suppressor protein merlin, which coordinates polarized Rac1 activation and lamellipodium formation at the multicellular scale²⁰⁶. We speculate that, since Rac1 is an important shared regulator of all three cytoskeletal systems, there could be crosstalk with intermediate filaments and microtubules in plithotaxis. At the same time, intercellular adhesions help collectively migrating cells to establish supracellular polarization with leader cells at the front and follower cells behind²⁰⁷. The leader cells explore the tissue environment using focal adhesions, find the path, and - if necessary - carve out a path by degrading the ECM. Cancer cells dynamically rearrange leader and follower positions dur-

ing collective invasion to cope with the large energy usage of the leader cells²⁰⁸.

Epithelial and endothelial cells interact through mechanosensitive *adherens junctions* based on classical cadherins and VE-cadherins, respectively, which connect to the actin cytoskeleton via α -catenin and vinculin^{207,209}. Endothelial cells are additionally connected by complexus adherens junctions that connect to vimentin via VE-cadherin²¹⁰. Epithelial cells are additionally connected by *desmosomes* based on desmosomal cadherins that connect to the keratin intermediate filament cytoskeleton via the adaptor proteins desmoplakin, plakophilin, and plakoglobin^{209,211,212}. The desmosomal junctions are expendable under homeostatic conditions but strictly required for preserving cell-cell adhesion under mechanical stress²¹³. There is growing evidence that cytoskeletal crosstalk is important for the organization, dynamics and mechanoresponsiveness of intercellular adhesions during multicellular migration, although the exact extent is not clear.

Keratin intermediate filaments and actin jointly influence desmosomes and adherens junctions because they are crosslinked via plectin. In epithelia, plectin organizes keratin into a rim-and-spoke configuration where contractile forces generated by acto-myosin are balanced by compressive elements provided by the keratin network, thus balancing internal tension and stabilizing cell-cell contacts⁸⁶. Deletion of plectin therefore causes perturbations of both desmosomes and adherens junctions. Although endothelial cells do not have desmosomes, also here plectin-mediated crosslinking between F-actin and vimentin intermediate filaments regulates adherens junction strength and tissue integrity²¹⁴. Migrating epithelial cells need to dynamically rearrange their adhesive contacts. Desmosome remodeling is dependent on both actin and keratin. Assembly of desmosomes at the leading edge and subsequent transport to the lateral sides is mediated through extensive actin remodelling, while more matured desmosomes are guided via keratins to the cell center to eventually disassemble²¹⁵. Intermediate filaments have an important mechanical role in distributing actin-myosin based forces, similar to their role in single-cell migration. Collective movement of both embryonic cells and astrocytes with proper leader-follower dynamics was shown to be highly dependent on this mechanical synergy of actin and intermediate filaments^{216,217}. 3D tumor cultures of *ex vivo* breast cancer demonstrated heterotypic keratin expression between leader and follower cells²¹⁸, which was speculated to be necessary to regulate individual cytoplasmic viscoelasticity and mechanical coupling through desmosome anchoring during collective invasion²¹⁹. Invasion assays of epithelial cancers with manipulated keratin expressions also indicate that keratin expression can regulate migration mode; positive keratin-14 cells are leaders of migrating strands in organoid carcinoma assays, while keratin-8 and keratin-18 depletion can shift migration from individual to collective^{218,220}. Interestingly, keratins can also organize asymmetrically in migrating cells and localize in lamellipodia to support polarization and invasive phenotype, which is mediated by actin filaments²²¹.

There is ample evidence that microtubule-actin crosstalk

affects adherens junctions via mechanisms similar to those observed for focal adhesions. Adherens junctions contain multiple proteins that bind microtubule plus ends, including APC, ACF7 and CLASP^{222,223}. This allows microtubules to promote myosin II activation and local concentration of cadherin molecules²²⁴ and facilitates trafficking of junctional components to the cell surface^{225,226}. At the same time, microtubules promote junctional actin assembly by promoting liquid-liquid-phase separation of the actin nucleator cordon bleu (Cobl)²²⁷. During collective migration *in vivo*, it was found that cell-cell contacts differed in their requirement for dynamic microtubules along the leader-follower axis²²⁸. Cells of the leading domain remained cohesive in the absence of dynamic microtubules, whereas dynamic microtubules were essential for the conversion of leader cells to epithelial followers. Interestingly, it was recently shown that physical confinement of collectively migrating cancer cells can induce the dissociation of leader cells by actin-microtubule crosstalk²²⁹. Confinement-induced microtubule destabilization releases and activates GEF-H1, which promotes RhoA activation and results in leader cell detachment.

B. Cell-free reconstitution studies

Interactions between cytoskeletal filaments and cell-cell adhesion complexes are relatively unexplored in reconstituted systems. Adherens junctions are based on transmembrane cadherin adhesion receptors. The extracellular domains of cadherins on adjacent cells form adhesions by forming homodimers. The cytosolic domains of cadherins bind β -catenin, which in turn binds α -catenin²³⁰. Biochemical studies showed that actin filaments do not bind directly to cadherins, but are tethered indirectly via α -catenin^{231,232}. In solution, α -catenin does not interact with actin filaments and the cadherin- β -catenin complex simultaneously²³³. However, under tension α -catenin stably connects the cadherin-catenin complex to actin filaments via a directionally asymmetric catch bond^{234,235}. This mechanosensitivity implies directional regulation of cell-cell adhesion in response to tension, which may connect to cooperative phenomena such as (un)jamming and plithotaxis mentioned above. Biochemical studies have shown that α -catenin influences the organization of junctional actin both directly, by inhibiting barbed-end growth, and indirectly, by interactions with various actin-binding proteins including Arp2/3²³⁶. With the complexity of cadherin-actin interactions starting to become uncovered, it will be interesting to study how crosstalk with microtubules may further regulate adherens junctions. Recently a first study in this direction was able to reconstitute the effect of microtubules on junctional actin nucleation, as was described above in live-cell studies²²⁷. When dynamic microtubules were incubated together with G-actin and Cobl, actin filaments were found to be nucleated via Cobl condensates from both the tips and lattice of microtubules.

Regarding desmosomes, so far there have been mainly biochemical and structural studies, but few cell-free biophysical studies. Biochemical studies of the desmosomal cad-

herins showed that they form cell-cell connections via heterodimerization of the extracellular domains of desmogleins and desmocollins²³⁷. Single-molecule force spectroscopy by AFM showed that the binding force is 30 to 40 pN²³⁸. The cytoplasmic domains of desmosomal cadherins bind plakoglobin and plakophilins, an interaction that has also been reconstituted²³⁹. Plakoglobin and plakophilins in turn bind to desmoplakin²⁴⁰, which finally binds keratins. Biochemical and structural studies showed that desmoplakin interacts via its C-terminus to the rod domain of keratin^{241,242}. To the best of our knowledge, there are no cell-free studies addressing cytoskeletal crosstalk with desmosomes.

VI. PLASTICITY OF CELL MIGRATION

A. Live-cell studies

Most terminally differentiated cells such as epithelial and stromal cells migrate only during morphogenesis. However, tissue injury can induce cell plasticity. Mature cells can reenter the cell cycle and change their phenotype guided by paligenesis programs²⁴³. Unfortunately plasticity can also contribute to disease. For instance, malignant cancer cells are often hyperplastic, contributing to their invasiveness. A well-studied example of cell plasticity is epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), a reversible process in which epithelial cells lose polarity through cytoskeletal remodelling, individualize and gain motility. EMT is a critical process in embryonic development and wound healing, but it also plays a key role in fibrosis and cancer invasion. EMT and the reverse mesenchymal-epithelial transition (MET) are influenced not only by biochemical cues, but also by mechanical properties of the ECM^{244,245}.

Cells sense the mechanical properties of the ECM through their acto-myosin cytoskeleton at focal adhesions, which are based on integrin adhesion receptors. Integrins interact with the ECM through their extracellular domains and with the actin cytoskeleton through their cytoplasmic tails²⁴⁶. The actin-integrin connection is mediated through talin and kindlin (reviewed in²⁴⁷). Single integrins form small and transient junctions, but mechanical stimulation reinforces integrin adhesions by causing maturation into large focal adhesions. Upon mechanical stimulation, talin and kindlin undergo conformational changes that expose cryptic binding sites for additional cytoskeletal and signalling proteins²⁴⁶. Mechanical stimulation further reinforces focal adhesions by inducing actin polymerization²⁴⁸. Variations in the biochemical composition and physical properties of the ECM can elicit different 3D cell migration modes characterized by different amounts of cell-ECM adhesion^{142,249}. Highly crosslinked and dense matrices elicit lobopodial migration, characterized by a high number of focal adhesions and high actomyosin contractility. Less dense, fibrous environments elicit mesenchymal migration with a characteristic front-to-rear gradient of focal adhesions. In low-confining areas that lack adhesion sites, cells depend on bleb formation to drive themselves forward, a mechanism that does not require focal adhesions¹⁴².

Not much is known about the role of cytoskeletal crosstalk in migration plasticity. Microtubules are likely involved through their feedback interactions with actin near focal adhesions. It was recently shown that higher substrate rigidity promotes microtubule acetylation through the recruitment of α -tubulin acetyltransferase (α TAT) to focal adhesions by talin⁴². In turn, microtubule acetylation tunes the mechanosensitivity of focal adhesions by promoting the release of GEF-H1 from microtubules to activate RhoA and thereby promote actomyosin contractility⁴². In breast cancer cells, actin-microtubule crosstalk near focal adhesions via the scaffolding protein IQGAP1 was demonstrated to promote invasion in wound healing and transwell assays²⁵⁰. In fibrosarcoma cells, the microtubule-destabilizing protein stathmin was shown to influence migration mode switching²⁵¹. Increased stathmin activity, and as a result less stable microtubule networks, promoted amoeboid-like migration, while phosphorylation of stathmin led to a more elongated migratory phenotype. Besides crosstalk near focal adhesions, microtubules can also influence migration mode switching through mechanical effects. In confined or compressed cells, microtubules are stabilized through CLASP2 localization to the lattice, providing a mechanosensitive pathway for cells to adapt to highly constricting environments⁸⁰.

The intermediate filament protein vimentin is considered a key cellular plasticity regulator and marker of tumor cell malignancy, especially based on its general upregulation in EMT and in motile cancer cells²⁵². Carcinoma cells in addition express integrin $\alpha 6\beta 4$, which recruits vimentin to focal adhesions through its binding to plectin, promoting a 3D invasive phenotype switch²⁵³. Together with nuclear lamins, vimentin contributes to migration plasticity through regulation of nuclear deformation, for instance allowing for a transition towards amoeboid-like and faster migration in Hela cells and melanoma cells when encountering confinement^{32,254}. Moreover, cells migrating under high confinement use their nucleus as a piston to squeeze through small pores. This complicated pulling mechanism is regulated through crosstalk between the vimentin cage around the nucleus and actomyosin in front of the nucleus¹⁴⁵.

B. Cell-free reconstitution studies

Understanding the molecular basis of migration plasticity is an enormous challenge since integrin-based matrix adhesions contain over 100 types of molecules that are potentially mechanosensitive²⁵⁵. One of the first mechanotransduction events during adhesion maturation is stretching of talin, followed by vinculin binding and activation. This core process was elegantly reconstituted by overlaying a network of actin-myosin bundles mimicking stress fibers on a talin-micropatterned surface²⁵⁶. It was shown that direct binding of the contractile actin-myosin network to talin was sufficient to stretch the protein and induce the association and activation of vinculin. Talin binding facilitates vinculin activation by allosterically weakening the head-tail interaction that keeps it in an auto-inhibited conformation²⁵⁷. Exposure




FIG. 3. Schematic of the two general cytoskeletal crosstalk mechanisms and their effect on cytoskeletal biophysics. *Entanglements* and *crosslinks* regulate stress stiffening, compressive reinforcement, force distribution and slower stress relaxation. *Bundling* regulates coupled polymerization and nucleation, guidance and co-alignment, and tip-mediated transport of filaments. Actin (magenta), microtubules (green), intermediate filaments (cyan) and crosslinkers (pink).

of the actin-binding tail induces a positive feedback that reinforces the connection with actin²⁵⁶. Using the same assay, it was shown that activated vinculin can interact with Arp2/3 complex-mediated branched actin networks and modify their organization by crosslinking actin filaments into bundles²⁵⁸. This is likely an important step towards focal adhesion maturation. Single-molecule studies showed that vinculin forms a directionally asymmetric catch bond with F-actin²⁵⁹. In this way vinculin can organize the polarity of the actin cytoskeleton and contribute to front-rear asymmetry in migrating cells. Recently the interaction of integrins, talin and kindlin, another major focal adhesion regulator, was reconstituted on giant unilamellar vesicles²⁶⁰. It was shown that phosphoinositide-rich membranes recruit talin and kindlin, which then cause the formation of large integrin clusters that can recruit actin-myosin. Another study showed that membrane-bound talin can also activate vinculin and the two proteins together can link actin to the membrane²⁶¹.

Cell-free reconstitution studies suggest that the actin cytoskeleton itself also contains proteins that mediate mechanotransduction. An example is filamin A (FLNA), a large multi-domain scaffolding protein that cross-links actin filaments and binds numerous proteins via cryptic binding sites along its length. Using reconstituted actin networks crosslinked with FLNA, it was shown that mechanical strain on the FLNA crosslinks alters its binding affinity for its binding partners²⁶². Both externally imposed bulk shear and contraction by myosin-II increased binding of the cytoplasmic tail of β -integrin while it weakened binding of FilGAP, a GTPase that inactivates Rac. Mechanical strain on FLNA can thus stabilize extracellular matrix binding and at the same time influence actin dynamics through Rac activity.

VII. THE ROAD AHEAD

Cytoskeletal crosstalk is increasingly recognized as a major determinant of cell migration. Coupling between the actin,

microtubule and intermediate filament cytoskeleton influences cell migration by regulating cell deformability, contractility, front-rear polarity and migration plasticity. Coupling of filaments through entanglements, crosslinking and bundling of filaments regulates a variety of mechanisms that mediate cellular mechanics and cytoskeletal dynamics involved in these migration strategies (Figure 3). To complicate matters, there is growing evidence that a fourth cytoskeletal protein family, the septins, also strongly impacts cell migration. Septins are well-equipped to mediate cytoskeletal crosstalk since they can bind to the cell membrane, actin and microtubules²⁶³. Recent research demonstrated roles of septins in mesenchymal and amoeboid single-cell migration^{264,265} and in the regulation of endothelial and epithelial cell-cell adhesion^{266,267}. Elucidating the biophysical mechanisms by which cytoskeletal crosstalk regulates cell migration is challenging due to the enormous molecular complexity of the cell and feedback between mechanical forces and biochemical signaling. Cell-free reconstitution provides a valuable complement to live-cell studies because it simplifies the challenge of separating biochemical and physical contributions to cytoskeletal crosstalk. However, there is still an enormous gap between the complexity of cells and the simplicity of reconstituted systems. How can this gap be bridged?

We propose different routes to bridge this gap (Figure 4). One obvious direction to bridge this gap is to enhance the complexity of cell-free assays. Simple assays combining cytoskeletal filaments without any accessory proteins showed that steric interactions alone suffice to give rise to nonlinear stiffening and enhanced compressive strength. There is some evidence that intermediate filaments directly interact with actin filaments and microtubules via electrostatic interactions^{131,132}, but this could be an artefact of *in vitro* conditions. Single-molecule measurements of filament interactions within cells or cell lysates could shed light on this issue. An important next step to bridge the gap to the cell is to incorporate accessory proteins that mediate cytoskeletal coupling. Several studies have shown that crosslinking via cytolinkers is sufficient to give rise to cytoskeletal filament co-alignment and mechanical synergy (e.g.^{139,140}). More detailed investigations of the effects of cytolinkers, both *in vitro* and in cells, will be important to delineate their roles in cytoskeletal co-organization, mechanical synergy, and mechanotransduction. In the cell, cytoskeletal crosstalk is guided by geometrical constraints provided by the cell membrane. The membrane organizes the cytoskeleton through spatial confinement and by providing adhesion sites where cytoskeletal filaments are nucleated or anchored. Reconstitution experiments have begun to recapitulate these constraints by encapsulating cytoskeletal proteins inside cell-sized emulsion droplets or lipid vesicles, including actin/microtubule and actin/keratin composites^{127,268}. These model systems could form a basis for reconstituting synthetic cells capable of migration. Adhesion-independent migration is probably easiest to reconstitute. Flow-driven confined migration was recently reconstituted, although based on a cell extract, so the minimal set of ingredients is not yet known¹⁷¹. It will be interesting to incorporate microtubules and/or intermediate filaments in this as-

say to control cell polarity and mechanics. Mesenchymal migration is likely more challenging to reconstitute because it requires coordinated actin polymerization, contraction, and cell-matrix adhesion. Motility driven by actin polymerization has been successfully reconstituted on the outer surface of lipid vesicles (reviewed in²⁶⁹), but motility of vesicles with actin polymerization inside will require substrate adhesion. Surface micropatterning provides an interesting approach to impose polarized shapes to synthetic cells by forcing them to adapt to the pattern shape and size²⁷⁰. In addition, one can use light-induced dimerization to induce spatial patterning and symmetry breaking of cytoskeletal networks. Light-inducible dimers (LIDs) come from photoactivatable systems naturally occurring in plants and allow for reversible photoactivation²⁷¹. Recently it was for instance shown that microtubule-interacting proteins fused to optochemical dimerization domains can be used to drive symmetry breaking of microtubule networks inside emulsion droplets²⁷².

The opposite direction to bridge the gap between live-cell and cell-free studies is to tame the complexity of living cells. Some of the same techniques that can provide more control over cell-free systems can also provide control over the behavior of living cells. Surface micropatterning for instance allows one to confine cells to adhesive islands with precisely controlled geometries, forcing the cells to adopt prescribed shape and corresponding cytoskeletal organizations. Imaging many cells adhered on the same pattern greatly facilitates quantification of cytoskeletal crosstalk¹⁸⁵. Moreover, micropatterning can be used to investigate how cytoskeletal interactions affect single-cell and collective cell migration dynamics²⁷³. Light-inducible dimerization can be used to manipulate cytoskeletal interactions with high spatial and temporal control. It was for instance recently shown that F-actin can be crosslinked to microtubule plus ends by transfecting cells with an iLID-tagged EB-binding SxIP peptide and SspB-tagged actin-binding domains²⁷⁴. This could be an interesting tool to systematically study the crosstalk of microtubules with actin and intermediate filaments that takes place near cell adhesions. Finally, molecular tension sensors provide a very interesting tool to selectively interrogate mechanical interactions between cytoskeletal networks. Tension sensors consist of two fluorescent proteins separated by a peptide with a calibrated mechanical compliance. Under strain, the fluorescent proteins are separated, decreasing fluorescence energy transfer (FRET) between them. By embedding a tension sensor in the actin crosslinker FLNA, it was recently shown that molecular tension can be measured within the actin cytoskeleton²⁷⁵. It will be interesting to use a similar approach to measure tension within the intermediate filament cytoskeleton and test force transmission between the actin and intermediate filament cytoskeleton.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge funding from the VICI project *How cytoskeletal teamwork makes cells strong* (project number VI.C.182.004) and from the OCENW.GROOT.20t9.O22




FIG. 4. The proposed route to bridge the gap between live cell (top down) and cell free (bottom up) approaches in the research of cytoskeletal crosstalk in cell migration. *Micropatterning* and *optogenetic tools* can be used to manipulate cytoskeletal interactions and help to bridge the gap between the two research approaches. Actin (magenta), microtubules (green), intermediate filaments (cyan) and crosslinkers (pink).

project *The Active Matter Physics of Collective Metastasis*, both financed by the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

VIII. DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Not applicable.

IX. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ¹E. Scarpa and R. Mayor, “Collective cell migration in development,” *The Journal of cell biology* **212**, 143–155 (2016).
- ²L. Lamalice, F. Le Boeuf, and J. Huot, “Endothelial cell migration during angiogenesis,” *Circulation research* **100**, 782–794 (2007).
- ³P. Su, Y. Tian, C. Yang, X. Ma, X. Wang, J. Pei, and A. Qian, “Mesenchymal Stem Cell Migration during Bone Formation and Bone Diseases Therapy,” *International journal of molecular sciences* **19**, 2343 (2018).
- ⁴X. Fu, G. Liu, A. Halim, Y. Ju, Q. Luo, and G. Song, “Mesenchymal Stem Cell Migration and Tissue Repair,” *Cells* **8**, 784 (2019).
- ⁵M. Delgado and A. M. Lennon-Duménil, “How cell migration helps immune sentinels,” *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology* **10**, 932472 (2022).
- ⁶J. Liu, X. Zhang, Y. Cheng, and X. Cao, “Dendritic cell migration in inflammation and immunity,” *Cell. Mol. Immunol.* **18**, 2461–2471 (2021).
- ⁷C. T. Mierke, “The matrix environmental and cell mechanical properties regulate cell migration and contribute to the invasive phenotype of cancer cells,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **82**, 064602 (2019).
- ⁸V. E. Galkin, A. Orlova, M. R. Vos, G. F. Schröder, and E. H. Egelman, “Near-atomic resolution for one state of f-actin,” *Structure* **23**, 173–182 (2015).
- ⁹H. Kang, M. J. Bradley, B. R. McCullough, A. Pierre, E. E. Grintsevich, E. Reisler, and E. M. De La Cruz, “Identification of cation-binding sites on actin that drive polymerization and modulate bending stiffness,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 16923–16927 (2012).
- ¹⁰P. J. Carman, K. R. Barrie, G. Rebowski, and R. Dominguez, “Structures of the free and capped ends of the actin filament,” *Science* **380**, 1287–1292 (2023).
- ¹¹N. Watanabe and T. J. Mitchison, “Single-molecule speckle analysis of actin filament turnover in lamellipodia,” *Science* **295**, 1083–1086 (2002).
- ¹²M. Fritzsche, A. Lewalle, T. Duke, K. Kruse, and G. Charras, “Analysis of turnover dynamics of the submembranous actin cortex,” *Molecular Biology of the Cell* **24**, 757 (2013).
- ¹³M. Murrell, P. W. Oakes, M. Lenz, and M. L. Gardel, “Forcing cells into shape: the mechanics of actomyosin contractility,” *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **16**, 486–498 (2015).

- ¹⁴R. Zhang, B. LaFrance, and E. Nogales, “Separating the effects of nucleotide and EB binding on microtubule structure,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, E6191–E6200 (2018).
- ¹⁵K. M. Taute, F. Pampaloni, E. Frey, and E.-L. Florin, “Microtubule dynamics depart from the wormlike chain model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 028102 (2008).
- ¹⁶G. J. Brouhard, “Dynamic instability 30 years later: complexities in microtubule growth and catastrophe,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **26**, 1207–1210 (2015).
- ¹⁷U. Rölleke, P. Kumari, R. Meyer, and S. Köster, “The unique biomechanics of intermediate filaments - from single filaments to cells and tissues,” *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **85**, 102263 (2023).
- ¹⁸H. Kang, M. J. Bradley, W. Cao, K. Zhou, E. E. Grintsevich, A. Michelot, C. V. Sindelar, M. Hochstrasser, and E. M. De La Cruz, “Site-specific cation release drives actin filament severing by vertebrate cofilin,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **111**, 17821–17826 (2014).
- ¹⁹R. Beck, J. Deek, M. C. Choi, T. Ikawa, O. Watanabe, E. Frey, P. Pincus, and C. R. Safinya, “Unconventional salt trend from soft to stiff in single neurofilament biopolymers,” *Langmuir* **26**, 18595–18599 (2010).
- ²⁰B. Nöding and S. Köster, “Intermediate filaments in small configuration spaces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 088101 (2012).
- ²¹P. Pawelczyk, N. Mücke, H. Herrmann, and N. Willenbacher, “Attractive interactions among intermediate filaments determine network mechanics in vitro,” *PLoS One* **9**, e93194 (2014).
- ²²M. Schopferer, H. Bär, B. Hochstein, S. Sharma, N. Mücke, H. Herrmann, and N. Willenbacher, “Desmin and vimentin intermediate filament networks: their viscoelastic properties investigated by mechanical rheometry,” *J. Mol. Biol.* **388**, 133–143 (2009).
- ²³N. Mücke, L. Kreplak, R. Kirmse, T. Wedig, H. Herrmann, U. Aebi, and J. Langowski, “Assessing the flexibility of intermediate filaments by atomic force microscopy,” *J. Mol. Biol.* **335**, 1241–1250 (2004).
- ²⁴B. Nöding, H. Herrmann, and S. Köster, “Direct observation of subunit exchange along mature vimentin intermediate filaments,” *Biophysical journal* **107**, 2923–2931 (2014).
- ²⁵Q. D. Tran, V. Sorichetti, G. Pehau-Arnaudet, M. Lenz, and C. Leduc, “Fragmentation and Entanglement Limit Vimentin Intermediate Filament Assembly,” *Physical Review X* **13**, 011014 (2023).
- ²⁶A. Robert, M. J. Rossow, C. Hookway, S. A. Adam, and V. I. Gelfand, “Vimentin filament precursors exchange subunits in an ATP-dependent manner,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **112**, E3505–14 (2015).
- ²⁷C. Hookway, L. Ding, M. W. Davidson, J. Z. Rappoport, G. Danuser, and V. I. Gelfand, “Microtubule-dependent transport and dynamics of vimentin intermediate filaments,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **26**, 1675–1686 (2015).
- ²⁸K. Rottner and M. Schaks, “Assembling actin filaments for protrusion,” *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **56**, 53–63 (2019).
- ²⁹M. F. Ullo and J. S. Logue, “ADF and cofilin-1 collaborate to promote cortical actin flow and the leader bleb-based migration of confined cells,” *Elife* **10**, 67856 (2021).
- ³⁰A. Akhmanova and L. C. Kapitein, “Mechanisms of microtubule organization in differentiated animal cells,” *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **23**, 541–558 (2022).
- ³¹A. E. Patteson, K. Pogoda, F. J. Byfield, K. Mandal, Z. Ostrowska-Podhorodecka, E. E. Charrier, P. A. Galie, P. Deptuła, R. Bucki, C. A. McCulloch, and P. A. Janmey, “Loss of vimentin enhances cell motility through small confining spaces,” *Small* **15**, e1903180 (2019).
- ³²S. B. Lavenus, S. M. Tudor, M. F. Ullo, K. W. Vosatka, J. S. Logue, E. M. De, and L. Cruz, “A flexible network of vimentin intermediate filaments promotes migration of amoeboid cancer cells through confined environments,” *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **295**, 6700–6709 (2020).
- ³³S. Seetharaman and S. Etienne-Manneville, “Cytoskeletal crosstalk in cell migration,” *Trends Cell Biol.* **30**, 720–735 (2020).
- ³⁴M. Dogterom and G. H. Koenderink, “Actin–microtubule crosstalk in cell biology,” *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* **20**, 38–54 (2019).
- ³⁵S. Seetharaman and S. Etienne-Manneville, “Cytoskeletal Crosstalk in Cell Migration,” *Trends in Cell Biology* **30**, 720–735 (2020).
- ³⁶B. M. Chung, J. D. Rotty, and P. A. Coulombe, “Networking galore: Intermediate filaments and cell migration,” *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* **25**, 600–612 (2013).
- ³⁷M. L. Pimm and J. L. Henty-Ridilla, “New twists in actin-microtubule interactions,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **32**, 211–217 (2021).
- ³⁸C. Schmidt and S. Stehbens, “Microtubule control of migration: Coordination in confinement,” *Curr Opin Cell Biol.* **86**, 102289 (2023).
- ³⁹A. Buttenschön and L. Edelstein-Keshet, “Bridging from single to collective cell migration: A review of models and links to experiments,” *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **16**, e1008411 (2020).
- ⁴⁰S. Banerjee and M. C. Marchetti, “Continuum models of collective cell migration,” *Adv. Exp. Med. Biol.* **1146**, 45–66 (2019).
- ⁴¹B. MacTaggart and A. Kashina, “Posttranslational modifications of the cytoskeleton,” *Cytoskeleton (Hoboken)* **78**, 142–173 (2021).
- ⁴²S. Seetharaman, B. Vianay, V. Roca, A. J. Farrugia, C. De Pascalis, B. Boëda, F. Dingli, D. Loew, S. Vassilopoulos, A. Bershadsky, M. Théry, and S. Etienne-Manneville, “Microtubules tune mechanosensitive cell responses,” *Nature Materials* **21**, 366–377 (2022).
- ⁴³V. Te Boekhorst, L. Preziosi, and P. Friedl, “Plasticity of cell migration in vivo and in silico,” *Annu. Rev. Cell Dev. Biol.* **32**, 491–526 (2016).
- ⁴⁴K. Wolf, S. Alexander, V. Schacht, L. M. Coussens, U. H. von Andrian, J. van Rheenen, E. Deryugina, and P. Friedl, “Collagen-based cell migration models in vitro and in vivo,” *Semin. Cell Dev. Biol.* **20**, 931–941 (2009).
- ⁴⁵J. Guck, F. Lautenschläger, S. Paschke, and M. Beil, “Critical review: cellular mechanobiology and amoeboid migration,” *Integr. Biol. (Camb.)* **2**, 575–583 (2010).
- ⁴⁶Z. Liu, S. J. Lee, S. Park, K. Konstantopoulos, K. Glunde, Y. Chen, and I. Barman, “Cancer cells display increased migration and deformability in pace with metastatic progression,” *FASEB J.* **34**, 9307–9315 (2020).
- ⁴⁷B. González-Bermúdez, G. V. Guinea, and G. R. Plaza, “Advances in micropipette aspiration: Applications in cell biomechanics, models, and extended studies,” *Biophys. J.* **116**, 587–594 (2019).
- ⁴⁸J. Guck, R. Ananthakrishnan, H. Mahmood, T. J. Moon, C. C. Cunningham, and J. Käs, “The optical stretcher: a novel laser tool to micromanipulate cells,” *Biophys. J.* **81**, 767–784 (2001).
- ⁴⁹O. Thoumine and A. Ott, “Time scale dependent viscoelastic and contractile regimes in fibroblasts probed by microplate manipulation,” *J. Cell Sci.* **110** (Pt 17), 2109–2116 (1997).
- ⁵⁰M. Urbanska, H. E. Muñoz, J. Shaw Bagnall, O. Otto, S. R. Manalis, D. Di Carlo, and J. Guck, “A comparison of microfluidic methods for high-throughput cell deformability measurements,” *Nature Methods* **2020** 17:6 17, 587–593 (2020).
- ⁵¹P. Fernandez, L. Heymann, A. Ott, N. Aksel, and P. Pullarkat, “Shear rheology of a cell monolayer,” *New Journal Physics* **9**, 419 (2007).
- ⁵²A. A. Sutton, C. W. Molter, A. Amini, J. Idicula, M. Furman, P. Tirgar, Y. Tao, A. Ghagre, N. Koushki, A. Khavari, and A. J. Ehrlicher, “Cell monolayer deformation microscopy reveals mechanical fragility of cell monolayers following EMT,” *Biophys. J.* **121**, 629–643 (2022).
- ⁵³K. M. I. Bashir, S. Lee, D. H. Jung, S. K. Basu, M.-G. Cho, and A. Wierschem, “Narrow-gap rheometry: A novel method for measuring cell mechanics,” *Cells* **11**, 2010 (2022).
- ⁵⁴K. Beicker, E. T. O’Brien, 3rd, M. R. Falvo, and R. Superfine, “Vertical light sheet enhanced side-view imaging for AFM cell mechanics studies,” *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 1504 (2018).
- ⁵⁵K. Pogoda, F. Byfield, P. Deptuła, M. Cieśluk, Ł. Suprewicz, K. Skłodowski, J. L. Shivers, A. van Oosten, K. Cruz, E. Tarasovet, E. L. Grishchuk, F. C. Mackintosh, R. Bucki, A. E. Patteson, and P. A. Janmey, “Unique role of vimentin networks in compression stiffening of cells and protection of nuclei from compressive stress,” *Nano Lett.* **22**, 4725–4732 (2022).
- ⁵⁶B. Fabry, G. N. Maksym, J. P. Butler, M. Glogauer, D. Navajas, and J. J. Fredberg, “Scaling the microrheology of living cells,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 148102 (2001).
- ⁵⁷S. Kerdegari, P. Canepa, D. Odino, R. Oropesa-Nuñez, A. Relini, O. Cavalleri, and C. Canale, “Insights in cell biomechanics through atomic force microscopy,” *Materials (Basel)* **16**, 2980 (2023).
- ⁵⁸F. Català-Castro, E. Schäffer, and M. Krieg, “Exploring cell and tissue mechanics with optical tweezers,” *J. Cell Sci.* **135**, 259–355 (2022).
- ⁵⁹A. R. Bausch, F. Ziemann, A. A. Boulbitch, K. Jacobson, and E. Sackmann, “Local measurements of viscoelastic parameters of adherent cell surfaces by magnetic bead microrheometry,” *Biophys. J.* **75**, 2038–2049 (1998).
- ⁶⁰A. W. C. Lau, B. D. Hoffman, A. Davies, J. C. Crocker, and T. C. Lubensky, “Microrheology, stress fluctuations, and active behavior of liv-

- ing cells," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 198101 (2003).
- ⁶¹P. Panorchan, J. S. H. Lee, T. P. Kole, Y. Tseng, and D. Wirtz, "Microrheology and ROCK signaling of human endothelial cells embedded in a 3D matrix," *Biophys. J.* **91**, 3499–3507 (2006).
- ⁶²J. R. Staunton, B. L. Doss, S. Lindsay, and R. Ros, "Correlating confocal microscopy and atomic force indentation reveals metastatic cancer cells stiffen during invasion into collagen I matrices," *Sci. Rep.* **6**, 19686 (2016).
- ⁶³J. Swift, I. L. Ivanovska, A. Buxboim, T. Harada, P. C. D. P. Dingal, J. Pinter, J. D. Pajeroski, K. R. Spinler, J.-W. Shin, M. Tewari, F. Rehfeldt, D. W. Speicher, and D. E. Discher, "Nuclear lamin-a scales with tissue stiffness and enhances matrix-directed differentiation," *Science* **341**, 1240104 (2013).
- ⁶⁴J. Lammerding, L. G. Fong, J. Y. Ji, K. Reue, C. L. Stewart, S. G. Young, and R. T. Lee, "Lamins A and C but Not Lamin B1 Regulate Nuclear Mechanics," *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **281**, 25768–25780 (2006).
- ⁶⁵A. D. Stephens, E. J. Banigan, S. A. Adam, R. D. Goldman, and J. F. Marko, "Chromatin and lamin a determine two different mechanical response regimes of the cell nucleus," *Mol. Biol. Cell* **28**, 1984–1996 (2017).
- ⁶⁶E. S. Bell, P. Shah, N. Zuela-Sopilniak, D. Kim, A.-A. Varlet, J. L. P. Morival, A. L. McGregor, P. Isermann, P. M. Davidson, J. J. Elacqua, J. N. Lakins, L. Vahdat, V. M. Weaver, M. B. Smolka, P. N. Span, and J. Lammerding, "Low lamin a levels enhance confined cell migration and metastatic capacity in breast cancer," *Oncogene* **41**, 4211–4230 (2022).
- ⁶⁷H. Liu, J. Wen, Y. Xiao, J. Liu, S. Hopyan, M. Radisic, C. A. Simmons, and Y. Sun, "In situ mechanical characterization of the cell nucleus by atomic force microscopy," *ACS Nano* **8**, 3821–3828 (2014).
- ⁶⁸A. L. McGregor, C. R. Hsia, and J. Lammerding, "Squish and squeeze — the nucleus as a physical barrier during migration in confined environments," *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* **40**, 32–40 (2016).
- ⁶⁹K. Wolf, M. te Lindert, M. Krause, S. Alexander, J. te Riet, A. L. Willis, R. M. Hoffman, C. G. Figdor, S. J. Weiss, and P. Friedl, "Physical limits of cell migration: control by ECM space and nuclear deformation and tuning by proteolysis and traction force," *The Journal of cell biology* **201**, 1069–1084 (2013).
- ⁷⁰P. M. Davidson, C. Denais, M. C. Bakshi, and J. Lammerding, "Nuclear deformability constitutes a rate-limiting step during cell migration in 3-D environments," *Cell. Mol. Bioeng.* **7**, 293–306 (2014).
- ⁷¹F. Lautenschläger, S. Paschke, S. Schinking, A. Bruel, M. Beil, and J. Guck, "The regulatory role of cell mechanics for migration of differentiating myeloid cells," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 15696–15701 (2009).
- ⁷²C. Rotsch and M. Radmacher, "Drug-induced changes of cytoskeletal structure and mechanics in fibroblasts: an atomic force microscopy study," *Biophys. J.* **78**, 520–535 (2000).
- ⁷³J. C. Martens and M. Radmacher, "Softening of the actin cytoskeleton by inhibition of myosin II," *Pflugers Arch.* **456**, 95–100 (2008).
- ⁷⁴E. Fischer-Friedrich, Y. Toyoda, C. J. Cattin, D. J. Müller, A. A. Hyman, and F. Jülicher, "Rheology of the active cell cortex in mitosis," *Biophys. J.* **111**, 589–600 (2016).
- ⁷⁵M. Guo, A. J. Ehrlicher, S. Mahammad, H. Fabich, M. H. Jensen, J. R. Moore, J. J. Fredberg, R. D. Goldman, and D. A. Weitz, "The role of vimentin intermediate filaments in cortical and cytoplasmic mechanics," *Biophys. J.* **105**, 1562–1568 (2013).
- ⁷⁶M. J. Brown, J. A. Hallam, E. Colucci-Guyon, and S. Shaw, "Rigidity of circulating lymphocytes is primarily conferred by vimentin intermediate filaments," *J. Immunol.* **166**, 6640–6646 (2001).
- ⁷⁷K. Seltmann, A. W. Fritsch, J. A. Käs, and T. M. Magin, "Keratins significantly contribute to cell stiffness and impact invasive behavior," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **110**, 18507–18512 (2013).
- ⁷⁸S. B. Lavenus, S. M. Tudor, M. F. Ullo, K. W. Vosatka, and J. S. Logue, "A flexible network of vimentin intermediate filaments promotes migration of amoeboid cancer cells through confined environments," *J. Biol. Chem.* **295**, 6700–6709 (2020).
- ⁷⁹N. Wang, "Mechanical interactions among cytoskeletal filaments," *Hypertension* **32**, 162–165 (1998).
- ⁸⁰Y. Li, O. Kučera, D. Cuvelier, D. M. Rutkowski, M. Deygas, D. Rai, T. Pavlovič, F. N. Vicente, M. Piel, G. Giannone, D. Vavylonis, A. Akhmanova, L. Blanchoin, and M. Théry, "Compressive forces stabilize microtubules in living cells," *Nat. Mater.* **22**, 913–924 (2023).
- ⁸¹B. P. Bouchet, I. Noordstra, M. van Amersfoort, E. A. Katrukha, Y.-C. Ammon, N. D. Ter Hoeve, L. Hodgson, M. Dogterom, P. W. B. Derksen, and A. Akhmanova, "Mesenchymal cell invasion requires cooperative regulation of persistent microtubule growth by SLAIN2 and CLASP1," *Dev. Cell* **39**, 708–723 (2016).
- ⁸²J. M. van Doorn, L. Lageschaar, J. Sprakel, and J. van der Gucht, "Criticality and mechanical enhancement in composite fiber networks," *Phys. Rev. E* **95**, 042503 (2017).
- ⁸³S. Chen, T. Markovich, and F. C. MacKintosh, "Nonaffine deformation of semiflexible polymer and fiber networks," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 088101 (2023).
- ⁸⁴Y.-C. Chang, P. Nalbant, J. Birkenfeld, Z.-F. Chang, and G. M. Bokoeh, "GEF-H1 couples nocodazole-induced microtubule disassembly to cell contractility via RhoA," *Mol. Biol. Cell* **19**, 2147–2153 (2008).
- ⁸⁵E. Latorre, S. Kale, L. Casares, M. Gómez-González, M. Uroz, L. Valon, R. V. Nair, E. Garreta, N. Montserrat, A. Del Campo, B. Ladoux, M. Arroyo, and X. Trepat, "Active superelasticity in three-dimensional epithelia of controlled shape," *Nature* **563**, 203–208 (2018).
- ⁸⁶M. Prechova, Z. Adamova, A.-L. Schweizer, M. Maninova, A. Bauer, D. Kah, S. M. Meier-Menches, G. Wiche, B. Fabry, and M. Gregor, "Plectin-mediated cytoskeletal crosstalk controls cell tension and cohesion in epithelial sheets," *J Cell Biol.* **221**, 202105146 (2022).
- ⁸⁷M. Das and F. C. Mackintosh, "Poisson's ratio in composite elastic media with rigid rods," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 138102 (2010).
- ⁸⁸M. Dogterom and B. Yurke, "Measurement of the force-velocity relation for growing microtubules," *Science* **278**, 856–860 (1997).
- ⁸⁹C. P. Brangwynne, F. C. MacKintosh, S. Kumar, N. A. Geisse, J. Talbot, L. Mahadevan, K. K. Parker, D. E. Ingber, and D. A. Weitz, "Microtubules can bear enhanced compressive loads in living cells because of lateral reinforcement," *J. Cell Biol.* **173**, 733–741 (2006).
- ⁹⁰P. Robison, M. A. Caporizzo, H. Ahmadvadeh, A. I. Bogush, C. Y. Chen, K. B. Margulies, V. B. Shenoy, and B. L. Prosser, "Detyrosinated microtubules buckle and bear load in contracting cardiomyocytes," *Science* **352**, aaf0659 (2016).
- ⁹¹N. Wang, K. Naruse, D. Stamenović, J. J. Fredberg, S. M. Mijailovich, I. M. Tolić-Nørrelykke, T. Polte, R. Mannix, and D. E. Ingber, "Mechanical behavior in living cells consistent with the tensegrity model," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **98**, 7765–7770 (2001).
- ⁹²P. H. Wu, D. R. B. Aroush, A. Asnacios, W. C. Chen, M. E. Dokukin, B. L. Doss, P. Durand-Smet, A. Ekpenyong, J. Guck, N. V. Guz, P. A. Janmey, J. S. Lee, N. M. Moore, A. Ott, Y. C. Poh, R. Ros, M. Sander, I. Sokolov, J. R. Staunton, N. Wang, G. Whyte, and D. Wirtz, "A comparison of methods to assess cell mechanical properties," *Nature Methods* **15**, 491–498 (2018).
- ⁹³J. Block, H. Witt, A. Candelli, J. C. Danes, E. J. Peterman, G. J. Wuite, A. Janshoff, and S. Köster, "Viscoelastic properties of vimentin originate from nonequilibrium conformational changes," *Science Advances* **4**, aat1161 (2018).
- ⁹⁴J. van Mameren, K. C. Vermeulen, F. Gittes, and C. F. Schmidt, "Leveraging single protein polymers to measure flexural rigidity," *J. Phys. Chem. B* **113**, 3837–3844 (2009).
- ⁹⁵R. Yasuda, H. Miyata, and K. Kinosita, Jr, "Direct measurement of the torsional rigidity of single actin filaments," *J. Mol. Biol.* **263**, 227–236 (1996).
- ⁹⁶J. P. Bibeau, N. G. Pandit, S. Gray, N. Shatery Nejad, C. V. Sindelar, W. Cao, and E. M. De La Cruz, "Twist response of actin filaments," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **120**, e2208536120 (2023).
- ⁹⁷L. Kreplak, H. Bär, J. F. Leterrier, H. Herrmann, and U. Aebi, "Exploring the mechanical behavior of single intermediate filaments," *Journal of molecular biology* **354**, 569–577 (2005).
- ⁹⁸A. Kis, S. Kasas, B. Babić, A. J. Kulik, W. Benoît, G. A. D. Briggs, C. Schönenberger, S. Catsicas, and L. Forró, "Nanomechanics of microtubules," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 248101 (2002).
- ⁹⁹L. Schaedel, K. John, J. Gaillard, M. V. Nachury, L. Blanchoin, and M. Théry, "Microtubules self-repair in response to mechanical stress," *Nat. Mater.* **14**, 1156–1163 (2015).
- ¹⁰⁰Y. Tsuda, H. Yasutake, A. Ishijima, and T. Yanagida, "Torsional rigidity of single actin filaments and actin-actin bond breaking force under torsion measured directly by in vitro micromanipulation," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **93**, 12937–12942 (1996).

- ¹⁰¹S. A. Endow and P. E. Marszalek, “An estimate to the first approximation of microtubule rupture force,” *Eur. Biophys. J.* **48**, 569–577 (2019).
- ¹⁰²C. Lorenz, J. Forsting, R. W. Style, S. Klumpp, and S. Köster, “Keratin filament mechanics and energy dissipation are determined by metal-like plasticity,” *Matter* **6**, 2019–2033 (2023).
- ¹⁰³F. Nunes Vicente, M. Lelek, J.-Y. Tinevez, Q. D. Tran, G. Pehau-Arnaudet, C. Zimmer, S. Etienne-Manneville, G. Giannone, and C. Leduc, “Molecular organization and mechanics of single vimentin filaments revealed by super-resolution imaging,” *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabm2696 (2022).
- ¹⁰⁴M. L. Gardel, K. E. Kasza, C. P. Brangwynne, J. Liu, and D. A. Weitz, “Chapter 19: Mechanical response of cytoskeletal networks,” *Methods Cell Biol.* **89**, 487–519 (2008).
- ¹⁰⁵D. Weihs, T. G. Mason, and M. A. Teitell, “Bio-microrheology: a frontier in microrheology,” *Biophys. J.* **91**, 4296–4305 (2006).
- ¹⁰⁶Y. Yang, M. Bai, W. S. Klug, A. J. Levine, and M. T. Valentine, “Microrheology of highly crosslinked microtubule networks is dominated by force-induced crosslinker unbinding,” *Soft Matter* **9**, 383–393 (2013).
- ¹⁰⁷Y. C. Lin, G. H. Koenderink, F. C. MacKintosh, and D. A. Weitz, “Viscoelastic properties of microtubule networks,” *Macromolecules* **40**, 7714–7720 (2007).
- ¹⁰⁸Y. Yang, J. Lin, B. Kaytanli, O. A. Saleh, and M. T. Valentine, “Direct correlation between creep compliance and deformation in entangled and sparsely crosslinked microtubule networks,” *Soft Matter* **8**, 1776–1784 (2012).
- ¹⁰⁹I. Kirchenbuechler, D. Guu, N. A. Kurniawan, G. H. Koenderink, and M. P. Lettinga, “Direct visualization of flow-induced conformational transitions of single actin filaments in entangled solutions,” *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5060 (2014).
- ¹¹⁰M. L. Gardel, J. H. Shin, F. C. MacKintosh, L. Mahadevan, P. Matsudaira, and D. A. Weitz, “Elastic behavior of cross-linked and bundled actin networks,” *Science* **304**, 1301–1305 (2004).
- ¹¹¹F. C. MacKintosh, J. Käs, and P. A. Janmey, “Elasticity of semiflexible biopolymer networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4425–4428 (1995).
- ¹¹²K. E. Kasza, C. P. Broedersz, G. H. Koenderink, Y. C. Lin, W. Messner, E. A. Millman, F. Nakamura, T. P. Stossel, F. C. MacKintosh, and D. A. Weitz, “Actin filament length tunes elasticity of flexibly cross-linked actin networks,” *Biophysical Journal* **99**, 1091–1100 (2010).
- ¹¹³C. P. Broedersz, K. E. Kasza, L. M. Jawerth, S. Münster, D. A. Weitz, and F. C. MacKintosh, “Measurement of nonlinear rheology of cross-linked biopolymer gels,” *Soft Matter* **6**, 4120–4127 (2010).
- ¹¹⁴J. Wilhelm and E. Frey, “Elasticity of stiff polymer networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 108103 (2003).
- ¹¹⁵D. A. Head, A. J. Levine, and F. C. MacKintosh, “Deformation of cross-linked semiflexible polymer networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 108102 (2003).
- ¹¹⁶O. Chaudhuri, S. H. Parekh, and D. A. Fletcher, “Reversible stress softening of actin networks,” *Nature* **445**, 295–298 (2007).
- ¹¹⁷Y. C. Lin, N. Y. Yao, C. P. Broedersz, H. Herrmann, F. C. MacKintosh, and D. A. Weitz, “Origins of elasticity in intermediate filament networks,” *Physical review letters* **104**, 058101 (2010).
- ¹¹⁸N. Y. Yao, C. P. Braedersz, Y. C. Lin, K. E. Kasza, F. C. MacKintosh, and D. A. Weitz, “Elasticity in ionically cross-linked neurofilament networks,” *Biophysical Journal* **98**, 2147–2153 (2010).
- ¹¹⁹A. Aufderhorst-Roberts and G. H. Koenderink, “Stiffening and inelastic fluidization in vimentin intermediate filament networks,” *Soft Matter* **15**, 7127–7136 (2019).
- ¹²⁰H. Bär, M. Schopferer, S. Sharma, B. Hochstein, N. Mücke, H. Herrmann, and N. Willenbacher, “Mutations in desmin’s carboxy-terminal ‘tail’ domain severely modify filament and network mechanics,” *J. Mol. Biol.* **397**, 1188–1198 (2010).
- ¹²¹H. Wu, Y. Shen, D. Wang, H. Herrmann, R. D. Goldman, D. A. Weitz, and J. A. Paulson, “Effect of Divalent Cations on the Structure and Mechanics of Vimentin Intermediate Filaments,” *Biophysical Journal* **119**, 55–64 (2020).
- ¹²²K. Fukuyama, T. Murozuka, R. Caldwell, and W. L. Epstein, “Divalent cation stimulation of in vitro fibre assembly from epidermal keratin protein,” *J. Cell Sci* **33**, 255–263 (1978).
- ¹²³A. V. Schepers, C. Lorenz, P. Nietmann, A. Janshoff, S. Klumpp, and S. Köster, “Multiscale mechanics and temporal evolution of vimentin intermediate filament networks,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **118**, 2102026118 (2021).
- ¹²⁴O. I. Wagner, S. Rammensee, N. Korde, Q. Wen, J. F. Leterrier, and P. A. Janmey, “Softness, strength and self-repair in intermediate filament networks,” *Experimental cell research* **313**, 2228 (2007).
- ¹²⁵M. Denz, M. Marschall, H. Herrmann, and S. Köster, “Ion type and valency differentially drive vimentin tetramers into intermediate filaments or higher order assemblies,” *Soft Matter* **17**, 870–878 (2021).
- ¹²⁶T. Golde, C. Huster, M. Glaser, T. Händler, H. Herrmann, J. A. Käs, and J. Schnauß, “Glassy dynamics in composite biopolymer networks,” *Soft Matter* **14**, 7970–7978 (2018).
- ¹²⁷J. Deek, R. Maan, E. Loiseau, and A. R. Bausch, “Reconstitution of composite actin and keratin networks in vesicles,” *Soft Matter* **14**, 1897–1902 (2018).
- ¹²⁸I. Elbalasy, P. Mollenkopf, C. Tutmarc, H. Herrmann, and J. Schnauß, “Keratins determine network stress responsiveness in reconstituted actin-keratin filament systems,” *Soft Matter* **17**, 3954–3962 (2021).
- ¹²⁹V. Pelletier, N. Gal, P. Fournier, and M. L. Kilfoil, “Microrheology of microtubule solutions and actin-microtubule composite networks,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 188303 (2009).
- ¹³⁰I. Piechocka, *Biopolymers: from structural hierarchy to nonlinear rheology*, Ph.D. thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (2011).
- ¹³¹O. Esue, A. A. Carson, Y. Tseng, and D. Wirtz, “A direct interaction between actin and vimentin filaments mediated by the tail domain of vimentin,” *The Journal of biological chemistry* **281**, 30393–30399 (2006).
- ¹³²L. Schaedel, C. Lorenz, A. V. Schepers, S. Klumpp, and S. Köster, “Vimentin intermediate filaments stabilize dynamic microtubules by direct interactions,” *Nature Communications* 2021 12:1 **12**, 1–12 (2021).
- ¹³³M. H. Jensen, E. J. Morris, R. D. Goldman, and D. A. Weitz, “Emergent properties of composite semiflexible biopolymer networks,” *Bioarchitecture* **4**, 138–143 (2014).
- ¹³⁴Y.-C. Lin, G. H. Koenderink, F. C. MacKintosh, and D. A. Weitz, “Control of non-linear elasticity in f-actin networks with microtubules,” *Soft Matter* **7**, 902–906 (2011).
- ¹³⁵S. N. Ricketts, J. L. Ross, and R. M. Robertson-Anderson, “Co-entangled actin-microtubule composites exhibit tunable stiffness and power-law stress relaxation,” *Biophys. J.* **115**, 1055–1067 (2018).
- ¹³⁶S. N. Ricketts, M. L. Francis, L. Farhadi, M. J. Rust, M. Das, J. L. Ross, and R. M. Robertson-Anderson, “Varying crosslinking motifs drive the mesoscale mechanics of actin-microtubule composites,” *Sci. Rep.* **9**, 12831 (2019).
- ¹³⁷Y. Shen, H. Wu, P. J. Lu, D. Wang, M. Shayegan, H. Li, W. Shi, Z. Wang, L. H. Cai, J. Xia, M. Zhang, R. Ding, H. Herrmann, R. Goldman, F. C. Mackintosh, A. Moncho-Jordá, and D. A. Weitz, “Effects of Vimentin Intermediate Filaments on the Structure and Dynamics of in Vitro Multicomponent Interpenetrating Cytoskeletal Networks,” *Physical Review Letters* **127**, 108101 (2021).
- ¹³⁸H. Wu, Y. Shen, S. Sivagurunathan, M. S. Weber, S. A. Adam, J. H. Shin, J. J. Fredberg, O. Medalia, R. Goldman, D. A. Weitz, and J. Lippincott-Schwartz, “Vimentin intermediate filaments and filamentous actin form unexpected interpenetrating networks that redefine the cell cortex,” *PNAS* **119**, 2115217119 (2022).
- ¹³⁹M. Preciado López, F. Huber, I. Grigoriev, M. O. Steinmetz, A. Akhmanova, G. H. Koenderink, and M. Dogterom, “Actin-microtubule coordination at growing microtubule ends,” *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 4778 (2014).
- ¹⁴⁰I. I. Petitjean, Q. D. Tran, A. Goutou, Z. Kabir, G. Wiche, C. Leduc, and G. H. Koenderink, “Reconstitution of cytolinker-mediated crosstalk between actin and vimentin,” *bioRxiv*, 2023.10.27.564417 (2023).
- ¹⁴¹S. SenGupta, C. A. Parent, and J. E. Bear, “The principles of directed cell migration,” *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **22**, 529–547 (2021).
- ¹⁴²R. J. Petrie, K. M. Yamada, and R. Mayor, “Multiple mechanisms of 3D migration: the origins of plasticity,” *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* **42**, 7–12 (2016).
- ¹⁴³S. P. Palecek, A. Huttenlocher, A. F. Horwitz, and D. A. Lauffenburger, “Physical and biochemical regulation of integrin release during rear detachment of migrating cells,” *Journal of Cell Science* **111**, 929–940 (1998).
- ¹⁴⁴R. W. Style, R. Boltyskiy, G. K. German, C. Hyland, C. W. Macminn, A. F. Mertz, L. A. Wilen, Y. Xu, and E. R. Dufresne, “Traction force microscopy in physics and biology,” *Soft Matter* **10**, 4047–4055 (2014).
- ¹⁴⁵R. J. Petrie, H. Koo, and K. M. Yamada, “Generation of compartmentalized pressure by a nuclear piston governs cell motility in a 3D matrix,”

- Science **345**, 1062–1065 (2014).
- ¹⁴⁶E. K. Paluch and E. Raz, “The role and regulation of blebs in cell migration,” *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **25**, 582–590 (2013).
- ¹⁴⁷Y.-J. Liu, M. Le Berre, F. Lautenschlaeger, P. Maiuri, A. Callan-Jones, M. Heuzé, T. Takaki, R. Voituriez, and M. Piel, “Confinement and low adhesion induce fast amoeboid migration of slow mesenchymal cells,” *Cell* **160**, 659–672 (2015).
- ¹⁴⁸K. M. Stroka, H. Jiang, S.-H. Chen, Z. Tong, D. Wirtz, S. X. Sun, and K. Konstantopoulos, “Water permeation drives tumor cell migration in confined microenvironments,” *Cell* **157**, 611–623 (2014).
- ¹⁴⁹M. Krendel, F. T. Zenke, and G. M. Bokoch, “Nucleotide exchange factor GEF-H1 mediates cross-talk between microtubules and the actin cytoskeleton,” *Nat. Cell Biol.* **4**, 294–301 (2002).
- ¹⁵⁰A. Rape, W. H. Guo, and Y. L. Wang, “Microtubule depolymerization induces traction force increase through two distinct pathways,” *Journal of Cell Science* **124**, 4233–4240 (2011).
- ¹⁵¹M. L. Azoitei, J. Noh, D. J. Marston, P. Roudot, C. B. Marshall, T. A. Daurigird, S. L. Lisanza, M.-J. Sandí, M. Ikura, J. Sondek, R. Rottapel, K. M. Hahn, and G. Danuser, “Spatiotemporal dynamics of GEF-H1 activation controlled by microtubule- and src-mediated pathways,” *J. Cell Biol.* **218**, 3077–3097 (2019).
- ¹⁵²J. N. Heck, S. M. Ponik, M. G. Garcia-Mendoza, C. A. Pehlke, D. R. Inman, K. W. Eliceiri, and P. J. Keely, “Microtubules regulate GEF-H1 in response to extracellular matrix stiffness,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **23**, 2583–2592 (2012).
- ¹⁵³A. Kopf, J. Renkawitz, R. Hauschild, I. Girkontaite, K. Tedford, J. Merrin, O. Thorn-Seshold, D. Trauner, H. Häcker, K.-D. Fischer, E. Kiermaier, and M. Sixt, “Microtubules control cellular shape and coherence in amoeboid migrating cells,” *J. Cell Biol.* **219** (2020).
- ¹⁵⁴Y. Jiu, J. Peränen, N. Schaible, F. Cheng, J. E. Eriksson, R. Krishnan, and P. Lappalainen, “Vimentin intermediate filaments control actin stress fiber assembly through GEF-H1 and RhoA,” *Journal of Cell Science* **130**, 892–902 (2017).
- ¹⁵⁵Z. Gan, L. Ding, C. J. Burckhardt, J. Lowery, A. Zaritsky, K. Sitterley, A. Mota, N. Costigliola, C. G. Starker, D. F. Voytas, J. Tytell, R. D. Goldman, and G. Danuser, “Vimentin Intermediate Filaments Template Microtubule Networks to Enhance Persistence in Cell Polarity and Directed Migration,” *Cell Systems* **3**, 252–263.e8 (2016).
- ¹⁵⁶Y. Jiu, J. Lehtimäki, S. Tojkander, F. Cheng, H. Jääliñoja, X. Liu, M. Varjosalo, J. E. Eriksson, and P. Lappalainen, “Bidirectional Interplay between Vimentin Intermediate Filaments and Contractile Actin Stress Fibers,” *Cell Reports* **11**, 1511–1518 (2015).
- ¹⁵⁷P. C. Marks, B. R. Hewitt, M. A. Baird, G. Wiche, and R. J. Petrie, “Plectin linkages are mechanosensitive and required for the nuclear piston mechanism of three-dimensional cell migration,” *Molecular Biology of the Cell* **33**, ar104 (2022).
- ¹⁵⁸C. Daday, K. Kolšek, and F. Gräter, “The mechano-sensing role of the unique sh3 insertion in plakin domains revealed by molecular dynamics simulations,” *Scientific Reports* **7**, 11669 (2017).
- ¹⁵⁹M. P. Murrell and M. L. Gardel, “F-actin buckling coordinates contractility and severing in a biomimetic actomyosin cortex,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 20820–20825 (2012).
- ¹⁶⁰V. Wollrab, J. M. Belmonte, L. Baldauf, M. Leptin, F. Nédélec, and G. H. Koenderink, “Polarity sorting drives remodeling of actin-myosin networks,” *J. Cell Sci.* **132**, jcs219717 (2018).
- ¹⁶¹J. Alvarado, M. Sheinman, A. Sharma, F. C. MacKintosh, and G. H. Koenderink, “Force percolation of contractile active gels,” *Soft Matter* **13**, 5624–5644 (2017), 1612.08713.
- ¹⁶²P. M. Bendix, G. H. Koenderink, D. Cuvelier, Z. Dogic, B. N. Koeleman, W. M. Briehar, C. M. Field, L. Mahadevan, and D. A. Weitz, “A quantitative analysis of contractility in active cytoskeletal protein networks,” *Biophys. J.* **94**, 3126–3136 (2008).
- ¹⁶³K. Carvalho, F. C. Tsai, E. Lees, R. Voituriez, G. H. Koenderink, and C. Sykes, “Cell-sized liposomes reveal how actomyosin cortical tension drives shape change,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **110**, 16456–16461 (2013).
- ¹⁶⁴E. Loiseau, J. A. M. Schneider, F. C. Keber, C. Pelzl, G. Massiera, G. Salbreux, and A. R. Bausch, “Shape remodeling and blebbing of active cytoskeletal vesicles,” *Sci. Adv.* **2**, e1500465 (2016).
- ¹⁶⁵W. M. McFadden, P. M. McCall, M. L. Gardel, and E. M. Munro, “Filament turnover tunes both force generation and dissipation to control long-range flows in a model actomyosin cortex,” *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **13**, e1005811 (2017).
- ¹⁶⁶S. K. Vogel, C. Wölfer, D. A. Ramirez-Diaz, R. J. Flassig, K. Sundmacher, and P. Schwill, “Symmetry breaking and emergence of directional flows in minimal actomyosin cortices,” *Cells* **9**, 1432 (2020).
- ¹⁶⁷Sonal, K. A. Ganzinger, S. K. Vogel, J. Mücksch, P. Blumhardt, and P. Schwill, “Myosin-II activity generates a dynamic steady state with continuous actin turnover in a minimal actin cortex,” *Journal of Cell Science* **132**, jcs219899 (2019).
- ¹⁶⁸T. Han Tan, M. Malik-Garbi, E. Abu-Shah, J. Li, A. Sharma, F. C. MacKintosh, K. Keren, C. F. Schmidt, and N. Fakhri, “Self-organized stress patterns drive state transitions in actin cortices,” *Tech. Rep.* **6** (2018).
- ¹⁶⁹M. Pinot, V. Steiner, B. Dehapiot, B.-K. Yoo, F. Chesnel, L. Blanchoin, C. Kervrann, and Z. Gueroui, “Confinement induces actin flow in a meiotic cytoplasm,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **109**, 11705–11710 (2012).
- ¹⁷⁰M. Malik-Garbi, N. Jerushalmi, S. Jansen, E. Abu-Shah, B. L. Goode, A. Mogilner, and K. Keren, “Scaling behaviour in steady-state contracting actomyosin networks,” *Nat. Phys.* **15**, 509–516 (2019).
- ¹⁷¹R. Sakamoto, Z. Izri, Y. Shimamoto, M. Miyazaki, and Y. T. Maeda, “Geometric trade-off between contractile force and viscous drag determines the actomyosin-based motility of a cell-sized droplet,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **119**, e2121147119 (2022).
- ¹⁷²Y. Shen, H. Wu, P. J. Lu, D. Wang, M. Shayegan, H. Li, W. Shi, Z. Wang, L. H. Cai, J. Xia, M. Zhang, R. Ding, H. Herrmann, R. Goldman, F. C. Mackintosh, A. Moncho-Jordá, and D. A. Weitz, “Effects of Vimentin Intermediate Filaments on the Structure and Dynamics of in Vitro Multicomponent Interpenetrating Cytoskeletal Networks,” *Physical Review Letters* **127**, 108101 (2021).
- ¹⁷³G. Lee, G. Leech, M. J. Rust, M. Das, R. J. McGorty, J. L. Ross, and R. M. Robertson-Anderson, “Myosin-driven actin-microtubule networks exhibit self-organized contractile dynamics,” *Sci. Adv.* **7**, eabe4334 (2021).
- ¹⁷⁴L. P. Cramer, “Forming the cell rear first: breaking cell symmetry to trigger directed cell migration,” *Nat. Cell Biol.* **12**, 628–632 (2010).
- ¹⁷⁵J. M. Vasiliev, M. Gelfand, L. V. Domnina, O. Y. Ivanova, S. G. Komm, and L. V. Olshevskaja, “Effect of colcemid on the locomotory behaviour of fibroblasts,” *Development* **24**, 625–640 (1970).
- ¹⁷⁶N. Efimova, C. Yang, J. X. Chia, N. Li, C. J. Lengner, K. L. Neufeld, and T. M. Svitkina, “Branched actin networks are assembled on microtubules by adenomatous polyposis coli for targeted membrane protrusion,” *J. Cell Biol.* **219**, e202003091 (2020).
- ¹⁷⁷J. L. Henty-Ridilla, A. Rankova, J. A. Eskin, K. Kenny, and B. L. Goode, “Accelerated actin filament polymerization from microtubule plus ends,” *Science* **352**, 1004–1009 (2016).
- ¹⁷⁸A. Kodama, I. Karakesisoglou, E. Wong, A. Vaezi, and E. Fuchs, “ACF7: An Essential Integrator of Microtubule Dynamics,” *Cell*, **115**, 343–354 (2003).
- ¹⁷⁹K. Drabek, M. van Ham, T. Stepanova, K. Draegestein, R. van Horssen, C. L. Sayas, A. Akhmanova, T. ten Hagen, R. Smits, R. Fodde, F. Grosveld, and N. Galjart, “Role of CLASP2 in Microtubule Stabilization and the Regulation of Persistent Motility,” *Current Biology* **16**, 2259–2264 (2006).
- ¹⁸⁰B. P. Bouchet, R. E. Gough, Y.-C. Ammon, D. van de Willige, H. Post, G. Jacquemet, A. M. Altelaar, A. Heck, Jr, B. T. Goult, and A. Akhmanova, “Talin-KANK1 interaction controls the recruitment of cortical microtubule stabilizing complexes to focal adhesions,” *Elife* **5**, e18124 (2016).
- ¹⁸¹E. Infante, A. Castagnino, R. Ferrari, P. Monteiro, S. Agüera-González, P. Paul-Gilloteaux, M. J. Domingues, P. Maiuri, M. Raab, C. M. Shanahan, A. Baffet, M. Piel, E. R. Gomes, and P. Chavrier, “LINC complex-lis1 interplay controls MT1-MMP matrix digest-on-demand response for confined tumor cell migration,” *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 2443 (2018).
- ¹⁸²B. T. Helfand, M. G. Mendez, S. N. Murthy, D. K. Shumaker, B. Grin, S. Mahammad, U. Aebi, T. Wedig, Y. I. Wu, K. M. Hahn, M. Inagaki, H. Herrmann, and R. D. Goldman, “Vimentin organization modulates the formation of lamellipodia,” *Molecular Biology of the Cell* **22**, 1274–1289 (2011).
- ¹⁸³Y. Sakamoto, B. Boëda, and S. Etienne-Manneville, “APC binds intermediate filaments and is required for their reorganization during cell migration,” *J. Cell Biol.* **200**, 249–258 (2013).

- ¹⁸⁴Z. Gan, L. Ding, C. J. Burckhardt, J. Lowery, A. Zaritsky, K. Sitterley, A. Mota, N. Costigliola, C. G. Starker, D. F. Voytas, J. Tytell, R. D. Goldman, and G. Danuser, "Vimentin intermediate filaments template microtubule networks to enhance persistence in cell polarity and directed migration," *Cell Syst.* **3**, 252–263.e8 (2016).
- ¹⁸⁵S. H. Shabbir, M. M. Cleland, R. D. Goldman, and M. Mrksich, "Geometric control of vimentin intermediate filaments," *Biomaterials* **35**, 1359–1366 (2014).
- ¹⁸⁶C. Leduc and S. Etienne-Manneville, "Regulation of microtubule-associated motors drives intermediate filament network polarization," *J. Cell Biol.* **216**, 1689–1703 (2017).
- ¹⁸⁷N. Costigliola, L. Ding, C. J. Burckhardt, S. J. Han, E. Gutierrez, A. Mota, A. Groisman, T. J. Mitchison, and G. Danuser, "Vimentin fibers orient traction stress," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **114**, 5195–5200 (2017).
- ¹⁸⁸Y. Sakamoto, B. Boëda, and S. Etienne-Manneville, "APC binds intermediate filaments and is required for their reorganization during cell migration," *J. Cell Biol.* **200**, 249–258 (2013).
- ¹⁸⁹R. E. Leube, M. Moch, and R. Windoffer, "Intermediate filaments and the regulation of focal adhesion," *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **32**, 13–20 (2015).
- ¹⁹⁰M. Preciado López, F. Huber, I. Grigoriev, M. O. Steinmetz, A. Akhmanova, M. Dogterom, and G. H. Koenderink, "In vitro reconstitution of dynamic microtubules interacting with actin filament networks," *Methods Enzymol.* **540**, 301–320 (2014).
- ¹⁹¹D. Inoue, D. Obino, J. Pineau, F. Farina, J. Gaillard, C. Guerin, L. Blanchoin, A.-M. Lennon-Duménil, and M. Théry, "Actin filaments regulate microtubule growth at the centrosome," *EMBO J.* **38**, e99630 (2019).
- ¹⁹²M. Gélín, A. Schaeffer, J. Gaillard, C. Guérin, B. Vianay, M. Orhant-Prioux, M. Braun, C. Leterrier, L. Blanchoin, and M. Théry, "Microtubules under mechanical pressure can breach dense actin networks," *J. Cell Sci.* **136** (2023).
- ¹⁹³D. van de Willige, J. J. Hummel, C. Alkemade, O. I. Kahn, F. K. Au, R. Z. Qi, M. Dogterom, G. H. Koenderink, C. C. Hoogenraad, and A. Akhmanova, "Cytolinker Gas2L1 regulates axon morphology through microtubule-modulated actin stabilization," *EMBO Rep.* **20**, e47732 (2019).
- ¹⁹⁴A. Elie, E. Prezel, C. Guérin, E. Denarier, S. Ramirez-Rios, L. Serre, A. Andrieux, A. Fourest-Lieuvin, L. Blanchoin, and I. Arnal, "Tau co-organizes dynamic microtubule and actin networks," *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 9964 (2015).
- ¹⁹⁵C. Alkemade, *Reconstituting microtubule-actin coordination by cytolinkers*, Ph.D. thesis, Delft University of Technology (2021).
- ¹⁹⁶N. C. Rodgers, E. J. Lawrence, A. V. Sawant, N. Efimova, G. Gonzalez-Vasquez, T. T. Hickman, I. Kaverina, and M. Zanic, "CLASP2 facilitates dynamic actin filament organization along the microtubule lattice," *Mol. Biol. Cell* **34**, 261a (2023).
- ¹⁹⁷C. Alkemade, H. Wierenga, V. A. Volkov, M. P. López, A. Akhmanova, P. R. ten Wolde, M. Dogterom, and G. H. Koenderink, "Cross-linkers at growing microtubule ends generate forces that drive actin transport," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **119**, 1–12 (2022).
- ¹⁹⁸M. Vishwakarma, J. P. Spatz, and T. Das, "Mechanobiology of leader-follower dynamics in epithelial cell migration," *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **66**, 97–103 (2020).
- ¹⁹⁹A. Haeger, K. Wolf, M. M. Zegers, and P. Friedl, "Collective cell migration: guidance principles and hierarchies," *Trends in Cell Biology* **25**, 556–566 (2015).
- ²⁰⁰S. Grosser, J. Lippoldt, L. Oswald, M. Merkel, D. M. Sussman, F. Renner, P. Gottheil, E. W. Morawetz, T. Fuhs, X. Xie, S. Pawlizak, A. W. Fritsch, B. Wolf, L.-C. Horn, S. Briest, B. Aktas, M. Lisa Manning, and J. A. Käs, "Cell and Nucleus Shape as an Indicator of Tissue Fluidity in Carcinoma," *Physical Review X* **11**, 011033 (2021).
- ²⁰¹J.-A. Park, J. Hun Kim, D. Bi, J. A. Mitchell, N. Taheri Qazvini, K. Tantisira, C. Young Park, M. McGill, S.-H. Kim, B. Gweon, J. Notbohm, R. Steward Jr, S. Burger, S. H. Randell, A. T. Kho, D. T. Tambe, C. Hardin, S. A. Shore, E. Israel, D. A. Weitz, D. J. Tschumperlin, E. P. Henske, S. T. Weiss, M. Lisa Manning, J. P. Butler, J. M. Drazen, J. J. Fredberg, C. Analysed, and N. Mater, "Unjamming and cell shape in the asthmatic airway epithelium guided data interpretation on the biological relevance of cellular migration," *Nat Mater* **14**, 1040–1048 (2015).
- ²⁰²O. Ilina, P. G. Gritsenko, S. Syga, J. Lippoldt, C. A. La Porta, O. Chepizhko, S. Grosser, M. Vullings, G. J. Bakker, J. Starrau, P. Bult, S. Zapperi, J. A. Käs, A. Deutsch, and P. Friedl, "Cell–cell adhesion and 3D matrix confinement determine jamming transitions in breast cancer invasion," *Nature Cell Biology* **22**, 1103–1115 (2020).
- ²⁰³A. Mongera, P. Rowghanian, H. J. Gustafson, E. Shelton, D. A. Kealhofer, E. K. Carn, F. Serwane, A. A. Lucio, J. Giammona, and O. Campàs, "A fluid-to-solid jamming transition underlies vertebrate body axis elongation," *Nature* **561**, 401–405 (2018).
- ²⁰⁴A. Palamidessi, C. Malinverno, E. Frittoli, S. Corallino, E. Barbieri, S. Sigismund, G. V. Beznoussenko, E. Martini, M. Garre, I. Ferrara, C. Tripodo, F. Ascione, E. A. Cavalcanti-Adam, Q. Li, P. P. Di Fiore, D. Parazzoli, F. Giavazzi, R. Cerbino, and G. Scita, "Unjamming overcomes kinetic and proliferation arrest in terminally differentiated cells and promotes collective motility of carcinoma," *Nature Materials* **18**, 1252–1263 (2019).
- ²⁰⁵D. T. Tambe, C. Corey Hardin, T. E. Angelini, K. Rajendran, C. Y. Park, X. Serra-Picamal, E. H. Zhou, M. H. Zaman, J. P. Butler, D. A. Weitz, J. J. Fredberg, and X. Trepap, "Collective cell guidance by cooperative intercellular forces," *Nature Materials* **10**, 469–475 (2011).
- ²⁰⁶T. Das, K. Safferling, S. Rausch, N. Grabe, H. Boehm, and J. P. Spatz, "A molecular mechanotransduction pathway regulates collective migration of epithelial cells," *Nature Cell Biology* **17**, 276–287 (2015).
- ²⁰⁷O. Campàs, I. Noordstra, and A. Yap, "Adherens junctions as molecular regulators of emergent tissue mechanics," *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* **1**, 1–18 (2023).
- ²⁰⁸J. Zhang, K. F. Goliwas, W. Wang, P. V. Taufalele, F. Bordeleau, and C. A. Reinhart-King, "Energetic regulation of coordinated leader–follower dynamics during collective invasion of breast cancer cells," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **116**, 7867–7872 (2019).
- ²⁰⁹J. A. Broussard, A. Jaiganesh, H. Zarkoob, D. E. Conway, A. R. Dunn, H. D. Espinosa, P. A. Janmey, and K. J. Green, "Scaling up single-cell mechanics to multicellular tissues - the role of the intermediate filament-desmosome network," *J. Cell Sci.* **133**, jcs228031 (2020).
- ²¹⁰M. Schmelz and W. W. Franke, "Complexus adhaerentes, a new group of desmoplakin-containing junctions in endothelial cells: the syndesmos connecting retothelial cells of lymph nodes," *Eur. J. Cell Biol.* **61**, 274–289 (1993).
- ²¹¹M. Hegazy, A. L. Perl, S. A. Svoboda, and K. J. Green, "Desmosomal cadherins in health and disease," *Annu. Rev. Pathol.* **17**, 47–72 (2022).
- ²¹²J. E. Lewis, J. K. Wahl, K. M. Sass, P. J. Jensen, K. R. Johnson, and M. J. Wheelock, "Cross-talk between adherens junctions and desmosomes depends on plakoglobin," *The Journal of cell biology* **136**, 919–934 (1997).
- ²¹³T. Sadhanasatish, K. Augustin, L. Windgasse, A. Chrostek-Grashoff, M. Rief, and C. Grashoff, "A molecular optomechanics approach reveals functional relevance of force transduction across talin and desmoplakin," *Sci. Adv.* **9**, eadg3347 (2023).
- ²¹⁴S. Osmanagic-Myers, S. Rus, M. Wolfram, D. Brunner, W. H. Goldmann, N. Bonakdar, I. Fischer, S. Reipert, A. Zuzuarregui, G. Walko, and G. Wiche, "Plectin reinforces vascular integrity by mediating crosstalk between the vimentin and the actin networks," *Journal of Cell Science* **128**, 4138–4150 (2015).
- ²¹⁵B. J. Roberts, A. Pashaj, and W. I. J. K. Johnson, Keith R, "Desmosome dynamics in migrating epithelial cells requires the actin cytoskeleton," *Exp. cell research* **317**, 2814–2822 (2011).
- ²¹⁶P. R. Sonavane, C. Wang, B. Dzamba, G. F. Weber, A. Periasamy, and D. W. DeSimone, "Mechanical and signaling roles for keratin intermediate filaments in the assembly and morphogenesis of xenopus mesendoderm tissue at gastrulation," *Development* **144**, 4363–4376 (2017).
- ²¹⁷C. De Pascalis, C. Pérez-González, S. Seetharaman, B. Boëda, B. Vianay, M. Burute, C. Leduc, N. Borghi, X. Trepap, and S. Etienne-Manneville, "Intermediate filaments control collective migration by restricting traction forces and sustaining cell-cell contacts," *Journal of Cell Biology* **217**, 3031–3044 (2018).
- ²¹⁸K. J. Cheung, E. Gabrielson, Z. Werb, and A. J. Ewald, "Collective Invasion in Breast Cancer Requires a Conserved Basal Epithelial Program," *Cell* **155**, 1639–1651 (2013).
- ²¹⁹S. Yoon and R. E. Leube, "Keratin intermediate filaments: intermediaries of epithelial cell migration," *Essays in Biochemistry* **63**, 521–533 (2019).

- ²²⁰A. M. Fortier, E. Asselin, and M. Cadrin, “Keratin 8 and 18 loss in epithelial cancer cells increases collective cell migration and cisplatin sensitivity through claudin1 up-regulation,” *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **288**, 11555–11571 (2013).
- ²²¹A. Kölsch, R. Windoffer, and R. E. Leube, “Actin-dependent dynamics of keratin filament precursors,” *Cell Motility and the Cytoskeleton* **66**, 976–985 (2009).
- ²²²E. Vasileva and S. Citi, “The role of microtubules in the regulation of epithelial junctions,” *Tissue Barriers* **6**, 1539596 (2018).
- ²²³M. N. Shahbazi, D. Megias, C. Epifano, A. Akhmanova, G. G. Gundersen, E. Fuchs, and M. Perez-Moreno, “CLASP2 interacts with p120-catenin and governs microtubule dynamics at adherens junctions,” *Journal of Cell Biology* **203**, 1043–1061 (2013).
- ²²⁴S. J. Stehbens, A. D. Paterson, M. S. Crampton, A. M. Shewan, C. Ferguson, A. Akhmanova, R. G. Parton, and A. S. Yap, “Dynamic microtubules regulate the local concentration of E-cadherin at cell-cell contacts,” *Journal of Cell Science* **119**, 1801–1811 (2006).
- ²²⁵X. Chen, S.-I. Kojima, G. G. Borisy, and K. J. Green, “P120 catenin associates with kinesin and facilitates the transport of cadherin-catenin complexes to intercellular junctions,” *J. Cell Biol.* **163**, 547–557 (2003).
- ²²⁶L. A. Ligon and E. L. Holzbaur, “Microtubules tethered at epithelial cell junctions by dynein facilitate efficient junction assembly,” *Traffic* **8**, 808–819 (2007).
- ²²⁷K. Tsukita, M. Kitamata, H. Kashihara, T. Yano, I. Fujiwara, T. F. Day, T. Katsuno, J. Kim, F. Takenaga, H. Tanaka, S. Park, M. Miyata, H. Watanabe, G. Kondoh, R. Takahashi, A. Tamura, and S. Tsukita, “Phase separation of an actin nucleator by junctional microtubules regulates epithelial function,” *Sci. Adv.* **9**, ead6358 (2023).
- ²²⁸C. Revenu, S. Streichan, E. Donà, V. Lecaudey, L. Hufnagel, and D. Gilmour, “Quantitative cell polarity imaging defines leader-to-follower transitions during collective migration and the key role of microtubule-dependent adherens junction formation,” *Development (Cambridge)* **141**, 1282–1291 (2014).
- ²²⁹R. A. Law, A. Kiepas, H. E. Desta, E. Perez Ipiña, M. Parlani, S. J. Lee, C. L. Yankaskas, R. Zhao, P. Mistriotis, N. Wang, Z. Gu, P. Kalab, P. Friedl, B. A. Camley, and K. Konstantopoulos, “Cytokinesis machinery promotes cell dissociation from collectively migrating strands in confinement,” *Sci. Adv.* **9**, eabq6480 (2023).
- ²³⁰A. Maker and B. M. Gumbiner, “Reconstitution of the full transmembrane cadherin-catenin complex,” *Protein Expression and Purification* **193**, 106056 (2022).
- ²³¹D. L. Rimm, E. R. Koslov, P. Kebriaci, C. D. Cianci, and J. S. Morrow, “Alpha 1(E)-catenin is an actin-binding and -bundling protein mediating the attachment of F-actin to the membrane adhesion complex.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **92**, 8813–8817 (1995).
- ²³²E. S. Rangarajan, E. W. Smith, and T. Izard, “Distinct inter-domain interactions of dimeric versus monomeric α -catenin link cell junctions to filaments,” *Commun. Biol.* **6**, 276 (2023).
- ²³³S. Yamada, S. Pokutta, F. Drees, W. I. Weis, and W. J. Nelson, “Deconstructing the cadherin-catenin-actin complex,” *Cell* **123**, 889–901 (2005).
- ²³⁴C. D. Buckley, J. Tan, K. L. Anderson, D. Hanein, N. Volkmann, W. I. Weis, W. J. Nelson, and A. R. Dunn, “The minimal cadherin-catenin complex binds to actin filaments under force,” *Science* **346**, 1254211 (2014).
- ²³⁵C. Arbore, M. Sergides, L. Gardini, G. Bianchi, A. V. Kashchuk, I. Pertici, P. Bianco, F. S. Pavone, and M. Capitanio, “ α -catenin switches between a slip and an asymmetric catch bond with f-actin to cooperatively regulate cell junction fluidity,” *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 1146 (2022).
- ²³⁶S. D. Hansen, A. V. Kwiatkowski, C.-Y. Ouyang, H. Liu, S. Pokutta, S. C. Watkins, N. Volkmann, D. Hanein, W. I. Weis, R. Dyche Mullins, and W. J. Nelson, “ α E-catenin actin-binding domain alters actin filament conformation and regulates binding of nucleation and disassembly factors,” *Mol. Bio. of the Cell* **24**, 3710–3720 (2013).
- ²³⁷O. J. Harrison, J. Brasch, G. Lasso, P. S. Katsamba, G. Ahlsen, B. Honig, and L. Shapiro, “Structural basis of adhesive binding by desmocollins and desmogleins,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **113**, 7160–7165 (2016).
- ²³⁸M. Fuchs, D. Kugelmann, N. Schlegel, F. Vielmuth, and J. Waschke, “Desmoglein 2 can undergo ca2+-dependent interactions with both desmosomal and classical cadherins including e-cadherin and n-cadherin,” *Biophys. J.* **121**, 1322–1335 (2022).
- ²³⁹M. Mathur, L. Goodwin, and P. Cowin, “Interactions of the cytoplasmic domain of the desmosomal cadherin dsG1 with plakoglobin,” *J. Biol. Chem.* **269**, 14075–14080 (1994).
- ²⁴⁰A. P. Kowalczyk, E. A. Bornslaeger, J. E. Borgwardt, H. L. Palka, A. S. Dhaliwal, C. M. Corcoran, M. F. Denning, and K. J. Green, “The amino-terminal domain of desmoplakin binds to plakoglobin and clusters desmosomal cadherin-plakoglobin complexes,” *J. Cell Biol.* **139**, 773–784 (1997).
- ²⁴¹L. Fontao, B. Favre, S. Riou, D. Geerts, F. Jaunin, J.-H. Saurat, K. J. Green, A. Sonnenberg, and L. Borradori, “Interaction of the bullous pemphigoid antigen 1 (BP230) and desmoplakin with intermediate filaments is mediated by distinct sequences within their COOH terminus,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **14**, 1978–1992 (2003).
- ²⁴²B. Favre, N. Bègré, J.-E. Bouameur, P. Lingasamy, G. M. Conover, L. Fontao, and L. Borradori, “Desmoplakin interacts with the coil 1 of different types of intermediate filament proteins and displays high affinity for assembled intermediate filaments,” *PLoS One* **13**, e0205038 (2018).
- ²⁴³J. W. Brown, C. J. Cho, and J. C. Mills, “Paligenosis: Cellular Remodeling During Tissue Repair,” *Annual Review of Physiology* **84**, 461–483 (2021).
- ²⁴⁴P. Savagner, “Epithelial–Mesenchymal Transitions: From Cell Plasticity to Concept Elasticity,” *Current Topics in Developmental Biology* **112**, 273–300 (2015).
- ²⁴⁵V. Poltavets, M. Kochetkova, P. Sm, and M. S. Samuel, “The Role of the Extracellular Matrix and Its Molecular and Cellular Regulators in Cancer Cell Plasticity,” *Cancer Cell Plasticity. Front. Oncol* **8**, 431 (2018).
- ²⁴⁶T. D. Ross, B. G. Coon, S. Yun, N. Baeyens, K. Tanaka, M. Ouyang, and M. A. Schwartz, “Integrins in mechanotransduction,” *Current Opinion in Cell Biology* **25**, 613–618 (2013).
- ²⁴⁷D. A. Calderwood, I. D. Campbell, and D. R. Critchley, “Talins and kindlins: partners in integrin-mediated adhesion,” *Nature reviews Mol. Cell Bio.* **14**, 503–517 (2013).
- ²⁴⁸J. I. Puleo, S. S. Parker, M. R. Roman, A. W. Watson, K. Rahmani Eliato, L. Peng, K. Saboda, D. J. Roe, R. Ros, F. B. Gertler, and G. Mounemine, “Mechanosensing during directed cell migration requires dynamic actin polymerization at focal adhesions,” *Journal of Cell Biology* **218**, 4215–4235 (2019).
- ²⁴⁹P. Friedl and K. Wolf, “Plasticity of cell migration: A multiscale tuning model,” *Journal of Cell Biology*, **188**, 11–19 (2010).
- ²⁵⁰J. M. Mataraza, M. W. Briggs, Z. Li, A. Entwistle, A. J. Ridley, and D. B. Sacks, “IQGAP1 Promotes Cell Motility and Invasion,” *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **278**, 41237–41245 (2003).
- ²⁵¹B. Belletti, M. S. Nicoloso, M. Schiappacassi, S. Berton, F. Lovat, K. Wolf, V. Canzonieri, A. Zucchetto, P. Friedl, A. Colombatti, and G. Baldassarre, “Stathmin Activity Influences Sarcoma Cell Shape, Motility, and Metastatic Potential,” *Molecular Biology of the Cell* **19**, 2003–2013 (2003).
- ²⁵²K. M. Ridge, J. E. Eriksson, M. Pekny, and R. D. Goldman, “Roles of vimentin in health and disease,” *Genes Dev.* **36**, 391–407 (2022).
- ²⁵³L. Qi, T. Knifley, M. Chen, and K. L. O’Connor, “Integrin α 6 β 4 requires plectin and vimentin for adhesion complex distribution and invasive growth,” *Journal of Cell Science* **135**, jcs258471 (2022).
- ²⁵⁴Y.-J. Wang, H. Liang, Y. Liu, Q. Bao, S. Yang, X.-X. Xu, Y.-C. Chen, W. Liu, X. Shi, Y. Shi, X. Liu, B. Liu, H. Gao, Y. Jiu, and Y.-J. Liu, “Lamin A/C and Vimentin as a Coordinated Regulator during Amoeboid Migration in Microscale Confined Microenvironments,” *Cite This: Nano Lett* **23**, 6735 (2023).
- ²⁵⁵H. B. Schiller, C. C. Friedel, C. Boulegue, and R. Fässler, “Quantitative proteomics of the integrin adhesomes show a myosin II-dependent recruitment of LIM domain proteins,” *EMBO Rep.* **12**, 259–266 (2011).
- ²⁵⁶C. Ciobanasi, B. Faivre, and C. Le Clainche, “Actomyosin-dependent formation of the mechanosensitive talin-vinculin complex reinforces actin anchoring,” *Nature Communications* **5**, 3095 (2014).
- ²⁵⁷F. Franz, R. Tapia-Rojo, S. Winograd-Katz, R. Boujemaa-Paterski, W. Li, T. Unger, S. Albeck, C. Aponte-Santamaria, S. Garcia-Manyes, O. Medalia, B. Geiger, and F. Gräter, “Allosteric activation of vinculin by talin,” *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 4311 (2023).
- ²⁵⁸R. Boujemaa-Paterski, B. Martins, M. Eibauer, C. T. Beales, B. Geiger, and O. Medalia, “Talin-activated vinculin interacts with branched actin networks to initiate bundles,” *eLife* **9**, 1–26 (2020).

- ²⁵⁹D. L. Huang, N. A. Bax, C. D. Buckley, W. I. Weis, and A. R. Dunn, “Vinculin forms a directionally asymmetric catch bond with F-actin,” *Science* **357**, 703–706 (2017).
- ²⁶⁰J. Pernier, M. Cardoso Dos Santos, M. Souissi, A. Joly, H. Narasimprakash, O. Rossier, G. Giannone, E. Helfer, K. Sengupta, and C. Le Clainche, “Talin and kindlin cooperate to control the density of integrin clusters,” *J. Cell Sci.* **136**, jcs260746 (2023).
- ²⁶¹C. F. Kelley, T. Litschel, S. Schumacher, D. Dedden, P. Schwille, and N. Mizuno, “Phosphoinositides regulate force-independent interactions between talin, vinculin, and actin,” *Elife* **9**, e56110 (2020).
- ²⁶²A. J. Ehrlicher, F. Nakamura, J. H. Hartwig, D. A. Weitz, and T. P. Stosel, “Mechanical strain in actin networks regulates FilGAP and integrin binding to filamin A,” *Nature* **478**, 260–263 (2011).
- ²⁶³E. T. Spiliotis and M. A. McMurray, “Masters of asymmetry - lessons and perspectives from 50 years of septins,” *Mol. Biol. Cell* **31**, 2289–2297 (2020).
- ²⁶⁴K. Nakos, M. N. A. Alam, M. R. Radler, I. A. Kesisova, C. Yang, J. Oklety, M. R. Tomasso, S. B. Padrick, T. M. Svitkina, and E. T. Spiliotis, “Septins mediate a microtubule-actin crosstalk that enables actin growth on microtubules,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **119**, e2202803119 (2022).
- ²⁶⁵A. Zhovmer, A. Manning, C. Smith, A. Nguyen, O. Prince, P. Sáez, X. Ma, D. Tsygankov, A. Cartagena-Rivera, N. Singh, R. Singh, and E. Tabdanov, “Septins provide microenvironment sensing and cortical actomyosin partitioning in motile amoeboid t lymphocytes,” *Sci Adv.* **10**, eadi1788 (2024).
- ²⁶⁶J. Kim, O. L. Mooren, M. D. Onken, and J. A. Cooper, “Septin and actin contributions to endothelial cell–cell junctions and monolayer integrity,” *Cytoskeleton* **80**, 228–241 (2022).
- ²⁶⁷X. Wang, W. Wang, X. Wang, M. Wang, L. Zhu, F. Garba, C. Fu, B. Zieger, X. Liu, X. Liu, and X. Yao, “The septin complex links the catenin complex to the actin cytoskeleton for establishing epithelial cell polarity,” *Journal of Molecular Cell Biology* **13**, 395 (2021).
- ²⁶⁸K. J. A. Vendel, C. Alkemade, N. Andrea, G. H. Koenderink, and M. Dogterom, “In vitro reconstitution of dynamic co-organization of microtubules and actin filaments in emulsion droplets,” *Methods Mol. Biol.* **2101**, 53–75 (2020).
- ²⁶⁹O. Siton-Mendelson and A. Bernheim-Groswasser, “Toward the reconstitution of synthetic cell motility,” *Cell Adh. Migr.* **10**, 461–474 (2016).
- ²⁷⁰A. Fink, C. R. Doll, A. Yagüe Relimpio, Y. Dreher, J. P. Spatz, K. Göpfrich, and E. A. Cavalcanti-Adam, “Extracellular cues govern shape and cytoskeletal organization in giant unilamellar lipid vesicles,” *ACS Synth. Biol.* **12**, 369–374 (2023).
- ²⁷¹T. Wittmann, A. Dema, and J. van Haren, “Lights, cytoskeleton, action: Optogenetic control of cell dynamics,” *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **66**, 1–10 (2020).
- ²⁷²J. G. Bermudez, A. Deiters, and M. C. Good, “Patterning microtubule network organization reshapes cell-like compartments,” *ACS Synth. Biol.* **10**, 1338–1350 (2021).
- ²⁷³D. B. Brückner, N. Arlt, A. Fink, P. Ronceray, J. O. Rädler, and C. P. Broedersz, “Learning the dynamics of cell-cell interactions in confined cell migration,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **118**, e2016602118 (2021).
- ²⁷⁴R. C. Adikes, R. A. Hallett, B. F. Saway, B. Kuhlman, and K. C. Slep, “Control of microtubule dynamics using an optogenetic microtubule plus end-f-actin cross-linker,” *J. Cell Biol.* **217**, 779–793 (2018).
- ²⁷⁵S. Amiri, C. Muresan, X. Shang, C. Huet-Calderwood, M. A. Schwartz, D. A. Calderwood, and M. Murrell, “Intracellular tension sensor reveals mechanical anisotropy of the actin cytoskeleton,” *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 8011 (2023).