Cell matrix adhesion in cell migration

R.W., Conway James; Jacquemet, Guillaume

Published in:
Essays in Biochemistry

DOI:
10.1042/EBC20190012

Published: 01/01/2019

Cell matrix adhesion in cell migration

James RW Conway [1] and Guillaume Jacquemet [1,2]*

1: Turku Bioscience Centre, University of Turku and Åbo Akademi University, FI-20520 Turku, Finland.
2: Faculty of Science and Engineering, Cell Biology, Åbo Akademi University, 20520 Turku, Finland

*: Correspondence to : Guillaume Jacquemet (guillaume.jacquemet@utu.fi)

Keywords:

Cell migration, integrins, clathrin plaques, focal adhesions, ECM and signal transduction.

Abstract (200 words):

The ability of cells to migrate is a fundamental physiological process involved in embryonic development, tissue homeostasis, immune surveillance and wound healing. In order for cells to migrate, they must interact with their environment using adhesion receptors, such as integrins, and form specialised adhesion complexes that mediate responses to different extracellular cues. In this review we discuss the role of integrin adhesion complexes (IACs) in cell migration, highlighting the layers of regulation that are involved, including intracellular signalling cascades, mechanosensing and reciprocal feedback to the extracellular environment. We also discuss the role of IACs in extracellular matrix remodelling and how they impact upon cell migration.

Main text:

Introduction

Translocation of cells is a fundamental physiological process that is essential to both normal tissue homeostasis and the development of multiple diseases. In tissues, cells migrate within a complex three-dimensional (3D) environment composed of neighboring cells and extracellular matrix (ECM), where efficient directional migration requires tight control over both cell-cell and cell-ECM adhesion machinery. One of the hallmarks of the migration process is flexibility and plasticity, where cells can migrate using various modes that differentially rely on adhesion machinery (Figure 1). During single cell migration on two-dimensional (2D) surfaces, cells migrate principally using lamellipodia-based protrusions (Figure 2). In this context, migrating cells can display surprising heterogeneity by adopting and switching between modes when strong or weak cell-ECM adhesions are required (1). In 3D, cells often migrate collectively as either a cluster or a stream, which relies upon cell-cell junction dynamics. In this context, leading cells can use lamella- and/or filopodia-like protrusions to engage the ECM and guide the movement of the group (2). Single cells can also adopt various modes of migration in 3D, including amoeboid protrusive or blebby, lobopodial, lamellipodial and/or pseudopodial (3,4); many of which have also been observed in vivo (5–7) (Figure 1). Importantly, specific cell types display preferences towards a particular migration mode, but many also demonstrate a highly plastic nature, often shifting between migration modes to adapt to particular situations (Figure 1) (8–10). Mechanistically, these migration modes are driven by different pathways and cells adopting these can differ in their shape, their use of membrane protrusions and their reliance on cell-ECM adhesion machinery. For instance, during amoeboid migration, cells remain rounded and extend pseudopods or membrane blebs to move forward. Amoeboid migration can be relatively fast and involve a weaker, more “passive” adherence to the substrate (17 μm/min, speed of normal human neutrophil (11)). Amoeboid cells can also migrate without using their cell-ECM adhesions, through actin cortical flow and membrane protrusions (12–14). In contrast, during lamellipodial, lobopodial and pseudopodial migration cells are elongated and in order to move they protrude their membrane forward at the leading edge, and retract it at the trailing edge. These types of migration require constant disassembly and recycling of old cell-ECM adhesion sites, along with the formation of new adhesions at the leading edge, and this spatiotemporal balance is crucial for effective cell migration. Cells adopting elongated migration modes rely strongly upon their cell-ECM adhesion machinery to move forward, which results in slower migration speeds (0.234 μm/min, speed of normal human dermal fibroblast (15)) (16).

The ECM is an intricate proteinaceous mesh where cells are able to recognise characteristic signatures, which can vary dramatically depending on the tissue or disease assessed (17–19). In order to bind to the ECM, cells primarily utilise the integrin family of transmembrane receptors, where integrin-ECM engagement results in the formation of integrin adhesion complexes (IACs) that bridge the ECM and the cell cytoskeleton (Figure 3). Through this cell-ECM bridge, IACs orchestrate cellular behaviours including migration, proliferation and cell fate. This bridge also provides a platform for ECM deposition and remodelling. In this review we will focus on the role of integrin-mediated cell adhesion to the extracellular matrix and highlight this contribution to the migration process. Much of this work builds upon studies looking at lamellipodial migration in 2D, but with advances in intravital microscopy and 3D systems the complexities of different migration modes will also be discussed in these higher fidelity scenarios.

Integrins

The integrin family is composed of 24 heterodimers generated from 18 α and 8 β subunits. These type I transmembrane glycoproteins combine a large extracellular domain with a short cytoplasmic tail (less than 50 amino acids; except for integrin β4 [>1000 amino-acids]) and can be broadly classified into RGD-, collagen-, laminin- and leukocyte-specific receptors. Inside the cell, the integrin tails function as platforms for the recruitment of regulatory elements. These IACs are then important for cytoskeletal reinforcement, along with downstream signalling cascades involved in survival, proliferation, polarisation and migration (Figure 3) (20–22). Most integrin heterodimers can interact with more than one ligand, with several heterodimers capable of binding the same ligand, but with different affinities or intracellular responses. For instance, both α5β1 and αVβ3 integrins can bind to fibronectin (FN), but only αVβ3 can bind to vitronectin (for a more exhaustive review of the various integrin heterodimeric combinations and their ligands see (23)). Interestingly, during FN adhesion initiation αVβ3 and α5β1 integrins cooperate, where αVβ3 initially outcompetes α5β1, but once engaged, αVβ3 promotes α5β1 activation and clustering, further strengthening cell adhesion (24,25).

At the plasma membrane, integrin functions are tightly regulated by intracellular trafficking and a conformational switch that modulates ECM binding, often referred to as activation (Figures 3 & 4). Integrin conformations can range from a bent to an extended open conformation, where the ligand affinity increases with stepwise opening (26–28). However, while this opening is important for the activation of several integrin heterodimers, not every integrins may follow this stepwise unfolding and some can instead assume a constitutively extended conformation (29,30). For specific integrin heterodimers, assessment of this unfolding can be performed using activation specific antibodies (31).

Integrin adhesion complexes (IACs)

Adhesion serves two major functions in migration. Firstly, it generates traction by linking the extracellular substratum to the cellular cytoskeleton, and secondly, it organizes the signaling networks that regulate migration. Integrin-ECM engagement leads to integrin clustering and the formation of macromolecular complexes that support adhesion with IACs. Given the broad range of cell types and extracellular environments within the body, it follows that IACs can take many forms in both migrating and non migrating cells (Figures 2, 5 & 6). By far the best characterised are FAs and FA-like structures, which are discussed further below (Figures 2 & 5). Additionally, some specialized cell types also utilise unique IACs, such as hemidesmosomes (32), podosomes (33), invadopodia (34) and the immunological synapse (35) not all of which are directly involved in the migration process (Figures 2 & 6).

Focal adhesions (FAs) and FA-like structures

The most well characterised adhesive structures involved in the migration process are focal FAs and FA-like structures. Microscopy-based studies of cells migrating on 2D substrates have classified FA-like structures in terms of maturation stage by assessing the components of the IAC, along with their subcellular distribution, shape and size (Figure 5). Many adhesions are thought to progress from early filopodial adhesions to nascent, focal and finally, fibrillar adhesions, but this process is heavily cell-type dependent and may begin at any of the maturation stages (Figure 5) (36–38). Early adhesions, such as filopodia and nascent adhesions, are very dynamic and support the migration process by enabling a constant probing of the cellular environment, while more mature adhesions, such as focal and fibrillar, allow the cell to exert traction on and remodel the ECM. Recent studies have further linked adhesion maturation with loss of talin and recruitment of tensin, which in fibroblasts can lead to metabolic reprogramming at these more stable complexes (39,40). At the nanoscale, FAs are vertically stratified into conserved layers: a membrane proximal integrin signalling

layer (containing integrins, paxillin and focal adhesion kinase (FAK)), an intermediate force transduction layer (containing talin and vinculin) and an actin regulatory layer (containing both actin and actin regulatory elements) (41–44). Further unbiased characterisation of FA and FA-like structures by literature curation (45,46) or mass spectrometry (MS) has also highlighted the vast complexity of these structures. In particular the molecular composition of FA and FA-like structures is affected by the integrin heterodimers (25), the ECM ligands (47), mechanical forces (48–50), integrin activation state (51) and the maturation time (50). Despite these variations, compilation of multiple MS datasets from cells adhering to FN have revealed a core cell adhesion machinery of around 60 components, which is collectively termed the consensus adhesome (50,52). It is important to note that these unbiased MS studies have not all been correlated with microscopy-based studies and that the precise composition of the different types of FA and FA-like structures remains unknown. Furthermore, the assessment of cells in 3D and adhering to different substrates is necessary for the consensus adhesome to fully encompass the vast complexity of the cellular adhesion machinery.

The spatiotemporal regulation of the assembly and disassembly of FAs and FA-like structures is essential for efficient cell migration, where defects can lead to failures in tail retraction and loss of directionality (53,54). There are several mechanisms involved in the disassembly of IACs, including microtubule targeting (55–57), degradation by proteases (58–60), mitotic progression (61) and integrin endocytosis (62). Importantly, if these adhesion platforms are too stable, cells will be unable to protrude the leading edge or retract their tail, resulting in an inability to move. In contrast, reduced or unstable adhesions may compromise cell attachment to the substrate, traction force generation and the signal transduction pathways necessary for directed cell migration. Of note, individual integrins are surprisingly motile within FAs where their immobilisation can last less than 80 sec (63). In addition, the dynamics of free-diffusion and immobilization are different between integrin heterodimers and likely provide further functional specificity within different FA and FA-like structures (64).

While FA-like structures can be observed in cells migrating in 3D (65) (see (66) for review), a greater challenge is the visualisation of these small molecular complexes in a more complex in vivo setting. For example, lamella-like protrusions have been observed in leading cells during collective invasion in mouse models (7). However, higher resolution imaging is still required to fully elucidate the organisation and architecture of these structures, where one interesting in situ example was achieved through paxillin staining of human endothelial cells lining the vascular basement membrane of several tissues (67). FA-like structures have also been observed in migrating cardiac cells in the developing heart of zebrafish embryos, where their components regulate collective migration during development (68). Similarly, analysis of drosophila development has identified several defects resulting from dysregulation of IACs, emphasising the essential nature of these structures in normal tissue homeostasis (69–71). Hence, the conserved and essential role of FA-like structures is apparent at the organism level and many studies are now aiming to gain a more in-depth understanding of FA composition and dynamics at the nanoscale.

Clathrin plaques (CPs)

Recently, a class of atypical IACs, referred to as flat clathrin lattices (72,73), reticular adhesions (61), or clathrin plaques (CPs) (74) have emerged as prominent adhesive structures for cell migration in 2D and 3D environments (72,74) (See (75) for detailed review). It is important to note that it has not been established if these structures are identical, but they share many similar properties and will be referred to herein as CPs for clarity. In cells migrating in 2D, CPs are enriched in β5 integrin (61,73,76), which is required for their formation (73). Other integrins can also be recruited to these structures depending on the cell contractility

status (73). MS analyses of CPs has revealed an absence of classical IAC components and instead, an enrichment of components belonging to the integrin endocytic machinery, including clathrin, AP2, numb and dab2 (Figure 2) (61,73). In addition, unlike FAs, CP formation is not dependent on an intact actin cytoskeleton or on myosin contractility, but they maintain mechanosensitivity (61,76). Indeed, the exact relationship between CPs and the cell cytoskeleton remains to be fully elucidated, as CPs do not appear to be directly connected to actin, but rather surrounded by branched actin filaments and intermediate filaments (77). A functional and spatiotemporal interplay between FAs and CPs has also been described, where digestion of the ECM at FAs was shown to create topographical cues that dictated the future location of CPs, contributing to directional cell migration (74). Moreover, while most FAs dissociate during mitosis, CPs persist and maintain cell-ECM attachment (61). So, with emerging links to cell migration and adhesion in vitro, further work is required to not only elucidate their role in the migration process, but also to ascertain their requirement in vivo.

Signalling by IACs

IACs can integrate both biochemical (ECM composition) and mechanical (ECM stiffness) cues, and transduce this information through both biochemical signalling cascades and mechanical organisation of the cytoskeleton. In the context of directed cell migration, IAC signalling mediates durotaxis (migration towards stiffer substrates), chemotaxis (migration towards a higher chemokine concentration) and haptotaxis (migration towards higher ECM concentrations) (78). These signals also modulate the activation of transcription factors, such as YAP/TAZ or SRF, and can lead to changes in the gene expression profiles of cells (79). Some of these gene expression changes can be long lasting (days after the interaction) due to epigenetic changes (80), while others directly modulate the expression of adhesion molecules and support forward movement (81). Interestingly, removal of the nucleus had no discernible effect on short-term directional cell migration on 2D substrates, but was found to be paramount for efficient 3D migration (82,83). This suggests that a transcriptional response may not be required to initiate 2D migration and highlights the differential requirements for different migration modes in 2D and 3D environments.

IACs are phosphorylation platforms that are especially enriched for tyrosine phosphorylation, suggesting an important regulatory role of kinases and phosphatases at these signaling hubs (84,85). Indeed, many classical cell migration-linked signaling molecules and adaptors are regularly associated with IACs, including FAK, Src, and paxillin, as well as the ILK/PINCH/PARVIN and p130Cas/CRK complexes (86). Importantly, the activation of kinase signalling events upon integrin-ECM engagement can be rapid, exemplified by α5β1 integrin-FN binding, which activates FAK and Src in less than half a second (87). Similarly, small GTPase signalling downstream of IACs regulates cytoskeletal dynamics, membrane protrusions and cell contractility. In 2D, the small GTPases RhoA, Rac1 and CDC42 contribute to the precise spatiotemporal coordination of the migration process (88) and their activation is tightly regulated by integrin-mediated cell adhesion (53,89). In 3D, differential activation of specific small GTPases at the leading edge can define the mode of cell migration. For instance, mesenchymal migration is primarily driven by Rac1, while pseudopodial and amoeboid are regulated by RhoA (8). Importantly, dynamic regulation of these small GTPases allows cells to switch between migration modes, while also contributing to integrin activation and IAC formation (90).

Significantly, cell adhesion to different ECMs can lead to the formation of IACs with overlapping but distinct compositions, which in turn lead to different signalling outputs. For instance, MS analyses of FN or V-CAM-induced IACs identified RCC2 as a specific component of FN-induced IAC (47). In this context,

RCC2 was found to regulate the small GTPases Rac1 and Arf6, which resulted in modulation of directional migration on cell-derived matrices (47). The complexity of IAC signalling is further increased by the fact that different integrin heterodimers binding to the same ECM molecule can trigger different cellular responses that in turn lead to different types of cell migration. For example, in fibroblasts migrating on FN in 2D, αVβ3 favours lamellipodium-driven directional cell migration, while α5β1 engagement leads to RhoA-ROCK-mediated phosphorylation of cofilin and rapid, random migration (91,92). In this way, we can see that signalling by IACs is a finely-tuned process that provides an essential bridge, mediating external cues through complex and specific intracellular signalling cascades.

Mechanosensing by IACs and the molecular clutch

At the leading edge of migrating cells, actin polymerises and flows backwards towards the cell body. This flow of actin connects to and pulls on integrin cytoplasmic tails via talin. This mechanical force is then transduced to the ECM through integrin heterodimers and drives cell protrusion. The efficiency of this cytoskeleton-Integrin-ECM bond to convert force into protrusion is variable and this modulates the migration response of the cell (93). The actin retrograde flow is modulated by both external and internal forces that are generated by myosin motors, membrane tension and substrate rigidity. This retrograde flow also contributes to the organisation and alignment of ECM-engaged integrins within FAs (94,95). Integrins demonstrate variable affinities for their ligands in response to these external stimuli and this provides a feedback mechanism for the cell to mediate intracellular responses (Molecular clutch dynamics reviewed in (96,97)). In addition, multiple IAC proteins, such as talin, vinculin and p130Cas, are mechanosensitive and their functions are strengthened by increased force (Figure 3) (98–100). The balance between these external forces, which are modulating adhesion strength, and the internal forces applied through actin cytoskeletal connections can then result in disassembly or reinforcement of IACs (96,97). Importantly, mechanical forces exerted on talin induce a conformational change that triggers a switch from talin-RIAM to talin-vinculin complexes and promote adhesion stabilisation and cell spreading (101–103). In this context, engagement of the ECM-integrin-actin molecular clutch can also contribute to local rearrangement of the plasma membrane, such as through the formation of glycosylphosphatidylinositol-anchored protein nanoclusters that also support cell spreading (104). Increasingly, our understanding of cellular mechanics is unveiling novel therapeutic opportunities (reviewed in (105)), and in vivo models are already showing promising preclinical efficacy when overalying their results with stiffness modulation of the cancer microenvironment (106,107).

Modulation of integrin functions and regulation of cell migration

Regulation of cell migration via integrin cytoplasmic tails

Integrin activity can be mediated by both ligand binding (outside-in activation) and by the recruitment of proteins to the integrin cytoplasmic tails (inside-out activation). Key integrin activators include talin, kindlin and tensin, while key integrin inactivators include ICAP1, SHARPIN and filamin-A (Figure 3 and (108) for review). Modulation of integrin activity has a strong impact on how cells interact with the ECM. Unsurprisingly, integrin activity regulators strongly contribute to cell migration, and their misregulation is often associated with diseases, such as cancer, fibrosis and cardiovascular disease (109). Recently, a mouse harboring an activating mutation in talin was used to demonstrate that increased talin-mediated integrin activity leads to more stable adhesions and impaired wound healing in vivo (110). Furthermore, in both fly and worm, defects in integrin activity lead to severe developmental deformities, suggesting a high level of evolutionary conservation that reinforces the importance of careful integrin regulation for multicellular organisms (111–113). Of note, only a small subset of known integrin tail binders have been implicated in the

regulation of integrin activity, instead they are likely to contribute to the migratory process by tuning the integrin response (114). For example, MENA, a member of the ENA/VASP family, binds to α5 integrin and modulates IAC signalling on FN or FN-rich matrices and can contribute to haplotaxis towards FN in vivo (115,116). However, the precise coordination of different integrin tail binders during cell migration remains poorly understood.

Regulation of cell migration by integrin trafficking

Integrin trafficking controls the membrane availability of integrin heterodimers through both clathrin-dependent or -independent pathways (Figure 4) (22,117). Importantly, both active and inactive integrins traffic through different compartments and are recycled at different rates (118). Once internalised, active integrin can also signal from recycling endosomes, a feature which in cancer cells contributes to anoikis resistance (119). Furthermore, migrating cells can maintain integrins in an active conformation, recycling them towards the leading edge, and this has been proposed to contribute to directional cell migration (120). Most integrin heterodimers are recycled back to the plasma membrane, with only a small proportion being degraded in the lysosomal compartment (121,122). Depending on the cell type, differential trafficking of heterodimers can also modulate specific responses to ECM cues, such as the formation of nascent adhesions upon cell spreading, or ruffling of the membrane at the cell front (123,124). This tight control of integrin recycling can also lead to migratory defects and eventually disease progression.

As integrin internalization contributes to IAC disassembly, misregulation of integrin endocytosis often leads to impaired cell migration with cells displaying tail retraction defects (125). Hence, changes in integrin recycling can lead to profoundly different phenotypes depending on the context. In ovarian or pancreatic carcinoma, preferential recycling of α5β1 over αVβ3 integrins promotes a switch from mesenchymal to pseudopodial cell migration on cell-derived matrices and cell invasion into FN-rich ECM (126,127). Mechanistically, α5β1 integrins are co-recycled with growth factor receptors, such as EGFR (Figure 4) (128). This can lead to increased EGFR signalling and the local activation of the PI3K/Akt pathway, in turn promoting filopodia formation in a RhoA- and FHOD3 formin-dependent manner (8,129). In agreement with these studies, the activity of RhoA in the invasive tip of metastatic tumour cells has been tracked *in vivo*, where pancreatic tumour cells show a clear polarization (130). Furthermore, in ovarian carcinoma the small GTPase Rab25 promotes invasive migration through 3D matrices (131,132) and is associated with increased aggressiveness of epithelial cancer cells in vivo (133). Rab25 is known to directly associate with β1 integrin and promote the recycling of α5β1 integrins towards the cell surface (131). Interestingly, in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma tumours with mixed populations of cells expressing the GTPase Rab25, or with Rab25 knocked out, only cells lacking Rab25 invaded towards lymphatic vessels, away from the primary tumour (134). This example further highlights the context-dependence of integrin recycling pathways, which can result in profoundly different phenotypes. This complex, regulation of integrins functions via intracellular trafficking could help to explain the limited clinical success of anti-integrin therapies, such as cilengitide (targeting RGD receptors such as αVβ3 integrin), which in some context, displays preclinical efficacy but in others drives cancer cell invasion (8, 109,135).

Regulation of cell migration by integrin co-receptors and the glycocalyx

In migrating cells, integrin functions are further modulated via cross-talk with co-receptors, such as receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs), CD98hc, neuropilin and syndecan-4 (Figures 3 & 4) (136–139). In particular, stimulation of cells with growth factors often leads to cytoskeletal rearrangement, chemotaxis, increased cell

migration and invasion. Indeed, multiple growth factor receptors have been described to synergise with integrin signalling (see (140,141) for reviews). For instance, EGFR stimulation can trigger a rapid change in the composition of IACs (142), while integrins can also influence the subcellular distribution, clustering and expression of growth factor receptors, along with their signalling (140,141). IACs are also associated with additional surface molecules, including selectins, chemokines and the glycocalyx (Figures 3 & 4) (143–145). The glycocalyx is a glyocoprotein- and carbohydrate-rich coating that surrounds many eukaryotic cells and is often associated with cell fate decisions and cancer progression (144). Importantly, the glycocalyx can facilitate integrin clustering upon ligand binding (146) that can contribute, for instance, to glioblastoma progression and dissemination (147).

Furthermore, syndecans (a small family of transmembrane proteoglycans) can also strongly modulate integrin functions and cell migration. Most ECM molecules possess both integrin- and syndecan-binding sites, and IAC formation on several matrix ligands requires engagement of both syndecan and integrin (136). In fibroblasts, Syndecan-4 is required for integrin-mediated adhesion and signalling on FN and contributes to cell migration in vitro and to wound healing in vivo (89,148,149). Moreover, Syndecan-4 signalling regulates the differential recycling of αVβ3 and α5β1 integrins, which guides cell adhesion dynamics and migration mode (54). Cumulatively, co-receptors and the glycocalyx provide an important layer of regulation for IACs, fine-tuning their responses to extracellular cues.

Integrin adhesion complexes serve as platforms for ECM remodeling

Stromal cells constantly secrete, deposit and remodel ECM molecules. The properties of the resulting ECM (molecular composition, topology and bulk mechanical properties) then guide the migration behaviour of other cells. For instance, early work found that cancer-associated fibroblasts (CAFs) assemble tracks composed of thick collagen fibres and FN, which facilitates cancer cell invasion into a 3D ECM (150). Furthermore, these tracks have established significance for collective migration, where integrins play an essential role in this invasive progression (151). ECM generated and remodelled by CAFs is also generally stiffer, which drives both cancer cell invasion (152) and proliferation (80). Furthermore, this can also provide a source of energy for cancer cells during starvation or stressful conditions (153).

Mechanistically, all the pathways which regulate IACs are likely to be implicated in ECM deposition and remodelling. One of the best understood examples is the assembly of FN fibrils, which is a multistep α5β1-dependent process and requires cells to apply mechanical force. Soluble FN molecules are first captured by α5β1 integrins in talin-rich FAs at the cell periphery. α5β1 integrins then move inward to leave the FA and populate fibrillar adhesions. During this translocation, the mechanical forces exerted by α5β1 integrin cause a conformational change in FN that exposes self-association sites and allows fibril elongation and maturation (154). It is therefore not surprising that pathways regulating integrin trafficking and activation also contribute to FN remodelling. For instance, modulation of integrin activity via tensins has been implicated in FN fibre formation (39). As another example, FN fibrillogenesis is also strongly modulated by the composition of the underlying ECM (155). In endothelial cells, active α5β1 integrin is recycled together with FN and this process regulates FN secretion and fibrillogenesis (156). The tightly regulated delivery of ECM molecules is not limited to FN as, for instance, collagen type X was recently shown to be secreted near FA (157). Collectively, integrins play an essential role in the assembly of the ECM by stromal cells, laying the groundwork for multicellular tissue formation.

Future perspectives

Given the important contribution of IAC to cell adhesion and migration, it is not surprising that integrins and integrin-associated molecules are considered to be attractive drug targets, where anti-integrin therapies are already used in the clinic to treat clotting disorders, multiple sclerosis and inflammatory bowel disease (109,135,158). However, current therapies aimed at targeting cancer or fibrosis have been met with disappointment. This may be partially explained by our limited in situ understanding of IAC structure and function. To address this, we are seeing advances in intravital microscopy and targeted mass spectrometry, using endogenously tagged fluorescent proteins or biotin ligases, that are providing high resolution characterisation of both the spatiotemporal organization and molecular composition of IACs in a more physiologically relevant scenario (159–161).

There remains an important place for 2D studies however, where reductionist scenarios are necessary to initially deconvolve the sheer complexity of these structures, which contain hundreds of proteins (50). Importantly, these signaling events (mechanical and biochemical) are transduced and coordinated within an IAC that can contain several integrin heterodimers, all binding to a complex mixture of ECM. In order to tease out the individual functions of each component, as well as the complex feedback loops and compensatory mechanisms involved, it is likely that mathematical modeling (162) or deep learning approaches will be required. As we increase our understanding of IACs, their complexity continues to baffle even the most sensitive experimental set ups. Moving forward, we expect to see multidisciplinary approaches tackle this complexity from many angles, to the eventual goal of understanding the complete structure and function of IACs, and to be able to apply this knowledge for therapeutic benefit.

Summary points

- Cell migration displays a high level of plasticity and a broad range of cell-ECM dependencies, with many cell types applying different modes depending on the situation
- IACs provide a bridge between the ECM and intracellular signalling cascades
- Integrin clustering leads to the formation of specialised adhesion complexes and guides directional cell migration
- Fine-tuning of IAC formation and stability takes multiple forms, including mechanical feedback, trafficking and co-receptor modulation of ligand affinities
- IACs facilitate stromal remodelling of the ECM to guide migratory behaviour for multicellular tissue development

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Dr. Hellyeh Hamidi, Dr. Hussein Al-Akhrass, Aleksi Isomursu and Dr. Jonathan D Humphries for critical reading of the manuscript.

Funding information

This work has been supported by the Academy of Finland (G.J.), by the Sigrid Juselius Foundation (G.J.) and by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 841973 (J.R.W.C.).

Author contributions

Writing – Original Draft, G.J. and J.R.W.C; Writing – Review and Editing, G.J., J.R.W.C.; Visualization, G.J. and J.R.W.C.;

References

1. Shafqat-Abbasi H, Kowalewski JM, Kiss A, Gong X, Hernandez-Varas P, Berge U, et al. An analysis toolbox to explore mesenchymal migration heterogeneity reveals adaptive switching between distinct modes. Ivaska J, editor. eLife. 2016 Jan 29;5:e11384.
2. Jacquemet G, Paatero I, Carisey AF, Padzik A, Orange JS, Hamidi H, et al. FiloQuant reveals increased filopodia density during breast cancer progression. J Cell Biol. 2017 Aug 1;jcb.201704045.
3. Petrie RJ, Yamada KM. Multiple mechanisms of 3D migration: the origins of plasticity. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 2016 Oct 1;42:7–12.
4. van Helvert S, Storm C, Friedl P. Mechanoreciprocity in cell migration. Nat Cell Biol. 2018;20(1):8–20.
5. Ilina O, Campanello L, Gritsenko PG, Vullings M, Wang C, Bult P, et al. Intravital microscopy of collective invasion plasticity in breast cancer. Dis Model Mech. 2018 Jan 1;dmm.034330.
6. Alieva M, Leidgens V, Riemenschneider MJ, Klein CA, Hau P, Rheenen J van. Intravital imaging of glioma border morphology reveals distinctive cellular dynamics and contribution to tumor cell invasion. Sci Rep. 2019 Feb 14;9(1):2054.
7. Weigelin B, Bakker G-J, Friedl P. Intravital third harmonic generation microscopy of collective melanoma cell invasion. IntraVital. 2012 Jul 1;1(1):32–43.
8. Jacquemet G, Green DM, Bridgewater RE, von Kriegsheim A, Humphries MJ, Norman JC, et al. RCP-driven α5β1 recycling suppresses Rac and promotes RhoA activity via the RacGAP1-IQGAP1 complex. J Cell Biol. 2013 Sep 16;202(6):917–35.
9. Petrie RJ, Harlin HM, Korsak LIT, Yamada KM. Activating the nuclear piston mechanism of 3D migration in tumor cells. J Cell Biol. 2017 Jan 2;216(1):93–100.
10. Sanz-Moreno V, Gadea G, Ahn J, Paterson H, Marra P, Pinner S, et al. Rac activation and inactivation control plasticity of tumor cell movement. Cell. 2008 Oct 31;135(3):510–23.
11. Butler KL, Ambravaneswaran V, Agrawal N, Bilodeau M, Toner M, Tompkins RG, et al. Burn injury reduces neutrophil directional migration speed in microfluidic devices. PloS One. 2010 Jul 30;5(7):e11921.
12. Bergert M, Erzberger A, Desai RA, Aspalter IM, Oates AC, Charras G, et al. Force transmission during adhesion-independent migration. Nat Cell Biol. 2015 Apr;17(4):524–9.
13. O'Neill PR, Castillo-Badillo JA, Meshik X, Kalyanaraman V, Melgarejo K, Gautam N. Membrane Flow Drives an Adhesion-Independent Amoeboid Cell Migration Mode. Dev Cell. 2018 Jul 2;46(1):9-22.e4.
14. Lämmermann T, Bader BL, Monkley SJ, Worbs T, Wedlich-Söldner R, Hirsch K, et al. Rapid leukocyte migration by integrin-independent flowing and squeezing. Nature. 2008 May;453(7191):51–5.
15. Liu Y-J, Le Berre M, Lautenschlaeger F, Maiuri P, Callan-Jones A, Heuzé M, et al. Confinement and low adhesion induce fast amoeboid migration of slow mesenchymal cells. Cell. 2015 Feb 12;160(4):659–72.
16. Huttenlocher A, Horwitz AR. Integrins in Cell Migration. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2011 Sep 1;3(9):a005074.
17. Hynes RO, Naba A. Overview of the matrisome--an inventory of extracellular matrix constituents and functions. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2012 Jan 1;4(1):a004903.
18. Socovich AM, Naba A. The cancer matrisome: From comprehensive characterization to biomarker discovery. Semin Cell Dev Biol. 2019 May;89:157–66.
19. Mayorca-Guiliani AE, Madsen CD, Cox TR, Horton ER, Venning FA, Erler JT. ISDoT: in situ decellularization of tissues for high-resolution imaging and proteomic analysis of native extracellular matrix. Nat Med. 2017 Jul;23(7):890–8.

20. Hynes RO. Integrins : Bidirectional , Allosteric Signaling Machines In their roles as major adhesion receptors , integrins. 2002;110(Table 1):673–687.
21. Legate KR, Wickström SA, Fässler R. Genetic and cell biological analysis of integrin outside-in signaling. Genes Dev. 2009 Feb 15;23(4):397–418.
22. Moreno-Layseca P, Icha J, Hamidi H, Ivaska J. Integrin trafficking in cells and tissues. Nat Cell Biol. 2019 Feb;21(2):122.
23. Humphries JD, Byron A, Humphries MJ. Integrin ligands at a glance. J Cell Sci. 2006 Oct 1;119(Pt 19):3901–3.
24. Bharadwaj M, Strohmeyer N, Colo GP, Helenius J, Beerenwinkel N, Schiller HB, et al. αV-class integrins exert dual roles on α5β1 integrins to strengthen adhesion to fibronectin. Nat Commun. 2017 Jan 27;8:14348.
25. Schiller HB, Hermann M-R, Polleux J, Vignaud T, Zanivan S, Friedel CC, et al. β1- and αv-class integrins cooperate to regulate myosin II during rigidity sensing of fibronectin-based microenvironments. Nat Cell Biol. 2013 Jun;15(6):625–36.
26. Askari JA, Buckley PA, Mould AP, Humphries MJ. Linking integrin conformation to function. J Cell Sci. 2009 Jan;122(Pt 2):165–170.
27. Shattil SJ, Kim C, Ginsberg MH. The final steps of integrin activation: the end game. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2010 Apr;11(4):288–300.
28. Sun Z, Costell M, Fässler R. Integrin activation by talin, kindlin and mechanical forces. Nat Cell Biol. 2019 Jan;21(1):25.
29. Wang J, Dong X, Zhao B, Li J, Lu C, Springer TA. Atypical interactions of integrin αVβ8 with pro-TGF-β1. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2017 May 23;114(21):E4168–74.
30. Miyazaki N, Iwasaki K, Takagi J. A systematic survey of conformational states in β1 and β4 integrins using negative-stain electron microscopy. J Cell Sci. 2018 May 15;131(10):jcs216754.
31. Byron A, Humphries JD, Askari JA, Craig SE, Mould AP, Humphries MJ. Anti-integrin monoclonal antibodies. J Cell Sci. 2009 Nov;122(Pt 22):4009–4011.
32. Jones JCR, Kam CY, Harmon RM, Woychek AV, Hopkinson SB, Green KJ. Intermediate Filaments and the Plasma Membrane. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2017 Jan 1;9(1):a025866.
33. Veillat V, Spuul P, Daubon T, Egaña I, Kramer Ij, Génot E. Podosomes: Multipurpose organelles? Int J Biochem Cell Biol. 2015 Aug 1;65:52–60.
34. Eddy RJ, Weidmann MD, Sharma VP, Condeelis JS. Tumor Cell Invadopodia: Invasive Protrusions that Orchestrate Metastasis. Trends Cell Biol. 2017;27(8):595–607.
35. Dieckmann NMG, Frazer GL, Asano Y, Stinchcombe JC, Griffiths GM. The cytotoxic T lymphocyte immune synapse at a glance. J Cell Sci. 2016 Aug 1;129(15):2881–6.
36. Zaidel-Bar R, Ballestrem C, Kam Z, Geiger B. Early molecular events in the assembly of matrix adhesions at the leading edge of migrating cells. J Cell Sci. 2003 Nov 15;116(22):4605–13.
37. Zaidel-Bar R, Cohen M, Addadi L, Geiger B. Hierarchical assembly of cell-matrix adhesion complexes. Biochem Soc Trans. 2004 Jun;32(Pt3):416–20.
38. Jacquemet G, Stubb A, Saup R, Miihkinen M, Kremneva E, Hamidi H, et al. Filopodome Mapping Identifies p130Cas as a Mechanosensitive Regulator of Filopodia Stability. Curr Biol. 2019 Jan 21;29(2):202-216.e7.
39. Georgiadou M, Lilja J, Jacquemet G, Guzmán C, Rafaeva M, Alibert C, et al. AMPK negatively regulates tensin-dependent integrin activity. J Cell Biol. 2017 Mar 11;jcb.201609066.
40. Rainero E, Howe JD, Caswell PT, Jamieson NB, Anderson K, Critchley DR, et al. Ligand-Occupied Integrin Internalization Links Nutrient Signaling to Invasive Migration. Cell Rep. 2015 Jan 20;10(3):398–413.

41. Kanchanawong P, Shtengel G, Pasapera AM, Ramko EB, Davidson MW, Hess HF, et al. Nanoscale architecture of integrin-based cell adhesions. Nature. 2010 Nov 25;468(7323):580–4.
42. Case LB, Baird MA, Shtengel G, Campbell SL, Hess HF, Davidson MW, et al. Molecular mechanism of vinculin activation and nano-scale spatial organization in focal adhesions. Nat Cell Biol. 2015 Jul;17(7):880–92.
43. Liu J, Wang Y, Goh WI, Goh H, Baird MA, Ruehland S, et al. Talin determines the nanoscale architecture of focal adhesions. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2015 Sep 1;112(35):E4864–73.
44. Stubb A, Guzmán C, Närvä E, Aaron J, Chew T-L, Saari M, et al. Superresolution architecture of pluripotency guarding adhesions. bioRxiv. 2018 Aug 28;402305.
45. Zaidel-Bar R, Geiger B. The switchable integrin adhesome. J Cell Sci. 2010 May 1;123(Pt 9):1385–8.
46. Zaidel-Bar R, Itzkovitz S, Ma'ayan A, Iyengar R, Geiger B. Functional atlas of the integrin adhesome. Nat Cell Biol. 2007;9(8):858.
47. Humphries JD, Byron A, Bass MD, Craig SE, Pinney JW, Knight D, et al. Proteomic analysis of integrin-associated complexes identifies RCC2 as a dual regulator of Rac1 and Arf6. Sci Signal. 2009;2(87):ra51.
48. Schiller HB, Friedel CC, Boulegue C, Fässler R. Quantitative proteomics of the integrin adhesome show a myosin II-dependent recruitment of LIM domain proteins. EMBO Rep. 2011 Mar;12(3):259–66.
49. Kuo J-C, Han X, Hsiao C-T, Yates JR, Waterman CM. Analysis of the myosin-II-responsive focal adhesion proteome reveals a role for β-Pix in negative regulation of focal adhesion maturation. Nat Cell Biol. 2011 Apr;13(4):383–93.
50. Horton ER, Byron A, Askari JA, Ng DHJ, Millon-Frémillon A, Robertson J, et al. Definition of a consensus integrin adhesome and its dynamics during adhesion complex assembly and disassembly. Nat Cell Biol. 2015 Dec;17(12):1577–87.
51. Byron A, Askari JA, Humphries JD, Jacquemet G, Koper EJ, Warwood S, et al. A proteomic approach reveals integrin activation state-dependent control of microtubule cortical targeting. Nat Commun. 2015;6:6135.
52. Horton ER, Humphries JD, James J, Jones MC, Askari JA, Humphries MJ. The integrin adhesome network at a glance. J Cell Sci. 2016 Jan 1;jcs.192054.
53. Jacquemet G, Morgan MR, Byron A, Humphries JD, Choi CK, Chen CS, et al. Rac1 is deactivated at integrin activation sites through an IQGAP1-filamin-A-RacGAP1 pathway. J Cell Sci. 2013 Jul 10;126(18):4121–35.
54. Morgan MR, Hamidi H, Bass MD, Warwood S, Ballestrem C, Humphries MJ. Syndecan-4 Phosphorylation Is a Control Point for Integrin Recycling. Dev Cell. 2013 Mar;24(5):472–85.
55. Ezratty EJ, Partridge MA, Gundersen GG. Microtubule-induced focal adhesion disassembly is mediated by dynamin and focal adhesion kinase. Nat Cell Biol. 2005 Jun;7(6):581–90.
56. Rafiq NBM, Nishimura Y, Plotnikov SV, Thiagarajan V, Zhang Z, Shi S, et al. A mechano-signalling network linking microtubules, myosin IIA filaments and integrin-based adhesions. Nat Mater. 2019 Jun;18(6):638.
57. Bouchet BP, Gough RE, Ammon Y-C, van de Willige D, Post H, Jacquemet G, et al. Talin-KANK1 interaction controls the recruitment of cortical microtubule stabilizing complexes to focal adhesions. Elife. 2016;5:e18124.
58. Franco SJ, Rodgers MA, Perrin BJ, Han J, Bennin DA, Critchley DR, et al. Calpain-mediated proteolysis of talin regulates adhesion dynamics. Nat Cell Biol. 2004 Oct;6(10):977–83.
59. Saxena M, Changede R, Hone J, Wolfenson H, Sheetz MP. Force-Induced Calpain Cleavage of Talin Is Critical for Growth, Adhesion Development, and Rigidity Sensing. Nano Lett. 2017 13;17(12):7242–51.
60. Chan KT, Bennin DA, Huttenlocher A. Regulation of Adhesion Dynamics by Calpain-mediated Proteolysis of Focal Adhesion Kinase (FAK). J Biol Chem. 2010 Apr 9;285(15):11418–26.

61. Lock JG, Jones MC, Askari JA, Gong X, Oddone A, Olofsson H, et al. Reticular adhesions are a distinct class of cell-matrix adhesions that mediate attachment during mitosis. Nat Cell Biol. 2018;20(11):1290–302.
62. Ezratty EJ, Bertaux C, Marcantonio EE, Gundersen GG. Clathrin mediates integrin endocytosis for focal adhesion disassembly in migrating cells. J Cell Biol. 2009 Nov 30;187(5):733–47.
63. Tsunoyama TA, Watanabe Y, Goto J, Naito K, Kasai RS, Suzuki KGN, et al. Super-long single-molecule tracking reveals dynamic-anchorage-induced integrin function. Nat Chem Biol. 2018 May;14(5):497.
64. Rossier O, Octeau V, Sibarita J-B, Leduc C, Tessier B, Nair D, et al. Integrins β1 and β3 exhibit distinct dynamic nanoscale organizations inside focal adhesions. Nat Cell Biol. 2012 Oct;14(10):1057–67.
65. Kubow KE, Horwitz AR. Reducing background fluorescence reveals adhesions in 3D matrices. Nat Cell Biol. 2011 Jan;13(1):3–5; author reply 5-7.
66. Doyle AD, Yamada KM. Mechanosensing via cell-matrix adhesions in 3D microenvironments. Exp Cell Res. 2016 Apr 10;343(1):60–6.
67. van Geemen D, Smeets MWJ, van Stalborch A-MD, Woerdeman LAE, Daemen MJAP, Hordijk PL, et al. F-actin-anchored focal adhesions distinguish endothelial phenotypes of human arteries and veins. Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol. 2014 Sep;34(9):2059–67.
68. Gunawan F, Gentile A, Fukuda R, Tsedeke AT, Jiménez-Amilburu V, Ramadass R, et al. Focal adhesions are essential to drive zebrafish heart valve morphogenesis. J Cell Biol. 2019 Mar 4;218(3):1039–54.
69. Pines M, Das R, Ellis SJ, Morin A, Czerniecki S, Yuan L, et al. Mechanical force regulates integrin turnover in Drosophila in vivo. Nat Cell Biol. 2012 Sep;14(9):935–43.
70. Green HJ, Griffiths AG, Ylänne J, Brown NH. Novel functions for integrin-associated proteins revealed by analysis of myofibril attachment in Drosophila. Schnorrer F, Stainier DY, editors. eLife. 2018 Jul 20;7:e35783.
71. Klapholz B, Herbert SL, Wellmann J, Johnson R, Parsons M, Brown NH. Alternative Mechanisms for Talin to Mediate Integrin Function. Curr Biol. 2015 Mar 30;25(7):847–57.
72. Elkhatib N, Bresteau E, Baschieri F, Rioja AL, Niel G van, Vassilopoulos S, et al. Tubular clathrin/AP-2 lattices pinch collagen fibers to support 3D cell migration. Science. 2017 Jun 16;356(6343):eaal4713.
73. Zuidema A, Wang W, Kreft M, Molder L te, Hoekman L, Bleijerveld OB, et al. Mechanisms of integrin αVβ5 clustering in flat clathrin lattices. J Cell Sci. 2018 Jan 1;jcs.221317.
74. Bucher D, Mukenhirn M, Sochacki KA, Saharuka V, Huck C, Zambarda C, et al. Focal adhesion-generated cues in extracellular matrix regulate cell migration by local induction of clathrin-coated plaques. bioRxiv. 2018 Dec 11;493114.
75. Lock JG, Baschieri F, Jones MC, Humphries JD, Montagnac G, Strömblad S, et al. Clathrin-containing adhesion complexes. J Cell Biol. 2019;in press.
76. Baschieri F, Dayot S, Elkhatib N, Ly N, Capmany A, Schauer K, et al. Frustrated endocytosis controls contractility-independent mechanotransduction at clathrin-coated structures. Nat Commun. 2018 Sep 20;9(1):3825.
77. Franck A, Lainé J, Moulay G, Lemerle E, Trichet M, Gentil C, et al. Clathrin plaques and associated actin anchor intermediate filaments in skeletal muscle. Mol Biol Cell. 2019 Jan 2;30(5):579–90.
78. Charras G, Sahai E. Physical influences of the extracellular environment on cell migration. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2014 Dec;15(12):813–24.
79. Cho S, Irianto J, Discher DE. Mechanosensing by the nucleus: From pathways to scaling relationships. J Cell Biol. 2017 Feb 1;216(2):305–15.

80. Kaukonen R, Mai A, Georgiadou M, Saari M, De Franceschi N, Betz T, et al. Normal stroma suppresses cancer cell proliferation via mechanosensitive regulation of JMJD1a-mediated transcription. Nat Commun. 2016 04;7:12237.
81. Mason DE, Collins JM, Dawahare JH, Nguyen TD, Lin Y, Voytik-Harbin SL, et al. YAP and TAZ limit cytoskeletal and focal adhesion maturation to enable persistent cell motility. J Cell Biol. 2019 Apr 1;218(4):1369–89.
82. Graham DM, Andersen T, Sharek L, Uzer G, Rothenberg K, Hoffman BD, et al. Enucleated cells reveal differential roles of the nucleus in cell migration, polarity, and mechanotransduction. J Cell Biol. 2018 05;217(3):895–914.
83. Renkawitz J, Kopf A, Stopp J, Vries I de, Driscoll MK, Merrin J, et al. Nuclear positioning facilitates amoeboid migration along the path of least resistance. Nature. 2019 Apr;568(7753):546.
84. Robertson J, Jacquemet G, Byron A, Jones MC, Warwood S, Selley JN, et al. Defining the phospho-adhesome through the phosphoproteomic analysis of integrin signalling. Nat Commun. 2015;6:6265.
85. Nobis M, McGhee EJ, Morton JP, Schwarz JP, Karim SA, Quinn J, et al. Intravital FLIM-FRET imaging reveals dasatinib-induced spatial control of src in pancreatic cancer. Cancer Res. 2013 Aug 1;73(15):4674–86.
86. Humphries JD, Chastney MR, Askari JA, Humphries MJ. Signal transduction via integrin adhesion complexes. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 2019 Feb;56:14–21.
87. Strohmeyer N, Bharadwaj M, Costell M, Fässler R, Müller DJ. Fibronectin-bound α5β1 integrins sense load and signal to reinforce adhesion in less than a second. Nat Mater. 2017 Dec;16(12):1262–70.
88. Machacek M, Hodgson L, Welch C, Elliott H, Pertz O, Nalbant P, et al. Coordination of Rho GTPase activities during cell protrusion. Nature. 2009 Aug;461(7260):99–103.
89. Bass MD, Roach KA, Morgan MR, Mostafavi-Pour Z, Schoen T, Muramatsu T, et al. Syndecan-4-dependent Rac1 regulation determines directional migration in response to the extracellular matrix. J Cell Biol. 2007 May;177(3):527–38.
90. Lawson CD, Burridge K. The on-off relationship of Rho and Rac during integrin-mediated adhesion and cell migration. Small GTPases. 2014 Mar 7.
91. Danen EHJ, Sonneveld P, Brakebusch C, Fassler R, Sonnenberg A. The fibronectin-binding integrins alpha5beta1 and alphavbeta3 differentially modulate RhoA-GTP loading, organization of cell matrix adhesions, and fibronectin fibrillogenesis. J Cell Biol. 2002 Dec 23;159(6):1071–86.
92. White DP, Caswell PT, Norman JC. alpha v beta3 and alpha5beta1 integrin recycling pathways dictate downstream Rho kinase signaling to regulate persistent cell migration. J Cell Biol. 2007 May 7;177(3):515–25.
93. Bangasser BL, Shamsan GA, Chan CE, Opoku KN, Tüzel E, Schlichtmann BW, et al. Shifting the optimal stiffness for cell migration. Nat Commun. 2017 May 22;8:15313.
94. Swaminathan V, Kalappurakkal JM, Mehta SB, Nordenfelt P, Moore TI, Koga N, et al. Actin retrograde flow actively aligns and orients ligand-engaged integrins in focal adhesions. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2017 Oct 3;114(40):10648–53.
95. Nordenfelt P, Moore TI, Mehta SB, Kalappurakkal JM, Swaminathan V, Koga N, et al. Direction of actin flow dictates integrin LFA-1 orientation during leukocyte migration. Nat Commun. 2017 11;8(1):2047.
96. Elosegui-Artola A, Trepat X, Roca-Cusachs P. Control of Mechanotransduction by Molecular Clutch Dynamics. Trends Cell Biol. 2018 May 1;28(5):356–67.
97. Kechagia JZ, Ivaska J, Roca-Cusachs P. Integrins as biomechanical sensors of the microenvironment. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2019 Jun 10;1.

98. Kumar A, Ouyang M, Dries KV den, McGhee EJ, Tanaka K, Anderson MD, et al. Talin tension sensor reveals novel features of focal adhesion force transmission and mechanosensitivity. J Cell Biol. 2016 May 9;213(3):371–83.
99. Nordenfelt P, Elliott HL, Springer TA. Coordinated integrin activation by actin-dependent force during T-cell migration. Nat Commun. 2016 10;7:13119.
100. Sawada Y, Tamada M, Dubin-Thaler BJ, Cherniavskaya O, Sakai R, Tanaka S, et al. Force Sensing by Extension of the Src Family Kinase Substrate, p130Cas. Cell. 2006 Dec 1;127(5):1015–26.
101. Yao M, Goult BT, Klapholz B, Hu X, Toseland CP, Guo Y, et al. The mechanical response of talin. Nat Commun. 2016 Jul 7;7:11966.
102. Goult BT, Yan J, Schwartz MA. Talin as a mechanosensitive signaling hub. J Cell Biol. 2018 Nov 5;217(11):3776–84.
103. Yao M, Goult BT, Chen H, Cong P, Sheetz MP, Yan J. Mechanical activation of vinculin binding to talin locks talin in an unfolded conformation. Sci Rep. 2014 Apr 9;4:4610.
104. Kalappurakkal JM, Anilkumar AA, Patra C, Zanten TS van, Sheetz MP, Mayor S. Integrin Mechano-chemical Signaling Generates Plasma Membrane Nanodomains that Promote Cell Spreading. Cell. 2019 May 16.
105. Lampi MC, Reinhart-King CA. Targeting extracellular matrix stiffness to attenuate disease: From molecular mechanisms to clinical trials. Sci Transl Med. 2018 Jan 3;10(422):eaao0475.
106. Hirata E, Girotti MR, Viros A, Hooper S, Spencer-Dene B, Matsuda M, et al. Intravital imaging reveals how BRAF inhibition generates drug-tolerant microenvironments with high integrin β1/FAK signaling. Cancer Cell. 2015 Apr 13;27(4):574–88.
107. Vennin C, Chin VT, Warren SC, Lucas MC, Herrmann D, Magenau A, et al. Transient tissue priming via ROCK inhibition uncouples pancreatic cancer progression, sensitivity to chemotherapy, and metastasis. Sci Transl Med. 2017 05;9(384).
108. Bouvard D, Pouwels J, De Franceschi N, Ivaska J. Integrin inactivators: balancing cellular functions in vitro and in vivo. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2013 Jul;14(7):430–42.
109. Hamidi H, Ivaska J. Every step of the way: integrins in cancer progression and metastasis. Nat Rev Cancer. 2018 Sep;18(9):533.
110. Haage A, Goodwin K, Whitewood A, Camp D, Bogutz A, Turner CT, et al. Talin Autoinhibition Regulates Cell-ECM Adhesion Dynamics and Wound Healing In Vivo. Cell Rep. 2018 Nov 27;25(9):2401-2416.e5.
111. Cram EJ, Clark SG, Schwarzbauer JE. Talin loss-of-function uncovers roles in cell contractility and migration in C. elegans. J Cell Sci. 2003 Oct 1;116(Pt 19):3871–8.
112. Brown NH, Gregory SL, Rickoll WL, Fessler LI, Prout M, White RAH, et al. Talin is essential for integrin function in Drosophila. Dev Cell. 2002 Oct;3(4):569–79.
113. López-Ceballos P, Herrera-Reyes AD, Coombs D, Tanentzapf G. In vivo regulation of integrin turnover by outside-in activation. J Cell Sci. 2016 01;129(15):2912–24.
114. Morse EM, Brahme NN, Calderwood DA. Integrin cytoplasmic tail interactions. Biochemistry. 2014 Feb 11;53(5):810–20.
115. Gupton SL, Riquelme D, Hughes-Alford SK, Tadros J, Rudina SS, Hynes RO, et al. Mena binds α5 integrin directly and modulates α5β1 function. J Cell Biol. 2012 Aug 20;198(4):657–76.
116. Oudin MJ, Jonas O, Kosciuk T, Broye LC, Guido BC, Wyckoff J, et al. Tumor Cell-Driven Extracellular Matrix Remodeling Drives Haptotaxis during Metastatic Progression. Cancer Discov. 2016;6(5):516–31.
117. Paul NR, Jacquemet G, Caswell PT. Endocytic Trafficking of Integrins in Cell Migration. Curr Biol. 2015;25(22):R1092–R1105.

118. Arjonen A, Alanko J, Veltel S, Ivaska J. Distinct recycling of active and inactive β1 integrins. Traffic Cph Den. 2012 Jan.
119. Alanko J, Mai A, Jacquemet G, Schauer K, Kaukonen R, Saari M, et al. Integrin endosomal signalling suppresses anoikis. Nat Cell Biol. 2015 Nov;17(11):1412–21.
120. Nader GPF, Ezratty EJ, Gundersen GG. FAK, talin and PIPKIγ regulate endocytosed integrin activation to polarize focal adhesion assembly. Nat Cell Biol. 2016 May;18(5):491–503.
121. Steinberg F, Heesom KJ, Bass MD, Cullen PJ. SNX17 protects integrins from degradation by sorting between lysosomal and recycling pathways. J Cell Biol. 2012 Apr 16;197(2):219–30.
122. Böttcher RT, Stremmel C, Meves A, Meyer H, Widmaier M, Tseng H-Y, et al. Sorting nexin 17 prevents lysosomal degradation of β1 integrins by binding to the β1-integrin tail. Nat Cell Biol. 2012 May 6;14(6):584–92.
123. Jacquemet G, Humphries MJ, Caswell PT. Role of adhesion receptor trafficking in 3D cell migration. Curr Opin Cell Biol. 2013 Oct;25(5):627–32.
124. Shafaq-Zadah M, Gomes-Santos CS, Bardin S, Maiuri P, Maurin M, Iranzo J, et al. Persistent cell migration and adhesion rely on retrograde transport of β(1) integrin. Nat Cell Biol. 2016 Jan;18(1):54–64.
125. De Franceschi N, Arjonen A, Elkhatib N, Denessiouk K, Wrobel AG, Wilson TA, et al. Selective integrin endocytosis is driven by interactions between the integrin α-chain and AP2. Nat Struct Mol Biol. 2016 Feb;23(2):172–9.
126. Caswell PT, Chan M, Lindsay AJ, McCaffrey MW, Boettiger D, Norman JC. Rab-coupling protein coordinates recycling of alpha5beta1 integrin and EGFR1 to promote cell migration in 3D microenvironments. J Cell Biol. 2008 Oct 6;183(1):143–55.
127. Muller PAJ, Caswell PT, Doyle B, Iwanicki MP, Tan EH, Karim S, et al. Mutant p53 drives invasion by promoting integrin recycling. Cell. 2009 Dec 24;139(7):1327–41.
128. Lakoduk AM, Roudot P, Mettlen M, Grossman HM, Schmid SL, Chen P-H. Mutant p53 amplifies a dynamin-1/APPL1 endosome feedback loop that regulates recycling and migration. J Cell Biol. 2019 May 2;jcb.201810183.
129. Paul NR, Allen JL, Chapman A, Morlan-Mairal M, Zindy E, Jacquemet G, et al. α5β1 integrin recycling promotes Arp2/3-independent cancer cell invasion via the formin FHOD3. J Cell Biol. 2015 Sep 14;210(6):1013–31.
130. Timpson P, McGhee EJ, Morton JP, von Kriegsheim A, Schwarz JP, Karim SA, et al. Spatial regulation of RhoA activity during pancreatic cancer cell invasion driven by mutant p53. Cancer Res. 2011 Feb 1;71(3):747–57.
131. Caswell PT, Spence HJ, Parsons M, White DP, Clark K, Cheng KW, et al. Rab25 Associates with α5β1 Integrin to Promote Invasive Migration in 3D Microenvironments. Dev Cell. 2007 Oct 9;13(4):496–510.
132. Dozynkiewicz MA, Jamieson NB, MacPherson I, Grindlay J, van den Berghe PVE, von Thun A, et al. Rab25 and CLIC3 Collaborate to Promote Integrin Recycling from Late Endosomes/Lysosomes and Drive Cancer Progression. Dev Cell. 2012 Jan 17;22(1):131–45.
133. Cheng KW, Lahad JP, Kuo W, Lapuk A, Yamada K, Auersperg N, et al. The RAB25 small GTPase determines aggressiveness of ovarian and breast cancers. Nat Med. 2004 Nov;10(11):1251.
134. Amornphimoltham P, Rechache K, Thompson J, Masedunskas A, Leelahavanichkul K, Patel V, et al. Rab25 regulates invasion and metastasis in head and neck cancer. Clin Cancer Res. 2013 Jan 22;clincanres.2858.2012.
135. Raab-Westphal S, Marshall JF, Goodman SL. Integrins as Therapeutic Targets: Successes and Cancers. Cancers. 2017 Aug 23;9(9).

136. Afratis NA, Nikitovic D, Multhaupt HAB, Theocharis AD, Couchman JR, Karamanos NK. Syndecans - key regulators of cell signaling and biological functions. FEBS J. 2017;284(1):27–41.
137. Valdembri D, Caswell PT, Anderson KI, Schwarz JP, König I, Astanina E, et al. Neuropilin-1/GIPC1 Signaling Regulates α5β1 Integrin Traffic and Function in Endothelial Cells. PLOS Biol. 2009 Jan 27;7(1):e1000025.
138. Feral CC, Nishiya N, Fenczik CA, Stuhlmann H, Slepak M, Ginsberg MH. CD98hc (SLC3A2) mediates integrin signaling. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2005;102(2):355–360.
139. Bajaj J, Konuma T, Lytle NK, Kwon HY, Ablack JN, Cantor JM, et al. CD98-Mediated Adhesive Signaling Enables the Establishment and Propagation of Acute Myelogenous Leukemia. Cancer Cell. 2016 Nov 14;30(5):792–805.
140. Streuli CH, Akhtar N. Signal co-operation between integrins and other receptor systems. Biochem J. 2009 Mar 15;418(3):491–506.
141. Ivaska J, Heino J. Cooperation between integrins and growth factor receptors in signaling and endocytosis. Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol. 2011 Nov 10;27:291–320.
142. Paul NR, Thomas JR, Maldonado H, Wolanska KI, Koper EJ, Humphries JD, et al. Eps8 is a convergence point integrating EGFR and integrin trafficking and crosstalk. bioRxiv. 2018 Sep 4;405043.
143. McEver RP. Selectins: initiators of leucocyte adhesion and signalling at the vascular wall. Cardiovasc Res. 2015 Aug 1;107(3):331–9.
144. Tarbell JM, Cancel LM. The glycocalyx and its significance in human medicine. J Intern Med. 2016;280(1):97–113.
145. Hakanpaa L, Sipila T, Leppanen V-M, Gautam P, Nurmi H, Jacquemet G, et al. Endothelial destabilization by angiopoietin-2 via integrin β1 activation. Nat Commun. 2015;6:5962.
146. Paszek MJ, DuFort CC, Rossier O, Bainer R, Mouw JK, Godula K, et al. The cancer glycocalyx mechanically primes integrin-mediated growth and survival. Nature. 2014 Jul 17;511(7509):319–25.
147. Barnes JM, Kaushik S, Bainer RO, Sa JK, Woods EC, Kai F, et al. A tension-mediated glycocalyx-integrin feedback loop promotes mesenchymal-like glioblastoma. Nat Cell Biol. 2018;20(10):1203–14.
148. Echtermeyer F, Streit M, Wilcox-Adelman S, Saoncella S, Denhez F, Detmar M, et al. Delayed wound repair and impaired angiogenesis in mice lacking syndecan-4. J Clin Invest. 2001 Jan 15;107(2):R9–14.
149. Ishiguro K, Kadomatsu K, Kojima T, Muramatsu H, Tsuzuki S, Nakamura E, et al. Syndecan-4 Deficiency Impairs Focal Adhesion Formation Only under Restricted Conditions. J Biol Chem. 2000 Feb 25;275(8):5249–52.
150. Gaggioli C, Hooper S, Hidalgo-Carcedo C, Grosse R, Marshall JF, Harrington K, et al. Fibroblast-led collective invasion of carcinoma cells with differing roles for RhoGTPases in leading and following cells. Nat Cell Biol. 2007 Dec;9(12):1392–400.
151. Gopal S, Veracini L, Grall D, Butori C, Schaub S, Audebert S, et al. Fibronectin-guided migration of carcinoma collectives. Nat Commun. 2017 Jan 19;8:14105.
152. Goetz JG, Minguet S, Navarro-Lérida I, Lazcano JJ, Samaniego R, Calvo E, et al. Biomechanical remodeling of the microenvironment by stromal caveolin-1 favors tumor invasion and metastasis. Cell. 2011 Jul 8;146(1):148–63.
153. Muranen T, Iwanicki MP, Curry NL, Hwang J, DuBois CD, Coloff JL, et al. Starved epithelial cells uptake extracellular matrix for survival. Nat Commun. 2017 10;8:13989.
154. Schwarzbauer JE, DeSimone DW. Fibronectins, Their Fibrillogenesis, and In Vivo Functions. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol. 2011 Jul 1;3(7):a005041.

155. Lu J, Doyle AD, Shinsato Y, Wang S, Bodendorfer MA, Zheng M, et al. Basement membrane regulates fibronectin organization using sliding focal adhesions driven by a contractile winch. bioRxiv. 2019 Apr 25;618686.
156. Mana G, Clapero F, Panieri E, Panero V, Böttcher RT, Tseng H-Y, et al. PPFIA1 drives active α5β1 integrin recycling and controls fibronectin fibrillogenesis and vascular morphogenesis. Nat Commun. 2016 Nov 23
157. Fourriere L, Kasri A, Gareil N, Bardin S, Bousquet H, Pereira D, et al. RAB6 and microtubules restrict protein secretion to focal adhesions. J Cell Biol. 2019 May 29;jcb.201805002.
158. Millard M, Odde S, Neamati N. Integrin Targeted Therapeutics. Theranostics. 2011 Feb 17;1:154–88.
159. Dong J-M, Tay FP-L, Swa HL-F, Gunaratne J, Leung T, Burke B, et al. Proximity biotinylation provides insight into the molecular composition of focal adhesions at the nanometer scale. Sci Signal. 2016 14;9(432):rs4.
160. Conway JRW, Warren SC, Timpson P. Context-dependent intravital imaging of therapeutic response using intramolecular FRET biosensors. Methods San Diego Calif. 2017 01;128:78–94.
161. Conway JRW, Carragher NO, Timpson P. Developments in preclinical cancer imaging: innovating the discovery of therapeutics. Nat Rev Cancer. 2014 May;14(5):314–28.
162. Hetmanski JHR, Zindy E, Schwartz J-M, Caswell PT. A MAPK-Driven Feedback Loop Suppresses Rac Activity to Promote RhoA-Driven Cancer Cell Invasion. PLOS Comput Biol. 2016 May 3;12(5):e1004909.}

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Three-dimensional migration of single and collective cells

(**A**) Schematic illustrating the various modes of 3D cell migration described as well as their key characteristics. (**B**) Representative images of cancer cells migrating on cell-derived matrices using amoeboid (fibrosarcoma cell), mesenchymal (fibrosarcoma cell) or pseudopodial (ovarian carcinoma cell) modes of migration. Cells were transfected with life-act GFP to visualise the actin cytoskeleton and imaged using a spinning disk confocal microscope (for methods see (8)). Videos are provided as supplemental information.

Figure 2: Adhesion structures found on a typical lamellipodia-driven cancer cell migrating in 2D

Schematic of a typical cancer cell with (**A**) invadopodia, (**B**) filopodia, (**C**) CPs (purple) and other IACs (black), as well as (**D**) lamellipodia. (**E**) U2OS cell expressing lifeact-mturquoise was plated on fibronectin and imaged using an airyscan confocal microscope. The video is provided as supplemental information. (**F**) U2OS cells were plated on vitronectin for 24 hr, stained for F-actin, paxillin and integrin β5, and imaged using structured illumination microscopy.

Figure 3: Integrin outside-in and inside-out signalling and activation

(**A**) Schematic representation of integrins at the plasma membrane in both bent (inactive) and extended (active) conformations, where collagen fibres are promoting clustering and IAC formation. (**B**) Downstream signal transduction from the IAC complex, with reinforcement of the actin cytoskeleton. (**C**) Summaries of the key components of an inactive integrin heterodimer (left), an open integrin heterodimer undergoing mechanical activation (middle), and a fully active integrin heterodimer (right).

Figure 4: Recycling and cross-talk of IACs with receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs)

(**A**) Clustering and co-signalling of RTKs at the plasma membrane. (**B**) Recycling of integrins either alone, or in concert with RTKs.

Figure 5: Maturation of FA and FA-like structures on a typical fibroblast
(A) Schematic of a typical fibroblast where adhesions are thought to mature along a progression model of filopodia adhesion (i), to nascent (ii) and focal adhesions (iii), then finally to fibrillar adhesions (iv). (B) U2OS cells expressing RFP-tagged Myosin-X were plated on fibronectin for 2 hr, stained for F-actin, phospho p130CAS and paxillin, and imaged using structured illumination microscopy. (C) Human fibroblasts were plated on fibronectin for 24 hr, stained for F-actin, fibronectin and paxillin, and imaged using structured illumination microscopy.

Figure 6: Adhesion structures found on specialised cell types
Schematic representations of (**A**) the immunological synapse, (**B**) a podosome and (**C**) a hemidesmosome.

Video 1: Amoeboid cancer cell migration.

Fibrosarcoma cell migrating on cell-derived matrices using amoeboid mode of motility. Cells were transfected with life-act GFP to visualise the actin cytoskeleton and imaged using a spinning disk confocal microscope.

Video 2: Mesenchymal cancer cell migration.

Fibrosarcoma cell migrating on cell-derived matrices using mesenchymal mode of motility. Cells were transfected with life-act GFP to visualise the actin cytoskeleton and imaged using a spinning disk confocal microscope.

Video 3: Mesenchymal cancer cell migration.

Ovarian carcinoma cell migrating on cell-derived matrices using mesenchymal mode of motility. Cells were transfected with life-act GFP to visualise the actin cytoskeleton and imaged using a spinning disk confocal microscope.

Video 4: 2D cell migration.

U2OS cell expressing lifeact-mturquoise were plated on 2D fibronectin and imaged using an airyscan confocal microscope.