Regulation of PDF receptor signaling controlling daily locomotor rhythms in *Drosophila*.

Weihua LI*, Jennifer Trigg* & Paul H. Taghert**

Department of Neuroscience

Washington University School of Medicine

St Louis, MO 63110

USA

* co-first authors

** for correspondence: taghertp@wustl.edu

Number of Figures: 8

Number of Tables: 1

Number of Supplemental Figures: 12

Number of Supplemental Tables: 5

Key Words:

Drosophila, PDF, PDF Receptor, Circadian Rhythms, G protein-coupled Receptor

Short title: PDF Receptor Desensitization

ABSTRACT

G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) trigger second messenger signaling cascades following activation by cognate ligands. GPCR signaling ceases following receptor desensitization or uncoupling from G proteins. Each day and in conjunction with ambient daylight conditions, neuropeptide PDF regulates the phase and amplitude of locomotor activity rhythms in *Drosophila* through its receptor, a Family B GPCR. Its time of action – when it starts signaling and when it stops – must change every day to following changing day lengths. We studied the process by which PDF Receptor (PDFR) signaling turns off *in vivo*, by modifying as many as half of the 28 potential sites of phosphorylation in its C terminal tail. We report that many such sites are conserved evolutionarily, and that in general their conversion to a non-phosphorylatable residue (alanine) creates a specific behavioral syndrome opposite to loss of function phenotypes previously described for *pdfr*. Such "gain of function" *pdfr* phenotypes include increases in the amplitudes of both Morning and Evening behavioral peaks as well as multi-hour delays of their phases. Such effects were most clearly associated with a few specific serine residues, and were seen following alanine-conversion of as few as one or two residues. The behavioral phenotypes produced by these PDFR sequence variants are not a consequence of changes to the pharmacological properties or of changes in their surface expression, as measured *in vitro*. We conclude that the mechanisms underlying termination of PDFR signaling are complex and central to an understanding of how this critical neuropeptide modulates daily rhythmic behavior.

AUTHOR SUMMARY

In multi-cellular organisms, circadian pacemakers create output as a series of phase markers across the 24 hr day to allow other cells to pattern diverse aspects of daily rhythmic physiology and behavior. Within

circadian pacemaker circuits, neuropeptide signaling is essential to help promote coherent circadian outputs. In the fruit fly *Drosophila* 150 neurons are dedicated circadian clocks and are heavily synchronized – they all tell the same time. Yet they provide diverse phasic outputs in the form of their discrete, asynchronous neuronal activity patterns. Neuropeptide signaling breaks that symmetry and drives many pacemakers away from their preferred activity period in the morning. Each day, neuropeptide PDF is released by Morning pacemakers and delays activity by specific other pacemakers to later parts of the day. When and how PDF stops acting each day is unknown. Further, timing of signal termination is not fixed because day length changes each day, hence the modulatory delay exerted by PDF must itself be regulated. Here we consider canonical models of G protein-coupled receptor physiology to ask how PDF receptor signaling is normally de-activated. We use behavioral measures to define sequence elements of the receptor whose post-translational modifications (e.g., phosphorylation) regulate receptor signaling duration.

63 **INTRODUCTION**

64

65 In *Drosophila*, neuropeptide PDF signaling helps pattern the output of the fly circadian
66 pacemaker network in controlling rhythmic daily locomotor activity [1-3]. Its functions have been
67 compared to those of neuropeptide VIP in regulating mammalian circadian physiology [4]. Historically
68 PDF was first isolated as an active principle (Pigment Dispersing Hormone) that mediates light-
69 dependent dispersion of pigment granules in diverse chromatophores of crustacea [5, 6]. In the insect
70 circadian system, PDF acts for a specified period within each 24 hr cycle, and works in conjunction with
71 environmental light to set phase and amplitude for locomotor activity rhythms that normally occur
72 around dawn and dusk [7-9]. Each day, the precise time of dusk and of dawn change, as does the time
73 interval between them. These facts require that the time of PDF signaling, the point when it starts and
74 the point when it stops, must also be adjusted each day to appropriately follow and reflect these daily
75 variations in the light:dark transitions. PDF signaling starts following its release by specific pacemaker
76 neurons, whose period of activity *in vivo* tracks the dawn in a variety of photoperiodic conditions [10].
77 Here we address molecular mechanisms by which PDF receptor signaling normally stops.

78

79 The PDF receptor (PDFR) is a member of the Family B (secretin receptor-like) GPCR group [11-
80 13]: it is G_s-coupled and its activation elevates cAMP levels *in vivo* [14]. It regulates different adenylate
81 cyclases (AC) in diverse target pacemakers (15, 16, Duvall and Taghert, 2012; 2013), which, through PKA
82 activation, ultimately regulate the pace of the molecular clock through regulation of Timeless [17]. PDFR
83 autoreceptor signaling promotes dramatic, daily morphological changes in the axonal terminals of sLNv
84 pacemakers [18]. PDFR activation also regulates calcium dynamics in subsets of pacemaker neuron
85 groups to help dictate their group-specific, daily phases of activation (in the sLNv, in the 5th sLNv and in
86 subsets of LNd, and DN3 groups – [10]). Such target cell-specific delays of PER-dependent neuronal

87 activity illustrates the basis by which the circadian network produces a daily series of phasic, neuronal
88 outputs to temporally bias diverse downstream rhythmic events [19, 20]. Finally, PDF/PDFR signaling is
89 long-lasting: its depression of basal calcium levels in target neurons persists without abatement over
90 many hours. These observations raise fundamental questions regarding the mechanism and the time
91 course by which PDFR signaling diminishes in anticipation of the next day's cycle of signaling.
92
93 The canonical model of GPCR phosphorylation and homologous desensitization features G
94 protein-coupled receptor kinases (GRKs) which associate with activated GPCRs and phosphorylate
95 cytosolic segments, thereby recruiting β-arrestins [21, 22]. β-arrestins uncouple the receptors from G
96 proteins [23, 24]. or enhance receptor endocytosis [25]; they can also serve as signal transducers by
97 recruiting distinct signaling molecules [26]. A second major regulatory mechanism to reduce GPCR
98 signaling is heterologous desensitization, whereby second-messenger-dependent kinases (PKA or PKC)
99 phosphorylate GPCRs [27]. Thus, we designed experiments to modify evolutionarily-conserved residues
100 in the C terminal tail of PDFR that could conceivably serve as substrates for phosphorylation and
101 subsequent signal termination. Our working hypothesis is that such modifications will reveal an
102 extension of the lifetime of PDFR activation *in vivo*.
103
104 Following activation of rhodopsin in the mammalian retina, visual arrestin is recruited with a
105 time constant of < 80 ms [28]; for many *Drosophila* neuropeptide receptors, β-arrestin2 is recruited
106 within a minute of exposure to ligand [29]. Does phosphorylation/de-phopsphorylation also regulate
107 the activity of a GPCR like PDFR, that signals over a much longer time base? The mammalian blue-light
108 sensitive GPCR melanopsin (OPN4) mediates intrinsic light sensitivity in certain classes of retinal
109 ganglion cells (RGCs): melanopsin signaling is distinguished by long latencies, graded responses and
110 sustained RGC depolarization that can outlast the duration of the light stimulus [30]. Melanopsin-
111 expressing RGCs produce exceptionally long timecourse integration because that GPCR behaves

112 differently from other opsins in two fundamental ways. Firstly, it undergoes photoequilibration
113 between signaling and silent states: a property that maintains the availability of pigment molecules for
114 activation, termed 'tristability' by Emmanual and Do [31]. Secondly, phosphorylation and β-arrestin
115 recruitment do contribute to the kinetics of melanopsin signaling, but over a long time course[32, 33].
116 Mure *et al.* [33] proposed that the distal aspect of the melanopsin C terminal tail creates a steric
117 blockade covering a cluster of specific serine residues situated in more proximal regions. The time
118 required for relief of that blockade therefore dictates a delayed time course of phosphorylation.
119
120 We know very little about the mechanisms that underlie termination of PDFR signaling. The *pdfr*
121 gene displays a transcript rhythm that peaks in the late day [34]. Sensitivity to PDF *in vivo* peaks in the
122 early day and is regulated by the PER-dependent clock, via post-transcriptional mechanisms*:* the EC50
123 for PDF responses in identified neurons varies systematically 5-10 fold: as a consequence of Ral A action,
124 as a function of time of day, and as a function of seasonality [35]. PDFR signaling is long-lasting: it
125 persists for many hours *in vivo* [19], for as long as free peptide ligand is available in the bath [14]. In
126 addition, β-arrestin2-GFP is not efficiently recruited to activated PDFR when the receptor is functionally-
127 expressed in *hEK-293T* cells [35]. In contrast, each of 13 other *Drosophila* neuropeptide GPCRs (including
128 two Family B GPCRs, CG8422 and CG17415) efficiently recruit β-arrestin2-GFP when they are activated
129 by their cognate ligands in that cellular environment 29, 36, 37].
130
131 Here we report (i) that PDFR is normally phosphorylated *in vivo* at conserved C terminal
132 residues; and (ii) that loss of conserved PDFR phosphorylatable sites leads to a behavioral syndrome
133 opposite to loss-of-function *pdf* and *pdfr* phenotypes. This 'gain of function' approach reveals a multi-
134 hour range of potential phases for both the Morning and Evening activity peaks, within which
135 neuropeptide PDF:PDFR signaling normally specifies rhythmic behavior, according to season.

136 Importantly, it shows that PDFR signaling affects the amplitude of the activity peaks and not just their
137 phases. Finally, this work identifies specific PDFR sequence elements that are major points at which the
138 duration of receptor activity is dictated, and through which behavior is modulated in season-specific
139 fashion.
140
141 **RESULTS**
142
143 **PDFR C-Terminal sequences.** Based on alternative splicing, the *pdfr* locus in *Drosophila*
144 *melanogaster* (CG13758) encodes GPCRs with two different C terminal sequences, for which the PA and
145 PD isoforms are representative (flybase.org/reports/FBgn0260753). The PD isoform is slightly longer
146 and lacks the final ~20 AAs of the PA isoform. As described in the Supplemental Information (*PDFR*
147 *Isoforms*), we focused on the PA protein isoform of PDFR, as it has been used in the majority of genetic
148 studies in the field. To identify residues for mutation, we first used comparative genomic analyses to
149 assess how well specific sequences in the C-terminal region of the PA receptor are conserved. We
150 obtained annotated *pdfr* genomic sequences from 16 additional species of *Drosophila*, in both the
151 *Sophophora* and *Drosophila* sub-families (**Supplemental Table 1**). Together this species collection
152 represents an estimated 40-60 MYr of *Drosophalid* evolution [38]. We defined residue V505 of the
153 *melanogaster* protein as the start of the C terminal sequence, following the consensus 7th
154 transmembrane TM domain (TM7) (**Supplemental Figure 1**). These 17 different C terminal sequences all
155 display considerable length, and vary between 189 to 215 amino acids (AAs). The *melanogaster* PDFR-A
156 C-terminal contains 28 Ser, Thr, or Tyr residues (these may be subject to post-translational
157 phosphorylation and de-phosphorylation). To survey putative functionality among these, we chose 14
158 residues that are distributed across the length of the C-terminal and which display high evolutionary
159 conservation (**Supplemental Figure 1** and **Supplemental Table 3)**. For naming purposes, we grouped

160 them into arbitrary clusters (CL) numbered #1 to #7, with positions shown in **Figure 1.** Following a
161 common paradigm in study of GPCR physiology [e.g., 33, 39, 40], we tested the consequences of their
162 mutation to Alanine, a non-phosphorylatable analog [41]. Some clusters have only a single modified AA
163 (e.g. CL4 and CL5), while in others we modified two AAs (e.g., CL1, CL6 and CL7), and in others, as many
164 as six closely-positioned residues (e.g., CL2-3).
165
166 This series of variant receptors contains 10 different mutated versions of PDFR (not including
167 the WT 'parent' PDFR-A) and is arbitrarily divided into two broad categories as indicated in **Figure 1**. The
168 first group (termed "Simple Variants") targeted one or two clusters of conserved Ser/Thr/Tyr AAs (i.e.,
169 CL 2-3A; 4A; 5A; 6A; 7A). The second category (termed "Multiple Variants") targeted three or more of
170 the AA clusters in various combinations (i.e., CL 1-4A; 1-5A; 1-6A; 1-7A and 5-7A). The CL1-7A variant
171 mutates all 14 of the targeted residues. We studied these ten variants, as well as the WT receptor, in a
172 *pdfr* mutant strain (*han*^{5537} – [11]) for their ability to rescue and to shape the phases and periodicity of
173 rhythmic locomotor behavior. We analyzed PDFR variants in the *pdfr* mutant background to permit
174 evaluation of their properties without competition from endogenous PDFR [although we acknowledge
175 that such possible interactions warrant future study]. Further we tested this PDFR series in different
176 photoperiodic conditions reflecting different seasons, as well as in constant darkness. *pdfr* loss-of-
177 function mutants display advanced behavioral peaks under Light:Dark conditions, as well as weak and
178 shortened free-running periods under constant darkness [11]. In general, we found that several of these
179 Ala-mutant PDFRs delayed the phase of the Morning and/or Evening activity peaks (**Figures 2-7**) and that
180 some also lengthened the free-running period (**Table 1**). Such results are generally consistent with a
181 prediction whereby non-phosphorylatable PDFR variants – those having a potential to increase the
182 duration of PDFR signaling - will produce behavioral actions opposite to those seen in loss-of-function
183 *pdfr* mutant flies. To better interpret the results produced by the different sequence variants, we also

184 present experiments that test assumptions used in the experimental design. These tests consider: i)
185 whether the C-terminal fusion of GFP (present in all variants tested) influenced the results; and ii)
186 whether the behavioral effects of receptor variants are independent of activation by the endogenous
187 ligand, neuropeptide PDF.
188
189 **Analysis of Behavior with PDFR variant expression**. Figures 2 -7 describe rhythmic locomotor
190 behavior of adult *pdfr* mutant flies expressing diverse *pdfr* transgenes in the aggregate, during six days
191 of light entrainment (LD), followed by activity during nine or more days of constant darkness (DD). For
192 each genotype, we display locomotor activity during light entrainment in four ways: (i) group actograms,
193 (ii) group eductions, (iii) derivations of behavioral phase, and (iv) direct comparisons of the amplitudes
194 of behavioral peaks between genotypes. Thus in Figures 2, 4 and 6, a representative group actogram
195 displays all locomotor activity double-plotted across all days in LD and DD (Panels A-L, sub-panel **-1** in
196 each Figure). Second a representative group eduction displays a 24 h average of the activity in the final
197 two days in LD (days 5-6) (Panels A-L, sub-panel **-2** in each Figure). Next, we define the phase onsets and
198 offsets for Morning and Evening activity peaks during the same final two LD days across all experiments
199 (Panels M and N in Figures 2, 4 and 6). For the comparison of peak amplitudes in these three
200 photoperiodic conditions, we describe Bin-by-Bin analyses of locomotor activity during the last two days
201 of entrainment (days 5-6) in Figures 3, 5 and 7. The Bin-by-Bin analyses directly compares experimental
202 genotypes to a control one [cf. 42]. They present data averaged across 2 to 5 independent experiments,
203 to help identify the differences that most consistently correlate with genotype. Finally, Table 1 compiles
204 measures of rhythmic activity displayed by the different genotypes in days 3-9 of constant darkness.
205
206 **Behavior under Short Day (winter-like) conditions (Figures 2 and 3).** Flies lacking *pdfr* function
207 in 8L:16D lack a prominent morning peak and their evening peak of activity begins earlier than controls;

208 the example shown in **Figure 2A-2** is heterozygous for the *tim*-Gal4 element. Rescue by WT-*pdfr* using
209 *tim*-Gal4 significantly delayed (i.e., rescued) the Evening peak initiation by about 1 h (**Fig. 2B-2).**
210 Expression of each of the Single Variants driven by *tim*-Gal4 produced also delayed the Evening peak
211 (**Fig. 2C-2** to **G-2**), with the variants 6A and 7A producing conspicuous, large amplitude peaks that
212 occurred on average as late as ~3 h after lights-off, at ZT12 (**2F-2** and **2G-2**). Variants 2-3A, 6A and 7A
213 also produced elevated activity during the period of ZT 18-19 (**Fig. 3C-1,2F-1** and **2G-1**): we speculate
214 this is promotion of a "Morning" peak of activity. Among the five Multiple Variants, we noted three
215 main effects (**Fig. 3**). First the progressive addition of more Ala substitutions in the series 1-5A, 1-6A and
216 1-7A (**Figure 3D-5** through **3G-5**) produced large and delayed Evening peaks in the time period ZT11.5-
217 12.5 (3-4 h after lights-off), with the variant 1-6A producing the most pronounced delay. The delayed
218 Evening peak activity at ZT12 appeared often appeared at the expense of, the normal Evening peak
219 activity that occurred prior to Lights-off (e.g., **Fig.3G-4**), although when averaged across all days in LD,
220 that effect was not significant (**Figure 3 – panel 2**). Second, the PDFR 1-5A and 1-7A forms in the
221 Multiple Variant series produced significant "Morning" peaks around ZT19, (**Fig 3J-1** and **3L-1**), Finally,
222 we noted that combining the Single 5A, 6A and 7A variants into a Multiple Variant (5-7A) did not
223 produce the anticipated additive effects on promoting morning locomotor activity at ~ZT19 (**Fig. 3C-3).**
224 Such anticipation was predicated on the effects seen with 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-7A (versus 1-4A) (**Fig 3J-1**
225 **and-3, K-3 and L-1 and -3**). Likewise the 5-7A did not produce the strong delay in the Evening activity
226 peak to ~ZT12 that was expected based on effects seen with 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-7A (versus 1-4A): instead
227 it produced only a minor delay (**Fig. 3H-3**).
228
229 **Behavior under equinox conditions (Figures 4 and 5).** Under 12:12 conditions, *han* mutant flies
230 (lacking *pdfr* function) typically display elevated nocturnal activity, a lack of morning anticipation prior to
231 Lights-on, and a pronounced advance in the peak of the Evening behavior [11]. **Fig. 4A-1** to **A-2** display

232 activity patterns of *han* mutants that are heterozygous for *tim*-Gal4; they generally matched prior
233 descriptions of *pdfr* mutant behavior. Restoration of some *pdfr* function by *han*; *tim*> WT-*pdfr*,
234 produced a modest Morning peak (anticipatory activity prior to lights-on – **Fig. 4B-2**) and delayed the
235 evening peak by 1-2 hrs (**Figures 4N and 5B-2**) [7,8,9]. Among the five "Simple PDFR Variants" (**Fig 4C-G**),
236 the 6A and 7A PDFR isoforms produced significantly elevated morning activity, with a peak ~2 hr prior to
237 Lights-on in the period ZT22-23 (**Fig 5F-1** and **G-1**). This elevated pre-Lights-on activity peaked ~3-4 hr
238 later than that seen under Short Day conditions with these same PDFR variants. Separately, the 6A
239 isoform increased Morning activity after the lights-on signal (**Fig. 5F-2)** and the 4A, 6A and 7A isoforms
240 increased the amount of Evening activity, but without changing its phase (**Fig. 5D-5, F- 5** and **G-5**). In the
241 case of the five Multiple Variants, we noted three main effects. First the progressive addition of more
242 Ala substitutions in the series 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-7A all produced significant additional Morning activity in
243 the period ZT22-23 compared to that seen with 1-4A. Notably, all of that activity appeared to decline
244 prior to the Lights-on signal (**Fig 5E-3, F-3, G-3).** Those variants also produced increased activity
245 immediately after Lights-on: an effect seemingly distinct from that produced prior to Lights-on (**Figure 5**
246 **J-42 K-2** and **L-2**). Second, combining the 5A, 6A and 7A variants in PDFR 5-7A did not produce additive
247 effects on behavior in the morning, either before or after Lights-on (**Fig 5H-1** and **-2**): instead the activity
248 at ZT22-23 and ZT 0.5-3.5 appeared similar only to that displayed by rescue with a WT PDFR. Finally, the
249 1-5A variant was notable among Multiple Variants in LD12:12 conditions by displaying elevated activity
250 in mid-day between the Morning and Evening Activity peaks (**Fig 5E-4** and **E-5**).
251
252 **Behavior under Long Day (summer) conditions (Figures 6 and 7)**. Flies lacking *pdfr* function in
253 16L:8D display locomotor patterns similar to those in 12L:12D – lack of an obvious Morning peak and
254 produce a broad Evening activity period that peaks ~3hr before Lights-off: the example in **Figure 6A-2**
255 displays behavior by *han* mutants that are also heterozygous for the *tim*-Gal4 element. Rescue (*han*;

256 *tim*> WT-*pdfr*, **Figure 6B-2**) typically delayed Morning activity offset (**Fig. 6M)** and delayed the Evening
257 peak onset each by about 1 h (**Fig. 6N).** Expression of the 5A and 6A PDFR variants produced
258 significantly greater amounts of Morning activity after Lights-on (**Fig. 7C-3** through **G-3**), while all of the
259 Single Variants increased the amplitude of the Evening peak without affecting its phase (**Fig. 6 C-5** to **G-**
260 **5**). Among the five Multiple Variants, we noted three main effects (all comparable to those seen
261 previously under 12L:12D entraining conditions). First the 1-6A and 1-7A variants displayed significantly
262 increased Morning activity after Lights-on (**Fig. 7 K-2** and **L-4**). Second, the variants 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-7A
263 increased the amplitude of the evening peak without affecting its phase (**Fig. 7J-3, K-3** and **G-3**). Third,
264 as in the other photoperiodic conditions, when we combining the 5A, 6A and 7A variants into a single 5-
265 7A variant, it did not produce the expected additive effects on behavior in the morning (**Fig 7H-2**) or in
266 the evening (**Figure 7H-3**): instead these activities appeared similar to effects displayed by the 1-4 and 1-
267 5 variants.
268
269 ***Behavior under DD.*** In DD following Short Day conditions, the PDFR variants that produced 3-4 h
270 delays in the evening peak often generated periods ~ 1-2 hr longer than the controls and also lowered %
271 arrhythmicity (**Table 1**). This was especially true for the Multiple Variant series (e.g., PDFR 1-5A, 1-6A
272 and 1-7A (**Table 1**). However the correlation between delayed evening peaks and a longer tau in DD was
273 not absolute" for example, the 6A, 7A and 5-7A variants all had strong significant delaying effects on the
274 Evening phase of activity under Short Day conditions (compared to the effect of the WT PDFR), but they
275 did not lengthen tau values in subsequent DD conditions (Table 1). These observations suggest that
276 delays of activity phases produced by PDFR modulation in LD are not necessarily a simple or direct
277 consequence of its effects on the PER and TIM--dependent clock [2, 3, 17]. In addition, the dominant
278 activity periods in DD typically reflected the delayed (~ZT12) Evening peak (**Fig. 2K-1** and **L-1**). Notably,

279 the early Morning peak (~ZT18-19) promoted by PDFR 6A and 7A clearly persisted in DD (**Fig. 2F-1** and

280 **G-1**).

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

Table 1.

						Average tau different from:		
Short Day Entrainment	**N**	**n**	**%AR**	**tau**	**SEM**	w[1118]	pdfrEgfp	pdf[01]
han[5304]; tim > w[1118]	5	72	22%	23.9	0.09	-	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfr	1	16	6%	23.7	0.13	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfr1-7A No GFP	3	30	8%	23.6	0.07	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp	3	46	35%	24.00	0.09	ns	-	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp23A	2	31	13%	24.8	0.12	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp4A	2	31	26%	24.7	0.13	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp5A	2	43	26%	24.58	0.11	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp6A	3	50	38%	24.37	0.08	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp7A	3	45	27%	24.83	0.11	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-4A	3	40	12%	24.6	0.12	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-5A	3	31	16%	25	0.23	***	*	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-6A	3	42	14%	25.1	0.13	****	**	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A	4	59	16%	24.9	0.11	****	*	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp567A	2	37	16%	23.9	0.09	ns	ns	nd
tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A	1	15	0%	25.77	0.25	nd	nd	****
pdf[01]	1	12	67%	22.50	0.12	nd	nd	-
tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A; pdf[01]/pdf[01]	1	25	20%	23.63	0.12	nd	nd	ns

Equinox Entrainment	N	n	%AR	tau	SEM		
han[5304]; tim > w[1118]	6	68	34%	23.7	0.09	-	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfr	3	16	25%	23.5	0.16	ns	ns
han[5304];; tim > pdfr1-7A No GFP	3	35	14%	23.67	0.08	ns	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp	4	48	13%	24.1	0.06	ns	-
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp23A	2	54	48%	25.6	0.12	****	****
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp4A	2	44	32%	24.1	0.07	ns	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp5A	2	47	34%	24.4	0.06	ns	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp6A	3	35	23%	24.3	0.13	ns	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp7A	3	47	21%	24.1	0.09	ns	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-4A	3	45	18%	24.5	0.08	**	ns
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-5A	2	32	6%	25.00	0.13	****	***
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-6A	2	32	19%	25.27	0.14	****	****
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A	6	88	6%	25.1	0.17	****	****
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp567A	2	45	24%	24.1	0.08	ns	ns

Long Day Entrainment	N	n	%AR	tau	SEM			
han[5304]; tim > w[1118]	7	###	47%	23.8	0.06	-	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfr	3	47	17%	24.88	0.15	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfr1-7A No GFP	3	40	48%	24.57	0.09	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp	4	82	17%	24.87	0.08	ns	-	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp23A	2	48	23%	25.35	0.12	****	****	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp4A	1	27	22%	25.50	0.16	****	****	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp5A	1	36	11%	24.66	0.16	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp6A	2	51	22%	25.02	0.09	ns	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp7A	2	54	13%	25.46	0.09	****	****	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-4A	3	40	8%	25.2	0.13	****	ns	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-5A	3	33	6%	25.18	0.14	****	*	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-6A	3	48	2%	25.59	0.09	****	****	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A	4	63	14%	25.3	0.08	****	***	nd
han[5304]; tim > pdfrEgfp567A	1	38	18%	24.31	0.09	ns	ns	nd
tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A	1	14	14%	25.50	0.13	nd	nd	****
pdf[01]	1	32	88%	22.75	0.05	nd	nd	-
tim > pdfrEgfp1-7A; pdf[01]/pdf[01]	1	29	21%	23.30	0.09	nd	nd	ns

Table 1. Locomotor activity measures of various genotypes during constant dark conditions.

291 Behavioral activity records from days 3-9 in constant conditions following entrainment in the three
292 indicated photoperiods (Short Day, Equinox and Long Day). N = number of independent experiments
293 performed for each genotype::photoperiod combination. n = total number of flies tested for each
294 genotype::photoperiod combination. % AR: the percentage of flies judged arrhythmic by criteria; tau =
295 average circadian periods calculated according to χ2-periodogram analysis. Statistical analysis
296 compared tau's using Tukey's multiple comparisons post hoc test following a one-way ANOVA: ns: not
297 significant; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$; **** $p < 0.0001$.; nd: not determined.
298
299
300 In DD following Equinox or Long Day entrainment, we noted that several variants produced
301 dominant activity phases which were phase-delayed relative to the Evening peak displayed in LD (e.g.,
302 **Fig.4F-1, G-1**, and **J-, K-** and **L-1; Fig.6F-1, G-1,** and **J-, K-** and **L-1**). Thus, photophases > 8 hr in duration
303 appear to repress expression of the delayed, post Lights-off Evening activity observed under SD
304 conditions: this was suggested by the emergence of a delayed phase activity peak once flies only after
305 release to DD. Once again, several of the variants significantly increased Tau in DD (**Table 1**), yet had
306 only slight effects on phase in LD.
307
308 ***Control experiments.*** The design of the *PDF*R variants contains numerous assumptions and
309 genotypic constraints, distinct from simply substituting Alanine at potential sites of phosphorylation in
310 the receptor C terminal tail. To determine their potential to affect the results we report, we performed
311 the following two sets of experiments as controls. (i) - ***The influence of epitope fusions.*** The PDFR
312 variants we have tested include epitope fusions (4xFLAG and eGFP), which in principle could confer
313 some of the properties observed. In part, the concern regarding fused sequences is mitigated by the
314 fact that all UAS-receptor isoforms described above (WT and sequence-variant) contained both epitopes

315 (in addition – all were genetically transduced to the same integration site). Hence comparisons across
316 different variants (e.g., **Figures 2 through 7**), should largely normalize for the effects of the non-receptor
317 sequences, and instead highlight variant-specific properties. However, we wished to test this
318 assumption explicitly to define the extent to which a bulky GFP fused to the C Terminal tail might confer
319 some of the behavioral properties we might otherwise ascribe to PDFR C terminal sequences. We
320 therefore compared a 1-7A version of PDFR to a wild type PDFR, both of which lacked GFP fusions. The
321 results in both Short Day and Long Day conditions, followed by release into DD, support the hypothesis
322 that alterations in daily locomotor rhythmicity were largely derived from sequence variation of the
323 PDFR, and not from the properties of the fused GFP (**Supplemental Figures 2** and **3** and tabulated in
324 **Table 1**).
325
326 ***Control experiments (ii) - dependence of GPCR PDFR variant effects on the presence of PDF ligand***.
327 Second, we assumed that the altered behavioral phenotypes produced by certain PDFR variants
328 depended on activation by their endogenous cognate ligand, the neuropeptide PDF. However, we could
329 not *a priori* exclude the possibility that PDFR variants may in fact produce novel constitutive activity
330 (neomorphic properties). We therefore placed the 1-7A PDFR variant in the pdf^{01} (null) background and
331 re-tested its activity when driven by *tim*(UAS)-Gal4 under both short day and long day conditions, and
332 then in constant darkness. In all conditions, the behavioral phenotypes largely resembled those of the
333 pdf^{01} background (lack of a morning activity peak, advanced evening peak, and shorter tau/s in DD). The
334 results are shown in **Supplemental Figures 4** and **5** and tabulated in **Table 1**. The 1-7A PDFR variant did
335 reduce the % arrhythmicity present in the *pdf* mutant background to nearly the same value as found in a
336 WT *pdf* background, which suggests some degree of constitutive (ligand-independent) activity. Apart
337 from that one aspect, we conclude that constitutive activity explains at best a small proportion of the
338 behavioral effects of the PDFR variants here tested.

339

340 **PDFR expression and signaling *in vitro*.** The PDFR is a G_s-coupled receptor and several reports
341 have documented the importance of the downstream cAMP pathway to mediate PDF behavioral
342 regulation [15, 17, 43]. In that context, we asked whether the *in vivo* properties of those PDFR variants
343 that affected behavioral phase and amplitude could be correlated with *in vitro* properties when
344 expressed in *hEK-293T* calls. We found no strong correlation. Significant differences in basal signaling
345 levels, in EC50 or in maximum values of signal transduction were rare (**Supplemental Figures 6-8**).
346 When noted, they were poorly correlated with behavioral effects (**Supplemental Table 5**). We also
347 measured surface expression of the PFDR variants in *hEK* cells using β-lactamase N terminal fusions [44]
348 to determine if PDFR variants tended to display longer surface lifetimes. The 1-4 and 1-7 variants
349 displayed higher basal levels, but no others were different from the WT levels (**Supplemental Figure 9**).
350 Following 20 min exposure to PDF, neither the WT not any of the variants displayed a change in surface
351 expression levels (**Supplemental Figure 10**).
352

353 **Measuring the phosphorylation state of over-expressed PDFR *in vivo*.** To obtain direct
354 evidence that PDFR sequences are phosphorylated *in vivo*, we first over-expressed an epitope-tagged-
355 PDFR WT construct using *tim*-Gal4, which directs expression broadly in cells that feature the PER-
356 dependent molecular oscillator. We immunoprecipitated the receptor from head extracts, then
357 employed tandem mass spectroscopy to determine which if any specific PDFR peptide fragments are
358 phosphorylated. We performed eight biological replicates, with two collections in the morning (ZT2-3)
359 and six in the evening hours (ZT11). **Supplemental Table 4** reports the phosphorylated peptides
360 detected from the PDFR-GFP fusion protein. Among the 28 conserved Ser/Thr and Tyr residues in the
361 PDFR C terminal tail, five were phosphorylated in one or more of these samples. In the two Mornings
362 samples S563 was phosphorylated in one sample; in the Evening samples, S531 (in CL2) was

363 phosphorylated in four of samples, S534 (in CL2) in one, T543 (in CL3) in one, and S560 in two of six
364 samples. The spectra documenting detection of these phosphopeptides are presented in **Supplemental**
365 **Figure 11**.
366
367 **Testing GRKs and β-arrestin2 contributions to locomotor rhythmicity.** Regarding which
368 potential PDFR phosphorylation sites might be β-arrestin binding sites, we considered a recent report by
369 Zhou *et al.* [45] who proposed a conserved GPCR sequence motif that promotes high affinity
370 interactions with β-arrestin. The motif includes three phosphorylation sites that align with three
371 conserved, positively-charged pockets in the arrestin N-domain. In *D. melanogaster* PDFR, the CL1
372 region contains a match with the proposed motif beginning with S512 (SLATQLS) and shows moderate
373 sequence conservation: of the 17 species we considered, 9 others retained this precise motif
374 (**Supplemental Figure 1**). In addition, the *D. melanogaster* PDFR sequence beginning with S629
375 (SRTRGS) also displays a match for the motif, but is retained in only 6 of the other 16 species. The
376 evidence that these two sites represent high affinity β-arrestin2 binding domains is therefore equivocal.
377 We previously reported that β-arrestin2-GFP is not efficiently recruited to activated PDFR when
378 functionally-expressed in *hEK-293T* cells [35]. In contrast, each of 13 other *Drosophila* neuropeptide
379 GPCRs do efficiently recruit β-arrestin2-GFP when expressed and activated in that cellular environment
380 [29, 36, 37].
381
382 We tested the potential to detect *in vivo* involvement by *Drosophila* orthologues of the
383 canonical desensitization effectors - mammalian G-protein coupled receptor kinases (GRKs – GPRK1
384 (CG40129) and GPRK2 (CG17998)) and of mammalian β-arrestin2 (βarr2 – *kurtz* (CG1487)) - in the
385 control of locomotor rhythms We drove specific over-expression of WT cDNAs and RNAi constructs
386 using *tim*-Gal4, to broadly affect signaling in the circadian pacemaker system. The PDFR-PA protein is

387 highly restricted in its expression to subsets of the pacemaker neural network [46]. We predicted that
388 elimination of a desensitizing component for PDFR signaling should produce behavioral phenotypes
389 opposite to that of *pdfr* loss of function phenotypes: these would potentially include (for example) a
390 delayed evening activity phase in LD conditions and a longer tau under DD. GPRK1- and *krz*-specific
391 RNAi's produced normal average locomotor profiles under 12:12, while one of two GPRK2-specific RNAi
392 constructs tested slightly advanced the evening peak (**Supplemental Figure 12**). Over-expressing GPRK1
393 cDNAs did not affect morning or evening phase; over-expressing GPRK2 broadened the evening peak.
394 Under DD, *krz* RNAi flies were uniformly arrhythmic, while GPRK RNAi's were normal or slightly
395 lengthened the circadian period (**Supplemental Table 5**). These results do not support the hypothesis
396 and suggest that the kinetics by which PDFR signaling terminates do not depend exclusively on the
397 activities of either dGPRK-1 or -2, or on that of the *Drosophila* β-arrestin2 ortholog, *krz*.
398
399
400 ***DISCUSSION***
401
402 We found that several PDF receptor variants, containing Ala-substitutions of phosphorylatable
403 residues, modulated the amplitudes of the Morning and/or or Evening activity peaks, or delayed their
404 phases and/ or lengthened the free-running period. Such results are generally consistent with a
405 prediction whereby non-phosphorylatable PDFR variants – those with a potential to increase the
406 duration of PDFR signaling - would produce behavioral actions opposite to those seen in loss-of-function
407 *pdf* [1], or *pdfr* [11] mutant stocks. The loss of function phenotypes include advanced behavioral peaks,
408 as well as weaker and shortened free-running periods. In this context, we acknowledge that GPCR
409 modification by phosphorylation does not exclusively lead to signal termination. GRK2-dependent
410 phosphorylation of the smoothened (smo) GPCR (which helps mediate Hh signaling) follows reception of

411 the Hh signal: that leads to smo activation in both *Drosophila* and mammalian systems [47]. Thus
412 modification of putative phosphorylation sites on GPCRs (to preclude phosphorylation) will not
413 exclusively promote extended signaling and therefore our interpretations must correspondingly
414 consider outcomes without *a priori* assumption of mechanisms.
415
416 ***GPCR signal termination.*** PDFR belongs to the Secretin Receptor Family (Family B) of
417 neuropeptide receptors [11-13]: there is no clear consensus regarding mechanisms of desensitization
418 and internalization for this receptor family. For VPAC2 receptors, phosphorylation and internalization is
419 mediated exclusively by GRK2 (48. Murthy, 2008;). Likewise, *Drosophila* orthologues of Cortocotrophin
420 Releasing Factor receptors (CG8422, DH44-R1) and Calcitonin receptors (CG17415, DH31-R1) are
421 internalized in *hEK* cells following recruitment of β-arrestin2 [29]. In contrast, PDFR, which is also
422 related to the mammalian Calcitonin receptor, is not internalized following exposure to PDF [35]. VPAC2
423 receptors are also regulated by heterologous receptor signaling: M3 cholinergic receptors via PKC
424 signaling can block VPAC2 phosphorylation, desensitization and internalization [49]. Furthermore,
425 secretin receptors and VPAC1 receptors undergo phosphorylation by GRKs and β-arrestin2-dependent
426 desensitization, but these are not sufficient to facilitate or mediate internalization [50-52]. Finally, GLP2-
427 Receptor associates with β-arrestin2 via its distal C terminal sequences, but that receptor domain is
428 required neither for GLP2-R desensitization nor its internalization [53]. Thus kinases other than GRKs
429 and effectors other than β-arrestin2 may regulate internalization of diverse Family B receptors.
430
431 ***Validating the behavioral phenotypes produced by PDFR variants.*** The actions of PDFR
432 variants we have described, following substitutions of Ala for various Ser/Thr or Tyr residues, are not
433 easily explained by a hypothesis invoking neomorphic or constitutive GPCR properties. The evidence for
434 this conclusion is three-fold. First, the effects on both amplitude and phase of activity peaks by these

435 variants are not of a random assortment: rather they are all strictly opposite to that of loss-of-function
436 models for *pdf* and *pdfr*. Second, the actions of PDFR variants display strong dependence on wild type
437 *pdf* gene function: this strongly argues that the actions of PDFR variants reflect responses to normal,
438 endogenous PDF signaling. Third, the action of PDFR variants on the phases and amplitudes of
439 locomotor activity reflected PDFR sequence variation, and not the properties of the GFP C-terminal
440 fusion. Together these control observations support the hypothesis that phosphorylation of some or all
441 of the C terminal residues we studied are normally modified to attenuate the strength and duration of
442 PDFR signaling.
443
444 ***PDF Signaling and seasonal adaptation.*** PDF neuropeptide actions were discovered in the
445 context of physiological adaptions to daylight in crustacea [5,6]. Helfrich-Förster [54] discovered PDF
446 expression within a defined subset of the insect *Drosophila* circadian pacemaker network. Renn *et al.*
447 [1] demonstrated that *pdf* makes a fundamental contribution by setting the normal behavioral phase of
448 Evening activity in *Drosophila* during light:dark entrainment and promoting normal rhythmicity during
449 constant darkness. PDF signaling coordinates with that driven by light: It works in parallel to direct
450 photosensitivity along with the CRY blue light photoreceptor. Flies doubly mutant for *cry* and *pdf* display
451 severe deficits of locomotor rhythmicity [7, 8], and such effects can be as severe as measured in clock-
452 deficient flies [9]. PDF and environmental light also work coordinately at the level of neuronal activity
453 patterns: in the case of the evening pacemakers (LNd and the 5th s-LNv), both light and PDF signaling
454 promote a delay in their PER-dependent activation period, and help align it to a phase just prior to dusk
455 [19].
456
457 Based on the close association of PDF signaling and photoperiodic signaling, we considered it
458 essential to test the different variant PDF Receptors in a variety of photoperiodic conditions. The

459 consensus of many prior observations indicates that PDF neuropeptide signaling is necessary for the
460 display of a Morning peak (its amplitude) and for proper adjustment of phase of the Evening activity
461 peak [e.g., 1, 7, 8, 55-57]. Our present observations, concerning likely gain-of-function *pdfr* variants,
462 support a revised hypothesis regarding regulation of the Morning peak: we propose PDF/PDFR can
463 affect - and normally does affect - both the phase and amplitude of the both Morning and Evening
464 activity peaks. Thus the consensus of many prior descriptions – concluding there is "no Morning activity
465 peak" in *Pdf* and *Pdfr* mutants – beginning with the description by Renn *et al.* [1], may have failed to
466 discern the presence of a greatly-diminished Morning peak that was also advanced. There is some
467 precedent for this contrary conclusion: Yoshii *et al.* [58] described behavior of pdf^{01} mutants and noted
468 advanced morning peaks especially under longer photoperiods. Likewise, the duration of the
469 photoperiod strongly influenced the effects we observed on the Morning versus the Evening activity
470 peaks. We only observed delayed Evening activity peak, produced by PDFR gain-of-function variants,
471 under Short Day conditions: the delayed evening peak appears strongly inhibited by light durations > 8
472 hr: and it remains unclear at what molecular level light exerts this inhibitory effect. We note a striking
473 similarity of these observations with effects recently described in loss-of-function states for the
474 phosphatase *PRL-1* [51]. Like the most active PDFR variants we herein describe (e.g., 6A, 7A, 1-5A 1-6A
475 and 1-7A), *PRL-1* mutants produce a 3-4 h delay in the phase of the evening activity peak, but only under
476 winter-like (short day) conditions, not under equinox or summer-like (long day) conditions. Kula-
477 Eversole *et al.* [59] have shown that TIM phosphorylation is affected by PRL-1 activity and suggest the
478 seasonal action of PRL-1 to advance the evening locomotor activity phase is mediated by modification of
479 TIM levels within the transcription-translation feedback loop. The extensive similarity of these two sets
480 of behavioral phenotypes reveals either serial or parallel pathways to effect comparable outcomes on
481 locomotor activity. If serial, then according to the simplest model, PRL1 acts downstream of PDFR, and

482 the combined results to-date suggest PRL-1 is inhibited by PDFR activation. Further genetic and
483 biochemical experiments are needed to evaluate if and how these pathways converge.
484
485 ***PDFR signaling effects on phase and on period.*** The behavioral effects of the PDFR variants
486 tested were most robust in modulating the phase of evening activity bouts. Evening locomotor activity
487 derives in large part from the activity of the primary Evening oscillators, termed E cells, the LNd and the
488 5th small LNv [10, 20, 51, 60-63]. However, numerous network interactions are also known to provide
489 critical contributions to the accuracy, precision and adaptibility of that timing system [e.g., 64 -67]. The
490 Evening oscillator group itself is known to be heterogeneous and to constitute at least three separate,
491 functionally distinct oscillators [68], only some of which express PDFR and respond to PDF [57, 68]. Vaze
492 and Helfrich-Förster [57] reported that the phase of Period protein accumulation in E neurons is phase-
493 locked to the previous lights-off transition and also sensitive to PDF signaling. They conclude that the
494 peak of PER accumulation is key to determining the phase of the evening activity peak, but also note
495 that the correlation between the Period-clock timing cue and the Evening activity peak is not perfect.
496 They suggest the Evening behavioral phase is better described by also factoring in the delay in E cell
497 neuronal activity driven by PDF neuromodulation [10, 19]. In that context, we interpret the many
498 examples of delayed Evening peaks resulting from PDFR variants (e.g., Figure 2M) as products at least
499 partly derived from PDF modulation (delay) of the cell intrinsic molecular clocks in E cells: that
500 conclusion is supported by the larger tau values in DD evident in the behavior of many PDFR variants
501 (Table 1). However, among the different variants, the association between delayed Evening activity
502 peaks in LD and longer tau values in DD was not perfect. For example, under short days, the 5A, 6A, 7A
503 and 5-7A variants all significantly delayed the offsets of Evening activity peaks versus that seen with WT
504 PDFR, but these variants did not significantly lengthen circadian period. Likewise under long day, 4A and
505 7A produced significant increases in tau versus that seen with WT PDFR, but they did not significantly

506 delay the onset of the Evening activity peak. Our working hypothesis is therefore that the duration of
507 PDF>PDFR signaling to target pacemakers in the *Drosophila* brain is modulated each day to
508 independently effect (i) entrainment of clock period, and (ii) delays of pacemaker neuronal activity. It is
509 the combination of these two PDFR signaling effects that is essential for proper rhythmic behavioral
510 outcomes across seasons. The signaling pathways downstream of PDFR, that independently regulate
511 diurnal phase and circadian period within E pacemaker neurons, are largely unknown.
512
513 ***Relations between in vitro and in vivo PDFR signaling measures.*** Using an *in vitro* assay for
514 cyclic AMP generation, we found that modifying phosphorylation properties of PDFR does not affect the
515 strength of signaling. That conclusion suggests that *in vivo* other GPCR features are normally affected to
516 regulate the extent/duration of PDFR signaling according to season, which corresponds to findings
517 described with other Family B GPCRs like VPAC1 [40]. Mutation of all the Ser and Thr residues of the C
518 terminal tail and of Ser250 to Ala led to a receptor with binding properties and adenylate cyclase activity
519 not different from that of the wild type receptor; however that variant receptor was neither
520 phosphorylated nor internalized. We propose that the PDFR variants we have described do not modify
521 locomotor behavior by virtue of greater second messenger signaling. Rather they do so by generating
522 cAMP (and perhaps other second messengers) over time periods longer than normal sustained by a WT
523 receptor over a portion of a 24-hr cycle.
524
525 **Specific versus non-specific phosphorylation regulating GPCR activity.** There are two broadly
526 divergent hypotheses to describe the mechanisms by which GPCR phosphorylation promotes
527 desensitization. The first posits that modification of specific residues have greatest significance for
528 downstream desensitizing mechanisms. The second invokes the triggering of termination processes by
529 the aggregate negative charge accumulated with phosphorylation, regardless of where it might occur.

530 For some GPCRs (e.g., OPN4), the evidence supports both models [33, 39]. Our data concerning PDFR
531 desensitization also support both viewpoints and we present a model in **Figure 8**. The evidence for the
532 importance of PDFR sequence specificity rests on the data that modification of certain single Clusters is,
533 among all variants tested, the most effective in affecting locomotor activity rhythms. In particular we
534 regard CL6 and CL7 to be especially critical in terminating the time course of PDFR signaling. Notably,
535 converting just the single pair of CL6 AAs, or the single pair of CL7 AAs, is enough to generate hours-long
536 delays in the peaks of locomotor rhythms under Light:Dark conditions (**Figure 2 F-G, 4F-G; 6 F-G, 7 F-G**),
537 as well as generating a significant increase in tau under Constant Dark conditions (**Table 1**). We note
538 that the splicing event that distinguishes the PDFR-A and PDFR-D isoforms occurs just prior to the
539 position of sequences encoding CL6 and 7, such that the D form lacks these two highly conserved
540 domains. Other clusters (like CL2-3) also appear to have potential for 'specific' contributions to PDFR
541 regulation. Together, these results speak to the potency of the inferred specific termination
542 mechanisms for PDFR GPCR signaling. In contrast, the evidence for the bulk phosphorylation hypothesis
543 comes from comparison of the 1-4A, versus the 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-7A variants. By inactivating increased
544 numbers of phosphorylatable residues, we observed a graded series increasingly delayed evening
545 phases in short day conditions (e.g., **Figure 2I-2 though 2L-2**). The tandem mass-spectroscopy results,
546 indicating endogenous phosphorylation of certain PDFR residues (**Supplemental Table 4**) demonstrates
547 such post-translational modifications can occur, but likely does not provide a complete accounting of
548 them.
549
550 Finally, our results point to what we propose as "context-dependent" effects of modifying
551 specific GPCR residues – ones that may produce opposite behavioral effects, depending on the
552 phosphorylation status of neighboring sites. In particular we point to the contradictory results we
553 observed with Ala-variants of the CL5 site. In comparing results from the series 1-4A, 1-5A, 1-6A and 1-

554 7A, we found that the 1-4A had only mild effects on the evening peak compared to over-expressing WT
555 PDFR (e.g., Figure **2B-2** vs. **2I-2**), whereas the others produced significant delays (**Figures 2M and 3I-3**
556 **through 3L-3)** under Short Day conditions. Those observations suggest modification of the CL5 residue
557 (S6333) promotes desensitization of PDFR and termination of PDFR signaling. However, the PDFR
558 variant 5-7A was constructed with the expectation that it would be as effective as 1-5A, 1-6A or 1-7A in
559 delaying the evening phase. Instead it proved only weakly effective. This same mis-match of expected
560 behavioral effects for 5-7A was also seen in other photoperiodic conditions (**Figure 6N, and 7H-3 vs 7J-3**
561 **through 7L-3).** Likewise, Langlet *et al*. [40] reported that effects on mutating Serine residues in the
562 carboxy terminus of VPAC1 did not produce additive effects. We propose that phosphorylation of CL5
563 will have either positive or negative consequences on PDFR desensitization depending on which other
564 neighboring residues are also modified. Thus we speculate that CL5 takes on outsize importance in
565 determining desensitization rates for PDFR and so may itself be subject to exceptional regulation. Such
566 complex interactions between phosphorylation sites is reminiscent of interactions documented between
567 diverse phosphorylation sites in the circadian clock protein PERIOD [69, 70]. Better resolution of these
568 apparent conflicting mechanisms (specific phosphorylation versus bulk negative charge, and paradoxical
569 effects of the CL5 site) awaits precise molecular definition of where and when PDFR is modified *in vivo*,
570 and by which modifying pathways.
571
572 ***MATERIALS and METHODS***
573
574 **Fly Rearing and Stocks.** *Drosophila* were raised on a cornmeal agar diet supplemented with
575 yeast at 25°C in 12 hr:12 hr LD cycles. The UAS-*pdfr* mutant transgenic series was created by injecting
576 *yw P{nos phiC31\int.NLS}X;P{CaryP}attP40* embryos (Rainbow Transgenic Flies, Inc, Camarillo, CA). The
577 UAS-*pdfr*-tandem construct was injected into *y[1] w[*] P{y[+t7.7]=nos-phiC31\int.NLS}X;*

578 *P{y[+t7.7]=CaryIP}su(Hw)attP6* embryos. For PDFR-tandem fusion protein expression, we made a stable
579 *yw*; *tim*(UAS)-Gal4; UAS-*pdfr*-tandem stock. *pdfr* mutant flies are described in [11]; *tim*(UAS)-Gal4 flies
580 are described in [71] – *BL80941*). The recombinant fly stock - han^{5304}; *tim* (UAS)-Gal4 - was confirmed by
581 PCR and sequencing.
582
583 ***hEK-293* Cell Culture**. *hEK-293* cells were maintained in DMEM, 10% FBS and 100U/mL penicillin
584 and streptomycin in 5% CO_2 atmosphere at 37°C. For all transient transfections, 1.5 x 10^6 cells were used
585 to inoculate T25 flasks, incubated overnight, then transfected with 10ug plasmid DNA and 20 uL
586 lipofectamine 2000 reagent (Invitrogen Life Technologies). Five hours after transfection, cells were split
587 4 x 10^4 cells/well into a 96-well assay plate. We created a series of stably-transfected *hEK-293* cells
588 expressing WT and sequence-variant PDFRs, using the Flp-In System (Invitrogen Life Technologies,
589 Waltham, Massachusetts) per manufacturers recommendations, and maintained them in DMEM
590 supplemented with 150 µg/ml hygromycin B.
591
592 **cAMP Assays**. We measured PDF Receptor signaling activity using a CRE-*Luciferase* reporter
593 gene, following methods described by Johnson *et al.* [29]. The reporter gene construct was transiently
594 transfected to each stable cell line and luminescence measured using Firefly Luciferase Assay Kit
595 (Biotium, Inc., Fremont, California) and a Wallac 1420 VICTOR2 microplate reader (PerkinElmer, Inc.,
596 Waltham, Massachusetts). Concentration-effect curves, EC_{50}, top values and p-values were calculated
597 using the dose response, in a nonlinear regression using GraphPad Prism 8.0 software (San Diego,
598 California).
599
600 **Locomotor activity Measures.** All locomotor activity experiments were conducted with 2-5
601 days-old male flies at 25°C using Trikinetics Activity Monitors as previously described [9]. We crossed

602 Gal4 lines to w^{1118} to create control progeny. Locomotor activities were monitored for 6 days under
603 different photoperiodic conditions, and then for 9 days under constant dark (DD). To analyze rhythmicity
604 under constant conditions, we normalized the activity of flies from DD day 3 to day 9 and used χ2-
605 periodogram analysis with a 95% confidence cut-off, as well as SNR analysis [72] Arrhythmic flies were
606 defined by a power value $\leq$ 10 and width value $\leq$ 2, and period outside the range, 18 to 30 hours. To
607 analyze periods, we used Graphpad Instat (v 8) software to run one-way ANOVA measures followed by
608 the Tukey-Kramer Multiple Comparisons Test. We used Clocklab (Actimetrics) software to produce
609 actograms and the Brandeis Rhythms Package [73] to produce average activity plots (group eductions).
610 To analyze onset and offset phases of Morning and Evening activity bouts on the final two days of
611 light:dark entrainment (LD 5&6), we followed the method of Kula-Eversole *et al.* (55, 2021): [$(A_{n+2} + A_{n+1})$
612 $- (A_{n-1} + A_{n-2}) = \Delta$Activity]. Experimental genotypes were tested in the *han* mutant background, $pdfr^{5304}$
613 [11], or in the pdf^{01} (null) mutant background [1], or in the w^{1118} background, as noted.
614
615 Additional details on Methods and procedures are found in **Supplemental Information**.
616
617 ***ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS***
618 We thank many colleagues for generously sharing reagents, fly strains and providing technical advice, all
619 of which helped us pursue these studies. These include Drs. Xuemei Si, Ali Salahpour, Dmitri Nusinow,
620 Johanna Chiu, Xitong Liang, Paul Hardin, Zsolt Lenkei, Ken Blumer and David Wheeler. We thank the
621 staff that manages the Flybase resource which provides valuable information, and the Danforth Plant
622 Science Center Mass Spectroscopy Facility for expert assistance, and the Bloomington *Drosophila* Stock
623 Center, and the Vienna *Drosophila* Research Center for providing many valuable fly stocks. We also
624 thank Joel Levine and Orie Shafer for kindly providing comments on the manuscript.
625 ***AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS***

626 W.L., J.T. and P.H.T designed experiments. W.L. and J.T. performed experiments. W.L., J.T. and P.H.T
627 analyzed experiments. P.H.T wrote the manuscript.
628
629
630 ***LITERATURE CITED***
631

632 1. Renn SC, Park JH, Rosbash M, Hall JC, Taghert PH. A *pdf* neuropeptide gene mutation and ablation of
633 PDF neurons each cause severe abnormalities of behavioral circadian rhythms in *Drosophila*.
634 Cell. 1999; 99:791-802. PMID: 10619432.
635 2. Peng Y, Stoleru D, Levine JD, Hall JC, Rosbash M. *Drosophila* free-running rhythms require intercellular
636 communication. PLoS Biol. 2003; 1:E13. PMID: 12975658.
637 3. Lin Y, Stormo GD, Taghert PH. The neuropeptide pigment-dispersing factor coordinates pacemaker
638 interactions in the *Drosophila* circadian system. J Neurosci. 2004; 24:7951-7. PMID: 15356209.
639 4. Vosko AM, Schroeder A, Loh DH, Colwell CS. Vasoactive intestinal peptide and the mammalian
640 circadian system. Gen Comp Endocrinol. 2007; 152:165-75. PMID: 17572414.
641 5. Fernlund, P. Structure of a light-adapting hormone from the shrimp, *Pandalus borealis.* Biochim
642 Biophysica Acta 1976; 439: 17-25. PMID: 95295.
643 6. Rao KR, Riehm JP, Zahnow CA, Kleinholz LH, Tarr GE, Johnson L, Norton S, Landau M, Semmes OJ,
644 Sattelberg RM, Jorenby WH, Hintz MF. Characterization of a pigment-dispersing hormone in
645 eyestalks of the fiddler crab *Uca pugilator*. Proc Nat'l Acad Sci (Wash) U S A. 1985; 82:5319-22.
646 PMID: 16593589.
647 7. Cusumano P, Klarsfeld A, Chélot E, Picot M, Richier B, Rouyer F. PDF-modulated visual inputs and
648 cryptochrome define diurnal behavior in *Drosophila*. Nat Neurosci. 2009; 12:1431-7. PMID:
649 19820704.

650 8. Zhang L, Lear BC, Seluzicki A, Allada R. The CRYPTOCHROME photoreceptor gates PDF neuropeptide
651 signaling to set circadian network hierarchy in *Drosophila*. Curr Biol. 2009; 19:2050-5. PMID:
652 19913424.
653 9. Im SH, Li W, Taghert PH. PDFR and CRY signaling converge in a subset of clock neurons to modulate
654 the amplitude and phase of circadian behavior in *Drosophila*. PLoS One. 2011; 6:e18974. PMID:
655 21559487.
656 10. Liang X, Holy TE, Taghert PH. Synchronous *Drosophila* circadian pacemakers display nonsynchronous
657 Ca^{2+} rhythms. Science (Wash). 2016; 351:976-81. PMID: 26917772.
658 11. Hyun S, Lee Y, Hong ST, Bang S, Paik D, Kang J, Shin J, Lee J, Jeon K, Hwang S, Bae E, Kim J. *Drosophila*
659 GPCR Han is a receptor for the circadian clock neuropeptide PDF. Neuron. 2005; 48:267-78.
660 PMID: 16242407.
661 12. Lear BC, Merrill CE, Lin JM, Schroeder A, Zhang L, Allada R. A G protein-coupled receptor, groom-of-
662 PDF, is required for PDF neuron action in circadian behavior. Neuron. 2005; 48:221-7. PMID:
663 16242403.
664 13. Mertens I, Vandingenen A, Johnson EC, Shafer OT, Li W, Trigg JS, De Loof A, Schoofs L, Taghert PH.
665 PDF receptor signaling in *Drosophila* contributes to both circadian and geotactic behaviors.
666 Neuron. 2005; 48:213-9. PMID: 16242402.
667 14. Shafer OT, Kim DJ, Dunbar-Yaffe R, Nikolaev VO, Lohse MJ, Taghert PH. Widespread receptivity to
668 neuropeptide PDF throughout the neuronal circadian clock network of *Drosophila* revealed by
669 real-time cyclic AMP imaging. Neuron. 2008; 58:223-37. PMID: 18439407.
670 15. Duvall LB, Taghert PH. The circadian neuropeptide PDF signals preferentially through a specific
671 adenylate cyclase isoform AC3 in M pacemakers of *Drosophila*. PLoS Biol. 2012; 10:e1001337.
672 PMID: 22679392.

673 16. Duvall LB, Taghert PH. E and M circadian pacemaker neurons use different PDF receptor
674 signalosome components in *Drosophila*. J Biol Rhythms. 2013; 28:239-48. PMID: 23929551.
675 17. Seluzicki A, Flourakis M, Kula-Eversole E, Zhang L, Kilman V, Allada R. Dual PDF signaling pathways
676 reset clocks via TIMELESS and acutely excite target neurons to control circadian behavior. PLoS
677 Biol. 2014; 12(3):e1001810.. PMID: 24643294.
678 18. Depetris-Chauvin A, Fernández-Gamba A, Gorostiza EA, Herrero A, Castaño EM, Ceriani MF. Mmp1
679 processing of the PDF neuropeptide regulates circadian structural plasticity of pacemaker
680 neurons. *PLoS Genet*. 2014; doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1004700. PMID: 25356918.
681 19. Liang X, Holy TE, Taghert PH. A Series of Suppressive Signals within the *Drosophila* Circadian Neural
682 Circuit Generates Sequential Daily Outputs. Neuron. 2017; 94:1173-1189. PMID: 28552314.
683 20. Liang X, Ho MCW, Zhang Y, Li Y, Wu MN, Holy TE, Taghert PH. Morning and Evening Circadian
684 Pacemakers Independently Drive Premotor Centers via a Specific Dopamine Relay. Neuron.
685 2019; 102:843-857. PMID: 30981533.
686 21. Pincas H, González-Maeso J, Ruf-Zamojski F, Sealfon SC. G Protein-Coupled Receptors. In:
687 Belfiore A, LeRoith D, editors. Principles of Endocrinology and Hormone Action.
688 Endocrinology. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-44675-2_6. 2018.
689 22. Lefkowitz RJ, Shenoy SK. Transduction of receptor signals by β-Arrestins. Science (Wash). 2005;
690 308:512-7. PMID: 15845844.
691 23. Benovic JL, Kühn H, Weyand I, Codina J, Caron MG, Lefkowitz RJ. Functional desensitization of the
692 isolated beta-adrenergic receptor by the beta-adrenergic receptor kinase: potential role of an
693 analog of the retinal protein arrestin (48-kDa protein). Proc Nat'l Acad Sci (Wash) U S A. 1987;
694 84:8879-82. PMID: 2827157.
695 24. Lohse MJ, Benovic JL, Codina J, Caron MG, Lefkowitz RJ. β-Arrestin: a protein that regulates beta-
696 adrenergic receptor function. Science (Wash). 1990; 248:1547-50. PMID: 2163110.

697 25. Ferguson SS, Downey WE 3rd, Colapietro AM, Barak LS, Ménard L, Caron MG. Role of β-arrestin in
698 mediating agonist-promoted G protein-coupled receptor internalization. Science (Wash). 1996;
699 271:363-6. PMID: 8553074.
700 26. Smith JS, Rajagopal S. The β-Arrestins: Multifunctional Regulators of G Protein-coupled Receptors. J
701 Biol Chem. 2016; 291:8969-77. PMID: 26984408.
702 27. Kelly E, Bailey CP, Henderson G. Agonist-selective mechanisms of GPCR desensitization. Brit J of
703 Pharm. 2008; 153 Suppl 1: S379–88. PMID 18059321.
704 28. Krispel CM, Chen D, Melling N, Chen YJ, Martemyanov KA, Quillinan N, Arshavsky VY, Wensel TG,
705 Chen CK, Burns ME. RGS expression rate-limits recovery of rod photoresponses. Neuron. 2006;
706 51:409-16. PMID: 16908407.
707 29. Johnson EC, Bohn LM, Barak LS, Birse RT, Nässel DR, Caron MG, Taghert PH. Identification of
708 *Drosophila* neuropeptide receptors by G protein-coupled receptors-beta-arrestin2 interactions. J
709 Biol Chem. 2003; 278(52):52172-8. PMID: 14555656.
710 30. Berson DM, Dunn FA, Takao M. Phototransduction by retinal ganglion cells that set the circadian
711 clock. Science (Wash). 2002; 295:1070-3. PMID: 11834835.
712 31. Emanuel AJ, Do MT. Melanopsin tristability for sustained and broadband phototransduction.
713 Neuron. 2015; 85:1043-55. PMID: 25741728.
714 32. Somasundaram P, Wyrick GR, Fernandez DC, *et al.* C-terminal phosphorylation regulates the kinetics
715 of a subset of melanopsin-mediated behaviors in mice. Proc Nat'l. Acad Sci (Wash) U S A. 2017;
716 114:2741-2746. PMID: 28223508.
717 33. Mure LS, Hatori M, Zhu Q, Demas J, Kim IM, Nayak SK, Panda S. Melanopsin-Encoded Response
718 Properties of Intrinsically Photosensitive Retinal Ganglion Cells. Neuron. 2016; 90:1016-27.
719 PMID: 27181062.

720 34. Abruzzi K, Chen X, Nagoshi E, Zadina A, Rosbash M. RNA-seq profiling of small numbers of *Drosophila*
721 neurons. Methods Enzymol. 2015; 551:369-86. PMID: 25662465.
722 35. Klose M, Duvall L, Li W, Liang X, Ren C, Steinbach JH, Taghert PH. Functional PDF Signaling in the
723 *Drosophila* Circadian Neural Circuit Is Gated by Ral A-Dependent Modulation. Neuron. 2016;
724 90:781-794. PMID: 27161526.
725 36. Johnson EC, Bohn LM, Taghert PH. *Drosophila* CG8422 encodes a functional diuretic hormone
726 receptor. J Exp Biol. 2004; 207:743-8. PMID: 14747406.
727 37. Johnson EC, Shafer OT, Trigg JS, Park J, Schooley DA, Dow JA, Taghert PH. A novel diuretic hormone
728 receptor in *Drosophila*: evidence for conservation of CGRP signaling. J Exp Biol. 2005; 208:1239-
729 46. PMID: 15781884.
730 38. Throckmorton, LH. The phylogeny, ecology and geography of *Drosophila*. In: King RC., editor.
731 Handbook of Genetics. Vol 3. New York: Plenum; 1975. pp 421-469.
732 39. Valdez-Lopez JC, Gulati S, Ortiz EA, Palczewski K, Robinson PR. Melanopsin Carboxy-terminus
733 phosphorylation plasticity and bulk negative charge, not strict site specificity, achieves
734 phototransduction deactivation. PLoS One. 2020; 15:e0228121. PMID: 32236094.
735 40. Langlet C, Langer I, Vertongen P, Gaspard N, Vanderwinden JM, Robberecht P. Contribution of the
736 carboxyl terminus of the VPAC1 receptor to agonist-induced receptor phosphorylation,
737 internalization, and recycling. J Biol Chem. 2005; 280: 28034 –28043. PMID: 15932876.
738 41. Dephoure N, Gould KL, Gygi SP, Kellogg DR. Mapping and analysis of phosphorylation sites: a quick
739 guide for cell biologists. Mol Biol Cell. 2013; 24:535-42. PMID: 23447708.
740 42. Shafer OT, Taghert PH. RNA-interference knockdown of *Drosophila pigment dispersing factor* in
741 neuronal subsets: the anatomical basis of a neuropeptide's circadian functions. PLoS One. 2009;
742 4:e8298. PMID: 20011537..

743 43. Zhang Y, Emery P. GW182 controls *Drosophila* circadian behavior and PDF-receptor signaling.
744 Neuron. 2013; Apr 10;78(1):152-65. PMID: 23583112.
745 44. Beerepoot P, Lam VM, Salahpour A. Measurement of G protein-coupled receptor surface expression.
746 J Recept Signal Transduct Res. 2013; Jun;33(3):162-5. PMID: 23557016.
747 45. Zhou XE, He Y, de Waal PW, Gao X, Kang Y, Van Eps N, Yin Y, Pal K, Goswami D, White TA, Barty A,
748 Latorraca NR, Chapman HN, Hubbell WL, Dror RO, Stevens RC, Cherezov V, Gurevich VV, Griffin
749 PR, Ernst OP, Melcher K, Xu HE. Identification of Phosphorylation Codes for Arrestin Recruitment
750 by G Protein-Coupled Receptors. Cell. 2017; 170:457-469.e13. PMID: 28753425.
751 46. Im SH, Taghert PH PDF receptor expression reveals direct interactions between circadian oscillators
752 in *Drosophila.* J Comp Neurol. 2010; 518:1925-45. PMID**:** 20394051.
753 47. Li S, Li S, Han Y, Tong C, Wang B, Chen Y, Jiang, J. (2016). Regulation of Smoothened Phosphorylation
754 and High-Level Hedgehog Signaling Activity by a Plasma Membrane Associated Kinase. PLoS
755 Biology, 2016; *14*(6), e1002481. PMID: 27280464.
756 48. Murthy KS, Mahavadi S, Huang J, Zhou H, and Sriwai W. Phosphorylation of GRK2 by PKA augments
757 GRK2-mediated phosphorylation, internalization, and desensitization of VPAC2 receptors in
758 smooth muscle. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 2008; 294: C477–C487. PMID: 18077607.
759 49. Huang J, Mahavadi S, Sriwai W, Grider JR, Murthy KS. Cross-regulation of VPAC(2) receptor
760 desensitization by M(3) receptors via PKC-mediated phosphorylation of RKIP and inhibition of
761 GRK2. Am J Physiol Gastrointest Liver Physiol. 2007; 292:G867-74. PMID: 17170028.
762 50. Shetzline MA, Premont RT, Walker JK, Vigna SR, Caron MG. A role for receptor kinases in the
763 regulation of class II G protein-coupled receptors. Phosphorylation and desensitization of the
764 secretin receptor. J Biol Chem. 1998 Mar 20;273(12):6756-62. PMID: 9506976.

765 51. Walker JK, Premont RT, Barak LS, Caron MG, Shetzline MA. Properties of secretin receptor
766 internalization differ from those of the 2-adrenergic receptor. J Biol Chem 1999; 274: 31515–
767 31523. PMID: 10531354.
768 52. Marie JC, Rouyer-Fessard C, Couvineau A, Nicole P, Devaud H, El Benna J, Laburthe M. Serine 447 in
769 the carboxyl tail of human VPAC1 receptor is crucial for agonist-induced desensitization but not
770 internalization of the receptor. Mol Pharmacol. 2003; 64: 1565–1574. PMID: 14645688.
771 53. Estall JL, Koehler JA, Yusta B, Drucker DJ. The glucagon-like peptide-2 receptor C terminus modulates
772 beta-arrestin-2 association but is dispensable for ligand-induced desensitization, endocytosis,
773 and G-protein-dependent effector activation. J Biol Chem. 2005; 280:22124-34. PMID:
774 15817468.
775 54. Helfrich-Förster C. The period clock gene is expressed in central nervous system neurons which also
776 produce a neuropeptide that reveals the projections of circadian pacemaker cells within the
777 brain of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Proc Nat'l Acad Sci (Wash) U S A. 1995; 92:612-6. PMID:
778 7831339.
779 55. Stoleru D, Peng Y, Agosto J, Rosbash M. Coupled oscillators control morning and evening locomotor
780 behaviour of *Drosophila*. Nature. 2004; 431:862-8. PMID: 15483615.
781 56. Schlichting M, Menegazzi P, Lelito KR, Yao Z, Buhl E, Dalla Benetta E, Bahle A, Denike J, Hodge JJ,
782 Helfrich-Förster C, Shafer OT. A Neural Network Underlying Circadian Entrainment and
783 Photoperiodic Adjustment of Sleep and Activity in *Drosophila*. J Neurosci. 2016; 36(35):9084-96.
784 PMID: 27581451.
785 57. Vaze KM, Helfrich-Förster C. The Neuropeptide PDF Is Crucial for Delaying the Phase
786 of *Drosophila's* Evening Neurons Under Long Zeitgeber Periods. J Biol Rhythms. 2021;36(5):442-
787 460. PMID: 34428956.

788 58. Yoshii T, Wülbeck C, Sehadova H, Veleri S, Bichler D, Stanewsky R, Helfrich-Förster C. The
789 neuropeptide pigment-dispersing factor adjusts period and phase of *Drosophila's* clock. J
790 Neurosci. 2009; Feb 25;29(8):2597-610. PMID: 19244536.
791 59. Kula-Eversole E, Lee DH, Samba I, Yildirim E, Levine DC, Hong HK, Lear BC, Bass J, Rosbash M, Allada
792 R. Phosphatase of Regenerating Liver-1 Selectively Times Circadian Behavior in Darkness via
793 Function in PDF Neurons and Dephosphorylation of TIMELESS. Curr Biol. 2021; 31:138-149.e5.
794 PMID: 33157022.
795 60. Grima B, Chélot E, Xia R, Rouyer F. Morning and evening peaks of activity rely on different clock
796 neurons of the *Drosophila* brain. Nature. 2004; Oct 14;431(7010):869-73. PMID: 15483616.
797 61. Stoleru D, Peng Y, Nawathean P, Rosbash M. A resetting signal between *Drosophila* pacemakers
798 synchronizes morning and evening activity. Nature. 2005; Nov 10;438(7065):238-42. PMID:
799 16281038.
800 62. Rieger D, Shafer OT, Tomioka K, Helfrich-Förster C. Functional analysis of circadian pacemaker
801 neurons in Drosophila melanogaster. J Neurosci. 2006; Mar 1;26(9):2531-43. PMID: 16510731
802 63. Picot M, Cusumano P, Klarsfeld A, Ueda R, Rouyer F. Light activates output from evening neurons
803 and inhibits output from morning neurons in the *Drosophila* circadian clock. PLoS Biol. 2007;
804 Nov;5(11):e315. PMID: 18044989;
805 64. Zhang Y, Liu Y, Bilodeau-Wentworth D, Hardin PE, Emery P. Light and temperature control the
806 contribution of specific DN1 neurons to *Drosophila* circadian behavior. Curr Biol. 2010; Apr
807 13;20(7):600-5. PMID: 20362449.
808 65. Delventhal R, O'Connor RM, Pantalia MM, Ulgherait M, Kim HX, Basturk MK, Canman JC, Shirasu-Hiza
809 M. Dissection of central clock function in *Drosophila* through cell-specific CRISPR-mediated clock
810 gene disruption. Elife. 2019;8:e48308. PMID: 31613218.

811 66. Menegazzi P, Beer K, Grebler V, Schlichting M, Schubert FK, Helfrich-Förster C. A Functional Clock
812 Within the Main Morning and Evening Neurons of *D. melanogaster* Is Not Sufficient for Wild-
813 Type Locomotor Activity Under Changing Day Length. Front Physiol. 2020; Mar 26;11:229. PMID:
814 32273848.
815 67. Schlichting M, Díaz MM, Xin J, Rosbash M. Neuron-specific knockouts indicate the importance of
816 network communication to *Drosophila* rhythmicity. Elife. 2019 Oct 15;8:e48301. PMID:
817 31613223
818 68. Yao Z, Shafer OT. The *Drosophila* circadian clock is a variably coupled network of multiple peptidergic
819 units. Science (Wash). 2014; 343(6178):1516-20. PMID: 24675961.
820 69. Chiu JC, Ko HW, Edery I. (2011) NEMO/NLK phosphorylates PERIOD to initiate a time-delay
821 phosphorylation circuit that sets circadian clock speed. Cell. 2011; 145:357-70. PMID: 21514639.
822 70. Yu W, Houl JH, Hardin PE. NEMO kinase contributes to core period determination by slowing the
823 pace of the *Drosophila* circadian oscillator. Curr Biol. 2011; 21:756-61. PMID: 21514156.
824 71. Blau J, Young MW. Cycling vrille expression is required for a functional *Drosophila* clock. Cell. 1999;
825 Dec 10;99(6):661-71 PMID: 10612401.
826 72. Levine JD, Funes P, Dowse HB, Hall JC. Signal analysis of behavioral and molecular cycles. BMC
827 Neurosci. 2002; 3:1. PMID: 1182533.
828 73. Wheeler DA, Hamblen-Coyle MJ, Dushay MS, Hall JC. Behavior in light-dark cycles of *Drosophila*
829 mutants that are arrhythmic, blind, or both. J Biol Rhythms. 1993; 8:67-94. PMID: 8490212.
830
831
832
833
834

835

836

837

838

839 ***FIGURE LEGENDS***

840

841 **Figure 1. A map illustrating the series of PDFR sequence variants used to test a role for PDFR**
842 **phosphorylaytion in regulating the locomotor rhythms.** The C Terminal of the PDFR-A isoform is
843 diagrammed (top) immediately following the position of the 7th transmembrane domain (TM7, blue).
844 Asterisks indicate the positions of the 28 serine, threonine or tyrosine residues present within the PDFR
845 C Terminal tail. The residues marked by the white asterisks were those chosen for study by sequence
846 alteration to encode Alanine; they were given arbitrary designations as Clusters (CL) 1 through 7. Each
847 cluster contains a single residue (e.g., CL4 or CL5), or as many as four residues (e.g., CL2). The ten
848 sequence variants are named by the Cluster(s) that was altered followed by the letter 'A". Simple
849 Variants include those wherein residues in one or two Clusters were altered. Multiple Variants include
850 those wherein residues within three or more Clusters were altered. All 14 targeted residues were
851 altered in the PDFR 1-7A variant.

852

853 **Figure 2. Locomotor Rhythms exhibited by WT PDFR and by Simple PDFR Variants under**
854 **Winter-like (Short Day) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies
855 that expressed either no UAS transgene (A), or a UAS-WT *pdfr* transgene (B) or a variety of Simple *PDFR*
856 Variants, including 2-3A (C), 4A (D), 5A (E), 6A (F) or 7A (G), or Multiple PDFR variants, including 5-7A
857 (H), 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) and 1-7A (L). Each Panel (A)-(L) contains sub-panels (1) and (2). Sub-Panel
858 (1) displays a double-plotted group actogram throughout the 6 days of Light: dark entrainment, followed

859 by ~9 days of constant darkness (DD, grey background). Sub-panel (2) displays a daily plot of locomotor
860 activity (a group eduction) averaged over the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Open bars indicate
861 the periods of Lights-on and filled bars indicate periods of Lights-off. Panel M displays the average
862 Phase Offset timepoint for the Evening activity phase (marked by a Blue Arrow) for each genotype over
863 the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Panel N displays the average Phase Onset timepoint for the
864 Morning activity phase (marked by a Red Arrow) for each genotype over the last two days of
865 entrainment (LD 5-6). The positions of the Blue and Red arrow in panels A-L are representative; panels
866 M and N presents their true values. Analyses represent ANOVA followed by Dunnett's post hoc multiple
867 comparisons of all compared to WT: ns = not significant; * = $p<0.05$; ** = $p<0.01$; *** = $p<0.005$; **** =
868 $p<0.001$.
869
870 **Figure 3. Amplitude measures of Locomotor activity exhibited by WT PDFR and by diverse**
871 **PDFR Variants under Winter-like (Short Day) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from
872 *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies that expressed either no UAS transgene (A – marked in YELLOW), or a WT *pdfr*
873 cDNA (B – marked in BLACK) or a variety of Simple *pdfr* Variants (marked in RED) including 2-3A (C), 4A
874 (D), 5A (E), 6A (F), 7A (G), 5-7A (H), 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) or 1-7A (L). These measures were
875 averaged across all experiments run for each individual genotype (see Table 1 for N and n values). Each
876 Panel (A)-(L) contains sub-panels (1) through (3), each of which displays Bin-by-Bin analyses of activity
877 levels sorted by 30 min bins, for three different time periods: (1) ZT17-23.5; (2) ZT 0.5 – 8; (3) ZT 8.5-16.
878 The missing bin at timepoint 0 contains the startle response that accompanies the sudden lights-on
879 signal. Asterisks indicate significantly-different activity levels according to a Student's T-test ($p< 0.05$).
880 Red arrows indicate elevated Morning activity levels displayed by different PDFR variants. Blue arrows
881 indicate elevated Evening activity levels produced by different PDFR variants.
882

883

884 **Figure 4. Locomotor Rhythms exhibited by WT PDFR and by Simple PDFR Variants under**
885 **Equinox (12:12) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies that
886 expressed either no UAS transgene (A), or a UAS-WT *pdfr* transgene (B) or a variety of Simple *pdfr*
887 Variants, including 2-3A (C), 4A (D), 5A (E), 6A (F) or 7A (G), or Multiple pdfr variants, including 5-7A (H),
888 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) and 1-7A (L). Each Panel (A)-(L) contains sub-panels (1) and (2). Sub-Panel (1)
889 displays a double-plotted group actogram throughout the 6 days of Light: dark entrainment, followed by
890 ~9 days of constant darkness (DD, grey background). Sub-panel (2) displays a daily plot of locomotor
891 activity (a group eduction) averaged over the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Open bars indicate
892 the periods of Lights-on and filled bars indicate periods of Lights-off. Panel M displays the average
893 Phase Offset timepoint for the Evening activity phase (marked by a Blue Arrow) for each genotype over
894 the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Panel N displays the average Phase Onset timepoint for the
895 Morning activity phase (marked by a Red Arrow) for each genotype over the last two days of
896 entrainment (LD 5-6). The positions of the Blue and Red arrow in panels A-L are representative; panels
897 M and N presents their true values. Analyses represent ANOVA followed by Dunnett's post hoc multiple
898 comparisons of all compared to WT: ns = not significant; * = $p<0.05$; ** = $p<0.01$; *** = $p<0.005$; **** =
899 $p<0.001$.

900

901 **Figure 5. Locomotor Rhythms exhibited by WT PDFR and by Multiple PDFR Variants under**
902 **Equinox (12:12) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies that
903 expressed either no UAS transgene (A – marked in YELLOW), or a WT *pdfr* cdNA (B – marked in BLACK)
904 or a variety of Simple *pdfr* Variants (marked in RED) including 2-3A (C), 4A (D), 5A (E), 6A (F), 7A (G), 5-7A
905 (H), 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) or 1-7A (L). These measures were averaged across all experiments run for
906 each individual genotype (see Table 1 for N and n values). Each Panel (A)-(L) contains sub-panels (1)

907 through (3), each of which displays Bin-by-Bin analyses of activity levels sorted by 30 min bins, for three
908 different time periods: (1) ZT17-23.5; (2) ZT 0.5 – 8; (3) ZT 8.5-16. The missing bin at timepoint 0
909 contains the startle response that accompanies the sudden lights-on signal. Asterisks indicate
910 significantly-different activity levels according to a Student's T-test ($p < 0.05$). Red arrows indicate
911 elevated Morning activity levels displayed by different PDFR variants. Blue arrows indicate elevated
912 Evening activity levels produced by different PDFR variants.
913
914 **Figure 6. Locomotor Rhythms exhibited by WT PDFR and by Simple PDFR Variants under**
915 **Summer-like (Long Day) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies
916 that expressed either no UAS transgene (A), or a UAS-WT *pdfr* transgene (B) or a variety of Simple *pdfr*
917 Variants, including 2-3A (C), 4A (D), 5A (E), 6A (F) or 7A (G), or Multiple *pdfr* variants, including 5-7A (H),
918 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) and 1-7A (L). Each Panel (A)-(L) contains sub-panels (1) and (2). Sub-Panel (1)
919 displays a double-plotted group actogram throughout the 6 days of Light: dark entrainment, followed by
920 ~9 days of constant darkness (DD, grey background). Sub-panel (2) displays a daily plot of locomotor
921 activity (a group eduction) averaged over the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Open bars indicate
922 the periods of Lights-on and filled bars indicate periods of Lights-off. Panel M displays the average
923 Phase Offset timepoints for the Evening activity periods (marked by a Blue Arrow) for each genotype
924 over the last two days of entrainment (LD 5-6). Panel N displays the average Phase Onset timepoints for
925 the Morning activity periods (marked by a Red Arrow) for each genotype over the last two days of
926 entrainment (LD 5-6). The positions of the Blue and Red arrows in panels A-L are representative; panels
927 M and N presents their true values. . Analyses represent ANOVA followed by Dunnett's post hoc
928 multiple comparisons of all compared to WT: ns = not significant; * = $p<0.05$; ** = $p<0.01$; *** =
929 $p<0.005$; **** = $p<0.001$.
930

931 **Figure 7. Locomotor Rhythms exhibited by WT PDFR and by Multiple PDFR Variants under**
932 **Summer-like (Long Day) conditions.** All behavioral records were recorded from *han* (*pdfr* mutant) flies
933 that expressed either no UAS transgene (A – marked in YELLOW), or a WT *pdfr* cdNA (B – marked in
934 BLACK) or a variety of Simple *pdfr* Variants (marked in RED) including 2-3A (C), 4A (D), 5A (E), 6A (F), 7A
935 (G), 5-7A (H), 1-4A (I), 1-5A (J), 1-6A (K) or 1-7A (L). These measures were averaged across all
936 experiments run for each individual genotype (see Table 1 for N and n values). Each Panel (A)-(L)
937 contains sub-panels (1) through (3), each of which displays Bin-by-Bin analyses of activity levels sorted
938 by 30 min bins, for three different time periods: (1) ZT17-23.5; (2) ZT 0.5 – 8; (3) ZT 8.5-16. The missing
939 bin at timepoint 0 contains the startle response that accompanies the sudden lights-on signal. Asterisks
940 indicate significantly-different activity levels according to a Student's T-test ($p < 0.05$). Red arrows
941 indicate elevated Morning activity levels displayed by different PDFR variants. Blue arrows indicate
942 elevated Evening activity levels produced by different PDFR variants.
943
944 **Figure 8. A model predicting the effects of phosphorylating different sites on the PDFR CT on**
945 **downstream signaling.** Asterisks indicate the positions Ser/ Thr/ and Tyr residues as described in Figure
946 1 and Supplemental Figure 1: white asterisks were targets of mutational analysis in this study. Mutation
947 of CL6 and CL7 consistently demonstrated the greatest delaying effects on the phases of locomotor
948 peaks, suggesting their phosphorylation normally will have the greatest effect to slow or terminate PDFR
949 signaling. Other sites are also effective, although to lesser degrees, including CL2-3, CL4 and CL5.
950 Primarily, such phosphorylation will decrease the extent of PDFR signaling (red bars) and so reduce the
951 delay that PDF imposes on the period of neuronal activation displayed by PDFR-responsive pacemaker
952 groups (like the Evening cells and the DN3: Liang *et al.*, 2016, 2017). The model also predicts that the
953 effects of phosphorylating CL5 will depend on the phosphorylation status of neighboring sites. In some
954 contexts (e.g., PDFR 1-5A), it will help terminate PDFR signaling, but in others (e.g., PDFR 567A) it may

955 promote the duration or extent of PDFR signaling, perhaps by blocking the effects of phosphorylating

956 CL6 and CL7 (green bar).

957

958

959

960

961

Figure 1.


PDFR-A
C-terminal
CL1
CL2
CL3
CL4
CL5
CL6
CL7
TM7
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
Simple Variants
Multiple Variants
Alanine scan

Figure 2


A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
TG : None
TG : WT
TG : 2-3A
TG : 4A
TG : 5A
TG : 6A
TG : 7A
TG : 5-7A
TG : 1-4A
TG : 1-5A
TGDF : 1-6A
TG : 1-7A
han
Time (hr)
ZT (hr)
Evening Activity:
Phase Offset
Morning Activity:
Phase Onset
w1118
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
ns
Phase (ZT, hr)

Figure 3 .


0
8
ZT (hr)
17
23.5
0.5
8
8.5
16
A
TG : None
han
NONE
B
TG :WT
NONE
WT
C
TG : 2-3A
2-3A
WT
D
TG : 4A
4A
WT
E
TG : 5A
5A
WT
F
TG : 6A
6A
WT
G
TG : 7A
7A
WT
H
TG : 5-7A
5-7A
WT
I
TG : 1-4A
1-4A
WT
J
TG : 1-5A
1-5A
WT
K
TG : 1-6A
1-6A
WT
L
TG : 1-7A
1-7A
WT
1
2
3

Figure 4


A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
Time (hr)
ZT (hr)
0
12
24
TG : None
TG : WT
TG : 2-3A
TG : 4A
TG : 5A
TG : 6A
TG : 7A
TG : 5-7A
TG : 1-4A
TG : 1-5A
TGDF : 1-6A
TG : 1-7A
han


M
Morning Activity:
Phase Onset
w1118
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
ns
**
18
20
22
24
Phase (ZT, hr)


N
Evening Activity:
Phase Onset
w1118
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
**
ns
***
6
8
10
12
Phase (ZT, hr)

Figure 5


0
12
ZT (hr)
17
23.5
0.5
8
8.5
16
A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
TG : None
TG : WT
TG : 2-3A
TG : 4A
TG : 5A
TG : 6A
TG : 7A
TG : 5-7A
TG : 1-4A
TG : 1-5A
TG : 1-6A
TG : 1-7A
han
NONE
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
1
2
3

Figure 6


A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
M
N
Time (hr)
ZT (hr)
0
16
24
TG: None
TG:WT
TG: 2-3A
TG: 4A
TG: 5A
TG: 6A
TG: 7A
TG: 5-7A
TG:1-4A
TG:1-5A
TGDF:1-6A
TG:1-7A
han
Morning Activity:
Phase Offset
Evening Activity:
Phase Onset
w1118
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
****
ns
**
*
***
Phase (ZT, hr)

Figure 7.


0
16
ZT (hr)
17
23.5
0.5
8
8.5
16
A
B
C
D
E
F
G
H
I
J
K
L
TG : None
TG : WT
TG : 2-3A
TG : 4A
TG : 5A
TG : 6A
TG : 7A
TG : 5-7A
TG : 1-4A
TG : 1-5A
TG : 1-6A
TG : 1-7A
han
NONE
WT
2-3A
4A
5A
6A
7A
5-7A
1-4A
1-5A
1-6A
1-7A
1
2
3

Figure 8.


PDFR-A
C-terminal
*** ****** *** *** * *** **** *****
Phospho-CL2-3
Phospho-CL4
Phospho-CL5
?
Phospho-CL6
Phospho-CL7
2nd messenger signaling
Delayed Pacemaker Neuron Activity
△ Locomotor Rhythm
Amplitude and Phase