1

Commissureless acts as a substrate adapter in a conserved Nedd4 E3 ubiquitin ligase pathway

to promote axon growth across the midline

Kelly G. Sullivan[1] and Greg J. Bashaw[1]*

[1]Department of Neuroscience, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 415

Curie Blvd., Philadelphia, PA, 19104, USA

* Author for correspondence: gbashaw@pennmedicine.upenn.edu

Running title: Nedd4 guides commissural axons

Keywords: Axon guidance; midline; Slit-Robo; Commissureless; Nedd4; E3 Ubiquitin ligase;

lysosomal degradation; Ndfip

SUMMARY

In both vertebrates and invertebrates, commissural neurons prevent premature responsiveness to the midline repellant Slit by downregulating surface levels of its receptor Roundabout1 (Robo1). In *Drosophila*, Commissureless (Comm) plays a critical role in this process; however, there is conflicting data on the underlying molecular mechanism. Here, we demonstrate that the conserved PY motifs in the cytoplasmic domain of Comm are required allow the ubiquitination and lysosomal degradation of Robo1. Disruption of these motifs prevents Comm from localizing to Lamp1 positive late endosomes and to promote axon growth across the midline *in vivo*. In addition, we conclusively demonstrate a role for Nedd4 in midline crossing. Genetic analysis shows that *nedd4* mutations result in midline crossing defects in the Drosophila embryonic nerve cord, which can be rescued by introduction of exogenous Nedd4. Biochemical evidence shows that Nedd4 incorporates into a three-member complex with Comm and Robo in a PY motif-dependent manner. Finally, we present genetic evidence that Nedd4 acts with Comm in the embryonic nerve cord to downregulate Robo1 levels. Taken together, these findings demonstrate that Comm promotes midline crossing in the nerve cord by facilitating Robo ubiquitination by Nedd4, ultimately leading to its degradation.

INTRODUCTION

In the embryo, neurons must find and form connections with the appropriate synaptic

partners as they wire circuits in the developing nervous system. To make these connections,

axons must travel long distances along complex but stereotyped trajectories, directed by a

variety of secreted and cell-surface molecules that are conserved from invertebrates to humans.

Interaction between these ligands and receptors on the membranes of axonal growth cones

generates attractive and repulsive responses by triggering downstream changes in growth cone

membrane and cytoskeletal architecture. Responses to these attractive and repulsive cues must

be precisely coordinated to allow axons to grow along the appropriate paths and to find their

proper post-synaptic targets.

Bilateral organisms must form neural circuits that coordinate the left and right halves of

the body, a process that is essential for normal sensory, motor, and cognitive function. Defects

in midline circuit assembly can result in a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders (for reviews

see (Engle, 2010; Izzi and Charron, 2011)) including horizontal gaze palsy with progressive

scoliosis (Bosley et al., 2005), congenital mirror movement disorder (Depienne et al., 2011;

Srour et al., 2010), autism spectrum disorder (Anitha et al., 2008; Suda et al., 2011), and

agenesis of the corpus callosum (Jamuar et al., 2017; Paul et al., 2007). A subset of neurons in

the central nervous system (CNS), called commissural neurons, contribute to the construction of

these circuits by extending their axons across the embryonic midline to connect with targets on

the opposite side of the body. Midline crossing requires a tight balance of attractive and

repulsive responses (Evans and Bashaw, 2010; Gorla and Bashaw, 2020; Nawabi and

Castellani, 2011). Pre-crossing commissural axons are initially drawn to the midline by several

attractive ligands including netrin (Ishii et al., 1992; Mitchell et al., 1996; Serafini et al., 1996;

Serafini et al., 1994) and sonic hedgehog (Charron et al., 2003). Upon reaching the midline,

however, they respond to repulsive molecules such as slits and secreted semaphorins (Brose et

al., 1999; Kidd et al., 1999; Zou et al., 2000) which allow them to exit the midline and keep them

restricted to the contralateral side of the body by preventing re-crossing. Midline glia secrete

both attractive and repulsive molecules concurrently, so an axon's behavior during a particular

moment in time relies on tight regulation of receptors at its growth cone surface.

Pre-crossing commissural axons must suppress premature responses to repulsive

signals to allow entry into the midline. In both vertebrates and invertebrates, axons prevent

premature sensitivity to the midline repellant Slit by downregulating surface levels of its

receptor, Robo1, until they reach the midline (Evans et al., 2015; Keleman et al., 2002;

Kinoshita-Kawada et al., 2019; Sabatier et al., 2004). In *Drosophila*, Robo1 surface expression

is downregulated by the Commissureless (Comm) protein (Keleman et al., 2002; Kidd et al.,

1998; Tear et al., 1996), which is absolutely required for midline crossing. Nerve cords of Comm

mutant embryos exhibit a complete lack of midline crossing (Tear et al., 1996), while Comm

overexpression decreases Robo1 levels and induces ectopic midline crossing events (Kidd et

al., 1998). Based on experiments in mammalian and insect cell culture, Comm is thought to act

by preventing newly synthesized Robo1 from reaching the growth cone membrane by binding to

it and shunting it to late endosomes, presumably leading to its degradation (Keleman et al.,

2002; Keleman et al., 2005).

While it is generally accepted that Comm prevents Robo1 from being expressed on the

growth cone in pre-crossing commissural axons, there are conflicting reports of the mechanism

of Comm function. Within a conserved region of the Comm cytoplasmic domain, there are two

PY motifs (PPCY and LPSY) (Myat et al., 2002). In a previous study, mutation of the LPSY motif

rendered Comm unable to localize Robo1 to endosomes in cell culture, and unable to induce

midline crossing *in vivo* (Keleman et al., 2002). PY motifs are known binding motifs for the WW-

domain containing Nedd4 family of HECT ubiquitin ligases (Kanelis et al., 2001; Kasanov et al.,

2001), suggesting that Comm may downregulate Robo1 via interactions with these ligases.

There remain several unanswered questions, however, concerning the roles of PY motifs in

Comm function and the mechanistic relationship between Comm, Robo1, and Nedd4 family

members during midline crossing in the embryonic nerve cord.

Firstly, it is debated whether Comm must be ubiquitinated by Nedd4-family ligases to

effectively downregulate Robo1, as two previous studies investigating this question generated

contradictory results. The first study demonstrated that Nedd4 ubiquitinated Comm, and that

Comm required both its PY motifs and its cytoplasmic ubiquitin-accepting lysines to direct

Robo1 to endosomes and downregulate its surface expression in cell culture (Myat et al., 2002).

Interestingly, in the second study, an un-ubiquitinatable Comm mutant (Comm KR with all

ubiquitin-accepting lysines mutated to arginines) was undistinguishable from wild-type Comm in

its ability to localize itself and Robo1 to endosomes *in vitro* and induce Comm gain-of-function

phenotypes *in vivo* (Keleman et al., 2005). In addition, it remains unknown whether Nedd4-

family ligases are involved in midline crossing. When stained with a pan-neuronal marker,

embryos homozygous for a chromosomal deletion that removes Nedd-4 had no noticeable

defects in commissural axon guidance (Keleman et al., 2005). This finding alone, however, is

insufficient to rule out a role for Nedd4 in midline crossing due to the possibility that loss of

function effects could be masked by maternal deposition of Nedd-4, and/or possible redundancy

with the other *Drosophila* Nedd4-family ligases Smurf and Su(dx).

In this study, we characterize the roles of PY motifs in Comm function and elucidate the

mechanistic relationship between Comm, Robo1, and Nedd4-family ligases during midline

crossing. To do this, we generated variants of Comm in which the LPSY motif (1PY) or both PY

motifs (2PY) are mutated and examined the effects of PY motif disruption on various Comm

functions. In contrast to previous literature, we find that mutating the Comm LPSY motif alone

does not completely disrupt proper localization to late endosomes *in vitro* and *in vivo*, direction

of Robo1 away from the cell surface, and promotion of midline crossing. In addition, while

previous studies only assayed the ubiquitination of Comm itself, we demonstrate that PY motifs

are necessary for Comm to facilitate Robo1 ubiquitination and lysosomal degradation. Due to

the importance of PY motifs for Comm function, we also investigated whether any of the three

Drosophila Nedd4-family ligases play a role in midline crossing. Using sensitized genetic

backgrounds, we provide evidence that loss of Nedd4, but not Smurf or Su(dx), lead to midline

crossing defects in the embryonic nerve cord. In addition, we observe that Comm, Robo1, and

Nedd4 interact as a three-member complex and that Comm PY motifs are necessary for Nedd4

incorporation into this complex. Finally, we demonstrate that exogenous Nedd4 enhances the

ability of Comm to downregulate Robo protein levels *in vivo*. Taken together, these findings

support a model in which Comm acts as a substrate adaptor to bring Robo1 into proximity to

Nedd4, which it recruits via its PY motifs. This adaptor activity then allows Nedd4 to ubiquitinate

Robo1, shunting it away from the growth cone membrane and to late endosomes and

lysosomes for degradation. Finally, the resulting downregulation of Robo1 surface levels

renders commissural axons insensitive to repulsive slit signals, allowing for midline crossing. In

addition to providing new insights into the mechanism of Comm function, the work in this study

reconciles two previously conflicting lines of research. Both earlier studies of Comm identified

important aspects of Comm function, and by investigating key features of the conflicting models,

we were able to unify them into a single coherent picture.

Results

The PY motifs of Comm are required to promote midline crossing *in vivo*

As a first step to investigate the relationship between Comm and Nedd4-family ubiquitin

ligases, we tested the roles of two putative Nedd4-family ligase binding sites in Comm's

cytoplasmic tail: the PY motifs PPCY at amino acid positions 220-223 and LPSY at amino acid

positions 229-232. Previous studies have demonstrated the necessity of these PY motifs for

Comm's ability to promote midline crossing in vivo (Keleman et al., 2002; Myat et al., 2002);

however, the previous studies used random insertions of Comm transgenes, making it very

difficult to directly compare the *in vivo* activities of different mutant variants of the Comm protein.

To circumvent this issue, we generated transgenic flies carrying UAS transgenes of the

following three Comm variants: WT (Wild-type), 1PY (LPSY->AASY), and 2PY (PPCY->AACY,

LPSY AASY, Figure 1A), and inserted them into the same integration site on the third

chromosome to ensure that these transgenic flies expressed equivalent levels of Comm

transcripts when crossed to flies bearing neuronal gal4 drivers. To allow us to vary the

expression levels of these different Comm variants, we created two sets of transgenic flies. In

the first set, we cloned the Comm coding sequence downstream of 5 copies of the UAS

promoter sequence (5X-UAS) and in the second set we used 10 copies of the UAS sequence

(10X-UAS). We then assayed the ability of the variants to induce misrouting of ipsilateral axons

across the midline in the embryonic nerve cord. In these assays, we examine the eight

posterior-most segments of the nerve cord, which are each comprised of an anterior and

posterior commissure or 16 total commissures. First, we expressed these 5X-UAS variants

under the pan-neuronal Elav-gal4 driver, and investigated their effect on FasII neurons, which

run in three parallel ipsilateral bundles along the longitudinal tracts of the nerve cord (Figure

1B). We found that WT Comm induced ectopic FAS II crossing in roughly half the commissures

in the nerve cord (mean=52%, n=17). In contrast to previously published data, Comm 1PY was

also able to induce ectopic FAS II crossing, though it was significantly less effective than WT

(p<0.0001, ANOVA/Tukey, n=23). Finally, nerve cords of embryos expressing Comm 2PY were

indistinguishable from those of control embryos not carrying any Comm transgenes (p=0.997,

ANOVA/Tukey, 2PY n=20, CTRL n=18) (Figure 1B, C).

To investigate the ability of Comm to induce ectopic midline crossing in a cell-

autonomous manner, we expressed Comm variants in apterous neurons using the apGal4

driver and investigated their effect on this specific ipsilateral neuron population. The apGal4

element is expressed in only three neurons per hemisegment allowing for greater resolution of

midline crossing phenotypes. We observed that Comm expression induces ectopic apterous

crossing in the anterior commissure of nerve cord segments. Nearly all nerve cord segments of

embryos expressing WT Comm had ectopic apterous crossing events (mean=85.28%, n=29).

Consistent with our FasII data, Comm 1PY induced significantly fewer ectopic crossing events

than WT, and Comm 2PY was completely unable to induce ectopic crossing (Figure 1D, E).

As expected, expressing higher levels of WT Comm using 10X-UAS results in a much

more severe ectopic crossing phenotype; indeed, these embryos have a *slit* mutant phenotype

(Figure S1). Surprisingly, we observed that pan neural expression of 10X Comm-2PY, which

has no effect when expressed at lower levels, leads to a striking gain of function phenotype

where many segments display strong ectopic crossing, both with FasII and with HRP (Figure

S1). Taken together, these data indicate that intact PY motifs play an important and a dose-

dependent role in Comm's ability to induce midline crossing and raise the possibility that Comm

may also inhibit midline repulsion independently of its PY motifs.

Comm PY motifs are required for Robo1 ubiquitination and lysosomal degradation

In vivo, Comm overexpression has been shown to reduce Robo1 protein levels and

produces a phenotype characterized by excessive midline crossing, reminiscent of the Robo1

loss-of-function phenotype (Kidd et al., 1998). However, previous studies have not investigated

the mechanism underlying Robo1 protein degradation. To determine the role of Comm PY

motifs in reducing Robo1 protein levels and to define the degradative mechanism, we co-

expressed Robo1 and Comm variants in S2R+ cells, and measured the expression of both

Comm and Robo1 by quantitative Western blotting. We found that co-expression of WT comm

significantly reduces Robo1 levels compared to those in cells transfected with Robo1 alone

(Figure 2A, B). Comm 1PY also reduces Robo1 levels, though it is significantly less effective at

doing so than WT Comm, while Comm 2PY is completely unable to reduce Robo1 levels

(Figure 2A, B). Interestingly, mutating the PY motifs in Comm also affects stability of the Comm

protein itself. Levels of Comm 1PY and 2PY are elevated relative to WT Comm (Figure 2A, C).

Taken together, these findings suggest that PY motifs are critical for turnover of the Comm

protein, as well as its ability to facilitate Robo1 degradation.

Since PY motifs can act as binding sites for Nedd4-family ubiquitin ligases (Kanelis et

al., 2006; Kanelis et al., 2001; Kasanov et al., 2001), we next investigated whether ubiquitination

plays a role in regulating Robo and Comm protein stability. Previous studies demonstrated that

Comm is ubiquitinated (Myat et al., 2002), but this ubiquitination appears to be dispensable for

its function including proper localization, and promotion of midline crossing, since mutation of all

of Comm's cytoplasmic lysines (Comm KR) has no apparent effect on its localization or function

(Keleman et al., 2005). Somewhat surprisingly, the possibility that Comm facilitates Robo1

ubiquitination was never investigated. This led us to evaluate the possibility that Comm

downregulates Robo1 levels by facilitating Robo1 ubiquitination and therefore, leading to its

degradation. To test whether Comm facilitates Robo ubiquitination, we co-transfected S2R+

cells with Robo1 and the Comm variants along with a construct expressing Flag-tagged

ubiquitin, and then immunoprecipitated Robo1 and assessed its ubiquitination levels (Figure 2D,

E). WT Comm significantly increases Robo1 ubiquitination levels relative to those observed in

cells transfected with Robo1 alone and removing either LPSY or both PY motifs eliminates

Comm's ability to enhance Robo1 ubiquitination (Figure 2D, E). Importantly, in cells co

transfected with Robo1 and WT Comm, treatment with the lysosomal inhibitor chloroquine

significantly stabilizes ubiquitinated Robo1 (Figure 2D, E). Taken together our results show that

Comm facilitates Robo1 ubiquitination in a PY motif-dependent manner and this ubiquitinated

Robo1 is degraded in the lysosome.

To test the effects of expressing Comm on Robo protein levels *in vivo*, we measured the

expression of endogenous Robo1 protein in embryos over-expressing 5X UAS Comm

transgenes by quantitative immunofluorescence (Figure 3). In stage 15-16 embryos,

endogenous Robo is expressed at high levels in the longitudinal portions of the axon scaffold

and is largely absent from the commissural portions of projecting axons (Figure 3Ai).

Overexpression of WT comm under the elavGal4 driver significantly reduces endogenous

Robo1 levels (Figure 3Aii, B). As predicted from our *in* vitro data, loss of one PY motif

significantly diminished Comm's ability to downregulate Robo1 levels, while loss of both

eliminated the ability altogether and endogenous Robo1 levels are indistinguishable from control

embryos (Figure 3Aii, B). Since expression of high levels of Comm 2PY with elavGal4 (10x-

UAS-Figure S1) is still able to induce significant ectopic midline crossing, we were curious

whether endogenous Robo1 levels are also reduced in embryos over expressing 10X-UAS

Comm 2PY. Intriguingly, while expression of either 10X-UAS Comm WT or Comm 1PY leads to

even stronger reduction in endogenous Robo1 than the 5X transgenes, expression of 10X-UAS

Comm 2PY does not reduce endogenous Robo1 levels at all (Figure S2A, B). We also tested

the effects of mutating the PY motifs on the expression of the Comm protein itself, and

consistent with our *in vitro* experiments, we find that loss of PY motifs increases Comm levels in

a dose-dependent manner (Figure 3A, C). Interestingly, even when over-expressed using the

Gal4-UAS system, Comm is barely detected unless the PY motifs are mutated. Taken together,

these data suggest that PY motifs control the stability of the Comm protein, as well as its ability

to facilitate Robo1 degradation. In addition, our observation that expression of 10X-UAS Comm

2PY does not reduce endogenous Robo1 levels suggests that in the absence of its PY motifs,

Comm can still inhibit midline repulsion and that this effect is not due to reduced levels of Robo

1 protein (see discussion).

The PY motifs of Comm act cooperatively to regulate Comm and Robo1 localization

As Comm has been proposed to promote midline crossing by preventing Robo1 from

reaching the growth cone surface (Keleman et al., 2002; Keleman et al., 2005), we next

investigated the involvement of PY motifs in the intracellular localization of both Comm and

Robo1. Previous studies used mammalian COS-7 cells to examine Comm's effect on Robo1

localization because of their large size and spread morphology (Keleman et al., 2002; Keleman

et al., 2005); thus, to allow comparison with the earlier studies, we first co-transfected COS-7

cells with HA-Robo1 and Myc-Comm variants and performed immunostaining for each to

visualize their localization. In cells transfected with Robo1 alone, Robo1 is diffusely localized

throughout the cell, in intracellular puncta, and at the cell surface (Figure 4A). As observed in

previous studies (Keleman et al., 2002; Keleman et al., 2005; Myat et al., 2002), when co-

transfected with WT Comm, we see a dramatic change in Robo1 localization. Instead of diffuse

localization throughout the cell, Robo1 is predominantly found with Comm in intracellular puncta

(Figure 4A, B). In contrast to previous findings (Keleman et al., 2002), disruption of the LPSY

motif alone (Comm 1PY) does not alter Comm localization compared to WT; however, Comm

1PY is significantly less effective at routing Robo1 to intracellular puncta, and we observe a

return of diffuse Robo1 expression (Figure 4A-C). In contrast to Comm 1PY, Comm2PY shows

diffuse localization throughout the cell, as well as impaired ability to route Robo1 to intracellular

puncta. In summary, the LPSY motif is dispensable for proper Comm localization in cell culture

but is required for effective routing of Robo1, while loss of both PY motifs, causes Comm mis-

localization as well as a failure to recruit Robo1 to intracellular puncta.

To explore the ability of Comm to regulate the surface expression of Robo1 and to

further evaluate the importance of the PY motifs in this context, we performed a series of

experiments in live dissected unpermeabilized stage 15 embryos. This method allows us to

detect the amount of endogenous Robo1 that is present on the axonal surface in various

genetic backgrounds. In control embryos, Robo1 is present on the surface of longitudinal

portions of axons in the developing ventral nerve cord (Figure 4D). In contrast, minimal Robo1 is

detected on the axonal surface in embryos expressing 5X UAS wild-type Comm (Figure 4D). In

embryos expressing 5X UAS Comm 2PY, Robo1 is expressed normally on the axonal surface.

These observations support our localization studies in COS-7 cells and suggest that Comm can

prevent Robo1 surface expression *in vivo.*

Comm can recruit Robo1 to late endosomes *in vivo*

To further investigate the role of PY motifs in Comm localization *in vivo*, and to define

the subcellular localization of Comm, we ectopically expressed UAS transgenes of the Comm

variants using the apGal4 driver. Although ap neurons are ipsilateral and do not express

endogenous Comm, they are a small and sufficiently sparse neuronal population to allow for

easy visualization of both axons and cell bodies. We found that WT Comm is restricted to cell

bodies and displays a punctate expression pattern indicative of localization in intracellular

vesicles (Figure 5A, B). Like WT Comm, Comm 1PY is observed in cell body puncta. However,

Comm 1PY, unlike WT Comm, is also present in axons. Comm 2PY displays even greater

enrichment in axons (Figure 5A, B). The observation that mutating Comm PY motifs leads to a

dose-dependent increase in axonal localization of Comm, coupled with a failure of these

mutants to down-regulate Robo1 and promote midline crossing strongly suggest that the

primary site of Comm function is in the cell soma. As most actively degradative intracellular

compartments are restricted to the soma in neurons (for a review of the neuronal

endolysosomal system, see (Roney et al., 2022)), these findings support the role of PY motifs

for routing Comm and its cargo to late endosomes and lysosomes.

To determine whether Comm localizes to late endosomes and lysosomes, we co-

expressed Comm variants with GFP-tagged late endosomal/lysosomal markers using apGal4.

Two such markers, Rab7 and Lamp1, are observed in a punctate pattern within cell bodies but,

as expected, are largely excluded from axons when overexpressed in apterous neurons (Figure

5C-E and Figure S3). Each Comm variant can be observed in puncta positive for Rab7 or

Lamp1; however, both Comm PY mutant variants show a significant reduction in total co-

localization with these late endosomal and lysosomal markers relative to wild-type Comm

(Figure 5 C-E, $p<0.05$ for both 1PY and 2PY, ANOVA). This reduction is largely due to the fact

that axonally localized Comm 1PY or 2PY does not co-localize with either marker (Figure 5C-E

and Figure S3). Interestingly, PY mutant Comm variants show significantly less co-localization

with Lamp1 even when only observing Comm present in cell bodies, suggesting that with

Lamp1, total co-localization is not only decreased due to Comm leakage into axons, but also

due to compromised routing to the correct subcellular compartments within cell bodies (Fig 5C,

E). Collectively, these findings demonstrate that Comm localizes to late endosomes and

lysosomes *in vivo* and that PY motifs keep Comm restricted to these compartments. In

summary, PY motifs are critical for proper localization of Comm to degradative compartments

and its ability to route its cargo Robo1 away from the cell surface.

Nedd4 promotes midline crossing of commissural axons

In the experiments described, we have demonstrated the importance of PY motifs for

numerous Comm functional outputs: promotion of midline crossing, targeting to

endosomes/lysosomes, Robo trafficking, and promotion of Robo ubiquitination and degradation.

As these motifs are known to bind Nedd4-family ubiquitin ligases and are indispensable for

Comm function, we investigated whether any of the Nedd4-family ligases play a role in midline

crossing *in vivo*. Previous studies have led to conflicting conclusions about the importance of

Nedd4 for midline crossing. One study found that Nedd4 overexpression increases the Comm

gain-of-function phenotype characterized by ectopic midline crossing (Myat et al., 2002);

however, a different research group was unable to replicate these results and also observed

that embryos homozygous for a chromosomal deletion covering the Nedd4 locus show no

obvious midline crossing defects (Keleman et al., 2005). These results call into question the role

of Nedd4 in midline crossing. Given our biochemical results showing that Comm promotes

Robo1 ubiquitination through its predicted Nedd4 binding sites and the potential redundancy

among the three Drosophila Nedd4 family ligases, we revisited the role of Nedd4 ubiquitin

ligases in commissural axon guidance and in the regulation of Robo1 using genetic and

biochemical approaches.

To evaluate a potential role for Nedd4 in midline crossing, we first examined its

expression pattern in developing embryos using a Mimic insertion (Nagarkar-Jaiswal et al.,

2015), which inserts a GFP tag into the coding sequence of the endogenous Nedd4 locus

(Nedd4-GFP). Using this tool, we observe a strong enrichment of Nedd4 protein in the ventral

nerve cord of stage 14 embryos, a stage when many commissural axons are extending across

the midline. Using this line, we are able to detect Nedd4 protein in both cell bodies and CNS

axons, indicating that Nedd4 is present at the right time and place to play a role in commissural

axon guidance (Figure S4). To test for a functional role of Nedd4 in midline guidance, we used

the well-characterized Nedd4T119FS allele, which was generated via EMS mutagenesis and

induces a frameshift mutation at the 119th amino acid. This frameshift truncates the Nedd4

protein, such that it lacks its WW (PY-motif binding) domains and HECT ubiquitin ligase domain,

which renders it non-functional (Sakata et al., 2004). When we examined embryos homozygous

for this loss of function allele with HRP immunofluorescence, we detected no obvious defects

(Figure 6A), consistent prior observations using a chromosomal deletion for Nedd4 (Keleman et

al., 2005). Since Nedd4 transcript is known to be maternally deposited, we sought to further limit

Nedd4 function by generating maternal/zygotic mutants. However, these approaches were not

successful, presumably due to the necessity of Nedd4-family ligases in oogenesis (Xia et al.,

2010) as well as early patterning events and cell fate decisions that occur before axon guidance

begins. ((Bakkers et al., 2005; Lin et al., 2017; Lohraseb et al., 2022; Persaud et al., 2011;

Podos et al., 2001; Zhang et al., 2014)).

To more thoroughly examine if Nedd4 plays any role in commissural axon guidance, we

used two sensitized genetic backgrounds that lead to partial disruptions in midline crossing,

frazzled loss of function mutants and ectopic expression of a truncated Frazzled receptor,

FraΔC (Garbe et al., 2007). We and others have used these genetic backgrounds to

demonstrate important functional roles for a number of genes in commissural axon guidance

that are otherwise undetectable, including Robo2 and the transmembrane and secreted

Semaphorins (Sema1a and Sema2A, B respectively) (Arbeille and Bashaw, 2018; Evans et al.,

2015; Hernandez-Fleming et al., 2017; Spitzweck et al., 2010). In *fra* mutants there are

significant disruptions in midline crossing that can be observed when visualizing the entire axon

scaffold as well as when visualizing a subset of commissural axons (labeled by egGal4

expressing CD8-GFP). Specifically, *fra* mutants display thin or missing posterior commissures in

approximately 30% of embryonic segments. In egGal4-expressing commissural neurons, the

EW cluster of neurons normally project across the posterior commissure and approximately

35% of EW neurons fail to project their axons across the midline in *fra* mutants (Figure 6A-D).

While removing one copy of Nedd4 does not increase crossing defects in the *fra*-null

background, as measured by commissure thickness with HRP (Figure 6A, B) or EW crossing

(Figure 6C, D), removing both copies of Nedd4 leads to a significant enhancement of the *fra*

mutant phenotype, and a profound disruption in midline crossing, in some instances resembling

comm loss of function mutants (Figure 6A). *fra, nedd4* double mutant embryos are missing over

half of their commissures (compared to the <10% missing in fra single mutants) and most of the

remaining commissures are thin (Figure 6A, B). These defects are also observed in the anterior

commissure, a phenotype that is never observed in *fra* mutants alone. The crossing defects of

the eagle neurons are also significantly increased and include defects in the projection of Eg

neurons through the anterior commissure (Figure 6C, D). These observations indicate that

Nedd4 acts in parallel to *fra* to promote commissural axon growth across the midline.

To further support these observations, we also examined the consequences of removing

nedd4 In the FraΔC background. Expression of FraΔC using the egGal4 driver induces EW

crossing defects in 30-50% of abdominal segments but does not affect EG neuron crossing.

While Nedd4 heterozygotes show no alterations in commissural axon guidance defects in the

FraΔC background, Nedd4 homozygous mutants display significantly increased EW non-

crossing phenotypes. We were able to take advantage of this genetic interaction to test for a

neuron-autonomous function of Nedd4 by performing rescue experiments. We find that

expressing a UAS Nedd4 transgene in embryos homozygous mutant for *nedd4* in the FraΔC

background leads to a significant reduction in the non-crossing defects (Figure 6 E, F). Taken

together, these results demonstrate an important role for Nedd4 in promoting midline crossing

and suggest that it functions cell autonomously in neurons.

Smurf and Su(dx) are dispensable for midline crossing

There are three Nedd4 family E3 ubiquitin ligases in *Drosophila:* Nedd4, Smurf and

Su(Dx). To investigate whether Smurf and Su(dx) could also play a role in midline crossing, we

first examined their expression patterns by searching the embryonic mRNA expression data

base of the Berkeley Drosophila Genome Project (BDGP). This database includes images of

mRNA *in situ* patterns for many fly genes. Data reported for Su(Dx) show that it is expressed

broadly or ubiquitously throughout all stages of embryogenesis including in the nerve cord of

stages 14 through 16 embryos. No data is publicly available for Smurf, so we generated our

own *in situ* probes to visualize the Smurf embryonic mRNA expression pattern and found that

like Su(Dx), Smurf is broadly expressed during embryogenesis, including in the developing

nerve cord (Figure S4). Thus, although Su(Dx) and Smurf do not show striking nerve cord

enrichment like Nedd4, their expression patterns are consistent with potential roles in

commissural axon guidance.

To investigate roles for Smurf and Su(Dx) in midline axon guidance, we examined the

nerve cords of embryos lacking functional copies of each gene. We used the Smurf 15C loss-of-

function allele, generated by insertion of a hobo element which disrupts the coding sequence of

its HECT domain (Podos et al., 2001), and the deficiency line Df(2L)Exel7008 which contains

the smallest available chromosomal deletion covering the Su(dx) locus. Similar to *nedd4*

mutants, zygotic loss of either Smurf or Su(dx) function produced no visible midline crossing

defects in nerve cords stained with the pan-neuronal marker HRP (Figure S5A, B and S6A, B).

Due to potential effects of maternal deposition and possible redundancy, we next investigated

whether loss of Smurf or Su(dx) could induce midline crossing defects in the *fra* mutant and

FraΔC sensitized genetic backgrounds as described above for our investigation of *nedd4*. In

marked contrast to our findings with *nedd4*, removing both zygotic copies of either *smurf* or

su(dx) does not increase the occurrence of EW non-crossing in either *fra* mutant embryos or in

embryos expressing FraΔC using egGal4. Based on these findings, it is unlikely that either

ligase plays a major role in midline crossing; however, we cannot rule out the possibility that

either Smurf or Su(Dx) acts redundantly with Nedd4. Nevertheless, our genetic experiments are

most consistent with Nedd4 playing the prominent role in regulating midline crossing.

Nedd4 interacts with the slit/Robo pathway both biochemically and genetically

Our observations that Comm facilitates Robo1 ubiquitination and lysosomal degradation

through its cytoplasmic PY motifs, together with our genetic data showing that *Nedd4* promotes

commissural axon guidance across the midline, suggest that Comm and Nedd4 function

together to inhibit Robo1 repulsion. If indeed, Comm serves as a substrate adapter to allow

Nedd4 to target Robo1 for ubiquitination and subsequent degradation, we reasoned that the

three proteins should form a complex. Furthermore, we predicted that in the absence of Comm

or when the PY motifs of Comm are mutated, Nedd4 should exhibit reduced association with the

Robo1 receptor. To test these predictions, we performed a series of coimmunoprecipitation

experiments in S2R+ cells. When Robo1 and Nedd4 are co-transfected in the absence of

Comm, we detect very little if any association between Nedd4 and Robo1 (Figure 7A).

Strikingly, when all three proteins are expressed, Nedd4 readily co-precipitates with Robo1,

even though the presence of Comm greatly reduces Robo1 protein levels (Figure 7A). As

predicted, mutating the PY motifs leads to a significant decrease in the amount of Nedd4 that is

incorporated into the complex, even though the level of Robo1 protein expression increases

when Comm PY motifs are mutated (Figure 7B). Both observations are consistent with the

model that Comm acts as a substrate adapter between Nedd4 and Robo1 (Figure 7C).

To determine whether Nedd4 can function together with Comm *in vivo* to downregulate

the expression of the Robo1 receptor*,* we measured the expression level of endogenous Robo1

protein biochemically in wild-type embryos, embryos expressing transgenic Comm, or embryos

expressing both Comm and Nedd4. We collected protein lysates from these three groups of

embryos that were aged between 13 – 18 hours post-fertilization, since this is developmental

window when axons in the CNS are actively growing toward their targets. As predicted from our

in vitro measurements of the effect of Comm on Robo1 expression levels, pan-neural

expression of Comm leads to a striking reduction in Robo1 protein levels. Importantly this effect

is significantly enhanced in embryos co-expressing Comm and Nedd4 (Figure 7D, E), which

further supports the idea the Nedd4 facilitates Comm-dependent Robo1 degradation.

Interestingly, and consistent with our *in vitro* biochemistry, co-expression of Nedd4 and Comm

also leads to reduced levels of Comm protein relative to embryos expressing Comm alone,

suggesting that Comm, like Robo1 is likely degraded by Nedd4 (Figure 7E, see discussion).

While these observations strongly support the idea that Nedd4 can work with Comm to

downregulate Robo1 protein levels *in vivo,* they do not allow us to make conclusions about

where Robo1 levels are decreasing. To address this question, we monitored endogenous

Robo1 levels in these embryos by immunofluorescence to determine if co-expression of Comm

and Nedd4 leads to reduction in the axonal expression or Robo1. Consistent with the data

presented in earlier (Figures 3, 4 and S2), ectopic expression of Comm results in a striking

decrease in axonal Robo1 expression. Importantly, axonal Robo1 levels are further reduced

when Nedd4 is co-expressed with Comm (Figure 7F-G). Taken together, these findings support

a model in which Comm recruits Nedd4 via its PY motifs, bringing it into proximity with Robo1,

facilitating its ubiquitination, localization to late endosomes/lysosomes, and ultimately its

lysosomal degradation (Figure 8).

Discussion

The data presented here support a model that is a hybrid of the two developed

previously (Keleman et al., 2005; Myat et al., 2002), in which Comm requires interaction with

Nedd4 to downregulate Robo1, and in which Robo1, not Comm, is the primary substrate for

Nedd4 ubiquitination. Through a combination of *in vivo* and *in-vitro* experiments, we

demonstrate that Comm requires intact PY motifs to localize effectively to late

endosomes/lysosomes, route Robo1 away from the cell surface, facilitate Robo1 ubiquitination

and degradation, and enable midline crossing. We also find that Comm lacking one or both of its

PY motifs is more stable than its wild-type counterpart. Using *in-vitro* biochemical assays, we

show that Nedd4 is recruited into a ternary complex with Comm and Robo1 in a manner

dependent on Comm PY motifs. In addition, *in-vivo* loss and gain-of-function experiments

indicate a specific and cell-autonomous role for Nedd4, but not other Nedd4 family members

Su(dx) and Smurf, in midline crossing. Finally, we show that overexpression of Nedd4 enhances

downregulation of Robo1 levels by Comm *in vivo*, as well as turnover of the Comm protein itself.

Taken together, these findings support a model of Robo1 downregulation in which Comm acts

as an adaptor protein between Robo1 and Nedd4, recruiting Nedd4 into a three-member

complex with itself and Robo1 via its PY motifs. Once the two proteins are close to one another,

Nedd4 can ubiquitinate Robo1, leading to lysosomal trafficking and degradation of the entire

complex and ultimately, inhibition of premature Robo1-mediated repulsion at the growth cone

(Figure 8).

New insights into the role of PY motifs in Comm Function

In accordance with previous studies (Keleman et al., 2002; Myat et al., 2002), we find

that PY motifs are necessary for Comm to promote ectopic midline crossing in ipsilateral neuron

populations and to promote Comm localization to intracellular puncta *in vitro*. One study had

reported that mutation of the LPSY motif alone completely disrupts both Comm's ability to

promote ectopic crossing and its localization to presumptive endosomes in cultured cells

(Keleman et al., 2002). In contrast, by directly comparing Comm transgenes inserted in the

same genetic locus, we were able to dissect the relative roles of these motifs and show that the

PY motifs act in an additive manner, as disruption of the LPSY motif alone and both PY motifs

disrupted Comm's ability to promote midline crossing in a dose-dependent manner. Our

experiments *in vitro* further support an additive role for the PY motifs in controlling Comm and

Robo1 localization and suggest distinct activities of the two motifs. Specifically, we observe that

while Comm 2PY is unable to efficiently localize itself or Robo1 to intracellular puncta in COS-7

cells, Comm lacking only the LPSY motif itself localizes normally, but it is compromised in its

ability to route Robo to puncta along with it. This suggests the interesting possibility that there

may be instances when Comm and Robo can separate during intracellular trafficking. We

further dissected the structural requirements for Comm localization *in vivo*, where we found that

disruption of Comm PY motifs causes "leakage" of Comm from cell bodies into axons in a dose-

dependent manner. These observations suggest that PY motifs are required to shunt Robo

away from the growth cone and this possibility is further supported by our finding that Comm

lacking functional PY motifs is unable to reduce the expression of Robo on the surface of

commissural axons *in vivo*. Finally, we demonstrate that mutation of the LPSY or both PY motifs

compromises colocalization of Comm and Lamp1+ puncta, showing that PY motifs are required

for trafficking to late endosomes and lysosomes *in vivo*.

In addition to localization, our work offers important new insights into how Comm

downregulates Robo1 protein levels. Both *in vivo* and *in vitro*, we find that disrupting Comm PY

motifs inhibits its ability to promote Robo1 degradation. Biochemical assays demonstrate that

Comm requires PY motifs to recruit Nedd4 into a complex with itself and Robo1 and promote

Robo ubiquitination. As ubiquitinated Robo1 is stabilized by chloroquine, our results show that

Comm facilitates the degradation of this pool of Robo1 via a lysosomal pathway. Taken

together, these observations implicate PY motifs as major players in all known aspects of

Comm function: localization to late endosomes, ability to regulate localization and protein levels

of its cargo, and promotion of midline crossing.

Robo1 is a substrate for Nedd4 ubiquitination

Comm has been shown to be ubiquitinated in the presence of Nedd4 (Myat et al., 2002);

however, the importance of ubiquitination for Comm function has been cast into doubt by the

findings that an un-ubiquitinatable form of Comm (Comm KR) is able to localize correctly and

traffic Robo1 to intracellular puncta in COS-7 cells, and promote midline crossing *in vivo* as

effectively as WT Comm (Keleman et al., 2005). Despite these observations and studies

implicating ubiquitination as a negative regulator of Robo1 repulsion (Yuasa-Kawada et al.,

2009), the possibility that Comm facilitates ubiquitination of its cargo Robo1 has not yet been

explored. We found that in the presence of Comm, Robo1 ubiquitination is significantly

increased, and that mutation of Comm PY motifs prevents this increase. This, combined with

the observation that the addition of exogenous Nedd4 leads to a further reduction of Robo1

protein levels by Comm, supports a model in which Comm downregulates Robo1 by recruiting

Nedd4 through its PY motifs to trigger Robo1 ubiquitination and subsequent lysosomal

degradation. In our biochemical assays, mutation of Comm PY motifs not only impedes

downregulation of Robo1 protein levels but also increases the stability of Nedd4 (Fig 7Aii) and

Comm, suggesting that these three proteins are trafficked to the lysosome and degraded

together as a complex.

Nedd4 is the primary member of the Nedd4 family involved in midline crossing

Prior studies had generated contradictory findings concerning the role for Nedd4 in

midline axon guidance. Here, we provide conclusive evidence of a role for Nedd4 in promoting

midline crossing by showing that loss of *nedd4* increases crossing defects in the fraΔc or fra-/-

sensitized genetic backgrounds. Further, we show that in the fraΔc background, re-expression

of transgenic Nedd4 in a the Eg subset of commissural neurons rescues the midline crossing

defects, indicating a likely cell autonomous role for Nedd4 in this process. In contrast, zygotic

mutation of either Su(dx) or Smurf did not result in midline axon guidance defects in wild-type

embryos or in either of these sensitized genetic backgrounds. While we were unable to show

evidence of a role for Su(dx) and Smurf through genetic assays in sensitized backgrounds, we

still have insufficient evidence to definitively rule out a role for them. Many of the factors

prompting us to use sensitized backgrounds, especially maternal expression and redundancy

among Nedd4 family members, present us with significant challenges in detecting loss of

function phenotypes. In addition, Nedd4 family E3 ligases regulate several additional pathways

involved in critical early-developmental patterning events, including germ layer specification,

establishment of major body axes, and fate determination of the neuroectoderm. At least two

different Nedd4-family ligases are known to regulate each of the following pathways: Notch,

TGF-β, and Wnt (for review see (Ingham et al., 2004)). The fact that none of these pathways are

regulated by a sole Nedd4 family E3 ligase suggests that Nedd4 may not be the only Nedd4

family member regulating Robo1 and Comm. Unfortunately, the conditions for definitively testing

their involvement, such as mutating multiple Nedd4 family members simultaneously or

abolishing their maternal expression has not yet been possible.

Comm is likely to regulate Robo1 repulsion through multiple mechanisms

Our data clearly supports an important role for Nedd4 in contributing to Comm's ability to

inhibit Robo1 signaling and promote midline crossing; however, several lines of evidence

support alternative roles for Comm in preventing midline repulsion. First, a previous study

investigated the consequences of generating an endogenously expressed Robo1 receptor that

cannot be inhibited by Comm through homologous recombination. Specifically, the coding

sequence of Robo1 was replaced by a mutant variant that could not bind to or be

downregulated by Comm (termed Robo1-SD for sorting defective)(Gilestro, 2008). If Comm's

sole function were to inhibit the surface expression of Robo1, then the prediction would be that

these Robo1-SD embryos would phenocopy *comm* mutants; however, quite surprisingly, these

embryos appear to be completely normal (Gilestro, 2008). This finding suggests either Comm

inhibits the function of another key component of the Slit-Robo1 repulsive pathway, potentially

through inhibiting its expression, or alternatively, Comm may inhibit Robo1 function through a

second mechanism that is independent of ubiquitin-mediated protein degradation. Since Robo1-

SD does not bind to Comm, this alternative mechanism would not depend on binding to Robo1.

Our finding that high-level over-expression of the Comm2PY mutant variant that cannot inhibit

Robo1 surface expression can still inhibit midline repulsion is consistent with mechanism of

regulation that is independent of protein degradation of Robo1, or another Comm substrate.

One interesting potential alternative role for Comm would be to prevent Robo1 endocytosis,

since receptor endocytosis is required for repulsive signaling (Chance and Bashaw, 2015;

Sullivan and Bashaw, 2023). Indeed, at the Drosophila neuromuscular junction (NMJ), Comm

has been proposed to regulate endocytosis from the plasma membrane to promote synapse

formation (Ing et al., 2007; Wolf et al., 1998).

The role for Nedd4 is evolutionarily conserved

Although we still do not know whether Smurf or Su(dx) play roles in midline crossing, our

observation that Nedd4 appears to be the main ligase involved in this process agrees with

recent findings in mice and provides additional evidence of a conserved mechanism of Robo1

downregulation between vertebrates and invertebrates. While Comm appears to be only present

in insects, several vertebrate proteins have been identified that may play analogous roles in

mammalian species (Gorla et al., 2019; Justice et al., 2017). Among these proteins that may

function analogously to Comm, the Nedd4 family interacting proteins Ndfip1 and Ndfip2 share

sequence similarity to the region of Comm containing PY motifs and appear to act as its

functional analog in mice. Like Comm, loss of mammalian Ndfip proteins impedes effective

midline crossing and results in the upregulation of Robo1 levels in pre-crossing commissural

axons in the spinal cord. In addition, Ndfip proteins negatively regulate Robo1 expression in a

manner nearly identical to that of Comm: by facilitating Robo1 ubiquitination, diversion away

from the cell surface, trafficking to late endosomes, and ultimately, degradation (Gorla et al.,

2019).

Since these functions of Ndfip proteins rely on functional PY motifs, efforts have been

made to determine which of the nine mammalian Nedd4 family E3 ligases they may recruit to

regulate Robo1 localization and protein levels. While the seven E3 ligases most related to

Drosophila Nedd4 family members can all bind Ndfip proteins *in vitro*, only the Nedd4 homologs

Nedd4-1 and Nedd4-2, and the Su(dx) homolog WWP2 can enhance Robo1 ubiquitination and

degradation. Unlike the other Nedd4 family ligases tested, Smurf homologs Smurf1 and Smurf2

can bind to Ndfip proteins in the absence of functional PY motifs suggesting that they bind to

additional structural elements of Ndfip proteins and may be involved in different biological

processes. In addition, single and double conditional knockouts of Nedd4-1 and Nedd4- 2

display impaired axon guidance across the floor plate of the spinal cord. Taken together, these

findings demonstrate an important role for mammalian Nedd4 homologs in commissural axon

guidance in the spinal cord (Gorla et al., 2022). The finding that some Nedd4 family members

do not facilitate Robo1 ubiquitination and degradation despite binding effectively to Ndfip

proteins suggests that additional factors are required to confer substrate specificity to E3

ligases. These additional factors appear to be highly cell-type specific, as the same cargo can

be ubiquitinated by different E3 ligases in different cellular contexts. For example, Ndfip-

mediated ubiquitylation of the divalent metal ion transporter (DMT1) is catalyzed by Nedd4-2 in

neuronal cells (Howitt et al., 2009), but is catalyzed by WWP2 in other non-neuronal cell types

(Foot et al., 2008; Gorla et al., 2022).. What factors may determine E3 ligase substrate

specificity in the developing mammalian and insect CNS remains an open question.

Despite the lack of comm homologs outside of insects, the work shown in this paper and

the research conducted on Ndfip proteins in the mouse spinal cord point to a common

mechanism of Robo1 regulation across species. In both vertebrates and invertebrates, Nedd4

substrate adaptor proteins serve as a vital means of downregulating growth cone Robo1 levels

by facilitating Robo1 ubiquitination, trafficking to lysosomes, and ultimately, degradation.

Discovering additional binding partners for both Comm and Ndfip proteins, especially those

shared between both, will be necessary for us to better understand other critical players in this

common mechanism. Such binding partners may include proteins involved in determining E3

substrate specificity and in trafficking Nedd4 adaptors and their cargoes to the proper

destinations. As it is highly likely that Comm regulates other proteins besides Robo1, and Ndfip

has several known cargoes in different cell contexts (Foot et al., 2008; Kang et al., 2015; Mund

and Pelham, 2010; Trimpert et al., 2017), additional binding partners may also include

alternative cargoes of Nedd4 adaptors involved in axon guidance. Such an investigation may

offer important insights into how this fundamental Nedd4 substrate adaptor-mediated

mechanism to tune the neuronal surface proteome may contribute to development and function

of the nervous system.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Contact for Reagent and Resource Sharing

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to the Lead

Contact, Greg J. Bashaw (gbashaw@pennmedicine.upenn.edu).

Experimental Model and Subject Details

Genetic stocks

The following *Drosophila* strains were used: w^{1118}, *apGal4, egGal4, elavGal4, UAS-CD8GFP II,*

UAS-TauMycGFP III, UAS-fraΔc-HA, fra³, nedd4^{T119FS}, Mi{PT-GFSTF.0}Nedd4[MI07766-

GFSTF.0], Df(2R)ED3385, and Df(2R)Excel7008. The fly strain *smurf^{15C}* was a kind gift from the

Pi Lab at Chang Gung University. The following transgenic stocks were generated: *10UAS-*

Comm-myc WT, 10UAS-Comm-myc 1PY, 10UAS-Comm-myc 2PY, 5UAS-Comm-myc WT,

5UAS-Comm-myc 1PY, 5UAS-Comm-myc 2PY, and 10UAS-Nedd4-HA. Transgenic flies were

generated by Bestgene Inc. (Chino Hills, CA) using PhiC31- directed site-specific integration

into landing sites at cytological position 86F8 (For *UAS-Comm* constructs) or 51C (for *UAS-*

Nedd4 constructs). All crosses were carried out at 25°C.

Cell Culture

Drosophila S2R+ cells were maintained at 25°C in Schneider's media (Life Technologies,

#21720024) supplemented with 10% (vol/vol) FBS and a mixture of 1% Penicillin and

Streptomycin. COS-7 cells were maintained at 37°C, 5% CO^{2} in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle

Medium (Corning, 10-017-CM) supplemented with 10% (vol/vol) FBS and a mixture of 1%

Penicillin and Streptomycin.

Method Details

Molecular Biology

To make the P10UAST-Comm-myc WT, the WT coding sequence of Comm was PCR amplified

and cloned into the *p10UAST-myc* vector described above by swapping out the *hspc300* insert

using *Kpn1/Asc1* sites and the following primers:

Fwd with Kpn1: GCGCGGTACCATGATTAGCACCACGGATTAT

Rev with Asc1: AAAGGCGCGCCCGCGGCAACAACAACGA

To make the P10UAST-Comm-myc 1PY construct, the LPSY motif of Comm was

mutated to AASY via SOE-ing PCR, using the WT Comm coding sequence from P10UAST-

Comm-myc WT as a template. The following primers were used to flank the coding sequence

and introduce point mutations into the LPSY motif.

Fwd with Kpn1: GCGCGGTACCATGATTAGCACCACGGATTAT

Rev with Asc1: AAAGGCGCGCCCGCGGCAACAACAACGA

LPSY->AASY Fwd: AATCGCCACCGGAGCGGCCAGCTACGATGAGGCACTGCAT

LPSY->AASY Rev: ATGCAGTGCCTCATCGTAGCTGGCCGCTCCGGTGGCGATT

The resulting Comm 1PY coding sequence was then subcloned back into a n-terminal myc-

tagged P10UAST backbone using Kpn1 and Asc1 restriction sites.

To generate the P10UAST-Comm-myc 2PY, the coding sequence from P10UAST

Comm-myc 1PY was subcloned into the smaller pbluescript backbone. Point mutations were

introduced into the PPCY motif using Quikchange II site-directed mutagenesis kit (Agilent,

#200523) using the following primers.

CAAATCGAATCGGCGGCCTGCTACACAATCGCCACCGGAT

ATCCGGTGGCGATTGTGTAGCAGGCCGCCGATTCGATTTG

The resulting Comm 1PY coding sequence was then subcloned back into a n-terminal myc-

tagged P10UAST c-term myc backbone using Kpn1 and Asc1 restriction sites

To generate p5UAST Comm-myc constructs, 5 UAS sites were excised from the

P10UAS Comm-myc constructs using the Sph1 restriction enzyme.

To generate myc-Comm constructs for transfection in mammalian cells, the coding

sequences of WT, 1PY, and 2PY Comm from the P10UAST Comm-myc constructs were

subcloned into the pKMyc backbone (Addgene #19400) using the Xba1 and Nhe restriction

sites and the following primers:

Fwd with Xba1: CCGGTCTAGAATGATTAGCACCACGGATTA

Rev with Nhe1: ATAGCTAGCTCACGCGGCAACAACAA

To make the P10UAST-FLAG-Ub construct, the FLAG-Ubiquitin coding sequence from a

mammalian-expressing Flag-Ub plasmid (cited in (Gorla et al., 2019), originally a kind gift from

the Dr. Hideaki Fujitha lab) was subcloned into the P10UAST backbone using Xho1 and Xba1

restriction sites. The following primers were used.

Fwd with Xho1: AAACTCGAGATGGACTACAAAGACCATGA

Rev with Xba1: AAATCTAGATTAACCACCACGAAGTCTCA

The P10UAST-Nedd4-HA construct was made by PCR amplifying Nedd4 cdna from the

pOT2 DGRC Gold collection (clone SD04682, DGRC Stock 5253) using the following primers.

Fwd with Not1: ATATGCGGCCGCATGTCGGCACGTTCCAGC

Rev with Kpn1: CCCGGTACCATCAACTCCAGCAAATCCTTGGC

The resulting insert was then subcloned into the P10UAST-HA backbone using Not1 and Kpn1

restriction sites.

Western Blot

S2R+ cells were transiently transfected with Effectene transfection reagent (Qiagen, Valencia

CA, #301425) and induced 24 hours later with 0.5mM copper sulfate. 24 hours after induction,

cells were lysed in TBS-V (150 mM NaCl, 10 mM Tris pH-8, 1 mM ortho-vanadate)

supplemented with 0.5% Surfact-AMPS NP40 (Thermo, Waltham MA, #85124)) and 1x

Complete Protease Inhibitor (Roche, #11697498001) and incubated with agitation for 20 min at

4^oC. Soluble proteins were recovered by centrifugation at 15,000 rpm for 15 min at 4^oC.

To collect lysates from *Drosophila* embryos, approximately 100 µl of embryos at the

desired developmental stages were treated with 50% bleach (Essendant) for 2 min and washed

three times with embryo wash buffer (120 mM NaCl supplemented with 0.1% (v/v) Triton X-100,

Sigma). Embryos were then rinsed with ice cold TBSV buffer (150 mM NaCl ,10 mM Tris pH

8.0, 2 mM Sodium orthovanadate), and lysed with manual homogenization using plastic pestles

in 300 µl lysis buffer (TBSV supplemented with 1% Surfact-AMPS NP40 and 1x complete

protease inhibitors). Homogenized samples were then incubated for 30 min at 4 °C with

agitation and recovered by centrifugation at 15,000 rpm for 15 min 4 °C.

Proteins were resolved by SDS-PAGE and transferred to nitrocellulose membrane

(Amersham, #10600032). Membranes were blocked with 5% dry milk and 0.1% Tween 20 in

PBS for 1 h at room temperature and incubated with primary antibodies in 2% dry milk/0.1%

Tween 20 in PBS overnight at 4^oC. Following three washes with PBS/0.1% Tween 20,

membranes were incubated with the appropriate HRP-conjugated secondary antibody at room

temperature for 1h. Signals were detected using Clarity ECL (Bio-Rad, #1705061) or Super

Signal West Femto Maximum Sensitivity Substrate (Thermo Fisher, 34094) according to

manufacturer's instructions.

Immunoprecipitation

S2R+ cells were transiently transfected with Effectene transfection reagent (Qiagen, Valencia

CA, #301425) and induced 24 hours later with 0.5mM copper sulfate. 24 hours after induction,

cells were lysed in TBS-V (150 mM NaCl, 10 mM Tris pH-8, 1 mM ortho-vanadate)

supplemented with 0.5% Surfact-AMPS NP40 (Thermo, Waltham MA, #85124) and 1x

Complete Protease Inhibitor (Roche, #11697498001) for 20 min at 4°C. Soluble proteins were

recovered by centrifugation at 15,000 x g for 10 min at 4°C. Lysates were pre-cleared with 30 µl

of a 50% slurry of protein A (Invitrogen, #15918-014) and protein G agarose beads (Invitrogen,

#15920-010) by incubation for 20 minutes at 4 °C. Pre-cleared lysates were then incubated with

0.7 µg of rabbit anti-GFP antibody for 2 hours at 4°C to precipitate Robo-GFP. After incubation,

30 µl of a 50% slurry of protein A and protein G agarose beads was added and samples were

incubated for an additional 30 minutes at 4°C. The immunocomplexes were washed three times

with lysis buffer, boiled for 10 min in 2x Laemmli SDS sample buffer (Bio-Rad, #1610737) and

analyzed by western blotting. Proteins were resolved by SDS-PAGE and transferred to

nitrocellulose membrane (Amersham, #10600032). Membranes were blocked with 5% dry milk

and 0.1% Tween 20 in PBS for 1 h at room temperature and incubated with primary antibodies

overnight at 4°C. Following three washes with PBS/0.1% Tween 20, membranes were

incubated with the appropriate HRP-conjugated secondary antibody at room temperature for 1h.

Signals were detected using Clarity ECL (Bio-Rad, #1705061) and SuperSignal West Femto

Maximum Sensitivity Substrate (Thermo Fisher, 34094) according to manufacturer's

instructions. Antibodies used: for immunoprecipitation, rabbit anti-GFP and for western blot,

rabbit anti-GFP (1:500, Invitrogen, #a11122), mouse anti-Myc (1:1000, DSHB, #9E10-C),

mouse anti-HA (1:1000, Biolegend, 901502), mouse anti-FLAG (1:1000, Sigma, F1804-50ug),

mouse anti-beta-tubulin (1:1000, DSHB, #E7) and HRP goat anti-mouse (1:10,000, Jackson

Immunoresearch, #115-035-146).

Immunostaining

Transiently transfected COS-7 cells were washed once with ice-cold PBS, fixed for 15 min in

4% paraformaldehyde at room temperature, permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS (PBT)

for 10 min and then blocked in PBT + 5% NGS (normal goat serum) for 30 min at room

temperature. Cells were then incubated with primary antibodies diluted in PBT + 5% NGS

overnight at 4°C. After three washes in PBT, secondary antibodies diluted in PBT + 5% NGS

were added and incubated for 1h at room temperature. After secondary antibodies, cells were

washed three times in PBS and coverslips were mounted in Aquamount. The following

antibodies were used: Rabbit anti-Myc (1:500, Sigma, C3956-2MG), mouse anti-HA (1:500,

BioLegend # 901502), Alexa488 Goat anti-mouse (1:500, Invitrogen, #A11029), and Cy3 goat

anti-rabbit (1:500, Jackson Immunoresearch, 111-165-003).

Dechorionated, formaldehyde-fixed *Drosophila* embryos were fluorescently stained using

standard methods. The following antibodies were used: rabbit anti-GFP (1:250, Invitrogen,

#a11122), mouse anti-HA (1:500, BioLegend,#901502), rabbit anti-myc (1:500, Sigma, C3956-

2MG), chick anti-beta gal (1:500, Abcam, #ab9361),, mouse anti-Robo (1:50, DSHB, #13C9),

mouse anti BP102 (1:50, DHSB, BP102), Alexa647 goat anti-HRP (1:500, Jackson

Immunoresearch, #123-605-021), Alexa488 goat anti-rabbit (1:500, Invitrogen, #A11034),

Alexa488 goat anti-mouse (1:500, Invitrogen, #A11029), Alexa488 goat anti-chick (1:500,

Invitrogen, #A11039), Cy3 goat anti-mouse (1:500, Jackson Immunoresearch, #115-165-003),

Cy3 goat anti-Chick (1:500, Abcam, #ab97145), Cy3 goat anti-rabbit (1:500, Jackson

Immunoresearch, 111-165-003) and 647 goat anti-HRP (1:1,000, Jackson Immunoresearch,

#123-605-021). Embryos were filleted and mounted in 70% glycerol/1xPBS. Surface staining of

endogenous Robo in *Drosophila* embryos was carried out as previously described (Bashaw,

2010). Briefly, embryos were dissected live, blocked with in 5% normal goat serum (NGS) in

PBS for 15 min at 4°C and stained with mouse anti-Robo (1:50, DSHB, #13C9) in PBS for 30

min at 4°C. Following washes with PBS, embryos were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (Electron

Microscopy Services, #15710) for 15 min at 4°C. Following washes with PBS, fixed embryos

were then permeabilized with 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS (PBT) for 10 min and stained with rabbit

anti-myc (1:500, Sigma, C3956-2MG) and 647 goat anti-HRP (1:1,000, Jackson

Immunoresearch, #123-605-021) in 5% NGS in PBT for one hour at room temperature.

Following washes with PBT, secondary antibody consisting of Alexa488 goat anti-mouse (1:500,

Invitrogen, #A11029) and Cy3 goat anti-rabbit (1:500, Jackson Immunoresearch, 111-165-003)

diluted in 5% NGS in PBT was added and incubated for 1 h at room temperature. Embryos were

then washed with PBT and mounted in 70% glycerol in PBS.

Fixed coverslips of COS-7 cells and samples of *Drosophila* embryo nerve cords were

imaged using a spinning disk confocal system (Perkin Elmer) built on a Nikon Ti-U inverted

microscope using a Nikon 40X or60X objective with Volocity imaging software. Images were

processed using NIH ImageJ software.

Quantification and Statistical Analysis

For analysis of *Drosophila* nerve cord phenotypes, image analysis was conducted blind to the

genotype. Data are presented as mean values ± 95% confidence interval. For statistical

analysis, comparisons were made between two groups using the Student's *t*-test. For multiple

comparisons, significance was assessed using one-way ANOVA with Tukey's *post hoc* tests.

Differences were considered significant when $p < 0.05$.

For quantification of biochemical data, blots were imaged with (what's the name of the

instrument) and quantification was performed using the densitometry function on ImageJ.

Comm, Robo, and Nedd4 levels in S2R+ cells or fly lysates are normalized to tubulin. For

immunoprecipitation experiments, ubiquitinated Robo was normalized to IGG, lysate Robo, and

tubulin. Nedd4 complex incorporation was normalized to immunoprecipitated Robo and lysate

Nedd4. Comparisons between two groups were made using Student's T test, and comparisons

between multiple groups were made using one-way ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test.

Differences were considered significant when $p < 0.05$.

For quantification of intracellular localization in COS-7 cells, images of seven cell fields

per condition were taken at random locations on the coverslip. Cells with overly bright staining,

in which we were unable to un-ambiguously observe intracellular localization, were excluded

from analysis. Only cells double positive for both HA and Myc were scored. Cells were scored

blind to condition. Distribution of exclusively punctate vs diffuse localization was compared

between groups using Chi Square.

For quantitation of Robo and Comm Levels in the nerve cord, in Drosophila embryos,

images were first batch processed using a macro in image J that set the channels of all images

to common thresholds. These processed images were then analyzed in CellProfiler. A common

thresholding algorithm was used on smoothened images of the HRP channel to create masks

for the nerve cord and axons. To quantify Robo, total Robo/488 intensity was measured within

the axon mask and divided by area of the mask. To quantify Comm, total Myc/Cy3 intensity was

calculated within the nerve cord mask and divided by area of the mask. Data are presented as

mean values ± 95% confidence interval. For statistical analysis, comparisons were made

between two groups using the Student's *t*-test, and between multiple groups using ANOVA with

Tukey's post-hoc test. Differences were considered significant when $p < 0.05$.

For quantification of cell body and axonal Comm localization, images were first batch

processed using a macro in image J that set the channels of all images to common thresholds.

These processed images were then analyzed in CellProfiler. A common smoothing algorithm

was applied to all images in the 488 channel (showing GFP-labelled apterous neurons). On this

smoothened image, both axons and cell bodies were automatically identified using an algorithm

that detects objects based on thresholding and size. This set of objects was then manually

edited to remove objects detected outside the appropriate area (posterior 8 segments of the

nerve cord). Using the original un-smoothened image in the 488 channel as a guide, objects

representing cell bodies were selected manually to generate a "cell body" mask. An "axon"

mask was generated by subtracting the manually-selected cell bodies from the total object set.

To quantify Comm expression in either cell bodies or axons, Cy3 fluorescence was measured

within the appropriate mask and divided by the area of those mask. The ratio of axonal Comm

to cell body Comm was then calculated. Comparisons between groups were made using one-

way ANOVA with Tukey's Post-hoc test and data are represented as mean values +/- 95%

confidence intervals. Differences were considered significant when $p<0.05$.

For quantification of colocalization of Comm variants and late endosomal markers in

apterous neurons, images were first batch processed using a macro in image J that set the

channels of all images to common thresholds. These processed images were then analyzed in

cell profiler. To generate masks of cell bodies, a common smoothing algorithm was applied to all

images in the 488 channel (for either Rab7 GFP or Lamp1 GFP), and cell bodies were identified

automatically via an algorithm that recognizes objects based on brightness threshold, size, and

round shape. To generate a mask for the total area of Comm expression, a common smoothing

algorithm was applied to all images in the Cy3 Channel (for Comm). Areas of Comm expression

within the nerve cord (cell bodies as well as axons if Comm had axonal expression) were

identified automatically via an algorithm that recognizes objects based on size and brightness

threshold. To eliminate objects detected outside the appropriate area (for example, areas of

Comm expression in motor neurons as opposed to the nerve cord, or in the anterior four body

segments) objects were then manually edited using the original un-smoothened image in the

Cy3 channel. The final edited set of objects was then used to generate a mask. To enhance

both endosomal marker and Comm puncta, an algorithm was applied in both the 488 and Cy3

channels. Using the area of these enhanced images (within either the cell body mask, or total

comm expression mask) Comm colocalization with late endosomal markers was measured

using Pearson's Coefficient. Comparisons between groups were made using one way ANOVA

with Tukey's post-hoc test. Data are presented as mean values +/- 95% confidence intervals.

Differences were considered significant when $P<0.05$.

Data and Software Availability:

Confocal stacks were collected using a spinning disk confocal system (Perkin Elmer) built on a

Nikon Ti-U inverted microscope with Volocity imaging software. Images were processed using

NIH ImageJ and Adobe Photoshop software. Image analysis was conducted using CellProfiler

4.2.5. All statistics and graphs were generated using GraphPad Prism 9.

Author Contributions

Kelly Sullivan: Investigation, Methodology, Data curation, Formal analysis, Writing – original

draft, Writing – review and editing. Greg J. Bashaw: Investigation, Writing – review and editing,

Funding acquisition, Supervision. The authors declare no competing interests.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge past and present members of the Bashaw lab for thoughtful

discussions and comments on this manuscript. We especially thank Dr. Madhavi Gorla for

guidance on cell and biochemical assays, Dr. Yixin Zang for guidance on the embryo live-

dissection experiments and Dr. Camila Barrios Camacho for help with Cell Profiler analysis. The

smurf 15C fly line were a kind gift from Dr. Haiwei Pi. This research was supported by NIH

grants 5T32GM007229-42 and F31NS115345-01 to KS, and NSF Grant IOS-1853719 and NIH

Grant R35 NS097340 to G.J.B

References

Anitha, A., Nakamura, K., Yamada, K., Suda, S., Thanseem, I., Tsujii, M., Iwayama, Y., Hattori, E., Toyota,
T., Miyachi, T.*, et al.* (2008). Genetic analyses of roundabout (ROBO) axon guidance receptors in autism.
Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet *147B*, 1019-1027.
Arbeille, E., and Bashaw, G.J. (2018). Brain Tumor promotes axon growth across the midline through
interactions with the microtubule stabilizing protein Apc2. PLoS Genet *14*, e1007314.
Bakkers, J., Camacho-Carvajal, M., Nowak, M., Kramer, C., Danger, B., and Hammerschmidt, M. (2005).
Destabilization of DeltaNp63alpha by Nedd4-mediated ubiquitination and Ubc9-mediated sumoylation,
and its implications on dorsoventral patterning of the zebrafish embryo. Cell Cycle *4*, 790-800.
Bashaw, G.J. (2010). Live dissection and surface labeling of proteins in Drosophila embryos. Cold Spring
Harb Protoc *2010*, pdb prot5504.
Bosley, T.M., Salih, M.A., Jen, J.C., Lin, D.D., Oystreck, D., Abu-Amero, K.K., MacDonald, D.B., al Zayed, Z.,
al Dhalaan, H., Kansu, T.*, et al.* (2005). Neurologic features of horizontal gaze palsy and progressive
scoliosis with mutations in ROBO3. Neurology *64*, 1196-1203.
Brose, K., Bland, K.S., Wang, K.H., Arnott, D., Henzel, W., Goodman, C.S., Tessier-Lavigne, M., and Kidd,
T. (1999). Slit proteins bind Robo receptors and have an evolutionarily conserved role in repulsive axon
guidance. Cell *96*, 795-806.
Chance, R.K., and Bashaw, G.J. (2015). Slit-Dependent Endocytic Trafficking of the Robo Receptor Is
Required for Son of Sevenless Recruitment and Midline Axon Repulsion. PLoS Genet *11*, e1005402.
Charron, F., Stein, E., Jeong, J., McMahon, A.P., and Tessier-Lavigne, M. (2003). The Morphogen Sonic
Hedgehog Is an Axonal Chemoattractant that Collaborates with Netrin-1 in Midline Axon Guidance. Cell
113, 11-23.
Depienne, C., Cincotta, M., Billot, S., Bouteiller, D., Groppa, S., Brochard, V., Flamand, C., Hubsch, C.,
Meunier, S., Giovannelli, F.*, et al.* (2011). A novel DCC mutation and genetic heterogeneity in congenital
mirror movements. Neurology *76*, 260-264.
Engle, E.C. (2010). Human genetic disorders of axon guidance. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol *2*,
a001784.
Evans, T.A., and Bashaw, G.J. (2010). Axon guidance at the midline: of mice and flies. Curr Opin
Neurobiol *20*, 79-85.
Evans, T.A., Santiago, C., Arbeille, E., and Bashaw, G.J. (2015). Robo2 acts in trans to inhibit Slit-Robo1
repulsion in pre-crossing commissural axons. Elife *4*, e08407.
Foot, N.J., Dalton, H.E., Shearwin-Whyatt, L.M., Dorstyn, L., Tan, S.S., Yang, B., and Kumar, S. (2008).
Regulation of the divalent metal ion transporter DMT1 and iron homeostasis by a ubiquitin-dependent
mechanism involving Ndfips and WWP2. Blood *112*, 4268-4275.
Garbe, D.S., O'Donnell, M., and Bashaw, G.J. (2007). Cytoplasmic domain requirements for Frazzled-
mediated attractive axon turning at the Drosophila midline. Development *134*, 4325-4334.
Gilestro, G.F. (2008). Redundant mechanisms for regulation of midline crossing in Drosophila. PLoS One
3, e3798.
Gorla, M., and Bashaw, G.J. (2020). Molecular mechanisms regulating axon responsiveness at the
midline. Dev Biol *466*, 12-21.
Gorla, M., Chaudhari, K., Hale, M., Potter, C., and Bashaw, G.J. (2022). A Nedd4 E3 Ubiquitin Ligase
Pathway Inhibits Robo1 Repulsion and Promotes Commissural Axon Guidance across the Midline. J
Neurosci *42*, 7547-7561.
Gorla, M., Santiago, C., Chaudhari, K., Layman, A.A.K., Oliver, P.M., and Bashaw, G.J. (2019). Ndfip
Proteins Target Robo Receptors for Degradation and Allow Commissural Axons to Cross the Midline in
the Developing Spinal Cord. Cell Rep *26*, 3298-3312 e3294.

Hernandez-Fleming, M., Rohrbach, E.W., and Bashaw, G.J. (2017). Sema-1a Reverse Signaling Promotes
Midline Crossing in Response to Secreted Semaphorins. Cell Rep *18*, 174-184.
Howitt, J., Putz, U., Lackovic, J., Doan, A., Dorstyn, L., Cheng, H., Yang, B., Chan-Ling, T., Silke, J., Kumar,
S.*, et al.* (2009). Divalent metal transporter 1 (DMT1) regulation by Ndfip1 prevents metal toxicity in
human neurons. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *106*, 15489-15494.
Ing, B., Shteiman-Kotler, A., Castelli, M., Henry, P., Pak, Y., Stewart, B., Boulianne, G.L., and Rotin, D.
(2007). Regulation of Commissureless by the ubiquitin ligase DNedd4 is required for neuromuscular
synaptogenesis in Drosophila melanogaster. Mol Cell Biol *27*, 481-496.
Ingham, R.J., Gish, G., and Pawson, T. (2004). The Nedd4 family of E3 ubiquitin ligases: functional
diversity within a common modular architecture. Oncogene *23*, 1972-1984.
Ishii, N., Wadsworth, W.G., Stern, B.D., Culotti, J.G., and Hedgecock, E.M. (1992). UNC-6, a laminin-
related protein, guides cell and pioneer axon migrations in C. elegans. Neuron *9*, 873-881.
Izzi, L., and Charron, F. (2011). Midline axon guidance and human genetic disorders. Clin Genet *80*, 226-
234.
Jamuar, S.S., Schmitz-Abe, K., D'Gama, A.M., Drottar, M., Chan, W.M., Peeva, M., Servattalab, S., Lam,
A.N., Delgado, M.R., Clegg, N.J.*, et al.* (2017). Biallelic mutations in human DCC cause developmental
split-brain syndrome. Nat Genet *49*, 606-612.
Justice, E.D., Barnum, S.J., and Kidd, T. (2017). The WAGR syndrome gene PRRG4 is a functional
homologue of the commissureless axon guidance gene. PLoS Genet *13*, e1006865.
Kanelis, V., Bruce, M.C., Skrynnikov, N.R., Rotin, D., and Forman-Kay, J.D. (2006). Structural determinants
for high-affinity binding in a Nedd4 WW3* domain-Comm PY motif complex. Structure *14*, 543-553.
Kanelis, V., Rotin, D., and Forman-Kay, J.D. (2001). Solution structure of a Nedd4 WW domain-ENaC
peptide complex. Nat Struct Biol *8*, 407-412.
Kang, Y., Guo, J., Yang, T., Li, W., and Zhang, S. (2015). Regulation of the human ether-a-go-go-related
gene (hERG) potassium channel by Nedd4 family interacting proteins (Ndfips). Biochem J *472*, 71-82.
Kasanov, J., Pirozzi, G., Uveges, A.J., and Kay, B.K. (2001). Characterizing Class I WW domains defines key
specificity determinants and generates mutant domains with novel specificities. Chem Biol *8*, 231-241.
Keleman, K., Rajagopalan, S., Cleppien, D., Teis, D., Paiha, K., Huber, L.A., Technau, G.M., and Dickson,
B.J. (2002). Comm Sorts Robo to Control Axon Guidance at the Drosophila Midline. Cell *110*, 415-427.
Keleman, K., Ribeiro, C., and Dickson, B.J. (2005). Comm function in commissural axon guidance: cell-
autonomous sorting of Robo in vivo. Nat Neurosci *8*, 156-163.
Kidd, T., Bland, K.S., and Goodman, C.S. (1999). Slit Is the Midline Repellent for the Robo Receptor in
Drosophila. Cell *96*, 785-794.
Kidd, T., Russell, C., Goodman, C.S., and Tear, G. (1998). Dosage-sensitive and complementary functions
of roundabout and commissureless control axon crossing of the CNS midline. Neuron *20*, 25-33.
Kinoshita-Kawada, M., Hasegawa, H., Hongu, T., Yanagi, S., Kanaho, Y., Masai, I., Mishima, T., Chen, X.,
Tsuboi, Y., Rao, Y.*, et al.* (2019). A crucial role for Arf6 in the response of commissural axons to Slit.
Development *146*.
Lin, C.M., Xu, J., Yang, W.T., Wang, C., Li, Y.C., Cheng, L.C., Zhang, L., and Hsu, J.C. (2017). Smurf
Downregulates Echinoid in the Amnioserosa To Regulate Drosophila Dorsal Closure. Genetics *206*, 985-
992.
Lohraseb, I., McCarthy, P., Secker, G., Marchant, C., Wu, J., Ali, N., Kumar, S., Daly, R.J., Harvey, N.L.,
Kawabe, H.*, et al.* (2022). Global ubiquitinome profiling identifies NEDD4 as a regulator of Profilin 1 and
actin remodelling in neural crest cells. Nat Commun *13*, 2018.
Mitchell, K.J., Doyle, J.L., Serafini, T., Kennedy, T.E., Tessier-Lavigne, M., Goodman, C.S., and Dickson, B.J.
(1996). Genetic analysis of Netrin genes in Drosophila: Netrins guide CNS commissural axons and
peripheral motor axons. Neuron *17*, 203-215.

Mund, T., and Pelham, H.R. (2010). Regulation of PTEN/Akt and MAP kinase signaling pathways by the
ubiquitin ligase activators Ndfip1 and Ndfip2. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *107*, 11429-11434.
Myat, A., Henry, P., McCabe, V., Flintoft, L., Rotin, D., and Tear, G. (2002). Drosophila Nedd4, a Ubiquitin
Ligase, Is Recruited by Commissureless to Control Cell Surface Levels of the Roundabout Receptor.
Neuron *35*, 447-459.
Nagarkar-Jaiswal, S., Lee, P.T., Campbell, M.E., Chen, K., Anguiano-Zarate, S., Gutierrez, M.C., Busby, T.,
Lin, W.W., He, Y., Schulze, K.L.*, et al.* (2015). A library of MiMICs allows tagging of genes and reversible,
spatial and temporal knockdown of proteins in Drosophila. Elife *4*.
Nawabi, H., and Castellani, V. (2011). Axonal commissures in the central nervous system: how to cross
the midline? Cell Mol Life Sci *68*, 2539-2553.
Paul, L.K., Brown, W.S., Adolphs, R., Tyszka, J.M., Richards, L.J., Mukherjee, P., and Sherr, E.H. (2007).
Agenesis of the corpus callosum: genetic, developmental and functional aspects of connectivity. Nat Rev
Neurosci *8*, 287-299.
Persaud, A., Alberts, P., Hayes, M., Guettler, S., Clarke, I., Sicheri, F., Dirks, P., Ciruna, B., and Rotin, D.
(2011). Nedd4-1 binds and ubiquitylates activated FGFR1 to control its endocytosis and function. EMBO J
30, 3259-3273.
Podos, S.D., Hanson, K.K., Wang, Y.C., and Ferguson, E.L. (2001). The DSmurf ubiquitin-protein ligase
restricts BMP signaling spatially and temporally during Drosophila embryogenesis. Dev Cell *1*, 567-578.
Roney, J.C., Cheng, X.T., and Sheng, Z.H. (2022). Neuronal endolysosomal transport and lysosomal
functionality in maintaining axonostasis. J Cell Biol *221*.
Sabatier, C., Plump, A.S., Le, M., Brose, K., Tamada, A., Murakami, F., Lee, E.Y., and Tessier-Lavigne, M.
(2004). The divergent Robo family protein rig-1/Robo3 is a negative regulator of slit responsiveness
required for midline crossing by commissural axons. Cell *117*, 157-169.
Sakata, T., Sakaguchi, H., Tsuda, L., Higashitani, A., Aigaki, T., Matsuno, K., and Hayashi, S. (2004).
Drosophila Nedd4 regulates endocytosis of notch and suppresses its ligand-independent activation. Curr
Biol *14*, 2228-2236.
Serafini, T., Colamarino, S.A., Leonardo, E.D., Wang, H., Beddington, R., Skarnes, W.C., and Tessier-
Lavigne, M. (1996). Netrin-1 is required for commissural axon guidance in the developing vertebrate
nervous system. Cell *87*, 1001-1014.
Serafini, T., Kennedy, T.E., Galko, M.J., Mirzayan, C., Jessell, T.M., and Tessier-Lavigne, M. (1994). The
netrins define a family of axon outgrowth-promoting proteins homologous to C. elegans UNC-6. Cell *78*,
409-424.
Spitzweck, B., Brankatschk, M., and Dickson, B.J. (2010). Distinct protein domains and expression
patterns confer divergent axon guidance functions for Drosophila Robo receptors. Cell *140*, 409-420.
Srour, M., Riviere, J.B., Pham, J.M., Dube, M.P., Girard, S., Morin, S., Dion, P.A., Asselin, G., Rochefort, D.,
Hince, P.*, et al.* (2010). Mutations in DCC cause congenital mirror movements. Science *328*, 592.
Suda, S., Iwata, K., Shimmura, C., Kameno, Y., Anitha, A., Thanseem, I., Nakamura, K., Matsuzaki, H.,
Tsuchiya, K.J., Sugihara, G.*, et al.* (2011). Decreased expression of axon-guidance receptors in the
anterior cingulate cortex in autism. Mol Autism *2*, 14.
Sullivan, K.G., and Bashaw, G.J. (2023). Intracellular Trafficking Mechanisms that Regulate Repulsive
Axon Guidance. Neuroscience *508*, 123-136.
Tear, G., Harris, R., Sutaria, S., Kilomanski, K., Goodman, C.S., and Seeger, M.A. (1996). commissureless
controls growth cone guidance across the CNS midline in Drosophila and encodes a novel membrane
protein. Neuron *16*, 501-514.
Trimpert, C., Wesche, D., de Groot, T., Pimentel Rodriguez, M.M., Wong, V., van den Berg, D.T.M.,
Cheval, L., Ariza, C.A., Doucet, A., Stagljar, I.*, et al.* (2017). NDFIP allows NEDD4/NEDD4L-induced AQP2
ubiquitination and degradation. PLoS One *12*, e0183774.

Wolf, B., Seeger, M.A., and Chiba, A. (1998). Commissureless endocytosis is correlated with initiation of
neuromuscular synaptogenesis. Development (Cambridge, England) *125*, 3853-3863.
Xia, L., Jia, S., Huang, S., Wang, H., Zhu, Y., Mu, Y., Kan, L., Zheng, W., Wu, D., Li, X.*, et al.* (2010). The
Fused/Smurf complex controls the fate of Drosophila germline stem cells by generating a gradient BMP
response. Cell *143*, 978-990.
Yuasa-Kawada, J., Kinoshita-Kawada, M., Wu, G., Rao, Y., and Wu, J.Y. (2009). Midline crossing and Slit
responsiveness of commissural axons require USP33. Nat Neurosci *12*, 1087-1089.
Zhang, Y., Ding, Y., Chen, Y.G., and Tao, Q. (2014). NEDD4L regulates convergent extension movements
in Xenopus embryos via Disheveled-mediated non-canonical Wnt signaling. Dev Biol *392*, 15-25.
Zou, Y., Stoeckli, E., Chen, H., and Tessier-Lavigne, M. (2000). Squeezing axons out of the gray matter: a
role for slit and semaphorin proteins from midline and ventral spinal cord. Cell *102*, 363-375.
997
998

1000

Figure 1. PY motifs are required for Comm to promote midline crossing

A) Comm variants used in this study including WT, and mutant forms in which the LPSY (1PY)

or both the LPSY and PPCY (2PY) motifs are disrupted. B-C) PY motifs are necessary for

Comm to cause ectopic crossing in the ipsilateral FasII neuron population when driven pan-

neuronally. B) Micrographs of stage 16-17 nerve cords stained with HRP (pan-neuronal marker,

magenta) and FasII (green) expressing no Comm (i), Comm WT (ii), Comm 1PY (iii), and Comm

2PY (iv) under the elav gal4 driver. C) Quantification of ectopic FasII crossing in stage 16-17

embryos expressing wild type and PY-mutant Comm variants. Groups were compared using

ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test, and error bars represent mean with 95% confidence

interval. D-E) PY motifs are required for Comm to cell-autonomously promote ectopic midline

crossing when driven in apterous neurons. D) Micrographs of stage 16-17 nerve cords stained

with HRP (magenta) and GFP (green), expressing GFP and no Comm (i), Comm WT (ii), Comm

1PY (iii), and Comm 2PY (iv) under the ap gal4 driver. E) Quantification of ectopic apterous

neuron crossing in stage 16-17 embryos expressing wild type and PY-mutant Comm variants.

Groups were compared using ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test, and error bars represent

mean with 95% confidence interval. For all graphs, each data point represents one embryo. **

(p<0.01) **** (p<0.0001). Scale bars represent 20μM.

1018

1019

1020

Figure 2. PY motifs are required for Comm to downregulate Robo1 protein levels *in vitro*.

A-C) Loss of PY motifs inhibits Robo1 degradation facilitated by Comm and increases Comm

stability. A) Western blot of S2R+ cells transfected with HA-Robo1 and Comm-Myc WT, 1PY, or

2PY. B) Fold change in Robo1 levels relative to the "Robo1 alone" condition. Protein levels were

calculated via densitometry and normalized to tubulin. C) Fold change in Comm levels relative

to the "WT Comm" condition. Protein levels were calculated via densitometry and normalized to

tubulin. For B and C, groups were compared using ANOVA with Tukey's post hoc test. Error

bars represent mean +/- SD. Each data point represents values calculated from a single

experiment. * ($p < 0.05$), ** ($p < 0.01$), *** ($p < 0.001$). D-E) Comm requires PY motifs to facilitate

Robo1 ubiquitination and degradation in the lysosome. D) Immunoprecipitation of ubiquitinated

Robo1 in control or chloroquine-treated S2R+ cells transfected with FLAG-Ubiquitin and HA-

Robo1 alone, or HA-Robo1 and WT, 1PY, or 2PY Comm-myc variants. Cells were incubated

with Chloroquine for 2 hrs. E) Fold change of ubiquitinated Robo1 levels relative to the "Robo1

only" condition. Ubiquitinated Robo1 levels were measured by quantifying immunoprecipitated

FLAG blotting via densitometry and normalizing to IGG, lysate Robo1, and tubulin. For B and C,

groups were compared using ANOVA with Tukey's post hoc test. Error bars represent mean +/-

SD. Each data point represents values calculated from a single experiment * ($p < 0.05$), **

($p < 0.01$), **** ($p < 0.0001$).

1039

Figure 3: PY motifs are necessary for Comm to downregulate Robo protein levels *in vivo*.

A) Stage 15-16 embryos expressing no Comm or 5X UAS Comm-myc variants under the pan

neuronal elav gal4 driver. Embryos are stained for endogenous Robo1 (i-iv) , Myc (v-viii), and

pan-neuronal marker HRP (ix-xii). Scale bar represents 20µM. B) Quantification of endogenous

Robo1 levels in stage 15-16 embryos expressing Comm variants under elav gal4 driver. Robo1

levels were measured by creating a mask of the axonal scaffold, measuring 488 fluorescence

within the scaffold, and dividing by scaffold area. C) Quantification of Comm levels in stage 15-

16 embryos expressing Comm variants under the *elavGal4* driver. Comm levels were measured

by creating a mask of the whole nerve cord, measuring Cy3 fluorescence within the nerve cord,

and dividing by nerve cord area. For B and C, groups were compared using ANOVA with

Tukey's post-hoc test. ** $p < 0.01$ **** $p < 0.0001$. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals

around the mean. Each data point represents one embryo.

1053

Figure 4: PY motifs are necessary for Comm to effectively traffic Robo1.

A) COS-7 cells transfected with HA-Robo1 and Myc-Comm variants. Cells in which Comm and

Robo1 are exclusively in puncta are outlined with dotted lines in merged images and labelled

with arrowheads in images of individual color channels. Scale bar represents 15μM. B)

Quantification of cells expressing Robo1 exclusively in intracellular puncta or in diffuse

localization throughout the cell. N represents the number of individual cells counted, which were

taken from seven images of cell fields chosen at random locations on the microscope slide.

Distribution of exclusively punctate vs diffuse Robo1 localization in Comm-transfected

conditions was compared to the Robo1 alone condition via Chi Square (** p<0.01). C)

Quantification of cells expressing Comm exclusively in intracellular puncta or in diffuse

localization throughout the cell. N represents the number of individual cells counted, which were

taken from seven images of cell fields chosen at random locations on the microscope slide.

Distribution of exclusively punctate vs diffuse Comm localization in comm mutant conditions was

compared to the WT Comm condition via Chi Square (** p<0.01). In both B and C, only cells

expressing both Comm and Robo1 were counted. D) Surface expression of Robo in nerve cords

1071   of stage 14-15 embryos. Embryos were live-dissected, left unpermeabilized, and stained with an

1072   antibody against endogenous Robo1 at 4°C. After Robo1 staining, embryos were permeabilized

1073   and stained with HRP and Myc. Scale bar represents 20µM.

1074

1075

Figure 5: Comm requires intact PY motifs to localize appropriately _in vivo_.

A) Micrographs of stage 16-17 embryos expressing CD8-GFP and WT or PY-mutant Comm-myc variants under the apgal4 driver. Embryos are stained with GFP to visualize apterous neurons, Myc (Comm), and HRP (pan neuronal marker). Cell bodies are circled in panels showing Myc staining (iv-vi). In v, axonal Comm expression is indicated with arrowheads. Scale bar represents 20μM. B) Quantification of the ratio of axonal Comm to cell soma Comm in stage 17 embryos expressing WT and PY-mutant Comm variants in apterous neurons. Axonal and cell soma comm were measured within masks created of these two features, derived from images of apterous neurons in the GFP channel. Axon/cell soma ratios were compared via ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test (**** $p < 0.0001$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Each data point represents a single embryo. C) Stage 15 embryos expressing Lamp1-GFP and WT or PY-mutant Comm myc variants under the _apGal4_ driver. Embryos are stained with GFP (Lamp1), Myc (Comm), and HRP (pan neuronal marker). Cell bodies are outlined with white circles except those that are enlarged in inset images, which are outlined with yellow squares. Within inset images, Comm/Lamp1 co-positive puncta are indicated with yellow arrowheads and puncta containing Comm alone are indicated with white arrowheads. Scale bar represents 20μM in the large image and 5μM in the inset image. D) Total colocalization of Comm and Lamp1. The proportion of areas of Comm expression that were also positive for Lamp1 was calculated via pearson's coefficient within a mask created of the area of Comm expression using smoothened images from the Comm channel. E) Colocalization of Comm and Lamp1 within cell bodies. The proportion of areas of Comm expression that were also positive for Lamp1 was calculated via Pearson's coefficient within a mask created of cell bodies using smoothened images from the Lamp1 channel. For D and E, colocalization across conditions was compared via ANOVA with Tukey's post hoc test (* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Each data point represents one embryo.

Figure 6: Nedd4 is required for midline crossing in vivo. A-B) Loss of *nedd4* enhances pan

neuronal crossing defects in a *fra-/-* background. A) Stage 15-16 embryos with various

combinations of *wild-type* and null *fra* and *nedd4* alleles, stained with pan-neuronal markers

BP102 (i-iv) and HRP (v). Commissures with crossing defects (either thin or completely missing)

are indicated with yellow arrowheads. B) Quantification of crossing defects in embryos within

the genotypes indicated in A. Percentage of total crossing defects was compared across groups

using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). N represents number of individual embryos. C-D) Loss

of *nedd4* enhances EW crossing defects in a *fra -/-* background. C) Stage 15-16 embryos with

various combinations of wild-type and null *fra* and *nedd4* alleles, expressing GFP under the egl

gal4 driver. Embryos are stained with pan-neuronal marker HRP, and GFP to visualize eg

neurons. Commissures with EW crossing defects are indicated with arrowheads. D)

Quantification of crossing defects in embryos within the genotypes indicated in (C). Percentage

of crossing defects was compared across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001).

Each data point represents an individual embryo and error bars represent 95% confidence

intervals around the mean E-F) Loss of *nedd4* enhances EW crossing defects in the fraΔc

background. E) Embryos with *nedd4* mutations and/or exogenous Nedd4 expression in the

fraΔc background. F) Quantification of EW crossing defects for the genotypes shown in (E).

Percentage of crossing defects was compared across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, ****

p<0.0001). Each data point represents an individual embryo and error bars represent95%

confidence intervals around the mean. All scale bars represent 20μM.

1124

1125

Figure 7: Nedd4 interacts genetically and biochemically with slit/Robo1 pathway.

A-C) Nedd4 is incorporated into a three-member complex with Robo1 and Comm. A)

immunoprecipitation (i) and input (ii) of Robo1-GFP in S2R+ cells co-transfected with Nedd4-HA

and WT, 1PY, or 2PY Comm-myc variants. B) Quantification of fold change in Nedd4

association with Robo1, relative to the Robo1 + Nedd4 condition, from the co-

immunoprecipitation in (A). This was measured by quantifying immunoprecipitated Nedd4 via

densitometry and normalizing to immunoprecipitated Robo1 and input Nedd4. Groups were

compared using ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test. (* $p < 0.05$) Error bars represent mean +/-

one standard deviation. C) Schematic illustrating how Nedd4 relies on Comm PY motifs for

recruitment into a ternary complex with Robo1 and Nedd4. D-G) Exogenous Nedd4 enhances

degradation of Robo1 in the presence of WT Comm *in vivo*. D) Western blot of Lysates of 13-

18hpf embryos expressing WT Comm-myc with or without Nedd4-HA under the elavGal4 driver.

E) Quantification of Robo1 (i) and Comm (ii) levels from the blot in (D). Protein levels were

measured via densitometry and normalized to tubulin. Protein levels were compared across

conditions using ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test. (* $p<0.05$, *** $p<0.001$, **** $p<0.0001$) Error

bars represent mean +/- one standard deviation. F) Nerve cords of stage 15-16 embryos

expressing WT Comm-myc with or without Nedd4-HA under the elavGal4 driver. Embryos are

stained with the pan neuronal marker HRP (magenta) and an antibody against endogenous

Robo1 (green). Scale bar represents 20µM. G) Quantification of Robo1 levels from the

conditions in (F). Robo1 levels were measured by creating a mask of the axonal scaffold,

measuring 488 fluorescence within the scaffold, and dividing by scaffold area. Robo1 levels

were compared across conditions using ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test. (** $p<0.01$, ****

$p<0.0001$) Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean.

1150

1151

1152

Figure 8: A schematic illustrating our proposed model for Robo1 downregulation in pre-

crossing commissural axons. A-B) Localization and repulsive activity of Robo1 in neurons

when Comm is absent. A) View of Robo1 trafficking down axons to the growth cone surface. In

neurons not expressing Comm (such as ipsilateral or post-crossing neurons), Robo1 travels

unimpeded to the growth cone surface. B). At the growth cone surface, Robo1 induces a

repulsive response to slit, preventing midline crossing. C-D) Robo1 localization and repulsive

activity in the presence of Comm. C) Comm facilitates Robo1 ubiquitination by recruiting Nedd4

via its PY motifs. Robo1 ubiquitination drives the entire Robo1/Nedd4/Comm complex to the

lysosome. D) Due to lysosomal degradation, little Robo1 reaches the growth cone membrane.

This lack of Robo1 renders axons insensitive to repulsion via slit, enabling them to cross the

midline.

1164

1165

1166 <u>**Supplementary figures and legends**</u>

1167
Figure S1: Driving high levels of Comm, including those lacking functional PY motifs,

induces ectopic midline crossing in ipsilateral neurons. A-D) Nerve cords of embryos

expressing no Comm (A), or 10X UAS transgenes for Comm WT(B) Comm 1PY (C) and Comm

2PY (D). Embryos are stained with the pan neuronal marker HRP (green) and an antibody

against FasII (magenta), which labels a population of ipsilateral neurons. Scale bar represents

20μM.

1174

1175

1176
Figure S2: Robo expression in 10XUAS Comm transgenic flies. Stage 15-16 embryos

expressing no Comm or 10X UAS Comm-myc variants under the pan neuronal elav gal4 driver.

Embryos are stained for endogenous Robo1 (i-iv), Myc (v-viii), and pan-neuronal marker HRP

(ix-xii). Scale bar represents 20μM. B) Quantification of endogenous Robo1 levels in stage 15-

16 embryos expressing Comm variants under elav gal4 driver. Robo1 levels were measured by

creating a mask of the axonal scaffold, measuring 488 fluorescence within the scaffold, and

dividing by scaffold area. C) Quantification of Comm levels in stage 15-16 embryos expressing

Comm variants under the *elavGal4* driver. Comm levels were measured by creating a mask of

the whole nerve cord, measuring Cy3 fluorescence within the nerve cord, and dividing by nerve

cord area. For B and C, groups were compared using ANOVA with Tukey's post-hoc test. **

p<0.01 **** p<0.0001. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Each

data point represents one embryo.

1189

1190

1191

Figure S3: Colocalization of Comm with the late endosomal marker Rab 7. A) Stage 17

embryos expressing Rab7-GFP and WT or PY-mutant Comm myc variants under the *apGal4*

driver. Embryos are stained with GFP (Rab7), Myc (Comm), and HRP (pan neuronal marker).

Cell bodies are outlined with white circles except those that are enlarged in inset images, which

are outlined with yellow squares. Within inset images, Comm/Rab7 co-positive puncta are

indicated with yellow arrowheads and puncta containing Comm alone are indicated with white

arrowheads. Scale bar represents 20μM. B) Total colocalization of Comm and Rab7. Proportion

of areas of Comm expression that were also positive for Rab7 was calculated via pearson's

coefficient within a mask created of the area of Comm expression using smoothened images

from the Comm channel. C Colocalization of Comm and Rab7 within cell bodies. Proportion of

areas of Comm expression that were also positive for Rab7 was calculated via pearson's

coefficient within a mask created of cell bodies using smoothened images from the Lamp1

channel. For B and C, colocalization across conditions was compared via ANOVA (* p<0.05, **

1205   p<0.01). Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean. Each data point

1206   represents one embryo.

1207

1208
Figure S4: Nedd4 and Smurf are expressed in the nerve cord at developmental stages

when midline crossing occurs. A. Nerve cords of Stage 14-16 Nedd4 MiMiC embryos, in

which endogenous Nedd4 protein is tagged with GFP. Nedd4 expression was visualized using

an antibody against GFP and the axon scaffold was visualized with HRP. B. In situ using an

antisense probe against Smurf in Stage 14-16 embryos heterozygous (i) or homozygous (ii) for

a chromosomal deletion covering the Smurf locus. Nerve cords are outlined with dotted lines. All

scale bars represent 20µM.

1216

1217
Figure S5: Smurf does not appear to be required for midline crossing *in vivo*. A-B) Loss of

smurf does not enhance pan neuronal crossing defects in a *fra-/-* background. A) Stage 15-16

embryos with various combinations of *wild-type* and null *fra* and *smurf* alleles, stained with pan-

neuronal marker BP102 (green). Commissures with crossing defects (either thin or completely

missing) are indicated with yellow arrowheads. B) Quantification of crossing defects in embryos

within the genotypes indicated in (A). Percentage of total crossing defects was compared across

groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). N represents number of individual embryos. C-

D) Loss of *smurf* fails to enhance EW crossing defects in a fra -/- background. C Stage 15/16

embryos with various combinations of wt and null fra and nedd4 alleles, expressing GFP under

the egl gal4 driver. Embryos are stained with pan-neuronal marker HRP, and GFP to visualize

egl neurons. Commissures with EW crossing defects are indicated with arrowheads. D)

Quantification of crossing defects in embryos within the genotypes indicated in C. Percentage of

crossing defects was compared across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). Each

data point represents an individual embryo and error bars represent 95% confidence intervals

around the mean. E-F) Loss of *smurf* fails to enhance EW crossing defects in the fraΔc

background. E) Embryos with *smurf* mutations in fraΔc background. F) Quantification of EW

crossing defects for the genotypes shown in E. Percentage of crossing defects was compared

across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). Each data point represents an

individual embryo and error bars represent 95% confidence intervals around the mean. All scale

bars represent 20μM.

1238

1239
Figure S6: Su(dx) does not appear to be required for midline crossing *in vivo*. A-B) Loss

of *Su(dx)* fails to enhance pan neuronal crossing defects in a fra-/- background. A) Stage 15/16

embryos with various combinations of *wild-type* and null *fra* and *Su(dx)* alleles, stained with pan-

neuronal marker BP102 (green). Commissures with crossing defects (either thin or completely

missing) are indicated with yellow arrowheads. B) Quantification of crossing defects in embryos

within the genotypes indicated in A. Percentage of total crossing defects was compared across

groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). N represents number of individual embryos. C-

D) Loss of *Su(dx)* fails to enhance EW crossing defects in a *fra -/-* background. C Stage 15/16

embryos with various combinations of *wild-type* and null *fra* and *nedd4* alleles, expressing GFP

under the egl gal4 driver. Embryos are stained with pan-neuronal marker HRP, and GFP to

visualize egl neurons. Commissures with EW crossing defects are indicated with arrowheads.

D) Quantification of crossing defects in embryos within the genotypes indicated in C.

Percentage of crossing defects was compared across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, ****

p<0.0001). Each data point represents an individual embryo and error bars represent95%

confidence intervals around the mean. E-F) Loss of *Su(dx)* fails to enhance EW crossing

defects in the fraΔc background. E) Embryos with *Su(dx)* mutations in fraΔc background. F)

Quantification of EW crossing defects for the genotypes shown in E. Percentage of crossing

defects was compared across groups using ANOVA (** p<0.01, **** p<0.0001). Each data point

represents an individual embryo and error bars represent95% confidence intervals around the

mean. All scale bars represent 20µM.

1260

1261

1262

1263