1
2

Single-molecule detection of transient dimerization of opioid receptors 1: Homodimers' effect on signaling and internalization

6
7

Peng Zhou[1], Taka A. Tsunoyama[1], Rinshi S. Kasai[2,3,4], Koichiro M. Hirosawa[4], Ziya Kalay[5], Amine Aladag[1], Takahiro K. Fujiwara[5], Simone Pigolotti[6], and Akihiro Kusumi[1,5]

[1]Membrane Cooperativity Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Onna-son, Okinawa 904-0495, Japan. [2]Institute for Life and Medical Sciences, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8507, Japan. [3]Division of Advanced Bioimaging, National Cancer Center Research Institute, Tokyo 104-0045, Japan. [4]Institute for Glyco-core Research (iGCORE), Gifu University, Gifu 501-1193, Japan. [5]Institute for Integrated Cell-Material Sciences (WPI-iCeMS), Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan. [6]Biological Complexity Unit, Okinawa Institute of Science and Technology Graduate University, Onna-son, Okinawa 904-0495, Japan.

Abstract

Opioid receptors (ORs) are critical for endogenous and synthetic analgesics. Their homodimerization is considered important for their pharmacological diversities, but whether they form homodimers remains controversial. Here, we established that the three classical ORs, μ-, κ-, and δ-ORs (MOR, KOR, and DOR, respectively) undergo repeated transient (120-180 ms) homodimerizations every few seconds. This was done by using single-molecule imaging and developing theories for analyzing single-molecule colocalization data, which provide the key parameters, homodimer-monomer dissociation equilibrium constants and rate constants. Their 9-26 amino-acid C-terminal cytoplasmic domains, without sequence similarities, are involved in specific homodimerization, whereas the transmembrane domains provide less specific affinities. Using the membrane-permeable peptides mimicking the C-terminal homodimerization sequences which block homodimerizations, functions of monomers and homodimers were dissected. KOR and DOR homodimers, but not MOR homodimers, activate downstream G-proteins differently from monomers upon agonist addition, without influencing OR internalization. These findings could guide strategies to enhance OR-based analgesia.

Introduction

Three classical opioid receptors (ORs), μ-, κ-, and δ-ORs (MOR, KOR, and DOR, respectively), are distributed across the central and peripheral nervous systems and play important roles in regulating pain perception, hedonic homeostasis, mood, and well-being.[1, 2] ORs are prototypical class A G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs), and serve as key receptors for a variety of endogenous and synthetic analgesics. These OR subtypes play critical roles in pain therapeutics, and at the same time, in the development of tolerance to and dependence on analgesics, which are likely associated with activations of the inhibitory G-protein and β-arrestin pathways in complex manners.[2, 3, 4]

The diversity of OR conformations and their interactions with other proteins not only drives various cellular physiological responses but also contributes to a spectrum of brain circuit responses, both beneficial and adverse.[4, 5, 6, 7] Hence, a profound understanding of the mechanisms by which ORs' distinct downstream responses are induced is essential for the development of analgesic drugs with minimized side effects. In addition, receptor dimerization and clustering are often key steps for triggering the downstream signaling cascades in other receptor signaling.[8]

The pharmacological diversities of ORs might be enhanced by their propensity to form homodimers[9, 10] and heterodimers.[11, 12, 13] Agonist-induced homodimer formation significantly influences the balance of MOR's downstream G-protein and β-arrestin pathways.[14] Other studies suggested that dimerization, both homo and hetero, might modulate or be modulated by biased agonism, highlighting its significance in receptor signaling (for example, see Refs[15,16] for homodimers and Refs[17, 18] for heterodimers). For the β2-adrenergic receptor, another class A GPCR, homodimers are responsible for generating the basal receptor signal in the absence of agonists, a key common characteristic of GPCRs.[19] Furthermore, OR heterodimerization is important for their cooperative functions, as supported by functional and pharmacological studies.[17, 20] Therefore, understanding both the homo- and hetero-dimerizations of ORs, as well as those of other class-A GPCRs, is fundamental to deciphering their functional regulation mechanisms.[16, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25]

Despite such extensive research, the very existence of homo- and hetero-dimers of ORs,

particularly at physiological expression levels, remains controversial.[26] Previous detection of

homodimers of DOR,[9, 27, 28] MOR,[27, 28] and KOR,[13, 28] and heterodimers of all OR pairs[28]

contrasts with recent single-molecule imaging studies. These studies, performed at

physiological expression levels in the plasma membrane (PM) of living cells, in contrast to the

results obtained under the conditions of overexpression in cells and very high concentrations

in vitro, which are often necessary for the use of bulk observation methods, showed that

MOR,[29, 30] DOR,[30] and KOR[31] are predominantly monomeric. Therefore, they concluded that

previously observed dimerization and its functional and pharmacological consequences would

be artifacts due to the employment of very high OR concentrations. Meanwhile, other single-

molecule investigations detected the nanodomains of KOR and MOR[32] as well as the transient

MOR dimerization[33] or that only after the agonist DAMGO binding, but not morphine.[14]

To address the overexpression issue and resolve these controversies, determining the

dimer-monomer equilibrium constant K_D is imperative, as it is unaffected by the expression

levels. In addition, since several GPCR homodimers are apparently metastable with lifetimes

on the order of 0.1-1 s,[19, 21, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37] estimating the dimer dissociation and association

rate constants, k_{off} and k_{on}, respectively, is essential for establishing the comprehensive

description of the dynamic dimer-monomer equilibrium of ORs. Such insights would enable us

to unequivocally determine whether ORs form homo- and hetero-dimers and to what extent

under various expression conditions, including both the lower and higher regions of

physiological expression levels in different cells in various brain regions. Furthermore,

identifying specific binding sites for homo- and hetero-dimerizations, given the high amino

acid similarities among the three classical ORs, would be interesting from the protein-

interaction viewpoint and highly beneficial for developing reagents that modify dimerizations.

In the present research, we addressed these issues, using advanced single-molecule

imaging, tracking, and analysis. The single-molecule approach was selected for its ability to

directly visualize receptor molecules' dimerization and dissociation in living cells. To extract

the dimer-monomer equilibrium constant, K_D, and rate constants, k_{off} and k_{on}, from single-

molecule imaging data, we developed two novel theories: one to evaluate k_{off} from the

distribution of single-molecule colocalization durations (instead of intuitive methods employed

previously), and another to estimates K_D (k_{on} can be calculated as k_{off}/K_D).

We present our findings in two back-to-back papers. This paper focuses on

homodimers, while the companion paper addresses heterodimers.[38] In this paper, we report

that all three ORs engage in continual, repeated, transient homodimerizations at 37˚C, with

K_Ds of 5.87 ± 0.56, 15.24 ± 1.54, and 16.42 ± 0.53 copies/μm^2 for KOR, MOR, and DOR,

respectively. The homodimer lifetimes are in the range of 120-180 ms (dimer dissociation rate

constants in the range of 6.71 to 8.47 s^{-1}), unequivocally demonstrating that even at low

physiological expression levels, the three ORs form transient homodimers. Furthermore, we

identified that the ≈9-26 amino acid sequences in the cytoplasmic C-terminal domains,

without sequence similarities, are involved in the distinct homodimerizations of the three ORs,

in line with the previous DOR homodimerization data,[9] whereas the transmembrane domains

might promote both homo- and heterodimerizations in a less specific manner, in partial

agreement with previous results.[21, 39, 40, 41, 42]

Building on these amino-acid sequences, we developed peptides that suppress OR

homodimerization within live cells. This has allowed us to distinguish the functions of OR

dimers from monomers, which could not be done before. OR monomerization by these

peptides enhances and diminishes agonist-induced signals downstream from G proteins for

KOR and DOR, respectively, without influencing agonist-induced internalization. Meanwhile,

monomerization had no discernible effect on MOR signaling or internalization. These findings

may inform novel strategies in developing more effective and safer pain treatments.

Results

All three ORs continually interconvert between transient homodimers and monomers: analysis by colocalization index based on the pair cross-correlation function (PCCF)

ORs conjugated with the SNAPf tag protein at their N-termini (SNAPf-ORs) were expressed in the PM of CHO-K1 cells, which do not express ORs.[43] These SNAPf-tagged molecules were functional (Supplementary Fig. 1a, b) and labeled with the fluorescent membrane-impermeable SNAP ligands, SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660R, with 60% and 61% efficiencies, respectively (Supplementary Fig. 1c-e). For the experiments examining OR homodimerization, we simultaneously labeled a SNAPf-OR (for example, SNAPf-KOR) with both SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660R so that the number densities of the two probes on the PM were about the same, with spot densities of 0.5 ± 0.25 spots/μm^2 for each color (total spot number densities of 1.0 ± 0.5 spots/μm^2; for conciseness, we will describe as ≈ 1 spot/μm^2 throughout this report), and then performed simultaneous dual-color single-molecule observations at normal video rate (30 Hz) at 37°C, using a home-built total internal reflection fluorescence (TIRF) microscope.[44, 45]

Virtually all of the SNAPf-OR fluorescent spots exhibited diffusion in the PM, but in addition, they often exhibited temporary colocalization and co-diffusion,[37] suggesting the frequent formation of transient homodimers (Supplementary videos 1 and 2; Fig. 1a). We focused on simultaneous two-color experiments, due to the ease of image analysis. For the single-color imaging data, see Supplementary Fig. 2a, b, which show an example of repeated homodimerizations of a KOR molecule with different partner KOR molecules, consistent with the observations made with other GPCRs.[35, 36, 37]

To quantitatively examine the extent of the colocalization of two single molecules, we employed a "colocalization index", which parameterizes the propensity of a pair of magenta and green molecules to become localized within 100 nm. Namely, the colocalization index is defined from the pair cross-correlation function (PCCF) histogram for the SNAP-Surface 549 (green) and SNAP-CF660R (magenta) spots (Fig. 1b),[46] as the ratio of PCCF (0-100 nm) vs. PCCF (400-500 nm) (Supplementary Fig. 2c-e). When a molecular interaction does not exist, the colocalization index is equal to one within experimental uncertainty. When it does exist,

the index becomes significantly greater than 1. As a negative control (including incidental

colocalization), the 180˚-rotated magenta image was superimposed on the green image (see

Supplementary Fig. 2d, grey histogram in Fig. 1b), providing a colocalization index of ≈ 1.

KOR, MOR, and DOR exhibited significantly higher colocalization indexes than the negative

controls (Fig. 1c), suggesting that they form homodimers (and possibly greater oligomers

when the expression levels are enhanced).

Homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} (inverse of the dimer lifetime) can be

obtained from single-molecule colocalization experiments

To evaluate the homodimer lifetimes, each time we found the colocalization event of spots

with different colors within a threshold distance R = 200 nm (see Supplementary Note 1,

which shows that the selection of R does not affect the measured k_{off} value, although it could

affect its SEM),[36, 37, 44, 45] its duration was measured. By measuring the durations of >1,500

events (in $\geqslant$17 cells; all statistical parameters are summarized in Supplementary Table 1),

we obtained the distribution of colocalization durations (Fig. 1d).

To evaluate the homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} (inverse of the homodimer

lifetime) from the distribution of colocalized durations, we developed a theory based on the

diffusion equation that predicts the distribution of colocalization durations (Supplementary

Note 1). The crucial result of this theory is that, from the histogram of the *colocalization*

durations, we can rigorously estimate the homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} and thus

the homodimer lifetime τ_2. This result holds despite the fact that the generally used

colocalization threshold distance is $\approx$200 nm, which is much greater than the molecular scale

of 3~10 nm. The theory shows that, at a time resolution of 33 ms and under the conditions

of quite limited signal-to-noise ratios in our experiments, the histogram of the colocalization

durations can be fitted with the sum of two exponential functions, where the two decay

constants represent the incidental colocalization lifetime ($1/\alpha$) and the inverse of the

dissociation rate constant ($1/k_{off}$).

Previously, we[36, 37, 45] and others[33, 34, 35] depended on intuitive methods to obtain the

homodimer lifetimes from optical colocalization data. However, due to the theory developed

here, we now have a firm basis to obtain the homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} from

the distribution of single-molecule colocalization durations.

Brief outline of the theory to evaluate k_{off} from the single-molecule colocalization

duration distribution (Supplementary Note 1)

In dual-color single-molecule tracking, a colocalization is defined as an event in which two

spots are located closer than a threshold distance R. Starting from the 2D diffusion equation,

we found that the distribution of the dwell times in the threshold circle without binding

(incidental lifetime τ_{inci}; i.e., incidental colocalization duration, Fig. 1e) is expressed by

$$p_d(t) \approx \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2D\epsilon\mu_n^2}{R^3} e^{-\frac{D\mu_n^2 t}{R^2}} \approx \alpha e^{-\alpha t} \quad , \tag{9}$$

where D is the diffusion coefficient, R is the threshold distance, ε is a regularization factor,

and μ_n is the n-th real positive 0 of the Bessel function (Equation numbers in the main text

are matched with those in Supplementary Note 1 and 2 for easy reference). Under our

experimental conditions, the first term is sufficient to describe the distribution, providing a

single exponential function with a decay time constant of $R^2/D\mu_1^2 = 1/\alpha$, which is the

incidental colocalization lifetime (τ_{inci}). We indeed found that the colocalization time

distribution for incidental colocalizations obtained for the overlay on the 180˚-rotated image

(Supplementary Fig. 2d) could be fitted with a single exponential function (using both

Akaike's and Bayesian information criteria; AIC and BIC, respectively) (Fig. 1d).

The dwell time in the threshold circle with binding (T; i.e., colocalization duration, Fig.

1e) is given by the sum of τ_{inci} added to the sum of multiple binding durations, τ_i.

$$T = \tau_{inci} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \tau_i \quad . \tag{10}$$

196   Here, the terms in the sum correspond to possible multiple binding events during a dwell;

197   i.e., to obtain the correct k_{off} value, we will need to consider the cases where the observed

198   colocalization durations are the results of multiple binding events.

199   Combining these results, we obtain the dwell time distribution in the threshold circle.

$$P(T) = \frac{\alpha k_{off}}{\Gamma} \left\{ \left[1 - \frac{(\Delta - \Gamma)}{2k_{off}} \right] e^{-\frac{T}{2}(\Delta - \Gamma)} - \left[1 - \frac{(\Delta + \Gamma)}{2k_{off}} \right] e^{-\frac{T}{2}(\Delta + \Gamma)} \right\} \quad , \tag{21}$$

200   where $\Delta = (\alpha + k_{\text{off}} + k_{\text{on}})$ and $\Gamma = \sqrt{\Delta^2 - 4\alpha k_{\text{off}}}$.

201   At a time resolution of 33 ms and under the conditions of the quite limited signal-to-

202   noise ratios in our experiments, we obtain

$$(\Delta - \Gamma)/2 \approx k_{\text{off}} \quad , \tag{30}$$
$$(\Delta + \Gamma)/2 \approx \alpha \quad . \tag{31}$$

This result explains why the histogram of the colocalization durations can be fitted by the

sum of two exponential functions. Most importantly, it permits to identify the two decay

constants with the incidental colocalization lifetime ($1/\alpha = \tau_{inci}$) and the inverse of the

dissociation rate constant ($1/k_{\text{off}}$), as anticipated.

OR homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} and true homodimer lifetime

As shown in Fig. 1d, we were able to fit the three histograms for KOR, MOR, and DOR,

obtained from the correctly overlaid images, with the sum of two exponential functions, as

predicted by equations 30 and 31. The fitting provided two time constants, τ_1 and τ_2 ($\tau_1 \leq$

τ_2). The histogram obtained from the rotated overlay images could be fitted with a single

exponential function, which provided the time constant τ_{inci} ($= 1/\alpha$) (the numbers of

significant exponential terms were always confirmed by both AIC and BIC in this work). We

found that $\tau_1 \approx \tau_{inci}$ for all three ORs. The longer decay time constant obtained from the

histogram for the correctly overlaid images (τ_2) provides k_{off} ($= 1/\tau_2$; Supplementary Note 1).

As such, using this theory, by simply plotting the histogram of the colocalization durations,

we can obtain the correct homodimer dissociation rate constant k_{off} (by taking account of the

multiple binding-dissociation cycles).

The homodimer lifetimes of KOR, MOR, and DOR were estimated to be 178 ± 5, 122 ±

3, and 120 ± 3 ms, respectively, from the histograms shown in Fig. 1d (after correction for

the trackable duration lifetimes of the two fluorescent probes). These lifetimes are

considerably shorter than that reported for KOR ($\approx$1.8 s at room temperature, perhaps

$\approx$20°C).[33] This difference might be predominantly explained by the lower temperatures

employed in the previous study (20°C), whereas our observations were performed at 37°C.

In addition, it is possible that our imaging and analysis methods are more sensitive to short-

term colocalization events, compared with previous investigations.

Determination of OR homodimer-monomer equilibrium constant (K_D) from PCCF

In the literature, the question of whether ORs (or GPCRs or any other membrane proteins) form homodimers or not has been extensively debated. However, the facts of the matter are that many membrane proteins would form homodimers and clusters anyway at higher expression levels, and that the physiological expression levels vary greatly from cell to cell. Therefore, the critical point should be to quantitatively estimate the homodimer affinity; i.e., to evaluate the homodimer dissociation (homodimer-monomer) equilibrium constant K_D. Here, we developed a theory (Supplementary Note 2) for evaluating K_D from the PCCF of the OR fluorescently-labeled in two colors (PCCF in the form of a histogram, as shown in Fig. 1b and Supplementary Fig. 2e), under conditions where the expression levels are low and so the presence of oligomers greater than dimers could be neglected. The K_D values evaluated from the PCCF by this method are quite accurate because we employed the expression conditions of ≈1 fluorescent spot/μm^2 (Supplementary Fig. 3c, e): Within this range, the colocalization index barely depended on the expression levels when K_D >6.5 copies/μm^2 (see the simulation results shown in Supplementary Fig. 3a-e, particularly Supplementary Fig. 3c). At these copy number densities, we hardly detected oligomers greater than dimers.

The values of K_D were 5.87 ± 0.56, 15.24 ± 1.54, and 16.42 ± 0.53 copies/μm^2 for KOR, MOR, and DOR at 37˚C, respectively (Fig. 2a and b; K_D was first determined for each movie using the PCCF and the number of fluorescent spots obtained from the movie, fixed fluorescent labeling efficiencies of 0.60 for SNAP- SNAP-Surface549 and 0.61 for SNAP-CF660R, and fitting parameters of K_D and the precision of overlaying two-color movies plus single-molecule localizations for the two fluorescent probes, and then the arithmetic mean (± SEM) K_D was obtained using K_Ds determined for all the movies; the number of movies are provided in Supplementary Table 1, like other statistical parameters). These K_D values mean that KOR is more likely to exist as homodimers than MOR and DOR (the main results are summarized in Table 1 and their statistical test results are in Supplementary Table 1). Our estimated values of K_D for the MOR and KOR homodimers found here exhibited much smaller errors compared with previous estimates (for MOR,[33] 27.43 ± 11.75 copies/μm^2; and for KOR,[30] 32 ± 15 copies/μm^2), and their mean values are smaller by factors of approximately

1.7 and 4.9, respectively. In contrast, these K_D values are greater than the K_D's of β2AR and

FPR homodimers (1.6 and 3.6 copies/μm², respectively).[19, 37] The K_D values for CD28, the

constitutive disulfide-linked dimer control molecule,[47] and the transmembrane domain of the

LDL receptor (TM^{LDLR}), the monomer control molecule,[37] are 0.041 ± 0.072 and 132 ±21

copies/μm², respectively, providing the basic dynamic range (4400x) for this method to

evaluate K_D values (although the value for CD28 is a nominal value, representing the

experimental limitation). Our results indicate that the KOR homodimer affinities are higher

than those of DOR and MOR, and thus partially explain previous data showing that KOR, but

not DOR or MOR, forms homodimers at low membrane densities.[30] In the following part of

this report and in the companion paper, we use the colocalization index when showing the

direct experimental data is preferrable, whereas we show the K_D values when providing the

fundamental constants is desirable. Under our standard experimental conditions, the

colocalization index is simply related to K_D as shown in Fig. 2c, and K_D can be roughly

evaluated using the graphs shown there, although we performed actual fitting for the PCCF

for each cell to obtain the K_D value for each cell (the final K_D value and its SEM were obtained

as the arithmetic mean of the K_Ds for all the observed cells).

Using k_{off} and K_D, k_{on} can be calculated as k_{off}/K_D (equation 1). Direct determination of

k_{on} from single-molecule movies is only possible when the labeling efficiency is 100%. This is

because the fluorescent spots that appear to be monomers (protomers) of A and B molecules

might be dimers of labeled and non-labeled molecules. For the correction to evaluate the

actual numbers of protomers, one would need to know K_D, and thus k_{on} cannot be

determined independently from K_D. The percentages (in copy numbers) of molecules

(protomers) that exist as dimers at various expression levels (number density of molecules)

were calculated from the obtained K_D values (Fig. 2d). Their overall variations are in the

range of 3.4-59% of protomers in homodimers over the ORs' predicted physiological

expression ranges of 0.3 - 10 copies/μm².[26, 29, 33]

Therefore, substantial amounts of homodimers would exist in various nerve tissues at

any time. The expected average protomer copy numbers existing as monomers and

homodimers per cell at various expression levels are shown in Fig. 2b and 2d. However, all of

these homodimers are forming and dispersing all the time, with lifetimes shorter than 0.2 s

(Fig. 1d). Once dissociated into monomers, they will again form homodimers, often with

different partner molecules (Supplementary Fig. 2a, b), which will occur more readily at

higher expression levels. Therefore, although at any moment, 10-21% of ORs might exist as

homodimers at the expression levels we employed ($\approx$1 copy/μm^2), the actual molecules

existing as dimers are turning over all the time, and within a few seconds (even at an

expression level of 1 copy/μm^2; calculated as $1/k_{off} + 1/[k_{on} \times 1]$), virtually all of the

molecules experience the periods of homodimers and monomers.

A previous biochemical study detected DOR homodimers[9] and a single-molecule

imaging study using a fluorescently-conjugated MOR antagonist detected MOR homodimers,[33]

in agreement with our results. Meanwhile, at apparent variance with our results, previous

single-molecule examinations demonstrated that MOR and KOR tend to exist as monomers

even at 20˚C, at expression levels between 0.1 and 0.3 copies/μm^2.[14, 31] Since we employed

somewhat higher number densities of $\approx$1 OR spot/μm^2, the discrepancy might simply be due

to the number densities of homodimers found in an image. This underscores the critical

importance of evaluating the homodimer-monomer dissociation equilibrium constant K_D,

rather than simply detecting homodimers.[37]

The 9-26 amino-acid sequences in the C-terminal cytoplasmic domains play

critical roles in OR homodimerization

To advance our understanding of OR homodimerization mechanism, we determined the OR

domains and amino acid sequences responsible for homodimerization. First, we examined the

involvement of the extracellular N-terminal domains in homodimerization, using the N-

terminal deletion mutants (KOR(Δ1-53), MOR(Δ1-51), and DOR(Δ1-35)). Given that the

amino-acid homologies in the N-terminal domains among the three ORs are quite low

(Supplementary Fig. 4a), we considered a possibility that they might be used to distinguish

particular homo- and/or hetero-dimers. These amino-acid sequence ranges were selected

partly because the removal of the entire N-terminal extracellular domains blocked the OR

expression in the PM, probably due to the deletion of the signal sequences. In addition, these

deletion mutants were previously used in X-ray crystallography studies to determine the

structures of the remaining parts of ORs.[48, 49, 50, 51]

The N-terminal deletion mutants of the three ORs all exhibited diffusion behaviors

similar to those of the wild types (without immobilization or clustering) and virtually the same

colocalization indexes as those of the wild types (Fig. 1c). These results clearly indicate that

the N-terminal extracellular domains are not responsible for homodimerization (see the

companion paper about the N-terminal domain involvement in heterodimer formation).

We next examined the involvement of the C-terminal cytoplasmic domains. Their

amino-acid homologies are also low, and in addition, a previous biochemical analysis

indicated that the 15-amino acid stretch in the C-terminal domain is responsible for DOR

homodimerization.[9] We examined systematically varied C-terminal deletion mutants (Fig. 3a,

b). They hardly exhibited immobility or clustering, and their colocalization indexes showed

that KOR's aa 365-380, MOR's aa 358-382, and DOR's aa 357-372 are critical for

homodimerization (Fig. 3b and Supplementary Table 1). For DOR, this amino-acid sequence

agrees with the previous biochemical data.[9] Meanwhile, the mean colocalization index values

never decreased to the index values comparable to those for rotated overlays (≈ 1) (Fig. 3b)

or a monomer control molecule TM^{LDLR} (≈ 1.1) (Fig. 2a), suggesting the possibility that there

might be other weaker homodimerization site(s), which might be the TM domains, as

previously suggested for ORs[26, 49, 50, 52, 53] and other class A GPCRs.[21, 39, 40, 41] However, as

shown in Supplementary Fig. 4a; the aa identities of TM domains among the three ORs are

quite high, and thus the homo-interaction between TM domains might be less specific. We

will revisit the TM interactions for homodimerization later.

The distribution (histogram) of the colocalization *durations* for each representative

deletion mutant, KOR(Δ365-380), MOR(Δ358-382), or DOR(Δ357-372), could be fitted by a

single exponential function, rather than the sum of two exponential functions (based on both

AIC and BIC). The decay time constants were only slightly longer than the incidental

colocalization lifetimes (Fig. 3c); i.e., the τ_2 component, representing the homodimer lifetime

fraction, is small and /or the τ_2 is short, and thus the τ_2 component could not be resolved

from the incidental colocalization lifetime decay component.

By introducing point mutations in these critical regions for homodimerization and their

surrounding regions (Fig. 3a), we found that a few to several basic/acidic residues, as well as

proline residues, are involved in the OR homodimerization (for particular amino acids, see the

colocalization indexes shown in Fig. 3d), suggesting that the electrostatic interactions and the overall structure of the cytoplasmic C-terminal domain could be important for homodimerization. Indeed, the IUPred2 scores (energy-estimation-based predictions for ordered and disordered residues; http://iupred2a.elte.hu)[54, 55] indicated that the C-terminal region could be weakly intrinsically disordered (Supplementary Fig. 4b), and the scores decreased (more ordered) with these point mutations (Supplementary Fig. 4c). Accordingly, in addition to the specific, relatively strong amino-acid interactions, multiple specific, but weak interactions, made possible by the flexible intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs) of the ORs' C-terminal regions, might facilitate the OR homodimerization. Such a mechanism resembling liquid-liquid phase separation was previously found for the dimerization of the transcription factor PU.1.[56] Furthermore, the IDRs in the C-terminal regions might be necessary to bring the specific binding sites closer so that the actual binding can occur.[57]

Peptides mimicking the homodimerization sites block homodimer formation

We then examined whether peptides with the same amino-acid sequences as those of the deleted parts of the mutants could block homodimerization. The use of these peptides was critical for unequivocally demonstrating that the specific amino-acid sequences in the C-terminal regions of KOR, MOR, and DOR are responsible for homodimerizations, because the deletion and point mutations might have induced conformational changes of the true homodimer interaction sites, thus inhibiting homodimerization. Furthermore, if we could develop such homodimerization blockers, they could become extremely useful tools to dissect the functions of OR monomers and homodimers, and might inform future developments of more effective analgesic treatments with fewer side effects and less tolerance development.

We employed two approaches. The first one involved the expression of peptides with the same amino-acid sequences as those of the deleted parts of the mutants, conjugated to the C-terminus of mGFP (named mGFP-Kpep, Mpep, and Dpep, collectively called mGFP-Xpeps; numbers in parentheses following mGFP-Xpeps indicate the amino-acid residue ranges in the wild-type ORs) in CHO-K1 cells stably expressing SNAPf-KOR, MOR, or DOR, respectively (Fig. 4a, b). The concentration of the cytoplasmic mGFP-Xpep was measured by confocal fluorescence microscopy, based on calibration with various concentrations of purified

mGFP protein dissolved in Ham's F12 observation medium in the glass-base dish

(Supplementary Fig. 5a; see Methods).

The OR homo-colocalization index in the cells expressing various concentrations of

mGFP-Xpep in the cytoplasm (homogeneously distributed throughout the cytoplasm; Fig. 4b)

exhibited a clear tendency to decrease with an increase of the specific mGFP-Xpep

concentration in the cytoplasm from 0 to 7.8 µM for all three ORs (Fig. 4c), whereas the

control mGFP-peptides (mGFP-Dpep for KOR and MOR and mGFP-Kpep for DOR) had no

effect (Fig. 4c). Consistently, the distributions of the colocalization *durations* in cells

expressing 3.8-7.8 µM mGFP-Xpeps could be fitted by a single exponential function, rather

than the sum of two exponential functions (based on both AIC and BIC; Fig. 4d), and the

decay time constants became similar to those for the C-terminal deletion mutants (compare

Fig. 4d with Fig. 3c; Table 1).

As the second approach, the K-, M-, and D-peps were conjugated with the fluorescent

dye 5-FAM at their N-termini for visualization, and with the TAT sequence (YGRKKRRQRRR)

(using a G10 linker sequence) at their C-termini for membrane permeabilization (FAM-Xpep-

TAT; see Methods), and added to cells preincubated with 150 µM pyrenebutyrate for 5 min

(Fig. 4e, f).[58] The FAM-peptide-TATs exhibited diffuse spatial distributions throughout the

cytosol (Fig. 4f). The cells containing 2.9-3.4 µM FAM-Xpep-TAT (see Supplementary Fig. 5b

for the concentration calibration; in the following, we describe this concentration range as ≈3

µM for conciseness) were selected and the effects of these cytoplasmic peptides on the OR

homodimerization were examined. The results indicated that ≈3 µM FAM-peptide-TAT

significantly blocked the homo-dimerization (Fig. 4g; Table 1), consistent with the data

obtained using mGFP-Xpeps (Fig. 4c). The control FAM-Xpep-TATs (FAM-Dpep-TAT for KOR

and MOR and FAM-Kpep-TAT for DOR) did not affect the colocalization indexes. The effects

on colocalization durations were consistent with these results and with those obtained by

expressing mGFP-Xpeps (Fig. 4h; compare with Fig. 4d; Table 1).

The Xpep concentrations required for blocking homodimer formation might appear quite

high (≈3 µM), compared with the ≈30-nM-level dissociation constants of various agonists and

antagonists for ORs. However, note that the latter is the value for simple binding of the

ligand to the receptor, whereas the former addresses the extremely efficient dimerization

propensities of membrane molecules in the two-dimensional (2D) PM. The efficiency of

dimerization in 2D space was previously found to be higher by a factor of 10^6 than that in 3D

space.[59]

The effects of the presence of ≈3 µM FAM-Xpep-TATs in the cytoplasm on the

homodimer K_D, k_{off}, and k_{on} values are summarized in Fig. 4i. In addition to K_D and k_{on}, FAM-

Xpep-TATs increased k_{off} (enhanced dimer dissociation), indicating that the OR

homodimerization cannot be described by simple first-order kinetics (simple binding reaction

at the C-terminal domains), perhaps due to the conformational changes of the C-terminal

domains induced by the peptide binding and/or to the presence of weaker secondary binding

sites such as TM domains (Fig. 5, which will be discussed later). Nevertheless, we think the

present simplified approach is useful as the starting point for quantitative understanding of

the dynamic equilibrium between OR homodimers and monomers.

421   Agonists modulate monomer-dimer interconversions, and FAM-Xpep-TAT peptides

422   reduce their effects

The addition of representative agonists, U-50488 for KOR, [D-Ala^2, N-Me-Phe^4, Gly^5-ol]-

enkephalin acetate salt (DAMGO) for MOR, and SNC-80 for DOR, at 0.2 µM (a concentration

sufficient to ligate virtually all OR molecules) affected the homodimerizations of the three ORs

differently (observed during 2-5 min after agonist addition rather than after longer incubation

because these agonists induce OR internalizations, which become evident after 5 min;

discussed later in this report). The agonist-bound KOR exhibited less homodimerization (lower

colocalization index), whereas the agonist-bound MOR and DOR exhibited more

homodimerization (Fig. 4g and Table 1), although these results might vary depending on the

particular agonist.[9, 14] For example, the DOR agonists, DADLE, DSLET, and DPDPE, were

previously found to induce fewer homodimers,[9] but in the present research, another DOR

agonist SNC-80 was found to increase the homodimer fraction, suggesting that the

dimerization propensity depends on each agonist. We only examined one agonist for each OR

subtype, because an extensive examination of the agonist effects on OR homodimerization is

beyond the scope of the present work.

The colocalization indexes of the agonist-bound ORs were reduced by the addition of

FAM-Xpep-TAT for all ORs, but in different ways depending on the OR type (Fig. 4g). The

colocalization index of the agonist-bound KOR, which exhibited a smaller index as compared

with that of non-ligated KOR, was further reduced by the presence of FAM-Kpep-TAT

(although with no statistical significance). The colocalization index of the agonist-bound MOR

was reduced in the presence of FAM-Mpep-TAT to a level near that for MOR with the FAM-

Mpep-TAT without the agonist. The colocalization index of the agonist-bound DOR was

reduced in the presence of FAM-Dpep-TAT, but was still greater than that of wild-type DOR in

the absence of the agonist. The reason for this higher tendency to form homodimers even in

the presence of FAM-Dpep-TAT is unknown, but we propose that the agonist-induced

conformational changes enhanced the interaction in the TM domains, because DOR

homodimerization also involves TM-domain interactions (see Fig. 5, which will be discussed in

the next subsection). The effects of the agonists and homodimer blocker peptides on the

colocalization *durations* were consistent with the colocalization index data (Fig. 4h), and the

agonists' effects on the homodimer K_D, k_{off}, and k_{on}, as well as the percentages of OR

protomers existing as homodimers are summarized in Fig. 4i. The actual copy numbers of OR

protomers existing as monomers and homodimers at various total numbers of OR molecules

in the entire PM in a cell are summarized in Supplementary Table 2.

MOR's transmembrane domain 1 (TM1^{MOR}) is involved in MOR homodimerization

with less specificity

Specific C-terminal cytoplasmic domain deletions/mutations and the addition of peptides with

the same amino acid sequences as the deleted sequences greatly reduced the OR

homodimers' colocalization indexes, but never to be compatible with 1 found for rotated

overlays or 1.1 found for the monomer control molecule TM^{LDLR} (Fig. 2a). Therefore, we

considered the existence of other OR sites for homodimer formation. Since the involvement of

transmembrane domains in OR homo- and hetero-dimerization has been proposed,[20, 21, 26, 49,

50, 52, 53] and the first OR transmembrane domain (TM1) is often mentioned in the literature,[26,

49, 50] we examined the involvement of MOR's TM1 domain (TM1^{MOR}) in MOR homodimerization

(Fig. 5a).

Colocalization indexes indicated that TM1^{MOR} interacts with another TM1^{MOR} and MOR, as

well as, importantly, with DOR (Fig. 5b; the fluorescent spot number densities of the two

molecules in the PM were always adjusted to ≈1 spot/µm^2, and thus the number ratio was

approximately 1:1). These results suggest that TM1^{MOR} is involved in MOR homodimerization

by the TM1^{MOR}-TM1^{MOR} interaction, as well as, surprisingly, in MOR-DOR heterodimerization.

These results are supported by the observation of the colocalization *durations* (Fig. 5c).

In contrast, in the homodimer blocking experiments where TM1^{MOR} is expressed ≈10x

more than MOR or DOR (Fig. 5d), TM1^{MOR} moderately suppressed both MOR and DOR

homodimers (positive controls, Mpep and Dpep, respectively: negative controls, TM^{LDLR} = the

TM domain of LDL receptor and Xpeps specific for different OR homodimers; Fig. 5e).

Particularly, TM1^{MOR} reduced both MOR and DOR homodimers, whereas Mpep reduced MOR

homodimers and not DOR homodimers and Dpep reduced DOR homodimers and not MOR

homodimers. Taken together, we conclude that the interaction specificity of TM1^{MOR} is limited

as shown from its ability to interact with both MOR and DOR (Fig. 5b, e). The results showing

that TM1^{MOR} suppresses both MOR-MOR and DOR-DOR homodimerization indicate that

TM1^{MOR} is involved in both MOR homodimerization and MOR-DOR heterodimerization (also

refer to Figure 5C in the companion paper for the involvement of TM1^{MOR} for MOR-DOR

heterodimerization). These results further indicate that TM1^{MOR} might not be useful as a

specific blocker for MOR homodimerization or MOR-DOR heterodimerization.

No major effects of Xpeps on the agonist-induced OR internalization

We specifically blocked OR homodimers by the addition of Xpeps (FAM-Xpep-TATs), and

examined the effects on the agonist-induced OR internalization. Since all experiments were

performed at expression levels of ≈1 OR spot/µm^2, the percentages of the OR protomers

existing as homodimers are 10-21% without any addition, 3.2-4.4% after the addition of

FAM-Xpep-TATs, and 10-18% after the agonist addition, which is decreased to 2.9-8.6% after

the further addition of FAM-Xpep-TATs (see the column of 1 copy/µm^2 in Fig. 4i).

OR internalization might be involved in opioid side effects and tolerance development.

Here, it was monitored by using the membrane-*im*permeable fluorescence quencher, Mn(III)

meso-tetra(4-sulfonatophenyl)porphine (Mn^{3+}-TSP). This quencher only suppresses

fluorescence emission from the SNAP-Surface 549 dye on the SNAPf-OR on the cell surface,

but not that in the cytoplasm.[60]

Accordingly, by subtracting the signal intensity after the quencher addition from that

before the addition, we evaluated the percentages of OR molecules remaining in the PM (Fig.

6a and Supplementary Fig. 6).

The time courses of the decrease in the numbers of ORs remaining in the PM during 35

min (due to their internalization) were examined in both the presence and absence of 0.2 µM

agonists and ≈3 µM Xpeps in the cytoplasm (Fig. 6b; Table 1 and Supplementary Table 1). All

the time-course data obtained under various conditions could be fitted with a single

exponential function plus a constant. The constant provides the OR fraction whose

internalization is undetectable by the 35-min observations, and the exponential decay

constant provides the residency lifetime in the PM for the OR component whose

internalization was detectable by this observation scheme (Table 1 and Supplementary Table

1). Without agonist, the three ORs all exhibited non-internalized fractions in the range of 91-

97% (for an observation period of 35 min). The internalized molecules found during the 35-

min observations showed characteristic dwell lifetimes (inverse of internalization rates)

between 24 and 45 min. The homodimer-blocking peptides, FAM-Xpep-TATs, did not

significantly affect the OR internalization (Fig. 6b and Table 1).

The addition of agonists employed in this investigation greatly increased the fractions of

detectable internalizations and the internalization rates for all three ORs (Fig. 6b and Table

1), although it decreases the percentages of KOR protomers existing as homodimers from 21

to 10% but increases the percentages from 11 to 18% and 10 to 17% for MOR and DOR,

respectively (Fig. 4i). The FAM-Xpep-TATs reduced the homodimer percentages to 2.9, 3.3,

and 8.6% for the engaged KOR, MOR, and DOR, respectively (Fig. 4i). The internalization

observations indicated that for the engaged KOR, the addition of FAM-Kpep-TAT induced only

slightly faster internalization, whereas for the engaged MOR and DOR, no differences in

internalization were detectable after the addition of FAM-Mpep-TAT and FAM-Dpep-TAT (Fig.

6b and Table 1).

The lack of effect (or only the slight effect) of FAM-Xpep-TATs on the agonist-induced

OR internalization is probably because monomers and homodimers are internalized at about

the same rate. This might be induced if the internalization rate of homodimers as an

internalization unit (two protomers together as a homodimer) might become about half of

that of monomers or if the complex processes involving GRK and β-arrestin 2[29, 61, 62, 63] might

remove the ORs bound by these proteins from the monomer-dimer equilibrium in the bulk

PM.[87-90] However, due caution in the interpretation of these data is required because the

Xpep-bound C-terminal domain might inhibit or enhance the interaction with GRK and β-

arrestin 2 (for the Gqi5 binding, see the next subsection).

In addition to CHO-K1 cells, T24 cells were employed for these experiments because

the expression level of β2-arrestin in T24 cells is higher than that in CHO-K1 cells,[64] and thus

T24 cells might undergo more active internalization. However, T24 cells exhibited

internalization behaviors quite similar to those of CHO-K1 cells (Fig. 6b; Supplementary

Tables 1 and 3).

Xpeps modulate KOR and DOR signals

The agonist-induced signal downstream from the OR was examined by a widely used method

for Gi-coupled GPCRs, employing the artificial G protein Gqi5 (Fig. 6c-6e; refer to the caption

to Supplementary Fig. 1a and Methods).[65, 66, 67] The addition of the homodimer-blocking FAM-

Xpep-TATs alone (thus the monomerization of ORs alone) did not induce any detectable Ca^{2+}

mobilization (Fig. 6f and Table 1). Meanwhile, the respective agonists triggered Ca^{2+}

mobilization. The effects of the homodimer-blocking peptides on the agonist-induced Ca^{2+}

mobilization were complex (both FAM-Xpep-TATs and mGFP-Xpeps produced similar effects

for all three ORs). In cells expressing KOR, MOR, or DOR, the homodimer-blocking peptides

(OR monomerization) enhanced, did not affect, and reduced the agonist-induced Ca^{2+}

mobilization, respectively (Fig. 6f and Table 1). These results indicate that KOR and DOR

monomers trigger higher and lower signals than their respective homodimers, whereas MOR

monomers and homodimers induce the downstream signals at similar levels (without

influencing the agonist-induced internalization of all ORs; Fig. 6b). In short, homodimerization

suppresses the ligand-induced signaling of KOR and enhances the ligand-induced signaling of

DOR.

It is possible that these results might be induced by the interfering effect of the bound

peptide on the binding of Gqi5 to ORs (Gqi5's binding site to ORs is the same as the original

Gαi) because the Gi binding to class A GPCRs involves various intracellular domains.[62, 63, 68, 69,

70, 71] However, since the Halo-tag protein bound to the C-termini of ORs do not affect OR-

induced Ca^{2+} responses (Supplementary Fig. 1b of the companion paper) and since the

peptide binding induces distinct effects on the three ORs, we think it likely that the effect of

homodimer blocking peptides on the agonist-induced Ca^{2+} signal can be interpreted based on

its effect on OR monomerization.

Furthermore, these results suggest that the homodimer-blocking peptide-TATs could be

used as reagents (drugs) to enhance or suppress the agonist-induced G-protein-biased

cellular responses for KOR and DOR, respectively, without affecting their internalization (Fig.

6b). However, note that these results are correct only for the employed agonists, and the

results would be agonist dependent.

Discussion

For the first time, the three critical parameters describing the homodimer-monomer dynamic equilibrium (K_D, k_{on}, and k_{off}) have been determined for the OR. This was done for the three classical ORs before and after the addition of a representative agonist for each OR (Fig. 2b and 4i). The results unequivocally demonstrated that the three classical ORs all form transient metastable homodimers at physiological expression levels (0.3-10 copies/μm^2) at 37°C, and predicting that 3.4-59% of OR protomers would exist as homodimers in various tissues both before and after the agonist binding (Fig. 2d). Accurate evaluation of the dimer dissociation rate constant (k_{off}) in the live-cell PM using single-molecule colocalization data became possible by developing a theory (Supplementary Note 1), and the dimer-monomer dissociation equilibrium constant (K_D) could be obtained much more readily compared with the method we developed previously.[37] These theories/methods enabled accurate quantitative evaluations of k_{off} and K_D, and would be applicable to evaluate the dimerization kinetics and equilibrium of any membrane molecules, as exemplified by their application to OR heterodimerization described in the companion paper.[38] Accordingly, they represent major developments for studies of molecular interactions in the PM in general.

A previous single-molecule imaging study of neurotensin receptor 1, a GPCR, in reconstituted membranes containing only this receptor and a phospholipid revealed that it forms homodimers. This result demonstrated that neurotensin receptor 1 homodimerization occurs without the involvement of any other proteins[21] (however, see[14]), and suggested that ORs might also form homodimers in a similar manner.

Importantly, all of these homodimers are forming and dispersing continually, with lifetimes shorter than 0.2 s at 37°C (Fig. 1d). When the homodimers dissociate into monomers, they will again form homodimers with the same and other partner molecules. Longer homodimer lifetimes on the order of 0.5-2 s or even 15 s have been reported, but they were observed at lower temperatures such as RT and 20°C.[33, 34, 35] How the limited dimer fractions and lifetimes modulate the downstream signaling and internalization is extensively discussed in the companion paper (refer to Figure 7C and related main text in the companion paper).

Specific 9-26 residue amino-acid sequences in the near-C-terminal cytoplasmic domains, which lack sequence similarities among the three ORs, are involved in the distinct homodimerizations of all three classical ORs (Fig. 3b, c, and 4), and do not participate in heterodimerization (Fig. 2a and 3a in the companion paper). In addition to localized electrostatic interactions between charged amino acid residues, the overall structures of the cytoplasmic C-terminal domains, and particularly the intrinsically disordered structures of the C-terminal regions, might be important for homodimerization.[56] The enhancement of homodimerization by the intrinsically disordered region might not be due to liquid-liquid phase separation, but rather to its ability to flexibly adopt various structures, bringing specific binding sites into positions and orientations for optimal interactions.

In the literature on homo- and hetero-dimerization of GPCRs, including ORs, the TM domains have been proposed or found to be responsible for homodimerization.[21, 26, 49, 50, 52, 53] In the present study, we experimentally and directly confirmed this using TM1^{MOR}, but we also found that TM1^{MOR} binding to ORs is likely to be quite non-specific, as found by its binding to DOR as well as MOR, and its suppressive effect on both DOR and MOR homodimerization. Blocking of DOR homodimerization of TM1^{MOR} suggests that it is also involved in DOR-MOR heterodimerization. Furthermore, we found that Xpeps failed to reduce the OR homo-colocalization indexes to the level of a monomer control molecule TM^{LDLR}. Therefore, we propose that TM-TM interactions enhance both the homo- and hetero-dimerizations of ORs in less specific manners, whereas the cytoplasmic C-terminal domain interactions provide the specificities for OR homodimerization.

To the best of our knowledge, the Xpep-TATs developed here are the first peptide-based reagents that specifically reduce GPCR homodimerization. These homodimer-blocking peptides can become important tools to dissect the functions of OR monomers and homodimers. The use of the Xpeps revealed that DOR and KOR homodimers, but not MOR homodimers, induce G-protein-dependent signals differently from their respective monomers (Fig. 6f), although both monomers and homodimers are internalized at the same rate before and after agonist addition (Fig. 6b). These results suggest that the C-terminal domain conformations of the DOR and KOR homodimers might undergo allosteric changes upon homodimerization, affecting their G-protein-based signaling. The possibility of the

involvement of allosteric conformational changes of ORs upon dimerization will be further

discussed in the companion paper (allosteric effects might be more important for DOR-MOR

heterodimers).

These homodimer blocking peptides could become the basis for designing modulators

and potentiators in opioid therapy to enhance the efficacy and suppress side effects such as

tolerance development, particularly for the opioids targeting KOR and DOR. The development

of agonists for favorable biased signaling is important,[72, 73, 74, 75] but the modulation of the OR

homodimerization would provide another means to produce biased signaling. Since the Xpep-

TATs are soluble and yet membrane-permeable (Fig. 4e-h) and thus they are likely to pass

the blood-brain barrier, they could be readily delivered via intravenous injections or nasal

sprays. In addition, Xpep-TATs would not compete with agonist binding because they bind to

the cytoplasmic C-terminal domains. Taken together, our findings reported here have greatly

extended our knowledge of ORs' metastable homodimers and their formation mechanisms

and functions, which can inform novel GPCR drug development strategies of modulating

homodimerization.

Figures

Fig. 1: ORs in the PM form metastable homodimers with lifetimes of 120~150 ms, without involving the N-terminal extracellular domain.

a Typical image sequence of simultaneous two-color single fluorescent molecule observations, showing transient homo-colocalization and co-diffusion of single molecules of SNAPf-KOR tagged with SNAP-CF 660R (magenta) and SNAP-Surface 549 (green), with their trajectories.

b PCCFs for the SNAPf-KOR spots (mean ± SEM after area normalization; 18 movies). Green and grey bars indicate the results of the correct and 180°-rotated overlays of the simultaneously observed magenta and green images. The colocalization index is defined as the mean of PCCF values for 0-100 nm divided by the mean of PCCF values for 400-500 nm (see Supplementary Fig. 2c-e).

c Colocalization indexes showing the homo-colocalizations of three ORs and OR mutants with deletions of the N-terminal extracellular domains.

Throughout this study, we employ the following conventions: for the box plots, horizontal bars, crosses, boxes, and whiskers indicate median values, mean values, interquartile ranges (25–75%), and 10-90% ranges, respectively; for the bar graphs and tables, mean ± SEM values are provided; and for the statistical analyses, * and ns represent significant ($p < 0.05$) and non-significant ($p \geq 0.05$) differences, respectively. The p values were obtained by Tukey's multiple comparison test, except the Brunner-Munzel test used for colocalization lifetimes. All of the quantitative results are summarized in Table 1 and their statistical parameters (sample size n and p values) are provided in Supplementary Table 1.

d Histograms showing the distributions of colocalization *durations* for correct and rotated overlays. The control histograms for rotated overlays (grey) were fitted by single exponential functions (black), providing the lifetime of the incidental overlap events (τ_{inci}). The histograms for correct overlays (colors) were fitted by the sum of two exponential functions: The faster decay time (τ_1) was close to τ_{inci}, and the slower decay time provided the true homodimer lifetime (τ_2; see Supplementary Note 1 for the theory). The homodimer lifetimes, after correction for the trackable duration lifetimes of the two fluorescent probes, are shown in the boxes (summarized in Table 1).

e The method to determine the true dissociation rate constant (k_{off}), considering the multiple binding events during an observed colocalization duration. See Supplementary Note 1.

ORs	K_D (copies/μm^2)	k_{off} (s^{-1})	k_{on} (μm^2/copies/s)	Predicted %OR protomers existing as dimers at different expression levels (copies/μm^2)				
				0.3	1	3	10	30
KOR	5.87 ± 0.56	6.71 ± 1.17	1.14 ± 0.23	8.6	21	39	59	73
MOR	15.24 ± 1.54	8.47 ± 0.86	0.56 ± 0.08	3.7	11	23	43	61
DOR	16.42 ± 0.53	8.00 ± 0.96	0.49 ± 0.06	3.4	10	22	42	60
CD28	0.041 ± 0.072	N.D.	N.D.					
TM^{LDLR}	132 ± 21	N.D.	N.D.					

b

c

d

Fig. 2: Dynamic OR homodimer-monomer equilibrium constants (K_Ds) and

homodimer formation and dissociation rate constants (k_{on} and k_{off}, respectively),

providing the %protomers existing as dimers as a function of the expression level.

a Experimental PCCFs for KOR, MOR, DOR, CD28, and TM^{LDLR} (the PCCF for KOR is the same

as that shown in Fig. 1c) fitted with theoretical PCCFs (Eq. 24) in Supplementary Note 2; the

total numbers of fluorescent spots, sN_{TA} and sN_{TB}, were determined from experiments;

labeling efficiency = 0.7 [Supplementary Fig. 1e]) using K_D and σ as fitting parameters. CD28

and TM^{LDLR} were dimer and monomer references, respectively. The black lines indicate the

best-fit functions, and their K_D values are shown. The PCCFs with K_D values of 3 and 30 are

also shown for comparison.

b Summary of K_D, k_{off} and k_{on} values for the three ORs without agonist, and also for CD28

and TM^{LDLR}. N.D.: not done. Predicted percentages of OR protomers existing as dimers at

various expression levels calculated from the K_Ds are also shown. Physiological expression

levels found in the literature (1-10 copies/μm^2) are highlighted by a pink background (see the

main text).

c Colocalization index is simply related to K_D, if the labeling efficiency, the precision of single-

molecule localization plus image overlaying, and the number density of fluorescent molecules

in each movie were the same (0.7, 140 nm, and 0.5, 1, or 1.5 fluorescent spots/μm^2,

respectively). K_D can be roughly estimated from the colocalization index using these curves.

d Predicted percentages of OR protomers existing as dimers, plotted as a function of

expression levels (without agonist). The curves indicate the mathematical functions calculated

from the K_D values, and solid curves are used for physiological expression levels found in the

literature (0.32-10 copies/μm^2). Tick marks between the exact digits represent ≈3.16x

($10^{0.5}$x) of the smaller digit.

Fig. 3: C-terminal cytoplasmic domains are predominantly responsible for OR homodimerization.

a Schematic figure showing the amino-acid sequences of the C-terminal cytoplasmic domains of the three ORs. The sequences surrounded by rectangles were extensively examined for their involvement in OR homodimerization.

b Colocalization indexes for WT and various C-terminal cytoplasmic deletion mutants, showing that KOR aa 365-380, MOR aa 358-382, and DOR aa 357-372, with very low amino-acid homologies, are critical for homodimerization.

c Histograms showing the distributions of colocalization *durations* for the C-terminal cytoplasmic deletion mutants, KOR(Δ365-380), MOR(Δ358-382), and DOR(Δ357-372) (only the results of correct overlays). WT-OR data are reproduced for comparison (for both correct and rotated overlays; Fig. 1d). Deletion mutants exhibited distributions that could be fitted by single exponential functions, and their decay time constants τs (after correction for the trackable duration lifetimes of the two fluorescent probes) are indicated in the boxes.

d The colocalization indexes of various C-terminal point mutants, indicating that the charged groups and prolines in the C-terminal cytoplasmic domains play important roles in OR homodimerization.

Fig. 4: Specific C-terminal-domain peptides suppress OR homodimerization.

a Schematic figure showing the experimental design to examine the effects of mGFP-Xpeps expressed in the cell on OR homodimerization.

b Representative confocal image of CHO-K1 cells transfected with cDNAs encoding SNAPf-KOR (not visible here; only visible by single-molecule imaging conditions) and mGFP-Kpep (green), co-stained with the Live 650 Nuclear Stain (magenta; white nuclei indicate the

entrance of mGFP-Kpep into the nuclei, whereas a magenta nucleus indicates the cell without

mGFP-Kpep expression).

c The OR homo-colocalization index in each cell tends to decrease with an increase of the

mGFP-Xpep concentration in the cytoplasm. The + keys at x = 0 and 6 μM mGFP-Xpep

indicate the mean value of the colocalization indexes without mGFP-Xpep expression and that

averaged over all the data points in the range of 3.8-7.8 μM mGFP-Xpep, respectively.

Significant reductions of the colocalization indexes in the presence of the mGFP-Xpeps, but

not the control mGFP-peptides, were found for all three ORs (Table 1).

d Histograms showing the *duration* distributions of transient homodimers of SNAPf-ORs in

cells co-expressing 3.8-7.8 μM mGFP-Xpeps (only the results of correct overlays; the value for

each bin is the mean of 18 cells), compared with those without co-expression (the same as

those shown in Fig. 1d; for both correct and rotated overlays). For further details of these

graphs, see the caption to Fig. 3c.

e Schematic figure showing the experimental design to examine the effect of the FAM-Xpep-

TATs incorporated in the cell on OR homodimerization.

f Representative confocal image of CHO-K1 cells containing an average of 3.4 μM FAM-Kpep-

TAT in the cytoplasm.

g, h Agonist addition (0.2 μM) suppressed KOR homodimerization, but enhanced the

homodimerization of MOR and DOR (colocalization indexes in **g** and durations of

colocalization events in **h**). The presence of $\approx$3 μM FAM-Xpep-TAT in the cytoplasm

suppressed homodimerization both before and 2-5 min after the agonist addition.

(**i**) Summary of K_D (homodimer-monomer equilibrium constant), k_{off} (dimer dissociation rate

constant), and k_{on} (dimer formation rate constant) for three ORs in the presence and absence

of $\approx$3 μM FAM-Xpep-TAT in the cytoplasm, both before and 2-5 min after the addition of

agonists. Predicted percentages of OR protomers existing as dimers at various expression

levels calculated from the K_Ds are also shown. Physiological expression levels found in the

literature are highlighted by a pink background (see the main text).

Fig. 5: TM1^MOR suppresses both MOR and DOR homodimerization.

a Schematic figure showing the experimental design for examining the interaction (binding)
of TM1^MOR with itself, MOR, and DOR.

b, c Colocalization indexes (**b**) and distributions of colocalization durations (**c**) showing that

TM1[MOR] forms metastable dimers with both MOR and DOR, suggesting that TM1[MOR] might be

involved in MOR-MOR homodimerization as well as MOR-DOR heterodimerization (see Figure

5 in the companion paper.[38]

d Schematic figure showing the experimental design for examining whether TM1[MOR] can

suppress homodimerizations of MOR and DOR.

e TM1[MOR] suppresses both MOR and DOR homodimerization, whereas Mpep and Dpep

specifically suppress MOR or DOR homodimerization, respectively.

Fig. 6: Xpeps hardly affect OR internalization in both the presence and absence of the agonist, whereas they enhanced, did not affect, or reduced the Ca²⁺ mobilization induced by the KOR, MOR, and DOR agonists, respectively.

a Schematic figure showing the experimental design for observing the internalization of OR (with possible recycling). Also see Supplementary Fig. 6**.**

b Time-dependent decreases of SNAPf-ORs on the PM due to their internalizations in CHO-K1 cells (top) and T24 cells (bottom) (mean ± SEM; 10 cells for each condition), before and after the addition of 0.2 μM agonist in the presence and absence of ≈3 μM FAM-Xpep-TATs and ≈6 μM mGFP-Xpeps in the cytoplasm. Photobleaching of the fluorescent probe is negligible because only one frame was recorded every 5 min. The time courses could be operationally fitted by single exponential functions, y = C∗exp(-t/τ_0) + (1-C), providing the fractions of OR molecules with detectable (C) and non-detectable (1 - C) internalizations for the observations up to 35 min, as well as the residency times (τ_0) for the internalized component.

c Schematic figure showing the experimental design for observing the Ca²⁺ mobilization after the agonist stimulation. The Ca²⁺ mobilization was monitored by the Rhod-3 fluorescence intensity (see the caption to Supplementary Fig. 1a and Methods).

d, e Typical fluorescence images of Rhod-3 in cells (**d**; orange rectangles = ROI) and the

time-dependent changes of the Rhod-3 signal intensity in the ROI (**e**), showing the changes

in the cytosolic Ca^{2+} concentration after the agonist stimulation. Cells with similar expression

levels of ORs ($\approx$1 fluorescent spot/μm^2) were selected.

f Ca^{2+} mobilization at 75 s after the agonist addition, parametrized by using $[F_{Max}-F_b]/F_b$ (see

e).

Table 1. Summary of the colocalization indexes, homodimer lifetimes, fractions and PM residency times of molecules with internalizations detectable by the 35-min observations, and Ca^{2+} mobilization parameter, $(F_{Max}-F_b)/F_b$, in the presence and absence of various modulators (0.2 µM agonists, ≈3 µM FAM-Xpep-TATs in the cytoplasm, and ≈6 µM mGFP-Xpeps in the cytoplasm). The agonists employed here were U-50488 for KOR, DAMGO for MOR, and SNC-80 for DOR.

ORs	Additions	Colocalization Index (Mean ± SEM)	Homodimer Lifetime (Mean ± SEM) (ms)	Fraction of internalized molecules (%)	PM residency time of internalized molecules (min)	Ca^{2+} $(F_{Max}-F_b)/F_b$
KOR	Control	2.30 ± 0.2	178 ± 5	8.4 ± 4.1	32.1 ± 23.8	0.04 ± 0.01
	+ FAM-pep-TAT	1.53 ± 0.1[*,Na]	62 ± 1[*,Na]	6.9 ± 2.4[Nc,†]	26.2 ± 15.4[Nc,†]	0.05 ± 0.01[Nc,†]
	+ mGFP-pep	1.41 ± 0.1[*,Na]	61 ± 1[*,Na]	-	-	-
	+ Agonist	1.48 ± 0.1[*]	59 ± 2[*]	51.4 ± 2.7[*]	11.9 ± 1.7[*]	1.96 ± 0.32[*]
	+ Agonist + FAM-pep-TAT	1.23 ± 0.1[*,†]	58 ± 1[*,Na]	60.5 ± 2.5[*,†]	9.6 ± 1.2[*,Na]	2.46 ± 0.21[*,†]
	+ Agonist + mGFP-pep	1.17 ± 0.1[*,†]	54 ± 2[*,Na]	-	-	3.11 ± 0.17[*,†]
MOR	Control	1.82 ± 0.1	122 ± 3	6.4 ± 1.9	25.8 ± 12.6	0.03 ± 0.01
	+ FAM-pep-TAT	1.38 ± 0.1[*,†]	59 ± 1[*,†]	6.3 ± 1.0[Nc,†]	22.1 ± 4.1[Nc,†]	0.04 ± 0.01[Nc,†]
	+ mGFP-pep	1.32 ± 0.1[*,†]	58 ± 2[*,†]	-	-	-
	+ Agonist	2.18 ± 0.2[*]	137 ± 3[*]	28.1 ± 1.7[*]	11.3 ± 1.9[*]	2.80 ± 0.21[*]
	+ Agonist + FAM-pep-TAT	1.38 ± 0.1[*,†]	68 ± 1[*,†]	28.9 ± 2.0[*,Na]	10.7 ± 2.1[*,Na]	2.78 ± 0.22[*,Na]
	+ Agonist + mGFP-pep	1.34 ± 0.1[*,†]	67 ± 3[*,†]	-	-	2.80 ± 0.24[*,Na]
DOR	Control	1.89 ± 0.1	120 ± 3	4.5 ± 3.5	29.8 ± 37.4	0.05 ± 0.01
	+ FAM-pep-TAT	1.36 ± 0.1[*,†]	67 ± 1[*,†]	4.9 ± 2.5[Nc,†]	26.2 ± 22.6[Nc,†]	0.05 ± 0.01[Nc,†]
	+ mGFP-pep	1.29 ± 0.1[*,†]	64 ± 2[*,†]	-	-	-
	+ Agonist	3.00 ± 0.3[*]	229 ± 5[*]	61.6 ± 1.7[*]	10.8 ± 0.9[*]	3.85 ± 0.23[*]
	+ Agonist + FAM-pep-TAT	2.08 ± 0.2[*,†]	171 ± 5[*,†]	55.0 ± 1.0[*,†]	10.1 ± 0.5[*,Na]	2.84 ± 0.20[*,†]
	+ Agonist + mGFP-pep	2.00 ± 0.2[*,†]	168 ± 5[Nc,†]	-	-	2.65 ± 0.22[*,†]

[*] [(Nc)]: Significant (insignificant) difference from the value for "Control".

[†] [(Na)]: Significant (insignificant) difference from the value for "+ Agonist".

Methods

cDNA construction

All of the newly generated cDNA constructs and other constructs obtained from outside sources, including gifts and constructs from commercial sources, were sequenced to examine their exact DNA sequences. The cDNA encoding rat MOR tagged with GFP was a gift from Dr. R. Schülz of the University of Münich, Germany.[76] The cDNA encoding rat KOR and DOR was a gift from Dr. Hiroshi Takeshima of the Kyoto University.[77] The mCherry was a gift from Prof. R. Y. Tsien of the University of California San Diego.[78] The cDNA encoding CD47 was a gift from Eric C Brown of Genentech.[79] The cDNA encoding CD28 was a gift from Simon J Davis of University of Oxford.[80] The cDNAs encoding SNAPf and mGFP (A206K) were obtained from Promega and Clontech, respectively. To generate plasmids for expressing SNAPf-ORs in CHO-K1 cells, the tag protein SNAPf was attached to the N-terminus of the ORs, an additional signal sequence of interleukin 6 was attached to the N-terminus of the tag protein, and a 21 amino-acid linker (SGGGSGG x3) was inserted between the ORs and the tag protein. A Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (New England Biolabs) was used to generate the cDNAs encoding the OR point mutants.

Cell culture, transfection, and microscope observations

CHO-K1 cells (Dainippon Pharma) and T24 cells (gift from Prof. M. Sokabe of Nagoya University),[81] confirmed free of mycoplasma contamination by MycoAlert (Lonza), were routinely cultured in Ham's Nutrient Mixture F12 (Sigma-Aldrich) supplemented with 10% (v/v) fetal bovine serum (FBS, Life Technologies), 100 units/ml penicillin, and 0.1 mg/ml streptomycin, at 37°C under a 5% CO_2 atmosphere in the incubator. Transfection of CHO-K1 cells with the cDNAs of interest was performed by electroporation, according to the manufacturer's instructions (4D-Nucleofector, Lonza; SF Cell Line solution and program CHO-K1 for CHO-K1 cells). The transfected cells were seeded in glass-base dishes (35-mm in diameter with a 12-mm diameter glass window, 0.15-mm-thick glass; Iwaki, Tokyo; 2×10^5 cells/dish) and cultured for 24-48 h before fluorescence microscopy observations. All microscope observations were performed at 37°C by placing the entire microscope, except for the far ends of the excitation arms and the detection arms, in a home-built microscope

environment chamber made with thermo- and electric-field-insulating plastic sheets and

equipped with four heating circulators (SKH0-112-OT, Kokensya, Tokyo, Japan). The Ham's

F12 medium used for microscope observations was free of sodium bicarbonate and phenol

red, and buffered with 2 mM N-[tris(hydroxymethyl)methyl]-2-aminoethanesulfonic acid (TES,

Sigma-Aldrich) at pH 7.4 (called Ham's F12 observation medium).

Cell treatments with agonists and FAM-Xpep-TATs

U-50488, DAMGO, and SNC-80 (Sigma-Aldrich), agonists for KOR, MOR and DOR,

respectively, were applied to the cells in the same way. The agonists were dissolved in DMSO

(2 mM), and then diluted with Hanks' balanced salt solution (HBSS, Nissui) buffered with 2

mM TES at pH 7.4 (T-HBSS), at a final concentration of 200 µM. The agonist solution (1 µl)

was added to the cells in 1 ml Ham's F12 observation medium (a final concentration of 200

nM) at 37°C.

For the cellular incorporation of FAM-Xpep-TATs (custom-synthesized by Cosmo-Bio),

the cells were first incubated with 150 µM pyrenebutyrate (Sigma-Aldrich) in T-HBSS at 37°C

for 5 min, and then 2 mM FAM-Xpep-TAT in T-HBSS was added at a final peptide

concentration of 20 µM. After an incubation at 37°C for 10 min, the cells were washed three

times with T-HBSS, and then fresh Ham's F12 observation medium was added to the cells.

The presence of FAM-Xpep-TAT in the cytoplasm was confirmed by the addition of the

membrane-impermeable quencher, trypan blue.[82]

Fluorescence labeling of ORs

The SNAPf-tagged wild-type and mutant ORs expressed in the PM (SNAPf tag located at the

extracellular N-terminus) were covalently conjugated by simultaneously incubating the cells

with two fluorescent SNAP ligands, SNAP-Surface 549 (New England Biolabs) and SNAP-

CF660R (Shinsei Kagaku), both at 300 nM, in the growth medium at 37°C in the CO_2

incubator for 30 min. The cells were washed three times with fresh medium (5-min

incubation each time), and then the Ham's F12 observation medium was added. The labeling

efficiency was determined by using the SNAPf-CD47-mGFP protein expressed in the PM. CD47

is a monomeric 5-pass transmembrane protein expressed in the PM.[83] We could not use ORs

for this purpose because they form transient dimers, and thus employed a monomeric CD47

(Supplementary Fig. 1c, d).

The labeling efficiency (the percentage of the SNAPf-tag protein labeled with the

fluorescent SNAP ligand) was determined in the following way. The percentage of fluorescent

mGFP spots of SNAPf-CD47-mGFP that was colocalized by the SNAP-dye spots were

measured as a function the concentration of the SNAP-dye-conjugated ligand in the medium,

after a 30 min incubation at 30˚C. Note that not every mGFP molecule was fluorescent, but

since we examined whether the fluorescent mGFP molecule identified in the image was

colocalized by a SNAP-dye spot, the labeling efficiencies of the SNAPf-protein tag can be

evaluated without the influence of the fluorescence efficiency of mGFP. Then the efficiency at

each fluorescent ligand concentration was plotted against the dye concentration

(Supplementary Fig. 1e). We found that the plot could be fitted by a function of a single

exponential function plus a constant, providing the saturating labeling efficiency (constant)

and the characteristic labeling efficiency (exponential constant).

To obtain the labeling efficiency at a dye concentration of 300 nM for an incubation

period of 30 min, the conditions used throughout this study, the determined exponential

function was used for a concentration of 300 nM. The fluorescence labeling efficiencies under

our normal observation conditions were found to be 60% and 61% for SNAP-Surface 549 and

SNAP-CF660, respectively.

Single fluorescent-molecule imaging

Fluorescently labeled ORs expressed in the bottom PM (the PM facing the coverslip) at

fluorescent-spot number densities of 0.5 ± 0.25 spots/μm^2 for each color (SNAP-Surface 549

and SNAP-CF660R; total spot number densities of 1.0 ± 0.5 spots/μm^2; for conciseness, we

describe the number densities as ≈1 spot/μm^2 throughout this report) were observed at the

level of single molecules at 37˚C, using a home-built objective lens-type TIRF microscope

constructed on an inverted microscope (Olympus IX-83), with a 100x, 1.49 numerical

aperture (NA) objective lens, optimized for the present research based on the instrument

used previously.[44, 84] ORs tagged with fluorescent probes were excited with TIR illumination

using the following power densities: SNAP-Surface 549 at 561 nm (Coherent OBIS 561-100

LS) at 0.35 μW/μm^2; and SNAP-CF660R at 642 nm (Omicron LuxXPlus 640-140) at 0.52

μW/μm^2. The dual-color images were separated by a dichroic mirror ZT405/488/561/640rpc-

UF3 (Chroma) and projected into two detection arms with band-pass filters of 572.5-647.5

nm (ET600/50m; Chroma) for the SNAP-Surface 549 dye and 662.5-737.5 nm (ET700/75m;

Chroma) for the SNAP-CF660R dye. In some experiments using mGFP-Xpeps and FAM-Xpep-

TATs, an additional detection arm equipped with a dichroic mirror ZT405/488/561/640rpc-

UF3 (Chroma) and a band-pass filter of 500.0-550.0 nm (ET525/50m; Chroma) was

employed. The fluorescence signal in each channel was first detected and amplified by a two-

stage microchannel-plate image intensifier (C9016-02MLP24; Hamamatsu Photonics), and the

intensified image was projected onto the scientific CMOS camera (C11440-22CU; Hamamatsu

Photonics), operated at 30 Hz, which was synchronized with the same intensifier-camera

set(s) placed on another detection arm. The image sequences in each channel were

superimposed after correction for spatial distortions, as described previously.[44] The positions

(x and y coordinates) of all of the observed single fluorescent-molecules were determined by

an in-house computer program, as described previously.[85]

Evaluating colocalization durations

The colocalization of two fluorescent molecules was defined as the event where two

fluorescent spots, representing these molecules, become localized within 200 nm of each

other, as described previously.[37, 44] Briefly, in single-color experiments using SNAP-Surface

549 (Supplementary Fig. 2), a spatial cross-correlation analysis was employed.[37] Using this

method, we found that when two fluorescent spots, each representing a single molecule of

SNAP-Surface 549, are located close together, the threshold distance for discriminating one

or two spots occurred at 200 nm in the present experimental set up. Using this definition,

colocalized trajectories were obtained and colocalization durations were estimated. In

simultaneous two-color single fluorescent-molecule tracking experiments, using the dye pairs

of SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660R, the distance between the two molecules was directly

measured from the locations (x, y-positions) of each molecule (with different colors). Even

when examining pairs of different-colored molecules that are known to be truly associated,

the probability of scoring the two molecules as associated is limited by the localization

accuracies of each molecule and the accuracies of superimposing the two images. Based on

the method developed previously[44] and the accuracies determined here, we found that, for

truly associated molecules, the probability of scoring the two molecules as associated

increases to 99% when using the criterion that the molecules lie within 200 nm of each other.

Therefore, we used this criterion as the definition of colocalization in simultaneous two-color

single-molecule observations. This distance of 200 nm coincided with the definition of

colocalization in single-color experiments. Due to this coincidence, in the present research,

we defined the colocalization of two fluorescent molecules as the event where the two

fluorescent spots representing these molecules become localized within 200 nm from each

other.

      Each time we found a green-magenta pair located within 200 nm (colocalization), we

measured the duration in which their distances remained within 200 nm (colocalized duration)

(for the results obtained by using two dye molecular species with different

excitation/emission wavelengths, we call them green and magenta probes/movies for

convenience in this report). After obtaining the colocalization durations for all of the

colocalization events, we generated a histogram (distribution) of colocalization durations. The

distribution of incidental colocalization durations was obtained by superimposing the magenta

image sequences with the 180-degree rotated (doubly flipped) green image sequences

(Supplementary Fig. 2d). For the precise analysis of these histograms, we first produced

cumulative histograms and fitted them with a single exponential function ($C_0 - C_1\exp[-t/\tau_1]$)

or the sum of two exponential functions ($C_0 - C_1\exp[-t/\tau_1] - C_2\exp[-t/\tau_2]$). The choice of the

number of exponentials (including the cases of the sum of three exponential functions) was

made based on Akaike's and Bayesian information criteria (they always agreed). Based on

these functions, the functions describing the original histograms were derived and overlaid on

the histograms.

      First, we found that the distribution of incidental colocalization durations could be fitted

by a single exponential function, with a time constant representing the incidental

colocalization lifetime τ_{inci}. Second, the distribution of colocalization durations was obtained

for correctly superimposed magenta and green image sequences. This distribution could be

fitted by the sum of two exponential decay functions (τ_1 and τ_2; $\tau_1 < \tau_2$,). These results are

consistent with the theory developed here that predicts the distribution of colocalization

durations based on the diffusion equation (Supplementary Note 1). Since τ_1 was almost the

same as τ_{inci} (Fig. 1e), following the theory developed in Supplementary Note 1, τ_2 provided

the true homodimer lifetime (inverse of k_{off}; after correction for the trackable duration

lifetimes of the two fluorescent probes). The trackable duration lifetime is obtained from the

distribution of trajectory lengths, which would represent how long single molecules can be

continuously tracked under the influences of photobleaching and loss of signals due to

blinking and the entrance of the molecules into the PM areas located farther from the PM.

The distributions could be fitted as single exponential functions providing trackable duration

lifetimes (τ_{track}'s) of 16.3 ± 1.2 s (n = 500) for SNAP-Surface 549 and 7.8 ± 0.6 s (n = 400)

for SNAP-CF660R bound to SNAPf-MOR expressed in CHO-K1 cells observed at 30 Hz

(Supplementary Fig. 1f). The correction was made by using the equation:

$\tau(\text{corrected}) = [\tau(\text{observed})^{-1} - \tau_{track}(\text{dye 1})^{-1} - \tau_{track}(\text{dye 2})^{-1}]^{-1}$.

Evaluating the colocalization index

For the quantitative evaluation of the extent of colocalization (representing both the

frequency and lifetime of colocalization events) in simultaneous two-color single-molecule

imaging movies, we defined a parameter called the colocalization index. This analysis method

is essentially based on a pair cross-correlation analysis,[46] and the detailed method used in

this research is explained in Supplementary Fig. 2c-e and 3.

Monte-Carlo simulations

For the detailed method for Monte-Carlo simulations to examine the theory to obtain K_D from

the pair cross-correlation function (PCCF) (Supplementary Note 2), see the caption to

Supplementary Fig. 3.

The colocalization index depends on the number density of fluorescent spots in the PM.

In the present experimental observations, we selected the cells exhibiting fluorescent spot

number densities in the PM of 0.5 ± 0.25 spots/μm^2 for each color (SNAP-Surface 549 and

SNAP-CF660R; total spot number densities of 1.0 ± 0.5 spots/μm^2; for conciseness, we

describe the number densities as ≈1 spot/μm^2 throughout this report). These densities were

found to be reasonable by the Monte-Carlo simulation results, which indicated that, for the K_D

greater than 6.5 copies/μm^2, the colocalization index does not vary sharply in the number

density range of 0.5 - 1.5 spots/μm^2 (refer to Supplementary Fig. 3c). At the same time, we

developed the theory to evaluate the dimer-monomer dissociation equilibrium constant K_D

from the PCCF and the total number of spots in the image (refer to Supplementary Note 2).

Confocal imaging to study the effects of mGFP-Xpeps and FAM-Xpep-TATs on cells

stably expressing ORs

CHO-K1 cells stably expressing ORs were transfected with mGFP-Xpeps. The cells were

identified by the incubation with NucSpot Live 650 Nuclear Stain (Biotium), according to the

protocol recommended by the manufacturer. After three washes with the complete medium,

it was replaced with the Ham's F12 observation medium. The incorporation of the FAM-Xpep-

TATs in the cells was performed as described in a previous subsection "Cell treatments with

agonists and FAM-Xpep-TATs". Confocal fluorescence images were acquired on the same

microscope station used for single-molecule imaging at 37°C, equipped with an Olympus

SR10 spinning-disc confocal super-resolution unit (with a Plan-Apochromat 100x oil

immersion objective; NA = 1.49).

GFP and FAM were excited at 488 nm and detected through a 505-530 nm band pass

filter. The NucSpot Live 650 was excited at 642 nm and detected through a 662.5-737.5 nm

long pass filter. The concentrations of cytoplasmic mGFP-Xpep and FAM-Xpep-TAT were

evaluated using calibration curves, obtained by observing the purified EGFP protein

(BioVision) and FAM-Xpep-TATs dissolved in Ham's F12 observation medium at various

concentrations, with a focus at 5 μm above the cover-glass surface (Supplementary Fig. 5b).

1017

Ca^{2+} mobilization assay

Since the OR expression level varies from cell to cell, the signaling process must be observed

at the level of individual cells. The ORs are coupled to the inhibitory trimeric G protein Gi,

which induces the decrease of the cytoplasmic cAMP concentration by inhibiting adenylyl

cyclase. However, using the cells with low OR expression levels employed for single-molecule

observations ($\approx$1 fluorescent spot/μm^2), the decrease of the cytoplasmic cAMP levels in

individual cells from those in non-stimulated state was impossibly difficult to measure.

Meanwhile, the increase of the cytoplasmic Ca^{2+} concentrations by the PLCβ activated by the

Gq signaling pathway could be measured in individual cells.[65, 66, 67] Therefore, in this assay,

Gαq was modified so that OR could be coupled to Gαq. Namely, the C-terminal five amino-

acid sequence of Gαq, ECGLY, was replaced with that of Gαi2, DCGLF (this chimeric protein is

called Gqi5), because the Gα protein binds to the specific GPCR by way of its short C-terminal

sequence.[86] Therefore, we generated the CHO-K1 cell line stably expressing Gqi5, had it

express the OR, and then observed the cytoplasmic Ca^{2+} mobilization upon agonist addition,

using the Ca^{2+}-sensitive dyes (Fig. 6c-f and Supplementary Fig. 1b). This method of using

Gqi5 has been widely employed in the research of ORs[65] and other Gi-coupled GPCRs.[66]

Briefly, CHO-K1 cells stably expressing Gqi5 were generated and transfected with the cDNAs

encoding the wild-type and SNAPf-linked ORs. The Ca^{2+}-sensitive dyes Fluo-4 AM (Dojindo)

and Rhod-3 AM (Thermo Fisher Scientific) were employed. Rhod-3 was used for the

experiments with mGFP-Xpeps and FAM-Xpep-TATs, and Fluo-4 was used for the experiments

that did not employ these homodimer-blocking reagents. These AM dyes were incorporated in

the cell, according to the manufacturers' recommendations, using the following solutions: for

Fluo-4, 4.6 μM Fluo-4 AM in T-HBSS containing 1.25 mM Probenecid (Dojindo) and 0.04 %

(w/v) Pluronic F127 (Dojindo), and for Rhod-3, 10 μM Rhod-3 AM in T-HBSS containing 2.5

mM Probenecid and 1× PowerLoad™ (Thermo Fisher Scientific). These loading solutions (2

ml) were added to the cells and incubated in the dark at 37°C for 30 min, and then the cells

were washed three times with T-HBSS.

For the observations of the Ca^{2+} mobilization downstream of the SNAPf-tagged ORs, we

selected cells expressing SNAPf-tagged ORs bound by SNAP-Surface 549 (or SNAP-CF660R

for experiments using Rhod-3) at number densities of ≈1 fluorescent spot/μm² in the basal

PM, using single-molecule detection (TIRF illumination) in the 561-nm channel (642-nm

channel when we employed Rhod-3). These cells were then observed by epifluorescence

illumination using the 488-nm channel to monitor the Fluo-4 signal (561-nm channel to

observe the Rhod-3 signal and 488-nm channel for mGFP-Xpeps and FAM-Xpep-TATs).

Agonist stimulation was performed by adding the DMSO solutions of agonists at a final

concentration of 200 nM. To determine the saturation levels of the fluorescence signal

intensity at higher concentrations of Ca^{2+}, 1 µM (final concentration) ionomycin (Wako) was

added (which would increase the intracellular Ca^{2+} concentration to that outside the cells [1.3

mM]). The Fluo-4 and Rhod-3 image sequences were analyzed using the ImageJ software.

1057   For the comparison of the functions of the SNAPf-ORs with those of the wild-type ORs,

we hoped to compare the cells expressing the SNAPf-ORs at the levels of $\approx$1 spot/$µm^2$ in the

basal PM with the cells expressing the wild-type ORs at levels comparable to or higher than

those of SNAPf-ORs, because the cells expressing the wild-type ORs should serve as the

positive controls. For this purpose, the expression levels of wild-type ORs were monitored by

using cells transfected with the cDNA linking the wild-type OR sequence to the mCherry

sequence via the self-cleavable 2A linker sequence (mCherry-2A-OR). This way, mCherry is

released from the OR into the cytoplasm at the ER, and the wild-type OR is then transported

to the PM. The expression of wild-type OR was detected by the presence of mCherry in the

cytoplasm using the epi-illumination at 561 nm (sensitivities much lower than single-molecule

imaging, showing the presence of rather high concentrations of mCherry). Therefore, the

expression of the wild-type OR used in this study is considered higher than that of SNAPf-

ORs.

1070

Software and statistical analysis

The microscope station that combined a single-molecule imaging system and a super-

resolution confocal microscope was controlled by in-house LabVIEW2018-based software, and

the single-molecule movie acquisitions were performed using the MCR software (Hamamatsu

Photonics) for Windows. All statistical analyses for *in vitro* experiments were performed with

Tukey's multiple comparison test except for the analysis of the colocalization lifetime data,

which was performed with the Brunner-Munzel test, using OriginPro 2019b for Windows and

RStudio 1.2.1335 for Windows. P values less than 0.05 were considered statistically

significant. The confocal images were processed and analyzed using Image J for Windows.

Curve fitting was performed by OriginPro 2019b for Windows. The simulation study was

performed using the in-house software based on MATLAB 2019a for Windows.

1082

1083 **Data availability**

All data generated or analyzed for this study are available within the paper and its associated Supplementary Information. Any additional information required to reanalyze the data reported in this paper is available from the lead contact upon reasonable request. Superimpositions of image sequences obtained in two colors and tracking single-molecules for in-vitro observation data were performed using C + +-based computer programs, produced in-house[87] and based on the well-established approaches. Further information regarding the experimental design may be found in the Nature Research Reporting Summary.

Code availability

Source codes for this have been integrated into a large, complex software package. While the software package cannot be extracted in a useful way, the entire software is available from the lead contact upon reasonable request, who will provide guidance on how to use it, as its manual and comments are written in Japanese.

Acknowledgements

We thank Profs. H. Takeshima of Kyoto University, R. Schülz of the University of Münich, R. Y. Tsien of the University of California San Diego, Simon J. Savis of the University of Oxford, Michiyuki Matsuda of Kyoto University, and M. Sokabe of Nagoya University, School of Medicine, for their kind gifts of cDNAs encoding rat KOR and DOR, that encoding rat MOR, that encoding mCherry, that encoding CD28, plasmids of pPBpuro and pCMV-mPBase, and the human T24 epithelial cell line, respectively. We also thank Ms. Irina Meshcheryakova for technical help in preparing the cDNAs. This work was supported in part by Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (Kiban A to A.K. [21H04772], Kiban S to A.K. [16H06386], Kiban B to T.K.F. [16H04775, 20H02585], Kiban C to R.S.K. [17K07333], Wakate B to R.S.K. [26870292], Wakate to T.A.T. [21K15058], and Challenging Exploratory Research to T.K.F. [18K19001] and A.K. [22K19334]), a Grant-in-Aid from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan (MEXT) for Transformative Research Areas (A) to T.K.F. (21H05252), and a JST grant ACT-X to T.A.T. (JPMJAX211B). WPI-iCeMS of Kyoto University is supported by the World Premiere Research Center Initiative (WPI) of MEXT.

Contributions

P.Z., R.S.K., and A.K. conceived and formulated the project. A.K., T.A.T., T.K.F., and P.Z. developed the simultaneous dual-color single-molecule tracking station. P.Z., T.A.T., R.S.K., and A.K. designed biological experiments, and P.Z., with help from T.A.T., performed virtually all of the biological and microscopic experiments. T.K.F. developed and improved the in-house image analysis software. S.P. developed the theory for evaluating the k_{off} from the single-molecule experimental data (Note S1). K.M.H., T.A.T., and A.K. developed the colocalization index method, and T.A.T., Z.K., and A.K. developed the theory for linking the PCCF to the dimer dissociation equilibrium constant and performed Monte-Carlo simulations to prove the theory (Note S2). A.A. performed the OR sequence analysis to detect intrinsically disordered regions. A.K., P.Z., and T.A.T. wrote the manuscript, and all authors discussed the results and participated in the manuscript revisions.

Competing interests

PZ and AK have a patent pending for Xpeps and Xpep-TATs. The remaining authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

References

1. Darcq, E., Kieffer, B.L. Opioid receptors: drivers to addiction? *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **19**, 499-514 (2018).

2. Valentino, R.J., Volkow N.D. Untangling the complexity of opioid receptor function. *Neuropsychopharmacology* **43**, 2514-2520 (2018).

3. Grimes, J., *et al.* Plasma membrane preassociation drives β-arrestin coupling to receptors and activation. *Cell* **186**, 2238-2255.e2220 (2023).

4. Schmid, C.L., *et al.* Bias factor and therapeutic window correlate to predict safer opioid analgesics. *Cell* **171**, 1165-1175.e1113 (2017).

5. Che, T., Roth, B.L. Molecular basis of opioid receptor signaling. *Cell* **186**, 5203-5219 (2023).

6. Hauser, A.S., Attwood, M.M., Rask-Andersen, M., Schiöth, H.B., Gloriam, D.E. Trends in GPCR drug discovery: new agents, targets and indications. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **16**, 829-842 (2017).

7. Spangler, S., Bruchas, M.R. Tuning biased GPCR signaling for physiological gain. *Cell* **171**, 989-991 (2017).

8. Bag, N., Wagenknecht-Wiesner, A., Lee, A., Shi, S.M., Holowka, D.A., Baird, B.A. Lipid-based and protein-based interactions synergize transmembrane signaling stimulated by antigen clustering of IgE receptors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **118**, e2026583118 (2021).

9. Cvejic, S., Devi, L.A. Dimerization of the delta opioid receptor: implication for a role in receptor internalization. *J. Biol. Chem.* **272**, 26959-26964 (1997).

10. He, L., Fong, J., von Zastrow, M., Whistler, J.L. Regulation of opioid receptor trafficking and morphine tolerance by receptor oligomerization. *Cell* **108**, 271-282 (2002).

11. Fujita, W., Gomes, I., Devi, L.A. Revolution in GPCR signalling: opioid receptor heteromers as novel therapeutic targets: IUPHAR review 10. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* **171**, 4155-4176 (2014).

12. Gomes, I., Gupta, A., Filipovska, J., Szeto, H.H., Pintar, J.E., Devi, L.A. A role for heterodimerization of μ and δ opiate receptors in enhancing morphine analgesia. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **101**, 5135 (2004).

13. Jordan, B.A., Devi, L.A. G-protein-coupled receptor heterodimerization modulates receptor function. *Nature* **399**, 697-700 (1999).

1176

1177 14. Möller, J., *et al.* Single-molecule analysis reveals agonist-specific dimer formation of μ-
1178 opioid receptors. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **16**, 946-954 (2020).

1179

1180 15. Ilien, B., *et al.* Pirenzepine promotes the dimerization of muscarinic M1 receptors through
1181 a three-step binding process. *J. Biol. Chem.* **284**, 19533-19543 (2009).

1182

1183 16. Liu, J., *et al.* Biased signaling due to oligomerization of the G protein-coupled platelet-
1184 activating factor receptor. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 6365 (2022).

1185

1186 17. Gomes, I., *et al.* Identification of a μ-δ opioid receptor heteromer-biased agonist with
1187 antinociceptive activity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 12072 (2013).

1188

1189 18. Waldhoer, M., *et al.* A heterodimer-selective agonist shows in vivo relevance of G protein-
1190 coupled receptor dimers. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **102**, 9050 (2005).

1191

1192 19. Kasai, R.S., Fujiwara, T.K., Kusumi, A. Metastable GPCR dimers trigger the basal signal
1193 by recruiting G-proteins. *bioRxiv*, 2020.2002.2010.929588 (2020).

1194

1195 20. He, S. Q., *et al.* Facilitation of μ-Opioid receptor activity by preventing δ-opioid receptor-
1196 mediated codegradation. *Neuron* **69**, 120-131 (2011).

1197

1198 21. Dijkman, P.M., *et al.* Dynamic tuneable G protein-coupled receptor monomer-dimer
1199 populations. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1710 (2018).

1200

1201 22. Ferré, S., Ciruela, F., Woods, A.S., Lluis, C., Franco, R. Functional relevance of
1202 neurotransmitter receptor heteromers in the central nervous system. *Trends Neurosci.*
1203 **30**, 440-446 (2007).

1204

1205 23. Fribourg, M., *et al.* Decoding the signaling of a GPCR heteromeric complex reveals a
1206 unifying mechanism of action of antipsychotic drugs. *Cell* **147**, 1011-1023 (2011).

1207

1208 24. George, S.R., O'Dowd, B.F., Lee, S.P. G-protein-coupled receptor oligomerization and its
1209 potential for drug discovery. *Nat. Rev. Drug Discov.* **1**, 808-820 (2002).

1210

1211 25. Navarro, G., *et al.* Evidence for functional pre-coupled complexes of receptor heteromers
1212 and adenylyl cyclase. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1242 (2018).

1213

1214 26. Meral, D., *et al.* Molecular details of dimerization kinetics reveal negligible populations of
1215 transient μ-opioid receptor homodimers at physiological concentrations. *Sci. Rep.* **8**,
1216 7705 (2018).

1217

1218 27. George, S.R., *et al.* Oligomerization of mu- and delta-opioid receptors: generation of
1219 novel functional properties. *J. Biol. Chem.* **275**, 26128-26135 (2000).

1220

1221   28.   Wang, D., Sun, X., Bohn, L.M., Sadée, W. Opioid receptor homo- and heterodimerization
1222   in living cells by quantitative bioluminescence resonance energy transfer. *Mol. Pharmacol.*
1223   **67**, 2173-2184 (2005).

1225   29.   Asher, W.B., *et al.* Single-molecule FRET imaging of GPCR dimers in living cells. *Nat.*
1226   *Methods* **18**, 397-405 (2021).

1228   30.   Cechova, K., Lan, C., Macik, M., Barthes, N.P.F., Jung, M., Ulbrich, M.H. Kappa but not
1229   delta or mu opioid receptors form homodimers at low membrane densities. *Cell. Mol.*
1230   *Life Sci.* **78**, 7557-7568 (2021).

1232   31.   Drakopoulos, A., *et al.* Investigation of Investigation of inactive-state κ opioid receptor
1233   homodimerization via single-molecule microscopy using new antagonistic fluorescent
1234   probes. *J. Med. Chem.* **63**, 3596-3609 (2020).

1236   32.   Rogacki, M.K., *et al.* Dynamic lateral organization of opioid receptors (kappa, mu(wt)
1237   and mu(N40D)) in the plasma membrane at the nanoscale level. *Traffic.* **19**, 690-709
1238   (2018).

1240   33.   Gentzsch, C., *et al.* Selective and wash-resistant fluorescent dihydrocodeinone
1241   derivatives allow single-molecule imaging of μ-opioid receptor dimerization. *Angew.*
1242   *Chem. Int. Ed.* **59**, 5958-5964 (2020).

1244   34.   Calebiro, D., *et al.* Single-molecule analysis of fluorescently labeled G-protein–coupled
1245   receptors reveals complexes with distinct dynamics and organization. *Proc. Natl. Acad.*
1246   *Sci. U.S.A.* **110**, 743 (2013).

1248   35.   Hern, J.A., *et al.* Formation and dissociation of M1 muscarinic receptor dimers seen by
1249   total internal reflection fluorescence imaging of single molecules. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
1250   *U.S.A.* **107**, 2693 (2010).

1252   36.   Kasai, R.S., Ito, S.V., Awane, R.M., Fujiwara, T.K., Kusumi, A. The Class-A GPCR dopamine
1253   D2 receptor forms transient dimers stabilized by agonists: detection by single-molecule
1254   tracking. *Cell. Biochem. Biophys.* **76**, 29-37 (2018).

1256   37.   Kasai, R.S., *et al.* Full characterization of GPCR monomer-dimer dynamic equilibrium by
1257   single molecule imaging. *J. Cell. Biol.* **192**, 463-480 (2011).

1259   38.   Zhou, P., *et al.* Single-molecule detection of transient dimerization of opioid receptors 2:
1260   Heterodimer blockage enhances morphine analgesia. *Companion paper* (2024).

1262   39.   Hernanz-Falcón, P., *et al.* Identification of amino acid residues crucial for chemokine
1263   receptor dimerization. *Nat. Immunol.* **5**, 216-223 (2004).

1265   40.   Jastrzebska, B., Chen, Y., Orban, T., Jin, H., Hofmann, L., Palczewski, K. Disruption of

1266   rhodopsin dimerization with synthetic peptides targeting an interaction interface. *J. Biol.*
1267   *Chem.* **290**, 25728-25744 (2015).

1268

1269   41.   McMillin, S.M., Heusel, M., Liu, T., Costanzi, S., Wess, J. Structural basis of M3 muscarinic
1270   receptor dimer/oligomer formation. *J. Biol. Chem.* **286**, 28584-28598 (2011).

1271

1272   42.   Petersen, J., *et al.* Agonist-induced dimer dissociation as a macromolecular step in G
1273   protein-coupled receptor signaling. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 226 (2017).

1274

1275   43.   Pan, Y. X. Expression of opioid receptors in mammalian cell lines. In: *opioid research:*
1276   *Methods and Protocols* (ed Pan ZZ). Humana Press (2003).

1277

1278   44.   Koyama-Honda, I., *et al.* Fluorescence imaging for monitoring the colocalization of two
1279   single molecules in living cells. *Biophys. J.* **88**, 2126-2136 (2005).

1280

1281   45.   Koyama-Honda, I., *et al.* High-speed single-molecule imaging reveals signal transduction
1282   by induced transbilayer raft phases. *J. Cell. Biol.* **219**, (2020).

1283

1284   46.   Stone, M.B., Veatch, S.L. Steady-state cross-correlations for live two-colour super-
1285   resolution localization data sets. *Nat. Commun.* **6**, 7347 (2015).

1286

1287   47.   Evans, E.J., *et al.* Crystal structure of a soluble CD28-Fab complex. *Nat. Immunol.* **6**,
1288   271-279 (2005).

1289

1290   48.   Granier, S., *et al.* Structure of the δ-opioid receptor bound to naltrindole. *Nature* **485**,
1291   400-404 (2012).

1292

1293   49.   Huang, W., *et al.* Structural insights into μ-opioid receptor activation. *Nature* **524**, 315-
1294   321 (2015).

1295

1296   50.   Manglik, A., *et al.* Crystal structure of the μ-opioid receptor bound to a morphinan
1297   antagonist. *Nature* **485**, 321-326 (2012).

1298

1299   51.   Wu, H., *et al.* Structure of the human κ-opioid receptor in complex with JDTic. *Nature*
1300   **485**, 327-332 (2012).

1301

1302   52.   Ferré, S., *et al.* G protein–coupled receptor oligomerization revisited: functional and
1303   pharmacological perspectives. *Pharmacol. Rev.* **66**, 413 (2014).

1304

1305   53.   Johnston, J.M., *et al.* Making structural sense of dimerization interfaces of delta opioid
1306   receptor homodimers. *Biochemistry* **50**, 1682-1690 (2011).

1307

1308   54.   Mészáros, B., Erdős, G., Dosztányi, Z. IUPred2A: context-dependent prediction of protein
1309   disorder as a function of redox state and protein binding. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, W329-
1310   W337 (2018).

55. Erdős, G., Dosztányi, Z. Analyzing protein disorder with IUPred2A. *Curr. Protoc. Bioinform.* **70**, e99 (2020).

56. Xhani, S., *et al.* Intrinsic disorder controls two functionally distinct dimers of the master transcription factor PU.1. *Sci. Adv.* **6**, eaay3178 (2020).

57. Kusumi, A., Tsunoyama, T.A., Suzuki, K.G.N, Fujiwara, T.K., Aladag, A. Transient, nano-scale, liquid-like molecular assemblies coming of age. *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **89**, 102394 (2024).

58. Inomata, K., *et al.* High-resolution multi-dimensional NMR spectroscopy of proteins in human cells. *Nature* **458**, 106-109 (2009).

59. Grasberger, B., Minton, A.P., DeLisi, C., Metzger, H. Interaction between proteins localized in membranes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **83**, 6258-6262 (1986).

60. Keppler, A., Pick, H., Arrivoli, C., Vogel, H., Johnsson, K. Labeling of fusion proteins with synthetic fluorophores in live cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **101**, 9955-9959 (2004).

61. Smith, J.S., *et al.* Noncanonical scaffolding of Gαi and β-arrestin by G protein–coupled receptors. *Science* **371**, eaay1833 (2021).

62. Wess, J., Oteng, A.B., Rivera-Gonzalez, O., Gurevich, E.V., Gurevich, V.V. β-arrestins: structure, function, physiology, and pharmacological perspectives. *Pharmacol. Rev.* **75**, 854-884 (2023).

63. Zhou, X.E., *et al.* Identification of phosphorylation codes for arrestin recruitment by G protein-coupled receptors. *Cell* **170**, 457-469.e413 (2017).

64. Ménard, L., *et al.* Synergistic regulation of beta2-adrenergic receptor sequestration: intracellular complement of beta-adrenergic receptor kinase and beta-arrestin determine kinetics of internalization. *Mol. Pharmacol.* **51 5**, 800-808 (1997).

65. Camarda, V., Calo', G. Chimeric G proteins in fluorimetric calcium assays: experience with opioid receptors. In: *Calcium Signaling Protocols* (eds Lambert DG, Rainbow RD). Humana Press (2013).

66. Han, Y., Moreira, I.S., Urizar, E., Weinstein, H., Javitch, J.A. Allosteric communication between protomers of dopamine class A GPCR dimers modulates activation. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **5**, 688-695 (2009).

67. Yokoyama, T., Kato, N., Yamada, N. Development of a high-throughput bioassay to screen melatonin receptor agonists using human melatonin receptor expressing CHO cells. *Neurosci. Lett.* **344**, 45-48 (2003).

68. Hauser, A.S., *et al.* GPCR activation mechanisms across classes and macro/microscales. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **28**, 879-888 (2021).

69. Zhou, Q., *et al.* Common activation mechanism of class A GPCRs. *Elife* **8**, (2019).

70. Mafi, A., Kim, S.K., Goddard, W.A., 3rd. Mechanism of β-arrestin recruitment by the μ-opioid G protein-coupled receptor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 16346-16355 (2020).

71. Koehl, A., *et al.* Structure of the μ-opioid receptor–Gi protein complex. *Nature* **558**, 547-552 (2018).

72. Che, T., Dwivedi-Agnihotri, H., Shukla, A.K., Roth, B.L. Biased ligands at opioid receptors: current status and future directions. *Sci. Signal.* **14**, eaav0320 (2021).

73. Violin, J.D., Crombie, A,L,, Soergel. D,G,, Lark, M.W. Biased ligands at G-protein-coupled receptors: promise and progress. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* **35**, 308-316 (2014).

74. Manglik, A. Molecular basis of opioid action: from structures to new leads. *Biol. Psychiatry.* **87**, 6-14 (2020).

75. De Neve, J., Barlow, T.M.A., Tourwé, D., Bihel, F., Simonin, F., Ballet, S. Comprehensive overview of biased pharmacology at the opioid receptors: biased ligands and bias factors. *RSC Med.Chem.* **12**, 828-870 (2021).

76. Schulz, R., Wehmeyer, A., Schulz, K. Opioid receptor types selectively cointernalize with G protein-coupled receptor kinases 2 and 3. *J. Pharmacol. Exp. Ther.* **300**, 376 (2002).

77. Fukuda, K., Kato, S., Mori, K., Nishi, M., Takeshima, H. Primary structures and expression from cDNAs of rat opioid receptor δ-and μ-subtypes. *FEBS Lett.* **327**, 311-314 (1993).

78. Shaner, N.C., Campbell, R.E., Steinbach, P.A., Giepmans, B.N.G, Palmer, A.E., Tsien, R.Y. Improved monomeric red, orange and yellow fluorescent proteins derived from Discosoma sp. red fluorescent protein. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **22**, 1567-1572 (2004).

79. Lindberg, F.P., Gresham, H.D., Schwarz, E., Brown, E.J. Molecular cloning of integrin-associated protein: an immunoglobulin family member with multiple membrane-spanning domains implicated in alpha v beta 3-dependent ligand binding. *J. Cell. Biol.* **123**, 485-496 (1993).

80. James, J.R., Oliveira, M.I., Carmo, A.M., Iaboni, A., Davis, S.J. A rigorous experimental framework for detecting protein oligomerization using bioluminescence resonance energy transfer. *Nat. Methods* **3**, 1001-1006 (2006).

1401 81. Naruse, K., Sai, X., Yokoyama, N., Sokabe, M. Uni-axial cyclic stretch induces c-src
1402   activation and translocation in human endothelial cells via SA channel activation. *FEBS*
1403   *Lett.* **441**, 111-115 (1998).
1404
1405 82. Cowen, T., Haven, A.J., Burnstock, G. Pontamine sky blue: a counterstain for background
1406   autofluorescence   in   fluorescence   and   immunofluorescence   histochemistry.
1407   *Histochemistry* **82**, 205-208 (1985).
1408
1409 83. Tsunoyama, T.A., *et al.* Super-long single-molecule tracking reveals dynamic-anchorage-
1410   induced integrin function. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **14**, 497-506 (2018).
1411
1412 84. Murakoshi, H., *et al.* Single-molecule imaging analysis of Ras activation in living cells.
1413   *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **101**, 7317 (2004).
1414
1415 85. Fujiwara, T.K., *et al.* Confined diffusion of transmembrane proteins and lipids induced by
1416   the same actin meshwork lining the plasma membrane. *Mol. Biol. Cell.* **27**, 1101-1119
1417   (2016).
1418
1419 86. Conklin, B.R., Farfel, Z., Lustig, K.D., Julius, D., Bourne, H.R. Substitution of three amino
1420   acids switches receptor specificity of Gqα to that of Giα. *Nature* **363**, 274-276 (1993).
1421
1422 87. Fujiwara, T.K., *et al.* Development of ultrafast camera-based single fluorescent-molecule
1423   imaging for cell biology. *J. Cell. Biol.* **222**, (2023).