1
2

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

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.

Graphical Abstract

Highlights

- Opioid receptors rapidly interconvert between monomers and transient homodimers

- We developed theories for evaluating the dimer k_{off} and K_D in the plasma membrane

- C-terminal cytoplasmic domains are involved in specific homodimerization

- Homodimer blocking peptides modulate signaling but not receptor internalization

SUMMARY

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.[2-7]

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.[7-15] 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.[16,17]

The pharmacological diversities of ORs might be enhanced by their propensity to form homodimers[18,19] and heterodimers.[20-23] Agonist-induced homodimer formation significantly influences the balance of MOR's downstream G-protein and β-arrestin pathways.[24] 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[25,26] for homodimers and Refs[27-29] 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.[30] Furthermore, OR heterodimerization is important for their cooperative functions, as supported by functional and pharmacological studies.[31-36] 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.[26,37-45]

Despite such extensive research, the very existence of homo- and hetero-dimers of ORs, particularly at physiological expression levels, remains controversial.[46] Previous detection of

homodimers of DOR,[18,47,48] MOR,[47,48] and KOR,[22,48] and heterodimers of all OR pairs[48]

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,[49,50] DOR,[50] and KOR[51] 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[52] as well as the transient

MOR dimerization[53] or that only after the agonist DAMGO binding, but not morphine.[24]

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,[30,37,53-57] 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.[58] 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,[18] whereas the transmembrane domains might promote both homo- and heterodimerizations in a less specific manner, in partial agreement with previous results.[37,59-66]

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.[67] These SNAPf-tagged molecules were functional (Figures S1A and S1B) and labeled with the fluorescent membrane-impermeable SNAP ligands, SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660R, with 60% and 61% efficiencies, respectively (Figures S1C-S1E). 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.[68,69]

Virtually all of the SNAPf-OR fluorescent spots exhibited diffusion in the PM, but in addition, they often exhibited temporary colocalization and co-diffusion (STAR Methods),[57] suggesting the frequent formation of transient homodimers (Movies S1 and S2; Figure 1A). We focused on simultaneous two-color experiments, due to the ease of image analysis. For the single-color imaging data, see Figure S2A and S2B, which show an example of repeated homodimerizations of a KOR molecule with different partner KOR molecules, consistent with the observations made with other GPCRs.[55-57]

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 (Figure 1B),[70] as the ratio of PCCF (0-100 nm) vs. PCCF (400-500 nm) (Figures S2C-S2E). 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

Figure S2D, grey histogram in Figure 1B), providing a colocalization index of ≈1. KOR, MOR,

and DOR exhibited significantly higher colocalization indexes than the negative controls

(Figure 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 Note S1, which shows that

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

SEM),[56,57,68,69] its duration was measured. By measuring the durations of >1,500 events (in ⩾

17 cells; all statistical parameters are summarized in Table S1), we obtained the distribution

of colocalization durations (Figure 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 (Note S1). 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 ≈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[56,57,69] and others[53-55] 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 (Note S1)

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, Figure 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 Notes S1 and S2 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 (Figure S2D)

could be fitted with a single exponential function (using both Akaike's and Bayesian

information criteria; AIC and BIC, respectively) (Figure 1D).

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

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

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

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

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

219 colocalization durations are the results of multiple binding events.

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

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

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

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

223 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 Figure 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} ($= 1/\tau_2$; Note S1). 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 Figure 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).[53] 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 (Note S2) 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 Figures 1B and S2E), 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 (Figures S3C and S3E): 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 Figures S3A-S3E, particularly Figure S3C). 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 (Figure 2A and 2B; 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 Table S1, 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 Table S1). Our estimated values of K_D for the MOR and KOR homodimers found here exhibited much smaller errors compared with previous estimates (for MOR[53], 27.43 ± 11.75 copies/μm^2; and for KOR[50], 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/µm^2, respectively).[30,57] The K_D values for CD28, the constitutive disulfide-linked dimer

control molecule,[71] and the transmembrane domain of the LDL receptor (TM^{LDLR}), the

monomer control molecule,[57] are 0.041 ± 0.072 and 132 ±21 copies/µm^2, 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.[50] 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 Figure 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 (Figure 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/µm^2.[46,49,53]

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 Figure 2B and 2D. However, all

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

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

different partner molecules (Figure S2A and S2B), 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 $1/k_{off} + 1/[k_{on}$ x 1]), virtually all of the

molecules experience the periods of homodimers and monomers.

A previous biochemical study detected DOR homodimers[18] and a single-molecule

imaging study using a fluorescently-conjugated MOR antagonist detected MOR homodimers,[53]

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.[24,51] 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.[57]

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 (Figure

S4A), 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.[72-75]

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 (Figure 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.[18] We examined systematically varied C-terminal deletion mutants (Figures 3A and 3B). 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 (Figure 3B and Table S1). For DOR, this amino-acid sequence agrees with the previous biochemical data.[18] Meanwhile, the mean colocalization index values never decreased to the index values comparable to those for rotated overlays ($\approx$1) (Figure 3B) or a monomer control molecule TM^{LDLR} ($\approx$1.1) (Figure 2A), suggesting the possibility that there might be other weaker homodimerization site(s), which might be the TM domains, as previously suggested for ORs[46,73,74,76-79] and other class A GPCRs.[37,59,60,62-65] However, as shown in Figure S4A; 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 (Figure 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 (Figure 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 Figure 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)[80,81] indicated that the C-terminal region could be weakly intrinsically disordered (Figure S4B), and the scores decreased (more ordered) with these point mutations (Figure S4C). 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.[82] 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.[83]

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 (Figures 4A and 4B). 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 (Figure S5A; see STAR Methods).

The OR homo-colocalization index in the cells expressing various concentrations of mGFP-Xpep in the cytoplasm (homogeneously distributed throughout the cytoplasm; Figure 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 (Figure 4C), whereas the control mGFP-peptides (mGFP-Dpep for KOR and MOR and mGFP-Kpep for DOR) had no effect (Figure 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; Figure 4D), and the decay time constants became similar to those for the C-terminal deletion mutants (compare Figure 4D with Figure 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 STAR Methods), and added to cells preincubated with 150 µM pyrenebutyrate for 5 min (Figures 4E and 4F).[84] The FAM-peptide-TATs exhibited diffuse spatial distributions throughout the cytosol (Figure 4F). The cells containing 2.9-3.4 µM FAM-Xpep-TAT (see Figure S5B 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 (Figure 4G; Table 1), consistent with the data obtained using mGFP-Xpeps (Figure 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 (Figure 4H; compare with Figure 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.[85]

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 Figure 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 (Figure 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.

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

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 (Figure 4G and Table 1), although these results might vary depending on

the particular agonist.[18,24] For example, the DOR agonists, DADLE, DSLET, and DPDPE, were

previously found to induce fewer homodimers,[18] 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 (Figure 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 Figure 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 (Figure 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 Figure 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 Table S2.

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

478   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} (Figure 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,[33,34,37,46,73,74,76-79] and the first OR transmembrane domain (TM1) is often mentioned

in the literature,[46,73,74,78,79] we examined the involvement of MOR's TM1 domain (TM1^{MOR}) in

MOR homodimerization (Figure 5A).

Colocalization indexes indicated that TM1^{MOR} interacts with another TM1^{MOR} and MOR, as well as, importantly, with DOR (Figure 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* (Figure 5C).

In contrast, in the homodimer blocking experiments where TM1^{MOR} is expressed ≈10x more than MOR or DOR (Figure 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; Figure 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 (Figures 5B and 5E). 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 blockers 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 Figure 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.[86]

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 (Figures 6A and S6).

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 (Figure 6B; Tables 1 and S1). 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 (Tables 1 and S1). 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 (Figure 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 (Figure 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 (Figure 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 (Figure 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 (Figure 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(Smith et al.,

2021; Asher et al., 2022; Wess et al., 2023; Zhou et al., 2017) 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(Ménard et

al., 1997),[91] and thus T24 cells might undergo more active internalization. However, T24 cells

exhibited internalization behaviors quite similar to those of CHO-K1 cells (Figure 6B; Tables

S1 and S3).

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 (Figures 6C-6E; refer to the

caption to Figure S1A and STAR Methods).[41,92,93] The addition of the homodimer-blocking

FAM-Xpep-TATs alone (thus the monomerization of ORs alone) did not induce any detectable

Ca^{2+} mobilization (Figure 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 (Figure 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; Figure 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. [89,90,94-97]

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

Ca^{2+} responses (Figure S1B 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

(Figure 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 (Figures 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 (Figure 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 (Note S1), and the dimer-monomer dissociation equilibrium constant (K_D) could be obtained much more readily compared with the method we developed previously.[57] 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.[58] 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[37] (however, see[24]), 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 (Figure 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.[53-55] 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 (Figures 3B, 3C, and 4), and do not participate in heterodimerization (Figures 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.[82] 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.[37,46,73,74,76-79] 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 (Figure 6F), although both monomers and homodimers are internalized at the same rate before and after agonist addition (Figure 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,[98-102] 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 (Figure 4E-4H) 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.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results obtained here revealed that the G-protein-mediated downstream signals are different between monomers and homodimers of KOR and DOR, suggesting that the agonist-induced conformational changes of G-protein binding sites in the IL3 domain are distinct between monomers and homodimers. More direct structural studies on this point are necessary.

G-proteins could often be bound to ORs before agonist stimulation,[103-105] which might affect OR homodimerization. This possibility has not been investigated in the present study. In general, we will need to comprehensively understand the involvement of G protein and β-arrestins, ORs' TM domains, and ORs' possible allosteric conformational changes in ORs' homo- and hetero-dimerizations. This will give us more complete description of the dimerization kinetics and equilibrium. Meanwhile, we believe that the present approach, using a simple first-order kinetics, is useful at this research stage towards our comprehensive

understanding of homo- and hetero-dimerization of ORs as well as those of GPCRs and other

membrane molecules in general.

Since we used only one agonist for each OR subtype, further examinations using other

agonists will be important. The effects of peptides blocking homodimerization were only

tested in cells, but for pharmacological applications, we will need to perform *in vivo*

experiments, such as those using mice.

Figure 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 Figures S2C-2E).

(**C**) Colocalization indexes showing that the three ORs undergo homo-colocalizations and that OR homo-colocaliations are not affected by the 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 Table S1.

(**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 Note S1 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 Note S1.

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.					

Figure 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 Figure 1C) fitted with theoretical PCCFs (Eq. 24) in Note S2; the total

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

efficiency = 0.7 [Figure S1E]) 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.

Figure 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; Figure 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.

Figure 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 indicate 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 Figure 1D; for both correct and rotated overlays). For further details of these

graphs, see the caption to Figure 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).

Figure 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.[58]

(**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.

Figure 6. Xpeps hardly affect OR internalization in both the presence and absence of the agonist, whereas they enhanced, did not affect, or reduced the Ca^{2+} 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 Figure S6.

(**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 Ca^{2+} mobilization

after the agonist stimulation. The Ca^{2+} mobilization was monitored by the Rhod-3

fluorescence intensity (see the caption to Figure S1A and STAR 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".

849 # STAR METHODS

850 Detailed methods are provided in the online version of this paper and include the following:

Supplemental information can be found online at ………………

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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.

AUTHOR 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.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

PZ and AK have a patent pending for Xpeps and Xpep-TATs. The remaining authors have no

conflicts of interest to declare.

 STAR Methods

 Key resources table

REAGENT or RESOURCE	SOURCE	IDENTIFIER
Bacterial and virus strains		
E. coli HST08 Premium Competent Cells	Takara	Cat# 9128
Chemicals, peptides, and recombinant proteins		
U-50488	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# D8040
DAMGO	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# E7384
SNC-80	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# S2812
Pyrenebutyrate	Sigma-Aldrich	Cat# 257354
Mn (III) meso-tetra(4-sulfonatophenyl)porphine chloride Mn^{3+}-TSP	Frontier Scientific	Cat# MnT1239
FAM-Kpep-TAT	Cosmo-Bio	N/A
FAM-Mpep-TAT	Cosmo-Bio	N/A
FAM-Dpep-TAT	Cosmo-Bio	N/A
EGFP protein	BioVision	Cat# 4999
SNAP-Surface 549 ligand	New England Biolabs	Cat# S9112S
SNAP-CF660R ligand	Shinsei Kagaku	N/A
SaraFluor650T Halo ligand	Goryo Chemical	Cat# A308-02
Critical commercial assays		
Gibson Assembly Master Mix	New England BioLabs	Cat# E2611L
Mycoplasma PCR Detection Kit	Beyotime Biotechnology	Cat# C0301S
VenorGeM Mycoplasma Detection Kit	Minerva Biolabs	Cat# MNV11-1100
SF Cell Line 4D-Nucleofector X Kit L	Lonza	Cat# V4XC-2012
Fluo 4-AM special packaging	Dojindo	Cat# F312
Rhod-3 Calcium Imaging Kit	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# R10145
NucSpot Live 650	Biotium	Cat# 40082
Experimental models: Cell lines		
Human: T24	Masahiro Sokabe (Nagoya University)[106]	N/A
Chinese Hamster: CHO-K1	Dainippon Pharma Co., Ltd.	Cat# 03-402
Recombinant DNA		
Plasmid: pEGFP	Clontech	Cat# Z2370N
Plasmid: pmCherry	Clontech	Cat# Z2522N
Plasmid: pPBpuro	Michiyuki Matsuda (Kyoto University)[107]	N/A
Plasmid: pCMV-mPBase	Michiyuki Matsuda (Kyoto University)[107]	N/A
SNAPf	New England Biolabs	Cat# N9172S
Halo7	Promega	Cat# G9651
mEGFP	Clontech	Cat# Z2370N
mCherry	Roger Y Tsien (University of California San Diego)[108]	N/A
CD47	Eric C Brown (Genentech)[109]	N/A
CD28	Simon J Davis (University of Oxford)[110]	N/A

TM[LDLR]	[57]	N/A
rat KOR	Hiroshi Takeshima (Kyoto University)[111]	N/A
rat MOR-GFP	Rüdiger Schulz (University of Munich)[112]	N/A
rat DOR	Hiroshi Takeshima (Kyoto University)[111]	N/A
GNA15	OriGene	CAT#: SC125360
mGFP-Kpep	This paper	N/A
mGFP-Mpep	This paper	N/A
mGFP-Dpep	This paper	N/A
SNAPf-TM1[MOR]	This paper	N/A
SNAPf-TM1[DOR]	This paper	N/A
Software and algorithms		
HSR v2.3.1.0	Hamamatsu Photonics	https://www.hamamatsu.com/jp/en.html
MCR v1.2.0.0	Hamamatsu Photonics	N/A
LabVIEW 2018 v18.0.1f4	National Instruments	RRID:SCR_014325 (https://www.ni.com/en-us.html)
MatLab 2019a v9.6.0	MathWorks	RRID:SCR_001622 (https://www.mathworks.com)
ImageJ (Fiji) v2.1.0	NIH[113]	RRID:SCR_002285 (https://imagej.net/software/fiji/)
Photoshop CC 2021 v22.4.2	Adobe	RRID:SCR_014199 (https://www.adobe.com)
Illustrator CC 2021 v.24.3	Adobe	RRID:SCR_010279 (https://www.adobe.com)
Origin 2017 v.b9.490.220	Origin Lab	RRID:SCR_014212 (https://www.originlab.com)
R studio v1.2.1335	R studio	RRID:SCR_000432 (https://www.rstudio.com)
Excel v16.51	Microsoft	https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-365/excel

RESOURCE AVAILABILITY

Lead contact

Further information and requests for resources and reagents should be directed to and will be fulfilled by the lead contact.

Materials availability

Plasmids and cell lines generated in this study will be shared by the lead contact upon request.

Data and code 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[114] and based on the well-established approaches. Source codes for this have been integrated into a large, complex software package. While

932 the software package cannot be extracted in a useful way, the entire software is available from the lead
933 contact upon reasonable request, who will provide guidance on how to use it, as its manual and
934 comments are written in Japanese.
935

EXPERIMENTAL MODEL AND SUBJECT DETAILS
Cell lines and culture
CHO-K1 cells (Dainippon Pharma) and T24 cells (gift from Prof. M. Sokabe of Nagoya University)[106],
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.
943

Plasmids and cloning
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. 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.
952

METHOD DETAILS
Transfections
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.
960

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.[115]
973

974 ### Fluorescence labeling of ORs

975	The SNAPf-tagged wild-type and mutant ORs expressed in the PM (SNAPf tag located at the
976	extracellular N-terminus) were covalently conjugated by simultaneously incubating the cells with two
977	fluorescent SNAP ligands, SNAP-Surface 549 (New England Biolabs) and SNAP-CF660R (Shinsei
978	Kagaku), both at 300 nM, in the growth medium at 37˚C in the CO_2 incubator for 30 min. The cells
979	were washed three times with fresh medium (5-min incubation each time), and then the Ham's F12
980	observation medium was added. The labeling efficiency was determined by using the SNAPf-CD47-
981	mGFP protein expressed in the PM. CD47 is a monomeric 5-pass transmembrane protein expressed in
982	the PM.[116] We could not use ORs for this purpose because they form transient dimers, and thus
983	employed a monomeric CD47 (Figures S1C and S1D).
984	The labeling efficiency (the percentage of the SNAPf-tag protein labeled with the fluorescent
985	SNAP ligand) was determined in the following way. The percentage of fluorescent mGFP spots of
986	SNAPf-CD47-mGFP that was colocalized by the SNAP-dye spots were measured as a function the
987	concentration of the SNAP-dye-conjugated ligand in the medium, after a 30 min incubation at 30˚C.
988	Note that not every mGFP molecule was fluorescent, but since we examined whether the fluorescent
989	mGFP molecule identified in the image was colocalized by a SNAP-dye spot, the labeling efficiencies of
990	the SNAPf-protein tag can be evaluated without the influence of the fluorescence efficiency of mGFP.
991	Then the efficiency at each fluorescent ligand concentration was plotted against the dye
992	concentration (Figure S1E). We found that the plot could be fitted by a function of a single
993	exponential function plus a constant, providing the saturating labeling efficiency (constant) and the
994	characteristic labeling efficiency (exponential constant).
995	To obtain the labeling efficiency at a dye concentration of 300 nM for an incubation period of 30
996	min, the conditions used throughout this study, the determined exponential function was used for a
997	concentration of 300 nM. The fluorescence labeling efficiencies under our normal observation
998	conditions were found to be 60% and 61% for SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660, respectively.
999	

1000	**Microscope observations**
1001	All microscope observations were performed at 37˚C by placing the entire microscope, except for the
1002	far ends of the excitation arms and the detection arms, in a home-built microscope environment
1003	chamber made with thermo- and electric-field-insulating plastic sheets and equipped with four
1004	heating circulators (SKH0-112-OT, Kokensya, Tokyo, Japan). The Ham's F12 medium used for
1005	microscope observations was free of sodium bicarbonate and phenol red, and buffered with 2 mM N-
1006	[tris(hydroxymethyl)methyl]-2-aminoethanesulfonic acid (TES, Sigma-Aldrich) at pH 7.4 (called Ham's
1007	F12 observation medium).
1008	

1009	**Single fluorescent-molecule imaging**
1010	Fluorescently labeled ORs expressed in the bottom PM (the PM facing the coverslip) at fluorescent-
1011	spot number densities of 0.5 ± 0.25 spots/μm^2 for each color (SNAP-Surface 549 and SNAP-CF660R;
1012	total spot number densities of 1.0 ± 0.5 spots/μm^2; for conciseness, we describe the number densities
1013	as ≈1 spot/μm^2 throughout this report) were observed at the level of single molecules at 37˚C, using a
1014	home-built objective lens-type TIRF microscope constructed on an inverted microscope (Olympus IX-
1015	83), with a 100x, 1.49 numerical aperture (NA) objective lens, optimized for the present research
1016	based on the instrument used previously.[68,117] ORs tagged with fluorescent probes were excited with
1017	TIR illumination using the following power densities: SNAP-Surface 549 at 561 nm (Coherent OBIS
1018	561-100 LS) at 0.35 $\mu W/\mu m^2$; and SNAP-CF660R at 642 nm (Omicron LuxXPlus 640-140) at 0.52
1019	$\mu W/\mu m^2$. 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.[68] 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.[118]
1032
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.[57,68] Briefly, in single-color experiments using SNAP-Surface 549 (Figure S2), a spatial cross-
correlation analysis was employed.[57] 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[68]
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 (Figure S2D). 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 (Note S1). Since
τ_1 was almost the same as τ_{inci} (Figure 1E), following the theory developed in Note S1, 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 (Figure S1F). The correction was made by using the equation:
$\tau(corrected) = [\tau(observed)^{-1} - \tau_{track}(dye\ 1)^{-1} - \tau_{track}(dye\ 2)^{-1}]^{-1}$.
1083

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,[70] and the detailed method used in this research is explained in Figures S2C-
S2E and S3.
1090

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) (Note S2), see the caption to Figure S3.
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 Figure S3C).
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 Note S2).
1103

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 (Figure S5B).

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.[41,92,93] 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.[119] 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 (Figures 6C-6F and S1B). This method of using Gqi5 has been widely employed in the research of ORs[92] and other Gi-coupled GPCRs.[41,93]

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^{TM} (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 $\approx$1 fluorescent spot/µm^2 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.
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 ≈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.
1170
QUANTIFICATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

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.
1178
1179

1180

REFERENCES

1. Darcq, E., and Kieffer, B.L. (2018). Opioid receptors: drivers to addiction? Nat. Rev. Neurosci. *19*, 499-514.
2. Valentino, R.J., and Volkow, N.D. (2018). Untangling the complexity of opioid receptor function. Neuropsychopharmacology *43*, 2514-2520.
3. Blythe, E.E., and von Zastrow, M. (2024). β-Arrestin-independent endosomal cAMP signaling by a polypeptide hormone GPCR. Nat. Chem. Biol. *20*, 323-332.
4. Flores-Espinoza, E., and Thomsen, A.R.B. (2024). Beneath the surface: endosomal GPCR signaling. Trends Biochem. Sci. *49*, 520-531.
5. Grimes, J., Lanoiselée, Y., Miljus, T., O'Brien, S.L., Stepniewski, T.M., Medel-Lacruz, B., Baidya, M., Makarova, M., Mistry, R., *et al.* (2023). Plasma membrane preassociation drives β-arrestin coupling to receptors and activation. Cell *186*, 2238-2255. E2220.
6. Mahoney, J.P., and Sunahara, R.K. (2016). Mechanistic insights into GPCR–G protein interactions. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. *41*, 247-254.
7. Schmid, C.L., Kennedy, N.M., Ross, N.C., Lovell, K.M., Yue, Z., Morgenweck, J., Cameron, M.D., Bannister, T.D., and Bohn, L.M. (2017). Bias factor and therapeutic window correlate to predict safer opioid analgesics. Cell *171*, 1165-1175.e1113.
8. Che, T., and Roth, B.L. (2023). Molecular basis of opioid receptor signaling. Cell *186*, 5203-5219.
9. Bruchas, M.R., and Roth, B.L. (2016). New technologies for elucidating opioid receptor function. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. *37*, 279-289.
10. Chan, H.C.S., McCarthy, D., Li, J., Palczewski, K., and Yuan, S. (2017). Designing safer analgesics via μ-opioid receptor pathways. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. *38*, 1016-1037.
11. Cong, X., Maurel, D., Déméné, H., Vasiliauskaité-Brooks, I., Hagelberger, J., Peysson, F., Saint-Paul, J., Golebiowski, J., Granier, S., and Sounier, R. (2021). Molecular insights into the biased signaling mechanism of the μ-opioid receptor. Mol. Cell *81*, 4165-4175. e4166.
12. Hauser, A.S., Attwood, M.M., Rask-Andersen, M., Schiöth, H.B., and Gloriam, D.E. (2017). Trends in GPCR drug discovery: new agents, targets and indications. Nat. Rev. Drug Discov. *16*, 829-842.
13. Spangler, S., and Bruchas, M.R. (2017). Tuning biased GPCR signaling for physiological gain. Cell *171*, 989-991.
14. Wacker, D., Stevens, R.C., and Roth, B.L. (2017). How ligands illuminate GPCR molecular pharmacology. Cell *170*, 414-427.
15. Brust, T.F., Morgenweck, J., Kim, S.A., Rose, J.H., Locke, J.L., Schmid, C.L., Zhou, L., Stahl, E.L., Cameron, M.D., Scarry, S.M., et al. (2016). Biased agonists of the kappa opioid receptor suppress pain and itch without causing sedation or dysphoria. Sci. Signal. *9*, ra117-ra117.
16. Bag, N., Wagenknecht-Wiesner, A., Lee, A., Shi, S.M., Holowka, D.A., and Baird, B.A. (2021). Lipid-based and protein-based interactions synergize transmembrane signaling stimulated by antigen clustering of IgE receptors. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *118*,

1222   e2026583118.

17. Wollman, A.J.M., Fournier, C., Llorente-Garcia, I., Harriman, O., Payne-Dwyer, A.L., Shashkova, S., Zhou, P., Liu, T.-C., Ouaret, D., Wilding, J., et al. (2022). Critical roles for EGFR and EGFR–HER2 clusters in EGF binding of SW620 human carcinoma cells. J. R. Soc. Interface *19*, 20220088.

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

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

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

21. Gomes, I., Gupta, A., Filipovska, J., Szeto, H.H., Pintar, J.E., and Devi, L.A. (2004). A role for heterodimerization of μ and δ opiate receptors in enhancing morphine analgesia. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *101*, 5135-5139.

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

23. Wang, D., Tawfik, V.L., Corder, G., Low, S.A., François, A., Basbaum, A.I., and Scherrer, G. (2018). Functional divergence of delta and mu opioid receptor organization in CNS pain circuits. Neuron *98*, 90-108.e105.

24. Möller, J., Isbilir, A., Sungkaworn, T., Osberg, B., Karathanasis, C., Sunkara, V., Grushevskyi, E.O., Bock, A., Annibale, P., Heilemann, M., *et al.* (2020). Single-molecule analysis reveals agonist-specific dimer formation of μ-opioid receptors. Nat. Chem. Biol. *16*, 946-954.

25. Ilien, B., Glasser, N., Clamme, J.-P., Didier, P., Piemont, E., Chinnappan, R., Daval, S.B., Galzi, J.-L., and Mely, Y. (2009). Pirenzepine promotes the dimerization of muscarinic M1 receptors through a three-step binding process. J. Biol. Chem.284, 19533-19543.

26. Liu, J., Tang, H., Xu, C., Zhou, S., Zhu, X., Li, Y., Prézeau, L., Xu, T., Pin, J.-P, Rondard, P., et al. (2022). Biased signaling due to oligomerization of the G protein-coupled platelet-activating factor receptor. Nat. Commun. 13, 6365.

27. Bhushan, R.G., Sharma, S.K., Xie, Z., Daniels, D.J., and Portoghese, P.S. (2004). A bivalent ligand (KDN-21) reveals spinal δ and κ opioid receptors are organized as heterodimers that give rise to δ1 and κ2 phenotypes. Selective targeting of δ−κ heterodimers. J. Med. Chem. 47, 2969-2972.

28. Gomes, I., Fujita, W., Gupta, A., Saldanha, S.A., Negri, A., Pinello, C.E., Eberhart, C., Roberts, E., Filizola, M., Hodder, P., *et al.* (2013). Identification of a μ-δ opioid receptor heteromer-biased agonist with antinociceptive activity. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *110*, 12072-12077.

29. Waldhoer, M., Fong, J., Jones, R.M., Lunzer, M.M., Sharma, S.K., Kostenis, E., Portoghese, P.S., and Whistler, J.L. (2005). A heterodimer-selective agonist shows in vivo relevance of G protein-coupled receptor dimers. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *102*, 9050-9055.

30. Kasai, R.S., Fujiwara, T.K., and Kusumi, A. (2020). Metastable GPCR dimers trigger the

basal signal by recruiting G-proteins. bioRxiv, 2020.2002.2010.929588.

31. Gomes, I., Fujita, W., Gupta, A., Saldanha, S.A., Negri, A., Pinello, C.E., Eberhart, C.,
Roberts, E., Filizola, M., Hodder, P.*, et al.* (2013). Identification of a μ-δ opioid receptor
heteromer-biased agonist with antinociceptive activity. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *110*,
12072-12077.

32. Gupta, A., Mulder, J., Gomes, I., Rozenfeld, R., Bushlin, I., Ong, E., Lim, M., Maillet, E.,
Junek, M., Cahill, C.M.*, et al.* (2010). Increased abundance of opioid receptor heteromers
after chronic morphine administration. Sci. Signal. *3*, ra54-ra54.

33. He, S.Q., Zhang, Z.N., Guan, J.S., Liu, H.R., Zhao, B., Wang, H.-B., Li, Q., Yang, H., Luo,
J., Li, Z.-Y.*, et al.* (2011). Facilitation of μ-opioid receptor activity by preventing δ-opioid
receptor-mediated codegradation. Neuron *69*, 120-131.

34. Jacobs, B.A., Pando, M.M., Jennings, E., Chavera, T.A., Clarke, W.P., and Berg, K.A.
(2018). Allosterism within δ opioid-κ opioid receptor heteromers in peripheral sensory
neurons: regulation of κ opioid agonist efficacy. Mol. Pharmacol. *93*, 376-386.

35. Jacobs, B.A., Pando, M.M., Jennings, E.M., Jamshidi, R.J., Zamora, J.C., Chavera, T.S.,
Clarke, W.P., and Berg, K.A. (2019). Signaling characteristics and functional regulation
of delta opioid-kappa opioid receptor (DOP-KOP) heteromers in peripheral sensory
neurons. Neuropharmacology *151*, 208-218.

36. Olson, K.M., Keresztes, A., Tashiro, J.K., Daconta, L.V., Hruby, V.J., and Streicher, J.M.
(2018). Synthesis and evaluation of a novel bivalent selective antagonist for the mu-
delta opioid receptor heterodimer that reduces morphine withdrawal in mice. J. Med.
Chem. *61*, 6075-6086.

37. Dijkman, P.M., Castell, O.K., Goddard, A.D., Munoz-Garcia, J.C., de Graaf, C., Wallace,
M.I., and Watts, A. (2018). Dynamic tuneable G protein-coupled receptor monomer-
dimer populations. Nat. Commun. *9*, 1710.

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

39. Fribourg, M., Moreno, J.L., Holloway, T., Provasi, D., Baki, L., Mahajan, R., Park, G., Adney,
S.K., Hatcher, C., Eltit, J.M.*, et al.* (2011). Decoding the signaling of a GPCR heteromeric
complex reveals a unifying mechanism of action of antipsychotic drugs. Cell *147*, 1011-
1023.

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

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

42. Kasai, R.S., and Kusumi, A. (2014). Single-molecule imaging revealed dynamic GPCR
dimerization. Current Opinion in Cell Biology *27*, 78-86.

43. Milligan, G., Ward, R.J., and Marsango, S. (2019). GPCR homo-oligomerization. Curr.
Opin. Cell Biol. *57*, 40-47.

44. Navarro, G., Cordomí, A., Casadó-Anguera, V., Moreno, E., Cai, N.-S., Cortés, A., Canela,

E.I., Dessauer, C.W., Casadó, V., Pardo, L.*, et al.* (2018). Evidence for functional pre-
coupled complexes of receptor heteromers and adenylyl cyclase. Nat. Commun. *9*, 1242.

45. Toneatti, R., Shin, J.M., Shah, U.H., Mayer, C.R., Saunders, J.M., Fribourg, M., Arsenovic, P.T., Janssen, W.G., Sealfon, S.C., López-Giménez, J.F.*, et al.* (2020). Interclass GPCR heteromerization affects localization and trafficking. Sci. Signal. *13*, eaaw3122.

46. Meral, D., Provasi, D., Prada-Gracia, D., Möller, J., Marino, K., Lohse, M.J., and Filizola, M. (2018). Molecular details of dimerization kinetics reveal negligible populations of transient μ-opioid receptor homodimers at physiological concentrations. Sci. Rep. *8*, 7705.

47. George, S.R., Fan, T., Xie, Z., Tse, R., Tam, V., Varghese, G., and O'Dowd, B.F. (2000). Oligomerization of mu- and delta-opioid receptors: generation of novel functional properties. J. Biol. Chem. *275*, 26128-26135.

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

49. Asher, W.B., Geggier, P., Holsey, M.D., Gilmore, G.T., Pati, A.K., Meszaros, J., Terry, D.S., Mathiasen, S., Kaliszewski, M.J., McCauley, M.D.*, et al.* (2021). Single-molecule FRET imaging of GPCR dimers in living cells. Nat. Methods *18*, 397-405.

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

51. Drakopoulos, A., Koszegi, Z., Lanoiselée, Y., Hübner, H., Gmeiner, P., Calebiro, D., and Decker, M. (2020). Investigation of inactive-state κ opioid receptor homodimerization via single-molecule microscopy using new antagonistic fluorescent probes. J. Med. Chem. *63*, 3596-3609.

52. Rogacki, M.K., Golfetto, O., Tobin, S.J., Li, T., Biswas, S., Jorand, R., Zhang, H., Radoi, V., Ming, Y., Svenningsson, P., et al. (2018). Dynamic lateral organization of opioid receptors (kappa, mu$_{wt}$ and mu$_{N40D}$) in the plasma membrane at the nanoscale level. Traffic *19*, 690-709.

53. Gentzsch, C., Seier, K., Drakopoulos, A., Jobin, M.-L., Lanoiselée, Y., Koszegi, Z., Maurel, D., Sounier, R., Hübner, H., Gmeiner, P.*, et al.* (2020). Selective and wash-resistant fluorescent dihydrocodeinone derivatives allow single-molecule imaging of μ-opioid receptor dimerization. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. *59*, 5958-5964.

54. Calebiro, D., Rieken, F., Wagner, J., Sungkaworn, T., Zabel, U., Borzi, A., Cocucci, E., Zürn, A., and Lohse, M.J. (2013). Single-molecule analysis of fluorescently labeled G-protein–coupled receptors reveals complexes with distinct dynamics and organization. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *110*, 743-748.

55. Hern, J.A., Baig, A.H., Mashanov, G.I., Birdsall, B., Corrie, J.E.T., Lazareno, S., Molloy, J.E., and Birdsall, N.J.M. (2010). Formation and dissociation of M1 muscarinic receptor dimers seen by total internal reflection fluorescence imaging of single molecules. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *107*, 2693-2698.

56. Kasai, R.S., Ito, S.V., Awane, R.M., Fujiwara, T.K., and Kusumi, A. (2018). The class-A

GPCR dopamine D2 receptor forms transient dimers stabilized by agonists: detection by single-molecule tracking. Cell Biochem. Biophys. *76*, 29-37.

57. Kasai, R.S., Suzuki, K.G.N., Prossnitz, E.R., Koyama-Honda, I., Nakada, C., Fujiwara, T.K., and Kusumi, A. (2011). Full characterization of GPCR monomer-dimer dynamic equilibrium by single molecule imaging. J. Cell Biol. *192*, 463-480.

58. Zhou, P., Kasai, R.S., Fujita W., Tsunoyama, T.A., Ueda H., Pigolotti, S., Fujiwara, T.K., and Kusumi, A. (2024). Single-molecule detection of transient dimerization of opioid receptors 2: Heterodimer blockage enhances morphine analgesia. Companion paper.

59. Cai, X., Bai, B., Zhang, R., Wang, C., and Chen, J. (2017). Apelin receptor homodimer-oligomers revealed by single-molecule imaging and novel G protein-dependent signaling. Sci. Rep. *7*, 40335.

60. Harikumar, K.G., Dong, M., Cheng, Z., Pinon, D.I., Lybrand, T.P., and Miller, L.J. (2006). Transmembrane segment peptides can disrupt cholecystokinin receptor oligomerization without affecting receptor function. Biochemistry *45*, 14706-14716.

61. Harikumar, K.G., Pinon, D.I., and Miller, L.J. (2007). Transmembrane segment IV contributes a functionally important interface for oligomerization of the Class II G protein-coupled secretin receptor. J. Biol. Chem. *282*, 30363-30372.

62. Hebert, T.E., Moffett, S., Morello, J.-P., Loisel, T.P., Bichet, D.G., Barret, C., and Bouvier, M. (1996). A peptide derived from a β2-Adrenergic receptor transmembrane domain inhibits both receptor dimerization and activation. J. Biol. Chem. *271*, 16384-16392.

63. Hernanz-Falcón, P., Rodríguez-Frade, J.M., Serrano, A., Juan, D., del Sol, A., Soriano, S.F., Roncal, F., Gómez, L., Valencia, A., Martínez-A, C., et al. (2004). Identification of amino acid residues crucial for chemokine receptor dimerization. Nat. Immunol. *5*, 216-223.

64. Jastrzebska, B., Chen, Y., Orban, T., Jin, H., Hofmann, L., and Palczewski, K. (2015). Disruption of rhodopsin dimerization with synthetic peptides targeting an interaction interface. J. Biol. Chem. *290*, 25728-25744.

65. McMillin, S.M., Heusel, M., Liu, T., Costanzi, S., and Wess, J. (2011). Structural basis of M3 muscarinic receptor dimer/oligomer Formation. J. Biol. Chem. 286, 28584-28598.

66. Petersen, J., Wright, S.C., Rodríguez, D., Matricon, P., Lahav, N., Vromen, A., Friedler, A., Strömqvist, J., Wennmalm, S., Carlsson, J., et al. (2017). Agonist-induced dimer dissociation as a macromolecular step in G protein-coupled receptor signaling. Nat. Commun. *8*, 226.

67. Pan, Y.X. (2003). Expression of opioid receptors in mammalian cell lines. In opioid research: methods and protocols, Z.Z. Pan, ed. (Totowa, NJ: Humana Press), pp. 17-28.

68. Koyama-Honda, I., Ritchie, K., Fujiwara, T., Iino, R., Murakoshi, H., Kasai, R.S., and Kusumi, A. (2005). Fluorescence imaging for monitoring the colocalization of two single molecules in living cells. Biophys. J. *88*, 2126-2136.

69. Koyama-Honda, I., Fujiwara, T.K., Kasai, R.S., Suzuki, K.G.N., Kajikawa, E., Tsuboi, H., Tsunoyama, T.A., and Kusumi, A. (2020). High-speed single-molecule imaging reveals signal transduction by induced transbilayer raft phases. J. Cell Biol. *219*.

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

71. Evans, E.J., Esnouf, R.M., Manso-Sancho, R., Gilbert, R.J.C., James, J.R., Yu, C., Fennelly, J.A., Vowles, C., Hanke, T., Walse, B., et al. (2005). Crystal structure of a soluble CD28-Fab complex. Nat. Immunol. *6*, 271-279.

72. Granier, S., Manglik, A., Kruse, A.C., Kobilka, T.S., Thian, F.S., Weis, W.I., and Kobilka, B.K. (2012). Structure of the δ-opioid receptor bound to naltrindole. Nature *485*, 400-404.

73. Huang, W., Manglik, A., Venkatakrishnan, A.J., Laeremans, T., Feinberg, E.N., Sanborn, A.L., Kato, H.E., Livingston, K.E., Thorsen, T.S., Kling, R.C.*, et al.* (2015). Structural insights into μ-opioid receptor activation. Nature *524*, 315-321.

74. Manglik, A., Kruse, A.C., Kobilka, T.S., Thian, F.S., Mathiesen, J.M., Sunahara, R.K., Pardo, L., Weis, W.I., Kobilka, B.K., and Granier, S. (2012). Crystal structure of the μ-opioid receptor bound to a morphinan antagonist. Nature *485*, 321-326.

75. Wu, H., Wacker, D., Mileni, M., Katritch, V., Han, G.W., Vardy, E., Liu, W., Thompson, A.A., Huang, X.P., Carroll, F.I.*, et al.* (2012). Structure of the human κ-opioid receptor in complex with JDTic. Nature *485*, 327-332.

76. Ferré, S., Casadó, V., Devi, L.A., Filizola, M., Jockers, R., Lohse, M.J., Milligan, G., Pin, J.-P., and Guitart, X. (2014). G protein–coupled receptor oligomerization revisited: functional and pharmacological perspectives. Pharmacol. Rev. *66*, 413.

77. Johnston, J.M., Aburi, M., Provasi, D., Bortolato, A., Urizar, E., Lambert, N.A., Javitch, J.A., and Filizola, M. (2011). Making structural sense of dimerization interfaces of delta opioid receptor homodimers. Biochemistry *50*, 1682-1690.

78. Marino, K.A., Prada-Gracia, D., Provasi, D., and Filizola, M. (2016). Impact of lipid composition and receptor conformation on the spatio-temporal organization of μ-opioid receptors in a multi-component plasma membrane model. PLoS Comput. Biol. *12*, e1005240.

79. Provasi, D., Boz, M.B., Johnston, J.M., and Filizola, M. (2015). Preferred supramolecular organization and dimer interfaces of opioid receptors from simulated self-association. PLOS Computat. Biol. *11*, e1004148.

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

81. Erdős, G., and Dosztányi, Z. (2020). Analyzing protein disorder with IUPred2A. Current protocols in bioinformatics *70*, e99.

82. Xhani, S., Lee, S., Kim, H.M., Wang, S., Esaki, S., Ha, V.L.T., Khanezarrin, M., Fernandez, G.L., Albrecht, A.V., Aramini, J.M.*, et al.* (2020). Intrinsic disorder controls two functionally distinct dimers of the master transcription factor PU.1. Sci. Adv. *6*, eaay3178.

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

84. Inomata, K., Ohno, A., Tochio, H., Isogai, S., Tenno, T., Nakase, I., Takeuchi, T., Futaki, S., Ito, Y., Hiroaki, H.*, et al.* (2009). High-resolution multi-dimensional NMR spectroscopy of proteins in human cells. Nature *458*, 106-109.

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

86. Keppler A, Pick H, Arrivoli C, Vogel H, Johnsson K. (2004) Labeling of fusion proteins with synthetic fluorophores in live cells. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *101*(27):9955-9959.

87. Smith, J.S., Pack, T.F., Inoue, A., Lee, C., Zheng, K., Choi, I., Eiger, D.S., Warman, A., Xiong, X., Ma, Z., et al. (2021). Noncanonical scaffolding of Gαi and β-arrestin by G protein–coupled receptors. Science *371*, eaay1833.

88. Asher, W.B., Terry, D.S., Gregorio, G.G.A., Kahsai, A.W., Borgia, A., Xie, B., Modak, A., Zhu, Y., Jang, W., Govindaraju, A., et al. (2022). GPCR-mediated β-arrestin activation deconvoluted with single-molecule precision. Cell *185*, 1661-1675.e1616.

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

90. Zhou, X.E., He, Y., de Waal, P.W., Gao, X., Kang, Y., Van Eps, N., Yin, Y., Pal, K., Goswami, D., White, T.A., et al. (2017). Identification of phosphorylation codes for arrestin recruitment by G protein-coupled receptors. Cell *170*, 457-469.e413.

91. Ménard, L., Ferguson, S., Zhang, J., Lin, F., Lefkowitz, R., Caron, M., and Barak, L. (1997). Synergistic regulation of beta2-adrenergic receptor sequestration: intracellular complement of beta-adrenergic receptor kinase and beta-arrestin determine kinetics of internalization. Mol. Pharmacol. *51*, 800-808.

92. Camarda, V., and Calo', G. (2013). Chimeric G proteins in fluorimetric calcium assays: Experience with opioid receptors. In Calcium Signaling Protocols, D.G. Lambert, and R.D. Rainbow, eds. (Totowa, N.J.: Humana Press), pp. 293-306.

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

94. Hauser, A.S., Kooistra, A.J., Munk, C., Heydenreich, F.M., Veprintsev, D.B., Bouvier, M., Babu, M.M., and Gloriam, D.E. (2021). GPCR activation mechanisms across classes and macro/microscales. Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol. *28*, 879-888.

95. Zhou, Q., Yang, D., Wu, M., Guo, Y., Guo, W., Zhong, L., Cai, X., Dai, A., Jang, W., Shakhnovich, E.I., et al. (2019). Common activation mechanism of class A GPCRs. Elife *8*. 10.7554/eLife.50279.

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

97. Koehl, A., Hu, H., Maeda, S., Zhang, Y., Qu, Q., Paggi, J.M., Latorraca, N.R., Hilger, D., Dawson, R., Matile, H., et al. (2018). Structure of the μ-opioid receptor–Gi protein complex. Nature *558*, 547-552.

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

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

100.   Manglik, A. (2020). Molecular Basis of Opioid Action: From Structures to New
Leads. Biol. Psychiatry *87*, 6-14.

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

102.   Huang, Y.H., Lin, S.Y., Ou, L.C., Huang, W.C., Chao, P.K., Chang, Y.C., Chang, H.F.,
Lee, P.T., Yeh, T.K., Kuo, Y.H., et al. Discovery of a mu-opioid receptor modulator that in
combination with morphinan antagonists induces analgesia. Cell Chem. Biol.
10.1016/j.chembiol.2024.06.013.

103.   Audet, N., Galés, C., Archer-Lahlou, É., Vallières, M., Schiller, P.W., Bouvier, M., and
Pineyro, G. (2008). Bioluminescence resonance energy transfer assays reveal ligand-
specific conformational changes within preformed signaling complexes containing δ-
opioid receptors and heterotrimeric G proteins *. J. Biol. Chem. *283*, 15078-15088.

104.   Ayoub, M.A., Trinquet, E., Pfleger, K.D.G., and Pin, J.-P. (2010). Differential
association modes of the thrombin receptor PAR1 with $G\alpha i1$, $G\alpha 12$, and β-arrestin 1.
FASEB J. *24*, 3522-3535.

105.   Bondar, A., and Lazar, J. (2017). The G protein G_{i1} exhibits basal coupling but not
preassembly with G protein-coupled receptors. J. Biol. Chem. *292*, 9690-9698.

106.   Naruse, K., Sai, X., Yokoyama, N., and Sokabe, M. (1998). Uni-axial cyclic stretch
induces c-src activation and translocation in human endothelial cells via SA channel
activation. FEBS Lett. *441*, 111-115.

107.   Nakamura, A., Oki, C., Kato, K., Fujinuma, S., Maryu, G., Kuwata, K., Yoshii, T.,
Matsuda, M., Aoki, K., and Tsukiji, S. (2020). Engineering orthogonal, plasma membrane-
specific SLIPT systems for multiplexed chemical control of signaling pathways in living
single cells. ACS Chem. Biol. *15*, 1004-1015.

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

109.   Lindberg, F.P., Gresham, H.D., Schwarz, E., and Brown, E.J. (1993). 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.

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

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

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

113.   Schindelin, J., Arganda-Carreras, I., Frise, E., Kaynig, V., Longair, M., Pietzsch, T.,

Preibisch, S., Rueden, C., Saalfeld, S., Schmid, B., et al. (2012). Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. Nat. Methods 9, 676-682.

114.   Fujiwara, T.K., Takeuchi, S., Kalay, Z., Nagai, Y., Tsunoyama, T.A., Kalkbrenner, T., Iwasawa, K., Ritchie, K.P., Suzuki, K.G.N., and Kusumi, A. (2023). Development of ultrafast camera-based single fluorescent-molecule imaging for cell biology. J. Cell Biol. *222*.

115.   Cowen, T., Haven, A.J., and Burnstock, G. (1985). Pontamine sky blue: A counterstain for background autofluorescence in fluorescence and immunofluorescence histochemistry. Histochemistry *82*, 205-208.

116.   Tsunoyama, T.A., Watanabe, Y., Goto, J., Naito, K., Kasai, R.S., Suzuki, K.G.N., Fujiwara, T.K., and Kusumi, A. (2018). Super-long single-molecule tracking reveals dynamic-anchorage-induced integrin function. Nat. Chem. Biol. *14*, 497-506.

117.   Murakoshi, H., Iino, R., Kobayashi, T., Fujiwara, T., Ohshima, C., Yoshimura, A., and Kusumi, A. (2004). Single-molecule imaging analysis of Ras activation in living cells. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. *101*, 7317-7322.

118.   Fujiwara, T.K., Iwasawa, K., Kalay, Z., Tsunoyama, T.A., Watanabe, Y., Umemura, Y.M., Murakoshi, H., Suzuki, K.G.N., Nemoto, Y.L., Morone, N.*, et al.* (2016). Confined diffusion of transmembrane proteins and lipids induced by the same actin meshwork lining the plasma membrane. Mol. Biol. Cell *27*, 1101-1119.

119.   Conklin, B.R., Farfel, Z., Lustig, K.D., Julius, D., and Bourne, H.R. (1993). Substitution of three amino acids switches receptor specificity of Gqα to that of Giα. Nature *363*, 274-276.

Figure 1

C

D

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Fig. S1

A

KOR dimer-colocalization

1 A B C
2 **3** **4** **5** **6** **7**

8 **9** **10** **11** **12** **13** **14**

KOR dimer-colocalization

2 μm (images)
0.4 μm (trajectories)

B

A

2 4
3 B 5

Colocalization A-B

C

12
11

Colocalization [A or B]-C

C

Green & Magenta

0.5~1.5 spots / μm²

D

Correct overlay

Experimental magenta image

Rotated magenta image

180°

Rotated overlay

Merge   Merge

Experimental green image

E

Spatial cross-correlation function

Number density of pairwise distances

3.0

2.0

1.0

0.0

0   100 200 300 400 500
Interparticle distance (nm)

Colocalization index

$$= \frac{\text{\# Density (0-100 nm)}}{\text{\# Density (400-500 nm)}}$$

Fig. S2

A Density of observed spots
(magenta + green spots/μm²)

0.5   1   2.5

K_D (copies/μm²): 1, 5, 20

○○ Monomer   ●● True dimer
▲▲ Incidental dimer

5 μm

B Default parameters
K_D = 5 (copies/μm²), Localization error: σ = 140 (nm)
Apparent total density = 1 (spots/μm²), Labeling efficiency: E= 0.7

—— Theory   ● Simulation

Normalized # density of pairwise dinstance: $N_p(r)$

K_D dependence
K_D = 1
(copies/μm²) 5
10
20

Localization error dependence
Localization error: σ = 70
(nm) 140
280

Density dependence
Apparent total density = 0.5
(spots/μm²) 1.0
2.0
5.0

Labeling efficiency dependence
Labeling efficiency: E = 0.5
0.7
1.0

Distance (nm)

C K_D: (copies/μm²)   Experimental data range
2   1   0   0.5 ~ 1.5
3
6.5
16.0
17.1
30
Inf

Colocalization index

Number density of the spots (spots/μm²)

D Actual data n = 120

Colocalization index

1.81   1.73   1.75

Number density of expressed
MOR molecules (spots/μm²)

E Experimental data range

K_D estimated from theory

True K_D for simulation = 1

True K_D for simulation = 5

True K_D for simulation = 15

Density of observed spots (spots/μm²)

Fig. S3

Rat opioid receptors

Fig. S4

Fig. S5

No quencher   + Mn^{3+}-TSP

No agonist

+ Agonist, 30min

20 μm

Fig. S6

Theory development

k_D = 5.9-16.4 copies/μm^2
k_{on} = 0.6-1.1 μm^2/copies/s

Agonists

Less specific
TM interactions

Xpep-TAT

Mononers

k_{off} = 6.7-8.5 s^{-1}

Xpep-TAT-induced
monomers

Specific
C-terminal domain binding

Gα β
γ

GRK
β-arrestin

Signal

KOR ↓
DOR ↑
MOR →

No difference in internalization
upon homodimerization

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

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.

Graphical Abstract

Highlights

- Opioid receptors rapidly interconvert between monomers and transient homodimers

- We developed theories for evaluating the dimer k_{off} and K_D in the plasma membrane

- C-terminal cytoplasmic domains are involved in specific homodimerization

- Homodimer blocking peptides modulate signaling but not receptor internalization

SUMMARY

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.