Correspondence: Dr. Alan M. Jones

Address: Department of Biology

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Coker Hall, CB#3280

Phone : (919) 962-6932

Fax: (919) 962-1625

E-mail: alan_jones@unc.edu

The author responsible for distribution of materials integral to the findings presented in this article

is Dr. Alan Jones alan_jones@unc.edu

Running Title: Biased System Signaling

Title: **Biased Signaling: Distinct Ligand-directed Plasma Membrane**

Signalosomes Using a Common RGS/ G protein Core

AUTHORS   Timothy J. Ross-Elliott[1], Justin Watkins[1], Xiaoyi Shan[2], Fei Lou[1], Bernd

Dreyer[1], Meral Tunc-Ozdemir[1], Haiyan Jia[1], Jing Yang[1], Luguang Wu[2], Yuri Trusov[3],

Patrick Krysan[4], and Alan M. Jones[1, 3, 5]

Department of [1] Biology and [3] Pharmacology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel

Hill, NC 27599, USA.

[2]Beijing Forestry University, Beijing China 1000083

[3]School of Agriculture and Food Science, The University of Queensland, St. Lucia, Q4072,

Australia.

[4]Department of Horticulture, University of Wisconsin Madison, Madison, WI 53706, USA

[5]Lead Contact

*Correspondence: alan_jones@unc.edu

Keywords: Arrestin analog, AtRGS1, calcium signaling, clathrin-mediated endocytosis, MAPK
activation, proximity labeling, sterol-dependent endocytosis, VPS26, WNK kinase,

Abbreviations: *Arabidopsis thaliana* **Regulator of G Signaling (AtRGS1), Clathrin-Mediated**
Endocytosis (CME), Sterol-Dependent Endocytosis (SDE), Total Internal Reflection
Fluorescence Microscopy (TIRF), Clathrin Light Chain (CLC), Flotilin 1 (FLOT1),
Vacuolar Protein Sorting 26 (VPS26)

SUMMARY

Biased signaling occurs when different ligands that are directed at the same receptor launch different cellular outcomes. Because of their pharmacological importance, we know the most about biased ligands and little is known about other mechanisms to achieve signaling bias. In the canonical animal G protein system, endocytosis of a 7-transmembrane GPCR desensitizes a cell from its extracellular signal. β-arrestins facilitate GPCR endocytosis but also propagate cytoplasmic signaling depending on the bias. In Arabidopsis, GPCRs are not required for G protein coupled signaling because the heterotrimeric G protein complex spontaneously exchanges nucleotide. Instead, the prototype 7-transmembrane Regulator of G Signaling 1 protein AtRGS1 modulates G signaling and through ligand-dependent endocytosis, de-repression of signaling is initiated but canonical arrestins are not involved. Endocytosis initiates from two separate pools of plasma membrane: microdomains and a clathrin-accessible neighborhood, each with a select set of discriminators, activators, and newly-discovered arrestin-like adaptors. Different trafficking origins and trajectories lead to different cellular outcomes. Thus, compartmentation with its attendant signalosome architecture is a previously unknown mechanism to drive biased signaling.

INTRODUCTION

Different ligands discriminated by the same receptor or utilizing the same core of signaling elements can set in motion a cascade of events that lead to multiple outcomes. When subsets of outcomes are ligand-specific, we label this biased signaling. This bias can be encoded in the ligand structure (biased ligands), in the receptors (biased receptors), or in the interactions between the signaling components (biased systems) (Smith et al., 2018). Of the three defined mechanisms,

biased ligands is the most widely studied because of its immediate pharmacological significance,

such as the development of drugs that provide analgesia without the addictive side effect (Manglik

et al., 2016; White et al., 2015; Wingler et al., 2019). **a)** Ligand bias occurs when a ligand stabilizes

one or few of several conformations of a receptor protein which then preferentially recruits or

activates signaling elements such as arrestin and the heterotrimeric G protein complex that lead

toward one cellular outcome over another (Bohn et al., 2000; DeWire et al., 2013). For example,

some ligands are biased towards β-arrestins (aka arrestin-2 and -3) signaling (Charest et al., 2007;

Gesty-Palmer et al., 2006; Shenoy et al., 2006) such as certain dopamine agonists compared to

dopamine which is biased towards D_2R-β-arrestin coupling (Allen et al., 2011). Certain opioid

agonists compared to morphine are biased toward G-protein signaling (DeWire et al., 2013; Rives

et al., 2012; White et al., 2015). **b)** Receptor bias occurs through recognition of the same ligand

by multiple receptor types (Géhin et al., 1999) including so-called decoy receptors (Lin and Hsieh,

2011; Pan et al., 1997), some of which may in fact be functional receptors that use non-classical

signaling pathways (Lin and Hsieh, 2011; Rajagopal et al., 2010a). Dopamine D_1 and D_2 class

receptors recognize dopamine, but signal through different subunits of Gα as well as arrestin (Urs

et al., 2017). **c)** System bias involves a cell-mediated shift to one pathway over another by some

unknown mechanism but one possibility is through mass action, for example, making arrestin more

abundant at the receptor than Gα or a particular kinase (Urs et al., 2016). This last category of bias

signaling is the least understood and the subject of the present work.

Phosphorylation patterns are the chemical bar codes for biased signaling at least for

arrestin-dependent outcomes (Butcher et al., 2011; Nobles et al., 2011; Shiraishi et al., 2018; Yang

et al., 2015; Yang et al., 2017). G-protein coupled Receptor Kinases (GRKs) phosphorylate the C-

terminus or other cytoplasmic elements of GPCRs in response to agonist binding (Choi et al.,

2018), unlike Protein Kinase A and C that phosphorylate GPCRs in a heterologous manner

(Benovic et al., 1986; Sibley et al., 1987). The subsequent coupling of arrestin to phosphorylated

GPCRs does not end G-protein-independent signaling. Arrestin-bound GPCRs further activates

some multiple kinase pathways including MAPK and tyrosine kinases (DeFea et al., 2000; Luttrell

et al., 2001; Rajagopal et al., 2010b) but not all (e.g. (O'Hayre et al., 2017)). While plants lack

GRKs, an Arabidopsis family of kinases called WITH NO LYSINE (**WNK**) Kinase phosphorylate

the C-terminal tail of the non-canonical 7-transmembrane Regulator of G Signaling (**AtRGS1**) in

response to extracellular glucose (Fu et al., 2014; Urano et al., 2012).   AtRGS1 is also

phosphorylated by other kinases including BAK1, a co-receptor for flg22 which is a Pathogen-

Associated Molecular Pattern (PAMP) (Liang et al., 2018; Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2017; Tunc-

Ozdemir et al., 2016) and loss of AtRGS1 and other G protein components severely affect

resistance in a wide range of pathogens (Zhong et al., 2018). System-biased signaling may be

particularly relevant in plants where AtRGS1 modulates intracellular signaling transduction

through G protein activation. AtRGS1 regulates G protein activation with ligand discrimination

likely facilitated by membrane bound Receptor Like Kinases (RLKs) of which there are more than

600 members in Arabidopsis (Shiu and Bleecker, 2001).

In animals, activation of G Protein signaling results from GDP exchange for GTP on the

Gα subunit, wherein this nucleotide exchange is the rate-limiting step (Ferguson et al., 1986).

Desensitization of the cell toward the signal occurs through endocytosis of the GPCR mediated by

arrestins (Benovic et al., 1987; Lohse et al., 1990). In Arabidopsis, however, the Gα subunit,

AtGPA1, spontaneously exchanges nucleotides without a GPCR thus it is self-activating with the

intrinsic GTPase activity being the rate-limiting step (Johnston et al., 2007; Jones et al., 2011a).

AtRGS1 accelerates the intrinsic GTPase of AtGPA1 (Jones et al., 2011b) and as a result, inactive

Gα remains bound to GDP until de-repression through AtRGS1 endocytosis, permitting Gα

activation through nucleotide exchange and subsequent downstream signal transduction (Urano et

al., 2012). This AtRGS1 endocytosis is a well-established proxy for sustained G protein activation

and the proportion of endocytosed AtRGS1 is linearly related to the proportion of G protein

activation (Fu et al., 2014). In Arabidopsis, sugars (Fu et al., 2014; Grigston et al., 2008) and flg22

(Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2016) activate AtRGS1 (Urano et al., 2012).

Physically de-coupling AtRGS1 from the heterotrimeric G protein complex by endocytosis

is the engine of the de-repression mechanism, at least for sustained activation. There are two modes

of endocytosis in plants: Clathrin-Mediated Endocytosis (**CME**) and Sterol-Dependent

Endocytosis (**SDE**) (Fan et al., 2015), however, the protein that directly couples to AtRGS1 and is

responsible for endocytosis is unknown. Extensive work elucidated the CME pathway in animal

and yeast systems with the function of many molecular components being well characterized. Of

particular interest is the ADAPTOR PROTEIN COMPLEX-2 (**AP-2**) that is required for

recognition and binding of cargo (Jackson et al., 2010; Kelly et al., 2008; Krauss et al., 2006),

recruiting clathrin to the PM, and the subsequent formation of clathrin-coated vesicles. In the

absence of AP-2 function, clathrin-coated vesicle formation is reduced and endocytosis is inhibited

(Boucrot et al., 2010). The AP-2 complex is a heteromeric complex consisting of 2 large subunits

(α2 and β2), 1 medium subunit (μ2), and 1 small subunit (σ2) (Collins et al., 2002).

SDE is a clathrin-independent mechanism for internalization of membrane-associated

proteins. Sometimes referred to as lipid raft endocytosis, SDE of these microdomains requires

flotilin1 (**Flot1**), and possibly the microdomain-associated remorin protein (Raffaele et al., 2009)

for internalization of sterol-rich vesicles (Li et al., 2012). Membrane proteins PIP2;1 and

Respiratory Burst Oxidase Homolog D (**RbohD**) are selectively internalized via sterol-dependent

endocytosis under salt stress conditions (Hao et al., 2014; Li et al., 2011).

We present data illustrating a biased system where two distinct extracellular ligands induce

endocytosis of AtRGS1 from separate plasma membrane origins, of which one is mediated by a

an arrestin-fold-containing protein, Vacuolar Protein Sorting 26 (VPS26). flg22 initiates AtRGS1

endocytosis via CME, while glucose activates both pathways of endocytosis. Phosphorylation of

AtRGS1 and involvement of individual subunits of the heterotrimeric G protein complex are also

ligand specific as are the immediate downstream consequences. From the CME-mediated-

AtRGS1 origin, flg22 induces a MAPK cascade known to drive transcriptional reprogramming

(Lee et al., 2015), whereas from the SDE-mediated-AtRGS1 origin, glucose induces

transcriptional change that is independent of the MAPK cascade.

RESULTS

Biased Signaling by Two Extracellular Signals

To date, there are 2 well-studied signals that directly and rapidly activate the Arabidopsis

heterotrimeric G protein signaling pathway through AtRGS1 endocytosis: **1)** flg22 which is a 22-

amino acid PAMP from the plant pathogen *Pseudomonas syringe* that is recognized on plant cells

to initiate the innate immunity pathway (Asai et al., 2002; Felix et al., 1999; Gómez-Gómez and

Boller, 2000). It is already established that flg22 is perceived extracellularly (e.g. (Jelenska et al.,

2017) by co-receptors BAK1 and FLS2 as part of a larger G protein complex (Sun et al., 2013;

Tunc-Ozdemir and Jones, 2017). **2)**. Glucose or a glucose metabolite which are products of

photosynthesis (Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2018) and metabolism of starch stores (Pharr and Keller,

2017).

Many sugars, although primarily sucrose, are transported extracellularly in the apoplastic

space where they are converted to glucose by cell wall localized invertases and potentially further

metabolized to a signal. These sugars are rapidly taken up through a large family of transporters

(Chen et al., 2010; Williams et al., 2000) where they are detected in the cytoplasm, but some sugars

may also be detected extracellularly (Li and Sheen, 2016). D-glucose or its metabolite induces

rapid endocytosis of AtRGS1-dependent sugar signaling (Fu et al., 2014; Urano et al., 2012) and

because AtRGS1 shares the membrane topology of GPCRs which perceive extracellular signals,

it has been assumed that the extracellular glucose or metabolite is perceived by the AtRGS1/G

protein complex. However, neither an extracellular site for perception nor direct evidence for

agonist binding to AtRGS1 has been shown. To address the former, impermeant sugars were

tested for the ability to activate G signaling.

The glucose-fructose dissacharide 6-0-α-D-glucopyranosyl-D-fructose (aka isomaltulose,

pallatinose), is presumed not to be transported across the plant cell membrane although it acts as

an active glucose precursor if synthesized intracellularly (Loreti et al., 2000; Sinha et al., 2002).

While the expression of sucrose isomerase in potato increased apoplastic isomaltulose, transport

across any membrane has yet to be demonstrated (Börnke et al., 2002). Importantly, isomaltulose

is not hydrolyzed extracellularly (Fernie et al., 2001; Wu and Birch, 2011). To determine if

isomaltulose is impermeant to the plasma membrane, we chemically synthesized [^{14}C]

isomaltulose (Figure S1A) and tested for uptake into Arabidopsis seedlings. Isomaltulose was at

least 9-fold less permeant to cells than glucose (Figure S1B). Therefore, to determine if sugars are

perceived extracellularly by hypocotyl cells, we tested the effect of isomaltulose on AtRGS1-YFP

endocytosis (Figure 1A) as a validated proxy for activation of G signaling as previously shown

(Fu et al., 2014; Urano et al., 2012). Whereas several mono and disaccharides failed to activate G

signaling, extracellular isomaltulose caused AtRGS1 internalization more effectively (P< 0.01)

than D-glucose (Figure 1B) despite being transported ~10-fold less suggesting that isomaltulose

activates AtRGS1 extracellularly. The 5% D-glucose impurity in the isomaltulose preparation

would induce at most 5% AtRGS1 internalization and therefore does not account for the observed

level of activation. Turanose is another disaccharide that is thought to be perceived extracellularly

(Loreti et al., 2000) and is impermeant (Rolland et al., 2002) therefore endpoint analysis was

performed using this sugar, and just as for both glucose and isomaltulose, turanose activated G

signaling (Figure 1C). Isomaltulose and turanose are disaccharides that share a glucose ring

(Figure 1D), suggesting that glucose or a glucose metabolite is the discriminated signal or is

important for a metabolic agonist (e.g. sugar nucleotides).

AtRGS1 Endocytic Pathway is Signal Biased

Having shown that extracellular flg22 is detected by BAK1/FLS2 (Chinchilla et al., 2006; Gómez-

Gómez and Boller, 2000; Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2016) and induces AtRGS1 endocytosis (Tunc-

Ozdemir et al., 2016) and that extracellular D-glucose acts upstream of AtRGS1 endocytosis, both

requiring at least in part the phosphorylation of AtRGS1 at its C terminal tail (Tunc-Ozdemir et

al., 2016; Urano et al., 2012), we turned to the question of whether these two signals activate the

same pool of AtRGS1. Endocytosis in plants utilizes two primary pathways: CME and SDE. Both

pathways have been individually associated with the activity of specific proteins and responses

(Adam et al., 2012; Dhonukshe et al., 2007; Irani et al., 2012; Li et al., 2012); for example, CME

and SDE cooperatively regulate the activity of RbohD in the flg22 pathway (Hao et al., 2014). We

used high-resolution microscopies to achieve the needed spatial and temporal resolution to answer

quantitative differences in signal-induced activation. To determine if one or both pathways

regulate AtRGS1 activity at the membrane, we induced internalization with D-glucose and *flg22*

while simultaneously inhibiting the CME pathway by arresting AP2μ function with

TyrphostinA23 (**TyrA23**) (Banbury et al., 2003; Dhonukshe et al., 2007) or inhibiting the SDE

pathway by suppressing microdomain formation via sterol solubilization with methyl-β-

cyclodextrin (**MβCD**) (Ilangumaran and Hoessli, 1998; Ohtani et al., 1989). MβCD, even at great

excess, did not block *flg22*–induced AtRGS1 internalization compared to the control ($p<0.01$)

(Figure 2A). Conversely, AtRGS1 internalization induced with glucose was reduced nearly 50%

compared to baseline with a minimum concentration of 5mM MβCD (Figure 2B). This suggests

that roughly half of the D-glucose-regulated pool of AtRGS1 is located in a SDE domain. To

determine if the CME pathway regulates AtRGS1 activity, we applied TyrA23 with *flg22* or D-

glucose. AtRGS1 internalization with both activators was significantly reduced ($p<0.01$);

completely for flg22-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis (Figure 2C) and by 50% for D-glucose-induced

AtRGS1 endocytosis (Figure 2D). The structurally similar but inactive TyrA23 analog

TyrphostinA51 showed no significant effect on AtRGS1 internalization ($p<0.01$) (Figure 2C and

2D, TyrA51), indicating that the inhibitory effect of TyrA23 is chemically specific (Banbury et

al., 2003). When both inhibitors were applied simultaneously with glucose, AtRGS1

internalization was ablated (Figure 2E). These results suggest that there is a single flg22-induced

pool that internalizes through a CME pathway and that there are two distinct glucose-induced

pools, one internalizes through the CME pathway and the other through the SDE pathway. Because

the glucose-induced pool is equally inhibited by the CME and SDE inhibitors, a rapid equilibrium

between the pools is not likely, otherwise neither inhibitor would have shown efficacy.

To further test our hypothesis of ligand-dependent membrane origins of AtRGS1

endocytosis, we used a genetic approach by measuring AtRGS1 internalization in the AP-2μ null

mutant, *ap2m* (Kim et al., 2013). The AP-2 complex plays a critical role in transporting cargo in

the CME pathway, whereby the μ subunit of this tetrameric AP-2 complex directly interacts with

cargo proteins during endocytosis (Bashline et al., 2013; Krauss et al., 2006). In the *ap2m* mutant

seedlings, flg22-induced AtRGS1 internalization was ablated ($p<0.01$), consistent with the

TyrA23 results (Figure 2F). In contrast, glucose resulted in less AtRGS1 internalization in the

ap2m mutant compared to Col-0 wild type ($p<0.01$). The addition of MβCD with glucose ablated

AtRGS1 internalization in the *ap2m* mutant to basal levels (Figure 2G). These observations are

consistent with two signal-dependent pools of AtRGS1 on the plasma membrane; 1) a homogenous

pool for flg22 signaling and 2) a conglomerate pool for D-glucose signaling.

A Point Mutation in the 7 Transmembrane Domain Disarms Biased Signaling

The μ subunit of the AP-2 complex is a cargo recognition and interaction component in the CME

pathway. It binds to known tyrosine motifs, YXXΦ, where X is any amino acid and Φ is an amino

acid with a hydrophobic side chain (Ohno et al., 1995). The second cytoplasmic loop in AtRGS1

contains such a motif with the amino acid sequence Y^{112}FIF (Chen et al., 2003). To determine if

this motif is necessary for AtRGS1 endocytosis and a potential binding motif for AP-2μ, we

generated AtRGS1 with a tyrosine to alanine mutation ($AtRGS1^{Y112A}$). flg22 failed to induce

endocytosis of the $AtRGS1^{Y112A}$ mutant (Figure 2H). Glucose-induced internalization of the

$AtRGS1^{Y112A}$ was reduced to half ($p<0.05$) compared to wild type internalization and was further

reduced to the resting level with the addition of MβCD ($p<0.01$) (Figure 2I) demonstrating that

the Y^{112}FIF is necessary for internalization and likely a recognition and binding site for AP-2μ.

The flg22-induced AtRGS1 pool is entirely mediated by the CME pathway whereas roughly half

of the D-glucose-induced AtRGS1 pool internalizes through the CME pathway.

Physically-Distinct, Dynamic Populations of AtRGS1: Architectural Basis for Biased Signaling

We showed through pharmacological and genetics approaches that two signal-dependent pools of AtRGS1 exist raising the possibility that the two AtRGS1 pools are physically distinct on the cell membrane. The differential dependence on sterol and clathrin for partial glucose- vs. flg22-induced endocytosis of AtRGS1 suggests this is the case. To test this hypothesis, we imaged AtRGS1 with a GFP C-terminal tag using Total Internal Reflection Microscopy (**TIRF**) and IMARIS (v9.2.2, Bitplane Inc) surface tracking (Figure S2 A-E, examples of raw data). We calculated the average size and speed of AtRGS1 proteins during a 30-second interval taken from time-lapse imaging at 5 and at 15 minutes post treatment with glucose and flg22. Two clearly distinct signal-dependent populations of AtRGS1 were observed (Figure 2J). After 5 minutes under glucose conditions, the surface area of AtRGS1-GFP clusters were significantly larger ($\ddot{x} = 0.9403$ μm^2 n=4619) than flg22 at ($\ddot{x} = 0.5998$ μm^2 n=2026) (Figure 2J inset) (p<0.01). At 15 minutes, the area of flg22 treated AtRGS1-GFP increased slightly to 0.6733 μm^2 (n=1751), with glucose treated AtRGS1-GFP, the area increased to 1.0072 μm^2 (n=6209) (Figure S2 F-H). Velocity differences for AtRGS1-GFP remain consistent between 5 and 15 minutes with flg22-treated AtRGS1 averages at 1.53µm/s and 1.63µm/s, respectively (n= 2026 and 1751) and glucose-treated AtRGS1 averages at 0.98µm/s and 1.01µm/s at 5 and 15 minutes, respectively (n= 4619 and 6209). Two populations of differently sized AtRGS1 protein clusters provides structural support for two origins of endocytosis.

The Signal Dependency Correlates with Endocytosis Marker Redistribution

The Clathrin Light Chain (**CLC**) and Flot1 proteins are associated with CME and SDE, respectively (Fan et al., 2015; Li et al., 2012). We generated transgenic lines expressing AtRGS1-

GFP with either CLC-mCherry or Flot1-mCherry endocytosis markers to investigate the

localization of AtRGS1 in relation to both markers. We imaged the response of both endocytosis

markers 5 minutes after application of water, flg22, and glucose to look for changes in marker

distribution in the cell (Figure 2K-P). Using Manders Overlap Coefficient, we quantified the co-

occurrence of both endocytosis markers with AtRGS1-GFP under all treatment conditions. We are

using Manders instead of Pearson's Correlation because our qualitative analysis shows a ligand

dependent change in marker localization and shape. We simply want to quantify the change in

overlap of the two signals (Manders) and not the change in signal intensity (Pearsons) that may

simply be a result of AtRGS1 internalization and not correlated to direct interaction with either

endocytosis marker.

A subset of the Manders Overlap Coefficients after background subtraction are shown in

Figure 2Q-V and correspond to the confocal micrographs in Figure 2K-P. M1 represents the

proportion of total GFP that overlaps with mCherry. Similarly, M2 represents the proportion of

total mCherry for CLC or FLOT1 that overlaps with GFP. Under conditions with no signaling

ligand (Figure 2K and 2N), RGS1-GFP and our endocytosis markers have a high overlap baseline

(Figure 2Q and 2R). Due to the restrictive cytoplasmic space, we believe this is not functional

interaction, merely fluorescence overlap due to high protein crowding and resolution limitation.

After flg22 addition (Figure 2L and 2O), the proportion of CLC associated with RGS1 decreased,

with the proportion of RGS1 overlapping with CLC also decreasing significantly (p<0.01) (Figure

2S. Simply stated, a smaller defined subset of the RGS1 and CLC populations are overlapping

with each other in a ligand-dependent manner with the endocytosis marker also exhibiting a

structural change. This response was not observed with FLOT1 when flg22 was added (Figure

2T). With glucose addition (Figure 2M and 2P) CLC showed no significant change compared to

water (Figure 2U), while FLOT1 overlap decreased with RGS1 compared to the water baseline

(p<0.01) (Figure 2V). The same responses were observed at 15 minutes post ligand addition

(Figure S2 I-T). The averages for the entire collection of M2 scores from all samples are presented

in Figure 2W. These results indicate that endocytosis markers are responding to specific ligands

and subsets of the total marker and AtRGS1 protein populations are overlapping in a signal specific

manner. In summary, the different intrinsic trafficking properties further support at least two pools

of ligand-activated AtRGS1.

Signaling Bias Involves Phosphorylation from Different Kinases.

Phosphorylation of AtRGS1 is a necessary requisite for both glucose- and flg22-induced

endocytosis. The C-terminus of AtRGS1 contains multiple di-serine residues that could function

as potential phosphorylation sites for signal transduction. A truncated version of AtRGS1 lacking

the 43 most C-terminal residues, AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$, served as a blunt phosphorylation-deficient mutation

to determine if the C-terminal tail, in particular any C-terminal serines located there are necessary

for AtRGS1 endocytosis (Figure S4A). Application of flg22 failed to internalize the AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$

mutant compared to water control (p<0.01) (Figure 3A). Glucose application however, internalized

the AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$ mutant, but at 50% the level of the wild type AtRGS1 (p<0.01). MβCD completely

inhibited internalization of the AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$ mutant levels (p<0.01) (Figure 3B). These results show

that the C-terminus is necessary for flg22- and glucose-induced endocytosis of AtRGS1 and

support two subpopulations of AtRGS1 among the glucose-induced pool.

Three phosphorylated serine residues on the C-terminus of AtRGS1 at positions 428, 435,

and 436 are necessary for at least partial endocytosis of AtRGS1 induced by both glucose and

flg22. Therefore, we mutated these serines to alanine (AtRGS1^{3SA}) to determine if those specific

residues were necessary to induce internalization by either agonist. Upon treatment with flg22,

AtRGS1^{3SA} internalization was at basal levels compared to wild type (p<0.01) (Figure 3C),

confirming previous results by Tunc-Ozdemir *et al* (Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2016) and suggesting

that the CME pathway is dependent on phosphorylation of serines 428, 435 and/or 436. In the case

of glucose, endocytosis was only partially impaired by the AtRGS1^{3SA} mutant (p<0.01) (Figure

3D). MβCD completely blocked glucose-induced endocytosis of the AtRGS1^{3SA} mutant (Figure

3D), consistent with our previous results that show glucose-induced internalization utilizes both

CME and SDE pathways and that the CME pathway requires phosphorylation at $Ser_{428/435/436}$.

These results enable us to exclude an osmotic effect that effectively sequesters a portion of

the plasma membrane pool of AtRGS1 into a sterol-dependent, or at least an MβCD-inhibitable,

microdomain that is incapable of internalizing its components. If an osmotic effect occurred, the

presence of MβCD would have prevented formation of these microdomains and consequently the

sequestration of AtRGS1 for the endocytic pool would cause 100% internalization by glucose.

This was not observed.

System Bias by Skewed Kinase and G-protein Complex Composition

Because the cluster of phosphorylated serines on the C-terminus of AtRGS1 are required for

AtRGS1 internalization, we hypothesize that one mechanism for system bias is to functionally-

sequester cognate kinases for glucose and flg22 in their respective ligand-delineated pools. To test

this hypothesis, we quantified AtRGS1 internalization in the mutant backgrounds of the flg22-

activated FLS2 kinase (*fls2*) and BAK1 co-receptor (*bak1*) and the D-glucose-activated WNK

kinase (*wnk8*-2, *wnk1*-1) null mutants. Upon treatment with flg22, AtRGS1 endocytosis was

ablated in *fls2* and *bak1-4* mutants (P<0.01), while glucose-induced internalization in these

mutants was unaffected (P=0.70 and 0.37 respectively) (Figure 3E and 3F). In contrast, D-glucose-

induced internalization in the *wnk8-2* was ablated (p<0.01), while flg22-induced AtRGS1

endocytosis was unaffected (P=0.89) (Figure 3G). Interestingly, a low dose, long duration application of 2% glucose over 6 hours to *wnk1-1* had no discernable affect compared to wild type (Figure S3A), prompting a revisit of the proposed mechanism that WNK1 kinase mediates low dose-long duration activation by glucose (Fu et al., 2014). Our results suggest that FLS2 and BAK1 are specific to the CME pathway and WNK8 kinase is specific to the SDE pathway.

The canonical components of the heterotrimeric G protein complex are necessary for glucose-induced internalization of AtRGS1 (Fu et al., 2014; Urano et al., 2012). More specifically, Gβγ is required for the recruitment of WNK kinases for phosphorylation of AtRGS1, leading to AtRGS1 endocytosis and activation of downstream G signaling. We hypothesized that individual components of the G protein heterotimer may be required for biased signaling. To test this hypothesis, we quantified AtRGS1 endocytosis in G protein mutant backgrounds after flg22 and glucose activation. In the AtGPA1 (Gα) null background, *gpa1-4,* AtRGS1 endocytosis showed no significant difference compared to wild type when glucose was applied (p=0.48) (Figure 3H). After addition of flg22, however, AtRGS1 endocytosis was at basal levels ($p < 0.01$) in the absence of Gα indicating that the G subunit is essential for this pathway (Figure 3H). We additionally tested AtRGS1 in the absence of XLG2, one member of a three-gene family of atypical, G proteins. XLG proteins have a homologous C-terminal Gα domain and N-terminal nuclear localization signal (Ding et al., 2008). Loss of XLG2 in the *xlg2-1* mutant, did not affect AtRGS1 endocytosis by glucose application (p=0.43), but completely inhibited AtRGS1 endocytosis to basal levels after addition of flg22 (p<0.01) (Figure 3I). Additionally, low dose, long duration glucose application had no effect in the *xlg2*-1 mutant compared to wild type (Figure S3B). In the *agb1-2/agg1* double null mutant, AtRGS1 endocytosis was diminished after addition of flg22 (p<0.01) (Figure 3J). Loss of the Gβγ dimer in the *agb1-2/agg1* mutant had no effect on glucose-induced AtRGS1

endocytosis compared to wild type after 30 minutes of treatment with 6% D-glucose (p=0.79)

(Figure 3J). Interestingly, a 2% - 6 hour application of D-glucose required AGB1/AGG1 for

activation (p<0.01) (Figure 3K).

VPS26 a Candidate Plant β-arrestin-like Adaptor Necessary for AtRGS1 Endocytosis in the

CME Pathway: Discovery and Validation

In the animal G signaling pathway, GPCR endocytosis results in β–arrestin-mediated

desensitization of the cell from an extracellular signal. Higher plant genomes do not encode

ancestral α-arrestins or canonical (i.e. visual and nonvisual) arrestins (Alvarez, 2008). We sought

candidate adaptors for AtRGS1 that may function like β-arrestins to recruit AP2/clathrin to

AtRGS1 for endocytosis by querying 3-D structure databases. As shown in Figure S4A and B, we

identified three *Arabidopsis* VACUOLAR PROTEIN SORTING 26 (VPS26) proteins that contain

arrestin folds (Oliviusson et al., 2006) and are orthologous to human VPS26. *Arabidopsis* VPS26A

and VPS26B amino acid sequences are 91% identical whereas VPS26-like is 20% identical to

VPS26A and VPS26B. In mammals and plants, VPS26 operates with VPS29 and VPS35 in the

retromer complex on the endosome (Zelazny et al., 2013). This raises the possibility that VPS26

proteins have a moonlighting function in modulating AtRGS1 internalization.

To compare the arrestin and AtVPS26A protein structures, we first created a model of

AtVPS26A using MODELLER (Martí-Renom et al., 2000). Toward this, a high quality

homogeneous sequence alignment was generated using the VPS26 family (Arabidopsis VPS26A,

VPS26B, VPS26like and Homo sapiens VPS26A) and arrestin family (Vertebrates: Human

arrestin-1 and arrestin-2; bovine arrestin-1, arrestin-2, arrestin-2, and a variant p44; Squid arrestin-

1; and the invertebrate shrimp arrestin (Figure S5A). Human, bovine, and squid sequences were

included because PDB structures are available. The squid and shrimp sequences were added for

divergence information (among the opistokonts). AtVPS26A and human VPS26A share 56.48%

sequence identity while AtVPS26A and arrestins share only 14-17% sequence identities (Figure

S5B). These results rationalized our use of the high-resolution (2.1Å) crystal structure of *Homo*

sapiens Vps26a (PDB [2FAU]) rather than an arrestin structure to generate models of AtVPS26A

for subsequent comparison to arrestin. Details of the top five selected models (atvps26a1 →5) are

provided in the Methods.

We compared the atvps26a-2 model with the bovine arrestin-3 (PDB [3P2D (Zhan et al.,

2011)]). Although the primary amino acid identity between arrestin and AtVPS26A is only ~15%

(Figure 4A), the structure of AtVPS26A model shows a remarkably similar arrestin scaffold with

arrestin which contains a semi-symmetric fold of two β strand sandwich structures in the N domain

and C domains linked by the central loops with each sandwich formed by 3 or 4 β sheets,

respectively.

For arrestin, the conserved structures mainly include the N-terminal and C-terminal arm,

central crest comprised of a finger loop (Hirsch et al., 1999), a middle loop (Kim et al., 2012;

Shukla et al., 2013); see box ii of Fig. 4) and C loop (Kang et al., 2015) see box I of Fig. 4), Figure

4A), the gate loop, polar core, and the hinge domain (Peterson and Luttrell, 2017). The N-terminal

and C-terminal arms stabilize the arrestin conformation. Model atvps26a-2 shares similar N-

terminal and C-terminal scaffolds with arrestin however it lacks a short α-helix inside the arrestin

N-terminal domain (Figure 4B) which has been implicated in receptor binding (Vishnivetskiy et

al., 2011). In addition, arrestin has a longer C-terminal tail, which extend all the way to bind the

N terminal domain, important for linkage to enable CME. The C terminus of atvps26a-2 has no

extension however some arrestins also have a short C-tail (Gurevich and Gurevich, 2006).

The overall central crest of atvps26a-2 is similar with that of arrestin which includes the

finger loop, middle loop and the C loop (Figure 4C). While arrestin has a longer finger loop

important for receptor binding. The rearrangement of the finger loop is a major change associated

with arrestin activity, likely serving as a critical part of the activation sensor (Chen et al., 2018).

The polar core is the key component of the phosphate sensor. In arrestin, the polar core is

comprised of five charged side chains including two Arg and three Asp that are essential to its

activation (Vishnivetskiy et al., 1999). The residues in the polar core of bovine arrestin-3 are:

Asp_{27}, Arg_{170}, Asp_{291}, Asp_{298} and Arg_{393} (Figure 4D and E). The human vps26A also contains a

polar core between the N terminal and C terminal domains which includes the N domain residues

Glu_{119} and Tyr_{121}, and C domain residues Lys_{213}, Glu_{215}, Thr_{258}, Tyr_{272}, and Arg_{296} (Shi et al.,

2006). The residues of the polar core of VPS26 are conserved suggesting that they play a critical

role in protein function. We thus labeled the polar core of atvps26a according to the human vps26a

template. The residues of atvps26a are the N-domain residues Glu_{118} and Tyr_{120}, and C domain

residues Arg_{213}, Glu_{215}, Thr_{258}, Tyr_{272}, and Arg_{296} (Figure 4 F and G). Although different amino

acid composition, both cores consist of positive charged residues and allow the formation of

hydrogen bonds under physiological conditions. However, the orientation and shape of the polar

core of VPS26 is distinct from arrestin. The arrestin polar core is embedded between β sheets in

the N terminal domain whereas the VPS26 core is open and elongated, spanning the length of

space between the N domain and C domain.

The most divergent arrestin structure from 3P2D is a 3Å-resolved truncated arrestin from

squid (PDB 1CF1, (Bandyopadhyay et al., 2018). Unlike for bovine arrestin, the C-tail interaction

with the gate loop of the polar core is weak and flexible.   This functional divergence between

squid and human arrestin, both recruited to receptors, tempers the impact of the lack of a long C-

tail in the atvps26a-2 model.

Taken together, these similarities between AtVPS26 and arrestin prompted the hypothesis

that AtVPS26 is a candidate adaptor for CME of AtRGS1. Therefore, we isolated null alleles of

the three VPS26 genes in Arabidopsis: VPS26A, VPS26B, and VPS26-LIKE (aka VPS26C) (Jha

et al., 2018; Zelazny et al., 2013) and phenotyped the hypocoty length at 5 days, the relevant stage

for our cytological analyses. As shown in Figure S4F, there were no qualitative differences

between VPS26 null mutants and Col-0 precluding any developmental basis for alterations in

AtRGS1 activation in these mutants. In addition, the AtRGS1-YFP reporter was combined with

the mutant backgrounds through generating stable transformants. As shown in Figure 4H, loss of

either VPS26A or VPS26B dramatically reduced the flg22-induced internalization of AtRGS1 to

levels that are not statistically different from the baseline level (p=0.34) whereas loss of VPS26-

like had no statistical effect on AtRGS1 internalization by flg22 (p=0.65). Loss of any of the three

VPS26 proteins had no statistical effect on glucose-induced internalization of AtRGS1 (p<0.001)

suggesting that VPS26A/B are involved in flg22- but not glucose-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis.

To confirm that VPS26 is not involved in glucose-induced AtRGS1 internalization, we quantitated

the CME and SDE portions of this trafficking pathway in the *vps26* mutants. As shown in Figure

4I, in each of the *vps26* mutant backgrounds, both the TyrA23A and MβCD-inhibitable segments

of the glucose-induced internalization of AtRGS1 remained intact. This suggests that the TyrA23-

dileneated (CME) pathway used by AtRGS1 when activated by flg22 differs from the TyrA23A-

dileneated pathway activated by D-glucose.

The genetic data suggest that VPS26A and B form dimers. To test if VPS26 A and B

subunits heterodimerize *in vivo*, BiFC analysis was conducted and showed that heterodimers can

form from ectopically-expressed monomers and suggested that the orientation is head-to-tail

(Figure 5A). Self-association of arrestin family members also occurs and may be part of a

regulatory mechanism for arrestin activation (Chen et al., 2014). For relative quantitation of *in*

vivo interaction, split luciferase was performed and found that the strongest interaction was

between VPS26A and VPS26B (Figure 5B). VPS26B dimers form under these conditions but not

VPS26A dimers or any oligomer with VPS26Like subunits. We have yet to find conditions which

allow stable expression of VPS26 subunits tagged with a full-length auto-fluorescent protein in

Arabidopsis suggesting that the additional mass of the tag prevents dimer formation and that

monomers are unstable.

To test if the full-length AtRGS1 protein interacts with the VPS26 subunits *in vivo*, BiFC,

split luciferase, and Y2H analyses were performed. Fluorescent complementation of YFP by

AtRGS1-nYFP with cYFP-VPS26A and with VPS26B-cYFP was observed (Figure 5C). The split

luciferase assay confirmed that this interaction is as strong as the interaction between AtGPA1 and

its AGB1/AGG1 partner (Figure 5D). Finally, Y2H showed that the interaction between AtRGS1

and VPS26 is direct. The entire C-terminal half of AtRGS1 (thus lacking the 7 TM domain)

interacts with VPS26B. Surprisingly, removal of the post RGS-box C-terminal tail which includes

the $Ser_{428,435,436}$ phosphorylation cluster did not ablate this interaction however, additional loss of

two other phosphorylated Ser located between helices VII and VIII of the RGS box completely

abolished the interaction.

Biased Signaling Outputs

While both D-glucose and flg22 result in different RGS1-YFP trafficking, we asked what other

signaling outputs distinguish these ligands. Two rapid events of the flg22 response is the induction

of MITOGEN ACTIVATED PROTEIN KINASE 6 (MPK6) activity and Ca^{2+} signaling (Ranf et

al., 2011). To test the impact of flg22 and D-glucose on MPK6 activity in etiolated hypocotyls, we

developed a FRET-based sensor that measures kinase activity specifically for MPK6, called *S*ensor

*O*f *M*APK *A*ctivity (SOMA) (Zaman et al., 2019). We used SOMA lines tagged with either the

human immunodeficiency virus 1 (HIV-1) nuclear export signal (SOMA-NES) or the SV40

nuclear localization signal (SOMA-NLS) (Kalderon et al., 1984; Wen et al., 1995) to measure

MPK6 activity in the cytosol or nucleus, respectively. To validate these reporters in hypocotyl

epidermal cells, we quantitated FRET efficiency in the SOMA lines in response to 150 mM NaCl

as a positive control (Droillard et al., 2004). FRET efficiency increased rapidly in SOMA-NES

and SOMA-NLS in response to NaCl with no response observed when treated with water (Fig S6

A-D). Additionally, flg22 treatment did not cause substantial FRET efficiency changes in negative

control reporter lines: SOMA^{T679A}-NES or SOMA^{T679A}-NLS, which contain mutations in the

known phosphorylation site of SOMA that are necessary for FRET changes (Fig S6 E, F). As

shown in Figures 6E and F, rapid FRET gains were observed in both SOMA-NES and SOMA-

NLS within 2-4 minutes after treatment with flg22. When treated with 6% D-glucose, no change

in FRET efficiency was observed, suggesting that D-glucose does not induce activity of MPK6

(Fig 6G and H).

To determine if CME-mediated endocytosis regulates flg22-induced MPK6 activity, we

pretreated SOMA-NES lines with TyrA23. TyrA23 successfully blocked the increases in FRET

efficiencies that were observed in the absence of the inhibitor (Fig 6E, replicates in Fig S6 G-N).

The negative control TyrA51 showed no significant effect on FRET efficiency after treatment with

flg22 (Fig S6 P-V), indicating that the inhibitory effect of TyrA23 is specific to its role in blocking

CME-mediated endocytosis and suggesting that AtRGS1 endocytosis, per se, is required.

However, we do not exclude the possibility that within the context of flg22-induced MAPK

signaling that some other CME-mediated step is rate-limiting.

Because D-glucose utilizes both CME and sterol-dependent pathways to induce AtRGS1

internalization, we tested if the depletion of CME pools of AtRGS1 by D-glucose would alter

flg22-induced MPK6 activation. After pretreating SOMA-NES lines with D-glucose for 30

minutes prior to imaging, we found that D-glucose did not have an effect on flg22-increased FRET

efficiency (Fig 6G inset) suggesting that the glucose pool of AtRGS1 is sequestered from the flg22-

induced CME of AtRGS1.

We tested the role of D-glucose and flg22 in triggering an increased Ca^{2+} transient response

using the intensity-based Ca^{2+} sensor R-GECO1, a red-shifted intensity-based Ca^{2+} reporter

(Keinath et al., 2015). We used stable transgenic Arabidopsis lines in wild type and *rgs1-2*

backgrounds expressing cytosolic- and nuclear-localized R-GECO1. For our assay, D-glucose and

flg22-induced Ca^{2+} signals in wild type and *rgs1-2* plants were measured over a time course in

etiolated hypocotyls and normalized against the untreated samples (Fig 6I and 6J). Ca^{2+} levels

represented by fractional fluorescence changes ($\Delta F/F$; the difference between the fluorescence

intensity before and after flg22 application divided by initial fluorescence intensity) increased in

wild type (p< 0.01) while $\Delta F/F$ was greatly diminished ($\Delta F/F = \sim 0.01$) in the *rgs1*-2 mutant in

response to flg22. D-glucose treatments did not significantly alter the $\Delta F/F$ in Col-0 wild type or

rgs1-2 mutant (p=0.62), suggesting that D-glucose does not utilize AtRGS1 in a Ca^{2+} branch of the

pathway. Despite both D-glucose and flg22 inducing AtRGS1-internalization, these results show

that within this context, only flg22 is capable of inducing MPK6 activity and Ca^{2+} changes.

Here, we showed that D-glucose signaling mediated by AtRGS1 does not involve MAPK

or Ca^{2+} branches, however, D-glucose has been shown to elicit a change in expression of a small

set of genes (Grigston et al., 2008; Urano et al., 2012). *TRICHOMELESS LIKE 26* (*TBL26*) is

induced by glucose in an AtRGS1/G protein complex-dependent manner (Grigston et al., 2008)

and has since been used as a reporter for activation (Fu et al., 2014; Urano et al., 2016; Urano et

al., 2012). Paradoxically, the loss of AtRGS1 inhibits *TBL26* expression indicating that genetically,

AtRGS1 is a positive modulator of signaling, contradictory to our understanding that RGS proteins

negatively modulate G protein activation. One solution to this paradox is that endocytosis of

AtRGS1 is required for signal propagation. To test this, we quantitated glucose-induced *TBL26*

expression in the presence of TyrA23 and found that expression is dramatically reduced (Fig 6L).

This is consistent with the notion that AtRGS1 signaling has an endosomal origin, analogous to

some GPCRs (Eichel and von Zastrow, 2018).

DISCUSSION

The key finding in this study is system bias wherein a single receptor-like RGS protein modulates

different quantifiable signaling outputs from two distinct signal inputs (Figure 7A). All of the

measured signal outputs correspond to a specific ligand input. For example, flg22 induces Ca^{2+}

release (Figure 6I-K) and MAPK signaling (Figure 6E-H, K) whereas D-glucose or its metabolite

has a measured effect on gene expression (Figure 6L). For flg22, all members of the G protein

heterotrimer, along with XLG2 and VPS26A/B are necessary for CME of AtRGS1. Additionally,

specific phosphorylation of di-serines at the AtRGS1 C-terminus is required. What is interesting

is that glucose signaling that transduces through the same CME of AtRGS1 also requires

phosphorylation of the same di-serine residues, but not VPS26 for high dose and low duration

sugar exposure (Figure 7B). This phenomenon of signaling through AtRGS1 mediated by the same

mechanism of phosphorylation-dependent endocytosis with different G proteins and adapters

raises the important question of how are extracellular ligands discriminated for downstream

signaling events? Although AtRGS1 endocytosis is necessary for G protein activation it would

seem that AtRGS1 is not the discriminator; rather an RLK protein that directly phosphorylates

AtRGS1, AtGPA1 and possibly VPS26, to provide the requisite information for ligand-specific

downstream signal transduction in the cell.

The two mechanisms of AtRGS1 endocytosis induced by D-glucose or its metabolites

implies that this signal-dependent pool of AtRGS1 is bipartite, prompting the question of an

equilibrium or steady state between the populations. The evidence so far suggests that it is not. If

these AtRGS1 pools were dynamically exchanging within the membrane, we would expect to

induce internalization of nearly all membrane bound AtRGS1 by inhibiting one mechanism of

endocytosis thereby causing a shift entirely to the other. For example, inhibiting CME with

TyrA23 would force AtRGS1 endocytosis entirely to the SDE mode, however this was not

observed. Inhibiting one mechanism of endocytosis only partly reduced AtRGS1 internalization

by half, indicating the AtRGS1 populations may be physically isolated and static in the cell

membrane (Figure 7C). Some AtRGS1 proteins may be grouped into so-called microdomains or

clusters surrounded by receptor/co-receptor RLK proteins while other AtRGS1 may be distributed

throughout the membrane without common neighbor RLKs (Figure 7C).

Similarly, the question exists whether an equilibrium between the flg22-mediated and D-

glucose-mediated CME pools exists and the conclusion is again that equilibria are not likely,

consistent with a genuine bias in signaling. To clarify, what we define as the "CME pools" here,

they are the portion of either the flg22- or D-glucose-activated AtRGS1 population that is inhibited

by TyrA23, by loss of the tyrosine binding motif, and by loss of the AP2μ subunit of the clathrin

complex (Figure 2). While the two pools share these properties, they do not share the requirement

of the candidate adapter, VPS26 monomer or dimer (Figure 4). Moreover, when the AtRGS1 pool

at the plasma membrane is depleted with D-glucose, there is no effect on the amplitude of flg22

activation (Figure 6).

The two mechanisms in the composite glucose-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis may be a

result of two distinct mechanisms of sugar perception: one through direct interaction of AtRGS1

with a sugar or sugar metabolite and the other through sugar binding to a RLK in the membrane

similar to flg22::FLS2 binding (Figure 7D). To compare and contrast these two ligand-biased

trajectories, the ordered steps of signal transduction from ligand perception (**step 1**) to

internalization of AtRGS1 (**step 5**) are enumerated in Figure 7D to illustrate mechanistically what

the present work revealed about each origin of endocytosis including phosphorylation (flg22- **step**

2/glucose- **step 2**), binding of our candidate adaptor VPS26 (flg22- **step 3**), formation of clathrin

coated vesicles (flg22- **step 4**/glucose- **step 3**), and finally endocytosis of AtRGS1 either via

clathrin coated vesicle (flg22- **step 5/** glucose **step 4**) or sterol dependent rafts (glucose). If glucose

or a metabolite is perceived by two distinct sensing mechanisms, each mechanism may operate

exclusively through one origin of endocytosis with a unique core of G protein and internalization

signaling components. Interestingly, within the glucose model, a system bias may exist favoring

one origin of endocytosis that results from architectural differences in the membrane surrounding

AtRGS1. A high density of glucose-binding RLKs may favor glucose-induced CME of AtRGS1

over the SDE origin.

The division of G protein involvement in glucose-induced CME and SDE challenges

previously published reports on the necessity for subunits of the G protein heterotrimer in the full

range of glucose signaling through AtRGS1; specifically shown was the complete abrogation of

AtRGS1 endocytosis in the Gβ null mutant and partial reduction of glucose-induced endocytosis

with the loss of Gα (Urano et al., 2012). Our results confirm that Gβ is required for AtRGS1

endocytosis, but only in a low dose scenario, 2% (~110 nM). We show no requirement for Gβ or

Gα at the higher 6% (~330nm) glucose concentration. It may be that higher sugar concentrations,

those typically found at or around vascular unloading areas, illicit a quicker signaling response

than low dose sugar likely found in or near epidermal cells where we quantified AtRGS1

internalization. The significance of sugar signaling with regard to cell growth, division, and

maintenance may necessitate multiple dose-dependent mechanisms of signal transduction encoded

in different origins of endocytosis and the individual G protein associated components.

Both flg22- and D-glucose outputs require AtRGS1 (Chen et al., 2003; Grigston et al.,

2008; Liang et al., 2018; Tunc-Ozdemir and Jones, 2017) and an intact heterotrimeric G protein

complex (Figure 3) but as discussed for D-glucose responsiveness, the outputs depends on both the

concentration and duration of D-glucose. We previously designated this non-threshold-based

activation phenomenon as Dose-Duration Reciprocity (**DDR**) where a low dose of D-glucose for

a long period reaches the same output amplitude as a high dose presented as a pulse (Fu et al.,

2014). The proposed mechanism is recruitment of WNK8 and WNK1 to the membrane by the

Gβγ dimer AGB1/AGG as a function of DDR to phosphorylate AtRGS1 for endocytosis.

However, our higher resolution analyses here challenge some aspects of that mechanism and

provide deeper mechanistic insight. AGB1 is essential for low D-glucose DDR but is not required

for high-glucose DDR. WNK8 kinase is required as previously shown but WNK1 is shown to not

be required at longer low-glucose treatments (6 hours) in contrast to previously published data (Fu,

et al 2014). This discrepancy is most likely due to differences in expression level between studies

(transient for Fu, et al 2014 and stable here) because glucose responsiveness is sensitive to the

pool size of AtRGS1 (Liao et al., 2017).

Besides the 2 visual and 2 non-visual (aka β-) arrestins, the arrestin super family in humans

also has 6 α-arrestin members. These α–arrestins have diverse functions including trafficking of

non-GPCRs (Patwari and Lee, 2012) and may be closest to the ancestral arrestin from which the

visual/non-visual arrestins evolved because they are found in stromenopiles basal to the opistokont

lineage containing metazoans and fungi (Alvarez, 2008). Therefore, we asked whether Plantae

contains α–arrestin homologs and are thus the true adaptors for trafficking plant 7TM proteins.

While we found clear α–arrestin orthologs in the 4-cell alga *Tetrtabaena* (PNH03120) and in the

green alga *Chara* (GBG71752), both basal to land plants, using *Mus* ARRDC3/TLIMP (BAC65781)

as the search query, no hits were found in Arabidopsis (eudicot), *Amborella* (base of angiosperms),

rice (monocot), and *Physcomitrella* (basal to higher land plants). This suggests that α–arrestins

were lost in the plantae kingdom and this loss possibly allowed expansion of the related VPS26

family to evolve other function(s) (Alvarez, 2008).

Given the fact that many GPCR-containing organisms divergent to humans lack arrestin

proteins, another important finding from this study is the suggestion that the retromer subunits

AtVPS26A and B moonlight as arrestin-like adaptors for phosphorylation-induced, clathrin-

dependent AtRGS1 endocytosis in Arabidopsis. Could this function be ubiquitous? Even in

humans, some GPCR endocytosis occurs independently of β-arrestins yet still requires C-terminal

phosphorylation, a tyrosine motif, AP2, and clathrin (e.g. (Paing et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2016))

raising the possibility that VPS26 orthologs in humans may serve the exact adaptor function for a

subset of GPCRs.

This study focuses on biased signaling launched from different architectures of two

AtRGS1-centered pathways. We show that phosphorylation by different sets of kinases encodes

this bias. However, we have not address how the architecture is established or maintained but we

speculate that this too is based on a phosphorylation bar code on the AtRGS1/G protein complex.

Therefore, establishing the dynamics of both the pre- and post-signaling phosphorylation bar codes

is important for our understanding of biased system signaling.

Why both cytoplasmic and extracellular glucose pools are monitored by the plant cell

remains unclear. We speculate that the extracellular pool of glucose is far more dynamic than the

cytoplasmic pool due to its rapid metabolic flux in the cytoplasm compared to the apoplast.

Therefore, an extracellular glucose detection system may be more appropriate for monitoring

sugars produced by photosynthesis for real time information. This is consistent with the recent

finding that AtRGS1 is important for detecting fluctuations in CO_2-fixed sugar in the minute time

range over the diel cycle (Chen et al., 2003; Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2018).

It is conceivable that this biased system sits at the crux of the "defense vs. growth trade-

off" dilemma that plants face. Specifically, pathogen attack compels the plant to shift its utilization

of fixed sugars from building cell walls to synthesizing defense molecules (Huot et al., 2014). The

AtRGS1/G protein complex may be the fulcrum for this balance because AtRGS1 is involved in

detecting fixed sugars (Mudgil et al., 2016; Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2018), establishing cell wall

composition (Delgado-Cerezo et al., 2012; Escudero et al., 2017; Klopffleisch et al., 2011) and

serving as a sentinel in innate immunity (Zhong et al., 2018).

In conclusion, our data provide evidence for system biased signaling through AtRGS1 and

introduces a previously unknown arrestin-like adaptor. We introduce the importance of system

architecture as it relates to system bias in G protein complex signaling.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemicals.

Methyl-β-cyclodextrin was purchased from Frontier Scientific, tyrphostin A51 and turanose were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, and tyrphostin A23 was purchased from Santa Cruz Biotechnology. All chemicals were indicated by the vendors to be >98% pure.

Plant Growth Conditions

Arabidopsis seeds were surface sterilized with 80% EtOH for 10 seconds while vortexing followed by a 10-second vortex with 30% bleach. Seeds were subsequently washed 3X with ddH$_2$0 and suspended in 12 well cell culture plates with ¼ MS with no sugar at pH 5.7 with 10-12 seeds per well. Plates were wrapped in aluminum foil and cold-treated at 4˚C for 2 days followed by a 2-hour light treatment to induce germination. After light treatment, plates were again wrapped in aluminum foil and placed on a horizontal shaker at ambient temperature for 5 days before imaging.

AtRGS1 Internalization Assay, Proxy for G protein activation

AtRGS1-YFP internalization was induced with D-glucose and flg22 as described (Fu et al., 2014; Tunc-Ozdemir et al., 2016; Urano et al., 2012). Briefly, wild type (Col-0) Arabidopsis seeds expressing 35S:AtRGS1-YFP were sterilized and then sown on 1-mL liquid 1/4 X Murashige and Skoog (MS) medium without sugar in 12-well plates and stratified at 5°C for 2 days, followed by 2 hours light, then grown in darkness at RT for 3-5 days. For optimal results, the plates were kept in darkness but moved to the microscope room on the third day to acclimate. 6% D-glucose or 1μm flg22 were applied to seedlings for 30 and 10 minutes respectively before imaging. Image acquisition was done on either a Zeiss LSM710 (Zeiss Microscopy, Oberkochen, Germany) with

a C-Apochromat 40X 1.2NA water immersion objective (for figures 2A-2I and figure 3A-3D) or

a Zeiss LSM880 with a C-Apochromat 40x/1.2NA water immersion objective (for figure 2K-2P,

3E-3K, and S3). YFP excitation was at 514nm and emission collection 525-565nm. Emission

collection on the LSM880 was done with a GaAsP detector. For RGS internalization assays a z-

stack series was acquired at 0.5μm intervals between images. Image processing and RGS

internalization measurements were done with the Fiji distribution of ImageJ (Schindelin et al.,

2012) as described by Urano *et al* (Urano et al., 2012) with the following modification:

Internalized YFP fluorescence was measured and subtracted from total YFP fluorescence of

individual cells as opposed to total fluorescence of the hypocotyl image as stated in Urano *et al*.

Images were acquired on the hypocotyl epidermis 2-4 mm below the cotyledons of seedlings

treated with water, glucose, and flg22 in addition to the pharmacological inhibitors. Seedling

exposure to light was minimized as much as is practical while imaging to avoid light induced

internalization of AtRGS1. Statistical analysis was performed using analysis of variance with

n=number of cells measured. Differences in basal and treatment induced levels of RGS1-YFP

internalization are a result of switching image acquisition from the LSM710 to the LSM880 to

improve image resolution and accuracy of internalization measurements.

Pharmacological Inhibition of RGS Internalization

AtRGS1 internalization was inhibited with TyrA23 and MβCD under the following conditions.

TyrA23 was applied to 3-day old seedlings for a pre-incubation period of 60 minutes at specified

concentrations. Following the pre-incubation period, a combination of TyrA23 and 6% D-Glucose

were applied to the seedlings for 30 minutes immediately followed by image acquisition. In the

case of flg22, TyrA23 and 1μm flg22 were applied to the seedling for 10 minutes following the

pre-incubation period. For MβCD, the pre-incubation period was 45 minutes at specified

concentrations. When both inhibitors were simultaneously applied, pre-incubation was 60 minutes

TIRF imaging and area/speed measurements of AtRGS1-GFP

Arabidopsis Col-0 seeds containing 35S-RGS1-GFP were grown as mentioned in the plant growth

section. 5-day-old seedlings were transferred to a solution of either 6% D-glucose or 1μm flg22

and imaged at 5, 10, and 15 minutes while immersed in the ligand solution. Imaging was performed

on a Nikon Ti Eclipse with SR Apo TIRF 100x lens (NA 1.5, WD 120μm). GFP excitation

occurred at 488nm and emission collection at 515-555nm with an Andor iXon3 EMCCD camera.

60 second time-lapse imaging was initiated at the beginning of each time point with 200ms

acquisition speed. Time-lapse sequences were normalized for fluorescence over time using

IMARIS (v9.2.2, Bitplane AG, Zurich, Switzerland). The IMARIS Surface feature was used to

track and calculate the area and speed of individually identifiable AtRGS1 proteins/clusters

(labeled as tracks in IMARIS) over time. The average speed and area of each unique track for a 30

second interval between 5:15-5:45 or 15:15-15:45 was calculated using a script in Matlab

(Supplemental code).

Synthesis of [^{14}C] isomaltulose

Sucrose isomerase (SI) from *Pantoea dispersa* UQ68J (GenBank AY223549) was cloned into

expression vector pET24b (Novagen) first by PCR of genomic DNA using the following PCR

forward primer 5'-GGA TCC AAC AAT GGC AAC GAA TAT ACA AAA GTC C-3' which

included a *BamHI* restriction site and a start codon; reverse primer 5'-ATA GGT ACC TCA GTT

CAG CTT ATA GAT CCC-3' which included a *KpnI* restriction site and a stop codon.

Expression was performed using *E. coli* BL21(DE3) (Novagen), 37°C, 225 rpm. When

the optical density at 600nm reached 1.00, isopropyl-D-thiogalactopyranoside was added to a final

concentration of 0.5 mM for induction. The incubation of the culture was continued for another 3

h at 28°C. Cells were harvested by centrifugation (3,000 ×g, 4°C, 10 min), resuspended in 50 mM

Tris-HCl (pH 8.0)-2 mM EDTA, and then re-centrifuged. The cell pellet was immediately frozen

in liquid nitrogen and stored at -75°C. Cells were suspended in extraction buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl

(pH 7.4), 200 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, 1 mM azide, 10 mM β-mercaptoethanol) and then lysed

by sonication (nine 15-s pulses at 50 W with a Branson Sonifier 450 microprobe), centrifuged

(10,000 ×g, 4°C, 10 min), and filtered through a 0.45-µm-pore-size membrane (Gelman Acrodisc).

The pET24b vector introduced a carboxy-terminal six-His tag into expressed proteins, which were

purified by adsorption to nitrilotriacetic acid (NTA) agarose (QIAGEN) and elution with 25 mM

NaH_2PO_4-150 mM NaCl-125 mM imidazole buffer (pH 8.0) by following the manufacturer's

instructions. The purity of SI proteins was verified by SDS-PAGE as a single band on Coomassie

Blue R-250 staining.

[^{14}C] isomaltulose was prepared using 1.48MBq [U-^{14}C]Sucrose (Amersham, UK) in 200

µl water with 3% ethanol (equals to 0.3379 mM) was reacted with 30 µl purified UQ68J SI for at

30 °C 60 min. The converted [^{14}C] isomatulose concentration by UQ68J SI was estimated by three-

replicate parallel conversions of unlabelled sucrose (S7903,Sigma) in the same concentration of

0.3379 mM with 3% Ethanol by the same enzyme. BioLC DX600 (Dionex, USA) determinations

showed 84.0±0.106% (Mean±SE) was converted into isomaltulose, 3.5±0.197% into trehalulose;

into the by-products of glucose and fructose were 4.6±0.072% and 7.8±0.237% respectively and

there was no sucrose left after the reaction was stopped (Figure 1A).

Sugar uptake assay

One-week-old seedlings, grown on a filter disc overlaying 1/2X Murashige and Skoog Basal Salts,

0.7% phytogel 23°C, pH 5.8, 8h/d of 100 mole/m2/s1, were lifted off the plate and overlaid 6 mL

of water containing approx. 25,000 cpm of [^{14}C] sugars as indicated. The specific activity of the

sugars was 12GBq/mmol. At the indicated times, triplicate sets of 10 seedling were gently rinsed

and placed in a 1.7-mL microfuge tube with 1 mL of scintillation fluid (Perkin Elmer Inc) and

radioactivity was quantitated by liquid scintillation counting. CPM from time zero (typically 80-

150 cpm) was subtracted from the average of the 3 samples. The CPM for [^{14}C] isomaltulose

uptake into seedlings at each time was corrected for its 84% purity. The experiment as shown was

repeated once with the same result. [^{14}C] glucose uptake was repeated 4 times.

Live cell imaging of MAPK reporter (SOMA) lines

Detached etiolated hypocotyls were prepared for imaging on the confocal microscope using the

HybriWell™ method as previously described (Vang et al., 2018; Zaman et al., 2019). A hypocotyl

from a dark grown 5-day-old seedling was placed on top of the droplet, and a HybriWell™ (Grace

BioLabs, http://gracebio.com/, cat. no. 611102) was gently placed on the coverslide with the

hypocotyl in the center to form a 150-µm deep imaging chamber with a volume of 30 µl. Ultrapure

water (300 µl) was injected through one of the HybriWell™ ports using a pipettor to fill the 30-µl

chamber with water and to expel any air bubbles. A 200-µl droplet of ultrapure water was then

placed on one of the ports to prevent the chamber from drying out. The HybriWells containing the

mounted hypocotyls were then placed in covered Petri dishes and equilibrated by incubating at

20–23°C under constant light for 6–8 hours prior to imaging.

Confocal microscopy was performed using a Zeiss LSM 710 with a C-Apochromat

40x/1.20 water immersion objective lens. Samples were excited at 458nm with 3% power, and

emission was measured between 463 and 517nm for Turquoise GL and between 534 and 570nm

for YPet. Z-stacks were collected every 2 min with an optical slice thickness of 1.2 μm. Chemical

treatments were added to the samples during imaging by pipetting 200 μl of solution containing

the treatment onto one port of the HybriWell. For experiments involving tyrphostin A23 and

tyrphostin A51, hypocotyls were pretreated with 50 μM of these compounds for 30 min prior to

imaging.

Post-processing of the raw image data was performed using Fiji (Schindelin et al., 2012).

The 'Z-projection' function was performed on an image stack using the 'Max Intensity' setting.

The resulting projection was then separated into two images, one for the Turquoise GL emission

channel and one for the YPet emission channel. The 'Subtract Background' function was

performed on both images, with the 'rolling-ball radius' set as the default 50 pixels. A mask was

then created from the YPet channel using the 'Convert to Mask' function. The background

subtracted YPet and Turquoise GL images were then converted into 32-bit images. These 32-bit

images were then multiplied by the Mask file. The resulting YPet image was divided by the

resulting Turquoise GL image using the 'Image Calculator' function to create a ratio image

representing the ratio of YPet to Turquoise emission. Finally, the 'Threshold' function was

performed using the default values, with the 'NaN background' option enabled. The 'Fire' lookup

table was then applied to the final ratio image. To measure the ratio of YPet to Turquoise GL

emission, a region of interest (ROI) was selected within the ratio image using Fiji and the average

ratio value within that ROI was then measured.

Live cell Ca^{++} imaging with R-GECO1

5-day-old etiolated hypocotyls expressing R-GECO1 calcium reporter were grown in aqueous

media containing ¼ MS. Hypocotyls were excised and mounted in HybriWells 6-8 hours prior to

imaging with a Zeiss LSM710 confocal laser scanning microscope equipped with a C-Apochromat

40×/1.20 water immersion objective. R-GECO1 was excited using 561nm laser with 7.0 % laser

power, and emission was measured between 620 and 650 nm. Z-stacks were collected 2 min after

chemical treatment with an optical slice thickness of 1.5μm. Chemical treatments were added to

the samples during imaging by pipetting 200 μl of solution containing the treatment onto one port

of the HybriWell. The digital images were analyzed with Fiji (Schindelin et al., 2012).

Modeling AtVPS26

Five models (atvps26a1-5) were created by the MODELLER using the automodel script based on

the human VPS26A template 2FAU. For evaluation and selection of the "best" model, we

calculated the objective function (molpdf), Discrete Optimized Protein Energy (**DOPE**) score,

GA341 assessment score and root mean square deviation (**RMSD**) between the model and the

template. The best model has the lowest value of the molpdf and overall DOPE assessment scores.

In addition, DOPE scores were calculated per-residue and the template and the five atvps26a

models were compared using GNUPLOT (Figure S4C) and found to be dissimilar in only three

positions (residue around 60, 240, and 260). The atvps26a2 model was selected based on the

lowest, RMSD value (Figure S4D) and plotted DOPE per-residue score curve (Fig. S4E). With an

RMSD of 0.17 Å, atvps26a-2 differs from the template by less than the length of a C-C bond.

Split firefly luciferase assays

pCAMBIA/des/cLuc and pCAMBIA/des/nLuc (Lin et al., 2015) were used to generate the

following plasmids: AtVPS26A-nLUC, AtVPS26B-nLUC, cLUC-AtVPS26A, cLUC-AtVPS26B,

cLUC-AtVPS26like, cLUC-AtGPA1, AtAGB1-nLUC and AtRGS1-nLUC. pART27H-mCherry-

AtAGG1 plasmid was obtained from Dr. Jose R Botella (University of Queensland, Brisbane,

QLD, 4072, Australia). All plasmids were transformed into *A. tumefaciens* strain *GV3101*. nLUC

and cLUC fusion partners were co-expressed in *N. benthamiana* leavesby agroinfiltration

following protocols in (Zhou et al., 2018). 48 hours after infiltration, 6mm Leaf discs were

collected to 96-well plate and 40μl 0.4mM D-luciferin was added to each well. Luminescence was

measured by spectraMax L microplate reader (Molecular Devices).

Yeast two-hybrid assays

Constructs used in yeast two-hybrid assays were pAS–RGS-J5 (amino acids 284–459), RGS-ΔCt

(amino acids 284–416), RGS-ΔCtS405,406A, pACTGW–AtVPS26B and AtVPS26like. Y2H

tested pairs were co-transformed into *AH109* yeast cells and plated on SD-LW media (Wagemans

and Lavigne, 2015). Colonies were then inoculated into SD-LW liquid media and grew overnight

at 30 °C. Then 1/10 diluted yeast cells were spotted on SD-LW, SD-LWH, and SD-LWH 10mM

3-AT (3-amino-1,2,4-triazole) plates. The plates were incubated at 30°C for 4 days and were

imaged by gel documentation system (Axygen) under white light.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes 6 figures and 1 text file.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Dr. N Phan for creating the AtRGS1[Y112A] plasmid and transgenic lines and

for experiments testing the involvement of adaptors in AtRGS1 endocytosis and data in Figure 1A

and B. We thank Dr. V Gurevich, Dr. M Garcia-Marcos and Dr. CE Alvarez for helpful comments

and Dr. K Ghusinga for assistance with writing MatLab code. We thank Dr. J Huang for help in

844 the turanose experiment. This work was supported by grants from the NIGMS (GM065989) and

845 NSF (MCB-1713880) to A.M.J. The Division of Chemical Sciences, Geosciences, and Bio-

846 sciences, Office of Basic Energy Sciences of the US Department of Energy through the grant DE-

847 FG02-05er15671 to A.M.J. funded the biochemical aspects of this project. The content is solely

848 the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the

849 National Institutes of Health.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

852 T.J.R-E., J.W., X.S., B.D., H.J., J.Y., M.T-O, F.L. and A.M.J. performed experiments and

853 produced data used in the figures. T.J.R-E., J.W., X.S., and A.M.J. designed experiments, and

854 analyzed results. P.K provided the MAPK reporters prior to its publication and guided those

855 experiments. L.W. synthesized and purified [^{14}C]isomaltulose. Y.T. performed sugar uptake

856 experiments shown in Figure 1. T.J.R-E., J.W., and A.M.J wrote the paper.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

858 The authors declare no competing interest.

859
860

  Figure legends

Figure 1. AtRGS1 perceives extracellular glucose or glucose metabolite. While flg22 is

perceived extracellularly, an extracellular site of glucose perception for activation of G signaling

in Arabidopsis has not yet been made with an impermeant glucose analog. See supporting data

for this figure in Supplemental Material Figure S1. **A**. Isomaltulose and D-glucose induce rapid

AtRGS1-YFP endocytosis in a dose-dependent manner. Images are representative from hypocotyl

epidermal cells ectopically expressing AtRGS1 tagged with YFP. **B**. Despite being 9-fold less

permeant to the Arabidopsis plasma membrane, isomaltulose is slightly more potent than D-

glucose in activation of G signaling as measured by proxy using AtRGS1-YFP endocytosis (Fu et

al., 2014). **C**. Turanose is impermeant to plant cells (Rolland et al., 2002) yet is as effective as D-

glucose in inducing AtRGS1-YFP endocytosis. The purity of turanose was >98%. **D**. Structures.

Both isomaltulose and turanose share a glucose ring moiety.

Figure 2. Two origins of AtRGS1 endocytosis. Pharmacological inhibitors show two origins of

AtRGS1-YFP endocytosis. (**A**) AtRGS1-YFP seedlings were treated with increasing

concentrations of MβCD at 0mM (n= 18 (flg22) and 15 (glucose)), 1mM (n= 14 and 14), 2mM

(n= 15 and 16), 5mM (n= 17 and 14), 10mM (n= 12 and 17), and 20mM (n= 15 and 6) for 45 min

followed by incubation in the same solution but supplemented with 1 μM flg22 for 10 min or (**B**)

6% D-glucose for 30 min before imaging epidermal cells. Internalized AtRGS1-YFP was

quantified to determine total endocytosis of AtRGS1. MβCD does not inhibit flg22-induced

AtRGS1 endocytosis, but does partially inhibit glucose-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis at 5mM and

above (p<0.01). (**C**) TyrphostinA23, an inhibitor of CME, significantly impairs flg22-induced

AtRGS1 endocytosis (n=14) and (**D**) partially inhibits glucose-mediated AtRGS1 endocytosis

(n=27) (p<0.01). The structurally similar, but inactive analog of TyrA23, TyrA51, has no effect

(n=19) indicating the effect of TyrA23 is specific. (**E**) When both inhibitors are applied with

glucose, AtRGS1 internalization is reduced to basal levels (n=8) (p<0.01). A genetics approach to

inhibit AtRGS1 internalization confirms pharmacological results. (**F**) A genetic null mutant of

ap2μ, the cargo recognition complex for CME, results in complete inhibition of flg22-induced

AtRGS1 (n=16) (p<0.01) down to basal levels, confirming TyrA23 results. (**G**) Glucose-induced

internalization of AtRGS1 is partially inhibited in the *ap2μ* mutant (n=32) (p<0.01), but further

reduced to basal levels with the addition of MβCD (n=18) (p<0.01). (**H**) Mutation of Y^{112} to

Alanine in the AtRGS1 tyrosine motif recognized by ap2μ, AtRGS1^{Y112A}, inhibits flg22-induced

AtRGS1 endocytosis to basal levels (n=16) (p<0.01). (**I**) Glucose-mediated AtRGS1 endocytosis

is partially inhibited in AtRGS1^{Y112A} (n=12) (p<0.05), but subsequently reduced to basal levels

with the addition of MβCD (n=9) (p<0.01). Quantification of AtRGS1-YFP fluorescence is

discussed in methods. (**J**) The speed and surface area of AtRGS1-GFP particles as tracked and

measured by IMARIS from 30 second time lapse imaging using TIRF at 5 minutes after treatment

with glucose and flg22. Identifiable AtRGS1-GFP particles are significantly smaller in the flg22

treated population (n=2026) compared to glucose (n=4619). No significant difference in speed is

observed between particles in the two treatments. (**K-P**) Endocytosis markers CLC-mCherry and

FLOT1-mCherry localize to the cell periphery and increase overlap with RGS1-GFP in a ligand

dependent manner after treatment with flg22 and glucose. Zeiss confocal micrographs show

AtRGS1-GFP (**green channel**) and either CLC-mCherry (**red channel K-M**) or FLOT1-mCherry

(**red channel N-P**) after 5 minute treatments with water (**K and N**), flg22 (**L and O**), and glucose

(**M and P**). After water treatment, CLC-mCherry (**K box inset**) and FLOT1-mCherry (**N box**

inset) remain distributed throughout the cell cytoplasm and highly overlapped AtRGS1-GFP

particles (**Q**). After treatment with flg22, CLC-mCherry migrates to the cell periphery with an

observed increase in protein agglomeration (**L red arrows**) and decrease overlap score with

RGS1GFP (**S**), while FLOT1-mCherry has no observable change compared to water (**G box inset**

and R). Upon treatment with glucose, FLOT1-mCherry protein bodies congregate at the cell

periphery (**P red arrows**) and decrease overlap with RGS1-GFP (**V**) , while CLC-mCherry

remains unchanged compared to water (**M box inset and U**). (**W**) The average overlap scores for

CLC-mCherry and FLOT1-mCherry after addition of water (n= 8 and 9), flg22 (n= 4 and 7), and

glucose (n= 4 and 3). flg22 addition induces a significant change in CLC compared to glucose and

water while glucose induces a significant change with FLOT1 compared to flg22 and water

($p < 0.01$).

Figure 3. CME of AtRGS1 is phosphorylation dependent and G protein monomer specific.

Known phosphorylation sites at serine residues on the C-terminal end of AtRGS1 are required for

both flg22 and glucose-induced CME of AtRGS1. (**A**) A truncated AtRGS1, AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$, lacking

the 43 most C-terminal residues, including 8 serines, resulted in basal levels of flg22-induced

AtRGS1 internalization (n=11) ($p < 0.01$). (**B**) Glucose-induced AtRGS1 internalization is partially

reduced in AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$ (n=12) ($p < 0.01$), but further reduced to basal levels with the addition of

MβCD (n=13) ($p < 0.01$). (**C and D**) Mutation of three specific serine residues to alanine at 428,

435, and 436, in a full length AtRGS1, AtRGS1^{3SA}, yielded similar results to AtRGS1$^{\Delta Ct}$ for flg22

(n=10) and glucose-mediated internalization (n=22) ($p < 0.01$), but indicate phosphorylation of one

or several specific serine residues is necessary for CME of AtRGS1. flg22 and glucose require

known kinases for AtRGS1 internalization. (**E**) Genetic ablation of the flg22 receptor FLS2 yields

basal levels of flg22-induced AtRGS1 internalization (n=12) ($p < 0.01$), but does not affect glucose-

induced AtRGS1 internalization (n=9). (**F**) Similarly, null mutation of the BAK1 co-receptor,

bak1-4, results in ablated flg22-induced AtRGS1 internalization (n=16) (p<0.01), but not for

glucose (n=17) (p=0.36). (**G**) The high dose and low duration glucose specific WNK8 kinase is

necessary for glucose induced AtRGS1 internalization (n=13) (p<0.01), but not flg22 (n=10)

(p=0.9). Individual G proteins are necessary for AtRGS1 endocytosis in a ligand specific manner.

(**H**) A genetic null mutant of Gα, *gpa1-4*, limits flg22-induced endocytosis of AtRGS1 to basal

levels (n=15), while glucose-induced endocytosis is unaffected compared to wild-type (n=22). (**I**)

A null mutation of XLG2, *xlg2-1*, an extra-large Gα protein, also reduced flg22-induced AtRGS1

endocytosis to basal levels (n=14), but had no significant effect on glucose-mediated endocytosis

compared to wild type (n=19) (p<0.01). (**J**) A null mutation of the AGB1/AGG1 heterodimer,

agb1-2/agg1, inhibited flg22-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis (n=15), but had no effect on high dose,

low duration glucose-induced AtRGS1 endocytosis (n=17) (p<0.01). (**K**) At low dose, long

duration AGB1/AGG1 are necessary for glucose induced internalization (n=25). Quantification of

AtRGS1-YFP fluorescence is discussed in methods.

Figure 4. Arabidopsis VPS26 subunits of the retromer complex may moonlight as arrestin-

like adaptors for AtRGS1 internalization. (**A**) 3-D alignment of the model atvps26a-2 (colored

cyan) with the bovine arrestin-3 (PDB 3P2D, (colored wheat). The structure of model atvps26a-2

shows a similar arrestin scaffold with arrestin-3 which contains a semi-symmetric fold of two β

strand sandwich structures in the N domain and C domains linked by the central loops (ii); each

sandwich is formed by 3 or 4 β sheets, respectively. (**B**). Differences between atvps26a-2 model

and bovine arrestin-3. Model atvps26a-2 lacks a short α-helix (i) inside the arrestin N-terminal

domain which has been implicated in receptor binding. Arrestin-3 contains a longer C terminal tail

which extend all the way to bind the N terminal domain which is important for clathrin-mediated

endocytosis (CME) in animals. The C terminus of atvps26a-2 has no extension. (**C**). The central

crest. The central crest of atvps26a is similar with that of arrestin-3 which includes the finger loop,

middle loop and the C loop, although arrestin-3 has a longer finger loop which is important for

receptor binding. (**D, E**) The polar core of bovine arrestin-3.The residues in the polar core of

arrestin-3 are Asp_{27}, Arg_{170}, Asp_{291}, Asp_{298} and Arg_{393} which are shown as vacuum electrostatics

(**D**) and sticks (**E**). (**F,G**) The polar core of atvps26A. The residues of atvps26a are the N domain

residues Glu_{118} and Tyr_{120}, and C domain residues Arg_{213}, Glu_{215}, Thr_{258}, Tyr_{272}, and Arg_{296} which

are also shown as vacuum electrostatics (**F**) and sticks (**G**). Although different amino acid

composition, both cores consist of similarly-positioned, positive-charged residues and allow the

formation of hydrogen bonds under physiological conditions. However, the orientation and shape

of the polar core of atvps26a-2 is distinct from arrestin-3. The arrestin-3 polar core is embedded

between β sheets in the N terminal domain whereas the atvps26a-2 core is open and elongated,

spanning the length of space between the N domain and C domain.

Figure 5. Physical interaction between AtRGS1 and VPS26. (**A**) Bifluorescence

complementation (BiFC) of VPS26A and VPS26B showing a specific head-to-tail orientation

requirement. Representative cells shown. n=5. Experiment repeated 2 times. (**B**) Split luciferase

complementation by VPS26A and VPS26B heterodimers and VPS26B homodimers. Error bars

are standard error of the mean (SEM). Means with different letters indicate significantly different

(Tukey's HSD test, $p<0.05$). n=64 leaf discs from 4 individual tobacco plants. (**C**) BiFC of VPS26

A and VPS26B with AtRGS1 in a specific orientation. (**D**) Split-luciferase complementation by

VPS26A and AtRGS1. Positive control is complementation by the heterotrimeric G protein

complex (GPA1/AGB1/AGG1). Negative control is AtGPA1 and AGB1 in the absence of AGG1.

Error bars are SEM. n=64. (p<0.05). (**E**) Yeast two-hybrid complementation between the

cytoplasmic domain of AtRGS1 (RGS1-J5) and VPS26B. RGS1-J5 contains the linker between

the 7TM domain and the RGS box, the RGS box and a C-terminal tail (CT). RGS1- ΔCT lacks the

C-terminal tail which contains the phosphorylation cluster required for AtRGS1 endocytosis.

RGS1- ΔCTS$_{405,406A}$ lacks the CT and has two additional phosphosites mutated. –LW is the

leucine/tryptophan dropout, -LWH is the leucine/tryptophan/histidine drop out media; 10 mM 3-

AT indicates higher stringency by the addition of 10 mM 3-amino-1,2,4-triazole.

Figure 6. MAPK activation and Ca^{2+} signaling in response to flg22 and D-glucose. (A-D)

Processed confocal images of the epidermis of etiolated hypocotyls from the SOMA-NLS (**A, B**)

and SOMA-NES (**C, D**) transgenic lines depicting the ratio of YPet to Turquoise GL emission

produced by exciting Turquoise GL. Scale bar represents 100 μm. Time stamps indicate when the

image was collected labeled minutes:seconds. Images at 00:00 were collected before treatment,

while those at time point 20:00 were collected 5 minutes after treatment with 1 μM flg22. White

rectangle represent regions of interest (ROIs) used to measure YPet and Turquoise GL emission.

(**E-H**). The ratio of YPet to Turquoise GL emission produced by exciting Turquoise GL over time

was determined using the ROIs shown in (A-D). During the first 10 minutes of each experiment

the samples were incubated in water. The arrow indicates the time at which 1 μM flg22 (**E, G**) or

6% D-glucose (**F, H**) was added to the sample. (**E**) SOMA-NES lines pretreated with water

(orange) or 50 μM TyrA23 (yellow) prior to imaging. Inset graph (**F**) shows SOMA-NES line

pretreated with 6% D-glucose for 30 minutes prior to imaging. (**I**) flg22 dose-response in SOMA-

NES lines. flg22 was added after two minutes of imaging. (**J, K**) R-GECO1 lines treated with

flg22 or D-glucose in Col-0 (**J**) or *rgs1-2* (**K**) backgrounds. Fluorescence intensity changes of R-

GECO1 in ~20 regions of interests in wild type plants. Fractional fluorescence changes (ΔF/F) for

R-GECO1 were calculated from background corrected intensity values of R-GECO1 as (F −

F0)/F0, where F0 represents the average fluorescence intensity of the baseline of a measurement

of each genotype. Error bars are standard deviations. Asterisks represent statistical significance (P

< 0.01) between treatment and water as determined by 2-way ANOVA.

1007

Figure 7. Component overview of flg22- and D-glucose-biased signaling. (A) Simple model

illustrating flg22 and glucose or metabolite input and the respective bias signaling output through

AtRGS1, as well as a chart summary detailing the origins of endocytosis (CME and SDE),

recognition motif and phosphorylation requirements, and individual proteins necessary for

glucose- and flg22-induced endocytosis of AtRGS1. (**B**) Membrane overview illustrating proposed

AtRGS1 microdomain clusters with common RLK neighbors. flg22 (orange circle) binds to FLS2

to initiate signaling through AtRGS1. The mechanism of glucose (blue circle) perception is

unknown as indicated by the question marks. After ligand perception, SDE or CME of AtRGS1

occurs to permit downstream signaling. (**C**) A diagram of the individual components involved in

the mechanism of endocytosis initiated by flg22 and glucose or metabolite. Numbers indicate the

order of operations. For flg22: (1) perception of ligand, (2) phosphorylation of AtRGS1 by a RLK,

(3 and 4) binding of clathrin complex and/or VPS26 in an unknown order, and (5) internalization

of AtRGS1. For glucose or metabolite: (1) ligand perception by a RLK or direct interaction with

AtRGS1, (2) receptor interaction with WNK kinase (in the case of SDE, #2 indicates immediate

endocytosis because other key components of the pathway are unknown), (3) phosphorylation of

AtRGS1 by WNK kinases, (4) binding of clathrin complex to AtRGS1, and (5) internalization of

AtRGS1. TyrA23 is shown inhibiting CME in both pathways, while MβCD is shown inhibiting

AtRGS1 microdomain formation at the membrane.

1026

1027 **Supplemental Information**

1028

1029

1030 **Supplemental Figure S1**. **Isomaltulose is nearly impermeant in Arabidopsis**. **A**. To test the

1031 permeability of Arabidopsis seedlings to isomaltulose, [^{14}C] isomaltulose was synthesized and

1032 purified to 84% as described in the methods. Sugar analysis is as described and the results shown.

1033 **B**. Uptake of [^{14}C] D-glucose and [^{14}C] isomaltulose into Arabidopsis seedlings was tested. AU,

1034 Arbitrary Units as described.

1035

Supplemental Figure S2. Tracking AtRGS1 after ligand addition. (**A-E**) IMARIS surface

tracking showing (**A**) the original wide-field image acquired by TIRF, (**B**) the tracked spots

imposed on the original image and tracked at (**C**) 15s, (**D**) 30s, and (**F**) 60s after initiating time-

lapse imaging. (**F-H**) Tracking results showing the (**F**) average speed and area for AtRGS1-GFP

particles after addition of (**x**) flg22 and (**o**) glucose at 15 minutes post ligand addition. (**G**) area

and (**H**) speed of AtRGS1-GFP particles are broken out into proportion of total tracked particles

at 15 minutes post ligand addition. (**I-T**) Original field of view confocal micrographs highlighting

areas used to calculate Manders Overlap Coefficients from Figure **2K-P** (white and yellow boxes)

with the addition of 15 minute post ligand addition images.

1045

1046 **Supplemental Figure S3. G protein involvement in low dose, long duration sugar signaling**

1047 (**A**) 2% glucose addition for 6 hours to the genetic null mutant *wnk1-1* shows no discernable

1048 difference in AtRGS1 internalization compared to wild type (n=16) (p<0.01). (**B**) XLG2 is not

1049 necessary for AtRGS1 internalization with low-glucose DDR (n=18) (p<0.01).

1050

Figure S4. Supplemental data used to create the VPS26 model and comparison with arrestin

structure described in main figure 4. (A) Homogeneous sequence alignment of VPS26 family

(Arabidopsis VPS26a, VPS26b, VPS26like and Human VPS26A, VPS26B) with arrestin family

(Human arrestin-1, arrestin-2 and bovine arrestin-1, arrestin-2, arrestin-3, squid arrestin-1, shrimp

arrestin-1)**. (B)** The identity matrix between arrestin family and VPS26 family. Clustal Omega

https://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/msa/clustalo/ was used to generate the Multiple Sequence Alignment

file and the identity matrix result. Then the ESPript 3.0 (Easy Sequencing in PostScript) which is

a program which renders sequence similarities and secondary structure information from aligned

sequences for analysis and publication purpose is used to generate the final alignment file

http://espript.ibcp.fr/ESPript/ESPript/index.php. A percentage of equivalent residues is calculated

per columns, considering physicochemical properties. A global score is calculated for all

sequences by extracting all possible pairs of residues per columns, for the score greater than

similarity GlobalScore (0.7), it was rendered as colored characters (red characters on a white

background and white characters on a red background if residues are strictly conserved in the

column) with blue frames. AtVPS26A has a high sequence identity of 91.06% with AtVPS26B

and a 56.48% sequence identity with human VPS26A (shown in red box in figure B). AtVPS26A

and the arrestin family share 14-20% sequence identity (shown in red box in the figure).

Sequences: 1. DpArr1, squid arrestin-1; 2. p44, bovine arrestin-1 splice variant; 3. BtArr3, Bovine

Arrestin-3; 4. PmArr1, shrimp arrestin-1; 5. BtArr1, Bovine Arrestin-1; 6. HsArr1, Human

Arrestin-1; 7. BtArr2, Bovine Arrestin-2; 8. HsArr2, Human Arrestin-2; 9. AtVPS26like,

Arabidopsis VPS26like; 10. AtVPS26A, Arabidopsis VPS26A; 11. AtVPS26B, Arabidopsis

VPS26B; 12. HsVPS26A, human VPS26A; 13. BtVPS26A, bovine VPS26A; 14. HsVPS26B,

human VPS26B; 15. BtVPS26B, bovine VPS26B.) (**C**)   Model evaluation results of the 5 models

of AtVPS26A. The MODELLER objective function (molpdf), DOPE assessment scores (Discrete

Optimized Protein Energy, which is a statistical potential used to assess homology models in

protein structure prediction), GA341 assessment score (range from 0.0 (worst) to 1.0 (native-like))

and RMSD (root-mean-square deviation, Å) with the template were calculated to evaluate the

models. The "best" model is selected with the lowest value of the molpdf, DOPE score and RMSD

value. The second model (atvps26a-2) was selected given the best DOPE score and RMSD value.

(**D**)   DOPE per residue score files of the 5 atvps26a models and the template. DOPE per residue

score files of the five atvps26a models and the template human VPS26A[2FAU] were plotted using

GNUPLOT which is a portable command-line driven graphing utility http://www.gnuplot.info/.

Upper panel is the curves of the five atvps26a models and the template. The lower panel is the

curve of the "best" model atvps26a-2 with the template. (**E**)   3D-structural alignment

between model atvps26a-2 with human VPS26a template (PDB [2FAU]). atvps26a-2 model

colored in pale-cyan and human VPS26A template colored in bright-orange using pymol. Upper

panel: Side view. Lower panel: Top view. (**F**) Etiolated hypocotyls of Col-0 and VPS26 null

mutants at 5 days old, the age used for experiments in Figure 5. Seedlings were germinated and

grown in liquid MS for 5 days and transferred to solid agar plates for imaging. Scale bar 5mm.

1090

Supplemental Figure S5. Positive and negative controls for SOMA markers. (A-D) **(A)**

Transgenic lines SOMA-NLS (Nuclear MAPK reporter) and **(B)** SOMA-NES (cytoplasmic

MAPK reporter) were analyzed before and after treatment with 150 mM NaCl as a positive control

and with water (**C** and **D**) as the negative control. **(E,F)** Negative control reporters: Mutants of

the transgenic lines SOMA^{T679A}-NLS (**E**) and SOMA^{T679A}-NES (**F**) were treated with 1 µM flg22.

(G - O) Replicate experimental tracings showing reproducibility of TyrA23 inhibition of the flg22-

induced activation of G signaling via AtRGS1-YFP internalization (**G - N**) and its corresponding

TyrA51 negative control (**O - V**). During the first 10 minutes of each experiment, SOMA-NES

lines pretreated with 50 µM TyrA23 for 10 min (**G - N**) or 50 µM TyrA51 (**O - V**) for 30 minutes

prior to activation with flg22. Each graph represents 1 individual hypocotyl and each trace is a

region of interest. **(W)** SOMA-NES was pretreated with 6% D-glucose for 30 minutes prior to

analysis. Hypocotyls were then treated with 1 µM flg22.

1103

Supplemental Figure S6. Positive and negative controls and dose response. Transgenic lines

SOMA-NLS and SOMA-NES were analyzed before and after treatment with 150 mM NaCl as a

positive control (**A, B**) and water (**C, D**). (**E, F**) Mutants of the transgenic lines SOMA^{T679A}-NLS

and SOMA^{T679A}-NES were treated with 1 µM flg22 during the first 10 minutes of each experiment

the samples. SOMA-NES lines were pretreated with 50 µM TyrA23 (**G-N**) or 50 µM TyrA51 (**O-**

V) for 30 minutes prior to imaging. (**W-AB**) flg22 dose-response in SOMA-NES lines. (**AC-AH**)

flg22 dose-response in R-GECO1 lines. Each graph represents 1 individual hypocotyl.

1111

Supplemental Code. MatLab code for averaging unique tracked AtRGS1 particle speed and

area. Speed and area data from IMARIS is exported in xls format and imported to MatLab for

sorting. Each AtRGS1 tracked protein or cluster has a unique trackID that is sorted while

maintaining association with speed and area at defined time points. We identified the start and end

location for each unique trackID and created a matrix to store the data and subsequently find the

mean for speed and area within our defined time points.

1118

1119

REFERENCES

Adam, T., Bouhidel, K., Der, C., Robert, F., Najid, A., Simon-Plas, F., and Leborgne-Castel, N. (2012). Constitutive expression of clathrin hub hinders elicitor-induced clathrin-mediated endocytosis and defense gene expression in plant cells. FEBS Letters *586*, 3293-3298.

Allen, J.A., Yost, J.M., Setola, V., Chen, X., Sassano, M.F., Chen, M., Peterson, S., Yadav, P.N., Huang, X.-p., Feng, B.*, et al.* (2011). Discovery of β-arrestin–biased dopamine D_2 ligands for probing signal transduction pathways essential for antipsychotic efficacy. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *108*, 18488-18493.

Alvarez, C.E. (2008). On the origins of arrestin and rhodopsin. BMC Evolutionary Biology *8*, 222.

Asai, T., Tena, G., Plotnikova, J., Willmann, M.R., Chiu, W.-L., Gomez-Gomez, L., Boller, T., Ausubel, F.M., and Sheen, J. (2002). MAP kinase signalling cascade in Arabidopsis innate immunity. Nature *415*, 977-983.

Banbury, D.N., Oakley, J.D., Sessions, R.B., and Banting, G. (2003). Tyrphostin A23 inhibits internalization of the transferrin Receptor by perturbing the interaction between tyrosine motifs and the medium chain subunit of the AP-2 adaptor complex. J Biol Chem *278*, 12022-12028.

Bandyopadhyay, A., Van Eps, N., Eger, B.T., Rauscher, S., Yedidi, R.S., Moroni, T., West, G.M., Robinson, K.A., Griffin, P.R., Mitchell, J.*, et al.* (2018). A novel polar core and weakly fixed C-tail in squid arrestin provide new insight into interaction with rhodopsin. Journal of Molecular Biology *430*, 4102-4118.

Bashline, L., Li, S., Anderson, C.T., Lei, L., and Gu, Y. (2013). The endocytosis of cellulose synthase in Arabidopsis Is dependent on µ2, a clathrin-mediated endocytosis adaptin. Plant Physiology *163*, 150-160.

Benovic, J., Kuhn, H., Weyand, I., Codina, J., Caron, M., and Lefkowitz, R. (1987). Functional desensitization of the isolated beta-adrenergic receptor by the beta-adrenergic receptor kinase: potential role of an analog of the retinal protein arrestin (48-kDa protein). Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America *84*, 8879 - 8882.

Benovic, J.L., Strasser, R.H., Caron, M.G., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (1986). Beta-adrenergic receptor kinase: identification of a novel protein kinase that phosphorylates the agonist-occupied form of the receptor. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *83*, 2797-2801.

Bohn, L.M., Gainetdinov, R.R., Lin, F.-T., Lefkowitz, R.J., and Caron, M.G. (2000). µ-Opioid receptor desensitization by β-arrestin-2 determines morphine tolerance but not dependence. Nature *408*, 720-723.

1164 Börnke, F., Hajirezaei, M., Heineke, D., Melzer, M., Herbers, K., and Sonnewald, U. (2002). High-
1165 level production of the non-cariogenic sucrose isomer palatinose in transgenic tobacco plants
1166 strongly impairs development. Planta *214*, 356-364.
1167
1168 Boucrot, E., Saffarian, S., Zhang, R., and Kirchhausen, T. (2010). Roles of AP-2 in clathrin-
1169 mediated endocytosis. PLoS One *5*, e10597.
1170
1171 Butcher, A.J., Prihandoko, R., Kong, K.C., McWilliams, P., Edwards, J.M., Bottrill, A., Mistry,
1172 S., and Tobin, A.B. (2011). Differential G-protein-coupled receptor phosphorylation provides
1173 evidence for a signaling bar code. Journal of Biological Chemistry *286*, 11506-11518.
1174
1175 Charest, P.G., Oligny-Longpré, G., Bonin, H., Azzi, M., and Bouvier, M. (2007). The V2
1176 vasopressin receptor stimulates ERK1/2 activity independently of heterotrimeric G protein
1177 signalling. Cellular Signalling *19*, 32-41.
1178
1179 Chen, J.-G., Willard, F.S., Huang, J., Liang, J., Chasse, S.A., Jones, A.M., and Siderovski, D.P.
1180 (2003). A seven-transmembrane RGS protein that modulates plant cell proliferation. Science *301*,
1181 1728-1731.
1182
1183 Chen, L.-Q., Hou, B.-H., Lalonde, S., Takanaga, H., Hartung, M.L., Qu, X.-Q., Guo, W.-J., Kim,
1184 J.-G., Underwood, W., Chaudhuri, B.*, et al.* (2010). Sugar transporters for intercellular exchange
1185 and nutrition of pathogens. Nature *468*, 527.
1186
1187 Chen, Q., Iverson, T.M., and Gurevich, V.V. (2018). Structural basis of arrestin-dependent signal
1188 transduction. Trends in Biochemical Sciences *43*, 412-423.
1189
1190 Chen, Q., Zhuo, Y., Kim, M., Hanson, S.M., Francis, D.J., Vishnivetskiy, S.A., Altenbach, C.,
1191 Klug, C.S., Hubbell, W.L., and Gurevich, V.V. (2014). Self-association of arrestin family
1192 members. In Arrestins - Pharmacology and Therapeutic Potential, V.V. Gurevich, ed. (Berlin,
1193 Heidelberg, Springer Berlin Heidelberg), pp. 205-223.
1194
1195 Chinchilla, D., Bauer, Z., Regenass, M., Boller, T., and Felix, G. (2006). The *Arabidopsis* receptor
1196 kinase FLS2 binds flg22 and determines the specificity of flagellin perception. The Plant Cell *18*,
1197 465-476.
1198
1199 Choi, M., Staus, D.P., Wingler, L.M., Ahn, S., Pani, B., Capel, W.D., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2018).
1200 G protein–coupled receptor kinases (GRKs) orchestrate biased agonism at the β_2-
1201 adrenergic receptor. Science Signaling *11*, eaar7084.
1202
1203 Collins, B.M., McCoy, A.J., Kent, H.M., Evans, P.R., and Owen, D.J. (2002). Molecular
1204 architecture and functional model of the endocytic AP2 complex. Cell *109*, 523-535.
1205
1206 DeFea, K.A., Zalevsky, J., Thoma, M.S., Déry, O., Mullins, R.D., and Bunnett, N.W. (2000). β-
1207 Arrestin–dependent endocytosis of proteinase-activated receptor 2 is required for intracellular
1208 targeting of activated Erk1/2. The Journal of Cell Biology *148*, 1267-1282.
1209

Delgado-Cerezo, M., Sánchez-Rodríguez, C., Escudero, V., Miedes, E., Fernández, P.V., Jordá,
L., Hernández-Blanco, C., Sánchez-Vallet, A., Bednarek, P., Schulze-Lefert, P.*, et al.* (2012).
Arabidopsis heterotrimeric G-protein regulates cell wall defense and resistance to necrotrophic
fungi. Molecular Plant *5*, 98-114.

DeWire, S.M., Yamashita, D.S., Rominger, D.H., Liu, G., Cowan, C.L., Graczyk, T.M., Chen, X.-
T., Pitis, P.M., Gotchev, D., Yuan, C.*, et al.* (2013). A G protein-biased ligand at the μ-opioid
receptor is potently analgesic with reduced gastrointestinal and respiratory dysfunction compared
with morphine. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics *344*, 708-717.

Dhonukshe, P., Aniento, F., Hwang, I., Robinson, D.G., Mravec, J., Stierhof, Y.-D., and Friml, J.
(2007). Clathrin-mediated constitutive endocytosis of PIN auxin efflux carriers in Arabidopsis.
Current Biology *17*, 520-527.

Ding, L., Pandey, S., and Assmann, S.M. (2008). Arabidopsis extra-large G proteins (XLGs)
regulate root morphogenesis. The Plant Journal *53*, 248-263.

Droillard, M.-J., Boudsocq, M., Barbier-Brygoo, H., and Lauriere, C. (2004). Involvement of
MPK4 in osmotic stress response pathways in cell suspensions and plantlets of *Arabidopsis*
thaliana: activation by hypoosmolarity and negative role in hyperosmolarity tolerance. FEBS
Letters *574*, 42-48.

Eichel, K., and von Zastrow, M. (2018). Subcellular organization of GPCR signaling. Trends in
Pharmacological Sciences *39*, 200-208.

Escudero, V., Jordá, L., Sopeña-Torres, S., Mélida, H., Miedes, E., Muñoz-Barrios, A., Swami, S.,
Alexander, D., McKee, L.S., Sánchez-Vallet, A.*, et al.* (2017). Alteration of cell wall xylan
acetylation triggers defense responses that counterbalance the immune deficiencies of plants
impaired in the β-subunit of the heterotrimeric G-protein. The Plant Journal *92*, 386-399.

Fan, L., Li, R., Pan, J., Ding, Z., and Lin, J. (2015). Endocytosis and its regulation in plants. Trends
in Plant Science *20*, 388-397.

Felix, G., Duran, J.D., Volko, S., and Boller, T. (1999). Plants have a sensitive perception system
for the most conserved domain of bacterial flagellin. The Plant Journal *18*, 265-276.

Ferguson, K.M., Higashijima, T., Smigel, M.D., and Gilman, A.G. (1986). The influence of bound
GDP on the kinetics of guanine nucleotide binding to G proteins. J Biol Chem *261*, 7393-7399.

Fernie, A.R., Roessner, U., and Geigenberger, P. (2001). The sucrose analog palatinose leads to a
stimulation of sucrose degradation and starch synthesis when supplied to discs of growing potato
tubers. Plant Physiol *125*, 1967-1977.

Fu, Y., Lim, S., Urano, D., Tunc-Ozdemir, M., Phan, N., Elston, T., and Jones, A. (2014).
Reciprocal encoding of signal intensity and duration in a glucose-sensing circuit. . Cell *156*, 1084-
1096.

1256

1257 Géhin, M., Vivat, V., Wurtz, J.-M., Losson, R., Chambon, P., Moras, D., and Gronemeyer, H.
1258 (1999). Structural basis for engineering of retinoic acid receptor isotype-selective agonists and
1259 antagonists. Chemistry & Biology *6*, 519-529.

1260

1261 Gesty-Palmer, D., Chen, M., Reiter, E., Ahn, S., Nelson, C.D., Wang, S., Eckhardt, A.E., Cowan,
1262 C.L., Spurney, R.F., Luttrell, L.M.*, et al.* (2006). Distinct β-arrestin- and G protein-dependent
1263 pathways for parathyroid hormone receptor-stimulated ERK1/2 activation. Journal of Biological
1264 Chemistry *281*, 10856-10864.

1265

1266 Gómez-Gómez, L., and Boller, T. (2000). FLS2: An LRR receptor–like kinase involved in the
1267 perception of the bacterial elicitor flagellin in Arabidopsis. Molecular Cell *5*, 1003-1011.

1268

1269 Grigston, J.C., Osuna, D., Scheible, W.R., Stitt, M., and Jones, A.M. (2008). D-glucose sensing
1270 by a plasma membrane regulator of G signaling protein, AtRGS1. . FEBS Lett *582*, 3577-3584.

1271

1272 Gurevich, E., and Gurevich, V. (2006). Arrestins: ubiquitous regulators of cellular signaling
1273 pathways. Genome Biol *7*, 236.

1274

1275 Hao, H., Fan, L., Chen, T., Li, R., Li, X., He, Q., Botella, M.A., and Lin, J. (2014). Clathrin and
1276 membrane microdomains cooperatively regulate RbohD dynamics and activity in *Arabidopsis*.
1277 The Plant Cell *26*, 1729-1745.

1278

1279 Hirsch, J., Schubert, C., Gurevich, V., and Sigler, P. (1999). The 2.8 A crystal structure of visual
1280 arrestin: a model for arrestin's regulation. Cell *97*, 257 - 269.

1281

1282 Huot, B., Yao, J., Montgomery, B.L., and He, S.Y. (2014). Growth–defense tradeoffs in plants: A
1283 balancing act to optimize fitness. Molecular Plant *7*, 1267-1287.

1284

1285 Ilangumaran, S., and Hoessli, D.C. (1998). Effects of cholesterol depletion by cyclodextrin on the
1286 sphingolipid microdomains of the plasma membrane. Biochemical Journal *335*, 433-440.

1287

1288 Irani, N.G., Di Rubbo, S., Mylle, E., Van den Begin, J., Schneider-Pizoń, J., Hniliková, J., Šíša,
1289 M., Buyst, D., Vilarrasa-Blasi, J., Szatmári, A.-M.*, et al.* (2012). Fluorescent castasterone reveals
1290 BRI1 signaling from the plasma membrane. Nature chemical biology *8*, 583.

1291

1292 Jackson, L.P., Kelly, B.T., McCoy, A.J., Gaffry, T., James, L.C., Collins, B.M., Höning, S., Evans,
1293 P.R., and Owen, D.J. (2010). A large-scale conformational change couples membrane recruitment
1294 to cargo binding in the AP2 clathrin adaptor Complex. Cell *141*, 1220-1229.

1295

1296 Jelenska, J., Davern, S.M., Standaert, R.F., Mirzadeh, S., and Greenberg, J.T. (2017). Flagellin
1297 peptide flg22 gains access to long-distance trafficking in Arabidopsis via its receptor, FLS2.
1298 Journal of Experimental Botany *68*, 1769-1783.

1299

1300 Jha, S.G., Larson, E.R., Humble, J., Domozych, D.S., Barrington, D.S., and Tierney, M.L. (2018).
1301 Vacuolar Protein Sorting 26C encodes an evolutionarily conserved large retromer subunit in

eukaryotes that is important for root hair growth in Arabidopsis thaliana. The Plant Journal *94*, 595-611.

Johnston, C.A., Taylor, J.P., Gao, Y., Kimple, A.J., Grigston, J.C., Chen, J.-G., Siderovski, D.P., Jones, A.M., and Willard, F.S. (2007). GTPase acceleration as the rate-limiting step in Arabidopsis G protein-coupled sugar signaling. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *104*, 17317-17322.

Jones, J., Duffy, J., M, M., Temple, B., Dohlman, H., and Jones, A. (2011a). The crystal structure of a self-activating G protein α subunit reveals its distinct mechanism of signal initiation. Sci Signal *4*, ra8.

Jones, J.C., Temple, B.R.S., Jones, A.M., and Dohlman, H.G. (2011b). Functional reconstitution of an atypical G protein heterotrimer and regulator of G protein signaling protein (RGS1) from *Arabidopsis thaliana*. Journal of Biological Chemistry *286*, 13143-13150.

Kalderon, D., Roberts, B.L., Richardson, W.D., and Smith, A.E. (1984). A short amino acid sequence able to specify nuclear location. Cell *39*, 499-509.

Kang, Y., Zhou, X.E., Gao, X., He, Y., Liu, W., Ishchenko, A., Barty, A., White, T.A., Yefanov, O., Han, G.W.*, et al.* (2015). Crystal structure of rhodopsin bound to arrestin by femtosecond X-ray laser. Nature *523*, 561.

Keinath, N.F., Waadt, R., Brugman, R., Schroeder, Julian I., Grossmann, G., Schumacher, K., and Krebs, M. (2015). Live cell imaging with R-GECO1 sheds light on flg22- and chitin-induced transient $[Ca^{2+}]_{cyt}$ patterns in Arabidopsis. Molecular Plant *8*, 1188-1200.

Kelly, B.T., McCoy, A.J., Späte, K., Miller, S.E., Evans, P.R., Höning, S., and Owen, D.J. (2008). A structural explanation for the binding of endocytic dileucine motifs by the AP2 complex. Nature *456*, 976.

Kim, M., Vishnivetskiy, S.A., Van Eps, N., Alexander, N.S., Cleghorn, W.M., Zhan, X., Hanson, S.M., Morizumi, T., Ernst, O.P., Meiler, J.*, et al.* (2012). Conformation of receptor-bound visual arrestin. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *109*, 18407-18412.

Kim, S.Y., Xu, Z.-Y., Song, K., Kim, D.H., Kang, H., Reichardt, I., Sohn, E.J., Friml, J., Juergens, G., and Hwang, I. (2013). Adaptor protein complex 2–mediated endocytosis is crucial for male reproductive organ development in *Arabidopsis*. The Plant Cell *25*, 2970-2985.

Klopffleisch, K., Phan, N., Augustin, K., Bayne, R.S., Booker, K.S., Botella, J.R., Carpita, N.C., Carr, T., Chen, J.-G., Cooke, T.R.*, et al.* (2011). Arabidopsis G-protein interactome reveals connections to cell wall carbohydrates and morphogenesis. Mol Syst Biol *7*, 532.

Krauss, M., Kukhtina, V., Pechstein, A., and Haucke, V. (2006). Stimulation of phosphatidylinositol kinase type I-mediated phosphatidylinositol (4,5)-bisphosphate synthesis by AP-2μ–cargo complexes. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *103*, 11934-11939.

Lee, J., Eschen-Lippold, L., Lassowskat, I., Böttcher, C., and Scheel, D. (2015). Cellular reprogramming through mitogen-activated protein kinases. Frontiers in Plant Science *6*.

Li, L., and Sheen, J. (2016). Dynamic and diverse sugar signaling. Current Opinion in Plant Biology *33*, 116-125.

Li, R., Liu, P., Wan, Y., Chen, T., Wang, Q., Mettbach, U., Baluška, F., Šamaj, J., Fang, X., Lucas, W.J.*, et al.* (2012). A membrane microdomain-associated protein, Arabidopsis Flot1, is involved in a clathrin-independent endocytic pathway and is required for seedling development. The Plant Cell *24*, 2105-2122.

Li, X., Wang, X., Yang, Y., Li, R., He, Q., Fang, X., Luu, D.-T., Maurel, C., and Lin, J. (2011). Single-molecule analysis of PIP2;1 dynamics and partitioning reveals multiple modes of Arabidopsis plasma membrane aquaporin regulation. The Plant Cell *23*, 3780-3797.

Liang, X., Ma, M., Zhou, Z., Wang, J., Yang, X., Rao, S., Bi, G., Li, L., Zhang, X., Chai, J.*, et al.* (2018). Ligand-triggered de-repression of Arabidopsis heterotrimeric G proteins coupled to immune receptor kinases. Cell Research.

Liao, K.-L., Melvin, C.E., Sozzani, R., Jones, R.D., Elston, T.C., and Jones, A.M. (2017). Dose-Duration Reciprocity for G protein activation: Modulation of kinase to substrate ratio alters cell signaling. PLoS ONE *12*, e0190000.

Lin, W.-W., and Hsieh, S.-L. (2011). Decoy receptor 3: A pleiotropic immunomodulator and biomarker for inflammatory diseases, autoimmune diseases and cancer. Biochemical Pharmacology *81*, 838-847.

Lin, Z.-J.D., Liebrand, T.W.H., Yadeta, K.A., and Coaker, G. (2015). PBL13 is a serine/threonine protein kinase that negatively regulates Arabidopsis immune responses. Plant Physiology *169*, 2950-2962.

Lohse, M., Benovic, J., Codina, J., Caron, M., and Lefkowitz, R. (1990). beta-Arrestin: a protein that regulates beta-adrenergic receptor function. Science *248*, 1547 - 1550.

Loreti, E., Alpi, A., and Perata, P. (2000). Glucose and disaccharide-sensing mechanisms modulate the expression of alpha -amylase in barley embryos. Plant Physiol *123*, 939-948.

Luttrell, L.M., Roudabush, F.L., Choy, E.W., Miller, W.E., Field, M.E., Pierce, K.L., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2001). Activation and targeting of extracellular signal-regulated kinases by β-arrestin scaffolds. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *98*, 2449-2454.

Manglik, A., Lin, H., Aryal, D.K., McCorvy, J.D., Dengler, D., Corder, G., Levit, A., Kling, R.C., Bernat, V., Hübner, H.*, et al.* (2016). Structure-based discovery of opioid analgesics with reduced side effects. Nature *537*, 185.

1394   Martí-Renom, M.A., Stuart, A.C., Fiser, A., Sánchez, R., and, F.M., and Šali, A. (2000).
1395   Comparative protein structure modeling of genes and genomes. Annual Review of Biophysics and
1396   Biomolecular Structure *29*, 291-325.

1397

1398   Mudgil, Y., Karve, A., Teixeira, P., Jiang, K., Tunc-Ozdemir, M., and Jones, A. (2016).
1399   Photosynthate regulation of the root system architecture mediated by the heterotrimeric G protein
1400   complex in Arabidopsis. Frontiers in Plant Science *7*.

1401

1402   Nobles, K.N., Xiao, K., Ahn, S., Shukla, A.K., Lam, C.M., Rajagopal, S., Strachan, R.T., Huang,
1403   T.-Y., Bressler, E.A., Hara, M.R.*, et al.* (2011). Distinct phosphorylation sites on the β_2-adrenergic
1404   receptor establish a barcode that encodes differential functions of β-arrestin. Science Signaling *4*,
1405   ra51-ra51.

1406

1407   O'Hayre, M., Eichel, K., Avino, S., Zhao, X., Steffen, D.J., Feng, X., Kawakami, K., Aoki, J.,
1408   Messer, K., Sunahara, R.*, et al.* (2017). Genetic evidence that β-arrestins are dispensable for the
1409   initiation of β_2 adrenergic receptor signaling to ERK. Science Signaling *10*, eaal3395.

1410

1411   Ohno, H., Stewart, J., Fournier, M., Bosshart, H., Rhee, I., Miyatake, S., Saito, T., Gallusser, A.,
1412   Kirchhausen, T., and Bonifacino, J. (1995). Interaction of tyrosine-based sorting signals with
1413   clathrin-associated proteins. Science *269*, 1872-1875.

1414

1415   Ohtani, Y., Irie, T., Uekama, K., Fukunaga, K., and Pitha, J. (1989). Differential effects of alpha-
1416   , beta- and gamma-cyclodextrins on human erythrocytes. Eur J Biochem *186*, 17-22.

1417

1418   Oliviusson, P., Heinzerling, O., Hillmer, S., Hinz, G., Tse, Y.C., Jiang, L., and Robinson, D.G.
1419   (2006). Plant retromer, Localized to the prevacuolar compartment and microvesicles in
1420   *Arabidopsis*, may interact with vacuolar sorting receptors. The Plant Cell *18*, 1239-1252.

1421

1422   Paing, M.M., Stutts, A.B., Kohout, T.A., Lefkowitz, R.J., and Trejo, J. (2002). β-arrestins regulate
1423   protease-activated receptor-1 desensitization but not internalization or down-regulation. Journal of
1424   Biological Chemistry *277*, 1292-1300.

1425

1426   Pan, G., Ni, J., Wei, Y.-F., Yu, G.-l., Gentz, R., and Dixit, V.M. (1997). An antagonist decoy
1427   receptor and a death domain-containing receptor for TRAIL. Science *277*, 815-818.

1428

1429   Patwari, P., and Lee, R.T. (2012). An expanded family of arrestins regulate metabolism. Trends in
1430   Endocrinology & Metabolism *23*, 216-222.
1431   Peterson, Y.K., and Luttrell, L.M. (2017). The diverse roles of arrestin scaffolds in G protein–
1432   coupled receptor signaling. Pharmacological Reviews *69*, 256-297.

1433

1434   Pharr, D., and Keller, F. (2017). In Photoassimilate distribution plants and crops sSource-sink
1435   relationships (Routledge), pp. 157-183.

1436

1437   Raffaele, S., Bayer, E., Lafarge, D., Cluzet, S., German Retana, S., Boubekeur, T., Leborgne-
1438   Castel, N., Carde, J.-P., Lherminier, J., Noirot, E.*, et al.* (2009). Remorin, a solanaceae protein

resident in membrane rafts and plasmodesmata, impairs potato virus X movement. The Plant Cell *21*, 1541-1555.

Rajagopal, S., Kim, J., Ahn, S., Craig, S., Lam, C.M., Gerard, N.P., Gerard, C., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2010a). β-arrestin- but not G protein-mediated signaling by the "decoy" receptor CXCR7. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences *107*, 628-632.

Rajagopal, S., Rajagopal, K., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2010b). Teaching old receptors new tricks: biasing seven-transmembrane receptors. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery *9*, 373.

Ranf, S., Eschen-Lippold, L., Pecher, P., Lee, J., and Scheel, D. (2011). Interplay between calcium signalling and early signalling elements during defence responses to microbe- or damage-associated molecular patterns. The Plant Journal *68*, 100-113.

Rives, M.-L., Rossillo, M., Liu-Chen, L.-Y., and Javitch, J.A. (2012). 6′-Guanidinonaltrindole (6′-GNTI) is a G protein-biased κ-opioid receptor agonist that inhibits arrestin recruitment. Journal of Biological Chemistry *287*, 27050-27054.

Rolland, F., Moore, B., and Sheen, J. (2002). Sugar sensing and signaling in plants. The Plant Cell *14*, S185-S205.

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. Nature Methods *9*, 676.

Shenoy, S.K., Drake, M.T., Nelson, C.D., Houtz, D.A., Xiao, K., Madabushi, S., Reiter, E., Premont, R.T., Lichtarge, O., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2006). β-Arrestin-dependent, G protein-independent ERK1/2 activation by the β2 adrenergic receptor. Journal of Biological Chemistry *281*, 1261-1273.

Shi, H., Rojas, R., Bonifacino, J.S., and Hurley, J.H. (2006). The retromer subunit Vps26 has an arrestin fold and binds Vps35 through its C-terminal domain. Nature Structural & Molecular Biology *13*, 540-548.

Shiraishi, Y., Natsume, M., Kofuku, Y., Imai, S., Nakata, K., Mizukoshi, T., Ueda, T., Iwaï, H., and Shimada, I. (2018). Phosphorylation-induced conformation of β2-adrenoceptor related to arrestin recruitment revealed by NMR. Nature Communications *9*, 194.

Shiu, S.H., and Bleecker, A.B. (2001). Plant receptor-llike gene family: diversity, function, and signaling. Science STKE *Dec. 18th*, RE22.

Shukla, A.K., Manglik, A., Kruse, A.C., Xiao, K., Reis, R.I., Tseng, W.-C., Staus, D.P., Hilger, D., Uysal, S., Huang, L.-Y.*, et al.* (2013). Structure of active β-arrestin-1 bound to a G-protein-coupled receptor phosphopeptide. Nature *497*, 137.

1484 Sibley, D.R., Benovic, J.L., Caron, M.G., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (1987). Regulation of
1485 transmembrane signaling by receptor phosphorylation. Cell *48*, 913-922.
1486
1487 Sinha, A.K., Hofmann, M.G., Romer, U., Kockenberger, W., Elling, L., and Roitsch, T. (2002).
1488 Metabolizable and non-metabolizable sugars activate different signal transduction pathways in
1489 tomato. Plant Physiol *128*, 1480-1489.
1490
1491 Smith, J.S., Lefkowitz, R.J., and Rajagopal, S. (2018). Biased signalling: from simple switches to
1492 allosteric microprocessors. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery *17*, 243.
1493
1494 Smith, T.H., Coronel, L.J., Li, J.G., Dores, M.R., Nieman, M.T., and Trejo, J. (2016). Protease-
1495 activated receptor-4 signaling and trafficking is regulated by the clathrin adaptor protein complex-
1496 2 independent of β-arrestins. Journal of Biological Chemistry *291*, 18453-18464.
1497
1498 Sun, Y., Li, L., Macho, A.P., Han, Z., Hu, Z., Zipfel, C., Zhou, J.-M., and Chai, J. (2013). Structural
1499 basis for flg22-induced activation of the *Arabidopsis* FLS2-BAK1 immune complex. Science *342*,
1500 624-628.
1501
1502 Tunc-Ozdemir, M., and Jones, A.M. (2017). Ligand-induced dynamics of heterotrimeric G
1503 protein-coupled receptor-like kinase complexes. PLoS ONE *12*, e0171854.
1504
1505 Tunc-Ozdemir, M., Li, B., Jaiswal, D.K., Urano, D., Jones, A.M., and Torres, M.P. (2017).
1506 Predicted functional implications of phosphorylation of regulator of G protein signaling protein in
1507 plants. Frontiers in Plant Science *8*.
1508
1509 Tunc-Ozdemir, M., Liao, K.-L., Ross-Elliott, T.J., Elston, T.C., and Jones, A.M. (2018). Long-
1510 distance communication in Arabidopsis involving a self-activating G protein. Plant Direct *2*,
1511 e00037.
1512
1513 Tunc-Ozdemir, M., Urano, D., Jaiswal, D.K., Clouse, S.D., and Jones, A.M. (2016). Direct
1514 modulation of heterotrimeric G protein-coupled signaling by a receptor kinase complex. Journal
1515 of Biological Chemistry *291*, 13918-13925.
1516
1517 Urano, D., Maruta, N., Trusov, Y., Stoian, R., Liang, Y., Jaiswal, D., Thung, L., Botella, J., and
1518 Jones, A. (2016). Saltatory evolution of the heterotrimeric G protein signaling mechanisms in the
1519 plant kingdom. Science Signaling *9*, ra93.
1520
1521 Urano, D., Phan, N., Jones, J.C., Yang, J., Huang, J., Grigston, J., Philip Taylor, J., and Jones,
1522 A.M. (2012). Endocytosis of the seven-transmembrane RGS1 protein activates G-protein-coupled
1523 signalling in Arabidopsis. Nat Cell Biol *14*, 1079-1088.
1524
1525 Urs, N.M., Gee, S.M., Pack, T.F., McCorvy, J.D., Evron, T., Snyder, J.C., Yang, X., Rodriguiz,
1526 R.M., Borrelli, E., Wetsel, W.C.*, et al.* (2016). Distinct cortical and striatal actions of a β-arrestin–
1527 biased dopamine D2 receptor ligand reveal unique antipsychotic-like properties. Proceedings of
1528 the National Academy of Sciences *113*, E8178-E8186.
1529

Urs, N.M., Peterson, S.M., and Caron, M.G. (2017). New concepts in dopamine D2 receptor biased
signaling and implications for schizophrenia therapy. Biological Psychiatry *81*, 78-85.

Vang, S., Seitz, K., and Krysan, P. (2018). A simple microfluidic device for live cell imaging of
Arabidopsis cotyledons, leaves, and seedlings. Biotechniques *64*, 255-261.

Vishnivetskiy, S.A., Gimenez, L.E., Francis, D.J., Hanson, S.M., Hubbell, W.L., Klug, C.S., and
Gurevich, V.V. (2011). Few residues within an extensive binding interface drive receptor
interaction and determine the specificity of arrestin proteins. Journal of Biological Chemistry *286*,
24288-24299.

Vishnivetskiy, S.A., Paz, C.L., Schubert, C., Hirsch, J.A., Sigler, P.B., and Gurevich, V.V. (1999).
How does arrestin respond to the phosphorylated state of rhodopsin? Journal of Biological
Chemistry *274*, 11451-11454.

Wagemans, J., and Lavigne, R. (2015). Identification of protein-protein interactions by standard
Gal4p-based yeast two-hybrid screening. In Protein-Protein Interactions: Methods and
Applications, C.L. Meyerkord, and H. Fu, eds. (New York, NY, Springer New York), pp. 409-
431.

Wen, W., Meinkotht, J.L., Tsien, R.Y., and Taylor, S.S. (1995). Identification of a signal for rapid
export of proteins from the nucleus. Cell *82*, 463-473.

White, K.L., Robinson, J.E., Zhu, H., DiBerto, J.F., Polepally, P.R., Zjawiony, J.K., Nichols, D.E.,
Malanga, C.J., and Roth, B.L. (2015). The G protein–biased opioid receptor agonist RB-64 is
analgesic with a unique spectrum of activities *in vivo*. Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental
Therapeutics *352*, 98-109.

Williams, L.E., Lemoine, R., and Sauer, N. (2000). Sugar transporters in higher plants – a diversity
of roles and complex regulation. Trends in Plant Science *5*, 283-290.

Wingler, L.M., Elgeti, M., Hilger, D., Latorraca, N.R., Lerch, M.T., Staus, D.P., Dror, R.O.,
Kobilka, B.K., Hubbell, W.L., and Lefkowitz, R.J. (2019). Angiotensin analogs with divergent
bias stabilize distinct receptor conformations. Cell *176*, 468-478.e411.

Wu, L., and Birch, R. (2011). Isomaltulose is actively metabolized in plant cells. Plant Physiol
157, 2094-2101.

Yang, F., Yu, X., Liu, C., Qu, C.-X., Gong, Z., Liu, H.-D., Li, F.-H., Wang, H.-M., He, D.-F., Yi,
F., *et al.* (2015). Phospho-selective mechanisms of arrestin conformations and functions revealed
by unnatural amino acid incorporation and 19F-NMR. Nature Communications *6*, 8202.

Yang, Z., Yang, F., Zhang, D., Liu, Z., Lin, A., Liu, C., Xiao, P., Yu, X., and Sun, J.-P. (2017).
Phosphorylation of G protein-coupled receptors: from the barcode hypothesis to the flute model.
Molecular pharmacology *92*, 201-210.
1575

1576 Zaman, N., Seitz, K., Kabir, M., George-Schreder, L.S., Shepstone, I., Liu, Y., Zhang, S., and
1577 Krysan, P.J. (2019). A Förster resonance energy transfer sensor for live-cell imaging of mitogen-
1578 activated protein kinase activity in Arabidopsis. The Plant Journal *97*, 970-983.
1579
1580 Zelazny, E., Santambrogio, M., Pourcher, M., Chambrier, P., Berne-Dedieu, A., Fobis-Loisy, I.,
1581 Miège, C., Jaillais, Y., and Gaude, T. (2013). Mechanisms governing the endosomal membrane
1582 recruitment of the core retromer in Arabidopsis. Journal of Biological Chemistry *288*, 8815-8825.
1583
1584 Zhan, X., Gimenez, L.E., Gurevich, V.V., and Spiller, B.W. (2011). Crystal structure of arrestin-
1585 3 reveals the basis of the difference in receptor binding between two non-visual subtypes. Journal
1586 of Molecular Biology *406*, 467-478.
1587
1588 Zhong, C.-L., Zhang, C., and Liu, J.-Z. (2018). Heterotrimeric G protein signaling in plant
1589 immunity. Journal of Experimental Botany *70*, 1109-1118.
1590
1591 Zhou, Z., Bi, G., and Zhou, J.-M. (2018). Luciferase complementation assay for protein-protein
1592 interactions in plants. Current Protocols in Plant Biology *3*, 42-50.

1606   Figure 1
1607

1616   Figure 2

1617

     Figure 3

1643   Figure 4

1644

1653   Figure 5
1654

1663   Figure 6

1664

1676   Figure 7
1677

1678
1679

1680   Figure S1
1681

 Figure S2

RGS1-GFP + CLC-mCherry   RGS1-GFP + FLOT1-mCherry

1716   Figure S3
1717

1752   Figure S4
1753

A

```
              1        10        20        30        40        50        60        70
DpArr1      ...MGSWSHPQFEKGMV...TKKAKVYKKASPNGKLTTYLAKRDYYDHKEWQDNIDGVCVVDPDYLKNRKVFGLIVVAFRYG
p44         ...........MKANKP...APNHVIFKKISRDKSVTIYLGKRDYIDHVERVEPVDGVVLVDPELVKGKRVYVSLTCAFRYG
BtArr3      ...............M...ANMSRVFKKTCSNGKLSIYLGKRDFVDHVDMVEPIDGVVLVDPEYLKGRKMFVMLTCAFRYG
PmArr1      ............MEDNSK...RQGTRVFKKSSPNGKITVYLGKRDFVDHITHVDPIDGVVLIDPEYLKDRKVFGHVLAAFRYG
BtArr1      ...............MG...DKGTRVFKKASPNGKLTVYLGKRDFVDHIDLVEPVDGVVLVDPEYLKERRVYVTLTCAFRYG
HsArr1      ...............MG...DKGTRVFKKASPNGKLTVYLGKRDFVDHIDLVDPVDGVVLVDPEYLKERRVYVTLTCAFRYG
BtArr2      ...............MGE...KPGTRVFKKSSPNCKLTVYLGKRDFVDHLDKVDPVDGVVLVDPDYLKDRKVFVTLTCAFRYG
HsArr2      ...............MGE...KPGTRVFKKSSPNCKLTVYLGKRDFVDHLDKVDPV..............VFVTLTCAFRYG
AtVPS26like ....................MATATTVNVKLS......RSNRIYRSSEPVEGKIVIK...SATSISHQAIRLSV.NG
AtVPS26A    MNYLLGAFKPACNISITFTDGKNRKQVPTKKDNGQ.I......VMNPLFQSQETIAGKINIEP.YQGKKVEHNGVKVEL.LG
AtVPS26B    MNYLLGAFKPACNISITFSDGKNRKQVPMKKENGQ.T......ALVPLFHSQDTISGKVCIEP.YQGKKVEHNGVKVEL.LG
HsVPS26A    MSFLGGFFGPICEIDIVLNDGETRKMAEMKTEDGK.V......EKHYLFYDGESVSGKVNLAFKQPGKRLEHQGIRIEF.VG
BtVPS26A    MSFLGGFFGPICEIDVVLNDGETRKMAEMKTEDGK.V......EKHYLFYDGESVSGKVNLAFKQPGKRLEHQGIRIEF.VG
HsVPS26B    MSFFG..FGQSVEVEILLNDAESRKRAEHKTEDGK.K......EKYFLFYDGETVSGKVSLALKNPNKRLEHQGIKIEF.IG
BtVPS26B    MSFFG..FGQSVDVDILLNDADSRRRAEHKTEDGK.K......DKYFLFYDGETVSGKVSLALKNPNKRLEHQGIKVEF.IG

              80        90       100       110       120       130       140       150
DpArr1      REDMDVMGVSFR..KDFA..VKQMQIYPPLEEN.QRPLTKLQAKLLNKLGENAVPFHYDLPTNTPDTVCIQPSEYDGGAPCG
p44         QEDIDVMGLSFR..RDLY..FSQVQVFPPVGA..SGATTRLQESLIKKLGANTYPFLLTFPDYLPCSVMLQPAPQDVGKSCG
BtArr3      HDDLDVIGLTFR..KDLY..VQVQQVVPAESSSPRGSLTVLQERLLHKLGDNAYPFTLQMVVNLPCSVTLQPGPDDTGKACG
PmArr1      REDLDVLGLTFR..KDLY..LASEQIFPLDPNN.KRPLTRLQERLIKKLGPNAFPFFFELPPHCPASVTLQPAPGDMGKPCG
BtArr1      REDLDVLGLTFR..KDLF..VANVQSFPPAPED.KKPLTRLQERLIKKLGEHAYPFTFEIPPNLPCSVTLQPGPEDTGKACG
HsArr1      REDLDVLGLTFR..KDLF..VANVQSFPPAPED.KKPLTRLQERLIKKLGEHAYPFTFEIPPNLPCSVTLQPGPEDTGKACG
BtArr2      REDLDVLGLSFR..KDLF..IANYQAFPPTPNP.PRPPTRLQDRLLRKLGQHAHPFFFTIPQNLPCSVTLQPGPEDTGKACG
HsArr2      REDLDVLGLSFR..KDLF..IATYQAFPPVPNP.PRPPTRLQDRLLRKLGQHAHPFFFTIPQNLPCSVTLQPGPEDTGKACG
AtVPS26like SVNLQVRGGSAGVIESFYGVIKPIQIVKKTIE........VKSSGKIPPGTTEIPFSLNLREPGEGIV.EKFYETFHGTNIN
AtVPS26A    QIEMYFDRGNFY...DFTSLVR.........E.......IDVPGEIYER.KTYPF.......EFSSV.EMPYETYNGVNVR
AtVPS26B    QIEMYFDRGNFY...DFTSLVR.........E.......LDVPGEIYER.KTYPF.......EFPTV.EMPYETYNGVNVR
HsVPS26A    QIELFNDKSNTH...EFVNLVK.........E.......LALPGELTQS.RSYDF.......EFMQV.EKPYESYIGANVR
BtVPS26A    QIELFNDKSNTH...EFVNLVK.........E.......LALPGELTQS.RSYDF.......EFMQV.EKPYESYIGANVR
HsVPS26B    QIELYYDRGNHH...EFVSLVK.........D.......LARPGEITQS.QAFDF.......EFTHV.EKPYESYTGQNVK
BtVPS26B    QIELYYDRGNHH...EFVSLVK.........D.......LARPGEVTQS.QAFDF.......EFTHV.EKPYESYTGQNVK

              160       170       180       190       200       210
DpArr1      VDYQVTTYVSQN...MDDKIH........KRNSVSLSIR......KLSYFEFGSDEQPRGEISKE..EK...FTSGAMKLEC
p44         VDFEIKAFATHSTDVEEDKIP........KKSSVRLLIR......KVQHAPRDMGPQPRAEASWQ..EF...MSDKPLRLAV
BtArr3      VDFEVKSFCAEN...LEEKVS........KRDSVRLVIR......KIQFAPLEPGPGPWARLCRR..EL...LSAQPLLLQA
PmArr1      VDYELKAYVGDT...VDDKPH........KRNSVRLAIR......KVMYAPIKQGEQPSVEVSKE..EM...MSPNKLHLEA
BtArr1      VDYEVKAFCAEN...LEEKIH........KRNSVRLVIR......KVQYAPERPGPQPTAETTRQ..EL...MSDKPLHLEA
HsArr1      VDYEVKAFCAEN...LEEKIH........KRNSVRLVIR......KVQYAPERPGPQPTAETTRQ..EL...MSDKPLHLEA
BtArr2      VDFEIRAFCAKS...LEEKSH........KRNSVRLVIR......KVQFAPEKPGPQPSAETTRH..EL...MSDRSLHLEA
HsArr2      VDFEIRAFCAKS...LEEKSH........KRNSVRLVIR......KVQFAPEKPGPQPSAETTRH..EL...MSDRSLHLEA
AtVPS26like IQYLLTADIPRG...YLHKPLSATMEFIIESGRVDLPERPIPPEIVFIYTQDTQRHPLLPDIKTGGFRVTGKLATQCSLQD
AtVPS26A    LRYVLKVTVTRG...YAGSIVEY.QDFVV.RNYVPLPPIN..NSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD
AtVPS26B    LRYVLKVTVTRG...YAGSILEY.QELVV.RNYAPLPDIN..NSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD
HsVPS26A    LRYFLKVTIVRR...LTDLVKEY..DLIV.HQLATYPDVN..NSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD
BtVPS26A    LRYFLKVTIVRR...LTDLVKEY..DLIV.HQLATYPDVN..NSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD
HsVPS26B    LRYFLRATISRR...LNDVVKEM..DIVV.HTLSTYPELN..SSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD
BtVPS26B    LRYFLRATISRR...LNDVVKEM..DIVV.HTLSTYPELN..SSIKME.V........GIEDCLHIEFE..YNKSKYHLKD

              220       230       240       250       260       270       280       290
DpArr1      TLDKARYYSGESMNISVCVDNPTSKKAKRIKIQIIQLADICLYETVTYKSVVTELETEEGFPIEPNTSGFCQVYKLRPVLEV
p44         SLSKEIYYHGEPIPVTVAVTNSTEKTVKKIKVLVEQVTNVVLYSSDYYIKTVAAEEAQE..KVPPN.SSLTKTLTLVPLLAN
BtArr3      WMDKEVNYHGQPISVNVSINNSTNKVIKKIKISVDQITDVVLYSLDKYTKTVFVQEFTE..TIAAN.STFSKSFAVTPLLAD
PmArr1      SLDKELYYHGETVAVNVHIQNNSNKSVKKIKVSIRQFADICLFSTAQYKCTVAETESEEGCPVGPG.FSISKVFTLTPLLSN
BtArr1      SLDKEIYYHGEPISVNVHVTNNTNKTVKKIKISVRQYADICLFNTAQYKCPVAMEEADD..TVAPS.STFCKVYTLTPFLAN
HsArr1      SLDKEIYYHGEPISVNVHVTNNTNKTVKKIKISVRQYADICLFNTAQYKCPVAMEEADD..TVAPS.STFCKVYTLTPFLAN
BtArr2      SLDKELYYHGEPLNVNVHVTNNSTKTVKKIKVSVRQYADICLFSTAQYKCPVAQVEQDD..QVSPS.STFCKVYTITPLLSN
HsArr2      SLDKELYYHGEPLNVNVHVTNNSTKTVKKIKVSVRQYADICLFSTAQYKCPVAQLEQDD..QVSPS.STFCKVYTITPLLSD
AtVPS26like PLSGELTVEASSVPI...........TSIDIHLLRVE......................................
AtVPS26A    VILGKIYFLLVRIKI...........KNMDLEIRRRE......................................
AtVPS26B    VILGKIYFLLVRIKM...........KNMDLEIRRRE......................................
HsVPS26A    VIVGKIYFLLVRIKI...........QHMELQLIKKE......................................
BtVPS26A    VIVGKIYFLLVRIKI...........QHMELQLIKKE......................................
HsVPS26B    VIVGKIYFLLVRIKI...........KHMEIDIIKRE......................................
BtVPS26B    VIVGKIYFLLVRIKI...........KHMEIDIIKRE......................................
```

1754

1755

1756

1757

1758

```
             290        300        310        320        330                                    340
DpArr1     KLRPVLEVTKRRAGLALNGKVKYEDTMLAASTEDAGNVDKENLGVV...................VSYKVRIKMTLGFG
p44        TLVPLLANNRERRGIALDGKIKHEDTNLASSTIIKEGIDKTVMGIL...................VSYQIKVKLTV..S
BtArr3     AVTPLLADNCHKQGLALDGKLKQGDTNLASSTILRPGVDKELLGIL...................VSYKVRVNLMVSCE
PmArr1     TLTPLLSNNRDKWGLALDGKLKDEDTNLASSTVITDSSQKENLGII...................VQYKVKVKLNL..G
BtArr1     TLTPFLANNREKRGLALDGKLKHEDTNLASSTLLREGANREILGII...................VSYKVKVKLVVSRG
HsArr1     TLTPFLANNREKRGLALDGKLKHEDTNLASSTLLREGANREILGII...................VSYKVKVKLVVSRG
BtArr2     TITPLLSNNREKRGLALDGKLKHEDTNLASSTIVKEGANKEVLGIL...................VSYRVKVKLVVSRG
HsArr2     TITPLLSDNREKRGLALDGKLKHEDTNLASSTIVKEGANKEVLGIL...................VSYRVKVKLVVSRG
AtVPS26like ...........SIIVGERIVTETSLIQSTQIADGDVCRNMTLPIYVLLPRLLMCPSVF..AGPFSVEFKVCITISFK
AtVPS26A   ...........STGACANTHVETETLAKFELMDGAPVRGESIPVRVFLTPYDLTPTHKNINNKFSVKYYLNLVLVDE
AtVPS26B   ...........STGACANTHVETETLAKFELMDGTPVRGESIPVRLFLAPYDLTPTHRNINNKFSVKYYLNLVLVDE
HsVPS26A   ...........ITGIGPSTTTETETIAKYEIMDGAPVRGESIPIRLFLAGYDPTPTMRDVNKKFSVRYFLNLVLVDE
BtVPS26A   ...........ITGIGPSTTTETETIAKYEIMDGAPVKGESIPIRLFLAGYDPTPTMRDVNKKFSVRYFLNLVLVDE
HsVPS26B   ...........TTGTGPNVYHENDTIAKYEIMDGAPVRGESIPIRLFLAGYELTPTMRDINKKFSVRYYLNLVLIDE
BtVPS26B   ...........TTGTGPNVYHENDTIAKYEIMDGAPVRGESIPIRLFLAGYELTPTMRDINKKFSVRYYLNLVLIDD

             350        360        370        380
DpArr1     .......SGDMLLEVPFKLCPARLKGRLAQPEARE.GDDAE.......................................
p44        GLLGELTSSEVATEVPFRLMHPQPEDPDTAKESA............................................
BtArr3     GILGDLTASEVGVELPLILMHPKPSNEAAS..............................................SEDIVI
PmArr1     PLVG....DLVAELPFTLMHPKPEEEPEVNN....KPAVPPASSPTQDPNSAPAVDTNLIELDTDGTTCYADQDDDIIF
BtArr1     GLLGDLASSDVAVELPFTLMHPKPKEEPP...............HREVPEHETPVDTNLIELDTN........DDDIVF
HsArr1     GLLGDLASSDVAVELPFTLMHPKPKEEPP...............HREVPENETPVDTNLIELDTN........DDDIVF
BtArr2     G........DVSVELPFVLMHPKPHDHIALPRPQS.APTHPPTLLPSAVPETDAPVDTNLIEFETNY.....ATDDDIVF
HsArr2     G........DVSVELPFVLMHPKPHDHIPLPRPQS.A.......APETDVPVDTNLIEFDTNY.....ATDDDIVF
AtVPS26like SKLA...............KAQPKSDPTAPRLWMALERLPLELV.............................RTKRDQFS
AtVPS26A   ED................RRYFKQQEITLYRLKEETS.........................................
AtVPS26B   ED................RRYFKQQEITLYRLKEDASS.......................................
HsVPS26A   ED................RRYFKQQEIILWRKAPEKLR...................................KQRTNFH
BtVPS26A   ED................RRYFKQQEIILWRKAPEKLR...................................KQRTNFH
HsVPS26B   EE................RRYFKQQEVVLWRKGDIVRKSM.................................SHQAAIAS
BtVPS26B   EE................RRYFKQQEVVLWRKGDIVRKSM.................................SHQAAIAS

DpArr1     ...............................
p44        ...............................
BtArr3     EEFAQQEPSGESQ..EALAAEGNEGS......
PmArr1     EDFARLRLKGETE..A...............
BtArr1     EDFARQRLKGMKD..DKEEEEDGTGSPRLNDR
HsArr1     EDFARQRLKGMKD..DKEEEEDGTGSPQLNNR
BtArr2     EDFARLRLKGLKD..EDYDDQFC.........
HsArr2     EDFARLRLKGMKD..DDYDDQLC.........
AtVPS26like C..............................
AtVPS26A   ...............................
AtVPS26B   ...............................
HsVPS26A   QRFESPESQASAEQPEM..............
BtVPS26A   QRFESPESQASAEQPEM..............
HsVPS26B   QRFEGTTSLGEVRTPSQLSDNNCRQ.......
BtVPS26B   QRFEGTTPLGEARTPGPLSDSGNRQ.......
```

1759

B.

1761

```
 1: DpArr1    100.00   37.22   38.42   46.98   46.61   46.89   43.13   42.03   19.03   18.22   19.77   15.44   15.44   16.73   16.73
 2: p44                100.00   52.79   49.72   59.50   59.22   56.46   56.01   18.56   15.16   15.16   12.65   12.65   12.24   12.65
 3: BtArr3                      100.00   50.00   60.77   60.51   56.58   54.79   17.10   16.03   16.03   13.51   13.51   14.61   16.10
 4: PmArr1                               100.00   66.33   66.58   63.48   63.09   17.86   17.41   18.55   12.96   12.96   14.65   15.02
 5: BtArr1                                        100.00   99.04   77.81   78.33   17.54   19.83   19.83   14.67   14.67   15.36   16.10
 6: HsArr1                                                 100.00   78.05   78.59   17.16   19.41   20.25   14.29   14.29   14.98   15.73
 7: BtArr2                                                          100.00   96.95   17.02   14.11   14.86   12.50   12.50   13.88   14.23
 8: HsArr2                                                                   100.00   16.79   13.91   14.35   11.51   11.51   13.90   14.29
 9: AtVPS261ike                                                                      100.00   21.61   19.71   21.35   21.35   20.42   20.07
10: AtVPS26A                                                                                  100.00   91.06   56.48   56.15   54.18   53.51
11: AtVPS26B                                                                                           100.00   57.95   57.62   55.00   54.33
12: HsVPS26A                                                                                                    100.00   99.69   70.46   68.92
13: BtVPS26A                                                                                                             100.00   70.15   68.62
14: HsVPS26B                                                                                                                      100.00   95.54
15: BtVPS26B                                                                                                                               100.00
```

1762

1763

1764   C.

1765

1766

1767

D.

Filename	molpdf	DOPE score	GA341 score	RMSD
atvps26a1.pdb	2292.41699	-30278.39648	1.00000	0.309
atvps26a2.pdb	2233.81055	-30840.71289	1.00000	0.17
atvps26a3.pdb	2258.48999	-30400.76953	1.00000	0.277
atvps26a4.pdb	2212.42798	-30568.29883	1.00000	0.244
atvps26a5.pdb	2188.86987	-30466.78711	1.00000	0.217

E.

F.

1776
1777 Figure S5
1778

1779
1780
1781 Figure S6
1782

1789 **Supplemental code**.

1790
1791
```
Data = xlsread('IMARIS statistics output')
```
1792
1793
```
% first step: sort the data based on the track ID, and
% subsort it on time points.
```
1794
1795
```
sortedData=sortrows(Data,[3,4]);
trackIDs=sortedData(:,3);
```
1796
1797
```
%trackIDs is only the ith column from the original sorted data, separate
%array
```
1798
1799
```
uniquetrackIDs=unique(trackIDs);
%uniquetrackIDs is a separate array with only unique track IDs
```
1800
1801
1802
```
%StartEnd=zeros(length(uniquetrackIDs),2);
meanSpeedArea=zeros(length(uniquetrackIDs),2);
```
```
% Make a matrix with all its elements zeros. One dimension of the matrix
% is length of unique track IDs, i.e., the number of unique track IDs.
% Another dimension is 2 because we want to store the start and end
% locations of each of the unique track IDs.
```
```
for i = 1:length(uniquetrackIDs)
    ItrackID=uniquetrackIDs(i);
    locations=find(trackIDs==ItrackID);
    startLoc=locations(1);
    endLoc=locations(end);
    SpeedColumn=sortedData(:,1);
    meanSpeedArea(i,1)=mean(SpeedColumn(startLoc:endLoc));
    AreaColumn=sortedData(:,2);
    meanSpeedArea(i,2)=mean(AreaColumn(startLoc:endLoc));
    %StartEnd(i,1)=startLoc;
    %StartEnd(i,2)=endLoc;
```
1819
1820
```
end
```
1821