Functional domain studies uncover novel roles for the ZTL Kelch repeat domain in clock function

Ann M. Feke¹, Joshua M. Gendron^{1*}

¹Department of Molecular, Cellular, and Developmental Biology, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA.

* Corresponding author

E-mail: Joshua.gendron@yale.edu

Abstract

The small LOV/F-box/Kelch family of E3 ubiquitin ligases plays an essential role in the regulation of plant circadian clocks and flowering time by sensing dusk. The family consists of three members, ZEITLUPE (ZTL), LOV KELCH PROTEIN 2 (LKP2), and FLAVIN-BINDING KELCH REPEAT F-BOX PROTEIN 1 (FKF1), which share a unique protein domain architecture allowing them to act as photoreceptors that transduce light signals via altering stability of target proteins. Despite intensive study of this protein family we still lack important knowledge about the biochemical and functional roles of the protein domains that comprise these unique photoreceptors. Here, we perform comparative analyses of transgenic lines constitutively expressing the photoreceptor LOV domain or the Kelch repeat protein-protein interaction domains of ZTL, FKF1, and LKP2. Expression of each domain alone is sufficient to disrupt circadian rhythms and flowering time, but each domain differs in the magnitude of effect. Immunoprecipitation followed by mass spectrometry with the ZTL Kelch repeat domain identified a suite of potential interacting partners. Furthermore, the ZTL Kelch repeat domain mediates interaction with the LOV domain of ZTL and the ZTL homologs LKP2 and FKF1. This suggests that the Kelch repeat domain of ZTL may mediate homo- and hetero-dimerization of the three LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins and provide added insight into the composition of the protein complexes and an additional role for the Kelch repeat domain.

30Introduction

31 Sensing day-night transitions is essential for proper adaptation of an organism to its
32environment. In plants, dusk is particularly important as it can communicate photoperiod
33duration and thereby the season to the plant. A multitude of biological processes depend on
34seasonal timing, such as reproduction, energy production, and starch biosynthesis and
35degradation rates that balance plant growth with night-time survival [1–4].

36 A small family of blue-light photoreceptors, the LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins,
37communicates the dusk transition to the photoperiodic flowering time pathway and the
38circadian clock in plants. In Arabidopsis, this family consists of three members, *ZEITLUPE*
39(*ZTL*), *FLAVIN-BINDING KELCH REPEAT F-BOX PROTEIN 1* (*FKF1*), and *LOV KELCH*
40*PROTEIN 2* (*LKP2*) [5–7]. These proteins act to both stabilize and de-stabilize target
41proteins in a light-dependent manner, thus regulating the abundance of target proteins in
42accordance with day/night and seasonal cycles. In order to do so, this family leverages its
43unique domain architecture, consisting of an N-terminal, blue-light sensing
44LIGHT/OXYGEN/VOLTAGE (LOV) domain, a C-terminal Kelch repeat domain, and a
45centrally-located F-box domain allowing it to form an E3 ubiquitin ligase that promotes
46ubiquitylation and subsequent proteasomal degradation of target proteins [8,9].

47 Despite the similarities in primary amino acid sequence between these three
48proteins, they display a complex pattern of genetic redundancy. For example, *ZTL* plays a
49major role in the regulation of the circadian clock and has only a minor role in the
50regulation of flowering time, while *FKF1* is an essential regulator of photoperiodic
51flowering that has minimal impact on the circadian clock [5,7,10–13]. *LKP2* is redundant
52with *ZTL* and *FKF1*, as single knockout mutations in this gene lead to minimal phenotypic

consequences but exaggerate *ZTL* and *FKF1* mutant phenotypes [11,12,14]. However, when *LKP2* is expressed at high levels it can cause the clock to be arrhythmic, indicating its role in clock function [6].

In order to fully understand the overlapping and distinct functions of this important gene family, intense research has begun to investigate the structures and biochemical functions of the LOV and Kelch repeat domains [9,11,22–24,14–21]. The N-terminal LOV domain is a blue light photoreceptor that is critical for the regulation of *ZTL*, *LKP2*, and *FKF1* function. Regulation occurs through light-dependent interaction with the regulatory protein GIGANTEA (GI) which can promote or inhibit E3 ligase activity depending on the target protein [21,25,26]. GI binding is required for the E3 ubiquitin ligase function of *FKF1*, and it restricts this activity the light period of the day. GI inhibits the E3 ubiquitin ligase activity of *ZTL*, restricting it to the dark period [21,25,26]. Interestingly, GI is also required for the stability of the *ZTL* protein during the day and performs this action by recruiting the deubiquitinating enzymes UBP12 and UBP13 and acting as a co-chaperone with HSP90 [21,27,28].

In addition to its role in promoting protein interactions with regulatory proteins such as GI, the LOV domain is also involved in directly binding substrate proteins that are stabilized or destabilized. For example, the *FKF1* LOV domain interacts with the floral activator CONSTANS (CO) in a GI-dependent manner, stabilizing CO in the light [19]. In contrast, the *ZTL* LOV domain interacts with the core clock repressors TOC1, PRR5, and CHE, promoting their degradation in the dark [13,29–31].

Adjacent to the LOV domain is a typical F-box domain and at the C-terminus of the protein is a Kelch repeat type protein-protein interaction domain. The F-box domain is a

critical component of the SKP1/CULLIN/F-BOX (SCF) multi-subunit E3 ubiquitin ligase that is required for interaction with the other components of this complex [32–34]. We have previously demonstrated that the F-box domain is required for proper function of the LOV/F-box/Kelch family of proteins, as the expression of “decoy” versions of *ZTL* and *FKF1* that lack the F-box domain mimics published loss-of-function mutant phenotypes [13]. One role of the Kelch repeat domain is to promote interactions with substrates that are ubiquitylated. This information comes from studies of *FKF1*, where the Kelch repeat domain binds to and promotes the degradation of the floral repressors called the CYCLING DOF FACTORS (CDFs) [24]. Interestingly, ubiquitylation of these substrates relies on the interaction between *FKF1* and GI [24,26].

In contrast, the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain has not been demonstrated to interact with known *ZTL* substrates [13,29–31]. However, the Kelch repeat domain is presumably important for *ZTL* function, as mutations in the Kelch repeat domain ablate *ZTL* function [10,20,30,35]. Additionally, expression of a truncated form of *ZTL* which contains only the LOV and F-box domains lengthens period similarly to a *ztl* loss-of-function mutant rather than shortening period as is observed in plants overexpressing full-length *ZTL* [7,10,22]. Together these data show that the Kelch repeat domain is important for *ZTL*’s role in clock function, but its exact biochemical role remains unknown.

In this study, we investigate the genetic and biochemical functions of the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain. By performing comparative genetic analyses of plants overexpressing the *ZTL*, *LKP2*, and *FKF1* LOV and Kelch repeat domains, we demonstrate that both the LOV and Kelch repeat domains are independently sufficient to disrupt the circadian clock and flowering time when expressed in plants. We then focus further studies on the biochemical

role of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain using immunoprecipitation followed by mass spectrometry to identify a list of putative protein interacting partners. We find that FKF1 and LKP2 as well as the native ZTL protein are part of a complex with the ZTL Kelch repeat domain. Using yeast-two-hybrid analyses, we determine that the Kelch repeat domain interacts directly with the LOV domain of ZTL suggesting two possibilities: an antiparallel conformation for intermolecular homodimers or intramolecular interaction between the two domains. Our results suggest that a biochemical role of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain may be promoting homo- or hetero-dimerization with other LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins supporting previous data providing a possible mechanism for the role of ZTL in promoting auto-ubiquitylation and also mediating stability of FKF1. Furthermore, our genetic analysis suggests that the Kelch repeat domain may modulate the formation of higher order protein complexes that are essential for the function of LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins.

Results

Expression of the LOV domain of LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins

disrupt the circadian clock and flowering time

We have previously shown that expressing ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 without the F-box domain results in disruption of circadian clock function and flowering time [13]. We next wanted to explore the roles of individual LOV and Kelch repeat domains separately and determine their effects on circadian clock pacing and flowering time. To do this, we overexpressed affinity-tagged LOV and Kelch repeat domains of *FKF1*, *LKP2*, and *ZTL* in the *CCA1p::Luciferase* (*CCA1* promoter driving expression of firefly *Luciferase*) background, and monitored circadian clock period and flowering time. We included *CCA1p::Luciferase* plants that express *FKF1*, *LKP2*, and *ZTL* decoys (LOV-Kelch fusion proteins which lack the F-box domain), which we have analyzed previously [13], and wild type *CCA1p::Luciferase* parental plants, as controls. In order to compare results from experiments performed separately, we use the difference between the period or flowering time of the individual T1 transgenic and the average period or flowering time of the concurrent wild type control plants for our statistical analyses [36,37]. The data generated in these experiments is displayed in Figure 1 and Tables 1 and 2. We track period and flowering time for a large number of individual T1 transgenic insertion plants allowing us to avoid potential pitfalls of following single insertion lines that may be affected by genomic insertion location.

130

Figure 1. Phenotypes of Plants Expressing Domains of ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1. A) Period lengths and B) flowering time were measured for individual T1 insertion transgenics in the

133CCA1p::Luciferase background. A) Values presented are the difference between the period
134of the individual transgenic and the average period of the CCA1p::Luciferase control plants
135in the accompanying experiment. B) Values presented are the difference between the
136flowering time (as measured by the age at 1 cm inflorescence height) of the individual
137transgenics and the average flowering time of the CCA1p::Luciferase control plants in the
138accompanying experiment. * = significantly different from wild type with a Bonferroni-
139corrected α of 0.0056.

140

141**Table 1. Summary of Circadian Phenotypes for ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 Decoy, LOV, and**
142**Kelch Repeat Domains.**

Domain	Subpopulation	Circadian Period Difference (Hours)		
		ZTL (n)	LKP2 (n)	FKF1 (n)
Decoy	Majority	4.5 (24)**	1.9 (34)**	0.6 (35)**
	Minority	0.2 (8)	-0.8 (5)*	-
LOV	Majority	4.1 (25)**	1.3 (26)**	0.8 (36)**
	Minority	0.1 (9)	-	-
Kelch	Majority	4.4 (34)**	0.8 (19)**	0.8 (32)**
	Minority	0.3 (3)	-	-

143The average period difference for each subpopulation of overexpression transgenics and
144the number of plants in each subpopulation is presented. - represents that a minority
145subpopulation does not exist for this domain. * represents $p < \alpha$ a Bonferroni corrected α of
146 3.8×10^{-3} (equivalent to $p < 0.05$); ** represents $p < \alpha$ a Bonferroni corrected α of 7.7×10^{-4}
147(equivalent to $p < 0.01$)

148

149**Table 2. Summary of Flowering Time Phenotypes for ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 Decoy,**
150**LOV, and Kelch Repeat Domains.**

Domain	Subpopulation	Flowering Time Difference (Days)		
		ZTL (n)	LKP2 (n)	FKF1 (n)
Decoy	Majority	2.8 (24)**	3.8 (33)**	6.0 (35)**
	Minority	19.9 (8)**	29.5 (6)**	-
LOV	Majority	2.6 (27)**	4.5 (22)**	4.1 (36)**
	Minority	16.0 (7)**	17.0 (4)*	-
Kelch	Majority	3.2 (37)**	3.0 (19)**	2.9 (32)**
	Minority	-	-	-

The average flowering time difference for each subpopulation of overexpression transgenics and the number of plants in each subpopulation is presented. – represents that a minority subpopulation does not exist for this domain. * represents $p < \alpha$ Bonferroni corrected α of 3.8×10^{-3} (equivalent to $p < 0.05$); ** represents $p < \alpha$ Bonferroni corrected α of 7.7×10^{-4} (equivalent to $p < 0.01$)

156

The function of the LOV domain is well defined [13,19,29–31], allowing us to predict that overexpressing the LOV domains of ZTL, FKF1, and LKP2 would be sufficient to disrupt the functions of the endogenous proteins [22]. We overexpressed affinity tagged LOV domains from *ZTL*, *LKP2*, and *FKF1* and monitored circadian clock period and flowering time (Fig 1A-B, green and blue points). In general, the clock and flowering phenotypes observed in plants expressing the LOV domains of ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 are similar to the plants expressing the decoys [13]. We observed statistically significant lengthening of circadian clock period and delays in flowering time in transgenic populations expressing any of the three LOV domain and decoy constructs (Tables 1 and 2, Fig 1, green and blue points). As we have observed previously, there are phenotypic subpopulations (two separable groups of T1 transgenics from the same overexpression population) when we overexpress some decoy, LOV, or Kelch repeat domains (Fig 1A-B green and blue circles

169and triangles) [13]. For clarity we define the majority subpopulation as the one with the
170larger number of individuals, and the minority subpopulation, as the subpopulation with
171the smaller number of individuals.

172 ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 have all been shown to regulate clock function [7,10,11,13,30].
173We observed the period defect of greatest magnitude in plants expressing the *ZTL* LOV
174domain or *ZTL* decoy (4.1 and 4.5 hours longer, respectively), the period defect of the
175smallest magnitude in the plants expressing the *FKF1* LOV domain or *FKF1* decoy (0.8 and
1760.6 hours longer, respectively), and a period defect of intermediate magnitude in the plants
177expressing the *LKP2* LOV domain or *LKP2* decoy (1.3 and 1.9 hours longer, respectively).

178 The relationship was inverted with regards to flowering time, with the longest delay
179in flowering observed in plants expressing the *FKF1* LOV domain or *FKF1* decoy (4.1 and
1806.0 days, respectively), the smallest delay in flowering observed in plants expressing the
181*ZTL* LOV domain or *ZTL* decoy (2.6 and 2.8 days, respectively), and an intermediate delay in
182plants expressing the *LKP2* LOV domain or *LKP2* decoy (4.5 days and 3.8 days,
183respectively). Interestingly, expressing the *FKF1* LOV and *FKF1* decoy do not have the same
184effect on flowering time (4.1 days versus 6.0 days). This is consistent with the known role
185of the *FKF1* Kelch domain in promoting the degradation of the CDF flowering time
186regulators [24,26].

187 For the minority subpopulations of plants expressing the *ZTL* LOV domain or *ZTL*
188decoy, we observe no statistical difference in the period from wild type, and extreme
189delayed flowering (16.0 days and 19.9 days late, respectively), consistent with what had
190previously observed in plants expressing the *ZTL* decoy (Fig 2A, blue and green circles)
191[13]. Interestingly, while we had not noted subpopulations in the plants expressing the

192 *LKP2* decoy in our previous study [13], here we identify subpopulations for the plants that
 193 express the *LKP2* decoy in both period and flowering time phenotypes and subpopulations
 194 for the plants that express the *LKP2* LOV domain in the flowering time phenotypes (Figure
 195 2B, blue and green triangles). We see a similar delay in flowering in the minority
 196 subpopulation of plants expressing the *LKP2* LOV domain (17.0 days delayed), and a more
 197 extreme delay in flowering in the minority subpopulation of plants expressing the *LKP2*
 198 decoy (29.5 days delayed). In the minority subpopulation of plants expressing the *LKP2*
 199 decoy, we also observe a small, but statistically significant, shortening of the circadian
 200 period. These results are consistent with published data that the *LKP2* Kelch repeat domain
 201 may regulate CDF proteins and be important for the role of *LKP2* in flowering time control
 202 [24]. In contrast, we do not observe sub-populations in the plants that express the *FKF1*
 203 LOV domain, and instead observe a positive correlation between delayed flowering and a
 204 lengthened circadian period in these plants (Figure 2C, blue and green squares), suggesting
 205 that the mechanisms through which expression of the *FKF1* LOV domain lengthens period
 206 and delays flowering are linked.

207

208 **Figure 2. Period and Flowering Time are Anti-Correlated in the ZTL LOV, ZTL Decoy,**
 209 **LKP2 LOV, and LKP2 Decoy Overexpressing Plants.** Data from Fig. 1 was replotted to
 210 present flowering time as a function of period for every T1 insertion plant and the
 211 *CCA1p::Luciferase* (wild type) control. A) Plants expressing domains of *ZTL* (circles); B)
 212 plants expressing domains of *LKP2* (triangles); C) plants expressing domains of *FKF1*
 213 (squares). Blue shapes: plants expressing the decoy (LOV-Kelch); Green shapes: plants

expressing the LOV domain; Pink shapes: plants expressing the Kelch repeat domain; open circles: wild type plants. Note that the same wild type data is used in panels A-C.

Expression of the Kelch repeat domains of LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins disrupt the circadian clock and flowering time control

Less is known about the Kelch repeat domain than the LOV domain of the LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins. We do know that mutations in the ZTL Kelch repeat domain cause defects in circadian clock function and the FKF1 Kelch repeat domain is needed for promoting the degradation of CDFs, demonstrating that the Kelch repeat domain is important [10,20,24,30,35]. To further explore the function of the Kelch repeat domain of the LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins we examined the effects of overexpressing affinity-tagged versions of the *ZTL*, *LKP2*, or *FKF1* Kelch repeat domain on the circadian clock and flowering time (Fig 1, pink points). Expressing the *ZTL*, *LKP2*, and *FKF1* Kelch repeat domains has similar effects on circadian period and flowering time as the majority populations of the respective decoy (Figure 1, blue and pink points, Tables 1 and 2). The most striking difference between the Kelch repeat and decoy experiments is that expressing the Kelch repeat of ZTL and LKP2 does not cause the dramatic late flowering phenotype that is caused by overexpressing the LOV domain (Fig 1, pink circles and triangles). Furthermore, we do not observe an anti-correlation between period and flowering time in the plants expressing the *ZTL* and *LKP2* Kelch repeat domain, and a weaker positive correlation in plants expressing the *FKF1* Kelch repeat domain (Figure 2,

236pink points). This is consistent with the idea that the LOV domain can sequester GI from the
237nucleus as was shown previously, but also that the Kelch repeat does not perform this
238function [22]. This information also demonstrates that expressing the Kelch repeat domain
239of the LOV/F-box/Kelch proteins can have dramatic effects on the circadian clock and
240flowering time confirming that this domain has an important function.

241

242**Determining the protein interaction profile of the ZTL Kelch** 243**repeat domain**

244

245 Our genetic results indicate that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain plays an important
246role in the regulation of the circadian clock and flowering. However, to our knowledge no
247biochemical function has been attributed to this domain, and it is not believed to interact
248with known ZTL ubiquitylation substrates or regulatory partners. We hypothesize that the
249ZTL Kelch repeat domain may interact with unknown substrates or regulatory partners
250that may help elucidate its biochemical function. Thus, we performed an
251immunoprecipitation followed by mass spectrometry (IP-MS) experiment in our transgenic
252plants constitutively expressing a HIS-FLAG tagged *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain. We collected
253samples from plants grown in 12 hours light/12 hours dark growth conditions at three
254hours before dusk (ZT9) and three hours after dusk (ZT15) (S1 Table). As controls, we
255included wild-type *Col-0* plants, which do not express the HIS-FLAG tag and thus control for
256any native Arabidopsis proteins which interact with the beads, and plants which express
257HIS-FLAG tagged *GFP* and thus control for any proteins which interact with the HIS-FLAG

258tag itself. Using this approach, we were able to identify 159 and 129 ZTL peptides from the
259Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 and ZT15, respectively suggesting that we were effectively
260immunoprecipitating the appropriate protein domain.

261 In our previous IP-MS studies using the ZTL decoy, we were able to identify peptides
262corresponding to the ZTL substrates TOC1, PRR5, and CHE and the regulatory proteins GI,
263UBP12, UBP13, and HSP90 [13]. While interaction studies in yeast have suggested that the
264Kelch repeat domain is not involved in these interactions [13,28–31], it remains possible
265that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain could interact with known interacting partners *in planta*.
266Thus, we searched our IP-MS results for peptides corresponding to the known ZTL
267interactors. We were unable to identify peptides corresponding to the majority of the
268known ZTL substrates and interacting partners (S2 Table). The only characterized
269interacting partners for which we were able to identify peptides were HSP90.1, HSP90.2,
270HSP90.4, and HSP90.5. However, we also identified peptides corresponding with these
271proteins in the controls. In order to determine whether the interactions between the ZTL
272Kelch repeat domain and HSP90 proteins was statistically significant, we performed
273SAINTexpress analysis [38,39] on our IP/MS results (S3 Table). We found that the
274interactions with HSP90.1 and 90.2 were statistically significant (SAINT score > 0.5 and Log
275Odds Score > 3), while the interactions with HSP90.4 and 90.5 were not statistically
276significant. The identification of a statistically significant interaction between the ZTL Kelch
277domain and HSP90 suggests that ZTL may be able to interact directly with HSP90 in the
278absence of GI, in addition to the ZTL-GI-HSP90 tri-partite complex that had been previously
279suggested [27,40]. However, lack of any peptides from other published ZTL interactors in
280our IP/MS results suggests that, consistent with previously published results [13,29–31],

the ZTL Kelch domain does not promote interactions with the remaining known substrates and interacting partners of ZTL. It is possible that our assay was not sensitive enough to detect these interactions, but it is also possible that the ZTL Kelch domain plays an unknown role in the function of the protein through interaction with a unique group of protein partners.

We were unable to identify peptides corresponding to known ZTL targets and regulatory partners in our IP/MS results performed with the ZTL Kelch repeat domain. We next wanted to determine if other known clock or flowering time regulators interact with the ZTL Kelch repeat domain. We identified 640 statistically significant interacting proteins at ZT9, and 405 statically significant interacting proteins at ZT15. Of those proteins, 152 were identified at both ZT9 and ZT15 (Fig 3A). We had previously performed IP-MS analysis at these same time points using plants expressing the ZTL decoy. As the ZTL decoy contains the Kelch repeat domain, we would expect that high-confidence Kelch repeat interactors would immunoprecipitate with the ZTL decoy and Kelch repeat [13]. For this reason, we compared the statistically significant interactors of the ZTL decoy with the interactors we identified in this study (Fig 3B, S4 Table). We identified 50 proteins that interacted with both the ZTL Kelch repeat domain and ZTL decoy at ZT9, and 40 proteins that interacted with both ZTL isoforms at ZT15. Of those proteins, 15 were identified as statistically significant interactors of both isoforms at both time points (Table 3). Six of those 15 proteins were subunits of the T-complex, molecular chaperones that assist in protein folding [41]. We also identify metabolic enzymes, a component of the 26S proteasome, AUXIN RESPONSE FACTOR 8 (ARF8), and the ZTL homolog LKP2. These 15

303proteins represent a small group of high-confidence interactors of the ZTL Kelch repeat
304domain.

305

306**Figure 3. Comparison of ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain Interaction Profiles.** A) A Venn
307diagram of the interaction profiles of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 and ZT15. B) A
308Venn diagram of the interaction profiles of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 and ZT15
309with the ZTL decoy from [13] at ZT9 and ZT15.

310**Table 3. Highly Confident ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain Interactors.**

Uniprot ID	Locus	Gene Name	Protein	ZT9 Peptide Count (SAINT Score, SAINT LOS)	ZT15 Peptide Count (SAINT Score, SAINT LOS)	Function
AAT3_ARATH	At5g11520	ASP3	Aspartate aminotransferase 3, chloroplastic	17 (0.98, 3.72)	14 (0.96, 3.20)	An amino acid acetyltransferase that is involved in nitrogen, carbon and energy metabolism in plants.
ADO2_ARATH	At2g18915	LKP2/ ADO2	Adagio protein 2	21 (1, 33.55)	20 (1, 32.08)	A LOV/F/Kelch protein homologous to ZTL known to be involved in regulation of both the circadian clock and photoperiodic flowering.
APR2_ARATH	At1g62180	APR2	5'-adenylylsulfate reductase 2, chloroplastic	85 (1, 125.36)	49 (1, 74.06)	Reduces sulfate for cysteine biosynthesis using glutathione or DTT as source of protons.
ARFH_ARATH	At5g37020	ARF8	Auxin response factor 8	13 (1, 21.65)	3 (1, 5.72)	A transcriptional activator with activity modulated by interaction with Aux/IAA proteins. Known to be involved in stamen and gynoecium maturation, fruit initiation, and jasmonic acid production.
PP303_ARATH	At4g04370	PCMP-E99	Pentatricopeptide repeat-containing protein	19 (1, 30.60)	11 (1, 18.61)	N/A
PSD3B_ARATH	At1g75990	RPN3B	26S proteasome non-ATPase regulatory subunit	6 (1, 10.78)	3 (1, 5.72)	A component of the regulatory subunit of the 26S proteasome.

			3 homolog B			
SYEM_ARATH	At5g6405 0	OVA3	Glutamate--tRNA ligase, chloroplastic/mitochondria 	15 (1, 24.66)	25 (1, 39.41)	Catalyzes the attachment of glutamate to tRNA(Glu).
SYIM_ARATH	At5g4903 0	OVA2	Isoleucine--tRNA ligase, chloroplastic/mitochondria 	50 (1, 75.49)	40 (1, 61.14)	Catalyzes the attachment of isoleucine to tRNA(Ile).
TCPA_ARATH	At3g2005 0	CCT1	T-complex protein 1 subunit alpha	39 (1, 59.7)	33 (1, 51.04)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.
TCPE_ARATH	At1g2451 0	CCT5	T-complex protein 1 subunit epsilon	15 (1, 24.66)	42 (1, 64.01)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.
TCPG_ARATH	At5g2636 0	CCT3	T-complex protein 1 subunit gamma	26 (1, 40.87)	16 (1, 26.15)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.
TCPH_ARATH	At3g1183 0	CCT7	T-complex protein 1 subunit eta	48 (1, 72.62)	44 (1, 66.89)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.
TCPQ_ARATH	At3g0396 0	CCT8	T-complex protein 1 subunit theta	31 (1, 48.14)	42 (1, 64.01)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.
TCPZA_ARATH	At3g0253 0	CCT6A	T-complex protein 1 subunit zeta 1	25 (0.99, 4.33)	32 (0.99, 5.13)	An ATP-dependent molecular chaperone that assists in protein folding.

311The gene names and functional descriptions (modified from Uniprot [53]) of the 15 proteins identified as statistically
312significant in both ZTL Kelch repeat domain IP/MS experiments (this study) and both ZTL decoy IP/MS experiments [13] are
313presented.

We have identified a group of time and light independent ZTL Kelch repeat interacting proteins, but we also wondered if there are time dependent interactors [13,14,31]. There were 50 high-confidence interactors of both the ZTL Kelch repeat domain and the ZTL decoy at ZT9 and 40 at ZT15 (Figure 3B, S4 Table). These proteins include numerous biosynthetic enzymes, additional components of the T-complex, and, at ZT9, HSP90.1 (S4 Table). FKF1 was also identified as a statistically significant interactor of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 (29 peptides), but not at ZT15 (0 peptides; Fig 4A-B). This aligns well with previous reports that show the ZTL Kelch repeat domain promotes interaction with FKF1 in heterologous systems [13,14,31]. We did not observe light-dependency for the interaction between the ZTL Kelch repeat and LKP2, as equal numbers of peptides at ZT9 and ZTL15 (20 and 21 peptides, respectively) were observed (Fig 4C-D). These results confirm previous studies that suggest the ZTL Kelch repeat domain can promote heterodimerization *in planta*, but also expand on this idea and suggest that the interaction with FKF1 may be light dependent.

328

Figure 4. LOV-F-Kelch Family Peptides Identified in the ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain IP-MS. Peptide counts are plotted with respect to the location of the peptide within the protein sequence. Domain schematics of ZTL, LKP2 and FKF1 are included below the plots for reference, and the numbers on the x-axis represent domain boundaries. A-B) LKP2, C-D) FKF1, E-F) ZTL, A, C, E) ZTL Kelch repeat IP-MS experiment performed at ZT9; B, D, F) ZTL Kelch repeat IP-MS experiment performed at ZT15.

335

336 The ZTL decoy is capable of interacting with the native ZTL protein, suggesting that
 337ZTL is also capable of homodimerization [13]. However, it is unclear whether the ZTL Kelch
 338repeat domain is sufficient to drive homodimerization. In order to determine whether we
 339identify any peptides belonging to the native ZTL protein, we aligned each ZTL peptide
 340identified by IP-MS to the ZTL protein sequence, and mapped it to the corresponding
 341domain (Fig 4 E-F). As expected, the majority of peptides belong to the region after the F-
 342box domain that contains the Kelch repeat domain. However, 4 peptides (of 163 total)
 343localized to the LOV domain (marked with a purple star). These peptides were specific for
 344the ZTL LOV domain, and do not match any sequences in FKF1, LKP2, or the ZTL Kelch
 345repeat domain. As with FKF1, we only observe interaction with the native ZTL protein at
 346ZT9, however the low numbers of peptides does not exclude the possibility of interaction at
 347ZT15 as well. This suggests that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain promotes homodimerization
 348*in planta*.

349 **The ZTL Kelch repeat domain interacts with the ZTL LOV** 350 **domain**

351 Our results suggest that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain is capable of interacting with
 352native ZTL protein, and its identification as possessing the strongest circadian effect in our
 353phenotypic assays suggests that its expression may disrupt higher order ZTL complexes.
 354However, it is unclear whether the interaction between the ZTL Kelch repeat and the native
 355ZTL protein is direct, and if so, which domain of the native ZTL protein interacts with the
 356ZTL Kelch repeat domain. Thus, we queried which domains of the ZTL protein the ZTL
 357Kelch repeat domain is capable of interacting with by yeast-two-hybrid (Figure 5). We

358 tested whether the ZTL Kelch repeat domain can interact with the ZTL LOV domain, with
 359 itself, with the ZTL decoy, or with the full-length ZTL protein. No interaction between the
 360 ZTL Kelch repeat domain and itself was observed. However, the ZTL LOV domain and the
 361 ZTL Kelch repeat domain did exhibit an interaction. This suggests that the interaction
 362 observed in our IP/MS results between the ZTL Kelch repeat domain and the native ZTL
 363 protein likely took place between the native ZTL LOV domain and the HIS-FLAG-tagged
 364 Kelch repeat domain. Interestingly, we did not observe interaction between the ZTL Kelch
 365 repeat domain and either the ZTL decoy or the full length ZTL protein in our yeast two
 366 hybrid experiments, which both contain the LOV domain. While the reason for this
 367 observation is currently unclear, we can posit that the presence of the Kelch in both the full
 368 length and decoy ZTL may decrease the affinity of their LOV domains for an extra-
 369 molecular Kelch repeat domain, suggesting that the LOV-Kelch interaction may typically
 370 take place intra-molecularly under natural conditions rather than inter-molecularly.

371

372 **Figure 5. The ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain and ZTL LOV Domains Interact.** Yeast-two-
 373 hybrid testing whether the activation-domain-tagged ZTL Kelch repeat domain interacts
 374 with the full ZTL protein, the ZTL decoy, the ZTL LOV domain, or the Kelch repeat domain
 375 tagged with the binding-domain.

376 Discussion

377 Summary

378 It has long been known that ZTL is an essential E3 ligase for controlling proper
379 periodicity in the circadian clock of *Arabidopsis thaliana*. However, the precise function of
380 each protein domain has not been fully elucidated. We had previously investigated the role
381 of the F-box domain in this protein by characterizing plants that express “decoy” forms of
382 ZTL and its homologs that lack the F-box domain [13]. Here, we continued this process by
383 investigating the phenotypes of plants that express either the LOV or Kelch repeat domain
384 of ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1, and determine that expression of either domain alone is capable of
385 disrupting the functions of the endogenous proteins. As the ZTL Kelch repeat domain has
386 no known function that would lead to the striking circadian phenotype we observed, we
387 follow up with a detailed investigation of this domain. We determine the protein-protein
388 interaction profile of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain, and identify a small suite of high-
389 confidence interacting proteins. We also show that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain is
390 sufficient to promote homo- and heterodimerization with the native ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1
391 proteins *in planta*. We find that the formation of homodimers is driven through a LOV-
392 Kelch repeat interaction. This data suggests a new role for the Kelch repeat domain in ZTL
393 function by promoting complex formation between ZTL and its homologs, which likely
394 contributes to the phenotypic consequences of overexpressing this protein domain alone.

395 **The LOV and Kelch repeat domains contribute to ZTL, LKP2,**
396 **and FKF1 function**

397 Expression of the *ZTL* LOV domain has effects on period and flowering time which
398has been investigated, as has the effect of expressing the *LKP2* Kelch repeat domain on
399flowering time [14,22]. This study represents the first systematic and comprehensive
400investigation of the period and flowering time phenotypes for the LOV and Kelch repeat
401domains for *ZTL*, *FKF1*, and *LKP2*.

402 As a whole, we found that expression of the Kelch repeat and LOV domains of all
403three proteins are sufficient to produce phenotypes akin to a dominant negative effect. The
404period and flowering time phenotypes we observed in plants expressing the *ZTL* LOV
405domain and the *LKP2* Kelch repeat domain are consistent with what was observed
406previously [14,22]. However, to our knowledge, this is the first description of the
407phenotypes of plants expressing the *LKP2* LOV domain, the *FKF1* LOV domain, the *FKF1*
408Kelch repeat domain, or the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain.

409 The ability of the *ZTL* LOV domain and *FKF1* Kelch repeat domain to inhibit native
410protein function is simplest to interpret: these characterized substrate interaction domains
411will preferentially interact with substrates and prevent their degradation. Similar
412interactions likely explain the ability of the *LKP2* and *FKF1* LOV domains to delay period
413when expressed, as both domains interact with TOC1 and PRR5 [30], although the different
414magnitudes of these phenotypes likely represent different affinities for these substrates.
415Similarly, the ability of the *LKP2* Kelch repeat domain to interact with the CDF proteins
416may cause the late flowering phenotype [24].

417 Not all of the observed phenotypes are as straightforward, however. For example,
418the delayed flowering phenotype observed in plants expressing the *FKF1* LOV domain may
419seem counter-intuitive. As the LOV domain of *FKF1* stabilizes CO, one might expect earlier

flowering [19]. However, the ability of the native FKF1 protein to degrade the CDFs is dependent on the interaction with GI [26]. Overexpressing the FKF1 LOV domain may prevent the native FKF1 protein from interacting with GI, thus preventing degradation of CDFs and leading to delayed flowering. A similar effect may explain the extremely late flowering phenotypes of the minority population of *ZTL* LOV domain and *LKP2* LOV domain expressing plants, as increased levels of the *ZTL* LOV domain drives GI localization towards the cytoplasm, preventing interaction between FKF1 and GI, which only occurs in the nucleus [22,26]. The absence of plants that exhibit an extremely late flowering phenotype when the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain is expressed supports this hypothesis, as the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain cannot directly interact with GI, and thus formation of the GI-*ZTL* or GI-FKF1 complex should be unaffected in a *ZTL*-Kelch repeat domain overexpression line [21].

To our knowledge, this study represents the first identification of a circadian defect dependent solely on the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain. The identification of a large number of mutations in the Kelch repeat domain that ablate *ZTL* function suggests that the Kelch repeat domain is necessary [10,20,30,35]. However, previous studies have hypothesized that these mutations may affect *ZTL* protein function by destabilizing the structure of the entire *ZTL* protein [20]. Here, we have shown that the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain is directly involved in circadian regulation, even in the absence of the LOV domain.

***ZTL* Kelch repeat interaction profiles**

In this study, we identified a large suite of proteins which may potentially interact with the *ZTL* Kelch repeat domain, of which 15 were identified as statistically significant interactors in both our samples here and our previous study with on the *ZTL* decoy [13]. Of those 15 interactors, over a third are chaperone proteins that are likely involved in the

443folding of the ZTL protein. Of the remainder, only one of our high confidence interactors,
444the ZTL homolog LKP2, is likely to play a role in circadian function. While not in our high-
445confidence list due to potential light-dependence, we also identify FKF1 and the native ZTL
446protein as putative interactors with the ZTL Kelch repeat domain.

447 We have noted previously that complex formation between E3 ubiquitin ligases and
448their homologs may be a common feature of this class of proteins, and the ability of ZTL,
449FKF1, and LKP2 to heterodimerize has been previously reported [13,14,31,36,37]. We
450demonstrate that the homodimerization takes place between the LOV and Kelch repeat
451domains, suggesting that the interactions between ZTL and FKF1/LKP2 may also occur in
452this manner. This suggests that a function of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain is to interact
453with the LOV domain and promote higher-order complex formation, thus modulating LOV/
454F-box/Kelch protein activity.

455 We hypothesize that the interaction between the LOV and Kelch repeat domains of
456ZTL are required for its function. In support of this hypothesis, plants overexpressing a
457truncated form of *ZTL* containing only the LOV and F-box (*ZTL* LOV-F) are phenotypically
458indistinguishable from plants overexpressing the *ZTL* LOV domain alone [22]. If the Kelch
459repeat domain was dispensable for substrate ubiquitylation, one would expect that the
460plants overexpressing *ZTL* LOV-F would shorten period like plants overexpressing the full-
461length *ZTL* protein [10,22]. However, as the expression of the *ZTL* LOV-F protein lengthens
462the period, it suggests this truncated form is non-functional, suggesting that the presence
463ZTL Kelch repeat domain is required for proper substrate ubiquitylation.

464 **The ZTL LOV-Kelch repeat interaction model**

We have demonstrated that the ZTL Kelch repeat domain can promote hetero- and homo-dimerization. By incorporating these interactions into models of ZTL protein function, we may begin to explain a structural conundrum of ZTL function. As F-box proteins typically have their substrate recognition domains on the C-terminus of the protein, the LOV domain is not located in a typical location for substrate ubiquitylation [32,42] and thus may be too spatially distant from the E2 conjugating enzyme to ubiquitylate LOV substrates (Fig 6A). An interaction between the LOV and Kelch repeat domains would bring the LOV domain into proximity with the E2 conjugating enzyme, and thus substrate ubiquitylation would occur (Figure 6B-C). Under this model, introduction of a truncated ZTL Kelch repeat domain would lead to the production of non-functional complexes by blocking the conformational change that brings the substrate-bound LOV domain into proximity of the E2 conjugating enzyme, potentially leading to the dominant negative phenotypes that we have observed here.

478

Figure 6. ZTL Models Demonstrate the Importance of the Kelch Repeat-LOV and Kelch Repeat-Substrate Interaction. A) Under the traditional LOV-substrate interaction without a LOV-Kelch interaction, the substrate may be too distant for ubiquitylation by a bound E2 conjugating enzyme. B-C) When these interactions are present, the substrate is brought into proximity with the E2, allowing its ubiquitylation. This interaction may either occur B) inter-molecularly, by folding the LOV domain towards the Kelch repeat domain of the same ZTL protein, or C) intra-molecularly. In the case of the intra-molecular model, two ZTL proteins share two ZTL substrates, with the LOV of one ZTL protein and the Kelch repeat of another interacting with the same substrate and with one another.

488

489 We cannot currently distinguish whether the LOV-Kelch repeat interaction occurs
490inter- or intra-molecularly. In the intermolecular model, the LOV domain and Kelch repeat
491domain of the same ZTL molecule interact with one another, folding the protein into a
492“closed” conformation to bring the substrates into proximity with the E2 conjugating
493enzyme (Figure 6B). This model is consistent with published data stating that ZTL occurs
494as a monomer *in planta* [43]. In the intramolecular model, two ZTL proteins align with one
495another in an anti-parallel fashion, and two substrate molecules are shared between the
496two ZTL proteins (Figure 6C). This model is more consistent with recent IP-MS data which
497suggests that ZTL interacts with itself to form higher-order complexes [13]. Furthermore,
498heterodimers of ZTL and LKP2 or FKF1 could form in the same manner as the anti-parallel
499ZTL homodimers. Future work will be required to distinguish between the inter- and
500intramolecular models of the LOV-Kelch repeat interaction.

501 It is interesting to note that we do not identify any peptides that correspond to GI in
502our ZTL Kelch repeat domain IP-MS experiments despite the observed interactions with
503the native FKF1, LKP2, and ZTL proteins. While this may be due to technical limitations, it
504may also be that the ZTL LOV-Kelch repeat interaction disrupts the LOV-GI interaction.
505Sequential co-immunoprecipitation experiments may prove whether the LOV-GI and LOV-
506Kelch repeat interactions are mutually exclusive. However, as interaction with GI inhibits
507ZTL E3 ligase activity [21], this suggests that the LOV-Kelch repeat conformation is the
508active ZTL conformation.

509**Conclusions**

510 ZTL is one of the most important E3 ligases involved in regulating the plant
511 circadian clock, however, much is yet unknown regarding its *in vivo* structure and
512 biochemistry. Most of the work surrounding this protein has involved the structure and
513 function of the LOV domain, while little has covered the role of the Kelch repeat domain.
514 Here, we have begun the process of assigning function to the Kelch repeat domain,
515 demonstrating its importance in interactions within ZTL and its homologs. Our results
516 illustrate the intricate interdependence of the domains of ZTL, and establish that all
517 domains of ZTL are involved in higher order complex formation.

518

519 **Materials and methods**

520 **Plant materials**

521 The creation of the ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1 decoy was described previously [13]. PCR was
522 used to amplify the LOV and Kelch repeat domains of ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1, including
523 everything N-terminal of the F-box domain within the LOV constructs and everything C-
524 terminal of the F-box domain within the Kelch repeat constructs, using the primers in S5 table.
525 The amino acid numbers of the F-box domain can be found in Figure 4. PCR products were
526 cloned into pENTR/D-TOPO vectors (Invitrogen, catalog no. K240020). The domains were then
527 fused to FLAG and His tags at the N terminus and under the control of a cauliflower mosaic
528 virus 35S promoter by recombination into the plant binary pDEST vector pB7-HFN [44,45]
529 using LR recombination. The decoy constructs were transformed into *Arabidopsis*
530 (*Arabidopsis thaliana*) Col-0 expressing the circadian reporter *CCA1p::Luciferase* [46] by the
531 floral dip method [47] using *Agrobacterium tumefaciens* GV3101.

532 **Phenotypic analysis**

533 Control *pCCA1::Luciferase* and transgenic seeds were surface sterilized in 70%
534 ethanol and 0.01% Triton X-100 for 20 minutes prior to being sown on ½ MS plates (2.15
535 g/L Murashige and Skoog medium, pH 5.7, Cassion Laboratories, cat#MSP01 and 0.8%
536 bacteriological agar, AmericanBio cat# AB01185) with or without appropriate antibiotics
537 (15 µg/mL ammonium glufosinate (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, cat# 77182-82-2)). Seeds
538 were stratified for two days at 4 °C, then transferred to 12 hours light/12 hours dark
539 conditions for seven days. Twenty seven-day old seedlings from each genotype were

arrayed on 100 mm square ½ MS plates in a 10x10 grid, then treated with 5 mM D-luciferin (Cayman Chemical Company, cat# 115144-35-9) dissolved in 0.01% TritonX-100. Imaging was performed at 22 °C under constant 100 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹ white light provided by two LED light panels (Heliospectra L1). Hourly images were acquired for approximately six and a half days. Each hour, lights are turned off for a total of eight minutes in order to capture a 5 minute exposure on an Andor iKon-M CCD camera; lights are off two minutes prior to the exposure and remain off for one minute after the exposure is completed. After imaging is complete, the lights return to the normal lighting regime. The CCD camera was controlled using Micromanager, using the following settings: binning of 2, pre-amp gain of 2, and a 0.05 MHz readout mode [48]. Data collected between the first dawn of constant light and the dawn of the sixth day are used for analyses.

The mean intensity of each seedling at each time point was calculated using ImageJ [49]. The calculated values were imported into the Biological Rhythms Analysis Software System (BRASS) for analysis. The Fast Fourier Transform Non-linear Least Squares (FFT-NLLS) algorithm was used to calculate the period, phase, and relative amplitude from each individual seedling [50].

Following luciferase imaging, seedlings were transferred to soil (Fafard II) and grown at 22 °C in inductive 16 hours light/8 hours dark conditions with a light fluence rate of 135 µmol m⁻² s⁻¹. Plants were monitored daily for flowering status, recording the dates upon which each individual reached 1 cm inflorescence height. Each experiment was repeated twice with new independent T1 insertion transgenics in order to demonstrate repeatability. Data presented in figures and tables represents all experimental repeats, and raw values can be found in S6 table.

563 **Data normalization and statistical analysis**

564 To allow for comparison across independent imaging experiments, data was
565 normalized to the individual wild type control performed concurrently. The average value
566 of the wild type control was calculated for every experiment, then this average was
567 subtracted from the value of each individual T1 insertion or control wild type plant done
568 concurrently. This normalized value was used for statistical analyses.

569 Welch's t-test was used to compare each normalized T1 insertion population or
570 subpopulation to the population of normalized control plants. In order to decrease the
571 number of false positives caused by multiple testing, we utilized a Bonferroni corrected α
572 as the p-value threshold. The α applied differs between experiments, and is noted
573 throughout.

574 **Immunoprecipitation and mass spectrometry of plants** 575 **expressing the ZTL Kelch repeat domain**

576 Individual T1 *pB7-HFN-ZTL-Kelch* transgenics in a Col-0 background and control
577 Col-0 and *pB7-HFC-GFP* were grown as described for phenotype analysis. Seven-day old
578 seedlings were transferred to soil and grown under 16 hours light/8 hours dark at 22 °C
579 for 2-3 weeks. Prior to harvest, plants were entrained to 12 hours light/12 hours dark at 22
580 °C for 1 week. Approximately 40 mature leaves from each background was collected and
581 flash frozen in liquid nitrogen, such that each sample was a mixture of leaves from multiple
582 individuals to reduce the effects of expression level fluctuations. Tissue samples were
583 ground in liquid nitrogen using the Mixer Mill MM400 system (Retsch).
584 Immunoprecipitation was performed as described previously [44,45,51]. Briefly, protein

from 2 mL tissue powder was extracted in SII buffer (100 mM sodium phosphate pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM EDTA, 0.1% Triton X-100) with cOmplete™ EDTA-free Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche, cat# 11873580001), 1 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF), and PhosSTOP tablet (Roche, cat# 04906845001) by sonification. Anti-FLAG antibodies were cross-linked to Dynabeads® M-270 Epoxy (Thermo Fisher Scientific, cat# 14311D) for immunoprecipitation. Immunoprecipitation was performed by incubation of protein extracts with beads for 1 hour at 4 °C on a rocker. Beads were washed with SII buffer three times, then twice in F2H buffer (100 mM sodium phosphate pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% Triton X-100). Beads were eluted twice at 4 °C and twice at 30 °C in F2H buffer with 100 µg/mL FLAG peptide, then incubated with TALON magnetic beads (Clontech, cat# 35636) for 20 min at 4 °C, then washed twice in F2H buffer and three times in 25 mM Ammonium Bicarbonate. Samples were subjected to trypsin digestion (0.5 µg, Promega, cat# V5113) at 37 °C overnight, then vacuum dried using a SpeedVac before being dissolved in 5% formic acid/0.1% trifluoroacetic acid (TFA). Protein concentration was determined by nanodrop measurement (A260/A280)(Thermo Scientific Nanodrop 2000 UV-Vis Spectrophotometer). An aliquot of each sample was further diluted with 0.1% TFA to 0.1µg/µl and 0.5µg was injected for LC-MS/MS analysis at the Keck MS & Proteomics Resource Laboratory at Yale University.

LC-MS/MS analysis was performed on a Thermo Scientific Orbitrap Elite mass spectrometer equipped with a Waters nanoACQUITY UPLC system utilizing a binary solvent system (Buffer A: 0.1% formic acid; Buffer B: 0.1% formic acid in acetonitrile). Trapping was performed at 5µl/min, 97% Buffer A for 3 min using a Waters Symmetry® C18 180µm x 20mm trap column. Peptides were separated using an ACQUITY UPLC PST

608(BEH) C18 nanoACQUITY Column 1.7 μm , 75 μm x 250 mm (37°C) and eluted at 300
609nl/min with the following gradient: 3% buffer B at initial conditions; 5% B at 3 minutes;
61035% B at 140 minutes; 50% B at 155 minutes; 85% B at 160-165 min; then returned to
611initial conditions at 166 minutes. MS were acquired in the Orbitrap in profile mode over the
612300-1,700 m/z range using 1 microscan, 30,000 resolution, AGC target of 1E6, and a full
613max ion time of 50 ms. Up to 15 MS/MS were collected per MS scan using collision induced
614dissociation (CID) on species with an intensity threshold of 5,000 and charge states 2 and
615above. Data dependent MS/MS were acquired in centroid mode in the ion trap using 1
616microscan, AGC target of 2E4, full max IT of 100 ms, 2.0 m/z isolation window, and
617normalized collision energy of 35. Dynamic exclusion was enabled with a repeat count of 1,
618repeat duration of 30s, exclusion list size of 500, and exclusion duration of 60s.

619 The MS/MS spectra were searched by the Keck MS & Proteomics Resource
620Laboratory at Yale University using MASCOT [52]. Data was searched against the
621SwissProt_2015_11.fasta *Arabidopsis thaliana* database with oxidation set as a variable
622modification. The peptide mass tolerance was set to 10 ppm, the fragment mass tolerance
623to 0.5 Da, and the maximum number of allowable missed cleavages was set to 2.

624 To determine statistically significant interactors, we removed all proteins that only
625occurred in the controls, then performed SAINTexpress using interface available on the
626CRAPome website [38,39]. Proteins with a SAINT score of greater than 0.5 and a Log Odds
627Score of greater than 3 were considered statistically significant.

628

629

630

631 **Yeast two-hybrid assay**

632 Yeast two-hybrid assays were performed according to the Yeast Protocol Handbook
633(Clontech, catalog no. P3024). Briefly, *ZTL* full length, decoy, LOV, and Kelch repeat coding
634sequences in pENTR/D-TOPO vectors were recombined into the pGBKT7-GW destination
635vector (Gateway-compatible pGBKT7 vector). This resulted in a translational fusion of the *ZTL*
636domains to the GAL4 DNA-binding domain [51]. These constructs were transformed into the
637yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) Y187 strain. Similarly *ZTL* Kelch repeat coding sequences in
638pENTR/D-TOPO vectors were recombined into the pGADT7-GW vector (Gateway-compatible
639pGADT7 vector), resulting in a translational fusion to the GAL4 activation domain (Lu et al.,
6402010). These were transformed into the yeast AH109 strain. To test protein-protein
641interactions, diploid yeast was generated by yeast mating of Y187 and AH109 strains bearing
642pGBKT7 and pGADT7 vectors, respectively, and tested on synthetic dropout/-Leu-Trp and
643synthetic dropout/-Leu-Trp-His-Ade plates. The empty pGBKT7-GW and pGADT7-GW vectors
644were included as negative controls.

645 **Acknowledgements**

646 We thank the Keck Proteomics Facility at Yale for materials and assistance with
647 proteomics. We also thank Wei Liu, Chin-Mei Lee, Christopher Adamchek, Suyuna Eng Ren,
648 and Catherine Chamberlin, for their technical support. We would also like to thank Sandra
649 Pariseau for administrative support. Additionally, we would like to thank Chris Bolick,
650 Eileen Williams, and the staff at Marsh Botanical Botanical Gardens for their support in
651 maintaining plant growth spaces.

652

References

6541. Graf A, Schlereth A, Stitt M, Smith AM. Circadian control of carbohydrate availability
655 for growth in Arabidopsis plants at night. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2010;107: 9458–
656 9463. doi:10.1073/pnas.0914299107
6572. Gibon Y, Bläsing OE, Palacios-Rojas N, Pankovic D, Hendriks JHM, Fisahn J, et al.
658 Adjustment of diurnal starch turnover to short days: depletion of sugar during the
659 night leads to a temporary inhibition of carbohydrate utilization, accumulation of
660 sugars and post-translational activation of ADP-glucose pyrophosphorylase in the
661 following light period. Plant J. 2004;39: 847–862. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
662 313X.2004.02173.x
6633. Mengin V, Pyl E-T, Alexandre Moraes T, Sulpice R, Krohn N, Encke B, et al.
664 Photosynthate partitioning to starch in *Arabidopsis thaliana* is insensitive to light
665 intensity but sensitive to photoperiod due to a restriction on growth in the light in
666 short photoperiods. Plant Cell Environ. 2017;40: 2608–2627. doi:10.1111/pce.13000
6674. Shim JS, Kubota A, Imaizumi T. Circadian Clock and Photoperiodic Flowering in
668 Arabidopsis: CONSTANS Is a Hub for Signal Integration. Plant Physiol. 2017;173: 5–
669 15. doi:10.1104/pp.16.01327
6705. Nelson DC, Lasswell J, Rogg LE, Cohen MA, Bartel B. FKF1, a clock-controlled gene
671 that regulates the transition to flowering in Arabidopsis. Cell. 2000;101: 331–40.
672 Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10847687>

6736. Schultz TF, Kiyosue T, Yanovsky M, Wada M, Kay SA, Kay SA, et al. A role for LKP2 in
674 the circadian clock of Arabidopsis. Plant Cell. 2001;13: 2659–70.
675 doi:10.1105/tpc.010332
6767. Somers DE, Schultz TF, Milnamow M, Kay SA. ZEITLUPE Encodes a Novel Clock-
677 Associated PAS Protein from Arabidopsis. Cell. 2000;101. doi:10.1016/S0092-
678 8674(00)80841-7
6798. Ito S, Song YH, Imaizumi T. LOV domain-containing F-box proteins: light-dependent
680 protein degradation modules in Arabidopsis. Mol Plant. 2012;5: 573–82.
681 doi:10.1093/mp/sss013
6829. Zoltowski BD, Imaizumi T. Structure and Function of the ZTL/FKF1/LKP2 Group
683 Proteins in Arabidopsis. Enzym. 2014;35: 213–39. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-801922-
684 1.00009-9
68510. Somers DE, Kim W-Y, Geng R. The F-Box Protein ZEITLUPE Confers Dosage-
686 Dependent Control on the Circadian Clock, Photomorphogenesis, and Flowering
687 Time. PLANT CELL ONLINE. 2004;16: 769–782. doi:10.1105/tpc.016808
68811. Baudry A, Ito S, Song YH, Strait AA, Kiba T, Lu S, et al. F-box proteins FKF1 and LKP2
689 act in concert with ZEITLUPE to control Arabidopsis clock progression. Plant Cell.
690 2010;22: 606–22. doi:10.1105/tpc.109.072843
69112. Fornara F, Panigrahi KCS, Gissot L, Sauerbrunn N, Rühl M, Jarillo JA, et al. Arabidopsis
692 DOF Transcription Factors Act Redundantly to Reduce CONSTANS Expression and

- 693 Are Essential for a Photoperiodic Flowering Response. *Dev Cell*. 2009;17: 75–86.
694 doi:10.1016/j.devcel.2009.06.015
69513. Lee C-M, Feke A, Li M-W, Adamchek C, Webb K, Pruneda-Paz J, et al. Decoys Untangle
696 Complicated Redundancy and Reveal Targets of Circadian Clock F-Box Proteins. *Plant*
697 *Physiol*. 2018;177: 1170–1186. doi:10.1104/pp.18.00331
69814. Takase T, Nishiyama Y, Tanihigashi H, Ogura Y, Miyazaki Y, Yamada Y, et al. LOV
699 KELCH PROTEIN2 and ZEITLUPE repress Arabidopsis photoperiodic flowering
700 under non-inductive conditions, dependent on FLAVIN-BINDING KELCH REPEAT F-
701 BOX1. *Plant J*. 2011;67: 608–621. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2011.04618.x
70215. Pudasaini A, Zoltowski BD. Zeitlupe Senses Blue-Light Fluence To Mediate Circadian
703 Timing in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Biochemistry*. 2013;52: 7150–7158.
704 doi:10.1021/bi401027n
70516. Pudasaini A, Shim JS, Song YH, Shi H, Kiba T, Somers DE, et al. Kinetics of the LOV
706 domain of ZEITLUPE determine its circadian function in Arabidopsis. *Elife*. 2017;6.
707 doi:10.7554/eLife.21646
70817. Nakasako M, Matsuoka D, Zikihara K, Tokutomi S. Quaternary structure of LOV-
709 domain containing polypeptide of *Arabidopsis* FKF1 protein. *FEBS Lett*. 2005;579:
710 1067–1071. doi:10.1016/j.febslet.2004.12.078
71118. Imaizumi T, Tran HG, Swartz TE, Briggs WR, Kay SA. FKF1 is essential for
712 photoperiodic-specific light signalling in Arabidopsis. *Nature*. 2003;426: 302–6.

- 713 doi:10.1038/nature02090
71419. Song YH, Smith RW, To BJ, Millar AJ, Imaizumi T. FKF1 conveys timing information
715 for CONSTANS stabilization in photoperiodic flowering. *Science*. 2012;336: 1045–9.
716 doi:10.1126/science.1219644
71720. Kevei E, Gyula P, Hall A, Kozma-Bognár L, Kim W-Y, Eriksson ME, et al. Forward
718 genetic analysis of the circadian clock separates the multiple functions of ZEITLUPE.
719 *Plant Physiol*. 2006;140: 933–45. doi:10.1104/pp.105.074864
72021. Kim W-Y, Fujiwara S, Suh S-S, Kim J, Kim Y, Han L, et al. ZEITLUPE is a circadian
721 photoreceptor stabilized by GIGANTEA in blue light. *Nature*. 2007;449: 356–360.
722 doi:10.1038/nature06132
72322. Kim J, Geng R, Gallenstein RA, Somers DE. The F-box protein ZEITLUPE controls
724 stability and nucleocytoplasmic partitioning of GIGANTEA. *Development*. 2013;140:
725 4060–9. doi:10.1242/dev.096651
72623. Fukamatsu Y, Mitsui S, Yasuhara M, Tokioka Y, Ihara N, Fujita S, et al. Identification of
727 LOV KELCH PROTEIN2 (LKP2)-interacting Factors That Can Recruit LKP2 to Nuclear
728 Bodies. *Plant Cell Physiol*. 2005;46: 1340–1349. doi:10.1093/pcp/pci144
72924. Imaizumi T, Schultz TF, Harmon FG, Ho LA, Kay SA. FKF1 F-box protein mediates
730 cyclic degradation of a repressor of CONSTANS in Arabidopsis. *Science*. 2005;309:
731 293–7. doi:10.1126/science.1110586
73225. Fujiwara S, Wang L, Han L, Suh S-S, Salomé PA, McClung CR, et al. Post-translational

- 733 regulation of the Arabidopsis circadian clock through selective proteolysis and
734 phosphorylation of pseudo-response regulator proteins. J Biol Chem. 2008;283:
735 23073–83. doi:10.1074/jbc.M803471200
73626. Sawa M, Nusinow DA, Kay SA, Imaizumi T. FKF1 and GIGANTEA complex formation is
737 required for day-length measurement in Arabidopsis. Science. 2007;318: 261–5.
738 doi:10.1126/science.1146994
73927. Cha J-Y, Kim J, Kim T-S, Zeng Q, Wang L, Lee SY, et al. GIGANTEA is a co-chaperone
740 which facilitates maturation of ZEITLUPE in the Arabidopsis circadian clock. Nat
741 Commun. 2017;8: 3. doi:10.1038/s41467-016-0014-9
74228. Lee CM, Li MW, Feke A, Liu W, Saffer AM, Gendron JM. GIGANTEA recruits the UBP12
743 and UBP13 deubiquitylases to regulate accumulation of the ZTL photoreceptor
744 complex. Nat Commun. 2019;10. doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11769-7
74529. Kiba T, Henriques R, Sakakibara H, Chua N-H. Targeted Degradation of PSEUDO-
746 RESPONSE REGULATOR5 by an SCFZTL Complex Regulates Clock Function and
747 Photomorphogenesis in Arabidopsis thaliana. PLANT CELL ONLINE. 2007;19: 2516–
748 2530. doi:10.1105/tpc.107.053033
74930. Más P, Kim W-Y, Somers DE, Kay SA. Targeted degradation of TOC1 by ZTL
750 modulates circadian function in Arabidopsis thaliana. Nature. 2003;426: 567–570.
751 doi:10.1038/nature02163
75231. Yasuhara M, Mitsui S, Hirano H, Takanabe R, Tokioka Y, Ihara N, et al. Identification of

- 753 ASK and clock-associated proteins as molecular partners of LKP2 (LOV kelch protein
- 754 2) in Arabidopsis. J Exp Bot. 2004;55: 2015–2027. doi:10.1093/jxb/erh226
75532. Gagne JM, Downes BP, Shiu S-H, Durski AM, Vierstra RD. The F-box subunit of the SCF
- 756 E3 complex is encoded by a diverse superfamily of genes in Arabidopsis. Proc Natl
- 757 Acad Sci U S A. 2002;99: 11519–24. doi:10.1073/pnas.162339999
75833. Vierstra RD. The ubiquitin–26S proteasome system at the nexus of plant biology. Nat
- 759 Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2009;10: 385–397. doi:10.1038/nrm2688
76034. Bai C, Sen P, Hofmann K, Ma L, Goebel M, Harper JW, et al. SKP1 connects cell cycle
- 761 regulators to the ubiquitin proteolysis machinery through a novel motif, the F-box.
- 762 Cell. 1996;86: 263–74. Available: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8706131>
76335. Martin-Tryon EL, Kreps JA, Harmer SL. GIGANTEA Acts in Blue Light Signaling and
- 764 Has Biochemically Separable Roles in Circadian Clock and Flowering Time
- 765 Regulation. PLANT Physiol. 2006;143: 473–486. doi:10.1104/pp.106.088757
76636. Feke A, Liu W, Hong J, Li MW, Lee CM, Zhou EK, et al. Decoys provide a scalable
- 767 platform for the identification of plant e3 ubiquitin ligases that regulate circadian
- 768 function. Elife. 2019;8. doi:10.7554/eLife.44558
76937. Feke AM, Hong J, Liu W, Gendron JM. A Decoy Library Uncovers U-box E3 Ubiquitin
- 770 Ligases that Regulate Flowering Time in Arabidopsis. Genetics. 2020;
- 771 genetics.303199.2020. Available:
- 772 <http://www.genetics.org/lookup/doi/10.1534/genetics.120.303199>

77338. Teo G, Liu G, Zhang J, Nesvizhskii AI, Gingras A-C, Choi H. SAINTexpress:
774 Improvements and additional features in Significance Analysis of INTeractome
775 software. J Proteomics. 2014;100: 37–43. doi:10.1016/j.jprot.2013.10.023
77639. Mellacheruvu D, Wright Z, Couzens AL, Lambert JP, St-Denis NA, Li T, et al. The
777 CRAPome: A contaminant repository for affinity purification-mass spectrometry
778 data. Nat Methods. 2013;10: 730–736. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2557
77940. Kim T, Kim WY, Fujiwara S, Kim J, Cha J-Y, Park JH, et al. HSP90 functions in the
780 circadian clock through stabilization of the client F-box protein ZEITLUPE. Proc Natl
781 Acad Sci U S A. 2011;108: 16843–8. doi:10.1073/pnas.1110406108
78241. Ahn H-K, Yoon J-T, Choi I, Kim S, Lee H-S, Pai H-S. Functional characterization of
783 chaperonin containing T-complex polypeptide-1 and its conserved and novel
784 substrates in Arabidopsis. J Exp Bot. 2019;70: 2741–2757. doi:10.1093/jxb/erz099
78542. Xu G, Ma H, Nei M, Kong H. Evolution of F-box genes in plants: Different modes of
786 sequence divergence and their relationships with functional diversification. Proc Natl
787 Acad Sci. 2009;106: 835–840. doi:10.1073/pnas.0812043106
78843. Han L, Mason M, Risseuw EP, Crosby WL, Somers DE. Formation of an SCF(ZTL)
789 complex is required for proper regulation of circadian timing. Plant J. 2004;40: 291–
790 301. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2004.02207.x
79144. Huang H, Alvarez S, Bindbeutel R, Shen Z, Naldrett MJ, Evans BS, et al. Identification
792 of Evening Complex Associated Proteins in Arabidopsis by Affinity Purification and

- 793 Mass Spectrometry. Mol Cell Proteomics. 2016;15: 201–17.
- 794 doi:10.1074/mcp.M115.054064
79545. Huang H, Alvarez S, Nusinow DA. Data on the identification of protein interactors
- 796 with the Evening Complex and PCH1 in Arabidopsis using tandem affinity
- 797 purification and mass spectrometry (TAP-MS). Data Br. 2016;8: 56–60.
- 798 doi:10.1016/j.dib.2016.05.014
79946. Pruneda-Paz JL, Breton G, Para A, Kay SA. A Functional Genomics Approach Reveals
- 800 CHE as a Component of the Arabidopsis Circadian Clock. Science (80-). 2009;323:
- 801 1481–1485. doi:10.1126/science.1167206
80247. Clough SJ, Bent AF. Floral dip: a simplified method for Agrobacterium-mediated
- 803 transformation of Arabidopsis thaliana. Plant J. 1998;16: 735–43. Available:
- 804 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10069079>
80548. Edelstein AD, Tsuchida MA, Amodaj N, Pinkard H, Vale RD, Stuurman N. Advanced
- 806 methods of microscope control using µManager software. J Biol methods. 2014;1: 10.
- 807 doi:10.14440/jbm.2014.36
80849. Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image
- 809 analysis. Nat Methods. 2012;9: 671–5. Available:
- 810 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22930834>
81150. Moore A, Zielinski T, Millar AJ. Online period estimation and determination of
- 812 rhythmicity in circadian data, using the BioDare data infrastructure. Methods Mol

- 813 Biol. 2014;1158: 13–44. doi:10.1007/978-1-4939-0700-7_2
81451. Lu Q, Tang X, Tian G, Wang F, Liu K, Nguyen V, et al. Arabidopsis homolog of the yeast
815 TREX-2 mRNA export complex: components and anchoring nucleoporin. Plant J.
816 2010;61: 259–70. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2009.04048.x
81752. Perkins DN, Pappin DJ, Creasy DM, Cottrell JS. Probability-based protein
818 identification by searching sequence databases using mass spectrometry data.
819 Electrophoresis. 1999;20: 3551–67. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1522-
820 2683(19991201)20:18<3551::AID-ELPS3551>3.0.CO;2-2
82153. Consortium U. UniProt: a worldwide hub of protein knowledge. Nucleic Acids Res.
822 2019;47: D506–D515.
- 823

824 **Supporting Information**

825

826 **Table S1. Unfiltered IP/MS results.** All results from the plants expressing the HIS-FLAG-
827 tagged ZTL Kelch repeat domain, the plants expressing the HIS-FLAG-tagged GFP, and wild
828 type plants are presented here.

829

830 **Table S1. Unfiltered IP/MS results.** All results from the plants expressing the HIS-FLAG-
831 tagged ZTL Kelch repeat domain, the plants expressing the HIS-FLAG-tagged GFP, and wild
832 type plants are presented here.

833

834 **Table S2. ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain Interaction Profile with Known ZTL Interactors.**
835 Peptide counts and SAINT scores are presented for all published ZTL interactors.

836

837 **Table S3. SAINTexpress Results.** The results of statistically significant interactors of the
838 ZTL Kelch repeat domain as produced by SAINTexpress.

839

840 **Table S4. Comparison of Significant Interactors Between the ZTL Kelch Repeat**
841 **Domain and ZTL Decoy IP/MS Experiments.** IP/MS results from this study were
842 compared with previously generated results from the ZTL decoy [13].

843

844 **Table S5. Primers in this Study.**

845

Table S6. Source data for Figures 1-2. Raw period and flowering time data for each individual plant presented in figure 1-2 are included.

Figure 1. Phenotypes of Plants Expressing Domains of ZTL, LKP2, and FKF1. A) Period lengths and B) flowering time were measured for individual T1 insertion transgenics in the *CCA1p::Luciferase* background. A) Values presented are the difference between the period of the individual transgenic and the average period of the *CCA1p::Luciferase* control plants in the accompanying experiment. B) Values presented are the difference between the flowering time (as measured by the age at 1 cm inflorescence height) of the individual transgenics and the average flowering time of the *CCA1p::Luciferase* control plants in the accompanying experiment. * = significantly different from wild type with a Bonferroni-corrected α of 0.0056.

Figure 2. Period and Flowering Time are Anti-Correlated in the *ZTL* LOV, *ZTL* Decoy, *LKP2* LOV, and *LKP2* Decoy Overexpressing Plants. Data from Fig. 1 was replotted to present flowering time as a function of period for every T1 insertion plant and the *CCA1p::Luciferase* (wild type) control. A) Plants expressing domains of *ZTL* (circles); B) Plants expressing domains of *LKP2* (triangles); C) Plants expressing domains of *FKF1* (squares). Blue shapes: plants expressing the decoy (LOV-Kelch); Green shapes: plants expressing the LOV domain; Pink shapes: plants expressing the Kelch repeat domain; open circles: wild type plants. Note that the same wild type data is used in panels A-C.

bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.26.173096>; this version posted June 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY 4.0 International license.

Figure 3. Comparison of ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain Interaction Profiles. A) A Venn diagram of the interaction profiles of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 and ZT15. B) A Venn diagram of the interaction profiles of the ZTL Kelch repeat domain at ZT9 and ZT15 with the ZTL decoy from [13] at ZT9 and ZT15.

Figure 4. LOV-F-Kelch Family Peptides Identified in the ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain IP-MS. Peptide counts are plotted with respect to the location of the peptide within the protein sequence. Domain schematics of ZTL, LKP2 and FKF1 are included below the plots for reference, and the numbers on the x-axis represent domain boundaries. A-B) LKP2, C-D) FKF1, E-F) ZTL, A, C, E) ZTL Kelch repeat IP-MS experiment performed at ZT9; B, D, F) ZTL Kelch repeat IP-MS experiment performed at ZT15.

Figure 5. The ZTL Kelch Repeat Domain and ZTL LOV Domains Interact. Yeast-two-hybrid testing whether the activation-domain-tagged ZTL Kelch repeat domain interacts with the full ZTL protein, the ZTL decoy, the ZTL LOV domain, or the Kelch repeat domain tagged with the binding-domain.

bioRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.26.173096>; this version posted June 26, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted bioRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under aCC-BY 4.0 International license.

Figure 6. ZTL Models Demonstrate the Importance of the Kelch Repeat-LOV and Kelch Repeat-Substrate Interaction. A) Under the traditional LOV-substrate interaction without a LOV-Kelch interaction, the substrate may be too distant for ubiquitylation by a bound E2 conjugating enzyme. B-C) When these interactions are present, the substrate is brought into proximity with the E2, allowing its ubiquitylation. This interaction may either occur B) inter-molecularly, by folding the LOV domain towards the Kelch repeat domain of the same ZTL protein, or C) intra-molecularly. In the case of the intra-molecular model, two ZTL proteins share two ZTL substrates, with the LOV of one ZTL protein and the Kelch repeat of another interacting with the same substrate and with one another.