Rescue of defective G protein–coupled receptor function in vivo by intermolecular cooperation
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G protein–coupled receptors (GPCRs) are ubiquitous mediators of signaling of hormones, neurotransmitters, and sensing. The old dogma is that a one ligand/one receptor complex constitutes the functional unit of GPCR signaling. However, there is mounting evidence that some GPCRs form dimers or oligomers during their biosynthesis, activation, inactivation, and/or internalization. This evidence has been obtained exclusively from cell culture experiments, and proof for the physiological significance of GPCR di/oligomerization in vivo is still missing. Using the mouse luteinizing hormone receptor (LHR) as a model GPCR, we demonstrate that transgenic mice expressing binding-deficient and signaling-deficient forms of LHR can reestablish normal LH actions through intermolecular functional complementation of the mutant receptors in the absence of functional wild-type receptors. These results provide compelling in vivo evidence for the physiological relevance of intermolecular cooperation in GPCR signaling.

Results

Experimental Design and Rationale. We hypothesized that coexpression of binding- and signaling-deficient LHR mutants in transgenic (TG) mice in the absence of functional endogenous receptor (i.e., in the LHR knockout background) could restore LHR function by functional complementation. We selected two LHR mutant receptors for their inability to bind the ligand (LH or hCG) or to transduce signaling after ligand binding. The first mutant receptor (LHR<sup>ΔH</sup>) harbored an inactivating Cys<sup>232</sup> to Ala<sup>232</sup> mutation in the ligand binding extracellular domain (35, 36). The second mutant (LHR<sup>ΔAMP</sup>) contained a deletion of TM helices 6 and 7 in exon 11 (amino acids deleted from Val<sup>553</sup> to Ala<sup>560</sup>), and it was chosen because of involvement of the deleted region in G protein coupling and second messenger generation (37). Furthermore, this region is a hotspot for inactivating LHR mutations (38).
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**Fig. 1.** Demonstration of intermolecular cooperation and di/oligomerization on binding- and signaling-deficient LHR mutants in cultured cells. (A and B) Schematic presentation of intramolecular (cis) and intermolecular (trans) activation of GPCRs. (A) When a hormone (green) binds to its WT receptor, the occupied receptor activates itself to generate a signal(s) (5). (B) Alternatively, a GPCR complexed with hormone may activate another GPCR molecule, as evidenced by intermolecular activation of signaling-deficient mutant (LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}) with red connecting loops) by binding-deficient mutant (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}, with red extracellular domain) when both mutants are coexpressed in a cell (33, 35, 36). (C–E) Cell culture experiments on ligand binding and cAMP generation of the LHR mutants. (C) Binding-deficient receptor (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}; red line) was incapable of displaying specific binding of [\(^{125}\text{I}\)]-hCG in the presence of increasing concentrations of unlabeled hCG (0–10 nM). In contrast, WT (black line) and signaling-deficient LHR (LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}; blue line) bound [\(^{125}\text{I}\)]-hCG specifically and with similar apparent affinity. (D) WT LHR (black line) produced cAMP in response to hCG stimulation. However, neither the signaling-deficient (LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}, blue line) nor the binding-deficient (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}, superimposed with the former) mutant produced cAMP. (E) When both (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} and LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}) mutants were coexpressed in HEK-293 cells, cAMP production was partially restored in response to hCG (purple line) as compared to WT LHR (black line). One of three experiments with similar results transfecting with BAC-LHR clones is shown. Each point is the mean ± SD of triplicate incubations. Experiments with cDNA clones produced similar results.

**Intermolecular Cooperation and Di/Oligomerization of the Mutant LHRs in Cell Culture.** To confirm that the mutant receptors on their own were inactive and could cooperate intermolecularly, the mutant LHR cDNAs, and BAC clones harboring the same LHR mutants (SI Experimental Procedures and Fig. S1), were tested in transfected HEK-293 cells. As expected, LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} showed no specific ligand binding and LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} no signaling, but when the two receptor mutants were coexpressed, the cAMP response to hCG stimulation was partially restored (Fig. 1 C–E), confirming earlier reports with similar receptor mutants (35) or even by more defective mutants, such as the exo-domain of the FSHR linked to a cell membrane phospholipid which is capable of activating a binding-deficient mutant (36).

The expected transfer of the mutated receptors to the plasma membrane was studied by confocal immunofluorescence analysis. cDNAs encoding the two mutant receptors were N-terminally tagged with HA or FLAG, respectively, after the signal peptide (referred to as HA-LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} and FLAG-LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}). Fig. 24 clearly shows that the WT and both mutant receptors, HA-LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} and FLAG-LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}, are localized at the cell surface. Hence, the lack of transfer to the cell membrane is not the reason for the total lack of function of the two LHR mutants when expressed on their own (Fig. 1 C and D).

To demonstrate physical interaction (di/oligomerization) between the receptor mutants, HEK-293 cells expressing either or both of the tagged LHR mutants (see above) were lysed, followed by immunoprecipitation (IP) of the FLAG-tagged receptor (Methods). Whereas FLAG-tagged receptors (FLAG-LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−}) could be observed after all IPs with the FLAG antibody (Fig. 2B), HA-tagged LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} could only be detected in immunoprecipitates from cells coexpressing both mutants with bands representing both monomers and SDS-resistant dimers (Fig. 2C, lane 5). A control sample containing combined extracts of cells expressing one of the mutants separately, combined after lysis, indicated that the LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}–LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} interaction can only occur in cells expressing both mutants, and not as a conglomeration artifact (Fig. 2C, lane 4). In another control experiment, we coexpressed FLAG-LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} and HA-β2-adrenergic receptor (β2-AR) (Fig. 2B and C, lane 6). FLAG antibody immunoprecipitation demonstrated presence of LHR di/oligomers, but no clear evidence for LHR-β2AR association could be shown using immunoblotting with HA antibody. Hence, LHR di/oligomerization under these conditions was specific and not a random phenomenon with other GPCRs.

To exclude the possibility that the apparent lack of activation of the mutant receptors as monomers depends on a low level of expression, we transfected HEK-293 cells with increasing amounts (up to 100 ng) of cDNAs encoding LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} and LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} (SI Results and Fig. S2). No cAMP generation was found either basally or in the presence of maximally stimulating hCG level (5 nM), indicating that the mutant receptors, even when highly expressed, are not able to restore signaling as monomers. The possibility of their activation as heterodimers with another functional GPCR was studied by cotransflecting the LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} mutant with the β2-AR to HEK-293 cells (SI Results and Fig. S2). No activation of cAMP signaling was found either basally or in response to hCG. This finding corroborates the lack of LHR activation in the TG mice expressing one of the mutant LHRs (see below).

**Generation of TG Mice.** To investigate the possibility of LHR activation through intermolecular cooperation in vivo, we set out to modify bacterial artificial chromosome (BAC) clones containing the entire mouse LHR by homologous recombination, to obtain two mutant clones containing the same mutations as described above (Fig. S1). The use of BAC clones ensures normal spatiotemporal expression of the TG LHR mutants. Each BAC also contained a reporter gene for bicistronic expression, Dicosoma sp. red fluorescent protein (RFP) or enhanced cyan fluorescent protein (eCFP), respectively, downstream of the LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} and LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}–genes, to be used for expression profiling and genotyping (for details, see SI Experimental Procedures and Fig. S1).

Both LHR mutant BACs were then microinjected into fertilized FVB/N mouse oocytes by standard procedures. As the definitive experiments needed to be carried out in the LHR\textsuperscript{null} (LuRKO) background, we designed a breeding strategy to create intercrosses of each of the TG LHR mutants alone or together in the homozygous LuRKO background (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}/cAMP−) (39). The mutant LHR BAC clones contained modified areas differing from the WT or LuRKO loci, which could be used for genotyping of the TG animals, as well as to make sure that the transgenes did not integrate to the WT or LuRKO genomic alleles by recombination (Fig. S1). The transgene copy numbers were similar in the LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} (3–11) and LHR\textsuperscript{AMP−} (2–8) lines (Table S1).
Both receptor mutants (LHR$^{\text{cAMP}^{-}}$ and LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}}$) in the LuRKO background presented with phenotypes indistinguishable from LuRKO animals (39, 41), with arrested postnatal sexual maturation, cryptorchid testes, small and poorly developed accessory sex organs, LC hypoplasia, spermatogenic arrest at the round spermatid stage (Figs. 4 and 5 A–C) and very low serum testosterone levels (Fig. 5F). These results confirm that the mutant LH Rs are completely inactive on their own also in vivo, and demonstrate that the mutant TG clones do not interact with the LuRKO alleles.

In striking contrast to the single mutants in LuRKO background, males expressing both LHR mutants (LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$) in this background showed complete rescue of the WT phenotype. The testes of these mice were descended to the scrotum and had normal weight and size. Accessory sex organs also were fully developed with normal size (Fig. 4 D and E, SI Results, and Table S3); serum testosterone levels were in the WT range (Fig. 5F). LC volume density and seminiferous tubule diameters were also similar in LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$ and WT mice (SI Results and Table S4).

Further evidence for functionality of LHR signaling in the LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$ mice was provided by the serum LH levels, which, albeit slightly higher than in WT mice, were only approximately one-quarter of those measured in LuRKO mice, as the sign of gonadal negative feedback effect on gonadotropin secretion (Fig. 5F). Full spermatogenesis and normal-sized interstitial LC islands were observed by histological analysis of the testes (Fig. 5 D and E). Furthermore, the LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$ males were fertile and sired similar numbers of pups as WT males (7.1 ± 1.9 vs. 7.5 ± 1.3, respectively (mean ± SD; n = 3–4)).

Finally, as clear evidence that the rescue of the phenotype was due to LHR-signaling in LCs, we measured the expression of two LH-dependent, LC-specific genes [steroidogenic acute regulatory protein (StAR; GenBank no. NM_011485) and P450, family 17, subfamily a, polypeptide 1 (Cyp17a1; GenBank no. NM_007809)] (42), by quantitative RT-PCR (qPCR), where both genes were highly expressed in WT and LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$, but at very low level in LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}}$ LHR$^{\text{cAMP}^{-}}$, or LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}}$ mice (SI Results and Table S5).

There was no evidence for residual activity of either of the mutant receptors alone even when these mice had 10-fold higher serum LH levels than control WT animals throughout their life, without significant testosterone production or LH-dependent gene response.

**Discussion**

Our findings demonstrate cooperation between GPCRs because this is the only possibility for a binding- and a signaling-deficient receptor to restore normal hormone action in the physiological context. The evidence for di/oligomerization upon GPCR activation is still exclusively based on data from cell cultures and immunoblots of tissue extracts, which has left the functional significance of this phenomenon open and controversial. In earlier studies on cultured living cells, coexpression of binding- and signaling-deficient LHR mutants was able to partly rescue the intracellular cAMP response (33, 35), as was also confirmed here (Fig. 1). Although cAMP is the key second messenger in LHR signaling, and a universal product of the activation of all GPCRs, these experiments cannot resolve how well the functional complementation can restore all physiologically important aspects of LHR function in vivo. Our current findings provide strong evidence that intermolecular cooperation is sufficient to restore all physiologically essential functions of LHR. To what extent this finding can be generalized to other GPCRs remains to be studied.

**LHR Mutant Expression in Vivo and Phenotypes of the TG Animals.**

The expression of both mutant LHR BAC transgenes at mRNA level was mainly confined to the gonads, with a low level of expression in the brain (Fig. 3 A), where LHR expression has been previously reported (40). To determine the transgene expression at protein level, we analyzed the expression of the reporter genes [Discosoma sp. red fluorescent protein (RFP) or enhanced cyan fluorescent protein (eCFP)] (Fig. 4). Due to the presence of high levels of cholesterol and its derivatives, there was high auto fluorescence of background, with a low level of expression in the gonads, particularly in testicular Leydig cells (LC), which made it difficult to detect the reporter fluorescent proteins. To differentiate the reporter fluorescence from background, and to increase the signal, immunofluorescence of fixed testis sections was performed by using specific antibodies against RFP or GFP (which also detects eCFP). This confirmed that the expression of both transgenes was confined only to LC in the testes (Fig. 4). In brain, the low expression observed at mRNA level (Fig. 3 A) was undetectable at protein level by immunohistochemistry.

The testes of LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}}$ and LHR$^{\text{cAMP}^{-}}$ mutant mice were analyzed for their ability to specifically bind [$^{125}$I]-hCG. Testis homogenates of LHR$^{\text{cAMP}^{-}}$- and LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}/\text{cAMP}^{-}}$-mice showed similar levels of binding as those of WT mice, whereas the LHR$^{\text{LH}^{-}}$ testes showed no hCG binding, as expected (Figs. 3 B and C). While LHR mRNA levels in the single TG testes were half that of the WT testes, they were over 2-fold higher in the double-TG testes (Table S2).
tion, and the LHR^LH− mutant was not able to bind hCG. Previous cell culture studies on expression of complementary receptor mutants have shown that the observed intermolecular cooperation was not due to rescue of one mutant, trapped in the endoplasmic reticulum (ER), by the other to the cell membrane, but to direct interaction of two complementary mutants at the cell membrane (33, 35), as was also the case with the intermolecular cooperation of FSHRs (36). Furthermore, overexpression of the mutant receptors alone in HEK-293 cells could not demonstrate any cAMP signaling activity, indicating that the mutant receptors do not attain spurious activation as monomers even when overexpressed.

Further evidence that the intermolecular cooperation of LHRs is not the result of trafficking rescue through the ER by another receptor, but of direct cooperation between these mutants, is presented by the surface expression of both mutants separately. Moreover, immunoprecipitation of one tagged LHR associated with the complementary receptor indicated that these receptors physically interact with each other at the molecular level, and form homo-di/oligomers (~120 KDa, ~240 KDa, and higher magnitude), similar to a recent report where LHR di/oligomers were detected by BRET (8). When both receptor mutants were coexpressed in TG mice in the LuRKO background, LHR signaling was restored to such an extent that it was able to normalize LC differentiation, gonadal development, sexual maturation, androgen production, and spermato genesis. Finally, the mice were fertile and sired similar numbers of pups with WT controls. Interactions between the LHR mutants and other GPCRs are unlikely because the mice carrying single LHR mutations did not present any recovery of phenotype, and signaling-deficient LHR mutant overexpressed in HEK-293 cells with another GPCR (i.e., the β2-AR) did not dimerize or generate cAMP response. It is therefore likely that the homo-di/oligomer cooperation detected represents a normal physiological phenomenon in the activation and intracellular signaling of the LHR, and might also apply to other structurally similar GPCRs such as FSHR and TSHR. However, our findings do not exclude the possibility of functional receptor monomers; for example, the single α/β-hCG-LHR fusion protein forms a constitutively active complex (43).

Fig. 3. Expression of the LHR^cAMP− and LHRLH^− BAC transgenes in male mice. (A) Expression of mRNA of the transgenes (LHR^cAMP− and LHRLH^−) in different tissues of TG mice as analyzed by RT-PCR, showing strong specific expression in gonads (product sizes 559 and 960 bp, respectively) and weak expression in brain. (B) Specific [125I]-hCG binding to testis homogenates of WT, LuRKO, LHR^cAMP−, and LHRLH^− mice (n = three per group), as well as in a separate binding assay, WT (n = 4) and LHRLH^−/cAMP− mice (n = 2) (C). Each bar is the mean + SD. Different letters above the bars in B indicate that these levels differ significantly (P at least <0.05).
and β-chains tethered into various dimeric or tetrameric orientations retain the bioactivity of the hormone–receptor complexes (44, 45). To what degree such conformations recapitulate the fully physiological response remains to be studied. What is becoming clear is that LHR and FSHR di/oligomers are already formed in the ER during their biosynthesis (8, 10).

Our approach to studying the GPCR intermolecular cooperation in vivo was made possible by the availability of the LuRKO mouse (39). It was crucial that the mutant LHRs were expressed in the absence of functional WT receptors and completely inactive on their own. It was also important to have a model where the phenotype is so specific and clear that only the expected intermolecular cooperation of mutant receptors could rescue it.

Earlier cell culture studies have revealed quantitative difference in the cAMP and phosphoinositide responses of gonadotropin receptors upon their cis- and trans-activation (33, 36, 46), but more pronounced qualitative differences in the responses to the two modes of receptor activation are possible. The only difference we found between the WT and LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup> mice was the 2-fold elevation of LH in the latter, suggesting that the trans-activated receptor complex is slightly less sensitive or less responsive to stimulation than the WT receptor. Lower binding affinity, smaller receptor density, or less efficient signaling are possible explanations for the difference. This was expected from the rescuing results on cultured cells where only partial cAMP activation is achieved.

The intermolecular cooperation upon LHR activation might provide answers to some questions hotly debated about GPCR dimerization (26–29), because it suggests that the receptors, when in close physical contact, can activate another or several others in their vicinity after ligand binding. It could also contribute to the “spare receptor” concept, i.e., that a small proportion of liganded receptors is sufficient to evoke full biological response (47). Most importantly, intermolecular cooperation may also occur between other GPCRs, adding to the complexity of these receptors interactions and their diversity in biological systems.

**Methods**

**LHR Mutants.** The mouse LHR cDNA was kindly provided by Lutz Birnbaumer (National Institutes of Health/National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences). LHR mutants were created by oligonucleotide-mediated site-directed mutagenesis using the QuikChange II Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene) according to the manufacturer’s instructions, and cloned into the expression vector pdNA3.1(−) (Invitrogen) (see SI Experimental Procedures for details and oligonucleotide sequences).

The bovine prolactin signal peptide was inserted by Red/ET recombination as for the BAC clone carrying the same mutant (see below). The entire coding region of each construct was sequenced to verify fidelity of the constructs.

**BACs and Recombination.** A BAC clone carrying the entire mouse LHR gene (RPCI23-18D7) was obtained from BAC PAC resources of Oakland Children’s Hospital in E. coli strain HS996. BAC point and deletion mutants were constructed by Red/ET recombination (GeneBranches). IRES-DrRed and IRES-eCFP (modified from the original Clontech vectors) were cloned into the mutated LHR-BACs by homologous recombination (see SI Experimental Procedures for primer sequences). BAC DNA was propagated in bacteria by standard procedures, purified, linearized, gel-purified and injected into the pronucleus of fertilized mouse oocytes using standard procedures. See SI Experimental Procedures for additional details about experimental settings and oligos.

**Cell Cultures.** Human embryonic kidney (HEK) 293 cells were maintained in T75 flasks at 5% CO<sub>2</sub> in a culture medium consisting of Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle’s Medium (Sigma) and 10% FBS. Transfections were carried out with Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen). Analyses of activity and immunoprecipitations were performed 48 h after transfections.

LHR binding measurements were carried out with [125I]-hCG as label; further details are presented in SI Experimental Procedures.

**Immunofluorescence Staining of Tagged Receptors by Confocal Imaging.** Visualization of the tagged LHR molecules was carried out using indirect immunofluorescence microscopy of HEK-293 cells stably transfected with N-terminally tagged LHR HA-WT, HA-LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>, or FLAG-LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>. Surface receptors were labeled with a rabbit anti-FLAG antibody or mouse anti-HA antibody using standard methods (see details in SI Experimental Procedures).

**Immunoprecipitation.** HEK-293 cells expressing either or both LHR mutants were collected using lysis buffer with protease inhibitors (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4, with 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, and 1% TRITON X-100). The extracts were incubated on ice for 20 min followed by centrifugation for 15 min at maximal speed. For coimmunoprecipitation of differentially tagged LHRs, cell lysates were incubated overnight with anti-FLAG agarose affinity gel (A2220; Sigma) and then eluted with FLAG peptide (F4799; Sigma). Immunoprecipitates were separated by SDS-polyacrylamide-gel electrophoresis (SDS/PAGE) under reducing conditions, electroblotted onto a nitrocellulose membrane, probed with either an anti-FLAG antibody (F7425; Sigma) or an anti-HA antibody (sc-805; Santa Cruz), and horseradish peroxidase-conjugated goat anti-FLAG IgG (DAKO). The immunoreactive bands were visualized using an ECL detection system (Amersham Biosciences).

**Mice.** Founder mice were used for generation of heterozygous lines with phenotypes indistinguishable from WT littermates. Both TG lines were then intercrossed with heterozygous LHR knockout mice (LuRKO) (39), to create LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>, LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>, and LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup>LHR<sup>Δ/CAMP−</sup> mice. The mice were kept in specific pathogen-free conditions, 2–4 per cage, in controlled pathogen-free conditions, 2–4 per cage, in controlled...
conditions of light (12 h light, 12 h dark) and temperature (21 ± 1 °C) in the animal facility of the University of Turku. The mice were fed with mouse chow Special Diet Service RM-3 (E, soy free; Whistam) and tap water ad libitum. The University of Turku Ethical Committee on Use and Care of Animals approved all procedures of the current experiments. In all experiments WT and heterozygous littermates were used as controls. The animals were killed by overdose of Avertin and cardiac puncture was used for blood collection. Tissues were dissected out, weighed, and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen, or fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde.

Immunofluorescence of Histological Sections. Whole-mount fixed testis sections were boiled in citric buffer (10 mM sodium citrate, 0.1% Tween-20, pH 6.0) for 10 min, washed and blocked with 10% normal goat serum (NGS) in PBS. Dissected images were mounted in standard protocols and commercial mouse anti-RFP and rabbit anti-gFP (which also detects eCFP) antibodies (both MBL International). As secondary antibodies we used Alexa Fluor-488 (green) for eCFP and goat anti-mouse Alexafluor-594 (red) for RFP. Nuclei were permeabilized in the last wash with PBS-Triton (0.1%) and stained with DAPI (Vector Laboratories) (see SI Experimental Procedures) before mounting with VECTASHIELD antifading medium (Vector Laboratories) (see SI Experimental Procedures for additional details about experimental settings). Images were captured on a Leica DMRB6E fluorescent microscope (Leica Microsystems), imaged with a CCD camera using IM500 (Leica) and cropped in Adobe Photoshop.

RT-PCR and Genotyping. Standard protocols were followed. Briefly, RT-PCR amplification of total mRNA extracted from different tissues and purified by RNeasy kit (Qiagen) was performed with AMV-reverse transcriptase (Promega) following the manufacturer’s instructions, using primer pairs F1 and R1 (SI Experimental Procedures). PCR was performed using BioTools polymerase and buffer. The presence of the transgenes was determined by screening tail DNA using the PCR primer pairs shown in SI Experimental Procedures.

Quantitative RT-PCR (qPCR). mRNA from tissue or cell culture samples were analyzed by standard protocols using a SYBR-green kit (DyNAmo; Finnzymes) and a Chomo4 thermo-cycler (Bio-Rad). Primer details are in the SI Experimental Procedures.

Statistical Analyses. ANOVA was used for statistical analyses, followed by Tuckey-Kramer multiple comparisons post hoc test to identify the groups differing. All numerical data are presented as the mean ± SD, and P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.
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SI Experimental Procedures

LHR cDNA Mutants. Oligonucleotide-mediated site-directed mutagenesis was performed by using the QuickChangeII Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Clones selected by ampicillin were directly sequenced to verify that they contained the correct mutation. The entire sequence of each mutant cDNA was determined.

The LHR mutants (LHR<sup>LH−</sup> and LHR<sup>AMP−</sup>) as cDNAs were then subcloned into an expression vector pDNA3.1(-) (Invitrogen) between the restriction site of EcoRI and BamHI and tagged with HA or FLAG into the N-terminal coding sequence just after the signal peptide (referred to as FLAG-LHR<sup>AMP−</sup> and HA-LHR<sup>LH−</sup>). The entire coding region of each cDNA construct was sequenced to verify the different modifications.

BACs and Recombination. A BAC clone carrying the entire mouse LHR gene (RPCI23-18D7) was obtained from the BAC PAC resources of Oakland Children’s Hospital in E. coli strain HS996. The C22A mutation (LHR<sup>LH−</sup>) was adjusted by a mouse codon usage program (www.entelechon.com). The point mutation in LHR<sup>LH−</sup> and ΔTM67 deletion in LHR<sup>AMP−</sup> were achieved by inserting and replacing a selection/counter selection cassette (RpsL-Neo) with single strand oligonucleotides (1) (see below for primer sequences). Bicistronic reporter cassettes were inserted by Red/ET recombination and screened with specific primers. Prolactin signal sequence was inserted by the ALFIRE procedure (2), first by inserting an RpsL-Neo cassette flanked by ISe-cl recombination and homology arms to the bovine PRL signal sequence from a previously described vector (3). All areas of modification were sequenced to ensure correctness. PCR amplification for recombineering was performed using TripleMaster polymerase mix and buffers (Eppendorf). BAC DNA was propagated in bacteria by standard procedures and purified using a large construct Maxiprep kit (Qiagen), linearized, PFGE gel purified and injected into the pronuclei of fertilized mouse oocytes using standard procedures. Additional details about the experimental settings and oligos are below.

Tissues for Immunofluorescence, RT-PCR, and Receptor Binding Assays. Blood, testes, seminal vesicles, and other organs were collected, and their weights were recorded. Serum was separated by centrifugation, frozen, and stored at -20 °C until used for hormone assays. After removal, one of each pair of testes was immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -70 °C until used for LHR binding and mRNA measurements. The other testis was boiled in citric buffer (10 mM sodium citrate, pH 8.5. Genomic DNA was isolated as described (4), precipitated with ethanol and resuspended in 10 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.5. Genomic DNA from different mouse samples was measured by UV spectrophotometer and adjusted to 5 ng/μL. PCR reactions were performed in duplicate in 20 μL using 96-well plates (Bio-Rad) in a qPCR thermocycler (Chromo4 with OpticonMonitor software, Bio-Rad), containing primers that recognize both WT and TG sequences. Specific primers that detect only endogenous WT receptor gene (as for genotyping LuRKO mice) were also used for normalization of the samples and standardization of TG copy numbers. A linear standard curve was drawn using WT genomic DNA at different dilutions. Considering that WT genome contains 2 copies of the LHR gene, the extra number of copies in the founder TG animals was considered as TG copies according to the trend line equation and dilution used. The following conditions were used: 95 °C for 15 min, followed by 40 cycles of 94 °C for 20 s, 56 °C for 45 s, 72 °C for 1 min, 80 °C for 1 s.

Cell Cultures and Transfections. To analyze the ability of the LHR<sup>LH−</sup> and LHR<sup>AMP−</sup> mutants to generate cAMP signal, either basally or in response to hCG, HEK-293 cells previously seeded onto 96 well plates were transfected with high dose of 100 ng of the receptor cDNAs, using Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen) transfection reagent. cAMP generation was monitored by cotransfection with 40 ng of a cre-luciferase plasmid DNA, and using 5 n of pRL-CMV as a transfection control. The total concentration of transfected DNA was standardized using pcDNA 3.1. Forty-eight hours after transfection, cells were stimulated with 0, 0.05, 0.5 and 5 mM hCG for 4 h and assayed for cre-luciferase and pRL-CMV activity using Lucilite substrate solution (Perkin-Elmer), and coelenterazine substrate (Calbiochem) respectively. Luminescence was determined using a Victor2 plate-reading Luminometer (Perkin-Elmer). In another experiment, plasmids encoding β2-adrenergic receptor (β2-AR) and the LHR<sup>AMP−</sup> mutant were co-transfected (100 ng of each) with cre-luciferase plasmid as above, and assayed for luciferase activity in the absence and presence of 0.05 and 0.5 mM hCG.

Immunofluorescence Staining of Tagged Receptors by Confocal Imaging. Visualization of the tagged LHR molecules was carried out using indirect immunofluorescence microscopy of HEK-293 cells stably transfected with N-terminally tagged LHR either HA-WT, HA-LHR<sup>LH−</sup> or FLAG-LHR<sup>AMP−</sup>. Surface receptors were labeled by ‘feeding’ the live intact cells either with a rabbit anti-FLAG antibody (1:500, Sigma) or mouse anti-HA antibody (1:250, Covance) for 20 min at 37 °C, before fixation (4% paraformaldehyde in PBS, 20 min), followed by incubation for an additional 15 min in the absence (nonpermeabilized) or presence of the 0.02% Nonidet P-40 in PBS with 2% FBS for 15 min (permeabilized). Cells were then washed extensively with PBS and further incubated for 30 min with goat anti-mouse or goat anti-rabbit Alexa Fluor 488-conjugated antibodies (1:1000, Invitrogen) in blocking solution. Specimens were washed extensively in PBS, mounted on...
glass slides, and examined using a Leica SP5 laser scanning confocal microscope with a 63x/1.4NA oil immersion objective, using instrument settings verified to produce negligible bleed through between channels and an estimated section thickness of 1 µm. Micrographs shown are representative optical sections imaged through the center of the cell.

Immunoprecipitation. HEK-293 cells expressing either or both LHR mutants, or both LHR-\textsuperscript{cAMP} and β2-AR (a gift from Mark von Zastrow, University of California San Francisco) were washed 48 h after transfection, and collected using lysis buffer with protease inhibitors (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4, with 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, and 1% TRITON X-100). The extracts were incubated on ice for 20 min followed by microfuge centrifugation for 15 min at maximal speed. Protein concentrations in the supernatants were measured using the Bradford assay. For immunoprecipitation of differentially tagged LHRs, and differentially tagged LHR-\textsuperscript{cAMP} and β2-AR, one-mL aliquots of cell lysates were incubated overnight with 40 µL of anti-FLAG agarose affinity gel (A2220, Sigma) and then eluted with FLAG peptide (F4799, Sigma). Immunoprecipitates were separated by SDS polyacrylamide-gel electrophoresis (SDS/PAGE) under reducing conditions, electroblotted onto a nitrocellulose membrane, probed with either an anti-FLAG antibody (F7425; Sigma) or an anti-HA antibody (sc-805, Santa Cruz Biotechnology), and horseradish peroxidase-conjugated goat anti-rabbit IgG (DAKO). The immunoreactive bands were visualized using an ECL detection system (Amersham Biosciences).

mRNA Expression by qPCR. Quantitative PCR was performed by standard protocols using DyNAmo SYBR Green (Finzymes) kit. PCR reactions were performed in triplicate in 20 µL using 96-well plates (Bio-Rad) in a qPCR thermocycler (Chromo4 with OpticonMonitor software, Bio-Rad), using primers that recognize LHR (WT and mutants, see below). For normalization of the samples a housekeeping gene (\textit{Ppia}) was used. A linear standard curve was drawn using different dilutions of a plasmid containing the cDNA of the LHR. Results are expressed as the number of LHR/\textit{Ppia} versus WT control.

The same procedure was used to determine the level of expression of LH-dependent Leydig cell-specific \textit{StAR} and \textit{Cypt17a1} genes in testes of the different mutant mice, and results are presented below as percentage of WT controls.

LHR Binding Measurements. \textit{\textsuperscript{[\text{125}]I}}-hCG binding to testicular homogenates was measured as previously described (5, 6). Briefly, a piece of the frozen testis (see above) was homogenized with an Ultra-Turrax 18/10 homogenizer in Dulbecco’s PBS (100 mg testes/mL) containing 0.1% (wt/vol) BSA (Sigma Chemical), and the homogenates was measured as previously described (5, 6). Brie-

\begin{align*}
\text{Measurement of Tubule Diameter and Leydig Cell Volume Density.} & \text{Tubule diameters and Leydig cell volume densities of testis samples were measured from paraffin sections stained with eosin-hematoxylin using a Leica microscope and Leica IM1000 software (Leica). Sections from three animals per group were analyzed, all tubules in three sections were measured and calculated as percentage (\% \text{ of total area of section}).}
\end{align*}
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Weights of the LuRKO, LHR −/− and LHR cAMP−/− mice were equal (Table S3). Seminal vesicles of the LuRKO, LHR −/− and LHR cAMP−/− mice were rudimentary, whereas the WT and LHR LH−/−/cAMP−/− seminal vesicles had similar weights (Table S3).

Seminiferous tubular diameters and Leydig cell volume densities of the LuRKO, LHR LH−/−, and LHR cAMP−/− tests were similar and narrower/smaller than in the LHR LH−/−/cAMP−/− and WT tests, which did not differ from each other (Table S4).

Transgene copy numbers were similar in the LHR LH−/− (3–11) and LHR cAMP−/− (2–8) mice (Table S1).

With maximal amounts (100 ng) of LHR LH−/− or LHR cAMP−/−-plasmids were transfected into HEK-293 cells, no cAMP signal (measured by cre-luciferase activity) was detected either in the absence or presence of hCG (0.05, 0.5, and 5 nM) (Fig. S2), indicating that overexpression of one of the mutants alone is not able to activate cAMP generation, which was readily detected in cells expressing WT receptor. Likewise, cotransfection (100 ng) of the LHR cAMP−/− mutant and β2-AR expression plasmids did not produce cAMP signal basally or in response to hCG stimulation (Fig. S2). Robust activation of signaling was observed in each case when WT LHR was transfected.

Total mLHR expression of different mutants was compared to WT controls, whereas LHR single mutants express ~60% of control levels, the double mutant (LHR LH−/−/cAMP−/−) overall expresses 2.3 times the LHR levels than WT (Table S2).

LH-dependent Leydig cell-specific genes (StAR and Cyp17a1) were analyzed by quantitative PCR to show the direct activation of cell signaling in Leydig cells by LH. Negligible expression of either gene could be detected in LHR single mutants and LuRKO mice samples, whereas LHR LH−/−/cAMP−/− and WT expressed both genes (Table S5) at near similar levels.

Fig. S1. Details of the BAC constructs used to express binding- and signaling-deficient LHR mutants in transgenic mice. BAC clones containing the entire LHR genomic gene (exons numbered) were modified by point mutations, insertions, and deletions of specific areas. (A) One receptor mutant harbored an inactivating mutation in the LH/hCG ligand binding region (LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}), where Cys\textsuperscript{22} was replaced by Ala\textsuperscript{22} (C22A) through a TGC/GCA point mutation. As reporter gene, a bicistronic cassette containing an internal ribosomal entry site (IRES) and enhanced cyan fluorescent protein (eCFP) were inserted after the LHR gene. (B) The other mutant contained a deletion of transmembrane domains 6 and 7 (ΔTM67) in exon 11 (amino acid deletion Val\textsuperscript{553} to Ala\textsuperscript{689}), which are involved in G protein coupling and second messenger production (7) (LHR\textsuperscript{cAMP−}). To ensure translocation of the latter LHR mutant to the cell membrane, a bovine prolactin (PRL) leader signal was inserted into the N-terminus of the mature receptor. As reporter gene, a bicistronic cassette containing an IRES and Dicosoma sp. red fluorescent protein (RFP), was inserted after the LHR gene. Primer positions are marked, for genotyping: IRESF for either transgene, with RFP-R for LHR\textsuperscript{LH−}-IRES-eCFP, and with CFP-R for LHR\textsuperscript{cAMP−}-IRES-RFP. (C) WT and LHR-knockout (LuRKO) alleles, and resulting WT receptor, no protein is generated by the LuRKO allele. Primers for genotyping the LHR knockout (LuRKO) and WT alleles were as previously described and shown in the figure to demark a different position. Primers F1-R1 were used for RT-PCR amplification of either transgene because LHR\textsuperscript{cAMP−} encoded a shorter product. Schematic representation of each of the receptor mutants is portrayed on the right of the BAC diagrams marking, with blue and red colors the areas of modification.

Fig. S2. Inactive LHR mutants are unable to respond to hCG or to trans-activate other GPCRs. LHR\textsuperscript{LH−} (A) or LHR\textsuperscript{cAMP−} (B) plasmids (100 ng per well) were transfected into HEK-293 cells together with the cAMP-cre-luciferase activity plasmid, and then cells were stimulated with different concentrations of hCG (0.05, 0.5, and 5 nM) but showed no cAMP response. (C) Cotransfection of LHR\textsuperscript{cAMP−} with β2 adrenergic receptor (β2R) expression plasmids in HEK-293 cells did not produce cAMP signal basally or in response to hCG stimulation (0, 0.05, 0.5, and 5 nM). A clear cAMP response was observed in each experiment in cells transfected with WT LHR.
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Table S1. Transgene copy number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TG founder</th>
<th>TG copy number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>3–11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>2–8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Genomic DNA of two founder mice per group in duplicate was analyzed by real-time PCR. Copy numbers were calculated after subtraction of the WT copy number (considered = 2) and calculated on a linear standard curve created by dilutions of WT genomic DNA.

Table S2. LHR expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Total LHR expression, times WT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LuRKO</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>0.58 ± 0.24\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.29\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}/AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>2.33 ± 0.64\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>1.00 ± 0.19\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testicular mRNA was isolated and analyzed by real-time PCR for LHR expression, normalized with a housekeeping gene (Ppia), and presented as total LHR expression as compared to control (WT). Results are the mean ± SD of at least three different samples per group, each sample measured in triplicate. Values with different superscript letters differ statistically significantly (P < 0.05).

Table S3. Testis and seminal vesicles weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Testis, mg</th>
<th>Seminal vesicles, mg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LuRKO</td>
<td>53.6 ± 5.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>52.1 ± 8.3\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>54.9 ± 6.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}/AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>145.3 ± 44.0\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>539.8 ± 37.7\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>147.9 ± 40.2\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>535.2 ± 26.6\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value is the mean ± SD of at least four mice. Groups with different superscripts differ significantly (P < 0.001). N/A, not applicable because the size of the seminal vesicles in LuRKO, LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}, and LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}} mice was too small for accurate measurement.

Table S4. Seminiferous tubule diameter and Leydig cell volume densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Seminiferous tubule diameter, nm</th>
<th>Leydig cell volume density, as % of the total area of a testicular section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LuRKO</td>
<td>98.9 ± 11.0\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>1.58 ± 0.18\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>100.4 ± 13.9\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.69 ± 0.16\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>95.4 ± 12.2\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>2.70 ± 0.20\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}/AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>138.2 ± 11.0\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>5.49 ± 0.52\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>127.8 ± 8.1\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>5.47 ± 0.36\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each value is the mean ± SD of at least three samples. Groups with different superscripts differ significantly (P < 0.001 for seminiferous tubular data; P < 0.05 for Leydig cell data). Leydig cell volume density (% of total section) was calculated as the area covered by Leydig cells in a testicular histological section divided by the total area of the section.

Table S5. LH-dependent gene expression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STAR/Ppia</th>
<th>Cyp17a1/Ppia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LuRKO</td>
<td>0.059 ± 0.017\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.077 ± 0.034\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>0.062 ± 0.015\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.096 ± 0.027\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>0.076 ± 0.036\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>0.053 ± 0.006\textsuperscript{a}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LHR\textsuperscript{LH\textsuperscript{-}/AMP\textsuperscript{-}}</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.15\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.13\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WT</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.084\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.17\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Isolated mRNA from testis of different animals was analyzed by real-time PCR, normalized with a housekeeping gene (Ppia), and presented as percentage of WT control. Results are the mean ± SD of at least three different animals per group, each analyzed in triplicate. Values with different superscript letters differ statistically significantly (P < 0.05).