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Abstract

Ambient temperature has a profound effect in the physiology of all animals and accurate evaluation of both external and internal temperatures is therefore an essential factor for fitness and survival. To this end, animals possess specialized cells and organs, which have evolved to obtain accurate information about this crucial factor.

*Drosophila melanogaster* relies on different thermosensitive neurons to gauge both its internal as well as the external temperature. One thermosensitive organ is located in the arista, a feather-like structure protruding from the third segment of the fly’s antenna. It has been found that the arista houses six neurons, three of which exhibit excitatory responses to heat (and were therefore called hot cells) and three which are responding to cold (named cold cells). In this study, I characterized the responses properties of the thermosensory organ in the arista and analyzed the role that the TRP ion channel NOMPC, classically associated with mechanosensation, plays in this particular structure.

Using Ca$^{2+}$ imaging, I found that the amplitude of temperature evoked Ca$^{2+}$ responses appears to be determined by the relative change in temperature, rather than the absolute value.

I furthermore found evidence that the TRP channel NOMPC can be found in the hot cell population of arista neurons. Data obtained in this study shows that a knockdown of *nompC* leads to a reduction in the temperature response amplitude of hot cells. Homozygous *nompC* null mutants exhibit a stronger reduction in amplitude than heterozygous mutants, hinting at a possible gene dosage effect. The response modulation via NOMPC also affects behaviour, as locomotion experiments in a temperature gradient showed that *nompC* knockdown mutants show later hot avoidance and have a higher preferred temperature. The effect in both physiological and behavioural experiments could be rescued.

Taken together, the findings of this study show that the thermosensitive neurons in the arista of *Drosophila* function as relative temperature sensors and that NOMPC serves an important modulatory role for the temperature evoked responses of these neurons.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Regulatory systems are vital for basically all processes in living organisms. From the first prokaryotes to highly evolved multicellular organisms, regulatory processes have developed to optimize and control cell metabolism, signalling and development (see for example Junger 2011; Mullur, Liu, and Brent 2014; Partridge, Lopez, and Johnston 1984). We find comparable regulatory processes on any other biological level from cell-organelles up to complex regulatory behaviour of animals. While the scope of regulatory processes changes with the complexity of the underlying system, the general basis appears to stay the same, as the concept of feedback regulation can be found from system such as gene expression (Hepker et al. 1997; Sheen 1994) to proper control of locomotion via proprio-reception (Lam and Pearson 2002; Pearson 1995). Regulatory systems, regardless if they are of technical, subcellular or behavioural nature are based on the IPO principle (Input-Processing-Output) (Frank 2013; Partridge, Lopez, and Johnston 1984; Waring 1996), implying that without sensory input, the finest tuned regulatory system is useless.

In order to extract information from the environment, animals rely on different senses as a sort of interface between them and their surroundings. This process is indispensable for the survival and fitness of behaving animals, be it to locate food sources, conspecifics or to avoid harmful circumstances such as extreme environmental conditions or predators. For non-sessile animals, this means that almost all behaviours are at least modulated, if not even motivated, by sensory input (Carlson 1994; Shettleworth 2001).

When thinking about the different senses and sensory modalities (such as vision, gustation, olfaction, temperature sensation, or mechanosensation), it is easy to imagine them as distinct and separate processes. Research, however, has begun to find a steadily increasing number of conserved features, structures and mechanisms between different sensory modalities. These features were not only conserved between different species, but also between the fundamental processes of different senses. This includes factors regarding the development of sensory cells/organs, as for example the *Drosophila* gene *atona* (ato) has been found to be required for the development of both photoreceptors and stretch receptive organs (Caldwell and Eberl 2002; Jarman et al. 1995; Niwa, Hiromi,
and Okabe 2004).

Shared features also extend into the area of actual sensory transduction, such as the different functions of opsins (primarily associated with the visual sense) in proprioception (Zanini et al. 2018), or the effect of opsins and chemosensors on the sound transduction/hearing in Drosophila (Senthilan et al. 2012). The sharing of transduction molecules in different sensory modalities is widespread in the animal kingdom: In mammals, the TRP channel TRPV-1 has been shown to be responsible for the perception of noxious temperatures, chemicals (such as capsaicin) and pH (Aneiros et al. 2011; Caterina et al. 1997; Salazar et al. 2008). Similarly, the mammalian ion channel TREK-1, which has been found to be a mechanically sensitive channel, can also be activated via chemical ligands, intracellular acidification and even heat (Brohawn, Su, and MacKinnon 2014; Chemin et al. 2005; Maingret, Lauritzen, et al. 2000; Maingret, Patel, et al. 1999; Maingret, Patel, et al. 2000).

The ability to extract information from the environment predates the evolution of distinct sensory organs. Single-celled organisms for example, use ion channels of, as mechanosensors (Sukharev et al. 1994) or cytoplasmatic kinases involved in chemosensation (Frank, Piñas, et al. 2016; Parkinson, Hazelbauer, and Falke 2015; Tu 2013). These findings have given rise to the idea that the different senses and the underlying transduction mechanisms might evolutionary related. the theory suggests a protosensory cell, from which the distinct sensory systems and organs of higher animals evolved and specialized (Niwa, Hiromi, and Okabe 2004; Simpson 2011).

The superfamily of TRP on channels is of special notice in this context, as its members have been found to be implicated in a wide number of sensory processes in many different species (including insects, worms, mice and humans), with certain channels playing a role in more than one sensory pathway/modality (for reviews, see Fowler and Montell 2013; Kadowaki 2015; Pan, Yang, and Reinach 2011; Venkatachalam and Montell 2007).

**Figure 1: Expression of GFP driven by nompC-Gal4 in the antenna of Drosophila** Overview image of a Drosophila head, expressing the membrane associated fluorescent protein mcd8-GFP under UAS control, driven via nompC-Gal4. Visible flourescence in the second antennal segment, which contains the animals hearing organ (Johnston’s organ), and in the base of arista (black arrowheads), which is the location of a set of thermosensitive neurons. Image courtesy of Dr. B.R.H.Geurten.

NompC > mCD8-GFP
In the study presented here, I studied the involvement of the TRP channel NOMPC, a mechanotransducer channel, in the context of a seemingly completely different sensory modality: temperature sensation. Initial studies of nompC expression in our lab found evidence that the TRP channel could be present in a set of neurons in the arista (Figure 1), which have been implicated in temperature sensation (Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013).

1.1 TRP ion channels

The superfamily of transient receptor potential (TRP) channels encompasses more than 30, relatively unspecific cation channels. In contrast to many other ion channel families, TRP channels show a surprisingly wide range of ion permeabilities, activation mechanisms and sensory modalities in which they act. Interestingly, some TRP channels can be activated through different mechanisms/modalities, as will be described in detail below, and they are therefore often considered as signal integrators of different stimuli (see for example Venkatachalam and Montell 2007). The importance of TRP channels for the responses to almost all external stimuli and their presence in so many different animal species makes them a compelling research subject when thinking about sensory processes and the underlying molecular mechanisms.

Even though members of the TRP channel family have been found to be involved in many different sensory modalities across a wide range of species, they all share a number of similar structural motifs: These are: six transmembrane domains, with the pore forming region located between the 5th and 6th transmembrane domain, a permeability for cations and the location of both N- and C-termini of the protein on the intracellular side (Montell 2005; Venkatachalam and Montell 2007).

The different TRP channels have been categorized into two main groups and seven subgroups (or sub-families), based on their role, structural properties and species in which they can be found. All sub-groups/sub-families follow a naming convention, in which a one or two letter abbreviation (usually derived from a phenotype, disease or structural feature, associated with the first found member of the sub-family) follows the TRP initials (Clapham, Montell, et al. 2003; Montell et al. 2002; Pan, Yang, and Reinach 2011).

Shared characteristics of members of the group 1 of TRP channels include a varying number of ankyrin repeats at the N-terminus region (with the exception of the TRPM sub-subfamily) and a so-called TRP domain, usually located shortly after the 6th transmembrane domain in the C-terminal direction (an exception to this is TRPA, which does however feature a structurally very similar \(\alpha\)-helix in the corresponding region, see Paulsen et al. 2015). It has been suggested that these domains play a role in regulating gating properties (including the direct gating of mechanosensory channels), ligand binding and localisation. (Cordero-Morales, Gracheva, and Julius 2011; Gaudet 2008; Hwang, Stearns, and
Tracey 2012; Lishko et al. 2007; Valdez et al. 2019; Zhang, Cheng, et al. 2015). Group 1 encompasses the sub-families TRPA (“ankyrin”), TRPC (“canonical”), TRPM (“Melastatin”), TRPN (“no mechano-receptor potential C” or short ”NompC”) and TRPV (“vanilloid”).

TRP channels belonging to group 2 are lacking the previously described ankyrin repeats and the TRP domain, and appear to share a strikingly long extracellular span between their first and second transmembrane domains. Group 2 includes the sub-families TRPML (“Mucolipin”) and TRPP (“Polycystin”).

A further sub-family, called TRPY (“yeast”) has been found in Saccharomyces cerevisiae (Denis and Cyert 2002; Dong, Wang, and Xu 2010; Palmer et al. 2001; Venkatachalam and Montell 2007) and is usually not associated with one of the 2 TRP channel groups described above. Phylogenetic analysis, showed no distinct relation between TRPY and any of the other metazoan TRP channels, suggesting that it emerged after the evolutionary separation of fungi and Metazoans (Cai and Clapham 2011; Kadowaki 2015).

The discovery of different TRP sub-families in apusozoa (Cai and Clapham 2011) and choanoflagellates (Cai 2006; Peng, Shi, and Kadowaki 2015), suggests that the origin of many of the TRP-subfamilies lies within the single-celled ancestors of Metazoa.

As previously mentioned, different TRP channels play a role in wide variety of sensory systems and modalities. These include taste, smell, vision, thermosensation, mechanosensation and hearing (for reviews, see Fowler and Montell 2013; Pan, Yang, and Reinach 2011; Venkatachalam and Montell 2007).

Not only are TRPs found in every sensory modality, some of them are involved in more than one sensory process. Examples are the mammalian TRPM8 channel or the Drosophila
dTrpA/one.pnum channel. Both have been found to be thermosensitive TRP channels, as TRPM8 is involved in cold sensation (Bautista et al. 2007; McKemy, Neuhausser, and Julius 2002; Nealen et al. 2003; Peier et al. 2002) and dTrpA1 is activated by hot temperatures (Hamada et al. 2008; Rosenzweig, Brennan, et al. 2005). However, it has been described that these channels can also be activated by chemical ligands, with TRPM8 being also activated by menthol and icilin (Andersson, Gentry, et al. 2008; Dhaka, Viswanath, and Patapoutian 2006; McKemy, Neuhausser, and Julius 2002; Peier et al. 2002). Certain dTrpA1 isoforms react to irritant chemicals, such as hydrogen-peroxide or allyl isothiocyanate (AITC) (Andersson, Gentry, et al. 2008; Kang, Pulver, et al. 2010; Takahashi et al. 2008; Zhong et al. 2012). Additionally, it has been shown that dTrpA1 can even be involved in the indirect sensing of UV light, via its sensitivity to hydrogen-peroxide (Guntur et al. 2015).

The actual activation of TRP channels can occur via different mechanisms. These can be direct activation, or the TRP channel can act as part of a receptor activation system (such as G-protein coupled receptors) or via ligand binding (Clapham, Runnels, and Strübing 2001; Ramsey, Delling, and Clapham 2006). As illustrated by the examples above, the same TRP channel can play a role in the sensing of different stimuli and can be activated via multiple mechanisms. It has also been shown that different activation pathways of the same channel can underlie different modulatory effects: In the mammalian TRPM8 channel, for example, activation via cold or icilin is modulated by intracellular pH, but its activation via menthol does not appear to be modulated this way (Andersson, Chase, and Bevan 2004).

Members of all seven metazoan TRP sub-families have been found in Drosophila, being involved in multiple sensory systems and processes (see Figure 3 for an overview). TRP channels of group 2 in Drosophila have so far not been shown to play a direct role in sensory transduction, though the channel Amo (short for "almost there", also called Pkd2), a member of the TRPP sub-family that is required for male fertility/sperm motility, has also been implied in cold sensation (Gao, Ruden, and Lu 2003; Köttgen et al. 2011; Turner et al. 2016; Watnick et al. 2003). Meanwhile, Trpml (only member of the TRPML group in Drosophila) has been shown to be important for calcium homeostasis/transport in lysosomes and maturation of neuromuscular junctions (Wong, Li, et al. 2012; Wong, Palmieri, et al. 2015).

Group 1 TRP channels on the other hand are involved in a multitude of sensory processes in Drosophila: The channels Trp, Trpl and Trpγ (belonging to the TRPC sub-family) have been shown to play a role in phototransduction, cold sensation and proprioception (and by extension fine motor control) (Akitake et al. 2015; Birnbaumer 2009; Rosenzweig, Brennan, et al. 2005). The TRPM sub-family is only represented by one channel in Drosophila, called Trpm, involved in ion homeostasis and larval cold sensation (Georgiev et al. 2010; Hofmann et al. 2010; Turner et al. 2016).
The TRPV channels in *Drosophila* are called Nanchung (Nan) and Inactive (Iav) and are implicated in mechanosensinsensitve processes (such as hearing and gravitation sensing) (Boekhoff-Falk 2005; Gong et al. 2004; Kim, Chung, et al. 2003; Sun et al. 2009; Zhang, Yan, et al. 2013) and thermosensation (Kwon, Shen, et al. 2010). Furthermore, Iav as been implied in synaptic signalling processes (Wong, Chen, et al. 2014) and Nanchung in hygrosensation (Enjin et al. 2016; Liu, Li, et al. 2007). The TRPA sub-family includes four channels in *Drosophila*, namely dTrpA1, Painless, Pyrexia and Waterwitch.


Finally, the TRPN sub-family includes a single channel in *Drosophila*, called no-mechano-receptor potential C (NomPC), which has been found to be crucial for multiple senses and processes involving mechanosensation, including hearing, locomotion and gentle touch reception. (Cheng et al. 2010; Effertz, Wiek, and Göpfert 2011; Göpfert, Albert, et al. 2006; Kernan, Cowan, and Zuker 1994; Walker, Willingham, and Zuker 2000; Yan et al. 2013; Zhang, Yan, et al. 2013).

### 1.2 The *Drosophila* NOMPC TRP channel

The *Drosophila* TRP channel No mechano-receptor potential C (NomPC) is the first discovered member of its sub-family, hence the naming of the group as TRPNOMPC (TRPN). The TRPN sub-family belongs to group 1 of TRP channels, as described in 1.1. Homologues
of this TRPN channel have been discovered in other species, namely Zebrafish (Danio rerio (Sidi, Friedrich, and Nicolson 2003)), african clawed frog (Xenopus laevis (Shin et al. 2005)), and a nematode (Caenorhabditis elegans (Li et al. 2006)). However, no equivalent channels have been discovered in any mammalian species. So far, no evidence of NOMPC in sensory systems that are not mechanosensitive has been discovered, making its apparent presence in the thermosensory cells of the arista very intriguing.

The NOMPC ion channel contains 29 ankyrin repeats at its N-terminus, connected via a linker domain to the transmembrane domains. It appears that the characteristically long ankyrin repeat domain in NOMPC is required for the mechanically induced gating of NOMPC (Zhang, Cheng, et al. 2015). The C-terminus is characterized by the so called TRP domain (see Figure 4 for an overview).

The NOMPC channel has been shown to be essential for mechanotransduction in a range of sensory systems. It was first discovered that mutations in nompC impaired larval locomotion and touch responses, as well as abolished of mechanoreceptor potentials in sensory bristles of adult Drosophila (hence the name "No mechanoreceptor potential"), leading to the idea that NOMPC is a mechanosensory transducer channel (Kernan, Cowan, and Zuker 1994; Walker, Willingham, and Zuker 2000). Soon after, it was shown that NOMPC (together with TRP channels Nan and Iav) would be an essential component in Drosophila hearing (Effertz, Wiek, and Göpfert 2011; Göpfert and Robert 2003; Kim, Chung, et al. 2003). It has since been shown that NOMPC plays a role in both larval and adult Drosophila locomotion, mechanosensitivity and sound transduction (Cheng et al. 2010; Yan et al. 2013; Zhang, Yan, et al. 2013). Furthermore, NOMPC was found to be necessary for the mechanosensitivity of certain stretch receptive neurons in the inner and outer labella, facilitating proper feeding behaviour (Zhou et al. 2019).

Additionally, research has found that Drosophila NOMPC appears to play a role in a different sensory modality: The sensing of noxious cold temperatures. nompC was found to be expressed in class III multidendritic neurons of Drosophila larvae. These neurons elicit body contractions in response to noxious cold (Turner et al. 2016). However, the exact way in which NOMPC influences cold sensation remains unclear, as although null mutations of nompC resulted in a reduction of cold evoked contractions, RNAi knockdown of nompC only resulted in a non-significant increase in cold evoked calcium responses. Additionally the TRP channels Amo and Trpm are also found in these neurons (Turner et al. 2016). Class III multidendritic neurons furthermore mediate gentle touch responses, and apparently require NOMPC for this transduction process (Tsubouchi, Caldwell, and Tracey 2012; Yan et al. 2013).

However, as described above, expression studies in our lab found indication of nompC expression in a neuron population inside the arista of adult Drosophila melanogaster (as shown in Figure 1). This group of sensory cells has so far not been shown to be
mechanosensitive, but is involved in Thermosensation (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013).

### 1.3 Thermosensation

Environmental temperatures have a significant impact on almost all physiological processes, and the ability to perceive these environmental factors is paramount to all animals.

When it comes to the molecular basics for thermosensation, insights into channels and activation mechanisms, many facets still remain to be discovered, although research in recent years has advanced this field considerably. As mentioned in 1.1, a number of different TRP channels have been implicated in thermosensation, in both vertebrates and invertebrates (Dhaka, Viswanath, and Patapoutian 2006; Romanovsky 2007; Vay, Gu, and McNaughton 2012). TRP channels that are involved in thermosensation are often referred to as “thermo-TRPs”. However, temperature sensitive channels are not limited to this superfamily, as a range of proteins have been found to play an active role in the transduction of temperature into neuronal signals, belonging to groups such as ionotropic

The exact way, by which temperature activates or modulates such temperature sensitive channels/proteins remains largely unknown, although recent studies have begun to investigate and model this process. The relationship between temperature sensing and voltage dependent gating has been extensively discussed in the literature, although no complete model of the relationship has been found (Chowdhury, Jarecki, and Chanda 2014; Latorre, Brauchi, et al. 2007; Voets et al. 2004). The possibility of localized "denaturation", meaning changes in protein tertiary structure induced by temperature have also been discussed (Latorre, Vargas, et al. 2006). Additionally, several structural features have been shown to be crucial for the thermotransduction process (Voets 2012).

In different studies for example, almost all structures of the TRP channel TRPV1 have been investigated and considered as thermosensors, such as the pore turret region and the ankyrin repeat domain (Ladrón-de-Guevara et al. 2019; Voets 2012; Yang et al. 2010). However, the exact way, by which a change in temperature leads to conformation change or gating of the channel remains elusive. Very recent studies, using molecular dynamics simulation, have implied that heat-induced contractions of certain domains of the TRPV1 channel (S2-S3 linker and MPD linker domain) as well as dynamic forming and breaking of hydrogenbonds are major factors for the temperature based gating (Zheng and Wen 2019). Future simulations and experiments will have to show, whether these predicted mechanisms can be confirmed, and whether these are specific features of the TRPV1 channel, or more fundamental properties/mechanisms of temperature gated ion channels.

Understanding the basics of thermosensation is of high interest, as nearly all animal behaviours are informed, modulated or directly motivated by the external and/or internal temperature of the organism (see for example Abram et al. 2017; Briffa, Bridger, and Biro 2013; Kang, Williams, et al. 2010; Steinmetz and Posten 2017). This is especially true in situations of extreme temperature, in which even the endocrine temperature regulation of homeothermic animals quickly reaches its limit and can only partly prevent hyper- or hypothermia, respectively (Flouris 2011), or even cause direct damage, resulting from protein denaturation for example.

But even outside of temperature ranges that are immediately harmful to an organism, it is paramount for animals to accurately gauge the surrounding temperatures, as they influence all physiological reactions. This extends beyond immediate effects and into more long-term relevant factors, as exposure to certain temperature ranges can affect adaptive gene expression (such as neuronal dopamine synthesis, see Marija et al. 2019) or even result in longer lasting "memory-effects" of physiological parameters, such as body fat storage (Klepsatel et al. 2016).

While homeothermic animals are less influenced in their bodily functions by external
temperatures than poikilothermic animals, they still need to take the thermal environmental conditions into account. In fact, certain research suggests, that behavioural thermoregulation is the primary factor for thermal homeostasis in homeothermic organisms, while endocrinin and autonomous thermal-regulation plays a secondary role (see for example Attia 1984; Flouris 2011).

For poikilotherm animals, this situation is of course even more strict, as the lack of autonomous thermoregulation means they have less latitude when it comes to temperature motivated behaviours: Even comparatively short exposure to unfavourable temperature ranges can have an immediate effect on their physiology, behaviour and ultimately, fitness and survival, thus necessitating distinct and precise behavioural responses (Garrity et al. 2010; Huey, Hertz, and Sinervo 2003; Stevenson 1985).

This influence of ambient temperature is of course even more pronounced in smaller, poikilothermic animals, as a smaller body size results in less "isolating" tissue, meaning central body functions and organs are affected by the external temperature much faster (see for example Heinrich 2013; Sayeed and Benzer 1996).

In the study presented here, thermosensation was investigated in the vinegar fly, *Drosophila melanogaster*. The demands for accurate thermosensors and fast temperature evoked behaviours in small poikilotherm animals, combined with an anatomically relatively simple nervous system, established genetic tools and mutant lines, make for a convincing case to study these essential sensory processes in the fly.

### 1.3.1 Thermosensation in *Drosophila melanogaster*

The fly *Drosophila* possesses a set of different thermosensitive neuronal structures, both in its larval and adult state, sensing both noxious and non-noxious heat and cold (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015). As described above, small, poikilotherm animals such as *Drosophila* are especially susceptible towards the influence of external temperatures (Garrity et al. 2010; Stevenson 1985), thus necessitating precise and reliable temperature sensation. It has been shown that *Drosophila* exhibits preference for temperature ranges, which the animal will actively try to pursue, ensuring survival and optimal physiological functions (with the exact temperature ranges varying, depending on factors like the life-cycle stage of the animal or the rearing temperature) (Dillon et al. 2009; Giraldo et al. 2019; Kwon, Shen, et al. 2010; Kwon, Shim, et al. 2008; Sayeed and Benzer 1996). Research has begun to unveil the cellular and molecular basics of how both noxious and non-noxious temperature sensation occurs in the fly.

In the larvae of *Drosophila*, thermosensors can be found in the head and repeated in each hemisegment of the body. Sensation of noxious cold in the larvae appears to be mediated by class III multidendritic (md) neurons, located in the body wall, which require the TRP channels NompC, Trpm and Amo for proper function (Turner et al. 2016). Non-noxious
Figure 5: Overview of *Drosophila* temperature sensitive neurons Schematic overview of temperature sensitive neurons in *Drosophila melanogaster*, and the proteins that are involved in temperature transduction. Left side shows neurons that have been described as heat sensitive, right side shows neurons described as cold sensitive. **A)** Temperature sensitive neurons in adult *Drosophila*. Illustration in upper right corner shows which part of the adult *Drosophila* is enlarged. Heat sensitive neurons have been found in the arista and the anterior cells of the central brain complex. Cold sensitive neurons were found in the arista and the sacculus of the third antennal segment. It is as of yet unclear, which neuronal structures are responsible for noxious heat and cold sensation. **B)** Temperature sensitive neurons in *Drosophila* larvae. Illustration in upper right corner shows which part of the larvae is shown enlarged in grey. Heat sensitive neurons have been found in the central brain complex, ventral nerve cord (VNC) and the multidendritic (md) neurons of the body wall. Cold sensitive neurons have been found in the dorsal and terminal organ in the head and the md neurons close to the body wall (which can be found in each abdominal hemisegment). Larvae and adult fly illustration adapted after Dr. C. Spalthoff, Dr B.R.H. Geurten and Dr. D. Giraldo
cold sensation has been ascribed to two organs located in the larvaes head: the terminal organ ganglion, requiring the TRP channels Trp and Trpl (Liu, Yermolaieva, et al. 2003; Rosenzweig, Kang, and Garrity 2008), as well as the dorsal organ ganglion, requiring the ionotropic receptors Ir21a, Ir25a and Ir93a (Klein et al. 2015; Knecht et al. 2016; Ni, Klein, et al. 2016).

Larval heat sensation on the other hand was found to be mainly mediated by sensory neurons in the central brain, ventral nerve chord and body wall regions of Drosophila larvae (Liu, Yermolaieva, et al. 2003; Rosenzweig, Brennan, et al. 2005): the TRP channel dTrpA1 was found to be present in a set of neurons in the central brain, the corpus cardiacum and the ventral nerve chord neurons and has been shown to be necessary for warm avoidance (Luo, Shen, and Montell 2017; Rosenzweig, Brennan, et al. 2005). Surprisingly, it was found that dTrpA1 mediated avoidance of lower temperatures (around the 20°C mark) is affected by the rhodopsins 1, 5 and 6, as well as phospholipase C (Kwon, Shim, et al. 2008; Shen et al. 2011; Sokabe, Chen, et al. 2016), proteins classically associated with phototransduction/vision (for a review, see Montell 2012). The exact way, by which these players in warm-transduction interact is still unclear, although it has been suggested that dTrpA1 might act as a thermosensor and the rhodopsin pathway might fulfill a modulatory role (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Kwon, Shim, et al. 2008; Shen et al. 2011). This is especially interesting, as functions of opsins beyond direct sensory transduction have been uncovered: Research suggests that ATP independent translocation of phospholipases across cellular membranes (flippase activity) might be vital to develop and maintain proper structure of certain sensory neurons (Ahmad et al. 2007; Giraldo Sanchez 2018; Kumar and Ready 1995; Menon et al. 2011).

Noxious heat sensation has been attributed to so-called class IV md neurons (also found close to the larval body wall) and requires the TRP channel Painless (Sokabe, Tsujiuchi, et al. 2008; Tracey Jr et al. 2003).

Additionally, the chordotonal organs of the Drosophila larvae (stretch receptive organs located close to the animals body wall) were implied to play a role in temperature sensation (Kwon, Shen, et al. 2010; Liu, Yermolaieva, et al. 2003). However, recent research did not show temperature sensitivity of the pentameric chordotonal organ (which was shown to express brivido1) or an effect of brivido1 mutations on larval temperature sensation (Giraldo Sanchez 2018). If and how exactly larval chordotonal organs play a role in thermosensation remains to be determined.

Thermosensation in adult Drosophila has so far been found to be localized to great extend in the head of the animal. The general temperature preference of the fly appears to be driven by the anterior cells, a set of neurons found in the brain, which are responsive towards warm temperatures and require dTrpA1 for this process (Hamada et al. 2008). These anterior cells furthermore seem to act as integrating interneurons for a, as of yet unknown, set of temperature sensor neurons. This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact
that these neurons show a dTrpA1 independent activity to higher temperatures, which seem to require the TRP channel Pyrexia (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Tang et al. 2013). Pyrexia also appears to play a role in the resistance against noxious heat, although its role in the actual sensing of noxious temperatures has been debated (Lee, Lee, et al. 2005; Neely et al. 2011).

The sensing of noxious temperatures in general remains an understudied topic in adult Drosophila so far. While the TRP channels dTrpA1 and Painless are thought to be involved in the sensing of noxious hot temperatures, the actual cells in which these processes take place remain elusive (Neely et al. 2011; Xu et al. 2006). Noxious cold sensation and its cellular and molecular mechanisms remain unknown (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015).

A set of neurons found in the sacculus, within the third antennal segment has been shown to be involved in the sensing of innocuous cold temperatures, with its signals being integrated with the information of other cold sensing neurons of the antenna, in higher order brain regions (Gallio et al. 2011). Lastly, a group of thermosensitive neurons has been found in the arista of Drosophila. The arista itself is a feather-like structure, protruding from the third antennal segment of Drosophilas antenna. It is known that the arista plays an important role in hearing, as deflections of the arista (by sound or wind for example) rotate the third antennal segment, in turn mechanically stimulating stretch receptive neurons inside the second antennal segment (Johnston’s organ) (Caldwell and Eberl 2002; Göpfert and Robert 2001; Göpfert and Robert 2002). This mechanosensory function is however not the only sensory process in which the arista is involved: Studies have found a set of six neurons, located inside the arista, to be temperature sensitive. These cells have been described to be necessary for temperature driven behaviours, triggered by both hot and cold, non-noxious temperatures (Budelli et al. 2019; Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013).

1.3.2 Thermosensation in the arista of Drosophila

The arista of Drosophila houses a population of six neurons which have been shown to be thermosensitive and necessary for certain temperature evoked behaviours (Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013; Ni, Klein, et al. 2016). When studying the morphology of the arista neurons, one can find the cell bodies located at the proximal base of the arista structure and a single dendrite per cell projecting along the length of the arista (Foelix, Stocker, and Steinbrecht 1989). The axons of the arista neurons project through the third, second and first antennal segment, into the central brain complex of the fly, targeting distinct glomerolus like structures in the posterior antennal lobe (PAL) (also referred to as the proximal antennal protocerebrum (PAP)) area (Frank, Jouandet, et al. 2015; Gallio et al. 2011).
The six neurons in the arista are temperature sensitive (Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013) and their localization at the most distal part of the *Drosophila* antenna suggests a function as primarily external temperature sensor. The neurons of the arista can be subdivided into two sub-groups with three cells each, that can be distinguished by their functionality: One group appears to be activated by increases in temperature, and was therefore named hot cells (HC), while the other group exhibits activation via cold stimuli and is therefore referred to as cold cells (CC) (Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). Cold cell dendrites show a unique morphological feature, as their endings form distinct, lamellar structures (Budelli et al. 2019; Foelix, Stocker, and Steinbrecht 1989), with the spacing of these lamella supported by so-called bossy orthogonal surface substructures (BOSS) (Steinbrecht 1989). Similar structures are apparently absent from the dendrites of HCs.

Recent studies have begun to unravel the molecular basics for temperature transduction in the HC and CC population, although several aspects remain poorly understood. Gallio et al. found that cold-evoked calcium responses in the CC population as well as cold avoidance behaviour was reduced in mutants of the gene *brivido* (*brv*)(Gallio et al. 2011). In this context, it has recently been discussed, whether the *Drosophila* proteins Brivido1-3 (*Brv1-3*) are members of the TRPP channel family (Gallio et al. 2011), although the Brivido proteins possess 10 transmembrane domains (Fowler and Montell 2013). This aspect has led to the omission of *Brv1-3* from some recent lists of TRP channels (Fowler and Montell 2013). Additionally, newer studies involving electrophysiological recordings of the arista were unable to identify a distinct effect of *brv* mutations on the spiking rate or amplitude of CCs (Budelli et al. 2019). In the same study, Budelli et al. collected evidence that three
ionotropic receptors (IRs) are not only involved in the temperature evoked responses of CCs, but are also required for proper morphogenesis of the dendritic region and its previously described lamellar structures (Budelli et al. 2019). The three ionotropic receptors are namely IR21a, IR25a and IR93a. As mentioned earlier, these same IRs have previously been found to be important for cold sensation in larvae. It is thought that IR25a and IR93a serve a more regulatory, co-receptor role (and act as such also in other sensory modalities, such as humidity sensing, see for example: Enjin et al. 2016; Kim and Wang 2016), while IR21a acts as specific cooling sensor (Knecht et al. 2016; Ni, Klein, et al. 2016).

The HC group of arista neurons has been shown to express a gene for a gustatory receptor, called gr28b.d. GR28B(D) seems to act as a relatively unspecific cation channel and mutations in this gene result in an impairment of negative thermotactic behaviour in Drosophila (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013, for a review see Montell 2013). The study performed by Ni et al. showed that functional GR28B(D) is necessary for the rapid response towards steep warmth gradients (gradient in the described experiment was at least 5°C per cm)(Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). Additionally, the misexpression of the gustatory receptor gene has been found to confer warm sensitivity to a variety of previously not temperature sensitive cells (Mishra et al. 2018; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). This clearly suggests that GR28B(D) serves as thermotransducing protein in the HCs of the arista.

The two cell groups appear to connect to distinct glomeruli in the PAL. Additionally, the glomerolus targeted by the projections of the HC population appears to also receive input from dTrpA1 expressing neurons, which have been described as internal warm temperature sensing cells (Gallio et al. 2011; Hamada et al. 2008), while a set of cold sensitive neurons found in the sacculus of Drosophilas third antennal segment also projects to the PAL region (Liu, Mazor, and Wilson 2015). From the PAL, projection neurons then relay the temperature information to higher order brain areas (Florence and Reiser 2015; Frank, Jouandet, et al. 2015).

Research in the recent years has postulated that the reason for multiple sensory systems involved in the sensing of non-noxious temperatures is a a functional separation: Whereas more internal temperature sensing neurons, such as the dTrpA1 positive cells, are necessary for the development of longterm temperature preferences and responses to longer temperature exposure, which reaches the body core, the more peripheral sensors, such as the arista neurons, are not involved in these processes (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). On the other hand, the peripheral sensors found in the antenna are necessary for the sensing of steep temperature steps in the ambient temperature. Taken together, it appears that while dTrpA1 serves as sensor for the registration of internal body temperature, the positioning of HC and CC populations in the most distal part of the antenna, the arista, points to a function as external temperature sensor. Interestingly, transduction of temperature in these cells involves proteins belonging to the groups of ionotropic and gustatory receptors, but members of the TRP channel superfamily have so far not
been shown to be involved in these thermosensors (if excluding the Brv channels for the reasons mentioned above). This is especially surprising, given the otherwise widespread implementation of TRP channels in sensory systems, including thermosensation, in other structures of the fly and other animals. In this study, I present first evidence of the presence of a TRP channel in the HCs of the arista: the TRPN channel NOMPC. The goal of my PhD thesis was to determine the influence of NOMPC on the sensory physiology of the HCs and on temperature preference and avoidance behaviour.
Chapter 2

Material & Methods

2.1 Fly Husbandry

*Drosophila* were kept in small vials on food (fresh yeast: 71.43g/L; sugar: 71.43g/L; flour: 25.71g/L; salt: 2.86g/L; propionic acid: 4.29 mL/L, apple juice 142.86mL/L; agarose 8.57g/L). Vials were closed using mite proof plugs. All fly lines were raised and kept at 25 °C (to avoid systematic alterations of preferred temperatures, see Giraldo et al. 2019) and 60% humidity, in a 12h/12h light/dark cycle.

Flies with a homozygous *nompC* mutation could not be kept in normal fly vials, as the severe impairment to mechanosensation makes it impossible for the flies to perform coordinated movements, including basic locomotion and flying. These mutant animals would stick to the food at the bottom of the vial and were therefore collected after eclosion and put into a Petri dish, containing slightly moist tissue paper. The mutant flies survived several days in this dish.

2.2 Genetic tools & mutant flies

Different established genetic methods were used during this study. Established mutant lines for the *nompC* gene in this study include *nompC*, which carries a mutation resulting in a premature stop codon in the anykrin repeat area of NOMPC (Cheng et al. 2010; Walker, Willingham, and Zuker 2000), leading to a complete loss of detectable protein (see for example Liang et al. 2011), as well as a line carrying the *nompC* mutation, in which a *piggyBac* construct (Thibault et al. 2004) insertion into the gene leads to lower expression rates of the gene, and therefore reduced amount of the protein (Lee, Moon, et al. 2010; Sun et al. 2009).

In addition to fly lines carrying specific mutations in genes of interest, two binary expression systems were employed: The Gal4/UAS system (Brand and Perrimon 1993) as well
as the LexA/LexAop system (Lai and Lee 2006). Both systems allow for the expression of one or more desired genes in a cell or tissue specific manner. These systems were used here in order to: (i) examine the expression pattern of certain genes using genetically expressed fluorophores, (ii) rescue mutant phenotypes by re-introducing functional copies of a gene, (iii) ablate cells using apoptotic factors Hid (Grether et al. 1995) and Rpr (White et al. 1994) and (iv) to express the calcium indicator GCaMP6m (Chen et al. 2013). The advantage of using two different expression system lies in the fact that they do not directly influence each other, allowing for two different genes to be expressed in different cell population within the same fly line.
### 2.3 Fly lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CantonS</td>
<td>+/+ ; +/+ ; +/+</td>
<td>BDSC64349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white nSybLexA LexAop GCaMP6m</td>
<td>w^{1118}/w^{1118} ; nSybLexA/CyO ; LexAop GCaMP6m/TM6C</td>
<td>Provided by Dr. C. Spalthoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;, nSybLexA</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; nSybLexA/TM6B</td>
<td>Provided by A. Adden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;, LexAop GCaMP6m</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; LexAop GCaMP6m/TM6B</td>
<td>Obtained by crossing double balanced nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; line with bloomington LexAop GCaMP6m line (BDSC44276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;, recombinated imaging</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; nSybLexA, LexAop GCaMP6m/TM6B</td>
<td>Obtained by homologous recombination of the nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;, nSybLexA and nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; LexAop GCaMP6m lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC-Gal4, nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; background</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;/Gal4/TM6B</td>
<td>Obtained by crossing nompC rescue parental line with double balanced nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC&lt;sup&gt;600914&lt;/sup&gt;, nSybLexA</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;600914&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; nSybLexA/TM6B</td>
<td>Provided A. Adden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC&lt;sup&gt;600914&lt;/sup&gt;, LexAop GCaMP6m</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;600914&lt;/sup&gt;/CyO ; LexAop GCaMP6m/TM6B</td>
<td>Obtained by crossing double balanced nompC&lt;sup&gt;600914&lt;/sup&gt; line with Bloomington LexAop GCaMP6m line (BDSC44276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC rescue (parental)</td>
<td>+/+ ; nompC&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;, UASnompC-GFP/CyO ; nompC-Gal4/TM6B</td>
<td>Provided by Li Cheng (UCSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC Overexpression (parental)</td>
<td>+/+ ; UASnompC-GFP/CyO ; nompC-Gal4/nompC-Gal4</td>
<td>Provided by Li Cheng (UCSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC-Gal4 UAS-mcd8-GFP</td>
<td>+/+ ; CyO/sp ; nompC-gal4, UAS-mcd8-GFP/nompC-Gal4, UAS-mcd8-GFP</td>
<td>Provided by Li Cheng (UCSF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC-Gal4</td>
<td>w* ; PGawBhot-cell ; +/TM6b</td>
<td>Provided by M. Gallio (Northwestern University)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1: Drosophila lines & genotypes |
### Table 1: *Drosophila* lines & genotypes (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UAS-mcd8-GFP</td>
<td>w* ; +/+ ; Py[t.7]w[mC]=20XUAS-IVS-mCD8::GFPattP2</td>
<td>BDSC32194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS-hid.rpr</td>
<td>UAS-hid.rpr ; +/+ ; +/+</td>
<td>Provided by John Nambu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2.4 *In vivo* calcium imaging

Rise in intracellular calcium concentration as a measure of neuronal activity was used to assess responses of arista neurons. All calcium imaging experiments were performed on adult *Drosophila*, 2-6 days after eclosion. Both male and female flies were used, as pilot studies in our lab showed no systemic difference in the neuronal Ca$^{2+}$ responses of the arista neurons. A Zeiss Axio Examiner.D1 microscope (Carl Zeiss AG, Oberkochen, Germany) was used and all movies were recorded using an Orca Flash 4.0 camera (Hamamatsu Orca Flash 4.0 V2, C11440-22CU, Hamamatsu Photonics K.K., Hamamatsu, Japan) and the Micro-Manager (https://micro-manager.org) software kit. Unless otherwise noted, all movies in this setup were recorded using a Zeiss 40X water immersion objective (Zeiss Objective W "Plan-Apochromat" 40x/1.0 DIC M27). Movies were recorded with a frame rate of 10 frames per second (fps). The genetically encoded calcium indicator (GECI) GCaMP6m (Chen et al. 2013) was used and expressed in a nearly panneuronal fashion, using the LexA-LexAop binary expression system (Lai and Lee 2006) and a neuronal-synaptobrevin promotor (nSyb-LexA). Since the arista only houses the 6 thermosensitive neurons that are being investigated in this study, the panneuronal expression did not interfere with detecting the desired neurons, as the target neurons do not occlude each other too often. In most experiments, one or more neurons were clearly separable.

The GCaMP family of GECIs consist of an circularly mutated EGFP molecule, fused with a calmodulin (CaM) and the so-called M13 domain (a peptide sequence obtained from the enzyme myosin light-chain kinase). Ca$^{2+}$ can bind to the CaM, leading to a conformational change in the EGFP, which increases its fluorescence (see Figure 7) (Akerboom et al. 2009; Nakai, Ohkura, and Imoto 2001; Wang et al. 2008).

Over the course of this study, a total of 954 flies were measured in this Ca$^{2+}$ setup. Of these, a total of 226 animals yielded recordings, resulting in a total of 495 cell signals measured.

It should be noted that by panneuronal expression, Ca$^{2+}$ responses of hot and cold cells
GCaMP consists of an EGFP, a calmodulin (CaM) and a M13 domain. Without binding of Ca^{2+} ions to the CaM, the EGFP is in a low fluorescent state (left). CaM can bind up to four Ca^{2+} ions, due to its E-F motifs. Once bound to Ca^{2+}, CaM undergoes a conformation change, which allows it to bind to the M13 domain and in turn effect the fluorophore, leading to an increase in fluorescence (right). Adapted after tian2012imaging.

could be measured at the same time thereby providing an internal control, as for example the cold cell could serve as a control for genetically manipulated hot cells, ensuring that the setup and GECI work fine. The occurrences of overlaying cold and hot cells showed a distinctive double peaked response, making it easy to discard them from the dataset.

### 2.4.1 Temperature stimulation

To assess the responses of the arista-neurons to temperature changes, flies were fixed and stimulated with different temperature steps, using a thermo electric generator: Adult *Drosophila* were glued to a coverslip (24mm X 24mm), using Heliobond dental glue (Ivoclar Vivadent, Ellwangen, Germany), which cures under ultraviolet light and is clear, allowing imaging through it. Flies were positioned so that the top of the head and the second antennal segment would touch the coverslip, with dental glue covering the top of the head and the antenna, including the arista. Then, the Heliobond glue would be hardened using a handheld UV lamp (Starlight Pro, mecron, Cologne, Germany). The rest of the body was not immobilized. This preparation would eliminate all movement that would interfere with the imaging of the arista, while still leaving thorax and abdomen free, so as to not block trachea and ensure the survival of the fly for the duration of the experiment. The animal would be angled in such a way that the arista would be very close to the surface of the coverslip (see figure 8). The coverslip with the attached *Drosophila* was then placed above a thermoelectric generator. This generator makes use of the Peltier effect, allowing to change the temperature by applying a voltage. The temperature generator
Figure 8: Overview of Drosophila preparation for Ca\(^{2+}\) imaging experiments with temperature stimulation A) Illustration of the preparation for Ca\(^{2+}\) imaging experiments, using temperature stimulation (side view). The fly is glued underneath a glass coverslip, using Heliobond dental glue. Only the top of the head, thorax and the antennae are fixed. The coverslip is placed atop of an thermo electric generator, allowing for temperature stimulation of the fly. A thermosensor is placed in close proximity to the fly, in order to accurately estimate the temperature reaching the animal. (Drosophila illustration altered after Dr. F. Bilz) B) Top-down view of the preparation, during an experiment. To reduce movies size, only a ROI around the antenna of the animal would be filmed during a recording.

was placed on an aluminum slab (measuring: 150mm X 170mm X 10mm) that stabilizes the setup on the microscope table and functions as an additional heat sink. A small 3D printed plastic rim was used to hold the coverslip, with the attached animal, closely above the thermo electric generator. An external temperature sensor (SEMI833ET, B+B Thermo-Technik GmbH, Donaueschingen, Germany) was positioned close to the fly, in order to get an more accurate readout of the temperature that the animal is experiencing during the experiment. The thermo electric generator was connected to a JUMO controller (JUMO dTRON 316 703041/181-400-23/000, JUMO GmbH & Co. KG, Fulda, Germany), which directly controls the voltage (and with that the temperature) of the generator, and also receives a sensor readout from the thermoelectric generator. The JUMO controller displays the present temperature and the target temperature of the generator on a front display.

An Arduino micro (arduino.cc) receives input from the JUMO temperature controller, a separate input from the external temperature sensor in proximity of the animal, and receives a timing signal from the camera. Camera and Arduino micro were connected to the same PC. The PC runs a MatLab (The MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) script/GUI, controlling and monitoring the temperature of the thermo setup. Using a proportional–integral–derivative controller (PID), a temperature, or a succession of different temperature steps can be set for the system. The GUI will display 3 different data traces in this setup: 1. The target
Figure 9: Temperature stimulation control GUI A representative example of the GUI in control of the thermo electric generator during a calcium imaging experiment. Left side show the area in which different temperature steps and their duration can be set an the icons to start the temperature run. Top right shows a temperature curve during an experiment. Blue: sensor temperature; Green: Target temperature; Red: Driving temperature. Note that the step-wise appearance of the curve is a result of the graphical representation showing a reduced number of samples in order to save computational power. Bottom right shows a graphical representation of the number of video frames recorded during the experiment.

temperature (the temperature that is supposed to be applied to the fly) 2. The sensor temperature (meaning the temperature value recorded by the external sensor close to the *Drosophila*) 3. The so called driving temperature (the temperature of the thermo-electric element, controlled by the JUMO temperature controller). The PID is supposed to alter the driving temperature, depending on how strong the difference between the sensor temperature and the target temperature is. As temperature is a more inertial type of stimulus, compared to, for example, light or mechanical stimulation, it was not possible to achieve a stimulus that reaches the desired temperature in a very short time window (this is especially true for large temperature differences). Instead, this setup, with the proper settings of the PID, which had to be empirically tested, allows for a "smooth approach" to the target temperature, without much of an over- or undershooting, over the time course of approximately 60 seconds. A more aggressive heating or cooling would
reach the target temperature sooner, but would also overshoot the desired value (often followed by an oscillation of the sensor temperature around the target value), leading to less precise and less reproducible stimuli.

Figure 10: Temperature stimuli during Ca\textsuperscript{2+} imaging experiments An overview of the different temperature stimuli, one of which was applied during a calcium imaging experiment via a thermo electric generator. Curves show the temperature recorded from a sensor in close proximity to the fly. A)-D) Four different temperature stimuli, used to investigate responses of arista neurons to different relative and absolute temperature steps. A initial waiting period of 75s at 22°C baseline temperature is followed by alternating steps of temperature increments and decrements (compared to the baseline), either increasing or decreasing in amplitude over the course of the experiment. After 8 Temperature steps, temperature is returned to the baseline temperature of 22°C. E-F) Temperature protocols applied in order to investigate adaptation over time. After a starting period of 75s at 22°C baseline, a single temperature step of either 26°C (E) or 18°C (F) is applied for 5 minutes, followed by a return to the baseline temperature of 22°C.

The Matlab script/GUI would furthermore register the frame count of the video that was recorded during the experiment (via the timing input from the camera to the Arduino Mirco). This would later allow to precisely correlate the temperature data with the imaging movie.

Different temperature protocols were used in order to investigate the responses of hot- and cold-cells to different relative and absolute changes in temperature. Each protocol consisted of a starting period at a baseline temperature of 22°C. This starting period was followed by alternating steps of temperature increases and decreases, in either rising or falling amplitude, with a total protocol duration of 650 seconds (75 seconds baseline...
temperature at the beginning, 8 temperature steps of 60 seconds each, and 75 seconds back at base temperature in the end). Alternatively, the initial waiting period would be followed by a 300 second lasting temperature step, followed by a return to baseline (see figure 10). At the end of each recording, the temperature data, along with the corresponding frame/time data would be saved as a .mat file.

2.4.2 Mechanical stimulation

To investigate whether mechanical stimulation/deflection of the arista would lead to an activation of the arista-neurons, recordings were performed in a setup similar to the temperature stimulation described in 2.4.1. For this experiment, adult Drosophila (age 2-6 days after eclosion) were again glued to a coverslip using UV hardening Heliobond dental glue, however only the funicle, pedicle and front of the head capsule were covered in glue, to eliminate any movement from the antennal segments while the arista itself remained free. A pulled glass capillary with a hook shaped bend was attached to a piezo actuator (Physik Instrumente, Karlsruhe, Germany) in order to mechanically stimulate the arista. The piezo was controlled by a modular controller (E-501, Physik Instrumente, Karlsruhe, Germany) connected to a SD9 Grass stimulator (MODEL SD9E, Grass Medical Instruments, Quincy, USA).

Once the fly was placed underneath the microscope, the bend tip of the glass capillary was brought into position using a micromanipulator, so that it just touched the arista at the distal part (approximately at 2/3 of the entire arista length). A voltage step, produced by the Grass stimulator was then used to deflect the arista. During the experiment, the temperature was kept at a baseline temperature of 22°C, as to not elicit any temperature induced neuronal responses.

The arista would be deflected continuously for 60s. The mechanical stimulation would be followed by a 1 minute pause window and two temperature steps (20 and 24 °C), in order to ensure that cells were alive and responsive during the experiment, and to identify HC and CC populations.

2.4.3 Calcium imaging analysis

Analysis of calcium imaging movies was performed with FIJI (https://fiji.sc). Small instances of image drift along the X- or Y-axis were corrected for by using the template matching and slice alignment plugin for FIJI (Plugin can be found at: https://sites.google.com/site/qingzongtseng/template-matching-ij-plugin). To correct for photobleaching during the course of the recording, a region of interest (ROI) was drawn in an area of the movie without abrupt changes in fluorescence and FIJI’s integrated bleach correction function was employed, using an exponential fit.
To assess the relative change in fluorescence, the measure $\Delta F/F_0$ (change of fluorescence divided by baseline fluorescence) was used. The calculations for this part of the analysis were performed with FIJI’s "Image Calculator" function.

The first step to this end was to calculate the baseline fluorescence ($f_0$) by generating a picture of the average intensity of the first 20 frames of a movie, using FIJI’s "Z-Project" function. By subtracting this baseline image from each of the 6500 frames of a movie, the change in fluorescence was obtained ($\Delta F$). Finally, each of these 6500 difference images were then divided by the baseline fluorescence ($F_0$).

By drawing a ROI around the cell body of an arista neuron in the obtained $\Delta F/F_0$ movie, the change in fluorescence of the corresponding cell could be obtained (using the function "Plot Z-Axis Profile"). The ROI was drawn at the cell bodies of the neurons, as they would give of a strong and reliable signal, viewable even thorough the cuticule, whereas the dendrites of the cell (due to being significantly thinner) would often not be visible in the experiment.

### 2.4.3.1 Analysis of temperature stimulated Ca$^{2+}$ imaging

Calcium traces and the corresponding temperature curves were correlated using a Python script, extracting the data from the $\Delta F/F_0$ file (see section 2.4.3) and the temperature file saved after each experiment and aligning them via the framenumber (as this information is saved in both data files). The resulting file, containing both the timing information as well as the values for the sensor temperature and the Ca$^{2+}$ trace, was then used in the further analysis, which was conducted using custom MatLab scripts. The first step in this analysis was a final drift correction, to eliminate remaining artifacts from bleaching and movement during the recording (which were not eliminated during the steps described in 2.4.3). The correction was done fit a cubic polynomial curve to the $\Delta F/F_0$ curve and subtracting this fit from the curve. A cubic polynomial was chosen, as it most closely matched the nonlinear curve drift, resulting from movement and photobleaching. Imaging data would be grouped, with respect to fly strain and stimulus conditions. Median and mean HC and CC responses and the corresponding SEM (mean) or confidence intervals (median) for each strain at each stimulus condition were calculated.

As the different stimulus conditions, shown in Figure 10 A-D, generate a set of absolute and relative temperature changes, peak responses to temperature changes were compared by establishing a 10 frame timewindow around the maximum of a temperature step response and comparing calcium response amplitude in that window. To compare the responses to relative changes, the $\Delta F/F_0$ response for different temperature steps with the same relative step size (for example a step from 22 to 26°C and from 18 to 22 °C would both constitute a relative change of +4°C), the median fluorescence change was plotted in regards to the relative temperature step amplitude. Median and mean $\Delta F/F_0$
**Figure 11: Example of calcium imaging analysis**  
A) Raw movie of the arista of an adult *Drosophila* with neurons expressing the GECI GCaMP6m B) $\Delta F/F_0$ result of the image shown in A), after bleach correction and drift correction. The high brightness in the difference image implies an increase in neuronal activity / intracellular $Ca^{2+}$ concentration. A ROI (red) is drawn on one of the responding cells. C) Change in luminescence of the cell marked with a ROI in B) over the timecourse of the experiment.

Values for all relative temperature step amplitudes would be calculated and the $\Delta F/F_0$ value plotted both as boxplot for each individual temperature step and as a function of the relative temperature step size. In order to gain an estimate of statistically significant
differences in the maximum responses, the gain of the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal per °C change was calculated for the biggest relative temperature changes of each stimulus condition (for both increments and decrements). To better visualize possible effects of different mutations on relative step response amplitudes in a quick overview, a linear fit was fitted to the relative response curves and the gain of this fit would be calculated. Furthermore, as the temperature stimulation would not produce an instant jump to each target temperature, but a change over time, the $\Delta F/F_0$ would also be plotted against the temperature change over time (°C change / s).

2.4.3.2 Analysis of mechanically stimulated Ca$^{2+}$ imaging

In the case of mechanical stimulation experiments, $\Delta F/F_0$ traces of the recorded movies were obtained in FIJI and the resulting imaging traces and temperature data were correlated with the same python script described in 2.4.3.1. The time and duration of the mechanical stimulation was determined directly from the video frame numbers, as the movement of the glass capillary was clearly visible. Mean $\Delta F/F_0$ response and SEM to the stimulation was calculated and plotted using Matlab.

2.5 Temperature preference behaviour

2.5.1 Recording of temperature preference behaviour

In order to assess the preferred and tolerated temperatures of adult *Drosophila*, their locomotion behaviour on a temperature gradient was recorded. This experimental setup was first established in Giraldo Sanchez 2018; Giraldo et al. 2019. The behavioural experiments were conducted under identical conditions, following strictly the aforementioned methods.

The basis for this gradient arena setup consisted of an aluminum slab, in which 5 lanes (measuring 50mm x 3mm x 3mm) were cut. Before the start of an experiment, a brass cylinder containing salt water and frozen in a -80°C freezer, was placed on one side of the aluminum block, while a set of 4 soldering irons were inserted into the block on the opposing side.

In order to monitor the temperature of the arena, 30 temperature sensors (SEMI833ET, B+B Thermo-Technik GmbH, Donaueschingen, Germany) were built into the aluminum block and measured the temperature with a frequency of 10Hz. A multiplexer, controlled by an Arduino micro (arduino.cc) was used to obtain the sensor data and forward it to a PC, running a MatLab script/GUI. In this script, the user can define a minimum and maximum temperature for the “hot side” of the arena. Once the sensors report a temperature...
lower than the set minimum, the soldering irons would turn on, heating up that end of the aluminum block. If the set maximum temperature was reached, the irons would be automatically shut off. The temperature of the arena could furthermore be live monitored before and during the experiment in the MatLab GUI.

This combination of heating on one side, while cooling down the opposing side, generates a stable temperature gradient, reaching from approximately 14° on the cold end to 30°C on the hot end, lasting well beyond the duration of an experiment. However, since the frozen salt water begins to thaw eventually, the brass cylinder was exchanged after every experiment.

Flies were anesthetized on ice and, once a stable gradient was reached, put into the lanes of the arena, on the hot end. Only female virgin *Drosophila*, with an age between 2 - 6 days were used in the experiment, as the larger females are easier to locate during tracing, and the use of virgins in the experiment would exclude potential influence of oviposition site search towards the preferred and tolerated temperatures (Dillon et al. 2009). The tracks were covered using a translucent Plexiglas slide, to prevent flies from escaping. The slide was covered in Sigmacote (Sigma-Aldrich) to discourage flies from crawling on it.

After all animals were placed into the tracks, they were given 10-12 minutes to recover from cold anesthesia, before a recording was started. During an experiment, flies were recorded from the top, using a GigE camera (Teledyne DALSA,), at 50fps, for 5 minutes. The setup was illuminated using a set of infrared LEDs (940nm ± 25; Bausatz Infrarot-
Scheinwerfer, Pollin Electronic GmbH, Pförring, Germany), as the flies cannot detect infrared light, thus eliminating interference from visually guided behaviours, such as positive phototaxis.

### 2.5.2 Analysis of temperature preference behaviour

![Figure 13: Temperature preference correction via IGLOO](image)

**A** Histogram of an example fly strains distribution in the temperature gradient locomotion experiment before correction with IGLOO. Red star denotes the mean preferred temperature. **B** Histogram of the same strain as in A, after cold bias correction via IGLOO, in which a simulated distribution is subtracted from the uncorrected dataset. Temperatures at which the probability density is positive would be regarded as preferred, temperatures with negative probability density as avoided or antipreferred. Should the 95% confidence interval (error bars) overlap with the 0 axis, the temperature would be regarded as neither avoided nor preferred.

In order to obtain the two-dimensional trajectories of flies moving inside the lanes, movies were analyzed using ivTrace (Jens P. Lindemann, Bielefeld University). The obtained trajectories were then correlated with the temperature data obtained during the experiment, in order to obtain exact information about the temperature that the fly was exposed to over time. To obtain a measure of the preferred and avoided temperature for different *Drosophila* strains, the probability density of position over the temperature gradient as well as the mean preferred temperature was calculated.

However, as *Drosophila* are ectothermic animals, a locomotion experiment in a temperature gradient can lead to a bias towards cold temperatures, as the animals metabolism and activity will slow down under certain temperatures, leading to an effect referred to as cold-trapping or cold-sleep. In order to correct for this, the locomotion null model...
IGLOO (Giraldo et al. 2019) was used. This model provides a simulated distribution without any temperature preference, only determined by the effect of the temperature on the animals locomotion behaviour. The simulated distribution can be subtracted from the experimentally obtained distribution for each fly strain. This would result in positive and negative values (see figure 13), which are referred to as preference index (PI). Temperatures at which the preference index was negative were counted as avoided, whereas temperatures with positive preference index would be defined as preferred. Should the 95% confidence interval of the median value overlap with 0, the temperature is regarded as neither avoided nor preferred.

2.6 Microscopy

2.6.1 Image Acquisition

Microscopic pictures of the arista, for the purpose of assessing anatomy and expression patterns, were obtained using a Leica TCS SP8 confocal laser scanning microscope (Leica microsystems, Wetzlar, Germany). Overview images of the head and antenna/arista were obtained using either a 10X (Leica HCX PL FLUOTAR 10X/0.30) or a 20X(Leica HC PL APO 20X/0.75 IMM) objective. Closeup images of the cells in the arista were obtained with a 63X(Leica HC PL APO 63X/1.20 W) immersion objective. Obtained images and 3D stacks were analyzed using FIJI.

2.6.2 Imaging of Gal4 driven expression patterns

In order to assess expression of genetically encoded fluorophores, such as GFP, whole Drosophila heads were imaged. Adult flies (age 2-6 days after eclosion) were collected, put under CO₂ anesthesia and decapitated. Heads were mounted facing upwards on glass depression slides using a small drop of glue, to prevent movement under the microscope. Heads were immersed in PBS with 1% TritonX and the slide was covered using a coverslip. Unless otherwise noted, heads were imaged directly after mounting, as the GFP fluorescence would decay within a few hours after the decapitation of the animal.

2.7 Statistical analysis

Unless otherwise noted, all plots and the corresponding statistical analysis were performed in Matlab or Python. Statistical significance was tested using Fishers exact permutation test, in order to evaluate the differences in median of the respective tested datasets. The obtained p-values were always corrected via Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for false detection rate (Benjamini and Hochberg 1995), implemented in Matlab by
D. Groppe and colleagues (Groppe, Urbach, and Kutas 2011).
Statistical significances in figures are denoted in regards to p-values as: * = p<0.05 ; ** = p<0.01 ; *** = p<0.001 ; NS: not significant.

When data is presented as boxplots, the red lines denote median values, box indicates upper and lower quartile range (50% of the data set). When no outliers are present, the whiskers indicate 100% of the dataset, if outliers are present, the whiskers indicate 1.5 interquartile distance. Black crosses denote outliers.
Chapter 3

Results

3.1 *nompC* is expressed in the hot cells of the arista

Research has well established that the arista of *Drosophila melanogaster* houses a population of 6 neurons, which have been found to be temperature sensitive, and, depending on their response behaviour towards temperature, are named hot-cells (HC) and cold-cells (CC) (Foelix, Stocker, and Steinbrecht 1989; Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). As described in 1.2, preceding studies in our lab found hints that the mechanosensory TRP channel NOMPC might be found in these arista neurons, as expressing GFP under *nompC-Gal4* control resulted in an observable fluorescent signal in the base of the arista. A preceding experiment, performed by A. Adden during the work for her Master thesis, indicated that *nompC* expression might be confined to the HC population of arista neurons. To confirm the localization of NOMPC in the arista, I studied the expression of membrane associated UAS-mcd8-GFP via different Gal4 lines. Driving expression of GFP via *nompC-Gal4* results in an observable signal from 3 cells (Figure 14 A), meaning that *nompC* is apparently not expressed in all neurons of the arista. In order to investigate whether NOMPC localized specifically in either the HC or CC subsets of neurons in the arista, I used specific driver lines for each of the cell groups: HC-Gal4 (Gallio et al. 2011) only shows expression in the HC population (Figure 14 B), whereas NP4486-Gal4 (brv1, from hereon referred to as CC-Gal4) expression in the arista is confined to the CC population (Figure 14 D) (Gallio et al. 2011). By using either HC- or CC-Gal4 together with the *nompC-Gal4* to drive the GFP expression, this overlap experiment can give clues to the cell group in which NOMPC localizes. A similar approach to cellular localization was performed in 2013 (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013) to identify the cell subset expressing the gustatory receptor GR28B(D). Initial experiments were performed by A. Adden during the work on her Master thesis. When driving GFP expression with both HC-Gal4 and *nompC-Gal4*, I could only observe up to 3 fluorescent cells (Figure 14 C). Sometimes cells were located so closely to each other,
that even with a confocal microscope, it was impossible to disentangle their anatomy, so that I only could count two cells with certainty. When employing both CC-Gal4 and nompC-Gal4 on the other hand, up to six cells would be labelled (Figure 14 E). I can therefore conclude, that the expression of nompC in the neurons of the arista is specific to the HC population of thermosensitive neurons.
Figure 14: Cellular expression pattern of nompC. Expression of membrane associated mcd8-GFP under UAS control in the neurons of the Drosophila arista. Maximum projections of confocal image stacks. A) nompC-Gal4 driving UAS-mcd8-GFP expression labels only 3 of the arista neurons. B) HC-Gal4 driver, labeling the 3 HCs of arista neurons C) Using both nompC-Gal4 and HC-Gal4 to drive GFP expression labels 3 cells, suggesting an overlapping expression pattern. D) CC-Gal4 driver, labeling the 3 CCs of arista neurons E) Using both nompC-Gal4 and CC-Gal4 to drive GFP expression. This combination of Gal4 drivers labels up to 6 neurons in the arista, suggesting no overlap in the expression pattern. This suggests that nompC expression is limited to the HCs of arista neurons. F) Schematic illustration of the overlapping expression experiment. Each of the employed Gal4 driver lines labels three cells in the arista. Only the combination of CC-Gal4 and nompC-Gal4 labelled all six arista neurons with the GFP under UAS control, suggesting an overlap of HC-Gal4 and nompC-Gal4 expression.
3.2 Hot and cold cells show relative calcium responses to temperature stimuli

When work on the study presented here began, the response properties of hot and cold cells were unknown, except of the fact that cold cells respond with deplorisations to temperature decreases and hot cells depolarise when stimulated with temperature increases (Gallio et al. 2011). Especially whether the sensors are operating in a relative or absolute response manner was unknown. It was therefore paramount to establish the response properties of the temperature sensitive cells before a more detailed analysis of nompC role could be undertaken. Luckily, a very recent publication confirmed the findings presented in the following chapter (Budelli et al. 2019).

Flies were exposed to a regime of different temperature steps during Ca$^{2+}$ imaging experiments, as described in 2.4.1. Panneuronal expression of the genetically encoded calcium indicator (GECI) GCaMP6m allowed for the assessment of Ca$^{2+}$ responses in both HC and CC populations simultaneously. This allowed us to monitor the quality of every trial based on the wildtype signals.

The first temperature stimuli presented consisted of alternating steps of temperature increases and decreases, with either increasing or decreasing amplitude (as described in Figure 10 A-D). Both HC and CC populations showed a distinctive response pattern to both temperature increments and decrements (Figure 15): HCs showed an increase in fluorescence (implying an excitatory response of the neurons) in response to temperature increments. Temperature decrements resulted in a decrease of overall fluorescence, dropping below the baseline value of $\Delta F/F_0 = 0$ (implying a hyperpolarization). In contrast CCs exhibit the exact opposite response behaviour, showing excitation towards temperature decrements and inhibition during temperature increments. This mechanism of both excitatory and inhibitory response patterns to temperature in either direction in both cell populations implies that, contrary to what the given names of the cell populations might suggest, both HCs and CCs respond to both increases and decreases in temperature.

Flies of both wildtype control strains, in either the CantonS or w$^{118}$ background showed robust temperature evoked Ca$^{2+}$ responses, in which the amplitude of the response is clearly correlated to the amplitude of the temperature change (Figure 15). No obvious difference in response amplitude can be observed between the two strains with different genetic background, implying that the Ca$^{2+}$ response amplitude provides a reliable measurement of the neuronal activity that can be compared between different strains.
Figure 15: Temperature evoked Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of wildtype flies  Calcium responses of CantonS and w\textsuperscript{1118} control flies to alternating heat and cold steps. Top: $\Delta F/F_0$ response of CantonS flies to the temperature stimuli shown in the bottom plot. HC responses in orange, CC responses in blue. Solid line denotes mean response of the respective cell type, shaded area represents SEM. Middle: $\Delta F/F_0$ response of w\textsuperscript{1118} flies Bottom: Temperature stimulus.

HCs show an increase in fluorescence in response to temperature increases and a reduction of fluorescence in response to temperature decreases. CCs show the opposite response behaviour.

n: CantonS HCs, CCs, w\textsuperscript{1118} HCs, CCs.
Interestingly, stimulation with the same absolute temperature did not generate the same amplitude of Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses in different stimulus protocols: As can be seen for example in figure 16, both the stimulus conditions in A) and B) use the same absolute temperature steps, but in a different order. The temperature increase to 26\degree C elicits a excitatory response of HCs in both conditions, however, the response amplitude in B) is visibly higher than in A). In the stimulus shown in B), the temperature changes from 18 to 26\degree C (a relative change of 8\degree C), whereas in A), the 26\degree C step is preceded by 22\degree C (a relative change of 4\degree C). Similarly, when comparing the first and second temperature increase step seen in Figure 16 A, the second temperature increase (towards 24\degree C) encompasses a relative change of 6\degree C, end elicits a higher response amplitude in HCs than the first increment, which only encompasses a 4\degree C change, even though it reaches a higher absolute temperature (of 26\degree C). This shows that the temperature evoked Ca\textsuperscript{2+} response amplitude is to a great extent determined by the relative, rather than absolute change in temperature. A complete overview of \(\Delta F/F_0\) response curves for all employed stimulus paradigms and fly strains can be found in the Appendix, sorted by stimulus protocols in figures A1 - A11.

This response behaviour can be further illustrated when comparing the Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses that are triggered by temperature steps that result in the same relative change in temperature albeit at different absolute temperatures (Figure 17).

In the employed temperature step stimulus paradigms shown in figure 10 A-D, a relative temperature increase of 4\degree C occurs in three different absolute temperature conditions (at 18 to 22\degree C, at 20 to 24\degree C and at 22 to 26\degree C). When comparing for example the responses of HCs of the \(w^{1118}\) control strain to these 3 different step conditions, no significant difference between the three stimulus conditions can be observed (as shown be the overlapping confidence intervals). Furthermore, no clear trend with increasing absolute temperature values can be observed, neither in the comparison of relative, peak to peak change of \(\Delta F/F_0\) values (Figure 17 A), nor in the absolute \(\Delta F/F_0\) responses (Figure 17 B). Conversely, when comparing temperature steps that end with the same absolute temperature, but encompass different relative changes, this response behaviour was further demonstrated (Figure 18). Comparing for example the 22.5\degree C temperature step, which occurs with 3 different temperature changes in the stimulus protocols, revealed a clear trend: Higher relative changes resulted in higher response amplitudes. A significant difference could be observed between the smallest (0.5\degree C) and the largest (1.5\degree C) relative temperature change (Figure 18 A). This further corooborates my hypothesis that the response amplitude of the arista neurons are determined by relative changes in temperature.

To analyse the effect of relative temperature changes on the \(\Delta F/F_0\) signal of the neurons, the mean responses were plotted against the relative temperature step amplitude (Figure 19). As shown above, HCs react to temperature increments with an increase in flu-
Figure 16: Comparison of Ca$^{2+}$ responses to different temperature stimulus protocols
The responses of both HCs and CCs in w$^{118}$ control flies to a different sequence of temperature stimuli is shown. HC responses shown in orange, CC responses in blue. Solid line denotes mean response, shaded area is SEM. A) Temperature stimuli are decreasing in amplitude with each step. The first step is a temperature increase to 26°C. HC response shows a higher amplitude to the second temperature increase (to 24°C) than to the first step (increase to 26°C). As the first temperature increase encompasses a relative temperature change of 4°C, while the second temperature increase a relative change of 6°C, the HC amplitude seems to be strongly affected by the relative change in temperature. n: 10 HCs, 13 CCs. B) Temperature stimuli are decreasing in amplitude with each step. The first step is a temperature decrease towards 18°C. HC response amplitude to the 26°C step is higher than to the same absolute temperature in A, as the 26°C step is preceded by a 18°C temperature step in this paradigm, but preceded by the 22°C baseline temperature in A). This further implies the relative temperature change as the determining factor of Ca$^{2+}$ response amplitude. n: 5 HCs, 10 CCs.

Fluorescence and to temperature decrements with a reduction in fluorescence, while CCs show an opposite response pattern. The response amplitude clearly rises with higher relative temperature step amplitudes for both HC and CC populations. CantonS and w$^{118}$ show a strong overlap in their respective mean response curves. CantonS flies reach the strongest increase in $\Delta F/F_0$ in HCs at a temperature step of +6°C (the second largest temperature increase in this experimental condition), with a $\Delta F/F_0$ mean response of 0.3, while the strongest excitatory CC response can be observed at the -8°C step with a mean response of 0.43 (Figure 19. Inhibitory responses reached their maximum for HCs at the -8°C step, with a mean $\Delta F/F_0$ response of -0.38, and for CCs at +6°C with a mean value of -0.42. The fact that the increase in response to stronger temperature changes appears to rise less strongly at higher temperatures might imply a saturation of the response, fitting nicely into the typically sigmoidal shaped response curve found in many receptor neurons (see for example Kandel et al. 2000; Moyes and Schulte 2008). A similar response pattern can be observed in w$^{118}$ flies, in which the largest temperature increase (+8°C) also elicits the strongest excitatory response in the HCs. Inhibitory responses peak at rel-
Figure 17: Comparison of HC Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses to temperature steps of same relative amplitude

Temperature steps in which the relative temperature change equals +4°C occur at 3 different absolute temperature changes in the stimulus protocols described in Figure 10: At the steps from 18 to 22°C, from 20 to 24°C and at the step from 22 to 26°C. The boxplots show the HC $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of $w^{118}$ flies to the three different temperature steps of +4°C. Red lines indicate median values, black boxes denote the upper and lower quartile (50% of the dataset) around the median. If no outliers are present, the whiskers denote 100% of the dataset, if outliers are present, whiskers denote the 1.5 interquartile distance. Outliers are marked as red crosses. Notches of the boxes denote the 95% confidence interval of the median. A) Change of $\Delta F/F_0$ value from the peak response of the previous step. B) The absolute value of $\Delta F/F_0$ peak during the respective temperature steps.

ative temperature changes of -6°C. The CC population shows its peak inhibitory response at +6°C and its peak excitatory response and -8°C. By fitting a sigmoid function to the data, the correlation between response amplitude and relative temperature step can be further illustrated. A sigmoid fit appears to match the data distribution of both control strains, although the shape of the fit appears somewhat more linear for the HC population of CantonS flies (Figure 20).

Additionally, if the arista neurons serve the role of relative temperature sensors, prolonged exposure to a temperature change would eventually result in an adaptation pro-
Figure 18: Comparison of HC Ca\(^{2+}\) responses to temperature steps of different relative amplitudes. Temperature changes to an absolute temperature of 22.5°C occur with 3 different relative temperature changes in the stimuli shown in 10 A-D: at 21-22.5°C (a change of 1.5°C), at 21.5 to 22.5°C (1°C relative change) and at 22 to 22.5°C (0.5°C relative change). Different response amplitudes between the different temperature steps illustrate that the deciding factor for Ca\(^{2+}\) response amplitude does not appear to be the absolute temperature value. A) Change of $\Delta F/F_0$ value from the peak response of the previous step. A clear trend towards higher responses with stronger, relative temperature changes is visible. Non-overlapping confidence intervals between the 21 to 22.5°C and the 22 to 22.5°C steps indicate a significant difference. B) The absolute value of $\Delta F/F_0$ peak during the respective temperature steps. Different response amplitudes between the different temperature steps illustrate that the deciding factor for Ca\(^{2+}\) response amplitude does not appear to be the absolute temperature value.

To gain a better understanding of adaptation processes and time-courses in the HCs and CCs, I assessed the HC and CC responses of $w^{1118}$ control flies, using the temperature...
Figure 19: Mean Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses to relative temperature steps  Mean $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of the arista neurons of the CantonS and w\textsuperscript{1118} control strains to relative temperature changes applied during the different temperature step protocols. CantonS shown in black, w\textsuperscript{1118} in green. HC responses shown with solid lines, CC responses with dashed lines. Error bars denote SEM. Both HC and CC populations show a stronger change in fluorescence, the stronger the relative temperature change, with HCs showing an increase in $\Delta F/F_0$ in response to temperature increments and a decrease in fluorescence to temperature decrements. CCs exhibit the opposite response behaviour. Both control strains show a similar response behaviour in both HC and CC populations.

stimuli described in Figure 10 E-F, in which a single temperature step of either 26°C or 18°C is applied for 5 minutes, before the temperature returns to the starting value of 22°C. w\textsuperscript{1118} were used, as they exhibited no substantial differences from CantonS controls in previous experiments and the line generated considerably more offspring.

Both HC and CC population exhibited apparently constant levels of activity/inhibition (depending on stimulus direction) for the entire 5 minutes(Figure 21), with the exception of a transient response in the preferred stimulus direction. When exposed to a temperature drop to 18°C (a relative change of -4°C), the CC population exhibited an initially rapid increase in $\Delta F/F_0$ signal (Figure 21 A), as was to be expected from previous experiments. I fitted an exponential function ($f(x) = a \cdot e^{-b \cdot x} + c$) to the relevant response part which rendered a $\tau$ ($\tau = \frac{1}{b}$) of 163 seconds for HC and 407 seconds for CC in preferred temperature direction. After reaching a peak amplitude about 30s before the timepoint in which the temperature curve reaches 18°C, fluorescence intensity began to drop again. However, after a time frame of approximately 50s, fluorescence decay began to stall. The Ca\textsuperscript{2+} signal even appears to reach a plateau like constant level, that lay above a $\Delta F/F_0$ value of 0.15, well above the starting value. Once temperature began to rise back to the baseline temperatur of 22°C again, the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal showed a fast drop to around -0.08, which
Figure 20: Sigmoid fits to relative temperature step responses of wildtype control flies

Fits to the $\Delta F/F_0$ response values of both CantonS and w^{1118} control strains. CantonS shown in black, w^{1118} in green. Dots mark single measurements of all tested HCs and CCs for the respective strains. Fits to HC responses shown as solid lines, fits to CC responses shown as dashed lines. Both HC and CC responses show a clear increase in response amplitude with increasing temperature step amplitude. As shown before, clear excitatory responses of HCs to temperature increments and inhibitory responses to temperature decrements. CCs react vice versa. Both fits appear to follow a sigmoid shape in the temperature ranges that were tested in this study.

adapted back to around baseline level over the course of 75s. This indicates a considerable tonic component of the calcium signal, while the "overshoot" of the response after returning to the 22°C base temperature illustrates the relative response coding, as the return to the previous temperature seems to be reacted to as a "cold step". As inferred from the previous experiments, the HC population showed a reduction in the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal, in response to the cold stimulus (Figure 21A). While the HC responses showed a signal change that was comparable in speed to the CCs at the onset of the cold stimulus, I could observe no obvious adaptation over time and the signal appeared to stay at a constant plateau level at about -0.3 to -0.35.

At the end of the temperature stimulus, a similar response behaviour to the CCs could be observed, in that the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal rose quickly and "overshot" the 0 level to a value just under 0.2, after which the signal adapted over a similar timecourse like the CCs to about baseline. When studying the responses of HC and CC to a prolonged temperature increment stimulus, I could observe a similar response behaviour as with the temperature decrement (Figure 21B): HCs react in an excitatory manner to the temperature increase and, after an initial peak, adapt to a constant level (of just under 0.1). The CC response showed no initial peak in a temperature increase, and instead exhibited a constant de-
increase, which however slowed down considerably over time. At the end of the stimulus step, in which the temperature returns to the starting value of 22°C, the CCs again show the "overshoot" that was also observed for both cell types in the previous stimulus condition, before adapting again to a value close to the starting value (Figure 21 B).

These findings suggest a substantial tonic part of the response of HCs and CCs to temperature steps. Intriguingly, in the experimental conditions tested here, I could only observe adaptation processes of the \( \Delta F/F_0 \) responses in the "preferred stimulus direction" of the arista neurons, namely temperature increases for HCs and decrease in temperature for CCs. This is especially confounding as the previous experiments strongly hinted at relative coding properties, making fast adaptation necessary. Adaptation analysis now suggests a strong tonic component.

Figure 21: Calcium response of arista neurons to prolonged temperature change. \( \Delta F/F_0 \) responses of the arista neurons of \( w^{Tri} \) control flies to 300s second temperature stimuli. After the temperature steps, the temperature was returned to starting temperature of 22°C. HC responses are shown in orange, CC responses in blue. Mean response is represented with a solid lane, shaded areas denote SEM. An exponential curve to the response during temperature stimulation is fitted to the \( \Delta F/F_0 \) signal of both cell types.

A) Response of HC and CC populations to a temperature step of 18°C for 300s. \( \tau \) of HC fit: 17414s, \( \tau \) of CC fit: 407 s. n: HC=13 ; CC=15

B) Response of HC and CC populations to a temperature step of 26°C for 300s. \( \tau \) of HC fit: 163s, \( \tau \) of CC fit: 884s. n: HC=12 ; CC=15
3.3 Effect of NOMPC on calcium responses in arista neurons

Based on my physiological characterization of the thermosensitive arista neurons, I could now compare their responses to those of nompC mutant flies unravel the function of a mechano-transducer in a thermosensitive cell.

I assessed the effect of different nompC mutations and nompC overexpression on the temperature evoked Ca\\textsuperscript{2+} responses. I used flies carrying the nompC\\textsuperscript{3} null mutation (in which a point mutation leads to a premature stop codon), both heterozygously and homozygously, as well as the weaker nompC\\textsuperscript{1009R} mutation, which shows a reduction in NOMPC protein amount, (Lee, Moon, et al. 2010). To increase the amount of NOMPC, I utilized flies expressing an additional functional copy of the nompC gene under UAS control in the wildtype background. I used the same constructs in the homozygous nompC\\textsuperscript{3} background to serve as a functional rescue. All fly lines were exposed to the 4 different temperature stimulus paradigms described in Figure 10 A-D. To control for possible effects of the nompC-Gal4 or UAS-nompC constructs, I also assessed the temperature evoked Ca\\textsuperscript{2+} responses of flies carrying only the Gal4 or only the UAS constructs, both in the wildtype and nompC\\textsuperscript{3} background. As these lines only served as additional controls, they were exposed to one of the temperature step stimuli, with an increasing amplitude of temperature stimulation (Stimulus shown in Figure 10 D). Neither the nompC-Gal4 nor the UAS-nompC constructs affected the $\Delta F/F_0$ response amplitude in both the wildtype and the nompC\\textsuperscript{3} background (for the Ca\\textsuperscript{2+} response curves, see Appendix Figures A12, page 105).

3.3.1 Mutations of nompC lead to a reduction in HC response amplitude

Flies carrying a homozygous nompC\\textsuperscript{3} mutation exhibited a distinctly lower response amplitude in the HC population, with the mean response amplitude of HCs staying below a $\Delta F/F_0$ value of 0.1 (Figure 22 B). While the amplitude of the CC population also appeared to be affected, this change in response amplitude was not as strong as in the HCs, with mean excitatory responses reaching a $\Delta F/F_0$ of 0.2 (Figure 23 B). The stimulus direction selectivity is preserved in both cell populations. The stark reduction in response amplitude also appears to affect both excitatory and inhibitory parts of the HC responses, as the drop in $\Delta F/F_0$ signal elicited by temperature decrements also appears to be not as pronounced as in the wildtype controls (Figure 22 B). When fitting a sigmoid function to the dataset, it is much more shallow and linear than in wildtype controls (Figure 24 B and Figure 25 B). Comparing the gain of the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal per °C of temperature change, in the case of the strongest temperature steps per stimulus, revealed a significant difference between CantonS controls and the nompC\\textsuperscript{3} mutants (Figure 26). The effect was visible in
both the HC (Figure 26 A) and CC population (Figure 26 B), although the effect was not as strong in the CC signal, similarly to how it appeared in the mean response curves and sigmoid fits.
Figure 22: Mean Ca\(^{2+}\) responses of hot cells in nompC\(^3\) mutant, rescue and overexpression flies

The mean values of the HC peak responses to each relative temperature step are shown. HCs exhibited excitatory responses to temperature increments and inhibitory responses to temperature decrements in all tested strains. The curve of the CantonS control strain is shown in each sub-plot in grey. Homozygous nompC\(^3\) (carrying a null mutation for the nompC gene) mutants show a flatter curve with overall lower response amplitudes to higher temperature changes. Heterozygous nompC\(^3\) mutants, which still carry one functional copy of nompC, exhibit an intermediate phenotype compared to homozygous mutants and wildtype controls. Mutants carrying the nompC\(^{G0914}\) allele show a somewhat more linear mean response curve, with lower response amplitudes than wildtypes in the range of +3 to +6°C relative temperature change. A) Mean response amplitude of CantonS flies to relative temperature changes. B) Mean responses of homozygous nompC\(^3\) mutants, carrying a null mutation for nompC, which should therefore lack any functional protein of the channel. C) Mean responses of nompC\(^{G0914}\) mutant flies, which leads to a reduced amount of NOMPC protein. D) Mean responses of heterozygous nompC\(^3\) mutants, which still retain one functional copy of the nompC gene. E) Mean responses of nompC-overexpression flies, carrying an additional nompC copy under UAS control. F) Mean responses of nompC-rescue flies, in which a nompC-gene under UAS control is used to rescue the nompC\(^3\) mutation.
Figure 23: Mean Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of cold cells in nompC\textsuperscript{3} mutant, rescue and overexpression flies The mean values of the CC peak responses to each relative temperature step are shown. CCs exhibited excitatory responses to temperature decrements and inhibitory responses to temperature increments in all tested strains. The curve of the CantonS control strain is shown in each sub-plot in grey. nompC\textsuperscript{3} mutants, carrying a null mutation of the nompC gene, again showed a reduction in response amplitude, although the effect did appear to be not as severe as in the HC population shown before. A) Mean response amplitude of CantonS flies to relative temperature changes. B) Mean responses of homozygous nompC\textsuperscript{3} mutants, carrying a null mutation for nompC, which should therefore lack any functional protein of the channel. C) Mean responses of nompC\textsuperscript{0079M} mutant flies, which leads to a reduced amount of NOMPC protein. D) Mean responses of heterozygous nompC\textsuperscript{3} mutants, which still retain one functional copy of the nompC gene. E) Mean responses of nompC-overexpression flies, carrying an additional nompC copy under UAS control. F) Mean responses of nompC-rescue flies, in which a nompC-gene under UAS control is used to rescue the nompC\textsuperscript{3} mutation.
Figure 24: Sigmoid fits to relative temperature step hot cell responses Fits to the $\Delta F/F_0$ response values of hot cells to relative temperature changes. Dots indicate the $\Delta F/F_0$ response peaks of all tested cells of the respective flies. The fit to $\text{nompC}^3$ data again shows a more shallow gain than the wildtype controls, although the effect appears to be not as severe as in HCs. A) Fit to responses of CantonS flies to relative temperature changes. B) Homozygous $\text{nompC}^3$ mutants. C) $\text{nompC}^{100914}$ mutant flies. D) Heterozygous $\text{nompC}^2$ mutants. E) $\text{nompC}$-overexpression flies, carrying an additional $\text{nompC}$ copy under UAS control. F) $\text{nompC}$-rescue flies, in which a $\text{nompC}$-gene under UAS control is used to rescue the $\text{nompC}^3$ mutation.
Figure 25: Sigmoid fits to relative temperature step cold cell responses Fits to the $\Delta F/F_0$ response values of cold cells to relative temperature changes. Dots indicate the $\Delta F/F_0$ response peaks of all tested cells of the respective flies. The fit to nompC$^3$ data clearly shows a much more shallow gain, illustrating a reduced response amplitude to higher temperature step amplitudes. Additionally, the shape of the fit is almost entirely linear, losing the sigmoid characteristic seen in wildtype flies. Heterozygous nompC$^3$ mutants again exhibit an intermediate phenotype. A) Fit to responses of CantonS flies to relative temperature changes. B) Homozygous nompC$^3$ mutants. C) nompC$^{100914}$ mutant flies. D) Heterozygous nompC$^3$ mutants. E) nompC-overexpression flies, carrying an additional nompC copy under UAS control. F) nompC-rescue flies, in which a nompC-gene under UAS control is used to rescue the nompC$^3$ mutation.
Figure 26: Comparison of $\Delta F/F_0$ gain per °C  Shown is the gain of the $\Delta F/F_0$ per °C change, for the biggest step of the preferred stimulus direction (meaning a temperature increase for HCs and a decrease for CCs). Red lines denote median values. Boxplots presented as described in 2.7 (Page 31). Significances as: * = $p<0.05$; ** = $p<0.01$; *** = $p<0.001$; NS: not significant. **A** $\Delta F/F_0$ gain per °C of HCs for the largest, relative temperature increase step (depending on stimulus protocol this means either +6 or +8°C). nompC$^3$ mutants (both homo- and heterozygously) differ significantly from wildtype controls. Rescue of the mutation via Gal4-UAS restores value to wildtype levels. Neither the nompC$^{f00914}$ mutation, nor overexpression of nompC altered the HC gain per °C significantly from CantonS controls. **B** $\Delta F/F_0$ gain per °C of CCs for the largest, relative temperature decrease step (depending on stimulus protocol this means either -6 or -8°C). Although the effect is not as strong as in the HC population, CC gain per °C of nompC$^3$ mutants still differs significantly from CantonS controls. Rescue of the mutation does not only restore CC gain to wildtype levels, but actually appears to increase the response, as the gain per °C is significantly higher than in wildtype controls. nompC$^{f00914}$ mutation or overexpression of nompC did again not show a significant difference.

When assessing the response of Drosophila carrying a heterozygous nompC$^3$ mutation, an intermediate effect on the HC response amplitude could be observed: The HC response amplitude was lowered, when compared to control flies, however the effect was not as strong as in the homozygous mutant flies, as mean HC response reached a maximum $\Delta F/F_0$ value of above 1.5 and the CC reached a maximum excitatory response of around 2.5 (Figure 22 D and Figure 23 D). Similarly, plotting a fit to the dataset reveals a gain and curve shape between the wildtype controls and the nompC$^3$ mutants (Figure 24 D and Figure 25 D). The comparison of $\Delta F/F_0$ gain per °C pointed towards the same result, with a significant difference between nompC$^3$/+ flies and CantonS controls, although not as significant as in the case of homozygous nompC$^3$ mutants (Figure 26 A). Furthermore, the HC gain per °C of nompC$^3$/+ was also significantly different from the homozygous nompC$^3$ mutants. This could be a first implication that the number of functional nompC gene copies has a direct effect on the temperature evoked responses of the arista HCs.

Furthermore, I assessed the temperature responses of nompC$^{f00914}$ mutant flies. Drosophila of this line exhibited an reduction in HC response amplitude, though not as pronounced as in homozygous or heterozygous nompC$^3$ mutants. Mean response amplitude of the HCs appears to show a slightly more linear curve, with lower response amplitudes in the range of +3 to +6°C relative temperature steps (Figure 22 C and Figure 23 C). Similarly, fits to the responses showed a sigmoid shape, comparable to what could be observed in controls (Figure 24 C and Figure 25 C). Evaluating the $\Delta F/F_0$ gain per °C furthermore revealed no significant differences between the mutant strain and wildtype
controls, in neither HC nor CC population (Figure 26).
Taken together, these results imply that NOMPC modulates the temperature evoked activity of the HCs in the *Drosophila* arista, and that NOMPC is necessary for the proper response amplitude of cells. Further the number of functional *nompC* gene copies seems to influence this modulation, hinting at a possible dosage dependency of NOMPC.

3.3.2 *NompC* rescue restores HC response amplitude

So far, I could show that mutations of *nompC* have a distinct effect on the HCs Ca\(^{2+}\) response to temperature changes. To investigate whether a functional rescue of *nompC*\(^3\) null mutation could restore the function of the HCs. To this end, I used flies with a homozygous *nompC*\(^3\) mutation that expressed one copy of *nompC* under UAS control. I also controlled for effects of the UAS or Gal4 lines alone by measuring the response of flies with either construct in the homozygous *nompC*\(^3\) background.
The Gal4-UAS controlled expression of *nompC* was successful in restoring the response amplitude of the aristas HCs (Figure 22 F) and CCs (23 F). Mean responses to relative temperature changes of arista HCs reached similar levels as the wildtype controls, and the response amplitude was clearly higher than in homozygous or heterozygous *nompC*\(^3\) mutants. In the same vein, functions fitted to the dataset of *nompC*-rescue showed a similar curve as the wildtype controls, including a sigmoid shape (Figure 24 F and Figure 25 F). The effect of the rescue could be further confirmed when investigating the \(\Delta F/F_0\) gain per °C, which revealed no statistically significant difference between wildtype controls and the rescue line, while being significant in comparison to both homo- and heterozygous *nompC*\(^3\) mutants (Figure 26 A). While the effect of NOMPC on the CC signal appears to be rescued by the Gal4-UAS rescue as well, the gain per °C actually rises above the value of *CantonS* control flies, exhibiting a significant difference (Figure 26 B). UAS-*nompC* and *nompC*-Gal4 control flies in the homozygous *nompC*\(^3\) background responded similarly to the respective mutant background line and did not show a restoration of HC response amplitude. (No step data shown, as UAS and Gal4 controls were not exposed to all stimulus protocols; for Ca\(^{2+}\) traces, see Appendix, Figure A12).

3.3.3 Overexpression of *nompC* does not significantly alter HC responses

The results described in 3.3.1 so far support the theory that the number of functional *nompC* gene copies might have a direct effect on the temperature evoked HC response. To further investigate this possible correlation, I assessed the temperature evoked Ca\(^{2+}\) re-
responses of flies expressing an additional nompC copy under UAS control. Expression was driven using the same nompC-Gal4 construct that was employed for the nompC rescue in 3.3.2. If the role of NOMPC in the HCs of the arista is one of a simple amplification of temperature triggered Ca\(^{2+}\), one might expect an increase in HC amplitude when introducing one more functional nompC copy into the HCs. Overexpression of nompC, however did not lead to an increase in HC response amplitude. While the mean response amplitude to relative temperature steps did not differ greatly from wildtype controls, there was a small trend towards lower responses in the HC population. (Figure 22 E and Figure 23 E). Similarly, fits to the ∆F/∆F\(_0\) responses to relative temperature changes overlapped to a great extent with wildtype controls for both HCs and CCs (Figure 24 E and Figure 25 E). Analyzing the ∆F/∆F\(_0\) gain per °C of the maximum responses furthermore reveals no significant effect of the overexpression in this measure (Figure 26). This observation could be due to a number of factors, such as posttranslational regulation which might affect protein levels of the channel. The response amplitude of UAS and Gal4 lines alone did not differ greatly from the wildtype level (No step data shown, as UAS and Gal4 controls were not exposed to all stimulus protocols; for Ca\(^{2+}\) traces, see Appendix, Figure A12).

These results indicate, that while a reduction of functional NOMPC leads to an impairment of HC function, which increases with the severity of the nompC knock-out/knockdown, this effect is not simply scalable into the opposite direction, as an increase in nompC copies did not alter HC responses significantly.

Taken together, the results from the physiological experiments suggest that the transduction mechanism of the arista HCs is a finely tuned system, in which NOMPC plays an important role in the regulation of temperature evoked Ca\(^{2+}\) influx, and alterations to this system in, which the amount of functional nompC genes is reduced, impairs the overall sensitivity of the HC population to temperature changes. For an overview visualization of the described effects of nompC on the arista neuron responses, the gain of a linear fit to the ∆F/∆F\(_0\) responses of all tested Drosophila strains to relative temperature changes is shown in Figure 27.
Figure 27: Gain of linear fits to hot and cold cell responses

Fits to the $\Delta F/F_0$ response values of the tested fly strains in temperature step experiments. Mutants of $nompC$ exhibit considerable reduction in $\Delta F/F_0$ per degree C in HCs, which appears to become stronger with the severity of the mutation. While CC response appears to be affected as well, the effect did not appear to be as strong as in the HC population, and the CC response amplitude of $nompC^{90914}$ mutants was not reduced compared to wildtype flies. Overexpression of $nompC$ did not appear to strongly alter HC or CC responses.

3.4 Arista neurons do not show calcium responses to mechanical deflection

So far, the neurons of the arista have been mainly studied in the context temperature sensation. Since NOMPC has been shown to be a mechanosensitive ion channel (Cheng et al. 2010; Effertz, Wiek, and Göpfert 2011; Göpfert, Albert, et al. 2006; Walker, Williams, and Zuker 2000; Yan et al. 2013; Zhang, Yan, et al. 2013), a question that presents itself is whether the $nompC$ expressing HCs of the arista show activity in response to mechanical deflection. Therefore, I deflected the arista using a piezo actuator and recorded the change in fluorescence from the calcium indicator GCaMP6m. The antenna of the flies were fixated, to that mechanical deflection of the arista would only bend it and not rotate the funiculus or move other part of the antennae. After mechanical stimulation, a hot and cold temperature step was used to identify HC and CC populations (see 2.4.2 for
Figure 28: Calcium responses to mechanical stimulation of the arista $\Delta F/F_0$ signal of arista neurons in $w^{1118}$ control flies during mechanical stimulation. Solid lines denote mean responses, shaded areas the SEM. HC responses shown in orange, CC responses in blue. Period of mechanical deflection of the arista is marked in green. After a initial waiting period of 75s, the arista was deflected for 60s using a bend glass capillary attached to a piezo actuator. After mechanical stimulation, a 60s pause was held before a 60s cold step (20°C) and a 60s hot (24°C) temperature step were applied to identify HC and CC populations. No distinct change in fluorescence could be observed during the mechanical stimulation/bending of the arista in either group of neurons. Temperature evoked responses were still functional. This implies no mechanosensitivity of the arista neurons. I could not observe responses triggered by the mechanical stimulation (Figure 28). A constant deflection for 60s did not lead to any observable change in $\Delta F/F_0$. Response of both HC and CC populations towards temperature increase and decrease was still functional. These experiments therefore imply that the arista neurons are not mechanosensitive, and even the expression of nompC, which has been shown to be mechanotransducer channel, does not render the HCs mechanosensitive.
3.5 NOMPC affects temperature preference and tolerance behaviour

After establishing that NOMPC modulates temperature evoked activity of the HCs in the arista, a question to consider is whether this influence extends to the behaviour. When observing the physiological data from the experiments described above, it can be hypothesized that NOMPC affects the behaviour towards hot temperatures. Actual behaviour, however, is of course the ultimate output of an animal system and influenced by a combination of all sensory inputs and internal states. It is therefore not obvious, if the effect of nompC mutations on HCs (altering, but not abolishing the responses) also has an influence on the behavioural level. Even more so, as Drosophila possesses additional temperature sensitive neurons (see 1.3.1). Thus, the effect of nompC mutations and overexpression on the temperature preference and avoidance behaviour of adult Drosophila was assessed by tracing and evaluating the movement of adult flies within a temperature gradient, as described in 2.5.

I compared the temperature preference and avoidance behaviour of nompC^{f00914} mutants, heterozygous nompC^{3} mutants and nompC overexpressing flies to wildtype controls in the CantonS and w^{1118} background. HC-Gal4, UAS-hid,rpr served as control group for flies with abolished heat sensation in the arista, as the HC population in these flies is ablated using apoptotic factors Hid and Reaper (Grether et al. 1995; White et al. 1994) under UAS control, and driven specifically in the HCs via the Gr28b.d-Gal4 construct (herein referred to as HC-Gal4) (data for the HC-Gal4, UAS-hid,rpr flies was kindly provided by Dr. D. Giraldo). It was not possible to employ homozygous nompC^{3} mutants, or flies with a similarly strong knockdown of nompC, as the severe impairment of mechanosensation and locomotion means these Drosophila do not show any coordinated locomotion behaviour, thus preventing the use in any form of locomotion based experiment. Flies with the UAS controlled rescue of nompC, which have been used in the physiological experiments (See 3.3), were employed in these behavioural experiments, as they again show proper locomotion behaviour, and I could therefore assess their temperature driven behaviour, compared to wildtype controls and heterozygous nompC^{3} mutants. The distributions of all fly strains were corrected for cold-trapping, using IGLOO (Giraldo et al. 2019), as described in 2.5.2.

Flies of the CantonS strain showed a peak distribution in the range between 23 - 24°C (Figure 29A) and a median preferred temperature of 21.5°C (Figure 30 D). Temperatures below 15.5°C and above 26.5°C were actively avoided (Figure 30A-B). w^{1118} flies showed a similar preference behaviour, with a median preferred temperature of 21.5°C (Figure 30 A), while avoiding temperatures below 15.5°C and above 26°C (Figure 30 A-B). The density distribution along the temperature gradient shows a peak between 18 - 20°C (Figure
Figure 29: Temperature distributions of Drosophila

Histograms show the grouped distribution of the different fly lines along the temperature gradient in behavioural experiments, after correction of cold bias via IGLOO. Error bars denote 95% confidence intervals. Preferred temperatures are shown in red, avoided (antiprefered) temperatures in blue, and grey denotes temperatures which are neither preferred nor avoided. Mean preferred temperature is marked with a red star. A), C) Distributions of control strains show similar mean preference for flies in CantonS and w^{1118}. B) Flies with ablated hot-cells exhibit a visible shift of mean temperature preference to hotter temperatures and a wider range of preferred temperatures at the hot side. D), E) nompC^{f00914} and heterozygous nompC^{3} animals exhibit a hot-shift in mean temperature preference and a range of preferred temperatures that continues farther into the hot range, when compared to wildtype controls. G) nompC-rescue flies still exhibit an effect when compared to wildtype flies, but not as severe as in the mutants. nompC overexpression leads to lower preferred temperature and a wider range of temperatures that are neither preferred nor avoided.

Behavioural data in the temperature gradient for *Drosophila* with ablated HCs (HC-Gal4, UAS-hid,rpr) revealed a distinct phenotype, when compared to the wildtype controls. Median preferred temperature was found to be at 23.5°C, about 2°C higher than the CantonS and w<sup>1118</sup> lines, although not a significant increase (Figure 30 D). Avoidance of cold temperatures was found in range very similar to the wildtype controls, starting approximately below 15.5°C (Figure 30 A). Hot temperature avoidance on the other hand was found to only begin at a median temperature above 28°C, a significant increase when compared to CantonS (Figure 30 B). As would be expected, loss of the HC population of arista neurons appears to result in a strong reduction in the avoidance of hotter temperatures, while cold avoidance and median temperature preference are not strongly affected.

Assessing the behaviour of heterozygous *nompC<sup>3</sup>* mutant flies in the temperature gradient experiment revealed effects on temperature preference and avoidance: Distribution density was shifted much more towards the hotter end of the temperature gradient, with the peak of distribution being around 26-27°C (Figure 29 D). Consistent with the effect observed in the Ca<sup>2+</sup> imaging experiment described in 3.3, the mutant flies showed a significant increase in both the start of hot avoidance (towards 27°C) and median preferred temperature (shifting towards 25°C) when compared to wildtype controls (Figure 30 B, D) or the aforementioned hid-rpr construct. The onset of cold avoidance behaviour meanwhile was not significantly affected. (Figure 30 A).

Flies of the *nompC* rescue strain, carrying a homozygous *nompC<sup>3</sup>* mutation and a functional copy of the gene under UAS control, could restore the temperature driven behaviour of *Drosophila* to wildtype levels: While a slight shift in the distribution along the temperature gradient was still observable (Figure 29 F) neither cold avoidance (at 15.5°C,) nor hot avoidance (at around 26.5°C) or even median preferred temperature (22°C) were distinctly different from wildtype lines (Figure 30 A, B, D). Start of hot avoidance and preferred temperature, were furthermore significantly lower than in the heterozygous *nompC<sup>3</sup>* line. Even though the *nompC* rescue line did not restore the hot cell response amplitude to wildtype completely in the Ca<sup>2+</sup> imaging experiments, the effect appears to be sufficient to rescue temperature driven behaviour.

*NompC<sup>600914</sup>* mutant flies on the other hand still exhibited a shift in the distribution density towards hotter temperatures and a shift in the mean temperature preference of the distribution, but no clear peak in the distribution could be observed, with the highest preference indices lying at 29 and 23°C (Figure 29 E). Furthermore, comparing the start of cold and hot avoidance, or the median preferred temperature to the wildtype control lines, reveals no significant difference (Figure 30 A, B, D), in contrast to the effect of the heterozygous *nompC<sup>3</sup>* mutation described above.

Lastly the effect of the expression of an additional *nompC* copy under UAS control in a
wildtype background on the temperature behaviour was analyzed. NompC overexpression lead to overall flatter distribution along the gradient, with preference index peaking at around 22 and 17°C (Figure 29 G). Of the strains tested in this study, only the nompC overexpression lead to and significantly lower onset in the start of cold avoidance, at a median of around 14.75°C, and an earlier start of hot avoidance, at approximately 24.5°C (Figure 30 A-B). Median preferred temperature was also found to be significantly lower than in all other tested strains, at 18°C (Figure 30 D).

We define a tolerated temperature as those temperatures that are not avoided. The range of these tolerated temperatures (as in how many different temperatures are tolerated) is also significantly higher in heterozygous nompC3 than in wildtype control lines and the nompC rescue line, but not higher than in the HC-Gal4, UAS-hid,rpr flies (Figure 30 C). This line with ablated HCs shows a significantly larger range of tolerated temperatures than CantonS flies. Range in tolerated temperatures was also significantly increased in the nompC overexpression when compared to CantonS, while nompC100914 and nompC rescue lines showed no significant differences compared to wildtype flies (Figure 30 C).

To summarize, NOMPC appears to affect temperature driven locomotion behaviour of adult Drosophila: Heterozygous nompC3 mutant flies exhibited a significant shift in the onset of heat avoidance towards hotter temperatures, as well as a significantly higher preferred temperature compared to wildtype control flies. Mutations of nompC did not have a significant effect on cold avoidance, although flies overexpressing nompC showed a somewhat reduced cold avoidance. Rescue of nompC3 did restore the behaviour back to wildtype levels.
Figure 30: Comparison of temperature avoidance and preferences. Red lines indicate median values, boxplots generated as described in 2.7 (page 31). Significances as: * = p<0.05 ; ** = p<0.01 ; *** = p<0.001 ; NS: not significant. Not shown comparisons are not significantly different. **A** Start of cold avoidance. Flies carrying the nompC overexpression are the only line exhibiting a significant difference, with cold avoidance starting at significantly lower temperatures than in controls. **B** Start of hot avoidance. Drosophila with ablated HC population (HC-Gal4, UAS-hid,rpr) exhibit a later start of hot avoidance when compared to CantonS controls. An even stronger shift towards later hot avoidance can be observed in heterozygous nompC\(^2\) mutant flies, with the effect being rescued in the nompC rescue line, which exhibits no significant difference compared to wildtype controls. Overexpression of nompC appears to lead to an earlier start of hot avoidance on the other hand. **C** Amplitude of tolerated temperatures. Heterozygous nompC\(^2\) mutations, nompC overexpression and ablation of HCs leads to a wider range of preferred temperatures. **D** Preferred temperatures. Heterozygous nompC\(^2\) mutant flies show a significantly higher preferred temperature than all other tested fly lines. Overexpression of nompC on the other hand leads to a significantly lower preferred temperature.
Chapter 4

Discussion

Accurate sensing of ambient temperatures is an essential ability for all behaving animals and the study of temperature sensation has become a considerable body of research in the field of sensory neuroscience. On Earth alone extreme temperature ranges are found, with highest temperatures at underwater hydrothermic vents at over 400°C and lowest temperatures about -100°C in antarctic ridges and even those extremes are habitats to extremophiles. With respect to the wide range of uninhabitable temperatures on our planet, it becomes clear that thermoregulation is necessary for survival. Even though that the tolerable range for Drosophila spans more than twenty degrees it is a question of survival and fitness for the tiny insect to avoid harmful temperatures.

Many recent studies have taken advantage of the available genetic, physiological and behavioural tools available for the fruit fly, Drosophila melanogaster, to uncover and understand the molecular and cellular mechanisms behind thermosensation (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Budelli et al. 2019; Fowler and Montell 2013; Gallio et al. 2011; Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013; Tracey Jr et al. 2003). However, many aspects of the transduction and regulation processes of thermosensation in Drosophila remain unknown. Here, I have presented evidence that a set of temperature sensing neurons in the arista of Drosophila functions as relative sensors for temperature changes, rather possessing an activation threshold of an absolute temperature. Furthermore, I collected data which suggests that the mechanotransducer channel NOMPC (a member of TRP family of ion channels) is involved in signal transduction in these arista neurons, specifically in the heat sensing sub-set of cells and is not only required for proper responses of the neurons, but also for temperature preference and avoidance behaviour.
4.1 The response properties of thermosensitive arista neurons

4.1.1 Arista neurons are relative temperature sensors

A total of six temperature sensitive neurons have been identified in the arista of *Drosophila*, three of which show excitatory responses to temperature increments, and are therefore referred to as hot cells (HC) and three which exhibit excitatory responses to temperature decrements, called cold cells (CC) (Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Foelix, Stocker, and Steinbrecht 1989; Gallio et al. 2011; Sayeed and Benzer 1996). In this study, I present evidence that the temperature evoked Ca$^{2+}$ responses of both HCs and CCs differ in amplitude, depending on the temperature stimulus. Response amplitude in this context appears to be mainly determined by the relative, rather than absolute change in temperature: Temperature stimuli of the same relative change, but at different absolute temperature levels did not elicit significantly different responses, while temperature stimuli that reached the same absolute value but with a different relative change did result in different response amplitudes (See 3.2, starting at page 36).

Earlier research on the thermosensitive neurons in the arista, performed by Ni et al. (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013) suggested that the HC and CC structures might be less involved in the determination of a preferred temperature for the animal and more of a sensor set for the detection of short term temperature change in the environment. This appears to be supported by the morphological situation of the temperature sensors: An external thermosensor should be located most distal to the body and by an appendage of small diameter to avoid being biased by the core temperature of the organism. The response properties that were observed in this study fall into line with these suggestions, as quick and precise assessment of temperature changes in the environment provide a relevant feedback for the animal when exploring its environment. Other thermosensitive structures in the fly have been implied in the determination of preferred temperatures, such as dTRPA1 positive neurons that are responsible for the response to more sustained temperatures that reach the inner body of the animal (see for example Hamada et al. 2008; Tang et al. 2013). When these sensors provide information about whether the fly is experiencing temperatures around its preferred range or not, it would make sense to rely on an external relative sensor during locomotion to gauge whether the animal is leaving a certain temperature range and how stark the contrast is, without a need for immediate information about the absolute temperatures. This would allow, for example for more rapid avoidance behaviour towards unfavorable temperature changes, which is especially important for a small poikilothermic animal (Heinrich 2013; Sayeed and Benzer 1996).

The idea that the arista neurons are relative temperature sensors also coincides with
very recent studies by Budelli et al., which analyzed the spiking rate of arista neurons and stated that the HCs and CCs would act more akin to "heating" and "cooling" cells (Budelli et al. 2019). However, one has to keep in mind that the exact way by which information from different temperature sensitive structures (and even other sensory modalities for that matter) is integrated in higher order brain regions is still subject to ongoing research. In this context, it has been found that the information of the arista neurons, in addition to reaching the PAL region via the projections, might be relayed to central brain areas involved in learning and determination of temperature preference, such as the mushroom body (Frank, Jouandet, et al. 2015; Liu, Mazor, and Wilson 2015, early anatomical evidence found in Stocker et al. 1990, for a review see Florence and Reiser 2015). It is therefore not likely that the arista neurons can be excluded from a complex mechanism like determining and finding a preferred temperature of the organism, even if there primary role appears to be that of external temperature change sensors.

4.1.2 Arista neurons show phasic-tonic responses to prolonged temperature changes

To study potential adaptation processes in the temperature evoked responses of HCs and CCs, I employed experiments in which the animal was exposed to a constant temperature step (either cold or hot) for a total of 5 minutes, before returning to the starting temperature. Interestingly, while an initial phasic peak in the $\Delta F/F_0$ signal could be observed in the excitatory responses of both HC and CC populations, the signal did not adapt back to the starting niveau. This is reflected in the large $\tau$ values of exponential decay functions at 163 and 407 seconds for HC and CC respectively, suggesting a considerable tonic component in the excitatory temperature responses. This effect was even more pronounced when observing the inhibitory responses to the "non-preferred" stimulus direction of both cells (meaning cooling for HCs and heating for CCs): The inhibitory Ca$^{2+}$ responses did not exhibit any observable initial phasic response peak (Figure 21, page 44).

These findings could imply that both cell types, in addition to their proposed role as relative temperature change sensors, might actually also obtain to a certain degree information about absolute temperature values. These findings are complemented by very recent data from Budelli et al., who employed electrophysiological recordings of the arista neurons and found that HCs exhibited both phasic increases in spiking rate after temperature increases, as well as a tonic component, in which the general spiking was to a considerable amount influenced by the external temperature level when held at a steady level for extended periods of time (Budelli et al. 2019). Intriguingly, Budelli et al. did report that no tonic responses could observed in the CC population of arista neurons, findings only fast adapting, phasic changes in spiking rate to temperature changes. While these findings do not overlap with the observed Ca$^{2+}$ responses of CCs in this study, I
cannot exclude a possible role of the temperature stimulus in these observations, as the stimuli employed in this study consisted of continuous changes which usually took up to a minute to reach the target temperature, while Budelli et al. employed much sharper stimuli, with temperature changes of 5°C in less than 10s. Additionally, one has to keep in mind that electrophysiological recordings and Ca²⁺ imaging are different measures of neuronal activity and findings from one method might not be directly transferable into the other measure. The intrinsic properties of Ca²⁺ imaging must also be considered when observing time based processes, such as adaptation, as ion diffusion/transport across the membrane and binding towards reporter proteins, like the here used GCaMP6m, have intrinsic time constants that must be kept in mind (Chen et al. 2013). This might be a deciding factor why for example the majority of adaptation after peak response observed by Budelli et al. happens within 30s, while the process was taking up to a minute in the here performed Ca²⁺ imaging experiments.

After the temperature stimulus in the adaptation experiment ended and temperature was returned to the starting value of 22°C, both HCs and CCs ∆F/F did not simply return to base level, but showed an "overshoot" (Figure 21, page 44). This again illustrates the function of the arista neurons as relative sensors, as the return to the starting temperature would not just be considered as the end of an absolute temperature step, but would be perceived as a relative change in temperature, opposite in direction to the temperature change experienced at the beginning of the stimulus.

To summarize, the findings of the first part of this thesis shed more light on the temperature responses by thermoreceptors of the arista. Complementary to the cold cell analysis of Budelli et al., I could characterise the responses of the so far elusive hot cells. In Budelli et al. HC responses could only be analysed after ablating CCs (Budelli et al. 2019). The thermosensitive neurons in the arista of Drosophila respond to relative temperature change, with Ca²⁺ response amplitude increasing with stronger changes in temperature. Adaptation experiments furthermore imply that in addition to this relative sensor role, both HCs and CCs exhibit tonic response component to prolonged temperature stimulation.

4.2 NOMPC modulates hot cell responses

Research in recent years has begun to gather comprehensive information on the molecular basics of thermosensation in the arista neurons. A number of proteins have been shown to be involved in the temperature responses of the CC population, although there has yet to be a concise explanation on how the different members of the ionotropic receptor (IR) and Brivido (Brv) families work and possibly interact (Budelli et al. 2019; Gallio et al. 2011). In the context of the warming responsive HCs, only one protein has been proven
to be essential in the transduction process so far, the gustatory receptor GR28B(D) (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). Data from the Ca\textsuperscript{2+} experiments performed in this study shows a considerable effect of the TRP channel NOMPC on the the temperature evoked responses of the arista neurons (see 3.3, starting at page 45). Consistent with the findings that nompC is expressed in the HC population of arista neurons, the effect of nompC mutations appeared to take a great effect on the response amplitudes of these cells. Flies carrying the null mutation nompC\textsuperscript{3} exhibited severe reductions in HC response amplitudes compared to wildtypes, while flies that were heterozygous for the mutation showed a more intermediate phenotype, with amplitudes above those of homozygous mutants but below wildtype level. The mutant phenotype could be rescued, using one wildtype copy of the gene under UAS control. The hypomorphic nompC\textsuperscript{100914} allele (see for example Sun et al. 2009) led to a reduction in response amplitude in the range of moderate temperature increases, from +3 to +6\degree C. Interestingly, the effect of nompC mutations was not exclusive to the HCs. While the expression analysis suggests a localisation specific to the HCs, the response amplitude of CCs was affected as well, albeit not as strongly as that of the HCs. How the mutation of a protein in one cell group might affect the other is not immediately clear, as no direct interaction or processes similar to lateral inhibition have been described in the arista so far. The neurons of the arista are organized into distinct sensilla, consisting of 2 neuronal dendrites (one HC and one CC dendrite), enveloped by two sheath cells (Foelix, Stocker, and Steinbrecht 1989). This close anatomical pairing of HC and CC neurons could make a cell to cell interaction at the level of the sensory neuron possible. However, anatomical studies have so far not found a clear indication of cell to cell contacts or similar structures, making the implications that a protein of one cell type might influence the other quite surprising.

NOMPC has been shown to be a mechanotransducing ion channel (Walker, Willingham, and Zuker 2000; Yan et al. 2013), necessary for processes such as hearing, touch sensation and proprioception in Drosophila (Cheng et al. 2010; Effertz, Wiek, and Göpfert 2011; Göpfert and Robert 2003). This of course raises the question on the role of the mechano TRP in the temperature sensing neurons of the arista. NOMPC itself has not been implied to be temperature sensitive. Furthermore, during the Ca\textsuperscript{2+} imaging experiments of this project, no distinct fluorescence change from the Johnston's organ (which, in its role as the fly’s hearing organ, houses around 500 nompC expressing neurons (see for example Effertz, Wiek, and Göpfert 2011; Todi, Sharma, and Eberl 2004)) could be observed. The modulatory effect of NOMPC is therefore more likely to originate from the interaction with other factors in the thermotransduction pathway or the regulation of the transduction process.

The fact that an ion channel acts in a modality outside of its described canonical main function or interacts with other transduction mechanisms/channels is not unprecedented and comparable examples have been found in a range of neuronal systems and
animals. A immediate comparison that comes to mind in this context is the mammalian ion channel TREK-1. Like the TRP channel NOMPC that was the subject of this study, TREK-1 has been shown to play a role in both mechano- and thermosensation (Maingret, Lauritzen, et al. 2000). TREK-1 is a K_{2p}, a two pore potassium channel, a group that plays a role in regulation cell excitability via rectifying K^+ efflux (for review, see Enyedi and Czirják 2010). However, in contrast to NOMPC, TREK-1 has been proposed to be gated by mechanical forces and heat (Brohawn, Su, and MacKinnon 2014; Chemin et al. 2005; Maingret, Lauritzen, et al. 2000; Noël et al. 2009; Plant 2012; Schneider et al. 2014), whereas no intrinsic gating via temperature has been found for NOMPC. So while the general mechanism and effect differ between the two channels, it does serve as an example for ion channels that play an active role in the transduction process of both mechano- and temperaturesensation.

The exact mechanism by which NOMPC modulates the HCs in the arista remains speculative. So far, only one other transducer channel has been shown to function in the HCs: the gustatory receptor GR28B(D) (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013). A knockout of GR28B(D) abolishes temperature induced activity of the HC population (Ni, Bronk, et al. 2013) and mis-expression in cells that are normally not temperature sensitive confers heat-sensitivity (Mishra et al. 2018). It is reasonable to assume that this gustatory receptor serves the role of the primary temperature transducer in the HCs and NOMPC acts in a modulatory fashion. It is well known that ion channels can shape the response properties of other transducer channels. An effect in this manner has for example been described for NOMPC and its interaction with Brv1 in the gentle touch sensation of Drosophila larvae, in which Brv1 appears to amplify/shape the mechanically induced response of NOMPC (Zhang, Li, et al. 2018). Experiments have shown that the conductance for Ca^{2+} ions of GR28B(D) is comparatively low (Mishra et al. 2018). It thus seems possible that while GR28B(D) is responsible for the initial response of the cell towards temperature changes, a considerable portion of the actual ion conductance across the membrane is contributed by the NOMPC TRP channel. This theory of NOMPC acting as a secondary mediator of ion conductance might also provide a possible explanation of the observed data, implying a gene dosage effect: if a heterozygous nompC^{3} mutation leads to a reduction of functional NOMPC protein amount, it could provide less ion conductance across the membrane. This effect would be even more severe in homozygous mutants, which reportedly exhibit no detectable amount of NOMPC anymore (Liang et al. 2011), coinciding well with the observed experimental data from Ca^{2+} experiments.

Overexpressing nompC in the HCs by introducing an additional gene copy under UAS control did not alter the response properties of the arista neurons significantly. This could be due to different reasons: As I did not employ electrophysiological recordings, I cannot make assumptions about the actual membrane potential during the temperature experiments, and it might be possible that in wildtype flies, responses to big temperature
steps that lead to the opening of NOMPC already approach the reversal potential of certain ions. This could imply that further NOMPC channels do not alter the ion transport across the membrane. I also cannot exclude that regulatory factors within the arista cells compensate for the additional gene copy of nompC. Cells show robust mechanisms to regulate the amount of proteins which are critical to the function of the cell, sometimes referred to as gene dosage compensation (see for example El-Brolosy and Stainier 2017; Marciano et al. 2014). Similar regulatory processes have been mainly described in the context of mutant genes and the upregulation of compensatory mechanisms/genes (El-Brolosy, Kontarakis, et al. 2019; Ma et al. 2019, for a review see Wilkinson 2019). Certain findings, however, suggest similar mechanisms to compensate for gene overexpression (see for example Ji et al. 2013) and it is therefore possible that the additional functional copy of the nompC gene under UAS control does not necessarily result in a significant increase in the net amount of NOMPC protein found in the HC population. Additionally, as will be discussed in more detail below, it is not unlikely that NOMPC relies on a functional interaction with other proteins in the HCs, be it the GR28B(D) receptor, or other, as of yet undiscovered channels/proteins. If a direct interaction with these factors is mandatory in order for NOMPC to fulfill its modulatory function, it is possible that the number of interaction partners for NOMPC might be a limiting factor. If the additional copy of nompC does increase the net amount of protein, but the number of essential interaction partners stays the same, it could mean that the additional NOMPC amount simply is not able to fulfill its function, or maybe even localize correctly.

Though we do not have information on how NOMPC and GR28B(D) might interact, several mechanisms of ion channel regulation and cooperative gating have been described for a range of cells and systems. While it is not clear whether the HC transduction machinery follows any of these established mechanisms, it does provide a possible starting point for further investigation of how temperature sensation in the arista neurons is modulated and regulated. TRP channels themselves have been proposed to be able to form heteromultimeric channels, such as in the case of Nanchung and Inactive (Gong et al. 2004). However, the fact that GR28B(D) is not a member of the TRP family, and that the gustatory receptor has been proven to function as a thermosensitive channel by itself, while NOMPC appears to fulfill a regulatory role, renders such interactions rather unlikely. Another proposed interaction pathway between channels is the so-called cooperative gating (for a review, refer to Choi 2014). Positive cooperativity has been proposed for a number of ion channels, such as voltage gated Na\(^+\) channels (Naundorf, Wolf, and Volgushev 2006). Different models on the exact way of channel interaction have been proposed, but the difficulty of an assessment in vivo has prevented the confirmation of the proposed mechanisms in biological systems (Choi 2014). The more prominent explanation in which the opening of one ion channels affects the gating of another include: The sensing/binding of ions that are transported across the membrane (mechanism pro-
posed in Standen and Stanfield 1982). This process has been described as the possible origin of negative feedback regulation for Ca\(^{2+}\) channels (Imredy and Yue 1992; Standen and Stanfield 1982). While the structure of GR28b(D) has to be solved, recent advances in the research of NOMPC have lead to more information on its structure (Jin et al. 2017), and possible binding sites of ions (such has Ca\(^{2+}\)) have been identified (personal communication, Dr. P. Hehlert). This might provide a possible starting point for how GR28b(D) influences NOMPC. Another proposed mechanism of cooperative ion channel interaction revolves around interaction across the cellular membrane (Ursell et al. 2007). As opening of one channel might lead to changes in membrane stretch or curvature, it might directly influence other ion channels embedded into the same membrane via mechanical activation (Ursell et al. 2007). As NOMPC is a mechanosensitive channel, this might allude to a possible interaction pathway, but as recent research has shown, the ankyrin repeat domain of NOMPC is essential for the force conveyance to the channel (Zhang, Cheng, et al. 2015). And the way in which mechanical stress from another channel could conveyed to another in a cytoskeleton-tethered system remains unclear (Choi 2014).

This are of course only a potential interaction mechanism in the particular case of the HCs. Established models of cooperative gating have been described to possess a number of prerequisites for proper function, such as the co-localization of the involved channel (Choi 2014). As data on the exact cellular localization of both GR28b(D) and NOMPC does not exist yet, it is not possible to evaluate this factor of channel interaction.

As NOMPC has been shown to be mechanotransducer channel, I aimed to investigate whether mechanical stimulation of the arista would result in responses from the arista neurons. Intriguingly, bending of the arista did not elicit any observable fluorescence changes in Ca\(^{2+}\) imaging experiments that correlated with the mechanical stimulation (see 3.4 on page 56). The initial assumption was not that the arista neurons would serve as mechanosensors for several reasons: From a purely information theory based standpoint, it would be problematic to rely on a single set of specialized sensors to encode for different sensory modalities, as this would raise the problem of how to differentiate between the two distinct perceptions. Additionally, as described in 2.4.2 (page 25), I had to fix the joints between the first, second and third antennal segments to deflect and bend the arista in the experimental trials, as otherwise the mechanical manipulation would just result in movement along the antennal joints. This means that in a normal, behavioural context, by the time a mechanical stimulus would begin to bend the arista structure, the joint between the third and second antennal segment would probably be rotated as far as possible, leading to an activation of all stretch receptive neurons in the Johnston’s organ. This makes sense in the context of audition, as vibration sensing of the Johnston’s organ relies on the stiff coupling of arista and funicle, so that even small deflections of
the arista can elicit responses in the hearing organ and are not get compensated by a flexible arista. But even if the mechanical stimulation was not behaviourally relevant, the question remains whether the presence of NOMPC would result in an ability to respond to mechanical stimulation that would just not occur outside of experimental conditions. The fact that I could not observe any mechanically evoked responses could be due to a number of factors: While it is of course possible, that the elicited responses were so small in amplitude that they were not observable during Ca\(^{2+}\) imaging.

Taken together, while the exact mechanism by which the temperature signaling is influenced still has to be investigated, it is clear that NOMPC fulfills a distinct modulatory role in the temperature evoked activity of the arista HCs that appears to be independent of its role as a canonical mechanotransducing channel.

4.3 nompC mutations alter temperature avoidance behaviour

The study presented here could determine that NOMPC modulates the physiological responses of arista neurons towards temperature. An immediate follow-up question in this context was, if the alterations to Ca\(^{2+}\) responses observed would also have an effect on the temperature driven behaviour of Drosophila. The analysis of temperature preference and avoidance behaviour has become an important tool to assess the effects of different cellular and molecular mechanisms in the context of temperature sensation (see for example Barbagallo and Garrity 2015; Fowler and Montell 2013; Giraldo et al. 2019; Rosenzweig, Brennan, et al. 2005; Rosenzweig, Kang, and Garrity 2008. As described in 1.3.1 (page 10), Drosophila possess additional temperature sensors outside of the arista, and even a null mutation of nompC did not completely abolish HC responses. I therefore assessed the temperature preference and avoidance behaviour of different wildtype and mutant strains (See 3.5, starting on page 58).

Heterozygous nompC\(^{3}\) mutants showed a significantly later onset of hot avoidance behaviour and a higher preferred temperature, while cold avoidance behaviour was not affected. To assess the effect that a loss of the HC information would have on the behaviour, I also tested flies in which the HC population was ablated using apoptotic factors Hid and Reaper (hid,rpr). Flies with ablated HCs did show later hot avoidance. Interestingly, the effect of the heterozygous nompC\(^{3}\) appeared to be stronger than the ablation of HCs in this regard, as the difference compared to wildtype controls showed a stronger significance. This might appear counter-intuitive at first, as nompC mutants were shown to still exhibit a HC response to temperature, although with a greatly reduced amplitude, while an ablation of the cell would eliminate this response. However, the explanation to
this observation might lie in the integration of conflicting signals from the temperature sensors: As was shown in the original characterization of the arista neurons (Gallio et al. 2011), and again demonstrated in the data of this study, both HC and CC populations exhibit changes in their activity to both temperature increments and decrements, by exhibiting excitatory responses towards one stimulus direction and inhibitory responses to the other directions. This suggests that both cell populations can provide information about both heating and cooling, albeit in a different manner. This could imply that a certain degree of redundancy in the system can compensate for the loss of information of one cell group. In the example of this study, it could mean that although the HC population was ablated and this affected the heat perception of the fly, the CCs could still provide some fundamental information about hot temperatures in the behavioural experiment. The previously discussed physiological experiments of this project suggested that nompC mutants exhibit lower HC response amplitudes than wildtypes. While the responses of CCs are also altered to some degree, the effect was stronger in the HCs. Information about the intensity of temperature change appears to be represented by the response amplitude. However, both HCs and CCs likely provide information about the temperature change, but with response amplitudes that suggest different temperature changes. This might in the end affect the integration of the sensory data, and ultimately the temperature driven behaviour, stronger than a simple loss of information from non-functional HCs. Conciliation of conflicting sensory information is a complex topic in all sensor driven systems, from biological systems (see for example Cloke, Jacklin, and Winters 2015; Fetsch, DeAngelis, and Angelaki 2013) all the way to technical applications of sensor fusion theory (Xiao and Qin 2018). Even in the wild, Drosophila has to deal with conflicting sensory information, as has for example been studied in the context of olfactory information during different behavioural situations, such as feeding (Lewis et al. 2015). In cases like this, complex higher order processing can be used to evaluate the different sensory inputs in order to reach a reliable state for decision making. If the conflicting sensory information does however originate from a sensory system that is not working "as intended", as would be the case in the nompC mutant flies examined in this study, it is improbable that compensatory or processing mechanisms can properly evaluate the obtained information. This might provide a possible explanation for the observed strong effect of nompC mutations in regards to temperature avoidance behaviour, when compared to wildtypes and animals with ablated HCs.

The behavioural effects analyzed in this study further underline the importance of the arista neurons as a first response system to ambient temperature changes, as even abolishment of only one of the two cell groups, and mutations that resulted in response amplitude reduction, but not elimination, lead to significant effects in the avoidance behaviour of adult Drosophila. I could furthermore show that NOMPCs role in modulating
temperature evoked neuronal responses is relevant in a behavioural context, and even a heterozygous knockout of the nompC gene is not easily compensated for by other thermosensitive systems in the fly.

To conclude, this study illustrates that the neurons found in *Drosophila* arista are relative temperature sensors, whose responses appear to be modulated by the TRP channel NOMPC. I showed that both HCs and CCs can theoretically provide information about an increase or decrease in temperature, wherein higher changes in temperature lead to stronger Ca\(^{2+}\) response amplitudes in the cells. Expression of nompC found in the HC population and NOMPC appears to play an active role in the amplitude modulation of temperature evoked Ca\(^{2+}\) responses of the arista neurons.
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6.1 Appendix: Ca$^{2+}$ traces sorted by temperature stimulus

Appendix Figure A1: Ca$^{2+}$ responses compiled to temperature stimulus (Descending Amplitude, first step hot) Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of fly lines used in this study to temperature stimulation. Temperature stimulus shown in lower right. Temperature starts at 22°C baseline. Order of temperature steps: 26°C, 18°C, 24°C, 20°C, 23°C, 21°C, 22.5°C, 21.5°C, then return to 22°C baseline. $\Delta F/F_0$ curves show mean value as solid line, SEM as shaded area. HC signals in orange, CC signals in blue.

n: CantonS: 4 HCs, 19 CCs, w$^{1118}$: 10 HCs, 13 CCs, nompC$^{U0914}$: 6 HCs, 10 CCs, nompC-overexpression: 5 HCs, 8 CCs, nompC$^{3}$: 11 HCs, 15 CCs, nompC$^{3}$/+: 4 HCs, 4 CCs, nompC-rescue: 8 HCs, 5 CCs
Appendix Figure A2: Ca²⁺ responses to Temperature Stimuli (Descending Amplitude, first step cold) Overview of ∆F/F₀ responses of fly lines used in this study to temperature stimulation. Temperature stimulus shown in lower right. Temperature starts at 22°C baseline. Order of temperature steps: 18°C, 26°C, 20°C, 24°C, 21°C, 23°C, 21.5°C, 22.5°C, then return to 22°C baseline. ∆F/F₀ curves show mean value as solid line, SEM as shaded area. HC signals in orange, CC signals in blue. 

n: CantonS: 6 HCs, 13 CCs, w^{118}: 5 HCs, 11 CCs, npmpC^{00914}: 10 HCs, 14 CCs, npmpC-overexpression: 4 HCs, 5 CCs, npmpC³: 11 HCs, 12 CCs, npmpC³/+: 4 HCs, 6 CCs, npmpC-rescue: 5 HCs, 4 CCs
Appendix Figure A3: Ca^{2+} responses compiled to temperature stimulus (Ascending Amplitude, first step hot)

Overview of \( \Delta F/F_0 \) responses of fly lines used in this study to temperature stimulation. Temperature stimulus shown in lower right. Temperature starts at 22°C baseline. Order of temperature steps: 22.5°C, 21.5°C, 23°C, 21°C, 24°C, 20°C, 26°C, 18°C, then return to 22°C baseline. \( \Delta F/F_0 \) curves show mean value as solid line, SEM as shaded area. HC signals in orange, CC signals in blue.

- CantonS: 6 HCs, 12 CCs, \textit{w^{118B}}. 12 HCs, 7 CCs, \textit{nompC^{D9D14}}. 6 HCs, 11 CCs, \textit{nompC-overexpression}: 4 HCs, 7 CCs, \textit{nompC^{3}}. 8 HCs, 5 CCs, \textit{nompC^{3}/+}: 7 HCs, 10 CCs, \textit{nompC-rescue}: 4 HCs, 4 CCs
Appendix Figure A4: Ca$^{2+}$ responses compiled to temperature stimulus (Ascending Amplitude, first step cold) Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of fly lines used in this study to temperature stimulation. Temperature stimulus shown in lower right. Temperature starts at 22°C baseline. Order of temperature steps: 21.5°C, 22.5°C, 21°C, 23°C, 20°C, 24°C, 18°C, 18°C, 26°C, then return to 22°C baseline. $\Delta F/F_0$ curves show mean value as solid line, SEM as shaded area. HC signals in orange, CC signals in blue.

n: CantonS: 4 HCs, 10 CCs, w^{118}: 5 HCs, 10 CCs, nompC^{00914}: 5 HCs, 12 CCs, nompC-overexpression: 5 HCs, 6 CCs, nompC^{2}: 8 HCs, 5 CCs, nompC^{3}+/+: 6 HCs, 8 CCs, nompC-rescue: 4 HCs, 6 CCs
6.2 Appendix: Ca$^{2+}$ traces sorted by fly strains

Appendix Figure A5: Ca$^{2+}$ responses of CantonS flies to different temperature step stimuli. Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of CantonS flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lanes in Ca$^{2+}$ traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A6: Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of \(\text{w}_{1718}\) flies to different temperature step stimuli
Overview of \(\Delta F/F_0\) responses of \(\text{w}_{1718}\) flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lines in Ca\textsuperscript{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A7: Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of nomp\textsuperscript{C3} flies to different temperature step stimuli. Overview of \(\Delta F/F_0\) responses of nomp\textsuperscript{C3} flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lanes in Ca\textsuperscript{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A8: Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of nompC\textsuperscript{3/+} flies to different temperature step stimuli. Overview of ΔF/F\textsubscript{0} responses of nompC\textsuperscript{3/+} flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lines in Ca\textsuperscript{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A9: Ca^{2+} responses of nompC-rescue flies to different temperature step stimuli
Overview of ΔF/F₀ responses of nompC-rescue flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lanes in Ca^{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A10: Ca^{2+} responses of *nompC^{FO0914}* flies to different temperature step stimuli. Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of *nompC^{FO0914}* flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lanes in Ca^{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A11: Ca\textsuperscript{2+} responses of nompC-overexpression flies to different temperature step stimuli. Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of nompC-overexpression flies to the temperature step stimulus protocols. Solid lanes in Ca\textsuperscript{2+} traces denote mean response, shaded areas are respective SEM. HCs shown in orange, CCs shown in blue.
Appendix Figure A12: CCa$^{2+}$ responses of nompC-Gal4 and UAS-nompC control flies

Overview of $\Delta F/F_0$ responses of Gal4 and UAS control fly lines in both the wildtype and homozygous nompC$^3$ background. Temperature stimuli on bottom line. Temperature starts at 22°C baseline. Order of temperature steps: 22.5°C, 21.5°C, 23°C, 21°C, 24°C, 20°C, 26°C, 18°C, then return to 22°C baseline. $\Delta F/F_0$ curves show mean value as solid line, SEM as shaded area. HC signals in orange, CC signals in blue. Shaded grey area shows the CantonS responses SEM during the same stimulus condition (See Appendix figures A5 and A3). 

A) Responses of nompC-Gal4 (top) and UAS-nompC (middle) control flies in the CantonS wildtype background. HC responses do not differ greatly from CantonS flies for either line. 

B) Responses of nompC-Gal4 (top) and UAS-nompC (middle) control flies in the nompC$^3$ mutant background. HC response amplitude is reduced in both lines compared to wildtype controls, as would be expected from nompC null mutants from previous experiments.

n: nompC-Gal4, wildtype background: 5 HCs, 6 CCs 
UAS-nompC wildtype background: 3 HCs, 4 CCs 
nompC-Gal4, nompC$^3$ background: 4 HCs, 5 CCs 
UAS-nompC nompC$^3$ background: 5 HCs, 4 CCs
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## List of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brv</td>
<td>brívido</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>cold-cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGFP</td>
<td>enhanced green fluorescent protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fps</td>
<td>frames per second</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCaMP6m</td>
<td>green fluorescent calmodulin M13 fusion protein 6 medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GECI</td>
<td>genetically encoded calcium indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFP</td>
<td>green fluorescent protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gr28b.d</td>
<td>gustatory receptor 28b.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUI</td>
<td>graphical user interface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>hot-cell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGLOO</td>
<td>Igloo is a Gradient Locomotion Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>md neurons</td>
<td>multidendritic neurons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nompC</td>
<td>no mechanoreceptor potential C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nSyb</td>
<td>neuronal synaptobrevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAL</td>
<td>posterior antennal lobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>proximal antennal protocerebrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>preference index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PID controller</td>
<td>proportional–integral–derivative controller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>region of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>standard error of the mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP channel</td>
<td>transient receptor potential channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VNC</td>
<td>ventral nerve cord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wt</td>
<td>wild-type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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