

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

Comp Biochem Physiol Part D Genomics Proteomics. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 April 21.

Published in final edited form as:

Comp Biochem Physiol Part D Genomics Proteomics. 2011 September ; 6(3): 282–309. doi:10.1016/ j.cbd.2011.06.002.

Genomic identification of a putative circadian system in the cladoceran crustacean Daphnia pulex

Andrea R. Tilden1,* , **Matthew D. McCoole**2, **Sarah M. Harmon**3, **Kevin N. Baer**2, and **Andrew E. Christie**3,*

¹Department of Biology, Colby College, 5720 Mayflower Hill, Waterville, Maine 04901, USA

²College of Pharmacy, Department of Toxicology, University of Louisiana at Monroe, 700 University Avenue, Monroe, Louisiana 71209 USA

³Neuroscience Program, John W. and Jean C. Boylan Center for Cellular and Molecular Physiology, Mount Desert Island Biological Laboratory, P.O. Box 35, Old Bar Harbor Road, Salisbury Cove, Maine 04672 USA

Abstract

Essentially nothing is known about the molecular underpinnings of crustacean circadian clocks. The genome of *Daphnia pulex,* the only crustacean genome available for public use, provides a unique resource for identifying putative circadian proteins in this species. Here, the *Daphnia* genome was mined for putative circadian protein genes using *Drosophila melanogaster* queries. The sequences of core clock (*e.g.* CLOCK, CYCLE, PERIOD, TIMELESS and CRYPTOCHROME 2), clock input (CRYPTOCHROME 1) and clock output (PIGMENT DISPERSING HORMONE RECEPTOR) proteins were deduced. Structural analyses and alignment of the *Daphnia* proteins with their *Drosophila* counterparts revealed extensive sequence conservation, particularly in functional domains. Comparisons of the *Daphnia* proteins with other sequences showed that they are, in most cases, more similar to homologs from other species, including vertebrates, than they are to those of *Drosophila*. The presence of both CRYPTOCHROME 1 and 2 in *Daphnia* suggests the organization of its clock may be more similar to that of the butterfly *Danaus plexippus* than to that of *Drosophila* (which possesses CRYPTOCHROME 1 but not CRYPTOCHROME 2). These data represent the first description of a putative circadian system from any crustacean, and provide a foundation for future molecular, anatomical and physiological investigations of circadian signaling in *Daphnia*.

^{© 2011} Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

^{*}Correspondence to either: Dr. Andrea R. Tilden, Department of Biology, Colby College, 5720 Mayflower Hill, Waterville, ME 04901 USA. Phone: 207-859-5743; FAX: 207-859-5705, atilden@colby.edu. Dr. Andrew E. Christie, John W. and Jean C. Boylan Center for Cellular and Molecular Physiology, Mount Desert Island Biological Laboratory, P.O. Box 35, Old Bar Harbor Road, Salisbury Cove, ME 04672 USA. Phone: 207-288-9880 ext. 284; FAX: 207-288-2130; achristi@mdibl.org.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Keywords

biological rhythm; circadian; Cladocera; clock; Crustacea; *Daphnia pulex*; *Drosophila melanogaster*; genome

1. Introduction

Virtually all organisms exhibit physiological and behavioral rhythms oscillating with a period of approximately 24-h. Regardless of species, these physiological/behavioral patterns, commonly referred to as circadian rhythms, are characterized by four basic properties (Allada and Chung, 2010): I. they persist under constant conditions (indicating the presence of a self-sustaining clock), II. the clock-driven activity reoccurs approximately every 24-h, III. the activity pattern is entrained by the solar day, and IV. the period of the activity, while sensitive to changes in environmental conditions, is stable over a wide range of temperatures. In addition, all circadian systems have three functional components (Allada and Chung, 2010): I. a core clock, which is responsible for time keeping, II. input pathways that act to synchronize the clock to the environment, and III. output pathways that transmit the timing information for the control of physiology and behavior (see Table 1 for the proteins in each category). Depending on the system in question, the cellular location of these components may be distinct or contained within a common locus.

While a number of species have been the subjects of investigations into the molecular mechanisms underlying the core circadian clock, perhaps the best studied are insects, and in particular, the fruit fly *Drosophila melanogaster* (Allada and Chung, 2010; Tomioka and Matsumoto, 2010). In *Drosophila*, work from many laboratories has elucidated several interacting molecular feedback loops, which form the core of a molecular clock. As recently reviewed by Allada and Chung (2010), a heterodimer formed by the CLOCK (CLK) and CYCLE (CYC) proteins binds to E-box elements in the promoter regions of the *period* (*per*) and *timeless* (*tim*) genes, activating their transcription (typically peaking late in the day). Due to this activation, PERIOD (PER) and TIMELESS (TIM) proteins are produced, accumulate and dimerize in the cytoplasm during the early evening hours, are translocated to the nucleus at approximately midnight, ultimately binding to the CLK/CYC heterodimer. The binding of the PER/TIM heterodimer to CLK/CYC inhibits this complex's DNA binding to, and hence activation of, the *per* and *tim* genes during the late night.

In addition to the core clock proteins CLK, CYC, PER and TIM, a number of others are also involved in the control of the core clock feedback loop of *Drosophila* (Allada and Chung, 2010). Specifically, PER, TIM and CLK each exhibit rhythmic phosphorylation, with the peak in this state occurring in the late night or early day; PER is phosphorylated by casein kinase Iε (DOUBLETIME [DBT]) and CASEIN KINASE II (CKII), while TIM is phosphorylated by GLYCOGEN SYNTHASE KINASE 3B (SHAGGY [SGG]) and CKII. CLK is phosphorylated by a nuclear complex of PER and DBT. The phosphorylation of PER is known to enhance its repressor activity. In addition, phosphorylated PER and TIM are targets of the phosphatases PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A (PP2A) and PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1 (PP1), the former of which is believed to be involved in generation of PER's phosphorylation rhythm. The peak in phosphorylation of these proteins is known to

precede their disappearance, which at least partially involves the ubiquitination of DBTphosphorylated PER (and its resulting degradation via the ubiquitin-proteasome pathway) by the E3 ubiquitin ligase SUPERNUMERARY LIMBS (SLIMB); the proteolysis of PER removes repression of the CLK/CYC complex allowing for a new cycle of *per* and *tim* transcription. TIM is the target for CYPTOCHROME (CRY), a cell autonomous blue-light photoreceptor protein, which triggers its degradation (in the remainder of this paper *Drosophila*-type CRY is referred to as CRY1 to distinguish it from vertebrate-type CRY or CRY2, which is present both with and without CRY1 in non-drosophalid insects; *e.g.* Yuan et al., 2007).

In addition to their roles in regulating the PER-TIM feedback loop, the CLK/CYC heterodimer also activates several other interdependent feedback loops that are hypothesized to play roles in setting the phase and amplitude of the *Drosophila* core clock, as well as its rhythmic output (Allada and Chung, 2010). Specifically, CLK/CYC bind to E-box elements in the promoters of the *par domain protein 1* (*pdp1*) and *vrille* (vri) genes, activating their transcription. In turn, the PAR DOMAIN PROTEIN 1 (PDP1) and VRILLE (VRI) proteins activate and repress, respectively, the transcription of the *clock* (*clk*) and *cryptochrome* (*cry*) genes. Because the accumulation of PDP1 is delayed relative to that of VRI, the rhythms of *clk* and *cry* activation are antiphase (peaking in early day) to those of *per* and *tim*. In addition the CLK/CYC heterodimer also activates transcription of the *clockwork orange* (*cwo*) gene. The CLOCKWORK ORANGE (CWO) protein, a basic helix-loop-helix (HLH) repressor, in turn targets the E-box elements of CLK/CYC target genes, repressing their activation.

Interestingly, while the *Drosophila* circadian system is arguably the best understood in the animal kingdom, it may not be stereotypical, even within insects (*e.g*. Zhu et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2008). Based on the complement of CRYs present, several models have been proposed for clock systems in insects (Yuan et al., 2007). Specifically, whereas *D. melanogaster* possesses a single CRY, in many insects, two CRYs have been identified, one similar to that of *Drosophila*, commonly referred to as dCRY or CRY1, and the other similar to that present in vertebrates, commonly referred to as CRY2; in several insects, only CRY2 has been found. In essentially all systems where it is present, CRY1 is proposed as a photosensitive input to the clock, providing a mechanism for entraining the clock to the solar day (Yuan et al., 2007). In contrast, CRY2 does not appear to play a role in photic entrainment, but rather appears to be a core clock protein, functioning as a repressor of CLK/CYC-mediated transcription (*e.g.* Zhu et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2008). Thus, in *Drosophila*, CRY likely functions solely as an input to the clock system, whereas in other insects members of the CRY family appear to serve both as inputs to the clock (CRY1) and as members of the core clock ensemble itself (CRY2); in insects with only CRY2, novel photic entrainment pathways are hypothesized, with CRY2 proposed to function primarily, perhaps solely, as a transcriptional repressor (*e.g.* Zhu et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2008). Evolutionary studies of CRY gene duplication and loss suggest that the clock system possessing both CRY1 and CRY2 is the most ancestral organization (Yuan et al., 2007).

As in other organisms, many crustaceans are known to display circadian patterns in physiology and behavior. As recently reviewed by Strauss and Dircksen (2010), known/ postulated crustacean circadian behaviors include, but are not limited to, locomotion, feeding, moulting, reproduction, hatching/larval release, color change, and diel vertical migration. Interestingly, and despite the rich repertoire of circadian rhythms exhibited by crustaceans, essentially nothing is known about the molecular underpinnings of circadian clocks in these animals. While many laboratories have attempted to molecularly clone crustacean circadian proteins via reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction using degenerate primers, only two putative circadian proteins have thus far been identified and characterized from crustaceans, *i.e.* a putative homolog CLK from the freshwater prawn *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* (Yang et al., 2006) and a CRY homolog from the Antarctic krill *Euphausia superba* (Mazzotta et al., 2010).

The recent sequencing of the genome of the cladoceran crustacean *Daphnia pulex* provides an alternative avenue for identifying putative crustacean homologs of known insect circadian proteins, namely identification via genome mining; members of the genus *Daphnia*, like many other planktonic crustaceans, are known to exhibit pronounced diel migratory behaviors (*e.g.* Lampert, 1989; Loose, 1993; Loose and Dawidowicz, 1994). In the study presented here, we have used such a strategy to predict a large suite of *D. pulex* proteins that show significant homology to those that form the molecular underpinnings of the *D. melanogaster* circadian clock. Structural analysis of the identified proteins, which include, among others, putative homologs of PER, TIM, CLK and CYC, revealed that essentially all contain the domains known to be required for function in the fruit fly. Moreover, putative homologs of both CRY1 and CRY2 were identified, suggesting that the clock system of *Daphnia* is organized more like that proposed for lepidopterans and mosquitoes, than it is to the *Drosophila* system (Yuan et al., 2007), *i.e.* CRY1 acting as a circadian photoreceptor to the clock and CRY2 participating in the establishment of the core clock itself. In addition, a protein likely involved in mediating the output signaling of the clock, *i.e.* a receptor for pigment dispersing hormone, was identified and characterized. Taken collectively, the data presented here represent the first description of a putative circadian system from any crustacean, and provide a foundation for future molecular, anatomical and physiological investigations of circadian signaling in *D. pulex* and other crustacean species.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Genome sequencing and gene modeling

For current descriptions of the preparation, sequencing and modeling of the *D. pulex* genome, readers are referred to<http://wfleabase.org/>(Colbourne et al., 2005; 2011), which is maintained by the Indiana University Genome Informatics Laboratory (Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA).

2.2. Genome mining

Genome mining was accomplished using BLAST+ 2.2.23 software (downloadable from the National Center for Biotechnology Information, Bethesda, MD, USA; [ftp://](ftp://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/blast/executables/blast+/)

[ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/blast/executables/blast+/\)](ftp://ftp.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/blast/executables/blast+/) and the beta-release of the *D. pulex* Genes 2010 frozen genome assembly (Indiana University Genome Informatics Laboratory, and Center for Genomics and Bioinformatics at Indiana University, Bloomington, IN, USA; <http://wfleabase.org/>) as described in several earlier publications (Christie et al., 2011; McCoole et al., 2011); *D. melanogaster* proteins were used to query the genome. For all searches, the BLAST score and BLAST-generated E-value for significant alignment are provided in Table 1. To strengthen our gene identifications, the sequence of the *Daphnia* protein deduced from each gene was reciprocally blasted against the *Drosophila* proteins curated in FlyBase (Tweedie et al., 2009); the results of these analyses are shown in Table 2. In addition, each protein was blasted against all non-redundant protein sequences curated at NCBI (excluding *Daphnia* proteins, obvious partial proteins, synthetic constructs and provisional protein sequences) using the online program protein blast (blastp algorithm used; <http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi>); the top five hits for each protein are shown in Table 3.

2.3. Analyses of protein structure

Analyses of protein structural motifs were accomplished using the online program SMART [\(http://smart.embl-heidelberg.de/](http://smart.embl-heidelberg.de/) [Schultz et al., 1998; Letunic et al., 2009]) and homology to the structural motifs of previously described insect circadian proteins, predominantly ones from *D. melanogaster*. Alignment of all proteins shown in our figures was done using the online program MAFFT version 6 [\(http://align.bmr.kyushu-u.ak.jp/mafft/online/server/](http://align.bmr.kyushu-u.ak.jp/mafft/online/server/); [Katoh and Toh, 2008]). Amino acid identity was calculated as number of identical amino acids (denoted by [*]) divided by the total number of amino acids in the longest sequence, while amino acid similarity was calculated as number of identical and similar amino acids (the latter denoted by the [:] and [.] symbols in the protein alignments) divided by the total number of amino acids in longest sequence.

2.4. Figure production

Alignments generated in MAFFT were copied and pasted into Microsoft Word, and the structural domains identified by SMART analyses, colored using this program. For all figures, a common coloring scheme was used to highlight each structural domain: serine/ threonine kinase catalytic, red; HLH, green; PAS, light blue; PAC, blue; coiled-coil, pink; orange, yellow; basic region leucine zipper, dark blue; protein phosphatase 2A, dark green; WD40, dark red; FBOX, dark gray; transmembrane, light gray; hormone receptor, black.

3. Results

As stated in Section 1, all known circadian systems are composed of three functional components: a core clock, input pathways that act to synchronize the clock to the environment, and output pathways that transmit timing information. With one exception, the results of genome searches and protein analyses are grouped according their putative role within the theoretical *Daphnia* circadian system, *i.e.* core clock proteins, input pathway proteins, or output pathway proteins; the results for CRY are presented under "input pathway proteins", though, in some species, family members also serve as key components of the core clock as well. Within each of these grouping, data are presented in alphabetical

order based on the *Drosophila* protein name. It should be noted that the *Daphnia* protein sequences reported in this study are based on the Genes 2010 gene model algorithm, which, in a previous study (Christie et al., 2011), was found to typically have the best fit with the extant *D. pulex* transcriptome data, at least for peptide precursor protein genes. This said, other gene model algorithms (*i.e.* JGI, Gnomon, PASA and SNAP) did in some cases predict slightly different protein sequences from those shown here, and readers should take heed of this and treat the sequences presented as theoretical rather than biochemically-confirmed.

3.1. Core clock proteins

3.1.1. CASEIN KINASE II (CKII)

3.1.1.1. CKII α**-subunit:** A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-ckII* α) was identified as encoding a putative CKII α-subunit protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CKII α (Accession no. **AAN11415**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-ckII* α to be located on Scaffold 17 of the genome, with a predicted length of 3693 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 1A shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-ckII* α (Dappu-CKII α; 365 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (336 amino acids long).

Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CKII α with that of Drome-CKII α revealed 81.1% amino acid identity/89.6 % amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-CKII α and Drome-CKII α identified a single, highly conserved (93.4% identical/97.9% similar) serine/threonine kinase catalytic domain within each protein (Fig. 1A).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-CKII α against all proteins curated in FlyBase revealed CKII α (Flybase no. **FBpp0070043**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Interestingly, blastp comparison of Dappu-CKII α with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed the catalytic subunit of human CK II $(1NA7 \text{ A})$ to be the most similar protein match (Table 3); the remaining top five blastp hits are all insect CKII α proteins, though *Drosophila* CKII α is not among them (Table 3).

3.1.1.2. CKII β**-subunit:** A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-ckII* β) was identified as encoding a putative CKII β-subunit protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CKII β (**AAF48093**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-ckII* β to be located on Scaffold 41 of the genome, with a predicted length of 2093 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 1B shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-ckII* β (Dappu-CKII β; 221 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (215 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CKII β with that of Drome-CKII β revealed 84.2% amino acid identity/94.6 % amino acid similarity between the two proteins. No functional domains were identified in either Dappu-CKII β or Drome-CKII β via SMART analysis.

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-CKII β against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified CKII β (Flybase No. **FBpp0089135**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Interestingly, and similar to the result found for Dappu-CKII α , a human CKII β protein (**CAI18393**) was found to have the highest homology score when Dappu-

CKII β was blasted against all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI (Table 3). Perhaps even more surprising was the finding that none of the remaining top five blastp hits from the NCBI database were from insects. In fact, only one invertebrate protein, a CKII β from the bivalve mollusc *Mytilus galloprovincialis* (**CBK3891**), was among these hits (Table 3).

3.1.2. CLOCK (CLK)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-clk*) was identified as encoding a putative CLK protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CLK (**AAC62234**; Bae et al., 1998). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-clk* to be located on Scaffold 27 of the genome, with a predicted length of 5939 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 2A shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-clk* (Dappu-CLK; 890 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (1027 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CLK with that of Drome-CLK revealed 30.8% amino acid identity/57.4% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-CLK and Drome-CLK identified similar, though not identical, sets of structural domains within each protein. Specifically, both Dappu-CLK and Drome-CLK are predicted to contain a single HLH domain, two PAS domains, and a single PAC domain (Fig. 2A). In addition, Drome-CLK is predicted to contain three coiled-coil regions; this motif is absent in Dappu-CLK (Fig. 2A). For those domains that are shared between Dappu-CLK and Drome-CLK, extensive amino acid conservation is evident: HLH, 60.8% identity/96.1 % similarity; PAS1, 43.3 % identity/80.6 % similarity; PAS2, 73.1 % identity/92.5 % similarity; PAC, 70.5 % identity/93.2 % similarity. Essentially no conservation of sequence is seen between the two proteins in any of the coiled-coil regions (Fig. 2A).

As stated in Section 1, CLK is one of the few circadian proteins for which a putative crustacean family member has been identified, *i.e. M. rosenbergii* CLK (Yang et al., 2006). Comparison of the sequences of Dappu-CLK and Macro-CLK (**AAX44045**; Yang et al., 2006), revealed a level of amino acid identity/similarity similar to that seen for Dappu-CLK and Drome-CLK (*i.e.* 30.4 % identity/56.0 % similarity; Fig. 2B). As for Dappu-CLK and Drome-CLK, SMART analysis of Macro-CLK identified single HLH domain, two PAS domains, and a single PAC domain within this protein (Fig. 2B). In addition, this analysis identified a single coiled-coil region in Macro-CLK (Fig. 2B). Comparison of the HLH, PAS and PAC domains of Macro-CLK and Dappu-CLK revealed slightly higher levels of conservation to those reported above for Drome-CLK and Dappu-CLK (HLH, 62.7% identity/100 % similarity; PAS1, 60.0% identity/85.0% similarity; PAS2, 80.0% identity/ 95.0% similarity; PAC, 81.8% identity/93.2% similarity). Little sequence conservation is seen between the *Macrobrachium* and *Daphnia* CLKs in the coiled-coil region of the former protein.

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-CLK against the proteins curated in FlyBase identified CLK (Flybase no. **FBpp0076500**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-CLK with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed the top five blastp hits to be insect CLK sequences, with a CLK from the firebrat *Thermobia domestica* (**BAJ16353**) showing the highest similarity (Table 3); *Drosophila* CLK was not among these proteins (Table 3).

3.1.3. CLOCKWORK ORANGE (CWO)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-cwo*) was identified as encoding a putative CWO protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CWO (**AAF54527**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-cwo* to be located on Scaffold 19 of the genome, with a predicted length of 3773 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 3 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-cwo* (Dappu-CWO; 809 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (698 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CWO with that of Drome-CWO revealed 23.9% amino acid identity/51.4% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-CWO and Drome-CWO identified a single HLH and a single orange domain within each protein (Fig. 3); high levels of amino acid conservation were evident when the *Daphnia* domains were compared to their *Drosophila* counter parts (HLH, 78.2% identity/ 92.7% similarity; ORANGE, 37.5% identity/85% similarity).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-CWO against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified CWO (Flybase No. **FBpp0081723**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query. Moreover, blastp comparison of Dappu-CWO with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed *D. melanogaster* CWO (**AAF54527**) as most similar to this protein as well (Table 3); three of the top five blastp hits are *D. melanogaster* sequences, the remaining two are also insect proteins (Table 3).

3.1.4. CYCLE (CYC)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-cyc*) was identified as encoding a putative CYC protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CYC (**AAF49107**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-cyc* to be located on Scaffold 1 of the genome, with a predicted length of 6473 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 4 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-cyc* (Dappu-CYC; 654 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (413 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CYC with that of Drome-CYC revealed 33.9% amino acid identity/49.7% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu- and Drome-CYC identified a single HLH domain, two PAS domains and a single PAC domain in each protein (Fig. 4). Comparisons of the *D. pulex* domains with those of *D. melanogaster* show high levels of amino acid conservation in these portions of the proteins: HLH, 71.4 % identity/95.2 % similarity; PAS1, 75.0 % identity/94.1 % similarity; PAS2, 59.7 % identity/91.9 % similarity; PAC, 53.8% identity/94.9 % similarity.

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-CYC against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified CYC (Flybase no. **FBpp0074693**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-CYC with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified a CYC from the firebrat *T. domestica* (**BAJ16354**) to be the most similar protein match (Table 3); no *Drosophila* proteins were among the top five blastp hits (Table 3).

3.1.5. DOUBLETIME (DBT)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-dbt*) was identified as encoding a putative DBT protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* DBT (**AAF57110**;

Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-dbt* to be located on Scaffold 1 of the genome, with a predicted length of 2124 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 5 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-dbt* (Dappu-DBT; 409 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (440 amino acids long). Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-DBT with Drome-DBT revealed 61.4% amino acid identity/78.4% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-DBT and Drome-DBT identified a serine/threonine kinase domain in each protein, the sequences of which were nearly identical, *i.e.* 82.6% amino acid identity/96.2% amino acid similarity (Fig. 5).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-DBT against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified DBT (Flybase no. **FBpp0085106**) as the most similar *D. melanogaster* protein to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-DBT with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed a casein kinase Iε (an alternative name for DBT) from the ant *Camponotus floridanus* (**EFN64010**) to be most similar to *Daphnia* DBT (Table 3); no *Drosophila* proteins were among the top five blastp hits (Table 3).

3.1.6. PAR DOMAINE PROTEIN 1ε **(PDP1**ε**)—**A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-pdp1*ε) was identified as encoding a putative PDP1ε protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* PDP1ε (**AAF04509**; Lin et al., 1997). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-pdp1*ε to be located on Scaffold 21 of the genome, with a predicted length of 4794 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 6 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-pdp1*ε (Dappu-PDP1ε; 350 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (351 amino acids long). Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-PDP1ε with that of Drome-PDP1ε revealed 39.6% amino acid identity/63.5% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-PDP1ε and Drome-PDP1ε identified a single basic region leucine zipper domain in each protein, which were 67.7% identical/81.5% similar in amino acid composition (Fig. 6).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-PDP1ε against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified PDP1 (Flybase No. **FBpp0076495**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Interestingly, comparison of Dappu-PDP1ε with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified a rat protein (**EDM05669**), likely a PDP1, to be most similar to Dappu-PDP1ε (Table 3), though the next three of the top five blastp hits were *D. melanogaster* PDP1 isoforms (Table 3).

3.1.7. PERIOD (PER)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-per*) was identified as encoding a putative PER protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* PER (**AAF45804**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-per* to be located on Scaffold 47 of the genome, with a predicted length of 5860 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 7 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-per* (Dappu-PER; 1286 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (1218 amino acids long).

Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-PER with Drome-PER revealed 27.4% amino acid identity/59.6% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-PER and Drome-PER identified two PAS domains in each protein (Fig. 7), both of which showed considerable amino acid conservation between the two proteins: PAS-1, 50.0% amino acid identity/82.3% amino acid similarity; PAS-2, 47.3% amino acid identity/84.2% amino acid similarity. In addition, SMART analysis identified a PAC domain within the Drome-PER (Fig. 7) but not in Dappu-PER. Interestingly, the portion of Dappu-PER that overlaps with the *Drosophila* PAC domain is 72.7% identical/93.2% similar in amino acid composition to that of the *Drosophila* protein (Fig. 7).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-PER against the proteins curated in FlyBase identified PER (Flybase No. **FBpp0070455**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Moreover, blastp comparison of Dappu-PER with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI showed the top five hits to be insect PER proteins (Table 3), with an isoform from the cockroach *Blattella germanica* (**AAN02439**; Table 3) exhibiting the highest similarity.

3.1.8. PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1 (PP1)—Two *D. pulex* genes (*dappu-pp1 a* and *dappu-pp1 b*) were identified as encoding putative PP1 proteins via a query using a *D. melanogaster* PP1 (**CAA39820**; Dombradi et al., 1990). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-pp1 a* and *dappu-pp1 b* to be located on Scaffolds 145 and 12 of the genome, respectively, with lengths of 2591 and 1972 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 8A shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-pp1 a* (Dappu-PP1 A; 332 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (327 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequences of Dappu-PP1 A with Drome-PP1 revealed 84.0% amino acid identity/90.7% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-PP1 B (325 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query with that of Drome-PP1 revealed a similar level of amino acid conservation, *i.e.* 81.3% identity/ 89.6% similarity (alignment not shown). Figure 8B shows the alignment of the two *Daphnia* PP1s with one another. As can be seen from this panel, the two proteins are nearly identical in amino acid sequences (84.3% identity/96.9% similarity in amino acid composition). SMART analyses of Dappu-PP1 A, Dappu-PP1 B, and Drome-PP1 identified a single serine/threonine protein kinase domain in each protein (Fig. 8A–B). The serine/threonine protein kinase domain in each of the *Daphnia* proteins is nearly identical to that present in their *Drosophila* counterpart: Dappu-PP1 A vs. Drome-PP1, 95.9% amino acid identity/ 100% amino acid similarity; Dappu-PP1 B vs. Drome-PP1, 89.6% amino acid identity/ 99.3% amino acid similarity. Similarly, this domain is highly conserved between the two *Daphnia* proteins (91.5% identity/98.5% similarity).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-PP1 A and B against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified isoforms of PP1 (Flybase nos. **FBpp0084026** and **FBpp0071382**, respectively; Table 2) as the most similar *D. melanogaster* proteins to the *Daphnia* queries. Comparison of the Dappu-PP1s with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified a serine/ threonine-protein phosphatase alpha-1 isoform (of which PP1 is a family member) from the ant *C. floridanus* (**EFN69572**) to possess the highest similarity score to Dappu-PP1 A

(Table 3), with a PP1 from the zebra fish *Danio rerio* (**CAD61270**) being most similar to Dappu-PP1 B (Table 3); no *Drosophila* proteins were among the top five blastp hits for either of the Dappu-PP1s (Table 3).

3.1.9. PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A (PP2A)

3.1.9.1. PP2A catalytic subunit – MICROTUBULE STAR (MTS): A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-mtr*) was identified as encoding a putative PP2A catalytic subunit protein (MTS) via a query using a *D. melanogaster* MTS sequence (**AAF52567;** Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-mts* to be located on Scaffold 13 of the genome, with a predicted length of 2099 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 9A shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-mts* (Dappu-MTS; 308 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (309 amino acids long). Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-MTS with Drome-MTS revealed 64.4% amino acid identity/90.3% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-MTS and Drome-MTS identified a single protein phosphatase 2A catalytic domain in each protein (Fig. 9A). Comparison of the sequences of these domains revealed 66.9% amino acid identity/92.6% amino acid similarity between these two regions of the proteins (Fig. 9A).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-MTS against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified MTS (Flybase no. **FBpp0077017**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-MTS with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed a serine/threonine-protein phosphatase 4 catalytic subunit from the ant *Harpegnathos saltator* (**EFN85419**) to be most similar to *Daphnia* MTS (Table 3); no *Drosophila* proteins were among the top five blastp hits (Table 3).

3.1.9.2. PP2A regulatory subunit

3.1.9.2.1. WIDERBORST (WBT): Two *D. pulex* genes (*dappu-wbt a* and *dappu-wbt b*) were identified as encoding putative PP2A regulatory subunit proteins (WBTs) via a query using a *D. melanogaster* WBT sequence (**AAF56720;** Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-wbt a* and *b* to be located on Scaffolds 8 and 2 of the genome, respectively, with a predicted lengths of 6199 and 4882 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 9B1 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-wbt a* (Dappu-WBT A; 481 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (524 amino acids long). Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-WBT with Drome-WBT revealed 73.7% amino acid identity/85.5% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. Alignment of Dappu-WBT B with Drome-WBT revealed a lower level of amino acid conservation between these two proteins, 52.6% identity/74.1% similarity (alignment not shown). Figure 9B2 shows the alignment of the two *Daphnia* WBTs; these proteins are 50.5% identical/69.7% similar in amino acid sequence. SMART analyses of Dappu-WBT A identified a single coiled-coil domain; this domain was not predicted by SMART analyses in either Dappu-WBT B or Drome-WBT, though in the former protein this region is 45.5% identical/69.7% similar in

amino acid composition to that of Dappu-WBT A and in the latter protein 72.7%identical/ 97.0% similar to that of Dappu-WBT A (Fig. 9).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-WBT A and B against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified PP2A regulatory subunit isoforms (Flybase nos. **FBpp0084579** and **FBpp0288759**, respectively; Table 2) as the most similar *D. melanogaster* proteins to the Daphnia queries. Comparison of the Dappu-WBTs with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified serine/threonine-protein phosphatase 2A 56 kDa regulatory subunit isoforms from the ant *C. floridanus* to show the highest similarity scores to each of Dappu-WBTs (Accession nos. **EFN66909** and **EFN69797**, respectively; Table 3); while a *Drosophila* isoform of WBT was among the top five blastp hits for Dappu-WBT A, none were among the top hits for Dappu-WBT B (Table 3).

3.1.9.2.2. TWINS (TWS): A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-tws*) was identified as encoding a putative PP2A regulatory subunit protein (TWS) via a query using a *D. melanogaster* TWS sequence (**AAF54498;** Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-tws* to be located on Scaffold 43 of the genome, with a predicted length of 4157 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 9C shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-tws* (Dappu-TWS; 443 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (499 amino acids long). Comparisons of the sequence of Dappu-TWS with Drome-TWS revealed 71.5% amino acid identity/83.6% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-TWS and Drome-TWS identified six and seven WD40 domains in these proteins, respectively (Fig. 9C). Comparison of the sequences of the shared WD40 domains, as well as the region of the *Daphnia* protein corresponding to the sixth of the seven *Drosophila* domains, revealed high degrees of amino acid conservation in these regions of the two proteins: WD40 1, 87.2% identity/100% similarity; WD40 2, 90.2% identity/100% similarity; WD40 3, 90.0% identity/95.0% similarity; WD40 4, 89.5% identity/94.7% similarity; WD40 5, 87.2% identity/100 similarity; WD40 6 (no domain formally identified by SMART in *Daphnia*), 75% identity/100% similarity; WD40 7, 94.7% identity/100% similarity (Fig. 9C).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-TWS against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified TWS (Flybase No. **FBpp0081671**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-TWS to all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified a beetle *Tribolium castaneum* protein (**EFA10095**) as showing the highest similarity to the *Daphnia* query (Table 3); three Drosophila TWS isoforms were among the top five blastp hits (Table 3).

3.1.10. SHAGGY (SGG)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-sgg*) was identified as encoding a putative SGG protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* SGG (**AAN09084**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-sgg* to be located on Scaffold 76 of the genome, with a predicted length of 5712 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 10 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-sgg* (Dappu-SGG; 439 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (514 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-SGG with Drome-SGG revealed 64.8% amino acid identity/77.6% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-SGG and Drome-SGG identified a single serine/threonine kinase domain in each protein (Fig. 10); the two serine/threonine kinase domains are nearly identical in amino acid sequence, *i.e.* 89.5% identity/98.2% similarity. Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-SGG against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified SGG (Flybase no. **FBpp0070450**) as *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-SGG with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed a glycogen synthase kinase (of which SGG is family member) from the tick *Rhipicephalus microplus* (**ABO61882**) to be the most similar protein match (Table 3); no *Drosophila* proteins were among the top five blastp hits (Table 3).

3.1.11. SUPERNUMERARY LIMBS (SLIMB)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-slimb*) was identified as encoding a putative SLIMB protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* SLIMB (**AAF55853**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-slimb* to be located on Scaffold 169 of the genome, with a predicted length of 2880 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 11 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-slimb* (Dappu-SLIMB; 510 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (510 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-SLIMB with Drome-SLIMB revealed 76.3% amino acid identity/91.8% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-SLIMB and Drome-SLIMB identified an FBOX domain and seven WD40 domains in each protein (Fig. 11); the amino acid sequences of each of these domains is highly conserved between the two species: FBOX domain, 80.0% amino acid identity/95.0% similarity; WD40-1, 89.5% amino acid identity/94.7% amino acid similarity; WD40-2, 84.2% amino acid identity/94.7% amino acid similarity; WD40-3, 89.5% amino acid identity/97.4% amino acid similarity; WD40-4, 94.7% amino acid identity/100% amino acid similarity; WD40-5, 97.4% amino acid identity/100% amino acid similarity; WD40-6, 94.7% amino acid identity/100% amino acid similarity; WD40-7, 94.7% amino acid identity/100% amino acid similarity.

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-SLIMB against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified SLIMB (Flybase No. **FBpp0083434**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Interestingly, comparison of Dappu-SLIMB to all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified vertebrate proteins, all apparent members of the E3 ubiquitin ligase family, as the top five blastp hits, with a mouse protein (**BAE26547**) being the best match with the *Daphnia* sequence (Table 3).

3.1.12. TIMELESS—Eight *D. pulex* genes (*dappu-tim a, dappu-tim b, dappu-tim c, dapputim d, dappu-tim e, dappu-tim f, dappu-tim g,* and *dappu-tim h*) were identified as encoding putative TIM proteins via a query using a *D. melanogaster* TIM (**AAN10371;** Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-tim a, dappu-tim b, dappu-tim c, dapputim d, dappu-tim e, dappu-tim f, dappu-tim g,* and *dappu-tim h* to be located on Scaffolds 24,

6, 10, 6, 6, 24, 75, and 91 of the genome, respectively, with lengths of 14166, 5052, 3650, 5438, 5542, 11674, 2798, and 4537 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 12 shows the alignments of the protein deduced from *dappu-tim a* (Dappu-TIM A; 1197 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (1421 amino acids in length). Comparison of the amino acid sequences of these two proteins revealed 29.8% identity/60.1% similarity between the two TIMs. Comparisons of the other *Daphnia* TIMs with Drome-TIM showed varying levels of amino acid conservation, with some nearly as high as that seen between Dappu-TIM A and Drome-TIM, and others considerably lower: Dappu-TIM B, 23.6% amino acid identity/52.0% amino acid similarity; Dappu-TIM C, 23.7% amino acid identity/47.8% amino acid similarity; Dappu-TIM D, 26.4% amino acid identity/55.9% amino acid similarity; Dappu-TIM E, 23.4% amino acid identity/47.9% amino acid similarity; Dappu-TIM F, 22.3% amino acid identity/51.1% amino acid similarity; Dappu-TIM G, 14.2% amino acid identity/30.8% amino acid similarity; and Dappu-TIM H, 21.3% amino acid identity/45.6% amino acid similarity (alignments not shown). Alignment of the eight *Daphnia* TIM proteins to one another shows considerable variation in sequence composition between the proteins (in the interest of space, this alignment is provided only as an online supplemental figure [Supplemental Figure 1]). Table 3 provides pairwise comparisons of the amino acid identity/similarity of Dappu-TIM A-H. No functional domains were identified by SMART analyses in Drome-TIM or any of the Dappu-TIMs. Reciprocal blasting of eight Dappu-TIMs against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified an isoform of TIM as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to each *Daphnia* query (Flybase nos. **FBpp0291971**, **FBpp0291971**, **FBpp0291971**, **FBpp0077254**, **FBpp0291970**, **FBpp0077254**, **FBpp0291970** and **FBpp0291970**, respectively; Table 2). Comparison of the Dappu-TIMs with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed each to be most similar to an insect TIM isoform (*i.e.* the butterfly *Danaus plexippus* [**AAR15505**], the moth *Antheraea pernyi* [**AAF66996**], the beetle *T. castaneum* [**EFA04644**], *T. castaneum* [**EFA04644**], *D. melanogaster* [**ADV36936**], *D. melanogaster* [**P49021**], the fruit fly *Drosophila virilis* [**O17482**], and the cricket *Gryllus bimaculatus* [**BAJ16356**] for Dappu-TIM A-H, respectively; Table 3). In fact, the top five hits for each of the *Daphnia* proteins were insect isoforms of TIM (Table 3).

3.1.13. VRILLE (VRI)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-vri*) was identified as encoding a putative VRI protein via a query using a *D. melanogaster* VRI (**AAF52237**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-vri* to be located on Scaffold 92 of the genome, with a predicted length of 2225 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 13 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-vri* (Dappu-VRI; 676 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (729 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequences of Dappu-VRI and Drome-VRI revealed 27.7% amino acid identity/49.5% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-VRI and Drome-VRI identified a single basic region leucine zipper domain in each protein (Fig. 13); the amino acid sequence of this domain is highly conserved between the two VRIs, *i.e.* 76.9% amino acid identity and 96.9% amino acid similarity.

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-VRI against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified VRI (Flybase no. **FBpp0289297**) as the most similar *D. melanogaster* protein to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-VRI with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed a VRI from the butterfly *D. plexippus* (**ATT86041**) to be most similar to *Daphnia* VRI (Table 3); two *Drosophila* VRIs are among the top five blastp hits for this query (Table 3).

3.2. Input pathway proteins

3.2.1. CRYPTOCHROME (CRY)—Four *D. pulex* genes (*dappu-cry a, dappu-cry b, dappu-cry c,* and *dappu-cry d*) were identified as encoding putative CRY proteins via a query using a *D. melanogaster* CRY (**AAC83828;** Emery et al., 1998). The Genes 2010 gene model shows that these genes are located on Scaffolds 40, 18, 10, and 7 of the genome, respectively, with lengths of 2706, 4661, 3072 and 2052 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 14A shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-cry a* (Dappu-CRY A; 525 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (542 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-CRY A with Drome-CRY revealed 44.8% amino acid identity/76.4% amino acid similarity between the two proteins (Figure 14A). Alignments of Dappu-CRY B, Dappu-CRY C and Dappu-CRY D with Drome-CRY also revealed high levels of structural homology between the proteins: Dappu-CRY B vs. Drome-CRY, 37.6% amino acid identity/69.1%; Dappu-CRY C vs. Drome-CRY, 38.2% amino acid identity/69.9% amino acid similarity; Dappu-CRY D vs. Drome-CRY, 24.4% amino acid identity/59.6% amino acid similarity (alignments not shown). Figure 14B shows the alignment of the four *Daphnia* CRYs with one another. As this panel shows, the four proteins show considerable variation in amino acid composition. Table 4 provides pairwise comparisons of the amino acid identity/similarity of Dappu-CRY A-D. No functional domains were identified by SMART analyses in Drome-CRY or any of the Dappu-CRYs.

As discussed in Section 1, along with CLK, CRY is the only other circadian protein for which a crustacean family member is known, *i.e.* an isoform from the Antarctic krill *E. superba* (Mazzotta et al., 2010). Alignments of the *Daphnia* CRYs with Eupsu-CRY, show similar levels of amino acid conservation to that seen for alignments with the *Drosophila* protein: Dappu-CRY A vs. Eupsu-CRY, 36.0% identity/69.5% similarity; Dappu-CRY B vs. Eupsu-CRY, 67.1% identity/88.6% similarity; Dappu-CRY C vs. Eupsu-CRY, 47.2% identity/76.5% similarity; Dappu-CRY D vs. Eupsu-CRY, 26.8% identity/58.9% similarity (alignments not shown).

Reciprocal blasting of four Dappu-CRYs against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified members of the CRY/6-4 photolyase family as the most similar *D. melanogaster* proteins to the *Daphnia* queries. For Dappu-CRY A, CRY (Flybase no. **FBpp0083150**) was found to be the most similar *Drosophila* protein to the query sequence, while the remaining three sequences were found to be most similar to 6-4 photolyase (Flybase no. **FBpp0080935**). Comparison of the Dappu-CRYs with all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI revealed each to be most similar to a CRY protein, though all are more similar to isoforms from other species than they are to *Drosophila* proteins (*i.e.* the cricket *Dianemobius*

nigrofasciatus [**BAF45421**], the mosquito *Anopheles darlingi* [**EFR20390**]*,* the clawed frog *Xenopus tropicalis* [**AAI66277**], and the European seabass *Dicentrarchus labrax* [**CBN81995**]) for Dappu-CRY A-D, respectively). Based on the results of our blastp analyses (Table 3), it would appear that Dappu-CRY A is a homolog of the *Drosophila*-type or CRY1 subfamily, with Dappu-CRY B being a homolog of the vertebrate-type or CRY2 subfamily; alignments of Dappu-CRY A and B with CRY1 and CRY2 of the butterfly *D. plexippus*, respectively, are shown in Figure 15. Dappu-CRY D appears most similar to members of the CRY DASH subfamily (Table 3). It is unclear as to which subfamily of the CRY/6-4 photolyase superfamily Dappu-CRY C is a member (Table 3).

3.3. Output pathway proteins

3.3.1. PIGMENT DISPERSING HORMONE RECEPTOR (PDHR)—A single *D. pulex* gene (*dappu-pdhr*) was identified as encoding a putative PDHR via a query using a *D. melanogaster* pigment dispersing factor receptor (PDFR; **AAF45788**; Adams et al., 2000). The Genes 2010 gene model shows *dappu-pdhr* to be located on Scaffold 1 of the genome, with a predicted length of 4621 nucleotides (Table 1).

Figure 16 shows the alignment of the protein deduced from *dappu-pdhr* (Dappu-PDHR; 516 amino acids in overall length) with that of the *Drosophila* query (669 amino acids long). Comparison of the sequence of Dappu-PDHR with that of Drome-PDFR revealed 32.7% amino acid identity/55.0% amino acid similarity between the two proteins. SMART analyses of Dappu-PDHR and Drome-PDFR identified seven transmembrane domains (TMDs) in each protein (Fig. 16). The amino acid sequences of these TMDs are highly conserved between the two proteins: TMD1, 52.2% amino acid identity and 87.0% amino acid similarity; TMD2, 72.2% amino acid identity and 94.4% amino acid similarity; TMD3, 72.7% amino acid identity and 95.5% amino acid similarity; TMD4, 47.4% amino acid identity and 78.9% amino acid similarity; TMD5, 55.5% amino acid identity and 95.0% amino acid similarity; TMD6, 72.2% amino acid identity and 83.3% amino acid similarity; TMD7, 81.8% amino acid identity and 100% amino acid similarity. In addition, a single hormone receptor domain was identified in Dappu-PDHR; this domain is absent in Drome-PDFR, though the corresponding region of this protein is 35.8% identical/58.9% similar to its *Daphnia* counterpart (Fig. 16).

Reciprocal blasting of Dappu-PDHR against all proteins curated in FlyBase identified PDFR (Flybase No. **FBpp0099841**) as the *D. melanogaster* protein most similar to the *Daphnia* query (Table 2). Comparison of Dappu-PDHR to all non-redundant protein sequences curated by NCBI identified a PDHR from the penaeid shrimp *Marsupenaeus japonicus* (BAH85843) as the top protein match for the query; three *Drosophila* proteins were also among the top five blastp hits identified via the *Daphnia* protein (Table 3).

4. Discussion

4.1. Genome mining identifies a putative set of putative circadian proteins in Daphnia pulex

Over the last decade, genome mining has become a major method for protein discovery in both vertebrates and invertebrates. At present, the only crustacean genome that has been fully sequenced and is available for public use is that of the cladoceran *D. pulex* (Colbourne et al., 2005; Bauer, 2007; Stollewerk, 2010; Colbourne et al., 2011; Tautz, 2011). Recently, this resource has been used for protein discovery in this species, providing detailed information on the structures of molecules involved in many physiological/behavioral processes, for example, steroid biosynthesis and innate immunity (Rewitz and Gilbert, 2008; McTaggart et al., 2009).

In the study presented here, we have used the *D. pulex* genome to mine for proteins that may be involved in the control of circadian rhythmicity in this species. Specifically, we used the sequences of known *Drosophila* circadian proteins to query the *Daphnia* genome for putative ortholog genes and their encoded proteins. Using this strategy, a number of putative *D. pulex* circadian genes and their proteins were identified and characterized, including those likely involved in the establishment of the core clock, *i.e.* PER, TIM, CLK, CYC and CRY2, as well as proteins in their post-translational modifications and degradation, *i.e.* DBT, CK2, SGG, PP2A, PP1 and SLIMB. Moreover, genes and proteins putatively involved in setting the phase and amplitude of the core clock were identified, *i.e.* PDP1, VRI and CWO, as were orthologs of the blue-light receptor protein CRY1, which likely function as input pathways to the core clock, synchronizing it to the solar day, and PDHR, which may serve to transduce one of the clock's output signals. Taken collectively, this collection of genes/proteins represents the first putative set of circadian proteins thus far described from any crustacean.

4.2. Several Daphnia circadian genes appear to exhibit extensive gene duplications

Overall, *Daphnia* have an unusually high level of gene duplication in comparison with the other arthropods for which genomic databases exist (Colbourne et al., 2011). In fact, only in aphids has a similar level of gene duplication been noted (Huerta-Cepas et al., 2010; Ollivier et al., 2010; Shigenobu et al., 2010); both *Daphnia* and aphids are cyclical parthenogens (Cortés et al., 2008). The purpose of gene redundancy in these and other species is generally not well understood. For some genes, the encoded protein isoforms may be nonfunctional, may have different kinetic properties for the same substrate, or may have novel functions (Force et al., 1999). It is also possible that the protein isoforms may be expressed in a life stage-specific manner (development, diapause, reproduction), or that their expression is tissue-specific. Multiple genes, and hence protein isoforms, may help an organism adjust to shifting environmental conditions, *e.g.* changes in salinity, oxygen levels, or temperature.

As discussed in Section 1, a defining parameter of circadian rhythms is temperature compensation, the molecular basis of which is not well understood (Salomé and McClung, 2005; Salomé et al, 2010). Tomaiuolo et al. (2008) constructed a mathematical model based on two splice variant isoforms of the β-subunit of *Drosophila* CKII that differ in kinetic

rates of PER phosphorylation. This model suggests that through dynamic regulation of the proportions of the two β-subunit isoforms expressed, an increase in robustness of the circadian clock can be predicted. Two *per* alleles exist in wild populations of *D. melanogaster*, with population differences in frequency that vary by latitude (Sawyer et al., 1997). The PER proteins have different thermokinetic properties that may be involved in the circadian clock temperature compensation. Likewise, in a northern-latitude *Drosophila* population, the *tim* mutation, *ls-tim*, has been shown to adjust photoresponsiveness in this more seasonally-variable environment (Sandrelli et al., 2007). The multiple *Daphnia* PP1, PP2A-WBT and TIM variants predicted here may likewise possess different kinetic parameters to offset temperature, salinity, oxygen, and/or other environmental variables.

4.3. Conservation of structural domains suggests Daphnia possesses an insect-like molecular clock, but organized more like that of butterflies and mosquitoes than of Drosophila

In our study, putative homologs to most of the known *Drosophila* circadian proteins were identified in *D. pulex*. Structural domains in both the *Daphnia* and *Drosophila* proteins were analyzed via the online program SMART (Schultz et al., 1998; Letunic et al., 2009). While we realize that not all of the domains/functional regions that have been reported for the *Drosophila* circadian proteins are detected via this program (*e.g.* Saez and Young, 1996; Ousley et al., 1998; Chang and Reppert, 2003; Lin and Todo, 2005), those that were, for the most part, appear to be highly conserved between the two species' putative homologs; significant amino acid variation was noted outside of functional regions for several proteins. Even where discrepancies were noted, *e.g.* a PAC domain identified in Drome-PER but not in Dappu-PER, the corresponding regions of the two proteins were often very similar in amino acid composition (in the case of the PER PAC domain 72.7% identical/93.2% similar). Interestingly, blast analyses of the *Daphnia* sequences show them to be, for the most part, more similar to proteins identified from other species than they are to *Drosophila*. Moreover, the presence of both CRY1 and CRY2 in *Daphnia* suggests that its molecular clock is likely organized more similar to that recently described for butterfly and mosquito (*e.g.* Zhu et al., 2005; Yuan et al., 2007; Zhu et al., 2008) where CRY1 is proposed as a photosenstive input to the clock and CRY2 is core clock protein (functioning to repress of CLK/CYC-mediated transcription), than it is to *Drosophila* (which possesses only CRY1).

4.4. Potential cellular locus and output signals of a Daphnia neuronal clock

All circadian systems have three functional components: a core clock, which is responsible for time keeping, input pathways that act to synchronize the clock to the environment, and output pathways that transmit the timing information from the clock for the control of physiology and behavior. Here we have identified a protein that may function as the input to a *Daphnia* clock, *i.e.* an isoform of CRY1, as well as proteins that may act to establish the core molecular clock itself, *i.e.* PER, TIM, CLK, CYC, CRY2, DBT, SGG, VRI, etc. To be determined, however, are possible output pathways from the *Daphnia* clock that would signal the timing information necessary to establish circadian rhythms in physiology and behavior in this species.

As the cellular location of the core circadian clock (or clocks) in *D. pulex* is unknown, it is difficult to postulate how output signals would be generated in, and transmitted from, this timekeeper. This said, work conducted on other species (both invertebrate and vertebrate) would suggest that circulating hormones are an important part of the *Daphnia* clock's output pathway, mediating the expression of the overt circadian rhythms present in this species. One possibility is that hormones are released directly from the clock cells themselves; alternatively, the clock cells may project to and innervate relay sites, likely endocrine organs, which are the sources of the hormonal signals. Regardless of locus, in insects, several peptide hormones have been shown to be key components of circadian signaling systems, particularly pigment dispersing factor (PDF), a member of the pigment dispersing hormone (PDH) family; PDF is present in a number of known circadian clock neurons in *Drosophila* (for review see: Allada and Chung, 2010; Tomioka and Matsumoto, 2010).

Recent transcriptome and genome mining in *D. pulex* has identified a homolog of PDF/PDH in this species, NSELINSLLGLPRFMKVVamide (Gard et al., 2009; Christie et al., 2011). Moreover, immunohistochemistry using an antibody generated against β-PDH (NSELINSILGLPKVMNDAamide) labels a small set of neurons (~8 somata) that are distributed throughout the brain/optic ganglia of *D. pulex* (Gard et al., 2009). While currently speculation, the role of PDF as a signaling agent, and hence marker, for some clock cells in the brain of *Drosophila* suggests that PDH-immunopositive neurons in the brain of *D. pulex* may represent at least a subset of the cellular loci for a circadian neuronal pacemaker in this species, a hypothesis recently strengthened by the finding of circadian patterns of activity in at least some of these cells (Strauβ et al., 2011).

In addition to PDF, a number of other hormones, primarily peptides, have been implicated in circadian signaling in insects. For example, corazonin, crustacean cardioactive peptide (CCAP) and diapause hormone have all been suggested as possible output signals from insect clock systems (*e.g.* Sehadová et al., 2007); isoforms of both corazonin and CCAP have been predicted from the *D. pulex* transcriptome and/or genome (Gard et al., 2009; Christie et al., 2011). Likewise, several peptide hormones have been shown to, or are postulated to show, circadian rhythms in their cycling in decapod crustaceans (Strauss and Dircksen, 2010), *i.e.* red pigment concentrating hormone and crustacean hyperglycemic hormone. Transcriptome and genome mining in *D. pulex* suggests that these hormonal systems too are present in this species (Gard et al., 2009; Christie et al., 2011). In fact, via transcriptome and genome mining over 100 peptide hormones have recently been identified in *D. pulex* (Gard et al., 2009; Christie et al., 2011). Here we have identified a putative PDH receptor protein, which, if we are correct in the peptide being a circadian signal in *Daphnia*, may function to transduce at least one of the core clocks output signals for the control of physiology and behavior in this species.

5. Conclusions and future directions

Circadian rhythms in physiology and behavior have been documented in numerous crustacean species; however, little is known about the molecular and/or cellular machinery underlying them in any member of this arthropod subphylum (Strauss and Dircksen, 2010). This said, their well-mapped nervous systems and amenability to in-depth

electrophysiological and molecular investigations make them an optimal group of animals for studying circadian biology. Moreover, the fact that many intertidal crustaceans exhibit both circadian and circatidal rhythms make these animals an ideal model to explore possible interactions between circadian and circatidal signaling systems, including whether these two timekeeping systems use common or distinct molecular and/or cellular components.

Clearly the first step toward understanding circadian signaling in any species is obtaining knowledge of the molecules required for the establishment of the core clock. Here, we have achieved this milepost for the cladoceran crustacean *D. pulex* using a strategy combining genome mining and phylogenetic comparisons to known previously identified circadian proteins. *D. pulex* is now the only crustacean for which a putative set of circadian genes and proteins are known. With these data, we are now positioned to begin functional studies directed at determining if the mRNAs of the identified genes cycle in a circadian fashion and, if so, whether these rhythms are similar to those seen in insects. Similarly, the proteins deduced from these identified genes now allows for the generation of *Daphnia*-specific antibodies to these molecules, which will be useful both for mapping the distribution of these proteins and for determining if they cycle in manners similar to their insect counterparts. Finally, the identification of the *D. pulex* circadian genes described here now provide targets for knockdown experiments designed to elucidate the functional roles their encoded proteins play in the establishment of circadian signaling in this and other crustacean species.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Joseph Shaw (Indiana University) and Benjamin King (MDIBL) are thanked for assisting us in developing a strategy to mesh the BLAST+ 2.2.23 software with the beta-release of the *Daphnia pulex* genome assembly. Financial support for this work was provided by: NIH P20 RR046463-10 from the INBRE Program of the National Center for Research Resources (Patricia Hand, Ph.D., Principal Investigator) and through institutional funds provided by MDIBL (to AEC). The authors acknowledge that the sequencing of the genome and portions of the analyses of it was performed at the DOE Joint Genome Institute under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Energy's Office of Science, Biological and Environmental Research Program, and by the University of California, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory under Contract No. W-7405-Eng-48, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231, Los Alamos National Laboratory under Contract No. W-7405-ENG-36, and in collaboration with the *Daphnia* Genomics Consortium (DGC; [http://](http://daphnia.cgb.indiana.edu) [daphnia.cgb.indiana.edu\)](http://daphnia.cgb.indiana.edu). Additional analyses were performed by wFleaBase, developed at the Genome Informatics Laboratory of Indiana University with support to Don Gilbert from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health. Coordination infrastructure for the DGC is provided by The Center for Genomics and Bioinformatics at Indiana University, which is supported in part by the METACyt Initiative of Indiana University, funded in part through a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc.

References

Adams MD, Celniker SE, Holt RA, Evans CA, Gocayne JD, Amanatides PG, Scherer SE, Li PW, Hoskins RA, Galle RF, George RA, Lewis SE, Richards S, Ashburner M, Henderson SN, Sutton GG, Wortman JR, Yandell MD, Zhang Q, Chen LX, Brandon RC, Rogers YH, Blazej RG, Champe M, Pfeiffer BD, Wan KH, Doyle C, Baxter EG, Helt G, Nelson CR, Gabor GL, Abril JF, Agbayani A, An HJ, Andrews-Pfannkoch C, Baldwin D, Ballew RM, Basu A, Baxendale J, Bayraktaroglu L, Beasley EM, Beeson KY, Benos PV, Berman BP, Bhandari D, Bolshakov S, Borkova D, Botchan MR, Bouck J, Brokstein P, Brottier P, Burtis KC, Busam DA, Butler H, Cadieu E, Center A,

Chandra I, Cherry JM, Cawley S, Dahlke C, Davenport LB, Davies P, de Pablos B, Delcher A, Deng Z, Mays AD, Dew I, Dietz SM, Dodson K, Doup LE, Downes M, Dugan-Rocha S, Dunkov BC, Dunn P, Durbin KJ, Evangelista CC, Ferraz C, Ferriera S, Fleischmann W, Fosler C, Gabrielian AE, Garg NS, Gelbart WM, Glasser K, Glodek A, Gong F, Gorrell JH, Gu Z, Guan P, Harris M, Harris NL, Harvey D, Heiman TJ, Hernandez JR, Houck J, Hostin D, Houston KA, Howland TJ, Wei MH, Ibegwam C, Jalali M, Kalush F, Karpen GH, Ke Z, Kennison JA, Ketchum KA, Kimmel BE, Kodira CD, Kraft C, Kravitz S, Kulp D, Lai Z, Lasko P, Lei Y, Levitsky AA, Li J, Li Z, Liang Y, Lin X, Liu X, Mattei B, McIntosh TC, McLeod MP, McPherson D, Merkulov G, Milshina NV, Mobarry C, Morris J, Moshrefi A, Mount SM, Moy M, Murphy B, Murphy L, Muzny DM, Nelson DL, Nelson DR, Nelson KA, Nixon K, Nusskern DR, Pacleb JM, Palazzolo M, Pittman GS, Pan S, Pollard J, Puri V, Reese MG, Reinert K, Remington K, Saunders RD, Scheeler F, Shen H, Shue BC, Sidén-Kiamos I, Simpson M, Skupski MP, Smith T, Spier E, Spradling AC, Stapleton M, Strong R, Sun E, Svirskas R, Tector C, Turner R, Venter E, Wang AH, Wang X, Wang ZY, Wassarman DA, Weinstock GM, Weissenbach J, Williams SM, Woodage T, Worley KC, Wu D, Yang S, Yao QA, Ye J, Yeh RF, Zaveri JS, Zhan M, Zhang G, Zhao Q, Zheng L, Zheng XH, Zhong FN, Zhong W, Zhou X, Zhu S, Zhu X, Smith HO, Gibbs RA, Myers EW, Rubin GM, Venter JC. The genome sequence of *Drosophila melanogaster*. Science. 2000; 287:2185–2195. [PubMed: 10731132]

Allada R, Chung BY. Circadian organization of behavior and physiology in *Drosophila*. Annu Rev Physiol. 2010; 72:605–624. [PubMed: 20148690]

- Bae K, Lee C, Sidote D, Chuang KY, Edery I. Circadian regulation of a *Drosophila* homolog of the mammalian Clock gene: PER and TIM function as positive regulators. Mol Cell Biol. 1998; 18:6142–6151. [PubMed: 9742131]
- Bauer DJ. The *Daphnia* genomics consortium meeting: the genome biology of the model crustacean *Daphnia*. Expert Rev Proteomics. 2007; 4:601–602. [PubMed: 17941814]
- Chang DC, Reppert SM. A novel C-terminal domain of *Drosophila* PERIOD inhibits dCLOCK:CYCLE-mediated transcription. Current Biol. 2003; 13:758–762.
- Christie AE, McCoole MD, Harmon SM, Baer KN, Lenz PH. Genomic analyses of the *Daphnia pulex* peptidome. Gen Comp Endocrinol. 2011; 171:131–150. [PubMed: 21216245]
- Colbourne JK, Pfrender ME, Gilbert D, Thomas WK, Tucker A, Oakley TH, Tokishita S, Aerts A, Arnold GJ, Basu MK, Bauer DJ, Cáceres CE, Carmel L, Casola C, Choi JH, Detter JC, Dong Q, Dusheyko S, Eads BD, Fröhlich T, Geiler-Samerotte KA, Gerlach D, Hatcher P, Jogdeo S, Krijgsveld J, Kriventseva EV, Kültz D, Laforsch C, Lindquist E, Lopez J, Manak JR, Muller J, Pangilinan J, Patwardhan RP, Pitluck S, Pritham EJ, Rechtsteiner A, Rho M, Rogozin IB, Sakarya O, Salamov A, Schaack S, Shapiro H, Shiga Y, Skalitzky C, Smith Z, Souvorov A, Sung W, Tang Z, Tsuchiya D, Tu H, Vos H, Wang M, Wolf YI, Yamagata H, Yamada T, Ye Y, Shaw JR, Andrews J, Crease TJ, Tang H, Lucas SM, Robertson HM, Bork P, Koonin EV, Zdobnov EM, Grigoriev IV, Lynch M, Boore JL. The ecoresponsive genome of *Daphnia pulex*. Science. 2011; 331:555–561. [PubMed: 21292972]
- Colbourne JK, Singan VR, Gilbert DG. wFleaBase: the *Daphnia* genome database. BMC Bioinformatics. 2005; 6:45. [PubMed: 15752432]
- Cortés T, Tagu D, Simon JC, Moya A, Martínez-Torres D. Sex versus parthenogenesis: a transcriptomic approach of photoperiod response in the model aphid *Acyrthosiphon pisum* (Hemiptera: Aphididae). Gene. 2008; 408:146–156. [PubMed: 18065167]
- Dombrádi V, Axton JM, Brewis ND, da Cruz e Silva EF, Alphey L, Cohen PT. *Drosophila* contains three genes that encode distinct isoforms of protein phosphatase 1. Eur J Biochem. 1990; 194:739– 745. [PubMed: 2176604]
- Emery P, So WV, Kaneko M, Hall JC, Rosbash M. CRY, a *Drosophila* clock and light-regulated cryptochrome, is a major contributor to circadian rhythm resetting and photosensitivity. Cell. 1998; 95:669–679. [PubMed: 9845369]
- Force A, Lynch M, Pickett FB, Amores A, Yan Y, Postlethwait J. Preservation of duplicate genes by complementary, degenerative mutations. Genetics. 1999; 151:1531–1545. [PubMed: 10101175]
- Gard AL, Lenz PH, Shaw JR, Christie AE. Identification of putative peptide paracrines/hormones in the water flea *Daphnia pulex* (Crustacea; Branchiopoda; Cladocera) using transcriptomics and immunohistochemistry. Gen Comp Endocrinol. 2009; 160:271–287. [PubMed: 19135444]

- Huerta-Cepas J, Marcet-Houben M, Pignatelli M, Moya A, Gabaldón T. The pea aphid phylome: a complete catalogue of evolutionary histories and arthropod orthology and paralogy relationships for *Acyrthosiphon pisum* genes. Insect Mol Biol. 2010; 19(Suppl 2):13–21. [PubMed: 20482636]
- Katoh K, Toh H. Recent developments in the MAFFT multiple sequence alignment program. Brief Bioinform. 2008; 9:286–298. [PubMed: 18372315]
- Lampert W. The adaptive significance of diel vertical migration of zooplankton. Funct Ecol. 1989; 3:21–27.
- Letunic I, Doerks T, Bork P. SMART 6: recent updates and new developments. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009; 37:D229–D232. [PubMed: 18978020]
- Lin C, Todo T. The cryptochromes. Genome Biol. 2005; 6:220. [PubMed: 15892880]
- Lin SC, Lin MH, Horváth P, Reddy KL, Storti RV. PDP1, a novel *Drosophila* PAR domain bZIP transcription factor expressed in developing mesoderm, endoderm and ectoderm, is a transcriptional regulator of somatic muscle genes. Development. 1997; 124:4685–4696. [PubMed: 9409684]
- Loose C. *Daphnia* diel vertical migration behaviour: response to vertebrate predator abundance. Arch Hydrobiol Heih Ergebn Limnol. 1993; 39:29–36.
- Loose C, Dawidowicz P. Trade-offs in diel vertical migration by zooplankton: the costs of predator avoidance. Ecology. 1994; 75:2255–2263.
- Mazzotta GM, De Pittà C, Benna C, Tosatto SC, Lanfranchi G, Bertolucci C, Costa R. A cry from the krill. Chronobiol Int. 2010; 27:425–445. [PubMed: 20524794]
- McCoole MD, Baer KN, Christie AE. Histaminergic signaling in the central nervous system of *Daphnia* and a role for it in the control of phototactic behavior. J Exp Biol. 2011; 214:1773–1782. [PubMed: 21525325]
- McTaggart SJ, Conlon C, Colbourne JK, Blaxter ML, Little TJ. The components of the *Daphnia pulex* immune system as revealed by complete genome sequencing. BMC Genomics. 2009; 10:175. [PubMed: 19386092]
- Ollivier M, Legeai F, Rispe C. Comparative analysis of the *Acyrthosiphon pisum* genome and expressed sequence tag-based gene sets from other aphid species. Insect Mol Biol. 2010; 19:33– 45. [PubMed: 20482638]
- Ousley A, Zafarullah K, Chen Y, Emerson M, Hickman L, Sehgal A. Conserved regions of the timeless (tim) clock gene in *Drosophila* analyzed through phylogenetic and functional studies. Genetics. 1998; 148:815–825. [PubMed: 9504927]
- Rewitz KF, Gilbert LI. *Daphnia* Halloween genes that encode cytochrome P450s mediating the synthesis of the arthropod molting hormone: evolutionary implications. BMC Evol Biol. 2008; 8:60. [PubMed: 18298845]
- Saez L, Young MW. Regulation of nuclear entry of the *Drosophila* clock proteins Period and Timeless. Neuron. 1996; 17:979–990. [PubMed: 8938129]
- Salomé PA, McClung CR. *PSEUDO-RESPONSE REGULATOR 7* and *9* are partially redundant genes essential for the temperature responsiveness of the *Arabidopsis* circadian clock. Plant Cell. 2005; 17:791–803. [PubMed: 15705949]
- Salomé PA, Weigel D, McClung CR. The role of Arabidopsis morning loop components CCA1, LHY, PRR7, and PRR9 in temperature compensation. Plant Cell. 2010; 22:3650–3661. [PubMed: 21098730]
- Sandrelli F, Tauber E, Pegoraro M, Mazzotta G, Cisotto P, Landskron J, Stanewsky R, Piccin A, Rosato E, Zordan M, Costa R, Kyriacou CR. Selection at the *timeless* locus in *Drosophila melanogaster*. Science. 2007; 316:1898–1900. [PubMed: 17600216]
- Sawyer LA, Hennessy JM, Peixoto AA, Rosato E, Parkinson H, Costa R, Kyriacou CP. Natural variation in a *Drosophila* clock gene and temperature compensation. Science. 1997; 278:2117– 2120. [PubMed: 9405346]
- Schultz J, Milpetz F, Bork P, Ponting CP. SMART, a mimple modular achitecture research tool: identification of signaling domains. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA. 1998; 95:5857–5864. [PubMed: 9600884]
- Sehadová H, Shao QM, Sehnal F, Takeda M. Neurohormones as putative circadian clock output signals in the central nervous system of two cricket species. Cell Tissue Res. 2007; 328:239–255. [PubMed: 17151870]
- Shigenobu S, Bickel RD, Brisson JA, Butts T, Chang CC, Christiaens O, Davis GK, Duncan EJ, Ferrier DE, Iga M, Janssen R, Lin GW, Lu HL, McGregor AP, Miura T, Smagghe G, Smith JM, van der Zee M, Velarde RA, Wilson MJ, Dearden PK, Stern DL. Comprehensive survey of developmental genes in the pea aphid, *Acyrthosiphon pisum*: frequent lineage-specific duplications and losses of developmental genes. Insect Mol Biol. 2010; 19:47–62. [PubMed: 20482639]
- Stollewerk A. The water flea *Daphnia* a 'new' model system for ecology and evolution? J Biol. 2010; 9:21. [PubMed: 20478012]
- Strauss J, Dircksen H. Circadian clocks in crustaceans: identified neuronal and cellular systems. Front Biosci. 2010; 15:1040–1074.
- Strauß J, Zhang Q, Verleyen P, Huybrechts J, Neupert S, Predel R, Pauwels K, Dircksen H. Pigmentdispersing hormone in *Daphnia* interneurons, one type homologous to insect clock neurons displaying circadian rhythmicity. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2011 In press.
- Tautz D. Not just another genome. BMC Biol. 2011; 9:8. [PubMed: 21294909]
- Tomaiuolo M, Bertram R, Houle D. Enzyme isoforms may increase phenotypic robustness. Evolution. 2008; 62:2884–2893. [PubMed: 18752604]
- Tomioka K, Matsumoto A. A Comparative view of insect circadian clock systems. Cell Mol Life Sci. 2010; 67:1397–1406. [PubMed: 20035363]
- Tweedie S, Ashburner M, Falls K, Leyland P, McQuilton P, Marygold S, Millburn G, Osumi-Sutherland D, Schroeder A, Seal R, Zhang H, FlyBase Consortium. FlyBase: enhancing *Drosophila* Gene Ontology annotations. Nucleic Acids Res. 2009; 37:D555–D559. [PubMed: 18948289]
- Yang JS, Dai ZM, Yang F, Yang WJ. Molecular cloning of Clock cDNA from the prawn, *Macrobrachium rosenbergii*. Brain Res. 2006; 1067:13–24. [PubMed: 16271708]
- Yuan Q, Metterville D, Briscoe AD, Reppert SM. Insect cryptochromes: gene duplication and loss define diverse ways to construct insect circadian clocks. Mol Biol Evol. 2007; 24:948–955. [PubMed: 17244599]
- Zhu H, Sauman I, Yuan Q, Casselman A, Emery-Le M, Emery P, Reppert SM. Cryptochromes define a novel circadian clock mechanism in monarch butterflies that may underlie sun compass navigation. PLoS Biol. 2008; 6:e4. [PubMed: 18184036]
- Zhu H, Yuan Q, Briscoe AD, Froy O, Casselman A, Reppert SM. The two CRYs of the butterfly. Curr Biol. 2005; 15:R953–954. [PubMed: 16332522]

A. Drosophila vs. Daphnia CASEIN KINASE II (CKII) α -subunit

B. Drosophila vs. Daphnia CKII β-subunit

 \cdot

Figure 1.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* CASEIN KINASE II (CKII) α- and β-subunit proteins. (**A**) Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* CKII α-subunit (Drome-CKII α) with *D. pulex* CKII α-subunit (Dappu-CKII α). (**B**). Alignment of *D. melanogaster* CKII βsubunit (Drome-CKII β) with *D. pulex* CKII β-subunit (Dappu-CKII β). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, serine/threonine kinase catalytic domains predicted by SMART analyses are highlighted in red.

A. Drosophila vs. Daphnia CLOCK (CLK)

B. Macrobrachium vs. Daphnia CLK

Figure 2.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* CLOCK (CLK) protein. (**A**) Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* CLK (Drome-CLK) with *D. pulex* CLK (Dappu-CLK). (**B**). Alignment of *Macrobrachium rosenbergii* CLK (Macro-CLK) with Dappu-CLK. In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, helix-loop-helix, PAS, PAC and coiled-coil domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in green, light blue, blue, and pink, respectively.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia CLOCKWORK ORANGE (CWO)

Figure 3.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* CLOCKWORK ORANGE (CWO) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* CWO (Drome-CWO) with *D. pulex* CWO (Dappu-CWO). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, helixloop-helix and orange domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in green and yellow, respectively.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia CYCLE (CYC)

Figure 4.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* CYCLE (CYC) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* CYC (Drome-CYC) with *D. pulex* CYC (Dappu-CYC). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, helix-loop-helix, PAS and PAC domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in green, light blue and blue respectively.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia DOUBLETIME (DBT)

Figure 5.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* DOUBLETIME (DBT) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* DBT (Drome-DBT) with *D. pulex* DBT (Dappu-DBT). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, serine/ threonine kinase domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in red.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia PAR DOMAIN PROTEIN 1 ε (PDP1 ε)

Figure 6.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* PAR DOMAIN PROTEIN 1ε (PDP1ε) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* PDP1ε (Drome-PDP1ε) with *D. pulex* PDP1ε (Dappu-PDP1ε). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, basic region leucine zipper domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in dark blue.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia PERIOD (PER)

-PER

Figure 7.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* PERIOD (PER) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* PER (Drome-PER) with *D. pulex* PER (Dappu-PER). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved,

while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, PAS and PAC domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in light blue and blue, respectively.

A. <i>Drosophila vs. Daphnia</i> FROTEIN FHOSFHATASE I (FFI)	
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	M--SDIMNIDSIISRLLEVRGARPGKNVOLSESEIRSLCLKSREIFLSQPILLELEAPLK MAETDKLNIDSIIARLLEVRGSRPGKNVOLTENEIRGLCLKSREIFLSQPILLELEAPLK
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	ICGDIHGQYYDLLRLFEYGGFPPESNYLFLGDYVDRGKQSLETICLLLAYKIKYAENFFL ICGDIHGOYYDLLRLFEYGGFPPESNYLFLGDYVDRGKOSLETICLLLAYKIKYPENFFL
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	LRGNHECASINRIYGFYDECKRRYTIKLWKTFTDCFNCLPVAAIVDEKIFCCHGGLSPDL LRGNHECASINRIYGFYDECKRRYNIKLWKTFTDCFNCLPVAAIVDEKIFCCHGGLSPDL
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	SSMEQIRRIMRPTDVPDQGLLCDLLWSDPDKDTMGWGENDRGVSFTFGAEVVGKFLQKHE OSMEOIRRIMRPTDVPDOGLLCDLLWSDPDKDTMGWGENDRGVSFTFGAEVVAKFLHKHD
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	FDLICRAHQVVEDGYEFFAKRQLVTLFSAPNYCGEFDNAGAMMSVDDTLMCSFQILKPAD MDLICRAHOVVEDGYEFFAKROLVTLFSAPNYCGEFDNAGAMMSVDETLMCSFOILKPAD
Drome-PP1 Dappu-PP1 A	KRRFVYPNFGSSGRPLTPPRGA----NNKNKKK KKKFPYGGL-NTGRPMTPPRGGPOAKONKGKNK *::* * .: .:***:*****. $***.*.*$
	B. Daphnia PP1 A vs. PP1 B
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	MAETDKLNIDSIIARLLEVRGSRPGKNVOLTENEIRGLCLKSREIFLSOPILLELEAPLK M--ADDLNVDSIISRLLEVRGCRPGKSVOMTEAEVRGLCLKSREIFLOOPILLELEAPLK
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	ICGDIHGOYYDLLRLFEYGGFPPESNYLFLGDYVDRGKOSLETICLLLAYKIKYPENFFL ICGDIHGOYTDLLRLFEYGGFPPEANYLFLGDYVDRGKOSLETICLLLAYKIKYPENFFL
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	LRGNHECASINRIYGFYDECKRRYNIKLWKTFTDCFNCLPVAAIVDEKIFCCHGGLSPDL LRGNHECASINRIYGFYDECKRRYNIKLWKTFTDCFNCLPIAAIIDEKIFCCHGGLSPDL
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	OSMEOIRRIMRPTDVPDOGLLCDLLWSDPDKDTMGWGENDRGVSFTFGAEVVAKFLHKHD ONMDOIKRIMRPTDVPDTGLLCDLLWSDPDKDVOGWSENDRGVSFTFGADVVSKFLNRHD
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	MDLICRAHQVVEDGYEFFAKRQLVTLFSAPNYCGEFDNAGAMMSVDETLMCSFQILKPAD LDLICRAHOVVEDGYEFFAKROLVTLFSAPNYCGEFDNAGGMMSVDETLMCSFOILKPSE
Dappu-PP1 A Dappu-PP1 B	KK-KFPYGGLNTGRPMTPPRGGPOAKONK--GKNK KKAKYOYSGINATKP--------NAAANKPVPKKK ** *: *.*:*: :* $* : *$

Drosophila vs. Daphnia PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1 (PP1)

Figure 8.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1 (PP1) proteins. (**A**) Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* PP1 (Drome-PP1) with *D. pulex* PP1 A (Dappu-PP1 A). (**B**). Alignment of Dappu-PP1 A and PP1 B. In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, serine/threonine kinase domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in red.

**PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A (PP2A)
A. Drosophila vs. Daphnia PP2A catalytic subunit –
MICROTUBULE STAR (MTS)**

Mappu-WBT A
Mappu-WBT B

Figure 9.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A (PP2A) proteins. (**A**) Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* PP2A catalytic subunit MICROTUBULE STAR (MTS) protein (Drome-MTS) with *D. pulex* MTS (Dappu-MTS). (**B1**). Alignment of *D. melanogaster* PP2A regulatory subunit WIDERBORST (WBT) protein (Drome-WBT) with *D. pulex* WBT A (Dappu-WBT A). (**B2**). Alignment of Dappu-WBT A and Dappu-WBT B. (**C**). Alignment of *D. melanogaster* PP2A regulatory subunit TWINS (TWS) protein (Drome-WBT) with *D. pulex* TWS (Dappu-TWS). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, protein phosphatase 2A catalytic, coiled-coil and WD40 domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in dark green, pink and dark red, respectively.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia SHAGGY (SGG)

Figure 10.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* SHAGGY (SGG) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* SGG (Drome-SGG) with *D. pulex* SGG (Dappu-SGG). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, serine/threonine kinase domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in red.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia SUPERNUMERARY LIMBS (SLIMB)

Figure 11.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* SUPERNUMERARY LIMBS (SLIMB) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* SLIMB (Drome-SLIMB) with *D. pulex* SLIMB (Dappu-SLIMB). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, FBOX and WD40 domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in dark gray and dark red, respectively.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia TIMELESS (TIM)

NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Figure 12.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* TIMELESS (TIM) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* TIM (Drome-TIM) with *D. pulex* TIM A (Dappu-TIM A). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia VRILLE (VRI)

Figure 13.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* VRILLE (VRI) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* VRI (Drome-VRI) with *D. pulex* VRI (Dappu-VRI). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, basic region leucine zipper domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in dark blue.

 $: *$ $*$:: \ldots : \colon $: : : * * : : :$ \cdots \star \cdots \cdot

Figure 14.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* CRYPTOCHROME (CRY) proteins. (**A**) Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* CRY (Drome-CRY) with *D. pulex* CRY A (Dappu-CRY A). (**B**). Alignment of Dappu-CRY A–D. In the line immediately below each sequence

grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure.

Figure 15.

Alignment of *Daphnia pulex* CRYPTOCHROME (CRY) A and B with their *Danaus plexippus* homologs. (**A**) Alignment of *D. plexipus* CRY1 (Danpl-CRY1) with *D. pulex* CRY A (Dappu-CRY A). (**B**). Alignment of *D. plexipus* CRY2 (Danpl-CRY2) with *D. pulex* CRY B (Dappu-CRY B). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure.

Drosophila vs. Daphnia PIGMENT DISPERSING FACTOR/ HORMONE RECEPTOR (PDF/HR)

Figure 16.

Putative *Daphnia pulex* PIGMENT DISPERSING HORMONE RECEPTOR (PDHR) protein. Alignment of *Drosophila melanogaster* pigment dispersing factor receptor (Drome-PDFR) with *D. pulex* PDHR (Dappu-PDHR). In the line immediately below each sequence grouping, stars indicated amino acids that are identically conserved, while single and double dots denote amino acids that are similar in structure. In this figure, hormone receptor and transmembrane domains identified by SMART analyses are highlighted in black and light gray, respectively.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 1

Putative Daphnia pulex genes identified via genome mining Putative *Daphnia pulex* genes identified via genome mining

 † Gene annotated as "conserved protein" in wFleaBase. *†*Gene annotated as "conserved protein" in wFleaBase.

Comp Biochem Physiol Part D Genomics Proteomics. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 April 21.

Gene annotated as "dna photolyase" in wFleaBase. Gene annotated as "dna photolyase" in wFleaBase.

Gene annotated as "phr6-4, cryptochrome-1" in wFleaBase. Gene annotated as "phr6-4, cryptochrome-1" in wFleaBase.

 $\sqrt[t]{t}$ dene annotated as "phr6-4, cryptochrome-1" in wFleaBase. *‡*Gene annotated as "phr6-4, cryptochrome-1" in wFleaBase.

 $^+$ Gene annotated as "Cryptochrome-1" in w
FleaBase. *+*Gene annotated as "Cryptochrome-1" in wFleaBase.

 $\pounds_{\mbox{Gene annotated as ``class b secretin-like g-protein coupled receptor gpccal2'' in wFleabase.}}$ *£*Gene annotated as "class b secretin-like g-protein coupled receptor gprcal2" in wFleaBase.

NIH-PA Author Manuscript NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table 2

Reciprocal blasting of deduced Daphnia pulex proteins versus known Drosophila melanogaster protein sequences in FlyBase Reciprocal blasting of deduced *Daphnia pulex* proteins versus known *Drosophila melanogaster* protein sequences in FlyBase

PIGMENT DISPERSING FACTOR RECEPTOR; PDHR, PIGMENT DISPERSING HOROMONE RECEPTOR; PDPIe; PAR DOMAIN PROTEIN 1e; PER, PEROD; PHR, PHOTOLY ASE; PPI,
PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1; PP2A, PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A; SGG, SHAGGY; SLIMB, SUPE PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 1; PP2A, PROTEIN PHOSPHATASE 2A; SGG, SHAGGY; SLIMB, SUPERNUMERARY LIMBS; TIM, TIMELESS; TWS, TWINS; VRI, VRILLE; WBT, WIDERBORST. PIGMENT DISPERSING FACTOR RECEPTOR; PDHR, PIGMENT DISPERSING HOROMONE RECEPTOR; PDP1ε; PAR DOMAIN PROTEIN 1ε; PER, PERIOD; PHR, PHOTOLYASE; PP1, KWORK ORANGE; CYC, CYCLE; DBT, DOUBLETIME; MTS, MICROTUBULE STAR; PDFR, Abbreviations: CKII, casein kinase II; CLK, CLOCK; CRY, CRYPTOCHROME; CWO, CLOCKWORK ORANGE; CYC, CYCLE; DBT, DOUBLETIME; MTS, MICROTUBULE STAR; PDFR,

It should be noted that the group designations are based on the organization of the *Drosophila melanogaster* clock, whose proteins were used for querying the *Daphnia* genome. Unlike *Drosophila*, which possesses only CR possesses only CRY1 (an input pathway protein), *D. pulex* appears to contain multiple CRY isoforms, including both CRY1 and CRY2 (a core clock protein), though in this table, all are presented under the It should be noted that the group designations are based on the organization of the *Drosophila melanogaster* clock, whose proteins were used for querying the *Daphnia* genome. Unlike *Drosophila*, which "INPUT PATHWAY PROTEIN" heading. "INPUT PATHWAY PROTEIN" heading.

Table 3

 \overline{a}

 \overline{a}

 $\sqrt{2}$

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

*** excluding *Daphnia* proteins, partial proteins, synthetic constructs and provisional protein sequences.

Table 4

Matrix of percent amino acid identity/similarity between putative Daphnia pulex TIMELESS (TIM) proteins Matrix of percent amino acid identity/similarity between putative *Daphnia pulex* TIMELESS (TIM) proteins

Values shown are percent amino acid identity/similarity. Values shown are percent amino acid identity/similarity.

Percent identity = number of amino acids identically conserved between the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein. Percent identity = number of amino acids identically conserved between the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein.

Percent similarity = number of identical and similar amino acids in the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein Percent similarity = number of identical and similar amino acids in the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein

Table 5

Matrix of percent amino acid identity/similarity between putative Daphnia pulex CRYPTOCHROME (CRY) proteins Matrix of percent amino acid identity/similarity between putative *Daphnia pulex* CRYPTOCHROME (CRY) proteins

Values shown are percent amino acid identity/similarity. Values shown are percent amino acid identity/similarity.

Percent identity = number of amino acids identically conserved between the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein. Percent identity = number of amino acids identically conserved between the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein.

Percent similarity = number of identical and similar amino acids in the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein Percent similarity = number of identical and similar amino acids in the two proteins divided by the total number of amino acids in the longer protein