

Molecular design of the $\gamma\delta$ T cell receptor ectodomain encodes biologically fit ligand recognition in the absence of mechanosensing

Robert J. Mallis^{a,b,c,d,e}, Jonathan S. Duke-Cohan^{a,d,e}, Dibyendu Kumar Das^{f,g,1}, Aoi Akitsu^{a,d,e}, Adrienne M. Luoma^h, Debasis Banik^{f,g}, Hannah M. Stephens^{f,g}, Paul W. Tetteh^{a,d,e}, Caitlin D. Castro^h, Sophie Krahnke^h, Rebecca E. Hussey^a, Brian Lawneyⁱ, Kristine N. Brazin^{a,d,e}, Pedro A. Reche^j, Wonmuk Hwang^{k,l,m,n,2}, Erin J. Adams^{h,2}, Matthew J. Lang^{f,g,2}, and Ellis L. Reinherz^{a,d,e,2}

^aLaboratory of Immunobiology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA 02115; ^bDepartment of Biological Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115; ^cDepartment of Dermatology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115; ^dDepartment of Medical Oncology, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA 02115; ^eDepartment of Medicine, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115; ^fDepartment of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; ^gDepartment of Molecular Physiology and Biophysics, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; ^hDepartment of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637; ⁱDepartment of Biostatistics, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA 02115; ^jDepartment of Immunology, Faculty of Medicine, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain; ^kDepartment of Biomedical Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843; ^lDepartment of Materials Science and Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843; ^mDepartment of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX 77843; and ⁿSchool of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, 02455 Seoul, Korea

Edited by Michael L. Dustin, University of Oxford, Headington, United Kingdom, and accepted by Editorial Board Member Peter Cresswell May 25, 2021 (received for review November 16, 2020)

High-acuity $\alpha\beta$ T cell receptor (TCR) recognition of peptides bound to major histocompatibility complex molecules (pMHCs) requires mechanosensing, a process whereby piconewton (pN) bioforces exert physical load on $\alpha\beta$ TCR–pMHC bonds to dynamically alter their lifetimes and foster digital sensitivity cellular signaling. While mechanotransduction is operative for both $\alpha\beta$ TCRs and pre-TCRs within the $\alpha\beta$ T lineage, its role in $\gamma\delta$ T cells is unknown. Here, we show that the human DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR specific for the sulfoglycolipid sulfatide bound to CD1d only sustains a significant load and undergoes force-induced structural transitions when the binding interface-distal $\gamma\delta$ constant domain (C) module is replaced with that of $\alpha\beta$. The chimeric $\gamma\delta$ – $\alpha\beta$ TCR also signals more robustly than does the wild-type (WT) $\gamma\delta$ TCR, as revealed by RNA-sequencing (RNA-seq) analysis of TCR-transduced *Rag2*^{−/−} thymocytes, consistent with structural, single-molecule, and molecular dynamics studies reflective of $\gamma\delta$ TCRs as mediating recognition via a more canonical immunoglobulin-like receptor interaction. Absence of robust, force-related catch bonds, as well as $\gamma\delta$ TCR structural transitions, implies that $\gamma\delta$ T cells do not use mechanosensing for ligand recognition. This distinction is consonant with the fact that their innate-type ligands, including markers of cellular stress, are expressed at a high copy number relative to the sparse pMHC ligands of $\alpha\beta$ T cells arrayed on activating target cells. We posit that mechanosensing emerged over ~200 million years of vertebrate evolution to fulfill indispensable adaptive immune recognition requirements for pMHC in the $\alpha\beta$ T cell lineage that are unnecessary for the $\gamma\delta$ T cell lineage mechanism of non-pMHC ligand detection.

T cell receptor | mechanosensor | optical tweezers | T cell activation | $\gamma\delta$ T cells

Within jawed vertebrates (Gnathostoma), $\alpha\beta$ and $\gamma\delta$ T cells utilize somatic genomic rearrangement to generate a receptor repertoire large enough to recognize the enormous diversity of viral or other pathogen-derived antigens and then mount a protective immune response (1–4). $\alpha\beta$ T cells are prominent in blood and lymph nodes while $\gamma\delta$ T cells are more abundant in barrier tissues including skin, intestinal and other epithelia, suggesting distinct, nonredundant roles for each T lineage subset (5, 6). Whereas the vast majority of $\alpha\beta$ T lymphocytes recognize sparse “foreign” peptides within a vast array of normal self-peptides processed and presented by classical major histocompatibility complex (MHC) molecules on the surface of pathogen-infected or otherwise damaged cells, this is almost without exception not

the case for $\gamma\delta$ T cells (7–9). Instead, $\gamma\delta$ T cells recognize ligands, including self-derived and plentiful stress-induced nonpeptide ligands, diverse in structure and distinct from classical MHC molecules (6, 8, 10–17). Furthermore, $\gamma\delta$ T cells are generally in an activation state capable of mediating rapid (i.e., minutes- to hours-long time frames) innate-like cytotoxicity and cytokine release, in contrast to $\alpha\beta$ T cells, which exist in distinct naïve, effector, and memory states (6, 18). Naïve $\alpha\beta$ T cells become cytotoxic or mediate cytokine/chemokine-based inflammation only following differentiation that requires exposure over several days to antigen and costimulatory molecules on professional antigen-presenting cells (APCs).

Over the last decade, it has become increasingly clear that contrary to conventional receptor–ligand interactions exemplified by antigen–antibody binding, bioforces are essential for nonthermal equilibrium, mechanosensor-based $\alpha\beta$ T cell activation (19–26). $\alpha\beta$ T cell motility and the local cytoskeletal machinery

Significance

TCR mechanosensing is thought necessary for digital sensitivity of $\alpha\beta$ T cell response to scant pMHC antigens. We use bioinformatic analysis, molecular dynamics, single-molecule optical tweezers techniques, cellular activation, and RNA-seq analysis to explore this paradigm in the $\gamma\delta$ T cell lineage. We find that, in keeping with its role in recognizing abundant cell-surface ligands, the $\gamma\delta$ TCR lacks force-dependent hallmarks of mechanosensing in $\alpha\beta$ T cells.

Author contributions: R.J.M., J.S.D.-C., W.H., E.J.A., M.J.L., and E.L.R. designed research; R.J.M., J.S.D.-C., D.K.D., A.A., A.M.L., D.B., H.M.S., P.W.T., C.D.C., S.K., R.E.H., B.L., K.N.B., P.A.R., and W.H. performed research; R.J.M., J.S.D.-C., A.M.L., and C.D.C. contributed new reagents/analytic tools; R.J.M., J.S.D.-C., D.K.D., A.A., D.B., K.N.B., P.A.R., W.H., M.J.L., and E.L.R. analyzed data; and R.J.M., J.S.D.-C., W.H., E.J.A., M.J.L., and E.L.R. wrote the paper.

The authors declare no competing interest.

This article is a PNAS Direct Submission. M.L.D. is a guest editor invited by the Editorial Board.

This open access article is distributed under [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 \(CC BY\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

¹Department of Biological Sciences and Bioengineering, Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh 208016, India.

²To whom correspondence may be addressed. Email: hwm@tamu.edu, ejadams@uchicago.edu, matt.lang@vanderbilt.edu, or ellis_reinherz@dfci.harvard.edu.

This article contains supporting information online at <https://www.pnas.org/lookup/suppl/doi:10.1073/pnas.2023050118/-DCSupplemental>.

Published June 25, 2021.

place physical load on individual $\alpha\beta$ TCR–pMHC bonds, which tunes both the sensitivity and specificity of $\alpha\beta$ TCR recognition (19). In fact, chemical thresholds in the absence of external load require a 1,000- to 10,000-fold higher number of pMHC molecules than observed physiologically to trigger cellular $\alpha\beta$ T cell activation (20). In contrast, under force the ligand-mediated induction of the $\alpha\beta$ T cell biological response can be essentially digital. Mechanistically, physical load fosters stability and interfacial matching as well as a temporally correlated structural transition in the $\alpha\beta$ TCR heterodimer ectodomain that strengthens bond lifetime (i.e., a “catch bond”), energizes the $\alpha\beta$ TCR and induces $\alpha\beta$ TCR complex quaternary change, conformationally altering the transmembrane (TM) segments and lipids surrounding the TCR and thereby exposing the immunoreceptor tyrosine-based activation motifs (ITAMs) in the cytoplasmic tails of the associated signaling CD3 for phosphorylation (19, 27–29 and refs. therein). As the structural transition of the TCR $\alpha\beta$ heterodimer is itself reversible in the context of relevant bioforces, a ligated TCR can be repetitively energized by the same pMHC in the absence of its release, thereby perpetuating the activation geometry of the $\alpha\beta$ TCR and surrounding membrane to optimize cognate antigen-dependent signaling performance, accounting for high acuity recognition (21, 30).

The role of bioforces in $\gamma\delta$ TCR recognition has not been addressed. Here, we examine the character of physical load in $\gamma\delta$ TCR signaling, comparing and contrasting with $\alpha\beta$ TCR signaling, using a combination of single-molecule (SM) optical tweezers-based technology, molecular dynamics (MD) simulation, transcriptomics, and functional analyses. For this purpose, we selected the DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR, since it is structurally well characterized and binds the MHCIIb molecule, CD1d, in complex with a defined ligand, sulfatide. This TCR–ligand pair is similar in overall three-dimensional topology and size to complexes of peptides bound to MHCII K^b or D^b molecules used in related work in $\alpha\beta$ TCR systems (31). Our findings reveal that the DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR, unlike $\alpha\beta$ TCRs, does not bear the force-sensitive hallmarks of a functional mechanosensor. Instead, although DP10.7 binds ligand with submicromolar affinity under zero force, it readily dissociates from its ligand under force loading. By creating a chimeric V $\gamma\delta$ –C $\alpha\beta$ TCR in which C $\alpha\beta$ replaces C $\gamma\delta$, we define a gain of function that supports mechanotransduction comparable to the level of a wild-type (WT) $\alpha\beta$ TCR. Moreover, RNA-sequencing (RNA-seq) analysis at the double negative (DN) thymocyte stages following retroviral transduction of TCRs into *Rag2*^{−/−} thymocyte progenitors reveals that such a chimeric TCR complex augments signaling compared to thymocytes expressing the wild-type $\gamma\delta$ TCR. Collectively, these findings inform that mechanotransduction associated with structural transitions and dynamic bond formation are linked to the constant domains in $\alpha\beta$ TCRs rather than a property of their variable domains per se. We reconcile our data with those of prior studies suggesting that $\gamma\delta$ TCR signaling is stronger than that of $\alpha\beta$ TCR during thymocyte development. Lastly, we discuss how structural differences between these two lineages of TCRs are well aligned with their distinct ligand specificities and attendant biology.

Results


The C β FG Loop Structurally Distinguishes $\alpha\beta$ from $\gamma\delta$ TCRs. We have previously characterized the mechanotransducing properties of the $\alpha\beta$ TCR at the SM and single-molecule–single-cell (SMSC) level and have noted signaling correlates with several structural features (19, 21, 27, 28, 30). Tied to preservation of the force-mediated catch bond, a requisite feature in pMHC ligand discrimination is the C β FG loop. We observe that the $\gamma\delta$ TCR, while sharing many features with the $\alpha\beta$ TCR, including CD3 components and general ectodomain organization, lacks the large FG loop in its homologous C γ domain as compared to the C β FG loop within the $\alpha\beta$ TCR (Fig. 1A). The C β FG loop but not that of C γ appears to buttress the region joining the V and C domains

(Fig. 1A). Multiple sequence alignment of mammalian C domains, comparing C β and C γ with C regions of human or murine immunoglobulin heavy (IgH) subtypes clearly shows that the extensive FG loop (containing a 12- to 13-amino-acid insertion relative to the heavy chain constant region domain 1 [CH1]) is a conserved feature only within the $\alpha\beta$ TCR (Fig. 1B). This contrasts with otherwise high structural conservation throughout the domains. Lack of the distinct FG loop feature within C γ could plausibly indicate either that equivalent mechanotransduction is not a property of the $\gamma\delta$ TCR, or alternatively that C δ may provide the avenue of mechanosensing, particularly given the predominance of the V δ in several characterized $\gamma\delta$ TCR–ligand interactions (10, 31, 32).

C β FG Loop Stabilizes the V–C Interface in $\alpha\beta$ and Chimeric $\gamma\delta$ – $\alpha\beta$ TCRs Relative to $\gamma\delta$ TCR. As we (19, 33) and others (34) have noted, the C β FG loop provides significant structural contact between V β and C β that is absent in the antibody V–C interface (~ 350 Å² versus ~ 150 Å² buried surface areas, respectively). Our previous MD simulation on TCR $\alpha\beta$ showed that the C β FG loop influences the motion of the variable domains relative to the constant domains, as well as imposes an orientational restraint of the former while facing pMHC, which enables a load- and ligand-dependent control of the bond lifetime (29). Comparative MD simulations of the TCR structures used in the present study show that the V γ –C γ interface has significantly fewer high-occupancy contacts as compared to V β –C β [Fig. 2A, V–C(β/γ); also see *SI Appendix, Fig. S1*], and similar to the α -chain of TCR $\alpha\beta$, the δ -chain has few V–C contacts [Fig. 2A, V–C(α/δ) group]. Thus, the TCR $\gamma\delta$ constant domains are unlikely to have any strong influence on the conformational motion of the variable domains. Another property important for mechanosensing in TCR $\alpha\beta$ is the compliance of the V α –V β interface, leading the interface with pMHC to be responsive to and controlled by an applied load. In our previous simulation, TCR $\alpha\beta$ lacking the C β FG loop had an increased number of V α –V β contacts (29). The higher number of nonpolar V γ –V δ contacts (Fig. 2A, V–V group) also suggests a reduced compliance, which further makes TCR $\gamma\delta$ unsuitable for mechanosensing. In contrast, when C $\alpha\beta$ was substituted for C $\gamma\delta$ the number of V γ –C β contacts increased, comparable to that of the full TCR $\alpha\beta$ [blue in Fig. 2A, V–C(β/γ), *SI Appendix, Fig. S1*], perhaps explaining why chimeric V $\gamma\delta$ –C $\alpha\beta$ ectodomain constructs have been successfully utilized in structural studies of TCR $\gamma\delta$ (31). The C β FG loop structurally supports the V γ domain as well, forming nearly half of its high-occupancy contacts (Fig. 2B). Our simulations thus suggest that not only will the $\gamma\delta$ TCR lack the requisite allosteric connections for mechanotransduction, but also that these connections should form in chimeric V $\gamma\delta$ –C $\alpha\beta$ constructs mainly via nonpolar contacts (*SI Appendix, Fig. S1*). By this analysis it would also appear that the V δ –C δ interface is unlikely to compensate for the relative paucity of contacts in the V γ –C γ interface and shift the mechanosensing potentiation to the δ -subunit.

The $\gamma\delta$ TCR Lacks Strong Mechanotransduction Elements, which Are Rescued by Replacement of $\gamma\delta$ C Domains with Those of $\alpha\beta$. To experimentally determine whether or not the TCR $\gamma\delta$ has the potential for mechanosensing by direct biophysical analyses, we utilized the DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR (DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$) in SM experiments to test the hypothesis that the $\gamma\delta$ TCR is a mechanosensor (Fig. 3A). Sulfatide–CD1d is the preferred ligand for DP10.7 with only weak interactions with CD1d in the absence of sulfatide lipid (31). To probe the DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$ –ligand interaction, CD1d \pm sulfatide was bound to a functionalized surface in a tethered bead configuration (19) (Fig. 3A). To this end, DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ was cloned and produced as a leucine zipper-paired heterodimer (LZ) with N15 $\alpha\beta$ –VSV8/K^b used as comparison (Fig. 3B) (19, 31). CD1d or VSV8/K^b ligands were bound through streptavidin to a PEG-pacified surface containing sparse PEG–biotin. The TCRs fused to LZ at the C terminus were tethered via a long DNA molecule

Fig. 2. Comparison of interdomain contacts within TCR $\gamma\delta$, TCR $\alpha\beta$, and TCR $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera. A 100- to 300-ns interval during MD simulation for each system was used for analysis (*Materials and Methods*). (A) Average number of contacts with occupancy greater than 80% (bar: SD of measurements in 10 overlapping time windows of size 36.4 ns). HB, hydrogen bond; NP, nonpolar contact. Locations of these contacts within each structure are shown in *SI Appendix, Fig. S1*. For the C γ -C δ interface, two hydrogen bonds were counted in all 10 windows, hence it has no error bar (red in the first HB group). Asterisk shows average number of contacts between TCR $\gamma\delta$ and the TCR $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera differing with significance level smaller than 10^{-5} . (B) Comparison of the V γ -C γ interface and the V γ -C β interface. Constant domains have surface representations overlaid in semitransparent colors, as approximate markers for their boundaries. Number of contacts of occupancy greater than 80% are marked (cf., *SI Appendix, Fig. S1*). Among the 10 V γ -C β interface bonds, the C β FG loop contributes one H bond and three nonpolar contacts. Boxes highlight the difference in conformations between the two systems, where the valley created by the FG loop in C β helps with stabilizing V γ .



such that force could be applied to the optically trapped bead (*Materials and Methods* and ref. 19). Lifetime measurements were performed by translating each sample relative to the fixed trap using the piezo stage, then holding at a fixed position/force until bond rupture. Bond rupture is identified as an abrupt snap back of the bead to the trap center (distance = 0 nm) while conformational extensions are observed as smaller displacements of the bead toward the trap center.

Testing the WT DP10.7 against CD1d alone in the absence of sulfatide we found lifetimes of less than 0.5 s down to 0.3 s at 10 pN (Fig. 3C and *SI Appendix, Fig. S2A and B*) while sulfatide-complexed CD1d resulted in similar bond lifetimes with the exception of a narrow force window in which lifetimes around 1 s were measured (Fig. 3D and *SI Appendix, Fig. S2C*). In the absence of sulfatide loading, bond formation was of lower frequency, with 1 to 2 tethers per field of view found in comparison to ~25 when presented with sulfatide-CD1d. Whereas the CD1d without exogenous ligand resulted in a slip-bond profile in force-bond lifetime plots of the collected binding data, a narrow enhancement of bond lifetime was measured for sulfatide-CD1d with forces under 10 pN, suggesting force may minimally organize the interface (29). There was no continued enhancement above 10 pN; instead, the system transitioned to a slip bond. This force threshold corresponds to loads generated by cells even under static culture conditions, and so this does not appear to be a physiologically relevant catch bond as observed in other systems (19, 26, 35–37) (Fig. 3E). In contrast, when the chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR is tested versus sulfatide-CD1d, longer bond lifetimes were measured (Fig. 3F and *SI Appendix, Fig. S2D*) with organization/bond strengthening continuing on to form a typical catch bond of 5-s lifetime at 15-pN force, comparable to N15 $\alpha\beta$ interacting with its cognate ligand VSV8-K^b (Fig. 3E). Incorporating the C $\alpha\beta$ domain in lieu of C $\gamma\delta$ thus leads to force-responsive properties in the context of the same V $\gamma\delta$ domain module and ligand. Of note, $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR does not form a catch bond with CD1d lacking sulfatide (Fig. 3E and G and *SI Appendix, Fig. S2E*) in keeping with previous observations of ligand gating specificity by TCR $\alpha\beta$ and, more specifically, requisite allosteric control within C β , another hallmark of mechanosensing (19, 26, 29, 30). Indeed, the SM sensitivity index (the ratio of a TCR-ligand bond lifetime for specific to nonspecific MHC-bound interaction) (19) shows discrimination of the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR to be much greater than that of the $\gamma\delta$ TCR, and more similar to the $\alpha\beta$ TCR (*SI Appendix, Fig. S3*). The appearance of sustained bond lifetime under force was consistently accompanied by a structural transition for the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR (Fig. 3F), analogous to that seen previously for the $\alpha\beta$ TCR and pre-TCR in response to specific ligands (19, 30) but essentially unobserved in traces for the $\gamma\delta$ TCR (Fig. 3C and D and *SI Appendix, Fig. S2C*).

Catch Bond and Structural Transition Rescue by $\alpha\beta$ C Domains on the T Cell Surface. To confirm that the biomechanical observations above translate to the fully assembled and membrane-embedded $\gamma\delta$ TCRs on T cell surfaces, TCR $\gamma\delta$ or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ heterodimers (Fig. 3H) were retrovirally transduced and resultant TCRs were interrogated with bead-bound sulfatide-CD1d in the SMSC format as previously described (19). To this end, BW5147 T cells lacking endogenous TCRs were transduced using a 2A peptide-containing construct for simultaneous expression of paired TCR subunits (38). Murine C domains and TM regions were substituted for the human counterparts to attain optimal surface expression in this mouse-derived thymocyte lymphoma line as previously described (39, 40). As shown in Fig. 3I, the $\gamma\delta$ TCR exhibits only slip bond, whereas in contrast, the chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR manifests a significant catch bond up to 15 pN and slip bond thereafter, in parallel to the SM behavior, demonstrating the same force sensitivity. The significant bond lifetime over a range of forces for both TCRs is likely due to the presence of CD3 molecules in the TCR complex (ref. 28 and refs. therein) as well as an increase in compliance and stress relaxation of the cell membranes and connecting linkages compared to the biotinylated surfaces in the SM assay (Fig. 3I). The SM is more similar to a force clamp, while the SMSC behaves more like a stress relaxation test. The cell mechanical linkage pathway may also participate in modulating bond lifetime, even actively through actin-myosin-based coupling and feedback (20). We note that SM and SMSC assays are executed differently, yielding a slower effective “instrument response time” for SMSC. In the absence of sulfatide we observed lower frequency of bond formation, with fewer than 10% of beads forming effective tethers for either $\gamma\delta$ (1 in 25) or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ (2 in 25), as compared to ~50% when presented with CD1d-sulfatide. Moreover, the structural transition previously observed in $\alpha\beta$ TCRs and pre-TCRs (19, 30) is present here in over 50% (23/44) of the individual traces and is similar in length to that of the N15 $\alpha\beta$ TCR (19) (Fig. 3J). All transitions occurred at 10 pN or higher force for the chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, consistent with behavior of the N15 $\alpha\beta$ TCR (19). In contrast, only 1 in 45 traces had evidence of a transition for the $\gamma\delta$ TCR. These data strongly suggest that the $\gamma\delta$ TCR lacks specific adaptations for mechanosensing, a result consistent with absent force-dependent ligand signaling threshold sensitivity enhancement (*SI Appendix, Fig. S4*).

Enhanced Thymic Signaling through TCR Is Imparted by $\alpha\beta$ C Domains. To assess the biological consequences of TCR mechanosensing function, we exploited an in vitro stromal cell-lymphoid progenitor coculture experimental system. Fetal liver-derived thymic progenitors isolated from *Rag2*^{-/-} B6 mice were transduced with either full-length $\gamma\delta$ TCR, $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, or $\alpha\beta$ TCR heterodimers as detailed in Fig. 4A. Stromal cells used in this assay were OP9-DL4 applied previously for both $\gamma\delta$ T cell and $\alpha\beta$ T cell development (35,




Fig. 3. SM and SMSC measurement of TCR $\gamma\delta$ DP10.7-CD1d interaction. (A) LZ-coupled TCR is bound to acid-base LZ-specific half-mAb 2H11 coupled to a DNA linker attached to a polystyrene bead held in an optical trap. Biotinylated CD1d is bound to streptavidin, which is itself bound to PEG-biotin that is attached to the movable piezo stage. (B) Constructs used in SM experiments. (C) Representative SM traces for DP10.7 interaction with CD1d lacking exogenous ligand (CD1d) at 10 or 17 pN. Force load is applied in the black section of the trace, binding dwell is the green section and bond dissociation is the red section. (D) SM trace of DP10.7 interaction with CD1d bound to sulfatide (sulfatide-CD1d) with 10 pN pulling force. (E) Force vs. lifetime plot for the DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$ (purple curve, $n = 191$) or DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera (red curve, $n = 126$) interaction with sulfatide-CD1d, TCR $\gamma\delta$ (brown curve, $n = 101$) or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ (pink curve, $n = 92$) with CD1d, or N15 $\alpha\beta$ interaction with its cognate ligand VSV8/H-2K^b (30) (green curve, $n = 192$). Error bars indicate SEM. (F) SM traces at indicated forces for DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera interaction with CD1d-sulfatide. Initial binding dwell is shown in green and posttransition dwell in blue. Transition points are indicated in each trajectory with blue arrows. Black and red sections are as in C. (G) SM traces at indicated forces for DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera interaction with CD1d with color coding as in F. A transition was identified in the 25-pN trace (blue arrow). (H) Constructs used in SMSC optical trap assay are indicated. Note that the TCR δ TM is depicted with a bend analogous to that of TCR α (28), although there is currently no data to confirm either a bipartite or single helix structure. (I) SMSC optical trap assay force vs. lifetime plot for the DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$ interaction (purple curve, $n = 45$) or DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera (red curve, $n = 44$) interaction with sulfatide-CD1d. Error bars indicate SEM. (J) Transition distances for DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ chimera (red curve, 23 of 44) interaction with sulfatide-CD1d from traces acquired by SMSC as compared to N15 $\alpha\beta$ (19) (green curve, $n = 15$). Error bars indicate SEM. For reference only a single, shorter transition was found in 45 traces for DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$ interaction with sulfatide-CD1d (purple triangles, see key).

41). In order to test the effect of ligand binding, an OP9-DL4 cell line, which expresses single-chain human CD1d/ β 2m at levels comparable to those of murine CD1d on these same cells, was developed (SI Appendix, Fig. S5 A and B). DP10.7 tetramer binding analysis (31) confirmed robust binding to this OP9-DL4-CD1d cell line when exogenous sulfatide was added (SI Appendix, Fig. S5C). Some tetramer binding was detected for the OP9-DL4-CD1d cell line in the absence of sulfatide addition. WT OP9-DL4 + sulfatide showed a slight increase over untreated WT OP9-DL4, while the OP9-DL4-MHC knockout (KO) cell line, which lacks class I MHC expression (30) including CD1d, showed no detectable effect of sulfatide treatment (SI Appendix, Fig. S5C).

Following an 8-d coculture of $\gamma\delta$ or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-transduced DN3 *Rag2*^{-/-} thymocytes with either WT OP9-DL4 or OP9-DL4-CD1d, we observed transition of thymocytes from the CD4⁻CD8⁻CD25⁺CD44⁻ (DN3) population through CD4⁺CD8⁻CD25⁻CD44⁻ (DN4) with a subset also progressing beyond DN4 to CD4⁺CD8⁺ (DP) (SI Appendix, Fig. S6A). When sulfatide was added to each culture, a differential loss in surface CD3 staining was measured in association with human CD1d-expressing stromal cells (Fig. 4B). This effect was significantly more pronounced for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR transduced thymocytes versus those expressing WT $\gamma\delta$ TCR and is present both in DN and DP thymocytes (Fig. 4B and C). Surface CD3 loss is most likely due to an enhanced responsiveness of these thymocytes imparted by the $\alpha\beta$ TCR C regions leading to down-

modulation of the TCR complex with activation (42). The down-modulation occurs in both DN3 and DN4 subsets for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, while the effect is not observed for $\gamma\delta$ TCR in DN3 (Fig. 4D). Of note, post-DN4 cell numbers following culture were significantly reduced for the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR cultures on stroma with sulfatide present (SI Appendix, Fig. S6 B and C). This was not the case for $\gamma\delta$ TCR thymocytes. In addition, the OP9-DL4 stroma expressing endogenous murine CD1d-only also showed this reduction, consistent with the ability of 10.7 TCR tetramers to bind weakly but nevertheless clearly to OP9-DL4 (SI Appendix, Fig. S5C). Loss of DP thymocytes in $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR- but not $\gamma\delta$ TCR-transfected thymocytes on both OP9-DL4 stroma implies negative selection linked to the C α C β module (SI Appendix, Fig. S6C).

The strong down-regulation of CD3 on $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR transduced thymocytes following sulfatide exposure implied that active TCR signaling was occurring for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR thymocytes. Given that higher TCR $\gamma\delta$ -ligand signaling strength was reported to induce IFN γ as opposed to IL-17 T cell differentiation (43-45), we assayed cytokine production within hours of calcium ionophore plus phorbol myristate acetate (PMA) stimulation following 8 d of $\gamma\delta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR thymocyte-stromal cultures with or without exogenous sulfatide addition (SI Appendix, Fig. S7). While no enhanced IFN γ production was observed when comparing $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR to $\gamma\delta$ TCR, an absence of cellular elements in epithelial cultures present in thymus and required to recapitulate the cytokine




Fig. 4. Thymocyte response to ligand in stromal cultures. (A) Constructs used in vitro thymic stromal culture. (B) Surface CD3 FACS fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) analysis of DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ ($\gamma\delta$ TCR) or DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ ($\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR)-transduced thymocytes cultured for 8 d in the absence or presence of sulfatide in coculture with parental OP9-DL4 stromal cells or OP9-DL4 cells stably transfected with human CD1d (OP9-DL4-CD1d). All cells were gated with FSC-A and SSC-A to isolate thymocytes then GFP⁺CD45⁺ to select transfected thymocytes. CD4⁺CD8⁺ = DP; CD4⁻CD8⁻ = DN (*SI Appendix, Fig. S6A*). Note: DP thymocytes fail to develop with vector transduction only. (C) Statistical analysis of five independent experiments as represented in B. Significance (*P* value) was determined by linear regression analysis. White bars are from cultures treated with dimethyl sulfoxide vehicle only, yellow are sulfatide treated. (D) Surface CD3 FACS analysis of DN3 and DN4 subsets in response to sulfatide ligand in OP9-DL4-CD1d stromal cell culture. Histogram colors are as in B.

phenotype could not be excluded. As a consequence, we selected a more global and unbiased approach to interrogate signaling differences.

Chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR Signaling Generates Stronger Transcriptome Changes than those Through WT $\gamma\delta$ TCR. To this end, we analyzed transcriptome signatures of DN3 and DN4 thymocytes from lymphoid progenitors previously transduced with $\gamma\delta$ TCR or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR and then cultured on OP9-DL4-CD1d with or without sulfatide addition for 8 d. Three independent experiments analyzing DN3 and DN4 cells \pm sulfatide for the $\gamma\delta$ TCR- and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-transduced thymocytes yielded 24 cDNA libraries that underwent next generation sequencing (*Dataset S1* and *SI Appendix, Tables S1–S7*). Global principal component analysis (PCA) separated cleanly between the DN3 and DN4 populations (Fig. 5A, Upper) where the drivers of this transition (e.g., *Samhd1*, *Lgals3*, *St3gal6*, *Gpr15*, and *S100a4*; *Dataset S1* and *SI Appendix, Table S4*) dominated the PCA, masking underlying transitions induced by the response of the wild-type and chimeric TCR to CD1d-sulfatide. Nevertheless, at the DN3 stage, only 20 genes were significantly fold-change regulated in $\gamma\delta$ TCR thymocytes following sulfatide stimulation (*Dataset S1*). In contrast, in DN3 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-expressing thymocytes responding to sulfatide, similar changes were observed not only for the 20 altered in the $\gamma\delta$ TCR cells but for >4,000 other genes (*Dataset S1* and *SI Appendix, Table S5*). PCA alone, however, could not separate the DN3 $\gamma\delta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR sulfatide-stimulated populations as the gene expression patterns were almost identical (Fig. 5A, Upper and *Dataset S1*); the differences resided in the extent of the fold change. Additionally, even in the absence of exogenous sulfatides, the $\alpha\beta$ domains in the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-expressing thymocytes influenced the signaling background. For example, using *Cd69* up-regulation as a proxy for TCR stimulation (46), the $\gamma\delta$ TCR background for *Cd69* at the DN3 stage was 153.6 ± 25.4 expression reads while, in $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, levels were 218.3 ± 26.6 with both rising to ~ 270 on sulfatide stimulation with a similar representation at the DN4 stage (*Dataset S1* and *SI Appendix, Table S1*).

Analysis at the DN4 stage, however, removing the influence of the DN3 to DN4 drivers, permitted discrimination of significant differences in expression programs for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ TCR (Fig. 5A, Lower). For the unstimulated condition, PCA revealed a slight shift on the PC1 axis for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, likely representing the background elevation of discrete gene transcripts, as discussed further below. Upon addition of sulfatide, the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR DN4 program shifts strongly on the PC2 axis as well as on the PC1 axis. In contrast, the centroids for the $\gamma\delta$ TCR-unstimulated and $\gamma\delta$ TCR-stimulated populations appear similar. Immune gene expression analysis (47), a system trained on subsets of mature single-positive CD4 and CD8 cells both resting and responding to a variety of stimuli, as well as on phenotypically defined and thymic region-localized thymocyte populations, identifies the DN4 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR sulfatide-stimulated population as highly and significantly similar to subcapsular cortical thymocytes (Fig. 5B).

Comparison of the gene expression profiles for $\gamma\delta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR thymocytes responding to sulfatide at the DN4 stage reveals 117 significantly regulated gene transcripts for which 20 appear to be preferentially regulated in the $\gamma\delta$ TCR condition (group I), 27 are shared (group II), and 70 are preferentially regulated in the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR condition (group III) (Fig. 6A and *Dataset S1*). Analysis of the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR group III profile, with significantly regulated transcripts grouped according to functional activity, shows that many of the gene transcript levels are directionally regulated similarly in $\gamma\delta$ TCR-expressing thymocytes but that the degree of regulation is much greater in $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-expressing thymocytes (Fig. 6B). Several of the genes represented in group I (specifically *Cd69*, *Egr1*, *Egr2*, *Nr4a1* [*Nur77*], *Cd200* variants and *Klrd1* [*Cd94*], and *Klra5* [*Ly49e*]) are key markers for TCR stimulation (43, 46, 48–52). Given that TCR signaling, measured as reduced cell surface expression of CD3, was greater in the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR condition than in the $\gamma\delta$ TCR condition, the inclusion of such TCR signaling-associated transcripts in group I was unexpected. As depicted in Fig. 6C, however, genes expected to be down-regulated or up-regulated upon TCR signaling had already moved in these respective directions in the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR cells in comparison with $\gamma\delta$ TCR cells prior to sulfatide stimulation. Since

the maximal stimulation changes for this signaling-associated gene group were similar for both cell types, the apparent fold change upon sulfatide stimulation is greater for the $\gamma\delta$ TCR cells than for the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR cells. In the absence of exogenous sulfatides, the background binding of DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$ tetramer is greater to OP9-DL4-CD1d than parental OP9-DL4 (SI Appendix, Fig. S5). Hence, endogenous sulfatide presentation may be sufficient to stimulate those genes noted in Fig. 6C through the chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR but not the $\gamma\delta$ TCR before signaling induction by exogenously added sulfatides. Overall, the transcriptomics results support the notion of enhanced signaling sensitivity and function of the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR.

Discussion

Our results demonstrate that $\gamma\delta$ T lineage cells exhibit differential signaling sensitivity to $\alpha\beta$ T lineage cells by virtue of their respective C modules. The relevance for $\gamma\delta$ T cell biology generally, and analog signaling in particular, is highlighted below. Pointedly, $\gamma\delta$ T cells cannot exploit TCR mechanosensing as used by $\alpha\beta$ T cells to harness physical load and extend TCR-ligand bond lifetime under nonequilibrium conditions. Load in vivo results from a range of bioforces that lymphocytes experience during both external (cell movement) or internal (cytoskeletal rearrangement) processes (reviewed in ref. 21). This differential behavior is striking, given shared use of CD3 dimeric signaling components by both TCRs (ref. 27 and refs. therein), although some distinctions in CD3 heterodimers, Fc ϵ R1 γ and CD3 ζ composition, may further tune signaling (53–56). Replacement of C γ C δ in WTDP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR with C α C β in the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR construct confers $\alpha\beta$ TCR mechanosensing properties to the chimeric receptor whose V γ V δ module (i.e., ligand interaction surface) remains the same. MD simulations show that the V β -C β interface is stabilized by the C β FG loop unique to mammalian pre-TCRs and $\alpha\beta$ TCRs (29) and thus likely implicates the β -subunit in this gain of function. In this regard, our earlier studies using optical tweezers on isolated TCR $\alpha\beta$

heterodimers as well as $\alpha\beta$ TCR complexes on T lymphocytes documented how the V α V β module was allosterically controlled by the C β FG loop (19, 30) to dictate TCR-pMHC bond lifetime as well as peptide discrimination. Concordantly, deletion of the C β FG loop created $\alpha\beta$ TCRs, whose recognition and signaling function were attenuated in vitro and in vivo (57, 58). $\alpha\beta$ TCR mechanosensing affords virtually digital responsiveness in signaling; only one or a handful of TCR-pMHC interactions is required for cellular activation, while chemical thresholds in the absence of load require pMHC numbers higher by orders of magnitude to trigger a cellular response (20). The pre-TCR, consisting of a pT α - β heterodimer, also manifests mechanosensing function that is C β FG loop dependent (30, 35).

Within Gnathostomata there was coevolution of the elongated C β FG loop and molecular speciation of CD3 γ and CD3 δ genes from a single CD3 precursor (58, 59). Thus, mammals, but likely not birds, amphibians, reptiles, or bony fish, are capable of mechanosensing in their respective $\alpha\beta$ TCR lineages. Given that the evolutionary distance between human and mouse from a common mammalian ancestor is 75 million years and that between human and birds from a common vertebrate ancestor is 300 million years, roughly 200 million years of vertebrate evolution was required for mechanosensing to emerge as the solution within the $\alpha\beta$ T lineage system to high acuity adaptive immune recognition.

Catch bonds are observed over a wide range of receptor-ligand systems (60). In these systems, the receptor is assumed to take two alternate conformations, one with a low affinity and the other with a high affinity to the ligand. Without load, the low-affinity state is prevalent. An applied load causes a conformational change to the high-affinity state, thereby initiating the catch-bond pathway (61). An essential aspect in this mechanism is allostery, where load-induced conformational change of the receptor alters the ligand-binding domain. While alternate conformations responsible for the two states have been observed in other systems




Fig. 5. Transcriptome analysis of DN3 and DN4 transduced thymocytes after 8 d of coculture with OP9-DL4-CD1d stromal cells in the presence or absence of sulfatide. (A) Global PCA of all populations delineates DN3 and DN4 populations (Upper). Restricted PCA of DN4 cells separates the cell states independent of the DN3-to-DN4 drivers (Lower). Ellipses in both panels provide a visual measure of overlap or separation of the indicated populations. Data represent three independent experiments for each condition except for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR unstimulated ($n = 2$). (B) Gene set enrichment analysis (MSigDB C7 immune signatures) identifies the DN4 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR sulfatide-stimulated transcriptome signature as being consistent with that of cortical thymocytes (Upper) with a subcapsular location (Lower).




Fig. 6. Gene signatures for DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ ($\gamma\delta$ TCR) or DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ ($\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR) control and sulfatide-stimulated states. (A) For DN4 thymocytes bearing $\gamma\delta$ or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCRs and developing on OP9-DL4-CD1d stromal cells in the absence or presence of sulfatide, RNA was isolated and gene expression profiles were determined by RNA-seq. For each TCR, gene expression profiles delineating the stimulated from the control state were determined using a threshold for $p_{adj} \leq 0.1$. Gene signatures were defined as present only in $\gamma\delta$ TCR-bearing cells (group I), only in $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-bearing cells (group III), or shared in both conditions (group II). (B) Heat map profiles, ordered into functional groupings (Left column) for the genes in developing $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR DN4 thymocytes identified as being significantly regulated in the presence of sulfatide. Expression profiles for the same genes developing in $\gamma\delta$ TCR-bearing thymocytes are also depicted. The scale indicates fold reduction (blue) or fold increase (red). White indicates no fold difference between control and stimulated state. For group I, the fold differences after stimulation did not differ significantly between $\gamma\delta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR ($P = 0.069$) but for all $\gamma\delta$ TCR transcripts, $p_{adj} \leq 0.1$ and for all $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, $p_{adj} > 0.1$. For group II, $p_{adj} \leq 0.1$ for all indicated genes with no significant difference in fold change. For group III, only the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR transcripts have a $p_{adj} \leq 0.1$ with an overall significant fold change over $\gamma\delta$ TCR ($P < 0.0001$). (C) For select genes in group I and group II, fold differences between $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR- and $\gamma\delta$ TCR-bearing thymocytes in the unstimulated control condition are presented. The dashed line delineates identity between $\gamma\delta$ TCR- and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-unstimulated expression levels. For all fold differences depicted (pink for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR $>$ $\gamma\delta$ TCR, blue for $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR $<$ $\gamma\delta$ TCR), $P < 0.05$.

(60), the structural origin for the catch bond behavior in TCR $\alpha\beta$ has remained enigmatic, as no clear conformational states have been observed in X-ray structures of TCR $\alpha\beta$ that might affect its interaction with the pMHC molecule. Two recent studies propose a catch-bond mechanism based on behaviors of a few hydrogen bonds between TCR $\alpha\beta$ and pMHC that formed when the complex was rapidly pulled apart in MD simulation (36, 62). Aside from the use of very large forces within short simulation times where conformational relaxation cannot occur, analyses based only on a handful of transiently formed contacts cannot address the question of allostery, which involves conformational motion of the whole protein.

More recently, our own MD simulation study has illuminated a possible mechanism of catch-bond formation within the V α -pMHC interface that is potentiated by V-C interactions, particularly those at the V β -C β interface, including the C β FG loop (29). An essential aspect of this mechanism is that the capacity to activate the catch bond is endowed by the conformational properties of the entire TCR $\alpha\beta$ chassis rather than only by residues that immediately contact pMHC. More specifically, the four-domain organization leads to relative motion between V α and V β , which can be stabilized by the applied load and in the presence of the cognate antigenic peptide. The C β FG loop is a structural element that is crucial for the allosteric control. By forming additional contacts with V β , the C β FG loop not only influences the V α -V β motion, but it also supports its orientation amenable to form an interface with pMHC in loaded conditions.

Based on the above, the MD simulations in the present study indicate that the TCR $\gamma\delta$ chassis is not well suited for mechanosensing. In particular, the V $\gamma\delta$ and C $\gamma\delta$ domains do not

include sufficient contacts to establish allostery responding to load (Fig. 2 and *SI Appendix*, Fig. S1). Further, the greater nonpolar contacts between V γ and V δ suggest a lower compliance. In contrast, the V $\gamma\delta$ -C $\alpha\beta$ chimera has the number of contacts between V γ and C β , as well as between V γ and V δ comparable to those for the corresponding interfaces of TCR $\alpha\beta$ (Fig. 2), which is fully consistent with our experimental results, demonstrating the chimera responding to load similar to TCR $\alpha\beta$. The reduction in the number of V γ -V δ contacts is due to the orientational constraint imposed by the C β FG loop, as observed between the wild-type TCR $\alpha\beta$ and a mutant lacking the C β FG loop (29). Since a majority of the contacts between V γ and C β are nonpolar, a steric constraint imposed by the C β FG loop is likely more important than forming specific contacts (Fig. 2B). To further elucidate the steric nature of the contact, we built a model of V $\alpha\beta$ -C $\gamma\delta$ chimera and performed MD simulation (*SI Appendix*, Fig. S1E). There were little contacts at the V α -C δ interface, and a small number of contacts formed at the V β -C γ interface. Since extensive contacts form at the V β -C β interface of TCR $\alpha\beta$, some of the residues in V β are amenable to form nonpolar contacts with C γ in the chimera. However, the contacts are not extensive and we do not expect the V $\alpha\beta$ -C $\gamma\delta$ chimera to exhibit a catch bond as strongly as the V $\gamma\delta$ -C $\alpha\beta$ chimera. The increase in the V α -V β contacts in this case is also consistent with the behavior of the FG-loop deletion mutant where the V α -V β motion is suppressed (29). While additional insight will be gained from future simulations of TCR $\gamma\delta$ complexed with sulfatide-CD1d, the present simulations elucidate conformational properties of TCRs that facilitate understanding of the current experiments.

The conserved $\gamma\delta$ T cell lineage chassis implies that mechanosensing is not a feature of $\gamma\delta$ TCRs, but detailed assessment of other TCRs using biophysical methods performed here is warranted. That said, TCR ligation-based exposure of the CD3 ϵ proline-rich cytoplasmic region in $\alpha\beta$ TCRs but not $\gamma\delta$ TCRs mapping to their respective constant regions reported previously (63) is consistent with the generality of differential mechanotransduction revealed here.

Anticipating that mechanosensing would augment TCR signaling upon sulfatide exposure, we observed that the chimeric $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-transfected thymocytes showed greater activation than the WT $\gamma\delta$ TCR-transfected thymocytes in CD1d-OP9 DL4 epithelial cultures at DN stages and beyond. This was initially revealed as a reduction in cell surface CD3 expression (Fig. 4). Subsequently, a global, unbiased assessment of signaling differences was determined by RNA-seq transcriptome analysis of $\gamma\delta$ TCR and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR thymocytes in CD1d-OP9DL4 epithelial cultures with and without sulfatide addition. These data clearly showed that stimulation of $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, relative to that of $\gamma\delta$ TCR, induced greater regulated expression of a multiplicity of genes in the DN4 compartment, many of which are specifically associated with T cell stimulation, adhesion control, chemotaxis, signaling, and cellular metabolism (Fig. 6).

Increasing evidence supports a model of gene network-driven lymphocyte lineage diversification preceding antigen receptor expression (64, 65). Although TCR signaling might contribute to $\gamma\delta$ T lineage fate, gene network drivers per se are a dominant component. Along these lines, we find by PCA that DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR manifest small differences in gene expression in the presence or absence of sulfatide in stromal cultures, relative to the $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR chimera. It is important to view the cellular results presented herein strictly as an indicator of the signaling capacity of the given receptors, and not as a study of developmental pathways of $\gamma\delta$ T cells per se, since aside from hints of preferential chimeric receptor deletion with sulfatide addition, evidence for ligand-directed progression was not unequivocal within the OP9-DL4 stromal system for this $\gamma\delta$ TCR.

$\gamma\delta$ T lineage cells are the first to exit the thymus, having already acquired effector function and been programmed to populate different anatomical epithelial locales linked to their $V\gamma$ usage (reviewed in ref. 66). These cells demonstrate ligand recognition straddling both innate and cognate immune spaces. A majority of $\gamma\delta$ TCR ligands are self-derived and stress-induced in lymphoid and nonlymphoid cells, including epithelial cells. For example, CD1 molecules as well as T10/T22 have prominent display in human and mouse thymus, respectively, with CD1d shared between species (67). The recognition by TCRs, even $\alpha\beta$ TCRs, of ligands expressed at high copy numbers does not require mechanosensing (20). Therefore, if $\gamma\delta$ T cell ligands are densely arrayed constitutively or upon up-regulation by cellular perturbations involving stress responses, including inflammation, then ligand multivalency per se is adequate to stimulate T cell signaling. Reduction in ligand density or attenuation of T cell signaling severely curtails class IIb T22/T10 reactive transgenic KN6 $\gamma\delta$ TCR-expressing thymocyte fate in favor of $\alpha\beta$ (43, 68–70). Insofar as the C β FG loop fosters DN progression and is essential to mediate effective negative selection (57, 58), the absence of demonstrable positive or negative selection of $\gamma\delta$ TCR-expressing thymocytes further fits with our observations. If $\gamma\delta$ thymocytes were similar to $\alpha\beta$ thymocytes, then high copy number of ligands such as with T22 binding receptors would stimulate deletion (71). Given that the $\gamma\delta$ TCR is tuned to respond to strong signals by virtue of ligand multiplicity, the results in the KN6 studies follow logically (43).

It is noteworthy that lymphoid progenitors begin to rearrange TCR γ -, δ -, and β -, but not α -genes at DN2. Those DN3 thymocytes simultaneously expressing γ - and δ -proteins array surface $\gamma\delta$ TCRs, whereas those expressing β -proteins paired with

invariant pT α express pre-TCRs. By contrast, the α -gene is rearranged and expressed only subsequently at the DP thymocyte stage. The sequential $\alpha\beta$ T lineage-tuning pathway dependent on mechanosensing at both pre-TCR and $\alpha\beta$ TCR stages is critical to permit $\alpha\beta$ T cells to distinguish between foreign versus self-peptides bound to identical MHC molecules arrayed on the same target cell where the representation of the relevant foreign ligand may be on the order of 1 relative to 10,000 self-peptides. The $\gamma\delta$ TCR need not mediate this level of specificity and digital sensitivity and hence requires no sequential selection steps for repertoire formation. Instead $\gamma\delta$ TCRs imbue $\gamma\delta$ T cells with the capacity to focus on their critical sentinel function of nonpeptide recognition in designated barrier tissues and internal organs employing innate and adaptive triggering mechanisms. Given that $\gamma\delta$ TCR ligands are distinct from and often more plentiful than conventional class I and class II MHC molecules, CD8 $\alpha\beta$ or CD4 coreceptors are not required, although a subset of $\gamma\delta$ T cells express CD8 $\alpha\alpha$, CD8 $\alpha\beta$, or CD4 (16, 66). While other receptor systems deploy sequence-related functional variants in different tissues (e.g., voltage-gated sodium channels) (72), the T lineage avails itself of a particular implementation. Its receptors comprise ligand-binding subunit variants differing in their capacity to amplify bioforces and thus to modulate triggering of cellular activation using a comparable set of signaling (CD3) subunits. Other distinctions between TCR $\alpha\beta$ and TCR $\gamma\delta$, including their connecting peptides and transmembrane segments (56), in addition to their ectodomains, might further nuance signaling differences.

To mount a robust response, signals are processed at many levels, including integrated input from multiple types of receptors, feedback loops within the cell, and communication among populations of cells (73). From a signaling and systems biology perspective, high acuity $\alpha\beta$ T cells are able to interpret rare input from a handful of peptides to drive a digital output. Here we stress the individual $\alpha\beta$ TCR as being critical to the $\alpha\beta$ T cell signal processing, amplifying the signal at the point of input and utilizing the $\alpha\beta$ constant domains and transmembrane elements to aid signal interpretation (28). Gated detection is a second strategy that places a window around a signal input and isolates it from noise outside of this window. Force may serve to “gate” the $\alpha\beta$ TCR signal input. Bond strengthening and conformational change require energy that is sustained for the cognate $\alpha\beta$ TCR-pMHC interaction (29), while weak interactions are gated out as noise. A third strategy, feedback, appears to be operating at the level of the $\alpha\beta$ TCR through both an active myosin-based transport that sustains optimal force (21, 74) and a passive method consequent to local membrane stiffness that buttresses this critical force. These mechanisms not only maximize bond lifetime but permit repeated conformational changes that foster a fourth strategy for signal processing, namely resonant detection.

A consequence of such a digital output is a loss of the ability to spread the response over a larger range of input conditions, i.e., in an integrative or analog mode. $\gamma\delta$ T cells may benefit from reduced sensitivity at the individual receptor level by retaining the ability to integrate signal input across multiple $\gamma\delta$ TCRs on that T cell. Integration across plentiful individual signals could be advantageous in sensing a gradient or threshold, in the presence of higher ligand concentrations representative of common target antigens for $\gamma\delta$ T cells. Similar analog $\alpha\beta$ TCR-pMHC interactions may be involved in positive selection in the thymus, homeostatic T cell proliferation in the periphery, or antiviral responses to high-density ligands on infected cells. Thus, while $\alpha\beta$ T cells may exploit both modalities, $\gamma\delta$ T cells appear to be designed exclusively for analog signaling. The implications of this distinction and further analysis of their molecular mechanisms may have translational impact in areas involving adoptive cellular therapies as well as vaccine design.

Materials and Methods

Choice of TCR Structures for MD Simulations. For the WT TCR $\alpha\beta$, N15 TCR $\alpha\beta$ Protein Data Bank (PDB), 1NFD (33) and JM22 TCR $\alpha\beta$, 1OGA (75), were used. PDB 1NFD corresponds to the N15 TCR $\alpha\beta$ used in experiments. JM22 TCR $\alpha\beta$ PDB 1OGA has a bound pMHC and is currently the highest in resolution available (1.40 Å). For the WT TCR $\gamma\delta$, we used 9C2, PDB 4LFH (76). For the V $\gamma\delta$ -C $\alpha\beta$ hybrid, we used DP10.7 TCR $\gamma\delta$, PDB 4MNH (31) and replaced the C $\alpha\beta$ part with those from PDB 1NFD, to match the construct with the one used in experiments (DP10.7-N15). This was done by aligning TCRs of 1NFD and 4MNH using Modeller (77) and replacing the C $\alpha\beta$ part of 4MNH with that of 1NFD. For V δ , residues up to L119 were kept, after which was C α of 1NFD. For V γ , residues up to P119 were kept, followed by C β of 1NFD. To ensure that the replacement of constant domains has minimal impact on the interface with the variable domains, we compared interdomain contacts between the original 4MNH structure and the one with C $\alpha\beta$ from 1NFD, prior to performing simulation. We found that they have very similar hydrogen bonds and nonpolar contacts, using nearly identical sets of residues, which reflect the sequence homology of the constant domains in 4MNH and 1NFD. The V $\alpha\beta$ -C $\gamma\delta$ chimera was built similarly, using the V $\alpha\beta$ domain of PDB 1NFD (up to residue 112 in both α - and β -chains) and the rest from the C $\gamma\delta$ of PDB 4LFH, starting from R120 of the δ -chain and K126 of the γ -chain. Missing loops in structures were built using Modeller, and hydrogen atoms were added in CHARMM (78). None of the missing residues are at the interdomain interface, hence they do not affect our interdomain contact analysis. Disulfide bonds were placed as they appear in respective domains.

MD Simulation and Analysis. Simulations were performed using CHARMM (79). Each construct was solvated in a cubic water box of about 98 Å in each dimension, which has boundaries at least 12 Å away from the protein. Sodium and chloride ions were added at about 50 mM concentration to neutralize the system. The simulation system underwent a series of energy minimization procedures (4,000 steps in total), where a set of gradually decreasing harmonic restraints was applied to the protein to remove close contacts and relax the surrounding water molecules and ions. After initial energy minimization, the system was heated from 30 K to 300 K during 100 ps, and equilibrated at 300 K for 200 ps. During heating and equilibration, backbone heavy atoms were harmonically restrained with a spring constant of 5 kcal/mol-Å². Pressure was maintained at 1 atm using the constant pressure and temperature thermostat. Harmonic restraint was then reduced to 0.001 kcal/mol-Å², applying only to the backbone alpha carbon atoms, and an additional 2-ns dynamics run was performed at 300 K in the constant atom number, volume, and temperature ensemble. Finally, a 300-ns production run was performed without any restraint applied (120 ns for the V $\alpha\beta$ -C $\gamma\delta$ chimera). Cutoff distance for nonbonded interaction was 12 Å. The particle-mesh Ewald summation method was used to account for the long-range electrostatic interactions. The SHAKE algorithm was used to fix the length of the covalent bond between hydrogen and heavy atoms. For integration, a 2-fs time step was used, and coordinates were saved every 20 ps. A periodic boundary condition was applied during the simulation. The domain decomposition module was used for efficient parallelization (79).

Contact analysis was performed as done previously (29, 80). Briefly, a 2.4-Å cutoff distance between a hydrogen atom and hydrogen bond acceptor atoms was used to identify hydrogen bonds. For nonpolar contacts, a 3.0-Å cutoff distance between atoms with the absolute value of partial charge less than 0.3e (e: charge of an electron) was used. Occupancy of a contact was calculated as the fraction of coordinate frames during 100 to 300 ns (50 to 120 ns for the V $\alpha\beta$ -C $\gamma\delta$ chimera; *SI Appendix, Fig. S1E*). For the contact statistics in Fig. 2A, 10 36.4-ns windows that overlap 50% (i.e., 100.0 to 136.4 ns, 118.2 to 154.5 ns, etc.) were used and contact occupancies were calculated in each window. Windows were made to overlap to avoid a contact appearing to have a low occupancy if spread between two nonoverlapping windows.

Single-Molecule Protein Production. DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR (WT) and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR (chimeric) constructs for SM experiments were produced as previously described (31, 81) except for the insertion of flexible linker and LZ motifs (82) prior to the 3C protease site and 6 \times His Tag. δ or $\delta\alpha$ were fused to the basic LZ and γ or $\gamma\beta$ were fused with acidic LZ (10). Ectodomain regions end with the heterodimer-forming Cys residue in all constructs. Sequences were confirmed by DNA (Sanger) sequencing. Protein was produced as described (31, 81) with additional anti-LZ purification as described (10, 19, 30, 31, 35, 81, 82). N15 $\alpha\beta$ was produced as described (4, 82). Biotinylated CD1d, without exogenous ligand and sulfatide bound, and VS δ /K^b were produced as described (4, 31, 81). DNA and protein sequences are included in *Dataset S2*.

Single-Molecule Tweezers Experiments Tether Geometry and Connectivity and Optical Tweezers Measurements. The tether geometry and optical tweezers measurements parallel assays performed in refs. 19, 30. Additional details are in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

Constructs for Cellular Experiments. DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR (WT) and $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR (chimeric) constructs, for cellular and SMSC experiments were cloned from previously reported constructs (31, 81). Viral 2A-linked system sites were inserted between subunits to create single δ -p2a- γ or δ - α -p2a- γ - β constructs for WT or chimeric constructs, respectively, as previously published for $\gamma\delta$ and $\alpha\beta$ TCR (30, 31, 38, 81). Chimeric constructs incorporate the constant domain, connecting peptide region and TM region of the α - or β -subunit as appropriate. Site-directed mutagenesis was used to create appropriate EcoRI and NotI restriction sites for insertion into LZRS-IresGFP (addgene) retroviral vectors for use in OP9-DL4 stromal cell cultures (35). DNA and protein sequences are included in *Dataset S2*.

Generation of BW5147.3 Cell Lines. BW5147 cells were cotransduced with plasmids pMIY encoding CD3 $\delta\gamma\epsilon\zeta$ (a gift of the Vignali Laboratory, St. Jude Children's Research Hospital, Memphis TN) and pMIGII (Addgene) encoding either DP10.7 $\gamma\delta$ or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ essentially as described in ref. 28. Additional details are in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

SMSC Assay. The SMSC assay was carried out essentially as detailed (19). Additional details are in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

OP9-DL4 Stromal Cell Culture. OP9-DL4 and OP9-DL4-CD1d stromal cell cultures were performed as described (35). Additional details are in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

Generation of OP9-DL4-hCD1d. Since the human D10.7 $\gamma\delta$ TCR recognizes sulfatide presented by human CD1d, by necessity the OP9-DL4 cells, which express low levels of mouse CD1d (*SI Appendix, Fig. S5B*), required modification to express human CD1d. Mouse β 2m can associate with human HLA class I heavy chains to generate an expressed heterodimer, but may generate both glycosylation and structural differences that differ from the human β 2m-containing heterodimer (83–85). To introduce human β 2m and to maximize the likelihood that the human CD1d only associates with human β 2m, we generated a single-chain h β 2m-hCD1d construct in pcDNA3.1-zeo for stable expression in OP9-DL4 (*SI Appendix, Fig. S5 A and B*). Additional details are found in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

Flow Cytometry and Cell Sorting. For cell-surface molecule staining, transduced cells were first treated with anti-mouse CD16/CD32 mAbs (2.4 G2) in staining buffer (2% fetal bovine serum and 0.05% sodium azide in phosphate buffered saline) to block FcR binding and then stained with antibodies. Antibodies used in this study are listed below. Zombie Aqua (BioLegend) was used for staining dead cells. Intracellular IL-17 and IFN- γ staining was performed after stimulation with 50 ng/mL PMA, 500 ng/mL ionomycin, and 5 μ g/mL Brefeldin A for 4 h. For intracellular staining, cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde and treated with permeabilization buffer (0.1% saponin in staining buffer) and then incubated with the antibodies against intracellular cytokine. Lymphocytes and thymocytes from a 9-wk-old female C57BL/6 (Taconic) mouse were used for the positive control of cytokine expression. Cells were analyzed on an LSR Fortessa (BD Biosciences) as described below. Data were analyzed with FlowJo software (Tree Star). The APC-conjugated DP10.7 TCR tetramer was produced as described (31). For DP10.7 TCR tetramer staining, OP9-DL4, OP9-DL4-MHC KO, and OP9-DL4-CD1d stromal cells were plated at 2.5×10^4 cells followed by overnight incubation. Cells were cultured with or without sulfatide (3 μ g/mL) for 2.5 h and then stained by 500 nM tetramer in 10% human serum/staining buffer.

Transcriptome Analysis. A total of 2,000 $\gamma\delta$ TCR- or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR-transduced GFP+ CD45+ DN3 cells were sorted, plated onto OP9-DL4-CD1d cells, which were plated the day before at 5×10^4 cells in six-well plates and cultured in OP9 medium supplemented with Flt-3, IL-7, and gentamicin with or without sulfatide. After 8 d, 5,000 live DN3 (GFP+CD45+CD4⁻CD8⁻CD44⁻CD25⁺) cells and DN4 (GFP+CD45+CD4⁻CD8⁻CD44⁻CD25⁻) cells were sorted (*SI Appendix, Fig. S8*).

For each condition ($\gamma\delta$ TCR or $\gamma\delta$ - $\alpha\beta$ TCR, DN3, or DN4, plus or minus sulfatide, yielding eight conditions/experiment), 5,000 cells were deposited into 350 μ L of TCL lysis buffer (Qiagen) and stored at -80°C until RNA isolation. Three independent experiments generated 24 libraries. Total RNA was then

purified from the stabilized lysates using the ARCTURUS PicoPure RNA isolation kit (Thermo Fisher). Following RNA purification, residual DNA was removed by treatment with the Turbo DNA-Free reagent kit (Thermo Fisher). Total RNA was quantified using the Qubit RNA assay kit (Life Tech) and RNA quality was determined on a bioanalyzer using the RNA Pico kit (Agilent). The NuGen Ovation Human RNA-Seq Multiplex system (NuGen, part 0341) prep kit, was used to target deletion of unwanted high abundance transcripts and ribosomal RNA. More than 100 ng of total RNA was converted into each DNA library following the manufacturer's protocol without modification. Following library construction, DNA libraries were quantified using the Qubit High Sensitivity DNA kit (Life Tech), and library size was determined using the Bioanalyzer High Sensitivity Chip kit (Agilent). Finally, qPCR was carried out on the libraries using the Universal Library Quantification kit for Illumina (Kapa Biosystems) and run on the 7900 HT Fast qPCR machine (ABI). Libraries passing quality control were diluted to 2 nM in sterile water and then sequenced on the NextSeq500 (Illumina) at a final concentration of 12 pM, following all manufacturer protocols.

Antibodies. Antibodies are detailed in *SI Appendix, Materials and Methods*.

Bioinformatic and Statistical Analysis. The output fastq files were aligned against the Ensembl GRCh38.75 reference genome using STAR aligner (v2.5) (86) and the resultant binary alignment map (BAM)-format files were filtered to retain only primary-aligned reads (samtools view -F 0 × 0100). The read counts were quantified at the exon level using subRead featureCounts (v1.4.4) software (87) and differential expression testing was performed using DESeq2 (v1.6.3) software (88). Individual results were considered to be

of significance only if the $p_{adj} \leq 0.1$ (q value; multiple-test corrections were performed using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure). Immune cell signatures were determined using the MSigDB (C7: immunologic signatures) package hosted at the Broad Institute (47).

Multisequence Alignment. TCR C γ and TCR C β sequences and equivalent CH1 sequences of selected Ig isotopes were aligned using three-dimensional structural information with PROMALS3D (89). All sequences were obtained from the international ImMunoGeneTics information system (90) but those of ferret TCR C γ (accession no. XP_012914450.1) and cow TCR C β (accession no. AAI42018.1) were obtained from GenBank after BLAST searches with human counterparts.

Data Availability. Sequencing read and summary files have been deposited in the National Center for Biotechnology Information Gene Expression Omnibus database (ID [GSE165297](https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.08.11.624)). All other study data are included in the article and/or supporting information.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. We gratefully acknowledge Dr Jia-huai Wang for scientific discussion. Simulations were performed using clusters at Texas A&M High-Performance Research Computing and the Texas Advanced Computing Center at the University of Texas at Austin. This work is supported by NIH PO1 Grant A1143565 to R.J.M., W.H., M.J.L., and E.L.R. and NIH R01 grants A1115698 to E.L.R., A1136301 to M.J.L., and A1073922 to E.J.A. Funding is also provided by NIH Transfusion Biology and Cellular Therapies fellowship 5T32HLD66978 to P.W.T. and American Cancer Society fellowship 128750-PF-15-179-01-LIB to C.D.C.

- C. D. Castro, A. M. Luoma, E. J. Adams, Coevolution of T-cell receptors with MHC and non-MHC ligands. *Immunol. Rev.* **267**, 30–55 (2015).
- M. M. Davis, P. J. Bjorkman, T-cell antigen receptor genes and T-cell recognition. *Nature* **334**, 395–402 (1988).
- J. H. Wang, E. L. Reinherz, The structural basis of $\alpha\beta$ T-lineage immune recognition: TCR docking topologies, mechanotransduction, and co-receptor function. *Immunol. Rev.* **250**, 102–119 (2012).
- S. Das *et al.*, Evolution of two prototypic T cell lineages. *Cell. Immunol.* **296**, 87–94 (2015).
- M. M. Nielsen, D. A. Witherden, W. L. Havran, $\gamma\delta$ T cells in homeostasis and host defence of epithelial barrier tissues. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **17**, 733–745 (2017).
- P. Vantourout, A. Hayday, Six-of-the-best: Unique contributions of $\gamma\delta$ T cells to immunology. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **13**, 88–100 (2013).
- P. M. Benveniste *et al.*, Generation and molecular recognition of melanoma-associated antigen-specific human $\gamma\delta$ T cells. *Sci. Immunol.* **3**, eaav4036 (2018).
- J. S. Blum, P. A. Wearsch, P. Cresswell, Pathways of antigen processing. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* **31**, 443–473 (2013).
- H. Schild *et al.*, The nature of major histocompatibility complex recognition by gamma delta T cells. *Cell* **76**, 29–37 (1994).
- E. J. Adams, Y. H. Chien, K. C. Garcia, Structure of a gammadelta T cell receptor in complex with the nonclassical MHC T22. *Science* **308**, 227–231 (2005).
- M. Bonneville *et al.*, Recognition of a self major histocompatibility complex TL region product by gamma delta T-cell receptors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **86**, 5928–5932 (1989).
- P. Constant *et al.*, Stimulation of human gamma delta T cells by nonpeptidic mycobacterial ligands. *Science* **264**, 267–270 (1994).
- E. Scotet *et al.*, Tumor recognition following Vgamma9Vdelta2 T cell receptor interactions with a surface F1-ATPase-related structure and apolipoprotein A-1. *Immunity* **22**, 71–80 (2005).
- A. E. Simões, B. Di Lorenzo, B. Silva-Santos, Molecular determinants of target cell recognition by human $\gamma\delta$ T cells. *Front. Immunol.* **9**, 929 (2018).
- F. M. Spada *et al.*, Self-recognition of CD1 by gamma/delta T cells: Implications for innate immunity. *J. Exp. Med.* **191**, 937–948 (2000).
- C. R. Wilcox *et al.*, Cytomegalovirus and tumor stress surveillance by binding of a human $\gamma\delta$ T cell antigen receptor to endothelial protein C receptor. *Nat. Immunol.* **13**, 872–879 (2012).
- X. Zeng *et al.*, $\gamma\delta$ T cells recognize a microbial encoded B cell antigen to initiate a rapid antigen-specific interleukin-17 response. *Immunity* **37**, 524–534 (2012).
- B. J. Laidlaw, J. E. Craft, S. M. Kaech, The multifaceted role of CD4(+) T cells in CD8(+) T cell memory. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* **16**, 102–111 (2016).
- D. K. Das *et al.*, Force-dependent transition in the T-cell receptor β -subunit allosterically regulates peptide discrimination and pMHC bond lifetime. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 1517–1522 (2015).
- Y. Feng *et al.*, Mechanosensing drives acuity of $\alpha\beta$ T-cell recognition. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, E8204–E8213 (2017).
- Y. Feng, E. L. Reinherz, M. J. Lang, $\alpha\beta$ T cell receptor mechanosensing forces out serial engagement. *Trends Immunol.* **39**, 596–609 (2018).
- K. L. Hui, L. Balagopalan, L. E. Samelson, A. Upadhyaya, Cytoskeletal forces during signaling activation in Jurkat T-cells. *Mol. Biol. Cell* **26**, 685–695 (2015).
- J. Husson, K. Chemin, A. Bohineust, C. Hivroz, N. Henry, Force generation upon T cell receptor engagement. *PLoS One* **6**, e19680 (2011).
- S. T. Kim *et al.*, The alphabeta T cell receptor is an anisotropic mechanosensor. *J. Biol. Chem.* **284**, 31028–31037 (2009).
- Y. C. Li *et al.*, Cutting edge: Mechanical forces acting on T cells immobilized via the TCR complex can trigger TCR signaling. *J. Immunol.* **184**, 5959–5963 (2010).
- B. Liu, W. Chen, B. D. Evavold, C. Zhu, Accumulation of dynamic catch bonds between TCR and agonist peptide-MHC triggers T cell signaling. *Cell* **157**, 357–368 (2014).
- K. N. Brazin *et al.*, Structural features of the $\alpha\beta$ TCR mechanotransduction apparatus that promote pMHC discrimination. *Front. Immunol.* **6**, 441 (2015).
- K. N. Brazin *et al.*, The T cell antigen receptor α transmembrane domain coordinates triggering through regulation of bilayer immersion and CD3 subunit associations. *Immunity* **49**, 829–841.e6 (2018).
- W. Hwang, R. J. Mallis, M. J. Lang, E. L. Reinherz, The $\alpha\beta$ TCR mechanosensor exploits dynamic ectodomain allostery to optimize its ligand recognition site. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 21336–21345 (2020).
- D. K. Das *et al.*, PreTCRs leverage V β CDRs and hydrophobic patch in mechanosensing thymic self-ligands. *J. Biol. Chem.* **291**, 25292–25305 (2016).
- A. M. Luoma *et al.*, Crystal structure of V δ 1 T cell receptor in complex with CD1d-sulfatide shows MHC-like recognition of a self-lipid by human $\gamma\delta$ T cells. *Immunity* **39**, 1032–1042 (2013).
- E. J. Adams, P. Strop, S. Shin, Y. H. Chien, K. C. Garcia, An autonomous CDR3delta is sufficient for recognition of the nonclassical MHC class I molecules T10 and T22 by gammadelta T cells. *Nat. Immunol.* **9**, 777–784 (2008).
- J. Wang *et al.*, Atomic structure of an alphabeta T cell receptor (TCR) heterodimer in complex with an anti-TCR fab fragment derived from a mitogenic antibody. *EMBO J.* **17**, 10–26 (1998).
- S. Rangarajan *et al.*, Peptide-MHC (pMHC) binding to a human antiviral T cell receptor induces long-range allosteric communication between pMHC- and CD3-binding sites. *J. Biol. Chem.* **293**, 15991–16005 (2018).
- R. J. Mallis *et al.*, Pre-TCR ligand binding impacts thymocyte development before $\alpha\beta$ TCR expression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 8373–8378 (2015).
- L. V. Sibener *et al.*, Isolation of a structural mechanism for uncoupling T cell receptor signaling from peptide-MHC binding. *Cell* **174**, 672–687.e27 (2018).
- Y. Liu *et al.*, DNA-based nanoparticle tension sensors reveal that T-cell receptors transmit defined pN forces to their antigens for enhanced fidelity. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 5610–5615 (2016).
- A. L. Szymczak, D. A. Vignali, Development of 2A peptide-based strategies in the design of multicistronic vectors. *Expert Opin. Biol. Ther.* **5**, 627–638 (2005).
- C. J. Cohen, Y. Zhao, Z. Zheng, S. A. Rosenberg, R. A. Morgan, Enhanced antitumor activity of murine-human hybrid T-cell receptor (TCR) in human lymphocytes is associated with improved pairing and TCR/CD3 stability. *Cancer Res.* **66**, 8878–8886 (2006).
- K. Malecek *et al.*, Specific increase in potency via structure-based design of a TCR. *J. Immunol.* **193**, 2587–2599 (2014).
- M. Mohtashami *et al.*, Direct comparison of Dll1- and Dll4-mediated Notch activation levels shows differential lymphomyeloid lineage commitment outcomes. *J. Immunol.* **185**, 867–876 (2010).
- D. A. Cantrell, A. A. Davies, M. J. Crompton, Activators of protein kinase C down-regulate and phosphorylate the T3/T-cell antigen receptor complex of human T lymphocytes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **82**, 8158–8162 (1985).
- S. P. Fehl *et al.*, Role of a selecting ligand in shaping the murine $\gamma\delta$ -TCR repertoire. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **115**, 1889–1894 (2018).

Mallis *et al.*

Molecular design of the $\gamma\delta$ T cell receptor ectodomain encodes biologically fit ligand recognition in the absence of mechanosensing

PNAS | 11 of 12

<https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2023050118>

44. K. Shibata *et al.*, IFN- γ -producing and IL-17-producing $\gamma\delta$ T cells differentiate at distinct developmental stages in murine fetal thymus. *J. Immunol.* **192**, 2210–2218 (2014).
45. N. Sumaria, C. L. Grandjean, B. Silva-Santos, D. J. Pennington, Strong TCR $\gamma\delta$ signaling prohibits thymic development of IL-17A-secreting $\gamma\delta$ T cells. *Cell Rep.* **19**, 2469–2476 (2017).
46. R. Testi, J. H. Phillips, L. L. Lanier, T cell activation via Leu-23 (CD69). *J. Immunol.* **143**, 1123–1128 (1989).
47. J. Godec *et al.*, Compendium of immune signatures identifies conserved and species-specific biology in response to inflammation. *Immunity* **44**, 194–206 (2016).
48. D. Amsen, C. Revilla Calvo, B. A. Osborne, A. M. Kruisbeek, Costimulatory signals are required for induction of transcription factor Nur77 during negative selection of CD4(+)CD8(+) thymocytes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **96**, 622–627 (1999).
49. T. B. Buus, N. Ødum, C. Geisler, J. P. H. Lauritsen, Three distinct developmental pathways for adaptive and two IFN- γ -producing $\gamma\delta$ T subsets in adult thymus. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1911 (2017).
50. B. Jabri *et al.*, TCR specificity dictates CD94/NKG2A expression by human CTL. *Immunity* **17**, 487–499 (2002).
51. H. Shao, D. H. Kono, L. Y. Chen, E. M. Rubin, J. Kaye, Induction of the early growth response (Egr) family of transcription factors during thymic selection. *J. Exp. Med.* **185**, 731–744 (1997).
52. T. Van Den Broeck *et al.*, Differential Ly49e expression pathways in resting versus TCR-activated intraepithelial $\gamma\delta$ T cells. *J. Immunol.* **190**, 1982–1990 (2013).
53. D. Guy-Grand *et al.*, Different use of T cell receptor transducing modules in two populations of gut intraepithelial lymphocytes are related to distinct pathways of T cell differentiation. *J. Exp. Med.* **180**, 673–679 (1994).
54. S. M. Hayes, P. E. Love, Distinct structure and signaling potential of the gamma delta TCR complex. *Immunity* **16**, 827–838 (2002).
55. D. Qian *et al.*, The gamma chain of the high-affinity receptor for IgE is a major functional subunit of the T-cell antigen receptor complex in gamma delta T lymphocytes. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **90**, 11875–11879 (1993).
56. A. Morath, W. W. Schamel, $\alpha\beta$ and $\gamma\delta$ T cell receptors: Similar but different. *J. Leukoc. Biol.* **107**, 1045–1055 (2020).
57. T. Sasada *et al.*, Involvement of the TCR C β FG loop in thymic selection and T cell function. *J. Exp. Med.* **195**, 1419–1431 (2002).
58. M. Touma *et al.*, The TCR C β FG loop regulates alpha beta T cell development. *J. Immunol.* **176**, 6812–6823 (2006).
59. S. T. Kim *et al.*, Distinctive CD3 heterodimeric ectodomain topologies maximize antigen-triggered activation of alpha beta T cell receptors. *J. Immunol.* **185**, 2951–2959 (2010).
60. W. E. Thomas, V. Vogel, E. Sokurenko, Biophysics of catch bonds. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* **37**, 399–416 (2008).
61. Y. V. Pereverzev, E. Prezhdo, E. V. Sokurenko, The two-pathway model of the biological catch-bond as a limit of the allosteric model. *Biophys. J.* **101**, 2026–2036 (2011).
62. P. Wu *et al.*, Mechano-regulation of peptide-MHC class I conformations determines TCR antigen recognition. *Mol. Cell* **73**, 1015–1027.e7 (2019).
63. E. P. Dopfer *et al.*, The CD3 conformational change in the $\gamma\delta$ T cell receptor is not triggered by antigens but can be enforced to enhance tumor killing. *Cell Rep.* **7**, 1704–1715 (2014).
64. N. A. Spidale *et al.*, Interleukin-17-producing $\gamma\delta$ T cells originate from SOX13+ progenitors that are independent of $\gamma\delta$ TCR signaling. *Immunity* **49**, 857–872.e5 (2018).
65. K. Narayan *et al.*; Immunological Genome Project Consortium, Intrathymic programming of effector fates in three molecularly distinct $\gamma\delta$ T cell subtypes. *Nat. Immunol.* **13**, 511–518 (2012).
66. B. E. Willcox, C. R. Willcox, $\gamma\delta$ TCR ligands: The quest to solve a 500-million-year-old mystery. *Nat. Immunol.* **20**, 121–128 (2019).
67. S. K. Dougan, A. Kaser, R. S. Blumberg, CD1 expression on antigen-presenting cells. *Curr. Top. Microbiol. Immunol.* **314**, 113–141 (2007).
68. M. C. Haks *et al.*, Attenuation of gammadeltaTCR signaling efficiently diverts thymocytes to the alphabeta lineage. *Immunity* **22**, 595–606 (2005).
69. T. Kreslavsky, M. Gleimer, H. von Boehmer, Alphabeta versus gammadelta lineage choice at the first TCR-controlled checkpoint. *Curr. Opin. Immunol.* **22**, 185–192 (2010).
70. P. Zarin, G. W. Wong, M. Mohtashami, D. L. Wiest, J. C. Zúñiga-Pflücker, Enforcement of $\gamma\delta$ -lineage commitment by the pre-T-cell receptor in precursors with weak $\gamma\delta$ -TCR signals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 5658–5663 (2014).
71. T. Sasada *et al.*, Disparate peptide-dependent thymic selection outcomes in beta2M-deficient mice versus TAP-1-deficient mice: Implications for repertoire formation. *Eur. J. Immunol.* **33**, 368–380 (2003).
72. W. A. Catterall, A. L. Goldin, S. G. Waxman, International Union of Pharmacology. XLVII. Nomenclature and structure-function relationships of voltage-gated sodium channels. *Pharmacol. Rev.* **57**, 397–409 (2005).
73. Y. Vodovotz *et al.*, Solving immunology? *Trends Immunol.* **38**, 116–127 (2017).
74. R. H. Pullen III, S. M. Abel, Catch bonds at T cell interfaces: Impact of surface reorganization and membrane fluctuations. *Biophys. J.* **113**, 120–131 (2017).
75. G. B. Stewart-Jones, A. J. McMichael, J. I. Bell, D. I. Stuart, E. Y. Jones, A structural basis for immunodominant human T cell receptor recognition. *Nat. Immunol.* **4**, 657–663 (2003).
76. A. P. Uldrich *et al.*, CD1d-lipid antigen recognition by the $\gamma\delta$ TCR. *Nat. Immunol.* **14**, 1137–1145 (2013).
77. A. Šali, T. L. Blundell, Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. *J. Mol. Biol.* **234**, 779–815 (1993).
78. B. R. Brooks *et al.*, CHARMM: The biomolecular simulation program. *J. Comput. Chem.* **30**, 1545–1614 (2009).
79. A. P. Hynninen, M. F. Crowley, New faster CHARMM molecular dynamics engine. *J. Comput. Chem.* **35**, 406–413 (2014).
80. W. Hwang, M. J. Lang, M. Karplus, Kinesin motility is driven by subdomain dynamics. *eLife* **6**, e28948 (2017).
81. L. Bai *et al.*, The majority of CD1d-sulfatide-specific T cells in human blood use a semiinvariant V δ 1 TCR. *Eur. J. Immunol.* **42**, 2505–2510 (2012).
82. J. Liu *et al.*, Crystallization of a deglycosylated T cell receptor (TCR) complexed with an anti-TCR Fab fragment. *J. Biol. Chem.* **271**, 33639–33646 (1996).
83. C. Bernabeu *et al.*, Coexpression of the human HLA-A2 or HLA-B7 heavy chain gene and human beta 2-microglobulin gene in L cells. *J. Immunol.* **133**, 3188–3194 (1984).
84. P. Ferrier, C. Layet, D. H. Cailloil, B. R. Jordan, F. A. Lemonnier, The association between murine beta 2-microglobulin and HLA class I heavy chains results in serologically detectable conformational changes of both chains. *J. Immunol.* **135**, 1281–1287 (1985).
85. C. Paduraru *et al.*, An N-linked glycan modulates the interaction between the CD1d heavy chain and beta 2-microglobulin. *J. Biol. Chem.* **281**, 40369–40378 (2006).
86. A. Dobin *et al.*, STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 15–21 (2013).
87. Y. Liao, G. K. Smyth, W. Shi, featureCounts: An efficient general purpose program for assigning sequence reads to genomic features. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 923–930 (2014).
88. M. I. Love, W. Huber, S. Anders, Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 550 (2014).
89. J. Pei, B. H. Kim, N. V. Grishin, PROMALS3D: A tool for multiple protein sequence and structure alignments. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **36**, 2295–2300 (2008).
90. M. P. Lefranc *et al.*, LIGM-DB/IMGT: An integrated database of Ig and TCR, part of the immunogenetics database. *Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci.* **764**, 47–49 (1995).