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Abstract:

Ionotropic glutamate receptor family members (iGluRs) are integrated into supramolecular complexes that modulate their location and function at excitatory synapses. However, a lack of structural information beyond isolated receptors or fragments thereof currently limits the mechanistic understanding of physiological iGluR signaling. Here, we report structural and functional analyses of the prototypical molecular bridge linking post-synaptic iGluR δ2 (GluD2) and pre-synaptic β-neurexin-1 (β-NRX1) via Cbln1, a C1q-like synaptic organizer. We show how Cbln1 hexamers “anchor” GluD2 amino-terminal domain dimers to monomeric β-NRX1. This arrangement promotes synaptogenesis, and is essential for d-Serine-dependent GluD2 signaling in vivo, underlying long-term depression of cerebellar parallel fiber-Purkinje cell (PF-PC) synapses and motor coordination in developing mice. These results lead to a model where protein and small-molecule ligands synergistically control synaptic iGluR function.

One Sentence Summary: A molecular bridge across excitatory synapses provides a structural framework that facilitates signaling in the cerebellum.
Main Text:

Excitatory neurotransmission in the vertebrate central nervous system is largely mediated by the iGluR family members, classified as AMPA (GluA1-4), NMDA (GluN1, GluN2A-D, GluN3A-B), Kainate (GluK1-5) and Delta (GluD1-2) subtypes. All iGluRs are assembled from four modular subunits, each displaying extracellular amino-terminal and ligand binding domains (ATD and LBD), a transmembrane domain (TMD) lining a central ion channel pore, and a cytoplasmic carboxy-terminal domain (CTD). Binding of agonist molecules to the LBDs of GluA, GluN and GluK receptors (typically glutamate, but also glycine or d-Serine for GluN subtypes) drives opening of the cation-conductive ion channel and neuronal membrane depolarization. Furthermore, all iGluRs appear to initiate post-synaptic signaling through non-ionotropic mechanisms, a process better understood for NMDA and Delta receptor subtypes.

In addition to their signaling function, mediated by excitatory amino acids, iGluRs are implicated in synaptogenesis. The membrane-distal position of iGluR ATDs makes them readily accessible to other proteins populating the synaptic cleft. In this context, the GluD subfamily of iGluRs are the best studied. Cbln1, a soluble synaptic organizer molecule belonging to the C1q/TNFα superfamily, directly binds the GluD1 and GluD2 ATDs. Cbln1 also interacts with pre-synaptic membrane-tethered neurexins (NRXs), establishing “molecular bridges” that span the cleft to facilitate bi-directional synaptic differentiation. Despite their importance, the architecture of supramolecular GluD assemblies and the mechanisms by which they support integration of the dual synaptogenic and metabotropic signaling functions have remained unknown. We sought to address these questions by structurally investigating the β-NRX1–Cbln1–GluD2 trans-synaptic triad.

As a first step towards solving a Cbln–GluD complex, we solved high-resolution crystal structures of (i) free human GluD2 (GluD2_ATD, 1.75 Å) and mouse GluD1 (GluD1_ATD, 2.30 Å) ATD dimers, and (ii) free nearly full-length human Cbln1 (Cbln1^AVRG, 2.80 and 7.00 Å) and the obligate Cbln1 globular domain trimer (with a C1q-like fold, Cbln1_C1q, 2.35 Å) (fig. S1-S4, table S1 and (24)). Using Surface Plasmon Resonance (SPR), we found that avidity governs the full-length Cbln1–GluD2 (Cbln1_FL–GluD2_FL) complex formation, resulting in a nM-range apparent affinity (K_D,app ~ 125 nM) (fig. S5 and (24)). Molecular dissection of the complex into individual
components revealed that the Cbln1 C1q-like trimer is the minimal unit needed for interaction with GluD2\textsubscript{ATD}, with an affinity in the high \(\mu\text{M}\)-range (fig. S5-S6 and (24)). Attempts at co-crystallizing a Cbln1–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} complex were hampered by the propensity of both components to crystallize separately. We consequently designed a construct that combines a fused Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} trimer with GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} into one continuous polypeptide chain, linked by a 30-residue flexible Gly-Gly-Ser ((G\textsubscript{2}S)\textsubscript{10}) spacer (Fig. 1A, fig. S7-S8 and (24)). We validated the mass and monodispersity of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} chimera using Multi-angle Light Scattering (MALS) and negative-staining single particle EM (fig. S8 and (24)).

We determined the crystal structure of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} complex at 3.10 Å (Fig. 1B, fig. S8 and table S1). Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} sits on top of the membrane-distal face of the GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} in an inward tilted orientation and breaks its threefold symmetry to engage an ATD monomer with a total buried surface area (BSA) of 873 Å\textsuperscript{2} (Fig. 1C). The arrangement of both Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} trimers suggests the position of the putative Cbln1 N-terminal “Cys-rich region” (CRR, not present in the chimeric construct) that links two Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} trimers into the hexameric Cbln1\textsubscript{FL} (Fig. 1B, fig. S4 and (25)). The distance between the calculated centers of mass of both trimers is 70 Å, in good agreement with the corresponding distances in two crystal structures of free Cbln1\textsuperscript{AVRSG} (77 and 79 Å, respectively, fig. S9). The tilted vs. linear arrangement of the C1q trimers in the three structures suggests their intrinsic hinge movement relative to the CRR (fig. S9), consistent with the single-particle EM analysis (Fig. 1D and fig. S10). The Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} structure however indicates that binding of GluD2 constrains the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} domain orientation. Single-particle EM class averages of free Cbln1\textsubscript{FL} indicated the CRR as a globular structure linking two Cbln1 C1q trimers (Fig. 1D, fig. S10 and (24)).

In the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} crystal lattice, GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} forms the same N-shaped tetrameric “AB–CD” arrangement (Fig. 2A) previously observed in the full-length GluA2 and GluK2 structures (5, 26) and in structures of isolated GluA2 (27, 28) and GluK6 (29) ATDs. Ca-atom superposition of GluA2\textsubscript{CRYST} (5) and GluD2 ATD tetramers yields an r.m.s.d. of 5.6 Å over 635 positions when aligning B–D dimers, and 7.3 Å over 695 positions when aligning A–C dimers (Fig. 2B). This AB–CD ATD arrangement is, as in GluA2\textsubscript{CRYST}, stabilized by two-fold symmetrical contacts between the D–B monomers (666 Å\textsuperscript{2} BSA), and consists of numerous putative salt bridges and hydrogen bonds as well as two potential calcium atoms (fig. S11 and (24)). Alignment of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} complex to the full GluA2\textsubscript{CRYST}, using the B–D
ATD dimer as reference, illustrates how one Cbln1 hexamer, binding to each ATD dimer, extends the outward-tapering, vertical Y-shape of the iGluR. The height of this arrangement (~17 nm) fits within the typical width of the PF-PC synaptic cleft (~20 nm) (Fig. 2C).

We then investigated how Cbln1 links GluD2 to pre-synaptic β-NRX1. The extracellular part of the single-span membrane-tethered β-NRX1 consists of a single LNS (laminin, neurexin, sex-hormone-binding globulin) domain, LNS6, of known structure (30). Insertion of the 30-residue “spliced sequence #4” (SS4) into β-NRX1LNS6 via alternative splicing, to yield β-NRX1(+4), is required for Cbln1 binding (18). Using Isothermal Titration Calorimetry (ITC), we measured that one hexameric Cbln1 and one monomeric β-NRX1(+4) bind with high-affinity ($K_D = 43.5 \pm 4.4$ nM), and that the Cbln1 CRR and β-NRX1 SS4 mediate all binding (fig. S12). Surprisingly, the 1-to-1 stoichiometry indicates that the two-fold Cbln1 symmetry is broken in β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1FL. Single-particle negative-stain EM class averages of β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1FL confirm this stoichiometry and confirm that the Cbln1 CRR is the β-NRX1(+4) binding platform (Fig. 2D, fig. S10 and (24)). Together, our structural analyses allow us to propose an overall model for the β-NRX1–Cbln1–GluD2 triad that features symmetry mismatches in both binary complex interfaces (Fig. 2E).

Cbln1C1q binds GluD2ATD at the membrane-distal ends of α-helices 1, 2, 3, 9 and 10 of the R1 lobe and the “flap” loop, an extended, structurally conserved segment that links α-helices 9 and 10 and folds back onto the top of the ATD. Cbln1 interface residues are contributed by loops AA′ (Ser$^{69}$-Ser$^{75}$), CD (Tyr$^{122}$-Thr$^{126}$), EF (Gly$^{144}$-Arg$^{150}$) and GH (Gly$^{174}$-Lys$^{181}$) from one C1q subunit (Fig. 3A). Cbln1 loops EF and CD rearrange upon binding the relatively flat to p of GluD2ATD, which remains largely unchanged between free and Cbln1-bound states (overall Cα-atom r.m.s.d. of 0.5 Å over 336 positions) (Fig. 3A).

Cbln1 Tyr$^{122}$ forms the central interaction hotspot; it is oriented by GluD2 Glu$^{61}$ and Thr$^{60}$ and buried in a small hydrophobic pocket formed by GluD2 Ile$^{26}$, Ile$^{27}$, Leu$^{58}$, Leu$^{342}$ and Trp$^{347}$ (fig. S13). At the periphery, Asp$^{24}$, the first residue of the mature GluD2 chain, is locked into an extended putative hydrogen-bonding network by Cbln1 residues Thr$^{70}$, Asn$^{71}$ and His$^{72}$ of loop AA′, and Lys$^{181}$ of loop GH. Cbln1 Arg$^{150}$ and Asp$^{147}$ on loop EF engage in putative charged interactions with GluD2 Glu$^{61}$ and Arg$^{345}$, respectively (fig. S13). Sequence conservation analysis indicates that the flap loop interface residues of GluD1/2ATD, and the loop-based
interface residues in the Cbln family (Cbln1-Cbln4) are highly conserved in vertebrates (fig. S14).

We performed single-position alanine-scanning mutagenesis on 15 contiguous GluD2 interface residues to validate the Cbln1_{C1q}–GluD2_{ATD} binding mode. D24A, S25A, I26A, E61A, L342A, R345A, H348A and S352A cluster into the center of the observed interaction interface and showed reduced binding to Cbln1 in an avidity-enhanced SPR setup. Seven peripheral mutations maintained binding: T60A, E343A, D344A, K346A, S349A, M350A and Q364A (Fig. 3B, 3C and fig. S15). Furthermore, the Cbln1_{FL}, Cbln1_{C34S,C38S} (lacking the CRR) and Cbln1_{C1q} variants containing the Y122A, R124A and D147A interface mutations lost all binding to GluD2_{ATD} (fig. S16).

The expression pattern of GluD2, specifically confined to PF-PC synapses in the cerebellar cortex (31), and the availability of well characterized Grid2-null (GluD2-deficient) and Cbln1-null mice, offered us the opportunity to validate and mechanistically interrogate structural models in a series of functional assays, from cell culture to in vivo. Guided by the Cbln1_{C1q}–GluD2_{ATD} structure, we designed a number of GluD2 mutants that target distinct structural features of the receptor to gauge their effect on the two well-established major functions of GluD2 signaling: (i) PF-PC synapse formation and (ii) induction of long-term depression (LTD) of synaptic transmission (8, 31). GluD2^{D24A,I26A,E61A,R345A} combines four Ala-mutations that abolish Cbln1 binding (Fig. 3B and fig. S17). GluD2^{E343A,K346A,S349A,M350A} combines four Ala-mutations that maintain Cbln1 binding but are immediately adjacent to the binding hotspot (Fig. 3B and fig. S17). GluD2^{F76D} contains monomerised ATDs (fig. S6); this mutation was specifically designed to disrupt the N-shaped ATD-layer, native Cbln1_{FL}–GluD2_{ATD} binding geometry and overall Y-shape of GluD2 (Fig. 2C), while maintaining the Cbln1_{C1q} binding platform (Fig. 3A). Finally, GluD2^{ATD-LBD\_GLYCAN\_WEDGE} contains a ten-residue glycosylated linker (ELSNGTDGAS in single-letter amino acid code) inserted between the ATD and LBD layers in order to space them apart and disrupt potential mechanical ATD-LBD coupling (fig. S17 and (24)).

The effect of the glycan wedge (GW) on ATD-LBD coupling was tested by introducing the Ala654Thr mutation (“Lurcher” (Lc), located in TM helix M3) into GluD2 to render the channel constitutively open (fig. S18). Application of the LBD agonist d-Serine (d-Ser) inhibited the Lc
current in a dose-dependent manner, as expected (32). However, the half-maximal inhibitory concentration (IC$_{50}$) was ~1.5-fold higher in GluD2$^{GW/Lc}$ compared to GluD2$^{WT/Lc}$, indicating that separation of ATD and LBD by the glycan wedge impaired the ability of the LBD to induce pore closure (fig. S18).

We set up a heterologous hemi-synapse formation assay in which HEK 293T cells expressing these mutants were co-cultured with isolated wild-type mouse cerebellar granule cells (GCs) (Fig. 3D and fig. S17). Consistent with our mutagenesis data, cells expressing GluD2$^{D24A,I26A,E61A,R345A}$ accumulated no GC axon terminals whereas cells expressing GluD2$^{E343A,K346A,S349A,M350A}$ did so normally. Cells expressing GluD2$^{F76D}$ showed intermediate GC axon terminal accumulation, suggesting that a disrupted ATD dimerization interface still allows synapse-spanning interactions to a certain extent. The GluD2$^{ATD-LBD/GLYCAN_WEDGE}$ mutant showed normal GC axon terminal accumulation, in line with the Cbln1–GluD2 complex interface, as well as receptor geometry, being intact.

We back-expressed GluD2$^{WT}$ and the GluD2 mutants using recombinant Sindbis virus into the cerebellum of adult (> P30) Grid2-null mice that typically display a marked (~40%) reduction of PF-PC synapse number (31). Immunohistochemical (IHC) analysis of ultrathin sections using gold-conjugated anti-GluD2 antibodies detected that all mutants reached the PC post-synaptic density (PSD) (fig. S19). We counted the number of PF-PC synapses in the EM micrographs; the proportion of contacted synapses for GluD2$^{E343A,K346A,S349A,M350A}$ and GluD2$^{ATD-LBD/GLYCAN_WEDGE}$ was comparable to GluD2$^{WT}$. GluD2$^{D24A,I26A,E61A,R345A}$ and GluD2$^{F76D}$ however failed to robustly induce PF-PC contacts (Fig. 3E and fig. S19). Thus, disruption of the Cbln1–GluD2 interface and binding geometry attenuates rapid induction of PF-PC synapses.

Cerebellar LTD is caused by activity-induced endocytosis of postsynaptic AMPA receptors in PC dendrites (33). GluD2 signaling via the CTD is absolutely required for LTD induction independent of PF synapse formation; LTD is impaired even when the PF synapse number is restored by reintroduction of GluD2 lacking the CTD in Grid-null mice (34). d-Ser binds and closes the LBD of GluD2 (fig. S18 and (32)) to enhance LTD induction via the CTD of GluD2 (8). Interestingly, application of exogenous d-Ser (200 µM for 10 min) reduced PF-evoked excitatory postsynaptic currents (PF-EPSCs) in mature wild-type, but not in Cbln1-null
PCs, in the presence of NMDA receptor blockers to prevent co-activation of NMDA receptors (fig. S20). Endogenous d-Ser is released at PF-PC synapses from neighboring Bergmann glia by burst stimulation (BS) of PFs in immature cerebellar slices (8). Indeed, conjunctive BS and direct PC depolarization (BS/ΔV) (Fig. 4A) induced a robust LTD in wild-type, but not in Cbln1-null or Grid2-null PCs in the presence of NMDA receptor blockers (fig. S20). These results indicate that GluD2 requires the presence of Cbln1 in order to respond to exo- or endogenous d-Ser and trigger AMPA receptor endocytosis.

We examined whether the structure-guided GluD2 mutants are able to support d-Ser-dependent LTD at PF-PC synapses. BS/ΔV induced LTD in immature Grid2-null PCs expressing GluD2WT and GluD2E343A,K346A,S349A,M350A, but not GluD2D24A,I26A,E61A,R345A, GluD2F76D or GluD2ATD-LBD/GLYCAN_WEDGE (Fig. 4B, fig. S21 and (24)). Thus, anchoring by Cbln1, stable ATD dimer formation and ATD-LBD coupling are all required for GluD2 to mediate the d-Ser-dependent LTD signals.

To relate our findings to cerebellar function in vivo, we subjected immature Grid2-null mice virally expressing GluD2WT and the structure-guided GluD2 mutants to an accelerating (4 to 40 r.p.m. in 5 min) rotor-rod test. Conventional cerebellum-dependent learning tasks such as eye blink-conditioning cannot be used in immature mice, when d-Ser is still present. Motor coordination was recovered following expression of GluD2WT, GluD2E343A,K346A,S349A,M350A and GluD2ATD-LBD/GLYCAN_WEDGE, but not of GluD2D24A,I26A,E61A,R345A or GluD2F76D (fig. S22). These results reflect our PF-PC synapse formation data and suggest that the interface and geometry of the Cbln1–GluD2 complex we describe is crucial for restoration of PF-PC cerebellar circuitry and motor-related performance.

Our results provide a molecular framework for the large body of studies on the β-NRX1–Cbln1–GluD2 trans-synaptic signaling system, and suggest a three-step model for GluD2 signaling activation. Cbln1 is secreted from cerebellar GCs through yet unidentified mechanisms and remains associated with β-NRX1 on the surface of GC axons (Fig. 4C, Step I) (35). When cerebellar GC axons encounter PC dendritic spines, the β-NRX1–Cbln1 complex “hooks” GluD2, via avidity-enhanced Cbln1C1q–GluD2ATD interactions, in a trans-synaptic complex (Fig. 4C, Step II). The biological importance of the binding avidity most likely lies in improving the probability for molecular recruitment of GluD2 by β-NRX1–Cbln1 at PF-PC synapses, given the
weak affinity between individual Cbln1 and GluD2 domains. It is however unclear whether GluD2 is fully occupied at any given time point. Finally, agonist binding triggers a conformational change of the GluD2 LBD which is transmitted to the transmembrane domain to initiate downstream signaling (9) resulting in AMPA receptor endocytosis and LTD (8, 9) (Fig. 4C, Step III).

Recent structures of isolated full-length GluA and GluK receptors in different functional states have established that iGluR gating is accompanied by complex ATD-LBD relative motions (26, 36, 37). Furthermore, desensitization of GluA receptors results in a marked conformational variability in the ATD layer (4, 26, 36). Similar motions might, in principle, be possible in GluD receptors, considering their overall structural and sequence homology to GluA and GluK family members. However, we propose that, in a trans-synaptic context, anchoring of GluD to the β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1 complex will limit or prevent large-scale motions of the ATD layer. As a result, the force generated by LBD closure, driving the overall receptor contraction, is likely to transfer predominantly towards the post-synaptic membrane. Since most, if not all, iGluR family members are anchored to synaptic cleft proteins via their ATDs (16-20), it is conceivable that their range of motions may also differ from those currently described in isolated receptors (4, 26, 36). Such interactions will impact on both iGluR location and conformation in response to agonist binding. We propose that the concept illustrated here, where small molecule and protein ligands cooperate in order to modulate GluD2 signaling, is likely to be more generally applicable to neurotransmitter receptors.
Figure Legends:

**Fig. 1: Architecture of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} Binary Complex.**

(A) Schematic representation of the chimeric Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} and Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} constructs. (B) “Front” and “side” view of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} complex. The inward tilted orientation of the Cbln1 C1q domains suggests the position of the Cbln1 cysteine-rich region (CRR), as visible in EM class averages and represented by a dotted ellipse here. GluD2 α-helix 6’ and flap and cleft loops are highlighted. Disulfide bridges are shown as yellow spheres. (C) Symmetry-breaking in the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} interface. The total buried interaction surface is shown in a 90° rotated open book view. (D) Selected negative-stain EM class averages of Cbln1\textsubscript{FL} illustrate its dimer-of-trimers arrangement. Yellow arrows indicate the suggested position of the CRR that links both C1q trimers. Scale bar: 10 nm.

**Fig. 2: Quaternary Structure of the β-NRX1–Cbln1–GluD2 Complex.**

(A) “Top” view of the full Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} dimer-of-dimers complex. The black ellipse, black arrows and red arrows indicate the overall two-fold symmetry axis, the two-fold symmetry axes in the GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} dimers and the three-fold symmetry axes in the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} trimers, respectively. The suggested position of the Cbln1 CRR is marked with dashed ovals. (B) Superposition of the GluD2 and GluA2 (PDB 3KG2, (5)) N-shaped ATD layers using the B–D ATD dimers (view equivalent to (A)). Centers of mass of GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} (black spheres) and GluA2\textsubscript{ATD} (red spheres) are connected to highlight overall similarity. (C) View along the overall two-fold axis of the Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q}–GluD2\textsubscript{ATD} complex aligned to Y-shaped GluA2\textsubscript{CRYST} using the B–D ATD dimers. (D) Selected negative-stain EM class averages of the β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1\textsubscript{FL} complex. Yellow arrows indicate the suggested position of β-NRX1(+4). Scale bar; 10 nm. CRR; cysteine-rich region. (E) Model of the synapse-spanning β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1–GluD2 complex.

**Fig. 3: Details and Structure-guided Mutagenesis of the Cbln1–GluD2 Interface.**

(A) Superposition of free and bound Cbln1\textsubscript{C1q} and GluD2\textsubscript{ATD}. (B) GluD2 alanine-scanning mutagenesis; SPR response levels are color-annotated as a heat map onto the GluD2 ATD structure. The mutated interface is outlined in black, and the interaction hotspot is outlined in
red. (C) GluD2 alanine-scanning mutagenesis using Cbln1FL and monomerised GluD2ATD. The bar chart shows absolute SPR responses after stimulation with 100 µM Cbln1, relative to wild-type GluD2. (D) Quantification of hemi-synapse formation by cerebellar granule cells (GCs) and HEK 293T cells expressing structure-guided GluD2 mutants. Syn; synaptophysin. Data represent mean ± SEM. ****; p < 0.0001 (Kruskal-Wallis and Steel-Dwass test). (E) Quantification of contacted synapses between PFs and PCs expressing structure-guided GluD2 mutants in Grid2-null (GluD2-deficient) cerebella. Data represent mean ± SEM. ****; p < 0.0001, n.s.; not significant (Kruskal-Wallis and Steel-Dwass test).

Fig. 4: Structure-guided GluD2 Mutants Affect Cerebellar Synaptic Plasticity.

(A) Setup to induce LTD in immature PC dendrites. PC: Purkinje cell, GC: granule cell, PF: parallel fiber, BG: Bergmann glia, BS: burst stimulation, Rec: recording electrode. (B) Averaged LTD data from immature Grid2-null (GluD2-deficient) PCs expressing GFP + GluD2 variants, after burst PF stimulation (BS) combined with direct PC depolarization (ΔV) (BS/ΔV; arrow). The insets show PF-EPSCs at t = −1 min and t = 30 min time points relative to BS/ΔV application. Data represent the mean ± SEM. **; p < 0.01, *; p < 0.05, n.s.; not significant (Kruskal-Wallis and Steel-Dwass test). NMDA receptor blockers are 100 µM D-AP5 plus 25 µM MK801. (C) Proposed key events leading to signal transmission in the β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1–GluD2 triad. I; β-NRX1–Cbln1 is a pre-synaptic anchor for GluD2. II; trans-synaptic complex formation. GluD2 allows binding of two β-NRX1(+4)–Cbln1 complexes and is shown at full occupancy. III; GluD2, Cbln1 and D-Ser cooperatively induce postsynaptic LTD.
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