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ABSTRACT

A simple nervous system combined with stereotypic behavioral responses to tastants, together with powerful genetic and molecular tools, have turned Drosophila larvae into a very promising model for studying gustatory coding. Using the Gal4/UAS system and confocal microscopy for visualizing gustatory afferents, we provide a description of the primary taste center in the larval central nervous system. Essentially, gustatory receptor neurons target different areas of the subesophageal ganglion (SOG), depending on their segmental and sensory organ origin. We define two major and two smaller subregions in the SOG. One of the major areas is a target of pharyngeal sensilla, the other one receives inputs from both internal and external sensilla. In addition to such spatial organization of the taste center, circumstantial evidence suggests a subtle functional organization: aversive and attractive stimuli might be processed in the anterior and posterior part of the SOG, respectively. Our results also suggest less coexpression of gustatory receptors than proposed in prior studies. Finally, projections of putative second-order taste neurons seem to cover large areas of the SOG. These neurons may thus receive multiple gustatory inputs. This suggests broad sensitivity of secondary taste neurons, reminiscent of the situation in mammals.

The primary goal of chemosensory neurobiology is to understand how information about the chemical environment is encoded by the nervous system. Drosophila is being intensely used as a model system for deciphering the olfactory code (Keller and Vosshall, 2003; Dahanukar et al., 2005; Jefferis, 2005; Rutzler and Zwiebel, 2005; Hallem et al., 2006). The recent discovery of a family of gustatory receptors (GRs) in the fly (Clyne et al., 2000; Scott et al., 2001) has also boosted interest in the study of taste. The simple nervous system of Drosophila larvae, in combination with powerful genetic and molecular tools, may be of great advantage for studying gustatory coding principles. Moreover, larvae exhibit interesting behaviors in response to tastants. They can discriminate between different salts and different sugars (Miyakawa, 1982) and are able to use gustatory information as reward (Scherer et al., 2003; Gerber et al., 2004). While olfactory coding in adult Drosophila relies on a multitude of combinatorial patterns of activity in olfactory glomeruli (Keller and Vosshall, 2003), taste information appears to be assigned to a small number of categories in the periphery (Scott, 2004). In mammals, mutually exclusive groups of gustatory receptor cells appear to respond to sweet and bitter taste (“labeled line” coding; Zhao et al., 2003; Mueller et al., 2005), although electrophysiological and molecular data contradict each other to some extent (reviewed in Meyerhof, 2005). For instance, whether finer discrimination within a category occurs in the periphery is currently in debate (Caicedo and Roper, 2001; see also Glendinning et al., 2002). In contrast, central neuronal
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responses become broadly tuned to multiple categories (Sato and Beidler, 1997; Lemon and Smith, 2005). These data suggest that taste information in the brain depends on the pattern of activity across neurons (“across-fiber coding”) (Smith and St John, 1999; Lemon and Smith, 2006; Stapleton et al., 2006). However, a recent review proposed that both models are too static to account for the high modulation of gustatory responses (Jones et al., 2006).

In Drosophila and other insects, adult taste sensilla usually contain four gustatory receptor neurons (GRNs), which were shown to respond to either water, sugar, or low or high salt concentrations (Ishimoto and Tanimura, 2004). Deterrent compounds (sensed as bitter by humans) appear to activate a subset of salt-responsing cells. Interestingly, despite their generally broad tuning (Marella et al., 2006), at least some of the bitter-responding GRNs exhibit a certain degree of selectivity (Meunier et al., 2003). Flies should thus be able to discriminate between certain bitter compounds. Sweet and deterrent compounds seem to be recognized by a family of seven transmembrane GRs, which are related to odorant receptors (reviewed in Scott et al., 2001; Robertson et al., 2003; Hallem et al., 2006). For instance, GR5a was shown to be the receptor responsive for trehalose perception (Dahanukar et al., 2006). For instance, GR5a was shown to be the receptor for trehalose perception (Dahanukar et al., 2006). GRs, which are related to odorant receptors (reviewed in Scott et al., 2001; Robertson et al., 2003; Hallem et al., 2006). For instance, GR5a was shown to be the receptor responsive for trehalose perception (Dahanukar et al., 2006; Ueno et al., 2001; Inomata et al., 2004) and GR66a was proposed to be a caffeine receptor (Moon et al., 2006).

Moreover, although the expression patterns of the GR genes in adults was essentially assessed indirectly, via Gal4 reporter gene expression (Dunipace et al., 2001; Scott et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2003a; Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004; Marella et al., 2006). Third, the larval expression of the GR genes in adults was essentially assessed indirectly, via Gal4 reporter gene expression (Dunipace et al., 2001; Scott et al., 2001; Liu et al., 2003a; Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004; Marella et al., 2006). Although reporter expression patterns may not accurately reflect GR expression patterns, the collected data suggest that many GRNs coexpress multiple receptors. For instance, the majority of GRs seem to be expressed in Gr66a-expressing cells, which mediate aversive behavior (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004). Moreover, the majority of sugar-responsive cells appear to coexpress at least three different, but molecularly uncharacterized, sugar receptive sites (Ishimoto and Tanimura, 2004). However, as a principle, putative sugar GRs and bitter GRs seem to be expressed in different subsets of GRNs. This allows initiation of distinct behavioral responses, i.e., attraction versus repulsion (Marella et al., 2006), similar to mammals (Zhao et al., 2003; Mueller et al., 2005). In insects, few data on central gustatory processing have been collected (Mitchell et al., 1999).

The central projection patterns of adult GRNs established by reporter gene expression (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004) correlate well with previous reports (Stocker and Schorderet, 1981; Nayak and Singh, 1985; Shanbhag and Singh, 1992). First, projections from different gustatory organs segregate in the subesophageal ganglion (SOG). Second, central projections of GRNs sensitive to attractive and aversive cues are distinct (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004; Marella et al., 2006). Third, labellar GRNs mediating aversive behavior project bilaterally, whereas those responsible for attractive behavior remain ipsilateral (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004). Bilateral projections are also typical for pharyngeal sensilla (Stocker and Schorderet, 1981; Raja Shekhar and Singh, 1994). The larval taste system is less well documented. It also comprises external and internal sense organs, most of which are multimodal (Stocker, 1994). External organs include the terminal organ (TO; with taste, stretch, touch, and thermoreceptive neurons), the ventral organ (VO; with taste and touch receptors), and the dorsal organ (DO) (Singh and Singh, 1984; Stocker, 1994; Python and Stocker, 2002). The DO is the unique larval olfactory organ (Fishilevich et al., 2005), which in addition contains putative mechanoreceptive and taste sensilla (Stocker, 1994). Other putative taste organs may occur in thoracic and abdominal segments (Dambly-Chaudière and Ghysen, 1986). Gustatory identity is suggested from the presence of polyinnervation and their dependence on the taste sensillum-specific poxn gene (Dambly-Chaudière et al., 1992). Internal chemosensory organs comprise the dorsal, ventral, and posterior pharyngeal sense organs (DPS, VPS, and PPS, respectively) and the dorsal pharyngeal organ (DPO) (Gendre et al., 2004). The axons deriving from the DO as well as three axons from the TO project to the brain via the antennal nerve, while the other TO neurons and all of the VO neurons pass to the SOG through the maxillary nerve. Fibers from the DPS, DPO, and PPS travel via the labral nerve, while those from VPS follow the labial nerve (Fig. 1) (Python and Stocker, 2002).

Electrophysiological recording of the TO demonstrates taste (Opplinger et al., 2000) and chemosensory function (Liu et al., 2003b). In addition, when the cells labeled by the enhancer trap line GH86 were inactivated or ablated, thermotaxis (Liu et al., 2003b) and chemotaxis toward fructose and salt (Heimbeck et al., 1999) were affected. Since this line shows the strongest expression in the TO (and only minor expression in other peripheral neurons or nonneuronal cells), the behavioral deficit was suggested to be due to the inactivation of TO neurons (Heimbeck et al., 1999).
Using the Gal4-based approach in combination with the Flp-out strategy (Wong et al., 2002), we investigated the connectivity of the primary larval gustatory center in the SOG. Essentially, we compared the central projection patterns of GRNs belonging to different organs or having potentially different response profiles. Our data suggest a similar but not identical organization of the larval taste center compared to its adult counterpart. Apart from information about primary taste neurons, we also collected examples of putative second-order taste neurons. Other interesting candidate taste interneurons are described in a companion article (Bader et al., 2007).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Fly strains

*Drosophila* stocks were raised on standard cornmeal medium at room temperature; CantonS (CS) was used as a wildtype control strain. Transgenic P[GAL4] lines used were Gr2a, 21a, 22f, 28be, 32a, 47a, 66a, (Scott et al., 2001; Wang et al., 2004), Gr5a, 8a, 22b, 22e, 22f, 28be, 32a, 59b, 59e, 59f, 64a, 64e, 66a (Dunipace et al., 2001; Thorne et al., 2004), and PPK 6, 10, 11, 12, 19 (Liu et al., 2003a). As a reporter line, we used UAS-mCD8:GFP (Lee and Luo, 1999). Larvae for the clonal analysis were obtained by crossing males of a given GAL4 line with virgins hsFLP;CyO/Sp;UAS/CD2 (Wong et al., 2002). For simultaneous labeling of different receptors, we crossed the males mentioned before with virgins of the genotype w-; UAS-CD2; Gr66a-I-GFP or w-; SP/CyO; Gr66a-I-GFP, UAS-CD2. We obtained these flies by combining the Gr66a-I-GFP/TM6 stock (Wang et al., 2004) and the CyO/UAS-CD2 and UAS-CD2 (III) stocks (Bloomington Stock Center, Bloomington, IN). For behavioral studies, we crossed UAS-Gcamp56; UAS-VR1E600K; TM2/TM6 (Marella et al., 2006) virgins to Gr66a-Gal4 or GS males or males of the same UAS line to virgins GH86 or CS.

Clone induction

FLP recombinase was induced by placing tubes containing larvae 1–2 days after egg laying (AEL) in a water bath maintained at 37°C for 1 hour (Gr-Gal4 clones) or 50 minutes (MJ94 clones).

Immunofluorescence

Antibody staining was adapted from an earlier protocol (Ramaekers et al., 2005). Briefly, young third instar larvae (72–96 hours AEL) were pre-dissected in phosphate buffer (PB; 0.1 M, pH 7.2). The brains attached to the body wall were fixed for 20 minutes in PB containing 3.7% formaldehyde and subsequently rinsed in PBT (0.3% Triton X-100 in PB). They were further dissected and placed for 2 hours in PBT in 5% goat serum (NGS) at room temperature for blocking. Subsequently, they were incubated with a cocktail of primary antibodies overnight at 4°C. Primary antibodies included two neuropile markers: the mouse monoclonal anti-ChATB1 (dilution 1:500; Hybridoma Bank, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA), and nc82 (1:20; A. Hofbauer, University of Regensburg, Germany). In addition, we used rabbit polyclonal anti-GFP (1:1,000; Molecular Probes, Eugene, OR; A6455) and mouse monoclonal antirat-CD2 (1:100; Serotec, Düsseldorf, Germany, MCA154R). After several rinses in PB, samples were incubated overnight in PBT-NGS with the secondary antibodies (antirabbit Alexa 488-conjugated and antimouse Cy3-conjugated, diluted 1:200; Molecular Probes). Finally, brains were mounted in Vectashield (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA), with nail polish used as spacer. The central nervous system (CNS) was mounted with the ventral nerve cord on top.

Anti-ChATB1 was raised by injection of bacterially expressed *Drosophila* dChAT protein and was
shown to react with a single band at the position of ~80 kDa in crude fly head samples (Takagawa and Salvaterra, 1996); nc82 was raised in mouse by injection of *Drosophila* head homogenate and which identifies a protein of 190 kDa in Western blots of homogenized *Drosophila* heads that was identified as Bruchpilot, a protein present in chemical synapses (Wagh et al., 2006). Anti-GFP was raised against GFP isolated directly from *Aequora victoria*, and antirat-CD2 was raised in mouse against activated T-helper cells from rat and was shown to recognize the rat CD2 cell surface antigen, a 50–54 kDa glycoprotein expressed by thymocytes and mature T cells (Whitehall et al., 1995). Both antibodies recognize the ectopically expressed GFP and CD2 proteins, respectively, as demonstrated by the absence of labeling in wildtype brains (data not shown). Secondary antibodies were raised in goat.

**Image acquisition and processing**

Images of the peripheral nervous system were taken by using a fluorescence microscope (Leica DM R) equipped with a CCD camera. Stacks of confocal images at 0.93 μm focal plane spacing were collected with a Biorad (Hercules, CA) MRC 1024 confocal microscope and Laser Sharp image-collection software. Images were then processed with ImageJ freeware (http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/index.html), curves (input to output options) were readjusted for each color independently but always on the whole picture. The intensity of unspecific background staining was lowered using the “dust and scratches” filter in Adobe Photoshop (San Jose, CA) for Macintosh 7.0 software.

**Behavioral tests**

Behavioral tests were performed using a modified previous protocol (Lilly and Carlson, 1990). Petri dishes separated in two halves with a plastic bridge (Greiner 635102) were filled first on both sides with 24 mL of agar, in order to minimize the required amount of tastant. After drying the agar, either 7 mL of plain 1.5% agarose were poured on the control (C) side, or agarose mixed with tastant on the stimulus (S) side, respectively. The second halves of the plates were poured 5–10 minutes later with the other type of agar. The central region was simultaneously filled with the second agar type in order to get a flat surface. The plates were then dried for 1 hour. Plates are thus divided into two halves containing agar alone and agar with tastant, respectively, the middle portion containing either type of agar in a random manner. To avoid any bias toward the type of agar in the center region and the sequence of pouring, in 50% of the cases the C side, and in the other 50% the S side, was poured first.

Three-day-old larvae (AEL; reared at 25° on a 12/12 light dark cycle) were collected using sugar solution and then rinsed in tap water. About 50 larvae were distributed along the separating plastic bridge and allowed to freely move on the entire plate. After 15 minutes in total darkness, a photo of the dish was taken and larvae were counted. A response index was calculated [RI = (Ns – Nc) / (Ns + Nc)], where Ns and Nc refer to the numbers of larvae present on stimulus and control areas, respectively. Animals found at a distance of less than 0.5 cm from each side of the bridge were discarded. Multiple tests were done in parallel; half of the plates were turned by 180° to compensate for any other unexpected context effect.

**RESULTS**

In this article we describe the sensory projections in the primary taste center of *Drosophila* larvae. Our observations allowed us to delimit the target region in the SOG dealing with gustatory information, and furthermore to define subareas that may be associated with different taste properties. We made use of the genetic tools provided by this species, studying the expression patterns of different Gal4 reporter lines, namely 1) 20 lines driven by different Gr promoters (for some Gr promoters also multiple lines), lines whose adult expression was previously reported (Dunipace et al., 2001; Scott et al., 2001; Bray and Amrein, 2003; Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004); 2) five Ppk-Gal4 lines, including three previously described (Liu et al., 2003a); and 3) the enhancer trap lines GH86 (Heimbeck et al., 1999) and MJ94 (Gendre et al., 2004) that were both shown to be expressed in GRNs.

Using the UAS-CDS:GFP reporter line, we visualized the expression of these lines in the peripheral and central nervous system (Figs. 1A–C, 2). The widespread expression pattern of certain Gal4 lines was dissected by tagging single cells via the Flip-out technique (Wong et al., 2002). In such preparations, one or a few of the Gal4 expressing cells were labeled by UAS-CDS:GFP, whereas the rest of the Gal4-expressing cells were labeled by UAS-CDS2 (Fig. 3A–D, L–O). Furthermore, using CD2 as a reporter, we investigated the expression of different Gal4 lines in the background of Gr66a-GFP. Studying coexpression allowed us to compare the location and morphology of sensory termini deriving from different sensory neurons (Fig. 3E–K). Finally, we describe a putative second-order gustatory neuron labeled in the GH146 Gal4 line (Fig. 3Q–S). Our results are schematized in Figures 1 and 4.

**Peripheral expression**

The *Drosophila* larva comprises about 90 pairs of GRNs, located in different sensory organs in the head and on the body wall (Table 1). The major cephalic chemosensory organs, the DO, TO, VO, and the four pharyngeal organs (Fig. 1A,B) (cf. Singh and Singh, 1984; Python and Stocker, 2002) contain multiple sensilla. Many of them, e.g., those of the TO, can be distinguished by their cuticular protrusions (Fig. 1C); this allowed us to identify the type of sensillum to which the labeled neurons belonged (Fig. 2, insets).

Of the 20 Gr-Gal4 lines tested, five showed expression neither in larvae nor in adults and five additional lines were expressed only in the adult taste system (Table 1). However, the 10 remaining Gr-Gal4 lines showed expression in both the larval and adult gustatory system (Table 1). Three of the five Ppk lines used were expressed in the larval taste system (Table 1), but in contrast to a previous report (Liu et al., 2003a), we did not detect expression of Ppk19 in taste organs. The number of labeled GRNs in the Gal4 lines studied varied from 1 to 18 pairs (Table 1). The expresion of different Gal4 lines in the background of Gr66a-GFP. Studying coexpression allowed us to compare the location and morphology of sensory termini deriving from different sensory neurons (Fig. 3E–K). Finally, we describe a putative second-order gustatory neuron labeled in the GH146 Gal4 line (Fig. 3Q–S). Our results are schematized in Figures 1 and 4.
In addition, different inserts of the same Gr-Gal4 construct revealed similar patterns in the majority of cases. Exceptions were Gr22b-Gal4 and Gr66a-Gal4; in the former, only one of the two strains (B7) labeled VPS neurons (Fig. 2G and data not shown). For Gr66a-Gal4, one line (from K. Scott) showed less expression than the other one (from H. Amrein), the latter being similar to the Gr66a-GFP line (compare Fig. 2B,C). Analogous pattern differences between these two lines were previously reported in adult flies (Wang et al., 2004). None of the lines studied displayed asymmetrical expression patterns. However, small differences in the level of expression were sometimes noticed between neurons on the left and right side (Fig. 3F and data not shown) and for particular cell types. For example, in Gr2a-Gal4 staining was weaker for TO and VO neurons than for other neurons (Fig. 1B).

In Gr4a-Gal4 lines expression was rare outside the gustatory system and was completely absent from the olfactory organ. Remarkably, Gr21a-Gal4, which labels olfactory neurons in the adult antenna (Suh et al., 2004), showed expression in one TO neuron but not in olfactory neurons of the DO (Fig. 2F). In contrast, Gr68a-Gal4 labeled non-neuronal cells of the TO, in addition to its expression in two VPS neurons (data not shown). Similarly, Gr22e-Gal4 labeled cells belonging to the TO, VPS, DPS, and DPO; these cells lacked axons and should thus be nonneuronal (Fig. 2J). Gr22e-Gal4 showed also expression in multidenritic neurons in head, thoracic, and abdominal segments (data not shown). As expected from the ionic channel nature of Ppk proteins, and as reported previously (Liu et al., 2003a), Ppk-Gal4 lines showed expression in various body parts apart from the gustatory system. For instance, Ppk11-Gal4, that labeled three TO neurons, also showed strong expression in the tracheal system, obscuring neuronal patterns in the CNS (data not shown).

Using CD2 as a reporter, we also studied the expression of different Gal4 lines in the background of Gr66a-GFP, a line that labels a relatively large proportion of GRNs (18 pairs: one-fifth of GRNs; Fig. 4). As expected from the situation in the adult (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004), Gr28b-, Gr22b-, and Gr22e-Gal4 lines showed expression in a subset of Gr66a-GFP-positive GRNs (Fig. 4). More surprisingly, Gr68a-Gal4 and even Ppk12-Gal4 showed coexpression with Gr66a-GFP (Fig. 3K). In contrast, Gr21a-Gal4, Gr2a-Gal4, Gr59f-Gal4, and Ppk6-Gal4 showed no overlap with Gr66a-GFP expression (Fig. 4). For another three Gal4 lines, coexpression with Gr66a-GFP was not checked. Together, these seven lines stained at least 11 and at most 17 GRNs that are not included in the Gr66a-GFP pattern (depending on their relative coexpression in TO neurons, see Table 1). About one-third of GRNs were thus labeled by the Gr-and Ppk-Gal4 lines studied (29–35, from the total of 90). Interestingly, the GH86 line was expressed in Gr66a-GFP-negative cells (Fig. 3L,J, periphery not shown), suggesting that the GH86 pattern covers another third of GRNs (Table 1; Fig. 4).

Central projections of GRNs

In order to define landmarks for limiting the SOG, we used the neuropile marker anti-choline-acetyltransferase (ChAT; Fig. 2A1); this allowed us to accurately map the projections of the different GRNs labeled by different Gal4 lines (Fig. 2). In the cases of Gr2a-Gal4 and Gr66a-Gal4 that labeled neurons from multiple organs (Fig. 2A,B), we used the Flp-out technique (Fig. 3A–D) to associate each terminal projection with its proper sensory organ (Fig. 1E,F). Then, studying the projections of different Gal4 lines or of the GH86 line in the background of Gr66a-GFP allowed us also to assess the spatial relations of two sets of projections (Fig. 3E–J). Finally, in order to see if the GRNs not expressed in those different Gal4 lines could show other types of projections, we generated Flp-out clones in MJ94, which is not only expressed in all GRNs but also in sensory neurons of other modalities (Fig. 3L–O). Because the afferent projection patterns appeared to depend mainly on their peripheral origin, the following description of taste afferents is grouped according to the different peripheral nerves, starting with the most ste
Figure 2
maxillary nerve (MN). MN projections derived from GRNs in the TO and VO (Fig. 1A); they remained on the ipsilateral side of the SOG throughout. All MN projections showed similar terminal patterns (Fig. 2A–E,H–J) independent of the Gal4 line studied (Fig. 3E–G,L,J) and irrespective of whether the afferents came from the TO or the VO (Fig. 3B). An exception was the TO neuron labeled by Gr21a-Gal4 (see below). “Regular” projections were best described in Gal4 lines showing expression only in one TO neuron (Fig. 2D,E). After entering the SOG quite posteriorly, the MN afferents passed horizontally toward the midline. Upon arriving in the neuropile proper (about one-third from lateral to medial), they turned anteriorly and slightly dorsally. In the middle of the SOG neuropile (from posterior to anterior) they bent laterally and ventrally again, establishing terminal extensions, in a target region that we called area 2 (Fig. 1D). The exceptional projection of the TO neuron labeled by Gr21a-Gal4 turned sooner anteriorly and terminated more posteriorly than the regular TO neurons (Figs. 2F,3H).

labral nerve (LrN). LrN projections that entered the SOG on its anterior part (Fig. 2A1,G), comprised GRNs from the DPS, DPO, and PPS (Fig. 1A). We found both ipsilateral (Figs. 2A,B,3O) and bilateral projections (Fig. 3P; see also Fig. 2C,G,J). Most of the LrN afferents followed those from the MN in area 2 (Fig. 2I) and generally continued to the midline region into area 1 (Fig. 1D, but see Fig. 2B). In the majority of cases they then seemed to target the contralateral area 2 (Fig. 3F, but see Fig. 3O). An exception was one DPS fiber labeled by Gr2a-Gal4 (Figs. 2A2,arrowheads;3B,E,arrows, also see Fig. 3N,arrowhead), which produced an ovoid-shaped cluster of terminals at the neuropile border of

Fig. 3. Clonal analysis (A–D) and double labeling studies (E–K) of different Gr-Gal4 and Ppk-Gal4 lines. Flp-out analysis of the MJ94 line (L–O), and dissection of the putative second-order taste neuron labeled by GH146 (Q–S). Z confocal stacks (depth 20–28 μm; 35 μm in Q,R) of sensory projections labeled with anti-GFP (green) and on top of (magenta) anti-CD2 (A–K,P,R,S) or the neuronal markers anti-ChAT (L–O) and noc2 (Q). Horizontal views, anterior on top. A–D: Clonal analysis of Gr2a and Gr66a permits linking the different projections with their organ of origin (cf. Figs. 1E,F,2A,B). Neurons that underwent Flp-out are labeled by GFP, nonflipped neurons by CD2. A: The DO neurons target area 3. B: This multiple clone shows the terminals of a VO neuron close to those of a TO neuron (labeled by Ppk5,arrowheads) in area 2, as well as DPS projections in area 4 (arrowheads) ventral to the TO projections (illustrated in projections of selected optical sections (insets); some overlap remains in sections 9–10). C: The TODO neuron terminates near the “regular” TO projection in area 4 (arrowheads). D: The terminals of a single TO neuron (arrowhead) and of a DPS neuron (arrow) overlap with CD2 labeled pharyngeal projections in area 2. E–K: Gr66a-GFP expression (green; cf. Fig. 2C) related to the expression of other Gal4 lines labeled by CD2 (magenta; cf. Fig. 2A,E,F,H,I). E: Terminals of TO and VO neurons labeled by Gr2a are in close proximity with those of a Gr66a-GFP labeled TO neuron in area 2 (arrowheads), best illustrated by a 150° turn (inset). A Gr2a-labeled DPS neuron projects slightly more medially than the TODO neuron labeled by Gr66a in area 4 (arrow, see Fig. 1D). F,G: Projections of a Gr59f-labeled TO neuron (F) and of TO and VPS neurons labeled by Ppk6-Gal4 (G), are in close proximity to the Gr66a-GFP projections in area 2 (arrow). H: The TO projection labeled by Gr21a extends more posteriorly than the Gr66a-GFP projections. I:J: The projections labeled by the GH86 line overlap with those of Gr66a-GFP in the lateral part of area 2 (arrow), but are

Fig. 4. Diagram showing proven and suggested patterns of coexpression of the different Gal4 lines used, as well as the proportion of GRNs labeled. Evidence of coexpression was obtained by double labeling and visualization of the periphery (cf. Fig. 3K). Square size corresponds to the numbers of labeled GRNs (i.e., Gr28e representing one pair of GRNs). From the total of 90 GRNs, one-fifth are labeled by two and one-third by three Gal4 lines (patterned arrowheads), best illustrated by a Gr2a-Gal4 (Fig. 2J) and two Gr66a-GFP (Fig. S21A). Therefore, about one-fifth of the GRNs coexpress Gr2a and Gr66a (dark gray) and one-third by GH86 (patterned area). Coexpression of Gr68a, Gr22b, and Gr66a in two VPS neurons). From the total of 90 GRNs, one-fifth were not assessed (gray squares and question mark). Lines expressing one pair of GRNs). From the total of 90 GRNs, one-fifth are labeled by two and one-third by three Gal4 lines (patterned arrowheads). The black part represents unlabeled reotyped ones. We numbered projections areas from lateral to medial (Fig 1D), irrespective of their sequence of appearance in this description.
the SOG lateral and ventral to area 2 (Fig. 3B, insets), inside area 4 (Fig. 1D).

**Labial nerve (LbN).** LbN projections derived from GRNs in the VPS (Fig. 1A); they remained ipsilateral. Fibers entered the brain more posteriorly than those from the MN (Fig. 2H) and then traveled at the midline, more dorsally than all other projections (Fig. 2H). They finally joined and got intermingled with pharyngeal (Fig. 2G) and TO projections (Fig. 2H, inset, see supplementary data online) in area 2 (Fig. 1D).

**Antennal (AN) and thoracic nerves.** Only a few Gal4 lines showed expression in GRNs associated with the AN or thoracic nerves. Hence, whether the observed projection patterns are the common ones for these neurons or rather exceptional cases remains unknown. Specifically, Gr2a-Gal4 labeled DO neurons and thoracic neurons (Fig. 2A), whereas Gr66a-Gal4 labeled one of the three neurons associated with the DO but extending their dendrite in a TO sensillum (referred to as TODO neuron, Fig. 2B,C). AN projections comprised both DO and TODO neurons (Fig. 1A), which established distinct but always ipsilateral terminals. Two DO neurons labeled by Gr2a-Gal4 (Figs. 2A, 3A,B), followed olfactory receptor axons along the AN, but continued posteriorly instead of passing into the antennal lobe (Fig. 3A3 inset, arrow). They ended in a small cluster at the neuropile border in area 3 (Fig. 1D,E), posterior to area 2 and area 4. The TODO neuron labeled by Gr66a-Gal4, in contrast to the DO neurons mentioned above, turned medially at the entrance of the AL and ended in an ovoid target area at the SOG neuropile border (Figs. 1D,F, 2B, arrow), just lateral to the exceptional DPS projection in area 4 (Fig. 3C–E). Thoracic projections from ventral pit organs (labeled by Gr2a-Gal4) established ipsilateral terminals in the ventral nerve cord and traveled further anteriorly to end adjacent to, but not intermingled with, DO projections (Figs. 1E, 3A).

**Projections from other sensory modalities**

Our data also provide information about afferents mediating other modalities than taste, such as smell, touch, stretch, temperature, or humidity (Stocker, 1994; Liu et al., 2003b). For example, olfactory receptor neurons projecting to the larval antennal lobe (Fishilevich et al., 2005; Ramaekers et al., 2005) (Fig. 2A, inset) were labeled by both MJ94 and GH86 lines (Fig. 3I). Moreover, Gr22e-Gal4 demonstrated that multidendritic neurons—thought to be pain receptors (Tracey et al., 2003)—project exclusively to the ventral nerve cord (Fig. 2J, arrow). Furthermore, as shown in clones of MJ94, which labels sensory neurons of different modalities, some afferents carried by the MN and LbN nerve projected to target areas in the ventral nerve cord (Fig. 3LM). These results suggest that the SOG might be devoted principally to taste processing (see Discussion).

**Functional testing**

The central projections of GH86 and Gr66a-GFP labeled GRNs were essentially similar, adjacent to each other along their path. However, the target area of GH86 appeared to be slightly more posterior, although overlap was found in the lateral portion of the SOG (Fig. 3LJ). To check whether the two sets of GRNs might correspond to functionally different categories, we took advantage of the Gal4/UAS system in order to drive expression of a modified version of the mammalian capsaicin receptor (Marella et al., 2006). This technique allows one to artificially activate GRNs by capsaicin, which normally does not drive any behavioral response in chemotaxis assays (but see Discussion). Thus, testing larval behavior toward capsaicin permits one to assess the basic function of these cells. In our experiment, control larvae (CS, heterozygous for the MJ94-CapsR) did not react to capsaicin (Fig. 5). However, the expression of the capsaicin receptor in Gr66a-Gal4 cells induced aversion toward capsaicin, suggesting that these cells normally respond to aversive stimuli. In contrast, the expression of the receptor in GH86-positive cells neither led to attraction nor to repulsion, suggesting that functionally different cells are labeled in this line (Fig. 5, see Discussion).

**Second-order taste neurons**

To search for putative second-order gustatory neurons, we studied the expression patterns of a number of Gal4...
and possible overlap of the terminals of different GRNs. GFP expression provided evidence about GR coexpression studying the patterns of Gal4 lines together with Gr66a-functional division of the SOG (see below). Furthermore, ever, we also found circumstantial indications for a subtle of origin. This allowed us to delimit subareas in the SOG, ent terminals in the SOG were correlated primarily with afferent morphologies. We observed that the sites of afferents traveling via a lateral path to the Another process of this neuron—perhaps representing an input connection—extended via a lateral path to the lateral horn and further to the mushroom body calyx (Fig. 3R,S). In both regions, arborsizations were present, partially overlapping with the terminals of olfactory projection neurons. Other good candidates of gustatory interneurons are the gustin-expressing neurons (Melcher and Pankratz, 2005); a detailed study of their anatomy is provided in the accompanying article (Bader et al., 2007).

DISCUSSION

By using Gr-Gal4, Ppk-Gal4, and enhancer trap lines, we defined gustatory interneuron that show labeling in the SOG. A candidate gustatory interneuron was identified in the GH146-Gal4 line, which is known for its expression in olfactory projection neurons (Stocker et al., 1997; Heimbeck et al., 2001). This novel neuron showed contralateral projections in the SOG, which cover a large area (3–7 μm) (Fig. 3Q, arrowhead). Expressing the presynaptic reporter synaptobrevin-GFP did not label these projections, suggesting that they might be postsynaptic (data not shown). Another process of this neuron—perhaps representing an output connection—extended via a lateral path to the lateral horn and further to the mushroom body calyx (Fig. 3R,S). In both regions, arborsizations were present, partially overlapping with the terminals of olfactory projection neurons. Other good candidates of gustatory interneurons are the gustin-expressing neurons (Melcher and Pankratz, 2005); a detailed study of their anatomy is provided in the accompanying article (Bader et al., 2007). Finally, observations about putative second-order taste neurons enabled us to hypothesize about the principles of gustatory coding in Drosophila larvae.

SOG architecture

By comparing the site of terminal projections in the SOG with their peripheral origin, which we assessed by identifying cell bodies and dendrites, we established that neurons projecting through the same nerve show essentially similar terminal patterns (Fig. 1D). Also, we were not able to recognize consistent differences in the projections of Gr66a-GFP and those of Gr-Gal4 or Ppk-Gal4 lines when afferents traveled in the same nerve (an exception was Gr21a-Gal4; see below). We showed that the majority of these projections are very close to each other (Fig. 3B,D; supplementary data online); this suggests that there is little spatial segregation between projections from neurons expressing different receptors. However, we do not know whether the selection of patterns visualized is biased to some extent by the Gal4 lines available (see below). Yet the projection patterns relate mainly to the nerve taken by a particular afferent and, accordingly, to the segmental origin of the GRN. This is reminiscent of the gustatory projections in larval Manduca sexta, which stay in the neuromeres corresponding to the segmental origin of the organs (Kent and Hildebrand, 1987).

However, three exceptions were found. First, GRN afferents traveling via the AN show at least two different kinds of terminals: while neurons deriving form nonolfactory sensilla of the DO terminate in area 3, TODO neurons target area 4. Second, a TO neuron labeled by Gr21a-Gal4 projects more posteriorly than the remaining TO neurons. Closer inspection revealed that these terminals remain outside the antennal lobe, in contrast to a previous report (Scott et al., 2001). Since this neuron was shown to respond to CO2 (Faucher et al., 2006), this particular target region may be devoted to the sensation of this particular chemical. Third, projections from pharyngeal sensilla do not belong to one homogeneous class: we found projections covering only the ipsilateral area 2, projections ending in area 1, and projections showing bilateral terminals. Moreover, certain DPS neurons terminate in area 4. The functional implications and the developmental constraints leading to these differences remain to be investigated.

Based on Gr2a-Gal4 projections, Scott et al. (2001) reported discrete terminal regions for gustatory projections in the larval CNS. From our more complete description, we define four major target regions in the SOG (Fig. 1D). A midline area 1 receives inputs exclusively from pharyngeal organs (DPS, DPO, PPS). A larger, more lateral area 2 is defined by the convergence of inputs from both inter- nal sensilla (including VPS) and external sensilla (TO). A small posterior area 3 appears to be the target of nonolfactory DO neurons and ventral pit neurons. However, because all evidence about area 3 projections was collected in Gr2a-Gal4, it remains possible that this region is related to a particular chemical rather than to particular sensilla. An anterior lateral area 4, adjacent to the antennal lobe, accommodates the terminals of one or a few DPS neurons and of a TODO neuron. Finally, the GRN labeled by Gr21a-Gal4 has its own, specific target region posterior to area 2. As in the adult, the SOG can thus be divided in different regions that are targets of different organs. However, unlike adults (Stocker and Schorderet, 1981; Nayak and Singh, 1985; Shanbhag and Singh, 1992;
Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004), the projections from internal and external organs do not segregate but remain intermingled.

Interestingly, most of the pharyngeal projections seem to be bilateral, similar to the situation in the adult (Stockler and Schorderet, 1981; Rajashekar and Singh, 1994). Terminals are sometimes restricted to area 1, but often extend to the contralateral area 2. In contrast, GRNs belonging to nonpharyngeal sensilla establish exclusive ipsilateral projections. An example is Gr66a-Gal4-labeled TO projections. This is very striking because adult Gr66a-Gal4 projections from the labial palp are clearly bilateral (Thorne et al., 2004). The reason for this disparity is unknown. Perhaps it is correlated with different functions of the two sensory organs. For maggots that live in a semiliquid environment, bitter taste information from the TO may help to navigate up or down a gradient, a behavior that may use laterality information. In contrast, Gr66a-Gal4-positive labellar GRNs may participate in food rejection, which very likely does not require spatial information. Compatible with such an interpretation, adult Gr32a-positive leg GRN (a subset of GR66a-positive cells) projections remain ipsilateral in the SOG (Wang et al., 2004). This suggests that they might be involved in chemotaxis in a bitter gradient.

**SOG and nongustatory cues**

In the blowfly, mechanosensory neurons were thought to target a specific region of the SOG (Edgecomb and Murdock, 1992). A similar segregation of the targets of mechanosensory neurons and GRNs is known from leg sensilla in *Drosophila* (see, for instance, Murphey et al., 1989). Our data show that multidendritic neurons, which may be involved in pain sensation (Tracey et al., 2003), project to the ventral nerve cord. Strikingly, we observed that some afferents from the MN or LrN also terminate in the ventral nerve cord. This suggests that certain nongustatory neurons associated with taste sensilla may have their targets outside the SOG. However, further studies will be required to clarify the sensory modalities involved and to answer whether the SOG receives direct mechanosensory input or not.

Evidence that temperature sensation may be encoded in the SOG is more compelling. TO neurons were shown to respond to heat (Liu et al., 2003b). Moreover, cells labeled by the GH86 line are necessary for thermotaxis (Liu et al., 2003b). It is thus likely that some of the TO neurons labeled by GH86, which we observed to project entirely into the SOG (Fig. 3L,J), are thermosensitive. Interestingly, a link between taste and temperature sensitivity was described at the molecular level. For instance, the mammalian capsaicin receptor appears to respond to heat, taste, and probably painful stimuli (Caterina et al., 1997). Similarly, in *Drosophila* the painless gene was shown to be involved in moderate thermal sensation, pain sensation (Tracey et al., 2003), and in the perception of isothiocyanate, a bitter-tasting chemical (Al-Anzi et al., 2006). Further evidence for links between taste, temperature, and pain sensation is provided by the expression of painless in the TO (data not shown; Tracey et al., 2003) and by the expected expression of the taste receptor Gr22e in pain-sensitive multidendritic neurons, as suggested by the Gr22e-Gal4 pattern.

**Functional subdivisions?**

Anatomical and functional evidence has shown that adult GRNs project to different target areas in the SOG, according to their receptivity to bitter or sweet compounds (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004; Marella et al., 2006). In these studies, Gal4 lines driven by the promoters of the trehalose receptor Gr5a and of the bitter receptor Gr66a served as marker lines. As mentioned, we did not find any obvious difference when comparing the projection patterns of different GR-Gal4 and Ppk-Gal4 lines, with the exception of Gr21a-Gal4. However, since none of the three Gr5a-Gal4 lines that we tested showed any expression in larvae, our failure of detecting two distinct projection patterns might merely indicate that we had selected only bitter- and salt-sensitive GRNs, which together may project in a region different from the sugar-sensitive neurons. Indeed, GRNs labeled by GH86 that were suggested to mediate chemotaxis toward sugars (Heimbeck et al., 1999) appear to project more posteriorly than the majority of the GRNs labeled by Gr66a-GFP.

In order to correlate these subtle differences in projection with functional responses, we tested the basic sensitivity of the GRNs labeled by Gr66a-Gal4 or by GH86 via the UAS-capsaicin receptor approach (Marella et al., 2006). Thus, we measured chemotaxis toward capsaicin of larvae expressing a modified version of the mammalian capsaicin receptor in these two sets of cells (Fig. 5). Wild-type and other control larvae did not respond to this chemical in this assay, although there is evidence that adults may sense it (Al-Anzi et al., 2006). Larvae expressing the receptor via the Gr66a-Gal4 line provided by H. Amrein (which shows a similar expression pattern as Gr66a-GFP) were repelled by capsaicin. This suggests that normally these neurons respond to aversive stimuli. In contrast, driving expression of the capsaicin receptor with GH86-Gal4 elicited neither aversion nor attraction. Several explanations might account for this result. First, expression could have been too low to trigger responses in the neurons. However, this is not very likely because the levels of GFP expression driven by GH86-Gal4 and Gr66a-Gal4 appeared similar. Second, the natural sensation of capsaicin could prevent larvae from showing attractive behavior in this test, although it does not drive avoidance. This also seems unlikely since capsaicin does not prevent, but strengthens the attraction of adult flies toward sucrose (Al-Anzi et al., 2006). As a third possibility, we rather believe that expressing the capsaicin receptor in GH86 activates functionally different neurons mediating attractive or aversive stimuli, respectively, which may result in indifferent behavior. Taken together with a previous tetanus toxin expression study (Heimbeck et al., 1999), our data suggest that a subset of GH86-labeled neurons may respond to palatable stimuli like sugars.

The primary larval taste center might thus well be divided into an anterior part, which is labeled by Gr66a-Gal4 and responds to aversive stimuli, and a posterior part, which is represented by a subpopulation of GH86 neurons and responds to attractive cues. This difference, if it in fact exists, remains much more subtle than in the adult system, where sweet and bitter responsive neurons have clearly segregated central projections (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004; Marella et al., 2006).
Hints about GR expression

In the transgenic lines used, the expression of Gal4 is controlled by the putative promoter region of Gr or ppk genes (about 1 kb in length). Conclusions from the reporter patterns about native gene expression must thus be taken with caution. Indeed, a number of observations, such as expression in nonneuronal cells in certain lines, pattern differences between different insertion lines (e.g., in Gr22b or Gr66a), the unexpected expression of Gr68a-Gal4 (a receptor proposed to mediate pheromone perception; Bray and Amrein, [2003]) in VPS neurons, or differences with prior reports (Table 1), introduce doubt whether these lines accurately reflect gene expression. Nevertheless, our data provide good evidence for coexpression of multiple taste receptors per cell (Fig. 4), in contrast to a prior report based on fewer lines (Scott et al., 2001). Interestingly, our results suggest coexpression of Gr66a and Ppk 12 (Fig. 3K), which would fit with observations that bitter responsive cells in the adult also respond to salt at high concentration (Meunier et al., 2003).

The four lines, Gr2a-Gal4, Gr59f-Gal4, Gr21a-Gal4, and Ppk6-Gal4, which were not coexpressed with Gr66a-GFP might thus be expressed in neurons responding to different, but perhaps also repulsive, tastants. In contrast to studies in the adult suggesting that the majority of GRs are coexpressed with Gr66a (Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004), we found an overlap of only 60%. This discrepancy may be due to a difference between adult and larval systems; alternatively, the data in the adult were incomplete. Indeed, Gr21a was not taken into account in adult studies because it showed expression in olfactory neurons. Also, possible coexpression of Gr2a-Gal4, Gr59f-Gal4, and Ppk-Gal4 with Gr66a-GFP was not checked.

Second-order neurons

An interesting candidate taste interneuron was revealed by the GH146 enhancer trap line. This neuron arborizes in the SOG and extends a process via the lateral horn in the mushroom body calyx, a brain region involved in larval olfactory learning (Honjo and Furukubo-Tokunaga, 2005). The putative dendritic arborization in the SOG extends bilaterally and is larger than afferent projections. Hence, it may receive inputs from different GRNs, suggesting that it may be broadly tuned. Interneurons that possibly link taste inputs with the mushroom body calyx were also described in the honeybee (Schröter and Menzel, 2003). Indeed, modulatory function of taste information in the larval mushroom bodies was proposed (Scherer et al., 2003; Honjo and Furukubo-Tokunaga, 2005; Gerber and Hendel, 2006). Such a function was hypothesized to be mediated by octopaminergic neurons in bees (Hammer and Menzel, 1995) and adult Drosophila (Thum et al., submitted; Sinakevitch and Strausfeld, 2006). The presence of neurons linking the SOG with the mushroom body calyx suggests that responses toward taste stimuli may be modulated by experience.

A cluster of 20 putative second-order taste neurons, which express the hugin neuropeptide, is presented in the accompanying article (Bader et al., 2007). Interestingly, arborizations of these neurons in the SOG are ipsilateral in area 2 and bilateral in area 1, in each of them covering the entire area. This is consistent with afferent projections, supporting direct connectivity between GRNs and the hugin cells. Moreover, it suggests that lateral information encoded by the afferents may be sent to the second-order taste neurons and thus to higher brain centers.

Concluding remarks

Previous studies on insect taste centers focused on adults of the flies D. melanogaster (Stocker, 1994; Thorne et al., 2004; Wang et al., 2004), Phormia regina (Yetman and Pollack, 1986; Edgecomb and Murdock, 1992), and Neobellieria bullata (Mitchell and Itagaki, 1992) and of mosquitoes (Ignell and Hansson, 2005). In all these species, central taste projections were shown to be governed primarily by their organ of origin. However, when tested, sensory receptivity also proved to be crucial: attractive and aversive information being segregated. Similar, albeit limited, information was collected from larvae of Manduca sexta (Kent and Hildebrand, 1987) and D. melanogaster (Scott et al., 2001). Our detailed description shows that subareas of the larval SOG are associated with different organs, similar to the situation in the adult. In contrast, functional divisions of this neuropile were more difficult to assess. The putative second-order neurons described so far exhibit extensive projections in the SOG and may thus receive inputs from different GRNs. We therefore postulate that gustatory target neurons are more broadly tuned than primary ones, similar to the mammalian system (Smith and St John, 1999; Stapleton et al., 2006). This apparent conservation in taste processing is reminiscent of the similarities between the mammalian and insect olfactory systems. If functional studies confirm our anatomical data, Drosophila larvae may become an interesting and powerful model for studying how animals decode gustatory information.
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Supplementary Fig.1 Stack of images showing a 360° rotation of a 3D reconstruction of axon terminals labelled by Ppk6-Gal4 (cf. Fig. 2H). It shows accurately the closeness of VPS and TO neuron projections.