Mechanics of coupling proton movements to c-ring rotation in ATP synthase

Robert H. Fillingame*, Christine M. Angevine, Oleg Y. Dmitriev

Department of Biomolecular Chemistry, 1300 University Avenue, University of Wisconsin Medical School, Madison, WI 53706, USA

Received 25 August 2003; accepted 1 September 2003

First published online 6 October 2003

Edited by Gunnar von Heijne, Jan Rydström and Peter Brzezinski

Abstract F_1F_0 ATP synthases generate ATP by a rotary catalytic mechanism in which H^+ transport is coupled to rotation of an oligomeric ring of c subunits extending through the membrane. Protons bind to and then are released from the aspartyl-61 residue of subunit c at the center of the membrane. Subunit a of the F_0 sector is thought to provide proton access channels to and from aspartyl-61. Here, we summarize new information on the structural organization of Escherichia coli subunit a and the mapping of aqueous-accessible residues in the second, fourth and fifth transmembrane helices (TMHs). Aqueous-accessible regions of these helices extend to both the cytoplasmic and periplasmic surface. We propose that c/TMH4 rotates to alternately expose the periplasmic or cytoplasmic half-channels to aspartyl-61 of subunit c during the proton transport cycle. The concerted rotation of interacting helices in subunit a and subunit c is proposed to be the mechanical force driving rotation of the c-rotor, using a mechanism akin to meshed gears.
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1. Introduction

H^+-transporting, F_1F_0-type ATP synthases utilize a transmembrane H^+ potential to drive ATP formation by a rotary catalytic mechanism [1]. ATP is formed in the F_1 sector of the enzyme, synthesis being driven by rotation of the γ subunit between three alternating catalytic sites (Fig. 1). Recent evidence now supports a mechanism in which H^+ transport drives rotation of an oligomeric ring of 10 c subunits in the F_0 sector of the enzyme, which in turn is coupled to rotation of subunit γ [3–6]. In such a model [7–9], the sequential protonation and deprotonation of Asp61 of subunit c is coupled with a stepwise movement of the rotor. Protons are thought to gain access to Asp61 in the center of the membrane via access channels that are at least partially located in subunit a. The γ subunit is forced to turn with the c-ring due to an apparently permanent binding between the γ and ε subunits of F_1 and a set of c subunits of the ring [6]. In this essay we will summarize recent studies that bear on the mechanism of c-ring rotation, and postulate that a meshed turning of transmembrane α-helices drives the c-ring rotation, akin to the rotation of meshed gears.

Subunit c folds in the membrane as a hairpin of two extended transmembrane helices (TMHs) with the proton carrying Asp61 centered in c/TMH2. A nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) structure of the purified monomeric protein depicts the predicted helical hairpin with inter-helical residue interactions consistent with those predicted for the protein in situ [10], and the model fits well with an extensive set of genetically introduced disulphide cross-links [11]. The cross-linking data were also used to model the c-ring [12,13]. The number of c subunits in the ring is controversial and may vary between species. Our most recent experiments suggest that the preferred number in Escherichia coli is 10, based upon cross-linking of functional genetically fused ε3 and ε4 oligomers [14]. The cross-link-based models of the c-oligomer show a ring of subunits with TMH1 on the inside and TMH2 on the outside. The placement of TMH2 on the outside is supported by other cross-linking studies in which TMH4 of subunit a can be cross-linked to c/TMH2 at multiple points over a span of 19 amino acid residues [15]. The NMR structure and c-ring models are now supported by direct crystallographic observations of a mitochondrial F_1-c_10 subcomplex at 3.9 Å resolution [16] and a two-dimensional, crystallographic analysis of the purified Hyrobacter tartaricus ε11 ring, crystallized in the absence of subunits a and b [17].

In the model of the c-ring, the H^+-carrying carboxyl of subunit c is occluded between neighboring subunits [12]. The subunits are arranged, with an ellipsoid-like cross-section, where the Asp61 side chain at the ‘front’ side of one subunit packs at the ‘back’ face of the next subunit (Fig. 2). In the case of E. coli, the packing meets the required functional interactions of residues 24 and 28 of TMH1 with Asp61 of TMH2 in DCCD resistant mutants [18], and the predicted interaction of residues 62 and 61 in a Li^+ binding mutant [19] (see Fig. 2). In the case of the L. tartaricus c-ring, the packing is predicted to result in the binding of Na^+ between residues equivalent to E. coli residue 61 of TMH2 at the front face of one subunit and TMH1 residue 28 and TMH2 residue 62 at the back face of a second subunit [17]. In order for protons to gain access to Asp61 during the H^+-transport cycle, we have proposed that the outer, Asp61-bearing
TMH2s of the c-ring must turn or swivel to allow interaction with the Arg210 residue of subunit a, which is hypothesized to lower the \( pK_a \) of cAsp61 to enable ionization and \( H^+ \) release to the exit channel [20, 21]. In this minireview, we present evidence that TMHs in subunit a may have to rotate to gate movement of protons from the entrance and exit channels. In addition, we will incorporate NMR structures of subunit c in several states in proposing a mechanistic model by which \( H^+ \)-transport and the concerted swiveling of helices in subunits c and a are linked to the stepwise rotational movement of the c-rotor.

2. Arrangement of TMHs in subunit a

A model for the cross-sectional arrangement of four of the five TMHs of subunit a is shown in Fig. 2. The model is based upon the theoretical helical wheels for the defined TMHs of subunit a and a series of second-site-suppressor mutations that restore function in primary mutants [21]. The second-site-suppressor pairs could indicate a physical juxtaposition of interacting residues. The mutational pairs that fit the model well are: residue 218 in TMH4 with residue 245 in TMH5, residue 219 in TMH4 with residue 145 in TMH3, and residue 245 in TMH5 with residue 119 in TMH2. Rastogi and Girvin [13] have used the same data set as distance constraints in molecular mechanics and energy minimization calculations to generate a three-dimensional model for TMH interaction. Despite some conflicting evidence [21], we now believe that the arrangement shown is a good working model, this conclusion being based upon disulfide cross-linking of Cys residues substituted in the vicinity of the second-site-suppressor mutational pairs, i.e. Cys-Cys cross-links between TMHs 2 and 4, TMHs 2 and 5, and TMHs 4 and 5 (B. Schwem and R.H. Fillingame, in preparation).

3. Aqueous access to the interior from both faces of subunit a

We have used \( N \)-ethyl-maleimide (NEM) and \( Ag^+ \) as probes of aqueous accessibility of Cys residues substituted into continuous stretches of residues in TMHs 2, 4 and 5 [22, 23]. NEM and \( Ag^+ \) react preferentially with the ionized thiol group, and hence reactive residues are presumed to reside in a polar, aqueous-accessible environment. NEM was found to preferentially react with Cys206, 210 and 214 at the peripheral face of TMH4 in the four-helix bundle shown in Fig. 2. NEM reaction led to inhibition of ATPase-coupled \( H^+ \)-transport in membrane vesicles from the a\( \alpha \) included mutants [22, 21]. The \( \alpha R210C \) mutation itself leads to loss of function, and NEM reactivity was demonstrated by labeling with [\( ^{14}C \)]NEM [22]. Other residues in TMH4 proved to be considerably less reactive to NEM. Residues 206, 210 and 214 extend from the cytoplasmic face to the center of the lipid bilayer in the topological model shown in Fig. 3, and most simply suggest aqueous access from the cytoplasm to the central core of subunit a via these and perhaps other residues. \( Ag^+ \) has also been used as a probe of aqueous access to subunit a, and NEM has been used to characterize aqueous access to subunit c.
accessibility of Cys-substituted mutants of subunit $a$. Ag$^+$ is thought to react as a Lewis acid with the thiolate group to form a covalent bond. Ag$^+$ has an ionic radius approximating that of H$_3$O$^+$, or Na$^+$, which may make it an ideal probe of such access channels. ATP-driven proton transport by the NEM-sensitive mutants, $a$S206C and $a$N214C, also proved to be inhibited by Ag$^+$ [22]. More surprisingly, a number of mutants that were NEM-insensitive showed striking inhibition when treated with Ag$^+$ [22,23]. In TMH4, for example, the two mutants showing the greatest sensitivity to Ag$^+$, $a$M215C and $a$G218C, were totally resistant to inhibition by NEM [22]. These residues fall towards the center of the four helix bundle shown in Fig. 2, and lie opposite to the helical face for residues 206, 210 and 214. For TMH5, the most Ag$^+$-sensitive residues cluster at the center of the membrane, with lesser reactive residues extending to the periplasmic surface (Fig. 3; [23]). For TMH2, the Ag$^+$-sensitive residues extend from the center of the membrane to the periplasmic surface (Fig. 3; [23]). In the four-helix bundle model for subunit $a$ (Fig. 2), the most Ag$^+$-sensitive residues in TMH2 and TMH4 tend to

![Figure 2: Cross-sectional model of subunit $a$ complexed with three $c$ subunits of the $c$-ring. TMH1 of subunit $a$ is not shown. The relative positions of residues interacting as second-site-suppressor pairs are indicated. NEM-sensitive residues in $a$TMH4 are described in the text. Ag$^+$-sensitive residues in $a$TMH2, 4 and 5 are shown in red or orange, based upon their relative reactivity (red > orange) [23]. The cross-linkable faces of $a$TMH4 and $c$TMH2 are shown in green shading. The positions of the key functional residues, $c$Asp61 and $a$Arg210 side chains are shown, and the cross-linkable residues in $c$TMH2 that are discussed in the text indicated in blue.]

![Figure 3: Topological model for the folding of subunit $a$ in the membrane (based upon [24]), and the positions of Ag$^+$-reactive residues [23] (reactivity scaled as red > orange > brown > gray). White residues have not been tested. Many of the numbered residues are referred to in the text.]
cluster at the center of the bundle, as was the case for the NEM-insensitive and Ag⁺-sensitive residues in TMH5. In summary, the NEM and Ag⁺-sensitive face of aTMH4 could provide an aqueous-access pathway from the center of the membrane to the cytoplasm, and a possible pathway of proton release from Asp61 of subunit c at the periphery of the c-rotor. In contrast, the Ag⁺-sensitive and NEM-insensitive residues in TMHs 2, 4 and 5 provide a possible aqueous pathway for proton access from the periplasm to the center of the membrane, but the pathway would appear to be centered at the middle of the four-helix bundle. If protons in the periplasmic pathway are to reach cAsp61, the pathway would have to be gated by structural changes in the postulated four-helix bundle, perhaps by the swiveling of helices.

4. Evidence for interaction of cTMH2 with aTMH4

High-yield disulfide cross-links can be formed between Cys residues introduced into cTMH2 and aTMH4, where the cross-linkable Cys-Cys pairs span a region 19 amino acids in both helices [15]. The cross-linkable residues extend from residues 55 to 73 in subunit c and residues 207 to 225 in subunit a. The cross-linkable residues in cTMH4 fall on the peripheral face of TMH4 in the four-helix bundle model of subunit a (Fig. 2), i.e. the NEM-sensitive face containing the essential aR210 residue. The cross-linkable residues in subunit c map to the interior face of cTMH2 in the oligomeric model of the c-ring (Fig. 2). For example, residues 62 and 65 pack at the interface with cTMH1, and both form cross-links with a N214C in high yield. Residue cG69C also packs at the interface with cTMH1 but forms a high-yield cross-link with a I221C. In this case, the cG69C mutation results in a loss of function, and one could argue that the structure of the mutant protein might be perturbed; hence the proximal positioning of residues might not apply to the native protein. Since the original study [15], we have screened for second-site suppressors with the cG69C mutant and remarkably found the second-site-suppressing mutation to be al221H, i.e. in the same residue as that of the cross-linkable pair. The new cG69C/ al221H suppressor pair suggests that these residues may interact in a functional way.

5. Evidence for rotation of TMH2 of subunit c

The following observations suggest that the rotational positions of cTMH2 in the c-ring model, relative to cTMH1, may have to change in the course of function. The position of helices shown in the c-ring model is based upon distance contraints derived from inter-subunit c-c cross-linking [11,12], and the original NMR model of the monomeric protein in its protonated form [10]. Other observations leading to a suggested rotation of cTMH2 are:

1. The essential residue aArg210 is postulated to interact with cAsp61 during the protonation/deprotonation cycle to transiently lower the $p_K_a$ of the proton-transporting carboxylate side chain [20]. In the oligomeric model of the c-ring, Asp61 packs at the interface between subunits and would appear to be shielded from a direct interaction with aArg210. Rotation of cTMH2 could expose cAsp61 to the periphery of the ring and promote interaction with aArg210.

2. As was described in Section 4, the interior face of cTMH2 in the oligomeric model of the c-ring is the segment that forms cross-links with aTMH4. A 180° rotation of cTMH2 would facilitate formation of the complete set of cross-links.

3. The original NMR structure of subunit c was solved at pH 5 where Asp61 is protonated [10]. Rastogi and Girvin [13] solved a second NMR structure at pH 8 under conditions where cAsp61 was known to ionize [25]. The structure at pH 8 revealed a 140° clockwise rotation of cTMH2 relative to cTMH1 when compared to the pH 5 structure. In the pH 5 structure, the Asp61 side chain packs on the front face of the molecule, where it is thought to interact with back face residues of adjacent subunits of the c-ring to form a proton or cation binding site [10,12,17]. In the pH 8 structure, TMH2 is rotated such that the Asp61 side chain projects from the back face of the structure. The pH 8 structure with cTMH2 rotated is consistent with the a-c cross-linking data discussed above [15], and we think it is reasonable to assume that this may be the form of the protein that cross-links in situ.

4. The NMR structure of a functional aspartate-interchange mutant in which the essential Asp is moved from position 61 in TMH2 to position 24 in TMH1 was recently solved [26]. The mutant is functional [27,28], and second-site suppressors mapping to aTMH4 further enhance function [29]. The structure of the Asp-interchange protein is of considerable interest because retention of robust function in the various suppressors [29] implies a functional interaction between cTMH1 and aTMH4. The structure of cAsp24Asn61 subunit c was solved at pH 5 under conditions where Asp24 was fully protonated [26]. Remarkably, the structure strongly resembles that of wild-type subunit c at pH 8. Relative to the wild-type protein at pH 5, TMH2 has swiveled clockwise such that Asn61 packs at the back of the structure with TMH1 rotated enough in the opposite direction to allow the Asp24 side chain to pack at the front of the molecule. The new structure suggests that the swiveling of cTMH2, as in the pH 8 structure, is not necessarily dictated by the protonation state of the essential carboxyl group. Further, it supports the idea that the swiveling of cTMH2 between the two conformational states may be an important step in the mechanism.

6. Mechanical model for rotation of the c-ring driven by a concerted swiveling of meshed TMHs at the a-c interface

Elsewhere we have described a detailed mechanical model of how helical interactions at the a-c interface may drive c-ring rotation [21]. The model incorporates the rotation of cTMH2 between the two general structural states seen in the NMR models, and rotation of helices in subunit a to gate alternate aqueous-access channels from the periplasmic and cytoplasmic sides of the membrane. Rastogi and Girvin [13] have proposed a model utilizing much of the same information. We will discuss the differences in models later in this section. The major difference, and inspiring motivation leading to our model is that the same set of helix-helix interactions can be used to explain the function of the cAsp24Asn61 mutant, whereas the Rastogi and Girvin model does not provide an explanation for this mutant's function.

We will use the scheme in Fig. 2 to describe the model beginning with a c-ring in which all of the c subunits are
protonated. In the first step, cTMH2 with Asp61 protonated revolves by 140° in the clockwise direction with Asp61 protonated. The forces driving the helical rotation are discussed below. The helical movement enables interaction of a Arg210 with cAsp61, which lowers the pKₐ of the essential carboxyl group, and following ionization of Asp61, the proton exits to the cytoplasmic side of the membrane via the aSer206, NEM-sensitive exit channel at the peripheral face of aTMH4. At this point, the aArg210 side chain must move from the vicinity of the Asp61 carboxylate such that the pKₐ can rise to permit reprotonation from the periplasmic surface. The movement of the aArg210 side chain is envisioned as being coupled to the simultaneous rotation of segments of aTMH4 (counterclockwise), and perhaps aTMH5 (clockwise), with a resultant exposure of cAsp61 to protons entering from the Ag⁺-sensitive cavity at the interior of the four-helix bundle of subunit α. At this point, the H⁺ electrochemical potential drives reprotonation of the Asp61 carboxylate via the periplasmic, Ag⁺-sensitive pathway. In the final step, the concerted rotation of helices back to their original position drives the translocation of the c-ring one step (1/10 of 360°) in the counterclockwise direction. In this step cTMH2 and aTMH4 roll against each other, in a manner akin to the meshing of rotating gears, and aTMH4 inserts between the c2 and c° helices. Simultaneously, TMH2 of subunit cε rotates to the position seen in the pH 8 structure. For subunit cε, this step is equivalent to the first step described above for the centrally located cTMH2 rotation of function [14]. The cAsp24Asn61 mutant may prove to be more sensitive to such cross-linking. We view the varying models as being testable, working hypotheses and expect they will change with new experimental information and structures.
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