

MOL#6320

The Ants Go Marching Two by Two:
oligomeric structure of G-protein-coupled receptors

Jonathan A. Javitch

Center for Molecular Recognition, Departments of Psychiatry and Pharmacology,
Columbia University college of Physicians and Surgeons, New York, NY 10032.

MOL # 6320

Running title: Oligomerization of GPCRs

To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Dr. Jonathan A. Javitch. Center for Molecular Recognition, Columbia University,
P&S 11-401, 630 West 168th Street, New York, NY 10032. Tel.: 212-305-7308;
Fax: 212-305-5594; E-mail: jaj2@columbia.edu

MOL #6320

Abstract

A number of class C G-protein coupled receptors (GPCRs) have been shown to form dimers in the plasma membrane, and mounting evidence supports the hypothesis that many, if not all, class A rhodopsin-like receptors, also form dimers or higher-order oligomers. Evidence for this hypothesis has come from SDS-PAGE, co-immunoprecipitation, resonance energy transfer, atomic force microscopy, and cross-linking studies, approaches that are reviewed in this article. Like any method, each has its strengths and limitations, and these must be kept in mind while interpreting the data for oligomerization. Recent experimental evidence supports the hypothesis that class A receptors may exist as higher-order oligomers, or even as arrays, with distinct symmetrical interfaces in both the first and fourth transmembrane segments.

MOL# 6320

G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) comprise a large superfamily of receptors that couple binding of a diverse group of ligands to activation of heterotrimeric G-proteins (Gether, 2000). A number of the class C GPCRs have been shown to form dimers in the plasma membrane, including the calcium-sensing receptor (Bai et al., 1998), the GABA_B receptor (Jones et al., 1998; Kaupmann et al., 1998; White et al., 1998), and the metabotropic glutamate receptors (Romano et al., 1996). Mounting evidence also supports the hypothesis that, in the plasma membrane, many, if not all, of the class A rhodopsin-like receptors are dimeric (or oligomeric) as well (reviewed in (Angers et al., 2002; Bai, 2004; George et al., 2002; Rios et al., 2001)).

The data that have supported a dimeric or oligomeric structure for Class A GPCRs have come from the application of a number of different biochemical and biophysical approaches, several of which have been used by Carillo et al. in this issue of *Molecular Pharmacology*. They used a combination of co-immunoprecipitation, single cell fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET) and cell surface time-resolved FRET to explore systematically the helix interactions that lead to the quaternary structure of the $\alpha 1b$ adrenergic receptor. These studies explored the self-association of a large number of N-terminal fusions containing only 1 or 2 of the transmembrane (TM) segments and also the ability of these fragments to interact with the full-length receptor. As discussed below, the results are remarkably consistent with a model of the rhodopsin quaternary structure based on the results of atomic force microscopy studies of native mouse rhodopsin in the membrane (Fotiadis et al., 2003; Liang et al., 2003).

MOL #6320

One of the earliest pieces of evidence that GPCRs might exist as higher-order complexes was the appearance of multiple bands on SDS-PAGE. Such bands have been observed for many membrane proteins, hydrophobic proteins that are susceptible to aggregation and SDS-resistance (Soulie et al., 1996). Thus, the appearance of SDS-resistant bands on immunoblots must be interpreted with caution. The higher-order bands seen with transient transfection may result, at least in part, from the fact that GPCRs exist in the membrane as dimers or oligomers and are prone to aggregate upon removal from the membrane into detergent-resistant multimeric forms, thus reflecting their state in the membrane. Indeed, the presence of SDS-resistant oligomeric species in native tissue (Nimchinsky et al., 1997; Zawarynski et al., 1998) suggests that such bands are not merely an artifact of heterologous expression.

Bovine rhodopsin, the only GPCR for which a high-resolution structure is available, was crystallized as a non-physiological dimer with the extracellular end of one receptor and the cytoplasmic end of its "dimer" partner facing the same direction (Palczewski et al., 2000). Thus, in the detergent and crystalization conditions used, rhodopsin is a monomer, although recent evidence suggests that rhodopsin is oligomeric in the native membrane (Fotiadis et al., 2003; Liang et al., 2003) (see below).

The beta2 adrenergic receptor (B2AR) has been inferred to be a monomer when solubilized in the detergent dodecyl maltoside (DDM), although the receptor binds ligands normally in this detergent and appears to be functionally intact (Gether et al., 1997; Gether et al., 1995). Moreover, we have found that a B2AR cysteine

MOL#6320

mutant is efficiently cross-linked in the plasma membrane, but when this mutant receptor is extracted in DDM, no cross-linking is observed (unpublished observations), consistent with the detergent-induced disruption of an oligomeric interface. Nonetheless, bioluminescence resonance energy transfer (BRET) (Angers et al., 2000; Mercier et al., 2002) and cross-linking studies (Guo et al., 2002) have shown that the B2AR and the dopamine D2 receptor (D2R) are almost exclusively dimeric or oligomeric in the plasma membrane. Thus, the native oligomeric structure that exists in the membrane appears to be disrupted in detergent.

Similarly, the M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor (mAChR) that can be co-immunoprecipitated from an detergent extract of Sf9 cells is almost completely non-functional, whereas the material that binds ligand in detergent appears to be almost exclusively monomeric, consistent with being a monomer in detergent (Park and Wells, 2003). Thus, the material that can be co-immunoprecipitated is either misfolded in the membrane or becomes misfolded during extraction from the membrane. It is possible, however, that in a different detergent and/or in the presence of ligand it might be possible to preserve higher-order structure in the soluble state. Consistent with this, more active M2 mAChR could be co-immunoprecipitated when the receptor was solubilized in the presence of ligand, which presumably partially stabilizes the oligomeric structure in detergent (Park and Wells, 2003).

Data derived from the use of co-immunoprecipitation have been used as support for an oligomeric structure of these and other receptors. Given the large amount of SDS-resistant material present on immunoblots of transiently

MOL#6320

transfected GPCRs and the findings discussed above for the M2 mAChR, data from the use of co-immunoprecipitation must be interpreted with caution and the aid of extensive controls (see below). Indeed, it was reported that *any* of a large number of GPCRs co-expressed with the 5HT-1A receptor could be co-immunoprecipitated (Salim et al., 2002).

Much useful information has come from FRET and BRET studies, which have the advantage that they can be applied to receptor in the membrane of living cells rather than to detergent extracts. Although the application of these techniques is complex and potentially rife with artifacts if not carried out appropriately, FRET and BRET have provided evidence that many GPCRs are homo-dimers and/or hetero-dimers in the membrane (reviewed in (Angers et al., 2002)). Most of these studies have employed receptors fused at their C-termini to different variants of green fluorescent protein or to luciferase. With standard FRET or BRET it can be difficult to establish the cellular compartment in which the FRET or BRET is being observed, and, given the caveats described above for transient transfection, it is difficult to rule out a contribution to the FRET or BRET signal of intracellular misfolded or aggregated material. FRET microscopy approaches, including ratio imaging, donor photobleaching and donor recovery after acceptor photobleaching (Schmid and Sitte, 2003), have been developed to visualize the localization of protein-protein interactions at the plasma membrane or in intracellular compartments.

The use of fluorescently labeled antibodies to two different co-expressed N-terminal extracellular epitope tags has allowed the application of time-resolved FRET to GPCRs in the plasma membrane (McVey et al., 2001). Since only cell

MOL#6320

surface receptors have an N-terminus accessible to antibodies in an intact cell, only cell surface interactions should be observed. A potential problem of this approach is that the antibodies used to identify the epitope-tagged receptors are bivalent and thus might be expected to cluster receptors. Thus, appropriate controls must be performed to establish that this is not the cause of the FRET signal observed. In addition, the size of the antibody is rather large compared to the receptor, making it difficult to assess distances between the epitopes to which these antibodies are attached.

A caveat related to the interpretation of FRET/BRET, as well as cross-linking studies, is the possibility that crowding of receptors in the membrane as a result of very high-level expression in heterologous cells, could lead to artifactual FRET/BRET signals or to cross-linking. This was elegantly addressed by Bouvier and colleagues who showed that the BRET signal produced by B2AR homo-dimers was unaffected over nearly a hundred-fold level of expression (Mercier et al., 2002). Only at extraordinarily high levels of expression was "bystander BRET" observed, indicating that at more typical levels of expression, as well as at very low levels of expression, the receptors were almost exclusively dimeric or oligomeric (Mercier et al., 2002). This conclusion is in full agreement with cross-linking studies in the D2R (Guo et al., 2002).

The introduction of quantitative BRET (Mercier et al., 2002) also has facilitated measurements of apparent affinity between the dimer partners and thereby demonstrated a specificity of GPCR interactions that is often not apparent by the

MOL#6320

co-immunoprecipitation methods described above or even in some cases by non-quantitative BRET.

Unraveling a structural mechanism for cross-talk between receptors in a dimeric complex must start with the identification of the dimer interface. Although extracellular, TM and/or C-terminal regions have been proposed as possible sites of receptor interactions in the dimerization of GPCRs in some classes (George et al., 2002), given the limitations imposed by the large size of the probes used in BRET and FRET and limited sites of attachment, it has not been possible to identify the interaction surface using these techniques. A number of studies have employed cross-linking to demonstrate that GPCRs in the membrane are dimeric or oligomeric (AbdAlla et al., 1999; Cvejic and Devi, 1997; Hebert et al., 1996; Rodriguez-Frade et al., 1999; Vila-Coro et al., 2000; Vila-Coro et al., 1999). These studies have used relatively long lysine-reactive bifunctional cross-linking reagents, and it has not been possible to infer the specific residues or regions that were cross-linked.

We have demonstrated that D2R can be oxidatively cross-linked via Cys168^{4,58} at the extracellular end of TM4 at a symmetrical interface (Guo et al., 2002). Mutation of Cys168^{4,58} to Ser, abolishes cross-linking, but does not disrupt the D2R dimer interface, based on the cross-linking of this construct observed when another residue at the interface is simultaneously mutated to cysteine (unpublished observations).

Because cross-linking requires that only one of the two cysteines involved is modified initially by the reagent and the derivatized cysteine then reacts by collision with the second unmodified cysteine, the rate of collision must be much faster than

MOL#6320

the rate of initial modification. This is consistent with the cysteines being initially very close. The actual distance between the α -carbons of disulfide-linked cysteines is $5.6 \pm 0.6 \text{ \AA}$ (Aziz et al., 2002). The very high fraction of receptor that can be cross-linked, the apparent specificity of the cross-linking (based on the appearance of a single homo-dimer band), and the lack of cross-linking of Cys56^{1.54} (which based on the bovine rhodopsin structure has a similar lipid accessibility as Cys168^{4.58}), all argue for the proximity of the TM4 cysteines in the native state. Thus, it is likely that in the membrane, untreated with copper phenanthroline, D2R exists as a homo-dimer but that this dimer does not survive detergent solubilization.

Our finding that the site of cross-linking in D2R is Cys168^{4.58} at the extracellular end of TM4 is consistent with the hypothesis that TM4 forms a symmetrical dimer interface. Fragment co-expression studies were also consistent with the existence of a symmetrical TM4 interface in D2R (Lee et al., 2003). In contrast, in a study which led up to the study in this issue, a truncated fragment containing only TM1 of the A1AR showed time resolved-FRET with the full-length receptor, suggesting the involvement of TM1 in the dimerization of this receptor (Carrillo et al., 2003). Studies on yeast α factor receptor (Overton et al., 2003) also have suggested that TM1 plays a central role in dimerization.

Based on analysis of correlated mutations, it has been hypothesized that various rhodopsin-like GPCR subtypes may differ in their contact interfaces (Filizola et al., 2002; Filizola and Weinstein, 2002), consistent with either TM1 or TM4 as dimer interfaces in different receptors. However, given the possible organization of

MOL#6320

GPCRs into higher order oligomers, it is important to note that these predictions may in fact include information about conserved interfaces other than dimers.

Interestingly, cross-linking studies of the C5a receptor provided evidence for cross-linking of a symmetric dimer interface in TM4 as well as in TM1/TM2, but it was difficult to incorporate both of these symmetrical cross-links into a model of dimer formation. These authors proposed the existence of a higher-order oligomeric structure as most consistent with these data (Klco et al., 2003).

The organization of rhodopsin into two dimensional arrays of dimers has been supported by atomic force microscopy analysis of native mouse retinal membranes (Fotiadis et al., 2003; Liang et al., 2003) (Figure 1) (but also see (Chabre et al., 2003)). Although these images are not of sufficient resolution to allow identification of individual helices, based on molecular modeling TM4 and TM5 were proposed to be involved in symmetric intra-dimeric contact while an asymmetric interface between the TM5-TM6 loop and the TM1-TM2 loop formed dimeric rows (Figure 2). A row of dimers was proposed to interact with an adjacent row of dimers at symmetric TM1 interfaces (Figure 2).

In this issue, Carrillo et al. reproduce their earlier finding of the interaction of a TM1 fragment with the full-length receptor, both by co-immunoprecipitation and by time-resolved FRET at the cell surface. In addition, these methods demonstrated self-association of a TM1 fragment. Fragments comprising TM3-4 and TM5-6, but not TM7, were also able to interact with full-length receptor based on co-immunoprecipitation and time-resolved FRET. Symmetrical interactions were noted between fragments containing TM4, but this fragment did not interact with TM1-2

MOL#6320

or TM5-6. Importantly, control experiments failed to show interaction of the TM1 fragment with the full-length histamine H1 receptor, suggesting a specificity of interaction, although related H1 receptor controls were not reported for the other fragment interactions.

These findings are consistent with the model proposed for the packing of mouse rhodopsin into an array (Liang et al., 2003), with a symmetrical TM4-5 interaction forming the dimers, an asymmetrical TM5-TM6 interaction with TM1-TM2 forming the interdimer contacts, and a symmetrical TM1 interface between the dimer rows (see Figure 2). It is remarkable that these receptor fragments (except for TM7) are expressed at the cell surface where they can show time-resolved FRET and that specific interactions appear to be maintained in detergent extracts. Additional methods, such as cysteine cross-linking, will be useful to map the exact interfaces and to investigate further the physical basis of these interactions and the determination of their specificity.

Although most GPCRs studied have been inferred to be dimers or oligomers, the role of GPCR oligomerization remains enigmatic. Most importantly, it has not been established thus far whether receptor activity relies on its organization in a quaternary structure or whether the primary function of oligomerization is to enable an additional criterion for the endoplasmic reticulum quality control mechanism. Multiple experiments suggest a functional interaction between the binding sites in hetero-dimeric receptors, from the perspective of novel pharmacology and synergistic or antagonistic effects on signaling (Gomes et al., 2000; Jordan and Devi, 1999; Jordan et al., 2003; Jordan et al., 2001). These findings are very

MOL#6320

provocative, but for those receptors, which are coupled to multiple G-proteins and to multiple signaling and regulatory pathways, it has been difficult to rule out indirect effects and to build a mechanistic understanding of receptor cross-talk.

Because of their hetero-dimeric nature, the GABA_B receptors have been enormously important in pointing out that a number of functions previously thought to occur in the monomer actually require a dimeric structure. Whether these lessons from a Class C GPCR can be generalized to Class A GPCRs is not yet known but merits serious consideration and experimental analysis. Cell-surface trafficking (Kaupmann et al., 1998; Margeta-Mitrovic et al., 2000) is not the only role of GABA_B receptor hetero-dimerization. Another role became apparent upon investigation of the mechanism of GABA binding and receptor-G protein coupling. The N-terminus of GB2 differs from that of GB1, and unlike GB1 does not bind GABA or any other known ligand (Galvez et al., 2001). Surprisingly, however, mutations in GB1 of intracellular residues predicted, by analogy with the closely-related metabotropic glutamate receptors family (Francesconi and Duvoisin, 1998; Gomeza et al., 1996), to be critical for coupling to G-protein, had no effect on G-protein activation by the GABA_B hetero-dimer (Duthey et al., 2002; Robbins et al., 2001). In contrast, analogous mutations within the second or third intracellular loops (IL2 and IL3) of GB2 alone led to a loss of G-protein signaling by the hetero-dimer (Duthey et al., 2002; Havlickova et al., 2002; Robbins et al., 2001). Thus the GABA_B receptor functions through a form of trans-activation, wherein GB1 binds agonist and GB2 couples to G-protein.

MOL#6320

Interestingly, co-expression of a chimeric construct containing the N-terminus (NT) of GB1 and the transmembrane domain (TMD) of GB2 (GB1/2) with a chimeric construct containing the NT of GB2 and the TMD of GB2 (GB1/2) resulted in induction of IP formation in response to GABA application, whereas the individual chimeras did not (Galvez et al., 2001). If the structure and function of the chimeric GB1/2 and GB2/1 receptors are not significantly different from those of wild-type receptors, the ligand-induced signaling (i.e. cis-activation) of this GB1/2+GB2/1 hetero-dimer suggests the possibility that both cis- and trans-activation may occur in homo-dimeric Class A GPCRs, in which both "subunits" are capable of binding ligand and signaling to G-protein. In this scenario, the GABA_B receptor might be a relatively unique case in which one subunit is unable to bind ligand and the other is unable to couple to G-protein, so that only trans-activation occurs in the wild-type GABA_B hetero-dimer and only cis-activation occurs in the GB1/2+GB2/1 hetero-dimer.

A recent study has demonstrated that in a hetero-dimeric complex of GPCRs, each fused to G protein, ligand binding can lead to 2nd messenger activation via an interaction between the "cis" receptor and the "trans" G-protein (Carrillo et al., 2003). This does not represent trans-activation but rather cis-activation (binding site and intracellular loops that contact G-protein from the same GPCR) of a G-protein fused to the trans-receptor. The only demonstration to date of true GABA_B-like trans-activation in another GPCR comes from a study of the leutinizing hormone (LH) receptor, a class A GPCR that has a large extracellular N-terminal domain that binds LH (Ji et al., 2002). Through studies of different combinations of

MOL#6320

co-expressed mutant LH receptors, thereby creating pseudo-hetero-dimers, these authors were able to conclude that both cis- and trans-activation must occur in the LH receptor dimer. The mechanism for the trans-activation of the LH receptor and whether it involves contact between an NT and the trans-TMD or propagation of conformational change directly between the TMDs is unknown.

Another important unanswered question is the stoichiometry of the signaling complex. That is, in a homo-dimeric GPCR in which both subunits are capable of interaction with G-protein, does the GPCR dimer signal through two hetero-trimeric G-proteins, or does the dimer interact with a single G-protein? Recent evidence from refolded leukotriene B4 receptor reconstituted with G-protein in detergent suggests that only one hetero-trimeric G-protein binds to a receptor dimer (Baneres and Parello, 2003) and interactions consistent with such a proposal have been modeled (Filipek et al., 2004). Whether this finding can be generalized to all GPCRs remains an important question for further research as is elucidation of the possible functional role of the formation of higher-order arrays of GPCRs.

An important step towards this goal is identification of the structural determinants of oligomerization. The physical basis of GPCR interaction in the membrane remains mysterious – a traditional view would be that the largely hydrophobic residues that appear to form these oligomeric interfaces would have a favorable interaction with lipid and would not be driven to associate with other helices, either symmetrically or asymmetrically. Nonetheless, based on multiple studies there appears to be specificity to these interactions, which is further supported in Carrillo et al. by the lack of time-resolved FRET between the $\alpha 1b$

MOL#6320

receptor and the full-length H1 receptor as well as by the interaction of particular fragments and not others.

Since co-immunoprecipitation data comprise a major component of this manuscript, it must be pointed out that despite the specificity of the data and their consistency with the rhodopsin model, this technique remains problematic. Note in Figure 2, the large amount of slowly migrating SDS-resistant aggregate present as the major species after immunoprecipitation but present in the initial lysate at a vastly lower ratio. These SDS-resistant aggregates are therefore formed during immunoprecipitation, conceivably in part through the formation of new disulfide bonds during the precipitation process. Enough of the monomer is dissociated in SDS to allow the detection of this species and thereby to establish co-immunoprecipitation, but this provides some warning since the mechanism leading to this aggregation is unclear. Perhaps similar but less stable aggregates form with co-expression of the fragments as well, but these may be more easily disrupted by SDS. Regardless, the authors are to be commended for the systematic application of the approach as well as for validating many of the results with time-resolved FRET measurements in the membrane, the results of which are qualitatively identical to the co-immunoprecipitation data. All methods of course have limitations, but the systematic application and validation through complementary methods make this an important contribution to our evolving understanding of GPCR oligomerization. Further studies must examine other receptors and use other complementary methods to continue to probe the validity and generality of these findings to the entire superfamily of GPCRs.

MOL#6320

Acknowledgements:

I am grateful to my colleagues Wen Guo, Marta Filizola, Lei Shi, and Harel Weinstein, for much helpful discussion and to Ulrik Gether and Kris Palczewski for comments on this manuscript. This work was supported in part by NIMH grants MH57324 and MH54137, and by NARSAD and the Lieber Center.

MOL#6320

References

- AbdAlla S, Zaki E, Lothar H and Quitterer U (1999) Involvement of the amino terminus of the B(2) receptor in agonist-induced receptor dimerization. *J Biol Chem* **274**:26079-84.
- Angers S, Salahpour A and Bouvier M (2002) Dimerization: an emerging concept for G protein-coupled receptor ontogeny and function. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol* **42**:409-35.
- Angers S, Salahpour A, Joly E, Hilairet S, Chelsky D, Dennis M and Bouvier M (2000) Detection of beta 2-adrenergic receptor dimerization in living cells using bioluminescence resonance energy transfer (BRET). *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **97**:3684-9.
- Aziz QH, Partridge CJ, Munsey TS and Sivaprasadarao A (2002) Depolarization induces intersubunit cross-linking in a S4 cysteine mutant of the Shaker potassium channel. *J Biol Chem* **277**:42719-25.
- Bai M (2004) Dimerization of G-protein-coupled receptors: roles in signal transduction. *Cell Signal* **16**:175-86.
- Bai M, Trivedi S and Brown EM (1998) Dimerization of the extracellular calcium-sensing receptor (CaR) on the cell surface of CaR-transfected HEK293 cells. *J Biol Chem* **273**:23605-10.
- Baneres JL and Parello J (2003) Structure-based analysis of GPCR function: evidence for a novel pentameric assembly between the dimeric leukotriene B4 receptor BLT1 and the G-protein. *J Mol Biol* **329**:815-29.
- Carrillo JJ, Pediani J and Milligan G (2003) Dimers of class A G protein-coupled receptors function via agonist-mediated trans-activation of associated G proteins. *J Biol Chem* **278**:42578-87.
- Chabre M, Cone R and Saibil H (2003) Biophysics: is rhodopsin dimeric in native retinal rods? *Nature* **426**:30-1; discussion 31.
- Cvejic S and Devi LA (1997) Dimerization of the delta opioid receptor: implication for a role in receptor internalization. *J Biol Chem* **272**:26959-64.
- Duthey B, Caudron S, Perroy J, Bettler B, Fagni L, Pin JP and Prezeau L (2002) A single subunit (GB2) is required for G-protein activation by the heterodimeric GABA(B) receptor. *J Biol Chem* **277**:3236-41.
- Filipek S, Krzysko KA, Fotiadis D, Liang Y, Saperstein DA, Engel A and Palczewski K (2004) A concept for G protein activation by G protein-coupled receptor dimers: the transducin/rhodopsin interface. *Photochem Photobiol Sci* **3**:628-38.
- Filizola M, Olmea O and Weinstein H (2002) Prediction of heterodimerization interfaces of G-protein coupled receptors with a new subtractive correlated mutation method. *Protein Eng* **15**:881-5.
- Filizola M and Weinstein H (2002) Structural models for dimerization of G-protein coupled receptors: the opioid receptor homodimers. *Biopolymers* **66**:317-25.
- Fotiadis D, Liang Y, Filipek S, Saperstein DA, Engel A and Palczewski K (2003) Atomic-force microscopy: Rhodopsin dimers in native disc membranes. *Nature* **421**:127-8.

MOL#6320

- Fotiadis D, Liang Y, Filipek S, Saperstein DA, Engel A and Palczewski K (2004) The G protein-coupled receptor rhodopsin in the native membrane. *FEBS Lett* **564**:281-8.
- Francesconi A and Duvoisin RM (1998) Role of the second and third intracellular loops of metabotropic glutamate receptors in mediating dual signal transduction activation. *J Biol Chem* **273**:5615-24.
- Galvez T, Duthey B, Kniazeff J, Blahos J, Rovelli G, Bettler B, Prezeau L and Pin JP (2001) Allosteric interactions between GB1 and GB2 subunits are required for optimal GABA(B) receptor function. *Embo J* **20**:2152-9.
- George SR, O'Dowd BF and Lee SP (2002) G-protein-coupled receptor oligomerization and its potential for drug discovery. *Nat Rev Drug Discov* **1**:808-20.
- Gether U (2000) Uncovering molecular mechanisms involved in activation of G protein-coupled receptors. *Endocr Rev* **21**:90-113.
- Gether U, Lin S, Ghanouni P, Ballesteros JA, Weinstein H and Kobilka BK (1997) Agonists induce conformational changes in transmembrane domains III and VI of the beta2 adrenoceptor. *Embo J* **16**:6737-47.
- Gether U, Lin S and Kobilka BK (1995) Fluorescent labeling of purified beta 2 adrenergic receptor. Evidence for ligand-specific conformational changes. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **270**:28268-75.
- Gomes I, Jordan BA, Gupta A, Trapaidze N, Nagy V and Devi LA (2000) Heterodimerization of mu and delta opioid receptors: A role in opiate synergy. *J Neurosci* **20**:RC110.
- Gomez J, Joly C, Kuhn R, Knopfel T, Bockaert J and Pin JP (1996) The second intracellular loop of metabotropic glutamate receptor 1 cooperates with the other intracellular domains to control coupling to G-proteins. *J Biol Chem* **271**:2199-205.
- Guo W, Shi L and Javitch JA (2002) The fourth transmembrane segment forms the interface of the dopamine D2 receptor homodimer. *J Biol Chem*.
- Havlickova M, Prezeau L, Duthey B, Bettler B, Pin JP and Blahos J (2002) The intracellular loops of the GB2 subunit are crucial for G-protein coupling of the heteromeric gamma-aminobutyrate B receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* **62**:343-50.
- Hebert TE, Moffett S, Morello JP, Loisel TP, Bichet DG, Barret C and Bouvier M (1996) A peptide derived from a beta2-adrenergic receptor transmembrane domain inhibits both receptor dimerization and activation. *Journal of Biological Chemistry* **271**:16384-92.
- Ji I, Lee C, Song Y, Conn PM and Ji TH (2002) Cis- and trans-activation of hormone receptors: the LH receptor. *Mol Endocrinol* **16**:1299-308.
- Jones KA, Borowsky B, Tamm JA, Craig DA, Durkin MM, Dai M, Yao WJ, Johnson M, Gunwaldsen C, Huang LY, Tang C, Shen Q, Salon JA, Morse K, Laz T, Smith KE, Nagarathnam D, Noble SA, Branchek TA and Gerald C (1998) GABA(B) receptors function as a heteromeric assembly of the subunits GABA(B)R1 and GABA(B)R2. *Nature* **396**:674-9.
- Jordan BA and Devi LA (1999) G-protein-coupled receptor heterodimerization modulates receptor function. *Nature* **399**:697-700.

MOL#6320

- Jordan BA, Gomes I, Rios C, Filipovska J and Devi LA (2003) Functional interactions between mu opioid and alpha2A-adrenergic receptors. *Mol Pharmacol* **64**:1317-24.
- Jordan BA, Trapaidze N, Gomes I, Nivarthi R and Devi LA (2001) Oligomerization of opioid receptors with beta 2-adrenergic receptors: a role in trafficking and mitogen-activated protein kinase activation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **98**:343-8.
- Kaupmann K, Malitschek B, Schuler V, Heid J, Froestl W, Beck P, Mosbacher J, Bischoff S, Kulik A, Shigemoto R, Karschin A and Bettler B (1998) GABA(B)-receptor subtypes assemble into functional heteromeric complexes. *Nature* **396**:683-7.
- Klco JM, Lassere TB and Baranski TJ (2003) C5a receptor oligomerization. I. Disulfide trapping reveals oligomers and potential contact surfaces in a G protein-coupled receptor. *J Biol Chem* **278**:35345-53.
- Lee SP, O'Dowd BF, Rajaram RD, Nguyen T and George SR (2003) D2 dopamine receptor homodimerization is mediated by multiple sites of interaction, including an intermolecular interaction involving transmembrane domain 4. *Biochemistry* **42**:11023-31.
- Liang Y, Fotiadis D, Filipek S, Saperstein DA, Palczewski K and Engel A (2003) Organization of the G Protein-coupled Receptors Rhodopsin and Opsin in Native Membranes. *J Biol Chem* **278**:21655-62.
- Margeta-Mitrovic M, Jan YN and Jan LY (2000) A trafficking checkpoint controls GABA(B) receptor heterodimerization. *Neuron* **27**:97-106.
- McVey M, Ramsay D, Kellett E, Rees S, Wilson S, Pope AJ and Milligan G (2001) Monitoring receptor oligomerization using time-resolved fluorescence resonance energy transfer and bioluminescence resonance energy transfer. The human delta -opioid receptor displays constitutive oligomerization at the cell surface, which is not regulated by receptor occupancy. *J Biol Chem* **276**:14092-9.
- Mercier JF, Salahpour A, Angers S, Breit A and Bouvier M (2002) Quantitative assessment of beta 1 and beta 2-adrenergic receptor homo and heterodimerization by bioluminescence resonance energy transfer. *J Biol Chem*.
- Nimchinsky EA, Hof PR, Janssen WGM, Morrison JH and Schmauss C (1997) Expression of dopamine D3 receptor dimers and tetramers in brain and in transfected cells. *J Biol Chem* **272**:29229-37.
- Overton MC, Chinault SL and Blumer KJ (2003) Oligomerization, biogenesis, and signaling is promoted by a glycoporphin A-like dimerization motif in transmembrane domain 1 of a yeast G protein-coupled receptor. *J Biol Chem* **278**:49369-77.
- Palczewski K, Kumasaka T, Hori T, Behnke CA, Motoshima H, Fox BA, Le Trong I, Teller DC, Okada T, Stenkamp RE, Yamamoto M and Miyano M (2000) Crystal structure of rhodopsin: A G protein-coupled receptor. *Science* **289**:739-45.
- Park PS and Wells JW (2003) Monomers and oligomers of the M2 muscarinic cholinergic receptor purified from Sf9 cells. *Biochemistry* **42**:12960-71.
- Rios CD, Jordan BA, Gomes I and Devi LA (2001) G-protein-coupled receptor dimerization: modulation of receptor function. *Pharmacol Ther* **92**:71-87.

MOL#6320

- Robbins MJ, Calver AR, Filippov AK, Hirst WD, Russell RB, Wood MD, Nasir S, Couve A, Brown DA, Moss SJ and Pangalos MN (2001) GABA(B2) is essential for g-protein coupling of the GABA(B) receptor heterodimer. *J Neurosci* **21**:8043-52.
- Rodriguez-Frade JM, Vila-Coro AJ, de Ana AM, Albar JP, Martinez AC and Mellado M (1999) The chemokine monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 induces functional responses through dimerization of its receptor CCR2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **96**:3628-33.
- Romano C, Yang WL and O'Malley KL (1996) Metabotropic glutamate receptor 5 is a disulfide-linked dimer. *J Biol Chem* **271**:28612-6.
- Salim K, Fenton T, Bacha J, Urien-Rodriguez H, Bonnert T, Skynner HA, Watts E, Kerby J, Heald A, Beer M, McAllister G and Guest PC (2002) Oligomerization of G-protein-coupled receptors shown by selective co-immunoprecipitation. *J Biol Chem* **277**:15482-5.
- Schmid JA and Sitte HH (2003) Fluorescence resonance energy transfer in the study of cancer pathways. *Curr Opin Oncol* **15**:55-64.
- Soulie S, Moller JV, Falson P and le Maire M (1996) Urea reduces the aggregation of membrane proteins on sodium dodecyl sulfate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. *Anal Biochem* **236**:363-4.
- Vila-Coro AJ, Mellado M, Martin de Ana A, Lucas P, del Real G, Martinez AC and Rodriguez-Frade JM (2000) HIV-1 infection through the CCR5 receptor is blocked by receptor dimerization. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **97**:3388-93.
- Vila-Coro AJ, Rodriguez-Frade JM, Martin De Ana A, Moreno-Ortiz MC, Martinez AC and Mellado M (1999) The chemokine SDF-1alpha triggers CXCR4 receptor dimerization and activates the JAK/STAT pathway. *Faseb J* **13**:1699-710.
- White JH, Wise A, Main MJ, Green A, Fraser NJ, Disney GH, Barnes AA, Emson P, Foord SM and Marshall FH (1998) Heterodimerization is required for the formation of a functional GABA(B) receptor. *Nature* **396**:679-82.
- Zawarynski P, Tallerico T, Seeman P, Lee SP, O'Dowd BF and George SR (1998) Dopamine D2 receptor dimers in human and rat brain. *FEBS Lett* **441**:383-6.

MOL#6320

Figure 1:

Organization and topography of the cytoplasmic surface of rhodopsin. (This figure was kindly provided by K. Palczewski and collaborators).

A topograph obtained using atomic-force microscopy (see (Fotiadis et al., 2003)), shows the paracrystalline arrangement of rhodopsin dimers in the native disc membrane. Individual dimers, presumably broken away from one of the rows, are shown inside an ellipse, and an occasional rhodopsin monomer is shown by an arrow.

Figure 2:

Model for the packing arrangement of rhodopsin molecules within the paracrystalline arrays of native disc membranes. Reprinted with permission from Fotiadis et al., 2004 (Fotiadis et al., 2004).

Cytoplasmic side (top) and extracellular side (bottom) of rhodopsin oligomers. Positions of helix ends are marked by colored discs and the corresponding helix numbers. Extracellular and cytoplasmic loops are drawn schematically at the corresponding locations. Contacts between monomers are formed by TM4 and TM5. Most contacts between dimers are created by the intracellular loop between TM5 and TM6 from one monomer with the loop between TM1 and TM2 and the C-terminal residues from the partner monomer. Only half of a second row of

MOL#6320

rhodopsins is shown. The contact between double rows is created mainly by hydrophobic residues from TM1 close to the extracellular side.




Fig 1

Fig 2

