

5-1-2009

Regulation of N-formyl peptide receptor trafficking and signaling by arrestins

Brant Wagener

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/biom_etds

Recommended Citation

Wagener, Brant. "Regulation of N-formyl peptide receptor trafficking and signaling by arrestins." (2009).
https://digitalrepository.unm.edu/biom_etds/105

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Electronic Theses and Dissertations at UNM Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Biomedical Sciences ETDs by an authorized administrator of UNM Digital Repository. For more information, please contact disc@unm.edu.

Brant Michael Wagener


Candidate

Biomedical Sciences



Department

This dissertation is approved, and it is acceptable in quality and form for publication on microfilm:

Approved by the Dissertation Committee:



, Chairperson



Accepted:

Dean, Graduate School

Date

**REGULATION OF N-FORMYL
PEPTIDE RECEPTOR TRAFFICKING
AND SIGNALING BY ARRESTINS**

BY

BRANT MICHAEL WAGENER

B. S. Biology, University of New Mexico, 1998

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**Doctor of Philosophy
Biomedical Sciences**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

May 2009

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to a magnificent woman: my wife. Dr. Jennifer Vigil has been an inspiration for hard work and has made completion of this project possible. Sometimes she had to push and pull me to get the job done, but this was always done with encouragement and love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my mentor, Dr. Eric Prossnitz. Eric has done a wonderful job with such a tough project as myself. He allowed me to pursue my interests within the lab while reining me in when it was necessary. He never squelched my enthusiasm nor failed to assist me when I needed it. He has given me the tools necessary to carry on a career in science and hopefully I will have the wisdom to use them properly.

Secondly, I would like to give a special thanks to Dr. Charlotte Vines. She has dutifully served as “Mentor 1A” throughout the course of this project. Her laughter, camaraderie and honesty have been refreshing on many occasions. Additionally, she never failed to listen to well-thought out or outlandish ideas from a maturing student. Her enthusiasm for research is infectious and I hope the candle of science she has lit inside me burns brightly for many years to come. Additionally, I give great thanks goes to Nicole Marjon. Without her, much of this project would not have been possible. She is an excellent co-worker, student and friend who will herself be an excellent physician-scientist.

Next, I would like to thank my committee members, Dr. Larry Sklar, Dr. Helen Hathaway and Dr. Laurie Hudson. They have kept me grounded throughout my dissertation work and have taught me much about good science and good presentation. I will try not to let their lessons fall on deaf ears.

Finally, I would like to thank fellow lab members and co workers: Whitney Petrie, Dan Cimino, Dr. Mei Xue, Dr. Ross Potter, Dr. Bruce Edwards, Mark Carter, Peter Simons, Dr. Alexandre Chigaev, Dr. Hugh Mitchell, Megan Dennis

and Angela Field, Elsa Romero and Dr. Angela Wandinger-Ness. Your congeniality and assistance, both direct and indirect, have been invaluable.

**REGULATION OF N-FORMYL
PEPTIDE RECEPTOR TRAFFICKING
AND SIGNALING BY ARRESTINS**

BY

BRANT MICHAEL WAGENER

ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES**

The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

MAY 2009

REGULATION OF *N*-FORMYL PEPTIDE RECEPTOR TRAFFICKING AND SIGNALING BY ARRESTINS

by

Brant Michael Wagener

B.S., Biology, University of New Mexico, 1998

Ph.D., Biomedical Sciences, University of New Mexico, 2009

ABSTRACT

This work focuses on how arrestin regulates trafficking and signaling of the *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR), a G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR). GPCRs are involved in almost all physiologic processes and numerous pathologic processes. There is an intimate relationship between GPCR trafficking and signaling that controls many cellular processes. However, the protein-protein interactions that control post-endocytic trafficking and signaling of GPCRs are poorly understood.

Our previous reports demonstrated that three events take place upon FPR activation in the absence of arrestins: accumulation of FPR in the perinuclear recycling endosome, lack of FPR recycling and apoptosis. All of these phenotypes were rescued by reintroduction of arrestin-2 cDNA. We therefore hypothesized that 1) FPR trafficking and signaling defects were linked and causal and 2) specific regions of arrestin-2 regulate normal FPR trafficking and signaling.

To address these hypotheses, we generated mutants of arrestin-2 that were previously described or changed regions of similar amino acids to alanine.

We then screened these mutants for the ability to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. Subsequently, we examined the role of these arrestin mutants in FPR trafficking. We found that two arrestin-2 mutants demonstrated altered binding to adaptor protein (AP)-2. Furthermore, FPR recycling was inhibited in the presence of either arrestin-2 mutant or the absence of AP-2. We also examined the role of Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling and determined that Src kinase has two independent roles in FPR-arrestin-2 regulation: one that controls FPR trafficking and one that mediated FPR signaling. Finally, we found that different SH3-binding domains of arrestin-2 regulate FPR trafficking and signaling independently. One arrestin-2 mutant did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis, but did mediate normal FPR trafficking. These results indicate that FPR trafficking and signaling are coordinated processes, but may also be regulated independently.

These studies have revealed novel aspects of arrestin-2 that regulate FPR signaling and trafficking. We hope they will serve as a model for the regulation of other GPCRs. Furthermore, we hope these data are used to create small molecule inhibitors to serve as experimental tools and chemotherapeutics to better understand and treat diseases caused by defects in GPCR trafficking and signaling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
ABSTRACT	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xiv
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 GPCR Overview	2
1.2 Life cycle of a GPCR	3
1.3 G protein signaling	4
1.4 GPCR signaling through arrestin	6
1.5 GPCR trafficking and Rab GTPases	7
1.6 Arrestin Overview	9
1.7 Arrestin regulation of GPCR trafficking and signaling	12
1.8 Clinical importance of GPCRs	15
1.9 <i>N</i> -formyl peptide receptor	18
1.10 Hypothesis	19
2 Adaptor Protein-2 interaction with Arrestin regulates <i>N</i>-formyl peptide receptor post-endocytic trafficking	21
2.1 ABSTRACT	23
2.2 INTRODUCTION	25
2.3 RESULTS	29
2.3.1 Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 domains	29
2.3.2 Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 tail mutants ..	31
2.3.3 Arrestin-2 mutants that rescue apoptosis do not inhibit FPR internalization	32
2.3.4 Arrestin-2 mutants that fail to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes	33
2.3.5 Arrestin-2 mutants that prevent normal FPR trafficking exhibit altered associations with AP-2	35
2.3.6 FPR displays differential trafficking with AP-1 complexes in the presence of arrestins	40
2.3.7 AP-1 binds arrestin in an FPR activation-dependent manner	42
2.3.8 Arrestin mutants and AP-2 regulate recycling of the FPR	42
2.3.9 Endogenous AP-2 and AP-1 traffic differentially with the FPR ..	44
2.4 DISCUSSION	45
2.5 MATERIALS AND METHODS	52
2.5.1 Reagents, Plasmids and Mutagenesis	52
2.5.2 Cell culture and Transfection	52
2.5.3 Cell Rounding	53
2.5.4 Apoptosis	53
2.5.5 FPR Internalization	54
2.5.6 Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy	55
2.5.7 Cell Lysis and Immunoprecipitation	56

2.5.8	Western Blotting	56
2.5.9	FPR Recycling.....	57
2.6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	59
2.7	ABBREVIATIONS	60
2.8	FIGURE LEGENDS	61
2.8.1	Figure 2.1. Structural regions of arrestin-2 do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis	61
2.8.2	Figure 2.2. Sequence of arrestin-2 carboxy terminus and selected mutants	61
2.8.3	Figure 2.3. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 mutants.....	61
2.8.4	Figure 2.4. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 mutants.....	62
2.8.5	Figure 2.5. Arrestin-2 mutants incapable of rescuing apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes	62
2.8.6	Figure 2.6. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2 63	63
2.8.7	Figure 2.7. Immunoprecipitation of AP-2 with arrestin-2 mutants 63	63
2.8.8	Figure 2.8. FPR-arrestin-2 trafficking and binding with AP-1	64
2.8.9	Figure 2.9. FPR recycling upon adaptor protein depletion	64
2.8.10	Figure 2.10. Model of FPR post-endocytic trafficking	65
2.8.11	Figure 2.11. Arrestin-2 mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis are sensitive to caspase inhibitor treatment	66
2.8.12	Figure 2.12. Arrestin-2 mutants capable of rescuing apoptosis do not accumulate in recycling endosomes	66
2.8.13	Figure 2.13. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2	67
2.8.14	Figure 2.14. Quantitation of AP-2 colocalization with FPR/arrestin complexes.....	67
2.8.15	Figure 2.15.....	67
3	Src Kinase-Arrestin interaction has two independent roles in <i>N</i> -formyl peptide receptor signaling and trafficking	87
3.1	ABSTRACT	89
3.2	INTRODUCTION	90
3.3	RESULTS	93
3.3.1	Src kinase binding-deficient arrestin mutant does not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis.....	93
3.3.2	Inhibition of Src kinase rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis in the presence of the P91G/P121E arrestin mutant.	94
3.3.3	Src kinase does not affect FPR internalization.....	95
3.3.4	P91G/P121E mutant alters normal FPR trafficking.....	96
3.3.5	Inhibition of Src kinase alters normal FPR trafficking.....	97
3.3.6	P91G/P121E arrestin mutant alters FPR dynamics with AP complexes.....	98

3.3.7	ERK1/2 signaling plays a role in Src- and FPR- mediated apoptosis.....	100
3.4	DISCUSSION	101
3.5	MATERIALS AND METHODS	106
3.5.1	Materials, Plasmids and Mutagenesis	106
3.5.2	Cell Culture and Transfection.....	106
3.5.3	Apoptosis	107
3.5.4	Internalization	107
3.5.5	Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy	108
3.6	FOOTNOTES.....	109
3.7	ABBREVIATIONS.....	110
3.8	FIGURE LEGENDS	111
3.8.1	Figure 3.1. Inhibition of Src kinase, but not expression of Arr2-P91G/P121E, rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis	111
3.8.2	Figure 3.2. FPR internalization is not affected by arrestins or Src inhibition	111
3.8.3	Figure 3.3. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11 in response to Src inhibition	111
3.8.4	Figure 3.4. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with AP-2 and AP-1	112
3.8.5	Figure 3.5. FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of P91G/P121E is sensitive to ERK inhibition.....	112
3.8.6	Figure 3.6. Role of Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling 113	
3.8.7	Figure 3.7. Vehicle and Src wild type do not alter FPR-arrestin trafficking phenotypes	114
4	Arrestin-2 SH3-binding domains differentially regulate <i>N</i> -formyl peptide receptor trafficking and signaling.....	124
4.1	ABSTRACT	126
4.2	INTRODUCTION	128
4.3	RESULTS	131
4.3.1	Mutations in SH3-binding domains of arrestin have differential effects on FPR-mediated apoptosis.....	131
4.3.2	Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by SH3-binding arrestin mutants is not due to inhibition of internalization.....	132
4.3.3	SH3-binding mutants allow normal FPR trafficking	133
4.3.4	Individual SH-3 binding point mutations in arrestin differentially regulate FPR-mediated apoptosis.....	135
4.3.5	FPR internalization is not affected by arrestin-2 point mutations 137	
4.3.6	Arrestin-2 SH-3 binding domain point mutations do not alter FPR trafficking	137
4.4	DISCUSSION.....	139
4.5	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	142
4.5	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	142

4.5.1	Plasmids.....	142
4.5.2	Cell Culture and Transfection.....	142
4.5.3	Apoptosis.....	142
4.5.4	Internalization.....	143
4.5.5	Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy.....	144
4.6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	145
4.7	ABBREVIATIONS.....	146
4.8	FIGURE LEGENDS.....	147
4.8.1	Figure 4.1. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.....	147
4.8.2	Figure 4.2. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.....	147
4.8.3	Figure 4.3. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.....	147
4.8.4	Figure 4.4. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-2 and AP-1.....	148
4.8.5	Figure 4.5. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.....	148
4.8.6	Figure 4.6. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.....	148
4.8.7	Figure 4.7. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.....	149
4.8.8	Figure 4.8. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with AP-2 and AP-1.....	149
5.	SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	159
5.1	SUMMARY.....	160
5.1.1	Chapter 2.....	160
5.1.2	Chapter 3.....	164
5.1.3	Chapter 4.....	166
5.2	MODEL AND IMPLICATIONS.....	168
5.2.1	Our new model of FPR trafficking and signaling.....	168
5.2.2	FPR internalization and that of other GPCRs.....	169
5.2.3	AP-2 regulates FPR post-endocytic trafficking and trafficking of other GPCRs.....	171
5.2.4	Arrestin and Src kinase regulation of FPR signaling.....	173
5.3	FUTURE STUDIES.....	174
5.3.1	Future Study 1. Understanding arrestin-2/AP-1 binding.....	174
5.3.2	Future Study 2. The effects of aberrant GPCR trafficking on non-G protein signaling cascades.....	175
5.3.3	Future Study 3. The role of aberrant GPCR trafficking on migration.....	177
5.3.4	Future Study 4. Rational design of small molecule inhibitors to interrupt GPCR-arrestin binding.....	178
5.3.5	Future Study 5. Rational design of small molecule inhibitors to interrupt AP-2-arrestin binding.....	179

5.4 Concluding Remarks	180
REFERENCES	181

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1. Life Cycle of a GPCR.....	3
Figure 1.2. Rab GTPases control GPCR trafficking.....	8
Figure 1.3. The 1.9 angstrom structure of arrestin-2....	10
Figure 1.4. The polar core of arrestin.....	11
Figure 1.5. Arrestin binding partners.....	13
Figure 1.6. Current model of FPR trafficking and signaling.....	20
Figure 2.1. Arrestin domains do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis.....	69
Figure 2.2. Sequence of arrestin-2 carboxy terminus and selected mutants.....	70
Figure 2.3. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 mutants.....	71
Figure 2.4. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 mutants.....	72
Figure 2.5. Arrestin-2 mutants incapable of rescuing apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes.....	73
Figure 2.6. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.....	74
Figure 2.7A. Immunoprecipitation of AP-2 with arrestin-2 mutants.....	75
Figure 2.7B. Quantification of AP-2/arrestin-2 interaction.....	76
Figure 2.8A. FPR-arrestin-2 trafficking and binding with AP-1.....	77
Figure 2.8B and C. Quantification of 2.8A and FPR-dependent AP-1/arrestin binding.....	78
Figure 2.9A and B. FPR recycling upon adaptor protein depletion.....	79
Figure 2.9C. Localization of endogenous AP-2 and AP-1 with FPR.....	80
Figure 2.10. Model of FPR post-endocytic trafficking.....	81
Figure 2.11. Arrestin-2 mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis are sensitive to caspase inhibitor treatment.....	82
Figure 2.12. Arrestin-2 mutants capable of rescuing apoptosis do not accumulate in recycling endosomes.....	83
Figure 2.13. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.....	84
Figure 2.14. Quantitation of AP-2 colocalization with FPR/arrestin complexes.....	85
Figure 2.15. Antibody staining of AP-2 and AP-1 in U937 FPR cells.....	86
Figure 3.1. Inhibition of Src kinase, but not expression of Arr2-P91G/P121E, rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis.....	115
Figure 3.2. FPR internalization is not affected by arrestins or Src inhibition.....	116

Figure 3.3A. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11.....	117
Figure 3.3B. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11 in response to Src inhibition.....	118
Figure 3.3C. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11 in response to Src inhibition.....	119
Figure 3.4. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with AP-2 and AP-1.....	120
Figure 3.5. FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of P91G/P121E is sensitive to ERK inhibition.....	121
Figure 3.6. Role of Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling.....	122
Figure 3.7. Vehicle and Src wild type do not alter FPR-arrestin trafficking phenotypes.....	123
Figure 4.1. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.....	150
Figure 4.2. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.....	151
Figure 4.3. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.....	152
Figure 4.4A. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-2.....	153
Figure 4.4B. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-1.....	154
Figure 4.5. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.....	155
Figure 4.6. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.....	156
Figure 4.7. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.....	157
Figure 4.8. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with AP-2 and AP-1.....	158
Figure 5.1. New model for FPR trafficking and signaling..	168

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 GPCR Overview

G protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) are the most abundant cell surface receptors in the human genome consisting of 600-1000 genes (Lander et al., 2001; Venter et al., 2001). They are involved in almost every physiologic process and numerous pathologic processes. These include, but are not limited to, the cardiac system (Rockman et al., 2002), immune system (Lombardi et al., 2002), neurologic system (Premont, 2005), nephrogenic diabetes insipidus (Barak et al., 2001; Oakley et al., 2001), human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome pathology (Lehner, 2002) and breast cancer metastasis (Muller et al., 2001). This receptor family is currently the target of greater than 50% of pharmacologic agonists (activators) and antagonists (inhibitors) currently prescribed by physicians (Papasaikas et al., 2003).

GPCRs are single proteins that range in size from 40-60 kDa. These receptors span the cell membrane seven times with interconnecting intracellular and extracellular loops. Typically, receptor ligands bind on the extracellular surface, inducing a conformational change in protein structure that transduces cellular signals to secondary signaling components within the cell. GPCR ligands include, but are not limited to, photons, ions, peptides, amino acid derivatives, lipid derivatives and odorants. One exception to these rules is the recently discovered estrogen-binding GPCR, GPR30, which is located in the endoplasmic reticulum (Revankar et al., 2005).

1.2 Life cycle of a GPCR

Recent reviews have extensively described the signaling and trafficking of GPCRs (Ferguson, 2001; Luttrell and Lefkowitz, 2002; Pierce and Lefkowitz, 2001). To summarize, these receptors bind ligand extracellularly, changing their conformation to an activated state that binds heterotrimeric G proteins intracellularly and mobilizes a variety of secondary messengers. These second messengers include, but are not limited to, calcium and cyclic-adenosine monophosphate and have a multitude of effects depending on cell type and the intracellular milieu.




Figure 1.1. Life Cycle of a GPCR

After activation of G protein signaling cascades, GPCRs are phosphorylated at serine and threonine residues in the cytoplasmic, C-terminal domain of the receptor and/or intracellular loops by receptor kinases. This phosphorylation lowers the receptor's affinity for G proteins and increases its affinity for arrestins. Arrestin binding to phosphorylated receptor sterically blocks the association of G proteins with activated receptor, thereby effectively stopping the G protein signaling cascade. This process is known as desensitization.

During or following desensitization, the receptor/arrestin complex is bound by proteins of the internalization machinery including, but not limited to, adaptor protein-2 (AP-2) (Kim and Benovic, 2002), clathrin (Goodman et al., 1997; Krupnick et al., 1997a; Krupnick et al., 1997b) and dynamin (van Koppen, 2001). After internalization, GPCR scaffolds form, which induce signaling through the MAPK signaling cascades (extracellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK) 1/2 and c-jun n-terminal kinase (JNK) 3) (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003; Miller and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce et al., 2001). Finally, after internalization and GPCR scaffold signaling, the receptor/arrestin complex generally has one of two fates: degradation or resensitization and recycling. These details are further outlined in Figure 1.1.

1.3 G protein signaling

The G proteins form a heterotrimeric complex that initially transduce signals of ligand-activated GPCRs. The heterotrimeric complex consists of an α , β and γ subunit. While there are currently 20 known forms of $G\alpha$, they have been divided into four families based upon sequence similarity: $G\alpha_s$, $G\alpha_i$, $G\alpha_q$ and $G\alpha_{12/13}$.

There are also 6 forms of $G\beta$ and 11 forms of $G\gamma$. While heterotrimeric G proteins may consist of any combination of subunits, they are classified based on the identity of the $G\alpha$ subunit (Lefkowitz, 1998). Members of the $G\alpha_s$ family stimulate adenylyl cyclase to increase production of cyclic AMP. Conversely, $G\alpha_i$ members inhibit adenylyl cyclase. $G\alpha_q$ members stimulate phospholipase $C\gamma$, the actions of which ultimately lead to a release of intracellular Ca^{++} . The target effectors of $G\alpha_{12/13}$ remain poorly characterized (Gether and Kobilka, 1998; Neves et al., 2002).

Typically, after GPCR ligand binding and conformational rearrangement, G proteins bind the intracellular face of GPCRs. The α subunit exchanges its currently bound GDP for GTP thereby activating the subunit. Binding leads to dissociation of the $G\alpha$ from the $G\beta/\gamma$ subunits leading to activation of second messengers via the $G\alpha$ subunit. Over time, the $G\alpha$ subunit hydrolyzes GTP to GDP and becomes inactive. GTP-GDP cycling can be accelerated by regulators of G protein signaling (RGS) (Willars, 2006). RGS inhibit $G\alpha$ signaling by acting as GTPase activating proteins. The $G\beta/\gamma$ subunit remains attached to the cell membrane (via lipid modifications) and activates phospholipase $C\gamma$ (PLC γ). PLC γ cleaves phosphoinositol bisphosphate to generate diacylglycerol and inositol triphosphate. These proteins can induce further signaling via calcium mobilization, binding to ion channels or phosphorylation of downstream targets (Gether and Kobilka, 1998).

After G protein signaling is initiated, ligand-bound GPCRs undergo homologous or heterologous desensitization. Homologous desensitization is

mediated by G protein-receptor kinases (GRK) (Ribas et al., 2006). This protein family contains seven members and GRK2 and GRK3 are most commonly involved within this process. Heterologous desensitization also occurs via protein kinases A and C. To mediate desensitization, kinases phosphorylate ligand-activated GPCRs at serine and threonine residues within the cytoplasmic tail or intracellular loops. C-terminal phosphorylation lowers GPCR affinity for G proteins and increases GPCR affinity for arrestins. Arrestin (discussed below) binding sterically blocks receptor binding to G proteins. This effectively stops GPCR signaling through heterotrimeric G proteins.

1.4 GPCR signaling through arrestin

Although GPCRs were originally thought to signal solely through activation of heterotrimeric G proteins, it is now known that non-G protein signaling occurs via arrestin binding of GPCRs (Hall and Lefkowitz, 2002; Miller and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce et al., 2001; Reiter and Lefkowitz, 2006). Stimulation of GPCRs with cognate ligands can lead to activation of Src kinase (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004), extracellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK) 1/2 (Kim et al., 2005), p38 (Sun et al., 2002), c-jun n-terminal kinase (JNK) 3 (Miller et al., 2001) and NF- κ B (Gao et al., 2004). While these processes are activated by G protein signaling they are also regulated by arrestins and are found within GPCR-arrestin scaffolds. Activation of GPCRs through signaling scaffolds allows proper control of spatial and temporal events while minimizing signaling crosstalk. These secondary signaling cascades control cellular processes such as proliferation and migration (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004).

Recent examples of arrestin regulation of GPCR signaling includes arrestin-2 binding to calmodulin (Wu et al., 2006) and its translocation to the nucleus (Beaulieu and Caron, 2005). While the function of the arrestin-2/calmodulin complex is currently unknown, but could have far reaching effects, the latter is better understood. Arrestin translocates to the nucleus after activation of the δ - and κ -opioid receptors. In the nucleus, arrestin complexes with p300 and CREB leading to acetylation of histone H4 that modulates chromatin organization and enhances gene transcription.

1.5 GPCR trafficking and Rab GTPases

Upon activation of GPCRs, a number of proteins can be recruited to the plasma membrane to aid internalization of activated GPCRs from the cell surface (Bockaert et al., 2004a; Bockaert et al., 2004b). While it was believed earlier that many or all GPCRs were dependent on the same families of molecules to mediate internalization, more recent reports have described a variety of determinants for GPCR internalization (Marchese et al., 2003). For example, GPCRs can move into clathrin-coated pits or undergo clathrin-independent internalization. Such GPCRs are dependent upon dynamin (Zhang et al., 1996), AP-2 (Laporte et al., 2002), arrestin (Kohout et al., 2001) or ARF6 (Claing et al., 2001). Other GPCRs are dependent upon none of these factors. At this time, it remains unclear which proteins are utilized for *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR) endocytosis.

After removal from the cell surface, endosomes formed during internalization need to be directed to different locations for further processing.

These cellular functions are controlled in part by the Rab GTPases, including Rab4, 5, 7 and 11 (Rosenfeld et al., 2002). Similar to heterotrimeric G protein complexes, these GTPases cycle between a GTP-bound form that is an active protein and a GDP-bound state that is primarily inactive. GTP-GDP cycling is regulated by GTP hydrolysis to GDP and release of GDP to bind GTP. These reactions are aided by accessory proteins that regulate the rate of GTP binding or GTP hydrolysis. Understanding the Rab GTPase pathway allows investigators to examine the location of GPCRs at specific times of GPCR processing.




Figure 1.2. Rab GTPases control GPCR trafficking.

Generally, endosomes derived from the plasma membrane contain Rab5 and are indicative of early endosomes. Some GPCRs are dependent upon Rab5

for internalization (Seachrist et al., 2000), while there are some that do not require Rab5 for internalization, but do colocalize with Rab5 at later time points (Holmes et al., 2006). After internalization, GPCRs follow three main pathways. They can translocate to 1) a Rab4-positive endosome indicative of an early recycling pathway, 2) a Rab7-positive endosome that will lead to degradation of the cargo by the lysosome or 3) a Rab11-positive endosome indicative of a late recycling pathway (Rosenfeld et al., 2002). This model is summarized in Figure 1.2.

1.6 Arrestin Overview

There are four arrestins found within the human genome: arrestin1-4. Arrestin1 (also known as visual arrestin) is found in rod cells of the eye and mediates desensitization of rhodopsin, a GPCR responsible for vision. Arrestin4 (also known as x-arrestin or cone arrestin) is found within cone cells of the eye. Arrestin-2 and 3 (also known as β -arrestin1 and β -arrestin-2, respectively) are ubiquitously expressed in humans. While knockout mice for both arrestins do not survive past early embryonic stages, knockout mice of either arrestin-2 or 3 yield normal phenotypes although they are deficient in responses such as blood pressure regulation (Conner et al., 1997). While this suggests that these two arrestins are functionally redundant, this may not be the case. For example, JNK3 binds arrestin-3 and is activated by GPCR-arrestin signaling scaffolds (McDonald et al., 2000), whereas the same has not been proven with respect to arrestin-2.

Arrestin-2 (the focus of this study) is a cytosolic protein consisting of 418 amino acids. The structures of visual arrestin and arrestin-2 have been solved by X-ray crystallography (Han et al., 2001; Hirsch et al., 1999), shown in Figure 1.3). The three-dimensional structure of arrestin consists of two groups of beta-




Figure 1.3. The 1.9 angstrom structure of arrestin-2. Taken from Han et al., 2001

pleated sheets. These two groups are referred to as the N domain (amino acids 8-180) and the C domain (amino acids 188-362). The remaining amino acids form a C-terminal “tail” that interacts with both groups of beta-pleated sheets. This “tail” is thought to move freely from the rest of the structure as it is not detected during crystallography studies.

Before receptor activation, phosphorylation and arrestin binding, arrestin is in a basal state with the C-terminal tail folded into the body of the structure. This structure is maintained by hydrophobic residues within the “tail” of arrestin which interact with corresponding hydrophobic residues within the beta-pleated sheets and helix I. The structure is stabilized by hydrogen bonding between Arg175,

Asp 30, Asp296, Asp303 and Arg382 and is referred to as the “polar core” (Figure 1.4). Critical to maintenance of this basal structure is Arg175 (Arg179 in




Figure 1.4. The polar core of arrestin. Taken from Vishnivetskiy et al., 1999

arrestin-2 and Arg180 in arrestin-3). Mutagenesis of this residue (Arg→Glu) confers the ability of arrestin to bind to non-phosphorylated GPCRs (Kovoor et al., 1999; Vishnivetskiy et al., 1999). Hence, this region is also thought to sense the phosphorylation state of GPCRs.

Upon activation of GPCRs and subsequent phosphorylation of their C-termini, the following sequence of events for arrestin activation is thought to take place based upon X-ray crystallography and mutagenesis studies. For an excellent review of this topic, see (Gurevich and Gurevich, 2004). First, the phosphorylated residues of receptor are drawn to positively charged lysine

residues in the N domain of arrestin (Lys14 and Lys15 in arrestin-2). Interaction of phosphorylated GPCRs with these residues causes the β strand of the N domain to shift. This destabilizes the hydrophobic interaction between the “tail” of arrestin and the N domain. The “tail”, now detached from the N domain forms and initial opening of the arrestin molecule which allows the “tail” to interact with accessory proteins. The phosphorylated C-terminus of the receptor is directed to the phosphate sensor of arrestin (Arg175). These phosphates disrupt hydrogen binding within the “polar core” allowing high affinity binding of arrestin and ligand-activated, C-terminal phosphorylated GPCRs.

1.7 Arrestin regulation of GPCR trafficking and signaling

Arrestins are cytosolic proteins originally thought only to mediate desensitization of G protein signaling via GPCRs. Subsequently, it was demonstrated that arrestins could mediate GPCR internalization and regulation of GPCR signaling scaffolds. It is currently known that arrestins bind numerous proteins, including AP-2, clathrin, ERK1/2, and Src kinase to mention a few (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003; Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004; Miller and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce et al., 2001; Reiter and Lefkowitz, 2006) (Figure 1.5). These accessory proteins assist arrestin with both the spatial and temporal control of GPCR signaling.

Arrestin mediates internalization of many GPCRs such as the β 2-AR and angiotensin II (Type 1A) (AT_{1A}R) receptors (Kohout et al., 2001). However, this




Figure 1.5. Arrestin binding partners. Taken from Lefkowitz and Shenoy, 2005

is not the case for all GPCRs. For example, the FPR internalizes in an arrestin-independent (Vines et al., 2003) manner as does the m2-muscarinic acetylcholine receptor (m2-AChR) (Pals-Rylaarsdam et al., 1997). However, while the proteins that mediate FPR internalization remain unclear, m2-AChR internalization is dependent upon ADP-ribosylation factor 6.

Arrestin binding to both clathrin and AP-2 is integral to internalization of certain GPCRs. Clathrin binds arrestin at the LIELD sequence from amino acid residues 378-382. When this region is deleted from arrestin-2, clathrin binding is diminished and internalization of the β 2-AR is inhibited (Krupnick et al., 1997a). With regards to AP-2, there are numerous binding sites within the arrestin-2 “tail”, including amino acids Phe391, Arg393, Arg395, Lys397, Met399 and Lys400 which regulate binding to AP-2 and β 2-AR internalization (Kim and Benovic, 2002; Milano et al., 2002). Additionally, Asp385 and Phe388 demonstrate decreased binding to AP-2 (Schmid et al., 2006), although the physiologic consequence of these sites have not yet been determined.

The kinases, Src kinase and ERK1/2 also have roles with arrestin in GPCR internalization. Src kinase phosphorylation of dynamin is required to allow

dynamin to “pinch off” clathrin coated pits at the cell membrane and mediate internalization of the β 2-AR (Ahn et al., 1999). Additionally, AP-2 must be phosphorylated on tyrosine residues by Src kinase to release AP-2 from arrestin and mediate internalization of the AT1_AR (Fessart et al., 2005). In the context of this receptor, both binding and release of AP-2 by arrestin are required to internalize the AT1_AR. Finally, ERK1/2 phosphorylation of Ser412 in the “tail” of arrestin mediates internalization of the β 2-AR (Lin et al., 2002; Lin et al., 1997). When a constitutively phosphorylated form of arrestin-2 (S412D) was overexpressed in cells, arrestin-2 could not change to its active state and internalization was inhibited.

GPCR non-G protein signaling is also regulated by arrestin and its interaction with accessory proteins. For example, ERK1/2 activation is mediated through arrestin binding to GPCRs and G protein-mediated pathways. In one study, it was determined that ERK1/2 activation via β 2-AR or AT1_AR stimulation exhibited two individual phases (Shenoy et al., 2006; Shenoy and Lefkowitz, 2005). Pertussis toxin (which inhibits heterotrimeric G proteins), decreased the early activation phase of ERK1/2. However, down-regulation of arrestins using siRNA decreased the prolonged, latent phase of ERK1/2 activation while leaving the former intact. Furthermore, it is thought that ERK1/2 activation via G protein signaling pathways leads to phospho-ERK1/2 translocation to the nucleus where it can induce changes in transcription (Tohgo et al., 2002). On the other hand, ERK1/2 activation within the confines of a GPCR-arrestin scaffold retains

phospho-ERK1/2 within the cytosol to activate other downstream effectors. The cellular effects of the latter are unknown at this time.

Arrestin binding to Src kinase is essential to ERK1/2 activation within the context of the β 2-AR (Luttrell et al., 1999). Mutation of SH3-binding domains within arrestin leads to decreased Src kinase binding upon receptor activation. Additionally, these mutations led to decreased ERK1/2 phosphorylation upon stimulation of the β 2-AR and 5-HT serotenergic receptors. However, stimulation of the AT1AR in the presence of the Src-binding deficient arrestin mutant yielded no alteration in ERK1/2 phosphorylation.

Finally, ERK1/2 itself is important to GPCR-mediated ERK1/2 activation. S412 of arrestin-2 is thought to be critical to activation of arrestin function. Phosphorylation of this serine residue is regulated by ERK1/2. In its phosphorylated form, arrestin-2 is considered to be in an inactive state. When unphosphorylated, arrestin can mediate many GPCR functions. Two mutants of arrestin that mimic these constitutive states (S412D and S412A, respectively) were overexpressed in the context of β 2-AR activation. S412A had no effect on β 2-AR-mediated ERK1/2 activation, whereas the S412D mutant decreased ERK1/2 phosphorylation (Luttrell et al., 1999). Hence, ERK1/2 activation through GPCRs is regulated by the phosphorylation state of arrestin-2 which is, in turn, regulated by ERK1/2.

1.8 Clinical importance of GPCRs

Three examples of the importance of GPCRs from a clinical perspective are their roles in nephrogenic diabetes insipidus (Barak et al., 2001), cardiac

pathology (Rockman et al., 2002) and breast cancer metastasis (Muller et al., 2001). Nephrogenic diabetes insipidus is a disease in which the V2-vasopressin receptor (V2R) cannot respond to stimulation from arginine vasopressin (AVP) and mobilize cyclic-AMP. As a result, the kidney cannot concentrate urine as it normally would and patients lose excess water. This loss can be on the order of 15 liters per day. While many V2R mutants have been studied, R173H is of note (Barak et al., 2001). V2R (R173H) fails to bind AVP, but binds arrestin with high affinity in the absence of ligand and is contained in endocytic compartments. Hence, V2R (R173H) was constitutively desensitized. When further mutations were made within V2R (R173H) that interrupted receptor-arrestin binding, the receptor returned to the cell membrane and was able to mobilize cyclic-AMP normally.

Second, a common example for the role of GPCRs in human disease is cardiovascular pathology. This is, in large part, due to the fact that the β 2-AR is involved in these processes and is the best studied GPCR to date although many adrenergic receptors play roles. Excellent reviews can be found on the role of the adrenergic receptors in heart disease (Lefkowitz et al., 2000; Rockman et al., 2002). As an example of the role of adrenergic receptors in heart disease, constant adrenergic stimulation (via stress, cortisol or other activation of the sympathetic nervous system) can lead to heart failure, characterized by left ventricular dysfunction with a complex of symptoms relating to inadequate perfusion and pulmonary congestion. It is currently hypothesized that adrenergic activation over long periods of time leads to desensitization and down-regulation

of adrenergic receptors. In addition, this may lead to mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) signaling via inappropriate receptors with the result being further ventricular remodeling. Without these receptors, the heart does not beat with adequate force to perfuse tissues properly. This leads to a never ending cycle of more adrenergic stimulation with deleterious results. Furthermore, while the molecular mechanisms are currently not understood, beta-blockers including metoprolol and carvedilol can reverse some of the aforementioned effects. Most importantly, studies have shown that long-term use increases patient survival in those suffering from both moderate (Packer et al., 1996) and severe heart failure (Packer et al., 2001). Improvements in heart function include positive effects on left ventricular contractile function and structural changes to the size and shape of the heart.

Finally, the chemokine receptors, CXCR4 and CCR7 play a role in breast cancer metastasis (Muller et al., 2001). In this seminal report, CXCR4 and CCR7 were demonstrated to be overexpressed in breast cancer cells. Additionally, the cognate ligands for the respective receptors were found highly expressed in lymph nodes, lung, liver and bone from human tissue samples and not in other organs. These are the most common sites for breast cancer metastasis. When breast cancer cells were injected into mice along with antibodies to CXCR4, metastasis to the aforementioned organs was decreased compared to injection of isotype antibodies.

It is clear from the above examples that an understanding of GPCR function is critical to understanding disease and treating patient illnesses. With

knowledge of the function of GPCRs in both health and disease, novel or improved treatments can be designed to help patients with a myriad of diseases.

1.9 N-formyl peptide receptor

The *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR) is a chemoattractant GPCR found commonly on macrophages and neutrophils (Prossnitz and Ye, 1997). It is one of the best described chemokine/chemoattractant GPCRs and its functions in the immune system include regulation of adhesion, chemotaxis, superoxide production and degranulation (Prossnitz and Ye, 1997). This receptor can be found in neuromuscular, vascular and endocrine tissues (Becker et al., 1998), fibroblasts (VanCompernelle et al., 2003) and hepatic cells (McCoy et al., 1995) although its role in these tissues is not well understood. Dysfunctional FPRs have been associated with localized juvenile periodontitis in humans (Gwinn et al., 1999). Additionally, FPR expression correlates with the rapid growth of human gliomas (Zhou et al., 2005). The classic FPR ligands are formylated peptides generated by bacteria, including *E. coli*, which generates *N*-formyl-Methionyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanine (fMLF) (Migeotte et al., 2006). When bacteria invade the body, the FPR controls neutrophil migration to the site of infection where degranulation is initiated and invading bacteria is killed.

Additionally, the FPR induces ERK1/2 phosphorylation (He et al., 2001) upon activation with ligand. ERK1/2 activation via FPR stimulation is thought to be mediated primarily through G protein activation (Gripentrog and Miettinen, 2005). This was determined using mutants of the FPR that do not bind arrestin, but can activate ERK1/2 upon FPR stimulation with translocation of activated

ERK1/2 to the nucleus. It has recently been demonstrated that FPR activation induces trafficking and signaling defects as well as apoptosis in the absence of one of its activated state binding partners, arrestin (Revankar et al., 2004; Vines et al., 2003).

1.10 Hypothesis

Initially, FPR recycling was inhibited in the absence of arrestins and FPR accumulated in the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (Vines et al., 2003). FPR was also demonstrated to internalize in the absence of arrestins. Furthermore, FPR activation in the absence of arrestins initiated apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). Reconstituting wild-type arrestin-2, -3 or both to arrestin-deficient cells expressing the FPR rescued both the trafficking and apoptotic phenotypes. In addition, inhibitors of Src family kinases and MAPKs (p38, ERK1/2 and JNK3) rescued the apoptotic phenotype.

We propose that in the absence of arrestins, activated FPR internalizes and merges with a Rab5-positive endosome. The receptor eventually transfers to a Rab11-positive endosome indicative of the recycling compartment. Normally, in the presence of arrestins, the receptor/arrestin complex would be dissociated and the FPR would travel back to the cell surface. However, in the absence of arrestins, the receptor accumulates in the Rab11-positive endosome in a perinuclear location. We hypothesize in this Rab11-positive signaling compartment, FPR continuously activates signaling complexes (MAPKs) leading to the initiation of apoptosis. This model is summarized in Figure 1.6.




Figure 1.6. Current model of FPR trafficking and signaling.

Based on these findings, we proposed two major hypotheses. First, we hypothesized that FPR signaling and trafficking defects were both causal and linked. Second, we hypothesized that specific regions of arrestin, which bind other proteins within GPCR-arrestin scaffolds were responsible for regulating these phenotypes. The following studies address both of these hypotheses and elucidate mechanisms for arrestin in FPR trafficking and signaling. Our results demonstrate novel roles for AP-2, AP-1 and Src kinase in FPR-arrestin signaling and trafficking that may lead to the development of novel chemotherapeutics for treatment of cancer metastasis.

2. Adaptor Protein-2 interaction with Arrestin regulates *N*-formyl peptide receptor post-endocytic trafficking

Submitted to the *Journal of Cell Biology*

Adaptor Protein-2 interaction with Arrestin regulates N-formyl peptide receptor post-endocytic trafficking

Brant M. Wagener, Chetana M. Revankar, Nicole A. Marjon and Eric R. Prossnitz

Department of Cell Biology and Physiology and
UNM Cancer Research and Treatment Center
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA

Running title: Adaptin-arrestin interaction regulates FPR recycling

Number of characters: 47,635

JCB #200607093
Revision Submission Date: November 16, 2006

Corresponding author:
Eric R. Prossnitz
MSC 08 4750
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
Tel: (505) 272-5649
Fax: (505) 272-1421
E-mail: eprossnitz@salud.unm.edu

Keywords: recycling, arrestin, GPCR, FPR, adaptor protein-2, post-endocytic trafficking

2.1 ABSTRACT

G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) are integral to cellular function in nearly all physiologic and numerous pathologic processes. GPCR signaling is an intricate balance between receptor activation, inactivation (desensitization and internalization) and resensitization (recycling and resynthesis). While much is known regarding the first two processes, the latter has not been as thoroughly studied. To better understand the process of GPCR post-endocytic trafficking, we focused on the *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR), a chemoattractant receptor found primarily on neutrophils and macrophages. Previous studies have demonstrated that, although FPR internalization occurs in the absence of arrestins, FPR recycling is arrestin-dependent. Furthermore, FPR stimulation in the absence of arrestins leads to receptor accumulation in recycling endosomes and apoptotic signaling. In this study, we determined that the carboxy terminus of arrestin-2 is critical for intracellular receptor trafficking and performed scanning mutagenesis of this region to ascertain the mechanisms involved. Our results reveal that two arrestin-2 mutants (F391A and K397A/M399A/K400A), at sites known to be involved in AP-2 binding, fail to rescue the trafficking and signaling defects observed in the absence of arrestins. Further results demonstrate that AP-2 associates with the receptor-arrestin complex in recycling endosomes and is required for proper post-endocytic trafficking of the FPR, as revealed by siRNA knockdown of AP-2, which inhibits recycling of the FPR to the cell surface. Finally, we observe that AP-1 is associated with the receptor-arrestin complex under recycling-competent conditions, suggesting a transfer of receptors from

AP-2- to AP-1-associated vesicles. This is the first study to demonstrate a requirement for AP-2 in the post-endocytic trafficking of a GPCR and serves as a model for future studies in GPCR trafficking and resensitization.

2.2 INTRODUCTION

G protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) are involved in signaling in virtually every part of the human body including cardiovascular (Penela et al., 2006), immune (Lombardi et al., 2002) and neuronal systems (Premont, 2005). An important feature of GPCR signaling is the cycle of receptor activation, desensitization, internalization, down-regulation/degradation, recycling and resensitization. When these processes are interrupted, they can detrimentally affect cellular migration (Moratz et al., 2004), proliferation and cell adhesion (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004). In the case of v2 vasopressin receptors, constitutive desensitization and internalization leads to nephrogenic diabetes insipidus (Barak et al., 2001).

GPCRs are activated by a myriad of ligands including, but not limited to, peptides, amino acids and their derivatives, proteins, ions, lipids and photons. Ligand-bound GPCRs activate heterotrimeric G protein signaling pathways, resulting in calcium mobilization and changes in cyclic-AMP levels, and are subsequently phosphorylated on intracellular domains by serine/threonine kinases, which reduce receptor affinity for G proteins and increases receptor affinity for arrestins. Arrestin binding sterically blocks receptor-G protein interactions, thereby effectively terminating G protein signaling, while simultaneously providing a scaffold protein that can coordinate the recruitment of internalization machinery, leading to receptor sequestration (Miller and Lefkowitz, 2001). In this model, based primarily on studies of the beta2-adrenergic receptor (β 2-AR), the most thoroughly described GPCR, adaptor protein (AP)-2 and

clathrin (Kim and Benovic, 2002) bind the carboxy terminus of arrestin, initiating association with clathrin-coated pits and internalization. Arrestin-recruited Src then phosphorylates dynamin, which pinches off the plasma membrane invagination to form an endosome containing receptor, from which arrestin rapidly dissociates (Ahn et al., 1999). Internalized β 2-AR in the rab5-containing early endosomal compartment, is then sorted to lysosomes (via a Rab7-containing compartment) for degradation or to the cell surface (via Rab4-positive endosomes) (Cao et al., 1999).

This classic pathway of GPCR internalization and post-endocytic trafficking is, however, not observed with all GPCRs. For example, internalization of the m2-muscarinic acetylcholine receptor is not dependent on either arrestin or clathrin, utilizing instead an ARF6-dependent pathway (Delaney et al., 2002). Similarly, the *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR) has been demonstrated to internalize in the absence of arrestins using knockout cell lines, in which β 2-AR internalization is completely inhibited (Kohout et al., 2001; Vines et al., 2003). In contrast to GPCRs that follow the rab4-mediated, rapid recycling pathway or the rab7-mediated, lysosomal degradation pathway (Rosenfeld et al., 2002), some GPCRs recycle via perinuclear Rab11-containing recycling endosomes. Such receptors include the FPR (Vines et al., 2003), v2 vasopressin receptor (Innamorati et al., 2001), somatostatin 3 receptor (Kreuzer et al., 2001) and CXC chemokine receptor 2 (Fan et al., 2003). In many cases, such GPCRs have been shown to recycle more slowly and form stable complexes with arrestins, resulting in prolonged endosome-associated arrestin

(Oakley et al., 2001; Tohgo et al., 2003; Vines et al., 2003). Although the stable endosomal association of arrestin with receptors has been shown to be critical in a second prolonged phase of ERK activation in the cytoplasm (Tohgo et al., 2003; Tohgo et al., 2002), little is known regarding the role of arrestin in regulating intracellular trafficking of GPCRs, particularly via the perinuclear Rab11-containing recycling compartment. Arrestin dissociation has however been implicated as an essential step in the recycling and resensitization of the bradykinin B2 receptor (Simaan et al., 2005). In cells lacking both arrestin-2 and arrestin-3, recycling of the FPR is absent resulting in receptor accumulation in perinuclear recycling endosomes, suggesting a critical role for arrestin in efferent trafficking of the FPR from this compartment (Vines et al., 2003). Thus, arrestin appears to mediate multiple aspects of GPCR trafficking.

Subsequent studies of FPR stimulation in arrestin-deficient cells revealed that, in addition to a recycling defect, cells also underwent apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). A requirement for receptor internalization was demonstrated using a signaling-competent, internalization-defective mutant of the FPR. Furthermore, apoptosis was prevented by MAPK and other signaling inhibitors. This led to the hypothesis that the accumulation of ligand-activated FPR in recycling endosomes results in aberrant signaling, which initiates apoptotic pathways culminating in caspase activation. Based on the fact that both the trafficking and signaling defects could be rescued by the re-introduction of either arrestin-2 or arrestin-3, we hypothesized that these two apparently distinct defects may be mechanistically linked. Because of the large number of arrestin-interacting

proteins, we speculated that the absence of specific interactions might be responsible for the observed defects. Therefore, in this study, we undertook a mapping study to identify the sites within arrestin that when mutated, result in aberrant signaling and trafficking. Our results reveal novel mechanisms in which AP-2 specifically regulates efferent FPR trafficking from recycling endosomes.

2.3 RESULTS

2.3.1 Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 domains.

We have previously described a requirement for arrestins in preventing apoptosis resulting from activation of multiple GPCRs, including the FPR, IL-8R/CXCR2 and Angiotensin II (Type 1A) receptor (Revankar et al., 2004). Arrestins also play a critical role in the proper intracellular trafficking of GPCRs such as the FPR, although FPR internalization does not require arrestin. To better understand the role of arrestin-2 in FPR post-endocytic trafficking, we sought to define the region(s) of arrestin-2 responsible for preventing FPR-mediated apoptosis. To this end, we generated four constructs producing large fragments of arrestin-2 (arr2): amino acids 1-186, 177-418, 319-418 and 1-382. The structure of arrestin-2 is composed of two domains of beta-pleated sheets and a C-terminal "tail" (Milano et al., 2002). Arr2-(1-186) contains the amino terminal domain of beta-pleated sheets of arrestin-2; arr2-(177-418) contains the carboxy terminal domain of beta-pleated sheets and the carboxy terminal "tail" of arrestin-2; arr2-(319-418) contains the "tail" (amino acids 357-418) that acts as a dominant-negative construct inhibiting β 2-AR internalization (Krupnick et al., 1997b). Arr2-(1-382) is a truncated form of arrestin-2 that has been previously described as constitutively active with respect to receptor binding, displaying binding to unphosphorylated, liganded receptors as well as phosphorylated, unliganded receptors, receptor forms that wild type arrestin-2 does not bind (Key et al., 2001; Key et al., 2003; Kovoov et al., 1999; Potter et al., 2002).

Mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEF) deficient in both arrestin-2 and -3, but stably expressing the FPR ($arr2^{-1}/3^{-1}$ FPR), were used to assess arrestin-2 mutants in the absence of competition from endogenous arrestins. Arrestin-deficient cells transiently transfected with the four GFP-fused arrestin-2 fragments, wild type arrestin-2 and empty GFP vector were assayed for apoptosis upon FPR stimulation by evaluation of cell rounding. In a previous report, cell rounding was demonstrated to correlate absolutely with classical markers of apoptosis including annexin-V staining, caspase activation and propidium iodide (PI) staining (Revankar et al., 2004). As shown in Figure 2.1, unstimulated cells (expressing GFP, wild type or mutant arrestins) did not exhibit significant cell rounding (<20-30%). On the contrary, 70-80% of fMLF-stimulated cells expressing GFP alone exhibited a rounded cell phenotype, whereas cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 were indistinguishable from unstimulated cells, as previously described (Revankar et al., 2004). Furthermore, none of the four expressed arrestin-2 domains were capable of preventing FPR-mediated apoptosis, although the $arr2$ -(177-418) showed a small reduction in the number of rounded cells. Of the four arrestin mutants, $arr2$ -(1-382) is the only domain that demonstrated association with the FPR upon stimulation (as determined by confocal fluorescence microscopy, unpublished data). This is consistent with previous data that demonstrated colocalization of $arr2$ -(1-382) with the FPR upon receptor activation (Key et al., 2005) and binding to the FPR in reconstitution assays (Key et al., 2003; Potter et al., 2002). These results demonstrate that the binding of arrestin-2 alone is insufficient to prevent FPR-mediated apoptosis and

furthermore that sequences within the carboxy terminus of arrestin-2 (amino acids 383-418) are essential to prevent apoptotic signaling.

2.3.2 Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 tail mutants.

The tail of arrestin-2 contains recognition sites for multiple adapter and signaling proteins, including clathrin (Goodman et al., 1997; Krupnick et al., 1997a; Krupnick et al., 1997b), AP-2 (Kim and Benovic, 2002; Milano et al., 2002) and ERK, which phosphorylates a serine at position 412 (Lin et al., 1997). Based on the cell rounding results (Figure 2.1), we hypothesized the amino acids in arrestin-2 responsible for suppressing FPR-mediated apoptosis lie within its carboxy terminus. To test this hypothesis, we generated nine mutants of arrestin-2 using alanine-scanning mutagenesis and previously described mutations (Figure 2.2). Previously described mutations include arr2-F391A, which demonstrates reduced AP-2 binding (Milano et al., 2002), arr2-4A, in which K397, M399 and K400 have individually been shown to mediate AP-2 binding (Kim and Benovic, 2002), arr2- Δ LIELD, which results in reduced clathrin binding (Goodman et al., 1997; Krupnick et al., 1997a; Krupnick et al., 1997b) and S412D/S412A, which mimic the phosphorylated and unphosphorylated states of arrestin-2, respectively (Lin et al., 1997).

GFP-fusions of the nine arrestin-2 tail mutants were tested for their ability to prevent FPR-mediated apoptosis. Following transient transfection, GFP-expressing cells (representing transfected cells) were stimulated with fMLF and scored for apoptosis by propidium iodide staining. Previous results have

demonstrated a direct correlation between cell rounding and PI staining in cells undergoing FPR-mediated apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). Greater than 95% of GFP vector- and arr2- (1-382)-expressing cells were PI positive upon fMLF stimulation (Figure 2.3), consistent with cell rounding results (Figure 2.1). Expression of wild type arrestin-2 and all mutants with the exception of the arr2-F391A and -4A rescued cells from FPR-mediated apoptosis (Figure 2.3). All transfected cells showed minimal PI staining in the absence of ligand stimulation. To confirm that positive PI staining was the result of FPR-mediated apoptosis, empty GFP, wild type arrestin-2, -(1-382), -F391A and -4A were treated with the pan-caspase inhibitor, zVAD-FMK, prior to fMLF stimulation. Transfected cells that underwent apoptosis in response to FPR stimulation failed to do so in the presence of zVAD-FMK, demonstrating that the PI staining in the presence of the arrestin-2 mutants F391A and 4A represents FPR-mediated, caspase-dependent apoptosis (Figure 2.11).

2.3.3. Arrestin-2 mutants that rescue apoptosis do not inhibit FPR internalization.

Previous results have demonstrated that receptor internalization, which occurs via arrestin-independent mechanisms, is essential for FPR-mediated apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). Because AP-2 is required for the internalization of certain GPCRs, we hypothesized that overexpression of arrestin-2 mutants might inhibit FPR internalization, thereby preventing FPR-mediated apoptosis. To this end, we measured FPR internalization for each

arrestin mutant. We determined that the extent of FPR internalization varied between 65-80%, with no significant difference between the extents (Figure 2.4) or rate (unpublished data) of internalization for any of the arrestin constructs expressed. This indicates that rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin mutants is not due to effects on FPR internalization. In addition, internalization of the Δ LIELD and F391A mutants is consistent with our previous studies showing that FPR internalization is independent of clathrin (Gilbert et al., 2001) and, similar to other GPCRs whose internalization is arrestin-independent (van Koppen and Jakobs, 2004), is also independent of AP-2.

2.3.4 Arrestin-2 mutants that fail to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes.

As we have previously observed in arrestin-deficient cells, FPR-mediated apoptosis is associated with defective intracellular trafficking, raising the question as to whether the arr2-F391A and arr2-4A mutants allow normal trafficking of the FPR and to what extent they remain associated with the receptor as it traffics intracellularly. Although the 6A mutant contains F391 and the 8A mutant contains residues that have also been shown to regulate interactions with AP-2 (Edeling et al., 2006; Schmid et al., 2006), these mutants rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. Therefore, we decided to focus our subsequent studies on mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis, namely the F391A and 4A mutants. Localization of the FPR (visualized using an Alexa633 labeled *N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine ligand (633-6pep)) and arrestin-2

mutants (tagged with monomeric red fluorescent protein, mRFP1 (Campbell et al., 2002)) was determined using confocal fluorescence microscopy. Recycling endosomes were visualized using a GFP fusion of Rab11. In unstimulated cells, the Rab11 compartment is located in the perinuclear region and arrestin-2 (either wild type or mutant) is dispersed throughout the cytoplasm. This is consistent for all arrestin-2 mutants (unpublished data). Activation of the FPR with fluorescent ligand (633-6pep) in the absence of arrestin-2 (empty mRFP1 vector-transfected) resulted in accumulation of the FPR in recycling endosomes (Figure 2.5). Expression of wild type arrestin-2, while also leading to localization of the FPR in perinuclear recycling endosomes, resulted in a greater proportion of cytosolic vesicles outside the recycling endosome containing FPR and arrestin, consistent with normal trafficking and recycling of the FPR (Vines et al., 2003).

Cytosolic complexes of FPR-633-6pep and arrestin-2 are believed to represent both internalized afferent endosomes as well as recycling efferent vesicles based on two independent results. First, following a 10 min stimulation of arrestin-deficient cells with 633-6pep, followed by 50 min chase without ligand, the FPR is not seen in cytosolic vesicles, as it is in the presence of arrestins (unpublished data). The presence of the FPR in vesicles after 50 min of agonist depletion suggests that the vesicle-localized receptor represents recycling receptor, since no such vesicles are seen in the arrestin-deficient cells. Second, FPR internalization experiments performed with 10nM fMLF (the concentration of 633-6pep used in imaging experiments) in the presence of wild type arrestin-2, reveal that the FPR achieves an equilibrium within 10 min wherein only

approximately 25-30% of the total receptor is internalized (compared to 1 μ M fMLF, where 75-80% of the FPR is internalized). This equilibrium with less total internalized receptor suggests that robust recycling is taking place under these conditions.

Localization results for the mutant arrestins paralleled their apoptotic phenotype. Expression of both the arr2-F391A and -4A mutants (which did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis) resulted in accumulation of the FPR with associated mutant arrestin in recycling endosomes. All other mutants (which did rescue the apoptotic phenotype) produced FPR trafficking patterns indistinguishable from wild type arrestin-2 (Figure 2.5 and Fig 2.12). These results provide additional support for the correlation between FPR trafficking defects and the initiation of FPR-mediated apoptosis observed in the complete absence of arrestins as well as in the presence of the arr2-F391A and -4A mutants.

2.3.5 Arrestin-2 mutants that prevent normal FPR trafficking exhibit altered associations with AP-2.

Both the arr2-F391A and -4A mutants fail to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis and also demonstrate trafficking defects exemplified by accumulation in perinuclear recycling endosomes. The region of arrestin-2 encompassing amino acids 391-400 has previously been associated with altered binding to AP-2 (Kim and Benovic, 2002; Milano et al., 2002). The F391A mutant exhibits decreased binding to AP-2, resulting in inhibition of β 2-AR internalization. While

the 4A mutant has not previously been described, three of the amino acids within this mutant (K397, M399 and K400) have been individually assessed and shown to exhibit decreased binding to AP-2 as well as decreased β 2-AR internalization similar to the F391A mutant (Kim and Benovic, 2002). To better understand the relationship between AP-2 association and FPR trafficking, we used confocal fluorescence microscopy to track the association of AP-2 with the FPR-arrestin complex. Although previous studies of other GPCRs have examined arrestin-2/AP-2 dynamics at early time points upon receptor internalization (Fessart et al., 2005), we observed trafficking defects most clearly following one hour of receptor stimulation. Therefore, we used a time course that examines FPR trafficking at both short and long stimulation times.

To assess the interaction between AP-2 and the FPR-arrestin-2 complex, we examined the subcellular localization of the GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2, in the context of internalized FPR (by tracking the activated 633-6pep-FPR complex) and arrestin (by tracking RFP-fused arrestins) using confocal fluorescence microscopy. In unstimulated cells, all arrestins (wild type and mutants) show a cytosolic distribution consistent with a lack of GPCR stimulation. AP-2 is distributed throughout the cytoplasm as well as in puncta at the plasma membrane. In the $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells, following 60 minutes of stimulation with 633-6pep in the absence of arrestins, the FPR accumulates in a perinuclear region (Figure 2.6) identified as the Rab11 recycling endosome (*cf.* Figure 2.5). This observation and the lack of AP-2 association with the FPR in cytosolic endosomes at 15 and 30 minutes in the absence of arrestins (Figure 2.13) are

consistent with a requirement for arrestin-2 in the recruitment of AP-2. Upon expression of wild type arrestin-2 in the $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells, ligand stimulation results in the accumulation of AP-2 with the 633-6pep-FPR/arrestin-2 complex in the perinuclear region at 60 minutes. However, AP-2 is not observed to associate with cytosolic endosomes containing FPR-arrestin-2 complexes, suggesting that AP-2 is not associated with the complex after exiting the recycling endosome. At 15 minutes, almost no AP-2 was seen associated with FPR-arrestin-2 complexes in recycling endosomes. It is not until 30 minutes that significant levels of AP-2 are concentrated with the FPR and wild type arrestin-2 in recycling endosomes. We interpret these results to suggest that AP-2 does not associate with FPR-arrestin-2 complexes prior to internalization.

Expression of the F391A and 4A arrestin mutants yield substantially different results with respect to AP-2 association. In the presence of the $arr2$ -F391A mutant, AP-2 showed no association with the 633-6pep-FPR/ $arr2$ -F391A complex at any of the time points (Figure 2.6 and Figure 2.13). This is consistent with published reports that demonstrate decreased AP-2 binding to $arr2$ -F391A (Kim and Benovic, 2002). However, while we hypothesized that the same would be true of the $arr2$ -4A mutant, this was not the case. Following 60 minutes stimulation, AP-2 showed strong colocalization with the 633-6pep-FPR/ $arr2$ -4A complex, as strong as or stronger than that observed with wild type arrestin-2. A similar association of AP-2 with the 633-6pep-FPR/ $arr2$ -4A complex was also observed following 15 and 30 minutes stimulation. Our results suggest that the $arr2$ -4A mutant, in contrast to the $arr2$ -F391A mutant, is capable of binding AP-2.

The major difference between wild type arrestin-2 and the 4A mutant in this assay is that there is little, if any, cytosolic 633-6pep-FPR/arr2-4A complex (particularly at 60 min) suggesting an accumulation of complex in recycling endosomes.

To determine the rate of association of AP-2 with FPR/arrestins, we measured AP-2 colocalization with FPR/arrestin-2 complexes over time by visually scoring the fraction of cells in which AP-2 was colocalized with FPR/arrestin-2 perinuclear complexes (Figure 2.14). Results are normalized to the response for wild type arrestin-2 at 60 minutes. At 15 minutes, 20-30% of cells show AP-2 to be clustered with arrestin when either wild type arrestin-2 or arr2-4A is expressed. The percentage of cells showing colocalization increased at the 30 and 60 minute time points for both wild type arrestin-2 (~35 and ~80%, respectively) and arr2-4A (~60 and ~95%, respectively). The arr-2-F391A mutant however showed essentially no AP-2 localization at any of the time points assayed.

To confirm the above results and validate our use of a GFP-tagged α -subunit of AP-2, we examined U937 cells that stably express the FPR (U937 FPR) and both endogenous arrestins. U937 cells are a promonocytic cell line used extensively as a model for FPR function (Browning et al., 1997; Hsu et al., 1997). Confocal immunofluorescence microscopy of U937 FPR cells transiently expressing Rab11-GFP and stained with antibodies against endogenous AP-2 confirms our results regarding the subcellular localization of AP-2 (Figure 2.15A). In unstimulated cells, Rab11-GFP is localized to the perinuclear region while AP-

2 shows puncta at the cell membrane with limited cytosolic staining. Upon stimulation of the FPR with Alexa 546-6pep (546-6pep) for 30 min, ligand-FPR complexes colocalize with endogenous AP-2 in the Rab11 endosome. In addition, ligand-receptor complexes exist outside the perinuclear region, but with little or no AP-2 staining, consistent with the idea that AP-2 only associates significantly with the FPR at recycling endosomes. Alternatively, these vesicles may represent efferent recycling endosomes (see below).

While colocalization of scaffolded proteins helps to define aspects of receptor trafficking and provides sub-micron resolution, it cannot directly measure protein complex formation. To extend our microscopy results (Figure 2.6), we immunoprecipitated FLAG-tagged arrestins and assayed AP-2 complex binding over a time course of FPR-activation (Figure 2.7A). We added additional shorter time points as compared microscopy assays to determine whether FPR/arrestin/AP-2 complexes form prior to their detection by colocalization in punctate structures. Western blotting with antibodies directed against the β -subunit of AP-2 (the subunit that directly binds wild type arrestin-2 (Fessart et al., 2005)) did not detect any adaptin following immunoprecipitation with anti-FLAG antibodies using arrestin-deficient cell lysates. Upon expression of FLAG-tagged wild type arrestin-2 in arrestin-deficient cells and immunoprecipitation of arrestin-2, β -adaptin was detected in the immunoprecipitate as early as 5 minutes (quantitated in Figure 2.7B), but not in unstimulated cells. Although there was virtually no detectable binding of AP-2 to the F391A mutant, particularly at the

later time points, AP-2 bound to the 4A mutant to a much greater extent than wild type arrestin-2 (~6-fold increase).

2.3.6 FPR displays differential trafficking with AP-1 complexes in the presence of arrestins.

AP-1 has been localized to the TGN and perinuclear recycling endosome of cells and is required for trafficking of proteins from these compartments to the plasma membrane (Miedel et al., 2006; Pagano et al., 2004). In addition, the beta-subunit of AP-1 (which in AP-2 directly binds arrestin-2) shows significant overall homology to the beta-subunit of AP-2. In addition, amino acids shown to be necessary for arrestin-2 binding to β 2-adaptin (E849, Y888 and E902) (Laporte et al., 2002) are absolutely conserved in β 1-adaptin (Lundmark and Carlsson, 2002). To determine whether AP-1 might also play a role in FPR trafficking, we examined the localization of the FPR, arrestins and AP-1 using confocal fluorescence microscopy. In unstimulated cells, AP-1 was localized primarily in a perinuclear region, but was also present in the cytoplasm. When the FPR was stimulated in the absence of arrestins, receptor accumulated in the perinuclear recycling endosome (see Figure 2.5) and it colocalized extensively with AP-1, with little or no receptor observed outside this compartment (Figure 2.8A). Upon stimulation of cells expressing wild type arrestin-2, the FPR-arrestin-2 complexes were extensively localized with AP-1 in the perinuclear region. However, arrestin was also observed outside this region in cytoplasmic vesicles in association with the FPR and AP-1. This suggests that upon

internalization, the FPR traffics to recycling endosomes where it associates with AP-1, which is likely involved in escorting the receptor back to the cell surface. The fact that arrestin appears to mediate these late trafficking events indicates a role for arrestin in receptor trafficking at a much later stage than previously thought. In contrast to wild type arrestin-2, the F391A and 4A mutants both accumulated with the FPR in the AP-1-positive endosome in the perinuclear region with no receptor, arrestin or AP-1 observed outside this cellular compartment, consistent with the lack of recycling. To further assess AP-1 trafficking with FPR/arrestin-2 complexes, we quantitated the number of cells that show AP-1 puncta outside of the perinuclear region (Figure 2.8B). Results demonstrate that only when wild type arrestin-2 is present is AP-1 observed on vesicles outside the perinuclear region following FPR activation. Finally, pulse-chase experiments (10 min pulse with 633-6pep, 50 min chase) using *arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells transiently transfected with γ -GFP show that AP-1 is colocalized with 633-6pep-FPR-wild type arrestin-2 in cytoplasmic vesicles following the 50 min chase, but not in early endosomes immediately following internalization (10 min pulse with no chase, unpublished data).

In order to confirm that the GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1 accurately reflects endogenous AP-1 trafficking, we used confocal immunofluorescence microscopy in U937 FPR cells transiently transfected with Rab11-GFP (Figure 2.15B). In unstimulated cells, AP-1 is predominantly colocalized with perinuclear Rab11 with minimal cytosolic staining. Upon stimulation of the FPR with 546-6pep, ligand-receptor complexes colocalize with Rab11 and AP-1 in the

perinuclear region. In addition, ligand-receptor complexes found in endosomes outside the perinuclear region also colocalize significantly with AP-1 consistent with efferent trafficking of the FPR.

2.3.7 AP-1 binds arrestin in an FPR activation-dependent manner.

Based on the colocalization of the FPR, arrestin and AP-1 upon receptor activation, we sought to determine whether arrestin also forms a complex with AP-1. Arr2-WT-FLAG was transiently transfected into $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells, and activated prior to immunoprecipitation with anti-FLAG antibodies (Figure 2.8C). AP-1 complex was detected in the immunoprecipitates by blotting for the γ -subunit of AP-1. In the absence of arrestins, AP-1 was not detected in anti-FLAG immunoprecipitates. However, in the presence of arr2-WT-FLAG, the γ -subunit of AP-1 was detected in the anti-FLAG immunoprecipitates in a stimulation-dependent manner, suggesting an association between the FPR-arrestin complex and AP-1, particularly at times consistent with receptor recycling.

2.3.8 Arrestin mutants and AP-2 regulate recycling of the FPR.

Previous reports have demonstrated that recycling of the FPR is impaired in the absence of arrestins and that this phenotype is rescued by reconstitution with wild type arrestin-2 (Vines et al., 2003). Similar to our previous results, in the current experiments, $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells recycled ~6% of internalized FPR whereas $arr2^{+/+}/3^{+/+}$ FPR cells recycled ~30% of internalized receptor with similar initial levels of internalization (unpublished data). $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells transfected

with EGFP alone do not recycle significant amounts of internalized FPR whereas reconstitution with wild type arrestin-2 significantly increases the amount of FPR recycled to ~15% (unpublished data). Expression of either the F391A or 4A mutants yielded no significant recycling of FPR (~5% for the 4A mutant and no recycling for the F391A mutant, unpublished data). These results confirm that the accumulation of the FPR in recycling endosomes in the presence of the F391A or 4A mutants corresponds to a lack of recycling as a result of a block in efferent trafficking from Rab11-containing recycling endosomes.

In order to determine explicitly whether AP-2 and AP-1 regulate FPR recycling, we used siRNAs to knockdown the μ 1A and μ 2 subunits of AP-1 and AP-2, respectively in U937 FPR cells (Figure 2.9A). Knockdown of μ 1A and μ 2 subunit expression was >90% in both cases (unpublished data). In addition, expression of the β -subunit of AP-2 and γ -subunit of AP-1 was decreased as well, but not to the same extent (>70% and >50% respectively, unpublished data). Although the rate of FPR internalization was not affected by knockdown of either AP-2 or AP-1 (control, 1.4 \pm 0.2 min; AP-1, 1.5 \pm 0.15 min; AP-2, 1.6 \pm 0.18 min), the extent of FPR internalization was modestly reduced upon AP-2 knockdown (control, 75 \pm 2%; AP-1, 82 \pm 3%; AP-2, 57 \pm 5%). FPR recycling was measured relative to the amount of internalization for each condition normalized to the extent of recycling in cells electroporated with control siRNA. Whereas knockdown of AP-2 produced a significant decrease of about 40% in FPR recycling (p <0.05), knockdown of AP-1 produced no effect (Figure 2.9B). Finally, U937 FPR cells treated with siRNAs were stimulated with 546-6pep for

30min and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Ligand-receptor complexes were observed in the perinuclear region under all conditions, but when AP-2 levels were reduced, liganded FPR exhibited increased juxtannuclear accumulation with reduced peripheral vesicles being observed (unpublished data). These results confirm an essential role for AP-2 in the recycling of the FPR.

2.3.9 Endogenous AP-2 and AP-1 traffic differentially with the FPR.

In order to determine whether AP-2 and AP-1 specifically colocalize with each other in response to FPR stimulation and trafficking, U937 FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP subunits of either AP-2 or AP-1 and stained for the complimentary adaptor protein with antibodies to AP-2 and AP-1 subunits (Figure 2.9C). In unstimulated cells, GFP-fused AP-1 and antibody staining of endogenous AP-1 show a perinuclear region and some cytosolic distribution. Similarly, GFP-fused AP-2 and staining of endogenous AP-2 both demonstrate a punctate localization at the plasma membrane with additional diffuse cytosolic expression. Upon stimulation of the FPR with 546-6pep for 30min, ligand-FPR complexes are present in a perinuclear location colocalized with both AP-2 and AP-1. Under these conditions, AP-2 is only seen with the FPR in the perinuclear location and AP-1 is seen in the perinuclear location as well as in cytosolic endosomes consistent with normal efferent FPR trafficking. These results not only validate the use of GFP-fused AP constructs but also confirm and extend the conclusions drawn from studies in MEF cells.

2.4 DISCUSSION

Receptor trafficking is important to proper receptor and therefore cell function. We have previously suggested a link between FPR-mediated apoptosis and altered FPR trafficking in the absence of arrestins (Revankar et al., 2004; Vines et al., 2003). In this report, we demonstrate that arrestin mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis accumulate in the Rab11, perinuclear recycling compartment. Furthermore, accumulation of receptor in this compartment was shown to be due to impaired recycling of internalized FPR in the presence of F391A and 4A mutants, resulting from altered AP-2 binding to arrestin-2. Associations between arrestin and AP-2 and AP-1 were also demonstrated by confocal microscopy and co-immunoprecipitations. siRNA-mediated knockdown of AP-2 confirmed the necessity of this interaction in FPR recycling, although an absolute requirement for an interaction with AP-1 in FPR recycling could not be demonstrated. As signaling inhibitors have been shown to inhibit FPR-mediated apoptosis, our results suggest that inhibition of proper FPR trafficking also alters proper spatial control of FPR signaling complexes leading to the initiation of apoptosis within the cell. This is supported by results that show spatial control of GPCRs can induce or limit their potential to create signaling complexes and initiate cellular signaling pathways (Daaka et al., 1998).

While the internalization of numerous GPCRs require arrestin, AP-2 and clathrin, the FPR was one of the first GPCRs suggested to internalize through arrestin- and clathrin-independent mechanisms (Bennett et al., 2001; Gilbert et al., 2001; Maestes et al., 1999). Arrestin independence was ultimately

definitively demonstrated using arrestin-deficient mouse embryonic fibroblasts, in which the stably expressed FPR exhibited normal internalization (Vines et al., 2003). Consistent with this observation is the fact that none of the arrestin mutants used in this study defective in AP-2/clathrin binding (F391A and Δ LIELD, respectively) or arrestin dephosphorylation (S412D) inhibited FPR internalization. These results also indicate that a lack of receptor internalization was not responsible for the observed rescue of apoptosis by certain arrestin mutants (Δ LIELD and S412D). Overall, these results support the conclusion that FPR internalization is independent of AP-2, clathrin and the phosphorylation state of arrestin.

Both arrestin mutants used in this study that did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis did inhibit FPR trafficking by preventing FPR recycling as a result of altered interactions with AP-2. The F391A arrestin mutant was previously shown to exhibit decreased binding to the β -subunit of AP-2 through *in vitro* binding assays while its overexpression in cells inhibited internalization of the β 2-AR (Milano et al., 2002). While the 4A mutant has not been previously described, the mutation and characterization of individual amino acids (K397, M399 and K400) have been described (Kim and Benovic, 2002). These individual mutants showed similar binding properties with the β -subunit of AP-2 and produced similar effects on β 2-AR internalization as the F391A mutant. What we found most surprising was the differential interaction these arrestin mutants displayed with the AP-2 complex. While the F391A mutant did not significantly colocalize or co-immunoprecipitate with AP-2 at any time point or at any location within the

cell, the 4A mutant strongly colocalized with AP-2 upon FPR activation. In fact, co-immunoprecipitation assays demonstrated increased binding of AP-2 to the 4A mutant compared to wild type arrestin-2. The reason for increased AP-2 binding to an arrestin mutant whose component mutations show decreased binding is unclear, but may be due to conformational changes within the protein that alter the binding properties of this specific motif or other secondary sites. It is intriguing that in addition to decreased binding of AP-2 to arrestin-2, increased association also inhibits the proper trafficking of the FPR.

A recent report (Schmid et al., 2006) suggests that the region of arrestin between amino acids 383-402 forms an α -helix as it binds the β -subunit of AP-2. The 4A mutant may form a more stable α -helix that increases binding to AP-2 through the remaining AP-2 interacting residues such as F391, R393 and R395 or alternatively it may exist in a constitutively active state as previously described for the arrestin-2 3A mutant (I386A/V387A/F388A), which dislodges the tail of arrestin from the body of the protein (Gurevich and Gurevich, 2004). Another constitutively active mutant of arrestin (R169E in the polar core of the protein) has also been shown to exhibit increased binding to AP-2 (Kim and Benovic, 2002). Surprisingly, the 6A mutant, which rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis and bound to activated FPR, lacked many of the residues that have been demonstrated to be involved in the association with AP-2, suggesting the 6A mutant may bind AP-2 at alternate or secondary sites. Similar to our 4A mutant, an AP-2 mutant R879A shows significantly enhanced (10-fold) binding to arrestin-2 (Schmid et al., 2006), suggesting that this interaction can be both

positively and negatively modulated by mutations in both arrestin and AP-2. The inhibitory effect of increased AP-2 binding by the 4A mutant suggests that appropriate cycling of AP-2 with arrestin (association followed by dissociation) is required for the exit of the FPR from recycling endosomes. This idea is supported by recent evidence demonstrating Src activity as a necessary component for AP-2/arrestin dissociation and internalization of the β 2-AR (Fessart et al., 2005). When Src activity was inhibited, AP-2 remained bound to arrestin and β 2-AR internalization was decreased. While the regulation of β 2-AR trafficking by AP-2 clearly occurs at the plasma membrane, arrestin's role in FPR trafficking appears to lie specifically with its recycling and not its internalization leaving AP-2's role in GPCR trafficking an intriguing phenomenon in GPCR function. Other GPCRs likely colocalize with AP-2 in the perinuclear region as well. In a recent report (Mundell et al., 2006), the authors found that two purinergic receptors, P2Y₁ and P2Y₁₂, colocalized with AP-2 in perinuclear "endocytic compartments", though the identity of this compartment was not established.

A significant remaining question is: What regulates the location at which AP-2 mediates its effects on GPCR-arrestin complexes? We have recently shown that the phosphorylation pattern of the FPR is highly complex with respect to its regulation of arrestin binding, internalization and desensitization (Potter et al., 2006). Although the presence of a single phosphorylation site can be sufficient to initiate internalization and arrestin binding, the presence of additional sites can inhibit arrestin binding without affecting receptor internalization.

Furthermore, work by our lab has suggested that the pattern of phosphorylation sites within the FPR carboxy terminus regulates arrestin affinity for the FPR, its ability to induce changes in ligand affinity, as well as the intracellular trafficking pattern of internalized receptors (Key et al., 2001; Key et al., 2003; Key et al., 2005; Xue et al., 2004). The stability/affinity of the receptor-arrestin interactions also regulates the trafficking of the β 2-AR and vasopressin V2 receptors. These effects are likely a result of carboxy terminus phosphorylation patterns, as exchanging the carboxy terminus of the β 2-AR for that of the vasopressin V2 receptor produced a trafficking pattern typical of the vasopressin V2 receptor (Oakley et al., 1999; Oakley et al., 2000). A similar conclusion regarding the complexity of receptor phosphorylation has recently been made based on functional studies of the β 2-AR following manipulations of GRK and arrestin expression (Kim et al., 2005; Ren et al., 2005). The results suggested that GPCR phosphorylation patterns resulting from the activity of GRK4/5 but not GRK2/3 produce arrestin-mediated signaling functions through ERK1/2. We therefore speculate that the initial phosphorylation of the FPR upon ligand binding may be sufficient to initiate internalization but insufficient to promote arrestin binding. Only upon additional phosphorylation, perhaps following internalization, is the receptor then competent for arrestin binding. Furthermore, it is possible that additional receptor or arrestin phosphorylation/modification may be required to permit the binding of AP-2 to FPR-arrestin complexes within endosomes.

Although AP-1 is predominantly known for mediating vesicle traffic from the Golgi compartment to the plasma membrane, it has also been shown to be involved in the formation of recycling vesicles (Deneka et al., 2003; Popa et al., 2005). To our knowledge, our report is the first to suggest a role for AP-1 in the post-endocytic processing of GPCRs. Colocalization studies with the FPR and arrestins demonstrate that upon FPR stimulation, receptor and arrestins colocalize with AP-1 in a perinuclear region. However, while the FPR and arrestins-F391A/4A remain with AP-1 in this region, in the presence of wild type arrestin-2, vesicles containing FPR, arrestin and AP-1 are observed outside the perinuclear region. Although AP-1 associates with arrestin in an FPR activation-dependent manner, siRNA studies do not show an effect on FPR recycling. In a recent review (Robinson, 2004), AP-4 was described as having possible additional functions, besides being localized in the Golgi and trafficking cargo to the cell surface. It may be that AP-4, or another trafficking protein, is capable of serving a redundant function to AP-1 when its levels are decreased.

Based on the results of this study, we propose a new model of FPR internalization and recycling (Figure 2.10). In this model, following ligand binding the FPR internalizes in an arrestin-independent manner. After, or perhaps during internalization, the FPR binds to arrestin, resulting in the presence of FPR/arrestin complexes in early endosomes. At some point during its trafficking to the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (or after its arrival at this location) the FPR-arrestin complex recruits AP-2. Within or as it exits the recycling compartment, the FPR/arrestin complex releases AP-2. AP-1 mediated

trafficking subsequently facilitates exit of the FPR/arrestin complex from recycling endosomes and their return to the cell surface. Along the path to the cell surface the complex dissociates and the FPR is dephosphorylated. Finally, the FPR completes its return to the cell surface in a resensitized form ready to continue signaling.

In this report, we have described a novel mechanism for GPCR post-endocytic trafficking and recycling. This is the first report that begins to reveal the protein-protein interactions necessary for the recycling of certain GPCRs, revealing a definitive role for arrestin in the late stages of GPCR trafficking as compared to the β 2-AR, where arrestins are involved in the earliest events of GPCR trafficking (McDonald and Lefkowitz, 2001). Furthermore, the fact that FPR-mediated apoptosis occurs under conditions where arr2-F391A/-4A are bound to the FPR demonstrates that the FPR-initiated apoptotic signaling is not purely a result of receptor activation in the absence of arrestins and confirms that receptor-arrestin accumulation in recycling endosomes results in aberrant signaling that leads to apoptosis. With this report of novel roles for arrestins and adaptor proteins in the trafficking and signaling of GPCRs, new avenues for the targeting of GPCR function are presented that may lead to therapeutic interventions for disease processes.

2.5 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.5.1 Reagents, Plasmids and Mutagenesis. All reagents are from Sigma unless otherwise noted. With the exception of the arr2-F391A and Δ LIELD mutants, regions of arrestin-2 were mutated by site-directed mutagenesis and cloned into EGFP-N1 vector or mRFP1 vector using standard subcloning procedures and HindIII/ApaI restriction sites. Arr2-F391A and Δ LIELD constructs were a gift from Jeffrey Benovic. These constructs were amplified using PCR with primers that created HindIII/ApaI restriction sites and subcloned as describe above. Arr2-WT-FLAG was created by cutting Arr2-WT-GFP at the ApaI/NotI restriction sites to remove GFP and inserting a linker that contained the FLAG sequence. Arr2-F391A- and Arr2-4A-FLAG were constructed by digesting with HindIII/ApaI sites and subcloning the ~1300bp fragment into the HindIII/ApaI restriction sites of Arr2-WT-FLAG. All mutants were confirmed by DNA sequencing. Rab11-GFP was a gift from Angela Wandinger-Ness. GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2 and GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1 (Wu et al., 2003) were gifts from Lois Greene.

2.5.2. Cell Culture and Transfection. Arr2^{-/-}/13^{-/-} FPR cells were grown in DMEM with 10% fetal bovine serum, 100 units/mL penicillin and 100units/mL streptomycin at 37°C and 5% CO₂. U937 FPR cells were grown in RPMI with 10% fetal bovine serum, 100 units/mL penicillin and 100units/mL streptomycin at 37°C and 5% CO₂. Transient transfections of mouse embryonic fibroblasts were performed with Lipofectamine 2000 according to manufacturer's instructions. siRNA transfection of U937 FPR cells was performed using siPORT

Electroporation Buffer (Ambion) with a Genepulser Xcell (Bio Rad) according to manufacturer instructions. Cells were transfected with 20 μ g of siRNA twice at 72 hour intervals. Cells were assayed 72 hours after the second transfection. Cell survival was measured using Trypan Blue and was >95% for all transfections. siRNAs used for depletion of μ 1A (AP-1) and μ 2 (AP-2) were as previously described (Janvier and Bonifacino, 2005). mRNA gene target sequences for siRNA design were as follows: μ 1A—GGCAUCAAGUAUCGGAAGA; μ 2—GUGGAUGCCUUUCGGGUCA. A nonfunctional siRNA (Ambion) was used as a control.

2.5.3 Cell Rounding. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins were plated on 12mm-glass coverslips, incubated overnight and serum-starved for 30 minutes. Cells were incubated in SFM or were stimulated with 10nM fMLF in SFM 5 hours at 37°C. Cells were washed twice with PBS, fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde and mounted using Vectashield. Slides were viewed by phase-contrast microscopy and random fields were evaluated (at least five) until 100-300 GFP-expressing cells were assayed. GFP-expressing cells were counted “positive” for cell death if they rounded or if they were spherical refractile cells with no extensions. Data are expressed as a percentage of rounded/GFP-expressing cells.

2.5.4. Apoptosis. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins were plated on 12mm-glass coverslips, incubated overnight and serum-starved for 30 minutes. Cells were incubated with SFM or were stimulated with 10nM fMLF in SFM for 5 hours at 37°C. Cells were stained with 100ng/mL

propidium iodide in SFM at room temperature for 5-10 minutes, washed twice with PBS, fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde and mounted using Vectashield. Slides were viewed by fluorescence microscopy and random fields were evaluated (at least five) until 100-300 GFP-expressing cells were assayed. GFP-expressing cells were counted “positive” for cell death if they were stained with propidium iodide. Data are expressed as a percentage of PI-positive/GFP-expressing cells.

2.5.5. FPR Internalization. *Arr2^{-/-}/13^{-/-}* FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins were harvested by trypsinization. U937 FPR cells were electroporated with siRNAs and harvested by centrifugation. Cells were resuspended in SFM and stimulated for 2, 5, 10, 20 and 30 minutes with 1 μ M fMLF. Cells were then washed extensively with cold SFM to remove excess unlabelled ligand. Remaining receptors on the cell surface were labeled with 10nM 633-6pep. Cells were then assayed by flow cytometry using a Becton-Dickinson FACSCalibur. Cells (100,000) were gated for live cells using forward and side scatter parameters. GFP-fused arrestin mutant expressing cells were subsequently gated using FL-1 and the mean channel fluorescence (MCF) was determined in FL-4 to monitor cell surface expression of the FPR. Non-specific binding was determined by labeling *arr2^{-/-}/13^{-/-}* cells not expressing the FPR with 633-6pep and assaying as described. Non-specific binding was subtracted before further calculations. MCF from unstimulated cells represented 100% FPR cell surface expression. Cell surface expression from stimulated cells was calculated by dividing the MCF following treatment by the MCF from unstimulated

cells. Internalization data were then plotted using GraphPad Prism to calculate maximum internalization extents using a single exponential decay. Statistical analysis was performed using Student's t-test.

2.5.6. Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells or U937 FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11, α -subunit of AP-2 or γ -subunit of AP-1. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were plated on 25mm-glass coverslips and grown overnight. U937 FPR cells were harvested by centrifugation. Cells were serum-starved for 30 minutes and stimulated with 10 nM 633- or 546-6pep in SFM for indicated time at 37°C. Coverslips or harvested cells were rinsed with PBS, fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde at room temperature and mounted with Vectashield. For experiments using antibody staining, after fixation cells were incubated in 0.02% Saponin/3% BSA for 15-20 minutes at room temperature. Cells were washed and incubated in 1:100 primary antibody (100/3 for γ 1-adaptin antibody or AP-6 for α -adaptin (Affinity Bioreagents)) in 3% NGS for 30 minutes at room temperature. After further washing, cells were incubated in 1:200 secondary antibody (Cy5-conjugated Donkey Anti-Mouse (Jackson ImmunoResearch)) in 3% NGS for 30 minutes at room temperature. Cells were then washed and mounted using Vectashield. Fluorescence images were acquired using a Zeiss LSM 510 inverted laser scanning microscope equipped with He-Ne and Kr-AR lasers. To assess the extent of colocalization, cells with perinuclear arrestin clusters were viewed and scored for the presence of any corresponding AP-2 clusters. Data were expressed as mean \pm SEM AP-2 clusters/arrestin clusters in >25

cells/experiment and were normalized to the wild type arrestin response at 60 minutes.

2.5.7. Cell Lysis and Immunoprecipitation. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells transiently transfected with FLAG-tagged arrestins were grown to confluence. Cells were serum-starved for 30 min and stimulated for the designated times with 10nM fMLF in SFM at 37°C. Media was removed and 1mL of cold co-IP lysis buffer (1% v/v TX-100, 150mM NaCl, 10mM Tris-HCl pH 7.4 supplemented with protease inhibitor cocktail (Calbiochem)) was added immediately. Lysates were collected, incubated on ice for 30 min, and centrifuged at maximum speed for 30 min at 4°C. An aliquot from each tube was set aside for determining pre-immunoprecipitation levels of proteins by Western blot. For immunoprecipitations, 25 μ L of protein A Sepharose (Pierce) was washed three times with co-IP lysis buffer. Beads were rotated for at least one hour at 4°C in 250 μ L of co-IP lysis buffer with 1:1000 M2 Anti-FLAG antibody. Beads were washed with co-IP lysis buffer and lysates were added and rotated overnight at 4°C. The following day, beads were washed again with co-IP lysis buffer, 40 μ L of 2X Sample Buffer was added and immunoprecipitated proteins released by boiling for 5 minutes.

2.5.8. Western Blotting. Lysates or immunoprecipitates were resolved with SDS-PAGE. Proteins were transferred to PVDF membranes and blocked for 1 hour with 5% dry milk in TBS-T. Blotting was carried out using 1:1000 dilutions of biotinylated M2 mouse anti-FLAG antibody, M2 mouse Anti-FLAG, mouse anti- β -adaplin antibody (BD Biosciences), mouse 100/3 to γ 1-adaplin antibody, rabbit

RY/1 to μ 1A (gift from L. Traub), rabbit R11-29 to μ 2 ((Aguilar et al., 1997), gift from J. Bonifacino) and 1:4000 mouse anti-GAPDH antibody (Chemicon) in 5% dry milk in TBS-T overnight at 4°C. Blots were washed with TBS-T and incubated with 1:2500 HRP-streptavidin (in 5% BSA in TBS-T), 1:2500 HRP rabbit anti-mouse antibody or 1:2500 HRP goat anti-rabbit antibody (in 5% Dry Milk in TBS-T) at room temperature for 1 or 3 hours, respectively. Bands were visualized using SuperSignal West Pico Chemiluminescent Substrate (Pierce). Densitometry was performed using Quantity One (BioRad) and ratios expressed as mean ratio +/- SEM adaptin/arrestin immunoprecipitated and normalized to zero time points for each vector expressed.

2.5.9. FPR Recycling. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins or U937 FPR cells transfected with siRNA were harvested and resuspended in SFM. An aliquot was removed to measure total cell surface receptor. The remaining cells were stimulated with 1 μ M fMLF in SFM at 37°C for 1 hour and were then washed extensively to remove excess unlabelled ligand. Half the remaining cells were resuspended in pre-warmed SFM for 30 min at 37°C (20 min for U937 FPR cells) to allow the FPR to recycle. The other half was kept on ice to measure post-internalization cell surface receptor levels. All aliquots were then resuspended in SFM containing 10nM 633-6pep and assayed by flow cytometry using a Becton-Dickinson FACSCalibur. For analysis, assayed cells were gated for live cells using forward and side scatter parameters. These cells were then gated using FL-1 for GFP-fused arrestin mutant expression and the mean channel fluorescence was measured in FL-4 to monitor cell surface

expression of the FPR. Non-specific binding was determined by labeling arrestin knockout cell lines (or U937 cells lines) that did not express FPR and was subtracted from all values. To account for differences in total recycling that could be due to differences in the initial extent of internalization, the fraction of recycled FPR (starting from the final internalization time point) was divided by the fraction of internalized FPR. Data are expressed as a percentage of recycled receptor /internalized receptor.

2.6 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Charlotte Vines and Angela Wandinger-Ness for helpful comments.

Flow cytometry data and confocal images in this study were generated in the Flow Cytometry and Fluorescence Microscopy Facilities, respectively, at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, which received support from NCRR 1 S10 RR14668, NSF MCB9982161, NCRR P20 RR11830, NCI R24 CA88339, the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, and the University of New Mexico Cancer Center.

This work was funded by grant BC030217 from the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program to B.M.W. and NIH grants AI36357 and GM68901 to E.R.P.

2.7 ABBREVIATIONS

AP-1—adaptor protein-1 complex

AP-2—adaptor protein-2 complex

Arr2—arrestin-2

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR—arrestin-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} knockout MEF cells stably expressing the FPR

fMLF—*N*-formyl-Methionyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanine

FPR—*N*-formyl peptide receptor

GPCR—G protein-coupled receptor

MEF—mouse embryonic fibroblast

PI—propidium iodide

SFM—serum-free medium (DMEM or RPMI)

6pep—*N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine

U937 FPR—U937 cells stably expressing the FPR

2.8 FIGURE LEGENDS

2.8.1. Figure 2.1. Structural regions of arrestin-2 do not rescue FPR-

mediated apoptosis. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with wild type or structural regions of arrestin-2 fused to GFP. Cells were stimulated for 5 hours in SFM with 10nM fMLF or vehicle at 37°C. GFP-expressing cells were randomly viewed using phase-contrast microscopy and counted for normal morphology or cell rounding. Only wild type arrestin-2 was capable of preventing FPR-mediated apoptosis. Data are expressed as mean +/- SEM rounded cells/GFP-expressing cell from three independent experiments.

2.8.2. Figure 2.2. Sequence of arrestin-2 carboxy terminus and selected

mutants. Arrestin-2 mutants within the carboxy terminus were designed based on previously described mutations or by changing regions of qualitatively similar amino acids (e.g. groups of charged residues) to alanine. An additional mutant, Δ LIELD (located just before the site of truncation at amino acid 382), lacking the clathrin-binding motif, was also used.

2.8.3. Figure 2.3. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2

mutants. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestin mutants were assayed for apoptosis. Cells were stained with PI and 100-300 GFP-expressing cells were viewed and scored for the presence of PI staining. Only in the absence of arrestin (EGFP vector only) or in the presence of arr2-(1-382), arr2-4A and arr2-F391A did the cells continue to undergo FPR-mediated

apoptosis. All other mutants prevented apoptosis like wild type arrestin-2. Data expressed as mean \pm SEM PI positive/GFP cell from three independent experiments.

2.8.4. Figure 2.4. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 mutants. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins were stimulated with 1 μ M fMLF and aliquoted at multiple time points. Cells were washed free of fMLF, labeled with 633-6pep and analyzed by flow cytometry for residual cell surface receptor. Cells were gated for GFP expression (FL1) to restrict the analysis to transfected cells. Data are expressed as the maximum extent of internalization based on curve fitting using a single exponential decay. Data are expressed as mean \pm SEM from three independent experiments

2.8.5. Figure 2.5. Arrestin-2 mutants incapable of rescuing apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11 and RFP-fused arrestins (wild type, arr2-4A, arr2-F391A and arr2-S412D) and plated on coverslips. Cells were stimulated with the 633-6pep for 1 hour at 37°C and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy using a 63X objective. In the absence of arrestin or the presence of arr2-4A or arr2-F391A, the FPR-ligand complex accumulated extensively in the Rab11 compartment. In cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 and arr2-S412D, the receptor is also seen in cytoplasmic vesicles. Representative images are

shown from three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m. See Figure 2.12 for images of additional mutants.

2.8.6. Figure 2.6. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.

Arr2^{-/-}/13^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins (wild type, arr2-F391A and arr2-4A) and the GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2. Cells were subsequently stimulated with 633-6pep at 37°C for the indicated time and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy with a 63X objective. In cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 or arr2-4A, following 60 min stimulation, AP-2 is localized with the FPR and arrestin in perinuclear endosomes. On the contrary, in cells expressing arr2-F391A, no AP-2 is associated with internalized receptor. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m. See Figure 2.13 for images of additional time points.

2.8.7. Figure 2.7. Immunoprecipitation of AP-2 with arrestin-2 mutants. A)

Arr2^{-/-}/13^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with FLAG-tagged arrestins. Cells were stimulated for the indicated times with 10nM fMLF and lysed. Lysates were immunoprecipitated with anti-FLAG antibodies, resolved by SDS-PAGE and blotted for FLAG-tagged arrestins and the β -adaptin subunit of AP-2. Representative blots are shown. **B)** Quantitation of immunoprecipitated bands by optometric density. Data are expressed as mean +/- SEM ratio of β -adaptin/arrestin intensity and normalized to respective zero time points. Data are from three independent experiments.

2.8.8. Figure 2.8. FPR-arrestin-2 trafficking and binding with AP-1. **A)** Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins (wild type, arr2-F391A and arr2-4A) and the GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1. Cells were then stimulated with the 10nM 633-6pep ligand, fixed and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. In all cases, after 60min stimulation, FPR-arrestin complexes were associated with AP-1. Note that only with the stimulated cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 are cytoplasmic vesicles containing AP-1, FPR and arrestin observed outside the recycling endosomes. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m. **B)** AP-1 differentially associates with cytosolic arrestin clusters. Association of AP-1 with cytosolic arrestin-containing clusters was determined by viewing cells with cytosolic arrestin clusters and scoring whether or not colocalized AP-1 clusters were also present. Data are expressed as mean \pm SEM for >30 cells from three independent experiments. **C)** Arrestin-2 and AP-1 bind in response to FPR activation. Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with arr2-WT-FLAG or empty vector and immunoprecipitated with anti-FLAG antibodies after a time course of FPR activation. Protein was resolved by SDS-PAGE and blotted as indicated. Representative blots from three independent experiments are shown.

2.8.9. Figure 2.9. FPR recycling upon adaptor protein depletion. **A)** U937 FPR cells were electroporated with control, AP-1 or AP-2 siRNA. A fraction of the electroporated cells were harvested before experimentation and lysed for evaluation of knockdown efficiency. Lysates were resolved by SDS-PAGE and

blotted with the indicated antibodies. Representative blots are shown. **B)** U937 FPR cells were treated with the indicated siRNA and assayed for FPR recycling. FPR recycling was normalized to that of the control siRNA transfected cells. Control cells internalized 75% of the surface FPR and recycled ~50% of the internalized receptor. Data are expressed as mean \pm SEM FPR recycling/internalization and are representative of three independent experiments. **C)** U937 FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused α - or γ -subunits. Cells were then stimulated with 546-6pep for the indicated times and stained with antibodies to α - or γ - subunits (AP-2 or AP-1, respectively). Cells were imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy with a 63X objective. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m.

2.8.10. Figure 2.10. Model of FPR post-endocytic trafficking. Following binding of ligand to the receptor and initial G protein-mediated signaling, the FPR becomes phosphorylated and internalizes in an arrestin-independent manner. The FPR nevertheless binds to arrestin either during or shortly after internalization. AP-2 is then recruited to the FPR-arrestin complex. This occurs either at some point during its trafficking to the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome or commensurate with or immediately after its arrival at this location. The FPR/arrestin complex then releases AP-2, either within recycling endosomes or as the FPR-arrestin complex exits the recycling compartment. Regardless, AP-1-associated trafficking subsequently results in the FPR/arrestin complex

exiting the recycling compartment and returning to the cell surface. During this latter process, the FPR-arrestin complex dissociates and the FPR is dephosphorylated. Finally, the efferent vesicles fuse with the plasma membrane completing the recycling of the FPR to the cell surface in a resensitized form ready to begin signaling anew. This figure was generated using ScienceSlides (www.visislides.com).

2.8.11. Figure 2.11. Arrestin-2 mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis are sensitive to caspase inhibitor treatment. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and incubated overnight with 10nM zVAD-FMK (pan-caspase inhibitor). Cells were then stimulated with 10 nM fMLF for 5 hours at 37°C, stained with PI and 100-300 GFP-expressing cells (from at least five random fields) were viewed and scored for PI staining. In all cases where FPR-mediated apoptosis occurred, the zVAD-FMK caspase inhibitor blocked apoptosis. Data expressed as mean ± SEM PI positive/GFP cell from three independent experiments.

2.8.12. Figure 2.12. Arrestin-2 mutants capable of rescuing apoptosis do not accumulate in recycling endosomes. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11 and RFP-fused arrestins and stimulated with 10nM 633-6pep. Cells were imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy using a 63X objective. As with cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 or arr2-S412D (*cf.* Figure 2.5) all cells expressing mutants that rescued the apoptotic phenotype

showed the presence of cytoplasmic FPR-arrestin complexes in addition to the accumulated FPR-arrestin complexes in the recycling compartment. Representative images are shown and are representative of three experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m.

2.8.13. Figure 2.13. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins (wild type, arr2-F391A and arr2-4A) and GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2. Cells were stimulated with the 633-6pep ligand for intermediate times (15 and 30 min, *cf.* Figure 2.6). Cells were imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy with a 63X objective. Representative images are shown and are representative of three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m.

2.8.14. Figure 2.14. Quantitation of AP-2 colocalization with FPR/arrestin complexes.

Rate of AP-2 association with arrestin was determined by viewing individual cells and ascertaining whether AP-2 clusters were present with perinuclear arrestin clusters. Data were normalized to the WT response at 60 minutes. Cells were counted from three independent experiments and data are expressed as the mean AP-2 clusters/arrestin clusters +/- SEM.

2.8.15. Figure 2.15. Antibody staining of AP-2 and AP-1 in U937 FPR cells.

U937 FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11. Cells were then stimulated with 546-6pep for the times indicated and stained with antibodies

to the α - or γ - subunits (AP-2 or AP-1, respectively). Cells were imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy with a 63X objective. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. Scale bars, 10 μ m.




Figure 2.1. Arrestin domains do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis.

383	390	400	410	418	
DDDIVFED	FARQRLKGMK	DDKEEEEDGT	GSPRLNDR		- native sequence
<u>AAAAAAAA</u>	FARQRLKGMK	DDKEEEEDGT	GSPRLNDR		- arr2-8A-GFP
DDDIVFED	<u>AAAAAAKGMK</u>	DDKEEEEDGT	GSPRLNDR		- arr2-6A-GFP
DDDIVFED	<u>FARQLAAAA</u>	DDKEEEEDGT	GSPRLNDR		- arr2-4A-GFP
DDDIVFED	FARQRLKGMK	<u>AAAAAAAAGT</u>	GSPRLNDR		- arr2-8A2-GFP
DDDIVFED	FARQRLKGMK	DDKEEEEDAA	<u>AAAAAAAA</u>		- arr2-10A-GFP
DDDIVFED	FARQRLKGMK	DDKEEEEDGT	<u>GAPRLNDR</u>		- arr2-S412A-GFP
DDDIVFED	FARQRLKGMK	DDKEEEEDGT	<u>GDPRLNDR</u>		- arr2-S412D-GFP
DDDIVFED	<u>AARQRLKGMK</u>	DDKEEEEDGT	GSPRLNDR		- arr2-F391A-GFP

Figure 2.2. Sequence of arrestin-2 carboxy terminus and selected mutants.




Figure 2.3. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 mutants.




Figure 2.4. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 mutants.




Figure 2.5. Arrestin-2 mutants incapable of rescuing apoptosis accumulate in recycling endosomes.




Figure 2.6. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.




Figure 2.7A. Immunoprecipitation of AP-2 with arrestin-2 mutants.




Figure 2.7B. Quantification of AP-2/arrestin-2 interaction.




Figure 2.8A. FPR-arrestin-2 trafficking and binding with AP-1.




B**C**

Figure 2.8B and C. Quantification of 2.8A and FPR-dependent AP-1/arrestin binding.

A



B




Figure 2.9A and B. FPR recycling upon adaptor protein depletion.

C




Figure 2.9C. Localization of endogenous AP-2 and AP-1 with FPR.




Figure 2.10. Model of FPR post-endocytic trafficking.




Figure 2.11. Arrestin-2 mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis are sensitive to caspase inhibitor treatment.




Figure 2.12. Arrestin-2 mutants capable of rescuing apoptosis do not accumulate in recycling endosomes.




Figure 2.13. Arrestin-2 mutants differentially colocalize with AP-2.





Figure 2.14. Quantitation of AP-2 colocalization with FPR/arrestin complexes.

A



B




Figure 2.15. Antibody staining of AP-2 and AP-1 in U937 FPR cells.

3. Src Kinase-Arrestin interaction has two independent roles in *N*-formyl peptide receptor signaling and trafficking

To Be Submitted to the *Journal of Biological Chemistry*

Src Kinase-Arrestin interaction has two independent roles in *N*-formyl peptide receptor signaling and trafficking

Brant M. Wagener, Nicole A. Marjon and Eric R. Prossnitz

From the Department of Cell Biology and Cancer Research and Treatment Center, The University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131

Running Title: Src Kinase Regulates FPR Signaling and Trafficking

Address correspondence to: Eric R. Prossnitz, MSC 08 4750, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 87131, Tel: 505-272-5649, Fax: 505-272-1421, E-mail: eprossnitz@salud.unm.edu

3.1 ABSTRACT

Arrestins were originally described as molecules that bound ligand-activated, phosphorylated G protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) to block further G protein signaling. Subsequently, they were demonstrated to mediate internalization of the β 2-adrenergic and other GPCRs. In addition to blocking G protein signaling and mediating GPCR internalization, arrestins recruit a number of signaling proteins including, but not limited to, Src family kinases, ERK1/2, and JNK3. GPCR-arrestin binding can control the spatial and temporal signaling of these signaling complexes. In previous reports, we have shown that *N*-formyl peptide receptor- (FPR) mediated apoptosis, which occurs upon receptor stimulation in the absence of arrestins, is associated with receptor accumulation in the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome. Under these conditions, inhibition of Src kinase and ERK1/2 rescued cells from apoptosis. To better understand the role of Src kinase in these processes, we used an arrestin-2 mutant deficient in Src binding (P91G/P121E). Unlike wild type arrestin, this mutant did not inhibit FPR-mediated apoptosis. However, cells expressing this mutant could be rescued by Src kinase inhibition with PP2. Finally, PP2, while inhibiting apoptosis in the presence of arr2-P91G/P121E, did not prevent FPR accumulation in the perinuclear recycling endosome. On the contrary, Src kinase inhibition by PP2 caused wild type arrestin-2 to accumulate in the recycling endosome without initiating FPR-mediated apoptosis. Based on these observations, we conclude that Src kinase has two independent roles with respect to arrestin-2 binding in FPR signaling and trafficking.

3.2 INTRODUCTION

Arrestins were originally described as cytosolic proteins that bound phosphorylated G protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) (Pierce and Lefkowitz, 2001). Through binding to phosphorylated GPCRs, arrestins sterically block the binding of heterotrimeric G proteins. This inhibits the GDP-GTP exchange of the $G\alpha$ subunit and abates G protein signaling cascades. This was believed to be their primary function. Subsequently, arrestins were discovered to mediate GPCR internalization (Ferguson, 2001). Binding sites for adaptor protein (AP)-2 and clathrin were described within the C-terminus of arrestin (Goodman et al., 1997; Kim and Benovic, 2002; Milano et al., 2002). Classical GPCRs such as the beta2-adrenergic receptor (β 2-AR) (Laporte et al., 1999) and the angiotensin II (Type 1A) receptor (AT_{1A}R) (Fessart et al., 2005) require arrestin and subsequent AP-2 and clathrin binding for proper internalization. In addition, arrestin-bound Src kinase is also required for proper internalization of the β 2-AR (Luttrell et al., 1999). However, receptors including, but not limited to, the *N*-formyl peptide receptor (FPR) (Vines et al., 2003) and m2-muscarinic acetylcholine receptor (Pals-Rylandsdam et al., 1997) do not require arrestin for ligand-dependent internalization.

More recently, arrestins have been described as scaffolds for non-G protein GPCR signaling complexes. Signaling proteins including Src kinase (Luttrell et al., 1999), ERK1/2 (Tohgo et al., 2002), JNK3 (McDonald et al., 2000) bind arrestins and are activated by ligand-bound GPCRs. It is hypothesized that arrestins recruit activated signaling mediators to activated GPCR signaling

scaffolds to prevent crosstalk. For example, following β 2-AR activation in the absence of arrestin binding, ERK1/2 is phosphorylated and translocated to the nucleus where it activates downstream effectors leading to changes in transcription (Tohgo et al., 2002). On the other hand, when ERK1/2 is phosphorylated in the context of a GPCR-arrestin scaffold, activated ERK1/2 remains in the cytosol and activates unknown effector molecules (Kim et al., 2005; Shenoy et al., 2006). Processes affected by the latter form of ERK1/2 activation are, as of yet, unknown.

Arrestin-Src kinase interaction is the best described of the signaling scaffolds mentioned above. This interaction is necessary for such processes as cell migration and degranulation (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004). In addition, disruption of the interaction between arrestin-2 and Src kinase, by mutation of arrestins, decreased the phosphorylation of ERK1/2 in response to β 2-AR activation (Luttrell et al., 1999). However, this disruption had no effect on ERK1/2 phosphorylation following stimulation of AT_{1A}R. Finally, proper interaction between arrestin-2 and Src kinase is required to phosphorylate tyrosine residues in AP-2 (Fessart et al., 2005). Without phosphorylation of AP-2, the AT_{1A}R does not internalize in response to activation by ligand.

In the absence of arrestins, FPR activation leads to receptor accumulation in the Rab11, perinuclear endosomes (Vines et al., 2003) and apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). Apoptosis was rescued by reconstitution of cells with wild type arrestin-2 or by pretreating cells with inhibitors of Src family kinases, ERK1/2, JNK3 and p38. In addition, arrestin-2 mutants that have altered binding

to AP-2 did not rescue apoptosis and prevented recycling from the Rab11 endosome (Chapter 2).

Whereas arrestins control early signaling and trafficking events for many GPCRs, it has become apparent that arrestins control post-endocytic events of the FPR. As the interaction between arrestin-2 and Src kinase can mediate both GPCR internalization via AP-2 and activation of ERK1/2, we hypothesized that decreased binding of Src kinase to arrestin-2 would lead to FPR accumulation in the recycling endosome and aberrant activation of ERK1/2 thereby initiating apoptosis. To this end, we used a mutant of arrestin-2 (arr2-P91G/P121E) that has been previously described to exhibit decreased binding to Src kinase in response to β 2-AR activation (Luttrell et al., 1999) to better understand the role of arrestin-2-Src kinase interaction in FPR trafficking and signaling. Our results demonstrate two independent roles for Src kinase in its association with arrestin-2 that independently regulate FPR signaling and trafficking.

3.3 RESULTS

3.3.1. Src kinase binding-deficient arrestin mutant does not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis.

We have previously shown that FPR-mediated apoptosis is inhibited by signaling inhibitors of p38, p44/42, JNK and Src family kinases (Revankar et al., 2004). Arrestins are thought to serve as scaffolds in signaling complexes to control temporal and spatial signaling (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003). To better understand how arrestins control signaling within the context of FPR activation and apoptosis, we used a mutant of arrestin-2 that is deficient in Src kinase binding (arr2-P91G/P121E) (Luttrell et al., 1999). This mutant does not support ERK1/2 phosphorylation in response to β 2-AR activation and inhibits the internalization of this receptor.

To determine whether arrestin-Src interaction plays a role in FPR signaling, we examined the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant for its ability to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis (Figure 3.1A). In the absence of ligand, cells expressing any of the GFP vectors were not stained with propidium iodide (PI) demonstrating a dependence on receptor activation. Large fractions of arr-2^{-/-}-3^{-/-} FPR cells expressing EGFP vector (no arrestins present) stained with PI (>90%) consistent with previous reports (Revankar et al., 2004). In contrast, when arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-} FPR cells are activated in the presence of wild type arrestin-2-GFP, very few cells stained with PI (<5%). When arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-} FPR cells are activated in the presence of this mutant, a large proportion of cells (>90%) stained with PI. This

led us to conclude that arrestin-Src regulated non-G protein GPCR signaling and prevented FPR-mediated apoptosis.

Our previous report (Revankar et al., 2004) has described this phenomenon in detail; including annexin V staining, caspase involvement and PI staining and these data confirm that this process is FPR- and caspase-dependent apoptosis. To confirm that the observed PI staining was apoptosis, *arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells expressing GFP-fused arrestins were assayed for apoptosis in the presence of zVAD-FMK (pan-caspase inhibitor) (data not shown). Cells expressing EGFP and *arr2*-P91G/P121E, were not stained with PI in the presence of caspase inhibitor (<5%), but were stained at high levels in the presence of vehicle (>90%). Wild-type arrestin-2 expressing cells did not stain in either case.

3.3.2. Inhibition of Src kinase rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis in the presence of the P91G/P121E arrestin mutant.

Overexpression of *arr2*-P91G/P121E inhibits ERK1/2 activation in response to β 2-AR activation (Luttrell et al., 1999). However, this mutant did not affect ERK1/2 activation by AT_{1A}R. These results demonstrated that Src association with arrestin was selectively required to activate ERK1/2 following stimulation of the β 2-AR. To determine whether Src kinase activity was required to initiate apoptosis in response to FPR stimulation, independent of arrestin-2, we used the Src family kinase inhibitor, PP2, (Figure 3.1B). In the *arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells expressing EGFP and the *arr2*-P91G/P121E mutant <5% stained with PI in the presence of PP2, while >90% stained in the presence of vehicle. In the *arr-2^{-/-}*

$^{-/-}$ FPR cells expressing arr2-WT only ~5% stained in the presence of either vehicle or PP2.

Because PP2 is a general inhibitor of Src family kinases, we confirmed that our results were due to inhibition of Src kinase activity and not one of the other family members subject to this inhibitor. Accordingly, arr-2 $^{-/-}$ -3 $^{-/-}$ FPR cells were cotransfected with GFP-fused arrestins and either wild type or kinase dead (K298M) Src kinase (Figure 3.1C). In the absence of FPR stimulation only ~5% of the cells stained with PI, indicating apoptosis did not occur. In the presence of wild type Src kinase, only arr-2 $^{-/-}$ -3 $^{-/-}$ FPR cells expressing EGFP or arr2-P91G/P121E (>90%) stained with PI, consistent with the above results (Figure 3.1A). In arr-2 $^{-/-}$ -3 $^{-/-}$ FPR cells expressing GFP-fused arrestins and kinase dead Src kinase, <5% cells were stained with PI in response to FPR activation, suggesting that Src kinase activity was required to induce the apoptotic phenotype (Figure 3.1B). These data suggest that although expression of an arrestin mutant with decreased binding to Src kinase does not rescue apoptosis. However, inhibition of Src kinase activity with PP2 does rescue apoptosis indicating that Src kinase signaling does play a role in FPR-mediated apoptosis.

3.3.3. Src kinase does not affect FPR internalization.

FPR internalization is required for FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins (Revankar et al., 2004). Based on these data, we expected that in the presence of the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant, the FPR would internalize upon activation. Maximum internalization of the FPR in the presence of the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant is similar to FPR internalization in the presence of EGFP

and Arr2-WT (Figure 3.2A). In addition, the rate of FPR internalization was unaffected (data not shown). Because PP2 was capable of inhibiting FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins and presence of Arr2-P91G/P121E-GFP, we tested FPR internalization in the presence of GFP-fused arrestins and PP2. Although Src kinase activity was required for FPR-mediated apoptosis in the *arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-}* FPR cells (Revankar et al., 2004) or presence of *arr2*-P91G/P121E-GFP (Figure 3.1B and C) neither PP2 nor vehicle had any effect on the internalization of the FPR (Figure 3.2B). These data suggest that FPR-mediated apoptosis is not being rescued due to inhibition of FPR internalization.

3.3.4. P91G/P121E mutant alters normal FPR trafficking.

FPR-arrestin complex accumulation in the Rab11-positive, perinuclear recycling endosome correlates directly with FPR-mediated apoptosis (Chapter 2). To determine whether the *arr2*-P91G/P121E mutant accumulated in the recycling endosome, RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11 WT were transiently expressed in *arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-}* FPR cells. The FPR was activated with Alexa 633-*N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine (633-6pep) for 1 hour and ligand-FPR-arrestin complexes were tracked using confocal fluorescence microscopy (Figure 3.3A). In all cases, arrestin was distributed throughout the cytosol and Rab11 was localized in a perinuclear location in unstimulated cells (data not shown, Chapter 2). In the presence of mRFP1 alone, the FPR accumulated in the Rab11 compartment with no significant ligand-receptor complexes present outside this area. In the presence of *arr2*-WT-mRFP, receptor-arrestin complexes were localized to the Rab11 compartment.

However, significant amounts of receptor-arrestin complexes were present outside the Rab11 compartment in endocytic vesicles. These phenotypes are consistent with the FPR's ability to traffic normally in the presence of wild type arrestin-2 (Chapter 2). In the presence of Arr2-P91G/P121E-RFP, receptor-arrestin complexes accumulate in the Rab11 compartment and very little receptor-arrestin complex was seen outside this compartment. This is consistent with the inability of the FPR to recycle and has been hypothesized as an underlying cause of FPR-mediated apoptosis (Chapter 2). These results demonstrate that the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant binds activated receptor.

3.3.5. Inhibition of Src kinase alters normal FPR trafficking.

Because arrestins play a critical role in normal FPR post-endocytic trafficking (Chapter 2) and FPR-mediated apoptosis was inhibited by PP2 in the presence of Arr2-P91G/P121E, we hypothesized that PP2 restores normal FPR-arrestin complex trafficking. To test this hypothesis, we used transfected arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells stimulated in the presence of PP2 or vehicle (Figure 3.3B). Vehicle did not affect FPR-arrestin trafficking (Figure 3.7A). Use of PP2 demonstrated no effect on FPR trafficking in the absence of arrestins (mRFP1) as receptor accumulated in the Rab11 compartment. Interestingly, PP2 inhibitor did not affect the trafficking of the FPR in the presence of the P91G/P121E mutant as receptor-arrestin complexes were retained in the Rab11 endosome. Furthermore, in the presence of wild type arrestin-2, PP2 lead to accumulation of the receptor-arrestin complex in the Rab11 recycling endosome. Our results

suggest Src kinase activity is necessary for normal trafficking of FPR-arrestin complexes.

To confirm that this was due to inhibition of Src kinase specifically, the same assay was performed with cells co-transfected with wild type Src kinase or kinase dead Src kinase. Wild type Src kinase had no effect on the trafficking of any of the receptor-arrestin complexes (Figure 3.7B) similar to vehicle (Figure 3.7A). The use of kinase dead Src kinase yielded the same results as the use of PP2 (Figure 3.3C) in which all ligand-FPR-arrestin complexes accumulated in the Rab11 compartment.

3.3.6. P91G/P121E arrestin mutant alters FPR dynamics with AP complexes.

Our previous results demonstrated a role for AP-2 in FPR post-endocytic trafficking (Chapter 2). In this study, we determined that AP-2 must bind and release arrestin to allow FPR to exit the perinuclear recycling endosome. Previous reports demonstrate that Src kinase regulates arrestin-AP-2 interaction to control AT_{1A}R internalization (Fessart et al., 2005). To better understand the role of Src kinase in arrestin-AP-2 interaction, we utilized *arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells transfected with the GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2 and RFP-fused arrestins to monitor trafficking via confocal fluorescence microscopy (Figure 3.4A). Antibody staining of the α -subunit of AP-2 confirmed that the α -GFP subunit represented endogenous AP-2 (Chapter 2). In unstimulated cells, arrestins showed a cytosolic distribution with AP-2 which was also present in membrane-associated puncta, consistent with previous data (data not shown, Chapter 2). In the

absence of arrestins, following a one hour stimulation of the FPR with 633-6pep, AP-2 failed to colocalize with FPR in the perinuclear region. In contrast, as reported in the presence of wild type arrestin (Chapter 2), AP-2 colocalized with FPR and arr2-WT in the perinuclear region. Interestingly, in the presence of the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant, AP-2 colocalized with receptor-arrestin complex in the perinuclear region suggesting arrestin-AP-2 binding occurs despite the fact that arrestin may not bind Src kinase.

We have shown that AP-1 colocalizes with receptor-associated vesicles outside the perinuclear region only in the presence of wild type arrestin-2 (Chapter 2). Because FPR-arr2-P91G/P121E complexes accumulate in the perinuclear recycling endosome, we hypothesized that arr2-P91G/P121E would not colocalize with AP-1 vesicles outside of the recycling endosome consistent with FPR post-endocytic trafficking in the presence of arrestin mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. To test this hypothesis, we used arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and the GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1 (Figure 3.4B). Antibody staining of the γ -subunit of AP-1 confirmed that the γ -GFP subunit reveals the localization of endogenous AP-1 (Chapter 2). In unstimulated cells, arrestins were cytosolic and AP-1 was localized in a perinuclear region consistent with previous data (data not shown, Chapter 2). When cells were stimulated for 1 hour by 633-6pep in the absence of arrestins (mRFP1), the FPR accumulated in the AP-1-positive endosome with no little ligand outside this compartment. In the presence of Arr2-WT, receptor-arrestin complex was colocalized with AP-1 in a perinuclear region, but receptor-arrestin-

AP-1 vesicles were also present throughout the cell. As expected, Arr2-P91G/P121E colocalized with AP-1 and receptor in the perinuclear region and not vesicles outside this area consistent with the inhibition of normal FPR trafficking.

3.3.7. ERK1/2 signaling plays a role in Src- and FPR- mediated apoptosis.

While arr2-P91G/P121E has decreased Src association and inhibits ERK1/2 activation in response to β 2-AR activation, ERK1/2 activation in response to AT_{1A}R activation is not impaired (Luttrell et al., 1999). In addition, GPCR-arrestin-Src scaffolds regulate localized activation of ERK1/2 and therefore other downstream processes (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003). Because Src has a clear role in FPR-mediated apoptosis (Figure 3.1) and because ERK1/2 inhibitors can inhibit FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins (Revankar et al., 2004), we wanted to understand ERK1/2's role with respect to the arr2-P91G/P121E mutant. To this end, we performed apoptosis assays using arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transfected with GFP-fused arrestins in the presence of ERK1/2 inhibitors (Figure 3.5). In the presence of vehicle, apoptosis in cells transfected with GFP alone and arr2-P91G/P121E-GFP is >90% and with wild type arrestin-2 is <5% consistent with previous data (Figure 3.1B). In the presence of MEK inhibitors U0126 or PD98059, transfected cells did not stain with PI (<5%) indicating that these inhibitors could stop FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of the P91G/P121E mutant. These results lead us to hypothesize that Src kinase may be aberrantly activating ERK1/2 in the absence of arrestin binding.

3.4 DISCUSSION

Receptor trafficking and signaling are intimately related within the cell and their proper control is paramount for proper cell function. We have previously demonstrated that these processes are linked by the fact that arrestin mutants that alter FPR signaling also alter its post-endocytic trafficking. Previous results have also suggested a role for Src kinase within these processes. In our present study, we used an arrestin mutant (P91G/P121E) previously shown to be defective in binding to Src kinase (Luttrell et al., 1999). We demonstrated that this mutant was incapable of rescuing FPR-mediated apoptosis, but that cell death in the presence of this mutant was rescued by inhibition of Src kinase or ERK1/2 activity. Additionally, this mutant and Src kinase inhibition did not affect FPR internalization. Finally, our results indicated that FPR-arr2-P91G/P121E complexes accumulate in the perinuclear recycling endosome with Rab11, AP-2 and AP-1. Although Src kinase inhibition rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis in the presence of arr2-P91G/P121E, it did not restore normal trafficking. Interestingly, Src kinase inhibition caused accumulation of FPR-arr2-WT in the Rab11 endosome without initiating cell death. These results indicate that Src kinase has two independent roles with respect to arrestin binding: one that controls its trafficking and one that controls non-G protein FPR signaling.

The most interesting results from our study involve the roles of Src kinase-arrestin interaction on FPR trafficking and signaling. The P91G/P121E arrestin mutant (decreased binding to Src kinase) did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. However, inhibition of Src kinase and ERK1/2 activity in the presence

of this mutant did prevent cell death. These results indicate that proper arrestin-Src kinase binding is necessary to control non-G protein FPR signaling. Interestingly, Src kinase and ERK1/2 are active in the absence of binding to arrestin-2. Where and how these signaling proteins are being activated by FPR stimulation is unclear at this time. Perhaps there is unknown, non-G protein GPCR activation of cellular signaling that is arrestin-independent. Alternatively, arrestin-2 binding to other proteins not affected by Src kinase binding may activate these pathways. For example, the ubiquitous signaling molecule calmodulin binds arrestins (Wu et al., 2006) and the effects of this binding on GPCR signaling are currently unknown.

Another interesting result from our study involves the role of arrestin-Src kinase interaction in FPR trafficking. Our Src kinase-binding deficient arrestin mutant allowed accumulation of FPR-arrestin complexes in the perinuclear region with Rab11, AP-2 and AP-1. This is not surprising given the fact that FPR-mediated apoptosis and FPR trafficking defects have been linked in previous work (Chapter 2). However, while Src kinase inhibition rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis, it did not restore normal FPR-arrestin trafficking. Furthermore, inhibition of Src kinase in the presence of wild type arrestin-2 caused FPR-arrestin complexes to accumulate in the perinuclear recycling endosome without initiating apoptosis. These results indicate a role for Src kinase in normal FPR post-endocytic trafficking. Previous reports have indicated that phosphorylation of tyrosine residues on AP-2 is necessary to release it from arrestin and mediate internalization of the AT_{1A}R (Fessart et al., 2005). Additionally, our previous

results suggest that binding and release of AP-2 from arrestin-2 is necessary to insure proper post-endocytic trafficking of the FPR (Chapter 2). Finally, our results indicate an accumulation of AP-2 with FPR-arrestin in the perinuclear recycling endosome in the absence of Src kinase activity. Therefore, we hypothesize in the absence of arrestin-2 binding or inhibition of its activity, Src kinase cannot phosphorylate arrestin-bound AP-2 in the perinuclear recycling endosome. This leads to accumulation of FPR-arrestin in this region and is independent of Src kinase's role in apoptotic signaling.

Finally, our previous results have shown that FPR internalization is not dependent on clathrin, AP-2, or arrestin (Chapter 2). In this study, we demonstrate further that FPR internalization is independent of Src kinase. Our data demonstrate that FPR internalization extent and rate was not affected by an arrestin mutant that does not bind Src kinase (P91G/P121E) and use of PP2. While the factors that control FPR internalization remain unclear at this time, possible candidates include G protein-receptor kinases and ADP-ribosylation factor 6. Both of these proteins have shown effects on internalization of the β 2-AR (Clainig et al., 2001) and m2-muscarinic acetylcholine receptor (Roseberry and Hosey, 2001), respectively.

Based on our results, we present a model for the two independent roles Src kinase plays in FPR trafficking and signaling (Figure 3.6). In this model, following ligand binding the FPR activates G proteins which, in turn, activate Src kinase-mediated apoptotic signaling pathways. The FPR internalizes in an arrestin-independent manner. After, or perhaps during internalization, the FPR

binds arrestin (wild type or P91G/P121E), resulting in the presence of FPR/arrestin complexes in early endosomes. At some point during its trafficking to the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (or after its arrival at this location) the FPR-arrestin complex recruits AP-2. At this point (or earlier), Src kinase is recruited to the FPR-wild type arrestin-AP2 complex and initiates anti-apoptotic signaling pathways to counter G protein-mediated apoptotic signaling. In addition, Src kinase phosphorylates AP-2 leading to its dissociation from arrestin. This results in FPR-arrestin egress from the perinuclear recycling endosome. Along the path to the cell surface the complex dissociates and the FPR is dephosphorylated. Finally, the FPR completes its return to the cell surface in a resensitized form ready to continue signaling. Alternately, FPR-arr2-P91G/P121E-AP-2 complex accumulates in the perinuclear recycling endosome due to inability to bind Src kinase without subsequent phosphorylation of AP-2. This, in turn, inhibits Src kinase from initiating anti-apoptotic signaling within the context of a GPCR-arrestin signaling scaffold.

This report elucidates two independent roles for Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling. To our knowledge, this is the first indication that Src kinase has multiple roles within the same GPCR signaling complex: one in control of its trafficking and one in mediating proper cellular signaling. Both of these roles are properly regulated with binding to arrestin-2. Our results clarify a role for arrestin-2 in the spatial and temporal control of non-G protein GPCR signaling and serve as a model for further study. An interesting question that arises from this work is: do trafficking defects alter cell signaling or vice-versa?

We plan to answer this question in the future with further analysis of SH3-binding domains within arrestin-2 to establish a framework for the regulation of these processes. With this report of novel roles for arrestins and Src kinase in the trafficking and signaling of GPCRs, new avenues for the targeting of GPCR function are presented that may lead to therapeutic interventions for disease processes.

3.5 MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.5.1. Materials, Plasmids and Mutagenesis – All materials are from Sigma unless otherwise specified. Arr2-P91G/P121E-GFP was created by using two-step PCR mutagenesis. Briefly, primer pairs 5'-GCCCATATGGGCGACAAAGGGACGCGG-3' and 5'-GCCCAGCTTCTTGATGAGGCGCTCCTGCAGCCGCGTCAGGGGCTTCTTGTCCTCACCGGCCGGCGGGAAAGACTGCACG-3' and primer pairs 5'-GCAGGAGCGCCTCATCAAGAAGCTGGGCGAGCATGCCTACCCTTTCACCTTGTAGATCCCTGAGAACTCCCATGCTCTGTGACTTTGCAGCCG-3' and 5'-GGATCCCGGGCCCATCTGTCTGTTGAGCCGCGG-3' were used to create N- and C-terminal fragments that contain each mutation respectively. Fragments were purified and amplified using the outside primers to create an Arr2-P91G/P121E fragment containing HindIII/ApaI restriction sites. Standard subcloning procedures were used to insert this fragment into EGFP or mRFP1 vector. mRFP1, Arr2-WT-RFP, EGFP, Arr2-WT-GFP, Rab11-WT-GFP, γ -subunit (AP-1)-GFP and α -subunit (AP-2)-GFP are previously described (Chapter 2). Murine wild type and kinase dead Src kinase are gifts from Steve Abcouwer (Upstate Cell Signaling Solutions).

3.5.2. Cell Culture and Transfection – Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were grown in Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM) with 10% fetal bovine serum, 100 units/mL penicillin and 100units/mL streptomycin at 37°C and 5% CO₂. Transient transfections of arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were performed with Lipofectamine 2000 according to manufacturer's instructions.

3.5.3 Apoptosis – Apoptosis assay was performed as previously described (Revankar et al., 2004). Briefly, *arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected and plated on 12mm glass coverslips. The next day, cells were serum-starved for 30 minutes and incubated with serum-free medium (SFM) for 5 hours with 10nM formyl-methionyl-leucyl-phenylalanine (fMLF) or vehicle at 37°C. Propidium iodide (PI) was then added to a final concentration of 100pg/ μ L for 5-10 minutes at room temperature. Coverslips were washed and fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde and mounted using Vectashield. Random fields were viewed by fluorescence microscopy until 100-300 GFP expressing cells were assayed. GFP cells were scored for the presence of PI staining. Data are expressed as mean PI positive/GFP cell.

3.5.4. Internalization – Internalization was performed as previously described (Vines et al., 2003). Briefly, transiently transfected *arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-}* FPR cells were grown to confluence and harvested by trypsinization. Cells were incubated with 1 μ M fMLF and aliquots were removed to cold SFM at 0, 2, 5, 10, 20 and 30 minutes. Cells were washed extensively with cold SFM to remove excess fMLF. Cells were then resuspended in cold SFM containing 10 nM Alexa633-N-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine (633-6pep) and analyzed using a Becton Dickinson FACSCalibur at appropriate wavelengths. Live cells were gated using forward- and side-scatter parameters. Cells expressing the GFP-fused protein of interest were gated using FL-1 and mean channel fluorescence (MCF) was measured in FL-4 to determine amount of cell surface receptor. Non-specific background was determined by labeling *arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-}* cells

not expressing the FPR with 10nM 633-6pep and assaying as described. Non-specific binding was subtracted before further analysis. MCF from unstimulated cells represented 100% FPR cell surface expression. Cell surface expression from stimulated cells was calculated by dividing the MCF following treatment by the MCF from unstimulated cells. Internalization data were then plotted using GraphPad Prism to calculate maximum internalization extents using a one phase exponential decay.

3.5.5. Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy – Microscopy was performed as previously described (Vines et al., 2003). Briefly, *arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with plasmids described. Cells were plated on 25mm coverslips, grown overnight and serum-starved for 30 minutes. Cells were then incubated in SFM containing 10nM 633-6pep for the indicated times. Cells were washed with PBS, fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde and mounted using Vectashield. Fluorescence images were acquired using a Zeiss LSM 510 inverted laser scanning microscope equipped with He-Ne and Kr-AR lasers.

3.6. FOOTNOTES

We thank Charlotte Vines for helpful comments during the preparation of this manuscript. Flow cytometry data and confocal images in this study were generated in the Flow Cytometry and Fluorescence Microscopy Facilities, respectively, at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, which received support from NCRR 1 S10 RR14668, NSF MCB9982161, NCRR P20 RR11830, NCI R24 CA88339, the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, and the University of New Mexico Cancer Center. This work was funded by grant BC030217 from the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program to B.M.W. and NIH grants AI36357 and GM68901 to E.R.P.

3.7. ABBREVIATIONS

AP-1—adaptor protein-1 complex

AP-2—adaptor protein-2 complex

Arr2—arrestin-2

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR—arrestin-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} knockout MEF cells stably expressing the FPR

fMLF—*N*-formyl-Methionyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanine

FPR—*N*-formyl peptide receptor

GPCR—G protein-coupled receptor

MEF—mouse embryonic fibroblast

PI—propidium iodide

SFM—serum-free medium (DMEM)

6pep—*N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine

3.8. FIGURE LEGENDS

3.8.1 Figure 3.1. Inhibition of Src kinase, but not expression of Arr2-

P91G/P121E, rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis. Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with constructs described, stimulated with 10nM fMLF and stained with PI. Random fields were viewed by fluorescence microscopy until 100-300 cells GFP cells were counted. GFP cells were scored for the presence of PI staining. Data are expressed as mean PI positive/GFP cell +/- SEM from three independent experiments. **A)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and incubated with DMSO or PP2 (10nM, 30 min) before and during stimulation. **C)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and either wild type Src kinase or kinase dead (K298M) Src kinase.

3.8.2 Figure 3.2. FPR internalization is not affected by arrestins or Src

inhibition. **A)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and assayed for internalization. Data are expressed as mean maximum internalization +/- SEM from three independent experiments. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins, pre-incubated with PP2 (10nM, 30 min) and assayed for internalization in the presence of inhibitor. Data are expressed as mean maximum internalization +/- SEM from three independent experiments.

3.8.3. Figure 3.3. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11

in response to Src inhibition. Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with constructs listed individually below. Cells were stimulated with

10nM 633-6pep for 1 hour and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Images are representative of three independent experiments. **A)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11-WT. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11-WT. Cells were incubated with PP2 (10nM, 30min) before and during stimulation **C)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11-WT, RFP-fused arrestins and kinase dead Src kinase.

3.8.4. Figure 3.4. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with AP-2 and AP-1.

Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with constructs described. Cells were stimulated with 10nM 633-6pep for 1 hour and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Images are representative of three independent experiments. **A)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1.

3.8.5. Figure 3.5. FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of P91G/P121E is sensitive to ERK inhibition.

Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and pre-incubated with U0126 (10 μ M, 30 min), PD98059 (25 μ M, 30 min) or DMSO. Cells were stimulated with 10nM fMLF and stained with PI. Five random fields were viewed by fluorescence microscopy until 100-300 cells GFP cells were counted. GFP cells were scored for the presence of PI staining. Data are expressed as mean PI positive/GFP cell +/- SEM from three independent experiments.

3.8.6. Figure 3.6. Role of Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling.

Based on our results, we present a model for the two independent roles Src kinase plays in FPR trafficking and signaling. In this model, following ligand binding the FPR activates G proteins which, in turn, activate Src kinase-mediated apoptotic signaling pathways. The FPR internalizes in an arrestin-independent manner. After, or perhaps during internalization, the FPR binds arrestin (wild type or P91G/P121E), resulting in the presence of FPR/arrestin complexes in early endosomes. At some point during its trafficking to the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (or after its arrival at this location) the FPR-arrestin complex recruits AP-2. At this point (or earlier), Src kinase is recruited to the FPR-wild type arrestin-AP2 complex and initiates anti-apoptotic signaling pathways to counter G protein-mediated apoptotic signaling. In addition, Src kinase phosphorylates AP-2 leading to its dissociation from arrestin. This results in FPR-arrestin egress from the perinuclear recycling endosome. Along the path to the cell surface the complex dissociates and the FPR is dephosphorylated. Finally, the FPR completes its return to the cell surface in a resensitized form ready to continue signaling. Alternately, FPR-arr2-P91G/P121E-AP-2 complex accumulates in the perinuclear recycling endosome due to inability to bind Src kinase without subsequent phosphorylation of AP-2. This, in turn, inhibits Src kinase from initiating anti-apoptotic signaling within the context of a GPCR-arrestin signaling scaffold. This figure was generated using ScienceSlides (www.visislides.com).

3.8.7. Figure 3.7. Vehicle and Src wild type do not alter FPR-arrestin trafficking phenotypes. Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with constructs listed individually below. Cells were stimulated with 10nM 633-6pep for 1 hour and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Images are representative of three independent experiments. **A)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11-WT. Cells were incubated with PP2 (10nM, 30min) before and during stimulation **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11-WT, RFP-fused arrestins and kinase dead Src kinase.




Figure 3.1. Inhibition of Src kinase, but not expression of Arr2-P91G/P121E, rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis.




Figure 3.2. FPR internalization is not affected by arrestins or Src inhibition.

A. Control




Figure 3.3A. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11.

B. PP2




Figure 3.3B. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11 in response to Src inhibition.

C. Src KD




Figure 3.3C. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with Rab11 in response to Src inhibition.




Figure 3.4. FPR-arrestin complexes traffic differentially with AP-2 and AP-1.




Figure 3.5. FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of P91G/P121E is sensitive to ERK inhibition.




Figure 3.6. Role of Src kinase in FPR trafficking and signaling.




Figure 3.7. Vehicle and Src wild type do not alter FPR-arrestin trafficking phenotypes.

4. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding domains differentially regulate *N*-formyl peptide receptor trafficking and signaling

To be submitted to *Traffic*

Arrestin-2 SH3-binding domains differentially regulate *N*-formyl peptide receptor trafficking and signaling

Nicole A. Marjon[‡], Brant M. Wagener[‡] and Eric R. Prossnitz*

Department of Cell Biology and Physiology and
UNM Cancer Research and Treatment Center
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
Albuquerque, NM 87131, USA

Running title: Arrestin SH3-domains regulate FPR trafficking and signaling

[‡] These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author:
Eric R. Prossnitz
MSC 08 4750
University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center
Tel: (505) 272-5649
Fax: (505) 272-1421
E-mail: eprossnitz@salud.unm.edu

4.1 ABSTRACT

Arrestin binding to Src kinase is an important event that regulates localized activation of MAPK signaling cascades and cellular proliferation. This interaction is controlled by SH3-binding domains (P-X-X-P) within arrestin at three locations: P88/P91, P121/P124 and P175/P178. When this interaction is disrupted by mutation of prolines within SH3-binding domains, ERK1/2 activation is decreased upon activation of the β 2-adrenergic receptor. In a recent report, we demonstrated that arrestin-Src kinase interaction was vital to proper regulation of *N*-formyl peptide receptor- (FPR) mediated signaling, trafficking and apoptosis. We elucidated two roles for arrestin-Src kinase interaction in these processes. First, Src kinase was hypothesized to control trafficking of the FPR by phosphorylating tyrosine residues in the adaptor protein (AP)-2 complex to release AP-2 from arrestin and allow egress of the FPR from the perinuclear recycling endosome. Second, Src kinase activity was also necessary to mediate FPR-mediated apoptosis independent of FPR trafficking. An important question that arose from this work was whether altered trafficking of the FPR lead to aberrant Src kinase-MAPK signaling or vice-versa. In order to understand the mechanisms of FPR trafficking and signaling that lead to FPR-mediated apoptosis, we generated three mutants of arrestin-2 in which prolines within SH3-binding domains were replaced with alanine. Our studies demonstrate two important results. First, arrestin-Src kinase binding is necessary to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis and one SH3-binding domain (P88-X-X-P91) controls this phenotype. Second, as FPR trafficking was not altered in the presence of any of

the arrestin mutants used in this study, we conclude that altered FPR signaling can occur without altered FPR trafficking. This study elucidates important mechanisms in G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) signaling and trafficking which will give insight to mechanisms of temporal and spatial control of GPCR signaling complexes.

4.2 INTRODUCTION

Arrestins are cytosolic proteins that have roles in mediating G protein-coupled receptor (GPCR) desensitization, internalization and non-G protein scaffold signaling (Reiter and Lefkowitz, 2006). These functions are controlled by arrestin binding to ligand-activated, C-terminal phosphorylated GPCRs, clathrin, adaptor protein (AP)-2 and Src kinase (Lefkowitz and Shenoy, 2005). Arrestin binding to these cellular components controls both the temporal and spatial signaling of GPCRs (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003). This, in turn, regulates various cellular functions including proliferation and migration.

Arrestin-Src kinase interaction is vital for mediating activation of extracellular-regulated kinase (ERK) 1/2 (Luttrell et al., 1999). When cells expressing the β 2-adrenergic receptor (β 2-AR) were transiently transfected with an arrestin mutant that exhibited decreased binding to Src kinase, ERK1/2 activation was decreased in response to stimulation with isoproterenol. This arrestin mutant also inhibited the internalization of the β 2-AR. Interestingly, ERK1/2 activation was not affected when cells expressing the angiotensin II (Type 1A) receptor (AT_{1A}R) were transfected with the same arrestin mutant and stimulated with angiotensin II.

An indirect interaction between Src kinase and arrestin also controls internalization of GPCRs. When arrestin and AP-2 were not allowed to dissociate, internalization of the AT_{1A}R was inhibited (Fessart et al., 2005). The authors went on to demonstrate that phosphorylation of tyrosine residues within AP-2 was necessary for arrestin and AP-2 to dissociate and internalization of the

AT1_AR to occur. Given that binding of AP-2 and arrestin are also necessary for proper GPCR internalization (Laporte et al., 1999), these results indicate that Src kinase plays an intimate role in arrestin-AP-2 interaction cycling.

Our previous results demonstrate that arrestin-Src kinase interaction is required for rescue of cells from *N*-formyl peptide receptor- (FPR) mediated apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). In addition, we showed that inhibition of Src kinase with PP2 could rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis, but not the associated trafficking defects (Chapter 3). In fact, inhibition of Src kinase activity led to aberrant FPR trafficking in the presence of wild type arrestin without initiating apoptosis. This result led us to believe that Src kinase plays two independent, arrestin-associated roles in FPR signaling and trafficking. One role is involved with control of FPR post-endocytic trafficking by phosphorylating AP-2 to allow its dissociation from arrestin and receptor egress from the perinuclear recycling endosome. The other role is to regulate proper FPR non-G protein scaffold signaling to prevent FPR-mediated apoptosis.

Our results were complicated by the fact that the arrestin-2 (arr2) mutant deficient in Src kinase binding contained mutations in individual SH3-binding domains (P91G and P121E). Therefore this led us to ask an important question in GPCR trafficking and signaling: Do GPCR signaling defects initiate GPCR trafficking defects or vice-versa? In order to answer this question, we further evaluated the role of SH3-binding domains (P-X-X-P) within arrestin-2 (P88/P91, P121/P124 and P175/P178). Prolines were mutated to alanine within individual SH-3 domains and evaluated for their ability to alter FPR-mediated signaling and

trafficking. In addition, arrestin mutants were designed that mimic the original arrestin mutant that has decreased binding to Src kinase to insure that our results were not due to changes in the secondary structure of arrestin-2 due to replacement of prolines with alanine. Our results demonstrate that altered arrestin-Src kinase interaction can alter FPR signaling without changing its normal trafficking. These results suggest that GPCR signaling may control GPCR trafficking, at least within the context of the FPR.

4.3 RESULTS

4.3.1. Mutations in SH3-binding domains of arrestin have differential effects on FPR-mediated apoptosis.

Previous results have demonstrated that mutation of individual prolines within multiple SH3-binding domains (P91G/P121E) do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis and cause receptor-arrestin complexes to accumulate within the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (Chapter 2). To better understand the role of arrestin-Src kinase interaction in FPR signaling and trafficking we generated three mutants of arrestin that mutated prolines in SH3-binding domains (P-X-X-P) to alanine (P88A/P91A, P121A/P124A and P175A/P178A). This method of analysis allows us to assess the individual contributions of arrestin-2 SH-3 binding to Src kinase in FPR signaling and trafficking.

Mouse embryonic fibroblasts (MEF) deficient in both arrestin-2 and -3, but stably expressing the FPR ($arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR), were used to assess arrestin-2 mutants in the absence of competition from endogenous arrestins. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were transiently transfected with empty GFP vector, arr2-WT-GFP and GFP-fused arrestin mutants and assayed for rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis (Figure 3.1A). Our use of propidium iodide (PI) staining has been validated previously (Revankar et al., 2004) as an accurate method of monitoring apoptosis. When GFP expressing cells were unstimulated, <10% of cells were stained with PI consistent with previous results exhibiting that apoptosis is FPR-dependent. When cells expressing empty GFP vector (absence of arrestins) were stimulated with *N*-formyl-Methionyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanine (fMLF), >90% of

cells stained with PI. However, cells expressing arr2-WT-GFP stained <10% with PI consistent with the ability of arrestin-2 to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells expressing GFP-fused mutants demonstrated differential ability to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. Arrestin-2 mutants with alterations in the first (P88A/P91A) and third (P175A/P178A) SH3-binding domains rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis (<10% PI staining. However, in cells expressing arr2-P121A/P124A-GFP, >90% of cells stained with PI. This indicates that the second SH3-binding domain of arrestin is responsible for regulating Src kinase binding and preventing FPR-mediated apoptosis.

To confirm that our results were due to activation of Src kinase in the absence of arrestin binding, we transiently transfected arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells with empty GFP vector, arr2-WT-GFP and arr2-P121A/P124A-GFP and inhibited Src kinase activity (with PP2, a Src family kinase inhibitor) during FPR stimulation (Figure 3.1B). In the presence of vehicle, empty GFP and arr2-P121A/P124A-GFP >90% transfected cells stained with PI while <10% of cells transfected with arr2-WT-GFP stained with PI. When cells were incubated with PP2, <10% of GFP cells stained with PI in all conditions. These results indicate that although Src kinase binding to arrestin may be decreased due to mutation of one of arrestin-2's SH3-binding domains, Src kinase activity initiates apoptotic signaling.

4.3.2. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by SH3-binding arrestin mutants is not due to inhibition of internalization.

In a previous report, a signaling competent, internalization-defective FPR mutant was incapable of initiating FPR-mediated apoptosis (Revankar et al.,

2004). Because internalization is required to initiate FPR-mediated apoptosis, we hypothesized those SH3-binding mutants that rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis may inhibit FPR internalization. To test this hypothesis, we transfected *arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells with GFP-fused arrestins and measured FPR internalization. FPR internalization extents were 60-70% for all GFP conditions (Figure 3.2) and rates of internalization were also similar (data not shown). Therefore, rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by SH3-binding mutants is not due to inhibition of FPR internalization.

4.3.3. SH3-binding mutants allow normal FPR trafficking.

Previous reports reveal FPR trafficking defects associated with arrestin-2 mutants that do not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis including mutation in AP-2 binding domains (F391A, 4A—Chapter 2) and Src-binding domains (P91G/P121E—Chapter 3). These arrestin mutants accumulate in the perinuclear recycling endosome, with little receptor-arrestin complex seen outside this location. Therefore, we hypothesized the *arr2*-P121A/P124A mutant would accumulate with the FPR in the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome. To test this hypothesis, *arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and Rab11-GFP and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy (Figure 3.3). In unstimulated cells, Rab11 is localized in a perinuclear location and arrestins are distributed throughout the cytosol consistent with a lack of FPR stimulation. When the FPR is stimulated with Alexa 633-*N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine (633-6pep) in the absence of arrestins (empty vector), ligand-FPR complexes accumulate in the Rab11 endosome with

little to no ligand outside this location (data not shown). When cells are transfected with mRFP-fused wild type arrestin-2 and stimulated with 633-6pep, ligand-FPR complexes are colocalized with the Rab11 endosome (data not shown). However, ligand-FPR complexes are distributed in vesicles throughout the cytosol. These phenotypes are consistent with previously published results (Chapter 2, (Vines et al., 2003). Interestingly, cells transfected with SH3-binding mutants are stimulated, all mutants have ligand-receptor complexes in vesicles within the cytosol as well as colocalized with the Rab11 endosome. Our results imply that while the arr2-P121A/P124A mutant does not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis, it does allow normal trafficking of the FPR.

AP complexes demonstrate differential trafficking patterns with FPR-arrestin signaling complexes (Chapter 2). AP-2 either accumulates with receptor-arrestin complexes in the Rab11 endosome or does not bind these complexes at all. AP-1 does colocalize with all mutants in the Rab11 endosome, but is only in vesicles outside this location with the FPR in the presence of wild type arrestin-2. We hypothesized that while FPR-SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with respect to the Rab11 compartment, they may have altered trafficking with either of the AP complexes.

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and either α -GFP and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy (AP-2, Figure 3.4A) or γ -GFP (AP-1, Figure 3.4B). In unstimulated cells, arrestins have a cytosolic distribution, AP-2 has some protein in the cytosol with most in puncta within the cell membrane and AP-1 is localized in a perinuclear region. In cells expressing

empty vector and stimulated with 633-6pep, AP-2 did not colocalize with ligand-FPR complexes in the perinuclear region. While AP-1 did colocalize with FPR in the perinuclear region, neither AP-1 nor ligand-FPR was outside this location (data not shown). When cells were stimulated with 633-6pep in the presence of wild type arrestin, both AP-2 and AP-1 colocalized with FPR-arrestin complexes in the perinuclear region. In addition, ligand-FPR-AP-1 complexes were localized outside the perinuclear region consistent with normal FPR trafficking. These phenotypes are consistent with previously published data (data not shown, Chapter 2). Once again, in the presence of all RFP-fused SH3-binding arrestin mutants, FPR-arrestin trafficking was similar to that of wild type arrestin-2. When stimulated, AP-2 and AP-1 were colocalized with FPR-arrestin complexes in the perinuclear region. However, FPR-arrestin-AP-1 complexes were trafficking outside the perinuclear region.

4.3.4. Individual SH-3 binding point mutations in arrestin differentially regulate FPR-mediated apoptosis.

In previous reports demonstrating that arrestin-Src kinase interaction regulate FPR trafficking and signaling (Chapter 3), we used a mutant containing individual point mutations within different SH3-binding domains. In previous sections, we have demonstrated that the second SH3-binding domain (P121/P124) alters FPR signaling by not rescuing FPR-mediated apoptosis, but demonstrated no effect on FPR trafficking. To remove the possibility that our results are due to mutations within SH3-binding domains that decrease arrestin-Src kinase binding and not alteration of arrestin-2 secondary structure, two

arrestin-2 mutants were generated with single point mutations (P91G and P121E). These mutants contain the same mutations as previous SH3-binding mutants described (P91G/P121E). However, they are done individually to more accurately describe the role of SH3-binding domains of arrestin-2 in FPR signaling and trafficking.

$Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were transfected with GFP-fused arrestin point mutations and assayed for rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis (Figure 3.5A). In unstimulated GFP-expressing cells, there is <10% PI staining. When the FPR is activated with fMLF, $arr2$ -WT and $arr2$ -P91G rescue apoptosis (<10% PI staining). However, empty GFP and $arr2$ -P121E cells were >90% PI positive. These results confirm that FPR-mediated apoptosis is due to mutations within the P121/P124 SH3-binding domain and not due to alteration of arrestin-2 secondary structure.

To confirm that Src kinase activity was necessary to initiate FPR-mediated apoptosis in the presence of the $arr2$ -P121E mutant, $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells expressing GFP-fused arrestins were assayed for apoptosis while incubated with PP2 (Figure 3.5B). In GFP cells incubated with vehicle, FPR activation did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins (empty vector) or the presence of $arr2$ -P121E (>90% PI staining). $Arr2$ -WT did rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis when incubated with vehicle (<10% PI staining). In the presence of PP2, all GFP cells were rescued from FPR-mediated apoptosis (<10% PI staining).

4.3.5. FPR internalization is not affected by arrestin-2 point mutations.

As previously mentioned, FPR-mediated apoptosis requires FPR internalization. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and FPR internalization was evaluated (Figure 3.6). In all GFP-expressing cells, FPR internalization extent varies between ~65-70% and rates of FPR internalization were similar (data not shown). These data indicate that rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis is not due to inhibition of its internalization.

4.3.6. Arrestin-2 SH-3 binding domain point mutations do not alter FPR trafficking.

To assess that normal FPR trafficking allowed by an arrestin mutant (P121A/P124A) was due to mutation of the SH3-binding domain and not due to alterations of arrestin-2 secondary structure, we assayed $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells expressing arrestin-2 point mutants fused to RFP for FPR trafficking with Rab11-GFP by confocal fluorescence microscopy (Figure 3.7). When the FPR was stimulated, both arrestin-2 point mutants colocalize with ligand-FPR in the Rab11 endosome. In addition, FPR-arrestin complexes were localized in vesicles outside the perinuclear region consistent with normal FPR trafficking (Chapters 2 and 3, (Vines et al., 2003).

To ascertain whether FPR and AP complexes traffic normally with arrestin SH3-binding point mutants, we used confocal fluorescence microscopy. $Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and either α -GFP or γ -GFP (Figures 3.8A and 3.8B, respectively). Upon stimulation of the FPR ligand-FPR-arrestin point mutant complexes colocalize with AP-2 and AP-1 in the

perinuclear region. Additionally, FPR-arrestin-AP-1 complexes are localized in vesicles outside the perinuclear region consistent with previous data evaluating normal FPR trafficking (Chapters 2 and 3).

4.4. DISCUSSION

Proper temporal and spatial control of GPCR signaling complexes is vital to proper cellular function. We have previously shown that FPR-mediated apoptosis is linked to receptor-arrestin accumulation in the perinuclear recycling endosome (Chapter 2). Additionally, we have demonstrated that two roles for Src kinase are involved in this process (Chapter 3). However, the Src binding-deficient mutant used in this work contained two point mutations in different SH3-binding domains of arrestin-2. An important question that arose from this work is whether altered FPR trafficking led to aberrant FPR signaling or vice-versa. We hypothesized that individual SH3-binding domains within arrestin-2 may be responsible cause aberrant trafficking and signaling sequentially. Our results indicate this is not the case.

In experiments to assay the effect of mutation of individual SH3-binding domains of arrestin-2 (P88A/P91A, P121A/P124A and P175A/P178A), we found the second SH3-binding domain (P121A/P124A) did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. However, none of the mutants assayed altered FPR internalization of post-endocytic trafficking. FPR-mediated apoptosis allowed by the P121A/P124A mutant was rescuable by inhibition of Src kinase activity. Because use of alanine to replace prolines within the SH3-binding domains could significantly alter arrestin-2 secondary structure, we also generated point mutants of arrestin-2 (P91G and P121E) that were exactly like the original mutant used (P91G/P121E, Chapter 3), but with mutation of only one SH3-binding domain at a time. The P121E mutant did not rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis (although

this was rescued by Src kinase inhibition) and neither mutant altered FPR trafficking.

These results suggest that FPR signaling and trafficking may operate independently (within the context of arrestin-Src kinase binding) rather than causally. Clearly, the second SH3-binding domain (P121/P124) is responsible for regulating FPR signaling complexes. However, it does not alter FPR trafficking. Additionally, the first domain (P88/P91) has no effect on FPR signaling and trafficking when mutated. It is only when both SH3-binding domains are mutated (P91G/P121E, Chapter 3) that defects in both FPR signaling and trafficking occur. This implies that Src kinase binding to either domain properly regulates FPR post-endocytic trafficking while mutation of the second domain (P121/P124) is sufficient to alter FPR signaling. Only when both domains are mutated, are alterations observed. A role for the third domain (P175/P178) is unclear at this time. By itself, this domain is not sufficient to rescue FPR from signaling and trafficking defects. However, its mutation does not alter FPR function in the assays we used. It is possible that this domain regulates some other function of FPR signaling or trafficking such as migration or degranulation.

Our findings elucidate differences in the regulation of FPR trafficking and signaling. Previously, we hypothesized a causal link between receptor-arrestin accumulation in the perinuclear recycling endosome and FPR-mediated apoptosis. However, our findings indicate this is not the case. It is clear that FPR signaling defects can occur independently of trafficking defects. Whether the opposite is true is unknown at this time. This report further elucidates the

intimate and intricate dualities of GPCR trafficking and signaling. Other GPCRs, such as the β 2-AR (Daaka et al., 1998), and receptor tyrosine kinases, such as the epidermal growth factor (Vieira et al., 1996) receptor also demonstrate a causal link between receptor internalization and ERK1/2 activation. Is it possible that trafficking and signaling can be altered independently of one another in these systems? The implication that receptor trafficking and signaling can be modified independently of other processes creates new avenues for the targeting of GPCR function that may lead to novel therapeutic interventions for disease processes.

4.5. MATERIALS AND METHODS

4.5.1. Plasmids

Empty GFP vector, Arr2-WT-GFP, Rab11-WT-GFP, γ -GFP (AP-1), α -GFP (AP-2), empty mRFP1 vector and Arr2-WT-RFP have been previously described (Chapter 2). Arrestin-2 mutants (P88A/P91A, P121A/P124A, P175A/P178A, P91G and P121E) were generated by site-directed mutagenesis using QuikChange Multi Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit (Stratagene) using Arr2-WT-GFP as the starting construct. RFP-fused arrestin-2 mutants were generated standard subcloning procedures and HindIII/ApaI restriction sites.

4.5.2. Cell Culture and Transfection

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were grown in DMEM with 10% fetal bovine serum, 100 units/mL penicillin and 100units/mL streptomycin at 37°C and 5% CO₂. Transient transfections of arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were performed with Lipofectamine 2000 according to manufacturer's instructions.

4.5.3. Apoptosis

Apoptosis of arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells was performed as previously described (Revankar et al., 2004). Briefly, arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins. Cells were then plated to 12mm glass coverslips and serum-starved for 30min. Cells were then stimulated with 10nM fMLF for 5 hours at 37°C. Propidium iodide (PI) was added to a final concentration of 100ng/mL for 5-10min at room temperature. Cell were washed with PBS, fixed and mounted with Vectashield. Slides were viewed by fluorescence microscopy and random fields were evaluated (at least five) until 100-300 GFP-expressing cells

were assayed. GFP-expressing cells were counted “positive” for cell death if they were stained with propidium iodide. Data are expressed as a percentage of PI-positive/GFP-expressing cells. For assays in which inhibitor was used, cells were treated with 10nM PP2 during serum-starvation and treatment remained throughout FPR stimulation.

4.5.4. Internalization

FPR internalization was assayed as previously described (Vines et al., 2003). Briefly, *arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins. Cells were harvested and resuspended in serum-free medium (SFM). The FPR was stimulated with 1µM fMLF and aliquots were removed at 3, 6, 10, 20 and 30min and added to pre-chilled SFM. One aliquot was removed before stimulation to measure total cell surface receptor. Cells were washed extensively with cold SFM to remove excess unlabelled ligand. Remaining cell surface receptor was labeled with 10nM 633-6pep and assayed by flow cytometry using a Becton-Dickinson FACSCalibur. For analysis, cells live cells were gated using forward- and side-scatter parameters. Cells were then gated for arrestin expression using FL-1. Mean channel fluorescence (MCF) was then measured using FL-4. Non-specific binding was determined by labeling *arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells not expressing the FPR and this value was subtracted from all internalization values. Unstimulated cells were considered to have 100% cell surface receptor. Cell surface expression of stimulated cells was calculated by dividing its MCF by the MCF of the corresponding unstimulated cells. Internalization data were then

plotted using GraphPad Prism to calculate maximum internalization extents using a single exponential decay.

4.5.5. Confocal Fluorescence Microscopy

Confocal microscopy was performed as previously described (Vines et al., 2003). Briefly, $arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}$ FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and GFP-fused Rab11, AP-1 or AP-2. Cells were plated to 25mm coverslips and serum-starved for 30min. Cells were stimulated with 10nM 633-6pep for 1 hour at 37°C in SFM. Cells were washed with PBS, fixed with 2% paraformaldehyde and mounted using Vectashield. Fluorescence images were acquired using a Zeiss LSM 510 inverted laser scanning microscope equipped with He-Ne and Kr-AR lasers.

4.6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Charlotte Vines for helpful comments during the preparation of this manuscript.

Flow cytometry data and confocal images in this study were generated in the Flow Cytometry and Fluorescence Microscopy Facilities, respectively, at the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, which received support from NCRR 1 S10 RR14668, NSF MCB9982161, NCRR P20 RR11830, NCI R24 CA88339, the University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, and the University of New Mexico Cancer Center.

This work was funded by grant BC030217 from the Department of Defense Breast Cancer Research Program to B.M.W. and NIH grants AI36357 and GM68901 to E.R.P.

4.7. ABBREVIATIONS

AP-1—adaptor protein-1 complex

AP-2—adaptor protein-2 complex

Arr2—arrestin-2

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR—arrestin-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} knockout MEF cells stably expressing the FPR

fMLF—*N*-formyl-Methionyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanine

FPR—*N*-formyl peptide receptor

GPCR—G protein-coupled receptor

MEF—mouse embryonic fibroblast

PI—propidium iodide

SFM—serum-free medium (DMEM or RPMI)

6pep—*N*-formyl-Leucyl-Leucyl-Phenylalanyl-Leucyl-Tyrosinyl-Lysine

4.8. FIGURE LEGENDS

4.8.1. Figure 4.1. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants. **A)** Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestin mutants were assayed for apoptosis. Cells were stained with PI and 100-300 GFP-expressing cells were viewed and scored for the presence of PI staining. Data expressed as mean ± SEM PI positive/GFP cell from three independent experiments. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/-3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and incubated with DMSO or PP2 (10nM, 30 min) before and during stimulation.

4.8.2. Figure 4.2. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants. Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins were stimulated with 1μM fMLF and aliquoted at multiple time points. Cells were washed free of fMLF, labeled with 633-6pep and analyzed by flow cytometry for residual cell surface receptor. Cells were gated for GFP expression (FL1) to restrict the analysis to transfected cells. Data are expressed as the maximum extent of internalization based on curve fitting using a single exponential decay. Data are expressed as mean ± SEM from three independent experiments.

4.8.3. Figure 4.3. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11. Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11 and RFP-fused arrestins and plated on coverslips. Cells were stimulated with the 633-6pep for 1 hour at 37°C and imaged by confocal

fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments.

4.8.4. Figure 4.4. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-2

and AP-1. A) Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and the GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2. Cells were subsequently stimulated with 633-6pep at 37°C for the indicated time and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. **B)** Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and the GFP-fused γ -subunit of AP-1. Cells were then stimulated with the 10nM 633-6pep ligand, fixed and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments.

4.8.5. Figure 4.5. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants. A)

Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestin mutants were assayed for apoptosis. Cells were stained with PI and 100-300 GFP-expressing cells were viewed and scored for the presence of PI staining. Data expressed as mean \pm SEM PI positive/GFP cell from three independent experiments. **B)** Arr-2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused arrestins and incubated with DMSO or PP2 (10nM, 30 min) before and during stimulation.

4.8.6. Figure 4.6. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants. Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-} FPR cells transiently transfected with GFP-

fused arrestins were stimulated with 1 μ M fMLF and aliquoted at multiple time

points. Cells were washed free of fMLF, labeled with 633-6pep and analyzed by flow cytometry for residual cell surface receptor. Cells were gated for GFP expression (FL1) to restrict the analysis to transfected cells. Data are expressed as the maximum extent of internalization based on curve fitting using a single exponential decay. Data are expressed as mean \pm SEM from three independent experiments.

4.8.7. Figure 4.7. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11. *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with GFP-fused Rab11 and RFP-fused arrestins and plated on coverslips. Cells were stimulated with the 633-6pep for 1 hour at 37°C and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments.

4.8.8. Figure 4.8. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with AP-2 and AP-1. **A)** *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and the GFP-fused α -subunit of AP-2. Cells were subsequently stimulated with 633-6pep at 37°C for the indicated time and imaged by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments. **B)** *Arr2^{-/-}/3^{-/-}* FPR cells were transiently transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and the GFP-fused β -subunit of AP-1. Cells were then stimulated with the 10nM 633-6pep ligand, fixed and viewed by confocal fluorescence microscopy. Representative images are shown from three independent experiments.





Figure 4.1. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.




Figure 4.2. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants.




Figure 4.3. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.

A




Figure 4.4A. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-2.

B




Figure 4.4B. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding mutants traffic normally with AP-1.





Figure 4.5. Rescue of FPR-mediated apoptosis by arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.




Figure 4.6. Internalization of the FPR in presence of arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants.




Figure 4.7. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with respect to Rab11.




Figure 4.8. Arrestin-2 SH3-binding point mutants traffic normally with AP-2 and AP-1.

5. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

5.1. SUMMARY

In the preceding studies, we sought to identify 1) whether aberrant signaling causal to FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins was linked to FPR trafficking defects and 2) which region(s) of arrestin-2 were responsible for these phenotypes. Our findings suggest that FPR-mediated apoptosis and FPR-arrestin trafficking defects are linked with respect to decreased binding by certain arrestin-2 binding partners. Additionally, we have done a thorough analysis of arrestin-2 and found that altered binding by certain accessory proteins (AP-2 and Src kinase) are responsible for these phenotypes. Finally, we have discovered that arrestin-2 has a new binding partner (AP-1) whose role in FPR-mediated trafficking and signaling is unknown at this time, but is under further investigation.

5.1.1. Chapter 2.

Results prior to this work demonstrated that in the absence of arrestins, FPR activation caused receptor accumulation in the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome (Vines et al., 2003) and initiated apoptosis (Revankar et al., 2004). In addition, FPR internalization was unaffected, but FPR recycling was inhibited. These phenotypes were rescued by reconstitution of arrestin-2 or -3 cDNAs. As arrestin-2 has numerous accessory protein binding partners involved in GPCR trafficking and signaling (Luttrell and Luttrell, 2003; Luttrell and Luttrell, 2004; Miller and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce and Lefkowitz, 2001; Pierce et al., 2001; Reiter and Lefkowitz, 2006), we hypothesized that apoptosis and trafficking alterations

were linked and that specific regions of arrestin-2 were responsible for these phenotypes.

We first narrowed our search for arrestin-2 regions responsible for these phenotypes by screening large domains of arrestin-2 for the ability to rescue FPR-mediated apoptosis. While none of the domains assayed rescued apoptosis, only one region was found to bind the activated FPR, arr2-(1-382). This arrestin-2 mutant is a constitutively active truncation (Krupnick et al., 1997b) that lacks amino acid residues 383-418. The missing amino acids constitute numerous binding sites for accessory proteins. We then used scanning mutagenesis to generate mutants that had been previously described or change qualitatively similar amino acids to alanine (Figure 2.2). When assayed for apoptosis, all mutants except arr2-F391A and -4A rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis. Additionally, in the presence of all mutants (except F391A and 4A), FPR trafficking was unaffected while the F391A and 4A mutants caused FPR accumulation in the perinuclear recycling endosome.

The F391A mutant had been previously described as having decreased AP-2 binding and inhibiting β 2-AR endocytosis (Milano et al., 2002). The 4A mutant had not been previously described, but individual mutations (K397A, M399A and K400A) yielded similar AP-2 binding defects and inhibition of β 2-AR internalization (Kim and Benovic, 2002). Therefore, we hypothesized that FPR-arrestin trafficking with AP-2 may be altered. In confocal fluorescence microscopy experiments using cells transiently transfected with AP-2-GFP, RFP-fused arrestins and stimulated with 633-6pep, FPR-arrestin trafficking was

indeed altered. In cells expressing wild type arrestin-2, FPR-arrestin trafficking was normal and AP-2 was colocalized with receptor-arrestin complexes in the perinuclear region. In cells lacking endogenous arrestins or expressing the F391A mutant, FPR-arrestin accumulated in the perinuclear recycling endosome without AP-2 consistent with an inability to bind AP-2. However, in the presence of the 4A mutant, FPR-arrestin accumulated in the perinuclear region with AP-2. In addition, AP-2 appeared to colocalize as strongly as or more strongly with the 4A mutant than wild-type arrestin-2. This was confirmed using co-immunoprecipitation of FLAG-tagged arrestins after FPR stimulation and looking for AP-2 binding. Our microscopy results were confirmed: after immunoprecipitation with FLAG antibodies, the F391A mutant did not bind AP-2, wild-type arrestin-2 did bind AP-2 and the 4A mutant bound AP-2 six times as much as wild-type arrestin-2.

As AP-1 had been previously shown to be necessary for formation of recycling endosomes (Pagano et al., 2004) and was important to egress from the Golgi to the cell membrane for certain proteins (Miedel et al., 2006), we hypothesized it may play a role in efferent FPR trafficking. Confocal fluorescence microscopy experiments in cells transiently transfected with AP-1-GFP, RFP-fused arrestins and stimulated with 633-6pep showed differential AP-1 trafficking with FPR-arrestin complexes. Without stimulation, AP-1 was localized to the perinuclear region. Upon FPR activation, cells lacking arrestins or expressing the F391A or 4A mutants, FPR-arrestin complexes accumulated with AP-1 in the perinuclear region. However, in cells expressing wild type arrestin-2,

FPR-arrestin complexes colocalized with AP-1 in the perinuclear region but FPR-arrestin-AP-1 complexes were also seen outside this region consistent with normal FPR trafficking. We hypothesized that arrestin-2 could bind AP-1 upon FPR activation and this was confirmed using co-immunoprecipitation assays.

To confirm that receptor-arrestin accumulation in the perinuclear region was consistent with an inability of the FPR to recycle, we measured FPR recycling by flow cytometry. While expression of wild type arrestin-2 allowed FPR recycling, there was virtually no recycling in the presence of the F391A and 4A mutants. To confirm a role for AP-2 and -1 in normal FPR trafficking, we used siRNA against each in U937 FPR cells (a monocyte cell line that expresses FPR and both endogenous arrestins) and measured FPR recycling and accumulation in the perinuclear region. Surprisingly, we found that a decrease in AP-2 levels inhibited FPR recycling and caused FPR accumulation in the perinuclear region while decrease of AP-1 levels had no effect.

These findings led to the creation of a model in which after FPR ligand binding and internalization, arrestin-2 binding occurs followed by AP-2 binding to arrestin-2. In the perinuclear recycling endosome, AP-2 must release from arrestin-2 and only then can FPR-arrestin complexes leave the recycling endosome and travel back to the cell surface. Along the latter path, AP-1 interacts with FPR-arrestin, but the physiologic consequences of this binding are unclear at this time. Finally, if AP-2 does not bind or release FPR-arrestin complexes, receptor will be trapped in the recycling endosome and aberrant signaling complexes will initiate apoptosis.

5.1.2. Chapter 3.

Previous results by our laboratory have demonstrated that FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestin can be rescued by inhibition of Src kinase, ERK1/2, JNK3 and p38 MAPKs (Revankar et al., 2004). It has also been demonstrated that Src kinase binding to arrestin-2 is necessary for ERK1/2 phosphorylation within the context of β 2-AR activation (Luttrell et al., 1999). Based on these findings, we hypothesized that an arrestin-2 mutant deficient in Src kinase binding (P91G/P121E) could alter FPR-non genomic signaling and initiate apoptosis. In apoptosis assays, expression of the P91G/P121E mutant did not rescue FPR-mediated, but Src kinase inhibition was able to stop apoptosis. These results indicated that although arrestin-2 and Src kinase have decreased binding, Src kinase activity can still initiate FPR-mediated apoptosis. In addition, FPR internalization was not affected by the arrestin-2 mutant or Src kinase inhibition.

To test the P91G/P121E mutant's effect on FPR trafficking, we used confocal fluorescence microscopy. Cells deficient in arrestins were transfected with RFP-fused arrestins and either Rab11-GFP, AP-2-GFP or AP-1-GFP. Upon FPR stimulation in the presence of the P91G/P121E mutant, FPR-arrestin complexes accumulated in the perinuclear recycling endosome with Rab11, AP-2 and AP-1. Because Src kinase inhibition rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis in the presence of the P91G/P121E mutant, we hypothesized that this inhibition may rescue the FPR trafficking defects caused by the mutant. To our surprise, this was not the case. In the presence of PP2, the P91G/P121E mutant accumulated

with the FPR and Rab11 in the perinuclear recycling endosome. In addition, PP2 caused wild type arrestin-2 to accumulate with the FPR in the Rab11 endosome, but did not initiate apoptosis. The above results led us to conclude that Src kinase plays two independent roles when it binds arrestin-2: a role in controlling FPR-arrestin signaling cascades and a role in FPR-arrestin complex trafficking.

Finally, we hypothesized that if Src kinase cannot bind the P91G/P121E which results in signaling defects that initiate apoptosis, this might also mean that ERK1/2 signaling was aberrantly affected. To test this hypothesis, we assayed apoptosis in the presence of the P91G/P121E mutant and ERK1/2 inhibitors U0126 and PD98059. Our results demonstrated that in the presence of this arrestin-2 mutant, ERK1/2 inhibition rescues FPR-mediated apoptosis. This indicates that in the absence of Src kinase binding to arrestin-2, not only is Src kinase signaling aberrantly, but ERK1/2 is as well.

Based on these results, we presented a model for the two independent actions of Src kinase with respect to arrestin-2 binding. After FPR activation and internalization, arrestin-2 binds phosphorylated FPR and AP-2 binds arrestin-2. Upon arrival at the recycling endosome, Src kinase also binds arrestin-2. Src kinase then phosphorylates AP-2 causing its release from arrestin-2. This has been previously demonstrated to be integral to internalization of the AT_{1A}R (Fessart et al., 2005). After AP-2 release, FPR-arrestin can leave the perinuclear recycling endosome and travel back to the cell surface. However, when the P91G/P121E mutant binds FPR, AP-2 binds the arrestin mutant, but Src kinase cannot bind the complex. The FPR complex accumulates in the recycling

endosome and Src kinase signals aberrantly independent of the complex and initiates apoptosis. Therefore, we conclude that arrestin-independent Src kinase activity initiates apoptosis, but arrestin-dependent Src kinase activity leads to normal FPR trafficking and signaling.

5.1.3. Chapter 4.

The results from Chapter 3 demonstrated that Src kinase has two roles in arrestin-mediated FPR trafficking and signaling. However, this led us to ask an important question: do FPR trafficking defects lead to FPR signaling defects or vice-versa? There are three SH-3 binding domains within arrestin-2: P88/P91, P121/P124 and P175/P178. In our previous work, we used an arrestin-2 mutant that had contained point mutations within different SH3-binding domains. To differentiate the effects of different SH3-binding domains on FPR trafficking and signaling we created three mutants that altered prolines within each SH3-binding domain (P88A/P91A, P121A/P124A and P175A/P178A).

FPR-mediated apoptosis was rescued by the above arrestin mutants except P121A/P124A which could only be rescued by Src kinase inhibition. This implicated the second SH3-binding domain as responsible for Src kinase binding that rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis. However, when these arrestin-2 mutants were assayed by confocal fluorescence microscopy for FPR trafficking defects a surprising result occurred. All mutants trafficked normally with FPR in respect to Rab11, AP-2 and AP-2 colocalization and FPR internalization was not inhibited. These results led us to believe that FPR signaling defects could occur in the absence of FPR trafficking defects.

In the above results, we used mutants that changed prolines within SH3-binding domains to alanine. We feared that alanine substitutions of multiple prolines within the same SH3-binding domain may cause different effects on FPR trafficking and signaling compared to the original mutant used (P91G/P121E). To alleviate this complication, we made point mutations similar to those used in Chapter 3, but in one SH3-binding domain at a time (P91G and P121E). In apoptosis assays, P91G rescued FPR-mediated apoptosis, but the P121E mutant could not rescue the phenotype. However, apoptosis in the presence of the P121E mutant was rescuable by Src kinase inhibition. In trafficking assays using confocal fluorescence microscopy, both mutants trafficked normally with FPR in correlation with Rab11, AP-2 and AP-1. Once again, FPR internalization was not affected. These results indicated that our previous results were not the effect of alanine replacing two prolines in SH3-binding domains of arrestin-2, but were the result of decreased Src kinase binding to the second SH3-binding domain (P121/P124) of arrestin-2.

Our results led us to conclude that FPR signaling defects could occur in the absence of associated trafficking defects. With respect to Src kinase-arrestin-2 binding, the second SH3-binding domain (P121/P124) alters FPR signaling and initiates apoptosis. However, this does not alter FPR trafficking. Additionally, mutation of the other SH3-binding domains can affect FPR signaling or trafficking. It is only when the first (P88/P91) and the second (P121/P124) SH3-binding domains are mutated that *both* FPR trafficking and signaling are aberrantly affected.

5.2. MODEL AND IMPLICATIONS.

5.2.1. Our new model of FPR trafficking and signaling.

Based on our findings in Chapters 2, 3 and 4 and previously published results, we suggest the following model for the FPR life cycle (Figure 5.1). FPR is expressed on the cell surface and binds its naturally occurring ligand, fMLF. This alters the conformation of the receptor, initiating heterotrimeric G protein




Figure 5.1. New model of FPR trafficking and signaling.

binding and activating G protein-mediated signaling pathways. The C-terminus is then phosphorylated by GRKs. This lowers receptor affinity for G protein binding and increases its affinity for binding by arrestins effectively desensitizing G protein signaling. While arrestin may bind FPR at the membrane or in endocytic vesicles, FPR internalization occurs independently of arrestins, dynamin, clathrin, AP-2, AP-1 and Src kinase and receptor is transferred to a Rab5-positive, early

endosome. Before or during transfer to the Rab11, perinuclear recycling endosome AP-2 and Src kinase bind the FPR-arrestin complex and initiate non-G protein, FPR-dependent signaling pathways. In the perinuclear endosome, Src kinase phosphorylates tyrosine residues on AP-2, causing dissociation of AP-2 from the FPR-arrestin complex. This allows the receptor to leave the recycling endosome in AP-1-associated vesicles. During its return to the cell surface, the FPR-arrestin complex dissociates, ligand is uncoupled from receptor and dephosphorylation of the receptor occurs. After these events, the FPR is once again expressed on the cell membrane ready to begin the cycle anew.

5.2.2. FPR internalization and that of other GPCRs.

In the previous chapters, we determined that FPR internalization is independent of arrestins, clathrin, AP-2, AP-1 and Src kinase. Previous reports have further demonstrated that FPR internalization occurs independently of dynamin (Gilbert et al., 2001). Our unpublished results also suggest that ADP-ribosylation factor 6 and the Rho-Rac-Cdc42 pathway are unnecessary for internalization of the FPR. An important question raised by these results is: what regulates internalization of this receptor? Jokingly, we suggest that only supernatural forces can inhibit FPR internalization. However, in a more serious manner, we suggest some differences in results and assay design from other laboratories that may provide insight to this dilemma.

Protein determinants for β 2-AR internalization have been well studied and reviewed. Currently, β 2-AR internalization is demonstrated to be dependent upon arrestins (Kohout et al., 2001), dynamin (Zhang et al., 1996), Src kinase

phosphorylation of dynamin (Ahn et al., 1999), clathrin (Goodman et al., 1997), AP-2 (Laporte et al., 1999) and ADP-ribosylation factor 6 (Claing et al., 2001). Many GPCRs have internalization pathways which operate independently of some of these proteins. For example, the m2-muscarinic acetylcholine receptor internalizes in an arrestin-independent, ADP-ribosylation factor 6-dependent manner (Pals-Rylaarsdam et al., 1997; Roseberry and Hosey, 2001). An interesting point common to these studies is the fact that experiments were all performed in HEK293 cells. FPR internalization studies in our laboratory have been performed primarily in MEF or U937 cell lines. It is possible that the cellular contexts between cell lines used in various studies may allow or inhibit GPCR use of various internalization pathways and machinery.

Furthermore, our internalization studies use saturating concentrations of ligand to “flood” the FPR. While this is also true of the aforementioned studies, it is possible that within our cellular context, multiple avenues of receptor internalization exist and pathway divergence is used by the FPR under these high concentrations of ligand. This hypothesis not only explains why we see FPR internalization occurring independently of so many proteins, but is supported by interesting results from our laboratory. Unpublished results indicate that use of lower ligand concentrations during FPR internalization assays has demonstrable effects on FPR internalization. When using 1 μ M fMLF to initiate FPR internalization, the half-time of internalization is ~90 seconds and the extent of internalization is ~80-90%. However, when 10nM ligand is used in the same assays, the rate of FPR internalization is similar with an extent of 20-25% at 10

minutes that remains constant. This indicates that recycling pathways may be balancing FPR internalization after 10 minutes. Also, by using 10nM fMLF, only a fraction of surface FPR is occupied with receptor at the beginning of the internalization assay leaving open the possibility that under these conditions, alternative avenues of internalization may not be required. Based on these data, we suggest that there are multiple internalization pathways for the FPR, and use of lower ligand concentrations in future experiments may help discovery of the protein(s) that mediate FPR internalization.

5.2.3. AP-2 regulates FPR post-endocytic trafficking and trafficking of other GPCRs.

In our studies, we have shown that AP-2 plays a critical role in FPR post-endocytic trafficking. It was demonstrated that both binding and release of AP-2 from arrestin-2 is necessary for it to leave the perinuclear recycling endosome and return to the cell surface. Additionally, we hypothesize, based on our evidence from Chapter 3, that Src phosphorylation of AP-2 may also be necessary for normal FPR trafficking. The FPR is not the only GPCR for which AP-2 regulates its trafficking. AT_{1A}R internalization at the cell membrane may be regulated similarly. One report demonstrated that AP-2 binding to arrestin-2 was necessary for β 2-AR internalization (Laporte et al., 1999). Furthermore, a different study examined the regulation of AT_{1A}R internalization by Src kinase (Fessart et al., 2005). It was determined that Src kinase phosphorylation of tyrosine residues on AP-2 was necessary for AP-2 release from arrestin-2 and subsequent internalization of AT_{1A}R. Given the functional similarity of the two

receptors (Kim et al., 2005; Shenoy et al., 2006), AP-2-dependent internalization for the AT_{1A}R is likely. Finally, in a recent report (Mundell et al., 2006), the authors found that two purinergic receptors, P2Y₁ and P2Y₁₂, colocalized with AP-2 in perinuclear “endocytic compartments”, though the identity of this compartment was not established.

While the trafficking of individual GPCRs is regulated by AP-2 interactions at different places within the cell, it is unclear how AP-2 regulates GPCR-arrestin trafficking. An answer may be found in the differential phosphorylation of GPCRs after ligand binding and activation. Our laboratory has demonstrated that FPR phosphorylation patterns by GRKs are highly complex and differentially regulate receptor desensitization, internalization and arrestin binding (Potter et al., 2006). For example, the presence of one phosphorylation site in the FPR C-terminus is adequate to mediate receptor internalization and arrestin binding while the presence of additional sites of phosphorylation can inhibit arrestin binding without affecting FPR internalization. Furthermore, exchanging the β 2-AR C-terminus for the V2-vasopressin C-terminus produces a V2-vasopressin receptor trafficking phenotype upon β 2-AR stimulation (Oakley et al., 1999; Oakley et al., 2000). Finally, differential phosphorylation of AT_{1A}R significantly affected arrestin-mediated ERK1/2 activation (Kim et al., 2005). In this study, GPCR phosphorylation by GRK4/5 activity, but not GRK2/3 activity, produced ERK1/2 phosphorylation upon receptor activation.

The above studies suggest that different amounts and location FPR phosphorylation within its C-terminus differentially regulates trafficking and

signaling. We suggest that minimal receptor phosphorylation mediates FPR internalization. Upon further phosphorylation, perhaps during or after internalization, arrestin binding occurs. Finally, after possibly additional phosphorylation, arrestin binding is sufficient to support binding of AP-2. Due to similar regulation of the FPR and AT_{1A}R by AP-2 interaction, it is possible to answer the aforementioned hypothesis by swapping the C-termini of the receptors and assaying differences in receptor trafficking. We hypothesize that an FPR/AT_{1A}R C-terminal chimera will traffic similarly to AT_{1A}R upon FPR stimulation and vice-versa.

5.2.4. Arrestin and Src kinase regulation of FPR signaling.

Throughout our previous studies (Chapters 2-4), we have demonstrated that proper control of FPR signaling is mediated by arrestins and Src kinase. Additionally, we have demonstrated that Src kinase binding to arrestin is necessary for proper regulation of FPR signaling. Finally, we have demonstrated that the FPR trafficking and signaling defects can be mediated independently of one another. When cells expressing wild type arrestin-2 are subjected to Src kinase inhibition with PP2, FPR-arrestin complexes accumulated in the perinuclear recycling endosome without initiation of apoptosis. On the contrary, expression of an arrestin mutant deficient in Src kinase binding (P121E) permits normal FPR-arrestin complex trafficking but initiates apoptosis.

Differential GPCR signaling via arrestin and Src kinase is demonstrated by the β 2-AR and AT_{1A}R (Luttrell et al., 1999). ERK1/2 phosphorylation via β 2-AR activation was inhibited by arrestin mutants that did not bind Src kinase

(P91G/P121E) or cannot be dephosphorylated (S412D). However, expression of the arrestin mutant that did not bind Src kinase in the context of AT_{1A}R stimulation did not alter ERK1/2 signaling. Furthermore, different ligands that bind the same GPCR can initiate differential activation of ERK1/2. In the context of CCR7 signaling, CCL19 activates ERK1/2 at early time points and is subsequently dephosphorylated over time whereas stimulation with CCL21 does not activate ERK1/2 at all (personal communication, Charlotte Vines, KUMC).

Given the complexity of arrestin regulation of FPR signaling, it is likely that numerous pathways of MAPK activation and deactivation exist. In addition, these pathways may both converge and diverge to control cellular function. More rigorous examination of these pathways is necessary to understand the effect of MAPK signaling on FPR trafficking and cellular physiology. These experiments are further outlined in Future Study 2.

5.3. FUTURE STUDIES.

5.3.1. Future Study 1. Understanding arrestin-2/AP-1 binding.

An interesting finding from Chapter 2, is the discovery that AP-1 binds arrestin-2 upon FPR activation. While the physiologic effects of this binding are currently unclear, an understanding of where AP-1 binds arrestin-2 may give us clues to its function. Currently, amino acids Asp385, Phe388, Phe391, Arg393, Arg395, Lys397, Met399 and Lys400 in arrestin-2 have all been demonstrated as binding sites for the β 2-subunit of AP-2 (Kim and Benovic, 2002; Milano et al., 2002). Additionally, amino acids E849, Y888, and E902 within the β 2-subunit of AP-2 are binding sites for arrestin-2 (Laporte et al., 2002). Furthermore, the β 1-

subunit of AP-1 shares significant homology with the β 2-subunit of AP-2 and the aforementioned amino acid residues in the β 2-subunit are conserved (Lundmark and Carlsson, 2002).

To better understand where AP-1 and arrestin-2 bind each other, GST fusions of the critical regions of the β 1-subunit containing the aforementioned amino acid binding sites for arrestin-2 could be used in *in vitro* binding assays with wild-type arrestin-2 to discover whether binding could be interrupted upon amino acid mutation. Furthermore, GST fusions of the β 1-subunit could be used in similar assays with arrestin-2 mutations at sites critical for AP-2 binding. These assays will determine two important results: 1) whether it is the β 1-subunit that binds arrestin-2 and 2) where the binding sites in the respective proteins are. These results will give us more data to help determine the role of AP-1/arrestin-2 binding in FPR trafficking and signaling. Alternatively, we may find that it is not the β 1-subunit that binds arrestin-2 or that, in trafficking assays, other proteins (AP-3 or AP-4) have redundant functions that allow normal FPR trafficking in the absence of AP-1 binding. Regardless, as this protein-protein interaction is novel to GPCR trafficking and signaling, data accrued from these experiments will aid us in elucidating its effects on cellular physiology.

5.3.2. Future Study 2. The effects of aberrant GPCR trafficking on non-G protein signaling cascades.

Our studies have indicated an intimate association between FPR trafficking and signaling defects. While these two defects are often linked, it is possible for each defect to occur independently of the other. In the previous

chapters, FPR trafficking defects are well documented, whereas FPR signaling defects are examined by apoptotic signaling and use of signaling protein inhibitors. We hypothesize that specific alterations in MAPK phosphorylation lead to FPR-mediated apoptosis in the absence of arrestins or presence of arrestin mutants.

To test our hypothesis, we suggest using Western blot analysis of MAPK phosphorylation patterns. These experiments would be done over a time course of FPR activation in the absence of arrestins and presence of wild type arrestin-2 or selected arrestin mutants. Phosphorylation patterns for n-terminal c-jun kinase 3, p38 and ERK1/2 should be explored. For example, preliminary results suggests in the absence of arrestins, FPR stimulation leads to early phosphorylation of ERK1/2, but in the presence of wild type arrestin-2 ERK1/2 has both an early and late phase of phosphorylation. In the presence of an arrestin mutant that does not bind Src kinase (P91G/P121E), the ERK1/2 phosphorylation pattern is similar to wild type arrestin-2, but is increased at all time points and is phosphorylated in the absence of ligand stimulation. Additionally, location of activated MAPKs relative the FPR-arrestin complexes should be ascertained by confocal immunofluorescence microscopy. These experiments may reveal a difference between the levels of MAPK activation and the possibility of differential location of the activated signaling complexes. The results of these experiments would lead to an increased understanding of signaling pathways induced by FPR activation and could be applicable to other GPCRs of interest.

5.3.3. Future Study 3. The role of aberrant GPCR trafficking on migration.

It is widely hypothesized, although not directly proven, that inhibition of GPCR trafficking may lead to defects in cellular migration (Perez et al., 1989; Perez et al., 1982). One problem has been the inability to stop chemokine/chemoattractant receptor trafficking without undue toxicity towards the cell itself. Our results demonstrate that the FPR accumulates in a perinuclear region and exhibits impaired recycling in the absence of arrestins or when AP-2 levels are decreased with siRNA. These results give us the ability to address the role of GPCR trafficking in cellular migration and we hypothesize that when the FPR traffics abnormally and does not recycle properly, FPR-mediated migration will be decreased.

To test this hypothesis, we would use U937 cells expressing the FPR. Then, siRNAs against both arrestin-2 and -3 or AP-2 could be transfected into cells to decrease the levels of the respective proteins. At this point, any of a variety of chemotaxis and/or migration assays could be used to monitor the effect of decreased arrestins or AP-2 on FPR-mediated cell migration. We could expect, in either case, that decreased migration in response to fMLF would be observed. Additionally, other chemokine/chemoattractant receptors could be tested in these assays. For example, while CXCR4 stimulation does not initiate apoptosis in the absence of arrestins (Revankar et al., 2004), CXCR4-mediated migration of cells is arrestin-dependent (Sun et al., 2002). However, in neither case was CXCR4 trafficking under their respective conditions examined.

5.3.4. Future Study 4. Rational design of small molecule inhibitors to interrupt GPCR-arrestin binding.

In previous studies we have found that GPCRs, including the FPR and IL-8R, undergo apoptosis upon activation in the absence of arrestins (Revankar et al., 2004). In addition, we have demonstrated that it is not merely the absence of arrestins that mediates this phenotype. On the contrary, FPR-mediated apoptosis can occur in the presence of arrestin mutants that bind FPR (Chapters 2-4). Based on these results, we suggest that small molecules that interrupt GPCR-arrestin binding will lead to apoptosis upon stimulation of the respective GPCR.

To test this hypothesis, we would isolate biotinylated arrestin-2 similar to that described previously (Potter et al., 2002). Next, we would bind biotinylated arrestin-2 to streptavidin beads. To ascertain GPCR C-termini binding, purified FITC labeled, IL-8R or FPR phosphorylated C-termini would be incubated with the arrestin-bound beads. When assayed with flow cytometer, the arrestin-bound beads can be gated using the forward- and side-scatter parameters and bound FITC-GPCR C-termini can be determined by reading the mean channel fluorescence in FL1. Then, the same assay can be used with a library of small molecules to determine which compounds interrupt GPCR-arrestin binding (mean channel fluorescence decreases in FL1). After compound screening, small molecules can be used in cell based assays to determine whether they alter receptor trafficking and/or initiate apoptosis upon ligand stimulation. This study would provide us an opportunity to discover small molecules that may be

able to treat breast cancer metastasis as the IL-8R is known to be involved in this process (Fournier et al., 2006).

5.3.5. Future Study 5. Rational design of small molecule inhibitors to interrupt AP-2-arrestin binding.

In our work from Chapter 2, we determined that the interaction between AP-2 and arrestin-2 was integral to normal FPR trafficking and signaling. Altered interaction between the two proteins led to FPR-arrestin complex accumulation in the perinuclear recycling endosome and apoptosis. Based on these results, we hypothesize that small molecules that inhibit the association of AP-2 and arrestin-2 may lead to FPR trafficking defects and apoptosis.

To test this hypothesis, we would isolate the GST-tagged β -adaptin subunit of AP-2 and bind it to glutathione beads. To examine binding of arrestin-2 to this subunit, we would incubate the protein-bound beads with purified GFP-fused wild type arrestin-2. Similar, to Future Study 4, arrestin binding would be determined by flow cytometry. Small molecules could then be incubated with the protein-bound beads and arrestin, to screen for compounds that interrupted the binding of AP-2 and arrestin-2. From this point, cell based assays could be employed to determine whether the compound could interrupt AP-2/arrestin binding *in vivo*. For example, co-immunoprecipitation, trafficking and apoptosis assay employed in Chapter 2 could be used to determine the physiologic effect of screened small molecules. In addition to the use of a compound that disrupted binding of AP-2 and arrestin-2 to GPCR researchers in general, the compound could be useful as a chemotherapeutic. For instance, if our hypothesis in Future

Study 3 was correct, small molecules screened in this study design could be used to inhibit CXCR4-mediated migration which could be used to treat breast cancer metastasis.

5.4. Concluding Remarks

In this study, we have made great strides in determining the trafficking and signaling patterns of the FPR. These results have led to discovery of novel interactions of AP-2 and AP-1 with arrestin-2 as well as the roles of Src kinase regulation of FPR trafficking and signaling. These results pertain to many GPCRs and will serve as a model for GPCR trafficking and signaling. We have also proposed numerous future studies that make use of our discoveries to further understand the implications of arrestins in GPCR migration, trafficking and signaling. It is our hope that these data and future studies will lead to the design of novel chemotherapeutics to treat countless patients affected by diseases that involve dysregulation of GPCR trafficking and signaling.

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, R.C., H. Ohno, K.W. Roche, and J.S. Bonifacino. 1997. Functional domain mapping of the clathrin-associated adaptor medium chains mu1 and mu2. *J Biol Chem.* 272:27160-6.
- Ahn, S., S. Maudsley, L.M. Luttrell, R.J. Lefkowitz, and Y. Daaka. 1999. Src-mediated tyrosine phosphorylation of dynamin is required for beta2-adrenergic receptor internalization and mitogen-activated protein kinase signaling. *J Biol Chem.* 274:1185-8.
- Barak, L.S., R.H. Oakley, S.A. Laporte, and M.G. Caron. 2001. Constitutive arrestin-mediated desensitization of a human vasopressin receptor mutant associated with nephrogenic diabetes insipidus. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 98:93-8.
- Beaulieu, J.M., and M.G. Caron. 2005. Beta-arrestin goes nuclear. *Cell.* 123:755-7.
- Becker, E.L., F.A. Forouhar, M.L. Grunnet, F. Boulay, M. Tardif, B.J. Bormann, D. Sodja, R.D. Ye, J.R. Woska, Jr., and P.M. Murphy. 1998. Broad immunocytochemical localization of the formylpeptide receptor in human organs, tissues, and cells. *Cell Tissue Res.* 292:129-35.
- Bennett, T.A., T.D. Foutz, V.V. Gurevich, L.A. Sklar, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2001. Partial phosphorylation of the N-formyl peptide receptor inhibits G protein association independent of arrestin binding. *J Biol Chem.* 276:49195-203.
- Bockaert, J., L. Fagni, A. Dumuis, and P. Marin. 2004a. GPCR interacting proteins (GIP). *Pharmacol Ther.* 103:203-21.
- Bockaert, J., G. Roussignol, C. Becamel, S. Gavarini, L. Joubert, A. Dumuis, L. Fagni, and P. Marin. 2004b. GPCR-interacting proteins (GIPs): nature and functions. *Biochem Soc Trans.* 32:851-5.
- Browning, D.D., Z.K. Pan, E.R. Prossnitz, and R.D. Ye. 1997. Cell type- and developmental stage-specific activation of NF-kappaB by fMet-Leu-Phe in myeloid cells. *J Biol Chem.* 272:7995-8001.

- Campbell, R.E., O. Tour, A.E. Palmer, P.A. Steinbach, G.S. Baird, D.A. Zacharias, and R.Y. Tsien. 2002. A monomeric red fluorescent protein. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 99:7877-82.
- Cao, T.T., H.W. Deacon, D. Reczek, A. Bretscher, and M. von Zastrow. 1999. A kinase-regulated PDZ-domain interaction controls endocytic sorting of the beta2-adrenergic receptor. *Nature*. 401:286-90.
- Claing, A., W. Chen, W.E. Miller, N. Vitale, J. Moss, R.T. Premont, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. beta-Arrestin-mediated ADP-ribosylation factor 6 activation and beta 2-adrenergic receptor endocytosis. *J Biol Chem*. 276:42509-13.
- Conner, D.A., M.A. Mathier, R.M. Mortensen, M. Christe, S.F. Vatner, C.E. Seidman, and J.G. Seidman. 1997. beta-Arrestin1 knockout mice appear normal but demonstrate altered cardiac responses to beta-adrenergic stimulation. *Circ Res*. 81:1021-6.
- Daaka, Y., L.M. Luttrell, S. Ahn, G.J. Della Rocca, S.S. Ferguson, M.G. Caron, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 1998. Essential role for G protein-coupled receptor endocytosis in the activation of mitogen-activated protein kinase. *J Biol Chem*. 273:685-8.
- Delaney, K.A., M.M. Murph, L.M. Brown, and H. Radhakrishna. 2002. Transfer of M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptors to clathrin-derived early endosomes following clathrin-independent endocytosis. *J Biol Chem*. 277:33439-46.
- Deneka, M., M. Neef, I. Popa, M. van Oort, H. Sprong, V. Oorschot, J. Klumperman, P. Schu, and P. van der Sluijs. 2003. Rabaptin-5alpha/rabaptin-4 serves as a linker between rab4 and gamma(1)-adaptin in membrane recycling from endosomes. *Embo J*. 22:2645-57.
- Edeling, M.A., S.K. Mishra, P.A. Keyel, A.L. Steinhauser, B.M. Collins, R. Roth, J.E. Heuser, D.J. Owen, and L.M. Traub. 2006. Molecular switches involving the AP-2 beta2 appendage regulate endocytic cargo selection and clathrin coat assembly. *Dev Cell*. 10:329-42.
- Fan, G.H., L.A. Lapierre, J.R. Goldenring, and A. Richmond. 2003. Differential regulation of CXCR2 trafficking by Rab GTPases. *Blood*. 101:2115-24.

- Ferguson, S.S. 2001. Evolving concepts in G protein-coupled receptor endocytosis: the role in receptor desensitization and signaling. *Pharmacol Rev.* 53:1-24.
- Fessart, D., M. Simaan, and S.A. Laporte. 2005. c-Src regulates clathrin adapter protein 2 interaction with beta-arrestin and the angiotensin II type 1 receptor during clathrin-mediated internalization. *Mol Endocrinol.* 19:491-503.
- Fournier, P.G., J.M. Chirgwin, and T.A. Guise. 2006. New insights into the role of T cells in the vicious cycle of bone metastases. *Curr Opin Rheumatol.* 18:396-404.
- Gao, H., Y. Sun, Y. Wu, B. Luan, Y. Wang, B. Qu, and G. Pei. 2004. Identification of beta-arrestin2 as a G protein-coupled receptor-stimulated regulator of NF-kappaB pathways. *Mol Cell.* 14:303-17.
- Gether, U., and B.K. Kobilka. 1998. G protein-coupled receptors. II. Mechanism of agonist activation. *J Biol Chem.* 273:17979-82.
- Gilbert, T.L., T.A. Bennett, D.C. Maestas, D.F. Cimino, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2001. Internalization of the human N-formyl peptide and C5a chemoattractant receptors occurs via clathrin-independent mechanisms. *Biochemistry.* 40:3467-75.
- Goodman, O.B., Jr., J.G. Krupnick, V.V. Gurevich, J.L. Benovic, and J.H. Keen. 1997. Arrestin/clathrin interaction. Localization of the arrestin binding locus to the clathrin terminal domain. *J Biol Chem.* 272:15017-22.
- Gripentrog, J.M., and H.M. Miettinen. 2005. Activation and nuclear translocation of ERK1/2 by the formyl peptide receptor is regulated by G protein and is not dependent on beta-arrestin translocation or receptor endocytosis. *Cell Signal.* 17:1300-11.
- Gurevich, V.V., and E.V. Gurevich. 2004. The molecular acrobatics of arrestin activation. *Trends Pharmacol Sci.* 25:105-11.
- Gwinn, M.R., A. Sharma, and E. De Nardin. 1999. Single nucleotide polymorphisms of the N-formyl peptide receptor in localized juvenile periodontitis. *J Periodontol.* 70:1194-201.

- Hall, R.A., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2002. Regulation of G protein-coupled receptor signaling by scaffold proteins. *Circ Res.* 91:672-80.
- Han, M., V.V. Gurevich, S.A. Vishnivetskiy, P.B. Sigler, and C. Schubert. 2001. Crystal structure of beta-arrestin at 1.9 Å: possible mechanism of receptor binding and membrane Translocation. *Structure.* 9:869-80.
- He, R., D.D. Browning, and R.D. Ye. 2001. Differential roles of the NPXXY motif in formyl peptide receptor signaling. *J Immunol.* 166:4099-105.
- Hirsch, J.A., C. Schubert, V.V. Gurevich, and P.B. Sigler. 1999. The 2.8 Å crystal structure of visual arrestin: a model for arrestin's regulation. *Cell.* 97:257-69.
- Holmes, K.D., A.V. Babwah, L.B. Dale, M.O. Poulter, and S.S. Ferguson. 2006. Differential regulation of corticotropin releasing factor 1α receptor endocytosis and trafficking by beta-arrestins and Rab GTPases. *J Neurochem.* 96:934-49.
- Hsu, M.H., S.C. Chiang, R.D. Ye, and E.R. Prossnitz. 1997. Phosphorylation of the N-formyl peptide receptor is required for receptor internalization but not chemotaxis. *J Biol Chem.* 272:29426-9.
- Innamorati, G., C. Le Gouill, M. Balamotis, and M. Birnbaumer. 2001. The long and the short cycle. Alternative intracellular routes for trafficking of G-protein-coupled receptors. *J Biol Chem.* 276:13096-103.
- Janvier, K., and J.S. Bonifacino. 2005. Role of the endocytic machinery in the sorting of lysosome-associated membrane proteins. *Mol Biol Cell.* 16:4231-42.
- Key, T.A., T.A. Bennett, T.D. Foutz, V.V. Gurevich, L.A. Sklar, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2001. Regulation of formyl peptide receptor agonist affinity by reconstitution with arrestins and heterotrimeric G proteins. *J Biol Chem.* 276:49204-12.
- Key, T.A., T.D. Foutz, V.V. Gurevich, L.A. Sklar, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2003. N-formyl peptide receptor phosphorylation domains differentially regulate arrestin and agonist affinity. *J Biol Chem.* 278:4041-7.

- Key, T.A., C.M. Vines, B.M. Wagener, V.V. Gurevich, L.A. Sklar, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2005. Inhibition of chemoattractant N-formyl peptide receptor trafficking by active arrestins. *Traffic*. 6:87-99.
- Kim, J., S. Ahn, X.R. Ren, E.J. Whalen, E. Reiter, H. Wei, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2005. Functional antagonism of different G protein-coupled receptor kinases for beta-arrestin-mediated angiotensin II receptor signaling. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 102:1442-7.
- Kim, Y.M., and J.L. Benovic. 2002. Differential roles of arrestin-2 interaction with clathrin and adaptor protein 2 in G protein-coupled receptor trafficking. *J Biol Chem*. 277:30760-8.
- Kohout, T.A., F.S. Lin, S.J. Perry, D.A. Conner, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. beta-Arrestin 1 and 2 differentially regulate heptahelical receptor signaling and trafficking. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 98:1601-6.
- Kovoor, A., J. Celfer, R.I. Abdryashitov, C. Chavkin, and V.V. Gurevich. 1999. Targeted construction of phosphorylation-independent beta-arrestin mutants with constitutive activity in cells. *J Biol Chem*. 274:6831-4.
- Kreuzer, O.J., B. Krisch, O. Dery, N.W. Bunnett, and W. Meyerhof. 2001. Agonist-mediated endocytosis of rat somatostatin receptor subtype 3 involves beta-arrestin and clathrin coated vesicles. *J Neuroendocrinol*. 13:279-87.
- Krupnick, J.G., O.B. Goodman, Jr., J.H. Keen, and J.L. Benovic. 1997a. Arrestin/clathrin interaction. Localization of the clathrin binding domain of nonvisual arrestins to the carboxy terminus. *J Biol Chem*. 272:15011-6.
- Krupnick, J.G., F. Santini, A.W. Gagnon, J.H. Keen, and J.L. Benovic. 1997b. Modulation of the arrestin-clathrin interaction in cells. Characterization of beta-arrestin dominant-negative mutants. *J Biol Chem*. 272:32507-12.
- Lander, E., L. Linton, B. Birren, C. Nusbaum, M. Zody, J. Baldwin, K. Devon, K. Dewar, M. Doyle, and W. FitzHugh. 2001. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature*. 409:860-921.

- Laporte, S.A., W.E. Miller, K.M. Kim, and M.G. Caron. 2002. beta-Arrestin/AP-2 interaction in G protein-coupled receptor internalization: identification of a beta-arrestin binding site in beta 2-adaptin. *J Biol Chem.* 277:9247-54.
- Laporte, S.A., R.H. Oakley, J. Zhang, J.A. Holt, S.S. Ferguson, M.G. Caron, and L.S. Barak. 1999. The beta2-adrenergic receptor/betaarrestin complex recruits the clathrin adaptor AP-2 during endocytosis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 96:3712-7.
- Lefkowitz, R.J. 1998. G protein-coupled receptors. III. New roles for receptor kinases and beta-arrestins in receptor signaling and desensitization. *J Biol Chem.* 273:18677-80.
- Lefkowitz, R.J., H.A. Rockman, and W.J. Koch. 2000. Catecholamines, cardiac beta-adrenergic receptors, and heart failure. *Circulation.* 101:1634-7.
- Lefkowitz, R.J., and S.K. Shenoy. 2005. Transduction of receptor signals by beta-arrestins. *Science.* 308:512-7.
- Lehner, T. 2002. The role of CCR5 chemokine ligands and antibodies to CCR5 coreceptors in preventing HIV infection. *Trends Immunol.* 23:347-51.
- Lin, F.T., W. Chen, S. Shenoy, M. Cong, S.T. Exum, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2002. Phosphorylation of beta-arrestin2 regulates its function in internalization of beta(2)-adrenergic receptors. *Biochemistry.* 41:10692-9.
- Lin, F.T., K.M. Krueger, H.E. Kendall, Y. Daaka, Z.L. Fredericks, J.A. Pitcher, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 1997. Clathrin-mediated endocytosis of the beta-adrenergic receptor is regulated by phosphorylation/dephosphorylation of beta-arrestin1. *J Biol Chem.* 272:31051-7.
- Lombardi, M.S., A. Kavelaars, and C.J. Heijnen. 2002. Role and modulation of G protein-coupled receptor signaling in inflammatory processes. *Crit Rev Immunol.* 22:141-63.
- Lundmark, R., and S.R. Carlsson. 2002. The beta-appendages of the four adaptor-protein (AP) complexes: structure and binding properties, and identification of sorting nexin 9 as an accessory protein to AP-2. *Biochem J.* 362:597-607.

- Luttrell, D.K., and L.M. Luttrell. 2003. Signaling in time and space: G protein-coupled receptors and mitogen-activated protein kinases. *Assay Drug Dev Technol.* 1:327-38.
- Luttrell, D.K., and L.M. Luttrell. 2004. Not so strange bedfellows: G-protein-coupled receptors and Src family kinases. *Oncogene.* 23:7969-78.
- Luttrell, L.M., S.S. Ferguson, Y. Daaka, W.E. Miller, S. Maudsley, G.J. Della Rocca, F. Lin, H. Kawakatsu, K. Owada, D.K. Luttrell, M.G. Caron, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 1999. Beta-arrestin-dependent formation of beta2 adrenergic receptor-Src protein kinase complexes. *Science.* 283:655-61.
- Luttrell, L.M., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2002. The role of beta-arrestins in the termination and transduction of G-protein-coupled receptor signals. *J Cell Sci.* 115:455-65.
- Maestes, D.C., R.M. Potter, and E.R. Prossnitz. 1999. Differential phosphorylation paradigms dictate desensitization and internalization of the N-formyl peptide receptor. *J Biol Chem.* 274:29791-5.
- Marchese, A., C. Chen, Y.M. Kim, and J.L. Benovic. 2003. The ins and outs of G protein-coupled receptor trafficking. *Trends Biochem Sci.* 28:369-76.
- McCoy, R., D.L. Haviland, E.P. Molmenti, T. Ziambaras, R.A. Wetsel, and D.H. Perlmuter. 1995. N-formylpeptide and complement C5a receptors are expressed in liver cells and mediate hepatic acute phase gene regulation. *J Exp Med.* 182:207-17.
- McDonald, P.H., C.W. Chow, W.E. Miller, S.A. Laporte, M.E. Field, F.T. Lin, R.J. Davis, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2000. Beta-arrestin 2: a receptor-regulated MAPK scaffold for the activation of JNK3. *Science.* 290:1574-7.
- McDonald, P.H., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. Beta-Arrestins: new roles in regulating heptahelical receptors' functions. *Cell Signal.* 13:683-9.
- Miedel, M.T., K.M. Weixel, J.R. Bruns, L.M. Traub, and O.A. Weisz. 2006. Posttranslational Cleavage and Adaptor Protein Complex-dependent Trafficking of Mucolipin-1. *J Biol Chem.* 281:12751-9.

- Migeotte, I., D. Communi, and M. Parmentier. 2006. Formyl peptide receptors: A promiscuous subfamily of G protein-coupled receptors controlling immune responses. *Cytokine Growth Factor Rev.* 17:501-19.
- Milano, S.K., H.C. Pace, Y.M. Kim, C. Brenner, and J.L. Benovic. 2002. Scaffolding functions of arrestin-2 revealed by crystal structure and mutagenesis. *Biochemistry.* 41:3321-8.
- Miller, W.E., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. Expanding roles for beta-arrestins as scaffolds and adapters in GPCR signaling and trafficking. *Curr Opin Cell Biol.* 13:139-45.
- Miller, W.E., P.H. McDonald, S.F. Cai, M.E. Field, R.J. Davis, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. Identification of a motif in the carboxyl terminus of beta -arrestin2 responsible for activation of JNK3. *J Biol Chem.* 276:27770-7.
- Moratz, C., K. Harrison, and J.H. Kehrl. 2004. Role of RGS proteins in regulating the migration of B lymphocytes. *Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz).* 52:27-35.
- Muller, A., B. Homey, H. Soto, N. Ge, D. Catron, M. Buchanan, T. McClanahan, E. Murphy, W. Yuan, S. Wagner, J. Barrera, A. Mohar, E. Verasegui, and A. Zlotnik. 2001. Involvement of chemokine receptors in breast cancer metastasis. *Nature.* 410:50-56.
- Mundell, S.J., J. Luo, J.L. Benovic, P.B. Conley, and A.W. Poole. 2006. Distinct clathrin-coated pits sort different G protein-coupled receptor cargo. *Traffic.* 7:1420-31.
- Neves, S.R., P.T. Ram, and R. Iyengar. 2002. G protein pathways. *Science.* 296:1636-9.
- Oakley, R.H., S.A. Laporte, J.A. Holt, L.S. Barak, and M.G. Caron. 1999. Association of beta-arrestin with G protein-coupled receptors during clathrin-mediated endocytosis dictates the profile of receptor resensitization. *J Biol Chem.* 274:32248-57.
- Oakley, R.H., S.A. Laporte, J.A. Holt, L.S. Barak, and M.G. Caron. 2001. Molecular determinants underlying the formation of stable intracellular G

protein-coupled receptor-beta-arrestin complexes after receptor endocytosis*. *J Biol Chem.* 276:19452-60.

Oakley, R.H., S.A. Laporte, J.A. Holt, M.G. Caron, and L.S. Barak. 2000. Differential affinities of visual arrestin, beta arrestin1, and beta arrestin2 for G protein-coupled receptors delineate two major classes of receptors. *J Biol Chem.* 275:17201-10.

Packer, M., M.R. Bristow, J.N. Cohn, W.S. Colucci, M.B. Fowler, E.M. Gilbert, and N.H. Shusterman. 1996. The effect of carvedilol on morbidity and mortality in patients with chronic heart failure. U.S. Carvedilol Heart Failure Study Group. *N Engl J Med.* 334:1349-55.

Packer, M., A.J. Coats, M.B. Fowler, H.A. Katus, H. Krum, P. Mohacsi, J.L. Rouleau, M. Tendera, A. Castaigne, E.B. Roecker, M.K. Schultz, and D.L. DeMets. 2001. Effect of carvedilol on survival in severe chronic heart failure. *N Engl J Med.* 344:1651-8.

Pagano, A., P. Crottet, C. Prescianotto-Baschong, and M. Spiess. 2004. In vitro formation of recycling vesicles from endosomes requires adaptor protein-1/clathrin and is regulated by rab4 and the connector rabaptin-5. *Mol Biol Cell.* 15:4990-5000.

Pals-Rylandsdam, R., V.V. Gurevich, K.B. Lee, J.A. Ptasienski, J.L. Benovic, and M.M. Hosey. 1997. Internalization of the m2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor. Arrestin-independent and -dependent pathways. *J Biol Chem.* 272:23682-9.

Papasaikas, P.K., P.G. Bagos, Z.I. Litou, and S.J. Hamodrakas. 2003. A novel method for GPCR recognition and family classification from sequence alone using signatures derived from profile hidden Markov models. *SAR QSAR Environ Res.* 14:413-20.

Penela, P., C. Murga, C. Ribas, A.S. Tutor, S. Peregrin, and F. Mayor, Jr. 2006. Mechanisms of regulation of G protein-coupled receptor kinases (GRKs) and cardiovascular disease. *Cardiovasc Res.* 69:46-56.

Perez, H.D., F. Elfman, S. Marder, E. Lobo, and H.E. Ives. 1989. Formyl peptide-induced chemotaxis of human polymorphonuclear leukocytes does not require either marked changes in cytosolic calcium or specific granule

discharge. Role of formyl peptide receptor reexpression (or recycling). *J Clin Invest.* 83:1963-70.

Perez, H.D., R. Ong, K. Khanna, D. Banda, and I.M. Goldstein. 1982. Wheat germ agglutinin specifically inhibits formyl peptide-induced polymorphonuclear leukocyte chemotaxis. *J Immunol.* 129:2718-24.

Pierce, K.L., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. Classical and new roles of beta-arrestins in the regulation of G-protein-coupled receptors. *Nat Rev Neurosci.* 2:727-33.

Pierce, K.L., L.M. Luttrell, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2001. New mechanisms in heptahelical receptor signaling to mitogen activated protein kinase cascades. *Oncogene.* 20:1532-9.

Popa, I., M. Deneka, and P. van der Sluijs. 2005. Expression and properties of the Rab4, Rabaptin-5alpha, AP-1 complex in endosomal recycling. *Methods Enzymol.* 403:526-40.

Potter, R.M., T.A. Key, V.V. Gurevich, L.A. Sklar, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2002. Arrestin variants display differential binding characteristics for the phosphorylated N-formyl peptide receptor carboxyl terminus. *J Biol Chem.* 277:8970-8.

Potter, R.M., D.C. Maestas, D.F. Cimino, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2006. Regulation of N-formyl peptide receptor signaling and trafficking by individual carboxyl-terminal serine and threonine residues. *J Immunol.* 176:5418-25.

Premont, R.T. 2005. Once and future signaling: G protein-coupled receptor kinase control of neuronal sensitivity. *Neuromolecular Med.* 7:129-47.

Prossnitz, E.R., and R.D. Ye. 1997. The N-formyl peptide receptor: a model for the study of chemoattractant receptor structure and function. *Pharmacol Ther.* 74:73-102.

Reiter, E., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2006. GRKs and beta-arrestins: roles in receptor silencing, trafficking and signaling. *Trends Endocrinol Metab.* 17:159-65.

- Ren, X.R., E. Reiter, S. Ahn, J. Kim, W. Chen, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2005. Different G protein-coupled receptor kinases govern G protein and beta-arrestin-mediated signaling of V2 vasopressin receptor. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 102:1448-53.
- Revankar, C.M., D.F. Cimino, L.A. Sklar, J.B. Arterburn, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2005. A transmembrane intracellular estrogen receptor mediates rapid cell signaling. *Science*. 307:1625-30.
- Revankar, C.M., C.M. Vines, D.F. Cimino, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2004. Arrestins block G protein-coupled receptor-mediated apoptosis. *J Biol Chem*. 279:24578-84.
- Ribas, C., P. Penela, C. Murga, A. Salcedo, C. Garcia-Hoz, M. Jurado-Pueyo, I. Aymerich, and F. Mayor, Jr. 2006. The G protein-coupled receptor kinase (GRK) interactome: Role of GRKs in GPCR regulation and signaling. *Biochim Biophys Acta*.
- Robinson, M.S. 2004. Adaptable adaptors for coated vesicles. *Trends Cell Biol*. 14:167-74.
- Rockman, H.A., W.J. Koch, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2002. Seven-transmembrane-spanning receptors and heart function. *Nature*. 415:206-12.
- Roseberry, A.G., and M.M. Hosey. 2001. Internalization of the M2 muscarinic acetylcholine receptor proceeds through an atypical pathway in HEK293 cells that is independent of clathrin and caveolae. *J Cell Sci*. 114:739-46.
- Rosenfeld, J.L., B.J. Knoll, and R.H. Moore. 2002. Regulation of G-protein-coupled receptor activity by rab GTPases. *Receptors Channels*. 8:87-97.
- Schmid, E.M., M.G. Ford, A. Burtey, G.J. Praefcke, S.Y. Peak-Chew, I.G. Mills, A. Benmerah, and H.T. McMahon. 2006. Role of the AP2 beta-Appendage Hub in Recruiting Partners for Clathrin-Coated Vesicle Assembly. *PLoS Biol*. 4.
- Seachrist, J.L., P.H. Anborgh, and S.S. Ferguson. 2000. beta 2-adrenergic receptor internalization, endosomal sorting, and plasma membrane recycling are regulated by rab GTPases. *J Biol Chem*. 275:27221-8.

- Shenoy, S.K., M.T. Drake, C.D. Nelson, D.A. Houtz, K. Xiao, S. Madabushi, E. Reiter, R.T. Premont, O. Lichtarge, and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2006. beta-arrestin-dependent, G protein-independent ERK1/2 activation by the beta2 adrenergic receptor. *J Biol Chem.* 281:1261-73.
- Shenoy, S.K., and R.J. Lefkowitz. 2005. Angiotensin II-stimulated signaling through G proteins and beta-arrestin. *Sci STKE.* 2005:cm14.
- Simaan, M., S. Bedard-Goulet, D. Fessart, J.P. Gratton, and S.A. Laporte. 2005. Dissociation of beta-arrestin from internalized bradykinin B2 receptor is necessary for receptor recycling and resensitization. *Cell Signal.* 17:1074-83.
- Sun, Y., Z. Cheng, L. Ma, and G. Pei. 2002. Beta-arrestin2 is critically involved in CXCR4-mediated chemotaxis, and this is mediated by its enhancement of p38 MAPK activation. *J Biol Chem.* 277:49212-9.
- Tohgo, A., E.W. Choy, D. Gesty-Palmer, K.L. Pierce, S. Laporte, R.H. Oakley, M.G. Caron, R.J. Lefkowitz, and L.M. Luttrell. 2003. The stability of the G protein-coupled receptor-beta-arrestin interaction determines the mechanism and functional consequence of ERK activation. *J Biol Chem.* 278:6258-67.
- Tohgo, A., K.L. Pierce, E.W. Choy, R.J. Lefkowitz, and L.M. Luttrell. 2002. beta-Arrestin scaffolding of the ERK cascade enhances cytosolic ERK activity but inhibits ERK-mediated transcription following angiotensin AT1a receptor stimulation. *J Biol Chem.* 277:9429-36.
- van Koppen, C.J. 2001. Multiple pathways for the dynamin-regulated internalization of muscarinic acetylcholine receptors. *Biochem Soc Trans.* 29:505-8.
- van Koppen, C.J., and K.H. Jakobs. 2004. Arrestin-independent internalization of G protein-coupled receptors. *Mol Pharmacol.* 66:365-7.
- VanCompernelle, S.E., K.L. Clark, K.A. Rummel, and S.C. Todd. 2003. Expression and function of formyl peptide receptors on human fibroblast cells. *J Immunol.* 171:2050-6.

- Venter, J., M. Adams, E. Myers, P. Li, R. Mural, G. Sutton, H. Smith, M. Yandell, C. Evans, and R. Holt. 2001. The sequencing of the human genome. *Science*. 291:1304-1351.
- Vieira, A.V., C. Lamaze, and S.L. Schmid. 1996. Control of EGF receptor signaling by clathrin-mediated endocytosis. *Science*. 274:2086-9.
- Vines, C.M., C.M. Revankar, D.C. Maestas, L.L. LaRusch, D.F. Cimino, T.A. Kohout, R.J. Lefkowitz, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2003. N-formyl peptide receptors internalize but do not recycle in the absence of arrestins. *J Biol Chem*. 278:41581-4.
- Vishnivetskiy, S.A., C.L. Paz, C. Schubert, J.A. Hirsch, P.B. Sigler, and V.V. Gurevich. 1999. How does arrestin respond to the phosphorylated state of rhodopsin? *J Biol Chem*. 274:11451-4.
- Willars, G.B. 2006. Mammalian RGS proteins: multifunctional regulators of cellular signalling. *Semin Cell Dev Biol*. 17:363-76.
- Wu, N., S.M. Hanson, D.J. Francis, S.A. Vishnivetskiy, M. Thibonnier, C.S. Klug, M. Shoham, and V.V. Gurevich. 2006. Arrestin binding to calmodulin: a direct interaction between two ubiquitous signaling proteins. *J Mol Biol*. 364:955-63.
- Wu, X., X. Zhao, R. Puertollano, J.S. Bonifacino, E. Eisenberg, and L.E. Greene. 2003. Adaptor and clathrin exchange at the plasma membrane and trans-Golgi network. *Mol Biol Cell*. 14:516-28.
- Xue, M., C.M. Vines, T. Buranda, D.F. Cimino, T.A. Bennett, and E.R. Prossnitz. 2004. N-formyl peptide receptors cluster in an active raft-associated state prior to phosphorylation. *J Biol Chem*. 279:45175-84.
- Zhang, J., S.S. Ferguson, L.S. Barak, L. Menard, and M.G. Caron. 1996. Dynamin and beta-arrestin reveal distinct mechanisms for G protein-coupled receptor internalization. *J Biol Chem*. 271:18302-5.
- Zhou, Y., X. Bian, Y. Le, W. Gong, J. Hu, X. Zhang, L. Wang, P. Iribarren, R. Salcedo, O.M. Howard, W. Farrar, and J.M. Wang. 2005. Formylpeptide receptor FPR and the rapid growth of malignant human gliomas. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 97:823-35.

