Functional sites involved in modulation of the GABA_A receptor channel by the intravenous anesthetics propofol, etomidate and pentobarbital

Maria C. Maldifassi^a, Roland Baur^a and Erwin Sigel^{a*}

^aInstitute of Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine, University of Bern, CH-3012 Bern, Switzerland.

***Correspondence:**

Erwin Sigel

Bühlstrasse 28

Institute of Biochemistry and Molecular Medicine

University of Bern

CH-3012 Bern

Switzerland

E-mail: sigel@ibmm.unibe.ch

Abbreviations:

GABA, gamma-aminobutyric acid; GABA_A receptor, gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptor

Abstract

GABA_A receptors are the major inhibitory neurotransmitter receptors in the brain and are the target for many clinically important drugs. Among the many modulatory compounds are also the intravenous anesthetics propofol and etomidate, and barbiturates. The mechanism of receptor modulation by these compounds is of mayor relevance. The site of action of these compounds has been located to subunit interfaces in the intra-membrane region of the receptor. In $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptors there are five such interfaces, two β^+/α^- and one each of α^+/β^- , α^+/γ^- and γ^+/β^- subunit interfaces. We have used reporter mutations located in the second trans-membrane region in different subunits to probe the effects of changes at these subunit interfaces on modulation by propofol, etomidate and pentobarbital. We provide evidence for the fact that each of these compounds either modulates through a different set of subunit interfaces or through the same set of subunit interfaces to a different degree. As a GABA_A receptor pentamer harbors two β^+/α^- subunit interfaces, we used concatenated receptors to dissect the contribution of individual interfaces and show that only one of these interfaces is important for receptor modulation by etomidate.

Keywords

GABA_A receptors; Chloride channels; Electrophysiology; *Xenopus* oocyte, Anesthetics; Barbiturates.

1. Introduction

GABA_A receptors are the major inhibitory neurotransmitter receptors in the mammalian central nervous system. Numerous subunits have been cloned (for review see: Barnard et al., 1998; Macdonald and Olsen, 1994; Olsen and Sieghart, 2008; Rabow et al., 1995; Sigel and Steinmann, 2012), indicating that numerous receptor isoforms exist (Olsen and Sieghart, 2008). The subunits show homology to subunits of other Cys-loop receptors (Betz, 1990; Miller and Smart, 2010). Many GABA_A receptors are heteromeric protein complexes consisting of five subunits, which are arranged around a central Cl⁻-selective channel (Macdonald and Olsen, 1994). The major receptor isoform of the GABA_A receptor in the brain consists of α_1 , β_2 and γ_2 subunits (Barnard et al., 1998; Macdonald and Olsen, 1994; Olsen and Sieghart, 2008; Rabow et al., 1995; Sigel and Steinmann, 2012). Different approaches have indicated a 2 α :2 β :1 γ subunit stoichiometry for this receptor (Baumann et al., 2001; Chang et al., 1996; Farrar et al., 1999; Tretter et al., 1997) with a subunit arrangement $\gamma\beta\alpha\beta\alpha$ anti-clockwise as seen from the synaptic cleft (Baumann et al., 2001; Baumann et al., 2002; Baur et al., 2006). The pharmacological properties of a receptor depend on subunit composition (Sigel et al., 1990) as well as their arrangement (Minier and Sigel, 2004). GABA_A receptors do not exclusively locate to synapses. Some receptor subtypes, among them the ones containing the δ subunit, have been found in extra-synaptic regions where they mediate tonic inhibition (Farrant and Nusser, 2005).

The GABA_A receptor is the target of many clinically used and experimental drugs (for review see Sieghart, 1995; Sieghart and Ernst, 2005; Middendorp et al., 2014), including benzodiazepines, barbiturates, volatile anesthetics, and the intravenous anesthetics propofol and etomidate. There is good evidence that the intravenous

anesthetics act near the extracellular end of the membrane-spanning domain (M) of various subunits. Amino acid residues located in the non-channel lining face of the β M2, and in α M1, β M1, β M3 and γ M3 have been proposed to form part of the binding site(s) (Bali and Akabas, 2004; Chiara et al., 2013; Jayakar et al., 2014; Richardson et al., 2007; Yip et al., 2013).

Co-crystallization of homomeric *Caenorhabditis elegans* GluCl receptors with the allosteric modulator ivermectin revealed that the latter binds at each of the five interfaces in the transmembrane domain of the receptor. S260 (M2-15') located within M2 forms a hydrogen bond with ivermectin (Hibbs and Gouaux, 2011). The homologous position in β subunits (β_2 N265) of GABA_A receptors is also important for modulation by anesthetics (Belelli et al., 1997; Jurd et al., 2003; Stewart et al., 2014). A docking analysis performed with etomidate in the GABA_A receptor placed this compound in a binding pocket homologous to the ivermectin-pocket in the GluCl receptor (Chiara et al., 2012). In $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptors there exist in principle 5 different interfaces that harbor the corresponding pocket.

β_2 N265 (β M2-15') was first identified as a determinant of the modulatory action of loreclezole (Wingrove et al., 1994). Later work has shown that this residue, located in the β +/ α - interface is crucial for modulation by etomidate and propofol. Many point mutations of this residue abolished or reduced sensitivity to etomidate, among them β_3 N265M, β_2 N265S, β_2 N265C, β_2 N265M (Belelli et al., 1997; Fernandez et al., 2012; Siegwart et al., 2002; Stewart et al., 2014; Wingrove et al., 1994). In β_3 N265M mutant mice its anesthetic action is impaired (Jurd et al., 2003). However, direct photo-labeling of this residue has never been observed. Moreover, propofol and etomidate failed to protect β_2 N265C from covalent modification from sulfhydryl-reactive reagents (Bali

and Akabas, 2004; Li et al., 2009; Stewart et al., 2014). Thus, it is not clear if the β_2 N265 residue has a direct role in binding, or in allosteric effects (Stewart et al., 2013). Modulation by the barbiturate pentobarbital is not affected by the β_2 N265C mutation (McCracken et al., 2010), although in a β_3 N265M knock-in mouse model some of the anesthetic responses towards this agent were reduced (Zeller et al., 2007). The influence of this residue in barbiturate action remains uncertain (McCracken et al., 2010).

In an attempt to further characterize the site of action of these compounds, photo-affinity labeling has been used. Photo-reactive etomidate analogs identified two equivalent anesthetic binding sites in the trans-membrane domain in the two β +/ α - interfaces, which also contain the GABA binding sites in the extracellular domain. A second class of anesthetic binding site has been labeled using a photo-reactive derivative of barbiturates, at the α +/ β - and γ +/ β - subunit interfaces. In $\alpha_1\beta_3\gamma_2$ and $\alpha_1\beta_3$ receptor types, propofol produced a concentration-dependent inhibition of photo-labeling by etomidate and barbiturate analogs > 90%. Propofol bound with similar affinities to β +/ α - sites and α +/ β - / γ +/ β - sites, with an IC_{50} of $\sim 40 \mu M$ in $\alpha_1\beta_3\gamma_2$ receptors. Since this concentration is nearly 10-fold higher than the concentrations of propofol necessary to potentiate the receptor, the authors suggested that propofol may not only bind to the aforementioned sites, but additionally to other unidentified sites (Chiara et al., 2013). Barbiturates failed to inhibit with high affinity etomidate binding, and etomidate does not inhibit the labeling by the barbiturate derivative (Chiara et al., 2013; Jayakar et al., 2014). Thus, the authors propose that occupation of any of these sites is enough for anesthetic action. Given the structural diversity of intravenous anesthetics it is also unlikely that all anesthetics bind to a common class of pockets (Chiara et al., 2012).

Use of photo-affinity labeling is a direct method for the identification of amino acid residues located in or close to drug binding sites through an irreversible covalent reaction, although the lack of labeling does not provide evidence that a certain amino acid residue is not involved in drug interaction (Yip et al., 2013). Successful photo-affinity labeling alone also can not provide information on whether the corresponding site mediates weak or strong positive allosteric properties or antagonist properties. In any case functional data using low concentrations of the compounds are required.

Here we performed a detailed study of the functional consequences of the β_2 N265I point mutation, and homologous mutations in other subunits (α_1 S269I, γ_2 S280I). All these mutations are located at subunit interfaces. Earlier work has shown that combined mutation of the three residues eliminated the low affinity potentiation by diazepam in mutated $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors (Walters et al., 2000). Our results indicate multiple sites of action all located at subunit interfaces for low concentrations of etomidate, propofol and pentobarbital. These sites mediate channel potentiation to a different degree. Using subunit concatenation, we demonstrate that the two β^+/α^- subunit interfaces differentially affect modulation by etomidate.

2. Methods

2.1. Construction of mutated receptor subunits

The point mutations α_1 S269I, β_2 N265I and γ_2 S280I were prepared using the QuikChangeTM mutagenesis kit (Stratagene, Agilent Technologies, Basel, Switzerland).

2.2. Construction of concatenated subunits

Construction of tandem and triple subunit cDNAs. The tandem construct $\gamma_2\text{-}\beta_2$, and triple construct $\alpha_1\text{-}\beta_2\text{-}\alpha_1$ has been described previously (Boulineau et al., 2005). Site-directed mutagenesis of $\beta_2\text{N265}$ to I was done in the tandem construct and the triple construct using the QuikChangeTM mutagenesis kit (Stratagene, Agilent Technologies, Basel, Switzerland).

2.3. Expression of GABA_A receptors in *Xenopus* oocytes

Capped cRNAs were synthesized (Ambion, Austin, TX, USA) from the linearized plasmids with a cytomegalovirus promotor (pCMV vectors) containing the different subunits, respectively. A poly-A tail of about 400 residues was added to each transcript using yeast poly-A polymerase (United States Biologicals, Cleveland, OH, USA). The concentration of the cRNA was quantified on a formaldehyde gel using Radiant Red stain (Bio-Rad) for visualization of the RNA. Known concentrations of RNA ladder (Invitrogen) were loaded as standard on the same gel. cRNAs were precipitated in ethanol/isoamylalcohol 19:1, the dried pellet dissolved in water and stored at -80°C . cRNA mixtures were prepared from these stock solutions and stored at -80°C .

Xenopus laevis oocytes were prepared, injected and defolliculated as described previously (Sigel, 1987; Sigel and Minier, 2005; Animal research permit by the Kantonstierarzt, Kantonaler Veterinärdienst Bern (BE98/12)). They were injected with 50 nL of the cRNA solution containing wild type or mutated rat α_1 , β_2 and γ_2 subunits of the GABA_A receptors at a concentration of 10 nM:10 nM:50 nM (Boileau et al., 2002). For concatenated tandem and triple constructs, cRNA combinations ratios of 25 : 25 nM

were used. Injected oocytes were incubated in modified Barth's solution at 18°C for at least 24 h before the measurements.

2.4. Functional characterization of the GABA_A receptors

Currents were measured using a modified two-electrode voltage clamp amplifier Oocyte clamp OC-725 (Warner Instruments) in combination with a XY-recorder (90% response time 0.1 s) or digitized at 100 Hz using a PowerLab 2/20 (AD Instruments) using the computer programs Chart (ADInstruments GmbH, Spechbach, Germany). Tests with a model oocyte were performed to ensure linearity in the larger current range. The response was linear up to 15 μ A. The holding potential was -80 mV. The perfusion medium contained 90 mM NaCl, 1 mM KCl, 1 mM MgCl₂, 1 mM CaCl₂, and 5 mM Na-HEPES (pH 7.4). Concentration response curves for GABA were fitted with the equation $I(c) = I_{\max}/[1 + (EC_{50}/c)^n]$, where c is the concentration of GABA, EC_{50} the concentration of GABA eliciting half-maximal current amplitude, $I_{\max}$ is the maximal current amplitude, I the current amplitude, and n is the Hill coefficient. Maximal current amplitudes ($I_{\max}$) were obtained from the fits of the concentration-response curves. For all receptors studied, modulation was measured at a GABA concentration eliciting 0.5-1.5 % of the maximal GABA current amplitude. GABA was applied two times for 20 s alone, and 45 s in combination with the different compounds. The duration of washout periods was 4 min in between agonist or agonist/drug applications to prevent receptor desensitization. GABA application were done repeatedly when the elicited current amplitude altered by $>5\%$. The relative currents in presence of an modulator were expressed as potentiation calculated by the following equation: $(I_{\text{Modulator} + \text{GABA}}/I_{\text{GABA}} - 1) * 100\%$. The perfusion system was cleaned between drug applications by washing

with DMSO to avoid contamination. All media contained a final concentration of 0.5 % DMSO (v/v) to ensure drug solubility.

The concentrations of propofol and etomidate were chosen as 3 μ M and 1 μ M, respectively. These concentrations are both well below the respective EC₅₀s for potentiation of the GABA response. Potentiation by pentobarbital was small under those conditions. Therefore, a concentration of 50 μ M was chosen which is slightly above this EC₅₀.

2.5. Statistical Analysis

All data are from as a minimum of five different oocytes from at least two different batches of oocytes, except the experiments with concatenated subunits were performed with three oocytes. Data represent mean $\pm$ SEM or mean $\pm$ SD as indicated in each case. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for multiple comparisons followed by a Tukey *post hoc* test.

3. Results

3.1. Functional characteristics of wild-type and mutated GABA_A $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors

Combined mutation in M2 of three subunits of $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors, α_1 S269I, β_2 N265I and γ_2 S280I, has been shown to abolish low affinity effects mediated by diazepam (Walters et al., 2000). We used these mutations here and call them α_1 M, β_2 M and γ_2 M in the following. These mutations are homologous to each other. Figure 1 shows a scheme of the localization of the mutations at the different subunit interfaces. We studied here this triply mutated receptor and receptors containing the individual mutations. Wild-type, $\alpha_1\beta_2$, α_1 M $\beta_2\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_2$ M γ_2 , $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ M and α_1 M β_2 M γ_2 M were expressed in *Xenopus* oocytes, and using electrophysiological techniques we first investigated the GABA sensitivity of these receptors. In α_1 M $\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors the α +/ β - and α +/ γ -subunit interfaces are affected. In $\alpha_1\beta_2$ M γ_2 the two β +/ α - subunit interfaces are affected. In $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ M only one subunit interface is affected, namely γ +/ β -. Full concentration-response curves for GABA were determined in all receptor types (Figure 2) and the normalized data were fitted as described in the methods section. Table 1 shows the parameters obtained from each receptor type

Oocytes expressing α_1 M $\beta_2\gamma_2$ and α_1 M β_2 M γ_2 M receptors, showed a leftward shift in the GABA concentration response curves compared to that obtained for wild-

type receptors, by about one order of magnitude. Hence these mutations rendered these receptors more sensitive to opening by GABA. In contrast, the $\alpha_1\beta_2$ M γ_2 mutant receptors presented a slightly higher EC₅₀ as compared to wild-type receptors.

Xenopus oocytes expressing the $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ M receptor, produced GABA activated currents

Table 1

GABA concentration-response curves of wild-type $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_2$ and mutated receptors.

GABA receptor	EC₅₀ (μM)	Hill	I_{max} (μA)
$\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ (WT)	25.6 $\pm$ 7.4	1.2 $\pm$ 0.2	7.5 $\pm$ 2.2
α_1 (S270I) β_2 (N265I) γ_2 (S280I)	1.4 $\pm$ 0.9	1.2 $\pm$ 0.9	10.3 $\pm$ 1.3
α_1 (S270I) $\beta_2\gamma_2$	2.2 $\pm$ 0.5	1.2 $\pm$ 0.2	3.8 $\pm$ 0.4
$\alpha_1\beta_2$ (N265I) γ_2	50 $\pm$ 19	1.4 $\pm$ 0.2	9.1 $\pm$ 1.8
$\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ (S280I)	14.5 $\pm$ 7.0	1.7 $\pm$ 0.2	6.9 $\pm$ 0.5
$\alpha_1\beta_2$	2.2 $\pm$ 0.6	1.4 $\pm$ 0.1	7.5 $\pm$ 1.5

EC₅₀, Hill coefficient, and I max are given as mean $\pm$ SEM (n = 4-6). Data from two injections each.

with a GABA EC₅₀ comparable to that of wild-type receptors. As the α_1 M mutation made the receptor more sensitive to GABA we tested it for spontaneous channel opening. The picrotoxin-sensitive current was small and amounted to only 0.8 $\pm$ 0.3 % of maximal GABA elicited currents (mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3), indicating a rather low probability of spontaneous opening.

3.2. Asymmetry in channel modulation

In order to determine the effect of these point mutations on the potentiation of GABA_A receptor by the anesthetics propofol and etomidate, and by the barbiturate pentobarbital, wild-type and mutated receptors were expressed in *Xenopus* oocytes and the effect of GABA responses was examined, using a concentration of GABA eliciting 0.5-1.5 % of the maximal current amplitude. Figure 3 shows original traces and Figure 4 summarizes the results.

As shown in Figure 4, the mutation in the α_1 subunit did not significantly affect the degree of potentiation by 3 μ M propofol observed in wild-type receptors.

Modulation by propofol was strongly impaired in the $\alpha_1\beta_2\text{M}\gamma_2$ receptor. Potentiation of the GABA response by propofol in wild-type receptors amounted to $1292 \pm 200\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$) and was reduced to $32 \pm 15\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$) in this latter receptor subtype. Moreover, potentiation in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2\text{M}$ receptors was strongly decreased, indicating that propofol may act at the $\gamma+/\beta-$ subunit interface. In $\alpha_1\beta_2$ receptors potentiation at GABA $\text{EC}_{0.5-1.5}$ amounted to $1443 \pm 364\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$), which is similar as in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors.

In $\alpha_1\text{M}\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors potentiation by 1 μM etomidate amounted to $974 \pm 112\%$ and did not significantly differ from the potentiation observed in wild-type receptors, which amounted to $1011 \pm 47\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$). Potentiation of the GABA response by etomidate in $\alpha_1\beta_2\text{M}\gamma_2$ and in $\alpha_1\text{M}\beta_2\text{M}\gamma_2\text{M}$ receptors was totally abolished. In the $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2\text{M}$ receptor type, potentiation was significantly enhanced as compared to wild-type receptors, amounting to $1746 \pm 93\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$). Thus, etomidate may also act at the $\gamma+/\beta-$ subunit interface. Potentiation in $\alpha_1\beta_2$ receptors was $510 \pm 52\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$), significantly lower than in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors.

Modulation of both propofol and etomidate is abolished by the mutation in the β_2 subunit, while the mutation in the α_1 subunit does not modify the response. Additionally the γ_2 mutation had different consequences for each; potentiation by propofol was reduced, whereas that by etomidate was increased. Thus, the site at the $\gamma+/\beta-$ subunit interface has different effects on potentiation by these two compounds.

Potentiation by 50 μM of the barbiturate pentobarbital was considerably reduced in all mutated receptors subtypes (Figure 4), thus displaying a different pattern from etomidate and propofol. Potentiation by pentobarbital in wild-type receptors amounted

to $816 \pm 37\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$) and was significantly reduced to $17 \pm 8\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$) in the $\alpha_1\text{M}\beta_2\text{M}\gamma_2\text{M}$ receptor. For the individual mutated receptors stimulated with pentobarbital potentiation amounted to $395 \pm 49\%$ in $\alpha_1\text{M}\beta_2\gamma_2$, $608 \pm 46\%$ in $\alpha_1\beta_2\text{M}\gamma_2$ and to $289 \pm 24\%$ in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2\text{M}$ receptor subtypes (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 5$), all being statistically different from the value of potentiation obtained in wild-type receptors. In $\alpha_1\beta_2$ receptors potentiation was increased compared to wild type receptors and amounted to $1114 \pm 124\%$ (mean $\pm$ SEM, $n = 4$).

The above data seem to suggest the presence of modulatory sites for barbiturates at least at one of the β_+/ α_- subunit interfaces, at one of the α_+/ β_- or α_+/ γ_- subunit interfaces and at the γ_+/ β_- subunit interface, respectively.

To establish that these mutations do not interfere with potentiation by all possible compounds, we tested whether $1 \mu\text{M}$ THDOC and $1 \mu\text{M}$ diazepam were sensitive towards them. Figure 5 shows that, single as well as combined mutations did not affect significantly potentiation by these compounds at the concentrations tested.

3.3. The two β_+/ α_- subunit interfaces have different properties

Each GABA_A receptor contains two β_2 subunits in different positions (Figure 6), both at β_+/ α_- subunit interfaces. As shown above, combined mutation in these subunits has been shown to greatly reduce the modulatory effects of propofol and etomidate. We wanted to study at the functional level the properties of individual mutations, in order to uncover the effects of both subunit interfaces. We called the mutation in the β_2 subunit next to the γ_2 subunit Site 1, and the mutation in the β_2 subunit located between the α_1 subunits Site 2. Using subunit concatenation, we introduced the $\beta_2\text{M}$ mutation

selectively in either Site 1 or Site 2. Double and triple concatenated subunits were built and expressed in *Xenopus* oocytes to form the receptors (Figure 6). The α_1 - β_2 M- α_1 or γ_2 - β_2 M constructs were co-expressed with corresponding non mutated dual or triple subunit constructs (α_1 - β_2 M- α_1/γ_2 - β_2 and α_1 - β_2 - α_1/γ_2 - β_2 M), or were expressed together to form the double mutant (α_1 - β_2 M- α_1/γ_2 - β_2 M). Wild-type concatenated receptors α_1 - β_2 - α_1/γ_2 - β_2 were also expressed. This construct has been previously characterized by an EC₅₀ value for GABA of approximately 120 μ M (Baumann et al., 2003). Thus, we were able to study the influence of the position of the β_2 M mutation in the receptor pentamer on modulation by etomidate, propofol and pentobarbital. In non-mutated concatenated GABA_A receptors, propofol, etomidate, and pentobarbital potentiated currents induced by GABA to a similar extent as in non-concatenated wild-type receptors (Figure 7).

As shown in Figure 7, in the Site 1 mutated and Site 2 mutated receptors, the modulation by propofol was reduced significantly compared to wild-type receptors (806 ± 41 %), to a similar degree (247 ± 102 % and 294 ± 85 %, mean $\pm$ SD $n = 3$, respectively, and was highly reduced in the double mutant, amounting to 24 ± 4 % (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$). Hence both binding sites seem to participate similarly in the modulation by propofol. In contrast, modulation by etomidate was sensitive to the mutation of both sites to a different degree. In the Site 2 mutant receptor the potentiation was reduced from 761 ± 41 % in wild type receptors to 498 ± 62 % (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$), while the potentiation in the Site 1 mutated receptor was more strongly affected with 129 ± 19 % residual potentiation (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$). In the double mutant potentiation was completely abolished. In this case, although both subunits are necessary for the full modulatory effect of etomidate, the contribution of Site 1 is more important than the other.

We also tested pentobarbital modulation in all concatenated receptors. In non-mutated receptors, pentobarbital potentiated currents induced by GABA to a comparable degree as non-concatenated wild-type receptors, $831 \pm 180\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$). In the double mutant, potentiation was reduced to $440 \pm 30\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$). Potentiation in Site 1 mutated receptor was $604 \pm 118\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$) and $449 \pm 141\%$ (mean $\pm$ SD, $n = 3$) in Site 2 mutated receptors. Thus, only mutation in Site 2 reduces potentiation.

4. Discussion

In this study we investigated how modification of subunit interfaces affects potentiation of GABA_A receptor by intravenous anesthetics. A detailed study of the functional properties of receptors carrying the β_2 N265I point mutation, and homologous mutations in other subunits (α_1 S269I, γ_2 S280I) was performed. All these mutations are located at subunit interfaces. The individual contribution of the two different β +/ α -subunit interfaces was also dissected.

If point mutation of a residue decreases modulation by a compound it is not clear if the mutated residue is required for binding of the compounds or is involved in the allosteric transduction required for modulation. Inhibition of photo-affinity labeling is similarly ambiguous. In any case, we assume here that if a mutation located at a subunit interface affects the functional response, this indicates an action at that interface. If the mutation fails to affect the functional response, this residue could still

be in contact with the compound or act at the same subunit interface, but could act as antagonist.

Earlier work on the location of anesthetic sites has included photo-affinity labeling experiments. This has the advantage of identification of single amino acid residues involved in the interaction, but the disadvantage of largely ignoring functional aspects and making use of modified anesthetic compounds that may orient in a different way from unmodified compounds. Competition with unmodified compounds has been interpreted as an overlap with the reacted compound, but may also reflect an allosteric interaction.

Amino acid residues located at the following subunit interfaces have been identified by direct labeling with a reactive compound. Alternatively, a low affinity site of action of an anesthetic has putatively been identified by competition with labeling. High affinity sites for propofol and etomidate (Li et al., 2006; Yip et al., 2013) and low affinity sites for barbiturates have been found at the β +/ α - subunit interfaces (Chiara et al., 2013; Jayakar et al., 2014). It should be pointed out here that there are two β +/ α - subunit interfaces which have not been differentiated in the above work. High affinity sites for photo-reactive barbiturate derivatives have been found at the α +/ β - and γ +/ β - subunit interfaces (Chiara et al., 2013; Jayakar et al., 2014). A site for propofol has been located to α +/ β - in $\alpha_1\beta_3$ receptors (Jayakar et al., 2014). Displacement of labeling by a barbiturate derivative by etomidate at the γ +/ β - interface has been attributed to an allosteric effect (Jayakar et al., 2015). No site has been reported for the α +/ γ - subunit interface.

Here, we first determined how these mutations affect gating by GABA. For this, we expressed the mutant receptors in *Xenopus* Oocytes. As previously demonstrated,

the triply mutated receptor showed a decrease in the EC_{50} for GABA as compared to wild type receptors (Walters et al., 2000), which has later been attributed to the mutation in the α_1 subunit (Nishikawa et al. 2002; Middendorp et al., 2015; this work). Thus, introduction of the point mutation α_1S269I into $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors led to a similar decrease. Earlier mutation studies of this residue have similarly found such a decrease in receptors carrying mutations to histidine, tryptophane, or isoleucine (Scheller et al., 2001; Nishikawa et al., 2002). A negative correlation between the EC_{50} value for GABA and the molecular size of the amino acids in this position was observed (Nishikawa et al., 2002). Similar to other studies using the point mutations β_2N265S (Fernandez et al., 2012), β_2N265I (Nishikawa et al., 2002), and β_2N265M (Siegwart et al., 2003), we found that mutation of β_2N265I led to a marginally higher EC_{50} as compared wild-type receptors. The γ_2S280I mutation that has never been studied before fails to significantly affect gating by GABA.

Subsequently, we examined the effect of these point mutations located at subunit interfaces on the potentiation by etomidate, propofol, and pentobarbital. Combined mutation at all interfaces nearly abolished potentiation by all compounds studied here and also by SJM-3 described earlier (Middendorp et al., 2015). Similarly, it has been reported that the low affinity site for benzodiazepines is abolished in receptors carrying these combined mutations (Walters et al., 2000). However, this triple mutant did not affect the potentiation by low concentrations of diazepam (1 μM) and by 1 μM of the neurosteroid THDOC (Fig. 5). At low concentration, diazepam interacts with a very specific modulatory site that is located extracellularly at the $\alpha+/\gamma-$ subunit interface (Sigel and Buhr, 1997; Sigel and Lüscher, 2011). Published observations are in agreement with our findings. First, THDOC failed to inhibit labeling of an etomidate

photoanalog in GABA_A receptors (Li et al., 2009; Li et al., 2010) and second, the β_2 N265 residue is not implicated in the modulation of the receptor by neurosteroids (Belelli and Lambert, 2005).

We also investigated the effect on potentiation by anesthetics in receptors carrying the single mutations. We separately discuss in the following the findings made in α_1 S269I $\beta_2\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_2$ N265I γ_2 and $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ S280I receptors.

α_1 S269I $\beta_2\gamma_2$ receptors showed a reduced potentiation by pentobarbital, while that by propofol and etomidate remained unaffected. In contrast, potentiation by volatile anesthetics was highly reduced in receptors carrying different point mutations of α_1 S269 (Nishikawa et al., 2002). Each GABA_A receptor pentamer contains two $\alpha+$ subunit interfaces that could contribute to the modulatory effect (Fig. 1). Our results do not differentiate between $\alpha+/\beta-$ or $\alpha+/\gamma-$ interfaces in barbiturate action. As stated above, photo-labeling with barbiturate derivatives also indicated involvement of the $\alpha+/\beta-$ interface.

In receptors containing the β_2 N265I mutations potentiation by etomidate and propofol was nearly abolished and that by pentobarbital reduced. As stated above, photo-labeling data indicated sites for etomidate and propofol and low affinity sites for pentobarbital at $\beta+/\alpha-$ interfaces (Chiara et al., 2010; Jayakar et al., 2014; Li et al., 2006; Yip et al., 2013). We used subunit concatenation to alter selectively one of the two interfaces. Concatenated receptors without mutation, or containing a single β_2 N265I subunit in both positions (Fig. 6), or doubly mutated receptors were assembled. As expected, in doubly mutated receptors, potentiation by etomidate and propofol was nearly abolished. Pentobarbital modulation in the double mutant was reduced to about half of the potentiation observed in non-mutated receptors. Potentiation by propofol was

reduced to the similar extent in both mutated receptors, indicating that both subunit interfaces participate to a similar degree in the effect of this anesthetic. Potentiation by etomidate, was affected by alteration at both subunit interfaces to a different extent. Mutation in Site 1 nearly abolished potentiation while mutation in Site 2 only led to a small reduction. Thus, contribution of Site 1 to the modulatory effect was more dominant than that by Site 2.

Our observation is surprising as earlier work with our concatenated receptors carrying the α_1 M236W point mutation has led to the conclusion that the two sites for etomidate at β_+/ α_- interfaces contribute equally to modulation and that no cooperative interaction occurs between the two sites (Guitchounts et al., 2012). Obviously, a mutation located in α_1 M1 leads to different consequences than a mutation in β_2 M2. The reason for this is not known.

Introduction of the γ_2 S280I mutation located at the γ_+ / β_- subunit interface altered potentiation by all studied compounds. While the mutation negatively affected the potentiation by propofol and pentobarbital, potentiation by etomidate was surprisingly enhanced. These observations indicate that all the investigated substances interact with the γ_+ / β_- subunit interface. Interestingly, as mentioned above, no photo-labeling at this subunit interface using a propofol or an etomidate analog has been observed, but etomidate inhibited labeling by a barbiturate derivative of a residue located at the γ_+ side (Jayakar et al., 2015).

The $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptor has five subunit interfaces, $\gamma\beta_+ / \alpha_- \beta$ (Site 1), $\alpha\beta_+ / \alpha_- \gamma$ (Site 2), α_+ / β_- , α_+ / γ_- and γ_+ / β_- . We conclude here that etomidate acts predominantly at $\gamma\beta_+ / \alpha_- \beta$ (Site 1) and γ_+ / β_- subunit interfaces, propofol acts predominantly at $\gamma\beta_+ / \alpha_- \beta$ (Site 1), $\alpha\beta_+ / \alpha_- \gamma$ (Site 2), γ_+ / β_- and pentobarbital acts

predominantly at Site 2 and additionally at α +/ β - and/or α +/ γ - subunit interfaces. Thus, at least four of the five subunit interfaces harbor sites for these compounds which are important for functional modulation, but each compound uses a different set of subunit interfaces. Thus, we observe an asymmetry in anesthetic potentiation of the $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptor.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. V. Niggli for carefully reading the manuscript. This work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation grant 315230_156929/1. M.C.M. is a recipient of a fellowship (Beca Chile Postdoctorado from CONICYT, Ministerio de Educacion, Chile).

References

- Bali M, Akabas MH (2004). Defining the propofol binding site location on the GABA_A receptor. *Mol Pharmacol* 65: 68-76.
- Barnard EA, Skolnick P, Olsen RW, Möhler H, Sieghart W, Biggio G, Braestrup C, Bateson AN, Langer SZ (1998). International Union of Pharmacology. XV. Subtypes of gamma-aminobutyric acidA receptors: classification on the basis of subunit structure and receptor function. *Pharmacol Rev* 50: 291-313.

- Baumann SW, Baur R, Sigel E (2001). Subunit arrangement of gamma aminobutyric acid type A receptors. *J Biol Chem* 276: 36275-36280.
- Baumann SW, Baur R, Sigel E (2002). Forced subunit assembly in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptors. Insight into the absolute arrangement. *J Biol Chem* 277: 46020-46025.
- Baumann SW, Baur R, Sigel E (2003). Individual properties of the two functional agonist sites in GABA_A receptors. *J Neurosci* 23: 11158-11166.
- Baur R, Minier F, Sigel E (2006). A GABA_A receptor of defined subunit composition and positioning: concatenation of five subunits. *FEBS Lett* 580:1616-1620.
- Belelli D, Lambert JJ, Peters JA, Wafford K, Whiting PJ (1997). The interaction of the general anesthetic etomidate with the gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptor is influenced by a single amino acid. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 94: 11031-11036.
- Belelli D, Lambert JJ (2005). Neurosteroids: endogenous regulators of the GABA_A receptor. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 6: 565-575.
- Betz H (1990). Ligand-gated ion channels in the brain: the amino acid receptor superfamily. *Neuron* 5: 383-392.

- Boileau A J, Baur R, Sharkey L M, Sigel E, Czajkowski C (2002). The relative amount of cRNA coding for $\gamma 2$ subunits affects stimulation by benzodiazepines in GABA_A receptors expressed in *Xenopus* oocytes. *Neuropharmacol* 43: 695-700.
- Boulineau N, Baur R, Minier F, Sigel E (2005). Consequence of the presence of two different β subunit isoforms in a GABA_A receptor. *J Neurochem* 95: 1724-1731.
- Chang CS, Olcese R, Olsen RW (2003). A single M1 residue in the beta2 subunit alters channel gating of GABA_A receptor in anesthetic modulation and direct activation. *J Biol Chem* 278: 42821-42828.
- Chang Y, Wang R, Barot S, Weiss DS (1996). Stoichiometry of a recombinant GABA_A receptor. *J Neurosci* 16: 5415–5424.
- Chiara DC, Dostalova Z, Jayakar SS, Zhou X, Miller KW, Cohen JB (2012). Mapping general anesthetic binding site(s) in human $\alpha_1\beta_3$ γ -aminobutyric acid type A receptors with [³H]TDBzl-etomidate, a photoreactive etomidate analogue. *Biochemistry* 51: 836-847.
- Chiara DC, Jayakar SS, Zhou X, Zhang X, Savechenkov PY, Bruzik KS, Miller KW, Cohen JB (2013). Specificity of intersubunit general anesthetic-binding sites in the transmembrane domain of the human $\alpha_1\beta_3\gamma_2$ γ -aminobutyric acid type A (GABAA) receptor. *J Biol Chem* 288: 19343-19357.

- Farrant M, Nusser Z (2005). Variations on an inhibitory theme: Phasic and tonic activation of GABA_A receptors. *Nature Rev Neurosci* 6: 215-229.
- Farrar SJ, Whiting PJ, Bonnert TP, McKernan RM (1999). Stoichiometry of a ligand-gated ion channel determined by fluorescence energy transfer. *J Biol Chem* 274: 10100-10104.
- Fernandez SP, Karim N, Mewett KN, Chebib M, Johnston GA, Hanrahan JR (2012). Flavan-3-ol esters: new agents for exploring modulatory sites on GABA(A) receptors. *Br J Pharmacol* 165: 965-977.
- Guitchounts G, Stewart DS, Forman SA (2012). Two etomidate sites in $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ γ -aminobutyric acid type A receptors contribute equally and noncooperatively to modulation of channel gating. *Anesthesiology* 116: 1235-1244.
- Hibbs RE, Gouaux E (2011). Principles of activation and permeation in an anion-selective Cys-loop receptor. *Nature* 474: 54-60.
- Jayakar SS, Zhou X, Chiara DC, Dostalova Z, Savechenkov PY, Bruzik KS, Dailey WP, Miller KW, Eckenhoff RG, Cohen JB (2014). Multiple propofol-binding sites in a γ -aminobutyric acid type A receptor (GABA_AR) identified using a photoreactive propofol analog. *J Biol Chem* 289: 27456-27468.

- Jayakar SS, Zhou X, Savechenkov PY, Chiara DC, Desai R, Bruzik KS, Miller KW, Cohen JB (2015). Positive and negative allosteric modulation of an $\alpha_1\beta_3\gamma_2$ γ -aminobutyric acid type A (GABA_A) receptor by binding to a site in the transmembrane domain at the $\gamma^+-\beta^-$ interface. J Biol Chem DOI: 10.1074.
- Jones MV, Harrison NL, Pritchett DB, Hales TG (1995). Modulation of the GABA_A receptor by propofol is independent of the gamma subunit. J Pharmacol Exp Ther 274: 962-968.
- Jurd R, Arras M, Lambert S, Drexler B, Siegwart R, Crestani F, Zaugg M, Vogt KE, Ledermann B, Antkowiak B, Rudolph U (2003). General anesthetic actions in vivo strongly attenuated by a point mutation in the GABA_A receptor beta3 subunit. FASEB J 17:250-262.
- Li GD, Chiara DC, Sawyer GW, Husain SS, Olsen RW, Cohen JB (2006). Identification of a GABA_A receptor anesthetic binding site at subunit interfaces by photolabeling with an etomidate analog. J Neurosci 26: 11599-11605.
- Li GD, Chiara DC, Cohen JB, Olsen RW (2009). Neurosteroids allosterically modulate binding of the anesthetic etomidate to gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptors. J Biol Chem 284: 11771-11775.

- Li GD, Chiara DC, Cohen JB, Olsen RW (2010). Numerous classes of general anaesthetics inhibit etomidate binding to gamma-aminobutyric acid type A (GABA_A) receptors. *J Biol Chem* 285: 8615-8620.
- Macdonald RL, Olsen RW (1994). GABA_A receptor channels. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 17: 569-602.
- McCracken ML, Borghese CM, Trudell JR, Harris RA (2010). A transmembrane amino acid in the GABA_A receptor β 2 subunit critical for the actions of alcohols and anesthetics. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 335: 600-606.
- Middendorp SJ, Maldifassi MC, Baur R, Sigel E (2015). Positive modulation of synaptic and extrasynaptic GABA_A receptors by an antagonist of the high affinity benzodiazepine binding site. *Neuropharmacology* 95: 459-467.
- Middendorp SJ, Puthenkalam R, Baur R, Ernst M, Sigel E (2014). Accelerated discovery of novel benzodiazepine ligands by experiment-guided virtual screening. *ACS Chem Biol* 9: 1854-1859.
- Miller PS, Smart TG (2010). Binding, activation, and modulation of Cys loop receptors. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 31: 161-174.

- Minier F, Sigel E (2004). Positioning of the α -subunit isoforms confers a functional signature to γ -aminobutyric acid type A receptors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 101: 7769-7774.
- Nishikawa K, Jenkins A, Paraskevakis I, Harrison NL (2002). Volatile anesthetic actions on the GABA_A receptors: contrasting effects of α 1(S270) and β 2(N265) point mutations. *Neuropharmacology* 42: 337-345.
- Olsen RW, Sieghart W (2008). International Union of Pharmacology. LXX. Subtypes of gamma-aminobutyric acid (A) receptors: classification on the basis of subunit composition, pharmacology, and function. Update. *Pharmacol Rev* 60: 243-260.
- Rabow LE, Russek SJ, Farb DH (1995). From ion currents to genomic analysis: recent advances in GABA_A receptor research. *Synapse* 21: 189-274.
- Richardson JE, Garcia PS, O'Toole KK, Derry JM, Bell SV, Jenkins A (2007). A conserved tyrosine in the β ₂ subunit M4 segment is a determinant of gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptor sensitivity to propofol. *Anesthesiology* 107: 412-418.
- Scheller M, Forman SA (2001). The gamma subunit determines whether anesthetic-induced leftward shift is altered by a mutation at α ₁S270 in α ₁ β ₂ γ ₂ GABA_A receptors. *Anesthesiology* 95:123-131.

- Sieghart W (1995). Structure and pharmacology of gamma-aminobutyric acidA receptor subtypes. *Pharmacol Rev* 47: 181-233.
- Sieghart W, Ernst M (2005). Heterogeneity of GABA_A receptors: Revived interest in the development of subtype-selective drugs. *Curr Med Chem* 5: 217–242.
- Sieghart R, Jurd R, Rudolph U (2002). Molecular determinants for the action of general anesthetics at recombinant $\alpha_2\beta_3\gamma_2$ gamma-aminobutyric acid(A) receptors. *J Neurochem* 80: 140-148.
- Sieghart R, Krähenbühl K, Lambert S, Rudolph U (2003). Mutational analysis of molecular requirements for the actions of general anaesthetics at the gamma-aminobutyric acidA receptor subtype, $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$. *BMC Pharmacol* 3:13.
- Sieghart W, Sperk G (2002) Subunit composition, distribution and function of GABA_A receptor subtypes. *Curr Top Med Chem* 2: 795-816.
- Sigel E (1987). Properties of single sodium channels translated by *Xenopus* oocytes after injection with messenger ribonucleic acid. *J Physiol Lond* 386: 73-90.
- Sigel E, Baur R, Trube G, Mohler H, Malherbe P (1990). The effect of subunit combination of rat brain GABA_A receptors on channel function. *Neuron* 5: 703-711.

- Sigel E, Buhr A (1997). The benzodiazepine binding site of GABA_A receptors. Trends Pharmacol Sci 18: 425-429.
- Sigel E, Minier F (2005). The Xenopus oocyte: system for the study of functional expression and modulation of proteins. Mol Nutr Food Res 49: 228-234.
- Sigel E, Lüscher BP (2011). A closer look at the high affinity benzodiazepine binding site on GABA_A receptors. Curr Top Med Chem 11: 241-246.
- Sigel E, Steinmann ME (2012). Structure, function, and modulation of GABA_A receptors. J Biol Chem 287: 40224-40231.
- Smith GB, Olsen RW (1995). Functional domains of GABA_A receptors. Trends Pharmacol Sci 16: 162-168.
- Stewart DS, Hotta M, Desai R, Forman SA (2013). State-dependent etomidate occupancy of its allosteric agonist sites measured in a cysteine-substituted GABA_A receptor. Mol Pharmacol 83: 1200-1208.
- Stewart DS, Hotta M, Li GD, Desai R, Chiara DC, Olsen RF, Forman SA (2013). Cysteine substitutions define etomidate binding and gating linkages in the α -M1 domain of γ -aminobutyric acid type A GABA_A receptors. J Biol Chem 288: 30373-30386.

- Stewart DS, Pierce DW, Hotta M, Stern AT, Forman SA (2014). Mutations at beta N265 in γ -aminobutyric acid type A receptors alter both binding affinity and efficacy of potent anesthetics. PLoS One 9: e111470.
- Tretter V, Ehya N, Fuchs K, Sieghart W (1997). Stoichiometry and assembly of a recombinant GABA_A receptor subtype. J Neurosci 17: 2728-2737.
- Walters RJ, Hadley SH, Morris KD, Amin J (2000). Benzodiazepines act on GABA_A receptors via two distinct and separable mechanisms. Nat Neurosci 12: 1274-1281.
- Wingrove PB, Wafford KA, Bain C, Whiting PJ (1994). The modulatory action of loreclezole at the gamma-aminobutyric acid type A receptor is determined by a single amino acid in the beta2 and beta3 subunit. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 91: 4569-4573.
- Yip GM, Chen ZW, Edge CJ, Smith EH, Dickinson R, Hohenester E, Townsend RR, Fuchs K, Sieghart W, Evers AS, Franks NP (2013). A propofol binding site on mammalian GABA_A receptors identified by photolabeling. Nat Chem Biol 9: 715-720.
- Zeller A, Arras M, Jurd R, Rudolph U (2007). Identification of a molecular target mediating the general anesthetic actions of pentobarbital. Mol Pharmacol 71: 852-859.

Legends

Fig. 1. Localization of mutations at different subunit interfaces. **A**, the $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ GABA_A receptor is composed of two α , two β and a γ subunit(s). Two GABA binding sites are located at the two β +/ α - subunit interfaces. The scheme shows the localization of the point mutations; α_1 S269I, β_2 N265I, and γ_2 S280I, studied in this paper. + and – indicate the plus sides and the minus sides of the subunits. **B**, sequence alignment of the transmembrane domains M2 of α_1 , β_2 , and γ_2 subunits. The underlined residues were each mutated to Ile.

Fig. 2. GABA dose response curve of wild type and mutated receptors. Concentration-response curves in oocytes expressing wild-type GABA_A $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ (close circle) receptors, $\alpha_1\beta_2$ receptors (open triangle), and the mutated receptors α_1 M $\beta_2\gamma_2$ (open circles), $\alpha_1\beta_2$ M γ_2 (inverted triangles), $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ M (triangles) and the triple mutated receptor α_1 M β_2 M γ_2 M (closed squares). GABA currents were normalized and fitted by a Hill equation. Data averaged from at least 3 dose response curves, mean $\pm$ SEM are shown.

Fig. 3. Potentiation of the GABA response by propofol, etomidate and pentobarbital. Original current traces showing potentiation of GABA current responses by **A** 3 μ M propofol, **B** 1 μ M etomidate, and **C** 50 μ M pentobarbital, in wild-type receptors and the mutated receptors α_1 M $\beta_2\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_2$ M γ_2 , $\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$ M, α_1 M β_2 M γ_2 M. Currents were activated several times with a concentration of GABA eliciting 0.5-1.5 % of the maximal current amplitude in the corresponding receptor until a constant response was observed, the last application is shown. Subsequently drug was applied in combination with GABA. Horizontal bars represent 20 s of GABA application and 45s of combined GABA plus drug application.

Figure 4. Potentiation of the GABA response by propofol, etomidate and pentobarbital. Modulation by propofol, etomidate, and pentobarbital in wild type

$\alpha_1\beta_2\gamma_2$, $\alpha_1\beta_2$, single mutant and triple mutant receptors. The bars indicate mean $\pm$ SEM, n = 4-5. ***, p < 0.0001; **, p < 0.001.

Fig. 5. Effect of the mutations on the potentiation by diazepam and THDOC. After a reproducible response to GABA was obtained, currents were potentiated by 1 μ M diazepam and 1 μ M THDOC. The bars indicate mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3. Modulation by both diazepam and THDOC did not differ significantly between wild type and any mutated receptor.

Fig. 6. Positional effect of the mutation in the β_2 subunit. With the help of subunit concatenation, receptors were prepared containing either no mutation (**A**), a mutation in Site 1 (**B**), a mutation in Site 2 (**C**), or in both sites (**D**). The interface harboring Site 2 has previously been shown to display a binding site for GABA with higher apparent affinity for channel gating than that located at the interface harboring Site 1 (Baumann et al., 2003).

Fig. 7. Individual roles of the two β_2 M residues in channel modulation. Potentiation by 3 μ M propofol, 1 μ M etomidate, or 50 μ M pentobarbital, using a concentration of GABA eliciting 0.5-1.5 % of the maximal current amplitude in the corresponding concatenated receptor subtype. The bars indicate mean $\pm$ SD, n = 3. *** p < 0.0001 ; **, p < 0.001. Mutation at Site 1 is nearly enough to abolish modulation by etomidate, while mutation at Site 2 has almost no consequences. In contrast, modulation by propofol is similarly sensitive to both mutations.

A **B**

α VPARTVFGVTTVLTM²⁶⁹TLSISA

β SAARVALGITTVLTM²⁶⁵TINTHL

γ VPARTSLGITTVLTM²⁸⁰TLSIA

TM2

Figure(s)

Figure(s)

Figure(s)

Figure(s)

Figure(s)