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GTP Hydrolysis by Complexes of the Signal Recognition Particle and the Signal Recognition Particle Receptor

Timothy Connolly and Reid Gilmore

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester, Massachusetts 01655

Abstract. Translocation of proteins across the endoplasmic reticulum membrane is a GTP-dependent process. The signal recognition particle (SRP) and the SRP receptor both contain subunits with GTP binding domains. One GTP-dependent reaction during protein translocation is the SRP receptor–mediated dissociation of SRP from the signal sequence of a nascent polypeptide. Here, we have assayed the SRP and the SRP receptor for GTP binding and hydrolysis activities. GTP hydrolysis by SRP was not detected, so the maximal GTP hydrolysis rate for SRP was estimated to be <0.002 mol GTP hydrolyzed × mol of SRP⁻¹ × min⁻¹. The intrinsic GTP hydrolysis activity of the SRP receptor ranged between 0.02 and 0.04 mol GTP hydrolyzed × mol of SRP receptor⁻¹ × min⁻¹. A 40-fold enhancement of GTP hydrolysis activity relative to that observed for the SRP receptor alone was obtained when complexes were formed between SRP and the SRP receptor. GTP hydrolysis activity was inhibited by GDP, but not by ATP. Extended incubation of the SRP or the SRP receptor with GTP resulted in substoichiometric quantities of protein-bound ribonucleotide. SRP–SRP receptor complexes engaged in GTP hydrolysis were found to contain a minimum of one bound guanine ribonucleotide per SRP–SRP receptor complex. We conclude that the GTP hydrolysis activity described here is indicative of one of the GTPase cycles that occur during protein translocation across the endoplasmic reticulum.

The process of protein translocation can be divided into a series of reaction steps that together implement the selective transport of a polypeptide across the RER membrane. Proteins that contain RER-specific signal sequences are selected in an initial sorting reaction when the signal recognition particle (SRP) binds to the signal sequence as it emerges from the large ribosomal subunit (Walter and Blobel, 1981; Walter et al., 1981). The specificity of the sorting reaction in protein translocation is explained by the ability of SRP to discriminate between nascent chains that either contain or lack a RER signal sequence (Walter et al., 1981). The specificity of the sorting reaction in protein translocation is explained by the ability of SRP to discriminate between nascent chains that either contain or lack a RER signal sequence (Walter et al., 1981).

The six protein subunits of SRP (72, 68, 54, 19, 14, and 9 kD) are organized into three functional domains by assembly onto the SRP (7SL) RNA (Siegel and Walter, 1985; Siegel and Walter, 1988a,b; Walter and Blobel, 1982). Nascent secretory chains that contain photoactivatable amino acid analogues can be cross-linked to the 54-kD subunit of SRP (Krieg et al., 1986; Kurzchalia et al., 1986). Based upon this finding, as well as upon experiments using subparticles derived from SRP, the signal sequence recognition domain of SRP was shown to consist of SRP54 and SRP19 (Siegel and Walter, 1988a,b). Targeting of the SRP–ribosome-nascent chain complex to the membrane is accomplished by interaction of SRP with the SRP receptor (Gilmore et al., 1982) or docking protein (Meyer et al., 1982), a heterodimeric protein consisting of 68-kD (SRct) and 30-kD (SRfl) subunits (Tajima et al., 1986). The signal sequence dissociates from SRP54 when the SRP–ribosome complex binds to the membrane bound SRP receptor (Gilmore and Blobel, 1983). Upon dissociation of the signal sequence from SRP, the nascent secretory polypeptide is inserted into a protein conducting channel in the membrane (Simon and Blobel, 1991).

The protein sequence of SRct, determined from canine and human cDNA clones (Hortsch et al., 1988; Lauffer et al., 1985), contains elements that are similar to the consensus motifs that comprise a GTP binding site (Connolly and Gilmore, 1989; Dever et al., 1987). Site-directed mutagenesis of SRct revealed that a functional GTP binding site in this subunit is essential for protein translocation across the endoplasmic reticulum (Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992). SRP54 contains a GTP binding domain that is related to the
G-domain of SRαs (Bernstein et al., 1989; Römsch et al., 1989). Photoaffinity labeling with [α-32P] GTP suggested that both SRαs and SRβ bind GTP in a specific manner. SRαs, but not SRβ, binds GTP when affixed to a nitrocellulose membrane after denaturing gel electrophoresis (Connolly and Gilmore, 1989). Recently, sequence analysis of SRβ disclosed the presence of a GTP binding site (Ogg et al., 1992). Thus, the SRP and the SRP receptor contains three protein subunits (SRα, SRP54, and SRβ) that belong to the GTPase superfamily. Several lines of experimental evidence suggest that the GTP binding and hydrolysis cycles of SRP54 and SRα regulate the affinity between the signal sequence, SRP, and the SRP receptor. The SRP receptor-initiated dissociation of the signal sequence from SRP is a GTP-dependent reaction (Connolly and Gilmore, 1989). The nonhydrolyzable GTP analogue guanylyl-5'-imidodiphosphate (GMPPPNP) can replace GTP in the SRP-signal sequence displacement reaction (Connolly et al., 1991). However, SRP fails to dissociate from the membrane-bound SRP receptor, demonstrating that the dissociation of the SRP-SRP receptor complex requires hydrolysis of protein-bound GTP (Connolly et al., 1991). The latter observation suggests that a GTP hydrolysis cycle regulates the affinity between SRP and the SRP receptor.

The discovery of three GTP binding sites in SRP and the SRP receptor was unanticipated and raised questions concerning the functional role of each of these GTP binding sites. Speculation on this point has been hindered by a lack of sufficient data concerning the GTPase activity of SRP and the SRP receptor. To begin to address such questions, we have assayed purified preparations of SRP and SRP receptor for GTP binding and hydrolysis activities. These studies have established that the formation of a bimolecular complex of SRP and the SRP receptor activates a GTP hydrolysis site. The GTP hydrolysis cycle that can be detected with SRP-SRP receptor complexes has a similar affinity for guanine ribonucleotides as the GTP binding site that was detected in vitro protein translocation assays (Connolly and Gilmore, 1986; Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992).

Materials and Methods

Preparation of SRP and the SRP Receptor

The triethanolamine buffer used for all preparative and analytical procedures was made as a 1 M stock solution, adjusted to pH 7.5 at 25°C with acetic acid and is abbreviated TEA. SRP and salt-extracted microsomal membranes (K-RM) were isolated from canine pancreas rough microsomal membranes using previously described methods (Walter et al., 1981). The concentration of the SRP was determined from the absorbance at 260 nm (Walter and Blobel, 1983a). SRP receptors were isolated from K-RM using a modification of a previous procedure (Gilmore and Blobel, 1983). Briefly, K-RM were adjusted to 0.25 M sucrose, 50 mM TEA, 100 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2, 0.1% Nikkol, 1 mM DTT (GTP hydrolysis buffer) unless otherwise noted. Typical assays contained 1 μM GTP including 2 μCi of [α-32P] GTP (410 Ci/mMol). The concentration of SRP and SRP receptor in individual assays is specified in the figure legends. Aliquots (0.2–0.5 μl) were removed at 0–5 min intervals and spotted onto polyethyleneimine (PEI) cellulose thin layer plates (J. T. Baker, Inc., Phillipsburg, NJ). GDP was resolved from GTP using 0.75 M KH2PO4, pH 3.3 as the solvent for the thin-layer chromatography (Der et al., 1986). The radioactivity in spots corresponding to GTP and GDP was quantitated using a Betagen Bioscope 630 Blot analyzer. The quantity of GTP hydrolyzed in a control assay lacking both SRP and SRP receptor was subtracted as background to determine the rate of protein-specific GTP hydrolysis. GTP hydrolysis rates were calculated from the linear phase of a GTP hydrolysis reaction when the percentage of GTP that had been hydrolyzed did not exceed 10%.

Dissociation constants for SRP-SRP receptor complexes were calculated from data obtained in GTP hydrolysis assays using a Scatchard analysis (Scatchard, 1949). The concentration of bound SRP was calculated for each concentration of added SRP using the following equation: (Bound SRP) = (SR-SRP)/(SRx), where (SR-SRP) is the concentration of the SRP-SRP receptor complex, VsR-S~ was was estimated from data obtained in GTP hydrolysis assays using a Scatchard analysis (Scatchard, 1949). The concentration of bound SRP was calculated for each concentration of added SRP using the following equation: (Bound SRP) = (SR-SRP)/(SRx), where (SR-SRP) is the concentration of the SRP-SRP receptor complex, VsR-S~ was estimated to be 0.9 molar GTP hydrolyzed × min⁻¹ × (SR – SRP)⁻¹. The fractional saturation (ϕ) of the SRP receptor with SRP is defined as ϕ = (SR-SRP)/[SR], where (SR-SRP) is the concentration of the SRP-SRP receptor complex.

Guanine Nucleotide Binding Assays

The nitrocellulose filter assay for protein bound GTP was based upon methods used to measure [α-32P] GTP or [35S] GTPS binding to G-proteins (Brandt and Ross, 1986). SRP, SRP receptor or both proteins together were incubated in a total volume of 100 μl of 50 mM TEA, 50 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2, 0.1% Nikkol, 1 mM DTT, and 1 μCi GTP (including 20 μCi of [α-32P] GTP (410 Ci/mMol). Binding of GTP was initiated by addition of SRP or SRP receptor. Aliquots (8 μl) were withdrawn at frequent time intervals and diluted 25-fold into ice-cold 50 mM TEA, 50 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2, 20% PEG-6000. The samples were vacuum filtered through 25 mm BAB5 nitrocellulose filters (Schleicher & Schuell, Inc., Keene, NH), and the filters were rapidly washed three times with 1.5 ml of 50 mM TEA, 50 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2. Radioactivity bound to nitrocellulose filters was determined by scintillation counting in Optiphos (Packard Instruments, Meriden, CT). Control experiments demonstrated that the nitrocellulose filters retained ~80% of a sample of detergent solubilized K-RM protein after precipitation with the wash buffer containing 20% PEG-6000.

Protein bound GTP was also detected after gel filtration chromatography. SRP and the SRP receptor were incubated alone or in combination at 25°C in a total volume of 10–30 μl of 50 mM TEA, 50 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)2, 0.1% Nikkol, 1 mM DTT, and 1 μl of [α-32P] GTP (410 Ci/mMol) and applied to a 10-ml column of Fractogel TSK DE-650 M that had been equilibrated with 50 mM TEA, 275 mM KOAc, 0.5% Nikkol, 1 mM DTT.
Results

SRP-SRP Receptor Complexes Hydrolyze GTP

SRP and the SRP receptor were incubated with GTP to determine whether either protein complex has an intrinsic GTPase activity. The GTP hydrolysis assays contained 1 μM \([\alpha^{32}P] GTP\), based upon the previous observation that micromolar concentrations of GTP or Gpp(NH)p were sufficient for the guanine ribonucleotide-dependent dissociation of SRP from the signal sequence in a protein translocation reaction (Connolly and Gilmore, 1986; Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992). As the intrinsic GTP hydrolysis rates of purified GTP binding proteins are often as low as 0.01 mol of GTP hydrolyzed × mol of protein × min⁻¹ (Bourne et al., 1990), the GTPase assay was designed to detect low hydrolysis rates when using 1 μM \([\alpha^{32}P] GTP\) as the substrate. Nikkol (0.05%) is present in the SRP storage buffer to stabilize SRP activity (Walter and Blobel, 1980), and is included here to stabilize SRP and to maintain the solubility of the SRP receptor. The signal recognition particle did not hydrolyze GTP at a rate that significantly exceeded the rate obtained with the assay buffer alone (Fig. 1). Several different SRP preparations were assayed for GTP hydrolysis activity and comparable results were obtained. The maximal GTP hydrolysis rate calculated from the data shown here is 0.002 mol GTP hydrolyzed × mol of SRP × min⁻¹. This value should be considered as a maximal estimate for the intrinsic GTP hydrolysis rate for SRP. Hydrolysis of GTP by the SRP receptor was quite low, yet readily detectable (Fig. 1). Several different SRP receptor preparations were assayed, and the intrinsic GTP hydrolysis rate ranged between 0.02 and 0.04 mol of GTP hydrolyzed × mol of SRP receptor × min⁻¹. The low intrinsic GTPase activity of the SRP and the SRP receptor suggest that the hydrolysis reactions catalyzed by these two GTPases are controlled by accessory factors.

High affinity SRP-SRP receptor complexes are formed by coincidence of the two proteins with Gpp(NH)p, but not GTP or GDP, suggesting that a GTPase cycle is initiated upon contact between SRP and the SRP receptor (Connolly et al., 1991). A significant enhancement of GTP hydrolysis activity was observed in an assay that contained 60 nM SRP and 15 nM SRP receptor (Fig. 1). Because SRP was present in a fourfold excess relative to the receptor in this experiment, the GTP hydrolysis activity was arbitrarily expressed with respect to the SRP receptor concentration.

GTP hydrolysis, but not GTP-P-S binding, by the heterotrimeric G protein G, is inhibited when the nonionic detergent Lubrol is present in assays at concentrations above the critical micelle concentration (Brandt et al., 1983; Brandt and Ross, 1985). In the case of G, the detergent inhibition of the GTPase activity was alleviated when the detergent concentration was reduced (Brandt and Ross, 1985). To determine whether the GTP hydrolysis rates determined here for SRP and SRP receptor were artificially low due to detergent inhibition, we reduced the concentration of Nikkol in the GTP hydrolysis assay. The critical micelle concentration for Nikkol is 7.1 × 10⁻⁴ M (0.0038%). The GTP hydrolysis rate for SRP was not enhanced when the Nikkol concentration was reduced to 0.002%, a value that is almost twofold below the critical micelle concentration. Likewise, the GTP hydrolysis rate for the SRP receptor was not enhanced when the Nikkol concentration was reduced to 0.005%. Based upon these results, we conclude that the low intrinsic rates of GTP hydrolysis for SRP and SRP receptor are not caused by detergent inhibition. However, we did observe a 5-10% increase in the hydrolysis rate when assays containing 60 nM SRP plus 10 nM SRP receptor contained 0.01% Nikkol instead of 0.1% Nikkol (data not shown). A further twofold reduction in the Nikkol concentration was accompanied by a reduction in GTP hydrolysis activity.

The validity of expressing the data with respect to the SRP receptor content was explored in more detail. The concentration dependence of SRP stimulation of the hydrolysis activity was determined in assays containing 15 nM SRP receptor (Fig. 2A). The SRP concentration required for maximal stimulation of the GTP hydrolysis activity was dependent upon the SRP receptor concentration used for the experiment (data not shown). A saturation curve like that shown here is consistent with activation of a GTP hydrolysis site upon formation of a complex between SRP and the SRP receptor. The data in Fig. 2A were analyzed as an equilibrium between uncomplexed SRP and SRP receptor and a hydrolytically active SRP-SRP receptor complex using the method of Scatchard (Scatchard, 1949). The experimental data could be adequately fit using a \( K_0 \) of 15 nM for the forma-
This parameter was calculated as described in Materials and Methods. SRP-SRP receptor complex formation at 150 mM KOAc. The parameter $ is the fractional ~,~" 0.6 ~7" 
assay was increased (Fig. 3 B). The concentration of SRP
upon the concentration of SRP when the ionic strength of the
substantially higher when the assays were conducted at physi-
required to achieve comparable levels of GTP hydrolysis was

terminations (50 mM KOAc), to favor the formation of SRP-SRP
complexes. These alternative explanations were tested by de-
the concentration of SRP receptor complexes (Connolly et al., 1991; Walter and
Blobel, 1983b). The GTP hydrolysis activity decreased
markedly as the KOAc concentration was raised (Fig. 3 A).
A 2.5-fold lower GTP hydrolysis activity was obtained when
the monovalent cation concentration was raised to a value
that mimics physiological ionic strength (150 mM KOAc).
Inhibition of the hydrolysis activity by increased ionic
strength could be due to a direct effect upon the GTPase or
it could be due to inhibition of SRP-SRP receptor complex
formation. These alternative explanations were tested by de-
termining whether the hydrolysis reaction was dependent
upon the concentration of SRP when the ionic strength of the
assay was increased (Fig. 3 B). The concentration of SRP
required to achieve comparable levels of GTP hydrolysis was
substantially higher when the assays were conducted at phys-

tiological ionic strength. Analysis of these data using a
Lineweaver-Burke plot or an Eadie-Hofstee plot yielded a
hydrolysis rate of 0.85 mol GTP hydrolyzed × mol of
SRP-SRP receptor complex × min⁻¹, and $ of 126 nM
for the SRP-SRP receptor complex. The calculated GTP hy-
drolysis rate for SRP-SRP receptor complexes at physiological
ionic strength was in good agreement with the value cal-
culated from the data presented in Fig. 2 B. A Hill plot of the
data (insert in Fig. 3 B) indicated that a simple binding equil-
ibrium between SRP and SRP receptor was operative. Like-
wise, the concentration of binding sites for SRP as de-
ected by Scatchard analysis (14.7 nM) was in good agree-
ment with the SRP receptor concentration (data not shown).
These results demonstrate that the primary cause for the
ionic strength dependence of the GTP hydrolysis activity was
the altered affinity between SRP and the SRP receptor.

Ribonucleotide Dependence of the Hydrolysis Reaction
Several criteria must be met to establish that the GTP hydro-
lysis activity of the SRP-SRP receptor complex is of rele-
vance to the GTP-dependent step in the protein translocation
reaction. Previous studies have shown that GTP cannot be
replaced by ATP to allow nascent chain insertion into the ER
(Connolly and Gilmore, 1986; Hoffman and Gilmore,
The GTP hydrolysis activity for SRP-SRP receptor complexes was determined for the SRP receptor and for the SRP-SRP receptor plus 75 nM SRP (m) were conducted as in Fig. 1 except that the GTP concentration was varied between 0.2 and 5 μM. The GTP hydrolysis activity for SRP-SRP receptor complexes was calculated from a 15-min time point and is expressed as mol GDP × mol SR-1 × min-1. The turnover number (Kₜ) for the SRP-SRP receptor complex was 2.1 mol of GTP hydrolyzed × mol of SRP-SRP receptor complex-1 × min-1.

GDP was found to be a potent inhibitor of the GTP hydrolysis assay with an apparent Kᵢ of 0.25 μM (Fig. 4 B). In contrast, ATP was not inhibitory when present in a 25-fold molar excess relative to GTP. Inhibition of the GTP hydrolysis assay by GDP is anticipated given that GTP binding proteins have affinity for both GDP and GTP (Bourne et al., 1990; Brandt and Ross, 1985). Previously, we had reported that GDP was a competitive inhibitor of the GTP-dependent insertion of nascent chains into the endoplasmic reticulum (Connolly and Gilmore, 1986). Half-maximal inhibition of the Gpp(NH)p-dependent insertion of a nascent polypeptide occurred at a GDP concentration of ~1 μM when the Gpp(NH)p concentration was 10 μM. Together these results indicate that the GTP binding site detected in the GTP hydrolysis assay has a similar affinity for guanine ribonucleotides as the GTP binding site that was detected in the protein translocation reaction.

**GTP Binding Activity of the SRP and the SRP Receptor**

The preceding experiments indicate that formation of an equimolar complex between SRP and the SRP receptor is a prerequisite for an active GTP hydrolysis cycle. Activation of a GTP hydrolysis cycle could occur either by increasing the hydrolysis rate of protein bound GTP or by increasing the rate of guanine nucleotide exchange (Bourne et al., 1990). We sought to determine whether either SRP or the SRP receptor binds GTP under the experimental conditions used for the GTP hydrolysis assay. Aliquots from a GTP hydrolysis assay containing [γ-32P] GTP were collected on nitrocellulose filters and washed by vacuum filtration to remove unbound guanine ribonucleotide. When the SRP receptor was tested for GTP binding, we detected 5 fmol of bound guanine ribonucleotide per 150 fmol of SRP receptor after a 50-min incubation (Fig. 5). Substoichiometric quantities of bound GTP were also detected when SRP was assayed for GTP binding. After a 50-min incubation with GTP, 24 fmol of [γ-32P] GTP were bound per 700 fmol of SRP. Two different explanations for substoichiometric binding of [γ-32P] GTP to SRP and the SRP receptor were considered. The dissociation rate for GTP may be rapid enough to permit ribonucleotide dissociation during the time required to wash the nitrocellulose filters. Alternatively, SRP and the SRP receptor may not readily bind GTP in the absence of guanine nucleotide exchange proteins.

Hydrolysis reactions containing both SRP and SRP receptor were assayed to determine the rate and stoichiometry of nucleotide binding to SRP-SRP receptor complexes (Fig. 5). The quantity of bound guanine ribonucleotide increased rapidly during the first three min of a GTP hydrolysis reaction. A first order rate constant of 0.62 min⁻¹ for binding of gua-
complex formation is due to an increase in the guanine ribonucleotide to the SRP-SRP receptor complex was the rate at which protein bound GTP is hydrolyzed. Based upon the data presented in Figs. 2 and 3, the kinetics of ribonucleotide binding are in good agreement with the time course of GTP hydrolysis. The three time courses contained either 70 nM SRP (a), 15 nM SRP receptor (b), or 70 nM SRP plus 15 nM SRP receptor (c). Aliquots were removed at frequent time intervals and the quantity of protein-bound guanine ribonucleotide in 10 μl of the reaction was determined as described in Materials and Methods. Note the compression of the abscissa after 10 min of the reaction.
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Discussion

Previous research from this laboratory demonstrated that GTP was required for the SRP receptor-mediated dissociation of SRP from the signal sequence of a nascent polypeptide (Connolly and Gilmore, 1989). Here, we have assayed SRP and the SRP receptor for GTP hydrolysis activity to gain insight into the functional significance of the GTP binding sites that have been detected in SRP54 and SRα by protein sequence comparisons (Bernstein et al., 1989; Connolly and Gilmore, 1989; Römisch et al., 1989). Several significant results were obtained from this analysis. Neither SRP nor the SRP receptor displayed robust GTP hydrolysis activities when assayed separately. Our maximal estimate for the intrinsic hydrolysis rate of the SRP (<0.002 min⁻¹) is comparable to the extremely low hydrolysis rates reported

Figure 5. Quantitation of bound guanine ribonucleotide to SRP and the SRP receptor by filtration through nitrocellulose filters. Guanine ribonucleotide binding assays were conducted at 25°C in 50 mM TEA, 50 mM KOAc, 2.5 mM Mg(OAc)₂, 0.1% Nikkol, 1 mM DTT, 2 μM GTP (including 0.5 μM α-32P GTP). The three time courses contained either 70 nM SRP (a), 15 nM SRP receptor (b), or 70 nM SRP plus 15 nM SRP receptor (c). Aliquots were removed at frequent time intervals and the quantity of protein-bound guanine ribonucleotide in 10 μl of the reaction was determined as described in Materials and Methods. Note the compression of the abscissa after 10 min of the reaction.

Figure 6. Quantitation of protein bound ribonucleotide by gel filtration chromatography. (A) GTP hydrolysis assays were conducted as in Fig. 1. The individual assays contained (a) no additions, (b) 60 nM SRP, (c) 7.5 nM SRP receptor, (d-f) 60 nM SRP and 7.5 nM SRP receptor. After 10 min at 25°C, samples e and f were adjusted to 25 μM ATP (e) or 25 μM GTP (f). After a total incubation of 20 min, the assays were chilled on ice and protein bound ribonucleotides were separated from unbound ribonucleotides by gel filtration chromatography at 4°C (see Materials and Methods). Protein bound ribonucleotide was quantitated by scintillation counting. (B) The load and selected eluate fractions from a gel filtration column were analyzed by thin layer chromatography on PEI cellulose plates. Aliquots were removed from GTP hydrolysis assays containing (lane a) no additions or (lane b) 60 nM SRP and 7.5 nM SRP receptor after 10 min at 25°C. The remainder of the assay in lane b was chilled on ice, and protein bound ribonucleotides (lane c) were separated from unbound ribonucleotides (lane d) by gel filtration chromatography.
for the Sec4 protein (Kabcenell et al., 1990) and the ras p21 protein (Gibbs et al., 1984). The intrinsic hydrolysis rate for the SRP receptor (0.02 min⁻¹) was lower than the value of 0.4 min⁻¹ reported for Gᵢ (Brandt and Ross, 1985), but comparable to rates reported for Gₛ (Sunyer et al., 1984) and Gₛ (Tamir et al., 1990). We were not able to detect a significant amount of protein bound ribonucleotide when the SRP receptor was incubated with GTP. For this reason, we cannot be certain that the GTPase activity displayed by our SRP receptor preparation was not due to a subpopulation of altered receptors or a protein contaminant. However, it should be noted that the low apparent Kₘ for GTP (15 μM) in the GTP hydrolysis assay may preclude detection of bound ribonucleotide to the SRP receptor using the nitrocellulose filtration method.

GTP binding proteins cycle between an active GTP-bound conformation and an inactive GDP-bound conformation (Milburn et al., 1990). The hydrolysis rate of GTP binding proteins is controlled by accessory proteins that catalyze guanine nucleotide exchange reactions or accelerate the hydrolysis of protein bound GTP (Bourne et al., 1990). Hence, the low hydrolytic activity of the SRP and the SRP receptor was not unexpected. Catalysis of the guanine ribonucleotide exchange reaction is the mechanism by which membrane bound hormone receptors accelerate the hydrolysis rate of signal transducing G-proteins (Gilman, 1987). The GTPase activating protein (GAP) preferentially interacts with the GTP-bound form of the ras p21 protein to stimulate hydrolysis of the protein bound GTP (Trahey and McCormick, 1987; Vogel et al., 1988). Accessory factors analogous to those identified for other GTP binding proteins are presumably required to initiate the GTP hydrolysis cycle for SRP and the SRP receptor. The observation that neither the SRP nor the SRP receptor bind stoichiometric quantities of GTP when tested separately suggests that the nucleotide binding sites in both proteins is either unoccupied, or in the GDP-bound form in the absence of a guanine nucleotide exchange or release factor (GNRP). Based upon analogies to other GTP binding proteins, we propose that the GTP hydrolysis reactions catalyzed by SRP and SRP receptor are limited, at least in part, by the conditional binding of GTP to the guanine nucleotide binding sites. The initiation of a hydrolysis cycle upon combination of the two proteins strongly suggests that the conditional binding of GTP to at least one site is initiated upon formation of the SRP-SRP receptor complex. Hence, one of these proteins acts as a guanine nucleotide exchange factor for the other protein.

When SRP was added to hydrolysis assays containing SRP receptor, a saturable stimulation of GTP hydrolysis was observed. The hydrolysis activity was GTP specific as shown by the ability of GDP, but not ATP to act as a competitive inhibitor of the hydrolysis reaction. The results of the GTP hydrolysis assays were entirely consistent with the formation of a hydrolytically active bimolecular complex between SRP and SRP receptor. The ion strength dependence of the hydrolysis assay matched the ion strength dependence of the association between SRP and the membrane bound SRP receptor (Connolly and Gilmore, 1992). The reduced GTPase activity observed at physiological ion strength should minimize nontranslocation associated GTP hydrolysis activity by SRP and SRP receptor within the cell. Ribonucleotide binding assays detected a single bound guanine nucleotide per SRP-SRP receptor complex during a GTP hydrolysis assay. However, the filter binding assays may underestimate the quantity of protein-bound ribonucleotide if dissociation of protein bound GTP or GDP occurs during washing of the nitrocellulose filter. These findings demonstrate that a minimum of one GTP binding site is hydrolytically active when the SRP-SRP receptor complex is formed. The experiments described in this manuscript do not allow us to determine which protein subunit (SRo, SRₛ, or SRP54) contains the GTP binding site that is active during the GTP hydrolysis reaction. However, the minimal proteins required for the GTP hydrolysis activity of the SRP-SRP receptor complex can be defined by combining partially reconstituted ribonucleoproteins derived from the SRP with the SRP receptor. This experimental strategy has revealed that SRP54 plus the 7S RNA comprise the minimal RNP that can form a hydrolytically active complex when combined with the SRP receptor (Poritz et al., 1990; Miller et al., 1993).

The binding affinity of the SRP binding site for GTP is roughly 10-100-fold lower than that reported for other GTP binding proteins including ras, Gₛ (Brandt and Ross, 1985) and Gₛ (Sunyer et al., 1984). The lower affinity of the hydrolysis site for GTP is probably due to differences in the precise architecture of the GTP binding site in SRα or SRP54. The GTP binding sites in SRo and SRP54 contain threonine instead of an asparagine in the third (NKXD) consensus element of the GTP binding site. In the H ras p21 protein, the primary role of the asparagine residue in the NKXD motif is to stabilize the nucleotide binding site by forming hydrogen bonds with several different elements of the nucleotide binding site (Pai et al., 1990). Clearly, the corresponding threonine residue within SRo or SRP54 may only make a subset of the hydrogen bonds ascribed to the asparagine residue present in more typical GTP binding proteins. Conversion of the atypical threonine residue in SRα to an asparagine residue by site directed mutagenesis led to the production of an SRP receptor with a 50-100-fold reduced affinity for guanine ribonucleotides (Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992). The apparent affinity of the GTP hydrolysis site for GDP (apparent Kₛ of 250 nM) was more than 10-fold higher than the apparent affinity for GTP (Kₛ of 3.2 μM). More importantly, the Kₛ for GTP and Kₛ for GDP determined with the GTP hydrolysis assay were in good agreement with Kₛ and Kₛ values obtained for the GTP-dependent insertion of nascent polypeptides into the endoplasmic reticulum (Connolly and Gilmore, 1986; Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992).

The ribonucleotide hydrolysis assay developed here presumably monitors a specific portion of the protein translocation reaction. Most likely, the reaction phase that is observed is initiated upon contact between the SRP-ribosome complex and the membrane bound SRP receptor. Recent experimental data indicate that SRP-dependent reactions that precede SRP receptor contact are not GTP-dependent (Zopf et al., 1993; Rapiejko, P., and R. Gilmore, manuscript in preparation). Hence, GTP hydrolysis cycles involving both SRo and SRP54 may initiate upon contact between the SRP-ribosome complex and the SRP receptor. As shown previously, contact between SRP and SRP receptor initiates a guanine nucleotide exchange reaction that ultimately results in dissociation of the signal sequence from SRP54 (Connolly and Gilmore,
Based upon the observation that point mutations in the GTP binding site of SRα block signal sequence dissociation from SRP54, we propose that binding of GTP to SRα is a prerequisite or a corequisite for GTP binding to SRP54 (Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992; Rapiejko, P., and R. Gilmore, manuscript in preparation). Guanine ribonucleotide induced alterations in protein tertiary structure are believed to regulate the affinity between GTP binding proteins and downstream effector proteins (Bourne et al., 1990). Thus, binding of GTP to the G domain of SRP54 presumably reduces the affinity between the M-domain of SRP54 and the signal sequence. Experiments using nonhydrolyzable guanine nucleotides have shown that SRP-SRP receptor complexes are more stable when one or more of the GTP binding sites in the SRP-SRP receptor complex is occupied by the nonhydrolyzable GTP analogue Gpp(NH)p (Connolly et al., 1991). Formation of high affinity complexes between SRP and the SRP receptor is dependent upon a functional GTP binding site in SRα (Rapiejko and Gilmore, 1992) and requires the G-domain of SRP54 (Zopf et al., 1993). Taken together, these results suggest that the cyclic formation and dissociation of the SRP-SRP receptor complex probably involves two interlocking GTP hydrolysis cycles. In the context of a protein translocation reaction, GTP hydrolysis by the SRP-SRP receptor complex may be regulated by an auxiliary protein factor or GAP-like activity that monitors the successful insertion of the nascent polypeptide into the protein conducting channel in the ER (Simon and Blobel, 1991; Simon and Blobel, 1992). Recently, experimental data showing that a synthetic signal sequence can inhibit the GTP hydrolysis activity of SRP-SRP receptor complexes has been obtained (Miller et al., 1993).

To date, a function for the GTP binding site in the β subunit of the SRP receptor has not been proposed, due to a lack of data concerning the role of this subunit in the protein translocation reaction. Conceivably, the GTPase cycle of the β subunit might promote the cyclic assembly and disassembly of complexes between the SRP receptor and the SEC61 protein, as the latter polypeptide is believed to comprise the central core of the protein conducting channel (Görlich et al., 1992). Interestingly, the stoichiometry between membrane-bound ribosomes engaged in protein translocation and the SRP receptor is roughly 5:1 (Gilmore et al., 1992), suggesting that the SRP receptor may mediate ribosome targeting to a cluster of protein translocation channels. Further insight into the role of the three GTPases in SRP and the SRP receptor will be provided by the development of assay systems that incorporate additional components of the protein translocation machinery into reconstituted proteoliposomes.
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