Mechanism of CO$_2$ and NH$_3$ Transport through Human Aquaporin 1:
Evidence for Parallel CO$_2$ Pathways

Raif Musa-Aziz[1,2*‡], R. Ryan Geyer[2*], Seong-Ki Lee[2],
Fraser J. Moss[2], and Walter F. Boron[2,3,4‡]

[1]Department of Physiology and Biophysics, Institute of Biomedical Sciences,
University of Sao Paulo.
[2]Department of Physiology and Biophysics, [3]Department of Medicine, and
[4]Department of Biochemistry
Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine
Cleveland, OH 44106, USA.

Author Contacts:

Raif Musa-Aziz   **R Ryan Geyer**

Department of Physiology and Biophysics   E-mail: geyerro1976@gmail.com
Institute of Biomedical Sciences
University of Sao Paulo
Sao Paulo, SP Brazil
Tel: 55-11-3091-7281
E-mail: raifaziz@icb.usp.br

*These authors contributed equally to this work

‡ **Address correspondence to:**

Raif Musa-Aziz   **Walter F. Boron**

Department of Physiology and Biophysics   Department of Physiology and Biophysics
Av. Prof Lineu Prestes, 1524,   10900 Euclid Ave. Robbins Building E524
Sao Paulo, SP, Brazil 05508-000   Cleveland, OH, USa 44106-4970
Tel: 55-11-3091-7281   Tel: 1-216-368-8978
E-mail: raifaziz@icb.usp.br   E-mail: walter.boron@case.edu

Key Points

- Some membranes have little or no CO_2 permeability, absent protein channels like aquaporin-1 (AQP1).

- We confirm that, during CO_2 influx, heterologous expression of human AQP1 (hAQP1) in *Xenopus* oocytes increases the magnitude of the transient surface-pH increase by an amount $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$, measured with microelectrodes. During NH_3 influx, hAQP1 expression increases the magnitude of the transient pH_S decrease by $(\Delta pH_S*)_{NH_3}$.

- p-chloromercuribenzene sulfonate (pCMBS), which reacts with C189 in the monomeric pore, reduces $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$ by; $(\Delta pH_S*)_{NH_3}$, to zero; and AQP1-dependent osmotic water permeability (P_f*), by half.

- 4,4'-diisothiocyanatostilbene-2,2'-disulfonate (DIDS) reduces $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$ by half, but has no effect on $(\Delta pH_S*)_{NH_3}$ or P_f*. DIDS crosslinks AQP1 monomers expressed in *Pichia pastoris*.

- Together, pCMBS+DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$ to zero. The C189S mutation of AQP1 eliminates the effects of pCMBS, but not DIDS. Our results thus show that CO_2 traverses AQP1 via the monomeric pore plus a novel, DIDS-sensitive route that may be the central pore.

Abstract

The traditional view had been that dissolved gases cross membranes simply by dissolving in and diffusing through membrane lipid. However, some membranes are impermeable to CO_2 and NH_3, whereas some aquaporin (AQP) water channels—tetramers with hydrophobic central pores—are permeable to CO_2, NH_3, or both. Nevertheless, we understand neither the routes that CO_2 and NH_3 take through AQP tetramers, nor the basis of CO_2/NH_3 selectivity. Here, we show—for human AQP1 (hAQP1)—that virtually all NH_3 and H_2O pass through the hydrophilic, monomeric pores. However CO_2 passes both through the monomeric pores and another pathway. We expressed hAQP1 in *Xenopus* oocytes and used microelectrodes to monitor the maximal surface-pH transient (ΔpH_S) caused by CO_2 or NH_3 influxes. We found that p-chloromercuribenzene sulfonate (pCMBS)—which reacts with C189 in the monomeric pore—eliminates the entire hAQP1-dependent (*) NH_3 signal (ΔpH_S*)$_{NH_3}$, but only half of the signals for CO_2 (ΔpH_S*)$_{CO_2}$ or osmotic water permeability P_f*. 4,4'-diisothiocyanatostilbene-2,2'-disulfonate (DIDS), eliminates the remaining (ΔpH_S*)$_{CO_2}$ but has no effect on (ΔpH_S*)$_{NH_3}$ or P_f*. Together, the two drugs completely eliminate the CO_2 permeability of hAQP1. When we express hAQP1 in *Pichia pastoris*, treat spheroplasts with DIDS, and examine hAQP1 by SDS-PAGE, reactivity with an anti-DIDS antibody shows that DIDS crosslinks hAQP1 monomers. Our results provide the first evidence that a molecule can move through an AQP via a route other than the monomeric pore, and raise the possibility that selectivity depends on the extent to which CO_2/NH_3 move through monomeric pores vs. an alternate pathway (e.g., the central pore).

Introduction

Before the discovery of specific protein-mediated pathways in cell membranes, investigators had believed that many small molecules (e.g., H_2O, urea, glycerol, lactic acid)—including CO_2—freely permeate all membranes to the extent that they can dissolve in and then diffusing through the lipid phase. Solubility-diffusion theory (S-DT) embodies this concept (reviewed in Boron, 2010; Michenkova *et al.*, 2021). For molecules other than dissolved gases, the generalizability of this notion faded with the discovery of each new membrane channel or transporter, consistent with the idea that cells evolved to achieve tight control over the transmembrane traffic of small molecules. We now believe that the traffic of such molecules depends on some combination of membrane proteins and S-DT (responsible for non-specific leaks).

Regarding CO_2 traffic across biological membranes, the first inconsistency in the applicability of S-DT was the demonstration that apical membranes (i.e., facing the lumen) of single gastric glands are impermeable to CO_2 (Waisbren *et al.*, 1994). The second was the discovery that the human (h) aquaporin-1 (AQP1) not only conducts H_2O of course (Preston & Agre, 1991), but also CO_2 (Nakhoul *et al.*, 1998). Soon after Nakhoul's observation, Cooper and Boron (1998) found that pCMBS inhibits CO_2 permeability in oocytes expressing wild-type (WT) hAQP1. Prasad *et al.* (1998) then reported that AQP1 purified from human red blood cells (RBCs) and reconstituted into lipids from *E. coli* increases CO_2 permeability, an effect blocked by $HgCl_2$. Moreover, Forster *et al.* (1998) found that 4,4'-diisothiocyanatostilbene-2,2'-disulfonate (DIDS) applied to native human RBCs reduces not only HCO_3^- permeability, but also CO_2 permeability.

Forster and colleagues recognized that an explanation for their data could be that DIDS blocks a protein pathway for CO_2 diffusion through the RBC membrane. Indeed, Endeward *et al.* (2006) later found that AQP1 is responsible for about half of the CO_2 traffic across the human RBC membrane, with the rhesus (Rh) complex's being responsible for most of the rest (Endeward *et al.*, 2008), leaving <10% to be accounted for by S-DT. Uehlein *et al.* (2003) reported that NtAQP1 in tobacco plants plays important physiological roles in CO_2 uptake—driven by a very small air-to-chloroplast gradient—for photosynthesis, stomatal opening, and leaf growth. Wang and colleagues demonstrated that the CO_2 permeability of tomato aquaporin PIP2;1 is essential for CO_2-dependent regulation of stomatal aperture (Wang *et al.*, 2016).

Besides H_2O and CO_2, various AQPs can conduct a variety of substances, including glycerol in the case of members of the aquaglyceroporin subfamily (Gomes *et al.*, 2009). Regarding

dissolved gases, hAQP1 conducts NH_3 (Nakhoul *et al.*, 2001) and NO (Herrera *et al.*, 2006).

Moreover, different AQPs can exhibit strong selectivity for CO_2 over NH_3 or vice versa (Musa-

Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*; Geyer *et al.*, 2013). More recent work has suggested that *Nicotiana tabacum*

PIP1;3 (Zwiazek *et al.*, 2017) as well as hAQP1 (Al-Samir *et al.*, 2025) are permeable to O_2, and

that AQP1, the Rh complex, and an unidentified protein are responsibly for nearly all O_2

permeability in murine RBCs (Moss *et al.*, 2025; Occhipinti *et al.*, 2025; Zhao *et al.*, 2025). These

results are consistent with the idea that cells, by regulating channel expression and trafficking to

specific membranes, could control the permeability to CO_2, O_2, and NH_3.

Structural studies show that AQP1 is a homotetramer with four independent monomeric

pores—lined mainly by hydrophilic residues—that conduct H_2O (Walz *et al.*, 1997; Sui *et al.*,

2001). At the core of its square-shaped array of four monomers, AQP1 has a central pore—lined

exclusively by hydrophobic residues—with no established function. Each monomer spans the lipid

bilayer six times and has cytoplasmic amino and carboxyl termini. As predicted by the "hourglass

model" of Preston and Agre (1991), two consensus NPA motifs—on intracellular and extracellular

loops that dip in towards the middle of AQP1, near the plane of the membrane—contribute

importantly to the monomeric pore. The well-established reduction of osmotic water permeability

(P_f) by $HgCl_2$ or pCMBS occurs as these agents react with cysteine-189 (C189), two residues

upstream from the second NPA (Preston *et al.*, 1993). Replacing this cysteine with serine (C189S),

which lacks a sulfhydryl group, eliminates this inhibition (Preston *et al.*, 1993).

We previously introduced an approach for using blunt, pH-sensitive microelectrodes to

monitor transient changes in extracellular-surface pH (pH_S), caused by the entry of CO_2 or NH_3

into *Xenopus* oocytes heterologously expressing membrane proteins (Endeward *et al.*, 2006; Musa-

Aziz *et al.*, 2009*b*, 2009*a*, 2010, 2014*a*). Mathematical modeling has elucidated the interpretation

of CO_2-dependent pH_S transients (Somersalo *et al.*, 2012; Occhipinti *et al.*, 2014; Calvetti *et al.*,

2020). Using this pH_S approach in a survey of mammalian AQPs, we found that AQPs 1, 6, and 9

are permeable to both CO_2 (exposure to 5% CO_2) and NH_3 (0.5 mM NH_4Cl); AQP0, the M23

variant of AQP4 (AQP4-M23), and AQP5 are permeable to CO_2 but not NH_3; AQPs 3, 7, and 8

are permeable to NH_3 but not CO_2; and AQP2 as well as AQP4-M1 appear to be permeable to

neither (Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*; Geyer *et al.*, 2013). Using an osmotic-shrinkage assay with an

80-fold higher extracellular [NH_3] than in our studies, Assentoft et al detected NH_3 permeability

through AQP4-M23 (Assentoft *et al.*, 2016). A key unanswered question is how various AQPs

exhibit such strikingly different CO$_2$/NH$_3$ selectivities. The answer presumably lies in the

pathways that these solutes take through various AQP tetramers. However, despite insights from

molecular-dynamics simulations (Wang *et al.*, 2007; Assentoft *et al.*, 2016), we still lack

physiological evidence that establishes the pathways by which either CO$_2$ or NH$_3$ moves through

any AQP. The purpose of the present study is to explore this problem.

Our approach was to use a combination of cell physiology and biochemistry. Heterologously

expressing hAQP1 or its C189S mutant in *Xenopus* oocytes, and using the pH$_S$ approach, we

assessed the effects of pCMBS and DIDS on CO$_2$ and NH$_3$ permeation. We also assessed P_f so

that we could normalize CO$_2$ and NH$_3$ data to H$_2$O permeability. We examine pCMBS because

mercury—acting on monomeric pores—reduces both the P_f (Preston *et al.*, 1993) and CO$_2$

permeability of hAQP1 (Cooper & Boron, 1998), as expressed heterologously in oocytes. We work

with DIDS because this drug reduces CO$_2$ permeability in RBCs, and in oocytes expressing hAQP1

(Endeward *et al.*, 2006). We find that virtually all of the hydrophilic NH$_3$ molecules—as well as

H$_2$O, as expected—pass through the four hAQP1 monomeric pores, which each possess three

hydrophilic nodes in their selectivity filters that are located at the center of an otherwise long

hydrophobic channel (Sui *et al.*, 2001). On the other hand, the more hydrophobic CO$_2$ travels both

via this pCMBS-sensitive pathway—the only established pathway through any AQP—as well as

an independent pathway that we can block with DIDS. Studies on hAQP1 expressed in *Pichia*

pastoris indicates that DIDS crosslinks hAQP1 monomers. Our work is the first to demonstrate

that a substance can move through an AQP via a pathway—possibly the hydrophobic central

pore—that is distinct from the monomeric pore. Considering that mutations in human AQPs are

associated with a wide variety of pathological conditions (see (Verkman, 2008; Verkman *et al.*,

2008; Wang & Boron, 2025), our work could lead to new insights into disease mechanisms,

diagnostic tools, and therapeutic approaches for improving clinical outcomes.

Methods

For previous summaries of our approach in oocyte experiments, see Musa-Aziz et al. (2010, 2009a, 2009b). The following description is in greater depth.

Ethical approval and animal procedures

The Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at Case Western Reserve University approved the protocols for housing and handling of *Xenopus laevis* (approval #2020-0066), used as a source of oocytes, and rabbits (approval # 2010-0146), for generating polyclonal antibodies.

Frogs. We purchased adult female *Xenopus laevis* frogs (NASCO Inc., Fort Atkinson, WI, USA) and housed them in a 20-gallon static aquarium, managed by the Animal Resources Center (ARC) of the School of Medicine. For stress mitigation, the tank had six or fewer frogs, and for environmental enrichment, we included a PVC elbow pipe. A charcoal Bio-Bag aquarium power pump (Tetra, Blacksburg, VA) circulated dechlorinated water through the tank. Three times per week, ARC staff fed the frogs with adult *Xenopus* diet (Zeigler Bros. Inc., Gardners, PA), sprinkling the food (10 pellets/frog) into the tank and, after a few hours when the *Xenopus* had fed, removing excess food with a net. As judged necessary, the ARC staff partially changed out water in the tank. Every 90 days, they moved the frogs into a newly cleaned tank that contained, in equal amounts, water from the previous tank and new de-chlorinated water.

We anesthetized frogs by immersion in a solution containing 0.2% tricaine (i.e., MS-222; ethyl 3-aminobenzoate methanesulfonate, catalog # A5040, Sigma-Aldrich, St Louis, MO, USA). When an animal became unresponsive to touch, we removed it from the solution and surgically extracted the ovaries. The animal was euthanized by cardiac excision prior to recovery from anesthesia.

In some experiments, we isolated oocytes from *Xenopus* ovarian lobes shipped overnight from NASCO.

Rabbits. We purchased adult female New Zealand white rabbits [1] from Charles River Laboratories (Ashland, OH). Following IACUC guidelines, ARC staff obtained a 5-mL pre-immune blood sample from an ear vein, and then inoculated two rabbits—gently restrained in a

---

[1] We code-named the rabbits, and the antisera they produced, "Ren" and "Stimpy."

rabbit-restraint cage, and lightly sedated with intramuscular acepromazine (2 mg/kg)—with fresh

DIDS-KLH fusion protein (see below) and Freund's complete adjuvant via subcutaneous injection

on the back of the rabbit. A 10-mL sample of blood (via ear veins, alternating sides) was taken 14–

21 days after the first boost, and the sera were evaluated for antigenicity towards proteins labeled

with DIDS. Once a rabbit began producing sufficient titers of polyclonal anti-DIDS antibodies,

staff collected 10 mL of blood per kg of body weight (~30–50 mL) at intervals of 21 to 30 days.

After two of such larger blood collections, ARC staff euthanized the animals by cardiac excision

and exsanguination, with blood from the terminal collection being transferred to our laboratory.

Solutions and chemicals

OR3 media (for maintaining oocytes). We follow the protocol described in (Musa-Aziz *et*

al., 2010). Briefly, we added to 1.8 L of H$_2$O one pack of powdered Leibovitz L-15 media with L-

glutamine (catalog # L4386, Sigma-Aldrich), 100 mL of 10,0000 U/mL penicillin/streptomycin

solution (cat # 15140122, Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA; hereafter abbreviated

TFS) and 5 mM HEPES free acid. We then titrated the solution to pH 7.50 with NaOH,

periodically measuring osmolality 195 mOsm, and sterile-filtered the solution using a Corning™

Disposable Vacuum Filter/Storage system (catalog # 09-761-107, TFS), and stored it in a cold

room for up to 2 weeks before use. Finally, just before use, we sterile-filtered a small volume of

solution using a 60-mL syringe (catalog # 14-955-461, TFS) and a sterile in-line Nalgene filter

with a 0.22-μm pore size and a 25-mm diameter (catalog # 723-9920, TFS).

Solutions for physiology experiments. Table 1 describes the final composition of nine

solutions used in the physiology experiments. All were assembled and used at room temperature

(~22°C). Where necessary, we describe any necessary additional steps for correct solution

assembly (e.g. the order in which components should be added) below.

(Solution 3) 5% CO$_2$/33 mM HCO$_3^-$ for measuring ΔpH$_S$ due CO$_2$ influx). After adding all

components except NaHCO$_3$, we titrated the solution to pH 7.50, then added the 33 mM NaHCO$_3$,

and then equilibrated the solution with 5% CO$_2$ (balance with air), which brought pH back to 7.50.

(Solutions 4 and 5) 0.5 mM NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$ in ND96 (for measuring ΔpH$_S$ due NH$_3$ influx). We

first made the 5 mM NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$ in ND96 solution (Solution #4) in which we replaced 5.0 mM NaCl

with an equivalent amount of NH$_4$Cl, and then diluted this solution 1:10 into ND96.

(Solution 6) Hypotonic ND96 (for measuring P_f): This is a variant of ND96 in which we
reduced [NaCl] to lower osmolality to 80 mOsm/kg.

(Solution 7) ND96 + pCMBS. In some experiments, we pre-incubated oocytes for 30 min in
an ND96 containing 1 mM pCMBS (catalog # C367750, Toronto 196 Research Chemicals, North
York, Ontario, Canada), a sulfhydryl reagent, added to solution as dry powder to ND96 (Solution
#1).

(Solution 8) DIDS. In some experiments, we pre-incubated oocytes for 1 h in an ND96
containing 100 µM DIDS (catalog # D3514, Sigma-Aldrich), an amino-reactive agent added to the
solution as a dry powder to ND96 (Solution #1).

(Solution 9) BSA (Bovine serum albumin, to scavenge DIDS). In some experiments, after
DIDS pretreatment, we washed off un-reacted DIDS by exposing oocytes to an ND96 to which we
added 0.2% BSA (catalog # A9418, Sigma-Aldrich) directly to ND96 (Solution #1).

When assembling all solutions, we measured pH using a Ross electrode (catalog # 927007MD,
TFS), a Dual Star pH meter (catalog # 8102BNUWP, TFS), and calibrated with two standards
(from TFS), buffer solution pH 6.0 (catalog # SB104-1) and 8.0 (catalog # SB112-20). We
measured osmolality with a vapor-pressure osmometer (catalog # 5520 Vapro, Wescor Inc.,
Logan, UT).

Oocyte Isolation

We placed ovarian lobes in a sterile 100-mm Petri dish containing ND96, cut them into
irregular pieces (<1 cm on an edge) containing ~10 oocytes each using small iridectomy scissors,
poured the mixture into a new Petri dish containing ~15 mL of Ca^{2+}-free ND96, gently agitated
the dish on a horizontal shaker[2] for 10 min, poured off as much liquid as possible, added fresh
Ca^{2+}-free ND96, and repeated the pour/shake/wash cycle twice more. We then poured off the Ca^{2+}-
free ND96, before adding ~15 mL of a freshly-made mixture of Ca^{2+}-free ND96 and 2 mg/mL
Collagenase Type IA (catalog # C9722, Sigma-Aldrich), and gently agitating the dish on a
horizontal shaker for 40 min. We next poured off the collagenase solution, added collagenase-free

---

[2] In some later experiments, we instead put the oocytes and Ca^{2+}-free solution into 50-mL Falcon tubes (catalog
14-959-49A, TFS) and agitated them using a Tube Rotator (Scientific Equipment Products, Baltimore, MD).

Ca^{2+}-free ND96, gently agitated the dish for 15 min, and repeated the pour/shake/wash cycle twice
more. We then poured off the Ca^{2+}-free ND96, added ND96 (i.e., containing Ca^{2+}), gently agitated
the dish on a horizontal shaker for 15 min, and repeated the pour/shake/wash cycle twice more.
Finally, we poured off the ND96, added ~15 mL OR3 media, repeated the pour/wash cycle twice
more, poured off most of the liquid, transferred the oocytes and remnant OR3 media to a fresh
petri dish containing fresh OR3 media, and incubated the oocytes in an incubator at 18ºC. Later
the same day, we used a stereomicroscope to sort the oocytes and select individual, defolliculated,
mature oocytes (stage V/VI), which we immediately moved to a 6-well plate containing OR3
media (as many as ~50 oocytes/well), using a fire-sterilized transfer pipette prepared by using a
diamond pencil to score the tapered end of a Pasteur pipette at a diameter large enough to
accommodate an oocyte, breaking off and discarding the thin end of the pipette, fire-polishing the
cut end of the pipette, and attaching the large end of the pipette to a manual, 2-mL Pipette Pump
pipetter (catalog # S3-594-3, TFS). We incubated the oocytes overnight at 18ºC before injection
the following day with cRNA or H_2O (see below).

cRNA synthesis

The cDNAs encoding both hAQP1-WT (accession# NM_198098) and AQP1-C189S were
gifts of Dr. Peter Agre (Johns Hopkins University). We subcloned the open reading frames of the
constructs into the expression plasmid pGH19 (Trudeau *et al.*, 1995), a vector containing the 3′
and 5′ untranslated regions of the *Xenopus* laevis β-globin gene. In experiments in which we
expressed AQP1-WT or AQP1-C189S in *P. pastoris*—as well as in some control experiments in
oocytes—we added an N-terminal (Nt) FLAG-tag (MDYKDDDDKASEFKKKL… ; FLAG
sequence, underscored; AQP1 sequence, double underscored).

We linearized cDNA constructs using NotI (for untagged AQP1-WT and AQP1-C189S) or
XhoI (for the AQP1-FLAG tagged versions). The linearized DNA was then purified using the
QIAquick PCR purification kit (catalog # 28104, Qiagen Inc., Valencia, CA). We then synthesized
capped RNA (cRNA) using T3 (for untagged constructs; catalog# AM1348, Ambion, Austin, TX,
USA) or T7 (for FLAG-tagged constructs; catalog# AM1344, Ambion) mMessage mMachine kits
(Ambion, Austin, TX, USA). The cRNA was purified using the RNeasy MinElute RNA Cleanup
Kit (catalog # 74204, Qiagen). The cRNA concentration was determined based on ultraviolet
absorbance at 260 nm, and quality was assessed according the A260/280 ratio and gel
electrophoresis.

Injection of oocytes with cRNA or water

One day after isolation and defolliculation, we injected stage V–VI oocytes with 25 nL of cRNA (1 ng/nL) encoding AQP1-WT, its C189S mutant, or the FLAG-tagged versions, or ~25 nL of water as a control. The injection apparatus consisted of a Nanoject II Variable Volume Automatic Injector (Drummond Scientific Company, Broomall, PA) connected to an injection needle that we pulled from 10-μl microdispenser capillary glass tubing (catalog # 3-000-210-G, Drummond), using a Model P-97 Flaming/Brown Micropipette Puller (Sutter Instrument Company, Novato, CA) and then modified by manually breaking the sealed end to yield a tip diameter of ~50-μm. After injection, we transferred oocytes to a 6-well plate (up to ~50/well) and incubated in OR3 media and maintained them for 3 days in an incubator at 18 °C before use.

Electrophysiological recordings

For a schematic representation of the experimental chamber, position of the oocyte, and arrangement of electrodes, see figure 8b in Musa-Aziz *et al.* (2010).

Chamber and solution delivery. We placed oocytes into the channel (3 mm wide × 2 mm deep × 30 mm long) of a plastic perfusion chamber. We delivered the physiological solutions—or pH standards for calibrating pH microelectrodes at the outset of an experiment (see next section)—at a constant, total flow of 4 mL/min at room temperature (~22 °C), using a series of dual-syringe pumps (Model 22, Harvard Apparatus, South Natick, MA), each of which drove two 140-mL plastic syringes (Sherwood Medical, St. Louis, MO) of identical content to deliver two solutions at 2 mL/min each.[3] The two solutions from each pump flowed through separate lengths of Tygon tubing (5/32-inch (~4.0 mm) outer diameter, 3/32-inch (~2.4 mm) inner diameter; Ryan Herco Products Corp., Burbank, CA; Formulation R3603-3; OD 4.8 mm /ID 1.6 mm) to two parallel assemblies of pneumatically operated 5-way valves (Clippard Instrument Laboratory, Cincinnati, OH), daisy-chained in such a way that we could switch among identical pairs of solution lines. The output of the parallel switching assemblies flowed into two lengths of Tygon tubing that carried the solutions to the vicinity of the chamber, where the two lines merged in a "mixing T",

---

[3] We apparatus had this dual-solution arrangement to enable the use of out-of-equilibrium CO_2/HCO_3^- solutions in experiments that are not part of the present study.

the output of which flowed into one end of the chamber channel. A suction device removed the

solution at the opposite end of the channel. See Musa-Aziz *et al.* (2014) for details.

Measurement of membrane potential and intracellular pH. As described previously (Musa-

Aziz *et al.*, 2010, 2014*a*), we impaled the oocyte (with the dark animal pole facing upward) with

two microelectrodes, one for measuring membrane potential and the other for measuring

intracellular pH. Both microelectrodes, with tip diameters of ~1 μm, we pulled from thin-walled

borosilicate microfilament glass tubing (Catalog # G200TF-4, 2.0 mm OD ×1.56 mm ID, Warner

Instruments Corporation, Hamden, CT), using the aforementioned P-97 microelectrode puller.

The microelectrodes for measuring membrane potential (V_m) we filled with 3 M KCl. We

inserted an electrode into a half-cell/microelectrode holder (model # ESW-F20N, Warner

Instruments Corp.), attached the holder to the V_m probe of an OC-725 two-electrode Oocyte Clamp

(Warner Instruments Corp.), and mounted the probe on a model MM-33R micromanipulator

(Warner Instruments Corp.). The V_m microelectrodes had resistances of ~0.3 – ~0.6 MΩ.

The microelectrodes for measuring intracellular pH (pH_i) were identical to the V_m electrodes

except for the following fabrication process. In order to remove moisture, we placed the pulled

micropipettes, with tips upwards, into the cylindrical holes of a reusable aluminum block

(machined to create "legs" and thereby allow gases to circulate from beneath, and with smaller

concentric cylindrical holes extending the entire height of the block to allow access of gases from

below, to the interior of the glass capillary), placed the block into the bottom of a 100-mm Pyrex

petri dish, covered the electrodes and block with an inverted 250-mL beaker, placed the petri dish

on an open metal rack of an oven at 200 °C, and then baked overnight. With the microelectrodes

still in the 200 °C oven, we then silanized them by tilting the beaker slightly and depositing 80 μL

of *bis*-di-(methylamino)-dimethylsilane (Sigma-Aldrich, catalog #14755) between the legs of the

aluminum block, releasing the breaker, and allowing the silane fumes to interact with the

microelectrodes for 40 min before removing beaker. The silanized electrodes cured in the oven at

200 °C until ready for use. We used a hand-drawn, soft-glass pipette with a long tip to backfill

each pH_i electrode with a liquid pH-sensitive sensor (catalog #95293, Hydrogen Ionophore I,

mixture B, Fluka Chemical Corp., Ronkonkoma, NY), as described by (Ammann *et al.*, 1981),

creating a column that extended ~1 mm from the microelectrode tip. We then backfilled an

microelectrode with a buffer solution (containing, in mM, 40 KH_2PO_4, 23 NaOH, 15 NaCl,

adjusted to pH 7.0), inserted the electrode into a half-cell/microelectrode holder (model # ESW-

F20N, Warner Instruments Corporation), attached the holder to one probe of a model FD223 dual

high-impedance electrometer, World Precision Instruments [WPI], Inc., Sarasota, FL), and

mounted the probe on a model MM-33R micromanipulator (Warner Instruments Corp.). The pH$_i$

microelectrodes had resistances of ~0.3 – 0.6 MΩ.

After placing the tips of the V_m and pH$_i$ microelectrodes in ND96 solution in the chamber

channel (which we now refer to as the "bath"), we obtained V_m by an analog electronic subtraction

of the system ground of the OC-725 amplifier from the signal of the V_m electrode. We similarly

obtained the voltage due to pH$_i$ by electronically subtracting the signal of the V_m electrode from

the signal of the pH$_i$ electrode. For a schematic representation of the configuration of the

electronics for obtaining V_m (this section) and the voltages due to pH$_i$ (this section) and pH$_S$ (next

section), see figure 7c in Musa-Aziz *et al.* (2010). The device that performed the subtractions (Yale

University Subtraction Amplifier, v3.1) also appropriately scaled the voltages for the inputs of an

analog-to-digital converter, installed in a Windows-based computer. With the tips of the V_m and

pH$_i$ electrodes (and also the pH$_S$ electrode, simultaneously; see next section) in the bath, we

obtained the slope of the pH$_i$ electrodes as we used the aforementioned solution-delivery system

(see previous section) to flow a pH standard at pH 6.0 (catalog # SB104-1) continuously through

the chamber channel, recorded the voltage due to that pH, used the valve system to switch the

flowing solution to a second, pH-8.0 standard (catalog # SB112-20), and then recorded the

corresponding voltage. We typically switched between standards in a pH-6→8→6→8 sequence,

accepting pH$_i$ microelectrodes that completed their electrical response—which also included the

time for the solution in the chamber channel to fully change composition—within ~5 s (~2 s for

pH$_S$ electrodes) and had slopes in the range of 53 to 60 mV/pH unit. After the recordings in the

final pH-calibration solution, we re-introduced the ND96 solution into the bath, and then added

the oocyte to the chamber channel. After impaling the oocyte with the V_m electrode, and with the

tip of the pH$_i$ electrode near the oocyte, we obtained a single-point pH calibration of the pH$_i$

microelectrode in the ND96 solution (defined as having a pH 7.50). We then impaled the oocyte

with the pH$_i$ microelectrode. After stabilization, oocytes had spontaneous V_m values at least as

negative as –40 mV. We continuously recorded pH$_i$ to judge the integrity of the oocyte and

compare the pH$_i$ time course with that of surface pH. In the present paper, we are not presenting

the pH$_i$ data, which nevertheless are similar to those of our previous studies (Musa-Aziz *et al.*,

2009*a*, 2010, 2014*a*, 2014*b*).

Measurement of surface pH. We measured surface pH with liquid-sensor pH

microelectrodes that we fabricated and employed in the same way as we did for pH$_i$

microelectrodes (see above), but with four differences. First, we pulled the pH$_S$ microelectrodes

from standard-walled (rather than thin-walled) borosilicate microfilament glass tubing (Part No.

G200F-4, 2.0 mm OD ×1.16 mm ID, Warner Instruments). Second, we used a microforge to break

off and fire polish the tips (inner diameter $\cong$ 20 µm at tip) as one would for a giant-patch pipette

(Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2010). It was to facilitate the fire polishing that we used the standard-walled

glass tubing. Third, we used a vented microelectrode holder (model # ESW-F20N, Warner

Instruments Corp.) mounted on a model MM-33L micromanipulator. The vent prevented pressure

buildup that would otherwise have pushed the liquid pH sensor out of the wide electrode tip as we

pushed the pH$_S$ electrode into the holder. Note that we attached the microelectrode holder of the

pH$_S$ electrode to the second of two inputs of the FD223 electrometer. And fourth, after obtaining

the pH$_S$-electrode slope (which we did at the same time as obtaining the pH$_i$ electrode slope, as

described above) and single-point calibration of the pH$_S$ electrode in ND96, we used an ultra-fine

computer-controlled micromanipulator (model MPC-200 system, Sutter Instrument Company) to

positioned the blunt tip of the pH$_S$ electrode near the oocyte's equator (i.e., between the upward-

facing animal pole and downward-facing vegetal pole), and ~5 degrees behind the meridian (i.e.,

barely in the "shadow" of the flowing extracellular solution) until the pH$_S$ electrode tip just touched

the surface of the oocyte (Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2010, 2014*a*). We then further advanced the tip by ~40

µm to create a slight dimple in the membrane. Periodically during the experiment (indicated by

vertical gray bands in each panel of Figure 2*B*, Figure 3, and Figure 6), we withdrew the electrode

~300 µm from the oocyte for recalibration in the bulk extracellular fluid (bECF) of the bath (i.e.,

pH 7.50).

The external reference electrode for the pH$_S$ measurement was a calomel half-cell, bridged to

the chamber channel via a long glass micropipette filled with 3M KCl, connected to a model 750

electrometer (WPI), and positioned so that its tip was just downstream of the oocyte. We obtained

the pH$_S$ signal by an analog electronic subtraction of the calomel signal from the signal of the pH$_S$

electrode.

We established a virtual ground with an Ag/AgCl half cell (connected to the I_{Sense} input of the

voltage-clamp amplifier) bridged to the chamber by a second glass microelectrode filled with 3M

KCl, and positioned the tip of this second bridging pipette close to that of the first, that is, just

downstream of the oocyte.

Measurement of osmotic water permeability. We measured P_f as described by (Zhang *et*

al., 1990; Preston *et al.*, 1992, 1993). Using an approach similar to those in previous studies by

our group (Virkki *et al.*, 2001; Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*), we dropped an oocyte into a Petri dish

containing a hypotonic solution (80 mOsm; Solution #6, Table 1) to induce cell swelling and, while

illuminating from beneath the dish, used a video camera to obtain images of the oocyte (1/s × 60

s). Using a small metal sphere next to the oocyte as a size reference, we determined the projection

areas of the oocyte, and—assuming the oocyte to be a perfect sphere—computed idealized oocyte

volume (V_{Oocyte}) and idealized oocyte surface area as a function of time. We estimated the actual

surface area (S, in cm^2) by multiplying the idealized surface area by a factor of 9 (Chandy *et al.*,

1997). We computed P_f from the following equation:

404
$$P_f = \underbrace{\frac{\left(\dfrac{dV_{Oocyte}}{dt}\right)_{max}}{S \times \Delta Osm \times V_W}}_{units:\, cm\,/\,s},$$

405   the form of which differs slightly from that of Zhang *et al.*, (1990).[4] Here, $(dV_{Oocyte}/dt)_{max}$ is the

406   maximum time rate of change of cell volume (i.e., the maximal H_2O influx, or $J_{V,max}$, in $cm^3\ s^{-1}$),

407   ΔOsm is the initial osmotic gradient across the oocyte membrane (i.e., $195 - 80 = 115$ mOsm,

408   expressed as mol cm^{-3}), and V_W is the molar volume of water ($18.1\ cm^3\ mol^{-1}$). As for the

409   electrophysiological studies, we performed all P_f assays at room temperature (~22 °C).

---

[4] To obtain P_f in the proper units ($cm\ s^{-1}$) in the above equation, the derivation by Zhang *et al.*, (1990) requires that the division of "moles of osmotically active particles" (in the ΔOsm term) by "moles of water" (in the V_W term) yield a numerical result that is unitless, which of course is impossible. This inconsistency arises during the derivation of the water-flux equation when one switches from describing the energy of water (i.e., RT) as "per mole of water" per se to the energy of water "per mole of osmotically active solute" during the introduction of the Van't Hoff equation. The introduction of a phantom conversion factor with a value of unity—but with the units "(per mole of osmotically active solute)/(per mole of water)"—eliminates the inconsistency.

Protocols for physiological experiments

Figure 1A–J illustrates the sequence of events in our experimental protocols.

Electrophysiological assays. On the day of an experiment, we followed a 10-step protocol:

(A) Use a transfer pipette to pick up an untreated oocyte from a well of a 6-well plate (each
well containing OR3 medium + ~30 oocytes, all injected with the same material) and drop the
oocyte into a petri dish containing ND96 (Solution #1, Table 1). After flushing the transfer pipette
tip several times with ND96 (to remove OR3).

(B) Use the transfer pipette to move the washed oocyte to an identified well of a 24-well plate
(1 oocyte/well) containing ND96. Repeat this procedure for several oocytes, each of which will
remain in its well (1–3 hours) until we …

(C) Use the transfer pipette to place the oocyte in the chamber, begin flowing ND96, and
measure V_m, pH_i, and pH_S under basal conditions.

(D) Monitor pH_S as we replace ND96 with either the 5% CO_2/33 mM HCO_3^- solution (Solution
#3, Table 1; as in Figure 2B, Figure 3) or the 0.5 mM NH_3/NH_4^+ solution (Solution #5, Table 1; as
in Figure 5B, Figure 6); all oocytes in the study underwent this control assay.

(E) Immediately upon completion of the pH_S assay, use a transfer pipette to return the oocyte
from the chamber to its original well and incubate the oocyte at ~22°C in ND96. We serially
process all oocytes from a 24-well plate up to this stage (i.e., steps 'C' through 'E') and then pause.
Thus, this second period of incubation in ND96 (step 'E') ranges from ~30 min to ~3 h.

(F) Use a transfer pipette to move each oocyte in the 24-well ND96 plate to a corresponding
well in one of three new 24-well plates. Here, the wells contain one of the following three
solutions: (F_1) 1 mM pCMBS dissolved in ND96 (Solution #7, Table 1) 30 min incubation; see
Figure 3DEF, Figure 6DEF, Figure 7, Figure 8, or Figure 9CD); (F_2) 100 µM DIDS dissolved in
ND96 (Solution #8, Table 1; 60 min incubation; see Figure 3GHI or Figure 6GHI); or (F_3) ND96
without an added drug ("sham").

(G) Wash the oocyte. Except in a few cases (see indented paragraph below), we wash the
oocyte ×3 in a petri dish containing ordinary ND96, as follows. We use a transfer pipette to pick
up an oocyte from a 24-plate (step 'F') and release the oocyte into a petri dish containing ND96,
quickly pick up and released the oocyte into this wash solution twice more (to remove excess drug,
if present). At this point, most oocytes progress immediately through step 'H' (below). However,

in a minority of experiments (see Figure 3*JKL*), we serially treated oocytes with both pCMBS and

DIDS. Here, oocytes previously treated with pCMBS (step 'F$_1$') we exposed to DIDS, as indicated

by steps $\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_3$. Conversely, oocytes previously treated with DIDS (step 'F$_2$') we exposed to

pCMBS, as indicated by steps $\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_3$. In one experiment without any drugs, we also followed

the steps $\gamma_1 \rightarrow \gamma_2 \rightarrow \gamma_3$ ("double sham").

Not illustrated in Figure 1 is a protocol variant that we employ in a few cases (i.e.,

Figure 9*AB/right bars*) in which we introduce an additional step between 'F$_2$' and 'G'.

Here, after treating an oocyte with DIDS (step 'F$_2$'), we scavenge unreacted DIDS with

albumin as follows. After using a transfer pipette to pick up the oocyte from the DIDS-

containing ND96 solution, we release the oocyte into a petri dish containing 0.2%

albumin in otherwise DIDS-free ND96 (Solution #9, Table 1), and allow the oocyte to

remain in the albumin solution for 20 min. We then wash off the albumin in step 'G' by

transferring the oocyte to a petri dish containing ordinary ND96, and pick up and release

the oocyte ×3 using a transfer pipette.

(H) Use a transfer pipette to move the oocyte from the petri dish (step 'G') to an identified well

in one of three new 24-well plates, all containing ND96, in preparation for the next assay.

(I) Transfer the oocyte back to the chamber and (as in step 'C'), and again measure the new

basal V_m, pH$_i$, and pH$_S$.

(J) Monitor (as in step 'D'), for the second time, the pH$_S$ transient as we replace ND96 with

the CO$_2$/HCO$_3^-$ (or NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$) solution.

Thus, oocytes in the top row of Figure 3 (i.e., Figure 3*ADGJ*) went through one of the following

two sequences: Panels $A \rightarrow D$ or $A \rightarrow J$, which requires 12–18 h for an entire group of 24 oocytes in

a day's work. Not all oocytes survived the entire protocol (as judged by the color/integrity of the

animal pole).

***P$_f$* assays.** On the same day that we performed our pH$_S$ assays, we also performed P_f assays

on separate cells from the same oocyte batch (i.e., oocytes prepared from the same ovary). On the

same day as pH$_S$ experiments, we: (1) Use a transfer pipette to remove 6 untreated oocytes of each

experimental group—hAQP1, C189S mutant, or hAQP1 FLAG-tagged—from an identified 6-well

plate containing ND96 (i.e., a total of 18). (2) Place the oocytes—as quickly as possible—in a Petri

dish containing hypotonic ND96 (Solution #6, Table 1). (3) Use a video camera (described above)

to monitor cell swelling; oocytes of each group underwent this control assay. (4) Immediately

remove the oocytes from the hypotonic solution to identified wells in another Petri dish containing

standard ND96 solution to wash the oocytes ×3 at ~22°C (described above under

electrophysiological assays). (5) Incubate at ~22°C either for (5a) 30 min in ND96 containing 1

mM pCMBS (Solution #7, Table 1), or (5b) 1 hour in ND96 containing 100 µM DIDS (Solution

#8, Table 1). (6) Wash the oocytes (as described under electrophysiological assays, point '5a'). (7)

Transfer the oocytes to a Petri dish containing hypotonic, drug-free ND96 as in '2' above. (8)

Monitor swelling as in '3' above.

Generation of the DIDS antibody

Generation of DIDS-fusion protein. We used two rabbits to produce polyclonal antibodies

against DIDS, as described by Garcia & Lodish (1989). Briefly, we reacted 2.4 mM DIDS (catalog

D3514, Sigma-Aldrich), with 5 mg keyhole limpet hemocyanin (KLH;, catalog # H7017, Sigma-

Aldrich) in 500 µL of phosphate buffer saline (PBS; i.e., 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM phosphate buffer,

pH 7.0) in the dark at 37°C × 40 min. Afterwards, we centrifuged the sample × 30 s in an Eppendorf

benchtop centrifuge (catalog # 5415C, TFS) to remove large insoluble aggregates After pooling

yellow supernatants from several centrifuge tubes, we dialyzed against PBS at 4°C overnight in a

slide-a-lyzer dialysis cassette (TFS). The following day, we removed the KLH-DIDS sample from

the cassette; quantified the DIDS by absorbance spectroscopy at 340 nm, assuming a molar

extinction coefficient (ε) of 54,000 M^{-1} cm^{-1}; aliquoted the dialyzed KLH-DIDS solution; and

immediately used it for immunization.

For both rabbits, we separately processed each of three blood samples (see above)—2 lots of

~30–50 mL plus the terminal sample. We centrifuged the blood for 10 min at 1000 ×g using an

Eppendorf bench top centrifuge to isolate the serum, and then evaluated antigenicity on western

blots of DIDS-labeled AQP1. We purified the antibodies (mainly IgG) from the remainder of the

serum using a Protein A column (Catalog # 20356, TFS), following the manufacturer's

instructions; estimated [IgG] by measuring absorbance at 280 nm (assuming ε = 210,000 M^{-1}cm^{-1}

) using a NanoDrop 2000c spectrophotometer (TFS); separated the material into aliquots

corresponding to 1 mg/mL of anti-DIDS antibody; and stored the aliquots at either –20°C for short-

term storage or –80°C for long-term storage.

Biochemical experiments

Isolation of oocyte membranes. We used a previously described method (Leduc-Nadeau *et al.*, 2007), except that, after disrupting oocytes and centrifuging, we removed the supernatant and added fresh buffer to the pellet, repeating the procedure until the supernatant was clear (i.e., void of yolk).

Purification of oocyte membrane proteins. We resuspended isolated oocyte membranes in Tris-Buffered Saline (TBS, 50 mM Tris HCl, pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl) + 2% n-dodecyl-β-D-maltopyranoside (DDM; Sol-Grade, catalogue #D310S, Anatrace, Maumee, OH), incubated at 4°C × 2h, centrifuged at 16,000 × g at 4°C × 30 min, and then collected the supernatant containing the solubilized membrane proteins and diluted it so that [DDM] was ≤ 0.5%.

Overexpression of AQP1-FLAG in *Pichia pastoris*. We ligated N-terminally FLAG-tagged hAQP1 (MDYKDDDDKASEFKKKL… ; FLAG sequence underscored, hAQP1 sequence double underscored) into the pPICZ-A vector (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA), induced protein expression with methanol × 72 h at 26 ºC, harvested the yeast by centrifugation, and obtained spheroplasts using zymolyase treatment (60 U/mL in 1 M sorbitol, 1 mM EDTA, 10 mM citrate buffer, pH 5.8) as previously described (Gustin *et al.*, 1998). We then equally divided the spheroplasted cells into two groups (i.e., no DIDS and added 100 µM DIDS), incubated × 1 h at ~22 °C, and then solubilized overnight at 4°C in TBS + 2% DM, with cOmplete™ Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (catalog #11697498001, Roche, Mannheim, Germany). Following membrane solubilization, we clarified the material by low speed centrifugation, mixed with anti-FLAG resin (catalog #A2220, Sigma-Aldrich), and eluted proteins from a column using TBS + 0.1% DM + 500 µg/mL FLAG peptide (catalog #F4799, Sigma-Aldrich) at pH 7.4. In some cases, we subjected FLAG-purified AQP1 to size-exclusion chromatography using a Sephadex 75 column.

Western blotting of membrane proteins from oocytes or *Pichia pastoris*. We separated proteins extracted from oocyte membranes by SDS-PAG using Tris-Glycine 4–20% gels (BioRad Laboratories, Hercules, CA) or proteins from extracted from *Pichia* membranes using 12% Tris-Glycine gels; transferred the proteins to polyvinylidene difluoride (PVDF) membranes using an iBlot 7-Minute Blotting System (TFS); and subsequently blocked the cross-linked proteins with Tris-buffered saline with tween (TBST), comprising 25 mM Tris at pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 0.05% Tween-20 (catalog # P9416, Sigma-Aldrich) + 5% milk powder × 1 h.

We probed blots from oocyte samples with a polyclonal anti-AQP1 (catalog # AQP11-A,

Alpha Diagnostics, San Antonio, USA), and blots from *P. pastoris* samples with monoclonal anti-

FLAG (catalog # F3165-2MG, Sigma-Aldrich) or polyclonal anti-DIDS (made in-house, see

above), applying all primary antibodies at 1:1000 dilution from their stocks in TBST + 5% milk,

at 4°C overnight. The next day, we washed the blot ×5 with TBST × 10 min. We detected the

primary polyclonal antibodies (i.e., anti-AQP1 and anti-DIDS) with an HRP-conjugated goat anti-

rabbit secondary antibody (catalog # 1706515, BioRad Laboratories), and detected the primary

monoclonal antibody (i.e., anti-FLAG), an HRP-conjugated goat anti-mouse secondary antibody

(catalog # STAR207P, BioRad Laboratories). We applied both secondary antibodies at 1:5000

dilution from their stocks in TBST × 1 h, washed the blot ×5 with TBST × 10 min, developed the

immunoblots using ECL Prime Western Blotting Detection Reagent (catalog # 12316992, GE

Healthcare Amersham, Piscataway, NJ), acquired images with a Typhoon Trio gel-documentation

system (GE Healthcarefryan), and evaluate band density patterns using Image J software (NIH,

Bethesda, MD).

Statistics

We present data as the mean ± S.D. (standard deviation), and define N as the number of

different frogs used and n as the number of replicate experiments (i.e., oocytes) for each condition

in each dataset. We define m as the number of comparisons in each dataset. Statistical analyses are

performed using Origin 2024 software. Statistical comparisons among means were performed

using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) among all groups, followed by Holm-Bonferroni

mean comparison (Holm, 1979) to control for type I errors across multiple comparisons,

establishing the familywise error rate (FWER) to α = 0.05. In brief, the unadjusted *P*-values for all

m comparisons in each dataset from lowest to highest. In the first test, we compare the smallest

unadjusted *P*-value to the first adjusted α value, α/m. Upon rejection of the null hypothesis, we

compare the second-smallest *P*-value to the second adjusted α value, α/(m–1), and continue the

process accordingly. If the unadjusted *P*-value is ≥ the adjusted α at any stage, the null hypothesis

is accepted, rending all subsequent hypotheses in the test group null. We conducted one-sample t-

tests (α=0.05) to ascertain whether the channel-dependent $(\Delta pH_S{}^*)_{CO_2}$ was significantly different

from zero when oocytes were treated with both pCMBS and DIDS. If $P < 0.05$, the $(\Delta pH_S{}^*)_{CO_2}$

was considered significantly greater than zero. We conducted one-sample t-tests (α=0.05) to

ascertain whether the channel-dependent $(\Delta pH_S{}^*)_{NH_3}$, was significantly different from zero when

oocytes were treated with pCMBS. If $P < 0.05$, the $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ was considered significantly greater

than zero.

Results

Surface-pH Measurements for AQP1-WT and AQP1-C189S

pH_S measurements for CO_2 transport. Figure 2*A* is a schematic representation of the reaction and diffusion events that take place as we switch the bath solution—that is, the bulk extracellular fluid—from ND96 to another that contains 5% CO_2/33 mM HCO_3^- at a constant pH of 7.50. This solution change not only leads to a net influx of CO_2 that lowers intracellular pH (Roos & Boron, 1981) but also lowers CO_2 concentration near the outer surface of the cell membrane ($[CO_2]_S$). This decrease in $[CO_2]_S$ has two effects. First, it creates a gradient for CO_2 diffusion from the bECF to the cell surface, which partially replenishes CO_2 at the cell surface but by itself has no effect on pH. Second, it drives the reactions $HCO_3^- + H^+ \rightarrow H_2CO_3 \rightarrow CO_2 + H_2O$ at the cell surface, which also partially replenishes CO_2. This reaction causes an alkaline pH_S transient, the maximal excursion of which we define as ΔpH_S (Endeward *et al.*, 2006; Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*; Geyer *et al.*, 2013). Our colleagues have used 3D reaction-diffusion models to simulate these pH_S and pH_i changes as CO_2 diffuses into a spherical cell (Somersalo *et al.*, 2012; Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2014*a*, 2014*b*; Occhipinti *et al.*, 2014; Calvetti *et al.*, 2020).

Figure 2*B* shows a representative pH_S recording from a H_2O-injected or "control" oocyte during such a solution change (for solution composition, see Table 1). The vertical gray bands in the figure indicate periods during which we withdraw the tip of the extracellular pH microelectrode from its previous position, in which its tip created a small dimple (~40 μm) in the oocyte surface, to a distance of ~300 μm for recalibration in the bECF, which we assume to have a pH of precisely 7.50. We describe the recalibration in the legend of Figure 2.

Figure 2*C* shows a representative western blot of membrane preparations (see Methods) of oocytes injected with H_2O or cRNA encoding either AQP1-WT or AQP1-C189S. The lower band(s) at ~25 kDa presumably represents unglycosylated or core-glycosylated AQP1 in the endoplasmic reticulum. The upper bands at ~37 kDa represent mature-glycosylated AQP1, much of which is presumably at the plasma membrane. Assuming that the AQP1 antibody has similar sensitivities for the WT and C189S proteins, we conclude that *Xenopus laevis* oocytes express similar amounts of each.

Figure 3 shows a series of 12 representative pH_S recordings, the first of which, in Figure 3*A*, is a replicate of Figure 2*B*. We can see that the ΔpH_S induced by the CO_2 influx in this H_2O-

injected control oocyte is much smaller (upward orange arrow in Figure 3*A*) than in a day-matched

oocyte injected with cRNA encoding hAQP1-WT (upward green arrow in Figure 3*B*).

We define $(\Delta pH_S{*})_{CO_2}$ as the difference between the CO_2-induced ΔpH_S value of an oocyte

expressing a channel protein (upward black arrow in inset of Figure 3*B*) and the mean ΔpH_S for

all day-matched control oocytes (e.g., Figure 3*A*). This difference is a semiquantitative index of

the channel-specific CO_2 flux (Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*; Somersalo *et al.*, 2012; Calvetti *et al.*,

2020). The leftmost bar in Figure 4*A* represents the mean $(\Delta pH_S{*})_{CO_2}$ value for 34 oocytes

expressing AQP1-WT in the absence of inhibitors.

To assess the importance of the monomeric pore, we examined the effect of pCMBS, which,

like $HgCl_2$, covalently modifies Cys-189 near the extracellular entrance of the monomeric pore

and reduces the component of P_f due to AQP1 (Preston *et al.*, 1993), which we define as $P_f{*}$.

Preston et al showed that $HgCl_2$ has no effect on P_f if oocytes express the C189S mutant of AQP1

(Preston *et al.*, 1993). On the basis of pH_i measurements, Cooper and Boron (1998) showed that

pCMBS significantly reduces the CO_2 permeability of oocytes expressing AQP1-WT, but that this

effect is absent oocytes expressing AQP1-C189S. In the present study, in which we now monitor

pH_S, experiments on individual oocytes confirm that pretreatment with 1 mM pCMBS (see

Methods) reduces the CO_2-induced ΔpH_S in an AQP1-WT oocyte (Figure 3*E* vs. *B*) but not in an

oocyte expressing AQP1-C189S (Figure 3*F* vs. *C*). pCMBS has no effect on a H_2O-injected oocyte

(Figure 3*D* vs. *A*), for which ΔpH_S is already small. We conclude that pCMBS reduces but does

not eliminate the ΔpH_S due to AQP1 (Figure 3*E* vs. *D*).

The leftmost bar in Figure 4*B* represents the mean $(\Delta pH_S{*})_{CO_2}$ from 22 oocytes expressing

AQP1-C189S in the absence of inhibitors. This $(\Delta pH_S{*})_{CO_2}$ value is very similar to that for oocytes

expressing AQP1-WT (leftmost bar in Figure 4*A*). A comparison of the first and second bars in

Figure 4*A* and *B* shows that pCMBS reduces $(\Delta pH_S{*})_{CO_2}$ by somewhat more than half in oocytes

expressing AQP1-WT, but has no significant effect in AQP1-C189S oocytes. These data support

the hypothesis that, of the CO_2 that transits AQP1, a major component moves through the same

monomeric pores as H_2O.

While studying HCO_3^- transport, Forster et al unexpectedly found that DIDS blocks a large

fraction of CO_2 permeability of human RBCs (Forster *et al.*, 1998). Endeward et al found that, in

RBCs genetically deficient in AQP1, DIDS has a reduced effect on CO_2 permeability (Endeward

et al., 2006). Here, in the present experiments on single oocytes, we find that pretreatment with

100 μM DIDS reduces the CO$_2$-induced ΔpH$_S$ in both an AQP1-WT oocyte (Figure 3H vs. B) and

an AQP1-C189S oocyte (Figure 3I vs. C), but not in a H$_2$O-injected oocyte (Figure 3G vs. A), for

which ΔpH$_S$ is already small.

The third bars in Figure 4A and B summarize mean $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ values from a larger group of

oocytes pretreated with DIDS. A comparison of the first and third bars shows that DIDS reduces

$(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by more than half in oocytes expressing either AQP1-WT (Figure 4A) or AQP1-C189S

(Figure 4B). These data are consistent with the hypothesis that a significant fraction of CO$_2$ moves

through AQP1 by a DIDS-sensitive pathway that is unaffected by the C189S mutation in the

extracellular mouth of the monomeric pore.

Returning to experiments on individual oocytes, we see that the sequential exposure of an

AQP1-WT oocyte to pCMBS and then DIDS substantially reduces the CO$_2$-induced ΔpH$_S$ (Figure

3K vs. B). Moreover, and the size of the ΔpH$_S$ for the pCMBS/DIDS-treated AQP1-WT oocyte

(Figure 3K) is about the same as for H$_2$O-injected oocytes ±inhibitors (Figure 3A,D,G,J). In an

AQP1-C189S oocyte, the combination of pretreating with pCMBS then DIDS reduces the CO$_2$-

induced ΔpH$_S$ (Figure 3L vs. C), but by no more than DIDS alone (Figure 3I vs. C).

The fourth bars in Figure 4A and B summarize mean $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ values from a larger group of

oocytes, in experiments in which we treated with pCMBS and DIDS in either order. A comparison

of the first and fourth bars shows that pCMBS+DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by slightly more than

100% in AQP1-WT oocytes (Figure 4A). In the AQP1-C189S oocytes, pCMBS+DIDS reduces

$(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ to about the same extent as DIDS alone (Figure 4B), about 40%. Taken together, the

data in Figure 3 and Figure 4A and B are consistent with the hypothesis that, in addition to the

component of CO$_2$ that moves through the four monomeric pores, another component—at least as

large—moves through an entirely separate, DIDS-sensitive pathway.

Figure 4C summarizes the results of ND96 sham experiments in which—in step F$_3$ of Figure

1—we simulated either a 30-min pCMBS exposure (n = 3) or a 60-min DIDS exposure (n = 2).

The averages of the two sham groups were nearly identical to that of the control group, showing

that the oocytes can tolerate these long protocols.

pH$_S$ measurements for NH$_3$ transport. Figure 5A is a schematic representation of the reaction

and diffusion events that take place as we exposing an oocyte to a solution containing 0.5 mM

NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$. Here, the changes in pH$_S$ are opposite in direction to those caused by CO$_2$/HCO$_3^-$

exposure. As the weak base NH_3 enters the cell, it causes a decrease in $[NH_3]_S$, which has two

effects. First, it provides a gradient for NH_3 diffusion from the bECF to the cell surface. By itself,

this diffusion, which partially replenishes NH_3 at the cell surface, has no effect on pH. Second, the

decrease in $[NH_3]_S$ also drives the reaction $NH_4^+ \rightarrow NH_3 + H^+$ at the cell surface, which also

partially replenishes NH_3. This reaction produces an acidic pH_S transient (Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*b*,

2009*a*), so that $\Delta pH_S < 0$. Figure 5*B* shows a representative pH_S recording as we introduce

NH_3/NH_4^+.

Figure 6 shows a series of 9 representative pH_S recordings on individual oocytes, the first of

which, in Figure 6*A*, is a replicate of Figure 5*B*. We find that the NH_3-induced '$-\Delta pH_S$' is much

smaller in the H_2O-injected oocyte (Figure 6*A*) than in a day-matched oocyte expressing AQP1-

WT (Figure 6*B*). Subtracting the ΔpH_S from the H_2O-injected oocyte from the ΔpH_S from the

AQP1-WT oocyte yields the channel-dependent, NH_3-induced ΔpH_S—$(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ (Musa-Aziz *et*

al., 2009*a*). The leftmost bar in Figure 7*A* represents the mean $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ for 18 oocytes

expressing AQP1-WT in the absence of inhibitors.

In experiments on representative oocytes, we find that pretreating an AQP1-WT oocyte with

1 mM pCMBS markedly reduces '$-\Delta pH_S$' (Figure 6*E* vs. *B*), but has no effect in an AQP1-C189S

oocyte, where '$-\Delta pH_S$' remains high (Figure 6*F* vs. *C*); or in a H_2O oocyte, where '$-\Delta pH_S$' remains

low (Figure 6*D* vs. *A*). The leftmost bar in Figure 7*B* represents the mean $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ value from

11 oocytes expressing AQP1-C189S in the absence of inhibitors. This $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ value is

virtually identical to that for oocytes expressing AQP1-WT (leftmost bar in Figure 7*A*). A

comparison of first and second bars shows that pCMBS reduces '$-(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$' by virtually 100%

in oocytes expressing AQP1-WT (Figure 7*A*), but has no effect in AQP1-C189S oocytes (Figure

7*B*).

Returning to experiments on individual oocytes, we see that DIDS has no effect on '$-\Delta pH_S$'

in a H_2O-injected control oocyte (Figure 6*G* vs. *A*), where '$-\Delta pH_S$' remains low; or in an AQP1-

WT oocyte (Figure 6*H* vs. *B*) or an AQP1-C189S oocyte (Figure 6*I* vs. *C*), where '$-\Delta pH_S$' remains

high. The third bars in Figure 7*A* and *B* summarize mean $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ values from larger groups of

DIDS-pretreated oocytes. A comparison of the first and third bars in each panel shows that DIDS

is without effect on $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ in oocytes expressing AQP1-WT (Figure 7*A*) or AQP1-C189S

(Figure 7*B*). Taken together, the data in Figure 6 and Figure 7 indicate that all of the NH_3 transiting

AQP1 moves via the same pathway as H_2O and one of the two major components of CO_2—namely

the four pCMBS-sensitive monomeric pores. None of the NH_3 moves via the alternate, DIDS-

sensitive pathway taken by the other major component of CO_2.

Cell-swelling experiments. In parallel with the CO_2 and NH_3 assays (Figure 4 and Figure 7),

we determined P_f*. In Figure 8*A*, we summarize our AQP1-WT data, which confirm earlier work

that shows that, in oocytes expressing AQP1-WT, mercurials reduce P_f* by about half (Macey,

1984; Preston *et al.*, 1993; Zeidel *et al.*, 1994; Musa-Aziz *et al.*, 2009*a*; Kabutomori *et al.*, 2018)

but that DIDS is without effect (Macey, 1984; Endeward *et al.*, 2006). Figure 8*B* confirms that the

AQP1-C189S mutation renders P_f* insensitive to pCMBS (Preston *et al.*, 1993; Cooper & Boron,

1998; Kabutomori *et al.*, 2018), and also shows that the mutation does not affect the lack of DIDS

sensitivity.

Modification of hAQP1 by DIDS

Via rapid and reversible electrostatic interactions, the two sulfonate groups of DIDS can

reversibly interact with cationic sites on proteins. Via slower covalent reactions with the $–NH_2$

group of lysine or –OH/–SH groups of other amino acids, the two isothiocyanate groups of DIDS

can act as a homobifunctional crosslinking reagent (Cabantchik & Rothstein, 1972; Lepke *et al.*,

1976).

pH_S experiments on oocytes. To assess whether the DIDS inhibition occurs via an

electrostatic or covalent interaction, we followed a DIDS exposure with an albumin wash (see

Methods) to scavenge non-covalently-bound DIDS. Figure 9*A* shows that the albumin wash does

not significantly reduce the degree to which the DIDS pretreatment reduces decreases $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$.

Because the inhibition is irreversible, the interaction of the DIDS with hAQP1 is most likely

covalent. To investigate this covalent modification, we performed the biochemistry experiments

(presented in next section) in which we FLAG-tagged hAQP1 at its N-terminus, overexpressed the

construct in *Pichia pastoris,* and prepared spheroplasts. Here, in control oocyte experiments, we

observe that the FLAG tag has no effect on the $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$ ±DIDS or ±albumin (Figure 9*B* vs. *A*).

We also find that the FLAG tag is without effect in P_f assays, ±pCMBS or ±DIDS (Figure 9*D* vs.

C).

Biochemistry experiments. In separate studies, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, we

overexpressed FLAG-tagged hAQP1 in *Pichia pastoris*, and prepared spheroplasts. We treated

intact spheroplasts with DIDS (or, as shams, without DIDS), solubilized the membranes in

detergent, and purified hAQP1 using an anti-FLAG resin. Further purification by size-exclusion

chromatography (Figure 10*A*) shows that DIDS treatment promotes the formation of higher–

molecular-weight hAQP1 species, as indicated by the increased peak height of the void volume

(V_0). We then pooled and concentrated fractions from each peak. Optical spectroscopy of this

material (Figure 10*B*) reveals the expected increase in absorbance centered at ~340 nm (brown

arrow; see Kodippili *et al.*, 2009), due to DIDS in the DIDS-treated vs. sham samples. We also

separated the pooled/concentrated material by SDS-PAGE, and transferred to membranes for

western blotting. In the anti-FLAG blot (Figure 10*C*), the dominant species are hAQP1 monomers

($\leq$50 kDa, arrows a–c) that, as we will see, represent mainly intracellular protein (i.e., not on

plasma membrane). Presumed dimers (arrow d) and tetramers (arrow e) are visible only in DIDS-

treated samples (lanes 2, 4, 6), and represent proteins accessible to DIDS at the outer cell surface.

In the anti-DIDS blot (Figure 10*D*), the monomeric species (dominant in the anti-FLAG blot) are

relatively poorly represented, whereas the presumed dimers and tetramers are clearly visible,

though only for DIDS-treated samples (lanes 2, 4, 6). These data are consistent with the hypothesis

that, once the divalent DIDS molecule reacts with one AQP1 monomer, the odds are high that the

DIDS crosslinks to one more to yield dimers and tetramers. Although we attempted to use mass

spectrometry to identify AQP1 residue(s) derivatized by DIDS, we were unable to achieve

coverage of protein fragments containing predicted DIDS-reactive sites near hydrophobic

transmembrane segments.

Discussion

Pathways for NH$_3$ vs. CO$_2$

NH$_3$ permeation through monomeric pores. Although previous work had shown that AQP1 can serve as a conduit for NH$_3$ (Nakhoul *et al.*, 2001), the present work is the first direct demonstration that the four monomeric pores of AQP1—which are responsible, of course, for all H$_2$O conductance (Preston *et al.*, 1993)—are, in fact, also responsible for all NH$_3$ conductance. This result is not unexpected, given the hydrophilicity of the monomeric pore (Walz *et al.*, 1997; Sui *et al.*, 2001; Tajkhorshid *et al.*, 2002), and the similarities of the electronic structures of the NH$_3$ molecule (i.e., 1 lone pair of electrons + 3 N–H bonds among 4 sp^3 hybrid orbitals) and the H$_2$O molecule (i.e., 2 lone pairs + 2 O–H bonds among 4 sp^3 hybrid orbitals). The primary evidence for our conclusion is that pCMBS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ to zero (Figure 7*A*, center vs. left bars), an effect abrogated by the C189S mutation (Figure 7*B*, analogous bars). On the other hand, none of the NH$_3$ moves via the parallel DIDS-sensitive pathway, inasmuch as DIDS has no effect on $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ (Figure 7*A* and *B*, right vs. left bars). These results for NH$_3$ permeability parallel those for osmotic water permeability in Figure 8.

CO$_2$ permeation through monomeric pores. The present work confirms earlier observations (Cooper & Boron, 1998) that at least some CO$_2$ moves through AQP1 via the monomeric pores and, furthermore, shows that this pathway amounts to about half the total $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ signal. This result is not unexpected, given the amphiphilic nature of CO$_2$. Moreover, the molecular dynamics simulations of Wang *et al.* (2007) suggest that 40% of the CO$_2$ permeability of AQP1 is due to the 4 monomeric pores (i.e., ~10% per monomeric pore). Supporting evidence for this conclusion in the present study is that pCMBS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by somewhat more than half (Figure 4*A*, second bar from left vs. leftmost bar), an effect abrogated by the C189S mutation (Figure 4*B*, analogous bars).

CO$_2$ permeation through a parallel pathway. The present work provides the first physiological evidence for a second pathway for CO$_2$ through any AQP tetramer. This alternative pathway is apparently parallel to the four monomeric pores. The primary evidence is that (a) DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by somewhat more than half in hAQP1-WT (Figure 4*A*, third bar from the left vs. leftmost bar), (b) the C189S mutation does not affect the DIDS blockade (Figure 4*B*, analogous bars), and (c) the combination of pCMBS and DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ to zero for oocytes

763 expressing AQP1-WT (Figure 4*A*, rightmost vs. leftmost bars), but still somewhat more than half

764 for oocytes expressing AQP1-C189S (Figure 4*B*, analogous bars).

Effect of Inhibitors

766 **DIDS.** Because the DIDS blockade is irreversible with both hAQP1-WT (Figure 9*A*) and

767 hAQP1-FLAG (Figure 9*B*), DIDS probably interacts covalently with nearly all functional AQP1

768 tetramers on the oocyte surface. Indeed, with DIDS-treated cells, western blots probed with a DIDS

769 antibody (Figure 10*D*) reveal presumed dimers and tetramers, but virtually no glycosylated

770 monomers (compare Figure 10*C* vs. *D*, blue arrows). Thus, we conclude that one or more bivalent

771 DIDS molecules likely crosslinks two or more monomers of almost all AQP1 tetramers on the cell

772 surface. These observations are consistent with the hypothesis that this crosslinking (observed in

773 biochemical experiments) is essential for blockade (observed in physiological experiments).

774 molecular dynamics simulations of Wang *et al.* (2007) suggest that ~60% of the CO$_2$ flux through

775 AQP1 occurs via the hydrophobic central pore that is largely devoid of H$_2$O because it is lined by

776 the sidechains of the following residues (from extracellular to intracellular sides): Val-50, Leu-54,

777 and Leu-58 (contributed by TM2), and Leu-174 and Leu-170 (from TM5). The mobility of a gas

778 like CO$_2$ through such a near vacuum is ~10^4 higher than in liquid water (see (Boron, 2010;

779 Rumble, 2022). Thus, even though central pores may comprise only a small fraction of total

780 membrane surface area, it is possible that such pores—on the background of a membrane with a

781 low intrinsic CO$_2$ permeability in the absence of AQP1 (Boron *et al.*, 2011)—could make a

782 significant contribution to overall CO$_2$ permeability. We propose that the central pore is the

783 anatomic substrate of the DIDS-sensitive component of CO$_2$ permeability of hAQP1-WT.

784 **Summing the effects of pCMBS and DIDS.** The mathematical simulations of Somersalo *et*

785 *al.* (2012) suggest that—in the region in which $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ is most sensitive to the membrane

786 permeability to CO$_2$ (P_{M,CO_2})—$(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ should rise linearly with $\log(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ (see their figure

787 7b). If we assume that pCMBS and DIDS each decrease $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by 50%, then each drug must

788 produce a far greater fractional decrease in P_{M,CO_2}. Following the logic of the mathematical

789 simulations, the blockade of the monomeric pore by pCMBS should be accompanied by some

790 degree of blockade of the parallel CO$_2$ pathway (e.g., central pore). However, the converse is

791 apparently not true. That is, the blockade of the parallel pathway by DIDS seems not to produce

792 significant effects on the four monomeric pores inasmuch as DIDS has no effect on either

793 $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ (Figure 7) or P_f^* (Figure 8). Such an overlapping effect of pCMBS on the monomeric

and parallel pathways is not unreasonable inasmuch as the target of pCMBS (i.e., C189) is near

the outward-facing NPA motif and the selectivity filter of the monomeric pore, both of which are

in close proximity to TM2, which lines the extracellular half of the central pore. We propose that

(1) pCMBS blocks CO_2 and NH_3 traffic through the monomeric pore and part of the CO_2 traffic

through the parallel pathway, and (2) DIDS blocks (most) CO_2 traffic through the parallel pathway

but no traffic through the monomeric pores.

Molecular Basis of Gas Selectivity

An important unresolved issue is the molecular basis for gas selectivity by AQPs (Musa-Aziz

et al., 2009*a*; Geyer *et al.*, 2013).

CO_2. The present study indicates that the amphiphilic CO_2 molecule transits AQP1 via 2

pathways, the four hydrophilic monomeric pores and a parallel pathway (e.g., hydrophobic central

pore).

NH_3. Here we show that all NH_3 transits the four hydrophilic monomeric pores of AQP1; that

is, none moves via the parallel pathway (e.g., hydrophobic central pore). Considering the broader

family of AQPs, we predict that the hydrophobic parallel pathways (e.g., central pores) are never

important routes of NH_3 conductance, but rather that the characteristics of the monomeric pores

determine whether a particular AQP has a relatively high permeability to NH_3 (AQPs 3, 6, 7, 8,

9), or a relatively low NH_3 permeability (AQPs 2, 4, 5).

We suggest that, for the AQPs known to be permeable to CO_2 (AQPs 0, 4, 5, 6, 9), CO_2 transits

some combination of monomeric pores and a parallel, more hydrophobic pathway. For the AQPs

with limited CO_2 conductance (AQPs 2, 3, 7, 8), both the monomeric pores and the parallel

pathways presumably have less favorable physico-chemical characteristics. Because more-

hydrophobic molecules like O_2 and N_2 are less likely to transit through the monomeric pores, their

permeabilities through AQPs likely depend exclusively on the physico-chemical characteristics of

the parallel, hydrophobic pathway. Thus, the gas-selectivity profile of each AQP likely depends

on the physico-chemical nature of each gas and the unique set of physico-chemical properties of

the (at least 2) potential pathways through the tetramer.

Concluding Remarks

Our work establishes the proof of principle for blocking two pathways for CO_2, at least
somewhat independently. Elimination of the monomeric pathway, combined with judicious
mutations to the hydrophobic alternate pathway, could enable the design of channels with exquisite
selectivity among gases. Such designer channels could improve industrial gas handling on a micro-
or nanoscale, provide a simple approach for venting metabolically produced CO_2 in diving or space
flight, provide control of CO_2 and N_2 conduction in agriculture, and enable precise O_2 control for
medical therapies, synthetic biology, and life-support systems in underwater or space
environments.

Additional information

Competing interests

All authors declare no conflict of interests.

Authors' contributions

R.M-A. contributed to the conception and design of the research; performed oocyte experiments; analyzed and interpreted the oocyte data; prepared figures; drafted and edited the manuscript. R.R.G. contributed to the conception and design of the research related to oocyte P_f experiments as well as *Pichia pastoris* research; performed all the *Pichia pastoris* experiments; analyzed and interpreted all results collected with *Pichia pastoris*; prepared figures; and drafted the manuscript. S-K. L. validated the cDNA clones for hAQP1 used in the experiments and contributed to the interpretation of pH$_S$ experiments. F.J.M. contributed to the design of the research; prepared the figures; analyzed the statistics and interpreted results; drafted and edited the manuscript. W.F.B contributed to the conception and design of the research, and also edited the manuscript.

All authors approved the final version of the manuscript and all qualify for authorship, and all those who qualify for authorship are listed.

Funding

R.M.A. was supported for parts of this project by Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP # 13/11364-3 and 18/22855-1). R.R.G. was supported by postdoctoral fellowship N00014-09-1-0246 from the Office of Naval Research and also by Fundação de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP # 2013/10780). This work was also supported by National Institutes of Health Grants NS 18400, DK 8156, HL 160857 and U54 GM087519, as well as Office of Naval Research (ONR) Grants N00014-05-1-0345, N00014-08-1-0532, N00014-11-1-0889, N00014-14-1-0716, N00014-15-1-2060 and a Multidisciplinary University Research Initiative (MURI) grant N00014-16-1-2535 from the DoD (to W.F.B.).

Acknowledgements

We thank Duncan Wong for helpful discussions and computer support; Dale Huffman for engineering assistance and helpful discussions. We thank Steven Torontali for designing and

fabricating the oocyte chamber; Gerald Babcock for technical assistance and laboratory
management; Morley Schwebel; Charleen Bertolini, Rosalyn Forster, and Lesa Goodman for
administrative support. W. F. Boron gratefully acknowledges the support of the Myers/Scarpa
endowed chair. R. Musa-Aziz gratefully acknowledges Dr. Mark D. Parker (University at Buffalo:
State University of New York) for encouragement and helpful discussions, and gives special
thanks in memory of Dr. Gerhard Malnic (University of São Paulo, SP, BR) for his unwavering
support and advice.

Supporting information

N/A

Data Availability Statement

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Footnotes

[1] We code-named the rabbits, and the antisera they produced, "Ren" and "Stimpy."

[2] In some later experiments, we instead put the oocytes and Ca^{2+}-free solution into 50-mL Falcon tubes (catalog # 14-959-49A, TFS) and agitated them using a Tube Rotator (Scientific Equipment Products, Baltimore, MD).

[3] We apparatus had this dual-solution arrangement to enable the use of out-of-equilibrium CO_2/HCO_3^- solutions in experiments that are not part of the present study.

[4] To obtain P_f in the proper units (cm s^{-1}) in the above equation, the derivation by Zhang *et al.*, (1990) requires that the division of "moles of osmotically active particles" (in the ΔOsm term) by "moles of water" (in the V_W term) yield a numerical result that is unitless, which of course is impossible. This inconsistency arises during the derivation of the water-flux equation when one switches from describing the energy of water (i.e., RT) as "per mole of water" per se to the energy of water "per mole of osmotically active solute" during the introduction of the Van't Hoff equation. The introduction of a phantom conversion factor with a value of unity—but with the units "(per mole of osmotically active solute)/(per mole of water)"—eliminates the inconsistency.

Figure legends

Figure 1: Flow chart showing experimental protocols. The letters "A", "B", "C" and so on are above broad arrows and near icons of a pipetter that identify the transfer of an oocyte (using a transfer pipette) from one step in our protocol to another. "D" and "J" are the initial and final electrophysiological recordings, respectively. The oocytes may be controls (injected with H_2O) or those expressing either hAQP1-WT (AQP1) or hAQP1-C189S (C189S). In transfer "F", we move the oocyte to a solution containing pCMBS (F_1), DIDS pCMBS (F_2), or no drug (F_3). As indicated by the white arrows, we can directly transfer from F_1 (or F_2 or F_3) to G to H. Alternatively, at transfer "F", we can execute subsidiary protocols (α/teal arrows, β/lavender arrows, γ/gray arrows) in which we return oocytes from washes in ND96 back to a solution containing an inhibitor (i.e., pCMBS or DIDS) or ND96 (i.e., sham drug exposure). Thus, an oocyte might undergo the teal-colored pCMBS/DIDS sequence ($\alpha_1 \rightarrow \alpha_2 \rightarrow \alpha_3$), the lavender-colored DIDS/pCMBS sequence ($\beta_1 \rightarrow \beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_3$), or the gray-colored Sham/Sham sequence ($\gamma_1 \rightarrow \gamma_2 \rightarrow \gamma_3$). After transfer H we perform the final electrophysiology recordings.

Figure 2: CO_2 influx into an oocyte.

A, schematic illustration of a CO_2-influx experiment. Thick black arrows indicate direction of convective flow within the bulk extracellular fluid (bECF). Thinner arrows indicate solute diffusion or reactions. The maize-colored halo indicates the layer of extracellular unconvected fluid (EUF). At the outer surface of the membrane, CO_2 influx creates a CO_2 deficit, in part replenished by the reaction $HCO_3^- + H^+ \rightarrow CO_2 + H_2O$ (which raises pH_S) and in part replenished by diffusion from the bECF (an isohydric process). The double-headed arrow indicates displacement of the pH_S electrode from the cell surface to the bECF for recalibration.

B, sample surface-pH (pH_S record). The upward arrow indicates the maximal change in pH_S (ΔpH_S) during the application of CO_2/HCO_3^-. During the two periods indicated by the vertical gray

bands, the tip of the pH_S electrode was displaced ~300 μm away from the cell surface for recalibration in the bulk extracellular fluid (i.e., pH = 7.50). The curved gray arrow points to horizontal braces that indicate the portions of the experiment to which each calibration pertains. The filename for this representative trace, "0423D"—that we reuse in Figure 3*A*—is annotated at the bottom left corner of the panel.

C, western blot, probed with an anti-AQP1 antibody, showing relative expression of AQP1-WT vs. AQP1-C189S in one of 3 membrane preparation of oocytes. ID, inner diameter; UCL, unconvected layer.

Figure 3: Surface-pH transients triggered by a CO₂/HCO₃⁻ exposure and subsequent CO₂ influx

The figure shows representative pH_S records from oocytes injected with H_2O (top row) or cRNA encoding hAQP1-WT (middle row) or its C189S mutant (bottom row), and later exposed first to the ND96 solution and then, at the indicated times, to a solution containing CO_2/HCO_3^-. All oocytes underwent the "Control" protocol, followed by one or two of the three indicated $F_1/F_2/F_3$ protocols in Figure 1, although some oocytes did not survive beyond the control protocol. As necessary, we pre-incubated oocytes in 1 mM pCMBS for 30 minutes, or in 100 µM DIDS for 1 hour. Neither drug was present in the bulk solution at the time of the assays. The two gray bars in each panel indicate when we withdrew the pH-electrode tip from the oocyte surface to the bulk extracellular fluid (pH 7.50) for recalibration. In panel *A*, the curved gray arrows points and horizontal braces have the same meanings as in Figure *2B*, and the upward gold arrow indicates the control ΔpH_S. In panel *B*, the upward green arrow indicates the ΔpH_S in an oocyte expressing AQP1. The inset shows that the difference in heights of the green arrow and the gold arrow (its day-matched control) is the channel-dependent ΔpH_S (ΔpH_S^*).

Figure 4: Summary of channel-specific data in assays for CO₂ influx

A, oocytes expressing hAQP1-WT. pCMBS and DIDS each reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by somewhat more than half, and the two drugs together reduce it to virtually zero. For the rightmost bar, the dagger symbol (†) adjacent to the replicates (i.e., n = 6) indicates that the $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ for the pCMBS+DIDS condition is not significantly different from zero (*P*=0.254, one-sample t-test). Of the 6 pCMBS+DIDS oocytes, 2 we treated first with pCMBS, and then DIDS; the other 4 were in the opposite order.

B, oocytes expressing the C189S mutant of hAQP1. DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by about half, but pCMBS is without effect, ±DIDS. Of the 6 pCMBS+DIDS oocytes (far-right bar), 4 we treated first with pCMBS, and then DIDS; the other 2 were in the opposite order.

C, oocytes expressing AQP1 but undergoing only sham drug exposures. These sham experiments show that the long protocols did not have a substantial effect on $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$. The pCMBS shams (30 min) and DIDS shams (60 min) differed only in the ND96 incubation time in Figure 1/F₃.

The data come from experiments like those in Figure 3, in which we expose oocytes to 5% CO₂/33 mM HCO₃⁻ (for protocol, see Methods and Figure 1). From each ΔpH_S of a channel-expressing oocyte (e.g., Figure 3*B, E, H, K* or *C, F, I, L*), we subtract the mean, day-matched ΔpH_S for the corresponding H₂O-injected oocytes (e.g., Figure 3*A, D, G,* and *J*) to calculate the channel-dependent ΔpH_S for CO₂, that is, $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$. The $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ values from individual oocytes are plotted as dots over the green-shaded bars in panels *A* and *C*, and purple-shaded

bars in panel *B*. At the base of each bar in parentheses is the numbers of oocytes (n), which come from a minimum of 5 batches of oocytes (i.e., different frogs; $N \geq 5$). Error bars represent S.D. In the horizontal gray bands at the bottom of each panel, "+" indicates a pre-incubation with pCMBS or DIDS, or a sham exposure. *P*-values denote statistically significant differences from the no-drug condition, and are results of one-way ANOVAs among all groups, followed by Holm-Bonferroni post hoc means comparisons (see Statistics in Methods). For clarity, we display only *P*-values that indicate statistical significance; we show the *P*-values for all comparisons in Statistics Table 4*A*, Statistics Table 4*B* and Statistics Table 4*C*.

Figure 5: NH$_3$ influx into an oocyte.

A, schematic illustration of a NH$_3$-influx experiment. Analogous to Figure 2, the thick black arrows indicate the direction of convective flow within the bulk extracellular fluid (bECF). Thinner arrows indicate solute diffusion or reactions. The maize-colored halo indicates the layer of extracellular unconvected fluid (EUF). At the outer surface of the membrane, NH$_3$ influx creates a NH$_3$ deficit, in part replenished by the reaction NH$_4^+ \rightarrow$ NH$_3$ + H$^+$ (which decreases pH$_S$) and in part replenished by diffusion from the bECF (an isohydric process). The double-headed arrow indicates movement of the pH$_S$ electrode from the bECF to the cell surface for recalibration.

B, Example of a surface-pH (pH$_S$) record. The downward arrow indicates the maximal change in pH$_S$ (ΔpH$_S$) during the application of NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$. During the two periods indicated by the vertical gray bands, the tip of the pH$_S$ electrode was ~300 μm away from the cell surface for calibration in the bulk extracellular fluid (i.e., pH = 7.50). The curved gray arrows point to horizontal braces that indicate the portions of the experiment to which each calibration pertains. ID, inner diameter. The filename for this representative trace, "0903D"—that we reuse in Figure 6*A*—is annotated at the bottom left corner of the panel.

Figure 6: Surface-pH transients triggered by NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$ exposure and the subsequent NH$_3$ influx

The figure shows representative pH$_S$ records from oocytes injected with H$_2$O (top row) or cRNA encoding hAQP1-WT (middle row) or its C189S mutant (bottom row), and later exposed first to the ND96 solution and then, at the indicated times, to a solution containing NH$_3$/NH$_4^+$. All oocytes underwent the "Control" protocol, followed by the F$_1$ or F$_2$ protocol in Figure 1, although some oocytes did not survive beyond the control protocol (see Methods). As necessary, we pre-incubated oocytes in 1 mM pCMBS for 30 min, or in 100 µM DIDS for 1 h. Neither drug was present in the bulk solution at the time of the assays. The gray bars indicate when we withdrew the pH-electrode tip from the oocyte surface to the bulk extracellular solution (pH 7.50) for recalibration. In each panel the filename the representative trace, is annotated at the bottom left corner of the panel. "0903D" in panel *A* is a reproduction of the recording in Figure *5B*.

Figure 7: Summary of channel-specific data in assays for NH₃ influx

A, oocytes expressing hAQP1-WT. pCMBS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ to virtually zero , whereas DIDS has no effect. For the middle bar, the dagger symbol (†) adjacent to the replicates (i.e., n = 6) indicates that the $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ for the pCMBS condition is not significantly different from zero (*P*=0.450, one-sample t-test).

B, oocytes expressing the C189S mutant of hAQP1. Neither drug affects $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$.

The data come from experiments like those in Figure 6, in which we exposed oocytes to 0.5 mM NH₄Cl (for protocol, see Methods and Figure 1). From each ΔpH_S of a channel-expressing oocyte (Figure 6*B*, *E*, *H* or *C, F, I*), we subtracted the corresponding mean, day-matched ΔpH_S for H₂O-injected oocytes (Figure 6*A, D, G*) to calculate the channel-dependent ΔpH_S for NH₃, that is, $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$. The $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{NH_3}$ values from individual oocytes are plotted over the green-shaded bars in panel *A*, and purple-shaded bars in panel *B*. At the base of each bar in parentheses is the number of oocytes (n), which come from a minimum of 5 batches of oocytes (i.e., different frogs; *N*). Error bars represent S.D. In the horizontal gray bands at the bottom of each panel, "+" indicates a pre-incubation with pCMBS or DIDS. *P*-values denote statistically significant differences from the no-drug condition, and are the results of one-way ANOVAs among all groups, followed by Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparisons (see Statistics in Methods). For clarity, we display only *P*-values that indicate statistical significance; we show *P*-values for all comparisons in Statistics Table 7*A* and Statistics Table 7*B*.

Figure 8: Summary of channel-specific data in assays for osmotic water permeability

A, oocytes expressing hAQP1-WT. pCMBS but not DIDS reduces P_f.

B, oocytes expressing the C189S mutant of hAQP1. Neither drug reduces P_f.

From each P_f from a channel-expressing oocyte, we subtracted the corresponding mean, day-matched P_f for H_2O-injected oocytes to calculate the channel-dependent P_f, that is, P_f^*. The P_f^* values from individual oocytes are plotted over the green-shaded bars in panel *A*, and purple-shaded bars in panel *B*. At the base of each bar in parentheses is the number of oocytes (n), which come from a minimum of 5 batches of oocytes (i.e., different frogs; N). Error bars represent S.D. In the horizontal gray bands at the bottom of each panel, "+" indicates a pre-incubation with pCMBS or DIDS. *P*-values denote statistically significant differences from the no-drug condition, and are the results of a one-way ANOVAs among all groups, followed by Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparisons (see Statistics in Methods). For clarity, we display only *P*-values that indicate statistical significance; we show *P*-values for all comparisons in Statistics Table 8.

Figure 9: Summary of channel-specific data for CO$_2$ and H$_2$O influx for WT vs. FLAG-tagged hAQP1

A, oocytes expressing hAQP1-WT: effect of albumin washes on the DIDS sensitivity of $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$. DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by about half, regardless of the albumin wash.

B, oocytes expressing N-terminally FLAG-tagged hAQP1: effect of albumin washes on the DIDS sensitivity of $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$. Also in the FLAG-tagged construct, DIDS reduces $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ by about half, regardless of the albumin wash.

C, oocytes expressing hAQP1-WT: effect of albumin washes on the DIDS sensitivity of P_f^*. These experiments are a matched control for the study in panel *D*. As in the comparable experiments summarized in Figure 8*A*, pCMBS but not DIDS reduces P_f.

D, oocytes expressing FLAG-tagged hAQP1: effect of albumin washes on the DIDS sensitivity of P_f*. As in panel *C* (no FLAG tag), pCMBS but not DIDS reduces P_f in oocytes expressing FLAG-tagged hAQP1.

For panels *A* and *B*, the control pH$_S$ data (leftmost dark-green bars) come from experiments like those in Figure 3, whereas for panels *C* and *D*, the control P_f data come from experiments like those in Figure 8. The $(\Delta pH_S*)_{CO_2}$ or P_f* values from individual oocytes are plotted as dots over the green-shaded bars in panels *A* through *D*. At the base of each bar in parentheses is the numbers of oocytes (n), which come from a minimum of 5 batches of oocytes (i.e., different frogs; $N \geq 5$). Error bars represent S.D. In the horizontal gray bands at the bottom of each panel, "+" indicates a pre-incubation with pCMBS or DIDS, or the presence of 0.2% bovine serum albumin (Alb 0.2%) *P*-values denote statistically significant differences from the no-drug condition, and are results of one-way ANOVAs among all groups, followed by Holm-Bonferroni means comparisons (see Statistics in Methods). For clarity, we display only the *P*-values that indicate statistical significance; we show *P*-values for all comparisons in Statistics Table 9.

Figure 10: Reaction of DIDS with N-terminally FLAG-tagged hAQP1 overexpressed in *Pichia pastoris*

A, Size-exclusion chromatography of solubilized proteins. We treated spheroplasts with DIDS (or no DIDS in parallel, sham experiments), solubilized with DMM, purified N-terminally FLAG-tagged hAQP1-WT using an anti-FLAG column, and then separated by FPLC on a Superdex-200 column, recording A_{280} vs. time. The orange record represents a DIDS-treated sample and the brown record, a control sample (–DIDS) from the same preparation. The first peaks are the void volume (V_0), which consists of high molecular-weight (MW) proteins. Peak #1 consists of lower-MW proteins, and Peak #2, even smaller ones. We translated both records to so that A_{280} averaged zero between 10 and 13 min, and then we scaled the orange +DIDS record to that it has the same total area under the curve as Peak #1 in the –DIDS record.

B, Absorbance spectra of material (±DIDS) from peaks V$_0$ and #1, from a preparation similar to that shown in panel *A*. We normalized all spectra to unity at 280 nm. The increased absorbance from ~320 to ~370 nm in the DIDS-treated samples presumably represents DIDS, which has an absorbance peak at ~340 nm (Kodippili et al., 2009).

C, Western blot of material from the same experiment as in panel *B*, probed with anti-FLAG: Lane 1. Material obtained from spheroplasts not treated with DIDS, and purified on anti-FLAG column, as described for panel *A*, but not subjected to size-exclusion chromatography. ||| Lane 2. Same as Lane 1, but from DIDS-treated spheroplasts ||| Lane 3. Peak V$_0$ from spheroplasts – DIDS ||| Lane 4. Same as Lane 3, but from spheroplasts +DIDS ||| Lane 5. Peak #1 from spheroplasts –DIDS ||| Lane 6. Same as Lane 5, but from spheroplasts +DIDS ||| Lane 7. Peak #2 from spheroplasts –DIDS ||| Lane 8. Same as Lane 7, but from spheroplasts +DIDS. The presumed assignments are: "a" band < 25 kDa, unglycosylated AQP1 monomer cleaved in the C-terminus; band "b", 28 kDa, full-length unglycosylated monomer; band "c", glycosylated monomer (blue arrow); band "d", glycosylated dimer; band "e", glycosylated tetramer.

D, Western blot of material from the same experiment as in panels *B* and *C*, probed with anti-DIDS. The lane assignments are the same as in panel *C*. The results in panels *A* through *D* are representative of two independent experiments.

Tables

Table 1 Solutions*

Solution Component or parameter	1 ND96	2 Ca²⁺-free ND96	3 5% CO₂/ 33 mM HCO₃⁻ [for $(\Delta pH_S)_{CO_2}$]	4 5 mM NH₃/NH₄⁺ in ND96	5 0.5 mM NH₃/NH₄⁺ in ND96 [for $(\Delta pH_S)_{NH3}$]	6 Hypotonic ND96 [for P_f]	7 ND96 + pCMBS	8 ND96 + DIDS	9 BSA [to scavenge DIDS]
NaCl (mM)	96	98.7	63	91	91	33	96	96	96
KCl (mM)	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
CaCl₂ (mM)	1.8	0	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
MgCl₂ (mM)	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
HEPES (mM)	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
NaHCO₃ (mM)	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
NH₄Cl (mM)	0	0	0	5	0.5	0	0	0	0
CO₂ (%)	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
pH (adjusted with NaOH)	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50	~7.50
Temperature (°C)	RT	RT	RT	RT	RT	RT	RT	RT	RT
Osmolality (mOsm)	~195	~195	~195	~195	~195	~80	~195	~195	~195
pCMBS (mM)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
DIDS (µM)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	0
BSA %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2%

*This table shows the compositions of all the solutions used in the physiology experiments the present paper.

Abbreviations: BSA, Bovine serum albumin; DIDS, 4,4'-diisothiocyanatostilbene-2,2'-disulfonate; pCMBS, p-chloromercuribenzene sulfonate, P_f, osmotic water permeability

References

Al-Samir S, Kyriazi D, Yool AJ, Moser I, Kyriazi K, Gros G, Tsiavaliaris G & Endeward V (2025). Aquaporin-1 acts as an O_2 channel. The permeability of human and mouse red cell membranes for oxygen. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol*; DOI: 10.1152/ajpcell.00858.2024.

Ammann D, Lanter F, Steiner RA, Schulthess P, Shijo Y & Simon W (1981). Neutral carrier based hydrogen ion selective microelectrode for extra- and intracellular studies. *Anal Chem* **53,** 2267–2269.

Assentoft M, Kaptan S, Schneider H-P, Deitmer JW, de Groot BL & MacAulay N (2016). Aquaporin 4 as a NH_3 channel. *J Biol Chem* **291,** 19184–19195.

Boron WF (2010). Sharpey-Schafer lecture: Gas channels. *Exp Physiol* **95,** 1107–1130.

Boron WF, Endeward V, Gros G, Musa-Aziz R & Pohl P (2011). Intrinsic CO_2 permeability of cell membranes and potential biological relevance of CO_2 channels. *Chemphyschem Eur J Chem Phys Phys Chem* **12,** 1017–1019.

Cabantchik ZI & Rothstein A (1972). The nature of the membrane sites controlling anion permeability of human red blood cells as determined by studies with disulfonic stilbene derivatives. *J Membr Biol* **10,** 311–330.

Calvetti D, Prezioso J, Occhipinti R, Boron WF & Somersalo E (2020). Computational model of electrode-induced microenvironmental effects on pH measurements near a cell membrane. *SIAM Multiscale Model Simul* **18,** 1053–1075.

Chandy G, Zampighi GA, Kreman M & Hall JE (1997). Comparison of the water transporting properties of MIP and AQP1. *J Membr Biol* **159,** 29–39.

Cooper GJ & Boron WF (1998). Effect of pCMBS on CO_2 permeability of *Xenopus* oocytes expressing aquaporin 1 or its C189S mutant. *Am J Physiol* **275,** C1481-1486.

Endeward V, Cartron J-P, Ripoche P & Gros G (2008). RhAG protein of the Rhesus complex is a CO_2 channel in the human red cell membrane. *FASEB J* **22,** 64–73.

Endeward V, Musa-Aziz R, Cooper GJ, Chen L-M, Pelletier MF, Virkki LV, Supuran CT, King LS, Boron WF & Gros G (2006). Evidence that aquaporin 1 is a major pathway for CO_2 transport across the human erythrocyte membrane. *FASEB J* **20,** 1974–1981.

Forster RE, Gros G, Lin L, Ono Y & Wunder M (1998). The effect of 4,4'-diisothiocyanato-stilbene-2,2'-disulfonate on CO_2 permeability of the red blood cell membrane. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **95,** 15815–15820.

Garcia AM & Lodish HF (1989). Lysine 539 of human band 3 is not essential for ion transport or inhibition by stilbene disulfonates. *J Biol Chem* **264,** 19607–19613.

Geyer RR, Musa-Aziz R, Qin X & Boron WF (2013). Relative CO_2/NH_3 selectivities of mammalian aquaporins 0-9. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* **304,** C985-994.

Gomes D, Agasse A, Thiébaud P, Delrot S, Gerós H & Chaumont F (2009). Aquaporins are multifunctional water and solute transporters highly divergent in living organisms. *Biochim Biophys Acta* **1788,** 1213–1228.

Gustin MC, Albertyn J, Alexander M & Davenport K (1998). MAP kinase pathways in the yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev MMBR* **62,** 1264–1300.

Herrera M, Hong NJ & Garvin JL (2006). Aquaporin-1 transports NO across cell membranes. *Hypertension* **48,** 157–164.

Holm S (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scand J Stat* **6,** 65–70.

Kabutomori J, Beloto-Silva O, Geyer RR & Musa-Aziz R (2018). Lithobates catesbeianus (American Bullfrog) oocytes: a novel heterologous expression system for aquaporins. *Biol Open*; DOI: 10.1242/bio.031880.

Kodippili GC, Spector J, Sullivan C, Kuypers FA, Labotka R, Gallagher PG, Ritchie K & Low PS (2009). Imaging of the diffusion of single band 3 molecules on normal and mutant erythrocytes. *Blood* **113,** 6237–6245.

Leduc-Nadeau A, Lahjouji K, Bissonnette P, Lapointe J-Y & Bichet DG (2007). Elaboration of a novel technique for purification of plasma membranes from Xenopus laevis oocytes. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* **292,** C1132-1136.

Lepke S, Fasold H, Pring M & Passow H (1976). A study of the relationship between inhibition of anion exchange and binding to the red blood cell membrane of 4,4'-diisothiocyano stilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid (DIDS) and its dihydro derivative (H_2DIDS). *J Membr Biol* **29,** 147–177.

Macey RI (1984). Transport of water and urea in red blood cells. *Am J Physiol* **246,** C195-203.

Michenkova M, Taki S, Blosser MC, Hwang HJ, Kowatz T, Moss FJ, Occhipinti R, Qin X, Sen S, Shinn E, Wang D-K, Zeise B, Zhao P, Malmstadt N, Vahedi-Faridi A, Tajkhorshid E & Boron WF (2021). Carbon dioxide transport across membranes. *Interface Focus* **11,** 2.

Moss FJ, Zhao P, Salameh AI, Taki S, Wass AB, Jacobberger JW, Huffman DE, Meyerson HJ, Occhipinti R & Boron WF (2025). Role of channels in the O_2 permeability of murine red blood cells II. Morphological and proteomic studies. *bioRxiv*; DOI: 10.1101/2025.03.05.639962.

Musa-Aziz R, Boron WF & Parker MD (2010). Using fluorometry and ion-sensitive microelectrodes to study the functional expression of heterologously-expressed ion channels and transporters in *Xenopus* oocytes. *Methods San Diego Calif* **51,** 134–145.

Musa-Aziz R, Chen L-M, Pelletier MF & Boron WF (2009*a*). Relative CO_2/NH_3 selectivities of AQP1, AQP4, AQP5, AmtB, and RhAG. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106,** 5406–5411.

Musa-Aziz R, Jiang L, Chen L-M, Behar KL & Boron WF (2009*b*). Concentration-dependent effects on intracellular and surface pH of exposing *Xenopus* oocytes to solutions containing NH_3/NH_4^+. *J Membr Biol* **228,** 15–31.

Musa-Aziz R, Occhipinti R & Boron WF (2014*a*). Evidence from simultaneous intracellular- and surface-pH transients that carbonic anhydrase II enhances CO_2 fluxes across *Xenopus* oocytes plasma membranes. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* **307,** C791-813.

Musa-Aziz R, Occhipinti R & Boron WF (2014*b*). Evidence from simultaneous intracellular- and surface-pH transients that carbonic anhydrase IV enhances CO_2 fluxes across *Xenopus* oocyte plasma membranes. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* **307,** C814-840.

Nakhoul NL, Davis BA, Romero MF & Boron WF (1998). Effect of expressing the water channel aquaporin-1 on the CO_2 permeability of *Xenopus* oocytes. *Am J Physiol* **274,** C543-548.

Nakhoul NL, Hering-Smith KS, Abdulnour-Nakhoul SM & Hamm LL (2001). Transport of NH_3/NH_4^+ in oocytes expressing aquaporin-1. *Am J Physiol Renal Physiol* **281,** F255-263.

Occhipinti R, Musa-Aziz R & Boron WF (2014). Evidence from mathematical modeling that carbonic anhydrase II and IV enhance CO_2 fluxes across *Xenopus* oocytes plasma membranes. *Am J Physiol Cell Physiol* **307,** C841-858.

Occhipinti R, Zhao P, Moss FJ & Boron WF (2025). Role of channels in the O_2 permeability of murine red blood cells. III. Mathematical modeling and simulations. *bioRxiv*; DOI: 10.1101/2025.03.05.639964.

Prasad GV, Coury LA, Finn F & Zeidel ML (1998). Reconstituted aquaporin 1 water channels transport CO_2 across membranes. *J Biol Chem* **273,** 33123–33126.

Preston GM & Agre P (1991). Isolation of the cDNA for erythrocyte integral membrane protein of 28 kilodaltons: member of an ancient channel family. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **88,** 11110–11114.

Preston GM, Carroll TP, Guggino WB & Agre P (1992). Appearance of water channels in *Xenopus* oocytes expressing red cell CHIP28 protein. *Science* **256,** 385–387.

Preston GM, Jung JS, Guggino WB & Agre P (1993). The mercury-sensitive residue at cysteine 189 in the CHIP28 water channel. *J Biol Chem* **268,** 17–20.

Roos A & Boron WF (1981). Intracellular pH. *Physiol Rev* **61,** 296–434.

Rumble JR ed. (2022). *CRC handbook of chemistry and physics. a ready-reference book of chemical and physical data*, 103rd edition, 2022-2023. CRC Press.

Somersalo E, Occhipinti R, Boron WF & Calvetti D (2012). A reaction-diffusion model of CO_2 influx into an oocyte. *J Theor Biol* **309,** 185–203.

Sui H, Han BG, Lee JK, Walian P & Jap BK (2001). Structural basis of water-specific transport through the AQP1 water channel. *Nature* **414,** 872–878.

Tajkhorshid E, Nollert P, Jensen MØ, Miercke LJW, O'Connell J, Stroud RM & Schulten K (2002). Control of the selectivity of the aquaporin water channel family by global orientational tuning. *Science* **296,** 525–530.

Trudeau MC, Warmke JW, Ganetzky B & Robertson GA (1995). HERG, a human inward rectifier on the voltage-gated potassium channel family. *Science* **269,** 92–95.

Uehlein N, Lovisolo C, Siefritz F & Kaldenhoff R (2003). The tobacco aquaporin NtAQP1 is a membrane CO_2 pore with physiological functions. *Nature* **425,** 734–737.

Verkman AS (2008). Mammalian aquaporins: diverse physiological roles and potential clinical significance. *Expert Rev Mol Med* **10,** e13.

Verkman AS, Ruiz-Ederra J & Levin MH (2008). Functions of aquaporins in the eye. *Prog Retin Eye Res* **27,** 420–433.

Virkki LV, Cooper GJ & Boron WF (2001). Cloning and functional expression of an MIP (AQP0) homolog from killifish (Fundulus heteroclitus) lens. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol* **281,** R1994-2003.

Waisbren SJ, Geibel JP, Modlin IM & Boron WF (1994). Unusual permeability properties of gastric gland cells. *Nature* **368,** 332–335.

Walz T, Hirai T, Murata K, Heymann JB, Mitsuoka K, Fujiyoshi Y, Smith BL, Agre P & Engel A (1997). The three-dimensional structure of aquaporin-1. *Nature* **387,** 624–627.

Wang C, Hu H, Qin X, Zeise B, Xu D, Rappel W-J, Boron WF & Schroeder JI (2016). Reconstitution of CO_2 regulation of SLAC1 anion channel and function of CO_2-permeable PIP2;1 aquaporin as carbonic anhydrase 4 interactor. *Plant Cell* **28,** 568–582.

Wang D-K & Boron WF (2025). Manipulating the CO_2/H_2O selectivity of human aquaporin 5 through mutagenesis. *Submitt*.

Wang Y, Cohen J, Boron WF, Schulten K & Tajkhorshid E (2007). Exploring gas permeability of cellular membranes and membrane channels with molecular dynamics. *J Struct Biol* **157,** 534–544.

Zeidel ML, Nielsen S, Smith BL, Ambudkar SV, Maunsbach AB & Agre P (1994). Ultrastructure, pharmacologic inhibition, and transport selectivity of aquaporin channel-forming integral protein in proteoliposomes. *Biochemistry* **33,** 1606–1615.

Zhang RB, Logee KA & Verkman AS (1990). Expression of mRNA coding for kidney and red cell water channels in *Xenopus* oocytes. *J Biol Chem* **265,** 15375–15378.

Zhao P, Moss FJ, Occhipinti R, Geyer RR, Huffman DE, Meyerson HJ & Boron W F (2025). Role of channels in the O_2 permeability of murine red blood cells. I. Stopped-flow and hematological studies. *bioRxiv*; DOI: 10.1101/2025.03.05.639948.

Zwiazek JJ, Xu H, Tan X, Navarro-Ródenas A & Morte A (2017). Significance of oxygen transport through aquaporins. *Sci Rep* **7,** 40411.

Statistics tables

Statistics Table 4: Tables of P-values for one-way ANOVA with Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparison for comparisons of differences of channel corrected $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ on exposure of the oocytes to 5% CO_2/33 mM HCO_3^-. Each table is split in two halves, with FWER α set at 0.05, the upper-right half shows the adjusted α-value for each comparison and the lower-left half the P-value. Significant P-values are highlighted bold.

Statistics Table 4*A*: Statistics summary of channel-specific data in assays for CO₂-influx into AQP1 expressing oocytes treated with pCMBS, DIDS or pCMBS and DIDS in Figure 4*A*

AQP1			Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS	+pCMBS & +DIDS
	P	$\diagdown$ α		α	α	α
Ctrl				0.0100	0.0125	0.00833
+pCMBS	*P*		7.53×10^{-6}		0.0500	0.0167
+DIDS	*P*		6.46×10^{-5}	0.657		0.0250
+pCMBS & +DIDS	*P*		3.80×10^{-7}	0.0242	0.0902	

Statistics Table 4*B*: Statistics summary of channel-specific data in assays for CO₂-influx into AQP1-C198S expressing oocytes treated with pCMBS, DIDS or pCMBS and DIDS in Figure 4*B*

AQP1-C188S			Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS	+pCMBS & +DIDS
	P	$\diagdown$ α		α	α	α
Ctrl				0.0250	0.0100	0.00833
+pCMBS	*P*		0.696		0.0167	0.0125
+DIDS	*P*		**0.00295**	0.0273		0.0500
+pCMBS & +DIDS	*P*		**0.00118**	0.0177	0.946	

Statistics Table 4*C*: Statistics summary of channel-specific data in assays for CO₂-influx into AQP1 expressing oocytes incubated with sham pCMBS, or sham DIDS treatments in Figure 4*C*

AQP1			Ctrl	Sham +pCMBS	Sham +DIDS
	P	$\diagdown$ α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0167	0.0250
Sham +pCMBS	*P*		0.768		0.0500
Sham +DIDS	*P*		0.874	0.887	

Statistics Table 7 Tables of *P*-values for one-way ANOVA with Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparison for comparisons of differences of channel corrected $(\Delta pH_S*)_{NH_3}$ on exposure of the oocytes to 0.5 mM NH_4Cl. Each table is split in two halves by the black-shaded cells, with FWER α set at 0.05, the upper-right half shows the adjusted α-value for each comparison and the lower-left half the *P*-value. Significant *P*-values are highlighted bold.

Statistics Table 7*A* Statistics summary of channel-specific data in assays for NH₃ influx into AQP1 expressing oocytes treated with pCMBS, or DIDS in Figure 7*A*

AQP1			Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS
	P	α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0250	0.0500
+pCMBS	*P*		6.34×10^{-5}		0.0167
+DIDS	*P*		0.551	4.38×10^{-5}	

Statistics Table 7*B* Statistics summary of channel-specific data in assays for NH₃ influx into AQP1-C189S expressing oocytes treated with pCMBS, or DIDS in Figure 7*B*

AQP1-C189S			Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS
	P	α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0167	0.0500
+pCMBS	*P*		0.636		0.0250
+DIDS	*P*		0.984	0.694	

Statistics Table 8 for Figure 8 Tables of *P*-values for one-way ANOVA with Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparison for comparisons of differences of channel corrected P_f^* after incubation in no drug control (Ctrl), +pCMBS or +DIDS solutions. Ctrl oocytes are separated into two groups. Those from the same oocyte preparations (frogs) pre-incubated with pCMBS and those from the same oocyte preparations pre-incubated with DIDS. Each table is split in two halves by the black-shaded cells, with FWER α set at 0.05, the upper-right half shows the adjusted α-value for each comparison and the lower-left half the *P*-value. Significant *P*-values are highlighted bold. Cells shaded gray are comparisons between conditions performed on oocytes from different frogs, therefore the comparisons are not pertinent even if the *P*-value is statistically significant.

Statistics Table 8*A* Statistics summary channel-specific *P*f data in assays for osmotic water permeability for AQP1 oocytes in Figure 8*A*

AQP1		Ctrl for +pCMBS	+pCMBS	Ctrl for +DIDS	+DIDS
	P ╲ α		α	α	α
Ctrl for +pCMBS			0.00833	0.0250	0.0167
+pCMBS	*P*	$1.70×10^{-12}$		0.0100	0.0125
Ctrl for +DIDS	*P*	0.0632	$9.02×10^{-7}$		0.0500
+DIDS	*P*	**0.00761**	$8.72×10^{-5}$	0.395	

Statistics Table 8*B* summary channel-specific *P*f data in assays for osmotic water permeability for AQP1-C189S oocytes in Figure 8*B*

AQP1-C189S		Ctrl for +pCMBS	+pCMBS	Ctrl for +DIDS	+DIDS
	P ╲ α		α	α	α
Ctrl for +pCMBS			0.0167	0.0125	0.0500
+pCMBS	*P*	0.514		0.0100	0.0250
Ctrl for +DIDS	*P*	0.171	0.0644		0.00833
+DIDS	*P*	0.722	0.702	0.0619	

Statistics Table 9 for Figure 9 Tables of *P*-values for one-way ANOVA with Holm-Bonferroni post-hoc means comparison for comparisons of differences in channel corrected *A*, $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ in WT AQP1 oocytes, *B*, $(\Delta pH_S^*)_{CO_2}$ in AQP1-FLAG tagged oocytes, *C*, P_f^* in WT AQP1 oocytes, and *D*, P_f^* in AQP1-FLAG tagged oocytes. Each table is split in two halves by the black-shaded cells, with FWER α set at 0.05, the upper-right half shows the adjusted α-value for each comparison and the lower-left half the *P*-value. Significant *P*-values are highlighted bold.

Statistics Table 9*A* Statistics summary of channel-specific CO₂ influx data for into WT AQP1 oocytes

AQP1			Ctrl	+DIDS	+DIDS +Alb 0.2%
	P	α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0250	0.0167
+DIDS		*P*	**0.00976**		0.0500
+DIDS +Alb 0.2%		*P*	**0.00682**	0.955	

Statistics Table 9*B* Statistics summary of channel-specific CO₂ influx data for into AQP1-FLAG oocytes

AQP1-FLAG			Ctrl	+DIDS	+DIDS +Alb 0.2%
	P	α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0250	0.0167
+DIDS		*P*	**3.01×10^{-5}**		0.0500
+DIDS +Alb 0.2%		*P*	**4.05×10^{-6}**	0.740	

Statistics Table 9*C* Statistics summary of channel-specific P_f data for into WT oocytes

AQP1			Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS
	P	α		α	α
Ctrl				0.0167	0.0500
+pCMBS		*P*	**4.73×10^{-5}**		0.0250
+DIDS		*P*	0.361	**0.00483**	

Statistics Table 9*D* Statistics summary of channel-specific *P*f data for into AQP1-FLAG oocytes

AQP1-FLAG		Ctrl	+pCMBS	+DIDS
	P ╲ α		α	α
Ctrl			0.0167	0.0500
+pCMBS	*P*	**7.49×10⁻⁸**		0.0250
+DIDS	*P*	0.322	**1.25×10⁻⁴**	