Auxiliary subunits keep AMPA receptors compact during activation and

desensitization

Jelena Baranovic and Andrew J.R. Plested[§]

Institute of Biology, Cellular Biophysics, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, 10115

Berlin; Leibniz Forschungsinstitut für Molekulare Pharmakologie (FMP),

13125 Berlin; NeuroCure, Charité Universitätsmedizin, 10117 Berlin,

Germany.

[§]To whom correspondence should be addressed: plested@fmp-berlin.de

Summary

Signal transduction at vertebrate excitatory synapses involves the activity of

ionotropic glutamate receptors, including the AMPA (α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-

methyl-4-isoaxazole propionate) receptor. Technical advances in cryo-electron

microscopy have brought a slew of full-length structures of AMPA receptors, on

their own and in combination with auxiliary subunits. These structures illustrate

a wide range of conformations, indicating that individual domains might

undergo substantial lateral and rotational motions during gating. Here, we used

bifunctional methanethiosulfonate cross-linkers to calibrate the conformations

that occur in functional AMPA receptors both in the presence and absence of

the auxiliary subunit Stargazin. Our data indicate that receptors without

auxiliary subunits have considerably more conformational freedom and can get

trapped in relaxed conformations. In contrast, Stargazin maintains both

activated and desensitized receptors in compact arrangements. Thus, auxiliary

subunits not only change the kinetics and trafficking of receptors, but also

restrict their structural dynamics.

Introduction

AMPA-type glutamate receptors are found at excitatory synapses throughout the mammalian brain, where they convert glutamate release into membrane depolarisation. Their fast kinetics (Colquhoun et al., 1992; Geiger et al., 1995; Taschenberger and von Gersdorff, 2000), as well as the physical attributes of synapses(Xu-Friedman and Regehr, 2003), allow them to follow glutamate transients at rates above 100 Hz. However, the structural dynamics underlying their rapid signalling are unclear. AMPA receptors are tetrameric ligand-gated ion channels with unique architectural features and loosely coupled structural domains: unstructured linkers connect the amino- and ligand-binding domains (ATDs and LBDs, respectively) forming the extracellular part of the receptor. The LBDs are in turn connected to the transmembrane region (TM) that harbors the integral ion channel (Fig. 1A). The extracellular domains adopt local dimer pairs in resting and active receptors. The LBD dimers 'break up' in the desensitized state (Sun et al., 2002; Armstrong et al., 2006; Dürr et al., 2014; Twomey et al., 2017b), but motions of the ATDs (if any) are unclear (Herguedas et al., 2016; Cais et al., 2014; Yelshanskaya et al., 2016).

The crowded and narrow synaptic cleft is scarcely wider than the receptors are tall themselves and has narrow edges (Zuber et al., 2005; Tao et al., 2018). This observation implies that conformational dynamics of the receptor domains and their relation to synapse dimensions and molecular composition has implications in both health and disease. For example, if extremely dilated conformations of AMPA receptors can be adopted rapidly, that is on the millisecond timescale of fast excitatory transmission, this could impact receptor anchoring at synapses. Activity-dependent anchoring might be a way to regulate synaptic strength (Constals et al., 2015). On the other hand, slow rearrangements could be relevant for trafficking, and in disease states.

Advances in the structural biology of ionotropic glutamate receptors (iGluRs) have produced a catalogue of static conformational snapshots. Very similar structures have been obtained in conditions corresponding to nominally very

different functional states (Chen et al., 2014; Dürr et al., 2014; Yelshanskaya et al., 2014). In addition, several structures suggest substantial movements of the extracellular domains when bound by agonist (Nakagawa et al., 2005; Dürr et al., 2014; Meyerson et al., 2014). In these structures, the domains "fall apart", either breaking local symmetry states, adopting higher order symmetries or switching into a ring-like arrangement (Fig. 1A). This broad and confusing range of conformations makes ordering of these pictures according to the putative activation states (resting, open and desensitized) difficult. We therefore set out to investigate the conformational range of agonist bound AMPA receptors with the aim of distinguishing frequently-visited, short-lived conformations from the long-lived ones that likely have less direct relevance to synaptic transmission.

Previously, we demonstrated disulfide bonds and metal bridges trapping receptors in compact arrangements (Salazar et al., 2017; Baranovic et al., 2016; Lau et al., 2013). To measure the separation of domains, in this work we used bifunctional methanethiosulfonate cross-linkers (bis-MTS) of defined lengths (Loo and Clarke, 2001; Guan et al., 2002; Armstrong et al., 2006; Tajima et al., 2016) (Fig. 1D). These cross-linkers show specific combination with two free thiol groups, provided by engineered cysteine residues. The reactivity of these probes can in principle report distances, giving them the property of nanometre-scale molecular rulers.

Overall, our results suggest that the more dilated conformation of the receptor, the slower it is to access, but once attained, these conformations are stable. However, auxiliary subunits restrict the conformational ensemble, maintaining more compact arrangements. This kinetic classification suggests AMPA receptors at synapses have similar, compact geometries regardless of their instantaneous gating state.

89
Figure 1 Geometry of AMPA receptors. (A) Structural models of full-length AMPA receptors in resting,
active and desensitized states. Accesion codes for PBD or EMDB are indicated. Subunits are colour-
coded: A – green, B – red, C – blue and D – yellow. Square brackets delineate AMPA receptor domains:
ATDs – amino terminal domains, LBDs – ligand binding domains and TM – transmembrane domain. The
cytoplasmic domain is not resolved. For the resting and active structures, LBDs are also shown in a top-
down view (omitted for the desensitized structure due to its low resolution). Orange spheres connected
by black lines indicate 665-666 residues (mutated in this study) in the LBD layer. (B) Same as in (A), but
for A2 structures complexed with auxiliary subunits: Stg – Stargazin (dark purple) and GSG1L (light
purple). (C) Distances between sulfhydryl groups of mutated residues, A665C and V666C, in agonist-
bound strucures shown in (A) and (B). (D) Structures of bifunctional (bis-MTS: M1M-M10M) and
monofunctional (MTSEA) compounds. Lengths were measured between reactive sulphur atoms
(asterisks).
102

Results

Desensitized AMPA receptors can adopt 'relaxed' conformations

The rupture of the LBD intra-dimer interface is a structural hallmark of AMPA

receptor desensitization, as shown by biophysical studies based on the

structures of isolated dimers of ligand binding domains (Sun et al., 2002;

Armstrong et al., 2006). Some cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM) structures

of full-length receptors suggest that desensitization might involve further

rearrangements of the ligand-binding domains, including separation of the two

dimers and 'dilation' of the entire extracellular layer (Fig. 1A).

We attempted to capture this movement between LBDs with bis-MTS cross-

linkers ranging from 7 to 18 Å in length (Fig. 1D). If the LBD layer opened up

upon receptor desensitization, this movement should create access for the bis-

MTS cross-linkers into the inter-dimer space of the LBD layer (orange dots in

Fig. 1A).

We identified positions 665 and 666 (in the FG loop) in homomeric GluA2

receptors as best positioned to follow separation of the LBD dimers (Fig. 1A-

C). The presumptive geometries of the sulfhydryl groups for cysteine mutants

at these sites, in the agonist bound states of GluA2 receptor (with and without

auxiliary subunits) are shown in Fig. 1C. The structure of the desensitized

GluA2 receptor (EMDB: 2688, Fig. 1A) is not detailed enough to measure

residue distances, but the equivalent residues are 21 Å apart in homologous

kainate receptors (PDB: 5KUF; (Meyerson et al., 2016)).

As shown in Fig. 2B and D, bis-MTS cross-linkers M1M to M10M all caused

strong reduction of the peak current in V666C mutant when applied in the

desensitized state. To quantify this effect, the peak current was measured from

the control pulses before (I_{peak} pre-trap, 4 pulses) and after the 1-minute

application (trap) of the cross-linker (I_{peak} post-trap, 2nd control pulse after the

trap, arrows in Fig. 2A-C). For each patch, the ratio of I_{peak} post-trap over I_{peak}

pre-trap was determined and plotted as shown in Fig. 2D-E.

For the V666C mutant, bis-MTS cross-linkers from 7 to 15 Å in length (M1M-

M8M; 1 μM), inhibited about 90% of the peak current in the patch after a 1

minute application (see Suppl. Table 1). The longest (M10M) cross-linker was

the slowest one to act (Fig. 2F), leading to slightly less inhibition (~70%) in the

first minute of exposure. The reduction was less pronounced for A665C mutant

for all cross-linkers (~50%, Fig. 2E and Suppl. Table 1).

Inhibition was overall so profound that we sought to establish that it was

specific. Two other factors potentially contribute to the current decrease: non-

specific run-down of the current and disulfide bonding of the introduced

cysteines to each other. Current run-down is particularly difficult to avoid in the

long records that we made for these experiments. A665C and V666C sulfhydryl

groups were both previously shown to crosslink in the presence of oxidizing

agent CuPhen (Salazar et al., 2017; Lau et al., 2013; Yelshanskaya et al.,

2016). To account for these confounding factors, we made paired recordings:

a patch was first exposed to a 1-minute long trapping pulse containing

glutamate only (no cross-linkers), followed by trapping of the same patch in

glutamate and a cross-linker (Fig. 2B-C). Any run-down in the patch or possible

cross-linking of the cysteines to each other was then assessed from trapping in

glutamate only. Both mutants underwent some peak current reduction in

glutamate in the absence of cross-linker (A665C: 0.78 ± 0.03, $n = 23$, $P <$

0.0000001 vs. WT, V666C: 0.85 ± 0.02, $n = 44$, $P = 0.003$ vs. WT; WT A2: 0.97

± 0.03, $n = 30$), consistent with previous results (Lau et al., 2013; Yelshanskaya

et al., 2016) . Limited cross-linking of A665C cysteines to each other in long

exposures to 10 mM glutamate was evident as a recovery of peak responses

after the trapping pulse (grey dots in Fig. 2C, $\tau = 3.3 \pm 0.4$ s, $n = 17$). For the

V666C mutant, all 6 bis-MTS cross-linkers (M1M-M10) resulted in substantially

more current inhibition than glutamate alone ($P \leq 0.03$ with and without bis-

MTS, depending on the cross-linker; paired randomisation test). Overall, paired

recordings gave indistinguishable results to the non-paired recordings. In other

words, disulfide crosslinking and rundown were minimal in these conditions.

Therefore, we pooled these data (Fig. 2D-E).

To confirm that the observed peak current reduction came from crosslinking

rather than monofunctional engagement of a cross-linker, we modified mutants

with MTSEA (Fig. 1D), which can interact only with a single cysteine. As shown

in Fig. 2D-E, MTSEA failed to inhibit either V666C or A665C above control (I_{peak}

post-trap / I_{peak} pre-trap for V666C: 0.89 ± 0.025, $n = 3\text{-}4$, $P = 0.1$; for A665C:

0.81 ± 0.06, $n = 3\text{-}4$, $P = 0.8$). This result also suggests that the mild oxidizing

environment created by MTS compounds at $1\mu M$ has little tendency to promote

disulfide bond formation. Thus, bifunctional MTS cross-linking was necessary

for the peak current reduction observed in desensitizing AMPA receptors.

The effect of all bis-MTS cross-linkers with respect to their length is summarized

in the trapping profile for desensitized V666C receptors (Fig. 2G). Rather than

showing a preferred cross-linking length (and thus, conformation) for

desensitized receptors, the profile is a shallow parabola with strong effects

across all tested lengths. These results demonstrate that desensitized AMPA

receptors can 'open up' their LBD layer to at least 18 Å at position 666 during

desensitization, but occupy a spectrum of conformations. Structural

heterogeneity and 'dilation' of the LBD layer to $\geq$18 Å are both in good

agreement with cryo-EM structures (Meyerson et al., 2014; Dürr et al., 2014).

Figure 2 LBDs separate at least 18 Å in desensitized GluA2. (A) Control recording of wild-type (WT) GluA2 AMPA receptors in response to a trapping protocol. Movements of the piezo reflecting the solution exchange are shown in thin, black lines above the current trace. Composition of the solutions is indicated in thick lines above the piezo trace. Downward ticks are 200 ms control jumps from DTT (1 mM) to DTT and glutamate (Glu, 10 mM). Four pre-trap control pulses were followed by a 1-minute long trapping pulse (red line) in Glu (10 mM) and M3M (1 μM). After the trapping pulse, the patch was exposed to 10 post-trap control pulses. The first post-trap pulse gives no response because receptors are desensitized (for details, see Experimental Procedures). (B) Same as in (A), but for V666C mutant. The top two recordings are from the same patch: in the first trace, V666C receptors were exposed only to Glu. Trapping of the same patch in Glu and M1M (1 μM), results in pronounced peak current reduction, which partly recovered with $\tau_{recovery} = 30 \pm 7$ s, $n = 5$ (grey dots; post-trap control pulses extended to 30 for fit). The bottom trace is a different patch trapped in bMTSp (1 μM), showing even stronger peak current reduction without any recovery. (C) As in (B) but for the A665C mutant. The two traces are paired recordings of the same patch. Post-trap control pulses show that A665C does cross-link to itself, but most of the current recovers within

In addition to positions 665 and 666, we also tested nearby positions 662 and

664 for their sensitivity to bis-MTS cross-linkers (Suppl. Fig. 1A). The I664C

mutant showed similar levels of the peak current reduction to V666C (Suppl.

Fig. 1B-C). However, we judged the I664C sulfhydryls were too far apart to

make effective use of the range of the available bis-MTS cross-linkers. Like the

A665C mutant, the S662C mutant showed considerable disulfide formation, so

we focused on the V666C mutant in further investigations.

Next, we wanted to test how specific the cross-linkers were in targeting the

inter-dimer interface of the LBD layer in our conditions. We generated another

single cysteine mutant, K493C (Armstrong et al., 2006), positioned within LBD

dimers (Suppl. Fig. 2A). Thus, bridging across the two cysteines should keep

the LBD dimers intact leading to block of desensitization. When we applied bis-

MTS cross-linkers on K493C receptors (1 μM, for ≥1 min), the effects were

profoundly different from the mutants at the inter-dimer interface: K493C

current underwent potentiation rather than inhibition, with shorter cross-linkers

(M1M, M3M and M6M) blocking the receptor desensitization almost completely

(Suppl. Fig. 2B-D). We also considered the possibility that bis-MTS cross-

linkers might be spuriously cross-linking to wild-type cysteines on the receptor

or forming inter-receptor cross-links (Suppl. Fig. 3A). If this were the case, the

peak current reduction effect would be expected to scale with the number of
the receptors in the membrane (i.e. peak current), but no such correlation was
found (Suppl. Fig. 3B). In addition, longer cross-linkers would be expected to
be more efficient in forging inter-receptor cross-links, but we found that the
longest cross-linker, M10M, was the slowest to react on desensitized AMPA
receptors (Fig. 2F). The absence of the strong peak current reduction in the WT
receptors also speaks against the bis-MTS cross-linkers interacting with native
cysteine residues. These results led us to conclude that the bis-MTS cross-
linkers are cross-linking cysteines introduced at the LBD inter-dimer interface
(V666C).
248
Cross-linked desensitized states are highly stable
Upon establishing specific and strong reduction of the peak current in
desensitizing V666C receptors by the bis-MTS cross-linkers, we next sought to
examine the stability of trapped states. The more stable the trapped state, the
longer we would expect that it takes for trapping effects to reverse, and vice
versa. The fastest recovery after trapping was observed with M1M ($\tau = 30 \pm$
7 s, $n = 5$) and the time constant of the peak current recovery could be
measured by directly fitting the peak current of the post-trap control pulses (grey
dots in Fig. 2B). With longer bis-MTS cross-linkers, the recovery time increased
to minutes, making direct measurements of the recovery time from post-trap
control pulses impractical. Instead, the experimental design was adjusted to
allow measurements of long recovery times as described in Experimental
Procedures and Fig. 3. After the receptors were trapped with M3M for 1 minute,
the peak current in the patch did recover, but very slowly, taking over 10
minutes (600 applications of glutamate) to reach the pre-trapping levels. With
longer cross-linkers, the peak current was essentially irreversible over the
timescales we could measure (20 minutes; Fig. 3D-G). The progressive inability
of the receptors to recover from trapping with longer cross-linkers indicates
increasingly stable trapped states corresponding to greater separation of the A
and C subunits in the desensitized state (Fig. 3G-H). Desensitized AMPA

Figure 3 Recovery of trapped desensitized V666C receptors depends on the LBD separation. (A) Protocol to measure recovery from trapping. To obtain a stable baseline response to glutamate, we first repeated brief glutamate applications in reducing conditions (1 mM DTT). In the given example, we gave 17 pulses (100 ms, 1 Hz). (B) In the following step, the patch was exposed to 1 μM cross-linker (here M3M) and 10 mM Glu for 1 minute, with control pulses before and after the trap. (C) After the trapping protocol, the patch was again exposed to fast, reducing glutamate jumps like in (A) in order to follow recovery of the response. In this example, we could record 1230 consecutive episodes (~20 min) and obtain almost complete recovery. Note the difference between the current amplitude in the 1st episode (grey) and the 1230th episode (red). The recovery of the patch current (I$_{peak}$) in typical experiments for different cross-linkers is plotted in panels D - F (panel E is the same patch as panels A - C). Black dots show the response before the trap and red dots the peak current after the trap. The gap in red dots in (D) represents a switch between recording protocols. (G) Summary of the peak current recovery for different cross-linkers. The percentage of recovered current is the ratio of the peak currents recorded ~10 min after the trap to the peak current before trapping. Dashed red line denotes a limit after which no recovery of the current could be measured within 10 min after the trap. (H) Plot of recovery time from trapped desensitized states vs. the inter-dimer separation at position V666C in the LBD layer. The first data point indicates recovery from V666C disulphide bridges formed in desensitized state (Plested and Salazar, unpublished data).

receptors with a disulphide bridge formed between the two V666C residues at inter-dimer interface fit in well with this trend, recovering in seconds following 100 s exposure to the oxidizing agent CuPhen (A.P. and Hector Salazar, unpublished data) (Fig. 3H).

Activation limits conformational heterogeneity of the LBD layer

We next investigated if the LBDs of activated V666C receptors are also accessible to a similarly wide range of bis-MTS cross-linkers. According to one cryo-EM structure of an apparently activated AMPA receptor (Meyerson et al., 2014) (Fig. 1C), V666C residues should be far enough apart to accommodate cross-linkers up to 19 Å in length.

To maintain the active state, we blocked desensitization with cyclothiazide (CTZ, 100 μM). As shown in Fig. 4, block of desensitization produced a near-universal attenuation of inhibition by bis-MTS cross-linkers, in the first minute of exposure (see Suppl. Table 2 for statistics). Current inhibition for every cross-linker in the presence and absence of desensitization is shown in Fig. 4B. With M1M, about 15% of V666C receptors recovered from inhibition with a time constant of $\tau = 7.1 \pm 1$ s, n = 4, leading to the final inhibition of 0.65 ± 0.02, n = 12. For M3M, the recovery was even faster with $\tau = 1.98 \pm 0.2$ s, n = 8 (grey dots in Fig. 4A), with about 15% the receptors recovering and leading to the final inhibition of 0.53 ± 0.03, n = 9. The fast recovery indicates that with dimer separation of about 9 Å, trapped receptors were in an unstable, stereochemically-strained state. We could observe trapping directly from the current decay, and shorter crosslinkers acted faster (Fig. 4A and D). As in desensitizing receptors, M10M took the longest to trap.

With desensitization blocked, AMPA receptors displayed a clearly distinct trapping profile from that of desensitized receptors (Fig. 4C). Instead of a shallow parabola, the extents of trapping active state could only be satisfactorily fit with third order polynomial functions. The sharper trapping profile indicated

a favored LBD separation of 15 Å, greater than the optimum of desensitized

receptors (11 Å).

The less profound inhibition we observed in non-desensitized receptors led us

to investigate the possibility that M10M modifies non-desensitizing V666C

receptors in other ways than current amplitude reduction. We measured the

rate of receptor deactivation before and after the trap in M10M in the presence

of CTZ and found no difference (Suppl. Fig. 4 C-D, $\tau_{pre\text{-}trap}$ = 1.7 ms $\pm$ 0.2, $\tau_{post\text{-}}$

$_{trap}$ = 1.6 $\pm$ 0.2 ms, n = 8, P = 0.05 (paired randomisation test)). We considered

the possibility that non-desensitizing receptors were modified by M10M, but in

a way that was silent to our electrophysiological approach. We tested this

scenario with the following experiment: a patch with V666C receptors was first

trapped in M10M and CTZ; CTZ was then washed-out the patch and freely

desensitizing V666C receptors were exposed to M10M only (Suppl. Fig. 4A). If

non-desensitizing V666C receptors had been silently modified by M10M, then

a fraction of the receptors should have been protected resulting in the reduced

sensitivity to further trapping by M10M. V666C receptors initially exposed to

M10M in the presence of CTZ were modified to the same extent as naïve

receptors by M10M once CTZ was unbound (I_{peak} post-trap / I_{peak} pre-trap for

V666C initially trapped in CTZ: 0.23 $\pm$ 0.04, n = 6 and for V666C never trapped

in CTZ: 0.30 $\pm$ 0.03, n = 16, P = 0.07; Suppl. Fig. 4B). Taken together, these

results strongly suggest that the reduced inhibition reflected state dependent

protection from modification.

Auxiliary subunits do not alter the geometry of desensitized receptors

Trapping with bis-MTS cross-linkers so far indicated more conformational

flexibility of the LBD layer in desensitized than activated AMPA receptors.

However, synaptic AMPA receptors are rarely expressed alone, and are

instead associated with various auxiliary proteins that re-define their kinetic

properties (Schwenk et al., 2012; Jackson and Nicoll, 2011). We, therefore,

wondered if the presence of auxiliary subunits, such as Stargazin (Stg), could

affect conformational flexibility of AMPA receptors.

Figure 4 The active LBD layer is dilated (A) Current traces of trapping protocols on active V666C receptors. Cyclothiazide (CTZ) was included at 100 μM throughout the experiment to block desensitization. The duration of the trapping pulse shown is indicated in green. Trapping rate (τ) was determined from the monoexponential fits (red, dotted line; n: number of patches). For M3M, gray, dotted line indicates recovery from the trap immediately after the trap (τ = 2.0 ± 0.2 s, $n = 8$). Extent of trapping was relative to the initial pulses (arrows) (B) Summary of bis-MTS trapping (1 min) of desensitizing (black) and non-desensitizing V666C receptors (green). Desensitizing data are from Fig. 2E. P values compare the desensitizing and non-desensitizing condition. For P values comparing effects with and without bis-MTS, see Suppl. Table 2. Bis-MTS length is indicated in brackets; "w/o MTS": without MTS. (C) Trapping profile of active V666C receptors after the first minute of exposure (green). Green line merely connects the points. Fit of the trapping profile of desensitized receptors is shown as a red, dashed line for comparison. Black triangle indicates minimum of the fit at 11 Å . (D) Plot summarizing the increase of the trapping time in CTZ for V666C receptors with bis-MTS length. The solid line is a Hill equation fit to the data with no physical meaning.

Recently, cryo-EM structures of AMPA receptors in complex with auxiliary subunits have been acquired in resting, active and desensitized states (Fig. 1B) (Chen et al., 2017; Twomey et al., 2017a). These structures all predict reduced separation of V666C residues when compared to receptors without auxiliary proteins. For example, sulfhydryl groups of V666C residues on subunits A and C are 19 Å apart in the apparent active state of isolated receptors and 15 Å in activated receptors complexed with Stg (Fig. 1C). In the desensitized state, the equivalent residues are 21 Å apart in homologous kainate receptors (PDB: 5KUF(Meyerson et al., 2016)) and 17 Å in desensitized GluA2 receptors associated with GSG1L auxiliary proteins (Fig. 1C, PDB: 5VHZ (Twomey et al., 2017b)). If, indeed, auxiliary subunits keep the LBD layer more compact, we reasoned that their presence should also limit the effects of longer bis-MTS cross-linkers.

To test this hypothesis, we repeated the trapping experiments on complexes of AMPA receptors with Stg (Fig. 5). GluA2 and Stg were co-expressed and association of complexes was assessed by measuring the ratio of kainate current over glutamate current (KA/Glu). The relative efficacy of the partial agonist kainate is known to be higher for GluA2-Stg complexes than for GluA2 alone, making it a good marker of GluA2-Stg association (Tomita et al., 2005; Shi et al., 2009). After establishing formation of the GluA2 V666C-Stg complexes in the patch, we proceeded with the trapping protocol that exposed complexes to glutamate and a bis-MTS cross-linker (1 μM) for 1 minute (Fig. 5), as described previously. No blocker of desensitization was added and the receptors were allowed to desensitize freely. Therefore the crosslinking represents trapping across a mixture of active and desensitized states.

The trapping results summarized in Fig. 5C show that the presence of auxiliary subunit Stg apparently protected V666C receptors from cross-linking by bis-MTS. Indeed, following trapping, a robust response was preserved, and could not be overcome by longer trapping intervals. This protection probably reflects an exaggerated role in channel gating for B and D subunits (in principle

untouched by our crosslinking approach), revealed or possibly amplified by

Stargazin (see Discussion).

To test whether bis-MTS cross-linkers perhaps act on non-complexed V666C

receptors only, without affecting V666C-Stg complexes, we measured the

KA/Glu current ratio before and after the bis-MTS trap for a series of patches.

We reasoned that if only non-complexed V666C receptors were being modified,

the glutamate-activated current should reduce, but the kainate current (which

is almost entirely carried by GluA2-Stg complexes) should not. Therefore,

preferential trapping of non-complexed V666C mutants should lead to an

increase in KA/Glu ratio. As shown in Fig. 5E, the KA/Glu ratio was not affected

(before trap: 0.46 ± 0.03; after trap: 0.43 ± 0.02, n = 13; $P = 0.2$, paired

randomisation test), indicating V666C-Stg complexes were being modified by

bis-MTS cross-linkers.

Figure 5. Stargazin attenuates effects of bis-MTS cross-linkers. (A) Current traces of V666C trapping in M3M, without (top) and with Stargazin (Stg; bottom). Legend is the same as in Fig. 2, with a trapping pulse shown here in orange. (B) Same as in (A), but for M10M. (C) Trapping effects for V666C without (black) and with Stg (orange). Post- and pre-trap peak current was determined from the control pulses (arrows in (A) and (B)). Data without Stg are the same as in Fig. 2D. Lengths of the cross-linkers are indicated in brackets and *P* values compare the effects of the respective cross-linker with and without Stg. (D) Trapping profile of desensitizing V666C+Stg complexes (data after the first minute of bis-MTS exposure). The data were fit with a parabola (orange line); the fit reaches minimum (orange triangle) at (11, 0.3). Trapping profile of desensitized receptors without Stg is shown as red, dashed line for comparison with the minimum at (11, 0.1) (black tringle). (E) The kainate/glutamate (KA/Glu) peak current ratio was determined for each patch before and after trapping with a bis-MTS (similar to the experimental design in Fig. 3A-C with 1mM KA and 10 mM Glu in 1 mM DTT). V666C + Stg KA/Glu measurements before and after trap shown here are paired recordings, pooled for various bis-MTS cross-linkers.

Stargazin maintains active receptors in a compact arrangement

The trapping profile of V666C-Stg complexes (orange in Fig. 5D) reflects the partial protection from trapping in the presence of Stg for all cross-linker lengths, but its overall shape is practically superposable onto the trapping profile of desensitized V666C receptors without Stg (red, dashed line in Fig. 5D). Strikingly, the two curves reach their minimum at the same point of 11 Å (triangles in Fig. 5D) and have identical curvature. This indistinguishable length dependence indicated that the trapping of V666C-Stg complexes came primarily from trapping desensitized receptors, and that the active complexes of V666C-Stg might be untouched by bis-MTS cross-linkers.

To test this hypothesis, we repeated the trapping protocol in the presence of CTZ, to block desensitization of V666C-Stg complexes. Two cross-linkers were tested in this condition: M1M, the shortest one, and M8M, which had the strongest trapping effect on active V666C receptors without Stg (Fig. 4B-C). As predicted, neither bis-MTS cross-linker had any effect on activated GluA2-Stg complexes ($P = 0.5$, paired recordings with and without bis-MTS) (Fig. 6). Over very long exposures, M8M could induce irreversible inhibition, presumably from residual desensitization. This result confirmed that partial trapping observed for desensitizing V666C-Stg mainly derived from bis-MTS cross-linkers accessing desensitized complexes. The most parsimonious explanation for the protection is that the dimers are preferentially held in a compact arrangement that protects V666C from reacting with crosslinkers. Overall, Stargazin complexes are more compact than their counterparts lacking any auxiliary protein.

Figure 6 Stargazin blocks access to bis-MTS cross-linkers in the active state. (A) Traces showing
trapping by M1M in the active state in the absence (black) and presence (blue) of Stargazin (Stg). Legend
is the same as in Fig. 2, with a trapping pulse shown here in blue. Desensitization was blocked by CTZ
(100 μM) present throughout the experiment. Glutamate (Glu) was 10 mM and DTT 1mM. (B) Same as
in (A), but for M8M cross-linker. (C) Summary of the trapping effects for M1M and M8M in the active state
in the absence (black) and presence (blue) of Stg. Pre- and post-trap current was determined from control
pulses as indicated by arrows. There was no difference in effect between M1M and M8M with Stg (P =
0.1, n = 9 and 11, respectively). (D) Putative compact structures that could protect from bis MTS
modification. Results of 268 runs of rigid body docking of LBD dimers against each other, to minimize
Cys666 access in subunit A and mimic the protection from crosslinking. Results from known structures
(5JEI, 4YU0 loose, 4YU0 tight and 5WE0, diamonds *a-d*) and generated models segregate into two
classes, similar to the loose (SG-SG distance between subunits < 10 Å) and tight arrangements (SG-SG
distance > 20Å, SG buried close to helix K) (Baranovic et al., 2016). The symbol size corresponds to the
dimer centre of mass separation and the colour to the number of atom clashes (distance < 2.2 Å.) (E)
Four models marked on the graph in panel D, and the original seed for each optimization, the glutamate
bound LBD tetramer from 5WE0 full-length GluA2 structure with Stg.

Discussion

Technical advances in cryo-electron microscopy have revolutionized the study of membrane proteins, and the supply of structural information is greater than ever before. However, as the catalogue of images swells, the need to relate their geometry to dynamics becomes ever more pressing. In case of AMPA receptors, full-length structures in complexes with various ligands and auxiliary subunits have been published. Here we have used a classical crosslinking approach allied to rapid perfusion to measure distances up to 18 Å in AMPA receptor extracellular domains across different functional states and in the time domain.

Bis-MTS cross-linkers have been used previously to aid identification of movements underlying state transitions in AMPA and NMDA receptors (Armstrong et al., 2006) (Tajima et al., 2016). Here, we report effects with a strong dependence on the target site, length of the cross-linker, functional state of the receptor and the presence or absence of auxiliary subunits. Since most bis-MTS cross-linkers are alkyl chains and hence flexible, we tested the bMTSp linker that includes a rigid benzene ring, but otherwise has a very similar length to M6M. The only difference we observed between these two cross-linkers was with K493C mutant, with M6M blocking desensitization more effectively than bMTSp, perhaps indicating an angle between the K493C side chains that was more easily accommodated by the flexible chain. At other sites, rigidity had little influence.

All bis-MTS cross-linkers inhibited the current, irrespective of the functional state. Indeed, all inter-dimer constraints seem to be inhibitory (Plested and Mayer, 2009) (Lau et al., 2013; Baranovic et al., 2016; Yelshanskaya et al., 2016). Whereas the zinc and disulphide bridges, previously used to cross-link LBD dimers, only form under strict geometrical requirements, the same cannot be said for bis-MTS cross-linkers. The cross-linkers are flexible and therefore do not restrict the trapped LBD tetramer to a single geometry. The inhibitory effect of the crosslinkers is not universal – at the active intra-dimer interfaces

we could potentiate receptors as shown previously (Armstrong et al., 2006). It

appears that crosslinks between dimer pairs, or indeed any restriction between

the active dimers, leads to a decrease in activity.

In Fig. 7A-B, the trapping profiles of V666C receptors with the available

structural models of GluA2 in the equivalent condition are compared. The

shallow trapping profile of desensitized AMPA receptors (Fig. 2G) indicates a

structural ensemble of conformations broadly in agreement with multiple

desensitized states (Meyerson et al., 2014) (Robert and Howe, 2003)(EMDB:

2688). Even though the LBD dimer-dimer separation observed in the model

($>$18 Å) was not tested with the bis-MTS cross-linker of the corresponding

length, extrapolation of the trapping profile indicates such conformations are

available to desensitized AMPA receptors. However, the longest cross-linker

(18 Å) was the slowest one to act on desensitized receptors, indicating that this

conformation, and more 'dilated' ones, are not readily available for cross-

linking, but slowly get populated during prolonged exposures to agonist. The

same trend, of the trapping time increasing with the length of the cross-linker,

was present in the active state. There, the most readily accessible separation

of V666C residues was at 15 Å (green in Fig. 7B) with 19 Å separation,

predicted by the structural model (PDB: 4UQ6), taking longer to populate.

Notably, 'dilations' of extracellular domains were also seen in antagonist-bound

NMDA receptors (Zhu et al., 2016).

The presence of Stg leads to universal attenuation of the cross-linking effect,

for all bis-MTS lengths and both functional states, desensitized and active

(orange and blue in Fig. 7A and B, respectively). This result seems to chime

with structural experiments, where the presence of Stg made the LBD layer

more compact. In the desensitized state, the shape of the trapping profile is the

same, with or without Stg (Fig. 7A), with both parabola reaching a minimum

point at 11 Å (triangles in Fig. 7A). This is in excellent agreement with the

structure of desensitized GluA2-Stg complex (PDB: 5VOV). In the active state,

our results deviate from the available full-length active structures. Both short

and long (7 or 15 Å) bis-MTS reagents failed to inhibit currents in the first minute of trapping, indicating more compact LBD arrangements over this timescale than obtained in the structures.

The protection from trapping in our cross-linking experiments most likely has multiple origins. Although "protection" could result from a persistent long-distance separation, outside the range of the crosslinkers, several observations and common sense speak against this possibility. First, we previously showed that active receptors (glutamate + CTZ) could be trapped by zinc bridges in compact arrangements (Baranovic et al., 2016). Second, the long distance must be maintained throughout the exposure, because any transit between compact and dilated arrangements must pass through intermediate separations, allowing crosslinkers to span the gap. Third, even the most dilated structures are in the range of crosslinker lengths that we used. Fourth, the mixed trapping condition for Stg-complexes in the absence of CTZ apparently supports desensitized state trapping over a wide range of geometries but no additional active state trapping. We reasoned that the best explanation is reduced accessibility of cysteine residues during exposure to bis-MTS, perhaps because the Cys666 residues are buried against other subunits or oriented such that the V666C side chain makes the sulfhydryl group inaccessible for cross-linking. This interpretation would mean that the active LBD tetramer is even more compact than that seen in CryoEM structures with Stg(Chen et al., 2017; Twomey et al., 2017a). We mined possible conformations of the LBD tetramer using a coarse docking approach, allowing each active dimer to move in the membrane plane, and allowing rotation of one dimer with respect to the other around axes parallel and perpendicular to the active dimer interface (Figure 6D and E). Interestingly, docked structures with low Cys666 accessibility segregated into two classes, a loose arrangement where Cys666 were physically close but sterically hindering each other, and a tighter arrangement of the LBDs with V666C close to helix K, not unlike the structure of the V666C mutant LBD bound with fluorowillardine (5JEI) (Salazar et al., 2017). In that structure, additional shielding of the V666C side chain is afforded

by its being shielded by neighbouring structural elements. We cannot discount

specific, state-dependent protection from crosslinking, produced by a unique,

closed-cleft LBD conformation provoked by Stg in the active state, but it seems

to us unlikely.

No matter how avid and complete trapping is, a possible source of receptor

activity after trapping is the activity of free (non-crosslinked) subunits. In all our

experiments, subunits A and C are trapped whereas B and D are not (Fig. 7C).

In GluA2 receptors without Stg, even in the presence of CTZ, the activity of only

two subunits (e.g. B and D) produces only low conductance openings with short

open times (Rosenmund et al., 1998). But the presence of Stg (Coombs et al.,

2017) (Zhang et al., 2014) increases the current carried by receptors with one

or two active subunits. In our experiments, Stg had an indefatigable effect of

maintaining receptor activity in the limit of long exposures to bis-MTS. The

effect of Stg was inordinately large, with a maximum effect of the crosslinking

leaving approximately half the receptor activity unscathed. A simple back-of-

the-envelope calculation suggests this effect is larger than expected from single

channel recordings. The conductance from two subunits, with desensitization

blocked should be about 40% but with $P_{open} < 1$ (Coombs et al., 2017). This

result therefore provides a first estimation, albeit indirect, of the stronger effect

of the B and D subunits in gating. This effect is predicted because these

subunits have greater leverage to open the pore deriving from their more

peripheral location (Sobolevsky et al., 2009).

We presume that the basal compactness of the LBD layer is related to

observation that longer cross-linkers have slower trapping rates, indicating slow

adoption of 'dilated' conformations. We cannot rule out the possibility that slow

reaction times are somehow linked to the bis-MTS mechanism itself, but

alkylthiosulfonates are generally distinguished by their extremely rapid

reactivity in mild conditions, selectivity for cysteinyl sulfhydryl groups, general

reversibility upon addition of thiols such as DTT and their ability to effect

quantitative and complete conversion to the disulphide without applying a large

excess of reagent (Kenyon and Bruice, 1977). Our reaction rates are close to
the maximum expected (10^5 M^{-1}s^{-1}; (Liu et al., 1997)).

Figure 7 Comparison of structural models with V666C cross-linking profiles. (A) Trapping profiles
for V666C in desensitized states, without (red) and with (orange) Stargazin (Stg). Solid lines are fit
parabola, with local minima indicated as triangles. For desensitized condition without Stg, minimum is
reached at (11, 0.1) and with Stg at (11, 0.3). The right handside of the x-axis is marked as >18 Å, as the
resolution of the only available desensitized structure without auxiliary subunits is too low to measure
residue distances. Vertical, dashed, black lines indicate V666C sulfhydryl separation in the respective
structure (PDB accession codes in brackets). Names of structures are colour-coded same as the trapping
profiles. (B) Same as in (A), but for active state without (green) and with (orange) Stg. 4YU0 is a structure
of soluble, isolated LBDs. Quis stands for quisqualate (full agonist), RR for (R, R)-2b (Kaae et al., 2007)
and LY for LY451646 (both desensitization blockers). (C) Cartoon depicting cross-linking (paperclips) of
A-C subunits (light grey), while B-D subunits are left free (dark grey). 'Native' column represents apparent
conformations of the LBD layer when it is not crosslinked. Muliple overlaid tiles indicate multiple available
positions of an LBD.

Physiological activation and desensitization of AMPA receptors takes place on
a millisecond timescale, and we monitored this process wherever possible
during our experiments. Generally, the remaining current responses were not
altered following bis-MTS exposures. The fast gating contrasts to desensitized
states trapped by bis-MTS cross-linkers that are accessed after minutes-long
exposures to glutamate (Fig. 2F) and take tens of minutes to recover (Fig. 3).
Though we necessarily worked at low bis-MTS concentrations to avoid
confounding effects like chaining and non-specific modification, mandating slow
trapping, the slow recovery from trapping is striking. It seems reasonable to
assume that the degree of stabilization by different crosslinkers is similar, and
that the difference in stability comes from the states themselves. This idea is
supported by the cut-off that we observe – for crosslinkers longer than 10 Å,
crosslinking in desensitized states is irreversible over 10 minutes. In contrast,
AMPA receptors trapped through disulphide bridges at the same sites recover
in hundreds of milliseconds (Lau et al., 2013; Salazar et al., 2017). Assuming
that the length of the bis-MTS cross-linkers reflects level of structural
rearrangements and following the trend plotted in Fig. 3H, this suggests that
AMPA receptors exposed to brief glutamate transients at synapses are unlikely
to undergo extreme conformational changes, due to their complexation with
auxiliary subunits.

Long agonist exposures of minutes to hours are necessary in structural biology
experiments and could, thus, contribute to the prevalence of more 'relaxed'
conformations in full-length structures without auxiliary subunits (Fig. 8).
However, long exposures to agonists are at odds with synaptic conditions
where AMPA receptors see glutamate on a millisecond timescale, before it is
actively cleared by transporters (Clements, 1996). Furthermore, any large
structural rearrangements of the extracellular domains would need to be
accommodated by the crowded synaptic environment (High et al., 2015; Tao et
al., 2018) and potential presynaptic interaction partners (Saglietti et al., 2007)
(Elegheert et al., 2016). When in complex with auxiliary subunits, no functional
state of AMPA receptors necessitates large domain movements, and compact

arrangements of the extracellular layer can sustain the gating process. We conclude that extracellular domains of synaptic AMPA receptors are unlikely to undergo large structural rearrangements during synaptic transmission and instead work in a fairly compact conformational regime, unless faced with long exposures to glutamate in pathological conditions.

Figure 8 The presence of Stg and short agonist exposures keep the agonist-bound LBD layer compact. Schematic summarizing the bis-MTS cross-linking results. Colour-code same as in Fig. 1; ATDs are omitted. Black spheres represent bound glutamate. Upper row: in the absence of Stg, GluA2 receptors access 'dilated' LBD conformation (black arrows) upon long exposures to agonist. Bottom row: presence of Stg limits 'dilation' of the LBD layer even at longer agonist exposures.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the ERC Grant "Gluactive" (647895) and the NeuroCure Cluster of Excellence (DFG EXC-257). A.J.R.P. is a Heisenberg Professor of the DFG (Project number 323514590).

Author Contributions

J.B. and A.J.R.P. designed experiments, J.B. performed experiments, A.J.R.P. wrote PYTHON code and did the docking computations. J.B. and A.J.R.P. analysed data and wrote the manuscript.

Experimental Procedures

Molecular Biology

In all experiments, the unedited (Q586) GluA2flip version of rat A2 gene was expressed from the pRK5 vector. Amino acid numbering refers to the mature receptor assuming a signal peptide of 21 amino acids in length. As a marker of transfection, eGFP was expressed from the same vector, downstream from an internal ribosomal entry sequence (IRES). Mouse Stargazin gene (a kind gift from Susumu Tomita) was expressed from a separate pRK8 vector containing IRES-dsRed (Carbone and Plested, 2016). All mutations were introduced by overlap PCR and confirmed by double-stranded sequencing.

Cell Culture and Transfection

GluA2 constructs were expressed transiently in HEK293 cells using calcium-phosphate precipitation or PEI method as described previously (Baranovic et al., 2016; Riva et al., 2017). HEK293 cells were obtained from the Leibniz Forschungsinstitut DSMZ (Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH, Germany) ACC no. 305, and tested negative for mycoplasma. Cells were maintained in MEM Eagle medium (PAN-Biotech GmbH, Aidenbach, Germany) supplemented with 10% (v/v) fetal bovine serum and antibiotics (penicillin (100 U/mL) and streptomycin (0.1 mg/mL; PAN-Biotech).

For transfections, 2-3 μg of DNA was transfected per 35 mm dish and cells were washed after 6-8 hours. Recordings were performed 24-72 hours after the transfection at room temperature. For transfections with Stargazin, Stargazin DNA was co-transfected with A2 DNA at 2:1 mass ratio and after the transfection, cell medium was supplemented with 40 μM NBQX to reduce Stargazin-induced cytotoxicity.

 Solutions

Chemicals were obtained from Sigma Aldrich (Munich, Germany), Abcam plc

(Cambridge, UK) and Hello Bio (Bristol, UK). MTS compounds were obtained

from Toronto Research Chemicals (North York, Canada).

The internal (pipette) solution for recordings without Stargazin contained (mM):

115 NaCl, 1 $MgCl_2$, 0.5 $CaCl_2$, 10 NaF, 5 Na_4BAPTA, 10 Na_2ATP, 5 HEPES,

titrated to pH 7.3 with NaOH. For recordings with Stargazin, the internal solution

was slightly modified: 120 NaCl, 0.5 $CaCl_2$, 10 NaF, 5 Na_4BAPTA, 5 HEPES

and 0.05 spermine, pH 7.3. The external recording solution in all experiments

contained (mM): 150 NaCl, 0.1 $MgCl_2$, 0.1 $CaCl_2$ and 5 HEPES, pH 7.3.

Different drugs were added to the external solution as needed. Glutamate was

always applied at 10 mM and DL-dithiothreitol (DTT) at 1 mM. Cyclothiazide

(CTZ) and kainate (KA) were thawed from stock solutions on the day of the

experiment. Final CTZ and KA concentrations in all experiments were 100 μM

and 1 mM, respectively.

All MTS compounds were obtained as powder. Whereas monofunctional MTS

reagents are known to be highly reactive and unstable in aqueous solutions

(Kenyon and Bruice, 1977), this information is lacking for bifunctional cross-

linkers used in this study. Hence, we took special care to minimize exposure of

bis-MTS compounds to oxidizing (aqueous) solutions (Takatsuka and Nikaido,

2010). The powder was dissolved in DMSO, aliquoted and kept on ice on the

day of the experiment. Once a stable patch recording was obtained, an aliquot

was dissolved in external solution to a final concentration of 1 μM and applied

to the patch. This way, aqueous bis-MTS solutions were on average 2-3

minutes old at the moment of application. Each MTS stock was tested with A2

wild-type receptors and A2 K493C receptors as negative and positive controls,

respectively. The final MTS concentration of 1 μM was chosen based on

previous work (Sobolevsky et al., 2003; Yelshansky et al., 2004). We avoided

higher concentrations of MTS compounds due to potential cross-reactivity and

chaining effects.

Patch clamp electrophysiology

Ligands and drugs were applied to outside-out patches via a custom made 4-barrel glass (VitroCom, USA) mounted to a linear piezo–electric wafer (PiezoMove P-601.4, PI, Germany) (Lau et al., 2013). Two barrels were perfused with control solutions and the third barrel with the trapping solution, as described below. All patches were voltage clamped at -40 mV unless stated otherwise. Currents were low-pass filtered at 10 kHz (-3 dB cut-off, eight-pole Bessel filter) using an Axopatch200B amplifier (Molecular Devices, U.S.A.) and acquired with AxographX software (Axograph Scientific, Australia) at 20 kHz sampling rate via Instrutech ITC-18 digitizer (HEKA, Germany).

To assess the effect of different bifunctional cross-linkers on AMPA receptors, the receptors were exposed to the cross-linker (1 μM) for 1 minute. Before and after this trapping exposure, the current in the patch was tested with four control pulses that contained only 10 mM glutamate, without the cross-linker and in the presence of DTT (1 mM) as a reducing agent (Fig. 2A-C). Four control pulses before application of the cross-linker provided a measure of the patch current before any exposure to the cross-linker. Accordingly, (up to thirty) control pulses recorded after the MTS application, were used to assess any changes in the patch current imparted by the cross-linker treatment.

For recordings of A2 receptors co-expressed with auxiliary subunit Stargazin, care must be taken that A2 receptors are indeed associating with Stargazin. One strategy to minimize the presence of lone V666C receptors relies on the relief of spermine (polyamine) block at positive voltages imparted by complexation with Stargazin (Carbone and Plested, 2016). Although we have included spermine in the pipette solution and measured relieve of block for each patch, we did not perform recordings at positive voltages, as the currents were not stable enough during minutes-long trapping protocols. Instead, a change in kainate efficacy was used as a marker of A2-Stargazin association as described in the text.

Analysis

Trapping effects were quantified as the ratio of the average current after the

trap (determined from the post-trap control pulses 7-10, except in the case of

fast recovery, in which case the 2nd post-trap control pulse was used) and

average current before the trap (determined from the 4 pre-trap control pulses;

arrows in Fig. 2A-C):

$$Active\ fraction = \frac{I_{post\ trap}}{I_{pre\ trap}}$$

In case of desensitizing receptors, peak current was measured and in the case

of non-desensitizing receptors, steady-state current.

In the presence of desensitization block (i.e. CTZ), the rate of trapping was

described with a monoexponential fit directly to the trapping pulse (Fig. 4A) for

all cross-linkers. The trapping time in CTZ (τ) vs. the length of the bis-MTS

cross-linker (l) (Fig. 4D) was fit with a Hill equation in Igor Pro (v7.06,

Wavemetrics, Lake Oswego, Oregon, U.S.A.):

$$\tau(l) = \tau_{min} + \frac{\tau_{max} - \tau_{min}}{\left(1 + \left[\frac{l_{half}}{l}\right]^n\right)}$$

782
783
where τ_{min} and τ_{max} were the minimum and maximum time constants, n was the

slope and l_{half} was length of the cross-linker giving the half maximal trapping

time. No physical meaning was ascribed to the fitted curve. Data were weighted

by the standard error of the mean (SEM) for the fit. To determine the rate of

recovery from trapping by MTS cross-linkers, the number of post-trap control

pulses was increased until full recovery was attained. An envelope of post-trap

peak current responses was then created in Igor Pro and fit with a

monoexponential. This approach was possible only for faster recovery rates,

on the time scale of seconds, such as recovery of desensitized V666C

receptors from trapping with M1M (Fig. 2B and 3D) and recovery of active

V666C receptors from trapping with M1M and M3M (Fig. 4A). With longer bis-

MTS cross-linkers, the recovery time increased from seconds to minutes,

making direct measurements of the recovery time from post-trap control pulses

impractical. Instead, the experimental design was re-adjusted to allow

measurements of long recovery times as described in Fig. 3A-C. In brief, peak

current in the patch was initially recorded with 100 ms jumps into glutamate in

control conditions until it stabilized. Then, a trapping protocol was performed as

described above, with control pulses before and after the trap. After the trapping

protocol, the current in the patch was again monitored, for about 10 minutes,

with fast control jumps into glutamate in order to follow any potential recovery

of the peak current. In this time period, desensitized V666C receptors managed

to recover only from trapping by M3M (Fig. 3E and G), in which case the

recovery was fit with a monoexponential.

807
808 Trapping profiles (Fig. 2G and 5D) were fit with a parabola in Igor Pro:

809 $$f(x) = K_0 + K_1(x - K_2)^2$$
810
where K_1 defines the curvature, K_0 the minimum effect and K_2 the x value at

the minimum. Data points were weighted by the standard error of the mean

for the fit.

Computational docking

To investigate structures of the LBD tetramer that could preclude trapping by

blocking access to the Cys666 SG moiety, we treated each dimer as a rigid

body and subjected them to rotations and translations in the membrane plane.

Python scripts (available at github.com/aplested/cystance) were written as a

glue for PyMOL molecular manipulations and CCP4 functions to measure

geometry and exposure of the Cysteine (AREAIMOL, NCONT (Winn et al.,

2011)). For each run, trial arrangements that reduced Cys666 SG accessibility

in subunit A whilst also keeping the dimers in close proximity (with minimal

atom clashes) and maintaining physiologically plausible in-plane linker

arrangements were retained as seeds for subsequent rounds, and the step

size was reduced. Trial arrangements with more than 10 atom clashes (<2.2

Å) were rejected. No refinement was done to eliminate spurious clashes from

flexible surface residues. The optimization was ended when no further

improvement was possible. Each search lasted about 5-10 minutes on a 2017

Macbook Pro.

All *P* values were determined by non–parametric randomisation test (paired or

non–paired, as stated), using at least 10^5 iterations (DC-Stats suite:

https://github.com/aplested/DC-Stats). Bars in graphs indicate mean and error

bars SEM.

Structural models and related measurements were visualized and measured in

MacPyMOL (v2.0) [The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 2.0

Schrödinger, LLC]. The length of bis-MTS cross-linkers was measured in

ChemDraw Professional (PerkinElmer, U.S.A.).

References

Armstrong, N., Jasti, J., Beich-Frandsen, M., and Gouaux, E. (2006).

Measurement of conformational changes accompanying desensitization in an

ionotropic glutamate receptor. Cell *127*, 85-97.

Baranovic, J., Chebli, M., Salazar, H., Carbone, A. L., Faelber, K., Lau, A. Y.,

Daumke, O., and Plested, A. J. (2016). Dynamics of the Ligand Binding Domain

Layer during AMPA Receptor Activation. Biophys J *110*, 896-911.

Cais, O., Herguedas, B., Krol, K., Cull-Candy, S. G., Farrant, M., and Greger,

I. H. (2014). Mapping the Interaction Sites between AMPA Receptors and

TARPs Reveals a Role for the Receptor N-Terminal Domain in Channel Gating.

Cell Rep *9*, 728-740.

Carbone, A. L., and Plested, A. J. R. (2016). Superactivation of AMPA receptors

by auxiliary proteins. Nat Commun *7*, 10178.

Chen, L., Dürr, K. L., and Gouaux, E. (2014). X-ray structures of AMPA

receptor-cone snail toxin complexes illuminate activation mechanism. Science

345, 1021-1026.

Chen, S., Zhao, Y., Wang, Y., Shekhar, M., Tajkhorshid, E., and Gouaux, E.

(2017). Activation and Desensitization Mechanism of AMPA Receptor-TARP

Complex by Cryo-EM. Cell *170*, 1234-1246.e14.

Clements, J. D. (1996). Transmitter timecourse in the synaptic cleft: its role in

central synaptic function. Trends Neurosci *19*, 163-171.

Colquhoun, D., Jonas, P., and Sakmann, B. (1992). Action of brief pulses of

glutamate on AMPA/kainate receptors in patches from different neurones of rat

hippocampal slices. J Physiol *458*, 261-287.

Constals, A., Penn, A. C., Compans, B., Toulmé, E., Phillipat, A., Marais, S.,

Retailleau, N., Hafner, A.-S., Coussen, F., Hosy, E., and Choquet, D. (2015).

Glutamate-Induced AMPA Receptor Desensitization Increases Their Mobility

and Modulates Short-Term Plasticity through Unbinding from Stargazin.
Neuron

Coombs, I. D., MacLean, D. M., Jayaraman, V., Farrant, M., and Cull-Candy,
S. G. (2017). Dual Effects of TARP γ-2 on Glutamate Efficacy Can Account for
AMPA Receptor Autoinactivation. Cell Rep *20*, 1123-1135.

Dürr, K. L., Chen, L., Stein, R. A., De Zorzi, R., Folea, I. M., Walz, T.,
Mchaourab, H. S., and Gouaux, E. (2014). Structure and Dynamics of AMPA
Receptor GluA2 in Resting, Pre-Open, and Desensitized States. Cell *158*, 778-
792.

Elegheert, J., Kakegawa, W., Clay, J. E., Shanks, N. F., Behiels, E., Matsuda,
K., Kohda, K., Miura, E., Rossmann, M., Mitakidis, N., Motohashi, J., Chang, V.
T., Siebold, C., Greger, I. H., Nakagawa, T., Yuzaki, M., and Aricescu, A. R.
(2016). Structural basis for integration of GluD receptors within synaptic
organizer complexes. Science *353*, 295-299.

Geiger, J. R., Melcher, T., Koh, D. S., Sakmann, B., Seeburg, P. H., Jonas, P.,
and Monyer, H. (1995). Relative abundance of subunit mRNAs determines
gating and Ca2+ permeability of AMPA receptors in principal neurons and
interneurons in rat CNS. Neuron *15*, 193-204.

Guan, L., Murphy, F. D., and Kaback, H. R. (2002). Surface-exposed positions
in the transmembrane helices of the lactose permease of Escherichia coli
determined by intermolecular thiol cross-linking. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *99*,
3475-3480.

Herguedas, B., García-Nafría, J., Cais, O., Fernández-Leiro, R., Krieger, J., Ho,
H., and Greger, I. H. (2016). Structure and organization of heteromeric AMPA-
type glutamate receptors. Science

High, B., Cole, A. A., Chen, X., and Reese, T. S. (2015). Electron microscopic
tomography reveals discrete transcleft elements at excitatory and inhibitory
synapses. Front Synaptic Neurosci *7*, 9.

Jackson, A. C., and Nicoll, R. A. (2011). The Expanding Social Network of
Ionotropic Glutamate Receptors: TARPs and Other Transmembrane Auxiliary
Subunits. Neuron *70*, 178-199.

Kaae, B. H., Harpsøe, K., Kastrup, J. S., Sanz, A. C., Pickering, D. S., Metzler,
B., Clausen, R. P., Gajhede, M., Sauerberg, P., Liljefors, T., and Madsen, U.
(2007). Structural proof of a dimeric positive modulator bridging two identical
AMPA receptor-binding sites. Chem Biol *14*, 1294-1303.

Kenyon, G. L., and Bruice, T. W. (1977). Novel sulfhydryl reagents. Methods
Enzymol *47*, 407-430.

Lau, A. Y., Salazar, H., Blachowicz, L., Ghisi, V., Plested, A. J. R., and Roux,
B. (2013). A conformational intermediate in glutamate receptor activation.
Neuron *79*, 492-503.

Liu, Y., Holmgren, M., Jurman, M. E., and Yellen, G. (1997). Gated access to
the pore of a voltage-dependent K+ channel. Neuron *19*, 175-184.

Loo, T. W., and Clarke, D. M. (2001). Determining the dimensions of the drug-
binding domain of human P-glycoprotein using thiol cross-linking compounds
as molecular rulers. J Biol Chem *276*, 36877-36880.

Meyerson, J. R., Kumar, J., Chittori, S., Rao, P., Pierson, J., Bartesaghi, A.,
Mayer, M. L., and Subramaniam, S. (2014). Structural mechanism of glutamate
receptor activation and desensitization. Nature *514*, 328-334.

Meyerson, J. R., Chittori, S., Merk, A., Rao, P., Han, T. H., Serpe, M., Mayer,
M. L., and Subramaniam, S. (2016). Structural basis of kainate subtype
glutamate receptor desensitization. Nature *537*, 567-571.

Nakagawa, T., Cheng, Y., Ramm, E., Sheng, M., and Walz, T. (2005). Structure
and different conformational states of native AMPA receptor complexes. Nature
433, 545-549.

Plested, A. J. R., and Mayer, M. L. (2009). AMPA receptor ligand binding
domain mobility revealed by functional cross linking. J Neurosci *29*, 11912-
11923.

Riva, I., Eibl, C., Volkmer, R., Carbone, A. L., and Plested, A. J. (2017). Control
of AMPA receptor activity by the extracellular loops of auxiliary proteins. Elife
6,

Robert, A., and Howe, J. R. (2003). How AMPA receptor desensitization
depends on receptor occupancy. J Neurosci *23*, 847-858.

Rosenmund, C., Stern-Bach, Y., and Stevens, C. F. (1998). The tetrameric
structure of a glutamate receptor channel. Science *280*, 1596-1599.

Saglietti, L., Dequidt, C., Kamieniarz, K., Rousset, M.-C., Valnegri, P.,
Thoumine, O., Beretta, F., Fagni, L., Choquet, D., Sala, C., Sheng, M., and
Passafaro, M. (2007). Extracellular interactions between GluR2 and N-cadherin
in spine regulation. Neuron *54*, 461-477.

Salazar, H., Eibl, C., Chebli, M., and Plested, A. (2017). Mechanism of partial
agonism in AMPA-type glutamate receptors. Nat Commun *8*, 14327.

Schwenk, J., Harmel, N., Brechet, A., Zolles, G., Berkefeld, H., Müller, C. S.,
Bildl, W., Baehrens, D., Hüber, B., Kulik, A., Klöcker, N., Schulte, U., and
Fakler, B. (2012). High-resolution proteomics unravel architecture and
molecular diversity of native AMPA receptor complexes. Neuron *74*, 621-633.

Shi, Y., Lu, W., Milstein, A. D., and Nicoll, R. A. (2009). The stoichiometry of
AMPA receptors and TARPs varies by neuronal cell type. Neuron *62*, 633-640.

Sobolevsky, A. I., Rosconi, M. P., and Gouaux, E. (2009). X-ray structure,
symmetry and mechanism of an AMPA-subtype glutamate receptor. Nature
462, 745-756.

Sobolevsky, A. I., Yelshansky, M. V., and Wollmuth, L. P. (2003). Different
gating mechanisms in glutamate receptor and K+ channels. J Neurosci *23*,
7559-7568.

Sun, Y., Olson, R., Horning, M., Armstrong, N., Mayer, M., and Gouaux, E.
(2002). Mechanism of glutamate receptor desensitization. Nature *417*, 245-
253.

Tajima, N., Karakas, E., Grant, T., Simorowski, N., Diaz-Avalos, R., Grigorieff,
N., and Furukawa, H. (2016). Activation of NMDA receptors and the mechanism
of inhibition by ifenprodil. Nature

Takatsuka, Y., and Nikaido, H. (2010). Site-directed disulfide cross-linking to
probe conformational changes of a transporter during its functional cycle:
Escherichia coli AcrB multidrug exporter as an example. Methods Mol Biol *634*,
343-354.

Tao, C. L., Liu, Y. T., Sun, R., Zhang, B., Qi, L., Shivakoti, S., Tian, C. L., Zhang,
P., Lau, P. M., Zhou, Z. H., and Bi, G. Q. (2018). Differentiation and
Characterization of Excitatory and Inhibitory Synapses by Cryo-electron
Tomography and Correlative Microscopy. J Neurosci *38*, 1493-1510.

Taschenberger, H., and von Gersdorff, H. (2000). Fine-tuning an auditory
synapse for speed and fidelity: developmental changes in presynaptic
waveform, EPSC kinetics, and synaptic plasticity. J Neurosci *20*, 9162-9173.

Tomita, S., Adesnik, H., Sekiguchi, M., Zhang, W., Wada, K., Howe, J. R.,
Nicoll, R. A., and Bredt, D. S. (2005). Stargazin modulates AMPA receptor
gating and trafficking by distinct domains. Nature *435*, 1052-1058.

Twomey, E. C., Yelshanskaya, M. V., Grassucci, R. A., Frank, J., and
Sobolevsky, A. I. (2017a). Channel opening and gating mechanism in AMPA-
subtype glutamate receptors. Nature

Twomey, E. C., Yelshanskaya, M. V., Grassucci, R. A., Frank, J., and
Sobolevsky, A. I. (2017b). Structural Bases of Desensitization in AMPA
Receptor-Auxiliary Subunit Complexes. Neuron *94*, 569-580.e5.

Winn, M. D., Ballard, C. C., Cowtan, K. D., Dodson, E. J., Emsley, P., Evans,
P. R., Keegan, R. M., Krissinel, E. B., Leslie, A. G. W., McCoy, A., McNicholas,

S. J., Murshudov, G. N., Pannu, N. S., Potterton, E. A., Powell, H. R., Read, R.
J., Vagin, A., and Wilson, K. S. (2011). Overview of the CCP4 suite and current
developments. Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr *67*, 235-242.

Xu-Friedman, M. A., and Regehr, W. G. (2003). Ultrastructural contributions to
desensitization at cerebellar mossy fiber to granule cell synapses. J Neurosci
23, 2182-2192.

Yelshanskaya, M. V., Li, M., and Sobolevsky, A. I. (2014). Structure of an
agonist-bound ionotropic glutamate receptor. Science *345*, 1070-1074.

Yelshanskaya, M. V., Saotome, K., Singh, A. K., and Sobolevsky, A. I. (2016).
Probing Intersubunit Interfaces in AMPA-subtype Ionotropic Glutamate
Receptors. Sci Rep *6*, 19082.

Yelshansky, M. V., Sobolevsky, A. I., Jatzke, C., and Wollmuth, L. P. (2004).
Block of AMPA receptor desensitization by a point mutation outside the ligand-
binding domain. Journal of Neuroscience *24*, 4728-4736.

Zhang, W., Devi, S. P. S., Tomita, S., and Howe, J. R. (2014). Auxiliary proteins
promote modal gating of AMPA- and kainate-type glutamate receptors. Eur J
Neurosci *39*, 1138-1147.

Zhu, S., Stein, R. A., Yoshioka, C., Lee, C. H., Goehring, A., Mchaourab, H. S.,
and Gouaux, E. (2016). Mechanism of NMDA Receptor Inhibition and
Activation. Cell *165*, 704-714.

Zuber, B., Nikonenko, I., Klauser, P., Muller, D., and Dubochet, J. (2005). The
mammalian central nervous synaptic cleft contains a high density of periodically
organized complexes. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *102*, 19192-19197.

1002

 Supplementary Material

 Supplementary Table 1 Statistics of trapping desensitized A2 wild-type (WT),

 A665C and V666C receptors with different bis-MTS cross-linkers. The

 statistics in the Table accompanies data in Fig. 2D-E. The effect was

 measured after 1 minute of exposure to a bis-MTS.

Desensitizing receptors						
A2 WT						
	M1M	M3M	bMTSp	M6M	M8M	M10M
Active Fraction	0.89	0.84	0.78	0.88	0.85	0.81
SEM:	0.08	0.06	0.08	0.07	0.05	0.05
n:	4	11	6	6	6	8
A2 A665C						
	M1M	M3M	bMTSp	M6M	M8M	M10M
Active Fraction	-	0.45	0.48	0.53	0.48	0.40
SEM:	-	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.075	0.03
n:	-	4	7	0.01	8	5
P (vs. WT):	-	0.02	0.02	7	0.006	0.003
A2 V666C						
	M1M	M3M	bMTSp	M6M	M8M	M10M
Active Fraction	0.14	0.12	0.070	0.12	0.11	0.30
SEM:	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.03
n:	6	13	7	7	9	16
P (vs. WT):	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	0.0004	0.0002	$< 10^{-7}$

1010 **Supplementary Table 2** Statistics of trapping active V666C receptors with

1011 different bis-MTS cross-linkers. The statistics in the Table accompany data in

1012 Fig. 5B.

Active receptors							
A2 V666C							
	M1M	M3M	bMTSp	M6M	M8M	M10M	w/o MTS
Active Fraction	0.51	0.38	0.29	0.32	0.23	0.48	0.82
SEM:	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.05	0.03
n:	12	9	9	8	9	12	38
P (vs. w/o MTS):	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	$< 10^{-7}$	

1013

Supplementary Figure 1 Effects of bis-MTS cross-linkers on A2 S662C and A2 I664C mutants. (A) Distances between sulfhydryl groups of S662C and I664C residues in the respective full-length cryo-EM structures (PDB accession codes in capitals). Colour-coding as in Fig. 1. (B) Lenghts and structures of MTS compounds used to probe S662C and I664C distances in agonist-bound states. (C) Summary of trapping effects for cross-linkers M3M-M10M for S662C mutant compared with WT. WT data are the same as in Fig. 2D-E. Trapping effect was measured as a ratio of the peak current post and pre-trap as described in Fig. 2. Dashed line indicates no effect. (D) Same as in (C), but for I664C mutant.

Supplementary Figure 2 Bis-MTS cross-linkers potentiate A2 K493C currents by accessing intra-dimer space. (A) Position of the K493C mutant in a full-length A2 receptor (PDB: 3KG). Subunits are colour-coded as in Fig. 1 and Cα atoms of K493C are shown as spheres. Top down view of the LBDs shows intra-dimer position of the mutation. (B) Effects of bis-MTS cross-linkers M1M-M10M on peak currents (black) and steady-state currents (red) of K493C mutant. Trapping effects are shown as a ratio of averaged post-trap over averaged pre-trap currents (encircled in (C)). Dashed line indicates no effect. (C) Current traces of A2 K493C receptors during trapping with various bis-MTS cross-linkers. Legend is the same as in Fig. 2A-C. Baseline is indicated as a black, dashed line at the bottom of each trace. Note current increase during the cross-linker application (thick, red line). (D) Zooms of encircled pre- and post-trap control pulses from traces in (C).

1042

1043

Supplementary figure 3 Bis-MTS compounds do not form inter-receptor

cross-links. (A) Extracellular domains of an A2 receptor (subunits colour-

coded as in Fig. 1), with S atoms of wild-type, free cysteines shown as magenta

spheres and of A665C and V666C mutants as cyan spheres. (B) Plot

summarizing size of the trapping effect vs. absolute peak current in the patch

for M3M (red), M6M (green), M8M (blue) and M10M (black) cross-linkers. Solid

lines are linear regression fits with the resulting R^2 indicated in brackets.

1051

Supplementary Figure 4 No silent modification of active V666C receptors.
(A) To check whether M10M modifies active V666C receptors silently, a patch
containing V666C receptors was first exposed to Glu (10 mM) and M10M (1
μM) in CTZ (100 μM) to block desensitization as shown in (1). Colours are as
in Fig. 2 and 4. The patch was then exposed to short (100 ms) jumps into 10
mM Glu (in reducing conditions), until CTZ unbound (2). Freely desensitizing
receptors in the same patch were then exposed again to M10M and glutamate,
without CTZ (3). (B) Summary of effects on V666C receptors in active state
(M10M+CTZ) and after CTZ unbinding (M10M-CTZ) (paired recordings). For
comparison, the trapping of patches that were never treated with CTZ (M10M)
is also plotted. Pre- and post-trap current amplitudes were measured from
ringed regions in (A). P value compares patches from which CTZ unbound and
patches that were never treated with CTZ. (C) Time constant of deactivation
(τ_{OFF}) was measured for active V666C receptors before (blue) and after (red) 1
min trap in M10M (from control pulses as indicated with a blue and red star in
(A-1)). Normalized current decays were fit with a monoexponential. (D)
Summary of τ_{OFF} as determined in (C).