Conductance Characteristics of Interactive Subunit Membranes

A. H. Bretag and D. I. B. Kerr

School of Pharmacy, South Australian Institute of Technology and Department of Human Physiology and Pharmacology, University of Adelaide, Adelaide

Membrane channels formed by groups of subunits with a special form of interaction between the subunits provide a simple basis for models of membrane conductance. It is shown how the subunit interaction can explain conductance kinetics; particular attention being paid to characteristics of the potassium conductance in the squid piant axon.

We have arrived at an explanation for some of the unique features of ion conductance through cell membranes. Here we show how "induction" and "superposition" of potassium conductance in the squid axon[1,2] can result from a special form of interaction between subunits of a planar array membrane. Various forms of interaction and cooperativity have been considered previously in attempts to describe potassium conductance[2-11], but few of these have proved any more successful than the original non-interactive Hodgkin-Huxley[12] formulation.

In several cases where claims have been made for potassium conductance models involving membrane subunit or pore interactions[4-9], it has been shown that the mathematical descriptions of the models are approximations only[2-5]. In particular, accurate computations of Adam's model[6] by Hill and Chen[2,3] have shown his approximation to be invalid and his model to be inadequate.

By contrast, the approximations shared by the models of Bretag, Davis and Kerr[4,5], Tille[7] and Starzak[8,9] remain, so far undisputed. The validity of these approximations and their relation to the exact mathematical description of the interaction in these models will be discussed in a forthcoming publication. Meanwhile, further consideration of the form of the interaction has provided a simple mechanistic explanation for the conductance characteristics of the models.

The interaction in these models occurs between nearest neighbour sites in a two dimensional lattice representing the membrane. Sites may exist in two states, active and inactive. The special constraint is that a site cannot undergo a change of state unless it is situated adjacent to a site in the active state.

"Seeding" or "nucleation" is a natural consequence of this form of interaction with the rate of increase in the number of active sites being low while the number of such sites is low and increasing as the number of active sites increases. In other words, if the external determinant of site activation (*e. g.* membrane potential) is increased, then the initial rate of increase in the number of active sites will depend upon the number of such sites existing at that time. Consequently, the models demonstrate "induction" and the duration of the induction period depends on the initial number of activated sites (Fig. 1). Inflexion occurs in the rate of increase when further increase in the number of active sites becomes limited by either the level of the external activation determinant or, eventually, by the shortage of activable sites. This, of course, always assumes that the proportion of active sites is being increased from a low level where not all inactive sites are nearest neighbours of active sites; which leads us to the second important property of these models.


Fig. 1. Induction behaviour. a. Induction illustrated by an arbitrary function

$$x = f(t),$$

where x has been plotted against

$$t' = t - t_0,$$

t_0 being the point chosen for the origin of the abscissa. The smaller the value of x at $t = t_0$, the longer the induction period. b. Induction illustrated by activation in a square lattice where only nearest neighbours may be activated. Beginning with one active site, four further sites may be activated, while beginning with two, three or four; six, at least seven, or at least eight respectively, may be activated. Active sites are indicated by "8", inactive nearest neighbours by "4" and other inactive sites by "1".

Once the proportion of active sites is great enough so that effectively all inactive sites are nearest neighbours of active sites, then further activation is free of our constraint regarding interaction: further activation then being dependent

solely on the level of the external determinant and the availability of activable sites. The rate of activation is thereafter constant at any specified proportion of active sites, for a fixed external determinant.


Fig. 2. Square array structure for a potassium-conducting subunit membrane. The rounded form of a subunit indicates the activated state, "8", which, when present in all subunits of a minimum functional group (all subunits adjacent to A), allows the formation of a conducting channel or pore at A. Openings at B and C are considered inadequate for the passage of ions.

a
```
41111484444848488884411488848414841448488448448441
841114848448484884841148444414841111484441448844484
411414884844844414441114888841484414114848414848441
111484844484148484444144848484414484841484411141441
148448841484848444888488488841484448444484111148841
484148414484484111444448484148488844884841114844414
488414444848444111114844414148484841144444111484144 8
144148844448484111148848841448444141114884114884488 48
111114848448841141448448448884111111148444114848448 414
411484448844441484844114148486414111484884448484441
844441488844484884444841111141484841144148884844848 4
448844148488448444441144114111148411484144444411144 1
148848484848444841148444844111144114888484444884411 111
484848841148444141148484448414841114484488844484141
114484448414441114848111448448441188868888411414848
148888418484148414844111114844844114144444844114848 44
148848484848414114841144488418884488411114111148444 841
414448441414841141148888488448884141141111411414484 11
841488844114841411484888441484844148414844484844111
411148848414441484114848484148444848484844114414441 11
414414414148414414148888411144148864441148848864484 14
848884841114444844844448884114884488448841144884488 448
848488844484844448484444441114848484444114448484484 88
48444444848448844148484884448844144484488448441488844
144844144141444844448488448444844448448664418884 4
148488488644488848488864114111488841144841448484 48
41484144444484848448444841111414444848484444148444 114
848484448414841444148414484448488414111444884141148
414141484114114841148411448884148411111484484484841 484
```

b
```
444488488844448888848448444484488488664488888888 8
48888414848484444484444148888888848888448448448488888
84888414844884884844884488848441484448488888448888
41448848888488488884448884488484844848448888448888
84488884488488848448448844848488684188484848444884
888448448884488888888888888488448488488848484488848
848484884888841448448488888448848884118444884414 44485
448488888484848888444444418888888888448448888848888444
11488848448448444848488484148448488484841484448884488
11444888844884884484888848448844884848484848884884484
148488484448488484488888848888888848488884888848884
488488488884844848888884848848848888848488848484844
88488848448848844448484484444888884888884848884888
84444414444848888884844884448444488488844488884 4
888844448888488844484411144844148488448884848448448
84848488888488448444441488884488848488448884888484 4
888841484488484888484888848444884484184884884888448
4848448848844846888888844886448844848444888414448 4888
844848888448848484444884884844484848884848448484 1488
848844484411448841488448488888888448484848484444848 44
44441448488888888844884448444484848488888444884844 1
888484848484484484888484488448448884848848444844 4
444844884448488884444488884488488848488848888888 441
484848448484844848888488844448488488488888848888441
884844884848888844488884488884444484844848888884848 4
484884888844884844484444884888484884444888848884884
48884444848488488444884484848484884848448488884884
48484448488488444884448448884848884888448448848888
88888484884414848488848888888888844884144884848448 4
88884148484884888488488884484884848444884484884888
```

Fig. 3. Parts of two 50 × 50 square arrays representing potassium-conducting patches of membrane. Subunits are labelled as in Fig. 1. In the first array (a) 26.2% of subunits were randomly set as active. Of those remaining 67.8% were then nearest neighbours of the active subunits. In the second array (b) 55.9% of subunits were randomly set as active. This time 98.8% of the remainder were nearest neighbours. These two cases represent epuilibrium potassium conductances, 0.4% and 9.8% of maximum, respectively, in the BDK square array model.

Thus rates of further activation to a fixed higher level show "superposition". That this is a legitimate property of the Bretag, Davis and Kerr [4] (BDK) potassium conductance model can be illustrated in the following way:

Let us consider a square array for the lattice where four neighbouring sites are required to be simultaneously activated to produce a potassium conductance channel (Fig. 2). Potassium conductance thus depends (if the site distribution is random) on the fourth power of the relative number of active sites. Then, for the resting potassium conductance to be close to that observed experimentally at the normal resting potential [13], it is necessary for the proportion of active sites to be about 25% (c. f. $n_0 = 0.24$ for the Hodgkin-Huxley [12] activating particle model). This proportion is already close to that where effectively all inactive sites are nearest neighbours of active sites (Fig. 3). Hence, kinetics for potassium currents, even only slightly above the resting level, will be approximately superimposable for a potential step to a fixed higher potential level. Any initial deviation would rapidly become insignificant as the potassium current increased.

The BDK model is therefore able to fit the experimental data of Cole and Moore [1] with respect to both induction and superposition, even though it does not strictly obey the conditions of stochastic independence of sites imposed by both Hill and Chen [2] and Albano [14]. This is because the working range of the model includes two distinctly different regions: one where there is significant interaction which specifies induction and another where there is no significant interaction which allows superposition.

Although the principles involved in the BDK model are therefore sound, it should be noted that the parameters used in the model were derived by fitting curves to the experimental potassium conductance data of Hogdkin and Huxley [12].

Recent work [15, 16] indicates that such modelling is in error because the conductance curves of Hodgkin and Huxley [12] are not true axolemmal conductance curves; these latter authors having failed to consider potassium ion accumulation in the Schwann Cell Layer (S.C.L.). However, conflicting views of the seriousness of the error are presented [15, 16]. Adam [15] even implies that axolemmal conductance kinetics may indeed not be superimposable and that the superposition of current curves may result from modifications imposed by the S.C.L. We feel that his extreme view is argued against by the experimental results of Cole and Moore [1]. Potassium currents following conditioning hyperpolarisation to various levels were just as superimposable as those following conditioning depolarisation. In the prior case, S.C.L. effects would be identical and inpendent of the level of conditioning hyperpolarisation, which strongly suggests that axolemmal conductance is superimposable. In fact, Adelman, Palti and Senft [16] take the view that axolemmal conductance is satisfactorily modelled merely by adjusting the maximum conductance $\overline{g}_K$ and the rate constants α_n and β_n in the Hodgkin-Huxley formulation. We are therefore confident that similar minor alterations to our model would enable it also to describe these recent findings as well as maintaining its ability to describe Cole-Moore induction and superposition.

Finally, we feel that the form of interaction specified in the BDK model may also prove more widely applicable: especially if the constraint is relaxed to allow some probability of change of state in those sites not situated adjacent to an active site.

[1] K. S. Cole and J. W. Moore, Biophys. J. **1**, 1 [1960].
[2] T. L. Hill and Y. Chen, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S. **68**, 1711 [1971].
[3] Y. Chen and T. L. Hill, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S. **70**, 62 [1973].
[4] A. H. Bretag, B. R. Davis, and D. I. B. Kerr, J. Membr. Biol. **16**, 363 [1974].
[5] A. H. Bretag, C. A. Hurst, and D. I. B. Kerr, J. Theor. Biol. **48**, 477 [1974].
[6] G. Adam, Physical Principles of Biological Membranes (F. Snell, J. Wolken, G. Iversen, and J. Lam, eds.), p. 35, Gordon and Breach, New York 1970.
[7] J. Tille, Biophys. J. **5**, 163 [1965].
[8] M. E. Starzak, J. Theor. Biol. **39**, 487 [1973].
[9] M. E. Starzak, J. Theor. Biol. **39**, 505 [1973].
[10] D. M. J. Quastel, Physiology Canada **4**, 203 [1973].
[11] T. L. Hill and Y. Chen, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S. **68**, 2488 [1971].
[12] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley, J. Physiol. (London) **117**, 500 [1952].
[13] A. L. Hodgkin and A. F. Huxley, J. Physiol. (London) **116**, 473 [1952].
[14] A. M. Albano, J. Theor. Biol. **45**, 275 [1974].
[15] G. Adam, J. Membr. Biol. **13**, 353 [1973].
[16] W. J. Adelman, Y. Palti, and J. P. Senft, J. Membr. Biol. **13**, 387 [1973].