Hyperpolarization-activated Chloride Currents in *Xenopus* Oocytes
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**ABSTRACT** During hyperpolarizing pulses, defolliculated *Xenopus* oocytes have time- and voltage-dependent inward chloride currents. The currents vary greatly in amplitude from batch to batch; activate slowly and, in general, do not decay; have a selectivity sequence of I− > NO3− > Br− > Cl− > propionate > acetate; are insensitive to Ca2+ and pH; are blocked by Ba2+ and some chloride channel blockers; and have a gating valence of ~1.3 charges. In contrast to hyperpolarization-activated chloride currents induced after expression of phospholemman (Palmer, C. J., B. T. Scott, and L. R. Jones. 1991. *Journal of Biological Chemistry.* 266:11126; Moorman, J. R., C. J. Palmer, J. E. John, J. E. Durieux, and L. R. Jones. 1992. 267:14551), these endogenous currents are smaller; have a different pharmacologic profile; have a lower threshold for activation and lower voltage-sensitivity of activation; have different activation kinetics; and are insensitive to pH. Nonetheless, the endogenous and expressed current share striking similarities. Recordings of macroscopic oocyte currents may be inadequate to determine whether phospholemman is itself an ion channel and not a channel-modulating molecule.

**INTRODUCTION**

*Xenopus* oocytes have at least two kinds of hyperpolarization-activated Cl− currents. Parker and Miledi (1988) reported a Ca2+-insensitive, noninactivating I(Cl), and Miledi (1982) and Peres and Bernardini (1983) described another I(Cl) which is Ca2+-sensitive and inactivates over several seconds. We have further characterized the Ca2+-insensitive, noninactivating hyperpolarization-activated I(Cl) which we call I(Cl(endo)). A major goal was to compare and contrast I(Cl(endo)) with another hyperpolarization-activated I(Cl) which is induced after oocyte expression of phospholemman (PLM), a 72 amino acid membrane protein which is a major substrate for protein kinases A and C (Palmer, Scott, and Jones, 1991). We call this expressed current I(Cl(PLM)) (Moorman, Palmer, John, Durieux, and Jones, 1992). I(Cl(endo)) has several characteristics in common with I(Cl(PLM)), and allows the possibility that PLM may modify I(Cl(endo)).
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MATERIALS AND METHODS

Oocyte Preparation

Our methods for oocyte isolation, RNA preparation and injection, and microelectrode voltage clamping have been described (Durieux, Salafranca, Lynch, and Moorman, 1992; Moorman et al., 1992). In this study, oocytes were evaluated 1 to 10 d after isolation and were defolliculated manually the day of or one day before electrophysiologic study.

Electrophysiological Analysis

Membrane currents were measured with a two-microelectrode voltage clamp (OC-725, Warner Instruments, New Haven, CT) and pCLAMP (Axon Instruments, Foster City, CA). Microelectrodes were beveled to resistances of 1-3 MΩ and contained (in mM): KCl 3000, EGTA 10, HEPES 10 (pH 7.3). Hyperpolarizing and depolarizing pulses were administered from a holding potential of -10 mV at 0.1-0.15 Hz. Currents were filtered at 40 Hz and sampled at 0.5 to 1 kHz. The external solution was perfused at 3-4 ml/min and contained (mM): NaCl 150, KCl 5, CaCl₂ 2, MgCl₂ 1, dextrose 10, and HEPES 10 (pH 7.4, NaOH). Data are represented as mean ± standard deviation unless noted otherwise. Current waveforms were fit to a sum of two exponentials function of the form:

\[ I(t) = I_o + A_1 \exp\left(-t/\tau_1\right) + A_2 \exp\left(-t/\tau_2\right). \]

For measurement of reversal potentials, the chamber was initially perfused with a solution that contained (mM): NaCl 20, KCl 5, CaCl₂ 2, MgCl₂ 1, dextrose 10, MES 180, and HEPES 10 (pH 7.4). The perfusate was changed by a series of solutions in which MES was replaced by Cl⁻. The Cl⁻ concentrations were (mM) 31, 47, 75, 123, and 211. Currents were activated by 1-3 s voltage steps to -160 to -220 mV, then the voltage was changed to values between -60 and 30 mV in steps of 2.5 to 10 mV. The decay phase of the tail currents was fit to an exponential function, and the extrapolated initial amplitudes were plotted as a function of tail potential. The interpolated x-intercept of this plot was taken as the reversal potential.

For measurement of the steepness of the voltage dependence of gating of the current, we measured the peak amplitude of tail currents after hyperpolarizing steps. After a 2-s hyperpolarizing step to potentials between -30 and -160 mV in decrements of 10 mV, the voltage was stepped to 10 or 40 mV. These potentials were selected because they do not significantly activate the endogenous Ca²⁺-activated Cl⁻ current I_{caCl} (Miledi, 1982; Barish, 1983). Tail current amplitudes were normalized for each oocyte by dividing by the amplitude of the largest tail current. The derived values are equivalent to the probability of opening, or \( P_o \). The log of \( P_o \) was plotted as a function of hyperpolarizing conditioning pulse potential, and a straight line was plotted through the values of \( P_o \) between 0.01 and 0.1. The gating valence \( z \), which reflects the minimum number of charges traversing the full thickness of the membrane during channel opening (Hille, 1992), is related to the slope of the line, \( \log P_o/V \):

\[ z = \frac{2.303 \frac{RT}{F} \log P_o}{V} \]

where \( R, T, \) and \( F \) have their usual meanings.

For measurement of permeability ratios \( P_X/P_{Cl} \), we measured reversal potentials in solutions with concentrations (mM): NaX 150, HEPES 20, dextrose 10, Ca(OH)₂ 1 (pH 6.5 to 7.0) where \( X \) corresponds to Cl⁻, Br⁻, NO₃⁻, I⁻, acetate, and propionate. Oocytes were first tested in the Cl⁻ solution. The second solution was perfused at a rate of 3-4 ml/min until the bath volume of 3 ml had been exchanged at least 8 to 10 times. The reversal potentials were determined as described above. Each oocyte was tested once in Cl⁻ and once in one other anion solution, and
was then discarded. The permeability ratios were calculated as (Hille, 1992):

\[
\frac{P_X}{P_{cl^-}} = \exp \left( \frac{\Delta E_{rev} + F}{RT} \right)
\]

where \( \Delta E_{rev} = (E_{rev,X} - E_{rev,cl^-}) \). We assumed that the internal concentration of ions was constant during the period of measurement.

The Cl\(^-\) channel blocking agents niflumic acid, bumetanide, 4,4'-diisothiocyanostilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid (DIDS), 4-acetamido-4-isothiocyanostilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid (SITS), and anthracene-9-carboxylic acid (9-AC) (all from Sigma Chemical Co., St. Louis, MO) were prepared at concentrations of 1 or 2 mM solutions in the standard external solution. After measurement of the current-voltage relationship in the external solution alone, we perfused the recording chamber with 8 to 10 bath volumes of the external solution with a blocking agent and repeated the measurement. Each oocyte was tested once with one blocking agent and then discarded. We measured the difference in current amplitude from the beginning to the end of 2-s pulses to a test potential of \(-150\) or \(-190\) mV, and we tabulated the ratio of this amplitude in the presence of blocker to the same measurement in the absence of blocker.

**RESULTS**

**Endogenous Hyperpolarization-activated Currents Showed a Spectrum of Current Decay Kinetics**

Fig. 1 shows hyperpolarization-activated currents elicited from defolliculated *Xenopus* oocytes. Though all activated relatively quickly, decay kinetics differed. The currents shown in A reached a peak and decayed, those in C continued to activate throughout the 2-s pulse, and those in B showed intermediate kinetics. Most of the currents we observed had kinetics similar to C. As an index of current kinetics, we measured the difference in current amplitude from 400 ms (or the peak, if there was one) to the end of the 2-s test pulse. D is a frequency histogram of the amplitude of these developed currents. Values less than 0 indicate noninactivating currents such as in C, and predominate the histogram.

Activation kinetics could be described as a sum of two exponentials. In 11 oocytes from four batches with large, noninactivating currents at a test potential of \(-140\) mV, the time constants (and relative weights) were 200 ± 96 ms (0.29 ± 0.15) and 13,230 ± 8,055 ms (0.71 ± 0.15).

Parker and Miledi (1988) found that the magnitude of \( \text{ICl}(\text{endo}) \) fell as the number of days after oocyte isolation increased. This phenomenon was not prominent in our experience with \( \text{ICl}(\text{endo}) \). Generally, the amplitude of \( \text{ICl}(\text{endo}) \) did not vary predictably. For example, from a single batch of oocytes (\( n = 15 \)) studied on days 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 after isolation, the mean currents at \(-150\) mV were (\( \mu A \)): 8.7, 3.9, 8.3, 6.3, and 4.8 respectively.

**Current Amplitudes Varied Among Batches of Oocytes**

An important feature of \( \text{ICl}(\text{endo}) \) is its variability among batches of oocytes. Fig. 2 A is a boxplot of current amplitudes as a function of batch number. The 32 batches, from at least 15 frogs, were studied from June, 1992, to February, 1993. For this analysis, we subtracted the instantaneous current and measured the current developed during a 2-s pulse to a test potential of \(-150\) mV. Variability of the current amplitudes is
FIGURE 1. Kinetics of $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$. Currents were elicited during steps from a holding potential of $-10\ mV$ to test potentials of $-30$ to $-160\ mV$ in $10\ mV$ decrements. There is no correction for leak or capacitance currents. Bar is $0.5\ s$ and (A) $1\ \mu A$, or (B, C) $2\ \mu A$. The times to half-maximal activation at a test potential of $-140\ mV$ are (A) $64\ ms$, (B) $126\ ms$, and (C) $326\ ms$.

$D$ is a histogram of current amplitudes from 98 oocytes with the largest currents from 22 batches. Current amplitude was measured as the difference of $I_{100\ \text{msec}}$ and $I_{2\ \text{sec}}$ for currents without peaks (e.g., Fig. 1 C), or the difference between $I_{\text{peak}}$ and $I_{2\ \text{sec}}$. A negative value means that current increased throughout the trace; a positive number means that current decayed during the trace.

seen between batches and within batches. Generally, most batches of oocytes showed small currents at this test potential. Oocytes from 17 batches never had currents $> 3\ \mu A$, whereas others ranged up to $12.4\ \mu A$. In batches of oocytes with large $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$, nearly every oocyte had currents. In batches with small or no $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$ at a test potential of $-150\ mV$, currents could be elicited by hyperpolarization to $-180$ to $-200\ mV$ (e.g., Fig. 5 A). We could discern no phenotypic marker of frogs or oocytes with large $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$. Oocytes were Dumont stage V-VI and did not have germinal vesicle breakdown.

FIGURE 2. Variability of $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$ amplitude and kinetics. A is a boxplot of the currents at the end of a 2-s hyperpolarization pulse minus instantaneous current, from $-10\ mV$ to a test potential of $-150\ mV$. The data are from 32 batches of oocytes with $n = 2$ to 32 oocytes. The line in the middle is the median; the box encompasses the 25th through 75th percentiles; the hatches encompass the 10th through the 90th. $B$ is a frequency histogram of the current amplitudes. The smooth line is of the form:

$$F(I) = 1.8 \times 10^4 (0.26\ \mu A \sqrt{2\pi})^{-1} \times \exp\left(-\frac{(I + 0.01\ \mu A)^2}{2(0.26\ \mu A)^2}\right)$$

and encompasses $\sim 190$ of the 299 current amplitudes.
Fig. 2B is a frequency histogram of the same data as A. The median current amplitude of 299 oocytes was 0.24 μA (mean 1.1 μA, standard deviation 2.1 μA). Current amplitudes of about two-thirds of the oocytes belonged to a Gaussian distribution with a mean near 0 μA.

The Current Was Anion-selective

We measured the reversal potential for multiple values of [Cl\textsuperscript{-}]\textsubscript{o} (Fig. 3A). As expected for Cl\textsuperscript{-} currents, the reversal potential became more negative as [Cl\textsuperscript{-}]\textsubscript{o} increased. The straight line is the expected relationship for channels permeable to Cl\textsuperscript{-} alone. The deviation of the data at low [Cl\textsuperscript{-}]\textsubscript{o} concentrations suggests that other ions are permeant as well. Other Cl\textsuperscript{-} channels are imperfectly selective (Hille, 1992). Na\textsuperscript{+} has been reported to be necessary for Cl\textsuperscript{-} conduction in other Cl\textsuperscript{-} channels (Bahinski et al., 1989; Matsuoka et al., 1990). We replaced Na\textsuperscript{+} with N-methyl-D-glucamine and saw no change in current amplitude (Fig. 3B).

The Selectivity Followed the Lyotropic Sequence

In nine oocytes, the reversal potential shifted an average of −22 mV when NaI was substituted for NaCl in the bathing solution. This indicates that I\textsuperscript{-} was more...
permeant than Cl\textsuperscript--, and \( P/I/P_{Cl} = 2.45 \). Overall, the current had a selectivity profile of I\textsuperscript-- > NO\textsubscript{3} > Br\textsuperscript-- > Cl\textsuperscript-- > propionate > acetate with ratios of: 2.5: 2.0: 1.4: 1.0: 0.35: 0.17, respectively. In similar experiments, we found the selectivity profile of \( I_{C_{1}}(P_{LM}) \) also to be I\textsuperscript-- > NO\textsubscript{3} > Br\textsuperscript-- > Cl\textsuperscript-- , with ratios of 1.9: 1.7: 1.6: 1.0. Four to nine oocytes were tested for each anion. This sequence is similar to that of other Cl\textsuperscript-- channels (Franciolini and Nonner, 1987), and follows the lyotropic or Hofmeister sequence (Hille, 1992).

The Gating Valence Was Low

The current-voltage relationship (Fig. 3 C) shows that the current was activated by hyperpolarizing voltage steps, but the threshold for activation is not clear. At potentials in the range of \(-30 \text{ mV} \), near \( E_{Cl} \), the combination of low probability of channel opening and small unitary currents may have made active currents too small to detect. To clarify the voltage dependence of activation, we measured tail currents at positive potentials following 2-s hyperpolarizing steps. Fig. 3 D shows a semilogarithmic plot of normalized tail current amplitudes as a function of the voltage of the hyperpolarizing step. The straight line was fit by linear regression, and its slope yields an estimated gating valence of 1.3 charges. From this plot, we estimate that between 0.1% and 1% channels were open during steps to \(-30 \text{ or } -40 \text{ mV} \).

The Current Did Not Require Ca\textsuperscript{2+} for Activity

Fig. 4, A and B, show currents from the same oocyte bathed in 5 mM Ca\textsuperscript{2+} and in nominally 0 mM Ca\textsuperscript{2+}. In these experiments, [Mg\textsuperscript{2+}]\textsubscript{o} was adjusted so that the total divalent concentration was 5 mM. As shown previously (Peres and Bernardini, 1983; Taglietti, Tanzi, Romero, and Simoncini, 1984; Parker, Gunderson, and Miledi, 1985), there was a fast-activating, fast-inactivating component of the current that was
enhanced by \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\). The amplitude of the current at the end of the trace, however, did not decrease as \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\) was varied. Fig. 4 C is an current-voltage relationship showing the effect of \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\) on the amplitude of \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\). There was no significant change when \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\) was varied from 0 to 5 mM, suggesting that \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) did not require \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\) for its activity. In fact, \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) increased in magnitude as \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\) fell, though the change was not large or statistically significant. D shows that there is no significant change in the current after EGTA injection to an estimated oocyte concentration of 5 mM \((n = 4)\). Thus, neither extracellular nor intracellular \(\text{Ca}^{2+}\) appear mandatory for activation of \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\).  

**The Current Was Blocked by \(\text{Ba}^{2+}\) But Not by Protons**

Fig. 5 A shows that \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) was blocked by \([\text{Ba}^{2+}]_o\), with an \(I_{50}\) of 0.18 mM \((n = 8)\). The current-voltage relationship (inset) did not shift along the voltage axis, suggesting that a shift in voltage-dependent gating is not the mechanism of block. The block was not readily reversible, and higher concentrations of \(\text{Ba}^{2+}\) were added sequentially. In these oocytes, \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) was small, and large hyperpolarizations were required to elicit measurable currents.

Because low pH activates a hyperpolarization-activated CI conductance in *Xenopus* skeletal muscle (Vaughan, 1991) and increases the amplitude of \(I_{\text{Cl(PLM)}}\) (Moorman et al., 1992), we tested the effect of pH on the amplitude of \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\). Fig. 5 B shows current-voltage relationships over a range of pH. They are very similar, suggesting that \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) is insensitive to variation in pH in the range of 6.5 to 8.0.

**The Current Was Blocked by CI Channel Blockers**

Table I summarizes experiments in which we measured the amplitude of \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) at a test potential of \(-150\) or \(-190\) mV in the absence and presence of CI channel blocking agents. The extent of block was variable, and no agent was a potent blocker. Surprisingly, the two disulfonic acid derivatives SITS and DIDS gave different results. DIDS had no consistent blocking effect—the mean \(I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}\) amplitude increased slightly—while SITS blocked more than any other agent we tested (Fig. 5, C and D).

Table I also shows the effects of these agents on \(I_{\text{Cl(PLM)}}\). There are some important differences. Most notably, DIDS blocked \(I_{\text{Cl(PLM)}}\) by \(-80\)% and was equivalent to SITS.

**DISCUSSION**

We studied hyperpolarization-activated CI currents endogenous to defolliculated *Xenopus* oocytes. These currents were first reported by Parker and Miledi (1988), who described their activation by hyperpolarization, dependence of reversal potential on \([\text{Cl}^-]_o\), and independence of \([\text{Ca}^{2+}]_o\). Our most important new findings are (a) current amplitudes are variable from one batch of oocytes to the next, (b) the current does not depend on extracellular or intracellular \(\text{Ca}^{2+}\), or on extracellular Na, (c) permeability ratios follow the lyotropic or Hofmeister sequence, (d) the equivalent gating valence is much lower than for K or Na channels, (e) the current is active at very modest hyperpolarization, (f) the current is blocked by \([\text{Ba}^{2+}]_o\), and some CI channel blockers, especially SITS, and (g) the current is insensitive to variations in external pH in the range of 6.5 to 8.0.
Comparison with Other Chloride Currents

$I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$ is easily distinguished from another kind of inactivating hyperpolarization-activated Cl$^-$ current in amphibian oocytes which requires both extracellular and intracellular Ca$^{2+}$ (Peres and Bernardini, 1983; Taglietti et al., 1984; Parker et al., 1985). This current, which is sometimes present endogenously and is accentuated after injection of brain mRNA and subsequent application of peptide hormones such as serotonin (Parker et al., 1985), was rarely observed in the course of our studies (Fig. 4 A).

Hyperpolarization-activated Cl$^-$ currents with slow kinetics have also been characterized in *Aplysia* neurons (Chesnoy-Marchais, 1982, 1983) and, at low pH, in
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amphibian skeletal muscle (Warner, 1972; Loo, McLaren, and Vaughan, 1981). Large conductance Cl⁻ channels have been reported from multiple tissues, including heart (Coulombe, Ducrotier, Coraboeuf, and Touzet, 1987; Coulombe and Coraboeuf, 1992), skeletal muscle (Blatz and Magleby, 1983; Schwarze and Kohl, 1984; Woll, Leibowitz, Neumcke, and Hille, 1987) and smooth muscle (Saigusa and Kokubun, 1988; Soejima and Kokubun, 1988; Kokubun, Saigusa, and Tamura, 1991).

Recently, it has been suggested that the cystic fibrosis transmembrane regulator protein (CFTR) is a Cl⁻ channel which is regulated by intracellular cAMP (Rich, Gregory, Anderson, Manavalin, Smith, and Welsh, 1991; Bear, Duguay, Naismith, Kartner, Hanratian, and Riordan, 1991). In addition, a cardiac Cl⁻ channel that is activated by β-adrenergic agonists (Harvey and Hume, 1989; Bahinski, Nairn, Greengard, and Gadsby, 1989; Ehara and Ishihara, 1990; Matsuoka, Ehara, and Noma, 1990) may well be the product of a cardiac CFTR gene (Levesque, Hart, Hume, Kenyon, and Horowitz, 1992). This and other cardiac Cl⁻ currents and channels have been recently reviewed (Ackerman and Clapham, 1993). The identity of CFTR as an ion channel, though, has recently been challenged (Gabriel, Clarke, Boucher, and Stutts, 1993). These currents differ significantly from I_{Cl(endo)} and I_{Cl(PLM)} in at least two ways: there is little voltage-dependence of gating—the CFTR and cardiac currents, once stimulated, persist at all voltages—and extracellular Na⁺ is required, at least for the cardiac Cl⁻ current (Bahinski et al., 1989; Matsuoka et al., 1990).

Cl⁻ channel cDNA has now been cloned from a number of sources by Jentsch and co-workers (Jentsch, Steinmeyer, and Schwarz, 1990; Steinmeyer, Ortland, and Jentsch, 1991; Thiemann, Gründler, Pusch, and Jentsch, 1992). One, which they named CIC-2, induces hyperpolarization-activated Cl⁻ currents in mRNA-injected Xenopus oocytes (Thiemann et al., 1992). This current has some kinetic similarities to I_{Cl(endo)}; however, it has a different selectivity profile. It has been recently shown to be activated by changes in osmolarity, and experiments with oocyte-expressed CIC-2 mutants have led to identification of domains within the channel protein responsible for this modulation (Gründler, Thiemann, Pusch, and Jentsch, 1992).

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT</th>
<th>I_{Cl(endo)}</th>
<th>% BLOCK</th>
<th>I_{Cl(PLM)}</th>
<th>% BLOCK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ooocytes (frogs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ooocytes (frogs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIDS* 1 mM</td>
<td>-13.7 (31.9)</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>70.1 (19.1)</td>
<td>6 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niflumic acid 1 mM</td>
<td>2.7 (36.0)</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>40.8 (25.6)</td>
<td>7 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-AC 1 mM</td>
<td>14.1 (19.6)</td>
<td>12 (3)</td>
<td>27.2 (16.0)</td>
<td>5 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bumetanide 1 mM</td>
<td>15.9 (40.4)</td>
<td>11 (3)</td>
<td>29.7 (20.1)</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITS 1 mM</td>
<td>57.7 (26.8)</td>
<td>13 (3)</td>
<td>78.9 (5.5)</td>
<td>5 (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DIDS, 4,4'-diisothiocyanostilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid; 9-AC, anthracene-9-carboxylic acid; SITS, 4-acetamido-4-isothiocyanostilbene-2,2'-disulfonic acid.
Is Phospholemman an Ion Channel, or Does it Modulate $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$?

We have reported that expression of phospholemman (PLM), a 72 amino acid peptide with a single transmembrane region (Palmer et al., 1991), induces hyperpolarization-activated $\text{Cl}^-$ currents in *Xenopus* oocytes (Moorman et al., 1992). Because mutations in the hydrophobic region altered activation kinetics, we speculated that PLM was an ion channel molecule. During the course of those experiments, we did not observe the endogenous hyperpolarization-activated $\text{Cl}^-$ current described here. Fig. 6 C shows current-voltage relationships for three kinds of oocytes. The circles are data from (Moorman et al., 1992) and show our early result of large $I_{\text{Cl(PLM)}}$ in oocytes with no $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$. The triangles are from 44 oocytes studied later with large $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$. We now consider the possibility that PLM is not itself an ion channel, but rather modulates $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$.
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We begin by inspecting currents in two oocytes from the same batch, one of which was injected with PLM mRNA (Fig. 6, A and B). There are some strong similarities. Both are hyperpolarization-activated, inward anion currents which do not inactivate. They share the halide selectivity sequence $I^- > NO_3^- > Br^- > Cl^-$. Neither requires $Ca^{2+}$, and both are blocked by $Ba^{2+}$ in the sub-millimolar range.

There are, however, major differences. $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ is an order of magnitude larger, has a different pharmacologic profile, and its amplitude is modulated by pH. The activation kinetics are different—where $I_{Cl(endo)}$ activates as a sum of two exponentials, $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ has a sigmoidal delay and is better described as:

$$I(t) = I_0 + A(1 - \exp(-t/\tau_1))^N \exp(-t/\tau_2).$$

Further, were $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ a modified $I_{Cl(endo)}$, one might expect that batches of oocytes with large $I_{Cl(endo)}$ would express larger $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ after RNA injection, as there would be more substrate channels for PLM to modify. $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ would then be expected to be positively correlated with $I_{Cl(endo)}$. Fig. 6 D suggests that this is not the case. If $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ were larger in oocytes having large $I_{Cl(endo)}$, a line through the data points would have a positive slope. The figure, on the other hand, shows no clear correlation. These results suggest that the amplitude of $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ was independent of the amplitude of $I_{Cl(endo)}$, which is not the expected result if $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ is a modified $I_{Cl(endo)}$.

Moreover, $I_{Cl(endo)}$, $I_{Cl(PLM)}$, and an $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ mutant have different voltage-dependence of activation. Fig. 7 shows families of $I_{Cl(endo)}$, $I_{Cl(PLM)}$, and $I_{Cl(F28Y)}$. The PLM mutant F28Y has a polar hydroxyl group in the middle of the transmembrane region. These records, which are from oocytes of different batches, were chosen because they had similar magnitudes of tail current. As we have reported, $I_{Cl(F28Y)}$ has faster activation kinetics than $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ (Moorman et al., 1992). The tail currents show three traces with active current for $I_{Cl(endo)}$ and $I_{Cl(F28Y)}$, but only two for $I_{Cl(PLM)}$, suggesting that $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ activates at more negative potentials. Fig. 7 D shows a plot of normalized tail current amplitude as a function of the voltage of a hyperpolarizing conditioning step. The data points for $I_{Cl(endo)}$ are the same as in Fig. 3 D. The gating valence for $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ is 2.2 charges, and significantly exceeds the value of 1.4 for $I_{Cl(F28Y)}$ as well as the value of 1.3 for $I_{Cl(endo)}$. In addition, the threshold for activation is significantly more negative for $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ than for the others, about $-80 \, mV$ for activation of 0.1 to 1% of maximum current, compared with $-30$ to $-40 \, mV$.

$I_{Cl(PLM)}$ and $I_{Cl(endo)}$ have similarities and differences. While the differences suggest that they are two different currents, several scenarios could explain the similarities. First, PLM might modulate the $I_{Cl(endo)}$ channel—to change the activation kinetics, threshold potential, and the voltage-sensitivity of activation, membrane-bound PLM molecules would have to modify the intrinsic gating and voltage-sensing mechanisms of the $I_{Cl(endo)}$ molecule. Specifically, the hydrophobic domain of PLM would have to modify the $I_{Cl(endo)}$ voltage sensor, as $I_{Cl(PLM)}$ has a different voltage-sensitivity than $I_{Cl(endo)}$, and this change is partially reversed by the F28Y mutation. This degree of modulation has precedent, as subunits of $Na^+$ and $Ca^{2+}$ channels have dramatic effects on current amplitude and gating (Lacerda, Kim, Ruth, Perez-Reyes, Flockerzi, Hofmann, Birnbaumer, and Brown, 1991; Isom, De Jongh, Patton, Reber, Offord, Charbonneau, Walsh, Goldin, and Catterall, 1992). Second, $I_{Cl(endo)}$ might flow through oligomeric complexes of PLM-like molecules which are endogenous to...
Xenopus oocytes. Thus, expressed PLM molecules might incorporate into heterooligomeric complexes, forming channels with similar selectivity but different gating and drug binding properties.

Measurement of whole oocyte currents does not resolve the issue of whether PLM is an ion channel, or a modulator of $I_{\text{Cl(endo)}}$. A rigorous test of the hypothesis that PLM is itself an ion channel awaits the demonstration of anion currents through PLM molecules reconstituted in a synthetic lipid bilayer.
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