

Kir2.1 & Na_v1.5 in Sickness and in Health Who Needs a Chaperone When They Have an Alpha Partner?

Benjamin Strauss, Fadi G. Akar

The ventricular action potential is sculpted by the orchestrated activity of multiple depolarizing and repolarizing ion currents, exchangers, and pumps. Owing to the time and voltage dependency of these ion transport mechanisms, even a subtle change in one will influence the activity of the others. This, in turn, will profoundly impact the electrophysiological properties of the myocyte and the heart as a whole. Indeed, altered ion channel activity in response to pharmacological agents, acquired diseases, or congenital disorders is a major cause of malignant ventricular arrhythmias leading to sudden cardiac death.¹

Article, see p 1501

Chief among the many cardiac ion currents that generate the action potential are the inward rectifier K current (I_{K1}) and the voltage-gated fast inward Na current (I_{Na}), along with their pore-forming α subunits, Kir2.1 and Na_v1.5.² The relative importance of these 2 channels is underscored by the tight control that they exert on myocyte excitability. Whereas I_{K1} establishes the resting membrane potential, I_{Na} is responsible for generating the action potential upstroke (or phase 0). Because the driving force for I_{Na} is fueled by the difference in voltage between the resting membrane potential and the reversal potential for Na, I_{K1} exerts primary control over myocyte excitability and secondary control over action potential formation and propagation. The relevance of the functional interplay between I_{K1} and I_{Na} extends beyond the regulation of normal excitability because it plays a particularly important role in pathophysiological situations, such as hyperkalemia and ischemia. In both settings, membrane depolarization reduces I_{Na} and promotes its partial inactivation.

In addition to the indirect influence of I_{K1} on I_{Na} that is mediated by its voltage dependence, accumulating evidence in the literature during the past few years is highlighting the importance of direct molecular interactions between the major subunits that form these channels. Specifically, an increase in the expression of Na_v1.5 at the cell membrane has been shown to result in a corresponding increase in Kir2.1

channels and vice versa.^{3,4} This curious interplay in channel expression has given rise to the so-called principal of reciprocal modulation of I_{K1} and I_{Na} . The dynamic reciprocity in current function is likely to have profound consequences not only to cardiac excitability under normal physiological conditions but also for the pathogenesis and maintenance of complex ventricular arrhythmias because the balance between I_{K1} and I_{Na} is a key determinant of the frequency and stability of fibrillatory rotors.⁵

Kir2.1 and Na_v1.5: For Better or for Worse

What causes the mutual reciprocity in the activity of these 2 seemingly distinct depolarizing and repolarizing ion fluxes? As it turns out, the answer to this basic question is anything but trivial. This is because the activity of any given ion channel depends not only on its pore-forming α subunit but rather on a myriad of auxiliary, anchoring, and adapter proteins that form large multiprotein macromolecular complexes. Furthermore, the individual components of these ion channel complexes undergo intricate regulation by diverse cell signaling cascades and are subject to a host of post-translational modifications that alter their function. Adding to this multi-tiered levels of complexity is the fact that ion channel regulation commences at the time of transcription of the channel subunits and continues through their translation, sorting, forward trafficking, membrane targeting, insertion, recycling, and degradation.⁶ In that regard, determining the exact nature of the molecular interactions that mediate the dynamic reciprocity of 2 major cardiac ion channels requires nothing short of a herculean effort.

Fortunately, diligent work by thought leaders in the field, including an elegant study in this issue of *Circulation Research*,⁷ is shedding major light on this important and understudied area. The steady work of these investigators is systematically revealing both the nature and implications of the physical interactions between Kir2.1, Na_v1.5, and a growing list of other members of their channelosome.^{2,3,8} Despite knowledge of the dynamic reciprocity of Kir2.1 and Na_v1.5 as revealed by their ability to control each other's cell surface expression, major questions remain. For example, at what point during the life cycle of these 2 critical proteins do they associate with one another? Are they processed separately and do they undergo distinct trafficking pathways as they journey to their ultimate destination within specific microdomains of the cell membrane, such as its lateral border, intercalated disc, or transverse tubules? Do these channels share separate or common trafficking partners? Do they casually meet one another and initiate their physical/functional interactions after or before they are embedded in the membrane? Does their shared destiny manifest at a much earlier

The opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily those of the editors or of the American Heart Association.

From the Cardiovascular Research Center, Cardiovascular Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY.

Correspondence to Fadi G. Akar, PhD, FHRS, Cardiovascular Research Center, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029. E-mail fadi.akar@mssm.edu

(*Circ Res.* 2018;122:1482-1484.)

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.313029.)

© 2018 American Heart Association, Inc.

Circulation Research is available at <http://circres.ahajournals.org>

DOI: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.313029

stage in their life cycle? And if so, does this subject those life partners to mutual regulation and condemn them to mutual annihilation?

In this issue of *Circulation Research*,⁷ Ponce-Balbuena et al address many of these fundamental questions using a rigorous, multidisciplinary approach that leaves no stone unturned. The study convincingly demonstrates that Na_v1.5 channels traffic more efficiently when they are joined by Kir2.1 compared with when they are separated from their K channel partner. This highlights the importance of the native association between the 2 α subunits well before they reach their intended destination to form functional currents. Furthermore, using trafficking-deficient mutant Kir2.1 channels that cause Andersen–Tawil Syndrome, these authors document the mutual impairment in the forward trafficking of wild-type Na_v1.5 channels without a change in its total cellular protein content or its gating properties.⁷ They go on to demonstrate that the tight association of these 2 α subunits occurs at an early time point in their biosynthetic pathway. They highlight the role of adaptor protein complex 1, which was previously shown to incorporate Kir2.1 channels into clathrin-coated vesicles in the export of Na_v1.5 at the level of the trans-Golgi.⁹

Looking Ahead

The paradigm shifting work by the team of investigators from Michigan and Madrid published in this issue of *Circulation Research*⁷ raises multiple intriguing questions that will require active investigation in future studies. For example, the downside of the mutual demise of Kir2.1 and Na_v1.5 channels when only the former is rendered trafficking deficient is obvious. But surely, there must be an upside to this elaborate, self-destructive scheme that attempts to shut down excitability in the face of a severe K channel mutation. After all, even a classic Na channel chaperone (β 2) that harbors a mutation associated with Brugada syndrome will happily traffic solo to the cell membrane leaving its pore-forming Na_v1.5 partner behind.¹⁰ A key question to be addressed in future studies is whether pharmacological or gene-based¹¹ strategies used to rescue defective trafficking of Kir2.1 or Na_v1.5 channels alone could be tailored for the re trafficking of the combined channelosome.

The tight molecular association between the 2 α subunits that is documented in this study suggests presence of substantial phenotypic overlap between the Andersen–Tawil syndrome arising from trafficking-deficient Kir2.1 and Na channelopathies, such as the Brugada syndrome. Of note, some Andersen–Tawil-causing mutations in Kir2.1 result in a mixed phenotype that gives rise to an arrhythmic disorder resembling catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia.^{12,13} Finally, the present findings have major implications for arrhythmias in other heritable disorders, such as arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy. Although classically considered to be a disease of the desmosome, mutations in intercalated disc proteins can lead to the mutual dysregulation of both Na_v1.5 and Kir2.1 via common partners, such as SAP97 (syntrophin-associated protein 97).^{14,15}

In summary, the present findings by Ponce-Balbuena et al⁷ offer a humbling perspective on the complexity of ion channel interactions in both health and disease. The study is expected

to impact the arrhythmia field for many years to come as we reconsider insights garnered solely from the reductionist approaches that are typically used to study mutations in individual ion channel proteins.

Sources of Funding

This work was supported by grants from the National Institutes of Health (R01 HL137259 and R21AG054211) to F.G. Akar.

Disclosures

None.

References

- Nass RD, Aiba T, Tomaselli GF, Akar FG. Mechanisms of disease: ion channel remodeling in the failing ventricle. *Nat Clin Pract Cardiovasc Med*. 2008;5:196–207. doi: 10.1038/npcardio1130.
- Willis BC, Ponce-Balbuena D, Jalife J. Protein assemblies of sodium and inward rectifier potassium channels control cardiac excitability and arrhythmogenesis. *Am J Physiol Heart Circ Physiol*. 2015;308:H1463–H1473. doi: 10.1152/ajpheart.00176.2015.
- Milstein ML, Musa H, Balbuena DP, Anumonwo JM, Auerbach DS, Furspan PB, Hou L, Hu B, Schumacher SM, Vaidyanathan R, Martens JR, Jalife J. Dynamic reciprocity of sodium and potassium channel expression in a macromolecular complex controls cardiac excitability and arrhythmia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2012;109:E2134–2143.
- Utrilla RG, Nieto-Marín P, Alfayate S, Tinaquero D, Matamoros M, Pérez-Hernández M, Sacristán S, Ondo L, de Andrés R, Díez-Guerra FJ, Tamargo J, Delpón E, Caballero R. Kir2.1-Nav1.5 channel complexes are differently regulated than Kir2.1 and Nav1.5 channels alone. *Front Physiol*. 2017;8:903. doi: 10.3389/fphys.2017.00903.
- Jalife J. Dynamics and molecular mechanisms of ventricular fibrillation in structurally normal hearts. *Card Electrophysiol Clin*. 2016;8:601–612. doi: 10.1016/j.jcep.2016.04.009.
- Curran J, Mohler PJ. Alternative paradigms for ion channelopathies: disorders of ion channel membrane trafficking and posttranslational modification. *Annu Rev Physiol*. 2015;77:505–524. doi: 10.1146/annurev-physiol-021014-071838.
- Ponce-Balbuena D, Guerrero-Serna G, Valdivia CR, et al. Cardiac Kir2.1 and Na_v1.5 channels traffic together to the sarcolemma to control excitability. *Circ Res*. 2018;122:1501–1516. doi: 10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.117.311872.
- Matamoros M, Pérez-Hernández M, Guerrero-Serna G, Amorós I, Barana A, Núñez M, Ponce-Balbuena D, Sacristán S, Gómez R, Tamargo J, Caballero R, Jalife J, Delpón E. Nav1.5 N-terminal domain binding to α 1-syntrophin increases membrane density of human Kir2.1, Kir2.2 and Nav1.5 channels. *Cardiovasc Res*. 2016;110:279–290. doi: 10.1093/cvr/cvv009.
- Ma D, Taneja TK, Hagen BM, Kim BY, Ortega B, Lederer WJ, Welling PA. Golgi export of the Kir2.1 channel is driven by a trafficking signal located within its tertiary structure. *Cell*. 2011;145:1102–1115. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2011.06.007.
- Dulsat G, Palomeras S, Cortada E, Riuró H, Brugada R, Vergés M. Trafficking and localisation to the plasma membrane of Nav1.5 promoted by the β 2 subunit is defective due to a β 2 mutation associated with Brugada syndrome. *Biol Cell*. 2017;109:273–291. doi: 10.1111/boc.201600085.
- Shinlapawittayatorn K, Dudash LA, Du XX, Heller L, Poelzing S, Ficker E, Deschênes I. A novel strategy using cardiac sodium channel polymorphic fragments to rescue trafficking-deficient SCN5A mutations. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet*. 2011;4:500–509. doi: 10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.111.960633.
- Barajas-Martinez H, Hu D, Ontiveros G, Caceres G, Desai M, Burashnikov E, Scaglione J, Antzelevitch C. Biophysical and molecular characterization of a novel de novo KCNJ2 mutation associated with Andersen-Tawil syndrome and catecholaminergic polymorphic ventricular tachycardia mimicry. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet*. 2011;4:51–57. doi: 10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.110.957696.
- Kimura H, Zhou J, Kawamura M, et al. Phenotype variability in patients carrying KCNJ2 mutations. *Circ Cardiovasc Genet*. 2012;5:344–353. doi: 10.1161/CIRCGENETICS.111.962316.

14. Asimaki A, Kapoor S, Plovie E, Karin Arndt A, Adams E, Liu Z, James CA, Judge DP, Calkins H, Churko J, Wu JC, MacRae CA, Kléber AG, Saffitz JE. Identification of a new modulator of the intercalated disc in a zebrafish model of arrhythmogenic cardiomyopathy. *Sci Transl Med*. 2014;6:240ra74. doi: 10.1126/scitranslmed.3008008.
15. Vaidyanathan R, Taffet SM, Vikstrom KL, Anumonwo JM. Regulation of cardiac inward rectifier potassium current (I(K1)) by synapse-associated

protein-97. *J Biol Chem*. 2010;285:28000–28009. doi: 10.1074/jbc.M110.110858.

KEY WORDS: Editorials ■ Andersen syndrome ■ death, sudden, cardiac ■ heart ■ ion transport