

Signaling and Communication in Plants

François Chaumont
Stephen Tyerman *Editors*



Plant Aquaporins

From Transport to Signaling

 Springer

Signaling and Communication in Plants

Series Editor

František Baluška

Department of Plant Cell Biology, IZMB

University of Bonn

Bonn, Germany

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/8094>

François Chaumont • Stephen D. Tyerman
Editors

Plant Aquaporins

From Transport to Signaling

 Springer

Editors

François Chaumont
Institut des Sciences de la Vie
Université catholique de Louvain
Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgium

Stephen D. Tyerman
School of Agriculture, Food and Wine
University of Adelaide
Adelaide
Australia

ISSN 1867-9048 ISSN 1867-9056 (electronic)
Signaling and Communication in Plants
ISBN 978-3-319-49393-0 ISBN 978-3-319-49395-4 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-49395-4

Library of Congress Control Number: 2017930691

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made.

Printed on acid-free paper

This Springer imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Springer International Publishing AG
The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

Preface

The discovery of the water channel activity of the first plant aquaporin, γ -TIP or TIP1;1, in 1993 has significantly challenged the concepts by which plants control cell water homeostasis but also the water relations of the whole organism. In addition, it appeared rapidly that plant aquaporins or MIPs (membrane intrinsic proteins) facilitate also the membrane diffusion of an increasing amount of small solutes, such as urea, CO₂, H₂O₂, ammonium, metalloids, etc. This diversity of substrates probably evolves from the high number of aquaporin genes identified in plant genomes. Higher plant aquaporins cluster into five phylogenetic subfamilies (PIPs, plasma membrane intrinsic proteins; TIPs, tonoplast intrinsic proteins; NIPs, NOD26-like intrinsic protein; SIPs, small basic intrinsic proteins; and XIPs, X intrinsic proteins) and are present in different cell membranes.

This book integrates exciting data illustrating the various regulation mechanisms leading to active aquaporins in their target membranes and addresses the involvement of different aquaporins in many physiological processes at different cell, organ, and tissue levels and in several environmental conditions. It includes the roles and regulation of aquaporins in plant water homeostasis, but also in plant distribution of other small solutes including nitrogen, CO₂, and metalloids. There are still many more discoveries to be made in how aquaporins are regulated and how their selectivity to different solutes are controlled, particularly those that appear to have dual permeation properties. Their interaction with plant mycorrhizae and their contribution in signaling processes are also discussed. This volume, by the diversity of the aspects developed in the different chapters, illustrates the importance of the aquaporins and their regulation in controlling plant physiology and development.

Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium
Adelaide, Australia

François Chaumont
Stephen D. Tyerman

August 2016

Contents

Structural Basis of the Permeation Function of Plant Aquaporins	1
Sukanya Luang and Maria Hrmova	
Heteromerization of Plant Aquaporins	29
Cintia Jozefkowicz, Marie C. Berny, François Chaumont, and Karina Alleva	
Plant Aquaporin Trafficking	47
Junpei Takano, Akira Yoshinari, and Doan-Trung Luu	
Plant Aquaporin Posttranslational Regulation	83
Véronique Santoni	
Plant Aquaporins and Cell Elongation	107
Wieland Fricke and Thorsten Knipfer	
Aquaporins and Root Water Uptake	133
Gregory A. Gambetta, Thorsten Knipfer, Wieland Fricke, and Andrew J. McElrone	
Aquaporins and Leaf Water Relations	155
Christophe Maurel and Karine Prado	
Roles of Aquaporins in Stomata	167
Charles Hachez, Thomas Milhiet, Robert B. Heinen, and François Chaumont	
Plant Aquaporins and Abiotic Stress	185
Nir Sade and Menachem Moshelion	
Root Hydraulic and Aquaporin Responses to N Availability	207
Stephen D. Tyerman, Jonathan A. Wignes, and Brent N. Kaiser	
Role of Aquaporins in the Maintenance of Xylem Hydraulic Capacity . .	237
Maciej A. Zwieniecki and Francesca Secchi	

Plant Aquaporins and CO₂	255
Norbert Uehlein, Lei Kai, and Ralf Kaldenhoff	
The Nodulin 26 Intrinsic Protein Subfamily	267
Daniel M. Roberts and Pratyush Routray	
Plant Aquaporins and Metalloids	297
Manuela Désirée Bienert and Gerd Patrick Bienert	
Plant Aquaporins and Mycorrhizae: Their Regulation and Involvement in Plant Physiology and Performance	333
J.M. Ruiz-Lozano and R. Aroca	

Structural Basis of the Permeation Function of Plant Aquaporins

Sukanya Luang and Maria Hrmova

Abstract Aquaporins facilitate rapid and selective bidirectional water and uncharged low-molecular-mass solute or ion movements in response to osmotic gradients. The term ‘aquaporin’ was coined by Peter Agre and colleagues, who in 1993 suggested that major intrinsic proteins (MIPs) that facilitate rapid and selective movement of water in the direction of an osmotic gradient be named ‘aquaporins (AQPs)’ (Agre et al. 1993). Aquaporins are spread across all kingdoms of life including archaea, bacteria, protozoa, yeasts, plants and mammals. Plant aquaporins are classified within the ancient superfamily of MIPs, and based on sequence homology and subcellular localisation, they constitute several subfamilies. Genome-wide identifications of aquaporin genes are now available from around 15 plant species, and this information provides a rich source of sequence data for molecular studies through structural bioinformatics, three-dimensional (3D) modelling and molecular dynamics simulations. These studies have capacity to reveal new information, unavailable to X-ray diffraction studies of time- and space-averaged molecules confined in crystal lattices.

1 Summary

Aquaporins facilitate rapid and selective bidirectional water and uncharged low-molecular-mass solute or ion movements in response to osmotic gradients. The term ‘aquaporin’ was coined by Peter Agre and colleagues, who in 1993 suggested that major intrinsic proteins (MIPs) that facilitate rapid and selective movement of water in the direction of an osmotic gradient be named ‘aquaporins (AQPs)’ (Agre et al. 1993). Aquaporins are spread across all kingdoms of life including archaea, bacteria, protozoa, yeasts, plants and mammals. Plant aquaporins are classified within

S. Luang • M. Hrmova (✉)

School of Agriculture, Food and Wine, University of Adelaide, Glen Osmond, South Australia 5064, Australia

e-mail: maria.hrmova@adelaide.edu.au

© Springer International Publishing AG 2017

F. Chaumont, S.D. Tyerman (eds.), *Plant Aquaporins*, Signaling and Communication in Plants, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-49395-4_1

the ancient superfamily of MIPs, and based on sequence homology and subcellular localisation, they constitute several subfamilies. Genome-wide identifications of aquaporin genes are now available from around 15 plant species, and this information provides a rich source of sequence data for molecular studies through structural bioinformatics, three-dimensional (3D) modelling and molecular dynamics simulations. These studies have capacity to reveal new information, unavailable to X-ray diffraction studies of time- and space-averaged molecules confined in crystal lattices.

Aquaporins fold into a monomeric ‘hourglass’ or ‘dumbbell-like’ shaped structure that has been retained in all aquaporins. Individual monomers associate *in vivo* into functional tetramers, whereby this vertically symmetric structure provides foundation for residence within a lipid bilayer. Two plant aquaporin structures are available in structural databases (as of May 2016), which is that of (i) a predominantly water-permeable plasma membrane intrinsic protein (PIP) aquaporin in open and closed conformational states (PDB IDs: 1Z98, 2B5F and 4IA4) from *Spinacia oleracea* (Tornroth-Horsefield et al. 2006; Frick et al. 2013a, b) and (ii) an open state of a water- and ammonia-permeable tonoplast intrinsic protein (TIP) aquaammoniaporin from *Arabidopsis thaliana* (PDB ID: 5i32) (Kirscht et al. 2016). Detailed structural information on other plant subfamily members is now needed from economically important food plants such as wheat, barley, maize and rice, to provide strong foundations for future smart decisions directed to food production and sustainability.

Surprisingly, limited information is available on the solute permeation specificity determinants of plant aquaporins, although these data in conjunction with structural information are vital strategic tools for modifying their molecular function. Based on predominantly structural studies, it has been suggested that properties and steric occlusions of residues within the specific structural and functional elements are one of the most fundamental characteristics that underlie differences in transport selectivities of aquaporins. These main characteristics include (i) pore dimension parameters including their diameters and overall morphology; (ii) identities and flexibilities of residues lining solute-conducting pores; (iii) chemical configurations of pore constrictions in solute-conducting pores; (iv) properties of pore vestibules and a central pore, also dictated by the residues alongside the fourfold symmetry axis of tetramers; and (v) gating of aquaporins controlled by pH, cation binding, post-translational modifications such as phosphorylation and the dispositions of interacting loops.

We conclude that although structural aquaporin research has significantly progressed in recent years, many questions remain open. For example, are individual protomers within tetramers identical in function, what is the structural basis of permeation of non-electrolytes and ionic species, and the thermodynamic origin of transporting function of solutes, and how exactly have aquaporin proteins evolved during millions of years of evolution into their current forms?

2 Aquaporins in Living Systems Including Plants

Plants acquire water from soil through aquaporins or use them as vehicles to dispose of excess of toxic substances (Schnurbusch et al. 2010; Hayes et al. 2013; Xu et al. 2015). Aquaporin molecules, amongst other pathways, are responsible for

hydraulic conductance of plants that underlies water uptake together with dissolved mineral nutrients (see also chapter “[Plant Aquaporins and Metalloids](#)”). Aquaporins facilitate rapid and selective bidirectional water and uncharged low-molecular-mass solute transport, in response to osmotic and concentration gradients, respectively. The latter does not necessarily rely on an osmotic gradient. This transport, occurring through polytopic aquaporins that span cell membranes, is independent of a supply of external energy (e.g. ATP). Thus, aquaporins are known to be passive transporters, although fundamental to their function are structural flexibility and gating, which may be dependent on the redox state of a cellular environment, on the activity of phosphorylation machinery (controlling the levels of, e.g. ATP) and on membrane and subcellular dynamics.

2.1 Aquaporins Occur in All Kingdoms of Life

Aquaporins are spread across all kingdoms of life including archaea, bacteria, protozoa, yeasts, plants and mammals. In archaea and bacteria, typically one aquaporin type is retained, while in eukaryotes gene duplications and horizontal gene transfer events have resulted in occurrence of subfamilies of aquaporins with diversified transport functions, although the canonical hourglass or dumbbell-like shaped architecture has been retained in all aquaporins. The typical examples of duplication and function diversification include aquaporins in fish, mammals and higher plants, in which neo-functionalisation has led to evolution of paralogous proteins with various solute selectivities, gating mechanisms or time and space differential expression (Fotiadis et al. 2001; Zardoya et al. 2002; Abascal et al. 2014). For example, 35, 35 and 39 aquaporins have been described in maize, *Arabidopsis* and rice, respectively (Chaumont et al. 2001; Johanson et al. 2001; Sakurai et al. 2005). These numbers are even higher in non-plant species such as in fish and some land vertebrates, due to several rounds of entire genome duplication during early stages of their evolution (Abascal et al. 2014), although most mammals only require the presence of limited numbers of aquaporins to properly function. Diverse aquaporin isoforms are directed to various subcellular locations and compartments and represent fundamental components for membrane evolution, diversity and differential gene expression. Through these specific membrane aquaporin-containing partitions, plants drive hydrostatic and osmotic forces that help them to maintain water homeostasis, together with hydraulic conductance in roots, stems and other organs (Fricke et al. 1997; Tyerman et al. 1999; Maurel et al. 2008; Chaumont and Tyerman 2014).

2.2 Plant Aquaporin Sequences and Their Genome-Wide Identification

Since the first member of the major intrinsic protein (MIP) family was described and its cDNA cloned (Gorin et al. 1984), the first plant MIP from soybean (nodulin 26) was identified (Sandal and Marcker 1988), along with the tonoplast intrinsic

protein (TIP) from bean seeds (Johnson et al. 1990), and α -TIP (Höfte et al. 1992) and γ -TIP (Maurel et al. 1993) from *Arabidopsis*, and other plants. Some of these proteins were described as water stress-induced proteins (Höfte et al. 1992) and only later functionally characterised as water channels. These discoveries were followed by a series of informative reviews on physiological function of aquaporins (e.g. Tyerman et al. 1999; Verkman and Mitra 2000; Gomes et al. 2009; Maurel et al. 2008; Chaumont and Tyerman 2014; Li et al. 2014; Mukhopadhyay et al. 2014). These physiological functions include photosynthesis, seed germination, cell elongation, stomata movement, reproduction (Reddy et al. 2015) and responses to a variety of abiotic stresses, such as anoxia (Choi and Roberts 2007), hydrogen peroxide toxicity (Dynowski et al. 2008; Wudick et al. 2015), mineral soil toxicity (boron and arsenic) (Isayenkov and Maathuis 2008; Ma et al. 2008; Kamiya et al. 2009; Schnurbusch et al. 2010; Li et al. 2011; Hayes et al. 2013; Xu et al. 2015), high salt (Zhang et al. 2008; Gao et al. 2010; Hu et al. 2012; Xu et al. 2013) and a low water potential drought (Xu et al. 2014; Li et al. 2015).

Genome-wide identification studies of aquaporin genes are now available from at least fourteen plant species, including *Arabidopsis* (Johanson et al. 2001), maize (Chaumont et al. 2001), rice (Sakurai et al. 2005), poplar (Gupta and Sankararamkrishnan 2009), grapevine (Shelden et al. 2009), cotton (Park et al. 2010), barley (Besse et al. 2011; Tombuloglu et al. 2015), soybean (Zhang et al. 2013), tomato (Reuscher et al. 2013) and bread wheat (Pandey et al. 2013). As a result of recent proliferations of genome sequencing initiatives, several new genome-wide identification studies were conducted in cabbage (Diehn et al. 2015), common bean (Ariani and Geps 2015), sorghum (Reddy et al. 2015) and wheat (Hove et al. 2015). These analyses have provided a rich source of sequence data information for molecular studies that have been conducted through structural bioinformatics (Wang et al. 2005; Deshmukh et al. 2015) and 3D structural (homology or comparative) modelling (Wallace and Roberts 2004; Schnurbusch et al. 2010; Gupta et al. 2012; Verma et al. 2015).

2.3 Classification of Aquaporins

Plant aquaporins are classified within the ancient superfamily of Major Intrinsic Proteins (MIPs) (Saier et al. 2016). Based on sequence homology and subcellular localisation, MIPs constitute five subfamilies, namely, plasma membrane intrinsic proteins (PIPs), tonoplast intrinsic proteins (TIPs), nodulin-26 intrinsic proteins (NIPs), small basic intrinsic proteins (SIPs) and X-intrinsic proteins (XIPs). In recent years, several studies have specifically focussed on molecular evolution and functional divergence of NIP (Liu et al. 2009) and XIP proteins (Bienert et al. 2011; Lopez et al. 2012; Venkatesh et al. 2015). These studies have pointed out that the functional divergence of various classes of aquaporins under selection pressures led to restrictions on the physicochemical properties of key functional amino acid residues, following gene duplication.


3 Three-Dimensional Structures of Aquaporins

3.1 *Structural Information on Aquaporins Is Available from All Kingdoms of Life*

3D atomic structures of aquaporins are accessible from archaea (Lee et al. 2005), bacteria (Fu et al. 2000; Savage et al. 2003; Savage et al. 2010), protozoa (Newby et al. 2008), yeasts (Fischer et al. 2009; Eriksson et al. 2013), plants (Fotiadis et al. 2000; Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006; Frick et al. 2013a, b; Kirscht et al. 2016) and mammals (Sui et al. 2001; Gonen et al. 2004; Harries et al. 2004), including humans (Murata et al. 2000; Viadiu et al. 2007; Horsefield et al. 2008; Ho et al. 2009; Agemark et al. 2012; Frick et al. 2014). For example, a sub-angstrom resolution structure of the *Pichia* water-conducting aquaporin (Eriksson et al. 2013) and a recent high-resolution structure of the *Arabidopsis* aquaammoniatorin (Kirscht et al. 2016) provided an unprecedented view into the landscape of positions of interacting residues and the mode of coordination of water molecules. The water positions that were defined with a high precision in a water-conducting pore (Eriksson et al. 2013), and definitions of tautomeric states of interacting Arg and His residues, provided an abundance of information on water molecule coordination at the entry of the channel. As a result of the availability of high-resolution aquaporin architectures of these structurally similar but functionally distinct MIP and TIP proteins, a plethora of theoretical in silico studies were initiated to investigate molecular dynamics of aquaporins and flow of solutes (Tajkhorshid et al. 2002; Wang et al. 2005; Cordeiro 2015; Han et al. 2015; Verma et al. 2015; Kitchen and Conner 2015). These studies revealed novel information, unavailable to studies of time- and space-averaged molecules confined in crystal lattices, and defined protein dynamics and energy barriers during permeation events of water, ammonia or other solute-conducting aquaporins (Wang et al. 2005; Han et al. 2015; Kirscht et al. 2016).

3.2 *An Overall Architecture of Protomers*

The 3D structures of aquaporins are highly conserved from archaea to humans. They consist of a circular α -helical bundle with a solute-conducting pore and cytoplasmic (intracellular) and periplasmic (extracellular) conical vestibules. Each monomer is formed by six tilted (crossing angles between 25 and 40°) membrane-spanning α -helices (H1-H3 and H4-H6) and two re-entrant short α -helices (HB and HE) running in two repeats, with five interconnecting loops (LA-LE) that collectively form a right-handed α -helical bundle (Fig. 1). The arrangements of first (H1-H3 and HB) and second (H4-H6 and HE) bipartite segments, α -helices of which are significantly tilted in a membrane, follow a pseudo-twofold axis that runs



perpendicularly to a membrane normal plane (Murata et al. 2000) (Fig. 1a; dashed line). In all aquaporins, N- and C-termini are cytoplasmically oriented (Fig. 1a). In some aquaporins, these termini are extended and carry sulfhydryl residues such as Cys (an inhibition site for mercury and other heavy metals) or N-glycosylation, phosphorylation and other post-translation modification sites.

3.3 A Circular Bundle and a Solute-Conducting Pore


The circular bundle of membrane-spanning α -helices encloses a solute-conducting pore (often referred to as a channel or a nanopore), which may be between 20 and 28 Å long and 4 and 6 Å in diameter. For example, in plant aquaporins, the pore narrows down around a selectivity filter region (defined below) (Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006; Frick et al. 2013a, b), or remains more uniform throughout the channel (Kirscht et al. 2016), but widens in all aquaporins to conical vestibules at both cytoplasmic and periplasmic sides (Fig. 1b).

A consensus, based on around 20 atomic structures of aquaporins, stipulates that the aromatic selectivity filter represents the narrowest constriction, at least in orthodox (predominantly water conducting) aquaporins (Fu et al. 2000; Sui et al. 2001). The selectivity filter is one of the most important regions underlying aquaporin specificity and represents as a package of four residues positioned near the periplasmic side of the pore. The selectivity filter is about 8–9 Å away from the first Asn-Pro-Ala (NPA) motif and was named the aromatic/Arg (ar/R)/LE1-LE2 constriction region (Fig. 1b). More precisely, this ar/R/LE1-LE2 region consists of one residue each from H2 and H5 α -helices, and two residues positioned on loop LE, located at partitions LE1 and LE2 that flank the NPA motif (Figs. 1a and 2b) (Fu et al. 2000; Sui et al. 2001; Savage et al. 2003). In all solved spinach aquaporins in closed or



Fig. 1 (a) A membrane topology diagram of aquaporins. Each protein molecule consists of six transmembrane α -helices (H1-H6) and two re-entrant α -helices (HB and HE), with NPA motifs, shown as cyan boxes. Transmembrane α -helices are connected via five interconnecting loops (LA-LE), whereby partitions LE1 and LE2 flank the second NPA motif, separated by approximately 4–5 Å from the first NPA motif. A *dashed line* indicates bipartite structural repeats of an hourglass aquaporin fold. (b) A cartoon representation of the spinach aquaporin SoPIP2;1 in the closed conformation (PDB ID: 1Z98). The selectivity filter residues (Phe81, His210, Thr219 and Arg225) and the two conserved asparagine residues (Asn101 and Asn222) of the NPA motifs are shown as cyan sticks. N- and C-termini are indicated. (c) The superposition of SoPIP2;1 structures including closed states at pH 8.0 (PDB ID: 1Z98) and at pH 6.0 (PDB ID: 4IA4), an open state (PDB ID: 2B5F), and the structure with a mercury activation site (PDB ID: 4JC6), shown in *cyan, pink, yellow and green*, respectively. Residues that interact with a single file of water molecules W1-W8, shown as red spheres, are indicated in cyan sticks. Hydrogen bonds between residues and water molecules are shown in *dashed lines*. (d) Prediction of a tetrameric assembly of the spinach aquaporin SoPIP2;1 in two orthogonal orientations (*left and right* images are related by 90° rotation to the viewer), whereby cysteine residues (shown in sticks) from each monomer participate in a quaternary assembly

open conformations, protein folds and more specifically pores enclose a single-file chain of water molecules coordinated by surrounding hydrophilic amino acid residues (Fig. 1c, cyan sticks). Recently, the presence of a novel water-filled side pore was defined in the AtTIP2;1 aquaammonia porin, which is assumed to play a role in



b

Conservation	H2	H5	LE1	LE2
	5 7 5 97 7 5 675 55	7 657 69 6 57	675777995965979	
SoPIP2-1	GSVGLLGIAWAGGGMFVLVYCTAG	VPILAPLPIGFAVFMVHLATIP	ITGSGINPASPFGAAVIF	
<i>NIP-I</i>				
CsNIP1-1	QGITFFGVAIVGLAVMMVMYAVGH	IGELAGLAVGATILLNVLVLAGP	ISGSMNPAISLGPAMIG	
GmNIP1-2	-SVTFPGVCTVGLIVMMIYSLRR	VGDFAGVAVGMTIMLVFVLAGP	VSGSMNPAISIGPALIK	
AtNIP1-1	NVVTLEGIADVGLTIMVLIYSLGH	IGELAGLAGTSTVLLNVLVLAGP	VSSSMNPAISLGPALVY	
ZmNIP1-1	GTVTFFGICAVGLAVMMVMYVSVGH	IGELAGLAVGATVLLNVLVLAGP	ISGSMNPAISLGPALVV	
AtNIP3-1	KFVTLGLIALVGLVVTVMYISIGH	TGSFAGIAGTIVLDDLFSGP	ISGSMNPAISLGPALIW	
<i>NIP-II</i>				
GmNIP3-1	GSETLIGCAATGLAVMIVILATGH	VGELAGIAGVATVMLNVLVLAGP	VSGSMNPAISLGPAAVA	
ZmNIP3-3	GAISPFNGAACGLAVATVILSTGH	VGELAGIAGVAATVLLNVLVLAGP	TTGSMNPAISLGPAAVA	
AtNIP5-1	GAETLIGNAACGLAVMIIILSTGH	VGELAGIAGVATVMLNVLVLAGP	STGSMNPAISLGPAAVA	
OsNIP3-1	GAISPFNGAACGLAVTTIILSTGH	VGELAGIAGVAATVLLNVLVLAGP	TTGSMNPAISLGPAAVA	
AtNIP7-1	GHVGLLEYAVTGLSVVVMYVYISIGH	LGNLTFGVIGTIVISLGLVITGP	ISGSMNPAISLGPAAVA	
<i>NIP-III</i>				
HvNIP2-1	TRISQLGQSVAGLIVVMYIYAVGH	VGELAGLAVGSSVCITISIFAGA	VSGSMNPAISLGPALAS	
TaNIP2-1	TRISQLGQSVAGLIVVMYIYAVGH	VGELAGLAVGSSVCITISIFAGA	VSGSMNPAISLGPALAS	
GmNIP2-1	RMVSKLGASLAGLIVTVMYISIGH	TGQLSGVAVGSSVCIAISVAGP	ISGSMNPAISLGPALAT	
ZmNIP2-1	DRISQLGQSVAGLIVTVMYIYAVGH	VGELAGLAVGSSVCITISIFAGA	VSGSMNPAISLGPALAS	
OsNIP2-1	SRSIQLGQSIAGLIVTVMYIYAVGH	VGELAGLAVGSSVCITISIFAGA	ISGSMNPAISLGPALAS	

ammonia deprotonation during permeation, as revealed by molecular dynamics simulations (Kirscht et al. 2016). In some aquaporins, a second well-formed constriction is located near to the cytoplasmic vestibule.

3.4 Cytoplasmic and Periplasmic Conical Vestibules

The cylindrical solute-conducting pore is flanked by two shallow, asymmetric vestibules. These are present on each side of the pore that flare into both cytoplasmic and periplasmic spaces and are formed by loop regions at each monomer face and by the N- and C-termini at the cytoplasmic face. The vestibules give a characteristic hourglass shape of aquaporin proteins (Fig. 1b). It was revealed that in nearly every atomic structure, these vestibules contain a contiguous chain of hydrogen-bonded molecules that extend from the surface of vestibules to either an ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter region of the periplasmic vestibule or to a second constriction near to the cytoplasmic vestibule (Fig. 1b).

3.5 Aquaporins Exist as Functional Tetramers

In native environments, individual monomers form a quaternary tetrameric assembly, in which homo- or hetero-oligomers that act as independent solute-conducting units associate with each other into a tightly fitting extended trapezoid or a



Fig. 2 (a) A phylogenetic tree of 75 NIP proteins from *Arabidopsis thaliana* (At), *Brachypodium distachyon* (Bd), *Brassica rapa* (Br), *Cajanus cajan* (Cc), *Citrus clementine* (Ccl), *Carica papaya* (Cp), *Citrus sinensis* (Cs), *Elaeis guineensis* (Eg), *Fragaria vesca* (Fv), *Glycine max* (Gm), *Hordeum vulgare* (Hv), *Musa acuminata* (Ma), *Oryza sativa* (Os), *Picea abies* (Pa), *Physcomitrella patens* (Pp), *Prunus persica* (Ppe), *Populus trichocarpa* (Pt), *Ricinus communis* (Rc), *Sorghum bicolor* (Sb), *Setaria italica* (Si), *Solanum lycopersicum* (Sl), *Selaginella moellendorffii* (Sm), *Solanum tuberosum* (St), *Triticum aestivum* (Ta), *Vitis vinifera* (Vv) and *Zea mays* (Zm). The tree was constructed by MEGA 6 (Tamura et al. 2013). A bootstrap analysis was performed with 1,000 replicates. Entries (Table 1) are clustered in the three independent clades NIP-I, NIP-II and NIP-III, each with specific selectivity filter signatures. NIP-I clade (in red): Trp-Val-Ala-Arg (WVAR) and Trp-Ile-Ala-Arg (WIAR). NIP-II (in blue): Ala-Ile-Ala-Arg (AIAR), Ala-Ile-Gly-Arg (AIGR) and Ala-Val-Gly-Arg (AVGR). NIP-III (in green): Gly-Ser-Gly-Arg (GSGR). Segregation of α (lighter grey shades)- and β (darkest grey)-sub-clades consisting of clearly distributed mono- and dicotyledonous sequences, respectively, is indicated. (b) A sequence alignment of α -helices H2 and H5 and loop LE of spinach aquaporins (SoPIP2-1) with NIPs from *A. thaliana* (AtNIP), *G. max* (GmNIP), *H. vulgare* (HvNIP2-1), *O. sativa* (OsNIP), *T. aestivum* (TaNIP2-1) and *Z. mays* (ZmNIP). The alignment was performed by ProMals3D (Pei and Grishin 2014). Selectivity filter residues and NPA motifs are shown in blue and yellow, respectively. Conservation of residues on a scale 5–9 from lower to higher conserved residues is displayed above sequences; 9 in brown indicates an absolute conservation

cylindrical wedge (Fig. 1d, tetrameric structures are shown in two orthogonal orientations). Monomers operate in their own right, as demonstrated by studies with mixed active or inactive monomers in *Xenopus laevis* oocytes (Jung et al. 1994). However, by close association, the four monomers form an additional central pore that has been suggested to serve as another route for permeation (Yool et al. 1996; Fu et al. 2000). Individual monomers are related by a fourfold crystallographic axis and interact with each other through neighbouring membrane-spanning α -helices via hydrophobic interactions and hydrogen bonds, such as those of ‘hole-to-knob’ configurations (Murata et al. 2000; Fu et al. 2000; Sui et al. 2001). Further, interconnecting loops between individual α -helices contribute to mutual inter-monomeric interactions (Fig. 1d, right panel). The tetramers associate with annular or exogenously added lipids, for example, with 1,2-dimyristoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (Gonen et al. 2005) or surfactants such as octyl (Fu et al. 2000) and nonyl (Sui et al. 2001) β -D-glucosides, where both lipids and surfactants stabilise supramolecular tetrameric assemblies. These lipid or surfactant interactions have been defined in structures based on 3D (Fu et al. 2000) and two-dimensional (Gonen et al. 2005) crystals and are formed between hydrophobic residues and acyl chains of lipids or between glycosyl moieties of alkyl β -D-glucosides surrounding polar groups and water coordinated molecules. Occasionally, lipid molecules have been found in a central tetrameric pore, formed alongside the fourfold symmetry axis that can be up to 8–10 Å in diameter (Horsefield et al. 2008; Newby et al. 2008).

4 A Structural Basis of Transport by Aquaporins

4.1 Approaches to Measure Solute Transport Selectivity and Kinetic Parameters

Four mainstream approaches have been used to measure selectivity and kinetic parameters of solute permeation of aquaporins: (i) In isolated tissues (e.g. tobacco leaf discs; Uehlein et al. 2003), organelles of living organisms (e.g. endoplasmic reticulum, Noronha et al. 2014) or protoplasts (Ramahaleo et al. 1996; Moshelion et al. 2004; Besserer et al. 2012). (ii) In native vesicles isolated and purified from cells or their membranes (Niemietz and Tyerman 1997; Fang et al. 2002) or in vesicles isolated from membranes of cells with recombinantly expressed aquaporins (Jung et al. 1994; Schnurbusch et al. 2010). (iii) In *X. laevis* oocytes, used for the first time by Preston and co-workers (1992) and subsequently adopted by many researchers (e.g. Dordas et al. 2000). (iv) In liposomes with purified and reconstituted aquaporin proteins (proteo-liposomes) or planar lipid bilayers (Ye and Verkman 1989; Zeidel et al. 1992; Weaver et al. 1994; Verdoucq et al. 2008). Some authors argue that solute permeation measurements using proteo-liposomes are more reliable than those with oocytes (Ho et al. 2009), whereby in the absence of other proteins in a bilayer in the proteo-liposomes, precise kinetic permeation parameters can be derived for wild-type or variant aquaporins and compared. On the

other hand, proteins may not be accommodated in the membranes of proteo-liposomes in optimal configurations as these environments are artificial and minimalist in composition. Under ideal circumstances, both non-defined native and fully defined artificial systems should be used when available, for derivation of transport characteristics.

4.2 Solute Selectivity of Aquaporins

Based on permeation function, three major groups of plant aquaporins are recognised: (i) aquaporins that transport water, (ii) aquaglyceroporins that permeate other neutral solutes in addition to water (Borgnia et al. 1999) and (iii) aquaporins that conduct ionic species, based on the evidence of human aquaporins (Yool et al. 1996; Fu et al. 2000; Yu et al. 2006), as discussed below. The group of aquaglyceroporins has been reported to transport a broad range of neutral molecules such as non-electrolyte acetamide (Rivers et al. 1997); long polyols (Tsukaguchi et al. 1999); short polyols including glycerol (1,2,3-propane-triol) (Fu et al. 2000); CO₂ (Uehlein et al. 2003, 2008; Otto et al. 2010; Mori et al. 2014); purines and pyrimidines (Tsukaguchi et al. 1999); non-electrolyte urea (Liu et al. 2003); ammonia and glycerol nitrate (Loqué et al. 2005); silicic acid (Ma et al. 2006; Schnurbush et al. 2010); boric, arsenic and germanic acids (Takano et al. 2006; Kamiya et al. 2009; Schnurbush et al. 2010; Hayes et al. 2013); lactic acid (Choi and Roberts 2007; Bienert et al. 2013); hydrogen peroxide and related oxy-radicals (Dynowski et al. 2008); and selenious acid (Zhao et al. 2010). Although permeation of short and certain long (ribitol, xylitol, D-arabitol and D-sorbitol but not D-mannitol) polyols (Fu et al. 2000) has been detected in numerous studies, permeation of cyclic monosaccharides such as glucose and fructose, or of disaccharides such as sucrose, has never been demonstrated (Tsukaguchi et al. 1998; Fu et al. 2000).

4.3 Rates of Solute Transport and Mechanisms

Aquaporins as water transport facilitators mediate the water flux at rates of approximately $3 \cdot 10^9$ water molecules per second per monomeric unit (Agre and Kozono 2003); these rates are significantly higher than diffusion rates of water molecules through lipid membranes. In nonorthodox aquaporins that permeate other solutes, water transport rates are significantly lower. It has been suggested that steric occlusions of amino acid residues within specific structural and functional elements of aquaporins are one of the most fundamental factors that underlie differences in solute permeation selectivity (Fu et al. 2000; Lee et al. 2005; Kirscht et al. 2016). To this end, in the text below, we will separately discuss three features that collectively contribute to solute transport selectivity: (i) dimensional filtering and roles of periplasmic or cytoplasmic constrictions in permeation of solutes of various volumes;

(ii) chemical filtering of solutes, barriers for ion or proton conductance through pores of monomers and significance of NPA signatures, including roles of dipole moments and electrostatic potentials; and (iii) ion conductance through a central pore of tetramers.

4.4 Dimensional Filtering and the Roles of Constrictions in Permeation of Solutes of Various Volumes

A pathway for solute permeation is shaped by re-entrant α -helices HB and HE that connect to cytoplasmic and periplasmic vestibules, thus generating an hourglass or dumbbell-like shape (Fig. 1c). The solute-conducting channel, which in canonical aquaporins carries a single-file chain of water molecules, is formed by symmetry-related sets of carbonyl groups and hydrophilic side chain residues, both operating as hydrogen bond acceptors, often punctuated by hydrophobic residues alongside the pore. At the pore centre in most aquaporins, the two re-entrant α -helices HB and HE carry NPA motifs, where highly conserved Asn residues, rarely replaced by other residues (Zeuthen et al. 2013; Kirscht et al. 2016), and located at the tip of each re-entrant α -helix, form a part of the surface of the solute-conducting pore (Fig. 1c).

The sequence signatures of aquaporin monomers translated into the structural context underlie the functional properties of aquaporins. Verma et al. (2015) calculated a specific cumulative van der Waals volume (CvV, expressed in \AA^3), by adding individual van der Waals volumes of each of the four residues of the ar/R/LE1-LE2 constriction, located close to the periplasmic vestibule. These authors noted large differences in CvV values in several subfamilies of aquaporins. For example, the largest CvV value was calculated for a mammalian aquaporin (ar/R/LE1-LE2 constriction region: Phe-Arg-Tyr-Arg) (572 \AA^3), while the lowest CvV values were found for plant SIP (Ser-His-Gly-Ala) (306 \AA^3) or protozoan (Ile-Ser-Gly-Ala) (312 \AA^3) aquaporins (Verma et al. 2015). However, the ar/R/LE1-LE2 constriction regions Phe-His-Thr-Arg and Trp-Gly-Phe-Arg of the *E. coli* water-selective (AqpZ) and glycerol-selective (AqpF) aquaporins, respectively, exhibit identical CvV values (413 \AA^3), so logically it is reasonable to conclude that besides chemical signatures and consequent structural importance of ar/R/LE1-LE2 constriction regions, other structural determinants that are not directly interact with solutes may play essential roles in solute permeation selectivity (Savage et al. 2010). Nevertheless, it might prove advantageous to investigate if additional quantitative parameters correlate with the solute permeation selectivity of aquaporins. The role of a cytoplasmic constriction, located in the proximity of the cytoplasmic vestibule, is less clear based on most structural studies, but this region may operate in a similar manner than that of a periplasmic constriction, regulating solute permeation in an opposite direction.

Further, it has recently been proposed that a specific pattern of residues forming ar/R/LE1-LE2 constriction regions and a precise spacing between NPA motifs control solute-conducting selectivity in plant aquaporins. A bioinformatics analysis of more than 30 aquaporins and experimental measurements of transport rates in X.

laevis oocytes (Deshmukh et al. 2015) revealed that permeation of silicic acid was confined to aquaporins with the Gly-Ser-Gly-Arg selectivity filter constriction signature and a precise spacing of 108 residues between NPA motifs. Notably, this Gly-Ser-Gly-Arg signature carried a low CvV value (317 \AA^3).

To determine if an observation that a barley NIP-type aquaporin HvNIP2;1 exerts a wide solute selectivity (Schnurbusch et al. 2010) can be linked to its specific sequence and structural features, we conducted the bioinformatics analyses of 75 mono- and dicotyledonous representative sequences of NIP aquaporins (Fig. 2a). These entries (Table 1) formed three independent clades NIP-I, NIP-II and NIP-III

Table 1 The names and GenBank/NCBI accession numbers of 75 nodulin 26-like intrinsic proteins (NIPs) from listed plant species that were used in phylogeny reconstruction (cf. Fig. 2)

Name in the tree	Accession number	Species
AtNIP1-1	CAA16760.2	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP1-2	NP_193626.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP2-1	NP_180986.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP3-1	NP_174472.2	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP4-1	NP_198597.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP4-2	NP_198598.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP5-1	NP_192776.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP6-1	NP_178191.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
AtNIP7-1	NP_566271.1	<i>Arabidopsis thaliana</i>
BdNIP1-1	XP_003571857.1	<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>
BdNIP2-1	XP_003570658.1	<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>
BdNIP2-2	XP_003564051.1	<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>
BdNIP3-3	XP_003574178.1	<i>Brachypodium distachyon</i>
BrNIP4-3	XP_009140163.1	<i>Brassica rapa</i>
BrNIP5-1	XP_009134192.1	<i>Brassica rapa</i>
CcNIP1-1	XP_006430637.1	<i>Citrus clementine</i>
CcNIP2-1	ESR44391.1	<i>Citrus clementine</i>
CcNIP3-2	XP_006434369.1	<i>Citrus clementine</i>
CsNIP1-4	KDO63097.1	<i>Citrus sinensis</i>
CsNIP2-1	XP_006482598.1	<i>Citrus sinensis</i>
CsNIP3-2	XP_006472916.1	<i>Citrus sinensis</i>
EgNIP1-2	XP_010915460.1	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>
EgNIP3-4	XP_010933763.1	<i>Elaeis guineensis</i>
FvNIP1-1	XP_004309621.1	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>
FvNIP2-1	XP_004304304.1	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>
FvNIP3-3	XP_004309493.1	<i>Fragaria vesca</i>
GmNIP1-2	XP_003518381.1	<i>Glycine max</i>
GmNIP2-1	XP_003534451.1	<i>Glycine max</i>
GmNIP3-1	XP_003547292.1	<i>Glycine max</i>
HvNIP2-1	BAH24163	<i>Hordeum vulgare</i>
MaNIP1-1	XP_009404528.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>
MaNIP2-1	XP_009381416.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Name in the tree	Accession number	Species
MaNIP2-2	XP_009401397.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>
MaNIP2-3	XP_009419139.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>
MaNIP2-4	XP_009403165.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>
MaNIP3-2	XP_009388143.1	<i>Musa acuminata</i>
OsNIP1-1	NP_001046375.1	<i>Oryza sativa</i>
OsNIP2-1	NP_001048108.1	<i>Oryza sativa</i>
OsNIP2-2	BAF19121.1	<i>Oryza sativa</i>
OsNIP3-1	Q0IWF3.2	<i>Oryza sativa</i>
PpNIP5-1a	XP_001754375.1	<i>Physcomitrella patens</i>
PpeNIP1-3	XP_007216120.1	<i>Prunus persica</i>
PpeNIP2-1	XP_007216227.1	<i>Prunus persica</i>
PpeNIP3-2	XP_007209472.1	<i>Prunus persica</i>
PtNIP1-4	XP_006372594.1	<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>
PtNIP2-1	XP_002324057.1	<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>
PtNIP3-3	XP_002298990.1	<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>
PtNIP3-4	XP_002317642.1	<i>Populus trichocarpa</i>
RcNIP1-4	XP_002532963.1	<i>Ricinus communis</i>
RcNIP2-1	XP_002534417.1	<i>Ricinus communis</i>
RcNIP3-1	XP_002518973.1	<i>Ricinus communis</i>
SbNIP1-1	XP_002453573.1	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>
SbNIP2-1	XP_002454286	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>
SbNIP2-2	XP_002438105.1	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>
SbNIP3-4	XP_002464380.1	<i>Sorghum bicolor</i>
SiNIP2-1	KQL31494.1	<i>Setaria italic</i>
SiNIP2-2	KQL10018.1	<i>Setaria italic</i>
SiNIP3-1	XP_004982621.1	<i>Setaria italic</i>
SINIP1-4	BAO18645.1	<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>
SINIP2-1	NP_001274283.1	<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>
SINIP3-2	NP_001274288.1	<i>Solanum lycopersicum</i>
SmNIP3-1	XP_002976312.1	<i>Selaginella moellendorffii</i>
SmNIP5-1	XP_002962550.1	<i>Selaginella moellendorffii</i>
StNIP1-4	XP_006344325.1	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>
StNIP3-2	NP_001274996.1	<i>Solanum tuberosum</i>
TaNIP2-1	ADM47602	<i>Triticum aestivum</i>
VvNIP1-4	CBI33542.3	<i>Vitis vinifera</i>
VvNIP2-1	XP_002278054.2	<i>Vitis vinifera</i>
VvNIP3-2	XP_002276319.1	<i>Vitis vinifera</i>
ZmNIP1-1	AFW77428.1	<i>Zea mays</i>
ZmNIP2-1	ACF79677.1	<i>Zea mays</i>
ZmNIP2-2	ABF67956.1	<i>Zea mays</i>
ZmNIP2-3	ACG28405.1	<i>Zea mays</i>
ZmNIP2-4	AAK26849.1	<i>Zea mays</i>
ZmNIP3-3	NP_001105021.1	<i>Zea mays</i>

with different selectivity filter signatures (Mitani et al. 2008; Ma and Yamaji 2015). Members of the NIP-I clade contain Trp-Val-Ala-Arg (WVAR) and Trp-Ile-Ala-Arg (WIAR) motifs, and the NIP-II members have Ala-Ile-Ala-Arg (AIAR), Ala-Ile-Gly-Arg (AIGR) and Ala-Val-Gly-Arg (AVGR) signatures. All NIP-III members, to which the barley NIP-type aquaporin HvNIP2;1 belongs, carry an absolutely conserved Gly-Ser-Gly-Arg (GSGR) signature in their selectivity filters (Fig. 2a in green). In this analysis, we further divided members of NIP-III into two sub-clades, α -sub-clade 1 and α -sub-clade 2 (highlighted in two lighter shades of grey) containing monocotyledonous members, and β -sub-clade (highlighted in darker grey) with dicotyledonous sequences. This suggested that the monocot α -sub-clade has diversified during evolution from the dicot β -sub-clade (Fig. 2a). However, it remains to be established if this clear diversification of selectivity filter motifs can be correlated with a solute permeation specificity of individual aquaporins, classified in specific clades or sub-clades.

4.5 Chemical Filtering of Solutes, Barriers for Ion or Proton Conductance Through the Pores of Monomers and Significance of NPA Signatures

It has been suggested, based on crystallographic analyses (Murata et al. 2000; Lee et al. 2005; Ho et al. 2009; Savage et al. 2010) and corroborated by molecular dynamics simulations (Tajkhorshid et al. 2002), that two NPA motifs provide a blocking mechanism against the passage of H⁺ and other ions. This mechanism is based on a unique role of Asn residues in the pore, whereby each Asn operates as a hydrogen bond donor that has the ability to polarise the orientation of central water molecules (Savage et al. 2010). In other words, NPA motifs with the macro-dipoles of neighbouring re-entrant α -helices have the ability to flip the dipole moments of water molecules at the centre of conducting pores and to disrupt a single-file chain of water molecules, thus preventing proton conductance through the Grotthuss mechanism (Agmon 1995). Dipole moments and electrostatic potentials of charged ions or protons also ensure that these would experience repulsive forces from many more accessible carbonyl oxygen atoms lining the inner regions of vestibules, selectivity filters and pore regions.

To assure that chemical filtering of solutes is in place, and barriers against ion or proton conductance through monomer pores are operating, a series of hydrogen bond donor carbonyls and other groups pre-align or preselect solute molecules in vestibules that may later be caught in the aquaporin pores. It is assumed that these solutes have already shed their water molecules (Harries et al. 2004; Sui et al. 2001; Ho et al. 2009). A relatively stronger hydrophobicity of vestibules in non-water-conducting aquaporins should improve transport rates of solutes that contain hydrophobic components, and correspondingly the more hydrophilic vestibules of canonical aquaporins would favour the preselection of water molecules (Sui et al. 2001; Savage et al. 2003;

Ho et al. 2009). It has further been proposed that these vestibules are sites for the energetically unfavourable shedding of hydration shells of water molecules from certain solutes during de-solvation, as well as for the increase of effective solute concentrations near the entry into the pore regions (Harries et al. 2004). However, the structural analyses of aquaporin vestibules revealed that central pores operate with a different molecular mechanism. The average distance between water molecules is minimal in the pore (forming a single-file water structure) because of a very high hydrophobicity, while the opposite was found to be true for the vestibule regions of aquaporins, where water adopts a bulk-like state (Han et al. 2015). Based on this premise, it was suggested that the vestibule regions could be effective drug design targets, as these regions are the sites for initial recruitment of solutes and may control their concentrations (Ho et al. 2009; Han et al. 2015). This approach could be tested using aquaporin homology models, based on structural data for closely related experimental structures, to solve the mechanistic problems of aquaporin solute selectivity and for in silico drug design.

4.6 Ion Conductance Through a Central Pore of Tetramers

While conductance of water or other neutral solutes through the central tetrameric pore has been excluded, due to its hydrophobic nature (Fu et al. 2000; Murata et al. 2000), a controversy prevails as to whether a central tetrameric pore conducts ionic species. The reason for this is that the central pore in some aquaporins may be up to 10 Å wide, considerably larger than, for example, the pore in the tetrameric KcsA potassium ion channel (Anderson et al. 1992). It was suggested that a central pore may serve as a potential path for ion permeation (Yool et al. 1996; Fu et al. 2000). To this end, the ion conductivity for a central pore in a human aquaporin has been proposed (especially after cGMP activation), and a proof-of-concept for this hypothesis was supported by molecular dynamics simulations and ion transport measurements in *X. laevis* oocytes (Yu et al. 2006). Notably, through molecular dynamics simulations, cGMP was found to interact with Arg-rich cytoplasmic loop D facilitating its outward movement, which was hypothesised to open a cytoplasmic gate and mediate ion conductance. Further, a homo-tetrameric plasma and inner chloroplast membrane PIP2;1 aquaporin from *Nicotiana tabacum* facilitated CO₂ but did not permeate water (Uehlein et al. 2008). These authors hypothesised that CO₂ could permeate through a central (so-called fifth) pore (Otto et al. 2010). The previous findings were confirmed by Wang et al. (2016), who showed that *Arabidopsis* PIP2;1 permeated CO₂, and served as a key interactor of the carbonic anhydrase βCA4. Importantly, these authors established that extracellular CO₂ signalling was linked to a SLAC1 ion channel regulation upon co-expression of PIP2;1, βCA4, SLAC1 and protein kinases. No molecular dynamics simulation studies have yet been performed on CO₂ transport. In summary, the question of whether the central tetrameric pore conducts ionic species or CO₂ is still highly contentious. This pathway must be more thoroughly investigated for its ion-conducting activity, at least in aquaporins in which the properties of the central pore are predicted to be conducive for this function.

4.7 *Mutational Studies to Alter Transport Selectivity and Rates*

One rapid way to investigate solute selectivity, modify transport rates, is to introduce variations in sequences (Jung et al. 1994; Jahn et al. 2004; Bienert et al. 2013; Hayes et al. 2013; Kirscht et al. 2016) and integrate both transport functional and structural observations. For over more than 20 years of this research, significant information has been gained based on the studies of wild-type and variant plant of aquaporins.

Several point mutations (His180Ala/Arg196Ala and Phe56Ala/His180Ala) in the ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter of a human water-specific aquaporin 1 allowed conversion of this orthodox water-permeable aquaporin into a more multifunctional aquaporin, permeating other solutes such as urea, glycerol and ammonia. These variations increased the maximal diameter of the constriction of the ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter by threefold (Beitz et al. 2006). However, surprisingly the Arg196Val substitution (removal of a positive charge from Arg196) allowed proton passage in both directions. Further, Beitz and co-authors (2006) established that protons did not permeate according to the Grothuss mechanism and concluded in accordance with Zeuthen et al. (2013) that the electrostatic proton barrier in aquaporins depended on both NPA and ar/R/LE1-LE2 constrictions. These findings and those of Hub and de Groot (2008) based on molecular dynamics simulations imply that the ar/R region does not preclude water conductance but affects uncharged solutes conductance, emphasising the importance of the ar/R/LE1-LE2 residues for channel selectivity.

On the other hand, when three selectivity filter signature residues (Phe43Trp/His174Gly/Thr183Phe) of the glycerol-permeating *E. coli* aquaporin (AqpF) were introduced into its water-conducting counterpart (AqpZ), there was no increase in glycerol conductance, although a decrease of water permeability was recorded in both reciprocally mutated aquaporins (Savage et al. 2010). Notable observations were reported by Liu et al. (2005), who in a rat anion-selective aquaporin 6 substituted Asn for Gly in α -helix 2. This mutation resulted in the elimination of anion permeability but also led to elevated water transport when variant proteins were expressed in *X. laevis* oocytes. These observations indicated that each aquaporin is structurally unique and that simple variations of selectivity filter residues may not result in an altered solute selectivity. To proceed forward with designing a desired solute selectivity of aquaporins, one needs to integrate multifaceted knowledge of bioinformatics, molecular modelling and classical molecular dynamics.

Ma and co-workers (2008) investigated the substrate specificity of a rice aquaporin NIP2;1 using *X. laevis* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cells. They isolated two alleles, whereby the allele lsi2-1 had lower accumulation of toxic arsenious acid than the allele lsi2-2 but a higher silicic acid uptake (see also chapter “[Plant Aquaporins and Metalloids](#)”). These metalloids differ by 0.62 Å in their atomic radii (Fig. 3), and thus it is conceivable to think that protein variants with different transport rates of essential (silicic acid) and toxic (arsenious acid) metalloids could in principle be engineered. Comparison of sequences indicated that Thr342 could be




Fig. 3 Structures and atomic radii of metalloid molecules of boric acid [B(OH)₃], silicic acid [Si(OH)₄], arsenious acid [As(OH)₃] and germanic acids [Ge(OH)₄] that are known to be transported by the members of an α -sub-clade of NIP-III aquaporins from monocotyledonous plants. Structures are shown in stick representations. The dimensions of atomic radii are given in Å

mutated to Arg in lsi2-2 that was positioned in the membrane H6 (topology explained in Fig. 1) and not in the pore region of the lsi2-2 protein. This study was extended by Mitani-Ueno et al. (2011), who investigated whether ar/R/LE1-LE2 filter and NPA motifs could be altered to influence the solute transport selectivity of rice NIP2;1 preferring silicic over boric acid, and conversely that of Arabidopsis NIP5;1 with a reversed substrate selectivity. Both proteins also permeate arsenious acid and thus this study also carries biotechnological significance. The individual changes in rice NIP2;1 at the ar/R/LE1 positions did not alter transport of metalloids; however, the H5 mutation led to a loss of transport activity of both metalloids. Conversely, mutations in *Arabidopsis* NIP5;1 did not restore transport of silicic acid, and double mutations in H2 and H5 did not affect transport of arsenious acid. Further, Hayes et al. (2013) performed targeted mutagenesis of the specific residues within the ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter in barley NIP2;1 to alter its metalloid solute selectivity. Two of the mutations in the H2 position Gly88Ala and Gly88Cys showed a growth restoration in the presence of boric (smallest atomic radius, Fig. 3) and germanic (largest atomic radius) acids; nevertheless, the growth inhibition on arsenious acid (the second smallest atomic radius from the four metalloids) was preserved. These observations suggested that although mutations altered the substrate specificity of barley NIP2;1, metalloid permeation seemed to be controlled by other factors than simply by atomic radii of solutes. Potential controlling factors may entail differences in de-solvation rates within the vestibule regions of aquaporins *prior* to interactions with ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter residues or differences in overall interaction modes of metalloids with aquaporin molecules. These hypotheses can be tested using molecular dynamics simulation experiments.

The observations outlined above further extend a suggestion that ar/R/LE1-LE2 selectivity filter properties alone do not control solute selectivity of aquaporins and that other structural elements that do not directly interact with solutes may play essential roles in solute permeation specificity (Savage et al. 2010).

Another alternative to identify variations in protein sequences of aquaporins is to search for natural variation in cultivars that have precisely adapted to specific or stress-affected environments. These types of studies are just beginning to appear with aquaporins and other transport systems (e.g. Pallotta et al. 2014). The question then arises as to whether the responses of natural variants for specific stresses, such as drought or mineral toxicity, have already been optimised in crop and other plants through a long history of selection of native variants or are there still opportunities for a significant gain through allelic mining (Langridge et al. 2006). Although the information on natural variation of aquaporins and other transport systems involved in drought or other biotic and abiotic stresses is scarce, a few landmark studies have appeared (Pallotta et al. 2014; Hayes et al. 2015; Nagarajan et al. 2016).

5 Gating Mechanisms of Aquaporins Induced by pH, Cation Binding and Phosphorylation or Lengths of Loops and Mutational Studies

The concept of gating in plant aquaporins was proposed long before (Tyerman et al. 1989; Azaizeh et al. 1992; Tyerman et al. 1999; Yool and Weinstein 2002) both states, i.e. open and closed, of any aquaporin were elucidated at the atomic levels. Later both states of the spinach aquaporin (Fig. 1c) were defined at atomic levels in: (i) closed states at pH 8.0 (PDB ID: 1Z98; Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006) and pH 6.0 (PDB ID: 4IA4; Frick et al. 2013a, b) and (ii) an open state (PDB ID: 2B5F; Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006). Further, a so-called stochastic model of osmotic water transport was suggested, based on testing of a range of channel sizes and geometries of human aquaporins and their mutants (Zeuthen et al. 2013); this knowledge can directly be linked to the concept of gating.

Two groups of mechanisms that appear to be conserved in plant aquaporins are known to facilitate gating, i.e. the transitions between open and closed states. More precisely, the term gating refers to the opened (activated or conductive) and closed (deactivated or non-conductive) states, whereby these states represent distinct spatial conformations of the same channel. Here, that conformation interchange results in increasing the limiting size of the pore to accommodate solutes. The first group of mechanisms of gating includes pH changes, cation binding and post-translational phosphorylation (Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006; Frick et al. 2013a, b). The second group of gating mechanisms is based on loop lengths and their movements (Fischer et al. 2009).

The origin of gating was explored in a spinach aquaporin, for which the atomic structures of both states are available, using single and double Ser115Glu and Ser274Glu phosphorylation mimic variants (Nyblom et al. 2009). Although all

mutants crystallised in a closed conformation, the analysis revealed that neither variation mimicked the naturally occurring phosphorylated state of the protein. However, combined functional and structural analyses revealed that in the Ser115Glu variant, the neighbouring Glu31 significantly moved away from its wild-type position, leading to a disruption of the divalent cation (presumed to be Ca^{2+})-binding site that stabilises loop D. These observations highlight the fact that phosphorylation of Ser115 could induce structural rearrangements and thus control opening and closing states of the pore.

The crystal structures of a spinach aquaporin, which have been obtained in several conformational states (a water-closed state at pH 8.0 (Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006) and at pH 6.0 (Frick et al. 2013a, b)), revealed a closing mechanism that in the plasma membrane results from a rapid drop of cytosolic pH due to anoxia that occurs during flooding (Tournaire-Roux et al. 2003). The closing mechanism is assumed to involve the interaction of the conserved pH-sensitive His193 residue on cytosolic loop D with the divalent cation (presumed to be Ca^{2+})-binding site. Here, in a protonated state, His adopts an alternative rotameric state and interacts with Asp28 that resides on a short N-terminal α -helix. This closing mechanism is also maintained by dephosphorylation of a closely positioned Ser115 residue on loop B (Frick et al. 2013a, b).

These observations, based on structural analyses of a wild-type and variant spinach aquaporins, indicate that gating mechanisms are linked to movements of loops B and D, post-translational phosphorylating events of Ser residues, protonation states of a His residue and the involvement of a divalent cation-binding site (Törnroth-Horsefield et al. 2006). These studies emphasise the control of gating by several concurrent events to open and close a solute-conducting pore (Nyblom et al. 2009; Frick et al. 2013a, b).

The second group of gating mechanisms is based on loop lengths and their movements alone and was revealed for the first time using the full-length and truncated forms of the yeast aquaporin Aqy1 from *Pichia pastoris*, resolved to 1.15 Å (Fischer et al. 2009). Structural data revealed that the pore of the Aqy1 aquaporin was closed by its own N-terminus. Here, Tyr31 formed a hydrogen bond to a water molecule and the backbone oxygen atoms of nearby Gly residues, located in the vicinity of the pore, consequently obstructing the cytoplasmic entrance to the pore. Additional mutational studies combined with molecular dynamics simulations suggested that water flow through the pore may be regulated by specific arrangements of post-translational regulation sites by phosphorylation and also by mechanosensitive gating. The latter gating could also be related to highly curved membrane environments, where aquaporins may reside. This was confirmed by molecular dynamics simulation, indicating that Aqy1 was regulated by both surface tension and membrane curvature. This type of gating could provide a rapid pressure regulator in response to unexpected cellular shock, aiding adaptation and microbial survival (Fischer et al. 2009), as well as to plants that employ a turgor pressure (Tyerman et al. 1989, 1999).

6 The Structural Knowledge of Aquaporins Has Strategic Significance in Agricultural Biotechnology, Nanobiotechnology and Environmental Sciences

Although transport function is central to plants, limited information is available on a structural basis of the permeation function of plant aquaporins. These investigations have so far been largely driven by genetics and physiology, but the knowledge of molecular function is required if we are to modify the properties of these transport proteins (Schroeder et al. 2013; Chaumont and Tyerman 2014; Nagarajan et al. 2016). Further, modifying the properties of aquaporins depends on a detailed mechanistic knowledge of their behaviour. Even though many aquaporins have been identified, their intrinsic hydrophobic properties made these studies difficult. As of May 2016, from 615 unique membrane proteins (<http://blanco.biomol.uci.edu/mpstruc/>), only five structures of plant transport proteins are known. These include two aquaporins from *S. oleracea* and *A. thaliana*, a nitrate transporter and a voltage-gated two-pore channel from *A. thaliana* and a SWEET transporter from *Oryza sativa*. Thus, two unique plant aquaporin structures are those of the water-conducting SoPIP2;1 aquaporin from *S. oleracea* (in several conformational states and variant forms) and the AtTIP2;1 aquaammoniaporin from *A. thaliana* (Kirscht et al. 2016).

Surprisingly, limited information is available on solute permeation specificity of plant aquaporins, although these data in conjunction with structural information are vital strategic tools for modifying their molecular function. We therefore need detailed structural data on all subfamilies of plant aquaporins from economically important food plants such as wheat, barley, maize and rice that conduct a variety of solutes, including those of multi-selective NIPs that have importance in food security and safety (Ma et al. 2006; Schnurbusch et al. 2010; Hayes et al. 2013). Targets for this knowledge include, for example, improving the nutritional quality and safety of plant products for humans, such as exclusion of toxic arsenic from food plants (Isayenkov and Maathuis 2008; Kamiya et al. 2009; Li et al. 2011; Hayes et al. 2013; Schnurbusch et al. 2010; Xu et al. 2015). Modifying nutrient fluxes is also important for protection of plants from excessive accumulation of metalloids such as boric acid, which become toxic at high concentrations (Hayes et al. 2015; Nagarajan et al. 2016).

Uncharged ion pairs of mercury, gold, copper and cadmium are also known to perturb plant water status (Belimov et al. 2015) and have been reported to be the potent inhibitors of aquaporins that operate through cysteine-related mechanisms (Niemietz and Tyerman 2002). Heavy metal-induced perturbations of aquaporin function at the plant level have been explained by a decrease of both root and shoot hydraulic conductance, leading to decreasing leaf water potentials and turgor, which may close stomata (Zhu et al. 2005). On the other hand, many aquaporins are mercury insensitive. Remarkably Frick et al. (2013a, b) in a spinach aquaporin observed mercury-increased water permeability, using a non-cysteine-related mechanism, whereby presumably other factors affected the aquaporin; one of them could be the properties of a lipid bilayer.

Finally, an obvious potential application of aquaporins is in nanotechnology by creating stable biomimetic membranes, such as those with embedded robust aquaporin folds that have excellent separation performance and permit rapid water diffusion. Hence, a next important application of aquaporins could be in environmental sciences, more specifically in water desalination, waste-water recovery and fertiliser and soil component retrieval. Application and profitability on an industrial scale would require stable and robust aquaporin structures with highly selective permeation functions and rapid transport rates (Wang et al. 2015).

Acknowledgements This work was supported by the grants from the Australian Research Council (LP120100201 and DP120100900 to M. H.). Jay Rongala and Dr. Julie Hayes (Australian Centre for Plant Functional Genomics, University of Adelaide) are thanked for the assistance with literature and for critically reading the manuscript, respectively. I acknowledge Professor Steve Tyerman and the past members of my laboratory for insightful discussions.

References

- Abascal F, Irisarri I, Zardoya R (2014) Diversity and evolution of membrane intrinsic proteins. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1840:1468–1481
- Agemark M, Kowal J, Kukulski W, Nordén K, Gustavsson N, Johanson U, Engel A, Kjellbom P (2012) Reconstitution of water channel function and 2D-crystallization of human aquaporin 8. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1818:839–850
- Agmon N (1995) The Grotthuss mechanism. *Chem Phys Lett* 244:456–462
- Agre P, Kozono D (2003) Aquaporin water channels: molecular mechanisms for human diseases. *FEBS Lett* 555:72–78
- Agre P, Sasaki S, Chrispeels J (1993) Aquaporins: a family of water channel proteins. *Am J Physiol Ren Physiol* 265:F461
- Anderson JA, Huprikar SS, Kochian LV, Lucas WJ, Gaber RF (1992) Functional expression of a probable *Arabidopsis thaliana* potassium channel in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 89:3736–3740
- Ariani A, Gepts P (2015) Genome-wide identification and characterization of aquaporin gene family in common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.). *Mol Genet* 290:1771–1785
- Beitz E, Wu B, Holm LM, Schultz JE, Zeuthen T (2006) Point mutations in the aromatic/arginine region in aquaporin 1 allow passage of urea, glycerol, ammonia, and protons. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103:269–274
- Belimov AA, Dodd IC, Safronova VI, Malkov NV, Davies WJ, Tikhonovich IA (2015) The cadmium-tolerant pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) mutant SGECDt is more sensitive to mercury: assessing plant water relations. *J Exp Bot* 66:2359–2369
- Besse M, Knipfer T, Miller AJ, Verdeil JL, Jahn TP, Fricke W (2011) Developmental pattern of aquaporin expression in barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.) leaves. *J Exp Bot* 62:4127–4142
- Besserer A, Burnotte E, Bienert GP, Chevalier AS, Errachid A, Grefen C, Blatt MR, Chaumont F (2012) Selective regulation of maize plasma membrane aquaporin trafficking and activity by the SNARE SYP121. *Plant Cell* 24:3463–3481
- Bienert GP, Bienert MD, Jahn TP, Boutry M, Chaumont F (2011) Solanaceae XIPs are plasma membrane aquaporins that facilitate the transport of many uncharged substrates. *Plant J* 66:306–317
- Bienert GP, Desguin B, Chaumont F, Hols P (2013) Channel-mediated lactic acid transport: a novel function for aquaglyceroporins in bacteria. *Biochem J* 454:559–570
- Borgnia M, Nielsen S, Engel A, Agre P (1999) Cellular and molecular biology of the aquaporin water channels. *Annu Rev Biochem* 68:425–458