

# The Role of Calcium in Lipoprotein Release by the Low-Density Lipoprotein Receptor<sup>†</sup>

Zhenze Zhao and Peter Michaely\*

Department of Cell Biology, University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, Texas 75390-9039

Received February 9, 2009; Revised Manuscript Received June 4, 2009

**ABSTRACT:** The LDL receptor (LDLR) mediates efficient endocytosis of VLDL, VLDL remnants, and LDL. As part of the uptake process, the LDLR releases lipoproteins in endosomes. Released lipoproteins are subsequently trafficked to lysosomes for degradation, while the LDLR recycles back to the cell surface for further rounds of uptake. Endosomes have at least two features that can promote lipoprotein release: an acidic pH and low concentrations of free calcium. The relative contributions of acidic pH and low free calcium to lipoprotein release are not known. Here, we generated fibroblasts that express either normal LDLR or an LDLR variant that is unable to employ the acid-dependent release mechanism to determine the relative contributions of acidic pH and low free calcium on lipoprotein release. We show that endosomal concentrations of free calcium can drive lipoprotein release at rates that are similar to those of acid-dependent release and that the calcium-dependent and acid-dependent mechanisms can cooperate during lipoprotein release. Assessment of lipoprotein uptake by these two cell lines showed that LDL uptake requires the acid-dependent mechanism, while uptake of the VLDL remnant,  $\beta$ -VLDL, does not. We propose that endosomes use both the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent release mechanisms to drive lipoprotein release and that the acid-dependent process is only required for LDL release.

The low-density lipoprotein (LDL)<sup>1</sup> receptor (LDLR) is the principal endocytic receptor that removes very low density lipoprotein (VLDL), VLDL remnants, and LDL from the circulation. Lipoprotein uptake involves first binding of lipoproteins to the LDLR on the cell surface, followed by internalization of the LDLR–lipoprotein complex through clathrin-coated pits. Lipoproteins bind to the extracellular domain (ectodomain) of the LDLR, which contains a ligand-binding domain, an epidermal growth factor- (EGF-) homology domain, and an O-glycosylated domain (1). Internalization requires the cytoplasmic domain of the LDLR, which contains determinants that interact with components of the clathrin-coated pit machinery (2–6). After internalization, the LDLR–lipoprotein complex traffics to endosomes, where the LDLR releases bound lipoproteins. Released lipoproteins are subsequently degraded in lysosomes, while the LDLR recycles back to the cell surface for further rounds of lipoprotein uptake. Loss-of-function mutations that impair any step in this pathway reduce the clearance rates of VLDL, VLDL remnants, and LDL and result in familial hypercholesterolemia (FH), a common autosomal dominant disorder that promotes atherosclerosis and the development of coronary artery disease (7–10).

Lipoproteins bind to the ligand-binding domain (11). This domain consists of seven LDLR type A (LA) repeats, which are small, irregular domains held together by calcium and cystine bridges (12, 13). LDL binding requires LA repeats 3–7, which interact with apolipoprotein B100 (apoB100) on LDL (11, 14–16). The binding of VLDL and VLDL remnants involves LA repeats 4 and 5 (LA4/5), which associate with apolipoprotein E (apoE) on VLDL/VLDL remnants (11, 16–19).

Lipoprotein release occurs in endosomes, whose lumen is acidic and has low concentrations of free calcium (high pCa, where  $pCa = -\log(\text{free } [Ca^{2+}])$ ). Acidic pH alone can drive lipoprotein release through a process that requires the EGF-homology domain (20, 21). The EGF-homology domain consists of two EGF-like domains (EGF-A and EGF-B), six YWTD repeats that form a six-bladed  $\beta$ -propeller, and a third EGF-like repeat (EGF-C) (1, 22). At acidic pH, the  $\beta$ -propeller of the EGF-homology domain forms an intramolecular contact with LA4/5 of the ligand-binding domain (23). Recent work suggests that this contact drives an allosteric change in LA4/5 that accelerates lipoprotein dissociation (24). In addition to the acid-dependent process, low concentrations of calcium can promote release because the LDLR requires calcium to bind LDL and VLDL (25, 26). Loss of calcium induces structural changes in LA repeats that have been proposed to disrupt lipoprotein-binding ability (27–31). LA repeats bind calcium with affinities in the nanomolar range at neutral pH and in the low micromolar range at acidic pH (27, 30–32). Endosomes have a pH in the range of 5.5–6.5 and a free calcium concentration in the range of 2.5–10  $\mu M$  (33). Thus, the endosomal lumen has the potential to trigger lipoprotein release through both a purely acid-dependent process that involves the EGF-homology domain and a low free calcium-dependent process that directly disrupts lipoprotein-binding surfaces.

Of the two potential triggers, the acid-dependent process involving the EGF-homology domain has been viewed as the

<sup>†</sup>This work was supported by National Institutes of Health Grant HL085218.

\*Address correspondence to this author. Phone: 214-648-3238. Fax: 214-648-8694. E-mail: Peter.Michaely@utsouthwestern.edu.

<sup>1</sup>Abbreviations: apoB100, apolipoprotein B100; apoE, apolipoprotein E; DiI, 3*H*-indolium, 2-(3-(1,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-1-octadecyl-2*H*-indol-2-ylidene)-1-propenyl)-3,3-dimethyl-1-octadecylperchlorate; EDTA, ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; EGF, epidermal growth factor; EGTA, ethylene glycol *O,O'*-bis(2-aminoethyl)-*N,N,N',N'*-tetraacetic acid; HEDTA, *N*-(2-hydroxyethyl)ethylenediamine-*N,N',N'*-tetraacetic acid; HEPES, 4-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazine-1-ethanesulfonic acid; LA, LDLR type A repeat; LDL, low-density lipoprotein; LDLR, low-density lipoprotein receptor; MEM, minimal essential medium; D-MEM, Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium; VLDL, very low density lipoprotein.

principal mechanism of lipoprotein release (34, 35); however, a role for the calcium-dependent process has not been excluded. A key impediment to characterization of the calcium-dependent process has been separating the two processes, both of which are promoted by low pH. Here, we generated fibroblast cells that express an LDLR variant (LDLR- $\Delta$ BC) lacking the EGF-B, the  $\beta$ -propeller, and EGF-C modules of the EGF-homology domain. The LDLR- $\Delta$ BC expressing cells have normal lipoprotein binding but are unable to employ the acid-dependent mechanism of lipoprotein release. Thus, the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC receptor provides a tool with which to characterize the calcium-dependent mechanism and to determine the relative contributions of the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent processes on lipoprotein release.

## EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

**Materials.** LDLR<sup>-/-</sup> primary human fibroblasts, human LDL, and rabbit beta-migrating VLDL ( $\beta$ -VLDL) were a gift of Michael Brown and Joseph Goldstein (Department of Molecular Genetics, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX). Rabbit polyclonal anti-LDLR (4548) was a gift of Joachim Herz (Department of Molecular Genetics, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX). Mouse monoclonal anti-LDLR (C7) was from Santa Cruz Biotechnology (Santa Cruz, CA). <sup>125</sup>I-Bolton–Hunter reagent was from Perkin-Elmer (Boston, MA). Alexa546 succinimidyl ester was from Invitrogen (Carlsbad, CA).

**Baculovirus-Mediated Protein Expression of the WT LDLR Ectodomain.** The cDNA encoding residues 1–699 of the LDLR was cloned into the pFastBac plasmid (Invitrogen). Recombinant plasmids were used to produce infectious baculoviruses that directed the synthesis of secreted LDLR ectodomains using the Bac-to-Bac system (Invitrogen).

**Introduction of LDLR Variants into LDLR<sup>-/-</sup> Fibroblasts.** WT LDLR or LDLR- $\Delta$ BC was stably expressed in LDLR<sup>-/-</sup> fibroblasts (549T) using a retroviral system as previously described (24). Briefly, LDLR variants were cloned into the pMX-IRES-GFP bicistronic retroviral vector (36). Retroviral vectors were cotransfected with the pAmpho packaging vector (Clontech, Mountain View, CA) into 293T cells to produce infectious, replication-defective retroviruses. Recombinant retroviruses were used to infect 549T cells, which are derived from primary human fibroblasts from an individual that lacks LDLR expression (LDLR<sup>-/-</sup>). GFP positive, LDLR-expressing fibroblasts were purified using two rounds of fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) with a MoFlo high-performance cell sorter (Dako, Glostrup, Denmark). Surface LDLR expression was monitored by flow cytometry using anti-LDLR mouse monoclonal antibody, C7 (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Santa Cruz, CA).

**Cell Culture.** All fibroblasts were cultured in medium A (DMEM medium supplemented with 10% (v/v) fetal bovine serum, 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.5, 100 units/mL penicillin G, and 100  $\mu$ g/mL streptomycin). Prior to experimentation, fibroblasts were starved of lipoproteins for 24 h by replacing the culture medium with medium B (DMEM medium supplemented with 10% (v/v) lipoprotein-poor serum, 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.5, penicillin G (100 units/mL), and streptomycin (100  $\mu$ g/mL)).

**Gel Filtration.** Gel filtration was conducted on a Superdex200 10/30 column attached to an Akta FPLC (Amersham, Piscataway, NJ). The column was equilibrated in buffers containing 25 mM HEPES, 25 mM maleate, 150 mM NaCl, and 0.5% Triton X-100 at pH 6.0. Free calcium was buffered between

0.3 and 80  $\mu$ M using either 25 mM EDTA (for 0.3–5  $\mu$ M free calcium) or 25 mM EGTA (for 10–80  $\mu$ M free calcium). Samples were equilibrated in the same buffers prior to loading. Fractions of 0.5 mL were collected, electrophoresed on 5–17% SDS–PAGE gels, transferred to nylon membranes, and immunoblotted for the LDLR using the 4548 polyclonal antibody. Thyroglobulin (85 Å), apoferritin (61 Å), amylase (48 Å), aldolase (45 Å), bovine serum albumin (36 Å), and carbonic anhydrase (20 Å) were used as standards.

**Lipoprotein Labeling.** Human LDL and rabbit  $\beta$ -VLDL were labeled with <sup>125</sup>I using the Bolton–Hunter method (37). LDL was labeled with Alexa546 using the succinimidyl ester of Alexa546 with the manufacturer's recommended protocol (Invitrogen).  $\beta$ -VLDL was labeled with DiI (3*H*-indolium, 2-(3-(1,3-dihydro-3,3-dimethyl-1-octadecyl-2*H*-indol-2-ylidene)-1-propenyl)-3,3-dimethyl-1-octadecylperchlorate) by adding 300  $\mu$ L of 3 mg/mL DiI suspended in DMSO to 10 mg of  $\beta$ -VLDL in 10 mL of lipoprotein-poor serum with gentle mixing. The suspension was mixed end over end for 16 h at 37 °C in the dark. The density of the suspension was increased to 1.019 by the addition of 0.0199 g of KBr/mL of suspension and centrifuged at 120000g for 16 h at 4 °C. DiI- $\beta$ -VLDL was removed from the top of the tube, dialyzed against PBS, and stored at 4 °C in the dark until use.

**Lipoprotein Binding Assays.** <sup>125</sup>I-LDL and <sup>125</sup>I- $\beta$ -VLDL binding assays were performed in triplicate using established methods (38). Assays were performed at 4 °C for 90 min using concentrations of <sup>125</sup>I-LDL or <sup>125</sup>I- $\beta$ -VLDL indicated in the figure legends. In all binding experiments, cells infected with empty retrovirus (vector control) were used as negative controls, and values of lipoprotein bound by vector cells were subtracted from values of WT LDLR, LDLR- $\Delta$ BC, and LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells. Binding by vector cells was < 5% of WT LDLR cells. Results are presented as means  $\pm$  standard deviation.

**In Vitro Release of Cell Surface Bound Lipoprotein.** Cells were preincubated at 37 °C with medium C, which consisted of medium B supplemented with 0.45 M sucrose to prevent clathrin-coated pit endocytosis (39). Cells were then incubated with either 10  $\mu$ g/mL <sup>125</sup>I-LDL or 5  $\mu$ g/mL <sup>125</sup>I- $\beta$ -VLDL in medium C for 30 min at 37 °C and washed with warm medium C. For acid-dependent release cells were incubated at 37 °C at the indicated pH with medium D (bicarbonate-free MEM supplemented with 0.45 M sucrose, 20 mM HEPES, 20 mM maleate, and 10% lipoprotein-poor serum). For release experiments in which the calcium concentration was varied, cells were incubated with medium E (bicarbonate-free MEM supplemented with 0.45 M sucrose, 20 mM HEPES, 20 mM maleate, 25 mM chelator (HEDTA, EGTA, or EDTA), 10% lipoprotein-poor serum, and sufficient calcium chloride to bring free calcium to the indicated calcium concentration at the indicated pH). The total calcium needed to achieve the indicated free calcium concentrations was determined using WEBMAXC (<http://www.stanford.edu/~cpatton/maxc.html>) (40). After incubation for the indicated time in either medium D or medium E, cells were washed two times with ice-cold TBSC (50 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 2 mM CaCl<sub>2</sub>), one time for 10 min with ice-cold TBSC supplemented with 1% BSA, and two times with ice-cold TBSC. Remaining cell-associated, <sup>125</sup>I-labeled lipoproteins were liberated by incubation with 0.1 N NaOH and counted. In all experiments, parallel trials with vector-infected fibroblasts were used as negative controls. Values for vector-infected cells were subtracted from values of WT LDLR and LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells to

obtain receptor specific values for lipoprotein binding and release. Rate constants for release were determined by plotting the  $\ln(\Delta y/\Delta y_0)$  vs time, where  $\Delta y$  is the amount of lipoprotein bound at time  $t$  and  $\Delta y_0$  is the amount of lipoprotein bound at time 0. The slope of this plot provides an estimate of the rate constant assuming a two-state model of release ( $\Delta y = \Delta y_0 e^{-kt}$ ). This procedure was used with data shown in Figures 5 and 6 to determine the rate constants shown in Table 1.

**Cellular Lipoprotein Uptake.** Cells were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g/mL}$  Alexa546-LDL or 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$  DiI- $\beta$ -VLDL in warm medium B for the times indicated. Cells were washed with ice-cold PBS, suspended by gentle scraping in PBS, and fixed in the presence of 3% paraformaldehyde. Cells were washed with PBS and analyzed by flow cytometry on a FACS Calibur (BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA). Mean fluorescence intensities were recorded for 10000 events for each experiment. All experiments used vector-infected cells as negative controls, and mean values for the vector cells were subtracted from values of WT LDLR, LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$ , and LDLR- $\Delta\text{AC}$  cells to produce the reported values. Vector cell fluorescence means did not significantly increase with time and by 1 h were <5% of WT LDLR cells. Results shown are representative of three independent experiments.

**Initial Endocytic Rates.** Initial internalization rates were determined as previously described (41, 42). Briefly, cells were incubated with 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL for 1 h at 4 °C in medium F (bicarbonate-free MEM supplemented with 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.5, and 10% lipoprotein-poor serum). Medium was changed for the times indicated with warm medium B that also contained 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL. Cells were extensively washed with ice-cold PBS and incubated with 1 mg/mL protease K in buffer A (PBS + 1 mM EDTA) for 2 h at 4 °C. The cell suspension was then centrifuged at 5000g for 10 min over a cushion of 10% sucrose in PBS. The tubes were frozen in liquid nitrogen, cut to separate the cell pellet (internal) from the solution (surface-bound material released by protease K), and counted on a  $\gamma$ -counter. Results are presented as means  $\pm$  standard deviation.

**Monensin Treatment and Analysis of Surface-Biotinylated Proteins.** Fibroblasts were treated with 10  $\mu\text{g/mL}$  LDL or 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $\beta$ -VLDL in the presence or absence of 30  $\mu\text{M}$  monensin for the times indicated in the figure legends. Cells were washed with ice-cold PBS and incubated with buffer B (1 mg/mL sulfo-NHS-(LC)-biotin (Pierce) in PBS, pH 8.0) for 30 min at 4 °C. Cells were then washed with ice-cold PBS and incubated with buffer C (100 mM NaCl and 20 mM Tris, pH 8.0) for 30 min at 4 °C. Cells were lysed in 0.5 mL of buffer D (1% Triton X-100, 4 mM EGTA, 10 mM Tris, pH 8.0) and lysates clarified by centrifugation for 15 min at 20000g at 4 °C. Biotinylated proteins from 400  $\mu\text{L}$  of the lysate were precipitated by addition of 40  $\mu\text{L}$  of a 50% slurry of neutravidin agarose (Pierce) followed by end over end mixing for 1 h at 4 °C. Biotinylated proteins bound to the agarose were washed three times with buffer E (15 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 500 mM NaCl, 4 mM EGTA, and 0.5% Triton X-100) and one time with buffer F (15 mM Tris, pH 8.0, 4 mM EGTA, and 0.5% Triton X-100). Biotinylated proteins were eluted from neutravidin agarose by the addition of 100  $\mu\text{L}$  of 4 $\times$  SDS-PAGE sample buffer and heating to 100 °C for 10 min. Samples were loaded on 5–17% SDS-PAGE gels, transferred to PVDF membranes, and immunoblotted for LDLR.

## RESULTS

The calcium-dependent mechanism has the potential to drive lipoprotein release from the LDLR; however, characterization of

Table 1: Rates of Lipoprotein Release<sup>a</sup>

LDLR	pH	lipoprotein	pCa 2.7	pCa 5.0	pCa 5.6
$\Delta\text{BC}$	6.0	LDL	$1.3 \times 10^{-4}$	$9.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.9 \times 10^{-3}$
$\Delta\text{BC}$	6.0	VLDL	$9.84 \times 10^{-5}$	$2.5 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.0 \times 10^{-3}$
$\Delta\text{BC}$	5.5	LDL	$2.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$1.1 \times 10^{-2}$
$\Delta\text{BC}$	5.5	VLDL	$2.8 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.5 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.1 \times 10^{-3}$
WT	6.0	LDL	$1.9 \times 10^{-3}$	$3.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.7 \times 10^{-3}$
WT	6.0	VLDL	$8.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$8.9 \times 10^{-4}$	$1.6 \times 10^{-3}$
WT	5.5	LDL	$7.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$2.3 \times 10^{-2}$	$2.4 \times 10^{-2}$
WT	5.5	VLDL	$5.1 \times 10^{-3}$	$8.0 \times 10^{-3}$	$8.0 \times 10^{-3}$

<sup>a</sup> All rate constants are in  $\text{s}^{-1}$ .

this mechanism has been hampered by the ability of the LDLR to release lipoproteins using the EGF-homology domain, which triggers release through an acid-dependent but calcium-independent process. To characterize the calcium-dependent mechanism of lipoprotein release, we generated fibroblasts that express either normal LDLR (WT LDLR) or an LDLR variant (LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$ ) that lacks the EGF-B,  $\beta$ -propeller, and EGF-C modules and thus should not be able to utilize the acid-dependent mechanism of lipoprotein release. The EGF-A module was not removed because removal of EGF-A impairs LDL binding (11, 20). The parental fibroblasts we used are 549T cells, which are immortalized primary skin fibroblasts from an LDLR<sup>-/-</sup> individual. These fibroblasts do not express any LDLR and have exceptionally poor ability to bind either LDL or  $\beta$ -VLDL (24). These fibroblasts were immortalized by introduction of human telomerase, which prevents senescence but does not change cell morphology or cell growth rate in fibroblasts (43). Comparison of WT LDLR and LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  fibroblasts showed that both fibroblasts express similar total and surface numbers of LDLRs (Figure 1A,B) and that the LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  has normal ability to bind to LDL and the VLDL remnant,  $\beta$ -VLDL (Figure 1C,D). The normal surface expression of LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  indicates that deletion of the EGF-B to EGF-C region does not impair either maturation or intracellular trafficking of the LDLR, while the normal lipoprotein binding properties indicate that the deletion does not remove regions necessary for lipoprotein binding. The normal ability of LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  cells to bind LDL is consistent with a previous report showing that a secreted LDLR variant consisting of just the ligand-binding domain and the EGF-A module efficiently competes with cellular LDLRs for binding to LDL (44). The normal ability of LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  cells to bind  $\beta$ -VLDL is consistent with the observation that a fusion protein of GST with LA4/5 retains the ability to bind apoE-containing lipoproteins (19). Together, these experiments show that deletion of the EGF-B to EGF-C region of the EGF-homology domain of the LDLR has little effect on the production of mature LDLR, on the intracellular trafficking of LDLR, or on the ability of the LDLR to bind lipoproteins.

At acidic pH, the  $\beta$ -propeller of the EGF-homology domain forms an intramolecular contact with LA4/5 of the ligand-binding domain (23), suggesting that acid-dependent lipoprotein release requires the interaction of the  $\beta$ -propeller with LA4/5 (21). We tested whether lipoprotein binding by the LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  was sensitive to acidic pH using an assay system in which cells expressing either WT LDLR or LDLR- $\Delta\text{BC}$  were first incubated with  $^{125}\text{I}$ -LDL or  $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL to saturate surface LDLRs and then incubated with media buffered between pH 5.5 and pH 7.5 to examine acid-dependent release. Incubations at acidic pH resulted in the loss of both LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL from the surface of






FIGURE 1: The LDLR-ΔBC has normal expression and ability to bind lipoproteins. Panel A shows the domains contained in WT LDLR and the LDLR-ΔBC protein. The seven LA repeats of the ligand-binding domain are labeled with numbers. Letters identify the three EGF-like repeats of the EGF-homology domain. The six circles indicate the YWTD repeats of the  $\beta$ -propeller. The wavy lines indicate the O-linked sugar domain. The cytoplasmic domain is labeled. Below the line drawing are immunoblots showing the relative expression of WT LDLR (WT) or LDLR-ΔBC (ΔBC). Also shown is an immunoblot of CD44, which is a plasma membrane protein that is used as a loading control. Panel B shows the relative surface expression of LDLR by cells expressing WT LDLR or LDLR-ΔBC as determined by cell cytometry using the C7 monoclonal antibody against the LDLR ectodomain. Panel C shows saturation binding of <sup>125</sup>I-LDL to cells expressing WT LDLR or LDLR-ΔBC. Panel D shows saturation binding of <sup>125</sup>I- $\beta$ -VLDL. The inserts in panels C and D are Scatchard plots of the saturation data shown in the respective panels.

cells expressing WT LDLR but had little ability to drive loss of surface-bound LDL or  $\beta$ -VLDL from cells expressing LDLR-ΔBC (Figure 2). Thus, the LDLR-ΔBC is unable to support acid-dependent lipoprotein release, consistent with the proposal that interaction of the  $\beta$ -propeller with LA4/5 is required for acid-dependent release.

We next compared lipoprotein release by the LDLR-ΔBC and WT-LDLR expressing cells in response to low concentrations of free calcium. Cells expressing WT LDLR or LDLR-ΔBC were loaded with <sup>125</sup>I-LDL or <sup>125</sup>I- $\beta$ -VLDL and then incubated with media containing free calcium concentrations from 1.8 mM (pCa 2.7) to 100 nM (pCa 7.0). The pH was held at pH 7.0 to prevent acid-dependent release through the EGF-homology domain. In response to reduced concentrations of free calcium, both WT LDLR expressing cells and LDLR-ΔBC expressing cells released LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL with similar dependence on free calcium (Figure 3). These observations show that the EGF-B,

$\beta$ -propeller, and EGF-C modules are not required for lipoprotein release in response to low calcium, consistent with the proposal that low calcium disrupts the lipoprotein binding surfaces of the LDLR (27, 29–31). These observations also indicate that the acid-dependent pathway is independent of the calcium-dependent pathway of lipoprotein release.

At neutral pH, half-maximal lipoprotein release occurred at a free calcium concentration of 0.5–2  $\mu$ M (pCa 5.7–6.2) for LDL and  $\sim$ 0.2  $\mu$ M (pCa 6.7) for  $\beta$ -VLDL. These values are lower than the free calcium concentration in endosomes, which ranges from 2.5 to 10  $\mu$ M (pCa 5.0–5.6); however, the ligand-binding domain of the LDLR binds calcium with weaker affinity at acidic pH than at neutral pH (30), suggesting that lipoprotein release mediated by low free calcium may be augmented by endosomal pH. In fibroblasts, endosomal pH drops to a pH of  $\sim$ 6 within 10 min and to a pH of  $\sim$ 5.5 within 20 min (33). To test the role of pH on calcium-dependent release, we compared lipoprotein




FIGURE 2: The LDLR-ΔBC does not support acid-dependent lipoprotein release. Cells expressing WT LDLR (WT) or LDLR-ΔBC (ΔBC) were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ -LDL (panel A) or 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B) for 1 h, washed, and further incubated with media at pH 5.5–7.5 for 30 min. Cell-associated lipoprotein remaining after treatments was determined by a  $\gamma$ -counter. Data are presented as a fraction of cell-associated lipoprotein at pH 7.5. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars show standard deviation. Calcium concentration was maintained at 1.8 mM (pCa 2.7) for all experiments.

release by LDLR-ΔBC expressing cells at pH 6.0 and pH 5.5 over a calcium range of 1  $\mu\text{M}$  to 1.8 mM (Figure 4). At 3  $\mu\text{M}$  free calcium, the majority of bound LDL was released at both pH 6.0 and pH 5.5, while ~40% of bound  $\beta$ -VLDL was released at pH 6.0 and 70% of bound  $\beta$ -VLDL was released at pH 5.5. These observations indicate that endosomal concentrations of free calcium can drive lipoprotein release in the absence of the EGF-homology domain. Low pH facilitates calcium-dependent release, presumably because the ligand-binding domain binds to calcium with weaker affinity at acidic pH than at neutral pH (30).

For this calcium-dependent mechanism to play a significant role in lipoprotein release, rates of release should be comparable to those of acid-dependent release. We used the LDLR-ΔBC expressing cells in time courses of lipoprotein release to determine rate constants for calcium-dependent lipoprotein release. The calcium-dependent rates were compared to rates of acid-dependent release by WT LDLR in the presence of millimolar calcium. Low concentrations of free calcium showed robust ability to drive lipoprotein release of both LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL (Figure 5 and Table 1). Significantly, the rate constants of calcium-dependent lipoprotein release by the LDLR-ΔBC at 3  $\mu\text{M}$  free calcium (pCa 5.6) were comparable to measured rate constants of acid-dependent lipoprotein release by WT LDLR at 1.8 mM free




FIGURE 3: Low calcium drives similar lipoprotein release from LDLR-ΔBC and WT LDLR expressing cells. Cells expressing either WT LDLR (WT) or LDLR-ΔBC (ΔBC) were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ -LDL (panel A) or 5  $\mu\text{g/mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B) for 1 h, washed, and then incubated for 30 min with media at pH 7.0 and the indicated free calcium concentrations. Free calcium concentrations are shown as pCa ( $-\log(\text{free } [\text{Ca}^{2+}])$ ). Cell-associated lipoprotein remaining after treatments was determined by a  $\gamma$ -counter. Data are presented as a fraction of cell-associated lipoprotein at pH 7.0 and pCa 2.7. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars show standard deviation.

calcium (pCa 2.7) (Figure 6 and Table 1). At pH 5.5, the acid-dependent release rates were  $7.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for LDL and  $5.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for  $\beta$ -VLDL, while the calcium-dependent release rates were  $1.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for LDL and  $4.1 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for  $\beta$ -VLDL (Table 1). Acid-dependent and calcium-dependent release rates were also similar at pH 6.0 with acid-dependent release rates of  $1.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for LDL and  $8.4 \times 10^{-4} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for  $\beta$ -VLDL and calcium-dependent release rates of  $4.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for LDL and  $1.0 \times 10^{-3} \text{ s}^{-1}$  for  $\beta$ -VLDL (Table 1). Each of these rate constants was significantly faster than the intrinsic rates of lipoprotein dissociation observed with the LDLR-ΔBC in the presence of 1.8 mM free calcium (Figures 5 and 6 and Table 1). Together, these observations indicate that both the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent processes provide robust mechanisms to accelerate lipoprotein release.

We next tested whether the calcium-dependent and acid-dependent processes cooperate during lipoprotein release. To test this possibility, WT LDLR cells were used in time courses of lipoprotein release in the presence of media at a pH of 5.5 or 6.0 and at a pCa of 5.0 or 5.6. In all cases, with the exception of  $\beta$ -VLDL release at pH 6.0 and pCa 5.0, reduced free calcium accelerated lipoprotein release (Figure 6 and Table 1). These observations indicate that the calcium-dependent mechanism can




FIGURE 4: Acidic pH augments calcium-dependent lipoprotein release by the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC. Cells expressing LDLR- $\Delta$ BC were incubated with either 10  $\mu$ g/mL  $^{125}$ I-LDL (panel A) or 5  $\mu$ g/mL  $^{125}$ I- $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B) for 1 h, washed, and further incubated for 30 min with media at pH 6.0 or pH 5.5 and the indicated free calcium concentrations. Free calcium concentrations are shown as pCa ( $-\log(\text{free } [\text{Ca}^{2+}])$ ). Cell-associated lipoprotein remaining after treatments was determined by a  $\gamma$ -counter. Data are presented as a fraction of cell-associated lipoprotein at pH 6.0 and pCa 2.7. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars show standard deviation.

cooperate with the acid-dependent mechanism to accelerate lipoprotein release.

The ability of low calcium to promote lipoprotein release suggested the possibility that low calcium might also disrupt the pH-dependent interaction of the  $\beta$ -propeller with LA4/5. We tested this possibility by following the LDLR ectodomain conformation as a function of free calcium at pH 6.0, when the  $\beta$ -propeller normally interacts with LA4/5. The acidic conformational state, sometimes referred to as the “closed” state, has a smaller hydrodynamic (Stokes) radius than the extended, “open” conformational state, which predominates at neutral pH (23, 45). Using gel filtration to follow the Stokes radius, reductions in the free calcium concentration shifted the Stokes radius from  $\sim 35$  Å at high free calcium to a Stokes radius of  $\sim 43$  Å at low free calcium. The half-maximal transition was near 1  $\mu$ M free calcium (Figure 7). This observation indicates that low calcium not only disrupts lipoprotein binding but can also reset LDLRs that undergo acid-dependent lipoprotein release back into an open conformation.

Lastly, we addressed whether the release mechanisms characterized in the surface release experiments play a role in cellular uptake of lipoproteins. Cellular uptake involves binding of lipoprotein to the LDLR, internalization of LDLR-lipoprotein

complexes, release of lipoprotein in endosomes, and recycling of the LDLR back to the cell surface. To follow lipoprotein uptake, WT LDLR cells and LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells were incubated with Alexa546-labeled LDL or DiI-labeled  $\beta$ -VLDL over the course of 4 h. Neither fluorophore is sensitive to acidic pH, and both accumulate in lysosomes as a function of lipoprotein uptake (42). LDL uptake was severely compromised in LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells as compared to WT LDLR cells (Figure 8A), while  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake was similar for both LDLR- $\Delta$ BC and WT LDLR cells (Figure 8B). These observations indicate that fibroblasts require the acid-dependent release process for LDL uptake but not for  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake.

The ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells to support normal  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake was unexpected because a previous report used transfected ldl-A7 CHO cells to show that deletion of the entire EGF-homology domain ( $\Delta$ AC) not only eliminated acid-dependent  $\beta$ -VLDL release but also reduced  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake (20). To directly compare lipoprotein handling by the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC and LDLR- $\Delta$ BC receptors, we generated fibroblasts expressing the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC receptor. Consistent with the prior observations with transfected CHO cells, the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC fibroblasts were unable to bind LDL but did bind  $\beta$ -VLDL, though with an affinity that was approximately one-third as strong as WT LDLR (Figure 9A,B). Also consistent with the prior observations, the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells were unable to support either LDL or  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake (Figure 9C,D). The EGF-A module is known to be required for LDL binding (16), and thus the inability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC to bind LDL can explain the inability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells to support LDL uptake. By contrast, the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells bound  $\beta$ -VLDL with reduced but still strong affinity, suggesting that the failure of the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells to support  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake occurs at a later stage in the endocytic pathway of  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake.

Davis et al. showed that treatment of LDLR- $\Delta$ AC CHO cells with  $\beta$ -VLDL caused loss of receptors from the cell surface, suggesting that the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC fails to recycle in the presence of  $\beta$ -VLDL (20). We tested whether lipoprotein treatment influenced the surface level of receptors by incubating WT LDLR, LDLR- $\Delta$ BC, and LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells with either LDL or  $\beta$ -VLDL, biotinylating surface proteins with a non-cell-permeable biotinylation reagent, isolating biotinylated proteins with neutravidin agarose, and immunoblotting for the LDLR. LDL treatment did not reduce surface receptors on any of the three cell types (Figure 10A).  $\beta$ -VLDL treatment had little effect on surface receptors on either WT LDLR or LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells but greatly reduced surface receptors on LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells (Figure 10B). These observations indicate that  $\beta$ -VLDL treatment inhibits the ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC to recycle, but not the recycling ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC or WT LDLR.

Recycling of the WT LDLR can be inhibited by treatment with the proton ionophore, monensin, an effect that can be augmented by cotreatment with lipoproteins (46, 47). We compared the effect of lipoprotein/monensin cotreatment on receptor recycling in WT LDLR, LDLR- $\Delta$ AC, and LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells. Consistent with expectation, WT LDLR cells rapidly lost surface receptors when treated with a combination of LDL and monensin or  $\beta$ -VLDL and monensin (Figure 10A,B). LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells likewise lost surface receptors with either cotreatment; however, the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells showed little loss of surface receptors when treated with LDL and monensin and a greatly reduced rate of loss of surface receptors when treated with  $\beta$ -VLDL and monensin (Figure 10A,B). A reduced rate of receptor loss could result either




FIGURE 5: The calcium-dependent mechanism mediates efficient lipoprotein release at endosomal pH. Cells expressing LDLR-ΔBC were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ -LDL (panels A and C) or 5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B and D) for 1 h, washed, and further incubated for the indicated times with media at pH 5.5 (panels A and B) or pH 6.0 (panels C and D) and the indicated free calcium concentrations. Free calcium concentrations are shown as pCa ( $-\log(\text{free } [\text{Ca}^{2+}])$ ). Cell-associated lipoprotein remaining after treatments was determined by a  $\gamma$ -counter. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars show standard deviation.




FIGURE 6: The calcium-dependent and acid-dependent mechanisms cooperate during lipoprotein release by WT LDLR. Cells expressing WT LDLR were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ -LDL (panels A and C) or 5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$   $^{125}\text{I}$ - $\beta$ -VLDL (panels B and D) for 1 h, washed, and further incubated for the indicated times with media at pH 5.5 (panels A and B) or pH 6.0 (panels C and D) and the indicated free calcium concentrations. Free calcium concentrations are shown as pCa ( $-\log(\text{free } [\text{Ca}^{2+}])$ ). Cell-associated lipoprotein remaining after treatments was determined by a  $\gamma$ -counter. All experiments were performed in triplicate. Error bars show standard deviation.



from a reduced rate of internalization or from a faster rate of recycling. To distinguish between these possibilities, we compared the initial rates of  $\beta$ -VLDL internalization by LDLR- $\Delta$ BC and WT LDLR cells. As shown in Figure 10C, the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC supported a normal rate of  $\beta$ -VLDL internalization, suggesting that the slower rate of surface receptor loss results from an enhanced ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC to recycle in the presence of monensin and  $\beta$ -VLDL.

## DISCUSSION

The mechanisms by which the endosomal lumen triggers lipoprotein release from the LDLR are not fully understood. In *in vitro* assays, both acidic pH and low calcium are sufficient to

drive lipoprotein release. The acid-dependent mechanism requires the EGF-homology domain (20), which forms an intramolecular contact with the ligand-binding domain at acidic pH (23). This association appears to drive an allosteric process that accelerates lipoprotein release (24). In cells, the acidification of endosomes also promotes the gating of an endosomal calcium channel, most likely the transient receptor potential V2 channel (33, 48). Activation of the endosomal calcium channel rapidly lowers the free calcium concentration in the endosomal lumen to micromolar concentrations (33). Low free calcium can drive lipoprotein release by extracting calcium from the LA repeats and thereby inducing structural changes in the lipoprotein-binding surfaces on the LDLR (27, 29, 30). Here, we show that this calcium-dependent mechanism accelerates release of both LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL with rates similar to those of the acid-dependent mechanism (Table 1). We propose that both the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent mechanisms operate during endosomal release of lipoproteins. In the case of acid-dependent release, low calcium may act subsequent to lipoprotein dissociation to disrupt the closed conformational state of the LDLR (Figure 7), thereby restoring the LDLR to an open conformation prior to delivery to the cell surface.

If both the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent processes provide efficient mechanisms of lipoprotein release, why have both? One potential reason for two mechanisms is to make the release process less reversible. The *in vitro* release experiments mimic three aspects of endosomal conditions: temperature (37 °C), acidity (pH 5.5–6.0), and free calcium (pCa 5.0–5.6). One feature, which cannot be mimicked, is lipoprotein concentration. In the *in vitro* assays, lipoproteins release into the extracellular milieu, which has a large volume. As a consequence, release is irreversible because the concentration of lipoprotein is very low in the release media. By contrast, the endosomal lumen has a small volume, and the endosomal concentration of lipoprotein is high after release. This high concentration of lipoprotein has the potential to reverse the release process. The combined action of the acid-dependent and calcium-dependent mechanisms may prevent rebinding of lipoproteins after release.

The inability of LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells to support LDL uptake indicates that the calcium-dependent process is not sufficient for cellular release of LDL and that LDL uptake requires the acid-dependent release process. Consistent with this observation, mutations that increase the acid requirement for acid-dependent




FIGURE 7: Low calcium disrupts the acid-dependent closed conformation of the LDLR. WT LDLR ectodomain was incubated at pH 6.0 and the indicated free calcium concentrations for 30 min and then chromatographed over a Superdex200 gel filtration column equilibrated at the same pH and free calcium concentration. Free calcium concentrations are shown as pCa ( $-\log(\text{free } [\text{Ca}^{2+}])$ ). Fractions corresponding to the indicated Stokes radius were electrophoresed on 5–17% SDS-PAGE gels and immunoblotted for LDLR.




FIGURE 8: LDL uptake requires the acid-dependent mechanism, while  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake does not. Cells expressing WT LDLR (WT) or LDLR- $\Delta$ BC ( $\Delta$ BC) were incubated with either 10  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$  Alexa546-LDL (panel A) or 5  $\mu\text{g}/\text{mL}$  DiI- $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B) for the indicated times. Cells were then washed, fixed, and processed by cell cytometry. Mean fluorescence values are shown for 10000 cells at each time point. The experiment shown is representative of three independent trials.






FIGURE 9: The LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cannot support either LDL or  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake. The affinity of LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL for fibroblasts expressing only the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC receptor was measured using saturation binding assays with  $^{125}$ I-LDL (panel A) and  $^{125}$ I- $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B). The inserts in panels A and B are Scatchard plots of the saturation data shown in the respective panels. Panels C and D compare the ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC cells to support uptake of Alexa546-labeled LDL and DiI-labeled  $\beta$ -VLDL with WT LDLR cells over a 4 h time course. Lipoprotein uptake experiments shown are representative of three independent trials.

release impair cellular uptake of LDL (24). Interestingly, mutations that increase the acid requirement by as little as 0.5 pH unit can reduce LDL uptake by more than 90%, suggesting that LDL uptake is exquisitely sensitive to the acid-dependent release process.

Whether LDL uptake also requires the calcium-dependent process is not clear. The LDLR completes a cycle of LDL uptake every  $\sim 12$  min (49), indicating that LDL release occurs in early endosomes, where the pH is  $\geq 6.0$  and free calcium concentrations are  $\geq 10$   $\mu$ M (33). Comparison of the calcium-dependent rate constant of LDL release by LDLR- $\Delta$ ABC at pH 6.0 and pCa 5.0 ( $9.5 \times 10^{-4}$  s $^{-1}$ ) with acid-dependent release by WT LDLR at pH 6.0 and pCa 2.7 ( $1.9 \times 10^{-3}$  s $^{-1}$ ) indicates that the acid-dependent process is a stronger driver of LDL release at early endosomal conditions (Table 1). However, LDL release by WT LDLR at pCa 5.0 ( $3.1 \times 10^{-3}$  s $^{-1}$ ) was faster than at pCa 2.7 ( $1.9 \times 10^{-3}$  s $^{-1}$ ), suggesting that low free calcium may facilitate LDL release. Unfortunately, inhibition of the endosomal calcium channel does not provide a means to determine whether LDL uptake requires the calcium-dependent process because fusion of primary endosomes with early endosomes requires calcium efflux from the endosomal lumen (50–52). Use of the calcium ionophore, A23187, to increase cellular calcium and collapse the endosomal calcium gradient inhibits LDL uptake by  $\sim 60\%$  (53). This observation is consistent with the possibility that LDL release is inhibited when endosomal calcium cannot be reduced; however, calcium plays multiple roles in endocytosis, and elevated levels of intracellular calcium can promote, inhibit, or have little effect on endocytic uptake depending upon the ligand and system (54–57).

A key observation of this study is that  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake is normal in LDLR- $\Delta$ ABC expressing cells. This observation indicates that the acid-dependent lipoprotein release is not required for  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake and suggests that the calcium-dependent process may be the principal driver of  $\beta$ -VLDL release. Two questions raised by this observation are, first, why does  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake not require acid-dependent release and, second, why is the process of endosomal release of  $\beta$ -VLDL not sufficient for LDL release?

One potential answer to the question of why  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake does not employ the acid-dependent lipoprotein release is the observation that acid-dependent  $\beta$ -VLDL release requires harsher acidic conditions than LDL release (Figures 2 and 6). This difference in pH sensitivity may be caused by the higher affinity of the LDLR for  $\beta$ -VLDL as compared to LDL or by the ability of multiple LDLR to bind  $\beta$ -VLDL simultaneously as compared to the 1:1 stoichiometry between LDL and the LDLR (58, 59). Consistent with the latter possibility, the number of apoE present on  $\beta$ -VLDL influences uptake of  $\beta$ -VLDL (60). Reduced sensitivity to low pH may thus preclude the acid-dependent mechanism for cellular release of  $\beta$ -VLDL.

A likely key to the question of why the mechanism driving  $\beta$ -VLDL release cannot support LDL release is differences in the intracellular trafficking of LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL after internalization. Comparison of the endocytic path of LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL in macrophages has shown that while internalized LDL rapidly accumulates in late endosomes and lysosomes, internalized  $\beta$ -VLDL accumulates first in peripheral structures, presumably




FIGURE 10: LDLR- $\Delta$ AC recycling is sensitive to  $\beta$ -VLDL treatment, while LDLR- $\Delta$ BC recycling is resistant to the effect of lipoproteins and monensin. The levels of surface receptor on fibroblasts expressing WT LDLR (WT), LDLR- $\Delta$ BC ( $\Delta$ BC), or LDLR- $\Delta$ AC were compared using surface biotinylation over a 4 h time course of LDL (panel A) or  $\beta$ -VLDL (panel B) treatment in the presence or absence of 30  $\mu$ M monensin. Surface-biotinylated proteins were isolated by neutravidin agarose and immunoblotted for the presence of LDLR. Experiments shown are representative of three independent trials. Panel C compares the initial rates of  $\beta$ -VLDL internalization by WT LDLR (WT) and LDLR- $\Delta$ BC ( $\Delta$ BC) cells. Experiments were performed as described in Experimental Procedures and are presented as means  $\pm$  1 SD.

an endosome-like compartment, before trafficking to degradative compartments (60–62). This bypass suggests that  $\beta$ -VLDL may be held in a specialized endocytic compartment to provide the LDLR- $\beta$ -VLDL complex with additional time or a more conducive environment for release. Targeting of  $\beta$ -VLDL to these compartments appears to involve engagement of multiple LDLR because accumulation of  $\beta$ -VLDL in these peripheral structures is augmented by increased apoE content of  $\beta$ -VLDL (60). While similar experiments have not been done in fibroblasts, fibroblasts show delayed degradation of apoE-containing lipoproteins (61, 63, 64), consistent with the possibility that fibroblasts also have a bypass segment in the degradative pathway of  $\beta$ -VLDL. Residence of  $\beta$ -VLDL in peripheral endosome-like structures may facilitate the calcium-dependent release process.

The ability of the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC, but not LDLR- $\Delta$ AC, cells to support  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake suggests that the EGF-A module plays a critical role in receptor trafficking. Consistent with this

possibility, natural deletions that remove either both EGF-A and EGF-B or just EGF-A result in familial hypercholesterolemia (FH) (65–69), and fibroblasts from individuals that are homozygous for the deletion removing both the EGF-A and EGF-B modules express an LDLR variant that recycles poorly in the presence of  $\beta$ -VLDL (70). The EGF-A module has also been implicated in LDLR trafficking because the secreted protein, PCSK9, binds to EGF-A and promotes LDLR degradation by redirecting internalized LDLR to lysosomes (71). The observation that the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC receptor was less sensitive than the LDLR- $\Delta$ AC to monensin (Figure 10) also suggests that the EGF-A promotes receptor recycling. Interestingly, the WT LDLR is sensitive to monensin, and this sensitivity is heightened in the presence of lipoprotein (42, 46). The reduced sensitivity of the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC to monensin/lipoprotein cotreatment indicates that the EGF-B to EGF-C (BC) region enhances the monensin sensitivity of the WT LDLR and suggests that the BC region may act to inhibit recycling prior to lipoprotein release. The process of recycling prior to lipoprotein release is termed retro-endocytosis and in fibroblasts accounts for  $\sim$ 10% of the LDL that is internalized by the LDLR (72, 73). Interestingly, LDLR- $\Delta$ BC cells bind LDL normally; however, these cells are unable to accumulate LDL, and the surface level of receptors does not change in the presence of LDL (Figures 1C, 8A, and 10A). These observations suggest that the LDLR- $\Delta$ BC recycles prior to lipoprotein release. The BC region may thus not only participate in acid-dependent release but also prevent receptor recycling until release has occurred.

In summary, both acidic pH and low free calcium can drive lipoprotein release. The acid-dependent process is required for LDL uptake, but not for  $\beta$ -VLDL uptake, suggesting that the calcium-dependent process may participate in the cellular release of  $\beta$ -VLDL. Cellular accumulation of  $\beta$ -VLDL requires the EGF-A module, which appears to participate in LDLR trafficking.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Michael Brown and Joseph Goldstein for LDL and  $\beta$ -VLDL, Brenda Pallares for administrative support, Drake LeBrun for technical assistance, and Jonathan Cohen and Richard Anderson for helpful discussions.

## REFERENCES

1. Yamamoto, T., Davis, C. G., Brown, M. S., Schneider, W. J., Casey, M. L., Goldstein, J. L., and Russell, D. W. (1984) The human LDL receptor: a cysteine-rich protein with multiple Alu sequences in its mRNA. *Cell* 39, 27–38.
2. Davis, C. G., Lehrman, M. A., Russell, D. W., Anderson, R. G., Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1986) The J.D. mutation in familial hypercholesterolemia: amino acid substitution in cytoplasmic domain impedes internalization of LDL receptors. *Cell* 45, 15–24.
3. Lehrman, M. A., Goldstein, J. L., Brown, M. S., Russell, D. W., and Schneider, W. J. (1985) Internalization-defective LDL receptors produced by genes with nonsense and frameshift mutations that truncate the cytoplasmic domain. *Cell* 41, 735–743.
4. He, G., Gupta, S., Yi, M., Michaely, P., Hobbs, H. H., and Cohen, J. C. (2002) ARH is a modular adaptor protein that interacts with the LDL receptor, clathrin, and AP-2. *J. Biol. Chem.* 277, 44044–44049.
5. Mishra, S. K., Watkins, S. C., and Traub, L. M. (2002) The autosomal recessive hypercholesterolemia (ARH) protein interfaces directly with the clathrin-coat machinery. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 99, 16099–16104.
6. Mishra, S. K., Keyel, P. A., Hawryluk, M. J., Agostinelli, N. R., Watkins, S. C., and Traub, L. M. (2002) Disabled-2 exhibits the properties of a cargo-selective endocytic clathrin adaptor. *EMBO J.* 21, 4915–4926.

7. Bilheimer, D. W., Watanabe, Y., and Kita, T. (1982) Impaired receptor-mediated catabolism of low density lipoprotein in the WHHL rabbit, an animal model of familial hypercholesterolemia. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 79, 3305–3309.
8. Kita, T., Brown, M. S., Bilheimer, D. W., and Goldstein, J. L. (1982) Delayed clearance of very low density and intermediate density lipoproteins with enhanced conversion to low density lipoprotein in WHHL rabbits. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 79, 5693–5697.
9. Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1986) A receptor-mediated pathway for cholesterol homeostasis. *Science* 232, 34–47.
10. Hobbs, H. H., Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1992) Molecular genetics of the LDL receptor gene in familial hypercholesterolemia. *Hum. Mutat.* 1, 445–466.
11. Esser, V., Limbird, L. E., Brown, M. S., Goldstein, J. L., and Russell, D. W. (1988) Mutational analysis of the ligand binding domain of the low density lipoprotein receptor. *J. Biol. Chem.* 263, 13282–13290.
12. Daly, N. L., Scanlon, M. J., Djordjevic, J. T., Kroon, P. A., and Smith, R. (1995) Three-dimensional structure of a cysteine-rich repeat from the low-density lipoprotein receptor. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 92, 6334–6338.
13. North, C. L., and Blacklow, S. C. (2000) Solution structure of the sixth LDL-A module of the LDL receptor. *Biochemistry* 39, 2564–2571.
14. Shireman, R., Kilgore, L. L., and Fisher, W. R. (1977) Solubilization of apolipoprotein B and its specific binding by the cellular receptor for low density lipoprotein. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 74, 5150–5154.
15. Brown, M. S., Kovanen, P. T., and Goldstein, J. L. (1981) Regulation of plasma cholesterol by lipoprotein receptors. *Science* 212, 628–635.
16. Russell, D. W., Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1989) Different combinations of cysteine-rich repeats mediate binding of low density lipoprotein receptor to two different proteins. *J. Biol. Chem.* 264, 21682–21688.
17. Bradley, W. A., and Gianturco, S. H. (1986) ApoE is necessary and sufficient for the binding of large triglyceride-rich lipoproteins to the LDL receptor; apoB is unnecessary. *J. Lipid Res.* 27, 40–48.
18. Schneider, W. J., Kovanen, P. T., Brown, M. S., Goldstein, J. L., Utermann, G., Weber, W., Havel, R. J., Kotite, L., Kane, J. P., Innerarity, T. L., and Mahley, R. W. (1981) Familial dysbetalipoproteinemia. Abnormal binding of mutant apoprotein E to low density lipoprotein receptors of human fibroblasts and membranes from liver and adrenal of rats, rabbits, and cows. *J. Clin. Invest.* 68, 1075–1085.
19. Fisher, C., Abdul-Aziz, D., and Blacklow, S. C. (2004) A two-module region of the low-density lipoprotein receptor sufficient for formation of complexes with apolipoprotein E ligands. *Biochemistry* 43, 1037–1044.
20. Davis, C. G., Goldstein, J. L., Sudhof, T. C., Anderson, R. G., Russell, D. W., and Brown, M. S. (1987) Acid-dependent ligand dissociation and recycling of LDL receptor mediated by growth factor homology region. *Nature* 326, 760–765.
21. Beglova, N., Jeon, H., Fisher, C., and Blacklow, S. C. (2004) Cooperation between fixed and low pH-inducible interfaces controls lipoprotein release by the LDL receptor. *Mol. Cell* 16, 281–292.
22. Jeon, H., Meng, W., Takagi, J., Eck, M. J., Springer, T. A., and Blacklow, S. C. (2001) Implications for familial hypercholesterolemia from the structure of the LDL receptor YWTD-EGF domain pair. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 8, 499–504.
23. Rudenko, G., Henry, L., Henderson, K., Ichtchenko, K., Brown, M. S., Goldstein, J. L., and Deisenhofer, J. (2002) Structure of the LDL receptor extracellular domain at endosomal pH. *Science* 298, 2353–2358.
24. Zhao, Z., and Michaely, P. (2008) The epidermal growth factor homology domain of the LDL receptor drives lipoprotein release through an allosteric mechanism involving H190, H562, and H586. *J. Biol. Chem.* 283, 26528–26537.
25. Goldstein, J. L., and Brown, M. S. (1974) Binding and degradation of low density lipoproteins by cultured human fibroblasts. Comparison of cells from a normal subject and from a patient with homozygous familial hypercholesterolemia. *J. Biol. Chem.* 249, 5153–5162.
26. Basu, S. K., Goldstein, J. L., and Brown, M. S. (1978) Characterization of the low density lipoprotein receptor in membranes prepared from human fibroblasts. *J. Biol. Chem.* 253, 3852–3856.
27. Blacklow, S. C., and Kim, P. S. (1996) Protein folding and calcium binding defects arising from familial hypercholesterolemia mutations of the LDL receptor. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 3, 758–762.
28. Fass, D., Blacklow, S., Kim, P. S., and Berger, J. M. (1997) Molecular basis of familial hypercholesterolemia from structure of LDL receptor module. *Nature* 388, 691–693.
29. Atkins, A. R., Brereton, I. M., Kroon, P. A., Lee, H. T., and Smith, R. (1998) Calcium is essential for the structural integrity of the cysteine-rich, ligand-binding repeat of the low-density lipoprotein receptor. *Biochemistry* 37, 1662–1670.
30. Dirlam-Schatz, K. A., and Attie, A. D. (1998) Calcium induces a conformational change in the ligand binding domain of the low density lipoprotein receptor. *J. Lipid Res.* 39, 402–411.
31. Arias-Moreno, X., Velazquez-Campoy, A., Rodriguez, J. C., Pocovi, M., and Sancho, J. (2008) Mechanism of low density lipoprotein (LDL) release in the endosome: implications of the stability and  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  affinity of the fifth binding module of the LDL receptor. *J. Biol. Chem.* 283, 22670–22679.
32. Simonovic, M., Dolmer, K., Huang, W., Strickland, D. K., Volz, K., and Gettins, P. G. (2001) Calcium coordination and pH dependence of the calcium affinity of ligand-binding repeat CR7 from the LRP. Comparison with related domains from the LRP and the LDL receptor. *Biochemistry* 40, 15127–15134.
33. Gerasimenko, J. V., Tepikin, A. V., Petersen, O. H., and Gerasimenko, O. V. (1998) Calcium uptake via endocytosis with rapid release from acidifying endosomes. *Curr. Biol.* 8, 1335–1338.
34. Rudenko, G., and Deisenhofer, J. (2003) The low-density lipoprotein receptor: ligands, debates and lore. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* 13, 683–689.
35. Beglova, N., and Blacklow, S. C. (2005) The LDL receptor: how acid pulls the trigger. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 30, 309–317.
36. Liu, X., Sun, Y., Constantinescu, S. N., Karam, E., Weinberg, R. A., and Lodish, H. F. (1997) Transforming growth factor beta-induced phosphorylation of Smad3 is required for growth inhibition and transcriptional induction in epithelial cells. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 94, 10669–10674.
37. Bolton, A. E., and Hunter, W. M. (1973) The labelling of proteins to high specific radioactivities by conjugation to a  $^{125}\text{I}$ -containing acylating agent. *Biochem. J.* 133, 529–539.
38. Goldstein, J. L., Basu, S. K., and Brown, M. S. (1983) Receptor-mediated endocytosis of low-density lipoprotein in cultured cells. *Methods Enzymol.* 98, 241–260.
39. Heuser, J. E., and Anderson, R. G. (1989) Hypertonic media inhibit receptor-mediated endocytosis by blocking clathrin-coated pit formation. *J. Cell Biol.* 108, 389–400.
40. Patton, C., Thompson, S., and Epel, D. (2004) Some precautions in using chelators to buffer metals in biological solutions. *Cell Calcium* 35, 427–431.
41. Lombardi, P., Mulder, M., van der Boom, H., Frants, R. R., and Havekes, L. M. (1993) Inefficient degradation of triglyceride-rich lipoprotein by HepG2 cells is due to a retarded transport to the lysosomal compartment. *J. Biol. Chem.* 268, 26113–26119.
42. Michaely, P., Zhao, Z., Li, W. P., Garuti, R., Huang, L. J., Hobbs, H. H., and Cohen, J. C. (2007) Identification of a VLDL-induced, FDNPVY-independent internalization mechanism for the LDLR. *EMBO J.* 26, 3273–3282.
43. Morales, C. P., Holt, S. E., Ouellette, M., Kaur, K. J., Yan, Y., Wilson, K. S., White, M. A., Wright, W. E., and Shay, J. W. (1999) Absence of cancer-associated changes in human fibroblasts immortalized with telomerase. *Nat. Genet.* 21, 115–118.
44. Dirlam, K. A., Gretch, D. G., LaCount, D. J., Sturley, S. L., and Attie, A. D. (1996) Expression and characterization of a truncated, soluble, low-density lipoprotein receptor. *Protein Expression Purif.* 8, 489–500.
45. Jeon, H., and Shipley, G. G. (2000) Vesicle-reconstituted low density lipoprotein receptor. Visualization by cryoelectron microscopy. *J. Biol. Chem.* 275, 30458–30464.
46. Basu, S. K., Goldstein, J. L., Anderson, R. G., and Brown, M. S. (1981) Monensin interrupts the recycling of low density lipoprotein receptors in human fibroblasts. *Cell* 24, 493–502.
47. Michaely, P., Li, W. P., Anderson, R. G., Cohen, J. C., and Hobbs, H. H. (2004) The modular adaptor protein ARH is required for low density lipoprotein (LDL) binding and internalization but not for LDL receptor clustering in coated pits. *J. Biol. Chem.* 279, 34023–34031.
48. Saito, M., Hanson, P. I., and Schlesinger, P. (2007) Luminal chloride-dependent activation of endosome calcium channels: patch clamp study of enlarged endosomes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 282, 27327–27333.
49. Brown, M. S., Anderson, R. G., Basu, S. K., and Goldstein, J. L. (1982) Recycling of cell-surface receptors: observations from the LDL receptor system. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Biol.* 46 (Part 2), 713–721.
50. Colombo, M. I., Beron, W., and Stahl, P. D. (1997) Calmodulin regulates endosome fusion. *J. Biol. Chem.* 272, 7707–7712.
51. Holroyd, C., Kistner, U., Annaert, W., and Jahn, R. (1999) Fusion of endosomes involved in synaptic vesicle recycling. *Mol. Biol. Cell* 10, 3035–3044.

52. Yan, Q., Sun, W., McNew, J. A., Vida, T. A., and Bean, A. J. (2004)  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  and N-ethylmaleimide-sensitive factor differentially regulate disassembly of SNARE complexes on early endosomes. *J. Biol. Chem.* 279, 18270–18276.
53. Maziere, J. C., Maziere, C., Mora, L., Gardette, J., and Polonovski, J. (1984) Effects of the calcium ionophore A 23187 on low-density lipoprotein processing and lipid metabolism in cultured human fibroblasts. *FEBS Lett.* 177, 76–80.
54. Teng, H., and Wilkinson, R. S. (2005) Clathrin-mediated endocytosis in snake motor terminals is directly facilitated by intracellular  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ . *J. Physiol.* 565, 743–750.
55. Hemmaplardh, D., and Morgan, E. H. (1977) The role of calcium in transferrin and iron uptake by reticulocytes. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 468, 423–436.
56. Iacopetta, B., Carpentier, J. L., Pozzan, T., Lew, D. P., Gorden, P., and Orci, L. (1986) Role of intracellular calcium and protein kinase C in the endocytosis of transferrin and insulin by HL60 cells. *J. Cell Biol.* 103, 851–856.
57. von Gersdorff, H., and Matthews, G. (1994) Inhibition of endocytosis by elevated internal calcium in a synaptic terminal. *Nature* 370, 652–655.
58. Pitas, R. E., Innerarity, T. L., Arnold, K. S., and Mahley, R. W. (1979) Rate and equilibrium constants for binding of apo-E HDLc (a cholesterol-induced lipoprotein) and low density lipoproteins to human fibroblasts: evidence for multiple receptor binding of apo-E HDLc. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 76, 2311–2315.
59. Windler, E. E., Kovanen, P. T., Chao, Y. S., Brown, M. S., Havel, R. J., and Goldstein, J. L. (1980) The estradiol-stimulated lipoprotein receptor of rat liver. A binding site that membrane mediates the uptake of rat lipoproteins containing apoproteins B and E. *J. Biol. Chem.* 255, 10464–10471.
60. Tabas, I., Myers, J. N., Innerarity, T. L., Xu, X. X., Arnold, K., Boyles, J., and Maxfield, F. R. (1991) The influence of particle size and multiple apoprotein E-receptor interactions on the endocytic targeting of beta-VLDL in mouse peritoneal macrophages. *J. Cell Biol.* 115, 1547–1560.
61. Tabas, I., Lim, S., Xu, X. X., and Maxfield, F. R. (1990) Endocytosed beta-VLDL and LDL are delivered to different intracellular vesicles in mouse peritoneal macrophages. *J. Cell Biol.* 111, 929–940.
62. Jones, N. L., Saunders, J. A., and Mallory, R. R. (2000) Intracellular trafficking of pigeon beta-very low density lipoprotein and low density lipoprotein at low and high concentrations in pigeon macrophages. *J. Lipid Res.* 41, 1823–1831.
63. Bersot, T. P., Mahley, R. W., Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1976) Interaction of swine lipoproteins with the low density lipoprotein receptor in human fibroblasts. *J. Biol. Chem.* 251, 2395–2398.
64. Chappell, D. A., Fry, G. L., Waknitz, M. A., Muhonen, L. E., and Pladet, M. W. (1993) Low density lipoprotein receptors bind and mediate cellular catabolism of normal very low density lipoproteins in vitro. *J. Biol. Chem.* 268, 25487–25493.
65. Horsthemke, B., Dunning, A., and Humphries, S. (1987) Identification of deletions in the human low density lipoprotein receptor gene. *J. Med. Genet.* 24, 144–147.
66. Russell, D. W., Lehrman, M. A., Sudhof, T. C., Yamamoto, T., Davis, C. G., Hobbs, H. H., Brown, M. S., and Goldstein, J. L. (1986) The LDL receptor in familial hypercholesterolemia: use of human mutations to dissect a membrane protein. *Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Biol.* 51 (Part 2), 811–819.
67. Top, B., Koeleman, B. P., Gevers Leuven, J. A., Havekes, L. M., and Frants, R. R. (1990) Rearrangements in the LDL receptor gene in Dutch familial hypercholesterolemic patients and the presence of a common 4 kb deletion. *Atherosclerosis* 83, 127–136.
68. Henderson, H. E., Berger, G. M., and Marais, A. D. (1988) A new LDL receptor gene deletion mutation in the South African population. *Hum. Genet.* 80, 371–374.
69. Sun, X. M., Webb, J. C., Gudnason, V., Humphries, S., Seed, M., Thompson, G. R., Knight, B. L., and Soutar, A. K. (1992) Characterization of deletions in the LDL receptor gene in patients with familial hypercholesterolemia in the United Kingdom. *Arterioscler. Thromb.* 12, 762–770.
70. van der Westhuyzen, D. R., Stein, M. L., Henderson, H. E., Marais, A. D., Fourie, A. M., and Coetzee, G. A. (1991) Deletion of two growth-factor repeats from the low-density-lipoprotein receptor accelerates its degradation. *Biochem. J.* 277, 677–682.
71. Zhang, D. W., Lagace, T. A., Garuti, R., Zhao, Z., McDonald, M., Horton, J. D., Cohen, J. C., and Hobbs, H. H. (2007) Binding of proprotein convertase subtilisin/kexin type 9 to epidermal growth factor-like repeat A of low density lipoprotein receptor decreases receptor recycling and increases degradation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 282, 18602–18612.
72. Greenspan, P., and St. C. R. W. (1984) Retroendocytosis of low density lipoprotein. Effect of lysosomal inhibitors on the release of undegraded  $^{125}\text{I}$ -low density lipoprotein of altered composition from skin fibroblasts in culture. *J. Biol. Chem.* 259, 1703–1713.
73. Aulinskas, T. H., Oram, J. F., Bierman, E. L., Coetzee, G. A., Gevers, W., and van der Westhuyzen, D. R. (1985) Retro-endocytosis of low density lipoprotein by cultured human skin fibroblasts. *Arteriosclerosis* 5, 45–54.