

New Concepts

A Mechanism for Src Kinase-Dependent Signaling by Noncatalytic Receptors[†]

Jonathan A. Cooper^{*,‡,§} and Hong Qian^{§,||}

Division of Basic Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington 98109, and Department of Applied Mathematics, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

Received February 21, 2008; Revised Manuscript Received April 9, 2008

ABSTRACT: A fundamental issue in cell biology is how signals are transmitted across membranes. A variety of transmembrane receptors, including multichain immune recognition receptors, lack catalytic activity and require Src family kinases (SFKs) for signal transduction. However, many receptors only bind and activate SFKs after ligand-induced receptor dimerization. This presents a conundrum: How do SFKs sense the dimerization of receptors to which they are not already bound? Most proposals for resolving this enigma invoke additional players, such as lipid rafts or receptor conformational changes. Here we used simple thermodynamics to show that SFK activation is a natural outcome of clustering of receptors with SFK phosphorylation sites, provided that there is phosphorylation-dependent receptor–SFK association and an SFK bound to one receptor can phosphorylate the second receptor or its associated SFK in a dimer. A simple system of receptor, SFK, and an unregulated protein tyrosine phosphatase (PTP) can account for ligand-induced changes in phosphorylation observed in cells. We suggest that a core signaling system comprising a receptor with SFK phosphorylation sites, an SFK, and an unregulated PTP provides a robust mechanism for transmembrane signal transduction. Other events that regulate signaling in specific cases may have evolved for fine-tuning of this basic mechanism.

Cells detect their environment through a wide variety of receptors. While signaling via receptors with intracellular catalytic activities or channel functions is well understood, signaling by a variety of receptors that are linked to Src family kinases (SFKs)¹ remains unresolved (1–11). SFKs

are a subgroup of the nonreceptor tyrosine kinases. They are allosteric enzymes with at least two conformational states that are differentially stabilized by protein–protein interactions and by phosphorylation–dephosphorylation at two different sites (12–14). Active SFKs can bind to other proteins through a phosphorylation-independent SH3 domain and a phosphorylation-dependent SH2 domain. This allows for stabilization of the active state.

Some receptors, such as CD4, are constitutively bound to an SFK (15, 16). Clustering of CD4 by its ligand brings the bound SFKs together and allows for a stimulating intermolecular phosphorylation event (17). This mechanism is comparable to that established for receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs) (Figure 1b) (18, 19). RTK kinase domains have a low basal activity, which is effectively opposed by cellular protein tyrosine phosphatases (PTPs). When the kinase

[†] This work was supported in part by Public Health Service Grants CA41072 and GM068610.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed: A2-025, 1100 Fairview Ave. N., Seattle, WA 98109. E-mail: jcooper@fhcrc.org. Phone: (206) 667-4454. Fax: (206) 667-6522.

[‡] Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

[§] Both authors contributed equally to this work.

^{||} University of Washington.

¹ Abbreviations: FcεRI, immunoglobulin Fc receptor type εRI; PTP, protein tyrosine phosphatase; SDR, SFK-dependent receptor; SFK, Src family kinase; SH2, Src homology 2; SH3, Src homology 3; RTK, receptor tyrosine kinase; TCR, T cell receptor.




FIGURE 1: Models for regulation of receptor tyrosine kinases and SFK-dependent noncatalytic receptors. (a) Structure and regulation of SFKs. SFKs have three domains: SH3 (blue, phosphorylation-independent binding, not considered here), SH2 (yellow, phosphorylation-dependent binding), and kinase (white, orange, or crimson according to increasing activity). The SFK can adopt two main conformational states: “closed” inactive (E^+) and “open” low-activity (E) and high-activity (E^*) forms. E is converted to E^* by intermolecular phosphorylation in the activation loop. In addition, phosphorylation at the C-terminus alters the balance between the closed and open conformations by stabilizing the closed form. This phosphorylation is not regulated in the model and is not considered further. (b) Regulation of RTKs. The kinase domains of monomeric RTKs, R , are inhibited by intramolecular interactions and have low basal activity (orange) which is readily reversed by PTPs. Following dimerization by ligand, L , intermolecular phosphorylation of the activation loop occurs, and the kinase is activated (crimson). If ligand dissociates, monomeric receptors will remain in the phosphorylated, active state until dephosphorylated by PTPs. This allows for hysteresis in signaling. (c) Proposed model for regulation of SDRs. Only a small fraction of monomeric SDRs (R) are phosphorylated. After dimerization by ligand, this phosphorylation may allow binding of an SFK (RR^*-E complex). This may lead to an “intramolecular” phosphorylation to form an R^*R^*-E complex. This stimulates receptor phosphorylation. If a second E binds, to form an $E-R^*R^*-E$ complex, then intermolecular phosphorylation of E will be stimulated, and the $E^*-R^*R^*-E^*$ complex will have high kinase activity. Phosphorylated E^* may be released into the cytosol, to phosphorylate more receptors. This would provide a mechanism for hysteresis in signaling.

Table 1: SFK-Dependent Receptors (SDRs)

SDR	SFK phosphorylation site(s) ^a	refs
multichain immune recognition receptors, e.g., T cell receptor ζ chain, B cell receptor $Ig\alpha$ and β chains, Fc ϵ RI γ	YXXL/I(6–8 ^b)YXXL/I	1–3
inhibitory immune receptors, e.g., Fc γ RIIB, SHPS, Siglecs	(I/V/L/S)xYxx(L/V)	4
lectins CLEC-2 and Dectin-1	DEDGYXXL	5
ephrin B family	YXXV(3)YXXPYXXQ ¹⁰ YYKV	6
nephrin ^c	five repeats of YDXV	7
CDCP1	YXXI(5)YXXL	8
myelin-associated glycoprotein	YAEI	9
Reelin receptor–Dab1 complexes	YQXI(9)YQXI	10, 11

^a Y, confirmed SFK phosphorylation site; Y, phosphorylation not shown. ^b Numbers in parentheses indicate spacing between sites. ^c Nephrin also binds to SFK SH3 domains.

domains are brought together, they undergo intermolecular phosphorylation, which stabilizes a new conformation with increased activity.

Unlike CD4, however, many other SFK-dependent receptors exhibit little SFK binding prior to clustering, so the RTK model does not apply. Some such receptors are listed in Table 1. They include immune regulatory receptors and several cell–matrix and cell–cell signaling receptors (1–11). Here we call these receptors SDRs (SFK-dependent receptors). SDR signaling is initiated by clustering (dimerization or oligomerization) of the receptors by ligand (1–11). This induces SDR tyrosine phosphorylation, SFK activation, and formation of phosphorylation-dependent SFK–SDR complexes via the SFK SH2 domain.

Various mechanisms have been proposed to explain how dimerization of an SDR is communicated to an SFK that is not previously bound. For example, dimerization of the T cell receptor (TCR) may alter the conformation of its cytoplasmic domain so that it partitions into lipid rafts, where

it is exposed to raft-associated SFKs (20–23). Alternatively, antigen-presenting cells may displace transmembrane PTPs with bulky extracellular domains from the vicinity of TCRs (24), or an SFK inhibitor, Csk, may be lost from the vicinity of the TCR due to rapid dephosphorylation of its membrane anchor, Cbp/PAG (25). However, none of these mechanisms is straightforward. Lipid rafts provide an environment that may inhibit SFKs (26); they are more important for maintaining than for initiating TCR signaling (27), and they do not coincide with initial SFK-dependent clusters of TCRs (28). Physical displacement of transmembrane PTPs seems unlikely for receptors with small ligands. In myeloid cells, the level of Cbp/PAG phosphorylation actually increases during the initial activation of Fc ϵ RI, which would seem to oppose SFK activation (25). Furthermore, none of these mechanisms satisfactorily explains a recent observation (29). The Dab1 component of the Reelin receptor–Dab1 complex contains SFK sites that are phosphorylated when the Reelin receptors are clustered. This phosphorylation is also induced

when the Dab1 component is artificially dimerized in the cytosol (29). This suggests that activation can occur by clustering phosphorylation sites in the absence of membranes or apparent mechanisms for regulating kinases or phosphatases.

Here we have explored the properties of a minimal signaling system. We asked what happens when a hypothetical SDR changes from a monomer state to a dimer state. We assumed that the only association between SDR and SFK requires phosphorylated SDR, and there are no conformational changes or compartmentalization of the receptor and no external influences on SFK or PTP activity. Using first principles, we found that that mass action can explain significant increases in the level of SDR phosphorylation and SFK activation following SDR dimerization.

RESULTS

The model is shown in Figure 1c. In the absence of ligand, basal activity of the SFK (E) causes low-level phosphorylation of the monomeric receptor (R) to create R* (where the asterisk represents phosphate). The SH2 domain of E can associate with R* to form an R*–E complex, protecting R* from dephosphorylation (30). However, association–dissociation is rapid (31), and constant PTP activity keeps the phosphorylation level low. In the presence of ligand, the receptor is a dimer (RR). Now, phosphorylation of one receptor molecule creates RR* and allows binding of E to create an RR*–E complex. The second receptor in the dimer can now be phosphorylated in an essentially intramolecular reaction (32, 33). This is a key step and creates an R*R*–E complex to which a second E may bind, creating an E–R*R*–E complex. In the second key step, the two SFKs in this tetramer can undergo intermolecular phosphorylation and become more active (14, 34–36). This creates the highly active E*–R*R*–E* complex. Subsequent dissociation of ligand will allow release of E*, increasing the activity of E in the cell and stimulating further phosphorylation of RR. With time, the system returns to baseline by PTP action.

Even though the model contains only SDR, SFK, and PTP, it is more complex than the RTK model and *a priori* seemed unlikely to be able to explain the experimentally observed increases in the level of SDR phosphorylation or SFK activation after ligand-induced receptor dimerization. We therefore tested the model by analyzing the component reactions and applying the laws of mass action.

We first analyzed the effect of SDR–SFK association on SDR phosphorylation (Appendices 1 and 2; all Appendices are available as Supporting Information). We then analyzed the effect of SDR–SFK association on SFK phosphorylation (Appendix 3). This breakdown allowed us to solve the simplest kinetic model representing each effect algebraically, without resorting to complex simulation or numerical methods. The Supporting Information includes Excel spreadsheets that will calculate results for any chosen values of input parameters, and selected results are plotted in Figures 2–4.

1. Positive and Negative Feedback Effects Due to SFK Binding to Monomeric Receptors. We analyzed the effects of SFK (E) binding to phosphorylated monomeric receptors (R*) (Figure 2a). SFKs are allosteric enzymes with at least two conformational states (12, 14): closed, inactive E[†] and open, active E (Figure 1a; E can be further activated by




FIGURE 2: Positive and negative feedback effects due to binding of SFK to monomeric receptors. (a) Reactions and equations describing the conformational states of the SFK and monomeric receptor phosphorylation. These reactions are solved in Appendix 1. (b) Fractional receptor phosphorylation (f_R) as a function of the ratio of SFK and PTP activities (the control parameter for receptor phosphorylation, θ_R). Results are shown for different values of the equilibrium between closed and open SFK (Q), the ratio of total SFK to receptor (E_t/R_t), and the product of receptor concentration and binding affinity ($K_3 R_t$). The control (red line) is for no binding of E to R*. Black lines show results where positive feedback (+) predominates. Blue lines show where negative feedback predominates (-).

phosphorylation in the activation loop, but for the present, we consider only E in its low-activity state). The relative amount of E[†] (the ratio Q) is regulated by C-terminal phosphorylation at a residue that stabilizes the E[†] state. We are not proposing any regulation of phosphorylation of the C-terminal site, so we assume that Q does not change when receptors are dimerized. The active E phosphorylates R with a bimolecular rate constant k_1 and binds R* with association constant K_3 . The PTP is in excess and not regulated, so it appears as a pseudo-first-order rate constant, k_2 , for dephosphorylating R*.

We calculated the fractional phosphorylation of receptors, f_R , under different conditions of SFK and PTP activity (Appendix 1). f_R is commonly measured experimentally, for example, by Western blotting and represents the amount of R* molecules relative to the total (Figure 2a). The cellular environment was represented by the ratio of SFK and PTP activities, θ_R (Figure 2a). Note that the cellular environment does not change when receptors dimerize but will differ according to cell type and conditions.

The best way to understand the effect of binding of E to R* is to compare it with the simplest situation of no binding. In this case, we have the standard “hyperbolic response curve” with 50% phosphorylation ($f_R = 0.5$) when the rates of phosphorylation and dephosphorylation are balanced ($\theta_R = 1$). Increasing or decreasing the ratio of kinase to phosphatase activities increases or decreases f_R accordingly (Figure 2b, red line). Binding of E to R* has two effects: First, it reduces the amount of free E able to phosphorylate more R. This is a negative feedback or sequestration effect (37). In addition, the R*–E complexes are protected from




FIGURE 3: Transphosphorylation of dimeric receptors. (a) Reactions and equations describing the interactions of open conformation E with dimeric receptor RR. The phosphorylation–dephosphorylation and association constants are as in Figure 2, except k_4 represents receptor transphosphorylation within an RR^*E complex. These reactions are solved in Appendix 2. (b) Fractional receptor phosphorylation (f_R) as a function of the control parameter for receptor phosphorylation (θ_R), for particular values of Q , E/R_t , and $K_3 R_t$. The control (red) is for monomeric receptors. Black lines show results for dimeric receptors with various values of the receptor transphosphorylation parameter (σ). Dimerization does not change any parameter except σ , which increases f_R (red arrow). (c) Relative increase in the level of receptor phosphorylation due to dimerization.




FIGURE 4: Transphosphorylation of SFK. (a) Reactions and equations describing the intermolecular phosphorylation of E. Phosphorylation of E, alone or complexed with various forms of R^* , occurs with bimolecular rate constant q_1 , and dephosphorylation occurs with pseudo-first-order rate constant q_2 . q_4 represents SFK transphosphorylation within an $E-R^*R^*E$ complex. These reactions are solved in Appendix 3. (b) Fractional SFK phosphorylation (f_E) as a function of the control parameter for receptor phosphorylation (θ_R), for particular values of the phosphorylation-induced increase in SFK activity (ϕ), and the control parameter for SFK phosphorylation (θ_E). The control (red) is for monomeric receptors. Blue lines show results for dimeric receptors with various values of the SFK transphosphorylation parameter (ξ). Dimerization does not change any parameter except σ , which increases f_E (red arrow). (c) Fractional receptor phosphorylation. Same parameters as in panel b. (d) Relative increase in the level of receptor phosphorylation due to dimerization. These graphs were constructed by interpolation of the data in panel c.

dephosphorylation (30), so this stabilizes R^* and causes a positive feedback. These two counteracting influences mean that more or less E activity may be needed for 50% phosphorylation; the response curve is shifted left by positive feedback and right by negative feedback (Figure 2b, + and – red arrows, respectively). Figure 2b (black lines) shows the effect of changing the association constant of E for R^* [K_3 (Figure 2a)]. At very low binding levels [Figure 2b (x)], the curve overlays the control (red line), but with high binding levels (◆), the response curve is shifted far to the left. The positive feedback effect predominates. On the other hand, reducing the total concentration of E relative to R, or increasing Q , which allows for a reservoir of closed conformation, inactive E^\dagger , causes negative feedback to predominate and shifts the curve to the right (Figure 2b, blue lines).

2. Effect of Transphosphorylation in Dimeric Receptor Complexes. The essence of our model for SDR-mediated signaling is an additional positive feedback pathway for a dimeric receptor: an intramolecular phosphorylation of the RR^*E complex to form R^*R^*E (32, 33). RR of course can still be phosphorylated on the two subunits independently by the bimolecular reaction, and phosphorylated subunit(s) can bind to E (Figure 3a). This receptor transphosphorylation effect is quantified by parameter σ , which includes the association constant, K_3 , and the unimolecular transphosphorylation constant, k_4 (Figure 3a). When R is a monomer, $\sigma = 0$ (Figure 3b, red line). However, when R is a dimer, σ has some positive value and the value of f_R is increased (Figure 3b, black lines; Appendix 2). Thus, for a given θ_R , receptor dimerization increases f_R , moving vertically on Figure 3b from the red line to the appropriate black line

depending on the value of σ for the dimer (red arrow). In the example shown, dimerization of receptors for which $\sigma = 1000$ causes an ~ 15 -fold increase in phosphorylation at $\theta_R = 0.05$ (Figure 3c, red arrow), but a smaller change at either higher or lower values of θ_R . The importance of θ_R fits with biological expectations: increasing the PTP activity too much will prevent receptor activation even at high levels of an extracellular stimulus, and decreasing the PTP too much will result in activation even in the absence of a stimulus. The concentration and activity of PTP set a threshold and appropriate range for receptor activation.

Surprisingly, we found that receptor monomers and dimers are similarly (but not identically) affected by negative and positive feedback in section 1 (Appendix 2 and Figure S1). We calculated the level of receptor phosphorylation for a variety of parameter values that shift the monomer response to the left or right (Figure 2b) and found that they similarly affect the dimer, so the set of curves shown in Figure 3b shifts left or right along the abscissa (Figure S1). Therefore, the effect of transphosphorylation in the RR^*-E complex (Figure 3b) is similar over a wide range of starting concentrations and other constants, such as Q (the fraction of E in the inactive conformation). A surprising result is that even if all the SFK is in the active conformation ($Q = 0$, e.g., in cells expressing a mutationally activated allele, or in cells where the C-terminal tyrosine of the SFK is not phosphorylated), dimerization of receptors can still cause a considerable increase in the level of phosphorylation (Figure S1). The effects of feedback on receptor monomers and dimers are not identical however, so changes in K_3 , R_t , E_t , or Q do have small effects on the fold increase in the level of phosphorylation induced by receptor dimerization.

3. Effect of SFK Transphosphorylation. We next analyzed the effect of SFK phosphorylation in its activation loop. The open, low-activity form of SFK (E) can be activated ϕ -fold by intermolecular phosphorylation (14, 34–36), with bimolecular rate constant q_1 (Figure 4a). E bound to various forms of R^* can also be phosphorylated by E. All forms of E^* , whether free or bound, are dephosphorylated with pseudo-first-order rate constant q_2 . All other binding and phosphorylation reactions are as before.

We introduce a control parameter for SFK phosphorylation (θ_E), which represents the balance between bimolecular phosphorylation of E and its dephosphorylation by PTP. For example, like θ_R , θ_E is the same for monomer and dimer receptors. It sets the tone for the system and can vary in different cell types. For receptor monomers, where E influences R phosphorylation but not vice versa, the fraction of E that is phosphorylated, f_E , depends on only θ_E . The relationship between θ_E and f_E for monomeric receptors is the same as that between θ_R and f_R (red line in Figure 2b). Note also that the only role of Q , the equilibrium between inactive and active conformations, is to change θ_E (Appendix 3, eqs 1 and 4). This means that the following argument applies equally to cells in which the SFK is or is not phosphorylated at its C-terminal tyrosine residue.

With receptor dimers, doubly phosphorylated R^*R^* can act as a scaffold for the formation of $E-R^*R^*-E$ complexes, and phosphorylation and activation of E in these complexes become unimolecular (rate constant q_3) and are greatly enhanced. This SFK transphosphorylation effect is represented by ξ . When receptors are monomers, there is no

transphosphorylation ($\xi = 0$) and f_E depends on θ_E but not θ_R (Figure 4b, red line). However, with receptor dimers, ξ is a positive number and f_E now depends on θ_E , ξ , and the concentration of R^*R^* . This latter depends on f_R , which in turn depends on θ_R , θ_E , ξ , and ϕ (E^* activity relative to E). This circular relationship between phosphorylation of E (f_E) and R (f_R) represents positive feedback, in which an increased level of R phosphorylation leads to an increased level of R^*R^* , an increased scaffolding effect, an increased level of E^* , and increased E activity to phosphorylate R.

The fraction of E phosphorylation (f_E) is graphed relative to θ_R for given θ_E and ϕ values and various ξ values in Figure 4b (blue lines). Receptor dimerization at a given θ_R increases the level of E phosphorylation vertically from the horizontal red line to the appropriate blue line, dependent on ξ (red arrow). The fraction of phosphorylated receptors, f_R , also increases, moving vertically on Figure 4c from the red line to the appropriate black line depending on the value of ξ for the dimer (red arrow). In the example shown, where $\xi = 100$, $\phi = 10$, $\theta_E = 0.1$, and $\theta_R = 0.1$, we find that f_E increases ~ 7 -fold and f_R increases ~ 2.7 -fold [Figure 4b,d (■)]. Depending on the starting conditions, the increases in the levels of SFK and receptor phosphorylation due to SFK transphosphorylation can be quite large (Figure S2). Note that we ignored the receptor transphosphorylation effect (Figure 3) in these calculations. Receptor transphosphorylation would further increase f_R , which would further increase f_E , which would further increase f_R .

4. Values for the Parameters from Experimental Measurements. Values for receptor transphosphorylation (σ), SFK transphosphorylation (ξ), SFK activation by phosphorylation (ϕ), and total cellular concentrations of SFK (E_t) and receptor (R_t) were obtained from the literature (Table 2, available in the Supporting Information). Each of these values may range over several orders of magnitude: σ from 20 to 5000, ξ from 2 to 800, and ϕ from 4 to 20. As explained above, the parameter Q , the relative amount of SFK in the inactive conformation, has approximately the same effect on phosphorylation of receptor monomers as it does on receptor dimers. To estimate the control parameters for receptor and SFK phosphorylation, θ_R and θ_E , we made use of the observation that low levels of phosphorylated receptors and SFKs can be detected in unstimulated cells (38–40), suggesting that these quantities are in the range of ~ 0.05 – 0.1 . Values from Table 2 were used for Figures 2–4. The results show that receptor and SFK transphosphorylation effects both contribute to ligand-induced phosphorylation of SDRs, and if both effects occur simultaneously, with the expected mutual reinforcement, then even greater increases are expected. In addition, further increases are predicted if receptors cluster into higher-order oligomers.

DISCUSSION

We analyzed a model for signal transduction by SFK-dependent receptors (Figure 1c). We found that dimerization significantly stimulates receptor and SFK phosphorylation without requiring any other regulatory events. Importantly, the model does not require regulation of SFK activity either by C-terminal phosphorylation and dephosphorylation or by stabilization of the active conformation of the SFK when bound to the phosphorylated receptor. The results are

surprising because there are many more steps than for the RTK model (Figure 1b), and many of the steps are inefficient. For example, only a subset of SFK molecules are in a conformation that can bind receptors. Phosphorylation of SFKs in the activation loop causes only a modest activation. The scaffolding effects require ternary and quaternary protein complexes, and the cellular concentrations of phosphorylated receptors and SFKs are low relative to their mutual binding affinity. Nevertheless, receptor dimerization will strongly increase the levels of SDR phosphorylation and SFK activation, provided that the values for receptor and SFK concentrations from cells and kinetic constants from in vitro assays and certain other assumptions (see below) are accurate. The ability of the model to predict effects that are consistent with biological measurements, without recourse to detailed computational modeling, suggests that the minimal system may underlie biological reality.

We had initially expected that the greatest extent of dimerization-induced stimulation would be 2-fold, with one bound SFK phosphorylating two receptor molecules instead of one. However, $\gg 2$ -fold increases may result, depending on cellular conditions (Figures 3c and 4b,d). The “something for nothing” effect does not come at no expense but is driven by “futile” cycles of phosphorylation and dephosphorylation. Another result of the analysis is that the signaling is stimulated in direct proportion to the fraction of receptors that are dimerized. There is no element of a “switch-like” (cooperative or ultrasensitive) response. However, the same applies to RTKs, where binding of a ligand to induce dimerization of a pair of RTKs activates only that one pair. Despite this initially linear response, positive and negative feedback events downstream of the initial receptor activation can allow a switch-like cellular outcome. In the case of multichain immune recognition receptors (MIRRs), this is called kinetic proofreading or serial engagement (41).

The validity of the results relies on the validity of the underlying assumptions. To our knowledge, the assumptions are reasonable and supported by the literature. The first is that molecular flexibility allows an SFK bound to one receptor in a dimer to phosphorylate its partner. It is known that an SFK bound to one phosphotyrosine can phosphorylate other tyrosine residues in the same substrate (42, 43), and others have proposed transphosphorylation of clustered SDRs by associated SFKs (32, 33). Activated SFKs have few interdomain contacts (12, 44), and molecular dynamics simulations predict flexibility (45, 46). We also suspect that SDRs are flexible, based on their lack of predicted secondary structure elements and the experimental finding that TCR proximity but not orientation is critical for activation (47). Thus, it seems likely that receptor transphosphorylation can occur.

We also assume that SFK phosphorylation in the activation loop is intermolecular and can occur on or off membranes. This is supported by experiment (14, 34–36). Phosphorylation in solution is inefficient because the SFK concentration is too low (35, 36). However, SFKs are more likely to transphosphorylate when bound to dimeric receptors. Indeed, SFKs that are associated with active SDRs have more phosphotyrosine than unbound SFKs (48).

The model does not require regulation of PTPs. They are passive players that keep the levels of phosphorylation of monomeric receptors and SFKs low and reset the system

when ligand is removed. They are also important because they cannot dephosphorylate sites to which other proteins are bound (30), allowing a positive feedback effect on phosphorylated receptors. There is abundant evidence that the balance of PTP to SFK is critical for MIRR signaling (49). Although we do not require that PTP be regulated, if it is, e.g., by displacement from dimerized SDRs, by reactive oxygen produced by active SFKs, or by active recruitment to phosphorylated SDRs (24, 26, 50), then the level of receptor activation may be further increased.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

We have found that dimerization can induce an increasing level of receptor phosphorylation by SFK, and SFK activation, by mass action kinetics alone. The increasing level of phosphorylation upon dimerization is due to a positive feedback among receptor phosphorylation, SFK binding, and SFK activation by phosphorylation in the kinase domain. The same principles can also explain cooperative phosphorylation of proteins with multiple phosphorylation sites. They also suggest that other SH2 domain-containing tyrosine kinases may be similarly regulated, since the SFK SH3 domain and C-terminal phosphate are not involved. However, we wish to emphasize that we do not exclude roles for many other mechanisms in the system, such as changes in PTP activity, the lipid environment, or kinases or PTPs that act on SFKs, but the results suggest that such changes are not necessary and may be evolutionary fine-tuning of a basically simple system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank J. Brugge, T. Hunter, T. Miller, A. Shaw, A. Veillette, E. Warren, and A. Weiss for pointing us toward relevant literature. We are grateful to T. Hunter, A. Shaw, J. Schlessinger, W.-y. Shou, and A. Weiss for thoughtful suggestions on various drafts of the manuscript.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Cellular concentrations and reaction rates for SFKs and SDRs, with literature citations (Table 2), effect of positive and negative feedback on phosphorylation of the monomeric receptor (Appendix 1), transphosphorylation of receptor dimers, allowing for feedback (Appendix 2), effect of SFK transphosphorylation, independent of receptor transphosphorylation (Appendix 3), and Figures S1 and S2. In addition, three Excel spreadsheets contain formulas for plotting Figures 2–4 with different input values. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

REFERENCES

1. Tamir, I., and Cambier, J. C. (1998) Antigen receptor signaling: Integration of protein tyrosine kinase functions. *Oncogene* 17, 1353–1364.
2. Sigalov, A. (2005) Multi-chain immune recognition receptors: Spatial organization and signal transduction. *Semin. Immunol.* 17, 51–64.
3. Germain, R. N. (1997) T-cell signaling: The importance of receptor clustering. *Curr. Biol.* 7, R640–R644.
4. Veillette, A., Latour, S., and Davidson, D. (2002) Negative regulation of immunoreceptor signaling. *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* 20, 669–707.
5. Fuller, G. L., Williams, J. A., Tomlinson, M. G., Eble, J. A., Hanna, S. L., Pohlmann, S., Suzuki-Inoue, K., Ozaki, Y., Watson, S. P.,

- and Pearce, A. C. (2007) The C-type lectin receptors CLEC-2 and Dectin-1, but not DC-SIGN, signal via a novel YXXL-dependent signaling cascade. *J. Biol. Chem.* 282, 12397–12409.
6. Palmer, A., Zimmer, M., Erdmann, K. S., Eulenburg, V., Porthin, A., Heumann, R., Deutsch, U., and Klein, R. (2002) EphrinB phosphorylation and reverse signaling: Regulation by Src kinases and PTP-BL phosphatase. *Mol. Cell* 9, 725–737.
 7. Lahdenperä, J., Kilpeläinen, P., Liu, X. L., Pikkarainen, T., Reponen, P., Ruotsalainen, V., and Tryggvason, K. (2003) Clustering-induced tyrosine phosphorylation of nephrin by Src family kinases. *Kidney Int.* 64, 404–413.
 8. Benes, C. H., Wu, N., Elia, A. E., Dharia, T., Cantley, L. C., and Soltoff, S. P. (2005) The C2 domain of PKC δ is a phosphotyrosine binding domain. *Cell* 121, 271–280.
 9. Jaramillo, M. L., Afar, D. E., Almazan, G., and Bell, J. C. (1994) Identification of tyrosine 620 as the major phosphorylation site of myelin-associated glycoprotein and its implication in interacting with signaling molecules. *J. Biol. Chem.* 269, 27240–27245.
 10. Tissir, F., and Goffinet, A. M. (2003) Reelin and brain development. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 4, 496–505.
 11. Herz, J., and Chen, Y. (2006) Reelin, lipoprotein receptors and synaptic plasticity. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* 7, 850–859.
 12. Cowan-Jacob, S. W., Fendrich, G., Manley, P. W., Jahnke, W., Fabbro, D., Liebetanz, J., and Meyer, T. (2005) The crystal structure of a c-Src complex in an active conformation suggests possible steps in c-Src activation. *Structure* 13, 861–871.
 13. Martin, G. S. (2001) The hunting of the Src. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 2, 467–475.
 14. Boggon, T. J., and Eck, M. J. (2004) Structure and regulation of Src family kinases. *Oncogene* 23, 7918–7927.
 15. Veillette, A., Bookman, M. A., Horak, E. M., and Bolen, J. B. (1988) The CD4 and CD8 T cell surface antigens are associated with the internal membrane protein-tyrosine kinase p56lck. *Cell* 55, 301–308.
 16. Shaw, A. S., Amrein, K. E., Hammond, C., Stern, D. F., Sefton, B. M., and Rose, J. K. (1989) The Lck tyrosine protein kinase interacts with the cytoplasmic tail of the CD4 glycoprotein through its unique amino-terminal domain. *Cell* 59, 627–636.
 17. Veillette, A., Bookman, M. A., Horak, E. M., Samelson, L. E., and Bolen, J. B. (1989) Signal transduction through the CD4 receptor involves the activation of the internal membrane tyrosine-protein kinase p56lck. *Nature* 338, 257–259.
 18. Ullrich, A., and Schlessinger, J. (1990) Signal transduction by receptors with tyrosine kinase activity. *Cell* 61, 203–212.
 19. Schlessinger, J. (2003) Signal transduction. Autoinhibition control. *Science* 300, 750–752.
 20. Cochran, J. R., Aivazian, D., Cameron, T. O., and Stern, L. J. (2001) Receptor clustering and transmembrane signaling in T cells. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 26, 304–310.
 21. Razzaq, T. M., Ozege, P., Jury, E. C., Sembi, P., Blackwell, N. M., and Kabouridis, P. S. (2004) Regulation of T-cell receptor signalling by membrane microdomains. *Immunology* 113, 413–426.
 22. Montixi, C., Langlet, C., Bernard, A. M., Thimonier, J., Dubois, C., Wurbel, M. A., Chauvin, J. P., Pierres, M., and He, H. T. (1998) Engagement of T cell receptor triggers its recruitment to low-density detergent-insoluble membrane domains. *EMBO J.* 17, 5334–5348.
 23. Xavier, R., Brennan, T., Li, Q., McCormack, C., and Seed, B. (1998) Membrane compartmentation is required for efficient T cell activation. *Immunity* 8, 723–732.
 24. Shaw, A. S., and Dustin, M. L. (1997) Making the T cell receptor go the distance: A topological view of T cell activation. *Immunity* 6, 361–369.
 25. Horejsi, V. (2004) Transmembrane adaptor proteins in membrane microdomains: Important regulators of immunoreceptor signaling. *Immunol. Lett.* 92, 43–49.
 26. Rodgers, W., and Rose, J. K. (1996) Exclusion of CD45 inhibits activity of p56lck associated with glycolipid-enriched membrane domains. *J. Cell Biol.* 135, 1515–1523.
 27. Bunnell, S. C., Singer, A. L., Hong, D. I., Jacque, B. H., Jordan, M. S., Seminario, M. C., Barr, V. A., Koretzky, G. A., and Samelson, L. E. (2006) Persistence of cooperatively stabilized signaling clusters drives T-cell activation. *Mol. Cell Biol.* 26, 7155–7166.
 28. Bunnell, S. C., Hong, D. I., Kardon, J. R., Yamazaki, T., McGlade, C. J., Barr, V. A., and Samelson, L. E. (2002) T cell receptor ligation induces the formation of dynamically regulated signaling assemblies. *J. Cell Biol.* 158, 1263–1275.
 29. Strasser, V., Fasching, D., Hauser, C., Mayer, H., Bock, H. H., Hiesberger, T., Herz, J., Weeber, E. J., Sweatt, J. D., Pramatarova, A., Howell, B., Schneider, W. J., and Nimpf, J. (2004) Receptor clustering is involved in Reelin signaling. *Mol. Cell Biol.* 24, 1378–1386.
 30. Rotin, D., Margolis, B., Mohammadi, M., Daly, R. J., Daum, G., Li, N., Fischer, E. H., Burgess, W. H., Ullrich, A., and Schlessinger, J. (1992) SH2 domains prevent tyrosine dephosphorylation of the EGF receptor: Identification of Tyr992 as the high-affinity binding site for SH2 domains of phospholipase C gamma. *EMBO J.* 11, 559–567.
 31. Felder, S., Zhou, M., Hu, P., Urena, J., Ullrich, A., Chaudhuri, M., White, M., Shoelson, S. E., and Schlessinger, J. (1993) SH2 domains exhibit high-affinity binding to tyrosine-phosphorylated peptides yet also exhibit rapid dissociation and exchange. *Mol. Cell Biol.* 13, 1449–1455.
 32. Wofsy, C., Vonakis, B. M., Metzger, H., and Goldstein, B. (1999) One lyn molecule is sufficient to initiate phosphorylation of aggregated high-affinity IgE receptors. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 96, 8615–8620.
 33. Pribluda, V. S., Pribluda, C., and Metzger, H. (1994) Transphosphorylation as the mechanism by which the high-affinity receptor for IgE is phosphorylated upon aggregation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 91, 11246–11250.
 34. Cooper, J. A., and MacAuley, A. (1988) Potential positive and negative autoregulation of p60c-src by intermolecular autophosphorylation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 85, 4232–4236.
 35. Barker, S. C., Kassel, D. B., Weigl, D., Huang, X., Luther, M. A., and Knight, W. B. (1995) Characterization of pp60c-src tyrosine kinase activities using a continuous assay: Autoactivation of the enzyme is an intermolecular autophosphorylation process. *Biochemistry* 34, 14843–14851.
 36. Moarefi, I., LaFevre-Bernt, M., Sicheri, F., Huse, M., Lee, C. H., Kuriyan, J., and Miller, W. T. (1997) Activation of the Src-family tyrosine kinase Hck by SH3 domain displacement. *Nature* 385, 650–653.
 37. Wofsy, C., Torigoe, C., Kent, U. M., Metzger, H., and Goldstein, B. (1997) Exploiting the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic kinases: Implications for regulation of signaling by immunoreceptors. *J. Immunol.* 159, 5984–5992.
 38. Iba, H., Cross, F. R., Garber, E. A., and Hanafusa, H. (1985) Low level of cellular protein phosphorylation by nontransforming overproduced pp60c-src. *Mol. Cell Biol.* 5, 1058–1066.
 39. Burkhardt, A. L., Stealey, B., Rowley, R. B., Mahajan, S., Prendergast, M., Fargnoli, J., and Bolen, J. B. (1994) Temporal regulation of non-transmembrane protein tyrosine kinase enzyme activity following T cell antigen receptor engagement. *J. Biol. Chem.* 269, 23642–23647.
 40. Saouaf, S. J., Mahajan, S., Rowley, R. B., Kut, S. A., Fargnoli, J., Burkhardt, A. L., Tsukada, S., Witte, O. N., and Bolen, J. B. (1994) Temporal differences in the activation of three classes of non-transmembrane protein tyrosine kinases following B-cell antigen receptor surface engagement. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 91, 9524–9528.
 41. Goldstein, B., Faeder, J. R., and Hlavacek, W. S. (2004) Mathematical and computational models of immune-receptor signalling. *Nat. Rev. Immunol.* 4, 445–456.
 42. Mayer, B. J., Hirai, H., and Sakai, R. (1995) Evidence that SH2 domains promote processive phosphorylation by protein-tyrosine kinases. *Curr. Biol.* 5, 296–305.
 43. Pellicena, P., and Miller, W. T. (2001) Processive phosphorylation of p130Cas by Src depends on SH3-polypoline interactions. *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 28190–28196.
 44. Hochrein, J. M., Lerner, E. C., Schiavone, A. P., Smithgall, T. E., and Engen, J. R. (2006) An examination of dynamics crosstalk between SH2 and SH3 domains by hydrogen/deuterium exchange and mass spectrometry. *Protein Sci.* 15, 65–73.
 45. Karplus, M., and Kuriyan, J. (2005) Molecular dynamics and protein function. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 102, 6679–6685.
 46. Young, M. A., Gonfloni, S., Superti-Furga, G., Roux, B., and Kuriyan, J. (2001) Dynamic coupling between the SH2 and SH3 domains of c-Src and Hck underlies their inactivation by C-terminal tyrosine phosphorylation. *Cell* 105, 115–126.
 47. Cochran, J. R., Cameron, T. O., Stone, J. D., Lubetsky, J. B., and Stern, L. J. (2001) Receptor proximity, not intermolecular orientation, is critical for triggering T-cell activation. *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 28068–28074.
 48. Yamashita, T., Mao, S. Y., and Metzger, H. (1994) Aggregation of the high-affinity IgE receptor and enhanced activity of p53/

- 56lyn protein-tyrosine kinase. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 91, 11251–11255.
49. Hermiston, M. L., Xu, Z., Majeti, R., and Weiss, A. (2002) Reciprocal regulation of lymphocyte activation by tyrosine kinases and phosphatases. *J. Clin. Invest.* 109, 9–14.
50. Tonks, N. K. (2005) Redox redux: Revisiting PTPs and the control of cell signaling. *Cell* 121, 667–670.

BI8003044