Proceedings of the British Pharmacological Society at http://www.pA2online.org/abstracts/Vol14Issue1abst035P.pdf

## Investigating the functional interaction between the dopamine $D_2$ receptor ( $D_2R$ ) and the dopamine transporter (DAT) using a novel platebased assay

Disruption of synaptic dopamine (DA) levels is implicated in a number of neurological disorders such as Parkinson's disease and schizophrenia (1). DA release and reuptake are regulated by the short isoform of the  $D_2R$  ( $D_2S$ ) and DAT co-expressed in pre-synaptic dopaminergic nerve terminals. Co-expression of  $D_2S$  with DAT has been reported to increase the uptake function of DAT (2). The aim of this study was to investigate whether co-expression of DAT and  $D_2R$  affected the function of either protein.

CHO K1 cells stably expressed DAT tagged with green fluorescent protein (GFP) alone, or with either SNAP-tagged D<sub>2</sub>S (DAT-D<sub>2</sub>S) or long isoform D<sub>2</sub>R (D<sub>2</sub>L) (DAT-D<sub>2</sub>L). In assaying DAT function, cells on 96 well plates were incubated in buffer (HBSS, 50µM Brilliant Black BN) with ligand (20min, 37°C), prior to addition of fluorescent DAT substrate 4-[4-(diethyl-amino)-styryl]-N-methylpyridinium iodide (ASP<sup>+</sup>, 10 µM) (3). Fluorescent substrate uptake after 30min at 37°C was quantified using a FlexStation3 (ex:485 nm, em:590nm). D<sub>2</sub>R function was studied using CHO D<sub>2</sub>S, D<sub>2</sub>L, DAT-D<sub>2</sub>S and DAT-D<sub>2</sub>L membranes. Membranes were pre-incubated with ligand and 1µM GDP (1h, 21°C) in buffer (20mM HEPES, 10mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>, 100mM NaCl, pH 7.4) before incubation with 200pM [ $^{35}$ S]GTPγS (20 min, 21°C). Bound radioactivity was separated using GF/B filter plates, which were washed and dried before quantification of radioactivity (Packard TopCount). Concentration response curves were fitted in GraphPad Prism v6.

The rank order of potency of DAT inhibitors in the ASP<sup>+</sup> assay was consistent across DAT, DAT-D<sub>2</sub>S and DAT-D<sub>2</sub>L cell lines: IN>GBR>JHW>BP (**Table 1**). D<sub>2</sub>R ligand effects were also consistent between cell lines: QP had no effect, AP and DA inhibited ASP<sup>+</sup> accumulation (**Table 1**), and BC increased accumulation at >10µM. In the [ $^{35}$ S]GTPγS assay, D<sub>2</sub>R agonists showed no difference in pEC<sub>50</sub> in D<sub>2</sub>S, DAT-D<sub>2</sub>S, D<sub>2</sub>L and DAT-D<sub>2</sub>L cell lines; QP: 6.82±0.23, 6.60± 0.07, 6.94±0.21, 6.54±0.10; BC: 8.76±0.18, 8.77±0.18, 8.84±0.19, 8.40±0.10; AP: no effect; and DA: 7.11±0.21, 6.78 ±0.08, 6.66±0.08, 6.53±0.11 respectively (n=5). The maximum responses to AP and DA (represented as % 10µM QP response) were similar in all cell lines, while BC Rmax decreased with DAT co-expression; D<sub>2</sub>S 76±9, DAT-D<sub>2</sub>S 51±3 and D<sub>2</sub>L 70±11, DAT-D<sub>2</sub>L 34±9% (*P*<0.05; unpaired t-test, Welch's correction). These data suggest that co-expression of either isoform of D<sub>2</sub>R with DAT does not affect DAT inhibitor potency; however BC efficacy at theD<sub>2</sub>S/L receptor is reduced with DAT co-expression, indicating an alteration in receptor function.

	ASP <sup>+</sup> Assay pIC <sub>50</sub> Values		
Ligand	DAT	DAT-D₂S	DAT-D <sub>2</sub> L
Quinpirole (QP)	NE	NE	NE
Bromocriptine	*	*	*
(BC)			
Aripiprazole (AP)	5.66 ± 0.16	5.54 ± 0.15	$5.79 \pm 0.16$
Dopamine (DA)	5.00 ± 0.17	5.41 ± 0.12	5.14 ± 0.11
GBR-12909	7.57 ± 0.09	7.53 ± 0.11	$7.55 \pm 0.07$
(GBR)			
Indatraline (IN)	8.00 ± 0.19	8.06 ± 0.15	7.77 ± 0.15
Bupropion (BP)	$6.32 \pm 0.17$	$6.46 \pm 0.07$	$6.39 \pm 0.10$
JHW007 (JHW)	7.59 ± 0.20	7.37 ± 0.06	$7.39 \pm 0.09$

**Table 1:** ASP\* assay data. Summary of  $D_2R$  agonist and DAT inhibitor responses in DAT,<br/>DAT- $D_2S$  and DAT- $D_2L$  expressing CHO cells. Data are shown as mean  $\pm$  SEM; n=5-19.<br/>NE=no effect.\* = Increase in ASP\* accumulation at 10µM BC.

Supported by an MRC DTA studentship to PE. (1) Beaulieu JM et al. (2015). IUPHAR **172**: 1–23.

(2) Bolan E *et al.* (2007). *Mol Pharm* **71**: 1222–1232.
(3) Mason JN. *et al.* (2005) *J Neurosci Methods* **143**: 3–25.