The Mechanism of GTP Hydrolysis by Dynamin II: A Transient Kinetic Study†
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ABSTRACT: Dynamin II is a 98 kDa protein (870 amino acids) required for the late stages of clathrin-mediated endocytosis. The GTPase activity of dynamin is required for its function in the budding stages of receptor-mediated endocytosis and synaptic vesicle recycling. This activity is stimulated when dynamin self-associates on multivalent binding surfaces, such as microtubules and anionic liposomes. We first investigated the oligomeric state of dynamin II by analytical ultracentrifuge sedimentation equilibrium measurements at high ionic strength and found that it was best described by a monomer–tetramer equilibrium. We then studied the intrinsic dynamin GTPase mechanism by using a combination of fluorescence stopped-flow and HPLC methods using the fluorescent analogue of GTP, mantGTP (2′-deoxy-3′-O-(N-methylanthraniloyl) guanosine-5′-triphosphate), under the same ionic strength conditions. The results are interpreted as showing that mantGTP binds to dynamin in a two-step mechanism. The dissociation constant of mantGTP binding to dynamin, calculated from the ratio of the off-rate to the on-rate (k_{off}/k_{on}), was 0.5 μM. Cleavage of mantGTP then occurs to mantGDP and P, followed by the rapid release of mantGDP and P. No evidence of reversibility of hydrolysis was observed. The cleavage step itself is the rate-limiting step in the mechanism. This mechanism more closely resembles that of the Ras family of proteins involved in cell signaling than the myosin ATPase involved in cellular motility.

Dynamin is a 98 kDa protein required for the late stages of clathrin-mediated endocytosis (for reviews, see refs 1–4); mutant forms of dynamin, defective in GTP binding and hydrolysis, have a strong inhibitory effect on clathrin-mediated endocytosis in fibroblast cells (5). Dynamin occurs in three known, highly homologous forms in mammalian cells: a neuro-specific dynamin called dynamin I, a ubiquitously expressed isoform called dynamin II, and an isoform expressed exclusively in the testis, lung, and brain called dynamin III (6, 7). Dynamin has been cloned and sequenced, and four structural domains have been identified. The 300 amino acid N-terminal third of the molecule contains a tripartite GTP-binding domain characteristic of other GTP-binding proteins such as Ras. The region from residues 510–620 contains a pleckstrin homology (PH) domain which is known to be involved in binding to PIP2, an interaction essential to its activity in vivo (8–10). The region from residues 600–750 contains two putative coiled-coil domains and has been termed the GTPase effector domain (GED) for its ability to stimulate dynamin GTPase activity (11). A proline/arginine-rich domain (PRD) extends over 100 residues from amino acid 750 to the C-terminus (residues 864 in rat dynamin I and 870 in rat dynamin II). The PRD domain has multiple proline-rich motifs implicated in protein–protein interactions; specifically this region binds SH3-containing proteins such as Grb2, amphipysin, and endophilin (12).

Dynamin’s GTPase is stimulated by several biomolecules including microtubules (13), negatively charged phospholipids (14), and growth factor receptor binding protein 2 (Grb2) (15, 16). The interaction of dynamin with these biomolecules promotes self-association of dynamin. Dynamin is also known to self-associate in low ionic strength solution, which leads to positive cooperativity in its GTPase activity (17). Although the precise role of dynamin is still unknown, it has been proposed to couple the energy released from GTP hydrolysis to the generation of the mechanical force required for membrane fusion during coated vesicle formation (18–20). However, it has recently been proposed that dynamin is not a force-generating enzyme, but rather is involved in the recruitment of an acyltransferase, endophilin, that promotes endocytosis by altering membrane curvature (21, 22).

Steady-state kinetic methods have generally been used to determine K_{m} and V_{max} values for the basal GTPase activity of dynamin as well as the enhanced GTPase activity stimulated by factors such as anionic lipids, microtubules, and Grb2. Preliminary transient kinetic studies of the GTPase of bovine brain dynamin I (23) have been carried out to determine the elementary processes in the GTPase reaction.
and to compare them with the kinetic mechanisms of other nucleoside triphosphatases such as myosin ATPase and small G-protein GTPases. For that study, fluorescent analogues of GTP and GDP, 2′(3′)-O-3′-N-methylanthraniloyl-GTP and -GDP (mantGTP and mantGDP), were utilized. These analogues exist as a mixture of the 2′-O- and 3′-O-substituted nucleotides which may complicate analysis of the data (24).

We have now made a detailed transient kinetic study of the intrinsic GTPase of recombinant rat dynamin II using 2′-deoxy-3′-O-3′-N-methylanthraniloyl-GTP and -GDP (mantdGTP and mantdGDP)1 which exist as single substituted derivatives, thus avoiding the problem of working with mixed isomers. This study will serve as a basis for understanding the mechanism of the activation of the GTPase by factors such as Grb2 and phosphoinositides. We have also characterized dynamin II by analytical ultracentrifugation techniques in order to relate the kinetic measurements with the protein’s oligomeric state.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Dynamin II. Dynamin II was purified according to Lin et al. (38), and its concentration was estimated using a theoretical extinction coefficient of 53 490 M−1 cm−1 at 280 nm by the method of Gill and von Hippel (25). All measurements were made in buffer containing 20 mM HEPES, pH 7.4, 300 mM NaCl, 5 mM MgCl2, 1 mM EDTA, 0.2 mM phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride, and 0.5 mM dithiothreitol. Immediately before use, the dynamin solution was centrifuged for 15 min at 100 000 g, to remove any aggregated protein. The analytical ultracentrifugation data were collected at 4 °C. All kinetic measurements were at 20 °C.

Mant-nucleotides. MantGTP and mantdGDP were synthesized, purified, and characterized as described previously (24). Their concentrations were determined from their extinction coefficient at 354 nm of 57 000 M−1 cm−1 (26).

Stopped-Flow Measurements. Stopped-flow measurements were made using a Hi-Tech MX61 instrument (Hi-Tech, Salisbury, U.K.) operated in the single push mode. All concentrations quoted are those after mixing and so are half of the syringe concentrations. For mant-fluorescence intensity, excitation was at 280 nm unless otherwise stated and emission was monitored through a Wratten 2E cutoff filter (50% transmission at 430 nm, less than 1% transmission at 420 nm). This took advantage of energy transfer between tryptophan residues in dynamin and the mant-fluorophore on the nucleotide which allowed measurements to be made at higher concentrations of mant-nucleotide than could be made by direct excitation at 366 nm (23, 27). All stopped-flow data were fitted to the appropriate equations using Hi-Tech software.

Hydrolysis of MantdGTP. Hydrolysis of mantdGTP to mantdGDP was monitored by HPLC. Fifty microliters of the dynamin II/mantdGTP reaction mixture was added to 5 μL of 0.25% perchloric acid (pH <2), and then 5 μL of 0.4 M sodium acetate was added to adjust the pH to ~4. After centrifugation to remove denatured protein, the supernatant was loaded onto a NovaPak C18 (150 × 3.9 mm) HPLC column (Waters) equilibrated with 100 mM potassium phosphate, pH 6.0, 12.5% acetonitrile and eluted isocratically at 0.75 mL min−1 with the same buffer. The eluant was monitored using a Hitachi F1050 fluorescence detector with excitation at 366 nm and emission at 440 nm. The signal was recorded using a Hewlett-Packard 3390A Integrator, and the relative concentrations of mantdGTP and mantdGDP were calculated.

Equilibrium Analytical Ultracentrifuge Measurements. Equilibrium analytical ultracentrifuge measurements were made with a Beckman XL-I analytical ultracentrifuge using a 4-position An60Ti rotor. Each cell had a 6-channel carbon—epoxy centerpiece with two quartz windows giving an optical path length of 1.2 cm. Each data set represents the average of 15 scans. Each cell was scanned stepwise (0.002 cm steps) at a wavelength of 280 nm and absorbance monitored relative to buffer. After equilibrium was reached (from 24 to 40 h), overspeed runs at 42 000 rpm were carried out to obtain baseline values of absorbance which were used in subsequent fits. The partial specific volume of dynamin II, 0.730 cm3 g−1 at 4 °C (0.737 cm3 g−1 at 20 °C), was calculated from its amino acid composition, and the calculated monomeric molecular weight of (His)6-tagged dynamin II is 99 053. The solvent density was calculated to be 1.013 g·mL−1 at 4 °C. Solutions of between 1.5 and 12 μM dynamin II were centrifuged at 7000 rpm at 4 °C until equilibrium had been reached. All data sets were fitted to the appropriate equation using Beckman Optima XL-A/ XL-1 data analysis software, version 4.0, either individually or collectively. Figures were replotted using Sigmaplot.

RESULTS

Sedimentation Equilibrium Measurements. To define the oligomeric state of dynamin II under the ionic strength conditions used for the kinetic studies, sedimentation equilibrium measurements were first made. As described under Materials and Methods, dynamin at a range of concentrations was centrifuged at 7000 rpm until equilibrium was reached. The data at three of these concentrations of dynamin II are shown in each panel of Figure 1 together with the best fit of the data to models of (A) a monomer—tetramer, (B) tetramer alone, and (C) dimer—tetramer. These three models all gave reasonable fits to the data whereas with other models, there was a clear discrepancy between the data and the theoretical line. Figure 1 also shows the residuals between the data at 5 μM dynamin and the fitted line for each of these models. It can be seen that the tetramer alone model shows a systematic deviation of the residuals. However, both the monomer—tetramer and dimer—tetramer models fit the data well. This result is in agreement with the in vivo data of Okamo et al. (28) and the in vitro analysis of Muhlbeg et al. (11) that dynamin exists primarily in an oligomeric state.

Analysis of each data set separately to the monomer—tetramer model gives values for the equilibrium constant for the oligomerization of between 1.38 and 3.36 μM−3. There was no correlation between the loading concentration and the equilibrium constant obtained. Fitting all of the data sets simultaneously to a monomer—tetramer model gave a value for the equilibrium constant of 1.92 μM−3 with a lower limit of 1.37 μM−3 and an upper limit of 2.76 μM−3. Similar

1 Abbreviations: mantGTP, 2′-deoxy-3′-O-3′-N-methylanthraniloyl guanosine 5′-triphosphate; the 5′-diphosphate is similarly abbreviated.
treatment of the data using a dimer–tetramer model gave values for the equilibrium constant from fits to separate data sets between 2.13 and 3.46 μM⁻¹ whereas fitting all the data sets simultaneously gave a value for the equilibrium constant of 1.88 μM⁻¹ with a lower limit of 1.54 μM⁻¹ and an upper limit of 2.35 μM⁻¹.

The variance of the monomer–tetramer fit is slightly better, but not significantly better, than for the dimer–tetramer fit. Thus, with the available data we cannot distinguish between these two models. We previously proposed that dynamin I existed as a monomer–tetramer model under these conditions (23). We have reexamined these data and fitted it to both monomer–tetramer and dimer–tetramer models. The dimer–tetramer model did not fit the data well, particularly at the lower concentrations of dynamin I. We therefore suggest that both dynamin I and dynamin II exist as a monomer–tetramer equilibrium.

Using the equilibrium constant for the monomer–tetramer model and calculating the concentrations of monomer and tetramer (based on monomeric concentration) with respect to total dynamin concentration show that equal amounts of monomer and tetramer occur at 1 μM. A similar calculation for the dimer–tetramer model shows that equal amounts of dimer and tetramer also occur at 1 μM. Therefore, whichever model is used does not change the interpretation of the kinetic results.

**Binding of MantdGTP and MantdGDP to Dynamin.** The binding of mant-d-nucleotides to dynamin was investigated under pseudo-first-order conditions by monitoring energy transfer between tryptophan in the dynamin and the mant-fluorophore. Figure 2a shows that on mixing 1 μM dynamin with 30 μM mant-dGTP, there is an increase in fluorescence intensity of 20% which can be well fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of 75 s⁻¹. The dependence of the observed rate constant of binding of mant-dGTP to dynamin was investigated over the range of 5–70 μM mant-dGTP. As the concentration of mant-dGTP increased, the background fluorescence signal also increased with a reduction in the signal from the binding reaction. Therefore, measurements could not be made above this concentration. The dependence of the observed rate constant of binding of mant-dGTP to dynamin on mant-dGTP concentration is shown in Figure 3a. Although this is linear at lower concentrations, there is evidence of hyperbolic behavior at higher concentrations.

There are several possible mechanisms of binding of mant-GTP to dynamin that could give rise to this type of behavior. These are described by Bagshaw et al. (29) in interpreting their results of the binding of ATP to myosin subfragment 1. The one possibility considered here is that the hyperbolic behavior arises from the binding of mant-GTP to dynamin being a two-step process in which there is a rapid equilibrium to form a collision complex, followed by an isomerization of this complex in a process which reports the change of fluorescence intensity:

**Scheme 1**

\[
\text{dynamin} + \text{mantdGTP} \xrightarrow{K_{eq}} \frac{\Delta F}{k_{in}} \text{dynamin} \cdot \text{mantdGTP} \xrightarrow{k_{in}} \text{dynamin} \cdot \text{mantdGTP}^* 
\]
If this is the case, then the observed rate constant of the process will be given by

\[ k_{\text{obs}} = k_{1b}/\{1 + [K_{1a}[mantdGTP]]\} + k_{-1b} \]  

(1)

where \( K_{1a} \) is the association equilibrium constant of step 1 and \( k_{1b} \) and \( k_{-1b} \) are the rate constants for the forward and backward processes of step 2. (This treatment assumes that any subsequent processes are very slow compared to the binding and dissociation processes. This is a valid assumption; see below.)

The solid line in Figure 3a is a fit of the data to this equation giving values of \( K_{1a} = 1.1 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1} \) (which is equivalent to a \( K_d \) of 91 \( \mu \text{M} \)) and \( k_{1b} = 280 \text{ s}^{-1} \). However, because the range of mantdGTP concentration is limited to 70 \( \mu \text{M} \), there may be considerable errors in these values. The intercept, as seen in the above equation, gives the value of \( k_{-1b} \) but is too close to the origin to define exactly.

When \( k_{\text{obs}} \ll k_{1b} \), then eq 1 reduces to

\[ k_{\text{obs}} = K_{1a}k_{1b}[\text{mantdGTP}] \]  

(2)

Therefore, the slope of the line at low concentration of mantdGTP is \( K_{1b}k_{1a} \), giving an apparent second-order binding constant of \( 3.0 \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \).

Similar binding measurements were made with mantdGDP. Again an exponential increase in fluorescence occurred, but this was faster and of smaller amplitude than that observed for mantdGTP. For example, at 30 \( \mu \text{M} \) mantdGDP, the observed rate constant was 171 \text{ s}^{-1}, and the increase in fluorescence was 8% (Figure 2b). This faster and smaller process limited measurements of mantdGDP binding to dynamin to the range of 5–40 \( \mu \text{M} \).

The observed constant of this process was shown to be linearly dependent on mantdGDP concentration (Figure 3b). This is the expected behavior of a simple one-step binding process:

\[ \text{dynamin} + \text{mantdGDP} \rightleftharpoons \text{dynamin-mantdGDP} \]

where the observed rate constant is given by

\[ k_{\text{obs}} = k_{1} [\text{mantdGDP}] + k_{-1} \]  

(3)

On this basis, the slope of the line in Figure 3b gives \( k_1 \) as \( 3.3 \times 10^6 \text{ M}^{-1} \text{ s}^{-1} \) and the intercept gives \( k_{-1} \) as 64 \text{ s}^{-1}.

However, the concentration range at which the reaction could be studied was more limited than that of mantdGTP, and it cannot be excluded that mantdGDP, like mantdGTP, also binds to dynamin by a more complex mechanism.
Displacement of ManTDGTP and ManTDGDP from Dynamin. To gain more information about the dissociation of mantd-nucleotides from dynamin, a solution containing dynamin with mantd-nucleotide was rapidly mixed with a large excess of GTP. Figure 4a shows that on mixing a solution of 1 μM dynamin, 2 μM manTDGTP with a solution of 100 μM GTP, there was a >50% decrease in fluorescence. This could be fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of 1.4 s⁻¹, but examination of the residuals between the data points and the fitted line showed a systematic deviation (top residuals plot). The data could be better fitted to a double exponential (lower residuals plot) with rate constants of 3.3 s⁻¹ (amplitude 63%) and 0.64 s⁻¹ (amplitude 27%). The data were obtained from a single reaction. (b) One syringe contained 1 μM dynamin, 2 μM ManTDGDP, and the other contained 5 mM GTP. The line is a fit to a single exponential with a rate constant of 86 s⁻¹. The data represent four reactions averaged.

Third, the biphasic nature of the dissociation of manTDGTP from dynamin was investigated with the view that one phase may represent dissociation of a hydrolysis product of a dynamin-manTDGTP complex. Therefore, a solution of 2 μM dynamin and 1 μM manTDGTP was rapidly mixed with a solution of 100 μM GTP within 30 s of adding the manTDGTP to the dynamin. The reaction was repeated at increasing time intervals after mixing the manTDGTP with the dynamin. All of the reaction profiles were best fitted to a double exponential. There was a slight decrease in the rate constant of the fast phase from time zero to 15 min from 3.41 to 2.96 s⁻¹. Also, the rate constant of the slow phase decreased from 0.66 to 0.50 s⁻¹ over this time range. However, the relative amplitudes of the two phases remained constant, 67.5 ± 2.3% for the fast phase and 32.2 ± 2.3% for the slow phase. Furthermore, the total amplitude of the fluorescence change together with the amplitudes of the individual phases all decreased exponentially with a rate constant of 0.088 s⁻¹ (data not shown). This is comparable with the rate constant of the GTP cleavage step (see below).

The displacement of manTDGDP from dynamin was then measured by mixing a solution of 1 μM dynamin and 2 μM manTDGDP with a solution of 100 μM GTP. Unlike the case with manTDGTP, the data could be fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of 18.2 ± 1.3 s⁻¹. However, this value is not in agreement with the value of the dissociation rate constant obtained from the binding data (Figure 3b). The concentration of GTP was increased, and the observed rate constant increased until a limiting value was obtained at 5 mM GTP of 88 ± 15 s⁻¹ (Figure 4b). This value could not be obtained more accurately because, unlike most other stopped-flow measurements reported here, excitation was at 366 nm, because of the large inner filter

Figure 4: Stopped-flow fluorescence record of the displacement of manTDGTP and manTDGDP from dynamin. (a) One syringe contained 1 μM dynamin, 2 μM manTDGTP, and the other syringe contained 100 μM GTP. The upper residuals plot is for a fit to a single exponential with a rate constant of 1.4 s⁻¹, and the lower residuals plot is for a fit to a double exponential with rate constants of 3.3 s⁻¹ (amplitude 63%) and 0.64 s⁻¹ (amplitude 27%). The data were obtained from a single reaction. (b) One syringe contained 1 μM dynamin, 2 μM manTDGDP, and the other contained 5 mM GTP. The line is a fit to a single exponential with a rate constant of 86 s⁻¹. The data represent four reactions averaged.
effect of 5 mM GTP at 280 nm. This resulted in a reduced signal-to-noise ratio. However, the value of the dissociation rate constant of mant\textsubscript{d}GDP from dynamin by the displacement experiment is now in agreement with that obtained by the binding data. [For a discussion of how displacement experiments can give false values of observed dissociation rate constants, see Gutfreund (30).]

Dissociation of GTP and GDP from Dynamin. The dissociation rate constants of GTP and GDP from dynamin were measured by displacing them with mant\textsubscript{d}GTP. On mixing a solution containing 1 \mu M dynamin and 2 \mu M GTP with a solution containing 50 \mu M mant\textsubscript{d}GTP, a 12\% increase in fluorescence occurred (Figure 5a). This was not well fitted to a single exponential but could be fitted to a double exponential. The first rate constant was 0.37 s\textsuperscript{-1} (amplitude 48\%), and the second rate constant was 0.073 s\textsuperscript{-1} (amplitude 52\%). On repeating the experiment but mixing a solution containing 1 \mu M dynamin and 3 \mu M GDP with a solution containing 50 \mu M mant\textsubscript{d}GTP, a 7\% increase in fluorescence occurred which could be fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of 111 s\textsuperscript{-1} (Figure 5b).

Higher concentrations of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP could not be used to determine if these are the real dissociation rate constants of GTP and GDP from dynamin because of the reduced signal-to-noise ratio resulting from the free mant\textsubscript{d}GTP in solution. However, the values most probably represent a lower limit of these rate constants.

Hydrolysis of Mant\textsubscript{d}GTP by Dynamin. Five micromolar dynamin was mixed with 2.5 \mu M mant\textsubscript{d}GTP, and the reaction was followed in two ways. First, measurements were made in a stopped-flow instrument, and the fluorescence intensity of the emitted light was measured with excitation at 280 nm. There was first a 3-fold rapid increase in fluorescence intensity followed by a slower decrease in intensity to a value of about 1.3-fold of the intensity before mixing (Figure 6). The fast phase was not well described by a single exponential but would not be expected to since the binding process is not under pseudo-first-order conditions. The slow phase was fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of 0.0056 s\textsuperscript{-1}.

Second, the reaction was repeated, but samples were taken at time intervals, quenched by the addition of perchloric acid, and analyzed for the relative concentrations of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP and mant\textsubscript{d}GDP by HPLC analysis. Plotting the percentage of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP in the reaction mixture with time showed an exponential decrease of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP with a rate constant of 0.0062 s\textsuperscript{-1} (Figure 7). The fluorescence decrease seen in Figure 6 therefore represents the cleavage step of GTP hydrolysis.

To confirm that there was no rapid formation of mant\textsubscript{d}GDP by dynamin during the first turnover of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP, a solution containing 5 \mu M dynamin and 25 \mu M mant\textsubscript{d}GTP was incubated at 20 °C, and samples were taken to measure the conversion of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP to mant\textsubscript{d}GDP by HPLC. The hydrolysis of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP by dynamin was linear over the first 300 s of the reaction with no evidence of rapid formation of mant\textsubscript{d}GDP prior to the overall steady-state rate of hydrolysis (data not shown). The steady-state rate of hydrolysis from the linear plot was calculated to be 0.0040 s\textsuperscript{-1}.

Hydrolysis of GTP by Dynamin. To compare the rate of hydrolysis of mant\textsubscript{d}GTP with GTP itself, the formation of
In the presence of GTP, 

\[ K_{\text{on}} \approx 10^6 \text{M}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \]

and the dissociation constants of 3.1 and 0.60 s\(^{-1}\), the values of the association rate constants of GTP and mantGTP are similar. Therefore, GTP binds to dynamin approximately 10 times tighter than mantGTP.

**Interaction of Dynamin with MantdGTP and GDP.** At first sight, the results on the interaction of mantdGDP with dynamin were easier to interpret. The observed first-order rate constants of the binding of mantdGDP to dynamin were linearly dependent on mantdGDP concentration (Figure 3b). The slope of the line gave a second-order association rate

\[ K_{\text{on}} \approx 10^6 \text{M}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \]

and the dissociation constants of 3.1 and 0.60 s\(^{-1}\), the values of the association rate constants of GTP and mantGTP are similar. Therefore, GTP binds to dynamin approximately 10 times tighter than mantGTP.

**Interaction of Dynamin with MantdGTP and GDP.** At first sight, the results on the interaction of mantdGDP with dynamin were easier to interpret. The observed first-order rate constants of the binding of mantdGDP to dynamin were linearly dependent on mantdGDP concentration (Figure 3b). The slope of the line gave a second-order association rate

\[ K_{\text{on}} \approx 10^6 \text{M}^{-1} \text{s}^{-1} \]

The dissociation of GTP itself was measured by displacement with mantdGTP. Again, this was not well fitted to a single exponential but showed biphasic behavior with rate constants of 0.37 ± 0.01 and 0.073 ± 0.003 s\(^{-1}\) with relative amplitudes of 48% and 52%. Therefore, both processes have rate constants about 10 times slower than for mantGTP displacement. It is reasonable to assume that the association rate constants of GTP and mantGTP to dynamin are similar. Therefore, GTP binds to dynamin approximately 10 times tighter than mantGTP.

**Interaction of Dynamin with MantdGTP and GDP.** At first sight, the results on the interaction of mantdGDP with dynamin were easier to interpret. The observed first-order rate constants of the binding of mantdGDP to dynamin were linearly dependent on mantdGDP concentration (Figure 3b). The slope of the line gave a second-order association rate
constant of $3.3 \times 10^6 \, M^{-1} \, s^{-1}$, and the intercept gave a dissociation rate constant of $64 \, s^{-1}$. Combining these two values gave an equilibrium dissociation constant of $19 \, \mu M$.

The dissociation of GDP from dynamin was measured by a displacement experiment with mant-GTP. This process was also well fitted to a single exponential with a rate constant of $111 \, s^{-1}$ (Figure 6b). Again, assuming that the association rate constants of GDP and mant/GDP are the same, this implies that if anything, GDP binds more weakly to dynamin than mant/GDP. However, the value for GDP dissociation is not accurately determined since a large excess of displacing nucleotide could not be used.

Hydrolysis by Dynamin. In the previous sections, we have addressed the initial interactions of mant/GTP and mant-GDP with dynamin. To gain an understanding of the hydrolysis mechanism, the interaction of mant/GTP with excess dynamin was studied over longer time courses. It was shown that on mixing 5 $\mu M$ dynamin with 2.5 $\mu M$ mant-GDP that following the binding process, an exponential decrease in fluorescence occurred (Figure 6) with a rate constant of $0.0056 \, s^{-1}$. When this reaction was repeated, but conversion of mant/GTP to mant-GDP was measured directly, the rate constant for the cleavage step was found to be $0.0062 \, s^{-1}$ (Figure 7). Therefore, the slow fluorescence decrease seen in Figure 6 is reporting the cleavage step of the reaction. There was no evidence for any rapid formation of phosphate during the first turnover of mant/GTP by dynamin as occurs with the hydrolysis of ATP by myosin subfragment 1 (32). The rate constant for GTP hydrolysis determined by monitoring $P_i$ release is $0.0061 \, s^{-1}$, within experimental error identical to that of mant/GTP hydrolysis.

These experiments show that following the two-step binding of mant/GTP to dynamin, the cleavage of mant/GTP to mant-GDP is the rate-limiting step in the reaction. This is followed by the release of mant/GDP (at $64 \, s^{-1}$) and $P_i$, although the order of product release cannot be determined.

These results show that the mechanism of hydrolysis of GTP by dynamin shows both similarities and differences with the hydrolysis of GTP by small G-proteins (33) and of hydrolysis of ATP by myosin subfragment 1 (34). The initial binding step is relatively weak compared to GTP binding to small G-proteins and ATP binding to myosin subfragment 1 although all these processes appear to occur by a two-step mechanism (29, 35). The cleavage step being rate-limiting in the overall hydrolysis reaction and being irreversible is common to the small G-proteins, but differs from the myosin subfragment 1 ATPase where cleavage is fast and reversible. $P_i$ release is fast compared to the cleavage step which is again a feature of the small G-proteins but not myosin subfragment 1. Finally, with dynamin, GDP release is very fast. Here it differs from the small G-proteins in which GDP release, in the absence of exchange factors, is of the same order of magnitude as the cleavage step (33).

Activation of dynamin GTPase activity accompanies dynamin self-association, apparently of higher order than tetramerization (36). At low ionic strength, this self-association can occur in the absence of other macromolecules. At physiological ionic strength, it is facilitated by anionic scaffolds [PS- or PIP2-containing liposomes or microtubules (13, 37, 38)] or cross-linking proteins [Grb2 or anti-dynamin polyclonal antibodies (39, 40)]. Regardless of the mode of GTPase stimulation, our data suggest that it must occur by a mechanism which accelerates the GTP cleavage step. In the case of the small G-proteins such as Rac and Rho, this is achieved by a GTPase activating protein (GAP) that promotes hydrolysis by the insertion of a catalytic arginine residue into the active site and by the stabilization of the effector loop (41–43). In the case of dynamin, this is accomplished by a domain located between amino acids 620 and 746 (in dynamin II) called the GTPase-effector domain (GED), which is believed to act intermolecularly between dynamins (11, 44). At the salt concentrations used in our experiments, dynamin cannot oligomerize into large structures (45). Consequently, there is no stimulation of the GTPase activity as a function of dynamin concentration. Therefore, we are characterizing only the basal GTPase activity of dynamin, and the GED interaction is not likely to play a role in the kinetics of GTP hydrolysis by dynamin under the conditions used in this paper.
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