Published in final edited form as:

Open Neurosci J. 2009 January 1; 3: 117–127. doi:10.2174/1874082000903020117.

Spatiotemporal Regulation of Signaling in and out of Dendritic Spines: CaMKII and Ras

Seok-Jin R. Lee¹ and Ryohei Yasuda^{1,2,*}

¹ Department of Neurobiology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC 27710

² Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, NC 27710

Abstract

Recent advances in 2-photon fluorescence lifetime imaging microscopy (2pFLIM) in combination with 2-photon photochemistry have enabled the visualization of neuronal signaling during synaptic plasticity at the level of single dendritic spines in light scattering tissue. Using these techniques, the activity of Ca²⁺/Calmodulin-dependent kinase II (CaMKII) and Ras have been imaged in single spines during synaptic plasticity and associated spine enlargement. These provide two contrasting examples of spatiotemporal regulation of spine signaling: Ras signaling is diffusive and spread over ~10 μ m along the dendrites, while CaMKII activation is restricted to the spine undergoing plasticity. In this review, we will discuss the mechanisms and roles of the different spatiotemporal regulation of signaling in neurons, and the impact of the spine structure upon these biochemical signaling processes.

Introduction

Dendritic spines are the sites of most excitatory synapses (>90%) on pyramidal neurons in the brain. Despite their relatively small size (~0.1 femtoliter), single spines can house several hundred signaling proteins and receptors [1,2]. Even within a single pyramidal neuron, spines greatly vary in size and shape [3], from immature, filopodia-like ones to more mature, mushroom-shaped spines [4,5]. Spine structure is dynamic: they change their morphology, appear and disappear quickly, sometimes on the minute time scale, in both activity-dependent and activity-independent manners [6–10]. The morphogenesis of spines is considered to be correlated with the functional plasticity of the spine [11,12]. Spine shrinkage and enlargements are associated with decreases and increases in synaptic AMPA receptors (AMPArs), which is one of the main mechanisms for long-term potentiation (LTP) and depression (LTD), respectively [13–17]. Also, spine formation and pruning have been reported to contribute to LTP and LTD [18–20].

What are the roles of the spine structure? Spines are connected to their parent dendrites through narrow necks, which act as diffusion barriers [21,22]. This structural feature is thought to biochemically isolate spine heads from their parent shafts to some degrees and to be important for spine specificity of synaptic plasticity [23,24]. Also, the role of the spine structure as an electric compartment has been also suggested to be important for dendritic computation [22, 25–28].

Consistent with the important roles of the structure and number of dendritic spines in biochemical and electrical signaling, aberrant morphology and density of dendritic spines have

*Corresponding author: yasuda@neuro.duke.edu.

been observed in brain tissues from many mental disorders, including Down syndrome patients [29,30], schizophrenia [31], and some forms of mental retardation [32]. Furthermore, early stages of neurodegenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's diseases are associated with abnormal morphology, dysregulation and retraction of dendritic spines [33,34] as well as attenuated synaptic plasticity caused by amyloid-beta oligomers [35,36] and their interaction with the cellular prion protein (PrP^C) [37].

The postsynaptic signaling mechanisms underlying synaptic plasticity, particularly LTP and LTD, have been extensively studied by a combination of pharmacology, electrophysiology and biochemistry [1,38,39]. The list of molecules involved in synaptic plasticity is continuously growing, and it is now clear that signaling is operated by complicated networks consisting of hundreds of proteins, which extensively interact with one another [1,2,40,41]. Although these studies identified players in synaptic plasticity, many fundamental questions about signaling dynamics remain elusive. To what extent is biochemical signaling in individual dendritic spines isolated from their parent shafts? To what extent do dendritic spines compete or share resources with neighboring dendritic spines? How does the modification of a dendritic spine in its strength affect neighboring spines? These are some of the fundamental biological questions that have been actively pursued by many laboratories.

With recent advances in imaging techniques to monitor signaling in single synapses, our knowledge of signaling mechanisms underlying synaptic plasticity has broadened. Here, we will review some of the recent studies that provided new insights and answers to long-standing biological questions on dendritic spines with a focus on the underlying biochemical signaling regulated at the level of single synapses.

New techniques to study signaling in single dendritic spines

In order to image dendritic spines in thick tissues such as hippocampal slices, 2-photon excitation laser scanning microscopy (2pLSM) has become a standard tool [42]. 2-photon excitation is caused by the simultaneous absorption of two photons with energy half as high as that required for 1-photon excitation [43]. The 2-photon excitation rate is proportional to the square of light intensity, allowing optimal localization of excitation at the focus of the laser. 2-photon excitation is localized well in light scattering tissues for two reasons: first, it uses long wavelength light, which scatters less; second, the scattered light is too diffuse to produce significant fluorescence. Due to this property of 2-photon excitation, 2pLSM can produce high resolution images in light scattering tissue. Further, the localization of 2-photon excitation provides great advantages in photochemistry such as photolysis of caged compound and photoactivation of fluorescence [42,43].

Recent advances in 2-photon photochemistry techniques and 2-photon fluorescence lifetime imaging microscopy (2pFLIM) have greatly facilitated the study of intracellular signaling in single dendritic spines [42].

2-photon photochemistry

Single-photon uncaging of caged compounds (caged Ca²⁺, caged IP₃, etc) has been a useful biological tool [44–47]. However, 2-photon uncaging originally envisioned by Denk *et al.* to confine the uncaging volume to a more finite scale [43] required the development of caged compounds with enough 2-photon excitation cross section area.

The first demonstration of optical stimulation of a single dendritic spine in brain slices was achieved after the development of MNI-glutamate, a caged glutamate with appreciable 2-photon cross section [48]. In this study, AMPAR currents evoked by 2-photon glutamate uncaging were measured by whole cell patch clamp. The resolution of the technique was

measured to be 0.5–1 μm and, the amplitude and kinetics of uncaging-evoked currents were similar to miniature AMPAR-excitatory postsynaptic current (EPSC). These results suggest that 2-photon glutamate uncaging is equivalent to glutamate release from presynaptic terminals. Later, the same group demonstrated that LTP and associated spine enlargement can be induced in single dendritic spines by either applying a train of uncaging pulses to a single spine in Mg^{2+} -free medium or pairing postsynaptic depolarization with uncaging pulses in the presence of Mg^{2+} [14].

Since the development of MNI-glutamate, only a handful of caged compounds have been successfully used for biology under 2-photon excitation. However, the list of available caged compounds is growing rapidly (Rubi-glutamate, Rubi-GABA, CDNI-glutamate) [49–51] and the development of new compounds will further the understanding of signaling in single spines.

Another useful tool developed recently is 2-photon excitation of photoactivatable GFP (paGFP) [22,52]. Photoactivation of paGFP increases the fluorescence of paGFP >10 fold, providing an excellent signal to noise ratio [52]. By photo-activating paGFP tagged molecules in single spines with 2-photon excitation, the diffusion coupling of the molecule between spine and dendrite through the spine neck can be monitored [13,22,53,54].

2-photon FRET/FLIM

Intracellular signaling dynamics have been studied using Fluorescence Resonance Energy Transfer (FRET) imaging in combination with signaling sensors made of fluorescent proteins [55,56]. FRET is non-radiative energy transfer between two fluorophores due to dipole-dipole interaction, which occurs when the donor and acceptor fluorophores reside in proximity (nanometers) [57,58]. The excitation energy of the donor is transferred to the acceptor, decreasing the donor fluorescence and increasing the acceptor fluorescence. Because the efficiency of FRET decreases sharply as the distance between the donor and the acceptor becomes larger than several nanometers, it can be used to measure protein-protein interactions and conformational changes of proteins [57,58].

FRET can be quantified by imaging the ratio of fluorescent intensity of the donor and acceptor (ratiometric FRET) [57]. Advantages of ratiometric imaging include a simple optical setting and high signal-to-noise ratio. However, the ratiometric FRET is prone to an artifact caused by the local concentration ratio between the donor and the acceptor and wavelength dependent light-scattering.

Alternatively, one can use the fluorescence lifetime of the donor to quantify FRET [57]. Fluorescence lifetime is the time elapsed between fluorophore excitation and photon emission. The fluorescence decay curve following a short excitation pulse is mono-exponential typically with a nanosecond time constant. FRET accelerates the fluorescence decay in proportion to the FRET efficiency, and thus one can use fluorescence decay as a readout of the FRET efficiency [57]. Because this measurement involves only the donor fluorescence, the measurement is independent of donor/acceptor ratio and free from wavelength-dependent light scattering unlike ratiometric FRET. Furthermore, when multiple populations with different FRET efficiency co-exist, the fluorescence decay curve becomes multi-exponential, and each component can be de-convolved to calculate the fraction of the donor binding to the acceptor [57]. The mean fluorescence lifetime of the entire populations can be measured by calculating the mean fluorescence lifetime $\tau = (\int tF(t)dt)/(\int F(t)dt)$, where $F(t)$ is the fluorescence lifetime decay after a short excitation pulse [57] (Figure 1).

Since Miyawaki *et al.* reported the first genetically encoded Ca^{2+} sensors based on FRET and fluorescent proteins [59], many FRET-based sensors have been developed to measure signaling activity including the concentration of second messengers and the activity of protein kinases/

phosphatases [55,56]. Biosensors designed to change their FRET between activated and inactivated states of a protein of interest largely fall into two groups: bi-molecular sensors and mono-molecular sensors. Bi-molecular sensors report binding between two proteins associated with signaling activity [56]. Typically a target protein is tagged with the donor and another protein that specifically binds to the active state of the target protein is tagged with the acceptor. Activation of the target protein is associated with the binding of two proteins, increasing FRET [56]. FLIM, but not ratiometric FRET, should be used for this type of sensors, because the donor/acceptor ratio is not constant. In contrast, a mono-molecular sensor has both the donor and acceptor in the same polypeptide, fixing the donor/acceptor ratio allowing simple ratiometry to be used. For example, a typical kinase activation reporter consists of a donor, a consensus substrate phosphorylation site for the kinase, a phospho-recognition motif and an acceptor all in the same polypeptide. When the kinase of interest is activated, the phosphorylation site becomes phosphorylated and binds to the phospho-recognition domain, changing the FRET efficiency [55].

Although FRET imaging techniques have provided insights into the spatiotemporal dynamics of intracellular signaling at the whole-cell level, it has been difficult to apply these techniques to the study of synaptic signaling. Limited fluorescence signal from the small structure of spines, and light scattering from tissue are the main issues. Recently, the combination of FRET signal imaging techniques with 2pLSM have addressed these issues and enabled imaging FRET in single synapses with high sensitivity. Using 2-photon ratiometric FRET imaging, actin polymerization in single spines was monitored during spine growth and shrinkage by overexpressing both CFP-tagged and YFP-tagged actin monomers [60]. More recently, it has been also demonstrated that the combination of FLIM and 2pLSM (2pFLIM) provides extremely robust signal in small neuronal compartments in light scattering brain slices [61]. However, most FRET sensors are optimized for ratiometric imaging, and not for FLIM [58]. Recently, sensitive sensors for the activity of Ras [61] and CaMKII [13], molecules important for synaptic plasticity, optimized for 2pFLIM have been developed and successfully employed to measure the activity of these molecules in single dendritic spines.

The Ras sensor for 2pFLIM, FRas-F, is a bi-molecular sensor consists of H-Ras tagged with monomeric enhanced green fluorescent protein (mEGFP) and the Ras-binding domain of Raf (RBD) tagged with two monomeric red fluorescence proteins (mRFPs). When mEGFP-Ras is activated, mRFP-RBD binds to mEGFP-Ras, thereby increasing FRET [61]. Because RBD binding to Ras competes with Ras inactivation, the affinity between RBD and Ras was decreased by mutating RBD (R59A), allowing fast reversing kinetics of the sensor signal [61]. FRas-F in combination with 2pFLIM provided high sensitivity sufficient for measuring Ras activity in single spines in response to physiologically relevant stimuli [16,61].

The CaMKII sensor optimized for 2pFLIM, Green-Camuia, is a mono-molecular sensor based on the original ratiometric CaMKII sensor Camuia [62]. Camuia is CaMKII α with its ends tagged with cyan fluorescent protein (CFP) and yellow fluorescent protein (YFP). When CaMKII α is activated, it changes its conformation from closed form to open form [63] thereby reducing FRET. Because the CFP-YFP pairs is not optimal for FLIM [58], the fluorophores were replaced by the pair of mEGFP and resonant energy transfer acceptor chromophore (REACH) [64,65]. The sensor in combination with 2pFLIM allows ones to measure CaMKII activity in single spines during LTP with high temporal resolution (~ seconds) [13].

These new 2-photon based FRET techniques provided many new insights into the roles of spine morphology in the spatiotemporal regulation of biochemical signaling during these processes.

The signaling during spine structural plasticity and LTP

Repetitive NMDA receptor (NMDAR) activation causes the enlargements of spines associated with recruitment of AMPARs into the stimulated spines [14]. The opening of NMDARs in a spine causes ~micromolar Ca^{2+} transients largely restricted to the spine [66–69] (Figure 2A). The resulting Ras and CaMKII signaling dynamics in spines induced by NMDAR activation has been recently revealed using 2pFLIM and glutamate uncaging [13,16].

Ras

A GTPase protein Ras constitutes an essential element in the signal transduction network that couples Ca^{2+} elevations to diverse signaling cascades. Calcium-dependent Ras activation results in the phosphorylation of extracellular signal-related kinase (ERK) and phosphoinositide-3 (PI3K) and this Ras pathway extensively branches out to different forms of neuronal plasticity, including LTP [70,71], regulation of dendritic excitability [72,73], new spine formation [74,75], spine morphological plasticity [16] as well as dendritic protein synthesis [76] and gene transcription [77]. To measure the activity of Ras at the level of single synapses during synaptic plasticity, the Ras sensor FRas-F [61] was expressed in Hippocampal pyramidal neurons [16]. When a single spine underwent structural plasticity induced by a train of uncaging pulses to open NMDARs in Mg^{2+} -free medium, Ras activation reached its peak in 1 min after the stimulation. Subsequently, Ras activation spreads into dendrites over ~10 μm and invades neighboring spines [16] (Figure 1).

Does the spreading of Ras occur even in unperturbed cells? In imaging experiments using a sensor, it is important to evaluate the effect of the overexpression of the sensor on signaling [58,78]. For example, overexpression of FRas-F may saturate Ras binding partners or inactivation machinery, causing larger Ras spreading. To address this concern, Harvey *et al.* measured the relationship between FRas-F expression level and the spreading width, and extrapolated to zero expression level. The width of Ras spreading only weakly correlated with the expression level of FRas-F, and the extrapolated value was similar to the measured value (~10 μm), confirming that spreading of Ras is not due to overexpression of FRas-F.

This study demonstrated that a biochemical signal triggered by NMDAR-mediated Ca^{2+} influx, which is mostly restricted to the stimulated dendritic spine, can diffuse out and spread over a short stretch of dendrite (~10 μm) sending signals to not only the stimulated spine but other nearby spines as well. In other words, at least for Ras signaling, spine morphology is not capable of constraining signaling within a dendritic spine. This study also shows that while Ras activation is required for the maintenance of structural plasticity of dendritic spines, it is not sufficient for the induction of structural plasticity. Neighboring spines with almost similar degree of Ras activation as the stimulated spine showed neither structural nor functional plasticity measured as uncaging-evoked AMPAR current. So what does activated Ras do in unstimulated, nearby spines while its activity takes ~10 min to fully return to the basal level of activity? What is the physiological function of the spreading of the activated signaling proteins during synaptic plasticity? Considering the role of Ras in synaptic plasticity, this observation calls for a new form of local plasticity that affects a group of spines on a short stretch of dendrite, which can be characterized as time- and location-dependent.

About that time, Harvey and Svoboda discovered a new form of plasticity that spans a similar length with the spread of Ras activity [15]. In this experiment, a spine is first stimulated with a usual train of uncaging pulses that induces synaptic plasticity (suprathreshold stimuli). Then within 5 minutes after the first stimulation, weak stimulation which does not produce plasticity by itself (subthreshold stimuli) was applied to a neighboring dendritic spine less than 10 μm away from the originally stimulated spine. Surprisingly, this subthreshold stimulation was now sufficient to induce long-lasting synaptic plasticity in time- (within 5 min after the initial

suprathreshold stimulation) and location-dependent manner (within 10 μm from the originally stimulated spine). They found that this new form of plasticity is caused by diffusion of intracellular factors.

The spatiotemporal scale of the facilitation of plasticity seems to be very similar to that of Ras activation, and thus Ras would be the natural suspect which causes this phenomenon. In order to test if Ras is required for this form of plasticity, Harvey *et al.* applied an inhibitor of downstream signaling of Ras (U0126) between the first suprathreshold and second subthreshold stimuli [16]. They found the reduction of structural plasticity in response to subthreshold stimuli, but not to suprathreshold stimuli [16]. Furthermore, the subthreshold stimuli did not produce any additional Ras activation, suggesting that spreading of Ras is essential to produce the facilitation of plasticity [16].

CaMKII

Ras imaging clearly showed that signaling can spread from spines undergoing plasticity. However, spine enlargement and LTP are known to be spine-specific [14], and thus there must be a biochemical signal that is input-specific for synapse-specificity of synaptic plasticity. CaMKII is a great candidate molecule for the synapse-specificity of synaptic plasticity given that it is sufficient for induction of LTP [79].

CaMKII consists of a dodecamer with each subunit acting as a kinase [80–82]. When $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$ increases, it binds to calmodulin and this Ca^{2+} -bound calmodulin binds to CaMKII [82]. CaMKII subsequently undergoes a conformational change from its closed conformation to open conformation, which exposes its kinase site and becomes active [63,83]. Active CaMKII subunits autophosphorylate the T286 site of an adjacent subunit [84]. Once a subunit is autophosphorylated at T286, its activity becomes insensitive to the interaction to Ca^{2+} /calmodulin, thereby leaving them active after $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$ decays [85–88]. It has been proposed that this Ca^{2+} -independent, autonomous activity due to T286 phosphorylation may last long-term for hours or days to maintain LTP and ultimately learning [89,90]. Consistent with the importance of T286 phosphorylation, mice with this autophosphorylation site mutated to alanine (T286A) are found to be deficient in LTP and spatial learning and memory [91] as well as experience-dependent cortical plasticity [92].

In a recent study by Lee *et al.*, the activity of CaMKII was directly measured in single spines using Green-Camuia. When expressed in CA1 pyramidal neurons in organotypic cultures, it co-assembles with endogenous CaMKII subunits to form dodecamers [13,83]. Stimulation of single spines via 2-photon glutamate uncaging to induce LTP caused FRET changes of Green-Camuia indicative of CaMKII activation only in the stimulated spines [13]. Contrary to the hypothesis of long-term autonomous CaMKII activity, CaMKII activity lasts only for ~1 min, while the plasticity lasts more than 1 hour (Figure 1).

What is the role of T286 phosphorylation, if the wild type activity lasts only for ~1 min? Lee *et al.* found that the activity of wild type Green-Camuia decays double exponential time constants of ~6 s and 45 s whereas T286A mutant completely returns to the basal state in 2 seconds. Therefore, in the protocols used in Lee *et al.* to induce LTP by uncaging (30–45 uncaging pulses at 0.5 Hz), the stimulation frequency is not fast enough to accumulate activated T286A-CaMKII mutant. Instead, the T286A mutant inactivates before the next stimulation arrives. Hence, the autophosphorylation at T286 site is critical for delaying inactivation kinetics thereby allowing repetitive stimulation to accumulate activated CaMKII efficiently.

These new imaging data showing transient CaMKII activation does not support the theory in which long-term autonomous CaMKII activity is important for the maintenance of LTP. How do these results fit with previous biochemical studies? Fukunaga *et al.* reported persistent

autonomous activity in response to LTP inducing stimuli [93]. Also, persistent T286 phosphorylation has been observed by several groups [94,95]. However, Lengyel *et al.* reported that the persistent T286 phosphorylation is not associated with persistent autonomous activity which decays within ~2 min while LTP persists more than 60 min [95]. Therefore, although there may be some stimulus conditions that causes persistent autonomous activity [93], persistent CaMKII activity is probably not required for LTP maintenance [95]. With one exception [96], pharmacological inhibition of CaMKII after induction of LTP does not affect the maintenance of LTP, arguing against the role of CaMKII in the maintenance of LTP [97–99]. A more specific approach using a CaMKII mutant with a bigger ATP binding pocket and an ATP analog that specifically inhibits the mutant CaMKII [100] also suggests that CaMKII kinase activity is required only for the first 10 min of stimulation to induce LTP [101]. Furthermore, auto-inactivation of T286 phosphorylated CaMKII by T305/T306 phosphorylation with a half life of 50 s has been proposed by a recent biochemical study supporting transient (~1 min) activation of CaMKII [102].

Principles of signal compartmentalization

Ras and CaMKII provide two beautiful examples of how spine signaling is spatiotemporally regulated in a contrasting manner. CaMKII activation is transient (~1 min) and restricted within a dendritic spine while Ras activation persists longer (~5 min) and spreads over ~10 μm along the dendrite (Figure 1). This clearly shows that some molecules are important for synapse specific signaling, while other molecules signal on a larger scale (Figure 3). What is the basic principle underlying the diffusivity of biochemical signals in and out of single spines?

The compartmentalization of signaling activity is in general determined by the balance between two factors: effective spine-dendrite diffusion coupling time constant (τ_{coupling}) and inactivation time constant ($\tau_{\text{inactivation}}$) [67]. When $\tau_{\text{coupling}} \gg \tau_{\text{inactivation}}$, the protein is inactivated before it diffuses out of the spine, and thus the activity is compartmentalized to the spine. In contrast, when $\tau_{\text{coupling}} \ll \tau_{\text{inactivation}}$, the molecule is inactivated after it diffuses out of the spine, and thus the activity spreads into dendrites. For example, in case of Ca^{2+} , τ_{coupling} is measured as 0.1 s and $\tau_{\text{inactivation}}$ (extrusion in the case of Ca^{2+}) as 15 ms [67–69, 103]. Thus, in general, Ca^{2+} is extruded before it can diffuse out of the spine, making it compartmentalized within spines [67–69] (Figure 2A). In spines with small τ_{coupling} , Ca^{2+} can spread into dendrites to some degree [68,104].

One can measure τ_{coupling} by photoactivating paGFP tagged molecule and measuring the decay of paGFP fluorescence (Figure 2A). For cytosolic small molecules such as Ca^{2+} or fluorophores, $\tau_{\text{coupling}} \sim 0.1$ s [67, 68], for cytosolic proteins such as paGFP, $\tau_{\text{coupling}} \sim 0.5$ s [16, 22], and for membrane targeted proteins like H-Ras and MARCKS, $\tau_{\text{coupling}} \sim 5$ s [16] (Figure 2B). CaMKII interacts with many proteins in the postsynaptic density (PSD) and actin cytoskeleton, increasing τ_{coupling} to double exponential time constants of ~1 min and 20 min [13, 105] (Figure 2). In comparison to these values, $\tau_{\text{inactivation}}$ was measured to be ~5 min for Ras [16, 61] and double exponential time constants of ~6 s and 45 s for CaMKII [13]. Thus, the balance of the time constants is $\tau_{\text{inactivation}} \gg \tau_{\text{coupling}}$ for Ras, and $\tau_{\text{inactivation}} \ll \tau_{\text{coupling}}$ for CaMKII (Figure 3). This explains why Ras signaling is diffusive and CaMKII activation is compartmentalized (Table 1).

The length constant of signaling activity – that is the mean distance an activated molecule travels before being inactivated – can be calculated using the following simple equation:

$$L = \sqrt{D_{\text{eff}} \tau_{\text{inactivation}}}$$

where D_{eff} is effective diffusion coefficient of the signaling molecule and $\tau_{\text{inactivation}}$ is the time constant of inactivation [16]. In other words, the length constant is balanced by diffusion and inactivation of the protein. For cytosolic proteins, D_{eff} can be calculated from τ_{coupling} as:

$$D_{\text{eff}} = \frac{lV}{s\tau_{\text{coupling}}},$$

where $V \sim 0.1 \mu\text{m}^3$ is the volume of the spine, and $l \sim 0.8 \mu\text{m}$ is the spine neck length, $s \sim 0.008 \mu\text{m}^2$ is the cross-section area of the spine neck. For membrane proteins, $V \sim 1 \mu\text{m}^2$ is the surface area of the spine and $s \sim 0.3 \mu\text{m}$ is the circumference of the spine neck [21,22]. D_{eff} and L calculated for Ca^{2+} , Ras, and CaMKII are in Table 1.

The length constant (L) of Ca^{2+} and CaMKII are calculated to be $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$ (Table 1), suggesting that they should be confined within the stimulated spines, consistent with previous experiments [13,67–69,105]. It should be noted that this also suggests that Ca^{2+} and CaMKII are confined within $\sim 1 \mu\text{m}$ length without the help of spine morphology. Indeed, compartmentalization of Ca^{2+} is observed in non-spiny neurons [106,107]. In contrast with these molecules, the length constant of Ras is much longer ($\sim 10 \mu\text{m}$; Table 1). This length is consistent with the observed width of the activity spreading of Ras during synaptic plasticity [16].

Role of spine morphology in compartmentalizing biochemical signaling

Since the finding of spine structure by Santiago Ramon y Cajal in 1888, it has been speculated that spine morphology is important for isolating biochemical reactions within a synapse [23, 24]. However, the spatiotemporal dynamics of Ras and CaMKII suggest that spine morphology does not contribute much to compartmentalize biochemical signaling. If a protein does not interact with PSD or cytoskeleton, the protein diffuses out of spines within a few seconds for membrane targeted protein and even faster for cytosolic proteins (Figure 2). This diffusion coupling time is much faster than the typical biochemical time scale for the maintenance of synaptic plasticity (min to hour) (Figure 2). Indeed, the Ras activation profile shows very little gradient between the stimulated spine and their parent dendrites (Figure 1), demonstrating the ineffectiveness of spine morphology on membrane targeted proteins. Molecular size plays a small role in the diffusion constant, as the diffusion constant is proportional to the cubic root of the molecular mass (Figure 2B).

To produce synapse specific activation of a protein for more than a few seconds, the molecule needs to interact with non-diffusible structures such as PSD or the cytoskeleton to limit their diffusion. Thus, the degree of the compartmentalization depends more on interactions of the molecule with the non-diffusible structures rather than spine morphology. Indeed, CaMKII compartmentalization is likely due to the ability of CaMKII to bind to the PSD or cytoskeletons. The “stickiness” of CaMKII can be observed by the difference between the effective diffusion constant in spines ($D_{\text{eff}} \sim 0.16 \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$, Table 1) and the diffusion constant of CaMKII in lysates ($\sim 25 \mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$) [13,108].

In contrast with slow signaling like Ras and CaMKII, spine structure is likely to be important for shaping Ca^{2+} dynamics by confining it in a small volume. Because the number of NMDARs is relatively independent of the spine volume and spine neck resistance is high, smaller spines experience higher Ca^{2+} elevation in response to NMDAR opening [68,69,109]. This may be important for differentiating plasticity in mature and immature spines [14,68].

Nanodomain signaling

Electron microscopy images of dendritic spines show specialized structures [3] such as the PSD and endocytic zone [110]. Receptors exchanging between synaptic and extra-synaptic sites for synaptic efficacy have been visualized by tracking diffusion of single synaptic receptors [111]. Hence, despite the relatively small size of a dendritic spine ($\sim 0.1 \mu\text{m}^3$), there exists even more finite, localized, compartmentalized signaling within a dendritic spine. Furthermore, nanometer scale signaling complexes at the mouths of channels are considered to play important roles in producing channel-specific signal transduction [112–114].

LTP induction is thought to be channel specific, because LTP can be induced by the micromolar level of Ca^{2+} elevation due NMDAR opening, but cannot by the similar level of Ca^{2+} elevation due to opening of voltage sensitive calcium channels (VSCCs) [13,115]. This specificity is important for input-specificity, because LTP in general requires pairing of postsynaptic depolarization and presynaptic activation to release Mg^{2+} block of NMDARs [39], and postsynaptic activation alone opens VSCCs to produce non-specific Ca^{2+} elevation in all spines [13,115]. Thus, some of the signaling pathways underlying LTP should be preferentially activated by NMDARs.

At the single spine level, Ras and CaMKII activity has been measured with 2pLSM [13,16]. In these studies, channel specificity of these molecules was also measured. Diffusion of Ras is fast [116,117], and its activity spreads long distances [16]. Thus, Ras signaling would not be able to produce local signaling at the nanometer scale. Consistent with this view, nanodomain Ca^{2+} does not play a role in Ras activation in response to action potentials measured with FRas-F in combination with 2pFLIM [61]. Further, during the uncaging-depolarization pairing protocol, Ras in all spines was activated [16]. Thus, Ras signaling is designed neither for synapse specificity nor channel specificity.

In contrast, CaMKII interacts with many channels including L-type VSCCs [118,119], T-type VSCCs [120], P/Q-type VSCCs [121], dopamine receptors [122], NMDARs [123,124], and thus should be able to detect Ca^{2+} through specific channels. To assess this possibility, Lee *et al.* measured CaMKII during the uncaging-depolarization pairing protocol [13]. During postsynaptic depolarization, although depolarization produces Ca^{2+} transients of similar amplitudes in spines and dendrites, CaMKII activation in spines was much smaller than in dendrites. Also, in spines, depolarization and uncaging produce similar elevations of Ca^{2+} , but uncaging produces much higher CaMKII activation. Thus, CaMKII activation is likely to be channel-specific. Further study showed that depolarization-induced CaMKII activation was completely blocked by inhibiting L-type VSCC with Nimodipine in spines but not in dendrites, while global Ca^{2+} elevation was not affected by Nimodipine.

Lee *et al.* performed further experiments using Ca^{2+} chelators EGTA and BAPTA to test the hypothesis in which nanodomain Ca^{2+} at the inner mouth of VSCCs is responsible for CaMKII activation [13]. Although BAPTA and EGTA have similar dissociation constants to Ca^{2+} , BAPTA is one hundred times faster at chelating Ca^{2+} ions than EGTA. Therefore, BAPTA can capture Ca^{2+} ions right away once they flow in through ion channels while Ca^{2+} ions can travel much longer distance before being chelated by EGTA [125]. Thus, BAPTA inhibits both global and nanodomain Ca^{2+} elevation, whereas EGTA inhibits global Ca^{2+} elevation without affecting nanodomain Ca^{2+} much. When cells were patch-clamped with an electrode containing 20 mM BAPTA, CaMKII activation in response to depolarization was completely inhibited. However, the same concentration of EGTA did not affect CaMKII activation significantly. Interestingly, unlike depolarization-induced CaMKII activation, uncaging evoked CaMKII activation shows similar sensitivity to EGTA and BAPTA, suggesting that NMDAR-mediated CaMKII activation requires global Ca^{2+} . Because CaMKII is not activated

by high Ca^{2+} through non-L-type VSCCs in response to depolarization, NMDAR-mediated CaMKII probably requires both nanodomain and global Ca^{2+} .

The nanodomain signaling of CaMKII at L-type VSCCs and NMDARs is consistent with previous studies showing that NMDARs interact with CaMKII [118,119,123,126]. However, the underlying mechanism for the difference between L-type VSCC-mediated CaMKII activation, which does not require global Ca^{2+} , and NMDAR-mediated CaMKII activation, which requires both global and nanodomain Ca^{2+} , remains unanswered. One possibility is that the difference in calmodulin distribution near channels causes this difference in the sensitivity in global Ca^{2+} . Because the Ca^{2+} sensor for the activity of CaMKII is calmodulin, the distribution of calmodulin near Ca^{2+} channels should have a large impact in shaping CaMKII activation dynamics. It has been reported that L-type VSCCs are highly enriched with calmodulin [127]. This calmodulin at L-type VSCCs might be locally activated in response to L-type VSCC activation, making this signaling insensitive to global Ca^{2+} elevation. More experimental and theoretical studies on Ca^{2+} – calmodulin – CaMKII interaction in spines will be required to fully understand the mechanisms of CaMKII activation in nanodomains of calcium channels.

Future

Imaging of the activity of a few proteins in single spines has already provided many insights into the principles and roles of the spatiotemporal regulation of signaling activity during synaptic plasticity. However, there are hundreds more proteins involved in synaptic plasticity [1,2,40] and thus we need to measure the activity of more proteins to disentangle the complicated signaling network in spines. This will answer many important questions, for example: are there signaling proteins whose activity lasts more than hours to maintain long-term synaptic plasticity? Are there signaling processes that are actively transported or regeneratively propagate from synapses to nucleus? Are there signaling processes that spread to negatively regulate synaptic plasticity, sharpening the synapse specificity of plasticity? We speculate that measuring the activity of almost any protein will provide us new surprises and insights.

Finally, although signaling in sub-spine structure and nanodomain signaling have been suggested to be important, current FRET imaging techniques cannot provide access to these compartments due to their limited spatial resolution. The combination of FRET imaging technique and recently developed super-resolution microscopy [128–130] may enable direct visualization of signaling dynamics on the nanometer scale and provide us with a more precise view about the sub-spine signaling.

Acknowledgments

We thank M. Patterson for critical reading of the manuscript. This study was funded by American Heart Association Predoctoral Fellowship (S.-J.R.L.), Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Alzheimer's Association of America, NIMH/NIH (R01MH080047) and NINDS/NIH (1R01NS068410).

References

1. Kennedy MB, Beale HC, Carlisle HJ, Washburn LR. Integration of biochemical signalling in spines. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2005 Jun;6(6):423–34. [PubMed: 15928715]
2. Sheng M, Hoogenraad CC. The postsynaptic architecture of excitatory synapses: a more quantitative view. *Annual review of biochemistry* 2007;76:823–47.
3. Harris KM, Kater SB. Dendritic spines: cellular specializations imparting both stability and flexibility to synaptic function. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 1994;17:341–71. [PubMed: 8210179]

4. Fiala JC, Feinberg M, Popov V, Harris KM. Synaptogenesis via dendritic filopodia in developing hippocampal area CA1. *J Neurosci* 1998 Nov 1;18(21):8900–11. [PubMed: 9786995]
5. Harris KM. Structure, development, and plasticity of dendritic spines. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 1999 Jun; 9(3):343–8. [PubMed: 10395574]
6. Trachtenberg JT, Chen BE, Knott GW, Feng G, Sanes JR, Welker E, et al. Long-term in vivo imaging of experience-dependent synaptic plasticity in adult cortex. *Nature* 2002 Dec 19–26;420(6917):788–94. [PubMed: 12490942]
7. Lendvai B, Stern EA, Chen B, Svoboda K. Experience-dependent plasticity of dendritic spines in the developing rat barrel cortex in vivo. *Nature* 2000 Apr 20;404(6780):876–81. [PubMed: 10786794]
8. Bhatt DH, Zhang S, Gan WB. Dendritic spine dynamics. *Annu Rev Physiol* 2009;71:261–82. [PubMed: 19575680]
9. Bonhoeffer T, Yuste R. Spine motility. Phenomenology, mechanisms, and function. *Neuron* 2002 Sep 12;35(6):1019–27. [PubMed: 12354393]
10. Yasumatsu N, Matsuzaki M, Miyazaki T, Noguchi J, Kasai H. Principles of long-term dynamics of dendritic spines. *J Neurosci* 2008 Dec 10;28(50):13592–608. [PubMed: 19074033]
11. Yuste R, Bonhoeffer T. Morphological changes in dendritic spines associated with long-term synaptic plasticity. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2001;24:1071–89. [PubMed: 11520928]
12. Bourne JN, Harris KM. Balancing structure and function at hippocampal dendritic spines. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2008;31:47–67. [PubMed: 18284372]
13. Lee SJ, Escobedo-Lozoya Y, Szatmari EM, Yasuda R. Activation of CaMKII in single dendritic spines during long-term potentiation. *Nature* 2009 Mar 19;458(7236):299–304. [PubMed: 19295602]
14. Matsuzaki M, Honkura N, Ellis-Davies GC, Kasai H. Structural basis of long-term potentiation in single dendritic spines. *Nature* 2004 Jun 17;429(6993):761–6. [PubMed: 15190253]
15. Harvey CD, Svoboda K. Locally dynamic synaptic learning rules in pyramidal neuron dendrites. *Nature* 2007 Dec 20;450(7173):1195–200. [PubMed: 18097401]
16. Harvey CD, Yasuda R, Zhong H, Svoboda K. The spread of Ras activity triggered by activation of a single dendritic spine. *Science* 2008;321(5885):136–40. [PubMed: 18556515]
17. Zhou Q, Homma KJ, Poo MM. Shrinkage of dendritic spines associated with long-term depression of hippocampal synapses. *Neuron* 2004 Dec 2;44(5):749–57. [PubMed: 15572107]
18. Engert F, Bonhoeffer T. Dendritic spine changes associated with hippocampal long-term synaptic plasticity. *Nature* 1999 May 6;399(6731):66–70. [PubMed: 10331391]
19. Maletic-Savatic M, Malinow R, Svoboda K. Rapid dendritic morphogenesis in CA1 hippocampal dendrites induced by synaptic activity. *Science* 1999 Mar 19;283(5409):1923–7. [PubMed: 10082466]
20. Nagerl UV, Eberhorn N, Cambridge SB, Bonhoeffer T. Bidirectional activity-dependent morphological plasticity in hippocampal neurons. *Neuron* 2004 Dec 2;44(5):759–67. [PubMed: 15572108]
21. Svoboda K, Tank DW, Denk W. Direct measurement of coupling between dendritic spines and shafts. *Science* 1996 May 3;272(5262):716–9. [PubMed: 8614831]
22. Bloodgood BL, Sabatini BL. Neuronal activity regulates diffusion across the neck of dendritic spines. *Science* 2005 Nov 4;310(5749):866–9. [PubMed: 16272125]
23. Alvarez VA, Sabatini BL. Anatomical and physiological plasticity of dendritic spines. *Annu Rev Neurosci* 2007;30:79–97. [PubMed: 17280523]
24. Nimchinsky EA, Sabatini BL, Svoboda K. Structure and function of dendritic spines. *Annu Rev Physiol* 2002;64:313–53. [PubMed: 11826272]
25. Tsay D, Yuste R. On the electrical function of dendritic spines. *Trends Neurosci* 2004 Feb;27(2):77–83. [PubMed: 15102486]
26. Grunditz A, Holbro N, Tian L, Zuo Y, Oertner TG. Spine neck plasticity controls postsynaptic calcium signals through electrical compartmentalization. *J Neurosci* 2008 Dec 10;28(50):13457–66. [PubMed: 19074019]
27. Araya R, Eiselent KB, Yuste R. Dendritic spines linearize the summation of excitatory potentials. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2006 Dec 5;103(49):18799–804. [PubMed: 17132736]

28. Araya R, Jiang J, Eiselthal KB, Yuste R. The spine neck filters membrane potentials. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2006 Nov 21;103(47):17961–6. [PubMed: 17093040]
29. Suetsugu M, Mehraein P. Spine distribution along the apical dendrites of the pyramidal neurons in Down's syndrome. A quantitative Golgi study. *Acta Neuropathol* 1980;50(3):207–10. [PubMed: 6447982]
30. Ferrer I, Gullotta F. Down's syndrome and Alzheimer's disease: dendritic spine counts in the hippocampus. *Acta Neuropathol* 1990;79(6):680–5. [PubMed: 2141748]
31. Garey LJ, Ong WY, Patel TS, Kanani M, Davis A, Mortimer AM, et al. Reduced dendritic spine density on cerebral cortical pyramidal neurons in schizophrenia. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1998 Oct;65(4):446–53. [PubMed: 9771764]
32. Fiala JC, Spacek J, Harris KM. Dendritic spine pathology: cause or consequence of neurological disorders? *Brain Res Brain Res Rev* 2002 Jun;39(1):29–54. [PubMed: 12086707]
33. Shankar GM, Bloodgood BL, Townsend M, Walsh DM, Selkoe DJ, Sabatini BL. Natural oligomers of the Alzheimer amyloid-beta protein induce reversible synapse loss by modulating an NMDA-type glutamate receptor-dependent signaling pathway. *J Neurosci* 2007 Mar 14;27(11):2866–75. [PubMed: 17360908]
34. Lacor PN, Buniel MC, Furlow PW, Clemente AS, Velasco PT, Wood M, et al. Abeta oligomer-induced aberrations in synapse composition, shape, and density provide a molecular basis for loss of connectivity in Alzheimer's disease. *J Neurosci* 2007 Jan 24;27(4):796–807. [PubMed: 17251419]
35. Hsieh H, Boehm J, Sato C, Iwatsubo T, Tomita T, Sisodia S, et al. AMPAR removal underlies Abeta-induced synaptic depression and dendritic spine loss. *Neuron* 2006 Dec 7;52(5):831–43. [PubMed: 17145504]
36. Walsh DM, Klyubin I, Fadeeva JV, Cullen WK, Anwyl R, Wolfe MS, et al. Naturally secreted oligomers of amyloid beta protein potently inhibit hippocampal long-term potentiation in vivo. *Nature* 2002 Apr 4;416(6880):535–9. [PubMed: 11932745]
37. Lauren J, Gimbel DA, Nygaard HB, Gilbert JW, Strittmatter SM. Cellular prion protein mediates impairment of synaptic plasticity by amyloid-beta oligomers. *Nature* 2009 Feb 26;457(7233):1128–32. [PubMed: 19242475]
38. Kessels HW, Malinow R. Synaptic AMPA receptor plasticity and behavior. *Neuron* 2009 Feb 12;61(3):340–50. [PubMed: 19217372]
39. Malenka RC, Bear MF. LTP and LTD: an embarrassment of riches. *Neuron* 2004 Sep 30;44(1):5–21. [PubMed: 15450156]
40. Sanes JR, Lichtman JW. Can molecules explain long-term potentiation? *Nat Neurosci* 1999 Jul;2(7):597–604. [PubMed: 10404178]
41. Bromberg KD, Ma'ayan A, Neves SR, Iyengar R. Design logic of a cannabinoid receptor signaling network that triggers neurite outgrowth. *Science* 2008 May 16;320(5878):903–9. [PubMed: 18487186]
42. Svoboda K, Yasuda R. Principles of two-photon excitation microscopy and its applications to neuroscience. *Neuron* 2006 Jun 15;50(6):823–39. [PubMed: 16772166]
43. Denk W, Strickler JH, Webb WW. Two-photon laser scanning fluorescence microscopy. *Science* 1990 Apr 6;248(4951):73–6. [PubMed: 2321027]
44. Cai X, Liang CW, Muralidharan S, Kao JP, Tang CM, Thompson SM. Unique roles of SK and Kv4.2 potassium channels in dendritic integration. *Neuron* 2004 Oct 14;44(2):351–64. [PubMed: 15473972]
45. Li W, Llopis J, Whitney M, Zlokarnik G, Tsien RY. Cell-permeant caged InsP3 ester shows that Ca²⁺ + spike frequency can optimize gene expression. *Nature* 1998 Apr 30;392(6679):936–41. [PubMed: 9582076]
46. Nerbonne JM, Richard S, Nargeot J, Lester HA. New photoactivatable cyclic nucleotides produce intracellular jumps in cyclic AMP and cyclic GMP concentrations. *Nature* 1984 Jul 5–11;310(5972):74–6. [PubMed: 6330568]
47. Walker JW, Somlyo AV, Goldman YE, Somlyo AP, Trentham DR. Kinetics of smooth and skeletal muscle activation by laser pulse photolysis of caged inositol 1,4,5-trisphosphate. *Nature* 1987 May 21–27;327(6119):249–52. [PubMed: 3494954]

48. Matsuzaki M, Ellis-Davies GC, Nemoto T, Miyashita Y, Iino M, Kasai H. Dendritic spine geometry is critical for AMPA receptor expression in hippocampal CA1 pyramidal neurons. *Nat Neurosci* 2001 Nov;4(11):1086–92. [PubMed: 11687814]
49. Ellis-Davies GC, Matsuzaki M, Paukert M, Kasai H, Bergles DE. 4-Carboxymethoxy-5,7-dinitroindolyl-Glu: an improved caged glutamate for expeditious ultraviolet and two-photon photolysis in brain slices. *J Neurosci* 2007 Jun 20;27(25):6601–4. [PubMed: 17581946]
50. Fino E, Araya R, Peterka DS, Salierno M, Etchenique R, Yuste R. RuBi-Glutamate: Two-Photon and Visible-Light Photoactivation of Neurons and Dendritic spines. *Front Neural Circuits* 2009;3:2. [PubMed: 19506708]
51. Rial Verde EM, Zayat L, Etchenique R, Yuste R. Photorelease of GABA with Visible Light Using an Inorganic Caging Group. *Front Neural Circuits* 2008;2:2. [PubMed: 18946542]
52. Patterson GH, Lippincott-Schwartz J. A photoactivatable GFP for selective photolabeling of proteins and cells. *Science* 2002 Sep 13;297(5588):1873–7. [PubMed: 12228718]
53. Honkura N, Matsuzaki M, Noguchi J, Ellis-Davies GC, Kasai H. The subspine organization of actin fibers regulates the structure and plasticity of dendritic spines. *Neuron* 2008 Mar 13;57(5):719–29. [PubMed: 18341992]
54. Steiner P, Higley MJ, Xu W, Czervionke BL, Malenka RC, Sabatini BL. Destabilization of the postsynaptic density by PSD-95 serine 73 phosphorylation inhibits spine growth and synaptic plasticity. *Neuron* 2008 Dec 10;60(5):788–802. [PubMed: 19081375]
55. Ni Q, Zhang J. Dynamic Visualization of Cellular Signaling. *Adv Biochem Eng Biotechnol*. 2009 Jun 5;
56. Miyawaki A. Innovations in the imaging of brain functions using fluorescent proteins. *Neuron* 2005 Oct 20;48(2):189–99. [PubMed: 16242400]
57. Lakowicz, JR. Principles of Fluorescence Spectroscopy. 3. NY, USA: Plenum; 2006.
58. Yasuda R. Imaging spatiotemporal dynamics of neuronal signaling using fluorescence resonance energy transfer and fluorescence lifetime imaging microscopy. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 2006;16:551–61. [PubMed: 16971112]
59. Miyawaki A, Llopis J, Heim R, McCaffery JM, Adams JA, Ikura M, et al. Fluorescent indicators for Ca²⁺ based on green fluorescent proteins and calmodulin. *Nature* 1997 Aug 28;388(6645):882–7. [PubMed: 9278050]
60. Okamoto K, Nagai T, Miyawaki A, Hayashi Y. Rapid and persistent modulation of actin dynamics regulates postsynaptic reorganization underlying bidirectional plasticity. *Nat Neurosci* 2004 Oct;: 1104–12. [PubMed: 15361876]
61. Yasuda R, Harvey CD, Zhong H, Sobczyk A, van Aelst L, Svoboda K. Super-sensitive Ras activation in dendrites and spines revealed by 2-photon fluorescence lifetime imaging. *Nat Neurosci* 2006;9:283–91. [PubMed: 16429133]
62. Takao K, Okamoto K, Nakagawa T, Neve RL, Nagai T, Miyawaki A, et al. Visualization of synaptic Ca²⁺/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II activity in living neurons. *J Neurosci* 2005 Mar 23;25(12):3107–12. [PubMed: 15788767]
63. Rosenberg OS, Deindl S, Sung RJ, Nairn AC, Kuriyan J. Structure of the autoinhibited kinase domain of CaMKII and SAXS analysis of the holoenzyme. *Cell* 2005 Dec 2;123(5):849–60. [PubMed: 16325579]
64. Ganesan S, Ameer-Beg SM, Ng TT, Vojnovic B, Wouters FS. A dark yellow fluorescent protein (YFP)-based Resonance Energy-Accepting Chromoprotein (REACH) for Förster resonance energy transfer with GFP. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2006 Mar 14;103(11):4089–94. [PubMed: 16537489]
65. Murakoshi H, Lee S-J, Yasuda R. Highly sensitive and quantitative FRET-FLIM imaging in single dendritic spines using improved non-radiative YFP. *Brain Cell Biol* 2008;36:31–42. [PubMed: 18512154]
66. Mainen ZF, Malinow R, Svoboda K. Synaptic calcium transients in single spines indicate that NMDA receptors are not saturated. *Nature* 1999 May 13;399(6732):151–5. [PubMed: 10335844]
67. Sabatini BL, Oertner TG, Svoboda K. The life cycle of Ca²⁺ ions in dendritic spines. *Neuron* 2002 Jan 31;33(3):439–52. [PubMed: 11832230]

68. Noguchi J, Matsuzaki M, Ellis-Davies GC, Kasai H. Spine-neck geometry determines NMDA receptor-dependent Ca^{2+} signaling in dendrites. *Neuron* 2005 May 19;46(4):609–22. [PubMed: 15944129]
69. Sobczyk A, Scheuss V, Svoboda K. NMDA receptor subunit-dependent $[\text{Ca}^{2+}]$ signaling in individual hippocampal dendritic spines. *J Neurosci* 2005 Jun 29;25(26):6037–46. [PubMed: 15987933]
70. Zhu JJ, Qin Y, Zhao M, Van Aelst L, Malinow R. Ras and Rap control AMPA receptor trafficking during synaptic plasticity. *Cell* 2002 Aug 23;110(4):443–55. [PubMed: 12202034]
71. Qin Y, Zhu Y, Baumgart JP, Stornetta RL, Seidenman K, Mack V, et al. State-dependent Ras signaling and AMPA receptor trafficking. *Genes Dev* 2005 Sep 1;19(17):2000–15. [PubMed: 16107614]
72. Adams JP, Anderson AE, Varga AW, Dineley KT, Cook RG, Pfaffinger PJ, et al. The A-type potassium channel Kv4.2 is a substrate for the mitogen-activated protein kinase ERK. *Journal of neurochemistry* 2000 Dec;75(6):2277–87. [PubMed: 11080179]
73. Watanabe S, Hoffman DA, Migliore M, Johnston D. Dendritic K^+ channels contribute to spike-timing dependent long-term potentiation in hippocampal pyramidal neurons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2002 Jun 11;99(12):8366–71. [PubMed: 12048251]
74. Wu GY, Deisseroth K, Tsien RW. Spaced stimuli stabilize MAPK pathway activation and its effects on dendritic morphology. *Nat Neurosci* 2001 Feb;4(2):151–8. [PubMed: 11175875]
75. Kumar V, Zhang MX, Swank MW, Kunz J, Wu GY. Regulation of dendritic morphogenesis by Ras-PI3K-Akt-mTOR and Ras-MAPK signaling pathways. *J Neurosci* 2005 Dec 7;25(49):11288–99. [PubMed: 16339024]
76. Klann E, Dever TE. Biochemical mechanisms for translational regulation in synaptic plasticity. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2004 Dec;5(12):931–42. [PubMed: 15550948]
77. Thomas GM, Huganir RL. MAPK cascade signalling and synaptic plasticity. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2004 Mar;5(3):173–83. [PubMed: 14976517]
78. Sabatini BL, Maravall M, Svoboda K. Ca^{2+} signaling in dendritic spines. *Curr Opin Neurobiol* 2001 Jun;11(3):349–56. [PubMed: 11399434]
79. Lledo PM, Hjelmstad GO, Mukherji S, Soderling TR, Malenka RC, Nicoll RA. Calcium/calmodulin-dependent kinase II and long-term potentiation enhance synaptic transmission by the same mechanism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 1995 Nov 21;92(24):11175–9. [PubMed: 7479960]
80. Rosenberg OS, Deindl S, Comolli LR, Hoelz A, Downing KH, Nairn AC, et al. Oligomerization states of the association domain and the holoenzyme of Ca^{2+} /CaM kinase II. *Febs J* 2006 Feb;273(4):682–94. [PubMed: 16441656]
81. Kanaseki T, Ikeuchi Y, Sugiura H, Yamauchi T. Structural features of Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II revealed by electron microscopy. *J Cell Biol* 1991 Nov;115(4):1049–60. [PubMed: 1659571]
82. Braun AP, Schulman H. The multifunctional calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase: from form to function. *Annu Rev Physiol* 1995;57:417–45. [PubMed: 7778873]
83. Thaler C, Koushik SV, Puhl HL 3rd, Blank PS, Vogel SS. Structural rearrangement of CaMKIIalpha catalytic domains encodes activation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2009 Apr 14;106(15):6369–74. [PubMed: 19339497]
84. Rich RC, Schulman H. Substrate-directed function of calmodulin in autophosphorylation of Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 1998 Oct 23;273(43):28424–9. [PubMed: 9774470]
85. Miller SG, Kennedy MB. Regulation of brain type II Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase by autophosphorylation: a Ca^{2+} -triggered molecular switch. *Cell* 1986 Mar 28;44(6):861–70. [PubMed: 3006921]
86. Yang E, Schulman H. Structural examination of autoregulation of multifunctional calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 1999 Sep 10;274(37):26199–208. [PubMed: 10473573]
87. Lou LL, Lloyd SJ, Schulman H. Activation of the multifunctional Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase by autophosphorylation: ATP modulates production of an autonomous enzyme.

- Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 1986 Dec;83(24): 9497–501. [PubMed: 3467320]
88. Saitoh T, Schwartz JH. Phosphorylation-dependent subcellular translocation of a Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase produces an autonomous enzyme in *Aplysia* neurons. *J Cell Biol* 1985 Mar; 100(3):835–42. [PubMed: 2982886]
 89. Lisman J, Schulman H, Cline H. The molecular basis of CaMKII function in synaptic and behavioural memory. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2002 Mar;3(3):175–90. [PubMed: 11994750]
 90. Lisman JE, Zhabotinsky AM. A model of synaptic memory: a CaMKII/PP1 switch that potentiates transmission by organizing an AMPA receptor anchoring assembly. *Neuron* 2001 Aug 2;31(2):191–201. [PubMed: 11502252]
 91. Giese KP, Fedorov NB, Filipkowski RK, Silva AJ. Autophosphorylation at Thr286 of the alpha calcium-calmodulin kinase II in LTP and learning. *Science* 1998 Feb 6;279(5352):870–3. [PubMed: 9452388]
 92. Hardingham N, Glazewski S, Pakhotin P, Mizuno K, Chapman PF, Giese KP, et al. Neocortical long-term potentiation and experience-dependent synaptic plasticity require alpha-calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II autophosphorylation. *J Neurosci* 2003 Jun 1;23(11):4428–36. [PubMed: 12805283]
 93. Fukunaga K, Stoppini L, Miyamoto E, Muller D. Long-term potentiation is associated with an increased activity of Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 1993 Apr 15;268(11):7863–7. [PubMed: 8385124]
 94. Barria A, Muller D, Derkach V, Griffith LC, Soderling TR. Regulatory phosphorylation of AMPA-type glutamate receptors by CaM-KII during long-term potentiation. *Science* 1997 Jun 27;276(5321): 2042–5. [PubMed: 9197267]
 95. Lengyel I, Voss K, Cammarota M, Bradshaw K, Brent V, Murphy KP, et al. Autonomous activity of CaMKII is only transiently increased following the induction of long-term potentiation in the rat hippocampus. *Eur J Neurosci* 2004 Dec;20(11):3063–72. [PubMed: 15579161]
 96. Sanhueza M, McIntyre CC, Lisman JE. Reversal of synaptic memory by Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II inhibitor. *J Neurosci* 2007 May 9;27(19):5190–9. [PubMed: 17494705]
 97. Malinow R, Schulman H, Tsien RW. Inhibition of postsynaptic PKC or CaMKII blocks induction but not expression of LTP. *Science* 1989 Aug 25;245(4920):862–6. [PubMed: 2549638]
 98. Otmakhov N, Griffith LC, Lisman JE. Postsynaptic inhibitors of calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase type II block induction but not maintenance of pairing-induced long-term potentiation. *J Neurosci* 1997 Jul 15;17(14):5357–65. [PubMed: 9204920]
 99. Chen HX, Otmakhov N, Strack S, Colbran RJ, Lisman JE. Is persistent activity of calcium/calmodulin-dependent kinase required for the maintenance of LTP? *J Neurophysiol* 2001 Apr;85(4):1368–76. [PubMed: 11287461]
 100. Wang H, Shimizu E, Tang YP, Cho M, Kyin M, Zuo W, et al. Inducible protein knockout reveals temporal requirement of CaMKII reactivation for memory consolidation in the brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2003 Apr 1;100(7):4287–92. [PubMed: 12646704]
 101. Wang H, Feng R, Wang LP, Li F, Cao X, Tsien JZ. CaMKII Activation State Underlies Synaptic Labile Phase of LTP and Short-Term Memory Formation. *Curr Biol*. 2008 Oct 15;
 102. Jama AM, Fenton J, Robertson SD, Torok K. Time-dependent auto-inactivation of phospho-thr286-alpha Ca^{2+} /calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2009 Aug 4;
 103. Simons SB, Escobedo Y, Yasuda R, Dudek SM. Regional differences in hippocampal calcium handling provide a cellular mechanism for limiting plasticity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2009 Aug 18;106(33):14080–4. [PubMed: 19666491]
 104. Majewska A, Tashiro A, Yuste R. Regulation of spine calcium dynamics by rapid spine motility. *J Neurosci* 2000 Nov 15;20(22):8262–8. [PubMed: 11069932]
 105. Okamoto K, Narayanan R, Lee SH, Murata K, Hayashi Y. The role of CaMKII as an F-actin-bundling protein crucial for maintenance of dendritic spine structure. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2007 Apr 10;104(15):6418–23. [PubMed: 17404223]

106. Goldberg JH, Tamas G, Aronov D, Yuste R. Calcium microdomains in aspiny dendrites. *Neuron* 2003 Nov 13;40(4):807–21. [PubMed: 14622584]
107. Soler-Llavina GJ, Sabatini BL. Synapse-specific plasticity and compartmentalized signaling in cerebellar stellate cells. *Nat Neurosci* 2006 Jun;9(6):798–806. [PubMed: 16680164]
108. Kim SA, Heinze KG, Bacia K, Waxham MN, Schwille P. Two-photon cross-correlation analysis of intracellular reactions with variable stoichiometry. *Biophys J* 2005 Jun;88(6):4319–36. [PubMed: 15792970]
109. Nimchinsky EA, Yasuda R, Oertner TG, Svoboda K. The number of glutamate receptors opened by synaptic stimulation in single hippocampal spines. *J Neurosci* 2004 Feb 25;24(8):2054–64. [PubMed: 14985448]
110. Racz B, Blanpied TA, Ehlers MD, Weinberg RJ. Lateral organization of endocytic machinery in dendritic spines. *Nat Neurosci* 2004 Sep;7(9):917–8. [PubMed: 15322548]
111. Triller A, Choquet D. New concepts in synaptic biology derived from single-molecule imaging. *Neuron* 2008 Aug 14;59(3):359–74. [PubMed: 18701063]
112. Tadross MR, Dick IE, Yue DT. Mechanism of local and global Ca²⁺ sensing by calmodulin in complex with a Ca²⁺ channel. *Cell* 2008 Jun 27;133(7):1228–40. [PubMed: 18585356]
113. Catterall WA, Few AP. Calcium channel regulation and presynaptic plasticity. *Neuron* 2008 Sep 25;59(6):882–901. [PubMed: 18817729]
114. West AE, Griffith EC, Greenberg ME. Regulation of transcription factors by neuronal activity. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 2002 Dec;3(12):921–31. [PubMed: 12461549]
115. Conti R, Lisman J. A large sustained Ca²⁺ elevation occurs in unstimulated spines during the LTP pairing protocol but does not change synaptic strength. *Hippocampus* 2002;12(5):667–79. [PubMed: 12440581]
116. Murakoshi H, Iino R, Kobayashi T, Fujiwara T, Ohshima C, Yoshimura A, et al. Single-molecule imaging analysis of Ras activation in living cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2004 May 11;101(19):7317–22. [PubMed: 15123831]
117. Lommerse PH, Vastenhouw K, Pirinen NJ, Magee AI, Spaank HP, Schmidt T. Single-molecule diffusion reveals similar mobility for the Lck, H-ras, and K-ras membrane anchors. *Biophys J* 2006 Aug 1;91(3):1090–7. [PubMed: 16920696]
118. Hudmon A, Schulman H, Kim J, Maltez JM, Tsien RW, Pitt GS. CaMKII tethers to L-type Ca²⁺ channels, establishing a local and dedicated integrator of Ca²⁺ signals for facilitation. *J Cell Biol* 2005 Nov 7;171(3):537–47. [PubMed: 16275756]
119. Wheeler DG, Barrett CF, Groth RD, Safa P, Tsien RW. CaMKII locally encodes L-type channel activity to signal to nuclear CREB in excitation-transcription coupling. *J Cell Biol* 2008 Dec 1;183(5):849–63. [PubMed: 19047462]
120. Welsby PJ, Wang H, Wolfe JT, Colbran RJ, Johnson ML, Barrett PQ. A mechanism for the direct regulation of T-type calcium channels by Ca²⁺/calmodulin-dependent kinase II. *J Neurosci* 2003 Nov 5;23(31):10116–21. [PubMed: 14602827]
121. Jiang X, Lautermilch NJ, Watari H, Westenbroek RE, Scheuer T, Catterall WA. Modulation of CaV2.1 channels by Ca²⁺/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase II bound to the C-terminal domain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2008 Jan 8;105(1):341–6. [PubMed: 18162541]
122. Liu XY, Mao LM, Zhang GC, Papasian CJ, Fibuch EE, Lan HX, et al. Activity-dependent modulation of limbic dopamine D3 receptors by CaMKII. *Neuron* 2009 Feb 12;61(3):425–38. [PubMed: 19217379]
123. Bayer KU, De Koninck P, Leonard AS, Hell JW, Schulman H. Interaction with the NMDA receptor locks CaMKII in an active conformation. *Nature* 2001 Jun 14;411(6839):801–5. [PubMed: 11459059]
124. Merrill MA, Chen Y, Strack S, Hell JW. Activity-driven postsynaptic translocation of CaMKII. *Trends Pharmacol Sci* 2005 Dec;26(12):645–53. [PubMed: 16253351]
125. Neher E. Usefulness and limitations of linear approximations to the understanding of Ca⁺⁺ signals. *Cell Calcium* 1998 Nov-Dec;24(5–6):345–57. [PubMed: 10091004]
126. Yasuda R, Sabatini BL, Svoboda K. Plasticity of calcium channels in dendritic spines. *Nat Neurosci* 2003 Sep;6(9):948–55. [PubMed: 12937422]

127. Mori MX, Erickson MG, Yue DT. Functional stoichiometry and local enrichment of calmodulin interacting with Ca²⁺ channels. *Science* 2004 Apr 16;304(5669):432–5. [PubMed: 15087548]
128. Willig KI, Rizzoli SO, Westphal V, Jahn R, Hell SW. STED microscopy reveals that synaptotagmin remains clustered after synaptic vesicle exocytosis. *Nature* 2006 Apr 13;440(7086):935–9. [PubMed: 16612384]
129. Rust MJ, Bates M, Zhuang X. Sub-diffraction-limit imaging by stochastic optical reconstruction microscopy (STORM). *Nat Methods* 2006 Oct;3(10):793–5. [PubMed: 16896339]
130. Betzig E, Patterson GH, Sougrat R, Lindwasser OW, Olenych S, Bonifacino JS, et al. Imaging intracellular fluorescent proteins at nanometer resolution. *Science* 2006 Sep 15;313(5793):1642–5. [PubMed: 16902090]

Figure 1.

Ras (A) and CaMKII (B) activation during structural plasticity in single spines using 2-photon fluorescence lifetime imaging microscopy combined with 2-photon glutamate uncaging. Shorter and higher lifetimes indicate higher levels of activation for Ras and CaMKII, respectively. The white arrowheads indicate stimulated spines.

Figure 2. Spine-dendrite coupling of Ca²⁺, Ras and CaMKII

A, Top panel: Spine Ca²⁺ elevation in response to a glutamate uncaging pulse (6 ms) measured with a Ca²⁺-sensitive dye Fluo4-FF (green) and Ca²⁺-insensitive dye Alexa-594 (red). Middle and bottom panels: Fluorescence of paGFP tagged Ras (middle) and CaMKII (bottom) before and after photoactivation in single spines (Green, paGFP-Ras and REACh-Camuiα-paGFP, respectively; Red, mCherry).

B, Spine-dendrite diffusion coupling time constants of paGFP tagged molecules.

Figure 3. Two different modes of spatiotemporal regulation of signaling in dendritic spines
 A, Time courses of Ras and CaMKII activation and spine volume change in stimulated spines.
 B, Spatial profile of protein activity where $\tau_{coupling} \gg \tau_{inactivation}$ leads to spine-specific signaling.
 C, Spatial profile of protein activity where $\tau_{coupling} \ll \tau_{inactivation}$ leads to diffusive signaling.

Table 1Spatiotemporal Characteristic of Ca^{2+} , CaMKII and Ras in Dendritic Spines

	Ca^{2+}	CaMKII	Ras
τ_{coupling}^a	0.1 s	60 s	5 s
$\tau_{\text{inactivation}}^a$	0.015 s	6 s	240 s
$D_{\text{eff}} = \frac{IV}{s\tau_{\text{coupling}}}$	100 $\mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$	0.17 $\mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$	0.6 $\mu\text{m}^2/\text{s}$
$L = \sqrt{D_{\text{eff}}\tau_{\text{inactivation}}}$	1 μm	1 μm	12 μm
Compartmentalization	Yes	Yes	No

^aFast component only