

Meeting Doug Henderson

Robert Eisenberg
Department of Applied Mathematics
Illinois Institute of Technology

Department of Biomedical Engineering
University of Illinois Chicago

Department of Physiology and Biophysics
Rush University Medical Center

Chicago IL USA

An invited submission to a special issue of the

Journal of Molecular Liquids

“On the progress of understanding liquids, solutions and interfaces

In Memory of Douglas Henderson”

Bob.Eisenberg@gmail.com

18 March 2022

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.30825.77923

File name: Meeting Doug Henderson March 18-1.docx

Abstract

Doug Henderson brought his profound knowledge of ionic solutions to biology in his study of ion channels. Ion channels are proteins that conduct ions and electric current across otherwise insulating membranes. The ions are so crowded in these protein channels that the competition between charge and space dominates their properties. Here is how that work started from an unjustified claim (by me), a rather rude question by Doug Henderson, a fortunate reply and a memorable drive, all resolved by a calculation by Dezső Boda.

It all began with a prayer, so Doug and Dave would say, as I chatted in the lab at Brigham Young University (BYU) with David Busath and his students. Here is the story:

It all began, I would say, with the work of Doug Henderson that I had known for a very long time.

All of life occurs in ionic solutions, so Doug's work is known to all biologists interested in how ions change biological function. Most biological cells respond to ions, but nerve cells and muscle cells are the most notable examples.

(Physical scientists: think of the oceans where life started. All of life originated in oceans and we all carry a little bit of an ancient ocean inside our cells, and more of the present oceans outside the cells, in our blood [1], and in the plasmas of life.[2])

Doug's view of "What is liquid?" [3] has been a bedrock of our understanding since that paper was written, and a broken metaphor is appropriate: as slippery and hard to grasp as a liquid is, Doug's understanding of what is a liquid was as solid as rock.

You can imagine then how I as a biologist who had worked on ions, nerve, and muscle since 1960, and who had worried about them even as a teenager, felt when I shook hands with this handsome, tall, distinguished gentleman in (or rather just outside) the lecture room of Brigham Young University, with its magnificent overwhelming view of the mountains in my favorite state Utah. (I must admit that I favor the beauty of Boulder and Torrey UT, even Hanksville, over Provo but undoubtedly that is the result of too many western movies in my youth as well as the overwhelming appeal to me of the red and sometimes white cliffs of those extraordinary places).

I was about to give a lecture to BYU faculty organized by my friend since the 1970's David Busath. David was and is a distinguished biophysicist who has been generous to me in many ways for which I will always be grateful. I had started working on the detailed properties of ionic solutions late in my career (around 1985) having been focused on muscle (and applied mathematics) until then. I was focused then (and now) on the electrical not chemical properties of those solutions but was so ignorant that I identified ionic solutions with their salt ions with the holes and electrons that carry current in silicon semiconductors.

You may wonder how a liquid can be like silicon and that is a very very good question. A psychiatrist who was told that "I can make a vacuum tube in a piece of sand if I can control the electric charges and field in the sand" might well doubt the sanity of the speaker. But that is exactly what William ('Bill') Shockley [4] of Bell Labs thought in the 1940s. The implementation of those ideas has led directly to all of our digital technology [5-15], from transistors to computers, to cell phones, to digital displays. If Shockley and his associates had not pursued this idea, we would not have all that technology in my opinion. And his business associates who funded all this work [16] deserve as much credit as the scientists [17-19] who worked for Shockley. They had to have confidence and invest in that confidence despite the wildly intelligent, but wildly abrasive personality Shockley showed the world.

As unlikely as it seems Shockley was right. Electrical properties are very much the same in liquids, solids and near vacuums if the charges and electric fields are the same. My understanding [20, 21] that electricity in Doug Henderson's salt solutions was very much like that in vacuum tubes and silicon was not the problem, hard as that is to believe [22, 23]. If the charges and the electric field are the same, the properties are the same, **almost**.

But it was the "almost" [24, 25] that Doug was to teach me [26, 27] and that made all the difference.

The solid background of silicon, or the vacuum background of a vacuum tube, or the liquid background of an ionic solution are not a problem. What is a problem is the size of the ions in a solution. They are huge compared to the size of electrons in a vacuum tube and even larger—grammar does not let me say “huge-er”—compared to the holes and electrons of semiconductors that are indistinguishable from points.

Wolfgang Nonner and I had realized that fact [28-30] while avoiding lectures in a physics institute at the University of California Santa Barbara and found a paper [31] saying how we should deal with the nonzero size of ions in solution. We did not know that Doug was a leader in this field. Nor did we fully realize that what we read was true only in solutions without structure that were part of biological molecules or systems.

But Wolfgang and I were biophysicists who had for decades learned the first chapters of many textbooks, without reading the rest of the book. We had built important electronic circuits that way (It is immodest but true to point out that one of the amplifiers I designed the AxoPatch, with Rick Levis and Alan Finkel, using only first chapter knowledge has been the world leader in sales since roughly 1987 and is still in some ways the best available: few electronic devices are usable, let alone nearly the best, after 35 years or so!). We had used the first chapters of anatomy, histology, physiology, and biophysics texts that way, as well as electronics, so why not do so with physical chemistry. (I speak for myself here and do not associate Wolfgang with this cursory and lazy way of learning things.)

So we calculated the properties that made biological cells so special directly from the theory paper we read [31] and were amazed that the properties came out right, over something like 8 orders of magnitude. Specifically, we worried about biological proteins that sit in cell membranes and have holes (channels) down their middle to let ions move through the protein and across the membrane. How could some of those channel proteins let only calcium ions through and keep the sodium and potassium (and chloride) ions out of the hole and stop them from crossing the membranes into cells? (This is called the ‘selectivity’ problem.)

Amazingly, the paper we read showed how that could happen using a ridiculously oversimplified picture of one of these channel proteins as lots of charges fixed in place (as charges are in silicon semiconductors that make up our transistors and computers). The size of the calcium ion and its electric charge interacted with the size and charges of the protein (in our oversimplified model) and it produced an approximation to calcium selectivity [32, 33] that no one had been able to compute before, and indeed no one can compute in a fundamentally different way to this day [34-43]. (My colleagues will argue about what ‘fundamentally different’ means of course, but for us the computation must include the biologically relevant five orders of magnitude of concentration of calcium used in biological systems.)

As you can imagine, Wolfgang Nonner and I were very excited about this and I planned just to mention it in the middle of my talk, which was about the analogy between transistors and ion channels and their electrical properties and reported our work on that which David Busath was interested in and had helped with.

I had hoped to meet Doug and chat with him about these ideas before my talk but my intense interactions with Dave Busath and his lab made that impractical. I shook hands with Doug, said I worked on ions in biological channels and systems, moved into the magnificent lecture room, shut out some of the view, so we could see slides, and started my talk.

The talk was rather more formal in style than I was used to in the USA, although having spent much time at Harvard and Cambridge UK that did not bother me. As a good Brooklyn boy, I pretended to ignore it and just did my thing.

My thing led me to say after talking about current flow in channels that Wolfgang Nonner and I had found something very surprising and problematic but that was so important that I wanted to report on it here, for the first time anywhere (if my memory is right: someone should check that before it is believed). We had found that the “Mean Spherical Approximation” could account for one of the most important properties of biological membranes and channels, if we simply assumed that the channel provided a lot of fixed charges with a definite diameter and these charges mixed with ions going through the hole in the protein. The key ideas were that the ions had definite size and charge, and the ions attached to the protein could mix with those ions but the protein charges were confined to that space. This idea seemed a useful albeit very crude approximation to Wolfgang and me because we were familiar with work [44, 45] (mostly in Germany) on ion exchange membranes, which made similar over approximations but did NOT allow the ions and protein charges to have finite diameter.

No sooner did I say this result, than a certain dignified handsome tall scientist stood up and said “You can’t do that. The MSA (his name for the Mean Spherical Approximation that he had established as much as anyone [46, 47], although Wolfgang and I did not know that at the time) only applies for homogeneous systems (nonscientists: systems without proteins, i.e., systems as far from a channel protein as you can imagine). Your system is inhomogeneous”.

The dignified Doug Henderson sat down, not really expecting an answer I suspect (since there was none possible logically), and the audience had a moment of shocked silence. Doug was well known for being more than polite, and soft spoken. Rarely did he ask critical questions, never before, I am told, had he interrupted a talk (without being called upon, I should add, by the chair of the session or the speaker) at all, let alone to say the speaker spoke nonsense!

Fortunately, my combative nature had been calmed by the supportive and kind environment at BYU and in Dave Busath’s lab, and so I said “Professor Henderson, you are quite right. We hope you will show us how to do this right.”

Then I quickly moved along to other material not so obviously ill founded.

Fortunately, Doug agreed (albeit reluctantly) to show us how to do it right. He was sure that a better calculation would give a very different result. Wolfgang did not think so. I had no idea, but only wanted to know how the calculation would come out. So Doug agreed to take a detour from his ongoing work with Dezső Boda (which was the best in the world on these subjects) and show us we were wrong. He found a way to do the MSA in a confined space with protein charges and persuaded Dezső to do the calculations. Remember Wolfgang and I had done the calculation in an unconfined space and applied it to a system which was as confined as one could be [24, 25, 27]

I met Doug and Wolfgang in Salt Lake City so I could show them Moab (then my favorite red rock: I had not discovered Torey and Boulder UT yet). We met at the airport and I drove to Moab in an unforgettable drive (through Price). Doug and Wolfgang argued the entire four hours, plus lunch. But that was not a problem: we all enjoyed the arguing, being used to the verbal conflict that is an essential part of producing fine science.

The problem was that both Doug and Wolfgang had good and bad sides.

No, not good and bad sides of themselves or their personalities (they are both wonderful agreeable people all the time in my many years of experience with them, often under stressful

circumstances, some produced by my not so good sides). They had bad sides for their hearing! In fact, I think they were quite deaf on (at least) one side and the deaf sides were facing each other.

It took me (the driver) awhile to figure this out, but soon after we had lunch at Provo, I realized that an argument without hearing would not work.

So for the remaining hours I simply repeated what each said (as politely as I could: neither Wolfgang nor Doug would admit to having a bad side, let alone to deafness) The reiteration aided their interaction substantially. It also helped me understand: Wolfgang has an immeasurably high IQ and Doug was in that league too, so the extra time I had to spend repeating things gave me a chance to understand a bit of what the arguments were about. Fortunately, the road from Price to Moab is unchallenging (until we crossed the old suspension bridge on the short cut I took so they could enter Moab unforgettably there and later by Arches National Park) and we were not in danger from my driving.

The next day we were sitting in an elegant motel/hotel lobby, arguing science to the wonder of staff and guests, when Doug said he had results from Dezsö. And they showed that the MSA and the Dezsö/Doug calculation agreed within 2.7% with the MSA Wolfgang and I had used even though one was properly confined, and the other was not.

I was thrilled. But Wolfgang spoiled it all. He was right and he rubbed it in. Wolfgang said "Dezsö defined the computation box wrong. He used the same size box in the MSA and his calculation and he should not have: the ionic spheres cannot get to the edge, so the MSA box is smaller by the diameter of the ions." Doug thought for about 3 seconds and said "You are right." He phoned Dezsö, who performed the calculation with revised parameters and sure enough with that correction the numbers agree within 0.4%, if I remember correctly. Wolfgang mumbled that he (Dezsö) got the corners wrong, counting them twice but I said "Please be quiet. 0.4% is good enough for me!"

And that began a collaboration that produced something many papers [26, 27, 32, 33, 48-60] among us and many many more by Doug, Dirk Gillespie, Dezsö Boda and others, including two memorable papers with Dave Busath [27, 50].

Indeed, I am working on versions of this model to this day. You all may be amused to know that we still do not know why the MSA and the simulation were so similar. At least I don't know. I never asked Doug that question and I haven't had the nerve to ask Wolfgang or Dezsö or Dirk or their colleagues that question!

So that is how all this got started.

What a joy!!!

How lucky I am to have been able to ride along with such wonderful men as Doug Henderson and Wolfgang Nonner.

References

1. Henderson, L.J., *Blood. A Study in General Physiology* 1928, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 397.
2. Henderson, L.J., *The Fitness of the Environment: an Inquiry Into the Biological Significance of the Properties of Matter*. 1913, New York: Macmillan.
3. Barker, J. and D. Henderson, *What is "liquid"? Understanding the states of matter*. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 1976. **48**: p. 587-671.
4. Shurkin, J.N., *Broken Genius: The Rise and Fall of William Shockley, Creator of the Electronic Age*. 2006, New York: Macmillan.
5. Shockley, W., *The Theory of p-n Junctions in Semiconductors and p-n Junction Transistors*. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 1949. **28**(3): p. 435-489.
6. Kahng, D., *A historical perspective on the development of MOS transistors and related devices*. *Electron Devices, IEEE Transactions on*, 1976. **23**(7): p. 655-657.
7. Sah, C.-T., *Evolution of the MOS transistor-from conception to VLSI*. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 1988. **76**(10): p. 1280-1326.
8. Neudeck, G.W., G.W. Neudeck, and R.F. Pierret, *The Bipolar Junction Transistor*. 1989: Addison-Wesley.
9. Arns, R.G., *The other transistor: early history of the metal-oxide semiconductor field-effect transistor*. *Engineering Science and Education Journal*, 1998. **7**(5): p. 233-240.
10. Schwierz, F. and J.J. Liou, *Modern microwave transistors: theory, design, and performance*. 2003: Wiley-Interscience.
11. Eisenberg, B., *Living Transistors: a Physicist's View of Ion Channels (version 2)*. [http://arxiv.org/q-bio.BM: arXiv:q-bio/0506016v2](http://arxiv.org/q-bio.BM:arXiv:q-bio/0506016v2) 2005.
12. Fuechsle, M., et al., *A single-atom transistor*. *Nat Nano*, 2012. **7**(4): p. 242-246.
13. Lundstrom, M., *Fundamentals of Nanotransistors*. 2017: World Scientific Publishing Company.
14. Moore, G.E. *Lithography and the future of Moore's law*. 1995. Santa Clara, CA, USA: SPIE.
15. Lundstrom, M., *Applied Physics Enhanced: Moore's Law Forever?* *Science*, 2003. **299**(5604): p. 210-211.
16. Gertner, J., *The idea factory: Bell Labs and the great age of American innovation*. 2012: Penguin.
17. Hoddeson, L.E. and V. Daitch, *True genius: the life and science of John Bardeen*. 2002: Joseph Henry Press.
18. Pearson, G. and W.H. Brattain, *History of semiconductor research*. *Proceedings of the IRE*, 1955. **43**(12): p. 1794-1806.
19. Brinkman, W.F., D.E. Haggan, and W.W. Troutman, *A history of the invention of the transistor and where it will lead us*. *IEEE journal of solid-state circuits*, 1997. **32**(12): p. 1858-1865.
20. Eisenberg, R.S., *Computing the field in proteins and channels*. *Journal of Membrane Biology*, 1996. **150**: p. 1-25. Preprint available on physics arXiv as document 1009.2857.

21. Eisenberg, R.S., *Atomic Biology, Electrostatics and Ionic Channels.*, in *New Developments and Theoretical Studies of Proteins*, R. Elber, Editor. 1996, World Scientific: Philadelphia. p. 269-357. Published in the Physics ArXiv as arXiv:0807.0715.
22. Eisenberg, B., *Maxwell Matters*. Preprint on arXiv <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1607.06691>, 2016.
23. Eisenberg, R.s., *Maxwell Equations for Material Systems*. doi: 10.20944/preprints202011.0201.v1, 2020.
24. Eisenberg, B., *Proteins, Channels, and Crowded Ions*. Biophysical Chemistry, 2003. **100**: p. 507 - 517.
25. Eisenberg, B., *Crowded Charges in Ion Channels*, in *Advances in Chemical Physics*, S.A. Rice, Editor. 2011, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York. p. 77-223 also on the arXiv at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1009.1786v1>.
26. Nonner, W., et al., *Ion Accumulation in a Biological Calcium Channel: Effects of Solvent and Confining Pressure*. The Journal of Physical Chemistry B, 2001. **105**(27): p. 6427-6436.
27. Boda, D., et al., *Monte Carlo simulations of ion selectivity in a biological Na⁺ channel: charge-space competition*. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics (PCCP), 2002. **4**: p. 5154-5160.
28. Nonner, W. and B. Eisenberg, *Ion Permeation and Glutamate Residues Linked by Poisson-Nernst-Planck Theory in L-type Calcium Channels*. Biophysical Journal, 1998. **75**: p. 1287-1305.
29. Catacuzzeno, L., et al., *Ca Selectivity in the 'EEEE' Locus of L-type Ca Channels*. Biophysical Journal, 1999. **76**: p. A259.
30. Catacuzzeno, L., W. Nonner, and B. Eisenberg, *PNP2 Links Crystallographic Structure and Conduction in K Channels*. Biophysical Journal, 1999. **76**: p. A79.
31. Simonin, J.-P., *Real Ionic Solutions in the Mean Spherical Approximation. 2. Pure Strong Electrolytes up to Very High Concentrations and Mixtures, in the Primitive Model*. Journal of Physical Chemistry B, 1997. **101**: p. 4313-4320.
32. Boda, D., et al., *Volume Exclusion in Calcium Selective Channels*. Biophys. J., 2008. **94**(9): p. 3486-3496.
33. Boda, D., et al., *Ionic selectivity in L-type calcium channels by electrostatics and hard-core repulsion*. Journal of General Physiology, 2009. **133**(5): p. 497-509.
34. Boda, D., D. Henderson, and D. Gillespie, *The role of solvation in the binding selectivity of the L-type calcium channel*. The Journal of Chemical Physics, 2013. **139**(5): p. 055103-10.
35. Boda, D., et al., *Selective transport through a model calcium channel studied by Local Equilibrium Monte Carlo simulations coupled to the Nernst-Planck equation*. Journal of Molecular Liquids, 2014. **189**(Dezsó Boda a,*, Róbert Kovács a, Dirk Gillespie b, Tamás Kristóf a): p. 100-112.
36. Hato, Z., et al., *Multiscale modeling of a rectifying bipolar nanopore: explicit-water versus implicit-water simulations*. Phys Chem Chem Phys, 2017. **19**(27): p. 17816-17826.
37. Ható, Z., et al., *Simulation study of a rectifying bipolar ion channel: Detailed model versus reduced model*. Condensed Matter Physics, 2016. **19**(1): p. 13802.
38. Jiang, J. and D. Gillespie, *Revisiting the Charged Shell Model: A Density Functional Theory for Electrolytes*. Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation, 2021.

39. Valiskó, M., et al., *Multiscale analysis of the effect of surface charge pattern on a nanopore's rectification and selectivity properties: from all-atom model to Poisson-Nernst-Planck*. arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.07117, 2019.
40. Rios, E., D. Gillespie, and C. Franzini-Armstrong, *The binding interactions that maintain excitation-contraction coupling junctions in skeletal muscle*. J Gen Physiol, 2019. **151**(4): p. 593-605.
41. Gillespie, D., *A review of steric interactions of ions: Why some theories succeed and others fail to account for ion size*. Microfluidics and Nanofluidics, 2015. **18** p. 717-738.
42. Boda, D. and D. Gillespie, *Steady-State Electrodifffusion from the Nernst-Planck Equation Coupled to Local Equilibrium Monte Carlo Simulations*. J Chem Theory Comput, 2012. **8**(3): p. 824-9.
43. Dudev, T., C. Grauffel, and C. Lim, *Calcium in Signaling: Its Specificity and Vulnerabilities toward Biogenic and Abiogenic Metal Ions*. J Phys Chem B, 2021.
44. Helfferich, F., *Ion Exchange*. 1962, New York: McGraw Hill. 624.
45. Helfferich, F., *A quantitative approach to ion exchange catalysis*. Journal of the American Chemical Society, 1954. **76**(21): p. 5567-5568.
46. Henderson, D., M. Lozada-Cassou, and L. Blum, *The application of the HNC/MSA approximation to bulk electrolytes*. The Journal of chemical physics, 1983. **79**(6): p. 3055-3057.
47. Henderson, D. and W.R. Smith, *Exact analytical formulas for the distribution functions of charged hard spheres in the mean spherical approximation*. Journal of Statistical Physics, 1978. **19**(2): p. 191-200.
48. Gillespie, D., et al., *A physical mechanism for large-ion selectivity of ion channels*. Physical Chemistry Chemical Physics, 2002. **4**: p. 4763-4769.
49. Boda, D., et al., *Computing induced charges in inhomogeneous dielectric media: application in a Monte Carlo simulation of complex ionic systems*. Phys Rev E Stat Nonlin Soft Matter Phys, 2004. **69**(4 Pt 2): p. 046702.
50. Boda, D., et al., *Monte Carlo simulation study of a system with a dielectric boundary: application to calcium channel selectivity*. Molecular Simulation 2004. **30**: p. 89-96.
51. Boda, D., et al., *Effect of Protein Dielectric Coefficient on the Ionic Selectivity of a Calcium Channel*. Journal of Chemical Physics 2006. **125**: p. 034901.
52. Boda, D., et al., *Steric selectivity in Na channels arising from protein polarization and mobile side chains*. Biophys J, 2007. **93**(6): p. 1960-80.
53. Boda, D., et al., *The combined effect of pore radius and protein dielectric coefficient on the selectivity of a calcium channel*. Physical Review Letters, 2007. **98**: p. 168102.
54. Boda, D., et al., *2222-Pos Competition of Steric repulsion and Electrostatic Attraction in the Selectivity Filter of Model Calcium Channels*. Biophys. J., 2008. **94**(1_MeetingAbstracts): p. 2222-.
55. Boda, D., et al., *Ions and inhibitors in the binding site of HIV protease: comparison of Monte Carlo simulations and the linearized Poisson-Boltzmann theory*. Biophys J, 2009. **96**(4): p. 1293-306.
56. Eisenberg, B., et al., *Self-organized Models of Selectivity in Ca and Na Channels*. Biophysical Journal, 2009. **96**(3): p. 253a.

57. Malasics, A., et al., *Protein structure and ionic selectivity in calcium channels: Selectivity filter size, not shape, matters*. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes*, 2009. **1788**(12): p. 2471-2480.
58. Boda, D., et al., *Analyzing the components of the free-energy landscape in a calcium selective ion channel by Widom's particle insertion method*. *J Chem Phys*, 2011. **134**(5): p. 055102-14.
59. Boda, D., et al., *A method for treating the passage of a charged hard sphere ion as it passes through a sharp dielectric boundary*. *J Chem Phys*, 2011. **135**(6): p. 064105.
60. Giri, J., et al., *Self-organized models of selectivity in calcium channels*. *Phys Biol*, 2011. **8**(2): p. 026004.