



Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2008 May 14; 130(19): 6082–6084. doi:10.1021/ja8012177.

Metal Mediated Self-Assembly of Protein Superstructures: Influence of Secondary Interactions on Protein Oligomerization and Aggregation

Eric N. Salgado, Richard A. Lewis, Jasmin Faraone-Mennella, and F. Akif Tezcan

University of California, San Diego, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, 9500 Gilman Dr., La Jolla, CA 92093

Protein-protein interactions (PPIs) are the most diverse of biological self-assembly processes, central to the construction and mechanical integrity of biological machinery on one hand, and cellular dynamics and communication on the other. While rational design and control of PPIs would provide access to novel protein assemblies¹ as well as the manipulation of cellular processes,^{2, 3} such efforts are hampered by the fact that PPIs comprise an extensive set of noncovalent bonds distributed over large and typically non-contiguous molecular surfaces.⁴ We have taken on the challenge of controlling PPIs using an inorganic chemical approach. Work by several groups has shown that small organic building blocks with acceptor groups can self-assemble into discrete superstructures and frameworks through metal coordination.⁵ We envisioned that the self-assembly of proteins can likewise be controlled by metal binding, with the added complications that a) protein surfaces are replete with polar side chains capable of coordinating metals, and b) the interactions between individual proteins in contrast to those between organic building blocks may not be negligible. Our previous studies have shown that metal coordination can be largely localized onto multidentate metal binding motifs inserted on surface helices that can outcompete other potential binding sites; one such construct (*His*⁴-*cb*₅₆₂; hereafter referred to as MBPC-1, Figure 1) was found to self-assemble into a discrete superstructure upon Zn coordination.⁶ In this study, we show that secondary interactions between proteins, *i.e.* those not involving metal coordination, can play a significant role in tuning the oligomerization/aggregation behavior of a protein.

MBPC-1 was engineered with two di-His motifs (59/63 and 73/77) located near each terminus of a single α -helix (Helix 3, spanning residues 56–80) in the parent protein cytochrome *cb*₅₆₂,⁷ with the idea that such an arrangement would yield a closed superstructure upon metal coordination. Indeed, at appropriate Zn and protein concentrations, MBPC-1 formed a tetrameric assembly (Zn₄:MBPC-1₄).⁶ The crystal structure of Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ revealed a unique quaternary architecture, in which two V-shaped dimers wedged into one another, held together by four Zn ions with identical His³(63/73/77) Asp¹(74) coordination environments (Figure 2a). The key to this supramolecular arrangement was the Asp74 residue located within the His73/77 clamp: Zn coordination by Asp74 rather than His59 allowed the V-shaped dimers, and ultimately, the observed tetramer to be formed (Figure S1). Hydrodynamic measurements showed that MBPC-1 did not have a tendency to self-associate in the absence of metals, which indicated that metal binding was the driving force for oligomerization. At the same time, the tetramer was found to have an extensive PPI surface area of nearly 5000 Å², raising the possibility that secondary interactions between proteins may still influence the formation of

Supporting Information Available: Materials and methods for protein expression/purification/characterization, experimental details for sedimentation velocity/equilibrium and NMR measurements, crystallographic data and collection/refinement statistics, table for interfacial interactions.

the observed tetramer. If, on the other hand, these interactions had negligible effect and metal coordination was the sole determinant of the supramolecular geometry, then the whole oligomeric assembly could be “inverted” simply by moving the coordinating Asp residue from within the His73/77 motif at the C-terminal end of Helix 3 to the N-terminus, inside the His59/63 motif (Figure 1). Thus, we engineered MBPC-2, the D74A/R62D variant of MBPC-1 (its approximate mirror image in terms of metal coordination), and determined its Zn-induced self-assembly properties.

As planned, MBPC-2 forms tetramers upon addition of one molar equivalent of Zn according to sedimentation velocity (SV) and sedimentation equilibrium (SE) measurements (Supporting Info; see also Figure 4). These experiments indicate that the stability of Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ is elevated compared to Zn₄:MBPC-1₄, with apparent association constants significantly higher than the latter.⁸ Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ readily lent itself to crystallization, and we determined its structure at 1.9-Å resolution (PDB ID: 3C62). The Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ architecture is similar to that of Zn₄:MBPC-1₄, with two interlaced V-shaped dimers that are slightly more open, an overall topology that is slightly flatter, and a nearly identical buried protein surface area (~5000 Å²) (Figure 2). The Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ structure is indeed the “inverse” of Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ (Figure 2a). Whereas the V-shapes are joined at the Helix3 C-termini in the latter, they are crosslinked at the N-terminus in the former; the transition between the two superstructures resembles a scissor motion. Surprisingly, Asp62 is not involved in Zn binding. Instead, each of the four Zn ions in the assembly are ligated by the His73/77 motif from one monomer, His59 from a second, and His63 from a third, yielding an ideal tetrahedral His⁴-Zn coordination geometry with an average Zn-His bond distance of 2.05 Å (Figure 2c). In this arrangement, each V-shape is stabilized by His59 and His63 coordination instead of the expected Asp62 and His63 coordination from two monomers, which splay apart to bind two Zn ions, thereby joining the Helix3 N-termini together. Interestingly, His⁴-Zn coordination has rarely been observed in natural systems, one example being the HAP1 transcriptional factor that contains a structural His²(Nε), His²(Nδ)-Zn site.⁹ Utilizing metal-binding motifs on surfaces to nucleate PPIs may provide access to unusual coordination environments not favored within protein interiors.¹⁰

While similarities between Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ structures suggest convergence in their mechanisms of self-assembly (*vide infra*), the differences in their metal coordination modes raise some questions: Why does MBPC-2 not oligomerize through the His³-Asp¹ Zn-coordination motif although it has access to it? Conversely, why does MBPC-1 not self-assemble through the same His⁴ motif as MBPC-2? And finally, why is Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ more stable than Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ despite the fact that both assemblies are held together by four Zn ions in unstrained, tetrahedral coordination geometries? We thus decided to take a closer look at the protein interfaces in both assemblies to determine whether secondary interactions may influence metal-induced self-assembly. As expected from a soluble protein whose surface is not optimized for self-association, the interfaces in both Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ structures feature overwhelmingly polar residues that are poorly packed. Furthermore, there are surprisingly few interfacial H-bonding interactions given the extensive buried protein surfaces in both assemblies. Earlier surveys of oligomeric protein structures have indicated average interfacial H-bond densities ranging from 0.5 to 0.7 per 100 Å² of buried surface;^{11, 12} these values are considerably higher than 0.3 and 0.2 per 100 Å² observed in Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ complexes. Significantly, the majority of these H-bonding interactions involve two pairs of residues that form salt bridges: Arg34-Asp62 in Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ accounting for 9 out of a total of 15 interactions, and Arg34-Asp66 in Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ accounting for 7 out of a total of 10 (Figure 3 and Table S2).

In order to probe the possible role of these salt bridges in the self-assembly of the two tetramers, we generated a series of Arg34 mutants of MBPC-1 and MBPC-2 aimed at weakening or abolishing these interactions. Figure 4 shows the oligomerization behavior of the Arg34

variants as determined by sedimentation velocity experiments. Indicating the higher relative stability of the Zn₄:MBPC-2₄, the parent MBPC-2 molecule exists only in the tetrameric form at 600 μM protein and Zn concentrations, whereas a significant population of dimeric species is also present with MBPC-1 under the same conditions. Upon the mutation of Arg34 to the shorter Lys, the peak for the tetrameric assembly disappears entirely for MBPC-1 and becomes broader for MBPC-2, consistent with the weakening of the salt-bridging interaction. The 1.75-Å crystal structure of the Zn₄:(R34K)MBPC-2₄ assembly (PDB ID: 3C63) reveals that Lys34 indeed maintains the salt bridge to Asp62 and stabilizes the parent tetrameric assembly, but its interactions are not as extensive compared to Arg34 (Figure S2). Dramatically, when Arg34 is mutated to Ala and Asp in MBPC-1 and MBPC-2, respectively, the tetrameric forms are replaced by heterogeneous ensembles that contain higher order aggregates.¹³ These findings demonstrate that Arg34 interactions clearly are the guiding factor for the metal-induced oligomerization of MBPC-1 and 2.

In the presence of limiting amounts of Zn, MBPC-1 or MBPC-2 molecules likely sample all of the conformations depicted in Figure 5, with the possible exception of **5** due to steric reasons. While monomeric and dimeric (**3**) forms dominate at low protein concentrations, the tetrameric, interlaced conformation **4** with the highest Zn-binding cooperativity is expected to be the prevalent species at intermediate concentrations. This is indeed borne out by the structural convergence of Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ assemblies despite differences in their metal coordination modes. Secondary interactions, particularly those involving Arg34, then, are crucial for fine-tuning the relative stabilities and geometric specificities of the different oligomeric states. MBPC-1 exclusively forms the type **4** conformation with the observed His³ Asp coordination motif rather than the His⁴-motif seen in Zn₄:MBPC-2₄, because a) the Arg34-Asp66 interaction (Figure 3a) stabilizes the former geometry, and b) the latter geometry would align the original Arg62 in MBPC-1 across from Arg34 (Figure 3b), leading to a destabilizing effect. Conversely, MBPC-2 specifically forms the type **4** conformation with His⁴-coordination as opposed to the His³ Asp-motif, because it is energetically more favorable to utilize Asp62 in an interfacial salt bridge when a tetracoordinate Zn-geometry is already accessible with four histidines. Lastly, a broader inspection of the interfaces in Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ reveals that the former assembly features a higher number of unfavorable interactions and sidechain environments (Supporting Info), which attests to its lower stability.¹⁴

To what extent H-bonds and salt bridges contribute to the stability of proteins and PPIs can greatly vary from system to system.¹⁵ Yet, it is generally thought that these alignment-dependent interactions are important in limiting the number of possible low energy docking conformations, thus playing a major role in determining specificity.^{16, 17} Our results provide clear evidence that salt-bridging and H-bonding interactions can dictate the geometric alignment of protein partners, leading to the population of discrete supramolecular structures over other conformations of similar energy. The combined ability to direct PPIs through metal coordination and secondary interactions could provide the specificity required for the construction of complex, multicomponent protein superstructures and the selective control of cellular processes that involve protein-protein association reactions.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Drs. Arnold L. Rheingold and Antonio DiPasquale for their help with X-ray data collection, and Drs. Andrew Herr, Peter Schuck, Patrick Brown, and Xavier Ambroggio for helpful discussions. This work was supported by UCSD,

a Hellman Faculty Scholar Award (F.A.T.), N.I.H. (Molecular Biophysics Training Grant GM08326 to E.N.S.), and N.S.F. (Instrumentation Grant 0634989 to A.L.R.).

References

1. Grueninger D, Treiber N, Ziegler MOP, Koetter JWA, Schulze MS, Schulz GE. *Science* 2008;319:206–209. [PubMed: 18187656]
2. Shifman JM, Mayo SL. *J Mol Biol* 2002;323:417–423. [PubMed: 12381298]
3. Reina J, Lacroix E, Hobson SD, Fernandez-Ballester G, Rybin V, Schwab MS, Serrano L, Gonzalez C. *Nat Struct Biol* 2002;9:621–627. [PubMed: 12080331]
4. (a) Kortemme T, Baker D. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 2004;8:91–97. [PubMed: 15036162] (b) Moreira IS, Fernandes PA, Ramos MJ. *Proteins* 2007;68:803–812. [PubMed: 17546660] (c) Shoemaker BA, Panchenko AR. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2007;3:595–601. (d) Fletcher S, Hamilton AD. *J R Soc Interface* 2006;3:215–233. [PubMed: 16849232]
5. (a) Fujita M, Tominaga M, Hori A, Therrien B. *Acc Chem Res* 2005;38:369–378. [PubMed: 15835883] (b) Banerjee R, Phan A, Knobler C, Furukawa H, O’Keeffe M, Yaghi OM. *Science* 2008;319:939–943. [PubMed: 18276887] (c) Caulder DL, Raymond KN. *Acc Chem Res* 1999;32:975–982. (d) Holliday BJ, Mirkin CA. *Angew Chem, Int Ed Eng* 2001;40:2022–2043. (e) Leininger S, Olenyuk B, Stang PJ. *Chem Rev* 2000;100:853–907. [PubMed: 11749254]
6. Salgado EN, Faraone-Mennella J, Tezcan FA. *J Am Chem Soc* 2007;129:13374–13375. [PubMed: 17929927]
7. Faraone-Mennella J, Tezcan FA, Gray HB, Winkler JR. *Biochemistry* 2006;45:10504–10511. [PubMed: 16939202]
8. The SE data were satisfactorily fit to a monomer/dimer/tetramer association model. The apparent monomer/dimer and dimer/tetramer dissociation constants ($-\log K_d$) are 4.9 and 4.8 M for Zn_4 :MBPC-1₄, and 11.9 and 9.15 M for Zn_4 :MBPC-2₄, respectively. These numbers, however, should not be taken as “true” dissociation constants, because the Zn-protein binding equilibria are also contained within. While Zn_4 :MBPC-2₄ is clearly more stable than Zn_4 :MBPC-1₄, as indicated in Figure 4, the differences in their dissociation constants are likely inflated by the cooperative nature of Zn binding and protein association.
9. King DA, Zhang L, Guarente L, Marmorstein R. *Nat Struct Biol* 1999;6:64–71. [PubMed: 9886294]
10. Unusual metal coordination environments also have been obtained within de novo designed coiled-coil architectures. See for example, Matzapetakis M, Farrer BT, Weng TC, Hemmingsen L, Penner-Hahn JE, Pecoraro VL. *J Am Chem Soc* 2002;124:8042–8054.8054 [PubMed: 12095348]
11. Janin J, Miller S, Chothia C. *J Mol Biol* 1988;204:155–164. [PubMed: 3216390]
12. Jones S, Thornton JM. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1996;93:13–20. [PubMed: 8552589]
13. Upon addition of equimolar Zn (600 μ M), (R34A)MBPC-1 promptly precipitates out of solution, indicating formation of high-order aggregates.
14. Another manifestation of the lower stability of Zn_4 :MBPC-14 is its higher sensitivity to R34 mutations.
15. (a) Froloff N, Windemuth A, Honig B. *Protein Sci* 1997;6:1293–1301. [PubMed: 9194189] (b) Makhataдзе GI, Loladze VV, Ermolenko DN, Chen XF, Thomas ST. *J Mol Biol* 2003;327:1135–1148. [PubMed: 12662936] (c) Kumar S, Nussinov R. *Biophys J* 2002;83:1595–1612. [PubMed: 12202384]
16. Hendsch ZS, Tidor B. *Prot Sci* 1994;3:211–226.
17. Sheinerman FB, Norel R, Honig B. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2000;10:153–159. [PubMed: 10753808]




Figure 1. Structure of MBPC-1 (based on the monomeric building blocks of the Zn_4 :MBPC-1₄ assembly; PDB ID: 2QLA).




Figure 2.

a) Cylindrical representations of $Zn_4:MBPC-1_4$ and $Zn_4:MBPC-2_4$ Helix3's and sidechains involved in Zn coordination, viewed along the non-crystallographic twofold symmetry axis. Pairs of protein molecules that form the V-shaped dimers are colored alike. The N- and C-termini of the four Helix3's in each assembly are labeled accordingly. b) Ribbon representation of the $Zn_4:MBPC-2_4$ crystal structure. c) Close-up view of the Zn coordination environment down the non-crystallographic twofold symmetry axis and the corresponding simulated-annealing F_o-F_c omit electron density map (3.5 σ).




Figure 3. Interfacial H-bonding interactions in Zn₄:MBPC-1₄ (a) and Zn₄:MBPC-2₄ (b) assemblies that involve R34 and D66 in the former and R34 and D62 in the latter. The pairwise interactions shown above are repeated twice due to the internal twofold symmetry of each tetrameric assembly.




Figure 4. Molecular weight distributions of MBPC-1 (left) and MBPC-2 (right) species as determined by sedimentation velocity measurements. All samples contain 600 μM protein and 600 μM Zn, with the exception of R34A-MBPC-1, which contains 300 μM Zn.¹³




Figure 5.

Possible Zn-induced oligomerization states of MBPC-1 and 2 under limiting (≤ 1 equivalent) metal concentrations assuming a 4-coordinate Zn geometry. 1) extended structures/aggregates, 2) trimer or tetramer with His⁴-coordination shared by two monomers, 3) dimer with His⁴-coordination shared by two monomers, 4) tetramer with His⁴ or His³ Asp-coordination shared by three monomers, 5) tetramer with His⁴-coordination shared by four monomers.