

Microcanonical versus Canonical Analysis of Protein Folding

J. Hernández-Rojas* and J. M. Gomez Llorente†

Departamento de Física Fundamental II and IUDEA. Universidad de La Laguna. 38205 Tenerife. Spain

The microcanonical analysis is shown to be a powerful tool to characterize the protein folding transition and to neatly distinguish between good and bad folders. An off-lattice model with parameter chosen to represent polymers of these two types is used to illustrate this approach. Both canonical and microcanonical ensembles are employed. The required calculations were performed using parallel tempering Monte Carlo simulations. The most revealing features of the folding transition are related to its first-order-like character, namely, the S-bend pattern in the caloric curve, which gives rise to negative microcanonical specific heats, and the bimodality of the energy distribution function at the transition temperatures. Models for a good folder are shown to be quite robust against perturbations in the interaction potential parameters.

PACS numbers: 87.15.A-, 87.15.Cc, 87.15.Zg

A protein is a polypeptide, i.e., a sequence of amino acids. Only a very small fraction of all possible sequences are valid, that is, they determine uniquely the native state. This state is the three-dimensional compact conformation that is stable and functionally active at room temperature in its biological environment [1]. Protein folding, i.e., the physical process by which a polypeptide folds from low-structure denatured states into its native state, remains an open fundamental problem in molecular biology. This process is remarkably fast (10^{-3} to 1 sec.) for natural proteins, which are the good folders selected by biological evolution. The understanding of the structural and energetic properties that characterize a good folder is a basic issue in the protein folding problem a necessary step towards two ambitious goals, namely, the prediction of the native structure from the amino acid sequence, and the corresponding inverse design problem. The formulation of energy landscape theory was a major breakthrough in this research field [2]. In this approach, good folders such as the natural proteins present globally funneled potential energy surfaces; this implies that the native state can be directly reached from almost any initial (unfolded) structure. The folding funnel landscape is closely related to the principle of minimal frustration [2]. High frustration is a feature characterizing the energy landscape of homopolymers, which are, therefore, generally bad folders.

Proteins having a well defined and unique native state which is reached from almost any initial condition induce a thermodynamic behavior which is similar to that of small systems undergoing phase separation between the denatured macrostate and the native one. This two-phase picture is also essential in the kinetic analysis of folding, where each of the two phases is associated with a free energy minimum along the reaction coordinate, and the transition is described as an activated rate process. The very different energy of the unfolded and native states is the origin of the two symmetry unrelated thermodynamic phases; thus the folding transition should be of first order in the thermodynamic limit. The two-

phase picture is however inadequate to the corresponding transition in bad folders such as homopolymers, which is known to be a second order transition (the so called coil-globule or θ -transition) [3]. The order of the transition is therefore a determining factor to characterize good and bad folders in the thermodynamical limit. However, proteins are actually finite size systems, and the classification of the transition under these circumstances is not an obvious task. Schemes based on Fisher zeroes or Lee-Yang zeros [4, 5] of the partition function depending on a complex intensive parameter (e.g. temperature) have been used to analyze the thermodynamics of finite-size systems [6], and more recently these methods have been applied to the characterization of the protein folding transition [7].

Closely connected to the behavior of Lee-Yang zeros in the complex temperature plane, some features of the microcanonical ensemble have turned out to be very useful in the characterization of transitions in finite-size systems where phase separation appear as a relevant pattern, as seem to occur in the folding transition for good folders. These systems may become colder upon absorbing energy (S-bend), which would lead to a convex behavior of the microcanonical entropy and to negative values of the corresponding specific heat. These features are rigorously linked to the bimodality of the energy distribution function at the transition temperature [8], again a clear evidence of the two-phase coexistence. These characteristic phenomena have been observed in astrophysical systems [9], in magic-number clusters [8], in nuclei fragmentation [10], and in finite-lattice spin models [11]. Related to the present work, the microcanonical analysis of peptide aggregation processes [12] and of association of hydrophobic segments in heteropolymers [13] have been carried out more recently.

In this Letter, we will demonstrate that the microcanonical analysis is able to characterize in a precise way the protein folding transition, thus allowing us to neatly distinguish between good and bad folders. Therefore, this scheme would provide us with a new tool in pro-

tein folding research that is simpler than the schemes based on the analysis of either the energy landscape or the behavior of partition function zeros in the complex temperature plane, but as powerful as them.

In order to illustrate how to characterize protein folding by the microcanonical analysis, the simple but still realistic off-lattice model proposed by Clementi *et al.* [14] (with some slight modifications) will be employed. This gives the conformation of a sequence of N beads (each one representing a residue) by their coordinates $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_N$ in three-dimensional space. The potential energy surface (PES) of the polymer is built as a sum of pairwise interactions $U_{ij} = \delta_{i,j+1}a(r_{ij} - r_0)^2 + (1 - \delta_{i,j+1})4\epsilon_{ij}[(\sigma_{ij}/r_{ij})^{12} - (\sigma_{ij}/r_{ij})^6]$, where the interaction between two non-bonding beads is chosen as a Lennard-Jones potential, while between bonding beads we have used a harmonic potential with force constant $a = 50 \text{ \AA}^{-2}$ (energies shall be measured in arbitrary dimensionless units) and equilibrium distance $r_0 = 3.8 \text{ \AA}$. In our analysis we shall consider the two polymer models with $N = 30$ proposed earlier [14], and a third new model. The first one corresponds to a homopolymer (HMP) for which we have chosen, $\epsilon_{ij} = 10$ and $\sigma_{ij} = 6.5 \text{ \AA}$ for all i, j . As expected for this system, this set of parameters leads to a very rugged energy landscape and therefore to a high frustration system; all these features characterize a bad folder. With the second model, a designed heteropolymer (DHTP), we intend to represent a natural protein, i.e. a good folder. In this case the proposed polymer sequence [14] is intended to make coincide the protein native structure with the homopolymer global minimum. As far as the ϵ_{ij} Lennard-Jones parameter are concerned, this sequence is made with four types of amino acids and, therefore, 10 different ϵ_{ij} values in the range $0.25 \leq \epsilon_{ij} \leq 10$. Following our reference work [14], we have chosen the σ_{ij} values so that the native structure corresponding to the chosen sequence is significantly stabilized, i.e. its frustration minimized; we obtain in this way values in the range $5 < \sigma_{ij} < 17 \text{ \AA}$. This parameter set leads to a clear funneled landscape, which characterizes good folders. The third model has also $N = 30$ and it is a random heteropolymer (RHTP) given by a random sequence of the previous four amino acids with the same set of ϵ_{ij} values and $\sigma_{ij} = 6.5 \text{ \AA}$.

At this point we should mention that homopolymers models different from those chosen in this work have been either shown or suggested to present a first-order-like (liquid-solid-like) transition at a temperature below the θ -like transition [15, 16]. Parallely, protein models have been proposed that present a θ -like transition above the folding transition temperature [17]. In these cases, the two θ -transitions as well as the protein folding and homopolymer liquid-to-solid transitions can be identified, but the major difference between the latter two is that the folded solid-like states in the homopolymer present polymorphism, while the protein native state

is generally unique. Therefore, the mechanisms behind these two first-order-like transitions are different. Under these circumstances our thermodynamic analysis will not be able to neatly distinguish between good and bad folders, but checking for the uniqueness of the native state would solve the issue. Indeed, using the basin-hopping method [18, 19] we have checked that polymorphism also characterizes the model introduced to study the association of hydrophobic segments in heteropolymers [13]. Therefore, one can not draw any conclusions about the folding transition from that study.

We have performed parallel tempering (also known as replica exchange) Monte Carlo simulations [20] for our three polymer models. Both canonical and microcanonical ensembles have been simulated. A good sampling requires the knowledge of the global minimum for each polymer. These have been found using the basin-hopping scheme [18, 19]. We confirm in this way that the geometrical structure of the native state in the DHTP coincides with that of the HMP global minimum. It is interesting to point out that the search of the DHTP protein native structure is a factor of 10 faster than that of the HMP and RHTP global minima, which is a direct consequence of their very different energy landscapes.

Starting out from each of these global minima we perform 50 replicas. For the canonical ensemble these replicas expand the temperature range $0 < k_B T \leq 25$ (k_B being the Boltzmann constant), while the microcanonical sampling is performed in the energy interval $-1560 \leq E \leq 875$. In order to equilibrate our systems at each sampling point, 1×10^8 Monte Carlo steps were run. Statistics were then collected for the same number of additional steps. Results for the canonical heat capacities




Figure 1: Canonical heat capacities for the polymer models HMP (a), RHTP (b) and DHTP (c).




Figure 2: Caloric curves for the polymer models HMP (a), RHTP (b), and DHTP (c). Results are for the canonical (dotted line) and microcanonical (full line) ensembles.

ity $C_v(T) = \frac{3}{2}Nk_B + (\langle U^2 \rangle - \langle U \rangle^2)/k_B T^2$, where U is the potential energy, are presented in Fig. 1.

The three polymer models show a single peak in the heat capacity that, using the same energy scale, is narrower for the DHTP model. Clearly, from these results we cannot extract any definite conclusion about the nature of the transition associated with the heat capacity peaks.

The situation changes dramatically when we move to the microcanonical ensemble. Fig. 2 presents energy-temperature plots (caloric curves) for both ensembles and three polymer models. While the data for both the HMP and RHTP models show the same behavior in both ensembles, the S-bend microcanonical feature that characterizes first-order-like phase transitions is observed in the DHTP model. The origin of this feature can be understood in terms of the two-phase picture behind the folding transition. Since the native state corresponds to a very deep potential well, the low temperature behavior will follow closely that of a multidimensional harmonic oscillator, with a density of states that grows with energy as a power law. Therefore, entropy is a concave function of energy. At energies where the unfolded state starts to participate, large high potential energy regions of the DHTP configuration space are sampled; thus the density of states grows significantly and a convex intruder appears in the above function. In other words, the system becomes colder upon absorbing energy and the microcanonical heat capacity (not shown here) becomes nega-




Figure 3: Energy distribution functions. HMP (a), RHTP (b) and DHTP (c). Numbers within the panels are the $k_B T$ values.

tive in the phase coexistence region. The same behavior is not possible in the θ -like transition for both HMP and RHTP models because, due to the rugged nature of the potential energy landscape, the energy regions just above and below the transition zone are very much alike.

We have mentioned in the introductory paragraphs that the microcanonical S-bend feature is directly connected to the bimodality of the energy distribution function at the transition temperature. In Fig. 3 we present this function for the three models at three temperatures close to the corresponding transition temperature. The totally different performance of these models is clearly observed; the two phase coexistence is obvious in the DHTP model. As is well known, the energy difference between the two maxima in the bimodal energy distribution provides the transition latent heat ($\Delta Q = 2.8 \times 10^2$). The energy distribution functions for both HMP and RHTP show also an interesting behavior, namely, not only the average energy increases monotonically with temperature but also the energy fluctuation does so. Of course, DHTP shows a maximum of this fluctuation at the transition temperature, as expected from its first-order-like nature. The internal energy fluctuation is nothing but $[C_v(T) - \frac{3}{2}Nk_B]k_B T^2$; therefore, when the heat capacity is properly shifted and multiplied by T^2 the peaks observed in Fig. 1 for both HMP and RHTP do indeed disappear, but the one for DHTP does not. Note that the same behavior is observed respectively for bad and good




Figure 4: Minimum values of the canonical (dotted line) and microcanonical (full line) caloric curve derivatives as a function of x (see text for details).

folders in the fluctuation of the energy landscape curvature defined by Mazzoni and Casetti [21]. This measure is directly related with the internal energy and the behavior found for the fluctuations of the latter might as well be the origin of the similar behavior observed in the fluctuation of this curvature.

Finally, an interesting issue is concerned with the following question: Once we have set the PES model parameters for a good folder, how much can we change them towards those for the bad folder without essentially altering the quality of the model as a good folder? In order to answer this question we have repeated the previous microcanonical analysis for a set of models with parameters chosen as $\{p\}_x = \{p\}_g - (\{p\}_g - \{p\}_b)x$ with $0 \leq x \leq 1$, where $\{p\}_g$ and $\{p\}_b$ are respectively the parameter sets for DHTP and HMP models. Fig. 4 presents the minimum values of dT/dE from both the canonical and microcanonical caloric curves. Notice that the transition from good ($dT/dE < 0$) to bad ($dT/dE > 0$) folder occurs at $x \sim 0.54$, and that the good folder behavior is markedly better for $x \sim 0.3$. The other properties characterizing good folders (unique native state and funneled energy landscape) were checked to be linked to the negative dT/dE interval. Therefore, even strong perturbations of the parameters for a good folder do not change the essential behavior of the folding transition.

Concluding, we have shown that the microcanonical analysis is a powerful tool to characterize the protein folding transition and to neatly distinguish between good and bad folders. We have applied this scheme to three toy models representing these two types of polymers and have shown that once we have a good folder, its properties are quite robust against perturbations in the interaction parameters. Possible connections between the features that come out from our analysis and the behavior of measures such as the curvature of the energy landscape [21] have been discussed.

This work was supported by ‘Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia (Spain)’ and ‘FEDER fund (EU)’ under contract No. FIS2005-02886. We thank Dr. F. Calvo and Dr. D.J. Wales for their valuable comments.

* Electronic address: jhrojas@ull.es

† Electronic address: jmgomez@ull.es

- [1] C. Anfinsen, *Science* **181**, 223 (1973).
- [2] J.D. Bryngelson and P.G. Wolynes, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **84**, 7524 (1987); P.E. Leopold, M. Montal, and J.N. Onuchic, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **89**, 8721 (1992); J.N. Onuchic, P.G. Wolynes, and N.D. Socci, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **92**, 3626 (1995); D.J. Wales, M.A. Miller, and T.R. Walsh, *Nature* **394**, 758 (1998).
- [3] H.S. Chan and K.A. Dill, *Annu. Rev. Biophys. Biophys. Chem.* **20**, 447 (1991).
- [4] M.E. Fischer, in *Lectures in Theoretical Physics* (University of Colorado Press, Boulder, 1965), Vol 7c, p. 1.
- [5] C.N. Yang and T.D. Lee, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 404 (1952); T.D. Lee and C.N. Yang, *Phys. Rev.* **97**, 410 (1952).
- [6] P. Borrmann, O. Mülken, and J. Harting, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 3511 (2000).
- [7] J. Wang and W. Wang, *J. Chem. Phys.* **118**, 2952 (2003).
- [8] D.J. Wales and R.S. Berry, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2875 (1994); D.J. Wales and J.P.K. Doye, *J. Chem. Phys.* **103**, 3061 (1995).
- [9] W. Thirring, *Z. Phys.* **235**, 339 (1970).
- [10] M. Pichon, B. Tamain, R. Bougault, and O. Lopez, *Nucl. Phys. A* **749**, 93c (2005).
- [11] H. Behringer and M. Pleimling, *Phys. Rev. E* **74**, 011108 (2006).
- [12] C. Junghans, M. Bachmann, and W. Janke, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 218103 (2006).
- [13] T. Chen, X. Lin, Y. Liu, and H. Liang, *Phys. Rev. E* **76**, 046110 (2007).
- [14] C. Clementi, A. Maritan, and J.R. Banavar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3287 (1998).
- [15] Y. Zhou, C.K. Hall, and M. Karplus, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 2822 (1996).
- [16] T.X. Hoang, A. Trovato, F. Seno, J.R. Banavar, and A. Maritan, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **101**, 7960 (2004).
- [17] K.A. Dill and D. Stigter, *Adv. Protein Chem.* **46**, 59 (1995).
- [18] D.J. Wales and J.P.K. Doye, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **101**, 5111 (1997).
- [19] Z. Li and H.A. Scheraga, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **84**, 6611 (1987).
- [20] C.J. Geyer, in *Computing Science and Statistics: Proceedings of the 23rd Symposium on the Interface*, edited by E.M. Keramidas (Interface Foundation, Fairfax Station, VA, 1991), p. 156; D.J. Earl and M.W. Deem, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **7**, 3910 (2005); F. Calvo, J.P. Neirotti, D.L. Freeman, and J.D. Doll, *J. Chem. Phys.* **112**, 10350 (2000).
- [21] L.N. Mazzoni and L. Casetti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 218104 (2006).