

Soft Matter Perspective on Protein Crystal Assembly

Diana Fusco^{1,2,3} and Patrick Charbonneau^{2,3,4}

¹*Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, USA*

²*Program in Computational Biology and Bioinformatics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708*

³*Department of Chemistry, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708*

⁴*Department of Physics, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708*

Crystallography may be the gold standard of protein structure determination, but obtaining the necessary high-quality crystals is in some ways akin to prospecting for the precious metal. The tools and models developed by soft matter to understand colloidal self-assembly, including their crystallization, offer some insights into the protein crystallization problem. This topical review describes the various analogies between protein crystal and colloidal self-assembly that have been made. We highlight the explanatory power of patchy models, but also the challenges of providing specific guidance. We conclude with a presentation of possible future research directions.

Biological macromolecules are central to life processes. Although some of these processes can be characterized at a relatively coarse scale, more often than not a complete microscopic understanding of the involved biomolecules' structure and dynamics is epistemologically essential[1]. Proteins, for instance, interact with each other and their environment through fine-tuned structural features so as to perform their biological functions [2–6]; reciprocally, protein malfunction is often due to structural defects, and may result in diseases [7]. Proteins also represent some of the most sophisticated nano-machines known, having been shaped over generations by natural selection. From an engineering perspective, few other systems offer more insights into designing devices on that size scale [8]. Our limited knowledge of protein structures thus limits our comprehension of biological phenomena, our ability to discover new drugs, and our capability to design bio-inspired materials [9–11]. In response, sizable research efforts are being expended on extracting exquisitely detailed information about protein structures and dynamics [12, 13].

Structural biology mostly relies on structural information obtained from diffraction-based methods. Since X-ray crystallography first enabled the formulation of the double-helix model for DNA and the structure determination of myoglobin, the number and quality of known biomolecular structures has steadily increased [14]. Protein crystallography, however, requires protein crystals, whose obtention is often the limiting experimental step. Many different areas of knowledge, from computational biology and robotics to surfactant science, have been brought together to partly surmount this hurdle [9]. Here, we review the insights brought by soft matter into the problem of protein crystal assembly. Although the dialog between the soft matter and structural biology communities has thus far mostly focused on providing a physical rationalization of experimental observations, recent conceptual advances and an increased back and forth between theory and experiment suggest that more fruitful exchanges may soon become the norm. In the following, we recapitulate how this advance has come to be. We first present an overview of the basics of protein crys-

tallography and protein crystal assembly. We then introduce and motivate various soft matter colloidal models of the phenomenon, and conclude with a brief discussion of possible future research directions.

I. DIFFRACTION AND PROTEIN CRYSTALLIZATION

Proteins are encoded in DNA as sequences of base pairs, which are then translated into a sequence of amino acids, forming the *primary* structure of the molecules. To perform their functions proteins must also hierarchically fold into their *secondary* and *tertiary* structures. It is indeed the properties of that three-dimensional object that largely determine how a protein interacts with its environment. This connection between function and shape is at the basis of both structural biology and structural genomics.

Advances in high-throughput sequencing have provided a marked increase of the number of protein-encoding genes and thus of known primary structures. Knowledge of the amino acid sequence alone, however, carries but little information on a protein's higher-order structure and thus of its function and behavior. Predicting a protein's full tertiary structure from its sequence is indeed a remarkably complex task [15]. For most intended purposes, protein structures thus cannot be inferred and must be determined from experimental methods. The most frequently used approaches for extracting that information are X-ray and neutron crystallography. In spite of important methodologically advances, NMR still cannot resolve the structure of proteins with more than few tens of amino acids [16], and even if recent studies have been able to push electron cryo-microscopy to near-atomic resolution [17], (sub-)atomic resolution may remain physically unattainable because of radiation damage, beam-induced movement and charging of the sample [18]. Other diffraction-based techniques are also in the works. Electrons, which scatter fairly strongly from molecules, provide a diffracted image of the Coulomb potential of a protein [19], and free-electron lasers (FEL), which produce intense and short

X-ray pulses, provide high-resolution structural information from relatively small crystals [20].

Whatever the chosen diffraction approach may be, prior to placing the sample in the collimated beam three main steps must be performed: (i) protein expression, which produces the actual molecules for the sample; (ii) protein purification, which separates the protein from everything else that was used to produce it; and (iii) protein crystallization, which brings together several copies of a same protein in an ordered and well-packed crystallite. The minimal size of a crystallite depends on the scattering intensity of the diffracted radiation (from tens of nanometers or less on the side for FEL to millimeters for neutron beams [21, 22]). Although each of these steps presents several research challenges, crystallization is by far the most troublesome of the lot [9–11, 23]. Under standard biological conditions, proteins do not easily crystallize because their assembly would interfere with their normal biological function (with some exceptions [9, 24]). Evidence even suggests that evolutionary pressure has been applied on proteins having molecular features that promote their solubility, rather than their crystallization [25, 26]. For instance, several neurodegenerative disorders, such as Alzheimer’s and Parkinson’s diseases, have been linked to protein solubilization failure resulting in unwanted aggregation [27], and cataract formation directly involves the crystallization of eye proteins [28–31]. Hence, in order to promote their periodic assembly, proteins must be placed in chemical conditions that are far from those encountered in biological systems, yet must not result in a loss of tertiary or secondary structure.

Even within those constraints, the chemical space that remains to be sampled in order to locate a set of conditions that promotes crystallization is so vast that exhaustive searches are beyond experimental reach. Crystallographers have thus developed chemical screens that summarize conditions that have worked in the past, which are complemented by choosing a few combinations of four families of co-solutes: inorganic salts, polymers (e.g., polyethylene glycol), small organic molecules and pH buffers [9]. Technological advances in automatizing the experimental process currently allow for thousands of these crystallization cocktails to be tested at once [32], but even that number is only a minute fraction of the full spectrum of possibilities.

Despite accrued experience and improved experimental techniques, successful crystallization nonetheless remains the exception rather than the rule. On average, only 0.04% of crystallization experiments generate good-quality crystals, which makes them quite time consuming and expensive [23]. Certain families of proteins, such as membrane proteins [33], are even harder to crystallize. Yet as long as crystallography remains the most desirable method for determining protein structures, a better understanding of the mechanisms underlying protein crystal assembly is the only possible path towards a high-throughput scheme to match that developed for




FIG. 1. Schematic description of the vicious circle of protein crystallization. The crystals that are needed to obtain protein structures through diffraction (green arrow), could more easily be obtained if experimental phase diagrams were known (black arrow). Experimental phase diagrams are, however, expensive to determine, whereas phase diagrams of coarse-grained models that mimic protein behavior may be accessible via simulations or numerical methods (blue arrow). An appropriate protein model should stem from detailed understanding of the protein-protein interactions that drive crystal assembly (red arrow). The computation of such interactions requires some knowledge of the protein structure (purple arrow), but not necessarily at the highest resolution. By contextualizing the observed protein behavior, soft matter models thus provide guidelines to refine crystallization screens.

genomics over the last couple of decades [12, 34].

II. SOLUBILITY PHASE DIAGRAMS AND PROTEIN CRYSTALLIZATION

Protein crystallization is a phase transition wherein protein molecules dispersed in an aqueous solvent aggregate in an ordered, periodic crystal. The process is in some ways similar to water freezing into ice. Although simplistic, this analogy suggests that statistical mechanics insights into protein self-assembly and liquid state theory may help make microscopic sense of the process. Protein crystallization should indeed naturally follow from the effective interactions between pairs of proteins (Fig. 1) [9, 35–37]. A detailed understanding of these interactions should thus correspond to a detailed understanding of the solution behavior. Yet, although the underlying forces through which proteins interact, i.e. hydrogen bonding, van der Waals and hydrophobic interactions, electrostatics, are individually fairly well characterized [38–42], their collective contribution to protein assembly is much less well understood [43]. A way to somehow coarsen the microscopic details into an effective description for protein-protein interactions is thus

needed.

Phase diagrams recapitulate the regions of parameter space in which different phases of matter are thermodynamically stable. For mixtures, the phase diagram is multi-dimensional, but in some systems two-dimensional projections, e.g., on the temperature-concentration plane of a key component, can recapitulate a significant share of that information. Many proteins indeed display a phase behavior that is analogous to that of a single-component system (for which this projection is complete). Crystal, liquid, vapor, and supercritical regimes are identifiable. The *vapor* phase corresponds to a low-concentration protein solution, the *liquid* to a high-concentration protein solution and the two phases are separated by a first-order transition, which terminates at a critical point and above which a supercritical regime is found. Because protein solutions are mixtures of proteins, water, and other additives, however, the phase match is not one to one. A protein crystal, for instance, contains on average more than 40% water [44] and may embed some of the co-solutes in fractions that differ from what is left in crystallization cocktail.

The phase diagram of a couple of common proteins, such as lysozyme and gamma-crystalline, have been experimentally determined under different solution conditions [45–50]. Intriguingly, these protein phase diagrams share a common topology that is qualitatively different from that of simple liquids [51] (Fig. 2). In simple liquids, the first-order phase transition between a vapor and a liquid phase terminates at a stable critical point that lies *above* the solubility curve, whereas in proteins the critical point is typically situated *below* the solubility line. The protein gas-liquid binodal that terminates at the critical point is, therefore, metastable with respect to gas-crystal coexistence (Fig. 2).

It is empirically found that successful crystallization typically appears to be most common when a protein solution drop is prepared in the supersaturated region between the solubility line and the metastable critical point, a region that is sometimes called the nucleation zone or the crystallization gap (Fig. 2A) [9]. If it is prepared at temperatures below the critical temperature, the system likely aggregates in a disordered, percolating network, i.e., a gel. Such aggregation, although thermodynamically metastable with respect to crystal assembly, forms much more rapidly and is often long-lived. It thus reduces the likelihood of successful protein crystallization.

Based on this description, given a protein phase diagram, protein crystallization should be easily achieved (Fig 1). Unfortunately, experimental determination of protein phase diagrams (considering the vast number of possible co-solutes) is a lot more time- and resource-consuming than even the most ambitious crystallization screens. Hence, although physically elegant, a direct approach would be of limited practical relevance. This picture may also be overly reductive in the sense that a protein’s structure can also respond to changing the solution conditions. In order to gain useful insights about

protein crystal assembly, one must therefore extract the key features of their phase diagrams with limited information. Models are then needed to fill in the missing information (Fig. 1).

III. EARLY COLLOIDAL MODELS OF PROTEIN PHASE BEHAVIOR

Soft matter has grown from our desire to understand the assembly of squishy, mesoscale objects, such as polymers, liquid crystals, grains, and cells. From the self-assembly of these objects emerges a surprisingly complex array of material behaviors, including glass formation and jamming, ordered microphases, and tissue growth. Soft materials are also particularly interesting because a large part of their complexity can be recapitulated by the statistical mechanics of purely classical models, and because for these models the relevant range of physical parameters is much wider than for comparable descriptions of atomic-scale simple liquids.

Colloidal suspensions in some ways epitomize soft matter, because of their rich yet well-controlled and robust phenomenology. In the mid-80’s, suspensions of purely repulsive colloidal particles were observed to crystallize similarly to hard spheres [52]. The addition of a depletant, i.e., a soluble and chemically inert co-solute that is much smaller than the colloidal particles, to such a suspension had long been understood to result in a net pair attraction between particles [53, 54]. From van der Waals description and the law of corresponding states, the expectation then was that adding a net attraction to hard spheres should result in a liquid-gas coexistence that terminates at a critical point (at sufficiently low temperatures or, equivalently, at sufficiently high depletant concentration) [51]. Experimental observations, however, repeatedly observed that adding a sufficient amount of depletant systematically results in the formation of amorphous colloidal gels [55].

A possible resolution to this discrepancy emerged from the work of Lekkerkerker and Frenkel [56, 57], who found that decreasing the attraction range lowers the gas-liquid critical point more than it lowers the crystal solubility curve (Fig. 2B). For particles with an attraction range $\lesssim 25\%$ of their diameter, the critical point even falls below the solubility curve. The study of many different models has confirmed the robustness of this result [58–65], and its universality was synthesized in an extended law of corresponding-states for systems with short-range attraction [66, 67].

The change in behavior observed in going from long- to short-range attraction can be intuitively explained by considering the energy-entropy balance in the liquid and crystal phases. For long-range interactions, there exists a concentration-temperature range in which the liquid particles are close enough to benefit from each other’s attraction while maintaining the high entropy characteristic of disordered configurations (Fig. 2B). The liquid




FIG. 2. A: Typical topology of a protein phase diagram. At low saturation (yellow in the color bar), the drive to crystallize is insufficient to generate crystals within a reasonable time scale. At high saturation (red in the color bar), protein interactions are so strong that the molecules amorphaously aggregate. In between lies the nucleation zone (or crystallization gap), where crystal assembly is possible (green in the color bar). B: The relative range of attraction affects the phase diagram topology. In simple liquids, the interaction range is sufficiently large to allow the liquid state to be entropically stable (top half). By contrast, in short-range attractive colloids and in proteins, the entropic cost of the liquid state lowers the critical point below the solubility line (bottom half).

free-energy is therefore lower than that of the crystal, despite the crystal's lower potential energy. When the interaction range is reduced, however, particles in the liquid have to be much closer to each other in order to remain within the attraction range (Fig. 2B). This constraint drastically reduces the number of low-energy configurations, and hence decreases the liquid entropy (and increases its free energy). For interaction ranges of order 10% of the particle diameter, which corresponds to the typical lattice spacing of a typical hard sphere crystal near coexistence [68], the crystal's entropy indeed remains almost unchanged. As a result, the liquid free-energy raises above that of the crystal and the liquid phase ceases to be thermodynamically stable (Fig. 2B).

From a thermodynamic standpoint, the critical point and the gas-liquid coexistence binodal then cease to exist. Yet careful theoretical and experimental work have showed that their dynamical influence does not fully disappear. Supersaturated systems near the hidden critical point experience critical fluctuations that lower the barrier to crystal nucleation [69]. Homogeneous systems quenched to the spinodal region further undergo a spontaneous phase separation whose early behavior is characteristic of spinodal decomposition. This decomposition, however, quickly gets arrested because of the sluggish dynamics of particles in the dense phase, which freezes in a percolating gel network [70–75].

From the soft matter viewpoint, the analogy between the phase diagrams of colloidal suspensions and of protein solutions became compelling [46, 69, 76, 77]. The logical association is supported by more than just a similarity in the phase diagram topology, which is a fairly perspective. Some microscopic evidence also drove the thinking. First,

many proteins, especially globular proteins, are roughly spherical objects with a diameter of at least few nanometers, while the mechanisms that result in pair attraction, e.g., hydrogen bonding, salt bridges, and the hydrophobic effect, are of the order of few angstroms. These attractive forces thus stretch to at most 10% of the protein diameter. Second, George and Wilson observed that the optimal solution conditions for protein crystallization were consistent with a proximity to a critical point [78]. Third, statistical studies of protein crystals at the time were not finding clear statistical signatures of a preferred relative orientation of proteins chains, which suggested that protein-protein attraction driving crystal assembly was orientation-independent (isotropic) [79, 80]. Although this last suggestion would prove to be problematic, as we discuss in Sec. IV, a number of studies nonetheless used simple short-range attractive particles to rationalize the phase diagram [62, 81] and solution behavior [82–84] of specific proteins as well as to make generic arguments about their heterogeneous nucleation [85].

IV. PATCHY COLLOIDAL MODELS OF PHASE BEHAVIOR

Though appealing in their simplicity, colloidal descriptions based on isotropic interactions between proteins are overly simplistic and miss some of the key phenomenology of globular proteins [46, 49, 86–88]. First, isotropic interactions systematically result in densely-packed crystals, such as the face-centered-cubic (FCC) or body-centered-cubic (BCC) lattices (Fig. 3), while crystals of biomolecules are fairly *empty*. Their pack-

ing fraction η , i.e., the fraction of space physically occupied by proteins, is found to be between 0.3 and 0.5 (compared to 0.74 and 0.68 for FCC and BCC, respectively), even though the protein chains themselves are essentially close packed [89]. Second, the region identified by the metastable vapor-liquid line is much wider for isotropically interacting particles than it is for proteins [88, 90, 91]. Third, protein-chain point mutations that change a single amino acid residue at the protein surface can dramatically alter the topology of a protein phase diagram [49]. By contrast, if attraction were truly isotropic, such a small perturbation would be unlikely to have but a small quantitative impact on the phase behavior.

From a (bio)chemical viewpoint, these observations are far from surprising. Protein surfaces are heterogeneous and complex. There is thus no reason to believe that different relative protein orientations should result in similar interactions. Unlike depletion attractions, hydrogen bonding and salt bridges are strongly directional and localized; they do not evenly cover the whole protein surface. Even more generic phenomena such as hydrophobicity relies on the existence a particularly good structural match (recognition) between two parts of a protein surface, and thus exhibits a strong orientation dependence. We also now better appreciate, thanks to more careful statistical analysis of a protein crystals, that protein-protein crystal contacts are quite different from randomly chosen elements of protein surfaces. They are enriched in glycine and small hydrophobic residues, and depleted in large polar residues with high side-chain entropy, such as lysine and glutamic acids [92]. Additionally, a large fraction of glycine and alanine on a protein surface correlates with a higher probability of having been crystallized [93].

A. Simple Patches

Under the weight of this evidence, it dawned on soft matter that directional aspects of protein pair interactions ought to be taken into account, in order to develop even only a minimal model of proteins (Fig. 3). Bonding directionality indeed makes proteins' solution behavior more akin to that of associative liquids, such as water, than that of simple (radially-symmetric) liquids. Coincident with this realization, came to life the promise of synthetic colloids with an increasing degree of sophistication [91]. Soft matter interest in colloidal particles with directional, short-ranged interactions thus boomed.

A broad array of schematic models with anisotropic, directional attraction, i.e., *patchy* particle models, have since been studied. The model details vary, but all of them add angular directionality to a relatively short-range pair interaction, allowing only specific regions of particle surfaces to attract one another (Fig. 3). These models have been found to have significantly different phase behavior [88, 91, 94–96], fluid properties [97],

and assembly pathways [98, 99] than isotropic models. Most saliently, patchiness lowers the metastable critical point further than isotropic attraction and allows the complex geometries of protein crystals to be thermodynamically stable. Although patchiness increased the model complexity, it also simplified their theoretical analysis. Patchiness indeed requires the specification of more model parameters and results in a certain loss of universality [91, 100], but also weakens high-order correlations in the fluid structure, which motivates the use of relatively simple liquid-state descriptions, such as Wertheim's theory [51, 101–106].

Because most of the theoretical studies were motivated by the promises of colloidal synthesis [107, 108], however, they often focused on either varying the number of patches on a given particle [109–112], or on varying the surface coverage of single-patch (Janus) particles [113–115]. For particles with 1 to 3 patches, small perturbations to the number of patches dramatically affects the liquid phase behavior, notably enabling the stabilization of empty liquids – liquid states with a vanishing density [109, 116]. Yet this regime is likely of limited interest to protein crystal assembly. Monomeric protein crystals nearly always display the minimal number of patches necessary for mechanical stability, i.e., six. In addition, the lack of evolutionary pressure for proteins crystallization results in the protein crystals having most commonly the lowest-symmetry (chiral – amino acids chains are chiral objects) point group compatible with that number of contacts, i.e. $P2_12_12_1$ [117]. Oligomeric proteins may form crystals with a larger number of patches, but that phenomenon has received limited attention from soft matter thus far [118].

B. Specific Patches

Most of the above studies have therefore not been much concerned with another key feature of protein-protein interactions that is the one-to-one relationship between pairs of crystal contacts (Fig. 3). Indeed, because pairwise attraction between proteins depends sensitively on molecular details, a given patch typically interacts exclusively with a single other patch, to the exclusion of all others. This interaction specificity has a sizable effect on protein assembly. It affects the liquid entropy and thus the position of the metastable critical point relative to the solubility curve [106, 119–122].

With interaction specificity also comes energy heterogeneity. Because each pair of interacting patches relies on different physicochemical mechanisms, their bonding strength varies [122]. Studies of patchy particles models have not paid much attention to this bond energy asymmetry, but our recent results suggest that this factor may play a key role in protein assembly. This asymmetry alone can indeed result in gel formation due to percolation, the closing of the crystallization gap, and the restabilization of the critical point above the crystal




FIG. 3. Increase in model complexity is necessary to accommodate the high interaction specificity that is characteristic of protein-protein interactions. Isotropic interactions, which are well-suited to describe simple liquids or depletion interaction in colloids, exclusively depend on the inter-particle distance and assemble in close-packed crystals (left). Thermodynamic stability of low-density crystal requires directionality, which is introduced in patchy models by requiring the alignment of the surface patches for two particles to interact (middle, red patches have to face one another). The highly heterogeneous protein surface requires, however, additional constraints, in which patches interact with only one partner-patch, not promiscuously (right, only patches of the same color interact).

solubility line [122]. Future studies will surely expand this list. Note that although no colloidal particle with surfaces as complex as those of proteins have yet been synthesized, patchy coatings of complementary selective DNA strands offer a synthetic gateway to obtaining such surface features [108].

C. Measuring Patches

As argued above, in order to develop patchy models that can accommodate protein crystal assembly, a better description of the patch energetics and coverage is necessary. Some insights can be gained directly from the PDB, because it provides a wealth of structural information about crystal contacts [92, 123]. Relating this information to an effective free energy of interaction in solution, however, is not straightforward. And, thus far, very few characterizations of crystal contacts have been done.

Early efforts used a phenomenological model to relate the PDB structure to pair interactions [119], which was then used to recapitulate the phase behavior of bovine chymotrypsinogen. Existing chemical databases do not suffice, however, to generalize this approach with much accuracy. More recent attempts have used all-atom molecular dynamics simulations of protein pairs in solutions in order to extract the angularly-resolved potential of mean force [106, 124, 125]. Within the quality of the selected molecular force fields, these simulations offer a reasonable characterization of known crystal con-

tacts. Some of these studies were even able to capture the crystal assembly behavior of various proteins. As long as sufficient structural information about patchiness is available, *crystal* patch energetics can thus be reconstructed reasonably well (Fig. 1).

For most systems, however, this information is not known. It is thus problematic to measure the patch characteristics of proteins that have not yet been crystallized or for those that display patchy interactions that are incompatible with the crystal structure. Because for the vast majority of proteins no structural information is available at all, the former is a genuine difficulty. The latter is also important, because evidence suggests that *non-crystallographic* contacts may play a kinetic role in protein crystal assembly [126] and may even make metastable crystal phases kinetically accessible [118].

Yet even if the structure of a protein of interest were fully known, brute force molecular dynamics sampling of the relative surface of a pair of proteins is well beyond computational reach. A hierarchy of methods for identifying candidate attractive patches without complete exhaustion is a more promising way forward. Approaches that consider protein-protein “docking predictions” as well as structural homology, followed by testing of these suggestions by higher-precision methods have been used for that purpose [106], but it is still early days for this idea.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND OPEN QUESTIONS

Soft matter has thus far provided a qualitative physical perspective to the problem of protein crystal assembly. In order to push the analogy between soft matter and protein assembly forward, both qualitative and quantitative improvements are needed.

First, as argued in Sec. IV C, more and higher quality information about the protein-protein interactions that give rise to patchiness must be obtained. For guiding the crystallization of protein homologues or optimizing solution conditions for improving the crystal quality in order to enhance structural resolution or for neutron scattering, this information could be particularly useful. From a computational viewpoint, insights could be obtained through large-scale simulations in order to extract angularly-resolved potentials of mean force of these interactions. If a sufficiently large database of interactions were available, it might even be conceivable to use statistical methods to parametrize the patchiness of protein-protein interactions without first extensively simulating the system. From an experimental viewpoint, careful studies of weak protein-protein interactions, as has recently been done for ubiquitin in solution would also be of much help [127]. The design of proteins that easily crystallize could cross-validate and further enrich the microscopic insights obtained from the direct studies of protein-protein interactions [128].

Second, richer varieties of patchy models ought to be developed in order to address basic qualitative questions about protein crystal assembly. For instance,

1. What is the role of competing patches and dimer formation? Some proteins are observed to crystallize in more than one crystal lattice in the same solution composition [129–132]. The type of crystal assembled can then depend on the initial protein concentration in the drop, the temperature at which the experiment is performed, and the length of the experiments.
2. What is the role of internal flexibility? The paradigm of a single well-folded protein structure is known to be overly simplistic [133], but it remains a key requirement for protein crystal assembly. Internal flexibility of the protein may therefore interfere with crystal assembly.
3. What causes inverted solubility? Some proteins are characterized by a decreasing protein solubility with increasing temperature, i.e., and *inverted solubility* [134–136]. Sometimes a single mutation can flip the solubility curve [49]. This phenomenon is tentatively attributed to the temperature dependence of the water entropy [137, 138], but remains poorly understood overall.
4. What are minimal models for membrane protein crystal assembly? The crystallization of membrane

proteins typically involves quite different assembly principles than other proteins. Soft matter insights might be helpful in building better experimental guidance for this difficult, yet highly important [139], problem.

The coming years will likely see the emergence of increasingly rich patchy models that can provide a clearer physical understanding of these and related processes.

In closing, it is important to note that patchy models have found a use in the study of proteins, beyond their crystal assembly. Virus capsid assembly, in particular, has greatly benefited [140]. The aggregation of proteins into amorphous structures, such as amyloids, might also be within conceptual reach of similar approaches. The absence of clear microscopic information on the protein-protein contacts in these systems, however, provides an additional conceptual challenge. In that context, the study of protein crystal assembly, which has the advantage of providing such structural information as feedback when successful, may thus lead the way towards a better understanding a whole host of protein-protein interactions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the help of our colleagues, collaborators and coauthors, at Duke and beyond, who have patiently walked us through many aspects of protein science over the years. We also acknowledge support from National Science Foundation Grant no. NSF DMR-1055586.

Appendix A: Characterizing crystal contacts: specific vs. non-specific protein-protein interactions

Protein-protein interactions have often classified as being either *specific* and *non-specific*. Biological specificity is well-known to be a problematic label [141, Ch. 4], but it is nonetheless a quite prevalent characterization, including of protein interactions that control crystal assembly. Its precise meaning, however, unsurprisingly differs depending on the disciplinary context (Table A.1). In this appendix, we aim to identify these different significations and thus provide a brief guide to the reader of the scientific literature on the topic.

In chemistry, specificity distinguishes certain attraction forces from others, although the classification of the various physical mechanisms is not unambiguous [38, (§ 18.8)]. In biophysics, the distinction between specific and non-specific interactions typically relies on the existence of an energy gap that clearly divides a single, strong (specific) interaction from the other (non-specific) ones [25, 142]. In molecular biology, specific interactions are deemed responsible for the stoichiometric recognition of a given target, while non-specific interactions arise from the promiscuous yet non-biologically

Field	Specific interactions	Non-specific interactions
Chemistry	Hydrogen bonds, salt bridges	Hydrophobic, depletion, van der Waals, electrostatic
Biophysics	Unique, strong, energetically gapped	Many and weak
Molecular biology	Evolutionary tuned, strong, geometrically constrained	Weak, randomly distributed

TABLE A.1. Summary of the properties that differentiate specific from non-specific interactions in different fields of study

relevant association of molecules [79, 80, 143, 144]. Specific interactions have thus been evolutionarily tuned to be free-energetically strong and geometrically oriented, while non-specific attractions have not. As mentioned above, this general weakness, however, may itself have evolved so as to prevent pathological aggregation [25, 26]. Although these three definitions are not necessarily orthogonal to one another, we here specifically aim to clarify the last one.

When applied to crystal contacts specificity has been used to suggest that these biologically non-functional interactions are in many ways indistinguishable from interfaces obtained by randomly bringing two proteins together [25]. These interfaces do present characteristics

that are typical of non-specific interactions: they are weaker than functional interaction (of the order of few kJ/mol) and they do not have any obvious biological purpose. However, they also have unique properties that distinguish them from randomly selected surface patches [92, 93]. Specific local protein properties are correlated with crystallization and protein surface regions carrying such properties are more likely to be responsible for the interactions that drive crystal formation. Hence, crystal contacts are triggered by the basic chemical interactions that are used in any molecular system, although they are typically different from biologically functional interactions.

-
- [1] This is the so-called *revenge* of structural biology.
- [2] T. L. Blundell, H. Jhoti, and C. Abell, *Nat. Rev. Drug. Discov.* **1**, 45 (2002).
- [3] P. Kuhn, K. Wilson, M. G. Patch, and R. C. Stevens, *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.* **6**, 704 (2002).
- [4] T. L. Blundell and S. Patel, *Curr. Opin. Pharmacol.* **4**, 490 (2004).
- [5] I. Tickle, A. Sharff, M. Vinkovic, J. Yon, and H. Jhoti, *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **33**, 558 (2004).
- [6] D. B. Kitchen, H. Decornez, J. R. Furr, and J. Bajorath, *Nat. Rev. Drug. Discov.* **3**, 935 (2004).
- [7] M. Congreve, C. W. Murray, and T. L. Blundell, *Drug. Discov. Today* **10**, 895 (2005).
- [8] N. Huebsch and D. J. Mooney, *Nature* **462**, 426 (2009).
- [9] A. McPherson, *Crystallization of Biological Macromolecules* (CSHL Press, Cold Spring Harbor, 1999).
- [10] N. E. Chayen and E. Saridakis, *Nat. Meth.* **5**, 147 (2008).
- [11] N. E. Chayen, in *Advances in Protein Chemistry and Structural Biology*, edited by J. Andrzej (Academic Press, London, 2009), Vol. 77, pp. 1–22.
- [12] M. Morange, in *History and Epistemology of Molecular Biology and Beyond*, edited by H. Rheinberger and S. Chadarevian (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin, 2006), p. 179.
- [13] K. Khafizov, C. Madrid-Aliste, S. C. Almo, and A. Fiser, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 3733 (2014).
- [14] J. Nicola, *Nature* **505**, 603 (2014).
- [15] K. A. Dill and J. L. MacCallum, *Science* **338**, 1042 (2012).
- [16] S. Grzesiek and H.-J. Sass, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **19**, 585 (2009).
- [17] A. Doerr, *Nat. Meth.* **11**, 30 (2014).
- [18] X.-C. Bai, I. S. Fernandez, G. McMullan, and S. H. Scheres, *eLife* **2**, e00461 (2013).
- [19] K. Yonekura, K. Kato, M. Ogasawara, M. Tomita, and C. Toyoshima, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., U. S. A.* **112**, 3368 (2015).
- [20] T. R. Barends *et al.*, *Nature* **505**, 244 (2014).
- [21] H. P. Stevenson *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 8470 (2014).
- [22] M. P. Blakeley, P. Langan, N. Niimura, and A. Podjarny, *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **18**, 593 (2008).
- [23] L. Chen, R. Oughtred, H. M. Berman, and J. Westbrook, *Bioinformatics* **20**, 2860 (2004).
- [24] J. P. K. Doye and W. C. K. Poon, *Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci.* **11**, 40 (2006).
- [25] J. Janin, *Prog. Biophys. Mol. Biol.* **64**, 145 (1995).
- [26] J. P. K. Doye, A. A. Louis, and M. Vendruscolo, *Phys. Biol.* **1**, P9 (2004).
- [27] C. A. Ross and M. A. Poirier, *Nat. Med.* **10**, S10 (2004).
- [28] S. Kmoch, J. Brynda, B. Asfaw, K. Bezouska, P. Novak, P. Rezacova, L. Ondrova, M. Filipec, J. Sedlacek, and M. Elleder, *Hum. Mol. Gen.* **9**, 1779 (2000).
- [29] A. Pande, J. Pande, N. Asherie, A. Lomakin, O. Ogun, J. King, and G. B. Benedek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **98**, 6116 (2001).
- [30] P. Evans, K. Wyatt, G. J. Wistow, O. A. Bateman, B. A. Wallace, and C. Slingsby, *J. Mol. Biol.* **343**, 435 (2004).
- [31] F. F. Li, S. Z. Wang, C. Gao, S. G. Liu, B. J. Zhao, M. Zhang, S. Z. Huang, S. Q. Zhu, and X. Ma, *Mol. Vis.*

- 14, 378 (2008).
- [32] A. E. Bruno, A. M. Ruby, J. R. Luft, T. D. Grant, J. Seetharaman, G. T. Montelione, J. F. Hunt, and E. H. Snell, *PLoS ONE* **9**, e100782 (2014).
- [33] M. Caffrey, *J. Struct. Biol.* **142**, 108 (2003).
- [34] H. Stevens, *Life Out of Sequence: A Data-Driven History of Bioinformatics* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2013), p. 272.
- [35] Z. Derewenda, *Acta Crystallogr.: D Biol. Crystallogr.* **66**, 604 (2010).
- [36] M. J. Anderson, C. L. Hansen, and S. R. Quake, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **103**, 16746 (2006).
- [37] E. Saridakis and N. E. Chayen, *Trends Biotechnol.* **27**, 99 (2009).
- [38] J. N. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and surface forces* (Academic Press, San Diego, 1991).
- [39] D. Chandler, *Nature* **437**, 640 (2005).
- [40] J. D. Gunton, A. Shiryayev, and D. L. Pagan, *Protein Condensation* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 2007).
- [41] S. Granick and S. C. Bae, *Science* **322**, 1477 (2008).
- [42] B. J. Berne, J. D. Weeks, and R. Zhou, *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.* **60**, 85 (2009).
- [43] P. G. Vekilov and A. A. Chernov, *Solid State Phys.* **57**, 1 (2002).
- [44] B. W. Matthews, *J. Mol. Biol.* **33**, 491 (1968).
- [45] M. Malfois, F. Bonnete, L. Belloni, and A. Tardieu, *J. Chem. Phys.* **105**, 3290 (1996).
- [46] A. Lomakin, N. Asherie, and G. B. Benedek, *J. Chem. Phys.* **104**, 1646 (1996).
- [47] M. Muschol and F. Rosenberger, *J. Chem. Phys.* **107**, 1953 (1997).
- [48] A. Stradner, G. M. Thurston, and P. Schurtenberger, *J. Phys.-Condens. Matter* **17**, S2805 (2005).
- [49] J. J. McManus, A. Lomakin, O. Ogun, A. Pande, M. Basan, J. Pande, and G. B. Benedek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**, 16856 (2007).
- [50] C. Gogelein, D. Wagner, F. Cardinaux, G. Nagele, and S. U. Egelhaaf, *J. Chem. Phys.* **136**, 015102 (2012).
- [51] J. P. Hansen and I. R. McDonald, *Theory of simple liquids* (Academic Press, London, 2006).
- [52] P. N. Pusey and W. Vanmegen, *Nature* **320**, 340 (1986).
- [53] S. Asakura and F. Oosawa, *J. Chem. Phys.* **22**, 1255 (1954).
- [54] A. Vrij, *Pure & Appl. Chem.* **48**, 471 (1976).
- [55] A. P. Gast, C. K. Hall, and W. B. Russel, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.* **96**, 251 (1983).
- [56] H. N. W. Lekkerkerker, W. C. K. Poon, P. N. Pusey, A. Stroobants, and P. B. Warren, *Europhys. Lett.* **20**, 559 (1992).
- [57] M. H. J. Hagen and D. Frenkel, *J. Chem. Phys.* **101**, 4093 (1994).
- [58] N. Asherie, A. Lomakin, and G. B. Benedek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4832 (1996).
- [59] F. W. Tavares and S. I. Sandler, *AIChE J.* **43**, 218 (1997).
- [60] M. A. Miller and D. Frenkel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 135702 (2003).
- [61] H. Liu, S. Garde, and S. Kumar, *J. Chem. Phys.* **123**, 174505 (2005).
- [62] D. L. Pagan and J. D. Gunton, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 184515 (2005).
- [63] R. Lopez-Rendon, Y. Reyes, and P. Orea, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 084508 (2006).
- [64] J. Largo, M. A. Miller, and F. Sciortino, *J. Chem. Phys.* **128**, 134513 (2008).
- [65] A. Fortini, E. Sanz, and M. Dijkstra, *Phys. Rev. E* **78**, 041402 (2008).
- [66] M. G. Noro and D. Frenkel, *J. Chem. Phys.* **113**, 2941 (2000).
- [67] G. Foffi and F. Sciortino, *Phys Rev E* **74**, (2006).
- [68] B. Smit and D. Frenkel, *Understanding molecular simulation : from algorithms to applications, Computational science series 1* (London : Academic, London, 2002).
- [69] P. R. ten Wolde and D. Frenkel, *Science* **277**, 1975 (1997).
- [70] G. Foffi, C. De Michele, F. Sciortino, and P. Tartaglia, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 224903 (2005).
- [71] S. Manley, H. M. Wyss, K. Miyazaki, J. C. Conrad, V. Trappe, L. J. Kaufman, D. R. Reichman, and D. A. Weitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 238302 (2005).
- [72] S. Sastry, *Nature* **441**, 671 (2006).
- [73] P. Charbonneau and D. R. Reichman, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 050401 (2007).
- [74] S. Buzzaccaro, R. Rusconi, and R. Piazza, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 098301 (2007).
- [75] P. J. Lu, E. Zaccarelli, F. Ciulla, A. B. Schofield, F. Sciortino, and D. A. Weitz, *Nature* **453**, 499 (2008).
- [76] D. Rosenbaum, P. C. Zamora, and C. F. Zukoski, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 150 (1996).
- [77] N. E. Chayen, *Progr. Biophys. Mol. Biol.* **88**, 329 (2005).
- [78] A. George and W. W. Wilson, *Acta Crystallogr. D*: **50**, 361 (1994).
- [79] J. Janin and F. Rodier, *Proteins* **23**, 580 (1995).
- [80] O. Carugo and P. Argos, *Protein Sci.* **6**, 2261 (1997).
- [81] G. Pellicane, D. Costa, and C. Caccamo, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **108**, 7538 (2004).
- [82] A. Stradner, G. Foffi, N. Dorsaz, G. Thurston, and P. Schurtenberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 198103 (2007).
- [83] N. Dorsaz, G. M. Thurston, A. Stradner, P. Schurtenberger, and G. Foffi, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **113**, 1693 (2009).
- [84] G. Foffi, G. Savin, S. Bucciarelli, N. Dorsaz, G. M. Thurston, A. Stradner, and P. Schurtenberger, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **111**, 16748 (2014).
- [85] A. J. Page and R. P. Sear, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **131**, 17550 (2009).
- [86] C. Haas, J. Drenth, and W. W. Wilson, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **103**, 2808 (1999).
- [87] R. A. Curtis, H. W. Blanch, and J. M. Prausnitz, *J. Phys. Chem. B* **105**, 2445 (2001).
- [88] A. Lomakin, N. Asherie, and G. B. Benedek, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **96**, 9465 (1999).
- [89] F. M. Richards, *J. Mol. Biol.* **82**, 1 (1974).
- [90] H. Liu, S. K. Kumara, and F. Sciortino, *J. Chem. Phys.* **127**, 084902 (2007).
- [91] E. Bianchi, R. Blaak, and C. N. Likos, *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* **13**, 6397 (2011).
- [92] M. Cieslik and Z. S. Derewenda, *Acta Crystallogr. D Biol. Crystallogr.* **65**, 500 (2009).
- [93] W. N. Price *et al.*, *Nat Biotechnol* **27**, 51 (2009).
- [94] R. P. Sear, *J. Chem. Phys.* **111**, 4800 (1999).
- [95] J. Chang, A. M. Lenhoff, and S. I. Sandler, *J. Chem. Phys.* **120**, 3003 (2004).
- [96] C. Gögelein, G. Nägele, R. Tuinier, T. Gibaud, A. Stradner, and P. Schurtenberger, *J. Chem. Phys.* **129**, 085102 (2008).
- [97] B. L. Neal, D. Asthagiri, and A. M. Lenhoff, *Biophys. J.* **75**, 2469 (1998).

- [98] S. Whitelam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 088102 (2010).
- [99] T. K. Haxton and S. Whitelam, Soft Matter **8**, 3558 (2012).
- [100] G. Foffi and F. Sciortino, J. Phys. Chem. B **111**, 9702 (2007).
- [101] M. S. Wertheim, J. Stat. Phys. **35**, 19 (1984).
- [102] M. S. Wertheim, J. Stat. Phys. **35**, 35 (1984).
- [103] E. Bianchi, P. Tartaglia, E. La Nave, and F. Sciortino, J. Phys. Chem. B **111**, 11765 (2007).
- [104] E. Bianchi, P. Tartaglia, E. Zaccarelli, and F. Sciortino, J Chem Phys **128**, 144504 (2008).
- [105] E. Bianchi, R. Blaak, and C. N. Likos, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **13**, 6397 (2011).
- [106] D. Fusco, J. J. Headd, A. De Simone, J. Wang, and P. Charbonneau, Soft Matter **10**, 290 (2014).
- [107] S. C. Glotzer and M. J. Solomon, Nat. Mater. **6**, 557 (2007).
- [108] Y. Wang, Y. Wang, D. R. Breed, V. N. Manoharan, L. Feng, A. D. Hollingsworth, M. Weck, and D. J. Pine, Nature **491**, 51 (2012).
- [109] E. Bianchi, J. Largo, P. Tartaglia, E. Zaccarelli, and F. Sciortino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 168301 (2006).
- [110] P. Charbonneau and D. Frenkel, J. Chem. Phys. **126**, 196101 (2007).
- [111] F. Romano, E. Sanz, and F. Sciortino, J. Chem. Phys. **132**, 184501 (2010).
- [112] F. Romano, E. Sanz, and F. Sciortino, J. Chem. Phys. **134**, 174502 (2011).
- [113] R. Fantoni, D. Gazzillo, A. Giacometti, M. A. Miller, and G. Pastore, J. Chem. Phys. **127**, 234507 (2007).
- [114] S. Granick, S. Jiang, and Q. Chen, Physics Today **2009**, 68 (2009).
- [115] G. Munao, Z. Preisler, T. Vissers, F. Smallenburg, and F. Sciortino, Soft Matter **9**, 2652 (2013).
- [116] B. Ruzicka, E. Zaccarelli, L. Zulian, R. Angelini, M. Sztucki, A. Moussaid, T. Narayanan, and F. Sciortino, Nat. Mat. **10**, 56 (2010).
- [117] S. W. Wukovitz and T. O. Yeates, Nat. Struct. Biol. **2**, 1062 (1995).
- [118] D. Fusco and P. Charbonneau, J. Phys. Chem. B **118**, 8034 (2014).
- [119] M. Hloucha, J. F. M. Lodge, A. M. Lenhoff, and S. I. Sandler, J. Cryst. Growth **232**, 195 (2001).
- [120] N. M. Dixit and C. F. Zukoski, J. Chem. Phys. **117**, 8540 (2002).
- [121] N. Dorsaz, L. Filion, F. Smallenburg, and D. Frenkel, Farad. Disc. **159**, 9 (2012).
- [122] D. Fusco and P. Charbonneau, Phys. Rev. E **88**, 012721 (2013).
- [123] N. W. Price II *et al.*, Microb. Inform. Exp. **1**, 1 (2011).
- [124] G. Pellicane, G. Smith, and L. Sarkisov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 248102 (2008).
- [125] A. Taudt, A. Arnold, and J. Pleiss, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 033311 (2015).
- [126] J. D. Schmit and K. Dill, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **134**, 3934 (2012).
- [127] Z. Liu, W.-P. Zhang, Q. Xing, X. Ren, M. Liu, and C. Tang, Angewandte Chemie International Edition **51**, 469 (2012).
- [128] C. J. Lanci, C. M. MacDermaid, S.-g. Kang, R. Acharya, B. North, X. Yang, X. J. Qiu, W. F. DeGrado, and J. G. Saven, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **109**, 7304 (2012).
- [129] M. Dixon, H. Nicholson, L. Shewchuk, W. Baase, and B. Matthews, J. Mol. Biol. **227**, 917 (1992).
- [130] H. Faber and B. Matthews, Nature **348**, 263 (1990).
- [131] D. E. McRee, S. M. Redford, T. E. Meyer, and M. A. Cusanovich, J. Biol. Chem. **265**, 5364 (1990).
- [132] A. V. Elgersma, M. Ataka, and T. Katsura, J. Cryst. Growth **122**, 31 (1992).
- [133] P. E. Wright and H. J. Dyson, Nat. Rev. **16**, 18 (2015).
- [134] M. Budayova-Spano, F. Bonnet, J.-P. Astier, and S. Veessler, J. Cryst. Growth **235**, 547 (2002).
- [135] M. Budayova-Spano, S. Lafont, J.-P. Astier, C. Ebel, and S. Veessler, J. Cryst. Growth **217**, 311 (2000).
- [136] S. Veessler, N. Fert, M.-S. Costes, M. Czjzek, and J.-P. Astier, Cryst. Growth & Design **4**, 1137 (2004).
- [137] A. Shirayayev, D. L. Pagan, J. D. Gunton, D. S. Rhen, A. Saxena, and T. Lookman, J. Chem. Phys. **122**, 234911 (2005).
- [138] N. Wentzel and J. D. Gunton, J. Phys. Chem. B **112**, 7803 (2008).
- [139] A. Bhattacharya, Nature **459**, 24 (2009).
- [140] M. F. Hagan, Advances in Chemical Physics: **155**, 1 (2014).
- [141] L. E. Kay, *Who Wrote the Book of Life?: A History of the Genetic Code* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, 2000).
- [142] M. E. Johnson and G. Hummer, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **108**, 603 (2011).
- [143] K. D. Wilkinson, in *Protein-Protein Interactions: Methods and Protocols* (Humana Press, New York, 2004), Vol. 261, pp. 15–31.
- [144] T. Zhuang, B. K. Jap, and C. R. Sanders, J. Am. Chem. Soc. **133**, 20571 (2011).