

# The finite size effects and the two-state paradigm of protein folding

Artem Badasyan\*

*Materials Research Laboratory & School of Science,  
University of Nova Gorica, Vipavska 13, SI-5000 Nova Gorica, Slovenia*

Matjaz Valant

*Materials Research Laboratory & School of Environmental Sciences,  
University of Nova Gorica, Vipavska 13, SI-5000 Nova Gorica, Slovenia and  
University of Electronic Science and Technology of China,  
Institute of Fundamental and Frontier Sciences, Chengdu 610054, China*

Joze Grdadolnik

*National Institute of Chemistry, Hajdrihova 19, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia*

Vladimir N. Uversky

*Department of Molecular Medicine and USF Health Byrd Alzheimer's Research Institute,  
Morsani College of Medicine, University of South Florida,  
12901 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., MDC07, Tampa. Florida 33612, USA*

(Dated: October 27, 2020)

The coil to globule transition of the polypeptide chain is the physical phenomenon behind the folding of globular proteins. Globular proteins with a single domain usually consist of about 30 to 100 amino acid residues, and this finite size extends the transition interval of the coil-globule phase transition. Based on the pedantic derivation of the two-state model, we introduce the number of amino acid residues of a polypeptide chain as a parameter in the expressions for two cooperativity measures and reveal their physical significance. We conclude that the  $k_2$  measure, related to the degeneracy of the denatured state, describes the number of cooperative units involved in the transition; additionally is found that the famous condition  $k_2 = 1$  is just the necessary condition to classify the protein as the two-state folder. We also find that  $\Omega_c$  is simply proportional to the square of the transition interval. This fact allows us to perform the classical size scaling analysis of the coil-globule phase transition. Moreover, these two measures are shown to describe different characteristics of protein folding.

From the point of view of Polymer Physics the folding of a protein is similar to the coil-globule transition of a short polypeptide chain [1]. The coil-globule transition is known as the phase transition of first (in rigid) or second order (in flexible chains) [1, 2]. By following the behaviour of the order parameter (degree of "nativeness")  $f_N(T) \in [1, 0]$  or its counterpart ("denaturation" degree)  $f_D(T) = 1 - f_N(T)$  it is possible to describe the phenomenon; the condition

$$f_N(T_D) = f_D(T_D) = 0.5 \quad (1)$$

defines the folding temperature  $T_D$ .

If there are no finite size effects or heterogeneity<sup>1</sup>, the order parameter at the transition point undergoes an abrupt all-or-none fashion. Responsible for this coil-globule **phase transition** are strong correlations between repeat unit conformations, which occur due to the

van der Waals interactions between the remote repeat units [1]. Changes in external conditions (temperature, pressure, pH, solution composition...) shift the equilibrium in these effective interactions from repulsion (good solvent regime) via neutral (ideal or theta conditions) to attraction (poor solvent regime), which forces the protein to fold. The hydrogen bonds, which are responsible for the formation of secondary structures, have a shorter span and influence the conformations locally. Therefore, according to the Landau-Pierls theorem [3] the hydrogen bonds cannot *per se* lead to coil-globule (phase) transition [1, 4]. However, in the presence of other long-range interactions, the formation of secondary structures can change the effective stiffness of the polypeptide chain, increase stability and thus promote the coil-globule transition. Indirect support for such a mechanism arises from the fact that both the coil-helix transition and protein folding occur at the same interval of external parameters [5].

**Thermodynamic cooperativity** as a concept is often attributed to the sharpness of the phase transition, which results from the spatially correlated behaviour of the particles (in this case repeating units). The situation of the idealized first-order phase transition with correla-

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of heteropolymeric effects in the coil-globule transition is outside the scopes of the current study.

tions that extend throughout the system and lead to the discontinuity of order parameter corresponds to infinite cooperativity and the zero transition interval. When it comes to the folding of single domain globular proteins of just  $N < 100$  repeating units long, the limited system sizes impose constraints onto otherwise infinite correlations at transition point. Consequently, the folding happens over some small temperature interval  $\Delta T (\neq 0)$ , which needs to be estimated. Using the Taylor expansion cut at first order, it is possible to approximate the order parameter with the help of the tangent at transition point

$$f_D(T) \approx f_D^{appr}(T) = f_D(T_D) + f'_D(T)|_{T_D}(T - T_D). \quad (2)$$

From the definitions of initial and final temperatures as  $f_D^{appr}(T_1) = 0$  and  $f_D^{appr}(T_2) = 1$ , one can define the transition interval (see e.g. [6, 7]) as

$$T_2 - T_1 = \Delta T = f'_D(T)|_{T_D}^{-1}. \quad (3)$$

The derivative of the order parameter at the transition point is the experimentally measurable quantity that provides access to information on the system's cooperativity. The temperature is not the only possible external parameter that can induce the transition. The experiments are often set by changing the concentration of denaturant such as urea or guanidinium chloride (GdmCl). After repeating the steps behind Eq. (2), the resulting expression for the change in the number of bound denaturant molecules during the transition is

$$n_2 - n_1 = \Delta n = f'_D(n)|_{n_D}^{-1}, \quad (4)$$

so that the thermodynamic cooperativity of transition can be still estimated by the measured slope of the transition curve at its middle point.

**The two-state model** is the simplest among the folding models, yet very general and fruitful and therefore deserves a detailed, even pedantic derivation of its formulas. Within the two-state paradigm the presence of just two possible macroscopic states is assumed: the native globular state with the energy value  $E_N$ , and the denatured coil one with the energy  $E_D$ . To reflect the uniqueness of the native state, a degeneracy  $g_N = 1$  is attributed; a  $g_D \gg 1$  degeneracy is set for the denatured state to reflect its greater conformational entropic freedom. Without any loss of generality one can assume  $E_N = 0$ ,  $E_D \neq 0$  and write down the density of states for the two-state model

$$g(E) = \delta(E) + g_D \delta(E - E_D), \quad (5)$$

where  $\delta(x)$  is Dirac delta function, resulting in the partition function

$$Z(\beta) = \int_0^\infty dE g(E) e^{-\beta E} = 1 + g_D e^{-\beta E_D} = [N] + [D], \quad (6)$$

where [...] is the number of repeat units in the native or denatured state, and  $\beta = 1/T$  is inverse temperature. The average energy is just the internal energy of the system, and follows directly as

$$\langle E(\beta) \rangle = \frac{\int_0^\infty dE g(E) e^{-\beta E} E}{\int_0^\infty dE g(E) e^{-\beta E}} = - \frac{d \log Z(\beta)}{d\beta} = \frac{g_D e^{-\beta E_D}}{1 + g_D e^{-\beta E_D}} E_D, \quad (7)$$

leading to the heat capacity

$$C_V(\beta) = -\beta^2 \frac{d \langle E \rangle}{d\beta} = (\beta E_D)^2 \frac{g_D e^{-\beta E_D}}{(1 + g_D e^{-\beta E_D})^2}. \quad (8)$$

The denaturation degree reads

$$f_D(\beta) = \frac{[D]}{[N] + [D]} = \frac{g_D e^{-\beta E_D}}{1 + g_D e^{-\beta E_D}} = \frac{\langle E(\beta) \rangle}{E_D} = - \frac{1}{E_D} \frac{d \log Z(\beta)}{d\beta}, \quad (9)$$

and the equilibrium constant

$$K_{eq}(\beta) = \frac{[D]}{[N]} = \frac{f_D(\beta)}{1 - f_D(\beta)} = g_D e^{-\beta E_D}. \quad (10)$$

At transition point the numbers of repeat units in the native  $N$  or the denatured  $D$  state are equal and with the help of Eq. (9) we can express the transition temperature Eq. (1) and interval Eq. (3) in terms of two-state model parameters as

$$T_D = \frac{E_D}{\log g_D}; \quad \Delta T = \frac{4E_D}{\log^2 g_D}. \quad (11)$$

Excluding  $\log g_D$  from the last expression we re-derive the famous expression for the energetic price of transition between the two states as

$$E_D = \frac{4T_D^2}{\Delta T}. \quad (12)$$

Privalov and Kheshinashvili [8] refer to Eq. (12) as approximation, but as we have shown above, it is indeed exact within the two-state picture. Since all the above formulae are derived under the assumption of the existence of strictly two states, results can only be attributed to one **cooperative unit**, i.e. a part of a molecule that undergoes the transition from  $N$  to  $D$  as a whole. Microcalorimetry allows the simultaneous measurement of the transition enthalpies for the whole protein molecule and for the cooperative unit [9]. Potentiometric titration also allows the difference in the degree of ionization to be measured for the entire molecule and compared with the value for the cooperative unit [10].

**The order** of a conformational transition can be evaluated by analysing the dependence of the slope of the

transition on the molecular weight of the protein ( $M$ ), which is linearly proportional to the degree of polymerisation  $N$ . It is clear that the slope of the phase transition in small systems depends on the dimensions of this system [1, 11]. In the case of first-order phase transition, the slope increases proportionally to the number of units in a system [11], while the slope for second-order phase transition is proportional to the square root of this number [1].

**The system sizes** can be introduced by the reasonable assumption that each repeating unit of the polypeptide chain can be found in one out of  $Q > 2$  rotational isomeric states, only one of which corresponds to the native. Since there is  $N$  such repeating units, the number of possible states in denatured conformation for the whole macromolecule and the additive energy of the system read

$$g_D = (Q - 1)^N; E_D = \epsilon_D N. \quad (13)$$

In view of Eq. (11) it means

$$T_D(N) = \frac{\epsilon_D}{\log(Q - 1)}; \Delta T(N) = \frac{4T_D}{\log(Q - 1)} \frac{1}{N}. \quad (14)$$

This is a very interesting result, which shows that within the two-state paradigm, denaturation temperature does not depend on system size. Instead, the transition interval is inversely proportional to  $N$ , which naturally leads to a zero interval at  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , just as it should in case of the phase transition.

This is a very interesting result, showing that within the two-state paradigm the denaturation temperature does not depend on system sizes. Instead, the transition interval is inversely proportional to  $N$ , naturally resulting in zero interval at  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , exactly as it should in case of the phase transition.

**The criterion of two-state cooperativity**  $k_2$  of protein folding has already been discussed in detail (see *e.g.* [12, 13] and references therein). It is defined as the ratio of vant Hoff and calorimetric enthalpy (energy)

$$k_2 = \frac{\Delta E_{vH}}{\Delta E_{cal}}, \quad (15)$$

where the vant Hoff energy is

$$\Delta E_{vH} = -\frac{d \log K_{eq}(\beta)}{d\beta} = E_D, \quad (16)$$

and the amount of heat exchanged during the transition is calculated as the integral under the heat capacity curve:

$$\Delta E_{cal} = \int_0^\infty dT C_V(T) = E_D \frac{g_D}{1 + g_D}. \quad (17)$$

According to Eqs. (13),(16),(17), the resulting

$$k_2 = \frac{\Delta E_{vH}}{\Delta E_{cal}} = 1 + 1/g_D = 1 + O(e^{-N \log(Q-1)}), \quad (18)$$

is an expression that asymptotically tends to 1 (from above) for large  $N$ . It can be concluded that the two-state *ansatz*, expressed in Eq. (5), results in  $k_2 = 1$ , making it the **necessary** condition for the transition to be classified as a two-state. Please note, strictly speaking, it follows from nothing that  $k_2 = 1$  means that the transition is two-state. In a certain sense, the condition is negative: if  $k_2$  is different from unity, the transition cannot be two-state, while if it is close to the unity, it is not enough to conclude the two-state behaviour.

### The folding cooperativity measure

$$\Omega_c = \frac{T_D^2}{\Delta T} \frac{df_D}{dT} \Big|_{T=T_D} \quad (19)$$

was proposed by Klimov and Thirumalai [14] to compare the cooperativities of different proteins. Based on a collection of experimental and simulation data of protein folding, a size scaling law for the folding cooperativity measure  $\Omega_c \propto N^{1+\gamma}$  [15] was later suggested, where  $\gamma$  is a susceptibility exponent.

Li *et al* define the interval  $\Delta T^* = T_2^* - T_1^*$  as the width at half-height of the differential curve [15]. One can approximate the peaked curve by the rectangle with sides at  $T_1^*$  and  $T_2^*$  and the height  $|f'_D(T)|_{T_D}$  in such a way, that  $1 = \int_0^\infty f'_N(T) dT \approx |f'_D(T)|_{T_D} (T_2^* - T_1^*)$ . With the account of Eq. (3) this leads to the obvious  $\Delta T^* = \Delta T$ , proving that both definitions of transition interval are equivalent, at least in the sense of asymptotic, size scaling relations. The same Eq. (3), when inserted into the cooperativity measure Eq. (19) simply results in

$$\Omega_c = \left( \frac{T_D}{\Delta T} \right)^2. \quad (20)$$

The result is not surprising, since the  $\frac{T_D}{\Delta T}$  ratio is common in the studies of finite size effects at phase transitions [16–18]. In view of Eq. (14), valid for the two-state model it simply means that

$$\Omega_c = (\log g_D / 4)^2 \propto N^2. \quad (21)$$

However, if not bound to the two-state paradigm, the more general and model-independent formula expressed with Eq. (20) allows to establish direct links between the well-known size scaling relations and the cooperativity measure  $\Omega_c$ . To take into account the possibility for both Ist and IInd order mechanisms of the phase transition,  $\frac{T_D}{\Delta T} \propto N^{1/d\nu}$  scaling should be considered [16–19] (instead of  $N^1$ , used by Li *et al*), where  $d\nu$  is a critical exponent of correlation length or radius of gyration;  $d\nu = 1$  and  $d\nu = 2$  values would correspond to the first and the second order phase transition, accordingly. From Eq. (20) it immediately follows, that

$$\Omega_c \propto N^{2/d\nu}. \quad (22)$$

In Fig. 1 we have replotted data from Ref. 15 and compared them with Eq. (20). The data points for  $\ln \Omega_c$  and




FIG. 1. The dependence of  $\ln \Omega_c$  ( $\times$ ) and  $2 \ln(\frac{T_D}{\Delta T})$  ( $\square$ ) vs  $\ln N$ . Straight lines, corresponding to the linear fits for both data point collections are indistinguishable on the graph.

$2 \ln \frac{T_D}{\Delta T}$  vs  $\ln N$  almost superimpose, and the corresponding fitted straight lines are indistinguishable, thus validating Eq. (20) over the set of data from Ref. [15]. The fit resulted in  $d\nu_{exp} = 0.92$ , which is close to, but not equal to one. The scaling on the basis of Eq. (20) nicely fits experimental trends and thus allows us to treat protein folding as a true phase transition in a finite system in the sense of Lifshits-Grosberg-Khokhlov [2]. The fact that the transition interval has the same size-scaling exponent as the correlation length is a nice example of the contribution of correlations in protein conformations to folding cooperativity.

There is another experimental evidence that supports our view. Ptitsyn and Uversky have proposed the molten globule as the third thermodynamic state of protein molecules in a number of publications [20, 21]. Based on the systematic analysis of data on urea and guanidinium chloride induced transition of globular proteins from the native to the unfolded state ( $N \rightarrow U$ ), from the native to the molten globule ( $N \rightarrow MG$ ) state and from the molten globule to the unfolded state ( $MG \rightarrow U$ ), it has been shown that in all these cases the cooperativity of unfolding increases linearly with the increase in molecular weight of the protein up to 25 – 30 kDa [20, 21]. In fact, this cooperativity of all three transitions measured in terms of  $\Delta n$  (see Eq. (4)) follows the  $\log \Delta n = d\nu \log M - b$ , with  $d\nu_{N-U} = 0.97$ ,  $d\nu_{N-MG} = 1.02$  and  $d\nu_{MG-U} = 0.89$ , all close to the  $d\nu = 0.92$  value, estimated from temperature inspired set of data from Ref. 15. It means, that such a dependence of the cooperativity of urea-induced and guanidinium chloride-induced transitions in small proteins on their molecular weight suggests that all three types of transitions are all-or-none, indicating that the molten globule state is separated from the native and unfolded state by all-or-none transitions [20, 21]. Thus the experimental data on

denaturant-induced unfolding of small globular proteins are consistent with the linear  $\log \Omega_c$  vs.  $\log N$  dependence described in Ref. 15.

**The comparison of cooperativity measures** shows that each of them has its advantages and drawbacks. The strict two-state assumption, expressed in Eq. (5) allows the derivation of  $k_2 \approx 1$  at large  $N$ , which is therefore a necessary condition for the two-state folding. Independent of the chain length,  $k_2$  allows the statement which of the proteins under consideration comes closer to the ideal two-state behaviour. Instead, in the same  $N \rightarrow \infty$  limit,  $\Omega_c$  tends to infinity, which means that under other equal conditions, longer chains have higher values of the cooperativity measure  $\Omega_c$ . On the other hand,  $k_2$  as defined by Eq. (15), contains both equilibrium and kinetic quantities, which are only equal when the system has reached equilibrium and the deviation from the unity can be attributed to kinetic traps (see also Ref. [13] for the definition and discussion about the *kinetic cooperativity*). Regarding the  $\Omega_c$ , once expressed through the  $\frac{T_D}{\Delta T}$  it becomes a criterion similar to those introduced in other areas of Physics to deal with the effects of finite size at phase transitions. The last fact puts it on very solid trails.

In summary, we have contributed to a better understanding of the physical basis of the two cooperation criteria under consideration. For the first time the size scaling expressions for the cooperation criteria are derived and analysed (Eqs. (18),(20)). As a result, we concluded that  $k_2$  can be conveniently used to compare cooperativity for individual proteins, while  $\Omega_c$  is more useful for comparing protein folding data sets with respect to size scaling analysis.

Discussions with prof. Hue Sun Chan from University of Toronto are thankfully acknowledged. A.B. acknowledges the partial financial support from Erasmus+ Project No. (2018-1-SI01-KA107-046966); A.B. and J.G. acknowledge the partial financial support from the Javna Agencija za Raziskovalno Dejavnost RS through Project No.(J1-1705); A.B. and M.V. acknowledge the partial financial support from the Javna Agencija za Raziskovalno Dejavnost RS through Program No.(P2-0412).

\* Corresponding author's email: abadasyan@gmail.com

- [1] A.Yu Grosberg and A.R. Khokhlov *Statistical Physics of Macromolecules* (AIP Press, New York, 1994).
- [2] I.M. Lifshitz *et al.*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **50**, 683 (1978).
- [3] Landau, L. & Lifshits, E. *Statistical Physics* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1988).
- [4] H.S. Chan, S. Bromberg, K.A. Dill, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B* **348**, 61 (1995).
- [5] V.N. Uversky, A.L. Fink, *FEBS Lett.* **515** 79 (2002).
- [6] Yu.S. Lazurkin, M. D. Frank-Kamenetskii, E. N. Trifonov, *Biopolymers* **9**, 1253 (1970).

- [7] E.Sh. Mamasakhlisov, A. V. Badasyan, A. V. Tsarukyan, A. V. Grigoryan, and V. F. Morozov, Abdus Salam ICTP preprint **IC2005037** (2005).
- [8] P.L. Privalov, N.N. Khechinashvili, J. Mol. Biol. **86**, 665 (1974).
- [9] P.L. Privalov, Adv. Prot. Chem, **33**, 167 (1979).
- [10] J. Hermans Jr, G. Acampora, J. Am. Chem. Soc, **89** 1547 (1967).
- [11] T.L. Hill, *Thermodynamics of the Small Systems* (Wiley, New York, 1963).
- [12] H. Kaya and H.S. Chan, Proteins **40**, 637 (2000).
- [13] H.S. Chan, S. Shimizu, H. Kaya, Meth. Enzym. **380**, 350 (2004).
- [14] D.K. Klimov and D. Thirumalai, Fold. Design **3**, 127 (1998).
- [15] M.S. Li, D. Klimov, D. Thirumalai, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 268107 (2004).
- [16] M.E. Fisher and A.N. Berker, Phys. Rev. B **26**, 2507 (1982).
- [17] M.S.S. Challa, D.P. Landau, K.Binder, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 1841 (1986).
- [18] N.A. Alves and U.H.E. Hansmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1836 (2000).
- [19] P.-G. de Gennes, *Scaling Concepts in Polymer Physics* (Cornell University Press, New York, 1985).
- [20] V.N. Uversky, O.B Ptitsyn, Fold. Des. **1**, 117 (1996).
- [21] O.B Ptitsyn, V.N. Uversky, FEBS Lett **341**, 15 (1994).