

Global optimization of proteins using a dynamical lattice model

F. Dressel and S. Kobe

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Dresden,
D-01062 Dresden, Germany


September 9, 2005

Abstract

The problem to predict protein structure from the sequence of amino acids only is approached by the introduction of a dynamical lattice model, which is constructed on the basis of the atomic distances and bonding angles in molecules. Using pairwise interactions between amino acids, the exact ground states of model proteins are calculated using a method of global optimization with respect to the total energy. The obtained secondary structures are in good agreement with the corresponding experimentally found structures.

The main task of quantitative biology and one of the most demanding problems in biophysics is to develop suitable models, which can describe fundamental properties of chemical and biological objects. Lattice models are widely investigated to discuss protein folding and dynamics (for a review see [1]). However, these models are

restricted in finding the real three-dimensional structure because of the rigidity of the underlying crystalline (predefined) lattice. Contrary to most of the up to now used low complexity discrete state models [2] the introduction of a dynamical lattice model (DLM) is motivated by the chemical bonding properties of the






Fig. 2: Ramachandran map of *proline* representing the correlation between ϕ (abscissa) and ψ (ordinate). A reduction of this map via a cluster analysis results in two points (see text).

Table 1: Hard-core radii r_{SC} (in Å) of the 20 amino acid (aa) side-chains. It is assumed that the Van-der-Waals volumes are concentrated in spheres, which touch the C_{α} atoms.

<i>aa</i>	r_{SC}
A	4.0
C	4.4
D	4.4
E	4.7
F	5.1
G	3.6
H	4.9
I	4.9
K	5.1
L	4.9
M	4.9
N	4.5
P	4.4
Q	4.8
R	5.2
S	4.1
T	4.5
V	4.7
W	5.4
Y	5.2

protein backbone: We consider first the distances between the atom positions in two subsequent amino acids. They are fixed in the following way: $C-N = 1.32$ Å, $C_{\alpha}-C = 1.53$ Å, $N-C_{\alpha} = 1.47$ Å. Additionally, the angles between the connection lines of these atoms can be fixed: $N-C_{\alpha}-C = 110^{\circ}$, $C_{\alpha}-C-N' = 114^{\circ}$, $C-N'-C_{\alpha}' = 123^{\circ}$.

The linkage section of two consecutive amino acids of a protein is sketched in Fig. 1. The crucial point is that the C_{α}' atom of the subsequent amino acid lies in the plane formed by the atoms $C_{\alpha}-C-N'$. So the position of the C_{α}' atom respective to the position of the preceding amino acid in the chain is determined by three angles. Because ω can be fixed additionally to 180° , there are only two remaining degrees of freedom (ϕ , ψ). Park and Levitt [3] have shown that, in principle, the spatial structures of proteins can be fitted by using such a (ϕ , ψ) model much better than by using a regular lattice model. However, they have regarded the same angle distribution for each amino acid neglecting the biochemical conditions. The latter demand the consideration of correlations between ϕ and ψ , which are different from one amino acid to another. Such correlations on the basis




Fig. 3: C_{α} trace of the DLM ground state structure of *polyalanine* A40 (two perspectives). We have identified the structure as an α -helix. The beginning of the protein backbone is indicated in Fig. 3 to 7 by red colour.

of experiments are usually represented in so-called Ramachandran maps. These maps are represented for a given amino acid in dependence on the pre- and succeeding ones. We use plots, which are produced by averaging over pre- and

done by a single-linkage cluster analysis [5]. Using a cluster resolution of $(10^{\circ})^2$, e.g., the number of remaining points averaged over all twenty amino acids is $q = 3.65$ leading altogether to about q^n theoretically possible conformations of




Fig. 4: DLM ground state structure of *compstatin* (left) and the corresponding PDB structure 1A1P (right).

succeeders in 403 different proteins [4]. The result for *proline*, e.g., is shown in Fig. 2.

The crucial point of the proposed model is a reduction of the Ramachandran map to a few relevant points. This can be

a DLM protein with the sequence length n . The task is to find out the global minimum of energy and the conformation belonging to it.

We have taken into account all the 20 different types of amino acids with

interaction constants $e_{\mu\nu}$ between amino acids μ and ν , which can be attractive or repulsive [6]. The strength of the interaction energy $E_{ij}(r_{ij})$ is modified according to the following form, which is a smooth approximation to a stepwise function with cutoff at 8.0 Å [6]

$$E_{ij}(r_{ij}) = e_{\mu\nu} \{ \tanh[(8.0-r_{ij})/2]/2 + 0.5 \}, \quad (1)$$

where r_{ij} (in Å) is the distance between the C_β 's of the i^{th} and j^{th} amino acid along the chain. C_β represents the first side chain atom (in the case of glycine a virtual C_β is assumed). The side-chains themselves are modeled by hard spheres with radii r_{SC} , which are specific for the different amino acids according to their Van-der-Waals volumes [7] (see Tab. 1). Their positions are fixed in consideration of chemical bonding in combination with the CORN law [8]. Furthermore, the C_α atoms are assumed to be hard spheres with the radius r_α .

The global optimum of the total energy of a DLM protein

$$E_{gs} = \min \sum_{i,j}^n E_{ij} \quad (2)$$

with $i, j \geq 1, i > j - 1$ can be found using an algorithm of discrete optimization. The method is based on *branch-and-bound* and was applied first to a magnetic Ising system with frustration by Kobe and Hartwig [9]. The strategy of branch-and-bound is to exclude as many states with high energy values as possible in an early stage of calculation. Now we are able to solve the above mentioned fundamental problem: The input is the sequence of amino acids *only*. Using an arbitrary set of DLM parameters, the output is the three-dimensional structure with the global minimum of total energy E_{gs} . (It should be mentioned that this algorithm differs clearly both from the threading

procedure to find the structure of larger proteins [10] and from the well-known Chou-Fasman algorithm [11], which is based on a pure phenomenological ansatz.)

In the language of Statistical Physics the proposed model is equivalent to a "mixed q -state Potts glass" with 20 different Potts elements (amino acids), where q , in general, is different for each of them. The meaning of the Potts states corresponds to an angle pair (φ, ψ) .

The following set of model parameters are uniformly chosen for all examples in Fig. 3 to 7: Reduced Ramachandran maps by cluster analysis with a resolution of $(10^\circ)^2$, side-chain overlap exclusion using the hard-core radii (Tab. 1), $r_\alpha = 1.5$ Å.

Firstly, we have tested the model and the optimization algorithm for *polyalanine*. We have found right-handed α -helices for each DLM ground state with the chain lengths $n = 11; 24; 30; 34$, and 40 (Fig. 3). Also non-helical structures, e.g. compstatin, are accessible by the model. In Fig. 4 the DLM structure is shown in comparison with the corresponding structure of the Protein Data Bank (PDB) [12].

The result for the two chains A of insulin with the sequence GIVEQCCTSICSLYQLENYCN is shown in Fig. 5. In nature the A chain is mainly coupled with the B chain by disulfide bonds, which are tied at the cysteines at positions 7 and 20 in the A chain. But in our example the A chain is computed in absence of its companion. Consequently, the non-bonded cysteines in our model would form disulfide bonds within the chain, which cause distortions with respect to the expected spatial structure. Therefore, we have switched-off the respective interac-




Fig. 5: DLM ground state structure of the insulin chain A, where the interactions between the 6th and 20th, 7th and 11th, 7th and 20th, and 11th and 20th amino acids are omitted.




Fig. 6: DLM ground state structure of the trp-cage protein with the sequence NLYIQWLKDGGPSSGRPPPS.

tions between the 6th and 20th, 7th and 11th, 7th and 20th, and 11th and 20th amino acids. Herewith, we have obtained as the DLM ground state a structure, which forms, e.g., a helix between position 1 and 7 in good agreement with the helical structure in the PDB.

The trp-cage protein with the PDB-id. 1L2Y is used as a common protein to test models, cf. [13]. In our model, we get a structure similar to the PDB entry:

It starts with a α -helix followed by a distorted 3_{10} -helix and ends with a lefthanded tail, which is one of the characteristics of this protein (Fig. 6).

The sequence length n of computable peptides can be increased by restriction of the regarded interactions up to the l^{th} neighbor of each amino acid along the chain. In this case, the summation in eq. (2) has to be restricted to $j-1 \leq i < j-1$. With this procedure




Fig. 7: One representative low-lying DLM structure of the Alzheimer's disease amyloid peptide (A4). Only interactions of amino acids up to the seventh neighbour along the chain are taken into account.

we handle the Alzheimer disease peptide 1AML choosing $l = 7$. One of the few representative energetically low-lying states is shown in Fig. 7. These structure agrees very good with the according PDB secondary structure, which assigns a helix in the middle part (amino acid 14 - 24) and one at the end (amino acid 32 - 35) as well as some bends between. These structural elements have been found in the calculated conformation at the right sequential positions. The tertiary structure indeed shows some small deviations due to the neglected long-range interactions along the chain, which bind the peptide fragments together.

For comparison of the DLM structure with experimental results we have calculated the RMSD (root mean square deviation) over the C_{α} atoms. In Tab. 2 these values are given for some DLM ground states.

Table 2: RMSD (in Å, calculated according to [14]) for comparison of some DLM ground states with experimental results of the PDB [12].

PDB	code name	n	RMSD
1AL1	α -helix protein	13	1.98
1A1P	compstatin (Fig. 4)	14	2.46
1AKG	conotoxin	17	3.21
1L2Y	trp cage (Fig. 6)	20	5.90
1D9J	cecropin-magainin hybrid	20	4.58
1B19	insulin A	21	5.65
1B19	insulin A (red., Fig. 5)	21	5.54
1G04	sheep prion segment	26	8.60
1AML	Alzheimer A4, $l = 7$ (Fig. 7)	40	5.99

Summarizing, we have suggested a new minimalistic model for proteins. Contrary to models using regular lattices the discrete lattice sites in the proposed model are dynamically created in dependence on the amino acid sequence. So one can obtain representative spatial structures of proteins. We have shown that most of the DLM ground state structures correspond to a high degree with the measured native structures. This is reflected as in good agreement of secondary and partly also tertiary structure as in acceptable RMSD values.

The DLM achieves good computability because of its low complexity. This opens, e.g., the possibility to investigate energy landscapes of realistic three-dimensional structures. To this end the used *branch-and-bound* algorithm can be extended in such a way that all energetically low-lying states are exactly calculated [15]. The dynamics of the system can be investigated. Furthermore, protein design *in silico* is

possible.

The chain length n , up to which a DLM ground state can be exactly calculated, is restricted by the complexity of the problem, which belongs to the class of NP-hard problems [16]. For proteins with distinctly larger sequence lengths good heuristic algorithms and especially such ones with a "high level of reliability" [17] can be applied.

We thank V. Lankau, W. Naumann, A. Schneider and J. Weißbarth for discussions and H. Schaefer for critical reading of the manuscript. S. K. is grateful to A. Hartwig for three decades of continuous cooperation and discussions on global optimization. F. D. acknowledges support from the Gesellschaft von Freunden und Förderern der Technischen Universität Dresden, e.V.

References:

- [1] A. Kolinski and J. Skolnick, *Polymer* **45**, 511 (2004).
- [2] J. Skolnick, A. Kolinski, and A. R. Ortiz, *J. Biomol. Structure and Dynamics* **16**, 381 (1998).
- [3] B.H. Park and M. Levitt, *J. Mol. Biol* **249**, 493 (1995).
- [4] G. J. Kleywegt and T. A. Jones, *Structure* **4**, 1395 (1996).
- [5] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Data_clustering.
- [6] G. Settanni, C. Micheletti, J. Banavar, and A. Maritan, cond-mat/9902364.
- [7] B. Rupp, *Protein Structure Basics*, http://www-structure.llnl.gov/Xray/tutorial/protein_structure.htm (2000).
- [8] J. S. Richardson, *Adv. Protein Chem.* **34**, 167 (1981).
- [9] S. Kobe and A. Hartwig, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **16**, 1 (1978).
- [10] R. H. Lathrop and T. F. Smith, *J. Mol. Biol.* **255**, 641 (1996).
- [11] P. Y. Chou and G. D. Fasman, *Biochemistry* **13**, 222 (1974).
- [12] H. M. Berman, J. Westbrook, Z. Feng, G. Gilliland, T. N. Bhat, H. Weissig, I. N. Shindyalov, and P. E. Bourne, *Nucleic Acids Research* **28**, 235 (2000).
- [13] A. Irbäck and S. Mohanty, *Biophys. J.* **88**, 1560 (2005).
- [14] E. A. Coutsiias, C. Seok, and K. A. Dill; *J. Comp. Chem.* **25**, 1849 (2004).

- [15] S. Kobe and J. Krawczyk, in: Computational Complexity and Statistical Physics, edited by A. Pincus, G. Istrate, and C. Moore (Oxford University Press, 2005), in print.
- [16] A. K. Hartmann and H. Rieger, Optimization Algorithms in Physics (Wiley-VCH, Berlin, 2002).
- [17] J. Houdayer and O. C. Martin, Phys. Rev. **E 64**, 056704 (2001).