

Thermodynamics Of Neutral Protein Evolution

Jesse D. Bloom^{*†}, Alpan Raval^{‡§}, Claus O. Wilke[¶]

November 16, 2018

* Division of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering
Mail Code 210-41
California Institute of Technology
Pasadena, California 91125, USA

‡ Keck Graduate Institute
Claremont, CA 91711, USA

§ School of Mathematical Sciences
Claremont Graduate University
Claremont, CA 91711, USA

¶ Section of Integrative Biology and Center for Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712, USA

† To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: jesse.bloom@gmail.com. Telephone: 626-354-2565. Fax: 626-568-8743.

Major classification: Biological Sciences. Minor classification: Evolution.

Manuscript length:

Words in abstract 248 (out of 250 allowed)

Characters in text: 38,490

Figure 1: one column, 4.6 cm high: 948 characters

Figure 2: two columns, 10.5 cm high: 4,020 characters

18 equations composing a total of 23 lines: 3,540 characters

one Supplementary Information section

total: 46,998 (out of 47,000 allowed)

Abstract

Naturally evolving proteins gradually accumulate mutations while continuing to fold to thermodynamically stable native structures. This process of neutral protein evolution is an important mode of genetic change, and forms the basis for the molecular clock. Here we present a mathematical theory that predicts the number of accumulated mutations, the index of dispersion, and the distribution of stabilities in an evolving protein population from knowledge of the stability effects ($\Delta\Delta G$ values) for single mutations. Our theory quantitatively describes how neutral evolution leads to marginally stable proteins, and provides formulae for calculating how fluctuations in stability cause an overdispersion of the molecular clock. It also shows that the structural influences on the rate of sequence evolution that have been observed in earlier simulations can be calculated using only the single-mutation $\Delta\Delta G$ values. We consider both the case when the product of the population size and mutation rate is small and the case when this product is large, and show that in the latter case proteins evolve excess mutational robustness that is manifested by extra stability and increases the rate of sequence evolution. Our basic method is to treat protein evolution as a Markov process constrained by a minimal requirement for stable folding, enabling an evolutionary description of the proteins solely in terms of the experimentally measurable $\Delta\Delta G$ values. All of our theoretical predictions are confirmed by simulations with model lattice proteins. Our work provides a mathematical foundation for understanding how protein biophysics helps shape the process of evolution.

Introduction

Proteins evolve largely through the slow accumulation of amino acid mutations. Over evolutionary time, this process of sequence divergence creates homologous proteins that differ at the majority of their residues, yet still fold to similar structures that often perform conserved biochemical functions [1]. The maintenance of structure and function during sequence divergence suggests that much of protein evolution is neutral in the sense that observed sequence changes frequently do not alter a protein's ability to fold and adequately perform the biochemical function necessary to enable its host organism to survive. This comparative evidence for neutrality in protein evolution has been corroborated by experimental studies showing that the mutations separating diverged sequences often have no effect other than modest and additive changes to stability [2], and that a large fraction of random mutations do not detectably alter a protein's structure or function [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. In this respect, it seems that protein evolution should be well described by Kimura's neutral theory of evolution, which holds that most genetic change is due to the stochastic fixation of neutral mutations [9]. One of the key predictions of the neutral theory is that assuming a constant mutation rate, the number of mutations separating two proteins should be proportional to the time since their divergence [9]. Indeed, Pauling and Zuckerkandl's observation [10] that proteins are "molecular clocks" that accumulate mutations at a roughly constant rate has long been taken as one of the strongest pieces of evidence supporting the neutral theory [11].

However, mutations that are neutral with respect to a protein's capacity to perform its biological function often affect protein thermodynamics. The biological functions of most proteins depend on their ability to fold to thermodynamically stable native structures [12]. Yet natural proteins are typically only marginally stable, with free energies of folding (ΔG_f) between -5 and -15 kcal/mol [13]. Most random mutations to proteins are destabilizing [14, 4, 15, 16], and their effects on stability (measured as $\Delta\Delta G$, the ΔG_f of the mutant protein minus the ΔG_f of the wildtype protein) are frequently of the same magnitude as a protein's net stability. The impact of a mutation on a protein's function can therefore

depend on the protein's stability: a moderately destabilizing mutation that is easily tolerated by a stable parent protein may completely disrupt the folding of a less stable parent. This effect of protein stability on mutational tolerance has been verified by experiments demonstrating that more stable protein variants are markedly more robust to random mutations [7, 8].

The fact that mutations that are neutral with respect to direct selection for protein function can affect a protein's tolerance to subsequent mutations is not consistent with the simplest formulation of the neutral theory of evolution, which tends to assume that the fraction of mutations that is neutral remains constant in time. Kimura himself recognized the possibility that the neutrality might change [17], and Takahata mathematically treated the consequences of a "fluctuating neutral space" [18]. In particular, Takahata showed that fluctuating neutrality could explain the observed overdispersion in the molecular clock [19] (the tendency for the variance in the number of fixed mutations to exceed the expectation for the Poisson process predicted by the neutral theory) long considered troublesome for the neutral theory. However, further progress on this topic was stymied by the lack of a specific model for how or why protein neutrality might fluctuate.

More recently, researchers have preferred to describe neutral evolution using the concept of "neutral networks," which are networks in the space of possible protein sequences in which each functional protein is linked to all other functional proteins that differ by only a single mutation [20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. A neutrally evolving protein population is then envisioned as moving on the neutral network, and the neutrality of the population may fluctuate if the nodes on the network differ in their connectivities. A general theoretical treatment [23] of evolution on neutral networks has shown that if the product of the population size and mutation rate is small then members of the population are equally likely to occupy any node, while if this product is large then the population will preferentially occupy highly connected nodes (see also [24, 27, 28]). Simulations with highly simplified lattice models of proteins have attempted to provide insight into the specific features of protein neutral networks. These simulations have

shown that lattice protein neutral networks are centered around highly connected nodes occupied by stable proteins [24, 28, 29], a finding consistent with the experimental findings [7, 8] that stable proteins are more mutationally robust. Lattice protein studies also suggest that protein structures differ in their “designabilities” (defined as the total number of sequences that fold into a structure), and that sequences that fold into more designable structures will neutrally evolve at a faster rate due to the increased size and connectivity of their neutral networks [22, 30, 31, 32]. Finally, simulations have demonstrated that fluctuations in neutrality as a protein population moves along its neutral network can lead to an overdispersion of the molecular clock [26], as originally suggested by Takahata. However, an extension of these lattice protein simulations of evolution on neutral networks into a quantitative theory has been difficult because protein neutral networks are far too large to be computed for all but the simplest lattice models.

Here we present a mathematical treatment of neutral protein evolution that describes the evolutionary dynamics in terms of the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for single mutations, which are experimentally measurable. Our treatment is based on the experimentally verified [7, 8] connection between protein stability and mutational robustness, as well as a few biophysically supported assumptions about $\Delta\Delta G$ values for random mutations. By linking a protein’s tolerance to mutations with stability, we are able to quantitatively describe neutral evolution without a full description of the neutral network. We can then compute the average number of accumulated mutations, the average fraction of neutral mutations, the index of dispersion, and the equilibrium distribution of stabilities solely from knowledge of the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for single mutations. In addition, we follow the formalism of ref. [23] to calculate how all four of these properties depend on the product of mutation rate and population size, and show that this dependence can cause the rate of fixation of neutral mutations to vary with population size in violation of one of the standard predictions of Kimura’s neutral theory [17]. Our work presents a unified view of neutral protein evolution that is grounded in measurable thermodynamic quantities.

Results

Assumptions and Mathematical Background

In this section we describe the physical view of protein evolution that motivates our work. We assume that a protein must stably fold to its native structure in order to function [12], and so ignore those proteins (estimated at 10% of prokaryotic and 30% of eukaryotic proteins) that are intrinsically disordered [33], as well as those rare proteins that are only kinetically stable [34]. Natural selection for function requires a protein to fold with some minimal stability ΔG_f^{min} , since proteins that lack this minimal stability will be unable to reliably adopt their native structure and perform their biochemical task. A protein's extra stability beyond this minimal threshold is quantified as $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} = \Delta G_f - \Delta G_f^{\text{min}}$, meaning that all functional proteins must have $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} \leq 0$ (more negative values of ΔG_f indicate increased stability). We further assume that as long as $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} \leq 0$, natural selection for protein function is indifferent to the exact amount of extra stability a protein possesses. We are aware that this assumption is at odds with the persistent speculation that high stability inherently impairs protein function and so is selected against by evolution [35, 36]. But the circular argument most commonly advanced to support this speculation — that the observed marginal stability of natural proteins indicates that higher stability is detrimental to protein function — has now been contradicted both by experiments that have dramatically increased protein stability without sacrificing function [2, 37, 38, 39] and by demonstrations that marginal stability is a simple consequence of the fact that most mutations are destabilizing [40, 41, as well as the current work]. There is a possibility, however, that certain regulatory proteins must be marginally stable to facilitate rapid degradation [42]. To summarize, current biochemical evidence supports our assumption that (with certain well-defined exceptions) the only requirement imposed on protein stability by natural selection for protein function is that stability must meet or surpass some minimal threshold (a protein must have $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} \leq 0$).

A mutation to a protein will change its stability by an amount $\Delta\Delta G$, and experimental measurements of $\Delta\Delta G$ values have shown that most mutations are destabilizing (have $\Delta\Delta G > 0$) [4, 14, 15, 16]. A mutation is neutral with respect to selection for stability if $\Delta\Delta G + \Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} \leq 0$ since the mutant protein still satisfies the minimal stability threshold; otherwise the mutant does not stably fold and is culled by natural selection. Of course, mutations can also have specific effects on protein function (such as altering an enzyme's activity), but experiments have shown that such mutations are rare [3, 4, 5, 8]. Mutations can also have effects unrelated to the functioning of the individual protein molecule: they can affect its propensity to aggregate [43], alter its codon usage [44], change its mRNA stability [45], affect the efficiency or accuracy of translation [44, 46], or change the fraction of mistranslated proteins that fold [47]. Such higher-level effects are especially important in the evolution of highly expressed proteins [47, 48], but here we ignore them to focus on properties of the isolated protein molecule. The view we present therefore describes the impact of a mutation solely by its $\Delta\Delta G$ value and the $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}}$ of the wildtype protein, and is summarized graphically in Fig. 1 (we have previously used a similar view to successfully describe experimental protein mutagenesis results [7, 8]).

To use the view of Fig. 1 to construct a useful description of neutral protein evolution, we make one further assumption, that the overall distribution of $\Delta\Delta G$ values for random mutations stays roughly constant as the protein sequence evolves. This assumption is based on several lines of evidence. First, lattice protein simulations explicitly support this assumption [7, 8, 29, 49], as well as the closely related point that the number of neighbors on a protein's neutral network is approximately determined by its stability [24, 28]. Second, protein mutagenesis experiments indicate that the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for random mutations are usually additive [2, 50], meaning that any given mutation to a protein of length L will alter only $\approx 1/L$ of the other $\Delta\Delta G$ values, leaving the $\Delta\Delta G$ distribution mostly unchanged. Third, this assumption has been shown to explain the experimentally observed exponential decline in the fraction of functional proteins with increasing numbers of mutations [7]. Finally, this assumption will be seen

to be consistent with the lattice protein simulations in the current work. We note, however, that our work could easily be extended to accommodate the possibility that the $\Delta\Delta G$ distribution is a function of ΔG_f .

We begin our mathematical treatment by conceptually dividing the continuous variable of protein stability into small discrete bins of width b . This discretization of stability allows us to treat mutations as moving a protein from one bin to another — the bins can be made arbitrarily small to eliminate any numerical effects of the binning. With this binning scheme, the stabilities of all of the folded proteins in the evolving population (those with $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} \leq 0$) are described by the column vector \mathbf{p} , with element p_i giving the probability that a randomly chosen folded protein from the population has $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}}$ between $(1-i)b$ and $-ib$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots$. Let W_{ij} be the probability that a random mutation moves a protein's stability from bin j to bin i , where i and j both are in the range $1, 2, \dots$. Then W_{ij} is easily computed as the fraction of $\Delta\Delta G$ values between $b(j-i-1)$ and $b(j-i)$. Since W_{ij} only describes transitions between folded proteins, and since we have assumed that a protein's mutational tolerance is determined by its stability, then the fraction of folded mutants (neutrality) of a protein in bin j is $\nu_j = \sum_i W_{ij}$. Clearly, more stable proteins will have larger values of ν_j .

In the next two sections, we will use the matrix \mathbf{W} with elements W_{ij} to calculate the distribution \mathbf{p} of stabilities in an evolving protein population of constant size N , the mean number of mutations $\langle m \rangle_T$ after T generations, the corresponding index of dispersion $R_T = \frac{\langle m^2 \rangle_T - \langle m \rangle_T^2}{\langle m \rangle_T}$, and the average fraction of mutations $\langle \nu \rangle$ that do not destabilize the proteins in the population past the minimal stability threshold. We assume that \mathbf{W} is computed from the distribution of $\Delta\Delta G$ values for all random single amino-acid mutations, although in principle it could be for any type of mutation. We also assume that the per protein per generation mutation rate μ is small, so that at each generation a protein undergoes at most one mutation. Our calculations at first follow, and then extend the theoretical treatment by van Nimwegen and coworkers [23] of evolution on a neutral network. In particular, we follow their lead

in separately treating the two limiting cases where the product $N\mu$ of the population size and mutation rate is $\ll 1$ and $\gg 1$. We emphasize that all of the equations derived in the next two sections depend only on the mutation rate μ , the number of generations T , and the matrix \mathbf{W} which can be computed from the single-mutant $\Delta\Delta G$ values. The population size N determines the applicable limiting case, but otherwise drops out of all final results.

Limit when $N\mu \ll 1$

When $N\mu \ll 1$, the evolving population is usually clonal, since each mutation is either lost or goes to fixation before the next mutation occurs. If a mutation does not destabilize the protein beyond the stability cutoff, it will go to fixation with probability $1/N$ [9]. The entire population moves as one entity along its neutral network, since the population has converged to a single sequence before a new mutation occurs.

If the population is initially in stability bin j , at each generation there is a probability $N\mu W_{ij}$ that a protein experiences a mutation that changes its stability to bin i , and a probability μW_{ij} that the mutation is eventually fixed. If we define the matrix \mathbf{V} so that the diagonal elements are given by $V_{ii} = \nu_i$ and all other elements are zero, then \mathbf{p} evolves according to

$$\mathbf{p}(t+1) = (\mathbf{I} - \mu\mathbf{V} + \mu\mathbf{W}) \mathbf{p}(t) \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix. This is a Markov process with the transition matrix $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I} - \mu\mathbf{V} + \mu\mathbf{W}$, and \mathbf{p} will approach a unique stationary equilibrium distribution \mathbf{p}_o satisfying

$$0 = (\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{W}) \mathbf{p}_o. \quad (2)$$

We now calculate the average number of mutations $\langle m \rangle_{T,o}$ accumulated after T generations and the corresponding index of dispersion $R_{T,o}$. We define $\mathbf{p}(m, t)$ to be the column vector with element i giving the probability that a randomly chosen folded protein in the population at time t has accumulated

m mutations and is in stability bin i . The time evolution of $\mathbf{p}(m, t)$ is given by

$$\mathbf{p}(m, t+1) = (\mathbf{I} - \mu\mathbf{V})\mathbf{p}(m, t) + \mu\mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}(m-1, t). \quad (3)$$

The k th moment of the number of mutations at time t is

$$\langle m^k \rangle_t = \mathbf{e} \sum_m m^k \mathbf{p}(m, t), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{e} = (1, \dots, 1)$ is the unit row vector. We can write a recursive equation for $\langle m \rangle_t$ by multiplying both sides of Equation 3 by m , summing over m , and left multiplying by \mathbf{e} to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m \rangle_{t+1} &= \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{I} - \mu\mathbf{V}) \sum_m m \mathbf{p}(m, t) + \mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_m m \mathbf{p}(m-1, t) \\ &= \mathbf{e} \mathbf{A} \sum_m m \mathbf{p}(m, t) + \mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o \\ &= \langle m \rangle_t + \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where we have used the property $\mathbf{e} \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{e}$, noted that $\sum_m \mathbf{p}(m, t) = \mathbf{p}_o$ since the population is in equilibrium, and defined the average neutrality as $\langle \nu \rangle_o = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{p}_o$. Summing the recursion yields

$$\langle m \rangle_{T,o} = T \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o. \quad (6)$$

To calculate the index of dispersion $R_{T,o} = \frac{\langle m^2 \rangle_{T,o} - \langle m \rangle_{T,o}^2}{\langle m \rangle_{T,o}}$, we need to find the second moment $\langle m^2 \rangle_{T,o}$. In a fashion analogous to the construction of Equation 5, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m^2 \rangle_{t+1} &= \mathbf{e}(\mathbf{I} - \mu\mathbf{V}) \sum_m m^2 \mathbf{p}(m, t) + \mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_m m^2 \mathbf{p}(m-1, t) \\ &= \mathbf{e} \mathbf{A} \sum_m m^2 \mathbf{p}(m, t) + 2\mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_m m \mathbf{p}(m, t) + \mu \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o \\ &= \langle m^2 \rangle_t + \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o + 2\mu^2 \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_{\tau=0}^{t-1} \mathbf{A}^\tau \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Summing the recursion yields

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m^2 \rangle_{T,o} &= T \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o + 2\mu^2 \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_{t=1}^T (T-t) \mathbf{A}^{t-1} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o \\ &= T \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o + T(T-1) \mu^2 \langle \nu \rangle_o^2 + 2\mu^2 \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \sum_{t=1}^T (T-t) (\mathbf{A}^{t-1} - \mathbf{Q}) \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_o, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where we have noted that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{A}^t = \mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{p}_o, \dots, \mathbf{p}_o)$ and $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}_o = \langle \nu \rangle_o^2$. We can further simplify Equation 8 by performing spectral decompositions of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{Q} . Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K$ be the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{V}$, and let $\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_K$ and $\mathbf{l}_1, \dots, \mathbf{l}_K$ be the corresponding right and left eigenvectors, normalized so that $\mathbf{l}_i \mathbf{r}_i = 1$. These eigenvectors are also eigenvectors of \mathbf{A} , and the corresponding eigenvalues are $1 - \mu\lambda_1, \dots, 1 - \mu\lambda_K$, with one eigenvalue (chosen here to be $1 - \mu\lambda_1$) equal to one and all other eigenvalues greater than zero and less than one. Then \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{l}_1 are right and left eigenvectors of \mathbf{Q} with eigenvalue 1, and all other eigenvalues of \mathbf{Q} are zero. The spectral decompositions are therefore $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{l}_1$ and $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{l}_1 + \sum_{i=2}^K (1 - \mu\lambda_i) \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{l}_i$, and so after inserting these spectral decompositions into Equation 8 for $\langle m^2 \rangle_{T,o}$, the index of dispersion is

$$R_{T,o} = 1 - \mu \langle \nu \rangle_o + \frac{2\mu}{\langle \nu \rangle_o} \mathbf{e}\mathbf{W} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(1 - \frac{t}{T}\right) \sum_{i=2}^K (1 - \mu\lambda_i)^{t-1} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{l}_i \mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}_o. \quad (9)$$

This equation is equivalent to the general formula given by Cutler [19], where we have now provided concrete values of $\mu \langle \nu \rangle_o$ for ρ and $\frac{\mu}{\langle \nu \rangle_o} \mathbf{e}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{A}^{t-1}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}_o$ for $h(t)$. In the limit of large T and small μ , $R_{T,o}$ approaches the constant value

$$R_{T,o} = 1 + \frac{2}{\langle \nu \rangle_o} \mathbf{e}\mathbf{W} \sum_{i=2}^K \lambda_i^{-1} \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{l}_i \mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}_o. \quad (10)$$

Limit when $N\mu \gg 1$

When $N\mu \gg 1$, the population is spread across many nodes of the neutral network rather than converged on a single sequence [23]. In this limit, \mathbf{p} can be interpreted as both the distribution of sequences in the various stability bins and the probability that a single randomly chosen sequence occupies a particular stability bin. At generation t , the fraction of mutated proteins that continue to fold is $\langle \nu \rangle_t = \mathbf{e}\mathbf{W}\mathbf{p}(t)$, so in order to maintain a constant populations size, all folded sequences must reproduce at a rate of $\alpha_t = [1 - \mu(1 - \langle \nu \rangle_t)]^{-1}$. The population therefore evolves according to

$$\mathbf{p}(t+1) = \alpha_t [(1 - \mu)\mathbf{I} + \mu\mathbf{W}] \mathbf{p}(t). \quad (11)$$

Let the equilibrium value of \mathbf{p} be \mathbf{p}_∞ . The equilibrium neutrality is $\langle \nu \rangle_\infty = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_\infty$, and the equilibrium reproduction rate is $\alpha = [1 - \mu(1 - \langle \nu \rangle_\infty)]^{-1}$, so

$$\mathbf{p}_\infty = \alpha [(1 - \mu) \mathbf{I} + \mu \mathbf{W}] \mathbf{p}_\infty. \quad (12)$$

This equation can be rewritten to show that \mathbf{p}_∞ is the principal eigenvector of \mathbf{W} ,

$$\langle \nu \rangle_\infty \mathbf{p}_\infty = \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}_\infty. \quad (13)$$

We note that $\langle \nu \rangle_\infty$ approximates the asymptotic neutrality for the decline in the fraction of folded proteins upon random mutagenesis [7, 49].

We now determine the average number of accumulated mutations $\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty}$ and the corresponding index of dispersion $R_{T,\infty}$ by treating the forward evolutionary process. In the Supporting Information, we show that identical results are obtained by tracing a randomly chosen protein backwards in time along its ancestor distribution. Defining $\mathbf{p}(m, t)$ as in the previous section,

$$\mathbf{p}(m, t+1) = \alpha(1 - \mu) \mathbf{p}(m, t) + \alpha \mu \mathbf{W} \mathbf{p}(m-1, t). \quad (14)$$

The recursion can be solved to obtain

$$\mathbf{p}(m, t) = \alpha^t \sum_{\kappa=0}^t \binom{t}{\kappa} (1 - \mu)^{t-\kappa} \mu^\kappa \mathbf{W}^\kappa \mathbf{p}(m - \kappa, 0), \quad (15)$$

as can be verified by direct substitution. Since we are assuming the population is in equilibrium at time 0 and no mutations have accumulated at that time, $\mathbf{p}(m, 0)$ is \mathbf{p}_∞ for $m = 0$ and 0 otherwise.

Furthermore, \mathbf{p}_∞ satisfies Equation 13, so multiplying Equation 15 by \mathbf{e} yields

$$p(m, t) = \binom{t}{m} \alpha^t (1 - \mu)^{t-m} (\mu \langle \nu \rangle_\infty)^m, \quad (16)$$

where $p(m, t) = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{p}(m, t)$ gives the fraction of the population that has accumulated m mutations after t generations. The average number of accumulated mutations after T generations is the mean of this binomial distribution,

$$\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty} = \frac{T \mu \langle \nu \rangle_\infty}{1 - \mu(1 - \langle \nu \rangle_\infty)}. \quad (17)$$

Using the well-known result for the variance of the binomial distribution, the index of dispersion is

$$R_{T,\infty} = 1 - \frac{\mu \langle \nu \rangle_\infty}{1 - \mu (1 - \langle \nu \rangle_\infty)}. \quad (18)$$

It is important to reiterate that the above equation was derived under the assumption that there is at most one mutation per sequence per generation. For realistic distributions of mutations (i.e. Poisson), this means that $\mu \ll 1$. In regime, $R_{T,\infty}$ is close to one.

Lattice Protein Simulations

We tested our theory’s predictions on the evolutionary dynamics of lattice proteins. Lattice proteins are simple protein models that are useful tools for studying protein folding and evolution [32]. Our lattice proteins were chains of 20 amino acids that folded on a two-dimensional lattice. The energy of a lattice protein conformation was equal to the sum of the pairwise interactions between non-bonded amino acids [51]. Each lattice protein has 41,889,578 possible conformations, and by summing over all of these conformations we could exactly determine the partition sum and calculate ΔG_f . We set a minimal stability threshold for the lattice proteins of $\Delta G_f^{\min} = 0$. Therefore, at each generation all proteins that folded to the parental native structure with $\Delta G_f \leq 0$ were replicated with equal probability.

We generated lattice proteins that folded to the three different conformations shown in Fig. 2. For each of these three proteins, we determined the distribution of $\Delta \Delta G$ values for all 380 single mutations (Fig. 2). These $\Delta \Delta G$ distributions were used to predict the equilibrium distribution of stabilities, the average number of fixed mutations, and the index of dispersion for 5,000 generations of evolution at a per residue per generation mutation rate of 5×10^{-4} . To test these predictions, we evolved replicate populations of lattice proteins with population sizes of $N = 10$ and $N = 10^5$. Since the per residue per generation mutation rate is 5×10^{-4} and the proteins are of length 20, these cases correspond to $N\mu = 0.1$ and $N\mu = 1000$. We performed 1,000 replicates for the $N\mu = 0.1$ case and 10 replicates for the $N\mu \gg 1$ case, equilibrating the populations for 5,000 generations and then collecting data for 5,000

more generations of evolution. Fig. 2 shows that the simulation results are in excellent agreement with the theoretical predictions.

Discussion

We have presented a theory that quantitatively predicts the distribution of stabilities, the average number of fixed mutations, and the index of dispersion for an evolving protein population in terms of the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for individual mutations. In this section, we give qualitative interpretations of the mathematical results and discuss their implications for our understanding of protein evolution.

One major result is to show that the effects of protein structure on the rate of sequence evolution can be quantitatively cast in terms of the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for single mutations. Numerous lattice protein simulations have shown that protein structure can dramatically affect the rate of sequence evolution (as can be seen in Fig. 2 of this work), but these effects are usually described by invoking either neutral networks or structural designability [22, 24, 25, 28, 30, 32], neither of which are accessible to experiments (although see ref. [31] for recent progress in connecting designability to measurable properties). Our work shows that these structural effects on sequence evolution can be quantitatively calculated from the experimentally measurable $\Delta\Delta G$ values.

A second important result is a precise description of how protein evolutionary dynamics depends on the product of population size and mutation rate, $N\mu$. When $N\mu \gg 1$, the evolving protein population is polymorphic in stability and subject to frequent mutations, so the more stable (and thus more mutationally tolerant) proteins produce more folded offspring. In contrast, when $N\mu \ll 1$, the population is usually monomorphic in stability and so all members of the population are equally likely to produce folded offspring. The general tendency for populations to neutrally evolve mutational robustness when $N\mu \gg 1$ has previously been treated mathematically [23, 24], and a variety of lattice protein simulations have noted the tendency of evolving protein populations to preferentially occupy highly connected

neutral network nodes [24, 27, 28]. Our work shows that for proteins this process can be rigorously described by considering only protein stability, rather than requiring a full analysis of the neutral network. In addition, we prove that both the number of accumulated mutations and the index of dispersion depend on whether $N\mu$ is $\ll 1$ or $\gg 1$. This finding is at odds with the standard prediction [17] of Kimura’s neutral theory that the rate of evolution is independent of population size. The reason for this discrepancy is that standard neutral theory fails to account for the possibility that increasing the population size so that $N\mu \gg 1$ can systematically increase the fraction of mutations that are neutral.

A third important contribution of our theory is to predict the extent of marginal stability of evolved proteins from the $\Delta\Delta G$ values for single mutations. Several researchers have pointed out that evolved proteins will be marginally stable simply because most mutations are destabilizing [40, 41]; we have described this process quantitatively. In addition, we have shown how the neutral evolution of mutational robustness when $N\mu \gg 1$ will shift the proteins towards higher stabilities (as shown in Fig. 2), although this increase in stability is limited by the counterbalancing pressure of predominantly destabilizing mutations. The formulae we provide can in principle be combined with experimentally measured $\Delta\Delta G$ values to predict the expected range of stabilities for evolved proteins.

Our work also weds Takahata’s concept that fluctuating neutral spaces might overdispense the molecular clock [18, 19, 26] to a concrete description of how protein neutrality fluctuates during evolution. When $N\mu \ll 1$, fluctuations in protein stability cause an overdispersion that can be calculated from the single-mutant $\Delta\Delta G$ distribution. Simulations have indicated that this overdispersion depends on the population size [26, 52] — we explain this dependence by showing that stability-induced overdispersion does not occur when $N\mu \gg 1$ since the population’s neutrality equilibrates when it spreads across many nodes of the neutral network. Mathematically, the difference in the cases $N\mu \gg 1$ and $N\mu \ll 1$ is that only in the former case does the probability of a substitution depend on a fluctuating distribution of stabilities (Equation 3 contains μV in the first term on the right side, while Equation 14 does not).

In summary, we have presented a mathematical theory of how thermodynamics shape neutral protein evolution. A major strength of our theory is that it makes quantitative predictions using single-mutant $\Delta\Delta G$ values, which can be experimentally measured. Our work also suggests how neutral and adaptive protein evolution may be coupled through protein thermodynamics. Protein stability represents an important hidden dimension in the evolution of new protein function, since extra stability that is itself neutral can allow a protein to tolerate mutations that confer new or improved functions [8]. Our theory describes the dynamics of protein’s stability during neutral evolution — adaptive protein evolution is superimposed on these stability dynamics, with proteins most likely to acquire beneficial mutations when they are most stable.

Materials and Methods

Lattice Protein Simulations

We performed simulations with lattice proteins of $L = 20$ monomers of 20 types corresponding to the natural amino acids. The proteins could occupy any of the 41,889,578 possible compact or non-compact conformations on a two-dimensional lattice. The energy of a conformation \mathcal{C} is the sum of the nonbonded nearest-neighbor interactions, $E(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{i=1}^L \sum_{j=1}^{i-2} C_{ij}(\mathcal{C}) \times \epsilon(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j)$, where $C_{ij}(\mathcal{C})$ is one if residues i and j are nearest neighbors in conformation \mathcal{C} and zero otherwise, and $\epsilon(\mathcal{A}_i, \mathcal{A}_j)$ is the interaction energy between residue types \mathcal{A}_i and \mathcal{A}_j , given by Table 5 of ref. [51].

We computed the stability of a conformation \mathcal{C}_t as $\Delta G_f(\mathcal{C}_t) = E(\mathcal{C}_t) + T \ln \{Q(T) - \exp[-E(\mathcal{C}_t)/T]\}$, where $Q(T) = \sum_{\{\mathcal{C}_i\}} \exp[-E(\mathcal{C}_i)/T]$ is the partition sum, made tractable by noting that there are only 910,972 unique contact sets. All simulations were performed at a reduced temperature of $T = 1.0$

We used adaptive walks to find sequences that folded into each of the three arbitrarily chosen conformations shown in Fig. 2 with $\Delta G_f \leq 0$, and then neutrally evolved these sequences for 10^4 generations

with a population size of $N = 100$. Our evolutionary algorithm was as follows: at each generation we randomly chose a protein that folded to the parental structure with $\Delta G_f \leq 0$ from the population and mutated each residue to some other randomly chosen residue with probability 5×10^{-4} , and continued doing this until we had filled the new population with proteins. At the end of this equilibration evolution, we chose the most abundant sequence in the population as the starting point for further analysis and computation of the distribution of $\Delta\Delta G$ values for all 380 point mutations (sequences shown in Fig. 2).

To collect data for $N\mu \ll 1$, we evolved 1,000 replicates as above but with $N = 10$ and for 5,000 generations starting with a clonal population of the initial sequence described above. We then evolved each of these equilibrated populations for a further 5,000 generations to collect data. We combined the data for all the folded proteins in the final populations of all the replicates to calculate $\langle m \rangle_T$, R_T , and the distribution of stabilities shown in Fig. 2. If we instead simply randomly chose a single folded protein from the final population of each replicate, we obtained results that were identical within the precision shown in Fig. 2.

To generate the data for $N\mu \gg 1$, we used the same procedure but with $N = 10^5$ and only performed 10 replicates. We again computed the statistics shown in Fig. 2 by combining the data for all of the folded proteins in the final populations of all 10 replicates. Similar results were obtained if we instead computed $\langle m \rangle_T$ and R_T over all of the folded proteins in the final population of a single replicate (average values of $\langle m \rangle_T$ were identical while the R_T values of 1.03, 0.95, and 0.94 were extremely similar to those shown from top to bottom in Fig. 2). This is expected since the probability distributions for $N\mu \gg 1$ evolve deterministically.

Lattice Protein Predictions

The numerical predictions for the lattice proteins given in Fig. 2 were computed by constructing the matrix \mathbf{W} with a bin size of $b = 0.005$ and truncating the matrix by assuming that no proteins would have stabilities less than -5.0 . For the case when $N\mu \ll 1$, $\langle m \rangle_T$ was calculated using Equation 6 and R_T was calculated using Equation 10. For $N\mu \gg 1$, $\langle m \rangle_T$ was calculated using Equation 17 and R_T was calculated using Equation 18.

Acknowledgements

We thank Frances H. Arnold for helpful comments and discussion. J.D.B. is supported by a HHMI pre-doctoral fellowship. C.O.W. is supported by the National Institutes of Health grant AI 065960. A.R. is supported by the National Science Foundation grants CCF 00523643 and FIBR 0527023.

References

- [1] Lesk, A. M & Chothia, C. (1980) *J. Mol. Biol.* **136**, 225–270.
- [2] Serrano, L, Day, A. G, & Fersht, A. R. (1993) *J. Mol. Biol.* **233**, 305–312.
- [3] Shortle, D & Lin, B. (1985) *Genetics* **110**, 539–555.
- [4] Pakula, A. A, Young, V. B, & Sauer, R. T. (1986) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **83**, 8829–8833.
- [5] Loeb, D. D, Swanstrom, R, Everitt, L, Manchester, M, Stamper, S. E, & III, C. A. H. (1989) *Nature* **340**, 397–400.
- [6] Guo, H. H, Choe, J, & Loeb, L. A. (2004) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **101**, 9205–9210.
- [7] Bloom, J. D, Silberg, J. J, Wilke, C. O, Drummond, D. A, Adami, C, & Arnold, F. H. (2005) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 606–611.




- [8] Bloom, J. D, Labthavikul, S. T, Otey, C. R, & Arnold, F. H. (2006) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **103**, 5869–5874.
- [9] Kimura, M. (1983) *The Neutral Theory of Molecular Evolution*. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, U.K.).
- [10] Zuckerkandl, E & Pauling, L. (1965) *Evolving genes and proteins*, eds. Bryson, V & Vogel, H. J. (Academic Press, New York, NY), pp. 97–166.
- [11] Ohta, T & Kimura, M. (1971) *J. Mol. Evol.* **1**, 18–25.
- [12] Anfinsen, C. B. (1973) *Science* **181**, 223–230.
- [13] Fersht, A. R. (1999) *Structure and Mechanism in Protein Science*. (W. H. Freeman and Company, New York).
- [14] Godoy-Ruiz, R, Perez-Jimenez, R, Ibarra-Molero, B, & Sanchez-Ruiz, J. M. (2004) *J. Mol. Biol.* **336**, 313–318.
- [15] Matthews, B. W. (1993) *Annu. Rev. Biochem.* **62**, 139–160.
- [16] Bava, K. A, Gromiha, M. M, Uedaira, H, Kitajimi, K, & Sarai, A. (2004) *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**, D120–D121.
- [17] Kimura, M. (1987) *J. Mol. Evol.* **26**, 24–33.
- [18] Takahata, N. (1987) *Genetics* **116**, 169–179.
- [19] Cutler, D. J. (2000) *Genetics* **154**, 1403–1417.
- [20] Smith, J. M. (1970) *Nature* **225**, 563–564.
- [21] Huynen, M. A, Stadler, P. F, & Fontana, W. (1996) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **93**, 397–401.


- [22] Govindarajan, S & Goldstein, R. A. (1997) *Biopolymers* **42**, 427–438.
- [23] van Nimwegen, E, Crutchfield, J. P, & Huynen, M. (1999) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **96**, 9716–9720.
- [24] Bornberg-Bauer, E & Chan, H. S. (1999) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **96**, 10689–10694.
- [25] Tiana, G, Broglia, R. A, & Shakhnovich, E. I. (2000) *Proteins* **39**, 244–251.
- [26] Bastolla, U, Porto, M, Roman, H. E, & Vendruscolo, M. (2002) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 208101.
- [27] Taverna, D. M & Goldstein, R. A. (2002) *J. Mol. Biol.* **315**, 479–484.
- [28] Xia, Y & Levitt, M. (2004) *Proteins* **55**, 107–114.
- [29] Broglia, R. A, Tiana, G, Roman, H. E, Vigezzi, E, & Shakhnovich, E. (1999) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 4727–4730.
- [30] Li, H, Helling, R, Tang, C, & Wingreen, N. (1996) *Science* **273**, 666–669.
- [31] England, J. L & Shakhnovich, E. I. (2003) *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 218101.
- [32] Chan, H. S & Bornberg-Bauer, E. (2002) *Applied Bioinformatics* **1**, 121–144.
- [33] Uversky, V. N, Oldfield, C. J, & Dunker, A. K. (2005) *J. Mol. Recognit.* **18**, 343–384.
- [34] Jaswal, S. S, Sohl, J. L, Davis, J. H, & Agard, D. A. (2002) *Nature* **415**, 343–347.
- [35] DePristo, M. A, Weinreich, D. M, & Hartl, D. L. (2005) *Nat. Rev. Genetics* **6**, 678–687.
- [36] Somero, G. N. (1995) *Annu. Rev. Physiol.* **57**, 43–68.
- [37] Giver, L, Gershenson, A, Freskgard, P. O, & Arnold, F. H. (1998) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 12809–12813.

- [38] van den Burg, B, Vriend, G, Veltman, O. R, Venema, G, & Eusink, V. G. H. (1998) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **95**, 2056–2060.
- [39] Zhao, H & Arnold, F. H. (1999) *Protein Eng.* **12**, 47–53.
- [40] Taverna, D. M & Goldstein, R. A. (2002) *Proteins* **46**, 105–109.
- [41] Arnold, F. H, Wintrode, P. L, Miyazaki, K, & Gershenson, A. (2001) *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **26**, 100–107.
- [42] Huntzicker, E. G, Estay, I. S, Zhen, H, Lokteva, L. A, Jackson, P. K, & Oro, A. E. (2006) *Genes and Development* **20**, 276–281.
- [43] Chiti, F, Taddei, N, Bucciantini, M, White, P, Ramponi, G, & Dobson, C. M. (2000) *EMBO J.* **19**, 1441–1449.
- [44] Akashi, H. (2003) *Genetics* **164**, 1291–1303.
- [45] Chamary, J. V & Hurst, L. D. (2005) *Genome Biology* **6**, R75.
- [46] Rocha, E. P. C & Danchin, A. (2004) *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **21**, 108–116.
- [47] Drummond, D. A, Bloom, J. D, Adami, C, Wilke, C. O, & Arnold, F. H. (2005) *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **102**, 14338–14343.
- [48] Pal, C, Papp, B, & Hurst, L. D. (2001) *Genetics* **158**, 927–931.
- [49] Wilke, C. O, Bloom, J. D, Drummond, D. A, & Raval, A. (2005) *Biophysical J.* **89**, 3714–3720.
- [50] Wells, J. A. (1990) *Biochemistry* **29**, 8509–8517.
- [51] Miyazawa, S & Jernigan, R. L. (1985) *Macromolecules* **18**, 534–552.
- [52] Wilke, C. O. (2004) *BMC Genetics* **5**, 25.

Figure 1: A thermodynamic view of protein evolution. A mutant protein stably folds if and only if it possesses some minimal stability, ΔG_f^{min} (in this case -5 kcal/mol). The stability of the wildtype protein is $\Delta G_f^{\text{wt}} = -7.5$ kcal/mol, meaning that it has $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} = -2.5$ kcal/mol of extra stability. The bars show the distribution of $\Delta\Delta G$ values for mutations. Those mutants with $\Delta G_f^{\text{extra}} + \Delta\Delta G \leq 0$ still stably fold, while all other mutants do not fold and so are culled by natural selection. The probability that a mutation will be neutral with respect to stable folding is simply the fraction of the distribution that lies to the left of the threshold. The data in this figure are hypothetical.

Figure 2: The theory gives accurate predictions for the evolution of model lattice proteins. Each row of panels is for a different lattice protein. The graphs at left show the starting protein and the distribution of $\Delta\Delta G$ values for all point mutations. The graphs in the middle and left show the predicted (lines) and measured (boxes) distributions of stabilities among the evolved proteins. The tables embedded in the graphs show the predicted and measured values for the average number of mutations ($\langle m \rangle_T$) and the index of dispersion (R_T) after 5,000 generations of neutral evolution. The center graphs are for a population size of $N = 10$, and the graphs at the right are for $N = 10^5$. In both cases, the per protein per generation mutation rate is $\mu = 0.01$. As predicted, the evolving population with $N\mu \gg 1$ evolved mutational robustness that is manifested by increased protein stability. This additional mutational robustness accelerated the rate of sequence evolution.





Supporting Information

Calculation of reverse process when $N\mu \gg 1$

When $N\mu \gg 1$, the population is now never converged to a single sequence, so it is not *a priori* obvious that the average number of mutations present in the population is equivalent to the expected number of fixed substitutions along the line of descent. In fact, in the limit of very large population sizes there may not even be a common line of descent in relevant time frames, since many new mutations will occur before any given mutation goes to fixation. In the main text we calculated the average number of mutations $\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty}$ a sequence in the population has accumulated over the last T generations by treating the forward evolution of the population. Here we trace a randomly chosen protein in the population back in time, and show that the average number of substitutions $\langle s \rangle_T$ that it has accumulated over the last T generations is equal to $\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty}$. We also show that indices of dispersion of $\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty}$ and $\langle s \rangle_T$ have the same value of $R_{T,\infty}$.

To calculate $\langle s \rangle_T$, we first define a vector \mathbf{a} giving the ancestor distribution [?]: element i of $\mathbf{a}(T-t)$ gives the probability that a randomly chosen sequence from the population at time T had a predecessor with stability in bin i at time $T-t$. The transition probabilities of $\mathbf{a}(T-t)$ at equilibrium are the discrete time analogue of those computed by Hermisson and coworkers [?]. From Equation ?? of the main text, it follows that the fraction of sequences in bin i at time $t+1$ that had as their ancestor in the previous generation a sequence in bin j is $\alpha_t [(1-\mu)\delta_{ij} + \mu W_{ij}] p_j(t)$. In order to obtain the probability that a sequence in bin i at time $t+1$ had an ancestor in bin j , we have to divide this fraction by the total fraction of sequences in bin i at time $t+1$, $p_i(t+1)$. In equilibrium, $\alpha_t = \alpha$ and $p_i(t+1) = p_i(t) = p_i$ where p_i is the element from \mathbf{p}_∞ . Hence, the probability that a sequence in bin i had an ancestor in bin j is $\alpha [(1-\mu)\delta_{ij} + \mu H_{ji}]$, where we have defined

$$H_{ji} = W_{ij} p_j / p_i, \quad (\text{S1})$$

The time evolution of \mathbf{a} is therefore

$$\mathbf{a}(T-t) = \alpha [(1-\mu)\mathbf{I} + \mu\mathbf{H}] \mathbf{a}(T-t+1), \quad (\text{S2})$$

where the matrix \mathbf{H} is defined by Equation S1. Equation S2 can be solved to show that the equilibrium value of \mathbf{a} is \mathbf{a}_∞ satisfying

$$\langle \nu \rangle_\infty \mathbf{a}_\infty = \mathbf{H} \mathbf{a}_\infty. \quad (\text{S3})$$

If we define $\mathbf{a}(s, T-t)$ as the vector with element i giving the probability that a randomly chosen sequence at time T had a predecessor at time $T-t$ in stability bin i and with s substitutions relative to the sequence at time T , then the time evolution for an equilibrated population is

$$\mathbf{a}(s, T-t-1) = \alpha(1-\mu) \mathbf{a}(s, T-t) + \alpha\mu\mathbf{H}\mathbf{a}(s-1, T-t). \quad (\text{S4})$$

We can solve Equations S4 and S3 in a manner analogous to the forward process to obtain

$$\mathbf{a}(s, T-t) = \binom{t}{s} \alpha^t (1-\mu)^{t-s} (\mu\langle \nu \rangle_\infty)^s \mathbf{a}_\infty. \quad (\text{S5})$$

Again defining $a(s, T-t) = \mathbf{e} \mathbf{a}(s, T-t)$ as the probability of having accumulated s substitutions as one moves back t generations from time T , we obtain the binomial distribution

$$a(s, T-t) = \binom{t}{s} \alpha^t (1-\mu)^{t-s} (\mu\langle \nu \rangle_\infty)^s. \quad (\text{S6})$$

Comparison of Equation ?? of the main text and Equation S6 shows that they are identical. Therefore, all moments computed from the two distributions must be equal. In particular, this proves that $\langle m \rangle_{T,\infty} = \langle s \rangle_T$, and that the corresponding indices of dispersion have the same value of $R_{T,\infty}$ defined by Equation ?? of the main text. This shows that when $N\mu \gg 1$, we expect equivalent results regardless of whether we average over the number of mutations in all sequences present in the population, or randomly choose a single sequence and trace back along its ancestor distribution.