

Fig. 2. Sequence of the reshaped V_H domain. The reshaped domain HuV_{HLYS} is based on the HuV_{HNP} gene (4), with the framework regions of human NEW alternating with the hypervariable regions of mouse D1.3 (7). Three oligonucleotides I, II, and III were used to replace each of the B1-8 CDRs with those from D1.3. Each oligonucleotide has 12 nucleotides at the 5' end and 12 nucleotides at the 3' end which are complementary to the NEW framework regions, whereas the central portion encodes CDRs 1, 2, or 3 of the D1.3 antibody. The primers are complementary to the marked portions of the coding strand of the reshaped domain. Three rounds of mutagenesis were used, transfecting into the *Escherichia coli* strain BMH71-18mutL, plating on a lawn of BMH71-18, and probing infected colonies with the mutagenic primers as in (8). In washing the filters, it was necessary to gradually increase the wash temperature from 65° to 75°C to distinguish the mutant from wild-type clones. The yield of mutants at each step was about 5%.





Fig. 3. Competition of reshaped and engineered mouse antibody for lysozyme. The wells of a microtiter plate were coated with lysozyme at a concentration of 100 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), and remaining binding sites on the plastic were blocked with 1% bovine serum albumin (in PBS). The binding of ^{125}I -labeled mouse antibody D1.3 (specific activity, $>0.6 \mu\text{Ci}$ per micrograms of D1.3) to lysozyme was competed with increasing concentrations of (■) engineered antibody (MoV_{HLYS} - $MoIgG1$, κ) or (□) reshaped antibody (HuV_{HLYS} - $HuIgG2$, κ), and the data presented are typical of two independent experiments. Antibody D1.3 and reassembled antibody D1.3 competed with the labeled D1.3 as effectively as did the engineered antibody D1.3. Radioiodination was carried out by the chloramine T method (22).



the binding of lysozyme to these antibodies. The binding to both antibodies was tight, with 2 mol of lysozyme molecules binding 1 mol of antibody. Our results indicate that the affinity is better than 5 nM, although previous work had indicated a value of 20 to 40 nM (6, 13). The antibodies were then compared in a competition assay for lysozyme; ^{125}I -labeled mouse antibody D1.3 competing with mouse antibody or with the reshaped antibody for binding to lysozyme. The reshaped antibody competes, albeit less effectively (about tenfold less) than the mouse antibody (Fig. 3). Nevertheless, the grafting of hypervariable regions from mouse to human framework regions is sufficient to transfer the lysozyme-binding site, an extensive surface of interaction, despite the 31 of 87 residues that differ between the heavy-chain framework regions.

The results confirm that the hypervariable

regions (mainly loops) fashion the antigen-binding site and that the more conserved regions (mainly β -sheet) form a structural framework (14). However, the result is remarkable given the several assumptions underlying the building of an antigen-binding site on a new framework region—namely, (i) the V_H and V_L domains pack together in the same way (15), (ii) the two β -sheets within each variable domain pack together in the same way (16), (iii) the antigen usually binds to the hypervariable regions, and (iv) the hypervariable regions are supported by the framework regions in a similar way (17). In particular, the hypervariable loops are not stand-alone structures, but make extensive contacts to the framework and to other hypervariable regions. Since the crystallographic structures of both parent antibodies are known, we could confirm that in the reshaped antibody the D1.3

CDRs could be supported by the NEW framework regions with the same (or similar) contacts as are used with the D1.3 framework regions. However, we also identified some potential problems. For example, in CDR1 of D1.3, Tyr-32 makes a van der Waals contact with the Phe-27 in FR1; in NEW this phenylalanine is replaced by serine, and this contact is therefore lost when the D1.3 CDRs are mounted on NEW framework regions. Furthermore, in antibody D1.3 the loop including the end of FR1 bulges out from the surface, whereas in NEW (and other solved structures), it is pinned back to the surface. Despite these problems, the reshaped antibody is able to bind lysozyme.

It is conceivable that the several contacts made by the FR1/CDR1 loop to lysozyme make only a small contribution to the overall energetics of binding. Problems in this region would then have only a slight effect on the affinity. It is also possible that the shape of the binding site could adjust to the binding of antigen (18) and therefore that small errors in assembling the CDRs on a new framework might be "self-correcting" when the antigen binds. The energetic price for such putative self-correcting induced fit would be low, given the small loss in binding affinity suggested by the competition data of Fig. 3. It is not possible to deduce the exact change in affinity from the competition data, as the competition may only reflect the relative on-rates. However, even if the difference in affinities were tenfold, this would correspond to no more than the loss of a single hydrogen bond interaction (19). The shape of the antigenic epitope could also adjust to the binding of antibody (20), although no structural change in lysozyme was detected in its complex with the mouse D1.3 antibody (6). Furthermore, the whole surface of interaction could reorientate slightly, perhaps by rocking on side chains (21), to make a set of new contacts. This is an attractive model for large surfaces making multiple interactions. Thus self-correction could occur at the level of the antibody, the antigen, or the complex.

In conclusion, the structure of antibodies may incorporate features that assist the grafting of hypervariable regions. The critical features are that framework contacts are largely conserved between V_H and V_L domains, between the sheets within a domain, and to the CDR loops. In addition, the shape of the antigen binding site or the antigenic determinant (or both) might be able to adjust to each other in an induced-fit mechanism.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. R. A. Miller, A. R. Oseroff, P. T. Stratte, R. Levy, *Blood* 62, 988 (1982).

2. D. A. Carson and B. D. Freimark, *Adv. Immunol.* **38**, 275 (1986).
3. G. L. Boulianne, N. Hozumi, M. J. Shulman, *Nature (London)* **312**, 643 (1984); S. L. Morrison, M. J. Johnson, L. A. Herzenberg, V. T. Oi, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **81**, 6851 (1984).
4. M. S. Neuberger *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **314**, 268 (1985).
5. P. T. Jones, P. H. Dear, J. Foote, M. S. Neuberger, G. Winter, *ibid.* **321**, 522 (1986).
6. A. G. Amit, R. A. Mariuzza, S. E. V. Phillips, R. J. Poljak, *Science* **233**, 747 (1986).
7. M. E. Verhoeyen, C. Berek, G. Winter, in preparation.
8. P. Carter, H. Bedouelle, G. Winter, *Nucleic Acids Res.* **13**, 4431 (1985).
9. J. Ellison and L. Hood, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **79**, 1984 (1982).
10. H. Potter, L. Weir, P. Leder, *ibid.* **81**, 7161 (1984).
11. V. T. Oi, S. L. Morrison, L. A. Herzenberg, P. Berg, *ibid.* **80**, 825 (1983).
12. Clones secreting antibody were grown in 1-liter roller bottles, and antibody was purified on protein A-Sepharose. The mouse λ light chain of antibodies secreted from the J558L myeloma was exchanged for the D1.3 κ light chain in vitro. For the D1.3 antibody and the two recombinant antibodies (i) 1 to 2 mg of antibody (in 1 ml) was dialyzed overnight at 4°C against 0.5M tris, pH 8.0, (ii) inter-chain disulfides were reduced with 0.1M 2-mercaptoethanol for 1 hour at room temperature, (iii) the free sulfhydryls were alkylated with 0.15M iodoacetamide for 15 minutes at room temperature, (iv) the heavy and light chains were fractionated on a Dupont Zorbax G250 column in 5M guanidine hydrochloride and 20 mM sodium phosphate, pH 8.0. The D1.3 κ light chain was refractionated on high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and an aliquot was checked on analytical HPLC to ensure no contamination with the D1.3 heavy chain, (v) appropriate heavy chains were mixed with equal amounts of D1.3 κ light chain and dialyzed against 0.1M trisCl, pH 7.4, at 4°C for 2 days, and (vi) reassembled antibody was purified on a protein A-Sepharose column. The reassembled mouse antibody (MoIgG1) eluted at pH 6, and the reshaped antibody (HuIgG2) at pH 4. From 1 mg of antibody, the yield of reassembled antibody was less than 20%.
13. M. Harper, F. Lema, G. Boulot, R. J. Poljak, *Mol. Immunol.* **24**, 97 (1987).
14. E. A. Kabat, *Adv. Protein Chem.* **32**, 1 (1978).
15. C. Chothia, J. Novotny, R. Brucoleri, M. Karplus, *J. Mol. Biol.* **186**, 651 (1985).
16. A. M. Lesk and C. J. Chothia, *ibid.* **160**, 325 (1982).
17. C. Chothia and A. M. Lesk, *ibid.* **196**, 901 (1987).
18. A. B. Edmundson and K. R. Ely, in *Synthetic Peptides as Antigens*, R. Porter and J. Whelan, Eds. (Wiley, New York, 1986), p. 107; E. D. Getzoff *et al.*, *Science* **235**, 1191 (1987).
19. A. R. Fersht *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **314**, 235 (1985).
20. P. M. Colman *et al.*, *ibid.* **326**, 358 (1987).
21. C. Chothia, A. M. Lesk, G. G. Dodson, D. C. Hodgkin, *ibid.* **302**, 500 (1983).
22. L. Hudson and F. C. Hay, *Practical Immunology* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1980), p. 240.
23. We thank R. Poljak, A. Amit, S. Phillips, and R. A. Mariuzza for the crystallographic coordinates of D1.3 lysozyme complex; R. A. Mariuzza, J. Foote, C. Chothia, and A. Lesk for discussions and comments on the paper; J. Foote for use of the fluorescence titration method and associated computer programs in advance of publication; and J. Jarvis, P. T. Jones, and R. Pannell for technical assistance. M.V. is a senior research assistant of the Belgian National Fund for Scientific Research and a fellow of the Commission of the European Communities.

29 September 1987; accepted 8 February 1988

Peroxisomal Membrane Ghosts in Zellweger Syndrome—Aberrant Organelle Assembly

M. J. SANTOS, T. IMANAKA, H. SHIO, G. M. SMALL, P. B. LAZAROW

Peroxisomes are apparently missing in Zellweger syndrome; nevertheless, some of the integral membrane proteins of the organelle are present. Their distribution was studied by immunofluorescence microscopy. In control fibroblasts, peroxisomes appeared as small dots. In Zellweger fibroblasts, the peroxisomal membrane proteins were located in unusual empty membrane structures of larger size. These results suggest that the primary defect in this disease may be in the mechanism for import of matrix proteins.

ZELLWEGER SYNDROME IS A DISEASE in which an entire organelle, the peroxisome, appears to be missing, as first recognized by Goldfischer *et al.* (1). The peroxisome is nearly ubiquitous in eukaryotic cells and functions in fatty acid β -oxidation, plasmalogen biosynthesis, cellular respiration (H_2O_2 -forming), gluconeogenesis, bile acid synthesis, and purine catabolism (2). This human genetic disorder, characterized by profound neurological impairment, metabolic disturbance, and neonatal death, has taught us much about peroxisome function (3) and promises to teach us more about peroxisome assembly. Some peroxisomal proteins are synthesized normally in Zellweger syndrome (4), but they are not assembled into peroxisomes. Many of these proteins are rapidly degraded, with the result that important soluble matrix enzymes (catalyzing β -oxidation) (4) and membrane-bound enzymes (catalyzing the initial steps in plasmalogen biosynthesis) (4, 5) are missing or seriously deficient, thus

causing severe metabolic abnormalities (3). On the other hand, some peroxisomal enzymes (for example, catalase) are present in normal amounts in Zellweger cells but are located free in the cytosol (4, 6, 7).

These defects correlate with the known facts of peroxisome biogenesis. All peroxisomal proteins investigated thus far are synthesized on free polyribosomes and are assembled posttranslationally into preexisting peroxisomes (8). If the organelle is missing (1), newly made proteins will just diffuse through the cytosol, unable to enter a peroxisome. Under these circumstances, it is not surprising that many are degraded.

The autosomal recessive genetics of Zellweger syndrome indicates that a single mutation is responsible for the defects. One explanation would be that the mutation prevents the assembly of the peroxisomal membrane. In this case peroxisomal integral membrane proteins (PxIMPs) (9) should be absent, since those that have been studied are made on free polyribosomes (10–12) and are unlikely to be stable if not integrated into a membrane. Two other possibilities

were suggested by the unexpected finding that several PxIMPs are present in normal amounts in Zellweger liver (13). The peroxisomal membranes could be assembled in Zellweger syndrome, but the import of matrix proteins is defective. This would result in empty (or nearly empty) membrane ghosts, which would not be recognizable by electron microscopy or cytochemistry. Alternatively, the PxIMPs, in the absence of peroxisomes, might have violated the rules of protein sorting and inserted into the wrong intracellular membrane(s).

To differentiate among these possibilities, we analyzed fibroblasts with a polyspecific antiserum against rat liver PxIMPs (polyspecific anti-PxIMPs) (12) (Fig. 1A, lane 1). This serum detected three human PxIMPs with masses of approximately 140, 69, and 53 kD in control cells (Fig. 1A, lanes 2 to 4). These PxIMPs were also present in Zellweger fibroblasts (lane 5), and they cosedimented in equilibrium density centrifugation of Zellweger fibroblast homogenates. However, the PxIMPs were found at an abnormally low density of 1.10 g/cm³ (instead of the usual fibroblast peroxisome density of 1.17 g/cm³) [lanes 6 and 7; further details in (14)]. Several other cell membranes also sedimented in the low-density region of the gradient where the PxIMPs were found (14). Therefore, the fractionation data are consistent with the possibility that the PxIMPs are present in aberrant peroxisomal membrane ghosts, but they do not exclude erroneous localization in lysosomes, the endoplasmic reticulum, or some other low-density organelle. Immunofluorescence studies were carried out to resolve this uncertainty.

The Rockefeller University, New York, NY 10021