


Volume 1, Number 1, 1986

WORKROOM
HEALTH SCIENCES LIBRARY

PROTEINS

Structure, Function, and Genetics



10 1987

Alan R. Liss, Inc., New York

PROTEINS

Structure, Function, and Genetics

Editor-in-Chief

Cyrus Levinthal

Department of Biological Sciences • Columbia University • New York, New York

Editorial Board

John Abelson

Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California

Robert L. Baldwin

Department of Biochemistry, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California

Herman J.C. Berendsen

Laboratory of Physical Chemistry, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

David Botstein

Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Ralph Bradshaw

Department of Biological Chemistry, University of California, Irvine, California

Jean-Michel Claverie

Institute Pasteur, Unite d'Informatique Scientifique, Paris, France

Thomas E. Creighton

Medical Research Council, Laboratory of Molecular Biology, Cambridge, England

David Davies

Section of Molecular Structure, N.I.A.M.D.D., National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland

William F. DeGrado

Central Research and Development Department, E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company, Wilmington, Delaware

David Eisenberg

Molecular Biology Institute, University of California, Los Angeles, California

Donald M. Engelman

Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Robert J. Fletterick

Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California

Walter Gilbert

Biological Laboratories, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Nobuhiro Go

Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

Arnold T. Hagler

The Agouron Institute, La Jolla, California

Stephen C. Harrison

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Jan Hermans

Department of Biochemistry, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Barry Honig

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, New York

Leroy Hood

Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California

Wayne L. Hubbell

Jules Stein Eye Institute, University of California School of Medicine, Los Angeles, California

Michael N.G. James

Department of Biochemistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Alwyn Jones

Department of Molecular Biology, Uppsala, Sweden

Emil T. Kaiser

Laboratory of Bioorganic Chemistry and Biochemistry, Rockefeller University, New York, New York

Arthur Karlin

Departments of Biochemistry and Neurology, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University, New York, New York

Martin Karplus

Department of Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

William Konigsberg

Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, School of Medicine, New Haven, Connecticut

Joseph Kraut

Department of Chemistry, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, California

Robert Langridge

Computer Graphics Laboratory, Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of California, San Francisco, California

Dale L. Oxender

Center for Molecular Genetics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Alexander Rich

Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Jane S. Richardson

Department of Biochemistry, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina

Michael G. Rossman

Department of Biological Sciences, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana

Chris Sander

Abteilung Biophysik, Max Planck Institut, Heidelberg, Federal Republic of Germany

Robert Sauer

Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Robert Schleif

Department of Biochemistry, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts

David Shortle

Department of Biological Chemistry, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, Maryland

Paul Sigler

Department of Biophysics and Theoretical Biology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Thomas A. Steitz

Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut

Lubert Stryer

Department of Cell Biology, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California

Don Wiley

Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Kurt Wüthrich

Institut für Molekularbiologie und Biophysik, Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule, Zürich, Switzerland

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Alan R. Liss, Inc. for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC) Transactional Reporting Service, provided that the base fee of \$00.50 per copy, plus \$00.25 per page is paid directly to CCC, 27 Congress Street, Salem, MA 01970, 0887-3585/86 \$00.50 + .25.

Proteins: Structure, Function, and Genetics (ISSN 0887-3585) is published by Alan R. Liss, Inc., 41 East 11th Street, New York, NY 10003. **Subscription price:** Volume 1, 1986: September, October, November, December. \$90.00 in the US; \$102.00 outside the US. All subscriptions outside North America will be sent by air. Payment must be made in US dollars. Payments not drawn on a US bank will be subject to bank collection charges. **Change of address:** Please send to publisher six weeks prior to move; enclose present mailing label with change of address. **Claims for missing issues:** Claims cannot be honored beyond four months after mailing date. Duplicate copies cannot be sent to replace issues not delivered because of failure to notify publisher of change of address. Exclusive agent in Japan: Igaku Shoin limited, Foreign Department, 1-28-36 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113, Japan.

Printed in the United States of America. Copyright © 1986 Alan R. Liss, Inc.

The Galactan-Binding Immunoglobulin Fab J539: An X-Ray Diffraction Study at 2.6-Å Resolution

Se Won Suh,¹ T.N. Bhat,¹ Manuel A. Navia,¹ Gerson H. Cohen,¹ D.N. Rao,² Stuart Rudikoff,² and David R. Davies¹

¹Laboratory of Molecular Biology, National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases and ²Laboratory of Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, Maryland 20892

ABSTRACT The crystal structure of the Fab of the galactan-binding immunoglobulin J539 (a mouse IgA, κ) has been determined at a resolution of approximately 2.6 Å by X-ray diffraction. The starting model was that obtained from the real space search described previously (Navia, M.A., Segal, D.M., Padlan, E.A., Davies, D.R., Rao, D.N., Rudikoff, S. and Potter, M. "Crystal structure of galactan-binding mouse immunoglobulin J539 Fab at 4.5 Å resolution." *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA*, 76:4071-4074, 1979). This Fab structure has now been refined by restrained least-squares procedures to an R-value of 19% for the 11,690 unique reflections between 8.0 Å and 2.6 Å. The rms deviation from ideal bond lengths is 0.025 Å. The overall structure differs from McPC603 Fab, another mouse IgA, κ antibody, in that the elbow bend, relating the variable and constant parts of the molecule, is 145° vs. 133° for McPC603. The region of the molecule expected to be the antigen binding site contains a large cavity with two clefts leading away from it. This has been fitted with a model of an oligo-galactan.

Key words: antibody, crystal structure, anti-galactan, J539

INTRODUCTION

Current knowledge of the three-dimensional structure of antibodies is based mostly on the X-ray diffraction investigations of fragments.^{1,2} The structures of three Fabs have been determined: Kol³ and New,⁴ two human myeloma proteins, and McPC603,^{5,6} a mouse IgA, κ protein. Of these, New and McPC603 have known binding specificities, while the specificity of Kol is not known. There is therefore only limited information available concerning the interaction of antibodies with their antigenic determinants. In this paper we describe the crystal structure determination of J539, a mouse immunoglobulin Fab with binding specificity for β (1-6)-D-galactan. J539 is a member of a group of several antigalactans whose binding properties have been extensively studied. It is the only carbohydrate-binding antibody to have been so far studied by X-ray diffraction.

Previously the structure of J539 Fab had been analyzed at low resolution.⁷ There, a poorly defined 4.5-Å electron density map was examined by using a

search procedure based on the known structure of McPC603 Fab. This analysis confirmed the overall similarity of these two Fab structures and provided a basis for the higher-resolution analysis reported here.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Crystallization and Data Collection

J539 Fab was prepared as described previously,⁸ except that the purified material was further subjected to preparative isoelectric focusing in order to produce material that would ultimately yield large crystals suitable for the production of high-resolution X-ray diffraction data.⁹ The crystallizations were carried out by the hanging drop method at room temperature by using the vapor diffusion technique to equilibrate the protein droplet with a solution containing approximately 35% saturated ammonium sulfate, 0.07 M imidazole, 0.03 M zinc sulfate, pH 6.8. The crystals were orthorhombic, space group P2₁2₁2₁, with a = 54.1 Å, b = 74.2 Å, c = 130.8 Å.⁷

Intensity data were collected by rotation photography¹⁰ on Kodak No-Screen Medical X-ray films by using an Elliott GX-6 rotating anode X-ray generator operating at 40 kV and 40 mA. A Franks double-bent mirror system¹¹ purchased from Brandeis University was used to focus the X-ray beam. Data were collected on an Enraf-Nonius Arndt-Wonacott rotation camera with a nominal 80-mm crystal-to-film distance. The c-axis of the crystal was parallel to the rotation axis of the camera and the rotation range for each film pack was 2.3° with 0.3° overlap between film packs. This range permitted us to discard the partially recorded reflections. A total rotation of 91° was sufficient to record all the independent reflections, except for those in the cusp along the c-axis. Precession camera data for the layers 0kl, 1kl, h0l, h1l, h2l, hk0, hk1, and hhl were also collected to assist in interfilm scaling and to supply some of the remaining unobserved reflections.

Received June 3, 1986; accepted June 16, 1986.

S.W. Suh is now at the Department of Chemistry, College of Natural Sciences, Seoul National University, Seoul, Korea.

M.A. Navia is now at the Merck Sharpe and Dohme Research Laboratories, Rahway, NJ 07065.

Address reprint requests to D.R. Davies, Laboratory of Molecular Biology, National Institute of Diabetes, Digestive and Kidney Diseases, Bethesda, MD 20892.

The films were scanned at 100- μ m raster steps on an Optronics P-1000 film scanner. The resulting digital data were processed on a VAX 11/780 computer with a rotation film program written by G. Cornick and M.A. Navia (unpublished work), which incorporated the dynamic mask procedure of Sjolín and Wlodawer¹² to extract the integrated intensities of reflections. The program was modified to allow the use of roughly measured coordinates of eight strong, fully recorded reflections as supplementary fiducial marks in obtaining the initial [Q] matrix.¹³ This provided a starting transformation for a more accurate determination of the [Q] matrix by a least-squares procedure based on all fully recorded reflections which met certain criteria.

Intensities from the three films in each pack were first scaled, corrected for Lorentz and polarization factors, and symmetry averaged. Data from individual packs were merged and scaled together with those from the set of zero- and upper-level precession films by using a program of Y. Satow (unpublished work). The current data set to 2.6- \AA resolution contains 81% of the possible reflections: 90% to 3.0- \AA resolution and 64% between 3.0- \AA and 2.6- \AA resolution. Approximately 77% of the independent reflections were measured more than once. The statistics of the data processing are given in Table I.

Generation and Refinement of the Model

The location and orientation of the starting model⁷ were confirmed using the rotation method¹⁴ and an R-value search.^{15,16} Initial refinement of the model was carried out by using CORELS.¹⁷ Six parameters defining the orientation and position of the molecule were refined by using 10- \AA to 7- \AA data. Then constant and variable domains were refined as separate rigid groups by using 10- \AA to 5.4- \AA data. No noticeable improvement in the R-value was obtained when light and heavy chains were also treated as separate rigid groups.

This model was then refined with 3.5- \AA data by using PROLSQ.^{18,19} Residues of Fv were "mutated" from the McPC603 original model to those appropriate for J539 during the course of refinement. As the phases improved higher-resolution data were incorporated to the limit of 2.6 \AA and the J539 sequence was substituted for the McPC603 residues. The sequence used was that of Rudikoff et al.²⁰ for VL, Rao et al.²¹ for VH, Svasti and Milstein²² and Hamlyn et al.²³ for CL and Auffray et al.²⁴ for CH1.

Initial model building was done by using the interactive graphics program BILDER²⁵ to fit the model to 2Fo-Fc and Δ F maps. With the availability of the OMITMAP procedure²⁶ the graphics program FRODO²⁷ was used to fit the model to an OMITMAP. This improved the location of a number of residues and the overall contrast in the maps increased along with the improvement in the phases. During the final

TABLE I. Statistics from Processing of the Film Data

Total number of reflections measured	37,222
No. of independent reflections	12,670
Interfilm scaling R-value*	0.077

$$*R = \frac{\sum_{h_i} |I_{h_i} - \bar{I}_h|}{\sum_{h_i} I_{h_i}}, \text{ where } \bar{I}_h \text{ is the average intensity}$$

for a given reflection and I_{h_i} is one of the measurements which were averaged to yield \bar{I}_h .

passes of model building, 304 water molecules were added.

The result of the final refinement cycle is summarized in Table II. The rms error in positional parameters was estimated to be 0.3 \AA by the method of Luzzati.²⁸ The coordinates and other relevant data have been deposited in the Brookhaven Protein Data Bank.²⁹ Table III shows the relationship of the serial numbering system which we have used in this work to the system used by Kabat.³⁰

RESULTS

In Figure 1 is drawn the carbon alpha skeleton of the J539 Fab. In overall appearance it resembles the structure of other Fabs, in particular McPC603. The pairs of domains, CH1 and CL, are quite similar, having 88 carbon alphas match to give an rms difference of 1.8 \AA . The relation between CH1 and CL is that of a screw axis with a rotation of 174 $^\circ$ and a translation of 1.9 \AA . Similarly, with VH and VL, 99 pairs of carbon alphas match with an rms deviation of 1.6 \AA to give a rotation of 169.4 $^\circ$ and 0.04- \AA translation.

As expected from their sequence identity, the constant domains of J539 resemble quite closely the two corresponding domains of McPC603. The rms deviation of the backbone atoms is 1.6 \AA (2.1 \AA for all atoms). The relative disposition of CL and CH1 in J539 and McPC603 is not, however, exactly the same. For McPC603 the screw relation between CL and CH1 corresponds to a 169 $^\circ$ rotation with a 2.6- \AA translation. In the region of residues 131-139 (J539 numbering) there appears to be a major difference in the folding of the two CH1 domains. This region includes a proline residue that has been interpreted to be a cis-proline in McPC603 but trans- in J539. We do not know whether these differences are the result of an inadequate analysis of weak electron density or represent real differences in structure. We are undertaking a higher resolution study of J539 in order to attempt to clarify this situation.

The angle between the constant and variable pairs of domains differs between J539 (145 $^\circ$) and McPC603 (133 $^\circ$). This angle, the "elbow bend" of the Fab,^{31,32} has been found to be quite variable in different Fabs, going from about 133 $^\circ$ in New and McPC603 to as much as 170 $^\circ$ in the Fab Kol,³ probably signify-

TABLE II. Refinement Data

	Actual rms deviation†	Target σ
Average ΔF	92.6	‡
R-factor*	0.19	
No. of structure factors	11,690	
rms deviations from ideal distance (Å)		
Bond distance	0.025	0.030
Angle distance	0.052	0.040
Planar 1-4 distance	0.029	0.030
rms deviation from planarity (Å)	0.016	0.025
rms deviation from ideal chirality (Å ³)	0.199	0.150
rms deviation from permitted contact distances (Å)		
Single torsion contacts	0.219	0.500
Multiple torsion contacts	0.289	0.500
Possible hydrogen bond	0.269	0.500
rms deviation from ideal torsion angles (°)		
For planar group (0 or 180)	2.5	3.0
For staggered group (± 60 or 180)	26.0	15.0
For orthonormal group (± 90)	22.3	15.0

$$*R = \frac{\sum_h ||F_o| - |F_c||}{\sum_h |F_o|}$$

†rms = root mean square.

‡The weight chosen for the structure factor refinement, the "target σ " of ΔF , was modeled by the function $w = (1/\sigma)^2$ with $\sigma = 47 - 230 \times (\sin(\theta)/\lambda - 1/6)$.

ing flexibility in the polypeptide chains between V and C.

The interdomain contacts are summarized in Tables IV and V. These tables show, for each residue, the number of atom pairs in contact with residues of the other chain. A contact is defined as a distance which is less than the sum of the atomic van der Waals radii³³ plus 1.0 Å. Similar tables have been published for the McPC603 Fab⁶ and we note that while the contacts between CL and CH1 are relatively preserved, the contacts between VL and VH

contain significant differences, perhaps because of differences in the hypervariable regions. In J539 some 32 out of 86 interactions (37%) involve hypervariable residues only, compared with 46 out of 105 (44%) in McPC603. However, many of the same conserved residues found by Novotny and Haber³⁴ are also found here, making contacts across the interface. These include Y35, Q37, Y86, and F97 of the light chain and Q39, L45, W47, Y95, and W108 of the heavy chain.

The Galactan Binding Site

The binding of galactan in J539 has been extensively studied in solution by Glaudemans and his co-workers. The antibody combining site was shown to accommodate four sequential $\beta(1-6)$ -galactopyranosyl residues.³⁵⁻³⁷ Recently, Glaudemans et al.³⁸ have concluded from a binding study of a number of deoxy-fluorogalactosides that the binding involves both of the two solvent-exposed tryptophans in the combining site (residues W92L and W33H). They also proposed a rather specific model for the orientation of the galactan on the surface of the antibody molecule.

In this crystal form of J539 the presumed binding site for galactan is in close proximity to the constant region of a neighboring molecule (Table VI). Probably because of this close contact our attempts to diffuse galactan into these crystals were unsuccessful. Thus we have no direct crystallographic evidence to define the binding pocket of the Fab. Nevertheless, the three-dimensional structure of the variable module does provide some clues. Figure 2 is a skeletal model of J539 showing just the complementarity determining

TABLE III. Correspondence Between the Numbering Scheme Used Here and That of Kabat et al.³⁰

Light chain		Heavy chain	
This paper	Kabat et al.	This paper	Kabat et al.
1-27	1-27	1-52	1-52
28-213	29-214	53	52a
		54-83	53-82
		84-86	82a-82c
		87-104	83-100
		105	100a
		106-135	101-130
		136-138	133-135
		139-159	137-157
		160-167	162-169
		168-180	171-183
		181-196	185-200
		197-201	202-206
		202-212	208-218
		213-218	220-225

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.