Abstracting Knowledge from Protein Structures for Biology in the 21st Century

PDB40 Symposium

CSHL October 2011

Janet Thornton EMBL-EBI



EBI is an Outstation of the European Molecular Biology Laboratory.

Overview

- Personal Recollections of PDB
- Abstracting knowledge from structures for biology in the past and today
- Thoughts about the Future of PDB
- Thanks



Personal Recollections of the PDB: 1974 - 1995

- 12" tapes about every 3 months from Brookhaven via Daresbury to Oxford Lab in ~1974
- Growth in number of entries ('70s)
- Validation 1989 CCP4 'Errors in Protein Structures' / PDBClean/ PROCHECK
- Visits to Brookhaven (Tom Koetzle, Frances Bernstein & Enrique Abola) as part of Scientific Advisory Board
- Challenges of data increase move to RCSB: Helen, Phil & Gary







Personal Recollections of the PDB: 1995 onwards

- Establishing PDBe grant from Wellcome Trust (for 4 staff) to EMBL- EBI:
- 1995 recruitment of Kim Henrick
- Building relationships between PDBe & RCSB/PDBj/BMRB 1995 2005
- Kim & colleagues started to build the EMDB (2002)

W

- Establishment of wwPDB
- Recruiting Gerard (Kleywegt) 2009
 'Bringing Structure to Biology'



PROTEIN DATA BANK





& Geoff Barton







Abstracting Knowledge from the PDB

- The knowledge contributed by an individual protein structure about how this particular protein performs its biological function remains the most important aspect of knowledge in the PDB e.g. Von Willebrand Factor
- BUT additional knowledge in many areas can also be abstracted by combining information over many structures. In practice most proteins interact with many other molecules, either as multimers or as parts of pathways
- PDB code: 1auq Emsley *et al* (1997) J.B.C. <u>273</u> 10396

Σ Information over all or subset of PDB entries to generate knowledge





Abstracting Knowledge from PDB: Historical perspective

- Practical knowledge e.g. Which proteins are likely to crystallise
- Basics Principles of Protein Structure (physics/chemistry)
- The Universe of Proteins & evolutionary relationships
- Structure to Function



1970's Basic Principles of Protein Structure (Understanding Sequence to Structure)

- Properties of amino acids eg helix propensities
- Basic geometry of pp chain, e.g. phi,psi values
- Hydrophobic Core
- Secondary Structures
 - Helices geometry; length, curvature; packing
 - Strands twist; geometry; residue pairs
 - Turns types; residue preferences
- Chirality
 - Twists of sheets, Right handed βαβ, Barrels
- Tools for 'describing' protein structures
 - Secondary Structure Assignment DSSP
 - Hydrogen bonds HBPlus
 - Accessibility NACCESS











1980's The Universe of Protein Structures from the PDB

- Interactions:
 - Amino acid packing



- Tertiary packing helix; sheet
- Domains & multi-domain architectures
- Folds
- Evolution conserved structures
- New Tools
 - Visualisation
 - Homology Modelling
 - Simulations
 - Electrostatics





1990s Folds; Classification; Interactions

- Protein Structure Classifications
 CATH & SCOP
- Interactions
 - Protein-protein
 - Protein-Ligand
 - Protein-DNA





- New Tools:
 - Structure Comparison eg DALI
 - Patch Analysis for PPI
 - Docking
 - Fold Recognition Threading

Many of Tools now provided by PDB as searches

• PDBeMotif – to identify motifs



PDBePISA – to assign multimeric status in crystal



PDBeFold – to find all similar folds in PDB





Structural Genomics Projects ~2000

Taken from www.isgo.org





| Ontario Centre for SG | Canada | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----|------|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Montreal-Kingston Bacterial SG Initia | Canada | | | | | | | |
| Montreal Network for Pharmaco-Proteomics and SG | | | | | | | | |
| CyberCell Project | | | | | | | | |
| Structural Proteomics in Europe (SPI | Europe | | | | | | | |
| SG of Mycobacterium pathogens | | | | | | | | |
| SG of Eukaryotes | France | | | | | | | |
| Yeast SG | | | | | | | | |
| SG of Orphan <i>E. coli</i> Genes | | | | | | | | |
| Protein Structure Factory | Germ | any | | | | | | |
| RIKEN SG/Proteomics Initiative | | | 1 | | | | | |
| National Project on Protein Structural and Functional A Japan enters) | | | | | | | | |
| Biological Information Research Center (BIRC) | | | | | | | | |
| The Korean Structural Proteomics Research Organization | | | | | | | | |
| National Centers for Competence in F | zorland - | | | | | | | |
| North West SG Centre | | | Svit | Zenanu | | | | |
| Oxford Protein Production Facility | UK | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG Berkeley SG Center | _ | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG Berkeley SG Center Northeast SG Consortium | | | | | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG Berkeley SG Center Northeast SG Consortium TB SG Consortium | | | | USA | | | | |
| Cambridge GroupNew York SG Research ConsortiumMidwest Center for SGBerkeley SG CenterNortheast SG ConsortiumTB SG ConsortiumSoutheast Collaboratory for SG | | | | USA | | | | |
| Cambridge GroupNew York SG Research ConsortiumMidwest Center for SGBerkeley SG CenterNortheast SG ConsortiumTB SG ConsortiumSoutheast Collaboratory for SGJoint Center for SG | | | | USA | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG Berkeley SG Center Northeast SG Consortium TB SG Consortium Southeast Collaboratory for SG Joint Center for SG SG of Pathogenic Protozoa Consortiu | | | | USA | | | | |
| Cambridge Group New York SG Research Consortium Midwest Center for SG Berkeley SG Center Northeast SG Consortium TB SG Consortium Southeast Collaboratory for SG Joint Center for SG SG of Pathogenic Protozoa Consortiu Center for Eukaryotic SG | | | | USA | | | | |

From Structure to Function



Molecular Function



Fold & Function

- No direct correlation between fold & function, though some tendencies
 - DNA binding proteins tend to be helical
 - Haem binding proteins tend to be helical
 - Enzymes tend to adopt $\alpha\beta$ folds



- Immune-related proteins tend to be β -sheet structures e.g. Ab
- Membrane proteins are predominantly helical apart from porins



From Structure To Biochemical Function

However identifying sequence or structural similarity (i.e. identifying an evolutionary relationship) is the most powerful route to function assignment

BUT members of the same protein superfamily often have a related but not identical function

MICROEVOLUTION BY ARTIFICIAL SELECTION



John Ellis

Aspartate Amino Transferase Superfamily



Decarboxylase

SDR Family Short chain dehydrogenase/reductase family



>60 in humans

Catalytic Tetrad: S,Y,K,N

Different Functions:

Oxidoreductases E.C. 1.1 & 1.3; Lyases E.C. 4.3; Isomerases E.C. 5.1

Many structures solved Many different substrates













UCL Christine Orengo Ian Sillitoe, Alison Cuff

Understanding Enzyme Families and Evolution

EBI Nick Furnham, Gemma Holliday

Understanding Enzyme Families & Evolution

- Data
 - Protein Sequences
 - Protein Structures with ligands!
 - Substrate Knowledge (promiscuity)
 - in vitro
 - In vivo
 - Reaction mechanisms
- Computational tools for:
 - Sequence comparison
 - Structure comparison
 - Small molecule comparison
 - Reaction comparison
- Then we need to integrate and visualise all these data!!







EMBL-E









Phosphatidylinositol-Phosphodiesterase (PIP) Superfamily





Phosphatidylinositol-Phosphodiesterase Superfamily^{EMBL-EBI}



*

Phosphatidylinositol-Phosphodiesterase Superfamily^{EMBL-EBI}





Phosphatidylinositol-Phosphodiesterase Superfamily



EMBL-EBI 🛛 🕄



Phosphatidylinositol-Phosphodiesterase Superfamily



EMBL-EBI 👪

Legend Spider venom (Clade 3) – red Eukaryote (Clade 1) - blue

Enzyme Domains & Superfamilies

To test we started with an analysis of 6 superfamilies (based on SFLD database from Babbitt group):

Haloacid dehalogenase Terpene Cyclases Amidohydrolase Crotonase Enolase Vicinal Oxygen Chelate

Now we have processed **276** Superfamilies

The superfamilies were chosen using MACiE to identify domains with known catalytic residues.

Data Overview



Changes in enzyme function:-

- Which changes in enzyme function are observed?
- At which level of E.C. Code?
- How do we represent these changes?





E.C. Changes Using Phylogenetic Trees

EMBL-EBI

| | E.C. 1 | E.C. 2 | E.C. 3 | E.C. 4 | E.C. 5 | E.C. 6 | |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------|
| Percentage of changes (total | 36.3% (1212) | 1.3% (42) | 0.8% (28) | 0.6% (19) | 0.7% (24) | 0.2% (7) | E.C. 1 |
| number of counts) | | 12.6% (421) | 1.6% (52) | 1.6% (52) | 0.5% (18) | 0.5% (16) | E.C. 2 |
| | | | 25.1% (837) | 0.8% (27) | 0.5% (17) | 0.2% (8) | E.C. 3 |
| Total Num within cla | iber 29 | 967 | | 9.4% (314) | 1.0% (33) | 0.4% (13) | E.C. 4 |
| changes | s (8 | 9%) | | | 2.4% (79) | 0.1% (4) | E.C. 5 |
| Total Num between c change | nber 3 lass s (1 | 60 1%) | | | | 3.4% (112) | E.C. 6 |

CONCLUSIONS

- New functions emerge by local domain evolution and domain fusions
- Evolution of enzyme function occurs within most superfamilies
 - Changes within a class dominate ie changes of specificity
 - Changes between EC primary classes do occur, but much more rarely – some changes are more common than expected
- Small number of families cover majority of reactions
 - Small no. of primordial enzymes sufficient for life?
- Most changes in reaction chemistry are observed in very distantly related enzymes (ancient changes?)
 - Changes in specificity at leaves of trees
 - Changes in reaction chemistry at 'root' of trees



Challenges for the PDB (from Gerard)

- Growth
 - Number, size, complexity of entries
 - Hybrid, low-resolution methods
 - From molecular to cellular structural biology
 - User base!
- Validation
- Integration
- From structural biology archive to biomedical resource
 - Best-practice models *versus* published models
 - New ways of accessing and using structural information





Growth of EBI Databases 2000-2010*

All resources are growing rapidly

Data doubling every 5 months

12 petabytes data storage

CHALLENGE: DATA => KNOWLEDGE

More Data

- Structural data:
 - More data
 - RNA
 - Membrane proteins
 - Protein complexes
 - FEL Data (Dynamics)
- Other data
- Integration of data
- ??

NGS Data Human Variation Data Links to disease phenotypes **HT Cell Biology** HT Light microscopy **EM** Tomography DNA in 3D _arge protein machines

Uroporphyrinogen decarboxylase (1uro) Heme biosynthesis pathway Porphyria cutanea tarda

Data Integration: PDB⇔ Sequences SIFTS

PLEA FOR MORE FUNCTIONAL DATA IN PDB TO FACILITATE KNOWLEDGE EXTRACTION: Capturing knowledge learnt from structure into the PDB, using agreed standards, vocabularies and ontologies:

- Simple things:
 - Experimental protocols
 - Function of protein
 - Function of ligand eg inhibitor/crystallisation aid
 - Functional highlights of structure – biological consequences
 - Role of dynamic movement
 - Relationship to other structures in PDB

• More complex:

- Protein localisation
- Catalytic site for enzyme
- Binding site for receptor
- Mechanism of enzyme
- Effects of Mutations
- Interaction partners/pathway context
- Disease relationships

THANKS to

- All Structural Biologists, who deposit in PDB
- Original Founders of PDB
- Current and past leaders of PDB
- All staff of wwPDB

