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The undersigned have a long standing concern with the problem of public access to the results of single crystal X-ray diffraction studies on biological macromolecules. The actual data from such research are the measured X-ray intensities, and the primary results are the lists of atomic coordinates derived from those data. While many papers on various proteins and nucleic acids have been published describing and interpreting the results of such a structure analysis, the actual data and results are often not made easily accessible, if at all. We are requesting that the journals which play a major role in the publication of such structural studies adopt and enforce rules for documentation similar to those which apply in all other areas of scientific research. Studies where the structural information has not been made available must be considered incomplete, as would any other piece of research where the data were not provided in published or deposited form.
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The Low Resolution Problem

How can one obtain a “good” crystal structure at low resolution?

There are generally more independent reflections than torsion angles at 5 Å resolution

Problems:
• poor observable to parameter ratio
• electron density maps may be difficult to interpret
• potential model bias

Need for powerful reciprocal and real space methods
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- MR for a new structure at 3 Å (high B-factors)
- Refinement at 7.4 Å resolution
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Target Function For Macromolecular Refinement

\[ E_{\text{total}} = E_{\text{geometric}} + \omega_{\text{x-ray}} E_{\text{x-ray}} + \omega_{\text{molecule}} E_{\text{molecule}} \]

improved model → improved phases → improved electron density maps

macromolecular structure knowledge

diffraction data
DEN (Deformable Elastic Network) Restraints

\[ E_{\text{total}} = E_{\text{geometric}} + w_{\text{x-ray}} E_{\text{x-ray}} + w_{\text{DEN}} E_{\text{DEN}} \]

\[ E_{\text{DEN}}(n) = \sum (d_{ij} - d_{ij}^0(n))^p \]

\[ N \text{ pairs } i, j \]

Reference model \(\to\) selected inter-atom distances \(\to\) sparse distance network \(d_{ij}^0(n)\)

- randomly selected atom pairs within a specified distance range, and separated by a specified interval in the primary sequence
- typically \(\sim 1\) distance restraint per atom

\(\text{Schröder, Levitt, Brunger, Nature 2010}\)
Implementation Of The DEN Method

Several (typically 10) macrocycles consisting of:
- torsion angle refinement (slow-cooling molecular dynamics)
- default option: restrained grouped B-factor refinement
- default option: last two cycles are without DEN restraints

Target function:

\[ E_{\text{total}} = E_{\text{geometric}} + w_a E_{\text{ML}} + w_{\text{DEN}} E_{\text{DEN}} \]

\[ E_{\text{DEN}}(n) = \sum_{N \text{ pairs } i,j} (d_{ij} - d_{ij}^0(n))^p \]

During slow-cooling cycles, periodic updates of the DEN equilibrium distances are performed

\[ d_{ij}^0(n + 1) = (1 - \kappa)d_{ij}^0(n) + \kappa\left[ \gamma d_{ij} + (1 - \gamma)d_{ij}^{\text{ref}} \right] \]

\( \gamma \): deformation factor (adjustable)
\( w_{\text{DEN}} \): weight for DEN restraints (adjustable)
\( \kappa \): damping factor (usually set to 0.1)
\( d_{ij}^{\text{ref}} \): distances from reference model
\( d_{ij}^0(n) \): current DEN restraint distances
\( d_{ij} \): current distances of refinement model

Multiple trials for each \((\gamma, w_{\text{DEN}})\) parameter pair and temperature
Trial with the best \(R_{\text{free}}\) is used for subsequent steps
DEN is a general refinement method that guides torsion angle molecular dynamics by restricting it to reasonable conformational changes (e.g., differences between homologous models or motions).

DEN introduces information that is specific for the particular starting structure (e.g., homology model).

Degree of deformation is determined by $\gamma$

- $\gamma=0$: no deformations of reference distances allowed
- $\gamma=1$: deformations track refined model (akin “jelly body”)
- $0<\gamma<1$: deformations allowed according to some interpolation between current and reference distances

Grid search for best $(\gamma, w_{\text{DEN}})$ parameters and annealing temperature
Some Notes And Considerations

• General modes
  • New refinement: initial model = reference model
  • Re-refinement: initial model ≠ reference model

• Special options
  • DEN-restraints active throughout
  • $w_{DEN}=0 \iff$ torsion angle simulated annealing (without DEN)

• Implementation in CNS 1.3 and Phenix.refine (development)

• Resource for grid search: SBGrid Science Portal (www.sbgrid.org)
Outline

- Overview of DEN-refinement
- MR for a new structure at 3 Å (high B-factors)
- Refinement at 7.4 Å resolution
Structure Of Cgll1109 (JCGS HP3342)  
(A Putative Succinyl-Diaminopimelate Desuccinylase (dapE) From C. Glutamicum)  

Collaboration with D. Das, A. Deacon, J. Grant, T. Terwilliger, R. Read, P. Adams, M. Levitt, G. Schröder

- Anisotropic diffraction data to ~ 3 Å resolution
- MAD data available, but experimental map was not easily interpretable
- Weak homology to known structures (1vgy with 25% identity)
- One of the cases used by DiMaio et al. (2011)
- MR solution for both 1vgy and Modeller model of Cgll1109 (Phaser: RFZ=3.2, TFZ=9.9, LLG=75, $R_{cryst}=0.65$)
DEN Refinement
+ Automated Model Building With AutoBuild

- Reference model = initial model = MR solution
  (search model: Modeller homology model)

- Standard DEN protocol: but restrained individual
  B-factor refinement

- AutoBuild with “morphing” and “rebuild in place”
Optimization Of DEN Parameters

Optimum $R_{\text{free}}$

Parameter $\gamma$

Weight $w_{DEN}$
Larger Radius Of Convergence For DEN Vs. Standard Refinement

Standard refinement ($R_{\text{free}}=0.52$) vs. final (orange)

Standard ref. + AutoBuild ($R_{\text{free}}=0.48$) vs. final (orange)

DEN ($R_{\text{free}}=0.44$) vs. final (orange)

DEN + AutoBuild ($R_{\text{free}}=0.42$) vs. final (orange)
DEN-Refinement Produced Better $2mF_o - DF_c$ Maps Than Standard Refinement

Standard ref. (blue) + AutoBuild (cyan)  
DEN (blue) + AutoBuild (cyan)

Orange: final model
DEN+Autobuild Map Showed How To Correct The Model

Magenta: model after first round of DEN+AutoBuild
Cyan: corresponding DEN+AutoBuild $2mF_o-DF_c$ map
Orange: final model
## Final Model

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{free}}$</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_{\text{cryst}}$</td>
<td>0.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandran favored</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandran outliers</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molprobity score</td>
<td>2.41 (96th percentile)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final $2mF_o-DF_c$**
Results For The Refinement Of Cgl1109

• Synergism between DEN-refinement and AutoBuild

• Improved model ➔ improved phases ➔ better starting point for AutoBuild

• Semi-automated completion of the structure with AutoBuild
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Refinement Of Photosystem 1 (PSI) At 7.4 Å Resolution

Collaboration with Henry Chapman, Thomas White (CFELS, DESY), Petra Fromme, Raimund Fromme (Univ. of Arizona)

- DEN-refinements using synchrotron (ALS) data of a PSI crystal in harvesting buffer used for nano-crystal generation (Chapman et al., Nature, 2011), $d_{\text{min}} \sim 5$ Å

- Data truncated to 7.4 Å to make it comparable to FEL (LCLS) data of PSI

- Increasingly scrambled starting models ($C_\alpha$ rmsd to target 1JB0: 0, 2.3,...,4.4 Å)

- Omitted three Fe-S clusters (for validation)

- Reference model = starting model

- Standard DEN protocol, except DEN active throughout, sparse random selection between all atoms, and only overall B-factor refinement
Increasingly Scrambled Starting Structures

Green: PS1 (PDB ID 1JB0)
Magenta: maximum scrambled structure
(Cα rmsd: 4.4 Å, right most helix displaced by 5.4 Å)
Solutions were found for all starting structures

Molecular Replacement (7.4 Å Resolution)

Phaser TFZ Score

Phaser LLG Score

Solutions were found for all starting structures
Comparison Of Refinement Protocols

**Rfree**

- 0.25 - 0.55
- 1 - 6

- Starting structure

**RMSD To Target**

- 0 - 7
- 1 - 6

- Starting structure

**Average Significance (<σ>) of FeS Peaks**

- 0 - 12
- 1 - 6

Legend:
- overall rigid body refinement
- standard refinement
- torsion simulated annealing refinement
- DEN-refinement
- secondary structure restrained refinement
Results For Maximally Scrambled Starting Structure

DEN (orange) vs. starting (magenta)
DEN-refinement shifted helices by 5.5 Å

DEN (orange) vs. target 1JB0 (green)

Mg ions are shown as spheres
Results For The Maximally Scrambled Starting Structure

Mg ions are shown as spheres

DEN $2mF_o-DF_c$ map (blue) vs. target 1JB0 (green)

target $2mF_o-DF_c$ map (blue) vs. target 1JB0 (green)

1.5 $\sigma$ contour level
DEN-Refinements With Two Helices Omitted (Chain F, Residues 103:126 - Yellow)

DEN-refinement starting from 1JB0

DEN mF₀-DFₐ map (mesh) vs. target 1JB0 (green and yellow)

DEN-refinement starting from max. scrambled

DEN mF₀-DFₐ map (mesh) vs. target 1JB0 (green and yellow)

3 (orange), 2.5 (blue), 2 σ (light blue) contour levels
Results For The Maximally Scrambled Starting Structure:
Standard Refinement

*Mg ions are shown as spheres*

standard refinement (teal)
vs. target 1JB0 (green)
Results For Maximally Scrambled Starting Structure:
Standard Refinement

*Mg ions are shown as spheres*

standard refinement $2mF_o-DF_c$ map (blue) vs. target 1JB0 (green)

1.5 $\sigma$ contour level
DEN-Refinement At 7.4 Å Resolution Is Beneficial

Compared to overall rigid body, standard, or simulated annealing refinement, DEN-refinement

• moves closer to the true structure

• recovers information not included in the refined model - more significant features in difference maps
Overall Conclusions For DEN-Refinement

- DEN-refinement is a general method that can produce better models than standard refinement or simulated annealing protocols.
- DEN-refined model phases are a better starting point for (automated) model building.
- Most benefit is for starting structures that are far from the true structure, low-resolution, or high B-factor cases.
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