NMR structural studies of the first catalytic half-domain of ubiquitin activating enzyme
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**Abstract**

We report a high resolution NMR structure and $^{15}$N relaxation studies of the first catalytic cysteine half-domain (FCCH) of the mouse ubiquitin-activating enzyme E1, together with interaction studies of FCCH and the other catalytic E1 subdomain – SCCH (second catalytic cysteine half-domain). In solution, mouse FCCH forms a well-defined six-stranded antiparallel β-barrel structure, a common fold for many proteins with a variety of cellular functions. $^{15}$N relaxation data reveal FCCH complex backbone dynamics and indicate which residues experience slow intramolecular motions. Some of these residues make contacts with the polar face of ubiquitin in the co-crystal structure of yeast E1 and ubiquitin. However, the titration of FCCH with ubiquitin does not show any visible chemical shift changes in the 2D $^{1}$H/$^{15}$N HSQC spectra of the FCCH. The 2D $^{1}$H/$^{15}$N HSQC experiments performed both for each catalytic half-domain individually and for their equimolar mixture in the millimolar concentration range display no detectable chemical shift perturbation, suggesting a lack of interaction between the two subdomains unless they are covalently linked via the adenylation domain.

**1. Introduction**

Ubiquitin is a major posttranslational protein modifier in all eukaryotes. The highly conserved 76 amino acid protein can be iso-peptide linked via its C-terminal glycine residue to the ε-amino group of a lysine residue in a substrate protein. If the substrate protein is ubiquitin itself, polyubiquitin chains are formed, which serve as a proteasome targeting signal. Ubiquitylation requires the subsequent action of three enzymes: E1 (ubiquitin activating enzyme), E2 (ubiquitin conjugating enzyme), and E3 (ubiquitin ligase) that together transfer Ub to substrate proteins (Hershko and Ciechanover, 1998; Cooper, 2000).

The ubiquitin activating enzyme E1 consumes ATP and converts Ub to a transfer-competent, enzyme-bound thioester. The reaction begins with Ub-adenylate formation and the release of pyrophosphate. The active site cysteine of the E1 then displaces the AMP, leading to a ubiquitin-E1 thioester complex. More detailed studies have shown that ubiquitin activation follows a complex choreography involving concerted processing of two Ub molecules (Haas et al., 1982). In recent years the structure of yeast E1 with a Ub molecule bound in the adenylation site has been reported (Lee and Schindelin, 2008). The E1 enzyme has several domains: an adenylation domain (composed of active and inactive adenylation subdomains), a so-called catalytic cysteine domain, and smaller accessory domains: a four helix bundle and a ubiquitin fold domain. The catalytic cysteine domain itself is composed of subdomains, which have been termed the first (FCCH) and second (SCCH) catalytic cysteine half domains (Szczepanowski et al., 2005) (Fig. 1).
Both the FCCH (111 amino acid residues) and the SCCH (276 amino acid residues) fold autonomously in solution. Previously it was shown that the SCCH of mouse E1 forms crystals suitable for X-ray diffraction experiments (Szczepanowski et al., 2005). Despite the publication of the yeast E1−ubiquitin complex crystal structure, the detailed catalytic mechanism of ubiquitinylatation initiation is still not well understood.

In this study, we present an NMR determined structure of the autonomously folded FCCH subdomain of mouse E1, coupled with 15N backbone relaxation studies. Moreover, we report that NMR cannot detect interactions between the FCCH and ubiquitin, or between FCCH and SCCH if they are on separate polypeptide chains.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Protein expression and purification

The Swiss-Prot entry Q02053 for mouse E1 has recently been changed by the addition of 60 amino acids to the amino terminus of the protein, reflecting a realignment of the initiator methionine. For consistency with previous structural work on mouse E1 (Szczepanowski et al., 2005), we based our numbering on the earlier version of the entry throughout the manuscript and also in the PDB submission. The design of the Escherichia coli expression constructs for the mouse E1 FCCH (residues 202−312 of the full length sequence according to Swiss-Prot entry Q02053) and SCCH of mouse E1 (residues 626−891) with a histidine tag has been described previously (Szczepanowski et al., 2005). The protocol available from the EMBL peptide services (EMBL Heidelberg) was used for the expression of 15N and 13C/15N labeled proteins. 5 ml of medium A (Supplementary Table A.1) was inoculated with a single colony of E. coli BL21 (DE3) and grown overnight at 37°C. This overnight culture was added to 1.1 of medium A and grown to an OD600 of 0.7−1.0. Afterwards, the culture was shifted to 28°C. Expression was induced by adding IPTG to a concentration of 0.5 mM. Cells were grown for additional 4 h and harvested by centrifugation. Recombinant, labeled proteins were purified by IMAC chromatography, followed by gel filtration (Szczepanowski et al., 2005).

2.2. NMR assignment and structure determination

13C, 15N-double labeled protein was suspended in a 90 : 10 H2O/D2O mixture, 50 mM TRIS-d11, 50 mM NaCl at pH 6.5 (uncorrected value) at a 1 mM concentration. 650 μl aliquots were used for NMR experiments. All NMR experiments used for structure determination were performed at 11.7 T on a Varian Unity +500 spectrometer at 298 K. FCCH and SCCH interactions in solution were studied by 1H/15N HSQC measurements of either 13N-labeled FCCH subdomain only or a 1:1 mixture of 15N labeled FCCH with unlabeled SCCH. Sample preparation, buffer composition and measurement conditions were the same as for the double labeled protein. FCCH titration with ubiquitin was carried out on 0.6 mM 14C, 15N-double labeled FCCH, using the buffer and other conditions as described above. Molar ratios of FCCH to ubiquitin were varied between 0 and 5.

NMR data were processed in NMRPipe (Delaglio et al., 1995) and analyzed with Sparky (Goddard and Kneller, 2010) and CARA software (Keller, 2004). Sequence specific assignment of backbone and side chain 1H, 15N and 13C resonances was based on standard 3D techniques and described previously (Jaremko et al., 2006). Briefly, the 1H, 15N, and 13C backbone resonances were assigned using 3D HNCACB (Wittkekind and Mueller, 1993), 3D HNCA (Ikura et al., 1990), and HNCO (Muhendidam and Kay, 1994) spectra and confirmed by the 15N-edited 3D NOESY-HSQC (mixing time 150 ms) spectrum (Zhang et al., 1994). Assignments of aliphatic 1H and 13C resonances in side chains were done based on 3D HBHA(CO)NH (Grzesiek and Bax, 1993), C(CO)NH-TOSCY (Gardner et al., 1996), and HCHC-TOSCY (Rax et al., 1990) experiments.

NOE distance constraints were derived from 3D heteronuclear 15N- and 13C-edited NOESY-HSQC experiments (Muhendidam et al., 1993). The initial structure calculations were performed with CYANA software (Guentert et al., 1997). The automatic NOE assignment procedure provided distance constraints. Additional restraints for backbone ϕ and ψ torsion angles were defined based on N, HN, Ca, Cα, Cβ, Hα and Cα chemical shifts estimated using the PREDITOR server (Berjanskii et al., 2006). Additional hydrogen bond constraints, defined as FPN.O = 1.7...2.0 Å and rN.O = 2.7...3.0 Å were introduced based on geometric criteria before the final structure calculations. A hydrogen bond was selected for the final refinement in explicit solvent if it existed in more than 75% of structures in the ensemble. XPLOR-NIH 2.26 (Schwieters et al., 2003) was used for final structure calculations on the 70 lowest energy structures from 200 submitted for simulated annealing. The edge length of the water box was 18.8 Å. The final ensemble discussed in this article represents 20 of the lowest energy conformers without distance violations of more than 0.5 Å and dihedral angle violations of more than 5° obtained after water refinement. Evaluation of the FCCH structure quality was performed with PROCHECK-NMR (Laskowski et al., 1993) and WHAT-IF (Vriend, 1990) programs.

2.3. 15N relaxation data measurements

All 15N relaxation measurements were performed with a 15N-labeled protein sample on a Varian 400 MHz (9.4 T) spectrometer at 298 K. Longitudinal (R1) and transverse (R2) relaxation rates were measured using a sensitivity-enhanced 15N-1H HSQC pulse sequence (Kay et al., 1992) included in the ProteinPack Varian Inc. (Palo Alto, USA) software. Zero filling was performed prior to the Fourier transformation. Eight evolution periods (10, 60, 110, 170, 240, 330, 460, and 600 ms) were used for the determination.

Fig.1. (A) Schematic architecture of E1 enzyme. The enzyme consists of an adenylation domain, a cysteine catalytic domain (CC), a four helix bundle (4HB), and a ubiquitin fold domain (UFD). The adenylation domain can be further subdivided into inactive (IAD) and active (AAD) adenylation (sub)domains, whereas the catalytic cysteine domain is split into first (FCCH) and second (SCCH) catalytic cysteine subdomains. (B) Subunit and domain architecture in the yeast E1. The catalytic cysteine domain is split into first (FCCH) and second (SCCH) catalytic subdomains. (A) Subunit and domain architecture in the yeast E1. The catalytic cysteine domain is split into first (FCCH) and second (SCCH) catalytic subdomains.
of $R_1$ values. $R_2$ relaxation rate measurements were performed with the Carr–Purcell–Meiboom–Gill (CPMG) pulse train. Refocusing time during eight evolution periods (10, 30, 50, 70, 90, 110, 130, and 170 ms) was 650 μs. In both types of experiments, 3.0 s delays between the scans were used. $^1$H-15N NOE values were measured with the pulse sequence included in the ProteinPack Varian Inc. (Palo Alto, USA) software. NOE values were calculated from spectra measured with and without $^1$H presaturation (3.0 s). The recycling delay was 8.0 s. Resonance intensities were used for calculating relaxation rates and NOE values. Experimental errors of relaxation rates were obtained from appropriate elements of the variance–covariance matrix. Experimental errors of NOE values were evaluated from signal-to-noise ratios obtained for corresponding signals in spectra with and without NOEs (Fushman, 2003).

2.4. Analysis of 15N relaxation data

Relaxation data were analyzed using the model-free approach (Lipari and Szabo, 1982). The number of global parameters, $a$, describing overall diffusion tumbling depends on the relevant model of motion; $a = 1$ for the isotropic diffusion, $a = 4$ for the axially symmetric diffusion, and $a = 6$ for the anisotropic diffusion. (Tjandra et al., 1995; Woessner, 1962). Three local, residue-specific parameters comprise a generalized order parameter $S_2$, which is a measure of the degree of spatial restriction of the motions faster than the overall diffusion, an effective correlation time $\tau_{int}$ related to the rate of these motions, and $K_{ex}$ describing conformational exchange contribution to the transverse relaxation rates resulting from the dynamic processes slower than the overall rotational diffusion, but fast on the chemical shift time scale. These processes are most often characterized by the microsecond to millisecond time scale (Stone et al., 1992). The $K_{ex}$ contribution to the transverse relaxation rate is proportional to the square of the chemical shift difference between exchanging states, $\Delta\delta$, and to $\omega_N$, the Larmor frequency. It should be pointed out that the conformational exchange mechanism can affect the apparent transverse relaxation rate only if $\Delta\delta \neq 0$. The optimal model parameters were determined by the least squares procedure consisting of minimization through a grid search of the target function comprising the sum of the squared differences between the experimental values of the relaxation parameters and their model-derived counterparts (Stone et al., 1992; Nowakowski et al., 2011, 2013). Model parameter uncertainties derived in the minimization of target function were obtained as standard deviations from 200 Monte Carlo simulations (Press et al., 1986).
For the analysis of the relaxation data measured at a single magnetic field strength, the unfavorable observations to parameters ratio was taken into account. In order to reduce the number of parameters, the $R_c/R_p$ product as a function of amino acid sequence was used to separate residues exhibiting chemical exchange (group A) from those with $R_c = 0$ (group B). Initially, residues with the $R_c/R_p$ product exceeding the weighted mean value of $R_c/R_p$ more than three standard deviations are assigned to group A. The use of $R_c/R_p$ product rather than their quotient ($R_c/R_p$)1 made it possible to minimize the effect of expected motional anisotropy (Kneller et al., 2002). After the preliminary selection of residues based on the $R_c/R_p$ values the minimization procedure was performed. Residues assigned to group A, for which $R_c = 0$, were moved to the group B. Conversely, group B residues displaying large values of local target function were moved to the group A and the minimization procedure was then reiterated. The distinction between an overall isotropic tumbling model (not requiring the use of molecule geometry) and an anisotropic model (using the atomic coordinates of the lowest energy NMR derived structure) was made based on Fisher–Snedecor statistics (F test).

3. Results

3.1. Sequence-specific assignments and secondary structure of the FCCH subdomain of mouse E1 enzyme

In the $^1$H/$^13$C HSQC spectrum (Fig. 2) 104 out of 105 expected backbone correlations were identified. The exception was Lys304, probably due to the correlation overlap of highly mobile residues clustering in the central region of the spectrum. The $^{13}$C$_\beta$ chemical shifts of three cysteines (Cys234, Cys262 and Cys278) showed that all cysteine thiol groups were in a reduced state (Sharma and Raja-rathnam, 2000). Based on the $^{13}$C$_\beta$ and $^{13}$C$_\gamma$ chemical shifts, five out of six prolines (Pro216, Pro264, Pro272, Pro298 and Pro307) were in a trans conformation. Pro229 exhibited a cis conformation, confirmed by observation of cross peaks Pro229 H$_\alpha$–Gly230 H$_\alpha$+1,2 in the 3D NOESY-HSQC $^{13}$C-edited spectrum. Secondary structure elements (six β-strands, one short 3_10-helix and one short α-helix) were initially deduced from $^1$H, N, C$_\alpha$, C$_\beta$ and C$_\gamma$ chemical shifts predicted with PREDICTOR server (Berjanskii et al., 2006) and then confirmed by observing characteristic cross peaks in 3D NOESY-HSQC spectra. The final positions of secondary structure motifs were estimated by STRIDE server (Heinig and Frishman, 2004) from the coordinates of the lowest energy structure after water refinement stage in XPLOR-NIH (Schwieters et al., 2003). The positions of six β-strands are as follows: Ser218–Thr225, Gly230–Cys234, Asp246–Gln254, Met265–Val269, Thr274–Ile277, Arg288–Gln294. A short α-helix and 3_10-helix comprise Ile257–Gly261 and Thr280–Asn282, respectively.
3.2. The FCCH subdomain of mouse E1 forms a six-stranded β-barrel

The three-dimensional structure of mouse FCCH has been determined based on NMR data (1558 distance constraints, 146 dihedral constraints derived from backbone chemical shifts, and 76 constraints resulting from hydrogen bonds). The statistics for the ensemble of the 20 most favorable FCCH structures is given in Table 1. Residues 202–216 and 294–312 are essentially unstructured in solution, at least if the FCCH fragment is isolated from the entire enzyme. In contrast, the core of the FCCH forms a well-defined six-stranded antiparallel β-barrel (Fig. 3). The details of the fold are best understood from a schematic representation, which results from slicing the barrel between strands 2 and 4 and unwrapping it. β-strands are arranged in the order β1, β2, β5, β4, β3, β6 with +1, -3, +1, -1, +3 connectivity according to the Richardson nomenclature (Richardson, 1981). Formally, this fold can be considered as a fusion of a β-hairpin (strands β1 and β2) and a Greek key motif (strands β5, β4, β3 and β6), that is interrupted by a very short α-helix between strands β3 and β4 and one 3_10 helix between β5 and β6. One can conclude that the FCCH sequences and structures (Fig. 4) of mouse and yeast E1 enzymes (Lee and Schindelin, 2008) are similar.

3.3. 15N relaxation-derived backbone dynamics of the FCCH subdomain

R1, R2 and (1H,15N) NOE data have been obtained for 96 backbone amide groups out of 104 identified correlations. Data for the majority of residues located in both terminal parts contain negative NOEs and markedly smaller R2 values characteristic of unstructured protein segments (Alexandrescu and Shortle, 1994; Zhukov et al., 2007). In many cases, overlaps in 2D spectra of (1H,15N) correlations preclude their quantitative analysis and therefore determination of relaxation parameters. Mostly the residues making up flexible termini are affected. The remaining data available for 69 residues of the central part of the construct (residues 217–293) differ from those for residues of both termini (Fig. 5). Their experimental relaxation parameters are rather uniform with only several outliers like R1 = 2.64 ± 0.04 s⁻¹ (Gly257), R2 = 20.4 ± 0.3 s⁻¹ (Glu237) or NOEs for Asp227 (0.28 ± 0.03), Val231 (0.41 ± 0.03), Asp236 (0.33 ± 0.03), and Ile267 (0.38 ± 0.02) in comparison with weighted mean values of relaxation data calculated for residues 217–293: 2.18 s⁻¹, 11.37 s⁻¹, and 0.66 for R1, R2 and NOE, respectively. Initially, 44 residues were selected for the group exhibiting R2 = 0 following the procedure described in Section 2.4. Finally, however, their number decreased to 27 (Fig. 6).

Comparison of two models of the overall tumbling (isotropic vs. fully anisotropic) favored the anisotropic model. The principal axes of the anisotropic overall diffusion tensor are equal to: Dx = (2.19 ± 0.03)10⁻⁷ s⁻¹, Dy = (1.36 ± 0.02)10⁻⁷ s⁻¹, and Dz = (1.86 ± 0.03)10⁻⁷ s⁻¹. The averaged isotropic rotational correlation time, τR = (2Dx + 2Dy + 2Dz)⁻¹ = 9.23 ± 0.12 ns is slightly larger than expected for a globular protein of 12.3 kDa size at 298 K. (Cavanagh et al., 2007), presumably due to the hindering effect of unstructured termini in our construct (Bae et al., 2009).

In the structured central part, the S2 values are fairly uniform (mean S2 value for residues located in the secondary structure elements is equal to 0.91 versus 0.89 for all residues). Only a few residues with diminished NOEs, situated in loops, display increased freedom of fast motions reflected by small S2 values: Asp227 (0.68 ± 0.03), Val231 (0.72 ± 0.03) or Asp236 (0.80 ± 0.03) as shown...
in Fig. 7. Long stretch of residues forming a loop between strands β2 and β3 (Leu235–Gly245) are characterized by intensive motions on the micro to millisecond time scale. Its mean $R_{ex}$ value is equal to 2.65 s$^{-1}$ in comparison to 1.13 s$^{-1}$ for all residues and 0.86 s$^{-1}$ for residues of secondary structure elements.

The obtained model parameters reproduce input experimental data very well ($r^2 > 0.99$). The plot of calculated vs. experimental $R_1 R_2$ products is given in Supplementary Fig. S.1.

4. Discussion

4.1. Structure of the FCCH domain

The solution structure of the mouse FCCH subdomain presented in this work agrees closely (RMSD of structured part Cα backbone atoms superposition equals 1.142 Å) with the structured part of the corresponding subdomain determined for the yeast E1 (Lee and Schindelin, 2008) (Fig. 4). A full turn around the 6-stranded β-barrel (in the direction of the hydrogen bonds) corresponds to a 10-residue shift around the barrel, typical for 6-stranded β-barrels (Murzin et al., 1994). The DALI scan (Holm and Rosenström, 2010) of the Protein Data Bank using FCCH as a search model identified β-barrel proteins with strand number $n = 6$ and shear number $S = 10$ as the most similar (Table 2). The selected proteins are involved in different cellular processes with no obvious connection to the Ub system. Therefore, the hits most likely show only structural similarity without functional implications.

4.2. Relaxation studies of the FCCH subdomain

The central fragment of the FCCH (217–293) is characterized by low backbone mobility typical for structured proteins, while unstructured C and N termini show much higher mobility (Figs. 5
Fig. 6. $R_1R_2$ product obtained for the residues of the FCCH subdomain with corresponding error bars. The horizontal line represents the weighted mean value of $R_1R_2$ plus three standard deviations. All residues above this line were initially assumed to exhibit chemical exchange. The final partition between the residues affected by chemical exchange (red circles) and the residues which display $R_{ex} = 0$ (green circles) is color coded. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 7. Results of the model-free analysis of $^{15}$N relaxation data for the structured part of the FCCH subdomain: data (vertical bars) for generalized order parameter values, $S^2$ (A) and chemical exchange, $R_{ex}$ (B) with corresponding error bars. The horizontal lines indicate the positions of secondary structure elements. Residues for which no chemical exchange has been assumed are indicated with grey circles in the lower part of the figure.
Several residues located in loops are characterized by chemical exchange. Moreover, according to the crystal structure, the side chains of residues Arg202 (equivalent of Arg239 in mouse FCCH), Gly204 (equivalent of Gly241 in mouse FCCH) and Glu206 (equivalent of Glu243 in mouse FCCH) of yeast Ub-E1 form hydrogen bonds with ubiquitin. In mouse E1 FCCH, Gly245 region, in which residues exhibit elevated chemical exchange. Moreover, according to the crystal structure, the side chains of residues Arg202 (equivalent of Arg239 in mouse FCCH), Gly204 (equivalent of Gly241 in mouse FCCH) and Glu206 (equivalent of Glu243 in mouse FCCH) of yeast Ub-E1 form hydrogen bonds with ubiquitin. In mouse E1 FCCH, Gly245 region, in which residues exhibit elevated chemical exchange in the micro to milliseconds time scale. However, these residues are not among the most conserved residues in eukaryotes.

4.3. Sequence alignment of the FCCH subdomain

FCCH domains of yeast, mouse and human Ub-E1s were aligned using MUSCLE (Edgar, 2004) (Fig. 4B). Residues highlighted in black. The sequences share 58% of identity. Such high conservation in evolutionarily very distant species indicates significant selective pressure on this domain. Conserved residues are approximately equally distributed on the outside of the barrel, therefore, no obvious protein–protein interactions can be delineated from the structure of the FCCH fragment alone. In the yeast E1–Ub crystal structure FCCH forms one of the walls of the Ub adenylation pocket (Fig. 8). In the crystal, the side chains of Arg202 and Glu206 form hydrogen bonds with ubiquitin. In mouse E1 FCCH, both residues are situated within the Glu237 – E243 region, where residues exhibit conformational exchange in the micro to millisecond time scale. However, these residues are not among the most conserved residues in eukaryotes.

Inspection of the yeast E1 crystal structure (PDB id: 3CMM) (Lee and Schindelin, 2008) revealed that some contacts between FCCH and SCCH domains were present (Fig. 5). FCCH and SCCH domains are evolutionary conserved and structurally similar. The backbone RMSD values between mouse catalytic half-domains and their yeast counterparts are 1.142 Å and 0.890 Å for FCCH and SCCH domain, respectively. These observations prompted us to test whether the mouse FCCH and SCCH domains interact in solution when not linked covalently by the adenylation domain. However, chemical shift perturbation in the 1H/15N HSQC spectrum of FCCH, hence, the FCCH in isolation (i.e. without the context of full length E1) does not bind to Ub in solution (Cavanagh et al., 2007).

Table 2
The DALI-score is a measure of structural similarity between two proteins in standard deviations above the statistically expected similarity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>PDB</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Fold of the similar region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1QFJ</td>
<td>Flavin reductase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1KKI</td>
<td>Initiation factor elf2 gamma subunit</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1EFC</td>
<td>Elongation factor</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1II8</td>
<td>Riboflavin synthase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2GJP</td>
<td>Siderophore-interacting protein</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1AMO</td>
<td>NADPH-cytochrome P450 reductase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2GLW</td>
<td>Transcription 92aa long hypothetical protein PHS018</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 8; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2GK7</td>
<td>Regulator of nonsense transcripts 1</td>
<td>Greek-key, n = 6, S = 10(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1SRY</td>
<td>F1-ATPase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 8; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1G7R</td>
<td>Initiation factor IF2/Elf3b</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1FDR</td>
<td>Flavodoxin reductase ferredoxin reductase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1TVC</td>
<td>Methane monoxygenase component c fragment</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1MRZ</td>
<td>Riboflavin kinase FMN adenyltransferase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2PIA</td>
<td>Pthaholate dioxygenase reductase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2F1M</td>
<td>Acriflavine resistance protein A</td>
<td>Barrel; n = 6, S = 8 greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1FCN</td>
<td>Ferredoxin reductase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1SQR</td>
<td>50S ribosomal protein L35ae</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2FVC</td>
<td>Endoglucanase</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 8 greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2D9R</td>
<td>Conserved hypothetical protein PG0164 from porphyromonas gingivalis</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 10; greek-key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1YOR</td>
<td>fiv operon protein fivx</td>
<td>Barrel; closed; n = 6, S = 8 greek-key</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 8. Superimposition of the solution structure of FCCH of mouse E1 and the crystal structure of yeast E1–Ub complex. (A) Crystal structure of the yeast E1–Ub complex (PDB code: 3CMM). Yeast FCCH is shown in pink and ubiquitin in yellow. The FCCH from mouse E1 (green) has been superimposed on its yeast counterpart. (B) Close up view of interactions between FCCH and Ub. Side chains of residues which form hydrogen bonds between Ub and yeast E1 in the complex are shown in ball-and-stick representation.
in the context of full-length E1, or could indicate that the interactions that are found in the crystal might be due to crystal packing.

5. Conclusions

The isolated FCCH domain adopts a native structure in aqueous solution. The structure of the FCCH subdomain of mouse E1 presented in this work closely resembles the structure of the corresponding subdomain of yeast E1 determined by Lee and Schindelin (2008). Interactions between SCCH and FCCH domains inferred from the crystal structure of E1 enzyme have not been confirmed by NMR spectroscopy. The lack of chemical shift perturbation in the 1H/15N HSQC spectrum of the FCCH/SCCH equimolar mixture might reflect the lack of coherent tethering in our experiments or a larger flexibility of full-length E1 than can be inferred from the crystal structure alone.

Accession numbers

The NMR resonance assignment for FCCH domain (residues 202–312) are available from the BMRB under accession number 18758. Coordinates of the FCCH solution structure refined in explicit solvent in XPLOR-NIH are available from the Protein Data Bank (http://www.rcsb.org) with accession number 2IZJ.
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