ChatGPT

Designing PETase Variants: Mechanism, Computational Methods, and Stability Metrics

1. PETase Enzyme Mechanism and Structure

Catalytic Triad and Mechanism: PETase (from *Ideonella sakaiensis*) is a serine hydrolase of the cutinase family. It employs the canonical catalytic triad **Ser–His–Asp** (Ser160, His237, Asp206 in *I. sakaiensis* PETase) to cleave PET's ester bonds [1] [2] . The serine acts as a nucleophile attacking the carbonyl carbon of the ester, while histidine and aspartate orient and activate the Ser for catalysis [1] . During catalysis, PETase forms a tetrahedral intermediate whose oxyanion is stabilized by an **oxyanion hole** formed by the backbone N–H groups of Tyr87 and Met161 (adjacent to Ser160) [1] . This stabilization is critical for lowering the transition-state energy. If any member of the triad is mutated (e.g. Ser160A, Asp206A, or His237A), PETase loses activity almost entirely [3] [4] – underscoring that the catalytic triad must be preserved for function.

Substrate Binding Cleft: PETase's active site is a long, shallow L-shaped cleft on the enzyme surface, adapted to bind multiple PET subunits [5] [6] . Structural studies with docked PET oligomers show the cleft can accommodate roughly **4 MHET** (mono-2-hydroxyethyl terephthalate) units of PET [7] [8] . The cleft is divided into **subsite I** (binding the first PET unit near the catalytic Ser) and **subsite II** (binding the next three units) [5] [9] . Subsite I is flanked by aromatic residues **Tyr87 and Trp185**, which engage in π–π stacking with the terephthalate ring of the first PET unit, significantly stabilizing substrate binding [9] [3] . Mutating Tyr87 or Trp185 to Ala causes a drastic >95% drop in PET hydrolysis activity [3] , highlighting their importance. Other subsite I residues (Met161, Ile208) and subsite II residues (e.g. Trp159, Asn241) form a hydrophobic groove that accommodates the PET chain [10] [11] . Mutating these binding-site residues also impairs activity (e.g. W159A or N241A cut activity to <20% of wild-type) [12] . The cleft terminates near Arg280, a positively charged "wall" that limits binding of longer PET chains [13] . Indeed, engineering studies have targeted **Arg280** (e.g. R280A mutation) to open the cleft for larger substrates or to improve flexibility [13] [14] .

Structural features of PETase's active site. Left: Catalytic Ser160, His237, Asp206 triad (cyan) and the bound PET-mimic (orange sticks) in a covalent intermediate state. The oxyanion hole (red dashed lines) is formed by Tyr87 and the amide of Met161, stabilizing the tetrahedral intermediate [1] *. Right: Surface view of PETase's substrate binding cleft accommodating a docked PET tetramer (orange). The cleft is shallow and open, divided into subsite I (red circle) and subsite II (green/cyan/magenta for sub-pockets IIa–IIc). Key binding residues (magenta in subsite I, light-blue in II) surround the PET fragment* [5] [6] *. Arg280 (yellow) caps the cleft and can hinder extension of longer substrates* [13] *.* [6] [15]

Structural Dynamics and Key Regions: Compared to homologous cutinases, PETase has a **more open active-site cleft**, which likely facilitates binding of bulky, semi-crystalline PET substrates [16] . This openness, however, may trade off with stability. PETase also features unique loops and disulfides: for example, it **lacks a large β8–α6 loop** present in other cutinases but has an **extra disulfide bond** not found in them [17] . Certain flexible loops in PETase influence its function: the β1–β2 loop (distal from the active site) has been

implicated in PETase's stability and activity, and the β7–α5 loop (near the active site) is associated with substrate binding specificity [16]. Engineering efforts have targeted these regions – e.g. mutating a perturbing proline in the β6 strand (P181) to restore a β-sheet or introducing mutations like S121D and D186H in a flexible loop to rigidify it [18] [19]. Such changes modestly improved PETase's thermal stability (e.g. +6 °C Tm) while maintaining activity [19]. **Disulfide bonds** (PETase has two) are also critical for structural integrity [20] and are always retained in variant designs.

Preserving Functionally Critical Features: Any PETase engineering pipeline must preserve the core active-site architecture – the Ser–His–Asp catalytic triad and the surrounding geometry (including the oxyanion hole and binding pocket shape) are "hard" constraints [21]. These residues and their orientation cannot be altered without abolishing activity. Likewise, key substrate-binding residues (aromatics in the cleft) and structural disulfides are typically conserved or only conservatively mutated, since they stabilize the enzyme-substrate complex [3] [4]. In practice, successful PETase variants (e.g. **FAST-PETase**, see below) maintain the catalytic machinery and overall fold, while introducing strategic mutations on the protein surface or flexible loops to enhance stability or substrate access. By **enforcing such constraints**, researchers ensure that engineered variants retain PETase's function (PET hydrolysis) even as they explore sequence changes for improved stability or activity [21].

2. Bayesian Optimization and Quality-Diversity in Protein Engineering

Bayesian Optimization (BO): BO is a machine-learning-guided strategy for efficient search of sequence space. In protein engineering, BO uses a surrogate model (for example, a Gaussian Process or ensemble neural network) trained on existing data (experimental or predicted) to predict a performance score (fitness) for new sequences [22] [23]. An **acquisition function** then suggests which sequences to test next by balancing exploitation (choosing sequences predicted to perform best) and exploration (choosing uncertain or novel sequences). A common choice is the **Upper Confidence Bound (UCB)**, which selects sequences maximizing (mean prediction + β·uncertainty) [24] [25]. This encourages exploring sequences with high predicted performance or high uncertainty. Another approach is **Thompson sampling**, which picks sequences probabilistically according to the surrogate's uncertainty (essentially sampling a high-performing sequence from the model's belief distribution) [24]. BO has proven very powerful in directed evolution: it can find improved protein variants with far fewer experiments than random or exhaustive methods [26] [23]. For example, one ML-guided evolution study showed that incorporating model predictions allowed searching multiple mutation positions simultaneously, yielding higher-fitness enzyme variants than traditional one-mutation-at-a-time evolution [26]. By **greatly increasing throughput with in silico modeling, BO-driven approaches enhance the quality of solutions and discover more diverse high-fitness variants** compared to naive screening [27]. In the PETase design pipeline provided, a surrogate model predicts both stability and activity for candidate sequences and BO guides the selection of new mutants predicted to improve thermostability without losing activity [28] [22]. This active-learning loop focuses experimental resources on the most promising designs.

Quality-Diversity (QD) Exploration: Quality-Diversity algorithms aim not just to find a single best solution, but to **maintain a diverse set of high-performing solutions**. In protein design, this is crucial because the fitness landscape can be rugged and multi-peaked – a single "optimal" sequence might dominate the search but could, for instance, have undesirable traits or might not generalize to all conditions. QD methods (e.g. MAP-Elites) create an **archive of "elite" sequences** across different niches (where a niche could be defined

by sequence diversity or a phenotype descriptor) [29] . Rather than converging to one winner, the algorithm **illuminates many peaks** by ensuring each niche retains its best sequence. In the PETase engineering pipeline, a QD archive is maintained where sequences are binned by genotype or property differences, and the top candidate in each bin is kept [30] . This way, even as BO optimizes stability, it does not "forget" about alternative solutions that achieve good stability with perhaps different sets of mutations. QD **preserves stepping-stones** at various mutation distances, prevents the search from collapsing into one region of sequence space, and guarantees sequence diversity in each batch of designs [29] [31] . For example, if one path to stability involves mutations in helix regions and another path involves β-sheet mutations, QD can keep representatives of both, whereas a purely exploitative algorithm might focus only on the first path. Maintaining multiple high-fitness lineages is analogous to exploring parallel evolutionary trajectories, increasing the chance of finding a variant that is both stable and active. The pipeline explicitly uses QD by **stratified batch selection** – e.g. picking the best candidate from each niche for experimental testing in a round [29] . As the authors note, QD *"prevents mode collapse when the optimizer exploits one basin, and enables stratified picks across niches to guarantee sequence diversity."* [32] This is especially important given the constraint of maintaining activity: there may be trade-offs where one set of mutations yields ultra-stability but kills activity, while another set modestly improves stability but preserves kinetics. A QD approach would carry both forward until further data clarifies which offers a better stability–activity balance.

Combined Role in the PETase Pipeline: In the context of the PETase design draft, the **thermostability-first** directed evolution loop uses BO to **efficiently search for mutations that improve stability (higher T_m or more favorable ΔΔG) with minimal activity drop**, and uses QD to **ensure a spectrum of functional variants is explored** [28] [29] . Each cycle, the surrogate model (trained on prior variants' data) predicts a stability score (e.g. ΔΔG or T_m) and an activity proxy for millions of virtual mutants [33] [22] . BO acquisition (like UCB with an annealing exploration factor) then selects a batch of promising candidates – for instance, sequences that maximize predicted stability while meeting a minimum activity threshold [28] . However, instead of selecting ten nearly identical top sequences, QD measures (diversity constraints and niche partitioning) ensure those candidates are **mutationally and functionally diverse** [34] [35] . In practice, the pipeline keeps a **map of elites** where each cell might correspond to a different number or location of mutations; a new sequence will only replace an existing elite if it's better and belongs to that niche [30] . This way, one niche might retain a variant with a mutation in a loop, another niche a variant with a core mutation, etc., as long as each is high-performing. The benefit is a robust set of leads: If one "optimal" variant fails experimental validation (e.g. misfolds or has an unforeseen issue), other diverse solutions are available. Indeed, such a QD+BO approach *"preserves stepping-stones at different mutation radii"* and provides multiple viable candidates that meet the design goals [32] . This strategy is increasingly used in machine-learning-assisted evolution to maintain **functional diversity** – it mirrors natural evolution's tendency to explore a variety of solutions rather than one single path [26] . The outcome for PETase engineering is an enriched pool of thermostable, active enzyme variants, as opposed to a single winner that might have unknown drawbacks.

3. Key Stability and Activity Metrics for Enzyme Variants

When evaluating engineered enzyme variants like PETase mutants, several metrics are used to quantify **stability** and **activity**. Below we detail important metrics, how they are measured or predicted, and why they matter for enzyme design:

Tm (Melting Temperature)

Definition: T_m is the **melting temperature** at which 50% of the protein is unfolded and 50% remains folded. In other words, it's the midpoint of the protein's thermal unfolding transition, where the folded and unfolded states are in equilibrium [36]. At T_m, the protein has lost half of its secondary/tertiary structure, so it's a key indicator of thermal stability.

Measurement: Experimentally, T_m is determined by monitoring protein unfolding as temperature increases. **Differential scanning calorimetry (DSC)** is a gold-standard method that measures heat absorption as the protein unfolds; the peak of the heat-capacity curve corresponds to T_m [37] [36]. Other techniques include **circular dichroism (CD)** or **fluorescence thermal melts** (e.g. DSF, differential scanning fluorimetry) where one observes the loss of secondary structure signal or changes in fluorescence as the protein denatures [38] [39]. For example, a DSC thermogram will show an endotherm with a maximum at T_m, indicating the temperature where unfolding requires the most heat input (i.e. where half the protein population is unfolding) [36]. These methods allow precise T_m determination often within ±0.1–0.5 °C.

Relevance: T_m reflects the **intrinsic stability** of the protein's folded state. A higher T_m means the protein can withstand higher temperatures before unfolding, which is desirable for enzymes meant to operate at elevated temperatures. In PETase engineering, raising T_m is a primary goal to prevent denaturation during PET depolymerization (which is often run at >50 °C to soften plastic). For instance, a mutant PETase (K95N/F201I) was reported to have a T_m **5.0 °C higher** than wild-type [40]. Another engineered variant with two mutations (W159H/F229Y) raised T_m by **10.4 °C** (along with improving catalytic efficiency) compared to wild-type [41]. Such increases are significant – an improvement of even 5–10 °C can dramatically extend the enzyme's usable range. However, T_m is an equilibrium, **folding stability** metric; it doesn't directly tell how long the enzyme remains active at a given temperature. Some mutations that increase T_m might slightly reduce catalytic rate (as seen with K95N/F201I, which traded some activity for stability) [40]. Thus, T_m is used alongside other metrics to balance stability and activity. In rational design or computational workflows, predicted T_m (from statistical potentials or machine learning) can be used as a target metric [28]. Ultimately, a high T_m enzyme is more robust: for example, **FAST-PETase** (an optimized PETase variant with five mutations) has a substantially higher T_m than wild-type and remains folded and active even at 50–60 °C, enabling much faster PET degradation at 50 °C [42].

T50 (Temperature of Half-Activity Loss)

Definition: T_{50} (often with a superscript denoting time, e.g. T_{50}^{15min}) is the **temperature at which the enzyme loses 50% of its activity after a given time period**. It is essentially a **thermal inactivation threshold**. More formally: if you incubate the enzyme at various temperatures for a fixed duration (e.g. 10, 15, or 30 minutes) and then measure the remaining activity, T_{50} is the temperature at which only half the original activity is retained [43] [44]. Unlike T_m, which is an equilibrium property, T_{50} captures the kinetics of irreversible inactivation.

Measurement: To determine T_{50}, one typically sets up a series of identical enzyme samples, incubating each at a different temperature (spanning the range of interest) for a fixed time (say 15 minutes). After heat treatment, all samples are cooled to a standard temperature and assayed for residual activity (for

PETase, this might involve measuring the rate of PET or a model substrate hydrolysis). The fraction of activity retained is plotted against incubation temperature, yielding a sigmoidal curve. T_{50} is obtained by finding the temperature at which residual activity is 50% [44]. This can be done by fitting a Boltzmann sigmoid or by linear interpolation around the 50% point [45]. Some studies denote T_{50} with a superscript for the time (e.g. T_{50}^{60} = temperature where half activity is lost after 60 min). It's crucial to specify the time, as a longer incubation will result in a lower T_{50} (stricter criterion). For example, one enzyme's T_{50} was defined as "the temperature at which 50% of activity is lost after 20 min incubation" in a thermostability test [44]. In another study, a directed-evolution variant showed T_{50} (10 min) increased by ~11–12 °C over wild-type, meaning it could endure considerably higher temperatures for 10 minutes before losing half its activity [43].

Relevance: T_{50} is a **practical measure of enzyme performance at high temperature**, reflecting both stability and the tendency to aggregate or irreversibly denature. Enzymes with higher T_{50} are more **thermally tolerant under working conditions**. For PETase variants, a higher T_{50} means the enzyme can be used at higher process temperatures (which often accelerate PET hydrolysis) without rapid inactivation. For instance, if wild-type PETase has T_{50} ~45 °C (meaning at 50 °C it would mostly inactivate in minutes), an engineered variant might push T_{50} to ~60 °C. Indeed, some PETase mutants show multi-fold increases in thermal *half-life* at a given temperature – e.g. a variant had a ~190-fold longer half-life at 53 °C than wild-type [43], corresponding to a significant T_{50} rise. While T_m and T_{50} both gauge thermostability, T_{50} is often more directly relevant to industrial use, since it accounts for time-dependent inactivation. In computational design, T_{50} is harder to predict *ab initio*, but it generally correlates with T_m and overall stability: improvements in T_m often raise T_{50} as well [41]. Experimentally, once a set of variants is made, measuring T_{50} is a quick way to down-select robust candidates.

Topt (Optimal Temperature for Activity)

Definition: T_{opt} is the **temperature at which the enzyme's catalytic activity is highest** (maximum turnover rate). Enzymes typically show increasing activity with temperature (due to faster reaction kinetics) up to a point, after which activity drops off due to thermal denaturation or loss of active conformation. That peak of the activity-vs-temperature curve is T_{opt}. Unlike T_m or T_{50}, which are purely stability metrics, T_{opt} is a combined result of **kinetic acceleration and thermal stability**.

Measurement: To determine T_{opt}, one measures the enzyme's activity (e.g. initial reaction rate on a given substrate) across a range of temperatures (while keeping other factors optimal and the assay time short enough to minimize denaturation effects). The activity is plotted against temperature, and the temperature with the highest activity is T_{opt}. For example, one might assay PETase from 20°C to 70°C on a soluble substrate like p-NP ester or BHET, each time using a fresh sample. Often, enzymes show a relatively sharp peak: below T_{opt}, activity increases (approximately following the Arrhenius equation as temperature helps overcome activation energy), and above T_{opt}, activity plunges as the enzyme rapidly inactivates. Wild-type *I. sakaiensis* PETase, for instance, has an optimal activity around **30–40 °C**; one report noted it "displayed highest activity at 35 °C, but almost no activity by 55 °C" [46] [47]. The steep loss beyond 50°C is because PETase unfolds or aggregates at those temperatures. When PETase's stability was improved (by immobilization or mutation), the entire activity curve shifted: the **optimal reaction temperature increased from 35 °C to 45 °C**, and the enzyme retained ~60% of its max

activity even at 65 °C [47] . This exemplifies a raised T_{opt}. Similarly, engineered high-thermal-stability variants like **FAST-PETase** have much higher T_{opt} – FAST-PETase performs optimally around 50 °C or above, enabling it to depolymerize PET extremely fast at that temperature (e.g. releasing 33.8 mM of PET monomers in 96 h at 50 °C) [42] .

Relevance: T_{opt} is important for understanding **where the enzyme will be most effective**. For industrial applications, a higher T_{opt} is often desirable: reactions can be run hotter, which not only can speed up the reaction (independent of the enzyme, chemical reaction rates increase) but also helps PET reach a more pliable state. However, T_{opt} must be considered alongside stability metrics. An enzyme might have a moderate T_{opt} but if it's stable, it can be used at or near that temperature for extended periods. Conversely, some extremely stable enzymes have a T_{opt} lower than their stability would allow, because their intrinsic rate doesn't increase further beyond a point (or they require some structural flexibility to be maximally active). In PETase engineering, the goal is to push T_{opt} upward by improving stability. The dramatic example of FAST-PETase shows that with rational design and machine learning, PETase's T_{opt} (and overall activity profile) can be shifted to at least **50 °C**, far above the wild-type's optimum [42] [48] . This means PET degradation can be done at 50 °C, where PET is more amorphous and the enzyme works **38-fold faster** than earlier variants at that temperature [42] . Thus, T_{opt} is a direct reflection of an enzyme variant's **performance sweet spot** and is a key metric to evaluate after making stability-enhancing mutations.

ΔΔG (Change in Free Energy of Folding upon Mutation)

Definition: *ΔΔG* in the context of protein stability is the **change in Gibbs free energy of folding caused by a mutation (or set of mutations)**. It is usually defined as: $\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{fold(mutant)} - \Delta G_{fold(wild-type)}$. Here ΔG_{fold} is the free energy difference between the folded and unfolded state (often given in kcal/mol). A **positive ΔΔG** means the mutant has a higher folding free energy than wild-type – i.e. it is **less stable** (it requires less energy to unfold, or its folded state is less favorable). A **negative ΔΔG** means the mutation stabilizes the protein (lower free energy of unfolding, so the protein is more resistant to unfolding). In simple terms, if ΔΔG > 0, the mutation is destabilizing; if ΔΔG < 0, it's stabilizing (and ΔΔG ≈ 0 means neutral mutation in terms of stability).

Measurement/Prediction: Experimentally determining ΔΔG for a mutation can be done via unfolding experiments: for example, by **chemical denaturation** (using urea or guanidine) or thermal denaturation, one can extract the ΔG of folding for both wild-type and mutant (from the unfolding curve or van't Hoff analysis) and take the difference. This usually requires reversible unfolding and precise assays (e.g. fluorescence or CD monitored unfolding). However, measuring small stability changes in practice can be tricky, so ΔΔG is often predicted by **computational tools**. **In silico ΔΔG calculators** like **FoldX** or Rosetta's **cartesian_ddG** are widely used to estimate the stability impact of mutations [49] . These programs use energy functions or statistical potentials to calculate how a mutation perturbs the protein's folding energy. For instance, the PETase design pipeline uses **Rosetta or FoldX to compute ΔΔG for each candidate mutation** as a fast proxy for stability [50] [49] . A predicted ΔΔG of +2 kcal/mol (for example) would flag a mutation as likely destabilizing, whereas −2 kcal/mol would suggest a stabilization. Modern machine learning predictors (trained on databases of known mutation effects) can also provide ΔΔG estimates [51] . These ΔΔG values are typically incorporated into the design objective – e.g. the pipeline seeks to **maximize predicted stability (minimize ΔΔG)** while maintaining activity [28] . It's worth noting ΔΔG is specific to a given mutation or combination at a given condition (e.g. pH); epistatic interactions mean ΔΔG of multiple mutations may not be additive, so tools like FoldX often evaluate combinations directly.

Relevance: $\Delta\Delta G$ is a **quantitative measure of stability changes** at the molecular level. In protein engineering, it guides mutation selection: one tries to avoid mutations with large positive $\Delta\Delta G$ (as they likely reduce T_m and T_{50}), and seek mutations with negative $\Delta\Delta G$ that stabilize the fold. For PETase, many beneficial mutations were initially identified by scanning for those that would rigidify the structure or improve packing (negative $\Delta\Delta G$). For example, replacing a glycine with a more rigid residue or introducing a salt bridge might yield a calculated $\Delta\Delta G$ of –1 kcal/mol, indicating a stabilization. Such a mutation could raise T_m by a few degrees. In the FAST-PETase example, the five mutations (S121E, D186H, R224Q, N233K, R280A) were chosen in part via a ML algorithm that implicitly evaluated stability; indeed, these changes collectively improve stability significantly while preserving the active-site geometry [52]. $\Delta\Delta G$ is especially useful in the *design stage*: before actually creating a mutant, one can predict $\Delta\Delta G$ to filter out very destabilizing substitutions. The PETase pipeline enforces a "thermostability-first" criterion, often rejecting sequences predicted to have worse stability than wild-type ($\Delta\Delta G > 0$) [28]. Additionally, $\Delta\Delta G$ analysis post-hoc can explain which mutations contributed most to stability – e.g. Rosetta $\Delta\Delta G$ decomposition might show that R280A (removing a surface arginine) contributed a big stability gain, aligning with the observed T_m increase when R280A is added to mutants [14]. In summary, $\Delta\Delta G$ provides a **molecular-scale evaluation of mutations' effects on folding**. In engineering reports, a successful variant might be described as having, say, a total $\Delta\Delta G$ of –3 kcal/mol relative to the parent, correlating with an observed +8 °C shift in T_m. By combining experimental metrics (T_m, T_{50}, T_{opt}) with $\Delta\Delta G$ calculations, researchers obtain a comprehensive picture: the $\Delta\Delta G$ tells **why** a variant is more stable (energetically), while T_m/T_{50} confirm **how much** more stable in practice, and T_{opt} reveals if that stability translates into better high-temperature performance.

References: Key references and tools for these concepts include the initial structural/mechanistic studies of PETase [1] [5], recent reviews on improving PETase stability [16] [40], and examples of ML-guided protein engineering showing the value of BO and QD in exploring sequence space [26] [32]. Computational tools like **Rosetta** and **FoldX** for $\Delta\Delta G$ calculations are well-established in the protein design community [49], and methods for measuring T_m and T_{50} are standard in protein biochemistry [36] [44]. By integrating insights from these techniques, the design of PETase variants can be approached rationally and efficiently, ensuring new mutations enhance stability while preserving the delicate catalytic machinery needed for PET degradation.

---

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [15] [20] Structural insight into molecular mechanism of poly(ethylene terephthalate) degradation - PMC
https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5785972/

[14] [16] [17] [18] [19] [40] [41] [42] [46] [47] [48] [52] Frontiers | Current advances in the structural biology and molecular engineering of PETase
https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/bioengineering-and-biotechnology/articles/10.3389/fbioe.2023.1263996/full

[21] [22] [24] [28] [29] [30] [31] [32] [33] [34] [35] [49] [50] [51] Petase Design Draft.pdf
file://file_00000000a48071f5b95b92bf741c5984

[23] [25] Self-driving laboratories to autonomously navigate the protein fitness landscape | Nature Chemical Engineering
https://www.nature.com/articles/s44286-023-00002-4?
error=cookies_not_supported&code=4d21e67d-7568-408b-80da-0c94cb12a5be

[26] [27] Machine learning-assisted directed protein evolution with combinatorial libraries - PubMed

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30979809/

[36] [37] [38] Differential scanning calorimetry

https://www.cureffi.org/2016/04/27/differential-scanning-calorimetry/

[39] The Methods of Measuring Protein Thermal Stability - Mtoz Biolabs

https://www.mtoz-biolabs.com/the-methods-of-measuring-protein-thermal-stability.html

[43] A thermostable variant of fructose bisphosphate aldolase constructed by directed evolution also shows increased stability in organic solvents - PubMed

https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15531627/

[44] Thermally denatured state determines refolding in lipase - PMC - NIH

https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC2774429/

[45] Structure-Based Engineering to Improve Thermostability of ...

https://pubs.acs.org/doi/pdf/10.1021/acsomega.5c02381