

## Protein Detection by Sequencing

Comprehensive Solutions to Uncover  
What Makes Each Cell Unique.



Learn More



## Response to Additional Comment on Three X-ray Crystal Structure Papers

Dinakar M. Salunke, Tarique Khan, Vineet Gaur, Suman  
Tapryal and Kanwaljeet Kaur

This information is current as  
of November 30, 2020.

*J Immunol* 2016; 196:530; ;  
doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1502468  
<http://www.jimmunol.org/content/196/2/530.2>

**References** This article **cites 1 articles**, 0 of which you can access for free at:  
<http://www.jimmunol.org/content/196/2/530.2.full#ref-list-1>

**Why *The JI*? Submit online.**

- **Rapid Reviews! 30 days\*** from submission to initial decision
- **No Triage!** Every submission reviewed by practicing scientists
- **Fast Publication!** 4 weeks from acceptance to publication

*\*average*

**Subscription** Information about subscribing to *The Journal of Immunology* is online at:  
<http://jimmunol.org/subscription>

**Permissions** Submit copyright permission requests at:  
<http://www.aai.org/About/Publications/JI/copyright.html>

**Email Alerts** Receive free email-alerts when new articles cite this article. Sign up at:  
<http://jimmunol.org/alerts>



basic principles of protein structure. We do not believe that any reviewer with access to the PDB validation reports would have accepted these peptide structure models for publication. Presenting this situation as ambiguous and open to interpretation would be a scientific mistake.

Robyn Stanfield,\* Edwin Pozharski,<sup>†</sup> and Bernhard Rupp<sup>‡,§</sup>

\*The Scripps Research Institute, La Jolla, CA 92037; <sup>†</sup>School of Medicine, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD 21201; <sup>‡</sup>Medical University of Innsbruck, A 6020 Innsbruck, Austria; and <sup>§</sup>Department of Forensic Crystallography, k.-k. Hofkristallamt, Vista, CA 92084  
ORCID: 0000-0002-3300-6965 (B.R.).

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Edwin Pozharski, School of Medicine, University of Maryland, 9600 Gudelsky Drive, 4127D Building 2, Rockville, MD 20850. E-mail address: EPozharskiy@som.umaryland.edu

Abbreviations used in this article: CNS, Crystallography and NMR system; PDB, Protein Data Bank; RSR, real space *R*-value; RSRZ, RSR *Z*-score.

## References

1. Emsley, P., B. Lohkamp, W. G. Scott, and K. Cowtan. 2010. Features and development of Coot. *Acta Crystallographica Section D* 66: 486–501.

www.jimmunol.org/cgi/doi/10.4049/jimmunol.1502281

## Response to Additional Comment on Three X-ray Crystal Structure Papers

We did not intend to infer that it is acceptable to project arbitrary structural models into electron density noise. What we emphasized, however, is that it is possible to see meaningful structural information from relatively weak electron density. We provided several examples in support of our argument from published work in our previous response.

Presence of negative density in some region does not necessarily mean that positive density in the ligand binding region is also noise, especially when this positive density is also supported by the presence of densities in simulated annealing 2Fo–Fc composite omit maps. After deletion of Y240 from Protein Data Bank (PDB): 4H0H, the suggestion that electron density for Y240 is not interpretable at contour level 2.5  $\sigma$  is not correct, as one can clearly make out boundaries of the hydrophobic ring and other features of Y240 in figure 2 of the response by Pozharski et al. to our comments.

The main argument of Pozharski et al. has been concerning the presence of experimental electron density for building the model in the map. In this context, it has to be noted that the Ramachandran parameters are not directly linked to the presence or absence of the electron density. Guidelines to define fit of model to the electron density used by the Uppsala Electron Density Server, on the basis of which the graphs providing real space *R*-value *Z* scores are calculated, are meant only for the relative quality of a PDB entry, but not for its absolute authenticity as indicated by the report of the Task Force of the Worldwide Protein Data Bank (1). It is important to note that a significant number of PDB entries associated with published structures have model fits similar to those in our structures. Incidentally, such data were included in the PDB subsequent to the acceptance of our papers for publication.

We disagree with the contention of Pozharski et al. about the interpretations of our electron density maps.

Dinakar M. Salunke,\* Tarique Khan,<sup>†</sup> Vineet Gaur,<sup>‡</sup> Suman Tapryal,<sup>§</sup> and Kanwaljeet Kaur<sup>¶</sup>

\*Regional Centre for Biotechnology, Faridabad-121001, India; <sup>†</sup>Department of Biochemistry, UT Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX 75390; <sup>‡</sup>International Institute of Molecular and Cell Biology; Warsaw 02-109, Poland; <sup>§</sup>Department of Biotechnology, Central University of Rajasthan, Bandarsindri-305817, India; and <sup>¶</sup>National Institute of Immunology, Aruna Asaf Ali Marg, New Delhi-110067, India

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Dr. Dinakar M. Salunke, Regional Centre for Biotechnology, Faridabad-121001, India. E-mail address: dinakar.salunke@gmail.com

Abbreviation used in this article: PDB, Protein Data Bank.

## References

1. Read, R. J., P. D. Adams, W. B. Arendall, III, A. T. Brunger, P. Emsley, R. P. Joosten, G. J. Kleywegt, E. B. Krissinel, T. Lütke, Z. Otwinowski, et al. 2011. A new generation of crystallographic validation tools for the Protein Data Bank. *Structure* 19: 1395–1412.

www.jimmunol.org/cgi/doi/10.4049/jimmunol.1502468

## Comment on “Cutting Edge: Inhibiting TBK1 by Compound II Ameliorates Autoimmune Disease in Mice”

With interest, we read the paper by Hasan et al. (1), who showed that inhibition of TANK-binding kinase 1 (TBK1) by Compound II has beneficial effects in a mouse model of autoimmune disease. Similarly, TBK1 inhibition by the small molecule drug amlexanox has been shown to mediate favorable metabolic and anti-inflammatory effects in mouse models of diabetes, obesity (2, 3) and multiple sclerosis (4).

We and others recently showed that haploinsufficiency of *TBK1*, i.e., *TBK1* gene dosage reduction from two to one allele by heterozygous loss-of-function mutations, can cause the genetically related neurodegenerative diseases amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS) and frontotemporal dementia (FTD) (5–7). TBK1 protein levels were reduced to 50% in cell lines derived from patients with heterozygous *TBK1* loss-of-function mutations (5).

Consequently, it is plausible that pharmacological reduction of cellular TBK1 activity to 50% or less might have similar cellular effects as *TBK1* haploinsufficiency. Long-term pharmacological TBK1 inhibition, as proposed for the treatment of autoimmune diseases (1, 4), could thus pose a risk of causing ALS or FTD. Also, in terms of a two-hit-model, chronic TBK1 inhibition may be able to trigger ALS/FTD in individuals exposed to an environmental insult or with a genetic predisposition who would otherwise not have developed ALS or FTD during their lifetime.

Experimental proof that pharmacological TBK1 inhibitors increase the risk for neurodegenerative diseases is currently lacking. Nevertheless, the existing unequivocal genetic evidence that *TBK1* haploinsufficiency causes ALS/FTD with high penetrance, in our opinion, strongly suggests the need to critically reconsider currently ongoing or planned clinical trials that are based on pharmacological TBK1 inhibition.