Chapter 3: Computational Methodology
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3.1 Abstract

With recent advancements in experimental techniques, researchers are more easily able to design experiments to retrieve high-throughput data. In conjunction with high-throughput data, computational tools and software have been developed to complement high-throughput data collection. However, understanding how to use and interpret these computational tools is a necessary skill to properly interpret and analyze high-throughput data. An important approach to designing and distributing these computational tools is the ability to explain how these technologies work to efficiently share them technologies with the research community (Greener et al., 2022; Mougeot et al., 2022; Na, 2020; van Iterson et al., 2012). The ability to assess protein structures allows researchers to determine how and why proteins fold with unique structural features essential for function. Many computational algorithms have been developed as tools to predict and design unknown proteins using information from solved structures. In this section, I will review a variety of computational tools that have been developed to expand understanding of protein structures, in particular highlighting commonly used structure prediction tools such as Rosetta and Alphafold. I then discuss in detail how I developed my protein design algorithm and the other programs used in my research.

3.2 Introduction

The protein data bank (PDB) was established to collaborate and share protein structures globally online. This tool allows researchers to deposit solved protein structures for others to access and assess their findings (Berman et al., 2000). Initially, proteins structures were solved primarily using x-ray crystallography. X-ray crystallography has contributed to solving ~80% of MP structures (Kermani, 2021). However, producing crystals at high resolution remains a difficulty in crystallography. To bypass the need to crystallize proteins, many other MP structures have been solved by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR). Solid-state NMR has bypassed the need for detergents in crystallography, obtaining structures of MPs less than 50 residues within lipid bilayers or nanodiscs (Liang & Tamm, 2016).

The complex nature of the lipid bilayer makes it difficult to directly study the forces involved in MP folding. As an initial approach, researchers aim to determine the structures of MPs to identify structural features important for folding. However, solving MP structures is an inherently difficult task due to the need to express and solubilize MPs for experiments. Furthermore, many of these approaches cannot determine more than a single protein structure, making it difficult to use this information to understand dynamic structural changes involved in folding. More recently cryo-EM has been used to solve MP structures. In addition to bilayers and nanodiscs, it is possible to solubilize and obtain the structures of MPs within detergents, saposin-lipoprotein nanoparticles, amphipols, and peptidiscs (Januliene & Moeller, 2021). Cryo-EM allows MP structures to be studied in a large variety of different environments, giving researchers the ability to study alternative structures of these proteins by changing the solubilization conditions.

Despite the advancements in MP structural characterization, many of these efforts take years to determine conditions that yield publishable results in high resolution. MPs make up only 4.6% of structures deposited in the PDB (April 2024; PDB). Lacking MP structures to assess, some groups focus on using previously solved protein structures to develop computational algorithms that can be used to predict or design unknown proteins. Built into many of these algorithms are energetic terms that estimate the contributions of biophysical forces on MP stability and folding.

3.3 Computational methods to study protein structure

In conjunction with structural determination, computational methods have been invented by evaluating previously solved MP structures. Many of these methods look to further understand MP folding by establishing energetic terms that aim to estimate the thermodynamics of MP folding. Below I review the current computational methods used to predict protein structures, highlighting unique features and energetics of each tool.

3.3.1 Rosetta

David Baker’s Lab at University of Washington are experts in this area, utilizing known energetic and structural information to develop the software suite Rosetta. Rosetta houses a variety of energy functions and prediction tools for soluble environments, including the ability to dock or design proteins *de* novo (Chaudhury et al., 2011; Koehler Leman et al., 2017; Leman et al., 2020; Weitzner et al., 2017; Yarov-Yarovoy, Schonbrun, et al., 2006). These energetics includes but are not limited to: terms parameterized by CHARMM (van der Waals and electrostatics), a hydrogen bond and disulfide function curated from polar contacts found in ~8000 high-resolution crystal structures, and a side chain conformation energy based on the probability of occurrence from the Dunbrack rotamer database (Alford et al., 2017; RICHARDSON et al.). These Rosetta energy functions have been adapted to accommodate predicting helical TMs within the membrane environment. The updated functions include an energy term that models the membrane into layers classified defining atoms as water-exposed, polar, interface, and hydrophobic (White & Wimley, 1999; Yarov-Yarovoy, Schonbrun, et al., 2006). Successful predictions determined structural details in MPs associated with voltage sensing and gating mechanisms (Vargas et al., 2012; Yarov-Yarovoy, Baker, et al., 2006).

Recently, RosettaMP was developed to enhance the functionality of MP prediction which includes modeling TM helices *de novo* from sequence, a representation of the membrane bilayer, and the ability to transform a protein into the membrane (Koehler Leman et al., 2017). These tools increase the accessibility to MP structure, improving the ability to visualize and predict structures of MPs that have not yet been solved. Simultaneously, energetic predictions enhance the knowledge in the field by allowing researchers to assess structural mutations *in silico* prior to testing with *in vitro* or *in vivo* experiments.

3.3.2 Molecular Software Library

Another computational tool for modeling protein structures is the Molecular Software Library, or MSL (Kulp et al., 2012). Similar to Rosetta, MSL houses a variety of tools to perform MP structure prediction. These tools include the ability to transform proteins in space, mutate specific residues, extract geometric information from known structures, and predict the structure and energetics of an input sequence. Additionally, it has been used to develop the CATM prediction algorithm. The CATM algorithm uses the Energy-Based conformer library applied at the 95% level for side chain mobility (Subramaniam & Senes, 2012). Energetics of predicted proteins are determined using the CHARMM 22 van der Waals function (MacKerell et al., 1998), the IMM1 membrane implicit solvation model (Lazaridis, 2003), and the hydrogen bonding function of SCWRL4 (Krivov et al., 2009). Each of these energy terms is used to optimize the dimer geometry by Monte Carlo (MC) backbone perturbation cycles where all parameters (xShift, zShift, axialRotation, and crossingAngle) are locally varied. The predicted energy of association is calculated as the energy of the dimer minus the energy of two monomers.

The CATM algorithm has been applied to predict the structures of both known and unknown TM dimers, and experimental studies have shown that it accurately predicts the energetics of association (Anderson et al., 2017; Díaz Vázquez et al., 2023; Mueller et al., 2014). My research adapts the CATM algorithm to design structures with strong van der Waals packing in the absence of hydrogen bonding, allowing me to assess the extent at which packing can drive MP association. I further detail how I used MSL to design my TM homodimers in section 3.4.

3.3.3 Docking Algorithms

Other methods for predicting interactions between MPs focus on predicting the topology or docking of individual TM helices. OCTOPUS predicts TM topology using a combination of Markov models and neural networks (Viklund & Elofsson, 2008). HADDOCK can apply experimental knowledge of the interface region between proteins to refine docking (de Vries et al., 2010; Dominguez et al., 2003). PREDDIMER utilizes a novel surface-based modeling approach to predict and screen TM dimers for conformation heterogeneity (Polyansky et al., 2012). EVFold uses evolutionary based structural restraints to refine their docked structures (Braun T et al., 2015). TMDOCK uses an all-atom model for helices, inserting them in the membrane and outputting a structure alongside a predicted ΔG of insertion and ΔG of association (Lomize & Pogozheva, 2017). Each of these methods was adapted into a webserver for online use, where users can input the sequence and additional information to guide the process.

3.3.4 Machine learning tools

Most notably, at the 2020 Critical Assessment of Structure Prediction (CASP) conference, Google’s Deepmind introduced the machine learning model AlphaFold. Unlike previously mentioned prediction algorithms, AlphaFold predicts structures without energetics. AlphaFold utilizes a combination of neural networks and training on multiple sequence alignments (MSAs) and solved protein structures to predict unknown structures to near atomic precision with a 95% confidence interval (Jumper et al., 2021). Shortly afterward, David Baker’s group introduced RoseTTAFold, improving on the Rosetta prediction by incorporating a similar architecture to AlphaFold, with the addition of a third track network that connects sequence, residue-residue distances, and atomic coordinates (Baek et al., 2021). Each of these methods drastically improved the ability to predict unknown protein structures using information from previously studied and solved proteins. With increasing interest in using these technologies, multiple free webservers have been established to enhance access to these advanced protein prediction algorithms (Mirdita et al., 2022; Roberts et al., 2024). However, there are limits to how well these prediction algorithms work. AlphaFold struggles to predict proteins with <30 homologs in their MSAs, and accuracy decreases for protein structures dependent on other protein-protein interactions, while RoseTTAFold has difficulty predicting higher-order oligomers (Agard et al., 2022). The disparity between soluble proteins and MPs in the PDB contributes to these limitations, making small TM proteins difficult to predict. To better understand the dynamics of association and folding in MPs, it is necessary to advance our knowledge of the forces involved in folding.

3.4 Protein Design Algorithm

To investigate the impact of van der Waals packing on membrane protein association, I opted for a high-throughput design approach. I developed a sequence search algorithm that allowed me to design 1000s of membrane protein structures using MSL v. 1.1, an open source C++ library that is freely available at http://msl-libraries.org (Kulp et al., 2012). I coupled this algorithm with a structural backbone refinement program also built in MSL. Below, I detail the algorithm alongside the experiments and tests to develop it.

3.4.1 Analysis of membrane protein PDBs
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Using a program developed in MSL, I extracted backbone geometries from all unique MPs found in the Orientations of Membrane Proteins (OPM) database (Lomize et al., 2006). This program reads an input PDB structure, identifies helical subunits of the protein composed of at least 13 AAs, and measures the distances between Cα carbons. Any two helices with at least 3 Cα carbons within 9Å of each other are extracted as individual helical pairs. To ensure that I did not extract helical pairs from redundant structures, the MPs from OPM were trimmed by sequence similarity. The PDB clusters protein sequences weekly using MMseqs2 with a variety of different sequence similarity cutoffs (Steinegger & Söding, 2017). I trimmed the OPM dataset for unique structures based on 30% sequence similarity from the PDB and compiled the geometric data. I then extracted two parameters the crossingAngle and xShift, which were plotted against each other for each protein and analyzed using kernel density estimation (figure).

The density plot identifies the most common interaction motifs for dimeric proteins. We expected the regions of highest density to be the most likely designable, as they are most often found in nature. There are three high density regions present in this dataset. The first region is present in the positive crossingAngle, or left-handed, region. Helical pairs interact frequently in the range between 8.5 to 10 Å of interhelical distance and 20 to 40° of crossing angle. We refer to this as the left-handed design region (Left). The other two high density regions are found in the negative crossingAngle, or right-handed, region. Helical pairs are found at a much broader range of distances from 6.5 to over 10 Å of interhelical distance. The region with the most density is found between 7.75 to 9.5 Å interhelical distance and -30 to -60° crossingAngle. We refer to this as the right-handed design region (Right). Finally, the third region corresponds to GASright, which is characterized by very short interhelical distance (6.5-7.5 Å) and crossing angles of -25 to -55°. The GASright ­is a well characterized dimerization motif that is stabilized by a combination of van der Waals packing and the formation of interhelical weak hydrogen bonds between helices (Anderson et al., 2017; Mueller et al., 2014). We decided to design in this region as a control to assess the differences in stability between designs stabilized solely by van der Waals packing and GASright stabilized by both packing and interhelical hydrogen bonding.

To determine the axial rotation and zShifts for protein design, I used MSL to set proteins at a variety of design templates. I created a grid of the geometric templates for each design region, resulting in ~10000 geometries that were input into MSL and assessed for clashing at the interface. To assess for clashing, I chose to use a poly-Ala sequence for each template, as clashing at the interface of the small AA Ala would suggest the geometry is unable to accommodate other AAs. I then plotted any geometries that did not result in clashes on a density map and extracted the ranges where axialRotations and zShifts did not clash **(Supplement 1,2,3)**. Finally, I randomly generated 1000s of geometries for each design region, where the crossingAngle and xShift is chosen from the membrane protein density map, and the axialRotation and zShift is chosen from the identified ranges where clashing did not occur in poly-Ala sequences. These geometries were used as input templates for homodimer protein design.

3.4.2 Defining the Interface
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Description automatically generatedTo reduce heterogeneity in expression, I designed the interface of a standardized TM helix of 21 AAs consisting of a poly-Leu backbone, a strategy previously used to study the association of GASrights (Anderson et al., 2017). In my first protein design run, I used Solved Accessible Surface Area (SASA) to identify the interfacial positions of a protein set at a geometry from my membrane protein analysis. I calculated the SASA for each position on the dimer and defined the interface as the 8 positions with the least amount of access to the solvent, or the most buried positions. After sorting these designs and looking at the fluorescence results, variations in the interface were seen to increase the complexity of the data **(Supplement?)**. Although we were successfully able to design sequences that associate, the population was small and our energy score showed little correlation to association.

For the subsequent design runs, I standardized the interface for each design region. The GASright was previously studied using similarly standardized backbones, so we chose to use the same 8 positions on the interface. Since Right designs have similar geometric parameters outside of a larger xShift, I used the same 8 interfacial positions as GASright. For the Left designs, I visually inspected a variety of sequences with unique crossing angles and defined 3 interfaces. These interfaces allowed me to account for known left-handed association motifs such as the leucine zipper, knobs-into-holes, and coiled coils (Ash et al., 2004; Bornberg-Bauer et al., 1998; Walshaw & Woolfson, 2003). Standardizing the interfaces allowed me to come up with a consistent mutational strategy to assess my proteins for their association at the given interface that is discussed in detail in section 3.4.6.

3.4.3 Developing the energy terms

To assess my designed proteins, I used the same set of energy terms used previously in CATM: CHARMM\_VDW, SCWRL4\_HBOND, and CHARMM\_IMM1. These terms are calculated for each protein during the sequence design search to find the best interfacial sequence for the input geometric structure. To determine the stability of our designed dimers, we predict the interaction energies of the dimer structure and two monomers, and then subtract the monomer energy from the dimer energy (Dimer-Monomer). However, computing the monomer energy for each sequence initially created a bottleneck in our design algorithm, limiting the number of sequences we could design. To account for this, I developed an energy term that estimates the monomer energy of each sequence: BASELINE\_MONOMER.
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The BASELINE\_MONOMER term was created by measuring the energetic contributions from each individual amino acid on a monomeric helix. These energy contributions were measured using the terms from CATM. I computed the energetics of 10000 random sequences and measured the self and pair energies for each amino acid. The self-energy represents the energy contribution for an individual amino acid to the protein stability alone, while the pair energies represent the energy contribution between any two interacting amino acids. I measured the pair energies for all AA pairs on the sequence and found that there was no longer a pair interaction between amino acids more than 10 away from each other. From each iterations, I calculated the average of all self and pair energies and saw a strong correlation between the measured monomer energy and the BASELINE\_MONOMER term (figure). This BASELINE\_MONOMER term was developed for the subset of amino acids used in design (G, A, L, I, M, S, T, W, Y, F) and would need to be rerun to establish the term for any additional amino acids. This term was helpful in decreasing computational time, allowing us to design 1000s of sequences within a week.

Another issue that I encountered while designing my proteins was that many of my initial designs were often composed of only 2-3 different AAs. This result could impact our protein expression, where designs with diverse sequences are not expected to express similarly to designs composed of only a few AAs. To combat this, I developed a SEQUENCE\_ENTROPY term that outputs a score based on how similar the output sequence is to a typical membrane protein sequence. This term was developed by using the sequences extracted from membrane protein PDBs and defining the frequency of each AA.

To convert the frequency of AAs in a sequence to an energy term, I utilized the following equation based on the Boltzmann entropy formula:

where R is the gas constant and T is temperature defaulted to 298K (RT = 0.592). To calculate the sequence entropy, I needed to determine the probability that the sequence occurs in membrane. First, the number of each AA (#AA) is counted within the sequence. Using these values, I then calculated the number of possible permutations for the sequence. This is determined using the following equation:

where n is the number of positions, which is divided by the factorial for #AA in the sequence multiplied, or the total number of combinations possible. The probability is then calculated by using the frequency of each AA in membrane protein sequences (freq\_AA) to the power of the number of each AA in the sequence multiplied by the permutations:

This probability is inserted into the sequence entropy equation, returning a value that can be applied as an additional energy term for each sequence. This term allows me to use the likelihood that a sequence would occur in the membrane as an additional term to predict the stability of my designed homodimer sequences.

3.4.4 Sequence Search

For each input geometry, the algorithm first defines the best sequence using the Self Consistent Mean Field (SCMF) theory as implemented in MSL. This method estimates the conformational entropy of each design AA as a probability that it is present within the dimer interface (Koehl & Delarue, 1994). The sequence from the SCMF is then run through a MC sequence optimization: A random position on the interface is switched to a random AA, and the energy is calculated using the combination of the CATM energies and the energies defined in section 3.4.3.

Each energy term can be multiplied by an optional weight, allowing the total energy to be changed proportionately by the given weights. Previous research in our lab defaulted the weights of the CATM energy terms to 1, which was repeated in this study. To determine if SEQUENCE\_ENTROPY performed better at different weights, I ran a 100 design test at weights of 1, 5, 10, 50, and 100 and compared the AA composition in these designs their frequency found in membrane proteins. Weights great than 10 were found to be optimal for mimicking the frequency of AAs in membrane proteins. We chose to use 10 as it resulted in the SEQUENCE\_ENTROPY term affecting the total energy at the same order of magnitude as the other terms. The equation for the total energy is as follows:

The total energy is used for the acceptance criteria, and the MC searches for a variety of sequences in energetic space before reaching an energetic minimum. The sequences are saved in an output file to show the search trajectory of sequences along with their corresponding energy terms. The interface sequence with the best interaction energy is saved as the design undergoes further backbone refinement. **(figure here?)**

3.4.5 Backbone Refinement

Backbone refinement aims to minimize the energy of the sequence and structure. After initially starting with a specific geometric template, the newly designed sequence undergoes an MC based structural refinement procedure. The structure undergoes MC backbone perturbations, where one of the four inter-helical parameters (xShift, crossingAngle, axialRotation, zShift) is chosen and shifted during each cycle. The total interaction energy for the refined structure is used as the acceptance criteria, with the BASELINE\_MONOMER energy being replaced by the calculated monomer energy and the SEQUENCE\_ENTROPY term no longer used:

The backbone refined geometry can be input into the sequence search to determine other designable sequences.

3.4.6 Mutating the interface

For each protein, I made point mutations on the interface corresponding to interfacial positions expected to decrease association. I created a program that accepts the structure and interface as inputs, individually mutates each interfacial position to a given amino acid, and outputs the energy and structure. The first mutation is a clash mutant, where the interface was mutated to an Isoleucine, which often can kink into the opposing helix, often disrupting the ability for a protein to associate. The second mutation is a void mutant, where the interface was mutated to the small AA Alanine, aiming to decrease the amount of packing at the interface. We expected these mutants to allow us to assess the impact that **A graph showing the difference between a refinement and a new

Description automatically generated**loss of steric packing has on association.

I also created a program to predict the energetics of the chosen mutants for each of my structures. The program reads an input structure and sequence. To ensure that the mutated sequence is allowed to find any alternate dimer interfaces, the structure undergoes a more detailed MC backbone refinement. In the backbone refinement designed in CATM, each geometric shift randomly alters the structure by choosing a value between 0 and an input upper limit. For example: When the geometric xShift is chosen, a random value from 0-0.5 Å is applied to the structure. In this version, the geometric term procedurally decreases to a lower limit. Each cycle, the chosen geometric term is decreased by multiplying it by the metropolis criteria until it reaches the lower limit. Once the lower limit is reached, this value will always be used whenever this term is shifted again. After initially testing this process on my designs, I found that the new backbone refinement resulted in more stable energies for my designed proteins (figure). The energetics from this refinement is what I used to evaluate my structures and mutants against their reconstructed fluorescence in sort-seq.

3.5 Analysis

3.5.1 Software

The following calculations, analyses, and graphing were implemented and performed using Python v. 2.7. Relevant packages include:

Pandas: (McKinney, 2011)

DNAChisel: (Zulkower & Rosser, 2020)

Numpy: (McKinney, 2012)

Matplotlib: (Tosi, 2009)

Seaborn: (Waskom, 2021)

Scipy: (Virtanen et al., 2020)

Sklearn: (Pedregosa et al., 2011)

Pymol: (DeLano, 2002)

All programs and code can be found on Github.

3.5.2 Design Analysis

During my first design run, I encountered an issue when visually inspecting my poly-Leucine standardized sequences: interfaces often included voids to accommodate Leucine at the termini, preventing clashing interactions. Although these designs had a considerable amount of van der Waals packing, we wanted to ensure that the interface was driving association. I chose to repeat my design process with the smaller AA Alanine at the termini. These structures were found to include less voids and a well packed interface. Although the termini are unchanged in our experiment, we included these Alanine termini designs in our dataset with the assumption that helices in the experiment would be more flexible to accommodate these interfaces than our rigid design helices.

To analyze my designs, I wrote a script that compiles all design directories and outputs a variety of plots. These plots include energetics bar graphs separated by each design region and AA percent composition **(S4)**. These sequences alongside their structures can then be input into the mutation program to identify mutations expected to decrease association. Finally, these designed sequences, their respective mutants, and a variety of control sequences were ordered in an oligo pool library from Twist Bioscience and cloned into plasmids for TOXGREEN sort-seq.

3.5.3 Fluorescence Reconstruction

As detailed previously in (cite sort-seq), plasmids obtained from sorted populations of *E. coli* can be sent for Next Generation Sequencing (NGS) and the sequencing results reconstructed to fluorescence corresponding to dimerization propensity. Briefly, reconstructed fluorescence levels were calculated as a weighted average (Kosuri et al., 2013). This method normalizes the reads per protein per bin with the fraction of the population found in that bin. The normalized fractional contribution of each bin (j) for each protein (i), aij is calculated as:

A diagram of a function

Description automatically generatedA mathematical equation with black letters

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

where the normalized fractional contribution is then multiplied by the median fluorescence of that bin (mj­). Finally, the contributions for each sorted bin are summed to determine the reconstructed fluorescence. The sequencing data is run through a Python pipeline that calculates the above reconstructed fluorescence for all sequences found in the NGS data.

3.5.4 TOXGREEN Conversion

Studies using TOXCAT systems typically normalize the dimerization propensity by comparing dimerization propensity to the well-studied strong dimer Glycophorin A (GpA). This normalization is calculated as a percentage of GpA fluorescence (%GpA). To be able to calculate the %GpA for the reconstructed sequences, we included GpA as a control sequence in each of our libraries. The reconstructed fluorescence is then converted to %GpA using the following equation:

To calibrate our fluorescence properly to %GpA, we also include a variety of control sequences that we have previously studied using TOXGREEN. Upon initial inspection, the control sequences present in our experiment reconstructed to a lower %GpA value than we’ve previously found in TOXGREEN.

I conducted a separate low-throughput TOXGREEN experiment on the control sequences and a subset of my designed sequences. When I compared the TOXGREEN %GpA to the reconstructed %GpA, the reconstructed values were noticeably smaller for most sequences. However, when these values are plotted against one another, we found a clear correlation between TOXGREEN and reconstruction (figure). To properly calibrate our reconstruction to the results we see in TOXGREEN, we converted the values from reconstruction to TOXGREEN. The slope and y-intercept of the correlation is used to convert the reconstructed fluorescence of sequences from each sorted population to the fluorescence seen in low throughput TOXGREEN. These values are averaged and normalized to the GpA sorted in each design population. This process allowed us to better differentiate between different levels of dimerization propensity as seen previously in TOXGREEN experiments: monomers (0-35%), weak dimers (35-60%), and strong dimers (>60%).
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3.5.5 Trimming the data for proper insertion

A liquid maltose growth assay was run in triplicate as in (cite sort-seq). Briefly, cultures composed of *E. coli* containing plasmids for the designs, mutants, and controls are grown overnight. These are normalized by OD600 in the morning and the normalized population added to flasks of liquid maltose media **(say what composed of?)** and grown for 36H, with timepoints taken every 6 hours. The populations for each timepoint are spun down, plasmids extracted through miniprep, and prepared for NGS. Within each population are control sequences that are known not to insert in the membrane, as shown by failure to grow on maltose plates. To assess whether the sequences properly insert into the membrane, we compare the relative abundance of our designs to these controls. The relative abundance from the overnight growth (0H) and the growth in liquid maltose at 30H to determine the ability to insert:

Sequences that are more abundant than these controls are considered properly inserted. **(could create a supplemental figure here if needed similar to SMA maltose figures)**

3.5.6 Trimming data for by mutations

To determine if sequences are associate with the designed interface, we sought to identify sequences where the mutant results in a significant decrease in association. First, we assessed the fluorescence for the clash and void mutants against the fluorescence of our designed sequences. When comparing the clash mutations to the fluorescence of the designed structure, we saw a significant decrease in their association. However, the void mutants did not show this same decrease, often resulting in similar fluorescence as the WT designs. This data suggests that mutating for loss of packing does not impact association, possibly as a result of dimerization by an alternate interface. We decided to move forward by trimming our data using the clashing mutants, which appear to disrupt association by our designed interface. **(boxplot figure from paper)**. We trimmed our data for any designs where the clashing mutation was monomeric **(< 35%GpA)** or less than 50% of the design fluorescence in terms of %GpA. Resulted in x out of y designs (%) that associate by our designed interface. **(also show the GAS, right, left splits; maybe as a figures)**

3.5.7 Comparison to energetics

We plotted the energy score against the dimerization propensity in fluorescence for each protein and separated the data by design region. Unfortunately, our energy score does not correlate well to proteins outside of the GASright region. This data suggests that although were able to design sequences that associate (>35% GpA), we are unable to predict their dimerization propensity using our energetics. However, a majority of our designs outside of the GASright associate as weak dimers (35-60% GpA). This suggests that our energetics may not be well tuned to predict weakly dimerizing proteins. I discuss how this can be addressed in future experiments in Chapter 4.

3.5.8 Hydrogen bond mutations

Because our energetics were unable to predict dimerization, we needed to further assess whether our designed proteins are associating by solely van der Waals packing. In our design procedure, we included AAs that had the potential to hydrogen bond due to how frequently they are found in membrane proteins. Our design energies predicted low levels of hydrogen bonding, suggesting that they wouldn’t impact association. However, since our energetics show little correlation to association, we are unable to confidently state that our sequences are associating by van der Waals packing without the influence of hydrogen bonding.

In order to determine if our proteins associate solely by packing, I conducted an experiment where we mutated our proteins to remove the potential for hydrogen bonding.

3.6 Conclusion

* Talk about ways to improve the molecular software library and/or to transition some of these scripts to something more usable like Rosetta/Alphafold/how to make this easy to use
  + Creating a webserver was a pipe dream I had but never got the skill to do it
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