

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Cracking phase diagram for the dynamics of an enzyme

Hao Qu, Jonathan Landy, and Giovanni Zocchi

Phys. Rev. E **86**, 041915 — Published 24 October 2012

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevE.86.041915](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.86.041915)

Cracking phase diagram for the dynamics of an enzyme

Hao Qu,¹ Jonathan Landy,² and Giovanni Zocchi^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of California Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1547*

²*Materials Department, University of California Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-5121*

(Dated: August 21, 2012)

We measure the ensemble averaged deformation of an enzyme for an oscillating applied force. From the low frequency divergence of the mechanical susceptibility for the hinge motion of Guanylate Kinase we obtain a non-equilibrium phase diagram in the frequency - force plane. A phase line separates linear elasticity dynamics from softer (viscoelastic) dynamics. The hinge motion corresponds to crossing this phase line (not to a soft linear elastic mode). The phase line is dramatically shifted in the closed state compared to the open state of the enzyme.

Introduction. Virtually all enzymes couple catalysis to conformational motion. Evident in motor proteins, mechano-chemical coupling is also the basis for substrate specificity [1, 2] and activity regulation [3–5] in these molecular machines. Conformational changes coupled to catalysis are often large, with amplitudes of ~ 1 nm compared to an overall size of the enzyme of ~ 5 nm. The folded protein being a solid, these huge strains pose an interesting question about the nature of conformational dynamics and the associated materials properties of the system. Surely this motion is not within the linear elasticity regime, and a specific nonlinear mechanism for these transitions, called “cracking”, was proposed some years ago [6, 7]. Cracking connects initial and final states through a local melting and refolding event. Translated into stress-strain relations, this should give rise to an interesting dynamics. Here we measure directly the stress-strain relations for the hinge motion of the enzyme Guanylate Kinase (GK), a molecule quite similar to the enzyme considered in [6, 7]. Specifically, we report comparative nano-rheology [8] measurements on the open (no substrate) and closed (with the substrate GMP) forms of the enzyme and find that while the linear elasticity regime is almost the same, the nonlinear behavior, or what we have called the viscoelastic regime [9, 10] is dramatically different in the two cases. A phase diagram in the frequency - force plane maps out regions of linear elastic vs softer (viscoelastic) dynamics. The existence of this phase line may be a universal feature of the dynamics of enzymes.

Results. The experimental system (Fig. 1) is described in detail in [8–10]. Briefly, the enzyme under study (Guanylate Kinase (GK) from *Mycobacterium Tuberculosis*, a ~ 4 nm size, ~ 200 amino acid globular protein which catalyzes the transfer of a phosphate group from ATP to GMP) tethers 20 nm size gold nanoparticles (GNPs) to an optically transparent (~ 30 nm thick) gold layer evaporated on a glass slide. The protein is attached to the gold surfaces through Cysteines introduced by mutagenesis on the two lobes of the structure. The “hinge motion” [11] which transforms the structure from the open to the closed form (Fig. 2) upon binding

the substrate GMP - a classic example of induced fit [1] - roughly corresponds to moving the two Cysteines by 1 nm towards each other. At each enzymatic cycle the molecule presumably performs this motion, though the pathway cannot be deterministic.

In the experiments, we drive the GNPs (which are negatively charged due to surface bound charged polymers) with an oscillating electric field generated by applying an AC voltage (~ 500 mV rms, in the frequency range 10 Hz - 10 kHz) between the gold layer and a similar upper electrode which forms the top of the $\sim 200 \mu\text{m}$ thick sample cell. This chamber is filled with a 3-fold diluted saline-sodium citrate buffer solution (SSC/3), giving an ionic strength of ~ 50 mM and a corresponding Debye length of ~ 1 nm. The amplitude of oscillation of the GNPs is measured by evanescent wave scattering [12] in a phase locked loop. This oscillation is collective, whereas the thermal motion of each individual GNP is independent; by averaging over many GNPs (there are $\sim 10^8$ GNPs in the field of view of the lens which collects the scattered light) it is possible to measure oscillation amplitudes of a fraction of 1 Å, whereas the amplitude of thermal motion of an individual GNP is several nm [10]. This extraordinary resolution allowed us to measure the mechanical response function of the protein as it transits from the linear elasticity regime (at low forcing and high frequency) to a regime (at high forcing and low frequency) which we called viscoelastic [9, 10]. In these experiments, the force on the GNPs is not calibrated, however we know that it is proportional to the applied voltage in the range of the experiments from control experiments using ss DNA molecules as tethers; these controls are published in [9]. Similarly, we know that the force on the GNPs is independent of frequency, from experiments at low force, where we expect elastic behavior and observe indeed a flat response vs frequency [8, 9]. At fixed amplitude F_0 of the forcing, the amplitude of the response $|z|$ vs frequency ν is constant at high frequency (the response of a spring) and diverges at low frequency (the response of a viscous fluid) [9]. At fixed frequency ν , $|z|$ vs F_0 is piecewise linear, the protein softening beyond a yield strain which defines the extent of the linear elasticity regime [10].

Here we start by presenting more detailed measurements of the low frequency divergence of the response function, shown in Fig. 3(a). The graph shows the amplitude of oscillation (in Å) vs driving frequency ν obtained for the same sample and different amplitudes of the driving voltage. The high frequency response is flat, the plateau value being proportional to the driving force F_0 within experimental uncertainty. This is the behavior of a spring. Measurements of this plateau in a wider frequency range are reported in [8, 9]. For $\nu \rightarrow 0$ the response diverges as $1/\nu$, as shown by the solid lines. This is the behavior of a viscous fluid. The functional form we use to fit the data of Fig. 3(a) reflects this behavior and is discussed below. It defines a corner frequency ω_1 below which the system “flows”. This corner frequency shifts to higher values for increasing amplitude of the forcing. This is shown in Fig. 3(b), where we plot the corner frequency ω_1 vs applied voltage V . The line through the points (which we discuss later) separates the $\omega - V$ plane into two regions, one where we observe linear elasticity (“elastic”), the other where we observe softening of the protein (“viscoelastic”). The transition between the two regimes is sharp when the response amplitude is plotted against the applied force [10], Fig. 4, so Fig. 3(b) constitutes a phase diagram of the dynamical behavior of the protein.

We may similarly probe the dynamics of the closed state. We add 1 mM GMP, which is saturating concentration (the binding constant for GMP is $K_G \approx 200 \mu\text{M}$ [5]). Fig. 5 shows the response of the enzyme in the “open” state (in the absence of GMP: squares) and in the “closed” state (with GMP bound: circles), for the same sample. The high frequency plateau, which defines the linear elasticity stiffness, changes very little; from accurate measurements in a wider frequency range we know in fact that with GMP bound this stiffness is increased by about 30% [8]. But the low frequency divergence is dramatically different, the open state being “softer” in this regime than the closed state. In short, the so-called hinge motion displays indeed a “soft” dynamics, but not in the linear elasticity regime (i.e. no “soft mode”). Instead, it is the phase line between elastic and viscoelastic (or “soft”) dynamics which is displaced (towards higher frequencies) in the open state compared to the closed state. Finally, we remark that all measurements presented here are reversible and cannot be attributed to electrochemical effects, but must reflect the dynamics of the tethers.

We now summarize quantitatively these observations by means of an heuristic model of the ensemble averaged protein’s mechanics which we introduced previously [9, 10]. The basic observation is that the ensemble averaged deformation, measured in the experiments, shows elastic behavior at high frequency and viscous flow behavior at low frequency. This is called viscoelasticity, and is captured in its simplest form by the Maxwell model, which is a spring and dashpot in series (Fig. 6(b)).

The relation between force f and displacement z for this model is:

$$\frac{dz}{dt} = \frac{1}{k} \frac{df}{dt} + \frac{1}{\gamma} f(t), \quad (1)$$

where k is the spring constant, γ the dissipation coefficient of the dashpot. In the experiment, this object is coupled to a GNP. The equation of motion of the GNP is:

$$F(t) = f(t) + \gamma_0 \frac{dz}{dt}, \quad (2)$$

where F is the force applied by the electric field. γ_0 is the hydrodynamic dissipation coefficient of the GNP, and inertial effects are negligible at the frequencies of interest. There is no thermal motion term in (1) or (2) because z is an ensemble averaged quantity. This deterministic dynamics reproduces exactly the ensemble averaged dynamics of the corresponding Langevin equations, because the system is linear (see Suppl. Mat. in [10]). From (1) and (2), with an oscillating force $F = F_0 \sin(\omega t)$ one finds that the amplitude of the response is:

$$|z| = \frac{F_0}{(\gamma + \gamma_0)\omega} \sqrt{\frac{1 + (\omega/\omega_1)^2}{1 + (\omega/\omega_2)^2}}, \quad (3)$$

where $\omega_1 = k^*/\gamma$ is the corner frequency of the viscoelastic element and $\omega_2 = k^*(\gamma + \gamma_0)/(\gamma\gamma_0)$. For $\gamma \gg \gamma_0$, which is the case for this setup [9], $\omega_2 \gg \omega_1$ and at frequencies $\omega \ll \omega_2$ (the regime we explore here) this response simplifies to $|z| \approx [F_0/(\gamma\omega)] \sqrt{1 + (\omega/\omega_1)^2}$. This describes very well the frequency dependence at fixed force F_0 (Fig. 3(a)). With this motivation, we fit the data of Fig. 3(a) with the form:

$$|z| = \frac{A}{\omega} \sqrt{1 + \left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_1}\right)^2}, \quad (4)$$

and determine for each data set the parameters A and ω_1 . In the inset of Fig. 3(a) we show the data collapse obtained by plotting $\ln \xi$ vs $\ln(1/\omega)$ (where $\xi = |z|/[A\sqrt{1 + (\omega/\omega_1)^2}]$), using these values of A and ω_1 . The slope of the graph is 1.02 ± 0.02 showing that the response function indeed diverges as $1/\omega$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$. Fig. 3(b) shows the values of the corner frequency ω_1 (obtained from the fits of Fig. 3(a)) plotted against the driving voltage F_0 . The relation $\omega_1 = \omega_1(F_0)$ defines a phase line in this diagram separating elastic from dissipative response. The existence of this phase line is a main new result in the mechano-chemistry of enzymes.

We now calculate the shape of the phase line, which is a stretched exponential (i.e. $\log \nu$ increases faster than linearly with V). Noting that the yield deformation z_c depends on frequency (Fig. 4), we assume that the DC elastic energy E vs deformation z of the protein has the qualitative behavior sketched in Fig. 6(a). The equilibrium states follow the lower of the two branches in Fig.

6(a). But there are also non-equilibrium (metastable) states - the higher of the two branches - which are accessible to the system dynamically. We assume this generic picture of a bifurcation (e.g. the energy diagram for the Euler buckling instability is similar) inspired by our measurements of the equilibrium bending elastic energy of another biopolymer, ds DNA [13]. Assume that for $\omega > 0$ the system can access the metastable states on the z^2 branch (Fig. 6(a)). The lifetime τ of such a state is (see Fig. 6(a)):

$$\tau \propto \exp(-\Delta/T) = \exp\left[-\left(\frac{1}{2}kz_c^2 - \alpha z_c\right)/T\right], \quad (5)$$

which yields the relation between ω and z_c :

$$\frac{1}{\omega} = \frac{1}{\omega_0} \exp\left[-\left(\frac{1}{2}kz_c^2 - \alpha z_c\right)/T\right], \quad (6)$$

and since $F_c = kz_c$ we obtain the frequency dependence of the critical force:

$$T \ln\left(\frac{\omega}{\omega_0}\right) = \frac{1}{2k}F_c^2 - \frac{\alpha}{k}F_c. \quad (7)$$

Interpreting (7) as a relation between the corner frequency ω_1 and F_0 , we obtain the solid line in Fig. 3(b). Thus Fig. 3(b) represents a non-equilibrium phase diagram for the protein, the phase line separating regions in the frequency - force plane where the dynamical behavior is elastic / viscoelastic.

We may apply these ideas to the measurements of the response in the open and closed states. We fit the data of Fig. 5 with the form (4) and obtain the parameters: $A_+ = 3.67 \pm 0.33$, $\nu_1^+ = 9.23 \pm 1.01$ with GMP (closed state, circles) and $A_- = 9.20 \pm 0.25$, $\nu_1^- = 23.29 \pm 1.29$ without GMP (open state, squares). We notice that $A_-/A_+ \approx \nu_1^-/\nu_1^+$. Within the viscoelastic model, $\nu_1 = k^*/(2\pi\gamma)$, $A = \text{const.}/\gamma$, and we can describe the data by saying that γ is a factor 2.5 smaller in the open state compared to the closed state, while k^* is the same. The phase line in Fig. 3(b) is displaced in the closed state compared to the open state.

Conclusions. Through a set of nano-mechanical measurements of extraordinary resolution on the “hinge motion” of the enzyme Guanylate Kinase we arrive at the following experimental picture. The system undergoes a sharp (Fig. 4) transition from linear elasticity to a softer (“viscoelastic”) dynamics as a function of force and frequency. Specifically, the susceptibility $\chi(\omega) = |z|/F_0$ diverges as $1/\omega$ for $\omega \rightarrow 0$ and goes to a constant for $\omega \rightarrow \infty$. We give an experimental description of this transition in terms of how the susceptibility $\chi(\omega)$ depends on the force: $\chi = \chi(\omega, F_0)$ (Figs. 3(a), and 4). Namely, we experimentally define a line in the $\omega - F_0$ (frequency - force) plane (Fig. 3(b)) which separates elastic from viscoelastic response. In the representation

of Fig. 3(a), following one curve towards lower frequencies corresponds to moving downwards along a vertical line in the phase diagram of Fig. 3(b): at some point one crosses from the elastic into the viscoelastic (soft) regime. Similarly, in the representation of Fig. 4, which shows plots of the forcing amplitude F_0 vs response amplitude $|z|$ at fixed frequency ν , moving along a curve for increasing F_0 corresponds to moving along a horizontal line in Fig. 3(b). Again one crosses from the elastic to the viscoelastic regime at a certain (frequency dependent) critical force. We give a simple argument for the shape of this phase line, and show that in the closed state it shifts to lower frequencies compared to the open state. The open state is “softer” than the closed state (Fig. 5), not because its linear elastic constant is smaller, but because it is easier to access the soft (viscoelastic) state. Therefore, the hinge motion has nothing to do with “soft modes” and everything to do with the viscoelastic transition [9]. From Fig. 4 it is also evident that most (90%) of the 1 nm amplitude functional conformational motion of GK happens in the viscoelastic regime.

The conclusions above are experimental, independent of assuming the viscoelastic dynamics (3). However, assuming for the ensemble averaged dynamics of the protein the model (3) produces remarkably good fits to the data (inset of Fig. 3(a)). In this interpretation, the shift of the phase line in the open compared to the closed state is due to the dependence of the parameter γ on force (a nonlinear effect).

The linear viscoelastic model (1) describes very well the frequency dependence of the measurements at fixed force F_0 (Fig. 3(a)). However it does not describe the force dependence, which is nonlinear (Fig. 4). A comprehensive mathematical description of the transition, and eventually a microscopic model, are tasks for future work.

Onuchic, Wolynes, and collaborators, using structure based coarse grained simulations [6, 7], have arrived at a structural description of the kind of conformational motion probed in our experiment. This description involves localized melting and refolding to connect open and closed states [6]. Qualitatively, it seems to us that a molten “hinge” would flow and thus produce a susceptibility which diverges as $1/\omega$, so we think that their predicted scenario, which they called “cracking” [6], and our observed dynamics, which we called the “viscoelastic transition” [9], may be one and the same. In this case, this study establishes experimentally the ensemble averaged dynamics of cracking.

This work was supported by the UC Lab Research Program, by NSF grant DMR-1006162, and by the US-Israel Binational Science Foundation under grant number 2010448.

* zocchi@physics.ucla.edu

- [1] D. E. Koshland Jr. Application of a theory of enzyme specificity to protein synthesis. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 44:98–104, 1958.
- [2] Y. Savir and T. Tlusty. Conformational proofreading: The impact of conformational changes on the specificity of molecular recognition. *PLoS ONE*, 2:e468, 2007.
- [3] J. Monod, J-P. Changeux, and F. Jacob. Allosteric proteins and cellular control systems. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 6:306–329, 1963.
- [4] M. F. Perutz. Nature of haem-haem interaction. *Nature*, 237:495–499, 1972.
- [5] C-Y. Tseng, A. Wang, and G. Zocchi. Mechanochemistry of the enzyme guanylate kinase. *Europhys. Lett.*, 91:18005, 2010.
- [6] P. C. Whitford, O. Miyashita, Y. Levy, and J. N. Onuchic. Conformational transitions of adenylate kinase: Switching by cracking. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 366:1661–1671, 2007.
- [7] O. Miyashita, J. N. Onuchic, and P. G. Wolynes. Nonlinear elasticity, proteinquakes, and the energy landscapes of functional transitions in proteins. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 100:12570–12575, 2003.
- [8] Y. Wang and G. Zocchi. Elasticity of globular proteins measured from the ac susceptibility. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 105:238104, 2010.
- [9] Y. Wang and G. Zocchi. The folded protein as a viscoelastic solid. *Europhys. Lett.*, 96:18003, 2011.
- [10] Y. Wang and G. Zocchi. Viscoelastic transition and yield strain of the folded protein. *PLoS ONE*, 6:e28097, 2011.
- [11] J. Blaszczyk, Y. Li, H. Yan, and X. Ji. Crystal structure of unligated guanylate kinase from yeast reveals GMP-induced conformational changes. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 307:247, 2001.
- [12] H. Jensenius and G. Zocchi. Measuring the spring constant of a single polymer chain. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 79:5030–5033, 1997.
- [13] H. Qu and G. Zocchi. The complete bending energy function for nicked DNA. *Europhys. Lett.*, 94:10803, 2011.




FIG. 1. The experimental system. (a) The sample chamber with AC electric field and synchronous evanescent wave scattering optical measurement of deformation. (b) The geometry of the enzyme Guanylate Kinase (GK) tethering a gold nanoparticle (GNP) to the gold coated slide. The attachment points (residues mutated to Cysteines at positions 171 and 75) are shown on the structure. The enzyme and the GNP are drawn approximately to scale.




FIG. 2. The open to closed conformational change (“hinge motion”) of (yeast) GK. Shown are the crystallographic structures of the enzyme with and without GMP bound (PDB structures 1EX7, 1EX6).




FIG. 3. (a) Ensemble averaged amplitude of the deformation $|z|$ vs frequency ν for different driving Voltages, showing the low frequency divergence of the susceptibility. The lines are fits to the data using eq. (4). The error bars represent standard deviations (\pm SD) over 5 measurements (on the same sample). The inset is a plot of $\ln(\xi) = \ln[|z|/(A\sqrt{1 + (\omega/\omega_1)^2})]$ vs $\ln(1/\omega)$ for the same data, showing the data collapse obtained using eq. (4). The best linear fit has a slope of 1. (b) The phase diagram of the viscoelastic transition, obtained by plotting the corner frequency ω_1 obtained from a) vs the Voltage V . The line, which is a fit using eq. (7), separates linear elastic from softer (viscoelastic) dynamics.




FIG. 4. Forcing amplitude vs deformation at fixed frequency; circles: $\nu = 10$ Hz; squares: $\nu = 50$ Hz. The linear elasticity regime is extended at the higher frequency. The transition to the soft (viscoelastic) dynamics is sharp.




FIG. 5. Deformation amplitude $|z|$ vs frequency ν for the same sample and driving Voltage, in the presence (circles: closed state) and absence (squares: open state) of the substrate GMP. While the linear elasticity (large ν) is essentially the same in the two cases, the low frequency behavior is dramatically different.




FIG. 6. (a) Sketch of a possible zero frequency free energy as a function of deformation z . The quadratic branch corresponds to linear elasticity, the linear branch gives rise to the soft (viscoelastic) dynamic states. Metastable states of energy Δ with respect to the ground state are accessible dynamically. (b) The simplest (Maxwell) model of viscoelasticity: a spring and dashpot in series.