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ABSTRACT
Motivation: A number of studies of individual proteins have shown that post-translational modifications (PTMs) are associated with structural rearrangements of their target proteins. Although such studies provide critical insights into the mechanics behind the dynamic regulation of protein function, they usually feature examples with relatively large conformational changes. However, with the steady growth of Protein Data Bank (PDB) and available PTM sites, it is now possible to more systematically characterize the role of PTMs as conformational switches. In this study, we ask (1) what is the expected extent of structural change upon PTM, (2) how often are those changes in fact substantial, (3) whether the structural impact is spatially localized or global and (4) whether different PTMs have different signatures.

Results: We exploit redundancy in PDB and, using root-mean-square deviation, study the conformational heterogeneity of groups of protein structures corresponding to identical sequences in their unmodified and modified forms. We primarily focus on the two most abundant PTMs in PDB, glycosylation and phosphorylation, but show that acetylation and methylation have similar tendencies. Our results provide evidence that PTMs induce conformational changes at both local and global level. However, the proportion of large changes is unexpectedly small; only 7% of glycosylated and 13% of phosphorylated proteins undergo global changes $>2\text{Å}$. Further analysis suggests that phosphorylation stabilizes protein structure by reducing global conformational heterogeneity by 25%. Overall, these results suggest a subtle but common role of allostery in the mechanisms through which PTMs affect regulatory and signaling pathways.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Post-translational modifications (PTMs) refer to in vivo biochemical processing events of a protein after its synthesis (Walsh, 2006). It is speculated that nearly every protein undergoes some form of PTM (Lodish, 2004) and >400 types of PTMs have been reported so far, spanning all domains of life. Different PTMs display different physicochemical properties (Mann and Jensen, 2003); thus, the same protein may exhibit different functions upon different modifications (Jungblut et al., 2008). As a result, the high diversity of PTMs, combined with their reversibility and enzymatic control, makes them a vital component of molecular recognition, signal transduction and protein degradation (Deribe et al., 2010; Uy and Wold, 1977; Walsh et al., 2005; Wold, 1981). Dysregulation of PTMs and mutation of PTM sites are implicated in a number of diseases (Vidal, 2011), from various monogenic disorders (Li et al., 2010) to complex diseases such as cancer (Bode and Dong, 2004; Krueger and Srivastava, 2006; Radivojac et al., 2008), heart disease (Van Eyk, 2011) and neurodegenerative disorders (Gong et al., 2005; Thomas et al., 2004).

The mechanisms through which PTMs regulate protein function are of great interest to biologists. Most PTM events introduce additional chemical groups to residue side chains with the potential to alter the energy landscape of a protein and subsequently lead to conformational changes observed in crystal structures. Various examples have shown that this structural change is essential for the modified protein to display new functionalities as in the case of phosphorylation (Blasie et al., 1990; Edreira et al., 2009; Giannopoulos et al., 2009; Lee and Koland, 2005; Menet and Rosbash, 2011), glycosylation (Arnold et al., 2007), acetylation (Gu and Roeder, 1997) and sumoylation (Geiss-Friedlander and Melchior, 2007). Additional mechanisms include change of binding affinity or creation of binding sites (Deribe et al., 2010; Nishi et al., 2011; Schaller and Parsons, 1995; Toh et al., 2001).

The most extensively studied PTM is phosphorylation that, with some exceptions, adds a phosphoryl group to serine, threonine or tyrosine residues in eukaryotes and to histidine or aspartic acid residues in prokaryotes. The phosphoryl group has a double negative charge under physiological conditions and is anticipated to affect the energy landscape of the modified protein (Stock and Da Re, 2000). In their review, Johnson and Lewis (2001) analyzed 17 pairs of phosphorylated and non-phosphorylated structures to characterize the structural consequences of phosphorylation. They showed that the dominant structural response was an adjustment of protein conformation to accommodate for the electrostatic effects between the phosphate and surrounding charged atoms. However, the types and extent of structural changes were highly diverse: they observed both local and long-range changes; both association and disassociation of protein complexes and both order-to-disorder and disorder-to-order transitions. In one extreme case, phosphorylation of Ser14 in glycogen phosphorylase results in a 50Å shift of Ser14 itself. In addition, this phosphorylation event alters the tertiary structure of enzyme’s catalytic site that is around 50 Å away from Ser14. However, there are also situations in which
proteins. However, with the rapid growth of protein structure data as well as the presence of multiple structures corresponding to the same amino acid sequence, larger scale studies focused on characterizing the overall trends of the structural impact are becoming realistic. This is further facilitated by the results of common strategies include molecular dynamics and conformational sampling. However, both of these strategies are limited by several factors, including computational requirements necessary for modeling micro- to millisecond events on large molecules, assumptions on the scale of conformational change or influence of a particular force field (Lwin and Luo, 2006; Narayanan and Jacobson, 2009). Recent studies have tested the accuracy of computational models by predicting the structure of the phosphorylated molecule based on the structure of the unmodified molecule and then comparing the predicted with the actual phosphorylated structure (Groban et al., 2006; Shen et al., 2005). The results of these and other studies (Latzer et al., 2008) suggest that such methods may be accurate enough to provide valuable insights into the structure–function relationship.

Despite the recent progress in understanding the structural impact of PTMs, much of the focus has been on individual proteins. However, with the rapid growth of protein structure data as well as the presence of multiple structures corresponding to the same amino acid sequence, larger scale studies focused on characterizing the overall trends of the structural impact are becoming realistic. This is further facilitated by the results of recent work in which multiple X-ray structures of the same protein in Protein Data Bank (PDB) (Berman et al., 2000) were reported to be similar to those observed in solution using nuclear magnetic resonance (Lange et al., 2008), suggesting that different X-ray structures of the same protein can in principle be used to study and understand protein conformational flexibility.

In this study, we systematically analyze groups of protein structures (corresponding to the same sequence) in their modified and unmodified forms to address questions regarding the universality, extent and signatures of structural changes upon PTM. Our work provides evidence that PTMs, similar to ligand binding, induce generally small but statistically significant conformational changes.

2 METHODS

2.1 Data collection and experimental protocol

Protein structures and sequences corresponding to the SEQRES fields were obtained from PDB. RNA, DNA and ligand sequences were discarded and only polypeptide sequences were retained. CD-HIT (Yang et al., 2010), which can cluster a sequence database at a given sequence identity threshold, was used to form clusters of PDB chains corresponding to identical sequences. Only clusters with two chains or more were kept. We then examined corresponding PDB files to find clusters in which chains had different MODRES profiles.

We analyzed four PTMs in this study: glycosylation, phosphorylation, acetylation and methylation. Regular expression patterns ‘GLYCO’, ‘PHOSPHO’, ‘ACETYL’ and ‘METHYL’ were used to retrieve clusters that may contain any of the PTM types. Then, the chemical component dictionary from PDB was consulted to retain proteins with appropriate modification descriptors (the list of descriptors is shown in Supplementary Table S1). Only protein structures with resolution ≤2.5Å and R-value ≤0.3 were retained. The final dataset contained 276 clusters, each with at least one modified and one unmodified structure; see Table 1 for a detailed breakdown. The average sequence identity between clusters was 19.2% (median was 18.6%), and the average number of structures for each cluster was 7.9 (median was 4). The experimental protocol is illustrated in Figure 1.

2.2 Calculation of RMSD, hydrogen bonds, crystal contacts and salt bridges

Although all PDB chains in a CD-HIT cluster had the same amino acid sequence, calculating the RMSD between pairs was not straightforward because missing residues in the corresponding 3D coordinate (ATOM) fields led to situations in which two structures were not directly superimposable. We established residue correspondences in each pair of structures by performing a global alignment between the two sequences concatenated from the 3D coordinate fields, allowing for gaps but not for mismatches. Then, a least-squares fitting of aligned amino acids was used to calculate the RMSD. Only Ca atoms were used for RMSD calculations.

Local structural environments were defined as concentric shells using radii 6, 12, 18 and 24Å from a PTM site or its counterpart in an
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unmodified chain (the average longest distance between any two Cα atoms of the protein structures involved in this study was 62 Å). Local RMSD was calculated in a similar way as global RMSD but only included amino acids within the local environment distance cutoffs.

Hydrogen bonds were calculated using HBPLUS (McDonald and Thornton, 1994), but the bonds between main chain atoms and water molecules were excluded since they were not expected to contribute to a change in the number of hydrogen bonds when modified and unmodified chains were compared. Crystal contacts were calculated using CryCo (Eyal et al., 2005) with a default threshold distance of 10 Å. A salt bridge was reported when a positively charged atom was within 4 Å of a negatively charged atom.

2.3 Statistical analysis

The paired t-test was used for hypothesis testing, with the significance level set to 0.05. Generalized linear model (GLM) fitting was used to explore the influence of various parameters on the structural effects upon PTM. We briefly summarize the GLM framework below (Agresti, 2007).

GLM is a generalization of the standard linear model in which the target variable \( y \) is modeled as a linear combination of the predictor variables \( x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \), that is \( y = a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n + \epsilon \), where \( a_{ij}[0,1] \) are real valued coefficients and \( \epsilon \) is a stochastic error term modeled using a normal distribution \( N(0, \sigma^2) \). In GLM, the target variable is modeled as \( y = g(a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n + \epsilon) \),
where the inverse function of \( g(\cdot, f(\cdot)) \) is called the link function. The GLM can be re-written using the link function as:

\[
E(y) = a_0 + a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 + \ldots + a_n x_n,
\]

where \( E(y) \) is the expectation of \( y \). GLM provides a convenient mechanism to model the error using distributions other than normal (e.g. a binomial distribution is used in logistic regression). An identity link function reduces GLM to a standard linear regression model in which \( e \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \).

The quality of the fit is tested using deviance, defined as

\[
D = -2[\log(L) - \log(L_0)],
\]

where \( L \) is the likelihood for the fitted model and \( L_0 \) is the likelihood for the full model which is a strict memorization of each data point (Agresti, 2007). Deviance can be viewed as a log-likelihood ratio statistic and thus it approximately follows a \( \chi^2 \) distribution with the degree of freedom equaling the number of data points minus the number of parameters in the model. Deviance can be used to calculate \( P \)-values in order to evaluate goodness-of-fit. Small \( P \)-values indicate poor fits, whereas ones that are not very small indicate adequate fits.

In our experiments, we seek to understand which predictor variables contribute to the observed difference between modified and unmodified structures within the same CD-HIT cluster (recall that all structures in a cluster correspond to the same amino acid sequence). To accomplish this, we used a vector-space representation in which each data point pertained to either one cluster (in calculations of global structural changes) or one PTM site (in calculations of local structural changes). The predictor variables included the following: (1) the difference between the indicator variables between modified and unmodified chains; since we compare a group of modified with a group of unmodified structures within a cluster, this value will be 1 for all data points \( (x_1 = 1) \); (2) the difference between the average number of crystal contacts in two groups \( (x_2) \); (3) the difference between the average number of chains in protein complex for two groups \( (x_3) \); (4) the difference between the average protein crystallization temperature \( (x_4) \); (5) the difference between the average pH \( (x_5) \); (6) the difference between the average protein structure resolutions \( (x_6) \) and (7) the difference between the average number of ligands in the protein complex \( (x_7) \).

Two target variables were used for the GLM fitting: (1) \( y = \log(\text{RMSD}^\text{u}) - \log(\text{RMSD}^\text{m}) \) and (2) \( y = \text{RMSD}^\text{u} - \text{RMSD}^\text{m} \); and the one with the better fit was selected. Here, \( \text{RMSD}^\text{d} \) represents RMSD\textsuperscript{d-m} in each analysis of structural change upon modification and RMSD\textsuperscript{d} in the analysis of stabilization or destabilization of protein structure. Both types of fitting enable estimating the expected extent of structural change upon modification as follows.

Let us first consider a situation where the target variable is defined as

\[
y = \log(\text{RMSD}^\text{u}) - \log(\text{RMSD}^\text{m}).
\]

Suppose that the first predictor variable is non-zero (i.e. \( x_1 = 1 \), with the regression coefficient \( a_1 \)), while the remaining variables all equal to zero (\( x_2 = x_3 = \ldots = x_7 = 0 \)), meaning that only PTM conditions are different between the two structure subgroups.

Since the identity link function assumes a normally distributed noise variable, the target can be expressed as

\[
\log(\frac{\text{RMSD}^\text{d}}{\text{RMSD}^\text{m}}) = a_1 + \sigma Z,
\]

where \( a_1 \) is the expectation of the target, \( \sigma \) is the standard deviation of the noise variable and \( Z \) is a standard normal variable. Both \( a_1 \) and \( \sigma \) can be estimated via the GLM fitting (Agresti, 2007). A normally distributed target \( y \sim N(a_1, \sigma^2) \) means that a transformed random variable \( e^y \) follows a log-normal distribution, i.e.

\[
\frac{\text{RMSD}^\text{d}}{\text{RMSD}^\text{m}} = e^{a_1 + \sigma Z}.
\]

Because the expectation of \( e^y \) equals \( e^{a_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}} \), the structural change upon PTM can be calculated as

\[
\frac{\text{RMSD}^\text{d} - \text{RMSD}^\text{m}}{\text{RMSD}^\text{d}} = e^{a_1 + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}} - 1.
\]

If the target variable is \( y = \text{RMSD}^\text{d} - \text{RMSD}^\text{m} \), instead of the relative difference, we can only report the expected absolute structural difference, which equals \( a_1 \).

It is important to note that because of the influence of other variables such as pH or temperature, the structural change due to PTM cannot be directly calculated from data as an average of the observed structural differences. Therefore, in cases when the fitting is adequate, the regression step estimates the proportion of the structural impact that can be attributed to the first predictor variable \( (x_1) \).

### 3 RESULTS

The major goal of this study was to quantify the expected structural difference between unmodified and post-translationally modified proteins and thus understand the allosteric potential of PTMs. We exploited the presence of multiple structures with identical amino acid sequence in PDB that provided us with a means to approximate conformational flexibility of each protein (Lange et al., 2008). In order to work with a sufficient number of structures, we focused on the four most abundant PTM types in PDB: glycosylation, phosphorylation, acetylation and methylation. Because the datasets for acetylation and methylation were too small to carry out a reliable statistical analysis, our main focus was on glycosylation and phosphorylation.

#### 3.1 PTMs significantly change protein local structure

We first asked to what extent the additional chemical group, or a polysaccharide molecule, impacts the local structural neighborhood around a PTM site. To understand this, for each PTM site, we studied the average RMSD between sets of modified and unmodified structures (RMSD\textsuperscript{d-m}) and how it relates to the RMSDs calculated on structures within each group (modified or unmodified). We then tested the hypothesis that PTMs significantly alter protein structure. Note that by using this approach, we compared RMSDs calculated on structures with similar number of atoms, as suggested previously by Gutteridge and Thornton (2005).

We studied local RMSD in four concentric shells defined by the distance \( d \) from the PTM site and only residues whose Ca atoms were within the shell were included in the RMSD calculation. We compared the within-group RMSD and between-group RMSD for each local environment using a one-tailed paired \( t \)-test with the null hypothesis that the within-group and between-group RMSDs are identical and the alternative hypothesis that between-group RMSD is larger than within-group RMSD. The percentage of clusters for which RMSD\textsuperscript{d-m} > RMSD\textsuperscript{d}, shown in Table 2, indicates preferences of all four PTMs for local structural re-arrangements. The \( P \)-values shown in Table 3 provide statistical support that glycosylation and phosphorylation affect protein local structure in all three layers when \( d > 6 \). The results are not significant for the \( d \leq 6 \) layer probably because there are on average <6 amino acids in this layer. Although few tests for methylation and acetylation suggest significant structural changes, potentially due to a small sample size (10 sites for methylation and 13 for acetylation), the results show a similar trend as those for glycosylation and phosphorylation. This is suggested by the observation that the majority of the cases have RMSD\textsuperscript{d-m} larger than RMSD\textsuperscript{d}. Supplementary Figure S1 shows the distributions of all RMSDs...
Table 2. Comparison of RMSD$^{<m}$ and RMSD$^>$ in the local environment of PTM sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glycosyl</th>
<th>Phosphoryl</th>
<th>Methyl</th>
<th>Acetyl</th>
<th>All four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d \leq 6$</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 &lt; d \leq 12$</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12 &lt; d \leq 18$</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18 &lt; d \leq 24$</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of PTM sites where RMSD$^{<m}$ is greater than RMSD$^>$ in the local structural environment. Variable $d$ represents the distance from the PTM site.

Table 3. Comparison of RMSD$^{<m}$ and RMSD$^>$ in the local environment of PTM sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glycosyl</th>
<th>Phosphoryl</th>
<th>Methyl</th>
<th>Acetyl</th>
<th>All four</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$d \leq 6$</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-4}$*</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$6 &lt; d \leq 12$</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
<td>0.011*</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12 &lt; d \leq 18$</td>
<td>$5.9 \times 10^{-7}$*</td>
<td>0.013*</td>
<td>0.521</td>
<td>0.197</td>
<td>$1.2 \times 10^{-4}$*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18 &lt; d \leq 24$</td>
<td>$5.7 \times 10^{-8}$*</td>
<td>0.004*</td>
<td>0.165</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>$5.2 \times 10^{-5}$*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$t$-test results corresponding to the values above. Each $P$-value was calculated using a paired $t$-test. *indicates $P$-values <0.05.

in the local environment for the $d \leq 6$ Å sphere (other local environments have similar distributions; Supplementary Table S2).

Previous studies suggested that crystallization conditions, protein complex formation and crystal packing may influence protein structure (Mohan et al., 2009; Palaninathan et al., 2008) and result in a difference between protein crystal structure and its structure in vivo (Eyal et al., 2005). We therefore explored the GLM fitting to seek explanatory variables associated with structural changes. It can be observed from Table 4 that fitting was adequate (large $P$-values for the goodness of fit). Furthermore, the $P$-values of coefficients for PTM were significant for both glycosylation and phosphorylation as well as for the four PTM types together. Although some other factors also influenced the fit, PTM was a contributing factor explaining the observed structural change. The results suggest that glycosylation on average increases local RMSD ($d \leq 6$ Å) by 0.074 Å, while phosphorylation increases it by 0.651 Å. Note that each of the statistical tests shown in Table 3 was performed on a separate dataset and thus does not require correction for multiple hypothesis testing. Similarly, the GLM fitting in Table 4 was run to test the hypothesis that a particular PTM is a significant explanatory variable for the observed change in structure, as opposed to a ‘discovery mode’ in which one seeks to identify and report any subset of explanatory variables for a particular phenomenon.

An interesting question arises regarding the percentage of cases with large conformational changes upon PTM. We find that changes >0.5 Å occur in 8.1% and 20.0% of cases for glycosylation and phosphorylation, respectively. Similar percentages were also observed for acetylation and methylation.

3.2 PTMs significantly change protein global structure

We next investigated whether PTMs induce structural change at a global protein level. Although our general approach is similar to that in Section 3.1, in this case all comparisons were carried out at the level of unique protein chains instead of at the level of PTM sites. Thus, some of the protein structures unavoidably contained more than one modified residue. As shown in Table 1, the data contained 121 protein chains (clusters) for glycosylation (236 sites), 54 chains for phosphorylation (55 sites), 14 chains for acetylation (13) and 13 for methylation (10).
Analyses and statistical tests summarized in Tables 5–8 provide evidence that PTMs significantly change protein structure at the global level for both glycosylation \((P = 5.7 \times 10^{-4})\) and phosphorylation \((P = 4.0 \times 10^{-3})\) compared with the unmodified structures. In addition, observed structural changes are strongly related to PTM rather than any other factor. As shown in Table 7, large \(P\)-values for GLM fitting suggest adequate linear fitting and significant \(P\)-values for the coefficient of PTM but not any other explanatory factor \((4.0 \times 10^{-4} \text{ and } 8.8 \times 10^{-7} \text{ for glycosylation and all four PTMs together})\). The \(P\)-value of the PTM coefficient for phosphorylation was not significant at a 0.05 level but it was considerably smaller than \(P\)-values for any other factor (Table 7), suggesting the need for more data (there were only 54 data points for phosphorylation).

Coefficients of GLM fitting suggest that glycosylation on average increases protein global structure RMSD by 69.7\% \((a_1 = 0.336, \sigma = 0.621)\). Similarly, phosphorylation increases global RMSD by 122.6\% \((a_1 = 0.421, \sigma = 0.871)\).

In terms of extreme changes, structural changes >2 Å were observed in only 13.0\% and 6.6\% of cases for phosphorylation and glycosylation, respectively. These results were similar for acetylation and methylation and were consistent with those observed at the local structure level.

### 3.3 Phosphorylation stabilizes protein structure at a global level

When comparing within-group RMSDs and between-group RMSDs, we compared RMSD\(^{\text{w}}\) and RMSD\(^{\text{m}}\) with RMSD\(^{\text{w-m}}\) separately and found similar results. In order to understand the conformational flexibility between unmodified and modified forms of the proteins, we next studied the difference between RMSD\(^{\text{w}}\) and RMSD\(^{\text{m}}\). The results of this analysis are shown in Supplementary Figures S1 and S2 and Tables 5–8.

The distributions of the two within-group RMSDs show a similar trend observed in the comparison between within-group and between-group RMSDs (Supplementary Figs S1 and S2). The distributions of RMSD\(^{\text{w}}\) shift toward the right-hand side compared with the distribution of RMSD\(^{\text{m}}\) at both local and global levels, suggesting that PTMs might be able to reduce internal structural movements and thus stabilize protein structures.

GLM fitting was performed on those significant comparisons to explore whether PTM was the main explanatory variable. For local RMSDs, the significant explanatory factors include the number of crystal contacts and crystallographic resolution, whereas the presence of a PTM was not significant. For global RMSD of phosphorylation, PTM was significant \((P = 0.036)\), along with temperature \((P = 0.036)\) and resolution \((P = 0.017)\), suggesting that phosphorylation significantly stabilizes protein structure. The correlation between the temperature value, resolution and RMSD suggest that both larger difference in crystallographic resolution and larger temperature difference result in larger RMSD difference. The coefficient of PTM from GLM fitting results provides evidence that on average phosphorylation reduces the global structural difference between two proteins by 25.2\% \((a_1 = -0.069, \sigma = 0.900)\).

To explore the mechanism of PTM-induced structural changes, we analyzed the change in hydrogen bonds and the number of salt bridges between modified and unmodified structures. For both glycosylation and phosphorylation, we observed a significant increase in the number of hydrogen bonds in the local environment \((P = 1.57 \times 10^{-4} \text{ and } 7.84 \times 10^{-5} \text{ for } d \leq 6 \text{ Å})\). The analysis of salt bridges showed that the phosphoryl group introduced new salt bridges in 45 of 70 protein structures (64.3\%; \(P = 0.036\)).

### 4 DISCUSSION

Although the importance of PTMs as functional modulators has been established, the mechanisms through which most of the regulation is carried out are still not well understood (Walsh, 2006). In this study, we investigated the potential for allosteric regulation in PTM-mediated functional changes by quantifying structural impact upon PTM (allosteric effect is usually seen as a specific form of structural change in which binding of an effector molecule at one site in a protein alters the local structure around a functional site elsewhere in the protein, thus...
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![Fig. 2. The speculated energy landscape changes upon phosphorylation and glycosylation. The dotted black curve and the solid red curve correspond to unmodified and post-translationally modified structures, respectively](image)

Affecting overall protein activity; Swain and Gierasch, 2006). Our results provide quantitative evidence that PTMs induce significant conformational changes to protein structure and suggest that PTMs act in similar ways as small-molecule allosteric effectors.

We investigated four PTMs, glycosylation, phosphorylation, methylation and acetylation, and showed that all exhibit similar effects in local (Tables 2-4) and global (Tables 5-8) conformational changes. In addition, phosphorylation has shown an effect of stabilizing protein structure by introducing new hydrogen bonds and salt bridges in the local neighborhood of the modified residue. Putting these results together, we speculate that the predominant mechanism of PTM action is alteration of the energy landscape, as shown in Figure 2. Specifically, we believe that glycosylation and phosphorylation frequently lead to a conformational shift of the lowest valley in the energy landscape; however, while glycosylation likely retains the approximate abundance of the conformation with the lowest energy, phosphorylation results in an enriched abundance in the lowest energy form thus restricting conformational flexibility. Similar conclusion has been speculated for intrinsically disordered proteins (Ma and Nussinov, 2009). For phosphorylation, the stabilizing effects might be a driving force to populate protein conformations to a new state, which has been suggested for ligand binding (Hilser, 2010). Conformational changes were also found in methylation and acetylation; however, due to the problems of dataset size, only glycosylation and phosphorylation showed statistically significant differences in most experiments.

Although these results suggest preferences among PTMs for conformational shifts, only a small fraction of structures go through extreme changes. At a global level, glycosylation and phosphorylation introduce structural changes $>2\AA$ in only 7–13% of cases. These results are similar to those observed for ligand binding where 9% of enzymes showed $>2\AA$ structural changes (Gutteridge and Thornton, 2005). These results strongly suggest that despite the importance of structural change for the modified protein to modulate its function, small-to-moderate structural changes are usually sufficient.

Experiments in this study were carried out with strict controls. We only compared conformational heterogeneity between (groups of) protein structures corresponding to identical amino acid sequences. Although such a requirement greatly reduced the number of data points that can be used for statistical analyses (one data point per sequence cluster or PTM site), the approach was necessary since absolute RMSD values are not directly comparable when calculated on very different numbers of atoms. In addition, since RMSDs were calculated using $Cz$ atoms only, side-chain alterations that may also be critical for protein function (Lee et al., 2008) could not be observed. We believe this resulted in more conservative estimation of the prevalence of structural change (note that allostery may occur without any observable backbone changes; Tsai et al., 2008). Another reason that the estimates of conformational changes may be conservative is the influence of the expression system when studying PTMs. In particular, non-observed N-linked glycosylation sites expressed in eukaryotic systems may still be glycosylated in the protein, but with the polysaccharide molecule missing from the structural model due to static disorder (Rhodes, 2006). On the other hand, proteins expressed in bacterial systems would be less likely to include such problems.

A potential limitation of this study stems from the suitability of crystallographic data for the study of conformational changes as well as the assumptions used in our statistical analysis. Although crystallographic data are generally reliable, its limitations are related to the inherent biases in PDB (Peng et al., 2004) and its ability to provide high-resolution insight into conformational flexibility of macromolecules. For example, PTMs that increase flexibility of protein regions leading to order-to-disorder transition could not be analyzed in this study. Statistically, one limitation stems from GLM fitting where we included seven variables that are believed to be the most important factors leading to observed structural differences. However, other factors may also exist as well as an interplay between them. For example, a PTM can lead to protein complex formation (Nishi et al., 2011), while in the GLM fitting they would be considered as independent events. Another limitation comes from the fact that a large enough data set could not be collected to investigate the influence of modifications of different amino acid residue types. As the size of PDB increases, it will become possible to further refine the analysis.

It is important to mention that PTMs have also been linked to intrinsically disordered protein regions, i.e. regions without a single dominant conformational macro-state under physiological conditions (Radivojac et al., 2007). For example, phosphorylation, ubiquitination, methylation and others have been associated to disordered regions either statistically (Daily et al.,...
2005; Iakoucheva et al., 2004; Radivojac et al., 2010; Xie et al., 2007) or experimentally (Collins et al., 2008; Gsponer et al., 2008). Although such associations are certainly useful for our understanding of the mechanisms underlying PTM regulation and signaling, a large number of proteins do contain PTM sites in their structured regions. Therefore, the results obtained through our experiments are of broad importance.

Finally, in this work we provide evidence that the observed differences between modified and unmodified structures are significant and can be attributed to PTM. However, the available data do not contain intermediate structures that lead from one observed conformation to another. Thus, the structural differences between modified and unmodified structures could be explained equally well by two alternative mechanisms: structural change upon modification and conformational selection from a pre-existing structural ensemble (our preliminary analyses suggest that both may be at play). Regardless of the underlying mechanism, PTMs are associated with small but common conformational changes of their target proteins.
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