

Monomeric Solution Structure of the Prototypical 'C' Chemokine Lymphotactin^{†,‡}E. Sonay Kuloğlu,[§] Darrell R. McCaslin,^{||} Moiz Kitabwalla,[⊥] C. David Pauza,[⊥] John L. Markley,[#] and Brian F. Volkman^{*,▼}

Department of Biochemistry, Biophysics Instrumentation Facility, and National Magnetic Resonance Facility at Madison, University of Wisconsin—Madison, 433 Babcock Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, Department of Biochemistry, Medical College of Wisconsin, 8701 Watertown Plank Road, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53226, and Institute of Human Virology, University of Maryland, 725 West Lombard Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Received May 30, 2001; Revised Manuscript Received July 23, 2001

ABSTRACT: Lymphotactin, the sole identified member of the C class of chemokines, specifically attracts T lymphocytes and natural killer cells. This 93-residue protein lacks 2 of the 4 conserved cysteine residues characteristic of the other 3 classes of chemokines and possesses an extended carboxyl terminus, which is required for chemotactic activity. We have determined the three-dimensional solution structure of recombinant human lymphotactin by NMR spectroscopy. Under the conditions used for the structure determination, lymphotactin was predominantly monomeric; however, pulsed field gradient NMR self-diffusion measurements and analytical ultracentrifugation revealed evidence of dimer formation. Sequence-specific chemical shift assignments were determined through analysis of two- and three-dimensional NMR spectra of ¹⁵N- and ¹³C/¹⁵N-enriched protein samples. Input for the torsion angle dynamics calculations used in determining the structure included 1258 unique NOE-derived distance constraints and 60 dihedral angle constraints obtained from chemical-shift-based searching of a protein conformational database. The ensemble of 20 structures chosen to represent the structure had backbone and heavy atom rms deviations of 0.46 ± 0.11 and 1.02 ± 0.14 Å, respectively. The results revealed that human lymphotactin adopts the conserved chemokine fold, which is characterized by a three-stranded antiparallel β-sheet and a C-terminal α-helix. Two regions are dynamically disordered as evidenced by ¹H and ¹³C chemical shifts and {¹⁵N}-¹H NOEs: residues 1–9 of the amino terminus and residues 69–93 of the C-terminal extension. A functional role for the C-terminal extension, which is unique to lymphotactin, remains to be elucidated.

Chemokines (chemotactic cytokines) are small, soluble proteins that play important roles in regulating leukocyte trafficking. They act primarily through high-affinity interactions with seven-transmembrane G-protein coupled receptors (1, 2). To stimulate migration of target cells, a gradient of increasing chemokine concentration is thought to arise

through the binding of chemokines to cell-surface glycosaminoglycans (GAGs)¹ (3, 4). These interactions may also promote chemokine oligomerization in some cases (5). The general degree to which GAG binding and chemokine aggregation are involved in receptor activation is unclear. A subset of chemokine receptors has been implicated as coreceptors for HIV entry into cells, and the cognate chemokine ligands have been found to inhibit HIV infection (6–12).

On the basis of the number and relative positions of their conserved cysteine residues, chemokines are divided into four classes: CXC, CC, C, and CX₃C. Each class shows distinct specificity for the general cell types that they chemoattract. CXC chemokines containing the ELR sequence motif specifically chemoattract neutrophils, whereas those without the ELR motif are chemotactic for T and B cells. Among the cytokines, CC chemokines exhibit the widest range of target cell specificity, although they act preferentially on monocytes. This class includes chemotactic effectors for most leukocyte cell types except neutrophils (1). The single known

[†] The study was supported by NIH Grant R01 AI45843. For all multidimensional NMR experiments, this study made use of the National Magnetic Resonance Facility at Madison (NMRFAM), using equipment purchased with funds from the University of Wisconsin, the NSF Biological Instrumentation Program (DMB-8415048), the NIH Biomedical Research Technology Program (RR02301), the NSF Academic Research Instrumentation Program (BIR-9214394), the NIH Shared Instrumentation Program (RR02781 and RR08438), and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Sedimentation equilibrium data were obtained at the University of Wisconsin—Madison Biophysics Instrumentation Facility, which is supported by the University of Wisconsin—Madison and Grants BIR-9512577 (NSF) and S10 RR13790 (NIH).

[‡] Coordinates for the minimized average structure and the family of 20 structures have been deposited in the RCSB Protein Data Bank under codes 1J90 and 1J8I, respectively. Chemical shifts have been deposited in the BioMagResBank under accession number 5042.

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed. Phone: (414) 456-8400, fax: (414) 456-6510, email: bvolkman@mcw.edu.

[§] Department of Biochemistry, University of Wisconsin—Madison.


^{||} Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics Instrumentation Facility, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

[⊥] Institute of Human Virology, University of Maryland.

[#] Department of Biochemistry and National Magnetic Resonance Facility at Madison, University of Wisconsin—Madison.

[▼] Department of Biochemistry, Medical College of Wisconsin.

¹ Abbreviations: *E. coli*, *Escherichia coli*; GAGs, glycosaminoglycans; hLtn, human lymphotactin; IL8, interleukin 8; RANTES, regulated upon activation, normal T-cell expressed and secreted; FRCD, fractalkine chemokine domain; IPTG, isopropyl β-D-thiogalactopyranoside; LB, Luria broth; Ltn, lymphotactin; PCR, polymerase chain reaction; PFG, pulsed field gradient; rmsd, root-mean-square deviation; TAD, torsion angle dynamics; EDTA, ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid; PMSF, phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride; HIV, human immunodeficiency virus; NK cells, natural killer cells; DTT, dithiothreitol.



Analysis of the cell lysate by SDS–PAGE on 16% Tris–glycine precast gels (Novex, San Diego, CA) showed that more than 80% of the fusion protein was expressed in the form of inclusion bodies. Initial attempts to purify hLtn from

the soluble fraction were unsuccessful. The following procedure was used to isolate and purify the protein from inclusion bodies: Cell paste from a 1–2 L culture was suspended in 50 mL of lysis buffer (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 50 mM sodium chloride, 50 mM PMSF, 2 mM EDTA) and lysed by multiple freeze/thaw cycles. The SNase in the fusion protein was activated by the addition of CaCl_2 to a final concentration of 10 mM; this catalyzed the digestion of DNA and RNA in the lysate and reduced its viscosity. The lysate was then stirred at room temperature for about 20 min or until no longer viscous. Inclusion bodies were isolated by centrifugation at 20000g for 15 min in a JLA-16.250 rotor (Beckman, Palo Alto, CA). The supernatant was decanted and discarded, and the pellet, which contained the inclusion bodies, was washed once with 50 mL of lysis buffer, once with 50 mL of lysis buffer containing 0.5% Triton-X100, and again with 50 mL of lysis buffer. The inclusion bodies were solubilized, and disulfide bonds were reduced by the addition of 30–50 mL of solubilization buffer (7 M guanidinium chloride, 40 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.4, 20 mM EDTA, 50 mM DTT) followed by stirring at room temperature for 2–3 h. The denaturant and reducing agent were removed by dialysis against 12 L of 20 mM acetic acid solution, repeated twice for 12 h. The resulting solution was clarified by centrifugation at 20000g for 20 min. The supernatant was added dropwise into oxidation buffer (200 mM Tris-acetate, pH 8.0, 25 μM 2-mercaptoethanol). To prevent aggregation due to intermolecular disulfide formation, the protein concentration was kept below 0.3 mg/mL. Oxidation was carried out with stirring at 4 °C for about 16 h. The oxidized fusion protein was concentrated to ~10 mL in an Amicon (Beverly, MA) stirred-cell ultrafiltration concentrator using a 3000 Da molecular mass cutoff membrane (Millipore, Bedford, MA). To remove the oxidation buffer, the concentrated fusion protein was washed 3 times with 50 mL of deionized water. An appropriate amount of 10 $\times$ cleavage buffer stock solution (0.5 M Tris-HCl, pH 8.0, 1 M NaCl, 10 mM CaCl_2) was then mixed with the concentrated fusion protein solution. The factor Xa cleavage reaction was optimized by treating varying amounts of fusion protein (5–10 mg/mL) with varying amounts of factor Xa (1–2 units). Although cleavage proceeded faster at higher concentrations (2 units of factor Xa/10 mg fusion at 10 mg/mL concentration) at room temperature, lower overall yields of hLtn were obtained due to nonspecific digestion of fusion protein. Subsequent cleavage reactions were carried out at 4 °C using 1 unit of enzyme for 10 mg of fusion protein at 5 mg/mL concentration for 1–2 days, or until the reaction was nearly complete. The hLtn product was separated from SNase by reversed-phase HPLC on a C18 column (Vydac, Hesperia, CA).

Sedimentation Equilibrium Studies. Sedimentation equilibrium studies were conducted in a Beckman XL-A Analytical Ultracentrifuge. Samples with initial concentrations of 235, 100, and 36 μM were prepared by dissolving appropriate amounts of hLtn in a buffer consisting of 20 mM sodium phosphate, 200 mM NaCl, pH 6.0. The samples were placed in separate Biodialyzers (Sialomed Inc., Columbia, MD) with 1000 Da cutoff membrane, and dialyzed simultaneously against 500 mL of the buffer overnight at 4 °C. The centrifuge cell centerpieces were double-sector charcoal-filled Epon (12 mm path length for the lowest concentration, 3

mm for the others), and dialysate was used in the reference sector. Equilibrium data were collected at 20 000, 26 000, 36 000, and 42 000 rpm at 10 °C. Concentration gradients were monitored by the absorbance at 280 nm with superimposable gradients recorded 2–4 h apart used as the criterion that equilibrium had been reached. At 26 000 rpm, the gradient was monitored for more than 12 h after equilibration and found to be stable. Integration of the concentration gradients showed no significant loss of protein during the experiment. High-speed sedimentation was used to deplete protein from the centrifuge cell and to measure the amount of nonsedimenting absorbance in each cell (<0.006).

The molecular weight of hLtn was calculated from the sequence to be 10 254. The partial specific volume was calculated to be 0.735 mL/g. The extinction coefficient was calculated as 7115 $\text{M}^{-1} \text{cm}^{-1}$ using the extinctions for Trp, Tyr, and cystine in Pace and Schmid (37). The solvent density was measured at 10 °C with an Anton Paar DMA5000 to be 1.01 g/mL.

Data were analyzed using programs written by Darrell R. McCaslin in the Igor Pro Data Analysis Program (Wavemetrics Inc., Lake Oswego, OR). Prior to analysis, all data sets were corrected for the amount of nonsedimenting absorbance measured after high-speed depletion of the protein, and the data from the lowest concentration of hLtn were normalized to a 3 mm path length for global fitting purposes. All data sets (three concentrations each at four speeds) were fit simultaneously to various models in a manner analogous to that discussed by Laue (38). Models included single species, two and three species in equilibrium, and two independent noninteracting species.

Diffusion Coefficient Measurements. A water-suppressed longitudinal encode–decode (Water-SLED) experiment (39) was used for measurements of translational self-diffusion coefficients at 600 MHz. All proteins were dissolved in 20 mM sodium phosphate buffer, pH 6.0, containing 0.05% sodium azide and 200 mM sodium chloride. All measurements utilized a 30.5 G/cm Z-gradient and were carried out at 10 °C. The gradient duration was incremented by 0.5 ms from 0.5 to 6.5 ms. One percent cyclodextrin dissolved in 90% H_2O /10% D_2O , which has a diffusion coefficient of $3.239 \times 10^6 \text{ cm}^2/\text{s}$ at 25 °C (40), served as the standard sample for calibration of gradient strength. Self-diffusion coefficients were obtained by nonlinear least-squares fits to the following equation:


$$A(2\tau) = A(0) \exp[(-\gamma\delta G)^2(\Delta - \delta/3)D_s] \quad (1)$$

where γ is the magnetogyric ratio of ^1H , G is the gradient strength (G/cm), δ is the pulsed field gradient (PFG) duration (s), and Δ is the time between the gradient pulses.

NMR Spectroscopy. NMR experiments were carried out at the National Magnetic Resonance Facility at Madison (NMRFAM) on Bruker DMX600 and Bruker DMX750 spectrometers equipped with three-axis gradient triple-resonance probes. All NMR samples were prepared either in 90% H_2O /10% D_2O or in 100% D_2O containing 20 mM sodium phosphate (pH 6.0), 0.05% sodium azide, 200 mM sodium chloride. Samples for NMR spectroscopy contained 0.5–1.3 mM hLtn and were placed in Shigemi (Tokyo, Japan) microcells. Heteronuclear NOEs were measured from

Structure Calculation and Analysis. The simulated annealing protocol of the torsion angle dynamics program DYANA (56) was used in calculating all structures. In preliminary rounds of structure calculations, 8000 dynamics steps were used in calculating each of 50 conformers; in the final round of calculations, 10 000 dynamics steps were used. NOE intensities were converted into upper distance bounds with the CALIBA function of DYANA. To account for disparities in line widths and peak intensities, separate NOE calibrations were performed for residues of the structured and unstructured regions (residues 1–9 and 69–93). The ASSIGN function of DYANA was utilized for automated assignment of NOEs on the basis of chemical shifts and initial structures. Additional NOE constraints were added in each round of calculations, and restraints that were consistently violated were removed. In addition to NOE restraints, a total of 60 ϕ and ψ dihedral angle constraints were generated from $^1\text{H}^\alpha$, $^{13}\text{C}^\alpha$, $^{13}\text{C}^\beta$, $^{13}\text{C}'$, and ^{15}N secondary shifts by the program TALOS and included in the later rounds of refinement (57). Of the final 50 structures calculated, the 20 conformers with the lowest target function values were selected for analysis. The mean structure, calculated from this ensemble of 20 structures in MOLMOL (58), was minimized in DYANA using 300 steps of variable target function minimization.

Protein Expression and Purification. Human lymphotactin was produced successfully from *E. coli* as a fusion protein with SNase. SDS-PAGE analysis indicated that more than 80% of the fusion protein was localized in the insoluble fraction. Protein isolated from inclusion bodies was purified as described above. The natural precursor form of lymphotactin contains an N-terminal signal sequence, which is removed in the mature secreted protein (32). A sequence identical to this mature 93 amino acid species (hLtn) was produced by proteolysis of the recombinant fusion protein



Self-Association of hLtn. A plot of the logarithm of absorbance vs squared radial position would be linear for a single species in sedimentation equilibrium. Plots for hLtn exhibited increasing slope with radial position requiring the presence of two or more species. This was confirmed by global fitting of the data to a single species model. This fit yielded a molecular weight of $12\,950 \pm 30$, corresponding to neither the monomer nor the dimer species of hLtn. Moreover, the quality of the single species fit is poor, exhibiting systematic deviations with radial position. An example of a fit constrained to the monomer molecular




FIGURE 3: Sedimentation equilibrium gradient of hLtn. Absorbance data at 280 nm (open circles) are shown for each of the initial concentrations used after equilibrium has been reached at 26 000 rpm and 10 °C. Solid lines are from a global fit to all 12 sets of data using a monomer–dimer equilibrium model resulting in a mass of 10 550 Da and an equilibrium constant of 660 M⁻¹. The additional curve (monomer) is the result of fitting the data to a single species model where the mass was constrained to that calculated from the hLtn sequence.

Table 1: Self-Diffusion Coefficients for Various Proteins at 10 °C

protein	M_r	D_s ($\times 10^{-6}$ cm ² /s)	concn (mM)	Δ (ms)
hLtn	10254	0.78 ± 0.03	0.5	150
ubiquitin	8565	1.09 ± 0.01	0.5	120
ribonuclease A	13690	0.81 ± 0.01	0.5	150

weight is shown in Figure 3. Using a model for a monomer to oligomer equilibrium and allowing the values for molecular weight, aggregation state, and equilibrium constant to vary, a mass consistent with the monomer was obtained as well as an aggregation number near 2 (2.10 ± 0.08). A fit with the aggregation number fixed at 2 resulted in a molecular weight of $10\,550 \pm 140$ and an association constant of 660 ± 80 M⁻¹. Fitted curves for this model are shown in Figure 3. Close examination of the fit residuals showed some systematic deviations at high concentrations, but attempts to include an additional association step did not yield consistent results. It is possible that higher molecular weight species are formed at higher concentration, but the present study has not permitted their enumeration. Therefore, hLtn is best described as existing in a monomer–dimer equilibrium under these solution conditions. A final fit with the aggregation number fixed at 2 and the mass constrained to that calculated from the hLtn sequence (10 254 Da) gave an association constant for dimer formation of 850 ± 10 M⁻¹.

Self-Diffusion Measurements. The results of diffusion measurements on hLtn and two other proteins are summarized in Table 1. A series of 1D ¹H spectra with PFG pulses of increasing duration (0.5–6.5 ms) were collected for each sample. The diffusion delay between gradient pulses was adjusted to obtain signal attenuation of at least 10-fold for accurate fitting of the data to eq 1. Each diffusion coefficient (D_s) in Table 1 reflects an average obtained from fits of the intensities of at least four peaks in the protein spectrum.

Values of D_s obtained for hLtn at 10 °C in 200 mM NaCl were nearly constant over the concentration range 0.1–1.0

mM (data not shown). Comparison of the diffusion coefficients obtained for Ltn with those for ribonuclease A (13.7 kDa) and ubiquitin (8.6 kDa) showed that the D_s for hLtn is nearer to that of the larger protein.

Resonance Assignments. Sequential backbone assignments were deduced from HNCOC, HNCA, HN(CO)CA, and ¹⁵N NOESY–HSQC data. CCONH, ¹⁵N TOCSY–HSQC, and HCCH–TOCSY spectra were used to assign aliphatic side chain ¹³C and ¹H resonances. Aromatic side chain proton resonances were assigned from the 2D NOESY spectrum of a sample dissolved in 100% D₂O. The existence of a disulfide bridge linking Cys11 and Cys48 was confirmed by analysis of the cysteine ¹³C α and ¹³C β chemical shifts, which are indicative of the oxidation states of cysteine pairs (59). All chemical shift assignments have been deposited in the BioMagResBank (accession number 5042).

Secondary Structure Elements from CSI and NOE Data. Secondary structure elements were identified on the basis of NOE connectivities and the chemical shift index (CSI). The consensus CSI values calculated from experimental ¹H α , ¹³C α , ¹³C β , and ¹³C γ chemical shifts, along with the summary of sequential and medium-range NOEs, are shown in Figure 4. The CSI identified four β -strands and one α -helix. Interstrand NOEs connect three of the β -strands (24–30, 36–41, 46–50) in an antiparallel sheet. An α -helix from residues 54 to 66 was confirmed by characteristic *i*, *i*+3 NOEs (Figure 4). No long-range NOEs were observed for the 9 N-terminal and 26 C-terminal residues.

The internal mobility of the polypeptide chain was probed by measuring {¹H}¹⁵N NOE values for all backbone amides; these are shown as a function of residue number in Figure 5A. A steady decline is seen in the heteronuclear NOE values for the unstructured residues approaching the ends of the N- and C-termini with negative NOE values observed for residues near each terminus; these values are consistent with large-amplitude motions on the picosecond to nanosecond time scale and a complete lack of stable secondary or tertiary structure. Residues connecting the first two β -strands (30's




FIGURE 4: Summary of NOE connectivities and consensus chemical shift index for hLtn. Relative intensities of sequential NOEs are indicated by the bar thickness. Consensus CSI values are indicated by +1, 0, and -1 values for sheet, no prediction, and helix, respectively. Secondary structure elements deduced from CSI and NOE patterns are shown above the amino acid sequence. While the CSI predicts sheet for residues 10–16, no interstrand NOEs were observed. Torsion angle constraints obtained from the program TALOS are also indicated. Circles, up triangles, and down triangles indicate torsion angle restraints in the random coil, helix, and sheet regions, respectively, of the Ramachandran plot.

loop) also exhibit low heteronuclear NOE values and few NOE constraints.

Structure Determination. A total of 3270 NOE peaks were assigned in 3 different NOESY spectra (^{15}N NOESY–HSQC, ^{13}C NOESY–HSQC, and 2D NOESY); these yielded 1258 unique, nontrivial distance constraints, which were used in the structure calculations. In addition, two upper bound and two lower bound distance constraints served to define the disulfide bond between Cys11 and Cys48. Backbone dihedral angle restraints (ϕ and ψ) from TALOS were used only in regions of secondary structures and in the N-loop, not in terminal regions or in the loops connecting the β -strands. Stereospecific assignments for valine C^γ methyl groups of residues 37, 56, 59, and 60 were obtained from quantitative J -correlation experiments (J_{CC} and J_{NC}) and included in structure calculations. No other stereospecific assignments were determined. The distribution of distance constraints along the sequence is shown in Figure 5B. Structural statistics are summarized in Table 2. Although the average number of constraints per residue is 13.5 for the entire molecule, the structured region of hLtn (residues 9–68) is defined by an average of 16.8 constraints per residue. Superposition of residues 9–68 for the final ensemble of 20 TAD structures yielded a root-mean-square deviation (rmsd) of 0.46 and 1.02 Å from the mean structure for backbone (N, C^α , and, C^γ) and heavy atoms, respectively. Average backbone and heavy atom rmsd values relative to

the mean structure are shown as a function of residue number in Figure 5C. The atomic rms deviations for terminal residues are much higher, reaching 10.7 Å for residue Val1 and 57 Å for Gly93. None of the 20 structures had NOE violations greater than 0.42 Å or van der Waals violations greater than 0.22 Å (Table 2).

Figure 6 shows a superposition of the ensemble of 20 structures for the well-ordered residues (9–68) of hLtn, together with a ribbon representation of the minimized mean structure. The hLtn molecule adopts the domain fold observed in all other chemokine structures, with a C-terminal α -helix packing against a three-stranded antiparallel β -sheet. Residues 1–8 and 69–93 are highly disordered. Residues 14–20 form the characteristic ‘N-loop’ lying above the β -sheet. A helical turn connects the N-loop to strand β_1 . Strand β_1 contains a β -bulge involving residues 24 and 25. Strands β_1 (24–30) and β_2 (36–41) are joined by the 30’s loop consisting of residues 31–35. A hydrogen bond is observed between side chain O^γ_1 of Thr30 and backbone H^N of Ala36. A type I turn involving residues 41–44 connects β_2 and β_3 (46–50) with Leu45 bulged out. An α -helix (residues 54–66) follows β_3 and lies atop the β -sheet, nearly parallel to the N-loop.

A number of hydrophobic interactions position the helix with respect to the β -sheet. Side chains of Ile24, Tyr27, Val37, and Phe39 from the β -sheet and Trp55, Val56, Val60, and Met63 from the helix contribute to the hydrophobic core.




FIGURE 5: Evidence for dynamic disorder in the 30's loop and N- and C-terminal residues. (A) Heteronuclear ^{15}N - ^1H NOE values are plotted as a function of amino acid sequence. Lower values are an indication of greater backbone mobility. (B) Distribution of NOE constraints along the primary sequence (intraresidue, short, medium, and long range NOEs are indicated by white, light gray, dark gray, and black bars, respectively). (C) Average backbone (solid lines) and heavy atom (dashed lines) rmsd values for the family of 20 structures to the mean structure. Residues of the N- and C-terminus reach maximal rmsd values of 10.7 and 57 Å, respectively.

Residues of the N-loop also contribute to the core, including Leu19 and Val21. In addition to NOEs between hydrophobic side chains, unusual ring-current effects on chemical shift also provide evidence of key tertiary interactions. Owing to their proximity to the Trp55 side chain, the backbone $^1\text{H}^{\text{N}}$ resonances of Val56 and Leu19 are shifted upfield of the normal range for backbone amide protons (Figure 2, inset).

DISCUSSION

Association State. Curvature in logarithmic plots of data from sedimentation equilibrium requires the presence of two or more species in the sample undergoing centrifugation. hLtn exhibited such curvature, and analysis by direct, global curve-fitting to specific models results in the simplest model being that of a monomer-dimer equilibrium. The best estimate for the association constant was found to be $850 \pm 10 \text{ M}^{-1}$.

The measured self-diffusion coefficient constant for hLtn, $0.78 \times 10^{-6} \text{ cm}^2 \text{ s}^{-1}$, is very close to that obtained for the

13.7 kDa protein ribonuclease A. Given a K_s of 850 M^{-1} , a 0.5 mM solution of hLtn would contain 0.32 mM monomer and 0.09 mM dimer, with an average mass near that of ribonuclease A. The unstructured C-terminus of hLtn may reduce the reliability of molecular weight estimates from self-diffusion measurements, but these results are generally consistent with the sedimentation analysis. Taken together, ultracentrifugation and NMR self-diffusion results indicate that hLtn exists in a monomer-dimer equilibrium.

NMR Structure of hLtn. Most CXC and CC chemokines form dimers, although with two very distinct mechanisms for oligomerization. Sedimentation and self-diffusion results clearly indicated that hLtn is able to form dimers, with a typical 1 mM NMR sample predicted to contain up to 50% of the total protein in the dimeric form ($\sim 0.53 \text{ mM}$ monomer, $\sim 0.23 \text{ mM}$ dimer). Throughout the refinement process, we searched unsuccessfully for NOEs that might identify a dimer interface. Moreover, NMR spectra of hLtn acquired as a function of protein concentration showed no shifting or

Table 2: Structural Statistics for hLTn Structures

NOE constraints	number	
long	286	
medium	184	
short	387	
intraresidue	401	
constraints/residue	13.5	
Ramachandran statistics (residues 9–68)		
most favored	76.8%	
additionally allowed	19.6%	
generously allowed	3.3%	
disallowed	0.3%	
parameter	family	minimized average
target function ($\text{\AA}^2$)	0.70 ± 0.23	0.29
upper limit violations		
number $>0.1 \text{ \AA}$	9 ± 3	0
sum of violations ($\text{\AA}$)	4.5 ± 0.8	1.9
maximum violation ($\text{\AA}$)	0.42	0.13
van der Waals violations		
number $>0.2 \text{ \AA}$	0 ± 0	0
sum of violations ($\text{\AA}$)	2.5 ± 0.5	1.7
maximum violation ($\text{\AA}$)	0.22	0.11
atomic rmsd's (residues 9–68) ($\text{\AA}$)		
family of 20 structures vs	mean	minimized average
backbone	0.46 ± 0.11	0.53 ± 0.14
heavy atom	1.02 ± 0.14	1.21 ± 0.20




FIGURE 6: NMR structure of hLTn. (A) The ensemble of 20 TAD conformers with lowest target function, from a total of 50 structures, is superimposed on the mean structure using backbone atoms of residues 9–68. (B) The minimized average structure of hLTn is shown in a ribbon representation. The disulfide bridge is shown in yellow, β -strands in green, and helices in red.

broadening of peaks that might be taken as evidence of exchange between monomer and dimer forms (data not shown). Only one set of resonances was observed in all the spectra, indicating that exchange between the monomer and dimer species is rapid on the NMR time scale. We conclude that the relatively low abundance and short lifetime of the dimer combine to prevent detection of NOEs between monomers. In the absence of specific information about the dimer interface, the NMR structure of hLTn was refined as a monomer. Whether hLTn forms a dimer analogous to either the typical CXC or the CC type remains to be determined. While unusual sequence features (missing disulfide, extended C-terminus) distinguish lymphotactin from the other classes, it adopts the same features of secondary and tertiary structure seen in all chemokines to date. Despite their role in lymphotactin function, residues of the unique C-terminal extension are dynamically disordered (Figure 5). While the absence of unique structural elements fails to explain the functional role of the hLTn C-terminal tail, it is still reasonable to assume that these residues, along with the mobile 30's




FIGURE 7: hLTn is a highly basic protein. (A) Ribbon diagram of hLTn with side chains of basic residues shown in blue. (B) A surface representation of hLTn oriented as in (A), colored according to electrostatic potential with positive regions in blue and negative regions in red. Potentials were calculated using the program MOLMOL. (C) Electrostatic surface as in (B) rotated by 180° about the vertical axis.

loop and N-terminus, can play a role in receptor binding or activation, as discussed below.

Glycosaminoglycan Binding. Virtually all chemokines, including lymphotactin, bind glycosaminoglycans such as heparin, and this interaction is thought to be important in forming chemokine concentration gradients directing cell migration to the site of injury or infection (3–5). A number




FIGURE 8: Comparison of hLtn structure with IL-8, RANTES, and FRCD. (A) Sequence alignment of hLtn with human interleukin 8 (IL-8), human RANTES, and human fractalkine chemokine domain (FRCD). Sequences were aligned based on structural alignments obtained with the program SwissPDBViewer. (B) Structural overlay for hLtn (green), IL-8 (yellow), RANTES (red), and FRCD (blue). All disulfides are shown with sulfur atoms in yellow. Residue ranges and backbone rmsds for the superimpositions were as follows: hLtn(13–15,18–32,35–64), IL-8(11–13,16–30,37–66) 1.3 Å; hLtn(14–15,18–29,34–62), RANTES(14–15,18–29,36–64) 0.9 Å; hLtn(13–15,18–28,35–65), FRCD(14–16,18–28,37–67) 0.9 Å. (C) Detailed view of the 30's loop and N-terminal cysteines, with structures colored and superimposed as in (B).

of different heparin binding residues have been identified in chemokines involving basic residues in the N-terminal loop, strand $\beta 1$, the C-terminal helix, and, most commonly, the 40's loop connecting $\beta 2$ and $\beta 3$ (29, 60–63). Ltn is a very basic protein, with an estimated isoelectric point of 10.6, and it binds to a heparin–Sepharose column with a high affinity (4). The electrostatic surface map of hLtn shown in Figure 7 reveals several clusters of positively charged residues that could participate in GAG–hLtn interactions. Two basic residues in the 40's loop (Lys42 and Arg43) are proximal to Arg23, Lys25, Lys 66, and Arg70; these create a large positively charged surface area (Figure 7A,B). Another cluster is located on the solvent-exposed surface of the α -helix. Three equally spaced arginine residues (Arg57, Arg61, and Arg65) of the α -helix together with Arg35 from the 30's loop make another possible binding site for GAGs.

Comparison of hLtn with Other Chemokines. The structures of all known chemokines share the same conserved chemokine fold. We have compared hLtn, the sole example of the C class, with representative members from each of the other chemokine classes (CXC, CC, and CX₃C). Figure 8 shows the sequence alignment and superposition of the backbone of the structured regions of hLtn and IL-8 (CXC), RANTES (CC), and fractalkine (CX₃C). Despite its lack of one of the two conserved disulfides, hLtn adopts the same folded structure as the other proteins (Figure 8B). The similarity of hLtn to the CC and CX₃C chemokines is somewhat greater than to this CXC chemokine in terms of both sequence and structure. hLtn shares 37.5%, 31.9%, and 20% sequence identity with RANTES, fractalkine, and IL8,

respectively (Figure 8A). Backbone rms deviations from hLtn for structured regions of RANTES, fractalkine, and IL8, excluding the N-terminal residues and 30's loop, were calculated to be 0.9, 0.9, and 1.3 Å, respectively. Residues of the N-terminus preceding the first cysteine are highly mobile in hLtn as well as in other chemokine structures (22, 27, 29). The three-stranded, antiparallel β -sheet and α -helix superimpose very closely in all four structures, with only minor differences in the lengths of the strands and the helices. Positioning of the N-loop and 3_{10} helical turn relative to the sheet are also similar (Figure 8B).

Significant structural differences between hLtn and the other chemokines arise from the absence of a second disulfide and a shortened 30's loop in hLtn and are localized to these regions (Figure 8C). Rotation of the χ_1 angle of Cys11 by $\sim 150^\circ$ in hLtn relative to the analogous residue in IL-8, RANTES, and fractalkine results in a completely different orientation for this disulfide. As a result, the backbone conformation for residues Cys11–Leu14 of hLtn diverges from the other three structures, which are quite similar to each other. Interestingly, these residues are predicted by the consensus CSI to form a β -strand, though no evidence for this was found in the NOESY data. In all other chemokines, the 30's loop is tethered to the N-terminal region by another disulfide bond. This interaction is completely absent in hLtn owing to the missing disulfide. Increased backbone flexibility for these residues, as detected by $\{^1\text{H}\}^{15}\text{N}$ heteronuclear NOE measurements, is not unique to hLtn, however, as the 30's loop is known to be highly mobile in a number of other chemokines (20, 64).

The positioning of the C-terminal helix relative to the sheet also varies throughout the chemokine family. Hydrophobic interactions of the helix and sheet in hLtn are similar to those in CC chemokines and fractalkine. This results from conservation in hLtn of apolar residues that play key roles in the hydrophobic core of CC chemokines (65), including Leu19, Tyr27, Val37, Phe39, Trp55, Val60, and Met63.

Receptor Binding and the Functional Role of C-Terminal Extension. Structural characterization of the mode of action of chemokines upon their cognate G-protein-coupled receptors (GPCR) is hampered by the insoluble nature of these integral membrane proteins. Other investigators have studied the interactions of chemokines and peptides derived from the N-terminal extracellular domain of the corresponding GPCR. Residues of the unstructured N-terminus, N-loop, and 30's loop as well as residues adjacent to the conserved disulfide motifs and in the α -helix have been implicated in various receptor-derived peptide–chemokine interactions (22, 66, 67). The unique C-terminal tail of Ltn has been shown to be necessary for its function by several groups (33, 35). It is clear from the structure presented here that the C-terminal extension of hLtn is highly dynamic and does not adopt any stable conformation in solution. Since they do not play a key structural role, it seems likely that residues of the C-terminus are involved in direct interactions with the receptor. However, our current studies do not predict which residues participate in binding or the relevant conformation.

As mentioned above, the 30's loop, often implicated in receptor–chemokine interactions, is decoupled from the N-terminal region of hLtn and is shorter by at least two residues in hLtn than in other chemokines (Figure 8C). It is possible that the 30's loop in Ltn interacts differently with its receptor than the corresponding loops in other chemokines do with their cognate receptors. In a commonly suggested two-part mechanism for GPCR signaling by chemokines, binding to the receptor N-terminus is followed by activation through interactions with the mobile loops and termini of the chemokine. Specific receptor-activating interactions provided by the 30's loop in other classes of chemokines might be augmented in hLtn by interactions with unstructured terminal residues.

Summary. Lymphotactin is an unusual member of the chemokine family owing to its single disulfide and extended C-terminal sequence (Figure 1). A synthetic gene coding for hLtn was constructed and used for expression of recombinant protein. We concluded from analytical ultracentrifugation and NMR self-diffusion measurements that at the conditions studied (10 °C, 200 mM NaCl, 20 mM phosphate buffer, pH 6.0) hLtn exists in a monomer–dimer equilibrium with an association constant of approximately 850 M^{-1} (Table 1, Figure 3). All ^1H , ^{15}N , and ^{13}C chemical shifts were assigned (Figure 2), and the solution structure was refined using NOE distance constraints and dihedral angle constraints generated with the program TALOS (Table 2). Residues comprising the unique C-terminal sequence of hLtn are entirely disordered in solution (Figures 4 and 5), but residues 9–68 adopt the conserved fold observed for all other chemokines (Figure 6). Our studies provide a structural basis for further investigations into the binding reactions of hLtn with cell-surface GAGs (Figure 7) and its specific G-protein-coupled receptor, XCR1 (Figure 8).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank Dr. Ed Mooberry for assistance with NMR instrumentation and gratefully acknowledge Dr. Steve L. Alam and Ed Meenen for synthesis of DNA oligonucleotides.

REFERENCES

- Gale, L. M., and McColl, S. R. (1999) *BioEssays* 21, 17–28.
- Murphy, P. M., Baggiolini, M., Charo, I. F., Hebert, C. A., Horuk, R., Matsushima, K., Miller, L. H., Oppenheim, J. J., and Power, C. A. (2000) *Pharmacol. Rev.* 52, 145–176.
- McFadden, G., and Kelvin, D. (1997) *Biochem. Pharmacol.* 54, 1271–1280.
- Kuschert, G. S. V., Coulin, F., Power, C. A., Proudfoot, A. E. I., Hubbard, R. E., Hoogewerf, A. J., and Wells, T. N. C. (1999) *Biochemistry* 38, 12959–12968.
- Hoogewerf, A. J., Kuschert, G. S. V., Proudfoot, A. E., Borlat, F., Clark-Lewis, I., Power, C. A., and Wells, T. N. C. (1997) *Biochemistry* 36, 13570–13578.
- Cocchi, F., DeVico, A. L., Garzino-Demo, A., Arya, S. K., and Gallo, R. C. (1995) *Science* 270, 1811.
- Feng, Y., Broder, C. C., Kennedy, P. E., and Berger, E. A. (1996) *Science* 272, 872–877.
- Bates, P. (1996) *Cell* 86, 1–3.
- D'Souza, M. P., and Harden, V. A. (1996) *Nat. Med.* 2, 1293–1300.
- He, J., Chen, Y., Farzan, M., Choe, H., Ohagen, A., Gartner, S., Busciglio, J., Yang, X., Hofmann, W., Newman, W., Mackay, C., Sodroski, J., and Gabuzda, D. (1997) *Nature* 384, 645–649.
- Greco, G., Mackewicz, C., and Levy, J. A. (1999) *J. Gen. Virol.* 80, 2369–2373.
- Berger, E. A., Murphy, P. M., and Farber, J. M. (1999) *Annu. Rev. Immunol.* 17, 657–700.
- Bazan, J. F., Bacon, K. B., Hardiman, G., Wang, W., Rossi, D., Greaves, D. R., Zlotnik, A., and Schall, T. J. (1997) *Nature* 385, 640–644.
- Clore, G. M., Appella, E., Yamada, M., Matsushima, K., and Gronenborn, A. M. (1990) *Biochemistry* 29, 1689–1696.
- St. Charles, R., Walz, D. A., and Edwards, B. F. P. (1989) *J. Biol. Chem.* 264, 2092–2099.
- Lodi, P. J., Garrett, D. S., Kuszewski, J., Tsang, M. L.-S., Weatherbee, J. A., Leonard, W. J., Gronenborn, A. M., and Clore, G. M. (1994) *Science* 263, 1762–1767.
- Kim, K. S., Clark-Lewis, I., and Sykes, B. D. (1994) *J. Biol. Chem.* 269, 32909–32915.
- Chung, C.-W., Cooke, R. M., Proudfoot, A. E. I., and Wells, T. N. C. (1995) *Biochemistry* 34, 9307–9314.
- Handel, T. M., and Dommelle, P. J. (1996) *Biochemistry* 35, 6569–6584.
- Young, H., Roongta, V., Daly, T. J., and Mayo, K. H. (1999) *Biochem. J.* 338, 591–598.
- Meunier, S., Bernassau, J. M., Guillemot, J. C., Ferrara, P., and Darbon, H. (1997) *Biochemistry* 36, 4412–4422.
- Crump, M. P., Gong, J.-H., Loetscher, P., Rajarathnam, K., Amara, A., Arenzana-Seisdedos, F., Virelizier, J.-L., Baggiolini, M., Sykes, B. D., and Clark-Lewis, I. (1997) *EMBO J.* 16, 6996–7007.
- Crump, M. P., Rajarathnam, K., Kim, K.-S., Clark-Lewis, I., and Sykes, B. D. (1998) *J. Biol. Chem.* 273, 22471–22479.
- LiWang, A. C., Wang, Z.-X., Sun, Y., Peiper, S. C., and LiWang, P. J. (1999) *Protein Sci.* 8, 2270–2280.
- Qian, Y. Q., Johanson, K. O., and McDevitt, P. (1999) *J. Mol. Biol.* 294, 1065–1072.
- Sticht, H., Escher, S. E., Schweimer, K., Forssmann, W.-G., Rosch, P., and Aderman, K. (1999) *Biochemistry* 38, 5995–6002.
- Mizoue, L. S., Bazan, J. F., Johnson, E. C., and Handel, T. M. (1999) *Biochemistry* 38, 1402–1414.
- Mayer, K. L., and Stone, M. J. (2000) *Biochemistry* 39, 8382–8395.
- Rajarathnam, K., Li, Y., Rohrer, T., and Gentz, R. (2001) *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 4909–4916.

30. Clore, G. M., and Gronenborn, A. M. (1995) *FASEB J.* 9, 57–62.
31. Kelner, G., Kennedy, J., Bacon, K., Kleyensteuber, S., Largaespada, D., Jenkins, N., Copeland, N., Bazan, J., Moore, K., Schall, T., and Zlotnik, A. (1994) *Science* 266, 1395–1399.
32. Kennedy, J., Kelner, G., Kleyensteuber, S., Schall, T., Weiss, M., Yssel, H., Schneider, P., Cocks, B., Bacon, K., and Zlotnik, A. (1995) *J. Immunol.* 155, 203–209.
33. Hedrick, J. A., Saylor, V., Figueroa, D., Mizoue, L., Xu, Y., Menon, S., Abrams, J., Handel, T., and Zlotnik, A. (1997) *J. Immunol.* 158, 1533–1540.
34. Hedrick, J. A., and Zlotnik, A. (1997) *Methods Enzymol.* 287, 206–215.
35. Marcaurelle, L. A., Mizoue, L. S., Wilken, J., Oldham, L., Kent, S. B. H., Handel, T. M., and Bertozzi, C. R. (2001) *Chem. Eur. J.* 7, 1129–1132.
36. Hinck, A., Walkenhorst, W., Westler, W., Choe, S., and Markley, J. (1993) *Protein Eng.* 6, 221–227.
37. Pace, N., and Schmid, F. X. (1997) *Protein Structure: A Practical Approach*, IRL Press, Oxford.
38. Laue, T. M. (1995) *Methods Enzymol.* 259, 427–452.
39. Altieri, A. S., Hinton, D. P., and Byrd, R. A. (1995) *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 117, 7566–7567.
40. Uedaira, H., and Uedaira, H. (1970) *J. Phys. Chem.* 74, 2211–2214.
41. Farrow, N. A., Muhandiram, R., Singer, A. U., Pascal, S. M., Kay, C. M., Gish, G., Shoelson, S. E., Pawson, T., Forman-Kay, J. D., and Kay, L. E. (1994) *Biochemistry* 33, 5984–6003.
42. Kay, L. E., Xu, G. Y., and Yamazaki, T. (1994) *J. Magn. Reson., Ser. A* 109, 129–133.
43. Muhandiram, D. R., and Kay, L. E. (1994) *J. Magn. Reson., Ser. B* 103, 203–216.
44. Grzesiek, S., and Bax, A. (1992) *J. Magn. Reson.* 96, 432–440.
45. Grzesiek, S., Anglister, J., and Bax, A. (1993) *J. Magn. Reson., Ser. B* 101, 114–119.
46. Zhang, O., Kay, L. E., Olivier, J. P., and Forman-Kay, J. D. (1994) *J. Biomol. NMR* 4, 845–858.
47. Kay, L. E., Xu, G.-Y., Singer, A. U., Muhandiram, D. R., and Forman-Kay, J. D. (1993) *J. Magn. Reson., Ser. B* 101, 333–337.
48. Santoro, J., and King, G. C. (1992) *J. Magn. Reson.* 97, 202–207.
49. Grzesiek, S., Vuister, G. W., and Bax, A. (1993) *J. Biomol. NMR* 3, 487–493.
50. Vuister, G. W., Wang, A. C., and Bax, A. (1993) *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 115, 5334–5335.
51. Delaglio, F., Grzesiek, S., Vuister, G. W., Zhu, G., Pfeifer, J., and Bax, A. (1995) *J. Biomol. NMR* 6, 277–293.
52. Markley, J., Bax, A., Arata, Y., Hilbers, C., Kaptein, R., Sykes, B., Wright, P., and Wüthrich, K. (1998) *Eur. J. Biochem.* 256, 1–15.
53. Bartels, C. H., Xia, T. H., Billeter, M., Günter, P., and Wüthrich, K. (1995) *J. Biomol. NMR* 5, 1–10.
54. Wishart, D. S., and Sykes, B. D. (1994) *J. Biomol. NMR* 4, 171–180.
55. Wishart, D. S., Sykes, B. D., and Richards, F. M. (1992) *Biochemistry* 31, 1647–1651.
56. Güntert, P., Mumenthaler, C., and Wüthrich, K. (1997) *J. Mol. Biol.* 273, 283–298.
57. Cornilescu, G., Delaglio, F., and Bax, A. (1999) *J. Biomol. NMR* 13, 289–302.
58. Koradi, R., Billeter, M., and Wüthrich, K. (1996) *J. Mol. Graph.* 14, 51–55.
59. Sharma, D., and Rajarathnam, K. (2000) *J. Biomol. NMR* 18, 165–171.
60. Koopman, W., and Krangel, M. S. (1997) *J. Biol. Chem.* 272, 10103–10109.
61. Amara, A., Lorthioir, O., Valenzuela, A., Magerus, A., Thelen, M., Montes, M., Virelizier, J. L., Delepiere, M., Baleux, F., Lortat-Jacob, H., and Arenzana-Seisdedos, F. (1999) *J. Biol. Chem.* 274, 23916–23925.
62. Proudfoot, A. E. I., Fritchley, S., Borlat, F., Shaw, J. P., Vilbois, F., Zwahlen, C., Trkola, A., Marchant, D., Clapham, P. R., and Wells, T. N. C. (2001) *J. Biol. Chem.* 276, 10620–10626.
63. Laurence, J. S., Blanpain, C., Leener, A. D., Parmentier, M., and LiWang, P. J. (2001) *Biochemistry* 40, 4990–4999.
64. Ye, J., Mayer, K. L., and Stone, M. J. (1999) *J. Biomol. NMR* 15, 115–124.
65. Fernandez, E. J., Wilken, J., Thompson, D. A., Peiper, S. C., and Lolis, E. (2000) *Biochemistry* 39, 12837–12844.
66. Clubb, R. T., Omichinski, J. G., Clore, G. M., and Gronenborn, A. M. (1994) *FEBS Lett.* 338, 93–97.
67. Laurence, J. S., Blanpain, C., Burgner, J. W., Parmentier, M., and LiWang, P. J. (2000) *Biochemistry* 39, 3401–3409.

BI011106P