

Table 8. Expected vs. actual frequency of the three-residue amyloidogenic motif LEF surrounded by amyloid breakers in protein databases

Motif*	P_{LEFXX} (P_{XXLEF})†	Nonredundant protein sequences (NR)*	TrEMBL (Tr)*		Swiss-Prot and TrEMBL (SP + Tr)*		Swiss-Prot (SP)*	
LEF ++	$3.812e^{-6}$	O_{LEFXX} (O_{XXLEF})‡	E_{LEFXX} (E_{XXLEF})§	O_{LEFXX} (O_{XXLEF})‡	E_{LEFXX} (E_{XXLEF})§	O_{LEFXX} (O_{XXLEF})‡	E_{LEFXX} (E_{XXLEF})§	O_{LEFXX} (O_{XXLEF})‡
++ LEF	$3.812e^{-6}$	1,055	571.86	1,206	673.08	1,032	551.14	108
LEF --	$4.089e^{-6}$	763	613.43	877	722.01	732	591.20	117
-- LEF	$4.089e^{-6}$	873	613.43	1026	722.01	854	591.20	145
P LEF	$1.337e^{-5}$	1755	2005.9	2093	2360.9	1716	1933.2	346
LEF P	$1.337e^{-5}$	1631	2005.9	1867	2360.9	1520	1933.2	270
P + LEF	$1.350e^{-6}$	138	202.47	153	238.31	116	195.14	24
LEF + P	$1.350e^{-6}$	198	202.47	225	238.31	197	195.14	41
P - LEF	$1.551e^{-6}$	203	232.69	224	273.87	201	224.26	46
LEF - P	$1.551e^{-6}$	185	232.69	235	273.87	185	224.26	46
+ P LEF	$1.350e^{-6}$	171	202.47	199	238.31	166	195.14	28
LEF P +	$1.350e^{-6}$	136	202.47	158	238.31	134	195.14	24
- P LEF	$1.551e^{-6}$	248	232.69	292	273.87	245	224.26	56
LEF P -	$1.551e^{-6}$	237	232.69	276	273.87	231	224.26	35
Mean difference¶		226.897		252.508		226.300		31.037
df¶		3		3		3		4
t value¶		2.2932		2.2914		2.3047		2.8344
t probability¶		0.1053		0.1058		0.1045		0.04713

*Motif database scanning has been carried out by using PATTINPROT (1).

†Motif probabilities have been calculated as the product of the expected individual amino acid frequencies (see *Methods* in the main text).

‡ O_{LEFXX} (O_{XXLEF}) is the number of hits of an amyloid breaker motif that have been found on the database.

§ E_{LEFXX} (E_{XXLEF}) is the expected number of hits of a given amyloid breaker motif based on the average composition of proteins (see *Methods* in the main text) and the total number of LEF hits found in database [O_{LEF} (NR) = 45,588; O_{LEF} (Tr) = 53,657; O_{LEF} (SP + Tr) = 43,936; O_{LEF} (SP) = 7,807].

¶Student's test of significance. Only data where O > E have been compared (boldface data).

1. Combet, C., Blanchet, C., Geourjon, C. & Deleage, G. (2000) *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **25**, 147-150.