Supplementary information

The crystal structure of γ -tubulin complex protein GCP4 provides insight into microtubule nucleation

Valérie Guillet^{1,2,6}, Martine Knibiehler^{3,6}, Lynn Gregory-Pauron^{1,2,6}, Marie-Hélène Rémy³, Cécile Chemin³, Brigitte Raynaud-Messina³, Cécile Bon^{1,2}, Justin M. Kollman^{4,5}, David A. Agard^{4,5}, Andreas Merdes³ & Lionel Mourey^{1,2}

¹Institut de Pharmacologie et de Biologie Structurale (IPBS), Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), Toulouse, France. ²Université de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier, IPBS, Toulouse, France. ³Centre de Recherche en Pharmacologie-Santé (CRPS), UMR 2587 CNRS-Pierre Fabre, Toulouse, France. ⁴ Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA. ⁵Keck Advanced Microscopy Center, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA. 6 These authors contributed equally to this work. Correspondence should be addressed to A.M. (amerdes@cict.fr) or L.M. (lionel.mourey@ipbs.fr).

Supplementary Figure 1 GCPs differ substantially in length and display rather low overall identity/similarity. Structure-based multiple sequence alignment within the GCP4 (upper block) and hGCP (lower block) families. The sequence numbering is for hGCP4. Sequence homology is highlighted in red whereas sequence identity is shown as white letters on a red background. Secondary structure elements (arrows for β-strands and coils for α-helices) of hGCP4 are indicated at the top and colored according to the different subdomains depicted in Figure 1. Residues of GCP4 that are disordered in the crystal structure have been underlined. Percentages of identity/similarity among hGCPs range from 6/11 to 18/36%. Abbreviations: XENLA, *Xenopus laevis*; DANRE, *Danio rerio*; DROME, *Drosophila melanogaster*; ARATH, *Arabidopsis thaliana*; MEDTR, *Medicago truncatula*; CHLRE, *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*; ASPFU, *Aspergillus fumigatus*; SCHPO, *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*.

Supplementary Figure 2 Structural determinants of the GCP4 fold. (**a**) Ribbon representation of the overall fold of GCP4 and (**b-g**) of selected representative interactions found within and between the five different helical bundles and extra secondary structure elements.

Supplementary Figure 3 GCP4 illustrates the structure of the core of all hGCPs. (**a**) Schematic representation of the primary structure of the five hGCPs (light grey). White rectangles indicate deletion regions. Missing loops in the GCP4 structure are in dark grey and corresponding residues are labelled. The most conserved regions are shown with bars color-coded according to the subdomain definition (see Figure 1). The previously defined grip1 and grip2 motifs are boxed in dark grey. (**b**) Ribbon representation in stereo view of the most conserved hGCP regions mapped onto the crystal structure of GCP4.

Supplementary Figure 4 Scatchard plot analysis of GCP4 binding to γ-tubulin. A Kd of 37 ± 23 nM was calculated for this interaction. Two out of four different experiments are represented in this graph. For details, see Materials and Methods.

Supplementary Figure 5 The structure of GCP4 can be used as a template for modeling all GCPs. Ribbon representation of the X-ray structure of GCP4 and of derived models for Spc97 and Spc98, the yeast orthologs of GCPs 2 and 3. Missing loops and insertions of GCP2 and GCP3 with respect to GCP4 are indicated by spheres whose size is proportional to the number of residues assuming a globular fold. Colors are according to the subdomain definition as depicted in Figure 1. The black arrow indicates the location of the 77 and 827 residue-long specific insertions in GCP5 and GCP6, respectively.

Supplementary Figure 6 Interactions between GCP2 and GCP3 within and between γTuSCs. (**a**) A molecular model for an entire ring of γTuSCs, based on the fitting in Figure 4 and the cryo-EM reconstruction of γTuSC oligomers. (**b**) Detailed packing of GCP2 and GCP3, both within and between γTuSCs. Green spheres denote the positions of highly charged inserts in GCP4, which may interfere with lateral assembly of GCP4 in one direction.

Supplementary Figure 7 Normal mode analysis of GCP4 indicates a flex point in the region corresponding to the GCP3 hinge. (**a**) A side view of the γTuSC pseudo-atomic model, showing GCP3, with the previously identified hinge region indicated. GCP3 is colored blue in helical bundles 1-3, and cyan in bundles 4 and 5. (**b**) The first mode from normal mode analysis indicates flexibility at the kink between helical bundles 3 and 4. Structures generated by normal mode analysis are superimposed on the N-terminal part of GCP4.

Supplementary Table 1 Results of Dali search at http://ekhidna.biocenter.helsinki.fi/dali_server/

*For each query structure (not all combinations are shown here), only the first two non-redundant structural neighbours with the highest Z-scores are given.

†PDB, PDB identifier of the matched structure; Z, Z-score of the match; Rmsd, rmsd of the match; Lali, number of aligned positions; Nres, number of residues in query/matched structures; %id, sequence identity of aligned positions.

SUPPLEMENTARY DISCUSSION

GCP4 three-dimensional structure

The structure can be viewed as successive layers or bundles (**Supplementary Fig. 2a**). Starting from the N terminus, the first bundle (residues 1-50, 98-126) comprises helices α 1, α4, and α5 and part of helix α2, plus 2 antiparallel β strands (β 1, β 2). This first layer is topped by a second bundle (residues 51-97, 127-180) consisting of the remaining part of helix α 2, part of helix α 8 and helices α 3, α 6, and α 7, and one disordered loop region spanning 13 residues (Val66-Gln78 between helices α2 and α3). Contiguous to the second bundle is a third bundle (residues 181-348) that includes the second half of helix α 8 and helices α 9, α 10, and α11, plus 2 antiparallel beta strands (β3, β4). This part of the structure also includes the longest disordered loop (residues Pro209-Pro252 between β3 and β4) and the partially disordered peptide segment (Gln289-Gly297 between helices α 9 and α 10). The fourth bundle (residues 349-363, 461-478, and 535-573) is made of part of helix α 15 and helices α 12, α 17, and α 18 whereas the fifth bundle (residues 479-534, 574-634) encompasses the remaining part of helix α 15 and helices α 16, α 19, and α 20. The two C-terminal bundles are flanked on one side by a small domain (residues 364-460) that comprises helices α 13 and α 14 plus 2 antiparallel beta strands (β5, β6) and on the other side by the C-terminal helix $α21$ (residues 635-654), which runs perpendicular to the diagonal. The small domain also contains one disordered region (Lys423-Pro445 between strands β 5 and β 6). The cohesion of the GCP4 tertiary structure is ensured in part by a set of longitudinal helices interconnecting two adjacent bundles, i.e. helix α 2 for bundles 1 and 2, helix α 8 for bundles 2 and 3, and helix α 15 for bundles 4 and 5. It is also noteworthy that the major axis of bundle 3 is shifted with respect to the major axes of the first two and the last two bundles, where bundles 1 and 2 on one hand and bundles 3 and 4 on the other hand may be considered a continuation of each other.

The first helix bundle is stabilized by a Leu-rich hydrophobic core that is strongly conserved in the GCP4 family. Peripheral to the hydrophobic core of the first helix bundle, a hydrogen bond involving Tyr100, a highly conserved residue within the GCP4 family, connects the extremities of α 1 and α 4 (**Supplementary Fig. 2b**). Contiguous to Tyr100, a hydrogen bond between His121 and Glu110 reinforces lateral contacts between helices α 4 and α 5. The β1-β2 anti-parallel β-sheet is docked against helices α 1 and α 2 through hydrophobic contacts and polar interactions involving the side-chains of Thr50 and Arg54 from helix α 2 whereas the hydrophilic side of the sheet is exposed to solvent. A salt bridge and water-mediated hydrogen bonds between several rather poorly conserved residues (Tyr52, Thr56, Asp94, Gln98, Arg101) pin the extremities of α 4 and α 3 as well as α 4 to α 2, thus harnessing together the first two helix bundles. This is reinforced by a set of hydrogen bonds between the side-chains of the non-conserved residues Arg44 (α 2), Asn123 (α 5) and Gln130 $(\alpha 6)$. These bonding networks contribute to, or are the result of, the tilts observed between helices α 3 and α 4 on the one hand and α 5 and α 6 on the other hand, and the relative orientation between bundles 1 and 2. Unlike the other bundles found in the GCP4 structure, which all contain 4 helices, the second bundle is made of 5α -helices. It is arranged around a hydrophobic core, enriched in leucine and valine residues conserved in the GCP4 family, where helices α 3, α 6, α 7, and α 8 are parallel in pairs while α 2 is tilted with respect to the other helices, docked against α 3 and α 6 that it moves apart (**Supplementary Fig. 2a**). The topology is under the influence of the tight bonding network that occurs between the top of the second bundle (helices α 3, α 7, α 8 and the loop α 6- α 7) and the bottom of the third bundle (α 8 and loops α 8- β 3 and β 4- α 9) (**Supplementary Fig. 2c**). A hydrogen bond is found between the highly conserved residues Tyr85 and Gln186. The N-terminus of α 3 is capped by a conserved glutamic acid at position 202 within the α 8- β 3 loop. The conformation of this loop is stabilized by the side-chains of two other conserved residues, Asp198 and His149, and a water molecule. Two weakly conserved residues (Gln142 and His160) also form a hydrogen bond, linking α 6 and α 7 together.

Numerous hydrophobic residues conserved among GCP4 proteins also contribute to the hydrophobic core and to lateral inter-helices interactions found in the third bundle as well as the hydrophobic interface specifically made between helix α 9 and the β 3- β 4 anti-parallel β sheet. Docking of the β -sheet onto the GCP4 structure also pulls away helices $\alpha\delta$ and $\alpha\theta$. Two salt bridges formed between residues Arg271 and Glu326 and between residues Lys275 and Asp330 pin α 9 obliquely to α 11 (**Supplementary Fig. 2d**). The strongly conserved His339 tethers the C-terminal side of the α 9- α 10 loop to the bundle thereby clamping the extremity of α 10 to α 11, whereas an additional salt bridge (involving residues Arg313 and Asp324) connects the opposing extremities of α 10 and α 11 together. A salt bridge formed between the poorly conserved residues His193 and Glu304 anchors α 8 to α 10. Finally, an aromatic core conserved in GCP4 (Tyr184, Tyr267, Phe320 and Phe325) anchors the bottom of the third bundle and may contribute to the slight curvature of helix α 8. The numerous hydrophobic and polar interactions displayed by the third bundle may help preserve the integrity necessary to a putative pivotal role. Interactions between bundle 3 and bundle 4 are

essentially mediated by the C terminus of helix α 11 that fits in a shallow hydrophobic groove provided by the N termini of α 12 and α 18, the short segment connecting α 17 to α 18, and the 3_{10} helix found at the C-terminal end of the loop β 6- α 15 (**Supplementary Fig. 2e**). Polar interactions occur at only two sites on the interface of bundle 3 with the C-terminal domain. The first site involves three relatively conserved residues (Arg333, Asp552, and Glu554) which form salt bridges connecting α 11 to α 18. On the opposite side, Trp460 forms a hydrogen bond with the main-chain oxygen atom of residue 285, linking the β6-η3 turn to the extremity of α 9. Strikingly, the side-chain of Trp460 is at van der Waals contact from Pro461, thus maintaining the aromatic ring of Trp460 in its position. Both Trp460 and Pro461 are almost strictly conserved in the GCP4 family.

The fourth helix bundle comprises four α -helices that establish many hydrophobic interactions through another set of highly conserved aliphatic and aromatic residues arranged around Phe540, Phe563 and the strictly conserved Tyr474. The side chain of Tyr474 forms in turn a hydrogen bond with the conserved His560 within the heart of the hydrophobic core, underlining the importance of these two residues in stabilizing the bundle's fold (**Supplementary Fig. 2e**). In contrast, relatively few electrostatic and polar interactions occur between the helices of the fourth bundle. For example, the only connection between α 12 and α 17 occurs at a salt bridge formed by Lys358 and Glu537, both strongly conserved in the GCP4 family. Gln539, which is conserved polar in all GCP4s, His562, and Asn566 along with three water molecules, form a hydrogen bond network linking α 17 and α 18. Several hydrophobic residues (Val476 and Tyr480 from α 15; Leu568, Phe572, and Phe579 from α 18) delineate an exposed hydrophobic patch at the interface between bundles 4 and 5. This hydrophobic surface could eventually accommodate the long segment between β 5 and β 6 (residues 423-445) and/or the very C-terminal stretch, which are both not seen in the GCP4 structure.

The fifth helix bundle is organized around a hydrophobic core that is capped by Trp495, an almost strictly conserved residue in the GCP4 family, and Phe592 (**Supplementary Fig. 2f**). The bundle is also characterized by an absence of close packing between α 15 and α 16 at the proximal end, and between α 16 and α 20 at the distal end. The gap observed between α 15 and α 16 is nevertheless partially filled by the side-chains of three conserved glutamines (488, 528, and 532), which form hydrogen bonds, and also allows housing helix α 12 (**Supplementary Fig. 2f**). Inter-helical interactions involve the only disulfide bridge of the GCP4 structure, formed between the non-conserved cysteine residues 494 and 589, linking α 15 to α 19. A long stretch of conserved residues within the GCP4 structure (526-540), which encompasses the C terminus of $\alpha 16$, is involved in several polar interactions. A watermediated hydrogen bond network formed among residues Tyr529, Tyr530, Asp534, and Arg633 connects α 16 to α 20. Another hydrogen bond involving His519 and Ser622 also bridges α 16 to α 20 midway along the bundle. Helices α 19 and α 20 both make hydrophobic contacts with α 21. The C-terminal helix is also clamped to the fifth bundle by polar interactions involving the hydroxyl group of the conserved residue Ser631, backbone atoms of the α 20- α 21 loop and the side-chain atom of Asn638, maintaining α 21 perpendicular to α 20.

The two C-terminal bundles also interact with the small domain. This interaction mainly involves helices α 12, α 13, and α 15 and strand β 6. Fastening of the subdomain onto the fourth bundle is insured by polar interactions involving the side-chains of three conserved residues (Tyr361, Tyr456, and Asn475) as well as that of Gln353 (**Supplementary Fig. 2g**). The interface between the small domain and the fifth helix bundle is smaller. It involves a hydrogen bond formed between the side-chains of two conserved residues, Gln370 and Arg485 (**Supplementary Fig. 2g**). The fold of the subdomain involves a highly conserved aromatic core located on α 13 and α 14, and onto which strands β 5 and β 6 are packed.

A search for structural homology with the program Dali^1 , using the whole GCP4 structure or its domains and any combination as a query structure, revealed that GCP4 represents an original protein fold (Supplementary Table 1). Significant similarity despite very weak sequence homology (less than 10% identity) was obtained between the C-terminal bundle of GCP4 and around 20 proteins containing a similar motif. However, common themes in the use of such α-helical bundle motif cannot be easily foreseen.

The TuSC model

The location, orientation, and rough boundaries of GCP2 and GCP3 in γ TuSC have been described previously². The GCP4 crystal structure fits very well into both the GCP2 and GCP3 densities (**Fig. 3a**). Indeed, in some regions of the EM map with clear alpha-helical density there is good agreement with the position of GCP4 helices, suggesting a remarkable level of structural conservation (**Fig. 3b**). The kink in the GCP4 structure between helical bundles 3 and 4 closely matches the bent shape of GCP3 in the EM density. The best fit for the straighter GCP2 subunit, however, was achieved by splitting the atomic model in two at the kink point and fitting each half of the structure independently, straightening the structure by about 7°. In the resulting model, an area of empty EM density remains at the base of the TuSC, which can accommodate the unmodelled N-terminal regions of GCP2 and GCP3, consistent with a prior report that the N-termini cross each other³. The other large area of unfilled EM density, near the second bundle of GCP2, is sufficient to accommodate a yeastspecific GCP2 insertion between helices 6 and 7 (**Fig. 3b**, black arrow). The position of this insert, directly beneath the kink in GCP2, may play a role in the straighter conformation of GCP2 relative to GCP4.

Within the γ TuSC, contacts are made between the first bundles of GCP2 and GCP3, and between their second bundles (**Supplementary Fig. 6**). In the first bundle, α 1, the α 1- β 1 loop, and α 4 of GCP2 pack against α 5 and the N-terminal end of α 2 of GCP3. The second bundles interact through the α 2- α 3 loop of GCP2 and α 6 and the α 7- α 8 loop of GCP3. A more minor contact is made in the third bundle between the α 9- α 10 loop of GCP2 and the Nterminal end of α 11 in GCP3. In γ TuSC oligomers, the equivalent surfaces are used to make lateral contacts between subunits.

- 1. Holm, L. & Rosenstrom, P. Dali server: conservation mapping in 3D. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **38** Suppl, W545–9 (2010).
- 2. Kollman, J.M., Polka, J.K., Zelter, A., Davis, T.N. & Agard, D.A. Microtubule nucleating gamma-TuSC assembles structures with 13‐fold microtubule‐like symmetry. *Nature* **466**, 879–82 (2010).
- 3. Choy, R.M., Kollman, J.M., Zelter, A., Davis, T.N. & Agard, D.A. Localization and orientation of the gamma‐tubulin small complex components using protein tags as labels for single particle EM. *J. Struct. Biol.* **168**, 571–4 (2009).