

Supplementary Information for

Kristian K. Kristensen^{1,2,*}, Katrine Zinck Leth-Espensen^{1,2,3,*}, Haydyn D.T. Mertens⁴, Gabriel Birrane⁵, Muthuraman Meiyappan⁶, Gunilla Olivecrona⁷, Thomas J.D. Jørgensen³, Stephen G. Young^{8,9}, and Michael Ploug^{1,2, ‡}

From the ¹Finsen Laboratory, Rigshospitalet, DK–2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark; ²Biotech Research and Innovation Centre (BRIC), University of Copenhagen, DK-2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark; ³Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University of Southern Denmark, DK–5320 Odense M, Denmark; ⁴European Molecular Biology Laboratory Hamburg, Notkestrasse 85, D-22607 Hamburg, Germany; ⁵Division of Experimental Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Boston, MA 02215; ⁶Discovery Therapeutics, Takeda Pharmaceutical Company Ltd., Cambridge, MA 02142; ⁷Department of Medical Biosciences,^{*} Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden; ⁸Department of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095; ⁹Department of Human Genetics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90095

Stephen G. Young and Michael Ploug

Email: <u>sgyoung@mednet.ucla.edu</u> and m-ploug@finsenlab.dk

This PDF file includes:

Supplementary text

Figure S1: SEC-MALS for human LPL in complex with GPIHBP1 and Fab-5D2 or Fab-RF4

Figure S2: Sequence coverage of LPL in HDX-MS experiments.

Figure S3: Deuterium uptake plots in peptic peptides from LPL.

Figure S4: Butterfly plots comparing deuterium uptake in various states of LPL.

Figure S5: Isotope envelopes illustrating correlated and uncorrelated hydrogen-deuterium exchange.

Figure S6: Quantification of correlated deuterium uptake in an LPL peptide by pulse-labelled HDX-MS.

Table S1: Compilation of SAXS data for LPL•GPIHBP1 in complex with Fab-5D2 or Fab-RF4

References for SI reference citation

Supplementary Information Text

Materials and Methods

Surface plasmon resonance. To define the functional epitope on LPL for the monoclonal antibody 5D2, we determined the binding kinetics for the interactions between immobilized 5D2 and LPL's C-terminal domain (CTD) as well as representative synthetic peptides with surface plasmon resonance (SPR) on a Biacore T200[™] system (GE Healthcare). To this end, we first immobilized the monoclonal mouse anti-LPL antibody 5D2 (1) directly on a CM5 sensor chip using N-hydroxysuccinimide and Nethyl-*N*-(3-(diethylamino)propyl)-carbodiimide as coupling chemistry. With 5 µg 5D2/ml in 10 mM sodium acetate, pH 5.0, we obtained a surface density of 2300 resonance units (RU), which corresponds to 15.3 fmols 5D2 mAb/mm² (assuming one RU ~ 1 pg/mm^2). Injecting 1 M ethanolamine inactivated excess NHS-esters. Kinetic rate constants for the various analytes were determined using single cycle protocols where five serial 2-fold dilutions of the interaction partner were injected for 200 s without intervening regeneration and followed by a longer dissociation phase after the last injection (2,500 to 30,000 s dependent on the dissociation rate constant k_{off}). Interactions were measured at 40 µl/min in 10 mM HEPES, 150 mM NaCl, 3 mM EDTA, and 0.05% (v/v) surfactant P-20 at pH 7.4 at 20°C. Two consecutive injections with 10 µl of 20 mM H₃PO₄ at the end of each single cycle regenerated the chip.

With the BiacoreT200 EvaluationTM 3.0 software (supplied with the instrument), we globally fitted the double blank-referenced data by non-linear regression to a simple bimolecular interaction model. Assuming pseudo-first order reaction conditions, we derived the association (k_{on}) and dissociation (k_{off}) rate constants, the K_D (k_{off}/k_{on}), as well as the binding capacity (R_{max}).

Small-angle X-ray scattering (SEC-SAXS). Synchrotron radiation X-ray scattering data coupled to an in-line chromatography system (SEC-SAXS) were collected on the EMBL P12 beamline of the storage ring PETRA III (DESY, Hamburg) (Table S1) (2), using PILATUS 6M and 2M pixel detectors (DECTRIS, Switzerland). 50-200 µl of concentrated hLPL complexed with GPIHBP1 and a Fab-fragment from the 5D2 antibody was injected onto a Superdex 200 Increase (5/150) column (GE Healthcare) equilibrated in 10 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 10% (v/v) glycerol, 0.05% (w/v) CHAPS (0.8 mM), pH 7.2. Samples were exposed to X-rays while flowing at 0.2 ml/min through a temperature-controlled capillary (1.2 mm I.D.) at 20°C. During sample elution, we collected frames of 1.0 s exposure time. The sample-to-detector distance was 2.7 m covering a range of momentum transfer and 0.008 Å⁻¹ ≤ s ≥ 0.6 Å⁻¹ (s = $4\pi \sin\theta/\lambda$, where 20 is the scattering angle, and λ = 1.24 Å is the X-ray wavelength). Data from the detector were normalized to the transmitted beam intensity, averaged, placed on absolute scale relative to water and the scattering of buffer solutions subtracted using CHROMIXS (3).

All data manipulations were performed with PRIMUS*qt* and the ATSAS software package (4). The forward scattering I(0) and radius of gyration, R_g were determined from Guinier analysis (5) assuming that at very small angles ($s \le 1.3/R_g$) the intensity is represented as $I(s)=I(0)\exp(-(sR_g)^{2/3})$). These parameters were also estimated from the full scattering curves using the indirect Fourier transform method implemented in the program GNOM (6), along with the distance distribution function p(r) and the maximum particle dimensions D_{max} . Molecular masses (*MMs*) of solutes were estimated from I(0) by computation of partial specific volume and the contrast between the glycosylated protein and the chemical components of the solution using the SASSIE server (http://sassie-web.chem.utk.edu/sassie2/). Theoretical scattering intensities were calculated using the program CRYSO (7).

Ab initio shape determination. Low resolution molecular shapes were reconstructed from SAXS data using the programs DAMMIF (8), which represents the macromolecule as a densely packed interconnected configuration of beads or chain-like ensemble of dummy residues, respectively, that best fits the experimental data $I_{exp}(s)$ by minimizing the discrepancy:

$$\chi^{2} = \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{j} \left[\frac{I_{\exp}(s_{j}) - cI_{calc}(s_{j})}{\sigma(s_{j})} \right]^{2}$$

where *N* is the number of experimental points, *c* is a scaling factor and $I_{calc}(s_j)$ and $\sigma(s_j)$ are the calculated intensity and the experimental error at the momentum transfer s_j , respectively. Multiple modeling runs were conducted to verify the stability of the solution, and to establish the most typical 3D reconstructions according to a spatial discrepancy measure using DAMAVER (9).

Hybrid Rigid body modeling. Rigid body models were computed from the experimental data using CORAL (10) and the available high-resolution structures of GPIHBP1•LPL (PDB 6E7K) and a representative monoclonal antibody fragment (PDB 1FGN) as rigid bodies. Glycosylation was introduced into the models based on mass spectrometry data using the GLYCOSYLATION routine of ATSAS (4) with a single C₄₀N₂O₂₉H₆₇ glycan attached to GPIHBP1 (Asn⁵⁸) and two C₆₈N₄O₄₉H₁₁₃ glycans attached to hLPL (Asn⁴³ & Asn³⁵⁹). Ambiguous distance restraints were employed for the GPIHBP1•LPL•5D2 structure calculations, with a 15 Å average distance between residues Asp²⁸, Lys³⁰, Gly⁶⁸, Glu⁹³ (light chain); Glu⁵⁴, Ser¹⁰¹ (heavy chain) of the antibody, and the tryptophan-rich motif loop residues encompassed by Tyr⁴¹⁴ and Ser⁴²² of LPL used. SAXS data are deposited at the SASBDB (www.sasbdb.org) with accession code: SASDHF4.



Fig. S1. Size-exclusion chromatography of hLPL complexes with multi-angle light scattering detection. *Panel A.* Elution of GPIHBP1•LPL•Fab-5D2 after size-exclusion chromatography on a Superdex200 Increase column in 10 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 0.05% (w/v) CHAPS, 10% (v/v) glycerol, 0.05% (w/v) NaN₃, pH 7.2. *Panel B.* Elution of GPIHBP1•hLPL•Fab-RF4, note the late elution volume compared to the corresponding complex with Fab-5D2. *Panel C.* Elution of GPIHBP1•hLPL. The red lines show the absorbance profiles at 280 nm for the samples under investigation; the light gray hatched lines show the BSA control (monomer, dimer, trimer). The molecular masses determined using refractive indices as wells as scattering profiles are shown as solid black lines. The presence of all the various proteins (LPL, GPIHBP1, Fabs) in the eluting peak fractions were verified by SDS-PAGE of reduced and alkylated samples followed by silver staining (insets). Note, Fab-RF4 contains two polypeptides, which differ in their masses as confirmed by ESI-MS (see Fig. 3).



Total: 93 Peptides, 88.9% Coverage, 3.48 Redundancy

Fig. S2. A total of 93 peptic peptides were identified for bLPL, corresponding to an overall sequence coverage of 89%. The bars shown beneath the primary sequence of bLPL identify each of the 93 peptic peptides. The deuterium uptake values for peptides identified by the *green* bars are shown in *SI Appendix*, Fig. S3. Red helices and blue arrows above the primary sequence highlight secondary structure elements in LPL (α -helices and β -sheets, respectively). Orange asterisks show the catalytic triad residues, and the green loop indicates the position of the lid covering the active pocket.

Kristensen, Leth-Espensen, et al.



5







Fig. S3. Time-dependent deuterium uptake in bLPL alone and complexed with Fab-5D2 and/or GPIHBP1.These plots show the deuterium uptake in 43 peptic peptides covering the majority of LPL's primary sequence, both for LPL alone and LPL complexed with Fab-5D2 and/or GPIHBP1. The red lines show LPL; the blue lines show LPL•GPIHBP1 complexes, and the broken lines show the presence of Fab-5D2 in those samples. The position of the individual peptides in the LPL structure are highlighted by blue in the cartoon representation of LPL prepared with PyMol (Schrödinger) using the crystal structure of human LPL (PDB code 6OB0) (11) and their primary sequences are shown below the uptake plots. The deuterium content represent the average mass of the isotope envelopes and is shown as mean of three replicates with S.D. Signatures in the individual isotope envelopes suggesting correlated exchanges or coexisting conformations are marked by *(peak broadening) and **(bimodal isotope distribution).

9



1	1	8	DRITGGKD	48	181	195	VDVLHTFTRGSPGRS
2	1	16	DRITGGKDFRDIESKF	49	181	197	VDVLHTFTRGSPGRSIG
3	9	15	FRDIESK	50	181	219	VDVLHTFTRGSPGRSIGIQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN
4	9	16	FRDIESKF	51	182	216	HTFTRGSPGRSIGIQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN
5	17	26	ALRTPEDTAE	52	185	197	HTFTRGSPGRSIG
6	17	27	ALRTPEDTAED	53	187	195	FTRGSPGRS
7	27	36	DTCHLIPGVT	54	187	197	FTRGSPGRSIG
8	45	55	NHSSKTFVVIH	55	187	219	FTRGSPGRSIGIQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN
9	51	62	FVVIHGWTVTGM	56	196	219	IGIQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN
10	52	62	VVIHGWTVTGM	57	198	219	IQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN
11	57	64	YESWVPKL	58	220	226	IGEALRV
12	63	72	YESWVPKLVA	59	224	237	LRVIAERGLGDVDQ
13	63	74	YESWVPKLVAAL	60	224	238	LRVIAERGLGDVDQL
14	64	70	ESWVPKL	61	225	237	RVIAERGLGDVDQ
15	73	83	ALYKREPDSNV	62	225	238	RVIAERGLGDVDQL
16	75	83	YKREPDSNV	63	225	249	RVIAERGLGDVDQLVKCSHERSVHL
17	83	101	VIVVDWLSRAQQHYPVSAG	64	226	238	VIAERGLGDVDQL
18	84	99	IVVDWLSRAQQHYPVS	65	227	237	IAERGLGDVDQ
19	84	101	IVVDWLSRAQQHYPVSAG	66	227	238	IAERGLGDVDQL
20	84	102	IVVDWLSRAQQHYPVSAGY	67	229	238	ERGLGDVDQL
21	86	101	VDWLSRAQQHYPVSAG	68	230	238	RGLGDVDQL
22	89	101	LSRAQQHYPVSAG	69	238	249	LVKCSHERSVHL
23	90	101	SRAQQHYPVSAG	70	239	249	VKCSHERSVHL
24	102	109	YTKLVGQD	71	250	255	FIDSLL
25	102	113	YTKLVGQDVAKF	72	256	272	NEENPSKAYRCNSKEAF
26	102	116	YTKLVGQDVAKFMNW	73	256	277	NEENPSKAYRCNSKEAFEKGLC
27	106	113	VGQDVAKF	74	260	273	PSKAYRCNSKEAFE
28	110	116	VAKFMNW	75	264	272	YRCNSKEAF
29	117	130	MADEFNYPLGNVHL	76	264	275	YRCNSKEAFEKG
30	117	132	MADEFNYPLGNVHLLG	77	264	277	YRCNSKEAFEKGLC
31	121	130	FNYPLGNVHL	78	271	278	AFEKGLCL
32	121	132	FNYPLGNVHLLG	79	279	293	SCRKNRCNNMGYEIN
33	133	145	YSLGAHAAGIAGS	80	290	303	YEINKVRAKRSSKM
34	131	165	LGYSLGAHAAGIAGSLTNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNFE	81	304	318	YLKTRSQMPYKVFHY
35	133	164	YSLGAHAAGIAGSLTNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNF	82	342	355	YGTVAESENIPFTL
36	133	165	YSLGAHAAGIAGSLTNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNFE	83	348	358	SENIPFTLPEV
37	138	165	HAAGIAGSLTNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNFE	84	378	389	LMLKLKWISDSY
38	142	165	IAGSLTNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNFE	85	380	389	LKLKWISDSY
39	147	165	TNKKVNRITGLDPAGPNFE	86	381	394	KLKWISDSYFSWSN
40	165	179	EYAEAPSRLSPDDAD	87	390	395	FSWSNW
41	166	173	YAEAPSRL	88	396	419	WSSPGFDIGKIRVKAGETQKKVIF
42	166	179	YAEAPSRLSPDDAD	89	402	419	DIGKIRVKAGETQKKVIF
43	166	180	YAEAPSRLSPDDADF	90	403	419	IGKIRVKAGETQKKVIF
44	180	186	FVDVLHT	91	420	437	CSREKMSYLQKGKSPVIF
45	180	195	FVDVLHTFTRGSPGRS	92	428	437	LQKGKSPVIF
46	180	197	FVDVLHTFTRGSPGRSIG	93	438	450	VKCHDKSLNRKSG
47	180	219	FVDVLHTFTRGSPGRSIGIQKPVGHVDIYPNGGTFQPGCN				

Fig. S4. Comparison of deuterium uptake in all peptic peptides recovered from LPL in different complexes with butterfly plots. These plots compare the differences in deuterium uptake for all peptic peptides recovered from bLPL in the different states: LPL versus LPL•Fab-5D2 (panel A); LPL•GPIHBP1 versus LPL•GPIHBP1•Fab-5D2 (panel *B*): and LPL•Fab-5D2 versus LPL•GPIHBP1•Fab-5D2 (panel C). In the case of bimodal peaks, deuterium uptake represent the average mass of both isotope envelopes and is the mean of three replicates. The shaded gray area corresponds to the largest standard deviation in the data sets recorded for each peptide (in triplicates). Transparent red and cyan colors on the left assign peptides to LPL's N-terminal hydrolase domain (NTD) or its C-terminal lipid-binding domain (CTD), respectively. The color shaded areas in the graphs highlight peptides covering the catalytic triad (red), the region 180-219 just before the lid (green), the lid (blue), the Fab-5D2 binding epitope (blue), and the GPIHBP1 binding epitope (yellow). The identity of the 93 unique peptic peptides recovered from LPL are shown in the bottom.



Peptide 131–165 (catalytic triad)

Fig. S5. Isotope envelopes revealing correlated and uncorrelated deuterium uptake in two different regions of LPL. The upper panel shows the temporal incorporation of deuterium into a region of LPL harboring the catalytic triad (residues 131–165). This region exhibits correlated exchange kinetics (resembling that of EX1), which signifies the progressive accumulation of protein populations with long-lived solvent exposure of that region (12). Binding GPIHBP1, but not Fab-5D2, prevents this slow transition. The lower panel shows a region of LPL exhibiting uncorrelated deuterium exchange (resembling EX2 kinetics) and binding of GPIHBP1 slows the rate of this exchange (residues 396–419).



Mass (m/z)

Fig. S6. Quantification of bimodal deuterium uptake in LPL by pulse labelling in deuterium oxidecontaining buffers. The coexistence of folded and unfolded LPL in the absence and presence of substoichiometric amounts of ANGPTL4 was measured by pulse-labeled HDX-MS. Shown are the isotope envelopes for a region of LPL harboring two of the three residues within the catalytic triad (residues 131-165). The progressive emergence of bimodality was quantified with the program HX-Express2 (13). The fractions of coexisting conformations in LPL are estimated by fitting two Gaussian distributions [folded state with low deuterium uptake (*blue line*) versus unfolded state with high deuterium uptake (*red line*)].

Table S1. Small-angle X-ray scattering data for Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1

(a) Sample details*					
	Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1				
Organism	Homo sapiens				
Source	Drosophila S2 (GPIHBP1); CHO cells (LPL); Sp2 myeloma cells (5D2)				
UniProt sequence ID (residues in construct)	P06858 (29-475); Q8IV16 (21-151)				
Extinction coefficient ϵ (280 nm, 0.1% w/v)	1.322				
Partial specific volume \overline{v} (cm ³ g ⁻¹)	0.725				
Mean solute and solvent scattering length densities and mean scattering contrast $\Delta \overline{\rho}$ $(\rho_{protein} - \rho_{solvent}) (10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-2})$	2.75 (12.43-9.68)				
Molecular mass <i>M</i> from chemical composition (monomer/dimer) (Da)	116610/233224				
SEC–SAXS column, 5 × 150 mm Superdex S200 Increase (GE LifeScience)					
Loading concentration (mg ml ⁻¹) [A280nm]	3.4				
Injection volume (ul)	50				
Flow rate (ml min ⁻¹)	0.3				
Average concentration in combined data frames (mg ml ⁻¹)	0.4				
Solvent composition (solvent blanks taken from SEC flowthrough prior to elution of protein)	10 mM Tris pH 7.2, 150 mM NaCl, 10% glycerol, 0.05% CHAPS				
(b) SAS data collection parameters					
Instrument/Data processing	EMBL P12 (PETRA-III, DESY, Hamburg) with Pilatus6M detector (2)				
Wavelength (Å)	1.24				
Beam geometry (size, sample-to-detector distance)	$0.12 \times 0.25 \text{ mm}^2$, 3.0 m				
<i>s</i> -measurement range (Å ⁻¹)	0.002-0.7				
Absolute scaling method	Comparison with scattering from 1.2 mm pure H ₂ O				
Basis for normalization to constant counts	To transmitted intensity by beam-stop counter				
Method for monitoring radiation damage	Frame comparison				
Exposure time, number of exposures	900 s (900 × 1.00 s)				
Sample temperature (°C)	10				

(c) Software employed for SAS data reduc	tion, analysis and interpretation				
SAS data reduction	<i>I(s)</i> versus <i>s</i> using <i>RADAVER</i> (ATSAS 2.8.3) (10), solvent subtraction using <i>PRIMUSqt</i> (ATSAS 2.8.3) (10)				
Calculation of ε from sequence	ProtParam (14)				
Calculation of $\Delta \overline{\rho}$ and $\overline{\upsilon}$ values from chemical composition	SASSIE web server (http://sassie-web.chem.utk.edu/sassie2/)				
Basic analyses: Guinier, $P(r)$, scattering particle volume (V_P)	PRIMUSqt from ATSAS 2.8.3 (10)				
Shape/bead modelling	DAMMIF (8) and DAMMIN (15) via ATSAS online (https://				
	www.embl-hamburg.de/biosaxs/atsas-online/)				
Atomic structure modelling	CRYSOL (7), CORAL (10)				
Molecular graphics	PyMOL v2.3 MacOS 10.13.6				
(d) Structural parameters					
Guinier Analysis	Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1				
$I(0) (cm^{-1})$	0.023 ± 0.001				
$R_{g}(\text{\AA})$	48.8 ± 0.1				
<i>q</i> -range (Å ⁻¹)	0.012-0.015				
M_r from $I(0)$ (Da)	100300				
P(r) analysis	Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1				
$I(0) (cm^{-1})$	0.023 ± 0.002				
$R_{\rm g}({ m \AA})$	48.2 ± 0.1				
$d_{\max}(\text{\AA})$	175 ± 5				
q-range (Å ⁻¹)	0.016-0.284				
χ^2 (total estimate from <i>GNOM</i>)	1.0 (0.37)				
M_r from $I(0)$ (Da) (ratio to predicted value)	100300 (0.82)				
Volume $(V_{\rm P})$ (Å ³)	187506				
(e) Shape modelling results					
DAMMIF (default parameters, 10 calc.)	Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1				
q-range for fitting (Å ⁻¹)	0.007-0.280				
Symmetry/anisotropy assumptions	P1, none				
NSD (standard deviation)	1.41 (0.16)				
χ^2 value/range	1.12-1.12				
Constant adjustment to intensities	8.7				
<i>P</i> value	0.28-0.28				
M_r estimate as 0.5 × volume of models (Da)	116977				
Model resolution from SASRES (Å)	47 ± 4				

(f) Atomistic modelling					
	Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1				
CORAL rigid body modeling					
Starting crystal structures	PDB: 1fgn, 6e7k				
Flexible residues	21-61,145-150 (GPIHBP); 415-422, 471-475 (LPL)				
Glycans added with GLYCOSYLATION *	$C_{40}N_2O_{29}H_{67} \ (GPIHBP1) + 2 \times C_{68}N_4O_{49}H_{113} \ (LPL)$				
q-range for fitting (Å)	0.012-0.50				
Symmetry, anisometry assumptions	P1, none				
χ^2 , <i>CORMAP P</i> value	1.07, 0.19				
(g) SASBDB IDs for data and models					
Fab-5D2•LPL•GPIHBP1	SASDHF4				

* For X-ray contrast, molecular weight and partial specific volume calculation it was assumed that the scattering particle consists of Fab-5D2, LPL, and GPIHBP1 with the following glycosylation composition: one $C_{40}N_2O_{29}H_{67}$ (GPIHBP1) and two $C_{68}N_4O_{49}H_{113}$ (LPL).

References

- 1. Chang SF, Reich B, Brunzell JD, & Will H (1998) Detailed characterization of the binding site of the lipoprotein lipase-specific monoclonal antibody 5D2. *J Lipid Res* 39:2350-2359.
- 2. Blanchet CE, *et al.* (2015) Versatile sample environments and automation for biological solution X-ray scattering experiments at the P12 beamline (PETRA III, DESY). *J Appl Crystallogr* 48:431-443.
- 3. Panjkovich A & Svergun DI (2017) CHROMIXS: automatic and interactive analysis of chromatography-coupled small-angle X-ray scattering data. *Bioinformatics* 34:1944-1946.
- 4. Franke D, *et al.* (2017) ATSAS 2.8: a comprehensive data analysis suite for small-angle scattering from macromolecular solutions. *J Appl Crystallogr* 50:1212-1225.
- 5. Guinier A (1939) La diffraction des rayons X aux très petits angles : application à l'étude de phénomènes ultramicroscopiques. *Ann. Phys.* 11:161-237.
- 6. Semenyuk AV & Svergun DI (1991) GNOM–a program package for small-angle scattering data processing. *Journal of Applied Crystallography* 24:537-540.
- 7. Svergun DI, Barberato C, & Koch MHJ (1995) CRYSOL—a program to evaluate X-ray solution scattering of biological macromolecules from atomic coordinates. *J Appl Crystallogr* 28:768-773.
- 8. Franke D & Svergun DI (2009) DAMMIF, a program for rapid ab-initio shape determination in small-angle scattering. *J Appl Crystallogr* 42:342-346.
- 9. Volkov VV & Svergun DI (2003) Uniqueness of ab-initio shape determination in smallangle scattering. *J Appl Crystallogr* 36:860-864.
- 10. Petoukhov MV, *et al.* (2012) New developments in the ATSAS program package for small-angle scattering data analysis. *J Appl Crystallogr* 45:342-350.
- 11. Arora R, et al. (2019) Structure of lipoprotein lipase in complex with GPIHBP1. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 116:10360-10365
- 12. Ferraro DM, Lazo N, & Robertson AD (2004) EX1 hydrogen exchange and protein folding. *Biochemistry* 43:587-594.
- 13. Guttman M, Weis DD, Engen JR, & Lee KK (2013) Analysis of overlapped and noisy hydrogen/deuterium exchange mass spectra. *J Am Soc Mass Spectrom* 24:1906-1912.
- 14. Gasteiger E, *et al.* (2005) Protein identification and analysis tools on the ExPASy server. *The Proteomics Protocols Handbook*:571-607.
- 15. Svergun DI (1999) Restoring low resolution structure of biological macromolecules from solution scattering using simulated annealing. *Biophys J* 76:2879-2886.