國立交通大學

生物資訊研究所

碩 士 論 文

中 華 民 國 九 十 六 年 七 月

The study of protein dynamics using Elastic Network Molecular Dynamics 利用彈性網路分子動力學研究蛋白質動態

研 究 生:顏士中 Student:Shih-Chung Yen

指導教授:黃鎮剛 Advisor:Jenn-Kang Hwang

in

Bioinformatics

July 2007

Hsinchu, Taiwan, Republic of China

中華民國九十六年七月

國立交通大學

博碩士論文全文電子檔著作權授權書

(提供授權人裝訂於紙本論文書名頁之次頁用)

本授權書所授權之學位論文,為本人於國立交通大學 生物資訊研 究所, 95 學年度第 2 學期取得碩士學位之論文。 論文題目:利用彈性網路分子動力學研究蛋白質動態 指導教授:黃鎮剛

■ 同意 □不同意

本人茲將本著作,以非專屬、無償授權國立交通大學與台灣聯合 大學系統圖書館:基於推動讀者間「資源共享、互惠合作」之理 念,與回饋社會與學術研究之目的,國立交通大學及台灣聯合大 學系統圖書館得不限地域、時間與次數,以紙本、光碟或數位化 等各種方法收錄、重製與利用;於著作權法合理使用範圍內,讀 者得進行線上檢索、閱覽、下載或列印。

授 權 人:顏士中

親筆簽名: 中華民國 96 年 7 月 16 日

博碩士紙本論文著作權授權書

(提供授權人裝訂於全文電子檔授權書之次頁用)

本授權書所授權之學位論文,為本人於國立交通大學 生物資訊研 究所, 95 學年度第 2 學期取得碩士學位之論文。 論文題目:利用彈性網路分子動力學研究蛋白質動態

指導教授:黃鎮剛

■ 同意

<u>, a a a delle dell</u>e

本人茲將本著作,以非專屬、無償授權國立交通大學,基於推動 讀者間「資源共享、互惠合作」之理念,與回饋社會與學術研究 之目的,國立交通大學圖書館得以紙本收錄、重製與利用;於著 作權法合理使用範圍內,讀者得進行閱覽或列印。

本論文為本人向經濟部智慧局申請專利(未申請者本條款請不予 理會)的附件之一,申請文號為: ___________________,請將 論文延至 年 月 日再公開。

授權人:顏士中 親筆 答 名:

TANK 民國 96 年 7 月 16

國家圖書館博碩士論文電子檔案上網授 權書

ID:GT009451507

本授權書所授權之學位論文,為本人於國立交通大學 生物資訊研究 所, 95 學年度第 2 學期取得碩士學位之論文。 論文題目:利用彈性網路分子動力學研究蛋白質動態

指導教授:黃鎮剛

茲同意將授權人擁有著作權之上列論文全文(含摘要),非專屬、 無償授權國家圖書館,不限地域、時間與次數,以微縮、光碟或其 他各種數位化方式將上列論文重製,並得將數位化之上列論文及論 文電子檔以上載網路方式,提供讀者基於個人非營利性質之線上檢 索、閱覽、下載或列印。

※ 讀者基於非營利性質之線上檢索、閱覽、下載或列印上列論文,應依著作權法 相關規定辦理。

E

授權人:顏士中

親筆簽名:

民國 96 年 7 月 16 日

1. 本授權書請以黑筆撰寫,並列印二份,其中一份影印裝訂於附錄三之 二(博碩士紙本論文著作權授權書)之次頁;另一份於辦理離校時繳交 給系所助理,由圖書館彙總寄交國家圖書館。

利用彈性網路分子動力學研究蛋白質動態

學生:顏十中 的第三人称单数 医二十二十二十一十一 计算教授:黃鎮剛

國立交通大學生物資訊研究所碩士班

摘 __ _ 要

在結構計算生物學上,蛋白質的動態一直與其功能有密切的關 係。而在實驗上x光結晶繞射所得的溫度因數與核磁共振所得到的蛋 白質動態多重模型也告知我們蛋白質並非靜態的。在過去,我們利用分子 動力學來研究蛋白質動態,但是分子動力學的時間複雜度太過龐大且須巨 大的計算量。在這篇論文中,首先我們試著建立一個粗略的模型來簡化分 子動力學中過多的力學因子與及原子個數來計算分子的動態軌跡然後我 們將其的振動來跟x光結晶繞射所得的溫度因數作比較。再來我們試著考 慮各參數對這個模型的影響。並針對一個資料集合做整體的測試並分析其 少數差距較大的蛋白質。最後我們證實蛋白質骨架的振動其實與其胺基酸 種類並無太大的關係,而是由結構體決定其振動大小。

The study of protein dynamics using Elastic Network Molecular Dynamics

student: Shih-Chung Yen Advisors: Dr. Jenn-Kang Hwang

Institute of Bioinformatics National Chiao Tung University **ABSTRAC**

In computational structural biology, protein motion has relationships about function. Some experimental evidence such as temperature factor (B factor) or NMR multi-structure also shows that protein is not static. In traditionally, the molecular dynamics is useful to studying the protein motion, but there are so huge time complexity and computational scale on MD. In this article, first, we try to generate a coarse-grained model to simplify the force characteristics and simulate the trajectory of protein dynamics. Then we compare the result of fluctuation with B-factor from X-ray crystallography protein structure. Then we try to change the parameter to test the model and calculate a whole dataset. At last, we found that the protein fluctuation is decided by the structure.

誌謝

曾經有人跟我說過誌謝文只要隨便寫寫就好,但是我想,一篇論文最認真的地方應 該就是誌謝文,尤其是只有這個才是真正屬於你自己的東西的時候。話說如果是六年前 我的腦袋還不知道生物資訊的存在,如果是四年前,我對生物的了解大概只有分子生物 學的中心法則,如果是三年前,我想我根本不奢望我會在這間實驗室。如果我這一生有 做對甚麼選擇的話,那就是我來到了這裡。

如果說我這兩年來最感謝的是誰?我的指導教授黃鎮剛老師絕對是第一中的第一。 對我而言他不只是一個教授,他是一個貴人,一個好友的存在。他對我的疼愛、付出、 指導,絕對不是一篇簡單的誌謝文可以說盡的。他開啓我的眼界與對學術的認知,指引 我方向。有人說一個好的老師不但交導你知識,還會教你如何做事,甚至如何做人。這 一點黃老師做到而且還遠遠的超過。

除了老師外學長姐的幫忙與指教也是千言萬語道不盡的謝意。尤禎祥學長對機器的 維護,玉菁學姐與景盛學長的關心研他們順利畢業)。還有草霸的幫忙,稅制的技術指 導,以及建華、小操、少偉和蔚倫諸多的指教。

至於我的同輩,要感謝我的房東祥逢,啓文,還有兩位可愛的學妹整天讓我欺負逗 我開心。當然更要感謝其他實驗是同學的幫助。尤其是楊老師實驗室的同學們。

最後就是我的父母,畢竟金主最大,沒有他們的資助與容忍我是不可能完成學業的。 他們理應接受我所有的榮耀與上天的恩賜。最後要感謝的太多了,就感謝天吧。

THE REAL PROPERTY

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 1

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 The importance of protein dynamics

Protein structure is dynamical and we can get other experimental evidence such as B-factor in X-ray structure and NMR structure.

The protein dynamics has relationship to protein function. This is consistent with the recent study¹, the catalytic residues have significantly lower positional fluctuations than other non-catalytic residues. Apparently, enzymatic activity is associated with the low translational mobility of the catalytic residues, which helps maintain the fine-tuned catalytic architecture. Then Wei-Chun Chiu² also use molecular dynamics to analyze the *N*-Acylamino acid racemase (NAAAR) and *N*-carbamoyl-d-amino-acid amidohydrolase (d-NCAase) and discover that the catalytic site are more stable than other residues.

Comparatively, the fluctuation of protein hinge region tends to move faster than others. This is support by Peter M. Jones³ in Q-loop of ABC transporter. The structural diversity and generally high crystallographic temperature factors for atoms within the Q-loop suggest that it is flexible and may undergo conformational changes during the catalytic cycle. For detecting the protein hinge motivation, molecular simulation is also to be used to observe the atoms fluctuation⁴.

1.2 The experimental evidence

In experiment, the evidence of protein motion are B-factor in X-ray structure and the multi-model structure from NMR.

The B-factor also called temperature factor. B-factor describes the thermal fluctuations of heavy atoms in the x-ray structure, its formula is

$$
\langle (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \bullet (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0) \rangle = \frac{3}{8\pi^2} B
$$

In figure 1, we can discover that the B-factor can reflect the fluctuation, the red means the fluctuation is large and blue means less. If the residues that are closed to the surface, the fluctuation would be large.

Besides B-factor of structure in X-ray crystallography, NMR (see Figure 2.) can get the protein large scales motion information. So we get a multi-models protein structure. Molecular dynamics can be used to calculate the motivation of proteins.

1.3 Molecular dynamics

For getting the information of protein motion, molecular dynamics (MD) is a well-known tool to calculate the trajectory of protein dynamics form of computer simulation. The atoms and molecules are allowed to interact for a period of time under known laws of physics. Because in general molecular systems consist of a large number of particles, it is impossible to find the properties of such complex systems analytically. MD simulation circumvents this problem by using numerical methods. It represents an interface between laboratory experiments and theory and can be understood as a virtual experiment. MD gained popularity in biochemistry and biophysics. In chemistry, MD serves as an important tool in protein structure determination and refinement using experimental tools such as X-ray crystallography and NMR. It has also been applied with limited success as a method of refining protein structure predictions. It is the physical principles of MD. One of the principal tools in the theoretical study of biological molecules is the method of molecular dynamics.

This computational method calculates the time dependent behavior of a molecular system. MD simulations have provided detailed information on the fluctuations and conformational changes of proteins and nucleic acids. These methods are now routinely used to investigate the structure, dynamics and thermodynamics of biological molecules and their complexes. They are also used in the determination of structures from x-ray crystallography and from NMR experiments.

In computational structure biology, it is an important tool to study the protein and Nucleic acids molecular structure. In fact, because it is impossible that we can see how water molecular try to across the aquaporin⁵. We only can get the information by simulation the molecular trajectories. For getting the trajectories, we calculate the potential energy, and try to get the motion. The total potential energy of any molecule is the sum of terms allowing for bond stretching, bond angle bending, bond twisting, van der Waals interactions and electrostatics. Many properties of a biomolecular canbe simulated with such an empirical energy function.

1.4 Force field

In the context of molecular mechanics, a force field (also called a force field) refers to the functional form and parameter sets used to describe the potential energy of a system of particles (typically but not necessarily atoms). Force field functions and parameter sets are

derived from both experimental work and high-level quantum mechanical calculations. In fact, force field is just to define the environment in computer. So all force fields are based on numerous approximations and derived from different types of experimental data. Therefore they are called empirical. "All-atom" force fields provide parameters for every atom in a system, including hydrogen, while "united-atom" force fields treat the hydrogen and carbon atoms in methyl and methylene groups as a single interaction center. Amber⁶ and $GROMACS⁷$ are famous classical force field.

From before potential function, we can define each kind of energy in general molecular dynamics force field. The bond and angle terms are usually modeled as harmonic oscillators in force fields that do not allow bond breaking. The functional form is highly variable. It also include potentials for hydrogen bonds, another important torsion term to account for the planarity of aromatic rings and other conjugated systems, and "cross-terms" that describe coupling of different internal variables, such as dihedral angles and bond lengths. Nonbonding force is the main point to make the huge time complexity. These terms are most computationally intensive because they include many more pair wise interactions per atom. So, every step, we have to run the loop of each atom-pairs. If there are 3000 atoms in a protein, it will make 9000000 atoms pairs. Therefore, we always set a distance as cutoff, if the distance of a atom pair is over the cutoff. Because the force is too small, we will reduce the nonbonding force. In nonbond terms, the van der Waals term is usually computed with a Lennard-Jones potential and the electrostatic term with Coulomb's law, although both can be buffered or scaled by a constant factor to produce better agreement with experimental observation.

1.5 Elastic network molecular dynamics (EMD)

MD simulations on very large systems may require such large computer resources that they cannot easily be studied by traditional all-atom methods. The most disadvantage of MD is extremely computational intensive. When we want to simulate the macromolecular such as virus coat or molecular chaperon. It will take huge computational ability and time⁸. For this reason, many people try to build coarse-grained model to simplify the feature to solve the limit of running macromolecular⁹ or use anisotropic normal mode analysis¹⁰. The coarse-grained model is like lattice model¹¹. Instead of all complexity representing every atom or force in system, define the atoms as a kind of "pseudo-atoms" and take the force field only two kinds of force, the hydrophobic and hydrophilic. Therefore, the time complexity will be reduced.

There are two examples for coarse-grained model, the discontinuous molecular dynamics $(CG-DMD)^{12}$ and Go-models¹³. We build a new method to calculate the fluctuation of proteins. We try to build a simplified structure model to run molecular dynamics for calculating the proteins fluctuations. We disable all non-bond force and connect all atoms in a cutoff by a simplified spring. Then we use molecular dynamics to simulate the movement of this network structure. Finally we can get the proteins fluctuation information and compare with the experimental temperature factor.

Chapter 2. Methods

The disadvantage of Molecular dynamics is that MD is extremely computational intensive. For example, non-bond force computation cost too much time complexity and space complexity, and we must add water molecular to simulate the real proteins environment. So we generate a elastic model to simplified some characters. We get only alpha carbon atoms and disable all non-bond force. Second, connect all atoms by a simplified spring. Third, use molecular dynamics to calculate the motivation. Forth, calculate the fluctuation of each atom. At last, compare with the experimental data.

2.2 Molecular dynamics and the elastic model

MD refers to the use of classical mechanics/Newtonian mechanics to describe the physical basis behind the models. Molecular models typically describe atoms (nucleus and electrons collectively) as point charges with an associated mass. The interactions between neighboring atoms are described by spring-like interactions (representing chemical bonds) and van der Waals forces¹⁴. In figure 3, the equation of potential energy and trajectory derives form the Newton's second law. In proteins, the total potential energy function includes energy from internal and external energy terms.

The internal energy terms describe the energy associated with changes in bond lengths, bond angles, and torsion angles. On the other hand, the external energy terms include salt-bridges, hydrogen bonds, and van der Waals interactions between atoms¹⁵. The empirical potential function reflects all the energy of the given protein structure. For example, (in figure 4) there are just five atoms but we have to calculated 6 non-bond force, 4 bond force, 2 torsion angle and 4 angles. Therefore, the time complexity has become an important

In our method, we try to keep the spring-like interaction and ignore the other force such as van der Waals interaction (non-bonded pairs), torsion angles, partial charges and bond angle bending force (in figure 5). So our total potential energy only considers all bonds force.

$$
U = \sum \frac{1}{2} K_b (r - r_0)^2
$$

Where *U* is the potential energy, *Kb* is the spring force constant (Hooken force constant). Besides this, we take only alpha-carbon of protein backbones (in figure 5).

In elastic network models (ENMs), the system is represented by a network of beads connected by elastic springs usually one bead per amino acid (although elastic networks have also been used together with all-atom descriptions, but in our method, we only take the C-alpha as the target). The extreme simplicity of the parameterization is balanced by the need to know the equilibrium reference configuration, from which only harmonic fluctuations are possible.

In figure 6, we try to generate a picture of elastic network model of 1crn. We can see that each CA is connected several bonding forces. The number of bonding force is decided by the cutoff. To set the most suitable cutoff is the key point of this model.

Chapter 3. Results

We generate this new methods, but there are three parameters can be discussed, the cutoff, force constant, and temperature. It is very interesting that some features are not like our anticipate results.

For compare these two data candidly, we transfer these data to z-scores and calculate the Pearson's correlation coefficient between the root mean square fluctuation (RMSF) from our method and the B-factor.

3.1 Effects of the cutoff on RMSF

First we use 1crn(see figure 7) and 5pti(see figure 8) as the example and set temperature is 500K, force constant is 1 and 1000000 steps. We can see that when the cutoff is lesser, the correlation is closer to the experimental results. In fact, the less cutoff means that the force between C-alpha to C-alpha become more and is close to the real environment. But when the cutoff is too less, the numbers of bond would decrease, in our tests, the cutoff may be between 4 to 6 .

5pti¹⁶ is bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor, also called BPTI, is a protein found in many tissues throughout the body. BPTI inhibits several of the serine protease proteins such as trypsin, kallikrein, chymotrypsin, and plasmin. BPTI is a member of the pancreatic trypsin inhibitor family, which is a family of serine protease inhibitors. These proteins usually have conserved cysteine residues that participate in forming disulfide bonds.

At last we try another 6 protein as example and get the same conclusion. Especially the main point is when the cutoff is too large, it will cover all the protein and make the number of bond force in every atom be the same one. So it makes the fluctuation calculated by our model almost to be a linear. (see figure 9 to figure 14)

3.2 Effects of the force constant on RMSF

In this work, we try to change the force constant in our model. It is interesting that we discover that the force constant is almost no influence to the results.

In figure 15, we added the force constant from 1 to 1000, and we can see that the

distribution of fluctuation is almost no transformation. The correlation has no changes.

In this experiment, we take $1aba^{17}(a/b)$ (see figure 15.) and $2omf^{18}(al)$ beta) (see figure 16.) for examples. 1aba is the oxidized bacteriophage T4 glutaredoxin. 2omf is an integral membrane protein located in the outer membrane of the bacteria, Escherichia coli. OmpF porin is a non-specific transport channel that allows for the passive diffusion of small, polar molecules (600-700 Dalton in size) through the cell's outer membrane.

3.3 Effects of the temperature on RMSF

Temperature is very important to protein structure. We all know that the protein would be denaturing when the temperature is too high. On molecular dynamics, we also use it in this model, because we connect each C-alpha by a simplified spring. The bonding force may be more stable than native protein. We try to change the temperature and discover that the temperature like force constant is almost no influence to the results. In fact, the protein move more quickly but the structure would not be crash. So the correlation coefficient also changes nothing.

In this experiment, we also take $1aba(a/b)(\text{see figure 17})$ and $2omf^{18}(all beta)$ (see figure 18) for examples.

3.4 Comparing with real molecular dynamics by GROMACS

We also take some examples to run the fine-grained simulation and compare the results with our method. Because of the so large time complexity, we just try a few proteins. In this case, the examples are 2omf, 1qr9a, 1c9oa, 1ucda and 1itua.

On environment in GROMACS, we test 2 nano-seconds (1000000 steps), as time and added water in our simulation. For getting the results, it cost me 3-5 days per target. Especially the 2omf, it almost takes 5 days but our method only takes 3 minutes.

After comparing the results with our method, we can get better correlation coefficient and take less time scale. In figure 19 to 23 and table 1, we can discover that the root mean square fluctuation calculated by our model is very closed to the results by fine-grained molecular dynamic from GROMACS. In this test, we use GROMACS 3.3 edition to run two examples, 2omf and 1crn. GROMACS¹⁹ was developed in Herman Berendsens group, department of Biophysical Chemistry of Groningen University.

3.5 Non-homologous datasets

After trying the parameter, we test a non-homologous dataset to calculate the distribution of correlation coefficient between the B-factor and RMSF. We get the results support that our method can work and better. The mean of correlation coefficient is 0.5326(in figure 24). The all time scales take only 5 day, but a real molecular dynamics simulation by GROMACS may need 1000 folds of time complexity. In before example, the real molecular dynamics of 2omf take 5 days to get the result at the same situation, but our method takes only 2 minutes and 36 seconds. Of course reducing the atoms and nonbonding force may be the most important reason to lower the time complexity.

Our data is selected by the next condition. We selected from PDB-REPRDB 972 protein chains of length ≥ 60 . Their structures are solved by X-ray crystallography with resolution \leq 2.0 Å and R-factors \leq 0.2. All chains are of pair-wise sequence identity \leq 25%. (See in Table

2)

3.6 Discussion of failure cases

3.6.1 The protein of multiple chains

First, the datasets that we analyzed is separated proteins by chain. In fact, some proteins are working together and connect to each other to form a oligomer. We have to combine this identical chain to other subunit for getting the real fluctuation. In this case, we show the 1kqf, c-chain as the example. When we only calculate the c-chain, the RMSF is far away from the experimental situation. When we take the whole protein to build a elastic network model. The correlation coefficient between RMSF and B-factor tend to be match together. (see in figure 25)

3.6.2 The missing residue

We discover that there are several errors in PDB. For example, the 2fwg has 10 missing residue at the last tail which connected to the last 5 residues. Therefore it makes the results to be bad. When we cut the last 5 Histidine of the C-terminal, The correlation coefficient is updated from -0.07 to 0.52. (See in figure 26)

3.6.3 Biological unit or asymmetrical unit

In PDB, some researchers present the structure is unique. But in biological situation, they may connect the other subunit to become oligomer and work. In this case, we take 2bop as the example. 2bop is a DNA binding protein. When it works, it will connect to another one subunit to become a dimmer. So, we have to calculate the whole dimer's root mean square fluctuation. (see in figure 27)

Asymmetrical unit is situation of protein stacking in the in X-ray crystal. Because the B-factor is getting from the X-ray crystallography, the protein stack would affect the fluctuation of protein. When we calculate the RMSF, we have to take into consider the factor.

3.6.4 Several independent domains

Sometimes, one amino acid sequence tend to fold to several domains. When we face this problem, we try to separate the protein by domain knowledge and classification. Such as 1nty and 2c4x. we can separate each protein as two domain by visualization check easily. For example, the 1nty can be separated to two independent domains. The correlation coefficient would be updated from 0.3 to 0.8. (see in figure 28 to 29)

3.6.5 PDB format error

At last, in fact, some researchers support the error data or uncompleted data to PDB. Such as 1ldd, there is no information about temperature factor. (See in figure 30)

Chapter 4. Conclusion

In this work, we develop a new coarse-grained model that combines molecular dynamics with elastic network model. According to our results, we found that our method can calculate the root mean square fluctuation better than MD, even we use less atoms and bonding force. It support us a new think of a way that the structure and the distance between atoms decide the backbone fluctuation. Although it is well-known that the side-chains traditionally decide the specificity in some cases, such as the trypsin and chymotrypsin, it has been suggested that the specificity of trypsin and chymotrypsin is decided by the structure²⁰.

Moreover, our method takes us around less than 1000-folds complexity to calculate the same results as MD does. In recent study, Rueda, $M²¹$ performed for all protein metafolds using the four most popular force fields (OPLS, CHARMM, AMBER, and GROMOS) to calculate motion and the RMSF. The time scale takes around 1.5 terabytes of data obtained using approximately 50 years of CPU. This paper shows that the difference of force fields would to make the same results. Our method also shows that even we use the simplest potential function, we can get the better results and faster.

Reference

1. Yang, L. W. & Bahar, I. Coupling between catalytic site and collective dynamics: a requirement for mechanochemical activity of enzymes. Structure 13, 893-904 (2005).

2. Chiu, W. C. et al. Structure-stability-activity relationship in covalently cross-linked N-carbamoyl D-amino acid amidohydrolase and N-acylamino acid racemase. J Mol Biol 359, 741-53 (2006).

3. Jones, P. M. & George, A. M. Mechanism of ABC transporters: a molecular dynamics simulation of a well characterized nucleotide-binding subunit. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 99, 12639-44 (2002).

4. van Aalten, D. M. et al. Engineering photocycle dynamics. Crystal structures and kinetics of three photoactive yellow protein hinge-bending mutants. J Biol Chem 277, 6463-8 (2002).

5. Page, E., Winterfield, J., Goings, G., Bastawrous, A. & Upshaw-Earley, J. Water channel proteins in rat cardiac myocyte caveolae: osmolarity-dependent reversible internalization. Am J Physiol 274, H1988-2000 (1998).

6. Case, D. A. et al. The Amber biomolecular simulation programs. J Comput Chem 26, 1668-88 (2005).

7. Van Der Spoel, D. et al. GROMACS: fast, flexible, and free. J Comput Chem 26, 1701-18 (2005).

8. Freddolino, P. L., Arkhipov, A. S., Larson, S. B., McPherson, A. & Schulten, K. Molecular dynamics simulations of the complete satellite tobacco mosaic virus. Structure 14, 437-49 (2006).

9. Arkhipov, A., Freddolino, P. L. & Schulten, K. Stability and dynamics of virus capsids described by coarse-grained modeling. Structure 14, 1767-77 (2006).

10. Poon, B. K. et al. Normal mode refinement of anisotropic thermal parameters for a supramolecular complex at 3.42-A crystallographic resolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 104, 7869-74 (2007).

11. Hinds, D. A. & Levitt, M. A lattice model for protein structure prediction at low resolution. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 89, 2536-40 (1992).

12. Ding, F., Borreguero, J. M., Buldyrey, S. V., Stanley, H. E. & Dokholyan, N. V. Mechanism for the alpha-helix to beta-hairpin transition. Proteins 53, 220-8 (2003).

13. Paci, E., Vendruscolo, M. & Karplus, M. Validity of Go models: comparison with a solvent-shielded empirical energy decomposition. Biophys J 83, 3032-8 (2002). m

14. Levitt, M. The birth of computational structural biology. Nat Struct Biol 8, 392-3 (2001).

15. Michael Levitt , M. H., Ruth Sharon, Valerie Daggett. Potential energy function and parameters for simulations of the molecular dynamics of proteins and nucleic acids in solution. Computer Physics Communication 91, 215-231 (1995).

16. Wlodawer, A., Walter, J., Huber, R. & Sjolin, L. Structure of bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor. Results of joint neutron and X-ray refinement of crystal form II. J Mol Biol 180, 301-29 (1984).

17. Eklund, H. et al. Structure of oxidized bacteriophage T4 glutaredoxin (thioredoxin). Refinement of native and mutant proteins. J Mol Biol 228, 596-618 (1992).

18. Cowan, S. W. et al. The structure of OmpF porin in a tetragonal crystal form. Structure 3, 1041-50 (1995).

19. Kutzner, C. et al. Speeding up parallel GROMACS on high-latency networks. J Comput Chem 28, 2075-2084 (2007).

20. Ma, W., Tang, C. & Lai, L. Specificity of trypsin and chymotrypsin: loop-motion-controlled dynamic cor**relation as a determinant. Biophys J 89, 1183-93 (2005).**

21. Rueda, M. et al. A consensus view of protein dynamics. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 104, 796-801 (2007).

Table Contents

Table 1. Comparison of the correlation coefficient of B-factor and RMSF that is calculated by GROMACS and EMD……17

Table 2. PDB-REPRDB entries list sorting parameters. This is our non-homologous datasets…………………………………18

Table 1. Comparison of the correlation coefficient of B-factor and RMSF that is calculated by GROMACS and EMD. The time scale of 2omf calculated by GROMACS is 5 days at one computer, but the EMD only take 2.5 minutes at

1974 **Table 2.** PDB-REPRDB entries list sorting parameters. This is our non-homologous datasets ٠

TREACH

Figures Contents

- **Figure 1. The B-factor showing picture of putty mode by pymol**
- **Figure 2. NMR structure of 1poq**
- **Figure 3. The numbers of potential energy of five atoms**
- **Figure 4. The elastic network model of 1crn, the cutoff is 7A**
- **Figure 5. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1crn**
- **Figure 6. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 5pti**
- **Figure 7. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1arb**
- **Figure 8. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1chd**
- **Figure 9. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1kqfb**
- **Figure 10. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1ql3a**
- **Figure 11. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1uf5a**
- **Figure 12. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 2bcgg**
- **Figure 13. Effect of force constant on RMSF in 1aba**
- **Figure 14. Effect of force constant on RMSF in 2omf**
- **Figure 15. Effect of force temperature on RMSF in 1aba**
- **Figure 16. Effect of force temperature on RMSF in 2omf**
- **Figure 17. Comparing the correlation coefficient of B-factor with RMSF from GROMACS and EMD in 2omf**
- **Figure 18. Comparing the correlation coefficient of B-factor with RMSF from GROMACS and EMD in 1ucda**
- **Figure 19. Comparing the correlation coefficient of B-factor with RMSF from GROMACS and EMD in 1qr9a**
- **Figure 20. Comparing the correlation coefficient of B-factor with RMSF from GROMACS and EMD in 1c9oa**
- **Figure 21. Comparing the correlation coefficient of B-factor with RMSF from GROMACS and EMD in 1itua**
- **Figure 22. The distribution of correlation coefficient of RMSF from EMD and B-factor**
- **Figure 23. C-chain is a subunit of a oligomer in 1KQFC, we combine it to other subunit and get the overlap results**
- **Figure 24. Effect of missing residue in 2fwg, we cut the five histidines of C-terminal**
- **Figure 25. Effect of biological unit in 2BOP**
- **Figure 26. Effect of separating proteins of several domains in 1nty**
- **Figure 27. Effect of separating proteins of several domains in 1nty**

Figure 28. Example of error of experimental data

C

۳ E **Control**

Figure 2. NMR structure of 1poq

¢

H

L.

Figure 4. The elastic network model of 1crn, the cutoff is 7A.

Figure 5. Effect of cutoff on RMSF in 1crn

Figure 23. C-chain is a subunit of a oligomer in 1KQFC, we combine it to other subunit and get the overlap results

Figure 24. Effect of missing residue in 2fwg, we cut the five histidines of C-terminal

Figure 25. Effect of biological unit in 2BOP

Figure 26. Effect of separating proteins of several domains in 1nty, testing all molecular.

Figure 27. Effect of separating proteins of several domains in 1nty, separating two domains

Figure 28. Example of error of experimental data

Appendix

The datasets pf PDB-REPEDB

