II. Structure and Specificity of the Interaction between the FHA2 Domain of Rad53 and Phosphotyrosyl Peptides
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The forkhead-associated (FHA) domain is a protein module found in many proteins involved in cell signaling in response to DNA damage. It has been suggested to bind to pThr sites of its target protein. Recently we have determined the first structure of an FHA domain, FHA2 from the yeast protein Rad53, and demonstrated that FHA2 binds to a pTyr-containing peptide \[^{826}EDI(pY)YLD^{832}\] from Rad9, with a moderate affinity (\(K_d\) ca. 100 \(\mu\)M). We now report the solution structure of the complex of FHA2 bound with this pTyr peptide. The structure shows that the phosphate group of pTyr interacts directly with three arginine residues (605, 617, and 620), and that the leucine residue at the +2 position from the pTyr interacts with a hydrophobic surface on FHA2. The sequence specificity of FHA2 was determined by screening a combinatorial pTyr library. The results clearly show that FHA2 recognizes specific sequences C-terminal to pTyr with the following consensus: XX(pY)N\(_1\)N\(_2\)N\(_3\), where N\(_1\) \(\hat{=}\) Leu, Met, Phe, or Ile, N\(_2\) \(\hat{=}\) Tyr, Phe, Leu, or Met, and N\(_3\) \(\hat{=}\) Phe, Leu, or Met. Two of the selected peptides, GF(pY)LYFIR and DV(pY)FMIR, bind FHA2 with \(K_d\) values of 1.1 and 5.0 \(\mu\)M, respectively. The results, along with other recent reports, demonstrate that the FHA domain is a new class of phosphoprotein-binding domain, capable of binding both pTyr and pThr sequences.

© 2000 Academic Press

Keywords: FHA domain; Rad53; phosphotyrosine; phosphopeptide

Introduction

Protein-protein interaction is one of the essential mechanisms used in cellular signaling processes. Interactions between two proteins are often mediated by small modular domains, which are autonomously folded and recognize short stretches of amino acid residues in their partner proteins. A number of such modules, including SH2, SH3, PTB, and 14-3-3 domains, have been identified in signaling proteins of organisms from yeast to human (Pawson & Scott, 1997). Recently, a new module, the forkhead-associated (FHA) domain, has been identified by sequence analyses (Hofmann & Bucher, 1995). It was first identified within a subset of forkhead transcriptional factors, located outside of the conserved DNA-binding forkhead domain. It was subsequently found in more than 20 other proteins, mostly nuclear protein kinases and transcriptional factors. New FHA-containing proteins of diverse functions continue to be identified. More recent additions include HuCdsl (or Chk2) from humans (Brown et al., 1999; Matsuoka et al., 1998) and Dmnk from Drosophila melanogaster (Oishi et al., 1998). Both proteins participate in the cellular response to DNA damage. Recently, an FHA domain was identified...
in the N terminus of nuclear RNA-binding protein NIPP1 (Boudrez et al., 2000). It has been suggested that the FHA domain is involved in the regulation of pre-mRNA splicing.

The FHA domain was initially defined as having approximately 55-75 amino acid residues with three conserved regions. However, our NMR structure of the FHA2 domain of Rad53 (residues 573-730) indicates that the FHA2 domain of Rad53 requires approximately 160 amino acid residues to fold into a stable three-dimensional (3D) structure (Liao et al., 1999), which is considerably larger than previously predicted on the basis of sequence homology (55-75 amino acid residues). Sun et al. (1998) also reported that deletion of 52 amino acid residues from either end of a functional fragment of Rad53 (residues 549-730) abolished its interaction with Rad9. Hammet et al. (2000) reported that the Dun1p FHA domain also contained 130-140 amino acid residues. Furthermore, in a subset of FHA domains, sequence homology extends beyond the originally defined region in both directions by 25 to 30 residues (Boudrez et al., 2000).

FHA has been proposed to be a new phosphoprotein binding domain (Hofmann & Bucher, 1995), which is supported by extensive experimental evidence. However, it remains to be established whether the FHA domain recognizes pSer/pThr or pTyr peptides. The FHA domain of kinase-associated protein phosphatase (KAPP) from Arabidopsis thaliana binds to a phosphorylated receptor-like protein kinase RLK5 (Li et al., 1999). Likewise, the FHA domain of NIPP1 interacts with CDC5L in a phosphorylation-dependent manner (Boudrez et al., 2000). Rad53, a yeast checkpoint protein involved in the DNA damage response (Allen et al., 1993; Zheng et al., 1993), contains two FHA domains and binds to phosphorylated Rad9 (Sun et al., 1998; Durocher et al., 1999). In most of these cases, the reported Evidence seems to suggest FHA as a pSer/pThr binding domain. For instance, the FHA domain of NIPP1 interacts with CDC5L in a phosphorylation-dependent manner (Boudrez et al., 2000). It has been suggested (Table 1) relative to the previously published structures (Liao et al., 1999). They satisfy the experimental distance restraints better (r.m.s.d. decreased from 0.042 Å to 0.033 Å), display smaller deviations from idealized covalent geometry (0.004 Å to 0.003 Å for bonds, 0.69° to 0.47° for angles and 0.52° to 0.4° for impropers), exhibit a better Ramachandran plot (54% to 83% for most favored regions), and have good non-bonded contacts (9 kcal/mol). Furthermore, the structures converge much better (Figure 1(a) and Table 1): excluding the disordered loops, 632-642 and 706-713, and the N and C-terminal residues, the r.m.s.d. values are 0.37(±0.05) Å (compared to 0.51(±0.09) Å and 0.83(±0.05) Å) for backbone and all heavy atoms, respectively. The following points are worth mentioning regarding the structural improvement observed from the refined structures. First, the C-terminal helix becomes longer, consisting of residues 721-729 (Figure 1(b)). The problem of having an abnormal kink at the C-terminal helix in the previous structure (Liao et al., 1999) has now been resolved. Second, the two central β-strands, β9 and β10, of the lower β-sheet are extended to consist of residues 676-683 and 688-696, respectively (Figure 1(b)). Note that the β9 strand has a bulge at Val680. Finally, one more β-strand, β3’ (residues 611-613), is added to the top β-sheet. In contrast to the other 11 strands that are in antiparallel β-sheets, this strand forms a parallel β-sheet with its partner strand, β3.

**Solution structure of the FHA2-pTyr peptide complex**

We have previously reported that a pTyr-containing peptide, 826EDI(pY)YLD832 derived from Rad9, binds FHA2 with a K_d value of ~100 μM. The superimposed 1H-15N-HSQC spectra of the free and the peptide-complexed FHA2 show that several backbone NH groups undergo significant shifts upon peptide binding (Figure 2). The side-chain N' H groups of Arg605, Arg617, and Arg620 are also shifted. In contrast, the peptide spectrum (not shown) exhibits only small shifts.
The solution structure of the FHA2-pTyr peptide complex was subsequently determined. Intermolecular NOE distance restraints were obtained mostly from the 3D 13C-edited (f$_j$), 13C/15N-filtered (f$_k$) NOESY experiment (Figure 3). The NOEs mainly came from the pTyr and the Leu at the +2 position of the peptide. A total of 18 intermolecular distance restraints were deduced from such NOE analyses. On the basis of the analysis of the HSQC spectra described in the previous paragraph, three additional distance restraints (4.3±0.3 Å for the C$_\alpha$ of Arg605, Arg6517, and Arg620 to the P atom of pTyr) were included in the calculation of the complex structure. The complex structures generated without using the artificial distance restraints clearly showed that the Arg side-chain amino groups are close to the pTyr phosphate group. The 19 superimposed complex structures are shown in Figure 4(a) and a summary of structural statistics is provided in Table 2. The structures of the FHA2 domain in the complex are very well converged, with r.m.s.d. values of 0.36(±0.05) Å and 0.80(±0.05) Å for the backbone and all heavy atoms, respectively. However, the peptide structures are less well converged: the r.m.s.d. values for the structured region of the peptide (the residues at the 0 to +2 positions) are 1.32(±0.40) Å and 2.18(±0.56) Å for the backbone and all heavy atoms, respectively (Table 2 and Figure 4(a)).

### Structural comparison of FHA2 in free and complexed forms

Figure 4(b) shows the superimposed backbone structures of the free and complexed FHA2 along with three arginine side-chains at the binding site. The FHA2 domain undergoes little backbone structural change upon peptide binding, as indicated by small r.m.s.d. values between the free and bound forms (Table 2). This is a reflection of the fact that the FHA2-peptide complex, excluding the 21 intermolecular NOES, gave largely the same set of NOEs as the free protein (except for 26 out of >3000 NOEs). The most interesting and clear NOE difference is that relatively strong NOEs were observed between the β protons of Ser606 and the δ protons of Arg620 in the complex but not in the free protein. Note that Arg620 undergoes the largest spectral shift upon binding (Figure 2). In fact, the side-chain of Arg620 moves by as much as 2.1 Å upon peptide binding (Figure 4(b)). The r.m.s.d. value for the Arg620 side-chain atoms is decreased from 1.92 Å to 0.47 Å, indicating that...
the flexible side-chain becomes less mobile upon binding. These results taken together suggest that binding of the peptide to FHA occurs by repositioning a few critical side-chains without causing backbone perturbation. Note that the Lennard-Jones energy of the FHA2-peptide complex is about 40-60 kcal/mol lower than that of the free FHA2.

Detailed interactions between FHA2 and the phosphotyrosine peptide

Figure 5 shows the interactions between FHA2 and the peptide. The pTyr phosphate group of the peptide interacts with the guanidino groups of Arg605, Arg617, and Arg620, which reside in the loops connecting strands β3 and β3′, and β3′ and β4. These guanidino groups, which are spatially close in the free form, come even closer upon peptide binding (Figure 4(b)). Ser619 is also in close contact with the phosphate group. These interactions with the phosphate group presumably constitute a major portion of the overall binding energy, because unphosphorylated peptide does not bind to FHA2 (Liao et al., 1999). These residues are well conserved in the FHA domains: Arg605 and Ser619 are absolutely conserved and the Arg617 and Arg620 are moderately conserved (Hofmann & Bucher, 1995). The phenyl ring of pTyr also contributes to binding because it is in close contact with the side-chains of Thr654, Asn655, and Arg617. Note that the pTyr aromatic group is in close contact with the Arg617 guanidino group, possibly by having an amino-aromatic interaction found in many protein structures (Burley & Petsko, 1986), except that the amino group does not lie exactly above the center of the phenyl ring. The binding is further strengthened by hydrophobic interactions between the Leu at the +2 position of the peptide and the side-chains of Ile681 and Asp683 from FHA2. The hydrophobicity at the +2 position seems to play an important role for the binding specificity, since "8DIY(pY)LDI" another peptide derived from Rad9 which has an Asp at the +2 position, binds FHA2 with an order of magnitude lower affinity (Liao et al., 1999). This preference for a hydrophobic residue at the +2 position is confirmed by combinatorial library screening (vide infra).

Comparison with other proteins that bind pTyr peptide

There are two other well-established pTyr peptide-binding domains: SH2 and PTB domains. Clearly, FHA2 has a very different structural topology and binding site from these two domains. However, we have tried to look for common features in pTyr peptide recognition. The pTyr peptide-binding mode of FHA2 is more similar to that of SH2 than that of PTB. This is consistent with the fact that the binding specificities of FHA2 and SH2 both depend on pTyr and the residues C-terminal to the pTyr, while PTB binds the pTyr peptides by recognizing the residues N-terminal to pTyr (reviewed by Kuriyan & Cowburn, 1997). Like FHA2, several conserved arginine, arginine/lysine, and serine residues of SH2 form ionic interactions with the phosphate group of pTyr (Figure 6). However, the phosphate-interacting residues of FHA2 reside in several loops and are solvent exposed, whereas in SH2 all except the serine residue are located on helices and β-sheets and the strictly conserved arginine residue (Arg154 in Src SH2) is buried. The buried Arg of SH2 is believed to be the critical residue that differentiates pTyr from pThr/pSer peptides. The guanidino group reaches the phosphate group of the pTyr peptide when the side-chain of this arginine residue exists in the extended conformation; no such interactions are possible for the much shorter pSer or pThr side-chains (Mayer et al., 1992; Eck et al., 1993; Kuriyan...
Figure 2. Superimposed $^{15}$N-HSQC spectra of the free FHA2 (black) and FHA2 complexed with the pTyr peptide $^{826}$EDI$(pY)^{832}$ derived from Rad9 (red). Only the peaks that undergo substantial shifts ($\geq 0.04$ ppm for protons or $\geq 0.5$ ppm for nitrogen atoms) are labeled with sequence numbers. The letters d and e stand for side-chain δ and ε positions, respectively. The Arg side-chain $\text{N}^\text{e}$H peaks are shown at the top. The spectrum of free FHA2 was obtained using a 0.5 mM $^{15}$N-labeled FHA2 sample; the spectrum of the complex was obtained by titrating with the peptide to ca. 1 mM concentration. The pH of the samples was maintained at pH 6.5 throughout the titration.

Figure 3. Selected regions of the 3D $^{13}$C-filtered ($f_2$), $^{13}$C/$^{15}$N-edited ($f_3$) NOESY spectrum of the FHA2 complexed with the Rad9 pTyr peptide. The intermolecular NOEs between Asp683 of FHA2 and the Leu (at the +2 position) of the peptide are shown at the top, and the NOEs between Thr654 of FHA2 and the pTyr of the peptide are shown at the bottom.
The lack of such a residue in FHA2 could allow FHA2 to have less stringent phospho amino acid specificity than SH2. In both complexes, the peptides adopt extended conformations, but the SH2-bound peptide lies across the protein surface orthogonal to the central β-sheet while the FHA2-bound peptide lies near the ends of the β-sheets interacting with mostly loop residues. In SH2, the residues at the +1 (preferably polar ones for group ISH2 domains but hydrophobic ones for group IIISH2 domains) and +3 positions (preferably hydrophobic ones) of the peptide are important for binding specificity (Kuriyan & Cowburn, 1997) while in FHA2, the +2 residue is likely the one that directs the sequence specificity.

Design, synthesis, and screening of a pTyr peptide library

Although we have shown that the pTyr829 peptide of Rad9 binds to FHA2 in a specific fashion, the binding affinity is weak, raising the question of whether the pTyr peptide binding by FHA2 is physiologically relevant. To determine whether the FHA2 domain is capable of high-affinity binding to pTyr peptides, we have constructed a pTyr peptide library on TentaGel S resin, in which two residues immediately N-terminal and three residues C-terminal to the pTyr residue were randomized. Each of the random positions had an equal representation by 18 natural amino acids (except for cysteine and methionine) plus norleucine (Nle), which was used as a substitute of methionine. Therefore, the theoretical diversity of the library is $19^5 = 2.48 \times 10^6$. This library contains all of the possible hexapeptides and each bead carries ~100 pmol of a unique peptide sequence. A peptide linker, IBBRM (B-β-alanine), was synthesized to the C terminus of the random region (Yu & Chu, 1997), whereas glutamate and aspartate were added to the N terminus of the random region to improve aqueous solubility. Therefore, each member of the library bears the sequence: acetyl-EDXX(pY)XXXIBBRM-resin (X= random amino acid). In addition to a full-length peptide, each bead also carries a family of truncated peptides derived from the full-length peptide on that bead, which form a peptide ladder in a mass spectroscopy (MS) spectrum to allow for sequence identification of the full-length peptide via peptide ladder sequencing (Youngquist et al., 1995; Hu et al., 1999).

A total of 900 mg of the peptide library, which contained $2.57 \times 10^6$ beads, was screened against GST-FHA2 in three batches. Statistically, each possible pTyr hexapeptide is represented once in the library. Approximately 150 positive beads (identified by their turquoise color) were selected from this library, whereas control screening in the absence of GST-FHA2 always resulted in completely colorless beads. Out of the 150 beads, 53 produced high-quality MS spectra and their sequences were unambiguously determined (Table 3). A total of 25 beads gave only partial sequences C-terminal to the pTyr, with their N-terminal sequences unassigned. The rest of the beads gave poor mass spectra that could not be reliably analyzed. Analysis of the selected sequences revealed that FHA2 clearly binds to pTyr peptides of correct sequence contexts (Figure 7). FHA2 is most selective at the +2 position, where Tyr is by far the most preferred residue, followed by the structurally related Phe and, to a lesser extent, Leu and Met.

Figure 4. (a) Stereoview showing the superposition of the backbone Cα atoms of the 19 lowest-energy structures of FHA2 complexed with the pTyr peptide from Rad9. They were superimposed to best fit to the FHA2 domain (see Table 2 for details). (b) Stereoview of the superimposed ribbon diagram of the restrained minimized mean structures of free (orange) and complexed FHA2 (purple). The side-chains of the arginine residues that interact with the peptide phosphate group are also displayed, using green for the free state and red for the complexed state, respectively. The Figure was generated using Insight II (Molecular Simulations Inc.).

(Nle). Clearly, a large hydrophobic side-chain is required for binding at this position, which is consistent with our structural study. Strong selectivity is also evident at the +1 and +3 positions, where large hydrophobic residues are again preferred (Figure 7). At the +1 position, Leu, Nle, and Phe are almost equally represented among the selected sequences, whereas Ile, Val, and Tyr are significantly less frequent. A similar pattern was observed at the +3 position, where Phe, Leu, and Nle are about equally preferred. There is also some selectivity for hydrophobic residues (e.g. Phe, Val, and Leu) at the −1 position, but this selectivity is much weaker than that of C-terminal residues. Very little, if any, selectivity was observed at the −2 position. In summary, the sequence specificity of the FHA2 domain resembles that of SH2 domains in the overall preference for large hydrophobic residues at three residues immediately C-terminal to pTyr. Residues beyond the −2 and +3 positions may also contribute to the overall binding affinity but were not examined here.

Characterization of binding of selected peptides by fluorescence resonance energy transfer

Three of the peptides in Table 3, each representing a different subfamily, were selected for further analysis. Peptide GF(pY)LYFIR (entry no. 3) features the most preferred amino acid residues at all positions that are important for binding. In peptide DV(pY)FYMI (entry no. 28), Phe and Met at the +1 and +3 positions, respectively, are not the most preferred residues. Peptide IQ(pY)YHIR (entry no. 14) has still less preferred residues at the +1 (Ile) and +3 (His) positions. These three peptides were individually synthesized on large scales with a dansyl group fused to their N termini, and tested by fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET) from protein tryptophan residues to the dansyl group. Binding assays were performed at a fixed concentration of the pTyr peptides and varying concentrations of the GST-FHA2 protein (Figure 8). Association was monitored by measuring the fluorescence yield of the dansyl group at 520 nm while exciting the tryptophan
residues at 290 nm. Peptide GF(pY)LYFIR (no. 3) showed the highest affinity to GST-FHA2, with a $K_d$ of 1.1 $\mu$M. Peptide DV(pY)FYMIR bound GST-FHA2 less tightly, with a $K_d$ of 5.0 $\mu$M. The third peptide, IQ(pY)IYHIR, showed little fluorescence enhancement with up to 10 $\mu$M GST-FHA2 protein so that the $K_d$ value could not be determined by the FRET method (Table 4). Our NMR titrations confirmed that this peptide binds to FHA2, but less tightly, with a $K_d$ of 100 $\mu$M (see below). To ensure that the observed binding is to the FHA2 domain but not to the GST portion, control experiments were carried out with GST only; no significant fluorescence enhancement was observed under the same conditions (Figure 8). Furthermore, when the untagged FHA2 domain was tested for binding to peptide GF(pY)LYFIR, a $K_d$ value of 2.7 $\mu$M was obtained (Figure 8). These results demonstrate that the selected pTyr peptides are indeed specific ligands for the FHA2 domain.

**Agreement between the complex structure and the library screening**

We next pursued the possibility of determining the structure of the complex between FHA2 and one of the high-affinity pTyr peptides identified from the combinatorial library. Unfortunately, neither the peptide GF(pY)LYFIR nor its derivatives, DGF(pY)LYFIR and DDGF(pY)LYFIR, were sufficiently soluble for NMR studies. Thus, we have utilized the weaker-binding but more soluble peptide, IQ(pY)IYHIR, for our studies. The addition of two charged residues to the N terminus rendered the resulting peptide (Ac-DEIQ(pY)IYHIR) sufficiently soluble to conduct NMR studies to map out the binding site on FHA2. The NMR

---

**Figure 5.** The binding interface for FHA2 and the Rad9 pTyr peptide (a) Surface representation of the FHA2 domain in complex with the peptide; (b) side-chain interactions of the peptide with the FHA2 domain. The backbone ribbons of FHA2 and the peptide are shown in purple and green, respectively. The side-chains of FHA2 and the peptide are shown in red and yellow, respectively. MOLMOL (Koradi et al., 1996) and Insight II (Molecular Simulations Inc.) were used for (a) and (b), respectively.
titration studies showed that the $K_d$ value of this peptide is similar to that of the Rad9 pTyr peptide, and that similar residues were shifted in the $^{15}$N-HSQC spectra. However, the magnitudes of shifts were smaller, and a smaller number of intermolecular NOEs were observed. Thus, complete determination of the complex structure was not performed. However, the results are sufficient to suggest that the two peptides interact with the same set of residues of FHA2.

Both NMR structure and library screening suggest that the residues C-terminal to the pTyr residue of the peptide are involved in the interaction with FHA2. In particular, the structure shows that a key interaction is mediated by the side-chains of the $-2$ residue and a hydrophobic surface on the FHA2 domain. Consistent with this mechanism, the result of library screening indicates that FHA2 shows the strongest selectivity at the $+2$ position.

Possible biological relevance of our results

Our results raise some interesting questions. First, why is the Rad9 pTyr829 sequence not selected from the library screening? Is Rad9 pTyr829 the physiological binding site of FHA2? The Rad9 sequence was not selected, most likely because it lacks a hydrophobic side-chain at the $+3$ position and therefore is weak binding. Among the 78 sequences in Table 3, none of them contained an Asp or Glu at the $+3$ position. Nevertheless, a number of the peptides selected from the library have very similar sequences to the Rad9 peptide.

**Figure 6.** Schematic ribbon diagrams of the FHA2-Rad9 pTyr peptide and the SH2-pTyr peptide (Eck et al., 1993) complex structures. The pTyr binding sites are also shown. The Figure was generated using MOLSCRIPT (Kraulis, 1991).

**Figure 7.** pTyr peptide sequence specificity for binding to the FHA2 domain. Displayed are the amino acid residues selected at the $-2$ to $+3$ positions relative to the pTyr residue. The $x$ axis indicates the identity of the 19 amino acid residues in single letter codes, whereas abundance on the $y$ axis represents the number of occurrence of an amino acid at a certain position (maximum 78). M, norleucine.
(pYYLD): pYYLF (no. 67), pYFLF (no. 40 and 41),
pYFL (no. 71), and pYFLV (no. 72), where large
hydrophobic or aromatic residues are selected for
the three residues C-terminal to the pTyr. The
second question is more difficult to answer, since
the actual Rad53 binding site(s) of Rad9 is still
unknown. However, among the 13 possible pTyr
sites, pTyr829-containing peptide binds to FHA2
with the highest affinity and therefore is the most
likely candidate (Liao et al., 1999) if the biological
binding site of FHA2 is a pTyr site. It is less likely
that the residues outside the −3 to +3 region are
involved in binding, since a Rad9 peptide extended
to 13 residues (825DEDI(pY)YLDIRIGD837) did not

Figure 8. Binding assay of the peptide DNS-GF(pY)-
LYFIR. The concentration of peptide for assay with
GST-FHA2 and GST was 96 nM; for assay with FHA2 it
was 432 nM.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Peptide sequence</th>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Peptide sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>RLpYLYF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>RTPYFLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MLpYLYF</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>SHpYLYF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>GFpYLYF</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>PIPYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>XXpYLYF</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>LApYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>QVPYLYY</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>FDPYKFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>GPpYLYY</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>VLPYLMF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DPpYLYF</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>VPpYMFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>VVPYLYF</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>RPpYLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RQPYLYF</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>XRPYLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>XXPYLYF</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>XRPYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NLpYLM</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>XXPYLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XPpYLM</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>VLPYLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>VPpYLM</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>RYPYMML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>IQPYLM</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>GLpYMML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>RFPYLYL</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>LPYPYLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>XXpYLM</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>LIPYLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>RMpYLM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>LDpYLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>EIPYLM</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>RRPYMML</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>EVpYLM</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>QFPYLLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>INpYYH</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>FPpYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>FFPYYH</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>XSPYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>VXpYYL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>XXPYMFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>IMpYYM</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>XLPYMFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>YHPYYLM</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>EFPYMFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>XPpYLM</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>SRpYYHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>NFPYYL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>NWpYYHY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>XXpYYL</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>XXPYFRY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>DVpYYFM</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>XXPYYLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>LVpYYFM</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>XLPYMFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>VNPYYYM</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>XXPYLF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>KLpYYEY</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>LApYLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>HWpYFEY</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>LMPYFEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>FApYYFM</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>SPFYFLV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>XMPYFFFF</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>GPyYGAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>XXpYYFF</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>GPyYVS1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>XPpYYFM</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>XXPYMK1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>XXpYYFF</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>XXPYMFI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>SVPYFF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>SApYIQG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>XEPYYFL</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>XSPYPAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Dissociation constants of pTyr peptides to
FHA2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>GST-FHA2</th>
<th>FHA2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GF(pY)LYFIR</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.7 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV(pY)FYLMR</td>
<td>5.0 ± 0.6</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ(pY)YHMR</td>
<td>~100</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND, not determined.
bind FHA2 any tighter than the shorter peptide (unpublished data). Rather, it may require other Rad9 segments, which are distal in primary sequences but spatially close to pTyr829, to complete the binding to FHA2 of Rad53. It is also possible that FHA2 binds to a pThr site of Rad9, since our preliminary data indicate that FHA2 also binds some pThr peptides (unpublished results).

**FHA domains have dual phosphopeptide specificity**

In our earlier paper (Liao et al., 1999) we proposed that FHA domains could have pTyr and pSer/pThr dual specificity, or FHA domains from different proteins could have different specificity. Our preliminary results from screening pThr, pSer, and pTyr libraries against FHA1 and FHA2 domains suggest that both domains are capable of binding to all three types of phosphopeptides (unpublished results). Since the pSer/pThr specificity is widely accepted for FHA domains (Durocher et al., 1999; Li et al., 1999; Yaffe & Cantley, 1999), our demonstration of the pTyr specificity for the FHA2 domain here provides conclusive experimental evidence for our dual specificity proposal. Thus, FHA domains represent the first phosphoprotein-binding module that has pTyr and pSer/pThr dual specificity. The structural determination of an FHA-pThr peptide complex is being completed in our laboratory and will be reported shortly.

**Materials and Methods**

**Materials**

TentaGel S NH2 resin, Wang resin, N-9-fluorenylmethoxycarbonyl (Fmoc)-amino acids, 1-hydroxybenzotriazole (HOBT) and 2-(1H-benzotriazole-1-yl)-1,1,3,3-tetramethyluronium hexafluorophosphate (HBTU) were purchased from Advanced ChemTech (Louisville, KY). N-Hydroxysuccinimidobiotin, acetylglucose, N-acetyl-d,L-alanine, 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate, streptavidin-alkaline phosphatase and dansyl chloride were obtained from the Sigma Chemical Co. (St. Louis, MO). All other chemicals were purchased from Aldrich Chemical (Milwaukee, WI).

The FHA2 domain of Rad53 (residues 573-730) were cloned into pGEX-4T vector (Pharmacia Biotech) for expression of glutathione S-transferase (GST) fusion proteins in BL21(DE3) (Novagen). The fusion proteins (GST-FHA2) were purified using glutathione agarose (Sigma). The GST tag was removed by thrombin (Sigma) digestion and gel-filtration chromatography. Isootope-labeled proteins were expressed in M9 media containing 15NH4Cl and 13C]glucose correspondingly. The purified Rad9 pTyr peptide (EDI[pY]YLD) was purchased from Genemed Synthesis, Inc. (S. San Francisco, CA).

**NMR experiments**

NMR experiments were performed on a Bruker DMX-600 or DRX-800 spectrometer at 20 °C. The protein concentration was 0.5 mM. The samples contained 10 mM sodium phosphate, 1 mM DTT, and 1 mM EDTA in 95 % H2O/5 % 2H2O or 100 % 2H2O at pH 6.5. Intermolecular (FHA2-Rad9 pTyr peptide) NOEs were identified from 3D 13C-edited (f3), 13C/15N-filtered (f1) NOESY (Lee et al., 1994), and the intramolecular NOE assignments of the pTyr peptide were obtained using 2D 13C/15N-filtered NOESY (Ikura & Bax, 1992; Lee et al., 1994) using the complexed sample ([13C/15N-FHA2][pTyr peptide] ~ 1:2). The intramolecular NOEs for the FHA2 domain in the complexed form were identified using 3D 13N-edited NOESY (Sklenar et al., 1995; GrzesieK & Bax, 1993) and 15C-edited NOESY (Fesik & Zuiderweg, 1988) using the complexed sample. A mixing time of 100 ms was used for all the NOESY data. The NOESY data were processed and analyzed using XWIN-NMR 2.6 (Bruker) or Felix 95.0 (Molecular Simulations Inc.). Structural calculations were conducted using a simulated annealing method (Nilges et al., 1988) within X-PLOR (Brünger, 1992) using the distance restraint derived from the identified NOEs and H-bonds as well as the backbone torsion angle restraints derived from the TALOS program (Cornilescu et al., 1999). For the complex structure calculation, three additional distance restraints (4.3±0.3 Å for the Cα of Arg605, Arg617, and Arg620 to the P atom of pTyr) were included, since the NMR titration data (Figure 2) and the complex structural calculation without these three restraints (not shown) clearly indicated that these three Arg side-chains are involved in binding (approximately 4.5 Å from the Arg Nα atom to the phosphate group O atom). The structures were analyzed by X-PLOR (Brünger, 1992), PROCHECK (Laskowski et al., 1993), and MOLMOL (Corradi et al., 1996). For both the free and the pTyr peptide-complexed FHA2 structures, the final 19 structures with lowest energy were selected from a total of 60 calculated ones.

Peptide-binding experiments were performed by recording a series of 2D 13N-HSQC spectra (GrzesieK & Bax, 1993) on uniformly 15N-labeled protein samples with different concentrations of peptides. The pH of the samples was maintained at pH 6.5 throughout the titration.

**Synthesis of the phosphotyrosyl peptide library**

TentaGel S NH2 resin (0.3 mmol/g loading, 2.86 x 106 beads/g, 80-100 μm) was used as the solid support for the peptide library. Synthesis was carried out on a 5.0 g scale on a home-made peptide synthesis apparatus using standard Fmoc/HBTU/HOBTr chemistry (Bodanszky, 1993). A common linker of four amino acids (for all random residues and phosphotyrosine (for all random residues and phosphotyrosine) was used, whereas a 1:1 mixture of acetylglucose and acetylalanine (total 10 %) was used during the coupling of isoleucine. After library synthesis was complete, deprotection was carried out using a cocktail containing 90 % (v/v) TFA,
2% anisole, 3% ethanediol, and 5% thioanisole for one hour at room temperature. The resin was washed with CH$_2$O$_2$ (10 ml) and methanol (5 ml), dried under vacuum, and stored at $-20{\degree}C$.

**Synthesis of dansylated peptides**

Peptides were synthesized on Wang resin using standard Fmoc/HBTU/HOBt chemistry on a 0.15-mmol scale. Coupling reactions were carried out with a fourfold excess of amino acids for at least one hour and the completion of the reaction was ensured by ninhydrin tests. Addition of a dansyl group to the N-terminal amino group was effectuated by incubating the protected, resin-bound peptide with 1.5 equivalents of dansyl chloride and three equivalents of triethylamine for 45 minutes at room temperature. Deprotection of the side-chains and cleavage of the peptide from the resin were carried out using the same cocktail as described above. The resulting peptide solution was drained into a glass vial and the solvent was evaporated under a flow of nitrogen gas. The semi-solid residue was triturated with anhydrous diethyl ether (3 ml) and stored at $-20{\degree}C$. The crude product was purified by reversed-phase HPLC before use. The identity of all dansylated peptides was confirmed by matrix-assisted laser desorption ionization mass spectrometry (MALDI MS) analysis.

**Preparation of biotinylated GST-FHA2**

Biotinylated GST-FHA2 was obtained by treating GST-FHA2 (114 µM) with 2.5 molar equivalents of N-hydroxysuccinimidobiotin (NHS-biotin) in PBS buffer (50 mM Na/PO$_4$, 350 mM NaCl (pH 7.4)) for three hours before the reaction was quenched by the addition of 4 µl of 2-aminoethanol (17 M). The biotinylated protein was quickly frozen and stored at $-80{\degree}C$ until use.

**On-bead screening of the pTyr peptide library against GST-FHA2**

Library screening was conducted in three separate batches. For each batch, 300 mg of resin was incubated with DMF (2 x 10 ml) for 30 minutes and exhaustively washed with water (20 x 10 ml) in a plastic column fitted with a filter/disc (Bio-Rad) before use. After incubation of the resin in 3.5 ml of TBS buffer (25 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mg/ml gelatin) for one hour, 70 µl of biotinylated GST-FHA2 (final concentration = 0.9 µM) was added to the solution. After overnight incubation at room temperature, the solution was drained, and 2.5 ml of TBS buffer, 70 µl of 1.5 M potassium phosphate (pH 7.4), and 10 µl of streptavidin-alkaline phosphatase (final concentration = 22 nm) were added to the resin. After incubation at room temperature for 15 minutes, the solution was again drained and the resin was washed with PBS buffer (10 ml) and then TBS buffer (10 ml). The resin was resuspended in 12 ml of TBS buffer (25 mM Tris (pH 8.5), 150 mM NaCl) in a Petri dish, and 6 mg of 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl phosphate was added to the mixture. The Petri dish was placed on a shaker at room temperature. Positive beads stained with intense turquoise color emerged from the dish within one hour. The staining reaction was stopped by treating the resin with 4 ml of 6 M guanidine-HCl for 20 minutes. The resin was washed with double-distilled water (10 x 3 ml) and the positive beads were removed from the dish and placed in individual Eppendorf tubes using a pipette under a low-power microscope. A control screening was conducted under the same conditions except that no GST-FHA2 protein was included in the screening. No colored beads were observed.

**Peptide sequencing by MALDI mass spectrometry**

Each positive bead selected from the library was treated with 20 µl of a CNBr solution (20 mg/ml in 70% formic acid) in a microcentrifuge tube in the dark for 20-24 hours at room temperature. After evaporation of the solvent under vacuum, the residue was dissolved in 5 µl of 0.1% TFA solution. For MALDI MS analysis, 1 µl of the peptide solution was mixed with 2 µl of a saturated solution of α-cyano-4-hydroxycinnamic acid in 50% aqueous acetonitrile. A 1 µl volume of the mixture was spotted onto the MALDI sample slide. After crystallization of the mixture, the sample was analyzed on a Kratos Kompact MALDI-III mass spectrometer.

**Determination of binding constants**

Binding of the dansylated peptides to GST-FHA2 or free FHA2 domain was monitored by fluorescence energy transfer from tryptophan residues in the protein to the dansyl group in the peptides on a Perkin-Elmer LS-5 spectrofluorimeter. The tryptophan residues were excited at 290 nm while the emission of the dansyl group at 520 nm was monitored. All binding assays were carried out in a phosphate buffer (4.3 mM Na/PO$_4$, 1.5 mM K/PO$_4$, 140 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl (pH 7.3)). Typically, the mixture of the peptide (0.2 µM) and varying concentrations of the protein (1-10 µM) was incubated for 10-20 minutes before the reading was taken. The net fluorescence increase ($\Delta F$) at 520 nm due to energy transfer was obtained for each protein concentration by subtracting the background fluorescence caused by the peptide, the protein, and the buffer solution from the total fluorescence. The experimental data were fitted against the equation:

$$\Delta F = \Delta F_{\text{max}} \cdot C/(K_d + C)$$

where $K_d$ is the dissociation constant, $\Delta F$ is the fluorescence enhancement at a given protein concentration C, and $\Delta F_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum fluorescence enhancement. Protein concentrations were determined by Bradford assay. The dansylated peptides were dissolved in 50% DMF and their concentrations were determined by measuring the absorbance of the dansyl group at 350 nm ($\varepsilon_{350} = 4.57 \times 10^3$ M$^{-1}$ cm$^{-1}$).

**Accession numbers**

Coordinates for the refined FHA2 and its complex structure with the Rad9 pTyr peptide have been deposited in the RCSB PDB (accession numbers are 1FHQ and 1FHR, respectively) and will be released upon publication of this work.
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