



Role of Mutations in Increasing Protein Constancy

Ali Ramezani Ahmadabadi*, Kaveh Mohammadi, Milad Valitabar

Department of Chemical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Kermanshah Branch, Islamic Azad University, Kermanshah, Iran

*Corresponding Author

Abstract: *There are many methods to choose mutations that increase the constancy of proteins, including rational design, functional screening of accidentally generated mutant libraries, and comparison of naturally occurring similar proteins. The protein engineer's toolbox is expanding and the number of successful instances of engineered protein constancy is increasing. Still, the selection of heat constancy mutations is not a standard process. Selection is complicated by lack of knowledge of the process that turns into thermal inactivation and by the fact that proteins employ a large variety of structural tricks to get constancy.*

Keywords: *Thermostable, Enzyme Stability, Thermophile, Random Mutagenesis, Protein Design, Protein Engineering*

INTRODUCTION

Many factors that limit the industrial use of enzymes are joined to the lack of constancy of these biocatalysts. When developing enzymatic processes, conflicts between optimization of process conditions and the fragility of enzymes are likely to appear. Thermal constancy of the biocatalyst is of main importance as running a process at high temperatures has many merits, for example, higher reaction rates, higher solubility of reactants and less microbial contamination. In general, better operational enzyme constancy will reduce process costs.

During the past 15 years there has been a continuous flow of reports describing proteins stabilized by the introduction of mutations. These reports span a period from pioneering rational design work on small enzymes (Matthews BW, 1995) to complete in computo design (Malakauskas SM, et al., 1998) and the use of random mutation strategies coupled with high-throughput screening for improved constancy (Giver L, et al., 1998; Martin A, et al., 2001; Wintrode PL, et al., 2000). Along the way, many constancy mutations have been chosen. Here we describe recent examples of mutant selection and discuss the current possibilities and limitations in engineering protein constancy.

Points from proteins from extremophiles

One way to get hyperconstancy enzymes is to look for them in organisms that grow under extreme conditions. During the past decade, many such enzymes have been described and characterized in detail (recently reviewed in (Stern R, et al., 2001; Vieille C, et al., 2001).

In principle, studies of naturally occurring hyperconstancy enzymes could provide important leads for the selection of constancy mutations. In its most simple form, this is indeed the case: there are numerous examples of proteins that have been stabilized by the introduction of structural elements found in their

similar parts isolated from hyperthermophilic organisms (Eijsink VGH, et al., 1995; Shriprapund D, et al., 2000; Perl D, et al., 2000; Delbruck H, et al., 2001; Pedone E, et al., 2001). Studies of hyperstable enzymes have, however, also shown that there is great variation in the (presumed) structural basis of hyperstability, meaning that it is difficult to derive general 'rules' for protein constancy from the available data.

Two of the most main characteristics of naturally occurring hyperstable enzymes are the presence of large surface networks of electrostatic interactions and a tendency to be multimeric (Sterner R, et al., 2001; Vieille C, et al., 2001; Szilagyi A, et al., 2000). There is some evidence in recent literature supporting the notion that these two characteristics indeed contribute to protein constancy (Szilagyi A, et al., 2000; Walden H, et al., 2001; Dalhus B, et al., 2002; Flores H, et al., 2002). Luckily, these characteristics are not easy to engineer into any protein one wants to stabilize.

Electrostatic networks are complex and contain cooperative interactions between several residues. The findings in hyperstable enzymes have revived interest in the contribution of charged surface residues to protein constancy (Elcock AH, 1998; Xiao L, et al., 1999; Sanchez-Ruiz JM, et al., 2001). This has gotten some interesting studies, clearly showing that surface electrostatics is worth looking at when stabilizing a protein (Grimsley GR, et al., 1999; Loladze VV, et al., 1999; Spector S, et al., 2000; Perl D, et al., 2001; Marshall SA, et al., 2002) however, there are hardly any examples of proteins that have been stabilized by engineering designed networks of electrostatic interactions on the surface.

Multimerization can be engineered in the sense that one may stabilize a multimeric protein by strengthening the interactions between the monomers (Thoma R, et al., 2000; Clantin B, et al., 2001; Flores H, et al., 2002). However, converting a monomeric protein into a stable multimer is not a simple role and cannot be counted as a clear strategy for the protein.

constancy engineer

Ever since the early days of constancy engineering, one has sought after statistical rules that would enable the stabilization of any protein, possibly even without the availability of a crystal structure. It is now more clear than ever that finding such rules makes limited sense. Every single mutation needs to be evaluated in its specific structural context, while taking into account the character of the thermal inactivation mechanism of the protein in question (Vieille C, et al., 2001; Eijsink VGH, et al., 2001; Sagermann M, et al., 2002) Work on extremophilic enzymes certainly has yielded new clues as to how one might try to achieve get stabilization by mutagenesis, but has not shown a defined and secure road to success.

It is important to note that there are many examples in the literature of proteins that have been stabilized dramatically by just a very limited number of mutations (Perl D, et al., 2000; Pedone E, et al., 2001; Mansfeld J, et al., 1999; Williams JC, et al., 1999). In fact, theoretically, this is to be expected as the net constancy of a protein equals the energy of only a very limited number of beneficial interactions. Although this observation in principle enlightens the task of the protein engineer, it underlines the fact that sequence statistics are not of much use.

The consensus approach

The consensus approach is based on the assumption that kept residues, as inferred from an alignment of homologous amino acid sequences, contribute more to constancy than residues that are not kept. Indeed, it has been shown that highly stable fungal phytases may be gotten by combining 'consensus' residues in one multiple mutated variant (Pasamontes L, et al., 2000). These rather surprising results may be rationalized in part by assuming a common thermophilic ancestor. This idea was recently proved by Miyazaki et al.

(Miyazaki J, et al., 2001), who used phylogeny to identify ancestral residues in 3-isopropylmalate dehydrogenases. It was shown that natural variants of the enzyme lacking some of the ancestral residues could be stabilized by introducing these residues. The consensus approach has recently been used to study the importance and evolution of packing in the hydrophobic core of staphylococcal nuclease, which contributes to the constancy of the enzyme (Chen J, et al., 2001) Of the many sequences tested, the consensus sequences were among the better ones, but were not necessarily the best. In conclusion, it seems that the consensus approach may be a valuable additional tool for the protein constancy engineer, which exploits the vast amount of protein sequences that are available today.

Lessons from random mutagenesis studies

The recent development of different molecular breeding technologies has led to the creation of many new biocatalysts, including variants with significantly improved constancy characteristics (for recent reviews see (Wintrode PL, et al., 2000; Bornscheuer UT, et al., 2001; Chen R, 2001; Arnold FH, 2001). The potential of these methods for constancy engineering is illustrated by the construction of subtilisin variants with an up to 1200 times increase in $t_{1/2}$ at 60°C (Zhao H, et al., 1999; Wintrode PL, et al., 2001), an esterase showing a 14°C increase in T_m (Giver L, et al., 1998) a galactose oxidase with a 4°C increase in T_{50} (Sun L, et al., 2001) and a cold-shock protein with a 28°C increase in T_m (Martin A, et al., 2001). Analysis of the selected amino acid substitutions has not provided straightforward explanations concerning the molecular basis of the stabilization that was obtained (Spiller B, et al., 1999). In general, the mutations selected by random mutagenesis approaches are scattered over the protein molecule (often near the surface) and their effects cannot always be explained on the basis of generally accepted principles of protein constancy.

The screening procedures that are employed in approaches based on random mutagenesis need major attention. The screening procedure must be both suitable for high-throughput analysis and sufficiently discriminative. Preferably, assay conditions are such that only stabilized variants are active, thus enabling them to be detected in a single step. Several new approaches are being developed to accomplish further improvements in high-thro (Cohen N, et al., 2001)

Among the screening procedures for thermostable biocatalysts, exploitation of thermophilic hosts could be a promising alternative. Unfortunately, to date, the expression of and selection for (essential) gene products in such hosts has not been explored to a great extent. Partly, this is because of the poor genetic accessibility of thermophiles. At present, the number of genetic tools available for thermophilic hosts is still limited. Nevertheless, cloning and selection in the thermophilic bacterium *Thermus thermophilus* was recently exploited successfully for the selection (Tamakoshi M, et al., 2001)

Rational engineering and design

As described above, neither studies of proteins from thermophilic organisms nor efforts in various types of protein engineering have yielded a simple set of 'rules' for protein stabilization with general practical application. Nevertheless, several rational approaches for protein stabilization do exist and these have been applied in successful constancy engineering of a variety of proteins. These approaches include improvement of the packing of the hydrophobic core, the introduction of disulfide bridges, stabilization of α -helix dipoles, engineering of surface salt bridges, and point mutations aimed at reducing the entropy of the unfolded state (Xaa→Pro and Gly→Xaa mutations, where Xaa is any amino acid; reviewed in (Sterner R, et al., 2001; Vieille C, et al., 2001) and in many reviews published in the previous decade). Each of these approaches has been shown to work in some cases, but many failures do exist too.

Entropic stabilization is one of the most promising strategies for the protein engineer (for some recent examples see (B, Vriend G, et al., 1998; Stewart RJ, et al., 2001; Muslin EH, et al., 2002)) and is also employed by nature (Eijsink VGH, et al., 1995; Watanabe K, et al., 1997) A prerequisite for mutations that decrease the entropy of the unfolded state is that the mutations do not introduce unfavorable strain in the folded protein structure. Thus, careful examination of the available structural information is necessary. Nevertheless, from a modelling point of view, entropic stabilizations (especially Ala→Pro and Gly→Ala) are among the ones that are easiest to evaluate. The main challenge is to assess the occurrence and possible effects of steric overlap that may be introduced (Shriprapund D, et al., 2004).

One of the most important developments in constancy engineering over the past few years has been the revived interest in the protein surface and in surface salt bridges. For a long time, the protein surface was considered relatively uninteresting, because surface mutations were supposed to affect protein constancy only marginally. In addition, some ten years ago, there was a certain consensus saying that surface salt bridges were not that important for constancy. Remarkably, however, many of the recent constancy engineering studies mentioned above concern surface-located mutations, in several cases affecting (Martin A, et al., 2001; Grimsley GR, et al., 1999; Loladze VV, et al., 1999; Perl D, et al., 2001; Zhao H, et al., 1999; B, Vriend G, et al., 1998; Pokkuluri PR, et al., 2002).

Probably one of the best analyses of the importance of protein surfaces and surface electrostatics for constancy comes from recent studies on the cold-shock proteins CspB and CspC from *Bacillus subtilis* and *Bacillus caldolyticus*, respectively (Martin A, et al., 2001; Perl D, et al., 2000; Delbruck H, et al., 2001; Perl D, et al., 2001) These and other studies (Grimsley GR, et al., 1999) emphasize that one should not only pay attention to salt bridges, but also to the overall charge distribution and to longer-range electrostatic interactions. It is important to note that surface salt bridges presumably become more favorable for constancy as temperature increases (Elcock AH, 1998; Xiao L, et al., 1999).

Surface residues are particularly important in proteins whose thermal inactivation is governed by local (as opposed to global) unfolding processes (see below). Obviously, such local (partial) processes are expected to mostly involve the protein surface.

Unfortunately, the rational design of mutations affecting the protein surface and/or electrostatics is intrinsically difficult. The surface of the protein is more flexible than other parts and its structure is usually less well defined (high B factors). In addition, the surface structure observed in X-ray crystal structures may in part be the result of (artificial) crystal contacts. Thus, the structural finesse of the protein surface is difficult to assess in 'static' modeling programs. Electrostatic calculations on proteins are still extremely difficult and, consequently, the prediction of mutations that could improve constancy by means of electrostatic interactions is complicated (Sanchez-Ruiz JM., 2001) One advantage of directing mutagenesis efforts to the protein surface is the high chance of obtaining an active form of the protein. In general, structural adaptability is much larger in surface regions than in the core of the protein. Thus, the chances of completely ruining the protein structure are small for a surface mutation, but much larger for a core mutation.

Pitfalls in rational design

One major advantage of engineering stability by the random approach is that one does not need to know much about the thermal inactivation process. The success of rational design is, however, greatly dependent on sufficient knowledge of the inactivation mechanism. If one is sure that stability of the protein in question depends on (reversible) global unfolding, constancy is relatively easy to rationalize. In such cases, it makes sense to apply the well-understood mutational strategies described above (e.g. entropic stabilization). By

studying the structure and using modeling programs such as WHAT IF (Vriend G, 1990), one can design stabilizing mutations anywhere in the protein and one may expect a reasonable success rate.

In most cases, and especially under industrial conditions, thermal inactivation is not likely to depend on global unfolding, but rather on partial (local) unfolding followed by an irreversible process such as aggregation or proteolysis (Eijsink VGH, et al., 2001; Fink AL, 1998; Finke JM, et al., 2000; Hori T, et al., 2000; Younus H, et al., 2001). This has profound consequences for constancy engineering as the effects of a mutation will no longer only depend on its thermodynamic effect, but also on its location in the protein. Consequently, not every mutation that is thermodynamically stabilizing will indeed stabilize against irreversible thermal inactivation. Likewise, the best mutations for kinetic constancy are not necessarily the best ones for thermodynamic constancy (Durr Schmidt P, et al., 2001). The literature contains a few studies showing discrepancies between mutational effects on thermodynamic and kinetic stability (Finke JM, et al., 2000; Durr Schmidt P, et al., 2001; Chrnyk BA, et al., 1993). The more local the constancy-determining unfolding process is, the larger the chance that a designed stabilizing mutation simply does not affect kinetic constancy at all. We have seen many such mutations in our own laboratories (in various proteins). Obviously, such mutations are not likely to appear in the scientific literature.

Our own work on engineering the constancy of *Bacillus* neutral proteases has underlined the importance of local unfolding for constancy (Eijsink VGH, et al., 2001; B, Vriend G, et al., 1998; Vriend G, et al., 1998). Of the very many potentially stabilizing mutations that were made, only a few were clearly stabilizing and these were all clustered in a certain surface region of the protein. This region is crucial in a local unfolding process that is rate-limiting for thermal inactivation (irreversibility is in this case caused by autoprolysis). Once this region had been identified, stabilization of the enzyme by rational design proved to be relatively straightforward (Mansfeld J, et al., 1997; B, Vriend G, et al., 1998). Proteases such as these are likely to be quite special in that they have very high kinetic stabilities, while being thermodynamically moderately stable or even unstable. Recent studies of the folding and stability of α -lytic protease provide fascinating insight into the peculiarities of the constancy of certain proteases. These studies show the necessity of considering protein folding energetics and dynamics when setting up stabilization strategies (Jaswal SS, et al., 2002).

Stabilizing mutations and activity

Natural hyperstable enzymes tend to have low activity at medium temperatures. For a long time, it was thus believed that high constancy could only be achieved by sacrificing activity at low temperatures. It is now clear that this is not the case. As long as stabilizing mutations do not have direct detrimental effects on active-site residues or active-site architecture, it is fully possible to engineer hyperstable enzymes that retain their activity at low temperatures (Wintrode PL, et al., 2000; Williams JC, et al., 1999; B, Vriend G, et al., 1998)

Conclusions and perspectives

In recent years the protein engineer's knowledge-base and toolbox for the prediction and introduction of thermostability-improving mutations have changed quite considerably. The advent of new stabilization strategies based on random mutagenesis coupled to high-throughput screening probably represents the most important development. With respect to the development of our knowledge-base, two developments stand out. One is the increasing awareness of the importance of the protein surface for constancy. In the early days of protein engineering much constancy-related research was focussed on stabilization of the hydrophobic core and other more or less 'internal' structural elements (see (Pakula AA, et al., 1990) for an interesting and early exception). Recent research, however, has unambiguously shown that the surface of the protein should be one of the first targets for a protein constancy engineer.

A second important development in rational constancy engineering is the increased understanding of how the character of the thermal inactivation mechanism affects the success of a stabilization strategy. The choice of a rational stabilization strategy for a biocatalyst must depend on the envisioned application of the biocatalyst, as process conditions may affect the thermal inactivation mechanism.

Although nowadays several powerful strategies for protein stabilization are available to the protein engineer, an easy-to-use high-precision tool set for rational engineering is still lacking. The accumulated information from genome sequencing projects and from the increasing number of structures (both X-ray and NMR) of psychrophilic, mesophilic, thermophilic and hyperthermophilic homologous proteins indicates that mechanisms underlying thermostability are highly diverse. However, in view of the anticipated forthcoming increase in available data, from rational mutagenesis, directed evolution, genome sequencing and structure determinations, it is likely that the tool set will become more user friendly and accurate in due time.

References

1. Arnold FH: Combinatorial and computational challenges for biocatalyst design. *Nature* 2001, 409:253-257.
2. B, Vriend G, Veltman or, Venema G, Eijsink VGH: Early steps in the unfolding of thermolysin-like proteases. *J Biol Chem* 1998, 273:35074-35077.
3. Bornscheuer UT, Pohl M: Improved biocatalysts by directed evolution and rational protein design. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 2001, 5:137-143.
4. Chen J, Stites WE: Packing is a key selection factor in the evolution of protein hydrophobic cores. *Biochemistry* 2001, 40:15280-15289.
5. Chen R: Enzyme engineering: rational redesign versus directed evolution. *Trends Biotechnol* 2001, 19:13-14.
6. Chrnyk BA, Wetzel R: Breakdown in the relationship between thermal and thermodynamic stability in an interleukin-1 β point mutant modified in a surface loop. *Protein Eng* 1993, 6:733-738.
7. Clantin B, Tricot C, Lonhienne T, Stalon V, Villeret V: Probing the role of oligomerization in the high thermal stability of *Pyrococcus furiosus* ornithine carbamoyltransferase by site-specific mutants. *Eur J Biochem* 2001, 268:3937-3942.
8. Cohen N, Abramov S, Dror Y, Freeman A: In vitro enzyme evolution: the screening challenge of isolating the one in a million. *Trends Biotechnol* 2001, 19:507-510.
9. Dalhus B, Sarinen M, Sauer UH, Eklund P, Johansson K, Karlsson A, Ramaswamy S, Bjørk A, Synstad B, Naterstad K, Sirevag R, Eklund H: Structural basis for thermophilic protein stability: structures of thermophilic and mesophilic malate dehydrogenases. *J Mol Biol* 2002, 318:707-721.
10. Delbruck H, Mueller U, Perl D, Schmid FX, Heinemann U: Crystal structures of mutant forms of the *Bacillus caldolyticus* cold shock protein differing in thermal stability. *J Mol Biol* 2001, 313:359-369.
11. Durrschmidt P, Mansfeld J, Ulbrich-Hofmann R: Differentiation between conformational and autoproteolytic stability of the neutral protease from *Bacillus stearothermophilus* containing an engineered disulfide bond. *Eur J Biochem* 2001, 268:3612-3618.
12. Eijsink VGH, Veltman OR, Aukema W, Vriend G, Venema G: Structural determinants of the stability of thermolysin-like proteinases, *Nature Structural Biology* vol. 2, p. 374-379 (1995)
13. Eijsink VGH, Vriend G, Van den Burg B: Engineering a hyperstable Biocatalysis Biotransformation 2001, 19:443-458.
14. Elcock AH: The stability of salt bridges at high temperatures: implications for hyperthermophilic proteins. *J Mol Biol* 1998, 284:489-502.

15. Fink AL: Protein aggregation: folding aggregates, inclusion bodies and amyloid. *Fold Des* 1998, 3: R9-R23.
16. Finke JM, Roy M, Zimm BH, Jennings PA: Aggregation events occur prior to stable intermediate formation during refolding of interleukin 1 β . *Biochemistry* 2000, 39:575-583.
17. Flores H, Ellington AD: Increasing the thermal stability of an oligomeric protein, β -glucuronidase. *J Mol Biol* 2002, 315:325-337.
18. Giver L, Gershenson A, Freskgard P, Arnold FH: Directed evolution of a thermostable esterase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1998, 95:12809-12813.
19. Grimsley GR, Shaw KL, Fee LR, Alston RW, Huyghues-Despointes BMP, Thurlkill RL, Scholtz JM, Pace CN: Increasing protein stability by altering long-range coulombic interactions. *Protein Sci* 1999, 8:1843-1849.
20. Hori T, Moriyama H, Kawaguchi J, Hayashi-Iwasaki Y, Oshima T, Tanaka N: The initial step of thermal unfolding of 3-isopropylmalate dehydrogenase detected by the temperature- jump Laue method. *Protein Eng* 2000, 13:527-533.
21. Jaswal SS, Sohl JL, Davis JH, Agard DA: Energetic landscape of α -lytic protease optimizes longevity through kinetic stability. *Nature* 2002, 415:343-346.
22. Loladze VV, Ibarra-Molero B, Sanchez-Ruiz JM, Makhatadze GI:24. Engineering a thermostable protein via optimization of charge-charge interactions on the protein surface. *Biochemistry* 1999, 38:16419-16423.
23. Malakauskas SM, Mayo SL: Design, structure and stability of a hyper thermophilic protein variant. *Nat Struct Biol* 1998, 5:470-475.
24. Mansfeld J, Vriend G, Dijkstra BW, Veltman OR, Van den Burg B, Venema G, Ulbrich-Hofmann R, Eijsink VGH: Extreme stabilization of a thermolysin-like protease by an engineered disulfide bond. *J Biol Chem* 1997, 272:11152-11156.
25. Marshall SA, Morgan CS, Mayo SL: Electrostatics significantly affect the stability of designed homeodomain variants. *J Mol Biol* 2002, 316:189-199.
26. Martin A, Sieber V, Schmid FX: In vitro selection of highly stabilized protein variants with optimized surface. *J Mol Biol* 2001, 309:717-726
27. Matthews BW: Studies on protein stability with T4 lysozyme. *Adv Protein Chem* 1995, 46:249-278.
28. Miyazaki J, Nakaya S, Suzuki T, Tamakoshi M, Oshima T, Yamagishi A: Ancestral residues stabilizing 3-isopropylmalate dehydrogenase of an extreme thermophile: experimental evidence supporting the thermophilic common ancestor hypothesis. *J Biochem* 2001, 129:777-782.
29. Muslin EH, Clark SE, Henson CA: The effect of proline insertions on the thermostability of barley α -glucosidase. *Protein Eng* 2002, 15:29-33.
30. Pakula AA, Sauer RT: Reverse hydrophobic effects relieved by amino- acid substitutions at a protein surface. *Nature* 1990, 344:363-364. Van den Burg.
31. Pasamontes L, Van Loon APGM: From DNA sequence to improved functionality: using protein sequence comparisons to rapidly design a thermostable consensus phytase. *Protein Eng* 2000, 13:49-57.
32. Pedone E, Saviono M, Rossi M, Bartolucci S: A single point mutation (Glu85Arg) increases the stability of the thioredoxin from *Escherichia coli*. *Protein Eng* 2001, 14:255-260.
33. Perl D, Mueller U, Heinemann U, Schmid FX: Two exposed amino acid residues confer thermostability on a cold shock protein. *Nat Struct Biol* 2000, 7:380-383.
34. Perl D, Schmid FX: Electrostatic stabilization of a thermophilic cold shock protein. *J Mol Biol* 2001, 313:343-357.

35. Pokkuluri PR, Raffin R, Dieckmann L, Boogaard C, Stevens FJ, Schiffer M: Increasing protein stability by polar surface residues: domain-wide consequences of interactions within a loop. *Biophys J* 2002, 82:391-398.
36. Sagermann M, Martensson LG, Baase WA, Matthews BW: A test of • proposed rules for helix capping: implications for protein design. *Protein Sci* 2002, 11:516-521.
37. Sanchez-Ruiz JM, Makhatadze GI: To charge or not to charge? *Trends Biotechnol* 2001, 19:132-135.
38. Shriprasad D, Vielle C, Zeikus JG: Molecular determinants of xylose isomerase thermal stability and activity: analysis by site-directed mutagenesis. *Protein Eng* 2000, 13:259-265.
39. Spector S, Wang M, Carp SA, Robblee J, Hendsch ZS, Fairman R, Tidor B, Raleigh DP: Rational modification of protein stability by the mutation of charged surface residues. *Biochemistry* 2000, 39:872-879.
40. Spiller B, Gershenson A, Arnold FH, Stevens RC: A structural view of evolutionary divergence. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1999, 96:12305-12310.
41. Sterner R, Liebl W: Thermophilic adaptation of proteins. *Crit Rev Biochem Mol Biol* 2001, 36:39-106.
42. Stewart RJ, Varghese JN, Garrett TPJ, Hoj PB, Fincher GB: Mutant barley (1→3, 1→4) β -glucan endohydrolases with enhanced thermostability. *Protein Eng* 2001, 14:245-253.
43. Sun L, Petrounia IP, Yagasaki M, Bandara G, Arnold FH: Expression and stabilization of galactose oxidase in *Escherichia coli* by directed evolution. *Protein Eng* 2001, 14:699-704.
44. Szilagy A, Zavodsky P: Structural differences between mesophilic, moderately thermophilic and extremely thermophilic protein subunits: results of a comprehensive survey. *Structure* 2000, 8:493-504.
45. Tamakoshi M, Nakano Y, Kakizawa S, Yamagishi A, Oshima T: Selection of stabilized 3-isopropylmalate dehydrogenase of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* using the host-vector system of an extreme thermophile, *Thermus thermophilus*. *Extremophiles* 2001, 5:17-22.
46. Thoma R, Hennig M, Sterner R, Kirschner K: Structure and function of mutationally generated monomers of dimeric phosphoribosylanthranilate isomerase from *Thermotoga maritima*. *Structure* 2000, 8:265-276.
47. Vetriani C, Maeder DL, Tolliday N, Yip KSP, Stillman TJ, Britton KL, Rice DW, Klump HH, Robb FT: Protein thermostability above 100°C: a key role for ionic interactions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 1998, 95:12300-12305.
48. Vieille C, Zeikus GJ: Mechanisms for thermostability. *Microbiol Mol Biol, Rev* 2001, 65:1-43
49. Vriend G, Berendsen HJC, Van den Burg B, Venema G, Eijsink VGH:56. Early steps in the unfolding of thermolysin-like proteases. *J Biol Chem* 1998, 273:35074-35077.
50. Vriend G: WHAT IF, a molecular modeling and drug design program. *J Mol Graph* 8:52-56.
51. Walden H, Bell GS, Russell RJM, Siebers B, Hensel R, Taylor GL: A small, tetrameric, hyperthermostable triosephosphate isomerase. *J. Mol. Biol.* (2001) 306, 745–757.
52. Watanabe K, Hata Y, Kizaki H, Katsube Y, Suzuki Y: The refined crystal structure of *Bacillus cereus* oligo-1,6-glucosidase at 2.0 Å resolution: structural characterization of proline-substitution sites for protein thermostabilization. *J Mol Biol* 1997, 269:142-153.
53. Williams JC, Zeelen JP, Neubauer G, Vriend G, Backmann J, Michels PAM, Lambeir AM, Wierenga RK: Structural and mutagenesis studies of leishmania triosephosphate isomerase: a point mutation can convert a mesophilic enzyme into a superstable enzyme without losing catalytic power. *Protein Eng* 1999, 12:243-250.
54. Wintrode PL, Arnold FH: Temperature adaptation of enzymes: • lessons from laboratory evolution. *Adv Protein Chem* 2000, 55:161-225.
55. Wintrode PL, Miyazaki K, Arnold FH: Patterns of adaptation in a laboratory evolved thermophilic enzyme. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 2001, 1549:1-8.

56. Xiao L, Honig B: Electrostatic contributions to the stability of hyperthermophilic proteins. *J Mol Biol* 1999, 289:1435-1444.
57. Younus H, Owais M, Rao DN, Saleemuddin M: Stabilization of pancreatic ribonuclease A by immobilization on sepharose-linked antibodies that recognize the labile region of the enzyme. *Biochim Biophys Acta* 2001, 1548:114-120.
58. Zhao H, Arnold FH: Directed evolution converts subtilisin E into a functional equivalent of thermitase. *Protein Eng* 1999, 12:47-53.