A novel RNA-binding motif in omnipotent suppressors of translation termination, ribosomal proteins and a ribosome modification enzyme?

Eugene V.Koonin*, Peer Bork^{1,2} and Chris Sander¹

National Center for Biotechnology Information, National Library of Medicine, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD 20894, USA, ¹Molecular Biology Laboratory, Meyerhofstrasse 1, D-69012 Heidelberg and ²Max-Delbruck-Center for Molecular Medicine, D-13189 Berlin, Germany

Received March 15, 1994; Accepted April 25, 1994

ABSTRACT

Using computer methods for database search, multiple alignment, protein sequence motif analysis and secondary structure prediction, a putative new RNA-binding motif was identified. The novel motif is conserved in yeast omnipotent translation termination suppressor SUP1, the related DOM34 protein and its pseudogene homologue; three groups of eukaryotic and archaeal ribosomal proteins, namely L30e, L7Ae/S6e and S12e; an uncharacterized *Bacillus subtilis* protien related to the L7A/S6e group; and *Escherichia coli* ribosomal protein modification enzyme RimK. We hypothesize that a new type of RNA-binding domain may be utilized to deliver additional activities to the ribosome.

Mutations in at least five essential yeast genes result in the 'omnipotent suppressor phenotype', i.e. suppression of translation termination at all three stop codons (1). SUP44 encodes ribosomal protein S4 (2); SUP46 encodes ribosomal protein S13 (ref. 3; synonyms Ys11 and Yp28); and SUP35 encodes a protein containing a domain related to elongation factor EF1 α (4). SUP1 (synonyms SAL4, SUP45, YBR11.20) gene product is associated with the 40S ribosome subunit and is thought to be involved in translation termination (5,6). Genes encoding highly conserved homologues of SUP1 have been identified in man, Xenopus laevis and Arabidopsis (7-9). SUP1 proteins are distantly related to the product of yeast gene DOM34 (chromosome XIV) and its pseudogene homologue on chromosome III (10,11). Alignment of the DOM34 and SUP1 sequences (11) scored 8.4 SD on a 237 amino acid residue overlap, which is indicative of a genuine relationship (12).

A non-redundant amino acid sequence database (National Center for Biotechnology Information, NIH) was searched for similarity to the SUP1-related proteins using the BLAST program (13). The output of the BLAST search was analyzed for mutually consistent alignments; multiple alignment blocks constructed from conserved segments of such alignments were converted to position-dependent matrices and used for further database search (R.L.Tatusov, S.F.Altschul and E.V.K., unpublished). A

sec. structure	1111 hhhhhhhhhl1111bbbbb111		
DOM34 yeast 216	NKDDDK A WY G EKEVVK AAB YGAISY LLL TD K V		P33309
DOM34R(III) yeast ?	SKDDNKAWYGAEETERAAKLDAIET LLI TD S V		X59720G
SUP1 yeast 291	SQDTGKFCYGIDDTLKALDLGAVEKLIVFENL	114	P12385
SUP1 Arabidopsis 294	SQDTGKYVFGVEDTLKALEMGAVETLIVWENL	109	S31328P
SUP1 Xenopus 294	SQDTGKYCFGVEDTLKALEMGAVEILIVYENL	111	S31633P
•			
RPL30 human 20	VMKSGKYVLGYKQTLKMIRQGKAKLVILANNC	63	P04645
RPL32 yeast 16	VIKSGKYTLGYKSTVKSLRQGKSKLIIIAANT	57	P14120
RPL30 T.cruzi 10	AQDTGKIVMGARKSIQYAKMGGAKLIIVARNA	59	P29160
RPL30 M. vannielii 15	AVDTGNVVLGTKQAIKNIKHGEGKLVIIAGNC	58	P14025
RPL30 S.acidocald. 11	LLRSGKVILGTRKTLKLLKTGKVKGVVVSSTL	61	P11522
RPS6 H.marısmortui 23	ARDTGAVKKGTNETTKSIBRGSAELVFVAEDV	62	P12743
NHP2 yeast 66	ASKAKNVKRGVKEVVKALRKGEKGLVVIAGDI	75	P32495
RPL4A yeast 125	SPKPYAVKYGLNHVVALIENKKAKLVLIANDV	113	P17076
YIF4 B.subtilis 12	ANRARKVVSGEDLVIKEIRNARAKLVLLTEDA	56	P32729
RPL7A rice 121	AKKPIVVKYGLNHVTYLIBOSKAOLVVIAHDV	105	D12631G
RPL7A human 129	TKRPPVLRAGVNTVTTLVENKKAOLVVIAHDV	105	P11518
RPS12 T.brucei 39	ARETNGLICGLSEVTRALDRRTAHLCVLADDC	73	S24781P
RPS12 rat 24	ALIHDGLARGIREAAKALDKROAHLCVLASNC	76	P09388
RimK E.coli 117	TSDLIDMVGGAPLVVKLVEGTQGIGVVLAETR	143	P17116
consensus	og.,oJoutz.		

Figure 1. Conserved motif in omnipotent suppressor gene products, three groups of ribosomal proteins and RimK. The alignment of the 32 residue protein segments was generated by database search with a position-dependent weight matrix as described in the text. Several highly conserved sequences of ribosomal proteins are omitted. The sequence of the human homologue of SUP1 (7) is not shown as it appeared to contain multiple frameshift errors in the region coding for the conserved motif. Distinct groups of proteins, namely the SUP1 family; the L30e family; the L7Ae/S6e family; the S12e family; and RimK, are separated by blank lines. In the L30e family, the conserved region includes the previously derived PROSITE signature (PS00709; ref. 20). In the consensus, O designates a hydrophobic residue (I,L,V,M,F,Y,W,C,A), U designates a bulky hydrophobic residue (I,L,V,M,F), Z designates a polar residue (K,R,D,E,S,T,N,Q,H), J designates a charged residue (K,R,D,E). The secondary structure is based on the information in all sequences in the multiple alignment (14). h designates α helix, b designates β strand, and 1 designates loop; no symbol is shown for positions where the prediction was uncertain. For each sequence, the distances from the protein ends are indicated by numbers. The sequences were from the current databases and are accompanied by their accession numbers in SwissProt, PIR (P) or GenBank (G). DOM34(III) is the pseudogene homologue of DOM34 encoded on chromosome III (10,11). NHP2 is a nuclear protein related to the L7Ae/S6e family of ribosomal proteins (21).

conserved counterpart to one of these motifs was identified in three groups of eukaryotic and archaeal ribosomal proteins, namely L30e, L7Ae/S6e and S12e; and in *Escherichia coli* protein RimK. We also found that an uncharacterized *Bacillus*

^{*} To whom correspondence should be addressed

subtilis protein belongs to the L7Ae/S6e group (Fig. 1). Only one glycine residue is strictly conserved in all these proteins, but several positions are occupied by physico-chemically related residues. The region shown in Fig. 1 was independently identified as the most conserved block in multiple alignments constructed separately for the SUP1-related proteins and three groups of ribosomal proteins using the MACAW program (15). The similarity between SUP1 and ribosomal proteins is evident from both a pairwise comparison and a motif search: the probability of the SUP1 homologue from Arabidopsis and archaeal S6 protein matching by chance is about 3.5×10^{-3} ; and, a positiondependent matrix constructed from the ribosomal protein alignment selectively retrieved all the SUP1-related sequences from the database (data not shown). These observations suggest that despite the scarcity of invariant amino acids, the alignment in Fig. 1 represents a conserved structural unit.

Secondary structure prediction (14) suggested conservation of an α -helix and a β -strand in SUP1 and the related proteins (Fig. 1). In those ribosomat proteins whose three-dimensional structure has been resolved, the RNA-binding domain has a mixed α/β structure, with characteristic, conserved hydrophobic β -strands (16–18). The ribosomal association of SUP1 may be through RNA binding and the alignment in Fig. 1 may therefore represent a new type of RNA-binding motif that is shared by SUP1 proteins and several groups of ribosomal proteins. The structure and function of the distinct N-terminal domain of SUP1 that is not related to any known proteins remain to be determined. Another omnipotent suppressor gene product, SUP35 also has a two-domain organization (4).

RimK is an enzyme that catalyzes addition of glutamic acid residues to the N-terminus of *E.coli* ribosomal protein S6 (19). Our finding of a motif that is conserved between RimK and several groups of ribosome-associated proteins raises the intriguing possibility that RimK has to be specifically positioned on the ribosome through binding to rRNA, in order to modify S6

These findings indicate that all known yeast omnipotent suppressor genes encode ribosomal proteins or ribosome-associated factors and that a new type of RNA-binding domain may be used to deliver additional activities to the ribosome.

REFERENCES

- 1. Eustice, D.C. et al. (1986) J. Mol. Biol. 188, 207-214.
- 2. All-Robyn, J.A. et al. (1990) Mol. Cell. Biol. 10, 6544-6553.
- 3. Vincent, A. and Liebman, S.W. (1992) Genetics 132, 375-386.
- Didichenko, S.A., Ter-Avanesyan, M.D. and Smirnov, V.N. (1991) Eur. J. Biochem. 198, 705-711.
- 5. Breining, P. and Piepersberg, P. (1986) *Nucleic Acids Res.* 14, 5187-5197.
- 6. Stansfield, I. et al. (1992) Mol. Microbiol. 6, 3469-3478.
- 7. Grenett, H.E., Bounelis, P. and Fuller, G.M. (1992) Gene 110, 239-243.
- 8. Tassan, J.P. et al. (1993) Mol. Cell. Biol. 13, 2815-2821.
- 9. Quigley, F.R. (1992) GenBank X69375.
- 10. Lalo, D. et al. (1993) C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sciences de la vie 316, 367-373.
- 11. Koonin, E.V., Bork, P. and Sander, C. (1994) EMBO J. 13, 493-503.
- 12. Gorbalenya, A.E. et al. (1989) J. Mol. Evol. 28, 256-268.
- 13. Altschul, S.F. et al. (1990) J. Mol. Biol. 215, 403-410.
- 14. Rost, B. and Sander, C. (1993) J. Mol. Biol. 232, 584-599.
- 15. Schuler, G.D., Altschul, S.F. and Lipman, D.J. (1991) Proteins 9, 180-190.
- 16. Wilson, K.S. et al. (1986) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83, 7251-7255.
- 17. Leijonmark, M. and Liljas, A. (1987) J. Mol. Biol. 195, 555-580.
- 18. Leijonmark, M. et al. (1988) Proteins 3, 243-251.
- 19. Kang, K.W. et al. (1989) Mol. Gen. Genet. 217, 281-288.
- 20. Bairoch, A. (1993) Nucleic Acids Res. 21, 3097-3103.
- 21. Kolodrubetz, D. and Burgun, A. (1991) Yeast 7, 79-90.