Rationally designed coiled-coil DNA looping peptides control DNA topology
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ABSTRACT

Artificial DNA looping peptides were engineered to study the roles of protein and DNA flexibility in controlling the geometry and stability of protein-mediated DNA loops. These LZD (leucine zipper dual-binding) peptides were derived by fusing a second, C-terminal, DNA-binding region onto the GCN4 bZip peptide. Two variants with different coiled-coil lengths were designed to control the relative orientations of DNA bound at each end. Electrophoretic mobility shift assays verified formation of a sandwich complex containing two DNAs and one peptide. Ring closure experiments demonstrated that looping requires a DNA-binding site separation of 310 bp, much longer than the length needed for natural loops. Systematic variation of binding site separation over a series of 10 constructs that cyclize to form 862-bp minicircles yielded positive and negative topoisomers because of two possible writhed geometries. Periodic variation in topoisomer abundance could be modeled using canonical DNA persistence length and torsional modulus values. The results confirm that the LZD peptides are stiffer than natural DNA looping proteins, and they suggest that formation of short DNA loops requires protein flexibility, not unusual DNA bendability. Small, stable, tunable looping peptides may be useful as synthetic transcriptional regulators or components of protein–DNA nanostructures.

INTRODUCTION

DNA looping is essential to the control of gene expression in both prokaryotes and eukaryotes. The short-range looping (typically <500 bp) characteristic of transcriptional activation and repression in prokaryotes requires DNA curvature, with an attendant free energy cost. The structure and flexibility of the protein components of the loop also determine the range of accessible loop conformations. The Lac repressor (LacI) has been the classic model for looping-mediated repression. The X-ray co-crystal structure of LacI bound to two DNA operators is a V-shaped dimer of dimers, with nearly parallel DNA segments (1). LacI can anchor loops as small as 52 bp in vitro (2), which would require a nearly circular DNA loop smaller than one gyre of the nucleosome to fit to V-shaped LacI. The related Gal repressor (GalR) forms a 113-bp loop stabilized by HU protein (3). Biochemical, topological and spectroscopic experiments suggest that very small LacI loops can be enabled by headpiece flexibility and/or open protein conformations (4–8). Non-specific bending proteins also act to decrease the free energy cost of the substantial DNA deformation required to form small loops. Widom and others have proposed that spontaneous sharp bending and twisting of sub-persistence length DNA also decrease the free energy of small loops, relative to the free energy predicted from classical persistence length and torsional modulus values (9,10). However, there is ongoing controversy about the existence of extreme DNA bendability (11,12). The results are of wide interest in part because they bear on the stability of in vivo loops, which are also stabilized by DNA supercoiling (13), specific DNA bending proteins like integration host factor (IHF) (14) and non-specific DNA bending proteins like HU (15). In vivo loops (as identified by periodicity of repression efficiency as a function of operator separation) can be as small as 55–59 bp (16), and loops this short must require sharp DNA bending that cannot all be provided by supercoiling (17). Resolution of the primary intrinsic sources of flexibility that stabilize DNA loops, and by extension a deeper understanding of the quantitative thermodynamics of looping in general, requires experimental separation of protein and DNA flexibility. To this end we sought to design a rigid looping protein, basing the design on the continuous coiled-coil of α-helices as a small and well-understood motif (18,19).

Electron microscopy, atomic force microscopy, tethered particle microscopy, X-ray crystallography and theoretical analysis suggest that the coiled-coil is at least as stiff as...
DNA, both in terms of bending persistence length and torsional modulus (20–24). The simplicity of the coiled-coil makes it an attractive template for protein engineering, and it is well understood how α-helices self-assemble in parallel versus anti-parallel orientations and in different oligomeric states (25,26). This palette has been used to engineer peptides with new ligand-binding properties (27,28). The GCN4 basic region leucine zipper (bZip) DNA-binding domain has been a common template, and Oakley and coworkers (29) have shown that transposing its N-terminal basic DNA-binding helix to the C-terminus provides a new sequence-specific DNA-binding protein. Here, we have extended the diversity of coiled-coil applications to include DNA looping, by appending both N- and C-terminal DNA-binding domains to a central coiled-coil dimerization domain, creating leucine zipper dual-binding (LZD) peptides. We demonstrate here using the electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) and DNA ligation, cyclization and topology assays that two designed LZD peptides loop DNA, and that loop formation requires >254 bp of DNA. The results can be quantitatively simulated without invoking extreme DNA bendability.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemicals, DNA and proteins

Oligonucleotide polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers and EMISA sequences were from IDT. T4 polynucleotide kinase, T4 DNA ligase and restriction enzymes were purchased from New England Biolabs (NEB). Radioactive triphosphates were from Perkin-Elmer or New England Biolabs (NEB). Peptides were purified from commercially synthesized genes (BioMatik) from pRSET A plasmids (Life Technologies)

Electrophoretic mobility shift assay

Complementary synthetic oligonucleotides were used to assemble the 30 bp and 58 bp dsDNA fragments, with Inv-2 and CREB-binding sites, respectively, as in Figure 2. One strand (5 μM) of each fragment was end labeled with 2 μM [γ-32P]ATP, using 10 U of T4 polynucleotide kinase in the manufacturer’s supplied buffer (70 mM Tris–HCl, 10 mM MgCl2 and 5 mM DTT, pH 7.6). The kinase was heat inactivated, and the complementary strands were annealed by mixing equal amounts of each oligonucleotide in an Eppendorf tube (2.5 μM each, 50 μl of total volume) and placing the sample in a beaker containing 300 ml of boiling water. The beaker was allowed to cool to near room temperature for >1 h. The dsDNA products were purified by native PAGE and then buffer exchanged into TE buffer using a BioSpin 6 column (Bio-Rad). Final concentration was determined using ultraviolet absorption.

Protein and DNA stocks were diluted to working concentrations in a binding/ligation (B/L) buffer consisting of 50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.7, 4 mM NaCl, 4 mM KCl, 4 mM MgCl2, 2 mM ATP, 0.2% glycerol, 100 μg/ml bovine serum albumin, 10 mM DTT and 0.01% Nonidet-P40 (IGEPAL). This low ionic strength formulation was required to perform the EMSA and the ligase-mediated cyclization experiments under identical conditions. All DNAs were mixed with each other before peptides being added. Peptides were added to the final concentrations indicated in Figure 2, in a final
volume of 10 μl and binding reactions were incubated for 10 min at room temperature. Immediately before gel loading, 2 μl of 6× DNA loading dye (30% glycerol, 0.25% each bromophenol blue and xylene cyanol in water) was added to each sample.

Previous results on leucine zipper proteins showed large electrophoretic mobility shifts even for small GCN4 fragments (30), and our experiments with standard acrylamide gels (≥6%) frequently led to retention of all the bound DNA in the well. To obtain the results here, we used a hybrid agarose/acrylamide gel matrix consisting of 0.5% agarose and 5% acrylamide (75:1 acrylamide:bis) in TBE buffer with 7.5 mM NaCl added (50 mM Tris-HCl, pH 8.1, 50 mM boric acid, 7.5 mM NaCl and 1 mM EDTA), which improved band resolution compared with gels that were cast and run in TBE alone. This formulation also served as the running buffer. Gels were run for 1 h at 20 V/cm in a gel box maintained at 15°C (Hoefler). The gels were dried on filter paper and exposed to storage phosphor screens overnight. Images were captured using a Storm 860 Phosphorimager (GE Healthcare Sciences/Molecular Dynamics) and visualized using ImageJ, with correction for the GE/Molecular Dynamics intensity scaling algorithm.

DNA ligation and topoisomer distribution experiments

DNA samples were diluted to 1 nM, and LZD peptide samples were diluted to 30 nM in B/L buffer. T4 DNA ligase was diluted in the same buffer to 10 U/μl immediately before use. The protein and DNA samples were mixed (5 μl each) and allowed to equilibrate for 10 min at room temperature. DNA-only samples (5 μl) were mixed with 5 μl of B/L buffer to maintain consistent concentration. A 5 μl aliquot of the T4 DNA ligase dilution was then added and mixed by gentle pipetting. The final concentrations during ligation were 0.33 nM DNA, 10 nM LZD or control peptide and T4 DNA ligase at 3.3 U/μl. The reaction was allowed to proceed at room temperature for 60 min. After ligation, some samples (as indicated in Figure 3 and all samples in Figure 4) were treated with BAL 31 DNA nuclease (NEB) to remove any linear DNA sites viewed along the coiled-coil axis as in Figure 5, there are two values of the oriented crossover angle, θ' = θ and θ' = θ − 180°. For non-zero θ, one connection orientation has positive writhe and the other has negative writhe. All the calculations below are carried out in parallel for both θ' angles. Each lobe of the assumed figure 8 shape is assumed to be a teardrop shape, which allows straightforward computation of the xyz coordinates along the DNA, from which the writhe integral (31) is calculated. The writhe results are insensitive to θ, as long as θ is not too small and the center-to-center distance between sites z is not too large. The two writhe values are within the limits Wr = ± (0.90 ± 0.06) for θ > 15° and 9 bp < z < 27 bp.

To simulate topoisomer distributions for comparison with the experiment of Figure 4, we calculate the energy of all of the combinations of Wr and Tw for each topoisomer and then apply the Boltzmann distribution. The energy is given by the sum of the DNA bending and twisting energies, for which we assume independence and additivity. The bending energy of a teardrop (with θ in radians) is given by

\[
E_{\text{bend}} = \frac{1}{2} A(\pi + \theta)(\pi + \theta + 2\tan(\left(\frac{(\pi - \theta)}{2}\right)))k_B T
\]

per Sankararaman and Marko, section IIIA of (32), calculated for each lobe of each of the two writhed forms. A is the persistence length, taken to be 150 (bp). This analysis ignores the influence of θ on the teardrop bending energy, which is reasonable for θ ≪ L. For θ near 0°, the energy of the teardrop with the acute included angle is large; therefore, the teardrop is probably not a good model for the real loop. In this case, the ‘double circle’ crossover geometry, with its large included angle, should be strongly preferred; hence, the inaccuracy in the energy of the high-energy state should not affect population estimates.
The twist in each lobe must be calculated independently because the protein isolates the two sides topologically when the loop exists (33). $\Delta T_w$, the difference between the actual twist and the relaxed twist, is determined by initially considering a planar circle with two binding sites perfectly aligned (parallel) on one face of the helix. The total local twist change introduced by the protein (the sum of the changes introduced by the two binding domains) is denoted $Prtn_Tw$. Net unwinding introduced by GCN4 has been estimated as $-53^\circ$ (34); we assume all unwinding appears as twist. The unwinding introduced by the reverseGCN4 is unknown. The relaxed linking number of the circle is, therefore, $L_k^c = L/hr + Prtn_Tw$, where $h$ is the helical repeat. The helical repeat is constrained by energetic consequences, we ignore writhe in the individual loops; the writhe in a loop it is $\text{Wr}$. The residual twist strain is $\Delta T_w = L_k - L_k^c$. The twist in each half of the circle must be integral because the sites are assumed to be helically in phase and are, therefore, separated by an integral number of helical turns. Given all this, we can calculate the ideal DNA-binding site spacing, corresponding to the ideal DNA-binding site spacing, corresponding to minimum twist energy with twist strain partitioned equally to both sides, as $S_{\text{ideal}} = \frac{1}{2}L_km/hr$, in base pairs.

We then consider forming the figure 8 writhed loop. As the linking number on looping does not change, the looping $\Delta T_w = \Delta L_k - \Delta W_r = -\Delta W_r$, and as the initial writhe of the planar circle is zero, the change in writhe $\Delta W_r$ on looping is equal to the writhe $W_r$ calculated as aforementioned. At $S = S_{\text{ideal}}$, the $\Delta T_w$ is partitioned equally to each lobe; therefore, the twist strain in each lobe is given by $\Delta T_{w_{\text{ideal}}} = \frac{1}{2}(L_k - L/hr - Prtn_Tw - W_r)$. We then consider the true binding site separations. For the inner loop, the twist strain becomes $\Delta T_{w_{\text{in}}} = \Delta T_{w_{\text{ideal}}} + (S - S_{\text{ideal}})/hr$, and for the outer loop it is $\Delta T_{w_{\text{out}}} = \Delta T_{w_{\text{ideal}}} - (S - S_{\text{ideal}})/hr$. In calculating $\Delta T_{w_{\text{in}}}$ and $\Delta T_{w_{\text{out}}}$ and considering their energetic consequences, we ignore writhe in the individual lobes; the writhe in a ~450 bp circle is small (31,35), and the energy of the lobe should be close to the twist energy plus the bend energy calculated ignoring writhe. With the $\Delta T_w$ values for the inner and outer lobes in hand, we calculate the twist energy on each side given by $E_{\text{twist}} = 4\pi^2C\Delta T_w^2/2\ell N$, where $C$ is the torsional modulus (taken to be $2 \times 10^{-19}$ erg cm), $\ell$ is the base pair separation $3.4 \times 10^{-8}$ cm and $N$ is the number of base pairs in the lobe. Thus, given a value for $\theta$ we have two values of $\theta'$, writhe and bending energy, and then for each value of $\theta$ we calculate a total twisting energy for each $\theta'$, giving two total energies for the two ways to make a $\Delta L_k = 0$ topoisomer.

We then consider formation of all additional topoisomers by assuming that the writhe shapes stay the same and calculating the twist energies corresponding to $\Delta T_w = \Delta T_{w_{\text{in}}} + m$ and $\Delta T_{w_{\text{out}}} + n$, with $m$ and $n = 0$, ±1, or ±2. The resulting observable $\Delta L_k$ is $m + n$. The energies of all 25 possible combinations of $m$ and $n$ for each value of $\text{Wr}$ are calculated, and their populations are calculated from the Boltzmann distribution:

$$E(\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n}) = E_{\text{bend,in}}(\text{Wr}) + E_{\text{bend,out}}(\text{Wr}) + E_{\text{twist,in}}(\text{Wr},m,n) + E_{\text{twist,out}}(\text{Wr},m,n)$$

$$P(\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n}) = \exp\left[-E(\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n})/k_BT\right]/\Sigma[\exp\left(-E(\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n})/k_BT\right)]$$

where $\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n}$ indicates the DNA loop with the designated Wr, m and n values, and the summation to give the partition function is over all 50 possible loops. The total probability $P(\Delta L_k)$ of observing a particular $\Delta L_k = m + n = 0$, ±1, ±2, ±3 or ±4 is the sum of the corresponding $P(\text{Loop}_{\text{Wr},m,n})$ values. In practice, we find that for most choices of $\theta$, $Prtn_Tw$, hr and z there is one dominant topoisomer and one minor topoisomer for each Wr, giving four values of $\Delta L_k$ with nonzero populations, as observed in the experiment.

The populations for each $\Delta L_k$ were calculated for each spacing S. The fit to experiment was measured as the sum of squared errors in $P(\Delta L_k, S)$ versus experiment. The best fit was optimized by varying hr, $Prtn_Tw$, z and $\theta$ individually for each peptide, arriving at locally optimum sets of parameters given in Table 1. A single variable offset was applied to all of the calculated sets of curves to account for possible variation in the helical repeat between the two lobes. This offset was optimized to be ~1.3 bp, corresponding to an average helical repeat difference of 1.3/431 = 0.3%. The value of $hr = 10.55$ bp/turn was optimized independently, but it matched the observed topoisomer distribution in the absence of protein.

All calculations were carried out in MATLAB. The experimental data from Figure 4 and replicate experiments is provided as a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet in the Supplementary Information. The $xyz$ coordinates for the loops were output as PDB files for visualization in Pymol. Sample PDB files for the loops in Figure 5 are available in the Supplementary Information, and code is available on request to jdkahn@umd.edu.

RESULTS

LZD peptide design and synthesis

The basic region-leucine zipper (bZip) domain of the yeast transcription factor GCN4 binds DNA as a homodimer (36), with the leucine zipper forming a coiled-coil of $\alpha$-helices that separate near the N-terminus into positively charged helices that grip the DNA (37,38). The GCN4 bZip is a common template for protein design (19,39,40). Our DNA looping peptides were inspired by the work from the Oakley laboratory in which the basic DNA-binding region was fused to the C-terminus of the leucine zipper instead, to make the reverseGCN4 peptide (29). They demonstrated that reverseGCN4 has high affinity and specificity for a DNA target in which the palindromic CREB binding site recognized by GCN4 (5'-ATGAC/GTCAT-3') is inverted to give the Inv-2 site (5'-GTCAT/ATGAC-3'); the underlining indicates the specific half-site recognized by each basic region.
forms a homodimeric coiled-coil of uninterrupted α-helices (43); therefore, the coordinates should be suitable for modeling even though the LZD protein sequences are not derived from cortexillin. The starting model side chains were replaced by those of the actual sequence in Pymol, and the C-terminal DNA-binding domains were docked by hand to remove steric conflicts. The structure was subjected to molecular dynamics (50 ns), and no substantial changes were observed. Even if this model is not correct in detail, it illustrates how varying the coiled-coil should allow programmed changes in the geometry of peptide–DNA complexes and the resulting DNA loops.

Synthetic genes coding for these peptides were cloned in *E. coli*, and the peptides were expressed and purified as in the ‘Materials and Methods’ section and the Supplementary Information. The peptides are toxic to cells, perhaps because they non-covalently cross-link chromosomal DNA. Circular dichroism showed that they are mostly α-helical at 1.2 μM, and the α-helical content increases slightly on DNA addition (Supplementary Figure S1).

**Assessing dual DNA-binding capacity of LZD peptides with the electrophoretic mobility shift assay**

Any DNA looping protein must have two binding sites for DNA; therefore, it must be able to bind two separate molecules of dsDNA in a stable ‘sandwich complex’ (2) if the DNA concentration exceeds the effective local concentration provided by looping. In the electrophoretic mobility shift assays (EMSAs) of Figure 2, sandwich complexes with LZD peptides were identified using mixtures in which either a 58-bp DNA containing a CREB site (the N-terminal target) or a 30 bp DNA containing the Inv-2 site (the C-terminal target) was 32P-labeled. Competition with unlabeled DNA reported on specificity. A 5% polyacrylamide/0.5% agarose hybrid gel was used to increase the electrophoretic mobility of the complexes relative to that in gels with higher acrylamide density (44), as leucine zipper complexes migrate anomalously slowly (30). Figure 2A shows that a GCN4 bZip control peptide, with its N-terminal binding domain, binds with high affinity to both the 58 bp and the 30 bp fragments. Non-specific binding to both fragments can be competed away with either unlabeled 58 or 30 bp DNA. The GCN4 peptide shows a weak preference for the CREB site over the Inv-2 site (the C-terminal target) was 32P-labeled. Competition with unlabeled DNA reported on specificity. A 5% polyacrylamide/0.5% agarose hybrid gel was used to increase the electrophoretic mobility of the complexes relative to that in gels with higher acrylamide density (44), as leucine zipper complexes migrate anomalously slowly (30). Figure 2A shows that a GCN4 bZip control peptide, with its N-terminal binding domain, binds with high affinity to both the 58 bp and the 30 bp fragments. Non-specific binding to both fragments can be competed away with either unlabeled 58 or 30 bp DNA. The GCN4 peptide shows a weak preference for the CREB site over the Inv-2 site (the C-terminal target) was 32P-labeled. Competition with unlabeled DNA reported on specificity. A 5% polyacrylamide/0.5% agarose hybrid gel was used to increase the electrophoretic mobility of the complexes relative to that in gels with higher acrylamide density (44), as leucine zipper complexes migrate anomalously slowly (30). Figure 2B shows that the reverseGCN4, bearing the C-terminal-binding region, shows a strong preference for the Inv-2 site over the CREB site and a significantly decreased extent of non-specific binding.

Panel C of Figure 2 shows a gel of unique mobility that requires both the 58 bp and the 30 bp DNA fragments and contains radiolabel from either DNA, which we assign as a sandwich complex (45) containing both fragments bound to LZD73. The gel also shows bands assigned as 58/58 and 30/30 sandwich complexes based on their mobilities relative to the 58/30 complex, as well as more slowly migrating species that grow in at higher protein concentration and, therefore, presumably contain...
non-specifically bound LZD peptide. Non-specific dual-binding events could be stabilized by high local DNA concentrations established by the specific sandwich complex. At high peptide concentrations there are also aggregates in the well, but they are released by added DNA. We do not observe bands that can be assigned to 1:1 peptide:DNA complexes, suggesting that a DNA-binding helix that is not occupied by specific DNA potentiates aggregation. These aggregates could be protein–DNA networks linked by non-specific protein–DNA binding or protein–protein interaction.

The existence of a stable specific sandwich complex confirms that the LZD peptides have two active DNA-binding domains. When the two DNA-binding sites are placed on the same DNA molecule, enhanced local concentration favors specific binding of one LZD peptide to CREB and Inv-2 sites embedded in a DNA loop, assuming that the DNA concentration is less than the effective concentration of the second DNA site in the neighborhood of a peptide anchored by binding at the first DNA site. If the loop is too short or torsionally misaligned, then the effective concentration of the second site will be very low, and sandwiches or singly bound DNA will be preferred.

Assaying looping by ligation of variable length DNA fragments

DNA looping can be detected by EMSA, footprinting, electron microscopy or atomic force microscopy, Förster resonance energy transfer (FRET) and tethered particle microscopy (TPM) (6,46–48). Initially we attempted to apply EMSA to DNA looping by the LZD peptides, but the large DNA size required and also competition with sandwich complexes made the results difficult to interpret. We turned to DNA ligation because the assay depends on the reactivity of molecules that are entirely in free solution, not immobilized or in gels. Ligation can also detect transient or unstable loops because formation of a sandwich complex can potentiate irreversible intermolecular ligation when the DNA ends hybridize to form a DNA loop (49). Ring closure of a single DNA that is looped to bridge two internal sites (as opposed to ‘looping’ of DNA to bring the ligatable ends together) can be especially diagnostic for protein-mediated looping. Ring closure of the complex to form a covalently closed minicircle DNA captures twist and writhe changes induced by the internal loop as a permanent change (relative to free DNA) in the linking number (Lk) distribution of the minicircle products (5). Modeling described later in the text suggests that an almost any LZD-mediated loop should introduce diagnostic changes in writhe. Finally, cyclization can be interpreted quantitatively to give estimates of the geometric parameters of the loop as well as the DNA or peptide-DNA deformability (5,50–52).

Figure 3 shows ligation experiments that measure the DNA length required for the LZD peptides to induce a loop, as indicated by changes in ligation efficiency or in the topology of the circular ligation products. After preliminary negative bimolecular ligation results on shorter DNAs, we constructed the Vx(153–448)414 series...
of looping/ligation substrates, in which the separation between CREB and Inv-2 binding sites (forming the inner loop on peptide binding) was varied from 153 to 448 bp. The total distance between the two binding sites and terminal XhoI overhangs, forming the outer loop on cyclization, was held at 414 bp. The Vx(448)212 construct, with a 448-bp inner loop and outer segments totaling 212 bp, was used to verify that the results should be independent of which side of the final looped minicircle product was initially continuous.

The amount of bimolecular products at all lengths increases on LZD binding because of enhanced ligation of DNA in sandwich complexes [or in the case of Vx(448)212 because of inhibition of cyclization]. The effect is enhanced at separations of ≤254 bp, for which no looping takes place. For 202 and 254 bp separations, the Vx(202 or 254)/414 constructs, a subtle shift to the circular product with a lower Lk is consistent with local protein-induced DNA untwisting (34) but not with writhe at a node, which would lead to a larger |ΔLk|. DNA bending by bZip proteins is controversial (53); significant bending should enhance cyclization of these short DNAs, but this is not observed. At site separations of ≥310 bp, new topoisomers are observed with ΔLk = ±1 in addition to the original product, suggesting the formation of loops with both positive and negative writhe. A ΔLk = +1 cannot result from protein-induced untwisting. The Vx(448)212 results show that when the DNA tails exiting a loop are too short, cyclization is inhibited, and no ΔLk = ±1 topoisomers are observed, in accord with the results showing that when the internal segment is too short, the loops also fail to form.

These results strongly suggest that loops of ≥310 bp can be formed by the LZD peptides, and shorter loops cannot be formed, but the results do not establish a precise lower limit for loop length because the particular lengths we tested could be torsionally strained. The lower limit set by bending strain could be resolved by exploring closely spaced loop lengths. In summary, cyclization as a function of loop length shows that the DNA length needed to form
A loop anchored by a small, rigid protein is much longer than the length needed for looping by flexible proteins like LacI.

**Cyclization of a series of 862-bp DNAs with helically phased binding sites**

To sample the diversity of accessible loop topologies and shapes systematically, we varied the loop length at a constant total DNA length and characterized the minicircle topoisomers produced by ring closure (Figure 4). This approach is modeled after classic demonstrations of looping as the cause of periodic variation of in vivo repression efficiency with DNA spacing (16,17,54,55). Ten DNA fragments in which the CREB to Inv-2 inner loop spacing ranged from 435 to 458 bp were constructed. A total length of 862 bp was maintained by concurrently reducing the outer loop length from 427 to 404 bp. Cyclization of each of the ten 862 bp fragments in the absence of LZD resulted in the same yields of a major product (Lk = 82, assuming a helical repeat of 10.55 bp/turn) and a minor product (Lk = 81). The distribution of topoisomers is strikingly different in the presence of LZD peptides: it is a periodic function of binding site separation, definitively confirming DNA looping, and it includes new Lk = 80 and Lk = 83 topoisomers. The near-disappearance of the original Lk = 82 topoisomer for some lengths suggests that the DNA, at least at those lengths, is almost exclusively found in looped complexes.

**Modeling and analysis of topoisomer distributions**

To model the results of Figure 4A quantitatively, we took advantage of the simplicity and assumed rigidity of the LZD peptides to construct a straightforward numerical model that combines reasonable assumptions for the peptide–DNA geometry with the established worm-like coil treatment of DNA bending and flexibility (31,32,34,35). Much more sophisticated treatments are possible (51,56,57), but here we are only trying to assess whether the observed oscillations in topology are reasonable based on the assumed protein–DNA geometry and the flexibility of DNA. As shown in Figure 5, we assume that the protein makes a sandwich complex with a fixed crossover angle between two DNA-binding site segments (0 < θ < 180° for symmetric sites) that lie in parallel planes separated by a distance z. The shape of the loop is assumed to be a figure 8, with the two lobes each adopting teardrop shapes, of length S for the continuous inner loop and length L–S for the outer loop, which is formed on ligation. The z-coordinate of each point is chosen to give an elliptical cross-section for the final figure 8. The protein–DNA model parameters are the angle y, the distance z, and the total local twist change (Prtn_Tw). DNA is described by its persistence length P = 150 bp, torsional modulus C = 2 × 10^{-19} erg·cm, and average helical repeat hr near 10.5 bp/turn. Based on the design of Figure 1, z should be ~27 bp, which is small relative to the DNA contour length; therefore, the modeling enforces the correct contour length, but it does not explicitly consider changes in z in calculating the energy. For each pair of DNA lengths S and L, the writhe Wr and the bending energy (32) are calculated for the two loop topologies of Figures 4C and 5. The twist Tw is treated for each lobe of each loop independently because the protein isolates the lobes topologically (33). An initial Tw required to make Lk = Tw + Wr an integer is set for each lobe, chosen to minimize ΔTw relative to relaxed DNA for lengths S and L–S. The variation in S provides
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a set of different required Tw values for the inner and outer loops. The twist energies for Tw of 0, ±1 or ±2 relative to the initial Tw as well as the total energies for each combination of Tw and Wr are then calculated. The Boltzmann distribution provides the population of each combination and the combined populations comprising each Lk simulate the experimentally observed topoisomer distribution. Details of the calculation are given in the ‘Materials and Methods’ section.

Figure 6 compares the experimental topoisomer distributions as a function of DNA-binding site separation from Figure 4 with the predicted distributions, using the best fit \( \theta, z, \text{Prtn}_\text{Tw} \) and \( h_r \) values found in Table 1. It was also necessary to fit a \( \sim 1 \) bp offset to allow for an apparent difference in the intrinsic twist between the inner and outer loops. The essential features of the experiment are that there are four populated topoisomers, the peak population for each topoisomer is offset by about half a helical turn from the next topoisomer and Lk = 82 and 83 topoisomers are more abundant than Lk = 80 and 81. The simulation explains these observations in qualitatively understandable ways as follows: first, Lk, the ideal linking number for the 862 bp circle, changes from 81.71 for free DNA to 81.57 with the inclusion of LZD-induced untwisting parameterized by Prtn_Tw = 50°, or 2° of untwisting per site, midway between the untwisting previously inferred for GCN4 at the CREB site (34) and the twist observed in the X-ray co-crystal structure (38). For
all $S$, the $L_k = 82$ and 83 topoisomers have $W_r \approx +0.9$ because of the crossover node created by the LZD loop. The $L_k = 82$ topoisomer is untwisted, with $\Delta Tw = \Delta L_k = \Delta W_r = (L_k - L_{k'}) - W_r = (82 - 81.57) - 0.9 = -0.47$ turns distributed over the two lobes, and the $L_k = 83$ is overtwisted in each lobe, with total $\Delta Tw = +0.53$. The peak abundance of the $L_k = 83$ topoisomer is lower because of the larger absolute value of total $Tw$, and hence, higher twist energy. The loop length $S$ that gives the peak abundance for each $L_k$ occurs when $\Delta Tw$ is equal in each lobe (for lobes of similar size); distributing twist strain evenly minimizes total energy because of the quadratic dependence of twist energy on $Tw$. This idea provides a straightforward explanation for the half helical turn offset between the $L_k = 82$ and 83 curves. For example, the peak at $\sim 440\text{ bp}$ for $L_k = 82$ represents a loop with $\Delta Tw = -0.23$ in each lobe. A change in $S$ of $+\frac{1}{2}\text{ hr}$ to $\sim 445\text{ bp}$, at constant $L_k$ and total $Tw$, gives $\Delta Tw = +0.27$ for the inner and $-0.73$ for the outer loop. The addition of one helical turn to the outer loop gives evenly distributed $\Delta Tw = +0.27$ in each lobe at $L_k = 83$; therefore, there is a peak at $445\text{ bp}$ for $L_k = 83$. $L_k = 80$ and 81 results are all analogous starting from $W_r \approx -0.9$, with lower overall abundance because the LZD geometry ($\theta \approx 33^\circ$) favors a loop with positive $W_r$, the orange DNA in Figure 5, with $\theta = 0 - 180^\circ = -147^\circ$.

This crude model is not perfect. It predicts peak values of $S$ for $L_k = 80$ that are offset by $\sim 3\text{ bp}$ between theory and experiment, and there are smaller errors in the peak positions for the other topoisomers. Improved modeling of the DNA energetics would probably lead to changes in the amplitudes rather than the positions of peaks. Also, by design $\theta$ should be $\sim 120^\circ$ for LZD73 and 0 for LZD87, but the two peptides actually gave similar results in the experiment of Figure 4, with the best fit $\theta$ estimated at $+33 - 35^\circ$ for both peptides. Finally, the best-fit values of $z$ are $\sim 8\text{ bp}$ less than the values estimated from Figure 1. These discrepancies between theory and experiment could be due to incorrect modeling of the orientation of the C-terminal DNA-binding domain, protein torsional flexibility or coupling between DNA deformation and protein conformation. These issues notwithstanding, we suggest that the agreement between the worm-like coil model for DNA and the experimental results of Figure 3 argues that DNA does not exhibit extreme bendability, and the agreement between the worm-like coil predictions and the results of Figure 4 argues against unusual twisting flexibility for DNA.

**DISCUSSION**

Demonstration of DNA looping by rationally designed coiled-coil peptides

The DNA binding, cyclization and topology results aforementioned show that addition of a C-terminal basic region to a GCN4 bZip coiled-coil provides peptides that bind two DNA sites simultaneously and thereby loop DNA efficiently, for loops of $\geq 310\text{ bp}$. Four-helix bundle proteins with pendant DNA-binding domains have been observed to form loops or sandwich complexes (45,49,58), but the LZD peptides described here are the first to form a more stable loop in which each polypeptide strand contacts both DNA partners. The topological results of Figures 4 and 6 showing modulation of DNA topoisomer distributions by changes in the separation between protein-binding sites and their helical phasing demonstrate that the looping is amenable to quantitative analysis. The model of Figure 5 combined with calculations assuming a rigid peptide and canonical worm-like chain values of the DNA persistence length and torsional modulus captures the essential features of the topoisomer distributions. Both positive and negative supercoils formed by ring closure of looped complexes are quantitatively explained by the existence of two loop topologies, which give either positive or negative writhe and have slightly different total bending energies.

Although the essential properties of the LZD peptides matched the design of Figure 1, two peptides that were intended to give markedly different crossover ($\theta$) angles yielded surprisingly similar topoisomer distributions. The coiled-coil structure could be deformable, so that the two peptides explore the same range of $\theta$; experiments on the myosin coiled-coil suggest that the motif can unfold under mechanical strain (59). Alternatively, the peptides could be stiff but $\theta$ could be nearer to $90^\circ$ for both: topoisomer distributions depend on $\theta$ mainly through differences in DNA-bending energy for the two writhes, and for larger $\theta$, the bending energy depends only weakly on $\theta$. The peak inter-site spacing for the $L_k = 80$ topoisomer was also not predicted accurately. This could be due to coupling between protein and DNA deformation (60), and we have shown previously that cyclization can preferentially capture distorted protein–DNA geometry (61,62). These structural and dynamic questions can be addressed with FRET, TPM or high-resolution structures, coupled with rod mechanics models for DNA shape (51,56,57).

**Length dependence of DNA looping by natural and artificial proteins**

The separation of DNA and protein flexibility contributions to looping free energy was one motivation for the LZD peptide design. Figures 3 and 4 show that loop shape and stability are indeed strongly dependent on DNA length, suggesting that systematic exploration of the shortest loop lengths will provide a sensitive test for theories of enhanced DNA flexibility (63,64). The LZD peptides are ideal for such tests because as long as the DNA-binding sites lie roughly perpendicular to the coiled-coil axis, the protein should be under tension in a loop; therefore, protein bending away from the extended form should be suppressed and should not affect the minimum-energy loop conformation. The shortest loops seen in Figure 3 are $\sim 310\text{ bp}$, much longer than the $\sim 50\text{-bp}$ loops formed *in vitro* by the natural repressors LacI (2) and $\lambda$ phage cl (65), or the $\sim 100 - 150\text{-bp}$ loops seen for the type II restriction enzymes FokI (60) and SfiI (66). The repressors can probably bridge DNA sites that lie on a continuous curved segment (17,67), and the FokI restriction enzyme includes a flexible linker between the
recognition domain and the catalytic domain (68). The SfiI:DNA co-crystal structure (69) does not show obvious flexibility, but the loop length estimates for SfiI are based on cleavage activity that could reflect transient binding (66).

In vivo loops such as those characterized for GalR (15), LacI (17), AraC (55) and the NtrC-RNA polymerase complex (14,70) can be <100 bp, but these are stabilized by supercoiling or bending proteins.

Figure 7 shows that the estimated DNA deformation energy at 254 bp is roughly comparable with the free energy available from protein–DNA binding for 1nM binding affinity at one site, \( \Delta G = -kT \ln(10^{-9}) = -20.7 \) kT; therefore, it is reasonable that loops of this length are unstable. We conclude that stabilization of shorter loops depends substantially on protein flexibility for proteins with \( \sim 1\) nM binding affinity for each DNA binding domain. Our results do not provide evidence in support of enhanced DNA flexibility. In these measurements based on the stability of small DNA loops in free solution, all of the DNA that is strongly bent or twisted over short length scales is contained within a longer DNA that is completely double-stranded, with no ends, single-stranded regions or chemical modifications. This avoids potential artifacts in ligation-mediated cyclization experiments; the cyclization to form minicircles in our experiments occurs within a 400-bp segment of a figure 8 shape, a length range at which all the models for DNA converge on the results of the worm-like coil. Systematic evaluation of loop stability and topology for 200–300-bp loops coupled with thermodynamic measurements of protein–DNA binding should allow more stringent tests of extreme bendability models.

Uses of rigid and readily modifiable looping proteins

Sequence-specific rigid looping proteins could find practical uses. They could act as repressors that are controlled through cooperative binding at a remote binding site, which in turn could be modulated by a second protein. Artificial looping could also potentiate the interaction of natural transcription factors. Retroviral integration is aided through localization of integrase via protein–protein interactions (71). Bridging of two DNA sites
could similarly be used to enhance genome editing, for example, by localizing DNA ends generated by zinc-finger nucleases (72) activity near a homologous chromosomal location. Finally, small, rigid, readily modified looping proteins with tunable crossover angles might enable synthesis of self-assembled protein–DNA nanostructures that could link the well-developed DNA nanotechnology and protein-nanotechnology fields. Natural looping proteins are less suitable for this purpose because of their size and flexibility.
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