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ABSTRACT: The ability of WWOX tumor suppressor to physically associate with the intracellular domain (ICD) of ErbB4 receptor tyrosine kinase is believed to play a central role in downregulating the transcriptional function of the latter. Herein, using various biophysical methods, we show that while the WW1 domain of WWOX binds to PPXY motifs located within the ICD of ErbB4 in a physiologically relevant manner, the WW2 domain does not. Importantly, while the WW1 domain absolutely requires the integrity of the PPXY consensus sequence, nonconsensus residues within and flanking this motif do not appear to be critical for binding. This strongly suggests that the WW1 domain of WWOX is rather promiscuous toward its cellular partners. We also provide evidence that the lack of binding of the WW2 domain of WWOX to PPXY motifs is due to the replacement of a signature tryptophan, lining the hydrophobic ligand binding groove, with tyrosine (Y85). Consistent with this notion, the Y85W substitution within the WW2 domain exquisitely restores its binding to PPXY motifs in a manner akin to the binding of the WW1 domain of WWOX. Of particular significance is the observation that the WW2 domain augments the binding of the WW1 domain to ErbB4, implying that the former serves as a chaperone within the context of the WW1−WW2 tandem module of WWOX in agreement with our findings reported previously. Altogether, our study sheds new light on the molecular basis of an important WW−ligand interaction involved in mediating a plethora of cellular processes.

While the role of ErbB4 receptor tyrosine kinase in mediating transmembrane signaling and the fact that the kinase is a prognostic factor in many human diseases are well-documented, its complex structural architecture continues to surprise us in terms of its ability to modulate downstream cellular activities via novel modes of action. Notably, ErbB4 harbors the canonical ECD−TM−ICD modular cassette, where the central single-helix transmembrane (TM) domain is between an N-terminal extracellular domain (ECD) and a C-terminal intracellular domain (ICD) (Figure 1a). Upon stimulation with its extracellular ligand heregulin or in response to TPA-induced activation of protein kinase C, ErbB4 undergoes intracellular proteolytic cleavage by γ-secretase. This action releases the ICD and marks the initiation of ErbB4 intracellular signaling in what appears to be a relatively new paradigm of signal transduction. In particular, similar mechanisms have also been reported for the proteolytic processing of the Notch receptor and the Alzheimer’s amyloid precursor protein.

Importantly, the ICD of ErbB4 contains putative PPXY motifs (designated PY1−PY3) that serve as recognition sites for the recruitment of WW-containing proteins such as YAP transcriptional regulator, WWOX tumor suppressor, and ITCH ubiquitin ligase. The physical association between YAP and ICD facilitates translocation of the latter to the nucleus, where it is believed to regulate the transcription of hitherto unidentified target genes involved in key cellular processes, including embryonic development. It should be noted here that the ICD of ErbB4 is a much more potent co-activator of YAP2 than YAP1. While YAP acts as transcriptional co-activator of ErbB4, interaction with WWOX not only results in cytoplasmic sequestration of the ICD but also suppresses its transcriptional co-activation by YAP. On the other hand, binding to ITCH promotes polyubiquitination and degradation of ErbB4, thereby regulating its stability and the availability of the ICD for subsequent transcriptional regulation in the nucleus. In this manner, WWOX and ITCH antagonize the co-activation function of YAP by virtue of their ability to bind to the ICD of ErbB4 in a competitive manner. In this study, we focus our efforts on uncovering the molecular basis of
WWOX serves a nonredundant role that cannot be served by any other gene. Moreover, disruption of the WWOX gene in mice results in defective metabolism, impaired growth, and postnatal lethality.39-41 The WWOX tumor suppressor, comprised of a tandem copy module of WWOX in agreement with our previous findings reported previously.43-45

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Protein Preparation.** The WW1 domain (residues 16–50), WW2 domain (residues 57–91), and WW1–WW2 tandem module (residues 16–91) of human WWOX were cloned into pET30 bacterial expression vectors with an N-terminal His tag using Novagen LIC technology as described previously.43-45 The mutant construct containing the Y85W single substitution within the WW2 domain (WW2W) was generated using the polymerase chain reaction primer extension method.44 All recombinant proteins were subsequently expressed in the *Escherichia coli* BL21(DE3) bacterial strain (Invitrogen) and purified on a Ni-NTA affinity column using standard procedures as described previously.43 Further treatment on a Hiload Superdex 200 size-exclusion chromatography (SEC) column coupled in-line with a GE Akta fast performance liquid chromatography (FPLC) system led to purification of recombinant domains to apparent homogeneity as judged by sodium dodecyl sulfate–polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis analysis. The final yield was typically between 50 and 100 mg of protein of apparent homogeneity per liter of bacterial culture. The protein concentration was determined spectrophotometrically on the basis of extinction coefficients calculated for each recombinant construct using the online software ProtParam at ExPasy Server.45

**Peptide Synthesis.** The 12-mer wild-type and mutant peptides spanning various PPXY motifs within the ICD of human ErbB4 were commercially obtained from GenScript Corp. The amino acid sequence of these peptides is shown in Figure 1a. The peptide concentrations were measured gravimetrically.

**Isothermal Titration Calorimetry.** Isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) experiments were performed on a Microcal VP-ITC instrument. All measurements were repeated at least three times. Briefly, WW domains of WWOX alone or in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module and ErbB4 peptides were dialyzed in 50 mM sodium phosphate, 100 mM NaCl, 1 mM EDTA, and 5 mM β-mercaptoethanol (pH 7.0). All experiments were initiated by injecting 25 × 10 μL aliquots of each ErbB4 peptide (4 mM) from the syringe into the calorimetric cell containing 1.46 mL of 40–60 μM WW domains of WWOX alone or in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module at 25 °C. The change in thermal power as a function of each injection was automatically recorded using the ORIGIN software, and the raw data were further processed to yield binding isotherms of heat release per injection as a function of the molar ratio of each peptide to the WW domain.
construct. The heats of mixing and dilution were subtracted from the heat of binding per injection by conducting a control experiment in which the same buffer in the calorimetric cell was titrated against each peptide in an identical manner. To extract the equilibrium dissociation constant (Kc) and the enthalpic change (ΔH) associated with binding, the ITC isotherms were iteratively fit to a one-site binding model by nonlinear least-squares regression analysis using the integrated ORIGIN software as described previously.\textsuperscript{25,46} Notably, all binding stoichiometries were fixed to unity, while ΔH and Kc were allowed to float during the fitting procedure to improve the accuracy of the thermodynamic parameters. The free energy change (ΔG) upon peptide binding was calculated from the relationship

\[ ΔG = RT \ln K_c \]  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where R is the universal molar gas constant (1.99 cal K\(^{-1}\) mol\(^{-1}\)) and T is the absolute temperature. The entropic contribution (TAS) to the free energy of binding was calculated from the relationship

\[ TΔS = ΔH − ΔG \]  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where ΔH and ΔG are as defined above.

**Analytical Light Scattering.** Analytical light scattering (ALS) experiments were conducted at 10 °C on a Wyatt miniDAWN TREOS triple-angle static light scattering detector and Wyatt QELS dynamic light scattering detector coupled in-line with a Wyatt Optilab rEX differential refractive index detector and interfaced with a Hiload Superdex 200 size-exclusion chromatography (SEC) column under the control of a GE Akta FPLC system. Briefly, WW domains of WWOX alone or in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module displayed no observable angular dependence, thereby rendering the determination of Rg for each construct impractical. Nonetheless, M was obtained in a global analysis from the y-intercept of linear fits of a series of \((Kc)/R_g − \sin^2(θ/2)\) plots as a function of protein concentration along the elution profile of each protein species using SLS measurements at three scattering angles. The weighted-average molar mass (Mw) and number-average molar mass (Mn) were calculated from the following relationships:

\[ M_w = \sum(c_i M_i)/\sum c_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

\[ M_n = \sum c_i/\sum(c_i/M_i) \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

where \(c_i\) is the protein concentration and \(M_i\) is the observed molar mass at the \(i\)th slice within an elution profile. The time and concentration dependence of dynamic light scattering (DLS) intensity fluctuation of each protein construct resolved in the flow mode were measured by the Wyatt QELS detector positioned at 90° with respect to the incident laser beam. The DLS data were iteratively fit using nonlinear least-squares regression analysis to the following built-in equation in the ASTRA software:\textsuperscript{49−51}

\[ G(λ) = α \exp(-2Γτ) + β \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

where \(G(τ)\) is the autocorrelation function of dynamic light scattering intensity fluctuation, \(I\) \(τ\) is the delay time of the autocorrelation function, \(Γ\) is the decay rate constant of the autocorrelation function, \(α\) is the initial amplitude of the autocorrelation function at zero delay time, and \(β\) is the baseline offset (the value of the autocorrelation function at an infinite delay time). Thus, fitting the equation given above to a range of \(G(τ)−τ\) plots as a function of protein concentration along the elution profile of each protein species was used to compute the weighted-average value of \(Γ\) using DLS measurements at a scattering angle of 90°. Next, the translational diffusion coefficient (\(D_t\)) of each protein species was calculated from the following relationship:

\[ D_t = (Γλ^2)/[16π^2 n^2 \sin^2(θ/2)] \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where \(λ\) is the wavelength of laser light in solution (658 nm), \(n\) is the refractive index of the solvent, and \(θ\) is the scattering angle (90°). Additionally, the hydrodynamic radius (\(R_h\)) of each protein construct was determined from the Stokes–Einstein relationship:

\[ R_h = (k_BT)/(6πηD_t) \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)

where \(k_B\) is Boltzman’s constant (1.38 × 10\(^{-23}\) J K\(^{-1}\)), \(T\) is the absolute temperature, and \(η\) is the solvent viscosity. Notably, the \(R_h\) reported here represents the weighted-average value as defined by the following expression:

\[ R_h = \sum(c_i R_{h_i})/\sum c_i \]  \hspace{1cm} (11)

where \(c_i\) is the protein concentration and \(R_{h_i}\) is the observed hydrodynamic radius at the \(i\)th slice within an elution profile. It is also noteworthy that, in both the SLS and DLS measurements, the protein concentration (\(c\)) along the elution profile of each protein species was automatically quantified in the ASTRA.
software from the change in the refractive index ($\Delta n$) with respect to the solvent as measured by the Wyatt Optilab rEX detector using the following relationship:

$$c = \frac{(\Delta n)}{(dn/dc)}$$

(12)

where $dn/dc$ is the refractive index increment of the protein in solution.

**Molecular Modeling.** Molecular modeling (MM) was employed to build atomic structures of WW1 and WW2 domains of WWOX in the context of a tandem module and individually in complex with a peptide containing the PY3 motif located within the ICD of ErbB4 (ErbB4_PY3) using the MODELER software based on homology modeling.52 For individual liganded WW domains, the NMR structure of the homologous WW domain of YAP bound to a peptide containing the PPXY motif was used as a template [Protein Data Bank (PDB) entry 1JMQ]. For the unliganded tandem WW1−WW2 module, the NMR structure of the tandem WW1−WW2 module of FBP21 was used as a template (PDB entry 2JXW). A total of 100 atomic models were calculated, and the structure with the lowest energy, as judged by the MODELER Objective Function, was selected for further analysis. The atomic models were rendered using RIBBONS.53

**Molecular Dynamics.** Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations were performed with GROMACS54 using the integrated AMBER99SB-ILDN force field.55 Briefly, the structural models of WW1 and WW2 domains of WWOX in the context of a tandem module and individually in complex with the ErbB4_PY3 peptide were each centered in a cubic box with dimensions of 10 Å and hydrated using the extended simple point charge (SPC/E) water model.56 The ionic strength of the solution was set to 100 mM with NaCl, and the hydrated structures were energy-minimized with the steepest descent algorithm prior to equilibration under the NPT ensemble conditions, wherein the number of atoms ($N$), pressure ($P$), and temperature ($T$) within the system were kept constant. The particle mesh Ewald (PME) method57 was employed to compute long-range electrostatic interactions with a spherical cutoff of 10 Å and a grid space of 1.6 Å with a fourth-order interpolation. The Linear Constraint Solver (LINCS) algorithm was used to restrain bond lengths.58 All MD simulations were performed under periodic boundary conditions (PBC) at 300 K

![Figure 2. ITC analysis for the binding of the WW1 domain of WWOX to ErbB4_PY1 (a), ErbB4_PY2 (b), and ErbB4_PY3 (c) peptides. The top panels show the raw ITC data expressed as the change in thermal power with respect to time over the period of titration. In the bottom panels, the change in molar heat is expressed as a function of the molar ratio of the corresponding peptide to the WW1 domain. The red lines in the bottom panels show the fit of data to a one-site binding model using the integrated ORIGIN software as described previously.43,46](image)

**Table 1. Thermodynamic Parameters for the Binding of the WW1 Domain of WWOX to PPXY Peptides Derived from the ICD of ErbB4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>$K_d$ / $\mu$M</th>
<th>$\Delta H$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$T\Delta S$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY1</td>
<td>PNIIPPPIYTSRA</td>
<td>383 ± 30</td>
<td>-6.88 ± 0.48</td>
<td>-2.21 ± 0.43</td>
<td>-4.67 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY2</td>
<td>GHSPPPAYTPMS</td>
<td>362 ± 45</td>
<td>-3.66 ± 0.33</td>
<td>+1.04 ± 0.40</td>
<td>-4.70 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY3</td>
<td>TVLPPPYYRHRN</td>
<td>144 ± 16</td>
<td>-6.21 ± 0.54</td>
<td>-1.24 ± 0.10</td>
<td>-5.25 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements at pH 7.0 and 25 °C. Note that the consensus residues within the PPXY motif of each peptide are colored blue for the sake of clarity. All binding stoichiometries were fixed to unity. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements. All errors are given to one standard deviation.*
using the leapfrog integrator with a time step of 2 fs. For the final MD production runs, data were collected every nanosecond over a time scale of 250 ns. Structural snapshots taken at various intervals during the course of MD simulations were rendered using RIBBONS.53

■ RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The WW1 Domain of WWOX Binds to PPXY Motifs in ErbB4 with Distinct Affinities. To uncover the molecular basis of WWOX–ErbB4 interaction, we measured the binding of WW domains of WWOX to PPXY peptides derived from potential WWOX binding sites in ErbB4 using ITC. While representative ITC isotherms for the binding of the WW1 domain are shown in Figure 2, no binding of the WW2 domain to any of the PPXY motif was observed, even when external conditions, including temperature, ionic strength, and pH, were altered. This salient observation strongly suggests that the WW2 domain of WWOX does not harbor intrinsic potential to interact with PPXY motifs derived from ErbB4, thereby further corroborating our previous finding that WW2 likely serves as an orphan domain.43 On the other hand, the WW1 domain binds to all three PPXY motifs located within ErbB4 but in a distinct manner (Table 1). Thus, while binding of the WW1 domain to the ErbB4_PY3 motif occurs with an affinity of slightly greater than 100 μM, it recognizes the ErbB4_PY1 and ErbB4_PY2 motifs on the order of hundreds of micromolar. Despite these differences, binding of the WW1 domain of WWOX to all three PPXY motifs is predominantly driven by favorable enthalpic forces accompanied by small unfavorable or favorable entropic changes. Notably, the enthalpically driven nature of the WW–PPXY interaction suggests the formation of specific intermolecular interactions such as hydrogen bonding and van der Waals contacts that likely underscore the fidelity of this key protein–protein interaction. In contrast, the overall unfavorable entropic changes most likely result from the loss of degrees of freedom available to both partners upon intermolecular association.

To understand the molecular factors that drive the binding of the WW1 domain of WWOX to various PPXY motifs in ErbB4 with differential affinities (Table 1), we next performed an alanine scan on the ErbB4_PY3 peptide and measured the binding of each mutant peptide to the WW1 domain as described above (Table 2). Strikingly, our data reveal that alanine substitution of nonconsensus residues within and flanking the PPXY motif within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide has little effect or a negligible effect on the binding of the WW1 domain. This finding suggests that nonconsensus residues within and flanking the PPXY motifs are not critical for driving the WWOX–ErbB4 interaction but may be important for stabilizing the conformation of PPXY peptides. It is, however, noteworthy that the alanine substitution of residues P+2 and R+4, according to the nomenclature presented in Figure 1a.

---

Table 2. Thermodynamic Parameters for the Binding of the WW1 Domain of WWOX to the Wild Type (PY3_WT) and Single-Alanine Mutants of the ErbB4_PY3 Peptide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>K_d / μM</th>
<th>ΔH / kcal.mol⁻¹</th>
<th>TΔS / kcal.mol⁻¹</th>
<th>ΔG / kcal.mol⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PY3_WT</td>
<td>TVLPPPYPYHRN</td>
<td>144 ± 16</td>
<td>-6.21 ± 0.54</td>
<td>-1.24 ± 0.10</td>
<td>-5.25 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A-3</td>
<td>TALPPPYPYHRN</td>
<td>113 ± 21</td>
<td>-3.67 ± 0.23</td>
<td>+1.73 ± 0.34</td>
<td>-5.40 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A-2</td>
<td>TVAPPYPYPYHRN</td>
<td>151 ± 15</td>
<td>-6.19 ± 0.60</td>
<td>-1.32 ± 1.16</td>
<td>-5.22 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A-1</td>
<td>TVLAPPYPYHRN</td>
<td>161 ± 29</td>
<td>-3.33 ± 0.42</td>
<td>+1.86 ± 0.52</td>
<td>-5.19 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A0</td>
<td>TVLPAPPYPYHRN</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+1</td>
<td>TVLPAPAOPYHRN</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+2</td>
<td>TVLPAPAPYPYHRN</td>
<td>287 ± 37</td>
<td>-3.63 ± 0.30</td>
<td>+1.21 ± 0.37</td>
<td>-4.84 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+3</td>
<td>TVLPAPPAPYPYHRN</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
<td>NBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+4</td>
<td>TVLPAPPAPAHRN</td>
<td>275 ± 64</td>
<td>-4.02 ± 0.24</td>
<td>-0.85 ± 0.38</td>
<td>-4.87 ± 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+5</td>
<td>TVLPAPPYPARH</td>
<td>157 ± 18</td>
<td>-11.40 ± 1.41</td>
<td>-6.20 ± 1.48</td>
<td>-5.20 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY3_A+6</td>
<td>TVLPAPPYPYRAN</td>
<td>135 ± 30</td>
<td>-4.78 ± 0.26</td>
<td>-0.52 ± 0.39</td>
<td>-5.29 ± 0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements at pH 7.0 and 25 °C. Note that the alanine substitutions within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide are colored red and underlined, while the consensus residues within the PPXY motif are colored blue for the sake of clarity. All binding stoichiometries were fixed to unity. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements. All errors are given to one standard deviation. NBD indicates no binding determined because of weak interactions (K_d > 1 mM).
within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide slightly mitigates the binding of the WW1 domain. This implies that the presence of a proline and a charged, bulky residue at positions 2 and 4, respectively, may account for the binding of the ErbB4_PY3 peptide to the WW1 domain with an affinity higher than those for the other two peptides. Indeed, residues P+2 and R+4 within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide are replaced with non-proline and noncharged, nonbulky residues, respectively, at the structurally equivalent positions in ErbB4_PY1 and ErbB4_PY2 peptides. In particular, the importance of a proline at the +2 position may be ascribed to its ability to buttress the polyproline II (PPII) helical conformation of the ErbB4_PY3 peptide required for its optimal binding to the WW1 domain.59–62 Taken together, our thermodynamic analysis shows that the WW1 domain of WWOX binds to ErbB4 peptides in a rather promiscuous fashion with a subtle contribution of nonconsensus residues within and flanking the PPXY motifs to the overall free energy of binding.

**Structural Analysis Provides a Physical Basis for the Binding of the WW1 Domain and a Lack Thereof of the WW2 Domain of WWOX to PPXY Motifs within ErbB4.** To understand the physical basis of the binding of the WW1 domain and the lack thereof of the WW2 domain of WWOX to PPXY motifs within ErbB4, we built their respective structural models in complex with the ErbB4_PY3 peptide (Figure 3). Our structural analysis reveals that the ErbB4_PY3 peptide adopts the PPII helical conformation and binds within the hydrophobic groove of the triple-stranded β-sheet fold of the WW1 domain in a canonical manner59–62 (Figure 3a). Consistent with our thermodynamic data presented above (Tables 1 and 2), the consensus residues within the PPXY motif appear to be exclusively engaged in key intermolecular contacts with specific residues lining the hydrophobic groove of the WW1 domain, while nonconsensus residues within and flanking the PPXY motif make no discernible intermolecular contacts. Briefly, the pyrrolidine moiety of P0, the first proline within the PPXY motif according to the nomenclature presented in Figure 1a, stacks against the indole side chain of W44 in the WW1 domain (Figure 3a). It should be noted here that W44 represents one of the two signature tryptophan residues that lend their name to WW domains. On the other hand, the side chain moieties of residues Y33 and T42 within the WW1 domain sandwich the pyrrolidine ring of P+1 within the PPXY motif. Finally, the phenyl moiety of Y+3, the terminal tyrosine within the PPXY motif, is buried deep into the hydrophobic groove and is escorted by side chain atoms of the A35/H37/E40 triad in the WW1 domain.

It is telling that the various interactions between specific side chain groups within the WW1 domain and the ErbB4_PY3 peptide are stabilized by an extensive network of van der Waals contacts and hydrogen bonding (Figure 3a). Importantly, the H37 phenolic hydrogen of the Y+3 residue appears to hydrogen bond with the imidazole Nδ1 atom of H37 in the WW1 domain. On the other hand, the E40 residue in the WW1 domain stabilizes the aromatic ring of Y+3 within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide by virtue of the apolar character of its -C\(\delta\)H2- methylene atoms, while its negatively charged carboxyl group points away to prevent unfavorable contact with Y+3. Of particular note is the observation that the pyrrolidine ring of P+2 within the ErbB4_PY3 peptide in complex with the WW1 domain is fully solvent-exposed (not shown). This strongly suggests that the P+2 residue, which is replaced by a non-proline in ErbB4_PY1 and ErbB4_PY2 peptides, may play an important role in the stabilization of the PPII helical conformation of the ErbB4_PY3 peptide. Accordingly, the presence of a proline at position +2 could account for the binding of the ErbB4_PY3 peptide to the WW1 domain having an affinity higher than those of the other two peptides, as suggested by our thermodynamic data (Tables 1 and 2), by virtue of its ability to lower the entropic penalty to the overall free energy of binding.

Equally importantly, while our alanine scan suggests that none of the residues flanking the PPXY motif are critical for binding to the WW1 domain in terms of the change in the overall free energy (\(\Delta G\)), the underlying changes in the enthalpic contribution (\(\Delta H\)) nonetheless paint a very different picture (Table 2). In particular, the enthalpic change associated with the binding of the mutant PY3_A+5 peptide, harboring an alanine in place of H+5, is concomitant with the release of more than \(-5\) kcal/mol of favorable enthalpy relative to the PY3_WT peptide. While we note the difficulties associated with the accurate determination of \(\Delta H\) associated with weak macromolecular interactions, it is nevertheless conceivable.
that the much smaller size of alanine allows the PY3_A+5 mutant peptide to engage in closer intermolecular contacts with the WW1 domain relative to the PY3_WT peptide. However, the resulting release of more favorable enthalpy appears to be offset and largely compensated by an equal but unfavorable change in entropy in agreement with the ubiquitous enthalpy–entropy compensation phenomenon that governs macro-molecular interactions (Table 2). It is also noteworthy that water-mediated hydrogen bonding has been recently shown to play a key role in driving the binding of proline-rich ligands to SH3 domains.63−65 Thus, although the role of water in mediating WW−ligand interactions has not been directly probed, it is possible that hydration also plays an important role in fine-tuning the affinity of various ErbB4 peptides for the WW1 domain of WWOX in addition to the role of specific intermolecular interactions.

More importantly, our structural analysis provides a tantalizing rationale for the lack of binding of the WW2 domain of WWOX to ErbB4 peptides (Figure 3b). The fact that all residues but W44 in the WW1 domain involved in intermolecular contacts with the ErbB4_PY3 peptide are highly conserved within the hydrophobic groove of the WW2 domain is striking. Thus, the Y33/T42 pair in the WW1 domain that serves as a counterpart for accommodating P+1 is substituted by a relatively conservative F74/T83 pair in the WW2 domain. In a similar manner, the A35/H37/E40 triad in the WW1 domain that escorts Y+3 is replaced by a relatively conserved V76/H78/K81 triad in the WW2 domain. However, residue W44 in the WW1 domain, whose indole side chain is involved in the stabilization of P0, is replaced by Y85 in the WW2 domain. Given the distinguishing chemistry and apolar character of the aromatic rings of W44 and Y85, we reason that this tyrosine for tryptophan substitution within the WW2 domain most likely accounts for its lack of binding to PPXY motifs. To test the validity of this hypothesis, we introduced the Y85W substitution within the WW2 domain and subsequently measured the binding of this mutant WW2 domain, hereafter termed the WW2W domain, to various ErbB4 peptides using ITC (Table 3). Our data indicate that while the WW2W mutant domain recognizes ErbB4_PY1 and ErbB4_PY2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>$K_d$ / $\mu M$</th>
<th>$\Delta H$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta S$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G$ / kcal.mol$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY1</td>
<td>FNIPPIYTSRA</td>
<td>680 ± 121</td>
<td>-4.74 ± 0.52</td>
<td>-0.40 ± 0.62</td>
<td>-4.33 ± 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY2</td>
<td>GHSPPAAYTFMS</td>
<td>620 ± 55</td>
<td>-8.08 ± 1.09</td>
<td>-3.70 ± 1.14</td>
<td>-4.38 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY3</td>
<td>TVLPPIYRHRN</td>
<td>54 ± 9</td>
<td>-4.15 ± 0.28</td>
<td>-1.68 ± 0.37</td>
<td>-5.83 ± 0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements at pH 7.0 and 25 °C. Note that the WW2W domain is the mutant construct of the WW2 domain harboring the Y85W substitution. The consensus residues within the PPXY motif of each peptide are colored blue for the sake of clarity. All binding stoichiometries were fixed to unity. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements. All errors are given to one standard deviation. NBD indicates no binding determined because of weak interactions ($K_d > 1$ mM).
peptides rather weakly, it binds to the ErbB4_PY3 peptide with an affinity that is more than 2-fold stronger than that observed for the binding of the WW1 domain (Tables 1 and 3). Taken together, these findings have an important implication for the engineering of WW domains of WWOX for therapeutic intervention.

The WW2 Domain Augments the Binding of the WW1 Domain in the Context of the WW1−WW2 Tandem Module of WWOX to PPXY Motifs within ErbB4. We previously reported that while the WW1 domain of WWOX is structurally disordered and folds upon ligand binding, the WW2 domain not only adopts a fully structured conformation but also aids in the stabilization and binding of the ligand to the WW1 domain. On the basis of this earlier finding, we postulate that the WW2 domain likely serves as a chaperone to augment the physiological function of the WW1 domain within WWOX. To test this hypothesis further, we next conducted ITC analysis on the binding of the WW1−WW2 tandem module of WWOX to various ErbB4 peptides (Figure 4). Conspicuously, our data show that the WW1 domain in the context of the WW1−WW2 tandem module binds to ErbB4 peptides with affinities that are more than 2-fold stronger than those observed for the binding of the WW1 domain alone (Tables 1 and 4).

**Table 4. Thermodynamic Parameters for the Binding of the WW1−WW2 Tandem Module of WWOX to PPXY Peptides Derived from the ICD of ErbB4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>$K_d / \mu M$</th>
<th>$\Delta H / \text{cal.mol}^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta S / \text{kal.mol}^{-1}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G / \text{cal.mol}^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY1</td>
<td>PNI\text{PPPIY}TSRA</td>
<td>170 ± 12</td>
<td>-7.25 ± 0.88</td>
<td>-2.10 ± 0.92</td>
<td>-5.15 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY2</td>
<td>GHS\text{PPAY}TPMS</td>
<td>175 ± 13</td>
<td>-4.88 ± 0.28</td>
<td>-0.26 ± 0.34</td>
<td>-5.13 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErbB4_PY3</td>
<td>TV\text{LP}PP\text{PY}RHRN</td>
<td>68 ± 8</td>
<td>-5.00 ± 0.30</td>
<td>-0.70 ± 0.37</td>
<td>-5.70 ± 0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All parameters were obtained from ITC measurements at pH 7.0 and 25 °C. Note that the consensus residues within the PPXY motif of each peptide are colored blue for the sake of clarity. All binding stoichiometries were fixed to unity. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements. All errors are given to one standard deviation.*

![Figure 5. ALS analysis of WW1 (top) and WW2 (middle) domains alone and in the context of the WW1−WW2 tandem module (bottom) of WWOX. (a) Elution profiles as monitored by the differential refractive index ($\Delta n$) of each protein construct plotted as a function of elution volume (V). (b) Partial Zimm plots obtained for each protein construct from analytical SLS measurements. Note that the red lines through the data points represent linear fits. (c) Autocorrelation function plots obtained for each protein construct from analytical DLS measurements. Note that the red lines represent nonlinear least-squares fits of the data to an autocorrelation function as embodied in eq 8.*
dimer or a higher-order oligomer to adopt quaternary structure cannot be ruled out either. This latter view is supported by the observation that the WW2 domain of the SAV1 adaptor, which shares a high degree of sequence homology with the WW2 domain of WWOX and has no known ligand, self-associates into a homodimer.66

In an effort to shed light on the physical basis of how the WW2 domain modulates binding of the ligand to the WW1 domain, we next performed ALS analysis on WW domains of WWOX alone and in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module (Figure 5). Importantly, we also quantified various physical parameters accompanying the solution behavior of WW domains from the first principles of hydrodynamics without any assumptions (Table 5). Our data indicate that WW domains alone and in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module predominantly adopt a monomeric conformation in solution. This is evidenced by the fact that the observed molar mass for all species in solution is in remarkable agreement with their corresponding molar mass calculated from their amino acid sequence alone (Table 5). Notably, the WW1 domain also harbors some propensity to homodimerize, as indicated by a small left-hand shoulder in the corresponding elution profile (Figure 5a). However, the homodimer–monomer equilibrium appears to be largely in favor of the latter species. Given that the ALS analysis was conducted at high protein concentrations (100–200 μM), a practical necessity because of the rather low sensitivity of light scattering detectors, we believe that the propensity of the WW1 domain to homodimerize is unlikely to be physiologically relevant. Most importantly, the lack of angular dependence of static light scattering is indicative of the fact that WW domains alone and in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module do not self-associate into higher-order oligomers (Figure 5b). This notion is further vindicated by the fact that the $M_w/M_n$ ratio is close to unity for all species (Table 5), implying that the WW domains alone and in the context of the WW1–WW2 tandem module are highly monodisperse.

To gain insights into macromolecular conformation, we also calculated the hydrodynamic radius ($R_h$) for each species on the basis of dynamic light scattering (Figure 5c and Table 5). Such analysis reveals that while both WW domains alone display a hydrodynamic radius of $\sim20$ Å, it only slightly increases in the case of the WW1–WW2 tandem module. While this is indicative of the fact that the WW domains may lie close to the WW1–WW2 tandem module, the alternative possibility that they may also physically associate with each other cannot be excluded either. To test this plausible scenario, we conducted ITC analysis on the binding of the WW1 domain of WWOX to the WW2 domain and vice versa. Interestingly, our analysis revealed no observable binding between the two WW domains. However, this does not necessarily preclude their physical association in the context of a tandem module, wherein they are physically connected by a short linker. For example, the presence of an interdomain linker is likely to significantly lower the entropic penalty associated with their physical association.

### The WW1–WW2 Tandem Module of WWOX Displays Dynamic Plasticity

To further test the extent to which WW domains of WWOX may physically associate with each other, we next conducted MD simulations on the WW1–WW2 tandem module (Figure 6). Briefly, the starting MD conformation of the WW1–WW2 tandem module of WWOX was structurally modeled on the basis of its homology with the tandem WW1–WW2 module of FB24 pre-mRNA splicing factor.67 As shown in Figure 6a, the MD trajectory reveals that the WW1–WW2 tandem module undergoes a rapid “burst” phase over the first 50 ns and then slowly reaches structural equilibrium with a root-mean-square deviation (rmsd) for the backbone atoms in the neighborhood of 10 Å. This rather large rmsd value is strongly indicative of the fact that the WW domains are unlikely to be physically associated with each other and most probably experience large degrees of freedom relative to each other.

To further glean insights into the origin of such relative flexibility, we also analyzed the root-mean-square fluctuation (rmsf) of backbone atoms over the course of the MD simulation (Figure 6b). Remarkably, our rmsf analysis reveals that the overall lack of stability of the WW1–WW2 tandem module arises from the rather large fluctuations within each of the two constituent WW domains in lieu of the interdomain linker. Notably, the WW1 domain appears to be somewhat less stable than the WW2 domain, which is in agreement with our observation that the latter serves the role of a chaperonin for the former. In other words, the relative flexibility of the WW1 domain is likely to be important for its ligand binding function, while the relative stability of the WW2 domain is a manifestation of its ability to aid the function of the WW1 domain. Strikingly, the rather small fluctuations of atoms observed within the interdomain linker with respect to their counterparts within the constituent WW domains imply that their motions may be somewhat restricted relative to each other. This notion is indeed further supported through the assessment of the radius of gyration ($R_g$) of the WW1–WW2 tandem module as a function of simulation time (Figure 6c). It is evident from such analysis that the WW1–WW2 tandem module boasts a rather compact conformation, which undergoes rapid expansion as monitored by an increase in $R_g$ during the first 50 ns burst phase. This is followed by a relaxation event that results in the WW1–WW2 tandem module becoming somewhat more compact in size than the starting conformation.

To investigate how a sharp increase followed by a rather slow decrease in $R_g$ relates to conformational changes within the WW1–WW2 tandem module, we took structural snapshots of the protein at various time points during the course of our MD simulation (Figure 7). Consistent with our $R_g$ analysis (Figure 6c), the constituent WW domains within the WW1–WW2

### Table 5. Hydrodynamic Parameters for WW Domains Alone and in the Context of the WW1–WW2 Tandem Module of WWOX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construct</th>
<th>$M_w$ (kDa)</th>
<th>$M_n$ (kDa)</th>
<th>$M_w/M_n$</th>
<th>$R_h$ (Å)</th>
<th>associativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WW1</td>
<td>9 ± 2</td>
<td>9 ± 1</td>
<td>1.06 ± 0.08</td>
<td>18 ± 1</td>
<td>monomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW2</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>9 ± 1</td>
<td>1.02 ± 0.03</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>monomer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW1–WW2 tandem</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.04</td>
<td>27 ± 1</td>
<td>monomer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“All parameters were obtained from ALS measurements at pH 7.0 and 25 °C. Note that the calculated molar masses of recombinant WW1, WW2, and WW1–WW2 constructs from their respective amino acid sequence are 9, 9, and 14 kDa, respectively. Errors were calculated from at least three independent measurements. All errors are given to one standard deviation.
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tandem module rapidly fall apart from their proximity observed in the starting conformation by virtue of the ability of the interdomain linker to uncoil. This relaxation step is slowly followed by compaction in which the two WW domains come together in a manner akin to physical association of two bodies. However, in light of the rather large rmsd observed for the WW1–WW2 tandem domain at structural equilibrium (Figure 6a), it is unlikely that such a compact conformation is stable and does not support their physical association in adopting a globular fold instead of a dumbbell-like conformation. Nonetheless, while the data presented above cannot ascertain the presence or absence of a stable physical association between the tandem WW domains of WWOX, their remarkable dynamic plasticity could in principle drive their transient physical association to allow the WW2 domain to chaperone the biological function of the WW1 domain.

### CONCLUSIONS

Receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs) play a key role in relaying extracellular signals in the form of growth factors, hormones, and cytokines to downstream effectors on the cytoplasmic side. This information is then ultimately integrated via specific signaling cascades to regulate the transcriptional machinery within the nucleus in a wide variety of cellular processes central to human health and disease. However, in recent years, it has increasingly become clear that RTKs such as ErbB4 may also employ an alternative mechanism for directly affecting gene transcription within the nucleus. In this new paradigm of signal transduction, the RTKs undergo proteolytic processing in response to mitogenic stimulation such that the cleaved fragment on the cytoplasmic side translocates to the nucleus and directly acts as a transcriptional regulator by virtue of its ability to collaborate with other cellular partners such as WWOX.

In an effort to understand the molecular basis of how such cleaved fragments affect gene transcription, we undertook the work presented here. With respect to this goal, our study shows that while the WW1 domain of WWOX binds to all three PPXY motifs (PY1–PY3) located within the ICD of ErbB4 in a highly promiscuous manner, the WW2 domain displays no ligand binding potential. Given that we have relied here on short peptides to mimic PPXY motifs in the ICD, caution is warranted in that these motifs may depart from their physiological behavior when they are treated as short peptides because of the loss of local conformational constraints to which they may be subjected in the context of the ICD. Additionally, the peptides used in our study were purposefully designed with charged amino and carboxyl termini to enhance their solubility in an aqueous buffer. While we recognize the fact that the protection of charged termini with amide and acetyl groups would have constituted better models of PPXY motifs, the loss of significant solubility of protected peptides clearly posed more technical challenges. We also note that the physiological relevance of PY1 and PY2 motifs in recruiting WWOX is questionable in light of the rather weak affinity with which they bind to the WW1 domain of WWOX compared to affinity of the PY3 motif. Interestingly, in vivo studies suggest that the interaction of WWOX with CYT1 and CYT2 isoforms of ErbB4 is indistinguishable. Given the fact that CYT1 harbors only PY1 and PY3, the role of the PY2 motif does not appear to be important for driving the WWOX–ErbB4 interaction. On the other hand, while the binding of YAP to the PY3 motif has been demonstrated in vivo, binding to the PY1 motif was not observed. We also note that Nedd4 ligases such as ITCH, WWP1, and NEDD4 have been suggested to exclusively bind to CYT1 but not CYT2 of ErbB4. This finding thus invokes a unique role of the PY2 motif in driving the interaction of ErbB4 with members of the Nedd4 family.

On the basis of the data presented here, together with our previous work, it appears increasingly likely that the WW2 domain is a putative orphan WW domain that is devoid of ligand binding capability and has evolved as a chaperone to augment the physiological function of the WW1 domain within WWOX. This notion is further corroborated by the observation that WWOX binds to its cellular partners exclusively through the WW1 domain. Most importantly, we have also shown here that the ability of the WW2 domain to chaperone the WW1 domain within WWOX most likely lies in their
dynamic plasticity that allows the WW2 domain to at least transiently associate with WW1. This scenario would be similar to that of the tandem WW domains of FBP21 pre-mRNA splicing factor and the fruit fly suppressor of deltex Su(dx) involved in Notch signaling. In both of these cases, the tandem WW domains are connected by a highly flexible loop, which allows them to move freely with respect to each other without a fixed orientation. On the other hand, stable physical association between the tandem WW domains of WWOX would likely impart rigidity and a fixed orientation upon them in a manner akin to that observed for the tandem WW domains of yeast splicing factor Prp40. Notably, the interdomain linker in Prp40 is comprised of a well-ordered helix that appears to impart strict rigidity and a fixed orientation upon tandem WW domains. Accordingly, the tandem WW domains in Prp40 essentially act as a single rigid body, and the ligand binding grooves lie on opposite faces, which allows them to bind to distinct ligands and bridge precisely between target sites within the splicing machinery.

It is well-documented that the WW domains can be used to regulate cellular signaling pathways. With respect to this goal, our demonstration that the WW2 domain of WWOX can be genetically manipulated through the Y85W substitution to generate the WW2W engineered domain that recognizes cognate ligands of the WW1 domain with high affinity bears therapeutic significance. In particular, the WW1—WW2W engineered tandem module could be therapeutically exploited to negatively regulate signaling pathways in response to hyperactivation of ErbB4 observed in a myriad of human disorders. In short, our study offers not only molecular insights into the physical and thermodynamic forces at play in the operation of a key WW—ligand interaction involved in mediating a plethora of cellular processes but also new directions for the rational design of novel therapies with greater efficacy coupled with low toxicity for the treatment of human disease.
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