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Lactose permease (LacY) catalyzes oligosaccharide/H⁺ symport across the membrane. Until recently, all LacY structures demonstrate inward-open conformations with closed periplasmic side. We sought to obtain LacY crystals that diffract at higher resolution and/or provide previously unsolved conformation. The strategy was to employ hybrid proteins available in the laboratory in which cytochrome\textsubscript{b562} or flavodoxin-1 of \textit{E. coli} was fused to LacY. Of the sixteen constructs, large-scale expression/purification of two LacY/cytochrome\textsubscript{b562} constructs was successful but crystallization proved difficult.
The crystal structure of LacY double-Trp (G46W/G262W) mutant with β-D-galactopyranosyl-1-thio-β-D-galactopyranoside (TDG) was recently reported. This structure has almost occluded, outward-open conformation with a rotation at the thioester linkage in TDG as compared to the previous structures. We obtained crystals of this double-mutant with octyl β-D-galactopyranoside that diffracted to ~20 Å. A mutagenesis strategy is proposed to obtain LacY in fully outward-open conformation. Further, a transport mechanism involving a configurational change(s) in TDG is postulated.
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INTRODUCTION

Transport proteins are part of integral membrane proteins in which the major facilitator superfamily (MFS) (Griffith et al., 1992; Baldwin, 1993; Goswitz and Brooker, 1995; Pao et al., 1998; Saidijam et al., 2011; Saier et al., 1999; Saier, 2000; Reddy et al., 2012; Madej et al., 2013; Madej and Kaback, 2013) and ATP-binding cassette (ABC) superfamily (Higgins, 1992; Fath and Kolter 1993; Island and Kadner, 1993; Dean and Allikmets, 1995a,b; Dean et al., 2001; Higgins, 2001) are found to occur ubiquitously in all classifications of living organisms (Pao et al., 1998; Paulsen et al., 1998; Saier et al., 1999; Saier 2000; Reddy et al., 2012; Madej et al., 2013; Madej and Kaback, 2013). The MFS proteins transduce the free energy stored in an electrochemical proton gradient into a substrate concentration gradient (Madej et al., 2013; Reddy et al., 2012), whereas the ABC superfamily utilizes the energy released from ATP hydrolysis to drive solute accumulation or efflux (Island and Kadner, 1993; Higgins, 2001). Members of the ABC superfamily are multicomponent transporters capable of transporting both small molecules and macromolecules, and are referred to as primary transporters (Higgins, 1992; Paulsen et al., 1997; Higgins, 2001). On the other hand, members of the MFS superfamily are single-polypeptide transporters capable of transporting only small molecules and are referred to as secondary transporters (Pao et al., 1998; Reddy et al., 2012; Madej et al., 2013).

The MFS represents the largest and most diverse group of transporters in the membranes of all living cells, and constitute ~25 % of prokaryotic membrane transport proteins (Paulsen et al., 1998; Saier et al., 1999; Saier, 2000; Reddy et al., 2012). They
are also referred to as the uniporter-symporter-antiporter family and transport a wide range of substrates in both directions across the membrane (Baldwin, 1993; Goswitz and Brooker, 1995; Pao et al., 1998; Madej et al., 2013). MFS transporters mostly contain 12 irregular transmembrane helices that form a deep central hydrophilic cavity through which the substrate/ions are transported (Calamia and Manoil, 1990; Abramson et al., 2003; Guan and Kaback, 2006; Dang et al., 2010; Madej et al., 2013). This family of proteins likely evolved from intragenic multiplication (Pao et al., 1998; Hvorup and Saier, 2002) since they share an alternating inverted triple-helix structural symmetry within the N- and C-terminal six-helix bundles (Radestock and Forrest, 2011). Although, MFS transporters have similar structural features, they share only weak sequence identities. Further, an important feature of the secondary transporters is their conformational adaptabilities to access the sugar from either side of the membrane without significantly altering the sugar and proton binding sites (Radestock and Forrest, 2011; Smirnova et al., 2011; Sugihara et al., 2012).

The lactose permease (LacY) of *E. coli* is the most extensively studied MFS protein (Guan and Kaback, 2006; Smirnova et al., 2011) and is part of the oligosaccharide:H\(^+\) symporter (OHS) family (Pao et al., 1998). LacY catalyzes the symport of D-galactose and D-galactopyranoside with an H\(^+\) across the membrane in either direction, depending upon the polarity of the sugar concentration gradient or the H\(^+\) electrochemical gradient (Guan and Kaback, 2006; Madej and Kaback, 2014). Until recently, the structures of wild-type LacY (Guan et al., 2007), the conformationally restricted C154G mutant (Abramson et al., 2003; Mirza et al., 2006) and a single-Cys
mutant with a covalently bound inactivator (Chaptal et al., 2011) had been determined by X-ray crystallographic methods, and all of these structures exhibit the same inward-open conformation with a relatively low resolution. As predicted, the LacY monomer is composed of 12 transmembrane helices in which the N- and C-terminal six helices form two distinct helical bundles (Fig. 1). In all structures, LacY molecule has a large interior hydrophilic cavity tightly closed from the periplasmic side and open only from the cytoplasmic side, which represents an inward-facing conformation as illustrated in the report by Abramson et al., 2003. In the structure (Fig. 1), the β-D-galactopyranosyl-1-thio-β-D-galactopyranoside (TDG), a homolog of lactose, is located at roughly the same distances from both sides of the membrane (Abramson et al., 2003).

The exposed hydrophilic surface area of LacY is extremely small, which limits extensive crystal contacts that, in part, might contribute to obtaining the low resolution diffracting crystals. Our initial objective was to increase the hydrophilic surface area of LacY using the approach implemented successfully earlier for crystallization of the β2-adrenergic G-protein coupled receptor (GPCR) (Rosenbaum et al., 2007). For this, Rosenbaum and colleagues designed a chimeric GPCR consisting of a T4-lysozyme sequence (PDB ID 2LZM) inserted between helix 5 and 6 of the receptor, thereby stabilizing the two flexible helices and allowing the protein to crystallize more readily (Rosenbaum et al., 2007). For the first part of the proposed studies, we obtained putative hybrid molecules containing cytochrome_b562 or bacterial flavodoxin-1 insert (Fig. 2, Table 1) into several loops of LacY (Prive et al., 1994; Engel et al., 2002). Although attempts had been made earlier to crystallize these hybrid proteins without success, we wished to
employ the recent advancements in the membrane protein crystallization techniques to
determine whether we could obtain crystals of the hybrid LacY molecules. DNA
sequencing, expression/purification and crystallization trails of these hybrid molecules
constitute the first part of the thesis.

Recently, crystal structure of a double-Trp mutant (G46W/G262W) of LacY was
determined at 3.5 Å resolution in partially occluded, outward-open conformation with a
bound lactose analog, TDG (Kumar et al., 2014). The TDG molecule in this structure
(Fig. 3) has a different configuration and interacts more strongly with LacY than the
previously published structure (Abramson et al., 2003). We attempted to obtain crystal
structures of this double-Trp LacY mutant with octyl β-D-galactopyranoside ligand to
understand if the galctopyranoside ring interacts similarly as in TDG. Initial screens
yielded crystals that diffracted to ~20 Å. Additional crystallization trials and extensive
resources would be required to obtain crystals with improved resolution. Further, based
upon analysis of the double-Trp mutant, we provide a mutagenesis strategy to obtain
structure of LacY in fully outward-open conformation. Finally, consistent with the
available data, a configurational change in TDG during transport is proposed that has not
been discussed or elaborated previously.
MATERIALS and METHODS

Preparation of Chemically Competent Escherichia coli Cells

Frozen *E. coli* competent cells (XL1 Blue, C41; see Table 2) were plated on Luria-Bertani (LB) agarose plates containing the appropriate antibiotics and incubated at 37 °C for 16 h. Single colonies were inoculated into 5-mL cultures LB broth containing the appropriate antibiotics and grown in incubator-shaker at 37 °C for 16 h. The 5-mL cultures were then diluted 10-fold into media of the same composition and grown to OD\textsubscript{600nm} = 0.6. Cultures were centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min and supernatants discarded. Cells were resuspended in 50 mM CaCl\textsubscript{2} on ice in half the original volume and incubated on ice for 30 min. The suspensions were then centrifuged at 4000 rpm for 10 min and supernatants again discarded. Cell pellets were resuspended in a solution containing 50 mM CaCl\textsubscript{2} and 15% glycerol in 10 percent of the original volume, flash frozen and stored at -80 °C.

Cloning and Construct Design

Lactose permease gene was cloned from *E. coli* genomic DNA into the pT7-5 expression vector, and carrier protein coding sequence was inserted at various sites of *lacY* sequence in previous studies (Engel *et al.*, 2002). Competent *E. coli* XL1Blue cells were transformed with each plasmid of interest. Approximately 5 µg of DNA was incubated in 50 µL competent cells for 20 min on ice, 45 sec at 42 °C, followed by 5 min on ice. Cells were allowed to grow for one hour in standard outgrowth culture broth at 37
°C while shaking, and the entire quantity of cells was plated on LB-agarose plates containing ampicillin (100 µg/mL) and incubated for 16 h at 37 °C. Single colonies were inoculated in 5 mL LB broth containing ampicillin (100 µg/mL) and incubated for 16 h at 37 °C. Single colonies were inoculated in 5 mL LB broth containing ampicillin (100 µg/mL) for 16 hours, cells were pelleted and the plasmid DNA was purified using the QIAGEN Miniprep kit (www.qiagen.com) and sequenced using the Sanger sequencing technology at the GenoSeq UCLA facility.

**Construct Mutagenesis**

For the chimeric permeases listed in Table 1, site-directed mutagenesis of residue Cys-154 to Gly-154 (C154G mutagenesis) was performed using the Quikchange method (Stratagene) with forward primer 5'-GCGCTGGGCGCCTCAATTGTCGGGATCATG-3' and reverse primer 3'-CATGATCCCGACAATTGAGGCGCCCAGCGC-5' (Integrated DNA Technologies) as outlined earlier (Smirnova et al., 2003). The double-Trp LacY mutant was prepared as described in Smirnova et al., 2013.

**Small Scale Expression Studies**

Competent *E. coli* XL1Blue cells (Table 2) were transformed as described above. Colonies were inoculated into 25 mL cultures LB broth and grown to OD$_{600nm}$ = 0.6 at 37 °C while shaking. Cultures were induced to 0.4 mM and 1.0 mM isopropyl β-D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG) and continued to grow in similar conditions for 4 h. Cells were harvested at 4000 rpm for 15 min; pellets were resuspended and washed in 50 mM
potassium phosphate (KP\textsubscript{i}) pH 7.5 at 4000 rpm for 15 min. Cells were kept on ice at 4 °C for 16 h before small-scale membrane preparation as described below. Total membrane protein concentration was quantified using Pierce Micro-BCA analysis. Quantities of 2-40 µg total membrane protein were analyzed using SDS-PAGE and immunoblot (Western blot) analyses as described below.

**Membrane Preparation**

Cell pellets were resuspended in 5x volume of a refrigerated buffer containing 50 mM sodium phosphate (NaP\textsubscript{i}) pH 7.5, 2 mM DTT, 28 mg/L DNAspe (Calbiochem), 102 mg/L Pefabloc (Gold Biotechnology), and 15 mg/L Complete tablets (Roche Diagnostics) and lysed 2x at 1500-2000 psi in a French Pressure Cell. Cell debris was removed by centrifugation in a GSA rotor at 11,000 rpm x15 min. Supernatant was then ultracentrifuged at 38,000 rpm for 3 h in Ti45 ultracentrifugation rotor. Membrane pellets were resuspended in 50 mM KP\textsubscript{i} pH 7.5 using a homogenizer, flash frozen, and stored at -80 °C.

**Western Blot Analysis**

Protein samples were transferred from SDS-PAGE gels to nitrocellulose membranes for one hour at 400 mA, 100V, 30W in a transfer buffer of 194 mM glycine, 15 mM Tris base, 20% methanol. Membranes were incubated in a blocking buffer (Qiagen) for one hour while shaking, followed by an incubation in similar conditions with anti-pentahistidine horseradish peroxidase conjugate antibody solution (Qiagen) for
one hour. Membranes were washed with TBS and TBST+T (20 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.5, 1 M NaCl; + 0.2% v/v Triton X-100, 0.05% Tween 20), rinsed with water and developed in a detection solution of Pierce’s SuperSignal West Pico Chemiluminescent Substrate.

**Large Scale Expression**

**Chimeric Permeases**

*E. coli* XL1Blue cells transformed with the appropriate plasmids were grown in 10-L BioFlo 2000 fermenters to OD$_{600\text{nm}}$ = 0.6 in LB broth at 37 °C with stirring at 300 rpm. Oxygen content was varied between 5-10 L O$_2$/minute across separate trials. Culture was induced to 0.4 mM IPTG, temperature lowered to 32°C and stirring to 50 rpm for 3 hrs. Induction temperature was varied between 18-37°C across separate trials. Cells were harvested at 6800 rpm x15 min/L, resuspended and washed in 50 mM KP$_i$ pH 7.5. Pellets were flash frozen and stored at -80 °C.

**Double-Trp LacY Mutant**

*E. coli* C41 cells transformed with the 2W-LacY-pT7-5 plasmid were grown in the aforementioned fermenters to OD$_{600\text{nm}}$ = 0.6 in LB broth at 37 °C with stirring at 350 rpm. Culture was induced to 0.3 mM IPTG, temperature lowered to 32°C and stirring to 50 rpm for 5 hrs. Oxygen content was maintained at 10 L O$_2$/minute throughout. Cells were harvested and stored as described above for the chimeric permease constructs.
Purification

Chimeric Permeases

Membranes were solubilized with 2% DDM on ice for 30 min with stirring. Membrane suspension was ultracentrifuged at 60,000 rpm for 20 min in Beckman Ti-70 rotor. Supernatants were combined and NaCl was added to 200 mM, Imidazole to 5 mM and pH adjusted to 7.6 by addition of 0.5 M dibasic NaPi, pH 10. Extract was applied to 5 mL TALON resin column equilibrated in column buffer (50 mM NaPi, pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM, 200 mM NaCl, 5 mM Imidazole) at flow rate 1-2 mL/min. Non-absorbed material was washed with column buffer, followed by wash with Buffer A (50 mM NaPi, pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM, 190 mM NaCl, 15 mM Imidazole) and elution with Buffer B (50 mM NaPi, pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM, 150 mM Imidazole). Elution volumes were concentrated in 100 molecular weight cut off (MWCO) Amicon Ultra-15 centrifugal filter units at 3500 rpm in swinging bucket rotors to a final volume of ~1 mL before dilution with Buffer C (50 mM NaPi, pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM) to 15 mL and further concentration to 5-10 mg/mL. Buffer was then exchanged to Buffer D (50 mM HEPES pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM) to remove phosphate.

Double-Trp LacY Mutant

Membranes were solubilized, NaCl (200 mM final concentration) and Imidazole (5 mM final concentration) were added, and pH was adjusted to 7.6 as described above. Extract was similarly applied to a 5 mL TALON resin column equilibrated in a column
buffer consisting of 50 mM NaP$_i$ pH 7.6, 0.01% DDM, 200 mM NaCl, 5 mM Imidazole. Non-absorbed material was washed with this column buffer, followed by wash with Buffer C (50 mM NaP$_i$ pH 7.6, 0.01% DDM, 190 mM NaCl, 10 mM Imidazole) to baseline. Detergent was exchanged by washing with 10 column volumes of Buffer D (50 mM NaP$_i$ pH 7.6, 0.2% NG). Protein was eluted in ~5 column volumes elution buffer (20 mM HEPES pH 6.5, 0.2% NG, 200 mM Imidazole). Elution fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE and concentrated using 50 MWCO Amicon Ultra-15 centrifugal filter units at 3500 rpm in swinging bucket rotors to a final volume of ~0.4 mL and diluted to 15 mL in an imidazole-free buffer consisting of 20 mM HEPES pH 6.5, 0.2% NG. This solution was concentrated again in the same manner to ~0.5 mL and loaded onto an S-200 FPLC size exclusion chromatography column (GE Healthcare). The eluted fractions were analyzed by SDS-PAGE and concentrated to 8.6 mg/mL before crystallization.

**Protein Crystallization**

*Chimeric Permeases*

Both L6_cyt_N2C5 LacY and L6_cyt_N2C5_C154G LacY were subject to crystallization using robotic methodology at the UCLA-DOE’s Crystallization Core Facility. Protein was centrifuged at 14,000 rpm for 2 minutes prior to incubation with 4-nitrophenyl α-D-galactoside (NPG) to 0.5 mM. Hanging drop vapor diffusion crystallization setups were performed with commercially available sparse matrix screens specific for membrane proteins. L6_cyt_N2C5 LacY was subjected to Molecular Dimensions Limited MemGold Screen in 96-well tray at a protein concentration of 3.8
L6_cyt_N2C5_C154G LacY was subject to MemGold as well as Qiagen’s MbClassI and MbClass II screens at a protein concentration of 7.5 mg/mL, also in 96-well trays. Three different drop ratios (protein:reservoir, 1:1, 1:2, 2:1) were attempted in 210 nL volume drops.

*Double-Trp LacY Mutant*

Each protein preparation was adjusted to 8.6 mg/mL and subject to crystallization using robotic methodology at the UCLA-DOE’s Crystallization Core Facility. Protein was centrifuged at 13,000 rpm for 5 minutes after incubation with octyl-β-D-galactopyranoside to 1 mM. Hanging drop vapor diffusion crystallization setups were performed with commercially available sparse matrix screens. Screens included MemGold, Qiagen’s MbClass I, MbClassII and PACT, and Hampton Research’s PEG/Ion and PEG/Ion II screens in 96-well trays. Three different drop ratios (protein:reservoir, 1:1, 1:2, 2:1) were attempted in 210 nL drops. In addition, homemade screens similar to the conditions used for crystallization by Kumar, *et al.*, 2014 were attempted.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

DNA sequence of LacY hybrid plasmids received have missing amino acids in majority of the constructs

The LacY hybrid vector constructs containing single and double cytochrome b562 inserts as well as the flavodoxin-1 inserts were sequenced to verify the published DNA
sequences (Prive et al., 1994; Engel et al., 2002). Surprisingly, out of the sixteen hybrid plasmid constructs received (Table 1), only two of them had the correct DNA sequence (Prive et al., 1994; Engel et al., 2002, Table 3A). The plasmids which had the correct DNA sequences are those that have single cytochrome \textsubscript{b562} insertions in loop 6, namely, L6\_Cyt\_N2C6 and L6\_Cyt\_N2C1 (Δ11-A195-H205) (Fig. 2 and Table 3).

The hybrid plasmid that had cytochrome \textsubscript{b562} insertion in loop 2 had deletion of the specific Ile residue (Table 3B) as compared to the published sequence (Engel et al., 2002). Similarly, as compared to the published sequences, the plasmid that had cytochrome \textsubscript{b562} insertion in loop 7 had deletion of specific Glu-Gln residues, whereas the plasmid that had cytochrome \textsubscript{b562} insertion in loop 10 had deletions of the Phe-Glu residues (Table 3B). We could explain these amino acid deletions based upon the molecular biology approach used to obtain the vector constructs (Engel et al., 2002). Our analysis revealed that the intervening DNA sequence coding the observed amino acids deleted lie between the \textit{Xho1} and \textit{Sac1} restriction sites introduced during the cloning strategy (Engel et al., 2002). Thus, during the restriction enzyme digestion step, the DNA translating to the missing amino acids in LacY would be excised.

The translated amino acid deletions were also observed in hybrid plasmids in which cytochrome \textsubscript{b562} was inserted in loops 1 and 6, loops 2 and 6, as well as in loops 6 and 10 of LacY. The specific translated amino acid(s) missing in loop 1 were Ile-Arg, in loop 2 was Ile and in loop 10 were Phe-Glu (Table 3C). These deletions could again be explained based upon the molecular biology approach used to obtain the vector constructs, as they lie between the the \textit{Xho1} and \textit{Sac1} restriction sites used for cloning.
Further, loop 6 in each of these constructs had 11 residues (A195-H205) deleted. An explanation for this could be that the parent LacY molecules used was LacY-Δ11 instead of the full-length LacY reported (Engel et al., 2002). Thus, these constructs had discrepancies in reported DNA sequences at two different respective sites.

The discrepancies in the reported flavodoxin-1 inserts in loops 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 10 of LacY were also observed. The specific translated amino acid(s) missing in loop 1 were Ile-Arg, in loop 2 was Ile, in loop 5 was Thr, in loop 7 were Glu-Gln and in loop 10 were Phe-Glu (Table 3D). Similar to the cytochrome₆₅₆₂ hybrid plasmids (Table 3B and C), the deleted translated amino acids in flavodoxin-1 hybrid plasmids lie between the XhoI and SacI sites introduced in the parent LacY sequence for cloning and thus would be excised during the restriction enzymes digestion step.

The reported LacY flavodoxin-1 hybrid constructs were also found to contain flavodoxin-2 insert instead of flavodoxin-1 (Table 3D). This was the most unexpected observation and could have been due to unforeseen reporting error in the previous publication (Engel et al., 2002). In our DNA sequence, the translated amino acid sequence clearly matched with the published flavodoxin-2 (Perna et al., 2001) and not with the flavodoxin-1 amino acid sequence (Osborne et al., 1991).

**Expression and purification of L6_cyt_N2C5 and L6_cyt_N2C5_Δ11 in WT and with C154G mutation**

The data presented in the previous section provides convincing explanation between the discrepancies observed in the current DNA sequences of the fourteen hybrid
LacY constructs when compared to the sequences reported previously. As a result, these plasmids have LacY insert with some of the residues missing. Thus, these fourteen plasmid constructs were deemed not suitable for further study.

The two plasmids, namely, L6_cyt_N2C5 and L6_cyt_N2_Δ11 each had the expected DNA sequence and were selected for further studies (Fig. 2). In each construct, C154G mutation was introduced to reduce the conformational flexibility (Smirnova et al., 2003). Level of expression of these four hybrid LacY proteins was then examined by Western blots. These data are shown in Fig. 4. All four LacY hybrid proteins with cytochrome_b562 inserted in loop 6 with Cys or Gly at position 154, and with or without deletion of 11 residues (A195-H205) appear to express at reasonable levels to proceed with large scale expression and purification. However, when large scale expression/purification was attempted with the Δ11 constructs, adequate quantities of each protein could not be obtained for crystallization trials.

As compared to the Δ11 constructs, large-scale expression and purification of the full-length chimeric permease was successful in E. coli XL1Blue cells. TALON column purification profiles of L6_cyt_N2C5 and L6_cyt_N2C5_C154G are shown in Fig. 5A and 5B, respectively. SDS-PAGE analysis of each protein is shown in Fig. 5C. Both proteins appear to be homogenous for crystallization trials. However, several crystallization attempts using different conditions (see Materials and Methods) did not result in protein crystals and only yielded crystals that appeared to be comprised of DDM (Fig. 6). Based upon these observations, it might be necessary in future studies to remove excess DDM by size exclusion chromatography (SEC) prior to crystallization attempts.
Surprisingly, yield and solubility of the L6_cyt_N2C5 fusion constructs was lower than that of wild-type LacY. In addition, our results are in agreement with previous attempts at crystallization of the L6_cyt_N2C5 construct in which crystals were not obtained. Therefore, the cytochrome\textsubscript{b562} insertion strategy might not be useful in improving the crystallization potential of LacY.

**Expression and purification of the double-Trp LacY mutant**

While the aforementioned studies were in progress, the structure of the double-Trp (G46W/G262W) LacY mutant with bound TDG was determined at 3.5 Å resolution (Kumar et al., 2014). LacY in this structure has a partially occluded, outward-facing conformation open to the periplasmic side. Based upon this new information and in light of the unsuccessful attempts to crystallize the cytochrome\textsubscript{b562}-LacY fusion proteins in both previous and present studies, we sought to obtain crystals of this double-Trp LacY mutant in the presence of a different galactoside ligand such as octyl β-D-galactopyranoside. Large scale expression and purification of the double-Trp LacY mutant protein was successful. TALON column purification profile of this mutant is shown in Fig. 7A and the SDS-PAGE analysis of the elution fractions is shown in Fig. 7B. The impurities observed in these fractions were removed using FPLC S-200 size exclusion chromatography. The concentrated purified protein at this stage had a single band of the expected molecular weight (Fig. 7C) and was deemed suitable for crystallization.
Crystallization was initially attempted in a range of conditions similar to those used to successfully obtain crystals of the double-Trp mutant bound to TDG (Kumar et al., 2014). However, the crystals with octyl β-D-galactopyranoside could not be obtained under these conditions. Thus, we proceeded to use commercial screens containing common crystallization conditions for membrane proteins. Surprisingly, of the several crystallization conditions attempted, 23 conditions listed in Table 4 yielded protein crystals. Crystals obtained under two of the conditions are shown in Fig. 8. These crystals were tested for diffraction at the Advanced Photon Source (Argonne National Laboratories), Chicago, Il. The crystals diffracted to ~20 Å (Fig. 9), indicating a need for further optimization of crystallization conditions in order to obtain better-diffracting crystals. We point out here that although crystals with TDG diffracted to a higher resolution, new conditions are needed for successful crystallization with other galactosidic substrates such as octyl β-D-galactopyranoside, which contains only one galactoside ring as opposed to the two rings present in TDG.

**Strategies to obtain LacY in fully outward-open conformation**

Based upon the double-Trp mutation strategy used in the recent structure determination of LacY with partially occluded outward-open conformation (Kumar et al., 2014), it is reasonable to propose additional mutations in residues in helix5 and helix8 surrounding the Trp46 (helix 5) and Trp262 (helix8) to obtain fully outward-open conformation in LacY. In one strategy, four additional Trp mutations in the double-Trp (G46W/G262W) are introduced (Fig. 10A). These mutations include A155W and G159W
in helix5, Q241W in helix7 and G370W in helix11. In the second strategy, four Arg mutations in the double-Trp (G46W/G262W) are introduced (Fig. 10B). These mutations include A155R and G159R in helix5, Q241R in helix7 and G370R in helix11. Note that in both strategies the same residues are either replaced with Trp or Arg. The concept behind this approach is to either increase the distance between the helices by bulky Trp residues (Fig. 10A) or by electrostatic repulsion (Fig. 10B). When mutated structures were subjected to energy minimization using CHARMM (Brooks et al., 2009), the resulting structures revealed further opening at the periplasmic side in the LacY double-Trp mutant (Fig. 10A and 10B). Whether these mutants would yield promising crystals and diffraction data with bound galactoside ligands remains to be determined.

**Postulated conceptual configurational changes involving rotation around 1-4 thioester linkage in TDG during its transport by LacY**

The crystal data presented in the two LacY structures (Abramson et al., 2003; Kumar et al., 2014) and molecular dynamics simulations (Yin et al., 2006; Holyoake and Sansom, 2007; Johnson and Brooker, 2009; Andersson et al., 2012; ) were used to postulate a rotation involving the 1-4 thioester linkage during TDG transport from the periplasmic side to the cytoplasmic side. Different configurations of TDG observed in the two LacY structures (Abramson et al., 2003; Kumar et al., 2014) are shown in Fig. 11A and 11B. Although, as proposed (Guan and Kaback, 2006), the TDG in these structures is bound essentially around the same site in LacY, it shows major difference in interactions (Table 5) with the protein as well as its configuration. These two observed configurations
of TDG make the basis for the proposed mechanism of substrate transport in LacY. This is shown in Fig. 11C. In step 1, protonation of E269 breaks the hydrogen bond between E269 and W151, which, in part, contributes to the opening of the N- and C-terminal domains of LacY on the periplasmic side. In step 2, substrate enters from periplasmic side and interacts very strongly with the protein. Since concentration of substrate is limiting on the periplasmic side, the strong interaction between the substrate and the LacY are essential for binding as observed (Kumar et al., 2014). In step 3, the binding of the substrate triggers the translocation of the proton from E262 to E325 via H322. This results in rotation around the 1-4 thioester linkage that changes the configuration and weakens the interactions of the substrate (TDG) with LacY. Consequently, it results in a substrate-induced conformational change in LacY and closing at the periplasmic side with simultaneous opening at the cytoplasmic side. In step 4, substrate is released to the cytoplasm. Since substrate is in high concentrations on the cytoplasmic side, the weak interactions of the substrate with LacY at this stage would favor dissociation. In step 5, the release of substrate triggers the release of proton to the cytoplasm, which results in the initial ground state of LacY. One should note that the proposed mechanism is consistent with all the biochemical and crystallographic studies with the introduction of a configurational change in the substrate. Importantly, the two structures (Abramson et al., 2003 and Kumar et al., 2014) of LacY provided the needed insight for the proposed substrate configurational change during transport.
CONCLUSIONS

First, in this study, two LacY molecules with cytochrome\textit{b}_{562} insertions, with and without the C154G mutation were successfully expressed and crystallization was attempted. We faced difficulty in obtaining protein crystals and instead obtained crystals likely comprised of DDM. It is plausible that the cytochrome\textit{b}_{562} insertion is not beneficial for improving ease of handling and crystallization of LacY. Other carrier protein insertions or variable positions and linker lengths might be necessary for this approach to be fruitful. Second, we were successful in expressing and purifying the double-Trp mutant (G46W/G262W); however, our initial attempts to crystallize this protein in the presence of octyl-\(\beta\)-D-galactopyranoside yielded crystals which diffracted to only \(~\)20 Å. Although the double-Trp mutant did yield diffraction-quality crystals in the presence of TDG, the presence of a different ligand could require new extensive crystallization efforts to obtain crystals of similar quality. Third, based on the recent crystal structure of LacY in an almost-occluded, open-outward conformation, we designed two mutational strategies to yield LacY molecule in a fully open, outward-facing conformation. We expect that employing these strategies will stabilize LacY in this conformation via bulky Trp residues or electrostatic repulsion by Arg residues, thereby moving the putative helices farther apart and keeping the protein in the outward-open conformation. Finally, we propose a configurational change in the substrate molecule involving a rotation around the 1,4-\(\beta\) linkage during transport that has not elaborated or discussed earlier.
Figure 1. Cartoon representation of LacY C154G mutant with TDG. Ribbon diagram of the LacY C154G mutant structure in fully opened inward-facing conformation adopted from Abramson et al. 2003. The N- and C-terminal domains of the LacY transporter are colored blue and red, respectively. The bound substrate lactose homolog, TDG, is shown in stick representation. Green represents carbon, yellow represents sulfur and red represents oxygen.
Figure 2. Representative topology of the LacY delta11 (A195-H205) and cytochrome_{b,562}-fusion chimeric permeases. A) Schematic representation of the LacY. The sites used to insert cytochrome_{b,562} or flavodoxin-1 are marked with a large arrow head and the deleted residues in the L6 loop are indicated by small arrows. B) Schematic representation of the LacY with the cytochrome_{b,562} insert. The point mutation C154G made in the helix 5 of LacY is also marked. Loops are marked as L1, L2 etc. and the helices are marked as I, II etc. N and C represents amino and C-terminal of LacY. PL, phospholipid membrane.
Table 1. List of LacY hybrid constructs selected for screening.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Plasmid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LacY with Single cytochrome insert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>L6_Cyt_N2C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>L6_Cyt_N2C1 (A11-195-205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>L2_Cyt_N2C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>L7_Cyt_N2C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>L10_Cyt_N2C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LacY with Double cytochrome insert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>L1_Cyt/L6_Cyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>L2_Cyt/L6_Cyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>L6_Cyt/L10_Cyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>LacY with Flavodoxin insert</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>L1_Fla_N5C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>L2_Fla_N1C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>L2_Fla_N2C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>L5_Fla_N5C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>L6_Fla_N1C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>L7_Fla_N5C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>L10_Fla_N1C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>L10_Fla_N1C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrophilic loop of LacY in which the carrier protein is inserted (e.g. L1 lies between helices 1 and 2). N1C1 and N2C5 refer to amino acid linker lengths between the N-terminal and C-terminal regions of the carrier protein (Engel, et al. 2002). Finally, the Δ11 construct contains a deletion of 11 residues (A195-H205) in the L6 cytoplasmic loop of LacY.
Figure 3. Cartoon representation of the double-Trp LacY mutant with TDG. Ribbon diagram of the LacY G46W/G262W mutant structure in partially occluded outward-facing conformation adopted from Kumar et al. 2014. The N- and C-terminal domains of the LacY transporter are colored blue and red, respectively. The bound substrate lactose homolog, TDG, is shown in stick representation. Green represents carbon, yellow represents sulfur and red represents oxygen. The positions of the two tryptophan residues mutated are marked.
Table 2. *Escherichia coli* strains used for expression of LacY hybrid proteins.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Genotype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XL1Blue</td>
<td>endA1 gyrA96(nalR) thi-1 recA1 relA1 lac glnV44 F’::Tn10 proAB⁺ lacI⁹ Δ(lacZ)M15 hsdR17(rK⁻ mK⁻)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41 (Walker)</td>
<td>F⁻ *ompT hsdS₉ (rB⁻ mB⁻) gal dcm (DE3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Comparison between observed and published DNA sequences of LacY fusion permeases with cytochrome_b562 and flavodoxin inserts

A. Cyt_b562 insert in loop (L) 6 of LacY with and without deletion of 195-205 residues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct*</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Linker (NH₂)</th>
<th>Insert (Cyt_b562)</th>
<th>Linker (COOH)</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L6_Cyt_N2C6</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>SFLISS</td>
<td>194-SATV-197</td>
<td>Published*</td>
<td>Confirmed in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>SFLISS</td>
<td>194-SATV-197</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6_Cyt N2C1</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S(195-205 Del)SAFS-209</td>
<td>Published*</td>
<td>Confirmed in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ17-195-205</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S(195-205 Del)SAFS-209</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The constructs are listed in the same order as in Table 1

Prive et al. 1994, b Engel et al. 2002

B. Cyt_b562 inserts in each of the loops L2, L7 and L10 of LacY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct*</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Linker (NH₂)</th>
<th>Insert (Cyt_b562)</th>
<th>Linker (COOH)</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L2_Cyt_N2C1</td>
<td>70-LGSS*</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SSLRK-74</td>
<td>Published*</td>
<td>missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-LGSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SSLRK-74</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7_Cyt N2C1</td>
<td>251-FASS*</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>EQSSRV-260</td>
<td>Published*</td>
<td>EQ missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251-FASS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>EQSSRV-260</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10_Cyt N2C1</td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FLSSFS-346</td>
<td>Published*</td>
<td>FL missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>nADLED ... HQKYRc</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FLSSFS-346</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The constructs are listed in the same order as in Table 1

Engel et al. 2002; * double underlines indicate insertions (Engel et al. 2002); * Single underlines indicate substitutions (Engel et al. 2002)
Table 3 (Continued):

C. Cytb562 inserts in loops 1 and 6, loops 2 and 6, as well as in loops 6 and 10 of LacY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct*</th>
<th>LacY (NH₂)</th>
<th>Linker (Cytb562)</th>
<th>Insert (Cytb562)</th>
<th>Linker (COOH)</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>L1_Cyt/L6_Cyt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 loop</td>
<td>36-DISS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>ISSS-44</strong></td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td>IR in L1 and residues 195-205 missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-DISS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>SS-44</strong></td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 loop</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>194-SATV-197</td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td>1 in L1 and residues 195-205 missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S(195-205 Del)SAFS-209</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L2_Cyt/L6_Cyt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2 loop</td>
<td>70LGSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>SSLRK-74</strong></td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70LGSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>SS-74</strong></td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 loop</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>194-SATV-197</td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S(195-205 Del)SAFS-209</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>L6_Cyt/L10_Cyt</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6 loop</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>194-SATV-197</td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td>FE in L10 and residues 195-205 missing in the current study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S(195-205 Del)SAFS-209</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10 loop</td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>SSSFS-346</strong></td>
<td>Publishedb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>NADLED...HQKYRe</td>
<td>S</td>
<td><strong>SS-346</strong></td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The constructs are listed in the same order as in Table 1

bEngel et al. 2002; double underlines indicate insertions (Engel et al. 2002); Single underlines indicate substitutions (Engel et al. 2002)
Table 3 (Continued):

D. Reported Flavodoxin1 (Fla, PDB code 1AG9) inserts in loops 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and 10 of LacY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct*</th>
<th>LacY (NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;)</th>
<th>Linker (Flavodoxin)</th>
<th>Insert (Flavodoxin)</th>
<th>Linker (COOH)</th>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>Comment (see footnote 'e' also)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1_Fla_N5C5</td>
<td>36-DISS&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>IFSSD-44</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>IR missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36-DISS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>-SSD-44</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2_Fla_N1C1</td>
<td>70-LGSS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ISSLRK-74</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-LGSS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>ISSLRK-74</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2_Fla_N2C5</td>
<td>70-LGSS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>ISSLRK-74</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70-LGSS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>ISSLRK-74</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5_Fla_N5C5</td>
<td>159-GISS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>ISSNQ-167</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>159-GISS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>ISSLRK-74</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6_Fla_N1C1</td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SATV-197</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>No missing residues but sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>190-DAPS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>SATV-197</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7_Fla_N5C5</td>
<td>251-FASS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>EQSSRV-260</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>EQ missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>251-FASS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>EQSSRV-260</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10_Fla_N1C1</td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FESSF8-346</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>FE missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>FESSF8-346</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10_Fla_N1C1</td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMAITGL ... ELHLDC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>FESSF8-346</td>
<td>Published&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>FE missing in the current study and sequence insert conflict&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337-ITSS</td>
<td>SGSGG</td>
<td>pMNMLG ... EMAELC</td>
<td>GSGGS</td>
<td>FESSF8-346</td>
<td>Current Study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The constructs are listed in the same order as in Table 1
<sup>1</sup>Engel et al. 2002; <sup>2</sup>double underlines indicate insertions (Engel et al. 2002); <sup>3</sup>single underlines indicate substitutions (Engel et al. 2002)<br><sup>4</sup>Reported Fla insert is of E. coli flavodoxin-1 (Osborne et al. 1991); however, the current sequence in each construct reveals that the insert is of E. coli flavodoxin-2 (Perna et al. 2001) and not of flavodoxin-1.
Figure 4. Western blots of expression of LacY cytochrome-fusion proteins (L6_cyt_N2C5 and L6_cyt_N2C5_Δ11) in WT and C154G mutant. *E. Coli* XL1Blue cells transformed with the appropriate plasmids were grown in LB broth in 25 mL cultures. Expression of the protein was induced with 0.4 mM IPTG for 4 hrs. Cells were lysed and the membranes were isolated as detailed in “Materials and Methods”. The membranes prepared from cells transformed with plasmid without the insert served as a negative control and the membranes prepared from the cells with wild-type LacY served as a positive control. Relative expression of each protein was assessed by Western blots as outlined in Materials and Methods section. Ten μg of total membrane proteins was loaded in each lane. Lane 1, MW markers; lane 2, wild-type LacY; lane 3, PT7-5 vector without the insert; lane 4, L6_cyt_N2C5_Δ11; lane 5, L6_cyt_N2C5; lane 6, L6_cyt_N2C5_Δ11 with C154G mutation; and lane 7, L6_cyt_N2C5 with C154G mutation.
Figure 5. Expression and purification of the LacY cytochrome-fusion proteins (L6_cyt_N2C5) in WT and C154G mutant. Elution profile for TALON column purification of the L6_cyt_N2C5 construct without (A) and with C154G (B) mutation. Arrow 1 indicates the addition of buffer A (50 mM NaPi pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM, 190 mM NaCl, 15 mM imidazole) and arrow 2 indicates the elution step with buffer B (50 mM NaPi pH 7.6, 0.02% DDM, 150 mM imidazole). C) SDS-PAGE gel analysis of the purified proteins. Lane 1, MW markers; lane 2, L6_cyt_N2C5; lane 3, L6_cyt_N2C5_C154G.
Crystallization. Crystallization trials were performed at a protein concentration of 7.5 mg/mL with 0.5 mm 4-nitrophenyl α-D-galactoside (NPG) ligand. Shown here is the crystalline precipitate observed in Qiagen Mb Class I screen, condition 46 (0.02 M sodium citrate, 0.1 M sodium dihydrogen phosphate pH 6.2, 15% PEG 2000). Crystals appear to be comprised of DDM, as excess detergent was not removed from the protein sample prior to crystallization.
10x
Figure 7. Purification of the LacY double-Trp (G46W/G262W) mutant. A) Elution profile of the TALON column purification of the double-Trp LacY mutant. Arrow 1 indicates the addition of buffer C (50 mM NaPi, pH 7.6, 0.01% DDM, 190 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole), arrow 2 indicates the detergent exchange step, addition of buffer D (20 mM HEPES pH 7.6, 0.2% NG), and arrow 3 indicates the elution step with 20 mM HEPES pH 6.5, 0.2% NG, 200 mM imidazole. B) SDS-PAGE analysis of the elution fractions (200 mM imidazole) from the TALON column. The first four 5-mL elution fractions contained the target protein; 15 µL aliquot of each eluted fraction was loaded on the gel. C) SDS-PAGE analysis of the concentrated double-Trp LacY mutant after FPLC S-200 size exclusion chromatography. Eluted fractions were pooled and concentrated to 8.6 mg/mL; 1 µL of the purified sample was loaded on the gel. The left lanes in (B) and (C) depict the molecular weight standards.
Table 4. Conditions that yielded crystals of LacY double-Trp mutant with octyl β-D galactopyranoside.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crystal Screen</th>
<th>Condition Number</th>
<th>Chemical compositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 1                | 0.08 M sodium citrate pH 5.2  
2.2 M ammonium sulfate   |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 7                | 0.1 M ammonium sulfate  
0.1 M HEPES pH 7.5  
12.0% w/v polyethylene glycol (PEG)  
4000  
22% v/v glycerol |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 11               | 0.15 M potassium phosphate pH 6.5  
3.3 M ammonium sulfate      |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 13               | 0.1 M sodium chloride  
0.02 M sodium citrate pH 5.6  
11% w/v PEG 3350          |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 18               | 0.2 M sodium chloride  
0.025 M HEPES pH 7.5  
13% w/v PEG 400            |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 19               | 0.1 M HEPES pH 7.5  
11% w/v PEG 3350           |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 37               | 0.2 M calcium chloride  
0.1 M HEPES pH 7.5  
53% v/v PEG 400             |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 38               | 0.05 M magnesium acetate  
0.05 M sodium acetate pH 5.0  
28% v/v PEG 400             |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 41               | 0.05 M magnesium acetate  
0.05 M sodium acetate pH 5.4  
24% v/v PEG 400             |
| Molecular Dimensions MemGold™ | 57               | 0.1 M sodium chloride  
0.1 M cadmium chloride  
0.1 M Tris HCl pH 8.0  
33% v/v PEG 400             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecular Dimensions</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>0.1 M Bicine pH 8.9 31% w/v PEG 2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MemGold™</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.2 M calcium chloride 0.1 M HEPES pH 7.0 33% w/v PEG 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemGold™</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.05 M sodium chloride 0.1 M sodium citrate pH 5.5 26% w/v PEG 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MemGold™</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.1 M BIS-TRIS propane pH 7.0 3.0 M sodium chloride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.2 M sodium sulfate decahydrate pH 6.7 20% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.2 M sodium phosphate monobasic monohydrate pH 4.7 20% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion II</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4% Tacsimate pH 6.0 12% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion II</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1 M DL-Malic acid pH 7.0 12% PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion II</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.05 M citric acid, 0.04 M BIS-TRIS propane pH 5.0 16% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion II</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.04 M citric acid, 0.06 M BIS-TRIS propane pH 6.4 20% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton PEG/Ion II</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.02 M calcium chloride dihydrate 0.02 M cadmium chloride hydrate 0.02 M cobalt (II) chloride hexahydrate 20% w/v PEG 3350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qiagen MbClass II</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.1 M sodium chloride 0.1 M tri-sodium citrate pH 5.6 30% w/v PEG 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Crystals of LacY double-Trp mutant with octyl β-D-galactopyranoside.

Shown are the light (left) and UV (right) images (10x magnification) of the crystals obtained in MbClass II condition #40 (Table 4, 0.1 M sodium chloride, 0.1 M tri-sodium citrate pH 5.6, 30% v/v PEG 400) (A) and in MemGold condition #81 (Table 4, 0.05 M sodium chloride, 0.1 M sodium citrate pH 5.5, 26% v/v PEG 400) (B).
**Figure 9. Diffraction pattern of LacY double-Trp mutant.** Crystals were flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and data were collected at Advanced Photon Source (Argonne National Laboratory) using beamline 24-ID-E and wavelength of 0.94 Å. Diffraction image was obtained from crystals obtained in Fig. 8B.
Figure 10. The proposed modeled structures of LacY with specific Trp or Arg mutations to obtain the structure in open outward-facing conformation. Both structural models were built using PDB ID 4OAA as the starting model. The residues were mutated using Pymol (Schrodinger Inc., 2013) in LacY structure and subjected to minimization using CHARMM (Brooks et al. 2009). The view on the right is obtained by rotating the structure on the left by 90° about the axis shown. The N- and C-terminal domains of the LacY transporter are colored blue and red, respectively. A. Ribbon diagrams of the LacY with Trp mutations at positions 46, 155, 159, 241, 262 and 370. B. Ribbon diagrams of the LacY with Trp mutations at positions 46 and 262 as well as Arg mutations at positions 155, 159, 241 and 370. Helices containing the above residues are depicted as h5 and h8.
Figure 11. Postulated conceptual configurational changes involving rotation around 1-4 thioester linkage in TDG during its transport by LacY. In A and B, the observed substrate binding modes in the two alternative conformations of LacY are shown. Ribbon diagrams of the overall structure of LacY with TDG is shown on the left. The detailed interactions between TDG and LacY are shown in the expanded view on the right and listed in Table 5. Color code for atoms: green, carbon in TDG; white, carbon in LacY; blue, nitrogen; red, oxygen; yellow, sulfur. The residues from LacY involved in substrate binding and C6, O6, C6' and O6' atoms in TDG are labeled. The observed hydrogen bonds and salt bridges are shown in dashed gray lines. A, The substrate TDG interaction with LacY (C154G) in the open inward-facing conformation (PDB ID 1PV7). B, TDG interaction with LacY (G46W/G262W) in the partially open outward-facing conformation (PDB ID 4OAA). C, The mechanism of TDG/H+ co-transport outlined in five intermediate steps consistent with the crystallographic and molecular dynamics simulation data (see text for details). Partially occluded outward LacY conformation on the periplasmic side (PDB ID 4OAA) and inward-open LacY conformation on the cytoplasmic side (PDB ID 1PV7) were used as guides. Only the key residues implicated in proton transfer and substrate binding are depicted. Initially in ground state, E269 in LacY is unprotonated and is hydrogen bonded to W151. Step 1, Protonation of LacY. The binding of H+ to E269 disrupts the hydrogen bond with W151 and, in part, contributes to the development of outward-open conformation in LacY. Step 2, Intake of TDG (or lactose) in LacY from the periplasmic side. Extensive salt bridge and hydrogen bonding
interactions between LacY residues E126, R144, E269, N172, H322 and TDG are observed (PDB ID 4OAA). *Step 3*, Proton translocation from E269 to E325. The H$^+$ translocation from E269 to E325 via H322 induces the configurational changes in TDG involving rotation around the 1-4 thioester linkage (shown by curved arrow); as a result this weakens the interaction between LacY and TDG and might, in part, associated with the transformation of LacY from outward-open to inward-open conformation. *Step 4*, Release of TDG to the cytoplasm. The diminished interactions between the TDG and LacY facilitate release of TDG to the cytoplasm. *Step 5*, Release of proton to the cytoplasm. In the final step, the release of H$^+$ from E325 to the cytoplasm induces conformational change in LacY resulting in the initial ground state.
Table 5. The amino acid residues involved in the interactions with TDG in inward-facing and partially occluded outward-open conformation of LacY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>TDG</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E126:OE2</td>
<td>O2'</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E126:OE2</td>
<td>O3'</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R144:NH2</td>
<td>O2'</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R144:NH1</td>
<td>O6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E269:OE1</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E269:OE2</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H322:NE2</td>
<td>O3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N272:ND2</td>
<td>O4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions observed in partially occluded outward open conformation (PDB ID, 4OAA)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LacY</th>
<th>TDG</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E126:OE1</td>
<td>O3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R144:NH2</td>
<td>O3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K258:NZ</td>
<td>O3'</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These residues are depicted in Figure 11A and 11B.
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