Structure of the VHL-ElonginC-ElonginB Complex: Implications for VHL Tumor Suppressor Function
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Mutation of the VHL tumor suppressor is associated with the inherited von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) cancer syndrome and the majority of kidney cancers. VHL binds the ElonginC-ElonginB complex and regulates levels of hypoxia-inducible proteins. The structure of the ternary complex at 2.7 angstrom resolution shows two interfaces, one between VHL and ElonginC and another between ElonginC and ElonginB. Tumorigenic mutations frequently occur in a 35-residue domain of VHL responsible for ElonginC binding. A mutational patch on a separate domain of VHL indicates a second macromolecular binding site. The structure extends the similarities to the SCF (Skp1-Cul1-F-box protein) complex that targets proteins for degradation, supporting the hypothesis that VHL may function in an analogous pathway.

VHL syndrome is characterized by the dominantly inherited predisposition to develop tumors of the central nervous system, kidney, retina, pancreas, and adrenal gland (1). VHL syndrome is caused by germline mutations in the VHL tumor suppressor, and VHL tumors are associated with loss or mutation of the remaining wild-type allele (2). VHL is also inactivated in ~80% of sporadic clear cell renal carcinomas (RCC), the predominant form of kidney cancer (3). The ability of RCC cells to form tumors in nude mice can be abrogated by introduction of wild-type VHL (4, 5).

VHL-associated tumors are highly vascularized (6), and this supports the current model that VHL negatively regulates the production of hypoxia-inducible factors such as the angiogenic vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) (5, 7, 8). VHL+/− tumors have high levels of these factors, and reintroduction of VHL down-regulates them under normoxic conditions (5, 7, 8). The mechanism of this VHL activity is not well understood, but appears to be mediated through the destabilization of hypoxia-regulated mRNA transcripts (5, 7, 8).

Biochemical studies revealed that VHL forms a ternary complex with the ElonginC and ElonginB proteins (9–11). The VHL-ElonginC-ElonginB complex (henceforth VCB complex) has a central role in VHL function because most of the tumor-derived mutations destabilize this complex (9–12). Furthermore, peptide mapping studies showed that a 12-amino acid region of VHL that contains nearly a quarter of the tumor-derived mutations makes key interactions with ElonginC (10), tightly linking the ElonginC binding and tumor suppression functions of VHL (9–12). Recent studies have shown that the VCB complex binds Cul2, in part through ElonginC-Cul2 association (12, 13). The formation of this VCB-Cul2 complex has been shown genetically to be required for the VHL-mediated regulation of VEGF mRNA (12). In addition to VHL, the ElonginC-ElonginB complex also binds to the suppressor of cytokine signaling (SOCS) superfamily of proteins that share the 40-residue SOCS-box motif (14), and to the ElonginA transcriptional elongation factor (15).

VHL is not homologous to any known protein, but its binding partners share homology to components of the SCF multiprotein complex that targets many cell cycle regulatory proteins for ubiquitin-mediated proteolysis (16). ElonginC has sequence homology to the SCF Skp1 protein (17), ElonginB to ubiquitin (18), and Cul2 to the SCF Cul1 protein (13). One component of the SCF complex without an apparent counterpart in the VCB-Cul2 complex has been the F-box protein, which recruits substrates to the SCF complex (17).

The structure of the VCB ternary complex, reported here, extends the homology between ElonginC and Skp1 and suggests a similarity between a 35-residue domain of VHL that binds ElonginC and the F box that binds Skp1. The structure also suggests that VHL may have a second macromolecular binding site that is important for its tumor suppressing function and suggests that VHL may function as a modular adapter like the F-box proteins.

Overview of the ternary complex. The human VCB complex was produced by coexpressing the three proteins together in Escherichia coli (19). We used the alternative in vivo initiating methionine of VHL, which removes a 54-residue GxExE repeat (G, Gly; E, Gln) not needed for tumor suppression (20). In the crystal structure of this ternary complex (21), ElonginC binds ElonginB and VHL across two distinct interfaces, whereas VHL and ElonginB do not interact (Fig. 1 and Table 1). The two interfaces are comparable in extent, each burying a total surface area of about 2000 Å2.

VHL has two domains: a roughly 100-residue NH2-terminal domain rich in β sheet (β domain) and a smaller α-helical domain (α domain), held together by two linkers and a polar interface (Fig. 2A). A large portion of the α domain surface, and a small portion of the β domain, interact with ElonginC. About half of the tumorigenic mutations map to the α domain and its residues that contact ElonginC. The
Fig. 2. Structural elements and conservation of VHL, ElonginC, and ElonginB. (A) Sequence of VHL demonstrating that tumor-derived missense mutations are divided between the α and β domains of VHL, whereas residues contacting ElonginC cluster in the α domain (40). The histogram represents 279 missense mutations in the database (29). The six most frequently mutated amino acids are labeled. Shaded squares above each residue describe the relative solvent exposure of a residue in a hypothetical VHL monomer. Blue boxes indicate residues that make hydrogen bonds or van der Waals contacts with ElonginC. (B) Sequence identity between human ElonginC and ElonginC homologs is indicated by yellow, and identity between human ElonginC and human Skp1, aligned with the program THREADER2, is indicated by green. Residues that make hydrogen bonds or van der Waals contacts with VHL are indicated by red and those contacting ElonginB by blue. Secondary structure and solvent accessibility are as in (A). A disordered segment in ElonginC is indicated with a dashed line and extended insertions in the alignments are indicated by lines below the sequence alignments. (C) Sequence identity between human ElonginB and ElonginB homologs is indicated by yellow. Identity between human ElonginB and human ubiquitin, which maps primarily to hydrophobic core residues, is indicated by green. Residues that make hydrogen bonds or van der Waals contacts with ElonginC are indicated by blue. Secondary structure and solvent accessibility are as in (A), and disordered segments in the ElonginB structure are indicated with a dashed line. (D) Close-up view of the α-β interface of VHL. VHL amino acids are in yellow and those of ElonginC are in cyan. White dashed lines indicate hydrogen bonds, red atoms indicate oxygen and blue, nitrogen. A red circle with the letter “M” indicates a residue that is one of the six most frequently mutated in tumors.
remaining mutations map to the β domain, and significantly, to a β domain surface patch uninvolved in ElonginC binding. This suggests that two intact macromolecular binding sites may be required for the tumor suppressor effects of VHL.

ElonginC binds into an α/β roll and binds VHL through helices and loops at its COOH-terminus (Figs. 1 and 2B). ElonginB has an α/β roll structure very similar to that of ubiquitin, as expected from sequence homology (Figs. 1 and 2C). The ElonginB-ElonginC interface is dominated by the juxtaposition of two β sheets to form a continuous intermolecular sheet.

**Structures of the VHL, ElonginC, and ElonginB proteins.** The β domain of VHL consists of a seven-stranded β sandwich (residues 63 to 154) and an α helix (H4; residues 193 to 204) that packs against one of the β sheets through hydrophobic interactions (Figs. 1 and 2A). The α domain of VHL (residues 155 to 192) consists of three α helices (H1, H2, and H3; Figs. 1 and 2A). These pack in an arrangement reminiscent of a four-helix cluster (“folded leaf” classification), except for the absence of a fourth VHL helix (23). A helix from ElonginC (H4) fits into this gap and completes the four-helix cluster arrangement, giving two pairs of helices packing at a perpendicular angle (Fig. 1). The α and β domains are connected by two short polypeptide linkers (residues 154 to 156 and 189 to 194) and by a polar interface that is stabilized by hydrogen-bond networks from the H1 helix, the β sandwich, and ElonginC (Fig. 2D). Several of the residues at the interdomain interface have been found mutated in tumors (Fig. 2, A and D).

The ElonginC structure consists of a three-stranded β sheet packing against four α helices, the last of which are separated by a long, well-ordered loop in an extended conformation (L5 loop; Figs. 1 and 2B). The extended L5 loop together with the H2, H3, and H4 helices form a concave surface with a central pocket. This is where VHL binds, and mutagenesis of these elements disrupts VHL binding (24). The VHL-binding concave surface is dominated by hydrophobic residues, and sequence alignment indicates that this surface hydrophobicity would be conserved in the fly and yeast ElonginC orthologs (Fig. 2B). Unexpectedly, ElonginC shares significant structural similarity [1.7 Å root mean square deviation (rmsd) for 63 residues] with the tetramerization domain of the Shaker potassium channel (25). However, the regions of ElonginC important for its protein-binding functions, like the L5 loop, are not similar (25).

ElonginC contains a ubiquitin-like structure (24% sequence identity with ubiquitin; 1.25 Å rmsd over 71 residues) that consists of two helices and several loops packing against a five-stranded β sheet (Figs. 1 and 2C). ElonginB differs from ubiquitin in two respects. It contains an insertion of nine amino acids between the S4 and S5 strands relative to ubiquitin (residues 63 to 71; Fig. 2C), and residues from this insertion make contacts to ElonginC. ElonginB also has an extension of 30 amino acids at the COOH-terminus. In the crystal structure, part of this extension adopts an extended conformation running along one side of the molecule, interacting with ElonginC, and nearly reaching VHL before it becomes disorder (Fig. 1). Twenty additional residues, partially conserved, remain in this disordered segment (Fig. 2C).
Molecular interfaces. The VHL-ElonginC interface is almost completely hydrophobic with only a handful of significant hydrogen bonds at the periphery (Fig. 3A). The H1 helix of the VHL α domain fits into the concave surface of ElonginC, inserting hydrophobic side chains into pockets along the surface (Fig. 3A). Reciprocally, the H4 helix of ElonginC, which bulges out from the side of the concave surface, fits into an extended groove formed by the H1, H2, and H3 helices of the VHL α domain and completes the intermolecular four-helix cluster packing (Fig. 3A).

The H1 helix of the VHL α domain coincides with the 12–amino acid segment shown to be important for ElonginC binding (10), and the structure reveals that it makes extensive contacts to ElonginC. The most significant van der Waals contacts are made by Leu153, which protrudes from the H1 helix and fits into an ElonginC pocket, and by Cys162 and Arg161 (Fig. 3A). These are augmented by contacts from the Lys159, Val165, Val166, and Leu169 sides of VHL (Fig. 3A).

The other two helices of the α domain also contribute contacts (Leu178, Ile180, and Leu184), with Leu184 making the most extensive ones in this region (Fig. 3A). Additional contacts are made by residues in the first α–β linker (Leu153 and Val155) and by Arg162 from the β domain (Fig. 3A). The hydrogen bonds made by Arg162, together with those made by Lys159 and Arg161 from the H1 helix, represent the few significant hydrogen-bond contacts made at the VHL-ElonginC interface. The arginine side chains are also anchored in the hydrogen-bond networks of the VHL α–β domain interface (Fig. 2D).

The ElonginC-ElonginB interface is similar in extent to the ElonginC-VHL interface but is less hydrophobic. The interface is centered on the S2 β strands from each protein, which align in parallel and make four backbone hydrogen bonds, creating a continuous, intermolecular β sheet (Fig. 3B). The sheet junction is reinforced by van der Waals contacts from hydrophobic residues residing on the S2 strands of both Elongins, and by interactions from additional structural elements on both faces of the sheet (Fig. 3B). The ElonginC residues whose mutation abolishes ElonginB binding map to these interacting regions (I2, 26). The COOH-terminal tail of ElonginB packs by means of loose van der Waals contacts in an extended conformation alongside ElonginC (Figs. 1 and 2C). Overall, the ElonginC residues that make side-chain contacts to ElonginB are less conserved across species than those that contact VHL (Fig. 2B).

An intermolecular strand-strand interaction forming a continuous β sheet is also seen in the binding of the ubiquitin-like domains of ratRBD (27) and ratGDS (28) to Ras. The ElonginB-ElonginC interface differs from these regulatory interfaces in that it (i) is roughly double in area, (ii) is more hydrophobic, and (iii) has parallel β–strand pairing.

Tumor-derived VHL mutations. The tumor-derived missense mutations [total of 279 entries (29)] map evenly to the α and β domains (Fig. 4A), each of the domains containing three of the six most frequently mutated residues (henceforth hotspots). In the α domain, the H1 helix is the primary target of tumorigenic mutations. It contains the most frequently mutated residue, Arg161, which has a structural role stabilizing the H1 helix and the α–β domain interface (Fig. 2D), and an additional mutational hotspot, Cys162, which contacts ElonginC (Fig. 3A). The third hotspot in the α domain is Leu178, and it has dual roles interacting with ElonginC and also stabilizing the H2–H3 packing of the α domain (Fig. 3A). The remaining α domain mutations map to residues involved in the packing of the helices (such as Val170, Ile180, Leu184, and Leu189), or in stabilizing the α–β interdomain interface (Arg161 and Gln164; Fig. 2D). Several of these residues also make important contacts to ElonginC (Arg161, Ile180, and Leu184; Fig. 3A). This pattern of mutations in the α domain solidifies the role ElonginC binding has in the tumor suppressor activity of VHL.

In the β domain some of the mutations map to residues important for the structural integrity of the β sandwich, such as hydrophobic core residues (the Pro86 hotspot, Phe76 Phe119, Trp117, and Val136; Figs. 2A and 4A), or buried polar residues that hold loops together (Asn95 hotspot; Fig. 4A).

The Tyr28 hotspot, which is the second most frequently mutated residue in VHL (Fig. 2A), reveals a significant exception to this trend of structural β domain mutations. This residue occurs on the surface of the β sandwich (Fig. 4B), opposite from where ElonginC binds (Fig. 4C), and has no apparent structural role, a conclusion supported by the ability of a Tyr28 tumor-derived mutant to bind ElonginC in vivo (9, 11, 30). Several additional solvent-exposed residues (Asn94, Gln96, and Tyr112) surrounding Tyr28 are also mutated (Fig. 4B). These observations indicate that this patch of solvent-exposed residues may correspond to another macrodomain binding site of VHL, and that the use of this site is important for the tumor suppressor activity of VHL.

Type II VHL syndrome associated with partial loss-of-function mutations. VHL families have clinically heterogeneous symptoms and are divided into two types differentiated by the presence of pheochromocytoma (type II) or its absence (type I) (31). The structure reveals that type II cases show a strong bias against hydrophobic core mutations. This is in contrast to type I mutations, which frequently map to the β domain hydrophobic core and would be pre-
VHL α domain is structurally and functionally homologous to the SOCS box. The 40–amino acid SOCS-box sequence motif was recently shown to bind ElonginC and to contain sequence homology with the H1 helix of VHL (14). We used a sequence-threading analysis to augment the sequence homology with the information inherent in the three-dimensional structure of the VHL α domain (32, 33). When the sequence of the SOCS-1 SOCS box was threaded against a library of 1925 structures, the VHL α domain ranked first (33). In this alignment, the pattern of hydrophobic residues in SOCS-1 and the SOCS-box consensus matches that of the entire VHL α domain (Fig. 5A). The agreement includes both the buried hydrophobic residues that are structural determinants of the VHL α domain and the exposed hydrophobic residues that bind ElonginC (Fig. 5, A and B). These findings, in conjunction with the reported SOCS box–ElonginC binding data, indicate that the SOCS box and VHL α domain may represent a common structural and functional motif.

Similarity of the ElonginC-VHL and Skp1–F-box protein complexes. The 30% sequence identity between the NH2-terminal two-thirds of Skp1 and ElonginC (Fig. 2B) indicates that the two proteins will contain a very similar overall structure (33). The structural and sequence features important for the VHL-binding function of ElonginC include the highly hydrophobic nature of the concave binding surface and the protruding H4 helix that completes the intermolecular four-helix cluster with the VHL α domain. Sequence alignment (Fig. 2B) indicates that the residues responsible for the hydrophobicity of this concave surface maintain their hydrophobic character in Skp1 (Fig. 5C). Furthermore, most H4 helix residues are either identical (7/14 residues) or conservatively substituted in Skp1 (4/14 residues; Fig. 2B). These observations suggest that Skp1 may use the corresponding portion of its structure to bind other proteins with a domain analogous to the α domain of VHL.

Because Skp1 binds proteins that contain the 45–amino acid F-box sequence motif, we performed a threading analysis of the F box against the VHL α domain (33). The F-box sequences we tested did not consistently rank highly, but most produced the same alignment with the VHL α domain helices (33). This alignment shows that the F box has an overall pattern of hydrophobic amino acids that matches that of the VHL α domain (Fig. 5, A and B). The hydrophobicity match includes residues involved both in α domain stabilization and in ElonginC binding (Fig. 5, A and B). This suggests that there may be a loose structural similarity between the VHL α domain and the F box. There is little sequence identity between the two, however, and this is consistent with the lack of cross-reactivity between the ElonginC-VHL and Skp1–F box complexes (34).

A combinatorial regulatory system. The
structure of the VCB complex extends the proposed analogy (12, 14) to the SFC complex (Fig. 6): (i) it indicates that Skp1 would contain a protein-binding site similar to that used by ElonginC to bind VHL (Figs. 2B and 5C); (ii) it suggests that the F box may contain a three-helix structure similar to that of the VHL α domain and that the F box–Skp1 complex may form in an overall analogous way to the VHL α–ElonginC complex (Fig. 5, A and B); (iii) it reveals that VHL has two domains and may contain a second protein-binding site, much like the modular F-box proteins that contain additional protein-binding sites on their WD-40 or leucine-rich repeat domains; and (iv) it indicates that VHL is part of the SOCS-box superfamily, whose members contain additional protein-binding modules such as Src homology 2 (SH2) (SOCS proteins), ankyrin [ASB proteins (14)], or WD-40 [WSB proteins (14)] domains (Fig. 6), thus paralleling the F-box proteins that form a diverse family of protein adapters (35).

The presence of the ubiquitin-like molecule ElonginB associated with the ElonginC–VHL complex has also been suggested to support a role in protein degradation (12). It is not yet known whether ElonginB is processed for conjugation, but it could potentially serve a similar targeting role by remaining tightly bound through noncovalent interactions. Alternatively, ElonginB may have a structural role helping to stabilize the ElonginC structure. Either role would be consistent with the extensive ElonginB–ElonginC interface observed in the structure (Fig. 3B).

The ElonginC system probably regulates a cellular process in a combinatory manner by binding different adapter proteins (Fig. 6). That this process may be protein degradation is further supported by the additional analogies between the ElonginC–VHL complex and the SFC complex revealed in this study.
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Fig. 6. The structure of the VHL–ElonginC–ElonginB complex supports the hypothesis that ElonginC may function in a combinatorial regulatory system analogous to the SFC complex. In the ElonginC system, binding to a second protein has been demonstrated only for SOCS1, whose SH2 domain binds the JAK2 kinase (14); for VHL, such binding to a second protein is predicted in this study, and for the WSB and ASB families it has been predicted on the basis of the presence of the WD-40 and ankyrin repeats (14), which are often involved in protein-protein interactions. It is not yet clear whether ElonginB would have a ubiquitin-like role in the ElonginC system.
Viscosity Near Earth’s Solid Inner Core

D. E. Smylie

Anomalous splitting of the two equatorial translational modes of oscillation of Earth’s solid inner core is used to estimate the effective viscosity just outside its boundary. Superconducting gravimeter observations give periods of 3.5822 ± 0.0012 (retrograde) and 4.0150 ± 0.0010 (prograde) hours. With the use of Ekman layer theory to estimate viscous drag forces, an inferred single viscosity of 1.22 × 10¹¹ Pascal seconds gives calculated periods of 3.5839 and 4.0167 hours for the two modes, close to the observed values. The large effective viscosity is consistent with a fluid, solid-liquid mixture surrounding the inner core associated with the “compositional convection” that drives Earth’s geodynamo.

Earth’s solid inner core of 1220-km radius is thought to have formed by freezing of the molten metallic alloy constituting the outer core (1). The fluid outer core extending to a radius of 3485 km is about 7% less dense than pure Fe (2), and a variety of lighter compounds have been proposed to account for the deficit in density from the Fe-Ni bulk composition implied by Fe meteorites, averaging 8% Ni by weight (3). Near the inner core boundary, the latent heat released by freezing out of the heavier metallic constituents and lighter Fe compounds with S, Si, or O has been suggested as the energy source that drives the geodynamo that generates the Earth’s magnetic field (4). The extra buoyancy of the lighter compounds results in a stirring of the outer core by “compositional convection” (5), providing the necessary velocity field for the geomagnetic dynamo.

A layer about 450 km thick surrounding the inner core, called the F-layer, is part of the earliest Earth models derived from seismic wave observations (6). It was based on seismic waves interpreted as having been scattered by a possibly semisolid layer outside the inner core. More recent, improved observations have shown that the scattering could occur at the core-mantle boundary, but the two are not mutually exclusive (7). Stevenson (8) has argued, on the basis of liquid-state physics, that this region may differ in composition from the rest of the outer core. Jeanloz (3) estimates that as much as 50% by volume may consist of crystals mixed in the liquid alloy for an Fe-S composition compatible with the seismologically determined density. Here I consider a method of estimating the viscosity in the F-layer.

The solid inner core is presumed to be near the center of the outer fluid core by gravitational forces. The possibility of gravimetric observation of its bodily oscillations about its equilibrium position within the outer fluid core was discussed by Slichter (9), and the inner core’s essentially rigid translational motions are often referred to as Slichter modes. There are three distinct modes, one along the axis of rotation, one prograde in the equatorial plane, and one retrograde in the equatorial plane. The axial mode period is reduced by about 0.6% by Earth’s rotation, but the Coriolis acceleration acts to weaken the restoring force of the prograde axial mode, lengthening its period by about 7.8%, and acts to strengthen the restoring force of the retrograde equatorial mode, shortening its period by about 7.8%. Laws governing this splitting of the periods can be obtained directly from the equation of motion for the inner core. The splitting of the periods according to these laws can be used as a diagnostic tool and led to the association of three resonances in the frequency spectra obtained from superconducting gravimeter observations in Europe with the Slichter modes (10). An automated computer-based search across 4119 discrete periods suggests that no other triplet of resonances are correctly split (11). A recent analysis (12) of nearly 300,000 hours of superconducting gravimeter observations made at stations in Canada, China, Europe, Japan, and the United States has confirmed the presence of these spectral resonances with central periods, in what are considered to be best estimates, at 3.5822 ± 0.0012, 3.7656 ± 0.0015, and 4.0150 ± 0.0010 hours.

In the original identification (10), the theoretical periods were calculated assuming no viscosity in the outer core and on the basis of the subseismic or anelastic approximation (13) that applies when the fluid velocities are small compared with seismic velocities. The anelastic approximation neglects the inertia of the solid inner core and shell (14), but these are accounted for by the introduction of frequency-dependent internal load Love numbers (Love numbers, named for A. E. H. Love, are a compact way of expressing Earth’s response to perturbing forces). A detailed discussion of the effects of the frequency dependence of Love numbers and several other controversial theoretical issues was presented earlier (15). Calculated inviscid periods for the two equatorial modes are then found to have a larger splitting than the observed periods. I show that the overshooting can be used to estimate the effective viscosity near the inner core (boundary layer thickness, 370 km).

The translational modes of the inner core