

“Structure-Based Sequence Alignment of the Transmembrane Domains of All Human GPCRs: Phylogenetic, Structural and Functional Implications”, Cvicek et al.

Supporting Text 1

Here we compare the GRoSS alignment to two other available GPCR alignments:

1. Structure based alignment with gaps developed by Isberg et al. [24], downloaded from GPCRDB [78]
2. HMM-HMM based alignment created by hhalgn [77]

Comparison of GRoSS sequence alignment to HMM-HMM and GPCRDB

GRoSS

Within each GPCR class, the GRoSS alignment is an alignment that preserves the most conserved (BW) residues and has been curated not to contain gaps in the TM regions. First, we used Clustal Omega [37] to align small (~40) groups of proteins together so that no gaps are created in the TM regions. These individual alignments were then aligned together again using Clustal Omega, which uses hidden Markov model for profile-profile alignments. Between classes, the sequences were aligned to maximize the number of conserved contacts.

HMM-HMM

We compare our alignment to a general HMM-HMM alignment computed for each target—template pair taken from the available crystal structures. For each crystal structure, we searched for related sequences using hhblitz (<http://toolkit.lmb.uni-muenchen.de/hhblits> with database: uniprot20_2013_03). The representative alignment was stored and used as a HMM model for HMM-HMM alignment performed with hhalgn [77].

GPCRDB

Isberg et al. [24] performed a detailed structural comparison of the GPCR crystal structures and concluded that the optimal alignments of TMs between some pairs of GPCR proteins have single residue gaps, which correspond to bulges or constrictions on the helices. We downloaded the Isberg alignment from GPCRDB [78], which contains several differences from the published version in [24] (panels A, I, and N in Figure 3 of ref. [24]). We assume that the differences are caused by a need to reconcile the pairwise alignments into a global alignment.

To the best of our knowledge, the gaps in the GPCRDB alignment cannot be predicted without prior knowledge of the protein structures. For example, sequence CIGWG in CRF1 aligns to IG-WG in GLR (Fig. 3G in [24]). Also HMM-HMM has

difficulty identifying the GPCRDB’s gaps. Table A highlights the differences between HMM-HMM and GPCRDB alignments in terms of number of misaligned residues in all TM regions for the crystallized GPCRs considered. HMM-HMM manages to predict all GPCRDB TM gaps for only a small number of target—template pairs (value 0 in Table A). However, for most pairs even within class A HMM-HMM cannot correctly determine the gaps (small positive values in the table). Large number of misaligned residues between different classes means that HMM-HMM is not suitable for comparisons across the different GPCR classes.

Table A. Number of misaligned residues in the TM regions between GPCRDB and HMM-HMM.

Target	Template																								
	A	RHO	Beta1AR	Beta2AR	D3	H1	M2	M3	5HT1B	5HT2B	A2A	S1P1	CXCR4	CCR5	KappaOR	MuOR	NOP	DeltaOR	PAR1	P2Y12	CRF1	GLR	MGLU1	MGLU5	SMO
A	RHO		1	1	3	1	0	0	0	12	4	33	4	4	0	2	2	2	41	23	30	18	96	94	93
	Beta1AR	1		0	5	2	1	1	1	15	5	34	5	7	1	3	3	3	43	27	34	19	92	88	77
	Beta2AR	1	0		6	3	1	1	1	15	5	34	5	7	1	3	3	3	43	26	33	19	97	91	77
	D3	3	5	6		5	5	3	1	6	3	33	3	3	7	8	8	8	35	21	48	26	100	96	93
	H1	1	2	1	5		1	1	1	5	5	34	3	3	7	8	9	9	39	23	40	24	101	97	83
	M2	0	1	1	4	1		0	0	12	4	32	5	5	0	2	3	3	37	23	44	18	97	94	71
	M3	0	1	1	3	1	0		0	12	4	32	4	4	0	2	2	2	36	22	43	18	101	95	72
	5HT1B	0	1	1	1	1	0	0		9	4	33	2	2	1	2	2	2	34	21	45	16	96	92	84
	5HT2B	12	15	15	6	5	12	12	9		13	41	12	11	15	15	16	16	42	30	51	32	108	100	89
	A2A	4	5	5	3	5	4	4	4	13		23	6	5	4	6	6	6	35	19	27	19	94	92	89
	S1P1	33	34	34	33	34	32	32	33	41	23		33	33	33	33	33	33	40	35	45	18	114	108	101
	CXCR4	4	5	4	3	3	5	4	2	12	6	33		3	7	6	5	6	32	25	21	17	98	91	98
	CCR5	4	7	7	3	3	5	4	2	11	5	33	3		4	4	5	31	26	21	20	103	99	103	
	KappaOR	0	1	1	7	7	1	0	1	15	4	33	7	4		1	0	1	35	29	24	9	98	93	103
	MuOR	2	3	3	8	8	2	2	2	15	6	33	6	4	1		0	0	36	26	24	15	97	93	97
	NOP	2	3	3	8	9	3	2	3	16	6	33	5	4	0	0		0	36	25	24	20	94	92	99
	DeltaOR	2	3	3	8	9	3	2	2	16	6	33	6	5	1	0	0		36	26	24	10	94	91	100
	PAR1	41	43	43	35	39	37	36	34	42	35	40	32	31	35	36	35	36		3	31	24	100	96	106
	P2Y12	23	27	26	21	23	23	22	21	30	19	35	25	26	29	26	25	26	3		25	18	99	95	79
B	CRF1	29	34	33	48	42	49	44	45	53	27	44	21	21	24	24	24	24	32	25		23	85	61	81
	GLR	16	19	18	26	24	18	18	16	32	19	18	17	20	9	14	20	17	24	18	23		90	91	66
C	MGLU1	98	94	98	100	100	99	102	97	108	76	118	98	103	98	97	94	97	102	99	79	73		0	105
	MGLU5	95	90	92	96	98	95	97	92	102	94	113	93	99	93	93	93	94	98	95	56	74	0		99
F	SMO	93	77	77	100	83	71	72	85	89	81	100	98	103	103	97	99	100	106	70	81	66	87		99

Comparing GRoSS to the reference alignments

The GRoSS alignment refines the BW TM.50 residues extended from class A to classes B, C, and F. In terms of the notation used in [24], this would be referred to as TM.50a, denoting the use of class A as a reference. For each TM and each target—template pair we compute the relative offset of the BW residues in the HMM-HMM alignment. If the offset is 0, we use “_” as a label; if the offset is 9 or more residues, we use “9”; and if template BW residue maps to a loop or a wrong TM, we use “X”. Table B shows the relative alignment of the BW residues between the GRoSS and the HMM-HMM alignments with the labels for the 7 TMs concatenated into one string.

When both the target and the template are from the same class, HMM-HMM aligns correctly all 7 BW .50 residues. When using class A templates for class B targets, HMM-HMM often gives the correct BW correspondence, and in some instances is off

by one turn (4 residues) on TM5. Class C gets TM7 off by 6 residues, which already constitutes too large of an error for homology models. The alignment between class A and SMO (class F) varies, but most often it disagrees by 4 residues on TM5 and 1 residue on TM7.

Table C shows the same comparison but between the GRoSS and the GPCRDB alignments. Here, classes A and B are aligned identically, class C differs by 1 residue on TM7 and class F differs on 3 TMs by 2 or 3 residues.

Table B. Relative alignment of BW residues between GRoSS and HMM-HMM.

		Mis-alignment of BW residues																								
		Template																								
Target	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
	BHO	Beta1AR	Beta2AR	D3	H1	M2	M3	SH1B	SH2B	A2A	SIP1	CCOR4	CCRS	KappaOR	MuOR	NOP	DeltaOR	PAR1	P2Y12	CRF1	GIR	MGU1	MGU5	SMO		
A BHO																										
Beta1AR																										
Beta2AR																										
D3																										
H1																										
M2																										
M3																										
SH1B																										
SH2B																										
A2A																										
SIP1																										
CCOR4																										
CCRS																										
KappaOR																										
MuOR																										
NOP																										
DeltaOR																										
PAR1																										
P2Y12																										
CRF1																										
GIR																										
B CRF1																										
C MGU1																										
MGU5																										
F SMO																										

Table C. Relative alignment of BW residues between GRoSS and GPCRDB.

		Mis-alignment of BW residues																								
		Template																								
Target	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z
	BHO	Beta1AR	Beta2AR	D3	H1	M2	M3	SH1B	SH2B	A2A	SIP1	CCOR4	CCRS	KappaOR	MuOR	NOP	DeltaOR	PAR1	P2Y12	CRF1	GIR	MGU1	MGU5	SMO		
A BHO																										
Beta1AR																										
Beta2AR																										
D3																										
H1																										
M2																										
M3																										
SH1B																										
SH2B																										
A2A																										
SIP1																										
CCOR4																										
CCRS																										
KappaOR																										
MuOR																										
NOP																										
DeltaOR																										
PAR1																										
P2Y12																										
CRF1																										
GIR																										
B CRF1																										
C MGU1																										
MGU5																										
F SMO																										

GRoSS, HMM-HMM and GPCRDB agree on alignment of the BW .50 residues for all TMs within class A. In this case, the only differences between these alignments are the gaps in HMM-HMM. Some gaps can be present in both target and template at matching locations, which would simplify homology modeling. Table D shows the number of residues aligned to gaps for each target—template pair when HMM-HMM is used. Similarly to the notation in the previous tables, we label “_” when there are no gaps; “9” for 9 or more gaps; “Y” for misaligned BW residues; “X” for any template residues aligned to loop regions of the target.

Table E shows the number of residues aligned to gaps if the GPCRDB alignment is used. Most target—template pairs have at least one gap. However, the number of

gaps predicted by HMM-HMM (Table D) is larger and often falls at wrong positions, which disagree with GPCRDB (Table A).

Table D. Gaps in HMM-HMM: Number of residues in template TMs aligned to gaps in target sequence.

Target	Number of TM gaps																									
	Template																									
A	RHO	Beta1AR	Beta2AR	D3	H1	M2	M3	SH1B	SH2B	A2A	SHP1	CCR4	CCRS	KappaOR	MuOR	NOP	DeRoOR	PAR1	P2Y12	R	GIR	C	MG1U1	MG1U5	SMO	
A RHO																										
Beta1AR																										
Beta2AR																										
D3																										
H1																										
M2																										
M3																										
SH1B																										
SH2B																										
A2A																										
SHP1																										
CCR4																										
CCRS																										
KappaOR																										
MuOR																										
NOP																										
DeRoOR																										
PAR1																										
P2Y12																										
R																										
GIR																										
C																										
MG1U1																										
MG1U5																										
SMO																										

Table E. Gaps in GPCRDB: Number of residues in template TMs aligned to gaps in target sequence.

Target	Number of TM gaps																									
	Template																									
A	RHO	Beta1AR	Beta2AR	D3	H1	M2	M3	SH1B	SH2B	A2A	SHP1	CCR4	CCRS	KappaOR	MuOR	NOP	DeRoOR	PAR1	P2Y12	R	GIR	C	MG1U1	MG1U5	SMO	
A RHO																										
Beta1AR																										
Beta2AR																										
D3																										
H1																										
M2																										
M3																										
SH1B																										
SH2B																										
A2A																										
SHP1																										
CCR4																										
CCRS																										
KappaOR																										
MuOR																										
NOP																										
DeRoOR																										
PAR1																										
P2Y12																										
R																										
GIR																										
C																										
MG1U1																										
MG1U5																										
SMO																										

Geometrical quality of homology models

Each alignment can be used to produce a homology model for a given target—template pair. For the following analysis, we constructed simple homology models for the backbone atoms only. We ignored any missing residues, which were gaps in the target—template alignment. For all pairs considered in the previous tables, we evaluated RMSD, TM-score, and the number of common inter-helical contacts. The results of these three measures comparing HMM-HMM with GRoSS are shown in Figure A panels 1, 2, and 3. The same measures comparing GPCRDB with GRoSS are shown in Figure A panels 4, 5, and 6.

The RMSD comparisons (lower number is better) show that GRoSS alignment outperforms HMM-HMM for essentially all cases (Fig. A1). The RMSD comparisons of GRoSS to GPCRDB (Fig. A4), show that GRoSS outperforms GPCRDB in cross-class cases and only slightly underperforms in intra-class cases. This is expected as

GPCRDB alignments include gaps/bulges based on pairwise structural comparison input, whereas GRoSS alignment ignores these gaps and bulges. TM-Score comparisons (higher number is better) show similar results as RMSD comparisons for GRoSS versus HMM-HMM (Fig. A2) and GRoSS versus GPCRDB (Fig. A5).

The comparison of the number of conserved contacts (higher number is better) shows that HMM-HMM performs slightly better than GRoSS (Fig. A3) for intra-class cases, but fails for inter-class cases. Same is true for GPCRDB comparison with GRoSS (Fig. A6).

Overall, these comparisons show that GRoSS alignments perform better than both HMM-HMM and GPCRDB. The cross-class sequence alignments for GRoSS are significantly better, whereas the intra-class sequence alignments are of similar quality.

Figure A. Comparing geometrical quality of the homology models.

