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I. INTRODUCTION

It has become standard practice to compare new amino-acid and nucleotide sequences with existing ones in the rapidly growing sequence databases. This has led to the recurring identification of certain sequence patterns, usually corresponding to less than 300 amino-acids in length. Many of these identifiable sequence regions have been shown to fold up to form a 'domain' structure; they are often called protein 'modules' (see definitions below). Proteins that contain such modules are widely distributed in biology, but they are particularly common in extracellular proteins.

Until a few years ago, structural studies of intact proteins with extracellular parts had proved difficult, partly because these proteins are often glycosylated, membrane spanning, large and flexible. The 3D structures of many of their modular components are, however, now known. This advance has come about, not only because of improvements in crystallography and NMR methods, but also because recombinant methods now facilitate the production of portions of the protein that contain identifiable modules. This 'dissection' approach is leading to a very rapid increase in knowledge of module 3D structure. This is thus an appropriate time to analyse recurring modules in terms of their sequences and 3D structures. Some aspects of this subject have already been covered extensively (Bork & Bairoch, 1995; Baron et al. 1991; Doolittle, 1995; Campbell & Downing, 1994). The aim of this review is to summarise information about the distribution of modules, to consider detectable relationships between sequences and structures and to look for patterns in the ways that modules can be fitted together in an intact protein. Because of space limitations, this review is limited in scope. The main restrictions are a concentration on modules found in extracellular proteins with known structure. Nevertheless, these alone cover a substantial fraction of known modules, since, for more than 50% of all described extracellular module families, there is at least one member with known three-dimensional structure. Furthermore, we estimate that about 40% of mammalian protein sequences are either completely extracellular or have an extracellular part. Many of them contain modules. The intra-/extra-cellular division for protein modules is not always clear since a few modules occur both outside and inside the cell but, in general, this distinction is useful and convenient. This review will show, largely by illustrations,
the distribution, structure and consensus sequences of extracellular modules whose coordinates are in the public domain.

2. SOME DEFINITIONS

**Domain** A domain is probably best defined as a spatially distinct structural unit that usually folds independently. In this definition, the sequence need not be contiguous. (In the absence of structural knowledge, the term domain is less clear although it is often used in current literature to describe functional units and sequence segments with characteristic features.)

**Module** Modules are a subset of domains that are contiguous in sequence and that are repeatedly used as ‘building blocks’ in functionally diverse proteins. They have identifiable amino-acid patterns that can be described by a ‘consensus’ sequence. The spread of a module in biological systems is likely to have been the result of a genetic shuffling mechanism that is not merely gene duplication and gene fusion. The presence of an identified sequence region in another, otherwise unrelated, protein and its location between other known modules, are strong indicators for a module. While the existence of exons with compatible phases at the exon/intron boundaries is good evidence that a module has been spread by ‘exon shuffling’ (Patthy, 1991), other means of module spreading could exist; thus the term ‘module’ may not only apply to sequence regions with compatible phases at exon boundaries. In the case of extracellular modules compatible boundary phases are in fact very often observed.

**Repeat** Modules frequently occur in tandem arrays. Nevertheless, the definition of module given above still applies and we will refer to ‘repeats’ as units that cannot occur as single copies but form super-structures. An example is the leucine rich repeat (Kobe & Deisenhofer, 1994, 1995).

**Mosaic** Proteins that are composed of several different module types are often referred to as ‘mosaic’ proteins. The biological role of modules may, or may not, vary in different settings.

3. EVOLUTION AND CELLULAR LOCATION OF MODULES

The major advantage of building proteins from modules is probably to facilitate the creation of new proteins during evolution. Phylogenetically ‘old’ proteins such as metabolic enzymes are usually only composed of one or two domains and the creation of a new enzyme during evolution required a gene duplication and numerous subsequent point mutations to acquire a new function for a given fold. Although modules are not found in phylogenetically old enzymes, they can already be observed in prokaryotes. However, some of the best-known bacterial modular proteins, such as the extracellular glycohydrolases, may have appeared relatively late in evolution as they are only found in rather specialised bacteria. In eukaryotes, intracellular modules mostly occur in the cytoskeleton and signal transduction pathways that do not seem to have equivalent counterparts in bacteria. Many domains have been known for a long time in nuclear proteins;
more and more of these turn out to fit the definition of a module given above. The best known intracellular modules, including several DNA binding domains, and the SH2, SH3 and PH (see e.g. Pawson, 1995) modules involved in signal transduction, are probably only a small sub-set of those that exist. To date, more than 30 cytoplasmic modules, have been described and many more will no doubt be found in the near future.

The largest fraction of modular proteins is, however, extracellular and seems to have evolved with the radiation of invertebrates. Mammals appear to have the largest fraction of extracellular proteins and most of them contain modules. Since many of the extracellular modules contain disulphide bridges, and thus cannot be located in the nucleus or cytoplasm, and since only a few other modules occur both outside and inside the cell, the distinction made in this review is useful.

4. EXTRACELLULAR MODULES AND THEIR BIOLOGICAL ROLE

In current sequence databases, about 60 of the abundant modules found in extracellular proteins seem to fit our definition of a module. Each of them can be separately identified by sequence analysis and by their detection in other, unrelated, extracellular proteins; this is a first indication that a protein has a modular architecture. The lengths of these modules vary from about 30 amino acids to over 300. The larger ones may have evolved by incorporation of smaller domains. Fig. 1 illustrates the nomenclature used for modules here. It also summarises the module size, the number of disulphide bonds and the number of times the module is found in the sequence database (Bork & Bairoch, 1995).

The abbreviations used are: first column – a 3 to 5 letter variant for unique identification in databases; second column – a two letter variant) the two letter code and the defined colour codes will be used in the various cartoons of modular proteins. Some other symbols used are explained in subsequent figures. The topology of modules with known three-dimensional structure (discussed in detail below) is indicated by the approximate arrangement of their secondary structure elements: a/b (α/β class), b (all-β), a (all-α) b+a (β+α). b?a indicates a predominantly β class module but where an α helix has been observed in some members of the family. The size is a rough estimate of the module length given in amino acids (rounded up to factors of 10). Single members of a module family may differ considerably. The number of cysteines (Nb Cys) may vary within a module family. 4/6 means 4 or 6 cysteines have been observed; 4–6 means that 4 to 6 cysteines may occur. The number of module occurrences (Occ column) in databases (excluding species redundancies) is mainly based on queries from 1993. The actual number might now be much higher for some of the modules.

The various modules discussed here occur in functionally diverse proteins. The modules interact, singly or in concert with others, with a wide variety of ligands, including proteins, peptides and carbohydrates. While there often seems to be a relatively unique role for a given module in intracellular proteins, e.g. SH2 domains bind phosphotyrosine peptides (Pawson, 1995), this kind of direct correspondence is not always recognisable in the modules illustrated in Fig. 1.
Only in a few cases has a unique function been reported e.g. the carbohydrate-binding of CLECT or the membrane-binding of GLA. For others it becomes clear that their function varies in different proteins, e.g. cell binding via an RGD

Fig. 1. Overview of extracellular modules and their abbreviations (for further details see Bork & Bairoch, 1995).
sequence in the 10th FN3 module of fibronectin versus dimerisation of FN3s in the insulin receptor. Apparently, different parts of the module surface can be used in different situations to provide interaction sites, often for other proteins. Some extracellular modules might also have a purely structural role, thus allowing a mosaic protein to present an interacting surface in an appropriate position.

Extracellular mosaic proteins are widely used as cytokine receptors (Bazan, 1993), in cell adhesion proteins (Barclay et al. 1993) and the extracellular matrix (Kreis & Vale, 1993; Venstrom & Reichardt, 1993). In some cases, mosaic proteins play a clear role in particular extracellular biological pathways. The two best-studied cases are the blood coagulation/fibrinolysis and the complement systems. The blood coagulation cascade (Fig. 2) is a host defence system that is initiated after blood vessel injury (Patthy, 1993). It comprises alternative pathways in which certain plasma proenzymes are successively activated by cleaving the protease domain from the modular N-terminal regulatory chains. It involves the formation of complexes with non-proteolytic plasma proteins and membrane-associated cofactors that, in the final step, leads to the formation of a blood clot.
During wound healing, the clot is dissolved by proteases of the fibrinolytic system (Fig. 2). Clotting and fibrinolysis are under multiple control. In addition to protease inhibitors, one anticoagulant pathway involves activation of protein C by thrombomodulin. Activated protein C then forms a membrane-associated complex with plasma protein S that inactivates factor VII. The level of protein S is regulated by C4 binding protein, a regulator that also inhibits the complement system.

The complement cascade (Fig. 3) is a defence system against infectious agents and plays an important role in inflammation. Via formation of the membrane attack complex (MAC) it finally leads to lysis of the membrane of infecting organisms. The classical pathway is triggered by immunoglobulins that recognise the foreign organisms; other pathways exists (Fig. 3). Although the proteins involved are biochemically well-characterised (Figs. 2, 3), the role of all modules in the participating proteins of these cascades is not yet completely understood in both systems. Only approximate regulatory functions such as Ca-dependent membrane-binding can be assigned to specific modules.

A specific biological function cannot be directly associated with all modules, partly due to lack of information and partly because, in some cases, modules do not function autonomously. Nonetheless, structural information is providing considerable insight into module function and hence forms the focus of this
review. Further brief comments on module function are given in the following
discussions of individual modules.

5. CONSENSUS SEQUENCES AND STRUCTURES OF EXTRACELLULAR
MODULES

Known structural information about module structures is summarised in this
section. The headings of the module sections reflect a recent proposal on the
nomenclature of extracellular modules that has been agreed on in a workshop in
Magretetorp (Bork & Bairoch, 1995). A two letter abbreviation is recommended;
a more extensive abbreviation of up to 5 letters can be used for unique
identification in database searches and the full name, from which the abbreviations
have been generated, is also given.

5.1 Solved module structures in the PDB

Emphasis is placed here on modules where structural information is available in
the public domain i.e. in the Brookhaven Protein Data Bank (PDB). Generally
speaking, structure determination of sequence homologues has demonstrated
considerable similarity in a core structure, with insertions and deletions usually
being found only in loop regions, although additional secondary structure
elements can also be added (discussed further below). In the illustrations here, one
structure has been selected as representative of each type of module. Where
available, PDB accession codes for structures of all known homologues are shown
(Table 1). In the figures, the secondary structure of each module, derived from its
observed pattern of backbone hydrogen bonding, is shown schematically with a
MOLSCRIPT figure (Kraulis, 1991). Atomic resolution illustrations for each
module produced using the program INSIGHT ( Biosym, Inc.) are also included
which highlight conserved amino acids. Consensus sequences, derived using
multiple sequence alignments, are illustrated for each module type using the
following notation: h: hydrophobic; t: turn; a: aromatic; +/- single
positively/negatively charged residue; o: Ser/Thr; s: small; -: single insertion;
capital letter: one letter amino acid code; c: Cys not always involved in a
disulphide bond. The apparent structural role of some consensus residues is
discussed briefly in the text for each module, with emphasis placed on residues
with roles in fold stabilisation.

While the number of known module structures is growing rapidly, it is still hard
to make very rigid classifications among different structural types. Some, however,
have clearly similar overall topology; many have a $\beta$-sandwich structure with N-
and C-termini at opposite ends of one long edge of an ellipsoid-shape (e.g. Ig,
FN3, CYTR, CAD and CCP); others are small and cystine-rich with no very
obvious hydrophobic core (e.g. EGF, FN1 and TNFR); others have mixed
secondary structure and N- and C-termini that are close together in space (e.g.
kringle, Ly-6 and C-type). In the following list of modules, some attempt has been
made to classify them on the basis of size, secondary structure and the proximity
Table 1. *Available 3D structures of extracellular modules*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein (domain no)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANATO</td>
<td>anaphylatoxins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C5a</td>
<td>Complement factor V</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADHE</td>
<td>cadherins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NCG</td>
<td>N-cadherin</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td>complement control proteins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HCC</td>
<td>Factor H (16)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HFH</td>
<td>Factor H (15–16)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HFI</td>
<td>Factor H (15)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLECT</td>
<td>C-type lectins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2MSB</td>
<td>Mannose bind. protein A</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Ca, peptide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1MSB</td>
<td>Mannose bind. protein A</td>
<td>Rat</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ESL</td>
<td>E-selectin</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCK</td>
<td>C-terminal cystine knots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2TGI</td>
<td>TGF beta 2</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>(Dimer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BET</td>
<td>NGF beta</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>(Dimer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PDG</td>
<td>PDGF beta b</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>(Dimer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TFG</td>
<td>TGF beta 2</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>(Dimer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYSTA</td>
<td>cystatins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CEW</td>
<td>Cystatin</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1STF</td>
<td>Steffin B</td>
<td>Papaya</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Papain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYTR</td>
<td>cytokine receptor N-terminal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3HHR</td>
<td>Growth hormone receptor</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Growth hormone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1APO</td>
<td>Coagulation factor X</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CCF</td>
<td>Coagulation factor X</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EGF</td>
<td>EGF</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EPG</td>
<td>EGF (ph2)</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EPI</td>
<td>EGF (ph2)</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1EPJ</td>
<td>EGF (ph6-8)</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1IXA</td>
<td>Coagulation factor XI</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HRE</td>
<td>Heregulin</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1HRF</td>
<td>Heregulin</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2TGF</td>
<td>TGF alpha</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TGF</td>
<td>TGF alpha</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3EGF</td>
<td>EGF</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TGF</td>
<td>TGF alpha (mutated)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ESL</td>
<td>EGF (E-selectin)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN1</td>
<td>fibronectin type I repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TPM</td>
<td>tPA (finger domain)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN2</td>
<td>fibronectin type II repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PDC</td>
<td>Sem. fluid prot. PDC109 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN3</td>
<td>fibronectin type III repeat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TTC</td>
<td>Fibronectin (10)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CFB</td>
<td>Neuroglan (1, 2)</td>
<td>Fly</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Sugar, sulfate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1FNA</td>
<td>Fibronectin (10)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TTF</td>
<td>Fibronectin (10)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein (domain no)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iTEN</td>
<td>Tenascin (3)</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Growth hormone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3HHR</td>
<td>Growth hormone receptor</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FOLLI – Follistatin-like (Kazal type protease inhibitors)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein (domain no)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2OVO</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Pheasant</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iOVO</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Quail</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iBUS</td>
<td>Protease inhibitor IIA</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BUS</td>
<td>Protease inhibitor IIA</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCHO</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Chymotrypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3OVO</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3, cleaved)</td>
<td>Quail</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4OVO</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3, cleaved)</td>
<td>Pheasant</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SGB</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Protease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPPF</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Elastase H nec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCGJ</td>
<td>Trypsin pancre. secr. inhib.</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Chymotrypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCGJ</td>
<td>Trypsin pancre. secr. inhib.</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Chymotrypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPCE</td>
<td>Pec-60</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iHPT</td>
<td>Trypsin pancre. secr. inhib.</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTGS</td>
<td>Trypsin pancre. secr. inhib.</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Trypsinogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTUR</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iTUS</td>
<td>Ovomucoid (3)</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GLA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein fragment</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2PF2</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PF1</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPT</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Ca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iCFH</td>
<td>Factor IX</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Kringe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein fragment</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2PF2</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PF1</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SPT</td>
<td>Prothrombin</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPK4</td>
<td>Plasminogen</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPML</td>
<td>t-PA kringle 2</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PK4</td>
<td>Plasminogen</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>e-NH3-cap.ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iKDU</td>
<td>Urokinase</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iPK2</td>
<td>t-PA kringle 2</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-NH3-hexanoic ac.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KUNIT – Kunitz type protease inhibitors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein (domain no)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iSHP</td>
<td>Trypsin inhibitor</td>
<td>Sea anem.</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PTC</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Trypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4PTI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5PTI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6PTI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7PTI</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8PTI</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Protein (domain no)</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9PTI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2TGP</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Trypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TPA</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Trypsin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2TPI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Trypsin, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3TPI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Trypsin, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4TPI</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Trypsin, VV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2KAI</td>
<td>BPTI</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Kallekrein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BPT</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y1BTI</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AAP</td>
<td>Alzheimer amyloid precursor</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1KNT</td>
<td>collagen type VI</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1FAN</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1AAL</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1NAG</td>
<td>BPTI (mutated)</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1BPI</td>
<td>BPTI form II</td>
<td>Bovine</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1TIE</td>
<td>Erythrina Trypsin Inhibitor</td>
<td>Erythrina</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1DTK</td>
<td>dendrotoxin K</td>
<td>Mamba</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1DTX</td>
<td>Alpha dendrotoxin</td>
<td>Mamba</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>SO4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LY6UP – Ly6/CD59 family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1ERG</td>
<td>CD59</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ERH</td>
<td>CD59</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1CDQ</td>
<td>CD59</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PDOM – P-domain (trefoil)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PSP</td>
<td>spasmosytic polypeptide</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PCP</td>
<td>spasmosytic polypeptide</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1POS</td>
<td>spasmosytic polypeptide</td>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TNFR – TNF/NGF receptors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Meth</th>
<th>Å</th>
<th>Ligand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1TNR</td>
<td>TNF receptor p55</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>X-ray</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>TNF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Folli has not been modelled due to differences in the N-terminus. Nevertheless, the folds are probably very similar.

of the N- and C-termini. Clearly the position of the N- and C-termini has implications for the way modules are linked together.

**IG/IGSF/Immunoglobulin ‘superfamily’**

Out of the about 60 modules characterised so far, the most frequently occurring ones seem to belong to the immunoglobulin type. About 40% of the surface proteins of leukocytes have been estimated to belong to the Ig family, based on the presence of a consensus sequence for immunoglobulins (Barclay et al. 1993). It is becoming clear that several other modules with only weak or no detectable sequence similarity to Igs, have the same, or at least a very similar β-sandwich topology; this percentage might thus be considerably higher. Sequence classification of proteins with sequence similarity to immunoglobulins (Williams
Fig. 4. Topology diagram of hydrogen bonding patterns in sandwich-like Ig-folds (reproduced from Bork et al. 1994). The 7–9 β strands (a, b, c, c', c''), d, e, f, g) form a sandwich of two β-sheets (front sheet, thick, back sheet, thin). The loop lengths are not drawn to scale. The common core observed in all Ig domains when superimposed (Bork et al. 1994) is shown in red. Ig constant domains (bottom left, c-type for constant) have seven strands, whereas the Ig variable domains (bottom right, v-type for variable) have an additional hairpin (c'–c'') between strand c and d, with a total of, usually, 9 strands.

& Barclay, 1988; Harpaz & Chothia, 1994) as well as structural comparisons of domains with Ig-like topology (Bork et al. 1994; Jones, 1993) have been extensively reviewed so the Igs will not be discussed here in much detail.

Domains that are structurally related to Igs are not confined to extracellular mammalian proteins; they seem to used in a variety of different contexts. Prokaryotic chaperonins (PapD), intra- and extracellular enzymes acting on carbohydrates (e.g. β-galactosidase, galactose oxidase, cyclodextrin glycosyltransferase and thermostable cellulase celD), haem-binding cytochrome f (Martínez et al. 1994) and Ca-binding synaptogamins (Sutton et al. 1995; L. Holm, personal communication) contain variants of the fold which contains between 7 and 9 β-strands arranged in two sheets (Bork et al. 1994). There is, however, considerable diversity in Ig-like folds that range from β-sandwiches (Fig. 4) to barrel-like structures; the hydrogen bonding pattern of the β-strands also varies considerably. For example, strand a has two alternative locations in v-type domains, being part of either the front sheet (parallel pairing with strand g) or the back sheet (antiparallel pairing with strand b). A similar behaviour for strand g, in yet to be solved structures, might be expected. Other Ig-like domains with 7 strands are distinguished because the 4th strand appears to have switched sheets (s-type for switched); the name of the 4th strand changes from d to c' to reflect the sheet switch. The last type represents an 8-stranded hybrid between c- and s-type that has a short c' that continues after a kink as d, so that both sheets have 4 strands (h-type, for hybrid). For many Ig-like domains it is not clear whether they have a common ancestor or whether they have evolved independently towards a stable fold. There are also technical difficulties related to ‘thresholds’
Fig. 5. Selected proteins that contain FN3 and CYTR modules. Note that additional mosaic proteins containing FN3s can be found in other figures of this review. For nomenclature of modules see Fig. 1.

in the distinction of modules with similar three-dimensional structure but rather limited sequence similarity. To illustrate this point, we discuss below several other extracellular modules with distinct sequence features that also have the \( \beta \)-sandwich topology.

**F3/FN3/Fibronectin type-III**

The FN3 domain is another extremely widespread module (Fig. 5) that was originally identified as the third type of repeat in the matrix protein fibronectin. Database searches have led to estimates that at least 2% of all animal proteins contain the fibronectin type III (FN3) unit (Bork & Doolittle, 1992); the continuing reports of proteins containing this module appear to support these estimates. The module topology, shown schematically in Fig. 6, left hand side differs mainly in a strand-switch of a single \( \beta \)-strand from classical Ig-like folds, although it is very similar to some Ig folds identified by sequence homology such as the second domain of CD2 (Bork et al. 1994). The two \( \beta \)-sheets have a right-handed twist, and they stack on top of each other. The domain does not contain any conserved disulphide bridges, hence a high number of consensus hydrophobic and aromatic residues are required to stabilise the packing of the two sheets (Fig. 6, right hand side). One of these residues is a highly conserved leucine which tethers the long loop connecting strands 5 and 6 to the core. The domain usually
does not contain fold-stabilising disulphide bridges. The well-defined consensus enables pattern and profile searches to identify the numerous occurrences in proteins at the sequence level.

Proteins containing FN3s are mainly extracellular matrix proteins, although the majority of domains (measured in total amounts) are found in a few giant intracellular muscle molecules such as titin and twitchin. Titin, the largest protein sequenced so far, with more than 30,000 amino acids, is almost exclusively composed of Iggs and FN3 modules; they have a length of about 100 and 90 residues, respectively (Labeit and Kolmerer, 1995). At least one more protein seems to contain intracellular FN3s: integrin β4. As FN3 does not require disulphide bridges to stabilise the fold, incorporation into intracellular proteins should not be difficult and additional occurrences in intracellular proteins can be expected.

While most of the extracellular FN3 modules have been found only in animals, FN3s have, surprisingly, also been identified in numerous extracellular glycohydrolases from soil bacteria (Bork & Doolittle, 1992). Quantitative sequence analysis suggests a rather recent horizontal gene transfer from the animals to the prokaryotes (Bork & Doolittle, 1992; Little et al. 1994).

The widespread occurrence of FN3 is accompanied by a variety of different functions. It often coexists with other modules in numerous receptors proximal to the membrane. This location, supported by some known 3D structures, e.g. the receptors for growth hormone and prolactin (de Vos et al. 1992; Somers et al. ...)
suggests that it might often play a role in dimerisation i.e. binding to similar FN3 modules. This model might have to be adjusted, however, in the light of the recent structure of interferon-γ (Walter et al. 1995) complexed with two receptor chains. Although difficult to detect at the sequence level and often treated as separate modules, the interferon-γ receptor, like the sequence-related tissue factor (Harlos et al. 1994; Muller et al. 1994), contains FN3-like domains. More specific binding features have been reported for FN3s in several matrix proteins; for example, the 10th FN3 repeat in fibronectin binds to cell surfaces via its RGD motif; neighbouring FN3s also seem to be involved in heparin binding (Potts & Campbell, 1994).

Structurally related to and sometimes grouped together with FN3s are the CYTR domains which usually precede FN3 domains within cytokine and related receptors, including growth hormone receptor (de Vos et al. 1992) and prolactin receptor (Somers et al. 1994). Sometimes tandem duplications of CYTR and FN3 domains or several FN3 units can be observed within receptors of this family. CYTR domain sequences appear to change or evolve much faster than the associated FN3 domains. This might be due to the 2–3 stabilising disulphide bridges, or perhaps it is a reflection of the development of binding specificity for respective substrates. (Receptors containing CYTRs and FN3s appear to exist at least as dimers and several CYTRs as well as FN3s seem to be involved in the process of ligand binding.)

CA/CADHE/Cadherin

Until recently, cadherin domains had only been found in repeats of four or five copies within the cadherin multi-gene family. With the identification of the fat tumour suppressor from Drosophila, containing as many as 34 CADHE copies as well as EGF and LamG modules, the widespread occurrence of CADHE domains has became clear (Fig. 7). At present, up to 8 copies of CADHE in cadherins have been reported; the receptor tyrosine kinase ret and related proteins contain a single CADHE module in their extracellular part (Fig. 7). The expanding family and the presence of CADHE in different functional contexts suggests that it acts as a structural scaffold for distinct functions, although the Ca-binding features seem to be conserved.

The cadherin domain is approximately the same size as the FN3 module, and it is also topologically similar to the immunoglobulin fold (Overduin et al. 1995; Shapiro et al. 1995). Unlike other Ig-like structures, however, its β-sheets are hydrogen bonded to form a cylindrical β-barrel rather than a sandwich of two β-sheets (Fig. 8, left hand side). Also, the cadherin domain contains two short helical regions, one of which is involved in calcium binding. Residues associated with calcium binding have been identified by NMR studies that monitor chemical shift changes upon addition of calcium (Overduin et al. 1995). Not all of these are conserved in the consensus sequence shown in Fig. 8, right hand side. Those which are potential ligands include the conserved D.E and D.N- regions which map, in 3-dimensional space, to the C-terminal region of the domain. The other
Fig. 7. Some proteins that contain CADHE, TNFR, LYUP and PDOM modules.

Fig. 8. Left) Schematic illustration of the cadherin domain fold. The structure selected as representative for this family is the epithelial cadherin domain responsible for selective cell-adhesion (Overduin et al. 1995). Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the cadherin domain fold highlighting conserved residues.
conserved carboxylate residues near the N-terminus appear to play a role in orienting the first helix with respect to the following $\beta$-strand by side chain-backbone hydrogen bonding interactions.

**CP/CCP/CCP, Sushi, SCR**

Like Ig, FN3, CYTR and CADHE, the CCP module has a $\beta$-sandwich structure with N- and C-termini at the opposite ends of one long edge of an ellipsoid shape. Fig. 9, left hand side illustrates the secondary structure of this module which is comprised of several short segments of $\beta$-strand held together by two disulphide bridges in a 1-3, 2-4 pattern.

This module is abundant in complement control proteins and also in the complement system itself (Fig. 3). It has also been found in viruses, the enzyme thyroxide peroxidase and in protein families such as selectins and mucins. Its function is still unclear and may well be different in the various proteins where it has been found so far. CCPs occur most frequently in tandem arrays but also a few single copies have been identified. An example is the complement receptor CR2, that has 16 CCP modules in its extra-membrane region. It is the receptor for proteins of the complement system and the Epstein Barr virus. It has been shown that the N-terminal two CCP modules are necessary and sufficient for binding both the virus and the natural ligand (Lowell et al. 1989).
The consensus sequence (Fig. 9, right hand side) includes a number of conserved hydrophobic and aromatic residues, most of which lie buried in the core of the module. One exception is the aromatic residue between the second and third cysteines which maps to the structure at the C-terminal end of the molecule. Interestingly this side chain ring appears to pack against the turn which is conserved between the first two β-strands, thereby stabilising its conformation.

A conserved Pro near the N-terminus terminates the first β-strand, directing the backbone chain towards the central core of the molecule. This change in direction, elicited by the proline leaves the ‘hypervariable’ loop extending in solution on the right-hand side of the molecule. This loop, which comprises the most disordered region of the solution structure of the module (Barlow et al. 1993), might be important for the protein-protein interactions.

**EG/EGF/EGF-like**

Like Ig and FN3 modules, EGF seems to be extremely widespread (Fig. 10). Tandem arrays of more than 70 EGFs have been identified in *C. elegans* proteins and the total number of distinct occurrences in databases probably already exceeds 600 (Campbell & Bork, 1993). All EGF-like domains contain a major double-stranded β-sheet, and some, such as the one shown in Fig. 11, top left, also include additional short segments of β-sheet or α-helix. The EGF-like domain may be described as relatively small and ellipsoid with its N- and C-termini located at opposite ends of its major axis. Unusually, no conserved hydrophobic residues are required to maintain the EGF-like domain fold; it is stabilised primarily by three disulphide bonds which form in a 1–3, 2–4, 5–6 pattern (Fig. 11, bottom left). While there are few residues which are conserved for the entire family of EGF-like domains, it is noted that amongst sub-groups, conservation patterns are detectable (Campbell & Bork, 1993).

EGFs are frequently found in both receptors and in matrix proteins (Fig. 10) and have distinct functions in different settings. Some EGFs bind specifically to receptors using large parts of their surface, others mediate interactions via Ca-binding. Recently an X-ray structure of the N-terminal calcium loaded EGF-like domain from factor IX has been reported (Rao et al. 1995) which has provided a very detailed picture of the coordination of the calcium atom as shown in Fig. 11, top right. Comparison of the structure of the calcium binding EGF-like domain in Fig. 11, bottom right to the non-calcium binding domain in Fig. 11, bottom left shows that the two folds are very similar. It has been suggested that Ca-binding may be used for formation of rod-like superstructures involving tandem arrays of EGFs (Rao et al. 1995).

EGFs coexist with certain domain types in quite different settings. The shuffling of blocks containing several modules is one possible explanation as is suggested, for example, by the arrangement of YWTD modules and EGF modules in various receptors similar to EGF precursor and LDL receptor, as well as in nidogen-like proteins. More puzzling is the frequent coexistence of EGF and the LAMB module e.g. in agrin, crumbs, the neurexins, protein S, perlecan and
the fat tumour suppressor. EGFs are also found attached to enzymes, not only in blood coagulation and complement but also in thyroid peroxidase and prostaglandin synthase, the latter being located in the endoplasmic reticulum. Various viruses encode EGF-containing proteins and they might even exist in several parasitic single cell eukaryotes.

**F1/FN1/Fibronectin type-I**

A rather rare module is the fibronectin type I repeat (FN1), first identified in the matrix protein fibronectin but later also found in tPA and in coagulation factor XII. Hepatocyte growth factor activator (HGFA) with a modular architecture similar to factor XII also contains one copy of this module (Fig. 2). FN1 modules
Fig. 11. Top left) Schematic illustration of the EGF-like domain fold. The structure selected as representative for this family is that of the human epidermal growth factor peptide hormone (Hommel et al. 1992). Bottom left) Atomic resolution illustration of the EGF-like domain fold highlighting conserved residues. Top right) Schematic illustration of the calcium binding EGF-like domain fold. The structure shown is the N-terminal calcium loaded epidermal growth factor-like domain from factor IX (Rao et al. 1995). Bottom right) Atomic resolution illustration of the calcium loaded EGF-like domain highlighting conserved residues. Conserved carboxylate residues (indicated by an O in the consensus sequence) all participate in defining the geometry of the calcium binding site.
are found in the fibrin and collagen binding region of fibronectin and they also seem to be involved in fibrin binding in other proteins such as tissue plasminogen activator (Potts and Campbell, 1994; Smith et al. 1995).

The topology of the F1 module is dominated by two regions of antiparallel β-sheet that are held together by two disulphide bridges that link conserved cysteines in a 1–3, 2–4 pattern (Fig. 12, left hand side). The double-stranded sheet is further anchored to the triple-stranded one by a salt bridge formed between the conserved +/− pair of amino acids (Fig. 12, right hand side). The majority of the conserved aromatic and hydrophobic residues are found in the domain core. One exception is noted at the back of the triple-stranded β-sheet. Interdomain contacts in F1-containing module pairs suggests that this exposed hydrophobic side chain is conserved for pairwise domain packing (Williams et al. 1994; Smith et al. 1995). For example, in the tissue-type plasminogen activator FN1-EGF pair this residue packs between the two domains and helps to define their relative orientation.

**TR/TNFRC/TNF family receptors Cys-rich**

The TNF/NGF receptor family is rapidly growing and includes receptor-like proteins that all seem to bind dimeric or multimeric cytokines; even several distinct ligands can be bound (reviewed in Mallet & Barclay, 1991; Bazan, 1993; Smith et al. 1994). The family includes (at least) two pox virus proteins which might block several defence mechanisms of the hosts. Typically, the proteins of
the TNF receptor family contain 3–5 copies of the TNFRC module, shown schematically in Fig. 7. Although TNFRC cannot be classified as a module in a strict sense as it has not yet been found to be associated with other modules, we have included it because of the diversity of the TNF/NGF family. Recently the presence of this module in the EGF and insulin receptors has also been proposed (Ward et al. 1995).

The secondary structure of the small, globular TNFRC module includes two double-stranded $\beta$-sheets (Fig. 13, left hand side). Its fold is constrained by three disulphide bonds connecting cysteines 1–2, 3–5 and 4–6, although the 3–5 bond does not form in all members of the TNFRC family (see below). These bridges tether the N-terminus, the two $\beta$-sheets and the C-terminus respectively, as highlighted in Fig. 13, right hand side. Few other residues besides the cysteines are conserved. The aromatic ring which extends from the first $\beta$-strand packs against the 3–5 disulphide bond as shown, and similarly the hydrophobic residue near the C-terminus packs against the 4–6 S-S bond.

**KR/KRING/Kringle**

The kringle domain was one of the first modules identified in the blood coagulation system (Fig. 2). The name stems from the Danish pastry that shows some similarities to the 2D representation of the sequence with its S-S bond constraints. Until recently, its spread was restricted to proteins of the coagulation
and fibrinolysis pathways. Much later, the discovery of apolipoprotein A, with as many as 37 kringle modules all very similar to those in plasminogen, has suggested functions outside the coagulation system. Hepatocyte growth factor and related proteins with modular architectures very similar to clotting/anticlotting proteases reveal similar cascades in other functional contexts (Fig. 2). The identification of kringles in ror-like and trk-like receptor tyrosine protein kinases revealed the presence of a completely new class of proteins in which kringles exist independent of serine proteases in one molecule (Fig. 2). The kringles within the coagulation system are well-studied and have apparently adapted different ligand-binding features that contribute to the fine-tuning of this complex cascade. For example, of the two kringle modules in tissue-type plasminogen activator, only one contains an active lysine binding site (van Zonneveld et al. 1986).

Unusually, the kringle domain contains a large number of β-turns and relatively little α or β secondary structure (Fig. 14, left hand side). Nonetheless, the module has a well-defined conformation due to the large number of conserved residues, all of which play important structural roles. In the consensus sequence shown in Fig. 14, right hand side, all five aromatic and the two hydrophobic side chains cluster and form a stable hydrophobic core. Proline residues that restrict backbone flexibility are especially important for maintaining turn conformations. The two conserved prolines perform this function and also bury their imino side chain rings in the core. Numerous conserved turn and glycine residues dot the consensus sequence, further favouring the kringle domain fold. In addition, each side chain of the conserved Arg-Asn pair near the centre of the sequence makes multiple hydrogen bonds to the protein backbone. Of course, the three disulphide bridges connecting cysteines 1–6, 2–4 and 3–5 covalently enhance the kringle

Fig. 14. Left) Schematic illustration of the kringle domain. The structure of the second kringle from tissue-type plasminogen activator (de Vos et al. 1992) has been selected to represent this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the kringle domain highlighting the positions of conserved residues.
domain structure; in particular the 1–6 S-S bond maintains the close proximity of the kringle N- and C-termini.

**LU/LY6UP/Ly6 antigen/uPA receptor**

This module has been found so far in members of the Ly-6/CD59/spg-2/ThB family as a single copy and in uPA receptor in a tandem array of three copies (Fig. 7). The precise functions of these proteins are unknown, but the different reported activities of CD59 such as complement inhibition and T-cell activation suggest distinct functions for the modules in the different settings. Structural similarity and some common sequence features between LY6UP and a group of snake venom neurotoxins exist (Fletcher et al. 1994; Kieffer et al. 1994). However, no common functional features have been predicted so far.

The LY6UP domain secondary structure is dominated by five antiparallel β-strands. The long turn on the left side of the molecule, as shown in Fig. 15, left hand side, is helix-like but lacks the regular backbone hydrogen bonds normally used to define this conformation. The pattern of disulphide bonds adopted by the 10 conserved cysteine residues was first elucidated by this structure of the extracellular region of the complement regulatory protein CD59 (Kieffer et al. 1994; Fletcher et al. 1994). Covalent S-S bond linkages are observed between cysteines 1–5, 2–3, 4–6, 7–8 and 9–10, although the 7–8 disulphide bond does not form in all Ly-6 homologues. The shape of the domain is approximately spherical, but flattened along the z-axis as shown in Fig. 15, right hand side. Most of the conserved hydrophobic residues cluster on the surface of the molecule near the N- and C-termini rather than in the core. This arrangement appears to stabilise the
Fig. 16. Some proteins that contain CLECT modules. Note that C-type lectins are not homologous to other lectin types. For nomenclature of modules see Fig. 1.

relative orientation of the termini with a zipper-like mechanism. The C-terminal hydrophobic side chain is neatly sandwiched between the two N-terminal ones. Precise displacement of the termini may be important for attachment of glycophaspatidylinositol (GPI) which serves as an anchor to the membrane for this domain. The site of attachment has been speculated to be at the C-terminal Asn in Fig. 15, right hand side, based on the otherwise inexplicable amino-acid identity at this position.

**CL/CLECT/C-type lectin**

C-type lectins are one of the few modules for which an overall function has been proposed: carbohydrate-binding. Nevertheless, only a few of the numerous C-type lectins in modular proteins have been subjected to binding studies to confirm their sugar-binding specificities. As many extracellular proteins are glycosylated, no precise predictions for their specific binding functions can be made. A classification of the different C-type lectins has been proposed and many features have already been reviewed (Drickamer, 1992), but more divergent types of lectins also exist (Fig. 16), as became recently obvious by the identification of a divergent C-type lectin in the gene product of PKD1 (Glucksmannkuis et al. 1995; Fig. 16).

The C-type lectin domain, which is depicted in Fig. 17, left hand side, is roughly spherical in shape with an overall diameter of ~30–35 Å. Its core contains a network of antiparallel β-strands some of which appear distorted,
Fig. 17. Left) Schematic illustration of the C-type lectin fold. The structure chosen to represent this family is the carbohydrate recognition domain of rat mannose-binding protein (Weis et al. 1992). Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the CLECT domain highlighting the placement of conserved residues.

possibly due to packing interactions. Two amphipathic helices flank the β-secondary structure. All of the hydrophobic and aromatic residues which are highlighted in Fig. 17, right hand side lie in the core of the molecule. The conserved valine appears at the centre of the molecule as it is shown, and lies underneath a hydrophobic canopy created by three aromatic rings. Two conserved disulphide bonds also contribute to the definition of the fold. In particular, the 1–4 S-S bond fixes the orientation of the first helix and the C-terminus. Finally, a conserved Glu, shown at the right of the figure, stabilises the first turn of the second helix via (i, i + 3) and (i, i − 4) side chain to backbone hydrogen bonds.

**GA/GLA/Gamma-carboxy-glutamate domain**

The GLA domain is found at the N-terminus of several clotting factors (Fig. 2). The name was derived because of the presence of numerous γ-carboxyglutamate residues. As illustrated in Fig. 18, left hand side, its secondary structure is composed of three short α-helices. GLA is a module with a well-defined function: Ca-dependent membrane-binding. On the right-hand side of the molecule as shown in Fig. 18, right hand side, two internal carboxylate surfaces are covered with γ-carboxyglutamate side chains which can bind multiple calcium atoms. Details of the mechanism are still far from being completely understood (Valcarce et al. 1994), although some insight has been provided by structural comparison of the calcium loaded and calcium free forms of the GLA module (Sunnerhagen et al. 1995). The restriction of GLA to clotting factors might be due to its post-translational modifications that require specific recognition mechanisms.
Fig. 18. Left) Schematic illustration of the gamma-carboxyglutamate domain. The GLA domain of Ca-prothrombin fragment 1 (Soriano-Garcia et al. 1992) has been chosen as representative of this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the GLA domain highlighting conserved residues. In this figure γ-carboxyglutamate residues are denoted by 'E'.

The main sources of stability for the GLA fold are conserved hydrophobic and aromatic side chains concentrated in the region between the three helices and a single disulphide bond. Two other conserved positions, one positively charged between GLA residues 3 and 4, and a Thr near the C-terminus, also help maintain the backbone conformation via side chain to carbonyl oxygen hydrogen bonds.

**AT/ANATO/Anaphylatoxin**

Anaphylatoxins are fragments of the central complement proteins C3, C4 and C5 which are released after proteolytic degradation during complement activation (Fig. 3). They seem to be involved in numerous biological activities including induction of smooth muscle contraction, histamine release from mast cells and basophilic leukocytes, increase of vascular permeability, antibody production and in chemotactic and chemokinetic processes. C5a is one of the major inflammatory proteins that has a range of activities (Hugli, 1981).

In spite of harbouring the anaphylatoxins and several other active degradation products, the related complement components C3, C4 and C5 were not originally considered as modular proteins because nearly their entire sequences are homologous to macroglobulins. However, their modular architecture began to be unravelled with the identification of the C-terminal domain in the netrin family and the detection of anaphylatoxin-like domains in the fibulin family (Fig. 3).

The structure of a complement anaphylatoxin module is a four α-helix bundle with down-up down-up topology when viewed in the orientation shown in Fig. 19, left hand side. However, fibulin anaphylatoxin modules only include approximately two-thirds of the anaphylatoxin homology region defined using
Fig. 19. Left) Schematic illustration of the anaphylatoxin fold. The structure of porcine C₅a (Williamson & Madison, 1990) represents this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the ANATO structure highlighting the positions of conserved residues.

Fig. 20. Some proteins that contain FN2 modules; see also Fig. 2.

Complement protein sequences. Specifically, if each helix shown is divided in two and labelled A'-A'', ... D'-D'', then fibulin anaphylatoxin repeats include the region defined from B'' to D'; the first of the three disulphide bonds which join cysteines 1-4, 2-5 and 3-6, does not form in all members of the family. Fibulins contain three copies of the domain arranged in a tandem array, followed by several copies of EGFs. Fibulin-2 also contains a preceding N-terminal domain. The function of ANATO in fibulins remains unclear.
Due to the great diversity of complement and fibulin anaphylatoxin sequences, most residues in the consensus sequence play structural roles (Fig. 19, right hand side). A hydrophobic core is not conserved; only one non-polar residue consistently packs in the interior of the module. Interestingly, this particular residue is located on the interior face of the D’ helix and its side chain packs against the B’’ helix. The high degree of conservation of this residue suggests that the fibulin AT repeat might fold independently.

**F₂/FN₂/Fibronectin type-II**

Although the second repeat of fibronectin usually coexists with FN₁, not only in fibronectin itself but also in factor XII and in HGFA, several independent occurrences of FN₂s are known (Fig. 20). Two FN₂s form seminal fluid and related proteins, one, or several, are inserted in various collagenases and improve ligand binding affinity. FN₂ have also been found in mannose receptor and related proteins (Fig. 20).

The F₂ domain is small and contains two short segments of double-stranded antiparallel β-sheet (Fig. 21, left hand side). Its structure is similar to the kringle domain in that it contains little secondary structure and consequently a high proportion of residues are conserved to stabilise its fold. Also like the kringle domain, disulphide bonds hold the N- and C-termini close together in a crossed conformation as shown in Fig. 21, right hand side. The core of the domain contains mainly of aromatic residues which form a partially exposed hydrophobic surface. NMR monitored binding studies of the domain suggests that these residues form a putative binding site for collagen (Constantine *et al.* 1992). The orientation of the side chain of the conserved threonine with its hydroxyl group on the surface probably enhances solubility of the domain.

**PD/PDOM/P-type (Trefoil)**

The P domain, illustrated in Fig. 22, left hand side, is small like the GLA and FN₂ domains. It is stabilised by three disulphide bonds which are joined in a 1-5, 2-4, 3-6 pattern, although the first does not form in all members of the PDOM family defined by sequence homology. Up to six copies of this module have been found in numerous proteins that are mainly associated with the gastrointestinal tract (Fig. 7) and are thought to be growth factors that also contribute to mucosal defence mechanisms.

The particular function of PDOM in this environment has been related to its resistance to proteolytic degradation. Nevertheless, reports of P domains in the lysosomal α-glucosidase and in the luminal sucrase isomaltase as well as in the major rabbit zona pellucida protein (Fig. 7) suggest a role in carbohydrate-binding, as all proteins containing PDOM exist in heavily glycosylated environments or, as in the case of the two enzymes, directly interact with sugars. This suggestion is well supported by the pattern of conservation shown in Fig. 22, right hand side. Three aromatic residues line a cleft which has been suggested
Fig. 21. Left) Schematic illustration of the fibronectin type-II domain fold. The structure of PDC-109 domain B (Constantine et al. 1992) has been used to represent this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the FN2 domain highlighting the positions of conserved residues.

Fig. 22. Left) Schematic illustration of the P-domain fold. The structure of porcine pancreatic spasmolytic polypeptide (Gajhede et al. 1993) has been used to represent this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the PDOM module highlighting conserved residues.

to bind mucin glycoproteins (Gajhede et al. 1993). These aromatic rings no doubt also play a role in stabilisation of the fold of the domain, as do the three hydrophobic residues clustered in the upper left-hand loop when the molecule is viewed in the orientation shown in Fig. 22, right hand side. This loop is further rigidified by multiple hydrogen bonds from the conserved hydroxyl (o) side chain.
which initiates the longer, left-hand helix. Finally, the conserved positive side chain is unexpectedly buried in the core, and forms a salt bridge joining the first \( \beta \)-strand to the end of the short helix at the back of the structure in the orientation shown.

**CK/CTCK/C-terminal cystine knot (TGF-\( \beta \))**

The three-dimensional structures of transforming growth factor-beta (TGF\( \beta \)) (Daopin et al. 1994), nerve growth factor (NGF) (McDonald et al. 1991), platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF) (Oesner et al. 1992) and gonadotropin (Lapthorn et al. 1994; Wu et al. 1994) all form two highly twisted antiparallel pairs of \( \beta \)-strands and contain three disulphide bonds, of which two form a cystine ring through which passes the third cystine juncture. The topology, shown in Fig. 23, left hand side, has thus been called cystine-knot (McDonald et al. 1993; Isaacs, 1995). The CTCK module is notably non-globular; it has an extended, crescent shape with dimensions of \( \sim 60 \) Å by \( 20 \) Å by \( 15 \) Å. The network of disulphide bonds formed between eight cysteines in a 1–2, 3–6, 4–7, 5–8 pattern is notable to the left of the N- and C-termini in Fig. 23, right hand side. There are few amino acids conserved in the region of the disulphide ‘knot’ apart from the cysteines,
while at the top of the molecule as shown, a number of hydrophobic residues are conserved, particularly between the two double-stranded β-sheets.

While TGFβ, NGF, PDGF and gonadotropin have not been reported to form parts of larger modular proteins, a distinct module that has been shown to be structurally related to this superfamily is found at the C-terminus of numerous modular proteins (Meitinger et al., 1993). These include von Willebrand factor, slit, growth factors of the CTGF family, several mucins and norrie disease protein (Fig. 24). As all proteins of the cystine knot superfamily appear to form homodimers stabilised by a particular intermolecular disulphide bridge and complimentary hydrophobic interactions (Daozin et al. 1994), this feature is also predicted for the CTCK module in the modular proteins mentioned above (Meitinger et al. 1993). The exposure of some of the conserved hydrophobic residues shown in Fig. 23, right hand side is consistent with this suggestion. Also, dimerisation via a disulphide bridge in the C-terminal part has been reported in von Willebrand factor. Another common functional feature is likely to be the receptor or ligand binding, but different specificities can be expected due to sequence diversity.

**CY/CYSTA/Cystatin-like**

The cystatins are a family of cysteine protease inhibitors that mainly occur as single domain proteins and are also present in plants. As some extracellular animal proteins contain several CYSTA domains (Fig. 25), they can be considered as modules. Two cystatin domains are found in proteins like fetuin and a histidine-rich glycoprotein. The successive CYSTA modules are fused with distinct C-terminal parts in these proteins. In kininogens, three successive CYSTA modules form about half of the molecule, the C-terminal part harbours bradykinin (Fig. 25). In the latter well-studied protein with important regulatory functions, the
Fig. 25. Some proteins that contain modules of the protease inhibitor families CY, KU and FS (Kazal-type).

first domain seems to have lost its inhibitory activity (see PROSITE database documentation PDOC00259).

The cystatin molecule is approximately described as a prolate ellipsoid, with major and minor axes of ~45 and 30 Å, respectively. The fold is comprised of a large, twisted, antiparallel β-sheet which wraps around a long, straight α-helix. A shorter region of α-helix is also found packed against the base of the backside of the β-sheet as shown in Fig. 26, left hand side. All of the residues which are highly conserved in cystatin-like modules are hydrophobic or in turns. As one would expect, the majority of the conserved non polar side chains are buried in the interface between the major α-helix and β-sheet. Fig. 26, right hand side illustrates that the positions of turn residues mainly coincide with major changes in chain direction, e.g., at the ends of the long helix and at the elbow of the longest β-strand.

**KU/KUNIT/Kunitz/BPTI inhibitor**

BPTI is a very well-studied proteinase inhibitor. Many sequence relatives from various species have been known for a long time (Creighton & Charles, 1987). It has also been noted that single Kunitz-type like (BPTI-related) protease inhibitors (KUNIT) are inserted in the amyloid precursor protein and in collagens VI and VII or are fused with other single modules as in chelonianan. Two successive
domains exist in the precursor of inter-α-trypsin inhibitor, three in tissue factor pathway inhibitor, and the C. elegans genome project revealed huge proteins with at least 12 copies of KUNIT and several other modules (Fig. 25). It remains to be seen whether the KUNIT module acts as a protease inhibitor in all modular proteins or whether only the protease recognition features are used.

The KUNIT fold includes a short region of double-stranded β-sheet, which is flanked on either side by long loops, and a C-terminal α-helix (Fig. 27, left hand side). Of the three disulphides only the ones joining cysteines 1–6 and 3–5 form consistently. These link the N- and C-termini and the helix and sheet, respectively. At the top of the figure the other S-S bond joins the two long loops, probably reducing their relative motion. No hydrophobic residues are conserved in the Kunitz/BPTI sequence, only aromatic rings. Of these, the two phenylalanines which are strictly conserved are buried to a greater extent than the other three aromatic rings, and they appear to be critical to the fold of the domain. The conserved hydroxyl side chain (o) hydrogen bonds to the backbone at position i + 3 and contributes to initiation of the first turn of the α-helix.

**FS/FOLLI/Follistatin-like (Kazal-type protease inhibitors)**

A third type of protease inhibitor that has been found in modular proteins are the Kazal-type (Fig. 25). However, only a strongly modified version of this inhibitor, first identified in follistatin as a repetitive domain, has apparently been subjected to shuffling events. FOLLI has doubtless sequence similarity to Kazal-type protease inhibitors (Fig. 28) but several disulphide bridges in the N-terminus
Fig. 27. Left) Schematic illustration of the Kunitz/BPTI fold. The structure of the sea anemone kunitz-type inhibitor (Antuch et al. 1993) has been used to illustrate this family. Right) Atomic resolution illustration of the KUNIT module highlighting the positions of conserved residues.

Fig. 28. Schematic illustration of the follistatin-like fold. The third domain of silver pheasant ovomucoid (Bode et al. 1985) has been used to represent this family.

seem to be rearranged and straight model-building by homology is difficult. FOLLI modules are found as part of the so-called SPARC unit of proteoglycans of the testican/osteonectin family; as many as 9 copies have been found in the
proteoglycan agrin (Fig. 25). Whether FOLLII acts as protease inhibitor or is associated with glycosylation remains to be studied.

5.2 Known module structures not yet in the PDB

New modules structures are appearing continuously. Some that have been published, and where the coordinates are not yet publicly available are described briefly here.

VA/VWFA/von Willebrand factor type A

Von Willebrand factor is a large multifunctional extracellular protein with several distinct module types. The most abundant one is the so-called ‘type A repeat’, a large domain occurring three times in von Willebrand factor itself, but also in numerous other extracellular proteins including collagens (Fig. 29). It does not contain disulphide bridges and is a rather large module with more than 200 amino-acids in length. The three-dimensional structure (Lee et al. 1995) of one VWFA in an integrin revealed a structural similarity to ras P21 and similar α/β-proteins. This suggests that a classical enzyme fold can be used as a module and that VWFA must have been subjected to diverse shuffling events. It has apparently lost its catalytic activity, but, as the metal-binding residues are well-conserved; metal-mediated-binding of numerous proteins might be a common functional theme of VWFA modules.

LA/LDLRA: LDL receptor class A

This module was originally identified in the LDL receptor where it occurs at the N-terminus in seven consecutive copies (Sudhof et al. 1985; Fig. 10). Although the majority of LDLRs has been found in various LDR receptor-related proteins,
the module has been observed in many other proteins: for example, in complement proteins, enterokinase, basement membrane proteoglycan and PKD1 protein.

The structure of the first N-terminal module from the human LDL receptor has been determined recently (Daly et al. 1995); it is composed of a β-hairpin, followed by a series of β-turns. Many of the conserved acidic residues are located next to each other at one side of the molecule and are probably involved in binding functions.

HX/HEMOP/Haemopexin-like

The module was originally found as 8 repetitive units within haemopexin, but 4 units were later identified in several other proteins including vitronectin (7 units), pea albumin PA-2(4) and some collagenases (4).

Structural analysis revealed that the units form a four-propeller β-superstructure (Li et al. 1995; Faber et al. 1995) similarly arranged to higher order β-propellers in enzymes such as neuraminidase, galactose oxidase or methanol dehydrogenase. Thus, the repetitive units appear to be repeats rather than modules; several of them are apparently required for structural stability and, probably, functional activity. Based on this structural observation one can, for example, predict that an eighth repeat will be present in vitronectin. Perhaps four repeats together form a haemopexin ‘module’ that seems to be involved in complex binding functions in several distinct proteins.

6. SOME GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON MODULES

The following section outlines some interesting general features of modules. Without going into the difficult question of the origins of modules and how many kinds exist, some general structure related observations can be made. For example, modules with less regular secondary structure (e.g., KR and FN2) appear to have a higher proportion of conserved residues which stabilise their fold.

6.1 Differences between members of one module family

Generally where several structures have been determined for one particular module, the 3D structures have been found to be very similar. Homology modelling of one member from another is usually viable. This has been extensively studied in the case of the immunoglobulin family (Harpaz & Chothia, 1994). The changes between members of one family are usually found in loop lengths between secondary structure elements and sometimes in the addition of extra secondary structure elements. For example, in all the known structures of EGF and FN1 modules the observed structural changes between members of a family occur mainly in the length of the loops between β-strands. In contrast, proteins with Ig-like topology not only have changes in their loop lengths but also have various strands added to a core structure (Fig. 4; Bork et al. 1994).
6.2 Conservation and variability of disulphide bridges

Most of the extracellular modules contain disulphide bridges, probably to increase the stability of relatively small domains and to protect against proteolysis. The structural analysis above has suggested that a correlation may exist between the size of a module's hydrophobic core and the number of disulphide bridges which stabilise its fold. Almost all conserved cysteine residues in various extracellular modules form disulphide bridges, mostly intra-modular ones. Cysteines have thus been, for a long time, the most important identifier of a particular module by sequence analysis. With the exponential increase of sequence data, more and more exceptions to this rule become obvious. A well-known example is the immunoglobulin family, that contains a subgroup that does not contain the, otherwise conserved, disulphide bridge (Williams & Barclay, 1988). The recent 3D structures of several cell surface proteins containing Ig-like domains clearly demonstrate the switch of disulphide bridges between strands (Jones, 1993; Bork et al. 1994; Wagner & Wyss, 1994).

Domains of the FN3-type usually do not contain disulphide bridges, but the structure of neuroglin (Huber et al. 1994) shows that they sometimes do. Modules that contain the FN3 consensus have been found in CD45 and the numerous cysteines therein probably also form disulphide bridges. Structurally very similar to FN3, and possibly related in evolution (see below), are the N-terminal domains of various cytokine and related receptors. Whereas in the growth hormone receptor 3 disulphide bridges are formed within this domain, sequence related modules in other receptors only contain 2; the location of the cysteine residues in related sequences also suggests different strand connections.

Some C-type lectins contain an additional S-S bridge, while some members of the LY6UP, ANATO and KUNIT families seem to lack one. Within the TNFR family different Cys-bonding patterns are suggested by the multiple alignment. The cystine knot arrangement of 3 intra-module disulphide bridges is surrounded by differing Cys-bonding patterns in the different members (PDGF, TGFβ, NGF, glycohormone, and CTCK families); most of them also share a Cys bond connecting the dimers. The different arrangement of S-S bonds in the, sequence related, follistatin-like modules and Kazal-type protease inhibitors complicate 3D homology modelling of the follistatin-like modules from the Kazal inhibitor structures.

Disulphide bridges might stabilise certain conformations and are thus important and, usually conserved, structural features. However, loss, addition, or change of position of S-S bridges frequently occurs. These changes might lead to different stable topologies where the constraints on supporting hydrophobic core residues might change, leading to the formation of structurally related modules that are no longer detectable at the sequence level.

6.3 Common topological features of different modules

As the module size increases, the fraction of core-stabilising disulphide bridges
decreases and the hydrophobic core becomes obvious. Another striking feature of extracellular modules is that many of them are $\beta$-sheet and, in particular, several larger ones have very similar topology. This is especially the case with the Greek key architecture of the Ig, FN3, CYTR and CAD modules. A comparison was made recently (Bork et al. 1994) of 23 structures of members of the first three of these module types, that had less than 25% pairwise residue identity. A structural core of four $\beta$-strands (b, c, e and f) was identified in all three types with three or five additional strands (a, c', c'', d and g). The structure of the additional strands is highly variable.

Structure comparisons of the different module types were carried out using a program that maximises a geometrical similarity score. Analysis of the pairwise structural similarity scores revealed three main structural clusters. However, it was concluded that the presence of the conserved structural core did not imply a similar hydrophobicity pattern among the different sequence families – only strand f appeared to retain conserved hydrophobic features. Compare, for example, the consensus sequences for FN3 and CADHE (see Figs 6, 8, right hand sides) and extend this comparison to other Ig-like domains (Bork et al. 1994). It can be observed that there are often conserved aromatic positions in one or more strands of the common core (Fig. 4) although they do not correspond to equivalent positions in the topology. Loop lengths vary in all positions between and even within sequence families of the Ig-type. This kind of analysis suggests that a common topology is achieved by fundamentally different sequences. It remains to be studied whether the different sequences have evolved from each other or whether the fold was invented several times independently during evolution.

Interestingly, the three functionally related, but structural distinct protease inhibitors (cystatin, Kunitz and Kazal) share some common topological features – they all contain a small antiparallel $\beta$-sheet with a surrounding helix.

7. MODULE ASSEMBLY

The database for individual module structures is extensive and knowledge about the way some modules fit together is growing. Biology seems to have used a limited set of protein structures. Are there also a limited number of ways in which modules fit together? Can we discern general rules for module assembly? Here we present a novel analysis of the geometry of different extracellular modular proteins, composed of at least two homologous modules of known structure. In this treatment, individual modules are treated as ellipsoid shapes and the geometry of the double module is described by the rotational parameters linking one module to the other. A rigid frame $(\mathbf{0_1, x_1, y_1, z_1})$ is first assigned to the N-terminal module, with origin $\mathbf{O}$, the calculated centre of mass, and unitary vector $\mathbf{z_1}$, aligned along the major axis of the inertia tensor of the module backbone atoms and pointing towards the C terminus (see Fig. 30a). A second frame $(\mathbf{0_2, x_2, y_2, z_2})$ is then calculated for the C-terminal module by superimposing the homologous backbone atoms of conserved secondary structural elements. Three rotational and one translational parameter are necessary to describe the
Fig. 30. a) Representation of a double module protein by two coordinate frames. b) Definition of the ‘tilt’ angle, \( \epsilon \); \( Z_1 \otimes Z_2 \) is the vector product of the \( Z \) axes of the two frames. c) Definition of the ‘twist’ angle, \( \zeta \); a top view of the two frames along the \( z \) axis is shown.

transformations linking the second frame to the first one. However, most of the modules shown have revolution symmetry around their major axis (two eigenvalues of the inertia tensor are nearly identical), therefore the orientation of the \( \mathbf{x}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{y}_1 \) vectors is arbitrary. In the main, the following two rotational parameters were thus used:

the tilt angle \( \epsilon \), given by: \( \cos(\epsilon) = \mathbf{z}_1 \cdot \mathbf{z}_2 \) (Fig. 30b)

the twist angle \( \zeta \), given by: \( \cos(\zeta) = \mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_2' \) (Fig. 30c)

\( \mathbf{x}_2' \) is the orientation of the \( \mathbf{x}_2 \) vector after tilting the second frame around the axis \( \mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \) by an angle \( \epsilon \) (\( \mathbf{z}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{z}_2 \) are collinear after this transformation; \( \mathbf{z}_1 \otimes \mathbf{z}_2 \) is the vector product of \( \mathbf{z}_1 \) and \( \mathbf{z}_2 \)).

The first step of this analysis requires identification and alignment of the \( C_\alpha \) positions of the conserved structural elements. For example for the immunoglobulin modules pairs, the strands B, C, D, E and F were used in this alignment. The observed range of observed tilt (\( \epsilon \)) and twist (\( \zeta \)) angles for a number of solved module pairs are illustrated in Fig. 31 and Table 2.

A wide set of Fab structures has been recently made available (see e.g. Wilson & Stanfield 1994). These structures showed a high diversity in the module pairing geometry. We have analyzed the geometry of five Fab domains with elbow angles ranging from 127° (1b8d) to 213° (8fab). In our study, the flexibility of Fab molecules translates into a large variation of the tilt and twist angles which are represented as relatively large grey boxes in the figure. The human growth
hormone receptor belongs to this ‘Fab cluster’ as well as the C-module pair. In this later case however, the NMR study showed a large variation of the twist angle (represented by an ellipse in Fig. 31). This variation may be due to a true domain flexibility or a lack of definition at the domain interface.

The cell surface molecules CD2, CD4, tissue factor and VCAM12 form a second cluster characterised by a smaller value of the tilt angle (around $45^\circ$). VCAM12 has an Ig module pair with the lowest tilt angle yet observed. It is striking to observe that CD2 and the two CD4 pairs have a very similar geometry despite their different linker conformation. In many of the X-ray structures some variation between module pair angles is also apparent. For example, there is a $5^\circ$ difference in the tilt angle between the two molecules in the crystal asymmetric unit in the VCAM12 structure. There are also significant differences between the
Table 2. Observed parameters required to translate one module on its neighbour in a module pair

(See Fig. 30 for definitions.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
<th>Orientation (deg)</th>
<th>Tilt (deg)</th>
<th>Twist (deg)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ig-like modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat CD2 a</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat CD2 b</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human CD2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 1-2 Wang</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 1-2 Ryu</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD4 3-4</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum GH Re</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hum Prolactin Re</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue Factor (Harlos)</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tissue Factor (De Vos)</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vcam12 a</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vcam12 b</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fab domains (PDB names)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1bbd H</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fab H</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1fai H</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8fab H</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1bbd L</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fab L</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>-29</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1nca L</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2iff L</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1fai L</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8fab L</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other modules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (4-5)</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (7-8)</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>104.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (8-9)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>159.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (9-10)</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3 (neuroglial)</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>177.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor H 15-16</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance: Distance in Å between the centre of mass of the two modules.
Orientation: This angle is only calculated for Ig-like modules since it requires the definition of an absolute frame on the first module.
Tilt: Angle between the major axis of the two modules (ε in Fig 31).
Twist: Rotation angle around the major axis of the second module relative to the first one once tilted (ξ in Fig. 31).

Module join angles in the same structures from different group e.g. CD4 and tissue factor (see Table 2).

A third class of geometry is formed by the fibronectin modules pairs. The recent structure of a four modules fragment 7FN3-10FN3 (Leahy et al. 1995) provides
additional data on the geometry of FN3 pairs. The range of twist angles observed for FN3 modules pairs is much larger than the tilt angle variation. It would be interesting to determine whether this geometric property is characteristic of fibronectin pairs or reflect an ordering constraint in the crystal. The $^{4}$FN1, $^{5}$FN1 pair showed a limited variation of the tilt angle within the set of NMR structures. Further solution structures of different fibronectin pairs will show if this relative rigidity is observed all along the fibronectin chain.

Another parameter that defines a module pair connection is the separation between the centres of the inertia tensors O1 and O2. These distances, shown in Table 2, are rather variable. For example, in CD2 the separation between centres is around 40 Å for rat and human, while it is around 30 Å for each of the various pairs in CD4. This is in spite of the fact that the rotational parameters for CD2 and CD4 are quite similar.

Not included in the above discussion are observed connections between pairs of modules with different structural topology. Examples of known structure are the EGF-kringle pair from urokinase (Hansen et al. 1994) and the FN1-EGF pair from tPA (Smith et al. 1995).

In general it seems that rules are hard to discern for the ways that modules fit together. There are trends that can be noted – for example, twist angles of around 130° for Ig domains – but it appears that biology can readily change the ways in which a given module pair fits together. The structures of the individual modules are predictable but the relative orientation of a pair can be changed by changing the length of a linker peptide or a few surface residues. This means that a modular protein structure can provide great variety in the spatial position and type of surface that can be presented. The relative positions of modules in a modular protein can also be readily changed by environmental changes (ligand concentration, pH etc.), thus providing a regulation mechanism. Examples are the changes in angles observed between the receptor FN3 modules of the prolactin receptor and the growth hormone receptor when growth hormone binds – see Table 2 (Somers et al. 1994) or SH3, SH2 module rearrangement in intracellular signalling proteins, induced by phosphorylation (Pawson, 1995).

8. CONCLUSIONS

During the writing of this review there has been an astonishing increase in available sequences and structures; no doubt by the time this appears, several new module structures will be in the PDB database. In spite of this increase it is becoming clear that the total number of extracellular module types is probably limited to about 100 and the structures of about many of these are already known. What remains uncertain in many cases is the ways in which mosaic proteins are assembled and how they present their appropriate surfaces for interaction with other proteins. The present level of structural information is, however, sufficient to construct first approximation models for many mosaic proteins. This is allowing a new phase in the determination of biological function since site-directed amino-acid changes and domain deletion and swapping experiments can
now be done in a much more rational way than was previously possible. A new dimension in module research will be added soon with the completion of the genome sequencing programmes for several multicellular organisms. The availability of the complete gene pool of an organism and thus of all extracellular proteins will allow a new kind of comparative analysis. This should give unprecedented information about the phylogenetic questions concerning the spread of modules. More importantly, there is the possibility of unravelling many of the functional networks in which modules are found. Perhaps we are about to understand the 'language' of modules.
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