Conformational changes of the clamp of the protein translocation ATPase SecA

Yu Chen¹, Benedikt W. Bauer¹, Tom A. Rapoport^{1*}, and James C. Gumbart^{2*}

¹Howard Hughes Medical Institute and Department of Cell Biology, Harvard Medical School, 240 Longwood Avenue, Boston, MA 02115, USA.

²School of Physics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, USA.

* Correspondence should be sent to: tom_rapoport@hms.harvard.edu or gumbart@physics.gatech.edu

Key words:

Protein translocation; SecA; crystal structure; molecular dynamics simulation; free energy

Abstract

Post-translational protein translocation across the bacterial plasma membrane is mediated by the interplay of the SecA ATPase and the protein-conducting SecY channel. SecA consists of several domains, including two nucleotide-binding domains (NBD1 and NBD2), a polypeptide crosslinking domain (PPXD), a helical scaffold domain (HSD), and a helical wing domain (HWD). PPXD, HSD, and NBD2 form a clamp that positions the polypeptide substrate above the channel, so that it can be pushed into the channel by a two-helix finger of the HSD. How the substrate is accommodated in the clamp during translocation is unclear. Here, we report a crystal structure of *T. maritima* SecA at 1.9 Å resolution. Structural analysis and free energy calculations indicate that the new structure represents an intermediate state during the transition of the clamp from an open to a closed conformation. Molecular dynamics simulations show that closure of the clamp occurs in two phases, an initial movement of PPXD, HSD, and HWD as a unit, followed by a movement of PPXD alone towards NBD2. Simulations in the presence of a polypeptide chain show that the substrate associates with the back of the clamp by dynamic hydrogen bonding, and that the clamp is laterally closed by a conserved loop of the PPXD. Mutational disruption of clamp opening or closure abolishes protein translocation. These results suggest how conformational changes of SecA allow substrate binding and movement during protein translocation.

Key words

Protein translocation; SecA; crystal structure; molecular dynamics simulation; free energy

Introduction

Protein translocation across the eukaryotic endoplasmic reticulum (ER) membrane or the prokaryotic plasma membrane is a decisive step in the biosynthesis of a large class of proteins, which includes secretory and membrane proteins (for reviews, see refs. 1-5). These proteins are targeted to the membrane by hydrophobic sequences, either cleavable signal sequences or non-cleaved trans-membrane (TM) segments. They are then translocated through a protein translocation channel that is formed from a conserved hetero-trimeric membrane protein complex, the Sec61 complex in eukaryotes or the SecY complex in prokaryotes. Translocation can occur either co- or post-translationally. In co-translational translocation, a polypeptide chain is transferred into the channel during its synthesis on a ribosome. In post-translational translocation, a ratcheting mechanism is used by the ER-luminal chaperone BiP in eukaryotes⁶, and a pushing mechanism is utilized by the SecA ATPase in bacteria^{3, 7, 8}. The mechanism by which SecA pushes polypeptide chains through the SecY channel is only poorly understood.

SecA is composed of five structural domains: nucleotide-binding domains 1 and 2 (NBD1 and NBD2), a polypeptide-cross-linking domain (PPXD), a helical scaffold domain (HSD), and a helical wing domain (HWD)⁹⁻¹⁵. NBD1 and NBD2 have RecA-like folds and bind the nucleotide at their interface. The HSD consists of a long helix and two shorter ones referred to as the two-helix finger^{16, 17}. The two-helix finger pokes into the cytoplasmic opening of the SecY channel and is thought to move during the ATP hydrolysis cycle, pushing the translocating polypeptide chain into the channel¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

Crystal structures of SecA from different bacteria revealed that the PPXD moves relative to the rest of the protein, resulting in distinct conformations of SecA^{9-11, 13-16}. These movements correspond to the opening and closure of a “clamp” that is formed from PPXD, HSD, and NBD2. In crystal structures of SecA in isolation, the clamp is open to varying degrees, with the PPXD at different positions relative to NBD2^{9-11, 13-}

1
2
3
4 15. In the most extreme case, the PPXD is far from NBD2 and close to the HWD^{9, 11, 13-}
5
6 15, 19. In crystal structures of SecA bound to the SecY channel, the clamp is closed, i.e.
7
8 PPXD is near NBD2¹⁶. In this conformation, the clamp could position a translocating
9
10 polypeptide chain above the channel. Indeed, disulfide crosslinking experiments
11
12 showed that a translocating polypeptide moves through the clamp, passes by the
13
14 two-helix finger, and is then transferred into the SecY channel^{17, 20}. However, how a
15
16 polypeptide chain is accommodated inside the clamp during translocation is
17
18 unclear. A crystal structure of *B. subtilis* SecA with a small hydrophilic peptide
19
20 suggested that the substrate forms a short β -strand that interacts with the two β -
21
22 strands connecting NBD1 and PPXD at the back of the clamp¹⁵. However, only the
23
24 backbones of three amino acids were visible in the density map, and in the crystal
25
26 structures of the SecA-SecY complex, there is insufficient space for a polypeptide
27
28 chain, even when in an unfolded conformation. The driving force for clamp closure
29
30 is also unclear.

31
32 Here, we have analyzed conformational changes of the clamp using X-ray
33
34 crystallography and molecular dynamics simulations. Our results indicate that
35
36 clamp closure occurs in two distinct phases, an initial movement of PPXD, HSD, and
37
38 HWD as a unit, and a second movement of PPXD alone. A translocating polypeptide
39
40 forms transient hydrogen bonds with the two-stranded β -sheet at the back of the
41
42 clamp. A conserved loop of PPXD occupies the clamp in the crystal structures
43
44 lacking the substrate. The simulations indicate that, during translocation, the loop
45
46 moves outwards and interacts with NBD2, thereby stabilizing a laterally closed
47
48 clamp. Residues involved in this interaction are highly conserved, and their
49
50 mutagenesis abolishes protein translocation. Taken together, these results suggest a
51
52 model for how conformational changes of SecA allow substrate binding and
53
54 movement during protein translocation.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Results

Structure of *T. maritima* SecA at 1.9 Å resolution

We were able to obtain a crystal structure of *T. maritima* SecA with bound ADP at 1.9Å resolution. Although crystallization was performed in the presence of SecY complex, ADP, and vanadate, the crystals contained only SecA and ADP; nonetheless, the presence of the SecY complex was essential for crystal formation.

In our new structure, *T. maritima* SecA displays an open conformation, in which the PPXD domain leans against HWD; the substrate-binding clamp formed by PPXD, HSD, and NBD2 is wide open (Figure 1a). Superficially, the structure looks similar to a published structure of *T. maritima* SecA (PDB accession code: 3JUX)¹⁵. However, although the overall R.M.S.D. is 2.06 Å, alignment of the two structures on the basis of the NBD domains reveals that PPXD, HSD, and HWD have moved towards NBD2 by ~12 Å and 14° (Figure 1b). The two β-strands at the back of the clamp, which connect NBD1 and PPXD, serve as the hinge for this movement. The C-terminal half of the long helix of HSD is bent, moving together with PPXD, HSD, and HWD, resulting in a ~6 Å displacement of the end of the helix.

The new *T. maritima* SecA structure can be compared with previous structures from the same species (Figure 1c). The most open conformation is the previously published structure (PDB accession code 3JUX, shown in beige in Figure 1c; the distance between PPXD-NBD2 and the angle of PPXD-hinge-NBD2 are 36.2 Å and 124°, respectively). The most closed conformation is seen in the SecA-SecY complex crystallized in the presence of ADP and BeFx (PDB accession code 3DIN, shown in red in Figure 1c; the distance between PPXD-NBD2 and the angle of PPXD-hinge-NBD2 are 7 Å and 74°, respectively)¹⁶. In the new structure (shown in blue in Figure 1c), the clamp is at an intermediate position (30 Å and 115°, respectively). The three

1
2
3
4 structures from the same species define a path for the clamp from the open to the
5 closed state.
6
7
8

9 10 Free energy analysis of clamp movements 11

12
13 We used molecular dynamics simulations to analyze the energetics of
14 conformational transitions of the clamp. When each of the three *T. maritima* SecA
15 structures was used as the initial state for the simulations, no large conformational
16 changes were observed during the tested time period (~850 ns). The energy
17 difference between the two SecA-ADP structures was estimated to be only 3-4
18 kcal/mol, as indicated by the significant overlap in the conformational space
19 sampled (cyan and grey dots in Figure 2a). Repeated simulations of ~150 ns for
20 each of the three SecA structures did not produce notably different behavior
21 (Supplemental Figures S1 and S2).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Next we calculated the free energy (Potential of Mean Force, PMF) as a function of
33 the PPXD-HWD distance and PPXD-hinge-NBD2 angle (Figure 2a). The PMF is
34 lowest (2 -3 kcal/mol) for the open clamp conformation (3JUX) and highest for the
35 closed clamp conformation (3DIN; 15-16 kcal/mol). The free energy for the new
36 intermediate conformation is about 5-6 kcal/mol.
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Based on the free-energy plot, we calculated the least free-energy pathway²¹ (Figure
44 2a), which represents the most probable transition path between two states in our
45 reduced coordinate space. Along this pathway, the PPXD, HSD, and HWD initially
46 move together towards NBD2 for about one third of the distance. PPXD then
47 separates from HSD and HWD, and continues to move alone towards NBD2 for the
48 rest of the distance. This pathway is supported by calculations of the interaction
49 energy between PPXD and HSD (Figure 2b). A significant drop in the interaction
50 energy is observed at the point where the PPXD separates from the HWD and starts
51 to move independently towards NBD2. In the open clamp conformation, the PPXD
52 associates with both HSD and HWD with buried interfaces of 651.4 Å² and 116.2 Å²,
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 respectively. These interaction surfaces must be broken for the second phase of
5 clamp movement. Both energy calculations indicate that the new structure of SecA-
6 ADP is an intermediate in the transition from the open to the closed clamp
7 conformation.
8
9

10
11
12
13 The transition from the intermediate to the closed conformation is likely caused by
14 interactions of SecA with the SecY channel. Indeed, the loop between TM6 and TM7
15 of SecY inserts into the interface between PPXD and HSD/HWD and disrupts the
16 interaction between the SecA domains (Figure 2c). In addition, loop 319-327 of
17 PPXD, which associates with the HSD in the open conformation, rotates outwards
18 and interacts with the loop between TM8 and TM9 of SecY in the closed clamp
19 conformation (Figure 2c). The interactions between the PPXD and the HSD/HWD
20 are thus replaced by interactions between SecA and SecY. These features and the
21 energetic estimates suggest that binding of SecA to SecY is necessary to drive the
22 conformational changes between the open and closed clamp states.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 34 Molecular dynamics simulation of substrate binding to SecA 35

36
37
38 To understand how SecA interacts with a substrate polypeptide, we performed
39 molecular dynamic simulations of *T. maritima* SecA in the presence of a 30-alanine
40 substrate polypeptide. The substrate was initially placed as an extended chain into
41 the closed clamp as seen in the SecA-SecY structure (PDB accession code: 3DIN)
42 using the *B. subtilis* SecA-peptide structure¹⁵ to guide its placement within the clamp
43 (Supplemental Figure S3a, left panel). After simulation run for 570 ns, we analyzed
44 both the conformations of the substrate and of SecA.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Throughout the simulations, the substrate polypeptide formed 1-3 hydrogen bonds
53 with the two-stranded β -sheet at the back of the clamp (Figure 3a), similar to what
54 was observed in a structure of *B. subtilis* SecA with a bound peptide (PDB accession
55 code: 3JV2)¹⁵. In agreement with the experimental observations, the region that
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 associates with the back of the clamp adopts a β -strand conformation, in which the
5 strand runs parallel to the exposed strand (residue 264-269) of the β -sheet (Figure
6 3a). The hydrogen bonds between substrate and the two β -strands form and break
7 repeatedly during the simulations, suggesting that each segment of a polypeptide
8 chain interacts only transiently during translocation (Supplemental Figure S3c). The
9 dynamic interaction between peptide substrate and the two β -strands was also
10 observed if the substrate was initially placed with its N-terminus in a bent
11 conformation (Supplemental Figure S3b and S3c) or if *B. subtilis* SecA was used
12 instead of *T. maritima* SecA (Supplemental Figure S4). These results support the
13 idea that β -strand augmentation may allow sequence-independent substrate
14 binding to the clamp of SecA¹⁵.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The simulations also showed significant changes in SecA, particularly for the loop
28 comprising residues 360-370 (C-loop; Figure 3b). In the closed conformation of the
29 clamp (PDB accession code: 3DIN), the C-loop is located in the center of the clamp
30 (Figure 3b). However, in the simulations with a translocating polypeptide, the loop
31 is moved outwards and forms new interactions with NBD2. These interactions are
32 electrostatic and involve residue R367 of PPXD and residues E485, E488 of NBD2
33 (Figure 3b). The net number of hydrogen bonds between the C-loop and NBD2
34 increases as well. All residues involved in the lateral closure of the clamp are
35 conserved among SecA proteins from different bacterial species (Supplemental
36 Figure S5). The C-loop-NBD2 interactions likely stabilize the closed state of the
37 clamp, preventing the translocating polypeptide from exiting the clamp laterally.
38 Consistent with this assumption, the C-loop stayed inside the clamp when the
39 simulations were performed in the absence of substrate polypeptide (data not
40 shown). Furthermore, the displacement of the conserved C-loop from the clamp and
41 the formation of the exact same interactions between PPXD and NBD2 were also
42 observed in simulations of a *B. subtilis* SecA – substrate complex (not shown).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

59 To assess whether the interaction between the C-loop of PPXD and NBD2 is
60
61
62
63
64
65

important for protein translocation, we mutated the conserved residue R367 to Glu and repeated the molecular dynamics simulations with a translocating peptide. A significant lateral opening of the clamp was observed (Figure 4a and Supplemental Figure S6), which resulted in increased dissociation of the substrate (not shown). Simulation of a triple mutant (E485R, E488R, and R367E) showed that the C-loop remained inside the clamp (Figure 4a). The closed conformation of the clamp in the triple mutant was stabilized by interactions between D350 of PPXD with R485 and R488 of NBD2, as well as by interactions between the backbone of loop 347 - 351 of PPXD with R485 of NBD2. R367E moved away from NBD2 in both mutants (Supplemental Figure S6), but the formation of the additional interactions between PPXD and NBD2 in the triple mutant locked the C-loop inside the clamp. We also observed changes in the HWD during the simulations with all SecA proteins, which are likely caused by the fact that several helices are no longer constrained when the PPXD has moved away from the HWD. Taken together, the simulations identified SecA mutants that either cannot properly close (R367E) or open (E485R, E488R, and R367E) their clamps.

Translocation activity of clamp mutants

To experimentally test the role of the C-loop-NBD2 interaction, we performed *in vitro* translocation experiments. Radioactively labeled proOmpA (pOA), a post-translational substrate, was incubated with proteoliposomes containing SecY complex and either wild type SecA or SecA that carried the R367E mutation. Whereas wild type SecA translocated the substrate in the presence of ATP, the mutant showed only low activity and seemed to accumulate some translocation intermediates (Figure 4b). Because some SecA mutants are primarily affected in the initiation of translocation¹⁸, i.e. the assembly of substrate, SecA, and SecY complex, we performed a second assay in which we tested whether the SecA mutant can move a polypeptide when starting with a previously established translocation intermediate. The translocation intermediate was generated with proOmpA containing a disulfide bridge that prevents the C-terminus from moving into the

vesicles. It was formed in the presence of N-terminal His-tag-substituted SecA (HisN-SecA) and proteoliposomes containing Ni-NTA lipids¹⁸. Then, imidazole and either wild type SecA or SecA R367E were added to replace His-SecA. With wild type SecA, the translocation intermediate was stable over time (Figure 4c, lanes 1-3). Upon addition of dithiothreitol (DTT) to reduce the disulfide bridge in proOmpA, the C-terminus of proOmpA was translocated, resulting in proteolytically protected full-length protein (lanes 4-6). In contrast, with the R367E mutant, the intermediate was not stable and its conversion into fully translocated product was inefficient (Figure 4c, lanes 7-12). Thus, a SecA mutant with defective clamp closure not only fails to initiate translocation, but also cannot sustain translocation when starting from an intermediate. Interestingly, the triple SecA mutant (E485R, E488R, and R367E), which is defective in clamp opening according to our molecular dynamics simulations, was totally inactive in both translocation assays (Figures 4b, 4c). Thus, clamp interactions need to be balanced to allow both its closing and its opening during translocation.

Discussion

Our results provide insight into the mechanism by which SecA translocates polypeptides through the SecY channel. Specifically, they elucidate the role of SecA's clamp. Structural studies and molecular dynamics simulations indicate that the clamp moves from its open to its closed state in two phases. In a first phase, PPXD, HSD, and HWD move as a unit towards NBD2. Our new crystal structure at 1.9 Å resolution corresponds to an early intermediate during this phase. In the next phase, the interactions between PPXD and HSD/HWD are broken, and the PPXD alone continues to move towards NBD2. Our analysis shows that the second phase requires most of the free energy input. The disruption of the PPXD – HSD/HWD interfaces is likely triggered by binding of SecA to SecY. The insertion of the TM6/7 loop of SecY into the interface between PPXD and HSD/HWD is probably responsible for overcoming the energy barrier of clamp closure. A partial separation

1
2
3
4 of PPXD from HWD and HSD has been observed in some structures of *B. subtilis* SecA
5 in the absence of SecY^{10, 15}. However, these conformational changes were probably
6 caused by crystal contacts, as the N-terminal part of the long helix of HSD and a
7 short helix of NBD2 from a neighboring molecule were inserted into the PPXD –
8 HWD/HSD interface.
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 Based on these considerations, we suggest that clamp closure occurs when SecA
16 binds to substrate and SecY channel. Our previous and current experiments (ref. 18
17 and Figure 4c) indicate that SecA can bind to substrate that is already located inside
18 the SecY channel. Thus, in this case, clamp closure occurs around the translocating
19 polypeptide chain. How the polypeptide chain would enter the clamp during
20 initiation of translocation, when SecA, substrate, and SecY channel all come together
21 and assemble into a complex, remains to be clarified.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Cross-linking experiments have shown that a substrate polypeptide moves through
32 the clamp during protein translocation²⁰. However, how substrate is accommodated
33 inside the clamp was unknown, particularly because the closed clamp in crystal
34 structures of SecA-SecY complexes did not leave space for a polypeptide substrate.
35 We now show by molecular dynamic simulations that a conserved loop of SecA
36 (called C-loop) is displaced from the interior of the clamp and forms interactions
37 with NBD2 that stabilize the closed conformation of the clamp and prevents lateral
38 exit of the translocating polypeptide chain.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 The translocating polypeptide forms a short β -strand that interacts through a few
48 hydrogen bonds with the two-stranded β -sheet at the back of the clamp¹⁵. Our
49 simulations show that the interaction is weak, resulting in the continuous
50 association and dissociation of polypeptide segments. During translocation,
51 successive segments of a polypeptide chain would interact in a sequence-
52 independent manner (Figure 5). The interaction needs to be relatively weak to allow
53 substrate movement, but it must be strong enough to hold the polypeptide chain in
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the clamp above the channel. The actual translocation of the polypeptide chain is
5 performed by the two-helix finger, whose movements are triggered by the ATP-
6 hydrolysis cycle (Figure 5). A previous crystal structure supports the idea that the β -
7 sheet at the back of the clamp can interact with extended polypeptide segments and
8 cause them to form an additional β -strand¹⁵. However, in contrast to the molecular
9 dynamics simulations, the clamp was not completely closed, likely because the
10 structure was determined in the absence of SecY complex.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 It is intriguing that the lateral opening of the clamp is aligned with the lateral gate of
20 the SecY channel (Supplemental Figure S7). This suggests that a translocating
21 polypeptide can laterally enter or exit both SecA and SecY at the same time. An
22 obvious scenario in which this could happen is during the integration of a nascent
23 membrane protein into the lipid phase: a TM segment located inside the SecY
24 channel would exit its lateral gate into the surrounding lipid, and at the same time,
25 the cytosolic domain of the translocating polypeptide would laterally exit the clamp
26 of SecA. SecA is in fact required for the biosynthesis of some membrane proteins²⁴,
27 but whether it is involved in the actual membrane integration is unknown. Another,
28 not mutually exclusive, possibility is that the alignment of the lateral gates is
29 important for initiation of translocation of a secretory protein; the intercalation of
30 the signal sequence into the lateral gate of SecY may be coordinated with the lateral
31 entry of the following polypeptide segment into the clamp.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Methods**

48 Protein crystallization and structure determination

49
50
51 *T. maritima* SecA-SecY complex with a His-tag on the C-terminus of SecA was
52 prepared as previously described¹⁶. One microliter of the protein solution at 15
53 mg/ml was mixed with an equal volume of well solution containing 100 mM
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

imidazole, pH 7.0, and 50% methyl-2,4-pentanediol. Crystals were obtained at 22°C in three days by the hanging-drop vapor diffusion method, and were directly frozen in liquid nitrogen. Diffraction data were collected at beamline 24ID-C at the Argonne National Laboratory, and were processed using the Denzo and Scalepack as part of the HKL2000 software package²⁵. The structure was determined by molecular replacement using PHASER in PHENIX software suite, using a published *T. maritima* SecA structure (PDB accession code 3JUX) as search model^{15, 26}. Only SecA and bound ADP were present in the structure. The model was modified in Coot^{27, 28}, and refined with Phenix.refine^{26, 29}. The final refined atomic model contained residues 2-816 of *T. maritima* SecA followed by three amino acids of the tag. It also contained ADP, Mg²⁺, and water molecules. Figures showing structures were prepared in PyMOL³⁰. All software packages were accessed through SBGrid³¹.

Molecular Dynamics simulations

Starting models were derived from crystal structures of (1) *T. maritima* SecA bound to ADP (3JUX), (2) *T. maritima* SecA bound to ADP.BeFx (3DIN), and (3) the new SecA structure reported here. Additionally, two systems incorporating a 30-amino-acid substrate peptide were constructed starting from (1) *T. maritima* SecA bound to ADP.BeFx (3DIN) and (2) *B. subtilis* SecA bound to a short peptide (3JV2). For all systems, SecA was solvated in TIP3P water sufficient to provide 15-30 Å between periodic images of the protein and ionized with 150 mM of KCl. System sizes ranged from 114,000-144,000 atoms. Simulations of *T. maritima* SecA were carried out at 353 K, which is the organism's optimal growth temperature, while those of *B. subtilis* SecA were carried out at 310 K. All simulations were run using the CHARMM36 force field³², while setup and analysis were performed in VMD³³. Initial equilibration runs of 10-50 ns were performed using the MD software NAMD³⁴.

Long-time simulations of the new structure of SecA as well of *T. maritima* SecA bound to ADP.BeFx (3DIN) and *T. maritima* SecA bound to ADP (3JUX) were carried out using the special-purpose Anton supercomputer at Pittsburgh Supercomputing

Center³⁵ for approximately 150 ns or 850 ns each. The two systems containing a 30-amino-acid substrate peptide were run for 140 ns or 570 ns on Anton. Additionally, two mutants of the *T. maritima* SecA bound to substrate peptide, R367E and the triple mutant E485R/E488R/R367E, were modified *in silico* and also simulated for 570 ns each. Approximately 5.6 μ s of equilibrium simulations were run in total.

Free energy analysis

The two-dimensional potential of mean force (PMF) for SecA as a function of two reaction coordinates, namely HWD-PPXD distance and NBD2-hinge-PPXD angle, was calculated using the adaptive biasing forces (ABF) method³⁶ in NAMD³⁷. Initial states of SecA at different separation distances and angles were generated using targeted MD, in which SecA was driven from its conformation in 3JUX to that in 3DIN over the course of a 15-ns simulation. To increase the efficiency of sampling, the 2D parameter space was broken up into 24 windows, with those along the distance ranging from 26-49 Å in 6-Å increments (four windows) and those along the angle ranging from 65-135° in 10-15° increments (six windows). Convergence of the PMF in each window was assumed when the system could diffuse freely along both reaction coordinates. A total of ~600 ns was used to obtain the PMF.

In vitro protein translocation assays

SecA and SecYEG were purified as described before²⁰. SecYEG was reconstituted into proteoliposomes containing *E. coli* polar lipids as described before¹⁸. pOA-CC(61) (*E. coli* pOA with residues 176-297 deleted, containing two cysteines at position 167 and 205, inserted into the pGEM3G vector³⁸) was synthesized *in vitro* in rabbit reticulocyte lysate in the presence of ³⁵S-methionine. The samples were precipitated with ammonium sulfate and resuspended in one volume of 20 mM Hepes pH 6.8, 6 M urea. To test for translocation, 200 nM SecA was mixed with 100 nM SecYEG in proteoliposomes, 5 mM ATP, and pOA-CC(61) (diluted 1:50) in buffer containing 20 mM Hepes, 50 mM KCl, 5 mM MgCl₂. For reactions lacking ATP, 0.4 U/ml hexokinase

1
2
3
4 and 20 mM glucose were added instead of ATP. Reactions were incubated for 10
5 min at 37°C, followed by the addition of 0.2 mg/ml proteinase K (Pierce) for 30 min
6 on ice. Protected fragments were precipitated by 10% TCA and analyzed by SDS-
7 PAGE and autoradiography.
8
9

10
11
12
13 Translocation assays starting with an intermediate were performed as follows. A
14 translocation intermediate was generated by mixing 200 nM SecA-HisDN20 (Ref.
15 18), 100 nM SecYEG reconstituted into proteoliposomes containing 90% *E. coli*
16 polar lipids and 10% Ni-NTA-DGS, pOA-CC(61) (diluted 1:5) in buffer containing 20
17 mM Hepes, pH7.5, 50 mM KCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, and 400 nM sodium tetrathionate. After
18 15 min at 37°C, the samples were incubated with 400 nM SecA mutants and 250 mM
19 imidazole for 20 min at 37°C. Translocation of the C-terminus of pOA-CC(61) was
20 then started by the addition of 50 mM DTT. Samples were taken at the indicated
21 time points, treated with 0.2 mg/ml proteinase K for 30 min on ice, precipitated
22 with 10% TCA, and analyzed by SDS-PAGE followed by autoradiography.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Accession code**

37
38 Coordinates for the new crystal structure of *T. maritima* SecA with bound ADP at
39 1.9Å resolution have been deposited at the RSCB Protein Data Bank (PDB) with the
40 accession code 4YS0.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 **Acknowledgements**

48
49 We thank the staff at the Advanced Photon Source of the Northeastern Collaborative
50 Access Team (NE-CAT) beamlines for help with data collection. NE-CAT is supported
51 by a grant from the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (P41 GM103403)
52 from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). This research used resources of the
53 Advanced Photon Source, a U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Office of Science User
54 Facility operated for the DOE Office of Science by Argonne National Laboratory
55 under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357. NAMD simulations were carried out using
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which is
5 supported by NSF grant number OCI-1053575. Anton computer time was provided
6 by the National Resource for Biomedical Supercomputing and the Pittsburgh
7 Supercomputing Center through NIH Grant RC2GM093307, using a machine
8 donated by DE Shaw Research. Y.C. was supported by an HHMI-Helen Hay Whitney
9 Foundation fellowship. B.W.B. was the recipient of a fellowship from the Boehringer
10 Ingelheim Fonds. The work in the laboratory of T.A.R. was supported by NIH grant
11 GM052586. T.A.R. is a Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigator. J.C.G. is
12 supported by NIH grant K22-AI100927.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

1. Rapoport T. A. (2007) Protein translocation across the eukaryotic endoplasmic reticulum and bacterial plasma membranes. *Nature*. 450, 663-669.
2. Park E. & Rapoport T. A. (2012) Mechanisms of Sec61/SecY-mediated protein translocation across membranes. *Annual review of biophysics*. 41, 21-40.
3. Driessen A. J. & Nouwen N. (2008) Protein translocation across the bacterial cytoplasmic membrane. *Annu Rev Biochem*. 77, 643-667.
4. Mori H. & Ito K. (2001) The Sec protein-translocation pathway. *Trends Microbiol*. 9, 494-500.
5. Denks K., Vogt A., Sachelaru I., Petriman N. A., Kudva R. & Koch H. G. (2014) The Sec translocon mediated protein transport in prokaryotes and eukaryotes. *Mol Membr Biol*. 31, 58-84.
6. Matlack K. E., Misselwitz B., Plath K. & Rapoport T. A. (1999) BiP acts as a molecular ratchet during posttranslational transport of prepro-alpha factor across the ER membrane. *Cell*. 97, 553-564.
7. Economou A. & Wickner W. (1994) SecA promotes preprotein translocation by undergoing ATP-driven cycles of membrane insertion and deinsertion. *Cell*. 78, 835-843.
8. Vrontou E. & Economou A. (2004) Structure and function of SecA, the preprotein translocase nanomotor. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 1694, 67-80.
9. Hunt J. F., Weinkauff S., Henry L., Fak J. J., McNicholas P., Oliver D. B., et al. (2002) Nucleotide control of interdomain interactions in the conformational reaction cycle of SecA. *Science*. 297, 2018-2026.
10. Osborne A. R., Clemons W. M., Jr. & Rapoport T. A. (2004) A large conformational change of the translocation ATPase SecA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 101, 10937-10942.
11. Zimmer J., Li W. & Rapoport T. A. (2006) A novel dimer interface and conformational changes revealed by an X-ray structure of *B. subtilis* SecA. *J Mol Biol*. 364, 259-265.
12. Papanikolaou Y., Papadovasilaki M., Ravelli R. B., McCarthy A. A., Cusack S., Economou A., et al. (2007) Structure of dimeric SecA, the *Escherichia coli* preprotein translocase motor. *J Mol Biol*. 366, 1545-1557.
13. Sharma V., Arockiasamy A., Ronning D. R., Savva C. G., Holzenburg A., Braunstein M., et al. (2003) Crystal structure of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* SecA, a preprotein translocating ATPase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 100, 2243-2248.
14. Vassilyev D. G., Mori H., Vassilyeva M. N., Tsukazaki T., Kimura Y., Tahirov T. H., et al. (2006) Crystal structure of the translocation ATPase SecA from *Thermus thermophilus* reveals a parallel, head-to-head dimer. *J Mol Biol*. 364, 248-258.
15. Zimmer J. & Rapoport T. A. (2009) Conformational flexibility and peptide interaction of the translocation ATPase SecA. *J Mol Biol*. 394, 606-612.
16. Zimmer J., Nam Y. & Rapoport T. A. (2008) Structure of a complex of the ATPase SecA and the protein-translocation channel. *Nature*. 455, 936-943.

17. Erlandson K. J., Miller S. B., Nam Y., Osborne A. R., Zimmer J. & Rapoport T. A. (2008) A role for the two-helix finger of the SecA ATPase in protein translocation. *Nature*. 455, 984-987.
18. Bauer B. W., Shemesh T., Chen Y. & Rapoport T. A. (2014) A "push and slide" mechanism allows sequence-insensitive translocation of secretory proteins by the SecA ATPase. *Cell*. 157, 1416-1429.
19. Kim D. M., Zheng H., Huang Y. J., Montelione G. T. & Hunt J. F. (2013) ATPase active-site electrostatic interactions control the global conformation of the 100 kDa SecA translocase. *J Am Chem Soc*. 135, 2999-3010.
20. Bauer B. W. & Rapoport T. A. (2009) Mapping polypeptide interactions of the SecA ATPase during translocation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 106, 20800-20805.
21. Ensing B., Laio A., Parrinello M. & Klein M. L. (2005) A recipe for the computation of the free energy barrier and the lowest free energy path of concerted reactions. *The journal of physical chemistry B*. 109, 6676-6687.
22. Natale P., den Blaauwen T., van der Does C. & Driessen A. J. (2005) Conformational state of the SecYEG-bound SecA probed by single tryptophan fluorescence spectroscopy. *Biochemistry*. 44, 6424-6432.
23. Robson A., Gold V. A., Hodson S., Clarke A. R. & Collinson I. (2009) Energy transduction in protein transport and the ATP hydrolytic cycle of SecA. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 106, 5111-5116.
24. Deitermann S., Sprie G. S. & Koch H. G. (2005) A dual function for SecA in the assembly of single spanning membrane proteins in *Escherichia coli*. *J Biol Chem*. 280, 39077-39085.
25. Otwinowski Z. & Minor W. (1997) Processing of X-ray Diffraction Data Collected in Oscillation Mode. *Methods in Enzymology*. 276, 307-326.
26. Adams P. D., Afonine P. V., Bunkoczi G., Chen V. B., Davis I. W., Echols N., et al. (2010) PHENIX: a comprehensive Python-based system for macromolecular structure solution. *Acta crystallographica Section D, Biological crystallography*. 66, 213-221.
27. Emsley P., Lohkamp B., Scott W. G. & Cowtan K. (2010) Features and development of Coot. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*. 66, 486-501.
28. Emsley P. & Cowtan K. (2004) Coot: model-building tools for molecular graphics. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*. 60, 2126-2132.
29. Afonine P. V., Grosse-Kunstleve R. W., Echols N., Headd J. J., Moriarty N. W., Mustyakimov M., et al. (2012) Towards automated crystallographic structure refinement with phenix.refine. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*. 68, 352-367.
30. The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 1.5.0.4 Schrödinger, LLC.
31. Morin A., Eisenbraun B., Key J., Sanschagrin P. C., Timony M. A., Ottaviano M., et al. (2013) Collaboration gets the most out of software. *eLife*. e01456.
32. Best R. B., Zhu X., Shim J., Lopes P. E., Mittal J., Feig M., et al. (2012) Optimization of the additive CHARMM all-atom protein force field targeting improved sampling of the backbone phi, psi and side-chain chi(1) and chi(2) dihedral angles. *Journal of chemical theory and computation*. 8, 3257-3273.
33. Humphrey W., Dalke A. & Schulten K. (1996) VMD: visual molecular dynamics. *Journal of molecular graphics*. 14, 33-38, 27-38.

- 1
2
3
4 34. Phillips J. C., Braun R., Wang W., Gumbart J., Tajkhorshid E., Villa E., et al. (2005)
5 Scalable molecular dynamics with NAMD. *Journal of computational chemistry*. 26,
6 1781-1802.
7
8 35. Shaw D. E., Dror R. O., Salmon J. K., Grossman J. P., Mackenzie K. M., Bank J. A., et
9 al. (2009) Millisecond-scale molecular dynamics simulations on Anton. *Proceedings*
10 *of the Conference on High Performance Computing Networking, Storage and*
11 *Analysis*. 39.
12
13 36. Darve E. & Pohorille A. (2001) Calculating free energies using average force. *The*
14 *Journal of Chemical Physics*. 115.
15
16 37. Henin J., Fiorin G., Chipot C. & Klein M. L. (2010) Exploring Multidimensional
17 Free Energy Landscapes Using Time-Dependent Biases on Collective Variables.
18 *Journal of chemical theory and computation*. 6, 35-47.
19
20 38. Erlandson K. J., Or E., Osborne A. R. & Rapoport T. A. (2008) Analysis of
21 polypeptide movement in the SecY channel during SecA-mediated protein
22 translocation. *J Biol Chem*. 283, 15709-15715.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure legends

Figure 1. Comparison of a new structure of *T. maritima* SecA with previous structures from the same species.

(a) A new structure of *T. maritima* SecA with bound ADP was determined at 1.9 Å resolution. Shown is the main chain with NBD1 colored in blue, NBD2 in cyan, PPXD in green, HWD in orange, and HSD in red. The two β-strands connecting NBD1 and PPXD are highlighted in yellow. Bound ADP is shown in stick representation (in magenta).

(b) Comparison of the new *T. maritima* SecA-ADP structure (in light purple) with a previous SecA-ADP structure from the same species (PDB accession code: 3JUX, in beige). The alignment is based on NBD1. The hinge for the movement of PPXD, HSD, and HWD is indicated by the yellow circle.

(c) Superposition of the new structure with other *T. maritima* SecA structures. The alignment is based on NBD1. The PPXDs are shown in different colors: the new structure - light purple; PDB 3JUX - beige; PDB 3DIN - red.

Figure 2. Free energy analysis of clamp movements.

(a) The potential of mean force (PMF) of *T. maritima* SecA was calculated for clamp closure as a function of the HWD-PPXD distance (x-axis) and the PPXD-hinge-NBD2 angle (y-axis). The PMF is presented as a heat map ranging from dark purple (lowest energy) to bright yellow (highest energy). Also shown are contour lines for the indicated energy values (in kcal/mol). The scale is shown on the right. Structures of *T. maritima* SecA reported in this study (square), PDB 3JUX (circle), and PDB 3DIN (star) are mapped at corresponding positions. Points shown in cyan (new structure), gray (PDB 3JUX), and pink (SecA in PDB 3DIN) give the regions of conformational space sampled in equilibrium simulations starting from crystal structures. The green line represents the least-free-energy path connecting the open and closed clamp conformations of SecA.

(b) The PPXD-HSD interaction energy was calculated for clamp closure as a function of the HWD-PPXD distance (x-axis) and PPXD-hinge-NBD2 angle (y-axis). PPXD-HSD interaction energy is shown as a heat map ranging from dark purple (lowest energy) to bright yellow (highest energy), with the scale given on the right. Contour lines of constant energy in kcal/mol are also shown. Structures of SecA are mapped into the diagram by symbols as in (a). The minimum-energy path is shown in green.

(c) Binding SecY to SecA (right panel) interferes with the interaction between PPXD and HSD/HWD seen in the open clamp conformation of SecA in isolation (left panel). PPXD is colored light purple and pink in the open and closed conformations, respectively. HSD and HWD domains are shown in cyan, and the TM6/7 and TM8/9 loops of SecY in red and yellow, respectively. PPXD loop 319-327 binds to HSD in the open conformation (in blue) and moves outwards in the SecY-bound state (shown in magenta).

Figure 3. Molecular dynamics simulation of SecA with a peptide inside the clamp.

(a) A 30-amino acid peptide was placed inside the closed clamp of *T. maritima* SecA (see Figure S3a). Shown is the position of the main chain of the peptide (blue line) after 50 ns of the simulation run. A short segment of the peptide forms a β -strand (dark blue arrow) that interacts through hydrogen bonds (in yellow) with the β -sheet at the back of the clamp (cyan arrows). The right panel shows a magnified view of the augmented β -sheet.

(b) Peptide binding to the clamp moves the C-loop (residues 360-370) from the interior (right panels) towards the outside (left panels), where it interacts with NBD2. The C-loop in the two states is shown in magenta and orange, respectively. The upper panels show space-filling models, the lower ones show the secondary structure of the main chain. The left-most panel shows a magnified view of the interaction between the C-loop and NBD2 with the residues involved in stick presentation. The substrate peptide is shown in ribbon presentation in blue.

Figure 4. Analysis of SecA mutants defective in clamp opening or closure.

(a) Comparison of the molecular dynamics simulations of wild type SecA (C-loop residues 360-370 in orange), a SecA mutant (R367E) defective in maintaining a closed clamp conformation (C-loop in blue), and a SecA mutant defective in clamp opening (R367E/E485R/E488R; C-loop in magenta). The alignment is based on NBD2. The left panel shows a magnified view of the interaction between the C-loop and NBD2, with residue 367 in all SecA proteins and E485/E488 in wild type SecA shown in stick presentation.

(b) Translocation assays were performed by incubating ³⁵S-methionine labeled proOmpA (pOA) with wild type or mutant SecA and proteoliposomes containing SecY complex. The reactions were performed in the presence or absence of ATP. Proteinase K was added and material protected from proteolysis was analyzed by SDS-PAGE and autoradiography. The left most lane shows 20% of the input material.

(c) A translocation intermediate was generated with proOmpA containing a disulfide bridge at its the C-terminus in the presence of His-tagged SecA and proteoliposomes containing SecY complex and Ni-NTA lipids. The samples were incubated with imidazole and either wild type or mutant SecA, followed by addition of DTT as indicated by arrows. Samples taken at the indicated time points were treated with proteinase K and analyzed by SDS-PAGE and autoradiography. IM, intermediate; FL, full-length protein.

Figure 5. Model for SecA-mediated protein translocation

SecA starts out in the cytosol with an open clamp. Upon binding to the SecY channel, PPXD moves and closes the clamp. The substrate polypeptide is embraced by the clamp and forms a short β -strand that interacts with the two-stranded β -sheet at the back of the clamp. During translocation, the two-helix finger of SecA moves towards the channel and drags the polypeptide chain with it. It then resets to grab the next

polypeptide segment. The polypeptide chain can also slide back and forth through the SecA-SecY complex and only occasionally gets a push from the two-helix finger (“push-and-slide” model)¹⁸.

Legends to the Supplementary figures

Figure S1. Free energy analysis of clamp conformational changes.

The potential of mean force (PMF) of *T. maritima* SecA was calculated for clamp closure as a function of the HWD-PPXD distance (x-axis) and the PPXD-hinge-NBD2 angle (y-axis). Shown is a comparison of two independent runs of equilibrium simulations starting from the new structure and the structure deposited as PDB 3DIN. Points shown in blue and gray give the regions of conformational space sampled from the first (~ 850 ns) and second (~ 150 ns) run, respectively.

Figure S2. PPXD-NBD2 angle changes during equilibrium simulations.

The value of PPXD-NBD2 angle (y-axis) was plotted against simulation time (x-axis) for equilibrium simulations starting from (a) the new SecA structure, (b) SecA in PDB 3JUX, and (c) SecA in PDB 3DIN. Results from a longer simulation (~850 ns) are shown in black; results from a shorter simulation (~150 ns) are shown in red.

Figure S3. *T. maritima* SecA-peptide conformations at the beginning and end of molecular dynamics simulations.

(a) The peptide substrate (30 Ala residues) was initially placed into the clamp of *T. maritima* SecA as a straight extended chain (left panel; position 1). The right panel shows the complex after a simulation of 570 ns. The substrate peptide is shown in blue, the two β -strands at the back of the clamp in green, and the two-helix finger in cyan.

(b) As in (a), but the N-terminus of the peptide substrate was initially in a bent conformation (left panel; position 2), and the simulation was performed for 140 ns.

(c) The number of hydrogen bonds between the substrate peptide and the β -strands at the back of the clamp was plotted versus the simulation time. Results from two simulations are shown in black (570 ns) and red (140 ns).

Figure S4. *B. subtilis* SecA-peptide conformations at the beginning and end of molecular dynamics simulations.

(a) The peptide substrate (30 Ala residues) was initially placed into the clamp of *B. subtilis* SecA as a straight extended chain (left panel; position 1). The right panel shows the complex after a simulation of 570 ns. The substrate peptide is shown in blue, the two β -strands at the back of the clamp in green, and the two-helix finger in cyan.

(b) As in (a), but the N-terminus of the peptide substrate was initially in a bent conformation (left panel; position 2), and the simulation was performed for 140 ns.

(c) The number of hydrogen bonds between the substrate peptide and the β -strands at the back of the clamp was plotted versus the simulation time. Results from two simulations are shown in black (570 ns) and red (140 ns).

Figure S5. Conservation of residues involved in the lateral closure of SecA's clamp.

SecA proteins from 30 different species were aligned. Regions corresponding to residues 333-381 and residues 454-495 of *T. maritima* are shown. The arginines in PPXD corresponding to residue R367 of *T. maritima* are colored in red. Acidic residues in NBD2 corresponding to E485 and E488 of *T. maritima* are shown in blue. The C-loop region (residues 360-370 of *T. maritima*) in PPXD of SecA is indicated.

Figure S6. Distances between residue 367 in PPXD and NBD2.

1
2
3
4 The distance between residue 367 from PPXD and NBD2 in wild type SecA (black),
5 R367E mutant (red), and R367E/E485R/E488R triple mutant (green) was plotted
6
7 versus the simulation time. For all systems, the shortest distance was determined
8
9 between residue 367 and any residue in NBD2.
10
11
12

13
14 **Figure S7. Alignment of the lateral opening of the clamp with the lateral gate of**
15 **SecY.**
16
17

18
19 Shown is a model of SecA bound to the SecY channel, as seen in a crystal structure¹⁶,
20 but with the C-loop moved towards the outside of the clamp, as in molecular
21 dynamics simulations in the presence of a peptide. Only the secondary structure of
22 the SecY complex is shown. The left and right panels show side and top views,
23 respectively. The C-loop of SecA's clamp is shown in orange, and the two TMs (TM7
24 and TM2b) that border the lateral gate of SecY are shown in blue.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Table1. Data collection and refinement statistics

<i>T. maritima</i> SecA bound to ADP	
<i>Data collection</i>	
Resolution limit (Å)	1.897
Space group	P 2 ₁ 2 ₁ 2 ₁
Cell dimensions	
<i>a</i> , <i>b</i> , <i>c</i> (Å)	64.404, 110.16, 115.863
α , β , γ (°)	90, 90, 90
Total reflections	364622
<i>R</i> _{sym}	0.086 (0.059)
Mean <i>I</i> / σ <i>I</i>	13.21 (1.24)
Completeness (%)	98.8 (97.0)
Redundancy	3.0 (2.8)
Wavelength (Å)	0.97914
<i>Refinement</i>	
Resolution range (Å)	39.92 - 1.897
<i>R</i> _{work} / <i>R</i> _{free} (%)	17.86 / 22.64
Number of reflections	
Total	65151
<i>R</i> _{free}	3300
No. non-hydrogen atoms	7090
Protein	6598
Ligand/ion	28
Average B-factor	28.54
Protein	28.32
Ligand/ion	18.36
Solvent	32.23
R.m.s deviations	
Bond lengths (Å)	0.009

Bond angles (°)	1.11
Ramachandran analysis (%)	
Favored	98
Allowed	1.7
Outliers	0

Statistics for the highest-resolution shell are shown in parentheses.

$R_{\text{sym}} = \sum_{hkl} \sum_i |I_i(hkl) - \bar{I}(hkl)| / \sum_{hkl} \sum_i I_i(hkl)$, where $I(hkl)$ is the integrated intensity of the reflection. $R = \sum |F_{\text{obs}} - F_{\text{calc}}| / \sum F_{\text{obs}}$, where F_{obs} and F_{calc} are observed and calculated structure factors, respectively. R_{free} was calculated with 5% of the reflections.

Figure1

(a)

(b)

(c)

Figure2

Figure3

(a)

(b)

+ Peptide

- Peptide

Figure4

(a)

(b)

(c)

Figure 5