Refolding of Amphioxus Insulin-like Peptide: Implications of a Bifurcating Evolution of the Different Folding Behavior of Insulin and Insulin-like Growth Factor 1†
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ABSTRACT: Insulin and insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1) share high sequence homology, but their folding behaviors are significantly different: insulin folds into one unique thermodynamically controlled structure, while IGF-1 folds into two thermodynamically controlled disulfide isomers. However, the origin of their different folding behaviors is still elusive. The amphioxus insulin-like peptide (ILP) is thought to be the common ancestor of insulin and IGF-1. A recombinant single-chain ILP has been expressed previously, and now its folding behavior is investigated. The folding behavior of ILP shows the characteristics of both insulin and IGF-1. On one hand, two thermodynamically controlled disulfide isomers of ILP have been identified; on the other hand, the content of isomer 1 (its disulfides are deduced identical to those of swap IGF-1) is much less than that of isomer 2 (its disulfides are deduced identical to those of native IGF-1); that is, more than 96% of ILP folds into the native structure. The present results suggest that the different folding behaviors of insulin and IGF-1 are acquired through a bifurcating evolution: the tendency of forming the thermodynamically controlled non-native disulfide isomer is diminished during evolution from ILP to insulin, while this tendency is amplified during evolution from ILP to IGF-1. Moreover, the N-terminal Gln residue of ILP can spontaneously form a pyroglutamate residue, and its cyclization has a significant effect on the folding behavior of ILP: the percentage of isomer 1 is approximately 2-fold that of isomer 1 of the noncyclized ILP; that is, isomer 1 becomes more favored when the N-terminal residue of ILP is cyclized. So, we deduce that the N-terminal residues have a significant effect on the folding properties of insulin, IGF-1, and ILP.

In the 1960s Anfinsen and co-workers first demonstrated the three-dimensional structure of a globular protein is uniquely determined by its amino acid sequence (1). Since then, significant advances have been made in the understanding of protein folding through experimental and theoretical approaches. For small proteins with two-state folding, topology is a major determinant of the folding rate and greatly influences the structure of the transition-state ensemble (2–4). Studies on the disulfide-coupled folding of some small globular proteins, such as BPTI, RNase A, and EGF, have revealed a sequence of preferred kinetic intermediates which define a folding pathway (5–12). In vivo the protein folding is assisted by the molecular chaperones, especially for large proteins (13–15); some chaperones even can provide the missing steric information for protein folding (16).

Insulin is an extensively studied small globular protein with A- and B-chains linked by three disulfides (one intrachain bond, A6–A11; two interchain bonds, A7–B7 and A20–B19). Its three-dimensional structure has been well solved by X-ray crystallography (17, 18) and NMR (19–21) since the 1970s. Although the separate A- and B-chains of insulin can be recombined successfully in vitro (22), a single-chain polypeptide (pre-proinsulin) is synthesized in vivo. When B29Lys and A1Gly were linked together by a peptide bond directly, the mini-proinsulin still retained the three-dimensional structure identical to that of insulin (23, 24). A single-chain insulin (PIP) can fold correctly and can be secreted efficiently from transformed yeast cells (25). In vitro PIP can efficiently fold into the native state with correct pairing of its three disulfides through a defined folding pathway (26). It can reasonably be presumed that the three-dimensional structure of PIP is identical or very similar to that of insulin/mini-proinsulin.
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IGF-1 is an insulin-like 70-residue single-chain protein composed of B-, C-, A-, and D-domains linked by three disulfides (47–52, 6–48, 18–61) corresponding to those of insulin, (A6–A11, A7–B7, A20–B19) (27). The B- and A-domains of IGF-1 are homologous to the B- and A-chains of insulin, respectively; the C-domain is analogous to the C-peptide of proinsulin, but they share no sequence homology; the D-domain has no counterparts in insulins. IGF-1 adopts an insulin-like structure also stabilized by its three disulfides (28). The ordered structure of IGF-1 is mainly encoded by its B- and A-domains; the C- and D-domains are highly flexible.

Although insulin and IGF-1 share high sequence homology, similar three-dimensional structure, and weakly overlapping biological activity, their folding behaviors are significantly different: insulin/PIP folds into one unique thermodynamically controlled structure (26), while IGF-1 folds into two isomers (native and swap) with different disulfide linkages but similar thermodynamic stability (29–36). The different folding behavior of insulin/PIP and IGF-1 is mainly controlled by their B-chain/domain that controls the different energetic state of the intra-A-chain/domain disulfide (37, 38).

The amphioxus insulin-like peptide (ILP) deduced from the cDNA sequence is a polypeptide that displays structural characteristics of both mammalian insulin and IGF-1 (39). The deduced ILP contains B-, C-, A-, and D-domains similar to those of IGF-1 while there are potential prohormone convertase cleavage sites at the two ends of the C-domain similar to proinsulin, and its A- and B-domains bear considerable sequence homology to the A- and B-chains of insulin as well as to the A- and B-domains of IGF-1. Therefore, amphioxus ILP is proposed as a common ancestor of insulin and IGF-1. Since ILP is the common ancestor of insulin and IGF-1, how did insulin and IGF-1 acquire different folding behaviors from a common ancestor during evolution? Previously, a recombinant single-chain ILP that shows an insulin-like conformation (40) had been expressed successfully, and when its five or six residues were replaced by the corresponding residues of insulin, the ILP analogues acquired moderate insulin activity (41). To investigate the origin of the different folding behaviors of insulin/PIP and IGF-1, the folding behavior of the recombinant single-chain amphioxus ILP was investigated (the residues of ILP were numbered according to the numbering system of insulin; therefore, the first residue of ILP was numbered as B2).

Similar to the folding behavior of IGF-1, two thermodynamically controlled disulfide isomers of ILP have been identified, but the equilibrium is much more favored to the native structure. Therefore, the folding behavior of ILP shows the characteristics of both insulin/PIP and IGF-1, which suggests a bifurcating evolution of the different folding behaviors of insulin and IGF-1 from a common ancestor. Moreover, the N-terminal Gln residue of ILP can spontaneously cyclize and form a pyroglutamate residue (it is named [pE]ILP), and the cyclization favors the formation of the isomer with swap disulfide linkages.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Materials.** *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* XV700-6B (leu2, ura3, pep4) was kindly provided by Professor Michael Smith (University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada). The chemical reagents used in experiments were of analytical grade. The Vydac reverse-phase columns (C8, 5 μm, 4.6 × 250 mm, and C8, 10 μm, 10 × 250 mm), Gilson 306 HPLC system, and Gilson 115 UV detector were used. In the HPLC analysis, a gradient elution was used. Solvent A was 0.15% aqueous TFA; solvent B was 60% acetonitrile containing 0.125% TFA. The elution gradient is listed as follows: 0 min, 0% solvent B; 1 min, 0% solvent B; 5 min, 40% solvent B; 35 min, 80% solvent B; 36 min, 100% solvent B; 38 min, 100% solvent B; 40 min, 0% solvent B; 45 min, 0% solvent B.

**Purification and Characterization of ILP and [pE]ILP.** The expression vector of ILP (40) was transformed into *S. cerevisiae* XV700-6B, then the transformed yeast cells were cultured in a 16 L fermenter for 3 days, and the secreted target protein in the media supernatant was purified as follows. First, target protein in supernatant was precipitated by trichloroacetic acid at the final concentration of 5% (w/v). Second, the pellet containing the target protein was dissolved with 1 M acetic acid for several times, and each time the supernatant was applied to a Sephadex G-50 column, and the column was eluted with 1 M acetic acid. Third, the lyophilized product separated by gel filtration was applied to an ion-exchange column (DEAE-Sepharose CL-6B) pre-balanced with 50 mM Tris-HCl and 40% (v/v) isopropyl alcohol, pH 7.8, and eluted with a linear gradient of NaCl from 0 to 0.2 M. The eluted product was lyophilized and then desalted with a Sephadex G-25 column. Fourth, the product was further purified by C8 reverse-phase HPLC and eluted with the gradient listed in the Materials section.

**Purification and Characterization of the Disulfide Isomers.** The native isomer (isomer 2) of ILP or [pE]ILP was purified from the media supernatant as described above. The swap isomer (isomer 1) of ILP or [pE]ILP was converted from isomer 2 as described in the Disulfide Rearrangement Assay section at 37 °C with a protein concentration of about 1 mg/mL due to its low content in the fermentation mixture. Their molecular masses were determined by electrospray mass spectrometry. Their purity was analyzed by native pH 8.3 PAGE and analytical C8 reverse-phase HPLC.

**Circular Dichroism Analysis.** The isomers of ILP and [pE]-ILP were dissolved in 1 mM HCl, respectively. The protein concentration was determined by the absorbance at 276 nm using an extinction coefficient of 1.2 mL mg⁻¹ cm⁻¹, and their final concentration was adjusted to 0.2 mg/mL, respectively. The measurements were performed on a Jasco-715 circular dichroism spectropolarimeter at room temperature. The spectra were scanned from 200 to 250 nm using a cell with 0.1 cm path length in the far-UV region and scanned from 300 to 245 nm using a cell with 1.0 cm path length in the near-UV region. The data were expressed as molar ellipticity. The software “J-700 for windows secondary structure estimation, Version 1.10.00” was used for secondary structural content estimation from the CD spectra.

**V8 Digestion Analysis.** The isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP were dissolved in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.8), respectively, and then V8 endoproteinase was added to the solution at about a mass ratio of 1:20 to the sample. Isomer 1 was digested at 37 °C for 6 h; isomer 2 was digested at 37 °C for 16 h. After digestion, the solution was adjusted to pH 2.0 with TFA and separated by C8 reverse-phase HPLC eluted with the gradient listed in the Materials section. The
The N-terminal Gln residue can spontaneously form a pyroglutamate residue. So, peak 2 was named [pE]ILP. The above deduction is consistent with the following observations. (1) The unexpected molecular mass of peak 2: The cyclization of the N-terminal Gln residue will release one NH$_3$ molecule with a molecular mass of 17. (2) The identical amino acid composition of peak 1 and peak 2: During hydrolysis both the glutamine and pyroglutamate residues will be converted to glutamate. (3) Different retention times of peak 1 and peak 2 on reverse-phase column: Under the acidic buffer (pH 2.0) the analysis used, the N-terminal Gln residue has a positive charge but the pyroglutamate residue does not carry net charge; therefore, [pE]ILP is more hydrophobic than ILP and more difficult to be eluted from the reverse-phase column. (4) Identical mobility rate of peak 1 and peak 2 on the native pH 8.3 PAGE: Under the pH value used for the PAGE (pH 8.3), the α-NH$_2$ of the N-terminal Gln is not ionized; therefore, neither the N-terminal Gln nor pyroglutamate carries net charge. (5) As shown in Peptide Mapping, except for the fragment of the N-terminal three residues, the other fragments of peak 2 all have the expected molecular masses. Therefore, the unexpected molecular mass of peak 2 is caused by its N-terminal three residues. Among the three residues (Gln-Ala-Glu), cyclization of the N-terminal residue has most likely happened. Moreover, when purified ILP is incubated in 1 M acetic acid, it can be converted to [pE]ILP gradually, but [pE]ILP is stable under the same condition (data not shown). This suggests that peak 2 is converted from peak 1 during fermentation and purification.

**RESULTS**

**Purification and Characterization of the Disulfide Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP.** Despite the high sequence homology, insulin/PIP and IGF-1-mini-IGF-1 have acquired quite different folding behaviors. We have investigated the sequence determinant of their different folding behaviors (37, 38) but are still puzzled by its origin. To answer this question, we have expressed a single-chain amphioxus ILP that is deduced to be the common ancestor of insulin and IGF-1 (40). The sequence and disulfide pairing of the single-chain amphioxus ILP are shown in Figure 1 and compared with the sequences of PIP and mini-IGF-1 (37). Here, the folding properties of the single-chain ILP and [pE]ILP were investigated. Similar to mini-IGF-1, two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP with identical molecular mass were identified. The purified isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP were analyzed by analytical reverse-phase HPLC and native PAGE as shown in Figure 2. On the C8 reverse-phase column, the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP have different retention times: the isomer with shorter retention time was named isomer 1, and the isomer with longer retention time was named isomer 2. The different retention time implies that the two isomers have different conformations. On native PAGE, isomer 2 runs a little faster than isomer 1, but cyclization has no effect on the mobility rate. This implies that the conformation of isomer 1 is likely somewhat looser than that of isomer 2. The molecular masses of the two isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP were analyzed by electrospray mass spectrometry and are listed in Table 1. These results suggest that the two isomers have identical amino acid sequence but different conformation. The different conformation of the two isomers was probably caused by the different disulfide linkages, which has been observed in IGF-1/mini-IGF-1.

**Table 1: Molecular Masses of the Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ILP isomer 1</th>
<th>ILP isomer 2</th>
<th>[pE]ILP isomer 1</th>
<th>[pE]ILP isomer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>measured value</td>
<td>5701.0</td>
<td>5701.0</td>
<td>5685.0</td>
<td>5684.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theoretical value</td>
<td>5702.4</td>
<td>5702.4</td>
<td>5685.4</td>
<td>5685.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circular Dichroism Analysis of the Disulfide Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP. The structural differences of the isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP were analyzed by circular dichroism (Figure 3). In both the far-UV and near-UV regions, the spectra of ILP and [pE]ILP (isomer 1 vs isomer 1; isomer 2 vs isomer 2) are very similar, which suggests that cyclization of the N-terminal residue has no significant effect on the conformation of ILP. However, the spectra of isomer 1 and isomer 2 are quite different in both the far-UV and near-UV regions. Therefore, the secondary and tertiary structures of the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP have significant differences: the conformation of isomer 2 is more ordered than that of isomer 1. The estimated α-helix content from the CD spectra of isomer 1 is significantly lower than that of isomer 2: isomer 1 of ILP, 12%; isomer 2 of ILP, 30%; isomer 1 of [pE]ILP, 16%; isomer 2 of [pE]ILP, 34%. Together with the biological activity of the ILP analogues, we deduced that the disulfides of isomer 2 are identical to those of insulin/native IGF-1, while the disulfides of isomer 1 are identical to those of swap IGF-1.

Peptide Mapping of the Disulfide Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP. To elucidate the disulfide linkages of the isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP, V8 endoproteinase digestion was carried out. The digested fragments were separated by C8 reverse-phase HPLC (Figure 4), and the measured molecular masses of the digested fragments are listed in Table 2. As shown in Figure 4, the chromatography profiles of ILP and [pE]ILP (isomer 1 vs isomer 1; isomer 2 vs isomer 2) are almost identical, while the two isomers show different characteris-
thermodynamically controlled folding products, they could be converted each other and finally reach an equilibrium in the presence of thiol catalyst. As expected, whether starting from isomer 1 or isomer 2, an equilibrium can be reached under a low concentration of thiol catalyst (Figure 5). For ILP, the molar ratio of isomer 1 to isomer 2 is 1–2:100 at 15 °C and 3–4:100 at 37 °C; for [pE]ILP, the molar ratio of isomer 1 to isomer 2 is 3–4:100 at 15 °C and 6–7:100 at 37 °C. From the equilibrium constant, the folding free energy difference (ΔΔG) of isomer 2 to isomer 1 can be calculated: for ILP, ΔΔG is −9.4 to −11.0 kJ/mol at 15 °C and −8.3 to −9.0 kJ/mol at 37 °C; for [pE]ILP, ΔΔG is −7.7 to −8.4 kJ/mol at 15 °C and −6.9 to −7.3 kJ/mol at 37 °C. These results suggest that, first, as the temperature increases, isomer 1 becomes more favored, and, second, cyclization of the N-terminal residue favors the formation of the isomer with swap disulfides.

**In Vitro Refolding of the Disulfide Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP.** To further demonstrate that both of the two disulfide isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP are thermodynamically controlled folding products, in vitro refolding was carried out. After reduction an aliquot was removed, and the free thiols were modified by sodium iodoacetate and then analyzed by native PAGE (data not shown). PAGE indicates that the three disulfides of ILP or [pE]ILP are fully reduced under the condition used. The refolding was initiated by dilution of the fully reduced isomer into the refolding buffer; after incubation the refolding product was analyzed by C8 reverse-phase HPLC (Figure 6). During refolding each isomer folds into a mixture of the two isomers with a ratio similar to that obtained from the disulfide rearrangement. Calculated from the peak area, the refolding yields of the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP are both over 90% under the refolding conditions used. This result further demonstrates that both of the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP are thermodynamically controlled disulfide isomers.

**DISCUSSION**

From the fermentation supernatant of ILP, two major products were obtained: one with the expected molecular mass and the other with unexpected molecular mass. Our present results suggest that the unexpected component is caused by the cyclization of the N-terminal glutamine residue, and its cyclization has no significant effect on the conformation of ILP. For both ILP and [pE]ILP, two disulfide isomers have been identified, but the percentage of isomer 1 is much lower than that of isomer 2. Peptide mapping results suggest that the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP both contain the common disulfide A20–B19, and the B7Cys, A6Cys, A7Cys, and A11Cys form one intrachain and one interchain disulfide bond. It is the different disulfide pairing that results in the different retention time of peak B of isomer 1 and peak C of isomer 2. Together with the result of CD analysis, the folding behavior of IGF-1/mini-IGF-1 (37), and the results of ILP and its mutants (40, 41), it can reasonably be presumed that the disulfides of isomer 2 are identical to those of insulin/native IGF-1, while the disulfides of isomer 1 are identical to those of swap IGF-1. Moreover, all of the three major fragments of [pE]ILP have the expected molecular masses; therefore, the different molecular masses between ILP and [pE]ILP must be caused by the difference of the three N-terminal residues, Gln-Ala-Glu. This observation suggests that the unexpected component, [pE]ILP, is caused by the cyclization of the N-terminal glutamine residue.

**Disulfide Rearrangement of the Disulfide Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP.** If the two isomers of ILP or [pE]ILP were...
one hand, two thermodynamically controlled disulfide iso-
mers of ILP have been identified; this behavior is similar to
that of IGF-1. On the other hand, isomer 2 (with native
disulfides) is much more favored than isomer 1 (with non-
native disulfides); that is, more than 96% of ILP folds into
the native structure. This behavior is similar to the refolding
of insulin/PIP that folds into the native structure with
nondetectable disulfide isomers under undenatured condi-
tions. Since ILP is deduced to be the common ancestor of
insulin and IGF-1, it can thus be deduced that the tendency
of forming the disulfide isomer with non-native disulfides
is diminished during evolution from ILP to insulin, while
this tendency is amplified during evolution from ILP to IGF-
1. As a result, insulin/PIP folds into one unique thermody-
namically controlled structure, while IGF-1 folds into two
disulfide isomers with similar thermodynamic stability.
Therefore, the refolding behavior of amphioxus ILP suggests
that the different folding behaviors of insulin and IGF-1 were
evolved through a bifurcating evolution from a common
ancestor.

Although the cyclization of the N-terminal residue has no
significant effect on the conformation of ILP, it has a
significant effect on the folding behavior. Although two
disulfide isomers of [pE]ILP also have been identified, the
equilibrium of the two isomers has been altered: the
percentage of isomer 1 of [pE]ILP is approximately 2-fold
of that of isomer 1 of ILP. Therefore, cyclization of the
N-terminal residue favors the formation of the isomer with
swap disulfides. Our previous work suggested that the
B-chain/domain plays a critical role in determining the
different folding behavior of insulin and IGF-1 (37, 38) and
proposed the co-evolution of IGF-1 and its binding proteins.
Since the N-terminal sequence of IGF-1 is important for
binding with IGF binding proteins, we deduce that the
N-terminal residue probably has a significant effect on the
folding behavior of insulin/PIP, IGF-1, and ILP.
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Table 2: Molecular Masses of the V8-Digested Fragments of the Isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sample</th>
<th>letter in Figure 4</th>
<th>retention time on HPLC (min)</th>
<th>measured molecular mass</th>
<th>corresponding fragment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>isomer 1 of ILP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.81</td>
<td>638.0</td>
<td>A13Tyr–A17Glu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>1756.0</td>
<td>B5Tyr–B13Asp + A6Cys–A12Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>3051.0</td>
<td>B14Val–A5Glu + A18Ser–A21Asn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isomer 2 of ILP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>638.0</td>
<td>A13Tyr–A17Glu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.21</td>
<td>2921.0</td>
<td>B14Val–A4Glu + A18Ser–A21Asn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>1885.0</td>
<td>B5Tyr–B13Asp + A5Glu–A12Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isomer 1 of [pE]ILP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.89</td>
<td>638.0</td>
<td>A13Tyr–A17Glu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.77</td>
<td>1756.0</td>
<td>B5Tyr–B13Asp + A6Cys–A12Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16.99</td>
<td>3051.0</td>
<td>B14Val–A5Glu + A18Ser–A21Asn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>isomer 2 of [pE]ILP</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>638.0</td>
<td>A13Tyr–A17Glu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>2921.0</td>
<td>B14Val–A4Glu + A18Ser–A21Asn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.89</td>
<td>1885.0</td>
<td>B5Tyr–B13Asp + A5Glu–A12Asp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Disulfide rearrangement of the isomers of ILP and [pE]-
ILP at 15 °C. At indicated reaction times 100 μL (5 μg) of the
sample was removed and acidified by TFA to pH 2.0 and
immediately loaded onto a C8 reverse-phase column. The elution
gradient described in Materials and Methods was used with a flow
rate of 0.5 mL/min and detected at 230 nm.

Figure 6: In vitro refolding of the isomers of ILP and [pE]ILP.
After incubation 100 μL of the refolding mixture was removed and
acidified by TFA and then analyzed by a C8 reverse-phase column.
The elution gradient described in Materials and Methods was used
with a flow rate of 0.5 mL/min and detected at 230 nm.
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