A new tool for the analysis of molecular motions: studying continuous heterogeneity through Zernikes3D



D. Herreros, R.R Lederman, J. Krieger, A. Jiménez-Moreno, M.Martínez, D. Myska, D. Strelak, J. Filipovic, S. Subramanian, C.O.S. Sorzano, J.M. Carazo













Space whole spike



RBD motions only

S1 motions only





Introduction

- Continuous flexibility is promoting a paradigm shift in cryoEM. The ability to capture a given macromolecule at different states leads to new and exciting heterogeneity analysis with the potential undercover structural to conformational landscapes from experimental data.
- In this work we present the Zernikes3D, a novel tool to study continuous heterogeneity from maps,

Results

COVID-19 spike combined analysis (WT + D614G) in 1Up conformation

(a)

- The structural effect of the mutation is hidden when the whole spike is considered
- Focused heterogeneity analysis on the RBD shows a clear distinction between the mutations. D614G is more efficient exploring the open state

Conclusions

- Novel approach to extract conformational landscapes from all CryoEM data types (maps, structures, and particles)
- Unique possibilities to perform focused analysis on specific regions of a molecule
- Innovative tools for real time inspection and annotation of conformational spaces
- ZART reconstruction: pushing local resolution of maps by correcting motion blurred artefacts

structures, and particles

Methods



- Coefficients $\alpha_{l,n,m}$ can be masked to focus the deformation field on a region of interest
- Maps, structures, and particles can be translated to a common framework (combined analysis)

 Flexibility analysis for the 1Up and 3Down conformations of the COVID-19 spike

(b)

- When classes are clear, the conformational landscape shows a clear distinction of states
- Richer conformational landscapes provide a better understanding of the intraclass and interclass conformational transitions

References

1. E.D. Zhong, et al. Nature Methods, 18: 176-185 (2021)

2. M. Chend, S. Ludtke. Nature Methods, 18: 930-936 (2021)

3. J. Frank, A. Ourmazd. Methods, 100: 61-67 (2016)

4. D. Herreros, et al. IUCR J, 8: 992-1005 (2021)