Single Copies of Sec61 and TRAP Associate with a Nontranslating Mammalian Ribosome
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SUMMARY

During cotranslational protein translocation, the ribosome associates with a membrane channel, formed by the Sec61 complex, and recruits the translocon-associated protein complex (TRAP). Here we report the structure of a ribosome-channel complex from mammalian endoplasmic reticulum in which the channel has been visualized at 11 Å resolution. In this complex, single copies of Sec61 and TRAP associate with a nontranslating ribosome and this stoichiometry was verified by quantitative mass spectrometry. A bilayer-like density surrounds the channel and can be attributed to lipid and detergent. The crystal structure of an archaeal homolog of the Sec61 complex was then docked into the map. In this model, two cytoplasmic loops of Sec61 may interact with RNA helices H6, H7, and H50, while the central pore is located below the ribosome tunnel exit. Hence, this copy of Sec61 is positioned to capture and translocate the nascent chain. Finally, we show that mammalian and bacterial ribosome-channel complexes have similar architectures.

INTRODUCTION

Many proteins are translocated across the endoplasmic reticulum (ER) membrane as they are being translated by the ribosome (Rapoport, 2007). During translocation, the ribosome binds to a membrane channel that is formed by the heterotrimeric Sec61 complex, which consists of α, β, and γ subunits. Secretory and other soluble proteins are transported completely through the channel, whereas hydrophobic segments exit the channel through a lateral gate and become transmembrane (TM) segments. Protein translocation in bacteria and archaea uses a homolog of Sec61 known as the SecY complex to form the channel.

The crystal structure of an archaeal SecY complex shows that the α subunit is composed of two helix bundles consisting of TMs 1–5 and 6–10 (van den Berg et al., 2004). The helix bundles form an hourglass-shaped pore that is plugged at the extracellular side by a short helix (TM2a). The constriction of the pore is formed by a ring of hydrophobic residues whose side chains surround the translocating polypeptide chain (Cannon et al., 2005). During initiation of translocation, a signal sequence or TM segment of a nascent polypeptide chain intercalates into the walls of the channel between TMs 2b and 7 (Plath et al., 1998). These helices are part of the lateral gate and their separation likely destabilizes the interactions of TM2a, causing it to move toward the back of the channel to open the pore (Tam et al., 2005). The SecY crystal structure and other data indicate that the translocation pore is formed from a single copy of the SecY complex (van den Berg et al., 2004; Osborne and Rapoport, 2007).

A central, unresolved issue is how ribosomes interact with SecY or Sec61 during cotranslational translocation. The structure of an Escherichia coli ribosome with an associated nascent chain and SecY channel has been determined by electron cryomicroscopy at ~15 Å resolution (Mitra et al., 2005). Based on this structure, a model was proposed in which two copies of the SecY complex are bound to the ribosome in a near front-to-front orientation. It was further postulated that the pores of the two SecY molecules may fuse during translocation (Mitra and Frank, 2006). However, a recent structure shows that a nontranslating ribosome binds a single copy of the SecY complex with the pore of SecY located beneath the ribosome tunnel exit (Ménétret et al., 2007). Hence, this copy of SecY could form the channel. In addition, the location and the orientation of SecY in this model are not similar to either copy of SecY in the dimer model (Ménétret et al., 2007; Mitra et al., 2005).

In eukaryotes, ribosome-Sec61 complexes have a donut-like structure beneath the ribosome (Hanein et al., 1996; Beckmann et al., 1997; Ménétret et al., 2000). Based on the volume of the electron density, it was suggested that this feature may contain three or four copies of the Sec61 complex (Beckmann et al., 2001; Ménétret et al., 2005). In addition, three or four connections were seen between the ribosome and channel, consistent with the idea that multiple Sec61 molecules are present in the complex. However, at low resolution it may be difficult to distinguish between density contributed by protein, detergent, and lipid. In addition, the choice of an
membrane protein subunits. The protein complex (TRAP) (Osborne et al., 2005; Johnson and Waes, 1999). The TRAP complex remains stably associated with detergent-solubilized ribosome-Sec61 complexes and has a prominent luminal domain that is located beneath the channel (Ménétret et al., 2005). The TRAP complex is composed of four membrane protein subunits. The α, β, and δ subunits are single-spanning membrane proteins, whereas the γ subunit crosses the membrane four times (Hartmann et al., 1993). TRAP can be crosslinked to nascent chains (Wiedmann et al., 1989; Görlich et al., 1992; Mothes et al., 1994) and may help translocate proteins that have prolonged access to the cytoplasm (Fons et al., 2003). However, the exact function of TRAP remains to be clarified.

Recently, we reported the structure of the mammalian ribosome at ~8.7 Å resolution in a ribosome-channel complex (Chandramouli et al., 2008). We have now performed a detailed study of the channel in this improved map. The new structure indicates that a single copy of Sec61 is bound to the nontranslating ribosome. In particular, we were able to use a crystal structure of the archaeal SecY complex, as a model for Sec61, to dock two cytoplasmic loops into a central connection at the tunnel exit. This placed a single copy of Sec61 in the center of a membrane-like disk with a single copy of TRAP located next to Sec61. Quantitative mass spectrometry verified the 1:1 stoichiometry of Sec61 and TRAP in the complex. In the density map, we find that Sec61 is positioned below the ribosome tunnel exit, where it may capture and translocate the nascent chain. In addition, our data show that interactions of Sec61 with the mammalian ribosome are fundamentally similar to those observed in a bacterial ribosome-SecY complex (Ménétret et al., 2007).

RESULTS

Single Copies of Sec61 and TRAP in the Native Channel

We recently determined the structure of a mammalian ribosome at 8.7 Å resolution by analyzing images of frozen-hydrated ribosome-channel complexes (RCCs) (Chandramouli et al., 2008). We have now used this electron density map to perform a detailed study of the channel. The samples were prepared from pancreatic rough microsomes treated with puromycin and 500 mM potassium acetate (PKRMs) (Morgan et al., 2002; Ménétret et al., 2005). This treatment strips ribosomes from the membranes and also moves the P site tRNA into the E site. The ribosomes were pelleted and then added back to an excess of stripped microsomes, so that all the ribosomes would associate with a channel complex. The membranes were floated in a sucrose gradient and solubilized in digitonin. The resulting RCCs were sedimented, resuspended, and then analyzed by electron cryomicroscopy.

A front view of the final map derived from ~79,000 particles is shown in Figure 1A. In the map, the channel (shown in magenta) is separated from the ribosome by a gap of 10–12 Å and is linked to the large subunit by a central connection. In addition, the TRAP complex is present at the back of the channel and has a prominent luminal domain. The region that would normally be contained in the ER membrane is preserved at ~24 Å resolution, based on the 0.5 value from a Fourier shell correlation (FSC) curve (Chandramouli et al., 2008; Figure 1B, gray curve). However, a calculated projection of the disk-like membrane region revealed two high-density features (shown in white). The larger one is similar in size to the Sec61 complex and the smaller one may contain the TRAP complex (Figure 1C, the third and fourth panels from the left). In this projection, the high-density area corresponding to Sec61 has five features arranged in a ring around a central pore. The resolution of this region was estimated to be ~11.1 Å based on the FSC0.5 calculated with a suitable mask (Figure 1B, red curve). When the crystal structure of the archaeal SecY complex is low-pass filtered at 11 Å resolution and viewed in projection, a similar density distribution can be seen for the membrane-embedded region (data not shown). Together, these data suggest that single molecules of Sec61 and TRAP are bound to the ribosome and that additional density surrounding the proteins may originate from lipid and detergent.

These data imply that previous structures were not able to resolve the membrane-embedded proteins, perhaps due to contrast matching (Ménétret et al., 2005; Morgan et al., 2002). We analyzed subsets of the final data set to test this idea. Two smaller data sets were independently refined with EMAN and three-dimensional maps were calculated with ~25,000 and ~57,000 particles. The resolution of the membrane-embedded region of Sec61 in these two maps was estimated to be ~19.6 and ~16.8 Å (Figure 1B, dark blue and black curves). Because the same mask was used for the Sec61 region in all the maps, the masking itself was not responsible for the increase in resolution. Projections of the membrane-embedded regions were calculated from these maps. In these projections, the protein features became more distinct as the resolution was improved (Figure 1C, compare the first three panels). Thus, higher resolution is required to overcome contrast matching between protein, lipid, and detergent.

Further evidence that the membrane proteins are surrounded by lipid and detergent comes from projections of side views of the disk-like density beneath the ribosome (Figures 1D and 1E). These projections show two parallel, high-density stripes separated by a low-density region. This density profile and its thickness of ~40 Å are suggestive of a lipid bilayer-like structure. Thus, ER membrane solubilization with digitonin resulted in single copies of Sec61 and TRAP being surrounded by a disk in which the lipids may be organized in a bilayer-like arrangement. Digitonin molecules might cap and stabilize the edges of this “mini-membrane.”

Quantitation of Sec61 and TRAP in the Native Channel

We then carried out a quantitative analysis with mass spectrometry to verify that single copies of Sec61 and TRAP are present in the RCCs. In these experiments, we used the AQUA method (Gerber et al., 2003), in which labeled peptides are added in
known amounts to trypsin-digested samples to serve as internal standards. A similar method was used to obtain the ratio of components in ribosome–SecY complexes (Ménêtret et al., 2007). In total we used six peptides, with two from ribosomal proteins (S5ε, SA/p40). In addition, we chose one peptide each from the α and β subunits of the Sec61 complex and from the α and β subunits of the TRAP complex (Table 1). The RCCs were prepared as before (Morgan et al., 2002; Ménêtret et al., 2005), except that the particles were purified on a sucrose gradient. Peak fractions from the gradient contained all of the expected components in the RCCs, as shown by blots and Coomassie-stained gels (not shown). Data from the quantitative analysis are summarized in Table 1.

We found that the stoichiometry of ribosomes, Sec61, and TRAP was about 1.0:0.8:0.62 in these complexes. As an internal control, two ribosomal proteins from the small subunit were present in a 1:1 stoichiometry. In addition, the α and β subunits of Sec61 and the α and β subunits of TRAP each had an approximate 1:1 ratio in their respective complexes. Although our data suggest that some ribosomes may not carry a channel, the occupancy estimated from our electron microscopy data appears to be higher. Indeed, about 95% of the particles contained a channel based on 3D classification with the multirefine option in EMAN (see the Experimental Procedures). In addition, the observed differences between Sec61 (~0.8 pmol) and TRAP (~0.62 pmol) may be due to experimental errors, given the spread of values for the α and β subunits. For example, trypsin digestion of TRAP subunits may have been incomplete. When taken together, the mass spectrometry and structural data both support the idea that single copies of Sec61 and TRAP are present in most of the purified RCCs.

Sec61 Connections to the Large Ribosomal Subunit

We used our improved map to evaluate the connections between the channel and the ribosome. This analysis was aided by a detailed model of the canine ribosome (Chandramouli et al., 2008), which allowed us to choose a reasonable threshold for the complex. As shown previously, a gap is present between the channel and the large ribosomal subunit (Figure 2A).
These proteins help to form the binding pocket and include contacts with surrounding large subunit proteins are also possible. For example, the 6/7 loop may interact with both H6 and H7, as it is located between them (Figures 2D and 2E). The 6/7 and 8/9 loops appear to interact with both H6 and H7, as it is located between them. The range of values for each component in the experiments is shown on the right in parentheses.

However, only a single connecting region is seen, in contrast to previous studies in which three major connections were identified as C1, C2, and C4 (Morgan et al., 2002; Ménetret et al., 2000; 2005; Beckmann et al., 2001). The prominent connection in the new map corresponds to the C2 connection and is located near the exit tunnel (Figure 2B). Connections C1 and C4 observed previously correspond to close approaches of H59 and H7, respectively, to the surface of the membrane-like disk. Although this map is qualitatively similar to those published previously, the improved resolution allowed us to identify C2 as the major, well-ordered link.

Cytoplasmic loops of Sec61α have been implicated in ribosome binding (Raden et al., 2000), including the loops between TM6 and TM7 (the 6/7 loop) and between TM8 and TM9 (the 8/9 loop; Cheng et al., 2005). In addition, these loops have been shown to mediate the binding of SecY to the bacterial ribosome (Ménetret et al., 2007). Thus, we docked the cytoplasmic loops from the crystal structure of archaean SecY into connection 2. Only small adjustments were required to obtain a good fit of the loops within the density, after taking into account the fact that the mammalian 8/9 loop lacks two residues near its tip (Figures 2C–2G; see the Experimental Procedures). We also repositioned the surface helix of the SecE/Sec61γ subunit within the map by tilting it slightly downward.

The docking within the channel region is shown at ~17 Å resolution, viewed from either the ribosome (Figures 3A and 3B) or the ER lumen (Figure 3C). Note that Sec61 is nearly encircled by a low-density feature in the center of the membrane-like disk. This low-density feature may arise from phospholipid tails. The overall fit of the SecY model into the map at ~11 Å resolution is shown in Figures 3E and 3F. A view of the SecY model on its own is shown in Figure 3D in the same orientation. The fit of the SecY model in the high-density features suggests that we were able to position groups of α helices accurately, commensurate with the estimated resolution of ~11 Å for this region. For example, we could easily follow the tilted trajectory of the TM helix of SecE/Sec61γ as it crosses the membrane region, as shown in a mini-map which contains the high-density channel features (see the Experimental Procedures, Figure S1B and Figure 4A). In addition, the TM helix of Sec61γ could be identified, as shown in a stereo view in Figures S2A and S2B, and we were able to resolve the surface helix of Sec61γ (Figures S1A, S1C, and S2C). In fact, most of the α helices do not cross significant low-density regions in the map with the exception of TM6 (Figures 3E and 3F). Stereo views further demonstrate the overall fit of Sec61, as shown in a thin slab near the ER lumen and in a thicker slab that encompasses most of the membrane-embedded region (Figures S2D and S2E).

The cytoplasmic entrance of the pore is clearly visible at the center of Sec61 in a mini-map, adjacent to the 6/7 and 8/9 loops (Figures 4A and 4B). The exit vestibule of the pore is also visible (Figures 4C and 4D; Figures S2A–S2C), whereas the pore itself appears to be closed because there is density in this region. Our model positions the central pore of Sec61 below the ribosome tunnel exit, such that a nascent chain could cross the gap and insert into the channel (see next section). This analysis provides further evidence that a single copy of Sec61 is present in the RCC.

### Table 1. Quantitative Mass Spectrometry of Purified Ribosome-Channel Complexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Proteins</th>
<th>Quantitation (pmol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ribosomal small subunit</td>
<td>S5e</td>
<td>1.11* (1.03–1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA/p40</td>
<td>1.18 (1.05–1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sec61 complex</td>
<td>Sec61α</td>
<td>0.76 (0.72–0.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sec61β</td>
<td>1.08 (1.05–1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAP complex</td>
<td>TRAPα</td>
<td>0.73 (0.65–0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TRAPβ</td>
<td>0.69* (0.64–0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normalized ratios</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0:0.8:0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The samples were divided into six aliquots which were analyzed and averaged. The appropriate tryptic peptide fragment for proteins marked with an asterisk (*) could only be detected reliably in five of the runs. The range of values for each component in the experiments is shown on the right in parentheses.
A Comparison of Sec61- and SecY-Ribosome Complexes

Given the sequence homology between Sec61 and SecY (van den Berg et al., 2004), one might expect structural similarities between mammalian and bacterial RCCs. We therefore aligned the structure of the E. coli RCC (Ménétret et al., 2007) with the new mammalian structure. The independent docking of Sec61 and SecY in their respective maps showed that the channels are positioned similarly beneath the ribosome. In both cases, the lateral gate between TMs 2b and 7 is pointed toward the small ribosomal subunit and the tunnel exit (asterisks) is only slightly offset from the central pore (Figures 5A and 5B).

In both structures, the 6/7 and 8/9 loops tether the respective channels at the tunnel exit (Figures 5C and 5D). We note, however, that the 6/7 and 8/9 loops in bacterial SecY are longer than the corresponding loops in Sec61. Hence, the SecY loops extend further into the ribosome tunnel than the shorter loops of Sec61. The 6/7 loop in bacterial SecY points toward H7, whereas it is located between H6 and H50 in the canine ribosome (compare Figures 5F and 5E). The longer bacterial 6/7 loop partially blocks the tunnel exit but might adopt an alternate conformation when a nascent chain is present (Ménétret et al., 2007).

The 8/9 loop in the canine complex is located between H6 and H50, whereas this loop in bacteria is located near H50 and could interact with H24. This difference can be ascribed to the shorter 8/9 loop that is present in archaea and mammals.

Finally, the Sec61 and SecY monomers are surrounded by an annulus of extra density in both specimens. This larger region in the mammalian complex may contain phospholipids and digitonin (Figure 1C). In the bacterial complex, the annulus may contain detergent because the SecY complex was probably delipidated during its purification (Ménétret et al., 2007).

The TRAP Complex

We evaluated the density contributed by the TRAP complex within the channel region. At the back of the membrane-like

---

**Figure 2.** The 6/7 and 8/9 Loops of Sec61 Form the Major Connection with the Ribosome

(A) An oblique front view of the RCC is shown. The RCC is color coded as described in Figure 1A. The small (S) and large (L) subunits are labeled. A single major connection spans the gap between the ribosome and the channel.

(B) A close-up is shown of the junction between the ribosome and the membrane-like disk. The positions of connections observed in previous maps at a lower threshold (C1, C2, and C4) are indicated. Also shown are the regions of TRAP (stalk, lumenal domain [LD]).

(C) A thin slab containing the interface between the ribosome and the channel is shown. Helices 50 and 7 in the large subunit interact with the loops of Sec61 near the tunnel exit (T). Density for the connection is shown as a transparent surface overlayed on the modeled loops (shown as ribbons).

(D) A bottom view shows the insertion of the 6/7 and 8/9 loops into a pocket at the exit tunnel. The loop density is shown in magenta and the large subunit is shown in blue. The tunnel is marked with a dot and a line that points into the large subunit, toward the small subunit (yellow surface).

(E) This view is similar to (D) but the surface of the large subunit is semitransparent to show the atomic model of the ribosome (2KZR) in this region.

(F) The 6/7 and 8/9 loops are shown within a binding pocket which is formed by H6, H7, and H50, along with proteins L23ae, L35e, and L39e. Basic residues in the Sec61 loops are shown in yellow and are labeled in the inset on the right.

(G) A rotated view of (F) is shown. A small helix of L39e is close to the 8/9 loop, and L35e helps to form the back of the binding pocket.
Structure
Ribosome Complexes with Sec61 and TRAP

disk, a high-density feature is almost completely encircled by a low-density "tail" (Figure 6A). This region is large enough to contain seven TM segments, the predicted number of TMs in the TRAP complex, and was modeled with bacteriorhodopsin. We then created a soft mask that included the membrane-embedded region, the stalk, and the lumenal domain of TRAP. We used the mask to isolate this density and calculated an FSC curve in the usual way. This analysis suggested that TRAP has been visualized at ~15 Å resolution in the map.

Upon closer inspection, we find that the TRAP and Sec61 complexes in the RCC are laterally offset relative to one another and separated by a low-density region (Figure 6A). Thus, a row of phospholipids is probably located between the two proteins on both sides of the disk. In addition, the surface helix of Sec61γ is located in close proximity to TRAP and may make a bridging contact (Figures 6B and 6F). There is no direct connection between TRAP and the ribosome, which suggests that this protein is recruited to the RCC by its association with Sec61. The small number of interaction points between TRAP and Sec61 may account for the measured difference in resolution of the two membrane proteins in the map (15.1 versus 11.1 Å). The lumenal domain of TRAP is connected to the transmembrane region by a large stalk (Figures 6C–6F), and the tip of the lumenal domain is located directly below the channel pore (Figures 6B and 6F). This suggests that TRAP may interact with the nascent chain or it could recruit lumenal chaperones to bind to the emerging polypeptide chain. Finally, the TRAP complex has a tilted appearance due to an offset between the membrane-embedded region and lumenal domain (Figure 6E).

DISCUSSION

We have shown that a nontranslating ribosome binds to single copies of Sec61 and TRAP in ribosome-channel complexes derived from mammalian ER membranes. The major connection is made between the ribosome and the 6/7 and 8/9 loops of Sec61. This connection is close to the ribosome tunnel exit, which positions the Sec61 complex so that an emerging nascent chain can move directly into the channel. Consistent with previous suggestions, this implies that a single copy of Sec61 would form the channel (van den Berg et al., 2004; Ménétret et al., 2007). In addition, the lumenal domain of the TRAP complex is positioned below the Sec61 channel so that it would be in close proximity to the nascent chain. Finally, our results demonstrate a fundamental similarity between mammalian and bacterial ribosome-channel complexes.

Architecture of the Channel
To our knowledge, the present structure gives the most detailed picture of a ribosome-bound channel that has been obtained. In this map, the resolution of the membrane-embedded region of Sec61 is estimated to be ~11 Å. Most of the α helices of Sec61 reside within high-density features in the map (with the exception of TM6), but are not fully resolved as individual rods. However, prominent features such as the TM and surface helix of Sec61γ and the entry and exit vestibules to the pore were visualized. In addition, the overall packing of the TM helices in the 11 Å map was reasonable, based on our docking of a crystal structure of the archaeal SecY complex. When combined with the placement of the 6/7 and 8/9 loops, the fit of the

Figure 3. Docking the Sec61 Complex into the Electron Density Map
(A) A bottom view is shown of the RCC with the membrane-embedded region rendered semi-transparent to show the docked SecY model. (B) A low-density Y-shaped region is present within the membrane-like disk and nearly encircles the embedded region of Sec61. The Y-like region is indicated by a dashed line. The electron density map was truncated to 17 Å resolution for (B) and (C). The Sec61 complex was modeled with a crystal structure of SecY and is color coded as follows. The N-terminal half of SecY/Sec61α is colored in red, while the C-terminal half is shown in blue. The SecEγ subunit is shown in green and the SecB subunit is shown in tan. (C) The docked SecY in the channel region is viewed from the ribosome. (D) A ribbon model of the SecY complex is shown and the helices are numbered. This view is from the ribosome and is similar to that in (E) and (F). The surface helix of the SecE/Sec61γ is labeled (γ-S helix) and helix 2α is shown in purple. (E) A cross-section is shown of the Sec61 region from the full 3D map truncated at 11 Å resolution. A thin slab encompasses the lumenal side of the channel and the SecY model fits within a low-density feature (marked with dashed line). Helices of the docked model are numbered (van den Berg et al., 2004). (F) A thicker slab is shown which contains the entire membrane-embedded region of Sec61.
translational protein translocation. Hence, we propose that the RCC. This similarity reflects a high degree of conservation in co-
SecY is similar to that observed for Sec61 in the mammalian
vicinity of H7 and H50. Moreover, the general orientation of
channels may interact with conserved RNA helices at the tunnel
exit. These cytoplasmic loops may also contact proteins in the

Figure 4. The Entrance and Exit Vestibules of the Hourglass-Shaped
Pore in Sec61
(A) The top surface of the mini-map is shown with the docked SecY model. The
map has been rendered as a solid surface to show the depression leading into the
pore. The 6/7 and 8/9 loops have been cut by a clipping plane to show their fit in the map. The TM of SecE/Sec61\textsubscript{t} forms a ridge (see dashed lines). Note that the entrance and exit vestibules are similar in the complete map of the channel region.
(B) The same view is shown as in (A), except that the surface is semitransparent
to show the helices that form the surface depression.
(C) The bottom surface of the mini-map is shown with the docked SecY model. The
map has been rendered as a solid surface to show the depression that forms the pore exit.
(D) The structure in (C) is shown with the mini-map rendered as a semitransparent
surface. The helices which form the exit vestibule.
membrane-embedded region allowed us to accurately dock the
crystal structure. In the resulting model, the lateral gate of Sec61
points toward the small subunit. This gate may allow TM seg-
ments of nascent membrane proteins to move into the lipid
bilayer. Even with the improved resolution, a gap is still present
between the ribosome and channel (Ménétret et al., 2000,
2005; Morgan et al., 2002; Beckmann et al., 2001). This gap
would allow loop segments of membrane proteins to emerge
into the cytoplasm.

The present structure is remarkably similar to that of the non-
translating ribosome-SecY complex (Ménétret et al., 2007). In
both cases, a single copy of the channel is bound to the ribo-
some and the 6/7 and 8/9 loops interact with a region at the tun-
nel exit. Despite some differences, the loops fit into the ribosome
like a key in a lock, and conserved basic loop residues in both
channels may interact with conserved RNA helices at the tunnel
exit. These cytoplasmic loops may also contact proteins in the
vicinity of H7 and H50. Moreover, the general orientation of
SecY is similar to that observed for Sec61 in the mammalian
RCC. This similarity reflects a high degree of conservation in co-
translational protein translocation. Hence, we propose that the
copy of Sec61 or SecY which binds at the ribosome tunnel exit
may form the active channel that captures and translocates the
nascent polypeptide chain.

Previous structures of ribosome-Sec61 complexes had sug-
gested that three or four copies of Sec61 may associate with the
ribosome (Beckmann et al., 2001; Ménétret et al., 2005). Our
current data show that only one copy is bound to the ribo-
some and, thus, much of the additional density surrounding the
Sec61 complex can be attributed to lipid and detergent. This
is supported by the observation that the disk has a bi-
layer-like density distribution. The formation of a membrane-
like disk presumably reflects the ability of steroidal detergents,
such as digitonin, to cap the exposed hydrophobic edges of
phospholipid bilayers. This may be similar in some respects to
the stabilization of membrane disks by apolipoproteins (Zhu
and Atkinson, 2007). Consistent with this idea, two ribosome-
SecY structures contained a smaller annulus of density around
the channel, presumably because extensively delipidated SecY
was used to form the complexes (Ménétret et al., 2007). The
association of Sec61 or SecY with lipid and/or detergent disks may
also explain the size of ring-like particles observed previously
with purified proteins (Hanein et al., 1996; Meyer et al., 1999;
Manting et al., 2000).

In a recent structure, an E. coli ribosome that carried a nas-
cent polypeptide chain was proposed to bind to two copies of
SecY (Mitra et al., 2005), but the channel region was not
much larger than that seen in a nontranslating ribosome-Sec-Y
complex (Ménétret et al., 2007). Perhaps the translating ribo-
some-SecY complexes contained a single copy of SecY along
with additional lipid and detergent. In any case, neither of the
SecY complexes in the proposed dimer model are positioned
beneath the ribosome like single copies of Sec61 or Sec61 ob-
served in structures with a nontranslating ribosome (Ménétret
et al., 2007; this study).

Our data do not exclude the idea that oligomers of the SecY or
Sec61 complex may form in a membrane during translocation. In
fact, SecY dimers are likely required for bacterial posttransla-
tional translocation driven by the SecA ATPase (Osborne and
Rapoport, 2007; Duong, 2003). In addition, SecYEG dimers
have been observed in 2D membrane crystals (Breyton et al.,
2002), large intramembrane particles were seen in freeze-frac-
ture experiments (Hanein et al., 1996; Meyer et al., 1999;
Scheuring et al., 2005), and oligomers may be required for the tight bind-
ing of ribosomes to ER membranes (Schaletzky and Rapoport,
2006). Hence, solubilization of SecY and Sec61 in detergent
may result in the disassembly of these oligomers. This idea is
supported by the observation that only the active copy of SecY
remains associated with SecA after solubilization (Duong,
2003). A similar situation may pertain to SecY or Sec61 com-
plexes bound to ribosomes.

The TRAP Complex
Our new structure shows that one copy of the TRAP complex is
associated with the mammalian RCC. Together, the electron mi-
croscopy and mass spectrometry data suggest that nearly ev-
every translocon may contain a TRAP complex. In addition, the
size of the TRAP luminal domain is consistent with one copy
of TRAP being present in the RCCs. Thus, TRAP is an integral
part of the translocon (Ménétret et al., 2005). Intriguingly, we
also find that membrane-embedded regions of TRAP and
Sec61 are separated by a low-density feature, which may correspond to a row of phospholipids on each side of the membrane-like disk. These phospholipids may form bridges between adjacent TM regions, as they do in some 2D membrane protein crystals (Gonen et al., 2005; Hite et al., 2008). Intervening lipids between the TM regions of Sec61 and TRAP may allow some flexibility of the proteins while maintaining their association. In addition, the interaction between membrane-embedded regions of TRAP and Sec61 does not block the lateral gate of Sec61.

We also verified that a stalk links the transmembrane region of TRAP to a prominent lumenal domain. Based on sequence

---

Figure 5. A Comparison of Sec61- and SecY-Ribosome Complexes

For (A)–(D), the complete ribosome with docked Sec61 or SecY is shown on the left and a close-up is shown on the right. The color coding is yellow for the small subunit and blue for the large subunit. The N- and C-terminal halves of the Sec61a/SecY subunits are shown in blue and red ribbons, respectively, while the Sec61b/SecE and Sec61b/b subunits are shown in green and tan. The plug helix (TM 2a) is shown in yellow.

(A) A bottom view is shown of the ribosome-Sec61 complex. The positions of the lateral gate (arrow) and the tunnel (*) are marked.

(B) A bottom view is shown of the ribosome-SecY complex with the lateral gate and tunnel marked as in (A).

(C) A tilted view is shown of the ribosome-Sec61 complex in which the 6/7 and 8/9 loops are clearly visible near the tunnel exit (marked with an asterisk).

(D) A tilted view is shown of the ribosome-SecY complex in which the cytoplasmic loops and their insertion into the tunnel can be seen (3BO0).

(E) The 6/7 and 8/9 loops are viewed from the exit tunnel for the Sec61-ribosome complex. The 6/7 loop is inserted between H6 and H7, whereas the 8/9 loop may interact with both H6 and H50. Basic residues in the loops are colored dark blue. Three conserved ribosomal large subunit proteins are also shown.

(F) A similar view to (E) is shown of the longer 6/7 and 8/9 loops for the SecY-ribosome complex (Menetret et al., 2007). The 6/7 loop interacts with H7, whereas the 8/9 loop may bind to H50 and H24.
analysis, the lumenal domain and stalk are likely composed of the N-terminal regions of the α, β, and δ subunits (Y. Liu, N. Sommer, R.S.H., J.-F.M., E. Hartmann, and C.W.A., unpublished data), and the size of this domain in the 3D map is consistent with this idea. The lumenal domain of TRAP is positioned so that it could interact with a nascent chain emerging from the channel, which would explain the crosslinking data (Wiedmann et al., 1989; Görlich et al., 1992). Alternatively, the lumenal domain of TRAP may direct chaperones to the nascent chain.

The Initiation of Protein Translocation
We postulate that the observed ribosome-Sec61 structure may resemble an early stage in cotranslational protein translocation. When a ribosome synthesizes a nascent secretory protein, the signal sequence first binds to the M domain of signal recognition particle (SRP) to form a stalled ribosome-SRP complex (Halic et al., 2004, 2006a; Figure 7, left). This stalled complex is then targeted to the ER membrane through reciprocal interactions between SRP and the α subunit of its receptor (SR) (Egea et al., 2004). When the SRP-SR complex is formed, the M domain is partially displaced from its position over the tunnel exit (Halic et al., 2006b). This may allow the cytoplasmic loops of Sec61 to bind to the ribosome as observed.
in our structure. This interaction with Sec61 may help to further displace the M domain. At this point, the signal sequence may be transferred to a binding site within Sec61α, which sits below the tunnel exit (Figure 7, middle). Subsequent disassociation of the SRP-SR complex from the ribosome would precede the formation of a fully active ribosome-channel complex (Figure 7, right). The RCC may then recruit a second copy of Sec61 (not shown) to help stabilize the junction between the ribosome and the channel. At some point during this process, TRAP may associate with Sec61 to form a stable membrane-protein complex. With the exception of TRAP association, this sequence of events may be the same in bacteria (Ménétrét et al., 2007). The structure of a translating mammalian RCC is now needed to provide additional insights into cotranslational protein translocation.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Sample Preparation and Quantitative Mass Spectrometry
Ribosome-channel complexes for electron cryomicroscopy were prepared from canine ribosomes with a bound E site tRNA and ribosome-striped microsomes (PKRMs), as described (Ménétrét et al., 2005; Morgan et al., 2002). For mass spectrometry, an excess of PKRMs was added to the ribosomes (~22 pmol), the complexes were solubilized in 0.8% Deoxycholate (DBC), and then separated on a 10%–40% sucrose gradient in 50 mM HEPES-KOH buffer (pH 7.5) in 500 mM KAc, 10 mM MgCl₂, 0.8% DBC. Solubilized membrane proteins ran at the top of the gradient. Peak fractions containing the RCs (fractions 6–9) were identified by their absorbance at 260 nm. SDS-PAGE and immunoblotting showed that they contained ribosomes (at ~25 fmol/ml), Sec61, and TRAP. Appropriate fractions were quick-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at ~80°C until they were analyzed. We chose six trypic peptides for the quantitative analysis of Sec61 and TRAP in the RCC. The ribosomal proteins were S5e and SA/p40, along with the +α and β subunits of Sec61 and the +α and +β subunits of TRAP. Labeled peptides for the AQUA method (Gerber et al., 2003) were obtained from Cell Signaling Technology. The general approach for precipitating the RCs from sucrose density gradient fractions and the quantitative analysis have been described (Ménétrét et al., 2007).

Image Processing and Modeling
The processing of ~101,000 particles to obtain an improved 3D map of the RCC was described previously (Chandramouli et al., 2008). In the end, we kept ~78,800 of the best particles for the final map. We also used the multireference option in EMAN to classify particles into groups that contained or lacked a channel using appropriate 3D reference volumes. This study showed that the overall occupancy of the channel in the particle data set is ~95%. We also assessed these subsets of the final data set separately with EMAN (version 1.8) running on a Linux cluster with ~28 nodes (Luftcke et al., 1999) to create lower-resolution maps of the RCC. The final 3D maps for these two data sets contained ~24,900 and 56,800 particles. Fourier shell correlation (FSC) curves for each of the 3D structures were calculated with the eotest option in EMAN, using volumes calculated from even and odd numbered particles and an appropriate mask for the various regions (see below; Ménétrét et al., 2005). Projections of the respective transmembrane regions were created in EMAN (Luftcke et al., 1999). The B/7 and B/9 loops of the crystal structure of archaeal SecY (PDB ID code: 1RHZ) were docked into the final 3D map manually in O (Jones et al., 1991) after converting the file to brix with SPIPER (Frank et al., 1996). The fit was checked in Chimera (Goddard et al., 2005) and the loop geometry was refined and regularized with Coot (Emsley and Cowtan, 2004). The transmembrane region of the SecY model was docked accurately into the final map by using the fit in map option in Chimera (T. Goddard, personal communication). In this option, a steepest ascent, 6D parameter optimization was calculated using the TM region of the SecY PDB and the 3D map, starting with the initial position provided by the loop docking. For each orientation, an average map value is tabulated from the intersection of the atoms in the PDB model with the map. The maximal value gives the best local fit. In a second approach, the SecY model was converted into a density map with EMAN. The sum of the product of the two map values for each (x, y, z) in the SecY map and the channel region of the RCC map was also calculated in Chimera with a 6D optimization to find the best local fit, again using the fit in map option. The surface helix of SecE was also moved downward a bit to better fit into the density. The docked SecY model was used to create a soft mask in EMAN, which was used to isolate the channel region for the FSC calculation in the three maps. We also low-pass filtered the mask to create a nearly featureless “blob” mask that was used to cut out the central high-density features of the membrane-embedded region for further visualization in Chimera. The borders of this mini-map were formed in part by a central low-density region that nearly encircles Sec61. This low-density region may be due to phospholipid hydrocarbon tails. However, higher-density regions at the top and bottom surface of the channel are not as clearly demarcated due to local contrast matching. Hence, the blob mask does cut through some higher density in these regions. Thus, the mini-map was used mainly for display purposes and to show features in the membrane-like disk that are not affected by the masking.

Ribosomes in the 3D maps were aligned as follows to compare bacterial and mammalian channel complexes. We started with the pseudo-atomic model of the canine ribosome which was docked within the appropriate 3D map in previous work (Chandramouli et al., 2008; 2ZKK). We also used an atomic model of the E. coli ribosome (Berk et al., 2006; 2I2T) docked within a map of the ribosome-SecY complex at ~9.6 Å resolution (Ménétrét et al., 2007; EMD 1484). Core regions of the two large subunits were superimposed in Chimera with the fit-model-to-model option and then the appropriate 3D maps were transformed into the same orientation. This docking was then checked with the fit in map option using the 3D volumes. Figures were made using Chimera (Goddard et al., 2005), GIMP (http://www.gimp.org/), and Adobe Photoshop.

ACCESSION NUMBERS
The modeled ribosome-Sec61 complex has been deposited in the Protein Data Bank (ID code 3DKN) and the EM map has been deposited in the EBI-EMSD database (ID code 1528).

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA
Supplemental Data include two figures and can be found with this article online at http://www lạnhn6rcy.org/cgi/content/full/16/7/1126/DC1/.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
We thank Andrea Neuhof for preparation of the ribosome-channel complexes that were used for data collection. We are also indebted to Preethi Chandramouli and Steve Ludtke for helpful discussions. Work in the T.A.R. and C.W.A. laboratories was supported by NIH grants. T.A.R. is a member of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

Received: February 26, 2008
Revised: May 12, 2008
Accepted: May 12, 2008
Published: July 8, 2008

REFERENCES
channel associated with the translating 80S ribosome. Cell 107, 361–372.


Duong, F. (2003). Binding, activation and dissociation of the dimeric SecA ATPase at the dimeric SecYEG translocaase. EMBO J. 22, 4375–4384.


distribution of SecYEG is altered by SecA and translocation ligands. J. Mol. Biol. 354, 258–271.
Supplemental Data

Single Copies of Sec61 and TRAP Associate with a Nontranslating Mammalian Ribosome
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Figure S1. Overviews of the 6/7 and 8/9 Loops, As Well As the Sec61γ Subunit

A. The docked SecY model is shown within a semi-transparent mini-map which contains the Sec61 density. The orientation is shown by the icon view of the entire complex (upper right). The surface helix of SecE/Sec61γ and the cytoplasmic loops are indicated.

B. The docking of the SecE/Sec61γ TM is shown within a nearly solid density map. The structure has been rotated ~110° from panel B and a cut-plane has removed the outer surface of the map.

C. The docked model and map have been rotated by ~50° relative to panel C, which brings the 5/6 turn and the surface helix into view.
Figure S2. Stereo Views Reveal the Fit of SecY Crystal Structure within the Sec61 Region of the Full Map of the Channel

The stereo images were generated with Chimera (Goddard et al., 2005) using the “left eye” and “right eye” options. Stereo-glasses are required to see the 3D effect, though crossed eyes may
work. The electron density map of the channel region has been rendered at a single threshold in light grey at 11Å resolution. A second copy of the map has been rendered as a darker hexagonal mesh that covers the inside surface of the thresholded volume. Higher density, internal regions are present when the hexagonal mesh is visible in cross-sections. Grey features without visible mesh enclose low density features within the map and are topologically equivalent to the outside of the map for this particular threshold.

A. A cross-section shows the TM of Sec61γ and the 5/6 turn within the channel. The box in the icon view on the right shows the direction of view within the RCC for panels A and B. The pore exit is marked.

B. A second cross-section is shown in the same orientation as panel A but cut further into the channel.

C. A cross-section is shown of the surface helix of Sec61γ. The orientation of this view is indicated by the boxed region in the icon view of the RCC on the right.

D. A cross-section is shown of the luminal side of the channel as viewed from the ribosome. The α-helices of Sec61 are labeled in the standard way based on SecY (van den Berg et al., 2004). A portion of the low density feature which nearly encircles Sec61 is marked by a dashed line.

E. A cross-section of the full TM region of Sec61 is shown within the map in a similar orientation as panel D.

Supplemental References
