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#### Abstract

Summary  and ${ }^{3}{ }^{H}$ uco coupling constants. The pulse sequences generate E.COSY-like multiplet patterns and comprise a magnetization transfer from the amide proton to the $\alpha$-proton or vice versa via the directly bound heteronuclei. For residues with the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ spin resonating close to the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ signai, a modified HNCA experiment can be employed to measure the vicinal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{c}$ couplings. Ambiguities associated with the conversion of ${ }^{3} J_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{H}}$ e values into 0 -angle constraints for protein structure determination can be resolved with the knowledge of the heteronuclear ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}$-couplings. In favourable cases, stereospecific assignments of glycine a-protons can be obtained by employing the experiments described here in combination with NOE data. The methods are applied to flavodoxin from Desulfovibrio vulgaris.


## Introduction

Estimates of torsion-angle contraints from vicinal scalar coupling constants are supplementary to NOE data for the determination of protein structures. In biomacromolecules the linewidths often exceed the coupling constants to be measured - a problem which in principle can be overcome by generating E.COSY-type (Griesinger et al., $1985,1986,1987$ ) multiplet patterns. During the past few years a variety of NMR techniques (Montelione et al., 1989; Sørensen, 1990; Schmieder et al., 1991; Eggenberger et al., 1992a; Schwalbe et al., 1993; Weisemann et al., 1994a,b) have been developed for isotopically labeled proteins, exploiting large one-bond couplings to separate unresolved multiplet components along another frequency domain.

Constraints for the backbone angle $\phi$ may be derived from ${ }^{3}{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{N}^{\alpha}}$ coupling constants which are available either from NMR methods based on the E.COSY principle (Schmieder et al., 1991; Seip et a1., 1992; Görlach et al., 1993; Madsen et al., 1993; Weisemann et al., 1994a) or from cross peaks in HMQC (Kay et al., 1989) and

NOESY and COSY (Ludvigsen et al., 1991) spectra. In a different approach, a quantitative evaluation of peak intensities in ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ (Billcter et al., 1992) and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N},}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ (Vuister and Bax, 1993) correlation spectra, where the ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{1} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{C}}$ coupling acts as a passive and an active coupling, respectively, leads to the determination of its size. However, since up to four dihedral angles correspond to one J -value (Karplus, 1959,1963), the conversion of a single coupling constant into structural information is not unambiguous.

As depicted in Fig. 1, apart from ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{H}}}$, the $\phi$-angle is also defined by three ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ couplings for which Karplus parameters exist (Bystrov, 1976). The combined use of the four vicinal couplings has recently been demonstrated for a cyclic hexapeptide (Schmieder and Kessler, 1992). In this paper we will demonstrate that ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} N \mathrm{Na}},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}}{ }^{\wedge} \mathrm{CO},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{NCB}_{\mathrm{C}}$ and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \times \mathrm{CO}}$ coupling constants can be measured for a protein with a set of modified 3D (H)NCAHA and (H)CANNH (Montelione and Wagner, 1990; Kay et al, 1991; Boucher et al., 1992) experiments. The pulse sequences induce a magnctization transfer from ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ to ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ or vice versa and correlate the chemical shifts of
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Fig. 1. Schematic representation of a peptide backbone fragment. The magnetization transfer pathways for intraresidual correlations provided by (H)NCAHA- and (H)CANNH-type experiments are given by broken arrows. Dotted lines indicate vicinal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ - and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ couplings which supply information about the o-torsion angle.
these nuclei with either the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ or the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ resonance. One of the spins not involved in the magnetization transfer between the amide nitrogen and the $\alpha$-carbon but directly bound to the nucleus which evolves as a function of $t_{1}$ is not decoupled during this period. As a consequence, the vicinal coupling between the passive spin and the proton detected in $\mathrm{t}_{3}$ can be extracted from the displacement of the two submultiplets along F3.

## Materials and Methods

The NMR experiments shown in Fig. 2 were carried out with a 2.2 mM sample of uniformly ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} /{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$-labeled, oxidized Desulfovibrio vulgaris flavodoxin in 0.5 ml 10 mM potassium phosphate buffer, $\mathrm{pH}=7$, containing $5 \%$ $\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. Recombinant flavodoxin was isotopically labeled using a ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{15} \mathrm{~N}$-enriched protein hydrolysate mixture (Martek Corporation) and purified following a procedure described by Curley et al. (1991). All spectra werc recorded at $27^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ on a Bruker AMX- 600 spectrometer, equipped with a multichannel interface and a triple resonance probe tuned for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$. Experiments C and D were carried out with an external power amplifier (M3205, American Microwave Technology, Inc.) for the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ channel.

The following experiments were performed using the pulse sequences depicted in Fig. 2 (characteristic multiplet patterns are shown in Fig. 3).

## ( A) $H^{N}$-coupled (H)NCAHA

This experiment correlates ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ backbone resonances with the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{6}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{t}$ resonances of the same and the preceding amino acid residue, according to the magnetization transfer pathway described by Montelione and Wagner (1990). Chemical shift evolution of the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ and the ${ }^{33} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{c}}$ spins is allowed simultaneously with the build-up and refocusing of antiphase magnetization due to ${ }^{1} \mathbf{J}^{\mathrm{N}^{x}}$ and
 lution period $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{y}}$ is applied after a fixed delay $1 /\left(4^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}^{\wedge}}\right)$, instead of being shifted parallel to the nitrogen $180^{\circ}$ pulse. Thercfore, a cosine modulation due to the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NHN}}$ coupling is observed in the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ dimension. The reverse ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$, , H INEPT transfer without perturbing amide proton spin states is achieved by inserting a $90_{x}^{\circ}$ proton pulse prior to detection of ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{u}}$, as proposed by Sorensen (1990). This allows measurement of vicinal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ coupling constants from the F3 displacement of the two multiplet components separated by ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}}{ }^{\mathrm{v}}$ in the F 1 dimension.

The 3D spectrum resulted from a 84 (real) $\times 38$ (complex) $\times 1024$ (real) data matrix recorded in 63 h with 32 scans per increment and acquisition times of $21.5,12.6$ and 111.6 ms in $\mathfrak{t}_{1}, t_{2}$ and $t_{3}$, respectively. Spectral widths were 1923 Hz in the $\mathrm{F}\left({ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}\right)$ dimension, 3012 Hz in the $\mathrm{F} 2\left({ }^{18} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}\right)$ dimension and 4587 Hz in the $\mathrm{F} 3\left({ }^{2} \mathrm{H}^{6}\right)$ dimension. Linear prediction and zero-iflling were applied to yield $256 \times 128 \times 1024$ real points after Fourier transformation.

## (B) $H^{a}$-coupled HNCA

The measurement of ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{H}} \alpha}$ couplings in a HNCA -type experiment has been reported previously (Schmieder et al., 1991; Wagner et al., 1991; Seip et al., 1992; Madsen et al., 1993; Weisemann et al., 1994a, b). In order to minimize multiplet distortions caused by relaxation effects during the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NC}}$ refocusing delay, nitrogen antiphase magnctization with respect to the amide proton is converted to proton nitrogen multiple-quantum coherence immediately following the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\prime \prime}$ evolution period (Görlach et al., 1993). The $1-1$ acho sequence (Sklenář and Bax, 1987) is used for selective excitation of amide protons.

The spectrum was recorded with 32 scans per increment and spectral widths of 1488 Hz in F1, 3164 Hz in F2 and 9091 Hz in F3. Acquisition times were 20.8 ms ( 32 complex data points), 14.8 ms ( 48 complex data points) and 112.6 ms (2048 real data points) in $\mathrm{t}_{1}, \mathrm{t}_{2}$ and $t_{3}$. After discarding the upfield half of the spectrum in the F3 dimension, the size of the absorptive part of the resulting 3D spectrum was $64(\mathrm{~F} 1) \times 256(\mathrm{~F} 2) \times 1024$ (F3) points.

## (C) CO-coupled (H)CANNH

The carbonyl-coupled (H)CANNH experiment relies on the same spin topology for the measurement of ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{Fi}} \mathrm{NCO}^{\mathrm{CO}}$ as the recently published Soft-HNCA-COSY sequcnce (Weisemann et al,, 1994a). The carbonyl spins are passively coupled during a constant-time ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{Ca}}$ chemical shift evolution period, leading to a 55 Hz splitting in F1 due to ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{CoCO}}$. Magnetization is relayed to the amide protons for detection via the amide nitrogens, thus permitting the heteronuclear vicinal coupling to be determined from F3 traces. To avoid perturbation of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ spins, all pulses on aliphatic carbons, with the exception of the first $180^{\circ}$
pulse, are implemented as Gaussian cascades G3 and G4 (Emsley and Bodenhausen, 1990). Setting the duration of the constant-time evolution period $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ to $1 /{ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C} \text { ar } \beta}$ removes the effect of this coupling from the $F 1$ dimension. Since in an (H)CANNH-type experiment ${ }^{[3} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{ar}}$ transverse magnetization is generated in a single INEPT polarization transfer step from the directly attached protons, pulse sequence $C$ is shorter and contains less pulses than the Soft-HNCA-COSY experiment, which starts with excitation of amide protons.

Spectral widths were 4310,1852 and 4630 Hz in F1, F2 and F 3 , respectively. The spectrum was recorded as a 228 $\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \times 60\left(\mathrm{t}_{2}\right) \times 1024\left(\mathrm{t}_{3}\right)$ real data set with acquisition times of $26.5,16$ and 110.6 ms . Sizes of the real part of the 3D spectrum were 512 in the F1 domain, 64 in the F2 domain and 1024 in the F3 domain. The total measuring time, using 16 scans per increment, was 71.5 h .

## (D) CO, $H^{\alpha}$-coupled (H)CANNH

 ured in a combined (H)CANNH-type experiment, when proton decoupling is avoided and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{C}}$ magnetization is returned to the $z$-axis prior to detection of the amide protons. The pulse sequence is virtually identical to a 3 D version of a 4D experiment proposed by Sarensen (1990) for the determination of ${ }^{3} \mathbf{J}_{\mathbf{H}^{N} \mathbf{H}^{\alpha}}$. However, since in our sequence ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ hard pulses are replaced by band-selective pulses on aliphatic carbons, the carbonyl carbons represent passive spins. As a consequence, the cross-pcak patterns consist of four components with an in-phase splitting due to ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} \mathrm{CO}}$ and an antiphase splitting due to ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{A}^{\alpha}}}$ in Fl .

Acquisition times in all dimensions as well as spectral widths in F2 and F3 were identical to those of the spectrum recorded with pulse sequence C. In F1, 208 (real) increments were acquired with a spectral width of 3906 Hz . The size of the absorptive part of the final 3D spectrum was $512(\mathrm{~F} 1) \times 64(\mathrm{~F} 2) \times 1024$ ( F 3 ) points. For each increment 16 scans were accumulated, resulting in a measuring time of 64 h .

## (E) $C^{\beta}$-coupled (H)CANNH

${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{C} \beta}$ couplings are accessible with an experimental scheme similar to pulse sequence $C$, provided that the chemical shift difference between the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha \beta}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ resonances of the same residue is sufficiently large to permit selective excitation of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{c}}$ resonances. Here, the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{CaCO}}$ coupling is refocused, whereas the ${ }^{1} J_{C^{\alpha} \beta \beta}$ coupling is allowed to evolve during $t_{1}$. To resolve this one-bond coupling of approximately 35 Hz , the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\infty}$ evolution period is implemented in a semi-constant-time manner (Grzesiek and Bax, 1993; Logan et al., 1993). The $180^{\circ}$ pulses on carbonyl carbons, nitrogens and $\alpha$-carbons are shifted with different rates during $t_{1}$, thereby removing the effect of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}-{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ scalar interaction and maintaining
a fixed value for the duration of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ magnetication transfer $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$. On the other hand, the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{6}$ precession period is increased by a factor of $2\left(\chi^{1}-\chi^{2}\right)$, which is set to 1.76 in the present case. Thus, evolution of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ chemical shifts and ${ }^{1} J_{\mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{a}}{ }^{\beta}}$ couplings can take place during a $t_{1}$ period of $1.76 \times T_{C}$. The pulse lengths of the $G 3$ and $G 4$ cascades on ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{C}}$ are adjusted for a 600 MHz spectrometer to produce a uniform excitation over a bandwidth of $\pm 1400 \mathrm{~Hz}$ while no perturbation of spins at offset frequencics larger than 2700 Hz can be observed. Therefore, vicinal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ coupling constants can be measured for amino acid residues with ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ spins resonating upfield from approximately 42 ppm .

The 3D spectrum resulted from a 160 (complex) $\times 25$ (complex) $\times 1024$ (real) data matrix recorded in 85 h with 16 scans per increment. Acquisition times were 53, 16.5 and 110.6 ms in $t_{1}, t_{2}$ and $t_{3}$, respectively. The spectral widths covered 3012,1453 and 4630 Hz in F1, F2 and F3. After linear prediction in F2 and zero-filling in all dimensions the size of the absorptive part of the spectrum was $512 \times 64 \times 1024$ points.

## (F) CO-coupled (H) NCAHA

The ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \text { cco }}$ vicinal couplings can be measured from F3 $\left({ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}\right)$ traces when the relatively small one-bond ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N},{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ coupling constant is resolved in the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ domain of a (H)NCAHA experiment. Again, a semi-constant-time evolution period is employed to overcome resolution limitations imposed by an optimal duration of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{V}}$ for the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ magnetization transfer. The ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ evolution is extended by a factor of $1 /(1-\chi)$ over $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{N}}$. In the present application, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{N}}$ is set to 31 ms and $1 /(1-\chi)$ is chosen to be 2.78. All pulses on aliphatic carbons have the shapes of Gaussian cascades G3 and G4. The decoupling of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ nuclei during acquisition is achieved with an MLEV-16 expansion of G 3 pulses (Eggenberger et al, 1992 b ), ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ decoupling is optional and can be applied in order to remove unresolved two-bond and three-bond ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ couplings from the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{e}}$ resonances.

The spectrum was recorded as a 128 (complex) $\times 32$ (complex) $\times 1024$ (real) data set with acquisition times of $85.5,10.3$ and 106.5 ms in $\mathrm{t}_{4}, t_{2}$ and $t_{3}$, respectively. Spectral widths in F1, F2 and F3 comprised 1488, 3012 and 4808 Hz . The size of the real part of the 3 D spectrum was $512(\mathrm{~F} 1) \times 64$ (F2) $\times 1024$ (F3). The total measuring time, using 16 scans per increment, was 91 h .

All spectra were processed on Silicon Graphics workstations with the FELIX program (version 1.1; Hare Research, Inc.). After Fourier transformation in the $t_{3}$ dimension, linear prediction was employed to extend the time-domain data by approximately $33 \%$ in the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ dimensions of all spectra and in the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ dimensions of the spectra recorded with pulse sequences $A, C, D$ and $F$. Squared sine-bell weighting functions shifted by $\pi / 5-\pi / 2$ were used for apodization in all dimensions. For the

 rectangles denote $90^{\circ}$ and $180^{\circ}$ pulses, respectively. Rectangular pulses on ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\circ}$ nuclei are applied at $60 \mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{A}, \mathrm{B}, \mathrm{E}, \mathrm{F})$ or at $58 \mathrm{ppm}(\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{D})$ with an rf field strength of 4.63 kHz . The $180^{\circ}$ pulses on aliphatic carbons during the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ constant-time evolution periods are centered at 45 ppm. In scheme $A$, a composite pulse with a field strength of 5.17 kIIz is applied to the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha / \beta}$ region, whereas G 3 pulses with a duration of 256 HS are used in the pulse sequences $C$. $D$ and $F$. Band-selective excitation and inversion of ${ }^{13}{ }^{\circ}{ }^{\alpha}$ spins is achieved with Gaussian cascades G4 and G3. Every other carbon $90^{\circ}$ pulse has a time-reversed $G 4$ shape. Pulse widths are 768 and $512 \mu s$ for $90^{\circ}$ and $180^{\circ}$ flip angles, respectively, in sequences C , D and $F$ or 2.05 and 1.28 ms in the case of sequence E . Carbony $180^{\circ}$ pulses are implemented as phase-modulated pulses with an amplitude profile corresponding to the central lobe of a sinc function and a duration of $108 \mu \mathrm{~s}$. The proton cartier is placed on the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ resonance frequency throughout sequences $A, B$ and $F$, whereas it is shifted in the remaining experiments to the centre of the amide region ( 8.6 ppm ) subsequent to pulses labeled $\phi_{2}$. Water suppression is achieved by weak presaturation during the relaxation delay and spin-lock purge pulses (sl) with a duration of 2 ms , except for the first spin-lock pulse in sequence $F$ which is applied for 3 ms . Proton decoupling is accomplished by WALTZ-16 modulation (Shaka ct al., 1983) with a 5 kHz rf ficld. The GARP-1 sequence (Shaba et al., 1985) is used for ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$-decoupling during acquisition with a fiek strength of 1.1 kHz and for ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$-decoupling in scheme A with a field strength of 1.5 kHz . Band-selective decoupling of ${ }^{3}{ }^{3}{ }^{N}$ resonances in scheme


D
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$F$ is achicved using an MLEV-16 expansion of a $768 \mu_{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{G} 3$ pulse cascadc. Delay durations and phase cycles are: (A) t $=2.3 \mathrm{~ms}, \eta=2.75 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}$ $=22 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{c}=26.6 \mathrm{~ms} \kappa=0.95 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta=1.4 \mathrm{~ms}, \phi_{1}=2(x), 2(-x), \phi_{2}=2(y), 2(-y), \phi_{3}=4(x), 4(-x), \phi_{4}=16(x), 16(-x), \phi_{5}=8(x), 8(-x), \phi_{6}=16(x), 16(y)$, $\phi_{7}=16(\mathrm{y}), 16(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{8}=\mathrm{x},-\mathrm{x}, \phi_{\mathrm{g}}=-\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{rec} .:+,-,-,+,-,+,+,--,+,+,-,+,-,-+;(B) \tau=2.3 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}=22 \mathrm{~ms}, \varepsilon=65 \mu \mathrm{~s}, \delta_{1}=10.04 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta_{2}=2.2 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta_{3}=$ $7.775 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta_{4}=4.465 \mathrm{~ms}+\tau_{130^{\circ}}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{0}\right)-\tau_{90^{2}}\left({ }^{2} \mathrm{~N}\right)$, where $\tau_{180^{\circ}}\left({ }^{15} \mathrm{C}^{0}\right)$ and $\tau_{90^{\circ}}\left({ }^{(5} \mathrm{N}\right)$ are the pulse widths of $180^{\circ}\left({ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{Co}}\right)$ and $90^{\circ}\left({ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}\right)$ pulses, respectively, $\phi_{1}=x,-x, o_{2}=y,-y, \phi_{3}=2(x), 2(-x), \phi_{4}=4(x), 4(-x), \phi_{5}=-x, \phi_{6}=8(x), 8(y), 8(-x), 8(-y), \phi_{7}=8(-x), 8(-y), 8(x), 8(y), r e c:---,-+,-,+,+,-,-,+,+,-+, \cdots,-,+;$ (C) $\tau=1.7 \mathrm{~ms}, \eta=2 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}=26.6 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}=22 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{k}=5 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta=2.3 \mathrm{~ms}, \phi_{1}=\mathrm{x},-\mathrm{x}, \phi_{2}=\mathrm{y},-\mathrm{y}, \phi_{3}=2(\mathrm{x}), 2(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{4}=8(\mathrm{y}), 8(-\mathrm{y}), \phi_{5}=4(\mathrm{x}), 4(-\mathrm{x})$, rec.: ,,,+--+-++-- (D) $\tau=1.7 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}=26.6 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}=22 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{x}=25 \mathrm{~ms}, \phi_{1}=\mathrm{x}=-\mathrm{x}, \phi_{2}=\mathrm{y},-\mathrm{y}, \phi_{3}=2(\mathrm{x}), 2(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{4}=8(\mathrm{x}), 8(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{5}=4(\mathrm{x}), 4(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{6}=$ $4(-x), 4(x)$, rec.: $+,-,-+,-,+,+,-\cdots,+,+,-,+-,-,+;(E) \tau=1.7 \mathrm{~ms}, \eta=3.4 \mathrm{~ms}, T_{C}=30 \mathrm{~ms}, \chi^{1}=1.44, \chi^{3}=2-\chi^{1}, T_{\mathrm{N}}=22 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{x}=5.5 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta=2.3 \mathrm{~ms}$, $\phi_{1}=x,-x, \phi_{2}=y,-y, \phi_{3}=2(x), 2(-x), \phi_{4}=8(x), 8(-x), \phi_{5}=4(x), 4(-x)$, rec.:,,,,,$+--+-++-;(F) \tau=2.3 \mathrm{~ms}, \eta=5.4 \mathrm{~ms}, T_{\mathrm{N}}=31 \mathrm{~ms}, \chi=0.64, T_{\mathrm{C}}=$ $26.6 \mathrm{~ms}, \mathrm{k}=2.1 \mathrm{~ms}, \delta=1.7 \mathrm{~ms}, \phi_{1}=y, \phi_{2}=2(\mathrm{x}), 2(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{3}=8(\mathrm{x}), 8(-\mathrm{x}), \phi_{4}=4(\mathrm{x}), 4(-\mathrm{x}), 0_{5}=\mathrm{x},-\mathrm{x}$, rec.:,,,,,,+--+-+-- . Nonlabeled pulses are applied along the $x$-axis. Quadrature detection in the $t_{1}$ and $t_{2}$ dimensions is obtained by altering the phases $\phi_{3}$ and $\phi_{5}(A, C, E), \phi_{3}$ and $\phi_{4}(B, D)$, and $\phi_{2}$ and $\phi_{4}(F)$ in a TPPI (Marion and Wüthrich, 1983) or States-TPPI manner (Marion et al., 1989).


Fig. 3. Application of the pulse sequences depicted in Fig. 2 to uniformly ${ }^{33} \mathrm{C}{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$-labeled oxjdized $D$. vuigaris flavodoxin. Panels a-f show expansions of $\mathrm{F}_{1, F 3}$ or F2,F3 slices from the 3D spectra obtained with the experimental schemes labeled with the corresponding capital letters. The cross peaks exhibit an E.COSY-type multiplet pattern with a large spliting along F1 or F2, due to one-bond couplings, and a small displacement along F3 due to three-bond couplings for intraresidual correlations and two-bond couplings for the shown interresidual correlations. Assignments as well as measured vicinal and geminal coupling constants are indicated. In panel d positive and negative levels are plotted without distinction.
extraction of vicinal and geminal coupling constants from the 3D data sets, two F3 traces, corresponding to the upper and lower E.COSY multiplet component, were generated by summing over the spectral points in $F 1$ and F2. Inverse Fourier transformation, followed by zerofilling, yielded digital resolutions between 0.27 and 0.29 $\mathrm{Hz} /$ point. Subsequently, the F3 traces were subtracted and the displacement was determined from the difference spectra by calculating the power integrals as a function of incremented frequency shifts (Schwalbe et al., 1993).

## Results and Discussion

The application of pulse sequences $\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{F}$ to ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ doubly labeled proteins leads to heteronuclear E.COSY cross peaks from which ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{HI}} \mathrm{VIIIS}^{4},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{II}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{CO}},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{C}^{\beta}}$ or ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{CO}}$ coupling constants can be determined. As an example, pulse sequence $A$ will be described in terms of the product operator formalism (Serensen et al., 1983) without considering relaxation effects. For simplicity, only terms that result in observable magnetization during the detection period $\mathrm{t}_{3}$ are retained and nonrelevant ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{t} \mathrm{H},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H} \cdot{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ couplings are not included. The spin operators $\mathbf{H}^{\mathbb{N}}, \mathbf{H}^{\alpha}, \mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{\alpha}$ denote magnetization components of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}},{ }^{1} \mathrm{I}^{\alpha},{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ and ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ nuclei, respectively.

The initial INEPT transfer (Morris and Freeman, 1979) converts longitudinal amide proton magnetization $\left(\sigma(0)=\mathbf{H}_{z}^{N}\right)$ into antiphase ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ magnetization according to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sigma(2 \tau)=-2 \mathbf{H}_{z}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathbf{N}_{y} \sin \left(2 \pi^{1} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{NH} \times \tau} \cdot \tau\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

During the constant-time ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ evolution period $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{v}}$, the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}-{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\infty}$ coupling leads to dephasing of the $\mathbf{H}_{z}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathbf{H}_{y}$ term while the effects of the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N} /{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ scalar interaction are relocused by the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$-selective $180^{\circ}$ pulses. ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ chemical shift and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{KH}} \mathrm{N}$ evolution take place as a function or $\mathrm{t}_{1}$. Considering only intraresidual correlations, these processes are described by:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(2 \tau, T_{N}\right)=\left[-4 \mathbf{H}_{6}^{N} N_{y} C_{z}^{\alpha} \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}} \times \mathrm{t}_{1}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+2 \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{z}}^{\alpha} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}}{ }^{\mathrm{N} \mathrm{t}_{1}}\right)\right]  \tag{2}\\
& \times \sin \left(2 \pi^{1} J_{N H^{N}} \eta\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} J_{\mathrm{NC}^{\mathrm{a}}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NCK}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{N}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

where $\Omega_{\mathrm{N}}$ is the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ angular frequency and $\eta$ is set to $1 /(4$ $\left.{ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}} \mathrm{N}\right)$. The pair of simultaneous $90^{\circ}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{2} / /^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ pulses converts the ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ antiphase magnetization into ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ antiphase magnetization. In the subsequent constant-ime ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ chemical-shift evolution period ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ antiphase magnetization is refocused with respect to amide nitrogens. Again, the effect of J-coupling to carbonyl carbons is eliminated by applying a shaped $180^{\circ}{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ pulse at time $\mathrm{t}_{2} / 2$, whereas the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} C^{\beta}}$ coupling is active throughout $\mathrm{T}_{C^{\prime}}$. ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ antiphase magnetization with respect to the $\alpha$-pro-
ton(s) builds up for a duration of $2 \kappa$. These effects can be summarized as follows:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(2 \tau, T_{N}, T_{C}\right)=\left[4 H_{z}^{N} H_{z}^{\alpha} C_{y}^{\alpha} \sin \left(\Omega_{N} t_{1}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{NH}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+2 \mathrm{H}_{z}^{u} \mathrm{C}_{y}^{\alpha} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{i}}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right)\right]  \tag{3}\\
& \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} \mathrm{t}_{2}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NCX}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NC}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}\right) \\
& \sin \left(2 \pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{H}}} K\right)} \cos ^{\mathrm{D}}\left(2 \pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}} \kappa\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} \mathrm{C}} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}\right)\right.
\end{align*}
$$

where the exponent $n$ is 1 for glycine and 0 for all other residues. The duration $T_{C}$ has to be adjusted to $1 / J_{\text {cac }}$ (i.e., approximately 27 ms ) in order to remove the effect of the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}-{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\beta}$ scalar coupling. The final reverse INEPT sequence creates detectable transverse magnetization of $\alpha$ protons given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(2 \tau, T_{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{~T}_{\mathrm{C}}, 2 \delta\right)=\left[2 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{Z}}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{z}}^{\mathrm{\alpha}} \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\boldsymbol{\pi}^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{KH}} \mathrm{Nt}_{1}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+H_{x}^{\alpha} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right)\right]  \tag{4}\\
& \times \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha}} t_{2}\right) \sin \left(2 \pi^{\prime} \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{C}^{2} \mathrm{H}^{\infty}} \delta\right)
\end{align*}
$$

The superposition of the two terms detected during $t_{3}$ results in an E.COSY-type cross peak with an in-phase splitting due to ${ }^{1} J_{\mathrm{YH}^{\mathrm{V}}}$ along F1 and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}}$ along F 3 . The signal amplitude is given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(\mathrm{t}_{3}, \mathrm{t}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)=\mathbf{H}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\alpha} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{cxt}} \mathrm{t}_{2}\right)  \tag{5~A}\\
& {\left[\sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NIIN}} \mathrm{~N}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{HCO}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{N} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{HC}} \mathrm{t}_{3}}\right)\right.} \\
& +\cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{NN}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NH}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}\right) \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{II}} \mathbf{t}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\left.\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right]}\right.
\end{align*}
$$

where constant multiplicative factors that result from the magnetization transfer steps have been excluded. For pulse sequences $B-F$ the respective expressions are:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}, \mathrm{t}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)=\mathbf{H}_{\mathrm{s}}^{\mathrm{N}} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right)  \tag{5~B}\\
& {\left[\operatorname { s i n } ( \Omega _ { C ^ { \text { at } } } \mathrm { t } _ { 2 } ) \operatorname { s i n } ( \pi ^ { 1 } \mathrm { J } _ { \mathrm { C } \mathrm { x } _ { \mathrm { H } } \mathrm { a } _ { 2 } } ) \operatorname { s i n } \left(\Omega _ { \mathrm { H } \cdot \mathrm { t } _ { 3 } ) } \operatorname { s i n } \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)}\right.\right.\right.} \\
& \left.+\cos \left(\Omega_{C^{\alpha}} t_{2}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} J_{C_{C_{H}}} t_{2}\right) \cos \left(\Omega_{H^{N}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{~N}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{t}_{3}}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}, \mathrm{t}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\vee} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{2}\right)  \tag{5C}\\
& {\left[\operatorname { s i n } ( \Omega _ { \mathrm { CQ } } \mathrm { t } _ { 1 } ) \operatorname { s i n } ( \pi ^ { 1 } \mathrm { J } _ { \mathrm { COCO } } \mathrm { t } _ { 1 } ) \operatorname { s i n } \left(\Omega_{\left.\mathrm{H}^{N} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)} \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{N} \mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right.\right.} \\
& \left.+\cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{CC}_{1}}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{COCO}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{H}^{2}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{F}^{N} \mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right] \\
& \sigma\left(t_{1}, t_{2}, t_{3}\right)=\mathbf{H}_{x}^{\mathrm{N}} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{2}\right) \tag{5D}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \cos \left(\Omega_{\left[\Gamma^{2}\right.} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)} \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right. \\
& +\sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{Ca}^{\mathrm{C}}} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{I}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{C}^{2} \mathrm{Hax}^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{t}_{1}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} J_{\mathrm{C}^{\alpha} \mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \\
& \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{E}^{-N}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{H}}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{H}^{N_{C O}}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)}\right. \\
& +\cos \left(\Omega_{C \alpha} t_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} J_{C^{\alpha_{H}}} t_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} J_{C^{\alpha_{C O}}} t_{1}\right) \\
& \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\wedge} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{t}_{3}}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{CO}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \\
& +\sin \left(\Omega_{C \alpha} t_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{1} J_{C^{\alpha} H^{\alpha} t_{1}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{i} J_{C^{2} C_{O}} t_{1}\right) \\
& \left.\cos \left(\Omega_{H^{*} \mathrm{~N}_{3}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{HNHact}}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{II}^{2} \mathrm{~N}} \operatorname{co}_{3} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$


 flavodoxin. The cross sections of the upper and lower multiplet components along F3 were obtained by summation over appropriate slices in F1 and F2 in the spectra recorded with the pulse sequences marked in the upper left corner of the expansions. To increase digital resolution, the rows were inverse Fourier transformed, zero-filled to 16 K complex points and Fourier transformed again. Right: Karplus curves for the measured coupling constants with parameters taken from Vuister and Bax (1993) for ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathcal{H}^{\mathrm{N}}} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{a}}$, from Bystrov et al. (1975) for ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{co}}$ and from Bystrov (1976)
 by open and hatched rectangles. The filled rectangles denote the most probable $\phi$-angle ranges as judged by the coincidence of the individual regions.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}, \mathrm{t}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)=\mathbf{H}_{x}^{\mathrm{N}} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{2}\right) \tag{5E}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sigma\left(\mathrm{t}_{1}, \mathbf{t}_{2}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)=\mathbf{H}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\alpha} \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{Cx}} \mathrm{t}_{2}\right)  \tag{5F}\\
& {\left[\sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{VCo}} \mathrm{l}_{1}\right) \sin \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right) \sin \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{CO}_{3}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right.} \\
& \left.+\cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{N}_{1}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NCO}} \mathrm{t}_{1}\right) \cos \left(\Omega_{\mathrm{Ha}^{2}} \mathrm{l}_{3}\right) \cos \left(\pi^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{mCO}}} \mathrm{t}_{3}\right)\right]
\end{align*}
$$

The proposed pulse sequences yield the coupling constant information required for the determination of the backbone torsion angle $o$ in proteins. In the F1-F3 planes of the 3D spectra the cross peaks exhibit the desired E.COSY multiplet patterns, as demonstrated in Fig. 3. The experiments were performed using a uniformly ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C} /$ ${ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}$-labeled sample of oxidized flavodoxin from Desuffovibrio vulgaris, a flavoprotein consisting of 147 amino acids and equimolar noncovalently bound FMN (for a review see Mayhew and Tollin (1992)).

All vicinal couplings that could be extracted from cross peaks shown in Fig. 3 have the same relative sign. The reverse tilt observed in panels $\mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}$ and f is due to the fact that complementary E.COSY patterns are obtained when an odd number of inversion pulses is applied to the passive spin. Here, a $180^{\circ}$ pulse on carbonyl carbons had to be inserted in order to refocus the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{NCO}}$ and the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{Cacco}}$ couplings in the F2 dimensions of the (H)CANNH and (H)NCAHA experiments, respectively.

For the sequential connectivities in the spectra with pulse sequences $C, D$ and $F$, the displacement of the upper and lower submultiplets is caused by geminal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ couplings. The ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{C}}}$ coupling may be useful, because it correlates with the backbone torsion angle $\psi$ (Hansen, 1991). However, ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{Ha}_{\mathrm{CO}}}$ as well as ${ }^{2} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N} C O}}$ can be obtained with higher sensitivity from HSQC experiments (Delaglio et al., 1991; Vuister and Bax, 1992; Madsen et al., 1993) and are just a by-product of the pulse sequences presented here.

An obvious disadvantage of the experiments which detect $x$-protons during $t_{s}$ is the fact that no coupling constants can be evaluated when the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ resonances are located near the strong residual $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ signal. Therefore, we also recorded an HNCA-type experiment (B) for determining ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \alpha}$. As pointed out by Görlach et al. (1993), protein ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ spin flips, caused by dipolar relaxation between the ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\alpha}$ evolution period and the detection of amide protons, lead to a significant attenuation of one of the two branches contributing to the observed cross peaks. In the resulting corrupted E.COSY patterns the peak maxima are shifted towards the centre of the cross peaks along F3 and the ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{1} \mathrm{NH}^{4}}$ coupling constants tend to be underestimated. To account for these effects, nitrogen antiphase magnetization with respect to anide protons can be converted into ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{15} \mathrm{~N}$ multiple-quantum coherence during the back-transfer of coherence from ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{C}}$ to the amide protons. In the pulse schemes introduced by Gör-


Fig. 5. Determination of possible $\phi$-angle ranges for two glycine residues of $D$. migaris flavodoxin. The ${ }^{3} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{CO}},{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\infty} \mathrm{CO}}$ and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\wedge} \mathrm{co}}$ coupling constants for Gly ${ }^{82}$ (top left) and Gly ${ }^{103}$ (bottom left) were extracted from a CO-coupled (H)NCAHA and a CO-coupled (H)CANNH spectrum, recorded with the pulse sequences $F$ and $C$, respectively. The reversed sign of the signals is due to the absence of the $C^{B}$, $C^{\beta}$ coupling effect factor cos $\pi \pi$ ${ }^{1} J\left(C^{\alpha} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{P}}\right) \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{C}}$ ) in the transfer functions for glycine residues. $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ and $\mathrm{H}^{\text {er }}$ denote the low-field and up-ield $\alpha$-proton resonances, respectively. Note that the F3 cross sections through the upper and lower submultiplets are plotted with different scales for the ' $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ and the ' $\mathrm{H}^{\wedge}$ domains. At the right the Karplus curves for the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{I}^{\mathrm{c} 2},{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha 3},{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}},{ }^{13} \mathrm{CO}$ vicinal couplings are shown together with $\phi$-angle ranges that correspond to the experimental values, arbitrarily assuming an uncertainty of $\pm 0.5 \mathrm{~Hz}$. Open boxes are used for Gly and hatched boxes for Gly ${ }^{103}$. Torsion angles that can be excluded by combination of the couping constant information are not indieated. In the case of Gly ${ }^{003}$, the value obtained for ${ }^{3} J_{H}{ }^{2}$ co does not exactly match the region suggested by the two remaining couplings. This might be due to an experimental crror larger than $\pm 0.5$ Hz . Note that the drawn Karplus curves represent only the centre of an allowed region. Two possible $\phi$-angle ranges, symmetric about $\phi=0$, can be assigned for each glycine residue.

TABLE 1
VICINAL COUPLING CONSTANTS (Hz) DETERMINED FOR OXIDIZED D. vigaris FLAVODOXIN

| Residue | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{NH}^{\text {u }}{ }^{4}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \times \mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{C}}{ }^{\text {b }}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{HNC} \mathrm{C}}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathbf{J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\text {n }} \text { CO }}$ | Secondary structure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lys $^{3}$ | 8 | 0 | 1.6 | 3.9 | s |
| $11 e^{6}$ | 8.1 | 0.6 | 1.2 | - | s |
| TyT ${ }^{6}$ | 9 | 0.6 | -0.8 | 2.4 | s |
| Ser ${ }^{10}$ | 6.2 | 1.6 | - | 2.6 |  |
| Thr ${ }^{11}$ | 7.8 | 0 | - | 2.5 |  |
| Glu ${ }^{15}$ | 4.6 | 0.9 | 2.9 | 0.7 | h |
| TyI ${ }^{17}$ | - | 1.7 | 2.6 | 0.5 | h |
| Ala ${ }^{13}$ | 3.5 | 1.7 | 3.3 | 0.5 | h |
| $\underline{\mathrm{Cl}}{ }^{22}$ | - | 0.8 | 3.1 | 0.8 | h |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{23}$ | 3.7 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 1.3 | h |
| $\mathrm{Arg}^{34}$ | 3.3 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 1.1 | h |
| Lell ${ }^{26}$ | 4.2 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 2.1 | h |
| Asp ${ }^{28}$ | 3.9 | 2 | 2.3 | - | h |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{29}$ | 8.6 | 0.3 | - | 2.7 |  |
| Tyr ${ }^{31}$ | 6.4 | -0.3 | 1.8 | - |  |
| Glu ${ }^{32}$ | 8.8 | -0.2 | 1.7 | - | s |
| Val ${ }^{33}$ | 8.6 | 0 | 0.5 | - | 8 |
| Asp ${ }^{34}$ | 9.1 | -0.4 | 1.5 | - | s |
| $\mathrm{Ser}^{35}$ | 9.7 | 0.2 | - | 4.3 | $s$ |
| Arg ${ }^{36}$ | 8.9 | 0.9 | -0.2 | - | s |
| Asp ${ }^{37}$ | 5.7 | 0.2 | 2.8 | 1.7 |  |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{38}$ | 2.7 | 2.6 | 3.2 | - |  |
| Ser ${ }^{40}$ | 8.6 | 0 | - | 3 |  |
| Val ${ }^{41}$ | 8.9 | 0.5 | 0.4 | - |  |
| Glu ${ }^{2}$ | 9.5 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.6 |  |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{43}$ | 3.8 | 2 | 3.1 | 0.9 |  |
| Phe ${ }^{47}$ | 6.2 | 0 | 2.2 | - |  |
| Glu | 2.8 | 1.4 | 2.6 | 0.8 |  |
| Phe ${ }^{50}$ | 6.7 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 2.4 |  |
| Val ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 8.9 | 0 | 0.2 | $\cdots$ | s |
| Leur ${ }^{54}$ | 9.2 | 0.9 | - | 5 | 8 |
| Trp ${ }^{\text {6in }}$ | 7.1 | 1.2 | -0.8 | 4.4 |  |
| Ser ${ }^{64}$ | 6.7 | 2.3 | - | 1.5 |  |
| Ile ${ }^{65}$ | 3.7 | 0.5 | 2.2 | 1.1 |  |
| Leu ${ }^{6{ }^{\text {F }}}$ | - | 0.2 | 1.7 | 1.5 |  |
| Asp ${ }^{70}$ | 5.6 | 0.5 | 2 | 2.2 | h |
| Leu ${ }^{74}$ | - | 0.3 | 2.5 | 0.2 | , |
| Phe ${ }^{75}$ | - | 1.5 | 2.8 | 0 | h |
| Asp ${ }^{76}$ | 3.8 | 1.4 | 2.5 | 0.6 | h |
| Glu ${ }^{79}$ | 4.8 | 1.7 |  | 0.7 | h |
| $\mathrm{Gln}^{84}$ | 2.6 | 1.2 | 3 | -0.7 |  |
| $\mathrm{Arg}^{88}$ | 8.3 | -0.2 | 1.7 | 2.7 |  |
| Lys ${ }^{87}$ | 5.8 | 0 | 2.6 | - |  |
| Val ${ }^{88}$ | - | 1.1 | 0 | 2.9 | s |
| $\mathrm{Al}^{89}$ | 5.4 | 3.1 | 0.2 | - | s |
| Cys ${ }^{\text {60 }}$ | 9.5 | 0.4 | - | 3.4 | s |
| Phe ${ }^{9 / 1}$ | 7.7 | 1,2 | 0 | 1.7 | s |
| Glu ${ }^{98}$ | 3 | - | 2.2 | 1.1 |  |
| Phe ${ }^{101}$ | 2 | 1.2 | 2 | - |  |
| Cys ${ }^{162}$ | 5.8 | 3.6 | 0 | 9.8 |  |
| Asp ${ }^{196}$ | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 0.2 | h |
| $\mathrm{Al}^{107}$ | 4.1 | 1.6 | 3.2 | 1.7 | h |
| $\mathrm{Tl} \mathrm{e}^{108}$ | 4.7 | 1.1 | - | 1.4 | h |
| Glu ${ }^{109}$ | - | 1.5 | 2.8 | 0.6 | h |
| Glu ${ }^{110}$ | 3.7 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 1.1 | h |
| Leu ${ }^{112}$ | - | 1.1 | 3.1 | 1.1 | h |
| Lys ${ }^{113}$ | 3.4 | 1.4 | 2.8 | - | h |
| Asn ${ }^{1 / 4}$ | 4.5 | 0.9 | 2.6 | 1.7 | h |
| Ley ${ }^{115}$ | 6.1 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 2.2 |  |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{117}$ | 5.9 | 0.6 | 31 | - |  |
| $\mathrm{Ile}{ }^{119}$ | 6.9 | 0.2 | 2.8 | - |  |
| Val ${ }^{120}$ | 5.6 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 3.6 |  |
| Gin ${ }^{121}$ | 6.1 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 2 |  |

TABLE 1
(continued)

| Residuc | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{H}^{\text {a }}}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \mathrm{NCO}{ }^{\text {b }}}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\text {N/E }}}$ | ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}} \mathrm{CO}$ | Secondary structure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Asp ${ }^{12}$ | 4.6 | 1.5 | 2.5 | - |  |
| Leu ${ }^{124}$ | 6.7 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.7 | s |
| Ile ${ }^{\text {i26 }}$ | 7.8 | -0.5 | 1.3 | 2.7 | s |
| Asp ${ }^{129}$ | 3.7 | 0.9 | 2.8 | - |  |
| Arg ${ }^{13}$ | 3.9 | 1.2 | - | 1.7 |  |
| $\mathrm{Ala}^{132}$ | 7.3 | 0.1 | - | 1.6 |  |
| Asp ${ }^{135}$ | 3.6 | 0.8 | 2.1 | -- | h |
| $\mathrm{Ile}{ }^{37}$ | 4.1 | 0.8 | 2.9 | - | h |
| Val ${ }^{188}$ | 4.4 | 1.4 | 3.9 | 1.7 | h |
| Trp ${ }^{140}$ | 3.9 | 0.9 | 3.3 | - | h |
| Ada ${ }^{\text {4/1 }}$ | 4.7 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 1.4 | h |
| $\mathrm{His}^{142}$ | 4 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 0.8 | h |
| Asp ${ }^{163}$ | 4.8 | 0.9 | 2.7 | 2 | h |
| Val ${ }^{144}$ | 3.9 | 1.4 | 3 | 1.5 | h |
| $\mathrm{Arg}^{1 / 4}$ | 3.1 | 1.7 | 2.8 |  | h |
| $\mathrm{Ile}^{148}$ | 8.4 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 2.6 |  |

Only residues for which values of more than two different couplings could be obtained are listed. Helical segments ( h ) and $\beta$-strands ( s ), as identified by NOE contacts (Knauf et al., 1993), are indicated in the right column.
${ }^{8}$ From either experiment $A$ or B.
${ }^{6}$ From experiment $C$.
lach et al. (1993), shaped band-selective pulses on amide protons are employed to avoid perturbation of ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ spins and to refocus the passive ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}, \mathrm{H}^{1 /}$ coupling during the persistence of the proton-nitrogen multiple-quantum coherence. Since we only used the HNCA-type experiment as a supplement to the (HI)NCAHA experiment A for amino acid residues with ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{c}$ chemical shifts in the vicinity of the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ resonance, the $1-1$ echo sequence (Sklenár and Bax, 1987) was implemented for the same purpose. This variant considerably facilitated water suppression.

No effort was made to minimize the influence of the above-mentioned relaxation effects in the $\mathrm{CO}, \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{E}}$-coupled (H)CANNH experiment $D$. As a consequence, the measured ${ }^{3} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ coupling constants were generally smaller than those extracted from experiments $A$ and $B$ for the same residues. A vicinal ' $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$, , $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{\alpha}}$ coupling constant of 4.6 Hz was oblained for $\mathrm{Gln}^{121}$ (see Fig. 3d), whereas a value of 6.1 Hz was measured in the spectrum recorded with pulse sequence B (Fig. 4d). The simultancous determination of two different coupling constants from E.COSY patterns that are split into four submultiplets is possible, although with reduced sensitivity (Eggenberger ct al., 1992a). The signal-to-noise ratio in two separate experiments is higher by a factor of $2^{1 / 6}$ when compared to an experiment with two passive splittings, acquircd in the same measuring time.
 coupling constants is demonstrated in Fig. 4 for selected residues of flavodoxin. In all cases the values for one vicinal coupling correspond to several conformations about the $\phi$-torsion angle according to the Karplus equations. If all available three-bond couplings are considered, only one possibility remains under the assumption of a single rigid conformation. In particular, for $\mathrm{Cy}^{102}$ the
positive $\phi$-angle would not have been detected using the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ coupling constant only. The relatively high values for both ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} N \mathrm{CO}}$ and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\alpha} \mathrm{CO}}$ exclude local conformations with a negative $\phi$-angle.

Among the 147 amino acid residues of flavodoxin, 18 are glycines and three are prolines. From the spectra recorded with pulse sequences $A$ and $B, 89^{3} J_{\mathrm{H}^{\wedge}{ }^{\circ}}$ coupling constants could be extracted for the remaining residues. Evaluation of cross peaks in the CO-coupled (H)CANNH (C), the $\mathrm{C}^{\beta}$-coupled (H)CANNH (E) and the CO -coupled (H)NCAHA (F) spectra resulted in the determination of $98{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} N \mathrm{CO}}, 79{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \times \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{C}}}$ and $62{ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H} \mathrm{C}_{(\mathrm{O}}}$ values. Table 1 summarizes the mcasured coupling constants for those residues where experimental data for at least three couplings were available.
The situation encountered for glycine residues is less clear. Constraints for the $\phi$-angle cannot be obtained solely by use of coupling constants. The $\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}$ - and CO -coupled (H)NCAHA experiments yield individual ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{N}}}$ and ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\text {IIrco }}$ couplings for the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{m} 2}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{e} 2}$ spins. These pairs of coupling constants, in combination with the value for ${ }^{3} \mathrm{~J}_{\left.\mathrm{H}^{\wedge} \mathrm{C}\right)}$, usually constrain the $\phi$-angle. However, due to the symmetry about $\phi=0$ only its absolute value and not the sign can be determined without knowledge of the stereospecific assignment of the $\alpha$-proton resonances. This is shown in Fig. 5 for residues Gly ${ }^{82}$ and Gly ${ }^{193}$ in flavodoxin. $\phi$-angles around $\pm 100$ and $\pm 60^{\circ}$, respectively, resulted from the measured vicinal couplings. On the basis of distance information provided by the different intensities of the two intraresidual ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{H}^{\mathrm{V}}, \mathrm{H}^{*} \mathrm{NOE}$ peaks in a 3 D ROESY${ }^{2} \mathrm{H}\left\{{ }^{15} \mathrm{~N}\right\} \mathrm{HMQC}$ spectrum recorded with a mixing time of 33 ms (data not shown), the low-field ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{\alpha}$ resonance of Gly ${ }^{82}$ can be assigned to $\mathrm{H}^{\alpha 3}$ (positive $\phi$-angle) and the low-field ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}^{c}$ resonance of Gly ${ }^{103}$ to $\mathrm{H}^{02}$ (negative $\phi$-angle).

In conclusion, the coupled (H)NCAHA and (H)CANNH experiments presented here can be employed to measure all vicinal ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H},{ }^{33} \mathrm{C}$ couplings related to the backbone angle $\phi$ in proteins and serve to reduce ambiguities arising from the translation of coupling constants into structural information.
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