arXiv:physics/0112083v1 [physics.bio-ph] 22 Dec 2001

Physical Constraints and Functional Characteristics of Transcription Factor-DNA Interaction

Ulrich Gerland*, J. David Moroz^{†*}, and Terence Hwa

Department of Physics, University of California at San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0319

(Dated: February 26, 2019)

We study theoretically the binding of transcription factors to their target sequences in bacteria, focusing particularly on the statistical interaction of the factors with the genomic background. An upper bound on the binding specificity of a factor is derived by requiring that the factors not be trapped kinetically by a small fraction of preferred background sequences. Together with the requirement of equilibrium occupation at reasonable cellular factor concentrations, we obtain a range for the physically-allowed factor-DNA interactions. Within this allowed range, we identify a special subset of interactions for which the threshold of factor binding is completely controlled by the target sequences. We argue that this special class of interactions is highly desirable since it makes the strength of factor-DNA binding individually *programmable* for each regulated target. We expect a large number of transcription factors to belong to this special class, and discuss their thermodynamic signatures.

With the rapid advance in the sequencing and annotation of entire genomes, the task of understanding the associated regulatory networks becomes increasingly prominent. Both studies of exemplary gene circuits and general design principles are desirable and mutually beneficial. The elementary molecular component in gene regulation is the interaction of transcription factors with their target sites on the DNA, also known as operators [1]. A study of the design of factor-DNA interaction is a first step in a 'bottom-up approach' to regulatory networks. A functional factor-DNA system requires the factors to be able to find their target sites rapidly and bind to them with a high probability; these constitute the minimal physical conditions on the design. Additional functional requirements arise in the context of gene regulation. In the present theoretical analysis, we first perform a biophysical study of the physical constraints and then compare the functional performance of different conceivable designs to identify the optimal design. To focus our discussion, we limit ourselves exclusively to the case of bacterial transcription factors, which are best characterized experimentally.

The biological function of the binding of a transcription factor to its operator is to up- or down-regulate the level of gene expression as the concentration of the factor in the cell changes. For instance, in response to a change in the environment, transcription factors are either newly produced or existing factors become activated or deactivated by small inducer molecules (a prominent example is cAMP for the catabolism regulator CRP in *E. coli* [2]). The factor-DNA interaction partly consists of a general, non-specific electrostatic attraction and partly of basepair-specific hydrogen bonds. Specificity of the interaction can be defined quantitatively as the fraction of sequences a factor selects in a pool of random sequences. For proper function, the interaction needs to be sufficiently specific such that above a desired factor concentration, one of the factors can correctly identify its target sequence among the vast majority of non-operator sequences in the genome. On the other hand, higher specificity also has negative consequences: it increases not only the binding energy to the targets, but also the binding energies to a small fraction of non-operator sequences that have spurious, partial sequence similarity with the targets. (The existence of such spurious sequence similarity is statistically unavoidable in a large genome). When the specificity is too large, these sequences with spurious similarity can serve as *kinetic traps* which prevent the factors from reaching the target in a reasonable amount of time. The bulk of this paper is devoted to a quantitative analysis of the conflicting demands of high specificity needed for proper discrimination and an upper bound on specificity required for kinetic accessibility.

Von Hippel and Berg have already discussed many issues related to the specificity of protein-DNA interaction in a series of seminal articles [3, 4, 5]. Our study is built firmly upon their work, but includes the additional issue of kinetic accessibility which cannot be taken for granted due to spurious traps present statistically in the genomic background. In our analysis, this complicated but important dynamics issue is treated approximately by a much simpler quasi-thermodynamic consideration. In particular, we require the factor-DNA interaction to be far from the "glass phase" which is characterized by exponentially slow dynamics. For the sake of concreteness, we apply our general approach to a simple two-state model of protein-DNA interaction originally introduced by Berg and von Hippel [4, 5]. We use the above-mentioned physical constraints to deduce limits on the model parameters. thereby obtaining a quantitative estimate of the allowed range of binding specificities.

^{*}These authors contributed equally to this work.

 $^{^\}dagger\mathrm{Present}$ address: NEC Research Institute, 4 Independence Way, Princeton, NJ 08540

Finally, we examine the functional demands on the factor-DNA binding: We note that the same factor may be required to bind at different regulatory sites at different thresholds of factor concentrations. We suggest that an optimal design of the factor-DNA interaction should allow the binding strength (and hence the threshold factor concentration) to be "programmable", i.e., be controlled simply by the choice of the binding sequence. We show that this programmability condition singles out a narrow range of parameters within the much larger parameter space allowed by the physical constraints. We expect "programmability" to be a design principle respected by a wide class of transcription factors, and discuss our prediction in terms of thermodynamic observables.

Model of Factor-DNA Interaction

Much of our knowledge on the details of transcription factor-DNA interaction is derived from extensive biochemical experiments on a few exemplary systems, dating back to pioneering work in the late 70's [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11]and continuing through recent years [12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. Furthermore, detailed structural information is available for many transcription factors from various structural families [17]. Based on this knowledge, quantitative models of factor-DNA interaction have been established [3, 4, 5, 9, 13]. Together with the recent availability of genomic sequences, these models can be used to characterize the thermodynamics of transcription factors with genomic DNA in a cell. We briefly review the primary model of factor-DNA interaction in this section, which serves to introduce our notation and formulate the problem

Biochemical and structural experiments have established firmly that (i) transcription factors bind strongly to the DNA regardless of its sequence due to electrostatic interaction alone, and (ii) additional sequence-specific binding energy can be gained (via hydrogen bonds) if the binding sequence is somewhat close to the recognition sequences of the factor. Let the binding energy of a factor to a sequence $\vec{S} = \{S_1, S_2, ..., S_L\}$ of L nucleotides $S_i \in \{A, C, G, T\}$ be $E[\vec{S}]$. Then given the genomic sequence $\{S_1, S_2, ..., S_{\Gamma}\}$ of length Γ , and assuming that the factor is bound to the DNA essentially all the time¹, all thermodynamic quantities regarding this factor can be computed from the partition function² $Z = \sum_{j=1}^{\Gamma} e^{-\beta E[\vec{S}_j]}$, where $\beta^{-1} = k_B T \approx 0.6$ kcal/mol and \vec{S}_j denotes the subsequence of the genomic sequence from position j to j + L - 1.

The form of the binding energy $E[\vec{S}]$ has been studied experimentally for several transcription factors [12, 13, 14, 15]. In particular, recent experiments on the factor Mnt from bacteriophage P22 [12] support the earlier model [4] that the contribution of each nucleotide in the binding sequence to the total binding energy is approximately independent and additive, i.e.,

$$E[\vec{S}] = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \mathcal{E}_i(S_i) . \tag{1}$$

For the factors Mnt, Cro, and λ -repressor, the parameters of the "energy matrix" $\mathcal{E}_i(S_i)$ have actually been determined experimentally by *in vitro* measurements of equilibrium binding constants $K[\vec{S}] \propto e^{-\beta E[\vec{S}]}$ for every *single-nucleotide* mutant of the best binding sequence \vec{S}^* [12, 14, 15]. (For these factors, $L = 15 \sim 20$ nucleotides.) While the simple form of the binding energy (1) will certainly not hold for all transcription factors, and di- or tri-nucleotide correlation effects are likely to be important in many cases (e.g., to some extent for *lac*repressor [16]), the key results of our study are not sensitive to such correlations as long as there is a wide range of binding energies for different binding sequences.

Careful experiments with lac-repressor [7, 10, 16] have shown that the sequence-specific binding energy $E[\vec{S}]$ is replaced by a non-specific energy $E_{\rm ns}$ if \vec{S} is sufficiently far from the best sequence \vec{S}^* that the binding energy according to (1) exceeds E_{ns} . However, for the *lac*-repressor the threshold for non-specific binding is quite high³, with $E_{\rm ns}$ being ~ 10 kcal/mol above the energy of the best binder, $E[\vec{S}^*]$. In general, it is believed that non-specific binding does not occur until the binding sequence is at least 4 to 5 mismatches from the best binder. With $E_{\rm ns}$ in such a high range, it does not make a significant difference to our final result (see below). Thus we will not include the effect of nonspecific binding here, and take the binding energy to be given by the form (1) for all sequences. For simplicity, we will choose our energy scale such that $E[\vec{S}^*] = 0$ for the best binder. Thus, $\mathcal{E}_i(S_i) = 0$ if $S_i = S_i^*, \mathcal{E}_i(S_i) > 0$ if $S_i \neq S_i^*$. For the three well-studied transcription factors, the non-zero entries of $\mathcal{E}_i(S)$ are typically in the range $1 \sim 3k_B T$.

¹ In vivo measurements for the case of *lac*-repressor found less than 10% of the factors were unbound [8]. This agrees well with an estimate based on a typical prokaryotic cell volume of 3 μm^3 , a genome length of $5 \cdot 10^6$ bases, and a non-specific binding constant on the order of 10^4 M^{-1} under physiological conditions [6], which yields a fraction of unbound factors at a few percent level.

 $^{^2}$ One should also include the reverse-complement of the genomic sequence in the actual evaluation of the partition function Z. In

order not to make the notation too complicated, we extend the definition of "genomic sequence" to include its complement.

 $^{^3}$ But $E_{\rm ns}$ is still low enough to keep the factor bound to the DNA almost all of the time.



FIG. 1 For the purpose of transcription factor binding, the genomic DNA may be treated as a random DNA plus a target site with binding energy close to 0: (a) Energy landscape for Mnt on the bacteriophage P22 DNA using the energy matrix determined in Ref. [12]. The landscape appears to be random, e.g. no "funnel" guides the factor to the target site. The spatial correlation function of the landscape (not shown) decays quickly to zero beyond the scale of L = 17 for this case. Random energy landscapes are also found for the other two factors with known energy matrices (not shown). (b) Histogram of binding energies for Cro [solid line] on the E. coli genome (contains no target for Cro), together with the average histogram [circles] for Cro on random nucleotide sequences (synthesized with the same length and single-nucleotide frequencies as the E. coli genome). Except for statistical fluctuations at the low energy end, the histograms are indistinguishable from each other. In both figures, the approximate position of the nonspecific energy is indicated.

Genomic Background and Target Recognition

The binding of a factor to its targets is strongly affected by its interaction with the genomic background. In order to characterize this interaction statistically, we examined the "energy landscape" and the histogram of the binding energies for the factors with known energy matrices along their natural genomes; see Fig. 1. We find that, as far as the interaction with transcription factors are concerned, we may model the real genome by one or more target sites interspersed in a *random* genomic background (see the caption of Fig. 1 for details). For simplicity, let us consider a single target sequence \vec{S}_t .

It is convenient to split the partition function for the factor into a contribution from the target site and another contribution Z_b due to binding to the "random background". The latter can be written down formally as

$$Z_b = \sum_{\vec{S} \in \mathcal{S}(\Gamma)} e^{-\beta E[\vec{S}]} \tag{2}$$

where $S(\Gamma)$ denotes a given collection of Γ random nucleotide sequences of length L, drawn according to the frequency p_S for each nucleotide S. Let the binding energy to the target sequence be $E[\vec{S}_t] \equiv E_t$ (which is expected to be close to zero). Then $Z = e^{-\beta E_t} + Z_b$ in our model, and the probability that a factor binds to the

target becomes

$$P_t = \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta(E_t - F_b)}},$$
(3)

where $F_b = -k_BT \ln Z_b$ is the effective binding energy (or free energy) of the entire genomic background. Eq. (3) is a sigmoidal function of E_t with a (soft) threshold at F_b , i.e., a factor binds (with probability $P_t > 0.5$) if $E_t < F_b$.

Of course, there is usually more than one factor present in the cell. The generalization of the binding probability to an arbitrary number of factors $N_{\rm TF}$ is the Fermi distribution [18] since each site on the genome can accommodate at most one transcription factor due to physical exclusion. The Fermi distribution has the same form as Eq. (3) except that the value of the soft threshold for binding, F_b , is replaced by the "chemical potential" $\mu = F_b + k_B T \ln N_{\rm TF}$. Since the number of factors in a cell is typically no more than $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm max} \sim 1000$, the effective binding energy of the background is constrained to

$$F_b > -k_B T \ln N_{\rm TF}^{\rm max} \sim -7 \, k_B T \tag{4}$$

in order to allow at least the best possible target site (with $E_t = E[\vec{S}^*] \equiv 0$) to be occupied at the maximal factor concentration.

How do we calculate the background binding energy F_b ? From its definition, it is clear that F_b is a random variable, and its precise value will depend on the actual collection of sequences $S(\Gamma)$; see (2). We are interested in the *typical* value of F_b ; a reasonable approximation is its statistical average, $\overline{F_b} \equiv -k_BT \ln Z_b$. [We use an overbar to denote averages over an ensemble of different sequence collections $S(\Gamma)$.] Computing the average $\ln Z_b$ is however difficult to do for an arbitrary energy matrix $\mathcal{E}_i(S)$ short of performing numerical simulations. An alternative is to compute the ensemble average of Z_b ,

$$\overline{Z_b} = \Gamma \prod_{i=1}^{L} \left[\sum_{S=\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{T}} e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}_i(S)} p_S \right]$$
(5)

with the single-nucleotide frequencies p_S , and assume

$$\beta F_b \approx -\ln \overline{Z_b} = -\ln \Gamma + L \cdot \ln \zeta_b , \qquad (6)$$

where ζ_b^{-1} is the quantity in the bracket in (5). This is, for example, the approach taken by Stormo and Fields [13] in their analysis of the factor Mnt⁴.

The relation (6) is based on the so-called "annealed approximation" $\ln Z \approx \ln \overline{Z_b}$ which is valid for $\Gamma \to \infty$ but not always appropriate for finite Γ . A great deal is known about systems of the type defined by the partition

⁴ In Ref. [13], the energy scale was in fact shifted by $\ln \zeta_b$ per base such that $\overline{Z_b} = \Gamma$.

function Z_b in (2), generically known as the Random Energy Model or REM⁵, introduced and first solved by Derrida [19]. It is known that the annealed approximation breaks down when the entropy of the system approaches 0. This is accompanied by a phase transition of the system to a "glass phase" which is marred by exponentially slow dynamics. As we will elaborate in the next section, proper function of the transcription factor requires the factor-DNA interaction to be far from the glass transition, so that the annealed approximation is justified. We will thus take the relation (6) for granted, and study how F_b (and through it the probability of target binding, P_t , and various other quantities) depends on the energy matrix $\mathcal{E}_i(S)$, the length of the binding sequence L, and the genome size Γ .

It will be useful to caricaturize the energy matrix \mathcal{E} so that we may extract the salient features of the behavior that are not biased by the detailed form of a particular energy matrix. We will adopt the two-state model originally introduced by Berg and von Hippel, characterizing all of the non-zero entries of the *significant positions*⁶ of the energy matrix by a *single* value, i.e.,

$$\beta \mathcal{E}_i(S) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } S = S_i^* \\ \varepsilon > 0 & \text{if } S \neq S_i^* \end{cases},$$
(7)

where, ε is a dimensionless "discrimination energy" (in units of $k_B T$). Note that ε describes the *preference* of the factor for the optimal binding sequence \vec{S}^* , and is a crucial parameter controlling the specificity of the factor.

The two-state model (7) allows an explicit evaluation of the background energy F_b via the formulae (5) and (6). Assuming for simplicity equal single-nucleotide frequencies in the background (i.e., $p_S = 1/4$), one finds ζ_b in (6) to be $\zeta_b(\varepsilon) = 4/(1 + 3e^{-\varepsilon})$. Note that $\zeta_b(\varepsilon)$ is in the range between $1 \leq \zeta_b \leq 4$, and can be viewed as the effective size of the nucleotide "alphabet". The maximum value $\zeta_b = 4$ is attained if the energy matrix has infinite discrimination, $\varepsilon \to \infty$, while no discrimination can be achieved at $\varepsilon = 0$ where $\zeta_b = 1$.

Kinetic Traps and Target Accessibility

In order to carry out their function properly, transcription factors not only need to have a high equilibrium binding probability to their targets, but also must be able to locate it in a reasonably short time (e.g. less than a few minutes) after they have been activated by an inducer or freshly produced by a ribosome. This constitutes a constraint on the "search dynamics" of transcription factors. Early in vitro experiments [9, 10, 11] have shown that a factor's search proceeds by a combination of 1D and 3D diffusion, involving "sliding" of the factor along the DNA backbone at short length scales and "hopping" between different segments of DNA through the cytoplasm. For a given DNA concentration, there is an optimal combination of 1D and 3D diffusion which maximizes the efficiency of the search process [9]. It is believed that the observed factor-DNA affinity yields a nearly optimal combination for the DNA concentration inside the cell, with the search mode being mostly 3D diffusion [11].

In these studies of factor dynamics, binding of the factor to the genomic background was assumed to occur at a single energy value, namely $E_{\rm ns}$ [9, 11]. On the other hand, the "energy landscape" of Fig. 1(a) clearly shows that there exist large variations in the binding energies below $E_{\rm ns}$. Such variations lead to isolated sites with exceptionally low binding energies (deep energy valleys) in the genomic background and can drastically impede the search process regardless of whether it is in the 1D or 3D mode: the factors will be trapped most of the time in these valleys, if the energy difference between the valleys and their surroundings are sufficiently large (see below). As a consequence, thermal equilibrium cannot be reached within reasonable time. Thus to understand the binding of the factor to its target, we need to characterize the effect of kinetic trapping due to variations in the binding energies of the genomic background.

A detailed quantitative study of the search dynamics in the cell is however difficult to carry out. The large scale organization of the bacterial DNA with architectural proteins is complicated and largely unknown — the dense packing of the DNA inside the cell suggests that it forms a 3-dimensional network as illustrated in Fig. 2(a), with the network conformation changing with time in an unknown fashion. Here, we will adopt an alternative strategy which gives us a useful constraint on the dynamics independent of its details: First, we assume that the factor-DNA interaction is such that thermal equilibrium can be established in reasonable time, despite the existence of variations in the binding energies along the genome. Then, we determine the magnitude of the variations where this assumption breaks down, thereby obtaining a constraint on the factor-DNA interaction imposed by the search dynamics. In the remainder of this section, we develop this approach.

In the absence of any target site, the thermal expectation value of a factor's binding energy to a sequence in the random collection is $E_0 = \sum_{\vec{S} \in S(\Gamma)} E[\vec{S}] e^{-\beta E[\vec{S}]}/Z_b$ in equilibrium, which can be computed as $E_0 = -\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta} \ln \overline{Z_b}$ in the annealed approximation. Note that E_0 is in between the minimal binding energy, $\min_{\vec{S} \in S} E[\vec{S}]$, and the

⁵ Note that in many applications including protein folding [20], the REM was introduced to *approximate* the random background interaction. Factor-DNA interaction as defined by (2) represents one of the few systems for which the REM description is *directly applicable*.

⁶ Note that the energy matrices for most factors contain a number of (fixed) positions which have no strong preference for any of the nucleotides. We will not consider these positions in the ensuing discussion of the two-state model, and will use L to refer to the total number of significant positions.



FIG. 2 Schematic illustration of the search dynamics: (a) A transcription factor (represented by a solid ellipse) moves among genomic DNA (lines) via a combination of 1D diffusion (along the genome) and 3D diffusion (hopping between nearby segments) as illustrated by the arrows. The open circles indicate the potential kinetic traps which are sites that are preferred by the factor in a random background. (b) Simplified background energy landscape, with Γ_0 preferred background sites of energy E_0 , separated typically by Γ/Γ_0 bases. The binding energy of a typical site in the genomic background is E_b . To insure kinetic accessibility, we must have $E_b - E_0 \leq 5 \sim 10 k_B T$.

average binding energy, $\overline{E} \equiv \sum_{\vec{S} \in S} E[\vec{S}]/\Gamma$. This is a manifestation of the fact that sequences with very low binding energies do not contribute significantly to the partition function Z_b because there are too few of them, while sequences with energy close to \overline{E} have too small Boltzmann weights $e^{-\beta \overline{E}}$ to contribute. The dominant contribution to Z_b stems from the sites with binding energy E_0 [18]. We can view these sites as being *preferentially selected* by the factor out of the entire collection of random sequences $S(\Gamma)$, when the system is in thermal equilibrium. The total number Γ_0 of these preferred sites can be obtained by exploiting the dominant contribution of these sites to the partition sum, i.e., $Z_b = \Gamma_0 e^{-\beta E_0}$, or alternatively from

$$F_b = E_0 - k_B T \ln \Gamma_0 \tag{8}$$

 $(k_B \ln \Gamma_0 \text{ is known as the "entropy" of the system}).$

We next observe that in order for the system to be in equilibrium, a factor must be able to move between a preferred site and its surrounding within a short time (see Fig. 2a). This requires that the differences between the binding energy of the preferred sites, E_0 , and the lowest binding energy of the *typical* surrounding sites, denoted by E_b , is not larger than a maximally tolerable activation barrier (see Fig. 2b),

$$E_b - E_0 \equiv \Delta < \Delta^{\max} . \tag{9}$$

Otherwise, the preferred sites would become kinetic traps that impede the factor from finding the true target. Since the activation time to overcome an energy difference Δ grows as $e^{\beta\Delta}$, the maximally tolerable barrier is not likely to exceed the range $\Delta^{\max} = 5 \sim 10k_BT$.

	Mnt	Cro	λ -repressor
F_b	-1.2	-1.6	-0.8
H	6.2	9.4	8.8

TABLE I Relative entropy H and background free energy F_b for Mnt, Cro, and λ -repressor, in units of $k_BT \approx 0.6$ kcal/mol.

A naive estimate of E_b is the average binding energy \overline{E} . This is likely to be an overestimate given the timedependence of the DNA network configuration and the 3D nature of the search process. A lower bound on E_b can be obtained by noting that the contribution to the total free energy from Γ typical sites cannot exceed the full free energy of the background⁷, and thus, we have $E_b - k_B T \ln \Gamma > F_b$. When combined with (9) this yields the condition $F_b - E_0 + k_B T \ln \Gamma < \Delta^{\max}$, which can be rewritten using Eq. (8) as

$$H \equiv \ln(\Gamma/\Gamma_0) < \beta \Delta^{\max} , \qquad (10)$$

where H is known as the "relative entropy" (in units of k_B). In fact, H has been used to characterize the (specific) information content of the energy matrix [12, 13] and is a direct measure of binding specificity. Our constraint (10) thus sets an *upper bound* on the specificity. Note that this bound is substantially below the maximal possible value for H which occurs when $\Gamma_0 = 1$. (For $\Gamma = 10^7$ the maximum is $H \approx 16$.) In fact, if the factor-DNA interaction is such that $\Gamma_0 = 1$, then the annealed approximation is no longer valid (since the partition sum is dominated by a single term). In this case, the thermodynamics of the system is marked by a "phase transition" to the glass phase with exponentially slow dynamics [21, 22]. Intuitively, it seems undesirable to have the factor-background interaction be in the glass phase for effective gene regulation. The upper bound we obtained above for H provides an explicit illustration of this intuitive preference. We note that the specificities computed for the factors with known energy matrices indeed lie within our bound; see Table I.

Physical Constraints and Functional Demands

We now seek to understand the combined effect of the thermodynamic occupancy and kinetic accessibility conditions on the allowed parameters for factor-DNA interaction. To this end, we apply the constraints to the explicit two-state model (7). Within the annealed approximation (6), the thermodynamic occupancy condition (4)

⁷ Here we have assumed that the non-specific binding energy $E_{\rm ns}$ is sufficiently large that it does neither dominate the thermodynamics, nor the dynamics. We will verify this assumption below for the relevant parameter regimes.



FIG. 3 (a) Plot of the two bounds (11) [dashed line] and (12) [solid line] as a function of the discrimination energy ε , using $\Gamma = 10^7$, $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm max} = 1000$ and a representative value of $\Delta^{\rm max} = 7k_BT$. The dotted line indicates $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$, and the symbols mark the parameter sets whose characteristic is shown in (b). See text for discussion. (b) Plot of the functional characteristic $N_{\rm TF}^*(r^*)$ for four different parameter sets indicated by the symbols in (a).

implies

$$L > L_1(\varepsilon) = \frac{\ln \Gamma - \ln N_{\rm TF}^{\rm max}}{\ln \zeta_b(\varepsilon)} .$$
 (11)

This condition is equivalent to $\Gamma/N_{\text{TF}}^{\text{max}} < \zeta_b^L$, and expresses the fact that the target length L must be sufficiently long so that the probability of finding a particular L-mer in a random sequence of character size ζ_b and length $\Gamma/N_{\text{TF}}^{\text{max}}$ is small. On the other hand, the kinetic constraint (10) can be expressed as an upper bound on the length of the binding sequence: For the two-state model, we find E_0 within the annealed approximation to be given by $\beta E_0 = e_0 \cdot L$, where $e_0 = \varepsilon/(1 + \frac{1}{3}e^{\varepsilon})$; together with Eq. (6), the kinetic constraint (10) becomes

$$L < L_2(\varepsilon) = \frac{\beta \Delta^{\max}}{\ln \zeta_b(\varepsilon) - e_0(\varepsilon)} .$$
 (12)

Fig. 3a shows the two bounds (11) [dashed line] and (12) [solid line] as a function of the discrimination energy ε , using a representative value of $\Delta^{\max} = 7k_BT$ with which the dynamics at the potential trap sites are slowed down by a factor of $e^{\beta\Delta^{\max}} \approx 10^3$. The discrimination energy ε has to stay in the range between the dashed and the solid line, which is of order k_BT for large L and vanishes for L below ~ 10 . Taken together, the thermodynamic and the kinetic constraints therefore lead to a limited 'allowed region' in the (ε, L) parameter space. Note that the observed data for the well-studied factors is compatible with this result, since the discrimination energies are typically in the range from 1 to $3k_BT$, while the energy matrices have about 10 to 14 significant positions.

So far, we considered the interaction of the factors with the genomic background which lead us to general physical constraints on the interaction parameters. We now take a different perspective, focusing on the biological function of factor-target binding in the context of typical demands arising in gene regulation.

The bacterial cell specifies factor-DNA binding by setting the desired threshold $N_{\rm TF}^*$ such that the binding probability to a target site is small if $N_{\rm TF} < N_{\rm TF}^*$ and large if $N_{\rm TF} > N_{\rm TF}^*$. When a factor has only a single target in the genome, the desired threshold $N_{\rm TF}^*$ can be implemented either by choosing the correct combination of interaction parameters (i.e., ε and L within the two-state model) or by choosing a binding sequence with the correct binding energy, $E_t(N_{\rm TF}^*) = F_b + k_B T \ln N_{\rm TF}^*$. However, oftentimes the same factor is needed to bind to several different target sites to regulate the expression of genes in different targets can be required:

Consider for example a case where a particular transcription factor X is involved in the regulation of two operons, A and B. Suppose it is desired that X activates the transcription of operon A on its own at a concentration N_X , while operon B is *only* activated if X is present (at the concentration N_X) together with another factor Y that can bind cooperatively with X. It is then desirable to have a strong binding site for X in the regulatory region of operon A such that its threshold $N_{X,A}^* < N_X$, and a weak binding site in the regulatory region of operon B, with a threshold $N_{X,B}^* \gg N_X$. The latter insures that operon B will not be accidentally activated by fluctuations in N_X alone, and only when the factor Y is present would the attractive interaction between X and Y induce the two to bind to their targets. Another example where different thresholds may be desirable functionally is to produce temporal *order* in the expression of different operons, as the concentration of the controlling factor gradually changes over time. This was observed recently in E. coli flagella assembly [23] and SOS response (U. Alon, private communication).

A straightforward way to set the threshold for each of the target sites individually is to select the appropriate binding energy $E_t(N_{\rm TF}^*)$ for each target by choosing the binding sequence. Thus a superior functional characteristic of the factor-DNA interaction is to yield maximal control of $N_{\rm TF}^*$ to the choice of binding sequence; we refer to factors with such attributes as *programmable*. In the following, we examine which parameter sets (ε, L) within the physically allowed region provide the best functional characteristics.

Within the two-state model, $\beta E_t = r \cdot \varepsilon$, where r is the number of mismatches of the target sequence from the best binder. Using (6), the target sequence to produce a desired threshold N_{TF}^* should contain

$$r^* = [L \ln \zeta_b(\varepsilon) + \ln N_{\rm TF}^* - \ln \Gamma]/\varepsilon \tag{13}$$

mismatches. We regard $N_{\rm TF}^*(r^*)$ as a key functional characteristic of the factor-DNA system. To illustrate the different characteristics of the system at different points within the allowed region, we plot $N_{\rm TF}^*(r^*)$ in Fig. 3b for four representative parameter sets (ε, L) marked with symbols in Fig. 3a. In order to aid the ensuing discussion, the dotted line in Fig. 3a indicates $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$, i.e. the line where a single factor suffices to occupy the best binding sequence.

The system described by the parameter set ($\varepsilon =$ 2.5, L = 9 located close to the intersection between $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1000)$ and $L_2(\varepsilon)$ and marked by a circle in Fig. 3a is not very programmable since no choice of r^* can set $N^*_{\rm TF}$ below 300. This limits the utility of this system and should be regarded an undesirable characteristic. Generally, this characteristic is shared by all systems with $L < L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$. In contrast, for the parameter set ($\varepsilon = 2.0, L = 15$), located at the intersection of $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$ with $L_2(\varepsilon)$ [square], different $N^*_{\rm TF}$ can be set by different r^* with a 10-fold resolution, since for $r^* = 0 \sim 3$, N_{TF}^* changes from 1 to 1000. This system is thus programmable. For the parameter set ($\varepsilon = 1.7, L = 20$) [diamond] above $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$, the target sites with less than 2 mismatches are always occupied. While this does not diminish the programmability of the system, there is no apparent functional gain either, and 2 positions in the binding region seem superfluous, eventually leading to their loss by mutation. Furthermore, a cost is associated with longer binding sites, since these require bigger transcription factors (or multimers). For these reasons, systems with L considerably above $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$ are in general unlikely to be selected. Finally, for the parameter set ($\varepsilon = 1.3, L = 20$) [triangle] located along $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$, the system also pays the price of the large factors required for large L, but appears to be more programmable on first sight, since $N_{\rm TF}^*$ can be set to a resolution of 3-fold. However, this seeming advantage may not be realized for two reasons: (i) Statistical fluctuations in $N_{\rm TF}$ and thermal fluctuation of the target occupancy strongly limit the potential for fine tuning of $N_{\rm TF}^*$, and (ii) the heterogeneity of the energy matrix $\mathcal{E}_i(S_i)$ (i.e. the deviation from the twostate model) can be exploited to fine tune $N_{\rm TF}^*$ already with the system at ($\varepsilon = 2.0, L = 15$). We conclude that the interaction parameters in the vicinity of the intersection between $L_2(\varepsilon)$ and $L_1(\varepsilon, N_{\rm TF} = 1)$ optimize the programmability of the system without unduly increasing the physical size of the factors.

In the above consideration we have stressed the importance of a programmable threshold $N_{\rm TF}^*$. There of course may be other situations where $N_{\rm TF}$ takes on approximate binary values of $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm OFF}$ and $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm ON}$, with the desired function that the factor is bound to the site if $N_{\rm TF} = N_{\rm TF}^{\rm ON}$ and unbound if $N_{\rm TF} = N_{\rm TF}^{\rm OFF}$. For such situations, $N_{\rm TF}^*$ can be anywhere in between $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm OFF}$ and $N_{\rm TF}^{\rm ON}$. As described in more detail in Ref. [24], the opposing forces of mutation and selection then lead to a distribution of rwhich is strongly peaked at the maximally allowed value $r(N_{\rm TF}^{\rm ON})$; see also Refs. [5, 25]. The advantage of the programmable factor-DNA systems is that they may be used to implement a wide range of desired functions.

We close this section with a discussion of the nonspecific binding, which we have neglected throughout the above analysis. Let us assume that the thermodynamics of the factor-DNA interaction is dominated by non-specific binding, and determine the range of ε and L that would be allowed by the same physical and functional considerations: Maximal programmability is achieved with a background free energy of $F_b \approx 0$. If nonspecific binding indeed dominates, then the factor binds with energy $E_{\rm ns}$ to most of the sites along the genome and F_b is given by $-k_BT\ln\Gamma + E_{\rm ns}$ rather than the expression (6). Thus, $E_{\rm ns} \approx k_B T \ln \Gamma \approx 16 k_B T$, while the right hand side of (6) is allowed to take on any positive values; this corresponds to the regime above the dotted line in Fig. 3a. The kinetic accessability condition also needs to be reevaluated for this case, with (9) replaced by $E_{\rm ns} - E_0 < \Delta^{\rm max}$. We obtain the condition $L > 9/e_0(\varepsilon)$ for $\Delta^{\max} = 7k_BT$. This opens up a limited range of allowed ε 's at and above the parameter set ($\varepsilon = 2, L = 15$). However as discussed already, the incremental advantage in function is small for large L's, so that the parameter set with the smallest L, namely ($\varepsilon = 2, L = 15$), is still favored. For very large ε 's, the annealed approximation actually breaks down and $L \cdot e_0(\varepsilon)$ becomes an underestimate of E_0 . In fact, for $L \approx 15$, kinetic accessability can be satisfied for $\varepsilon \gtrsim 5k_BT$. However, having large ε 's would strongly limit the programmability of the factor-DNA system: Since $r^* = \ln N^*_{\rm TF} / \varepsilon$ for $F_b \approx 0$, a discrimination energy of $5 k_B T$ would only allow one to set $N^*_{\rm TF}$ with a 150-fold resolution. Hence we conclude that the parameter region close to ($\varepsilon = 2.0, L = 15$) remains the optimal choice.

Summary and Outlook

In this study, we analyzed quantitatively the function of the simplest molecular component of gene regulation. We find the factor-DNA interaction can be characterized by two important numbers, (i) the free energy F_b which characterizes the relative binding strength of the genomic background, and (ii) the relative entropy H which quantifies the binding specificity; they are intrinsic properties of the factor (through the binding energy $E[\vec{S}]$) and the statistics of the genomic background. We find an upper bound for the specificity, $H < \beta \Delta^{\max}$, where $\Delta^{\rm max} \approx 5 \sim 10 k_B T$ is the maximally tolerable depth of kinetic traps presented by the preferred background sites. This upper bound, together with the criterion for thermodynamic occupancy (4), leads to a limited region of the allowed interaction parameters within the two-state model (7) for factor-DNA binding. If we further demand the functional characteristic of maximal programmability of the binding threshold, without unduly increasing the physical size of the factors, we obtain a small optimal parameter range in the vicinity of ($\varepsilon = 2.0, L = 15$).

While our optimal parameter set is rather close to the typical range of the discrimination energy and binding length known for several well-studied transcription factors, we note that the precise values depend on the specific choice for Δ^{\max} , and should not be taken too liter-

ally. Furthermore, the two-state model itself is only an approximation that allows us to get a quantitative sense of the possible behavior. On the other hand, our characterization of the factor-DNA interaction by F_b and His independent of the two-state model and also largely independent of the additive form (1) assumed for the interaction energy. The physical constraints (4) and (10)on these two quantities should apply as long as there is a broad distribution of binding energies $E[\vec{S}]$ for the ensemble of random sequences. These constraints, together with the desirable functional property of 'maximal programmability' of the binding threshold, can be reformulated generally in terms of H and F_b , resulting in the conditions $H \approx \beta \Delta^{\text{max}} \approx 5 \sim 10$ and $F_b \approx 0$ (within a few $k_B T$'s). The values of F_b and H for the factors with known binding energy matrices are listed in Table I and are consistent with these conditions. These findings lead us to postulate that maintaining high programmability might be a design principle guiding the selection of factor-DNA interaction, and predict that a large class of transcription factors follows this optimal choice of interaction parameters. This prediction can be verified with biochemical experiments. In particular, it would be useful to measure the thermodynamic observables F_b and H directly for a large number of factors (rather than inferring them from the much more tedious measurement of the complete binding energy matrix $\mathcal{E}_i(S)$, and see whether they generally lie in the predicted region.

The basic issue discussed here, i.e., the recognition of a target in the presence of a random background, is of interest not only to the factor-DNA binding problem, but also to a broader class of molecular recognition systems. Obvious examples are recognition of small ligand molecules by receptors, and the binding of proteins to each other. In fact, an interaction model similar in spirit to ours was already proposed in the context of ligand recognition in olfactory systems several years ago [26]. All of these molecular recognition systems must satisfy the same constraints of thermodynamic occupancy and kinetic accessibility, as we showed for the factor-DNA system, although the relevant properties of the "background" (e.g., the effective number of states) become more difficult to quantify. However, as long as the molecular interaction involved is not too cooperative (i.e., graded rather than drastic changes in binding between similar targets) and the distribution of the different types of molecules constituting the background is not too specifically arranged (so that the histogram of binding background energies is smooth), we expect the salient features of our finding to be of relevance. In particular, we expect a small fraction of the background states with natural high affinity to the factor to serve as potential kinetic traps. We hope that our study will stimulate quantitative, statistical characterization of the "background" for whichever molecular recognition system one analyzes, because the background is as important as the target which most current studies focus on. Finally, the programmable aspect of factor-DNA interaction leads one to question whether

the design of protein-protein interaction might be guided by a similar principle.

Acknowledgments

It is a pleasure to acknowledge useful discussions with G. Stormo, P. von Hippel, and K. Sneppen on many aspects of factor-DNA interaction. We are also grateful to the hospitality of the Institute for Theoretical Physics in Santa Barbara where some of the work was carried out. This research is supported in part by the National Science Foundation through Grant Nos. DMR-9971456. UG is supported additionally by a German DAAD fellowship, and TH by a Burroghs-Wellcome functional genomics award.

References

- McKnight, S.L. & Yamamoto, K.R., eds. (1992) Transcriptional regulation (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press, Plainview, N.Y.)
- [2] Neidhardt, F.C., ed. (1996) Escherichia coli and Salmonella: cellular and molecular biology (ASM Press, Washington D.C.)
- [3] von Hippel, P.H. (1979) in *Biological regulation and development*, ed. Goldberger, R.F. (Plenum, New York) 279–347.
- [4] von Hippel, P.H. & Berg, O.G. (1986) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 83 1608–1612.
- [5] Berg, O.G. & von Hippel, P.H. (1987) J. Mol. Biol. 193 723–750.
- [6] deHaseth, P.L., Gross, C.A., Burgess, R.R. & Record, M.T. Jr. (1977) *Biochemistry* 16 4777-4783.
- [7] Record, M.T., Jr., deHaseth, P.L. & Lohman, T.M. (1977) Biochemistry 16 4791–4796.
- [8] Kao-Huang, Y., Revzin, A., Butler, A.P., O'Conner, P., Noble, D.W. & von Hippel, P.H. (1977) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 74 4228–4232.
- [9] Berg, O.G., Winter, R.B. & von Hippel, P.H. (1981) Biochemistry 20 6929–6948.
- [10] Winter, R.B. & von Hippel, P.H. (1981) Biochemistry 20 6948–6960.
- [11] Winter, R.B., Berg, O.G. & von Hippel, P.H. (1981) Biochemistry 20 6961–6977.
- [12] Fields, D.S., He, Y., Al-Uzri, A.Y. & Stormo, G.D. (1997) J. Mol. Biol. 271, 178–194.
- [13] Stormo, G.D. & Fields, D.S. (1998) Trends in Biochemical Sciences 23, 109–113.
- [14] Sarai, A. & Takeda, Y. (1989) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 86, 6513–6517.
- [15] Takeda, Y., Sarai, A. & Rivera, V.M. (1989) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 86, 439–443.
- [16] Frank, D.E., Saecker, R.M., Bond, J.P., Capp, M.W., Tsodikov, O.V., Melcher, S.E., Levandoski, M.M. & Record, M.T., Jr. (1997) J. Mol. Biol. 267 1186–1206.
- [17] Pabo, C.O. & Sauer, R.T. (1992) Annu. Rev. Biochem.
 61 1053–1095.
- [18] Landau, L.D. & Lifshitz, E.M. (1980) Statistical Physics (Reed, Oxford).
- [19] Derrida, B. (1981) Phys. Rev. B 24 2613–2626.

- [20] Bryngelson, J.D. & P.G. Wolynes (1987) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 84 7524–7528.
- [21] Binder, K. & Young, A.P. (1986) Rev. Mod. Phys. 58 801–976.
- [22] Marinari, E. & Hwa, T. (2001) unpublished.
- [23] Kalir, S., McClure, J., Pabbaraju, K., Southward, C., Ronen, M., Leibler, S., Surette, M.G. & Alon, U. (2001)

Science **292** 2080–2083.

- [24] Gerland, U. & Hwa, T. (2001) submitted to J. Mol. Evol.; preprint physics/0112039.
- [25] Sengupta, A.M. & B.I. Shraiman, 2001, submitted for publication.
- [26] Lancet, D., Sadovsky, E. & Seidemann, E. (1993) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 90 3715–3719.