

Comment on “Chain Length Scaling of Protein Folding Time”

In a recent Letter, Gutin, Abkevich, and Shakhnovich [1] reported on a series of dynamical Monte Carlo simulations on lattice models of proteins. Based on these highly simplified models, they found that four different potential energies lead to four different folding time scales τ_f , where τ_f scales with chain length as N^λ (see, also, Refs. [2-4]), with λ ranging from 2.7 to 6.0. However, because of the lack of microscopic models of protein folding dynamics, the interpretation and origin of the data have remained somewhat speculative. It is the purpose of this Comment to point out that the application of a simple “mesoscopic” model of protein folding [2] provides a quantitative interpretation of the data, as well as a major qualitative difference with Ref. [1].

The main features of the theory [2] are as follows. Consistent with the heuristic arguments regarding the entropic cost of loop formation [1,3], we model the acquisition of native-like features by considering the full set of loops or links of an ideal chain of N monomers, and a target state defined by a unique set of $N/2$ “native-like” links. Folding is tuned by a *microscopic* frustration parameter Δ , defined as the contact energy ratio δ/ε between random and native-like links, respectively. For a finite chain, the model has an effective folding transition temperature $T_f(N) \sim (1 - \Delta)/\ln N$, between random conformations and native-like structures. At $T_f(N)$, a bimodal distribution on the number of non-native contacts is observed, whereas away from $T_f(N)$ distributions are unimodal. We point out that the latter is commonly associated with “cooperativity” [1]. However, we predict the size of the critical folding nucleus to be proportional to the size of the system. The same conclusion is found based on exact enumerations of self-avoiding walks [5]. In agreement with the ideal “minimally frustrated” Go model $\lambda^{Go} \simeq 2.7$ [1], optimal folding to fully equilibrated native-like structures takes place in an entropic dominated time scale $\tau_f \sim N^{\lambda_0}$, where $\lambda_0 \simeq 3$. The striking prediction of the theory is that at the transition $T_f(N)$ —which, in all likelihood, corresponds to the “optimal” temperature estimated using mean first passage time simulations [1]— $\tau_f(T_f) \sim N^\lambda$, where $\lambda \simeq 4$ (see Fig. 1), the same behavior *now* being confirmed by simulations [1] on specially designed fast folding sequences!

This scaling breaks down when the frustration limited folding time scale $\tau_\Delta \sim N^{\lambda_0} \exp(a\varepsilon\Delta/T)$ becomes larger than τ_f , $a \sim O(1)$ being a constant. These scaling forms predict that, for small enough $\Delta \lesssim 1/3$, proteins fold fast in a unique range of temperatures roughly independent of size and structural specificities, i.e. $T_\Delta(N) < T < T_f(N)$, where T_Δ is a dynamically determined transition temperature at which $\tau_f \simeq \tau_\Delta$. Below T_Δ the relaxation is slow, following an Arrhenius law [1] (higher energy barriers not included here may also be important in this regime). If $T_f(N) < T_\Delta(N)$ frustration dominates altogether, and folding can be extremely slow [2], with

$$\tau_f(T_f) \sim N^{\lambda_0 + 2\Delta/(1-\Delta)}. \quad (1)$$

Simulations have shown that different potential energies have different landscapes with different degrees of frustration [1,4]. The model averages frustration into a single *model dependent* parameter Δ . As sketched in Fig. 3 of Ref. [2], random or frustration dominated sequences with $\Delta \lesssim 1/2$ will not be able to fold in a physically relevant time scale. Equating $\lambda^{RAN} \simeq 6$ with the exponent in (1), we find $\Delta^{RAN} \simeq 3/5$, which is quite appropriate for a random selection of contact energies (cf. [2]).

It has been claimed that these results can be understood in the context of a first-order-like folding transition [1]. However, it is well known that near a first-order transition different relaxation times grow in different ways. In particular, these authors have also argued about the existence of a macroscopic barrier between native and non-native states (“cooperativity”). Thus, if this barrier needs to be crossed over, the relaxation must then be exponential in N ! On the contrary, we find an effective second order folding transition, where at $T_f(N)$ any typical relaxation time must grow as a power of N . In summary, the data in [1] is accounted for by [2], giving further credence to the cross-linking model, and emphasizing the role of loop formation in folding kinetics.

Support from Fondecyt Nr. 3940016 is acknowledged.

Carlos J. Camacho

Facultad de Física, Universidad Católica de Chile
Casilla 306, Santiago 22, Chile

PACS numbers: 87.15.By, 82.20.Db, 05.70.Fh, 64.60.Cn

- [1] A.M. Gutin *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5433 (1996).
- [2] C.J. Camacho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2324 (1996).
- [3] D. Thirumalai, J. Phys. (Paris) **5**, 1457 (1995).
- [4] C.J. Camacho and D. Thirumalai, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **90**, 6369 (1993).
- [5] C.J. Camacho and T. Schanke, cond-mat/9604174.

FIG. 1. Folding time scale at the transition as a function of size N . The slopes correspond to $3.8 \pm .25$ ($\Delta = 0$) and $4.3 \pm .2$ ($\Delta = 1/3$) [2]. For details of master equation see [2].