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#### Abstract

Genetic engineering has produced a transgenic insectresistant plant which produces a serine protease inhibitor (Hilder et al., 1987). More insects can be targetted if a plant can be made to produce thiol protease inhibitors. Hence this project attempts to do some preliminary work - purification and gene isolation of thiol protease inhibitors, which is necessary before plants resistant to insects using thiol proteinases as their digestive enzymes can be created.

It is known that cowpea seeds contain thiol protease inhibitors. However, their protein sequences have never been elucidated. In the first part of the project, it was attempted to obtain a pure thiol protease inhibitor. This was so that its sequence could be determined partially to construct an oligonucleotide probe to pick the gene coding for it from a cDNA library.

\section*{$\rho$}

In the second part of the project, it-was attempted to isolate the gene coding for the bromelain inhibitor of pineapple, to clone it $\mu \mathrm{p}$, and to sequence it. Though the sequence of this inhibitor has been known for years, its gene has never been isolated or sequenced.
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| ABBREVIATIONS |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| The abbreviations used throughout the dissertation were |  |
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| Biochemical Journal "Policy of the Journal and Instruction to |  |
| Authors", vol. 209, pp 1-27, 1983. Other notations used are |  |
| listed below. |  |
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| BSA | bovine serum albumin |
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| IPTG | Isopropyl B-D-thio-galactopyranoside |
| m.wt., mw | relative molecular weight |
| - ligos | oligonucleotides |
| PAGE | polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis |
| PCR | polymerase chain reaction |
| PEG | polyethylene glycol |
| SDS | sodium dodecyl sulphate |
| SSC | saline sodium citrate |
| TEMED | N, $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime}, \mathrm{N}^{\prime}$-tetramethylethylemediamine |
| Tris, Tris.Cl | Tris (hydroxymethyl) methylamine |
| X-gal | 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl-B-galactoside |
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## Chapter I

Introduction

## 1: INTRODUCTION

## 1.1: Genetic Engineering to produce insect-resistant crops

Substantial crop losses occur each year due to attacks by insect pests. These are largely controlled by spraying crops with large quantities of agrochemicals, which is not only expensive but can also have detrimental effects on ecosystems. Many cultivars of crop species already exhibit resistance to pests to some extent, but pest evolution forces the plant breeder to continually produce new resistant varieties. Radical changes in the type of resistance conferred are required. Some possibilities have been proposed, involving transfer of genes or groups of genes encoding the following to crop plants; antimetabolite proteins such as lectins or enzyme inhibitors; viral coat proteins; the enzymes chitinase and B-glucanase, the cell wall protein extensin ; and bacterial insecticidal toxins, such as that produced by Bacillus thuringiensis. Expression of these products throughout the aerial parts of a plant may enhance resistance but must occur without detrimental effects upon the plant or to the consumer. One disadvantage of expressing an extra gene could be a drain of the plant's resources, hence decreasing its yield, thus one can try to put in a regulatable promoter which switches on the gene only at a certain stage of development when the plant is most susceptible or which expresses the foreign gene only in a certain susceptible organ. Another possibility is to have the gene triggered by a wound or by the infection itself.

A promising set of such genes is the wound-induced protease inhibitors. After certain plants are wounded mechanically or by a
chewing insect, "protease inhibitor inducing factor" (PIIF) is released and this induces the systemic synthesis of several protein protease inhibitors. These inhibitors are directed against insect and microbial proteases and hence protect the plant (Ryan, 1981, 1988).

The bacterium B. thuringiensis produces toxins that are toxic to specific insects, depending on the strain used. These bacteria have been used as biological insecticides for over a quarter of a century. The gene coding for its toxins has recently been introduced into tobacco (Vaek et al., 1987) and tomato (Fischoff, 1987). However, the limited range of pests against which it is toxic to is a great disadvantage.

A plant protein that can confer resistance to a wide range of pests is the cowpea trypsin inhibitor. As its metabolic target is the catalytic site of an enzyme, the ability of the insects to evolve a resistance mechanism based on mutation at this site would be minimal. Furthermore, cowpea seeds are not toxic to humans. It has been shown that when the gene encoding this inhibitor is transferred to tobacco, the plant shows enhanced resistance to its own insect pests (Hilder et al., 1987). Such "protease inhibitors" may be able to make plants fight off a much wider range of insects than do the toxins from $B$. thuringiensis. A big advantage of transgenic plants that make their own insecticides is that only insects that attack the plants are affected. Such transgenic plants are now a possibility, encompassing a wide range of plants, due to the rapid development of new techniques in genetic engineering.

## 1.2: Genetic engineering

Genetic engineering is the artificial recombination of nucleic acid molecules in the test tube, their insertion into a virus, bacterial plasmid, or other vector system, and the subsequent incorporation of the chimaeric molecules into the host organism in which they are capable of continued propagation. The basis of crop breeding is the transfer of genetic information between plants in order to develop desired phenotypes. However, genetic engineering allows directed and highly specific manipulation of the genetic material. Recombinant DNA technology also broadens the possibilities of transferring genes between unrelated organisms, and creating novel genetic information by the specific alteration of cloned genes. It has not yet been perfected to a sufficient level to allow it to be used routinely as a tool in plant breeding but it is likely to become so within the next few decades. The types of breeding situation in which recombinant DNA would be of most value are those involving transfer of a single or small group of genes from one organism to an unrelated organism (even from outside the plant kingdom) where such transfer cannot be achieved by conventional means.

Conventional plant breeding suffers from some drawbacks when breeding for insect resistance in plants. Firstly in relying on sexual fertilisation for improvement of a crop plant, the breeder is limited in the gene pool he has available by the range of plants with which it is sexually compatible. Secondly, conventional plant breeding requires a long "investment" time. On average, 12 generations of backcrossing are necessary following a successful hybridisation of two varieties of small grain cereals.

## 1.3: Methods of plant genetic engineering

Several different potentially useful systems of introducing foreign genes into plants are currently under active investigation. Agrobacterium tumefaciens has provided an effective DNA delivery system for the transformation of several dicot species. Unfortunately, infection in monocots is greatly reduced and apparently lacking in members of the Gramineae. Because of the inability of $A$. tumefaciens to infect gramnineous monocots which are the most important crop plants, exploratory research in the development of other methods for the stable transformation of grasses is being carried out by several groups. A lot of emphasis is placed in transformation by direct delivery of DNA into regenerable intact cells/protoplasts, meristems and embryos. It should be recognized, however, that transformation of one or more cells in multicellular structures will yield chimeral plants that will require a great deal of efffort before being useful for the production of pure lines containing the introduced genes

### 1.3.1: Agrobacterium tumefaciens

A. tumefaciens, a gram-negative soil bacterium, is the causative organism of Crown Gall tumour, which it can incite upon the aerial parts of most dicotyledonous plants. This property is conferred upon the bacterium by the presence of a large Ti(Tumour inducing) plasmid. During the infection process, a defined small part of the Ti-plasmid is transferred to the plant cell, where it becomes inserted into the plant chromosome. This small piece of transferred DNA, the $T$-DNA, encodes the functions which are expressed as the tumourous phenotype - rapid growth and
the production of opines (unusual tumour specific metabolites). Both these properties are maintained when the tumours are explanted into tissue culture, where Crown Gall cells proliferate without added phytohormones. Methods have been devised whereby the gene responsible for causing tumourous growth has been removed and foreign ones to be expressed added. Thus infected plants will express the foreign genes and so will plants regenerated from this infected tissue.

However, regeneration of normal healthy plants expressing the foreign gene is not achieved in all infected plant species. Also, there is a problem of limited host range for the bacterium. But the recent discovery by scientists at BioTechnica International (Cambridge, MA) that Agrobacterium can transfer plasmids other than $T i$ opens the possibility that its host range can be extended. Researchers have shown that the mobilization functions of a small, wide-host-range bacterial plasmid (RSF1010) can effectively substitute for the Ti plasmid's 25 base pair direct repeat $T$-DNA borders (considered essential for transfer to occur)(Buchanan-Wollaston et al., 1987).

### 1.3.2: Plant virus vectors

As a means of introducing DNA into the genomes of dicotyledonous plants, there is currently nothing to rival $A$. tumefaciens. However, for some applications it may be useful to use a non-integrating vector which replicates to high copy number in each cell and disseminates throughout the organism when introduced into a mature plant. Moreover, a vector for monocotyledonous crops has not yet been developed. For these


#### Abstract

reasons the only two known groups of plant DNA viruses, the Caulimoviruses and Geminiviruses are currently under investigation. Researchers have shown that geminivirus-derived vectors should also be useful for heritable gene amplification by the integration of stable master copies of the vector into the plant chromosomal DNA. Production of genetically engineered plants with increased resistance to herbicides, insects or viruses and increased yields of important plant products are applications of potential commercial value.

\subsection*{1.3.3: Other possible vector systems}


There are several other potential vectors for gene transfer to plants. They are transposable elements, maize mitochondrial elements, nuclear genomic components, RNA viruses and viroids.

### 1.3.4: Direct DNA delivery

These methods are advantageous in that they can be used with any crop species.

Researchers have managed to stably transform tobacco protoplasts with Ti-plasmid by incubating protoplasts and DNA in the presence of polyetylene glycol with a post-incubation with high Ca++ concentration (Krens et al., 1982).

Another technique, electroporation, uses electrical pulses of high field strength to permeabilize cell membranes reversibly so as to facilitate the transfer of DNA into cells. This has resulted in stably transformed cells.

Direct DNA transformation into cereal protoplasts using polyefylene glycol treatment or electroporation has been reported for the monocotyledons wheat, Italian ryegrass, maize (Fromm et al, 1986), Panicum sp. and rice.

The method of microinjection involves the introduction of DNA solutions under pressure into cellular compartments with microscopic pipettes. In one study (Crossway et al.,1986), cell lines cultured from microinjected tobacco protoplasts were shown to have integrated the foreign DNA sequences into the nuclear DNA; the average transformation frequency depended on whether the injections were intranuclear (14\%) or cytoplasmic (6\%).

All these direct methods share a big drawback: it is difficult to regenerate mature plants from protoplasts of monocotyledons. Where achieved, it is at low efficiencies. Researchers have managed to regenerate transgenic rice plants (Oryza sativa) (Kyozuka et al., 1987, Toriyama et al., 1988). Others (Rhodes et al., 1988) have also managed to regenerate transgenic maize plants by transforming them by electroporation and growing them over feeder or "nurse" cells. These, however, were found to be sterile. Some other successful monocot regenerations are for sugar cane (Srinivasan et al., 1986) and Polypogon (Chen et al., 1987). The problem of regeneration of single cells or protoplasts can, however, be totally avoided by introducing DNA into whole tissues.

Researchers can introduce DNA into whole cells either by by using microprojectiles or by microinjection.

In the former method, the projectiles, small particles of tungsten or gold coated with DNA, are accelerated by a particle gun or electric discharge so that they penetrate the outer cell wall and membrane of intact cells (Sanford et al., 1988). This method has produced stably transformed cells of tobacco and maize (Klein et al., 1988a,b,c). Recently, Agrocetus, in Wisconsin
(McCabe et al., 1988), produced fertile transgenic soya bean plants by shooting microprojectiles at meristems of immature soya bean seeds. Approximately $2 \%$ of shoots derived from these meristems via organogenesis were chimeric for expression of the introduced gene.

Another method which has been suggested to transform cereal plants without involving tissue culture techniques is by De la Pena et al., 1987. They have injected DNA into developing floral tillers of rye plants 14 days before the first meiotic metaphase of the archesporial cells. Seeds were obtained by pair-wise crossing of injected tillers from different plants. Some seeds germinated into plants which expressed the foreign DNA. The team is confident that this transformation procedure can be extended to other cereals, which have a premeiotic development equivalent to that of rye.

Transgenic wheat plants have been obtained by another method in which mature wheat embryos take up DNA by imbibition (Schell, 1987).

Other methods that have potential include gene transfer into pollen (Luo et al., 1988) and microinjection into cells of immature embryos (Neuhaus et al., 1987).

## 1.4: Natural protease inhibitors

Plants, micro-organisms and animals contain a number of proteins which have the property of forming reversible stoichiometric protein-protein complexes with various proteolytic enzymes, thus bringing about competitive inhibition of their catalytic functions.

The proteolytic enzymes found in nature can be conveniently subdivided into four main groups which are characterized by the nature of their active sites and the reaction mechanism involved. These are the serine proteases (e.g. trypsin, chymotrypsin); the thiol or cysteine proteases (papain, bromelain, ficin); the metalloproteinases (carboxypeptidases $A$ and $B$, and the aminopeptidases); and the aspartylproteases (pepsin and rennin). Nearly all of these types of enzymes have been shown to be inhibited by proteins or peptides isolated from the cells of animals, plants and micro-organisms. In some cases the proteinase inhibitors exhibit a very narrow range of specificity, being capable of inhibiting only one or two closely related proteinases, whilst others of broad specificity are active against a wide range of different enzymes.

In the plant kingdom most storage organs, such as seeds and tubers, contain from 1 to $10 \%$ of their proteins as inhibitors of various types of proteolytic enzymes (Ryan, 1981), and some fruits contain up to $50 \%$ of their proteins as inhibitors of serine endoproteinases. The function of the inhibitors in Nature appear to be twofold: (1) to prevent uncontrolled proteolysis within cells, organelles or fluids where limited proteolysis is important to biochemical or physiological processes, and (2) to protect proteins of cells, fluids or tissues from foreign proteolytic enzymes. The specific roles of most known proteinase inhibitors, however, are not well understood.

## 1.5: Protease Inhibitors as defensive chemicals

Relatively high levels of protease inhibitors are synthesized and stored in plant tissues, where they can interact
with plant pests or pathogens that attempt to consume them. The effects of protease inhibitors on insect digestive enzymes were first researched by Birk and her associates in the early 1960 s. From this and other research in many laboratories, it became clear that the defensive role of proteinase inhibitors was only a part of a complex interaction between the many defensive chemicals that are present in plants and the predators and pathogens that attack them. Plants have evolved various chemical weapons of defense against their predators over the years. This has included inhibitors of the digestive proteolytic enzymes of the attacking pests (Broadway et al., 1986).

The digestive processes of higher animals, insects, and microorganisms can differ considerably, both in the classes of the enzymes utilized for protein digestion and in their specificities. Thus in considering inhibitory activity, the mechanistic class and the peptide-bond specificity of the protease must be considered as well as structural aspects of the inhibitor that determine its ability to interact specifically with the enzyme. The association constant of the interaction must be of sufficient magnitude to inhibit the enzyme effectively. Association constants of most protease-inhibitor interactions are from $10^{6} \mathrm{M}$ to $10^{10} \mathrm{M}$, and sometimes higher.

The amino acids that comprise the reactive sites of the inhibitors have the potential to be changed by in vitro mutagenesis to produce new inhibitory specificities. This provides a basis for future strategies to design various protease inhibitor genes with different active sites to inhibit particular proteo-
lytic enzymes of specific plant pests.
The serine and cysteine endopeptidases are considered to be the most likely targets for inhibition by such engineered protease inhibitors. Both classes of enzymes have been identified in guts of herbivorous insects, and both are secreted by various microorganisms. Digestive roles in insects and microorganisms for the other two classes of proteinases, aspartyl- and metallo- have not been extensively studied and few of their inhibitors are known.

## 1.6: Purification of protease inhibitors

The isolation and purification of proteinase inhibitors from plants has involved the full range of general techniques for the separation of proteins, but in addition certain novel and special methods have been employed. Many of the plant proteinase inhibitors are extremely resistant to denaturation by heat and this property has frequently been exploited. For example, several isolation procedures include a preliminary step in which the extract or homogenized suspension is heated at $80-100^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for approximately 10 min during which period various contaminating proteins become precipitated and can be removed by filtration or centrifugation. The inhibitors themselves are left essentially unaltered by this process.

Another popular method of purification for these inhibitors involves affinity chromatography on columns containing the proteinase énzymes bound to insoluble resins or polymerized dextrans such as Sepharose. One of the attractions of this method is that crude or only partially purified extracts of plant material may
be applied to the columns at near neutral $p H$ values. As the extract passes through the column the inhibitors form stable complexes with the immobilized proteinases and are retained on the colummn during subsequent washing which removes most of the other impurities. The inhibitors can then be released from their complexes by lowering the pH and increasing the ionic concentration of the eluting buffer. Although this method of purification is attractive because of its relative speed and specificity, it does however suffer from the major drawback that partial proteolysis of the reactive site of the inhibitor may occur. Such cleavage of the reactive site results in the formation of modified forms of the inhibitor which can interfere with the further purification, particularly if a multiplicity of iso-inhibifrs are involved.

Ion-exchange chromatography has been widely employed for the separation of different proteinase inhibitors found in plant extracts. The technique has also been adapted for use in the presence of dissociating solvents such as 4 M guanidine or 8 M urea and this has permitted the separation of the dissociated protomers (sub-units) of the many inhibitors which are normally polymeric in their native form (Melville et al, 1972). The technique of iso-electric focusing has proved to be particularly useful in separating the proteins of families of iso-inhibitors where the individual components sometimes only differ from one another by slight variations in their iso-electric (pI) points.

## 1.7: Cysteine protease inhibitors

It has been shown that the larvae of Cowpea Weevils (Gate-
house et al., 1985), which thrive on cowpeas, and Colorado Potato Beetles (Wolfson et al., 1987), which consume potato and tomato leaves, employ cysteine proteases as important digestive enzymes. Thus cysteine protease inhibitors have a strong potential to control these insect pests as well as many others that might use cysteine proteases as their digestive enzymes.

Inhibitors of cysteine proteases of animal origin have now been studied in rather great detail, whereas not much is known with respect to these inhibitors from plants. The presence of inhibitors of cysteine proteinases has been demonstrated in barley, wheat, and rye seeds (Fossum, 1970), seeds of legumes (Goldstein et al., 1973, Rele et al., 1980), corn (K. Abe et al., 1980, 1988), rice (M. Abe et al., 1985, 1987a, 1987b, 1988), pumpkin seeds (Zimacheva et al., 1988) and potato tubers (Rodis et al., 1984, Zimacheva et. al, 1984, Brzin et al., 1988). The best studied inhibitor of cysteine proteases was isolated from pineapple stem (Reddy et al., 1975).

## 1.8: Obtaining the gene

The first step towards producing transgenic insectresistant crops would be to isolate the gene for the inhibitor from its native organism. When a protein has been known to effectively affect insects and if it has been isolated and its sequence known in full or partially, oligonucleotides to a few consecutive amino acids of the proteins can be constructed. These can be used to probe a cDNA library or genomic library for the gene or if the oligonucleotides are complementary to the ends of the gene, they can be used to isolate the gene from the genome of
the native organism by polymerase chain reaction (see below). Once the gene has been isolated and further amplified by cloning into bacteria, it can be sequenced or expressed in yeast and studied in more detail before inserting into plants.

### 1.8.1: Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)

The polymerase chain reaction is capable of enriching a specific DNA sequence by a factor of $10^{6}$ within just a few hours, hence greatly facilitating a variety of subsequent analytical manipulations.

The polymerase chain reaction amplification involves two oligonucleotide primers that flank the DNA segments to be amplified and repeated cycles of heat denaturation of the DNA, annealing of the primers to their complementary sequences, and extension of the annealed primers with DNA polymerase. These primers anneal to opposite strands of the target sequence and are oriented such that DNA synthesis by the polymerase proceeds across the region between the primers, hence doubling the amount of that DNA segment. Since the amplified DNA segment is also capable of binding primers, each successive cycle doubles the amount of DNA synthesized in the previous cycle.

Previously, the polymerase used was the Klenow fragment of Escherichia coli DNA Polymerase I. However, a recently discovered thermostable DNA polymerase (Taq) purified from the thermophilic bacterium, Thermophilus aquaticus, that can survive extended incubation at $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ has simplified the procedure tremendously (Saiki et al., 1988). The process can now be automated as the polymerase does not have to be replenished after the denaturation step. The overall performance of the reaction is also improved by
increased specificity, yield, sensitivity, and length of targets that can be amplified.

A significant improvement in specificity is obtained when the temperature of the primer annealing step is raised from $40^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to $55^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The optimal temperature for annealing, however, depends on the template DNA and the oligonucleotide primers. This can be determined only by trial and error.

The sensitivity of this method is very high. It has been suggested that a single molecule in $10^{5}$ to $10^{6}$ can be amplified.

Whereas the Klenow polymerase could not sustain the exponential accumulation of DNA sequences much greater than 250bp, the Taq polymerase, in contrast, can readily effect the synthesis of segments longer than 400 bp . With longer primers and longer extension times, this enzyme can even amplify genomic target sequences, longer than 3 kb .

## 1.9: Aims of project

As cysteine protease inhibitors are potentially useful in conferring resistance to plants from insects and microorganisms if expressed, this project attempts to accomplish the following: (1) purify a cysteine protease inhibitor from cowpea that its sequence might be known and hence its gene picked out from a cowpea cDNA and hence genomic library.
(2) find out the gene sequence of another cysteine protease inhibitor (bromelain inhibitor from pineapple) whose protein sequence has already been elucidated (Reddy et al., 1975).

It is hoped that these genes may some time in the future be inserted into plants to make them resistant to insects and microorganisms utilising cysteine proteases.

# Chapter II <br> Materials and Methods 

## 2: MATERIALS AND METHODS

## 2.1: Materials

### 2.1.1: Chemicals and biological reagents

Reagents, unless otherwise specified, were purchased from BDH Chemicals Ltd., Poole, England. The following materials were purchased from the designated sources.

Acrylamide
N,N'-methylene-bis-acrylamide
Ampicillin
Azo-albumin
BAPNA
BSA
Bromelain Inhibitor
EGTA
Ethidium Bromide
L-Cysteine
Lysozyme
Papain
Papain-Agarose
SDS Molecular Weight Markers (Dalton Mark VII-L): Sigma Chemical Co. Ltd., Poole, Dorset, England

Agarose: Bethesda Research Laboratories, Inc., Cambridge, England.

Bacto-agar: Difco Laboratories, Detroit, Michigan, USA.
Calf intestinal alkaline phosphatase: Boehringer Corporation Ltd., London.

DEAE cellulose: Whatman BioSystems Ltd., Kent, England.
DNA amplification reagents: GeneAmp, Perkin Elmer Cetus.
DNA from pineapple, oligonucleotides: a gift from Dr. Vaughn Hilder

DH5 $\propto$ competent cells: Bethesda Research Laboratories Life Technologies, Inc., Uxbridge, Middlesex, England.

Dialysis tubing: Medicel International Ltd., London.

IPTG: Northumbria Biologicals Ltd., Northumberland, England. Nick-translation kit: Amersham Laboratories, Buckinghamshire, England.

Nitrocellulose filters (BA85, 0.45mm): Schleicher and Schull, Anderman and Co. Ltd., Surrey, U.K.

One-Phor-All Buffer Plus: Pharmacia LKB Biotechnology.
Plasmids: Boehringer mannheim GmbH, West Germany.
Restriction enzymes: Northumbria Biologicals Ltd., Northumberland, England.

Sephacryl 200, Sephadex G-50: Pharmacia AB, Laboratory Separation Division, Uppsala, Sweden.

T4 DNA ligases: Boehringer Corporation Ltd., London.
TG2 cells: Amersham Laboratories, Buckinghamshire, England.
Trypticase Peptone: Becton Dickinson, Microbiology systems, Cockeysville, USA.

X-gal: Northumbria Biologicals Ltd., Northumberland, England. Yeast extract: Oxoid Ltd., Basingstoke, Hampshire, England 3MM paper: Whatman Ltd., Maidstone, Kent, U.K.

### 2.1.2: Buffers

### 2.1.2.A: Phosphate buffer

A stock of 0.2 M Phosphate buffer, pH 7.6 was made. This was done by adding 43.5 ml of $0.2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}$ to 6.5 ml of $0.2 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{NaH} \mathrm{NO}_{4}$. To make larger volumes, a similar ratio was used, checking with a pH meter. On dilution to lower ionic strengths, it was made sure that the correct pH was obtained by adding more of $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{HPO}_{4}$ to increase alkalinity or by adding more of $\mathrm{NaH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}$ to increase acidity.

### 2.1.2.B: Tris-HCl buffer

To make 50 ml of stock 0.1 M Tris-HCl buffer, 50 ml of 0.1 M Tris solution was made and to this was added concentrated HCl, drop by drop with stirring until the correct $p H$ was obtained on the pH meter.

### 2.1.2.C: TAE buffer

TAE buffer (Alec's buffer) 10X
Tris base --------------- 48.5 g
EDTA ------------------- 3.7 g
Made up to pH 7.7 with glacial acetic acid and to 1 litre with distilled water.

Running buffer
TAE buffer 1X
2.1.2.D: TE buffer
pH 7.6 TE buffer
Tris.Cl ( pH 7.6 ) ------- 10 mM

```
EDTA (pH 8.0) ----------- 1mM
```


### 2.1.2.E: TBE buffer

TBE buffer stock (5X)

```
Tris-borate ------------ 54g
Boric acid ------------- 27.5g
EDTA (0.5M, pH8.0) ----- 20ml
```

Made up to 1 litre with distilled water. Diluted to 1 X for
working solution.
2.1.2.F: G-50 buffer
NaCl -------------------- 2.63 g
EDTA -------------------- 1.12 g
Tris.Cl ----------------- 1.82 g
SDS -------------------- $0.3 g$
Made up to 300 ml with distilled water and HCl added to pH 7.5 .

### 2.1.3: Solutions

### 2.1.3.A: Miniprep solutions

Solution 1
EDTA ( 0.2 M ) ------------ 5 ml
Tris (1.0M, pH 8.0) ---- 2.5 ml
D-glucose -------------- 0.9 g
Made up to 100 ml with distilled water. Made up fresh before use.
Solution 2 ( NaOH - SDS)
$\mathrm{NaOH}(1 \mathrm{M})-------------2 \mathrm{ml}$
SDS (20\%) -------------- 0.5 ml
Made up to 10 ml with distilled water. The final solution was not put on ice. This was to prevent the SDS from precipitating out.

```
The solution was made fresh.
Solution 3 ( K(3M)Ac(5M) )
KAC (5M) --------------- 6ml
Glacial acetic acid ---- 1.15ml
Made up to 10ml with distilled water.
2.1.3.B: S.O.C.
Trypticase peptone ----- 2.0g
Yeast extract ---------- 0.5g
NaCl (1M) -------------- 1ml
KCl (1M) --------------- 0. 0. 2ml
MgCl}\mp@subsup{2}{2}{},\mp@subsup{\textrm{MgSO}}{4}{}(2\textrm{M})\ldots.-.-- 1m
Glucose (2M) ----------- 1ml
Made up to 100ml with distilled water. Stored in aliquots at 4 4
```


### 2.1.3.C: Agarose beads (Agarose gel dye)

```
The gel dye for the agarose gels was made with the
following:
Glycerol ---------------- 3.125 ml
Tris (50mM, pH 7.7) ---- 2 ml
EDTA ( \(0.2 \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{pH} 8\) ) ------0.5ml
Distilled water -------- 4.375 ml
Agarose ----------------- 20 mg
Bromophenol blue ------- 10 mg
Xylene cyanol ---------- 10 mg
The above mixture was auatoclaved and cooled, then squeezed
through a syringe with a fine needle attached.
```

```
2.1.3.D: RNase
    To prepare a stock RNase solution that was free of DNase,
pancreatic RNase was dissolved at a concentration of 10mg/ml in
distilled water. This was heated to }100\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{C}\mathrm{ for 15min, allowed to
cool slowly at room temperature, dispensed into aliquots, and
stored at -20' C.
2.1.3.E: Polyacrylamide gel solutions
Main gel stock (mini gel)
Acrylamide ------------- 30g
bis-acrylamide --------- 1g
Made up to 100mls with distilled water.
Stacking gel stock
Acrylamide ------------- 30g
bis-acrylamide --------- 0.344g
Made up to 100ml with distilled water.
SDS Sample Buffer (2X)
Tris -------------------- 4.844g
SDS -------------------- 4g
Sucrose ----------------- 20g
Made up to 100ml with distilled water and adjusted to pH 6.8.
Tris/SDS/Glycine Running Buffer Stock (10X)
Glycine ---------------- 141g
Tris -------------------- 30g
SDS --------------------- 10g
This was made up to 1 litre with distilled water. Diluted to 1 X for working buffer.
```


## Kenacid Blue R Stain

Kenacid R ---------------1g
Methanol ---------------- 1 l

Glacial acetic acid ---- 0.141
Made up to 2 litres with distilled water.

## 12.5\% Main Gel

The main gels used were $12.5 \%$ gels. This was made by adding the following (for 2 mini gels):

Main gel stock --------- 4.4 ml
Tris (1M, pH 8.8) ------ 4.5 ml

Distilled water -------- 1.96 ml
This mixture was degased in a Buchner flask connected to a vacuum generated by water pressure. Then the following was added:

Ammonium persulphate --- 0.3 ml
(a freshly made
solution of $15 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ )
$10 \%$ SDS 0.12 ml

TEMED ------------------0. $0.004 m 1$

The TEMED was added just before the gel was poured as TEMED
starts polymerization.
Stacking Layer Gel
The following was mixed in a separate buchner flask:
Stacking gel stock ----- 1.0 ml
Tris (1M, pH 6.8) ------ 1.25 ml
Distilled water -------- 7.32 ml
The mixture was degased then the following added:

```
Ammonium sulphate ------ 0.33g
(Freshly made
at 15mg/ml)
10% SDS ---------------- 0.1ml
```

TEMED

### 2.1.3.F: $10 \%$ SDS

10 g of SDS was dissolved in 90 ml of distilled water. This was heated to $68^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to assist dissolution. The pH was adjusted to 7.2 by adding a few drops of concentrated HCl. The volume was adjusted to 100 ml . This was then autoclaved.
2.1.3.G: 20X SSC
$\mathrm{NaCl}-----------------17.5 \mathrm{~g}$
Sodium citrate -------- 8.8 g
Distilled water -------- 80 ml
The pH was adjusted to 7.0 with NaOH and the volume adjusted to 100 ml . This was then autoclaved.
2.1.3. $\mathrm{H}: ~ \mathrm{PEG} / \mathrm{NaCl}$

Polyethylene glycol 6000 --- 20 g
NaCl ------------------------ 14.6 g
Made up to 100 ml with distilled water and sterilized by autoclaving.

### 2.1.3.I: Chloroform

Chloroform ------------------ 96 ml
Isoamyl alcohol ------------ 4 ml
The above is mixed and stored at room temperature in a closed bottle.

### 2.1.3.J: Southern filter hybridization solutions

Denhardt's solution (50X)
Ficoll-----------------------1g

```
Polyvinylpyrrolidone ------- 1g
Albumin ---------------------- 1g
Made up to 100ml with distilled water and stored at
-20}\mp@subsup{}{}{\circ}\textrm{C
Prehybridization solution
50X Denhardt's solution ----------- 10ml
Denatured DNA (Boiled for 10min) -- 10mg
20X SSC ---------------------------- 15ml
10% SDS ----------------------------- 1ml
Made up to 100ml with distilled water. Freshly prepared before
use.
Hybridization solution
50X Denhardt's solution ---------- 10ml
Denatured DNA (Boiled for 10min) -- 10mg
Denatured 32P-labeled probe
DNA (Boiled for 10min) -------------- 0.5-1\mug
20X SSC ----------------------------- 15ml
10% SDS ------------------------------- 1ml
Made up to 100ml with distilled water.
```


### 2.1.4: Bacteriological Media

### 2.1.4.A: YT-amp-Xgal agar

```
YT agar (1X)
Distilled water -------- 1000 ml
Trypticase peptone ----- 8g
Yeast extract ---------- 5 g
NaCl -------------------- 5 g .
```

Bacto agar ------------- 15 g
The above was put in a flask or Schott bottle and autoclaved at $1 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ and at $120^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 15 minutes. After cooling till hand-hot (approximately $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), ampicillin and Xgal were added to concentrations of $0.1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ and $0.04 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ respectively. Plates were immediately poured.

Ampicillin stock solution
Ampicillin ------------- 0.2 g
70\% ethanol ------------- 20 ml
This was stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 10 ml of this was added per litre of YT agar.

X-gal stock solution
X-gal ------------------- 0.2 g
Dimethylformamide ----- 10 ml
This was stored at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 2 ml of this was added per litre of YT agar.

### 2.1.4.B: YT-amp media

YT media was made in a similar as above except that no bacto agar was added. 10 ml aliquots were put into universal bottles and autoclaved with their caps loose. Once hand-hot, 0.1 ml of ampicillin stock was added to each bottle and their caps tightened. These were stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ till required.

### 2.1.4.C: 2 X YT media

Double the amount of materials as 1 X YT media was used. No ampicillin was added.

```
2.1.4.D: Glucose/minimal medium plates
MgSO}44------------------------------4.92
Thiamine HCl ---------------------- 6.74g
CaCl2 ------------------------------- 0.29g
Glucose --------------------------- 4g
The above reagents were each dissolved in 20ml of distilled water
and autoclaved and cooled before mixing aseptically with 20ml of
an autoclaved mixture of M9 salts and 3g of agar, using the
following volumes:
MgSO}4(1M) ------------------------1m
Thiamine HCl (1M) --------------- 1ml
CaCl2
Glucose (20%) ------------------- 10ml
M9 salts were made as follows:
Na}2\mp@subsup{}{2HPO}{4 ----------------------------6g
KH2 PO
NH44Cl --------------------------------1g
NaCl ---------------------------- 0. 5g
Made up to 1 litre with distilled water and stored at 4}\mp@subsup{4}{}{\circ}\textrm{C}
2.1.4.E: H Plates
Trypticase peptone -------- 5g
NaCl ------------------------ 4g
Bacto agar -----------------7.5g
Made up to 500ml with distilled water and sterilized by auto-
claving. Plates poured when hand-hot.
```

```
2.1.4.F: H Top Agar
```

2.1.4.F: H Top Agar
Trypticase peptone -------- 2.5g

```
Trypticase peptone -------- 2.5g
```

$\mathrm{NaCl}--------------------2 \mathrm{~g}$
Bacto agar ---------------- 2 g
Made up to 250 ml with distilled water and aliquoted into 50 ml lots in glass bottles. Sterilized by autoclaving and kept at $4{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

When ready to use, the agar was melted in a microwave oven.
2.1.4.G: Fresh cells/X-gal/IPTG mix

IPTG ( 100 mM ) ------------------------ $40 \mu \mathrm{l}$
X-gal (2\% in dimethylformamide) --- $40 \mu \mathrm{l}$
Log phase E. coli cells ------ $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$
The X-gal and IPTG solutions was freshly prepared. Log phase E. coli cells were prepared by innoculating 20 ml of 2 X YT media with one drop of fresh overnight culture of TG2 cells. This was shaken at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for approximately 4 h .

## 2.2: METHODS

### 2.2.1: Protein Purification Methods

### 2.2.1.A: Extraction

One kilogram of cowpea seeds was ground in a blender and suspended in 2.51 of 100 mM Tris-HCl buffer, pH 7.5 . This was left overnight at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with stirring from a metal propeller.

### 2.2.1.B: Centrifugation

This was done at approximately $20,000 \mathrm{~g}$, the centrifugal field being calculated from the formula:

$$
\text { Centrifugal field }(g)=1118 \times 10^{-8} \times \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}^{2}
$$

where $R$ is the radius of the head and $N$ is the number of revolutions per minute. These were done in volumes of 250 ml or 50 ml .

### 2.2.1.C: Ammonium Sulphate Precipitation

This was done by adding the appropriate amount of ammonium sulphate slowly with stirring from a magnetic stirrer. The amount of ammonium sulphate required to reach the desired saturation was read off the table (Appendix 1, A1.1, Dawson et al., 1986).

### 2.2.1.D: Dialysis

For dialysis of protein, 1 m lengths of large dialysis tubing was cut and rinsed thoroughly, inside and out with distilled water. These were then boiled in distilled water for 10 mins., cooled and used immediately or stored in distilled water
at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The tubing was always handled with gloves. The dialysis was done by firstly filling the tubes with the material to be dialysed, leaving an inch or two of empty space at one end to ease osmotic pressure. Three knots were tied at each end to ensure no leakage of material. These filled dialysis tubes were then immersed in more than 5 X their volume of buffer ( 41 buckets were ideal for this) and continuous stirring was achieved with a magnetic stirrer. Frequent changes of the buffer was required and around 2 days at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was quite sufficient to get the ionic concentration of the material being dialysed down to the ionic concentration of the surrounding buffer or to get rid of ammonium sulphate sate.

### 2.2.1.E: Ion Exchange Column

Resin preparation
Pre-swollen DEAE cellulose was used. Approximately 30 g of DEAE cellulose was weighed out and stirred with 180 ml of 0.2 M Phosphate buffer, pH 7.5 (Phosphate buffer at pH 7.5 is used throughout). This was left overnight and the "fines", bits of sloughed off cellulose which floats to the top of the beaker, removed with a 10 ml pipette. The wet settled volume of the resin was measured in a measuring cylinder, allowing sufficient time for it to settle using the formula:

$$
\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{nh}
$$

where "t" is time in minutes, $h$ is the total height of slurry in the measuring cylinder $(\mathrm{cm})$ and $n$ is a factor between 1.3 and 2.4. The supernatant was removed with any remaining fines to leave a final volume consisting of the "wet settled volume" plus

20\% buffer.

## Column Packing

A 20 cm -long column of diameter 1.5 cm was packed. This was done in an area free of draughts, direct sunlight and heaters and done as quickly as possible to prevent convection currents in the slurry. The tap of the column was first closed and the stirred slurry quickly poured in. The tap was then opened to allow a drip and the slurry topped up as soon as the buffer at the top of the column was clear. This was repeated until the resin settled up to a height of 20 cm .1 cm of clear buffer was left at the top to prevent the column from drying.

## Equilibration

The column was connected to a pump at the bottom. The top was fitted with a tight cap connected to a plastic tubing that was immersed at the other end in the buffer to be passed through the column. The level of the buffer had to be higher from the ground than the top of the column to ensure that the column never ran dry. The buffer was pulled into the air-tight column at a rate of 0.5 ml per minute.

A buffer of a slightly higher ionic strength was first passed through the column to ensure that the pH of the buffer coming out of the column was the same as the pH of the buffer going in ( pH 7.5 ). After that, around three times the volume of the column of buffer of the similar ionic strength and pH as the buffer the protein was suspended in was poured through.

Loading and washing
After equilibrating, the protein sample was loaded and the
pump connected to a uv-spectrophotometer and a fraction collector respectively. Fractions of 2 ml were collected. The uv-spectrophotometer was connected to a chart-recorder so that the peaks showing on the chart could be correlated to the tubes in the fraction collector.

When all of the sample had been loaded, the column was washed with a buffer similar to the equilibrating buffer and similar to the buffer the protein was suspended in.

## Eluting

Gradient elution was done with a small glass bridge, with each of its $8 \mathrm{~cm}-l o n g$ arms immersed in buffers of differing ionic concentration in 250 ml beakers. One of the beakers had an ionic: strength of 0.5 mM and another had 20 mM buffer. The plastic tubing leading to the column was put at the bottom of the beaker with lower ionic strength and liquid sucked up through the glass bridge with a syringe to connect the two different buffers. Stirring in the 0.5 mM buffer was achieved with a small magnetic stirrer to ensure uniform increase of ionic concentration throughout the buffer in the beaker. Elution was started when the peak from the chart recorder leveled out.

### 2.2.1.F: Gel Filtration

A 10 ml disposable pipette was used for the column (length 20 cm , diameter 0.8 cm ). Sephacryl 200 was used as the resin. A plug of steel wool was used to plug up the opening to prevent resin from coming out. Resin preparation and column packing was done as above. The column was equilibrated with 20 ml of 0.1 M $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{HCO}_{3}$ manually. The sample was loaded manually when the level
of buffer had just reached the resin. 0.5 ml fractions were collected manually in 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes. The pump could not be used because such small fractions were being collected. 0.1 M $\mathrm{NH}_{4} \mathrm{HCO}_{3}$ was used to elute the sample once it had been loaded. The fractions were examined one at a time on a spectrophotometer at 280 nm wavelength for the presence of protein.

### 2.2.1.G: Papain Affinity Column

1 ml of papain-agarose resin was put into a 2 ml syringe (length 1.5 cm , diameter 0.9 cm ) with a piece of filter paper at the bottom to prevent the resin from coming out. The column was rigged up to the pump for equilibrating using 50 mM Phosphate buffer, pH 7.5 containing 25 mM EDTA and 30 mM 2 -mercaptoethanol to activate the papain. A flow rate of $0.18 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ was used. The column was made air-tight with parafilm wrapped tightly round the top and the plastic tubing. Sample similar to that loaded onto the ion exchange column was loaded onto this column. However, it was brought up to 50 mM first by adding the appropriate volume of then. 0.2M Phosphate buffer, and EDTA and 2 -mercaptoethanol were added to 25 mM and 30 mM respectively to maintain papain in the active state. After loading, the column was first washed with the equilibrating buffer followed by another 50 mM Phosphate buffer containing only 5 mM EDTA to wash away the mercaptoethanol. Elution was carried out using a 1.7 pH buffer consisting of 0.3 M NaCl and 0.01 M HCl.

### 2.2.1.H: BAPNA assays

These were done using the reagents as follows:

EDTA/L-Cysteine ( $37.25 \mathrm{mg}, 30.25 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ respectively)------0.080m]. BAPNA ( $0.87 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ) ------------------------------------------1.000ml

Inhibitor fractions --------------------------------- various amts. Others (eg. eluting buffer in inhibitor fractions) -- as required. Phosphate buffer ( 0.1 M ) ----------------------- to top $u p$ to 4 ml . These were made fresh on the day required. Controls were done without papain, without inhibitor and without papain or inhibitor. The reaction mixtures were pre-incubated at $28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 minutes before BAPNA was added. At half-hourly intervals, absorbance at 410 nm wavelength was taken. A total of 2 to $2 \frac{1}{2}$ hours of incubation at $28^{\circ}$ was done each time.

### 2.2.1.I: TCA precipitation

This was done to the protein fractions so that the protein would become concentrated enough to be detected by polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis. To the sample was added twice its volume of $60 \%$ TCA. This was stood on ice for 1 h . The samples were then centrifuged at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and the precipitates washed three times with $80 \%$ ethanol. The samples were then dried on a vacuum line and redissolved in $2 X$ SDS sample buffer to a concentration of 1 $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l}$ depending on how pure the protein was expected to be. The total amount of protein present was estimated from spectrophotometer readings at 280 nm , assuming $1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of protein per 0.1 unit absorbance. This mixture was boiled for 10 minutes before loading onto a polyacrylamide gel.

### 2.2.1.J: Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis

 Mini-gelsTwo glass plates were held together with bulldog clips. This
is to allow minimal contact of the gel with the air which might prevent setting. A piece of rubber tubing was inserted between the glass plates and round three sides to hold in the gel. The main gel was pipetted in and a layer of water put on top to level the gel out and to prevent contact of the gel with the air. After the main gel had set, the water was poured away and the stacking layer added as well as the well-former containing slots to form wells. When this had set, the well-former and rubber tubing were removed and the whole apparatus clamped to the reservoir using two bulldog clips for the sides. Running buffer was poured into the upper and lower reservoirs, checking for leaks, and air bubbles directly beneath the gel displaced with a syringe with a bent needle. $10-15 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of protein samples were then loaded. Before loading, the protein samples were dissolved in $2 X$ SDS sample buffer to a concentration of 1 to $10 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l}$. This was boiled for 10 minutes, then $0.5 \mu l$ of bromophenol blue added. After loading, a drop of mercaptoethanol was put into each well. A marker was run beside the samples hence the molecular weights of the proteins could be calculated from a graph of distance migrated vs log mol. wt. After the gel had been run at 90 V for around 2 h and the dye front was near the edge of the gel, the gel was removed and the stacking layer cut off with a razor. The bottom edge of the gel containing sample 1 was cut at the corner for identification. The gel was then soaked in kenacid blue stain overnight or longer, then transferred to destain and finally to presoak before taking photographs and drying between acetate sheets in a gel drier conected to a vacuum pump.

### 2.2.2: DNA Manipulation Methods

### 2.2.2.A: Polymerase Chain reaction

These was done at the different annealing temperatures of $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 48^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The reaction mixtures consisted of the following:

C-terminal oligonucleotide ( $2 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l})----10 \mu \mathrm{l}$
$N$-terminal oligonucleotide $(2 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l})----10 \mu \mathrm{l}$
Pineapple DNA ( $0.4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l})$------------------ $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$
dNTPs mix ( 1.25 mM each dNTP) -----------16 16
Reaction buffer --------------------------1 $10 \mu l$
Water -------------------------------------- $51 \mu \mathrm{l}$
1 ul of Taq DNA polymerase (final concentration was 5 units/assay) was added after the samples were heated to $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This was to make sure that all proteases that might have been present in the DNA sample were first inactivated. A layer of $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ paraffin oil was then added to prevent condensation.

The mixtures were put in 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes which were coated on the outside with petroleum jelly and put in an intelligent heating block which was programmed as such:

(1X) $\quad x^{\circ} \mathrm{C}------------2 m i n$


(28X) $x^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots-\cdots 2 m i n$ $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-----------1 \mathrm{~min}$

$x^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-----------2 \mathrm{~min}$
$72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-----------\min ^{\circ}$
Step 2 was programmed to be repeated 28 times. $x$ refers to the temperature at which annealing was done which was the same for all steps in a single experiment. The longer final extension step was to ensure complete polymerization as the polymerase might have become limiting as the amount of DNA increased. All the steps could be accomplished within 5 h.

### 2.2.2.B: Agarose Gel Electrophoresis

$2 \%$ to $2.5 \%$ gels were used. $2 \%$ gels were to separate DNA molecules within the range $3-0.1 \mathrm{~kb}$ and $2.5 \%$ gels were to separate DNA molecules smaller than 0.1 kb .

The apparatus to hold the gel was prepared by using vacuum grease to stick the gel mould to a glass slab. The well former was then balanced on one end such that it was approximately 1 mm above the glass slab. The gel was prepared by dissolving the appropriate amount of agar ( 4 g for $2 \%$ gels, 5 g for $2.5 \%$ gels) in a solution of 200 ml 1 X TAE. This was done by boiling them together with frequent shaking to prevent the agar from burning. Once the agar had dissolved, the solution was allowed to cool and when hand-hot (approximately $70^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ), $12 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml} \mathrm{EtBr}$ was added. After swirling, this mixture was poured into the apparatus formed above. After hardening, the mould and well-former were removed with the help of a razor and the glass slab with the gel placed in the gel electrophoresis tank. This was then flooded with $1 X$ TAE buffer to 1 mm above the gel surface and the samples loaded with $1 / 5^{\text {th }}$ their volume of gel dye. The gel was run at 25 V overnight or at 80 V during the day (approximately 5 h )

Photographs of the gel were taken with a polaroid camera using uv light (Polaroid 667, ISO 3000 film).

### 2.2.2.C: Enzymatic restriction of DNA

Restrictions were done by adding $2 u l$ of enzyme (5u/ $\mu \mathrm{l}$ ) and $2 \mu$ l of the appropriate restriction buffer (10X) to the DNA sample. This was then made up to $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ with distilled water and incubated for over 3 h at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. For miniprep DNA samples, $2 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $1 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ RNase was added to remove any tRNA present.

### 2.2.2.D: Electroelution (Maniatis et al., 1982)

Preparation of bands
An agarose gel was run as normal and the desired bands cut out with a razor under uv light. Exposure to uv light was minimised to prevent denaturation of DNA.

## Preparation of Dialysis tubing

Small dialysis tubing of width 1 cm when flat was used. This was cut into 10 cm lengths and boiled for 10 minutes in a large volume of $2 \%$ sodium bicarbonate and 1 mM EDTA. The tubings were then rinsed thorougly in distilled water. They were then boiled for a further 10 minutes in 0.001 M EDTA. After cooling, they were stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ submersed in $70 \%$ ethanol. Before use, the tubing was rinsed inside and out with distilled water. Gloves were used to handle the tubing.

Electroelution
A dialysis tubing was clipped in the middle and the gel slab inserted into one end with forceps. This section was then filled with sufficient $T B E$ buffer to cover the gel slab. The tubing was
then clipped without leaving any space between the buffer and the clip. The same thing was done for the opposite compartment. This tubing was then immersed in some TBE in a minigel electrophoresis tank. 100 V was passed for 30 min . The polarity of the current was then reversed for 2 min to release the DNA from the wall of the dialysis bag. The dialysis bag was then carefully opened and the buffer containing the eluted DNA recovered. The gel slab was examined under uv light to make sure that all the DNA had eluted. If not, a further few minutes of electroelution was required. The bag was washed out with a small amount of TBE buffer at the end to make sure no DNA was lost. The DNA was then purified.

### 2.2.2.E: Purification of DNA

To the DNA solution was added an approximately equal volume of phenol. This was vortexed till an emulsion formed, then spun for 2 min in a microcentrifuge. The supernatant was transferred to another tube and an equal volume of chloroform added. This was vortexed and spun as above. To the supernatant was added twice its amount of $100 \%$ ethanol and $1 / 10$ th its volume of 3 M NaAc to enable precipitation. This was left precipitating at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight or at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for one hour. The mixture was then centrifuged for 20 min and as much of the liquid as possible removed with a pasteur pipette, taking care not to remove the DNA pellet. $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $70 \%$ ethanol was added with vortexing and centrifuging to remove any remaining solutes. This was carefully removed and the pellet vacuum dried in a dessicator. The pure DNA was then resuspended in distilled water or $T E$ buffer. When smaller volumes of DNA had to be purified, TE buffer was added before the addition
of phenol to give a larger volume so that losses through the separation of the aqueous and organic phases were minimized.

### 2.2.2.F: Ligation of DNA to Vector

## Vector Preparation

The vectors used were pUC18 and M13mpl9. These were first restricted at certain single restriction sites to form linear lengths of DNA (see section 2.2.2.C). Then, $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of Calf intestinal phosphatase (CIP) was added and incubation continued at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 min. This was to remove the phosphate groups at the open ends of the restricted DNA to prevent self-ligation. $2 \mu l$ of 500 mM EGTA was then added to remove all traces of CIP. This mixture was incubated at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 1 h . The plasmid DNA was then purified.

## DNA preparation

The DNA to be inserted was restricted with the appropriate enzyme using the method in section 2.2.2.C. High specific activity (HSA) Hind III restriction enzyme ( $40 u / \mu l$ ) was used for the PCR amplified DNA. As the oligonucleotides used in the PCR had attached Hind III cleavage sites at their ends, this restriction served only to restrict the ends of the $D N A$, hence leaving the amplified gene intact.

Ligation reaction
The following reaction mixture was set up:

DNA sample (> $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mu \mathrm{l})$ ——-------------1 $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$

10X Ligation buffer ------------------1 $1 \mu l$

Ligase ( $0.25 \mathrm{u} / \mu \mathrm{l}$ ) ---------------------1 $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$
The above was made up to $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ with distilled water. This was then incubated at $12^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for more than 4 h . Two kinds of controls were also set up, one without the DNA sample to ensure that the phosphate groups had been removed in the vector, and another without the DNA sample or ligase.

### 2.2.2.G: Transformation with pUC 18

Commercially available DH5 $\alpha$ competent cells of library efficiency were used. These were claimed to give more than $1 \times 10^{8}$ transformants/ $\mu \mathrm{g}$ supercoiled pUC19. $20 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of these were put into Eppendorf tubes. All of the ligation mixture was then added and the mixture shaken gently. This was then put on ice for 30 mins. When the 30 minutes was up, the mixture was heat-shocked for 40 s in a $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath, care being taken not to shake the tubes. They were then placed on ice for a few minutes to stabilize before $80 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of S .O.C. was added. These were shaken at 225 rpm for 1 hour at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to ensure that the ampicillin resistance genes were expressed before plating out on YT-X-gal-amp plates.

### 2.2.2.H: Streaking

This was carried out whenever it was required to get individual colonies or colonies from a single parent on a plate. Sterile toothpicks or a metal loop were used. The metal loop was flamed then cooled and the bacteria to be plated out picked up. A zig-zag pattern was drawn on one edge of the plate and the loop flamed again. After cooling, the loop was passed across one or two of the previous lines and a zig-zag pattern drawn on a fresh
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edge of the plate. This was repeated one or two more times. In the case of sterile tooth-picks, these were changed after each line was drawn. They were then soaked in ethanol before discarding. The plates were grown overnight at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ in an inverted position.


### 2.2.2.I: Plasmid Isolation (Miniprep)

## Bacteria propagation

To 10 ml of autoclaved YT medium in Universal bottles was added $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ ampicillin. Bacteria was added either from its colony on a plate or from a previous miniprep ( $10 \mu \mathrm{l}$ is sufficient). This was grown overnight at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

## Plasmid purification

The bacteria were pelleted down in a high speed centrifuge (30 000 g for 10 min ). The broth was poured off and the tubes inverted for a few minutes on absorbant paper to dry the pellets. $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of $4 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{ml}$ lysozyme in miniprep solution 1 was added, the mixture was then vortexed and stood on ice for 30 minutes. Then $400 u l$ of miniprep solution 2 was added. This was not vortexed but gently shaken. This solution is meant to denature the proteins in solution. After incubation for 5 minutes on ice, $300 \mu l$ of solution 3 was added. This was incubated for 30 minutes on ice. This solution got rid of any chromosomal DNA. The final solution was spun for 30 min at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The supernatant containing the plasmid DNA was removed and the DNA purified and concentrated as before (section 2.2.2.E), but excluding the addition of 3 M NaAc as the KAc present (solution 3 ) was sufficient to precipitate the DNA.

### 2.2.2.J: Preparation of competent TG2 E. coli cells

The E. coli host strain TG2 is used as it is strongly recommended for transformation with M13. The method used to make competent cells was a quick and easy method which produced competent cells wih only a limited storage life (24h).

A single colony of $T G 2$ was first picked from a glucose/ minimal medium plate. This was grown overnight in 10 ml of 2 X YT medium at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with shaking. 40 ml of 2 X YT media in a 250 ml flask was inffoculated with 2 ml of this overnight culture and shaken at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 hours to $\mathrm{OD}_{5} 50^{\sim 0.3}$. The cells were then spun down (3,000g for 5 min$)$. These were then resuspended in 20 ml of sterilized 50 mM CaCl 2 , pre-chilled on ice. After leaving on ice for 20 minutes, the cells were again spun down (3000g for 2 min ). They were then resuspended in 4 ml of cold 50 mM CaCl 2 . As transformation efficiency increases after standing on ice for a few hours, the cells were left to stand for 3 hours.

### 2.2.2.K: Transformation with M13mp19

$300 \mu l$ of competent cells were aliquoted into chilled 15 ml tubes. Approximately 1 ng of DNA was added ( $4 u l$ of the ligation mixture in section $2.2 .2 . F$ gave good results), stirring the cells whilst pipetting. The tubes were rolled gently for a few minutes on ice then left to stand for 40 minutes (on ice). The cells were heat-shocked at $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 45 seconds, care being taken not to shake the tubes. They were then placed on ice for 5 min before plating out. To each tube was added 270 ul of fresh cells/ X-gal/ IPTG mix. Then 3 ml of molten $H$ top agar was added (kept at $\left.45^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$. This mixture was mixed by rolling and immediately poured
onto a prewarmed $\left(37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right) \mathrm{H}$ plate each. When set, the plates were inverted and incubated at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight. Clear plaques the next day indicated transformation. These plaques could not be stored as such so phage stocks were made. Single-stranded template DNA was also directly prepared.

### 2.2.2.L: Preparation of 1 ml phage stock

A single TG2 colony was picked from a glucose/minimal medium plate and grown overnight in 10 ml of 2 X YT medium with shaking. One drop of this was added to 20 ml of fresh medium, and shaken at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 3 hours. $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of this and a whole recombinant plaque (using a sterile pasteur pipette for picking up) were added to 1 ml of 2 X YT media in a sterile 10 ml culture tube. This was incubated for 4 hours with shaking at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This was then transferred to a Eppendorf tube and stored at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, or long term at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. 50ul of this could be used in place of the recombinant plaque in section 2.2.2.M to produce plasmid DNA.

### 2.2.2.M: Double-stranded and single stranded template DNA

## preparation from phage

5 ml of 2 X YT media in a sterile culture tube was inoculated with $50 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of a fresh overnight culture of TG2 cells and a whole recombinant plaque. This was incubated with shaking at $37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 hours. The cells were spun down ( 30000 g for 10 min ) and the supernatant put into five 1.5 ml Eppendorf tubes. These could be used to prepare single-stranded DNA immediately or kept at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for a few days. One of the 5 tubes was kept at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ as a stock in case more DNA had to be prepared. The precipitate after centrifugation was used for purification of double-stranded DNA by
the miniprep method mentioned in section 2.2.2.I., cutting the volumes by half.

To prepare single-stranded DNA from the 4 tubes, $200 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of PEG/NaCl was added to each tube, shaken, and left to stand at room temperature for 15 minutes. This was then centrifuged for 5 minutes and the supernatant discarded. After a further 2 minutes of centrifugation, all traces of $P E G$ was carefully removed with a drawn out Pasteur pipette. $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of TE buffer was added to each tube and vortexed for $30 s$ to resuspend the pellet. DNA purification was then carried out as mentioned in section 2.2.2.E. The dry DNA pellets obtained were resuspended in TE buffer in a total volume of $100 \mu l$ (by transfer from tube to tube). This was centrifuged for five minutes and the supernatant transferred to a clean tube. This was to remove any protein precipitate which would affect the optical density reading. The amount of single-stranded DNA present was then estimated as mentioned below. The yield from a 4 ml culture should be around $16-40 \mu \mathrm{~g}$. The estimated sample was ethanol precipitated and resuspended in TE buffer to give $1 \mu g / \mu l$ for subsequent sequencing with the automatic DNA sequencer. At least $4 \mu g$ was needed.

### 2.2.2.N: Estimation of concentration of DNA

(Maniatis et al. 1982)
$1 u l$ of the sample to be estimated was added to 1 ml of TE buffer in a quartz cuvette and the $O D$ at 260 nm taken. 1 OD of single stranded DNA was equivalent to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$. The same reading was equivalent to $50 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of double-stranded DNA and to $20 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{ml}$ of oligonucleotides. The ratio $O D_{260} / O D_{280}$ showed how pure the

DNA was. The ratio should be 1.8 for pure samples and less for impure samples. In such cases, accurate quantitation was not possible.

### 2.2.2.0: Southern Blot (Maniatis et al.. 1982)

This method is useful for locating DNA of a specific sequence on an agarose gel. DNA fragments that have been separated according to size by electrophoresis are transferred to a nitrocellulose filter, and immobilized. The relative positions of the DNA fragments in the gel are preserved during their transfer to the filter. The DNA attached to the filter is then hybridized to $32 \mathrm{p}-1$ abeled DNA, and autoradiography used to locate the position of any bands complementary to the radioactive probe.

After electrophoresis had been completed, the gel was transferred to a glass baking dish. First, two pieces of Whatman 3MM paper were placed on top of a piece of glass such that they overlapped each other. These were then placed inside a large baking dish and elevated by rubber stoppers. The dish was filled with $10 X$ SSC such that the ends of the paper were in constant contact with it. On top of this, a few more sheets of paper were placed (dampened with 10 X SSC), then the agarose gel, with its front side facing downwards. A piece of nitrocellulose filter (presoaked in $2 X$ SSC for a few minutes) was then placed in contact with the gel. A few more sheets of paper (dampened with 2 X SSC) were placed on top of this followed by absorbant material such as the filling of babies' napkins. A glass slab and weights were placed on top of this to ensure good contact between the different layers. The objective was to set up a flow of liquid from
the reservoir through the gel and the nitrocellulose paper, so that the DNA fragments would be eluted from the gel and deposited onta the nitrocellulose paper. The gel was surrounded with a water-tight layer of Saran Wrap to prevent short circuiting of fluid between the absorbant material above the gel and the 3 MM paper beneath it. After 2 days, the nitrocellulose filter was marked for the wells on the gel and placed in between dry $3 M M$ paper. It was then dried for 2 hours under vacuum at $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

### 2.2.2.P: Nick Translation

The DNA labelling kit from Amersham was used to prepare radioactive probes. To $0.5-1 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of the DNA to be labelled was added 10 ul of deoxynucleotide triphosphate mix (contains buffer, dNTPs). Then 5 ul of enzyme solution (contains DNA polymerase) was added, as well as $5 \mu$ l of $50 \mu \mathrm{Ci}$ [ $\left.{ }^{32} \mathrm{P}\right]$ dCTP. The reaction mixture was incubated for $3-4 \mathrm{~h}$ at $15^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After phenol extraction, the sample was poured through a Sephadex $G-50$ gel filtration column.

### 2.2.2.Q: Sephadex G-50 gel filtration column

Sephadex G-50 was swollen in G-50 buffer for 1 hour at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The resin was then stood to cool at room temperature and the column packed in a 5 ml disposable pipette (length 15 cm , diameter $0.7 \mathrm{~cm})$. The nick translated reaction mixture was then poured through followed by more G-50 buffer. Fractions of 5 drops were collected and tested for radioactivity using a Geiger counter. The samples were placed at a fixed distance from the counter in turn and the reading recorded. The first peak of high radioactivity represented the labeled pUC18 whereas the second peak
represented the free $\left[{ }^{32} \mathrm{P}\right]$ dCTP. On measuring the first peak on a liquid scintillation counter, putting $5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of the pooled fractions in 1 ml of water, a reading of $7.5 \times 10^{6}$ Cerenkov cpm/ug was obtained (Cerenkov radiation is emitted when a charged particle (beta particle, in this case), travels with a velocity greater than that of light in a given medium (Rengan, 1986) ). This indicated successful labeling. The pooled fractions were then used for the hybridisation reaction with the nitrocellulose filter.

### 2.2.2.R: Hybridisation of nitrocellulose filter

 PrehybridizationThe baked filter was first immersed in 6X SSC for 2 minutes. The wet filter was then slipped into a heat-sealable plastic bag. 0.2 ml of prehybridization fluid warmed to $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was then added per $\mathrm{cm}^{2}$ of filter. As much air as possible was squeezed from the bag and the open end sealed with the heat sealer. The bag was incubated for 4 or more hours in a plastic container weighed to the bottom of a $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ water bath.

## Hybridization

The bag was opened after prehybridization by cutting off one corner. As much prehybridization solution was squeezed out as possible. The hybridization fluid was then added to the bag ( $50 \mu \mathrm{\mu} / \mathrm{cm}^{2}$ of filter). As much air as possible was squeezed out of the bag and the cut edge sealed. The bag was incubated as before overnight.

## Washing

The bag was cut along the length of three sides and immediately submerged in a tray containing a solution of 0.1 X SSC
and 0.1\% SDS. After five minutes at room temperature, the solution was changed for a fresh one. This was repeated again after five minutes. The filter was then transferred to a plastic box containing fresh solution and incubated at $65^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for one and a half hours, changing the solution after each half-hour interval. After the final half-hour, $0.1 \%$ SSC solution was added instead. This was to remove the SDS. After 5 minutes at room temperature, the filter was placed on a sheet of Whatman $3 M M$ paper and dried at room temperature.

### 2.2.2.S: Autoradiography

The dried nitrocellulose filter mentioned above was taped to a piece of Whatman 3 MM paper, leaving a small border around for marking with radioactive ink. After marking with the ink (a few randomly placed dots ), it was put into a plastic bag sealed round three edges. It was not totally sealed as air bubbles trapped could alter the image on the film. This was then placed in an X-ray film holder.

The $X$-ray film (Fuji film) was first activated by flashing it for a short while. This was then placed on top of the nitrocellulose filter in the $X$-ray film holder and closed securely. This was done in a dark room with only a red safety light on. The holder was then left at $-80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ overnight or longer.

### 2.2.2.T: Disposal of wastes

Any material that had been in contact with bacteria was disinfected with $25 \%$ Chloros or autoclaved before re-using or discarding. Any radioactive material was rinsed thoroughly under running water until no longer radioactive or soaked in Decon.

## Chapter III

Result

## 3: RESULTS

## 3.1: PURIFICATION OF A THIOL PROTEASE INHIBITOR FROM COWPEA

The methods used were that of Rele et al.(Rele et al., 1980) with certain modifications as appropriate. The alkaline extract of cowpea seeds was used and the inhibitor attempted to be purified was designated "inhibitor $C$ " in their paper. This was only partially purified by them. However, others (Gatehouse et al., 1985) have managed to get a single polypeptide inhibiting only papain and not trypsin by a similar method. Therefore, was attempted to follow their work to get a pure thiol protease specific inhibitor in sufficient quantity that its sequence might be determined.

## 3.1: Steps in protein purification

Two methods were used to purify the protein. The initial steps used were similar but later on, two different columns were used -- a DEAE cellulose ionic exchange column and a papain affinity column.

Steps in common
One kilogram of cowpea seeds were milled and extracted in 2.51 of 100 mM Tris-HCl buffer, pH 7.5. This was done overnight with stirring. The extract was then filtered through a piece of muslin. 1.751 of extract was recovered and centrifuged at $20,000 \mathrm{~g}, 4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, in 250 ml bottles for 30 min . The supernatant was precipitated at 0.9 ammonium sulphate saturation overnight at $4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The solution was then centrifuged again as before. The precipitate obtained was resuspended in 800 ml of 10 mM Tris- $\mathrm{HCl}, \mathrm{pH}$ 7.5. This was put into large dialysis tubing and dialysed against
the same buffer to remove the ammonium sulphate. Centrifugation was done as before. To the supernatant was added $2 M$ acetic acid till a pH of 5 was obtained. After centrifugation, the supernatant was put into large dialysis tubing and these were immersed for 3 min in a large volume of 10 mM sodium acetate, pH 5 , heated up to $80^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. These tubes were then immediately cooled in chilled water. The inhibitor was very unstable at pH 5 before heating and it was essential to carry out acid precipitation and heating as rapidly as possible. After cooling, the solution was centrifuged to remove the denatured protein. Ammonium sulphate precipitation was carried out again, this time at 0.95 saturation. This was then centrifuged and the precipitate resuspended in 100 ml of 50 mM Phosphate buffer, pH 7.5. This was brought down to 5 mM by dialysing against this buffer. After centrifugation, the fraction was ready for the two columns. It was later discovered that there was a misprint in the paper therefore another dialysis against 0.5 mM buffer was required before pouring through the columns.

### 3.1.2: Results from the ion exchange column

100 ml of the fraction, having been dialysed against 5 mM buffer, pH 7.5, was poured through the DEAE cellulose column. When 5 mM Phosphate buffer'was passed through to wash the column, there was a huge absorbance peak on the uv spectrophotometer. Subsequent elution did not yield any peaks as all the protein had passed through with the 5 mM buffer. Hence, the washing peak fractions were pooled together and dialysed against 0.5 mM Phosphate buffer. This was poured through the column and 3 peaks were obtained altogether (fig, 1). The first peak was the washing peak,
the second and the third were the peaks supposed to contain the inhibitor. Unfortunately, due to a fault with the fraction collector, the third peak was lost, hence assays were done only on the second peak.

## Assay results

The 2 ml fractions from the second peak were pooled together and their absorbance at 280 nm measured. This was found to be 0.083. BAPNA assays were done with 2 ml and 2.72 ml of this pooled fraction. This implied a protein concentration of approximately 1.66 mg and 2.26 mg respectively, judging from its absorbance. Both showed inhibition of $16.8 \%$ and $20.5 \%$ respectively (fig. 2 , table 1a \& 1b, fig. 3, table 2a \& 2b).

## Further purification

This protein (11.9ml of pooled fractions) was further purified by passing it through a Sephacryl 200 gel filtration column Only one protein peak was obtained (fig. 4) The fractions from this peak were pooled together and freeze-dried. 9 mg of protein was obtained and further enzyme assays were carried out on this, using up to 2.1 mg per assay. No inhibition, however, was observed. This could be due to one of several reasons which are discussed in the next chapter. On SDS polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis, this protein showed a single band at approximately 32,000 relative molecular weight (fig. 5, fig 6, table 3).

### 3.1.3: Results from the papain column

15 ml of 0.5 mM extract obtained previously was made up to


## Ion exchange column enzyme assays


$\rightarrow$ Control $1+2 \mathrm{ml}$ from peak $2 \quad$ * Control2
Fig 2: DEAE ion-exchange column - BAPNA assay rate graph of 2 ml of fraction from peak 2.

| Tube no. | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Control 1, with papain but <br> without inhibitor. |
| 2 | With inhibitor, 2ml of peak <br> 2 from ion-exchange column. |
| 3 | Control 2, without papain <br> or inhibitor. |

Table 1a: Reaction mixtures in fig. 2.

| I Saple do | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | 0.040 | 0.037 | 0.018 |
| 60 | 0.062 | 0.059 | 0.018 |
| 90 | 0.081 | 0.076 | 0.019 |
| 130 | 0.116 |  | 0.020 |
| 150 | 0.135 |  | 0.020 |
| 180 | 0.155 |  | 0.018 |
| Rate (10tuits/in) | 7.81 | 6.50 | 0.00 |


| Constant | 10.014772 | 10.019666 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std Brr of Y Bst | 0.002715 | 0.000408 |
| a Squared | 0.997019 | 0.999780 |
| No. of Observation | 6 |  |
| Degrees of Preedor | 1 |  |
| $\triangle$ Coefficieat(s) | 0.000981 | 0.00065 |
| Std Brr of Coef. | 10.000021 | 10.000009 |

Table 1b: Absorbance of BAPNA assays at 410nm \& regression output of lines obtained. From rates of change in absorbance, it can be seen that tube 2 inhibits papain by $16.8 \% . \sim 1.66 \mathrm{mg}$ protein was present.

## Ion-exchange column enzyme assays



- Control +-2.72 ml from peak 2

Fig 3: DEAE ion-exchange column - BAPNA assay rate graph of 2.72 ml of fraction from peak 2.

| Tube no. | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Control 1, with papain but <br> without inhibitor. |
| 2 | With inhibitor, 2.72ml of <br> peak 2 from ion-exchange <br> column. |

Table 2a: Reaction mixtures in fig. 3.

| I Saaple no <br> fiae | 1 | 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.019 | 0.024 |
| 30 | 0.041 | 0.041 |
| 60 | 0.063 | 0.055 |
| 90 | 0.083 | 0.069 |
| 130 | 0.105 | 0.092 |
| 150 | 0.123 | 0.106 |
| 180 | 0.144 | 0.124 |
| Rate (10 wits/an) | 6.89 | 5.48 |

Regression Output:

| Constant | 0.0192851 | 10.022845 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std Bre of Y Bst | 0.002463 | 0.002299 |
| \& Squared | 0.997538 | 0.996625 |
| No. of Observation | i |  |
| Degrees of Preedor | 5 |  |
| \& Coefficient(s) | 0.000689 | 0.000548 |
| Std Bri |  |  |

Table 2b: Absorbance of BAPNA assays at 410nm \& regression output of lines obtained. From rates of change in absorbance, it can be seen that tube 2 inhibits papain by $20.5 \%$. 2.26 mg of protein was present.

## Gel Filtration Column Absorbance of 0.5 ml fractions




| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Protein off the Sephacryl 200 <br> gel filtration column after <br> TCA precipitation |
| 2 | Sigma SDS molecular markers |

Fig 5: Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of single protein peak from gel filtration column.


50 mM with 0.2 M Phosphate buffer. This was passed through the column as mentioned in section 2.2.1.G. Three peaks were obtained. The first one was obtained when the sample was put in, the second one was obtained when washing buffer 2 was put in, and the third was obtained when the eluting buffer was passed through (fig. 7).

## Enzyme assays

Peak 2 fractions were pooled together and called fraction 1 $\left(\mathrm{OD}_{280} 0.115\right)$. Peak 3 was divided into two and the first part of the peak pooled together and called fraction $2\left(\mathrm{OD}_{280} 0.156\right)$. Fractions from the second part of the peak were pooled together and called fraction $3\left(\mathrm{OD}_{280} 0.083\right)$. BAPNA assays were carried out on 2 ml of these fractions. Fraction 1 ( 2.30 mg protein) showed enhanced enzymic activity (39\%) whereas fraction 2 ( $\sim 3.12 \mathrm{mg}$ protein) and fraction 3 ( $\sim 1.66 \mathrm{mg}$ protein) showed inhibition of papain ( $33.5 \%$ \& $48.9 \%$ respectively) (Fig. 8, table $4 a$ \& 4b). On TCA precipitation and polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis, however, it was found that peaks 2 and 3 contained a number of proteins including the one obtained through the ion exchange column ( fig.9, fig. 10 , table 5 ). A 52000 m.wt. protein band was clearly seen. As there was no more material to further purify, the attempt was stopped there.

Just as a further confirmation to make sure that there was inhibitory activity in the extract before pouring through the column, assays was done on some of this solution dissolved in 10 mM Tris-HCl donated by Mr A. Remfry. Inhibition was observed for the different volumes used of 0.5 ml ( $32.9 \%$ ), 1 ml (96.0\%) and 1.5 ml (98.2\%) (fig 11, table 6a \& 6b).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{\text {mom }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 920 | 为 |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | T | + | $\pm$ | 0 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $z_{0}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $\varepsilon$ |  | ${ }_{\sim}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{*}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Fig. 7: Papain column - absorbance readings of fractions at 280 nm .

## Papain affinity column enzyme assays



Fig 8: Papain affinity column - BAPNA assay rate graph of 2 ml of each fraction.

| Tube no. | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Control 1, with papain but without <br> inhibitor. |
| 2 | $2 m l$ of fraction 1 from papain column. |
| 3 | $2 m l$ of fraction 2 from papain column. |
| 4 | $2 m l$ of fraction 3 from papain column. |
| 5 | Control 2, without papain or inhibitor. |

Table 4a: Reaction mixtures in fig. 8.

| Sasple no <br> rine abs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0.018 | 0.023 | 0.033 | 0.029 |
| 30 | 0.036 | 0.044 | 0.039 | 0.035 |
| 60 | 0.050 | 0.067 | 0.050 | 0.045 |
| 90 | 0.066 | 0.089 | 0.062 | 0.055 |
| 130 | 0.082 | 0.110 | 0.022 | 0.061 |
| 150 | 0.094 | 0.128 | 0.082 | 0.066 |
| Rate (10units/in) | 4.93 | 6.87 | 3.28 | 2.52 |

Regression Output:
Constant $\quad 0.019852|0.024113| 0.031149 \mid 0.029169$

$\mathbb{R}$ Squared $\quad 0.996922|0.9966890 .991319| 0.985870$
Ho. of Observation Degrees of Preedon

Std Brr of Coef. $|0.000013| 0.000019|0.000015| 0,000015$

Table 4b: Absorbance of BAPNA assays at 410 nm \& regression output of lines obtained. From rates of change in absorbance, it can be seen that tube 2 enhances enzymic activity by $39 \%$ whereas tube 3 \& 4 inhibit papain activity by $33.5 \%$ and $48.9 \%$ respectively (contains $\sim 2.30 \mathrm{mg}, 3.12 \mathrm{mg} \& 1.66 \mathrm{mg}$ of protein respectively).


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Sigma molecular wt. markers. |
| 2 | Protein off the Sephacryl 200 <br> gel filtration column after <br> TCA precipitation. |
| 3,5 | Protein off the papain column <br> from peak 3, fraction 2. |
| 4 | Protein off the papain column <br> from peak 3, fraction 3. |

Fig 9: Polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of protein from gel filtration column \& papain affinity column. (bands not very clear in photograph).


| Harker <br> Migration | Size/ay | Log.size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3.80 | 66000 | 7.8195 |
| 5.25 | 45000 | 4.6532 |
| 5.80 | 36000 | 4.5563 |
| 6.65 | 29000 | 4.4624 |
| 6.80 | 24000 | 4.3802 |


| Band $\Delta$ <br> Yigration <br> (asjor <br> band) | Size/iy | Log.size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4.65 | 51857 | 4.7148 |


| Band B <br> Yigration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.25 | 32339 | 4.5097 |

Fig. 10:
Graph of migration/cm vs log/m.wt. for marker in fig. 9.

Using first three points, Regression Dutput:

| Constant | 5.310821 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Std Brr of PBst | 0.019376 |
| R Squared | 0.989409 |
| Ho. of Observations | 3 |
| Degrees of Preedon | 1 |

Table 5: Migration distances \& sizes of bands in fig. 9. Regression output of fig. 10.

## Extract before pouring through column - enzyme assays



$$
\begin{aligned}
& =0.5 \mathrm{ml} \text { extract } \\
& * \quad 1.5 \mathrm{ml} \text { extract }
\end{aligned}
$$

- 1 ml extract
$\square$ Control
Fig. 11: Partially purified inhibitor before pouring through column - BAPNA assay rate graph.

| Tube no. | Description |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Control 1, with papain but without <br> inhibitor. |
| 2 | 0.5 ml of extract before pouring through <br> any column. |
| 3 | 1 ml of extract before pouring through <br> any column. |
| 4 | 1.5 ml of extract before pouring through <br> any column. |
| 5 | Control 2, without papain but with 1 ml <br> inhibitor. |

Table 6a: Reaction mixtures in fig. 11.

| I Sauple no <br> Pine <br> abs. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.017 | 0.097 | 0.052 | 0.067 | 0.055 |
| 30 | 0.044 | 0.051 | 0.060 | 0.069 | 0.059 |
| 60 | 0.070 | 0.071 | 0.072 | 0.095 | 0.060 |
| 90 | 0.095 | 0.087 | 0.082 | 0.080 | 0.063 |
| 120 | 0.118 | 0.104 | 0.092 | 0.084 | 0.061 |
| Rate (10units/sin) | 8.13 | 5.66 | 0.34 | 0.15 | 0.00 |


| sion Output: |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Constant | 0.036 | 0.0512 | 0.066 | 0.0182 | 0.0556 |
| Std Bre of Y Bst | 0.001414 | 0.000966 | 0.001080 | 0.001402 | 0:001693 |
| \& Squared | 0.997928 | 0.997315 | 0.983009 | 0.999099 | 0.794119 |
| No. of Observation | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Degrees of Preedor | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 1 Coefficient(s) | 0.000566 | 0.00034 | 0.00015 | 0.000843 | 0.00006 |
| Std Brr of Coef. | b. 00001 | 0.000010 | 0.000011 | 0.000014 | . 0000 |

Table 6b: Absorbance of BAPNA assays at 410 nm \& regression output of lines obtained. 0.5 ml extract inhibited papain activity by $32.9 \%, 1 \mathrm{ml}$ by $96 \%$ and 1.5 ml by $98.2 \%$.

## 3.2: FINDING OUT THE GENE SEQUENCE OF A BROMELAIN INHIBITOR FROM <br> PINEAPPLE

Pineapple stem acetone powder is a rich source of compositionally similar but chromatographically distinct polypeptide inhibitors of bromelain. The isoinhibitors have molecular weights of 5600 , and they contain five disulfide bonds and about 50 amino acids each (Perlstein et al., 1973). Primary structural analysis of one of the seven inhibitor fractions (VII) showed extensive microheterogeneity (Reddy et al., 1975). At least five isoinhibitors were present, each composed of two peptide chains joined by disulfide bonds. These chains, designated $A$ and $B$ on the basis of size, comprise 41 and 10-11 residues respectively. On the basis of ionization properties and yields of the $A$ and $B$ chains, one of the major inhibitor species in Fraction VII is the covalently linked complex of the two chains shown:

A Chain (A-1): $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$-Asp-Glu-Tyr-Lys-Cys-Tyr-Cys-Ala-Asp-Thr-Tyr1

5

Ser-Asp-Cys-Pro-Gly-Phe-Cys-Lys-Lys-Cys-Lys-Ala15 20

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Glu-Phe-Gly-Lys-Tyr-Ile-Cys-Leu-Asp-Leu-Ile-Ser- } \\
& 25
\end{aligned}
$$

Pro-Asn-Asp-Cys-Val-Lys-COOH
40

B Chain (B-2): $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~N}$-Thr-Ala-Cys-Ser-Glu-Cys-Val-Cys-Pro-Leu-Gln-

1
5
10

COOH

The complete amino acid sequence of each of the five components have been determined and the differences observed between the structures were accounted for by single substitiutions at four sites in the sequence.

It was attempted to find out the gene sequence of the inhibitor shown above. First, DNA from young tissue cultured pineapple plants was extracted. Then oligonucleotides complementary to the inhibitor's $A-1$ and $B-1$ ends were constructed. It is postulated that both protein chains are coded for on a single strand of DNA. DNA coding for the chains are separated by DNA coding for the proper folding and cleavage of the protein. The constructed oligonucleotides were as shown:

A-1 N-terminus (179): 5' -CGGAAGCTTGATGAATATAAATGTTATTGTGC C $\quad$ G $\quad C \quad G \quad C . C \quad C$

A-1 C-terminus (180): 5' -CGGAAGCTTTTTIACACAATCATTIGG C G G G

B-1 $N$-terminus (181): 5' -CGGAAGCTTACIGCITGTTCIGAATGTGT
C $\quad G \quad C$

B-1 C-terminus (182): 5' -CGGAAGCTTTGIAAIGGACAIACACATTC
where $I=$ infosine, which will base pair with $A, G, C$ or $T$. HindIII sites were attached at the beginning of each oligo (first nine bases) to simplify ligation into a vector plasmid at a later stage. These oligos were combined together in pairs with the pineapple DNA and a polymerase chain reaction carried out to amplify the inhibitor gene. This amplified DNA was then cleaved with HindIII, as short overhangs (1-2bp) are usually generated by PCR, and inserted into pUC18 cleaved with a similar enzyme (see Appendix 2, A2.1, A2.2, for the nucleotide sequence and restric-
tion sites of pUC18, Yanish-Perron et al., 1985). Competent Escherichia coli bacterial cells (DH5 $)$ were transformed with this ligation mixture. The plasmids from the transformants containing the correct gene were cleaved with AluI. The correct fragment of DNA was then ligated to M13mp19 vector, using its HincII for insertion (see Appendix 2, A2.3 \& A2.4, for the nucleotide sequence and restriction sites of M13mp19, YanishPerron, et al., 1985). Restriction with PstI and KpnI showed that certain clear plaques contained the gene. Hence one of these with the gene inserted in the HincII site was chosen and the single stranded DNA sequenced.

### 3.2.1: Polymerase Chain Reaction

An annealing temperature of $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was first tried. There was no amplified band unique to a certain pair of oligos (fig. 12), hence the experiment was repeated at a higher temperature of $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. This time round, the non-specific DNA that had been amplified earlier was not amplified. However, there were two distinct bands representing the amplified products of oligos 180 and 181 (fig. 13, fig. 14, table 7). One band (a) represented a size of approximately 160 bp which was just the appropriate size for the gene. The other band (b) represented a size of approximately 390bp. This could be a tandem repeat of the gene. A clear band (c) representing approximately 60 bp was present in all tracks. This could have been dimers of the oligos. Another amplification at $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ was carried out. The previous amplification containing the DNA of interest was also reamplified at this temperature. No non-specific DNA was amplified at this temperature, but the pre-


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of pUC19 <br> cleaved with HinfI. |
| 2,3 | Amplification at $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 180 and 181 oligonucleotides. |
| 4,5 | Amplification at $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 179 and 182 oligonucleotides. |
| 6 | Amplification at $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 179 and 180 oligonucleotides. |

Fig. 12: $P C R$ at $42^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. No unique amplified band for a certain pair of oligonucleotides.


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |
| 2 | Oligonucleotides 179 and 180. <br> 3Amplification at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using 180 and <br> 181 oligonucleotides. |
| 4 | Amplification at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using 179 and <br> 5Amplification at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using 179 and <br> 180 oligonucleotides. |

Fig. 13: PCR at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Oligonucleotides 180 \& 181 give amplified bands of approximately $160 b p$ (band a) \& 390bp (band b) (well no.3).


| Hartar <br> Higration | Size/bp | Log. size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.80 | 1408 | 3.1486 |
| 3.80 | 517 | 2.7135 |
| 4.40 | 396 | 2.5977 |
| 5.90 | 225 | 2.3522 |
| 8.00 | 75 | 1.8751 |
| 8.20 | 65 | 1.8129 |


|  | Higration | Size/bp | Log size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Band 1 | 6.50 | 164 | 2.2140 |
| Band C | 8.30 | 63 | 1.7973 |
| 01igos | 9.90 | 27 | 1.4269 |
|  | (Calculated using eqn 21 |  |  |
| Band B | 4.40 | \| 3911 | 12.5924 |
|  | (Calculated using eqn 1) |  |  |

Fig.14:
Graph of migration/cm vs log/bp for marker in fig.13.

Using first three points,
Using last three points,

## Refression lutput:

No. of Observations
Degrees of Preedor
$x$ Coefficient(s) -0.21331
Std Bry of Coef, 0.004591
Ron-1: $x=-0.21331 x+3.530978$

Regression Output:-
3.718688
. 008839 Std Bre of 7 8st
3 No. of Obseryations 3
1 Degrees of Preedon
$X$ Coefficieat(s) -0.23148
Std Bre of Coef. 0.006239
B90.2: $I=-0.23148 x+3.218688$

Table 7:
Migration distances \& sizes of bands in fig. 13. Regression output of fig. 14.
viously amplified DNA was amplified even more. However, the 390 bp band was lost (fig. 15 , fig. 16 , table 8). The amplified DNA from another PCR was digested with Hind III and run on a gel. The 160 bp and the 390 bp bands were cut out from the gel and the DNA electroeluted out.

### 3.2.2: Cloning in pUC18

pUC18 was used as the vector to clone the fragments in $E$. coli. The vector was first cut with HindII and ligated to the fragments. Commercial competent cells (DH5 $\alpha$ ) were transformed with this ligation mix and plated on YT-X-gal-amp plates. Plasmid DNA from white recombinant colonies were isolated by minipreps and tested for the presence of the correct fragment using a variety of restriction enzymes, for example, EcoRI (fig. 17, fig. 18, table 9). Recombinant no. 2 contained an insert. HindIII was unable to retrieve the fragments from the transformed bacteria (fig. 19), hence Alu I (fig. 20, fig. 21, table 10) was used. As AluI cuts at the same site as HindIII, and a band corresponding to a fragment of approximately 210 bp was obtained, this band was cut out and the DNA electroeluted to be cloned into M13mpl9 for easy gene sequencing by the Sanger method (Sanger, 1979).

### 3.2.3: Cloning in M13mp19

M13mp19 vector DNA was prepared for insertion of the fragment by restricting with Hinc II. This enzyme gives blunt ended fragments, hence the 210 bp fragment cleaved by AluI, which was also blunt ended was inserted into this site. A commercial . PN97 strain of $E$ coli, $T G 2$, was transformed with this ligation mix. Clear plaques indicated transformed bacteria hence minipreps


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of pUC 19 <br> cleaved with Hinf I. |
| 2 | $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ amplification reamplified <br> at $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. |
| 3 | Amplification at $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 179 and 182 oligonucleotides. |
| 4 | Amplification at $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 179 and 180 oligonucleotides. |

Fig. 15: PCR at $46^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Reamplified sample from fig. 13, well no. 3, gave a band of approximately 180 bp (band a).


| Karker <br> Higration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 3.65 | 1408 | 3.1486 |
| 7.20 | 517 | 2.7135 |
| 8.20 | 396 | 2.5977 |
| 10.30 | 225 | 2.3522 |


| Band A nigration | Size $/ \mathrm{bp}$ | Log size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.10 | 179 | 2.2518 |

(Calculated using equation 1)

Fig.16:
Graph of migration/cm vs log/bp for marker in fig. 15.

Regression Output:

| Constant | 3.582953 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Std Bre of Y Est | 0.005949 |
| R Squared | 0.999987 |
| No. of Observations | 4 |
| Degrees of Rreedon | 2 |

$\mathbb{X}$ Coefficieat(s) -0.11992
Std Bre of Coef. 0.001236
ROB L $7=-0.11992 x+3.582953$

Table 8:
Migration distances \& sizes of bands in fig. 15. Regression output of fig. 16.


| Well no. | Sample (cleaved with EcoRI) |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Control, pUC 18 without insert. |
| 2 | pUC 18 from recombinant no.2. |
| 3 | pUC 18 from recombinant no.3. |
| 4 | pUC 18 from recombinant no.4. |
| 5 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |

Fig. 17: Restriction with EcoRI of pUC18 plasmids from transformants shows that recombinant no. 2 (in well no. 2) contains an insert.


| Karker <br> Migration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6.25 | 2029 | 3.3069 |
| 6.45 | 1904 | 3.2797 |
| 7.10 | 1584 | 3.1998 |
| 7.60 | 1330 | 3.1239 |
| 8.80 | 983 | 2.9926 |
| 9.20 | 831 | 2.9196 |
| 10.35 | 564 | 2.7513 |

Using first four points, Regression Output:

| Hell <br> no. | Heariest band <br> nigration | Size/bp | Log size |
| ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 5.10 | 2639 | 3.4215 |
| 2 | 5.15 | 2850 | 3.4549 |
| 3 | 5.40 | 2639 | 3.4215 |
| 4 | 5.55 | 2520 | 3.4014 |

(Calculated using eqa 1 )
Table 9:
Migration distances \& sizes of bands in fig. 17. Regression output of fig. 18.

Fig. 18:
Graph of migration/cm
vs log/bp for
marker in fig. 17.

Using last three points,
Constant Regression Output. 4,143765 Coistantession Output

Std Bre of I Bst
R Squared
No. of Observations
Degrees of Preedon
$\&$ Coefficient(s) -0.13375
Std Brr of Coef, 0.004489
Bgn. 1: $y=-0.13375 x+4.143765$ Regression Output:

| Constant | 4.143765 | Constant |  | 4.339308 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Std Bri of Y Bst | 0.001801 | Std Bre of I Bs |  | 0.00840 |
| R Squared | 0.997754 | a Squared |  | 0.99769 |
| No. of Observations |  | No. of Observat |  |  |
| Degrees of Preedor |  | Degrees of Pree |  |  |
| \& Coefficient(s) -0.13375 |  | $X$ Coefficient(s) | -0.15359 |  |
| Std Brr of Coef, 0.004489 |  | Std Bry of Coef | 0.007985 |  |
| Bqn. 1: $y=-0.13375 x+4$. | 143765 | Bgn 2: $y=-0.007$ | $85 x+4.39$ | 39308 |



| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| $1-5,7-11$ | pUC18 from transformants <br> restricted with HindIII. |
| 6,12 | pUC18 restricted with <br> HindIII. |

Fig. 19: Restrictions with HindIII of pUC18 plasmids from transformants were only partial. The 3 bands for each track represent the supercoiled form (SC), the linear form ( $L$ ) and the open circular form (OC).


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |
| $2-3$ | pUC 18 from recombinant no.2 <br> restricted with Alu I. |

Fig. 20: Restriction with AluI of plasmid from recombinant no.2. DNA from band a (~215bp) was cloned into pUC18.


| Karker <br> Higration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2.35 | 2027 | 3.3069 |
| 2.55 | 1904 | 3.2799 |
| 3.00 | 1584 | 3.1998 |
| 3.35 | 1330 | 3.1239 |
| 4.45 | 983 | 2.9926 |
| 4.85 | 831 | 2.9196 |
| 6.10 | 564 | 2.7513 |

Using first four points, Resression Output:
Constant
Std Brr of P Bst
a Squared
No. of Observations
Degrees of Preedo
$\mathbb{Z}$ Coefficieat(s) $\quad-0.18341$
Std Err of Coef. 0.009773
Bgn 1: $y=-0.18341 x+3.743977$

| Band A <br> Migration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9.00 | 215 | 2.3331 |

Fig.21:
Graph of migration/cm vs log/bp for marker in fig. 20.

Table 10:
Migration distances
(Calculated using eqn 2) \& sizes of bands in fig. 20. Regression output of fig. 21.
Using last three points, Reqression Output;
3.743377 Constant 3.624219
0.007613 Std Brr of 7 Bst 0.011318
0.994353 R Squared
0.995819

4 No. of Observations 3
2 Degrees of Preedor 1
\& Coefficient(s) -0.14346
Std Ber of Coef. 0.009298
Bga 2: $y=-0.14346 x+3.624247$
from these were tested for the correct fragment by restricting with a mixture of Pst $I$ and Kpn I. Most of the transformants gave a cleaved fragment of a size corresponding to 190 bp (fig. 22, fig, 23, table 11). Single stranded DNA was prepared from one of these. The DNA was suspended in $100 \mu \mathrm{l}$ of TE buffer and the $O D$ at 260 nm of $1 u$ of this in TE buffer measured. An absorbance of 0.010 was obtained, implying approximately $40 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of purified DNA. As the $O D$ at $280 n m$ was 0.016 , this meant that the DNA was not pure nd the estimation of $40 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ not reliable. Hence it was reconcentrated to $4 \mu g / \mu l$ for sequencing by the automatic DNA sequencer.

### 3.2.4: The Gene Sequence Obtained

The gene sequence obtained was 169 bases long (fig. 24). It did not correspond to the bromelain inhibitor gene sought after. The last 75 bases of the fragment corresponded to the $987^{\text {th }}$ to $1061^{\text {st }}$ bases of pUC18 (its kanamycin-resistance gene). There was an additional TAG sequence before the M13 sequence started. Before these 78 bases, 91 bases of an unknown gene sequence was present. 13 out of 19 bases in the beginning part of the sequence showed homology to the 181 oligonucleotide mix and 10 out of 17 bases in the ending part of the sequence showed homology to the 180 oligonucleotide mix. Further experiments were done to find out the source of contamination.

### 3.2.5: Source of contamination

It was strongly suspected that the source of contamination came from the pineapple template DNA. A Southern blot was done of a gel containing a track of PCR-amplified material. Controls were pUC18 with and without the insert. This gel also clearly showed


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |
| $2-4$ | M13 plasmid from recombinants with <br> inserts at HincIIsite and cleaved <br> with Pst I and Kpn I. |
| $5-9$ | Control, plasmid from blue colony <br> with no insert cleaved with Pst I <br> and Kpn I. |

Fig. 22: Restriction with PstI \& KpnI of M13 plasmids from transformants. Band $B$ ( $\sim 190$ bp) contained the correct sized insert and was sequenced.


| Marker <br> Kipration | Size/bp | Log.sige |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.60 | 2027 | 3.3069 |
| 1.70 | 1904 | 3.2797 |
| 2.00 | 1584 | 3.1998 |
| 2.20 | 1330 | 3.1239 |
| 2.90 | 983 | 2.9926 |
| 3.20 | 831 | 2.9196 |
| 1.10 | 564 | 2.7513 |

Usịg first four points, Resression Output:

| Insert A <br> Migration | Size/bp | Log.size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5.10 | 356 | 2.5515 |


| Insert B |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Misration | Size/bp | Log. sige |
| 6.50 | 188 | 2.276 |

(Calculated using eq̧a)
Using last three points,

Fig. 23:
Graph of migration/cm vs log/bp for marker in fig. 22.

Table 11:
Migration distances \& sizes of bands in


Fig. 24: Gene sequence of the DNA fragment inserted into M13mpl9.

3' - CTGGCGAAAGGGGGATGTGCTGCAAGGCGATTAAGTTGGGTAACGCCAGGGTTTTCCCAG
$\begin{array}{llllll}10 & 20 & 30 & 40 & 50 & 60\end{array}$ TCACGACGTTGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTGCCA - 5,
$70 \quad 80 \quad 90$

Fig. 24a: The first 91 bases of the DNA fragment. Source not known.

```
3' - CTCTCCTGTTCCGACCCTTCCGCTTACCGGATACCTGTGCGCC'1'TTTTCCCTTCGGGAA
            100 110 120 130 140
    GCGTGGCGCTTTCTCATGA - 5,
        160
Fig. 24b: The last 78 bases of the DNA fragment.
    Bases no. 92 to 166 correspond to
    bases no. }987\mathrm{ to 1061 of pUC18.
```

that the insert in pUC18 was the $P C R$-amplified product (fig. 25). The Southern blot hybridization and subsequent autoradiograph was not successful, hence it was attempted to repeat the whole experiment using a fresh batch of pineapple template DNA. However, an amplification at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ failed to give any amplified prod ducts. An amplification at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, using 20 ng of pUC18 as template DNA was then attempted. The results were rather conclusive (fig. 26, fig. 27, table 12) as a 160 bp band was present, hence proving that the original pineapple DNA was contaminated with prokaryotic DNA containing the kanamycin gene.


| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |
| 2 | pUC 18 from recombinant no.2. <br> restricted with Alu I. |
| 3 | Amplification at 500C with <br> oligonucleotides 180 and 181. |
| 4 | Control, pUC 18 restricted with <br> Alu I. |

Fig. 25: Gel used for Southern blot. Band a \& b are of approximately the same weight implying that the insert, $b$, and the amplified fragment, $a$, are the same fragment.

## Marker size/bp



| Well no. | Sample |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Marker consisting of lambda DNA <br> restricted with EcoRI and Hind III. |
| 2 | Amplification of pUC18 at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ using <br> 180 and 181 oligonucleotides. |

Fig. 26: PCR of pUC18 at $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. Band a is $160 b p$, which corresponds to the band obtained when pineapple DNA was was used as the template.


| Karker <br> Kigratioa | Size/bp | Log.size |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.65 | 2027 | 3.3069 |
| 1.80 | 1904 | 3.2797 |
| 2.10 | 1584 | 3.1998 |
| 2.35 | 1330 | 3.1239 |
| 3.20 | 983 | 2.9926 |
| 3.50 | 831 | 2.9196 |
| 1.60 | 564 | 2.7513 |
| 8.25 | 125 | 2.0969 |

Using first four points, Regression Output:


Fig.27:
Graph of
migration/cm vs log/bp for marker in fig. 26.
(Calculated using eqn 2)

Using last three points, Regression Output:
3.549235
.013396


Table 12:
Migration distances \& sizes of bands in fig. 26. Regression output of fig. 27.

## Chapter IV

## Discussion

## 4.1: Protein Purification

### 4.1.1: Method of Purification

At present the only method to purify thiol protease inhibitors from the alkaline fraction of cowpea is the method described. It is not a very good method, as the yield is very low2 kg of seeds gave only 3.2 mg of impure protein for Rele et al, 1980. As alot of protein is needed for assays and feeding trials on insects, a much better method of purification is required, hence the attempts on the papain affinity column. The column, however, bound many proteins as seen in the gels (fig. 9, fig. 10, table 5) and no single band could be narrowed down as the inhibitor.

If enough of the pure inhibitor had been purified, its amino acid sequence could have been determined. Complementary oligonucleotide probes could then have been constructed to fish out the gene. Once this had been done, the gene could be inserted into an expression vector and expressed in yeast, hence much more inhibitor could be obtained in this way and various other tests done on it. If successful in disrupting the growth and physiology of insects and micro-organisms, this gene could then be used to generate resistant transgenic plants.

### 4.1.2: Assay System

The assay system used involved benzoyl-DL-arginine-p-nitroanilide (BAPNA) (Arnon, 1970), modified as in Methods. This system is based upon the cleavage of an amide bond in the small molecular weight synthetic substrate. The free amine is estimated
by the spectrophotometric determination of the $p$-nitroanilide formed during the hydrolysis of BAPNA. This assay system was chosen because it was the most convenient and sensitive one available. There are other systems that could be better like the colorimetric assay for papain using Ac-Phe-Arg-Nan as substrate, which allows the detection of minute quantities of papain (as low as $0.1 \mu \mathrm{~g})($ Oliva et al., 1988) and the determination by titration using Z-Phe-Arg-NMec as substrate (Brzin et al., 1988). However, such substrates were not readily available.

As a result, alot of the partially purified protein had to be used for assays, leaving little for further purification or other work. The modified assay system used could not be made any more sensitive as maximal periods of 3 h were used and minimal amounts of BAPNA and papain. Any further alterations would have led to greater possibilities of error. Furthermore, as readings were taken from the same samples at intervals, a minimal volume of $4 m l$ was required to prevent dilution effects from the washed cuvettes.

### 4.1.3: Results from the Ion-exchange Column

Gatehouse et al., 1986, obtained four elution peaks from their ion exchange column. Peaks 2 and 3 showed papain inhibitory activity and no trypsin inhibitory activity. Peak 2 consisted of two proteins when analysed by SDS-PAGE, of which one had approximately $32,000 \mathrm{~m} . \mathrm{w}^{\prime} \mathrm{t}$. This was of the same weight as the protein obtained from the gel filtration column after pouring through peak 2 from the ion-exchange column (fig. 5, fig. 6, table 3). This, however did not show any inhibition whereas there was inhi-
bitory activity in the fraction before pouring through (fig. 2, table $1 a$ \& $1 \mathrm{~b}, \mathrm{fig} .3$, table 2 a \& 2b). As approximately same amounts of protein were used as before, this showed that either there was a trace amount of a second protein that was the inhibitor or that the protein had lost its activity during the interval between the two assays (15 days). As the sample was freeze dried immediately after eluting from the gel filtration column (2 days after the first assay), it could also have been the freezedrying that inactivated the protein, if it is the inhibitor.

### 4.1.4: Results from the Papain Column

On Bapna assay, strong inhibitory activity was obtained from the eluting peak of this column (fig. 8, table 4a \& 4b). SDS-PAGE showed many faint bands but a strong band at $52,000 \mathrm{~m}$. wt. was observed. This could be the main source of the inhibitory activity but could not be proved. The second washing peak showed enhanced enzymatic activity. This could be due to the mercaptoethanol and EDTA present in the solution or due to some papain leaving the column.

### 4.1.5: Future Work

As have been shown in the results above, there certainly is an inhibitor of cysteine proteases in cowpea. The problem is in isolating it. If there were just a stretch of amino acids that were known of this inhibitor, an oligonucleotide probe could be constructed to fish the gene out. If the amino acid sequence of the site of plant inhibitors that is responsible for their inhibitory activity on cysteines were known, then this sequence could be used to pick out cysteine inhibitor genes from any plant with
a similar site. Such a common site has been known for years in animals (Barrett, 1987) and have been shown to inhibit cysteines when constructed synthetically (Teno et al., 1987). However, recently it has been shown that this site also exists in a plant cysteine inhibitor (Abe et al., 1987). In their work, a nearly full-length cDNA clone for a cysteine proteinase inhibitor of rice (oryzacystatin) was isolated and the amino acid sequence deduced from it. It was found that it contained the sequence Gln-Val-Val-Ala-Gly which was conserved among most members of the cystatin superfamily (proteinaceous cysteine protease inhibitors of animal origin). If the cysteine protease inhibitor gene in cowpea contains a similar site, this five-amino-acid sequence could be used to isolate it. The bromelain inhibitor, however, is known not to contain this site.

## 4.2: Gene Isolation

### 4.2.1: Reason of Contamination

The sensitivity of $P C R$ is its advantage as well as its shortcoming. Trace amounts of contaminants can be detected by this method (Lo et. al, 1988). They suggest the following strategy for detection of contamination. (1) A negative control consisting of all PCR reagents minus the DNA template should be included in every amplification. (2) A likely source of contaminant is plasmid DNA, which is in common use in the laboratory, and such contamination can be proven by amplification with primers that span the vector-insert junction of such plasmid. The precautions in (1) and (2) exclude contamination of the PCR reagents and plasmid contamination of the DNA template. However, contamination of the template other than by the plasmid cannot be excluded.

As it was not expected that a prokaryotic DNA containing a kanamycin gene would have contaminated our template DNA, this could not have been detected any earlier. Future work can be done on the non-contaminated template DNA, but with a lower annealing temperature because $50^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ gave no amplification.

## SUMMARY

There were two aims to this project. One was to get a pure thiol protease inhibitor from cowpea seeds and the other to get the gene sequence of a bromelain inhibitor from pineapple.

Two methods were tried to get a thiol protease inhibitor from cowpea. One involved an ion-exchange column and another a papain affinity column. The second peak from the ion-exchange column showed slight inhibition of papain in the BAPNA assays (16.8\% for 1.66 mg protein and $20.5 \%$ for 2.26 mg protein, the amount of protein being estimated from absorbance readings). On further purification on a gel-filtration column, no inhibition was observed. The third peak from the papain column was divided into two and called fraction 2 and 3. Fraction 2, containing approximately 3.12 mg of protein, inhibited papain activity by $33.5 \%$, whereas fraction 3 , containing approximately 1.66 mg of protein, inhibited papain activity by $48.9 \%$, Both fractions consisted of a mixture of proteins and there was insufficient material for further purification.

The method used to get the gene sequence of the bromelain inhibitor from pineapple was to first amplify the gene from its genomic DNA using PCR. Two amplified fragments ( $\sim 160 \mathrm{br}$ and 390 bp ) were obtained using the oligonucleotides coding for the $C$ terminus of the long chain and the $N$-terminus of the short chain of the bromelain inhibitor as primers. The 160bp fragment was inserted into pUC18 and cloned in E. coli. It was then inserted into M13mp19 and cloned before sequencing by the Sanger method. The gene obtained was suspected to have come from a prokaryotic

DNA containing a kanamycin-resistance gene. The most probable source of this contaminant was from the pineapple template DNA sample.
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| Hindill | Sphl | Psti | Accl Hind II Soll | Xbal | amtl | Aval <br> Smal <br> Xinal | Asp718 Kport | Banll Sact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | AGTGCCAAGCTGCATGCCTGCAGGICGAC TCTAGAGGATCCCCGGGIACCGAGCTCGAATCGIA 393
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\begin{aligned}
& { }_{6} 6228 \\
& \text { M13mp } 19
\end{aligned}
$$
\]



| Enavee | Hite | Pas. |  |  | Pan. | Pow. |  | Eniyme bite |  | Pon. |  |  |  | Pos. | Pos. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hphia | (batba) | 2701 | 5116 | ( 589) | 5705 | 2411 | 5946 | Real | (btac) |  | (143) 1 | 1164 | 1 604) | 1769 | ( 271 | 1793 |
|  |  | ( 331 | 3979 ' | ( 1025) | 7004 |  |  |  |  |  | $(93) 11$ | 1809 | $2{ }^{(106)}$ | 1704 | ${ }^{65}$ | 1949 |
| Henic | (TCACC) | 15021 | 1502 | ( 1132 | 2034 | 2288) | 4922 |  |  |  | $(103) 2$ | 2132 | (1336) | 3436 | 2011 | 3647 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Kpnl } \\ \substack{\text { mol }} \end{gathered}$ | (BGtacc) | $\left(\begin{array}{ll}(2108) \\ \text { ( } 5242)\end{array}\right.$ | 7030 6242 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(\mathrm{S221}$ (102) | ${ }^{1189}$ | ( 1909 | 4379 | $\left(\begin{array}{c}(1004) \\ (599)\end{array}\right.$ | 3303 |
|  | (eatc) | 13911 | 1301 | ( 332) | 1713 | 5071 | 2220 |  |  |  | ( 322) 7 | 7164 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 40321 | 6252 | 1531 | 6405 | 9b) | 6501 | 8aci | (Gasctic) |  | ( 82341 | 2234 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4341 | ${ }^{4} 835$ |  |  |  |  | 8011 | (etcbac) |  | ( 42631 ) | 263 |  |  |  |  |
| mbolif moolle | (eapaba) | 22171 | 2217 | (1694) | 3911 | (2479) | ${ }^{6390}$ | 8au961 | (eancc) |  | ( 5723) 5 | 373 | ( 170) | 5713 | 24) | 3837 |
|  | (tctic) | 7811 | 781 | ( 32931 | 4074 | 196) | 4270 |  |  |  | $(458)$ | 6395 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 86b) | 4936 | 3191 | 5254 | 332) | 3504 | BCrFI | (CCNBa) |  | $(10131$ | 1013 | ( 1107 | 1923 | 421 | 1705 |
|  |  | 917 | ${ }^{405}$ | 3011 | ${ }^{6004}$ |  |  |  |  |  | ( 397315 | 3740 | ( 57\% | 5997 | 1391 | ${ }^{6136}$ |
| milia | (CCTC) | 2341 | 234 | 1191 | 373 | 187) | 560 |  |  |  | ( 110) | 446 | ! 11 | 4347 | c) | 437 |
|  |  | 271) | 5807 | (4) | ${ }_{\text {ctis }}$ | 303) | 1030 |  |  |  | ( 127) |  | ( 3as) | 4037 |  |  |
|  |  | 419) | 12097 | $\\|^{1431}$ | 1230 1325 | $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { ( } 619\end{array}\right.$ | 1296 | 8tania | (вatac) |  | ( 38989 | $485$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5(363) \\ & 9(1696) . \end{aligned}$ | $300$ | ( 965) | 1383 |
|  |  | 711 | 1418 | 901 | 1508 | 3911 | 109* | Btanit | (acatc) |  | ( 3976) 3 | 1979 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 48) | 1944 | 73) | 2019 | 2431 | 2262 | Ban 1 | (eccoma) |  | $\left({ }^{4246)}\right.$ | 4246 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 6) | 2268 | 404) | 2672 | 4) | 2874 | Enabl | (tacata) |  | $(1257) 12$ | 1267 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 217) | 2003 | 159) | 3031 | 2491 | 3320 | SphI | (8catac) |  | ( 6275 ) 6 | 6275 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 31) | 3351 | 3511 | 3702 | 604) | 4305 | Teq1 | (tça) |  | ( 336) | 336 | ( 740) | 1120 | 3911 | 1507 |
|  |  | 3911 | 4697 | 74) | 4772 | 149) | 4920 |  |  |  | ( 4411) 1 | 1948 | ( 5791 | 2527 | 927 | 3434 |
|  |  | 5) | 4925 | 4211 | 3346 | 491 | 3415 |  |  |  | 2391 3 | 3693 | ( 971) | 4654 | 10181 | ${ }^{5307}$ |
|  |  | 2651 | S690 | 3401 | 6020 | 235) | 6235 |  |  |  |  | 6234 | ( 301 | 6264 | 4181 | ceer |
|  | (8008) | 2771) | ${ }_{6}^{6532}$ | 423) | ${ }_{6953}^{695}$ | 7471 | 1372 | xbal | (tegatci) |  | ( 62351 ) | 6237 |  |  |  |  |
| malis |  | 3591 | 1731 | 102) | 1633 | 15) | 1848 | Xholit | (agatce) |  | ( 2219) 2 | 2219 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 131 | 1063 | 15) | 1876 | 129) | 2007 | Xholld | (agatcti |  | ( 6934 ) | ${ }^{4934}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3121 | 2319 | 151) | 2334 | 151) | 2349 | $x$ mil |  |  | ( 357) | 389 | ? 122001 | 2645 |  |  |
|  |  | (151) | 2364 4020 | ( 797) | ${ }^{2360}$ | ${ }^{9671} 1$ | 3335 | these | mixymes did not |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 612) | 5446 | 9471 | ${ }_{6} 393$ | 117) | 5510 |  |  |  | Ahalit |  | analio | Apal | Avaie | aralid |
|  |  | 573) | 7003 | ( 105) | 7190 |  |  |  |  |  | avalit |  | amilia | menilc | selit | Pemil |
| metit | (Tacaca) | 6424) | 8424 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Betx |  | Deteli | Ecomv |  |  |
| Metil | (ccimade) | ( ${ }_{(0507)}^{(5012)}$ | ${ }_{5612}^{6307}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Hinclic NatI |  | Hincild | $\begin{gathered} \text { Healil } \\ \text { Neil } \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {chal }}^{\text {clal }}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Mcol } \\ \text { acal } \end{array}$ |
| Nari | (eacacc) | ( 6000 ) | 6000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | stul |  | Tthalit | xhal | xholic | Mael11 |
| nesila | (ccces) | $\left(\begin{array}{c}\text { (246) } \\ \text { (1923) }\end{array}\right.$ | 4246 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mcilo | (ccemol | 2723) | 1923 2122 | ( $\begin{aligned} & \text { ( } \\ & \text { (1090) } \\ & \text { (1) }\end{aligned}$ | 4247 3002 | ( ${ }^{\text {3 } 3943)}$ | ${ }_{6045} 6037$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mlalil | (cata) | 149) | 149 | ( 47) | 196 | ( 9101 | 1106 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 193) | 1299 | 4991 | 1798 | 2351 | 2033 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1231 | 2156 | ( 649) | 2834 | 1 6771 | 3331 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 871 | 3418 | ( 931 | 3717 | (1941) | 9170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| masiv | (8Grucc) | 10611 | ${ }_{1061} 620$ | ( 187) | ${ }_{1248}$ | 2921 | 1590 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | ${ }^{101}$ | 1350 | 232) | 1802 | 248) | 2050 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 3231 123 | 2373 | ( 191 | 2391 | ( 32321 | 5643 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 134) | 5653 | 211 2301 | 3676 6150 | $\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { (120) } \\ (122)\end{array}\right.$ | ${ }_{8}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 4231 | 213) | 6444 | ( 12) | 6476 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Patil | (cracaa) (caatca) | ( 02097 (0409) | 6269 4404 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prull | (cascia) | ( 5959 (73) | 395\% | 1 1831 | ${ }^{2082}$ | ( 322) | ${ }_{1021}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Real | (etac) | 173) | 173 | ( 1071 |  | ( 7411 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    AGTGAATTCGAGCTCGGTACCCGGGGATCCTCTAGAGTCGACTGCAGGCATGCAAGCTTGGCGTA
    pUC19

