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Abstract

L-tartaric acid (TA) is accumulated to be the dominant organic acid in the grape (*Vitis vinifera*) berries and remains metabolically stable during berry ripening and the wine making process. It confers a low pH and a “sharp” flavor to wine, affecting many quality aspects such as colour, taste, microbial stability and aging potential. Exogenous TA is widely used as a flavorant and an antioxidant additive in the food and wine industry. The metabolic intermediates involved in the TA synthesis pathway in grapevine have been well characterized. The primary pathway utilizes L-ascorbic acid (Vitamin C) as the precursor which is sequentially converted to 2-keto-L-gulonic acid (2KLG), L-idonic acid (IA), 5-keto-D-gluconic acid (5KGA) and TA by several biochemical reactions. Only one candidate enzyme, *V. vinifera* L-idonate-5-dehydrogenase (LIDH, EC 1.1.1.264), involved in this pathway has been characterized so far. It catalyzes the inter-conversion of IA and 5KGA, the rate-limiting step of the TA biosynthesis pathway. In addition, another enzyme, a putative 2-keto-L-gulonate reductase (VV2KR), which is assumed to be responsible for the reduction of 2KLG to IA, has also been reported. However, further enzymatic characterization of this enzyme is still needed to validate its metabolic function in grapevine. The present study aims to investigate the molecular and structural characteristics of these two proteins, thereby improving our understanding on TA biosynthesis in grapevine.

LIDH is highly homologous to sorbitol dehydrogenase (SDH, EC 1.1.1.14). We employed a computational approach to show that LIDH originates from the functional divergence of SDH in grapevine. We demonstrated that core eudicot (the strongly supported monophyletic group following the early-diverging eudicot lineages ([Soltis, Senters et al. 2003](#)) SDHs have evolved into two distinctive phylogenetic lineages (Class I and Class II) due to positive natural selection after tandem gene duplication in the common ancestor of core eudicot plants. LIDH was identified as a Class II SDH. While the Class I SDH gene is universally conserved, Class II SDH genes are retained only in some plants including *V. vinifera*, *Solanum tuberosum*, *Theobroma cacao*. The
distribution of SDH genes among plant genomes showed a positive correlation between the occurrence of Class II SDH genes and the capacity for TA synthesis. These results provided new insights into the TA biosynthesis pathway from the evolutionary perspective. Protein modeling analyses revealed three amino acid substitutions at the catalytic sites between Class I and Class II SDHs. These three amino acid changes are suspected to be responsible for the unique enzymatic profile of LIDH. To confirm this hypothesis, Class I and Class II SDH genes from *V. vinifera*, *T. cacao* and *S. tuberosum* were cloned in this study. Site-mutations of the three amino acids were performed to assess their impact on enzyme substrate specificity. Recombinant protein of both wild-type and mutant SDHs from the above plants were expressed and purified. Enzyme kinetic tests confirmed that LIDH has a preference for L-idonate over D-sorbitol as its substrate. The Class I SDH from *T. cacao* demonstrated the highest activity with D-sorbitol but could hardly utilize L-idonate. The recombinant protein of the other SDHs could not be purified in this study due to troubles in protein induction and purification. Despite this, the preliminary results showed a significant enzymatic divergence between Class I and Class II SDHs, supporting the putative role of Class II SDHs in the TA biosynthesis pathway. In addition, a complete enzymatic characterization of the recombinant VV2KR was performed. VV2KR has the highest substrate specificity with D-glyoxylate, followed by hydroxypyruvate and 2KLG. We showed that VV2KR could catalyze the reduction of 2KLG to L-idonic acid effectively using NADPH as the preferred coenzyme. We went further to crystallize the recombinant VV2KR to determine its 3-dimentional structure. The ligand-free crystal structure of VV2KR was solved to a resolution of 2.1 Å. VV2KR has the highest similarity with *Coleus blumei* hydroxypyruvate/glyoxylate reductase (CbHPR) and *Arabidopsis thaliana* hydroxypyruvate/glyoxylate reductase (AtHPR) isoform 2 (~75% amino acid sequence identity). The VV2KR monomer structure adopts the typical folding of the D-isomer 2-hydroxyacid dehydrogenase (2KDH) proteins and has the highest structural homology with the CbHPR structure (main-chain atom Root Mean Square Deviation of 0.76 Å; main-chain atom include all atoms in the peptide chain except
those from the R-group, i.e. the side-chain). It represents the second plant HPR structure being determined to date. Structural comparison of VV2KR and CbHPR with other HPR structures revealed some unique structural features for plant HPRs. The commonly accepted substrates for HPRs (D-glyoxylate, hydroxypyruvate, pyruvate) and the 2KLG intermediate from TA pathway were docked to the VV2KR structure by a computational method. The potential biological function of VV2KR in the TA biosynthesis pathway in grapevine was discussed.

In summary, we focused on the molecular and structural characterization of the candidate enzymes responsible for TA biosynthesis in grapevine. The results of the present study highlighted the effects of enzyme structural variations on their in-vivo biological functions and significantly extended our understanding on the molecular mechanism of the TA biosynthesis pathway in grapevine.
Declaration

This work contains no material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, no material which has been published or written by any other person except where due reference is made in the text.

I acknowledge that the copyright of published works contained within this thesis (as listed below-p9) resides with the copyright holder of those works.

Date 03-April-2016

Yong Jia
Statement of the contributions of jointly authored papers and manuscripts

   Author contributions: YJ conceived the research. YJ and DCJW did sequence retrieval, curation and gene duplication characterization. YJ performed phylogenetic, synteny, natural selection and ancestral sequence analyses. YJ drafted the manuscript. JBB and YJ carried out protein modeling analyses. DCJW performed the transcript expression and gene co-expression analysis. CS and DCJW assisted with the drafting of the manuscript. CMF and JBB supervised the project.

   Author contributions: YJ, JBB and CMF conceived the research. CAB performed gene cloning and transformation. YJ and JBB purified the protein for enzymatic tests and crystallization. JBB collected the diffraction data. YJ and JBB solved the structure together. YJ, CS and CAB performed the enzymatic tests. YJ performed kinetic data and protein structure analyses. YJ drafted the manuscript. JBB and CMF contributed to the editing of the manuscript. CMF and JBB supervised the project.

The above papers and manuscripts are displayed in this thesis in either their published forms or submission forms according to the author guidelines of the specific journal.

The following authors agree with the Statement of the contributions of jointly authored papers and manuscripts and give consent to their inclusion in this thesis.

Yong Jia
John B Bruning
Crista A Burbidge
Darren CJ Wong
Crystal Sweetman
Christopher M Ford
Acknowledgement

I wish to acknowledge my supervisors Associate Professor Chris Ford and Dr. John Bruning. I would like to thank Chris for his guidance and support throughout my PhD and beyond, for introducing me into a research area that has changed my life. I feel extremely grateful for his persistent encouragement and invaluable suggestions regarding my experiments, without which I wouldn’t have been able to go through those depressing PhD days. I will never forget the very enjoyable, relaxing, sometimes “aimless”, chats that we had in office, which always successfully solve my problems the other way around. I would like also to thank my co-supervisor John for revealing me the novel world of crystals and protein structures, for making me feel that doing research could also be fun and cool. I appreciate John’s patience and trust for me to start learning protein crystallization over half-way into my PhD, for teaching me all the relevant skills hand by hand.

I would like to thank members from the Ford’s lab, including Dr. Crystal Sweetman, Dr. Damian Drew, Emma Drew, Dr. Jake Dunlevy, Dr. Darren Wong, David Contreras Pezoa, Emily Higginson, Denise Ong, Huihui Chong, Karen Francis. Also Ass/Prof. Colin Jenkins, Ass/Prof. Kathleen Soole from Flinders University. Special thanks to Dr. Crystal Sweetman, for teaching and guiding me since the first day of my PhD, the first person I would come to when I encounter any problem in the lab, and also for taking me to a lot of activities and parties and allowing me the opportunities to get in touch with local cultures. To Dr. Darren Wong, for the valuable suggestions and motivating talks regarding my research project. I miss those days working side by side with all you guys in the lab. How I wish sometime in the future we could still go back to the lab and run SDS-PAGE together. Also to members from John’s lab: Alice Kroker, Andrew C. Marshall, Long Tan and Jia Truong, thanks for all the valuable advices and help regarding my experiment. It’s been really lucky to meet them. I would also like to acknowledge all of the colleagues on level 4 of WIC building. These members include Dr. Sandra M. O. Mantilla, Dr. Susan Bastian, Yaelle Saltman, Dr. Ancheng Huang, Hannah Wang, Mariola Kwiatkowski, Renata Ristic, Dr. David Jeffery, Jame Wang, Joanna Gambetta, Sijing Li, Chen Liang. My thanks also go to Ee Lin Tek, Dr. Jin Zhang, Jiao Jiang from the microbiology lab level 3. They make my PhD life in Australia funny and interesting. Special thanks to Prof. Dabing Zhang, Dr. Gang Li and Xiujuan Yang from PGC. Thanks for their great help and advices with my research and beyond. I would also like to acknowledge all my CSC friends, especially Xiaoyu Chen, Cuicui Zhao, Huihui Bi etc. And also to the numerous friends I met in Highgate lodge, it’s been so lucky to know them.

I wish to acknowledge my family: my parents, my sister, my young niece and nephew, and all my relatives. Thanks for always being within touch whenever I need support and encouragement. Whatever I do and wherever I am, they are always the most important people in my heart and make who I am. Finally, a special thank you to Miss Zhuolin Pan. She is the most beautiful girl that I have ever met.