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A B S T R A C T

Cereblon (CRBN) is a substrate recognition subunit of the CRL4 E3 ubiquitin ligase complex, directly binding to specific substrates for poly-ubiquitination followed by proteasome-dependent degradation of proteins. Cellular CRBN is responsible for energy metabolism, ion-channel activation, and cellular stress response through binding to proteins related to the respective pathways. As CRBN binds to various proteins, the selective pressure at the interacting surface is expected to result in functional divergence. Here, we present two mammalian CRBN datasets of molecular evolutionary analyses. (1) The multiple sequence alignment data shows that positive selection occurred, determined with a dN/dS calculation. (2) Data on co-evolutionary analysis between vertebrate CRBN and related proteins are represented by calculating the correlation coefficient based on the comparison of phylogenetic trees. Co-evolutionary analysis shows the similarity of evolutionary traits of two proteins. Further molecular, functional interpretation of these analyses is explained in 'Positive selection of Cereblon modified function including its E3 Ubiquitin Ligase activity and binding efficiency with AMPK' (W. Onodera, T. Asahi, N. Sawamura, Positive selection of cereblon modified function including its E3 ubiquitin ligase activity and binding efficiency with AMPK. Mol Phylogenet Evol. (2019) 135:78-85. [1]).
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1. Data

The data contains phylogenetically analyzed CRBN sequences. The sequences were collected from NCBI GenBank (sequence accession numbers available in Supplementary Table 1). Fig. 1 shows phylogenetic tree of the mammalian CRBN sequence reconstructed using maximum likelihood and neighbor-joining method. On the same dataset, site-model test for detection of positively selected site (position 366) was applied, represented in Fig. 2. Ancestral state of position 366 are illustrated in Fig. 3 estimated using maximum likelihood method. The result for coevolutionary analysis of vertebrate CRBN based on mirror tree method are listed in Table 1 and Fig. 3.

2. Experimental design, materials, and methods

2.1. Data collection of sequences

Protein coding sequences of mammalian crbn genes were obtained from GenBank [2] in September 2017 (Supplementary Table 1). Partial sequences were excluded from the dataset. The sequences were aligned with ClustalW implemented in MEGA7 [3]. The default parameters were used for ClustalW. Redundant sequences were removed manually after multiple sequence alignment, 64 sequences were further analyzed (Supplementary Table 1).

Gene copy numbers were determined to validate the orthologous relationships of crbn genes. They were confirmed with the orthologous matrix (OMA) database and the orthologues view of Ensembl.
Fig. 1. Phylogenetic tree of full length CRBN tree. The tree was constructed using the Neighbor-Joining method with bootstrapping (1000 replicates). The scale bar indicates the branch length scaled by substitution per site.
A total of 42 sequences out of 64 were registered in those databases. Among the registered sequences, 41 species had a single copy of *crbn* (Supplementary Table 1).

### 2.2. Phylogenetic tree reconstruction

Phylogenetic trees of the CULT (cereblon domain of unknown activity, binding cellular ligands and thalidomide) domain (position of protein: 317-442), Lon domain (position of protein: 80-316) and full length *crbn* were constructed. Trees were built using maximum likelihood (ML) estimation implemented with MEGA7. The Kimura two parameter substitution model with discrete Gamma distribution of five categories were selected based on Akaike information criterion (AIC) scores [6]. The dataset was also analyzed using the neighbor-joining method in the Tamura three parameter substitution model [7,8]. Bootstrap resampling was conducted 1000 times for each method (Fig. 1, fig1 in Ref. [1] for the CULT domain).

### 2.3. Positive selection test and ancestral sequence reconstruction

The Selecton server was used to identify positive selection using the site-model [9,10]. Briefly, the server conducts likelihood ratio test (LRT) between the null hypothesis (M7 or M8a) that does not allow positive selection and the alternative hypothesis (M8) that allows positive selection (dN/dS > 1) to determine if there is positive selection in the dataset. The MEC (Mechanistic codon model), which assumes positive selection, uses AICc (AIC corrected) to compare the fitness in the dataset as it is not a nested model. If there is positive selection in the dataset, the Selecton server calculates dN/dS for each site and presents sites with a dN/dS statistically significant above one as positively selected site. A Bayesian approach was used for the dN/dS calculation. To assess the reliability of dN/dS values, a confidence interval defined by the 5th and 95th percentile of the posterior distribution is used. When
the lower bound of the confidence interval is larger than one, the site is defined as positively selected site [10]. The dataset did not show statistical significance between M8 and M8a but showed statistical significance between M8 and M7. MEC fitted the dataset best as it had the lowest AICc (Supplementary Table 3 and Table 1 in Ref. [1] for LRT).

Table 1
Co-evolution analysis between domains of CRBN. Co-evolutionary signals between CRBN and its related proteins were calculated for Lon and CULT domain. As trend, LON domain exhibited larger co-evolutionary signals compared to CULT domain. AMPKα and Meis2 had statistically significant increase for Lon domain. (p-value with * < 0.10, ** < 0.05, *** < 0.01).

| Protein          | Symbol | Correlation coefficient | P-value (Lon vs CULT) |
|------------------|--------|-------------------------|-----------------------|
| Complex factor   |        |                         |                       |
| Full length      | Lon domain | CULT domain |                       |
| DDB1             | 0.892  | 0.856                   | 0.363                 |
| RBX1             | 0.847  | 0.773                   | 0.734                 |
| Binding protein  | AMPKα  | 0.935                   | 0.718                 |
|                   | 0.935***| 0.935***                | 0.935***              |
| IKZF1            | 0.923  | 0.852                   | 0.1442                |
| Meis2            | 0.922  | 0.911***                | 0.0001                |
| SQSTM1           | 0.902  | 0.87*                   | 0.075                 |
| BK channel       | 0.841  | 0.816                   | 0.101                 |
| Conserved protein| GAPDH  | 0.836                   | 0.515                 |
|                  | 0.836  | 0.803                   | 0.515                 |
|                  | 0.836  | 0.803                   | 0.515                 |
|                  | GPI    | 0.857                   | 0.555                 |
|                  | 0.857  | 0.798                   | 0.555                 |
|                  | EF-1α  | 0.641                   | 0.171                 |
|                  | 0.641  | 0.636                   | 0.171                 |
|                  | β-Actin| 0.673                   | 0.516                 |
|                  | 0.673  | 0.606                   | 0.516                 |
FEL (fixed-effects likelihood), REL (random-effects likelihood), and SLAC (single-likelihood ancestor counting) methods were simultaneously applied to. This server is also based on a site-model calculated with the ML approach [11–14]. \( \frac{dN}{dS} > 1 \) is defined as positively selected site here with statistical confidence (p-value < 0.10 in FEL and SLAC; Bayes Factor > 50 in REL) by testing whether \( dN \) is significantly different from \( dS \) [11]. The Codon positions detected in dataset 1 are presented in Supplementary Tables 4–6. MSA colored with \( \frac{dN}{dS} \) value are presented in Fig. 2 for 13 representative species and for all 64 MSA species in Supplementary Table 7. Next, the ancestral sequence reconstruction was conducted in MEGA7 [3]estimating the maximum likelihood with the MSA and CULT domain phylogenetic tree of dataset 1. Fig. 3 represents the ancestral state of codon 366, detected as positively selected site.

2.4. Co-evolution analysis of dataset 2

The protein coding sequences of 11 vertebrate genes were collected from GenBank [2] in May 2018 (Supplementary Table 1). Proteins that are known to be the E3 complex factor or binding partners of CRBN were selected. Here, binding domain of CRBN is not restricted to CULT domain but also Lon domain. Those are DDB1: DNA damage-binding protein1, Rbx1: RING-box protein 1, AMPPKα: AMP-activated protein kinase α, IKZF1: IKAROS family zinc finger 1, Meis2: Meis Homeobox 2, SQSTM1: Sequestosome 1, BK channel: Big potassium channel. Four conserved proteins were selected as negative control, GAPDH: Glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase, GPI: Glucose-6-phosphate isomerase, EF-1α: Elongation factor 1α, and β-Actin. CULT domain, Lon domain, and full length CRBN were separately prepared for comparison between the domains. Partial sequences were cut from the dataset. The sequences were aligned with ClustalW implemented in MEGA7 [3]. Default parameters were used for ClustalW. Redundant sequences were removed manually after multiple sequence alignment, which consisted of a total number of 47–55 sequences for further analysis (Supplementary Table 1). The composition of the sequence species are briefly described in supplementary table 2. A phylogenetic tree was reconstructed with the neighbor-joining method using the maximum composite likelihood model with 500 bootstrap replicates. The trees were uploaded for a co-evolution analysis to the MirrorTree Server [15]. Briefly, the server generates scatter plots from a pair of corresponding species branch lengths of two phylogenetic trees. Then, correlation coefficients, which represent the similarity of evolutionary pressure from two phylogenetic trees, were derived from the

**Fig. 4. Correlation coefficient between CRBN and related proteins.** The correlation coefficient was calculated using the MirrorTree Server. The plots show the difference between the corresponding branches of two reconstructed phylogenetic trees.
plots. For test of significant difference between Lon and CULT domain, p-value was calculated after z-transformation of correlation coefficient. Fig. 4 shows 11 scatter plots derived from CRBN and its related proteins with the respective correlation coefficients. Within the 11 proteins, CRBN-related proteins (E3 complex factors and binding partners) tends to have higher correlation coefficient compared to conserved proteins with statistically significant value for AMPKα (GPI used in statistical comparison) [1]. Furthermore, domain-specific co-evolution analysis is shown in Table 1, exhibiting larger Lon domain’s correlation coefficient compared to that of CULT domain for CRBN-related proteins, while no inter-domain difference was observed for conserved proteins.
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Appendix A. Supplementary data
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