Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

PORTLAND PRESS

Review Article

On the specificity of protein–protein interactions in the context of disorder

Kaare Teilum[1,2], Johan G. Olsen[1,2,3] and Birthe B. Kragelund[1,2,3]

[1]The Linderstrøm-Lang Centre for Protein Science, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, DK-2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark; [2]Structural Biology and NMR Laboratory, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, DK-2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark; [3]REPIN, Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen, DK-2200 Copenhagen N, Denmark

Correspondence: Birthe B. Kragelund (bbk@bio.ku.dk)

With the increased focus on intrinsically disordered proteins (IDPs) and their large interactomes, the question about their specificity — or more so on their multispecificity — arise. Here we recapitulate how specificity and multispecificity are quantified and address through examples if IDPs in this respect differ from globular proteins. The conclusion is that quantitatively, globular proteins and IDPs are similar when it comes to specificity. However, compared with globular proteins, IDPs have larger interactome sizes, a phenomenon that is further enabled by their flexibility, repetitive binding motifs and propensity to adapt to different binding partners. For IDPs, this adaptability, interactome size and a higher degree of multivalency opens for new interaction mechanisms such as facilitated exchange through trimer formation and ultra-sensitivity via threshold effects and ensemble redistribution. IDPs and their interactions, thus, do not compromise the definition of specificity. Instead, it is the sheer size of their interactomes that complicates its calculation. More importantly, it is this size that challenges how we conceptually envision, interpret and speak about their specificity.

Introduction

Molecular communication is at the base of life, and to understand life, we need to understand how information is conveyed by molecules through their interactions. In and between cells, communication operates through a myriad of proteins, which interact with other proteins and molecules, thereby translating information across molecular classes. Because of their key roles in communication, protein interactions have attracted both academic, scientific and industrial interest, developing methods for the detection of complex formation, deriving models to describe the observations, and developing drugs to target interactions connected to pathological states.

Early on, it became clear that a given protein may bind a number of structurally very similar ligands, but prefers one of these ligands by orders of magnitude, measured as substrate turn-over or binding affinity, in work pioneered by Emil Fischer [1]. This property to selectively interact with one ligand was termed *specificity* (Figure 1A). In the 1950's, the binding of differently substituted benzoates to rabbit serum revealed a dependency on the chemical nature of the substituted benzoates, which was interpreted as specificity [2]. A similar observation was made for insulin binding to an insulin binding factor in serum where the presence of the many proteins and compounds in serum had no effect on binding of the insulin binding factor [3].

With the development of structural biology, which provided atomic resolution insight into protein–ligand interaction surfaces, the details of molecular communication were brought to light. Interactions at the atomic level could be resolved and their individual contributions to the binding energy determined. In a protein ligand complex, an interaction between e.g. the hydroxyl group of a threonine forming a hydrogen bond to a side chain of an aspartate would typically be termed a specific contact: a contact that would not happen in the absence of chemical complementarity.

Received: 27 March 2021
Revised: 14 May 2021
Accepted: 17 May 2021

Version of Record published:
8 June 2021

PORTLAND PRESS

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828



Figure 1. Specificity, complementarity, and valency.

(**A**) Specific binding as opposed to non-specific binding implicating complementary contact between ligand and receptor, as illustrated here by a π-cation interaction between a tryptophan and a lysine, and a hydrogen bond between the indole NH and a carbonyl backbone. The graph at the top illustrates that total binding to a receptor on a cell typically is the sum of specific binding to the receptor as well as non-specific, non-saturable binding e.g. to the membrane. (**B**) Non-specific binding in terms of lack of discrimination between any phosphorylated residue (top) or lack of complementary matching and increased dynamics in the binding site (bottom). (**C**) Multispecificity of the protein (in red) binding to several different binding partners (black) using the same or different sites along the chain. This is in contrast to mono-specific where only one ligand can bind the protein. (**D**) Multivalent interactions in the form of hetero-multivalent binding where different partners (black) binds to the protein (left) and homo-multivalent binding, where the similar ligand binding sites of the protein (in red) binds to similar partner proteins (in black, here globular proteins). In the latter case one may have homotypic interactions, e.g. IDP–IDP interactions or heterotypic between IDPs and folded domains.

Intrinsically disordered proteins (IDP) are proteins without a well-defined globular structure that are rich in polar and charged amino acids, and depleted in hydrophobic ones, leading them to populate ensembles of near-isoenergetic dynamic conformations [4,5]. Around the year 2000, their abundance and importance became acknowledged through bioinformatic scrutiny of the human genome and subsequent experimental confirmation [6–10]. The past 20 years of research have revealed a plethora of properties of IDPs, which are linked to the flexibility and dynamics of the individual structural ensembles. These dynamic properties expand the communication toolbox. Not only are IDPs capable of adapting to binding surfaces through coupled folding and binding [11–15], they can also remain disordered within a complex [16,17], even to a degree where specific chemical contacts are lacking [18]. Similarly, dynamics enables ultra-sensitivity and switch functionality as exemplified by the interaction of the cyclin-dependent kinase inhibitor Sic-1 with Cdc4. This interaction occurs through any one of a number of Sic-1 phosphoryl groups in an apparent non-specific way. However, a cumulative effect from increasing the number phosphorylations provides a threshold for binding [19,20] (Figure 1B).

The same binding region in an IDP may have the capacity to bind several different partners with very similar affinities [21]. This property has suggested that most IDPs are *multispecific*; a term which has been

Biochemical Journal (2021) 478 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

conceptually useful, as it contrasts the concept of being specific, where one ligand is preferred over many others. Nevertheless, the quantitative meaning of multispecificity is not well established. For transcriptional activators and co-activators, a prevailing view has been that these act non-specifically, the argument being that the density of hydrophobic and negatively charged residues combined with the dynamic nature of their complexes would not provide the necessary specificity and hence would not lead to selectivity (Figure 1B). Recent work, however, suggests that specific interactions do exist in these dynamic complexes, and that redistribution of the conformational ensemble of the complex and interactions with residues outside the main interaction surface play key roles [22]. This, and many other studies have shown that the context of which given binding site is found in is emerging as an important dimension in IDP interactions [23–25].

Proteins have more than one binding partner and are thus multispecific (Figure 1C,D) [26]. This property is essential for the function of communication foci in the cytoplasm where *hub-proteins* interact with a multitude of ligands, in some cases hundreds [27,28]. This raises the question of how specificity can be maintained. In hubs, structural disorder dominates [29–31], where either the hub protein itself is disordered, as exemplified by the protein p53 [21], or the ligands are, as observed for the folded hub proliferating cell nuclear antigen (PCNA) [32,33] or the group of 14-3-3 proteins [34,35]. Thus, structural disorder appears to be a molecular tool for obtaining multispecificity, and understanding how specificity is achieved as well as its quantification remain important.

One of the early characteristics that became associated with IDPs was that they bound with low affinity, but high specificity. However, recent analyses have highlighted that when comparing complexes formed by globular proteins to those formed between an IDP and a globular protein, their affinities covered the same range [36]. It was shown that for complexes where one of the interaction partners was an IDP that folded-upon binding, the binding free energies were moderately compromised, on average by 2.5 kcal mol^{-1}, which was suggested to originate from the loss of conformational entropy [36]. Furthermore, tight complexes of nM affinities can form between short linear motifs (SLiMs) in IDPs and folded proteins [37,38], and pM affinities are possible in complexes formed between two IDPs of opposite charge forming highly dynamic complexes [18]. In this light, it appears that IDPs do not adopt a different affinity profile strategy from folded proteins. The question is then how an IDP with a large number of biologically relevant binding partners can be specific in the formal sense of conveying relevant biological information via a relevant binding partner.

Here we address the question if IDPs challenge our concepts of specificity and multispecificity, and if IDPs tend to be more or less specific than their globular counterparts. We describe the concepts of specificity and multispecificity and relate these to how IDPs partake in molecular communication. In the present review, we reason that IDPs are not particularly different from globular proteins in terms of specificity. Rather, it is their larger interactomes [39] that challenge the quantification and perception of their specificity.

Specificity, affinity and biological relevance

A protein capable of binding several different ligands is referred to as multispecific or promiscuous. Protein chemists may even talk about 'very specific' or 'highly multispecific' proteins. While an intuitive understanding of such expressions seems to be shared in the community, a precise definition is lacking. Two extreme degrees of specificity can be envisaged. One extreme would be a protein that binds to one single ligand only, which would make it absolute specific. The other is a protein that binds everything it comes into contact with, which would make it absolute non-specific. Both extremes are likely purely hypothetical, and all proteins exist somewhere along this continuum. An intrinsically disordered hub-protein may for example be able to bind many different ligands with similar affinities. If all those ligands are accessible in equimolar amounts at the same time, then, by definition, the hub protein shows very low specificity. However, the relative concentration levels and accessibility of the ligands are likely tightly adjusted depending on the biological state of the given system. If the hub protein is presented with only one of its ligands in a crowded cellular environment, then this ligand will be the only binding partner, and then, by definition, the hub-protein is highly specific. The affinity of a complex on its own is thus not a measure of specificity although it provides basic knowledge of the energetics in the process. With their high flexibility, IDPs can bind and adapt to a large surface area on a binding partner and in this way make favorable contacts, which result in high affinity [40–43]. The affinity alone, however, does not dictate which one of a series of ligands occupies the binding site of the protein most of the time, and higher affinity does not necessarily result in higher specificity. As we discuss further below, both the concentration of a ligand and the affinity for the ligand *relative* to the same parameters for other ligands determine the specificity.

PORTLAND PRESS

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

Specificity can also be considered in terms of the molecular details of binding, referred to as *chemical specificity* or *complementarity* (Figure 1A). The interface between two protein molecules that interact may contain a number of salt bridges, hydrogen bonds, van der Waals' interactions etc.; each interface requiring from the other a certain distribution of functional groups in three-dimensional space, i.e. the interfaces are complementary. An interface may also, either exclusively or in addition, consist of long-range interactions between complementary charges, the exact distribution of which may not change the energy of binding. For example, certain DNA binding proteins recognize and bind a unique sequence of nucleotides. Such a complementary binding interface is an example of chemical specificity. Assuming a protein that has a single available target sequence on DNA, it can be regarded as highly specific. The chemical specificity is ensured by the sequence preference. However, parts of the protein outside the DNA base-pair binding region interact with the phosphate backbone, contributing energy to the complex. In itself, the phosphate backbone interaction is independent of the base-pair combination, and so it can be argued that this part of the protein does not contribute to the chemical specificity, but because the interaction changes the binding K_d, the chemically unspecific regions may actually increase the specificity. Another typical example is the interaction between a membrane-bound receptor and a soluble ligand, which is specific, and the interaction between the soluble ligand and the membrane itself, which is chemically non-specific (Figure 1A).

Finally, there is the question of biological relevance. Non-specific interactions may very well be biologically relevant. The molecular storm or noise inside a living system must result in molecules continually interacting, and although many of these so-called quinary interactions [44,45] have no immediate biological output, they necessarily must constitute an evolutionary driving mechanism of fundamental importance to biology for developing new communication lines. Thus, even highly non-specific, low affinity and accidental interactions can have biological relevance. This means that the degree of specificity, the magnitude of the K_ds and biological relevance are not necessarily correlated.

Specificity can be quantified

The most basic parameter for describing a binding reaction is the *affinity*, which is a measure of the binding strength. For a simple one-step reaction involving one protein and one ligand ($P + L \rightleftharpoons PL$), the strength of the binding is given by the equilibrium constant for the reaction, called *the association constant,* K_a, or, more frequently, *the dissociation constant* K_d, which is the equilibrium constant for the reverse reaction (and $K_a = 1/K_d$). It has the value of the concentration of free ligand that results in half saturation of the protein.

For a protein binding two different ligands, two binding equilibria exist, each with an associated K_d value:

$$P + L_1 \rightleftharpoons PL_1 \quad K_{d,1} = [P][L_1]/[PL_1]$$
$$P + L_2 \rightleftharpoons PL_2 \quad K_{d,2} = [P][L_2]/[PL_2]$$

Here, P is a protein, and L_1 and L_2 are two different (protein) ligands. The simplest and most straightforward way to compare the binding of the two ligands is by taking the ratio of the two K_d values. This ratio is called the *selectivity* or *discrimination ratio*, $d = K_{d,1}/K_{d,2}$ and gives the concentration of ligand L_1 relative to ligand L_2 needed to get the same level of saturation of the protein by the two ligands [46]. The selectivity, however, does not take the actual concentrations of free ligands into account, so the value itself cannot directly be used to assess which of the complexes, PL_1 or PL_2, that will dominate in a given situation and hence the specificity.

In the case where a protein has more than one potential ligand, the quantification of how much one complex is favored over others, the *specificity factor*, α_1, is defined, in which the free ligand concentrations are included. For the two binding reactions above, we have [47]:

$$\alpha_1 = [PL_1]/[PL_2] = ([L_1]/K_{d,1})/([L_2]/K_{d,2})$$

and in the more general case where several alternative ligands L_i can bind, this becomes:

$$\alpha_1 = [PL_1]/\Sigma[PL_{(i>1)}] = ([L_1]/K_{d,1})/\Sigma([L_{(i>1)}]/K_{d,(i>1)})$$

Here, the sum in the denominator is over all ligands except ligand 1. α_1 thus depends both on all the affinities and on the concentrations of all the free ligands. This means that α_1 will change if the free concentration of

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

any one ligand changes. The specificity factor thus considers the situation where the ligand with the highest affinity may be present at extremely low concentration, and *vice versa*. This means that in order to evaluate the specificity of a certain protein quantitatively, we need the K_d values and free concentrations of all possible biologically relevant ligands in the cell at any given time. Such information is rarely, if ever, available.

Specificity in relation to IDPs

Variations in the free concentrations of a set of ligands capable of binding to the same IDP can affect biological outcome. To illustrate this, we will use the tumor suppressor protein p53 as an example and look at a subset of the many p53 binding partners, specifically the K_d values for p53 binding and their concentrations in the cell. The p53-derived peptides used in the different studies vary in length, but the interaction region is the same when in complex with different folded domains. The purpose here is to illustrate how varying concentrations of the competing ligands change biological outcome.

The p53 tumor suppressor is a transcriptional activator, that contain ordered and disordered discrete domains participating in sequence-specific DNA binding, tetramerization, or transcriptional activation [48] (Figure 2A). One of its domains, the transcriptional activation domain 2 (TAD2) engages in complexes with many differently folded ligands including, but not restricted to, ligands active in transcriptional machinery complexes, chromatin modification and DNA homeostasis (Figure 2B). Their affinities were measured through isothermal titration calorimetry, fluorescence polarization, or nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy and range from 7.5 mM to 300 nM [49–54]. Based on the observed affinities alone (Figure 2C), it is hard to imagine how the weakest binding ligand would ever stand a chance. To address the *specificity* for a selected



Figure 2. Part of the interactome of p53 and illustration of the role of concentration in specificity.

(**A**) domain structure of p53 with its TAD2 domain highlighted in red. (**B**) Variations in bound-state structures of the p53–TAD2 domain (in red) in complex with different folded domains (in grey) from RPA (the N-terminal DBD domain (DBD-F); PDB 2B3G [49]), TFIIH (The TFB1 domain; PDB 2GS0 [50]), CBP (the TAZ2 domain; PDB 2MZD [51]), HMGB1 (the A-box; PDB 2LY4 [52]) and p62 (The PB1 domain; PDB 2RUK [148]). The N-terminus of p53 is to the left in each figure. (**C**) Association constants K_a for p53 TAD2 from [49–53]. (**D**) Cellular concentrations taken from PaxDB [55] in two different cell lines HEK293 and HeLa (Geiger) converted from ppm to μM [58]. (**E**) Specificity of p53 given by the specificity factor α for different ligands of the p53–TAD2 in two different cell lines. HEK293 cells in black and HeLa cells in red.

Biochemical Journal (2021) 478 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

subset of TAD2-binding ligands (Figure 2A), the cellular concentrations of their free states are required. We simulated these concentrations from the K_ds and their total cellular concentrations in two different cell lines (HEK293 and HeLa cells) available in the PaxDB database [55,56], using the software Copasi [57]. The abundance values are reported in ppm (parts-per-million), which were converted to μM as described [58] (Figure 2D). From this, we calculated the specificity factor for each ligand in the presence of the others, disregarding any other contact among the ligands (Figure 2E). Several observations are relevant. First, it is evident that the specificity factor for most ligands is below 1, but dominated by HMGB1, the concentration of which is much higher than any of the other ligands. This could not be concluded from inspection of the affinities alone (Figure 2B). Second, changing the concentrations from those found in HEK cells to those in HeLa cells changed the specificity factor for all ligands, and hence will change the resulting biological outcome. In this particular case, p53 binding to RPA and PC4 is less likely in HeLa cells, which proliferate abnormally fast. Indeed, p53 binding to RPA suppresses homologous recombination [59] and PC4 binding to p53 enhances its tumor suppresser function [60], so different specificity profiles manifest in the phenotype. A more complete model of this system would have to consider all the different ways the available pool of free ligands can be modified. Modification can be achieved via degradation, rate of synthesis, interaction with other molecules or chemical modifications such as phosphorylation and methylation. As an example, acetylation of PC4 enhances, while phosphorylation blocks, its ability to activate p53 DNA binding [60]. In such cases, it becomes increasingly difficult to predict the actual biological output. The example illustrates that especially for IDPs, interactions *per se* do not compromise the definition of specificity, but the size of their interactomes [39] complicates its quantification.

Multivalent interactions

In the above, we have implicitly assumed that the ligands compete for the exact same binding site. In many cases, however, IDPs have several binding sites next to one another, which complicates the picture somewhat (Figure 1C). The core binding sites often take the form of short linear motifs (SLiMs) that either may be very different in sequence and bind different ligands, or very similar in sequence and bind the same ligand [24,61]. The multiple binding sites or domains make the protein multivalent (Figure 1D) and a quantitative description of the interactions becomes complex [62–65]. Multivalent binding reactions occur stepwise, but not necessary in a predetermined sequence of events. The first binding event may significantly alter the properties of the interacting molecules and perturb the strength of the subsequent binding events, resulting in an overall macroscopic binding equilibrium described by the avidity constant K_{av}.

$$K_{av} = [P_{bound}]/([P_{free}][L])$$

If the binding sites in the multivalent system are independent, K_{av} will be the same as K_d for the monomeric interaction as long as [P] refers to the total concentration of binding sites. K_{av} may, however, become much larger than for a monomeric interaction. As much as a 10^{17}-fold increase has been reported for a fairly simple system of a trivalent peptide binding to vancomycin [66]. The avidity in a system depends on how the individual binding sites are connected. The avidity also depends on how the initial binding and the linker(s) between the binding sites modulate the entropy (dynamics) of the system, and whether the linker becomes structured or not upon binding of a ligand [67]. All these thermodynamic parameters can be rationalized, although they may be hard to quantify experimentally.

Closely connected to the avidity of a multivalent system is the *effective concentration,* which is a more operational measure of the strengths of binding sites in multivalent interactions. Where the initial binding event is dependent on the concentrations of the interacting molecules, this is not the case for the subsequent intra-complex interactions. The spatial tethering of subsequent binding sites in a multivalent binding reaction infers that the probability of two binding sites forming a constructive interaction is greatly increased. The effect can be quantified by measuring the effective concentration, which is the concentration of the ligand-binding domain in an untethered monomeric form needed to outcompete half of the intra-complex binding of the tethered domains. Methods to experimentally measure the effective concentration have been devised [68,69] and can be used to explain both the thermodynamics and the structural changes in the binding process [70].

A key feature of multivalent binding is that several weak binding sites can — when they are linked together — result in very strong binding and lead to a steep binding transition over a narrow range of ligand

concentration in what has been named super-selectivity [71]. For multivalent IDPs, extremely strong binding is typically not desirable, as it would imply that the molecules in the complex would practically never dissociate [65]. Multivalent IDPs appear to have evolved to circumvent this disadvantageously strong binding by taking advantage of increased dynamics in the complex. One illustrative example is the behavior of the interaction between the FG-repeat proteins in the nuclear pore transport complex and the molecular cargo that has to be transported through the nuclear pores [72,73]. The FG-repeat proteins are disordered and have multiple (up to 50) similar SLiMs (Phe–Ser–Phe–Gly) connected by disordered linkers. They line the rim of the nuclear pores, where they bind cognate transport factors through multiple interactions with the SLiMs. For one transport factor, NTF2, the interactions with variants harboring a variable number of FSFG SLiMs, was studied. As the number of repeats went up, so did the affinity, but there was no affinity gain by adding more than four repeats [74]. Thermodynamic analysis showed that the favorable enthalpic contribution to the binding continues to increase up to at least 12 repeats. However, this is counteracted by an increasing unfavorable loss of entropy as the flexible linkers joining the repeats become ordered [74]. Based on the thermodynamic parameters, the effective concentrations of the FG-repeats reach more than 32 mM when six repeats are present [74]. It is noteworthy that this is near the actual concentration of FG-repeats estimated, which may be as high as 50 mM in the center of the nuclear pore complexes [73]. The system has evolved to give just the right affinity to keep the transport factors within the nuclear pore transport complex, but in a highly dynamic way that allows the transport factors to slide through the pore by transient interactions with the many FG-repeat proteins [75]. The transport process is, however not fully understood. It turns out that purified FG-repeat proteins may undergo liquid–liquid phase separation (LLPS) *in vitro* and form droplets that have similar permeability for proteins known to be transported through the nuclear pore complex [76]. Whether the FG-repeat proteins form the same phase separation *in vivo* remains to be clarified.

Condensate formation and LLPS is a direct result of multivalency, either acting through intermolecular interactions between the same protein (homotypic) or between different proteins (heterotypic) [77–79] (Figure 1D). Condensates form in a concentration dependent manner and is driven by low-affinity interactions between several sites, often of low sequence complexity [80–82]. This behavior results in a distribution of affinities in the dense phase, as observed from power-law distributions of dwell-times within the condensates [83]. These membrane-less micrometer-scale compartments have liquid-like properties [84] and are widespread in eukaryotic cells, with the phenomenon being observed and described for different types of proteins and organisms both *in vivo* and *in vitro* (for recent reviews, see e.g. [80,82,85–87]). Disordered regions are important co-actors and drivers in these processes, and multivalent IDR-IDR contacts are often seen. However, the process is not restricted to IDPs [88–90], but more to the property of multivalency (Figure 1D), although disordered linkers as well as IDPs play additional roles in this process [91]. RNA and DNA are inherently highly multivalent, and LLPS phenomena involving proteins typically active in RNA and DNA metabolism are currently some of the most thoroughly described. There is, for example, growing evidence for the role of phase separated condensates in transcription [92–95] and in activation domains of transcription factors, such as the estrogen receptor [93] and the glucocorticoid receptor [83]. In all cases, the spatiotemporal confinement and the resulting population increase in the condensates, increase the concentration from typically low μM in the dilute phase, to high μM–mM concentrations in the dense phase [96–100]. Moreover, the condensates are dynamically formed and sensitive to environmental factors such as phosphorylation, pH and temperature, which can lead to their swift dissolution [101–104]. Thus, condensate formation may affect specificity in several ways. One is the compartmentalization, which leads to an effective elimination of potential competing ligands and confinement in a restricted reaction zone. Another is through the large increase in concentration, which greatly increases the specificity factor (as defined above), for ligands available in the condensates. Depending on the mechanism of interaction, the increased concentration also affects the rate of complex formation via an increase in the on-rate for binding, resulting in faster regulation. Thus, condensate formation can be a relevant biological avenue for specificity regulation. Indeed, specificity in condensate formation has been seen [94]. However, how chemical specificity is achieved in condensed phases is still an ongoing question, although patterning, affinity and valency play key roles [105–107].

Multivalency and multispecificity are also properties of globular hub proteins

DNA replication, translesion synthesis, homologous recombination, mismatch repair, chemical modification, transcription and more, are all processes that require the presence of a DNA clamp, a pivotal hub protein.

Biochemical Journal (2021) 478 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

In eukaryotes, the DNA clamp is the proliferating cell nuclear antigen, PCNA [108]. It is folded into a ring-shaped trimer (Figure 3), which is loaded onto DNA to encircle the double helix [109]. In this position, it can slide along the DNA strands and recruit and position ligands within its three binding sites to enable whatever DNA operating molecular machinery is required, similar to a DNA toolbelt.

A curated list of ∼80 interaction partners was recently collected along with an analysis of PCNA–ligand interactions at the molecular level [32]. Most of these ligands are all either IDPs or intrinsically disordered regions (IDRs) of proteins with disorder in and around the PCNA binding SLiM [32]. The ligands fold into the PCNA interacting protein (PIP) binding pockets, mostly as a single 3_{10} helical turn (Figure 3). The PCNA binding SLiM is referred to as the PIP-box [33], although some sequence variants are referred to as a PIP-degron [110,111] or an APIM (AlkB homolog 2 PCNA-interacting motif) [112]. The interactions in the PIP pockets constitute the central binding site. However, despite similar SLiMs, binding affinities for PCNA can vary 3–4 orders of magnitude between ligands. Small peptides comprising only the PIP-box region, have K_d values as high as 3 mM as in the case of an Spd1 derived peptide, and as low as 6 nM for a p21 derived peptide [32].

With >80 ligands harboring more or less the same motif, the specificity for PCNA binding as well as its selectivity may reside elsewhere. Indeed, the binding pockets only constitute a minor part of the large surface of PCNA and recent work has shown that flanking regions of the disordered ligand can modulate affinities by four orders of magnitude [32]. Interactions between the flanking regions of the motif and residues outside the PIP pockets are mainly electrostatic [32]. These interactions are rarely seen in the crystal structures, but they contribute significantly to the binding affinity.



Figure 3. Multivalency and multispecificity is also a property of globular domains.

The PCNA trimer (in grey) is shown in the central part with three Cdt1 ligands bound (in red). The canonical PIP box motif is shown below. With a few possible exceptions, all ligands have the motif within an intrinsically disordered region and bind to the same site on PCNA forming a 3_{10} turn and with varying structures and dynamics in the flanking regions. Here, seven crystal structures of PCNA and small ligand peptides are shown with their PIP box motif indicated below. The bound ligands and the corresponding PDB codes are: Left panel: DNA polymerase iota (2ZVM), RNase H2B (3P87), and p15 (6GWS); central panel: Cdt1 (6QCG); right panel: DNA pol delta (1U76), DNA pol eta (2ZVK), and DNA pol kappa (2ZVL).

Biochemical Journal (2021) 478 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

PCNA is a fine example of a multivalent folded protein where multispecificity is possible when the ligands are disordered. In this case, the energy of binding to the central complementary PIP-binding pocket is supplemented by contributions from dynamic charge-charge interactions in the flanking regions of the disordered ligands [32]. Thus, different post-translational modifications, primarily phosphorylation, both of PCNA and its ligands, regulate binding [113,114]. So even though p21 is by far the strongest PCNA-binding ligand, obviously DNA replication and all other PCNA dependent processes also happen. The presence of disorder in the ligands will allow for more rapid exchange in the binding pockets (see below) and provide access to modifying enzymes, including those leading to ubiquitylation and proteasomal degradation. In this way, the α-factors for the ligands can be modulated both directly and indirectly.

Specificity of highly charged IDPs

Although original work suggested IDPs to be more charged and polar than globular proteins [115–117], it is becoming evident that the sequence properties of IDPs are more diverse [118], where some have minimal charges, as seen in the low complexity regions of FUS and hnRNPA1 [119], and others have additional enrichment in proline [120] or glutamine [121,122]. A particular group of IDPs is highly charged with a large surplus of either positive or negative charges, resulting in a large net charge per residue. These IDPs still form many different types of complexes including those with DNA [16,123]. One example is the linker histone H1 and its chaperone prothymosin α that form a high-affinity complex in which both proteins remain as dynamic and disordered as in their free state [18,124]. At low concentration, the complex forms a 1 : 1 complex of nM affinity. At higher concentration, the dynamics of the complex makes it possible for a second ligand (of either partner) to enter the complex, forming ternary (or higher order) complexes of lower affinity (Figure 4) [125]. The trimers are only transient, and one of the ligands sharing the interaction will remain and reestablish a new nM affinity 1 : 1 complex. This can happen much faster than one would expect from a 'normal' nM affinity interaction with long-lived established contacts at the interface, and with a concentration dependent dissociation rate constant. As a result, the exchange rate in the complex changes more than 45-fold compared with a two-state reaction [125], which has implications for affinity measurement at higher protein concentrations [124]. This mechanism has been referred to as facilitated ligand exchange via *competitive substitution* [125,126]. The highly charged complexes remain dynamic with apparent non-specific contacts in a mean-field type interaction [18].

A similar concentration dependent behavior was observed for the binding between Cu^{II} ions and Aβ, which in its monomeric soluble state is a disordered polypeptide. At certain conditions, Aβ forms fibrils that are the main constituent of plaques in the brains of patients with Alzheimer's disease [127]. Aβ binds Cu^{II} with nM affinity [128]. At low concentrations of Aβ, the Cu^{II}-ions dissociate slowly from the complex. However, as the Aβ concentration increases, Cu^{II} starts to dissociate faster in a process that depends on the concentration of Aβ through the formation of a ternary Aβ-Cu^{II}-Aβ complex [129]. This demonstrates how the components of apparently very stable multimeric species still may exchange in and out of the complex in a highly dynamic way.

Ligand exchange via competitive substitution where transient trimers (or higher order oligomers) are involved in swapping binding partners has been observed in other types of complexes, some also involving folded domains. Examples include facilitated exchange of DNA bound proteins, transcription factors and transcriptional coactivators [130–133], where complex affinity switching has been suggested to be facilitated by dynamics in the folded partner [133,134], and of highly charged antigenic peptides from MHC class II in antibody binding sites, in which case the exchange reaction was termed *push-off* [135]. In all cases, dynamics at the interface underlies the possibility for enhanced exchange allowing access to interactions for incoming ligands (Figure 4). Thus, the mechanism of facilitated exchange through competitive substitution is not limited to IDPs but requires that the binding site is dynamic.

Although highly charged IDPs may be expected to bind to almost any oppositely charged ligand, they may still be specific. This may be compared with the nuclear transport proteins that travel through the pore down the concentration gradient through many low-affinity encounters with several different proteins [74,75]. However, for the highly charged proteins, specificity in terms of specific contacts may not exist, but may instead depend on other yet to be defined properties such as the number of charges, their distributions along the chains or on surfaces, or on concentration and localization *in vivo*.

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828



Figure 4. Dynamic complexes enable facilitated exchange.

Dynamics in the complex facilitated by the disordered chains allows for temporary simultaneous binding of two ligands (red and grey) to a partner, here illustrated by another IDP (in black). Once two (or more) ligands share the partner, being it through charges, ions, or a mean-field, this lowers the affinity of both ligands. In this case, the dissociation rate constants for the ligands will be concentration dependent. Depending on the life time of the trimers (or higher order oligomers) compared with the chain reconfiguration times of the IDPs, either ligand may leave the complex as indicated.

Conclusions

In this paper we have asked if IDPs are different from globular proteins in terms of specificity. The answer is that they are not. Quantitatively, specificity for globular proteins and IDPs is similar. What differs is the size of their interactomes [39] and their adaptability and dynamics. As a result, the values of the specificity factors for protein–ligand systems involving IDPs are much lower for the individual complexes. This is a direct consequence of their large interactomes. Simply by being capable of adapting to more partners, even using the same binding site through composite SLiMs, IDPs increase the number of partners and hence parameters in the system, and this complicates calculation of their specificity factors. Conceptually, however, it is the sheer sizes of their interactome rather than their dynamic nature, that challenge how we envision, interpret and speak about specificity.

In light of these considerations, we can now return to the early statement of low affinity and high specificity as a generic property for IDPs. There may in fact be some truth to it. Although we have seen many IDPs binding with high affinity, even in the low or sub nM range [32,37,38], the higher degree of multispecificity and potentially lower specificity factors, combined with high adaptability, may indeed require low affinity for

generating high specificity. In this case, to increase the value of the specificity factor α for a particular ligand, the affinity for all competing ligands must be even lower. Whereas this will be the case for some IDPs, another suggestion has been that multiple SLiMs present in an IDP will increase specificity. From the above considerations, such SLiM trains will indeed increase the local concentrations of a particular binding site and through this increase the avidity, and even give rise to super-selectivity. However, it does not a priori increase specificity. The protein may still have many partners where similar exploitation of avidity happens and hence in this way, the protein remains multispecific.

Multispecificity appears to be an evolutionary advantage and the functions of many different proteins including enzymes, antibodies, the ubiquitin system, G-coupled protein receptors and more, rely on it [26,136–138]. One of the advantages may be to increase network resilience, as higher specificity in terms of smaller interactomes have been suggested to result in decreased network pliability and malleability [139]. For IDPs, multispecificity is coupled to their flexibility and adaptability, and as important drug targets with key roles in disease [140,141], this cocktail constitutes a challenge for their drugability. Proof-of-concept in targeting of IDPs by small molecules has, however, been made [142–144], and new mechanisms for drug targeting have emerged, such as targeting a folded binding partner or the IDP-complex [145], or via ensemble expansion and entropy optimization [146,147]. Thus, it is not their multispecificity that obstruct targeting of IDPs, but more so their highly dynamic ensembles.

In conclusion, the main difference between IDPs and globular proteins roots back to the property of flexibility and adaption and to the propensity to remain dynamic in a complex. These properties enable a higher degree of multivalency and larger interactomes, and open for new interaction mechanisms through dynamics such as facilitated ligand exchange through competitive substitution, ultra-sensitivity and ensemble redistribution. More importantly, these properties challenge how we envision their specificity and speak about it, and how we unravel their biology and target them in disease.

Competing Interests

The authors declare that there are no competing interests associated with the manuscript.

Funding

This is a contribution from REPIN funded by the Novo Nordisk Challenge program (Grant #NNF18OC0033926 to BBK). K.T.E. was funded by Independent Research Fund Denmark (Grant #8020-00099B).

Acknowledgements

We thank all members of REPIN for their continued contributions to discussions and Karen Skriver for thoughtful feed-back. Asta B. Andersen is thanked for graphics support.

Abbreviations

IDP, intrinsically disordered proteins; LLPS, liquid–liquid phase separation; PCNA, proliferating cell nuclear antigen; PIP, PCNA interacting protein; SLiMs, short linear motifs; TAD2, transcriptional activation domain 2.

References

1 Fischer, E. (1894) Einfluss der Configuration auf die Wirkung der Enzyme. *Berichte der Dtsch. Chem. Gesellschaft* **27**, 2985–2993 https://doi.org/10.1002/cber.18940270364
2 Pressman, D. and Siegel, M. (1953) Specificities of the binding to rabbit serum. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* **45**, 41–54 https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861(53)90403-2
3 Grodsky, G.M., Peng, C.T. and Forsham, P.H. (1959) Effect of modification of insulin on specific binding in insulin-resistant sera. *Arch. Biochem. Biophys.* **81**, 264–272 https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861(59)90195-X
4 Wright, P.E. and Dyson, H.J. (2015) Intrinsically disordered proteins in cellular signalling and regulation. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **16**, 18–29 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm3920
5 Babu, M.M., van der Lee, R., de Groot, N.S. and Gsponer, J. (2011) Intrinsically disordered proteins: regulation and disease. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **21**, 432–440 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2011.03.011
6 Dunker, A.K., Lawson, J.D., Brown, C.J., Williams, R.M., Romero, P., Oh, J.S., et al. (2001) Intrinsically disordered protein. *J. Mol. Graph. Model.* **19**, 26–59 https://doi.org/10.1016/S1093-3263(00)00138-8
7 Uversky, V.N. (2002) Natively unfolded proteins: a point where biology waits for physics. *Protein Sci.* **11**, 739–756 https://doi.org/10.1110/ps.4210102
8 Dyson, H.J. and Wright, P.E. (2002) Coupling of folding and binding for unstructured proteins. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **12**, 54–60 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-440X(02)00289-0

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

9 Dunker, A.K., Obradovic, Z., Romero, P., Garner, E.C. and Brown, C.J. (2000) Intrinsic protein disorder in complete genomes. *Genome Inform. Ser. Workshop Genome Inform.* **11**, 161–171 PMID:11700597

10 Tompa, P. (2002) Intrinsically unstructured proteins. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **27**, 527–533 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0968-0004(02)02169-2

11 Rogers, J.M., Wong, C.T. and Clarke, J. (2014) Coupled folding and binding of the disordered protein PUMA does not require particular residual structure. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **136**, 5197–5200 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja4125065

12 Ješmantavičius, V., Dogan, J., Jemth, P., Teilum, K. and Kjaergaard, M. (2014) Helical propensity in an intrinsically disordered protein accelerates ligand binding. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **53**, 1548–1551 https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201307712

13 Dogan, J., Mu, X., Engström, Å. and Jemth, P. (2013) The transition state structure for coupled binding and folding of disordered protein domains. *Sci. Rep.* **3**, 2076 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep02076

14 Sugase, K., Dyson, H.J. and Wright, P.E. (2007) Mechanism of coupled folding and binding of an intrinsically disordered protein. *Nature* **447**, 1021–1025 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature05858

15 Gianni, S., Dogan, J. and Jemth, P. (2014) Deciphering the mechanisms of binding induced folding at nearly atomic resolution: the Φ value analysis applied to IDPs. *Intrinsically Disord. Proteins* **2**, e970900 https://doi.org/10.4161/idp.28624

16 Camacho-Zarco, A.R., Kalayil, S., Maurin, D., Salvi, N., Delaforge, E., Milles, S. et al. (2020) Molecular basis of host-adaptation interactions between influenza virus polymerase PB2 subunit and ANP32A. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 3656 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-17407-x

17 Tillu, V.A., Rae, J., Gao, Y., Ariotti, N., Floetenmeyer, M., Kovtun, O. et al. (2021) Cavin1 intrinsically disordered domains are essential for fuzzy electrostatic interactions and caveola formation. *Nat. Commun.* **12**, 931 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21035-4

18 Borgia, A., Borgia, M.B., Bugge, K., Kissling, V.M., Heidarsson, P.O., Fernandes, C.B., et al. (2018) Extreme disorder in an ultrahigh-affinity protein complex. *Nature* **555**, 61–66 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature25762

19 Borg, M., Mittag, T., Pawson, T., Tyers, M., Forman-Kay, J.D. and Chan, H.S. (2007) Polyelectrostatic interactions of disordered ligands suggest a physical basis for ultrasensitivity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**, 9650–9655 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0702580104

20 Mittag, T., Orlicky, S., Choy, W.-Y., Tang, X., Lin, H., Sicheri, F. et al. (2008) Dynamic equilibrium engagement of a polyvalent ligand with a single-site receptor. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **105**, 17772–17777 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0809222105

21 Oldfield, C.J., Meng, J., Yang, J.Y., Yang, M.Q., Uversky, V.N. and Dunker, A.K. (2008) Flexible nets: disorder and induced fit in the associations of p53 and 14-3-3 with their partners. *BMC Genomics* **9**, S1 https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2164-9-S1-S1

22 Parker, B.W., Goncz, E.J., Krist, D.T., Statsyuk, A.V., Nesvizhskii, A.I. and Weiss, E.L. (2019) Mapping low-affinity/high-specificity peptide–protein interactions using ligand-footprinting mass spectrometry. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **116**, 21001–21011 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1819533116

23 Bugge, K., Brakti, I., Fernandes, C.B., Dreier, J.E., Lundsgaard, J.E., Olsen, J.G. et al. (2020) Interactions by disorder: a matter of context. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* **7**, 110 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmolb.2020.00110

24 Ivarsson, Y. and Jemth, P. (2019) Affinity and specificity of motif-based protein-protein interactions. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.* **54**, 26–33 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2018.09.009

25 Palopoli, N., González Foutel, N.S., Gibson, T.J. and Chemes, L.B. (2018) Short linear motif core and flanking regions modulate retinoblastoma protein binding affinity and specificity. *Protein Eng. Des. Sel.* **31**, 69–77 https://doi.org/10.1093/protein/gzx068

26 Erijman, A., Aizner, Y. and Shifman, J.M. (2011) Multispecific recognition: mechanism, evolution, and design. *Biochemistry* **50**, 602–611 https://doi.org/10.1021/bi101563v

27 Jespersen, N. and Barbar, E. (2020) Emerging features of linear motif-binding hub proteins. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **45**, 375–384 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2020.01.004

28 Patil, A. and Nakamura, H. (2006) Disordered domains and high surface charge confer hubs with the ability to interact with multiple proteins in interaction networks. *FEBS Lett.* **580**, 2041–2045 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2006.03.003

29 Cumberworth, A., Lamour, G., Babu, M.M. and Gsponer, J. (2013) Promiscuity as a functional trait: intrinsically disordered regions as central players of interactomes. *Biochem. J.* **454**, 361–369 https://doi.org/10.1042/BJ20130545

30 Hu, G., Wu, Z., Uversky, V.N. and Kurgan, L. (2017) Functional analysis of human hub proteins and their interactors involved in the intrinsic disorder-enriched interactions. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **18**, 2761 https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms18122761

31 Patil, A., Kinoshita, K. and Nakamura, H. (2010) Hub promiscuity in protein-protein interaction networks. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* **11**, 1930–1943 https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms11041930

32 Prestel, A., Wichmann, N., Martins, J.M., Marabini, R., Kassem, N., Broendum, S.S., et al. (2019) The PCNA interaction motifs revisited: thinking outside the PIP-box. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* **76**, 4923–4943 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-019-03150-0

33 Moldovan, G.-L., Pfander, B. and Jentsch, S. (2007) PCNA, the maestro of the replication fork. *Cell* **129**, 665–679 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2007.05.003

34 Sluchanko, N.N. (2018) Association of multiple phosphorylated proteins with the 14-3-3 regulatory hubs: problems and perspectives. *J. Mol. Biol.* **430**, 20–26 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2017.11.010

35 Sluchanko, N.N. and Bustos, D.M. (2019) Intrinsic disorder associated with 14-3-3 proteins and their partners. *Prog. Mol. Biol. Transl. Sci.* **166**, 19–61 https://doi.org/10.1016/bs.pmbts.2019.03.007

36 Teilum, K., Olsen, J.G. and Kragelund, B.B. (2015) Globular and disordered-the non-identical twins in protein-protein interactions. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* **2**, 40 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmolb.2015.00040

37 O'Shea, C., Staby, L., Bendsen, S.K., Tidemand, F.G., Redsted, A., Willemoës, M. et al. (2017) Structures and short linear motif of disordered transcription factor regions provide clues to the interactome of the cellular Hub protein radical-induced cell Death1. *J. Biol. Chem.* **292**, 512–527 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M116.753426

38 Rogers, J.M., Steward, A. and Clarke, J. (2013) Folding and binding of an intrinsically disordered protein: fast, but not 'diffusion-limited'. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **135**, 1415–1422 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja309527h

39 Perovic, V., Sumonja, N., Marsh, L.A., Radovanovic, S., Vukicevic, M., Roberts, S.G.E. et al. (2018) IDPpi: protein-protein interaction analyses of human intrinsically disordered proteins. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 10563 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-28815-x

40 Gao, A., Shrinivas, K., Lepeudry, P., Suzuki, H.I., Sharp, P.A. and Chakraborty, A.K. (2018) Evolution of weak cooperative interactions for biological specificity. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **115**, E11053–E11060 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1815912115

41 Varadi, M., Zsolyomi, F., Guharoy, M. and Tompa, P. (2015) Functional advantages of conserved intrinsic disorder in RNA-binding proteins. *PLoS ONE* **10**, e0139731 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0139731
42 Berlow, R.B., Dyson, H.J. and Wright, P.E. (2015) Functional advantages of dynamic protein disorder. *FEBS Lett.* **589**, 2433–2440 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.febslet.2015.06.003
43 Chong, P.A., Ozdamar, B., Wrana, J.L. and Forman-Kay, J.D. (2004) Disorder in a target for the Smad2 Mad homology 2 domain and its implications for binding and specificity. *J. Biol. Chem.* **279**, 40707–40714 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.M404375200
44 Monteith, W.B., Cohen, R.D., Smith, A.E., Guzman-Cisneros, E. and Pielak, G.J. (2015) Quinary structure modulates protein stability in cells. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 1739–1742 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1417415112
45 Sukenik, S., Ren, P. and Gruebele, M. (2017) Weak protein-protein interactions in live cells are quantified by cell-volume modulation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, 6776–6781 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1700818114
46 von Hippel, P.H. and Berg, O.G. (1986) On the specificity of DNA-protein interactions. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **83**, 1608–1612 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.83.6.1608
47 Eaton, B.E., Gold, L. and Zichi, D.A. (1995) Let's get specific: the relationship between specificity and affinity. *Chem. Biol.* **2**, 633–638 https://doi.org/10.1016/1074-5521(95)90023-3
48 Raj, N. and Attardi, L.D. (2017) The transactivation domains of the p53 protein. *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Med.* **7**, a026047 https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a026047
49 Bochkareva, E., Kaustov, L., Ayed, A., Yi, G.-S., Lu, Y., Pineda-Lucena, A., et al. (2005) Single-stranded DNA mimicry in the p53 transactivation domain interaction with replication protein A. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **102**, 15412–15417 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0504614102
50 Di Lello, P., Jenkins, L.M.M., Jones, T.N., Nguyen, B.D., Hara, T., Yamaguchi, H. et al. (2006) Structure of the Tfb1/p53 complex: insights into the interaction between the p62/Tfb1 subunit of TFIIH and the activation domain of p53. *Mol. Cell* **22**, 731–740 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2006.05.007
51 Miller Jenkins, L.M., Feng, H., Durell, S.R., Tagad, H.D., Mazur, S.J., Tropea, J.E. et al. (2015) Characterization of the p300 Taz2-p53 TAD2 complex and comparison with the p300 Taz2-p53 TAD1 complex. *Biochemistry* **54**, 2001–2010 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.5b00044
52 Rowell, J.P., Simpson, K.L., Stott, K., Watson, M. and Thomas, J.O. (2012) HMGB1-facilitated p53 DNA binding occurs via HMG-Box/p53 transactivation domain interaction, regulated by the acidic tail. *Structure* **20**, 2014–2024 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.str.2012.09.004
53 Lee, M.S., Lee, S.O., Lee, M.K., Yi, G.S., Lee, C.K., Ryu, K.S. et al. (2019) Solution structure of MUL1-RING domain and its interaction with p53 transactivation domain. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **516**, 533–539 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrc.2019.06.101
54 Yao, H., Mi, S., Gong, W., Lin, J., Xu, N., Perrett, S. et al. (2013) Anti-apoptosis proteins Mcl-1 and Bcl-xL have different p53-binding profiles. *Biochemistry* **52**, 6324–6334 https://doi.org/10.1021/bi400690m
55 Wang, M., Herrmann, C.J., Simonovic, M., Szklarczyk, D. and von Mering, C. (2015) Version 4.0 of paxDb: protein abundance data, integrated across model organisms, tissues, and cell-lines. *Proteomics* **15**, 3163–3168 https://doi.org/10.1002/pmic.201400441
56 Wang, M., Weiss, M., Simonovic, M., Haertinger, G., Schrimpf, S.P., Hengartner, M.O. et al. (2012) Paxdb, a database of protein abundance averages across all three domains of life. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **11**, 492–500 https://doi.org/10.1074/mcp.O111.014704
57 Hoops, S., Sahle, S., Gauges, R., Lee, C., Pahle, J., Simus, N. et al. (2006) COPASI–a COmplex PAthway SImulator. *Bioinformatics* **22**, 3067–3074 https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btl485
58 Dubreuil, B., Matalon, O. and Levy, E.D. (2019) Protein abundance biases the amino acid composition of disordered regions to minimize non-functional interactions. *J. Mol. Biol.* **431**, 4978–4992 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2019.08.008
59 Romanova, L.Y., Willers, H., Blagosklonny, M.V. and Powell, S.N. (2004) The interaction of p53 with replication protein A mediates suppression of homologous recombination. *Oncogene* **23**, 9025–9033 https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.onc.1207982
60 Batta, K. and Kundu, T.K. (2007) Activation of p53 function by human transcriptional coactivator PC4: role of protein-protein interaction, DNA bending, and posttranslational modifications. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **27**, 7603–7614 https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.01064-07
61 Palopoli, N., Iserte, J.A., Chemes, L.B., Marino-Buslje, C., Parisi, G., Gibson, T.J. et al. (2020) The articles.ELM resource: simplifying access to protein linear motif literature by annotation, text-mining and classification. *Database* **2020**, baaa040 https://doi.org/10.1093/database/baaa040
62 Mammen, M., Choi, S.-K. and Whitesides, G.M. (1998) Polyvalent interactions in biological systems: implications for design and use of multivalent ligands and inhibitors. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **37**, 2754–2794 https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1521-3773(19981102)37:20<2754::AID-ANIE2754>3.0.CO;2-3
63 Krishnamurthy, V.M., Estroff, L.A. and Whitesides, G.M. (2006) Multivalency in Ligand Design. In *Methods and Principles in Medicinal Chemistry* (Mannhold, R., Kubinyi, H., Folkers, G., Jahnke, W., and Erlanson, D.A., eds.), pp. 11–53, Wiley-VCH, Weinheim. https://doi.org/10.1002/3527608761.ch2
64 Vauquelin, G. and Charlton, S.J. (2013) Exploring avidity: understanding the potential gains in functional affinity and target residence time of bivalent and heterobivalent ligands. *Br. J. Pharmacol.* **168**, 1771–1785 https://doi.org/10.1111/bph.12106
65 Erlendsson, S. and Teilum, K. (2021) Binding revisited—avidity in cellular function and signaling. *Front. Mol. Biosci.* **7**, 615565 https://doi.org/10.3389/fmolb.2020.615565
66 Rao, J., Lahiri, J., Weis, R.M. and Whitesides, G.M. (2000) Design, synthesis, and characterization of a high-affinity trivalent system derived from vancomycin and L-Lys-D-Ala-D-Ala. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **122**, 2698–2710 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja992648l
67 Sriram, S.M., Banerjee, R., Kane, R.S. and Kwon, Y.T. (2009) Multivalency-assisted control of intracellular signaling pathways: application for ubiquitin-dependent N-end rule pathway. *Chem. Biol.* **16**, 121–131 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chembiol.2009.01.012
68 Sørensen, C.S., Jendroszek, A. and Kjaergaard, M. (2019) Linker dependence of avidity in multivalent interactions between disordered proteins. *J. Mol. Biol.* **431**, 4784–4795 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2019.09.001
69 Dyla, M. and Kjaergaard, M. (2020) Intrinsically disordered linkers control tethered kinases via effective concentration. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 21413–21419 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2006382117
70 Errington, W.J., Bruncsics, B. and Sarkar, C.A. (2019) Mechanisms of noncanonical binding dynamics in multivalent protein–protein interactions. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **116**, 25659–25667 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1902909116

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

71 Dubacheva, G.V., Curk, T., Auzély-Velty, R., Frenkel, D. and Richter, R.P. (2015) Designing multivalent probes for tunable superselective targeting. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **112**, 5579–5584 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1500622112

72 Yamada, J., Phillips, J.L., Patel, S., Goldfien, G., Calestagne-Morelli, A., Huang, H., et al. (2010) A bimodal distribution of two distinct categories of intrinsically disordered structures with separate functions in FG nucleoporins. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics* **9**, 2205–2224 https://doi.org/10.1074/mcp.M000035-MCP201

73 Milles, S., Mercadante, D., Aramburu, I.V., Jensen, M.R., Banterle, N., Koehler, C., et al. (2015) Plasticity of an ultrafast interaction between nucleoporins and nuclear transport receptors. *Cell* **163**, 734–745 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2015.09.047

74 Hayama, R., Sparks, S., Hecht, L.M., Dutta, K., Karp, J.M., Cabana, C.M. et al. (2018) Thermodynamic characterization of the multivalent interactions underlying rapid and selective translocation through the nuclear pore complex. *J. Biol. Chem.* **293**, 4555–4563 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.AC117.001649

75 Raveh, B., Karp, J.M., Sparks, S., Dutta, K., Rout, M.P., Sali, A. et al. (2016) Slide-and-exchange mechanism for rapid and selective transport through the nuclear pore complex. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, E2489–E2497 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1522663113

76 Celetti, G., Paci, G., Caria, J., VanDelinder, V., Bachand, G. and Lemke, E.A. (2020) The liquid state of FG-nucleoporins mimics permeability barrier properties of nuclear pore complexes. *J. Cell Biol.* **219**, e201907157 https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.201907157

77 Tsang, B., Pritišanac, I., Scherer, S.W., Moses, A.M. and Forman-Kay, J.D. (2020) Phase separation as a missing mechanism for interpretation of disease mutations. *Cell* **183**, 1742–1756 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.11.050

78 Banjade, S. and Rosen, M.K. (2014) Phase transitions of multivalent proteins can promote clustering of membrane receptors. *eLife* **3**, e04123 https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.04123

79 Sanders, D.W., Kedersha, N., Lee, D.S.W., Strom, A.R., Drake, V., Riback, J.A., et al. (2020) Competing protein-RNA interaction networks control multiphase intracellular organization. *Cell* **181**, 306–324.e28 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.03.050

80 Shin, Y. and Brangwynne, C.P. (2017) Liquid phase condensation in cell physiology and disease. *Science* **357**, eaaf4382 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf4382

81 Sabari, B.R., Dall'Agnese, A. and Young, R.A. (2020) Biomolecular condensates in the nucleus. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **45**, 961–977 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2020.06.007

82 Banani, S.F., Lee, H.O., Hyman, A.A. and Rosen, M.K. (2017) Biomolecular condensates: organizers of cellular biochemistry. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **18**, 285–298 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrm.2017.7

83 Garcia, D.A., Johnson, T.A., Presman, D.M., Fettweis, G., Wagh, K., Rinaldi, L., et al. (2021) An intrinsically disordered region-mediated confinement state contributes to the dynamics and function of transcription factors. *Mol. Cell* **81**, 1484–1498.e6 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2021.01.013

84 Brangwynne, C.P., Mitchison, T.J. and Hyman, A.A. (2011) Active liquid-like behavior of nucleoli determines their size and shape in xenopus laevis oocytes. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **108**, 4334–4339 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1017150108

85 Kim, J., Lee, H., Lee, H.G. and Seo, P.J. (2021) Get closer and make hotspots: liquid-liquid phase separation in plants. *EMBO Rep.* **22**, e51656 https://doi.org/10.15252/embr.202051656

86 Alberti, S. and Hyman, A.A. (2021) Biomolecular condensates at the nexus of cellular stress, protein aggregation disease and ageing. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **22**, 196–213 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41580-020-00326-6

87 Murthy, A.C. and Fawzi, N.L. (2020) The (un)structural biology of biomolecular liquid-liquid phase separation using NMR spectroscopy. *J. Biol. Chem.* **295**, 2375–2384 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.REV119.009847

88 Marzahn, M.R., Marada, S., Lee, J., Nourse, A., Kenrick, S., Zhao, H., et al. (2016) Higher-order oligomerization promotes localization of SPOP to liquid nuclear speckles. *EMBO J.* **35**, 1254–1275 https://doi.org/10.15252/embj.201593169

89 Martin, E.W., Thomasen, F.E., Milkovic, N.M., Cuneo, M.J., Grace, C.R., Nourse, A. et al. (2021) Interplay of folded domains and the disordered low-complexity domain in mediating hnRNPA1 phase separation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **49**, 2931–2945 https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkab063

90 Fritzsching, K.J., Yang, Y., Pogue, E.M., Rayman, J.B., Kandel, E.R. and McDermott, A.E. (2020) Micellar TIA1 with folded RNA binding domains as a model for reversible stress granule formation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **117**, 31832–31837 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2007423117

91 Harmon, T.S., Holehouse, A.S., Rosen, M.K. and Pappu, R.V. (2017) Intrinsically disordered linkers determine the interplay between phase separation and gelation in multivalent proteins. *eLife* **6**, e30294 https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.30294

92 Boehning, M., Dugast-Darzacq, C., Rankovic, M., Hansen, A.S., Yu, T., Marie-Nelly, H., et al. (2018) RNA polymerase II clustering through carboxy-terminal domain phase separation. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **25**, 833–840 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-018-0112-y

93 Boija, A., Klein, I.A., Sabari, B.R., Dall'Agnese, A., Coffey, E.L., Zamudio, A.V., et al. (2018) Transcription factors activate genes through the phase-separation capacity of their activation domains. *Cell* **175**, 1842–1855.e16 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2018.10.042

94 Chong, S., Dugast-Darzacq, C., Liu, Z., Dong, P., Dailey, G.M., Cattoglio, C., et al. (2018) Imaging dynamic and selective low-complexity domain interactions that control gene transcription. *Science* **361**, eaar2555 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aar2555

95 Lu, Y., Wu, T., Gutman, O., Lu, H., Zhou, Q., Henis, Y.I. et al. (2020) Phase separation of TAZ compartmentalizes the transcription machinery to promote gene expression. *Nat. Cell Biol.* **22**, 453–464 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41556-020-0485-0

96 Wei, M.-T., Elbaum-Garfinkle, S., Holehouse, A.S., Chen, C.C.-H., Feric, M., Arnold, C.B. et al. (2017) Phase behaviour of disordered proteins underlying low density and high permeability of liquid organelles. *Nat. Chem.* **9**, 1118–1125 https://doi.org/10.1038/nchem.2803

97 Kanaan, N.M., Hamel, C., Grabinski, T. and Combs, B. (2020) Liquid-liquid phase separation induces pathogenic tau conformations in vitro. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2809 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16580-3

98 Murthy, A.C., Dignon, G.L., Kan, Y., Zerze, G.H., Parekh, S.H., Mittal, J. et al. (2019) Molecular interactions underlying liquid–liquid phase separation of the FUS low-complexity domain. *Nat. Struct. Mol. Biol.* **26**, 637–648 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41594-019-0250-x

99 Ryan, V.H., Dignon, G.L., Zerze, G.H., Chabata, C.V., Silva, R., Conicella, A.E. et al. (2018) Mechanistic view of hnRNPA2 low-complexity domain structure, interactions, and phase separation altered by mutation and arginine methylation. *Mol. Cell* **69**, 465–479.e7 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2017.12.022

100 Brady, J.P., Farber, P.J., Sekhar, A., Lin, Y.-H., Huang, R., Bah, A., et al. (2017) Structural and hydrodynamic properties of an intrinsically disordered region of a germ cell-specific protein on phase separation. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **114**, E8194–E8203 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706197114

101 Bah, A. and Forman-Kay, J.D. (2016) Modulation of intrinsically disordered protein function by post-translational modifications. *J. Biol. Chem.* **291**, 6696–6705 https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.R115.695056
102 Nott, T.J., Petsalaki, E., Farber, P., Jervis, D., Fussner, E., Plochowietz, A., et al. (2015) Phase transition of a disordered nuage protein generates environmentally responsive membraneless organelles. *Mol. Cell* **57**, 936–947 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2015.01.013
103 Adame-Arana, O., Weber, C.A., Zaburdaev, V., Prost, J. and Jülicher, F. (2020) Liquid phase separation controlled by pH. *Biophys. J.* **119**, 1590–1605 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2020.07.044
104 Hahm, J., Kim, K., Qiu, Y. and Chen, M. (2020) Increasing ambient temperature progressively disassembles Arabidopsis phytochrome B from individual photobodies with distinct thermostabilities. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1660 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-15526-z
105 Regy, R.M., Dignon, G.L., Zheng, W., Kim, Y.C. and Mittal, J. (2020) Sequence dependent phase separation of protein-polynucleotide mixtures elucidated using molecular simulations. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **48**, 12593–12603 https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkaa1099
106 Martin, E.W., Holehouse, A.S., Peran, I., Farag, M., Incicco, J.J., Bremer, A. et al. (2020) Valence and patterning of aromatic residues determine the phase behavior of prion-like domains. *Science* **367**, 694–699 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaw8653
107 Sanchez-Burgos, I., Espinosa, J.R., Joseph, J.A. and Collepardo-Guevara, R. (2021) Valency and binding affinity variations can regulate the multilayered organization of protein condensates with many components. *Biomolecules* **11**, 278 https://doi.org/10.3390/biom11020278
108 González-Magaña, A. and Blanco, F.J. (2020) Human PCNA structure, function and interactions. *Biomolecules* **10**, 570 https://doi.org/10.3390/biom10040570
109 Bowman, G.D., O'Donnell, M. and Kuriyan, J. (2004) Structural analysis of a eukaryotic sliding DNA clamp-clamp loader complex. *Nature* **429**, 724–730 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature02585
110 Michishita, M., Morimoto, A., Ishii, T., Komori, H., Shiomi, Y., Higuchi, Y. et al. (2011) Positively charged residues located downstream of PIP box, together with TD amino acids within PIP box, are important for CRL4(Cdt2) -mediated proteolysis. *Genes Cells* **16**, 12–22 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2443.2010.01464.x
111 Havens, C.G. and Walter, J.C. (2009) Docking of a specialized PIP Box onto chromatin-bound PCNA creates a degron for the ubiquitin ligase CRL4Cdt2. *Mol. Cell* **35**, 93–104 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2009.05.012
112 Gilljam, K.M., Feyzi, E., Aas, P.A., Sousa, M.M.L., Müller, R., Vågbø, C.B., et al. (2009) Identification of a novel, widespread, and functionally important PCNA-binding motif. *J. Cell Biol.* **186**, 645–654 https://doi.org/10.1083/jcb.200903138
113 Hoege, C., Pfander, B., Moldovan, G.-L., Pyrowolakis, G. and Jentsch, S. (2002) RAD6-dependent DNA repair is linked to modification of PCNA by ubiquitin and SUMO. *Nature* **419**, 135–141 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature00991
114 Rössig, L., Jadidi, A.S., Urbich, C., Badorff, C., Zeiher, A.M. and Dimmeler, S. (2001) Akt-dependent phosphorylation of p21(Cip1) regulates PCNA binding and proliferation of endothelial cells. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **21**, 5644–5657 https://doi.org/10.1128/MCB.21.16.5644-5657.2001
115 Mao, A.H., Crick, S.L., Vitalis, A., Chicoine, C.L. and Pappu, R.V. (2010) Net charge per residue modulates conformational ensembles of intrinsically disordered proteins. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **107**, 8183–8188 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911107107
116 Williams, R.M., Obradovi, Z., Mathura, V., Braun, W., Garner, E.C., Young, J. et al. (2001) The protein non-folding problem: amino acid determinants of intrinsic order and disorder. *Pac. Symp. Biocomput.* **6**, 89–100 https://doi.org/10.1142/9789814447362_0010
117 Uversky, V.N., Gillespie, J.R. and Fink, A.L. (2000) Why are 'natively unfolded' proteins unstructured under physiologic conditions? *Proteins* **41**, 415–427 https://doi.org/10.1002/1097-0134(20001115)41:3<415::AID-PROT130>3.0.CO;2-7
118 Uversky, V.N. (2019) Intrinsically disordered proteins and their 'Mysterious' (Meta)Physics. *Front. Phys.* **7**, 10 https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2019.00010
119 Martin, E.W. and Mittag, T. (2018) Relationship of sequence and phase separation in protein low-complexity regions. *Biochemistry* **57**, 2478–2487 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.8b00008
120 Seiffert, P., Bugge, K., Nygaard, M., Haxholm, G.W., Martinsen, J.H., Pedersen, M.N. et al. (2020) Orchestration of signaling by structural disorder in class 1 cytokine receptors. *Cell Commun. Signal.* **18**, 132 https://doi.org/10.1186/s12964-020-00626-6
121 Escobedo, A., Topal, B., Kunze, M.B.A., Aranda, J., Chiesa, G., Mungianu, D., et al. (2019) Side chain to main chain hydrogen bonds stabilize a polyglutamine helix in a transcription factor. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 2034 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09923-2
122 Vitalis, A., Wang, X. and Pappu, R.V. (2007) Quantitative characterization of intrinsic disorder in polyglutamine: insights from analysis based on polymer theories. *Biophys. J.* **93**, 1923–1937 https://doi.org/10.1529/biophysj.107.110080
123 Wu, H., Dalal, Y. and Papoian, G.A. (2021) Binding dynamics of disordered linker histone H1 with a nucleosomal particle. *J. Mol. Biol.* **433**, 166881 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2021.166881
124 Feng, H., Zhou, B.-R. and Bai, Y. (2018) Binding affinity and function of the extremely disordered protein complex containing human linker histone H1.0 and its chaperone proTα. *Biochemistry* **57**, 6645–6648 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.8b01075
125 Sottini, A., Borgia, A., Borgia, M.B., Bugge, K., Nettels, D., Chowdhury, A., et al. (2020) Polyelectrolyte interactions enable rapid association and dissociation in high-affinity disordered protein complexes. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 5736 https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-18859-x
126 Peng, B. and Muthukumar, M. (2015) Modeling competitive substitution in a polyelectrolyte complex. *J. Chem. Phys.* **143**, 243133 https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4936256
127 Murphy, M.P. and LeVine, H. (2010) Alzheimer's disease and the amyloid-β peptide. *J. Alzheimer's Dis.* **19**, 311–323 https://doi.org/10.3233/JAD-2010-1221
128 Pedersen, J.T., Borg, C.B., Michaels, T.C.T., Knowles, T.P.J., Faller, P., Teilum, K. et al. (2015) Aggregation-Prone amyloid-β·Cu II species formed on the millisecond timescale under mildly acidic conditions. *ChemBioChem* **16**, 1293–1297 https://doi.org/10.1002/cbic.201500080
129 Pedersen, J.T., Teilum, K., Heegaard, N.H.H., Østergaard, J., Adolph, H.-W. and Hemmingsen, L. (2011) Rapid formation of a preoligomeric peptide-metal-peptide complex following copper(II) binding to amyloid β peptides. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **50**, 2532–2535 https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.201006335
130 Graham, J.S., Johnson, R.C. and Marko, J.F. (2011) Concentration-dependent exchange accelerates turnover of proteins bound to double-stranded DNA. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **39**, 2249–2259 https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkq1140
131 Joshi, C.P., Panda, D., Martell, D.J., Andoy, N.M., Chen, T.-Y., Gaballa, A. et al. (2012) Direct substitution and assisted dissociation pathways for turning off transcription by a MerR-family metalloregulator. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **109**, 15121–15126 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1208508109

Biochemical Journal (2021) **478** 2035–2050
https://doi.org/10.1042/BCJ20200828

132 Potoyan, D.A., Zheng, W., Komives, E.A. and Wolynes, P.G. (2016) Molecular stripping in the NF-κB/IκB/DNA genetic regulatory network. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **113**, 110–115 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1520483112
133 Berlow, R.B., Dyson, H.J. and Wright, P.E. (2017) Hypersensitive termination of the hypoxic response by a disordered protein switch. *Nature* **543**, 447–451 https://doi.org/10.1038/nature21705
134 Berlow, R.B., Martinez-Yamout, M.A., Dyson, H.J. and Wright, P.E. (2019) Role of backbone dynamics in modulating the interactions of disordered ligands with the TAZ1 domain of the CREB-binding protein. *Biochemistry* **58**, 1354–1362 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biochem.8b01290
135 Schmitt, L., Kratz, J.R., Davis, M.M. and McConnell, H.M. (1999) Catalysis of peptide dissociation from class II MHC-peptide complexes. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **96**, 6581–6586 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.96.12.6581
136 Dasgupta, B., Nakamura, H. and Kinjo, A.R. (2013) Counterbalance of ligand- and self-coupled motions characterizes multispecificity of ubiquitin. *Protein Sci.* **22**, 168–178 https://doi.org/10.1002/pro.2195
137 Fonin, A.V., Darling, A.L., Kuznetsova, I.M., Turoverov, K.K. and Uversky, V.N. (2019) Multi-functionality of proteins involved in GPCR and G protein signaling: making sense of structure-function continuum with intrinsic disorder-based proteoforms. *Cell. Mol. Life Sci.* **76**, 4461–4492 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00018-019-03276-1
138 Biou, V. and Cherfils, J. (2004) Structural principles for the multispecificity of small GTP-binding proteins. *Biochemistry* **43**, 6833–6840 https://doi.org/10.1021/bi049630u
139 Alhindi, T., Zhang, Z., Ruelens, P., Coenen, H., Degroote, H., Iraci, N. et al. (2017) Protein interaction evolution from promiscuity to specificity with reduced flexibility in an increasingly complex network. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 44948 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep44948
140 Kulkarni, P. and Uversky, V. (2019) Intrinsically disordered proteins in chronic diseases. *Biomolecules* **9**, 147 https://doi.org/10.3390/biom9040147
141 Vacic, V. and lakoucheva, L.M. (2012) Disease mutations in disordered regions–exception to the rule? *Mol. Biosyst.* **8**, 27–32 https://doi.org/10.1039/C1MB05251A
142 Santofimia-Castaño, P., Xia, Y., Peng, L., Velázquez-Campoy, A., Abián, O., Lan, W. et al. (2019) Targeting the stress-induced protein NUPR1 to treat pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Cells* **8**, 1453 https://doi.org/10.3390/cells8111453
143 Neira, J.L., Bintz, J., Arruebo, M., Rizzuti, B., Bonacci, T., Vega, S. et al. (2017) Identification of a drug targeting an intrinsically disordered protein involved in pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 39732 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep39732
144 Estébanez-Perpiñá, E., Arnold, L.A., Arnold, A.A., Nguyen, P., Rodrigues, E.D., Mar, E., et al. (2007) A surface on the androgen receptor that allosterically regulates coactivator binding. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **104**, 16074–16079 https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0708036104
145 Wolter, M., Valenti, D., Cossar, P.J., Levy, L.M., Hristeva, S., Genski, T. et al. (2020) Fragment-based stabilizers of protein-protein interactions through imine-based tethering. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* **59**, 21520–21524 https://doi.org/10.1002/anie.202008585
146 Heller, G.T., Sormanni, P. and Vendruscolo, M. (2015) Targeting disordered proteins with small molecules using entropy. *Trends Biochem. Sci.* **40**, 491–496 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibs.2015.07.004
147 Heller, G.T., Bonomi, M. and Vendruscolo, M. (2018) Structural ensemble modulation upon small-molecule binding to disordered proteins. *J. Mol. Biol.* **430**, 2288–2292 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmb.2018.03.015
148 Okuda, M. and Nishimura, Y. (2014) Extended string binding mode of the phosphorylated transactivation domain of tumor suppressor p53. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **136**, 14143–14152 https://doi.org/10.1021/ja506351f

