Aβ(1-40) Fibril Polymorphism Implies Diverse Interaction Patterns in Amyloid Fibrils
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Introduction

Amyloid fibrils are fibrillar polypeptide aggregates that occur inside the human body associated with aging and a group of debilitating diseases, including type II diabetes, Creutzfeldt-Jakob and Alzheimer’s disease (AD).1,2,3 In the case of AD, amyloid fibrils are formed from amyloid-β (Aβ) peptide.4 Amyloid fibrils possess a structural spine that is formed by a cross-β structure. This structure consists of oriented β-sheets with interstrand hydrogen bonds aligned parallel with the main fibril axis. It follows from this arrangement that the amino acid side chains extend perpendicular to the fibril axis and define the intra- or intermolecular interactions within the plane of the fibril cross-section.5 Therefore, side chain interactions determine several important properties of amyloid fibrils, such as the packing distance between adjacent β-sheets,6 the regions of self-complementarity of a polypeptide sequence,6,7 and the contact surfaces of juxtaposed...
protofilaments. Protofilaments represent the filamentous substructures of mature amyloid fibrils. 

Samples of amyloid fibrils commonly exhibit significant structural heterogeneity, which can arise from variations in bending or twisting of the fibrils, as well as from different fibril morphologies. Each fibril morphology is associated with its own specific overall shape, thickness, or twisting.

Different fibril morphologies have been attributed to different numbers of protofilaments, different protofilament arrangements, or different peptide conformations. The conformational specifics of distinct fibril or aggregate morphologies can be propagated by nucleation, and different aggregate conformations are thought to give rise to different aggregate cytotoxicities or clinical manifestations in terms of different prion strains.

Here, we have determined the diversity of amyloid fibrils formed from Aβ(1-40) peptide in vitro. This peptide adopts, within the fibril, a β-sheet conformation. Structural models were proposed suggesting that the fibril cross-section encompasses a side-by-side arrangement of either four or eight β-sheet layers. The 3D reconstruction of one Aβ(1-40) fibril morphology based on electron cryo-microscopy (cryo-EM) data, however, revealed a fibril structure that was different from all previously proposed models. Although the 3D-reconstructed fibril also consists of four major β-sheet regions, they are arranged into two equal pairs that are offset from each other in the fibril cross-section. However, Aβ(1-40) is known to give rise to different fibril morphologies and the previous cryo-EM analysis could only address the topological characteristics of one specific Aβ fibril morphology. Therefore, we determine here the structural characteristics of different Aβ(1-40) fibril morphologies. The main techniques of our analysis are negative stain transmission electron microscopy (TEM) and cryo-EM combined with 3D image reconstruction.

Results

Structural persistence of individual amyloid fibrils

We found that two parameters are particularly useful for describing different amyloid fibril morphologies: the fibril width (w) and the crossover distance (d). While w corresponds to the lateral fibril extension, crossovers represent apparent constrictions of the fibril width when visualizing the fibrils with TEM techniques (Fig. 1a). The distance d

Fig. 1. Demonstration of the structural persistence and morphological diversity of Aβ(1-40) fibrils. (a) Example measurement of fibril width and crossover distance at different positions on the same fibril. (b) Plot of fibril width and crossover distance measured for six different fibrils grown in 50 mM sodium borate (pH 7.8) at 22 °C. Columns I – VI show the values measured at different positions of the same fibril (crosses) and their mean with standard deviation (filled circles). (c) Negative stain images of Aβ(1-40) fibrils grown either in 50 mM sodium borate (pH 7.8) at 22 °C or in PBS (pH 7.4) at 37 °C. (d) Distribution of fibril width (w) and crossover distance (d) of different individual fibrils formed in sodium borate buffer (black) or PBS (gray). Data points with d = 0 represent fibrils with no measurable d value (see the text for details).
between two adjacent crossovers equals half the pitch of helically structured fibrils. Analysis of \( d \) and \( w \) in different amyloid fibrils shows that these values can vary significantly between individual fibrils (Fig. 1b). By contrast, \( w \) and \( d \) vary only slightly when measured at different positions within the same amyloid fibril (Fig. 1a and b). The high level of conservation of \( w \) and \( d \) at different axial positions of the same fibril implies that the basic structural scaffold is mostly retained along the main axis of a mature fibril. This conclusion is corroborated by comparison of the shape and width of the individual crossovers that occur within the same fibril with those occurring in different fibrils: while a single fibril retains its crossover properties along its main axis, different fibrils can show substantial differences (Fig. 2a).

Different A\( \beta \) amyloid fibrils can show quasi-continuous structural alterations

Based on measurements of \( d \) and \( w \), we have explored the structural heterogeneity of two samples of A\( \beta \)(1-40) fibrils that were obtained by incubation under different conditions. One sample was obtained by incubation of A\( \beta \)(1-40) peptide in sodium borate buffer (pH 7.8, 22 °C). The other sample was incubated closer to physiologic conditions in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.4, 37 °C). Judged from their appearance in negative stain (Fig. 1c), the observed fibril morphologies corresponded closely to previously reported A\( \beta \)(1-40) fibrils.\(^{11,16,20}\) Moreover, and consistent with previous reports,\(^{11,16,20}\) both samples encompass evidently more than one fibril morphology (Fig. 1c). Even after incubation of the A\( \beta \)(1-40) peptide for more than six weeks, we did not obtain homogeneous fibril preparations (data not shown). Measurement of 200 randomly selected fibrils from each sample showed that the \( w \) values can vary from 5 nm to 26 nm (in PBS) or 8 nm to 23 nm (in sodium borate buffer). The \( d \) values of these fibrils vary between 30 nm and 330 nm (in PBS) or 50 nm and 380 nm (in sodium borate buffer).

A correlation plot of the two properties \( d \) and \( w \) produces, for borate fibrils, a cluster of data points that overlaps considerably with the \( d/w \)-pair distribution of PBS fibrils (Fig. 1d). Since each \( d/w \)-pair characterizes a specific fibril structure, the substantial overlap of the two \( d/w \)-pair distributions implies that, most if not all, borate fibril morphologies occur also in PBS. However, the structural diversity of PBS fibrils is apparently greater than that of borate fibrils. Moreover, 82% of the PBS fibrils do not allow measurement of a crossover distance. Possible reasons are a higher irregularity of PBS fibrils, their shorter length, and perhaps, a sometimes much lower extent of twisting (Fig. 1c).

Some regions of the \( d/w \)-plot are populated more densely than others, but it is not possible to separate out the measured \( d/w \) values into clearly distinct subpopulations (Fig. 1d). Instead, we observe an almost continuous distribution of the \( d \) and \( w \) values, and of the \( d/w \)-pairs, suggesting the presence of numerous types of fibrils. This finding is further supported by the 3D reconstructions presented in the next section.

### 3D reconstruction of 12 single amyloid fibrils by cryo-EM

We have reconstructed the 3D density of 12 individual amyloid fibrils from one sample (Fig. 2a); i.e. each of the 12 reconstructions shown in Fig. 2b was calculated from a single amyloid fibril. All 12 fibrils

---

**Fig. 2.** Cryo-EM reconstructions of 12 individual A\( \beta \)(1-40) fibrils. (a) Electron micrographs of the 12 individual A\( \beta \)(1-40) fibrils from the same sample. (b and c) Side (b) and top (c) views of the reconstructed fibrils shown in (a).
Table 1. Properties of the 12 reconstructed fibrils and reconstruction details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fibril</th>
<th>w (nm)</th>
<th>d (nm)</th>
<th>Segment size (nm)</th>
<th>Segment number</th>
<th>Resolution (Å)</th>
<th>Cross-sectional area (nm²)</th>
<th>Iₙ (nm⁴)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.5±1.2</td>
<td>74±13</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67±13</td>
<td>1298±111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.6±1.6</td>
<td>65±8</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>75±15</td>
<td>1419±104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.3±2.1</td>
<td>84±4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77±15</td>
<td>2608±166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.9±1.3</td>
<td>84±3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>74±15</td>
<td>2599±203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.4±1.5</td>
<td>77±5</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93±19</td>
<td>2303±152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.7±1.1</td>
<td>77±3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72±14</td>
<td>1757±130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.8±1.5</td>
<td>80±3</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90±18</td>
<td>2927±181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.3±1.5</td>
<td>99±5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>76±15</td>
<td>2868±182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>19.1±1.4</td>
<td>113±7</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92±18</td>
<td>3680±252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.3±1.4</td>
<td>136±13</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>103±21</td>
<td>4831±279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21.5±1.6</td>
<td>163±25</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>88±18</td>
<td>4634±248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.1±1.7</td>
<td>134±14</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>91±18</td>
<td>2172±218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fibril width w and the crossover distance d represent averages from a minimum of eight single measurements and are given with their standard deviations. An error of 20% was assumed for the cross-sectional areas, based on the errors of w, which are typically about 10%. Errors on Iₙ were estimated from the measurement uncertainty of the dimensions of the fibril cross-section.

were grown in sodium borate buffer. Fibrils grown under these conditions were generally found to be longer and better resolved than PBS fibrils (see above). Moreover, borate acts as a negative stain agent,37 which is an advantage when working with otherwise unstained cryo-EM samples. The only criteria for selecting these 12 fibrils were their relatively straight structure and a length of more than 700 nm. Otherwise, these fibrils were chosen randomly, without paying attention to their morphology. The fibrils are numbered according to ascending width, except for fibril 12, which possesses a significantly different structure (see below). Within the series of fibrils 1–11, w increases progressively from 10.5 nm to 21.5 nm (Table 1). The d values vary from 65 nm to 163 nm and tend to increase with w. Hence, the 12 selected fibrils adequately represent the total d and w diversity of the fibrils seen in negative stain (Fig. 1c).

The resolution of the reconstructed densities range from 24 Å to 39 Å (Table 1; Fig. 3) based on the 0.5 Fourier shell correlation criterion. The 12 fibrils show significant crossover periodicity, but no axial 2.7 nm repeat or a tubular substructure.8,25 Unidirectional platinum shadowing demonstrated that all helical fibrils of this sample possess a left-handed chirality (data not shown). All 12 fibrils were reconstructed twice, once by assuming 2-fold rotational symmetry around the fibril axis, and once by assuming no additional symmetry. The 2-fold symmetry means that the cross-section superimposes with itself after a 180° rotation. Asymmetry means that this occurs only after a 360° rotation. The pairs of 3D reconstructions obtained for fibrils 1–11 are similar, irrespective of the symmetry assumption used. Therefore, there is good correspondence between the raw data and the projections of the 2-fold symmetrical and asymmetrical reconstructions of these fibrils. This is shown in Fig. 4a and b, using fibril 11 as an example. Hereafter, we only refer to the 2-fold symmetrical reconstructions of fibrils 1–11 (see Fig. 2b). The cross-sectional structures of fibrils 1–11 range from a compact, square-like shape over several cross-sections with relatively elliptical structure to one that is roughly S-shaped (Fig. 2c). Besides these cross-sectional differences, fibrils 1–11 differ also with respect to the shape and width of their crossovers. For example, fibril 11 possesses crossovers that are prominent and much narrower than the width of this fibril. By contrast, fibril 1 possesses crossovers that are much less pronounced (Fig. 2a).

While fibrils 1–11 all comply with a 2-fold symmetry, fibril 12 does not. Enforcement of a 2-fold symmetry on fibril 12 leads to a 3D density map inconsistent with the raw data (Fig. 4c). Only the asymmetrical reconstruction of this fibril produces a density map that agrees well with the raw data (Fig. 4d). The fundamental structural difference of fibril 12 compared with the other 11 reconstructed fibrils is also evident from the raw electron micrographs. In these images, the brightest features represent the regions of the highest density in projection (Fig. 2a). In the case of fibrils 1–11, these regions lie always on the central fibril axis. In the case of fibril 12, however, they are arranged into pairs of two and are offset from the central fibril axis, alternating from the left-hand to the right-hand side (Fig. 2a). Finally, fibril 12 also shows different mechanical properties compared with the other 11 fibrils, as presented in more detail in the next section.

The cross-sectional structure is a determinant of the observable fibril twist

In the past, the estimation of the fibril cross-section from AFM measurements enabled the calculation of the polar moment of inertia _IPV about the main fibril axis z.38 _IPV describes the mechanical resistance of a fibril towards torsional stress. In contrast to previous approaches, which estimated _IPV values only from the cross-sectional diameter of a fibril,38 we determine here the _IPV value of each fibril directly from its cross-sectional shape according to the general formula:

\[
_IPV = \int r^2 dA
\]  

where r is the radial distance and A is the cross-sectional area. _IPV was originally defined for macros-
copic structures that possess homogeneous and isotropic material properties. Although the properties of a fibril on a microscopic and near-atomic scale must be quite different when compared with a macroscopic object, fibrils 1–11 show a clear correlation between \( I_z \) and the crossover distance \( d \) that describes the twist of a fibril. Within this series, \( d \) tends to increase with \( I_z \) (Fig. 5). A linear fit produces a correlation coefficient \( R \) of 0.93. While some 2-fold symmetrical fibrils deviate slightly from such a linear relationship, fibril 12 shows more substantial differences. This deviation testifies further to the fundamental structural difference of this fibril.

**Discussion**

Here, we show that A\(_\beta\) (1–40) peptide can form a range of different amyloid fibril morphologies, even when incubated under the same conditions. It is known that different conditions of incubation can lead to different fibril structures. Additionally, this study shows that polymorphic fibrils can exist even within the same sample. This observation is consistent with a previous analysis of the effects of salts on A\(_\beta\) (1–40) fibrils,\(^{16}\) and a study by Goldsbury et al. that revealed different types of coiled A\(_\beta\) (1–40) fibrils and flat ribbons in the same sample.\(^{11}\) Hence, different incubation conditions produce different polymorphic ensembles of A\(_\beta\) (1–40) fibril morphologies.

The differences between different A\(_\beta\) (1–40) fibrils are sometimes rather fundamental, such as in the case of fibril 12, which differs substantially from the other 11 reconstructed fibrils, as shown by its different basic symmetry and different micromechanical properties. However, even 2-fold symmetrical fibrils can present significant structural differences, such as fibrils 1, 5 and 11, which differ in properties such as width, crossover distance, cross-sectional structure and in the shape and size of the crossovers (Fig. 2a–c). Nevertheless, the present study shows that the differences between different fibrils are sometimes small. These observations are made here by analysis of different A\(_\beta\) (1–40) samples and by using negative stain TEM, cryo-EM and 3D reconstruction. For example, Fig. 2 shows that fibrils 4, 6, 7 and 8 have an overall similar structure despite some small differences. In several samples, the range of fibrils presents almost continuously differing structural properties. This observation is consistent with negative stain TEM analysis of many fibrils from the same sample (Fig. 1d), as well as with the gallery of 3D fibril reconstructions shown in Fig. 2.

We have compared the reconstructed fibrils with previous structural models of A\(_\beta\) amyloid fibrils. Indeed, fibrils 1 and 11 show clear similarities to some previous models. Fibril 1 possesses a square-shaped cross-section that is compatible with models of a side-by-side arrangement of four major \( \beta \)-sheet regions (Fig. 6) as suggested by Petkova et al. based on solid-state nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy.\(^{34,39}\) Fibril 11 is similar to a recently reconstructed A\(_\beta\) (1–40) fibril that represents a double-helix formed from two protofilaments.\(^{35,36}\) Each protofilament in this fibril consists of a pair of \( \beta \)-sheet regions, similar to the class 1 steric zipper.
structures. The study by Sachse et al. suggested that these β-sheet regions belong to two oppositely directed Aβ peptides, rather than to the previously proposed single Aβ peptide in a β-arch conformation. Figure 6 shows a corresponding structural arrangement of fibril 11. Given that analysis of this fibril morphology suggested that two β-sheet regions constitute the core of one protofilament, fibrils 1 and 11 may differ mainly in the relative position of two underlying protofilaments. In fibril 1, the two protofilaments are organized side-by-side, while they are offset from one another in fibril 11 (Fig. 6).

By contrast, none of the remaining ten single-fibril reconstructions readily correspond to any previous structural model. Based on proposals that different fibril morphologies can differ in the arrangement of structurally equivalent protofilaments, we have considered this case for fibrils 2–10. Indeed, these fibrils are associated with w and d values and cross-sectional structures intermediate between those of fibrils 1 and 11, consistent with intermediate protofilament–protofilament arrangements. This can be shown also by structural interpretation of fibril 5 (see Fig. 6). By contrast, other fibril cross-sections are more difficult to reconcile with such a model. For example, fibril 10 may also involve a different protofilament core structure and peptide–peptide arrangement compared with fibril 11. Such an interpretation is consistent with several reports of peptide microcrystals of zipper-like structures from a seven residue peptide that can assume several different modes of packing and conformations.

The structural heterogeneity of amyloid fibril samples described here implies that amyloid fibril formation is significantly different from monomeric protein folding reactions. Protein folding reactions are characterized by the fact that a given protein always folds into the same 3D conformation, irrespective of the pathway through which the native conformation is adopted. Hence, all folded molecules share the same inter-residue contacts. By contrast, amyloid formation reactions can lead to different inter-residue contacts for the same polypeptide sequence. These differences may affect both the contacts within a protofilament and those between different protofilaments.

These observations are consistent with concepts according to which amyloid fibril formation represents a generic conformational property of polypeptide chains. In other words, the amyloid fibril polymorphism observed reflects the fact that polypeptide chains represent organic polymers and are
able to form structural states for which a sequence specificity is much less important than in native protein folding reactions.\(^{5,45}\) This does not mean that any polypeptide sequence can be arranged in a complementary fashion into an amyloid structure. Analyses by Eisenberg and co-workers have provided evidence that there are actually only a small number of polypeptide chain segments for which this is possible.\(^{46}\) Compared with native protein folding reactions, however, the side chains possess many different possibilities to interact favorably, so that differently shaped amyloid fibrils are possible.\(^{47}\) Hence, this property of amyloid fibrils resembles chemically much simpler organic polymers, such as polyamide or nylon chains.\(^{48}\)

Given that the present data show that Aβ peptide possesses an intrinsic ability to form morphologically heterogeneous amyloid fibrils, we predict that different Aβ amyloid fibril morphologies may exist in humans. Indeed, electron microscopic examination shows that tissue-derived amyloid fibrils formed from apolipoprotein A1, lysozyme and tau protein also possess different morphologies.\(^{18,23}\) The development of methods to discriminate between these different structures and to manipulate their formation will be important for defining the structural states relevant for conformational diseases. These methods may also enable analysis of how heterogeneous biological activities, such as different prion strains or aggregate cytotoxicities, may be encoded in differently structured aggregates.\(^{49,50}\)

### Materials and Methods

#### Fibril preparation

Amyloid fibrils were grown as described, using a final concentration of 1 mg/ml Aβ(1-40) (with 1% fibril seeds) in 50 mM sodium borate buffer (pH 7.8) or PBS (pH 7.4) incubated for a minimum of two days.\(^{51}\)

#### Electron microscopy

Samples for negative stain analysis were placed onto copper grids covered with a carbon film and counterstained with 2% (w/v) uranyl acetate, using the droplet technique.\(^{52}\) Platinum shadowing was carried out as described.\(^{35}\) Specimens were examined in an FEI Morgagni 268 or Zeiss 902 electron microscope operated at an acceleration voltage of 80 kV. Cryo-EM samples were placed onto R 1.2/1.3 holey carbon 400-mesh copper grids (Quantifoil Micro Tools) and plunge-frozen in vitreous ice. Low-dose images of the vitrified specimens were collected at -180°C on a Philips CM12 electron microscope operating at 120 kV. Micrographs were recorded at a nominal magnification of 60,000× and an underfocus of 2.1–2.3 μm on Kodak SO-163 film.

#### Image processing

Fibril micrographs were scanned with a raster size of 7 μm, using a Zeiss SCAI flatbed scanner. Averaging of 4 × 4 or 6 × 6 pixels resulted in a final pixel size on the specimen of 0.47 nm or 0.7 nm. A detailed description of the reconstruction procedure can be found elsewhere.\(^{53}\) Segment sizes were set to either 77 nm × 77 nm, 112 nm × 112 nm or 147 nm × 147 nm (see Table 1). The step size along the fibril axis was 7 nm. Reference projections of fibrils 1 – 11 were computed by rotating about the fibril axis between 0° and 180° in 4° increments and using out-of-plane tilt angles of ±6.97°, ±9.83° and ±12°. This procedure led to a final set of 315 projections. Reference projections of fibril 12 were generated by rotation from 0° to 360°, yielding 630 projections in total. Helical symmetry was imposed with a subunit repeat of

---

**Fig. 6.** Structural model of the protofilament core topology of fibrils 1, 5 and 11. Top, side view of the fibrils with two protofilament cores modeled into the densities. Bottom, contoured density cross-sections of the fibrils superimposed with two protofilament cores. Each protofilament core comprises a pair of two β-sheet regions colored in yellow (interface) and blue (outside). Each β-sheet region may be formed by one Aβ peptide, as suggested by a recent analysis of a morphology corresponding to fibril 11.\(^{36}\) To date, it is not known whether a β-sheet region consists of a single long strand or whether it is constructed from several short β-sheet segments.
0.47 nm, consistent with X-ray diffraction data. Noise was masked from the 3D models by application of a helical mask. The volumes were low-pass filtered with a cosine falloff to a resolution of 20 Å. At this filter radius, no important structural detail was removed. Fibril reconstructions were displayed with the Chimera Visualization System. The thresholds for the representations of fibril surfaces and cross-sections were set so that the fibril widths measured from the raw images and the reconstructions were equal (Table 1).

### Calculation of the cross-sectional area and polar moment of inertia

The cross-sectional areas of the fibril reconstructions were estimated by determination of the number of pixels above the density threshold and converted into square nanometres by multiplication with the pixel size. The values given in Table 1 represent the averages of the cross-sectional areas of the symmetric and asymmetric fibril reconstructions. In the case of fibril 12, only the asymmetric reconstruction was included in the calculation.

The polar moment of inertia $I_z$ was calculated according to equation (1) (see Results), using the dimensions of the reconstructed cross-sections. To simplify computation of $I_z$, the cross-sectional areas were approximated with one or two rectangles or ellipses.
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