Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

ScienceDirect

Site-specific ubiquitination: Deconstructing the degradation tag

Emma C. Carroll[1] and Susan Marqusee[2,3,4]

Abstract

Ubiquitin is a small eukaryotic protein so named for its cellular abundance and originally recognized for its role as the post-translational modification (PTM) "tag" condemning substrates to degradation by the 26S proteasome. Since its discovery in the 1970s, protein ubiquitination has also been identified as a key regulatory feature in dozens of non-degradative cellular processes. This myriad of roles illustrates the versatility of ubiquitin as a PTM; however, understanding the cellular and molecular factors that enable discrimination between degradative versus non-degradative ubiquitination events has been a persistent challenge. Here, we discuss recent advances in uncovering how site-specificity — the exact residue that gets modified — modulates distinct protein fates and cellular outcomes with an emphasis on how ubiquitination site specificity regulates proteasomal degradation. We explore recent advances in structural biology, biophysics, and cell biology that have enabled a broader understanding of the role of ubiquitination in altering the dynamics of the target protein, including implications for the design of targeted protein degradation therapeutics.

Addresses

[1] Institute for Neurodegenerative Diseases, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, 94038, USA
[2] Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA
[3] QB3 Institute for Quantitative Biosciences, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA
[4] Department of Chemistry, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA

Corresponding authors: Marqusee, Susan (marqusee@berkeley.edu); Carroll, Emma C (emma.carroll@ucsf.edu)
(Carroll E.C.), (Marqusee S.)

Current Opinion in Structural Biology 2022, **73**:102345

This review comes from a themed issue on **Folding and Binding**

Edited by **Fabrizio Chiti** and **Anna Sablina**

For complete overview of the section, please refer the article collection - Folding and Binding

Available online 2 March 2022

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbi.2022.102345

0959-440X/© 2022 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Ubiquitin is an 8.6 kDa protein covalently appended as a posttranslational modification (PTM) to target proteins (substrates), most frequently via an isopeptide bond between ubiquitin's C terminus and the epsilon amino group of a lysine side chain on the substrate. Less commonly, the primary amino group of a protein's N terminus or the side chain of cysteine, serine, and threonine can serve as sites of ubiquitin attachment [1,2]. Additionally, ubiquitination targets can be non-proteinaceous; a recent study identified ubiquitin-modified lipopolysaccharides incurred during *Salmonella* bacteria infection [3]. Attachment of ubiquitin to target proteins proceeds via a highly regulated, three-enzyme cascade (Figure 1a). The ubiquitin modification is traditionally conceptualized as a "degradation tag", identifying and delivering condemned substrates for degradation via binding to the 26S proteasome. It is also now widely recognized that ubiquitination is also involved in a rich array of other non-degradative cellular processes (Figure 1b).

Lysine is a relatively abundant amino acid, accounting for 6% of the total proteome [4], and, thus, the typical protein contains numerous theoretical sites of canonical ubiquitin attachment. Additionally, ubiquitin itself contains seven lysines (at positions 6, 11, 27, 29, 33, 48, and 63), allowing formation of polyubiquitin chains with diverse lengths, linkages, and topologies. As such, ubiquitin modifications exist in a vast combinatorial space [5] that must be carefully regulated to ensure accurate cellular signal transduction and prevent aberrant degradation.

Together, the site of ubiquitin attachment and the ubiquitin chain identity/length form a 'ubiquitin code' [6,7] that can be read out by cellular factors. Basic chemical constraints present a molecular recognition problem: what controls which lysines are modified, and how are these modifications read or translated into the correct cellular response? Moreover, how can this system be harnessed for the degradation of disease-causing proteins?

Figure 1



(a) Enzymatic cascade for site-specific ubiquitination. Given that any surface exposed lysine (or alternative residues) is theoretically competent for ubiquitination, the modification site is a product of the identity of the E2 ubiquitin conjugating and E3 ubiquitin ligase enzymes as well as cellular environmental conditions and the presence of cofactors. E4 ubiquitin chain-elongation enzymes may add additional ubiquitin subunits to existing substrate-anchored ubiquitin chains. **(b) Hypothetical example of a substrate protein with two potential ubiquitination sites.** One site directs the substrate to the 26S proteasome for degradation (the 'degradative' site), while the other is a 'non-degradative' site that regulates one of many known cellular processes. **(c) Cartoon example of a hypothetical E2/RING E3-substrate-ubiquitin ternary complex illustrating steric constraints that lead to preferential substrate lysine ubiquitination (Left).** By contrast, a hypothetical alternative E3 (here displayed as a HECT-type E3 charged with ubiquitin) exhibits differential lysine site specificity with the same substrate based on conformational and topological properties of the E3-substrate interaction (Right). Recent advances in structural biology have enabled direct inspection of such complexes to illustrate how site specificity arises and subsequent molecular effects.

How does ubiquitination site selection arise?

Theoretically, all surface-exposed lysines are equally probable and competent for ubiquitination; in practice, the 'writers' of the ubiquitin code determine which substrate lysines are actually modified. E3 ubiquitin ligases are the terminal enzymes of the ubiquitination machinery cascade, downstream of the E1 ubiquitin-activating enzymes and E2 ubiquitin-conjugating enzymes. E3s are complex and highly regulated enzymes [7,8] that all share a "matchmaker" role. In the case of RING E3s, the E3 brings the substrate and ubiquitin-charged E2 together to facilitate ubiquitin transfer. By contrast, homologous to the E6AP carboxyl terminus (HECT) and RING-between-RING (RBR) E3s participate in the enzymatic transfer of ubiquitin to substrate themselves via a covalent E3-ubiquitin intermediate (a thioester linkage between ubiquitin's C terminus and a catalytic E3 cysteine residue).

The terminal E3 enzyme plays a crucial role in this matchmaking process (Figure 1c). The human proteome

encodes hundreds of E3s, compared to only ∼60 E2s and 2 E1s, illustrating the importance of E3s in controlling substrate and site selectivity [9–12]. As such, it is tempting to speculate that the decision of which proteins/sites to ubiquitinate is at the discretion of the E3-substrate pairing, but this cannot explain the whole story. In fact, while some E3s have dedicated sites and substrates, others interact with hundreds of targets in response to cellular stressors [13,14]. Moreover, mutation of preferred ubiquitination sites does not deter certain E3s from interacting with and ubiquitinating another site on the substrate [1], suggesting that, to a certain extent, ubiquitin site selection occurs stochastically (Figure 1c). Additionally, a class of enzymes known as E4 ubiquitin chain-elongation factors facilitate ubiquitin monomer addition to previously conjugated ubiquitin chains, expanding upon the modification written by the E3 (Figure 1a) [15]. Thus, future studies are needed to parse cellular and molecular determinants of ubiquitin site selection.

In contrast to these E1, E2, and E3 ubiquitin code 'writers', deubiquitinases serve as 'erasers'. The ∼80 human deubiquitinases work in opposition to the conjugation machinery to remove and recycle ubiquitin modifications that are no longer needed or erroneous. Deubiquitinases are also carefully regulated, playing a key role in which substrates and sites remain ubiquitinated for interaction with the cellular 'readers' of site-specific ubiquitination [16]. Moreover, a suite of other ubiquitin-like proteins, known as ubiquitin-like modifiers (UBLs), share structural homology with ubiquitin but have non-overlapping regulatory roles [17]. Interestingly, one of the best characterized UBLs, SUMO, is frequently directed to target lysines via a consensus motif recognized by SUMO's dedicated E2, Ubc9, [18]. Though other non-canonical SUMOylation sites have been observed, this Ubc9-directed consensus motif suggests distinct mechanisms for site selection.

Competition with other lysine PTMs, such as lysine acetylation, at sites of ubiquitination imparts an additional dimension to the site-specificity question. Indeed, recent studies have shown that acetylation of the lysine residues on ubiquitin itself can alter the intra-ubiquitin chain linkages built by multiple E3s *in vitro*, fundamentally altering the "ubiquitin code" message contained in the modification [19]. Furthermore, crosstalk between ubiquitin and other non-lysine-based modifications expands the ubiquitin code. For example, recent work shows that caspase cleavage near the C terminus of target proteins exposes cryptic binding sites for the E3 ligase CHIP (carboxy-terminus of Hsp70-interacting protein), promoting ubiquitination events that shuttle the cleaved substrate to the cellular quality control and degradation machinery [20]. C-terminal proteolysis has also recently been shown to expose masked proteasomal initiation regions, termed degrons. For example, calpain protease cleavage of a transcription factor liberates a proteasome initiation region that triggers ubiquitination and degradation of the transcription factor upon viral infection [21].

Here we explore the molecular mechanisms for reading the ubiquitin code. While it is clear there are a host of ubiquitin receptors and binding partners, the mechanisms by which they can discriminate among different ubiquitinated substrates is less clear. We focus on recent work exploring how the fundamental biophysical changes resulting from the attachment of ubiquitin to the substrate connects to proteasomal degradation.

Molecular and thermodynamic consequences of site-specific ubiquitination

Molecular recognition of a ubiquitinated protein signal is nontrivial and multifaceted. The site of modification, the ubiquitin chain length, and intra-ubiquitin chain lysine connectivity all have the potential to play a role in modulating which downstream cellular factors interact with the ubiquitinated substrate. These observations, however, are frequently insufficient to fully describe ubiquitin signaling; for example, proteasomal ubiquitin receptors have similar affinities for K63-linked ubiquitin chains as they do for the more canonically degradation-associated K48-linked ubiquitin chains [22]. In addition, the 26S proteasome readily degrades K63-linked ubiquitin-modified substrates *in vitro* [23–26].

A major hurdle in biochemical and biophysical studies of the effects of ubiquitination at individual sites is the difficulty in purifying homogenously ubiquitinated proteins with native isopeptide linkages [27]. A diverse array of chemical biology approaches for site specifically conjugating ubiquitin to target proteins of interest have enabled substantial gains in this area [28], but such approaches frequently come with tradeoffs in the chemical properties of the ubiquitin-substrate bond, deubiquitinase sensitivity, and proteasomal recognition. As such, purification of ubiquitinated proteins with native isopeptide linkages typically relies upon biochemical reconstitution of ubiquitination enzymatic machinery [29–31], isolation directly from cells [32], or total chemical synthesis [33].

Recent studies have revealed that the biophysical consequences of ubiquitination are site-specific and can serve as a key mechanism to regulate signaling and function (Figure 2). For example, we showed that ubiquitination can affect the energy landscape of a protein in a site-specific manner [30,31], allowing the substrate to access high-energy, partially unfolded states only when modified at certain sites. Moreover, we found that the proteasome selectively recognizes and

Figure 2



(a) Protein conformational energy landscape depicting the energetic and structural consequences of site-specific ubiquitination. Left: At one ubiquitination site, the hypothetical substrate undergoes a conformational change within the native well that alters enzymatic activity and/or interaction partners. Right: At a different ubiquitination site, the hypothetical substrate is energetically destabilized by the addition of ubiquitin, allowing population of a high-energy, partially unfolded state on the landscape that may contain a sufficient unstructured region for degradation by the 26S proteasome. **(b)** The 26S proteasome requires an obligate unstructured to engage the condemned substrate for degradation (top). Recent studies have shown that ubiquitin can destabilize substrate proteins site specifically, regulating whether or not a substrate is recognized for degradation (bottom).

degrades substrates ubiquitinated at these destabilizing sites, uncovering a new layer of regulation for proteasomal degradation. We also determined that the exact thermodynamic mechanism driving this destabilization depends on the site of ubiquitination (Figure 2a), with entropic vs. enthalpic mechanisms driving destabilization at different sites within the same substrate [31].

Interestingly, the observed ubiquitin-induced destabilization was rarely of sufficient magnitude to unfold the substrate at equilibrium; ubiquitin-destabilized substrates largely retained the ability to recognize binding partners and did not yield drastically different HSQC signatures compared to their unmodified counterparts by NMR [30,31]. Instead, fluctuations from the native state resulting in population of partially unfolded states on the landscape appear to be responsible for the observed differences in proteasomal degradation. Another possibility is that the fate of ubiquitin-destabilized substrates may be under kinetic control, with ubiquitin attachment modulating the height of the barriers to these partially unfolded, proteasome-engageable states. Beyond proteasomal recognition, these ubiquitin-induced energetic changes likely also direct molecular recognition by other cellular factors, ubiquitin-regulated signaling pathways, and nodes in the proteostasis network.

Furthermore, site-specific ubiquitination can impart large conformational changes to key signaling proteins (e.g., Ras, kinases) [34] that affect protein function [35,36], enzymatic activity [37], protein–protein interactions mediated via the ubiquitin moiety [34,38], and even the conformation of the proteasome components itself [39,40]. In addition, the removal of the positive charge from the lysine side chain upon ubiquitination imparts specific molecular recognition and cellular signaling consequences. Recent work using chemical biology approaches to screen multiple aliphatic side chain geometries for the amine that is conjugated to ubiquitin found that the lysine amine geometry is crucial for site determination by E2s/E3s, explaining why these ubiquitination enzymes frequently have canonical acceptor lysines [41].

Site-specificity in 26S proteasomal degradation

On a broad level, rewiring of cellular ubiquitin networks — targeting different proteins for degradation by the proteasome — can direct cell fates, such as the aging process in *C. elegans* [42] or erythrocyte maturation [43]. These examples highlight the critical role of ubiquitination site-specificity in tuning the flux through degradative pathways. Numerous challenges, however, have prevented a cell- and system-wide understanding of how ubiquitinated protein fate is regulated. Thus, we do not yet have a full understanding of the molecular rules that govern these fates, nor do we have a complete map of what proteins are ubiquitinated under a given condition.

Historically, ubiquitin chain length and intra-ubiquitin linkage identity were posited to act as a “switch” between degradation and other cellular fates, with K48-linked chains of four or more ubiquitin moieties believed to confer proteasomal degradation. However, recent work has challenged this paradigm, with multiple ubiquitin chain linkages shown to be robustly degraded both *in vitro* and *in vivo* [24,44,45]; even monoubiquitin can act as a degradation signal [46]. Furthermore, mechanistic studies have demonstrated that diverse ubiquitin chain types have similar affinities for the proteasomal ubiquitin receptors and that the proteasome can recognize and degrade multiple ubiquitin chain architectures [47]. Therefore, the code for degradation cannot be as simple as the type of ubiquitination.

The substrate itself can also play a role in regulating proteasomal degradation. For instance, engagement with the proteasome requires an unstructured region [48] (Figure 2b). On a proteome-wide level, degradation-promoting ubiquitination sites appear only loosely correlated with particular ground-state secondary or tertiary structural features on the substrate [31,49,50]. Biophysical studies evaluating the effect of ubiquitination at different sites on the same protein demonstrated that at some sites ubiquitination can alter the energetics, regulating whether a substrate is degraded by the 26S proteasome *in vitro* [30]. Importantly, these modifications increase the population of partially unfolded states on the energy landscape but do not alter the ground-state, or native, protein structure [31]. The exact cellular pathways that respond to such ubiquitin-mediated changes in energetics (e.g. proteostasis systems) have yet to be identified. For example, a destabilized substrate could be recognized and transformed by a chaperone [51,52] or an unfoldase such as p97 [53–56], prior to delivery to the 26S proteasome.

One hurdle to identifying degradative vs. regulatory ubiquitination sites throughout the proteome is the technical difficulty of mapping ubiquitination sites in general. Recent advancements in mass spectrometry and proteomic profiling techniques have enabled considerable progress in this area [5]. New native mass spectrometry methods allow interrogation of E3:substrate:small-molecule ternary complexes to understand how individual ubiquitination sites are chosen in targeted protein degradation systems [57]. Advances in analysis pipelines [58] and sample preparation workflows [59] have increased the coverage and resolution possible from ubiquitin proteomics experiments. Beyond mass spectrometry, development of activity-based chemical probes for RING E3s [60] have allowed for direct profiling of E3-substrate interactions in cell lysates. These new methods will facilitate a more complete understanding of what sites in the proteome are ubiquitin-modified, which E3s ‘write’ a given modification, and under what conditions these modifications occur, providing a foundation for broader profiling, or even predictive algorithms, of degradative vs. non-degradative ubiquitination sites.

Site-specific ubiquitination in targeted protein degradation and therapeutics

While it is increasingly clear that site-specificity is important for cellular ‘readers’ to correctly translate the ubiquitin code, we still lack a “dictionary” for what associates a certain site with a particular fate (or what cellular factors cause a site to switch from one fate to another). Elaborating this dictionary with new technologies is particularly important in light of new approaches for small molecule-directed targeted protein degradation therapeutics. Specifically, proteolysis-targeting chimeras (PROTACs) are divalent molecules containing target-binding and E3-recruiting moieties [61]. Typically, they are directed to disease-associated targets, such as oncogenes overexpressed in a cancer state, to induce ubiquitination and degradation of pathogenic proteins. Although PROTAC development has historically focused on cancer therapeutics [62], there is increasing interest in developing targeted degraders of viral, metabolic, and cardiovascular disease-associated proteins and neurodegeneration-associated aggregates [63].

Advances in PROTAC technologies have been thoroughly reviewed elsewhere [61,64,65], but it is clear that the basic science discoveries of the roles of site-specific ubiquitination have important implications for their future. First, the evolving role of ubiquitin chain topology/length in 26S proteasome recognition for degradation expands the repertoire of E3s/E3-recruiting moieties that may successfully induce target degradation. Additionally, previous work indicates that PROTAC linker length (between the target-binding and E3-recruiting sites) can determine whether or not degradation occurs, potentially by mediating which

Table 1

Highlighted recent studies of site-specific ubiquitination in non-degradative biological regulation and summary of findings. Advances in structural biology and mechanistic biochemistry have enabled detailed studies of individual proteins and ubiquitination sites of interest, leading to advancements and insights across broad areas of biology.

Biological Process	Studies	Summary
Histone regulation/gene expression	1. Höllmüller et al., 2021 [68] 2. Witus et al., 2021 [69] 3. Kruijsbergen et al., 2020 [70]	1. Established regulatory role for ubiquitin and linker histone H1 2. Structure of BRCA1/BARD1 E3 heterodimer with the E2 enzyme UbcH5c bound to its cellular target, the nucleosome 3. Development of site-specific ubiquitin antibodies using histones as a model system
DNA repair	1. Chaugule et al., 2020 [71] 2. Kelliher et al., 2020 [72]	1. Substrate FANCI rewires E2 Ube2T active site to promote ubiquitinations at certain substrate sites 2. E3 RNF168 ubiquitinates non-canonical histone variants at their divergent N-terminal tail lysine residues
Apoptosis/cell death	1. Fennell et al., 2020 [73] 2. Li et al., 2020 [74]	1. Site-specific ubiquitination of E3 ligase HOIP activates apoptosis 2. RIPK1 (kinase that regulates apoptosis) is regulated by site-specific ubiquitination to promote apoptosis
Immune Signaling and Host-pathogen interactions	1. Shin et al., 2020 [75] 2. Schubert and Nguyen et al., 2020 [76]	1. Legionella possesses a suite of deubiquitinases that are selective for different ubiquitin chains and sites 2. Prediction and validation of deubiquitinases in pathogenic bacteria provides insight into ubiquitin chain site recognition
Neurodegeneration	1. Hakim-Eshed et al., 2020 [77] 2. Munari et al., 2020 [78]	1. Ubiquitination of Huntingtin leads to less toxic, larger aggregates and shapes aggregate morphology 2. Aggregation propensities differ for tau monoubiquitinated with chemoselective disulfide approach vs. enzymatic/native isopeptide approach

target protein lysine residues are accessible for ubiquitination [66,67]. The understanding of the specific molecular effects of ubiquitination at individual sites gained from the studies discussed herein, coupled to future predictive methods for the structural, energetic, and biological consequences of ubiquitination at given sites, empowers rational design of degradation-inducing therapeutics. It is clear that continued studies are crucial to fully realize this therapeutic potential of degradation-directed site-specific ubiquitination.

Beyond the proteasome – site specificity in regulation of cellular processes

Beyond proteasomal degradation, site-specific ubiquitination is crucial for driving biological signaling and regulation of non-degradative processes (Table 1). By definition, the decision of whether to degrade a given substrate ubiquitinated at a distinct site is intricately linked to all of the other options. As such, a comparison with non-degradative site-specific ubiquitination is fundamental to understanding cellular decision making for proteasomal degradation. Although outside the scope of this review, Table I summarizes some recent advancements in this area.

Conclusions and outlook

Rather than acting as a passive 'tag', site-specific ubiquitination imparts a myriad of consequences to target proteins that drive regulation of proteasomal degradation and other cellular processes. Recent

detailed mechanistic studies have revealed how, and under what conditions, individual ubiquitin sites are selected, illuminating everything from basic biological signaling pathways to new therapeutic strategies. Although mapping ubiquitination sites has historically been challenging, new methods in structural biology, mass spectrometry, and chemical biology have enabled unprecedented resolution of molecular mechanisms in site-specific ubiquitination associated with proteasomal degradation and beyond. Future studies will expand and refine these mechanisms towards predictive models of the biophysical and cellular effects of ubiquitination at individual ubiquitination sites. Ultimately, to understand ubiquitination site-specificity on a protein-by-protein and proteome-wide level is to have the power to engineer cellular ubiquitination pathways, tipping the cellular scales towards or against degradative outcomes.

Funding

All of the sources of funding for the work described in this publication are acknowledged below: National Institutes of Health RO1 to Susan Marqusee.

Conflict of interest statement

Nothing declared.

Acknowledgements

We thank Eric Greene, Naomi Latorraca, Avi Samelson, and Sarah Williams for helpful comments and feedback on this manuscript. We acknowledge support from the US National Institutes of Health R01-GM050945 to S.M. S.M. is a Chan Zuckerberg Biohub investigator.

References

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

* of special interest
** of outstanding interest

1. Mattiroli F, Sixma TK: **Lysine-targeting specificity in ubiquitin and ubiquitin-like modification pathways**. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2014, **21**:308–316.
2. McDowell GS, Philpott A: **Non-canonical ubiquitylation: mechanisms and consequences**. *Int J Biochem Cell Biol* 2013, **45**:1833–1842.
3. Otten EG, Werner E, Crespillo-Casado A, Boyle KB, Dharamdasani V, Pathe C, Santhanam B, Randow F: **Ubiquitylation of lipopolysaccharide by RNF213 during bacterial infection**. *Nature* 2021, **594**:111–116.
4. Hacker SM, Backus KM, Lazear MR, Forli S, Correia BE, Cravatt BF: **Global profiling of lysine reactivity and ligandability in the human proteome**. *Nat Chem* 2017, **9**:1181–1190.
5. Deol KK, Strieter ER: **The ubiquitin proteoform problem**. *Curr Opin Chem Biol* 2021, **63**:95–104.
6. Komander D, Rape M: **The ubiquitin code**. *Annu Rev Biochem* 2012, **81**:203–229.
7. Yau R, Rape M: **The increasing complexity of the ubiquitin code**. *Nat Cell Biol* 2016, **18**:579–586.
8. Swatek KN, Komander D: **Ubiquitin modifications**. *Cell Res* 2016, **26**:399–422.
9. Zheng N, Shabek N: **Ubiquitin ligases: structure, function, and regulation**. *Annu Rev Biochem* 2017, **86**:129–157.
10. Buetow L, Huang DT: **Structural insights into the catalysis and regulation of E3 ubiquitin ligases**. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2016, **17**:626–642.
11. Gundogdu M, Walden H: **Structural basis of generic versus specific E2–RING E3 interactions in protein ubiquitination**. *Protein Sci* 2019, **28**:1758–1770.
12. Deol KK, Lorenz S, Strieter ER: **Enzymatic logic of ubiquitin chain assembly**. *Front Physiol* 2019, **10**:1–14.
13. Li Y, Xie P, Lu L, Wang J, Diao L, Liu Z, Guo F, He Y, Liu Y, Huang Q, *et al.*: **An integrated bioinformatics platform for investigating the human E3 ubiquitin ligase-substrate interaction network**. *Nat Commun* 2017, **8**:1–9.
14. Fang NN, Chan GT, Zhu M, Comyn SA, Persaud A, Deshaies RJ, Rotin D, Gsponer J, Mayor T: **Rsp5/Nedd4 is the main ubiquitin ligase that targets cytosolic misfolded proteins following heat stress**. *Nat Cell Biol* 2014, **16**.
15. Koegl M, Hoppe T, Schlenker S, Ulrich HD, Mayer TU, Jentsch S: **A novel ubiquitination factor, E4, is involved in multiubiquitin chain assembly**. *Cell* 1999, **96**:635–644.
16. Clague MJ, Urbé S, Komander D: **Breaking the chains: deubiquitylating enzyme specificity begets function**. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* 2019, **20**:338–352.
17. Cappadocia L, Lima CD: **Ubiquitin-like protein conjugation: structures, chemistry, and mechanism**. *Chem Rev* 2018, **118**:889–918.
18. Desterro JMP, Thomson J, Hay RT: **Ubch9 conjugates SUMO but not ubiquitin**. *FEBS Lett* 1997, **417**:297–300.
19. Lacoursiere RE, O'Donoghue P, Shaw GS: **Programmed ubiquitin acetylation using genetic code expansion reveals altered ubiquitination patterns**. *FEBS Lett* 2020, **594**:1226–1234.
20. Ravalin M, Theofilas P, Basu K, Opoku-Nsiah KA, Assimon VA, Medina-Cleghorn D, Chen YF, Bohn MF, Arkin M, Grinberg LT, *et al.*: **Specificity for latent C termini links the E3 ubiquitin ligase CHIP to caspases**. *Nat Chem Biol* 2019, **15**:786–794.
21. Tomita T, Huibregtse JM, Matouschek A: **A masked initiation region in retinoblastoma protein regulates its proteasomal degradation**. *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**:1–8.
22. Chojnacki M, Mansour W, Hameed DS, Singh RK, El Oualid F, Rosenzweig R, Nakasone MA, Yu Z, Glaser F, Kay LE, *et al.*: **Polyubiquitin-photoactivatable crosslinking reagents for mapping ubiquitin interactome identify Rpn1 as a proteasome ubiquitin-associating subunit**. *Cell Chem Biol* 2017, **24**:443–457.e6.
23. Saeki Y, Kudo T, Sone T, Kikuchi Y, Yokosawa H, Toh-e A, Tanaka K: **Lysine 63-linked polyubiquitin chain may serve as a targeting signal for the 26S proteasome**. *EMBO J* 2009, **28**:359–371.
24. Yu H, Matouschek A: **Recognition of client proteins by the proteasome**. *Annu Rev Biophys* 2017, **46**:149–173.
25. De la Peña AH, Goodall EA, Gates SN, Lander GC, Martin A: **Substrate-engaged 26S proteasome structures reveal mechanisms for ATP-hydrolysis–driven translocation**. *Science* 2018, **80**:362.
26. Bard JAM, Bashore C, Dong KC, Martin A: **The 26S proteasome utilizes a kinetic gateway to prioritize substrate degradation**. *Cell* 2019, **177**:286–298.e15.
27. Faggiano S, Pastore A: **The challenge of producing ubiquitinated proteins for structural studies**. *Cells* 2014, **3**:639–656.
28. Gui W, Davidson GA, Zhuang Z: **Chemical methods for protein site-specific ubiquitination**. *RSC Chem Biol* 2021, **2**:450–467.
29. Tan W, Murphy VJ, Charron A, Van Twest S, Sharp M, Constantinou A, Parker MW, Crismani W, Bythell-Douglas R, Deans AJ: **Preparation and purification of monoubiquitinated proteins using Avi-tagged ubiquitin**. *PLoS One* 2020, **15**:1–16.

30. ** Carroll EC, Greene ER, Martin A, Marqusee S: **Site-specific ubiquitination affects protein energetics and proteasomal degradation**. *Nat Chem Biol* 2020, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41589-020-0556-3.

Carroll and colleagues develop a generalizable *in vitro* ubiquitination and purification system for single-lysine proteins and use biophysical techniques to interrogate the effects of site-specific ubiquitination on protein energetics. They find that ubiquitin can exert a wide range of energetic effects, ranging from no effect to substantial thermodynamic destablization, and that these energetic changes can regulate proteasomal degradation *in vitro*. This study is the first to report site-specific energetic consequences of ubiquitination attached via a native isopeptide bond and to connect these changes to proteasomal degradation rates and substrate selection.

31. Carroll EC, Latorraca NR, Lindner JM, Maguire BC, Pelton JG, Marqusee S: **Mechanistic basis for ubiquitin modulation of a protein energy landscape**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci Unit States Am* 2021, **118**.

32. Gao Y, Li Y, Zhang C, Zhao M, Deng C, Lan Q, Liu Z, Su N, Wang J, Xu F, *et al.*: **Enhanced purification of ubiquitinated proteins by engineered tandem hybrid ubiquitin-binding domains (ThUBDs)**. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 2016, **15**:1381–1396.

33. Sun H, Brik A: **The journey for the total chemical synthesis of a 53 kDa protein**. *Acc Chem Res* 2019, **52**:3361–3371.

34. * Yin G, Zhang J, Nair V, Truong V, Chaia A, Petela J, Harrison J, Gorfe AA, Campbell SL: **KRAS ubiquitination at lysine 104 retains exchange factor regulation by dynamically modulating the conformation of the interface**. *iScience* 2020, **23**: 101448.

Yin and colleagues use disulfide chemistry to monoubiquitinate KRas at lysine 104, a posttranslational modification hotspot known to be important for modulating Ras conformational switching at a helix–helix interface. Using NMR, Rosetta modeling, and MD simulation, they discover that monoubiquitination of lysine 104 tunes conformational switching to regulate interactions with the Ras nucleotide exchange factor, son of sevenless (SOS). This study leverages experimental and computational approaches to atomistically map changes in substrate dynamics upon ubiquitination and conenct these changes to biological signaling.

35. Ball KA, Johnson JR, Lewinski MK, Guatelli J, Verschueren E, Krogan NJ, Jacobson MP: **Non-degradative ubiquitination of protein kinases**. *PLoS Comput Biol* 2016, **12**:1–44.

36. Nair S, Bist P, Dikshit N, Krishnan MN: **Global functional profiling of human ubiquitome identifies E3 ubiquitin ligase DCST1 as a novel negative regulator of Type-I interferon signaling**. *Sci Rep* 2016, **6**:1–13.

37. Rinaldi L, Delle Donne R, Catalanotti B, Torres-Quesada O, Enzler F, Moraca F, Nisticò R, Chiuso F, Piccinin S, Bachmann V, *et al.*: **Feedback inhibition of cAMP effector signaling by a chaperone-assisted ubiquitin system**. *Nat Commun* 2019, **10**:2572.

38. Tanner N, Kleifeld O, Nachman I, Prag G: **Remodeling membrane binding by mono-ubiquitylation**. *Biomolecules* 2019, **9**:1–14.

39. Keren-Kaplan T, Zeev Peters L, Levin-Kravets O, Attali I, Kleifeld O, Shohat N, Artzi S, Zucker O, Pilzer I, Reis N, *et al.*: **Structure of ubiquitylated-Rpn10 provides insight into its autoregulation mechanism**. *Nat Commun* 2016, **7**:1–12.

40. Chen X, Htet ZM, López-Alfonzo E, Martin A, Walters KJ: **Proteasome interaction with ubiquitinated substrates: from mechanisms to therapies**. *FEBS J* 2020, https://doi.org/10.1111/febs.15638.

41. ** Liwocha J, Krist DT, van der Heden van Noort GJ, Hansen FM, Truong VH, Karayel O, Purser N, Houston D, Burton N, Bostock MJ, *et al.*: **Linkage-specific ubiquitin chain formation depends on a lysine hydrocarbon ruler**. *Nat Chem Biol* 2021, **17**:272–279.

Liwocha and colleagues develop chemical biology techniques to explore the role of lysine side chain aliphatic group geometry in driving ubiquitin site selection for a range of E2 and E3 families. Using ubiquitin constructs where single native lysines are replaced with these analogs, they find that the lysine side chain hydrocarbon linker impacts the sites and topologies of ubiquitin chains built by the E2/E3 enzymatic machinery. They further show these lysine analogs have distinct effects on ubiquitin/ubiquitin chain structure and dynamics. This study is the first systematic interrogation of the role of the lysine side chain chemistry itself in modulating ubiquitination site-specificity.

42. ** Koyuncu S, Loureiro R, Lee HJ, Wagle P, Krueger M, Vilchez D: **Rewiring of the ubiquitinated proteome determines ageing in C . elegans**. *Nature* 2021, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03781-z.

Koyuncu et al. utilize mass spectrometry proteomics approaches to map changes in the ubiquitin-modified proteome over the course of the 19-day *C. elegans* lifespan. They find that the ubiquitin-modified proteome is extensively remodeled during the aging process, including a depletion of proteasomal degradation-targeting ubiquitination sites as a function of age. This study is the first to longitudinally map the ubiquitin-modified proteome and link changes in site-specific ubiquitination to ageing phenotypes and tissue-specific alterations in proteasomal degradation.

43. Nguyen AT, Prado MA, Schmidt PJ, Sendamarai AK, Wilson-Grady JT, Min M, Campagna DR, Tian G, Shi Y, Dederer V, *et al.*: **UBE2O remodels the proteome during terminal erythroid differentiation**. *Science* 2017, **80**:357.

44. Samant RS, Livingston CM, Sontag EM, Frydman J: **Distinct proteostasis circuits cooperate in nuclear and cytoplasmic protein quality control**. *Nature* 2018, **563**:407–411.

45. Ohtake F, Tsuchiya H, Saeki Y, Tanaka K: **K63 ubiquitylation triggers proteasomal degradation by seeding branched ubiquitin chains**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2018, **115**: E1401–E1408.

46. Braten O, Livneh I, Ziv T, Admon A, Kehat I, Caspi LH, Gonen H, Bercovich B, Godzik A, Jahandideh S, *et al.*: **Numerous proteins with unique characteristics are degraded by the 26S proteasome following monoubiquitination**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci Unit States Am* 2016, **113**:E4639–E4647.

47. * Martinez-Fonts K, Davis C, Tomita T, Elsasser S, Nager AR, Shi Y, Finley D, Matouschek A: **The proteasome 19S cap and its ubiquitin receptors provide a versatile recognition platform for substrates**. *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**.

Martinez-Fonts and colleagues utilize a wide array of GFP-based proteasome substrates modified with diverse ubiquitin chain lengths and linkages to systematically characterize the effects of site-specificty in ubiquitin–ubiquitin chain linkages on proteasomal degradation *in vitro*. They find that diverse ubiquitin modifications facilitate substrate degradation and map ubiquitin chain interactions with specific proteasomal ubiquitin receptors to explore the molecular logic underlying this system. This study represents the most comprehensive *in vitro* analysis of the interactions between different ubiquitin chain lengths and linkage types to date.

48. Prakash S, Tian L, Ratliff KS, Lehotzky RE, Matouschek A: **An unstructured initiation site is required for efficient proteasome-mediated degradation**. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2004, **11**:830–837.

49. Gendron JM, Webb K, Yang B, Rising L, Zuzow N, Bennett EJ: **Using the ubiquitin-modified proteome to monitor distinct and spatially restricted protein homeostasis dysfunction**. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 2016, **15**:2576–2593.

50. Hagai T, Azia A, Tóth-Petróczy Á, Levy Y: **Intrinsic disorder in ubiquitination substrates**. *J Mol Biol* 2011, **412**:319–324.

51. Kandasamy G, Andréasson C: **Hsp70-Hsp110 chaperones deliver ubiquitin-dependent and -independent substrates to the 26S proteasome for proteolysis in yeast**. *J Cell Sci* 2018:131.

52. Kevei É, Pokrzywa W, Hoppe T: **Repair or destruction—an intimate liaison between ubiquitin ligases and molecular chaperones in proteostasis**. *FEBS Lett* 2017, **591**:2616–2635.

53. Olszewski MM, Williams C, Dong KC, Martin A: **The Cdc48 unfoldase prepares well-folded protein substrates for degradation by the 26S proteasome**. *Commun Biol* 2019, **2**:29.

54. Godderz D, Heinen C, Marchese FP, Kurz T, Acs K, Dantuma NP: **Cdc48-independent proteasomal degradation coincides with a reduced need for ubiquitylation**. *Sci Rep* 2015, **5**:1–8.

55. Tsuchiya H, Ohtake F, Arai N, Kaiho A, Yasuda S, Tanaka K, Saeki Y: **In vivo ubiquitin linkage-type Analysis reveals that the cdc48-rad23/dsk2 Axis contributes to K48-linked chain specificity of the proteasome**. *Mol Cell* 2017, **66**: 488–502.e7.

56. Twomey EC, Ji Z, Wales TE, Bodnar NO, Ficarro SB, Marto JA, Engen JR, Rapoport TA: **Substrate processing by the Cdc48 ATPase complex is initiated by ubiquitin unfolding**. *Science* 2019, **365**, eaax1033.

57. * Beveridge R, Kessler D, Rumpel K, Ettmayer P, Meinhart A, Clausen T: **Native mass spectrometry can effectively predict PROTAC efficacy**. *ACS Cent Sci* 2020, **6**:1223–1230.
Beveridge et al. develop label-free, semi-quantitative native mass spectrometry approaches to measure the formation of E3-substrate-small molecule (PROTAC) ternary complexes and determine the specificty of PROTAC targeting. This study represents a significant methodological advancement in terms of sample requirements, throughput, and quantitation for mapping E3-substrate-small molecule ternary complexes and has important implications for mapping E3-substrate interactions to understand ubiquitination site specificity in basic biology applications.

58. Hendriks IA, Akimov V, Blagoev B, Nielsen ML, MaxQuant: **Live enables enhanced selectivity and identification of peptides modified by endogenous SUMO and ubiquitin**. *J Proteome Res* 2021, **20**:2042–2055.

59. Akimov V, Olsen LCB, Hansen SVF, Barrio-Hernandez I, Puglia M, Jensen SS, Solov'Yov IA, Kratchmarova I, Blagoev B: **StUbEx plus - a modified stable tagged ubiquitin exchange system for peptide level purification and in-depth mapping of ubiquitination sites**. *J Proteome Res* 2018, **17**:296–304.

60. * Mathur S, Fletcher AJ, Branigan E, Hay RT, Virdee S: **Photo-crosslinking activity-based probes for ubiquitin RING E3 ligases**. *Cell Chem Biol* 2020, **27**:74–82.e6.
Mathur et al. develop the first activity-based probes for RING E3 ubiquitin ligases. They utilize reengineered E2 enzymes, incorporating a stably conjugated photocrosslinker by replacing the native thioester-ubiquitin linkages with isopeptide linkages. These photocrosslinking RING E3 activity probes will useful for researchers interested in diverse aspects of changes to RING E3 activty profiles under different cellular conditions.

61. Nalawansha DA, Crews CM: **PROTACs: an emerging therapeutic modality in precision medicine**. *Cell Chem Biol* 2020, **27**:998–1014.

62. Liu J, Ma J, Liu Y, Xia J, Li Y, Wang ZP, Wei W: **PROTACs: a novel strategy for cancer therapy**. *Semin Cancer Biol* 2020, **67**: 171–179.

63. Wang C, Zhang Y, Xing D, Zhang R: **PROTACs technology for targeting non-oncoproteins: advances and perspectives**. *Bioorg Chem* 2021, **114**:105109.

64. Pettersson M, Crews CM: **PROteolysis TArgeting Chimeras (PROTACs) — past, present and future**. *Drug Discov Today Technol* 2019, **31**:15–27.

65. Sun X, Gao H, Yang Y, He M, Wu Y, Song Y, Tong Y, Rao Y: **Protacs: great opportunities for academia and industry**. *Signal Transduct Target Ther* 2019, **4**.

66. Smith BE, Wang SL, Jaime-Figueroa S, Harbin A, Wang J, Hamman BD, Crews CM: **Differential PROTAC substrate specificity dictated by orientation of recruited E3 ligase**. *Nat Commun* 2019, **10**:1–13.

67. Nowak RP, Deangelo SL, Buckley D, He Z, Donovan KA, An J, Safaee N, Jedrychowski MP, Ponthier CM, Ishoey M, *et al.*: **Plasticity in binding confers selectivity in ligand-induced protein degradation article**. *Nat Chem Biol* 2018, **14**:706–714.

68. Höllmüller E, Geigges S, Niedermeier ML, Kammer KM, Kienle SM, Rösner D, Scheffner M, Marx A, Stengel F: **Site-specific ubiquitylation acts as a regulator of linker histone H1**. *Nat Commun* 2021, **12**:1–15.

69. ** Witus SR, Burrell AL, Farrell DP, Kang J, Wang M, Hansen JM, Pravat A, Tuttle LM, Stewart MD, Brzovic PS, *et al.*: **BRCA1/BARD1 site-specific ubiquitylation of nucleosomal H2A is directed by BARD1**. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* 2021, **28**:268–277.
Witus et al. use cryo-electron microscopy to solve the structure of the E3 ubiquitin ligase BRCA/BARD1 complex bound to the nucleosome and an E2, UbcH5c. In combination with NMR studies to characterize dynamics of this ternary complex, this structure reveals the molecular mechanistic basis for site-specificty of ubiquitination of histone tail lysine residues. This study represents a signifcant advance in structural biology approaches towards using ternary complex architecture to rationalize ubiquitin site selection and specificity, and methodological advancements developed herein will be broadly applicable to other E2-E3-substrate structural biology endeavors.

70. van Kruijsbergen I, Mulder MPC, Uckelmann M, van Welsem T, de Widt J, Spanjaard A, Jacobs H, El Oualid F, Ovaa H, van Leeuwen F: **Strategy for development of site-specific ubiquitin antibodies**. *Front Chem* 2020, **8**:1–13.

71. Chaugule VK, Arkinson C, Rennie ML, Kämäräinen O, Toth R, Walden H: **Allosteric mechanism for site-specific ubiquitination of FANCD2**. *Nat Chem Biol* 2020, **16**:291–301.

72. Kelliher JL, West KL, Gong Q, Leung JWC: **Histone H2A variants alpha1-extension helix directs RNF168-mediated ubiquitination**. *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**:1–14.

73. Fennell LM, Gomez Diaz C, Deszcz L, Kavirayani A, Hoffmann D, Yanagitani K, Schleiffer A, Mechtler K, Hagelkruys A, Penninger J, *et al.*: **Site-specific ubiquitination of the E3 ligase HOIP regulates apoptosis and immune signaling**. *EMBO J* 2020, **39**:1–19.

74. Li X, Zhang M, Huang X, Liang W, Li G, Lu X, Li Y, Pan H, Shi L, Zhu H, *et al.*: **Ubiquitination of RIPK1 regulates its activation mediated by TNFR1 and TLRs signaling in distinct manners**. *Nat Commun* 2020, **11**:1–18.

75. Shin D, Bhattacharya A, Cheng Y-L, Alonso MC, Mehdipour AR, van der Heden van Noort G, Ovaa H, Hummer G, Dikic I: **Bacterial OTU deubiquitinases regulate substrate ubiquitination upon Legionella infection**. *Elife* 2020.

76. Schubert AF, Nguyen JV, Franklin TG, Geurink PP, Roberts CG, Sanderson DJ, Miller LN, Ovaa H, Hofmann K, Pruneda JN, *et al.*: **Identification and characterization of diverse OTU deubiquitinases in bacteria**. *EMBO J* 2020, **39**:1–16.

77. Hakim-Eshed V, Boulos A, Cohen-Rosenzweig C, Yu-Taeger L, Ziv T, Kwon YT, Riess O, Nguyen HHP, Ziv NE, Ciechanover A: **Site-specific ubiquitination of pathogenic huntingtin attenuates its deleterious effects**. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2020, **117**: 18661–18669.

78. Munari F, Barracchia CG, Franchin C, Parolini F, Capaldi S, Romeo A, Bubacco L, Assfalg M, Arrigoni G, D'Onofrio M: **Semisynthetic and enzyme-mediated conjugate preparations illuminate the ubiquitination-dependent aggregation of tau protein**. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2020, **59**:6607–6611.