























Revisiting the Ramachandran plot from a new angle A.Q. Zhou, C.S. O'Hern, and L. Regan Protein Science (2011) 20,1166–1171

A.Q. 2nou, C.S. O'Hern, and L. Regan Protein Science (2011) 20,1166—11/1

The "Ramachandran plot" is an iconic image of modern biochemistry.



In summary, we have shown that the distribution of backbone dihedral angles observed in proteins of known structure is well explained by Ramachandran and coworker's original analysis of an alanyl dipeptide, where only repulsive hardsphere interactions together with bond length and angle constraints determine the allowed phi/psi angles

We find no need to invoke additional interactions to explain the backbone conformations of proteins.





Today the Ramachandran diagram is taught in all classes on protein structure and is featured in every textbook to give insight into the forces that determine the structures of proteins. But there is nothing in this diagram beyond what Pauling and Corey knew well: they built models of their proposed structures that embodied all features the of Ramachandran diagram. Apparently they understood the principle so well that they felt no need to explain them by a diagram of this sort.

The discovery of the α -helix and β -sheet, the principal structural features of proteins David Eisenberg, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci USA., 100, 11207, 2003

























N.Yathindra



Ramachandran on Collagen

The importance of hydrogen-bonds for helix formation became established with the theoretical elucidation of the now well-known alpha-helix by Pauling in 1951. Once the parameters of the helix were found from sterereochemistry, it took no time at all to prove the correctness of these by Xray diffraction, as was done by Perutz. Within a year or two of the demonstration of the alpha-helix in the KMEF group of fibrous proteins, came the even more exciting double helix for DNA as proposed by Watson and Crick in 1953. The helix era had begun.

Continued...

I mention all these because I was encouraged to enter this field by reading the beautiful series of papers published by Pauling and coworkers in 1951, and, when I was appointed Professor and Head at the newly started Physics Department in Madras in 1952, I chose X-ray diffraction, and X-ray crystallography in particular, as the main theme of our laboratory, and their application to biomolecules as the main aspect of this field that is to be pursued vigorously. However, I did not know where to begin, and which molecules, or biopolymers, were the most profitable ones to study. This problem was resolved by the happy coincidence of a visit by Prof. J. D. Bernal to Madras in the early 50s. When I put this question to him, he told me that he was not very happy with the various structures of collagen that had been proposed in the literature at that time, and that the problem was wide open. Even more than that, he indicated that there were some specimens of shark fin ray collagen (elastoidin) in the Department of Biochemistry of Madras itself.

From: G. N. Ramachandran "Stereochemistry of Collagen", International Journal of Peptide and Protein Research, 1988,31,1-16.



Linus Pauling on Collagen

In 1951 Professor Corey and I proposed a structure for collagen, involving three polypeptide chains twisted about one another.... It is well known that our structure turned out not to be right. In a lecture on the stochastic method and the structure of proteins that I gave in Stockholm in 1953, at the Thirteenth International Congress of Pure and Applied Chemistry, I pointed out that in applying the stochastic method the first step is to make a hypothesis, a guess.... In order for the stochastic method to be significant, the principles used in formulating the hypothesis must be restrictive enough to make the hypothesis itself essentially unique; in other words, an investigator who makes use of this method should. I contended. be allowed only one guess.... At that time (1953), however, I contended that Professor Corev and I together should be allowed two guesses on collagen, and I stated that we were determined that our second one would be right

Continued...

As you all know, it turned out that Professor Corey and I did not get to make our second guess. In 1955 Professor Ramachandran and his coworker G. Kartha described the striking triple-helical structure of collagen that is now generally accepted as being essentially correct. Although I may have some feeling of regret that Professor Corey and I did not succeed in making our second guess (which I trust would have turned out to be the right one), I may point out that the problem was a very difficult one, and that Professor Ramachandran and his coworkers deserve great credit for their successful attack on it, and for their continuing vigorous effort in the solution of the many difficult problems in the field of protein structure and other aspects of structural chemistry to which they have devoted themselves for many years.

From Pauling's presidential address at the International Symposium held at the University of Madras, 18-21 January 1967. Conformation of Biopolymers, (ed. Ramachandran, G. N.) Academic Press, New York and London, 1967, pp. 4-5.

Francis Crick on DNA and Collagen

I think what needs to be emphasized about the discovery of the double helix is that the path to it was, scientifically speaking, fairly commonplace. What was important was not the way it was discovered but the object discovered - the structure of DNA itself. You can see this by comparing it with almost any other scientific discovery. Misleading data, false ideas, problems of personal interrelationships occur in much if not all scientific work. Consider, for example, the discovery of the basic structure of collagen, the major protein of tendons, cartilage, and other tissues. The 'basic fiber of collagen is made of three long chains wound around one another. Its discovery had all the elements that surrounded the discovery of the double helix. The characters were just as colourful and diverse. The facts were just as confused and the false solutions just as misleading. Competition and friendliness also played a part in the story. Yet nobody has written even one book about the race for the triple helix. This is surely because, in a very real sense, collagen is not as important a molecule as DNA.

Continued...

Of course this depends to some extent on what you consider important. Before Alex Rich and I worked (quite by accident, incidentally) on collagen, we tended to be rather patronizing about it. "After all," we said, "there's no collagen in plants." In 1955, after we got interested in the molecule, we found ourselves saying, "Do you realize that one-third of all the protein in your body is collagen?" But however you look at it, DNA is more important than collagen, more central to biology, and more significant for further research. So, as I have said before: it is the molecule that has the glamour, not the scientists.

From Francis Crick, What Mad Pursuit: A Personal View of Scientific Discovery, Basic Books, New York, 1989, p. 67. In the paper by Ramachandran and Ambady (Current Science, 23,349,1954) the existence of extra spots that conflict with the existence of a 20A⁰ repeat, which is solely based on a schematic illustration, is a matter of controversy. Furthermore, even Ramachandran himself neglected these extra spots when he proposed his last triple helix model

K. Okuyama et al, Bioploymers, 97, 607, 2012

























Pauling's Left-Handed α-Helix Jack D. Dunitz	
Angew. Chem., Int. Ed., 40, 4167, 2001.	Ramachandran map
A few months after publication of the Pauling structures, Maurice L. Huggins noted that for amino acids with the correct absolute configuration— he was already aware of the Bijvoet result – a left-handed helix would lead to a $C(\beta) \cdots O$ distance of only 2.64Å{ref}. He concluded that " <i>levo</i> polypeptide form right-handed spirals and <i>dextro</i> polypeptides left-handed spirals, whichever of these two types of structure is correct". The protein chain is of course a " <i>levo</i> nolypentide"	-180° -180° (a) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c

Ref: M. L. Huggins, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 74, 3963, 1952











N. V. Joshi

Income Tax Appellate Tribunal - Bangalore Income-Tax Officer vs Dr. G.N. Ramachandran on 29 April, 1982 भारत INDIA 1909-2009 500 Equivalent citations: 1982 1 ITD 902 Bang Bench: T Venkatappa, O Subramanian 1. The assessee went to USA. He received stipend of \$10,833.33 and \$24,111.08 in the calendar years 1977 and 1978, relevant to the assessment years 1978-79 and 1979-80, respectively, from the National Institute of Health संख्यान INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE (NIH), Bethesda, Maryland, USA. He also received \$1,025 and \$600 in the said two years, respectively, for giving lectures and also received royalty of \$505 in the calendar year 1978. The foreign income was shown in the returns for these two years. No claim for exemption under Section 10(16) was made before the ITO. In appeals, it was held that the amount received by the assessee was not in the nature of salary but in the nature of scholarship



Pauling in Madras - 1967 17 Jamay 1967. Dem Patie, we left have on the 34et y December and spect New years Ease with fine in Horabuly Stayed there will the #th and came on here vie gen, Menily can's a here in fan, heider Sayn 5 gapare, herders, Wer shael go hanne view Honderen, loo, al see fine off He is not too hele one goet the week topse Chartman the hospitch. I hope here of the hospitch I too hot here and my gy but please t none the less Dorthy Hoda arise her efternant, John arise her get. Us have her herry a hugte. It is interest, too. Treese cont see any filme for India with We have been having a busy time. It is interesting, too. I really a daastically It is can't see any future for India sall. The women do a lot here given two talks a unless they change drastically. It seen more than the is sad. The women do a lot here. Paddyte Fabr Were seen some Letter from Ava Helen Pauling to Peter Pauling. January 17, 1967.





