A molecular mechanism for the generation of ligand-dependent

differential outputs by the epidermal growth factor receptor

Yongjian Huang[1,2,3], Jana Ognjenović[4], Deepti Karandur[1,2,3], Kate Miller[1], Alan Merk[4],

Sriram Subramaniam[5*], John Kuriyan[1,2,3,6,7*]

[1] Department of Molecular and Cell Biology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

94720, USA.

[2] California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley,

CA 94720, USA.

[3] Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720,

USA.

[4] Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research, Frederick, MD 21701, USA.

[5] University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia V6T 1Z3, Canada.

[6] Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

[7] Divisions of Molecular Biophysics and Integrated Bioimaging, Lawrence Berkeley National

Laboratory, Berkeley, CA 94720, USA.

*Correspondence: sriram.subramaniam@ubc.ca, kuriyan@berkeley.edu

Abstract

The epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) is a receptor tyrosine kinase that couples the binding

of extracellular ligands, such as EGF and transforming growth factor-α (TGF-α), to the initiation

of intracellular signaling pathways. EGFR binds to EGF and TGF-α with similar affinity but

generates different signals from these ligands. To address the mechanistic basis of this

phenomenon, we have carried out cryo-EM analyses of human EGFR bound to EGF and TGF-α.

We show that the extracellular module adopts an ensemble of dimeric conformations when bound

to either EGF or TGF-α. The two extreme states of this ensemble represent distinct ligand-bound

quaternary structures in which the membrane-proximal tips of the extracellular module are either

juxtaposed or separated. EGF and TGF-α differ in their ability to maintain the conformation with

the membrane-proximal tips of the extracellular module separated, and this conformation is

stabilized preferentially by an oncogenic EGFR mutation. Close proximity of the transmembrane

helices at the junction with the extracellular module has been associated previously with increased

EGFR activity. Our results show how EGFR can couple the binding of different ligands to

differential modulation of this proximity, thereby suggesting a molecular mechanism for the

generation of ligand-sensitive differential outputs in this receptor family.

Introduction

Human EGFR can be activated by seven related ligands that generate different signaling outputs

from the receptor. While the classical mechanism for receptor tyrosine kinase activation, ligand-

induced dimerization, is essential for all these ligands to activate the receptor (Kovacs et al., 2015;

Leahy, 2004; Lemmon et al., 2014), it cannot explain how the extracellular module of EGFR is

able to respond differently to different ligands once the receptor is dimerized (Ronan et al., 2016;

Singh et al., 2016; Wilson et al., 2009). The extracellular module of EGFR consists of four domains,

denoted Domains I, II, III, and IV (Figure 1). Domains I and III sandwich the ligands between

them (Garrett et al., 2002; Ogiso et al., 2002). Domain II, which bridges the ligand-binding

domains, contains the "dimerization arm", a loop that mediates the principal interaction with the

other subunit in an activated dimer (Dawson et al., 2005). Domains I, II, and III form a compact

unit that we refer to as the ligand-binding "head", and Domain IV forms a rigid and elongated "leg"

that connects the ligand-binding head to the single transmembrane helix (Figure 1).

Previous crystallographic analyses of fragments of the EGFR extracellular module have

revealed different conformations of the ligand-binding head when bound to EGF, TGF-α,

epiregulin, and epigen (Freed et al., 2017; Garrett et al., 2002; Lu et al., 2010; Ogiso et al., 2002).

It appeared that these conformational differences might explain how different EGFR ligands

generate different signals (Wilson et al., 2009; Scheck et al., 2012), but the significance of these

structural difference is unclear because only fragments of the receptor were analyzed. For weakly-

binding ligands, such as epiregulin and epigen, the lifetime of the dimeric receptor is shortened

relative to that for the tighter-binding ligands, such as EGF, and the reduction in dimer lifetime

affects signaling output (Freed et al., 2017). However, EGF and TGF-α are both high-affinity

ligands (Jones et al., 1999), and they also generate different outputs from EGFR. How this happens

is still unclear.

Cell-based studies using fluorescent reporters of EGFR conformation have shown that the

binding of EGF and TGF-α results in different conformations of the intracellular juxtamembrane

segments of the receptor (Scheck et al., 2012; Doerner et al., 2015; Lowder et al., 2015). The

balance between alternative conformations of the juxtamembrane segments can be modulated by

point mutations in the transmembrane helices (Sinclair et al., 2018) and oncogenic mutations in

the kinase domains (Lowder et al., 2015). A more recent study reveals that simply switching the

conformation of the juxtamembrane segments by mutation suffices to switch EGFR signaling

outputs (Mozumdar et al., 2020). These studies demonstrate that the extracellular module, the

transmembrane helix, the intracellular juxtamembrane segments, and the intracellular kinase

domains are coupled allosterically, and that they respond differently to EGF and TGF-α. How the

two ligands generate these differences remains unknown. To gain structural insight into this

mechanism, we analyzed full-length human EGFR in complex with EGF and TGF-α by cryo-EM.

Results

Linkages between the extracellular modules and the transmembrane helices are not

rigidly defined

We purified full-length human EGFR expressed in a human HEK293S GnTI⁻ cell line(Reeves et

al., 2002), and reconstituted the complex of EGFR with EGF into four membrane-mimetic

environments: detergent micelles, lipid nanodiscs (Bayburt and Sligar, 2010), amphipols (Gohon

et al., 2006), and peptidiscs (Angiulli et al., 2020; Carlson et al., 2018) (Figure 2-figure supplement

1). Cryo-EM reconstructions of the full-length EGFR:EGF complex in all four reconstitutions look

very similar, and only the extracellular modules are resolved in the cryo-EM densities (Figure 2).

The lack of resolvable density for the transmembrane helices and the intracellular kinase domains

suggests that the linkage between the extracellular modules and the transmembrane helices is not

rigidly defined, consistent with 2D class averages of negative-stain EM images (Mi et al., 2011)

(Figure 2-figure supplement 1). Thus, mechanisms for ligand-dependent differential responses in

EGFR that require strict stereochemical coupling between the extracellular ligand-binding

modules and the transmembrane helices appear to be ruled out. Recently published cryo-EM

analyses of intact insulin receptor and intact type 1 insulin-like growth factor receptor also did not

resolve the transmembrane and intracellular modules (Li et al., 2019; Uchikawa et al., 2019; Zhang

et al., 2020), suggesting that a lack of rigidity in the connection between the extracellular module

and the transmembrane helices is a feature common to receptor tyrosine kinases.

Cryo-EM single-particle analysis reveals a range of conformations for the EGF-bound extracellular module

After focusing the cryo-EM reconstructions on the extracellular module alone, the dataset for the

full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in peptidiscs yielded the highest resolution

reconstruction of the dimeric extracellular module, with an overall resolution of 2.9 Å (Figure 3A,

Figure 3-table supplement 1). In this reconstruction, cryo-EM density for the Domain IV legs is

less well resolved than for the heads. To better understand the origin of this apparent structural

heterogeneity, we used 3D classification to further partition the entire dataset of 765,883 particles

into 10 subclasses (Punjani et al., 2017). Cryo-EM reconstructions corresponding to individual

subclasses resulted in overall resolutions ranging between 3.1 Å and 3.7 Å (Figure 3A, Figure 3-

figure supplement 1).

The resulting structures for different subclasses differ from one another in the extent of a

"scissor-like" rotation between the two ligand-binding heads of the dimeric extracellular module

(Figure 3A, Figure 3-video supplement 1-3). The rotation between the two ligand-binding heads

is due to a rigid-body rotation of each head about an axis parallel to the dimerization arms, and is

correlated with a slight twist in the dimerization arm of each EGFR subunit (Figure 3B-D, Figure

3-video supplement 1-3). The extent of this intersubunit rotation can be estimated by defining a

dihedral angle corresponding to rotation about a virtual bond connecting the Cα atoms of Thr 249

in each EGFR subunit (we number amino acid residues in EGFR without including the 24-residue

signal sequence). The positions of the Cα atoms of Ile 190 in each subunit are used to further

specify the dihedral angle, and the value of this dihedral angle ranges from ~10° to ~25° in the 10

representative structures (Figure 3A).

The scissor-like rotation between ligand-binding heads in the cryo-EM structures is

reminiscent of differences noted previously between crystal structures of fragments of EGFR

extracellular modules bound to different ligands (Liu et al., 2012). At one extreme, the EM-derived

structure with the largest intersubunit rotation (~25°) resembles closely the crystal structure of the

ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP (Lu et al., 2010; Ogiso et al., 2002),

root-mean-square deviations (RMSDs) in Cα positions calculated over EGFR residues 1-501: 0.8

Å, Figure 4A). The EM-derived structure with the smallest intersubunit rotational angle (~10°)

resembles the crystal structure of the EGFR ligand-binding head bound to TGF-α (PDB code:

1MOX (Garrett et al., 2002), RMSDs in Cα positions calculated over EGFR residues 1-501: 1.5

Å, Figure 4B). Thus, the partitioning of the cryo-EM data into subclasses reflects an intrinsic

conformational variability of the ligand-bound EGFR extracellular module. Importantly, the

cryoEM results demonstrate that the conformations ascribed previously to specific binding of EGF

or TGF-α to the receptor are actually part of an ensemble of conformations that are readily

accessible to EGFR when bound to either one of these ligands.

Different dimeric conformations of the ligand-bound extracellular module have

different separations between the tips of the two legs

The two Domain IV legs in the dimer behave differently when the scissor-like rotational angle

between the ligand-binding heads changes. The structure of the Domain IV leg from a previously

determined crystal structure of the EGFR extracellular module (PDB code: 3NJP (Lu et al., 2010))

can be docked into our cryo-EM densities (Figure 3-figure supplement 2A, 2B). This allowed us

to determine the position and orientation of the Domain IV legs associated with each representative

conformation from the ensemble revealed by cryo-EM. When the rotational angle between the two

heads is at its largest value (~25°), the two legs adopt similar conformations, and the membrane-

proximal tips of the two legs are juxtaposed, with a separation of ~5 Å between the Cα atoms of

the last residue in the legs (Thr 614) (the "juxtaposed" conformation, Figure 3B, Figure 5). When

the rotation between the two subunits is small, maintenance of the same conformation in both legs

would lead to steric clashes between the two legs (Figure 3-figure supplement 2C). The clashes

are relieved by one of the two Domain IV legs undergoing a hinge rotation around the connection

between the head and the leg, and we refer to this leg as "flexible". This hinge rotation causes the

flexible leg to swing upwards, closer to the ligand-binding head, increasing the separation between

the membrane-proximal tips of the two Domain IV legs in the dimer. When the angle between the

heads is at its minimal value (~10°), the flexible leg swings maximally towards the ligand-binding

head, increasing the distance between the membrane-proximal tips of the extracellular module by

nearly 15 Å (the "separated" conformation, Figure 3D, Figure 5).

The tips-separated conformation of the dimeric extracellular module can couple more

readily to the N-terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices

The EGFR transmembrane helix contains two dimerization motifs, one located toward the N-

terminal end of the transmembrane helix, near the extracellular face of membrane, and the other

located toward the C-terminal end (Mendrola et al., 2002). These dimerization motifs are involved

in close association between the transmembrane helices in alternative structures defined by NMR,

in which the helices are splayed apart at either the N-terminal or the C-terminal ends (Bocharov et

al., 2016, 2017; Endres et al., 2013). To understand how these alternative dimeric configurations

of the transmembrane helices connect to the different conformations of the extracellular module,

with different separation between the tips of the Domain IV legs, we analyzed two structures of

EGFR transmembrane helix dimers determined previously by NMR. One structure shows N-

terminal association of the transmembrane helices (PDB code: 5LV6 (Bocharov et al., 2017)) and

the other shows C-terminal association (PDB code: 2M0B (Bocharov et al., 2016)) (Figure 6A).

The seven-residue linker connecting the extracellular module and the transmembrane

helices (Asn 615-Ser 621) is modeled in both NMR structures. The three C-terminal residues of

the linker (Ile 619-Ser 621), located at the junction with the transmembrane helix, adopt well-

defined conformations in both NMR structures. The hydrophobic sidechain of Ile 619 packs

against the sidechain of Ala 623 in the first turn of the transmembrane helix. Ile 619 is followed

by a 3_{10}-helical turn spanning Pro 620 to Ala 623 (Figure 6B). These structural constraints cause

the linker-transmembrane helix junction to orient parallel to the membrane surface in both

structures (Figure 6A). As a consequence, in the N-terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices,

the two linkers are oriented away from each other, with the two Ile 619 residues separated by ~20

Å. In contrast, the C-terminal dimer has the two linkers oriented towards each other, with the

distance between the two Ile 619 residues at ~10 Å. Thr 614 is at the junction between Domain IV

leg of the extracellular module and the linker. In the ensemble of NMR structures for the N-

terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices (Bocharov et al., 2017), the two threonine residues

(Thr 614) are separated by an average distance of ~35 Å. In comparison, the separation between

the two threonine residues is ~20 Å in the ensemble of structures for the C-terminal dimer of the

transmembrane helices (Bocharov et al., 2016) (Figure 6A). These observations suggest that the

junctions between the extracellular module and the transmembrane helices are more separated in

the N-terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices than the connection in the C-terminal dimer.

We used molecular dynamics simulations to explore the constraints on the separation

between the two threonine residues at position 614 in the linker, starting either the N-terminal

dimer configuration (PDB code: 5LV6 (Bocharov et al., 2017)) or the C-terminal dimer

configuration (PDB code: 2M0B (Bocharov et al., 2016)). Following equilibration (see Materials

and Methods for full details), we initiated twenty-five independent molecular dynamics trajectories

for both configurations, each 100 ns long, for a total simulation time of 2.5 μs for each

configuration. The configuration of the transmembrane helices remains close to the starting

configuration over this timescale. The conformation of the junction between the linker and the

transmembrane helices is also very stable in both sets of simulations, with the sidechain of Ile 619

remaining associated with Ala 623 over the course of the simulations (Figure 6E, 6F). In the

simulations of the N-terminal dimer configuration, the linkers explore a range of configurations

but are oriented predominantly such that they point away from one another, and the distance

between Thr 614 from each subunit ranges between 20 Å and 35 Å (Figure 6C). In the simulations

starting from the C-terminal dimer configuration, the Thr 614 residues from each subunit are much

closer to each other, predominantly sampling distances between 7 Å and 12 Å (Figure 6C). These

results further support the idea that the junction between the linker and the transmembrane helices

imposes a constraint on the orientation of the linkers. When the transmembrane helices are in the

N-terminal dimer configuration, this linker favors a connection to the tips-separated conformation

of the extracellular module, and when the transmembrane helices are in the C-terminal dimer

configuration, a connection to the tips-juxtaposed conformation of the extracellular module is

indicated.

We computed the free-energy change of the system when the distance between the Thr 614

residues from each subunit is driven from 27 Å to 8 Å, when the transmembrane helices are in the

N-terminal dimer configuration. We used umbrella-sampling simulations (Torrie and Valleau,

1977), with sampling windows spaced 1 Å apart (for a total of 20 windows) and starting structures

for each window taken from a steered molecular dynamics simulation. Three independent

umbrella-sampling calculations were performed, with the starting structures for each taken from

different steered molecular dynamics trajectories. These calculations converged (i.e., the potential

of mean force does not change) when each window sampled ~60-90 ns of simulation. All three

umbrella-sampling simulations yield similar results (Figure 6D), with the free-energy being lowest

when the distance between the Cα atoms of Thr 614 residues from each subunit is ~26 Å.

Decreasing this distance to 8 Å leads to the free energy of the system increasing by ~9 kJ.mol^{-1}

(~3.5 $k_{B}T$ at room temperature, Figure 6D). This indicates that in the N-terminal dimer

configuration, it is thermodynamically unfavorable for the linkers between the extracellular

modules and the transmembrane helices to sample conformations where the distance between the

Thr 614 residues is small. Thus, when the transmembrane helices are in the N-terminal dimer

configuration, it is likely that the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module dimer,

with the tips of Domain IV at a larger distance, is favored over the tips-juxtaposed conformation.

An oncogenic mutation in the kinase domain stabilizes the tips-separated

conformation of the extracellular module

Dimerization of the transmembrane helices through the N-terminal dimerization motif is

associated with increased kinase activity (Miloso et al., 1995; Lu et al., 2010; Pahuja et al., 2018;

Sinclair et al., 2018), so our structural analysis of the connection between the extracellular module

and the transmembrane helices suggests that the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular

module is associated with a more active conformation of the kinase domains, through its coupling

to the N-terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices.

To test this hypothesis, we examined an oncogenic variant of EGFR seen frequently in

cancer patients, in which a leucine residue in the activation loop of the intracellular kinase domain

is substituted by arginine (L834R; this is residue 858 when the signal sequence is included). The

activation loop is a key allosteric control element at the active site of the kinase domain, and the

L834R mutation promotes the formation of the catalytically-active asymmetric dimer of the kinase

domains, leading to hyper-activation of EGFR (Red Brewer et al., 2013; Shan et al., 2012). We

carried out cryo-EM analysis of full-length EGFR(L834R) bound to EGF, using the same

procedures as for wild-type EGFR. The two structures representing the tips-juxtaposed and the

tips-separated conformations of the EGFR(L834R):EGF complex were determined at resolution

of 3.3 Å and 3.4 Å, respectively (Figure 3-table supplement 1).

The overall structures of the tips-juxtaposed and tips-separated conformations of the

EGFR(L834R):EGF complex are very similar to that seen for the corresponding complex of the

wild-type receptor. The effect of the activating mutation, L834R, becomes apparent when

comparing the quality of the cryo-EM densities in the Domain IV legs for the wild-type and mutant

EGFR. For the tips-juxtaposed conformations, the cryo-EM densities are of comparable quality

(Figure 7). An important result emerges when comparing the tips-separated conformations for

wild-type EGFR and the oncogenic variant. Although the oncogenic L834R mutation involves a

residue that is located in the intracellular kinase domain, this mutation markedly stabilizes the

flexible leg in the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module on the other side of the

membrane, compared to wild-type EGFR. The cryo-EM density for the flexible leg is much better

resolved in the EGFR(L834R):EGF complex than for wild-type EGFR, with secondary structural

features clearly visible (Figure 7). Thus, activation of the intracellular kinase domains by

oncogenic mutation preferentially stabilizes the flexible leg in the tips-separated conformation of

the extracellular module, providing direct evidence for conformational coupling between the

extracellular and intracellular modules of EGFR. These results are in agreement with the idea that

the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module is coupled to the more active

conformations of the transmembrane helices and the intracellular kinase domains.

EGF and TGF-α differ in their ability to stabilize the flexible Domain IV leg in the

tips-separated conformation

Given the association of the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module with

increased activity of the receptor, we wondered if EGF and TGF-α can differentially modulate

different conformations of the extracellular module. We carried out cryo-EM analysis of EGFR

bound to TGF-α using the same procedures as before. Compared to the EGFR:EGF complex, the

flexible leg in the tips-separated conformation of the EGFR:TGF-α complex is destabilized. The

cryo-EM density for the flexible leg is poorly defined, and there is no interpretable density for this

leg in the reconstruction of the tips-separated conformation of the EGFR:TGF-α complex (Figure

7). For the tips-juxtaposed conformation, the reconstructions for the EGFR:EGF and EGFR:TGF-

α complexes are similar (Figure 7), with near-symmetrical densities for the Domain IV legs in

both complexes. The only noticeable difference is that the cryo-EM density at the very end of the

Domain IV legs in the EGFR:TGF-α complex is slightly weaker than the corresponding density

in the EGFR:EGF complex (Figure 7).

The structures we have determined provide a plausible explanation for why EGF and TGF-

α differ in their ability to stabilize the flexible leg in the tips-separated conformation. Several key

interactions with Domain I of the receptor are different between EGF and TGF-α (Figure 8A). As

a result, the ligand-binding pocket is slightly compressed when TGF-α is bound. We used

molecular dynamics simulations to investigate this difference. We initiated four trajectories from

the crystal structure of the EGFR extracellular module bound to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP (Lu et al.,

2010)). We also initiated four trajectories starting from this crystal structure (PDB code: 3NJP),

but with the EGF replaced by TGF-α, taken from the crystal structure of truncated EGFR bound

to TGF-α (PDB code: 1MOX (Garrett et al., 2002)). Each trajectory was run for between ~350 and

~550 ns, for a total simulation time of ~1.8 μs for EGFR bound to EGF and ~2.0 μs for EGFR

bound to TGF-α. We measured the angle between the centroids of Domain I, part of Domain II

and Domain III (Figure 8B) over the course of the simulations. In EGFR bound to EGF, this angle

is slightly larger, with the mode occurring at ~80°. In the simulations of EGFR bound to TGF-α,

this angle is slightly smaller, with the mode occurring at ~75°, indicating that the ligand-binding

pocket is slightly compressed when EGFR is bound to TGF-α (Figure 8C). This compression

between Domains I and III causes Domain II to bend in the TGF-α complex relative to its structure

in the EGF complex (Figure 8A), leading to a small difference in the orientation of the dimerization

arm with respect to Domains III and IV. EGF and TGF-α both maintain the same interface between

the dimerization arms of the two EGFR subunits in the dimer, but the additional bending of

Domain II in the TGF-α complex requires the two Domain IV legs to rotate towards each other.

In the tips-separated conformation of the TGF-α complex, this inward motion would cause a steric

clash between the two legs if the legs maintained the conformation seen in the EGF complex

(Figure 9A). The increased disorder in the Domain IV leg when TGF-α is bound appears to be a

result of this close contact being avoided.

298   These results demonstrate that the structural difference between the two ligand-bound

299   EGFR complexes can propagate from the ligand-binding head to the disposition of the Domain IV

300   legs. Due to the more compressed ligand-binding pocket in the TGF-α complex, which leads to

301   potential steric clashes between the Domain IV legs, TGF-α is less effective than EGF at

302   stabilizing the Domain IV legs in the tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module.

303   **EGF and TGF-α induce different levels of phosphorylation in EGFR and Erk**

304   Our cryo-EM analysis of the oncogenic EGFR variant (L834R) show that the stabilization

of the flexible Domain IV leg in the separated conformation is correlated with the presence of an

oncogenic mutation that results in increased levels of kinase activity. We speculate that the

observed differences in the ability of EGF and TGF-α to stabilize the Domain IV leg in the tips-

separated conformation underlies the ability of these two ligands to trigger different levels of

kinase activity and downstream signaling from EGFR. Specifically, our structural model suggests

that the EGF-bound EGFR complex is likely to be more active than the TGF-α bound EGFR.

311   Although previous studies have demonstrated that these two ligands can induce different

long-term cellular responses (Wilson et al., 2009), it is unclear how this is manifested at the level

of receptor autophosphorylation and the activation of proximal signaling events. To test the effect

of these two ligands on the kinase activity of EGFR, we first purified detergent-solubilized full-

length human EGFR from mammalian cells (HEK293FT), followed by stimulation of EGFR

activity through addition of EGF and TGF-α, and detection of phosphorylation on EGFR by

western-blot analysis. Indeed, the results show that EGF induces stronger EGFR

autophosphorylation than TGF-α (Figure 9-figure supplement 1A). Next, we transiently

transfected mammalian cells with full-length human EGFR and stimulated the cells with EGF and

TGF-α, respectively. EGFR phosphorylation levels in the stimulated cells were analyzed by

western blot. Consistent with the results obtained with the purified EGFR protein, the EGFR

phosphorylation level is higher in the EGF-stimulated cells than that in the TGF-α-stimulated cells

(Figure 9-figure supplement 1B). Importantly, ligand-dependent differences can also be detected

in the downstream signaling events following receptor activation, by monitoring the

phosphorylation level of the extracellular signal–regulated kinase (Erk). As shown in Figure 9C,

EGF stimulates higher levels of Erk phosphorylation than TGF-α does, in cells transiently

transfected with EGFR.

According to our structural model, for these two ligands to differentially activate EGFR,

the structural difference originating from the ligand-binding head needs to be transmitted to the

tips of the extracellular module, and thereby to the transmembrane helices. We hypothesize that

disrupting the conformational coupling between the ligand-binding head and the Domain IV leg,

or the coupling between the Domain IV leg and the transmembrane helices, will interfere with the

differential effects of EGF and TGF-α. To disrupt the connection between the ligand-binding head

and the Domain IV leg, we mutated a conserved residue (Trp 492) buried in a hydrophobic pocket

between Domain III and Domain IV (Figure 9B). Mutating this tryptophan to glycine (W492G) is

expected to loosen the connection between Domain III and Domain IV, and the Erk

phosphorylation assay shows that this mutation results in levels of Erk phosphorylation that are

the same for activation by EGF and TGF-α (Figure 9C).

Since our structural model suggests that the conformation of the linker at the junction

between the extracellular module and the transmembrane helices is important for the coupling

between the two domains, replacing the linker (Asn 615-Pro 620) with a flexible sequence, Gly-

Gly-Ser-Gly-Gly-Ser (GGSGGS), should compromise this coupling. This mutation (replacement

of the linker by GGSGGS) breaks the differential Erk activation by EGF and TGF-α (Figure 9D,

9E). In another construct, we inserted a flexible segment, with sequence Gly-Gly-Ser-Gly-Gly-

Ser-Gly-Gly-Ser (GGSGGSGGS), into the linker connecting the extracellular module to the

transmembrane helix, between Pro 617 and Lys 618. The insertion of this flexible segment results

in a similar extent of Erk activation by EGF and TGF-α (Figure 9D, 9E), which is consistent with

the importance of this linker in coupling the conformations of the extracellular module and the

transmembrane helix.

Conclusions

Our cryo-EM analysis provides a molecular explanation for the ability of EGFR to respond

differently to two high-affinity ligands, EGF and TGF-α (Figure 10). The differential activation

of EGFR by these two ligands arises from structural differences in the receptor-ligand interactions.

As a result, EGF and TGF-α differ in their abilities to stabilize the tips-separated conformation of

the extracellular module that couples to the N-terminal dimer configuration of the transmembrane

helices, which is further coupled to a specific configuration of the juxtamembrane segments

(Arkhipov et al., 2013; Endres et al., 2013; Jura et al., 2009; Sinclair et al., 2018), ultimately

promoting the formation of kinase dimers with higher activity (Zhang et al., 2006). In this way,

EGF and TGF-α can generate different responses from EGFR by differentially modulating the

structure of the junction point between the extracellular module and the transmembrane helices,

altering the balance between alternative dimeric configurations of the transmembrane helices

(Figure 10B). A lack of rigidity in the linkage between the extracellular module and the

transmembrane helices is emerging as a common feature in receptor tyrosine kinases (Diwanji et

al., 2021; Li et al., 2019; Lu et al., 2010; Uchikawa et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020), and the

mechanism we have defined, involving modulation of the separation of the tips of the extracellular

modules, could potentially be utilized by other receptor tyrosine kinases to generate ligand-specific

signaling outputs (Ahmed et al., 2020).

Members of the EGFR family are important targets for the development of cancer

therapeutics, including antibodies that block receptor dimerization and activation (Arteaga and

Engelman, 2014; Cai et al., 2020). Our structural analysis suggests new strategies for the

modulation of EGFR signaling. For example, antibodies or peptides that can bind to the Domain

IV legs and stabilize the juxtaposed conformation would allow the receptor to dimerize but send

weaker signals. Such a strategy may circumvent resistance mechanisms that arise in response to

antibodies and inhibitors that shut down EGFR signaling completely (Brand et al., 2011; Chong

and Jänne, 2013; Cai et al., 2020).

Materials and Methods

Cell culture

Insect cells

Spodoptera frugiperda Sf9 cells were maintained as suspension cultures at 27 ^{o}C in ESF-

921™ Insect Cell Culture Medium (Expression Systems). Isolation of bacmid DNA, transfection

of Sf9 cells, and amplification of baculovirus were performed following the protocols detailed in

the Bac-to-Bac Baculovirus Expression System (ThermoFisher Scientific).

Mammalian cells

Human HEK293S GnTI⁻ cells were cultured as suspension at $37^{o}C$ in FreeStyle293

expression medium (Invitrogen) supplemented with 2% (vol/vol) FBS, in the presence of 8% CO_2.

The HEK293S GnTI⁻ suspension cells were maintained between 0.2 and 3 x 10^6 cells/ml.

HEK293T and HEK293FT cells were cultured at $37^{o}C$ in complete Dulbecco's modified Eagle's

medium (DMEM) supplemented with GlutaMAX™ (ThermoFisher) and 10% (vol/vol) FBS, in

the presence of 5% CO_2.

Full-length EGFR protein expression and purification for cryo-EM studies

Protein expression

A cDNA fragment encoding full-length human EGFR (UniProt accession no. P00533) was

cloned into the pEG_BacMam vector (Goehring et al., 2014). To facilitate affinity purification, a

FLAG-tag (with sequence DYKDDDDK) was inserted after the signal sequence of EGFR. To

monitor protein expression and to reduce non-specific degradation of the C-terminal tail of EGFR,

EGFP was fused after the C-terminus of EGFR. An oncogenic EGFR variant (L834R) was

generated by site-directed mutagenesis.

Plasmid DNA carrying the EGFR sequence was transformed into DH10Bac competent

cells (ThermoFisher Scientific) to produce the bacmid DNA, following the protocol detailed in the

Bac-to-Bac Baculovirus Expression System. To produce the recombinant baculovirus, purified

bacmid DNA was transfected into Sf9 cells using Cellfectin II (ThermoFisher Scientific). After

two rounds of amplification, the recombinant baculovirus was used to infect HEK293S GnTI⁻ cells

at a 1:20 (vol/vol) ratio. After 24 hours, the infected HEK293S GnTI⁻ suspension culture was

supplemented with 2 μM of Erlotinib, an EGFR inhibitor, and 8 mM sodium butyrate, for optimal

protein expression and stability. Cells were harvested by centrifugation 72 hours after the infection.

Protein purification

Harvested cells were resuspended in lysis buffer (25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 2

μM Erlotinib and cOmplete Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (Roche)) and were lysed by sonication in

pulse mode for 10 minutes, with 2s intervals between each 1s pulse. Large debris and unbroken

cells were removed from the crude lysate by centrifugation for 12 mins at 19,000g. The membrane

fraction was pelleted by ultra-centrifugation at 190,000g for 1 hr and resuspended in lysis buffer.

To extract EGFR from the membrane, 1% DDM (Dodecyl-β-D-Maltoside, Anatrace) and 0.1%

CHS (Cholesteryl Hemisuccinate, Anatrace) were added to the suspended membrane fraction.

After mixing for 2 hrs at 4 °C, detergent solubilized proteins were collected by ultra-centrifugation

at 190,000g for 30 mins. The supernatant was incubated with Anti-FLAG M2 Affinity agarose gel

(Sigma-Aldrich) for 4 hrs at 4 °C. The gel was washed with lysis buffer supplemented with 0.05%

DDM and 0.005% CHS. EGFR was eluted from the gel by lysis buffer containing 0.16 mg/ml

FLAG peptide, 0.05% DDM and 0.005% CHS.

Affinity-purified full-length EGFR was concentrated to 50 μM and treated with 100 μM

human EGF (Novoprotein) or TGF-α (Sino Biological) for at least 5 mins on ice, before further

fractionation by size-exclusion chromatography using a Superose 6 Increase 10/300 GL column

(GE Healthcare), with buffer containing 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 2 μM Erlotinib, 0.02%

DDM and 0.002% CHS). The peak fractions containing ligand-bound dimeric EGFR were

collected and immediately used for reconstitution and the reconstituted receptor was applied to

EM grids. The fractions were also flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and used for reconstitution at

later times. Freezing and thawing the fractions more than once leads to deterioration in cryo-EM

sample quality.

Reconstitution of ligand-bound full-length EGFR complex

Reconstitution into lipid nanodiscs

Purified protein complexes of EGFR bound to EGF or TGF-α were reconstituted into lipid

nanodiscs as previously described, with modifications (Ritchie et al., 2009). Briefly, membrane

scaffold proteins MSP1D1 and MSP1E3D1 were expressed and purified from *Escherichia coli*. 10

mg soybean PC (L-α-phosphatidylcholine (soy), Avanti) dissolved in chloroform was dried using

nitrogen stream and residual chloroform was further removed by desiccation under vacuum

overnight. Rehydration buffer containing 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 0.2 mM DTT, 1%

DDM and 1% sodium cholate was added to the dried lipid and vortexed briefly, resulting in a semi-

clear solution at 10 mM lipid concentration. After 3 cycles of freezing (in liquid nitrogen)-and-

thawing (warm water bath), the lipid solution was bath sonicated for 1 hr. The resulting clear lipid

stock (10 mM) was immediately used for lipid nanodiscs assembly or stored at -80 ^{o}C in small

aliquots. Purified complexes of EGFR bound to EGF or TGF-α (~10 μM, solubilized in 0.02%

DDM and 0.002% CHS) was supplemented with 20 μM extra EGF or TGF-α to keep the ligand-

binding site on the receptor saturated, before it was mixed with the soybean PC stock and

membrane scaffold proteins at molar ratios of 1:6:240 (EGFR monomer:MSP1D1:soy PC) and

1:6:600 (EGFR monomer:MSP1E3D1:soy PC). The reaction mixture (~500 μl) was incubated on

ice for 30 mins, before 20 mg Bio-beads SM2 absorbent (Bio-Rad) were added to initiate the

removal of detergents from the mixture and to start the nanodiscs assembly process. The mixture

was incubated at 4 $^{\circ}$C by continuous rotation. After 1 hour, a second batch of Bio-beads (20 mg)

was added to the mixture to replace the first batch, and the sample was incubated for overnight at

4 $^{\circ}$C. A third and final batch of Bio-beads (20 mg) was added to replace the second batch, 2 hrs

before the reconstitution mixture was cleared by removing the Bio-beads through centrifugation.

After another centrifugation at 14,000 rpm for 10 mins, the reconstitution mixture was fractionated

by size-exclusion chromatograph using Superose 6 Increase 10/300 GL column (GE Healthcare)

in detergent-free buffer containing 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl and 5 μM Erlotinib. The

peak fraction corresponding to dimeric EGFR:ligands complexes reconstituted in lipid nanodisc

was collected and analyzed by SDS-PAGE, before being applied to negative-stain and cryo-EM

grids.

Reconstitution into amphipols

Samples containing purified complexes of EGFR bound to EGF or TGF-α (~10 μM,

solubilized in 0.02% DDM and 0.002% CHS) were supplemented with 20 μM extra EGF or TGF-

α, before the amphipol A8-35 (Anatrace) was added to reach a mass ratio of 1:3 (EGFR:A8-35).

After incubation at 4 $^{\circ}$C overnight, free amphipol molecules were removed by size-exclusion

chromatography using a Superose 6 Increase 10/300 GL column in detergent-free buffer

containing 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl and 5 μM Erlotinib. Peak fractions corresponding

to the reconstituted EGFR:ligand complexes in amphipol were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, before

EM studies.

Reconstitution into peptidiscs

As for the reconstitution into amphipols, samples containing purified complexes of EGFR

bound to EGF or TGF-α (~10 μM, solubilized in 0.02% DDM and 0.002% CHS) were

supplemented with 20 μM extra EGF or TGF-α, before the addition of NSP_r peptide (Carlson et

al., 2018) to the samples at a mass ratio of 1:1.5 (EGFR:NSP_r peptide). After overnight incubation

at 4 ^{o}C, the sample was fractionated using a Superose 6 Increase 10/300 GL column (detergent-

free buffer: 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl and 5 μM Erlotinib) and free NSP_r peptides were

removed during fractionation. Peak fractions corresponding to the reconstituted EGFR:ligand

complexes in peptidiscs were analyzed by SDS-PAGE, before applied to EM grids.

Preparation of electron microscopy (EM) grids and data acquisition

For negative-stain EM, a 5 μL sample of reconstituted full-length human EGFR (~0.05

mg/mL protein in 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl and 2 μM Erlotinib) was placed on the

continuous-carbon side of a glow-discharged copper grid (Ted Pella, Redding, CA, USA), and the

excess sample was removed by wicking with filter paper after 1 min incubation. The bound

particles were stained by floating the grids on four consecutive 30 μL droplets of freshly prepped

2% uranyl formate solution and incubating the grids with each droplet for 15 s. The excess stain

was removed by blotting with filter paper and the grids were air-dried for at least 5 min. Images

of negative-stained full-length human EGFR reconstituted in lipid nanodisc, amphipol, and

peptidisc were recorded on a 4049 x 4096 pixels CMOS camera (TVIPS TemCam-F416) using

the automated Leginon data collection software (Suloway et al., 2005). Samples were imaged

using a Tecnai 12 transmission electron microscope (FEI, Hillsboro, OR, USA) at 120 keV with a

nominal magnification of 49,000x (2.18 Å calibrated pixel size at the specimen level) using a

defocus range of -0.8 to -1.5 μm. All data were acquired under low dose conditions, allowing a

dose at around 35 e$^-$/Å^2.

For cryo-EM, UltrAuFoil R 1.2/1.3 300 mesh grids (Electron Microscopy Sciences,

Q350AR13A) were rendered hydrophilic by pretreatment with a O$_2$/H$_2$ gas mixture using a Solarus

950 plasma cleaning system (Gatan, Inc., Pleasanton, CA) for 15s at 50W. After application of 3

μL sample of reconstituted full-length human EGFR (~0.5 mg/ml protein in 25 mM Tris pH 8.0,

150 mM NaCl and 2 uM Erlotinib), grids were plunge-frozen using a Leica EM GP (Leica

Microsystems Inc., Buffalo Grove, IL) with blotting time of 8 seconds, chamber temperature and

humidity of +4°C and 95%, and a liquid ethane temperature of -184°C. The grids were imaged

using a Titan Krios transmission electron microscope (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA)

operated at 300 kV. Images were recorded on a K3 camera (Gatan, Inc.) operated in super-

resolution counting mode with a physical pixel size of 0.54 Å. The detector was placed at the end

of a GIF Quantum energy filter (Gatan, Inc.), operated in zero-energy-loss mode with a slit width

of 20 eV. Due to strongly preferred particle orientations, all movies were collected at 40° tilt, at a

nominal magnification of 81,000x and a defocus range between -0.75 and -1.5 μm., using the

automated data collection software Latitude (Gatan, Inc.). The nominal dose per frame was ~1 e$^-$

/Å^2 and the total dose per movie is ~50 e$^-$/Å^2. For the full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted

in peptidiscs, a total of 4,331 movies were collected. For the full-length EGFR:TGF-α complex

reconstituted in peptidiscs, a total of 7,406 movies were collected. For the full-length

EGFR(L834R):EGF complex reconstituted in peptidiscs, a total of 5,013 movies were collected.

EM image processing

For negative-stain EM images of full-length EGFR:EGF complexes reconstituted in lipidic

nanodiscs (MSP1E3D1), the initial image processing and classification steps were performed

using the Appion image processing environment (Lander et al., 2009). Particles were first selected

from micrographs using DoG Picker (Voss et al., 2009). The contrast transfer functions (CTFs) of

the micrographs were estimated using the CTFFIND3 (Mindell and Grigorieff, 2003). CTF

correction of the micrographs was performed by Wiener filter using ACE2 (Mallick et al., 2005).

A total of 112,408 particles were extracted using a 192 x 192 box size and binned by a factor of 2.

Each particle was normalized to remove pixels whose values were above or below 4.5 σ of the

mean pixel value using the XMIPP normalization program (Scheres et al., 2008). In order to

remove incorrectly selected protein aggregates or other artifacts, particles with extreme intensity

values were removed. The remaining 84,260 particles were subjected to 2D iterative reference-

free alignment and classification using IMAGIC multi-reference alignment (MRA) and a

topology-representing network classification (van Heel et al., 1996; Ogura et al., 2003), to produce

the 200 2D class averages.

For Cryo-EM images of full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in peptidiscs,

Extended Data Figure 3 shows a summary of the image processing workflow. In brief, movies

were motion-corrected using the MotionCor2 wrapper (Zheng et al., 2017) in Relion3 (Zivanov et

al., 2018). Corrected micrographs were imported to cryoSPARC v2 (Punjani and Fleet, 2020;

Punjani et al., 2017) for further processing. After local CTF determination using Patch-Based CTF

Estimation, a total of 4,234,635 particles from 4,431 micrographs were automatically selected

using template-free Blob_picker and were extracted with a box size of 320 x 320 pixels. Due to

strongly preferred particle orientations, a relatively low threshold value was used during the

particle picking to include particles with less contrast than the preferred views. The majority of the

initial 4,234,635 picks are from the background. After iterative 2D classification, most of the

background particles were removed based on 2D class averages. The remaining 1,587,872 particles

were further cleaned-up by ab-initio reconstruction into 4 classes. The resulting 3D maps showed

that 3 of the ab-initio reconstruction classes were mostly "junk" particles without recognizable

structural features, and the other class showed clear resemblance to the dimeric extracellular

module of EGFR. This clean class of particles (814,089) were selected and subjected to a final

round of 2D classification. After visual inspection of the final 2D class averages, 765,883 particles

were retained and ab-initio reconstruction was performed to generate the initial model, which was

used as the reference for a round of homogeneous refinement as well as a non-uniform refinement

(Punjani et al., 2019). Based on the gold-standard Fourier shell correlation (FSC) 0.143 criterion,

the overall resolution of the reconstructions from homogeneous refinement and non-uniform

refinement are determined as 3.0 Å and 2.9 Å, respectively. After visual inspection of both

reconstructions, the map generated from non-uniform refinement with better quality was chosen

for further analysis and used as the reference in the subsequent round of heterogeneous refinement

(3D classification) using the 765,883 particles, resulting in 10 classes. A final round of

homogeneous refinement and non-uniform refinement were performed for each of the resulting 10

classes from the heterogeneous refinement run. After visual inspection, the 10 maps resulting from

non-uniform refinement were chosen for model building and refinement for each class. The overall

resolution of these 10 maps ranges between 3.1 Å and 3.7 Å.

Cryo-EM data processing of full-length EGFR(L834R):EGF complex and full-length

EGFR:TGF-α complex reconstituted in peptidiscs followed similar procedures described above.

For full-length EGFR(L834R):EGF complex, after local CTF estimation by Patch-Based CTF

Estimation, a total of 3,250,237 particles were automatically picked by Blob_Picker. After iterative

2D classification and ab-initio reconstruction, background and spurious particles were removed.

987,367 cleaned particles were subjected to homogeneous as well as non-uniform refinement,

using the initial model generated from ab-initio reconstruction as reference. After visual inspection,

the map generated by non-uniform refinement (overall resolution: 3.0 Å) was chosen as the

reference for the subsequent heterogeneous refinement, resulting in 10 classes. A final round of

non-uniform refinement was performed for each of the 10 classes and the resulting 10 maps were

used for model building and refinement. The resolutions of these 10 maps were determined to be

in the range of 3.2-4.2 Å.

For the full-length EGFR:TGF-α complex, a total of 6,846,834 particles were initially

picked by Blob_Picker. Iterative 2D classification and ab-initio reconstruction were performed to

remove background and spurious particles, and 1,019,024 cleaned particles were retained. These

cleaned particles were subjected to homogeneous refinement and non-uniform refinement. The

map resulting from non-uniform refinement was at an overall resolution of 3.0 Å and it was used

as the reference for the subsequent heterogeneous refinement, resulting in 10 classes. A final round

of non-uniform refinement was performed for each of the 10 classes and the resulting 10 maps

were determined at resolutions between 3.2 Å and 4.2 Å. These maps were used for model building

and refinement.

3D variability analysis, local resolution estimation, and B-factor sharpening of all refined

maps were performed using the cryoSPARC v2.

Model building and refinement

To generate models for different conformations of the EGFR(WT):EGF and

EGFR(L834R):EGF complexes, a crystal structure of the isolated EGFR extracellular module

bound to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP) was split into four fragments: two heads and two legs. The two

heads contain EGFR residues 1-500 and EGF residues 5-51 from each side of the dimeric structure,

respectively. The two legs contain EGFR residues 501-614 from each EGFR molecule,

respectively. These four fragments were fit into the reconstructed cryo-EM maps of the

EGFR(WT):EGF and EGFR(L834R):EGF complexes, using UCSF Chimera (Pettersen et al.,

2004). UCSF chimera-fitted models were subjected to one round of real-space refinement (Afonine

et al., 2018) in *Phenix* (Liebschner et al., 2019). To prevent overfitting due to the lower local

resolution in the map region corresponding to the flexible Domain IV legs, the coordinates of the

flexible Domain IV leg was not refined against the cryo-EM maps. The models were manually

adjusted in *Coot* (Emsley et al., 2010), followed by iterative rounds of real-space refinement in

Phenix and manual fitting in *Coot*. Model quality was assessed using the comprehensive model

validation tools from *Phenix* (Extended Data Table 1). All maps and models were visualized using

UCSF Chimera and PyMOL (The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 2.0 Schrödinger,

LLC).

Similar procedures were followed to generate models for the different conformations of

the EGFR:TGF-α complex, except that a crystal structure of the truncated EGFR extracellular

domains bound to TGF-α (PDB code: 1MOX) was used to generate the fragments of the heads for

the initial model fitting in UCSF Chimera.

Molecular dynamics simulations

System preparation for molecular dynamics simulations of extracellular module

We built a system comprising of the extracellular module bound to EGF starting from the

crystal structure (PDB code: 3NJP (Lu et al., 2010)). The N-terminal ends of each EGFR subunit

are the true termini and were left uncapped. The C-terminal ends of EGFR were capped with a

methyl group. In the crystal structure four residues are missing from the N-terminal ends of the

either ligand, and two residues are missing from the C-terminal ends. We initiated one trajectory

starting with these structures while capping the N-terminal ends with acetyl groups and the C-

terminal ends with methyl groups. For three other trajectories, we built in the missing residues

with PyMOL (Schrödinger, LLC., 2015) and left the termini uncapped in these structures. These

systems were solvated such that the water layer extended for 15 Å beyond the longest dimension

of the protein, and ions were added such that the ionic strength was 0.15 M with VMD (Humphrey

et al., 1996).

We built a second system of EGFR bound to TGFα. For this structure, EGFR was taken

from the crystal structure 3NJP (Lu et al., 2010), and TGFα was taken from the structure of

truncated EGFR bound to TGFα (PDB code: 1MOX (Garrett et al., 2002)). Similar to the system

of EGFR bound to EGF, the EGFR subunits were left uncapped at the N-terminal ends and capped

at the C-terminal ends. The ligands were uncapped in all the simulations. These systems were

solvated such that the water layer extended for 15 Å beyond the longest dimension of the protein

and ions were added such that the ionic strength was 0.15 M with VMD (Humphrey et al., 1996).

Minimization, equilibration and production protocols for simulations of extracellular

module

The energies of each system were minimized, first for a 1000 steps while holding protein

atoms fixed, and then for a 1000 steps while allowing all the atoms to move. The systems were

then equilibrated, first for 1 ns while holding all the heavy atoms fixed, then for 1 ns while holding

the protein backbone atoms fixed, and then for 1 ns without any constraints. The four trajectories

for each system were then allowed to run for between ~350 and ~550 ns, for a total simulation

time of ~ 1.8 μs for EGFR bound to EGF and ~ 2.0 μs for EGFR bound to TGF-α. All equilibration

and production simulations were carried out at a temperature of 300 K and pressure of 1 atm.

System preparation for molecular dynamics simulations of transmembrane helices in POPC

membrane

We built two systems – the first of the two transmembrane helices (residues 610-653)

associating at the N-terminal ends starting from model 1 of the NMR structure (PDB code: 5LV6

(Bocharov et al., 2017)), and the second of the two transmembrane helices (residues 614-653)

associating at the C-terminal ends starting from model 6 of the NMR structure (PDB code: 2M0B

(Bocharov et al., 2016)), We used the Membrane Builder module on the CHARMM-GUI website

(Jo et al., 2008; Wu et al., 2014) to insert each protein system into a lipid bilayer comprising of

neutral POPC lipids. The x- and y- dimensions of the bilayer was set to 100 Å each. This lipid

bilayer comprised of 148 lipids in the upper leaflet, and 146 lipids in the lower leaflet in the N-

terminal dimer system, and 142 lipids in each leaflet in the C-terminal dimer system. The N-termini

of each protein chain were capped with acetyl groups and the C-termini were capped with methyl

groups. The system was solvated such that the solvent layer extended to 20 Å beyond the lipid

bilayer on either side, and ions were added such that the ionic strength was 0.1 M, using VMD

(Humphrey et al., 1996). The final edge dimensions of these systems were ~103 Å x 103 Å x 118

Å.

Minimization, equilibration and production protocols

For each system, first the energy was minimized while holding the protein, waters, ions,

and lipid heads fixed, and allowing only the lipid tails to move, for 1000 steps, then while holding

the protein and lipid heads fixed for 5000 steps, then while holding only the protein fixed for 1000

steps, and finally for a 1000 steps while allowing all the atoms to move. This system was then

equilibrated using molecular dynamics for 5 ns while holding the protein fixed, to allow the lipids

to relax about the protein.

For the N-terminal dimer system, a longer trajectory of 175 ns then was generated from

this equilibrated structure, during which all the atoms were allowed to move. During the course

of this simulation, the N-terminal ends of the linkers (residues 610-613), which are disordered in

this structure, interacted frequently with each other. In the full-length structure, these residues are

a part of the ordered region in Domain IV of the extracellular module and would not be available

to form such interactions. We therefore deleted these 4 residues, such that the protein chains started

at Thr 614, and capped these N-terminal ends with acetyl groups. The energy of this system was

minimized with the same multi-step protocol as before and used to initiate 25 independent

molecular dynamics trajectories.

For the simulations starting from the C-terminal dimer, in the initial structure the gap

between the N-terminal ends is too small to accommodate lipid tails. Additionally, the helices tilt

away from each other such that the distance between the Thr 627 residues at the N-terminal ends

of the helices changes from ~18 Å to ~23 Å, in order to optimally pack the hydrophobic residues

of the protein into the membrane (Killian and Nyholm, 2006). In order the maintain the N-terminal

ends of the helices, a multi-step equilibration protocol was used. First, the distance between the

Thr 627 residues of either subunit was increased from ~18 Å to ~23 Å over 5 ns. During this

phase, restraints applied to the protein backbone atoms of residues 620-626 to maintain the Ile619-

Ala623 association and the 3_{10}-helical turn at the N-terminal ends of the helices. The system was

equilibrated for another 25 ns with these restraints applied. The system was then run for 20 ns

without restraints, to ensure that the N-terminal ends were stable. This structure was then used to

start 25 productions runs which ran for 100ns each for a total of 2.5μs. All equilibration and

production simulations were carried out at a temperature of 300 K and pressure of 1 atm.

Simulation parameters

The NAMD package was used to run the minimization and equilibration simulations

(Phillips et al., 2005) with the CHARMM36m force field (Huang et al., 2017). The velocity Verlet

algorithm was used to calculate the trajectories of the atoms. A time step of 2 fs was used. Particle

Mesh Ewald was used to calculate long-range electrostatic interactions, with a maximum space of

1 Å between grid points (Darden et al., 1993). Long-range electrostatics were updated at every

time step. Van der Waals interactions were truncated at 12 Å. Hydrogen atoms bonded to the heavy

atoms were constrained using the ShakeH algorithm (Ryckaert et al., 1977). The temperature was

controlled with Langevin dynamics with a damping coefficient of 1/ps, applied only to non-

hydrogen atoms. Pressure was controlled by the Nose-Hoover method with the Langevin piston,

with an oscillation period of 200 fs and a damping time scale of 50 fs (Feller et al., 1995; Martyna

et al., 1994).

Distance and angle variations over the course of the simulations were calculated with the

AmberTools20 package (Case et al., 2020).

Free energy calculations with umbrella sampling

Umbrella sampling simulations (Torrie and Valleau, 1977) were carried out to measure the

free energy change as the distance between the Thr614 residues was decreased from 27 Å to 8 Å

when the transmembrane helices are in the N-terminal dimer conformation. We performed three

umbrella sampling calculations, starting from initial paths generated from three different steered

molecular dynamics simulations. For each umbrella sampling calculation, 20 windows of

simulations were run, where each window was separated by 1 Å, and the starting structure in each

window had distances between Thr614 distances ranging from 8 Å to 27 Å. A force constant of 1

$kcal.mol^{-1}.Å^{-2}$ was used to maintain the distance between Thr 614 residues in each window, using

the colvars module (Fiorin et al., 2013). Two of the umbrella sampling simulations converged over

60 ns while the third converged over 90 ns. The biased probability distribution thus generated was

reweighted and the free energy change was calculated using the Weighted Histogram Analysis

Method (Kumar et al., 1992) using the implementation provided by Alan Grossfield (Grossfield).

Western-blot analysis of EGFR autophosphorylation with purified EGFR proteins

Expression and purification of FLAG-tagged full-length human EGFR from HEK293FT

cells

A cDNA fragment encoding full-length human EGFR (UniProt accession no. P00533) was

cloned into the pEGFP-N1 plasmid (Clontech, Mountain View, CA). To facilitate affinity

purification, a FLAG-tag (with sequence DYKDDDDK) was inserted after the signal sequence of

EGFR. To monitor protein expression and to reduce non-specific degradation of the C-terminal

tail of EGFR, EGFP was fused after the C-terminus of EGFR. HEK293FT cells were transfected

with the plasmid using FuGENE6 (Promega). After 24 hours, 10 mM sodium butyrate was added

to the culture medium. The cells were harvested from culture dishes 36 hours after transfection

and were resuspended in lysis buffer (25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, and cOmplete Protease

Inhibitor Cocktail). To extract EGFR from the membrane, 1% DDM and 0.1% CHS were added

to the cell suspension. After mixing for 1 hour at 4 °C, detergent solubilized proteins were collected

by ultra-centrifugation at 190,000g for 40 mins. The supernatant was incubated with Anti-FLAG

M2 Affinity agarose resin for at least 4 hours at 4 $^{\circ}$C and applied to a Micro Bio-Spin column. The

resin was washed with lysis buffer supplemented with 0.05% DDM and 0.005% CHS. EGFR was

eluted from the resin with lysis buffer containing 0.16 mg/ml FLAG peptide, 0.05% DDM and

0.005% CHS. Protein concentration was estimated by the band intensities on a SDS-PAGE gel

stained with Coomassie Brilliant Blue and by UV absorbance at 280 nm measured using NanoDrop

(ThermoFisher).

Western-blot assays using purified EGFR protein

~1 μM purified EGFR protein prepared as described above, was mixed with ~16 μM EGF

or TGF-α in a buffer containing 25 mM Tris pH 8.0, 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM $MgCl_2$, 1 mM sodium

orthovanadate, and 0.2 mM DTT. The mixture was incubated for 5 minutes, and phosphorylation

reactions were initiated by addition of ATP to a final concentration of 1 mM. Reactions were

typically carried out at 25 °C. At various time points, aliquots of the reaction solution were mixed

with quenching solution, SDS-PAGE loading buffer supplemented with 20 mM EDTA, to achieve

final concentration of 1% SDS and 10 mM EDTA in the quenched solutions. The samples

quenched at different time points were run on two 12% acrylamide SDS-PAGE gels at 250 V, 400

mA for 35 min at room temperature.

The first SDS-PAGE gel was stained using Coomassie Brilliant Blue to monitor the total

amount of EGFR protein loaded in each lane. The second SDS-PAGE gel was transferred to PVDF

membrane using a semi-dry transfer apparatus TRANS-BLOT (Bio-Rad) at 25 V, 150 mA for 40

minutes at room temperature, in transfer buffer containing 25 mM Tris, 192 mM glycine, 0.02%

SDS, and 10% Methanol. The PVDF membranes were blocked for 1 hour at room temperature in

5% (w/v) dry milk dissolved in Tris-buffered saline with 0.1% Tween-20 (TBST). A pan-

phosphotyrosine antibody (pY20, catalog no. sc-12351, Santa Cruz Biotechnology) was diluted

(1:2000) with 5% (w/v) dry milk in TBST and incubated with the membranes at 4°C overnight.

The membranes were then washed 3 times with TBST, and incubated with horseradish peroxidase

(HRP)-conjugated anti-mouse secondary antibody (catalog no. 7074, Cell Signaling Technology)

at a 1:3000 dilution in TBST with 5% dry milk at room temperature for 1 hour. The membranes

were then washed 3 times with TBST, incubated with WesternBright® Quantum®

chemiluminescent reagents (Advansta) for 2 minutes, and were imaged using ImageLab (Bio-Rad).

Cell-based western-blot assays for EGFR autophosphorylation and Erk phosphorylation

EGFR autophosphorylation in cells

N-terminal Flag-tagged full-length human EGFR was cloned into the pEGFP-N1 plasmid.

HEK293T cells were transiently transfected with EGFR using polyethylenimine (PEI) in a 6-well

plate format. 24 hours after transfection, cells were serum starved overnight (~12 hours) in serum

free medium. For stimulation, cells were incubated with fresh medium without ligand, with EGF

(16.7 nM), or with TGF-α (16.7 nM) for 1 hour at 4 ^{o}C (on ice). Following ligand stimulation,

cells were pelleted and then immediately lysed in ice-cold cell lysis buffer (catalog no. 9803, Cell

Signaling Technology) supplemented with cOmplete Protease Inhibitor Cocktail and PhosSTOP

phosphatase inhibitors (Roche) for 30 minutes on ice. Cell lysates were clarified by centrifugation

and western-blot analyses were carried out as described above for the purified EGFR proteins. A

pan-phosphotyrosine antibody (pY20) was used to detect EGFR autophosphorylation. An anti-

FLAG M2 antibody (catalog no. F1804, Sigma-Aldrich) was used to monitor the total amount of

EGFR protein in the cell lysate loaded to each lane.

Erk phosphorylation in cells

N-terminal Flag-tagged full-length human EGFR was cloned into the pEGFP-N1 plasmid.

The mutations were introduced by QuikChange site-directed mutagenesis (Stratagene). 24 hours

after transfection, HEK293T cells transiently transfected with EGFR and EGFR variants were

serum starved overnight (~12 hours) in serum free medium. For stimulation, cells were incubated

with fresh medium without ligand, with EGF (16.7 nM), or with TGF-α (16.7 nM) for 5 minutes

at 37 $^{\circ}$C. Following ligand stimulation, cells were immediately placed on ice and then lysed in ice-

cold cell lysis buffer supplemented with cOmplete Protease Inhibitor Cocktail and PhosSTOP

phosphatase inhibitors for 30 minutes on ice. Cell lysates were clarified by centrifugation and

western-blot analyses were carried out as described above. An anti-phospho-Erk antibody (catalog

no. 4370, Cell Signaling Technology) is used to detect phosphorylation of p44 and p42 MAP

kinase (Erk1 and Erk2). An anti-FLAG M2 antibody was used to monitor the total amount of

EGFR protein in the cell lysate loaded to each lane.

All western blots were reproduced at least three times and the representative ones were presented.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Cell Culture Facility at the University of California, Berkeley, for insect cell and

mammalian cell cultures. We thank the Eric Gouaux group at the Vollum Institute at the Oregon

Health & Science University, for the pEG_BacMam plasmid. This research was in part supported

by the National Cryo-EM Facility of the National Cancer Institute at the Frederick National

Laboratory for Cancer Research, under contract HSSN261200800001E. We also acknowledge the

Berkeley Bay Area Cryo-EM Facility and the HHMI Janelia Cryo-EM Facility. Molecular

graphics and analyses performed with UCSF Chimera, developed by the Resource for

Biocomputing, Visualization, and Informatics at the University of California, San Francisco, with

support from NIH P41-GM103311. This work used the Extreme Science and Engineering

Discovery Environment (XSEDE), which is supported by National Science Foundation grant ACI-

1548562. This work is in part supported by an award from the Canada Excellence Research Chair

program (to S.S.) and by a philanthropic gift to the VGH and UBC Hospital Foundation (to S.S.).

Author Contributions

796   Y.H., S.S., and J.K. conceived the project; Y.H. designed and performed experiments; Y.H., J.O.,

797   and A.M. performed EM experiments; Y.H. analyzed data; Y.H., D.K., and K.M. performed

798   molecular dynamics simulations; S.S. and J.K. supervised the project; Y.H. and J.K. drafted the

799   manuscript; Y.H., S.S., and J.K. edited the manuscript. All authors commented on the manuscript.

Competing interests

801   J.K. is a cofounder of Nurix Therapeutics and is on the scientific advisory boards of Carmot and

802   Revolution Medicine. S.S. is Founder and Chief Executive Officer of Gandeeva Therapeutics Inc.

803   S.S. is a reviewing editor for eLife.

References

Afonine, P.V., Poon, B.K., Read, R.J., Sobolev, O.V., Terwilliger, T.C., Urzhumtsev, A., and
Adams, P.D. (2018). Real-space refinement in PHENIX for cryo-EM and crystallography. Acta
Crystallogr. D Struct. Biol. *74*, 531–544.

Ahmed, F., Paul, M., and Hristova, K. (2020). The biophysical basis of receptor tyrosine kinase
ligand functional selectivity: Trk-B case study. Biochem J.

Angiulli, G., Dhupar, H.S., Suzuki, H., Wason, I.S., Duong Van Hoa, F., and Walz, T. (2020).
New approach for membrane protein reconstitution into peptidiscs and basis for their adaptability
to different proteins. Elife *9*.

Arkhipov, A., Shan, Y., Das, R., Endres, N.F., Eastwood, M.P., Wemmer, D.E., Kuriyan, J., and
Shaw, D.E. (2013). Architecture and membrane interactions of the EGF receptor. Cell *152*, 557–
569.

Arteaga, C.L., and Engelman, J.A. (2014). ERBB receptors: from oncogene discovery to basic
science to mechanism-based cancer therapeutics. Cancer Cell *25*, 282–303.

Bayburt, T.H., and Sligar, S.G. (2010). Membrane protein assembly into Nanodiscs. FEBS Lett
584, 1721–1727.

Bocharov, E.V., Lesovoy, D.M., Pavlov, K.V., Pustovalova, Y.E., Bocharova, O.V., and Arseniev,
A.S. (2016). Alternative packing of EGFR transmembrane domain suggests that protein-lipid
interactions underlie signal conduction across membrane. Biochim Biophys Acta *1858*, 1254–
1261.

Bocharov, E.V., Bragin, P.E., Pavlov, K.V., Bocharova, O.V., Mineev, K.S., Polyansky, A.A.,
Volynsky, P.E., Efremov, R.G., and Arseniev, A.S. (2017). The conformation of the epidermal
growth factor receptor transmembrane domain dimer dynamically adapts to the local membrane
environment. Biochemistry *56*, 1697–1705.

Brand, T.M., Iida, M., and Wheeler, D.L. (2011). Molecular mechanisms of resistance to the EGFR
monoclonal antibody cetuximab. Cancer Biol Ther *11*, 777–792.

Cai, W.-Q., Zeng, L.-S., Wang, L.-F., Wang, Y.-Y., Cheng, J.-T., Zhang, Y., Han, Z.-W., Zhou,
Y., Huang, S.-L., Wang, X.-W., et al. (2020). The latest battles between EGFR monoclonal
antibodies and resistant tumor cells. Front Oncol *10*, 1249.

Carlson, M.L., Young, J.W., Zhao, Z., Fabre, L., Jun, D., Li, J., Li, J., Dhupar, H.S., Wason, I.,
Mills, A.T., et al. (2018). The Peptidisc, a simple method for stabilizing membrane proteins in
detergent-free solution. Elife *7*.

Case, D.A., Belfon, K., Ben-Shalom, I.Y., Brozell, S.R., Cerutti, D.S., Cheatham, III, T.E.,
Cruzeiro, V.W.D., Darden, T.A., Duke, R.E., Giambasu, G., et al. (2020). AMBER 20.

Chong, C.R., and Jänne, P.A. (2013). The quest to overcome resistance to EGFR-targeted therapies
in cancer. Nat Med *19*, 1389–1400.

Darden, T., York, D., and Pedersen, L. (1993). Particle mesh Ewald: An N · log(N) method for
Ewald sums in large systems. J. Chem. Phys. *98*, 10089.

Dawson, J.P., Berger, M.B., Lin, C.-C., Schlessinger, J., Lemmon, M.A., and Ferguson, K.M.
(2005). Epidermal growth factor receptor dimerization and activation require ligand-induced
conformational changes in the dimer interface. Mol Cell Biol *25*, 7734–7742.

Diwanji, D., Trenker, R., Thaker, T.M., Wang, F., Agard, D.A., Verba, K.A., and Jura, N. (2021).

Structures of the active HER2/HER3 receptor complex reveal dynamics at the dimerization
interface induced by binding of a single ligand. BioRxiv.
863
864 Doerner, A., Scheck, R., and Schepartz, A. (2015). Growth Factor Identity Is Encoded by Discrete
865 Coiled-Coil Rotamers in the EGFR Juxtamembrane Region. Chem Biol *22*, 776–784.
866
867 Emsley, P., Lohkamp, B., Scott, W.G., and Cowtan, K. (2010). Features and development of Coot.
868 Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr *66*, 486–501.
869
870 Endres, N.F., Das, R., Smith, A.W., Arkhipov, A., Kovacs, E., Huang, Y., Pelton, J.G., Shan, Y.,
871 Shaw, D.E., Wemmer, D.E., et al. (2013). Conformational coupling across the plasma membrane
872 in activation of the EGF receptor. Cell *152*, 543–556.
873
874 Feller, S.E., Zhang, Y., Pastor, R.W., and Brooks, B.R. (1995). Constant pressure molecular
875 dynamics simulation: The Langevin piston method. J Chem Phys *103*, 4613–4621.
876
877 Fiorin, G., Klein, M.L., and Hénin, J. (2013). Using collective variables to drive molecular
878 dynamics simulations. Mol Phys *111*, 3345–3362.
879
880 Freed, D.M., Bessman, N.J., Kiyatkin, A., Salazar-Cavazos, E., Byrne, P.O., Moore, J.O., Valley,
881 C.C., Ferguson, K.M., Leahy, D.J., Lidke, D.S., et al. (2017). EGFR ligands differentially stabilize
882 receptor dimers to specify signaling kinetics. Cell *171*, 683–695.e18.
883
884 Garrett, T.P.J., McKern, N.M., Lou, M., Elleman, T.C., Adams, T.E., Lovrecz, G.O., Zhu, H.-J.,
885 Walker, F., Frenkel, M.J., Hoyne, P.A., et al. (2002). Crystal structure of a truncated epidermal
886 growth factor receptor extracellular domain bound to transforming growth factor alpha. Cell *110*,
887 763–773.
888
889 Goehring, A., Lee, C.-H., Wang, K.H., Michel, J.C., Claxton, D.P., Baconguis, I., Althoff, T.,
890 Fischer, S., Garcia, K.C., and Gouaux, E. (2014). Screening and large-scale expression of
891 membrane proteins in mammalian cells for structural studies. Nat Protoc *9*, 2574–2585.
892
893 Gohon, Y., Giusti, F., Prata, C., Charvolin, D., Timmins, P., Ebel, C., Tribet, C., and Popot, J.-L.
894 (2006). Well-defined nanoparticles formed by hydrophobic assembly of a short and polydisperse
895 random terpolymer, amphipol A8-35. Langmuir *22*, 1281–1290.
896
897 Grossfield, A. An implementation of WHAM: the Weighted Histogram Analysis Method Version
898 2.0.9.
899
900 van Heel, M., Harauz, G., Orlova, E.V., Schmidt, R., and Schatz, M. (1996). A new generation of
901 the IMAGIC image processing system. J Struct Biol *116*, 17–24.
902
903 Huang, J., Rauscher, S., Nawrocki, G., Ran, T., Feig, M., de Groot, B.L., Grubmüller, H., and
904 MacKerell, A.D. (2017). CHARMM36m: an improved force field for folded and intrinsically
905 disordered proteins. Nat Methods *14*, 71–73.
906

Humphrey, W., Dalke, A., and Schulten, K. (1996). VMD – Visual Molecular Dynamics. J. of
Mol. Graph. *14*, 33–38.

Jo, S., Kim, T., Iyer, V.G., and Im, W. (2008). CHARMM-GUI: a web-based graphical user
interface for CHARMM. J Comput Chem *29*, 1859–1865.

Jones, J.T., Akita, R.W., and Sliwkowski, M.X. (1999). Binding specificities and affinities of egf
domains for ErbB receptors. FEBS Lett *447*, 227–231.

Jura, N., Endres, N.F., Engel, K., Deindl, S., Das, R., Lamers, M.H., Wemmer, D.E., Zhang, X.,
and Kuriyan, J. (2009). Mechanism for activation of the EGF receptor catalytic domain by the
juxtamembrane segment. Cell *137*, 1293–1307.

Killian, J.A., and Nyholm, T.K.M. (2006). Peptides in lipid bilayers: the power of simple models.
Curr Opin Struct Biol *16*, 473–479.

Kovacs, E., Zorn, J.A., Huang, Y., Barros, T., and Kuriyan, J. (2015). A structural perspective on
the regulation of the epidermal growth factor receptor. Annu Rev Biochem *84*, 739–764.

Kumar, S., Rosenberg, J.M., Bouzida, D., Swendsen, R.H., and Kollman, P.A. (1992). THE
weighted histogram analysis method for free-energy calculations on biomolecules. I. The method.
J Comput Chem *13*, 1011–1021.

Lander, G.C., Stagg, S.M., Voss, N.R., Cheng, A., Fellmann, D., Pulokas, J., Yoshioka, C., Irving,
C., Mulder, A., Lau, P.-W., et al. (2009). Appion: an integrated, database-driven pipeline to
facilitate EM image processing. J Struct Biol *166*, 95–102.

Leahy, D.J. (2004). Structure and function of the epidermal growth factor (EGF/ErbB) family of
receptors. Adv Protein Chem *68*, 1–27.

Lemmon, M.A., Schlessinger, J., and Ferguson, K.M. (2014). The EGFR family: not so
prototypical receptor tyrosine kinases. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol *6*, a020768.

Li, J., Choi, E., Yu, H., and Bai, X.-C. (2019). Structural basis of the activation of type 1 insulin-
like growth factor receptor. Nat Commun *10*, 4567.

Liebschner, D., Afonine, P.V., Baker, M.L., Bunkóczi, G., Chen, V.B., Croll, T.I., Hintze, B.,
Hung, L.W., Jain, S., McCoy, A.J., et al. (2019). Macromolecular structure determination using
X-rays, neutrons and electrons: recent developments in Phenix. Acta Crystallogr. D Struct. Biol.
75, 861–877.

Liu, P., Cleveland, T.E., Bouyain, S., Byrne, P.O., Longo, P.A., and Leahy, D.J. (2012). A single
ligand is sufficient to activate EGFR dimers. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *109*, 10861–10866.

Lowder, M.A., Doerner, A.E., and Schepartz, A. (2015). Structural Differences between Wild-
Type and Double Mutant EGFR Modulated by Third-Generation Kinase Inhibitors. J Am Chem

Soc *137*, 6456–6459.

Lu, C., Mi, L.-Z., Grey, M.J., Zhu, J., Graef, E., Yokoyama, S., and Springer, T.A. (2010).
Structural evidence for loose linkage between ligand binding and kinase activation in the epidermal
growth factor receptor. Mol Cell Biol *30*, 5432–5443.

Mallick, S.P., Carragher, B., Potter, C.S., and Kriegman, D.J. (2005). ACE: automated CTF
estimation. Ultramicroscopy *104*, 8–29.

Martyna, G.J., Tobias, D.J., and Klein, M.L. (1994). Constant pressure molecular dynamics
algorithms. J. Chem. Phys. *101*, 4177.

Mendrola, J.M., Berger, M.B., King, M.C., and Lemmon, M.A. (2002). The single transmembrane
domains of ErbB receptors self-associate in cell membranes. J Biol Chem *277*, 4704–4712.

Mi, L.-Z., Lu, C., Li, Z., Nishida, N., Walz, T., and Springer, T.A. (2011). Simultaneous
visualization of the extracellular and cytoplasmic domains of the epidermal growth factor receptor.
Nat Struct Mol Biol *18*, 984–989.

Miloso, M., Mazzotti, M., Vass, W.C., and Beguinot, L. (1995). SHC and GRB-2 are constitutively
by an epidermal growth factor receptor with a point mutation in the transmembrane domain. J Biol
Chem *270*, 19557–19562.

Mindell, J.A., and Grigorieff, N. (2003). Accurate determination of local defocus and specimen
tilt in electron microscopy. J Struct Biol *142*, 334–347.

Mozumdar, D., Quach, K., Doerner, A., and Schepartz, A. (2020). Coiled coil control of diverse
EGFR functions. BioRxiv.

Ogiso, H., Ishitani, R., Nureki, O., Fukai, S., Yamanaka, M., Kim, J.-H., Saito, K., Sakamoto, A.,
Inoue, M., Shirouzu, M., et al. (2002). Crystal structure of the complex of human epidermal growth
factor and receptor extracellular domains. Cell *110*, 775–787.

Ogura, T., Iwasaki, K., and Sato, C. (2003). Topology representing network enables highly
accurate classification of protein images taken by cryo electron-microscope without masking. J
Struct Biol *143*, 185–200.

Pahuja, K.B., Nguyen, T.T., Jaiswal, B.S., Prabhash, K., Thaker, T.M., Senger, K., Chaudhuri, S.,
Kljavin, N.M., Antony, A., Phalke, S., et al. (2018). Actionable activating oncogenic
ERBB2/HER2 transmembrane and juxtamembrane domain mutations. Cancer Cell *34*, 792–
806.e5.

Pettersen, E.F., Goddard, T.D., Huang, C.C., Couch, G.S., Greenblatt, D.M., Meng, E.C., and
Ferrin, T.E. (2004). UCSF Chimera—a visualization system for exploratory research and analysis.
J Comput Chem *25*, 1605–1612.

Phillips, J.C., Braun, R., Wang, W., Gumbart, J., Tajkhorshid, E., Villa, E., Chipot, C., Skeel, R.D.,
Kalé, L., and Schulten, K. (2005). Scalable molecular dynamics with NAMD. J Comput Chem *26*,
1781–1802.

Punjani, A., and Fleet, D.J. (2020). 3D Variability Analysis: Directly resolving continuous
flexibility and discrete heterogeneity from single particle cryo-EM images. BioRxiv.

Punjani, A., Rubinstein, J.L., Fleet, D.J., and Brubaker, M.A. (2017). cryoSPARC: algorithms for
rapid unsupervised cryo-EM structure determination. Nat Methods *14*, 290–296.

Punjani, A., Zhang, H., and Fleet, D.J. (2019). Non-uniform refinement: Adaptive regularization
improves single particle cryo-EM reconstruction. BioRxiv.

Red Brewer, M., Yun, C.-H., Lai, D., Lemmon, M.A., Eck, M.J., and Pao, W. (2013). Mechanism
for activation of mutated epidermal growth factor receptors in lung cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci U
S A *110*, E3595–E3604.

Reeves, P.J., Callewaert, N., Contreras, R., and Khorana, H.G. (2002). Structure and function in
rhodopsin: high-level expression of rhodopsin with restricted and homogeneous N-glycosylation
by a tetracycline-inducible N-acetylglucosaminyltransferase I-negative HEK293S stable
mammalian cell line. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *99*, 13419–13424.

Ritchie, T.K., Grinkova, Y.V., Bayburt, T.H., Denisov, I.G., Zolnerciks, J.K., Atkins, W.M., and
Sligar, S.G. (2009). Chapter 11 - Reconstitution of membrane proteins in phospholipid bilayer
nanodiscs. Meth Enzymol *464*, 211–231.

Ronan, T., Macdonald-Obermann, J.L., Huelsmann, L., Bessman, N.J., Naegle, K.M., and Pike,
L.J. (2016). Different epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) agonists produce unique
signatures for the recruitment of downstream signaling proteins. J Biol Chem *291*, 5528–5540.

Ryckaert, J.-P., Ciccotti, G., and Berendsen, H.J.. (1977). Numerical integration of the cartesian
equations of motion of a system with constraints: molecular dynamics of n-alkanes. J Comput Phys
23, 327–341.

Scheck, R.A., Lowder, M.A., Appelbaum, J.S., and Schepartz, A. (2012). Bipartite tetracysteine
display reveals allosteric control of ligand-specific EGFR activation. ACS Chem Biol *7*, 1367–
1376.

Scheres, S.H.W., Núñez-Ramírez, R., Sorzano, C.O.S., Carazo, J.M., and Marabini, R. (2008).
Image processing for electron microscopy single-particle analysis using XMIPP. Nat Protoc *3*,
977–990.

Schrödinger, LLC., P. (2015). PyMOL (Schrödinger, LLC.).

Shan, Y., Eastwood, M.P., Zhang, X., Kim, E.T., Arkhipov, A., Dror, R.O., Jumper, J., Kuriyan,
J., and Shaw, D.E. (2012). Oncogenic mutations counteract intrinsic disorder in the EGFR kinase

and promote receptor dimerization. Cell *149,* 860–870.
1046
1047   Sinclair, J.K.L., Walker, A.S., Doerner, A.E., and Schepartz, A. (2018). Mechanism of Allosteric
1048   Coupling into and through the Plasma Membrane by EGFR. Cell Chem. Biol. *25,* 857–870.e7.
1049
1050   Singh, B., Carpenter, G., and Coffey, R.J. (2016). EGF receptor ligands: recent advances. [version
1051   1; peer review: 3 approved]. F1000Res *5.*
1052
1053   Suloway, C., Pulokas, J., Fellmann, D., Cheng, A., Guerra, F., Quispe, J., Stagg, S., Potter, C.S.,
1054   and Carragher, B. (2005). Automated molecular microscopy: the new Leginon system. J Struct
1055   Biol *151,* 41–60.
1056
1057   Torrie, G.M., and Valleau, J.P. (1977). Nonphysical sampling distributions in Monte Carlo free-
1058   energy estimation: Umbrella sampling. J Comput Phys *23,* 187–199.
1059
1060   Uchikawa, E., Choi, E., Shang, G., Yu, H., and Bai, X.-C. (2019). Activation mechanism of the
1061   insulin receptor revealed by cryo-EM structure of the fully liganded receptor-ligand complex. Elife
1062   *8.*
1063
1064   Voss, N.R., Yoshioka, C.K., Radermacher, M., Potter, C.S., and Carragher, B. (2009). DoG Picker
1065   and TiltPicker: software tools to facilitate particle selection in single particle electron microscopy.
1066   J Struct Biol *166,* 205–213.
1067
1068   Wilson, K.J., Gilmore, J.L., Foley, J., Lemmon, M.A., and Riese, D.J. (2009). Functional
1069   selectivity of EGF family peptide growth factors: implications for cancer. Pharmacol Ther *122,* 1–
1070   8.
1071
1072   Wu, E.L., Cheng, X., Jo, S., Rui, H., Song, K.C., Dávila-Contreras, E.M., Qi, Y., Lee, J., Monje-
1073   Galvan, V., Venable, R.M., et al. (2014). CHARMM-GUI Membrane Builder toward realistic
1074   biological membrane simulations. J Comput Chem *35,* 1997–2004.
1075
1076   Zhang, X., Gureasko, J., Shen, K., Cole, P.A., and Kuriyan, J. (2006). An allosteric mechanism
1077   for activation of the kinase domain of epidermal growth factor receptor. Cell *125,* 1137–1149.
1078
1079   Zhang, X., Yu, D., Sun, J., Wu, Y., Gong, J., Li, X., Liu, L., Liu, S., Liu, J., Wu, Y., et al. (2020).
1080   Visualization of Ligand-Bound Ectodomain Assembly in the Full-Length Human IGF-1 Receptor
1081   by Cryo-EM Single-Particle Analysis. Structure *28,* 555–561.e4.
1082
1083   Zheng, S.Q., Palovcak, E., Armache, J.-P., Verba, K.A., Cheng, Y., and Agard, D.A. (2017).
1084   MotionCor2: anisotropic correction of beam-induced motion for improved cryo-electron
1085   microscopy. Nat Methods *14,* 331–332.
1086
1087   Zivanov, J., Nakane, T., Forsberg, B.O., Kimanius, D., Hagen, W.J., Lindahl, E., and Scheres, S.H.
1088   (2018). New tools for automated high-resolution cryo-EM structure determination in RELION-3.
1089   Elife *7.*
1090

Figure 1

1091

1092

1093

1094 **Figure 1 A structural collage of a ligand-bound EGFR dimer**

1095 Left, a schematic diagram of ligand-bound dimeric EGFR. Right, structures of EGFR fragments,

1096 determined previously: a dimeric extracellular module bound to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP (Lu et al.,

1097 2010)), a transmembrane helix dimer (PDB code: 2M20 (Endres et al., 2013)), and an asymmetric

1098 dimer of kinase domains (PDB code: 2GS6 (Zhang et al., 2006)).

Figure 2

Figure 2 Linkage between the extracellular module and transmembrane helices in full-length

human EGFR is not rigid

A, C-E, In each panel, the cryo-EM density map for a reconstituted full-length EGFR:EGF

complex is shown at two contour levels. Note the lack of EM density for the transmembrane and

kinase domains of EGFR at higher contour level (left) in all these complexes.

A, Full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in nanodiscs.

B, Superposition of the cryo-EM map shown in **A** with a model for full-length EGFR embedded

in the lipid bilayer, described previously (Arkhipov et al., 2013).

C, Full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in peptidiscs.

D, Full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in amphipols.

E, Full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in detergents.

Figure 3

1111

1112

Figure 3 Cryo-EM analysis reveals a range of conformations for the EGF-bound

extracellular module

A, Summary of the cryo-EM data processing workflow for the full-length EGFR:EGF complex

reconstituted in peptidiscs. The two extreme conformations of the ensemble, the juxtaposed and

the separated, are highlighted by red dotted circle. The intersubunit rotational angles and the

separations between the tips of the extracellular module are summarized below each subclass.

See Materials and Methods for more details.

B-D, Two orthogonal views of the cryo-EM maps for three representative states of the

conformational ensemble of the EGF-bound extracellular module: the tips-juxtaposed

conformation (**B**), an intermediate conformation (**C**), and the tips-separated conformation (**D**).

These conformations differ from one another in the rotations between the ligand-binding heads, as

well as in the distances between the two Thr 614 residues located at the membrane-proximal ends

of the Domain IV legs.

Figure 4

A

top view

○ cryo-EM structure
EGFR:EGF
juxtaposed

○ crystal structure
PDB code:
3NJP

○ cryo-EM structure
EGFR:EGF
juxtaposed

○ crystal structure
PDB code:
1MOX

B

top view

○ cryo-EM structure
EGFR:EGF
separated

○ crystal structure
PDB code:
3NJP

○ cryo-EM structure
EGFR:EGF
separated

○ crystal structure
PDB code:
1MOX

1126

Figure 4 Comparison of Cryo-EM structures of EGFR:EGF complex in two extreme

conformations with previous crystal structures of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound

to EGF and TGF-α.

In each panel, a cryo-EM structure of the extracellular module of the full-length EGFR:EGF

complex (juxtaposed or separated) is compared to a crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of

EGFR bound to EGF or TGF-α. In each comparison, structures are superimposed on the right-

hand EGFR subunits (grey).

A, Top, the cryo-EM structure of juxtaposed conformation of EGFR:EGF (cyan) is compared to a

crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to EGF (pink, PDB code: 3NJP).

Bottom, the cryo-EM structure of juxtaposed conformation of EGFR:EGF (cyan) is compared to

a crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to TGF-α (light purple, PDB code:

1MOX).

Note that the cryo-EM structure of the juxtaposed conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex

resembles closely the crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to EGF (PDB

code: 3NJP), but deviates from the crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to

TGF-α (PDB code: 1MOX).

B, Top, the cryo-EM structure of separated conformation of EGFR:EGF (yellow) is compared to

a crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to EGF (pink, PDB code: 3NJP).

Bottom, the cryo-EM structure of separated conformation of EGFR:EGF (yellow) is compared to

a crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to TGF-α (light purple, PDB code:

1MOX).

Note that the cryo-EM structure of the separated conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex

resembles closely the crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound to TGF-α (PDB

code: 1MOX), but deviates from the crystal structure of the ligand-binding head of EGFR bound

to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP).

Figure 5

A

Figure 5 Comparison between the cryo-EM structures of the juxtaposed and the separated

conformations of the extracellular module of the EGFR:EGF complex

A, The cryo-EM structures representing the juxtaposed conformation (cyan) and the separated

conformation (yellow) are superimposed on the right-hand EGFR subunits which have similar

Domain IV leg conformations (light grey). A vector (dark grey) is used to indicate the displacement

of Cα atoms between the two structures, pointing from the juxtaposed structure to the separated

structure.

B-E, Side by side comparison between the juxtaposed conformation and the separated

conformation of the extracellular module of the EGFR:EGF complex. Molecular surface of the

cryo-EM models of the juxtaposed and separated conformations are shown from the front (**A**), the

side (**B**), the top (**C**), and the bottom (**D**). EGF molecules are shown in slate blue. The same EGFR

subunit used for superposition in **A** is colored grey and the other EGFR subunit is light pink.

1165

Figure 6

Figure 6 The tips-separated conformation of the extracellular module can couple more

readily to the N-terminal dimer of the transmembrane helices

A, Models of the transmembrane helices in two configurations based on previous NMR structures.

One of the structures in the NMR-based ensemble for the N-terminal dimer configuration (PDB

code: 5LV6) is shown in yellow (chain A) and grey (chain B), and the structure for the C-terminal

dimer configuration (PDB code: 2M0B) is shown in cyan (chain A) and grey (chain B). Shown in

spheres are superimposed Cα atoms of the residue Thr 614, located at the end of the extracellular

module, from the 20 structures in the NMR-based ensemble for the N-terminal dimer configuration

(left) and for the C-terminal dimer configuration (right), respectively. The black dotted square

indicates the linker region that is imposing a constraint on the orientation of the linkers. In the N-

terminal dimer configuration of the transmembrane helices (left), the linkers from each subunit are

oriented away from one another. In the C-terminal dimer configuration of the transmembrane

helices (right), the linkers are oriented towards each other.

B, Enlarged view of the linker located at the junction with the transmembrane helices, zoomed in

from the areas highlighted by dotted black square in **A**, showing well-defined conformations for

this region in both NMR structures.

C, Probability distribution of the distances between the Cα atoms of the two Thr 614 residues,

sampled every 250 picoseconds over 2.5 μs of MD simulations of the N-terminal dimer

configuration (purple) and the C-terminal dimer configuration (cyan) of the transmembrane helices.

Initial structures of the transmembrane helices dimers with the linker are shown as cartoons.

Residues Thr 614 located at the end of the extracellular module are shown as spheres. Also shown

as spheres are residues Ile 619 and Ala 623, located at the junction between the linker and the

transmembrane helix, and the interaction between these two residues is maintained over 2.5 μs

MD simulations (see **E** and **F**).

D. Free-energy change of the system when the distance between the Thr 614 residues from each

subunit is driven from 27 Å to 8 Å, when the transmembrane helices are in the N-terminal dimer

configuration. Results from three independent umbrella-sampling calculations are shown in green,

orange, and purple. The dotted gray line indicates the value of $k_B T$ at room temperature, 2.479

kJ/mol.

E and **F**, Probability distribution of the distances between the Cα atoms of Ile 619 and Ala 623,

sampled every 250 picoseconds over 2.5 μs of MD simulations of the N-terminal dimer

configuration (**E**) and the C-terminal dimer configuration of the transmembrane helices (**F**).

1199

Figure 7

1200

1201

1202

Figure 7 Comparison between Cryo-EM density maps of the tips-separated and the tips-

juxtaposed conformations in different EGFR complexes

Cryo-EM density maps of the tips-separated (upper row) and the tips-juxtaposed (lower row)

conformations in three different EGFR complexes are shown: EGFR(L834R) bound to EGF (left),

EGFR(WT) bound to EGF (middle), and EGFR(WT) bound to TGF-α (right). The black arrows

highlight the difference in stabilities of the flexible Domain IV legs in these complexes.

1209

Figure 8

A

B

angle between centroids of
domain I, II, and III

C

1210

1211

Figure 8 Difference in the ligand-binding heads between EGF- and TGF-α-bound EGFR

complexes

A, The differences in structure between the separated conformations of the EGF and TGF-

α complexes of EGFR are illustrated. Structures corresponding to the separated conformations of

the EGFR:EGF complex (yellow:slate) and the EGFR:TGF-α complex (cyan:salmon) are aligned

on Domain III of each structure. Enlarged views of the interface between Domain I of EGFR and

the ligands are shown on the right. The interface between Domain I of EGFR (cyan) and TGF-

α (salmon) features hydrophilic residues that are shown (upper right). The equivalent interface

between Domain I of EGFR (yellow) and EGF (slate) is characterized by hydrophobic residues

(lower right).

B, The angle between centroids of Domain I (residues 7-200), part of Domain II (residues 260-

285), and Domain III (317-470) is used to estimate the degree of closure of the ligand-binding site

in a ligand-bound EGFR complex.

C, Probability distribution of the angles defined in **B**, sampled every nanosecond over ~1.8 μs and

~2.0 μs of MD simulations of the EGFR extracellular module bound to EGF (purple) and TGF-

α (pink), respectively.

1228

Figure 9

1229

Figure 9 EGF and TGF-α differ in their abilities to stabilize the tips-separated conformation

and to generate different levels of EGFR activation

A, Destabilization of the flexible Domain IV leg in the separated conformation of the EGFR:TGF-

α complex. The EGFR:TGF-α complex (upper left) is colored in cyan:salmon and the

EGFR:EGF complex (lower left) is colored in yellow:slate. The flexible leg in the EGFR:TGF-

α complex (green, red dotted line) is modeled based on the conformation of Domains III and IV

in the left-hand subunit of the EGFR:EGF complex (lower left). When viewed from the bottom

(right), the two Domain IV legs are accommodated in the EGFR:EGF complex (yellow), but not

in the EGFR:TGF-α complex. There are steric clashes between the legs (green and cyan), within

the dotted red line.

B, Location of the Trp 492 (purple), shown in the crystal structure of EGFR bound to EGF (cyan,

PDB code: 3NJP).

C, Western-blot analysis of Erk phosphorylation in HEK293T cells transiently transfected with

wild-type EGFR or EGFR variant, W492G. Anti-phospho-Erk antibody is used to detect

phosphorylation of p44 and p42 MAP kinase (Erk1 and Erk2), and anti-FLAG antibody is used to

detect the total amount of EGFR in the cell lysate loaded to each lane.

D, Mutations introduced to the linker at the junction between the extracellular module and the

transmembrane helices, shown in the NMR structure of the N-terminal dimer configuration of the

transmembrane helices (PDB code: 5LV6).

E, Western-blot analysis of Erk phosphorylation in HEK293T cells transiently transfected with

two EGFR variants, linker insertion (left) and linker replacement (right). In linker insertion variant,

Gly-Gly-Ser-Gly-Gly-Ser-Gly-Gly-Ser is inserted between Pro 617 and Lys 618. In linker

replacement variant, the linker (Asn 615-Pro 620) is replaced by Gly-Gly-Ser-Gly-Gly-Ser.

Figure 10

A

B

1253

1254

Figure 10 A mechanism for differential activation of EGFR by EGF and TGF-α

A, Schematic representations of the ligand-bound extracellular module of EGFR illustrate the

differential modulation of the conformation of the Domain IV legs by TGF-α (left), EGF(middle)

and oncogenic L834R mutation (right). Cryo-EM densities for the Domain IV legs in the

juxtaposed conformation is similarly defined in all three complexes (EGFR(WT):TGF-α,

EGFR(WT):EGF, and EGFR(L834R):EGF). In contrast, density for the Domain IV legs in the

separated conformation is poorly defined in the EGFR(WT):TGF-α complex and best defined in

the EGFR(L834R):EGF complex. Increased stability of the tips-separated conformation of the

extracellular module is correlated with higher level of EGFR activity.

B, Schematic diagrams illustrate two extreme dimeric conformations of the ligands-bound full-

length EGFR, representing a lower activity state (left) and a higher activity state (right). It shows

how different EGFR ligands and oncogenic mutation could generate different EGFR activity by

altering the balance between these dimeric conformations of the full-length EGFR.

1268

Figure 2-figure supplement 1

A   EGFR:EGF reconstituted in nanodiscs

size-exclusion chromatography

negative-stain EM micrograph

2D class averages from
negative-stain EM

B   EGFR:EGF reconstituted in peptidiscs

size-exclusion chromatography

negative-stain EM micrograph

2D class averages from
negative-stain EM

C   EGFR:EGF reconstituted in amphipols

size-exclusion chromatography

negative-stain EM micrograph

2D class averages from
negative-stain EM

1269

1270

Figure 2-figure supplement 1 Reconstitution of full-length human EGFR:EGF complex.

A, Sample preparation of full-length EGFR:EGF reconstituted into nanodiscs.

B, Sample preparation of full-length EGFR:EGF reconstituted into peptidiscs.

C, Sample preparation of full-length EGFR:EGF reconstituted into amphipols.

For each sample preparation, a representative profile of size-exclusion chromatography is shown

on the left, a representative negative-stain micrograph is shown in the middle, and the

representative 2D class averages are shown on the right.

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1290

Figure 3-figure supplement 1

1291

1292

Figure 3-figure supplement 1 Cryo-EM image processing for focused reconstruction on the

extracellular module of full-length EGFR:EGF complex reconstituted in peptidiscs.

A, Representative cryo-EM micrograph after motion-correction.

B, Representative 2D class averages generated from reference-free 2D classification.

C, Fourier shell correlation (FSC) curves output from cryoSPARC v2 Non-uniform refinement

job, for the cryo-EM reconstruction of the juxtaposed conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex

reconstituted in peptidiscs. The resolution is estimated at FSC = 0.143.

D, Fourier shell correlation (FSC) curves output from cryoSPARC v2 Non-uniform refinement

job, for the cryo-EM reconstruction of the separated conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex

reconstituted in peptidiscs. The resolution is estimated at FSC = 0.143.

E, Representative cryo-EM densites for the juxtaposed conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex.

The structural model and the cryo-EM density corresponding to one of the EGF binding site (left)

and the dimerization arm (right, Cys 240-Lys 270) are shown.

1306

Figure 3-figure supplement 2

A

superposition of the Domain IV legs
from crystal structures of EGFR

B

Docking of the Domain IV leg
into cryo-EM density

C

EGFR:EGF
separated

front view

side view

90°

clashes between
Domain IV legs
if the left leg maintains
the same conformation
as the right leg

1307

1308

1309

Figure 3-figure supplement 2 Conformation of the Domain IV leg.

A, Superposition of the Domain IV leg from the dimeric crystal structure of the isolated EGFR

extracellular domains bound to EGF (cyan, PDB code: 3NJP), with the Domain IV legs from seven

different crystal structures of monomeric extracellular domains of EGFR (grey, PDB codes: 4UV7,

5XWD, 1NQL, 3QWQ, 1YY9, 6ARU, 4UIP). This comparison shows that the Domain IV leg is

a fairly rigid structural component.

B, The Domain IV leg from a crystal structure of the isolated EGFR extracellular domains bound

to EGF (PDB code: 3NJP) is fitted into the cryo-EM density corresponding to the flexible leg in

the cryo-EM map for the juxtaposed conformation of the EGFR:EGF complex.

C, The extracellular module of the EGFR:EGF complex in separated conformation is shown in

two orthogonal views. The Domain IV leg shown on the left-hand subunit (grey) is modeled based

on the conformation of Domains III and IV in the right-hand subunit. Maintaining the same

conformation in both legs would lead to steric clashes between the two legs (circled by red dotted

lines), when the extracellular module of EGFR adopts the separated conformation.

Figure 3-table supplement 1
Statistics of cryo-EM data collection and structure determination

	EGFR(WT) :EGF juxtaposed	EGFR(WT) :EGF separated	EGFR(WT) :TGF-α juxtaposed	EGFR(WT) :TGF-α separated	EGFR(L834R) :EGF juxtaposed	EGFR(L834R) :EGF separated
Data collection						
Electron microscope	Titan Krios	Titan Krios	Titan Krios	Titan Krios	Titan Krios	Titan Krios
Camera	Gatan K3	Gatan K3	Gatan K3	Gatan K3	Gatan K3	Gatan K3
Voltage (kV)	300	300	300	300	300	300
Magnification	81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000	81,000
Pixel sise (Å)	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54	0.54
Nominal dose (e⁻/Å²)	50	50	50	50	50	50
Tilt angle (°)	40	40	40	40	40	40
Defocus range (μm)	-0.75 to -1.5	-0.75 to -1.5	-0.75 to -1.5	-0.75 to -1.5	-0.75 to -1.5	-0.75 to -1.5
Image processing						
Micrographs	4,331	4,331	7,406	7,406	5,013	5,013
Final particle number	105,728	89,757	126,471	102,206	123,670	100,615
Map resolution (Å)	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.4
Map sharpening B factor	-97.6	-94.7	-108.2	-108.2	-103.5	-92.8
Model refinement						
Rms deviation bonds (Å)	0.007	0.006	0.004	0.007	0.004	0.004
Rms deviation angles (°)	0.691	0.732	0.639	0.820	0.663	0.705
Map CC (mask)	0.82	0.76	0.79	0.74	0.81	0.72
Validation						
Molprobility score	1.96	2.20	2.05	2.45	1.91	2.19
Clash score	7.50	11.14	8.84	17.78	6.41	10.87
Rotamer outliers (%)	0.09	0.19	0.00	0.38	0.00	0.00
Cβ outliers (%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Ramachandran plot						
Favored (%)	90.08	86.00	88.97	82.75	89.55	86.14
Allowed (%)	9.92	14.00	11.03	17.25	10.45	13.86
Outliers (%)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

1324

1325

Figure 3-table supplement 1 Statistics of cryo-EM data collection and structure

determination

Figure 3-video supplement 1-3

3D variability analysis of the EGFR:EGF complex performed in cryoSPARC v2 (Punjani and Fleet,

2020), shown from the front (Figure3_video s1_front), the side (Figure3_video s2_side), and the

top (Figure3_video s3_top). Note the intersubunit rotation between the two heads and the

corresponding movement of the Domain IV legs.

1333

1334

1335

1336

1337

1338

1339

1340

Figure 9-figure supplement 1

A

B

1341

Figure 9-figure supplement 1 EGF and TGF-α generate different levels of EGFR

autophosphorylation

A, Western-blot analysis of EGFR autophosphorylation in purified full-length EGFR protein

stimulated by EGF and TGF-α. A pan-phosphotyrosine antibody is used to detect total

phosphorylation of the receptor at the indicated time points after the reaction was initiated by

addition of ATP. Coomassie brilliant blue staining shows the total amount of EGFR protein loaded

to each lane on the gel. Two protein standard bands (250 kD and 150 kD) were shown in the middle

lane.

B, Western-blot analysis of EGFR autophosphorylation in HEK293T cells transiently transfected

with EGFR. A pan-phosphotyrosine antibody is used to detect total phosphorylation of the receptor

in cells that are left unstimulated, stimulated by EGF, and stimulated by TGF-α. An anti-FLAG

antibody is used to detect the total amount of EGFR proteins in the cell lysate loaded to each lane.