

Integrative Structure Validation Report

October 09, 2025 - 04:38 PM PDT

The following software was used in the production of this report:

IHMValidation Version 3.0

Python-IHM Version 2.5

MolProbity Version 4.5.2

PDB ID	9A07 pdb_00009a07
PDB-Dev ID	PDBDEV_00000043
Structure Title	Integrative Modeling of a Sin3/HDAC Complex Sub-structure
Structure Authors	Banks CAS; Zhang Y; Miah S; Hao Y; Adams MK; Wen Z; Thornton JL; Florens L; Washburn MP
Deposited on	2019-02-28

This is a PDB-IHM Structure Validation Report.

We welcome your comments at helpdesk@pdb-ihm.org

A user guide is available at https://pdb-ihm.org/validation_help.html with specific help available everywhere you see the  symbol.

List of references used to build this report is available [here](#).

1. Overview

1.1. Summary

This entry consists of 1 model(s). A total of 10 dataset(s) were used to build this entry.


Name	Type	Count
Crosslinking-MS data	Experimental data	1
Mutagenesis data	Experimental data	1
Comparative model	Starting model	4

Name	Type	Count
Experimental model	Starting model	4


1.2. Overall quality [?](#)

This validation report contains model quality assessments for all structures, data quality and fit to model assessments for SAS and crosslinking-MS datasets. Data quality and fit to model assessments for other datasets and model uncertainty are under development. Number of plots is limited to 256.

Model Quality: MolProbity Analysis [?](#)



Fit to Data Used for Modeling [?](#)



2. Model Details [?](#)

2.1. Ensemble information [?](#)

This entry consists of 0 distinct ensemble(s).

2.2. Representation [?](#)

This entry has 1 representation(s).

ID	Model(s)	Entity ID	Molecule name	Chain(s) [auth]	Total residues	Rigid segments	Flexible segments	Model coverage/ Starting model coverage (%)	Scale
1	1	1	SAP30L C terminal	A	90	1-90	-	100.00 / 100.00	Atomic
		2	SAP30L N terminal	B	68	1-68	-	100.00 / 100.00	Atomic
		3	SIN3A	C	122	1-122	-	100.00 / 100.00	Atomic
		4	HDAC1	D	369	1-369	-	100.00 / 100.00	Atomic

2.3. Datasets used for modeling [?](#)

There are 10 unique datasets used to build the models in this entry.

ID	Dataset type	Database name	Data access code
1	Comparative model	Not available	Not available
2	Comparative model	Not available	Not available
3	Comparative model	Not available	Not available
4	Comparative model	Not available	Not available
5	Crosslinking-MS data	MASSIVE	MSV000084311
6	Experimental model	PDB	pdb_000021d7
7	Experimental model	PDB	pdb_00002n1u
8	Experimental model	PDB	pdb_00002n2h
9	Experimental model	PDB	pdb_00005ix0
10	Mutagenesis data	Not available	10.1074/jbc.RA119.009780

2.4. Methodology and software

This entry is a result of 1 distinct protocol(s).

Step number	Protocol ID	Method name	Method type	Method description	Number of computed models	Multi state modeling	Multi scale modeling
1	1	Not available	comparative modeling	Not available	Not available	False	False
2	1	Not available	docking	Not available	200	False	False

There are 2 software packages reported in this entry.

ID	Software name	Software version	Software classification	Software location
1	HADDOCK	Not available	molecular docking	http://haddock.science.uu.nl/services/HADDOCK/
2	SWISS-MODEL	Not available	model building	https://swissmodel.expasy.org

3. Data quality

3.2. Crosslinking-MS

At the moment, data validation is only available for crosslinking-MS data deposited as a fully *compliant* dataset in the *PRIDE Crosslinking* database. Correspondence between crosslinking-MS and entry entities is established using *pyHMMER*. Only residue pairs that passed the reported threshold are used for the analysis. The values in the report have to be interpreted in the context of the experiment (i.e. only a minor fraction of in-situ or in-vivo dataset can be used for modeling).

Crosslinking-MS dataset is not available in the [PRIDE Crosslinking](#) database.

3.4. Mutagenesis

Validation for this section is under development.

4. Model quality ?

For models with atomic structures, MolProbity analysis is performed. For models with coarse-grained or multi-scale structures, excluded volume analysis is performed.

4.1b. MolProbity Analysis ?

Excluded volume satisfaction for the models in the entry are listed below. The Analysed column shows the number of particle-particle or particle-atom pairs for which excluded volume was analysed.

Standard geometry: bond outliers ?

There are no bond length outliers.

Standard geometry: angle outliers ?

There are no bond angle outliers.

Too-close contacts ?

The following all-atom clashscore is based on a MolProbity analysis. All-atom clashscore is defined as the number of clashes found per 1000 atoms (including hydrogen atoms). The table below contains clashscores for all atomic models in this entry.

Model ID	Clash score	Number of clashes
1	5.99	63

There are 63 clashes. The table below contains the detailed list of all clashes based on a MolProbity analysis. Bad clashes are ≥ 0.4 Angstrom.

Atom 1	Atom 2	Clash(Å)	Model ID (Worst)	Models (Total)
D:115:SER:HB3	D:127:ALA:HB1	0.81	1	1
D:29:ARG:HB3	D:300:ILE:HG22	0.72	1	1
D:134:LEU:HD23	D:146:CYS:HA	0.64	1	1
D:119:LEU:HD11	D:289:PRO:HB3	0.62	1	1
D:76:PRO:HA	D:79:MET:HE2	0.60	1	1
D:253:VAL:HG13	D:291:LEU:HD23	0.58	1	1
D:46:MET:HB3	D:315:LEU:HD21	0.58	1	1
D:273:ILE:HD12	D:339:HIS:HA	0.58	1	1
D:264:ASP:HA	D:299:THR:OG1	0.57	1	1
D:237:LYS:HB3	D:238:PRO:HD3	0.57	1	1
C:78:LEU:HD21	C:89:VAL:HG21	0.57	1	1
D:43:TYR:HB2	D:48:ILE:HD11	0.56	1	1
D:240:MET:HA	D:240:MET:HE2	0.56	1	1
D:244:MET:HE1	D:252:VAL:HG21	0.55	1	1
D:138:LYS:HB2	D:141:GLU:HB2	0.55	1	1
C:105:ARG:HA	C:109:LYS:HB2	0.55	1	1
D:235:ILE:HG22	D:358:LYS:HD2	0.55	1	1
D:52:HIS:O	D:110:GLY:HA3	0.55	1	1

Atom 1	Atom 2	Clash(Å)	Model ID (Worst)	Models (Total)
C:63:LEU:HD21	C:74:ILE:HB	0.54	1	1
B:7:LEU:HB3	B:38:LEU:HD11	0.53	1	1
D:164:ARG:HB3	D:247:PHE:CZ	0.53	1	1
D:135:HIS:HB3	D:151:ILE:HD12	0.53	1	1
C:86:VAL:HA	C:89:VAL:HG22	0.52	1	1
D:258:SER:HB2	D:303:VAL:HG22	0.52	1	1
A:50:GLU:O	A:54:ARG:HG2	0.52	1	1
A:86:GLU:O	B:42:LYS:HB2	0.51	1	1
D:5:LYS:HG2	D:124:THR:HA	0.51	1	1
A:55:HIS:O	A:59:ILE:HG13	0.50	1	1
C:30:ILE:O	C:34:LEU:HG	0.50	1	1
D:138:LYS:HD3	D:177:GLY:HA2	0.50	1	1
D:130:TRP:HZ3	D:256:CYS:HB2	0.49	1	1
D:134:LEU:HB3	D:146:CYS:HB3	0.49	1	1
D:264:ASP:HB3	D:267:GLY:HA3	0.48	1	1
C:98:GLU:O	C:102:GLU:HG2	0.48	1	1
B:46:HIS:HA	D:22:GLY:HA3	0.47	1	1
D:35:ASN:OD1	D:326:ASN:HB2	0.47	1	1
D:1:GLY:N	D:287:ASN:HD21	0.47	1	1
A:45:LYS:HA	A:48:LEU:HD12	0.47	1	1
C:31:GLN:HA	C:34:LEU:HD12	0.47	1	1
C:110:VAL:O	C:114:GLN:HG2	0.47	1	1
D:200:PHE:CD1	D:201:PRO:HA	0.47	1	1
D:36:LEU:HD11	D:323:LEU:HD22	0.47	1	1
D:229:ASP:OD1	D:275:GLY:HA3	0.46	1	1
D:273:ILE:HG23	D:306:CYS:HA	0.45	1	1
B:23:PHE:HE2	B:28:GLN:HG2	0.45	1	1
A:77:ASN:HB3	A:80:ARG:HB2	0.44	1	1
D:138:LYS:HE3	D:176:ASP:OD2	0.44	1	1
B:40:ILE:HG12	B:42:LYS:HE3	0.44	1	1
D:94:ASP:O	D:96:PRO:HD3	0.44	1	1
D:51:PRO:HB3	D:111:GLY:HA2	0.43	1	1
D:102:PHE:O	D:106:GLN:HG3	0.43	1	1
C:86:VAL:HB	C:87:PRO:HD3	0.43	1	1
D:279:CYS:O	D:283:VAL:HG23	0.43	1	1

Atom 1	Atom 2	Clash(Å)	Model ID (Worst)	Models (Total)
C:52:GLY:HA2	C:56:GLU:HB3	0.43	1	1
D:189:MET:HG3	D:217:TYR:O	0.43	1	1
C:105:ARG:O	C:110:VAL:HG23	0.42	1	1
D:231:SER:HB3	D:354:LEU:HD11	0.42	1	1
A:32:LYS:HB3	A:32:LYS:HE2	0.41	1	1
C:56:GLU:HG3	C:57:VAL:N	0.41	1	1
D:166:LEU:HD21	D:240:MET:HE1	0.41	1	1
D:259:ASP:OD2	D:296:GLY:HA3	0.41	1	1
D:191:VAL:HG13	D:219:VAL:HB	0.41	1	1
D:163:GLN:HG3	D:164:ARG:HG3	0.41	1	1

Torsion angles: Protein backbone ?

In the following table, Ramachandran outliers are listed. The Analysed column shows the number of residues for which the backbone conformation was analysed.

Model ID	Analysed	Favored	Allowed	Outliers
1	641	599	39	3

There are 3 unique backbone outliers. Detailed list of outliers are tabulated below.

Chain	Res	Type	Models (Total)
A	15	ILE	1
A	86	GLU	1
C	8	ASP	1

Torsion angles : Protein sidechains ?

In the following table, sidechain rotameric outliers are listed. The Analysed column shows the number of residues for which the sidechain conformation was analysed.

Model ID	Analysed	Favored	Allowed	Outliers
1	573	474	53	46

There are 46 unique sidechain outliers. Detailed list of outliers are tabulated below.

Chain	Res	Type	Models (Total)
A	1	THR	1
A	4	ASP	1
A	12	ASP	1
A	13	THR	1
A	14	ASP	1
A	39	THR	1

Chain	Res	Type	Models (Total)
A	80	ARG	1
A	82	ASP	1
A	85	SER	1
B	4	SER	1
B	13	ARG	1
B	34	LYS	1
B	40	ILE	1
B	43	SER	1
B	53	HIS	1
B	63	LYS	1
B	65	LYS	1
C	6	CYS	1
C	7	GLU	1
C	17	LEU	1
C	32	LYS	1
C	50	THR	1
C	54	THR	1
C	55	SER	1
C	73	ASP	1
C	122	SER	1
D	16	ASN	1
D	40	TYR	1
D	80	SER	1
D	83	SER	1
D	119	LEU	1
D	136	HIS	1
D	180	GLU	1
D	184	THR	1
D	190	THR	1
D	199	TYR	1
D	203	THR	1
D	228	ASP	1
D	240	MET	1
D	250	SER	1
D	258	SER	1

Chain	Res	Type	Models (Total)
D	260	SER	1
D	316	ASP	1
D	341	SER	1
D	346	THR	1
D	350	THR	1

5. Fit to Data Used for Modeling Assessment ?

5.2. Crosslinking-MS ?

5.2.1. Restraint types ?


This table summarizes information about crosslinker(s) used for data generation, and how crosslinking information was translated into actual modeling restraints. Restraints assigned "by-residue" are interpreted as between CA atoms. Restraints between coarse-grained beads are indicated as "coarse-grained". *Restraint group* represents a set of crosslinking restraints applied collectively in the modeling.

There are 12 crosslinking restraints combined in 12 restraint groups.

Linker	Residue 1	Atom 1	Residue 2	Atom 2	Restraint type	Distance, Å	Count
DSSO	LYS	CA	LYS	CA	upper bound	30.00	12

Distograms of individual restraints

Distograms (i.e., histogram plots of distances) provide an overview of distributions of distances between residues for which chemical crosslinks were identified. The shift of the distogram relative to the threshold value may indicate a poor model. Restraints with identical thresholds are grouped into one plot. Only the best distance per restraint per model group/ensemble is plotted. Inter- and intramolecular (including self-links) restraints are also grouped into one plot. Distance for a restraint between coarse-grained beads is calculated as a minimal distance between shells; if beads intersect, the distance will be reported as 0.0. A bead with the highest available resolution for a given residue is used for the assessment.




5.2.2. Satisfaction of restraints ?

Satisfaction of restraints is calculated on a *restraint group* (a set of crosslinking restraints applied collectively in the modeling) level. Satisfaction of a restraint group depends on satisfaction of individual restraints in the group and the conditionality (all/any). A restraint group is considered satisfied, if the condition was met in at least one model of the model group/ensemble. The number of measured restraints can be smaller than the total number of restraint groups if crosslinks involve non-modeled residues. Only deposited models are used for validation right now.

State group	State	Model group	# of Deposited models/Total	Restraint group type	Satisfied (%)	Violated (%)	Count (Total=12)
1	1	1	1/1	All	100.00	0.00	12
				Heteromeric links/Intermolecular	100.00	0.00	12

Per-model satisfaction rates in ensembles

Every point represents one model in a model group/ensemble. Where possible, boxplots with quartile marks are also plotted.



5.4. Mutagenesis ?

Validation for this section is under development.

6. Fit to Data Used for Validation Assessment ?

Validation for this section is under development.

Acknowledgments

The development of integrative model validation metrics, implementation of a model validation pipeline, and creation of a validation report for integrative structures are funded by NSF awards to the [PDB-IHM team](#) (DBI-1756248, DBI-2112966, DBI-2112967, DBI-2112968, and DBI-1756250) and awards from NSF, NIH, and DOE to the [RCSB PDB](#) (DBI-2321666, R01GM157729, and DE-SC0019749). The PDB-IHM team and members of the [Sali lab](#) contributed model validation metrics and software packages.

Dr. Jill Trewhella, Dr. Dina Schneidman, and members of the [SASBDB](#) repository are acknowledged for their advice and support in implementing SAS validation methods. Team members from the labs of Dr. Juri Rappsilber, Dr. Alexander Leitner, Dr. Andrea Graziadei, and members of [PRIDE](#) database are acknowledged for their advice and support in implementing crosslinking-MS validation methods. We are grateful to Dr. Shruthi Viswanath for discussions about uncertainty assessment of integrative structural models.

Members of the [wwPDB Integrative/Hybrid Methods Task Force](#) provided recommendations and community support for the project.