Protein:Protein Association Analyzed by Alanine Scanning Mutagenesis

Pedro Alexandrino Fernandes,

Dep. Chemistry & Biochemistry, University of Porto, Portugal

pedro.fernandes@fc.up.pt





Mostly non-covalent

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature



0

0

- Quaternary Structure
 - Signal transduction
 - Intercell Communication
- Post-translational modifications

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Very peculiar structure

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Very peculiar structure



Large (mostly 1000 – 2000 Å²)
Flat
Hydrophobic, with hydrophilic spots

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Very peculiar structure

Very peculiar energetics

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Very peculiar structure

Very peculiar energetics



- Most residues do not contribute for binding
- A few residues contribute the most
- These are spatially complementary

Mostly non-covalent

Ubiquitous in nature

Very peculiar structure

Very peculiar energetics



- Most residues do not contribute for binding
- A few residues contribute the most
- These are spatially complementary

To interfere with protein:protein association







ASM measures the free energy contribution of **each sidechain** for protein binding by the following procedure:

ASM measures the free energy contribution of **each sidechain** for protein binding by the following procedure:

1. Measure ΔG_{bind} for the wild type complex

ASM measures the free energy contribution of **each sidechain** for protein binding by the following procedure:

1. Measure ΔG_{bind} for the wild type complex

2. Mutate selected residue for Ala















ASM measures the free energy contribution of **each sidechain** for protein binding by the following procedure:

1. Measure ΔG_{bind} for the wild type complex

2. Mutate selected residue for Ala

3. Measure $\Delta G'_{bind}$ for the mutant complex

ASM measures the free energy contribution of **each sidechain** for protein binding by the following procedure:

1. Measure ΔG_{bind} for the wild type complex

2. Mutate selected residue for Ala

3. Measure $\Delta G'_{bind}$ for the mutant complex

4. Calculate $\Delta \Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G'_{bind} - \Delta G_{bind}$

How to measure ΔG_{bind} ?



MM-GBSA



MM-GBSA MM-PBSA



MM-GBSA MM-PBSA FEP



MM-GBSA MM-PBSA FEP TI











MM-PBSA

















MM-PBSA





MM-PBSA



$$\Delta\Delta G_{bind} = \Delta G'_{bind} - \Delta G_{bind}$$
Alanine Scanning Mutagenesis



Single MD Protocol



Single MD Protocol



Single vs Multiple MD Protocols...



Single vs Multiple MD Protocols...



How to account for the interface reorganization?



How to account for the interface reorganization?



•the different ϵ account for the different degree of relaxation of the interface when different types of amino acids are mutated for Ala

How to account for the interface reorganization?



•the stronger the interactions these amino acids establish, the more extensive the relaxation should be, and the greater ϵ must be to mimic these effects.

Calibration – Results of \approx 50 mutants

ZipA:FtsZ

IgG:C2 frag. of protein G



immunoglobulin:lysozyme



MUE= 0.8 Kcal/mol

MaxUE= 2.4 Kcal/mol

Overall success close to 100% in the detection of hot-spots

J Comput Chem, 28, 644, 2007

Theor Chem Acc, 120, 533, 2008

Calibrated &-MMPBSA as accurate as TI

3 Protein:Protein complexes, 25 mutations

 $\Delta\Delta G \text{ (theory vs. exp.) with TI:} 1.5 \text{ kcal·mol}^{-1} \text{ (max: 5.1 kcal·mol}^{-1)}$ $\Delta\Delta G \text{ (theory vs. exp.) with } \mathbf{\mathcal{E}}\text{-MMPBSA:} 1.2 \text{ kcal·mol}^{-1} \text{ (max: 4.7 kcal·mol}^{-1)}$



J. Chem. Theory Comput. 1311, 2013

Calibrated &-MMPBSA as accurate as TI

 ϵ -MMPBSA CPU Time: ≈90 % MD + ≈10% MM-PBSA (the last grows linearly with n° mutations) TI CPU Time: longer MDs, growing linearly with n° mutations



J. Chem. Theory Comput. 1311, 2013

Map whole protein interfaces with a single MD



J PHYS CHEM B, 2525 2010



J PHYS CHEM B, 2525 2010

Map whole protein interfaces with a single MD

Quantify the backbone contribution for ΔG_{bind}



J PHYS CHEM B, 2525 2010

Map whole protein interfaces with a single MD

Quantify the backbone contribution for ΔG_{bind}

Decompose ΔG bind in electrostatic, dispersive and solvation contributions



J PHYS CHEM B, 2525 2010

Map whole protein interfaces with a single MD

Quantify the backbone contribution for ΔG_{bind}

Decompose ΔG bind in electrostatic, dispersive and solvation contributions

Analyse hot spot complimentarity and detect druggable sites







J PHYS CHEM B, 2525 2010

Map whole protein interfaces with a single MD

Quantify the backbone contribution for Δ Gbind

Decompose Δ Gbind in electrostatic, dispersive and solvation contributions

Analyse hot spot complimentarity and detect druggable sites

Example: HIV-1 Protease



Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Inhibition controls HIV-1 proliferation

Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Inhibition controls HIV-1 proliferation

Present in all HAART therapies

Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Inhibition controls HIV-1 proliferation

Present in all HAART therapies

Develops resistance to antiretrovirals

Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Inhibition controls HIV-1 proliferation

Present in all HAART therapies

Develops resistance to antiretrovirals

Dimmerization Inhibitors?

Active Site at the Dimmer Interface



Cleaves polyproteins into functional units

Inhibition controls HIV-1 proliferation

Present in all HAART therapies

Develops resistance to antiretrovirals





Mutation Subunit β Difference SASA lost in SASA lost in Subunit α Average Dimmer (Å2) $\Delta\Delta G_{\text{Binding}}$ $\Delta\Delta G_{\text{Binding}}$ between chains Dimmer $\Delta\Delta G_{Binding}$ Gln2Ala 1.51±0.53 2.21±0.53 1.86 0.70 17.7% 50.4 lle3Ala 1.73±0.55 1.86±0.56 1.80 0.13 19.1% 52.6 Thr4Ala 0.35±0.54 0.38±0.53 0.37 0.03 7.7% 18.5 Leu5Ala 4.98±0.55 5.02±0.55 5.00 0.04 45.6% 129.4 Trp6Ala 2.49±0.54 3.76±0.54 3.13 1.27 13.7% 49.5 Gln7Ala 0.24±0.53 0.24±0.53 0.24 0.00 2.6% 7.5 Arg8Ala 2.07 0.43 17.9% 62.2 2.28±0.53 1.85±0.54 Val11Ala 0.37±0.56 0.44±0.55 0.41 0.07 2.7% 7.0 Leu23Ala 0.88±0.55 0.96 7.2% 20.3 1.03 ± 0.55 0.15 Leu24Ala 1.08 ± 0.55 1.36±0.55 1.22 0.28 11.4% 32.3 Asp25Ala 0.94±0.53 4.44±0.53 2.69 3.50 14.3% 35.0



Null Spots Hot Spots Warm Spots Total **Overall results** 5 26 35 4 ΔΔGBinding 6,0 2,7 0,8 1,8 1,5 $\Delta\Delta E_{electrostatic}$ -0,8 6,8 1,1 1,9 ΔΔΕνdw 7,2 1,8 0,9 $\Delta\Delta G$ PolarSolv -0,8 -6,1 -1,2 -1,7 0,3 0,1 0,0 0,1 $\Delta\Delta G_{NonPolarSolv}$ -1,5 Hydrophilic Contribution 0,8 -0,1 -0,2 Hydrophobic Contribution 7,5 1,9 0,9 2,0 SASA lost upon Dimerization (%) 45% 25% 8% 15% SASA lost upon Dimerization $(Å^2)$ 134 66 22 43



Hot Spots Warm Spots Null Spots Total **Overall results** 26 35 4 6,0 ΔΔGBinding 2,7 0,8 1,8 $\Delta\Delta E_{electrostatic}$ -0,8 6,8 1,1 1,5 $\Delta \Delta E_{vdW}$ 7,2 1,8 0,9 1,9 -0,8 $\Delta\Delta G$ PolarSolv -6,1 -1,2 -1,7 0,3 0,1 0,0 0,1 $\Delta\Delta G$ NonPolarSolv -1,5 Hydrophilic Contribution 0,8 -0,1 -0,2 7,5 Hydrophobic Contribution 1,9 0,9 2,0 SASA lost upon Dimerization (%) 45% 25% 8% 15% SASA lost upon Dimerization $(Å^2)$ 134 66 22 43



Null Spots Hot Spots Warm Spots Total **Overall results** 5 4 26 35 ΔΔGBinding 6,0 2,7 0,8 1,8 1,5 $\Delta\Delta E_{electrostatic}$ -0,8 6,8 1,1 1,9 ΔΔΕνdw 7,2 1,8 0,9 -0,8 $\Delta\Delta G$ PolarSolv -6,1 -1,2 -1,7 0,3 0,1 0,0 0,1 $\Delta\Delta G_{NonPolarSolv}$ -1,5 Hydrophilic Contribution 0,8 -0,1 -0,2 Hydrophobic Contribution 7,5 1,9 0,9 2,0 SASA lost upon Dimerization (%) 45% 25% 8% 15% SASA lost upon Dimerization $(Å^2)$ 134 66 22 43



Null Spots **Hot Spots** Warm Spots Total **Overall results** 5 26 35 4 ΔΔGBinding 6,0 2,7 0,8 1,8 1,5 $\Delta\Delta E_{electrostatic}$ -0,8 6,8 1,1 1,9 ΔΔΕνdw 7,2 1,8 0,9 $\Delta\Delta G$ PolarSolv -0,8 -6,1 -1,2 -1,7 0,3 0,1 0,0 0,1 $\Delta\Delta G_{NonPolarSolv}$ -1,5 Hydrophilic Contribution 0,8 -0,1 -0,2 Hydrophobic Contribution 7,5 1,9 0,9 2,0 SASA lost upon Dimerization (%) 45% 25% 8% 15% SASA lost upon Dimerization $(Å^2)$ 134 66 22 43





Interface Map





Interface Pockets ...

,

HMG-CoA-Reductase



Cholesterol

- High blood cholesterol causes atherosclerosis, which is related to other diseases:
 - Ischemic heart disease (IHD).
 - Stroke.
- In 2008, IHD was the <u>number 1</u> leading cause of death (12.8%).
- Stroke and other cardiovascular diseases was <u>number 2</u> (10.8%).
- Hypercholesterolemia affects most people after a certain age.
 - The number of young people who suffer from high blood cholesterol is rising.



Structure of HMG-CoA Reductase


Molecular Dynamics

10 ns Molecular Dynamics



Interface Studied



Entire interface is too large... Over 120 mutations per subunit.

So: Buried surface > 40 $Å^2$.

Total mutations: 232 residues (58 for each subunit)

ASM and SASA Results

- Hot spots are usually residues which have very little surface exposed to the solvent upon dimerization.
- SASA allows us to evaluate the surface of a residue that is exposed.

	Null Spots	Warm Spots	Hot Spots	Total
Residues identified in each monomer	23	25	10	58
Average $\Delta\Delta G_{ extsf{binding}}$ (kcal/mol)	0.7	2.7	5.6	2.4
Average SASA in Monomer (Ų)	82.4	86.6	102.6	90.5
Average SASA in Dimer (Ų)	29.6	16.7	8.5	18.3
Average SASA lost upon Dimeration (Å ²)	52.8	69.9	94.0	72.3
Average SASA lost upon Dimeration (%)	19.5	25.0	33.1	25.9

ASM Results













Protein:Protein Association Analyzed by Alanine Scanning Mutagenesis

Pedro Alexandrino Fernandes,

Dep. Chemistry & Biochemistry, University of Porto, Portugal

pedro.fernandes@fc.up.pt

