EMERALD BIOSTRUCTURES

Predicting Success For Crystallographic Fragment Screens

Doug R. Davies Sr. Director of Structural Biology

> FBLD 2010 October 12, 2010

Outline

- (Re)Introduction to Emerald BioStructures
- Fragments of Life[™] library—rationale and design
- Seattle Structural Genomics Center for Infectious Disease (SSGCID)
- Fragment Screening Review: Predicting Successful Fragment Targets From Initial Crystal Structures



Emerald BioStructures: A Collaborative Research Organization With Gene-Structure-Lead-IND Capabilities

- Formerly deCODE biostructures, now independent, privately-owned
- Located on Bainbridge Island, near Seattle, WA
- 55 Employees, 10 Ph.D. crystallographers
- Over 13 years experience in structural biology collaboration
- High throughput pipeline: >1500 crystals/month, >400 structures/year



Fragments of Life: Natural Products & Derivatives



D.R. Davies, et al. (2009). *J Med Chem*. 52(15):4694-715. Discovery of leukotriene A4 hydrolase inhibitors using metabolomics biased fragment crystallography.

Fragments of Life: Protein Structure Mimetics

- Inspiration from recent papers describing small molecule mimics of protein structure.
 - Biros, *et al.* (2007) Heterocyclic alpha-helix mimetics for targeting protein-protein interactions. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.* **17**, 4641.
 - Robinson (2008) Beta-hairpin peptidomimetics: design, structures and biological activities. *Acc. Chem. Res.* **41**, 1278.
- Biaryl compounds screened *in silico* for energy-minimized conformations that match α -, β -, and γ -turns.



D.R. Davies, et al. (2009). *J Med Chem*. 52(15):4694-715. Discovery of leukotriene A4 hydrolase inhibitors using metabolomics biased fragment crystallography.





Fragments of Life Library Physical and Chemical Properties (1444 Compounds)



6

BIOSTRUCTURES

Seattle Structural Genomics Center for Infectious Disease (SSGCID)

- **Role**: Emerald is contractor providing all X-ray services, some construct design, expression and purification
- **Targets**: NIAID Category A-C agents; (re)emerging infectious diseases
- **Goal:** Produce 500+ structures of novel infectious disease targets
- 250th Structure milestone marked September, 2010
- Emerald is the only CRO that collaborates on such a large scale.



Productivity of SSGCID

- 253 structures, 183 unique targets solved to date
- On pace to exceed 500 structures by 2012



New Concepts in Structural Genomics

PSI I-II Concepts (2000-2005):

1. Establish HT structure determination centers, technology development -Reduce time and expense per target

2. Coverage of "fold space"

-Enable prediction of 3D structure from primary sequence

Emerging Concepts in SSGCID:

- 1. Engaging the Scientific Community
- 2. Ensembles of Structures/ Pilot Screening Projects



SSGCID: Engaging The Scientific Community

Community Requests Submitted Via Web:

- http://apps.sbri.org/SSGCIDCommTargReq/
- 489 requests have entered SSGCID pipeline
- 22 structures from 13 targets solved to date



Edwards TE, Phan I, Abendroth J, *et al.* 2010 1.35 Å Structure of a *Burkholderia pseudomallei* Trimeric Autotransporter Adhesin Head. PLoS ONE 5(9): e12803.

Copyright 2010



SSGCID: Ensembles of Ligand-Bound Structures → Pilot Screening



Superposition of four ligand (fragment) bound structures of *Burkholderia pseudomallei* IspF

Why Ensembles?

- Economical use of crystallized protein
- Reveal structural dynamics
- Identify multiple binding sites
- Blueprint for SBDD



Fragment Screening of SSGCID Targets

- Fragments of Life library used for screening of some SSGCID Targets
- Crystallography used as primary screen
 - Emerald has high throughput in-house X-ray system
 - Two Rigaku X-ray generators
 - Four detectors, two ACTOR robots
 - 24 hour unattended data collection possible
 - Semi-automated scripts for data processing, solution
 - Primary screen on amenable crystals in < 1 week
- Targets chosen for desirable crystal properties (diffraction, symmetry)
- Some were "productive": yielding hits that could inspire lead development
- Some were unexpectedly "non-productive": no hits, or crystal artifacts



Why Are Some Crystals Non-Productive?

- Can we predict success of crystallographic screens?
- Crystal system is layer of complexity on top of "ligandability" problem
- Some intractable crystals can be identified by experienced researcher
 - Active site blocked by crystal contacts
 - Active site blocked by binding of component of crystallization solution
- Can we identify other factors that correlate with "productivity"?
 - Survey conditions of 18 fragment screening campaigns
 - 12 "productive" targets
 - 5 SSGCID
 - 1 internal drug discovery target
 - 4 literature examples
 - 2 examples from proprietary work
 - 6 "non-productive" targets
 - 4 SSGCID
 - 2 examples from proprietary work



Non-Productive Fragment Targets



10/12/2010



Productive Fragment Targets



Productive Fragment Targets (Other Published Case Studies)





Factors With No Significant Correlation To Tractability of Crystal for Fragment Screening:

- Enzyme class
- Size
- Oligomeric State
- Precipitant
- pH
- Solvent Content
- Solvent Channel Size

	Productive	Non-Productive	
pH Range	4.2 - 8.5	5.4 - 8.5	
Mean pH	7.03	7.08	



Solvent Channel Analysis

Modified program AREAIMOL (CCP4) to measure largest solvent channel

- Symmetry operators applied to create model of crystal lattice
- Probe sphere size increased until protein monomer at "center" inaccessible
- Biggest sphere that contacts central monomer ~ solvent channel diameter

	Productive	Non-Productive
Solvent Content Range	39% - 62%	39% - 50%
Mean Solvent Content	53.3%	44.2%
Solvent Channel Diameter	18 - 34	15 - 31
Mean Channel Diameter	25.8	25.0



Solvent Channel Analysis

Productive Target

Non-Productive Target



3F0D: solvent content: 45 %, diameter 34 Å

3KHW: solvent content: 43 %, diameter 15 Å

10/12/2010

Copyright 2010

Slide 19



Pocket-Finding Software

- Pocket Finder (P-Pocket) http://www.modelling.leeds.ac.uk/pocketfinder/
 - spatial/directional algorithm based on LIGSITE which effectively pushes a neutral sphere through a protein structure while taking note of its surroundings.
 - Hendlich, M., et al. (1997). J Mol Graph Model. 15, 359-63, 389.
- Q-Sitefinder (Q-Pocket) <u>http://www.modelling.leeds.ac.uk/qsitefinder/</u>
 - Method positions and clusters methyl (CH₃) probes to the protein surface followed by calculation and ranking of likely pockets based on predicted binding energies for such hydrophobic clusters.
 - Laurie AT, Jackson RM (2005). *Bioinformatics*, **21**: 1908-1916
 - F-Pocket <u>http://bioserv.rpbs.univ-paris-diderot.fr/fpocket/</u>
 - Detects protein cavities by scanning, categorizing, clustering and ranking sets of alpha spheres which can be drawn within a 3D protein structure
 - Le Guilloux, V., et al. (2009). *Bioinformatics*. **10,** 168



Pocket Prediction for IspF



Consensus Prediction Gives Best Agreement With Experimental Results



Numbers of predicted pockets (numbers of predicted pockets shown experimentally to bind ligands)

Consensus (C-Pocket): Determined by visual inspection of overlap of pockets-consensus determined when >50% overlap between P,Q and F.

Slide 22



Pocket Factor Analysis and "Pocket Factor"

PRODUCTIVE					
PDB	known sites	total F- Pockets	total C- Pockets	Pocket Factor*	C-Pockets w/ligands
3lr0	1 (2)	10	5	26	1
1wbo	1	15	7	20	1
PRP4	N.A.	11	4	14	N.A.
3f0d	8	14	6	14	4
1h19	5	19	8	13	4
PRP1	N.A.	13	5	13	N.A.
1rrw	1 (4)	28	6	13	4
3ezn	1 (2)	13	5	11	2
3eom	3 (12)	44	8	11	7
1y2b	2 (4)	19	7	11	2
2wi1	1	4	2	10	1
3lrf	1	22	5	6.6	0
	SUM:	212	68		26
	MIN:	4	2	7	
	MAX:	44	8	26	
	MEAN:	18	6	14	
	STDEV:	10	2	5	

NON-PRODUCTIVE							
PDB	known	total F-	total C-	pocket	C-Pockets		
	sites	Pockets	Pockets	factor*	w/ ligands		
3khw	1	10	3	16	0		
3eiz	3 (18)	18	8	7.7	1		
PRP3	N.A.	12	3	7.4	N.A.		
3gvg	1 (2)	12	3	6.3	2		
PRP2	N.A.	4	1	3.9	N.A.		
3gwa	0	22	2	3.1	0		
	SUM	78	20		3		
	MIN	4	1	3			
	MAX	22	8	16			
	MEAN	13	3	7			
	STDEV	6	2	5			

 Pocket factor: total number of C-pockets per volume of protein (in 100 nm³) as calculated by Q-Pocket.

• Average pocket factor for Productive proteins was twice that of Non-productive, at a 98% confidence level (p = 0.024)



Conclusions

- Fragment screening has a place in structural genomics efforts
- Tractability of crystal system to fragment screening is impossible to predict with certainty
- "Pocket Factor" shows statistically significant correlation
 - *Not* absolutely predictive
 - may be a useful metric for prioritizing multiple targets for fragment screening



Acknowledgements

Crystallography /FOL Team (Emerald)











- **Darren Bagley** \leftarrow
 - **Robert Hartley**
- Tom Edwards \leftarrow

4

- Jan Abendroth

- SSGCID
 - Dr. Peter Myler (SBRI)
 - Dr. Gabriele Verani (UW)
 - Dr. Gary Buchko (PNNL)
 - Dr. Wes Van Voorhis (UW)
 - Robin Stacy (SBRI) _
 - **Bart Staker (Emerald)**
 - Alberto Napuli (UW)
 - **SSGCID** Funding from NIAID HHSN272200700057C





25





 \rightarrow

 \rightarrow

- Jeff Christensen
- **Jess Leonard**
- **Michele Dieterich** \leftarrow
 - Bart Staker, Sr. Dir. →
- Alex Burgin, COO \leftarrow
 - Lance Stewart, CEO \rightarrow



10/12/2010

