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a b s t r a c t
Excessive activity of neutrophils has been linked to many pathological conditions, including rheumatoid arthritis, cancer and Alzheimer’s disease. Calpain-I is a Ca2+-dependent protease that plays a key role in the extravasation of neutrophils from the blood stream prior to causing damage within affected tissues. Inhibition of calpain-I with small molecule mercaptoacrylic acid derivatives slows the cell spreading process of live neutrophils and so these compounds represent promising drug leads. Here we present the 2.05 and 2.03 Å co-crystal X-ray structures of the pentaEF hand region, PEF(S), from human calpain with (Z)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid and (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid. In both structures, the a-mercaptoacrylic acid derivatives bind between two a-helices in a hydrophobic pocket that is also exploited by a leucine residue of the endogenous regulatory calpain inhibitor calpastatin. Hydrophobic interactions between the aromatic rings of both inhibitors and the aliphatic residues of the pocket are integral for tight binding. In the case of (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid, hydrogen bonds form between the mercaptoacrylic acid substituent lying outside the pocket and the protein and the carboxylate group is coplanar with the aromatic ring system. Multiple conformations of (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid were found within the pocket. The increased potency of (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid relative to (Z)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid may be a consequence of the indole group binding more deeply in the hydrophobic pocket of PEF(S) than the phenyl ring.

1. Introduction

The calpain family includes 15 known calcium activated cysteine proteases (Sorimachi et al., 2011), of which calpain-I and calpain-II are the two best-studied isoforms (Campbell and Davies, 2012; Sorimachi et al., 2011). They are heterodimeric proteins expressed in the cytosol and comprised of a large (80,000 M₀) and a small subunit (30,000 M₀). The large subunit contains the active site within the CysPe domain along with a calcium binding domain, PEF(L), a postulated phospholipid binding domain (C2L) and a N-terminal anchor helix (Sorimachi et al., 2011). The small subunits (CAPNS1) of calpain-I and calpain-II are identical (Ohno et al., 1986). CAPNS1 is composed of a glycine rich domain and a second calcium binding domain, PEF(S). The large subunit varies significantly between the two isoforms with an overall sequence identity of 62% (Imajoh et al., 1988). The concentration of calcium that is required for activation in vitro is 50 lM and 0.35 mM for calpain-I and calpain-II, respectively (Goll et al., 2003).

Numerous functions have been postulated for calpain-I and calpain-II in the human body with links to signal transduction (Sato and Kawashima, 2001), cell motility (Hallett and Dewitt, 2007), apoptosis (Harwood et al., 2005; Orrenius et al., 2003) and the cell cycle (Schollmeyer, 1988; Zhang et al., 1997). The lack of availability of isoform specific calpain inhibitors has hindered elucidation of their exact physiological roles. Calpain-I and calpain-II are both inhibited by the regulatory endogenous protein calpastatin (Wendt et al., 2004). Calpastatin contains four inhibitory domains and each of these domains is capable of inactivating one molecule of calpain (Emori et al., 1987; Hanna et al., 2007). Each inhibitory domain is composed of three binding regions that bind to different regions of the heterodimeric protease (Hanna et al., 2008). Regions A and...
C bind to the calcium binding domains PEF(L) and PEF(S), respectively, and region B binds to the CysPc domain (Hanna et al., 2008; Maki et al., 1987).

Decreased levels of calpastatin as well as over-activation of calpain-I are linked to a wide variety of pathological conditions. These include Alzheimer’s disease (Saito et al., 1993), rheumatoid arthritis (Miller et al., 2013), cancer (Storr et al., 2011) and ischemic cell death (Tontchev and Yamashima, 1999). Calpain I mediates the cell spreading behaviour of neutrophils, a necessary preliminary to their extravasation through the blood vessel wall and migration towards pathogens or sites of tissue damage (Hallett and Dewitt, 2007). Hence calpain-I is a potential target for small molecule intervention (Miller et al., 2013). Previously, we have reported the synthesis of a series of cell permeable α-mercaptoacrylic acid derivatives that act as potent inhibitors of calpain-I and cause decreased rates of cell spreading in live neutrophils (Adams et al., 2012). We now report the binding mode of two α-mercaptoacrylic acid derivatives with the calcium binding domain of human PEF(S). PEF(S) is composed of nine α-helices that fold to form five EF-hands. Four of these EF-hands bind calcium and the fifth is used to form the heterodimeric interface with the corresponding EF-hand of PEF(L) of the large subunit (Hosfield et al., 1999; Strobl et al., 2000). The structure of PEF(S) (PDB:1ALV) (Murshudov et al., 1997) is shown that 2.3. Molecular replacement and refinement

The structures were solved with molecular replacement using Phaser (CCP4i) (McCoy, 2007). The search model was derived from the structure of PEF(S) (PDB:1ALV) (Lin et al., 1997b; McCoy, 2007). The solution obtained was adjusted with the COOT program (Crys-talllographic Object-Oriented Toolkit) (Emsley and Cowtan, 2004) for molecular model building and completion, and the model was refined further with the Refmac5 refinement program (Murshudov et al., 1997). The models for the small molecules 1 and 2 were created with ProDrg (Schuttekoef and van Aalten, 2004).

3. Results and discussion

The data collection and refinement statistics for human PEF(S) and PEF(S) complexed with 1 and 2 are reported in Table 1. The structure of porcine unliganded-PEF(S) was also determined for completeness (Table S1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crystal form</th>
<th>Unligand-PEF(S)</th>
<th>PEF(S)-1</th>
<th>PEF(S)-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>X-ray source</td>
<td>Wavelength (Å)</td>
<td>Space group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS I03</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>49.63</td>
<td>P121h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS I04</td>
<td>0.9637</td>
<td>49.54</td>
<td>P121h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS I04-1</td>
<td>0.9673</td>
<td>79.00</td>
<td>P121h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1. Unliganded structure of PEF(S)

Previous structures of isolated PEF(S) have been derived from Sus scrofa (wild boar), while the structures discussed in this work are for human PEF(S). There is a difference of five amino acids between the human and porcine forms of PEF(S), namely K173R, V183T, G190C, S211N and G221S. These amino acids have little effect on the overall structure of PEF(S) as the refined structure...
Table 2
The r.m.s.d. values for the side chains in the hydrophobic pocket of PEF(S) on binding of 1 and 2 to both chains in the homodimer (N/A = more than one conformation of the side chain in the unliganded-PEF(S)). Comparison between unliganded-PEF(S), PEF(S)-1 and PEF(S)-2 carried out using Superpose in the CCP4 package (Bailey, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>Unliganded-PEF(S)/PEF(S)-1 r.m.s.d.</th>
<th>Unliganded-PEF(S)/PEF(S)-2 r.m.s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chain A (Å)</td>
<td>Chain B (Å)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L124</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V127</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V128</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H131</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F139</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W168</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H171</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q175</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F226</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2. PEF(S) with inhibitors bound

The two inhibitors (Z)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid (1) and (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid (2) both bind between the second and fourth α-helix of PEF(S) (Fig. 1). This pocket is also known to accommodate a leucine residue from the calpastatin binding region C and another α-mercaptoacrylic acid PD150606 (Hanna et al., 2008; Lin et al., 1997b; Todd et al., 2003). To accommodate both ligands the side chain of Q175 that normally occupies this pocket is driven away to form a cavity for the ligand (Fig. 2). R.m.s.d. calculations of the side chains within the hydrophobic pocket using Superpose (Bailey, 1994) indicated that Q175 of protein chain A showed the most significant movement within the protein upon binding an inhibitor; the values for r.m.s.d. were 2.32 and 2.62 Å for 1 and 2, respectively (Table 2). These values also indicate that L124 and V127 significantly alter their conformation upon ligand binding (Table 2). L124 rotates and V127 shifts to accommodate the ligand. The refined structures indicate that the phenyl ring of F139 undergoes a translational shift on compound 1 binding but this shift is not observed in the complex of PEF(S) with 2 (Table 2).

The movement of these residues can be seen more clearly with a surface diagram of the protein (Fig. 2) as there is no hydrophobic pocket observed in the surface representation of unliganded-PEF(S), due to the pocket being filled by Q175, L124 and V127 (Fig. 2). In the presence of the inhibitors the residues within the
pocket move to accommodate the aromatic rings of both 1 and 2 (Fig. 2). The volume of the pocket is dependent on the size of the aromatic ring and the pocket is slightly larger when 2 is bound (Fig. 2). In chain A of PEF(S)-2 two separate conformations of the ligand are visible within the pocket suggesting that the pocket might be able to accommodate ligands larger than indoles (Fig. 2).

The 4-chlorophenyl ring of 1 sits inside the hydrophobic pocket with the hydrophilic a-mercaptoacrylic acid substituent adopting a conformation perpendicular to the aromatic ring in chains A and B of the homodimer (Fig. 3). The majority of interactions are within the hydrophobic pocket itself. The CCP4i program Contact (Bailey, 1994) indicated that van der Waals (vdW) contacts are pre-dicted within 4 Å between the 4-chlorophenyl group and the alkyl chains of K173 and Q175 as well as H131, W168, L127, I171 and F226. No hydrogen bonds or other polar contacts were observed between the mercaptoacrylic acid substituent and the protein.

Compound 2 adopts two separate conformations in each of the monomers of PEF(S) in the asymmetric unit. In chain A, the electron density map indicated that the a-mercaptoacrylic acid lies perpendicular to the aromatic ring in a conformation similar to that found for 1. In chain B on the other hand 2 the hydrophobic group is coplanar with the aromatic ring (Fig. 3). For chain A, 2 adopts two conformations in the hydrophobic pocket, with the indole ring flipped 180° relative to the other. Hence the NH group of the indole ring and the thiol of the mercaptoacrylic acid sub-tstituent interact with different residues inside the pocket. There are over 50 vdW interactions between the residues within the hydrophobic pocket and the two conformations of 2 in chain A. Fewer interactions were observed when the inhibitor lies in the fully pla-nar conformation within the pocket seen in chain B, despite the hydrogen bond that forms between the carboxylic acid and Ne2 of Q175, at 3.0 Å.

The size of the aromatic ring system is an important factor for determining the affinity of PEF(S) for the mercaptoacrylic acid inhibitors. The binding pocket is flexible and able to enlarge to accommodate the larger indole ring of 2 in addition to the larger halogen atom relative to 1. The combination of the ring system, halogen type and the flexible nature of the pocket may explain the higher affinity of 2 over 1 towards calpain-I. With increased hydrophobic contact with the protein, 2 will bind more tightly within the pocket. The two different conformations of 2 found in the structure of PEF(S) with the ligand bound indicate that specific bonding interactions with the NH group are not important for tight binding so that even larger aromatic ring systems could perhaps be accommodated.

Taken together, the flexibility of the binding site inaccompanied by different aromatic ring conformations and the lack of polar contacts with the surface of the protein suggest that significant scope exists to refine our inhibitor design. Since the mercaptoacrylic acid unit does not seem to be directly involved in binding or establishing selectivity to PEF(S), it might be replaced with more synthetically accessible groups or used as a spacer to target other interactions of the protein surface. However, although both inhibitors bind to the calcium binding domain PEF(S) and are hence allosteric modulators of calpain-I, the second calcium binding domain within the heterodimeric structure, PEF(L), may also bind these compounds as it is very similar in structure and also contains a binding groove occupied by a helical domain of calpastatin in the inhibitory complex (Hanna et al., 2008). It is the binding of the inhibitors to this domain that may explain the discrepancy in inhibition constants between the two major calpain isoforms since PEF(S) is identical in calpains I and II (Adams et al., 2012) and the mercaptoacrylic acid may play a greater role in this interaction. The inhibitors mode of action may disrupt the overall movement of the domains that occurs during the activation of the protease.

4. Conclusion
Since human calpain I is a potential drug target, it is preferable to study the interactions of inhibitors with the human form of the enzyme. Here we report the first crystal structure of human calpain PEF(S). For completeness we also redetermined the crystal structure of unliganded-PEF(S) from Sus scrofa at 1.79 Å resolution (PDB: 4PHN) and found that it was highly similar to the structure of the human homologue. The excellent quality of the crystals obtained enabled solution of the structures to high resolution hence allowing observation of multiple conformations of the inhibitors in the co-crystals.

The 2.03 and 2.05 Å structures of both (Z)-3-(5-bromoindol-3-yl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid and (Z)-3-(4-chlorophenyl)-2-mercaptoacrylic acid bound to the allosteric calcium binding domain PEF(S) revealed that the binding pocket is flexible enabling a mul-titude of van der Waals interactions to tightly bind the a-mercaptoacrylic acids. To form hydrogen bonds the a-mercaptoacrylic acid moiety needs to remain in the plane of the aromatic ring but it seems likely that the hydrophilic interactions are not critical for the affinity of these compounds to the protein since they are only observed in one structure. Hydrophobic interactions are key for the stability of the complex. With these new structures in hand new compounds can be developed that are more selective and potent inhibitors of both calpain-I and calpain II and used for the elucidation of the physiological role of the protease.
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