Structural transition of ETS1 from auto-inhibited to functional state upon association with p16^{INK4a} native and mutated promoter region

Kannan Muthu, Manivel Panneerselvam, Nishith Saurav Topno and Krishna Ramadas* Centre for Bioinformatics, Pondicherry University, Puducherry, India-605014

*Corresponding Author Dr. R. Krishna, Assistant Professor, Centre for Bioinformatics, Pondicherry University Puducherry-605014

Supplementary methods

T-Pad analysis

Understanding the protein plasticity plays a key role in molecular recognition and numerous cellular processes like metabolism, protein aggregation, gene expression and molecular signaling ¹⁻⁴. T-pad analysis is performed on residue-by-residue to identify flexible and rigid sites in proteins. This method also pinpoints backbone transitions concerning two conformations of Ramachandran plot which could subsequently explain the structural adaptation through its hinge point in a molecular mechanism. Specifically, in our case we used T-pad analysis to understand the structural transition of ETS1 protein residues upon binding with native and mutated p16^{INK4a} promoter region. Accordingly, each 50 ns trajectory of native and mutated complexes were prepared by removing the water molecules, ions and un-equilibrated trajectories by using the triconv tool and used for T-pad analysis. Previously, the protein plasticity was described based on the circular spread Ramachandran angles Φ or ψ (CS Φ or CS ψ) but the protein backbone conformation was not accounted when using these angular dispersion indices. Hence, Protein Angular Dispersion (PAD ω), a new quantity was introduced to overcome these complications and by the assessment of both CS ω and PAD ω , protein backbone plasticity can be enumerated clearly. PAD ω is advantageous over CS ω due to the two features: i) the function ω ($\omega = \Phi + \psi$) is dependent on both the Ramachandran angles; ii) and it is formulated in the range between 0° and 180° ⁵.

Supplementary figure legends:

S1: The interaction of ETS1 (green) with A) Native_ $p16^{INK4a}$, B) M1_ $p16^{INK4a}$, C) M2_ $p16^{INK4a}$ and D) M3_ $p16^{INK4a}$. Color codes; ETS1 protein: green, Native_ $p16^{INK4a}$: Cyan, M1_ $p16^{INK4a}$: Cornflower blue, M2_ $p16^{INK4a}$: Purple and M3_ $p16^{INK4a}$: Gray. Here, atoms are shown in heteroatom type.

S2: The major and minor groove width of native and mutated p16^{INK4a} promoters with ETS1 protein.

S3: The structural transition of ETS1 in complex with M2_p16^{INK4a} promoter. A) Describes the four types of mechanism governing folding of HI1 helix and changes in DNA bending. The docked (protein: plum and DNA: tan) and free energy represented structure (protein: green and DNA: purple) superimposed and explains the changes in the protein (orange arrow) and DNA (black arrow). Mechanism I) the hydrophobic interaction formed between P334 and (green spheres) DNA, loss of triangle basic patch interaction (blue sphere) and triplet residues contribution (orange spheres) are shown. Mechanism II) the series of hydrophobic interaction (residues yellow spheres) and hydrogen bond (green spheres) formed between H2 and H1 helix. Mechanism III) defines the hydrophobic interaction between H1 and HI2 helix. Mechanism IV) folding of HI1 helix and consequent basic to acidic patch and hydrophobic interaction were shown. (B) *Roll (\rho) - Twist (\Omega)* plot, (C) *Slide (D_y) - Twist (\Omega)* plot and (D) major (straight line) - minor groove (dotted line) width parameters explain the mode of DNA distortion. The reference (B and C) / docked (D) and free energy representative (B, C, D) DNA is shown in black and red, respectively. The shaded band (in C) shows the conformational channel responsible for naked DNA mode I distortion.

S4: The structural transition of ETS1 in complex with M3_p16^{INK4a} promoter. A) Describes the four types of mechanism governing folding of HI1 helix and changes in DNA bending. The docked (protein: plum and DNA: tan) and free energy represented structure (protein: green and DNA: gray) superimposed and explains the changes in the protein (orange arrow) and DNA (black arrow). Mechanism I) the hydrophobic interaction formed between P334 and (green spheres) DNA, loss of triangle basic patch interaction (blue spheres) and triplet residues

contribution (orange spheres) are shown. Mechanism II) the series of hydrophobic interaction (yellow spheres) and hydrogen bond (green spheres) formed between H2 and H1 helix. Mechanism III) defines the hydrophobic interaction formed between H1 and HI2 helix. Mechanism IV) folding of HI1 helix and consequent basic to acidic patch and hydrophobic interaction formed. (B) *Roll (\rho) - Twist (\Omega)* plot, (C) *Slide (D_y) - Twist (\Omega)* plot and (D) major (straight line) - minor groove (dotted line) width parameters explain the mode of DNA distortion. The reference (B and C) / docked (D) and free energy representative (B, C, D) DNA is shown in black and red, respectively. The shaded band (in C) shows the conformational channel responsible for naked DNA mode I distortion.

Supplementary Table legends

ST1: The parameters, *Roll, Slide, Twist*, H-twist, minor and major groove width calculated using 3DNA tool for the selected single nucleotide base pair steps in each free energy representative DNA structure are listed. The high *Roll* values of single nucleotide base pair steps highlighted in bold and discussed.

ST2: The distance of helical orientation and number of hydrogen bond maintained between the helices was calculated throughout the simulation and listed here. The ETS domain helical distance was highlighted in bold.

S1:





S2:

S3:



S4:



Representative	Base pair step		Roll	Slide	Twist	H-	Minor	Major	DNA
structure			ρ	D _v	Ω	twist	Width	Width	form
N_P16 ^{INK4a} – ETS1	4	CG/CG	12.92	-0.35	31.78	34.33	13.6	20.7	В
	5	GG/CC	6.24	-2.07	26.96	27.76	11.7	22.5	-
	6	GA/TC	1.19	-1.45	33.49	33.52	10.9	22.6	-
	10	AA/TT	-0.48	-0.46	20.64	20.87	12.2	22.2	-
	11	AG/CT	16.19	0.26	35.82	39.52	12.0	18.8	В
	12	GA/TC	-2.15	-0.01	40.24	40.30	9.7	16.8	В
	Avg		2.17	-0.30	30.58	30.57			
	S.D		6.43	1.12	10.89	13.57			
M1_P16 ^{INK4a} – ETS1	3	CC/GG	16.16	-1.36	34.34	38.70	9.4	21.3	В
	4	CC/GG	-0.94	-0.81	36.19	36.32	9.7	22.8	В
	5	CC/GG	7.42	-0.68	37.44	38.17	12.7	22.9	В
	6	CA/TG	8.80	0.66	11.92	15.00	15.6	18.6	B
	10	AA/TT	-4.16	-1.22	35.96	36.25	10.3	23.3	В
	11	AG/CT	0.19	-1.18	31.78	32.19	12.5	24.5	-
	12	GA/TC	18.77	-1.44	31.43	33.11	14.5	22.8	-
	Avg		5.71	-0.43	29.95	32.00			
	S.D		8.46	0.97	8.20	7.25			
M2_P16 ^{INK4a}	3	CC/GG	3.71	-1.91	22.08	22.87	11.1	23.3	-
– ETS1	4	CG/CG	5.15	-0.37	20.26	21.61	13.8	22.6	В
	5	GG/CC	11.06	0.09	35.71	37.82	14.0	19.4	В
	7	AT/AT	15.90	-0.66	33.07	37.31	14.3	17.6	В
	8	TT/AA	7.88	-0.98	17.54	23.48	13.5	19.3	-
	9	TA/TA	2.83	0.62	41.58	41.83	11.2	25.3	В
	Avg		7.40	-0.68	26.81	27.37			
	S.D		8.74	0.76	16.40	20.63			
M3_P16 ^{INK4a}	3	CC/GG	11.45	0.00	30.54	32.59	13.7	18.9	B
– ETS1	4	CC/GG	-0.98	-1.56	28.88	29.00	12.9	19.6	В
	5	CC/GG	11.20	-1.91	31.79	33.93	13.3	20.6	B
	8	TT/AA	5.30	-0.20	36.25	36.79	11.8	22.3	В
	9	TA/TA	14.50	-0.48	32.91	36.38	11.1	19.1	B
	10	AA/TT	-2.63	-0.78	35.04	35.30	11.4	20.7	В
	11	AG/CT	-4.96	-0.45	38.09	38.50	11.4	21.6	В
	12	GA/TC	16.06	0.72	18.70	24.50	13.0	20.2	-
	Avg		5.93	-0.44	31.60	33.17			
	S.D		6.58	0.80	5.28	4.47			

ST1:

	~
ST.	·)•
$\mathbf{D}\mathbf{I}$	4.

Complex-	N_P16 ^{INK4a} -	M1_P16 ^{INK4a} -	M2_P16 ^{INK4a} -	M3_P16 ^{INK4a} -					
simulation data	ETS1	ETS1	ETS1	ETS1					
Distance of helices and sheet (Å)									
H1-βsheet	11.5	11.5	11.7	11.5					
H1-H2	11.5	11.25	11.5	11.5					
H1-H3	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.5					
H2- βsheet	17.5	17.5	17.8	17.5					
Н2-Н3	12.0	12.3	12.5	12.3					
H3- βsheet	12.5	12.3	12.3	11.5					
HI2-H4	13.0	12.0	11.3	12.3					
Hydrogen bond between the helices and sheet (number)									
H1-βsheet	1	1	1	1					
H1-H2	3	3	3-1 maintains &	3					
			2 rarely						
H1-H3	1	1	1 rarely	1					
Н2-Н3	1	0	1 rarely	1 rarely					
H3- βsheet	2	1 rarely	2-1 maintain & 1	3					
		-	rarely						
HI2-H4	1	1	1	1					
Number of hydrogen bonds in interface area									
Numbers	10-15	7-12	5-10 for 30,00 &	10-17					
			7-13 remaining						

Supplementary references

- 1. R. Huber, *Nature*, 1979, 280, 538-539.
- 2. J. H. Lin, *Current topics in medicinal chemistry*, 2011, 11, 171-178.
- 3. M. Nocker and P. Cozzini, *Current topics in medicinal chemistry*, 2011, 11, 133-147.
- 4. K. Teilum, J. G. Olsen and B. B. Kragelund, *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 2011, 1814, 969-976.
- 5. R. Caliandro, G. Rossetti and P. Carloni, *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation*, 2012, 8, 4775-4785.