Published in final edited form as:

J Mol Biol. 2008 September 12; 381(4): 1068–1087. doi:10.1016/j.jmb.2008.05.042.

Conformer selection and induced fit in flexible backbone protein-protein docking using computational and NMR ensembles

Sidhartha Chaudhury[†] and Jeffrey J. Gray^{#,†,*}

[#] Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N. Charles St. Baltimore, Maryland, 21218

[†] Program for Molecular and Computational Biophysics, Johns Hopkins University, 3400 N. Charles St. Baltimore, Maryland, 21218

Abstract

Accommodating backbone flexibility continues to be the most difficult challenge in computational docking of protein-protein complexes. Towards that end, we simulate four distinct biophysical models of protein binding in RosettaDock, a multi-scale Monte-Carlo based algorithm that uses a quasi-kinetic search process to emulate the diffusional encounter of two proteins and identify low energy complexes. The four binding models are: 1) key-lock model (KL) using rigid-backbone docking, 2) conformer selection model (CS) using a novel ensemble docking algorithm, 3) induced fit model (IF) using energy gradient-based backbone minimization, and 4) a combined conformer selection/induced fit model (CS/IF). Backbone flexibility was limited to the smaller partner of the complex, structural ensembles were generated using Rosetta refinement methods, and docking consisted of local perturbations around the complexed conformation using unbound component crystal structures for a set of 21 target complexes. The lowest-energy structure contained more than 30% of the native residue-residue contacts for 9, 13, 13, and 14 targets for KL, CS, IF and CS/IF docking respectively. When applied to 15 targets using NMR ensembles of the smaller protein, the lowest-energy structure recovered at least 30% native residue contacts in 3, 8, 4 and 8 targets for KL, CS, IF and CS/IF docking respectively. CS/IF docking of the NMR ensemble performed equally well or better than KL docking with the unbound crystal structure in 10 of 15 cases. The marked success of CS and CS/IF docking shows that ensemble docking can be a versatile and effective method for accommodating conformational plasticity in docking and serves as a demonstration for the conformer selection theory - that binding-competent conformers exist in the unbound ensemble and can be selected based on their favorable binding energies.

Keywords

protein-protein docking; flexible docking; ensemble docking; conformer selection; NMR ensembles

INTRODUCTION

The formation of highly specific protein complexes is a fundamental process in biology, and the structures of these complexes provide detailed insight into the mechanisms of protein

*corresponding author, jgray@jhu.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

function. Given the enormous number of undetermined complex structures and the difficulties in determination of structures through x-ray crystallography or nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR), there is a need for accurate computational methods to predict protein complex structures. Complex structure prediction, also known as 'protein docking,' consists of determining the structure of the bound complex using the unbound structures of its partners (for review see Gray 2006).¹ Although protein docking could be viewed as primarily an engineering problem – without need to follow the physical basis of protein binding – physical models of biomolecular interactions have long served as starting points for development. Furthermore, the success or failure of docking algorithms based on these models may provide insight into the biophysical models themselves.

A comparison of bound and unbound structures often reveals significant changes in backbone conformation upon binding^{2,3} which confound current docking methods and represent the single greatest challenge to predictive protein docking. Accurate modeling of backbone conformational changes in docking is difficult because of the enormous complexity of backbone conformational space both in size and degrees of freedom (for review see Bonvin 2006⁴), making exhaustive sampling impossible. Furthermore, since changes in backbone conformation affect both the intra and intermolecular energies of putative complexes, they create additional challenges in the discrimination of near-native structures. Effective strategies for both backbone conformational sampling and discrimination are needed before flexible docking is feasible for predictive applications.

Four biophysical models of protein binding suggest distinct conformational sampling strategies in flexible protein docking. First, the key-lock (KL) model of protein interactions, proposed by Emil Fischer in 1894,⁵ states that proteins interact purely via surface complementarity of their rigid unbound structures. The KL model is the most influential model in the development of protein docking algorithms, underlying the original grid-based⁶ and fast-Fourier transform⁷ (FFT) techniques. Since most modern docking methods include side-chain motions in some capacity, for the purposes of this paper we define the KL model in terms of protein backbone flexibility. After allowing side-chain motions, KL docking strategies include, among others, ZDOCK/RDOCK,^{8,9} CLUSPRO,¹⁰ and RosettaDock.¹¹ These methods are moderately successful at predicting complexes for proteins that undergo minimal backbone conformational change upon binding, but perform progressively worse as the magnitude of backbone conformation changes increases.¹² Furthermore, these methods are far more successful when starting from bound structures than unbound structures,^{11,13,14} even in cases with minor conformational changes, indicating that backbone flexibility is an important component to protein binding in general and that accurate modeling of backbone flexibility may improve docking for all complexes, not just those that exhibit greater flexibility.

Second, the conformational selection (CS) model proposed by Monod *et al.* (1965)¹⁵ for protein allostery and later adapted to protein interactions by Kumar *et al.* (2000)¹⁶ is a statistical mechanical view of protein binding. The unbound state of a protein is represented by an ensemble of low-energy conformations, or conformers, one of which is the bound conformation. During the binding process, the bound-like conformers are selected over the other conformers in the ensemble as a result of their favorable binding energies. Thus, for docking, backbone flexibility is modeled implicitly as a pre-generated ensemble of rigid structures generated from the unbound structure. Previous CS-docking examples include both FFT-based^{17–19} and Monte Carlo (MC)-based ensemble docking.²⁰ Both Grunberg *et al.* (2004)¹⁹ and Smith *et al.* (2005)¹⁸ used molecular dynamics (MD) to create an unbound ensemble that contained conformations that in some ways resemble the bound conformation, but both groups were unable to recover the bound structure in its entirety. Subsequent FFT-based cross-docking of an ensemble of structures from the MD simulations showed substantially improved sampling near the bound structure in the former study and marginal

improvements in docking accuracy in the latter. Bastard *et al.* carried out ensemble docking with an ensemble of loop conformations and successfully discriminated near-native structures when the bound loop conformation was deliberately added to the ensemble.²⁰

Third, in Koshland's induced-fit (IF) model,²¹ two proteins recognize each other to form an encounter complex, and then mutually alter their structures to form the intricate surface complementarity observed in bound structures. This model dictates that the bound conformation of a protein exists in response to the presence of the partner in complex, so the backbone conformational space must be sampled explicitly during docking in response to local energetics of the interface. Explicit backbone flexibility has been modeled primarily using MD, ^{22–24} energy minimization,^{23,25} or with gradient-based methods in Monte Carlo minimization (MCM),^{26,27} but not FFT-based methods. Wang *et al.* have shown impressive results in docking proteins in which a loop undergoes moderate to large conformational changes upon binding using explicit backbone flexibility, but their methods are extremely computationally intensive and require prior knowledge of the flexible regions, which limit their use in blind structure prediction.^{26,28} Krol *et al.* carried out both MD relaxation and energy minimization of docking poses and showed significant increases in the fraction of native residue contacts recovered.²³

The fourth model is a hybrid conformational-selection/induced-fit (CS/IF) model proposed by Grunberg *et al.*¹⁹ where binding is a two-stage process that begins with conformational selection to form an encounter complex, followed by an induced-fit or 'refolding' step that leads to the final bound conformation. The conformations that are selected to form the encounter complex need not resemble either the bound or unbound structure. A docking algorithm based on this model would combine both ensemble docking and explicit backbone flexibility during docking. Krol *et al.*¹⁷ employed a docking strategy that combines FFT-based cross-docking of MD generated ensembles with MD-refinement of top-ranked decoys on a limited set of targets. Their approach improved docking accuracy by measure of the number of native residue contacts recovered but decreased accuracy by other measures, such as root mean square deviation (RMSD) of interface residues. HADDOCK combines both implicit and explicit backbone flexibility while incorporating biochemical information,²² and it is capable of using ensembles from a wide variety of sources including MD, homology modeling, or NMR structures. When HADDOCK was used to dock MD-derived ensembles for two sets of CAPRI targets, significant improvements over rigid-body docking were observed.^{25,29} In several specific applications, docking of ensembles of NMR models using HADDOCK successfully generated structures of unknown protein complexes that have been subsequently validated by biochemical experiments.^{30–32}

Our goal in this work is to implement the four binding models as conformational sampling strategies in a common algorithm (RosettaDock11) and evaluate the differing abilities and limitations of each approach. We aim to create the optimal docking algorithm which allows backbone flexibility. As this is an ambitious goal, we limit this study to docking targets with small to moderate amount of conformational change upon binding and we restrict backbone motion to the smaller of the two proteins (ligand). At a minimum, a flexible backbone algorithm must be able to recover correct docked complex structures (near-native) for these simpler targets. Insights we gain in this study can be later extended toward the goal of capturing large-scale conformational change in docking. Furthermore, we test our new ensemble-based methods using the sets of structural models provided by NMR solution state studies (hereafter referred to as NMR ensembles). Compared to computational ensembles, NMR ensembles are typically more diverse and arguably provide a better representation of the unbound state.³³ Although NMR structures make up roughly 15% of known structures, a systematic study showing successful docking using NMR ensembles, to our knowledge, has never been done.

RESULTS

We have implemented and tested flexible backbone docking approaches using RosettaDock, a multi-scale Monte Carlo based algorithm that samples docking orientations by emulating the diffusional encounter of two proteins in solution and identifying low-energy complexes using an approximate energy function. Although RosettaDock is not a rigorous physical simulation of protein binding, its multi-scale approach, quasi-kinetic sampling method and previous success in the Critical Assessment of Protein Interactions (CAPRI)^{27,28,34,35} make it well suited to apply the four kinetic models of binding to protein docking. The low-resolution phase of RosettaDock simulates the formation of an encounter complex between two proteins, while the high-resolution phase models the transition from the encounter complex to a fully complexed structure. Physically realistic conformational sampling strategies may more effectively locate the correct complex structure³⁶ and likewise, an efficient sampling technique may provide insight into the underlying theories that inspired its design.

The methods are tested on a set of docking targets using both crystal structures and NMR ensembles of the ligand, and backbone flexibility was limited to the ligand (Table 1). Docking is restricted to local perturbations around the native complexed orientation (local docking) which resembles blind predictive docking in cases where biochemical information on the interaction is available. Global docking, where all of docking search space is sampled, while compatible with the presented methods, is outside of the scope of this study due to the computational cost of evaluating a target benchmark of this size (~100 times the computational cost of local docking¹¹).

Ensemble Generation

To dock crystal structures, we created computational ensembles using RosettaRelax,^{37,38} a multi-scale Monte Carlo-based structural refinement algorithm which samples the local conformation space for alternate low-energy structures using small backbone torsion angle perturbations, side-chain packing and energy gradient-based minimization in torsion space. Each structure required 15–30 minutes to generate on a 1.5 GHz processor, and 10 structures were generated for each target. Figure 1A illustrates the ensemble generation technique for crystal structures, including idealization of bond lengths and angles, low-resolution relaxation and high-resolution structural refinement. Figure 1B illustrates the preparation of NMR ensembles, which consists of idealization followed by high-resolution refinement.

For the Rosetta-generated ensemble, diversity is achieved primarily through the low-resolution relaxation step. Conformers are typically within a root mean square deviation (RMSD) of C_{α} atoms (C_{α} RMSD) of 1.0 Å of each other, while NMR ensembles are generally much more diverse, as can be seen in comparing Figure 1A and 1B. To show the conformational range of each type of ensemble and their potential for containing a binding-competent conformer, the C_{α} RMSD of the interface residues towards the bound ligand conformation after superposition of the entire ligand (BB_rmsd) is shown in Table 1 for the closest and furthest conformer in each ensemble. In the Rosetta-generated ensembles, the closest conformer is often further from the bound structure than the unbound crystal structure, suggesting that within this target set, Rosetta has a limited ability to generate conformers that are closer to the bound state. In the NMR ensemble, the closest conformer is often significantly closer to the bound conformation than the first conformer (Model 1) in the NMR structure coordinate file, which is typically the model that satisfies the most experimental constraints.

Docking Algorithms

The general docking algorithm is illustrated in Figure 2. The ligand in the starting structure is first randomly translated and rotated to generate an initial starting position which approximates

a collisional encounter between the two partners in which the appropriate interacting surfaces are proximal to each other.¹¹ Typically less than 3.5% of initial starting positions are less than 10 Å from the native structure by C α RMSD of ligand residues after superposition of the receptor (L_rmsd) with the native structure. The initial complex then undergoes 500 cycles of low-resolution docking, which consists of randomized rigid-body moves of ~1 Å each followed by a Metropolis acceptance criterion. During this phase, side chains are represented rigidly as centroid pseudo-atoms.

To capture conformer selection in binding, we added a step in the low-resolution stage (green box, Figure 2) of the algorithm immediately following the rigid-body move and preceding the Metropolis step. Following a rigid-body move, the entire ensemble of conformers is superposed along the interface residues of the current conformer (Figure 1C). The centroid-mode binding energy is calculated for each conformer and used to generate a partition function. A conformer is selected from the ensemble to replace the current conformer based on its Boltzmann weighted probability within the partition function. Once a conformer is selected, the Metropolis criterion is applied on the combined rigid-body/conformer selection move. The use of a partition function in this manner allows for robustness of this method towards both ensemble size and heterogeneity, compared to a simple random selection. Conformer selection is restricted exclusively to the low-resolution phase to remain consistent with the theory that the conformers in the unbound ensemble represent distinct low-energy structures that are the result of thermal fluctuations at time scales much greater than that of a binding event.

The lowest energy complex sampled during the low-resolution phase serves as a putative encounter complex and is converted to a high resolution structure through a side-chain packing step. The complex then undergoes 50 steps of high resolution refinement consisting of rigid body moves of ~0.1 Å and periodic combinatorial side-chain packing, followed by energy gradient-based minimization of the rigid-body orientation (**R**, **T**) and side-chain torsion angles (χ_n). To capture induced fit in binding, we use a previously developed²⁶ extended minimization scheme (orange box, Figure 2) that includes the backbone torsion angles (ϕ_n, ψ_n), allowing the backbone conformation of the ligand to respond to local energy gradients along the interface created by the docking process. The lowest energy structure in the high-resolution stage is selected as the final complexed structure for that iteration of the docking algorithm (hereafter referred to as a ‘decoy’), and the entire algorithm is repeated to generate 1000 decoys and all decoys are re-ranked by all-atom binding energy. To test the four kinetic models (KL, CS, IF, and CS/IF) we simply include or skip the appropriate conformer selection or induced fit step in the algorithm.

The computational cost of a docking method not only restricts user accessibility but also the extent of conformational sampling, which is often a limiting factor in predictive docking. Using a 1.5 GHz processor, the standard RosettaDock algorithm requires 1.5 to 5 minutes to generate a single decoy, depending on the size of the protein partners. The CS method requires approximately 1.5 to 2 times longer per decoy for an ensemble of 10 conformers, representing a 5-fold increase in efficiency over exhaustive docking of each conformer in the ensemble to the receptor. The IF method requires approximately 4–6 times longer per decoy than standard RosettaDock, while the CS-IF method requires approximately 5–7 times longer. Therefore, some consideration must be placed on the computational costs of each method along with overall docking performance when evaluating the methods in this study.

Energy Function and Discrimination

Energetic discrimination of near-native decoys remains a persistent challenge in flexible docking across FFT-based,¹⁸ MD-based^{17,23} and MC-based methods,²⁶ due in part to the interplay between intramolecular and intermolecular energies. Previous studies on docking have used either total energy of a complex, intermolecular energies between two partners in a

complex, or binding energy of a complex, which measures the difference in energy between the bound complex and the unbound state.^{17,18,23,24,26} Although rigid-body docking with standard RosettaDock uses total energy, the variation in the backbone conformation in flexible docking can lead to significant changes in intramolecular energies, which can alter both sampling and discrimination. We therefore compared the use of total energy and binding energy for conformer selection and final decoy discrimination.

Figure 3A shows the observed frequency that a particular conformer was selected in the low-resolution phase of CS-docking when using total energy or binding energy in generating the partition function in the conformer selection step, as a function of its unbound energy. Using total energy in the conformer selection step leads to a large bias towards low-energy conformers in the ensemble. While thermodynamically correct, it depends on the accuracy of the relative free energies of the different conformers and prevents adequate sampling of the entire ensemble. By contrast, the use of binding energy leads to a more even distribution between conformers. Unexpectedly, conformer selection is slightly biased towards higher-energy conformers when using binding energy compared to total energy, possibly due to the non-specific burial of hydrophobic residues.

To illustrate the effects on near-native discrimination, Figure 3B charts 1000 decoys in docking funnel plots (energy vs. L_rmsd to the native structure) created by the CS method for the same target. The degree of near-native discrimination in a docking funnel can be quantified by the difference in average energy of near-native decoys and the average energy of non-native decoys, normalized by the standard deviation of the energy of non-native decoys (hereafter referred to as Z-score).³⁹ Z-scores of -1.2 and -2.6 for the total energy and binding energy, respectively, show that the use of binding energy yields significantly improved discrimination. Since binding energy avoids accurate thermodynamic calculation of free energies of the conformers, the starting conformers must be physically realistic and of comparable energies.

Case study: Acetylcholinesterase-fasciculin II

To illustrate results of the four docking algorithms in detail, we analyze the representative case of the acetylcholinesterase (AChE) - fasciculin II (FAS2) complex (Protein Data Bank⁴⁰ (PDB) code 1FSS) before describing the results of the entire target set. There is a change in conformation of interface residues of FAS2 from the unbound to bound state which impedes high-quality prediction using current docking methods. In global docking of 1FSS, neither Li *et al.*⁹ using ZDOCK+RDOCK nor Smith *et al.*¹⁸ using an FFT-based ensemble docking method were able to generate a prediction that was within 2.5 Å C_α RMSD of interface residues (I_rmsd) among their 10 top-ranked decoys. In local docking, Wang *et al.*²⁶ used both rigid and flexible backbone docking in RosettaDock, but did not produce a decoy within 2.0 Å L_rmsd in the top three predictions.

FAS2 features a three-finger structural motif common to a number of toxins. A visual comparison of the bound crystal structure⁴¹ with the unbound crystal structure⁴² reveals a ~2 Å movement of Loop II (Figure 4A). Computer simulations have provided evidence for both a conformational gating⁴³ and an induced-fit mechanism⁴⁴ of binding to AChE. The ensemble representing the unbound state of FAS2 that was generated from the unbound crystal structure contained conformational variability in all three loops, but most noticeably in loop II (Figure 4B). A quantitative analysis of the heterogeneity in the ensemble comparing the mean square fluctuation (MSF) of C_α position for the ensemble with the C_α MSF between the bound and unbound conformation and the C_α MSF calculated from the crystallographic B-factors⁴⁵ of the unbound structure (Figure 4C) reveals good qualitative agreement. The most flexible regions are loop II (residues 27–34), loop I (residues 5–12), and the turn region between loops I and II (residues 15–24). Furthermore, NMR data of the solution state dynamics of the closely related toxin-α⁴⁶ also follow the diversity of the FAS2 ensemble generated using Rosetta.

Broad agreement with these diverse measurements of protein flexibility suggests that conformational heterogeneity in the Rosetta ensembles qualitatively reflects inherent flexibility of the protein, validating their use as a representation of the unbound state. In fact, four conformers in the ensemble were closer to the bound state than the unbound state, with BB_rmsds of 0.90 Å, 0.94 Å, 1.06 Å and 1.10 Å compared to a BB_rmsd of 1.15 Å for the unbound crystal structure.

To capture the results using the four docking methods, Figure 5 presents the lowest energy structure and docking funnel plots for docking FAS2 to the unbound AChe structure as a function of both ligand RMSD (L_{rmsd}) and the fraction of native contacts recovered (f_{nat}). The upper bound of accuracy is represented by KL-docking using the *bound* crystal structure of FAS2 (Figure 5A) which produces a lowest energy structure with a CAPRI accuracy rating of high quality with L_{rmsd} of 1.1 Å and an f_{nat} of 0.74. In contrast, KL-docking using the *unbound* crystal structure of FAS2 (Figure 5B) does not produce a docking funnel towards the bound complex and contains numerous false positives, or non-native structures with low energy, including the lowest-energy structure. CS-docking (Figure 5C) produces a lowest-energy structure of medium quality with an L_{rmsd} of 2.3 Å and an f_{nat} 0.45. IF-docking (Figure 5D) shows a more pronounced docking funnel than the KL method, but also contains a number of false positives, including the lowest-energy structure. Finally, like the CS-docking, CS/IF-docking (Figure 5E) produces a lowest-energy structure of medium quality, with an L_{rmsd} of 2.5 Å and an f_{nat} of 0.61.

The high level of accuracy of the interface in the lowest energy structure from the CS/IF method is illustrated in Figure 6, where both the position of FAS2 relative to AChe and side-chain orientations on both partners are recovered closely. Hydrogen-bond donor atoms from one partner are within 4 Å of hydrogen-bond acceptor atoms from the other partner for 9 of the 15 hydrogen bonds, the unusual hydrophobic stacking interaction between Met33 of FAS2 and Trp279 of AChe⁴¹ is recovered, and overall 61% of the native residue-residue contacts are satisfied. The only major interaction not recovered in the model compared to the bound structure is the polar and hydrophobic interactions between the C-terminal Tyr61 of FAS and Lys341, Pro76, and Phe75 of AChe.

The significant difference in docking accuracy achieved by the docking algorithms is a result of their respective treatments of backbone flexibility. Therefore it is useful to analyze how the different methods affect the backbone conformation of the ligand during docking. Figure 7A demonstrates the breadth and density of backbone conformational space being sampled by showing the BB_rmsd and UB_rmsd (C_{α} RMSD of interface residues to the unbound structure) for all 1000 decoys for the flexible docking methods. KL-docking samples the single unbound backbone conformation that is 1.15 Å from the bound structure (red line for comparison), while CS-docking samples 10 distinct backbone conformations, ranging from 0.90 Å to 1.64 Å from the bound structure. Since both IF and CS/IF docking include explicit backbone flexibility, each backbone conformation generated from docking is a unique result of the stochastic docking process. As a result, these methods sample a wide variety of backbone conformations. Although IF-docking samples nearly as wide a range of conformations as CS/IF-docking (0.75 Å to 2.0 Å compared to 0.63 Å to 1.93 Å), a large fraction of these conformations was closer to the unbound state, indicating it is unable to overcome conformational and energetic barriers to move towards the bound state. Overall, the FAS2 conformations from CS and CS/IF-docking were closer to the bound conformation than the unbound crystal structure in 40% and 42% of decoys respectively, compared to 22% in IF-docking.

Ideally, to achieve appropriate energetic discrimination of near-native complexes in flexible docking, an energy funnel should exist not only in the rigid-body conformational space towards the bound docking orientation of the two partners (measured by binding energy vs. L_{rmsd}),

but also in backbone conformation space towards the bound backbone conformation of both partners (measured by binding energy *vs.* BB_rmsd). Although in this study the receptor was kept fixed in the unbound conformation, an energy funnel towards the bound conformation of the ligand may still be observed. Figure 7B shows the binding energy and the BB_rmsd for all decoys from CS, IF, and CS/IF-docking with near natives decoys colored in tan, orange and brown for acceptable, medium and high quality predictions, respectively (compare to the energy funnel in rigid-body conformation space, Figure 5C–E). Docking decoys close to the native docked orientation should have lower energies for conformers closer to the bound conformation. Overall, a distinct energy funnel is not observed in the dimension of BB_rmsd for any of the three flexible docking methods, although in both CS and CS/IF-docking, the decoy with the lowest binding energy also had a relatively low BB_rmsd (1.0 Å and 1.2 Å, respectively). The lack of an energy funnel in backbone conformation space could be due either to sampling too few backbone conformations or to a deficiency in energy function in discriminating bound-like conformers during docking. Alternately, differences between the bound and unbound *receptor* conformation (which is kept fixed in the unbound form) could force the ligand to adopt a binding-competent conformation slightly away from the bound conformation, obscuring or eliminating an energy funnel in this relatively narrow range of conformation space (BB_rmsd of 0.9–1.3 Å).

Flexible docking methods outperform rigid-body docking

We applied the four docking methods to a set of 21 target complexes using crystal structures for both the ligand and receptor. A docking method was said to produce a ‘hit’ if it passed two criteria: 1) the lowest-energy structure was of at least medium quality and 2) at least 5 of the 10 lowest energy structures were of at least medium quality. This represents a relatively strict criterion in which a docking run is deemed successful only if its lowest energy structure is of good quality and it has converged on that solution. We also performed KL-docking of the bound ligand with the unbound receptor to serve as a control.

Table 2 shows the number of medium or high quality decoys within the 10 top-scoring structures (N_{10}) and the L_{rmsd} , I_{rmsd} and f_{nat} of the top-scoring decoy. Figure 8A summarizes these results as a histogram of hit quality, and funnel plots for each method for several selected targets are presented in Supplementary Figure 1. KL-docking with the bound ligand structure produced 15 total hits with 12 of high quality and 3 of medium quality and represents the upper bound of results achievable through modeling backbone flexibility in the ligand. KL-docking using the unbound crystal structure produced 8 total hits with 3 of high quality and 5 of medium quality, demonstrating the potential for improvement in modeling flexibility in the ligand backbone conformation.

As seen in Figure 8A, CS/IF-docking came closest to the quality of KL-docking with the bound ligand conformation producing 13 total hits with 7 high quality and 6 medium quality predictions. CS-docking performed comparably to the CS/IF-docking with 13 total hits, and 7 and 6 high and medium quality prediction, respectively. IF-docking produced 11 hits with 4 and 7 high and medium-quality predictions, respectively. At least one of the flexible docking methods produced a hit in 8 of the 13 cases in which KL-docking did not, and in the 8 cases where KL-docking did produce a hit, in 4 cases at least one of the flexible docking methods produced a higher quality hit. Overall, there was substantial overlap in the improvement in performance of the flexible docking methods compared to KL-docking with 8 of 21 cases in which two or three of the flexible docking methods produced a top-ranked decoy of a higher CAPRI quality than KL-docking (*e.g.* 2JEL in Table 2; funnel plots in Supplementary Figure 1).

Assessing ensemble docking and explicit backbone minimization

In a comparison between the flexible docking methods within each target, the two ensemble docking methods (CS and CS/IF) combined to produce 14 top-ranked decoys that were highest in f_{nat} , compared to 5 for top-ranked decoys by the non-ensemble dock methods (KL and IF). Furthermore, the CS and CS/IF methods had, overall, a greater number of hits and a higher accuracy of hits. The larger breadth of conformations sampled by the CS methods is critical to the success of the flexible docking methods, even in complexes with relatively small conformation changes.

In a number of cases, an improvement in docking performance was observed despite the fact that no conformers in the ensemble were present that were closer to the bound structure than the unbound structure. Although initially counterintuitive, this observation agrees with the findings of both Grunburg *et al.*¹⁹ and Smith *et al.*¹⁸ and suggests that there is inherent value in allowing backbone conformational variability in docking, irrespective of whether the bound conformation is being sampled. Even a small, relatively homogenous ensemble of ten structures can make a significant difference in docking compared to a single structure.

The explicit backbone minimization methods (IF and CS/IF) produced greater sampling of higher f_{nat} decoys, as seen in the example of 1FSS (Figure 4). Similarly, Krol *et al.*²³ observed increased f_{nat} when refining near-native decoys using MD, possibly as the result of the formation of a greater number of energetically favorable contacts along a putative docking interface when minimizing or relaxing. The increase in sampling is not clearly reflected in the overall results however, because discrimination is more difficult. In the case of 1CSE, the top-ranked decoy is near-native in the CS method, but not the CS/IF method despite the fact that both methods use an identical ensemble of ligand conformations. Explicit backbone minimization improves the binding energy across all decoys, and in this case, the binding energy of a non-native docking orientation is improved more than the binding energy of the near-native docked orientation, leading to a false positive. The loss of a near-native lowest energy structure is also observed in two cases (1BQL and 1WQ1) when comparing KL-docking with IF-docking. In summary, except in cases where explicit backbone minimization results in a false positive, it generally improves the quality of the top-ranked decoy. Indeed, where CS and CS/IF-docking both produced a hit, backbone minimization in CS/IF-docking leads to an increase in f_{nat} in 8 of 12 cases.

Ensemble docking with NMR targets

We applied these docking methods to a set of 15 targets in which the unbound ligand structure is an NMR ensemble. A comparison of the BB_rmsd of both the unbound crystal structure and the closest conformer in the NMR ensemble to the bound crystal structure in Table 1 reveals a significant degree of variability in the NMR ensemble. Still, the closest NMR conformer to the bound conformation is often substantially closer than an arbitrary conformer in the ensemble, providing a means for overcoming the structural uncertainties.

Table 3 shows the docking accuracy for the four methods using the NMR structure of the ligand, with rigid-body docking results with the unbound and bound crystal structure provided for comparison. Figure 8B summarizes these results as a histogram of hit quality, and Supplementary Figure 2 provides docking funnels for each target across all the methods. For KL and IF-docking, the starting structure was the first conformer in the NMR structure coordinate file from the PDB (Model 1). For the CS and CS/IF methods the entire NMR ensemble was used.

KL-docking with the bound ligand conformation produced 9 hits, all of high quality. KL-docking with the unbound ligand conformation produced 7 hits, 4 of high quality and 3 of

medium quality. In contrast, KL-docking with the NMR ensemble Model 1 produced 3 hits, all of medium quality, demonstrating the difficulties inherent in docking NMR structures compared to crystal structures.

Overall, while none of the flexible docking methods were able to approach the accuracy of docking with the bound ligand conformation, CS-docking approached the results of KL-docking with the unbound crystal structure, producing 8 hits, 2 of high quality and 6 of medium quality. CS/IF-docking produced 6 hits, 3 of high quality and 3 of medium quality, while IF-docking produced 3 hits, 2 of high quality and 1 of medium quality.

Two trends can be observed from the data. First, in contrast to the crystal structure docking targets, with one exception, IF-docking only produces a hit if KL-docking produces a hit. When IF-docking does produce a hit, it generally improves the accuracy of the hit, for example in 2PTC, where IF-docking is able to produce a high-quality hit where KL-docking produces a medium-quality hit. A potential explanation is that the single backbone methods (KL and IF) only produce hits in cases where the NMR structure is close to the bound conformation: for all three cases in which the IF-docking produced a hit, the first conformer in the NMR ensemble Model 1 has a BB_rmsd in the lower range among NMR targets, at 0.94 Å, 1.12 Å and 1.16 Å for 1BRS, 2KAI, and 2PTC, respectively.

Second, the ensemble docking methods perform significantly better than the single-backbone methods, especially for targets with a BB_rmsd of the first conformer in the NMR ensemble of greater than 1.2 Å. As a representative example, we examine the docking of α -chymotrypsin with the NMR solution structure of eglin-C (1ACB). CS-docking produces a moderate docking funnel (Figure 9A) with a Z-score of -0.95 and a medium-quality hit. Figure 9B shows the binding energy plotted against the BB_rmsd for each decoy, which, in contrast to the example of 1FSS (Figure 7B), shows a pronounced energy funnel towards the bound backbone conformation. Out of the considerable diversity in the entire 20-model NMR ensemble of eglin-C (Figure 9C), CS-docking successfully selects the conformer closest to the bound conformation (1.9 Å BB_rmsd, Figure 9D-E). In contrast, the first model in the NMR ensemble used in the (unsuccessful) KL and IF-docking is much further from the bound conformation (3.9 Å BB_rmsd, Figure 9D). Similar results are observed for other cases (e.g. 1EAW and 1CSE) and also for CS/IF-docking (funnel plots in Supplementary Figure 2).

The issues with near-native discrimination observed in docking crystal structures when using induced fit were present in the results for NMR targets as well. In 1CHO, CS-docking produced a medium-quality hit while CS/IF-docking failed to produce even a single medium-quality decoy among the 10 top-scoring decoys. Likewise CS-docking produced a medium-quality hit for 2BTF while the top-scoring decoy from CS/IF-docking was of acceptable quality and only 2 of the top 10 decoys were of medium or better quality. In a surprising number of cases, the top-ranked decoy from CS/IF-docking was of acceptable quality. In 3 cases (1KTZ, 1CHO, 2PCC) CS/IF-docking appears to have converged at the solution producing at least 5 of the top 10 decoys at acceptable quality. For 1KTZ and 2PCC this represents an improvement over the other docking methods; for 1CHO it is a decrease in accuracy compared to CS-docking.

Interestingly, in 4 of 15 cases CS/IF-docking produced a top-ranked decoy that was of higher accuracy than KL-docking with the unbound crystal structure, and in another 5 cases it performed equally well. In 2 of those 4 cases (2KAI and 2BRS), KL-docking using just a single conformer from the NMR ensemble outperformed KL-docking with the unbound crystal structure, suggesting that the improvement in docking is a result of differences between all NMR conformers and the crystal structure, and not the use of multiple NMR conformers. Nonetheless, excluding those 2 cases, CS/IF-docking performs equal to or better than rigid-backbone docking with the crystal structure in 8 of 13 cases. By using an ensemble docking

with minimization method it is possible for the first time to locally dock NMR structures with comparable accuracy to rigid-body docking with crystal structures.

DISCUSSION

Conformer selection and induced fit are two fundamentally distinct kinetic mechanisms for protein binding, and here we attempt to model them as conformational search strategies within RosettaDock. RosettaDock's MC algorithm samples different thermodynamic configurations of the system irrespective of time, limiting the conclusions we can draw about the physical validity of these two mechanisms. However, the success of these distinct conformational search strategies in recapitulating the binding models which inspired their design can be addressed. The success of CS-docking using both computationally generated ensembles and NMR ensembles suggests that binding-competent conformers do exist in the unbound ensemble, as demonstrated by Grunberg *et al.*,¹⁹ and that these conformers can be selected from the ensemble based on their favorable binding energies, both central tenets of the conformer selection binding model. Likewise, success of IF-docking through energy gradient-based backbone minimization demonstrates that a binding-competent conformation can be reached through a low-energy pathway through conformational space from the unbound structure while in complex with the partner - a necessary component in the induced fit binding model. Finally the success of CS/IF-docking, especially in the number of top-ranked structures of acceptable quality in the NMR targets, suggests that for larger conformational changes, both conformer selection over a broad range of conformational space and local induced fit may be necessary for binding, as proposed by both computational¹⁹ and experimental⁴⁷ studies.

As observed in CAPRI, accommodating backbone flexibility is currently the biggest obstacle to accurate protein-protein docking. Although most of the crystal structure docking targets we tested were classified as 'rigid-body' by Mintseris *et al.*,⁴⁸ modest backbone conformational changes between the bound and unbound state can still make high-resolution docking challenging. In rigid-body global docking, Li *et al.*⁹ produced at least one medium quality prediction among their 10 top ranked predictions in 9 of 21 (43%) targets that overlapped with ours. In FFT-based global-docking using MD-derived ensembles, Smith *et al.*¹⁸ produced at least one medium-quality prediction in their 10 top ranked predictions for 4 of 12 (33%) targets that overlapped with ours. Using backbone minimization in local docking with Rosetta (very similar to our IF-docking), Wang *et al.*²⁶ produced at least medium-quality models in their 3 top-ranked predictions in 9 of 17 (53%) targets that overlapped with ours. In our study, CS and CS/IF-docking produced a top-ranked medium quality prediction in 13 and 14 of 21 crystal structure targets (62% and 67%), respectively. Although direct comparisons with other studies is difficult due both to differences in docking strategies (global vs. local docking) and the different target sets used, the general improvement in performance observed in our study may be attributed to better discrimination between conformers due to a more physically realistic scoring function, and the greater breadth of conformational sampling due to the use of an ensemble of unbound structures.

Although no flexible docking method clearly outperformed the other in cases where the single unbound conformation was relatively close to the bound conformation (BB_rmsd < 1.1 Å), in cases where the single conformation was relatively far from the bound conformation (BB_rmsd > 1.3 Å), particularly among the NMR targets, the ensemble docking methods (CS and CS/IF) significantly outperformed the backbone minimization method (IF). Furthermore, CS-docking, which was the most successful method in both target sets by some measures, is the least computationally expensive. However, the CS/IF method did show moderate improvements in some cases, particularly in increasing the number of native contacts. Therefore, one potential strategy for predictive docking would be to use CS-docking first for global searches where near-native discrimination and computational efficiency are paramount. Potential near-native

orientations and their respective binding-competent conformers can then be used as starting structures for further local docking and refinement with IF-docking.

Our work included the first systematic study of docking using NMR solution-state structures. NMR ensembles contain conformational variation as a result of both methodological reasons, such as under-determination of protein structure, as well as biophysical reasons, such as solution-state protein dynamics.⁴⁹ Our results suggest that while a single conformer may not be sufficient for docking, the use of the entire NMR ensemble can overcome structural uncertainties in the model to a degree that is comparable to rigid-body docking of unbound crystal structure. Conformational heterogeneity in NMR structural ensembles has demonstrated qualitative agreement with a number of quantitative measures thought to be related to protein dynamics, from experimental data such as S^2 order parameters⁴⁶ and crystallographic B-factors,⁴⁵ to computational simulations using molecular dynamics,^{33,45} essential dynamics⁵⁰ or normal mode analysis.⁵¹ Although, to our knowledge, a direct relationship between this heterogeneity and binding-induced conformation changes has not been studied, our results show that the conformational variation found in NMR ensembles provides meaningful backbone conformational sampling in ensemble docking and may thus, to some degree, be relevant to the conformational changes associated with binding. Still, the difference in performance between docking with the NMR ensembles and the unbound crystal structures, suggests that structure under-determination plays a predominant role in the conformational heterogeneity of NMR ensembles.

These flexible docking methods were inspired by biophysical models of protein binding, but they can be applied more broadly to address uncertainty in the bound backbone conformation in docking, whether that uncertainty is the result of true flexibility, i.e. binding-induced conformational changes, or because of uncertainties in the initial unbound structures. Efficient methods for general sampling of conformational plasticity in proteins during docking could be applied to docking of homology model or low-resolution structures, where docking of an ensemble of multiple structural models instead of a single model may effectively increase the margin of error in structural modeling as applied to docking. We have recently demonstrated this in a separate study where docking of an ensemble of multiple antibody homology models to their respective antigens, using the CS-docking methods presented here, significantly outperforms the docking of a single homology model in recovering near-native docking solutions.⁵² Likewise, HADDOCK has shown several specific successes in docking ensembles from a variety of sources from homology models to NMR structures.^{30–32} Together, these results suggest a fundamental robustness of ensemble docking for accommodating conformational plasticity.

There are a number of limitations of the methods for use in predictive docking efforts such as CAPRI. First, this study analyzed local docking only, but often global docking is necessary when no biochemical information exists to assist in prediction. A test of global docking for both target sets with all four docking methods was beyond the scope of this study, but successful local docking can improve global docking. Using RosettaDock, Gray *et al.*¹¹ showed that global docking succeeded in 18 of 24 cases where local docking produced a medium or high-quality prediction and in none of the 6 cases where local docking produced, at best, an acceptable-quality prediction, suggesting that the increase in medium and high-quality models using local flexible docking in this study may directly translate to improvements in global docking.

Second, effective energetic discrimination of near-native decoys with explicit backbone flexibility in docking remains a challenge in IF and CS/IF-docking. Although the use of binding energy in this study yielded improvements in discrimination compared to total energy, the existence of false positives still confounded accurate docking, perhaps as a result of

inaccuracies in the energy function. Deficiencies in the energy function may include backbone torsion angle and other internal energy components, accurate modeling of electrostatics and side-chain protonation states, ordered water molecules at the interface, or the correct balance between scoring terms. Additionally, more sophisticated approaches to discriminating near-native funnels in rigid-body docking⁵³ can be extended to include variables such as backbone conformation or conformer identity.

Finally, large global conformation changes (*e.g.* domain hinge-motions) or large local conformation changes (*e.g.* loops) cannot yet be accurately modeled because neither the ensemble generation method nor the backbone minimization used in this study can capture conformational changes of that magnitude. The docking methods presented here were developed to be largely independent of the method of ensemble generation, so the ensemble generation method can be tailored to accommodate specific types of conformational flexibility. Large global motions may be modeled using larger or more diverse ensembles generated from normal mode analysis,⁵⁴ accelerated MD⁵⁵ or essential dynamics.^{50,56} Likewise, specific features of the protein structure can be varied between conformers in the ensemble, for example, the substrate binding-loop conformation of an enzyme, the conformation of a disordered region of an unbound crystal structure, or V_H - V_L orientation in antibody docking. Previous methods addressed specific types of conformation changes such as hinge motions or domain-domain motions with some predictive success.^{57,58} Progress has been made towards the prediction of flexible regions of proteins that change conformation upon binding⁵⁹ as well as generating ensembles of flexible regions that contain bound-like conformations,⁶⁰ both of which can improve the quality of the ensembles generated for docking.

CONCLUSION

In this study we present three different methods for accommodating backbone flexibility in protein docking and show substantial improvements in overall docking accuracy, including sampling and discrimination, without using any *a priori* knowledge of the flexible regions of the ligand protein. These methods have been intentionally developed to be versatile and can be used in conjunction with ensembles derived from a wide variety of sources, including NMR data, MD simulations, loop ensembles, and homology modeling. Local docking using RosettaDock is featured in a number of successful CAPRI strategies,^{27,28,53,61} and given the substantial improvements in performance over the standard RosettaDock algorithm, the new methods are a significant step forward in the state of the art of protein-protein docking towards general flexible docking. Incorporation of backbone conformational plasticity in docking might ultimately allow us to expand the list of “dockable” components beyond high-resolution crystal structures, to lower-resolution electron microscopy (EM) structures, NMR structures and homology models, which will be essential to applying predictive docking towards a structural understanding of protein interactions in conjunction with on-going genomic and proteomic efforts.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Structural Data

We assembled two target sets to test our docking methods (Table 1). The crystal structure target set consists of 21 protein complexes from Docking Benchmark 1.0⁶² with a BB_rmsd of less than 2.0 Å and no disordered residues in the interface region of the unbound crystal structures. The NMR structure target set consists of 15 complexes from both Docking Benchmark 1.0 and 2.0⁴⁸ that meet the same criteria and also have an unbound NMR structure and an unbound crystal structure in the PDB.⁴⁰

Docking Metrics

A number of metrics are used to measure docking accuracy that are sensitive to both the ligand position relative to the receptor, the specificity of the interactions across the interface, and the backbone conformation of the ligand. L_rmsd is an overall measure of the ligand position and orientation with respect to the receptor and is the RMSD of C_α coordinates of the ligand protein between the decoy and the native structure after superposition of the receptor. Interface RMSD (I_rmsd) is the C_α RMSD of interface residues in the decoy compared to the native structure after superposition of the interface residues, where interface residues are defined as those with intermolecular distances of less than 4 Å in the native structure. Fraction of native residue-residue contacts (f_{nat}) is a measure of the specificity of the interactions across an interface. For CAPRI, Mendez *et al.*⁶³ outline three classifications for docking accuracy based on these metrics: high quality ($f_{nat} > 0.5$ OR $I_rmsd < 1.0$ Å), medium quality ($f_{nat} > 0.3$ AND $L_rmsd < 5.0$ Å OR $I_rmsd < 2.0$ Å) and acceptable quality ($f_{nat} > 0.1$ AND $L_rmsd < 10.0$ Å OR $I_rmsd < 4.0$ Å). The backbone RMSD of the flexible ligand is measured as the C_α RMSD of interface residues after superposition of the entire ligand, to the bound ligand conformation (BB_rmsd) and unbound ligand conformation (UB_rmsd).

Docking Methods

Backbone flexibility is always limited to the ligand, defined as the smaller of the two proteins in the complex. All starting structures are prepared by replacing the side chains with rotamers from a standard rotamer library expanded to include rotamers from the unbound crystal structures.^{11,39} Independent local docking runs generate 1000 decoys for docking crystal structures or 5000 decoys for docking NMR structures for CS or CS/IF-docking in order to accommodate the significantly larger ensemble sizes.

KL-docking is local docking using standard RosettaDock as described by Gray *et al.*¹¹ with rotamer torsion angle minimization as described by Wang *et al.*³⁹ Antibody docking targets use an alignment file that biased low-resolution docking towards CDR residues as described previously.^{34,64,65} For IF methods, the gradient-based energy minimization is expanded beyond rigid-body orientation to include backbone torsion angles during the minimization step in the high-resolution MCM phase of RosettaDock, as described by Wang *et al.*²⁶ The unbound ligand structure used in IF-docking was relaxed prior to docking to ensure that the structure was at a local energy minimum with the Rosetta energy function, as described by Wang *et al.*²⁶

For CS-docking's conformer selection moves, all n conformers in the ensemble are superposed along the interface residues of the current conformer (residues with less than 4 Å atomic distance to the receptor). Binding energy is calculated for each conformer to create a partition

function, $Z = \sum_i^n \exp(-\Delta G_i^{\text{binding}}/RT)$, and a random conformer i is selected based on its

Boltzmann probability, $P_i = \frac{\exp(-\Delta G_i^{\text{binding}}/RT)}{Z}$. As in IF-docking, each conformer in the NMR ensemble underwent high-resolution refinement prior to docking to ensure they were in a local energy minimum within the Rosetta energy function.

Scoring Methods

Scoring both during the docking simulation and in final decoy discrimination is based on binding energy, defined as the change in total energy from the final bound complex and the total energy of the initial unbound state, $\Delta G^{\text{binding}} = G(\text{complex}) - G(\text{unbound})$. The unbound energies for the receptor and each ligand conformer are calculated by taking the lowest energy from doing 10 independent side-chain packing runs. The total unbound energy is the sum of the unbound energies of the receptor and the ligand and is specific to the conformer used in

the final complex, $G(\text{unbound}) = G(\text{receptor}) + G(\text{conformer } i)$. All unbound reference energies are calculated prior to docking.

The Rosetta centroid-mode energy function used in docking is identical to that used in Gray *et al.*¹¹ and consists of contact, bump, residue environment and residue-residue pair potential. The Rosetta all-atom energy function used in docking consists of Van der Waals, hydrogen bonding, side-chain probability, solvation and electrostatic terms,¹¹ and the weights used for each component are identical to those used by Wang *et al.*³⁹ In high resolution, an additional component of a secondary structure dependant backbone (Ramachandran) torsional potential was also used⁶⁶ and assigned a weight of 0.1.

Ensemble Generation

Ensembles are generated using RosettaRelax as described by Misura *et al.*³⁷ except that ‘wobble’ and ‘crank’ perturbations are omitted primarily to reduce computational cost.

Algorithm Availability

Ensemble generation, NMR ensemble refinement, and all docking methods presented here are freely available for academic and non-profit use as part of the Rosetta structure prediction suite at www.rosettacommons.org. The distribution includes supporting scripts, documentation and full source code.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

We acknowledge Michael Daily, Monica Berrondo, Arvind Sivasubramanian, and Chu Wang for insightful discussions and reading and editing of the manuscript. This work was supported by National Institute of Health (NIH) grant R01 GM078221. S.C. received funding from NIH training grant T32 GM008403.

References

1. Gray JJ. High-resolution protein-protein docking. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2006;16:183–93. [PubMed: 16546374]
2. Betts MJ, Sternberg MJ. An analysis of conformational changes on protein-protein association: implications for predictive docking. *Protein Eng* 1999;12:271–83. [PubMed: 10325397]
3. Lo Conte L, Chothia C, Janin J. The atomic structure of protein-protein recognition sites. *J Mol Biol* 1999;285:2177–98. [PubMed: 9925793]
4. Bonvin AM. Flexible protein-protein docking. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2006;16:194–200. [PubMed: 16488145]
5. Fischer E. Einfluss der Configuration auf die Wirkung der Enzyme. *Ber Dt Chem Ges* 1894;27:2985–2993.
6. Wodak SJ, Janin J. Computer analysis of protein-protein interaction. *J Mol Biol* 1978;124:323–42. [PubMed: 712840]
7. Katchalski-Katzir E, Shariv I, Eisenstein M, Friesem AA, Aflalo C, Vakser IA. Molecular surface recognition: determination of geometric fit between proteins and their ligands by correlation techniques. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1992;89:2195–9. [PubMed: 1549581]
8. Chen R, Li L, Weng Z. ZDOCK: an initial-stage protein-docking algorithm. *Proteins* 2003;52:80–7. [PubMed: 12784371]
9. Li L, Chen R, Weng Z. RDOCK: refinement of rigid-body protein docking predictions. *Proteins* 2003;53:693–707. [PubMed: 14579360]

10. Comeau SR, Gatchell DW, Vajda S, Camacho CJ. ClusPro: an automated docking and discrimination method for the prediction of protein complexes. *Bioinformatics* 2004;20:45–50. [PubMed: 14693807]
11. Gray JJ, Moughon S, Wang C, Schueler-Furman O, Kuhlman B, Rohl CA, Baker D. Protein-protein docking with simultaneous optimization of rigid-body displacement and side-chain conformations. *J Mol Biol* 2003;331:281–99. [PubMed: 12875852]
12. Vajda S. Classification of protein complexes based on docking difficulty. *Proteins* 2005;60:176–80. [PubMed: 15981248]
13. Goodford PJ. A computational procedure for determining energetically favorable binding sites on biologically important macromolecules. *J Med Chem* 1985;28:849–57. [PubMed: 3892003]
14. Kuntz ID, Blaney JM, Oatley SJ, Langridge R, Ferrin TE. A geometric approach to macromolecule-ligand interactions. *J Mol Biol* 1982;161:269–88. [PubMed: 7154081]
15. Monod J, Wyman J, Changeux JP. On the Nature of Allosteric Transitions: A Plausible Model. *J Mol Biol* 1965;12:88–118. [PubMed: 14343300]
16. Kumar S, Ma B, Tsai CJ, Sinha N, Nussinov R. Folding and binding cascades: dynamic landscapes and population shifts. *Protein Sci* 2000;9:10–9. [PubMed: 10739242]
17. Krol M, Chaleil RA, Tournier AL, Bates PA. Implicit flexibility in protein docking: Cross-docking and local refinement. *Proteins* 2007;69:7.
18. Smith GR, Sternberg MJ, Bates PA. The relationship between the flexibility of proteins and their conformational states on forming protein-protein complexes with an application to protein-protein docking. *J Mol Biol* 2005;347:1077–101. [PubMed: 15784265]
19. Grunberg R, Leckner J, Nilges M. Complementarity of structure ensembles in protein-protein binding. *Structure* 2004;12:2125–36. [PubMed: 15576027]
20. Bastard K, Prevost C, Zacharias M. Accounting for loop flexibility during protein-protein docking. *Proteins* 2006;62:956–69. [PubMed: 16372349]
21. Koshland DE. Application of a Theory of Enzyme Specificity to Protein Synthesis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1958;44:98–104. [PubMed: 16590179]
22. Dominguez C, Boelens R, Bonvin AM. HADDOCK: a protein-protein docking approach based on biochemical or biophysical information. *J Am Chem Soc* 2003;125:1731–7. [PubMed: 12580598]
23. Krol M, Tournier AL, Bates PA. Flexible relaxation of rigid-body docking solutions. *Proteins* 2007;68:159–69. [PubMed: 17397060]
24. Smith GR, Fitzjohn PW, Page CS, Bates PA. Incorporation of flexibility into rigid-body docking: applications in rounds 3–5 of CAPRI. *Proteins* 2005;60:263–8. [PubMed: 15981258]
25. de Vries SJ, van Dijk AD, Krzeminski M, van Dijk M, Thureau A, Hsu V, Wassenaar T, Bonvin AM. HADDOCK versus HADDOCK: new features and performance of HADDOCK2.0 on the CAPRI targets. *Proteins* 2007;69:726–33. [PubMed: 17803234]
26. Wang C, Bradley P, Baker D. Protein-protein docking with backbone flexibility. *J Mol Biol* 2007;373:503–19. [PubMed: 17825317]
27. Chaudhury S, Sircar A, Sivasubramanian A, Berrondo M, Gray JJ. Incorporating biochemical information and backbone flexibility in RosettaDock for CAPRI rounds 6–12. *Proteins* 2007;69:793–800. [PubMed: 17894347]
28. Wang C, Schueler-Furman O, Andre I, London N, Fleishman SJ, Bradley P, Qian B, Baker D. RosettaDock in CAPRI rounds 6–12. *Proteins* 2007;69:758–763. [PubMed: 17671979]
29. van Dijk AD, de Vries SJ, Dominguez C, Chen H, Zhou HX, Bonvin AM. Data-driven docking: HADDOCK's adventures in CAPRI. *Proteins* 2005;60:232–8. [PubMed: 15981252]
30. Dominguez C, Bonvin AM, Winkler GS, van Schaik FMA, Timmersm HTM, Boelens R. Structural model of the UbcH5B/CNOT4 complex revealed by combining NMR, mutagenesis, and docking approaches. *Structure* 2004;12:633–644. [PubMed: 15062086]
31. Jensen GA, Andersern OM, Bonvin AM, Bjerrum-Bohr I, Etzerodt M, Thogersen HC, O'Shea C, Poulsen FM, Kragelund BB. Binding site structure f LRP-RAP complex: implications for a common ligand-receptor binding motif. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 2006;362:700–716. [PubMed: 16938309]

32. Drogen-Petit A, Zwahlen C, Peter M, Bonvin AM. Insight into molecular interactions between two PB1 domains. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 2004;336:1195–1210. [PubMed: 15037079]
33. Philippopoulos M, Lim C. Exploring the dynamic information content of a protein NMR structure: comparison of a molecular dynamics simulation with the NMR and X-ray structures of *Escherichia coli* ribonuclease HI. *Proteins* 1999;36:87–110. [PubMed: 10373009]
34. Gray JJ, Moughon SE, Kortemme T, Schueler-Furman O, Misura KM, Morozov AV, Baker D. Protein-protein docking predictions for the CAPRI experiment. *Proteins* 2003;52:118–22. [PubMed: 12784377]
35. Daily MD, Masica D, Sivasubramanian A, Somarouthu S, Gray JJ. CAPRI rounds 3–5 reveal promising successes and future challenges for RosettaDock. *Proteins* 2005;60:181–6. [PubMed: 15981262]
36. Camacho CJ, Vajda S. Protein-protein association kinetics and protein docking. *Curr Opin Struct Biol* 2002;12:36–40. [PubMed: 11839487]
37. Misura KM, Baker D. Progress and challenges in high-resolution refinement of protein structure models. *Proteins* 2005;59:15–29. [PubMed: 15690346]
38. Bradley P, Misura KM, Baker D. Toward high-resolution de novo structure prediction for small proteins. *Science* 2005;309:1868–71. [PubMed: 16166519]
39. Wang C, Schueler-Furman O, Baker D. Improved side-chain modeling for protein-protein docking. *Protein Sci* 2005;14:1328–39. [PubMed: 15802647]
40. Berman HM, Westbrook J, Feng Z, Gilliland G, Bhat TN, Weissig H, Shindyalov IN, Bourne PE. The Protein Data Bank. *Nucleic Acids Res* 2000;28:235–42. [PubMed: 10592235]
41. Harel M, Kleywegt GJ, Ravelli RB, Silman I, Sussman JL. Crystal structure of an acetylcholinesterase-fasciculin complex: interaction of a three-fingered toxin from snake venom with its target. *Structure* 1995;3:1355–66. [PubMed: 8747462]
42. le Du MH, Housset D, Marchot P, Bougis PE, Navaza J, Fontecilla-Camps JC. Structure of fasciculin 2 from green mamba snake venom: evidence for unusual loop flexibility. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr* 1996;52:87–92. [PubMed: 15299729]
43. Gabdoulline RR, Wade RC. Protein-protein association: investigation of factors influencing association rates by brownian dynamics simulations. *J Mol Biol* 2001;306:1139–55. [PubMed: 11237623]
44. Bui JM, McCammon JA. Protein complex formation by acetylcholinesterase and the neurotoxin fasciculin-2 appears to involve an induced-fit mechanism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2006;103:15451–6. [PubMed: 17021015]
45. Brunne RM, Berndt KD, Guntert P, Wuthrich K, van Gunsteren WF. Structure and internal dynamics of the bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor in aqueous solution from long-time molecular dynamics simulations. *Proteins* 1995;23:49–62. [PubMed: 8539250]
46. Guenneugues M, Drevet P, Pinkasfeld S, Gilquin B, Menez A, Zinn-Justin S. Picosecond to hour time scale dynamics of a “three finger” toxin: correlation with its toxic and antigenic properties. *Biochemistry* 1997;36:16097–108. [PubMed: 9405043]
47. Tang C, Schwieters CD, Clore GM. Open-to-closed transition in apo maltose-binding protein observed by paramagnetic NMR. *Nature* 2007;449:1078–82. [PubMed: 17960247]
48. Mintseris J, Wiehe K, Pierce B, Anderson R, Chen R, Janin J, Weng Z. Protein-Protein Docking Benchmark 2.0: an update. *Proteins* 2005;60:214–6. [PubMed: 15981264]
49. Andrec M, Snyder DA, Zhou Z, Young J, Montelione GT, Levy RM. A large data set comparison of protein structures determined by crystallography and NMR: statistical test for structural differences and the effect of crystal packing. *Proteins* 2007;69:449–65. [PubMed: 17623851]
50. de Groot BL, van Aalten DM, Scheek RM, Amadei A, Vriend G, Berendsen HJ. Prediction of protein conformational freedom from distance constraints. *Proteins* 1997;29:240–51. [PubMed: 9329088]
51. Yang LW, Eyal E, Chennubhotla C, Jee J, Gronenborn AM, Bahar I. Insights into equilibrium dynamics of proteins from comparison of NMR and X-ray data with computational predictions. *Structure* 2007;15:741–9. [PubMed: 17562320]
52. Sivasubramanian A, Sircar A, Chaudhury S, Gray JJ. High-resolution homology modeling of antibody Fv regions using knowledge-based techniques, de novo loop modeling and docking. 2008submitted

53. London N, Schueler-Furman O. Assessing the energy landscape of CAPRI targets by FunHunt. *Proteins* 2007;69:809–815. [PubMed: 17803233]
54. Cavasotto CN, Kovacs JA, Abagyan RA. Representing receptor flexibility in ligand docking through relevant normal modes. *J Am Chem Soc* 2005;127:9632–40. [PubMed: 15984891]
55. Markwick PR, Bouvignies G, Blackledge M. Exploring multiple timescale motions in protein GB3 using accelerated molecular dynamics and NMR spectroscopy. *J Am Chem Soc* 2007;129:4724–30. [PubMed: 17375925]
56. Seeliger D, Haas J, de Groot BL. Geometry-based sampling of conformational transitions in proteins. *Structure* 2007;15:1482–92. [PubMed: 17997973]
57. Ben-Zeev E, Kowalsman N, Ben-Shimon A, Segal D, Atarot T, Noivirt O, Shay T, Eisenstein M. Docking to single-domain and multiple-domain proteins: old and new challenges. *Proteins* 2005;60:195–201. [PubMed: 15981268]
58. Schneidman-Duhovny D, Inbar Y, Nussinov R, Wolfson HJ. Geometry-based flexible and symmetric protein docking. *Proteins* 2005;60:224–31. [PubMed: 15981269]
59. Tobi D, Bahar I. Structural changes involved in protein binding correlate with intrinsic motions of proteins in the unbound state. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2005;102:18908–13. [PubMed: 16354836]
60. Noy E, Tabakman T, Goldblum A. Constructing ensembles of flexible fragments in native proteins by iterative stochastic elimination is relevant to protein-protein interfaces. *Proteins* 2007;68:702–11. [PubMed: 17510963]
61. Wiehe K, Pierce B, Tong WW, Hwang H, Mintseris J, Weng Z. The performance of ZDOCK and ZRANK in rounds 6–11 of CAPRI. *Proteins* 2007;69:719–725. [PubMed: 17803212]
62. Chen R, Mintseris J, Janin J, Weng Z. A protein-protein docking benchmark. *Proteins* 2003;52:88–91. [PubMed: 12784372]
63. Mendez R, Leplae R, De Maria L, Wodak SJ. Assessment of blind predictions of protein-protein interactions: current status of docking methods. *Proteins* 2003;52:51–67. [PubMed: 12784368]
64. Sivasubramanian A, Chao G, Pressler HM, Wittrup KD, Gray JJ. Structural model of the mAb 806-EGFR complex using computational docking followed by computational and experimental mutagenesis. *Structure* 2006;14:401–14. [PubMed: 16531225]
65. Sivasubramanian A, Maynard JA, Gray JJ. Modeling the structure of mAb 14B7 bound to the anthrax protective antigen. *Proteins*. 2007
66. Simons KT, Kooperberg C, Huang E, Baker D. Assembly of protein tertiary structures from fragments with similar local sequences using simulated annealing and Bayesian scoring functions. *J Mol Biol* 1997;268:209–25. [PubMed: 9149153]

Figure 1.

Ligand ensemble generation and conformer selection. (A) Crystal structures are idealized and then relaxed in low and high-resolution to generate an ensemble of 10 structures. (B) Conformers in an NMR ensemble are idealized and refined in high-resolution only. (C) During low-resolution docking, conformers are superposed along the current conformer's interface residues, and a conformer is selected from a partition function using Boltzmann-weighted energies.

Figure 2. The flexible docking algorithm. The low-resolution phase models the formation of an encounter complex and the high-resolution phase models its transition to a bound complex. CS and CS/IF-docking include the conformer selection step (green box). IF and CS/IF-docking include backbone minimization (orange box).

Figure 3.

(A) The frequency of selecting a particular conformer during the conformer selection step vs. the internal energy for each conformer when using total energy (red) and binding energy (blue) for 1BRC. (B) Total energy vs. L_{rmsd} and binding energy vs. L_{rmsd} for 1BRC. CAPRI criteria high-quality decoys are shown in brown, medium-quality in orange and acceptable-quality in tan; note that high-quality decoys sometimes meet the CAPRI I_{rmsd} criterion rather than the L_{rmsd} criterion.

Figure 4. Backbone variability of FAS2. (A) Bound (red) and unbound (blue) FAS2 conformations. (B) Ensemble generated by Rosetta from the unbound FAS2 conformation. (C) C_{α} mean-squared fluctuation (MSF) for the Rosetta ensemble (black circles), the C_{α} MSF between the bound and unbound FAS2 conformation (red squares), and the C_{α} MSF calculated from the crystallographic B-factors⁴⁵ from 1FSC (green triangles).

Figure 5.

Binding energy vs. L_{rmsd} , binding energy vs. f_{nat} , and the top-ranked decoy (blue) superposed along the receptor (green) with the crystal structure of the bound ligand (red) for AChE binding to FAS2 (1FSS). (A) KL-docking using the bound FAS2 structure, (B-E) KL, CS, IF, and CS/IF-docking, respectively, using the unbound FAS2 structure. The unbound AChE structure (1FSC) is used in all cases. CAPRI criteria high quality decoys are shown in brown, medium quality in orange, and acceptable quality in tan.

Figure 6. Detail of the lowest energy structure ligand (cyan) and receptor (green) for the CS/IF method for 1FSS superposed with the native structure (gray) along the receptor. This decoy has an L_{rmsd} of 2.5 Å, an I_{rmsd} of 0.94 Å, and an f_{nat} of 0.61. Met33 of FAS2 and Trp239 of AChE are shown as spheres.

Figure 7. Backbone sampling and discrimination. (A) The BB_rmsd and UB_rmsd in each decoy output by CS, IF and CS/IF-docking respectively. Red lines show the BB_rmsd and UB_rmsd of the unbound and bound conformations respectively. (B) Binding energy vs. BB_rmsd, for CS, IF, and CS/IF-docking, respectively. CAPRI criteria high quality decoys are shown in brown, medium quality in orange, and acceptable quality in tan.

Figure 8.

Histogram of hit quality (quality of the top-ranked decoy for all runs with at least 5 of the 10 top-scoring decoys of medium or high quality) for each docking method for (A) crystal structure targets and (B) NMR targets. CAPRI criteria high-quality is shown in brown, medium-quality in orange.

Figure 9.

NMR docking results for CS-docking of 1ACB. (A) Binding energy vs. L_rmsd. (B) Binding energy vs. BB_rmsd. (C) Rosetta-refined NMR ensemble. (D) Lowest energy conformer from CS-docking (purple) superposed on the bound structure (red) and the first model in the NMR ensemble (blue). (E) Lowest energy structure from the CS method (receptor, green; ligand, purple) superposed on the native complex (gray).

Table 1

Crystal structure and NMR docking targets. PDB codes include chain identifiers, E_size is the number of conformers in each ensemble, Ub_{xtal} is the BB_rmsd of the unbound structure crystal structure to the bound crystal structure, Ub_{NMR} is the BB_rmsd of the first model in the NMR structure for NMR targets, and Ens_{min} and Ens_{max} are the minimum and maximum BB_rmsd of conformers in the ensemble. All RMSD measurements are listed in Ångströms.

Crystal structure docking targets									
complex PDB	Receptor PDB	Receptor	Ligand PDB _X	Ligand	size	Ub _{xtal}	Ens _{min}	Ens _{max}	
2PTC(E:I)	2PTN	B-Trypsin	6PTI	Pancreatic trypsin inhibitor	10	0.28	0.82	1.3	
2JEL*(LH:P)	2JEL(LH)	Ile42 Fab fragment	1POH	A06 Phosphotransferase	10	0.31	0.39	1.0	
1BVK(DE:F)	1BVL(LH)	Antibody Huly11 Fv	3LZT	Lysozyme	10	0.38	0.71	1.8	
1BQL*(LH:Y)	1BQL(LH)	HyHEL-5 Fab	IDKJ	Lysozyme	10	0.40	1.7	2.4	
1DFJ(E:I)	2BNH	Ribonuclease inhibitor	7RSA	Ribonuclease A	10	0.40	1.7	2.4	
2KAI(AB:I)	2PKA(XY)	Kallikrein A	6PTI	Pancreatic trypsin inhibitor	10	0.40	0.67	1.1	
2BTF*(A:P)	2BTF(A)	B-actin	1PNE	Profilin	10	0.44	0.91	1.5	
1BRS(A:D)	1A2P(B)	Barnase	1A19(A)	Barstar	10	0.47	0.77	1.7	
1BRC(E:I)	1BRA	Trypsin	1AAP(A)	APPI	10	0.57	0.99	1.6	
2SIC(E:I)	1SUP	Subtilisin BPN	3SSI	Subtilisin inhibitor	10	0.65	0.97	2.2	
1MLC(AB:E)	1MLB(AB)	IgG1 D44.1 Fab fragment	1LZA	Lysozyme	10	0.73	0.69	1.7	
2SN(E:I)	1SUP	Subtilisin Novo	2C12(I)	Chymotrypsin inhibitor 2	10	0.82	0.96	1.9	
1WQ1(G:R)	1WER	RAS activating domain	5P21	RAS	10	0.85	1.0	1.5	
1UGH(E:I)	1AKZ	uracil-DNA glycosylase	1UGI(A)	UDG inhibitor	10	0.90	0.92	1.3	
1CHO(E:I)	5CHA(A)	a-chymotrypsin	2OVO	ovomucoid third domain	10	0.95	1.1	1.8	
1ACB(E:I)	5CHA(A)	a-chymotrypsin	1CSE(I)	Eglin-C	10	1.0	0.79	1.8	
1CSE(E:I)	1SCD	subtilisin Carlsberg	1ACB(I)	Eglin-C	10	1.0	0.79	1.8	
1MAH(A:F)	1MAA(B)	Acetylcholinesterase	1FSC	Fasciculin II	10	1.0	0.87	1.4	
1FSS(A:B)	2ACE(E)	Acetylcholinesterase	1FSC	Fasciculin II	10	1.2	0.90	1.6	
1TGS(Z:I)	2PTN	Trypsinogen	1HPT	pancreatic trypsin inhibitor	10	1.6	1.8	2.5	
1CGI(E:I)	1CHG	a-chymotrypsinogen	1HPT	pancreatic trypsin inhibitor	10	1.8	1.8	2.3	
NMR structure docking targets									
Complex PDB	Receptor PDB	Receptor	Ligand PDB _X	Ligand PDB _N	size	Ub _{xtal}	Ub _{NMR}	Ens _{min}	Ens _{max}
1AY7	1RGH(B)	Ribonuclease SA	1A19	1BTB	30	0.62	0.86	0.57	1.4
1BRS	1A2P(B)	Barnase	1A19	1BTB	30	0.52	0.94	0.72	1.3
1EAW	1EAX(A)	Matriline	9PTI	1PIT	20	0.62	0.97	0.76	1.7
1AK4	2CPL	Cyclophilin	1E6J	1OCA	20	0.50	0.97	0.78	2.0
2KAI	2PKA(XY)	Kallikrein A	6PTI	1PIT	20	0.40	1.1	0.74	2.0
2PTC	2PTN	B-Trypsin	6PTI	1PIT	20	0.28	1.2	0.84	2.2
1KTZ	1TGK	TGFB	1M9Z	1PLO	10	0.39	1.2	0.96	1.6
2PCC	1CCP	Cyt C peroxidase	1YCC	2HV4	35	0.35	1.3	0.88	2.6
2BTF*	2BTF(A)	Actin	1PNE	1PEL	20	0.44	1.8	0.92	2.6
1BVK	1BVL(LH)	Antibody Huly11 Fv	3LZT	1E8L	50	0.38	2.1	0.86	6.4
1MLC	1MLB(AB)	IgG1 D44.1 Fab fragment	3LZT	1E8L	50	0.73	2.2	1.6	4.0
1CSE	1SCD	subtilisin Carlsberg	1ACB(I)	1EGL	25	1.0	2.5	1.3	4.4
1CHO	5CHA(A)	a-Chymotrypsin	2OVO	1OMT	50	1.0	2.5	1.2	2.7
1B6C	1D6O(A)	FKBP-binding protein	1IAS	1FKR	20	0.66	3.3	1.3	3.8
1ACB	5CHA(A)	a-chymotrypsin	1CSE(I)	1EGL	25	1.0	3.9	1.9	4.8

Table 2

Results summary for crystal structure targets. KL(B) is KL-docking using the bound ligand, and KL, CS, IF, CS/IF are the four docking methods using the unbound ligand. N_{10} is the number of structures among the 10 lowest-energy structures that are of at least medium quality. The f_{nat} , L_{rmsd} , I_{rmsd} , and CAPRI rating are for the lowest energy structure produced. CAPRI ratings are acceptable (*), medium quality (**), and high quality (***). Totals show the number of targets for which the lowest-energy structure was of at least medium quality and, in parenthesis, the number of hits for each method (hit defined as having a lowest energy structure of at least medium quality and $N_{10} > 4$). Targets are sorted by the I_{rmsd} in the KL(Ub) case.

PDB	KL(B)					KL					CS					IF					CS/IF				
	N_{10}	f_{nat}	L_{rmsd}	I_{rmsd}	CAPRI	N_{10}	f_{nat}	L_{rmsd}	I_{rmsd}	CAPRI	N_{10}	f_{nat}	L_{rmsd}	I_{rmsd}	CAPRI	N_{10}	f_{nat}	L_{rmsd}	I_{rmsd}	CAPRI	N_{10}	f_{nat}	L_{rmsd}	I_{rmsd}	CAPRI
2SIC	10	0.85	3.9	0.51	***	10	0.72	1.8	0.38	***	10	0.74	3.6	0.59	***	8	0.67	3.4	0.52	***	10	0.74	3.9	0.52	***
1MAH	10	0.64	0.23	0.13	***	3	0.78	2.3	0.66	***	8	0.59	1.6	0.65	***	6	0.64	2.4	1.1	**	6	0.69	3.7	1.4	**
1CHO	10	0.75	0.76	0.31	***	10	0.53	1.8	0.78	***	5	0.81	1.6	0.47	***	6	0.39	6.3	1.5	**	5	0.54	7.7	1.7	**
2PTC	10	0.60	2.7	0.58	***	10	0.48	3.5	0.86	***	10	0.43	4.3	1.0	**	10	0.55	3.0	0.68	***	10	0.62	2.3	0.75	***
2ETF	6	0.86	1.0	0.38	***	8	0.44	2.6	1.2	**	7	0.45	3.0	1.9	**	4	0.41	2.2	1.5	**	9	0.69	1.9	0.67	***
1ACB	10	0.68	0.88	0.40	***	6	0.38	6.1	1.3	**	10	0.51	3.3	0.84	***	10	0.57	2.9	1.1	**	10	0.60	3.8	0.82	***
1BRC	10	0.36	9.2	2.0	**	9	0.43	4.2	1.5	**	9	0.58	3.2	0.81	***	9	0.57	2.8	0.72	***	4	0.36	8.2	1.1	**
2SNI	10	0.76	0.91	0.25	**	8	0.38	5.4	1.5	**	10	0.51	5.7	1.2	**	7	0.40	6.1	1.6	**	10	0.77	2.3	0.82	***
1BQL	7	0.41	3.1	1.1	**	9	0.39	5.1	1.6	**	10	0.74	5.2	1.3	**	6	0.07	22	11		6	0.33	3.6	1.4	**
1UGH	10	0.70	0.43	0.19	***	6	0.37	5.2	2.5	*	3	0.23	5.6	2.8	*	9	0.30	3.4	1.9	**	5	0.31	5.0	2.5	**
1WQ1	4	0.39	4.9	1.5	**	0	0.17	5.8	3.7	*	0	0.26	3.6	2.1	*	0	0.09	6.9	4.1		0	0.07	6.5	4.2	
2KAI	6	0.72	2.5	0.47	***	0	0.04	10	4.5		4	0.03	8.4	3.2	*	6	0.50	5.9	1.2	**	10	0.58	2.9	0.69	***
2JEL	8	0.79	0.74	0.26	***	7	0.10	9.3	4.6	*	7	0.77	1.2	0.43	***	10	0.68	1.3	0.46	***	9	0.56	1.6	0.55	***
1BVK	0	0.11	20	5.9		0	0.25	9.7	4.7	*	0	0.12	30	10		0	0.08	19	9.2		0	0.24	10	4.3	
1CSE	10	0.64	1.3	0.36	***	0	0.00	13	6.0		5	0.32	2.7	1.2	**	2	0.13	18	7.4		2	0.03	13	5.5	
1DFJ	0	0.00	12	7.1		0	0.00	19	7.3		0	0.00	22	11		0	0.00	25	12		0	0.00	18	8.5	
1FSS	10	0.74	1.1	0.43	***	1	0.05	12	7.9		5	0.45	2.3	1.2	**	6	0.00	13	8.1		7	0.55	3.2	1.4	**
1TGS	10	0.74	1.7	0.50	***	5	0.09	15	9.4		10	0.64	2.4	0.87	***	7	0.12	16	9.3		7	0.55	4.9	2.4	**
1CGI	3	0.69	1.2	0.42	***	0	0.06	17	9.5		0	0.08	13	5.0		0	0.16	13	5.8		0	0.28	19	10	
1MLC	4	0.08	19	9.4		2	0.71	23	11		1	0.14	20	9.1		3	0.48	2.3	1.1	**	2	0.14	20	9.2	
1BRS	4	0.09	18	9.5		1	0.03	19	11		8	0.00	18	9.5		9	0.43	3.0	1.5	**	5	0.06	19	11	
Totals					17(15)					9(8)					13(13)					13(11)					14(13)

Table 3

Results summary for the NMR targets. KL(B) is rigid-body docking using the bound structure, KL(Ub) is rigid-body docking using the unbound crystal structure, and KL, CS, IF, CS/IF are the four docking methods using the ligand solution-state NMR structure. All column descriptions are the same as in Table 2. Targets are sorted by I_{rmsd} in the KL(Ub) case.

PDB	KL(B)					KL(Ub)					KL					CS					IF					CS/IF					
	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	N _{lig}	F _{nat}	L _{rmsd}	I _{rmsd}	CAPRI	
1KTZ	10	0.80	3.0	0.50	***	9	0.85	1.9	0.47	***	2	0.03	25	9.3		0	0.29	6.3	4.2	*	1	0.46	4.9	1.8	**	1	0.30	4.8	4.1	**	
1EAW	5	0.40	3.4	1.2	**	6	0.50	2.3	0.69	***	2	0.25	8.1	2.6	*	6	0.38	4.8	1.8	**	7	0.04	10	5.0		8	0.35	3.7	1.5	**	
1CHO	10	0.75	0.76	0.31	***	10	0.53	1.8	0.78	***	8	0.22	10	2.2	*	5	0.39	8.9	1.9	**	1	0.44	9.0	2.1	*	0	0.48	9.8	2.2	*	
2PTC	10	0.60	2.7	0.58	***	10	0.48	3.5	0.86	***	6	0.43	5.4	1.4	**	10	0.54	5.5	1.1	**	10	0.35	3.3	1.0	***	9	0.57	4.0	0.75	***	
1CSE	10	0.64	1.3	0.36	***	8	0.57	3.6	1.0	**	0	0.07	15	7.3		3	0.03	13	5.6		1	0.16	14	6.8		2	0.26	5.6	1.8	**	
2BTF*	5	0.86	1.0	0.38	***	8	0.44	2.6	1.2	**	5	0.03	21	13		8	0.48	2.6	1.7	**	0	0.10	15	8.8		2	0.30	6.4	3.1	*	
1ACB	10	0.68	0.88	0.30	***	6	0.38	6.1	1.3	**	0	0.18	10	2.9	*	10	0.25	5.1	1.7	**	0	0.00	19	6.8		8	0.31	4.0	1.7	**	
1B6C	9	0.70	2.3	0.56	***	7	0.43	8.6	1.4	**	0	0.07	22	13		0	0.13	13	5.2		0	0.07	16	7.7		0	0.07	14	4.9		
1AK4	10	0.70	4.6	0.60	***	1	0.27	19	2.5	*	0	0.00	24	9.3		0	0.02	28	7.6		0	0.21	15	3.6	*	0	0.18	15	3.7	*	
2PCC	0	0.00	27	14		1	0.27	8.7	3.7	*	0	0.06	14	5.5		0	0.00	20	9.3		0	0.38	7.7	3.1	*	0	0.25	8.5	3.4	*	
2KAI	6	0.72	2.5	0.47	***	0	0.04	10	4.5		5	0.47	6.6	1.3	**	9	0.55	4.5	0.90	***	9	0.55	4.3	0.9	***	8	0.50	5.2	1.1	**	
1BVK	0	0.11	20	5.9		0	0.25	9.7	4.7	*	1	0.24	16	7.6		0	0.06	19	10		4	0.00	21	12		0	0.24	9.5	4.2	*	
1AY7	6	0.73	3.2	0.86	***	0	0.10	16	7.7		0	0.00	20	9.4		7	0.67	2.1	0.99	***	6	0.06	20	8.8		5	0.72	2.2	0.91	***	
1MLC	4	0.08	19	9.4		2	0.07	23	11		0	0.08	26	9.7		0	0.05	19	9.4		0	0.03	17	9.2		0	0.25	8.3	3.4	*	
2BRS	4	0.09	18	9.5		1	0.03	19	11		7	0.63	2.1	1.0	**	6	0.67	2.5	1.2	**	6	0.58	3.9	1.89	**	10	0.75	2.9	0.87	***	
Totals					11(11)					8(8)				3(3)						8(8)					4(3)						8(6)