Published in final edited form as:

Biochemistry. 2011 May 17; 50(19): 4038–4045. doi:10.1021/bi200244k.

Mapping the Protein-Protein Interface between a Toxin and its Cognate Antitoxin from the Bacterial Pathogen *Streptococcus pyogenes*

Justin B. Sperry¹, Craig L. Smith³, Michael G. Caparon⁴, Tom Ellenberger³, and Michael L. Gross^{*,2}

¹ Analytical Research and Development, Pfizer Inc., Chesterfield, MO 63017

² Department of Chemistry, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63130

³ Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biophysics, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63110

⁴ Department of Molecular Microbiology, Washington University in St. Louis, St. Louis, MO 63110

Abstract

Protein-protein interactions are ubiquitous and essential for most biological processes. Although new proteomic technologies have generated large catalogs of interacting proteins, considerably less is known about these interactions at the molecular level, information that would aid in predicting protein interactions, designing therapeutics to alter these interactions, and understanding the effects of disease-producing mutations. Here we describe mapping the interacting surfaces of the bacterial toxin SPN (*Streptococcus pyogenes* NAD⁺ hydrolase) in complex with its antitoxin IFS (immunity factor for SPN) by using hydrogen-deuterium amide exchange and electrospray ionization mass spectrometry. This approach affords data in a relatively short time for small amounts of protein, typically 5–7 pmol per analysis. The results show a good correspondence with a recently determined crystal structure of the IFS-SPN complex, but additionally provide strong evidence for a folding transition of the IFS protein that accompanies its binding to SPN. The outcome shows that mass-based chemical footprinting of protein interaction surfaces can provide information about protein dynamics that is not easily obtained by other methods and can potentially be applied to large, multi-protein complexes that are out of range for most solution-based methods of biophysical analysis.

Nearly all biological functions involve the interaction of one protein with another; for example, many cellular tasks are achieved by the coordinated action of a dimeric or multimeric protein assembly (1). The formation of these protein assemblies affords some of the most complex architectures in biology; the specificity of these interactions has become one of the most studied problems in the biological sciences (2–5). Protein interactions require specific recognition between partners to form the interface (6–9). Interfaces can be categorized into two subclasses: homomeric and heteromeric. Heteromeric interfaces are those pertaining to two or more different polypeptide chains that form non-covalent higher order structures. Each protein is synthesized separately by the cell, and the complex forms under appropriate biological conditions (6). Formation of each of these interfaces is

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: Department of Chemistry, Washington University in St. Louis, Campus Box 1134, St. Louis, MO 63130. Telephone: (314) 935-4814, Fax: (314) 935-7484, mgross@wustl.edu.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION AVAILABLE

Several additional examples of region-specific data from IFS and SPN are included in the Supporting Information section. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

thermodynamically driven (10, 11) and usually the result of many factors including hydrophobic effects (12–14), interaction of electrostatically charged polar residues (15–17), and formation of new hydrogen bonds (18–20).

There are many techniques used for the structural characterization of protein-protein interfaces; they include cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM) (21), nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) (22–25), infrared microscopy (IR) (26), the yeast two-hybrid assay (Y2H) (27, 28), fluorescence resonance energy transfer (FRET) (29, 30), and, most commonly, X-ray crystallography (31–34). X-ray crystallography, however, requires the multimeric protein complex to be produced at high concentrations and be amenable to crystal formation. These methods involve trade-offs in resolution, protein-sample requirements, experimental effort, and inability to capture the dynamics of the interacting proteins. Mass spectrometry (MS) is a flexible platform for protein analysis; it can accommodate a variety of approaches to identify interacting proteins and to characterize their interactions (35, 36). Some of these approaches use affinity tags (37), hydrogen-deuterium amide exchange (38, 39), chemical footprinting (40, 41), and chemical cross-linking (42). The utility and interest of hydrogen-deuterium exchange to characterize protein-protein interfaces are increasing, as demonstrated in several recent examples (43–49). Mass spectrometry-based approaches do, however, suffer drawbacks related to protein-sequence coverage. Region-specific structural information of proteins is highly dependent on the ionization properties of peptides resulting from digestion. Taking these into consideration, we wish to apply a mass spectrometric approach to aid in the determination of a protein-protein interface.

Protein-protein interactions are important for bacterial pathogens (50, 51) including *Streptococcus pyogenes* (52, 53) (*S. pyogenes*), or more generally Group A Strep. To enhance infectivity, *S. pyogenes* injects the SPN NAD⁺-glycohydrolase into host cells (54–56), catalyzing the destruction of β -NAD⁺ and altering host-cell metabolism (57–61). SPN is also toxic to *S. pyogenes*. SPN-producing strains, however, are protected by expressing in its cytoplasm a specific antitoxin named IFS (Immunity Factor for SPN) (57) or SNI (streptococcal NADase inhibitor) (62) that binds to SPN as a competitive inhibitor with respect to the β -NAD⁺ substrate (63–65). IFS-SPN forms a stable protein complex that was recently crystallized, revealing how bound IFS forms a lid over the SPN active site (66). Understanding these interactions should have implications for developing therapeutics against *S. pyogenes*.

We report here the use of a region-specific H/D exchange (H/DX) protocol to probe the binding interface of the IFS-SPN complex, first analyzing each protein separately followed by determining changes in H/DX upon complex formation. Regions of the protein that show decreased exchange upon complex formation must either be buried in the protein-protein interface or become restructured upon binding to a partner protein. Using H/DX methods, we show that the native fold of IFS changes in conjunction with binding to SPN. A similar coupling of protein folding and binding is recognized to contribute to the specificity of a growing number of protein-protein interactions (67, 68)

EXPERIMENTAL

Materials

Deuterium oxide, sodium chloride, formic acid, calcium chloride, acetonitrile, and Tris buffer were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO) at the highest purity available. Immobilized pepsin on agarose was purchased from Pierce (Rockford, IL). IFS and SPN proteins were prepared in the Ellenberger laboratory using previously published techniques and used without further purification (66). The molecular mass of IFS was determined to be 21960 ± 1 Da by electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (ESI-MS); the protein included

a small linker (FRSF), a C-terminal c-myc tag (residues 170–181), a second small linker (NSAV) and a His tag (residues 182–187). The base peak in the SPN ESI mass spectrum corresponded to an N-terminal truncation between residues 36 and 37, and the molecular mass was determined to be 46026 ± 1 Da.

H/D Exchange Kinetics

Protein stock solutions (30 μ M for IFS and 40 μ M for SPN) were prepared in 20 mM Tris (pH = 8.8) and 50 mM NaCl. H/D exchange kinetics experiments were conducted with three samples: IFS alone, SPN alone, and IFS-SPN complex (1:1 molar ratio). To initiate exchange, 0.5 μ L of the protein stock was diluted with 20 μ L of D₂O containing 20 mM Tris and 50 mM NaCl at 25 °C to give a D₂O content of > 97%. At various times the exchange was quenched with ice cold 1.0 M HCl to give a final pH of 2.0. The K_I of IFS to SPN was determined to be on the order of 2 nM (57); therefore, the complex should be nearly 100% bound at low μ M concentrations during the H/D exchange studies.

To determine deuterium uptake at the peptide level, 5 μ L of immobilized pepsin on agarose was added to the quenched solution to release various peptides from the protein. The digestion took place for 3 min at 0 °C with a quick vortexing pulse every 15 seconds. After digestion, the beads were briefly centrifuged (2 – 3 sec) so that they settled at the bottom of the sample tube. The supernatant solution containing the digested protein was loaded on a C₁₈ column (LC Packings, 1 $\times$ 15 mm, PepMap cartridge, Dionex Corp., Sunnyvale, CA) that was pre-equilibrated with 100 μ L of 0.2% formic acid in water (0 °C). The column was washed with 300 μ L of 0.2% formic acid in water (0 °C), back exchanging the labile sites of the peptides and undigested protein. The peptides were separated by HPLC with a gradient (10% B to 40% B in 9 min, 40% B to 80% B in 1 min, 80% B to 40% B in 2 min, 40% B to 10% B in 1 min, then 10% B for equilibration) at a flow rate of 40 μ L/min. To minimize back exchange, the incoming/outgoing LC solvent line, injection valve, and sample loop were submersed in ice (0 °C).

LC-ESI/MS Analysis with a Q-TOF Mass Spectrometer

All ESI mass spectra of the exchanging protein and peptides were acquired in the positive-ion mode on a Waters (Micromass) Q-TOF Ultima (Manchester, U.K.) equipped with a Z-spray ESI source. The capillary voltage was 3.2 kV, cone voltage readback of 100 V, and the source and desolvation temperatures were 80 and 180 °C. The cone and desolvation gas flows were 40 and 400 L/h. The MS profile used for quadrupole transmission was from m/z 500, dwell for 5% of the scan time, ramp to m/z 1000 for 45% of the scan time, and then dwell at m/z 1000 for 50% of the scan time.

LC-ESI/MS-MS Analysis of Protein Digest

Peptides produced by pepsin cleavage were identified by accurate mass and product-ion sequencing on a LTQ-Orbitrap hybrid mass spectrometer (Thermo, San Jose, CA). After 3 min of pepsin digestion, following the protocol above, the solution was loaded onto a C₁₈ custom-packed column (75 μ m i.d., 10 cm length). The peptides were separated over 80 min using an Eksigent NanoLC-1D (Dublin, CA) with an LC gradient (2% B hold for 5 min, 2% to 50% B in 60 min, 50% B to 80% B in 15 min, 80% B hold for 2 min, 80% B to 2% B in 3 min, then 2% B for equilibration) at 260 nL/min. The solution was sprayed directly from the column into the mass spectrometer by using a PicoView PV-500 nanospray source (New Objective, Woburn, MA) attached to the LTQ-Orbitrap. A full mass spectrum was recorded in the Orbitrap part of the instrument, operating at 60,000 mass resolving power at m/z 400, and data-dependent product-ion spectra of precursors identified by the Orbitrap were collected by the ion trap. The MS/MS experiments carried out in the LTQ utilized wide-

band activation and dynamic exclusion. The resulting accurate mass and product-ion spectra were searched against a database by using Mascot (Matrix Science, Oxford, UK).

Data Analysis

The protein mass spectrum at each H/D exchange time point was deconvoluted by using the MaxEnt1 algorithm (MassLynx 4.0), and the deuterium level at each time point was determined by subtracting the average mass of the undeuterated protein from the average mass of the deuterated protein. The rate of back exchange was measured to be 1 deuterium loss per min. Ion signals for the deuterated peptides were smoothed twice in MassLynx with a Savitsky-Golay algorithm and imported into Microsoft Excel as an x,y pair (mass, intensity). The centroid and width of the deuterium distribution for each peptide was analyzed using HX-Express software (69). The back exchange occurs at the same rate as in the experiment in which the intact protein was investigated; however, no corrections were made for this back exchange because only relative (not absolute) deuterium levels were compared in all experiments. The deuterium uptake plots were fit using a pseudo-first-order kinetics model as described previously (70). All of the experiments were conducted in triplicate, and the precision was shown as ± 1 standard deviation as error bars in the H/DX uptake plots.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION

H/D Exchange of the Full-Length Proteins

The forward H/D exchange (H/DX) experiments were conducted over a 60 min time course on three different samples: IFS alone, SPN alone, and IFS-SPN as a 1:1 complex. The deuterium uptake data for the intact protein were obtained by using the undigested protein remaining in the sample after 3 min. of proteolytic digestion at 0 °C. The deuterium levels in the digested products were determined at each time point (0.25, 0.75, 3, 10, and 60 min) by subtracting the average (centroid) mass of the undeuterated protein from the average mass of the deuterated protein.

A plot of deuterium uptake versus time for IFS reveals that hydrogen bonding increases upon binding SPN, affording “protection” to the protein as indicated by a decreased deuterium uptake with time (Figure 1A). After 3 min of H/DX, IFS alone shows an upward mass shift of 90 ± 1 Da, and, in the presence of SPN, a lower mass shift of 69 ± 1.0 Da. This result implicates 21 ($90 - 69$) amide hydrogens that become “protected” by binding SPN. IFS has a total of 182 exchangeable amide sites (187 amino acids minus four proline residues and the fast-exchanging N-terminus). A normalization of the deuterium uptake to the number of exchangeable amide sites on the protein indicates that the percent deuteration of IFS is 50% in the apo state and 38% in the presence of SPN. Subtracting the two numbers gives a “protection” of $\sim 12\%$. At all H/DX times, IFS is on average 10% protected upon binding SPN, indicating that the protein-protein complex is not transient. If it were transient (i.e., has a large k_{off}), then the deuterium uptake curves would come together at long times.

On the basis of the results for IFS, amides in SPN should also show protection upon binding, and indeed this is realized (Figure 1B). At 3 min of H/DX, SPN alone has a mass shift of 205 ± 1 Da and in the presence of IFS, a mass shift is 184 ± 2 Da. This result implicates 21 amide hydrogens that are “protected” by the binding IFS. SPN has a total of 414 exchangeable amide sites (423 amino acids, of which eight are prolines and one fast-exchanging N-terminus); hence, SPN becomes 50% deuterated when alone and 44% deuterated in the presence of IFS. The difference of $\sim 6\%$ is a measure of the effect of binding IFS. The protection in SPN remains constant at all H/DX times, a result that is similar to that observed for IFS.

The “protection” shown by each protein is a result of increased H-bonding and decreased solvent accessibility at the protein-protein interface. Although SPN is roughly twice the size of IFS, similar numbers of amide hydrogens are “protected” in both proteins upon formation of the IFS-SPN complex.

Region-Specific H/D Exchange of IFS

We now describe results that localize the sites with decreased rates of H/DX that form the protein-protein interface. Digestion of the deuterated IFS alone and in the presence of SPN affords region-specific information regarding the extent of deuterium incorporation and the location of those changes upon complex formation. Several regions of IFS do not show any change in the extent of H/DX whereas other regions show significant changes between IFS alone and in the complex with SPN. Some of the residues in the C-terminal portion of IFS are strongly protected in the IFS-SPN complex (Figure 2). We see this beginning with the peptide spanning residues 120–142. In unbound IFS, this peptide shows a significant time-dependent extent of deuteration (e.g., from 30% at 15 sec to 70% at 60 min). In the presence of SPN, the percent deuteration is decreased by ~10% at all exchange times, indicating that a few residues in this peptide are stably sequestered in complex with SPN (Figure 2).

Peptides 143–151 and 154–161 show dramatic changes upon binding SPN. For example, 143–151 becomes greater than 75% deuterated at long times, indicating that the corresponding region of the protein is solvent-exposed and/or unstructured in the absence of SPN. Upon complex formation, however, the extent of HDX decreases ~33%. In the IFS-SPN complex, this segment comprises the SPN-interacting loop SIL2, and in the unbound IFS structure it is located in the middle of the extended, C-terminal helix $\alpha 7$ (Figure 3). The C-terminal peptide spanning IFS residues 154–161 takes up more than 80% deuterium at long times, one of the highest extents of deuteration in the IFS protein. When bound to SPN, however, the extent of H/DX decreases by 25% at all times. This change is likely due to the repacking of this C-terminal helical segment against the helical core of the IFS protein bound to SPN (Figure 3). These large changes in the kinetics of H/DX for the IFS protein reveal that binding to SPN involves a substantial rearrangement of C terminus of the IFS structure.

According to the X-ray structure, residues 132–164 form a continuous α -helix ($\alpha 7$) in IFS alone (Figure 3); this region is restructured in the IFS-SPN complex as two α -helices ($\alpha 7a$ and $\alpha 7b$) with an intervening loop (residues 139–149 SIL2) (66). The large difference in the extent of H/DX between IFS and the complex for this region raises questions about the true conformation of this segment in solution. The large extents of H/DX for the IFS alone support the conclusion that the conformation of the C-terminal region is dynamic. Moreover, there are large changes in H/DX extents upon binding. The intervening loop, which is closely represented by the peptic peptide 143–151, undergoes considerably less H/DX because it contacts SPN. Additionally, two other peptic peptides, 120–142, containing $\alpha 7a$ (128–138), and 154–161, representing most of $\alpha 7b$ (150–161), also change considerably in H/DX extents when interacting with SPN. These regions do not, however, directly contact SPN in the crystal structure of the complex (Figure 3). Instead, they are stabilized by the adjoining interface formation. We conclude that the C-terminal region of IFS alone is less structured in solution than in the crystalline state, whereas for the complex in solution, it adopts a compact folded structure.

Affinity purification tags (c-Myc; EQKLISEEDL, residues 167–176; and His₆, residues 182–187) appended to the C-terminal region of the recombinant IFS protein showed no change in H/DX in the presence and absence of SPN purification tags. Given that this region is not present in the wild type protein from *S. pyogenes*, we expected no difference between

the apo and holo forms, and we point to it as an internal control. The peptic peptide, 166–187, is ~ 53% deuterated at all H/DX times, whether SPN is present or not (Figure 2).

The N-terminal region of IFS is represented by several peptides from the peptic digest that show no changes in their extents of deuteration upon binding SPN (Supporting Information – Section 1). These peptides span residues 1–14, 15–34, 56–62, 88–91 and 106–119 and are located in the α -helical core of the IFS protein. The N-terminus of IFS (1–14) shows a constant and high percent deuteration in the absence and presence of SPN. Region 56–62, on the other hand, undergoes modest and nearly constant deuteration in both states, consistent with its location in the hydrophobic core of IFS.

We are unable to draw conclusions for certain regions of IFS because the extents of H/DX could not be measured accurately for the two binding states. The gaps in sequence coverage are for regions 35–55, 63–87, 92–105, 152–153, and 162–165. The peptide 35–55, for example, could be readily identified in H/DX experiments for IFS alone (both by accurate mass and its product-ion spectrum), but the signal-to-noise ratio for peptide detection in the IFS-SPN complex was insufficient to determine accurately the deuterium uptake. Overlapping signals from other peptides eluting at the same time further interfered with detection.

Region-Specific H/D Exchange of SPN

Four peptides derived from the SPN protein show significant changes in H/DX upon binding IFS (Figure 4). A region of SPN represented by residues 282–300 shows the largest changes. In the absence of IFS, the corresponding peptide is >70% deuterated, indicating that it is solvent-exposed or unstructured. In the presence of IFS, the extent of H/DX decreases by 70% at early time points and by 50% at later times. This region comprises one side of SPN's active site cleft and is buried in the IFS-SPN complex, becoming inaccessible for H/DX. No other peptide from IFS or SPN shows such a large change upon formation of the protein-protein complex, and this result highlights the power of H/DX and MS to locate accurately buried interfaces in protein complexes.

The three regions of SPN that show smaller extents of protection upon complexation are represented by peptides 196–220, 349–379 and 393–408. SPN residues 196–220 constitute the other side of SPN's active-site cleft, opposite the 282–300 peptide described above, and residues 196–220 are similarly buried upon binding to IFS (Figure 3). The 349–379 segment is deeper in the SPN active site, but residues 368–370 protrude in a loop that contacts the SIL1 loop (SPN Interaction Loop 1) of IFS bound to SPN. SPN residues 393–408 form an extended polypeptide that buttresses the 349–379 segment (described above) that is strongly protected in the complex with IFS. Thus, the regions of SPN showing greatest protection upon IFS binding are all located at or around the protein-binding interface that is revealed by X-ray. Many of these SPN residues are located in connecting loops and turns that protrude from SPN's active site cleft and make direct interactions with the IFS inhibitor. The SPN peptides that are strongly protected from H/DX account for nearly all the residues that directly contact IFS in the crystal structure.

The N-terminal domain of SPN, represented by peptides 80–94, 95–108, 109–141, and 142–172, shows no detectable differences in H/DX upon binding IFS (see Supplemental Info – Section 2). This region comprises a separate domain required for export of the SPN protein into mammalian cells. It is separated by a proteolytically sensitive linker from the catalytic domain of SPN (64) and was absent from the IFS-SPN complex that was crystallized. Peptide 80–94 is more than 70% deuterated at all H/DX times in both bound and unbound states, indicating that this region is neither highly H-bonded nor involved in the interface. Peptides 95–108 and 109–141 are deuterated to a similar extent compared to the full-length

SPN at all H/DX times, whereas peptide 142–172 shows an overall lower extent of deuteration compared to the full-length SPN (35% deuterated in both states after 15 sec of H/DX). These results indicate that SPN's N-terminal domain is stably folded and it does not appear to interact with IFS when it is bound to SPN's catalytic domain.

Two SPN peptides show very low H/DX in both binding states, indicating sites of solvent-inaccessibility (Supplemental Info – Section 2). Peptide 220–234, for example, undergoes 10–15% HDX at 15 s and 40% at 60 min for both states. Region 301–305 undergoes little H/DX (<10%) at all times whether the protein is free or complexed. Both of these peptides are located away from the IFS binding site at the core of the SPN glycohydrolase. Two other peptides (409–417 and 418–451) in the C-terminal region of SPN exhibit little difference in extents of deuteration (< 5%) between free and complexed and little protection upon binding to IFS. Correspondingly, they are located distal to the IFS interaction surface. Peptide 313–341 is interesting because it shows no change in response to IFS binding, despite residues Gly330, Val331, and Asp332 participating in interactions with IFS in the crystal structure. The lack of response may simply be that only three residues of 29 are affected.

There are other regions of SPN where we cannot draw conclusions about direct or indirect effects of IFS binding because the extents of deuteration could not be measured accurately for both the free and complexed states. Those regions are represented by peptides 29–79, 173–195, 235–281. After residue 281, the sequence coverage is nearly 95% for the catalytic domain of SPN.

Summary of Region-Specific H/D Exchange Data

The changes in H/DX reveal those regions of IFS and SPN that become more protected upon complex formation. SPN on the whole decreases its deuteration level by 5% upon binding IFS, whereas the smaller IFS protein undergoes ~10% decrease upon binding to SPN. The regions of SPN most affected by complex formation directly correspond to the binding site for IFS. The IFS subunit, however, undergoes less H/DX in the C-terminal region represented by peptides 120–142 and 154–161, which include a number of residues that don't contact SPN in the crystal structure and a region represented by 143–151 that does contact SPN. This latter region undergoes a large structural transition between the free and bound conformations of IFS, causing the decreases in the rate of H/DX. The kinetics of H/DX accurately reflects the dynamic interactions of IFS with its cognate toxin, SPN. After 3 min of H/D exchange, a total of twenty-one additional amide sites are protected in IFS when complexed to SPN as compared to free IFS protein. We can detect eight protected amides in the regions 120–142, 143–151, and 154–161 after 3 min of H/DX, representing 38% of the total change in IFS. Given that we can only account for 38% of the overall change in H/DX, there are other regions not identified that play a role in binding SPN. For example, we were unable to determine changes for peptides from regions 35–55, 63–87, and 92–105 owing to their low signal-to-noise ratios. In contrast, coverage of the SPN catalytic domain is excellent.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

Protein-protein complexes present a challenge in H/DX studies by MS. The number of peptides produced in the pepsin proteolysis of the IFS-SPN complex is greater, of course, than the number from each protein individually. The peptides must be eluted rapidly from the LC column, and overlap in elution can lead to ion suppression. Our inability to monitor certain regions of both proteins results from the insufficient signal-to-noise ratios of co-eluting peptides. The use of ultra performance liquid chromatography (UPLC) (71) should ameliorate this problem because it offers increased chromatographic resolution by using a combination of high pressure and small particle sizes in the C₁₈ column. Another approach

is to complement H/DX with other chemical footprinting experiments including reactions with OH radicals and specific reactions of lysine, for example. These approaches can take advantage of higher resolution liquid chromatography because they make an irreversible covalent change on the proteins.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Funding: This research was supported by the NCRR of the NIH (Grant No. 2P41RR000954) to MLG and NIGMS (R01GM52504) to TEE. This study was also supported in part by UNCF/Merck Science initiative postdoctoral fellowship awarded to CLS and also by an unrestricted grant from Schering Plough (Merck) to MLG (MLG was a consultant for Schering Plough).

We thank Dr. Henry Rohrs for his assistance with the LTQ-Orbitrap studies and the database searching.

Abbreviations

SPN	<i>Streptococcus pyogenes</i> NAD ⁺ hydrolase
IFS	Immunity Factor for SPN
MS	mass spectrometry
ESI-MS	electrospray ionization mass spectrometry
Da	Dalton
H/DX	hydrogen/deuterium exchange
cryo-EM	cryo-electron microscopy
NMR	nuclear magnetic resonance
IR	infrared microscopy
Y2H	yeast two-hybrid assay
FRET	fluorescence resonance energy transfer
NAD	nicotinamide adenine dinucleotide
D₂O	deuterium oxide
HCl	hydrochloric acid
HPLC	high performance liquid chromatography
UPLC	ultra performance liquid chromatography
Q-TOF	quadrupole time-of-flight
MaxEnt	maximum entropy
SIL	SPN-intervening loop

References

1. Alberts B. The cell as a collection of protein machines: preparing the next generation of molecular biologists. *Cell*. 1998; 92:291–294. [PubMed: 9476889]
2. Aytuna AS, Gursoy A, Keskin O. Prediction of protein-protein interactions by combining structure and sequence conservation in protein interfaces. *Bioinformatics*. 2005; 21:2850–2855. [PubMed: 15855251]

3. Nariai N, Kolaczyk ED, Kasif S. Probabilistic protein function prediction from heterogeneous genome-wide data. *PLoS ONE*. 2007; 2:e337. [PubMed: 17396164]
4. Punta M, Forrest LR, Bigelow H, Kernytsky A, Liu J, Rost B. Membrane protein prediction methods. *Methods*. 2007; 41:460–474. [PubMed: 17367718]
5. Sharan R, Ulitsky I, Shamir R. Network-based prediction of protein function. *Molecular Systems Biology*. 2007; 3:1–13.
6. Bahadur RP, Zacharias M. The interface of protein-protein complexes: analysis of contacts and prediction of interactions. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences*. 2008; 65:1059–1072. [PubMed: 18080088]
7. Chothia C, Janin J. Principles of protein-protein recognition. *Nature*. 1975; 256:705–708. [PubMed: 1153006]
8. Keskin O, Gursoy A, Ma B, Nussinov R. Principles of protein-protein interactions: what are the preferred ways for proteins to interact? *Chemical Reviews*. 2008; 108:1225–1244. [PubMed: 18355092]
9. Yan C, Wu F, Jernigan RL, Dobbs D, Honavar V. Characterization of protein-protein interfaces. *Protein Journal*. 2008; 27:59–70. [PubMed: 17851740]
10. Janin J. Principles of protein-protein recognition from structure to thermodynamics. *Biochimie*. 1995; 77:497–505. [PubMed: 8589061]
11. Kleanthous, C. Protein-protein recognition. Oxford University Press; Oxford, New York: 2000.
12. Spolar RS, Ha JH, Record MT. Hydrophobic effect in protein folding and other noncovalent processes involving proteins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1989; 86:8382–8385.
13. Young L, Jernigan RL, Covell DG. A role for surface hydrophobicity in protein-protein recognition. *Protein Science*. 1994; 3:717–729. [PubMed: 8061602]
14. Tsai CJ, Lin SL, Wolfson HJ, Nussinov R. Studies of protein-protein interfaces: a statistical analysis of the hydrophobic effect. *Protein Science*. 1997; 6:53–64. [PubMed: 9007976]
15. Xu D, Lin SL, Nussinov R. Protein binding versus protein folding: the role of hydrophylic bridges in protein associations. *Journal of Molecular Biology*. 1997; 265:68–84. [PubMed: 8995525]
16. Norel R, Sheinerman F, Petrey D, Honig B. Electrostatic contributions to protein-protein interactions: fast energetic filters for docking and their physical basis. *Protein Science*. 2001; 10:2147–2161. [PubMed: 11604522]
17. Sheinerman FB, Norel R, Honig B. Electrostatic aspects of protein-protein interactions. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*. 2000; 10:153–159. [PubMed: 10753808]
18. Jeffrey, GA.; Saenger, W. Hydrogen bonding in biological structures. Springer-Verlag; 1991.
19. Jiang L, Lai L. CH---O Hydrogen bonds at protein-protein interfaces. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2002; 277:37732–37740. [PubMed: 12119293]
20. Baker EN, Hubbard RE. Hydrogen bonding in globular proteins. *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology*. 1984; 44:97–179. [PubMed: 6385134]
21. Chiu W, McGough A, Sherman M, Schmid MF. High-resolution electron cryomicroscopy of macromolecular assemblies. *Trends in Cell Biology*. 1999; 9:154–159. [PubMed: 10203794]
22. Yi Q, Erman JE, Satterlee JD. Studies of protein-protein association between yeast cytochrome *c* peroxidase and yeast iso-1 ferricytochrome *c* by hydrogen-deuterium exchange labeling and proton NMR spectroscopy. *Biochemistry*. 1994; 33:12032–12041. [PubMed: 7918422]
23. Fiaux J, Bertelsen EB, Horwich AL, Wuthrich K. NMR analysis of a 900K GroEL GroES complex. *Nature*. 2002; 418:207–211. [PubMed: 12110894]
24. Takahashi H, Nakanishi T, Kami K, Arata Y, Shimada I. A novel NMR method for determining the interfaces of large protein-protein complexes. *Nature Structural Biology*. 2000; 7:220–223.
25. Zuiderweg ER. Mapping protein-protein interactions in solution by NMR spectroscopy. *Biochemistry*. 2002; 41:1–7. [PubMed: 11771996]
26. Li T. Investigation of protein-protein interactions by isotope-edited Fourier transformed infrared spectroscopy. *Spectroscopy*. 2004; 18:397–406.
27. Fields S, Song O. A novel genetic system to detect protein-protein interactions. *Nature*. 1989; 340:245–246. [PubMed: 2547163]

28. Stansfield, I.; Stark, MJR. *Yeast Gene Analysis*. Academic Press; 2007. p. 139-164.
29. Truong K, Ikura M. The use of FRET imaging microscopy to detect protein-protein interactions and protein conformational changes *in vivo*. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*. 2001; 11:573–578. [PubMed: 11785758]
30. Yan Y, Marriott G. Analysis of protein interactions using fluorescence technologies. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*. 2003; 7:635–640.
31. Yusupov MM, Yusupova GZ, Baucom A, Lieberman K, Earnest TN, Cate JH, Noller HF. Crystal structure of the ribosome at 5.5 Å resolution. *Science*. 2001; 292:883–896. [PubMed: 11283358]
32. Braig K, Otwinowski Z, Hegde R, Boisvert DC, Joachimiak A, Horwich AL, Sigler PB. The crystal structure of the bacterial chaperonin GroEL at 2.8 Å. *Nature*. 1994; 371:578–586. [PubMed: 7935790]
33. Williams SP, Kuyper LF, Pearce KH. Recent applications of protein crystallography and structure-guided drug design. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*. 2005; 9:371–380. [PubMed: 16006182]
34. Russel RB, Alber F, Aloy P, Davis FP, Korkin D, Pichaud M, Topf M, Sali A. A structural perspective on protein-protein interactions. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*. 2004; 14:313–324. [PubMed: 15193311]
35. Gingras AC, Gstaiger M, Raught B, Aebersold R. Analysis of protein complexes using mass spectrometry. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*. 2007; 8:645–654.
36. Zhou M, Robinson CV. When proteomics meets structural biology. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*. 2010; 35:522–529. [PubMed: 20627589]
37. Gavin AC, Maeda K, Kühner S. Recent advances in charting protein-protein interaction: mass spectrometry-based approaches. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*. 2011; 22:42–49. [PubMed: 20934865]
38. Kaltashov IA, Bobst CE, Abzalimov RR. H/D Exchange and Mass Spectrometry in the Studies of Protein Conformation and Dynamics: Is There a Need for a Top-Down Approach? *Analytical Chemistry*. 2009; 81:7892–7899. [PubMed: 19694441]
39. Suchanova B, Tuma R. Folding and assembly of large macromolecular complexes monitored by hydrogen-deuterium exchange and mass spectrometry. *Microbial Cell Factories*. 2008; 7:12. [PubMed: 18394161]
40. Konermann L, Stocks BB, Pan Y, Tong X. Mass spectrometry combined with oxidative labeling for exploring protein structure and folding. *Mass Spectrometry Reviews*. 2010; 29:651–667. [PubMed: 19672951]
41. Fitzgerald MC, West GM. Painting Proteins with Covalent Labels: What's in the Picture? *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry*. 2009; 20:1193–1206. [PubMed: 19269190]
42. Sinz A. Investigation of protein-protein interactions in living cells by chemical crosslinking and mass spectrometry. *Analytical and Bioanalytical Chemistry*. 2010; 397:3433–3440. [PubMed: 20076950]
43. Low DHP, Freceer V, Saux AL, Srinivasan GA, Ho B, Chen J, Ding JL. Molecular Interfaces of the Galactose-binding Protein Tectonin Domains in Host-Pathogen Interaction. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2010; 285:9898–9907. [PubMed: 20118243]
44. Mendillo ML, Hargreaves VV, Jamison JW, Mo AO, Li S, Putnam CD, Woods VL Jr, Kolodner RD. A conserved MutS homolog connector domain interface interacts with MutL homologs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2009; 106:22223–22228.
45. Hamuro, Y.; Coales, SJ.; Hamuro, LL.; Woods, VL, Jr. Use of enhanced peptide amide hydrogen/deuterium exchange-mass spectrometry (DXMS) in the examination of protein-protein interactions. In: Chance, MR., editor. *Mass Spectrometry Analysis for Protein-Protein Interactions and Dynamics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc; Hoboken, NJ: 2008. p. 123-155.
46. Komives, EA. Deuterium exchange approaches for examining protein interactions: case studies of complex formation. In: Chance, MR., editor. *Mass Spectrometry Analysis for Protein-Protein Interactions and Dynamics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc; Hoboken, NJ: 2008.
47. Mitchell, JL.; Engen, JR. Protein analysis with hydrogen-deuterium exchange mass spectrometry. Elsevier B.V; Amsterdam, Neth: 2009.

48. Zhang HM, Kazazic S, Schaub TM, Tipton JD, Emmett MR, Marshall AG. Enhanced Digestion Efficiency, Peptide Ionization Efficiency, and Sequence Resolution for Protein Hydrogen/Deuterium Exchange Monitored by Fourier Transform Ion Cyclotron Resonance Mass Spectrometry. *Analytical Chemistry*. 2008; 80:9034–9041. [PubMed: 19551977]
49. Bennett MJ, Chik JK, Slys GW, Luchko T, Tuszyński J, Sackett DL, Schriemer DC. Structural Mass Spectrometry of the .alpha..beta.-Tubulin Dimer Supports a Revised Model of Microtubule Assembly. *Biochemistry*. 2009; 48:4858–4870. [PubMed: 19388626]
50. Bhavsar AP, Guttman JA, Finlay BB. Manipulation of host-cell pathways by bacterial pathogens. *Nature*. 2007; 449:827–834. [PubMed: 17943119]
51. Cash P. Proteomics of bacterial pathogens. *Expert Opinion on Drug Discovery*. 2008; 3:461–473.
52. Pichichero ME, Casey JR. Systematic review of factors contributing to penicillin treatment failure in *Streptococcus pyogenes* pharyngitis. *Otolaryngology - Head and Neck Surgery*. 2007; 137:851–857. [PubMed: 18036409]
53. Stollerman GH, Dale JB. The importance of the Group A *Streptococcus* capsule in the pathogenesis of human infections: a historical perspective. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2008; 46:1038–1045. [PubMed: 18444821]
54. Stevens DL, Salmi DB, McIndoo ER, Bryant AE. Molecular epidemiology of nga and NAD glycohydrolase/ADP-ribosyltransferase activity among *Streptococcus pyogenes* causing streptococcal toxic shock syndrome. *Journal of Infectious Diseases*. 2000; 182:1117–1128. [PubMed: 10979908]
55. Cunningham MW. Pathogenesis of group A streptococcal infections. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*. 2000; 13:470–511. [PubMed: 10885988]
56. Bricker AL, Carey VJ, Wessels MR. Role of NADase in virulence in experimental invasive group A streptococcal infection. *Infection and Immunity*. 2005; 73:6562–6566. [PubMed: 16177331]
57. Meehl MA, Pinkner JS, Anderson PJ, Hultgren SJ, Caparon MG. A novel endogenous inhibitor of the secreted streptococcal NAD-glycohydrolase. *PLoS Pathogens*. 2005; 1:0362–0372.
58. Bernheimer AW, Lazarides PD, Wilson AT. Diphosphopyridine nucleotidase as an extracellular product of streptococcal growth and its possible relationship to leukotoxicity. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 1957; 106:27–37. [PubMed: 13439112]
59. Carlson AS, Kellner A, Bernheimer AW, Freeman EB. A streptococcal enzyme that acts specifically upon diphosphopyridine nucleotide: characterization of the enzyme and its separation from streptolysin O. *Journal of Experimental Medicine*. 1957; 106:15–26. [PubMed: 13439111]
60. Gerlach D, Ozegowski JH, Gunther E, Vettermann S, Kohler W. Purification and some properties of streptococcal NAD-glycohydrolase. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*. 1996; 136:71–78. [PubMed: 8919458]
61. Karasawa T, Takasawa S, Yamakawa K, Yonekura H, Okamoto H, Nakamura S. NAD(+)-glycohydrolase from *Streptococcus pyogenes* shows cyclic ADP-ribose forming activity. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*. 1995; 130:201–204. [PubMed: 7649441]
62. Kimoto H, Fujii Y, Hirano S, Yokota Y, Taketo A. Genetic and biochemical properties of streptococcal NAD-glycohydrolase inhibitor. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 2006; 281:9181–9189. [PubMed: 16380378]
63. Ghosh J, Anderson PJ, Chandrasekaran S, Caparon MG. Characterization of *Streptococcus pyogenes* beta-NAD⁺ glycohydrolase: reevaluation of enzymatic properties associated with pathogenesis. *J Biol Chem*. 2010; 285:5683–5694. [PubMed: 20018886]
64. Ghosh J, Caparon MG. Specificity of *Streptococcus pyogenes* NAD⁺ glycohydrolase in cytolysin-mediated translocation. *Molecular Microbiology*. 2006; 62:1203–1214. [PubMed: 17042787]
65. Tatsuno I, Sawai J, Okamoto A, Matsumoto M, Minami M, Isaka M, Ohta M, Hasegawa T. Characterization of the NAD-glycohydrolase in streptococcal strains. *Microbiology*. 2007; 153:4253–4260. [PubMed: 18048938]
66. Smith CL, Ghosh J, Elam JS, Pinkner JS, Hultgren SJ, Caparon MG, Ellenberger T. Structural Basis of *Streptococcus pyogenes* Immunity to Its NAD⁺ Glycohydrolase Toxin. *Structure*. 2011; 19:192–202. [PubMed: 21300288]
67. Spolar RS, Record MT. Coupling of local folding to site-specific binding of proteins to DNA. *Science*. 1994; 263:777–784. [PubMed: 8303294]

68. Wright PE, Dyson HJ. Linking folding and binding. *Curr Opin Struct Biol.* 2009; 19:31–38. [PubMed: 19157855]
69. Weis DD, Engen JR, Kass IJ. Semi-automated data processing of hydrogen exchange mass spectra using *HX-Express*. *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry.* 2006; 17:1700–1703. [PubMed: 16931036]
70. Sperry JB, Shi X, Rempel DL, Nishimura Y, Akashi S, Gross ML. A Mass Spectrometric Approach to the Study of DNA-Binding Proteins: Interaction of Human TRF2 with Telomeric DNA. *Biochemistry.* 2008; 47:1797–1807. [PubMed: 18197706]
71. Wales TE, Fadgen KE, Gerhardt GC, Engen JR. High-Speed and High-Resolution UPLC Separation at Zero Degrees Celsius. *Analytical Chemistry.* 2008; 80:6815–6820. [PubMed: 18672890]

Figure 1.

(A) Global H/D exchange kinetics experiment of IFS alone (squares) and IFS in the presence of SPN (diamonds). A protection change is observed in IFS upon binding SPN. (B) Global H/D exchange kinetics experiment of SPN alone (triangles) and SPN in the presence of IFS (circles). A protection change is observed in SPN upon binding IFS. H/D exchange was conducted over a 60 min time course with 97% D₂O content.

Figure 2.

Regions of IFS that show large changes in extents of deuteration upon binding SPN. IFS-alone (squares) and 1:1 IFS-SPN complex (diamonds). Residues 166–187 represent the c-Myc and His₆ tags and should not show changes in deuterium incorporation upon binding SPN.

Figure 3.

Crystal structure of IFS (PDB entry 3QB2) and the IFS-SPN complex (PDB entry 3PNT), as reported by Smith et al.(66). Several peptides affected by complex formation are highlighted in both IFS and SPN.

Figure 4.

Regions of SPN that show large changes in extents of deuteration upon binding IFS. SPN-alone (triangles) and 1:1 IFS-SPN complex (circles).