Published in final edited form as:

Anal Chem. 2006 December 15; 78(24): 8265–8272. doi:10.1021/ac061104g.

A Novel Assay Principle for Modulators of Protein-Protein Interactions and its Application to non-ATP-Competitive Ligands Targeting Protein Kinase A

S. Adrian Saldanha^{1,2}, Gregory Kaler³, Howard B. Cottam⁴, Ruben Abagyan², and Susan S. Taylor^{1,5}

¹Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, University of California, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

²Department of Molecular Biology, The Scripps Research Institute, 10550 N. Torrey Pines Rd, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA

³Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093, USA

⁴Moore's Cancer Center, University of California at San Diego Medical Center, La Jolla, CA 92093-0820, USA

⁵Howard Hughes Medical Institute, University of California, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

Abstract

Targeting sites that modulate protein-protein interactions represents an ongoing challenge for drug discovery. We have devised an assay principle, named Ligand-Regulated Competition (LiReC), in an effort to find non-ATP competitive small molecule regulators for type Ia cAMP-dependent Protein Kinase A (PKA-Ia), a protein complex that is implicated in disease. Our assay based on the LiReC principle utilizes a competitive fluorescent peptide probe to assess the integrity of the PKA-Ia complex upon introduction of an allosteric ligand. The developed fluorescence polarization method screens for small molecules that specifically protect (antagonists) or conversely activate (agonists) this protein complex. In high throughput format, various cyclic nucleotide-derived agonists and antagonists are successfully detected with high precision. Furthermore, assay performance (Z' -factors above 0.7) far exceeds the minimum requirement for small molecule screening. To identify compounds that operate through novel modes of action, our method shields the ATP binding site and purposely excludes ATP-competitive ligands. These proof-of-principle experiments highlight the potential of the LiReC technique and suggest its application to other protein complexes, thereby providing a novel approach to identify and characterize modulators (small molecules, proteins, peptides, or nucleic acids) of protein-protein systems.

INTRODUCTION

cAMP-dependent Protein Kinase as a drug target

cAMP-dependent Protein Kinase (Protein Kinase A, PKA) is a ubiquitous serine/threonine protein kinase that phosphorylates intracellular protein substrates in response to the secondary messenger, adenosine 3',5'-cyclic monophosphate (cAMP). The PKA holoenzyme is composed of two catalytic (C) and two regulatory (R) subunits that form an inactive tetramer. Binding of four cAMP molecules, two per R-subunit, activates PKA by causing the tetramer to dissociate into a dimer of R-subunits and two catalytically active C-

subunits, thereby enabling phosphorylation of downstream PKA substrates. The R-subunit has two major roles. First, it maintains the C-subunit in an inactive state in the absence of cAMP, and second it determines subcellular localization via specific interactions with A-kinase anchoring proteins (AKAPs). There are four isoforms of the PKA regulatory subunit (RI α , RI β , RII α , and RII β) that diversify PKA-mediated signaling by differing in their abundance, affinity for the C-subunit, sensitivity to cAMP, and specificity for different AKAPs^{1,2}.

PKA is implicated in several cancers (e.g. prostate complex³, pituitary⁴ and breast^{5,6}) and is also suggested to be a therapeutic target for diseases of the immune system (e.g. SLE and HIV).⁷ However, given the ubiquitous distribution of this protein kinase, it is unwise to target the ATP-binding site of the catalytic subunit, since an ATP-competitive inhibitor would just as likely kill healthy cells. Disease progression in some cancers correlates with abnormally high levels of the RI α isoform^{5,6}, and it is presumably the over abundance of type I α PKA holoenzyme (PKA-I α) that causes aberrant phosphorylation and promotes cancer. As a result, RI α antisense therapy is currently undergoing phase I/II clinical trials for the treatment of patients with malignant solid tumors.⁸ A small molecule that would selectively inhibit the catalytic action of PKA-I α (antagonist) may mimic the effect of RI α antisense therapy by repressing aberrant phosphorylation. In addition, a PKA-I α antagonist has been suggested as a therapeutic agent to improve T cell responsiveness to HIV.⁷ On the other hand, a small molecule activator of PKA may also be of benefit. For example, S49 T-lymphoma cells undergo cAMP-stimulated apoptosis through activation of PKA.⁹

PKA small molecule ligands

Two classes of small molecule modulators targeting PKA have been described. The first class represents ATP competitors that target the C-subunit and inhibit the catalytic function. However, potent ATP-competitive inhibitors of PKA, such as H89¹⁰ and staurosporine¹¹, also inhibit other protein kinases as well as non-related cellular receptors¹², thus compromising the therapeutic potential of this class of inhibitors. The second class comprises molecules related to the endogenous PKA regulator, cAMP.¹³ Cell permeable derivatives have been designed that either act as agonists (activating the holoenzyme in the same way as cAMP) or antagonists (competing with cAMP for binding to the R-subunit but not inducing holoenzyme dissociation).

Targeting PKA allosteric sites

The cAMP binding sites are obvious targets for novel non-ATP competitive modulators of PKA function. To date, only cyclic nucleotide analogs have been reported to bind to these sites. However, as the charged cyclic phosphate group is a strict requirement, these compounds exhibit poor *in vivo* efficacy¹⁴ due to cell permeability and sensitivity to phosphodiesterases.

Crystal structures obtained for free R-subunit¹⁵, complexes with cAMP analogs¹⁶ and most recently for R-subunit bound to the C-subunit¹⁷ bring insights into the allosteric mechanism behind cAMP binding and allow correlation between the sequence and structure of the cAMP-binding sites. The R-subunit is composed of two homologous domains, each having a high affinity cAMP binding site (named A and B sites). Sequence divergence of A and B sites (Figure 1) suggests that small molecules can be discovered that distinguish between them. Indeed, synthetic cAMP analogs have been designed that bind preferentially to one or the other site.¹³ The most recent structure of a deletion mutant of type I α R-subunit (containing A domain only) reveals major conformational changes in the A site upon binding to C-subunit¹⁷. This finding suggests that antagonists may be found that exploit the rearrangement of the A site between the holoenzyme (i.e. R-C complex) and free R-subunit.

Moreover, sequence divergence between the RI and RII isoforms is sufficient to suggest that selective binders may be designed. Figure 1 shows that 6 out of 19 residues directly in contact with cAMP in the A site and 11 out of 22 residues in the B site differ between RI and RII sub-types. The discovery of isoform-specific binders then opens up the possibility for selectively targeting only the disease-associated forms of PKA.

Limitations in high-throughput screening of protein kinases

Assays commonly used in HTS against protein kinases follow substrate or ATP turnover as measured by a variety of approaches, including luminescence¹⁸, fluorescent polymer superquenching¹⁹, homogenous time resolved fluorescence (HTRF)²⁰, scintillation proximity assay (SPA)²¹, AlphaScreen²², electrophoretic shift²³ and fluorescence polarization (FP).²⁴

The identification of non-ATP competitive ligands that modulate kinase function through stabilizing active or inactive conformational states (e.g. allosteric modulators) would provide a novel mechanism-of-action for kinase drugs. In principle, existing kinase HTS assays can also identify these types of ligands as demonstrated by the discovery of allosteric Akt inhibitors.²⁵ In practice, however, discerning true non-ATP competitive modulators from ATP competitors, as well as promiscuous compounds that act through high-stoichiometry binding or by causing protein aggregation or denaturation has not been rigorously pursued. Furthermore, a bias for ATP competitors is inherent in these screens because they are performed at relatively low ATP concentrations compared to the affinity for kinases (e.g. K_d for ATP binding to PKA is around 25 μM ²⁶). This has undoubtedly resulted in all top ranking HTS hits, and subsequently drug-leads, being ATP-competitive.

Our ultimate goal is to identify novel subtype-selective small molecule modulators of PKA that mediate their effect through binding to sites distinct from the ATP-binding site. This report describes development of a novel assay, with fluorescence polarization as readout, designed to identify non-ATP competitive small molecules targeting PKA-I α .

EXPERIMENTAL SECTION

Reagents

The PKA inhibitor peptide IP20 (Thr-Thr-Tyr-Ala-Asp-Phe-Ile-Ala-Ser-Gly-Arg-Thr-Gly-Arg-Arg-Asn-Ala-Ile-His-Asp) was synthesized at the University of California at San Diego (UCSD) in the Peptide and Oligonucleotide Core Facility and purified by HPLC. Succinimidyl esters of (5,6)-carboxyfluorescein (5,6-FAM) and Texas red-X were from Invitrogen (Carlsbad, CA). 8-Br-Adenosine 3',5'-cyclic monophosphorothioate (Rp-8-Br-cAMPS) was from Axxora (San Diego, CA). Adenosine 3',5'-cyclic monophosphate (cAMP), 2'-Deoxyadenosine 3',5'-cyclic monophosphate (deoxy-cAMP), Guanosine 3',5'-cyclic monophosphate (cGMP) and PKI(14–24) amide (Gly-Arg-Thr-Gly-Arg-Arg-Asn-Ala-Ile-His-Asp-NH₂) were from Aldrich (Milwaukee, WI). ATP competitive inhibitors (H89 and staurosporine) were obtained from LC Laboratories (San Diego, CA) and 2-(3,5-O-phosphinico-beta-D-ribofuranosyl)-4-Thiazolecarboxamide (cTzMP) from the Developmental Therapeutics Program, National Cancer Institute.

Synthesis of labeled IP20

IP20 was conjugated at the N-terminus with succinimidyl activated carboxyfluorescein (FAM-IP20) or Texas red-X (TR-IP20). To synthesize FAM-IP20, 1 mg of 5,6-FAM succinimidyl ester and 2 mg of IP20 were incubated in 1 mL of PBS:DMF (50:50) overnight at 4°C with gentle agitation. The fluorescent peptide was purified by C18 reverse phase HPLC with a water-acetonitrile gradient (0.08% TFA). FAM-IP20 eluted in 38%

acetonitrile. To synthesize TR-IP20, 1mg of Texas red-X succinimidyl ester and 2mg of IP20 were incubated in 1 mL of PBS:DMF (20:80) overnight at 4 °C with gentle agitation. The fluorescent peptide was purified by C18 reverse phase HPLC and eluted in 49% acetonitrile.

Protein expression and purification

To minimize reagent preparation for HTS, stable constructs for the C and R-subunits were used, namely, the C199A mutant of the C-subunit, which can be stored at 4 °C for over a year, and the $\Delta 1-91$ deletion mutant of type Ia R-subunit, RI α ($\Delta 1-91$), lacking the dimerization docking domain and thus less prone to aggregation. The C199A mutant and wildtype C-subunit showed identical binding profiles with FAM-IP20 (data not shown), while the binding and activation behavior of the deletion mutant is nearly identical to wildtype RI α .²⁷ The C199A mutant of recombinant murine catalytic subunit²⁸ and bovine RI α ($\Delta 1-91$)²⁹ were expressed and purified from *E. coli* as previously described.

Fluorescence polarization readings

Fluorescence readings were taken on a GeniosPro microplate reader (Tecan, Research Triangle Park, NC) with solid black 96-well untreated Costar (Corning, cat no. 3915) or 384-well Fluotrac-200 plates (Greiner, cat no. 781076). Fluorescein FP readings were with 485 nm excitation (20 nm bandpass) and 535 nm emission (20 nm bandpass) filters and the supplied 510 nm dichroic mirror. Texas red FP readings were with 570 nm excitation (20 nm bandpass) and 630 nm emission (30 nm bandpass) filters and a 590 nm dichroic mirror from Tecan.

FP values (P) were calculated in millipolarization units (mP),

$$P=1000 \times \frac{I_{\parallel} - G \times I_{\perp}}{I_{\parallel} + G \times I_{\perp}},$$

where $I_{\parallel}$ and $I_{\perp}$ are the emission intensities recorded, respectively, in the parallel and perpendicular directions relative to the plane of excitation polarization, after background intensity correction. G-factor values (G) for the fluorescein and Texas red spectral windows were measured with 1 nM fluorescein and a red low polarization standard (P2889) from Invitrogen.

Catalytic subunit binding and competition experiments

Unless specified otherwise, all concentration-dependent binding and competition experiments were performed using two-fold dilution series in the assay buffer: 50 mM HEPES (pH 7.0), 0.005% Triton-X100, 10 mM MgCl₂, 2 mM ATP and 2 mM DTT. In a typical experiment, 12 different concentrations of a test compound or protein were tested in at least duplicate. FAM-IP20 and TR-IP20 binding experiments were performed by adding 5 μ L of C-subunit in 50 mM HEPES (pH 7.0) to 45 μ L of FAM-IP20 or TR-IP20 solution in the assay buffer. Final concentrations were: 0.5 to 512 nM C-subunit, and 1 or 50 nM FAM-IP20 or 40 nM TR-IP20. The ATP concentration dependence of IP20 binding was measured by varying ATP concentration (12.5 nM to 12.8 μ M) in the assay buffer, with 1 nM FAM-IP20 and 5 nM C-subunit. Competition experiments with PKI(14–24) were performed at 156 nM to 100 μ M PKI(14–24), 1 nM FAM-IP20 and 5 nM C-subunit in the assay buffer. A stable FP reading was reached within 30 minutes upon addition of all the reagents and remained constant for at least 16 hours. Binding and displacement curves were fit using Prism 4 software (GraphPad, San Diego, CA).

Holoenzyme binding and competition experiments

PKA-I α was formed *in situ* by combining C-subunit with 1.2 molar excess of R-subunit in the assay buffer 5 minutes prior to performing the study. This period is sufficient to form a stable holoenzyme complex that is completely resistant to displacement by the fluorescent IP20 probe in the absence of an agonist. Typically the FP reading was taken within an hour of adding all the reagents. The concentration dependence for cyclic nucleotides was measured by adding 1 μ L of cyclic nucleotide solution in DMSO to 49 μ L of assay buffer containing 40nM TR-IP20, 64 nM C and 77 nM R subunits. Final cyclic nucleotide concentrations were: 20 nM to 20 μ M cAMP, 200 nM to 200 μ M cGMP, 100 nM to 100 μ M cTzMP, or 2 μ M to 2 mM deoxy-cAMP.

High-throughput assay format

HTS was performed by adding 1 μ L of a test-compound solution in DMSO to 49 μ L assay buffer containing TR-IP20, C-subunit, R-subunit and cGMP. The final composition of the assay mixture was: 25 μ M test-compound (unless stated otherwise), 40nM TR-IP20, 64 nM C-subunit, 77 nM R-subunit, and 3 μ M cGMP in the assay buffer with 2% DMSO. In the absence of test compound (negative control samples), a mid-range FP value was registered corresponding to ~50% bound TR-IP20 fraction.

Each screening plate contained eight half maximal response control wells (no test-compound, just 1 μ L DMSO added and FP response due to 3 μ M cGMP), eight agonist control wells (500 μ M cGMP final, maximal FP reading), and eight antagonist control wells (50 μ M Rp-8-Br-cAMPS final, minimal FP reading). In addition, readings from four buffer blank wells were taken for the background intensity correction.

For both agonistic and antagonistic responses, Z'-factors were calculated by:

$$Z'_{agonist} = 1 - \frac{3 \times (SD_{agonist} + SD_{1/2max.control})}{|P_{agonist} - P_{1/2max.control}|}, Z'_{antagonist} = 1 - \frac{3 \times (SD_{antagonist} + SD_{1/2max.control})}{|P_{antagonist} - P_{1/2max.control}|}$$

FP values (P) and standard deviation (SD) were determined for the agonist, antagonist and half maximal response control wells.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Assay design

An assay was required that is capable of detecting both PKA-I α agonists (inducing holoenzyme dissociation) and antagonists (compounds that protect holoenzyme). Recently, AlphaScreen technology has been used for this purpose, with C and R-subunits attached to donor and acceptor beads, respectively, so that formation of the PKA protein complex brings the beads into close proximity and luminescence is emitted.³⁰

We chose to develop a new technique for probing the integrity of the PKA holoenzyme complex that does not require protein attachment or labeling. The developed assay is based on a new principle, Ligand-Regulated Competition (LiReC) for probing protein-protein interactions. This technique utilizes a probe that competes with one of the protein partners for binding to the other protein partner. The concentration of the first protein partner is adjusted such that it out-competes the probe and probe binding can only occur by introduction of a modulator that destabilizes the protein complex. Binding to a protein receptor may be measured by changes in fluorescence polarization³¹ if a small fluorescently labeled ligand is used as the probe.

To implement a LiReC assay for the PKA system, the binding partners are the C and R-subunits, and the allosteric modulator will be a cyclic nucleotide. The heat stable protein kinase inhibitors (PKIs) are a family of small proteins that inhibit PKA by binding to the substrate-binding site of the catalytic subunit with sub-nanomolar affinity.³² The high affinity binding motif is found at residues 5 to 24, and the respective 20-mer peptide spanning this range (named PKI(5–24) or IP20) binds to the C-subunit with high affinity, with a K_i of 2.3 nM.³³ Thus, IP20 is the ideal probe for this novel method.

Our LiReC assay (Scheme 1) exploits the following facts: (i) IP20 and the R-subunit bind to overlapping sites on the catalytic subunit and thus compete with each other, and (ii) the R-subunit affinity for the C-subunit is cAMP-dependent. In the absence of cyclic nucleotide, the R-subunit affinity for the C-subunit (K_d of 0.39 nM²⁷) exceeds that of IP20 (K_i of 2.3 nM). However, binding of cyclic nucleotide to the R-subunit weakens the R-C complex and enables IP20 to bind to C-subunit. Consequently, fluorescently labeled IP20 can be used as a probe for the interaction of the C and R-subunits.

Interaction of FAM-IP20 with the catalytic subunit

Fluorescence polarization has been previously used to measure the binding of a fluorescently labeled variant of IP20 (labeled with fluorescein on a C-terminal cysteine) to the catalytic subunit of PKA, and a K_d of 31 nM was obtained.³⁴ A similar binding study was designed in which the N-terminus of IP20 was labeled with carboxyfluorescein (FAM-IP20) and the concentration dependence with catalytic subunit was measured (Figure 2a). A K_d of 4.4 nM and a Hill slope close to 1 was obtained in this experiment for the interaction of C-subunit with 1 nM of FAM-IP20. This value is close to the K_i recorded for IP20 (2.3 nM), and demonstrates that N-terminal labeling does not significantly weaken IP20 binding.

We specifically aimed to use a high probe concentration, since this offers significant advantages in HTS assay format (see later). At a FAM-IP20 concentration of 50 nM (i.e. significantly above the K_d for the interaction with C-subunit) a steep concentration dependence was observed (Figure 2a). This pattern is consistent with quantitative titration of FAM-IP20 by C-subunit.

Published structural and biochemical studies show dramatic changes in the PKA conformation and in the affinity of the C-subunit for R-subunit or IP20 induced by ATP.²⁶ This behavior is synergistic, since in the presence of the R-subunit or IP20, the affinity of the C-subunit for ATP is also enhanced by over 3000-fold.²⁶ In agreement with these findings, the interaction between FAM-IP20 and C-subunit was sensitive to ATP concentration (Figure 2b). Therefore, to minimize possible interaction of test compounds with the ATP-binding site, all further experiments were performed at saturating concentrations of ATP (2 mM) and $MgCl_2$ (10 mM).

To prove probe specificity and demonstrate that this assay is not reporting artifacts such as protein or peptide aggregation, a truncated version of IP20, PKI(14–24), was shown to compete with FAM-IP20 for binding to C-subunit in a dose dependent manner, with an IC_{50} of 2.7 μ M (Figure 2c).

Optimizing assay conditions for HTS

First, as mentioned previously, we wished to use the fluorescent probe at a high concentration, since this would improve assay performance by reducing optical interference from test-compounds and thus eliminate a significant fraction of false hits during screening. In a regular competition binding assay, a probe concentration significantly exceeding the K_d for its interaction with the binding site would compromise screening, since weak competitors, that may become promising candidates through lead optimization, will be

missed. However, this is not the case with our novel LiReC assay (Scheme 1), in which test-compounds do not directly compete with the probe (fluorescently labeled IP20), but regulate the affinity of another assay component (R-subunit) that competes with the probe for binding to a common target (C-subunit).

The use of red-shifted fluorescent dyes in FP small molecule screening provides additional advantage, since compound interference is minimized at longer excitation and emission wavelengths.^{31,35} For this reason, IP20 was labeled at the N-terminus with a long-wavelength fluorescent dye, Texas red-X. The obtained fluorescent peptide, TR-IP20, at 1 nM showed four-fold weaker binding (K_d of 19.4 nM, see Figure 3) to C-subunit compared to FAM-IP20, and again when used at a high concentration (40 nM), a steep concentration dependence was observed (Figure 3). The same data plotted on a linear concentration scale (Figure 3, inset) shows a linear increase in the probe bound fraction followed by a plateau, which is indicative of quantitative titration. An added bonus by using TR-IP20 is a larger response window ($P_{\text{bound}} - P_{\text{free}}$) of 237 mP, compared to 136 mP for FAM-IP20. This may reflect a more restricted mobility upon binding of the Texas red moiety or to the longer fluorescence lifetime of Texas red (4.5 ns) compared to fluorescein (4.1 ns).³⁶

The following conditions were found optimal for assaying with TR-IP20: probe concentration of 40 nM, C-subunit concentration of 64 nM (close to the saturation of the FP response) and R-subunit concentration of 77 nM (a 1.2-fold molar excess over C-subunit was required to form holoenzyme when TR-IP20 is present). In this system, practically all of C-subunit is in complex with the R-subunit, leaving TR-IP20 unbound (low FP readout).

To gauge the effectiveness of this system for probing the R-C interaction, the change in FP signal was measured at varying concentrations of four PKA agonists, namely the cyclic nucleotides cAMP, deoxy-cAMP, cGMP and cTzMP (Figure 4). The potency of cAMP (EC_{50} of 59 nM) is consistent with literature values of less than 100 nM.^{37, 38} A steep dose response observed for cAMP is a consequence of using R-subunit at a concentration that is significantly above the affinity for its interaction with cAMP (K_d of 1.7 nM³⁹). This rationale is inline with the more gradual response curves observed for the three other weaker binding cyclic nucleotides.

Although PKA responds endogenously to cAMP, previous findings that cGMP is a weaker activator of PKA-I α were corroborated. Interestingly, activation by cTzMP (EC_{50} of 614 nM), which lacks the nucleobase core, is intermediate between cAMP (EC_{50} of 59 nM) and cGMP (EC_{50} of 3.12 μ M). The 2' deoxyribose derivative of cAMP was also tested and found to be a 1000-fold weaker activator (EC_{50} of 53.8 μ M) than cAMP. This simple structure-activity series highlights the greater importance of the 2' hydroxy on the ribose ring compared to the nucleobase.

High-throughput assay for screening both PKA agonists and antagonists

The described assay system involving fluorescent peptide (TR-IP20), C-subunit and R-subunit, is appropriate for the screening of PKA agonists. To broaden the scope and enable detection of both agonists and antagonists, a robust HTS format was designed incorporating a four-component system with TR-IP20, C and R-subunits and cyclic nucleotide (Scheme 2). In this system, concentrations of C, R-subunit and a cyclic nucleotide are adjusted such that about half of fluorescently labeled IP20 is bound to the catalytic subunit and the other half is free. As a result, a half-maximal FP signal is observed that is proportional to the bound fraction of the probe. Given the steep concentration dependence of cAMP-induced activation (Figure 4) and to offer a better screen-to-screen reproducibility, a weaker agonist, cGMP was used at a concentration equal to its EC_{50} of 3 μ M. Agonists are compounds that weaken the R-C complex allowing more TR-IP20 to bind to C-subunit. This results in an

increase of the bound probe fraction and as a consequence, an increase in the FP value. In contrast, an antagonist is a compound that shields the R-C complex. Consequently, more C-subunit will form a stable complex with R-subunit, and less will be available to bind TR-IP20, so that the fraction of bound probe will be reduced and the FP signal will decrease.

LiReC assay performance in HTS format

To assess the performance of our LiReC assay in HTS format, the Z' -factor, a statistical parameter that considers both the response magnitude and variation⁴⁰ was calculated. An assay was performed in a 384-well plate with half maximal response control wells (3 μ M cGMP), agonist control wells (500 μ M cGMP), and antagonist control wells (3 μ M cGMP and 50 μ M Rp-8-Br-cAMPS). Values obtained, for Z' _{agonist} of 0.75 and Z' _{antagonist} of 0.77, far exceed the minimum requirement of 0.5 for high throughput screening⁴⁰ and demonstrate the robustness of this assay.

Next, a real screen was conducted on an in-house compound collection, all tested at 25 μ M (three sets totaling 134 compounds, Figure 5a). Our collection consisted of a structurally diverse set of heterocycles (mainly purine and xanthine analogs) and purine-like ribonucleosides. Several of the nucleosides were naturally occurring antibiotics (eg. tubercidin, toyokamycin, sangivamycin, formycin A, minimycin and pyrazomycin). Z' -factors were consistently over 0.73 when screening these compounds. Included in Set 1 are the known PKA modulators 8-Cl-cAMP (agonist) and Rp-8-Br-cAMPS (antagonist).

Finally, The designed assay has demonstrated its ability not only to identify antagonists, but also to accurately quantify their potencies. Thus, based on the concentration-response dependence for Rp-8-Br-cAMPS (Figure 5b), the IC_{50} value of 617 nM was calculated.

Resistance to ATP competitors

It may be suspected that ATP-competitors will register as antagonists, since they will displace ATP from its binding site, leading to a decrease in the IP20 probe affinity for C-subunit (Figure 3), so that less of the probe is bound and thus a lower FP signal is recorded. However, it has been shown that the affinity of ATP in the presence of IP20 improves by over 3000-fold (i.e. 25 μ M to 7.3 nM²⁶). A positive consequence of this behavior is that with the high ATP concentration (2 mM) in the assay it is unlikely that ATP-competitors will appear as hits. As proof, no reduction in FP signal was observed with the potent ATP competitors, H89 (K_i of 49 nM¹⁰) and staurosporine (K_i of 7 nM¹¹), tested at 200 μ M (data not shown).

CONCLUSIONS

In the present study, a novel assay principle has been devised, Ligand-Regulated Competition (LiReC), that utilizes a competitive probe for a protein-protein binding site to identify and characterize modulators of protein-protein interactions. For the proof of principle experiments we chose the disease-relevant PKA-I α system, where the integrity of the catalytically inactive protein complex is sensitive to cyclic nucleotides. The next step will be to adapt this assay for other R-subunit sub-types (RI β , RII α and RII β) in order to find selective drug-like small molecules for potential therapeutic benefit.

The described assay is superior to existing methods for high throughput identification of novel drug-like PKA regulators. A key advantage is shielding the ATP binding site so as not to be swamped with compounds that bind to this site. In addition, a format for the assay is described that can identify both agonists and antagonists even though they have opposing effects. We are now in a position to screen large libraries for novel compounds that modulate PKA function in an ATP independent manner.

Application to other protein-protein systems

We envision that Ligand Regulated Competition can be applied to other systems where the stability of a protein complex is regulated by a modulator (i.e. proteins, peptides, small molecules or nucleic acids). Regulation by this modulator may occur through stabilization of the protein complex by formation of a ternary complex; destabilization through direct competition; or destabilization through allosteric selection of an alternate conformational state. All three mechanisms may be characterized with an appropriately designed LiReC assay.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by NIH grants GM 19301 and GM 34921 to SST and a California Breast Cancer Research Program Postdoctoral Award to SAS. We thank Mike Deal, Sventja von Daake and Cecilia Cheng for preparing protein constructs.

REFERENCES

1. Feliciello A, Gottesman ME, Avvedimento EV. J Mol Biol. 2001; 308:99–114. [PubMed: 11327755]
2. Skälhegg BS, Tasken K. Front Biosci. 2000; 5:D678–D693. [PubMed: 10922298]
3. Casey M, Vaughan CJ, He J, Hatcher CJ, Winter JM, Weremowicz S, Montgomery K, Kucherlapati R, Morton CC, Basson CT. J Clin Invest. 2000; 106:R31–R38. [PubMed: 10974026]
4. Lania AG, Mantovani G, Ferrero S, Pellegrini C, Bondioni S, Peverelli E, Braidotti P, Locatelli M, Zavanone ML, Ferrante E, Bosari S, Beck-Peccoz P, Spada A. Cancer Res. 2004; 64:9193–9198. [PubMed: 15604292]
5. Taimi M, Breitman TR, Takahashi N. Arch Biochem Biophys. 2001; 392:137–144. [PubMed: 11469804]
6. Miller WR. Ann N Y Acad Sci. 2002; 968:37–48. [PubMed: 12119266]
7. Skälhegg BS, Funderud A, Henanger HH, Hafte TT, Larsen AC, Kvissel AK, Eikvar S, Orstavik S. Curr Drug Targets. 2005; 6:655–664. [PubMed: 16178799]
8. Nesterova MV, Cho-Chung YS. Clin Cancer Res. 2004; 10:4568–4577. [PubMed: 15240549]
9. Zhang L, Insel PA. J Biol Chem. 2004; 279:20858–20865. [PubMed: 14996839]
10. Chijiwa T, Mishima A, Hagiwara M, Sano M, Hayashi K, Inoue T, Naito K, Toshioka T, Hidaka H. J Biol Chem. 1990; 265:5267–5272. [PubMed: 2156866]
11. Matsumoto H, Sasaki Y. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 1989; 158:105–109. [PubMed: 2912441]
12. Son YK, Park WS, Kim SJ, Earm YE, Kim N, Youm JB, Warda M, Kim E, Han J. Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2006; 341:931–937. [PubMed: 16455049]
13. Schwede F, Maronde E, Genieser H, Jastorff B. Pharmacol Ther. 2000; 87:199–226. [PubMed: 11008001]
14. Prinz A, Diskar M, Erlbruch A, Herberg FW. Cell Signal. 2006
15. Wu J, Brown S, Xuong NH, Taylor SS. Structure. 2004; 12:1057–1065. [PubMed: 15274925]
16. Wu J, Jones JM, Nguyen-Huu X, Ten Eyck LF, Taylor SS. Biochemistry. 2004; 43:6620–6629. [PubMed: 15157095]
17. Kim C, Xuong NH, Taylor SS. Science. 2005; 307:690–696. [PubMed: 15692043]
18. Singh P, Lillywhite B, Bannaghan C, Broad P. Comb Chem High Throughput Screen. 2005; 8:319–325. [PubMed: 16101008]
19. Xia W, Rininsland F, Wittenburg SK, Shi X, Achyuthan KE, McBranch DW, Whitten DG. Assay Drug Dev Technol. 2004; 2:183–192. [PubMed: 15165514]
20. Beasley JR, McCoy PM, Walker TL, Dunn DA. Assay Drug Dev Technol. 2004; 2:141–151. [PubMed: 15165510]
21. Mallari R, Swearingen E, Liu W, Ow A, Young SW, Huang SG. J Biomol Screen. 2003; 8:198–204. [PubMed: 12844441]

22. Von Leoprechting A, Kumpf R, Menzel S, Reulle D, Griebel R, Valler MJ, Buttner FH. *J Biomol Screen.* 2004; 9:719–725. [PubMed: 15634799]
23. Miick SM, Jalali S, Dwyer BP, Havens J, Thomas D, Jimenez MA, Simpson MT, Zile B, Huss KL, Campbell RM. *J Biomol Screen.* 2005; 10:329–338. [PubMed: 15964934]
24. Sportsman JR, Gaudet EA, Boge A. *Assay Drug Dev Technol.* 2004; 2:205–214. [PubMed: 15165516]
25. Barnett SF, Defeo-Jones D, Fu S, Hancock PJ, Haskell KM, Jones RE, Kahana JA, Kral AM, Leander K, Lee LL, Malinowski J, McAvoy EM, Nahas DD, Robinson RG, Huber HE. *Biochem J.* 2005; 385:399–408. [PubMed: 15456405]
26. Lew J, Coruh N, Tsigelny I, Garrod S, Taylor SS. *J Biol Chem.* 1997; 272:1507–1513. [PubMed: 8999821]
27. Herberg FW, Dostmann WR, Zorn M, Davis SJ, Taylor SS. *Biochemistry.* 1994; 33:7485–7494. [PubMed: 8003514]
28. Gangal M, Cox S, Lew J, Clifford T, Garrod SM, Aschbaher M, Taylor SS, Johnson DA. *Biochemistry.* 1998; 37:13728–13735. [PubMed: 9753461]
29. Su Y, Dostmann WR, Herberg FW, Durick K, Xuong NH, Ten Eyck L, Taylor SS, Varughese KI. *Science.* 1995; 269:807–813. [PubMed: 7638597]
30. Gesellchen F, Prinz A, Zimmermann B, Herberg FW. *Eur J Cell Biol.* 2006; 85:663–672. [PubMed: 16529845]
31. Owicki JC. *J Biomol Screen.* 2000; 5:297–306. [PubMed: 11080688]
32. Scott JD, Fischer EH, Takio K, Demaille JG, Krebs EG. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 1985; 82:5732–5736. [PubMed: 3898070]
33. Cheng HC, Kemp BE, Pearson RB, Smith AJ, Misconi L, Van Patten SM, Walsh DA. *J Biol Chem.* 1986; 261:989–992. [PubMed: 3511044]
34. Schneider TL, Mathew RS, Rice KP, Tamaki K, Wood JL, Schepartz A. *Org Lett.* 2005; 7:1695–1698. [PubMed: 15844883]
35. Vedvik KL, Eliason HC, Hoffman RL, Gibson JR, Kupcho KR, Somberg RL, Vogel KW. *Assay Drug Dev Technol.* 2004; 2:193–203. [PubMed: 15165515]
36. Zhang R, Mayhood T, Lipari P, Wang Y, Durkin J, Syto R, Gesell J, McNemar C, Windsor W. *Anal Biochem.* 2004; 331:138–146. [PubMed: 15246006]
37. Cadd GG, Uhler MD, McKnight GS. *J Biol Chem.* 1990; 265:19502–19506. [PubMed: 2174040]
38. Shabb JB, Ng L, Corbin JD. *J Biol Chem.* 1990; 265:16031–16034. [PubMed: 2168874]
39. Dostmann WR, Taylor SS, Genieser HG, Jastorff B, Dorskland SO, Ogreid D. *J Biol Chem.* 1990; 265:10484–10491. [PubMed: 2162349]
40. Zhang JH, Chung TD, Oldenburg KR. *J Biomol Screen.* 1999; 4:67–73. [PubMed: 10838414]

	A-site																B-site																													
Consensus	I	:	V	.	-	S	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	:	:	-	:	:	-	:	:	-	:	-	:	-	Y	F	G	E	:	A	L	P	R	A	A	:	.	Y	:	.	-
RI α _Human	I	V	V	A	T	S	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	V	D	W	V	V	Q	V	L	Y	F	G	E	I	A	L	P	R	A	A	T	V	Y	N	S	S					
RI β _Human	I	V	V	V	T	S	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	V	E	W	V	V	V	Q	V	L	Y	F	G	E	I	A	L	P	R	A	A	T	V	Y	N	S	S				
RII α _Human	I	I	V	V	G	S	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	I	E	S	I	I	M	M	C	Y	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	S	A	Y	E	E	V					
RII β _Human	I	I	V	V	G	S	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	I	E	S	I	I	I	I	C	Y	F	G	E	L	A	L	P	R	A	A	S	A	Y	E	E	V					

Figure 1.

Alignment of residues that directly contact cAMP in the A and B sites for RI and RII isoforms. In the consensus ':' and '.' denote strong and weak conservation (according to ClustalW convention) and '-' denotes no conservation. Residues separated by a space are non-adjacent in the protein sequence but come together in the 3D structure to form a discontinuous binding motif for cAMP. The A and B binding sites were identified by selecting all residues within a 3 Å radius of the cAMP mimic, Sp-cAMPS, bound to both sites in RI α from PDB: 1NE6.

Figure 2.

(a) Equilibrium binding studies between C199A C-subunit and FAM-IP20 at 1 nM or 50 nM. Experiments were performed with a two-fold serial dilution series for C-subunit ($n = 4$) in a final volume of 50 μ L. The affinity for 1 nM FAM-IP20 was found by fitting to a sigmoidal dose response with $K_d = 4.4 \pm 0.2$ nM and Hill slope = 1. (b) Dependence on ATP concentration of FAM-IP20 binding to C-subunit. The experiment was performed using 1 nM FAM-IP20 and 5 nM C-subunit with a two-fold serial dilution series for ATP ($n = 3$) in a final volume of 165 μ L. Fitting to a sigmoidal dose response gave $EC_{50} = 145 \pm 8$ nM, Hill slope = 1. (c) Displacement of FAM-IP20 from C-subunit by PKI(14–24). The experiment was performed at fixed concentrations of FAM-IP20 (1 nM) and C-subunit (5 nM) with a two-fold serial dilution series for PKI(14–24) in a final volume of 50 μ L ($n = 4$). Fitting to a sigmoidal dose response gave $IC_{50} = 2.7 \pm 0.3$ μ M and Hill slope = 1.

Figure 3.

Equilibrium binding results between C199A C-subunit and TR-IP20 at 1 nM or 40 nM. A two-fold serial dilution series for C-subunit ($n = 4$) in a final volume of 50 μ L was used. The affinity for 1nM TR-IP20 was found by fitting to a sigmoidal dose response with $K_d = 19.4 \pm 0.7$ nM. Inset: The response with 40 nM TR-IP20 is plotted on a linear scale and shows quantitative titration.

Figure 4.

Activation by cAMP (Δ), cTzMP (▲), cGMP (□) and deoxy-cAMP (●). With fixed concentrations of TR-IP20 (40 nM), C-subunit (64 nM) and R-subunit (77 nM) and with $n = 2$. Dose responses were fit to sigmoidal behavior with a variable slope. cAMP ($EC_{50} = 59 \pm 3$ nM, Hill slope = 2.1), cTzMP ($EC_{50} = 614 \pm 13$ nM, Hill slope = 1.3), cGMP ($EC_{50} = 3.12 \pm 0.06$ μM, Hill slope = 1.2) and deoxy-cAMP ($EC_{50} = 53.8 \pm 1.9$ μM, Hill slope = 1.6). Structures of the cyclic nucleotide agonists are shown.

Figure 5.

Screening results for 134 in-house compounds (Δ). Included in each screening set were 8 agonist response (500 μ M cGMP), 8 half maximal and 8 antagonist response (50 μ M Rp-8-Br-cAMPS) controls (all shown as 'O'). Z' -factors for each screen were calculated from these controls, Set 1: $Z'_{\text{agonist}} = 0.91$, $Z'_{\text{antagonist}} = 0.90$; Set2: $Z'_{\text{agonist}} = 0.73$, $Z'_{\text{antagonist}} = 0.81$; and Set3: $Z'_{\text{agonist}} = 0.83$, $Z'_{\text{antagonist}} = 0.78$. A compound is recognized as an agonist if the FP reading is significantly increased compared to the half maximal control response but equal to or lower than the agonist control response; or an antagonist if the FP reading is significantly decreased compared to the half maximal control response but greater than or equal to the antagonist control response. An agonist, 8-Cl-cAMP (+) and an antagonist, Rp-8-Br-cAMPS (x) were included in Set 1. (b) Antagonism by Rp-8-Br-cAMPS. The competition experiment was performed with a two-fold serial dilution series for Rp-8-Br-cAMPS ($n = 2$) and with fixed concentrations of TR-IP20 (40 nM), C-subunit (64 nM), R-subunit (77 nM) and cGMP (3 μ M) in a final volume of 50 μ L. The IC_{50} was determined with a sigmoidal dose response with $IC_{50} = 617 \pm 22$ nM and Hill slope = 1. The structure of Rp-8-Br-cAMPS is shown.

Scheme 1.

The LiReC assay principle as applied to PKA. Binding of IP20 or R-subunit is mutually exclusive. In the absence of cyclic nucleotide (cAMP) R-subunit out competes IP20 and the R-C complex is the dominating species (blue box). However, cAMP binds to the R-subunit and weakens this complex allowing IP20 to compete for C-subunit. Fluorescent labeling of IP20 enables the use of fluorescence polarization as a readout for peptide binding and consequently a probe for the integrity of the R-C complex. ATP/MgCl₂ (red oval) is necessary for high affinity binding of either IP20 or R-subunit. A change in conformation between R bound to C-subunit and free R is depicted by a change in shape. For simplicity only the R-C half is depicted although PKA holoenzyme is a R₂C₂ complex.

Scheme 2.

The LiReC assay in HTS format. A C199A mutant of C-subunit and a RI α (Δ 1-91) truncation of R-subunit are used. This R-subunit construct cannot dimerize but otherwise is almost identical to wildtype. An agonist ($\blacktriangle$) at its EC₅₀ concentration will allow 50% of TR-IP20 to bind, eliciting a half maximal FP response. Another agonist ($\blacktriangle$) will further weaken the R-C complex allowing more TR-IP20 to bind and increasing the FP signal. Alternately, an antagonist ($\blacktriangle$) competes with agonist and shields the R-C complex, preventing binding of TR-IP20 to C-subunit and decreasing the FP signal.