Published in final edited form as:

Biochemistry. 2012 January 10; 51(1): 1–3. doi:10.1021/bi2013883.

Structural analysis of HopPmaL reveals the presence of a second adaptor domain common to the HopAB family of *Pseudomonas syringae* type III effectors

Alex U. Singer[†], Bin Wu[‡], Adelinda Yee[‡], Scott Houlston[‡], Xiaohui Xu[†], Hong Cui[†], Tatiana Skarina[†], Maite Garcia[‡], Anthony Semesi[‡], Cheryl H. Arrowsmith[‡], and Alexei Savchenko^{†,*}

[†]Department of Chemical Engineering and Applied Chemistry, Banting and Best Department of Medical Research, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5G 1L6, Canada

[‡]Division of Cancer Genomics and Proteomics, Ontario Cancer Institute, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, and Department of Medical Biophysics, University of Toronto, Toronto

Abstract

HopPmaL is a member of the HopAB family of type 3 effectors present in the phytopathogen *Pseudomonas syringae*. Using both X-ray crystallography and solution NMR, we demonstrate that HopPmaL contains two structurally homologous yet functionally distinct domains. The N-terminal domain corresponds to the previously-described Pto-binding domain, while the previously uncharacterised C-terminal domain spans residues 308 to 385. While structurally similar these domains do not share significant sequence similarity and most importantly demonstrate significant differences in key residues involved in host protein recognition suggesting that each of them targets a different host protein.

The plant pathogen *Pseudomonas syringae* secretes a large repertoire of type III effectors into the host plant cell in order to suppress the host immune system and allow the spread of the pathogen. The best studied representative of the HopAB effector family from *P. syringae*, AvrPtoB, from *P. syringae* pv. tomato str. DC3000 (1), was found as one of two effectors (the other called AvrPto) that trigger resistance in tomato plants due to interaction with the tomato kinase Pto (1). This effector also exhibited anti-apoptotic activity, both in the plant *Nicotiana benthamiana* and in the yeast model system (2), which was localised to the C-terminal ~110 residues of AvrPtoB. The crystal structure of this fragment (PDB 2FD4) revealed the presence of a U-box motif, and subsequent experiments confirmed that AvrPtoB possesses E3 ligase activity (3). The interaction of AvrPtoB with Pto was delimited to residues 121 to 205, and the structure of this region, both in the apo-form and in complex with Pto has been characterized (4). Finally, AvrPtoB also suppresses host basal defences mediated by recognition of pathogen-associated molecular signatures or PAMPs. This

*To whom correspondence should be addressed: Phone: 416-978-4013. Fax: 416-978-8528. alexei.savchenko@utoronto.ca.

Accession Codes. Coordinates and structure factors for the crystal structures of HopPmaL[54–232] plus thermolysin, plus HopPmaL[135–273] plus chymotrypsin, and the NMR structures of HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1[220–320] from *P. syringae* pv. phaseolicola str. 1448A (HopAB1p_{ph}1448a) were deposited at the Protein Data Bank with accession codes 3SVI, 3TJY, 2LF3 and 2LF6, respectively. The chemical shifts of HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1p_{ph}1448a[220–320] were submitted to the BioMagResDB with BMRB accession number 17737 and 17739, respectively.

Author Contributions Conceived and designed the experiments: A.U.S., B.W., A.Y., C.H.A. and A.S*. Performed the experiments: A.Y., S.H., X.X., H.C., T.S., M.G., A.S. Analyzed the data: A.U.S., B.W., A.Y., A.S. Wrote the paper: A.U.S., B.W., A.Y., A.S*. All authors have given approval to the final version of the manuscript.

Supporting Information. Materials and methods for experimental protocols, Table S1 and S2, and Figures S1–S5. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

activity is present in an N-terminal 387 residue fragment of AvrPtoB, while further deletion to an N-terminal 307 fragment which still evokes Pto-mediated resistance causes the loss of this activity (5,7). AvrPtoB was also found to interact with and ubiquitinate components of pattern recognition receptor (PRR) complexes, especially FLS2 (6) and BAK1 (7), and CERK1 (8).

A unique member of the HopAB family, called HopPmaL, had been identified from a functional screen of secreted effectors of the pathogen *P. syringae* pv. *maculicola* str. ES4326 (9). This effector is significantly shorter and lacks the C-terminal U-box domain, suggesting that HopAB effectors in general, and HopPmaL in particular, may contain an additional functional domain(s) that does not require the E3 ligase domain for some of its functions *in vivo*.

In order to test this hypothesis we designed several HopPmaL fragments (Figure 1A), and recombinantly expressed them in *E. coli*. Expression of HopPmaL fragments from residue 54 to 232 (HopPmaL[54–232]) and from 135 to 273 (HopPmaL[135–273]) both incorporating the Pto binding domain similar to that found in AvrPtoB (10) resulted in soluble recombinant polypeptides of corresponding size which were submitted to crystallisation trials. Treatment of the HopPmaL[135–273] fragment with chymotrypsin led to protein crystals diffracting to 1.7 Å, while treatment of HopPmaL[54–232] with thermolysin led to diffraction data to 1.8 Å. Both structures were solved using SAD (single-wavelength anomalous dispersion) phasing. In both cases the interpretable electron density corresponded to residues 140 to 217, with the thermolysin-treated crystal showing additional density for residue Y139, a probable P1 site for thermolysin cleavage. This HopPmaL region almost exactly matches the AvrPtoB[121–205] Pto binding domain (PDB 3HGL), suggesting that the rest of the HopPmaL N-terminal region (residues 57–138 and 218 to 273) was poorly structured and prone to protease degradation. Not surprisingly, these structures (Figure 1B, see Table S1 for data collection and refinement statistics) were very similar to that of the previously characterised AvrPtoB[121–205] fragment (PDB 3HGL) and superimposed with an RMSD of 1.1 Å (Figure S1A). The similarity between these structures extends into the Pto binding site. In AvrPtoB[121–205] six residues form a hydrophobic patch contacting Pto. Two of these six residues are conserved in the HopPmaL structure while the other four positions are occupied by chemically similar residues (Figure S1B).

We then analysed the expression of fragments corresponding to the C-terminus of HopPmaL. The expression of a fragment spanning residues 281 to 385 (HopPmaL[281–385]) resulted in a soluble polypeptide of corresponding size. While we could not obtain protein crystals of this fragment that diffracted to atomic resolution, the ¹⁵N-¹H HSQC spectrum of this fragment demonstrated features of a globular domain, as did a fragment from the HopAB1 effector from *P. syringae* pv *phaseolicola* str. 1448A (HopAB1_{Pph1448a}) spanning residues 220 and 320 and sharing 45 % of sequence identity with HopPmaL[281–385]. Notably both fragments share significant sequence similarity with the region of AvrPtoB (residues 308 to 387, see Figure 1A) involved in suppressing PAMP defences.

Solution structure determination by heteronuclear solution NMR methods was performed on both HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] fragments. Both protein fragments behaved as a monomer in solution, as assessed by both gel filtration and the rotational correlation times ($\tau_c \sim 5.2$ and 6.3 ns, respectively), which are in good agreement with the expected value for a folded ~11–12 kDa protein. Both structures (Figure 1B, see Table S2 for experimental restraints and structural statistics and Figure S2 for representations of the 20 lowest energy structures) show a well-ordered core composed of at least 4 α -helices. For the HopPmaL[281–385] structure, this core corresponds to residues

308 to 385 with an RMSD of 0.28 Å for backbone atoms and 0.58 Å for all atoms (Figure S2B). The HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] structure was most precisely defined between residues 239 and 316, however even in this region, the structure is somewhat less defined than the HopPmaL core region of residues 308–385 (RMSD of 0.39 Å for backbone atoms and 0.82 Å for all atoms). This is in part because residues M268 to P274 connecting helices B and C contain missing resonances and fewer NOE's, probably due to line broadening arising from conformational change on an intermediate time scale.

Surprisingly, the common fold shared by HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] was very similar to the structure of the HopPmaL/AvrPtoB Pto kinase-binding domain mentioned above (Figure 2A). According to the EBI SSM server (<http://www.ebi.ac.uk/msd-srv/ssm/cgibin/ssmserver>) the HopPmaL[139–217] and HopPmaL[308–385] structures superimpose with an RMSD of 2.8 Å and a Z-score of 5.2 despite the absence of notable sequence similarity (less than 14 % ID). However, sequence alignment of HopAB1 alleles in the region of the HopPmaL C-terminal domain with the Pto-binding domains of AvrPtoB and HopPmaL reveal conservation of hydrophobic residues present in the hydrophobic core of both domains (Figure S3). The HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] structure also superimposes well on the HopPmaL structure from residues 308–385 (Z-score of 7.1, RMSD of 1.6 Å), though helix E is 3 residues longer in the HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] structure.

Outside the core HopPmaL[281–385] domain, random coil regions or regions of local secondary structure were observed (Figure S2A). The N-terminal 19 residues up to residue A299 exhibited sharp NMR signals and a lack of medium- and long-range NOE signals typical of a flexible random coil. However residues 300 to 304 form a short α -helix, as indicated by $^{13}\text{C}_\alpha$ and $^{13}\text{C}_\beta$ chemical shifts as well as $d_{\text{NN}(i,i+1)}$, $d_{\alpha\text{N}(i,i+3)}$ and $d_{\alpha\beta(i,i+3)}$, but with no fixed orientation relative to the core, as do residues 224–233 of the HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] solution structure. Finally, the four C-terminal residues of the HopPmaL[281–385] fragment also appear disordered.

The strong similarity between structures of HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[239–316] on one hand, and the Pto-binding domains of AvrPtoB and HopPmaL on the other hand, allowed us to investigate the conservation of the Pto-binding site in the former structures. This analysis demonstrated that these residues are not conserved in HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[239–316] domains (Figure 2B). Specifically the positions corresponding to the three hydrophobic residues (I356, P358, F360 in AvrPtoB) from the loop connecting helix C and D are occupied by charged residues. Moreover, in both the HopPmaL[281–385] and the HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] structures, helix C is tilted relative to its position to the AvrPtoB and HopPmaL Pto-binding domains. In HopPmaL[281–385], helix D is longer and occupies a position orthogonal to that of the Pto-binding domains of AvrPtoB and HopPmaL. However, in HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320], helix D is absent; instead we observe an extended loop from residue 285–300 between helix C and E. This analysis suggests that while the structure of HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] domains share an overall fold with the Pto-binding motif, the former domains may be adapted to interact with different host proteins.

Since the region of AvrPtoB that binds AvrPtoB (7) overlaps the sequence corresponding to the C-terminal domain of HopPmaL, we tested binding of our HopPmaL C-terminal domain with the cytoplasmic kinase domain of BAK1. To our surprise, NMR titration of GST-BAK1[268–615] did not demonstrate binding of HopPmaL[281–385] (Figure S4). As differences in conformation are observed around helix α D in HopPmaL[281–385] and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320], different specificities could lie within the helical domains of HopAB alleles, and further work remains to elucidate the true target of these domains.

Outside these two domains, no additional folded regions were found in HopPmaL. Specifically, ^{15}N - ^1H HSQC spectra of the first 138 residues of HopPmaL (Figure S5A) and the first 90 residues of HopAB1_{Pph1448A} (Figure S5B) show little evidence of folded structure; though peaks are reasonably sharp indicating little in terms of aggregation, the amide proton chemical shifts vary over a narrow range (7.9–8.6 ppm). Thus unstructured regions in the N-terminus of this effector family may be a commonality. Finally, the region in HopPmaL between the two helical domains (residues 218–307, see Figure S5C) also showed little evidence for a folded structure.

In conclusion, we have identified two distinct yet structurally homologous domains conserved within the HopAB family of effector proteins. Both domains shared the same overall fold as the expected Pto-binding domain of AvrPtoB, but the C-terminal domain lacks residues required for binding to Pto kinase. Thus the HopPmaL effector and other representatives of HopAB family contain two structurally similar domains potentially interacting with different host targets. HopPmaL appears to have no globular structure according to our NMR studies outside these two domains.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Funding Sources

This work was supported by the NIH Protein Structure Initiative (Grants GM074942 and U54 GM094597), by the Ontario Research and Development Challenge Fund, Genome Canada and the Canadian Institute of Health Research through the Canada Research Chairs program (to C.H.A.).

We would like to thank the staff at the Argonne National Laboratory beam line 19-ID, in particular Dr. Adam Stein, for assistance with data collection.

ABBREVIATIONS

NMR	nuclear magnetic resonance
RMSD	root mean squared deviation
HSQC	heteronuclear single quantum coherence

References

- Kim YJ, Lin NC, Martin GB. Cell. 2002; 109:589–598. [PubMed: 12062102]
- Abramovitch RB, Kim YJ, Chen S, Dickman MB, Martin GB. Embo J. 2003; 22:60–69. [PubMed: 12505984]
- Janjusevic R, Abramovitch RB, Martin GB, Stebbins CE. Science. 2006; 311:222–226. [PubMed: 16373536]
- Dong J, Xiao F, Fan F, Gu L, Cang H, Martin GB, Chai J. Plant Cell. 2009; 21:1846–1859. [PubMed: 19509331]
- Xiao F, He P, Abramovitch RB, Dawson JE, Nicholson LK, Sheen J, Martin GB. Plant J. 2007; 52:595–614. [PubMed: 17764515]
- Gohre V, Spallek T, Haweker H, Mersmann S, Mentzel T, Boller T, de Torres M, Mansfield JW, Robatzek S. Curr Biol. 2008; 18:1824–1832. [PubMed: 19062288]
- Shan L, He P, Li J, Heese A, Peck SC, Nurnberger T, Martin GB, Sheen J. Cell Host Microbe. 2008; 4:17–27. [PubMed: 18621007]

8. Gimenez-Ibanez S, Hann DR, Ntoulakis V, Petutschnig E, Lipka V, Rathjen JP. *Curr Biol.* 2009; 19:423–429. [PubMed: 19249211]
9. Stavrinos J, Guttman DS. *J Bacteriol.* 2004; 186:5101–5115. [PubMed: 15262947]
10. Lin NC, Abramovitch RB, Kim YJ, Martin GB. *Appl Environ Microbiol.* 2006; 72:702–712. [PubMed: 16391110]

Figure 1.

(A) Cartoon of HopPmaL, HopAB_{Pph1448a} and AvrPtoB with coloured boxes representing the different structured domains of these proteins. Black lines above the cartoons represent the different fragments used in this study. (B) Ribbon diagram of the HopPmaL[139-207], HopPmaL[281-385] and HopAB_{Pph1448a}[220-320] structures. Helices are labeled according to the nomenclature of (4).

Figure 2.

(A) Superposition of AvrPtoB[120–205] (from PDB 3HGK) with HopPmaL[281–385] residues 308–385 (left) and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] residues 239–316 (right). N and C represents the N- and C-terminus of AvrPtoB[120–205], while N' and C' represents the N- and C-terminus of the superimposed molecule. (B) Closeup of the Pto binding region of AvrPtoB[120–205] as it lies on the surface of the Pto kinase (PDB 3HGK). Selected residues of AvrPtoB[124–200] interacting with Pto kinase are displayed and labeled. (C) Close-up of the putative Pto binding region of HopPmaL[281–385] residues 308–385 and HopAB1_{Pph1448a}[220–320] residues 239–316. Residues from these structures expected to bind Pto based on the AvrPtoB[120–205] structure are shown and labeled.