Published in final edited form as:

J Mol Model. 2013 November ; 19(11): . doi:10.1007/s00894-013-1998-2.

Destabilization of the MutS α 's protein-protein interface due to binding to the DNA adduct induced by anticancer agent Carboplatin via molecular dynamics simulations

Lacramioara Negureanu and Freddie R Salsbury Jr*

Department of Physics, Wake Forest University, Winston Salem, NC 27106

Abstract

DNA mismatch repair (MMR) proteins maintain genetic integrity in all organisms by recognizing and repairing DNA errors. Such alteration of hereditary information can lead to various diseases, including cancer. Besides their role in DNA repair, MMR proteins detect and initiate cellular responses to certain type of DNA damage. Its response to the damaged DNA has made the human MMR pathway a useful target for anticancer agents such as carboplatin.

This study indicates that strong, specific interactions at the interface of MutS α in response to the mismatched DNA recognition are replaced by weak, non-specific interactions in response to the damaged DNA recognition. Data suggest a severe impairment of the dimerization of MutS α in response to the damaged DNA recognition. While the core of MutS α is preserved in response to the damaged DNA recognition, the loss of contact surface and the rearrangement of contacts at the protein interface suggest a different packing in response to the damaged DNA recognition.

Coupled in response to the mismatched DNA recognition, interaction energies, hydrogen bonds, salt bridges, and solvent accessible surface areas at the interface of MutS α and within the subunits are uncoupled or asynchronously coupled in response to the damaged DNA recognition.

These pieces of evidence suggest that the loss of a synchronous mode of response in the MutS α 's surveillance for DNA errors would possible be one of the mechanism(s) of signaling the MMR-dependent programmed cell death much wanted in anticancer therapies. The analysis was drawn from dynamics simulations.

Keywords

platinum-DNA adducts carboplatin-induced damage DNA recognition; mismatch repair proteins; MMR; protein-protein interface destabilization; MD simulations

1. Introduction

DNA mismatch repair (MMR) proteins maintain genetic integrity in virtually all organisms [1] by recognizing and repairing post-replicative DNA errors [2]. Such alteration of hereditary information can lead to various diseases, including cancer, and defective MMR genes are associated with increased risk of cancer [3]. Besides their role in DNA repair during the cell division, the system of MMR proteins also detect certain types of DNA damage, initiating cellular death responses [4,5], making the proteins in MMR pathway, particularly the human recognition protein complex MutS α (Msh2-Msh6), potential targets for the development of anticancer agents [5–7].

*Corresponding author, salsbufr@wfu.edu, phone: 336.758.4975, fax: 336.758.6142.

A highly conserved process from prokaryotes to eukaryotes, the DNA repair in eukaryotes is initiated by the concerted action of several MMR complexes, namely MutS α , MutS β (Msh2-Msh3), and MutL α (Mlh1-Pms2) [2]. In the first step, MutS α heterodimer detects and signals mispaired DNA nucleotides or small insertion/deletion loops. These events lead to MutL α nicking the DNA strand in the vicinity of the error [8]. Subsequently, the nicked strand is excised and the replication machinery resynthesizes DNA. The final cellular outcome is DNA repair [8]. MutS β heterodimer binds to post-replicative DNA containing insertion/deletion loops of two, three, four or six unpaired nucleotides [9]. A recent study [10] indicates large conformational changes in MutS (the *E. Coli* homologue of human MutS α) during DNA scanning, mismatch recognition and repair signaling. The same study also indicates that the lifetime of the MutS-DNA complex, in which presumably the protein interacts with downstream proteins required for repair, is on the scale of seconds.

In addition to the DNA repair function, MutS α also recognizes and initiates cellular response to certain types of DNA damage, such as DNA adducts induced by platinum-based anticancer agents [11,12]. In this case, the final cellular outcome is cell death. The mechanism by which lesion recognition triggers cell cycle checkpoints and apoptosis is not yet resolved [13,14]. However, it has been established that MMR-dependent DNA repair is uncoupled from MMR damage response to the anticancer agent cisplatin [15].

Carboplatin (*cis*-diammine(cyclobutane-1,1-dicarboxylato)-platinum(II) [16] and its predecessor, cisplatin (*cis*-diamminechloroplatinum(II) [17], are platinum-based anticancer agents used in the treatment of many solid cancers [18]. Since its discovery in 1960's, thousands of platinum analogues have been synthesized and screened for anticancer effect in an attempt to overcome cisplatin's limitations, many have entered clinical trials, but, besides carboplatin, only one other, oxaliplatin, gained international marketing approval [18]. Platinum-based anticancer drugs exert their anticancer effect through the formation of several types of adducts with nuclear DNA [19,20]. In these adducts the DNA double-helix is severely distorted [21–23]. Sharing the same *cis*-diammine carrier ligands, cisplatin and carboplatin form the same type of platinum-DNA adducts *in vivo*. In these adducts, the platinum atom forms covalent bonds to the N7 positions of imidazole ring of purine bases, primarily guanine, generating 1,2-d-(GpGp) and 1,3-d-(GpXGp) intra-strand cross-linked adducts, as well as a limited number of inter-strand cross-linked adducts [4]. However, while the 1,2-d(GpGp) intra-strand platinum-DNA adduct is the major component induced by cisplatin [22], the 1,3-d(GpXGp) intra-strand platinum-DNA adduct is considered responsible for the biological activity of carboplatin [22].

Current knowledge on the cellular recognition of the platinum-DNA adducts is based mostly on the cisplatin-induced adducts [4,6,24,25]. Previous studies in our group provided computational evidence suggesting that MutS α proteins recognize mismatched and damaged DNA substrates in significantly different modes [26], and that MutS α signals the mismatched and damaged DNA recognition through independent pathways [27]. These observations are in agreement with experimental evidence indicating that repair-deficient MMR mutants are functional in MMR-dependent cisplatin cytotoxicity [5]. Additionally, Msh2 subunit is indicated “to assist” [26] the mismatch recognition subunit Msh6 in recognition and to play a key role in signaling both mismatched and damaged DNA recognition [27].

The focus of this study is on conformational and structural changes at the protein-protein interface of MutS α complex in response to carboplatin-induced damaged DNA recognition, as derived from atomistic molecular dynamics simulations of the MutS α -DNA recognition complex. Nonbonding interactions energies, solvent accessible surface area, contact maps, hydrogen bonding, and salt bridges calculations at the protein-protein interface in the

carboplatin-damaged complex will be contrasted to those found in the mismatched DNA recognition complex.

These data indicate that strong, specific interactions at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in response to the mismatched DNA recognition are replaced by weak, non-specific interactions in response to the damaged DNA recognition, suggesting a severe impairment of the dimerization of MutS α in response to the damaged DNA recognition. While the core of MutS α is preserved in response to damaged DNA recognition, the loss of contact surface and the rearrangement of contacts at the protein-protein interface suggest a different packing in response to damaged DNA recognition. Coupled in response to the mismatched DNA recognition, interaction energies, hydrogen bonds, salt bridges, and solvent accessible surface area at the interface of MutS α and within subunits are uncoupled or asynchronously coupled in response to the damaged DNA recognition.

These pieces of evidence suggest that the loss of a synchronous mode of response while "surveying" post-replicative DNA errors would possibly be one of the mechanism(s) of signaling the MMR-dependent programmed cell death much wanted in anticancer therapies. Such knowledge would advance the understanding of the mechanism of the cellular processing of the damaged DNA by MMR pathway.

The results at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in the carboplatin-induced damaged DNA recognition complex are similar to those in the cisplatin-induced damaged DNA recognition complex, and the latter system has been the subject of multiple computational studies with experimental validation in our group [5,7]. Specifically, employing the same simulation protocol, 2–10 ns of simulations of the *E. Coli* homologue (MutS) molecular complex have been experimentally verified to be sufficient to examine the experimental questions addressed in the MutS α mismatched and cisplatinated DNA complexes [5,6,15]. To this end, changes associated with the DNA damage response, such as conformational differences in disordered loops at the protein-protein interface, conformational changes associated with ATP binding/hydrolysis, and key protein-DNA contacts, predicted by conformational analysis of MutS complex with cisplatin-damaged DNA were validated by mutational and genetic analysis experiments [6]. Most importantly, mutational and cell survival studies [6] confirmed that predicted inter-subunit interactions are essential for the repair event and that these inter-subunit interactions are absent or altered in the cisplatin-DNA complex.

2. Methods

2.1 Molecular Dynamics Simulations

Preparing the MutS α -DNA complex—The structural model for our simulations on 1,3-d(GCG) intra-strand platinum-DNA adduct recognition by the MMR machinery was based on the X-ray structure [28] of human Msh2-Msh6 heterodimer complex with duplex DNA and two ADP molecules bound in the ATPase sites of the heterodimer (PDB ID 2O8B). Each subunit of MutS α is divided into five domains [28]: the mismatch binding domain, the connector domain, the lever domain, the clamp domain, and the ATPase domain (Figure 1). A complete list of residues sequence and numbering is included in Online Resource 1, Figures 1&2.

All protein residues were considered in their default protonation state at physiological pH. Coordination of [cis-Pt(NH₃)₂]²⁺ fragment to DNA, in which platinum atom links N7 atoms of two guanines from the same DNA strand, G8 and G10, alters the duplex DNA. The mismatched DNA was used as a template in building the 1,3 intra-strand platinum cross-link. The cross-linked structure was fitted into the binding pocket of the protein to maximize

the structural overlap with the mismatched DNA structure, followed by rotations and translations to minimize the energy of the unrelaxed structure using the coordinate manipulation and energy minimization facilities of CHARMM [29]. N-terminal residues 1–361, not resolved in the crystalline structure, were omitted from the simulations. Note that in our system residue 1 of Msh6 corresponds to residue 362 in the solved structure. Hydrogen atoms were added using the *hbuild* facility of CHARMM. The prepared structure was fully solvated in a rectangular box of TIP3P water [30] (33,143 molecules of water) using the VMD package [31], keeping a 10 Å minimum distance between each face of the box and the solute. Na⁺ and Cl[−] ions were added to neutralize the total charge of the solvated system using the Autoionize plugin from VMD. There are 855 amino acids in Msh2, 974 amino acids in Msh6, 30 nucleotides in the DNA substrate, and two ADP molecules, a total of 30,046 atoms in the protein-DNA complex and 129,533 atoms in the simulated recognition complex.

Simulations protocol—Simulations were performed using CHARMM27 force field [32] and additional parameters based on preexisting cisplatin parameters [32–34]. CHARMM27 force field has been extensively parameterized for a wide range of biologically important molecules, including amino acids and nucleic acids. Each simulation was the result of a combined CHARMM/NAMD protocol that was derived from earlier protocols [35,36] that have been used in multiple previous studies [5–7,26,27], and the rationale behind it has been reviewed recently [37]. The water molecules were briefly minimized for 100 cycles of conjugate gradient minimization with a small (0.25 kcal/(mol · Å²)) harmonic force constant on all protein atoms. The entire system then underwent 250 ps of molecular dynamics simulation to achieve a thermal equilibration using Berendsen pressure regulation with isotropic position scaling [38]. During the thermal equilibration, the system's temperature was equilibrated by reassigning atom velocities from a Boltzman distribution for a given temperature every 1000 steps, in a 25 K increment, from an initial temperature of 0 K to a target temperature of 300 K. Then periodic adjustments of velocities were allowed, if necessary, within the first 125000 steps.

Following the equilibration, for each simulation, a 20 ns NPT production simulation at 300K and 1 bar was performed using NAMD package [39] with standard parameters and periodic boundary conditions. All bonds involving hydrogen atoms in the protein were constrained using SHAKE constraint algorithm [40]. A 2 fs integration time step was used for all interactions. The van der Waals potential was switched to zero starting at a radius of 8 Å and ending at 12 Å. Particle Mesh Ewald (PME) [41] method for full long-range electrostatics was used, with a maximum space between grid points of 1 Å and a local interaction distance of 12 Å, evaluated every two time steps. Constant temperature was achieved using Langevin thermostat, as implemented in NAMD [39], with a damping coefficient of 5 ps^{−1}. Berendsen's constant pressure algorithm with a target pressure of 1.01325 bar, a compressibility of 45.7 mbar, a relaxation time of 1 ps, and a pressure frequency of 40 fs provided the pressure control during the simulations.

Four simulations employing the same protocol with different initial velocities and the same coordinates were performed. For the production simulations, initial coordinates, velocities and system dimensions were taken from the final state of the corresponding equilibration simulation.

Cα root-mean-square deviations (RMSD) from the starting structure and total energies are provided in Online Resource 1, Figure 3. These data show that there are two different relaxation timescales, a fast one on the 10s–100s of picosecond timescale, and a slow one on the nanosecond timescale. Data show that most of the relaxation to equilibrium occurs within the first 2 ns, and while there may be additional long-time relaxation, starting the

simulations analysis at 8 ns allows for a conservative removal of the majority of the non-equilibration effects. Since our four different simulations started from different initial conditions, it is expected they to show different pathways to equilibration, as well as variation in relaxation. Prior to RMSD calculations the solute was aligned to the initial structure by least-square superimpositions performed to remove translational and rotational movements.

The structural model and the molecular dynamics simulations protocol for the simulations of the 1,2 intra-strand platinum-DNA MutS α complex are presented elsewhere [26,27]. The structural model, in which platinum atom links N7 atoms of central adjacent guanine bases G8 and G9, was built using the G-T mismatched MutS α -DNA complex [28]. Employing the same protocol, the 50 ns of all-atom molecular dynamics simulations [26,27] were extended here to a total of 80 ns. A table describing the conditions and the duration of all the simulations considered in this study is included in Online Resource 1, Table 1.

Sufficient sampling of the configurational portion of phase space is a matter of considerable concern in macromolecular dynamics simulations [26,42,43]. Those studies and others [44–46] indicate that more effective sampling of the conformational space of proteins is obtained from multiple short trajectories starting from a single conformation with the use of different random distributions for the initial velocities rather than from a single, long trajectory.

In general, it has been observed that a single longer trajectory samples only one region of configurational space [43,47], whereas multiple shorter trajectories starting from the same configuration with different initial velocities sample multiple nearby regions of configurational space [43,45,47,48]. That is, multiple shorter simulations allow for the sampling of different regions of phase space, and so a set of these trajectories is necessary to have reasonable phase-space coverage. Hence, structural and dynamic properties obtained from multiple trajectories are improvements of those obtained from single longer trajectories [43,45,48]. In this work, fluctuations about the native-state and perturbations due to carboplatin and cisplatin binding were sampled by multiple molecular dynamics simulations with different initial atomic velocities.

Representative ensemble of structures—The last 12 ns of each of the four independent simulations were considered for analysis. Snapshots, each containing a record of all atom positions in the protein-DNA complex at a given time, taken every 20 ps intervals from the trajectories of the simulated MutS α -carboplatin-damaged-DNA complex, were collected to obtain a representative ensemble of structures. Only the protein complex was included in the snapshots. Similar representative ensembles of structures were generated for the cisplatin-damaged and mismatched DNA MutS α recognition complexes.

2.2 Nonbonding Interactions Energy Calculations

Protein-protein and protein-DNA electrostatic and van der Waals nonbonding interactions energies were calculated from the trajectories by applying CHARMM [29] interaction energy analysis to the collected snapshots. Coulomb's electrostatic interactions and van der Waals interactions based on 6–12 Lennard-Jones potential were shifted to zero using a cutoff value of 22 Å. Any interactions beyond 22 Å were discarded. The spherical cutoff shifting criterion was applied on an atom by atom basis, method which has been proved [49] to be able to approximate no-cutoff results (computationally unfeasible for this large system) when a cutoff at or beyond 12 Å is used. A cutoff radius of 24 Å was used to generate the non-bonded pair list, and the non-bonding list was updated at every step. The solvent serves the dual function of solvating each individual charge of the simulated protein-DNA complex and of screening the interaction between charge pairs. To approximate the solvent screening without including explicit water molecules, electrostatic interactions were calculated using a

distance-dependent dielectric coefficient (RDIE [49] implemented in CHARMM [29]), $\epsilon(r)=4r$.

2.3 Solvent Accessible Surface Area Calculations

The topology of the surface of a protein is intimately related to its function. Solvent accessible surface area (SASA) calculations for the damaged and mismatched MutS α -DNA recognition complexes were performed using the analytical method to compute the Lee and Richards surface [50], as implemented in CHARMM [29]'s *Coordinate Manipulation Commands* module. In the Lee-Richards surface the molecular system is represented by a set of interlocking spheres of appropriate van der Waals' radii and the accessible surface is traced out by the center of a spherical probe representing the solvent, as it rolls over the molecular systems' surface. CHARMM27 [32] force field's van der Waals radii for the nucleic acids, CHARMM22 [33] force field's van der Waals radii for the protein, and a spherical probe of 1.4 Å for water were used to calculate SASA based on the analytical method. Solvent accessible surface area per residue was calculated as mean value over the trajectories in each system.

For each of the representative ensemble of structures, the contact surface between the two subunits was calculated as the following: for example, for a given structure, the contact surface for Msh2 was calculated as the difference between the SASA of Msh2 alone and the SASA of Msh2 when Msh6 was present. Similarly, the contact surface for Msh6 was calculated as the difference between the SASA of Msh6 alone and the SASA of Msh6 when Msh2 was present.

SASA relation to hydrophobic effect: each square Angstrom of accessible surface area removed from contact with water gives a free energy gain of 25 kcal/mol [51,52].

2.4 Contact Maps

The center-of-geometry distance matrixes between residues, weighted average of residues, were computed from the trajectories using the *Coordinate Manipulation Commands* module in CHARMM [29] for several contact cutoff distances (20, 10, and 5 Å, respectively).

2.5 Hydrogen Bonding Analysis

Hydrogen bonding analysis was performed using the hydrogen bond analysis tool *hbond* from CHARMM [29], based on purely geometrical criteria of search for hydrogen bonding. As a special case of dipole interactions, hydrogen bonding or rather "hydrogen bridging" is defined as the attractive force between the hydrogen covalently bound to an electronegative atom of one molecule and an electronegative atom of another molecule or chemical entity. Usually, the electronegative atom is oxygen, nitrogen or fluorine, but hydrogen attached to carbon can also participate in hydrogen bonding when the carbon atom is bound to electronegative atoms [53]. In the strong/weak convention to characterize hydrogen bonding in biomolecules [54–56], its definition of strong or weak takes into account the electronegativity of the hydrogen's donor and acceptor. Following the above convention, in this study strong hydrogen bonding or hydrogen bonding refers to strong donor-strong acceptor interactions, such as in O-H...O, N-H...O, O-H...N, and N-H...N. The criterion for hydrogen bonding interactions in this study was defined as having a separation distance $d \leq 3.0$ Å between the hydrogen atom and acceptor atom, and the cutoff for the angle θ between the donor-H...acceptor was set at 90° , $90^\circ < \theta \leq 180^\circ$. Hydrogen bonds mediated or formed by water molecules with the protein are beyond the scope of this analysis and were not considered.

2.6 Salt Bridging Analysis

Salt bridges were evaluated according to the distance between the charged donor atoms, positively charged N ζ of lysine, or N ζ , N η 1 and N η 2 of arginine, and the charged acceptor atoms, negatively charged O ϵ 1 and O ϵ 2 of glutamic acid, or O δ 1 and O δ 2 of aspartic acid, in the protein, and oxygen atoms in the phosphate group of the DNA nucleotides. The backbone of polynucleotides are highly charged, double stranded DNA having two negative charges per base-pair, one unit negative charge per phosphate group. A distance 4 Å, found as a “working definition” for an ion-pair based upon analysis of charged groups in 38 proteins [57], was employed. Applied to the collected snapshots from the trajectories, the salt bridge calculations were performed in CHARMM.

2.7 Clustering Analysis

To determine the occupancy of different conformations during the time course of the simulations clustering analysis was performed. The clustering was performed based on the root mean-square distances between conformations comprising the trajectories, calculated across all residues. The conformations were grouped together using distances in the coordinates space, as a measure of conformational similarity, using the ART-2' algorithm [58] as implemented in CHARMM. The conformation closest to the cluster's center was considered as being representative of the class of structures making up the cluster, and these conformations were further analyzed. The conformations generated in this fashion, 14 for the carboplatin-damaged, 12 for the cisplatin-damaged, and eight for the mismatched MutS α -DNA recognition complex, were weighted in the overall trajectories (data presented in Online Resource 2, Figure 1) and were further investigated for similarities.

Their hierarchical clustering dendrogram, constructed using the agglomerative method of average linkage implemented in Matlab [58], presented in Online Resource 2, indicate that the representative conformations for the carboplatin-damaged MutS α -DNA recognition complex are substantially different than the representative conformations for the mismatched MutS α -DNA recognition complex. The affinity for clusters is the relative RMSD between the conformations and at each particular stage the method joins together the two clusters that are the most similar, or have the highest affinity.

Histograms were generated with Matlab [59]; t-test analysis was performed using Matlab; structural details were rendered with VMD [31].

3. Results and Discussion

Functional proteins are dynamic structures that allow for certain types of internal motion to enable their biological function. In the emerging view of allosteric regulation in proteins function, in which an event in one place at a protein structure causes an effect at another site, ligand interactions at the binding site causes changes in the protein conformational distribution that lead to altered protein activity. In our investigated system, the “default” function of MutS α is to recognize and to initiate repair of post-replicative DNA errors through the MMR-repair pathways. The “altered” activity of MutS α can be considered the recognition of damaging, platinum-based DNA adducts and consequently the initiation of cell death by MMR-dependent apoptosis pathway.

We have previously shown [27] that MutS α binding to the cisplatin-induced damaged DNA adduct alters the protein dynamics around the native state, providing evidence on the molecular origin of the MMR-apoptotic pathway. Here, through means of nonbonding interactions energies, solvent accessible surface area, hydrogen bonding and salt bridges we investigate and quantify conformational and structural changes at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in response to the binding to the 1,3-d(GXG) intra-strand platinum-DNA

adduct (the main adduct induced by chemotherapeutic agent carboplatin) by comparison with protein-protein interactions in the mismatched DNA recognition complex.

3.1 Nonbonding interactions at the protein-protein interface and MutS α ' subunits self-interactions

Msh2-Msh6 nonbonding interactions energies over the course of our simulations were used as an indication of the degree of dimerization between the protein's monomers in response to carboplatin-damaged and mismatched DNA substrates recognition. These data suggest a severe impairment of the dimerization of MutS α and structural rearrangements at the protein-protein interface and within subunits in response to damaged DNA recognition.

The electrostatic (specific) and van der Waals (non-specific, induced dipole) interactions were calculated in an implicit solvent approximation using a distance-dependent dielectric to mimic the screening effect of the solvent (see Methods). The histograms of the nonbonding interactions at the protein-protein interface and the MutS α 's subunits self-interaction energies in the carboplatin-damaged and mismatched recognition complexes are presented in Figure 2, a–f. Their average values from the simulations are presented in Table 1. Similar results are seen in the cisplatin-induced damaged DNA MutS α recognition complex, Online Resource 2.

MutS α dimerization seems to be severely impaired in response to damaged DNA recognition—Data in Table 1 indicate that, while in the mismatch recognition complex electrostatic interactions are dominant at the protein-protein interface and within subunits, in the damage recognition complex the disperse forces interactions are dominant. Overall, the nonbonding interactions are about five times weaker at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in the damage recognition complex than in the mismatch recognition complex. In addition, while self-electrostatic interactions within subunits are indicated about 10 times weaker in response to damaged DNA recognition, the van der Waals interactions within subunits are about three times stronger in response to damaged DNA recognition than in response to the “default” mismatched DNA recognition.

These major differences in interactions energies suggest the possibility of significant conformational and structural changes at the protein-protein interface and within subunits in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Specific interactions at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in damaged versus mismatched DNA recognition complexes—To investigate the specific interactions responsible for the large differences on nonbonding interactions energies at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in the damaged and mismatched DNA recognition complexes, the Msh2-Msh6 interactions per residue were calculated for the representative structures indicated by clustering analysis (the structures representing the center of the most populous cluster in each system and proved to be substantially different, see the clustering analysis in the Methods section and the dendrogram of the representative structures included in the Online Resource 2, Figure 1), and their differences are presented in Figure 3.

These data indicate not only strong differences in the nonbonding interactions at MutS α 's interface in the damaged versus mismatched DNA recognition complexes (Figure 3, a–d), but also significant differences between the carboplatin and cisplatin damaged DNA recognition complexes (Figure 3, e&f). The main differences in the electrostatic interactions (Figure 3, a, c, and e) derive from interactions of the mismatch binding, lever and ATPase domains of Msh2 with lever, mismatch binding and ATPase domains of Msh6, respectively. The main differences in the van der Waals interactions (Figure 3, b, d, and f) derive from interactions of the mismatch binding domain of Msh2 with the mismatch binding and lever

domains of Msh6, lever domain of Msh2 with the mismatch domain of Msh6, clamp domain of Msh2 with the clamp domain of Msh6, and the ATPase domain of Msh2 with the lever and ATPase domains of Msh6.

Differences in the electrostatic interactions—Overall, data indicate that carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition induces stronger differences in the electrostatic interactions at the protein-protein interface than the cisplatin-damaged DNA recognition, when compared with the mismatched DNA recognition. Specifically, about 15 kcal/mol stronger interactions, as indicated in Figure 3, a&c and confirmed in Figure 3e.

Most of the protein-protein electrostatic interactions responsible for the main differences between mismatched and damaged DNA recognition complexes are common or similar for both carboplatin and cisplatin damages, namely the interactions between residue pairs 55–399, 382-7, 716–821, 737–946, 809-216 or 810-216, 850–973 (data labeled in blue in Figure 3c).

However, some of these particularly strong common electrostatic interactions at the protein-protein interface are indicated as specific to the carboplatin-induced damage, specifically the interactions between residue pairs 850–973, 318–821, 720-383, and 55–394, while others are indicated as specific to the cisplatin-induced damage, such as the electrostatic interactions between residue pair 382-7 (Figure 3e). Particularly strong and specific to the later damaged DNA recognition complex are also indicated the 382-7 and 847–894 electrostatic interactions, Figure 3e; the 382-7 electrostatic interaction is indicated as weaker than in the mismatched complex but stronger than in the carboplatin complex and the 847–894 interaction is indicated as stronger than in both mismatched and carboplatin recognition complexes. All interactive residue pairs are described in the Msh2-Msh6 representation.

Differences in the van der Waals interactions—On the contrary, overall, data indicate that the cisplatin-damaged DNA recognition induces slightly stronger differences in the van der Waals interactions at the protein interface than the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition, when compared with the mismatched DNA recognition. Specifically, about 7 kcal/mol stronger interactions, as indicated by data in Figure 3, b&d and confirmed by data in Figure 3f.

As pointed out above, the most significant differences in the van der Waals interactions at the MutSα's interface in damaged versus mismatched, as well as between the two damaged DNA recognition complexes, are predicted as interactions between the ATPase domain of Msh2 and the lever and ATPase domains of Msh6 (the labeled regions in Figure 3d). Same of the strongest, nonspecific interactions at the protein-protein interface are common or similar for both carboplatin and cisplatin damaged DNA recognition complexes, and they are indicated in magenta in Figure 3d. Specifically, these are the interactions between the residue pairs 764–958 or 758–935, 757–889 or 757–963, and 773–950.

However, these calculations also indicate several significant differences in the nonspecific interactions at the protein interface in the two damaged DNA recognition complexes. To this end, data in Figure 3f suggest that the 720-383, 850–973 382-2 and 757–889 interactions seem to be specific to the cisplatin-damaged complex, while the 382-7, 2–111 and 847–894 interactions seem to be specific to the carboplatin-damaged complex. All interactive residue pairs are described in Msh2-Msh6 representation.

Structural changes derived from differences in interactions at the MutSα interface: mismatched versus damaged—Highlighted in Figure 4 are regions at the MutSα's protein-protein interface predicted to be responsible for energy differences higher/

lower than ± 5 kcal/mol in electrostatic interactions and ± 2 kcal/mol in van der Waals interactions.

In regard to the regions responsible for the significant differences in the electrostatic interactions (Figure 4a): depicted in magenta for Msh2's residues and in blue for Msh6's residues, the strong, specific interactions corresponding to the mismatched versus damaged differences lower than -5 kcal/mol are located at the (1) clamp-clamp, (2) mismatch binding-mismatch binding, (3) lever-mismatch binding, (4) mismatch binding-lever, (5) ATPase-connector, (6) ATPase-lever, and (7) ATPase-ATPase interfaces. On the contrary, several strong, specific interactions (depicted in lime for Msh2's residues and in yellow for Msh6's residues) at the (5) ATPase-connector, (8) lever-ATPase, and (7) ATPase-ATPase interfaces in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex weaken in the mismatched DNA recognition complex (mismatched versus damaged differences higher than 5 kcal/mol).

In regard to the regions responsible for the significant differences in the van der Waals interactions (Figure 4b): depicted in lime for Msh2's residues and yellow for Msh6's residues, the interactions corresponding to the mismatched versus damaged differences higher than 2 kcal/mol are located at the (1) clamp-clamp, (2) mismatch binding-mismatch binding, and (7) ATPase-ATPase interfaces. Additionally, several sites with stronger van der Waals interactions at the (6) ATPase-lever and (8) lever-ATPase interfaces of the mismatched DNA recognition complex than of the damaged DNA recognition complex are also predicted (interactions depicted in magenta-blue; mismatched versus damaged differences lower than -2 kcal/mol).

Overall, strong, specific electrostatic interactions at the protein-protein interface of MutS α in the "default" mismatched DNA recognition complex are replaced by weaker non-specific van der Waals interactions in the "altered" carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex.

Structural details derived from differences in interactions at the protein-protein interface of MutS α in the carboplatin versus cisplatin damaged DNA recognition complexes, along with a comprehensive conformational analysis of the two systems will be the subject of a future investigation in our group.

It can be concluded that nonbonding interactions at the MutS α heterodimer interface suggest a severe impairment of the protein dimerization in response to damaged DNA recognition. In the following section, by means of solvent accessible surface area calculations we will try "to quantify" the alteration of the MutS α 's dimerization and to address the question of whether either hydrophobic forces or stronger van der Waals interactions are possibly responsible for structural rearrangements in response to damaged DNA recognition.

3.2 Solvent accessible surface area calculations

Indicating significant structural changes in response to damaged DNA recognition, the mean values for the solvent accessible surface area (SASA; see Methods) of the Msh2 and Msh6 subunits, along with SASA of their charged residues are presented in Table 2. Histograms of SASA that are indicated in Table 2 to undergo statistically significant changes in response to damaged DNA recognition are included in Figure 5, a&b. These data also suggest that, by comparison with the mismatched DNA recognition, the MutS α binding to the carboplatin-damaged DNA allosterically regulates the protein's dynamics at the Msh2-Msh6 interface in a different manner, and, subsequently, may induce a different than repair functional response of the protein.

van der Waals interactions possible responsible for different packing in response to damaged DNA recognition by MutS'—Specifically, in the damage recognition complex, the mean SASA of the Msh2 subunit is indicated to be about 714 Å² higher than in the mismatch recognition complex. These data are presented in Table 2 and their statistical analysis is included in Online Resource 2, Table 2. How precisely to extract the degrees of freedom from this data, and the data below in Table 3, is not entirely clear. At one extreme, in Online Resource 2, Tables 2 and 3, each structure from the equilibrated ensemble of structures (last 12 ns of each of the independent simulations, see Methods) could be considered as an individual uncorrelated data point. At this extreme, all of the results are statistically significant with p-values < 0.001. The other extreme is to consider each independent simulation as a data point. The latter extreme is too clearly too pessimistic as that would the results from an ideal - i.e., infinitely long -- simulation insignificant. However, the extreme of consider each structure independently is likely too optimistic. Given that for our simulated systems, most of the equilibration occurs within the first 2 ns (see Methods) and the last 12 ns of the 20 ns long simulations were considered for analysis, it would be reasonable to consider the relaxation time as on the order of nanoseconds and so the number of independent samples is in the 10s. As a result, as shown in Online Resource 2, Tables 2 and 3, the largest two changes in Table 2 are statistically significant. A commonly-accepted relation of SASA to hydrophobic effect: each square Angstrom of accessible surface removed from contact with water gives a free energy gain of 25 kcal/mol [51,52]. Consequently, no significant change in Msh6's SASA and higher Msh2's SASA in response to damaged DNA recognition would suggest that hydrophobic forces may not be responsible for the impairment of the MutSα's dimerization in response to damaged DNA recognition.

However, higher solvent accessible surface area of the charged residues in the Msh2 subunit (Table 2) would indicate a rather different “pose” of the signaling subunit in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Corroborated with the above observations derived from calculations of the nonbonding interactions, the SASA calculations suggest the possibility of a different packing at the protein-protein interface and within subunits in response to damaged DNA recognition. Advancing our investigation into the MutSα's structural changes in response to the damaged DNA recognition, surface representations of representative structures for both mismatched and carboplatin-damaged recognition complexes are included in Figure 6. These representations reveal a more compact protein, especially the Msh6 subunit, in response to damaged DNA recognition by comparison with the “default” mismatched DNA recognition complex, in which multiple channels and larger cavities are indicated in both subunits.

Loss of contact at the MutSα's interface in response to damaged DNA recognition—To further analyze changes at the MutSα's interface in response to damaged DNA recognition, the area of the contact surface between the two subunits as well as the area of the charged residues in the contact surface as seen by a spherical probe of 1.4 Å, were calculated in both damage and mismatch recognition systems. Mean values and standard deviations for these data are included in Table 3, and their statistical analysis is included in Online Resource 2, Table 3, and the statistical analysis is discussed above with Table 2. Histograms of these calculated quantities are included in Figure 5, c-e.

These data (Table 3) indicate a significant decrease of the mean values of the contact surface area for both Msh2 and Msh6 subunits, by about 252 Å² and 375 Å², respectively, in the damaged DNA recognition complex, “quantifying” the loss of the degree of dimerization of the heterodimer indicated by the nonbonding interactions at the protein-protein interface.

Additionally, these data (Table 3) hint a significant decrease of the mean value of the area of the Msh6's charged residue in the protein-protein contact surface in response to damaged DNA recognition, by about 140 Å². This finding corroborates with the decrease of electrostatic interactions at the MutSα's protein-protein interface, as indicated by nonbonding interactions, and supports the general observation of structural rearrangements in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Structural details of the changes at the MutSα's protein-protein interface, defined here as atoms of each of the two monomers as well as of the solvent within 5 Å, are presented in Figure 7. Rendered from solvated representative structures indicated by clustering analysis, the structural details include a general view of the protein-protein interface, Figure 7, a&b, as well as "the pose" at the interface for each subunit in both carboplatin-damaged (Figure 7, c&d) and mismatched (Figure 7, e&f) DNA recognition complexes.

These structural pieces of evidence indicate that in both damaged and mismatched DNA recognition complexes the protein-protein interface comprises residues from all five domains of each subunit of the protein, with ATPase domains being dominant, Figure 7, c–f.

However, even though the protein-protein interface in the damaged DNA recognition complex is indicated to extend over a larger number of residues, 127 from Msh2 and 137 from Msh6, as compared with the mismatched DNA recognition complex, 108 residues from Msh2 and 124 residues from Msh6, a higher presence of water molecules at the protein-protein interface in the damaged DNA recognition complex is noteworthy. These structural pieces of evidence support the SASA calculations indicating (1) a loss of contact at the MutSα's interface and (2) the possibility for water-mediated interactions in response to damaged DNA recognition. The latter observation is supported by higher exposure of charged residues on the Msh2 surface (Table 2). Beyond of the scope of this investigation, the water-mediated protein-protein interactions in these MutSα-DNA recognition complexes is under consideration for a follow up study.

Similar protein core in response to damaged DNA recognition by MutS'—To further identify structural elements responsible for the major differences in nonbonding interactions at the MutSα's protein-protein interface and within subunits in response to damaged DNA recognition, major differences on the calculated solvent accessible surface area per residue (Figure 8, a&b), as well as the protein's core residues (Figure 8, c&d) in the two recognition complexes will be investigated next.

The mismatched versus carboplatin-damaged differences on the average SASA per residue indicate structural changes primarily in the mismatched binding and connector domains of the Msh2 subunit (Figure 8a), and in the ATPase domain of the Msh6 subunit (Figure 8b).

Specifically, in the Msh2 subunit (Figure 8a) hydrophobic residues F286 and L258, polar residues N109 and N285, and positively charged K627 are indicated as more exposed to the solvent in the mismatched complex than in the carboplatin-damaged complex. On the contrary, hydrophobic F136 and L719, and positively charged R227 and K246 are indicated as more exposed to the solvent in the carboplatin-damaged complex than in the mismatched complex.

Specifically, in the Msh6 subunit (Figure 8b) hydrophobic residues I601, L629, or I921, polar residue Q761, and negatively charged residues E758 and E911 are indicated as more exposed to the solvent in the mismatched DNA recognition complex than the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex. Oppositely, hydrophilic residues F572 and M823, polar residues N763 and N912, and negatively charged residues E394 and D710 are

indicated as more exposed to the solvent in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex than in the mismatched DNA recognition complex.

However, the core residues of MutS α —defined here as residues with solvent accessible surface area averaged over the simulations lower than 1 Å²—are indicated as conserved in response to damaged DNA recognition (Figure 8, c&d). These pieces of evidence support the general observation that the most significant structural changes in response to damaged DNA recognition may occur at the protein-protein interface and on the surface of the two subunits of the protein.

Rearrangement of contacts at the MutS α 's interface in response to damaged DNA recognition

—To further substantiate the general observation of structural rearrangements in response to damaged DNA recognition, changes in contacts between residues at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface calculated from the average distance matrix were also investigated, Figure 8, e&f.

For a cutoff distance of 20 Å, these data predict both a loss (Figure 8e) of about 14% and a gain (Figure 8f) of about 9% in the contacts between the residues at the protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition, suggesting an overall rearrangement of the contacts at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition

Specifically, apart from the contacts at the interface between the mismatched binding (residues 1–124) and connector (residues 125–297) domains of Msh2 and the ATPase domain (residues 715–974) of Msh6 (Figure 8e), whose loss has no predicted corresponding gain (Figure 8f), most of the lost or gained contacts are in similar regions at the MutS α 's interface.

The gained contacts in response to the damaged DNA recognition are indicated mainly at the interfaces of the clamp (region marked in red in Figure 8f) and ATPase domains (region marked in black in Figure 8f) of the two subunits. These observations corroborate with the predicted stronger van der Waals interactions in these regions of the protein-protein interface, as discussed above and depicted in Figure 4b.

On the other hand, the lost contacts at the protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition are indicated mainly at the interfaces of (i) the mismatched binding domain of Msh2 with the lever domain of Msh6 (region marked in blue in Figure 8e), (ii) the connector domain of Msh2 with the ATPase domain of Msh6 (region marked in red in Figure 8e), and (iii) the ATPase domains of the two subunits (region marked in green in Figure 8e).

When contacts at the protein-protein interface within 10 Å are considered (Online Resource 3, b), 53 or 8.4% of the contacts from the “default” mismatched DNA recognition complex are lost in response to the “altered” damaged DNA recognition. Furthermore, when contacts within 5 Å are considered (data not shown), MutS α 's protein-protein interface losses 5 such contacts, namely 721–338 and 721–391 at the interface of the ATPase domain of Msh2 with the connector domain of Msh6, and 733–947, 836–837, and 844–869 at the interface of the ATPase domains of the two subunits. These observations further substantiate the overall conclusion of severe impairment of the MutS α 's dimerization and structural rearrangements at the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Point mutations studies of the residues predicted to differentiate the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in the repair and cell-death conformations may allow the discovery of small ligands

that would selectively induce these conformations, leading to new anticancer therapies targeting the MMR-dependent apoptotic pathway.

3.3 Correlated entities in the mismatched DNA recognition complex un-correlate or anti-correlate in response to damaged DNA recognition

Up to this point, structural interferences derived from nonbonding interactions, solvent accessible surface area, and contact map calculations suggest a severe impairment of the MutSc's dimerization by loss and rearrangement of interactions at the protein-protein interface. In this concluding section of our study, possible correlations between hydrogen bonds, salt bridges, nonbonding interactions and solvent accessible surface area calculated from the trajectories are investigated. Correlation coefficients of the above entities are included in Online Resource 4. 2D histograms of the representative cases are included in Figures 9 and 10. Overall, these data point out that correlated entities in the mismatched DNA recognition complex un-correlate or anti-correlate in response to damaged DNA recognition, and their significance is summarized as following. The 2D histograms were generated using the *hist* and *contour* functions in Matlab. Normalizations were not performed so that the ranges of the data could be seen. The correlation coefficient for two given series of data collected for the representative ensemble of structures from trajectories, was calculated using the *corrcoef* function in Matlab. This function calculates the zeroth lag of the normalized covariance function, e.g., it calculates the $t=0$ value of the equal-time correlation function between two sets of data.

Msh2 binding to the damaged DNA triggers non-specificity and destabilizing effects at the Msh2-Msh6 interface and within Msh6 subunit—While in the mismatched DNA recognition complex Msh2-DNA strong hydrogen bonding interactions seem to have no effect on the strong hydrogen bonding at the protein-protein interface (Figure 9b, correlation coefficient $r=0.07$), on the contrary, in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex an increase in the number of Msh2-DNA strong hydrogen bonding interactions is accompanied by a decrease in the number of hydrogen bonding interactions at the proteinprotein interface (Figure 9a, $r=-0.40$). This finding can be seen as a destabilization of the heterodimer interface in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Additionally, Msh2 binding to the damaged DNA seems to trigger non-specificity and destabilizing effects within the mismatch recognition subunit, Msh6 (Figure 9, c–h).

Specifically, while in the mismatched DNA recognition complex an increase in the Msh2-DNA strong hydrogen bonding interactions is accompanied by an increase in the strong hydrogen bonding interactions within the mismatch recognition subunit Msh6 (Figure 9d, $r=0.56$), on the contrary, in the damaged DNA recognition complex an increase in the Msh2-DNA strong hydrogen bonding triggers a decrease in the hydrogen bonding interactions within Msh6 subunit (Figure 9c, $r=-0.18$). This finding can be seen as an internal destabilization of Msh6 by loss of specific interactions.

This propensity is also consistent with patterns observed in the nonbonding electrostatic interactions, as depicted in Figure 9, e&f. In this regard, while in the mismatched DNA recognition complex changes in the Msh2-DNA electrostatic interactions highly correlate with changes in the Msh6's self-electrostatic interactions (Figure 9f, $r=0.63$), these entities are anti-correlated (Figure 9e, $r=-0.27$) in response to the damaged DNA recognition.

Furthermore, synchronous changes in the solvent accessible surface area of the charged residues in Msh2 and Msh6 subunits in the mismatched DNA recognition complex (Figure 9h, $r=0.45$), becomes asynchronous in response to the damaged DNA recognition by MutSc (Figure 9g, $r=-0.34$). This finding also supports the general observation of structural

rearrangements in response to damaged DNA recognition: it indicates that an increase in the “presentation” of charged residues at Msh2’s surface is accompanied by a decrease in the “presentation” of charged residues at Msh6’s surface, or an increase in the buried charged residues in the Msh6 subunit.

It can be concluded that, unlike in the mismatched DNA recognition, Msh2 binding to the damaged DNA seems to send a distress signal through the mismatch recognition subunit and at the dimer’s interface, which would possibly trigger the MMR-dependent programmed cell death.

Msh6 binding to the damaged DNA triggers non-specificity and destabilizing effects within both subunits—Interestingly enough, an analysis of the Msh6’s interactions with the damaged DNA indicates similar effects, as presented in Figure 10. To this end, synchronous Msh6-DNA electrostatic interactions and self-electrostatic interactions within the other subunit of the heterodimer, Msh2, in the mismatched DNA recognition complex ($r=0.72$, Figure 10b), become anti-correlated in response to damaged DNA recognition ($r=-0.38$, Figure 10a). This finding can be seen as a destabilizing effect on the Msh2 subunit in response to damaged DNA binding by the Msh6 subunit.

In the same context, uncorrelated in response to mismatched DNA recognition ($r=0.02$, Figure 10d), an increase in the number of the specific ionic interactions at the Msh6-DNA interface triggers a decrease in the number of specific ionic interactions within Msh6 subunit in response to damaged DNA recognition ($r=-0.44$, Figure 10c). This finding can be regarded as a destabilizing effect by loss of salt bridge interactions within Msh6 subunit upon its binding to the damaged DNA.

Finally, highly correlated in response to the mismatched DNA recognition ($r=0.75$, Figure 10f), protein-DNA and protein-protein specific ionic interactions (which includes salt bridges at the heterodimer interface as well as within the subunits) become uncorrelated in response to damaged DNA recognition ($r=0.21$, Figure 10e).

These data suggest that the loss of a synchronous mode of response while “surveying” post-replicative DNA would possibly be one of the cellular mechanism(s) of signaling the MMR-dependent programmed cell-death much wanted in anticancer therapies.

3.4 Predictions from the current and similar simulations confirmed by experimental studies

Employing the same protocol, 2–10 ns of simulation of the *E. Coli* homologue molecular complex (MutS) have been experimentally verified to be sufficient to examine the experimental questions addressed [6,7,15]. Responses such as changes in disordered loops associated with the DNA damage response, conformational changes associated with ATP binding/hydrolysis, and key protein-DNA contacts predicted by conformational analysis of MutS complex with cisplatin-damaged DNA [5,6] were validated by mutational and genetic analysis experiments [6].

Furthermore, the molecular dynamics simulations reported herein, predict conformational and structural DNA changes due to (1,3) cross-linking [60] that are in agreement with NMR structural studies on DNA structural changes due to (1,3) cross-linking, albeit without protein binding [22]. Specifically, in agreement with experimental observations [22], our simulations indicate that the distortion to DNA structure induced by carboplatin-based 1,3d(GpXGp) intra-strand platinum-DNA adduct spreads out over the entire lesion site, and it is most severe at the 5' site. In this regard, the G8-C8 damaged base pair and the central C9-G7 base pair lost their hydrogen bonding during the entire simulations time. In

agreement with experiment [22], our simulations also indicate that the central base C9 is extruded from the minor groove. At the 3' end, less distorted according to the experimental observations [22], our simulations indicate that at the other damaged base pair, G10-C6, the base pairing is completely lost about 15% of the simulations time and at least one hydrogen bond is present about 85% of the simulations time [60].

Comprehensive descriptions of the different binding modes, as well as of the conformational and structural differences at the MutS α binding site (regarding both mismatch recognition and signaling subunits) and at the MutS α -DNA interface in response to damaged DNA recognition from the simulations herein are presented elsewhere [60,26]. Here, a figure of the superimposed aligned representative structures for the mismatched and damaged MutS α -DNA recognition complexes is included in Online Resource 4, Figure 1. It provides a global view of the DNA conformational changes induced by the Pt-DNA adducts, as well as of the conformational changes within the mismatch recognition subunit, Msh6, and the signaling subunit, Msh2, in response to damaged or mismatched DNA recognition at the binding site and beyond.

4. Summary

We provide evidence indicating that strong, specific interactions at MutS α 's protein-protein interface in response to the mismatched DNA recognition are replaced by weak, non-specific van der Waals interactions in response to the damaged DNA recognition, suggesting a severe impairment of the MutS α 's dimerization in response to the damaged DNA recognition.

By comparison with the “default” mismatched DNA recognition, the MutS α 's core is indicated as preserved in response to the damaged DNA recognition. However, the loss of contact surface and the rearrangement of contacts at the protein-protein interface suggest a different packing in response to the “altered” damaged DNA recognition.

We predict that point mutations studies of the residues indicated to differentiate the MutS α 's protein-protein interface in the repair versus cell-death conformations, namely residues 338, 391, 837, 869, and 947 of Msh6 and 721, 733, and 844 of Msh2, may allow the discovery of small ligands that would selectively induce these conformations, leading to new anticancer therapies targeting the MMR-dependent apoptotic pathway.

Correlated in the mismatched DNA recognition complex, interaction energies, hydrogen bonding, salt bridges, and solvent accessible surface areas become uncorrelated or anti-correlated in response to the damaged DNA recognition. These pieces of evidence suggest that the loss of a synchronous mode of response while “surveying” post-replicative DNA would possible be one of the cellular mechanism(s) of signaling the MMR-dependent programed cell-death much wanted in anticancer therapies.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This research was partially supported by National Institute of Health R01CA129373 grant to FRS. The computational herein were performed on the Wake Forest University DEAC cluster. We thank Wake Forest University's Provost's office and Information Systems Department for their generous support.

References

1. Kunkel TA. DNA Replication Fidelity. *J Biol Chem*. 1992; 267:18251–18254. [PubMed: 1526964]
2. Iyer RR, Pluciennik A, Burdett V, Modrich PL. DNA Mismatch Repair: Functions and Mechanisms. *Chem Rev*. 2006; 106:302–323. [PubMed: 16464007]
3. Peltomaki P. Role of DNA Mismatch Repair Defects in the Pathogenesis of Human Cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2003; 21:1174–1179. [PubMed: 12637487]
4. Wang D, Lippard SJ. Cellular Processing of Platinum Anticancer Drugs. *Nature*. 2005; 4:307–321.
5. Vasilyeva A, Clodfelter JE, Reactor B, Hills T, Scarpinato KD, Salsbury FR Jr. Small molecule induction of Msh2-dependent cell death suggests a vital role of mismatch repair proteins in cell death. *DNA Repair*. 2009; 8:103–113. [PubMed: 18955167]
6. Salsbury FR Jr, Clodfelter JE, Gentry MB, Hollis T, Scarpinato Drotschman K. The molecular mechanism of DNA damage recognition by MutS homologs and its consequences for cell death response. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2006; 34:2173–2185. [PubMed: 16648361]
7. Vasilyeva A, Clodfelter JE, Gorczynski MJ, Gerardi AR, King SB, et al. Parameters of Reserpine Analogs That Induce MSH2/MSH6-Dependent Cytotoxic Response. *J Nucleic Acids*. 2010
8. Fukui K, Shimada A, Iino H, Masui R, Kuramitsu S. Biochemical Properties of MutL, a DNA Mismatch Repair Endonuclease, DNA repair – On the pathway to fixing DNA damage and errors. In Tech. 2010
9. Gupta S, Gellert M, Yang W. Mechanism of mismatch recognition revealed by human MutS β bound to unpaired DNA loops. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2012; 19:72–79. [PubMed: 22179786]
10. Qiu R, DeRocco VC, Harris C, Sharma A, Hingorani MM, Erie DA, Weninger KR. Large conformational changes in MutS during DNA scanning, mismatch recognition and repair signaling. *EMBO J*. 2012; 31:2528–2540. [PubMed: 22505031]
11. Duckett DR, Drummond JT, Alastair IH, Murchie AIH, Reardon JT, et al. Human MutS α recognizes damaged DNA base pairs containing O⁶-methylguanine, O⁴-methylthymine, or the cisplatin-d(GpG) adduct. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1996; 93:6443–6447. [PubMed: 8692834]
12. Mello JA, Acharya S, Fishel R, Essigmann JM. The mismatch-repair protein hMSH2 binds selectively to DNA adducts of the anticancer drug cisplatin. *Chem Biol*. 1996; 3:579–589. [PubMed: 8807890]
13. Jiricny J. The multifaceted mismatch-repair system. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 2006; 7:335–346. [PubMed: 16612326]
14. Kelland L. The resurgence of platinum-based cancer chemotherapy. *Nature*. 2007; 7:573–584.
15. Drotschmann K, Topping RP, Clodfelter JE, Salsbury FR Jr. Mutations in the nucleotide-binding domain of MutS homologs uncouple cell death from cell survival. *DNA Repair (Amst)*. 2004; 3:729–742. [PubMed: 15177182]
16. Harrap KR. Preclinical studies identifying carboplatin as a viable cisplatin alternative. *Cancer Treat Rev*. 1985; 12:21–33. [PubMed: 3910219]
17. Rosenberg B, Van Camp L, Krigas T. Inhibition of cell division in *Escherichia coli* by electrolysis products from a platinum electrode. *Nature*. 1965; 205:698–699. [PubMed: 14287410]
18. Wheate NJ, Walker S, Craig GE, Onun R. The status of platinum anticancer drugs in the clinic and in clinical trials. *Dalton Trans*. 2010; 39:813–827.
19. Andrews P, Howell S. Cellular pharmacology of cisplatin: Perspectives on mechanisms of acquired resistance. *Cancer Cells*. 1990; 2:35–43. [PubMed: 2204382]
20. Shirazi FH, Wong PTT, Goel R. Interaction of Cisplatin with Cellular Macromolecules: A Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy Study. *Iran J Pharm Res*. 2003; 2:11–15.
21. Takahara PM, Rosenzweig AC, Frederick CA, Lippard SJ. Crystal structure of double-stranded DNA containing the major adduct of the anticancer drug cisplatin. *Nature*. 1995; 377:649–652. [PubMed: 7566180]
22. Teuben JM, Bauer C, Wang AHJ, Reedijk J. Solution structure of a DNA duplex containing a cis-diammineplatinum(II) 1,3-d(GTG) intrastrand cross-link, a major adduct in cells treated with the anticancer drug carboplatin. *Biochemistry*. 1999; 38:12305–12312. [PubMed: 10493798]

23. Wolfe KC, Hastings WA, Dutta S, Long A, Shapiro BA, et al. Multiscale Modeling of Double-Helical DNA and RNA: A Unification through Lie Groups. *J Phys Chem B*. 2012
24. Kartalou M, Essigmann JM. Recognition of cisplatin adducts by cellular proteins. *Mutat Res*. 2001; 478:1–21. [PubMed: 11406166]
25. Jamieson ER, Lippard SJ. Structure, Recognition, and Processing of Cisplatin-DNA Adducts. *Chem Rev*. 1999; 99:2467–2498. [PubMed: 11749487]
26. Negureanu L, Salsbury FR Jr. Insights into Protein-DNA Interactions, Stability and Allosteric Communications: A Computational Study of MutS α -DNA Recognition Complexes. *J Biomol Struct Dyn*. 2012; 29:757–776. [PubMed: 22208277]
27. Negureanu L, Salsbury FR Jr. The molecular origin of the MMR-dependent apoptosis pathway from dynamics analysis of MutS α -DNA complexes. *J Biomol Struct Dyn*. 2012; 30:347–361. [PubMed: 22712459]
28. Warren JJ, Pohlhaus TJ, Changele A, Iyer RR, Modrich PL, et al. Structure of the Human MutS DNA Lesion Recognition Complex. *Molecular Cell*. 2007; 26:579–592. [PubMed: 17531815]
29. Brooks B, Bruccoleri RE, Olafson BD, States DJ, Swaminathan S, et al. CHARMM: A program for macromolecular energy, minimization, and dynamics calculations. *J Comput Chem*. 1983; 4:187–217.
30. Jorgensen WL, Chandrasekhar J, Madura JD, Impey RW, Klein ML. Comparison of simple potential functions for simulated liquid water. *J Chem Phys*. 1983; 79:926–935.
31. Humphrey W, Dalke A, Schulten K. VMD: Visual Molecular Dynamics. *J Mol Graphics*. 1996; 14:33–38.
32. MacKerell DA Jr, Banavali N, Foloppe N. Development and current status of the CHARMM force field for nucleic acids. *Biopolymers*. 2001; 56:257–265. [PubMed: 11754339]
33. MacKerell DA Jr, Bashford D, Bellot M, Dunbrack RL, Evanseck JD, et al. All-atom empirical potential for molecular modeling and studies of proteins. *J Phys Chem B*. 1998; 102:3586–3616.
34. Scheeff ED, Briggs JM, Hawell SB. Molecular modeling of the intrastrand guanine-guanine DNA adducts produced by cisplatin and oxaliplatin. *Mol Pharmacol*. 1999; 56:633–643. [PubMed: 10462551]
35. Salsbury FR Jr, Crowley MF, Brooks CL. Modeling of the metallo-beta-lactamase from *B. fragilis*: Structural and dynamic effects of inhibitor binding. *Proteins*. 2001; 44:448–459. [PubMed: 11484222]
36. Knaggs MH, Salsbury FR Jr, Edgell MH, Fetrow JS. Insights into correlated motions and long-range interactions in CheY derived from molecular dynamics simulations. *Biophys*. 2007; 2062–2079.
37. Salsbury FR Jr. Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Protein Dynamics and their relevance to drug discovery. *Curr Opin Pharmacol*. 2010; 10:738–744. [PubMed: 20971684]
38. Berendsen HJC, Postma JPM, van Gunsteren WF, DiNola A, Haak JR. Molecular dynamics with coupling to an external bath. *J Chem Phys*. 1984; 81:3684–3690.
39. Kale L, Skeel R, Bhandarkar M, Brunner R, Gursoy A, et al. NAMD2: Greater scalability for parallel molecular dynamics. *J Comput Phys*. 1999; 15:1283–1312.
40. van Gunsteren WF, Berendsen HJC. Algorithms for macromolecular dynamics and constraint dynamics. *Mol Phys*. 1977; 34:1311–1327.
41. Darden T, York D, Pedersen L. Particle Mesh Ewald: an $N \log(N)$ method for Ewald sums in large systems. *J Chem Phys*. 1993; 98:10089–10092.
42. Hunenberger P, Mark AE, van Gunsteren WF. Fluctuation and cross-correlation analysis of protein motions observed in nanosecond molecular dynamics simulations. *J Mol Biol*. 1995; 252:492–503. [PubMed: 7563068]
43. Caves LSD, Evanseck JD, Karplus M. Locally accessible conformations of proteins: Multiple molecular dynamics simulations of crambin. *Protein Sci*. 1998; 7:649–666. [PubMed: 9541397]
44. Straub JE, Rashkin AB, Thirumalai D. Dynamics in rugged energy landscapes with applications to the S-peptide and ribonuclease. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1994; 116:2049–2063.

45. Horita DA, Zhang W, Smithgall TE, Gmeiner WH, Byrd RA. Dynamics of the Hck-SH3 domain: comparison of experiment with multiple molecular dynamics simulations. *Protein Sci.* 2000; 9:95–103. [PubMed: 10739251]
46. Auffinger P, Westhof E. Three ns of multiple molecular dynamics simulations of solvated tRNA(ASP) anticodon hairpin. *J Mol Biol.* 1997; 269:326–341. [PubMed: 9199403]
47. Salsbury FR Jr, Crowder MW, Kingsmore SF, Huntley JJA. Molecular dynamics simulations of the metallo-beta-lactamase from *Bacteroides fragilis* in the presence and absence of a tight-binding inhibitor. *J Mol Model.* 2009; 15:133–145. [PubMed: 19039608]
48. Loccisano AE, Acevedo O, DeChancie J, Schulze BG, Evanseck JD. Enhanced sampling by multiple molecular dynamics trajectories: carbonmonoxy myoglobin 10 micros A0-->A(1-3 transition from ten 400 picosecond simulations. *J Mol Model.* 2004; 22:369–376.
49. Steinbach P, Brooks BR. New Spherical-Cutoff Methods for Long-Range Forces in Macromolecular Simulations. *J Comp Chem.* 1994; 15:667–683.
50. Lee B, Richards FM. The Interpretation of Protein Structures: Estimation of Static Accessibility. *J Mol Biol.* 1971; 55:379–400. [PubMed: 5551392]
51. Chothia C. The nature of the accessible and buried surfaces in proteins. *J Mol Biol.* 1976; 105:1–14. [PubMed: 994183]
52. Raschke TM, Tsai J, Levitt M. Quantification of the hydrophobic interaction by simulations of the aggregation of small hydrophobic solutes in water. *Proc Natl Acad of Sci USA.* 2001; 98:5965–5969. [PubMed: 11353861]
53. Taylor A, Kennard O. Crystallographic evidence for the existence of C—H---O, C-H---N and C-H---Cl hydrogen bonds. *J Am Chem Soc.* 1982; 104:5063–5070.
54. Desiraju, GR.; Steiner, T. *The Weak Hydrogen Bond In Structural Chemistry and Biology.* New York: Oxford University Press; 1999.
55. Jeffrey, GA.; Saenger, W. *Hydrogen bonding in biological structures.* Berlin: Springer Verlag; 1991.
56. Panigrahi SK, Desiraju GR. Strong and weak hydrogen bonds in the protein-ligand interface. *Proteins.* 2007; 67:128–142. [PubMed: 17206656]
57. Barlow D, Thornton JM. Ion-pairs in proteins. *J Mol Biol.* 1983; 168:867–885. [PubMed: 6887253]
58. Karpen M, Tobias DJ, Brooks CL. Statistical clustering techniques for the analysis of long molecular dynamics trajectories: analysis of 2.2-ns trajectories of YPGDV. *Biochemistry.* 1993; 32:412–420. [PubMed: 8422350]
59. Matlab. 7.10.0 edn. Natick, Massachusetts: The MathWorks Inc; 2010.
60. Negureanu, L.; Salsbury, FR, Jr. Non-specificity and synergy at the binding site of the carboplatin-induced DNA adduct via molecular dynamics simulations of the MutSα-DNA recognition complex. *J Biomol Struct Dyn.* 2013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07391102.2013.799437>

Fig. 1. MutS α -DNA complex structural model

DNA is shown in light blue. The color code for the heterodimer domains is as following: red for the mismatch binding domain, residues 1 to 124 in Msh2 and 1 to 157 in Msh6; yellow for the connector domain, residues 125 to 297 in Msh2 and 158 to 356 in Msh6; green for the lever domain, residues 300 to 456 and 554 to 619 in Msh2, and 357 to 573 and 648 to 714 in Msh6; purple for the clamp domain, residues 457 to 553 in Msh2 and 574 to 647 in Msh6; blue for the ATPase domain, residues 620 to 855 in Msh2 and 715 to 974 in Msh6. The two ADP molecules bound to the ATPase domains are depicted in VDW representations. Note that the first 361 residues of Msh6 are unsolved in the X-Ray structure and in our system residue 1 of Msh6 corresponds to residue 362 in the solved structure.

Fig. 2. Nonbonding Interactions

Histograms for the representative ensemble of structures are presented. **Carboplatin-damaged DNA MutSα recognition complex (a-c).** At both Msh2-Msh6 interface and within subunits van der Waals interactions are stronger than electrostatic interactions. At Msh2-Msh6 interface (a) van der Waals interactions, $-377.59(18.49)$ kcal/mol, are stronger than the electrostatics interactions, $-140.68(30.97)$ kcal/mol. Within the subunits, van der Waals interactions are stronger than electrostatics interactions, and about 400 kcal/mol stronger within Msh6 than within Msh2, $-3839.6(67.25)$ kcal/mol versus $-3422.21(46.63)$ kcal/mol (in c). Electrostatic interactions within Msh6 are about 800 kcal/mol stronger than

within Msh2, in **(b)** $-2802.50(46.06)$ kcal/mol versus $-2017.51(39.74)$ kcal/mol.

Mismatched DNA MutS α recognition complex (d-f). Unlike in the damage recognition complex, in the mismatch recognition complex at both Msh2-Msh6 interface and within subunits the electrostatic interactions are dominant. At Msh2-Msh6 interface **(d)** electrostatic interactions are dominant over van der Waals interactions, $-2282.50(91.61)$ kcal/mol versus $-189.85(10.26)$ kcal/mol. Within subunits electrostatic interactions **(e)** are dominant and about 500 kcal/mol stronger within Msh6, $-29272.00(224.38)$ kcal/mol, than within Msh2, $-24440.00(147.61)$ kcal/mol. van der Waals interactions **(f)** within Msh6, $-1343.80(31.30)$ kcal/mol, are slightly stronger than within Msh2, $-1147.50(26.31)$ kcal/mol. Data presented are mean(std).

Fig. 3. Energy differences at the MutS α 's interface from representative structures of the mismatched and damaged DNA recognition complexes

Differences in the electrostatic (a) and van der Waals (b) interactions at the protein-protein interface between carboplatin-damaged and mismatched recognition complexes. (c) In blue are common or similar differences in the nonbonding electrostatic interactions at the protein interface between the cisplatin-damaged and mismatched DNA recognition complexes. (d) In magenta are common or similar differences in the van der Waals interactions at the protein interface between the cisplatin-damaged and mismatched DNA recognition complexes. As in carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex, most differences in non-specific interactions at the protein interface derive from interactions of lever and ATPase domains of Msh2 with ATPase domain of Msh6. (e) Indicates particularly strong

electrostatic interactions specific to the carboplatin-damaged complex, namely 850–973, 318–821, 720–383, and 55–394, as well as particularly strong electrostatic interactions specific to the cisplatin-damaged complex, namely 382–7 and 847–894. **(f)** Indicates strong van der Waals interactions specific to cisplatin-damaged complex, 720–383, 850–973, 383–2 and 757–889, as well as strong van der Waals interactions specific carboplatin-damaged complex, namely 382–7, 2–111 and 847–894. Residue pairs herein are in Msh2-Msh6 format.

Differences in Electrostatic Interactions

Differences in vdW Interactions

Fig. 4. Mapping structural changes as derived from the differences in nonbonding interactions at the MutS α 's interface

Differences higher/lower than ± 5 kcal/mol in electrostatic interactions and ± 2 kcal/mol in van der Waals interactions were considered. **(a) Differences in electrostatic interactions:** strong, specific interactions (depicted in magenta for Msh2's residues and in blue for Msh6's residues) at the (1) clamp-clamp, (2) mismatch binding-mismatch binding, (3) lever-mismatch binding, (4) mismatch binding-lever, (5) ATPase-connector, (6) ATPase-lever, and (7) ATPase-ATPase Msh2-Msh6 interfaces in the mismatched DNA recognition complex weaken in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex; strong, specific interactions (depicted in lime for Msh2's residues and in yellow for Msh6's residues) at the (5) ATPase-connector, (8) lever-ATPase, (7) ATPase-ATPase Msh2-Msh6 interfaces in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex weaken in the mismatched DNA recognition complex. **(b) Differences in van der Waals interactions:** are dominated by stronger interactions at the (1) clamp-clamp, (2) mismatch binding-mismatch binding, and (7) ATPase-ATPase Msh2-Msh6 interfaces (interactions depicted in lime-yellow) in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex; several sites with stronger van der Waals interactions at the (6) ATPase-lever and (8) lever-ATPase Msh2-Msh6 interfaces in the mismatched DNA recognition complex are also predicted (interactions depicted in magenta-blue). Overall, strong, specific electrostatic interactions at the protein-protein interface in the mismatched recognition complex are replaced by weak, non-specific van der Waals interactions in the carboplatin-damaged recognition complex.

Fig. 5. Solvent accessible surface area (SASA) analysis

(a) The mean of SASA of Msh2 subunit in the carboplatin-damaged complex, $37640.63(512.66) \text{ Å}^2$, is higher than in the mismatched complex, $36926.58(579.57) \text{ Å}^2$ (b) The mean of SASA of the charged residues of Msh2 in the carboplatin complex, $16644.35(362.10) \text{ Å}^2$, is higher than in the mismatched complex, $16316.11(400.14) \text{ Å}^2$ (c) The mean of contact surface area of Msh2 at the protein-protein interface in the carboplatin complex, $5222.39(280.33) \text{ Å}^2$, is lower than in the mismatched complex, $5474.91(134.88) \text{ Å}^2$ (d) The mean of contact surface area of Msh6 at the protein-protein interface in carboplatin complex, $5000.48(255.37) \text{ Å}^2$, is lower than in the mismatched complex,

5376.15(159.18) Å²(e) The mean of contact surface area of the charged residues in Msh6 at the protein-protein interface in carboplatin complex, 1414.09(120.46) Å², is lower than in the mismatched complex, 1553.89(166.33) Å². The two populations corresponding to the mismatched recognition complex are simulation dependent, but not entirely (Online Resource 3, a). Data presented are mean(std).

Fig. 6. Surface representation the carboplatin-damaged and mismatched MutS α -DNA recognition complexes

A more compact protein, especially the Msh6 subunit, is indicated in response to carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition by comparison with “the default” mismatched DNA recognition complex, in which multiple channels and larger cavities are indicated in both subunits. Positively charged residues at the protein surface are depicted in blue, while negatively charged residues are depicted in red. The surface representations are for representative structures indicated by clustering analysis of the dynamics trajectories in each system.

Fig. 7. Structural details at the MutSα's protein-protein interface in the damaged and the mismatched DNA recognition complexes

Protein-protein interface is defined here as atoms of each of the monomers as well as of the solvent within 5 Å. The Msh2 subunit is depicted in pink and the Msh6 subunit is depicted in silver. The water molecules are depicted in a ball-and-stick representation. The presented structural details are for solvated representative conformations identified by clustering analysis. They include a general view of the above defined interface, (a&b), as well as "the pose" at the interface for each subunit in both carboplatin-damaged (c&d) mismatched (e&f) DNA recognition complexes. The protein-protein interface comprises atoms from all five domains of the heterodimer protein in both recognition complexes, as indicated by marked

region: red for the mismatched binding domain; yellow for the connector domain; green for the lever domain and blue for the ATPase domain in **c-f**. By comparison, even though the protein-protein interface in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex (**c&d**) extends over a large number of residues, 127 from Msh2 and 137 from Msh6, versus 108 residues from Msh2 and 124 residues from Msh6 in the mismatched DNA recognition complex (**e&f**), a higher content of water molecules is indicated at the protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition.

Fig. 8. Structural differences at the interface of the damaged DNA recognition complex revealed by SASA and contact maps calculations

(a&b) The positive differences indicate residues more exposed to the solvent in the mismatched than in the carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complex, while the negative differences indicate the opposite. (c&d) No significant changes are indicated on the core residues within both mismatched and carboplatin damaged recognition complexes. Core of the protein is defined here as composed of residues with solvent accessible surface area averaged over the simulations lower than $1 \text{ \AA}^2$. (e) The lost contacts, about 1458, at the protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition are predominantly at the interface of the mismatched binding, the connector and the lever domains of Msh2 with the

ATPase domain of Msh6. (f) The gained contacts, about 830, at the interface of the carboplatin-damaged DNA MutS α recognition complex are mainly at the ATPase-ATPase interface, suggesting, apart an overall rearrangement of the interactions at the protein-protein interface in response to damaged DNA recognition. The 2D contact maps were generated from the average distance matrix throughout the course of the trajectories in either system for a cutoff distance of 20 Å.

Fig. 9. Msh2 binding to the damaged DNA triggers non-specificity and destabilizing effects at the Msh2-Msh6 interface and within Msh6 subunit

2D histograms for the representative ensemble of structures are presented. (a&b) Uncorrelated ($r=0.07$) Msh2-DNA and Msh2-Msh6 strong hydrogen bonding in the mismatched DNA recognition complex are anti-correlated ($r=-0.40$) in the damaged DNA recognition complex. (c&d) Correlated ($r=0.56$) Msh2-DNA and Msh6-Msh6 strong hydrogen bonding in the mismatched DNA recognition complex are anti-correlated ($r=-0.18$) in the damaged DNA recognition complex. (e&f) Highly correlated ($r=0.63$) Msh2-DNA electrostatic interactions and Msh6 self-electrostatic interactions in the mismatched DNA recognition complex are weakly anti-correlated ($r=-0.27$) in the damaged DNA

recognition complex. (**g&h**) Correlated ($r=0.45$) solvent exposed area of charged residues in Msh2 and Msh6 in the mismatched DNA recognition complex are anti-correlated ($r=-0.34$) in the damaged DNA recognition complex.

Fig. 10. Msh6 binding to the damaged DNA triggers non-specificity and destabilizing effects within both subunits

2D histograms for the representative ensemble of structures are presented. (a&b) Synchronous Msh6-DNA electrostatic interactions and self-electrostatic interactions of the Msh2 subunit in the mismatched DNA recognition complex ($r=0.72$) become anti-correlated in response to damaged DNA recognition ($r=-0.38$). (c&d) Uncorrelated in response to mismatched DNA recognition ($r=0.02$), an increase in the number of specific ionic interactions at the Msh6-DNA interface triggers a decrease in the number of specific ionic interactions within the Msh6 subunit ($r=-0.44$). (e&f) Highly correlated in response to mismatched DNA recognition ($r=0.75$), protein-DNA and protein-protein specific ionic

interactions (which includes salt bridges at the protein-protein interface and within subunits) are weakly correlated in response to damaged DNA recognition ($r=0.21$).

Table 1

Protein-protein interactions in carboplatindamaged and mismatched MutSa recognition complexes, mean(std), kcal/mol.

	Carboplatin	Mismatched
Msh2-Msh6 elect.	-140.68(30.97)	-2282.50(91.61)
Msh2-Msh6 vdw	-377.59(18.49)	-189.85(10.26)
Msh2 self elect.	-2017.51(39.74)	-24440.00(147.61)
Msh6 self elect	-2802.50(46.06)	-29272.00(224.38)
Msh2 self vdw	-3422.21(46.63)	-1147.50(26.31)
Msh6 self vdw	-3839.60(67.25)	-1343.80(31.30)

Table 2

Solvent accessible surface area calculations, mean(std) Å², in the mismatched and carboplatin-damaged DNA MutSa recognition complexes¹.

	Mismatched	Carboplatin
Msh2	36926.58(579.57)	37640.63(512.66)
Msh6	42238.64(635.67)	42278.95(989.03)
ch_Msh2	16316.11(400.14)	16644.35(362.10)
ch_Msh6	19438.87(375.65)	19451.35(395.97)

¹“ch” indicates charged residues

Table 3

Contact surface area between Msh2 and Msh6 subunits at the MutS α interface (Int.), mean(std) Å², in the mismatched and carboplatin-damaged DNA recognition complexes ^a.

	Mismatched	Carboplatin
Msh2@Int.	5474.91(134.88)	5222.39(280.33)
Msh6@Int.	5376.15(159.18)	5000.48(255.37)
ch_Msh2@Int.	1382.07(108.21)	1397.44(235.78)
ch_Msh6@Int.	1553.89(166.33)	1414.09(120.46)