Published in final edited form as:

Anal Biochem. 2014 December 15; 467: 54–61. doi:10.1016/j.ab.2014.08.022.

Determination of relative rate constants for *in vitro* RNA processing reactions by internal competition

Hsuan-Chun Lin, Lindsay E. Yandek, Ino Gjermeni, and Michael E. Harris*

Department of Biochemistry, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH 44106

Abstract

Studies of RNA recognition and catalysis typically involve measurement of rate constants for reactions of individual RNA sequence variants by fitting changes in substrate or product concentration to exponential or linear functions. A complementary approach is determination of relative rate constants by internal competition, which involves quantifying the time dependent changes in substrate or product ratios in reactions containing multiple substrates. Here, we review approaches for determining of relative rate constants by analysis of both substrate and product ratios and illustrate their application using the *in vitro* processing of precursor tRNA by ribonuclease P as a model system. The presence of inactive substrate populations is a common complicating factor in analysis of reactions involving RNA substrates, and approaches for quantitative correction of observed rate constants for these effects are illustrated. These results together with recent applications in the literature indicate that internal competition offers an alternate method for analyzing RNA processing kinetics using standard molecular biology methods that directly quantifies substrate specificity and may be extended to a range of applications.

Introduction

Quantitative comparison of rate constants for the reactions of individual RNA sequence variants is an essential experimental tool for determining the biological specificity and catalytic properties of ribozymes, ribonucleases and RNA processing factors[1–5]. Typically, RNA substrates are analyzed one at a time by fitting time courses of changes in substrate or product concentration to linear or exponential functions to determine reaction rate constants[6–8]. This direct approach is best, but it can be time consuming and precision may be limited by variation in enzyme specific activity, difficulty controlling reaction conditions between experimental trials, as well as inaccuracies or non-linearity in quantification of substrate or product concentrations.

© 2014 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

*Phone: 216-368-4779, FAX: 216-368-2110, mharris@cwru.edu.

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

Internal competition is an alternative method for quantifying enzyme rate constants that involves analyzing the change in the ratios of concentrations of alternative substrates or products as a function of reaction progress in reactions containing multiple substrates[9–12]. This approach has potential advantages to direct fitting of kinetic data by offering higher precision, increased throughput and less sensitivity to variation in enzyme specific activity[9, 10]. Internal competition kinetics have been used extensively to measure kinetic isotope effects[12, 13] and substrate and product ratios have been measured using a wide range of analytical methods including mass spectrometry[14, 15], NMR[16, 17], and radioactive remote labeling[18–20]. Recently, we used linear internal competition to measure relative rate constants for *in vitro* tRNA processing by RNase P under initial rate (steady state) conditions[1] and by analyzing single time point data using equations for internal competition adapted to large substrate populations[21]. Although successful, these previous applications have not included analyses of complete reaction time courses and, importantly, have not accounted for the contributions of incomplete reacting populations of substrates or biphasic kinetics to the observed relative rate constants[22].

To provide a consistent framework for further applications of internal competition to RNA processing reactions *in vitro*, and a resource for wider application to additional experimental systems, we briefly review approaches for the determination of relative rate constants by internal competition. Approaches for analysis of complete time courses of both precursor and product ratios for reactions containing two alternative substrates are surveyed. We demonstrate their application using the ribonuclease P endonuclease (RNase P) and a two substrate model system that allows direct comparison of results with direct fitting. Importantly, an approach is described for fitting precursor ratio data to correct for inaccuracies due to inactive substrate populations. The results illustrate that internal competition provides an accurate means for quantification of specificity in RNA processing reactions with potential for improving precision and increasing throughput.

Materials and Methods

Preparation of substrate ptRNA and RNase P holoenzyme

Precursor tRNAs (ptRNAs) used as substrates and the RNA subunit of the RNase P holoenzyme were generated by *in vitro* transcription from plasmid or PCR DNA templates and purified by denaturing PAGE as described[1, 23, 24]. The substrate ptRNAs were dephosphorylated using alkaline phosphatase and 5'-end labeled with ^{32}P using $\gamma\text{-}^{32}\text{P}\text{-ATP}$ and polynucleotide kinase and purified using standard methods[23, 25]. Concentrations of ptRNA and RNase P RNA were determined by UV spectroscopy and diluted to appropriate stock concentrations in 10 mM Tris (pH 8), 1 mM EDTA.

Determination of precursor and product ratios from *in vitro* ptRNA processing reactions

Reaction conditions for *in vitro* processing of ptRNA by the RNase P holoenzyme contained 200 nM of each ptRNA, 5 nM RNase P holoenzyme, 0.1 M NaCl, 40 mM Tris pH 8, 17.5 mM MgCl_2 , 1 mM EDTA. Mixtures containing 2x concentration of ptRNA or P RNA were prepared in reaction buffer lacking MgCl_2 and refolded by incubation at 90°C for 2 minutes. The reactions were cooled to 37°C and the appropriate concentration of MgCl_2 was added

and the 37°C incubation was continued for 30 minutes. An equivalent concentration of C5 protein was added to the holoenzyme solution and the incubation was continued for an additional 15 minutes. Enzyme and substrate were mixed to start the reaction and aliquots taken at appropriate time points were quenched by pipetting into an equivalent volume of 50 mM EDTA, 80% formamide.

The precursor and products from ptRNA processing reactions were resolved by PAGE on 10% acrylamide/0.5% bis-acrylamide gels containing 8M urea. Gels were dried onto Watmann 3MM paper and exposed to phosphorimager screens (Molecular Dynamics/GE) for 10–24 hours and quantified using ImageQuant software to obtain the intensities of precursor and product bands as indicated in the text. Regions of the gel outside the sample lanes were also analyzed and the background intensity was subtracted from precursor and product band intensities. The corrected phosphorimager signals were used to compute the precursor and product ratios used in the data fitting analyses described below.

Results and Discussion

Determination of relative rate constants by internal competition

Alternative substrate kinetics are well-described in the literature[9–11, 26] although they are not often applied analytically to RNA processing reactions. The general equations for measurement of relative rate constants by analysis of precursor and product ratios for two alternative substrates are summarized here, and their application is illustrated. Briefly, when two substrates compete in the same reaction for association with an enzyme active site, the ratio of their observed rates of product formation is the ratio of their respective V/K values multiplied by their concentrations[6, 9, 26].

$$\frac{v_2}{v_1} = \frac{(\frac{V}{K})_2}{(\frac{V}{K})_1} \left(\frac{S_2}{S_1} \right) \quad (1)$$

The derivation of Eq. 1 for multiple turnover steady state reactions is reproduced in Supplementary Information. As illustrated in Fig 1A, where S_1 and S_2 represent two alternative ptRNA substrates for the processing endonuclease RNase P; and, v_1 and v_2 are the observed steady state rates (M/s) for these two ptRNAs, respectively. The terms V and K are the rate constant for reaction of reaction of the enzyme-substrate complex (ES) to yield free enzyme and product ($E + S$) and K is the apparent steady state equilibrium constant (either K_d or K_m) for the multiple turnover reaction. The ratio of the V/K ($M^{-1}s^{-1}$) values for the two substrates provides a quantitative description of enzyme specificity[27, 28] and defines a relative rate constant ($^rk = (V/K)_2/(V/K)_1$) for which the substrate included in the denominator (S_1) is considered as the reference substrate. A substrate with a larger V/K relative to the reference substrate will have an $^rk > 1$, while an rk of < 1 indicates that the substrate has a correspondingly smaller V/K .

The free energy landscapes for the competitive reactions of S_1 and S_2 are illustrated in Fig. 1B. At the start of the reaction ($f = 0$) the concentrations of both substrates are at experimentally defined values, which are equimolar in this example. Similarly, after

completion ($f = 1$) the ratio of products P_2/P_1 will be equivalent to the initial substrate ratio S_2/S_1 , provided all of the input substrate is active. At an intermediate time during the reaction ($1 > f > 0$) the ratio of the substrates (S_2/S_1) and products (P_2/P_1) will be offset from their initial and final values, respectively. The faster reacting substrate, in this example S_1 , becomes enriched in the product population ($P_2/P_1 > 1$) at early time points, while the slower reacting species is enriched in the residual unreacted substrate population ($S_2/S_1 < 1$) at later time points. These ratios change with increasing f as a function of the relative rate constant r_k which is defined by the differences in activation energy ($\Delta G^\ddagger$) for the reactions of the two substrates.

Given the following definitions for the ratios of S_1 and S_2 an expression for the r_k can be obtained in terms of the ratios of the two substrates [11, 12, 29] (see Supplementary Information).

$$\begin{aligned} R_s &= S_2/S_1 \\ R_0 &= S_{2,0}/S_{1,0} \\ R_p &= P_2/P_1 = (S_{2,0} - S_2)/(S_{1,0} - S_1) \end{aligned}$$

In these ratios S_1 and S_2 are the substrate concentrations at a specific fraction of reaction (f), while P_1 and P_2 are the corresponding product concentrations. $S_{1,0}$ and $S_{2,0}$ are the substrate concentrations at the beginning of the reaction.

The following expression is used to quantify relative rate constants from analysis of the ratios of the concentrations of the residual, unreacted substrates at a fraction of reaction (usually $f = 0.3$ – 0.7) sufficient to achieve a measurable level of fractionation while still providing sufficient signal.

$$r_k = \frac{\ln \left((1-f) \frac{R_s}{R_0} \right)}{\ln(1-f)} \quad (2)$$

Similarly, the relative rate constant can be determined by measuring the enrichment of the faster reacting substrate in the product population at low fractions of reaction.

$$r_k = \frac{\ln \left(\left(1 - \frac{R_p}{R_0} \right) f \right)}{\ln(1-f)} \quad (3)$$

Eq. 2 and 3 are routinely used to measure kinetic isotope effects by analyses of multiple measurements of R_p or R_s taken at or near the f value where there will be the maximum expression of the rate difference while still providing sufficient material for analysis [12, 30–33].

A more complete approach has been to rearrange Eq. 3 such that the measured parameters R_s and f are on opposite sides of the equation and R_0 and r_k are the fitted parameters in a time course (for example, [12, 15–17]).

$$\ln(R_s) = (r^k - 1)\ln(1-f) - \ln(R_0) \quad (4)$$

Additionally, the transient accumulation of the faster reacting product can be analyzed by fitting plots of R_p versus time [34].

$$\frac{R_p}{R_0} = \frac{1 - e^{-k_2 t}}{1 - e^{-k_1 t}} \quad (5)$$

Simulations illustrating the expected changes in precursor and product ratios for different r^k values are shown in Fig. 1C and D. As the reaction proceeds the faster reacting substrate becomes progressively depleted from the residual substrate population. Therefore, the ratio of the two substrates changes as the reaction progresses reflecting the increasing enrichment of the slow reacting substrate (Fig. 1C). At high fractions of reaction even a relatively small difference in the rate constants (< 2 -fold) for the two substrates results in a large change in the residual substrate ratio. Similarly, the ratio of the two products show characteristic changes as a function of reaction progress depending on the relative rate constant. In this case the fast reacting substrate is enriched at early time points and the product ratio approaches the initial substrate ratio as the reaction progresses (Fig. 1D).

As described, below, for RNA processing reactions the presence of unreactive, mis-folded substrate populations are a potential complicating factor. In this case, the concentration of S_2 can be given by,

$$S_2 = S_{2,0}(1 - U_2)e^{-k_2 t} + S_{2,0}U_2 \quad (6)$$

where U_2 is the fraction of substrate population S_2 that is inactive for processing by the enzyme and $S_{2,0}$ is the initial substrate concentration. For the reference substrate the reactions kinetics are assumed to be ideal.

$$S_1 = S_{1,0}(e^{-k_1 t}) \quad (7)$$

If the concentrations of the two substrates are essentially equal, then the ratios of the two substrates becomes the following (see Supplementary Information).

$$\frac{S_2}{S_1} = (1 - U_2)(1 - f)^{(r^k - 1)} + \frac{U_2}{(1 - f)} \quad (8)$$

This form can then be used to fit substrate ratio data in order to determine the experimental r^k value when the fraction of the experimental substrate which has a known fraction, U_2 , that is unreactive as illustrated, below. It is also possible for there to be a fraction of the reference substrate population (U_1) that is inactive as well. As illustrated, below, a significant U_1 value results in an apparent increase in the calculated r^k from fitting to Eq. 8, while r^k value decreases as U_2 increases. As a consequence, data fitting using

equations in which both U_1 and U_2 are variables proved problematic due to difficulty in specifying the relative magnitudes of these parameters. Note that no assumption is made regarding the size of the fraction of inactive fraction U and thus Eq. 8 is general. However, as the active fraction of the experimental substrate population decreases the signal/noise ratio will also decrease and ultimately place a limit on the size of the unreactive population that can be analyzed.

With respect to practical application of competitive alternative substrate kinetics for structure-function experiments several key issues follow from application of this approach[9–11]. First, because both substrates must compete for the available free enzyme in order to react and form product. Thus, the association step contributes to the relative population of ES_1 and ES_2 and therefore the observed rates. Direct measurements of rate constants is therefore the only way to determine k values for V . However, if V reflects the same rate constant as that measured under single turnover conditions ($E \gg S$), then it should be possible to measure relative effects on V by internal competition kinetics performed under these conditions. Second, since the enzyme concentration occurs in the rate equations for v_{obs1} and v_{obs2} it cancels out in their ratio. So long as the steady state conditions are maintained the ratio of observed rates and the ratio of V/K values are independent of enzyme concentration. This could be useful for reactions involving impure enzyme or difficult to control reaction conditions. Third, it is also evident that the individual step or steps in the reaction scheme that is rate limiting for V/K does not have to be the same for the two substrates. Application of competitive kinetics will therefore report on the relative V/K values for the two substrates and provided that the V/K of the reference substrates is known the other can be calculated, but does not make any assumptions about what is rate limiting for either substrate. Fourth, because substrate and product ratios are analyzed, systematic errors in the accuracy of their measurement such as differences in enzyme specific activity, reaction conditions or inaccuracies in measurements of substrate or product concentrations (i.e. differences in species ionization during MS analysis), which confound direct data fitting, cancel out in the internal competition approach which can result in a corresponding increase in precision of relative rate constant measurements.

In vitro processing of alternative ptRNA substrates by RNase P

In vitro processing of ptRNA processing by RNase P is a good model system to examine the advantages and disadvantages of using internal competition kinetics for *in vitro* RNA processing reactions including ribozyme catalysis. RNase P is a ribonucleoprotein enzyme that cleaves ptRNA to generate the mature tRNA 5' end. Typical *in vitro* RNA processing reactions, such as those used to measure RNase P activity, use radiolabeled RNA, and the substrate and products are resolved by PAGE. The absolute intensities of the resulting bands are quantified by phosphorimager analysis. Structure-function studies *in vitro* have been used to gain insight into the intrinsic molecular recognition properties of RNase P that determine its biological function[35, 36]. Endogenous ptRNA substrates have similar V/K values however, changes in sequence and structure contacted by RNase P can result in miscleavage or reduced processing rate constants[1, 21]. Thus, RNase P is a useful example for application of internal competition that is relevant to a wider range of RNA processing reactions and enzyme systems.

In order to apply internal competition kinetic analyses it is necessary to measure the ratio of the concentrations of the two competing substrates or products, and to precisely measure the fraction of reaction of the reference substrate [11]. As shown in Fig. 2A, the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ substrate has a 5' leader sequence that is 10 nucleotides in length, while the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}$ substrates have leader sequences that are 31 nucleotides long. Additionally, these substrates differ from $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ at positions N(-3) to N(-8) relative to the cleavage site that is located between nucleotides N(-1) and N(1). These positions contact or influence the binding to the essential protein cofactor in the RNase P-ptRNA complex, and variation of their sequence affects the observed V/K value for processing by *E. coli* RNase P [21]. The difference in 5' leader length allows the precursors and products of both substrates to be resolved by PAGE, and thus, time courses for their reactions to be analyzed separately by fitting these data to an exponential function (Fig. 3A and B). Consistent with previous results, the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ substrate with the L5+21 leader sequence ($\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}$) is processed with a *ca.* 4-fold slower rate constant at 0.00017 min^{-1} compared to the reference substrate that reacted with an observed rate constant of 0.0006 min^{-1} (Table 1). Calculation of a relative rate constant from these values yields a value of $^{\text{r}}k = 0.14(5)$. The $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ substrate with the L1+21 leader sequence shows a *ca.* 2-fold faster rate constant (0.0010 min^{-1}) relative to $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ yielding a calculated $^{\text{r}}k$ value of $1.8(9)$ using the rate constants measured by direct fitting; however, in these experiments the propagated error from the individual measurements is relatively large placing an intrinsic limit on any mechanistic interpretation that may be drawn.

Determination of relative rate constants by analysis of substrate and product ratios

The $^{\text{r}}k$ values for substrate and product ratios were also determined by fitting the data from experiments exemplified in Fig. 2A and B to Eq. 4 and 5. As shown in Fig. 3C, the ratio of the products for the reaction containing $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ expressed as $R_p = P_2/P_1 = \text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}/\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ (*i.e.* using $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ as the reference substrate) showed a transient depletion due to accumulation of the product from the faster reacting $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ species at early time points. In contrast, there is a transient enrichment of the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ product and a corresponding larger $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}/\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ product ratio at early time points (Fig. 3D). Fitting these data to Eq. 5 yielded absolute values for k_1 and k_2 that were used to calculate $^{\text{r}}k$ values of $1.4(2)$ for $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ and $0.30(4)$ for $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}$ that compare favorably to the results from direct fitting (Table 1).

A large increase is observed in the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL5+21}}/\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ratio ($R_S = S_2/S_1$) as the reaction containing both substrates proceeds due to the larger rate constant for $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ and the faster depletion of this substrate from the residual substrate population (Fig. 3E). Fitting these data to Eq. 4 yielded an $^{\text{r}}k$ value of $0.22(1)$, consistent with both direct fitting and internal competition analysis of product ratios (Table 1). However, as shown in Fig. 3F, the change in substrate ratio ($\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}/\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}} = S_2/S_1$) as a function of reaction progress does not follow ideal behavior for the reaction containing $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ substrates. In this case, an initial decrease in the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}/\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ratio is observed followed by an increase at later time points. The non-ideal behavior is likely to be due to mis-folding of a portion of the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{MetL1+21}}$ substrate RNA population that renders it refractory to cleavage by RNase P. This behavior is not

unexpected since a characteristic feature of the biophysical behavior of structured RNAs is their ability to adopt alternative folded structures[22, 37]. Only one or a subset of these alternative structures may be biologically active, and examples where this has been observed include tRNA folding ([22] and references therein). Indeed, the data show in Fig. 2B show that a small fraction of residual ptRNA^{Met}L1+21 substrate is not consumed.

To illustrate the effect of substrate misfolding resulting in inactive species in the experimental sample we simulated the substrate ratio data for hypothetical substrates with slower ($k = 0.5$) or faster ($k = 2$) than the reference substrate, or with the same rate constant ($k = 1$) using Eq. 6. For each case the effect of increasing fraction of unreactive experimental substrate, U_2 , on the observed S_2/S_1 ratio was simulated ranging from 0.01 – 0.1 using the exponential functions Eq. 6 and Eq. 7 (Fig. 4A). When $k = 0.5$ and the observed S_2/S_1 data are fit to Eq. 4, which assumes complete reaction of both S_1 and S_2 , an increasingly inaccurate k value is obtained for the reaction of S_2 as the fraction of unreactive population increases. For a reaction where there is no difference in the rate constants for the two substrates ($k = 1$) the presence of unreactive species in the experimental substrate population results in an apparent increase in the S_2/S_1 ratio and $k < 1$ is obtained from fitting to Eq. 4. Although this effect is comparatively small, it is apparent that for an experimental substrate that has no difference in rate constant relative to the reference substrate ($k = 1$) could be subject to false interpretation that it reacts more slowly if an appreciable fraction is mis-folded and therefore inactive. For an experimental substrate that reacts with a faster rate constant than the reference ($k = 2$), then the S_2/S_1 ratio decreases as the reaction proceeds, however, increasing fractions of unreactive S_2 result in deflection of this trend and ultimately an overall increase in the S_2/S_1 ratio (Fig. 4B). As a result, fitting these data to Eq. 4 returns an increasingly inaccurate k value that underestimates the intrinsic value (Fig. 4D). Thus, the presence of unreactive species in the experimental substrate population can significantly confound internal competition analyses of substrate ratios.

As illustrated in Fig. 3F, for the reaction containing both ptRNA^{Met}L5+21 and ptRNA^{Met} substrates the data are adequately described by a function describing a faster reacting S_2 which also contains a small fraction that is inactive (Eq. 8). The derivation of Eq. 8 is provided in the Supplementary Information and includes the variable, U_2 , for the fraction of the experimental substrate that is unreactive. An k value of 1.6(5) is obtained by fitting to this function and a U_2 value of 0.03 consistent with the PAGE data observed in Fig. 2B. It is also possible that there will be an unreactive fraction in the reference substrate (U_1) as well as an unreactive fraction in the experimental substrate (U_2). In order to explore the consequences of this scenario, we performed a series of simulations for $k = 2$ in which U_1 was assumed to be 0.1 and U_2 was varied from 0 to 0.1 (Fig. 4C). A significant fraction of unreacted reference substrate U_1 results in an artificially lower S_2/S_1 substrate ratio at high fractions of reaction that results in an overestimate of the intrinsic k value. This results contrasts with the effect of increase U_2 values that result in an underestimate of the intrinsic k (Fig. 4D). While an expression containing both U_1 and U_2 as variables can be derived, data fitting proved problematic due to the opposing effects of their values on the observed S_2/S_1 ratio. A more general solution is to fit these data with Eq. 8 in which a single

value for the experimental substrate is assumed. As shown in Fig. 4C and D fitting the entire time course returns $^{\text{r}}k$ values that overestimate the intrinsic value by as much as 25% (*ca.* 2.5–2.4 *versus* 2). However, when the fitting is restricted to $f < 0.8$ the calculated $^{\text{r}}k$ value is more accurate (*ca.* 2.2–2.). Therefore, in cases where analysis of product ratios is not applicable, and there is a significant (and unavoidable) fraction of the experimental and reference substrates that are unreactive, it is nonetheless possible to obtain accurate relative rate constants.

Conclusions

Direct fitting of kinetic data is the primary tool of enzyme kinetics including RNA processing enzymes and ribozymes, however, internal competition can offer significant advantages in some cases and can serve as a valuable experimental tool. As illustrated by the examples presented here, this approach can be used to accurately distinguish small differences in relative rate constants for reactions of alternative RNA substrates *in vitro*. The ability to compare reaction kinetics within the same reaction necessarily minimizes differences due to enzyme concentration and specific activity. Thus, competitive methods may be particularly useful for complex enzyme preparations or extracts. Importantly, alternative substrate kinetics provide a direct readout of enzyme specificity which is essential for understanding the competition between substrates *in vivo* [1, 20, 38]. The method is applicable to single time point assays in those cases in which the entire reaction course cannot be followed or material is limiting. However, fitting of multiple data points over reaction time courses is preferable for optimizing accuracy. Internal competition kinetics is also advantageous when measuring absolute substrate concentrations is difficult, for example in mass spectrometry where differences in ionization can influence signal intensities. Because changes in substrate or product ratios are quantified inaccuracies in their values cancel (*e.g.* $R_S/R_0 = (S_2/S_1)/(S_{2,0}/S_{1,0}) = (S_2/S_{2,0})/(S_1/S_{1,0})$) with concomitant increases in accuracy of rate constant measurements [11, 39]. As noted previously in the literature on KIE analyses by internal competition there are inherent limitations due to low signal to noise ratios at early and late fractions of reaction [12]. That is, at low fractions of reaction there is little change in the residual substrate ratio while at high fractions of reaction the enrichment of the slower reacting substrate is greatest. However, this increase in fractionation is offset by inaccuracy in measuring the remaining low concentration of unreacted substrate. Additionally, the results shown here further underscore the limitation that small differences in inactive populations can be problematic for quantifying small differences in rate constants. Purification of substrate RNAs by non-denaturing PAGE to isolate more uniformly folded population could provide a way to avoid this limitation. Nonetheless, the approach is broadly applicable and advantages include the ability quantify effects on reaction rate constants with greater precision, increased throughput of individual kinetic trials, and the potential for recognizing non-ideal kinetic behavior. The simple kinetic method applied here provides a consistent framework for extending internal competition analysis to other systems and more complex substrate populations.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Vernon Anderson for assistance and advice on application of competitive methods and members of the Harris laboratory for comments on the manuscript. The diagrams illustrating internal competition in Fig. 1B were adapted from images provided by Dr. Mark Ruszczycky. This work was supported by NIH grants GM096000 and GM056740 to MEH.

References

1. Yandek LE, Lin HC, Harris ME. Alternative substrate kinetics of Escherichia coli ribonuclease P: determination of relative rate constants by internal competition. *J Biol Chem.* 2013; 288:8342–8354. [PubMed: 23362254]
2. Dale T, Fahlman RP, Olejniczak M, Uhlenbeck OC. Specificity of the ribosomal A site for aminoacyl-tRNAs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2009; 37:1202–1210. [PubMed: 19129224]
3. Cooper DA, Jha BK, Silverman RH, Hesselberth JR, Barton DJ. Ribonuclease L and metal-ion-independent endoribonuclease cleavage sites in host and viral RNAs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2014
4. Hougland, J.; Piccirilli, J.; Forconi, M.; Lee, J.; Herschlag, D. How the Group I Intron Works: A Case Study of RNA Structure and Function. In: Akins, R.; Gesteland, R.; Cech, T., editors. *The RNA World*. 3. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press; Cold Spring Harbor, NY: 2006.
5. Nicholson AW. Ribonuclease III mechanisms of double-stranded RNA cleavage. *Wiley Interdiscip Rev RNA.* 2014; 5:31–48. [PubMed: 24124076]
6. Fersht, A. *Structure and Mechanism in Protein Science*. W.H. Freeman & Co; 1998.
7. Cleland, WW.; Cook, PF. *Enzyme Kinetics and Mechanism*. Garland Publishers; London and New York: 2007.
8. Uhlenbeck OC. Keeping RNA happy. *Rna.* 1995; 1:4–6. [PubMed: 7489487]
9. Cha S. Kinetics of enzyme reactions with competing alternative substrates. *Molecular pharmacology.* 1968; 4:621–629. [PubMed: 5725576]
10. Schellenberger V, Siegel RA, Rutter WJ. Analysis of enzyme specificity by multiple substrate kinetics. *Biochemistry.* 1993; 32:4344–4348. [PubMed: 8476864]
11. Cleland WW. The use of isotope effects to determine enzyme mechanisms. *Arch Biochem Biophys.* 2005; 433:2–12. [PubMed: 15581561]
12. Melander, L.; Saunders, WH. *Reaction Rates of Isotopic Molecules*. Wiley; New York: 1980.
13. Kohen, A.; Limbach, HH. *Isotope Effects In Chemistry and Biology*. Taylor & Francis; 2005.
14. Pi N, Leary JA. Determination of enzyme/substrate specificity constants using a multiple substrate ESI-MS assay. *J Am Soc Mass Spectrom.* 2004; 15:233–243. [PubMed: 14766290]
15. Harris ME, Dai Q, Gu H, Kellerman DL, Piccirilli JA, Anderson VE. Kinetic isotope effects for RNA cleavage by 2'-O- transphosphorylation: nucleophilic activation by specific base. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132:11613–11621. [PubMed: 20669950]
16. Manning KA, Sathyamoorthy B, Eletsky A, Szyperski T, Murkin AS. Highly precise measurement of kinetic isotope effects using 1H-detected 2D [13C,1H]-HSQC NMR spectroscopy. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2012; 134:20589–20592. [PubMed: 23215000]
17. Chan J, Lewis AR, Gilbert M, Karwaski MF, Bennet AJ. A direct NMR method for the measurement of competitive kinetic isotope effects. *Nat Chem Biol.* 2010; 6:405–407. [PubMed: 20418878]
18. Hiller DA, Zhong M, Singh V, Strobel SA. Transition states of uncatalyzed hydrolysis and aminolysis reactions of a ribosomal P-site substrate determined by kinetic isotope effects. *Biochemistry.* 2010; 49:3868–3878. [PubMed: 20359191]
19. Parkin DW, Leung HB, Schramm VL. Synthesis of nucleotides with specific radiolabels in ribose. Primary 14C and secondary 3H kinetic isotope effects on acid-catalyzed glycosidic bond hydrolysis of AMP, dAMP, and inosine. *J Biol Chem.* 1984; 259:9411–9417. [PubMed: 6746654]
20. Bertram JG, Oertell K, Petruska J, Goodman MF. DNA polymerase fidelity: comparing direct competition of right and wrong dNTP substrates with steady state and pre-steady state kinetics. *Biochemistry.* 2010; 49:20–28. [PubMed: 20000359]

21. Guenther UP, Yandek LE, Niland CN, Campbell FE, Anderson D, Anderson VE, Harris ME, Jankowsky E. Hidden specificity in an apparently nonspecific RNA-binding protein. *Nature*. 2013; 502:385–388. [PubMed: 24056935]
22. Herschlag D. RNA chaperones and the RNA folding problem. *J Biol Chem*. 1995; 270:20871–20874. [PubMed: 7545662]
23. Siew D, Zahler NH, Cassano AG, Strobel SA, Harris ME. Identification of adenosine functional groups involved in substrate binding by the ribonuclease P ribozyme. *Biochemistry*. 1999; 38:1873–1883. [PubMed: 10026268]
24. Brunelle, JL.; Green, R. Chapter Five - In Vitro Transcription from Plasmid or PCR-amplified DNA. In: Jon, L., editor. *Methods in Enzymology*. Academic Press; 2013. p. 101-114.
25. Porecha, R.; Herschlag, D. Chapter Fourteen - RNA Radiolabeling. In: Jon, L., editor. *Methods in Enzymology*. Academic Press; 2013. p. 255-279.
26. Herschlag D. The Role of Induced Fit and Conformational Changes of Enzymes in Specificity and Catalysis. *Bioorganic chemistry*. 1988; 16:62–96.
27. Northrop DB. Rethinking fundamentals of enzyme action. *Adv Enzymol Relat Areas Mol Biol*. 1999; 73:25–55. ix. [PubMed: 10218105]
28. Herschlag D. The role of induced fit and conformational changes of enzymes in specificity and catalysis. *Bioorganic chemistry*. 1988; 16:62–96.
29. Cleland WW. Use of isotope effects to elucidate enzyme mechanisms. *CRC critical reviews in biochemistry*. 1982; 13:385–428. [PubMed: 6759038]
30. Merkler DJ, Kline PC, Weiss P, Schramm VL. Transition-state analysis of AMP deaminase. *Biochemistry*. 1993; 32:12993–13001. [PubMed: 8241153]
31. Sowa GA, Hengge AC, Cleland WW. ¹⁸O isotope effects support a concerted mechanism for ribonuclease A. *J Am Chem Soc*. 1997; 119:2319–2320.
32. Hengge AC, Denu JM, Dixon JE. Transition-state structures for the native dual-specific phosphatase VHR and D92N and S131A mutants. Contributions to the driving force for catalysis. *Biochemistry*. 1996; 35:7084–7092. [PubMed: 8679534]
33. Hiller DA, Singh V, Zhong M, Strobel SA. A two-step chemical mechanism for ribosome-catalysed peptide bond formation. *Nature*. 2011; 476:236–239. [PubMed: 21765427]
34. Unrau PJ, Bartel DP. An oxocarbenium-ion intermediate of a ribozyme reaction indicated by kinetic isotope effects. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2003; 100:15393–15397. [PubMed: 14668444]
35. Smith JK, Hsieh J, Fierke CA. Importance of RNA-protein interactions in bacterial ribonuclease P structure and catalysis. *Biopolymers*. 2007; 87:329–338. [PubMed: 17868095]
36. Hartmann RK, Gossringer M, Spath B, Fischer S, Marchfelder A. The making of tRNAs and more - RNase P and tRNase Z. *Progress in molecular biology and translational science*. 2009; 85:319–368. [PubMed: 19215776]
37. Russell R. RNA misfolding and the action of chaperones. *Frontiers in bioscience : a journal and virtual library*. 2008; 13:1–20. [PubMed: 17981525]
38. Ledoux S, Uhlenbeck OC. Different aa-tRNAs are selected uniformly on the ribosome. *Mol Cell*. 2008; 31:114–123. [PubMed: 18614050]
39. Cassano AG, Wang B, Anderson DR, Previs S, Harris ME, Anderson VE. Inaccuracies in selected ion monitoring determination of isotope ratios obviated by profile acquisition: nucleotide ¹⁸O/¹⁶O measurements. *Anal Biochem*. 2007; 367:28–39. [PubMed: 17560863]

Fig. 1.

(A). Minimal kinetic scheme for competitive multiple turnover reactions containing two alternative substrates. A single enzyme E combines with two alternative substrates, S_1 and S_2 , and reacts with rates V_1 and V_2 . The equilibrium constants K_1 and K_2 are the apparent equilibrium constants (K_m or K_d) for the multiple turnover reactions of S_1 and S_2 , respectively. (B). Two dimensional free energy landscapes for the reactions of S_1 and S_2 at the start of the reaction (top; $f = 0$), at an intermediate time during the reaction (middle; $1 > f > 0$), and after completion (bottom; $f = 1$). Note that at intermediate times during the reaction the ratio of the substrates (S_2/S_1) and products (P_2/P_1) will be offset from their initial and final values. The relative concentrations of S_1 and S_2 are depicted in black and grey, respectively. The differences in activation energy ($\Delta G^\ddagger$) and consequently the differences in rate constant are indicated by arrows. (C). Dependence of the residual substrate ratio $R_S = S_2/S_1$ as a function of reaction progress, f , for a range of normal and inverse τk values from 0.1 to 2 using Eq. 4. (D). Dependence of the residual product ratio $R_P = P_2/P_1$ as a function of time for a range of normal and inverse τk values from 0.1 to 2 using Eq. 5. Normal effects on the relative rate constant ($\tau k > 1$) are shown by lines while inverse effects ($\tau k < 1$) are shown by dashed lines.

Fig. 2.

Quantification of substrate and product ratios for *in vitro* RNase P reactions containing two alternative ptRNA substrates. **(A)**. Sequence and secondary structure of the reference substrate ptRNA^{Met} (*i.e.* S₁), and two experimental substrates (*i.e.* S₂) ptRNA^{Met}L1+21 and ptRNA^{Met}L5+21. These three substrates differ in nucleotides N(−6) to N(−3), numbering relative to the RNase P cleavage site between N(−1)/N(1). These sequences are within the binding site for the essential RNase P protein and variation can affect the *V/K* for individual substrates. **(B)**. PAGE analysis of the precursor and products of *in vitro* RNase P reaction containing the ptRNA^{Met} and ptRNA^{Met}L1+21 substrates. **(C)**. PAGE analysis of the precursor and products of *in vitro* RNase P reaction containing the ptRNA^{Met} and ptRNA^{Met}L5+21 substrates. The position of the substrates and products in the gel are indicated. Quantification of these data by phosphorimager analysis is used to determine S₂/S₁ and P₂/P₁ ratios analyzed in Fig. 3.

Fig. 3.

Determination of rate constants for the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ substrates by direct fitting and internal competition analysis of substrate and product ratios. **(A)**. Kinetic data for product accumulation in individual reactions containing either $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ (squares, solid line) or $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ (circles, dashed line). **(B)**. Kinetic data for product accumulation in individual reactions containing either $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ (squares, solid line) or $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ (circles, dashed line). The data in panels **A** and **B** are fit to a single exponential function to obtain $k(\text{obs})$. **(C and D)** Plots of the product ratio data from the reactions of $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ($P_2/P_1 = \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21} / \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$) versus f (**C**), and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ($P_2/P_1 = \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21} / \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$) versus f (**D**). These data are fit to Eq. 5 (solid line) in order to determine the relative rate constants for the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ substrates. **(E and F)**. Plots of the substrate ratio data from the reactions of $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ($S_2/S_1 = \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21} / \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$) versus f (**E**), and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$ ($S_2/S_1 = \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21} / \text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}$) versus f (**F**). The data in both panels are fit to Eq. 4 (solid lines) in order to determine the relative rate constants for the $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L1+21}$ and $\text{ptRNA}^{\text{Met}}\text{L5+21}$ substrates. The data in panel **F** are also fit to Eq. 8 (dashed line) assuming a U value of 0.062 in order to account for the increase in the S_2/S_1 ratio at higher fractions of reaction. Average and standard deviations of the rate constants for all three substrates are summarized in Table 1.

Fig. 4.

Effects of increasing unreactive substrate population (U) on the observed change in substrate ratio (S_2/S_1) as a function of reaction progress (f). **(A)**. Simulations of S_2/S_1 as a function of f for substrates with $r_k = 0.5, 1$ and 2 . At each r_k value the magnitude of U was varied from 0.01 to 0.1. **(B)**. Detail showing the simulated data from panel A for the case of $r_k = 2$ with increasing U from 0 to 0.1 as indicated. The data for conversion of 80% of the substrate ($f = 0 - 0.8$) were fit to Eq. 4 (shown in black) in order to obtain an apparent r_k values as summarized in panel D. These data were also fit to Eq. 8 (shown in red), which accurately describes the data and returns therefore an accurate r_k value. **(C)**. Simulations showing the effect of the presence of unreactive populations in both the substrate (U_2) and the reference substrate (U_1). The U_1 value was fixed at 0.1 and U_2 was varied from 0.02 – 0.1 as indicated. These simulated data were fit to Eq. 8 using either the entire data set or restricted to $f < 0.8$. **(D)**. Summary of calculated r_k values (r_{k_calc}) from fitting simulated data in panels B and C. The values of r_{k_calc} from fitting the simulated data in panel B to Eq. 4 (open circles); the entire range of data in panel C to Eq. 8 (open circles); and the data for $f < 0.8$ from panel C to Eq. 8 (filled squares) are shown as a function of the U_2 .

Table 1

Comparison of relative reaction rate constants determined by direct fitting and internal competition using either product or substrate ratios.

	$k(\text{obs}) \text{ min}^{-1}$	Direct fitting $r_k (\text{calc.})^1$	Product ratio r_k	Substrate ratio	
				r_k	$r_k (\text{corr.})^2$
ptRNA ^{Met}	0.0006(3)				
ptRNA ^{Met} L1+21	0.0010(5)	1.8 (9)	1.4 (2)	0.9 (1)	1.6 (5)
ptRNA ^{Met} L5+21	0.00017(4)	0.24 (5)	0.30 (4)	0.22 (1)	0.22 (2)

¹ Relative rate constant calculated from $k(\text{obs})$ values, standard deviations are shown in parenthesis and errors on calculated r_k values are propagated by accordingly.

² Corrected r_k value obtained by fitting to Eq. 8.