Published in final edited form as:

ACS Chem Biol. 2019 June 21; 14(6): 1249–1259. doi:10.1021/acscchembio.9b00214.

Targeting dynamic ATP-binding site features allows discrimination between highly homologous protein kinases

Sujata Chakraborty[†], Takayuki Inukai[‡], Linglan Fang[†], Martin Golkowski[§], and Dustin J. Maly^{†,||,*}

[†]Department of Chemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

[§]Department of Pharmacology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

^{||}Department of Biochemistry, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

[‡]Medicinal Chemistry Research Laboratories, Ono Pharmaceutical Company, Ltd., 3-1-1 Sakurai, Shimamoto, Mishima, Osaka 618-8585, Japan

Abstract

ATP-competitive inhibitors that demonstrate exquisite selectivity for specific members of the human kinome have been developed. Despite this success, the identification of highly selective inhibitors is still very challenging, and it is often not possible to rationally engineer selectivity between the ATP-binding sites of kinases, especially amongst closely-related family members. Src-family kinases (SFKs) are a highly homologous family of eight multi-domain, non-receptor tyrosine kinases that play general and specialized roles in numerous cellular processes. The high sequence and functional similarities between SFK members make it hard to rationalize how selectivity can be gained with inhibitors that target the ATP-binding site. Here, we describe the development of a series of inhibitors that are highly selective for the ATP-binding sites of the SFKs Lyn and Hck over other SFKs. By biochemically characterizing how these selective ATP-competitive inhibitors allosterically influence the global conformation of SFKs, we demonstrate that they most likely interact with a binding pocket created by the movement of the conformationally-flexible helix α C in the ATP-binding site. With a series of sequence swap experiments, we show that sensitivity to this class of selective inhibitors is due to the identity of residues that control the conformational flexibility of helix α C rather than any specific ATP-binding site interactions. Thus, the ATP-binding sites of highly homologous kinases can be discriminated by targeting heterogeneity within conformationally flexible regions.

Protein kinases are key regulators of signal transduction pathways and represent a significant portion of the human proteome.¹ All kinases possess a catalytic domain (CD) composed of an N-lobe and a C-lobe with a catalytic cleft that interacts with ATP located between them. Dysregulated kinase activity is associated with a number of human diseases and, for this

*Corresponding author: djmaly@uw.edu.

Supporting Information

The Supporting Information is available free of charge on the ACS Publication website at DOI: Supplemental figures S1–12, methods, protein amino acid sequence and DNA sequence, synthetic procedures and inhibitor characterization.

The authors declare no competing financial interest.

reason, protein kinase inhibition is an active area of drug discovery.^{2, 3} There have been significant advancements in our ability to target specific kinases with small molecule inhibitors over the last decade. Despite the fact that a majority of potent and selective small molecule inhibitors target the highly conserved ATP-binding site, it is possible to identify inhibitors that demonstrate exquisite selectivity for a specific kinase target.^{4–6} However, the development of highly selective kinase inhibitors is still very challenging and it is often not possible to rationally engineer discrimination between similar targets because the molecular determinants of specificity are often not well understood. This selectivity problem is particularly acute for closely-related subgroups of kinases that possess ATP-binding sites with very few sequence differences.

Most ATP-competitive kinase inhibitors can be classified into three broad categories based on the active site conformation that they stabilize (Figure 1).⁷ Many inhibitors—often called *type 1*—stabilize or are compatible with an “active” ATP-binding site conformation, where all catalytic residues are aligned in an orientation compatible with phosphate transfer. ATP-competitive inhibitors can also stabilize two distinct “inactive” kinase conformations, in which catalytically important residues are displaced from a phosphotransferase-competent orientation. The most common inactive conformation stabilized by ATP-competitive inhibitors is the DFG-out conformation, which is defined by displacement of the Asp-Phe-Gly (DFG)-motif at the base of the activation loop from an active conformation.^{8, 9} Inhibitors that stabilize the DFG-out conformation—often called *type 2*—usually possess moieties that make hydrogen bonds with a conserved Glu residue in helix α C and the backbone of the DFG-motif and a large hydrophobic substituent that occupies a pocket created by movement of the Phe residue in the DFG-motif. Potent inhibitors that stabilize an inactive conformation characterized by displacement of helix α C from an active conformation have also been developed.^{10–12} Inhibitors that stabilize this inactive form, which is often referred to as the helix α C-out conformation, usually possess substituents that occupy a pocket created by movement of helix α C. It has been widely speculated that inhibitors that stabilize the DFG-out inactive conformation are inherently more selective than type 1 inhibitors but recent studies call into question the magnitude of this effect.^{8, 11} Fewer inhibitors that stabilize the helix α C-out conformation have been characterized and the inherent selectivity of this ligand class is less understood.

Human Src-family kinases (SFKs) are a family of eight multidomain, nonreceptor tyrosine kinases that play general and specialized roles in numerous cellular processes.^{7, 13} SFKs all share regulatory SH2 and SH3 domains that are N-terminal to a highly conserved kinase CD. SFKs are closely related in sequence—64–90% CD sequence identity—and only significantly diverge at their membrane-interacting N-termini and the linker (SH2-kinase domain linker) that connects the SH2 domain to the kinase domain. The SFKs are grouped into two subfamilies—Src-A and Src-B subfamilies (Figure S1A)—based on their SH2-kinase domain linker motifs.¹⁴ Despite the importance of SFKs in numerous fundamental processes, there has been limited success in identifying cell-permeable inhibitors that discriminate between family members.^{4, 15–17} Here, we describe a series of ATP-competitive inhibitors that are highly selective for the Src-B subfamily over the Src-A subfamily SFKs. Using a panel of biochemical assays, we show that these inhibitors promote the autoinhibited form of SFKs, most likely by stabilizing the helix α C-out conformation of the

ATP-binding site. Finally, by performing a series of sequence swap experiments, we demonstrate that flexible linker residues that connect helix α C to the N-terminal lobe of the ATP-binding site are responsible for inhibitor sensitivity. Together, these experiments show that it is possible to discriminate between highly similar ATP-binding sites by targeting differences in the conformational flexibility of helix α C.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The kinase domains of SFKs are highly conserved, with very few sequence differences in the residues comprising their ATP-binding sites. To structurally define the similarity of SFK ATP-binding sites, we analyzed co-crystal structures of the CD of Src bound to the drug dasatinib and two conformation-selective analogs of dasatinib (Figure 1A–C).¹¹ Using these three co-crystal structures, we identified residues that make hydrophobic or polar contacts with each inhibitor (within 4 Å) and performed sequence alignments of inhibitor contact residues for the Group A SFKs Src and Fyn and the Group B SFKs Hck and Lyn (Figure S1B–D). As expected, there are very few sequence differences between Å Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn in the regions that make contact with all three inhibitors (Figure S1B–D). There are sixteen residues in Src's ATP-binding site, which is in the active conformation, that make contact with dasatinib. For Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn, twelve of these residues are identical, three are similar, and only one—residue 342 (chicken Src numbering)—varies substantially (Figures 1A, Figure S1B). Seventeen ATP-binding site residues in Src interact with the helix α C-out version of dasatinib, with three residues making unique interactions relative to dasatinib (Figures 1D, S1C). For Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn, fourteen of these residues are identical, two are similar, and, again, only residue 342 varies substantially. Src forms the largest interaction surface with the DFG-out version of dasatinib, with twenty ATP-binding site residues making inhibitor contacts (Figure 1G, S1D). However, seventeen of these residues are identical and two are similar in Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn. Like the other two inhibitors, only contact residue 342 greatly varies between these four kinases. (Figure S1D). Residue 342 is located on the hinge region and its side chain is perpendicular to the ATP-binding site, making it an unlikely source of inhibitor selectivity.

To functionally define the similarities of SFK ATP-binding sites, we tested the sensitivities of Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn constructs that contain the SH3, SH2, and CDs (SFK^{3D}) to pyrazolopyrimidine-based inhibitors that stabilize either the active (**1**), helix α C-out (**2**), or DFG-out (**3**) conformation of the ATP-binding site (Figures 1B, 1E, 1H). Consistent with the high sequence similarity of their ATP-binding sites, we found that Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D}, and Lyn^{3D} are equally sensitive to all three inhibitors (Figures 1C, 1F, 1I, S2). Notably, conformation-selective inhibitors **2** and **3** were as non-selective amongst the SFKs as type 1 inhibitor **1**. alignment of the 16 hydrophobic or polar dasatinib contact residues for Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn (*bottom*). Residues shown in black are conserved, while residues shown in red vary between these four SFKs. **B**. Binding pose of inhibitor **1**, which stabilizes an active ATP-binding site conformation. **C**. Inhibitory curves for inhibitor **1** against Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D}, and Lyn^{3D} activity in the presence of 1 mM ATP (n=3). **D**. Crystal structure of Src bound to a helix α C-out-stabilizing analog of dasatinib (PDB ID, 4YBK; *top*). Residues that form hydrophobic or polar contacts—within 4 Å—with helix α C-out-stabilizing dasatinib are shown in dark red. Sequence alignment of the 17 hydrophobic or polar residues that form

contacts with helix α C-out-stabilizing dasatinib for Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn (*bottom*). **E.** Binding pose of inhibitor **2**, which stabilizes the helix α C-out conformation of the ATP-binding site. **F.** Inhibitory curves for inhibitor **2** against Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D}, and Lyn^{3D} activity in the presence of 1 mM ATP (n=3). **G.** Crystal structure of Src bound to a DFG-out-stabilizing analog of dasatinib (PDB ID, 4YBJ; *top*). Residues that form hydrophobic or polar contacts—within 4 Å—with DFG-out-stabilizing dasatinib are shown in dark red. Sequence alignment of the 20 hydrophobic or polar DFG-out-stabilizing dasatinib contact residues for Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn (*bottom*). **H.** Binding pose of inhibitor **3**, which stabilizes the DFG-out conformation of the ATP-binding site. **I.** Inhibitory curves for inhibitor **3** against Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D}, and Lyn^{3D} activity in the presence of 1 mM ATP (n=3).

Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors.

The sequence and functional similarities between Src, Fyn, Hck, and Lyn makes it hard to rationalize how selectivity can be gained by targeting specific interactions within their ATP-binding sites. However, we have observed that differences in the linker connecting the SH2 domain to the CD (SH2-CD linker) of SFKs lead to heterogeneous allosteric coupling between their regulatory and CDs.^{19, 20} When SFKs are in a closed autoinhibited state, their SH3 domains and SH2-CD linkers form extensive contacts with helix α C in the CD and these regions are highly coupled through allostery. Based on these observations, we predicted that it may be possible to distinguish between the ATP-binding sites of SFKs with inhibitors that make extensive contacts with the region adjacent to helix α C. Therefore, we generated a panel of inhibitors based on a pyrrolo[2,3-d]pyrimidine scaffold that should project substituents from its C-5 position towards helix α C when forming hydrogen-bonding interactions with the hinge region of SFKs.²¹ To provide selectivity for kinases that contain threonine gatekeeper residues, like the SFKs, a 2-methoxyaniline was introduced at the C-5 position of the pyrrolo[2,3]pyrimidine scaffold. Acylation of the 2-methoxyaniline allowed us to introduce diverse substituents that we predicted would project towards the helix α Cs of SFKs (Figure 2A). Various benzofurans, benzothiophenes, indoles, pyrroles, and pyrazoles were introduced at this position.

We first obtained IC₅₀s and *KI* values for each inhibitor in our panel against Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D} and Lyn^{3D} constructs using a fluorescent reporter activity assay (Figure S3).^{22, 23} We observed that while indole **4** potentially inhibited all four SFKs, all other derivatives in this series demonstrated high selectivity within the SFKs. Strikingly, all inhibitors are more potent against group B SFKs Hck and Lyn over the group A members Src and Fyn. Notably, **7**, **15**, **17**, **19**, **20**, **22**, and **23** potentially inhibited both Hck^{3D} and Lyn^{3D} but had minimal activity against Src^{3D} and Fyn^{3D} at the highest concentration tested (30 μ M). Within this group of Hck/Lyn-selective inhibitors, a structural motif consisting of a 5-membered heterocycle with a 1, 3-relationship between the aryl group and the amide linkage to the 2-methoxyaniline scaffold is common. Some of the inhibitors in this series were also able to discriminate between Lyn^{3D} and Hck^{3D}, with **10**, **11**, and **12** demonstrating at least 40-fold selectivity for Lyn^{3D} over Hck^{3D}—with no inhibition of Src^{3D} or Fyn^{3D}. These Lyn-selective inhibitors all contain a 2-carboxyindole with a substituent at the 4-position. Thus, by

introducing structural diversity off of the 2-methoxyaniline at the *C*-5 position it is possible to discriminate between the highly conserved ATP-binding sites of the SFKs.

Global profiling of inhibitor selectivity.

Next, we investigated how the selectivity we observed within the SFKs was reflected throughout the broader kinome. To determine this, we tested four representative inhibitors—**7**, **9**, **12**, and **19**—in a mass spectrometry-based lysate profiling assay (Figure 3A).^{24–27} This kinase profiling assay involves determination of the level of competition an inhibitor provides for enriching endogenous kinases in an HCT116/HEK293 cell lysate mixture by an immobilized, non-selective, ATP-competitive inhibitor matrix. We tested each inhibitor at a single high concentration—30 μ M—to identify strong and weak kinase interactors. In total, ~160 kinases were quantitatively profiled in these experiments. We found that **7**, **9**, **12**, and **19** possess fairly narrow specificity profiles and that Lyn was their most competed target (Figure 3B–C, S4). Amongst the SFKs, Yes and Hck showed the highest level of competition after Lyn. Similar to our *in vitro* inhibition assays with purified constructs, Src and Fyn, as well as closely-related FRK, showed significantly lower levels of competition. Furthermore, we observed that our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors were generally selective for the SFKs, with only a handful of non-SFK targets that appeared to be of low to moderate affinity. To obtain an indication of what type of inhibitory potency this low to moderate competition translates to, we performed activity assays with a recombinant construct of Abl1, which was competed at comparable, albeit slightly lower, levels as Abl2/Arg by **9**, **12**, and **19** but did not match either our selected cutoff for quantification of significance (compounds **9**, **12** and **19**) (Figure S5). We observed that **7**, **9**, **12**, and **19** were at least 60-fold less potent in inhibiting the activity of Abl1 (Figure S6). Thus, our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors are, in general, selective for Lyn within the SFKs and across the wider kinome.

Influence of activation loop phosphorylation.

Next, we determined how activation loop phosphorylation affects the potency and selectivity of our Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors. We observed that the activation loops of Lyn, Hck, and Src undergo near quantitative phosphorylation on Tyr 416 during the pre-incubation step in our activity assays (Figure S7). Because activation loop phosphorylation can affect the potencies of some inhibitors for non-receptor tyrosine kinases,^{29, 30} we investigated if our inhibitors are sensitive to this modification. To do this, we developed an assay for ATP-binding site occupancy that does not require measuring kinase activity and can be used with quantitatively dephosphorylated SFKs. Specifically, we used a time-resolved fluorescence resonance energy transfer (TR-FRET)-based competitive binding assay between a Europium-labeled, anti-His₆ antibody—bound to the N-termini of SFKs—as a FRET donor and a Cy5-labeled, ATP-competitive probe (SCP-2) as a FRET acceptor (Figures 4A, 4B, S8).³¹

With our TR-FRET assay, we first determined the *K_I* values of eight—**5**, **6**, **7**, **9**, **10**, **12**, **19** and **22**—representative inhibitors for dephosphorylated Lyn. Unlike DFG-out-stabilizing inhibitor **3**, all eight inhibitors were nearly equipotent for phosphorylated and dephosphorylated Lyn (Figure 4C, S9). Thus, despite targeting a conformationally flexible

region of the SFKs, our Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors are not sensitive to kinase phosphorylation state. We also tested **5**, **6**, **7**, **9**, **10**, **12**, **19** and **22** in the TR-FRET assay with Hck and Src. Like Lyn, Hck's and Src's sensitivity to this panel of inhibitors was minimally influenced by their phosphorylation states (Figure 4D, S9). In sum, the phosphorylation state of the SFKs does not appear to have a major effect on their affinities for our panel of Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors. Furthermore, differences in SFK activation loop phosphorylation in our activity assays cannot account for the dramatic selectivity we observe.

Stabilization of the helix α C-out conformation.

We next performed mechanistic studies to further define how Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors interact with the ATP-binding sites of SFKs. Our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors were designed to project their *C*-5 substituents into a pocket that is available if helix α C in the N-terminal lobe of the kinase domain moves into an inactive conformation—the helix α C-out inactive conformation. We have previously demonstrated that inhibitors that stabilize the helix α C-out inactive conformation of SFKs allosterically promote a more closed global conformation with enhanced intramolecular SH2 and SH3 domain engagement.^{19, 20, 32, 33} In contrast, we have observed that inhibitors that stabilize the DFG-out inactive conformation of the ATP-binding site promote a more open global SFK conformation with SH2 and SH3 domains that are freely accessible to intermolecular binding partners. To test whether our Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors promote the helix α C-out inactive conformations of Lyn and Hck as designed, a representative panel of SFK-inhibitor complexes were tested in two biochemical assays of SH2 and SH3 domain accessibility.^{19, 20, 23, 32, 33}

First, we tested the intermolecular accessibility of representative SFK^{3D}-inhibitor complexes in a pulldown assay with an immobilized SH3 domain ligand. To allow quantitative comparisons of the amount of Lyn pulled down in this assay, we generated a Lyn^{3D} construct with a tetramethylrhodamine (TMR) fluorophore at its *N*-terminus using the transpeptidase Sortase A (Figures 5A, S10A).³⁴ Using the TMR-labeled Lyn construct, we confirmed that inhibitors **1-3** lead to expected levels of intermolecular SH3 domain accessibility (Figure 5B, S10B). TMR-Lyn^{3D} bound to helix α C-out-stabilizing inhibitor **2**, which promotes a closed global SFK conformation, demonstrated minimal pulldown in this assay, while TMR-Lyn^{3D} bound to DFG-out-stabilizing inhibitor **3**, which promotes an open global SFK conformation, was efficiently retained by the immobilized SH3 domain ligand. As expected, complexation to inhibitor **1**, which has a minimal influence on the global conformation of SFKs, led to an intermediate level of retained TMR-Lyn^{3D}. With these benchmarks in hand, we next tested the intermolecular accessibility of TMR-Lyn^{3D}'s SH3 domain when complexed to a representative set of pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors. We found that all TMR-Lyn^{3D}-inhibitor complexes exhibited limited pulldown with the immobilized SH3 domain ligand, with retained levels comparable to the TMR-Lyn-**2** complex (Figure 5B, S10B). These results strongly suggest that the pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors in our panel promote displacement of Lyn's helix α C from an active conformation, resulting in a closed global conformation with strengthened intramolecular regulatory interactions. We also observed that TMR-Hck^{3D} exhibited limited pulldown (Figure 5B, S10C) when bound to a representative set of pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors,

demonstrating that the binding mode of our Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors is likely conserved amongst the SFKs.

To probe how inhibitor binding affects intramolecular SFK SH2 domains engagement, we monitored C-terminal tail phosphorylation of SFK^{3D}-inhibitor complexes by C-terminal Src kinase (Csk).^{35–38} We have previously demonstrated that the amount of C-terminal tail phosphorylation by Csk is highly sensitive to the global conformation of SFK^{3D} constructs. Open, regulatory domain-disengaged SFKs are efficient Csk substrates, while closed, regulatory domain-engaged SFKs exhibit limited phosphorylation by Csk (Figure 5C, 5D).^{19, 20} Prior to testing inhibitors in the C-terminal tail phosphorylation assay, we first determined whether the required concentrations (3–5 μ M) used to form near quantitative SFK-inhibitor complexes directly inhibit the activity of the Csk construct used in this assay. To do this, we monitored Csk's ability to phosphorylate a Lyn construct–Lyn^{CD}–that consists of only the catalytic domain (CD) and C-terminal tail. Because Lyn^{CD} does not contain an SH2 domain capable of shielding the C-terminal tail from phosphorylation, any diminution observed must be due to direct inhibition of Csk. Because our prototypical helix α C-out-stabilizing inhibitor **2** reduced the ability of Csk to phosphorylate Lyn^{CD}, it could not be used as a benchmark for C-terminal tail phosphorylation levels when Lyn is in the closed global conformation. However, inhibitors **1** and **3** displayed no such liability. Consistent with their high kinome selectivity, all representative pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors tested minimally affected Csk's ability to phosphorylate Lyn^{CD} (Figure S11A). Similar to our observations with other SFKs, Lyn^{3D} was a more efficient substrate for Csk when complexed to DFG-out-stabilizing inhibitor **3**, which promotes an open global conformation, than when bound to **1**.¹⁹ All representative pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitor–Lyn^{3D} complexes tested displayed lower levels of C-terminal tail phosphorylation than the **1**–Lyn^{3D} complex, which further suggests that they stabilize the helix α C-out, ATP-binding site conformation and promote a closed, autoinhibited global conformation. We also observed that representative pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors similarly influenced Csk's ability to phosphorylate the C-terminal tail of Hck^{3D} (Figure 5D, S11B). Together, these biochemical studies suggest that our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors stabilize the helix α C-out conformation of SFKs and that contacts within this region most likely are responsible for inhibitor potency and selectivity.

Sequence determinants of inhibitor sensitivity.

The mechanistic studies above suggest that our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors stabilize the helix α C-out conformation and likely require large movements within this region of the ATP-binding site. This suggests that their selectivity within the SFKs is most likely due to sequence differences within helix α C or in residues that influence the conformation of this region of the ATP-binding site. To determine if we could identify these sequence differences, we generated a series of chimeric constructs consisting of an inhibitor-sensitive SFK–Lyn– and inhibitor-resistant SFK–Src (Figure 6A). Until this point, all inhibition and biochemical assays, except Figure S11, were performed with SFK constructs that possess an SH3, SH2 and CD (SFK^{3D} constructs). To limit sample search space and allow more facile protein expression and purification, we first determined whether the regulatory domains of Src or Lyn influence their sensitivities to pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors. We found that Src

and Lyn constructs containing only the catalytic domain (Src^{CD} and Lyn^{CD}) were similarly inhibited by a representative set of inhibitors as SFK^{3D} constructs, although **5** and **6** were less potent against Src^{CD} than Src^{3D} (Figures 2B, 6B). Therefore, we generated and tested chimeras that only contain CDs and lack SH2 and SH3 domains. First, we generated a Lyn chimera (LynS^{CD1}) that consists of a majority of Src's N-terminal lobe by swapping residues 258–315 between the two SFKs (Figure 6A, S12). Consistent with the N-terminal lobe serving as a key region of pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitor sensitivity, we found that LynS^{CD1} was almost completely insensitive to a representative set of inhibitors (Figure 6B).

Having established that Src's N-terminal lobe is sufficient to provide resistance to our pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors, we next determined whether we could sensitize Src through the introduction of residues from Lyn's N-terminal lobe. To do this, we generated two Src chimeras—SrcL^{CD1} and SrcL^{CD2}—that possess different regions of Lyn's N-terminal lobe (Figure 6C). The Src chimera SrcL^{CD1}, which contains residues 258–314 from Lyn, displayed increased sensitivity to several inhibitors—**5**, **6**, **7**, **12**, and **19** (Figure 6D). Furthermore, a Src chimera—SrcL^{CD2}—containing a smaller region of Lyn's N-terminal lobe (residues 294–314) displayed a similar level of inhibitor sensitivity as SrcL^{CD1} (Figure 6E). As both SrcL^{CD1} and SrcL^{CD2} contain most of helix α C from Lyn, we narrowed our focus on this region of the ATP-binding site.

Next, we generated a Src chimera, SrcL^{CD3}, that contains the entire helix α C of Lyn and the linker residues that connect it to the β 3 and β 4 strands of the N-terminal lobe by swapping residues 304–324 between these two SFKs (Figure 7A, S12). Remarkably, introducing this ~20 residue region of Lyn into Src provided high sensitivity to all of the inhibitors in our representative panel (Figure 7B). There are nine residues that differ between Src and Lyn in the region that spans residues 304–324. Four of these differing residues—305, 309, 312, and 313—are in the structured region of helix α C and five are in the residues that connect helix α C to the N-terminal lobe. To probe whether residues within helix α C or the linkers that connect this structured region to the N-terminal lobe are responsible for inhibitor sensitivity, we generated the Src chimera SrcL^{CD4} (Figure 7C). SrcL^{CD4} contains the entire C- and N-lobes of Src, including the helical region of helix α C, except for the five sequence differences in the residues that connect helix α C to the N-terminal lobe from Lyn. Consistent with the conformational preference of Lyn's helix α C being responsible for its high sensitivity to Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors, SrcL^{CD4} is almost equally sensitive to our representative panel of Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors as SrcL^{CD3} (Figure 7D). Thus, the conformational flexibility of Lyn's helix α C, which is controlled by N-lobe connecting residues, appears to be responsible for its sensitivity to Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors rather than the presence or absence of specific interactions. For inhibitors like **9** and **10**, which are several-fold more potent against SrcL^{CD3} than SrcL^{CD4}, Lyn's sensitivity may stem from both the conformational preference of helix α C and specific contacts with helix α C itself. Together, our data show that high selectivity amongst the SFKs can be achieved by targeting the conformational preference of helix α C.

CONCLUSIONS

Diverse strategies are needed for identifying inhibitors that are capable of discriminating between the ATP-binding sites of kinases that possess high sequence homology, like the SFKs. Here, we show that, unsurprisingly, the ATP-binding sites of SFKs are equally susceptible to different modes of ATP-competitive inhibition. However, by modifying a non-selective scaffold with substituents that project towards the conformationally-flexible helix α C, we were able to generate ATP-competitive inhibitors that are highly selective for group B SFKs Hck and/or Lyn over Group A members Src and Fyn. Biochemical analyses of how these inhibitors allosterically modulate SFK regulatory domain engagement confirm that they displace helix α C from an active conformation. Our Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors, in general, possess substituents that would be expected to require large movements of helix α C to be accommodated in SFK ATP-binding sites. Whether the helix α Cs of Hck and Lyn are capable of larger movements or pay a smaller energetic penalty for adopting an inactive conformation than Src and Fyn remains to be determined. The ability to identify inhibitors that discriminate between SFKs is somewhat reminiscent of the mechanism proposed for how the ATP-competitive inhibitor FRAX597 is able to selectively inhibit Group II p21-Activated Kinases (PAKs) over Group I PAKs.³⁹ While FRAX597 does not displace helix α C from an active position in PAKs, the apparent increased conformational flexibility of a residue on Group II PAKs' helix α C allows more favorable accommodation of FRAX597 despite Group I PAKs containing identical contact residues in this region. Therefore, it is also a possibility that the helix α C of Lyn and Hck are no more mobile than that of Src and Fyn but that residues in this region can adopt unique rotamer configurations when these SFKs are in the helix α C-out conformation. Regardless of the exact mechanism of discrimination, our sequence swap experiments strongly implicate the flexible linker residues connected to helix α C as being responsible for inhibitor sensitivity.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health (R01GM086858 (D.J.M.) and R01DK116064 (D.J.M.)), Ono Pharmaceutical Co, and a National Science Foundation GRFP (E.M.D.).

ABBREVIATIONS

SFKs	Src family kinases
CD	catalytic domain (SH1 domain of kinase)
3D	three domain SFK containing CD (SH1), SH2 and SH3 domains
EDTA	ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid
HEPES	N-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazine-N'-2-ethanesulfonic acid
DTT	dithiothreitol
BSA	bovine serum albumin
EGTA	ethylene glycol bis(2-aminoethyl ether)-N,N,N',N'-tetraacetic acid
PMSF	Phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride
IPTG	Isopropyl β -D-1-thiogalactopyranoside
Cy5	cyanine 5
TMR	6-carboxytetramethylrhodamine
Ni-NTA	Ni ²⁺ -nitrilotriacetate
BME	β -mercaptoethanol
Tris	tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane
DMSO	dimethyl sulfoxide
NMR	nuclear magnetic resonance
MS	mass spectrometry

REFERENCES

- [1]. Manning G, Whyte DB, Martinez R, Hunter T, and Sudarsanam S (2002) The protein kinase complement of the human genome, *Science* 298, 1912–1934. [PubMed: 12471243]
- [2]. Lahiry P, Torkamani A, Schork NJ, and Hegele RA (2010) Kinase mutations in human disease: interpreting genotype-phenotype relationships, *Nat Rev Genet* 11, 60–74. [PubMed: 20019687]
- [3]. Ferguson FM, and Gray NS (2018) Kinase inhibitors: the road ahead, *Nat Rev Drug Discov* 17, 353–377. [PubMed: 29545548]
- [4]. Brandvold KR, Steffey ME, Fox CC, and Soellner MB (2012) Development of a highly selective c-Src kinase inhibitor, *ACS Chem Biol* 7, 1393–1398. [PubMed: 22594480]
- [5]. Telliez JB, Dowty ME, Wang L, Jussif J, Lin T, Li L, Moy E, Balbo P, Li W, Zhao Y, Crouse K, Dickinson C, Symanowicz P, Hegen M, Banker ME, Vincent F, Unwalla R, Liang S, Gilbert AM, Brown MF, Hayward M, Montgomery J, Yang X, Bauman J, Trujillo JI, Casimiro-Garcia A, Vajdos FF, Leung L, Geoghegan KF, Quazi A, Xuan D, Jones L, Hett E, Wright K, Clark JD, and Thorarensen A (2016) Discovery of a JAK3-Selective Inhibitor: Functional Differentiation of JAK3-Selective Inhibition over pan-JAK or JAK1-Selective Inhibition, *ACS Chem Biol* 11, 3442–3451. [PubMed: 27791347]

- [6]. Xia W, Mullin RJ, Keith BR, Liu LH, Ma H, Rusnak DW, Owens G, Alligood KJ, and Spector NL (2002) Anti-tumor activity of GW572016: a dual tyrosine kinase inhibitor blocks EGF activation of EGFR/erbB2 and downstream Erk1/2 and AKT pathways, *Oncogene* 21, 6255–6263. [PubMed: 12214266]
- [7]. Roskoski R Jr. (2016) Classification of small molecule protein kinase inhibitors based upon the structures of their drug-enzyme complexes, *Pharmacol Res* 103, 26–48. [PubMed: 26529477]
- [8]. Zhao Z, Wu H, Wang L, Liu Y, Knapp S, Liu Q, and Gray NS (2014) Exploration of type II binding mode: A privileged approach for kinase inhibitor focused drug discovery?, *ACS Chem Biol* 9, 1230–1241. [PubMed: 24730530]
- [9]. Liu Y, and Gray NS (2006) Rational design of inhibitors that bind to inactive kinase conformations, *Nat Chem Biol* 2, 358–364. [PubMed: 16783341]
- [10]. Georgiou G, Kleiner RE, Pulkoski-Gross M, Liu DR, and Seeliger MA (2012) Highly specific, bisubstrate-competitive Src inhibitors from DNA-templated macrocycles, *Nat Chem Biol* 8, 366–374. [PubMed: 22344177]
- [11]. Kwarcinski FE, Brandvold KR, Phadke S, Beleh OM, Johnson TK, Meagher JL, Seeliger MA, Stuckey JA, and Soellner MB (2016) Conformation-Selective Analogues of Dasatinib Reveal Insight into Kinase Inhibitor Binding and Selectivity, *ACS Chem Biol* 11, 1296–1304. [PubMed: 26895387]
- [12]. Palmieri L, and Rastelli G (2013) alphaC helix displacement as a general approach for allosteric modulation of protein kinases, *Drug Discov Today* 18, 407–414. [PubMed: 23195331]
- [13]. Ingley E (2008) Src family kinases: regulation of their activities, levels and identification of new pathways, *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1784, 56–65. [PubMed: 17905674]
- [14]. Williams JC, Wierenga RK, and Saraste M (1998) Insights into Src kinase functions: structural comparisons, *Trends Biochem Sci* 23, 179–184. [PubMed: 9612082]
- [15]. Fraser C, Dawson JC, Dowling R, Houston DR, Weiss JT, Munro AF, Muir M, Harrington L, Webster SP, Frame MC, Brunton VG, Patton EE, Carragher NO, and Unciti-Broceta A (2016) Rapid Discovery and Structure-Activity Relationships of Pyrazolopyrimidines That Potently Suppress Breast Cancer Cell Growth via SRC Kinase Inhibition with Exceptional Selectivity over ABL Kinase, *J Med Chem* 59, 4697–4710. [PubMed: 27115835]
- [16]. Brandvold KR, Santos SM, Breen ME, Lachacz EJ, Steffey ME, and Soellner MB (2015) Exquisitely specific bisubstrate inhibitors of c-Src kinase, *ACS Chem Biol* 10, 1387–1391. [PubMed: 25793938]
- [17]. Aleem S, Georgiou G, Kleiner RE, Guja K, Craddock BP, Lyczek A, Chan AI, Garcia-Diaz M, Miller WT, Liu DR, and Seeliger MA (2016) Structural and Biochemical Basis for Intracellular Kinase Inhibition by Src-specific Peptidic Macrocycles, *Cell Chem Biol* 23, 1103–1112. [PubMed: 27593110]
- [18]. Wallace AC, Laskowski RA, and Thornton JM (1995) LIGPLOT: a program to generate schematic diagrams of protein-ligand interactions, *Protein Eng* 8, 127–134. [PubMed: 7630882]
- [19]. Leonard SE, Register AC, Krishnamurthy R, Brighty GJ, and Maly DJ (2014) Divergent modulation of Src-family kinase regulatory interactions with ATP-competitive inhibitors, *ACS Chem Biol* 9, 1894–1905. [PubMed: 24946274]
- [20]. Register AC, Leonard SE, and Maly DJ (2014) SH2-catalytic domain linker heterogeneity influences allosteric coupling across the SFK family, *Biochemistry* 53, 6910–6923. [PubMed: 25302671]
- [21]. Stachlewitz RF, Hart MA, Bettencourt B, Kebede T, Schwartz A, Ratnofsky SE, Calderwood DJ, Waegell WO, and Hirst GC (2005) A-770041, a novel and selective small-molecule inhibitor of Lck, prevents heart allograft rejection, *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 315, 36–41. [PubMed: 16014572]
- [22]. Wang Q, Cahill SM, Blumenstein M, and Lawrence DS (2006) Self-reporting fluorescent substrates of protein tyrosine kinases, *J Am Chem Soc* 128, 1808–1809. [PubMed: 16464077]
- [23]. Register AC, Chakraborty S, and Maly DJ (2017) Allosteric Modulation of Src Family Kinases with ATP-Competitive Inhibitors, *Methods Mol Biol* 1636, 79–89. [PubMed: 28730474]
- [24]. Bantscheff M, Eberhard D, Abraham Y, Bastuck S, Boesche M, Hobson S, Mathieson T, Perrin J, Raida M, Rau C, Reader V, Sweetman G, Bauer A, Bouwmeester T, Hopf C, Kruse U, Neubauer G, Ramsden N, Rick J, Kuster B, and Drewes G (2007) Quantitative chemical proteomics reveals

mechanisms of action of clinical ABL kinase inhibitors, *Nat Biotechnol* 25, 1035–1044. [PubMed: 17721511]

- [25]. Golkowski M, Brigham JL, Perera GK, Romano GE, Maly DJ, and Ong SE (2014) Rapid profiling of protein kinase inhibitors by quantitative proteomics, *Medchemcomm* 5, 363–369. [PubMed: 24648882]
- [26]. Golkowski M, Perera GK, Vidadala VN, Ojo KK, Van Voorhis WC, Maly DJ, and Ong SE (2018) Kinome chemoproteomics characterization of pyrrolo[3,4-c]pyrazoles as potent and selective inhibitors of glycogen synthase kinase 3, *Mol Omics* 14, 26–36. [PubMed: 29725679]
- [27]. Golkowski M, Vidadala RS, Lombard CK, Suh HW, Maly DJ, and Ong SE (2017) Kinobead and Single-Shot LC-MS Profiling Identifies Selective PKD Inhibitors, *J Proteome Res* 16, 1216–1227. [PubMed: 28102076]
- [28]. Eid S, Turk S, Volkamer A, Rippmann F, and Fulle S (2017) KinMap: a web-based tool for interactive navigation through human kinome data, *BMC Bioinformatics* 18, 16. [PubMed: 28056780]
- [29]. Hari SB, Perera BG, Ranjitkar P, Seeliger MA, and Maly DJ (2013) Conformation- selective inhibitors reveal differences in the activation and phosphate-binding loops of the tyrosine kinases Abl and Src, *ACS Chem Biol* 8, 2734–2743. [PubMed: 24106839]
- [30]. Wodicka LM, Ciceri P, Davis MI, Hunt JP, Floyd M, Salerno S, Hua XH, Ford JM, Armstrong RC, Zarrinkar PP, and Treiber DK (2010) Activation state-dependent binding of small molecule kinase inhibitors: structural insights from biochemistry, *Chem Biol* 17, 1241–1249. [PubMed: 21095574]
- [31]. Lombard CK, Davis AL, Inukai T, and Maly DJ (2018) Allosteric Modulation of JNK Docking Site Interactions with ATP-Competitive Inhibitors, *Biochemistry* 57, 5897–5909. [PubMed: 30211540]
- [32]. Krishnamurty R, Brigham JL, Leonard SE, Ranjitkar P, Larson ET, Dale EJ, Merritt EA, and Maly DJ (2013) Active site profiling reveals coupling between domains in SRC-family kinases, *Nat Chem Biol* 9, 43–50. [PubMed: 23143416]
- [33]. Young MA, Gonfloni S, Superti-Furga G, Roux B, and Kuriyan J (2001) Dynamic coupling between the SH2 and SH3 domains of c-Src and Hck underlies their inactivation by C-terminal tyrosine phosphorylation, *Cell* 105, 115–126. [PubMed: 11301007]
- [34]. Theile CS, Witte MD, Blom AE, Kundrat L, Ploegh HL, and Guimaraes CP (2013) Site-specific N-terminal labeling of proteins using sortase-mediated reactions, *Nat Protoc* 8, 1800–1807. [PubMed: 23989674]
- [35]. Ayrapetov MK, Wang YH, Lin X, Gu X, Parang K, and Sun G (2006) Conformational basis for SH2-Tyr(P) 527 binding in Src inactivation, *J Biol Chem* 281, 23776–23784. [PubMed: 16790421]
- [36]. Okada M, Nada S, Yamanashi Y, Yamamoto T, and Nakagawa H (1991) CSK: a protein-tyrosine kinase involved in regulation of src family kinases, *J Biol Chem* 266, 24249–24252. [PubMed: 1722201]
- [37]. Levinson NM, Seeliger MA, Cole PA, and Kuriyan J (2008) Structural basis for the recognition of c-Src by its inactivator Csk, *Cell* 134, 124–134. [PubMed: 18614016]
- [38]. Okada M (2012) Regulation of the SRC family kinases by Csk, *Int J Biol Sci* 8, 1385–1397. [PubMed: 23139636]
- [39]. Staben ST, Feng JA, Lyle K, Belvin M, Boggs J, Burch JD, Chua CC, Cui H, DiPasquale AG, Friedman LS, Heise C, Koeppen H, Kotey A, Mintzer R, Oh A, Roberts DA, Rouge L, Rudolph J, Tam C, Wang W, Xiao Y, Young A, Zhang Y, and Hoeflich KP (2014) Back pocket flexibility provides group II p21-activated kinase (PAK) selectivity for type I 1/2 kinase inhibitors, *J Med Chem* 57, 1033–1045. [PubMed: 24432870]

Figure 1: The ATP-binding sites of SFKs are structurally and functionally similar.

A. Co-crystal structure of Src bound to dasatinib (PDB ID, 3G5D; top). Residues that form hydrophobic or polar contacts—within 4 Å—with dasatinib (identified using Ligplot⁺)¹⁸ are shown in dark red. Sequence

A.

B.

 K_i (nM) Table

Compound	R_1	Hck ^{3D}	Lyn ^{3D}	Src ^{3D}	Fyn ^{3D}	Compound	R_1	Hck ^{3D}	Lyn ^{3D}	Src ^{3D}	Fyn ^{3D}
4		< 3.0	< 3.0	6.5 ± 1.5	16 ± 1	13		330 ± 20	40 ± 10	> 2000	> 2000
5		4.7 ± 0.5	< 3.0	180 ± 20	> 2000	14		> 2000	29 ± 8	> 2000	> 2000
6		3.9 ± 1.5	< 3.0	130 ± 20	> 2000	15		26 ± 3	3.3 ± 0.4	> 2000	> 2000
7		14 ± 2	6.5 ± 1.5	> 2000	> 2000	16		> 2000	61 ± 1	> 2000	> 2000
8		5.4 ± 0.8	< 3.0	110 ± 10	> 2000	17		< 3.0	< 3.0	> 2000	> 2000
9		210 ± 10	58 ± 1	> 2000	> 2000	18		310 ± 20	250 ± 20	> 2000	> 2000
10		> 2000	45 ± 12	> 2000	> 2000	19		3.5 ± 0.6	5.2 ± 0.4	> 2000	> 2000
11		> 2000	8.7 ± 1.1	> 2000	> 2000	20		7.2 ± 0.1	4.9 ± 0.7	> 2000	> 2000
12		280 ± 10	5.6 ± 1.5	> 2000	> 2000	21		12 ± 1	80 ± 10	50 ± 10	260 ± 20
						22		13 ± 2	25 ± 5	> 2000	> 2000

Figure 2: Pyrrolo[2,3-d]pyrimidine-based SFK inhibitors.

A. Structure and proposed ATP-binding mode of the pyrrolopyrimidine-based inhibitors generated and tested. **B.** K_i values of inhibitors **4-22** against Src^{3D}, Fyn^{3D}, Hck^{3D}, and Lyn^{3D} (mean ± sem, n=3).

Figure 3. Chemoproteomic profiling of representative inhibitors.

A. Schematic of the kinobead-based profiling method used for profiling inhibitors **7**, **9**, **12** and **19**.²⁷ SILAC-labeled HEK293/HCT116 lysates were incubated with DMSO or 30 μ M of the inhibitor being profiled and an immobilized matrix of non-selective kinase inhibitors (kinobeads). Captured proteins were subjected to on-bead digestion, identified and quantified by LC/MS analysis. **B.** Phylogenetic trees showing the kinases that were profiled in the chemoproteomic profiling experiments.²⁸ All profiled kinases are represented by grey circles and labeled by name. The size of the circle corresponds to relative percent competition (larger circle, more competed). Each profiling experiment was performed in duplicate. **C.** Transverse water-fall plots of the profiling data shown in **B**.

Figure 4: SFK activation loop phosphorylation minimally influences inhibitor potency.

A. Chemical structure of Cy5-labeled probe SCP-2. **B.** Schematic of the TR-FRET-based competitive binding assay. An Europium-labeled, anti-His₆ antibody acts as a FRET donor for the Cy5-labeled, ATP- competitive ligand SCP-2. Displacement of SCP-2 with an inhibitor leads to a loss in TR-FRET. **C.** Ratio of K_I values determined for phosphorylated and non-phosphorylated Lyn^{3D} (n=3). **D.** Ratio of K_I values determined for phosphorylated and non-phosphorylated Hck^{3D} (n=3). K_I values for phosphorylated Lyn^{3D} and Hck^{3D} were determined with an activity assay. K_I values for non- phosphorylated Lyn^{3D} and Hck^{3D} were determined with the competitive binding assay shown in **B**. If one or more of the K_I values measured approached the enzyme concentration used in an assay, ratios are denoted with a *. K_I values from the TR-FRET-based competitive binding assay are shown in Figure S9B.

Figure 5. Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors behave like helix α C-out-stabilizing ligands.

A. Schematic of the SH3 domain ligand pulldown assay using TMR-Lyn^{3D} and TMR-Hck^{3D}. SFK^{3D}-inhibitor complexes are incubated with an immobilized SH3 domain ligand and the amount of retained kinase is determined after incubation and resin washing. Retained SFKs are quantified after elution using fluorescence imaging. **B.** Percent retained Lyn^{3D} (top) and Hck^{3D} (bottom) inhibitor complexes in the SH3 pulldown assay. Values shown are mean $\pm$ sem (n=3). **C.** Schematic of the SH2 domain accessibility assay using Csk. SFK^{3D}-inhibitor complexes are incubated with a drug-resistant mutant of Csk (T338I) and γ^{32} P-ATP. Radioactive phosphate transfer to the C-terminal tail of SFKs is quantified. Closed, SH2-engaged Src cannot be phosphorylated by Csk whereas open, SH2-disengaged Src is efficiently phosphorylated by Csk. **D.** Quantification of Lyn's (top) and Hck's (bottom) C-terminal phosphorylation by Csk T338I. Values shown are mean $\pm$ sem (n=3).

Figure 6. Inhibitor sensitivity of Lyn-Src chimeras.

A. Crystal structure of the SH1 domain (Src^{CD}) from PDB ID, 2SRC (Note: only the SH1 domain (CD) from 2SRC, which contains the SH3, SH2, and SH1 domains, is shown for all crystal structures in Figures 6 and 7 because all K_I values shown were determined against constructs that lack SH2 and SH3 domains). The regions of Lyn (yellow) that were swapped with regions from Src (blue) in chimera LynS^{CD1} are shown. **B.** K_I values of a representative panel of Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors for Lyn^{CD}, Src^{CD}, and LynS^{CD1} (values shown are mean ± sem (n=3)). **C.** Crystal structures of Src^{CD} showing the regions of Src (blue) that were swapped with regions from Lyn (yellow) in chimeras SrcL^{CD1} (left) and SrcL^{CD2} (right). **D.** K_I values of a representative panel of Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors for SrcL^{CD1} and SrcL^{CD2} (values shown are mean ± sem (n=3)).

Figure 7. Inhibitor-sensitive Src chimeras containing Lyn's helix α C.

A, B. Crystal structures of the SH1 domain of Src (Src^{CD}) (PDB ID, 2SRC) showing the regions of Src (blue) that were swapped with regions from Lyn (yellow) in chimeras SrcL^{CD3} and SrcL^{CD4}. Insets show an enlarged version of the area circled in the left panel. A sequence alignment of Lyn and Src showing the residues that have been swapped (boxed) in Src is shown below each inset. Residues that differ between Lyn and Src are colored orange. **C.** K_i values of a representative panel of Lyn/Hck-selective inhibitors for LynS^{CD3} and LynS^{CD4} (values shown are mean ± sem (n=3)).