# Common Mechanistic Features among Metallo- $\beta$ -Lactamases: a Computational Study of *Aeromonas hydrophila* CphA Enzyme

## Fabio Simona \*, Alessandra Magistrato ‡, †, Matteo Dal Peraro §, Andrea Cavalli # £, Alejandro J. Vila ¶, Paolo Carloni †.

\* Laboratory of Computational Chemistry and Biochemistry, Departement für Chemie und Biochemie, Universität Bern, Freiestrasse 3, CH-3012, Bern, Switzerland.

† SISSA, Via Beirut 2-4 – 34014 Grignano - Trieste - Italy.

‡ CNR-INFM-Democritos National Simulation Center, via Beirut 4 34014 Grignano, Trieste, Italy.

§ Laboratory for Biomolecular Modeling, Institute of Bioengineering, School of Life Sciences, Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, EPFL, CH-1015, Lausanne, Switzerland.

# Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Bologna, Via Belmeloro 6, I-40126, Bologna, Italy.

£ Department of Drug Discovery and Development, Italian Institute of Technology, Via Morego 30, I-16163, Genova, Italy.

¶ Instituto de Biologia Molecular y Celular de Rosario (IBR), Facultad de Bioquímicas y Farmaceuticas, Universidad Nacional de Rosario, Suipacha 531, (S2002LRK) Rosario, Argentina.

Running head: Common role of zinc in metallo  $\beta$ -lactamases.

Address correspondance: Paolo Carloni SISSA, Via Beirut 2-4 – 34014 Grignano - Trieste - Italy. Phone:0039-040-3787-407. Fax: 0039-040-3787-528. E-mail: carloni@sissa.it.

#### Supporting information: MD Simulations of the intermediate of ES1-based reaction.

#### **SI: METHODS**

Two classical MD simulations were carried out, **IntA** and **IntB**. In both models, the force field parameters of the protein (except for the protein active site, Fig. 2), water, counterions were treated with the AMBER PARM99, as in ref. [1]. Active site and **Int** charges, in both models, were calculated with the RESP method [2, 3]. In both simulations, **Int** parameters were constructed using the gaff force field [4].

The simulations differed for the parametrization of ligand-Zn bonds in the active site. In **IntA**, a nonbonded approach was used, in which **Int** were not explicitly bound to the metal by any atom.

In **IntB**, the atom donors N(1)@Int and O(2)@Int, formed a covalent bond with the Zn(II) ion, following the parametrization of Merz and coworkers [5, 6, 7]

5 ns MD calculations were carried out in the NPT ensemble using the NAMD program [8, 9], an integration time step of 1.5 fs was used, with the SHAKE algorithm [10] to constrain bonds involving hydrogen atoms. Electrostatic interactions were computed using the Particle Mesh Ewald (PME) [11]. A cutoff of 12 Å was used for van der Waals and for short range component of electrostatic interactions. The systems were initially relaxed with 5,000 steps of optimization of the solvent, while the protein was held fix, followed by 5,000 steps of optimization of the whole system. The systems were slowly heated to 300 K performing runs at constant volume and constant temperature using Langevin thermostat [8, 9]. Constant temperature and pressure (1 atm, 300 K) MD runs were finally performed [12]. The pressure coupling was accomplished with Langevin piston [13], and the temperature with the Nosé-Hoover method [14, 15].

All the structural analysis of the trajectories have been performed with the VMD visualization software [16].

The RMSD was calculated over the backbone atoms (hydrogen atoms not included) [17]. Hydrogen bonds were assumed to be present if donor and acceptor were located within 3.4 Å and the angle between donor, hydrogen and acceptor was comprised between 150 and 210 degrees.

#### SI: RESULTS

During the 5 ns of dynamics, the overall folds of **IntA** and **IntB** were fully maintained (RMSD =  $0.9 \pm 0.1$  Å), pointing to a good stability of the MD structures, as observed in all our MD simulations of this system [18] and B1 enzymes [5, 6, 7, 19, 20, 21, 22]

The substrate formed the following non-bonded

### References

- [1] Case, D. A., Pearlman, D. A., Caldwell, J. W., S., T. C. I., Wang, J., Ross, Simmerling, C., Darden, T., Merz, K., Stanton, R. V., Cheng, A., Vincent, J. J., Crowley, M., Tsui, V., Gohlke, H., Radmer, R. J., Duan, Y., Pittera, J., Massova, I., Seibel, G. L., Singh, U. C., Weiner, P., and Kollman, P. A. (2002). University of California, San Francisco.
- [2] Bayly, C. I., Cieplak, P., Cornell, W., and Kollman, P. A. (1993). J. Phys. Chem., 97(40), 10269–10280.
- [3] Cornell, W. D., Cieplak, P., Bayly, C. I., and Kollmann, P. A. (1993). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 115(21), 9620–9631.
- [4] Wang, J., Wolf, R. M., Caldwell, J. W., Kollman, P. A., and Case, D. A. (2004). J. Comput. Chem., 25(9), 1157–1174.
- [5] Suárez, D. and Merz, K. M. (2001). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 123(16), 3759-3770.
- [6] Díaz, N., Suárez, D., and Merz, K. M. (2001). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 123(40), 9867–9879.
- [7] Suárez, D., Díaz, N., and Merz, K. M. (2002). J. Comput. Chem., 23(16), 1587–1600.
- [8] Nelson, M. T., Humphrey, W., Gursoy, A., Dalke, A., Kale, L. V., Skeel, R. D., and Schulten, K. (1996). Int. J. High Perform C., 10, 251–268.
- [9] Phillips, J. C., Braun, R., Wang, W., Gumbart, J., Tajkhorshid, E., Villa, E., Chipot, C., Skeel, R. D., Kale, L., and Schulten, K. (2005). *J. Comput. Chem.*, 26, 1781–1802.
- [10] Ryckaert, J. P., Ciccotti, G., and Berendsen, H. J. C. (1977). J. Comput. Phys., 23, 327–341.
- [11] Darden, T., York, D., and Pedersen, L. (1993). J. Chem. Phys., 98, 10089–10092.
- [12] Martyna, G. J., Tobias, D. J., and Klein, M. L. (1994). J. Chem. Phys., 101, 4177–4189.
- [13] Feller, S. E., Zhang, Y. H., Pastor, R. W., and Brooks, B. R. (1995). J. Chem. Phys., 103, 4613–4621.
- [14] Nosé, S. (1984). Mol. Phys., 52, 255–268.
- [15] Hoover, W. G. (1985). Phys. Rev. A, 31, 1695–1697.
- [16] Humphrey, W., Dalke, A., and Schulten, K. (**1996**). J. Mol. Graphics, 14, 33.

interactions: Lys224-O(2)@Bia, Asn223@NH-O(2)@Bia along with two weak H-bonds between His118@N $\epsilon$ H-O(2)@Bia and between Asn223@NH<sub>2</sub>-O(1)@Bia (Tab. 4).

The **Bia**@N(1)-Zn distance and **Bia**@O(2)-ZN one (Tab. 4) turned out to increase in **IntA**, whilst kept the same values as the initial ones in **IntB** (Tab. 4). These different results are to be ascribed to the different parametrizations at the active site.

- [17] Leach, A. R. (2001). Pearson Education.
- [18] Simona, F., Magistrato, A., Vera, D. M., Garau, G., Vila, A. J., and Carloni, P. (2007). Proteins, 69(3), 595–605.
- [19] Dal Peraro, M., Llarrull, L. I., Rothlisberger, U., Vila, A. J., and Carloni, P. (2004). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 126(39), 12661–12668.
- [20] Dal Peraro, M., Vila, A. J., Carloni, P., and Klein, M. L. (2007). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 129(10), 2808– 2816.
- [21] Park, H., Brothers, E. N., and Merz, K. M. (2005). J. Am. Chem. Soc., 127(12), 4232–4241.
- [22] Oelschlaeger, P., Schmid, R. D., and Pleiss, J. (2003). Prot. Eng., 16(5), 341–350.
- [23] Garau, G., Bebrone, C., Anne, C., Galleni, M., Frère, J. M., and Dideberg, O. (2005). J. Mol. Biol., 345(4), 785–795.
- [24] Ma, L., Tibbitts, T. T., and Kantrowitz, E. R. (1995). Prot. Sci., 4(8), 1498–1506.
- [25] Wilke, M. S., Lovering, A. L., and Strynadka, N. C. (2005). Curr. Opin. Microbiol., 8(5), 525–533.
- [26] Zhanel, G. G., Wiebe, R., Dilay, L., Thomson, K., Rubinstein, E., Hoban, D. J., Noreddin, A. M., and Karlowsky, J. A. (2007). *Drugs*, 67(7), 1027–1052.
- [27] Nicolau, D. P. (2008). Expert Opin. Pharmacother., 9(1), 23–37.
- [28] Livermore, D. M. and Woodford, N. (2000). Curr. Opin. Microbiol., 3(5), 489–495.
- [29] Walsh, T. R., Toleman, M. A., Poirel, L., and Nordmann, P. (2005). Clin. Microbiol. Rev., 18(2), 306–325.
- [30] Crowder, M. W., Spencer, J., and Vila, A. J. (2006). Acc. Chem. Res., 39(10), 721–728.



RC	Asp120@O-Zn	His263@Ne-Zn	Bia@O(2)-Zn	Cys221@S-Zn	Lys224@NH3-O(3)@Bia	Bia@C(7)-N(1)@Bia		Wat1@O-Zn	sn233@NH-O(3)@Bia Asn233@!		O(1)@Bia	Thr157@OH-O(4)@Bia	
Initial	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.6	1.9		1.4	2.1	2.1 1.9		1.9	
Free	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.8 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$1.3 \pm 0.1$		$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	2.0 ± 0	).1	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	
3.1	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.8 \pm 0.3$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$1.3 \pm 0.1$		$2.12 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	1.9 ± 0	).1	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	
2.9	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.8 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$1.3 \pm 0.1$		$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	1.9 ± 0.1 1.9 ±		$1.9 \pm 0.2$	
2.7	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.9 \pm 0.3$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.2$	$1.4 \pm 0.1$		$2.14 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	1.9 ± 0.1 2.0 ±		$2.0 \pm 0.1$	
2.5	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.7 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.2$	$1.4 \pm 0.1$		$2.16 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	0.1 1.9 ± 0		$1.9 \pm 0.1$	
2.3	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.5 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	$1.4 \pm 0.1$		$2.19 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0$	).1	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	
2.1	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.2 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.8 \pm 0.2$	$1.4 \pm 0.1$		$2.2 \pm 0.1$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	1.9 ± 0	).1	$1.9 \pm 0.2$	
1.9	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	$3.2 \pm 0.2$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.8 \pm 0.1$	$1.5 \pm 0.1$		$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	2.0 ± 0	).1	$1.9 \pm 0.1$	
1.8	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.1$	3.2 ± 0.5	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	$1.8 \pm 0.1$	$1.5 \pm 0.2$		$3.0 \pm 0.2$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$		$2.0 \pm 0.1$	
1./	$2.4 \pm 0.4$	$2.1 \pm 0.2$	$2.4 \pm 0.3$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$	1.8 ± 0.1	$1.6 \pm 0.2$		$2.8 \pm 0.2$	1.9 ± 0.1	1.9 ± 0.1		1.9 ± 0.1	
RC 1.6	$20 \pm 0.1$ $118203@N_{epsilon}-ZII$		$22 \pm 01$ $23 \pm 01$		31+02 2		$0 \pm 0.1$	22+02 20+01		10+01		$20 \pm 0.1$	
1.0	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ $2.0 \pm 0.1$	$2.2 \pm 0.2$ $2.2 \pm 0.2$	$2.2 \pm 0.1$ $2.2 \pm 0.1$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$ $2.2 \pm 0.1$	$3.1 \pm 0.2$ $3.4 \pm 0.2$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ 1.9 ± 0.2		$2.2 \pm 0.2$ $2.5 \pm 0.2$	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ 1.0 ± 0.1	$1.7 \pm 0.1$ $1.9 \pm 0.1$		$2.0 \pm 0.1$ 1.0 ± 0.1	
1.5	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ $2.0 \pm 0.1$	$2.2 \pm 0.2$ $2.2 \pm 0.2$	$2.2 \pm 0.1$ $2.2 \pm 0.1$	$2.3 \pm 0.1$ $2.3 \pm 0.1$	$3.4 \pm 0.2$ $3.7 \pm 0.2$	$1.9 \pm 0.2$ $1.9 \pm 0.1$		$2.5 \pm 0.2$ 2.6 ± 0.2	$1.9 \pm 0.1$ 2.1 ± 0.3	$1.7 \pm 0.1$ $1.9 \pm 0.1$		$1.9 \pm 0.1$ 2.0 ± 0.1	
Free	$2.0 \pm 0.1$ 2.0 ± 0.1	$2.2 \pm 0.2$ $2.2 \pm 0.1$	$2.2 \pm 0.1$ 2 2 + 0 1	$2.3 \pm 0.1$ 2 3 ± 0.1	$3.7 \pm 0.2$ $3.8 \pm 0.2$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$ $1.9 \pm 0.1$		$2.0 \pm 0.2$ $2.6 \pm 0.1$	$2.1 \pm 0.3$ $2.1 \pm 0.3$	$1.9 \pm 0.1$ $1.9 \pm 0.1$		$2.0 \pm 0.1$ $2.0 \pm 0.1$	
RC	Asp120@O-Zn-NeHis263		Cys221@S-Zn-Ne@His263		Asp120@O-Zn-O@Wat1		Asp120@O-Zn-S@Cys221		221 His263@Nε-Z	s263@Ne-Zn-O@Wat1 C		@S-Zn-O@Wat1	
Initial	95		112		94			108	125	125		130	
Free	$93 \pm 4$		110 ± 5		92±5		1	$10 \pm 6$	123 ±	$123 \pm 9$		$125 \pm 8$	
3.1	$92 \pm 4$		$109 \pm 6$		$92 \pm 6$		$110 \pm 7$		123 -	123 ± 9		$123 \pm 9$	
2.9	93 ± 4		$110 \pm 7$		95 ± 5		$110 \pm 6$		119 -	119 ± 7		$121 \pm 7$	
2.7	$92 \pm 4$		111 + 5		94 + 4		$109 \pm 5$		122 -	$122 \pm 8$		$118 \pm 9$	
2.5	92 + 4		$109 \pm 6$		$93 \pm 4$		$105 \pm 6$		122 -	$122 \pm 6$		$122 \pm 6$	
2.0	92 + 4		$110 \pm 5$		$93 \pm 4$		$105 \pm 6$		123 -	$123 \pm 7$		$110 \pm 5$	
2.0	92 + 3		$110 \pm 5$ $110 \pm 4$		$92 \pm 3$		$103 \pm 0$ $103 \pm 4$		128 -	128 ± 5		117 + 5	
1.0	92 + 3		$100 \pm 4$ $100 \pm 4$		90 + 3		$103 \pm 4$ $101 \pm 4$		120 -	120 ± 5		118 + 5	
1.9	00 + 8		$107 \pm 4$ $117 \pm 0$		94 ± 5		101 ± 4		125 -	$127 \pm 5$ $126 \pm 15$		105 ± 8	
1.0 DC	→ → → 0 Acm120@O Zn Nc@Hic262		$117 \pm 7$		04 ± 3		Am 120@0.7m S@Cur221		120 ±	120 ± 15		$C_{\rm V}$ 221@S $T_{\rm R}$ $O(2)$ @ <b>P</b> ia	
KC 1.7	Asp120@O-Zil-NE@HIS205		Cys221@S-ZII-INERIIS203		Asp120@O-Zn-O(2)@Bla		Asp120@O-Zh-S@Cys221		221 HIS203@E-ZII	1115203@e-ZII-O(2)@Bla		102 + 6	
1./	$\delta \psi \pm 0$		$10/\pm 0$		$104 \pm 7$		69 ± 9		90 ±	90±9		$102 \pm 0$	
KC	HIS203@NE-Zn-N(1)@Bia		Cyszz1@S-Zn-NE@His263		ва@N(1)-Zn-O(2)@Віа		Cys221@S-Zn-N(1)@Bia		BIA HIS263@NE-Z	nis203@INE-Zn-U(2)@Bla		Cys221@S-Zn-O(2)@Bia	
1.6	$103 \pm 5$		151±6		$80 \pm 2$		143 ± 9		96 ±	96±5		$106 \pm 4$	
1.5	$103 \pm 6$		$101 \pm 6$		$79 \pm 3$		$149 \pm 6$		95 ±	$95 \pm 7$		$110 \pm 5$	
1.4	$104 \pm 7$		$100 \pm 5$		$80 \pm 3$		$149 \pm 8$		96 ±	$96 \pm 6$		$109 \pm 6$	
Free	$103 \pm 6$		$101 \pm 6$		$83 \pm 2$		$150 \pm 7$		96 ±	$96 \pm 6$		$110 \pm 5$	

Table 1: QM/MM calculations based on **ES1**-based reaction (first step: the nucleophilic attack to the  $\beta$ -lactam ring). We report here selected ligand/enzyme distances, metal coordination distances (in Å), and bond angles (in degrees), during the constrained simulations along the reaction coordinates. For this step we defined RC as the distance between O@Wat1 and C(7)@Bia.



Table 2: QM/MM calculations of the **ES1**-based reaction (second step: the protonation of N(1)@Bia). Selected ligand/enzyme distances, metal coordination distances (in Å), and bond angles (in degrees) at different value of RC, defined here as distance between Asp120@OH and N(1)@Bia.



Table 3: QM/MM calculations of **ES2**-based reaction mechanism. Metal coordination distances and ligand/enzyme bond lenghts (in Å) and angles (in degrees) during QM/MM constrained simulations during hydrolysis, along different RC values, defined here as the distance between O@Wat1 and C(7)@Bia.



Figure 1: The protein provides three metal ligands in each site: the 'Zn2' site is composed by Asp120, Cys221 and His263 in the B1 and B2 subclasses, and the Asp120, His121 and His263 triad in B3 subclasses. His116, His118 and His196 form the 'Zn1' site both in B1 and B3 subclasses. In B2 subclasses the residue in position 116 is is replaced by Asn [23]. This mutation is most likely responsible for the experimentally observed low Zn(II) binding affinity of this site [24]. The Zn(II) coordination spheres are completed by solvent molecules.



Figure 2: IntA and IntB active sites with two different parametrizations of Zn environment: in the first N(1)@Bia and C(7)@Bia are not directly bound to the metal, while in the second model, they are explicitly coordinated with it.



Table 4: **IntA** and **IntB** ligand/enzyme interaction distances (in Å): initial, averaged over 5 ns of MD, and final values.



Figure 3: QM/MM calculations of **ES1**. Superimposition of initial (backbone trace colored in blue and atoms colored using different color for each atom type) and final QM/MM structures (colored in red). Whilst **Bia** keeps its salt bridge with the protein, it readily loses its interaction with the metal ion.



Figure 4: QM region in the QM/MM calculations performed to characterize the reaction mechanism of **ES1** and **ES2**: QM atoms are showed in bold licorice, while the sidechain atoms of **Bia** and the remaining methyl groups, described as MM atoms, are depicted in thin licorice. Dummy hydrogens are shown as balls.



Figure 5: Schematic representation of X-ray structure of CphA in complex with the antibiotic derivative (PDB entry 1X8I).



Figure 6: Schematic representation of the three major  $\beta$ -lactam antibiotics used in the clinical settings [25]. For **Bia**, R is a bicyclotriazolium group. Carbapenems are similar to penicillins with the exception of a carbon atom in position 4 and the presence of an unsaturated bond between C(2) and C(3) in the backbone [26, 27]. They have the broadest spectrum within the  $\beta$ -lactam class, and exhibit bactericidal activity against numerous pathogens, and finally, they are stable to almost all  $\beta$ -lactamases [26]. This is mainly due to the *trans* orientation of the hydroxyethyl substituent in position C(6), which is present in carbapenems only, whereas cephalosporins and penicillins always possess a *cis* orientation. The spreading among pathogenic bacteria of genetically encoded carbapenemases [28, 29, 30] further increases the need of developing novel more powerful inhibitors against M $\beta$ Ls.