

Computational Studies of the Structure and Function of Two Lipid-Activated  
G Protein-Coupled Receptors

Thesis by

Rachel K. Niemer

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Pasadena, California

2007

(Defended February 6, 2007)

© 2007

Rachel K. Niemer

All Rights Reserved

## Acknowledgments

This dissertation is dedicated to the memory of my mother, Joan Christine Niemer. Without the strength she and my father instilled in me, I would not have been able to finish my degree after losing her.

I am grateful for the support of all of my family (in its enormity), but my father, sister Melissa, and nephew Bobby were sources of unending patience, love, and humor. Dave, my husband-to-be and the love of my life, sat through the tears of frustration, the jokes about giving up, and many, many cross-country flights to get me through my last years of graduate school. Dr. Ronald Grimm (the younger) provided encouragement and support in countless ways, both personally and scientifically. I hope some day I am able to illustrate to all of them just how important they are to me.

I owe great thanks to Dr. William Goddard and Dr. Nagarajan Vaidehi for their scientific insight, their unique ability to know when to let me struggle on my own and when to step in, and, of course, for their patience. Drs. Harry Gray, Mitchio Okumura, Jack Beauchamp and Doug Rees were excellent committee members. Drs. Mario Blanco and John Seinfeld taught me a great deal in my early years of graduate school. I would not have gotten anywhere with this project if it weren't for the hours of work put in by the other members of the Biogroup in WAGland.

Of course, graduate school would not have been nearly as fun (or even bearable) if it weren't for my friends. I know that there are important people I am forgetting, so please forgive me. The "girls" from Monday nights, especially Drs. Julie Biteen, Cynthia Collins and Betsy Sinclair, provided hours of laughter. All of the residents in Ruddock during my tenure as RA kept me on my toes and created a legacy for me that I could never have earned

on my own. The Vagina Warriors who so bravely stood on stage with me to fight violence against women will always be an inspiration to me. I am very appreciative for Candace Rypisi and Susan Friedman, as they both kept me sane during some impossible times. James Lamanna, Scott Bruce and Ronnie Chen all deserve recognition for their role in getting me through graduate school, although it's quite hard to categorize exactly what they did to help.

There have been people from beyond the Caltech world (yes, there is one...) that I must acknowledge. Most of these individuals have been a part of my life for much longer than I was in graduate school. They deserve special recognition, not for just helping me get through my degree, but also for all they did to help me get here before I even knew I wanted to do research. Dr. Lisa Andrews and Dr-to-be Amber Godey are two examples of the friends one makes in college that never leave your side and help you through all of the major events in life. Dr. Jonathan Smith has been an inspiration on many levels: showing me how much I love quantum mechanics, leading me on my first research project and helping me get through my first experience as a professor. Although Dr. Brandy Russell became a force in my life near the end of graduate school, there is no way to overstate how important a role she has played in helping me earn my degree.

I am thankful that all of these individuals, and many more, have been a part of my life. Obviously, they have all aided in my professional development, but more importantly, they have all helped me grow into the person I am today. The most painful lesson in all of graduate school was learning that you won't always have time to tell people how much they mean to you. Unfortunately, there is no way this document can articulate my gratitude, but hopefully it is a start.

Mom, if you're reading this somehow, know that my thesis would have been dedicated to you even if we hadn't lost you.

## Abstract

Phospholipids are pleiotropic intercellular signaling molecules that have been implicated in various pathologies, including tumorigenesis. Both lysophosphatidic acid (LPA) and sphingosine-1-phosphate (S1P), among other phospholipids, use G protein coupled receptors (GPCRs) to transduce extracellular signals. Other families of GPCRs have successfully been utilized by the pharmaceutical industry, and further understanding of the phospholipid-receptor interaction can highlight potential therapeutic targets in these signaling pathways.

This thesis presents research into the interaction between specific G protein-coupled receptors, lysophosphatidic acid receptor-2 (LPA<sub>2</sub>) and sphingosine-1-phosphate receptor-1 (S1P<sub>1</sub>), and their ligands, in an attempt to further validate our method of GPCR structure prediction and to understand subtype specificity within this family of lipid receptors. Although the first principles method of GPCR structure prediction has quite successfully predicted the protein structure of small molecule receptors, lipid receptors create a unique challenge. The surface area on the inside of a small molecule receptor contains a large percentage of polar groups, easily differentiating the inner surface from the highly hydrophobic outer surface. Lipid receptors do not show as dramatic a distinction, as the inner surface is significantly hydrophobic to bind the lipid ligand.

Herein we propose and test a new method of orienting the seven transmembrane helices of a GPCR relative to one another through an analysis of the lipid solubility of each residue in conjunction with an optimization of the inter-helical hydrogen bonding associations. We predict structures for LPA<sub>2</sub> and S1P<sub>1</sub> that replicate the relative binding of different lipids

within the LPA and S1P lipid families. The interaction energies between the receptors and the tested ligands correlates well with ligand efficacy, and qualitative analysis of functional group-residue interactions further validates our model for both LPA<sub>2</sub> an S1P<sub>1</sub>.

<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>VI</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES.....</b>	<b>XII</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES.....</b>	<b>XV</b>
<b>LIST OF STRUCTURES.....</b>	<b>XVI</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. OVERVIEW.....	1-1
1.2. REFERENCES.....	1-4
<b>CHAPTER 2. BIOLOGY OF LPA AND S1P AND THEIR RECEPTORS .....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1. OVERVIEW.....	2-1
2.2. PHOSPHOLIPIDS .....	2-1
2.2.1. <i>Lysophosphatidic Acid</i> .....	2-1
2.2.2. <i>Sphingosine-1-Phosphate</i> .....	2-3
2.3. G PROTEIN-COUPLED RECEPTORS.....	2-4
2.4. LYSOPHOSPHATIDIC ACID AND SPHINGOLIPID RECEPTORS .....	2-6
2.4.1. <i>LPA<sub>1</sub>/EDG2/vz<math>\zeta</math>g-1</i> .....	2-7
2.4.2. <i>LPA<sub>2</sub>/EDG4</i> .....	2-8
2.4.3. <i>LPA<sub>3</sub>/EDG7</i> .....	2-9
2.4.4. <i>S1P<sub>1</sub>/EDG<sub>1</sub></i> .....	2-10
2.5. CONCLUSION .....	2-11
2.6. FIGURES AND TABLES .....	2-12
2.7. REFERENCES.....	2-15
<b>CHAPTER 3. DEVELOPMENT OF COMPUTATIONAL METHODS .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	3-1
3.2. FORCE FIELDS AND CHARGES.....	3-2



3.3. PREDICTION OF THE TRANSMEMBRANE BARREL .....	3-2
3.3.1. Construction and Relaxation of the Transmembrane Helices.....	3-3
3.3.2. Packing and Translation of the Helices Relative to One Another.....	3-4
3.3.3. Optimization of the Helical Rotations.....	3-4
3.4. DETERMINATION OF BINDING MODES .....	3-7
3.4.1. Isolation of Potential Binding Pockets.....	3-7
3.4.2. Docking of Ligand Conformations.....	3-8
3.4.3. Preliminary Scoring of Docked Ligands.....	3-8
3.4.4. Completion of the Protein Structure .....	3-10
3.4.5. Calculation of Binding Energies and Interaction Energies .....	3-10
3.5. BINDING OF OTHER AGONISTS .....	3-11
3.6. MOLECULAR DYNAMICS STUDIES .....	3-12
3.7. FIGURES AND TABLES .....	3-14
3.8. REFERENCES.....	3-19
<b>CHAPTER 4. DESCRIPTION AND VALIDATION OF PREDICTED STRUCTURE FOR LPA<sub>2</sub>.....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	4-1
4.2. STRUCTURE OF LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-1
4.3. PREDICTION OF PUTATIVE BINDING SITES.....	4-4
4.4. BINDING OF OTHER AGONISTS .....	4-7
4.4.1. Lipid Chain Selectivity.....	4-7
4.4.2. Selectivity About the Polar Headgroup.....	4-10
4.5. MOLECULAR DYNAMICS.....	4-15
4.5.1. Changes in Protein Structure.....	4-16
4.5.2. Changes in the Ligand and Binding Pocket.....	4-17
4.6. TABLES AND FIGURES .....	4-20
4.7. REFERENCES.....	4-52
<b>CHAPTER 5. PROTEIN STRUCTURE AND BINDING SITE PREDICTIONS FOR S1P<sub>1</sub>.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>

5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	5-1
5.2. MODIFICATIONS TO STANDARD METHOD.....	5-1
5.3. STRUCTURE OF S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-2
5.4. PREDICTION OF PUTATIVE BINDING SITES.....	5-4
5.4.1. <i>Endogenous Ligand Binding Site</i> .....	5-5
5.4.2. <i>Other Agonist Binding Sites</i> .....	5-8
5.4.3. <i>Antagonist Binding Sites</i> .....	5-9
5.5. TABLES AND FIGURES .....	5-12
5.6. REFERENCES.....	5-31

## Appendices

Appendix A.....	A-1
A.1. Sequences used in alignment to predict TM regions of LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	A-1
A.2. Alignment for predicting the TM region of LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	A-3
Appendix B.....	B-1
B.1. Sequences used in alignment to predict TM regions of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	B-1
B.2. Alignment for predicting the TM region of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	B-3

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1. A cartoon schematic of a generic GPCR.....	2-13
Figure 2.2. The alignment of the predicted transmembrane regions for the LPA receptors and S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	2-14
Figure 3.1 A sketch of the topology of the frog rhodopsin crystal structure.....	3-18
Figure 4.1 A plot of the hydrophobicity of LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-28
Figure 4.2 A comparison of the TM 1-2-7 hydrogen-bonding network in bovine rhodopsin and human LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-29
Figure 4.3 An overlay of the TM region in bovine rhodopsin and human LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-30
Figure 4.4 The transmembrane regions of bovine rhodopsin and human LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-31
Figure 4.5 The sphere sets from the PASS algorithm.....	4-33
Figure 4.6 A visual depiction of the sampling of the TM region during docking.....	4-34
Figure 4.7 A picture of the binding pocket for the phosphate head of LPA <i>cis</i> -18:1 docked into LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-35
Figure 4.8 A picture of LPA from the lowest energy complex in the TM region.....	4-36
Figure 4.9 LPA docked into LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-37
Figure 4.10 Residues in the binding pocket of LPA in LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-38
Figure 4.11 LPA <i>cis</i> -18:1 fits snugly into the 5.0 Å binding pocket in LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-39
Figure 4.12 LPA 20:0 in the binding pocket in LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-40
Figure 4.13 Different LPA species in the binding pocket.....	4-41
Figure 4.14 The correlation between cavity interaction energies and experimentally measured efficacies.....	4-42
Figure 4.15 A general picture of the NAEPA derivatives inside the protein.....	4-43

Figure 4.16 VPC31139 and its enantiomer VPC31180 .....	4-44
Figure 4.17 An overlay of the predicted structures for LPA <sub>2</sub> , before and after long time-scale molecular dynamics .....	4-45
Figure 4.18 Helices 4 and 7 undergo substantial rotation over the course of molecular dynamics. ....	4-46
Figure 4.19 The overlay of LPA <i>cis</i> -18:1, before and after molecular dynamics. ....	4-47
Figure 4.20 Ligand shifts over the course of the dynamics. ....	4-48
Figure 4.21 The fit of the polar head group into the 4.0 Å binding pocket after MD is similar to what is seen before molecular dynamics. ....	4-49
Figure 4.22 Collapse of binding pocket during dynamics .....	4-50
Figure 4.23 Comparison of the polarity of residues in the binding pocket.....	4-51
Figure 5.1 A examination of relative hydrophobicity vs. residue position of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-16
Figure 5.2 The two putative packing structures for the TM region of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-17
Figure 5.3 S1P <sub>1</sub> and bovine rhodopsin show a hydrogen bonding network between helices 1, 2, and 7.....	5-18
Figure 5.4 Two low energy packings for the transmembrane region of S1P <sub>1</sub> . ....	5-19
Figure 5.5 Rhodopsin and S1P <sub>1</sub> overlap closely in helices 1 and 2.....	5-20
Figure 5.6 The sphere sets for Structure A. ....	5-22
Figure 5.7 The sphere sets for Structure B. ....	5-24
Figure 5.8 The polar head group of S1P in S1P <sub>1</sub> . ....	5-25
Figure 5.9 Spingosine-1-phosphate fits into the TM barrel of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-26
Figure 5.10 Spingosine-1-phosphate fits in between helices 3, 6, and 7 of S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-27

Figure 5.11 FTY720-P ( <i>S</i> ) has a <i>pi-pi</i> interaction between the aromatic group on the ligand and F <sup>125</sup> on helix 3.....	5-28
Figure 5.12 VPC23019 docks closer to helices 6 and 7 than S1P does.....	5-29
Figure 5.13 VPC23019 forms strong polar-polar interactions with the protein. ....	5-30

## List of Tables

Table 2.1. The comparative identities of GPCRs that bind to LPA.....	2-12
Table 3.1 The original and optimized Eisenberg hydrophobicity value for each amino acid residue.....	3-14
Table 3.2 An average of the Wimley-White and White Biological scales are used to determine the thermodynamic benefit of each residue .....	3-15
Table 3.3 A description of the members of the LPA family docked into LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	3-16
Table 3.4 A description of the NAEPA derivatives.....	3-17
Table 4.1 The sequence of LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-20
Table 4.2 The inter-helical hydrogen bonds in the predicted structure of LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-21
Table 4.3 A cavity analysis of LPA <i>cis</i> -18:1 docked into LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-22
Table 4.4 The structures of all LPA species docked into LPA <sub>2</sub> .....	4-23
Table 4.5 The total cavity interaction energy for each species of LPA.....	4-24
Table 4.6 A comparison of important residues in the binding pocket of each ligand. ....	4-25
Table 4.7 The ligands examined as LPA <sub>2</sub> agonists and their efficacies.....	4-26
Table 4.8 The predicted cavity interaction energies .....	4-27
Table 5.1 The seven predicted helices for S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-12
Table 5.2 The inter-helical hydrogen bonds in the predicted transmembrane packings for S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-13
Table 5.3 A cavity analysis of S1P docked into S1P <sub>1</sub> .....	5-14
Table 5.4 A comparison of cavity energies. ....	5-15

## List of Structures

Structure 2.1 Lysophosphatidic Acid <i>cis</i> -18:1 .....	2-2
Structure 2.2 Sphingosine-1-phosphate .....	2-3
Structure 2.3 FTY720-P (racemic) .....	2-11
Structure 4.1 N-acyl ethanolamide phosphatidic acid, NAEPA .....	4-11
Structure 4.2 FAP-12 .....	4-11
Structure 4.3 FAP-10 .....	4-12
Structure 5.1 FTY720-P ( <i>racemic</i> ) .....	5-8
Structure 5.2 VPC23019 .....	5-10