Probing the Active Site of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Porphobilinogen Synthase Using Newly Developed Inhibitors†
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ABSTRACT: Porphobilinogen synthase catalyzes the first committed step of the tetrapyrrole biosynthesis pathway. In an aldol-like condensation, two molecules of 5-aminolevulinic acid (ALA) form the first pyrrole, porphobilinogen. Newly synthesized analogues of a reaction intermediate of porphobilinogen synthase have been employed in studying the active site and the catalytic mechanism of this early enzyme of tetrapyrrole biosynthesis. This study combines structural and kinetic evaluation of the inhibition potency of these inhibitors. In addition, one of the determined protein structures provides for the first time structural evidence of a magnesium ion in the active site. From these results, we can corroborate an earlier postulated enzymatic mechanism that starts with formation of a C–C bond, linking C3 of the A-side ALA to C4 of the P-side ALA through an aldol addition. The obtained data are discussed with respect to the current literature.

Porphobilinogen synthase (PBGS, EC 4.2.1.24), also called 5-aminolevulinic acid dehydratase (ALAD), catalyzes the first common step during the biosynthesis of tetrapyrroles such as hemes, chlorophylls, and bilins (1, 2). During the catalytic process, the asymmetric condensation of two molecules of 5-aminolevulinic acid (ALA) yields the first pyrrole porphobilinogen (PBG) (Figure 1). PBGSs from a wide variety of organisms have been studied in detail, and crystal structures of many have been published (3–7). The most common active form of PBGS is a homo-octamer, but it has been shown that lower oligomeric states can be catalytically active as well (8). Each monomer consists of a classical eight-stranded (βα)8 barrel with the active site located at the C-terminal ends of the β-strands. A flexible loop (lid) covers the active site and separates it from the surrounding medium. The two ALA substrate molecules are distinguished as A- and P-side ALA due to the acetic acid and propanoic acid side chains, respectively, that they contribute to the product PBG. The corresponding binding sites of PBGS are termed the A-site and P-site, respectively.

Although it is a family of highly homologous enzymes, significant variation can be observed in the employment of metal ions at catalytic and allosteric sites. The PBGS from Pseudomonas aeruginosa (PaPBGS) contains four magnesium ions per octamer which are located at an allosteric site remote from the active site. Furthermore, monovalent cations have been found in the active site and also at the subunit interfaces (9, 10). PBGSs from other organisms have been shown to contain zinc ions in the active site. Because of the variable requirement for metal ions, a phylogenetic diversity in the chemical reaction mechanism has been postulated depending on whether the enzyme carries an active site zinc ion (11). Despite the differences in metal ion utilization in the enzyme family, it is commonly accepted that the PBGS reaction starts with the binding of the P-side ALA. The subsequent step in the reaction is the binding of the second substrate molecule to the A-site. In zinc-dependent PBGS, the active site metal ion is essential for the binding of A-side ALA (12). Crystal structures support this scenario (13) (PDB entry 1e51). On the basis of structural and biochemical data, we and others previously postulated a catalytic mechanism for PBGS.
initiated by the formation of Schiff bases between the two substrate molecules and two conserved lysine residues in the active site \((9, 14, 15)\). Several studies suggest that the reaction proceeds with the formation of a \(C-C\) bond between \(C3\) of the A-side ALA and \(C4\) of the P-side ALA \((9, 11, 13)\).

Despite the impressive efforts in studying PBGS and its multistep mechanism \((11)\), many questions are still open. No unequivocal picture for the succession of the chemical transformations involved in the enzyme-catalyzed mechanism has emerged.

In this study, we have employed six synthesized inhibitors to probe the active site of P.a PBGS using X-ray crystallography. Five of the inhibitors resemble bisubstrate analogues (symmetric dicarboxy, di-\(\gamma\)-keto compounds) with variation of the central linking moiety. The sixth inhibitor is a close structural analogue of the substrate ALA (see Figure 1 for structures).

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Construction of Expression Vector pLM_PBGS.** The vector was constructed and kindly provided by L. Stith and E. K. Jaffe (Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA). After insertion (Ndel) and internal removal (BamHI) of restriction sites via QuikChange mutagenesis, the P. aeruginosa hemB gene was excised from pGEX hemB \((16)\) using Ndel and BamHI and ligated into similarly digested pET3a, generating pLM_PBGS. The integrity of the plasmid construct was verified by DNA sequencing.

**Protein Production and Purification.** Freshly transformed *Escherichia coli* BL21(\(\lambda\)DE3) cells containing vector pLM_PBGS were grown in 500 mL batches of LB medium containing 100 mg/L ampicillin and supplemented with 0.4% glucose. An inoculum from a single bacterial colony was grown at 37 °C and vigorously shaken for 16 h. The cells were harvested by centrifugation, resuspended in fresh LB medium, and cooled to 17 °C, and protein production was induced by adding IPTG to a final concentration of 100 \(\mu\)M. The cells were further grown at 17 °C overnight and subsequently harvested by centrifugation.

The bacterial pellet from a total growth of 1 L was resuspended in lysis buffer [50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.0), 100 mM NaCl, 0.05% Triton X-100, and 5 mM MgCl\(_2\)] containing a protease inhibitor cocktail (Roche Diagnostics) and disrupted with a French press \(2 \times 20,000 \text{ lb/in}^2\). Cell debris was removed by centrifugation for 45 min at 10000g. The resulting supernatant was subjected to a 25% \((\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4\) precipitation at 4 °C overnight. After centrifugation at 4 °C for 20 min at 5000g, the pellet was resuspended in 50 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 8.0) and 5 mM MgCl\(_2\) (buffer A) and directly loaded onto a phenyl-Sepharose column \((V = 10 \text{ mL})\) which had been previously equilibrated with 50 mM HEPES-KOH (pH 8.0), 5 mM MgCl\(_2\), and 20% \((\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4\) (buffer B). Unbound protein was removed by washing the column with 3 column volumes of buffer B. Protein was eluted with a linear gradient from 20 to 0% \((\text{NH}_4)_2\text{SO}_4\) in buffer A. PBGS-containing fractions were identified UV spectrophotometrically and by SDS–PAGE, pooled, and directly loaded onto a DEAE-Sepharose column \((V = 25 \text{ mL})\) which had been equilibrated with buffer A. Protein was eluted with a linear gradient from 0 to 1 M KCl in buffer A. PBGS eluted with \(500 \text{ mM KCl}\) from the DEAE column. For further analysis, the enzyme was dialyzed against 100 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5) and 10 mM MgCl\(_2\) and concentrated using Amicon concentrator devices (MWCO = 10 000). The yield of purified *P. aeruginosa* was approximately 100 mg from 1 L of bacterial culture.

**Enzyme Activity Assay.** The activity of PBGS was determined using a modified Ehrlich’s test which is based on the reaction between the product PBG and 4-(dimethylamino)-benzaldehyde as described previously \((16)\).

**Determination of IC\(_{50}\) Values.** IC\(_{50}\) values were determined to approximate the potency of the inhibitors. The assay
Table 1: Crystallization and Cryo Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-OH-LA/ PaPBGS</th>
<th>“amine”/ PaPBGS</th>
<th>“ether”/ PaPBGS</th>
<th>“sulfoxide”/ PaPBGS</th>
<th>“sulfone”/ PaPBGS</th>
<th>“thioether”/ PaPBGS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>protein solution</td>
<td>10 mg/mL protein, 50 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM 5-OH-LA sodium salt</td>
<td>10 mg/mL protein, 50 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM 5-OH-LA sodium salt</td>
<td>10 mg/mL protein, 100 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM “ether” monosodium salt</td>
<td>10 mg/mL protein, 50 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM “sulfoxide” disodium salt</td>
<td>10 mg/mL protein, 50 mM Tris-HCl, 5 mM MgCl₂, 10 mM “sulfone” disodium salt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reservoir</td>
<td>9.0% (w/v) PEG-4000, 200 mM LiNO₃, 0.05 mM sodium cacodylate (pH 6.0)</td>
<td>18.0% (w/v) PEG-3350, 20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>12.0% (w/v) PEG-8000, 20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>18.0% (w/v) PEG-3350, 20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>31.0% (w/v) PEG-400, 20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cryoprotective solution</td>
<td>20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>crystal directly frozen in its mother liquor</td>
<td>20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
<td>20% (v/v) PEG-400, 80% reservoir solution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

contained a final PBGS concentration of 4 μg/mL and varying final concentrations of inhibitor [from 125 mM (or lower due to solubility problems) to 12.5 μM] in a bis-tris-propane (BTP) buffer [100 mM BTP (pH 8.5) and 10 mM MgCl₂]. Stock solutions of protein, buffer, inhibitor, and water were mixed and incubated at 37 °C for 30 min. To start the reaction, substrate was added to a final concentration of 2 mM in a final volume of 400 μL. The mixture was incubated for 15 min. The PBGS-catalyzed reaction was then stopped by adding the reaction mixture (350 μL) to the stop reagent (350 μL) (25% trichloroacetic acid). After centrifugation (3 min at 5000g), the supernatant (450 μL) was treated with Ehrlich’s reagent (450 μL) [0.4 g of 4-(dimethylamino)benzaldehyde in 10 mL of acetic acid and 10 mL of perchloric acid]. After 15 min at room temperature, the amount of product was determined by measuring the absorbance at 555 nm (ε = 60 200 M⁻¹ cm⁻¹).

For determination of IC₅₀ values, the data dose–response plot were fitted to eq 1.

\[
\frac{A}{A_0} = \frac{1}{1 + \left(\frac{[I]}{IC_{50}}\right)^h}
\]

where \( h \) is a Hill coefficient and accounts for potential deviations from a simple noncooperative inhibition model (see Discussion for details) (17).

**Crystallization and Structure Determination.** Protein solutions containing inhibitors were generated by mixing aliquots of protein solution [20 mg/mL protein, 100 mM Tris-HCl, and 10 mM MgCl₂ (pH 7.5)] and inhibitor solution (see Table 1 for final concentrations). Crystallization lead conditions were identified using Crystal Screen, Crystal Screen 2, Low Ionic Strength Screen, Natrix, and Crystal Screen Cryo sparse matrix screens (Hampton Research, Aliso Viejo, CA) in 96-well sitting-drop CrystalClear strip racks (Douglas Instruments) with 100 μL of reservoir solution and drops of 3 μL of reservoir and 3 μL of protein solution. Thereby produced initial conditions as well as known crystallization conditions for wild-type PaPBGS (5) were optimized by the hanging-drop, vapor-diffusion method with 500 μL of reservoir solution and drops of 5 μL of protein and 5 μL of reservoir solution in lino plates (Hampton Research) (Table 1). Prior to X-ray data collection, crystals were washed in a cryoprotective solution for 5 s and flash-frozen in liquid N₂ (Table 1). Data collection was performed under cryogenic conditions using Cu Kα radiation and a Rigaku-MSC R-Axis IV++ image plate or synchrotron radiation (PDB, BESSY, Berlin, Germany; beamline BL1, \( \lambda = 0.98010 \) Å) using a MAR Research CCD detector (Table 2).

The structures of PaPBGS in complex with the inhibitors were determined by difference Fourier synthesis, using the refined model of wild-type PaPBGS (PDB entry 1b4k). This was followed by several rounds of refinement using REFMAC5 (18, 19) and ARP/wARP (20) and manual model building using O (21). Na⁺, K⁺, Mg²⁺, and Cl⁻ and ethylene glycol oligomers were incorporated to match the electron density, temperature factors, and coordination sphere (22 and references cited therein). In obvious cases, two to three alternate amino acid conformations were modeled. The quality of the structure was checked using PROCHECK (23) and WhatIf (24).

Analysis of protein–inhibitor interactions was facilitated by the use of ligplot (25). Overlays have been created using lsqkab as a part of the CCP4 suite (18). The overlay of the PBGSs from different organisms (Figure 4A) was generated by searching for the best fit for the backbone atoms of the eight central β-strands of these proteins to the respective residues of wild-type PaPBGS (PDB entry 1b4k). Figures 3 and 4 were generated using PyMOL (DeLano Scientific LLC, South San Francisco, CA).

Structural coordinates were deposited in the PDB (Table 2).

**RESULTS**

**Expression and Purification of Recombinant P. aeruginosa PBGS.** P. aeruginosa PBGS was produced and purified from a new expression system which is under the control of a T7 promoter. The advantage of this system over the previous one (GST fusion) (16) is the extremely high protein yield (~100 mg of protein per liter of bacterial culture) and the lack of an affinity tag for purification. Therefore, the recombinant protein employed in this study most closely resembles the native enzyme. The obtained protein was purified to ~98% homogeneity.

**Inhibition Potency of the Employed Inhibitors.** Five analogues of a bisubstrate were synthesized (26) and tested in the standard PBGS assay system. Common to all compounds are the two carboxylate groups and two keto functions. The only difference between the analogues is the variation of the central function and consequently the volume
and polarity of this moiety (Figure 1). It has been shown previously that the carboxylate group and the y-keto groups are essential for recognition by the enzyme (27, 28). In addition to the bisubstrate analogues, one single-substrate analogue, 5-hydroxylevulinic acid (5-OH-LA), was employed (29).

To approximate the potency of the inhibitors, their IC$_{50}$ values were determined using protein and substrate concentrations comparable to those used in earlier studies (9, 14, 30). The data are summarized in Figure 2, and deduced IC$_{50}$ values are listed in Table 3. “Ether”, “amine”, and “thioether” are decent inhibitors with IC$_{50}$ values of <1 mM, whereas the three others displayed weaker inhibition potency. Data obtained for “sulfone” and “sulfoxide” were the only ones that fit eq 1 with a Hill coefficient (h) that deviated significantly from unity (Table 3).

Crystal Structures of the Active Site of P. aeruginosa PBGS with the Various Inhibitors. Because of the excellent crystallization behavior of PabPBGS, we were able to determine structures with each inhibitor bound. All enzymes display the same overall fold that has been described for the wild-type enzyme (5). The loop covering the active site (“active site flap”) of monomer A is ordered in all structures except for “sulfoxide”/PabPBGS, while in “sulfone”/PabPBGS, it displays a hitherto unobserved but ordered conformation.

Table 2: X-ray and Refinement Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5-OH-LA</th>
<th>“amine”</th>
<th>“ether”</th>
<th>“sulfoxide”</th>
<th>“sulfone”</th>
<th>“thioether”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
<td>P42,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cell dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (Å)</td>
<td>126.31</td>
<td>126.88</td>
<td>127.54</td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td>125.60</td>
<td>127.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b (Å)</td>
<td>126.31</td>
<td>126.88</td>
<td>127.54</td>
<td>125.51</td>
<td>125.60</td>
<td>127.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c (Å)</td>
<td>85.48</td>
<td>86.10</td>
<td>85.79</td>
<td>86.77</td>
<td>86.57</td>
<td>85.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total no. of reflections $^a$</td>
<td>418190</td>
<td>433644</td>
<td>798378</td>
<td>297780</td>
<td>339607</td>
<td>467805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of unique reflections</td>
<td>37881</td>
<td>55853</td>
<td>117544</td>
<td>45985</td>
<td>55920</td>
<td>44731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolution range (Å)$^b$</td>
<td>40.2–2.15</td>
<td>40.13–1.90</td>
<td>38.10–1.48</td>
<td>39.68–2.02</td>
<td>39.50–1.93</td>
<td>34.26–2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completeness (%)$^b$</td>
<td>(2.23–2.15)</td>
<td>(1.94–1.90)</td>
<td>(1.51–1.48)</td>
<td>(2.07–2.02)</td>
<td>(1.98–1.93)</td>
<td>(2.10–2.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redundancy$^b$</td>
<td>99.2 (99.5)</td>
<td>98.8 (95.2)</td>
<td>96.2 (98.2)</td>
<td>99.8 (99.8)</td>
<td>95.0 (93.4)</td>
<td>97.8 (97.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandran plot$^c$</td>
<td>11.0 (9.9)</td>
<td>7.8 (7.0)</td>
<td>6.8 (6.1)</td>
<td>6.5 (6.0)</td>
<td>6.1 (5.5)</td>
<td>10.5 (9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of reflections$^a$</td>
<td>35917</td>
<td>52367</td>
<td>107399</td>
<td>43556</td>
<td>47003</td>
<td>41499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of reflections$^a$</td>
<td>6020</td>
<td>6349</td>
<td>6841</td>
<td>6395</td>
<td>6180</td>
<td>6273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of reflections$^a$</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of solvent molecules/dimer</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. of ions/dimer</td>
<td>35917</td>
<td>52367</td>
<td>107399</td>
<td>43556</td>
<td>47003</td>
<td>41499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Na$^+$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K$^+$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg$^{2+}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl$^-$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average B-factor (Å$^2$)</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>11.31</td>
<td>15.63</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>18.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramachandran plot (%)$^c$</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>93.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most favored regions</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additionally allowed regions</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generously allowed regions</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bond angles (deg)$^d$</td>
<td>1.696</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>1.474</td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>1.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bond lengths (Å)$^d$</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDB entry</td>
<td>home source</td>
<td>Bessy, PSF, BL1</td>
<td>Bessy, PSF, BL1</td>
<td>Bessy, PSF, BL1</td>
<td>Bessy, PSF, BL1</td>
<td>Bessy, PSF, BL1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c13</td>
<td>2c14</td>
<td>2c15</td>
<td>2c16</td>
<td>2c18</td>
<td>2c19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Greater than 1σ. $^b$ Value for the highest-resolution shell in parentheses. $^c R_{merge} = \frac{\sum_h \sum_i |I_{hi} - \langle I_h \rangle|}{\sum_h \sum_i |I_{hi}|}$, where summation is over all I$_{hi}$ observations contributing to the I$_h$ reflection intensities. $^d$ F$_{o}$ for a range of 87.71–20.0 Å. $^e$ Five percent of the data was omitted from refinement (42). $^f$ Calculated using Procheck (23). $^g$ Calculated using Whatif (24).

Figure 2: Dose–response plots for the determination of IC$_{50}$ values. Shown is the dependence of product formation (here shown as absorbance at 555 nm for the complex of PBG with Ehrlich’s reagent) on inhibitor concentration: (●) 5-OH-LA, (○) “amine”, (▼) “ether”, (Δ) “thioether”, (■) “sulfoxide”, and (□) “sulfone”.
In the case of “sulfone”/PaPBGS, this might be due to the special binding of the inhibitor (see below) that induces slight changes (Cα atom shifts of D131 and Q138 of approximately 0.8 and 1.0 Å, respectively) in the loop connecting D131 to D139 lying adjacent to the active site flap. In “sulfoxide”/PaPBGS, this might be due to the condensation reaction. Two molecules of 5-OH-LA are bound to the A- and P-site. Both are fixed via Schiff bases to K205 and K260, and their conformation is analogous to the binding of 5F-LA (Figure 3A) (9). Nevertheless, the interactions of the moieties in the 5 position of inhibitor species 5F-LA and 5-OH-LA differ notably. While the two fluorine atoms of the 5F-LA molecules coordinate a monovalent cation that is integrated into a network of hydrophilic interactions, the hydroxy groups of the A-site 5-OH-LA inhibitor directly interact with the respective residues (D139 and S175) through H-bonds. Furthermore, the inhibitor in the P-site is stabilized not only through the Schiff base fixation to K260 but also via the fixation of the carboxylic group through interactions with Y324 and S286 and via hydrophobic interactions between the inhibitors’ apolar part (C2–C5) and F86, Y202, Y211, F214, and Y283. The A-side 5-OH-LA is fixed via the Schiff base to K205 but also forms hydrophilic interactions with its carboxylic group with R215, K229, Q233, and a water molecule and with D139 and S175 (O and O₂) with its hydroxyl group. On the basis of the similarity between 5-OH-LA and the substrate, we propose that the complex represents a snapshot of the onset of catalysis (Figure 5). Recently, the structure of yeast PBGS in complex with 5-OH-LA was determined. In contrast to the structure presented here, 5-OH-LA is bound in two conformations in the yeast PBGS but only to the P-site lysine residue (31).

The high-resolution structure of “ether”/PaPBGS gives an ambiguous picture of the inhibitor’s binding (Figure 3B): The P-side part of “ether” including the ether moiety as well as C2 and the carboxylic group of the A-side part are nicely defined by electron density, while the rest of the molecule (except partly the keto group) is flexible and not resolved in the electron density. This part was modeled with the most likely conformation based on conformational constraints. The second Schiff base in the A-site is not formed according to the electron density. The conformation of the defined part in the P-site is identical to the conformation found in 5F-LA/PaPBGS (9), 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS, and ALA/ScPBGS (32) (Figure 4A,B) structures, allowing comparable interactions of both the carboxylic group (hydrophilic) and the apolar part (C7–C10, hydrophobic) with the surrounding residues. Furthermore, the interactions responsible for the recognition of the A-side carboxylic group and the positioning of this group are consistent with the 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS structure. The C4 keto moiety possibly deploys H-bonds to two of the water molecules present in the active site.

The determination of the structures of PaPBGS in complex with “amine” and “thioether” revealed additional insights (Figure 3C,D). Both inhibitors are covalently linked with their C4 and C8 atoms to the amino moieties of K205 and K260, respectively. Interestingly, in both cases, the structure reveals continuous electron density directly connecting C3 and C8 of the inhibitors, indicating that a C–C bond has been formed. We postulate that initially both keto moieties of the inhibitors have been linked to the lysines via Schiff bases followed by an aldehyde addition of C3 of the A-side to C8 of the P-side. Consequently, bond formation brings the two parts of the inhibitor and thereby the lysine amino groups closer together. Nevertheless, no significant rearrangements of the surrounding residues are observed when they are compared to the 5F-LA/PaPBGS, 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS, and ALA/ScPBGS structures (Figure 4A). Instead, the P-side part of the inhibitor changes its conformation except the carboxylic group which is kept fixed in its position (Figure 3A,C,D). For the same reasons, the position of the A-side carboxylic group is slightly shifted in both structures. Thereby, these “upper” parts of the reacted inhibitors (comprising C1 to C4 and C8 to C11 in A- and P-side, respectively) serve as a model for an intermediate, in which the C–C bond formation has occurred. This can be seen in an overlay of these inhibitors with this respective intermediate that had been modeled in the structure of HsPBGS mutant F12L (7) [intermediate 1, Figure 5/IV and Figure 4C]. This comparison underscores the relevance of these reacted inhibitors as mimics of reaction intermediates.

The reacted inhibitors are stabilized by hydrophilic interactions with M177, A204, Y211, F214, Y283, V285, and S286. As found for all bound compounds so far (Figure 4A–C), the P-side carboxylic groups of “amine” and “thioether” are fixed through H-bonds to S286 (O₂ and N) and Y324. Their A-side carboxylic groups interact with R215, K229, Q233, and a water molecule that is part of a hydrophilic network at the A-site, which also includes D131, D139, S175, and two additional water molecules. In contrast to the hydrophobic thioether moiety of “thioether”, the secondary amino moiety of “amine” forms an additional H-bond with one of these two water molecules.

The structure of “sulfoxide”/PaPBGS is much like those of “amine”/PaPBGS and “thioether”/PaPBGS except for the differences in the loop connecting D131 to D139 (Figure 3E). Again, formation of a C–C bond has occurred, and its conformation and interaction with the surrounding residues are analogous to those of “amine” and “thioether” except for the sulfoxide moiety. The amine moiety is a H-bond donor, while the thioether is apolar. The sulfoxide moiety on the contrary is bulkier and a H-bond acceptor. In this structure, the side chains of D131 and D139 are moved slightly away from the inhibitor compared to those of 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS and PaPBGS possibly due to this change in

---

**Table 3: IC₅₀ Values for the Employed Inhibitors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>inhibitor</th>
<th>IC₅₀ (mM)</th>
<th>Hill coefficient (h)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-OH-LA</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ether”</td>
<td>0.963</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“amine”</td>
<td>0.313</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sulfoxide”</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“sulfone”</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“thioether”</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>~1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the polarity. These changes are accompanied by the emergence of a second conformation for residues 136–138 and a disordered active site flap. The remainder of the active site nevertheless is unaffected.

Among the diketo inhibitors, “sulfone” exhibits the most unexpected mode of binding, unmatched by any other PBGS structure so far (Figure 3F). It is covalently fixed only with one of its keto groups via a Schiff base to K260 in the P-site. As in “ether”/PaPBGS, the second Schiff base is not formed, and coincidentally, the conformation of its P-site part resembles the P-sites of 5F-LA/PaPBGS, 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS, and ALA/ScPBGS (Figure 4B). Furthermore, the A-side part of “sulfone” is clearly defined by electron density. The respective carboxylic moiety lies in the expected position but with an orientation tilted by 90° highlighting the degree of structural flexibility in this part of the active center. The formation of the second Schiff base has not yet occurred; instead, the keto group oxygen and one of the sulfonyl oxygen atoms are within H-bonding distance of N1 of K205. This unexpected conformation is very likely a precondition for the binding of a metal ion in the active site, coordinated by D131, D139, D176, and three water molecules (Figures 3F and 4D). Several indications are consistent with the need for a magnesium ion: an octahedral coordination sphere, the distances of 2.02–2.17 Å between the coordinating oxygen atoms and the metal ion (22 and references cited therein), and the amount of electron density (calcium, manganese, or zinc ions would fit the electron density at only low occupancies). Furthermore, magnesium is the only divalent cation present in significant amounts in the purification and crystallization solutions. The inhibitor chelates the supposed magnesium ion indirectly. Two of the magnesium ion coordinating water molecules are within H-bonding distance of the carboxylic moieties of the A-side part of the inhibitor. The third water molecule is part of a hydrophilic network comprising D127, S175, the sulfonyl moiety of the inhibitor, and another water molecule. Additionally, circular-shaped electron density was found adjacent to the magnesium binding site that could not be sufficiently explained by a water molecule. Instead, it was interpreted as a chloride ion fitting well the electron density. It exhibits a relatively short H-bond to one of the magnesium ion coordinating residues (2.86 Å) as well as two long H-bonds to the backbone amide of M177 (3.22 Å) and the side chain amide nitrogen of Q233 (3.29 Å). This chloride ion completes a network of H-bond donors and acceptors. This is the first time that either a magnesium or a chloride ion has been found in the active site of any PBGS structure.

**DISCUSSION**

**Kinetic Measurements**

“Amine”, “ether”, and “thioether” are relatively good inhibitors compared to other compounds assessed previously (9), while 5-OH-LA, “sulfone”, and especially “sulfoxide” are weaker inhibitors. Interestingly, the inhibition data obtained for “sulfoxide” and “sulfone” could only be fitted to the dose–response equation if a Hill coefficient (h) was introduced. Different events can account for deviations leading to the introduction of Hill coefficients: nonideal behavior of the inhibitor, cooperativity in the binding process due to the multimeric character of the protein, alteration of the multimeric state of the enzyme, more than one binding site per monomer for the inhibitor, etc. (17). At this point, we cannot state the reason for these deviations. One might be the alteration of multimeric states of the protein. In this regard, recent findings describe the existence of freely equilibrating alternate PBGS quaternary isoforms, called morpheins for mutants of the human PBGS (7, 33, 34). It has been proposed that the wild-type enzyme exists as an equilibrium of octameric and hexameric forms, the latter of which has been shown to have decreased affinity for the substrate due to the loss of interaction between the active site flap and the carboxyl moieties of the A-side ALA (34). If this concept holds true for other wild-type PBGSs, inhibitor binding might alter this equilibrium and therefore account for the observed deviations of the Hill coefficient from 1.0. This might then lead to different binding constants for the inhibitors for the different oligomeric states.

**Conformational Differences between PBGSs in the Inhibitor Complex Structures**

The conformational differences among the six PaPBGS structures are restricted to the loop connecting D131 with
Figure 4: Overlays and a close-up of the magnesium binding site in “sulfone”/PaPBGS. (A) Overlay of the residues lining the active centers of 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS (orange), “ether”/PaPBGS (yellow), “amine”/PaPBGS (green), “sulfone”/PaPBGS (blue), ALA/ScPBGS (gray) (32), DOSA/EcPBGS (pink) (28), intermediate 1/HsPBGS mutant F12L (cyan) (7), and intermediate 2/ScPBGS (deep olive) (13), with the numbering from PaPBGS, and alternative residues in EcPBGS, ScPBGS, and HsPBGS in italics. The A- and P-site lysines with their bound respective compounds are colored black. Most of the active site residues closely align, while the members of the two flexible loops corresponding to D127, D131, D139, and K229 are less fixed in their positions. Equivalents of D131, D139, and K229 are mutated in the zinc-binding enzymes. In the HsPBGS mutant F12L, equivalents of Q233, D131, D139, and K229 are undetectable due to disordering of this part of the active site in this mutant. When a magnesium ion binds in this region in “sulfone”/PaPBGS, D131 and D139 are significantly shifted compared to those of the other PaPBGS structures. The positioning of the carboxylic group of all compounds in the P-site seems to be very rigid, while there is diversity in the positioning of the second carboxylic group in the A-site. (B) Overlay of 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS (orange), “ether”/PaPBGS (yellow), “sulfone”/PaPBGS (blue), ALA/ScPBGS (gray) (32), and DOSA/EcPBGS (purple) (28). The conformation of substratelike (unreacted) molecules seems to be structurally conserved in the P-site. The amino moiety of the A-site lysine in DOSA/EcPBGS is forced to the left to accommodate the formation of a second Schiff base; the wounded conformation of DOSA is therefore not suitable for C-C bond formation. (C) Overlay of “amine”/PaPBGS (green), intermediate 1/HsPBGS mutant F12L (cyan) (7), and intermediate 2/ScPBGS (deep olive) (13). “Amine” is a good mimic of intermediate 1. (D) Magnified view of the magnesium binding site in the active center of “sulfone”/PaPBGS. The electron density at a level of 1.0σ describes the ion and its octahedral coordination sphere formed of D131, D139, D176, and three water molecules that interact with “sulfone” and the chloride ion through H-bonds.
D139 and the neighboring active site flap. The remainder of the enzyme and, especially, the rest of the active site appear to be remarkably rigid and unaffected by the binding of different compounds. This observation can be expanded even to structures of PBGSs from other sources with or without different substances bound (Figure 4A). Therefore, the necessary flexibility of the active site is achieved by residues belonging to these two loops. Variations range from the binding of different numbers of water molecules in this region to the presence of a magnesium and chloride ion in the case of “sulfone”/PaPBGS (see below). The flexibility of the loops is also reflected by the temperature factors of the corresponding residues lying well above the average for all structures.

A Magnesium Ion in the Active Site

The binding of a magnesium ion in the active sites of PBGSs lacking the active site zinc binding site has been a continuous matter of discussion. On the basis of kinetic and NMR data, the binding of a magnesium ion in the active site of zinc-free PBGSs had been postulated (35, 36), but so far, all structures of exclusively magnesium binding PBGSs (5, 6, 9, 10) showed only a magnesium ion bound to an allosteric binding site distant from the active site. Therefore, the structure of the “sulfone”/PaPBGS complex is the first structural hint that a magnesium ion can truly be stabilized within the active site (Figure 4D). Nevertheless, the interactions stabilizing the magnesium ion in “sulfone”/PaPBGS are partly artificial due to the artificial nature of the bound inhibitor. This finding should therefore not be overrated, but it revives the idea of an intermediary bound magnesium ion participating in catalysis of zinc-free PBGSs.

Catalytic Mechanism of PaPBGS

The comparison of the six different structures of inhibitor/PaPBGS complexes together with recently determined structures now allows us to describe the catalyzed mechanism in more detail.

(I) Binding of P-Site ALA. At first, a stable Schiff base is formed between the substrate molecule’s keto moiety and the amino group of the P-site lysine (K260), as proven by several crystal structures and Schiff base trapping studies (Figures 4B and 5, step I) (4, 5, 12, 15, 37–39).

(II) Binding of A-Site ALA. In a similar event, the second substrate molecule is bound to the second lysine in the A-site (K205); thereby, the more flexible parts of the active site (D131, D139, R215, and K229) are stabilized by several defined interactions. The active site is shielded from the surrounding medium by the ordering of the active site flap. 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS and 5F-LA/PaPBGS (9) resemble this state prior to the onset of catalysis (Figures 3A and 5, step II).

(III) Enamine Formation. In vivo, the second Schiff base is formed between the substrate molecule’s keto moiety and the amino group of the P-site lysine (K260), as proven by several crystal structures and Schiff base trapping studies (Figures 4B and 5, step I) (4, 5, 12, 15, 37–39).

(II) Binding of A-Site ALA. In a similar event, the second substrate molecule is bound to the second lysine in the A-site (K205); thereby, the more flexible parts of the active site (D131, D139, R215, and K229) are stabilized by several defined interactions. The active site is shielded from the surrounding medium by the ordering of the active site flap. 5-OH-LA/PaPBGS and 5F-LA/PaPBGS (9) resemble this state prior to the onset of catalysis (Figures 3A and 5, step II).

(III) Enamine Formation. In vivo, the second Schiff base is formed between the substrate molecule’s keto moiety and the amino group of the P-site lysine (K260), as proven by several crystal structures and Schiff base trapping studies (Figures 4B and 5, step I) (4, 5, 12, 15, 37–39).

(IV) Aldole Addition (formation of the C-C bond). The C–C bond between C3 of the A-site ALA and the P-site ALA is formed by an aldole addition (Figure 5, step IV). The formation of the A-site Schiff base and the enamine as activation seems to be a prerequisite for this reaction step.
This fact is supported by the complexes “ether”/PaPBGS and “sulfone”/PaPBGS (Figure 3B,F), where the second Schiff base is lacking. In these cases, no formation of the C=−C bond has occurred which is in contrast to complexes in which the second A-site Schiff base is established (“amine”/PaPBGS, “thioether”/PaPBGS, and “sulfoxide”/PaPBGS). These inhibitor structures thereby support the interpretation of electron density found in the partly disordered active site of HsPBGS that was modeled as this respective intermediate I (Figure 5) (7). Why does formation of the C−N bond not occur first? Here the comparison among “amine”/PaPBGS, “thioether”/PaPBGS, “sulfoxide”/PaPBGS, and DOSA/EcPBGS (Figure 4B,C) (14) helps to explain that formation of the C−C bond can only occur when the compounds possess enough conformational flexibility. This allows the nucleophile (the A-side C3 atom) to attack the electrophile (P-side C4 atom, i.e., C8 atom of the inhibitors) along the Buri−Dunitz angle. This is most likely the case for the two separate ALA molecules, prior to formation of the C−N bond.

(V) Schiff Base Exchange (formation of the C−N bond). Following the aldol addition, the C−N bond is formed through an attack of the P-side substrate amino moiety on the A-site Schiff base (Figure 5, step V), leading to a Schiff base exchange that sets the A-site lysine free. The intermediate formed this way exactly resembles the intermediate 2/SvPBGS (Figure 4C) and intermediate 2/HsPBGS (13, 40) complexes and was also found in a structure of PaPBGS (unpublished results). The existence of such protein intermediate complexes that are even suitable for crystallization indicates that this state is relatively stable (or metastable). This relative stability might be the explanation for the slow conversion of this intermediate into the product through the lysis of the remaining single bond linking the intermediate to the P-site lysine (Figure 5, step VII). It has been suggested that substrate binding in a neighboring active site of the PBGS multimer triggers a conformational change that facilitates this lysis (11). The “amine”, “thioether”, and “sulfoxide” structures clearly support the assumption of stabilization of closed ring structures by the protein (Figure 3C−E).

(VI) Protonation of P-site lysine and (VII) trans elimination of P-site lysine might thereby be the rate-limiting step of catalysis causing the PBGSs to be slow enzymes with k cat values in the range of 1 s−1 and a k cat/K m of 10 s−1 M−1.

(VIII) Abstraction of the pro-R H+ from C5 of P-side ALA (41), aromatization, and release of PBG after lysis of the connecting bond between intermediate 2 and the P-site lysine (Figure 5, step VIII) are the last steps of the catalytic process prior to product release.

This last step, the formation of the aromatic ring structure, provides the driving force for the whole reaction.

Why do 5F-LA and 5-OH-LA not form the C−C bond? Obviously, they are not able to form an intermediate with a ring structure that is stabilized by the enzyme, and consequently, the reaction is stalled prior to formation of the C−C bond.

Conclusion and Outlook

The new crystal structures of PaPBGS in complex with several inhibitors presented here allowed us to confirm the catalytic mechanism of PaPBGS proposed in an earlier study (9). Comparison with the findings of Erskine et al. (13) and Breinig et al. (7) and the mechanisms proposed by these groups leads to the conclusion that substrate binding and activation through two Schiff bases, the initial C−C bond formation, and the stabilization of a ring structure intermediate are fundamentals of PBGS catalysis.

Nevertheless, the function of metal ions in the catalytic process remains an open question. The participation of the zinc ion at the active site in zinc-binding enzymes has been postulated (4, 11). The “sulfone”/PaPBGS structure in which a magnesium ion is bound to the active site sheds new light on the direct involvement of magnesium ions in the mechanism for exclusively magnesium binding PBGSs. To tackle this question, new kinetic and crystallization experiments are underway.
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