

Protein-protein docking

Arrimage protéine-protéine

Dirk Stratmann

Master M2 BIM (NV 634, Biopol), Université Pierre et Marie Curie (Paris VI)


03 décembre 2012



Introduction

- Motivation
- Steps of protein-protein docking
- Outline

Motivation



Free proteins - Structural genomics



- 3D structure of a large number of unbound/free proteins solved => PDB
- Only about 1000 types of folds, almost all known.
- => Comparative modeling / Homology modeling

Protein-protein complexes

- Number of types of protein-protein interactions at least 10x times greater (> 10.000) than number of folds (1000).
- Experimental difficulties to solve protein-protein 3D structures.

Models of Protein Complexes

What can we learn from 3D structures (models) of complexes?



- Models provide structural insight into function and mechanism of action
- Models can drive and guide experimental studies
- Models can help understand and rationalize the effect of disease-related mutations
- Models provide a starting point for drug design

AB/10-07

Protein-docking problem

- Connolly [Connolly, 1986] has posed the protein-docking problem as: "Given the structures of any two proteins, is it possible to predict whether they associate, and if so, in what way?"
- Connolly was very optimistic at that time:
"With a few years more development they stand a good chance of solving the protein-docking problem. If the protein-docking problem cannot be solved by a purely geometric approach, there remains the option of bringing in chemical considerations."
- The problem of docking molecules of any complexity based on the complementarity of their features has been shown to be NP-complete (Kuhl et al., 1984).

Steps of protein-protein docking

Representation, Sampling and Scoring

Three key ingredients:



- *Representation of the system*
- *Global conformational space search*
- *Reranking of top solutions based on scoring function*

Similar steps as for protein folding

Reviews: [Smith and Sternberg, 2002], [Halperin et al., 2002]


Protein Docking: General Methodology

Input: Individual Structures




Sampling and Scoring

Sampling



Sampling and Scoring


Sampling



Score Function



Scoring



Rank

1

2

3

Outline

- 1 Introduction
 - Motivation
 - Steps of protein-protein docking
 - Outline
- 2 Protein-protein interaction
 - Models
 - Types of complexes
- 3 Scoring
 - Scoring Functions
 - Shape complementarity
 - Electrostatics
 - Desolvation / Hydrophobic effect
 - Amino-acids preferences
- 4 Rigid-body docking
 - Surface representation
 - Geometric docking
 - FFT docking
- 5 Flexible docking
 - Flexible docking
- 6 Evaluation
 - Performance of docking programs
 - CAPRI
- 7 Inclusion of experimental data
 - NMR - chemical shifts
 - CS-HADDOCK
- 8 Bibliography

2 Protein-protein interaction

- Models
- Types of complexes

Models

Lock and Key




Emil Fischer 1894


“ To use an image, I would say that enzyme and glycoside have to fit into each other like a lock and a key, in order to exert a chemical effect on each other.”

Source: Kohlbacher and Lenhof


Lock and Key




Lock and Key




Lock and Key




Lock and Key




Lock and Key



Lock and Key



Lock and Key





Lock and Key







Geometry



Chemistry








Flexible Protein Recognition

3-step mechanism of diffusion, free conformer selection, and refolding:



Types of complexes

Enzyme / Inhibitor

Enzymes and their inhibitors have co-evolved to form an interface with a high degree of surface complementarity

Antibody / Antigen

The immune system produces many different antibodies in response to an antigen, some of which bind their respective epitopes quite well while others bind quite poorly.

Antibody => always the same binding site location
Antigen => Highly variable binding site locations

Protein-Protein Docking Benchmark 4.0

<http://zlab.umassmed.edu/benchmark/>

PDB => 1667 complex structures with unbound structures => 109
 non-redundant complexes (according to SCOP families) => 176
 unbound-unbound cases with reference complex structure

Table II

Statistics of the Three Classes of Difficulty in the Entire Benchmark 4.0
 and the New Cases (in Parentheses)

	I-RMSD	f_{nat}	$f_{non-nat}$	Number
Rigid body	0.90 (1.12)	0.79 (0.80)	0.21 (0.19)	121 (33)
Medium	1.76 (1.86)	0.63 (0.66)	0.35 (0.27)	30 (11)
Difficult	3.76 (3.45)	0.51 (0.60)	0.51 (0.41)	25 (8)

52 enzyme-inhibitor, 25 antibody-antigen, 99 other functions

[Hwang et al., Proteins 2010]

3 Scoring

- Scoring Functions
- Shape complementarity
- Electrostatics
- Desolvation / Hydrophobic effect
- Amino-acids preferences

Scoring Functions

Introduction

- What distinguishes the true complex structure from "false positives"?
- *Physical chemistry*: Complex structure with the lowest binding free energy is the one observed in nature.
- *Caveat*: relies on sufficiently complete sampling of conformation space

Prediction of Binding Free Energy

- Currently very difficult
- Would need to include entropic contributions and solvent effects
- Free energy prediction is also very difficult in:
 - Protein-ligand docking
 - Protein structure prediction

Prediction of Binding Free Energy

$$\Delta G_{binding} = \Delta G_{elec} + \Delta E_{vdW} + \Delta G_{des} + \Delta E_{int} - T\Delta S_{sc} - T\Delta S_{bb} \quad (1)$$

ΔG_{elec} electrostatic, ΔE_{vdW} van der Waals, ΔG_{des} desolvation, ΔE_{int} conformational changes upon binding
 $-T\Delta S_{sc}$ and $-T\Delta S_{bb}$ entropy changes from side chain and backbone, respectively.

[Pierce and Weng, 2007]


Alternative: Scoring Functions

- Geometry:
 - Lock and key principle
 - Large contact areas are favorable
 - Steric clashes / overlaps should be avoided
- Chemistry:
 - Models based on physicochemistry
 - Compromise between speed and accuracy


Scoring functions must be accurate and fast at the same time to evaluate several billions of docking poses.

Scoring functions based only on geometry or only on chemistry are not successful in general.


Geometry and Chemistry




Geometry and Chemistry



Geometry



Chemistry



Geometry

- 1 Steric complementarity of shapes
- 2 Buried surface area (BSA) = $SAS_A + SAS_B - SAS_{AB}$, typical values for complexes: 1200-2200 Å²

Chemistry

- Electrostatic interactions
- Hydrogen bonding
- *Desolvation*: Exclusion of the solvent from the interface => solvent entropy change


Categories of scoring functions

- *Knowledge-based*
- *Empirical*
- *Forcefield-based*

[Moreira et al., 2010]


Shape complementarity

Bound VS unbound




Kallikrein A/trypsin inhibitor
complex (PDB codes 2KAI,6PTI)


10 highly penetrating residues



Soft van der Waals

$$V_{L-J} = A/r^{12} - B/r^6 \quad (2)$$





$$V_{\text{Lennard-Jones}} = 4\epsilon \left\{ \left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^{12} - \left(\frac{\sigma}{r} \right)^6 \right\} \quad V_{\text{soft}} = \begin{cases} 256x^4 & x < 0 \text{\AA} \\ 4x^2 & 0 \text{\AA} \leq x \leq 4 \text{\AA} \\ 64 & x > 4 \text{\AA} \end{cases} \quad \text{when}$$

$$\begin{cases} x < 0 \text{\AA} \\ 0 \text{\AA} \leq x \leq 4 \text{\AA} \\ x > 4 \text{\AA} \end{cases}$$

Source: Matthew James Betts, PhD thesis, 1999

Electrostatics

Poisson-Boltzmann equation:

$$\nabla \cdot (\epsilon(\mathbf{r})\nabla\phi(\mathbf{r})) - \epsilon(\mathbf{r})\kappa^2(\mathbf{r}) \sinh(\phi(\mathbf{r})) + \rho(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \quad (3)$$

ϵ dielectric term, ϕ electrical potential, ρ charge density,
 κ charge screening parameter for mobile ions.

Simplifications:

- 1 no mobile ions $\Rightarrow \kappa = 0$
- 2 dielectric term invariant inside the protein: $\epsilon(\mathbf{r}) = \epsilon$

\Rightarrow Poisson's equation:

$$\nabla^2\phi(\mathbf{r}) = -\frac{\rho(\mathbf{r})}{\epsilon} \quad (4)$$

\Rightarrow Coulomb force:

$$F = \frac{Q_1 Q_2}{4\pi\epsilon_0 r^2} \sim 1/r^2 \quad (5)$$

No point - point model, but point - field model, as side chain positions are not always correct

Desolvation / Hydrophobic effect

Desolvation

Desolvation in protein binding is the energy needed to change water-protein bonds with bonds between proteins.

= "Hydrophobic effect"

Atomic contact energy (ACE) [Zhang et al., 1997]:

- Contact energies ΔG_i for 18 atom types obtained from known structures
- Statistical potential (like [Miyazawa and Jernigan, 1996])


$$\Delta G_{des} = \sum_i N_i \Delta G_i \quad (6)$$

N_i : number of atom pairs of type i

Amino-acids preferences

Statistical pairwise-potential

Derived from an analysis of complexes with known 3D structure, example:





4 Rigid-body docking

- Surface representation
- Geometric docking
- FFT docking

Surface representation

Solvent accessible surface - SAS


Connolly's MS (molecular surface) algorithm



Knobs and Holes

Solid angle

$$\Omega[sr] = A/r^2 = [0..4\pi]$$



Michael L. Connolly, *Molecular Surfaces: A Review*


<http://www.netsci.org/Science/Compchem/feature14.html>

Connolly 1986, J Mol Graph

Knobs and Holes

Sphere volume inside the protein

[Connolly, 1986]:



shape function => sphere volume:


- concave/Hole = larger sphere volume = local maximum of shape function
- convex/Knob = smaller sphere volume = local minimum of shape function

here: sphere radius = 6\AA (approximation of the radius of an amino acid)

Knobs and Holes

Matching

[Connolly, 1986]:




sum of sphere volumes should give a whole sphere

Knobs and Holes

Matching

[Connolly, 1986]:

One outward pointing vector $-c$ at each sphere center \Rightarrow vector field
good shape match = anti-parallel vectors



centroid = barycentre

Knobs and Holes

Matching

[Connolly, 1986]:

Criteria for a good surface shape measure for docking:

- 1 local, i.e. not dependent on distant parts of the protein (the protein-protein interface is only a local part of the whole surface)
- 2 independent of the coordinate system (otherwise the complementarity is difficult to find, as proteins
- 3 fast way to identify complementary shapes

Critical Points

Critical points = Local extrema of shape function = knob and holes

Find critical points:

- 1 triangulate the solvent-accessible surface => polyhedron with triangular faces (better than dot surface representation, as it defines which vertices are neighbors)
- 2 calculate shape function at each vertex of the polyhedron
- 3 compare values with neighboring vertices

Knob = value lower than any of the neighboring vertices


Hole = value higher than any of the neighboring vertices

Shape function = sphere volume inside the protein


Tested on one complex: about 160 knobs and holes per protein

[Connolly, 1986]

Dot surface VS critical points





(a) dense, Connolly



(b) sparse, Lin et al. 1994

green = concave, yellow = convex, red = flat

Critical points - Histogram



Only 30% are knobs or holes.

Max Shatsky

<http://bioinfo3d.cs.tau.ac.il/Education/Workshop02a/>


Geometric docking

Matching with critical points



At least four points of each protein must be matched together to define one assembly unambiguously.

First try [Connolly, 1986]: Four knobs and holes pairs (Problem: difficulties to find four pairs, especially for flat interfaces, ex: trypsin + inhibitor)

Second try [Norel et al., 1994]: Two knobs and holes pairs plus points defined by their surface normals:



matchings: $a \leftrightarrow d$, $b \leftrightarrow e$

Topological graph G_{top} 

Color code of the right figure: yellow = knob, cyan = hole, green = flat, dark blue = protein surface

<http://bioinfo3d.cs.tau.ac.il/Education/Workshop02a/>

Group critical points as patches


Goal: divide the surface into connected, non-intersecting, equal sized patches of critical points with similar curvature.

- *connected* the points of the patch correspond to a connected sub-graph of G_{top} .
- *similar curvature* all the points of the patch correspond to only one type: knobs, flats or holes.
- *equal sized* to assure better matching we want shape features of almost the same size.


<http://bioinfo3d.cs.tau.ac.il/Education/Workshop02a/>

Group critical points as patches

(B)



(B)



yellow = knob, cyan = hole, green = flat, dark blue = protein surface
<http://bioinfo3d.cs.tau.ac.il/Education/Workshop02a/>

Surface Patch Matching

Knob \leftrightarrow hole patches and flat patches \leftrightarrow any patch

- 1 *Single Patch Matching*: One patch of the receptor with one patch of the ligand, for small ligands
- 2 *Patch-Pair Matching*: Two patches of the receptor with two patches of the ligand, for protein-protein complexes


Match critical points within patches by computer vision techniques:

- Geometric Hashing
- Pose Clustering

[Duhovny et al., 2002]

Surface Patch Matching

PATCHDOCK



Molecular Docking Algorithm Based on Shape Complementarity Principles

[\[About PatchDock\]](#) [\[Web Server\]](#) [\[Download\]](#) [\[Help\]](#) [\[FAQ\]](#) [\[References\]](#)

Type PDB codes of receptor and ligand molecules or upload files in PDB format

Receptor Molecule:

(PDB:chainId e.g. 2kai:AB) **or** upload file:

Ligand Molecule:

(PDB:chainId e.g. 2kai:I) **or** upload file:

e-mail address:

(the results are sent to this address)

Clustering RMSD:

Complex Type:

Be sure to give receptor and ligand in the corresponding order!

Advanced Options:


[\[Show\]](#)[\[Hide\]](#)

FireDock - Fast Interaction Refinement in Molecular Docking

SymmDock - An Algorithm for Prediction of Complexes with C_n Symmetry


FFT docking

3D grid



Katchalski-Katzir et al., PNAS 1992

- Protein on grid
- Assign values
 - $a_{i,j,k} =$
 - 1 at the surface of A
 - $\rho \ll 0$ inside A
 - 0 outside
 - $b_{i,j,k} =$
 - 1 at the surface of B
 - $\delta > 0$ inside B
 - 0 outside B



A \ B	inside	surface	outside
inside	$\rho^* \delta < 0$	$\rho < 0$	0
surface	$\delta > 0$	1	0
outside	0	0	0

Correlation $c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$


For all translation vectors (α, β, γ) calculate:

- surface-surface contacts $\mathbf{a}_{i,j,k} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{i+\alpha,j+\beta,k+\gamma} > 0$
- inside-inside contacts $\mathbf{a}_{i,j,k} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{i+\alpha,j+\beta,k+\gamma} < 0$

$$c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{a}_{i,j,k} \cdot \mathbf{b}_{i+\alpha,j+\beta,k+\gamma} \quad (7)$$

Run time $O(N^6)$!

[Katchalski-Katzir et al., 1992]

Correlation $c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma}$ Cross Section $c_{\alpha=0,\beta,\gamma}$ 

From: Katchalski-Katzir et al., PNAS 1992, 2195

Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)

Discrete Fourier Transform (DFT):

$$X_{o,p,q} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N x_{i,j,k} \cdot \exp[-2\pi i(o_i + p_j + q_k)/N] \quad (8)$$

Inverse Fourier Transform (IFT):

$$c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} = \frac{1}{N^3} \sum_{o=1}^N \sum_{p=1}^N \sum_{q=1}^N C_{o,p,q} \cdot \exp[-2\pi i(o\alpha + p\beta + q\gamma)/N] \quad (9)$$

Fast Fourier Transform (FFT)

$$c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \sum_{k=1}^N a_{i,j,k} \cdot b_{i+\alpha,j+\beta,k+\gamma} \quad (10)$$

Cross-correlation:


$$(f \star g)[n] = \sum_{m=-\infty}^{\infty} f^*[m]g[n+m] \quad (11)$$

$$DFT(f \star g) = (DFT(f))^* \cdot DFT(g) \quad (12)$$


$$C_{o,p,q} = A_{o,p,q}^* \cdot B_{o,p,q} \quad (13)$$

$$c_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} = IFT(C_{o,p,q}) \quad (14)$$


FFT for DFT



FFT for IFT




IFFT




■ Surface ■ Interior ■ Binding Site


FFT 1D




FFT 3D




FFT 3D



FFT 3D



FFT 3D



Grid size in ZDOCK

- Grid spacing: 1.2 Å
- Grid points $N = 128$ for the largest protein (about 150 Å cube side length), otherwise $N = 100$
- $128^3 = 2$ million grid points \Rightarrow 2 million different translation vectors (α, β, γ)
- Without FFT $\Rightarrow 128^6 = 4.4 \cdot 10^{12} = 4400$ billion elementary operations (addition or multiplication)
- With FFT $\Rightarrow 128^3 \cdot \log_2(128^3) = 2.1 \cdot 10^6 \cdot 21 = 44$ million elementary operations


$\Rightarrow 10^5$ times faster with FFT !

[Chen and Weng, 2002]

Ligand rotations

ZDOCK 2.3-3.x => two rotational sampling options (non-redundant rotations, uniform sampling of the sphere):

- 1 $\Delta = 15^\circ \Rightarrow M_{rot} = 3600$
=> $M_{rot} \cdot N^3 = 7.5$ billion docking poses
- 2 $\Delta = 6^\circ \Rightarrow M_{rot} = 54000$
=> $M_{rot} \cdot N^3 = 113$ billion docking poses



Total number of operations

$$M_{trans+corr} = N^3 \cdot \log_2(N^3) \quad (15)$$

$$M_{total} = M_{rot} \cdot M_{trans+corr} = M_{rot} \cdot N^3 \cdot \log_2(N^3) \quad (16)$$

ZDOCK 2.3-3.x =>

$M_{total} = 160$ billion operations with $M_{rot} = 3600$ => average runtime (2.3: 1h, 3.0: 3h)

$M_{total} = 2300$ billion operations with $M_{rot} = 54000$ => average runtime (2.3: 15h, 3.0: 45h)

[Pierce et al., 2011]

Run-time improvement with Conv3D

Table 1. Average running time, running time fold improvement, and memory usage of optimized ZDOCK versions.

Name	Optimization ¹	Running Time (min)	Fold Improvement ²	Memory (MB)
ZDOCK 3.0	-	167.1	-	700
ZDOCK 3.0.1	Conv3D	26.5	6.4	303
ZDOCK 3.0.2f	Conv3D+Cent	23.2	7.2	282
ZDOCK 3.0.2	Conv3D+Cent+Rot+Switch	18.9	8.6	256
ZDOCK 2.3	-	53.2	-	296
ZDOCK 2.3.1	Conv3D	13.1	4.0	215
ZDOCK 2.3.2f	Conv3D+Cent	11.2	4.7	203
ZDOCK 2.3.2	Conv3D+Cent+Rot+Switch	9.3	5.5	191

All values are averages from running ZDOCK on 176 unbound docking test cases, each run using a single 2.8 GHz 64-bit Opteron processor with 8 GB available RAM.

[Pierce et al., 2011], [Nukada et al., 2007]

5

Flexible docking

- Flexible docking

Flexible docking

Introduction



- Flexibility makes the docking problem harder
 - Increased number of degrees of freedom
 - Scoring more difficult
- Difficult to predict a-priori conformational changes
- Current docking methodology can mainly deal with small conformational changes

Reviews

- Bonvin, A. M. J. J. (2006). Flexible protein-protein docking. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 16(2):194–200. PMID: 16488145
- Andrusier, N., Mashiach, E., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2008). Principles of flexible protein-protein docking. *Proteins*, 73(2):271–289. PMID: 18655061
- Zacharias, M. (2010). Accounting for conformational changes during protein-protein docking. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 20(2):180–186. PMID: 20194014
- Tuffery, P. and Derreumaux, P. (2012). Flexibility and binding affinity in protein-ligand, protein-protein and multi-component protein interactions: limitations of current computational approaches. *J R Soc Interface*, 9(66):20–33. PMID: 21993006


Large-scale domain motions

Shear motion




Large-scale domain motions


Hinge motion



Disordered regions


Flexible loop





Four major stages

- 1 Preprocessing => conformational ensemble / selection
- 2 Rigid body "soft"-docking
- 3 Refinement => induced fit
- 4 Scoring



Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Methods can be grouped in three major categories:

- 1 Generate an ensemble of discrete conformations
 - Conformational ensemble analysis of solved structures
 - Snapshots of Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulations
- 2 Continuous protein conformational space
 - Normal Modes Analysis (NMA)
 - Essential Dynamics
- 3 Identification of rigid and flexible regions
 - Rigidity theory
 - Hinge detection algorithms

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Conformational ensemble analysis

- Instead of a single unbound structure use an ensemble of slightly different unbound structures
- Use experimentally solved 3D-structures of different conformations of the same protein or homologs
 - Morphing techniques: linear interpolation, with limited biological relevance
 - Detect rigid domains and hinge locations (DynDom, HingeFind, FlexProt)

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Molecular Dynamics (MD)



Problems and solutions in using MD:

- MD simulates only small-scale movements (ns timescale)
- Protein conformational changes take up to 1 ms
 - *Solutions:* restricting degrees of freedom (ex: torsional space)
- Energy barriers may trap the MD simulation in certain conformations
 - *Solutions:* Simulated annealing (ex: HADDOCK), scaling methods, biased methods, flooding technique (used in GROMACS), puddle-jumping

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA)



- (a) Polypeptide chain with C_{α} atoms as spheres
- (b) Simplified spring model

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA) - Models


- Goal: Study equilibrium fluctuations
- Common setup:
 - Simplified spring model which relies primarily on the geometry and mass distribution of a protein
 - every two atoms (or residues) within a distance below threshold are connected by a spring
 - all springs usually have a single force constant

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA) - Models

- Gaussian Network Model (GNM)
 - Gaussian-distributed fluctuations about mean positions
 - Isotropic fluctuations
 - Coupling with harmonic potentials
 - Yields an analytical solution
 - Yields mean-square displacements and cross-correlations between fluctuations
 - Motion is projected to a mode space of N dimensions
- Anisotropic Network Model (ANM)
 - Extension of the GNM
 - Account for anisotropic fluctuations
 - Yields directional preferences
 - Motion is projected to a mode space of $3N-6$ dimensions
 - More time-consuming than GNM

Hinges




Example: Calmodulin \rightleftharpoons myosin kinase peptide


b



c




HingeProt




- Predicts locations of hinges and rigid parts
- HingeProt employs the Elastic (Gaussian) Network Model, based on normal mode analysis (NMA)
- Fully automated analysis of NMA results
- Using the two slowest modes, it calculates to correlation between the fluctuations of each pair of residues, that is their tendency to move in the same direction
- A change in the sign of the correlation value between two consecutive regions in the protein suggests a flexible joint that connects rigid units

FlexDock



FlexDock - CAPRI target 8




FlexDock uses HingeProt to identify the hinges.


[Schneidman-Duhovny et al., 2007]

FlexDock - Replication Protein A (1FGU) + DNA

(a)



(b)









FlexDock uses HingeProt to identify the hinges.


[Schneidman-Duhovny et al., 2007]

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA) - cautions

- When bound to a structure, a ligand can :
 - stabilize a conformation that is generally unpopulated in the ligand-free state
 - stretch the structure along the direction of certain normal modes that were irrelevant in the unbound state
- => Difficulty to predict which modes are relevant
- => Use as many modes as possible
- Fortunately, in the majority of cases ligand binding perturbs a system along its lower-frequency normal modes










[Petrone and Pande, 2006]

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA) - loops

- Binding site of proteins often contains loops which undergo relatively small conformational changes triggered by an interaction (ex: protein kinase binding pockets)
- Loop movements can only be characterized by high-frequency normal modes
- Cavasotto et al. developed a method for measuring the relevance of a mode to a certain loop
- Goal: Flexible ligand (here small molecule) - flexible receptor docking

[Cavasotto et al., 2005]

Normal Modes Analysis (NMA) - FiberDock



Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Methods can be grouped in three major categories:

- 1 Generate an ensemble of discrete conformations
 - Conformational ensemble analysis of solved structures
 - Snapshots of Molecular Dynamics (MD) simulations
- 2 Continuous protein conformational space
 - Normal Modes Analysis (NMA)
 - **Essential Dynamics**
- 3 Identification of rigid and flexible regions
 - Rigidity theory
 - Hinge detection algorithms

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Step 1: Flexibility analysis


Essential dynamics

- Capture the main flexible degrees of freedom of a protein, given a set of its feasible conformations
- Degrees of freedom are described by vectors, called *essential modes* or principal components (PC)
- Set of conformations \Rightarrow $(3N \times 3N)$ covariance matrix (N = number of atoms) of the deviation of each atom from its average position
- Matrix is diagonalized \Rightarrow eigenvectors (= PC of flexibility), eigenvalues (= amplitude)
- Applied by Ritchie et al. (LORIA Nancy)

[Andrusier et al., 2008], [Mustard and Ritchie, 2005]

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Rigidity theory



Pebble (=galet) game on graph


[Jacobs et al., 2001]

http://gepard.bioinformatik.uni-saarland.de/old_html/html/ProSeminarWS0607/

[JanChristoph/ProteinFlexibilityPredictions_JanChristoph.pdf](#)

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Rigidity theory



Pebble (=galet) game on graph


[Jacobs et al., 2001]

http://gepard.bioinformatik.uni-saarland.de/old_html/html/ProSeminarWS0607/

JanChristoph/ProteinFlexibilityPredictions_JanChristoph.pdf

Step 1: Flexibility analysis

Rigidity theory



Pebble (=galet) game on graph

[Jacobs et al., 2001]

http://gepard.bioinformatik.uni-saarland.de/old_html/html/ProSeminarWS0607/

JanChristoph/ProteinFlexibilityPredictions_JanChristoph.pdf

Methods for flexibility analysis

Table I*Some Methods for Flexibility Analysis*

Method	Flexibility type	Description
DynDom ¹⁷	Hinge bending	Given two conformations, clusters rotation vectors of short backbone segments and detects the rigid domains.
HingeFind ¹⁸	Hinge bending	Compares given conformational states using sequence alignment and detects hinge locations.
FlexProt ^{20,21}	Hinge bending	Compares given conformational states, performs structural alignment and detects hinge locations.
HingeProt ⁴⁸	Hinge bending	Detects hinge locations using GNM.
CONCOORD ⁶¹	General flexibility	Generates conformations that fulfill distance constraints.
Dynamite ⁶³	General flexibility	Generates conformations using the essential dynamics approach.
FIRST ⁶⁵	General flexibility	Identifies rigid and flexible substructures using Rigidity Theory.

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Backbone flexibility

Four groups of methods:

- 1 Soft interface
- 2 Ensemble docking
- 3 Hinge bending motions
- 4 Heuristic search for energetically favored conformations in a wide conformational space

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Backbone flexibility

Soft interface

- Rigid-body docking which allows a certain amount of steric clashes
- Accounts only for side chain flexibility and small scale backbone movements
- Assumes that the proteins are capable of performing the required conformational changes which avoid the steric clashes
- The actual changes are not modeled explicitly
- Results of soft docking usually contain steric clashes => need further refinement

Three major groups:

- 1 Brute force techniques speeded up by FFT
- 2 Randomized methods
- 3 Shape complementary methods

Backbone flexibility

Ensemble docking

- Prior to docking: generate an ensemble of conformations for the binding partners
- Docking of the whole ensemble:
 - 1 Cross-docking: dock one-by-one
 - 2 Dock all together: mean-field approach

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Ensemble docking

Mean-field MC2 (Multi-Copy/Monte-Carlo) method


- Predict conformation of flexible loop in the interface
- Multiple copy representation of the loop
- Side-chains conformations are samples by Monte Carlo Simulated Annealing process
- Multiple copy representation and Monte Carlo simulation are coupled via copy weights
- Initially equal, these weights are recalculated at the end of each Monte Carlo cycle
- A unique loop copy is selected at the end
- Introduced into ATTRACT docking program

[Bastard et al., 2003], [Bastard et al., 2006]

csb.stanford.edu/karine/thesis-k-bastard.pdf


Ensemble docking

Mean-field MC2 (Multi-Copy/Monte-Carlo) method



Ensemble docking

Mean-field MC2 (Multi-Copy/Monte-Carlo) method



Backbone flexibility

Heuristic search

- Energy minimization + normal modes (ATTRACT)
- Flexibility tree: hierarchical data structure which represents conformational sub-spaces of proteins and full flexibility of small ligands
- Monte Carlo methods:
 - Monte Carlo minimization (MCM) used in RosettaDock


[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Example: ATTRACT


- Coarse grained: Three pseudo atoms per amino acid residue
- Side-chain flexibility: multicopy approach

[Zacharias, 2003]

The ATTRACT approach





Energy minimization in low-frequency normal modes




- Docking in $6 + n$ -dimensional space (n is the number of modes (up to five) + 6 rotational and translational degrees of freedom)
- About 300000 starting structures

[May and Zacharias, 2008]

Flexibility Tree (FT)


**B**

Used in FLIPDock [Zhao et al., 2006], [Zhao and Sanner, 2007]




RMSE = 15.28 Å

A




RMSE = 0.65 Å

B




C



D

Monte Carlo minimization (MCM) used in RosettaDock



Monte Carlo minimization (MCM) used in RosettaDock

Table 1. Fold-tree-based sampling strategies for a range of structure modeling problems

Modeling task	Fold tree	Low-resolution MC	High-resolution MCM	
		Perturbation	Perturbation	Minimization
Protein folding	1a	Backbone (fragment insertion)	Backbone	Backbone, side chain
Domain assembly	1b		(small, shear, wobble)	
Loop modeling	1c			
Fixed-backbone docking	1d	Rigid body	Rigid body	Rigid body
<i>Composite type</i>				
Docking with backbone relaxation	1e	Rigid body	Rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body
Folding and docking	1e	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body
Docking with small hinge motion	1f	Rigid body	Rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body
Docking with large hinge motion	1f	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body
Docking with loop refinement	1g	Rigid body	Rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body
Docking with loop rebuilding	1g	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, rigid body	Backbone, side chain, rigid body

The flexible regions in the fold trees in Fig. 1 can be varied in several different ways as indicated in Fig. 2. The table indicates the combinations of fold trees with sampling strategies appropriate for different modeling tasks.


Methods for docking with backbone flexibility

Table II*Some Methods for Docking with Backbone Flexibility*

Method	Flexibility type	Description
MC2 ⁸¹	Flexible loops	Chooses the best loop conformations from an ensemble using the Mean-Field approach.
ATTRACT ^{51,83}	Flexible loops	Chooses the best loop conformations from an ensemble using the Mean-Field approach.
FlexDock ⁸⁶	General flexibility	Energy minimization on degrees of freedom derived from the lowest frequency normal modes.
	Hinge bending	Allows hinge bending in the docking. The rigid subdomains are docked separately and consistent results are assembled.
FLIPDock ⁹²	General flexibility	Searches favored conformations by a genetic algorithm and a divide and conquer approach. Uses FT data structure.
HADDOCK ^{32,33}	General flexibility	Handles backbone flexibility in the refinement stage, by simulated annealing MD.
RosettaDock ^{10,93,118}	General flexibility	Handles backbone flexibility in the refinement stage, by Monte Carlo minimization.

[Andrusier et al., 2008]

Refinement of side-chains: FireDock





[Mashiach et al., 2008], [Andrusier et al., 2008],
[Andrusier et al., 2007]

Docking and refinement methods with side-chain and rigid-body optimization


Table III*Some Docking and Refinement Methods with Side-Chain and Rigid-Body Optimization*

Method	Side-chain flexibility	Rigid-body optimization	Scoring function terms
RosettaDock ^{10,93,118}	MC on rotamers and minimization of rotamer torsion angles	MC with DFP quasi-Newton minimization ^{147,148}	Linear repVdW, attrVdW, EEF1 (SASA), rotamer probability, hydrogen bonds, residue pair potentials, and electrostatics.
ICM-DISCO ¹²⁸	Biased probability MC on internal coordinates	Biased probability MC on internal coordinates	Truncated VdW, electrostatics, solvation, hydrogen bonds, and hydrophobicity.
3D-DOCK ¹²¹	SCMF	Steepest-descent minimization ¹³⁹	VdW, electrostatics, and Langevin dipole solvation.
SmoothDock ^{11,129}	Pre-docking MD and ABNR minimization in the refinement	Simplex ¹⁴² and ABNR minimization	VdW, electrostatics, and ACE.
HADDOCK ^{32,33}	Simulated annealing MD	Steepest-descent minimization ¹³⁹	VdW, electrostatics, binding site restriction, and buried surface area.
RDOCK ¹⁴⁹	ABNR minimization	ABNR minimization	Electrostatics and ACE.
FireDock ¹¹³	MILP	MC with BFGS quasi-Newton minimization ^{150,151}	Linear repVdW, attrVdW, ACE, electrostatics, π -stacking and aliphatic interactions, hydrogen and disulfide bonds, and insiderness measure.





[Andrusier et al., 2008]



[Andrusier et al., 2008]

6

Evaluation

- Performance of docking programs
- CAPRI

Performance of docking programs

CAPRI

Assessing structural predictions in community-wide experiments: CAPRI and CASP

➤ CASP (Critical Assessment of methods of Structure Prediction):

- predict the mode of **folding** of a protein based on the amino acid sequence
- compare to an unpublished X-ray or NMR structure.
- J. Moult (CARB, Rockville MD) launched CASP in 1994
- round of predictions once every two years (CASP8 in 2008) with 50-100 targets

➤ CAPRI (Critical Assessment of PRedicted Interactions):

- predict the **mode of recognition** of two proteins by docking their 3D structures
- compare to unpublished X-ray structures of **protein-protein complexes**.
- CAPRI started in 2001
- a round of prediction begins **any time a target is made available**

<http://capri.ebi.ac.uk/>

Running CAPRI

The Management Committee

Web site	K. Henrick, S. Velenkar (EBI, Hinxton, UK)	M. Sternberg (Imperial College London)
Targets	J. Janin (Orsay, France)	S. Vajda (Boston University)
Assessors	S. Wodak (Toronto), M. Lensink (Brussels)	I. Vakser (Kansas University)
		L. Ten Eyck (UC San Diego)

Special Issues of *Proteins: structure, fonction and bioinformatics*

1: Vol. 52-1, July 1, 2003

2: Vol. 60-2, Aug.1, 2005

3: Vol. 69-4, Dec. 2007

4: **Vol. 78, Nov. 15, 2010**

Evaluation meetings

La Londe des Maures, France Sept. 19-21, 2002

Gaeta, Italy, Dec. 8-10, 2004

Toronto, Canada, April 20-21, 2007

Barcelona, Spain, Dec. 9-11, 2009



CAPRI star evaluation

The CAPRI star system

Mendez, Lepae,
Wodak 2003
Lensink et al.
2005, 2007, 2010

Model quality		% native contacts (correctly predicted residue pairs)	main chain RMSD (Å)	
		f_{nc}	Ligand L_{rms}	Interface I_{rms}
High	(three-star)	> 50%	< 1 Å	or < 1 Å
Good	(two-star)	> 30%	< 5	or < 2
Acceptable	(one-star)	> 10%	< 10	or < 4
Incorrect		< 10%	>10	and > 4

Source: Janin, LIX 2010



CAPRI rules

- 1 Each group gets the input structures (bound, unbound or sequence only).
- 2 Some weeks later they have to submit 10 models for the complex.
- 3 Exception: web-servers have to submit within 24h to prevent "human scoring".
- 4 The best model out of the 10 models is used to evaluate the performance of one group or web-server.
- 5 Group \neq Program: each group can use the programs they like, but usually they are using their own programs.

Table III

Summary of Target Prediction Performance in CAPRI Rounds 13–19

	L-rms (Å)	R-rms (Å)	***			**			*		
			P	U	S	P	U	S	P	U	S
T29	1.7	B	0	2	1	9	78	13	8	87	13
T30	1.7	2.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
T32	0.3	2.1	15	0	0	13	3	0	6	12	2
T33	2.0	2.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T34	2.0	B	0	0	0	25	13	4	40	165	26
T35	2.9	2.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
T36	2.9	B	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
T37	0.6	0.4	1	8	5	7	34	13	13	34	11
T38	3.2	1.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T39	3.2	B	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	1	0
T40	B	0.4	79	176	39	54	163	40	31	149	13
T41	2.0	1.5	24	2	2	58	99	16	67	198	51
T42	1.5	1.5	9			5			6		

Web-server

Table V

Prediction Performance of Web-Servers

Target	29	30	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42
ClusPro	0	0	0	0	1*	0	0	0	0	1**	2/1**	1**	1***
FiberDock												10/1***	0
FireDock			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2/1***		
GRAMM-X	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2***	1***	0
HADDOCK			0	0	7*	0	0	0	0	0	1***	4/1**	1*
SKE-DOCK	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2*	0	0	2/1***	0	0
Top down								0	0		2/1**	0	0

Conclusion

Is the protein-protein docking problem solved ?

Not really:

- Final goal: best structure at first rank
- CAPRI results:
 - Best structure at top 10 => still up to 90% (worst case) false positives
 - No program works for all complexes
 - Bad performance of non-human scores, i.e. web-servers
 - Scores are only a first help for "human scorers"

Conclusion

Is the protein-protein docking problem solved ?

Challenges:

- Better sampling and scoring
- Conformational changes upon binding
- Predicting domain motions
- Folding upon binding
- Large scale docking => Interactome, Large molecular assemblies
- Predicting which proteins interact => Predicting binding affinities

Conclusion

Is the protein-protein docking problem solved ?

Not really and there are still a lot of challenges.

One possible solution:


- Combine docking with experimental data (NMR, mutagenesis, cryo-EM, SAXS, ...)

7 Inclusion of experimental data

- NMR - chemical shifts
- CS-HADDOCK




NMR - chemical shifts

Chemical shift




Chemical Shift Perturbation (CSP)


1-Ala 2-Cys 3-Trp 4-Cys 5-Val ...

 ^{15}N 


Chemical Shift Perturbation (CSP)




Chemical Shift Perturbation (CSP)



Interface localization on 3D structures




EIN




HPR


red = active residues derived from CSP data and surface accessibility
green = passive residues, i.e. the surface neighbors of the active residues

Docking




red = active residues derived from CSP data and surface accessibility
green = passive residues, i.e. the surface neighbors of the active residues





$$E_{Haddock} = E_{vdW} + E_{elec} + E_{AIR} + E_{desolv}$$




CS-HADDOCK





3D to CS with ShiftX

Contributions to calculated CS δ_{calc} :

$$\delta_{calc} = \delta_{coil} + \delta_{RC} + \delta_{EF} + \delta_{HB} + \delta_{HS}$$

- δ_{coil} - random coil (amino acid type)
- δ_{RC} - ring current
- δ_{EF} - electric field
- δ_{HB} - hydrogen bonding
- δ_{HS} - empirical hypersurfaces (backbone dihedral angles)



RMSD between δ_{calc} and δ_{exp} for $^1H^\alpha$ -CS

Protocole d'arrimage CS-HADDOCK

Structures 3D protéines libres

Données RMN (CSP)

Arrimage avec HADDOCK 2.1

Calculer H α CS avec ShiftX


H α CS exp. du complexe

Calculer CS-RMSDs


CS-RMSD =

$$\frac{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_A} (\delta_i^{exp} - \delta_i^{theo})^2}{n_A}} + \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_B} (\delta_i^{exp} - \delta_i^{theo})^2}{n_B}}}{2}$$


CS-RMSD scoring on all generated structures




CS-RMSD scoring on all generated structures




CS-RMSD scoring on all generated structures




CS-RMSD scoring on all generated structures




Classement des clusters de structures par CS-RMSD




Classement des clusters de structures par CS-RMSD




Classement des clusters de structures par CS-RMSD




CS-HADDOCK vs HADDOCK



CS-HADDOCK vs HADDOCK




CS-HADDOCK vs HADDOCK




CS-HADDOCK vs HADDOCK

Meilleure structure (en bleu) par rapport à la référence (en orange):



(c) CS-RMSD score



(d) HADDOCK score

8 Bibliography



Andrusier, N., Mashiach, E., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2008). Principles of flexible protein-protein docking. *Proteins*, 73(2):271–289.
PMID: 18655061.



Andrusier, N., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2007). FireDock: fast interaction refinement in molecular docking. *Proteins*, 69(1):139–159.
PMID: 17598144.



Atilgan, A. R., Durell, S. R., Jernigan, R. L., Demirel, M. C., Keskin, O., and Bahar, I. (2001). Anisotropy of fluctuation dynamics of proteins with an elastic network model. *Biophys J*, 80(1):505–515.
PMID: 11159421 PMCID: PMC1301252.



Bastard, K., Prévost, C., and Zacharias, M. (2006). Accounting for loop flexibility during protein-protein docking. *Proteins*, 62(4):956–969.
PMID: 16372349.



Bastard, K., Thureau, A., Lavery, R., and Prévost, C. (2003). Docking macromolecules with flexible segments. *J Comput Chem*, 24(15):1910–1920.
PMID: 14515373.



Boehr, D. D., Nussinov, R., and Wright, P. E. (2009). The role of dynamic conformational ensembles in biomolecular recognition. *Nat. Chem. Biol.*, 5(11):789–796.
PMID: 19841628.



Bonvin, A. M. J. J. (2006). Flexible protein-protein docking. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 16(2):194–200.
PMID: 16488145.



Cavasotto, C. N., Kovacs, J. A., and Abagyan, R. A. (2005). Representing receptor flexibility in ligand docking through relevant normal modes. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 127(26):9632–9640.
PMID: 15984891.



Chen, R. and Weng, Z. (2002). Docking unbound proteins using shape complementarity, desolvation, and electrostatics. *Proteins*, 47(3):281–294.
PMID: 11948782.



Connolly, M. L. (1986). Shape complementarity at the hemoglobin alpha 1 beta 1 subunit interface. *Biopolymers*, 25(7):1229–1247.
PMID: 3741993.



Deupi, X. and Kobilka, B. K. (2010). Energy landscapes as a tool to integrate GPCR structure, dynamics, and function. *Physiology*, 25(5):293–303.



Duhovny, D., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2002). Efficient unbound docking of rigid molecules. In *In WABI '02: Proceedings of the Second International Workshop on Algorithms in Bioinformatics*, page 185–200. Springer Verlag.



Emekli, U., Schneidman-Duhovny, D., Wolfson, H. J., Nussinov, R., and Haliloglu, T. (2008). HingeProt: automated prediction of hinges in protein structures. *Proteins*, 70(4):1219–1227.
PMID: 17847101.



Grünberg, R., Leckner, J., and Nilges, M. (2004). Complementarity of structure ensembles in protein-protein binding. *Structure*, 12(12):2125–2136.
PMID: 15576027.



Halperin, I., Ma, B., Wolfson, H., and Nussinov, R. (2002). Principles of docking: An overview of search algorithms and a guide to scoring functions. *Proteins*, 47(4):409–443.
PMID: 12001221.



Jacobs, D. J., Rader, A., Kuhn, L. A., and Thorpe, M. (2001). Protein flexibility predictions using graph theory. *Proteins*, 44(2):150–165.



Katchalski-Katzir, E., Shariv, I., Eisenstein, M., Friesem, A. A., Aflalo, C., and Vakser, I. A. (1992). Molecular surface recognition: determination of geometric fit between proteins and their ligands by correlation techniques. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 89(6):2195–2199.
PMID: 1549581.



Krippahl, L., Moura, J. J., and Palma, P. N. (2003). Modeling protein complexes with BiGGER. *Proteins*, 52(1):19–23.
PMID: 12784362.



Lensink, M. F. and Wodak, S. J. (2010). Docking and scoring protein interactions: CAPRI 2009. *Proteins*, 78(15):3073–3084. PMID: 20806235.



Mashiach, E., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2010a). FiberDock: a web server for flexible induced-fit backbone refinement in molecular docking. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 38(Web Server issue):W457–461. PMID: 20460459.



Mashiach, E., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2010b). FiberDock: flexible induced-fit backbone refinement in molecular docking. *Proteins*, 78(6):1503–1519. PMID: 20077569.



Mashiach, E., Schneidman-Duhovny, D., Andrusier, N., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2008). FireDock: a web server for fast interaction refinement in molecular docking. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 36(Web Server issue):W229–232. PMID: 18424796.



May, A. and Zacharias, M. (2008). Energy minimization in low-frequency normal modes to efficiently allow for global flexibility during systematic protein-protein docking. *Proteins*, 70(3):794–809. PMID: 17729269.



Miyazawa, S. and Jernigan, R. L. (1996). Residue-residue potentials with a favorable contact pair term and an unfavorable high packing density term, for simulation and threading. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 256(3):623–644. PMID: 8604144.



Méndez, R., Lepplae, R., Lensink, M. F., and Wodak, S. J. (2005). Assessment of CAPRI predictions in rounds 3-5 shows progress in docking procedures. *Proteins*, 60(2):150–169. PMID: 15981261.



Moont, G., Gabb, H. A., and Sternberg, M. J. (1999). Use of pair potentials across protein interfaces in screening predicted docked complexes. *Proteins*, 35(3):364–373. PMID: 10328272.



Moreira, I. S., Fernandes, P. A., and Ramos, M. J. (2010). Protein-protein docking dealing with the unknown. *J Comput Chem*, 31(2):317–342. PMID: 19462412.



Mustard, D. and Ritchie, D. W. (2005). Docking essential dynamics eigenstructures. *Proteins*, 60(2):269–274.
PMID: 15981272.



Norel, R., Lin, S. L., Wolfson, H. J., and Nussinov, R. (1994). Shape complementarity at protein-protein interfaces. *Biopolymers*, 34(7):933–940.
PMID: 8054472.



Nukada, A., Hourai, Y., Nishida, A., and Akiyama, Y. (2007). High performance 3D convolution for protein docking on IBM blue gene. In Stojmenovic, I., Thulasiram, R. K., Yang, L. T., Jia, W., Guo, M., and Mello, R. F. d., editors, *Parallel and Distributed Processing and Applications*, number 4742 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 958–969. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.



Palma, P. N., Krippahl, L., Wampler, J. E., and Moura, J. J. (2000). BiGGER: a new (soft) docking algorithm for predicting protein interactions. *Proteins*, 39(4):372–384.
PMID: 10813819.



Petrone, P. and Pande, V. S. (2006). Can conformational change be described by only a few normal modes? *Biophys J*, 90(5):1583–1593.
PMID: 16361336 PMCID: PMC1367309.



Pierce, B. and Weng, Z. (2007). Structure prediction of protein complexes. In Xu, Y., Xu, D., and Liang, J., editors, *Computational Methods for Protein Structure Prediction and Modeling*, Biological and Medical Physics, Biomedical Engineering, pages 109–134. Springer New York.



Pierce, B. G., Hourai, Y., and Weng, Z. (2011). Accelerating protein docking in ZDOCK using an advanced 3D convolution library. *PLoS ONE*, 6(9):e24657.
PMID: 21949741.



Sandak, B., Wolfson, H. J., and Nussinov, R. (1998). Flexible docking allowing induced fit in proteins: insights from an open to closed conformational isomers. *Proteins*, 32(2):159–174.
PMID: 9714156.



Schneidman-Duhovny, D., Inbar, Y., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2005). Geometry-based flexible and symmetric protein docking. *Proteins*, 60(2):224–231.
PMID: 15981269.



Schneidman-Duhovny, D., Nussinov, R., and Wolfson, H. J. (2007). Automatic prediction of protein interactions with large scale motion. *Proteins*, 69(4):764–773.
PMID: 17886339.



Smith, G. R. and Sternberg, M. J. E. (2002). Prediction of protein-protein interactions by docking methods. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 12(1):28–35.
PMID: 11839486.



Stratmann, D., Boelens, R., and Bonvin, A. M. J. J. (2011). Quantitative use of chemical shifts for the modeling of protein complexes. *Proteins*, 79(9):2662–2670.
PMID: 21744392.



Tuffery, P. and Derreumaux, P. (2012). Flexibility and binding affinity in protein-ligand, protein-protein and multi-component protein interactions: limitations of current computational approaches. *J R Soc Interface*, 9(66):20–33.
PMID: 21993006.



Wang, C., Bradley, P., and Baker, D. (2007). Protein-protein docking with backbone flexibility. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 373(2):503–519.
PMID: 17825317.



Zacharias, M. (2003). Protein-protein docking with a reduced protein model accounting for side-chain flexibility. *Protein Sci.*, 12(6):1271–1282.
PMID: 12761398.



Zacharias, M. (2010). Accounting for conformational changes during protein-protein docking. *Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol.*, 20(2):180–186.
PMID: 20194014.



Zhang, C., Vasmatzis, G., Cornette, J. L., and DeLisi, C. (1997). Determination of atomic desolvation energies from the structures of crystallized proteins. *J. Mol. Biol.*, 267(3):707–726.
PMID: 9126848.



Zhao, Y. and Sanner, M. F. (2007). FLIPDock: docking flexible ligands into flexible receptors. *Proteins*, 68(3):726–737.
PMID: 17523154.



Zhao, Y., Stoffler, D., and Sanner, M. (2006). Hierarchical and multi-resolution representation of protein flexibility.
Bioinformatics, 22(22):2768–2774.
PMID: 16984893.