

Linda Blaier, Paul Brunner, Selina Ernst, Valerie Segatz, and Chloé Weiler February 2024

1 Workflow



Workflow for the discovery of NSP13 helicase inhibitors.

2 Material and Methods

1616 FDA-approved drugs from the ZINC database (**Irwin.2020**) and 5016 files from the ECBD pilot library were downloaded. Three protein structures of NSP13 (PDB codes: 6ZSL, 5RME, and 5RM2) were aquired from RCSB PDB.

For identification of the consensus pocket, the protein structures were prepared using PDBFixer (Eastman'2017). Fpocket (package'Fpocket), PrankWeb 3 (package'P2Rank; package'PrankWeb; package'PrankWeb3), and FTMap (package'FTMAP) were run on the structures to determine the consensus binding pocket. For further experiments, the docking box was set to be a cube with an edge length of 30 Å. Molecular docking was performed on the A chain of 6ZSL whose catalytic activity had been confirmed in previous publications (Berta'2021). Molecular docking of the ligands was performed using AutoDock Vina (Trott.2010) and Glide (Friesner2004). The docking results were then validated through blind docking with DiffDock (Corso.2022). The toxicity and synthetic accessibility of the Top 100 scorers from AutoDock Vina were predicted using eToxPred (pu2019toxpred). In order to validate the binding of the top scorer, a molecular dynamics simulation was performed using Gromacs (packageGROMACS). Lastly, for a deeper understanding of the potential inhibitors of NSP13! (NSP13!), our 10 top scoring compounds from Glide were clustered against the top 10 best-docking ligands of the teams "Sorebonne5" and "Warsaw1" based on structural similarity as well as their physico-chemical properties.

3 Results

The location of our consensus pocket was found within the ATP binding site, between the RecA-like domains A1 and A2. The molecular docking with $AutoDock\ Vina$ indentified 100 top scorers, which were ranked by their binding affinity, ranked from -10.3 to -8.8 $\frac{kcal}{mol}$. Passing these top 100 compounds through Glide returned the following top three compounds: ZINC000096077632 (popular name: Angiotensin 1-7), ZINC000008101127 and ZINC000035880991. While they exhibit good binding affinities, they still did not bind as well as ATP. DiffDock did not predict our Top 1 Glide scorer within our binding box, however the molecular dynamics simulation suggested a stable bond between the ligand and the helicase in our consensus pocket, as the ligand stayed inside of the pocket through the whole simulation. Multiple hydrogen bonds were observed at the end of the 100 ns simulation. These findings had almost all been previously found by Glide. The estimation of toxicity and synthetic accessibility using eToxPred showed that only one out of out top 100 compounds is predicted to be toxic. Furthermore, most of the compounds seem to be accessible in their synthesis. Based on

the obtained clustering of the top scoring ligands from all three paired teams, we can see that the compounds are rather dissimilar. This might be due to the fact that each team investigated a different binding site of NSP13 in their work. Therefore, we cannot designate one outstandingly important structural nor physico-chemical property that determines how well a ligand binds to the NSP13 helicase.

4 Discussion and Outlook

Molecular Docking was performed using the FDA approved ligands from ZINC and the pilot library from ECBD. The Top 100 Vina results were further analysed by Glide and their toxicity and synthetic accessibility estimated via eToxPred. Validation of our Top 10 scorer was achieved by blind docking with Diffdock and MD-Simulation using GROMACS. In conclusion, our findings suggest Angiotensin 1-7 as lead compound. This result is further supported by **angio**, who proposed Angiotensin 1-7 as a new therapy to support the recovery from Covid-19. Moreover, because of its role in the Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosteron System, it seemingly could also lower the viral damage to the body by inhibiting NSP13.

In comparison, Sorbonne team 5 used a pre selection of the ECBD pilot library and subjected these to Vina. For their first ranked ligand our results predict an affinity score of -11.1 and was ranked 63 in our Vina results. The remaining 7 were mapped to lower with ranks between 123 and 2626. These results however aren't surprising, as Sorbonne 5 used a different binding pocket, compared to us.

4.1 Limitations of the project

Regarding molecular dynamics (MD) simulation, the project was held back by the tight time schedule. Further simulations should have been performed in order to validate our pipeline and compare our top scorer. Moreover, since MD simulations are a very stochastic process, they should always be estimated using replicas. Multiple runs of the same simulation, using replica exchange with dynamical scaling (**REDS**) could have therefore deepened our confidence in the results.

Of further interest could have been the implementation of AutoGrow4 (packageAutogrow4). This could have helped, alongside toxicity and synthetic accessibility predictions via eToxPred to improve our lead drugs and to generate novel compounds.