Molecular blueprint of allosteric binding sites in a homologue of the agonist-binding domain of the α7 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor
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The α7 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor (nAChR) belongs to the family of pentameric ligand-gated ion channels and is involved in fast synaptic signaling. In this study, we take advantage of a recently identified chimera of the extracellular domain of the native α7 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor and acetylcholine binding protein, termed α7-AChBP. This chimeric receptor was used to conduct an innovative fragment-library screening in combination with X-ray crystallography to identify allosteric binding sites. One allosteric site is surface-exposed and is located near the N-terminal α-helix of the extracellular domain. Ligand binding at this site causes a conformational change of the α-helix as the fragment wedges between the α-helix and a loop homologous to the main immunogenic region of the muscle α1 subunit. A second site is located in the vestibule of the receptor, in a preexisting intrasubunit pocket opposite the agonist binding site and corresponds to a previously identified site involved in positive allosteric modulation of the bacterial homolog ELIC. A third site is located at a pocket right below the agonist binding site. Using electrophysiological recordings on the human α7 nAChR we demonstrate that the identified fragments, which bind at these sites, can modulate receptor activation. This work presents a structural framework for different allosteric binding sites in the α7 nAChR and paves the way for future development of novel allosteric modulators with therapeutic potential.

Significance

In this study we take advantage of a recently described chimera of the α7 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor (nAChR) and acetylcholine binding protein (AChBP), termed α7-AChBP. To date, more than 70 crystal structures have been determined for AChBP in complex with ligands that occupy the orthosteric binding site. Here, we use an innovative screening strategy to discover molecular fragments that occupy allosteric binding sites. In combination with X-ray crystallography we determine a molecular blueprint of three different allosteric sites in α7-AChBP. Using electrophysiological recordings on the human α7 nAChR we demonstrate that each of the three sites is involved in allosteric modulation of the receptor. Our study contributes to understanding the sites of allosteric binding in ion channels.
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channel opening. Despite these insights, structural data on ligand recognition are currently limited to ligands binding in the orthosteric or agonist binding site of nicotinic receptors, whereas information on allosteric binding sites is lacking. Detailed structural knowledge of possible allosteric binding sites in nicotinic receptors is fundamentally important and has great therapeutic potential for the development of allosteric modulators. This is especially clear in the context of benzodiazepines, which bind at allosteric binding sites of the extracellular domain of the GABA<sub>A</sub> receptors and are widely prescribed as hypnotics, sedatives, anxiolytics, antiepileptics, and muscle relaxants (17, 18). Positive allosteric modulators (PAMs) of the α7 nAChR are also recognized as having therapeutic potential. Two different types are distinguished based on the functional effect: type I PAMs, for example NS-1738 (17, 19), mainly potentiate the peak current response evoked by the agonist ACh, whereas type II PAMs, for example PNU-120596 (20, 21), both potentiate the peak current response and alter the time course (4, 20). Based on the results of chimeric protein domain fusion experiments distinct allosteric binding sites are expected: Type I PAMs bind at a site in the extracellular domain, whereas type II PAMs bind at a site in the transmembrane domain (20, 22). However, structural data on the molecular determinants of PAM recognition are currently lacking.

In this study, we took advantage of a recently established α7-nicotinic receptor chimera constructed from the human α7 ligand-binding domain and AChBP (20, 23). This receptor, termed α7-AChBP, shares 71% sequence similarity with the native α7 receptor, including surface-exposed pockets and loops. This is much improved compared with the similarity of 33% between the widely used Aplysia AChBP and the human sequence. Our results show that small amino acid differences result in a different ligand-binding orientation for lobeline, a result critical when performing structure-based drug design. To bias our search toward allosteric binders we used a surface plasmon resonance (SPR)-biosensor-based fragment screening approach in which the orthosteric binding site of α7-AChBP was blocked. This was achieved using two different strategies that were applied in parallel during the screen. The first strategy was to block the orthosteric binding site by preincubation with a high-affinity ligand. The second strategy was to use competition in solution where each fragment was mixed with an orthosteric ligand of lower affinity. This allowed detection of fragments not competing for binding to the orthosteric site and were therefore potential allosteric ligands. Multiple allosteric binders were identified and X-ray crystal structures of α7-AChBP in complex with these fragments are reported herein. These structures reveal three novel allosteric binding sites in the α7 extracellular domain. In combination with electrophysiological recordings on the human α7 nAChR we demonstrate that fragment binding function at these sites modulates receptor function. Altogether, the results reveal a molecular blueprint of novel binding sites in the α7 nAChR. This work paves the way for future development of novel positive allosteric modulators of the α7 nAChR, which is intensively studied as a potential target to improve cognitive impairment in certain disease states, including Alzheimer’s disease (1, 24).

**Results**

The **Agonist Binding Site in α7-AChBP.** Before describing the screening we first present our X-ray crystallographic results describing the binding of lobeline at the orthosteric site in α7 nAChR. AChBPs have been highly instrumental in structural studies aimed at revealing ligand-bound nicotinic receptor complexes. However, these studies have been limited to ligands acting at the orthosteric agonist binding site of nicotinic receptors. Currently, more than 70 crystal structures of AChBPs in complex with different orthosteric ligands have been determined (3, 5, 25), most of which were obtained from different crystal forms and different crystallization conditions. The quality of crystal diffraction and the resolution of the X-ray data varies widely, from 4.2 Å for the α-cobratoxin complex with Lymnaea AChBP (6, 25) to 1.75 Å for a DMXB analog in complex with Aplysia AChBP (10, 26). The different crystal forms are largely dependent on the conformation of loop C, which often forms crystal contacts between neighboring pentamers in the crystal packing and is strongly influenced by the nature of the ligand in the agonist binding site. To facilitate our structural studies of allosteric binders with

---

**Fig. 1.** Structure of α7-AChBP and location of the agonist binding site. (A) Side view of the Torpedo nAChR (PDB ID code 2BG9) in cartoon representation. Different colors are used for extracellular domain (ECD, blue), transmembrane domain (TMD, red) and intracellular domain (ICD, green). (B) Top-down view of the α7-AChBP crystal structure in complex with lobeline. Each subunit of the pentamer is shown in a different color. (C) Detailed side view of the agonist binding site in α7-AChBP, which is localized at the subunit interface of the (+) and (−) subunit. Lobeline is shown in yellow sphere representation. The α7-AChBP chimera is shown in cartoon representation and blue regions correspond to residues originating from the α7 nAChR (UniProt accession code P36544), whereas orange regions correspond to residues from Lymnaea AChBP (UniProt accession code PS8154). (D and E) Detailed view of the agonist binding site, highlighting the different binding pose of lobeline in the α7-AChBP structure (D) and the Aplysia AChBP structure (E). The conserved aromatic residues of the agonist binding site are shown in ball and stick representation. The blue circles indicate the corresponding "loops" of the binding site, termed loops A, B, and C on the (+) subunit and loop D on the (−) subunit. In α7-AChBP, lobeline pinches onto W53 (loop D), whereas in Aplysia AChBP lobeline adopts an extended binding mode. The dashed line indicates a hydrogen bond.
α7-AChBP, we first screened for optimal crystal diffraction of α7-AChBP with a ligand preoccupying the orthosteric site. From this screen, we found that crystals of α7-AChBP in complex with lobeline gave high diffraction quality in a reproducible manner. The diffraction limit for the different complexes with allosteric binders lobeline gave high diffraction quality in a reproducible manner. The lobeline is shown in sphere presentation (Fig. 1C). Unexpectedly, we observe that lobeline adopts a binding pose in α7-AChBP that is different from the one previously reported in the Aplysia or Capitella AChBP complexes (8, 27) (Fig. 1D and E). In α7-AChBP, lobeline adopts a tweezers-like conformation (Fig. 1D) with the two aromatic rings pinching onto the highly conserved aromatic residue of loop D (W53 in α7-AChBP). Here, lobeline forms intramolecular interactions between the hydrogen on the protonated piperidine nitrogen and its own alcohol and carbonyl functional groups. In contrast, in the Aplysia and Capitella AChBP complexes, lobeline adopts an extended conformation (Fig. 1E), which favors interactions with both faces of the subunit interface. Specifically, the extended conformation is mediated by a hydrogen bond between the central piperidine nitrogen and the carbonyl oxygen of the highly conserved aromatic residue of loop B (W145 in Aplysia AChBP) (8, 28), which is an interaction not present in the α7-AChBP complex despite a similar spatial position of this tryptophan. In α7-AChBP, lobeline pinches onto W53 and this interaction seems important. In comparison, Aplysia AChBP and Capitella AChBP contain Y53 and I64, respectively, which likely prevent a pinching binding pose of lobeline. Importantly, W53 is highly conserved between the α7 nAChR and other nicotinic ACh receptors. Therefore, it is likely that our crystallographic binding pose in α7-AChBP is a more realistic model for understanding ligand recognition in the native nAChRs. Nevertheless, these distinct binding orientations of lobeline in different AChBP complexes highlight the plasticity of the binding pocket, which can accommodate ligands in different binding modes despite similar arrangement of highly conserved aromatic residues.

### Three Allosteric Binding Sites in α7-AChBP.

We performed a fragment-based screen and designed a strategy to identify novel allosteric binding sites using SPR spectroscopy (Fig. 2). In short,
our strategy was to inject each fragment either alone or together with d-tubocurarine, which acts as a competitive antagonist at the orthosteric binding site. Our choice of d-tubocurarine was based on a thorough evaluation of multiple orthosteric ligands. SPR validation work compared the sensograms and saturation curves for acetylcholine, carbamylcholine, strychnine, tubocurarine, lobeline, nicotine, and α-bungarotoxin. The interactions were studied for the target protein, α7-AChBP, as well as Capitella AChBP, which was used as a similar control protein to ensure screening hits would be selective for α7-AChBP and avoid non-specific binders. α-Bungarotoxin was shown to be a slowly dissociating ligand for α7-AChBP that could be used to block the orthosteric binding site. The results showed that d-tubocurarine had a fast dissociation rate and could be used as a positive control and as a competitor, providing a high-quality screening assay with $Z'$ of 0.88 for α7-AChBP and 0.70 for Capitella AChBP while allowing for a competition in solution analysis of fragment binding ($Z'$ is a statistical measure of the screening window, i.e., difference in signal from background, ranging from 0 to 1, with 1 being the theoretical maximum) (29). Although lobeline had a subnanomolar affinity for Capitella AChBP, the dissociation rate was not slow enough to allow lobeline to be used as a blocking agent for the control protein Capitella AChBP. Thus, within our screening strategy for allosteric binders, the observed SPR response of fragment plus d-tubocurarine would be very close to the theoretical sum of fragment alone and d-tubocurarine alone because both ligands bind to separate sites on the receptor and no competition is expected (Fig. 2B). In the case of a competitive binder, the observed response of fragment plus d-tubocurarine is much lower than the theoretical sum of fragment alone and d-tubocurarine alone because both ligands compete for binding at the same site (Fig. 2C). The second strategy was simultaneously applied during the screen by comparing the binding signals of fragments for α7-AChBP with the orthosteric binding site blocked by α-bungarotoxin and nonblocked α7-AChBP. Using this strategy, a single concentration screen of 3,028 fragments was performed and 302 potentially allosteric fragment hits were identified. These were further characterized in concentration-response experiments to estimate affinity and 24 potential allosteric binders were selected for cocrystallization based on affinity, competition, and selectivity over Capitella AChBP. Cocrystallization trials for α7-AChBP preoccupied with lobeline and the allosteric ligand were set up if the binder remained soluble at a final concentration of 5–10 mM. Lobeline was chosen for crystallization studies because of the

![Fig. 2. Design of fragment-based screen for allosteric binders on α7-AChBP. (A) Schematic presentation of the location of the agonist binding site in α7-AChBP as well as possible allosteric binding sites. Competitive binders, the agonist lobeline, and the antagonist d-tubocurarine all compete for binding at the agonist binding site, whereas allosteric binders bind at different sites. (B) To distinguish allosteric binders from competitive binders using SPR spectroscopy we perfused each fragment alone (green triangle) or in combination with the competitive antagonist d-tubocurarine (black circle). In the case of an allosteric binder, the response units observed for the mixture of fragment + d-tubocurarine is close to the sum of fragment alone + d-tubocurarine alone (blue dashed line). No competition exists because the fragment and d-tubocurarine bind at distinct sites. (C) In the case of a competitive binder, the response units for the mixture of fragment + d-tubocurarine is lower than the sum of fragment alone + d-tubocurarine alone because both compounds compete for binding at the same site. (D) Example traces for fragment 4, which was identified as one of the allosteric binders in this study.]

reproducible crystal growth and good-quality diffraction of crystals. From this crystallization screen, we here report cocrystal structures of \( \alpha_7 \)-AChBP with five different fragments bound (fragments 1–5, Table 2). The other remaining fragments produced either poorly diffracting crystals or no clear density for the fragment could be observed in the electron density map. The experimental SPR traces are shown in Fig. 2D for fragment 4, showing the lack of competition with \( d \)-tubocurarine, indicative of allosteric binding.

First, we took advantage of the bromine atom in fragment 1 to collect anomalous diffraction data, which allowed us to pinpoint the location of the bromine atoms in the electron density map.
Calculation of anomalous difference density maps reveals intense peaks (5σ) in all five subunits located near the N-terminal α-helix and weaker peaks just below the orthosteric binding site (Fig. S1). We first discuss binding to the N-terminal site. At this location, the anomalous density is visible to a level of 15σ and the contours of fragment 1 are further revealed by the simple electron density map, which allowed us to unambiguously assign the binding pose of the fragment (Fig. 3). Fig. 3A and B illustrates how fragment 1 forms a wedge between the N-terminal α-helix and the β2–β3 loop, opening up a pocket which we term the “top pocket.” Fig. 3D shows the electron density of the fragment in the binding site. Binding of fragment 1 to the top pocket is accompanied by a conformational change in the α-helix (K5 to K12), which moves inward by a distance of ~3 Å in the direction of the receptor vestibule (Fig. 3C). The top pocket is further exposed by a side-chain reorientation of residue L10, causing an induced fit to accommodate fragment 1. In this orientation, the bromophenyl moiety of the fragment points deep into the top pocket, forming van der Waals interactions with the carbonyl oxygen of L6 and L63 (indicated with dashed lines in Fig. 3D). Other interactions include residues L6, E9, Y62, L63, Y70, and Y76. In addition to the movement of the α-helix, there is also a reorientation of the loop connecting the β2- and β3-strands. Importantly, this region overlaps with the main immunogenic region in the α1-subunit of the muscle nAChR, which plays an important role in myasthenia gravis.

In addition to anomalous density peaks at the top site, we also observe peaks with weaker intensity, but still clearly visible at 5σ, just below the agonist binding site at all five interfaces (Fig. S1).

This result indicates that under the current crystallization conditions, fragment 1 likely binds with lower occupancy at this site compared with the top site. The anomalous density, combined with the simple electron density map (2Fo − Fc), allowed us to assign the second binding site for fragment 1 (Fig. 4A–C). At this location, which we term the “agonist subpocket,” fragment 1 binds just in between loop C and loop F, which are important determinants of ligand recognition (8, 10, 16, 28). Similar to binding at the top site, the bromophenyl moiety points into the pocket and forms interactions with the side chains of residues on the (+) subunit, including N92 and I94 (loop A) and K 141 (loop C), as well as residues on the (−) subunit, including Q35 and L36 (loop F) and I165. Importantly, the agonist subpocket overlaps with a possible binding site for the anesthetic ketamine in a cocrystal structure of the bacterial homolog GLIC (17, 30). Ketamine in GLIC was shown to cause channel inhibition and mutagenesis of residues involved in ketamine recognition demonstrated weaker ketamine binding as well as effects on channel gating, indicating that the binding site is functionally important and may offer an attractive target for development of novel allostERIC modulators (11, 17). In our study, we extend these observations and find a binding pose for fragment 1 that strongly resembles that of ketamine bound in GLIC (Fig. S2).

Fragment 1 binds to two allosteric binding sites in α7-AChBP; one is the top pocket and the second is the agonist subpocket. In addition, we identified two other fragments, fragments 2 and 3 (Fig. S3), which also occupy the top pocket. Both of these fragments are comparable in chemical structure to each other and adopt a binding pose that partially overlaps with fragment 1 at the top pocket. However, no electron density could be observed for fragment 2 or 3 at the agonist subpocket, indicating that these fragments bind specifically at the top pocket and not at the agonist subpocket.

![Fig. 4](link) Allosteric binding at the agonist subpocket and vestibule pocket in α7-AChBP. (A) α7-AChBP is shown in transparent surface and cartoon representation. The black dashed circle indicates the location of the agonist subpocket, which is occupied by fragment 1 right below the orthosteric binding site. (B) Detailed view of the overlapping agonist binding site and agonist subpocket. Lobeline and fragment 1 are shown in ball and stick presentation. (C) Detailed view of the amino acid interactions between fragment 1 and residues of the agonist subpocket. The green mesh is 2Fo − Fc density contoured at 1σ and the magenta mesh is anomalous difference density contoured at 5σ. (D) The location of the vestibule pocket is indicated with the black dashed circle. (E) Detailed view of the vestibule pocket, which is occupied by fragment 4. (F) Detailed view of the amino acid interactions between fragment 4 and residues of the vestibule pocket. The green mesh is 2Fo − Fc density contoured at 1σ and the magenta mesh is anomalous difference density contoured at 10σ.
Finally, we again took advantage of the bromine atoms in fragment 4 to collect anomalous diffraction data and map a third distinct binding site in α7-ACHBP. For this fragment, calculation of anomalous difference density maps clearly reveals two adjacent peaks (10σ) located in a pocket within each of the five subunits and facing the vestibule of the receptor (Fig. S4). Combined with the simple electron density map (2Fo − Fc) we were able to assign the binding pose for fragment 4, which is illustrated in Fig. 4 D–F. At this site, the fragment does not cause any significant conformational changes but rather occupies a preexisting cavity in α7-ACHBP, which we term the “vestibule pocket.” Similar to fragment 1, the bromine-containing moiety points into the pocket and forms extensive interactions mainly with residues within one (+) subunit, including F31, L33, F52, L54, P97, I119, and F142. Hydrogen bonds are formed with the backbone carbonyl of L88 and the side-chain atoms of Q121. Two additional interactions are formed with residues of the neighboring (−) subunit and include L100 and P102. Importantly, the vestibule pocket corresponds to a previously identified site in the bacterial homolog ELIC and is involved in positive allosteric modulation of ELIC by benzodiazepines (20, 31). Cysteine-scanning mutagenesis of residues involved in benzodiazepine recognition at this site in ELIC abolished channel modulation (20, 32). Additionally, modification of certain cysteine residues with (2-(biotinyl)amino)ethyl methanethiosulfonate mimicked the effect of benzodiazepines, indicating that occupancy of this pocket mediates positive allosteric modulation. In our study, we confirm the existence of this pocket in α7-ACHBP and demonstrate that a fragment with chemical composition different from benzodiazepines can occupy this pocket. This result suggests that compounds with different chemical composition can be designed to specifically target the vestibule pocket in different Cys-loop receptors. The importance of the vestibule pocket and the recognition of chemically diverse compounds at this site are further illustrated by the crystal structure of α7-ACHBP in complex with fragment 5 (Fig. S5).

In conclusion, five crystal structures of α7-ACHBP in complex with different allosteric binders have been described. These fragments were identified by a biophysical SPR screening approach specifically designed to identify allosteric binders. Overall, three allosteric sites were found as summarized in Fig. 5. Fragment 1 binds at two different sites: the top pocket, which was not identified before, and the subagonist pocket, which corresponds to the ketamine binding site in GLIC. Fragments 2 and 3 specifically bind at the top pocket. Fragments 4 and 5 bind at the vestibule pocket, which corresponds to the site involved in positive allosteric modulation of ELIC by benzodiazepines (17, 20). The sequence conservation between the α7 nAChR and <i>Lymnaea</i> AChBP at these sites is illustrated in Fig. S6.

**Functional Characterization of Fragment Binding at Allosteric Sites.**

The cocystal structures of α7-ACHBP in complex with five different allosteric binders raise an important question about whether these allosteric sites are functionally important in channel gating. Detailed functional characterization of these binders was carried out by using the two-electrode voltage clamp technique on <i>Xenopus</i> oocytes expressing the human α7 nAChR. Each fragment was tested in a concentration range according to their relatively low affinity from 3 μM to 3 mM and each concentration was coapplied with 1.3 mM acetylcholine (traces are shown in Fig. S7). We observed that all fragments cause a concentration-dependent inhibition of acetylcholine-induced responses of the α7 nAChR (Fig. 6 A and B). Fragment 5 was the most potent with an IC<sub>50</sub> value of 34 ± 6 μM (Table 3). Fragment 3 was the least potent with an IC<sub>50</sub> value of 398 ± 43 μM (Table 3). Fragment 4 gave a partial inhibitory effect, but the analysis of this fragment was complicated owing to solubility issues at millimolar concentrations.

Next, we investigated the effect of each fragment on the concentration-activation curve of acetylcholine. To accomplish this we coapplied a fixed concentration of fragment (IC<sub>50</sub> value) with increasing concentrations of acetylcholine. We observed that each fragment caused a decrease of the maximal current response of acetylcholine (Fig. 6C), which is indicative of a noncompetitive mechanism of action versus acetylcholine and is consistent with the crystal structures. A detailed overview of the Hill fit is given in Table 3.

Next, we investigated the role of each of the allosteric binding sites in mediating inhibitory responses by the fragments through site-directed mutagenesis. We did not consider the agonist subpocket because this site is targeted only by fragment 1, which also targets the top pocket. This complicates the interpretation of mutagenesis data, and therefore the agonist subpocket was not

![Fig. 5. Overview of the different allosteric binding sites discovered in α7-ACHBP. α7-ACHBP is shown in cartoon representation. Lobeline and different allosteric binders are presented as spheres. The orange ligand corresponds to lobeline and occupies the orthosteric binding site. The red ligand occupies the top pocket, the green ligand occupies the agonist subpocket, and the magenta ligand occupies the vestibule pocket.](image-url)
decrease of the maximal current, without any pronounced effect on the EC\textsubscript{50} concentration-activation curve of acetylcholine. All of the fragments cause a value, which is indicative for an allosteric effect and is consistent with the crystal structures.

Fig. 6. Functional characterization of allosteric binders on the human α7 nAChR. (A) Example traces of the α7 nAChR repetitively activated with a fixed concentration of acetylcholine (1.3 mM). Coapplication of increasing concentrations of fragment 1 causes a progressive decrease in the ACh-activated current. (B) Concentration-inhibition curves constructed from data shown in A. Error bars indicate SD. (C) Effect of each fragment on the concentration-activation curve of acetylcholine. All of the fragments cause a decrease of the maximal current, without any pronounced effect on the EC\textsubscript{50} value, which is indicative for an allosteric effect and is consistent with the crystal structures.

Further investigated. Our mutagenesis approach was to construct phenylalanine mutants at positions in each of the respective pockets that would cause steric hindrance with the fragment. Therefore, we constructed L7F and V78F in the top pocket and L35F and L92F in the vestibule pocket. Double mutants gave responses that were too small for reliable measurements. L92F gave no current responses, indicating this position is structurally important. L7F, V78F, and L35F were functional. Construction of concentration-activation curves for each mutant revealed that L7F and V78F have EC\textsubscript{50} values for ACh that are not significantly different from WT α7 nAChR (Tables S1 and S2). In contrast, L35F has an EC\textsubscript{50} value of 81 ± 5 μM compared with 154 ± 4 μM for WT, suggesting this site is functionally important.

The mutagenesis data are most convincing for L35F in the vestibule pocket. Fragments 4 and 5 have IC\textsubscript{50} values of 2,670 ± 497 μM and 173 ± 24 μM, respectively, compared with 70 ± 10 μM and 34 ± 6 μM on WT α7 nAChR, which provides strong evidence that the effects of these fragments are mediated through the vestibule pocket. For L7F in the top pocket, we observe that fragment 2 has an IC\textsubscript{50} value of 229 ± 11 μM compared with 132 ± 36 μM on WT, indicating a possible effect of this fragment through the top pocket. Other values on L7F were not significantly different or even lower than WT (Tables S1 and S2). For V78F in the top pocket, we did not observe significant changes. It should be remembered that site-directed mutagenesis is not without caveats, and the lack of activity difference in this case could be explained if the 78F side chain adopts an alternative rotamer pointing away from the pocket, thereby still allowing binding.

In conclusion, the mutagenesis data provide strong support for an inhibitory action of fragments 4 and 5 through the vestibule pocket and results for one mutant indicate action of fragment 2 through the top pocket.

Together, these data suggest that all of the allosteric binders reported in this study act as negative allosteric modulators on the α7 nAChR. Important to note is that fragments 4 and 5 bind in the vestibule pocket, which is a site involved in positive allosteric modulation of ELIC by benzodiazepines (17, 20). Therefore, we hypothesize that chemical optimization of our fragments, increasing their molecular weight, potency, and number and type of interactions, could lead to a modification in functional activity and cause positive allosteric modulation of the α7 nAChR.

**Discussion**

Channel opening of the α7 nAChR and other Cys-loop receptors is associated with a conformational transition from a resting nonconductive state to an activated state that opens the channel pore. This transition is typically triggered by binding of an agonist at the orthosteric binding site. Allosteric modulation is defined as the process that modifies the energetic barrier between the resting and activated state and that is caused by binding of a molecule at a site that is different from the orthosteric binding site. PAMs lower the energetic barrier for channel opening and cause potentiation of the evoked current, whereas negative allosteric modulators increase the energetic barrier and inhibit the channel response. From a structural perspective, detailed insight into the molecular determinants of modulator recognition derives from several homologous ion channels, including the prokaryote Cys-loop receptor GLIC and the invertebrate glutamate-gated ion channel GluCl. First, general anesthetics such as desflurane and propofol act as negative allosteric modulators of nAChRs (4, 24), as well as GLIC (4, 25). Cocrystal structures of GLIC with these anesthetics reveal that the binding site for propofol and desflurane is located in the upper part of the transmembrane domain in a preexisting cavity between the M1 and M4 transmembrane helices of each protomer (22, 25). In addition, ethanol acts as a positive allosteric modulator of different ligand-gated ion channels, including nAChRs (23, 26) and GABA\textsubscript{A}
receptors (27) as well as the ethanol-sensitized F14-A mutant of GLIC (28). The crystal structure of GLIC in complex with ethanol shows that this allosteric binding site is located at an intersubunit transmembrane cavity formed by M1–M2 transmembrane helices of one subunit and M2–M3 transmembrane helices of the neighboring subunit (28). The ethanol binding site overlaps with the binding site for the anthelmintic ivermectin, which is considered as an allosteric agonist of different Cys-loop receptors, including the α7 nAChR (30), and has been co-crystallized with GluCl (11). Next, ketamine is considered as a non-competitive antagonist of NMDA receptors (31) as well nAChRs (32) and its allosteric site has been revealed in a co-crystal structure of GLIC (17). Here, ketamine binds in the extracellular ligand-binding domain at an intersubunit cavity that partially overlaps with the agonist binding site (17) and corresponds to the agonist subpocket described and occupied by our allosteric fragment 1 in this paper. Specifically for the α7 nAChR, positive allosteric modulators are further subdivided into so-called type I and type II modulators (4). Type I PAMs, for example NS-1738, mainly potentiate the peak current response evoked by the agonist ACh, whereas type II PAMs, for example PNU-120596, both potentiate the peak current response and alter the time course (4). Structural data for type I or II PAMs on the α7 nAChR are currently lacking, but a chimeric study has revealed that the binding site for type I PAMs is located in the extracellular domain, whereas the action of type II PAMs relies in part on the M2–M3 loop (22). We note that NS-1738 and our fragments 2 and 3 share a similar and simple linear geometry. A central urea functionality separates two distal monocyclic rings. The close structural similarity prompts speculation whether NS-1738 binds at the same site as 2 and 3, albeit eliciting the opposite functional effect.

In this study, we have overcome the limitations of distant ion channel homologs such as GLIC and GluCl and carried out a combined fragment screen and structural characterization to identify allosteric binding sites in α7-ACHBP, which is a reliable mimic of the extracellular domain of the α7 nAChR (23). We found that allosteric binders can localize to three different sites in the extracellular domain. One allosteric site is surface-exposed and is located near the N-terminal α-helix of the extracellular domain. At this site, allosteric binding causes a conformational change in the fragment, which can be observed between the first and a loop homologous to the main immunogenic region of the muscle α1 subunit. A second site is located in the vestibule of the receptor, in a preexisting intrasubunit pocket opposite the agonist binding site and corresponds to a previously identified site involved in positive allosteric modulation of the bacterial homolog ELIC. A third site is located at a pocket right below the agonist binding site and corresponds to a binding site for the anesthetic ketamine in the bacterial homolog GLIC. It is possible that one of the allosteric sites identified in α7-ACHBP in this study corresponds to the allosteric binding site for type I PAMs in the α7 nAChR (22).

In conclusion, this work unveils novel allosteric binding sites in the extracellular domain of the α7 nAChR and paves the way for further development of novel allosteric modulators with therapeutic potential.

Methods

Protein Expression and Crystallization. The α7-ACHBP chimera (23) was expressed as a C-terminal His6x fusion using a synthetic gene (Genscript) with optimized codon use for expression in insect cells. The cDNA was cloned into the pFastBac vector and bacmid DNA was produced according to the manufacturer’s guidelines of the Bac-to-Bac expression system (Invitrogen). Protein was expressed by addition of baculovirus to a Spodoptera frugiperda SF21 cell culture at a cell density of 1 million cells per milliliter and a multiplicity of infection of around 1. Cell culture medium was harvested 72 h after infection by centrifugation at 10,000 × g and α7-ACHBP was purified by incubation of the medium with Ni Sepharose 6 Fast Flow beads (GE Healthcare). Beads were washed with buffer containing 20 mM Tris (pH 8.0), 300 mM NaCl, and 40 mM imidazole. α7-ACHBP was eluted with the same buffer plus 100 mM imidazole, 200 mM sodium chloride, and 10% glycerol. The protein was expressed by addition of baculovirus to a cell culture medium harvested 72 h after infection by centrifugation at 10,000 × g and α7-ACHBP was purified by incubation of the medium with Ni Sepharose 6 Fast Flow beads (GE Healthcare). Beads were washed with buffer containing 20 mM Tris (pH 8.0), 300 mM NaCl, and 40 mM imidazole. α7-ACHBP was eluted with the same buffer plus 100 mM imidazole, 200 mM sodium chloride, and 10% glycerol.

For crystallization screening, α7-ACHBP was mixed with a-lobeline hydrochloride (Sigma-Aldrich) at a final concentration of 1 mM and fragment at a final concentration of 10 mM. Fragments 1–5 were obtained from commercial compound vendors. The respective CAS numbers were CAS1242098–5–6, CAS893019–25–5, CAS57599–26–9, CAS186956–98–9, and CAS206749–62–4. Sitting-drop vapor diffusion crystallization screens were set up using a Mosquito nanoliter crystallization robot (TTP Labtech) and crystal growth was monitored by automated imaging in a Rocker (Formulatrix). Crystals grew at 20 °C in the presence of solution composed of 200 mM potassium/sodium tartrate and 20% PEG3350 or 200 mM sodium malonate and 20% PEG3350. Crystals were cryoprotected by addition of 30% (mass/vol) glycerol to the mother liquor and immersed in liquid nitrogen before storage and transportation.

Structure Determination. X-ray diffraction datasets obtained during the course of this study were collected at the PROXIMA-1 beam line of the SOLEIL synchrotron or the PX-II beam line of the Swiss Light Source. Diffraction data were processed with XDS (33) and scaled in Scala of the CCP4 suite (34). Structure solution was obtained using molecular replacement with Phaser or Molrep (34) and the published α7-ACHBP structure (23) as a search model (PDB ID code 3SQ6). Automated structure building was carried out with the Autobuild rebuild in place feature of PHENIX (35). Iterative cycles of structure refinement and manual rebuilding were carried out in PHENIX (35) and Coot (36), respectively. Structure validation was done with Molprobity (37) and figures were prepared in Pymol (Schrodinger).

SPR Screening. A Biacore 4000 instrument (GE Healthcare) was used for fragment screening. The proteins were immobilized on a CMS chip by amine coupling using standard procedures and materials (GE Healthcare). α7-ACHBP was immobilized on spot 4 and spot 5 in all flow cells. Capitella ACHBP was immobilized on spot 1. Spot 2 was unmodified and used as reference. α7-ACHBP was prepared as 0.15 mg/mL in 10 mM Heps, pH 7.0 (Sigma), and injected for 10 min over activated carboxylated dextran surfaces (NHS/EDC). Capitella ACHBP was prepared as 0.15 mg/mL in 10 mM acetate, pH 5.0 (GE Healthcare), and injected for 10 min over activated carboxylated dextran surfaces (NHS/EDC). The surface was deactivated by 1 M ethanolamine, pH 8.5.

The interaction experiments were performed at 25 °C (PBS, Sigma), with addition of 0.05% Tween 20 (Sigma) and 1% (vol/vol) DMSO (Sigma), was used as assay buffer. Fragments were injected for 15 s at 200 μL/min using a flow rate of 30 μL/min. All samples were also injected in mixture with 10 μM d-tubocurarine. Negative controls (buffer) and positive controls (10 μM d-tubocurarine and 500 μM acetylcholine) were injected every 40th sample cycle. The orthosteric binding site was blocked by a capture injection of 10 μM α-bungarotoxin (Toxin) every 20th cycle over spot 5 (α7-ACHBP). Signals arising from interactions with the sensor surface matrix were removed by subtraction of signals from the unmodified reference surface.

Biacore 4000 evaluation software was used for the analysis of screening data. Report point tables were exported as text files and further calculations were made in Excel (Microsoft).

The degree of competition with d-tubocurarine (DoC Tub oc) was calculated using Eq. 1, where R represents signals not normalized for molecular weight (MW). The signal for the Competitor (R Competitor) was normalized to 100.

$$ DoC_{\text{Tub oc}} = 1 - (\frac{R_{\text{Runblocked}} - R_{\text{Tuboc}}}{R_{\text{Fragment}}}) $$

The degree of competition with α-bungarotoxin (DoC Chunga) was defined as the relative difference between the scaled signals from the blocked and nonblocked protein using Eq. 2, where 4.3 represents a scaling factor compensating for the remaining surface activity of the blocked surface.

$$ DoC_{\text{Chunga}} = R_{\text{Runblocked}} - R_{\text{Chunga}}/4.3/R_{\text{Fragment}} $$

The degree of competition with α-bungarotoxin (DoC Chunga) was defined as the relative difference between the scaled signals from the blocked and nonblocked protein using Eq. 2, where 4.3 represents a scaling factor compensating for the remaining surface activity of the blocked surface.
non-blocked protein using Eq. 4, where SC is a scaling factor ranging between 4 and 5 for different experiments, compensating for the remaining surface activity of the blocked surface.

\[
\text{DoC}_{\text{unimp}} = 100 \% \left(1 - \left(\frac{\text{R}_{\text{blocked}}}{\text{R}_{\text{non-blocked}}}\right)\right).
\]

[4] Negative values of the DoC were replaced by 0.0 before ranking. Test compounds showing signals less than one-third of the signal from the reference were discarded together with test compounds showing signals more than five times the signal from the reference.

Hits were ranked-order by use of a multiplicative Paretone ranking as implemented in the Erl Wood community nodes in Knime 2.5.1, based on the MW-normalized responses from the blocked surfaces in combination with the calculated degree of competition.

The hits from the primary screen were tested in dose–response by injecting the fragments for 15 s at 1.23–300 μM (1.2 dilution series from 300 μM) using a flow rate of 30 μL/min. Samples at 100 μM were also injected in mixture with 10 μM d-tubocurarine. Negative controls (buffer) and positive controls (10 μM d-tubocurarine) were injected every 24th sample cycle. Furthermore, the orthosteric binding site of α7-ACHBP immobilized on spot 5 was blocked by a capture injection of 10 μM α-bungarotoxin (Tocris) every 24th cycle over spot 5 (α7-ACHBP). Replicate experiments were performed similarly but using a 1.95–500 μM 1:1 dilution series of the fragments. Sample at 250 μM were also injected in mixture with 10 μM d-tubocurarine. Data analysis for the dose–response experiments was performed similarly as described above. Apparent affinities were determined by nonlinear regression analysis of dose–response data obtained at the Binding Early report points from reference-subtracted sensorgrams using the Sprint software (Beactica AB), accounting for nonspecific binding.

Electrophysiological Recordings. All experiments were carried out on human α7 nAChRs expressed in Xenopus oocytes using the method of cDNA or cRNA expression, as described before (38). All mutant receptors were constructed using a QuikChange strategy and verified by sequencing. cRNA was synthesized using the T7 nMESSAGE/nMACHINE transcription kit (Ambion). Xenopus oocytes were prepared and injected using standard procedures. Briefly, oocytes were harvested from Xenopus laevis females that had been deeply anaesthetized by cooling to 4 °C and with MS-222 (150 mg/l). Once anaesthetized the animal was decapitated following the rules of animal rights from the Geneva canton. A small piece of ovary was isolated for immediate preparation and the remaining part was placed at 4 °C in a sterile Barth solution containing (in millimolar) NaCl 88, KCl 1, NaHCO3 2.4, Heps 10, MgSO4·7H2O 0.82, Ca(NO3)2 4 H2O 0.33, CaCl2·6 H2O 0.41 (pH 7.4), and supplemented with 20 μg/ml of Kanamycine, 100 units/mL penicillin, and 100 μg/ml streptomycin. Injections of WT α7 nACH cDNA and mutant α7 nACH cRNA were performed in ≥100 oocytes using a proprietary automated injection device. Receptor expression was examined at least 2 d later.

Oocytes were impaled with two electrodes and their membrane potential maintained at ~80 mV throughout the experiment. ACh was prepared as a concentrated stock solution (100 μM) in water and diluted in the recording medium to obtain the desired test concentration. Fragments were prepared as stock solutions in DMSO and diluted to the desired concentrations immediately before the experiment. All recordings were performed at 18 °C and cells were superfused with OR2 medium containing (in millimolar) NaCl 82.5, KCl 2.5, Heps 5, CaCl2·2 H2O 1.8, MgCl2·6 H2O 1 (pH 7.4). Currents evoked by ACh were recorded using an automated process equipped with standard two-electrode voltage clamp configuration. Data were captured and analyzed using a HOScreen proprietary data acquisition and analysis software running under MATLAB (The MathWorks, Inc.). All experiments were carried out using at least three cells and statistical analysis was performed either with Excel (Microsoft) or MATLAB. Plots of the peak inward currents as a function of the logarithm of the agonist concentration yield classical concentration-activation and concentration-inhibition curves that are readily fitted by single Hill equations.
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Fig. S1. Anomalous difference maps for α7-AChBP in complex with fragment 1. The magenta mesh represents the bromine anomalous difference density contoured at 5σ for α7-AChBP in complex with the bromine-containing fragment 1. This figure illustrates strong density for fragment 1 at the top site and somewhat weaker density at the agonist subpocket.
Fig. S2. Comparison of fragment 1 bound at the agonist subpocket in (A) α7-AChBP with the ketamine binding site in (B) GLIC. The agonist subpocket binding site for fragment 1 just below the agonist binding site corresponds to a previously described binding site for ketamine in GLIC (PDB ID code 4F8H).
Fig. S3. Comparison of fragments (A) 1, (B) 2, and (C) 3 bound at the top pocket.
Fig. S4. Anomalous difference maps for α7-AChBP in complex with fragment 4. The magenta mesh represents the bromine anomalous difference density contoured at 10σ for α7-AChBP in complex with the bromine-containing fragment 4. This figure illustrates strong densities for fragment 4 at the vestibule site.
Fig. S5. Comparison of fragments (A) 4 and (B) 5 bound in the vestibule pocket of α7-AChBP.
Fig. S6. Sequence conservation in the three allosteric binding sites identified in this study. The α7-AChBP chimera is shown in cartoon representation and blue regions correspond to residues originating from the α7 nAChR (UniProt accession code P36544), whereas orange regions correspond to residues from Lymnaea AChBP (UniProt accession code P58154). The amino acid residues that shape the binding site are shown in ball and stick representation. For the top pocket, all residues originate from the α7 nAChR. For the agonist subpocket, all residues originate from the α7 nAChR, except for one residue, I94, which is an Asp residue in the α7 nAChR. For the vestibule pocket, most residues on the outer rim of the pocket belong to Lymnaea AChBP, whereas the residues deeper inside the pocket belong to the α7 nAChR.
Fig. S7. Electrophysiological recordings from *Xenopus* oocytes expressing the α7 nAChR. Two-electrode voltage clamp recordings were obtained from *Xenopus* oocytes expressing the human α7 nAChR. Receptors were activated with a fixed concentration of 1.3 mM acetylcholine and coapplication was carried out with a range of concentrations (3–3,000 μM) of fragment.

| Table S1. Mutagenesis of the top pocket and vestibule pocket: Concentration-activation curve parameters |
|-------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Parameter                                      | WT             | L7F            | V78F           | L35F           | L92F           |
| EC50, μM                                       | 154 ± 4        | 116 ± 21       | 166 ± 24       | 81 ± 5         | —              |
| Hill coefficient                               | 1.52 ± 0.01    | 1.24 ± 0.04    | 1.81 ± 0.07    | 1.63 ± 0.06    | —              |
| Maximal current amplitude, μA                  | 6.6 ± 0.6      | 0.5 ± 0.2      | 5.6 ± 0.7      | 8.1 ± 0.8      | N.C.           |
| No. of experiments                             | 5              | 6              | 6              | 6              | 3              |

N.C., no current.
Table S2. Mutagenesis of the top pocket and vestibule pocket: Concentration-inhibition curve parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ WT, μM</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ L7F, μM</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ V78F, μM</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ L35F, μM</th>
<th>IC$_{50}$ L92F, μM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>42 ± 12</td>
<td>77 ± 14</td>
<td>67 ± 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>132 ± 36</td>
<td>229 ± 11*</td>
<td>127 ± 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>398 ± 43</td>
<td>214 ± 26</td>
<td>404 ± 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70 ± 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,670 ± 497**</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34 ± 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>173 ± 24***</td>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.C., no current. *P < 0.05, **P < 0.0005, ***P < 0.0002 compared with WT.