



2015

# Modeling ATP-Binding Cassette G2 (ABCG2) Substrate Specificity

Raghav D. Acharya

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Aurijit Sarkar

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Glen E. Kellogg

*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/uresposters>

 Part of the [Integrative Biology Commons](#), and the [Molecular Biology Commons](#)

© The Author(s)

## Downloaded from

Acharya, Raghav D.; Sarkar, Aurijit; and Kellogg, Glen E., "Modeling ATP-Binding Cassette G2 (ABCG2) Substrate Specificity" (2015). *Undergraduate Research Posters*. Poster 130.  
<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/uresposters/130>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Undergraduate Research Posters by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).





## Modeling ATP-Binding Cassette G2 (ABCG2) Substrate Specificity

Raghav D. Acharya<sup>1</sup>, Aurijit Sarkar<sup>2</sup>, and Glen E. Kellogg<sup>2\*</sup>


Department of Biology,<sup>1</sup> and Department of Medicinal Chemistry<sup>2</sup>, VCU, Richmond, VA

### Abstract

- Cancer estimates for USA in 2015:
  - 1.6 million new cases,
  - half a million deaths [1]
  - majority of deaths due to resistance to chemotherapy [2]
- ATP-binding cassette (ABC) efflux transporters (e.g., ABCG2)
  - overexpressed in chemotherapy-resistant cancer cells
  - Anticancer drugs are prone to efflux
- What we need:
  - identify substrate and non-substrate chemotypes
  - gain a structural understanding of the efflux mechanism

**Aim: Understand ABCG2 structure and function**


### Introduction



**Why are certain compounds effluxed while others are not?**


### Method

#### Discrimination Analysis



$$\text{Target property} = ax + by + cz + k$$

Where:  
a, b & c are correlation coefficients  
x, y & z are independent properties



### References


- (1) American Cancer Society "facts and figures 2015" [www.cancer.org/research/cancerfactsstatistics/cancerfactsfigures2015/index](http://www.cancer.org/research/cancerfactsstatistics/cancerfactsfigures2015/index) (accessed March 30, 2014).
- (2) Gottesman, M. M. et al. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **2002**, 2, 48–58.
- (3) Hazai, E. et al. *BMC Bioinformatics* **2013**, 14, 130.
- (B) Sugimoto et al. *Mol Cancer Ther* **2003**, 2(1): 105-112
- (C) Rosenberg, M. F. et al. *Structure* **2010**, 18(4), 482–493.

### Descriptors Used

Our Model
LogP (I)
Length (II)
Width (III)
Binding Energy (IV)
Atom Count (V)
Radius of Gyration (VI)
[3]
3D Morse signal 17/ weighed by mass
3D Morse signal 25/ weighed by mass
Gateway R autocorrelation of lag2 weighed by mass
Spherosity
Mean information on atomic composition


Lucid descriptors are capable of producing predictive models.

● Non Substrate ● Substrate



Descriptors encompass physico-chemical properties as well as efflux mechanism information.

### Results



Our models are significantly better ( $p < 0.01$ )

	Accuracy	fS	fNS
[3]	68.9 ± 4.9%	71.2 ± 7.1%	65.9 ± 14.8%
<b>This work</b>	<b>75.6 ± 4.7%</b>	<b>76.2 ± 6.5%</b>	<b>72.5 ± 11.1%</b>
Atom count	66.4 ± 5.2%	68.9 ± 7.1%	62.8 ± 17.1%
Binding energy	68.5 ± 5.4%	67.9 ± 5.8%	73.4 ± 13.9%
Radius Of Gyration	64.8 ± 4.7%	65.9 ± 5.9%	63.2 ± 19.3%
Length	65.3 ± 6.3%	67.7 ± 7.8%	50.2 ± 26.4%
Width	65.2 ± 5.4%	66.3 ± 6.5%	59.8 ± 23.1%
LogP	65.8 ± 6.1%	67.6 ± 7.2%	58.9 ± 26.3%

fS: fraction of substrates predicted correctly; fNS: fraction of non-substrates predicted correctly; Accuracy: fraction of dataset correctly predicted; Values shown in table represent Mean ± Standard Deviation of external validation set from 100 runs of SVM.

### Discussion

- SVM model capable of discriminating between substrates and nonsubstrates with a median accuracy of 76.05% and an Interquartile range of 7.04%.
- Accuracy highly dependent on composition of training, test and external validation sets.
- Insights into efflux mechanism – role of Arg482 in substrate recognition suggested by significant difference in binding energy between substrates and non substrates.

### Implications

- Discriminant models are noisy – understanding of the structural mechanism of efflux might lead to better models.
- More experimental data needed – might make for a better predictive model.

### Future directions

- Glean structural information on ABCG2-mediated efflux to improve model.

### Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the Mary Louise Andrews Award from the Virginia Academy of Science.