Influence of substituent modifications on the binding of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines to cytosine opposite an AP site in DNA duplexes: thermodynamic characterization
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ABSTRACT

Here, we report on a significant effect of substituents on the binding affinity of a series of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines, i.e., 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridine (AND), 2-amino-7-methyl-1,8-naphthyridine (AMND), 2-amino-5,7-dimethyl-1,8-naphthyridine (ADMND) and 2-amino-5,6,7-trimethyl-1,8-naphthyridine (ATMND), all of which can bind to cytosine opposite an AP site in DNA duplexes. Fluorescence titration experiments show that the binding affinity for cytosine is effectively enhanced by the introduction of methyl groups to the naphthyridine ring, and the 1:1 binding constant \(K = 10^6 \text{M} \cdot \text{L} / \text{mol}\) follows in the order of AND \(< AMND < ADMND < ATMND\) in solutions containing 110 mM Na⁺ (pH 7.0, at 20 °C). The thermodynamic parameters obtained by isothermal titration calorimetry experiments indicate that the introduction of methyl groups effectively reduces the loss of binding entropy, which is indeed responsible for the increase in the binding affinity. The heat capacity change \(\Delta C_p\), as determined from temperature dependence of the binding enthalpy, is found to be significantly different between AND \((−161 \text{cal/mol} K)\) and ATMND \((−217 \text{cal/mol} K)\). The hydrophobic contribution appears to be a key force to explain the observed effect of substitutions on the binding affinity when the observed binding free energy \(\Delta G_{\text{obs}}\) is dissected into its component terms.

INTRODUCTION

The chemistry of DNA-binding drugs and/or small ligands is of ongoing interest due to their promising functions and biological activities, including their anticancer properties and ability to regulate gene expression (1–4). Besides the anthracycline antibiotics doxorubicin and daunorubicin, many DNA-binding molecules have been developed as effective pharmaceutical agents, especially in cancer chemotherapy (5–7). Another class of DNA-binding molecules is useful stain agents for nucleic acids, and typical of such molecules are ethidium and Hoechst 33258 (8–9). Of particular interest to us is a class of ligands applicable to gene analysis (10,11), especially single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) typing (12).

We have recently found a series of aromatic ligands that can selectively bind to a nucleobase opposite an abasic site (AP site) in DNA duplexes, and we have proposed a new strategy of ligand-based fluorescence assay for SNP typing (Figure 1A) (13–23). In contrast to typical DNA binding such as intercalation or groove binding (24,25), it is characteristic of ligands to bind to non-Watson–Crick base-pairing sites in DNA duplexes, where the binding is selectively promoted by a pseudo-base pairing along the Watson–Crick edge of the intrahelical target nucleobases (cf. Figure 7). Successful examples of this class of ligands are the mismatch-binding molecules developed by Nakatani and co-workers, and a surface plasmon resonance (SPR) assay has been proposed based on these molecules for the detection of mismatched base pairs in heteroduplexes (26–28). In our approach, on the other hand, we have paid attention to the AP site as a binding
cavity for effective ligand–nucleobase interactions; while naturally occurring AP site is one of the most common forms of DNA damages (29), we have incorporated a chemically stable AP site in a probe DNA so as to orient the AP site toward a target nucleobase (Figure 1A). Such AP sites in the duplex provide a unique binding pocket that allows a direct contact of ligands to nucleobases via hydrogen bonding (cf. Figure 7), where the ligand is further stacked with two nucleobases flanking the AP site. Useful affinity and selectivity for target nucleobases opposite the AP site has been indeed obtained by various kinds of heterocyclic planar compounds, including cytosine selective 2-amino-7-methyl-1,8-naphthyridine (AMND, Figure 1B) (13,14), guanine selective 2-amino-6,7-dimethyl-4-hydroxypteridine (15), adenine selective alloxazine (16) and thymine selective amiloride (17), riboflavin (18). All of these ligands show a complexation-induced fluorescence signaling, and SNP genotype of samples can be clearly distinguished by combining ligands with selectivity for respective target nucleobases.

Simple substituent modification of the parent ring was found to be quite effective for tuning the binding affinity and selectivity when designing such AP site-binding ligands. In the case of pteridines capable of selectively binding to guanine, for example, the binding affinity of the parent ligand, 2-amino-4-hydroxypteridine, was found to be quite effective for tuning the binding affinity with selectivity for respective target nucleobases.
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Melting temperature measurements

Absorbance of DNA was measured at 260 nm as a function of temperature using an UV-vis spectrophotometer Model UV-2450 (Shimadzu Corp., Kyoto, Japan) equipped with a thermoelectrically temperature-controlled micro multicell holder (8 cells; optical path length = 1 mm). The temperature ranged from 2°C to 92°C with a heating rate of 1.0°C/min. The resulting absorbance versus temperature curve was analyzed by a differential method to determine $T_m$ values.

Determination of binding constants by fluorescence titrations

To determine the 1:1 binding constant ($K_{11}$), fluorescence spectra of ligands were measured at 20°C with a JASCO FP-6500 spectrophotometer (Japan Spectroscopic Co. Ltd., Tokyo, Japan) equipped with a thermoelectrically temperature-controlled micro multicell holder (quartz cuvette, 3 mm x 3 mm). Typically, in the case of ATMND titration, the ligand concentration was fixed at 500 nM, and the concentration of DNA duplex ranged from 0 to 2.5 μM. The changes in fluorescence intensity at 403 nm (maximum wavelength) were monitored as a function of duplex concentration. The resulting titration curve was analyzed by nonlinear least-squares regression based on a 1:1 binding isotherm (35):

$$F/F_0 = \frac{1 + kK_{11}[D]}{1 + K_{11}[D]} \quad (1)$$

where $F$ and $F_0$ are the observed fluorescence intensities of ligand in the presence and absence of DNA duplexes, respectively, and $k (= k_{11}/k_1)$ represents the ratio of proportionality constants connecting the fluorescence intensities and concentrations of the species (1:1 complex: $k_{11}$, free ligand: $k_1$). The free duplex concentration, [D], can be related to known total concentrations of duplex (D_0) and ligand (L_0) by the following equation:

$$D_0 = [D] + [L_0K_{11}[D]]/(1 + K_{11}[D]) \quad (2)$$

Together, Equations (1) and (2) describe the system.

Salt dependence of the binding constants

The effect of different NaCl concentrations on the 1:1 binding constants was examined at 20°C (pH 7.0) by fluorescence titration experiments, as described above, and analyzed according to the polyelectrolyte theory by Record et al. (36) The observed salt dependence of the binding constants is explained by the following relationship:

$$\delta \log K_{11}/\delta \log [\text{Na}^+] = -Z\psi = SK$$

where $Z$ is the apparent charge on the ligand, and $\psi$ is the proportion of counterions associated with each DNA phosphate group. The slope (SK) of the plot, which is equivalent to the number of counterions released from DNA upon ligand binding, was obtained from lines of best linear least squares fit, and was used to evaluate the polyelectrolyte contribution ($\Delta G_{pe}$) to the observed binding free energy ($\Delta G_{obs}$) using the relationship (36):

$$\Delta G_{pe} = -(SK)RT\ln[\text{Na}^+]$$

The nonpolyelectrolyte contribution ($\Delta G_i$) was then given by the following equation (37):

$$\Delta G_{obs} = \Delta G_{pe} + \Delta G_i$$

Isothermal titration calorimetry

ITC experiments were carried out using a Microcal VP-ITC calorimeter (Microcal Inc., Northampton, MA, USA). The Origin software (Microcal) was used for data acquisition and analysis. All solutions were degassed by stirring under vacuum before use. Typically, the reference cell contained deionized water, and a titration was done at 20°C so that 15 μl of ligand solution were added (a total of 17 injections) to 1.43 ml of DNA solution in the sample cell. The injection time was 30 s, and the interval between injections was 300 s. In order to remove any air bubbles in the tip of syringe, the initial injection was set as 5 μl and the resulting peak was neglected in the analysis. The peaks produced during titration were converted into heat output per injection by integration and correction for the cell volume and sample concentration. The heats of dilution for the addition of ligand into buffer solution were determined independently, and the net enthalpy for ligand–DNA interactions was determined by subtraction of the heats of dilution. The data thus obtained were best fitted to a model that assumed a single set of identical binding sites, giving binding enthalpies and stoichiometries.

Heat capacity measurements

ITC titration experiments were carried out at four temperatures between 5°C and 20°C, and the binding enthalpies were determined as described above. From the observed temperature dependence of the binding enthalpy, the change in heat capacity, $\Delta C_p$, was determined according to the relationship:

$$\Delta C_p = \delta(\Delta H)/\delta T$$
The obtained value of $\Delta C_p$ was then used to estimate the hydrophobic contribution ($\Delta G_{hyd}$) according to the relationship of Record et al. (38):

$$\Delta G_{hyd} = 80(\pm 10) \times \Delta C_p$$

**Preparation and analysis of PCR products**

Asymmetric PCR (52,53) amplification of 107-meric sense or antisense strands of $K$-ras gene (codon 12) (54) was done with a 20-meric forward primer (5'-GACTGAAATAAACTTTGTG-3') and a 20-meric reverse primer (5'-CATT GTTGG ATCAT ATTCG-3'). The reaction solution (100 µl) contained dNTPs (0.2 mM each), 10 × PCR buffer (10 µl; TakaraR), forward primer (300 pmol or 20 pmol), reverse primer (20 pmol or 300 pmol), template (0.5 ng) and Taq (2.5 U; Takara Hot Start Version).

PCR conditions: 94°C for 5 min, followed by 40 cycles of 94°C for 30 s, 52°C for 30 s and 72°C for 30 s, and then 72°C for 7 min and kept at 4°C. The 107-meric PCR product: sense strand, 5'-GACTG AATAT AAAC T TGTGG TAGTT GGAGC TATG GTTGG ATCAT ATTCG-3'; antisense, 5'-CTATT GTTGG ATCAT ATTCG TCCAC AAAAT GATTC TGAAT TAGCT GTATC G TCAA GCCAC TCTTG CCAAG CAGCT CC-3' (N = G, C, A, or T).

After PCR amplification, an aliquot (40 µl) from the PCR product was buffered to pH 7.0 with 100 mM sodium cacodylate containing EDTA (1.6 mM). Then, ATMND (50 nM), and a 20-meric AP site-containing probe oligonucleotide (5.0 µM) were added (for sense strand analysis, 5'-GCT CCG GCC GCA CTC GCT TGG-3'; for antisense strand analysis, 5'-GCC CCG GCA CTC GCT TGG-3', X = AP site; dSpacer). Fluorescence spectrums of the resulting solutions (50 µl) were then measured at 5°C with a JASCO FP-6500 spectrophotometer equipped with a thermoelectrically temperature controlled cell holder (quartz cuvette: 3 mm × 3 mm); the slits for the excitation and emission monochromators were 5 and 5 nm, respectively.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

First, we examined the binding of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines to cytosine in an 11-mer AP site-containing DNA duplex [5'-TCC AGX GCA AC-3'/3'-AGG TCC GTG-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine]. As shown in Figure 2, all melting curves of the duplex give a sigmoidal shape typical for the thermal denaturation of DNA duplexes. In the absence of ligands (curve a), $T_m$ value of the duplex is determined as 30.5°C from the first derivative of the melting curve. In the presence of ligands (curves b-e), an increase in $T_m$ is clearly observed, indicating that each ligand is incorporated into the AP site by the binding to cytosine, which results in an increase in the thermal stability of the DNA duplex. The stabilization by ATMND is the most significant as compared to that of the other three ligands, where the $T_m$ increases by as much as 20.6°C (curve e), and the $\Delta T_m$ follows in the order of ADMND (+17.4°C) > AMND (+13.6°C) > AND (+10.8°C). It is therefore highly likely that the binding affinity of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines strongly depends on the number of methyl groups attached to the mother ring, and ATMND, having three methyl groups, shows the strongest binding affinity among these ligands.

The examination by fluorescence titration experiments clearly supports the above consideration. Figure 3 shows a typical fluorescence response of 2-amino-5,6,7-trimethyl-1,8-naphthyridine (ATMND, 500 nM) to cytosine in a 21-meric AP site-containing DNA duplex [5'-GCA GCT CCC GXX GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA GGG CTC CAG AGG AGC-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine], as measured in solutions containing 110 mM Na+ (pH 7.0, at 20°C). While almost no response is observed for a fully complementary duplex (500 nM, 5'-GCA GCT CCC GGG GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA GGG CTC CAG AGG AGC-5'), ATMND shows significant quenching in the presence of the AP site-containing duplex, indicating that the binding event is taking place at the AP site. The other three 1,8-naphthyridines (ADMND, AMND and AND) also show fluorescence quenching upon binding to cytosine in the AP site-containing duplex (Supplementary Figure S1). For all ligands, the response is concentration-dependent, which is well analyzed by nonlinear least-squares regression based on a 1:1 binding isotherm (inset of Figure 3,
and Supplementary Figure S1). The 1:1 binding constants $K_{11}$ for cytosine thus obtained are summarized in Table 1.

As compared to AND having no methyl groups, the introduction of even one methyl group is effective for increasing the binding affinity, and the resulting ligand, AMND, shows an affinity for cytosine with one order of magnitude higher ($K_{11} = 2.7 \times 10^8 \text{M}^{-1}$) than that of AND ($K_{11} = 0.30 \times 10^8 \text{M}^{-1}$). The binding affinity is further enhanced for ADMND having two methyl groups ($K_{11} = 6.1 \times 10^8 \text{M}^{-1}$), and the affinity does reach $19 \times 10^8 \text{M}^{-1}$ for ATMDND. As for the binding to other three nucleobases (Figure 4), the binding affinity for thymine is also enhanced effectively by the introduction of methyl groups $[K_{11}/10^6 \text{M}^{-1} (n = 3): \text{AND}: 0.12 \pm 0.01, \text{AMND}: 0.98 \pm 0.09, \text{ADMND}: 2.4 \pm 0.2, \text{ATMDND}: 9.1 \pm 0.3]$, and the binding selectivity for pyrimidines over purines remains unchanged from AND to ATMDND. Significantly, the magnitude of binding affinity of ATMND for cytosine is stronger than that of typical intercalators such as ethidium (0.1 $\times 10^6 \text{M}^{-1}$, in 0.2 M NaCl, pH 7.0, at 25°C (25) or actinomycin (3.8 $\times 10^6 \text{M}^{-1}$, in 0.1 M NaCl, pH 7.0, at 10°C (39), and is almost comparable to that of groove binders such as distamycin (36 $\times 10^6 \text{M}^{-1}$, in 30 mM NaCl, pH 7.0, at 20°C (40)).

In order to understand such a favorable effect of methyl groups on the binding affinity, thermodynamic parameters for DNA–ligand interactions were examined, focusing on the binding to cytosine in the 21-meric AP site-containing duplex. First, the binding enthalpy was determined by ITC. Figure 5 shows typical ITC data for the binding of 2-amino-5,6,7-trimethyl-1,8-naphthyridine (ATMDND) to cytosine in the AP site-containing DNA duplex [5'-GCA GCT CCC GXG GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA CGG CCC CAG AGG AGC-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine], measured in solutions buffered to pH 7.0 (10 mM sodium cacodylate) containing 100 mM NaCl and 1.0 mM EDTA. Excitation wavelength, 350 nm; temperature, 20°C. Inset: non-linear regression analysis of the changes in the fluorescence intensity ratio at 403 nm based on a 1:1 binding isotherm model. F and $F_0$ denote the fluorescence intensities of ATMND in the presence and absence of DNA duplexes, respectively.

**Figure 3.** Fluorescence responses of ATMDND (500 nM) to 21-meric AP site-containing DNA duplex [5'-GCA GCT CCC GXG GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA CGG CCC CAG AGG AGC-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine], measured in solutions buffered to pH 7.0 (10 mM sodium cacodylate) containing 100 mM NaCl and 1.0 mM EDTA. Excitation wavelength, 350 nm; temperature, 20°C. Inset: non-linear regression analysis of the changes in the fluorescence intensity ratio at 403 nm based on a 1:1 binding isotherm model.

**Table 1.** Thermodynamic parameters for the 1,8-naphthyridine binding to cytosine in the 21-meric AP site-containing DNA duplex$^a$

|        | $K_{11}$ (M$^{-1}$) | $\Delta G_{obs}$ (kcal/mol) | $SK$ | $\Delta G_{pe}$ (kcal/mol) | $\Delta G_t$ (kcal/mol) | $\Delta H_{obs}$ (kcal/mol) | $T \Delta S_{obs}$ (kcal/mol) |
|--------|------------------|------------------------|-----|--------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| AND    | 3.0 (±0.2) $\times 10^8$ | -7.3 (±0.1) | -1.15 | -1.4 | -5.9 | -20.5 ± 0.6 | -13.2 (±0.6) |
| AMND   | 2.7 (±0.2) $\times 10^8$ | -8.6 (±0.1) | -1.31 | -1.7 | -6.9 | -19.8 ± 0.4 | -11.2 (±0.4) |
| ADMND  | 6.1 (±0.5) $\times 10^8$ | -9.1 (±0.1) | -1.36 | -1.8 | -7.3 | -16.7 ± 0.3 | -7.6 (±0.3) |
| ATMDND | 1.9 (±0.2) $\times 10^9$ | -9.8 (±0.1) | -1.45 | -1.8 | -8.0 | -12.8 ± 0.7 | -3.0 (±0.7) |

$^a$ $K_{11}$ (M$^{-1}$), determined by fluorescence titration experiments (cf. Figures 3 and 4), is the 1:1 binding constant in 110 mM Na$^+$ at 20°C ([sodium cacodylate] = 10 mM, [EDTA] = 1.0 mM, [NaCl] = 100 mM, pH 7.0) with the standard deviations obtained from three independent experiments. $\Delta G_{obs}$ is the observed binding free energy calculated from $\Delta G_{obs} = -RT \ln K_{11}$. $SK$ is the slope of the plot of log $K_{11}$ versus log [Na$^+$] (cf. Supplementary Figure S3); fitting error is within 0.02. $\Delta G_{pe}$ and $\Delta G_t$ are the polyelectrolyte and nonpolyelectrolyte contributions to the observed binding free energy ($\Delta G_{obs}$) evaluated at 110 mM Na$^+$ ($\Delta G_{obs} = \Delta G_{pe} + \Delta G_t$). $\Delta G_{pe}$ and $\Delta G_t$ are from polyelectrolyte contributions (37): $\Delta G_{obs} = \Delta G_{pe} + \Delta G_t$. The polyelectrolyte contribution arises from a release of counterions from DNA upon ligand binding, while the nonpolyelectrolyte contribution is due to changes in the structure of DNA. $\Delta H_{obs}$ was directly determined by ITC at 20°C (cf. Figure 5). Errors are the standard deviations obtained from three independent measurements. $T \Delta S_{obs}$ was calculated from $T \Delta S_{obs} = \Delta H_{obs} - \Delta G_{obs}$. DNA duplex: 5'-GCA GCT CCC GXG GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA CGG CCC CAG AGG AGC-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine.
nonpolyelectrolyte contribution arises from all other molecular interactions. As is shown in Supplementary Figure S3, the binding constant $K_{11}$ increases with decreasing the salt concentration, and a linear relationship is obtained between log $K_{11}$ and log $[\text{Na}^+]$ for all ligand–cytosine interactions (cf. also Supplementary Table S1). The slope ($SK_{11}$) of the linear plot was used to evaluate $G_{11}^\circ$ in 110 mM Na$^+$ using $G_{11}^\circ = (SK_{11})RT\ln [\text{Na}^+]$, followed by calculation of $\Delta G_{11} (= G_{11}^\circ - G_{11}^\circ_{\text{pe}})$.

Thermodynamic parameters thus obtained for the 1,8-naphthyridine-cytosine interactions are summarized in Table 1. While the binding reaction is enthalpy-driven in all cases, the effect of methyl groups can be clearly seen from the comparison of binding enthalpy and entropy. The most favorable gain in binding enthalpy is obtained for AND ($\Delta H_{11}^\circ = 20.5 \text{ kcal/mol}$), but the loss of binding entropy is also significant ($T\Delta S_{11}^\circ = -13.2 \text{ kcal/mol}$). This results in the weakest binding free energy for AND–cytosine interactions ($\Delta G_{11}^\circ = -7.3 \text{ kcal/mol}$). By introducing methyl groups to the naphthyridine ring, the enthalpy term becomes destabilized, and this is highly compensated for by less negative values of entropy that result in a more favorable binding free energy. In case of AMND ($\Delta G_{11}^\circ = -8.6 \text{ kcal/mol}$), the gain in binding enthalpy is somewhat reduced ($\Delta H_{11}^\circ = -19.8 \text{ kcal/mol}$), whereas the loss of binding entropy is effectively decreased ($T\Delta S_{11}^\circ = -11.2 \text{ kcal/mol}$). This leads to the increased binding affinity of AMND ($\Delta \Delta G_{11}^\circ = -1.3 \text{ kcal/mol}$) as compared to AND. Such an effect is more significant for ADMND ($\Delta G_{11}^\circ = -9.1 \text{ kcal/mol}$, $\Delta H_{11}^\circ = -16.7 \text{ kcal/mol}$, $T\Delta S_{11}^\circ = -7.6 \text{ kcal/mol}$), and the loss of binding entropy reaches the minimum for ATMND ($\Delta G_{11}^\circ = -9.8 \text{ kcal/mol}$, $\Delta H_{11}^\circ = -12.8 \text{ kcal/mol}$, $T\Delta S_{11}^\circ = -3.0 \text{ kcal/mol}$). These results clearly indicate that the introduction of methyl groups effectively reduces the loss of binding entropy, which is responsible for the increase in the binding affinity of 1,8-naphthyridine–cytosine interactions.

It has been well recognized that, for DNA–ligand interactions, the favorable binding entropy term may be due to the release of structured water from DNA and/or ligand into bulk solvent, and/or due to the release of condensed counterions from DNA. The latter effect has been reasonably observed for positively charged ligands such as AND, AMND, ADMND, and ATMND.
as ethidium (25), and even for uncharged ligands such as actinomycin (39) or chartreusin (42), the binding has been shown to accompany the release of counterions from DNA. This is generally attributed to lengthening and unwinding of the DNA duplex, both of which increase the phosphate spacing along the helix axis. This results in a decrease in the charge density of the duplex, thereby releasing condensed counterions from DNA. In the present case, 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines have a positive charge due to the protonation at the N1 moiety when binding to cytosine (cf. Figure 7), and the chemical modification of the naphthyridine ring seems cause some additional effects on the binding-induced release of counterions. As summarized in Table 1, on increasing the number of methyl groups from AND to ATMND, the slope (SK) of the linear plot (SK), which is equivalent to the number of counterions released from DNA upon ligand binding, increases somewhat, providing a more favorable gain from the polyelectrolyte contribution (ΔG_{pe}). In the case of AND, the binding is accompanied by the release of 1.1 counterions, which corresponds to the favorable gain of −1.4 kcal/mol from ΔG_{pe}. In the case of ATMND, 1.4 counterions are released upon binding, and the value of ΔG_{pe} increases to −1.8 kcal/mol. It is therefore likely that the effect of methyl groups is ascribed partially to the increased release of condensed counterions from DNA, which provides a favorable entropy contribution to the overall binding free energy (ΔG_{obs}).

The effect of methyl groups is however more evident for the non-polyelectrolyte contribution (ΔG_{t}). Again, as summarized in Table 1, ΔG_{t} is indeed fundamental in the stabilization of the binding events, and ΔG_{t} clearly increases as the number of methyl groups increases. As compared to AND (ΔG_{t} = −5.9 kcal/mol), the favorable gain from ΔG_{t} is increased by as much as −2.1 kcal/mol for ATMND, which is roughly comparable to the value for increased gain in the overall binding free energy (ΔG_{obs} = −2.5 kcal/mol). Thus, the effect of methyl groups on the binding affinity is mainly ascribed to the increased gain from the nonpolyelectrolyte contribution ΔG_{t}, so as to provide a favorable entropic term, probably due to the release of structured water from DNA and/or the ligand itself into bulk solvents.

According to the literatures (24,25,42–44), the nonpolyelectrolyte (ΔG_{t}) contribution is further dissected into four contributions that drive the binding process, and thus the observed binding free energy (ΔG_{obs}) is totally composed of at least five contributions:

\[ ΔG_{obs} = ΔG_{pe} + ΔG_{t+1} + ΔG_{hyd} + ΔG_{conf} + ΔG_{int} \]

where ΔG_{t+1} is the free energy cost resulting from losses in rotational and translational degrees of freedom upon complex formation, ΔG_{hyd} is the free energy for the hydrophobic transfer of the ligand from aqueous solution into the DNA binding site, ΔG_{conf} is the contribution due to conformational transitions in DNA and the ligand, and ΔG_{int} is the contribution from intermolecular DNA–ligand contacts within the binding site. Among these contributions consisting of ΔG_{obs}, it has been well shown that the hydrophobic contribution (ΔG_{hyd}) is a key parameter which is related to the change in surface area that is exposed to solvent upon complex formation, and it is also possible to correlate changes in solvent-accessible surface area (ΔSASA) with the heat capacity changes (ΔC_{p}). This relationship has been successfully shown to hold for a typical DNA–ligand interaction, e.g. the Hoechst 33258 binding to DNA duplex, where the negative change in heat capacity was observed due to the removal of nonpolar surface from bulk solvent upon complexation, and the experimentally determined value for ΔC_{p} was in excellent agreement with the value computed using ΔSASA obtained by two crystal structures (24). We therefore estimated the values of ΔG_{hyd} from the heat capacity change (ΔC_{p}), for which temperature dependence of the binding enthalpy was examined.

Table 2 summaries the binding enthalpy (ΔH_{obs}) for two typical ligands, AND and ATMND, as determined by ITC measurements at different temperatures. For both ligands, the value for ΔH_{obs} becomes less negative as the
Table 2. Temperature dependence of the observed binding enthalpy ($\Delta H_{\text{obs}}$) and calculated heat capacity change ($\Delta C_p$) for the 1,8-naphthyridine binding to cytosine in the 21-meric AP site-containing DNA duplex

|        | $\Delta H_{\text{obs}}$ (kcal/mol)$^a$ | $\Delta C_p$ (cal/mol K)$^b$ |
|--------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|        | 20°C                                 | 15°C                         | 10°C                        | 5°C                        |
| AND    | $-20.5 \pm 0.6^{1}$                  | $-20.0 \pm 0.6^{2}$          | $-19.1 \pm 0.5^{2}$        | $-18.2 \pm 0.1^{2}$        | $116$                         |
| ATMND  | $-12.8 \pm 0.7^{2}$                  | $-11.7 \pm 0.5^{3}$          | $-10.6 \pm 0.1^{2}$        | $-9.5 \pm 0.2^{2}$         | $217$                         |

$^a$ $\Delta H_{\text{obs}}$ was directly determined by ITC experiments. Errors are the standard deviations obtained from at least three independent measurements at each temperature ($^{1}$ 4 times; $^{2}$ 3 times). Sample solutions were buffered to pH 7.0 with 10 mM sodium cacodylate, containing 100 mM NaCl and 1.0 mM EDTA. DNA duplex: 5'-GCA GCT CCC GXX GTC TCC TCG-3'/3'-CGT CGA GGG CCC CAG AGG AGC-5', X = AP site (dSpacer), C = target cytosine.

$^b$ Heat capacity change calculated from the slope $\delta(\Delta H)/\delta T$ obtained by linear least squares fit (cf. Figure 6, $r = 0.9996$ for AND, $r = 0.9999$ for ATMND).

The energetic profiles thus determined for the binding of AND and ATMND are summarized in Table 3. For both ligands, the contribution from the hydrophobic transfer process ($\Delta G_{\text{hyd}}$) is very large as compared to the other favorable contributions ($\Delta G_{\text{conf}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{int}}$), and appears to be a key force to explain the observed effect of methyl groups on the binding affinity. In the case of AND, the favorable gain mainly comes from $\Delta G_{\text{hyd}}$ ($-12.8$ kcal/mol), and further from $\Delta G_{\text{conf}}$ ($-1.4$ kcal/mol) and $\Delta G_{\text{int}}$ ($-7.8$ kcal/mol). The entropic cost of $\Delta G_{\text{conf}}$ is $5.4$ kcal/mol, which seems the most appropriate value to use, as has been extensively discussed in literatures (24,25,31). By using this value, we estimate $\Delta G_{r+t}$ to be $14.7$ kcal/mol at $20^\circ C$, with about $20\%$ uncertainty. The remaining two contributions from unfavorable $\Delta G_{\text{conf}}$ and favorable $\Delta G_{\text{int}}$ are considered together in this work, and are obtained by subtracting the sum of the other three contributions discussed above ($\Delta G_{r+t} + \Delta G_{\text{conf}} + \Delta G_{\text{int}}$) from the experimental $\Delta G_{\text{obs}}$.

The observed nature of the thermodynamic profile, i.e., the large magnitude of negative binding enthalpies, is similar to the profile for typical intercalators such as ethidium ($\Delta G = -6.7$ kcal/mol, $\Delta H = -9.0$ kcal/mol, $\Delta T\Delta S = -2.3$ kcal/mol, in 0.2 M NaCl, pH 7.0, at 25°C) (25) and daunorubicin ($\Delta G = -7.9$ kcal/mol, $\Delta H = -9.0$ kcal/mol, $\Delta T\Delta S = -1.1$ kcal/mol, in 0.2 M NaCl, pH 7.0, at 20°C) (31). This is consistent with the intercalation-like binding mode proposed for the 1,8-naphthyridine-cytosine interaction in AP site-containing DNA duplexes.
Table 3. Energetic profiles for the 1,8-naphthyridine binding to cytosine in the 21-meric AP site-containing DNA duplexa

|           | ΔGobs (kcal/mol) | ΔGpe (kcal/mol) | ΔGintr (kcal/mol) | ΔGconf* + ΔGint (kcal/mol) |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| AND       | −7.3             | −1.4            | 14.7              | −12.8                     |
| ATMND     | −9.8             | −1.8            | 14.7              | −17.3                     |

*aThe estimated contributions to the observed free energy (ΔGobs) obtained from the five sources discussed in the text are given: Binding to the duplex (5′-GCA GCT CCC GXXG GTX GXXG GXXG CGA GGG CCC CAG AGG AGC-3′), X = AP site; dSpacer, C = target cytosine) in 100 mM NaCl, 1.0 mM EDTA, 10 mM sodium cacodylate, pH 7.0 at 20°C.

(cf. Figure 1). However, it is of interest to note that the values of ΔCp obtained for 1,8-naphthyridines, especially for ATMND (−217 cal/mol K), are indeed larger than the values of such typical intercalators. In the case of ethidium consisting of a heterocyclic phenanthridine, the value of ΔCp has been estimated to be −139 cal/mol K (25), and even for much larger anthracycline antibiotics, daunorubicin, the ΔCp value has been estimated to be −160 cal/mol K (31). The ΔCp values estimated for 1,8-naphthyridines therefore appear to be somewhat large when considering their relatively smaller molecular size as compared to those of these intercalators. This interesting result may be ascribed to a unique local conformation of AP site-containing DNA duplexes.

As has been reviewed in the literature (48), the existing NMR data show that the local duplex structure strongly depends on the type of adjacent base pairs, the AP residue, and the orphan base, i.e., the base opposite the AP site. While the orphan purine bases, being largely hydrophobic, always stack inside the helix, the position of orphan pyrimidine residues shows more variability (49). When the THF abasic site analog is used, an orphan cytosine residue adopts extrahelical conformations, and tends to be solvent exposed when it is flanked by cytosine residues that have weak stacking ability. In the present study, the THF analogue is used for the AP site, and the target cytosine is flanked by cytosine residues, indicating that the target cytosine base is located outside the helix and exposed to solvent. For the binding of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines, it is therefore likely that the DNA duplex must undergo a conformational transition to form the cavity suitable for ligand binding, where the target cytosine stacks inside the helix, and this is followed by the transfer of 1,8-naphthyridines from solution into the binding cavity (AP site). This kind of binding events seem to accompany a considerable change in ΔSASA, providing the relatively large values of ΔCp as compared to those of typical DNA intercalation.

It is also of interest to note that, for the 1,8-naphthyridine-cytosine binding, molecular interactions (ΔGintr), arising generally from specific hydrogen bonds, van der Waals contacts and other interactions, are effective contributors to the observed binding free energy (Table 3). Although the sums of values of ΔGintr and ΔGconf are estimated in the present study, the sign and magnitude of the values obtained for

ΔGconf* + ΔGint (AND: −7.8 kcal/mol; ATMND: −5.4 kcal/mol) clearly indicate that the molecular interaction (ΔGintr) is overcoming the unfavorable contribution due to conformational transitions in the DNA and the ligand (ΔGconf), and it is a more effective driving force than the polyelectrolyte contribution (ΔGpe: AND, −1.4 kcal/mol; ATMND, −1.8 kcal/mol). This is similar to intercalators such as ethidium (25), but distinct from groove binders such as Hoechst 33258 (24), where molecular interactions (ΔGintr) were found to contribute little to the observed binding free energy, and both the hydrophobic (ΔGhyd) and polyelectrolyte (ΔGpe) contributions were found to be the primary driving forces for association.

As for molecular interactions involved in the 1,8-naphthyridine binding, specific hydrogen bonds are crucial for the selective binding to nucleobases in AP site-containing DNA duplexes. As suggested by Nakatani et al. (28,50) and revealed by 15N NMR experiments (51), 1,8-naphthyridine (AMND, pKb = 6.8) exists as a tautomeric mixture of N1 and N8 protonated form in acidic solutions, and the N1 protonated form of 1,8-naphthyridine binds to cytosine, so that a fully complementary base-pairing is formed via three-point hydrogen bonds (Figure 7). The N8 protonated form seems responsible for the binding to thymine, and this would also allow a fully complementary base-pairing based on three-point hydrogen bonds (Figure 7). These binding modes explain the observed binding selectivity for pyrimidines over purines in AP site-containing DNA duplexes (cf. Figure 4). In the case of ATMND, while the cytosine/thymine selectivity is only moderate, the binding affinity for cytosine is indeed two-order of magnitude higher than those for adenine and guanine (Kd/nM: C, 53 ± 6.0; T, 111 ± 4.1, A, 5800; G, 6000). Similarly, the other three 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines show the selectivity for pyrimidines over purines, irrespective of the number of methyl groups attached to the naphthyridine ring. Thus, the 1,8-naphthyridine–DNA interaction does involve specific hydrogen bonds, and is not simply promoted by the transfer of ligands from solution into the hydrophobic binding site (AP site), which is another distinct feature, differing from typical DNA intercalation (25).

It should be here noted that the introduction of methyl groups does not contribute to the improvement of the binding selectivity between cytosine and thymine,
another important issue from a practical point of view. While ATMND shows some preference for cytosine over thymine, the thermodynamic parameters for the ATMND–thymine interaction is almost comparable with parameters for the binding to cytosine. As summarized in Supplementary Table S2, the binding to thymine is enthalpy-driven ($\Delta G_{\text{obs}} = -9.3 \text{kcal/mol}$, $\Delta H_{\text{obs}} = -13.6 \text{kcal/mol}$, $T \Delta S_{\text{obs}} = -4.3 \text{kcal/mol}$), and the values of binding enthalpy and entropy are comparable with the values for ATMND–cytosine interaction ($\Delta G_{\text{obs}} = -9.8 \text{kcal/mol}$, $\Delta H_{\text{obs}} = -12.8 \text{kcal/mol}$, $T \Delta S_{\text{obs}} = -3.0 \text{kcal/mol}$). The polyelectrolyte ($\Delta G_{\text{pe}}$) contribution is also effective for the thymine binding ($\Delta G_{\text{pe}} = -1.8 \text{kcal/mol}$), which is consistent with the proposed binding mode by the positively charged (protonated) 1,8-naphthyridine (cf. Figure 7). Thus, a different approach rather than the methylation strategy should be required in order to develop 1,8-naphthyridine-based ligands with the improved binding selectivity between cytosine and thymine.

Finally, ATMND was applied to the analysis of single-base mutation present in 107-mer DNAs ($K$-ras gene, codon 12) (54). After asymmetric PCR amplification (52,53), the products were analyzed at 5°C in a buffer solution (pH 7.0, 100 mM sodium cacodylate) containing 1.6 mM EDTA, 50 nM ATMND and 5.0 μM AP site-containing probe DNA. As shown in Figure 8A, in the case of sense strand analysis, a significant fluorescence quenching of ATMND (excitation wavelength: 350 nm, analysis: 403 nm) is observed for the cytosine-containing sequence (GCT: 79%), while the response is relatively moderate for the thymine- or purine-containing sequences (GTT: 40%; GAT: 18%; GGT: 21%). In the case of antisense strand analysis (Figure 8B), a fluorescence response is observed effectively for pyrimidine-containing sequences over purine-containing sequences (ACC: 48%; ATC: 38%; AAC: 1%; AGC: 2%). ATMND would be thus applicable to the detection of cytosine (thymine)-related transversion such as C(T)>G and C(T)>A, for which the simultaneous use of purine-selective ligands would assure the analysis, as has been previously demonstrated for G>A detection (16).

CONCLUSION

In summary, we have demonstrated a significant effect of the methyl substitutions on the binding of a series of 2-amino-1,8-naphthyridines to pyrimidines in AP site-containing DNA duplexes. Despite the relatively simple modification, the binding affinity of 1,8-naphthyridines clearly increased with increasing the number of methyl groups of the naphthyridine ring, and ATMND having three methyl groups showed the strongest binding affinity of 1.9 × 10^7 M^{-1} and 0.91 × 10^7 M^{-1}, respectively for cytosine and thymine (in 110 mM Na^+, pH 7.0, at 20°C). These value were nearly two order of magnitude higher than those of the parent AND having no methyl groups (0.030 × 10^7 M^{-1} for cytosine, 0.012 × 10^7 M^{-1} for thymine). The obtained thermodynamic parameters for 1,8-naphthyridine-cytosine interactions ($\Delta G_{\text{obs}}$, $\Delta H_{\text{obs}}$, $T \Delta S_{\text{obs}}$) indicated that, while the binding was enthalpy-driven for all ligands, the introduction of methyl groups effectively reduced the loss of binding entropy, which was responsible for the increase in the binding affinity of 1,8-naphthyridine-cytosine interactions. From the analysis based on the polyelectrolyte theory, we found that the nonpolyelectrolyte contribution ($\Delta G_{\text{i}}$) was fundamental in the stabilization of the binding events, and $\Delta G_{i}$ clearly increased with increasing the number of methyl groups. Interestingly, the value of the heat capacity change ($\Delta C_{p}$) was found to be significantly different between AND and ATMND, and the estimated contribution from the hydrophobic transfer process ($\Delta G_{\text{hyd}}$) was found to be effectively modulated by the introduction of methyl groups to the naphthyridine ring. Indeed, the obtained energetic profiles revealed that a major driving force for the 1,8-naphthyridine binding was the contribution from the hydrophobic transfer process, which appeared to be a key force to explain the observed effect of methyl groups on the binding affinity.

As has been reported for some DNA-binding molecules, thermodynamic characterization of the binding reactions offers valuable insights into the major driving forces involved in the complex formation, and the obtained thermodynamic data, together with structural characterization, would be a rational basis for the further...
development of the chemistry of DNA-binding molecules. In particular, the comprehensive examination of a series of structurally related compounds might be an effective approach for this direction. We strongly expect that the results described here represent a piece of such data, especially for the further design of DNA-binding molecules applicable to gene analysis. We are now undertaking further studies on the design and synthesis of this class of ligands including the thermodynamic and structural characterization.
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