



# www.bioinformation.net Volume 17(5)

### **Research Article**

DOI: 10.6026/97320630017530

### Molecular docking analysis of two bioactive molecules *KLUF10 and* KLUF13 isolated from the marine bacteria *Micrococcus sp.* OUS9 with TNF alpha

### Shanthi Kumari<sup>1,3</sup>, Pabba Shivakrishna<sup>2,\*</sup> & K. Sreenivasulu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Osmania University, Department of microbiology, Hyderabad, India; <sup>2</sup>Lavin laboratories, Hyderabad, India; <sup>3</sup>KLEF University, Andhra Pradesh, India; \*Corresponding author: Dr. Pabba Shivakrishna: E-mail: Shiva-krishnapabba@yahoo.com

Received March 15, 2021; Revised April 21, 2021; Accepted April 30, 2021, Published May 31, 2021

#### Declaration on official E-mail:

The corresponding author declares that official e-mail from their institution is not available for all authors

#### **Declaration on Publication Ethics:**

The authors state that they adhere with COPE guidelines on publishing ethics as described elsewhere at https://publicationethics.org/. The authors also undertake that they are not associated with any other third party (governmental or non-governmental agencies) linking with any form of unethical issues connecting to this publication. The authors also declare that they are not withholding any information that is misleading to the publisher in regard to this article

#### Abstract:

Tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF- $\alpha$ ) is known to be linked with tumor. Therefore, it is of interest to document the Molecular docking analysis of two bioactive molecules *KLUF10 and* KLUF13 isolated from the marine bacteria *Micrococcus sp.* OUS9 with TNF alpha. We report the molecular interactions of *KLUF10 and* KLUF13 with TNF alpha.

Kew Words: TNF-a, KLUF10, KLUF13, PDB ID 2AZ5, Docking.

#### Background:

Oceans occupy about 70% of the Earth's surface area, and many aquatic species have novel components that are not found on land, as well as specific biological properties of high activity and efficacy. Since the National Cancer Institute (NCI) began screening marine tools for anti-cancer activity in 1968, research on marine drugs has evolved into a distinct field **[1]**. Docking is a process that predicts the preferred orientation of one molecule to another when they are bound together to form a stable complex **[2]** and it plays an important role in drug rational design. The *in-silico* method is a low-cost and fast approach for identifying protein targets of natural based ingredients **[3]** By analyzing the interactions between small

molecule ligands and receptor biomacromolecules, this method could predict the binding mode and affinity strength, and then realize structure-based drug design, which is of great significance to the molecular mechanisms of pharmacological activities, structure prediction of protein-ligand complexes, and targeted drug screening **[4,5,6]** A number of molecular modeling and docking studies have been done for predicting molecular targets and molecular mechanism of ginsenosides **[7, 8, 9,10]** The most widely used computational technique for characterization of protein-ligand binding sites is molecular docking. A variety of molecular simulation and docking experiments have been conducted in order to predict ginsenoside molecular targets and

ISSN 0973-2063 (online) 0973-8894 (print) Bioinformation 17(5): 530-535 (2021)



molecular mechanisms **[7,8]**. Therefore, it is of interest to document the Molecular docking analysis of two bioactive molecules *KLUF10* 

*and* KLUF13 isolated from the marine bacteria *Micrococcus sp.* OUS9 with TNF alpha.

| Fable 1: Molecular dockir | g energies for com | pounds KLUF10 & KLUF13 |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------------------|

|                     | Electrostatic energy |                               |         |        |                |
|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Ligand name         | (kJ/mol)             | Van der Waals Energy (kJ/mol) | -       | -      | Binding energy |
| KLUF10 (Zeaxanthin) | -9.817               | 4.521                         | -95.449 | 31.377 | -41.2121       |
| C1                  | 7.427                | -1.446                        | 7.235   | 23.759 | -36.84683      |
|                     |                      | - (                           |         |        |                |

C1 = KLUF13 (1 -(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-2-(methylamino) ethyl) cyclohexanol)

| fable 2: Hydrogen bonding residues, interactiv | ng atoms and H-distance between | protein and novel compounds |
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
|--|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|

| Ligand name         | Interacting amino acids                              | Interacting atoms    | H-distance |
|---------------------|--|----------------------|------------|
| KLUF10 (Zeaxanthin) | Tyr119, Leu120, Gly121, Gly122, Ser60, Leu57,Tyr151  | No Hydrogen bond     | -          |
| C1                  |  |                      |            |
|                     | Tyr119, Leu120, Gly121, Gly122, Ser60, Leu57, Tyr151 | C4:H30 - A: LEU120:O | 2.022      |
|                     |  |                      |            |

C1 = KLUF13 (1 -(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-2-(methylamino) ethyl) cyclohexanol)

#### Materials and methods:

#### Sampling site and sample collection

Seawater and soil samples were collected from coastal locations of Nellore, Visakha Patnam and Bapatla, under aseptic conditions and were processed within 1-2 hours after collection **[11,12]**. The isolated bacteria were screened and identified by molecular characterization (using 16s rRNA sequencing), as per our previous study **[13]**.

#### Extraction of crude extracts

The shake-flask fermentation was performed using 250ml capacity Erlenmeyer flasks for the selected active bacterial strains, containing 100ml of Zobell broth medium. The pure selected bacteria strain was inoculated with 1ml culture suspension for the sterilized fermented broth. Fermentation was conducted on a rotary shaking incubator by incubating inoculated flasks at 28 °C, 250 rpm for five days. The fermentation broth was centrifuged for crude extract preparation at 10,000rpm for 20 min after incubation.

#### Purification of the active compounds

The column chromatography had chosen with silica gel of L00-200 µm particle size. The gel was suspended for the packing of the column with petroleum ether. The column was formed by a corning glass tube 40 cm long with a glass stopper at the bottom and an internal diameter of 2.5 cm. The column's final size was 25X2.5 cm. The column had methanol balanced. The sample was not exceeding 5 ml, and the flow rate was kept to 0,2 ml/min, with the chloroform gradient water system methanol (9:1, 7:3, 1:1). Then the column was washed with hexaneand methanol. 10ml fractions were gathered and all the different fractions were analyzed with each solvent

scheme. All pooled fractions have been tested with antimicrobial agents. The active fraction was analyzed and characterized by NMR spectroscopy and Mass spectroscopy.

#### Docking study

#### **Protein preparation**

TNF- $\alpha$  (PDB ID 2AZ5) protein X-ray crystallographic structure (resolution 3.0) was obtained from the Protein Data Bank. Water molecules, and other heteroatoms ligands, with chains B, C, and D, were excluded from the protein molecule. The CHARMm force field was used to bind hydrogen atoms to the protein. Using the Accelyrs Discovery studio (version 2.1), energy was minimized using the conjugate gradient procedure with an RMS gradient of 0.01kcal/mol.

#### Ligand preparation

The ligand molecules (KLUF10-zeaxanthin and KLUF13- novel compound) structure were drawn in Hyperchem molecular modeling and visualization tool (version 7.5) and the energy was minimized using Accelyrs Discovery studio client (version 2.1) software. The minimized protein and ligands were saved in PDB and mol-2 format, respectively for further analysis as shown in the Figure 1 and the energy values obtained.

#### Docking

The protein and ligand docking studies were performed by using (using a grid-based MD docking algorithm, CDOCKER (CHARMm-based MD docking tool) software (Wu *et al.* 2003).The CDOCKER interaction energy as an estimation of molecular complex binding affinity was used in this study.

ISSN 0973-2063 (online) 0973-8894 (print) Bioinformation 17(5): 530-535 (2021)





**Figure 1:** Molecular Docking simulation results: (A) Secondary structure of TNF-*α* with a small molecule inhibitor (2AZ5), (B) threedimensional structure of 2AZ5\_A chain represented in Wireframe model (Black –Carbon,Red-Oxygen,Blue –nitrogen, Yellow-Sulphur), (C) Prepared protein, (D) Shows identification of active site pocket





**Figure 2:** Molecular Docking results of compound KLUF10, showing Receptor-ligand interactions of *KLUF10* (Zeaxanthin) compound with active site residues of protein



**Figure 3:** Molecular Docking results of compound KLUF13. Receptor-ligand Hydrogen bonding (green dotted line) interactions betweenKLUF13 (1-(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-2-(methylamino) ethyl) cyclohexanol) compound with active site residues of protein

#### **Results and Discussion:**

Marine organisms have developed biochemical and physiological processes including the production of bioactive metabolites for reasons such as reproduction, communication, and predation, infection, and competition protection (Halvorson, 1998). Virtually, every kind of marine organism displays different molecules with distinctive structural characteristics, due to their physical and chemical circumstances in the marine environment. In the present investigation, the total 29 different bacterial cultures were isolated from different locations of Nellore district regions the bacterial colonies present on agar plates with morphologically different pigment producing has been identified. The chosen colonies were screened by well diffusion for antagonistic activity and identified by 16s molecular identification method. The crude extract form *Micrococcus sp.* OUS9 was separated using column chromatography and from the different fractions obtained from the column the KLUF10 and KLUF13 were shown bioactive nature compare to other fractions. Hence, fraction KLUF10 and KLUF13 was subjected to further analysis to identify the bioactive compound NMR studies. The two fractions were revealed as KLUF10 (Zeaxanthin) KLUF13(1-(1-(4-methoxyphenyl)-2-(methylamino) ethvl) cyclohexanol).

#### **Docking studies**

Two bioactive compounds isolated from marine bacteria Micrococcus sp. OUS9 KLUF10 and KLUF13substances were selected as possible lead structures and optimized. The inhibitory potential of the obtained structures to PDB ID 2AZ5 were evaluated by means of molecular dockingusing a grid-based MD docking algorithm, CDOCKER (CHARMm-based DOCKER), which offers all the advantages of full ligand flexibility (including bonds, angles, dihedrals). From the docking studies KLUF10 shows the negative CDOCKER energy score (-95.449 K.cal/mol) with binding energy of -41.21210 K.cal/mol (Table 1 and Table 2) and forms non-bonded interactions with active site residues Tyr119, Leu120, Gly121, Gly122, Ser60, Leu57, Tyr151 (Figure 2). Whereas another CDOCKER energy KLUF13 shows compound score (7.235K.cal/mol) with binding energy of -36.84683K.cal/mol with one Hydrogen bonding interaction (Figure 3). Hydrogen bond is formed between the oxygen atom of LEU120 interacting with NH atom of the KLUF10 (C4:H30 - A: LEU120: O) with a hydrogen bond distance of 2.022Å.

#### **Conclusion:**

We report the optimal molecular interactions of *KLUF10 and* KLUF13 with TNF alpha for further considerations.

#### Acknowledgment:

The authors are thankful to the management of KLEF, Guntur, Osmania University, Hyderabad, Lavin laboratories, Hyderabad



and Averin Biotech, Hyderabad for providing the lab facilities needed to carry out this present study.

#### Conflict of interest:

We declare that we have no conflict of interest

#### **References:**

- [1] Ruggieri GD Science 1976 194:491.
- [2] Lengauer T et al. Curr. Opin. Struct. Biol. 1996 6:402.
- [3] Chen X *et al.* Nat Prod Rep. 2003 **20:**432
- [4] Villoutreix BO et al. Curr. Pharm. Biotechnol. 2008 9:103.
- [5] Vakser IA *Biophys. J.* 2014 107:1785.

- [6] Xue LC et al. FEBS Lett. 2015 589:3516.
- [7] Chen RJ *et al. Sin.* 2009 **30:**61.
- [8] Qu C et al. Spectrochim Acta A Mol Biomol Spectrosc. 2010 78:676.
- [9] Sathishkumar *et al. J. Enzyme. Inhib. Med. Chem.* 2011 27: 685.
- [10] Sathishkumar et al. Comput. Biol. Med. 2013 43:786.
- [11] Jayaprakashvel M et al. Adv. Biotech. 910:39.
- [12] Krishna PS et al. Indian J. Microbiol. 2015; 55:292.
- [13] Kumari KS et al. Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 2020 27: 2398.

#### Edited by P Kangueane

Citation: Kumari et al. Bioinformation 17(5): 530-535 (2021)

License statement: This is an Open Access article which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. This is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License

Articles published in BIOINFORMATION are open for relevant post publication comments and criticisms, which will be published immediately linking to the original article for FREE of cost without open access charges. Comments should be concise, coherent and critical in less than 1000 words.



