Structural Studies on Netb: A B- Pore Forming Toxin

Mr. Pankaj Kumar[1], Dr. Karan Paul[2], Mr. Amandeep Paul[3], Mr. Fakir Chand[4], Mr. Suhail Anjum Rather[5]

[1,3,4,5] *Assistant Professor Department of Paramedical Sciences, Lyallpur Khalsa College Technical Campus Jalandhar, Punjab India.*

[2] *HOD of Biochemistry and Associate professor DAV University Jalandhar, Punjab India.*

***Abstract*—This study used bioinformatics and molecular modeling to analyze PFTs. Protein sequences were retrieved from NCBI and analyzed for homology using BLAST and HMMER. Homology modeling via SWISS-MODEL predicted 3D structures, and PyMOL enabled structural comparisons of conserved domains like rim, stem, and β-sandwich. Hydropathy plots from ProtScale provided insights into membrane-binding and hydrophobic interactions.**

The results identified conserved motifs essential for toxin oligomerization and pore formation. Comparative analysis of NetB with α-hemolysin and δ-toxin revealed key interactions between residues and host membranes. Hydrophobicity and polarity profiles highlighted regions crucial for toxin function.

This study emphasizes the importance of conserved structural features in PFTs and suggests targeting these regions or disrupting oligomerization as potential therapeutic approaches. These findings provide a framework for understanding bacterial toxins and exploring anti-virulence therapies.

I. INTRODUCTION

Pore-forming toxins (PFTs) are a diverse group of cytolytic proteins that are produced by many different organisms (1,2). Bacterial PFTs are important virulence factors (1) and in general are produced as soluble precursors that bind to the host-cellmembrane and assemble as oligomers that subsequently form transmembrane pores (3, 4). Pore-forming toxins (PFTs) are a class of virulence factors produced by various pathogenic bacteria, including *Escherichia coli*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, and *Clostridium perfringens*. These toxins play a pivotal role in bacterial pathogenesis by compromising the integrity of host cell membranes. They form transmembrane pores that disrupt cellular homeostasis, leading to osmotic imbalance, immune modulation, and, ultimately, cell death. Depending on their concentration and target cell type, PFTs can trigger necrosis, pyroptosis, or apoptosis, contributing to bacterial survival and proliferation in host tissues.

PFTs are categorized into two major structural classes based on their secondary structure:

1. α-PFTs, which form pores using clusters of α-helices. Examples include colicins and cytolysin A (ClyA) produced by *Escherichia coli*.
2. β-PFTs, characterized by β-barrel structures, such as α-hemolysin from *Staphylococcus aureus* and NetB from *Clostridium perfringens*.

These toxins typically exist as water-soluble monomers that oligomerize upon interaction with specific cell surface receptors, forming functional pores. Their activity can lead to diverse effects, including the release of intracellular molecules, ion flux, and disruption of mitochondrial function. PFTs also manipulate host immune responses, facilitating bacterial evasion and enhancing colonization.

Despite their destructive potential, host cells have evolved repair mechanisms such as membrane patching, clogging, shedding, and endocytosis to counteract PFT-induced damage. However, these mechanisms are often insufficient against high toxin concentrations.

Understanding the structural and functional dynamics of PFTs is critical for developing novel therapeutic strategies. Targeting their conserved pore-forming domains or inhibiting oligomerization offers promising approaches to mitigating their impact on host cells. This research investigates the structural characteristics, mechanisms of action, and functional implications of key PFTs, providing insights into their role in bacterial virulence and pathogenesis.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study employed a combination of bioinformatics and structural analysis tools to explore the structural and functional properties of pore-forming toxins (PFTs). The methodological steps are detailed below:

A. Protein Sequence Retrieval

Protein sequences were obtained from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) database, focusing on telomerase and pore-forming toxins from various species. Sequence similarity searches were conducted using tools like BLAST, PSI-BLAST, and HMMER. These tools facilitate the identification of homologous sequences, which is fundamental for comparative analysis and functional annotation. Conserved sequences were inferred to share a common evolutionary ancestor, providing insights into biologically significant regions under selective pressure. Comparative sequence analysis was employed to identify coding regions, conserved non-coding sequences, and species-specific genomic features.

B. Homology Modeling

Homology modeling was performed using the SWISS-MODEL web server to predict the three-dimensional structures of proteins. This approach followed four key steps:

1. Template Identification: Structural templates were identified by aligning the target sequences with known protein structures in the SWISS-MODEL template library.
2. Sequence Alignment: Accurate alignment of the target and template sequences ensured the reliability of model building.
3. Model Building: A 3D model was constructed for each target protein.
4. Model Quality Evaluation: The generated models were assessed for structural accuracy and compatibility using integrated validation tools.

C. Structural Overlap Analysis

The PyMOL molecular graphics tool was used to visualize and analyze protein structures. PyMOL provided capabilities for high-quality structural visualization, alignment, and manipulation. Structural overlaps of different PFTs, including NetB, α-hemolysin, and LukF, were analyzed to identify conserved motifs and domain-specific similarities.

D. Hydropathy Plots

Hydropathy plots were generated using ProtScale from the ExPASy server to evaluate the hydrophobic or hydrophilic nature of amino acids within the sequences. These plots helped identify membrane-spanning regions and hydrophobic domains critical for protein function.

E. Data Integration and Interpretation

The outputs from sequence analysis, homology modeling, structural comparisons, and hydropathy assessments were integrated to derive insights into the mechanisms of pore formation, receptor interactions, and functional dynamics of PFTs. This comprehensive approach facilitated the identification of structural features critical for protein functionality, offering potential targets for therapeutic interventions.

III. RESULTS

1. Structural Comparison of NetB with α-Hemolysin Toxins

Motif Analysis (Rim Domain: EGFIPSDKQIFGSKYYGKMKW)

- Bulkiness:
- The average bulkiness of the rim domain is 308.17, influenced by residues like Isoleucine (21.4) and Phenylalanine (19.8).

Amino Acid	Bulkiness	Amino Acid	Bulkiness
E	16.25	F	19.8
G	3.4	G	3.4
F	19.8	S	9.47
I	21.4	K	15.71
P	17.43	Y	18.03

- Hydrophobicity:
- The average hydrophobicity is **-15.6**, with negatively contributing residues like Glutamate (-3.5) and positively contributing ones like Isoleucine (4.5).

Amino Acid	Hydrophobicity	Amino Acid	Hydrophobicity
E	-3.5	F	2.8
G	-0.4	G	-0.4
F	2.8	S	-0.8
I	4.5	K	-3.9

2. Structural Comparison of NetB with ε-Toxins

Motif Analysis (Rim Domain: SRLYNNGDKNFTDDRDLS)

- Bulkiness:
- The average bulkiness for this domain is **248.19**, with Leucine (21.4) and Arginine (14.28) contributing significantly.

Amino Acid	Bulkiness	Amino Acid	Bulkiness
S	9.47	D	11.68
R	14.28	L	21.44
L	21.4	S	9.47
Y	18.03	N	12.82

- Hydrophobicity:
- The average hydrophobicity is **-31**, with negatively contributing residues like Aspartate (-3.5).

Amino Acid	Hydrophobicity	Amino Acid	Hydrophobicity
S	-0.8	D	-3.5
R	-4.5	L	3.8
L	3.8	S	-0.8
Y	-1.3	N	-3.5

III. FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF NETB

- Domains:
- Rim Domain: Critical for receptor binding. Mutations like K107A and Y108A reduce receptor interactions.
- Stem Domain: Involved in transmembrane β-barrel formation. Cholesterol enhances oligomerization, though it's not essential.
- β-Sandwich: Provides structural stability during oligomerization. Mutations like S254L disrupt oligomerization.

IV. COMPARISONS OF OTHER MOTIFS AND TOXINS

NetB vs. δ-Toxin

- Rim Domain Bulkiness: Average 248.19.
- Hydrophobicity: Average -20.16.
- NetB **vs**. α-Hemolysin
- Structural alignment revealed similarities in the β-barrel structures critical for pore formation.

V. DISCUSSION

The findings of this study highlight the structural and functional dynamics of pore-forming toxins (PFTs), particularly NetB, and their role in bacterial pathogenesis. PFTs are critical virulence factors that disrupt host cell membranes, resulting in osmotic imbalance, cellular dysfunction, and eventual cell death. By analyzing conserved motifs and domains, such as the rim, stem, and β-sandwich regions of NetB, this study provides insights into the mechanisms underlying toxin binding, oligomerization, and pore formation.

Structural comparisons of NetB with other PFTs, including α-hemolysin and δ-toxin, revealed conserved β-barrel and α-helical architectures that facilitate their function. These conserved domains are essential for membrane receptor binding and subsequent oligomerization, a prerequisite for pore formation. Additionally, hydropathy and bulkiness analyses identified specific amino acid residues critical for these processes. For example, residues like R200 and W262 were found to be vital for receptor interaction and cytotoxic activity, while mutations in the rim domain significantly impaired binding and oligomerization.

The role of cholesterol in enhancing oligomerization underscores its importance in membrane-binding efficiency, although it is not essential for all PFTs. This finding aligns with previous studies suggesting that cholesterol-rich microdomains in host membranes serve as anchoring sites for many bacterial toxins. The comparative analysis of NetB with ε-toxin and other PFTs further confirmed structural similarities and functional differences, emphasizing the specificity of each toxin's interaction with its target membrane.

The implications of these findings extend to therapeutic strategies. Targeting conserved regions or disrupting oligomerization may provide effective means to neutralize PFTs. For instance, small molecules or antibodies designed to block receptor binding or oligomerization could mitigate toxin-induced damage, thereby reducing bacterial virulence and aiding host recovery

VI. CONCLUSION

This study underscores the critical role of PFTs in bacterial pathogenesis, highlighting their conserved structural features and functional mechanisms. The structural and functional analysis of NetB revealed its dependence on specific domains and amino acid residues for membrane interaction, oligomerization, and pore formation. Comparative studies with other toxins like α-hemolysin and δ-toxin validated the universality of certain mechanisms while emphasizing the unique properties of individual toxins.

The findings provide a foundation for developing therapeutic interventions targeting PFTs. By focusing on conserved structural domains or disrupting critical steps like receptor binding and oligomerization, it may be possible to neutralize these toxins and alleviate their pathological effects. Future studies should explore the development of inhibitors and antibodies tailored to PFTs, as well as their potential in combination therapies for bacterial infections.

This research contributes to a deeper understanding of bacterial virulence mechanisms and offers a pathway toward effective anti-virulence therapies to combat PFT-mediated diseases.

REFERENCES:

[1] Gonzalez MR, Bischofberger M, Pernot L, van der Goot FG, Frêche B. 2008. Bacterial pore-forming toxins: the (w)hole story? Cell. Mol. Life Sci. 65:493–507

[2] Rosado CJ, Buckle AM, Law RH, Butcher RE, Kan WT, Bird CH, Ung K, Browne KA, Baran K, Bashtannyk-Puhalovich TA, Faux NG, Wong W,Porter CJ, Pike RN, Ellisdon AM, Pearce MC, Bottomley SP, Emsley J, Smith AI, Rossjohn J, Hartland EL, Voskoboinik I, Trapani JA, Bird PI, Dunstone MA, Whisstock JC. 2007. A common fold mediates verte brate defense and bacterial attack. Science 317:1548–1551.

[3] Bischofberger M, Gonzalez MR, van der Goot FG. 2009. Membrane injury by pore-forming proteins. Curr. Opin. Cell Biol. 21:589–595.

[4] Feil SC, Polekhina G, Gorman MA, Parker MW. 2010. Proteins: mem brane binding and pore formation. Introduction. Adv. Exp. Med. Biol. 677:1–13.