Identifying Nonspecific Ligand Binding in Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry Using the Reporter Molecule Method

Nian Sun, Jiangxiao Sun, Elena N. Kitova, and John S. Klassen

Alberta Ingenuity Centre for Carbohydrate Science and Department of Chemistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

The application of the reporter molecule (M_{rep}) method for identifying nonspecific complexes in the ES-MS analysis of protein–ligand and DNA–ligand interactions *in vitro* is described. To test the reliability of the method, it was applied to the ES-MS analysis of protein–carbohydrate complexes originating from specific interactions in solution and from nonspecific interactions in the ES process. These control experiments confirm the basic assumptions underlying the M_{rep} method, namely that nonspecific ligand binding is a random process, and that the ES droplet histories for specific and nonspecific complexes are distinct. The application of the M_{rep} method to the ES-MS analysis of the sequential binding of the ethidium cation, a DNA intercalator, to single and double strand oligodeoxynucleotides is also described, and highlights the general utility of the method. (J Am Soc Mass Spectrom 2009, 20, 1242–1250) © 2009 Published by Elsevier Inc. on behalf of American Society for Mass Spectrometry

The association of biological molecules to form specific, noncovalent complexes is implicated in virtually all biological processes, including the immune response, inflammation, bacterial, and viral infections. Detailed information regarding the structure and stability of these noncovalent complexes is essential to a complete understanding of biological processes, as well as the development of new therapeutics. Critical to achieving these goals are analytical methods capable of measuring the stoichiometry and affinity of noncovalent biological complexes *in vitro*. Recently, the direct electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (ES-MS) assay has emerged as a powerful tool for quantifying the association thermochemistry of protein–small molecule ligand interactions in solution [1–3]. With the ES-MS assay, protein–ligand binding constants (K_a) are determined from the ratio (R) of the total abundance (Ab) of bound and unbound protein ions (e.g., PL^{n+} , P^{n+}) measured in the gas phase by ES-MS for solutions of known initial concentrations of protein ($[P]_0$) and ligand ($[L]_0$), eqs 1, 2.

$$\frac{[PL]_{\text{eq}}}{[P]_{\text{eq}}} = \frac{Ab(PL^{n+})}{Ab(P^{n+})} = R \quad (1)$$

$$K_a = \frac{R}{[L]_0 - \frac{R}{1+R}[P]_0} \quad (2)$$

The technique boasts a number of strengths, including its simplicity (no labeling or immobilization required), speed

(measurements can usually be completed within a few seconds), and specificity (the unique ability to provide direct insight into stoichiometry and ability to study multiple binding equilibria simultaneously). Additionally, when performed using nanoflow ES (nanoES), the ES-MS assay affords high sensitivity, normally consuming picomoles or less of analyte per analysis.

The ES-MS assay has been used to quantify a variety of protein–ligand interactions [4–10] and, in many instances, the affinities agree well with values obtained by more established analytical methods, such as isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) and surface plasmon resonance. Despite these successful examples, there remain a number of experimental limitations to be overcome for the direct ES-MS assay to achieve its full potential. Among these is the problem of false positives, which result from the formation of nonspecific protein–ligand complexes during the ES process. These nonspecific interactions are not present in bulk solution but form in the ES droplets due to concentration effects [11]. The resulting complexes may be sufficiently stable in the gas phase that they survive until detection [11, 12]. In fact, it has been shown that nonspecific interactions involving a given protein and its specific ligand can be more stable than the corresponding specific complex in the gas phase [13]. The occurrence of nonspecific ligand binding obscures the true binding stoichiometry in solution and introduces errors into the K_a values derived from ES-MS measurements. The problem of nonspecific binding is most severe in the case of weak ligand interactions ($K_a < 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}$) because high concentrations of ligand are generally required to produce detectable levels of complex [14].

Address reprint requests to Dr. J. S. Klassen, Alberta Ingenuity Centre for Carbohydrate Science and Department of Chemistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G2. E-mail: john.klassen@ualberta.ca

Our laboratory recently demonstrated that for carbohydrate ligands, the distribution of ligands bound non-specifically to proteins during the ES process is independent of protein structure and size [15]. Based on these findings, we developed a quantitative approach to correct for nonspecific protein–ligand binding in ES-MS analysis. The method involves the addition of a reference protein (P_{ref}), which does not bind specifically to any of the solution components, to the ES solution containing the protein and ligand of interest [15]. The occurrence of nonspecific protein–ligand binding is identified by the appearance of peaks corresponding to ions of nonspecific ($P_{\text{ref}} + q$ ligand) complexes in the ES mass spectrum. Additionally, the fraction of P_{ref} undergoing nonspecific ligand binding provides a quantitative measure of the contribution of nonspecific ligand binding to the measured abundance of protein and specific protein–ligand complex. As a result, errors in binding stoichiometry and K_{on} introduced by non-specific ligand binding, can be corrected.

This simple correction method for false positives has dramatically improved the reliability of the ES-MS assay for quantifying protein–small molecule ligand interactions, in particular, low affinity complexes [14, 16]. However, the P_{ref} method does have certain limitations. One of the underlying assumptions in the P_{ref} method is that in-source gas-phase dissociation of the non-specific protein–ligand complexes does not occur or, if it does, it affects equally all protein complexes present [15]. Based on available data, the gas-phase stability of non-specific protein–small molecule complexes are relatively insensitive to the structure of the protein, but are sensitive to size and charge state of the protein [13]. The effects of differential gas-phase dissociation can be minimized by choosing a P_{ref} that is similar in molecular weight to the protein(s) of interest. Of course, this precaution does not preclude the possibility of in-source dissociation of the specific (formed in solution) protein–ligand interactions, which may be less stable than the nonspecific interactions. Additionally, it has yet to be established whether the P_{ref} method can be extended to monitor nonspecific ligand binding to other biopolymers or macromolecules.

Recently, a qualitative method to identify the formation of non-specific protein–protein interactions in ES-MS analysis was reported. The method involves the addition of a reporter molecule (M_{rep}), which does not bind specifically to the proteins and protein complexes of interest, to the ES solution at high concentration [17]. The high concentration promotes the formation of non-specific interactions between M_{rep} and all of the protein species. From the measured distributions of nonspecifically bound M_{rep} it is possible to establish whether a given protein complex originates in solution or whether it forms, at least in part, from nonspecific binding during the ES process. Complexes originating from nonspecific interactions will necessarily have different droplet histories than those of the unbound protein and specific protein complexes. Specifically, the nonspecific

protein complexes are formed later in the ES process from older and more concentrated ES droplets. These older droplets will be more concentrated in protein, as well as M_{rep} . As a result, the distributions of nonspecifically bound M_{rep} molecules observed for the unbound protein (if present) and specific protein complex(es) will differ from those observed for the nonspecific complexes; the nonspecific complexes will experience more extensive non-specific binding to M_{rep} . Although the M_{rep} method does not provide a quantitative measure of the extent of non-specific binding it can be made resistant to in-source dissociation by selecting an M_{rep} that forms strong gas-phase interactions. Additionally, the method is not limited to protein–protein interactions but can be extended to protein–small molecule ligand interactions, as well as interactions involving other biopolymers or macromolecules.

Here, we describe for the first time the application of the M_{rep} method for identifying the formation of non-specific ligand interactions with proteins and DNA in ES-MS. The method was implemented in the ES-MS analysis of protein–carbohydrate interactions, as well the sequential binding of ethidium cation, a small DNA intercalator, to single and double strand oligodeoxynucleotides. Importantly, the basic assumptions underlying the M_{rep} method, namely that nonspecific ligand binding is a random process, and that the ES droplet histories for specific and nonspecific complexes are distinct, were shown to be generally valid.

Materials and Methods

Proteins, DNA, and Small Molecules

The carbohydrate-binding antibody single chain fragment, scFv (MW 26 539 Da), was produced using recombinant technology [18]. The scFv was concentrated and dialyzed against deionized water using microconcentrators (Millipore Corp., Bedford, MA) with a molecular weight cut-off of 10 kDa, and lyophilized. The scFv was weighed immediately after removing it from the lyophilizer, dissolved in a known volume of aqueous 50 mM ammonium acetate and stored at -20°C until used. The 20-mer oligodeoxynucleotides (ODN) 5'-CGCCCAACCTCCTTC-CCGC-3' (ODN1, MW 5894.9 Da) and 5'-GCGG-GAAGGAGGGTTGGGCG-3' (ODN2, MW 6344.2 Da) were purchased from ACGT Corporation (Toronto, Canada). Stock solutions (300 μM) of each ODN were prepared by dissolving known amounts of ODN in deionized water. Portions of each stock solution were mixed in equimolar proportions and diluted with STE buffer (1 M pH 8 Tris-Cl, 3 M NaCl, 0.5 M pH 8 EDTA in water) and deionized water to obtain a final concentration of 300 μM . Duplex annealing was performed by heating the solution to 95°C and gradually cooling to room-temperature over a period of 30 min. The duplex was precipitated out of solution (initial volume 300 μL) by adding 30 μL of sodium acetate (2.9 M pH 5.2) and

600 μL of 100% ethanol. The entire mixture was stored at -20°C overnight. The duplex pellet was then washed twice using 95% ethanol. The duplex was then dissolved in 100 μL of 150 mM ammonium acetate and dialyzed against 150 mM ammonium acetate using a microconcentrator with a molecular weight cut-off of 10 kDa. The purified synthetic trisaccharides, $\alpha\text{Tal}[\alpha\text{Abe}]\alpha\text{Man}$ (1), 2-trimethylsilylethyl 4-O-[(4-O- α -D-galactopyranosyl)- β -D-galactopyranosyl]- β -D-glucopyranoside (2) were provided by D. Bundle (University of Alberta). The disaccharide trehalose (3) and the trisaccharide maltotriose (4) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, Oakville, Canada and used without further purification. Ethidium bromide (5) was provided by T. Lowary (University of Alberta) and used without further purification. The structures of 1–5 are shown in Figure 1. The ES solutions were prepared by mixing known amounts of the scFv or DNA, ligand and M_{rep} stock solutions.

Mass Spectrometry

All experiments were performed on an Apex II Fourier transform ion cyclotron resonance (FT-ICR) mass spectrometer (Bruker, Billerica, MA) equipped with an external nanoES ion source. NanoES was performed using aluminosilicate or borosilicate capillaries (1.0 mm o.d., 0.68 mm i.d.), pulled to $\sim 5\ \mu\text{m}$ o.d. at one end using a P-2000 micropipette puller (Sutter Instruments,

Novato, CA). Details of the instrumental parameters employed in positive ion mode are given below. For measurements in negative ion mode, the voltage polarity was switched. The electric field required to spray the solution was established by applying a voltage of 800 V to a platinum wire inserted inside the glass nanoES tip. The solution flow rate was typically $\sim 20\ \text{nL/min}$. The droplets and gaseous ions emitted from the nanoES tip were introduced into the mass spectrometer through a stainless steel capillary (i.d. 0.43 mm) maintained at an external temperature of 66°C . The ion/gas jet sampled by the capillary (48–52 V) was transmitted through a skimmer (0–2 V) and stored electrostatically in an rf hexapole. A hexapole accumulation time of 1.5–2.0 s was used for measurements performed in positive ion mode and 2–8 s in negative ion mode. Ions were ejected from the hexapole and accelerated to $\sim 2700\ \text{V}$ into a 9.4 T superconducting magnet, decelerated, and introduced into the ion cell. The trapping plates of the cell were maintained at a constant potential of (1.4–1.8 V) throughout the experiments. The typical base pressure for the instrument was $\sim 5 \times 10^{-10}$ mbar.

Data acquisition was controlled by an SGI R5000 computer running the Bruker Daltonics XMASS software, version 5.0. Mass spectra were obtained using standard experimental sequences with chirp broadband excitation. The time domain signal, consisting of the sum of 20–40 transients containing 128 or 256 K data points per transient, were subjected to one zero-fill before Fourier transformation.

Implementation of the M_{rep} Method

An overview of the implementation of the M_{rep} method for distinguishing specific from nonspecific protein–ligand interactions in ES-MS measurements is given below. Considered are the following cases: (1) ions corresponding to free protein (P) and its specific protein–ligand complex (PL) are detected by ES-MS, (2) ions corresponding P and both specific and nonspecific PL complexes are detected, and (3) ions corresponding to P and only the nonspecific PL complex are detected. The same general approach can be applied to the ES-MS analysis of ligand binding to other biopolymers or macromolecules.

P and specific PL complex. The addition of M_{rep} at relatively high concentration to the ES solution containing P and specific PL complex will result in the nonspecific attachment of one or more M_{rep} molecules to P and PL during the ES process and the appearance of peaks in the mass spectrum corresponding to free and ligand-bound protein, and free and ligand-bound protein associated with one or more M_{rep} molecules, i.e., $P(M_{\text{rep}})_i^{n+}$ and $PL(M_{\text{rep}})_i^{n+}$, where $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. The fraction (f_i) of P and of PL bound nonspecifically to i molecules of M_{rep} (relative to all possible numbers of M_{rep}) is given by eqs 3 and 4, respectively:

Figure 1. Structures of the $\alpha\text{Tal}[\alpha\text{Abe}]\alpha\text{Man}$ (1), 2-trimethylsilylethyl 4-O-[(4-O- α -D-galactopyranosyl)- β -D-galactopyranosyl]- β -D-glucopyranoside (2), 1-O-(α -D-glycopyranosyl)- α -D-glycopyranose (3), 4-O-[4-O-(α -D-glycopyranosyl)- α -D-glycopyranosyl]- α , β -D-glycopyranose (4), and ethidium bromide (5).

$$f_{P,i} = \frac{AbP(M_{rep})_i^{n+}}{\sum_i AbP(M_{rep})_i^{n+}} \quad (3)$$

$$f_{PL,i} = \frac{AbPL(M_{rep})_i^{n+}}{\sum_i AbPL(M_{rep})_i^{n+}} \quad (4)$$

where $AbP(M_{rep})_i^{n+}$ and $AbPL(M_{rep})_i^{n+}$ are the measured abundance of the P^{n+} and PL^{n+} ions, respectively, bound nonspecifically to i molecules of M_{rep} . The P^{n+} and PL^{n+} ions are expected to have identical or nearly identical ES droplet histories in the case where the PL^{n+} ions originate exclusively from specific interactions in solution [15]. As discussed above, the nonspecific association of small molecules to proteins during the ES process is expected to be independent of protein structure and size. Consequently, in the absence of in-source dissociation, the distribution of M_{rep} bound nonspecifically to the P and PL species will be identical (i.e., $f_{P,i} = f_{PL,i}$), Figure 2a, b.

P and both specific and nonspecific PL complex. If nonspecific protein–ligand binding contributes to signal of the PL^{n+} ions, then the P^{n+} and some of the PL^{n+} ions will have different droplet histories and the distributions of M_{rep} bound nonspecifically to P and PL will no longer be equivalent (i.e., $f_{P,i} \neq f_{PL,i}$). Specifically, the nonspecific PL^{n+} ions form preferentially from late generation droplets that are enriched in L, as well as M_{rep} . Consequently, the PL^{n+} ions that result from nonspecific association are expected to undergo more extensive nonspecific binding to M_{rep} than the P^{n+} ions, Figure 2a, c.

P and nonspecific PL complex. It is also useful to consider the situation where L does not bind specifically to P in solution. In this case, all of the detected PL_j^{n+} ions, where $j = 1, 2, \dots$, originate from nonspecific interactions during the ES process. In the presence of M_{rep} , both L and M_{rep} will bind nonspecifically to P during the ES process leading to the appearance of $PL_j M_{rep,i}^{n+}$ ions. The composition of the $PL_j M_{rep,i}^{n+}$ ions will ultimately depend on the concentrations of L and M_{rep} and their relative efficiencies of nonspecific binding to P. In the simplest case (equimolar concentrations of L and M_{rep} in bulk solution and equivalent nonspecific binding efficiencies) the overall distribution of P bound nonspecifically to L and M_{rep} (i.e., $PL_j M_{rep,i} \equiv PM_{rep,k}$, where $k = i + j$) will resemble that of a Poisson process (at least at low to moderate concentrations of these molecules) and the chemical makeup of the $PL_j M_{rep,i}$ species will be statistical (i.e., $f_{PL,1} = f_{PM_{rep},1}$, $2f_{PL,2} = 2f_{PM_{rep},2} = f_{PL,1}M_{rep,1} \dots$), Figure 3.

In principle, any molecule can be used to play the role of M_{rep} . However, small, neutral polyfunctional molecules capable of forming strong nonspecific interactions with the target protein (or macromolecule) in the gas phase are preferred. In this case nonspecific binding of M_{rep} to the proteins and protein complexes will not alter the charge state distribution of the protein ions and will not spread the protein ion signal over a broad range of m/z values, where differences in detection efficiency may complicate the comparison of the f_i values. For these reasons, small carbohydrates (di- and trisaccharides) are ideally suited for the role of M_{rep} .

Figure 2. Simulated ES mass spectra illustrating the influence of nonspecific binding of M_{rep} molecules to a protein and its specific protein–ligand complex during the ES process. (a) Mass spectrum in case where only ions corresponding to free protein (P^{n+}) and specific protein–ligand complex (PL^{n+}) are present. (b) Mass spectrum resulting from the nonspecific binding M_{rep} to P and PL during the ES process. Notably, the distributions of M_{rep} bound to P^{n+} and PL^{n+} are identical, i.e., $f_{P,i} = f_{PL,i}$. (c) Mass spectrum resulting from the nonspecific binding M_{rep} and free L to P and PL during the ES process. In this case, the distributions of M_{rep} bound to P^{n+} and PL^{n+} are expected to be non-equivalent, i.e., $f_{P,i} \neq f_{PL,i}$.

Figure 3. Simulated ES mass spectra illustrating the influence of nonspecific binding of two noninteracting molecules, L and M_{rep} , to free protein during the ES process. (a) Mass spectrum in the case where only the free protein ion (P^{n+}) is present. (b) Mass spectrum resulting from the nonspecific binding of L and M_{rep} to P during the ES process. The distribution of PL_iM_{repj} species shown corresponds to the situation where L and M_{rep} bind nonspecifically to P with the identical efficiencies.

Results and Discussion

ES-MS of Protein–Carbohydrate Interactions

To test the M_{rep} method for monitoring non-specific protein–ligand binding, the method was applied to the ES-MS analysis of several protein solutions containing either interacting or noninteracting carbohydrates. The scFv of the monoclonal antibody Se155-4 and its specific trisaccharide ligand 1 served as a model specific protein–carbohydrate complex. The scFv possesses a single binding site for 1 with a K_a of $1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}$, [Bundle, D. R. Unpublished data]. Additionally, the M_{rep} method was tested in the situation where protein–carbohydrate interactions originated exclusively from non-specific binding in the ES process. According to ES-MS measurements carried out using the P_{ref} method, neither the disaccharide 3 nor the trisaccharide 4 binds specifically to the scFv in solution (data not shown). These two carbohydrates served as model “noninteracting” ligands for the scFv.

It is useful to consider first the situation where the ions corresponding to protein–carbohydrate complexes originated exclusively from nonspecific interactions in the ES process. Shown in Figure 4a is an illustrative ES mass spectrum obtained for a solution of scFv (10 μM)

and 3 and 4 at equimolar concentrations (150 μM). Ions corresponding to unbound scFv and scFv bound non-specifically to one or more molecules of 3 or 4 were identified, i.e., $\text{scFv}^{n+} 3,4_j$ at $n = 10\text{--}12$ and $i, j = 0\text{--}3$. A list of protein ions identified in Figure 4a is given in Supplementary Material Table S1, which can be found in the electronic version of this article. Plotted in Figure 4b is the normalized distribution of the $\text{scFv}3,4_j$ species, as determined from the mass spectrum. Notably, the distribution determined for $\text{scFv}3,4_j$ species is consistent with the distribution expected for two molecules, at equimolar concentrations, that have identical (or nearly so) non-specific binding efficiencies. These results support the assumption that nonspecific protein–carbohydrate binding in the ES process occurs in a random fashion.

ES-MS analysis was also performed on solutions containing the scFv and its specific ligand, 1 at four different initial concentrations of protein and ligand (9 μM and 9 μM ; 18 μM and 18 μM ; 6 μM and 18 μM ; 9 μM and 18 μM). The trisaccharide 2, which does not interact with scFv in solution, served as M_{rep} for these measurements. Shown in Figure 5 are illustrative mass spectra acquired for two different solutions: one containing 9 μM scFv, 9 μM 1, and 47 μM M_{rep} (Figure 5a); and one containing 6 μM scFv, 18 μM 1, and 47 μM M_{rep} (Figure 5b). Ions corresponding to $\text{scFv}(2)_i^{n+}$ and $(\text{scFv} + 1)(2)_i^{n+}$, where $n = 9\text{--}11$ and $i = 0\text{--}2$, were identified in both cases (Tables S2 and S3). Notably, there were no $(\text{scFv} + 2)(1)_i^{n+}$ ions, resulting from the nonspecific association of scFv with 1, detected at any of the concentrations investigated. Reported in Table 1 are the ratios of f_i values determined for the scFv and $(\text{scFv} + 1)$ species for each of the four solutions.

Figure 4. (a) ES mass spectrum obtained for a solution of 10 μM scFv, 0.15 mM 3 and 0.15 mM 4. (b) Normalized distribution of $\text{scFv}3,4_j$ species, as determined from the mass spectrum shown in (a).

Figure 5. ES mass spectra obtained for solutions of 47 μM **2** and (a) 9 μM scFv and 9 μM **1**, (b) 6 μM scFv and 18 μM **1**.

Also listed are the corresponding K_a values for the (scFv + **1**) complex, which were calculated from the relative abundance of bound and unbound scFv ions, as determined from the mass spectra, using eq 2.

Importantly, the K_a values determined for the two equimolar solutions of scFv and **1** are in good agreement with the literature value determined at 25 °C by ITC, [Bundle, D. R. Unpublished data]. These results suggest that non-specific binding of **1** to scFv during the ES process did not contribute appreciably to the signal for the (scFv + **1**) $^{n+}$ ions. At the same time, the ratios of the f_i values are close to unity, which is consistent with the scFv $^{n+}$ and (scFv + **1**) $^{n+}$ ions having similar ES droplet histories. In contrast, the K_a values obtained for solutions where the concentration of **1** was two or three times larger than that of scFv are 30%–40% larger than the values obtained at equimolar concentrations. At the same time, the ratios of f_i values deviate noticeably from unity. The inflated K_a values and the nonequivalent f_i values are consistent with the occurrence of non-

specific protein–ligand binding during ES-MS analysis. These findings are also consistent with a previous observation, made using the P_{ref} method, of nonspecific binding between **1** and the scFv at molar ratios >2 [15].

ES-MS of DNA–Ligand Interactions

The direct ES-MS assay is also finding widespread use in the characterization of DNA–ligand interactions [19–22]. To demonstrate the general utility of the M_{rep} method for the detection of nonspecific ligand binding to macromolecules in ES-MS, it was used to monitor the nonspecific binding between the ethidium cation **5**, a small intercalator, and single (SS) and double strand ODNs (DS). Intercalators, such as **5**, interact with DNA by binding between base pairs; they exhibit low specificity and can bind to multiple sites within single and double strand DNA in solution [23–26]. The application of the ES-MS assay to probe the number of binding sites and to evaluate the equilibrium constants for the sequential binding of intercalators to DNA may be complicated by the contribution of nonspecific binding, particularly at the high ligand concentrations needed to populate extensively the multiple binding sites that exist.

To test the applicability of the M_{rep} method for identifying nonspecific DNA–drug interactions, ES-MS measurements were performed in negative ion mode on a series of aqueous solutions containing SS (ODN1) or DS (consisting of ODN1 and ODN2), at fixed concentrations (17 μM (SS) or 34 μM (DS)) and **5** at concentrations ranging from 20 to 70 μM in the case of SS and from 50 to 160 μM in the case of DS. The trisaccharide **1** (at a concentration of 83 μM) served as M_{rep} for all of

Table 1. Comparison of the K_a values measured by ES-MS for the (scFv + **1**) complex and the corresponding $f_{x,i}$ terms determined for the nonspecific binding of M_{rep} ($\equiv$ **2**) to scFv $^{n+}$ ($x = \text{P}$) and (scFv + **1**) $^{n+}$ ($x = \text{PL}$) ion during ES-MS analysis^{a,b,c,d}

[scFv] (μM)	[1] (μM)	K_a (10^5 M^{-1})	$f_{\text{PL},0}/f_{\text{P},0}$	$f_{\text{PL},1}/f_{\text{P},1}$
18	18	1.13 ± 0.17	1.01 ± 0.04	1.06 ± 0.04
9	9	1.03 ± 0.06	1.02 ± 0.02	1.07 ± 0.04
6	18	1.41 ± 0.20	0.89 ± 0.04	1.32 ± 0.10
9	18	1.45 ± 0.14	0.95 ± 0.10	1.22 ± 0.11

^aAll measurements performed at 25 °C, pH 7.

^bFor all experiments the concentration of **2** was 47 μM .

^cRatios calculated from average $f_{x,i}$ values taken from 4 measurements.

^dErrors correspond to one standard deviation.

Figure 6. ES mass spectra obtained for solutions of 17 μM SS, 83 μM 1 and (a) 30 μM 5, or (b) 70 μM 5. The peaks labeled with filled square and filled diamond correspond to ODN 19- and 18-mer ions produced by the loss of C and CG, respectively, from SS and their 1:1 complexes with 1. The peak labeled with filled circle corresponds to the deprotonated cluster ion, $[(2)1 + 5]^-$. ES mass spectra obtained for solutions of 34 μM DS, 83 μM 1 with (c) 70 μM 5, or (d) 160 μM 5.

the binding measurements. Shown in Figure 6a, b are illustrative ES mass spectra acquired for solutions of SS and 5. At the lower ligand concentrations investigated, deprotonated ions corresponding to free SS, at charge states -4 to -5 , and SS bound to a single molecule of 5 at the same charge states were detected, i.e., SS^{z-} and $(\text{SS} + 5)^{z-}$ ions (Figure 6a, Table S4). Non-specific attachment of up to two molecules of 1 to the SS^{z-} and $(\text{SS} + 5)^{z-}$ ions was also observed. Alkali metal ion adducts were also evident in the mass spectra. Increasing the concentrations of 5 resulted in an increase in the number of bound ligands; at the highest concentrations investigated, SS ions bound to as many as five molecules of 5 were detected (Figure 6b, Table S5). Interest-

ingly, the distributions of bound 5 at these higher concentrations are suggestive of cooperative ligand binding, with the $(\text{SS} + q5)^{z-}$ ions at $q \geq 3$ being unusually abundant compared to $q < 3$ species. Our laboratory is currently investigating this phenomenon in more detail. Shown in Figure 6c, d are illustrative ES mass spectra acquired for solutions of DS and 5. Ions corresponding to free DS, at charge states -5 , -6 , and -7 , and DS bound to as many as five molecules of 5 were detected (Tables S6 and S7). The nonspecific binding of one molecule of 1 to the free and bound DS species was observed, as well as abundant alkali metal ion adducts.

From relative abundance of ligand-bound and unbound SS or DS ions measured by ES-MS, the apparent

Table 2. Comparison of the $K_{a,1}$ values determined for the (SS + 5) and the (DS + 5) complexes by ES-MS and the corresponding $f_{x,i}$ terms for the nonspecific binding of M_{rep} ($\equiv 1$) to SS^{z-} or DS^{z-} ($x = \text{DNA}$), (SS or DS + 5) $^{z-}$ ($x = \text{DNAL}$), and (SS or DS + 2(5)) $^{z-}$ ions ($x = \text{DNAL2}$)^{a,b,c,d}

DNA	[5] (μM)	$K_{a,1}$ (10^4 M^{-1})	$f_{\text{DNAL},0}/f_{\text{DNA},0}$	$f_{\text{DNAL},1}/f_{\text{DNA},1}$	$f_{\text{DNAL2},0}/f_{\text{DNA},0}$	$f_{\text{DNAL2},1}/f_{\text{DNA},1}$
SS	20	1.15 ± 0.02	1.01 ± 0.01	1.09 ± 0.01		
SS	30	1.21 ± 0.04	1.00 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.01		
SS	40	1.15 ± 0.05	0.99 ± 0.01	1.03 ± 0.01		
SS	50	1.19 ± 0.04	1.00 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.01		
SS	60	1.44 ± 0.14	0.98 ± 0.01	1.10 ± 0.01	0.93 ± 0.01	1.21 ± 0.01
SS	70	1.51 ± 0.12	0.94 ± 0.01	1.29 ± 0.01	0.90 ± 0.01	1.41 ± 0.01
DS	50	4.59 ± 0.01	0.99 ± 0.01	1.04 ± 0.01		
DS	70	5.97 ± 0.01	1.01 ± 0.01	0.95 ± 0.01	1.00 ± 0.04	1.02 ± 0.10
DS	160	4 ± 1	1.01 ± 0.01	0.97 ± 0.01	1.08 ± 0.04	0.9 ± 0.1

^aAll measurements performed at 25 °C, pH 7.^bThe concentration of SS was 17 μM , DS was 34 μM , and 1 was 83 μM .^cRatios calculated from average $f_{x,i}$ values taken from 4–5 measurements.^dErrors correspond to one standard deviation.

equilibrium constant ($K_{a,1}$) for the attachment of one molecule of 5 to SS and to DS was calculated at the different ligand concentrations investigated (Table 2). Overall, the $K_{a,1}$ values determined for DS are ~ 3 -fold larger than for SS, which is consistent with the findings of a previous study of binding of 5 with single and double strand DNA [27]. Notably, within the range of concentrations of 5 investigated, the magnitude of $K_{a,1}$ measured for DS was found to be essentially constant, $\sim 5 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}$, suggesting that non-specific binding between DS and 5 during ES-MS analysis was insignificant. In contrast, the $K_{a,1}$ values for binding of 5 to SS exhibit a small but measurable dependence on ligand concentration. At the lower concentrations investigated (20–50 μM), the $K_{a,1}$ value is constant, $\sim 1.2 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}$, but increases by 15% at the highest concentration studied. Taken on their own, these results suggest that non-specific binding of 5 to SS contributed to the mass spectra measured for the solutions with ligand concentrations $> 50 \mu\text{M}$. Also listed in Table 2 are the ratios of f_i values determined for free and ligand-bound SS and DS species at each concentration. Notably, the f_i ratios determined for DS are close to unity for all of the ligand concentrations investigated, indicating that non-specific binding of 5 to bound and unbound DS during the ES process was negligible. This finding is consistent with the conclusion reached based on the similarity in the $K_{a,1}$ values. In the case of SS, at ligand concentrations $\leq 50 \mu\text{M}$, the f_i ratios are also close to unity, indicating that nonspecific binding of 5 to the SS species did not contribute appreciably to the mass spectra. In contrast, at ligand concentrations $> 50 \mu\text{M}$, the f_i ratios deviate from unity. This observation is indicative of nonspecific ligand binding at these higher concentrations, consistent with the conclusions drawn from the concentration dependence of the $K_{a,1}$ values.

Conclusions

The present study describes the first applications of the M_{rep} method for identifying the formation of

nonspecific ligand binding in the ES-MS analysis of protein–ligand and DNA–ligand interactions in solution. The reliability and sensitivity of the M_{rep} method for identifying the occurrence of nonspecific protein–carbohydrate interactions was highlighted by its application to cases where the protein–carbohydrate interactions detected by ES-MS originated exclusively from nonspecific association during the ES process, exclusively from specific interactions in solution, and from both specific and nonspecific interactions. These control experiments confirmed that the basic assumptions underlying the M_{rep} method, namely that nonspecific ligand binding is a random process and that the ES droplet histories for specific and nonspecific complexes are distinct, are generally valid. To demonstrate that the M_{rep} method can generally be used to identify nonspecific ligand binding it was used to monitor nonspecific DNA–ligand interactions in the ES-MS analysis of the sequential binding of the ethidium cation, a DNA intercalator, to single and double strand oligodeoxynucleotides. Using a trisaccharide reporter molecule, the M_{rep} method was shown to identify correctly the absence or presence of nonspecific DNA–ligand binding.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada and the Alberta Ingenuity Centre for Carbohydrate Science for funding, and Professors D. Bundle and T. Lowary (University of Alberta) for providing the ligands used in this study.

Appendix A Supplementary Material

Supplementary material associated with this article may be found in the online version at [doi:10.1016/j.jasms.2009.02.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jasms.2009.02.024).

References

- Loo, J. A. Studying Noncovalent Protein Complexes by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Mass Spectrom. Rev.* **1997**, *16*, 1–23.
- Fandrich, M.; Tito, M. A.; Leroux, M. R.; Rostom, A. A.; Hartl, F. U.; Dobson, C. M.; Robinson, C. V. Observation of the Noncovalent Assembly and Disassembly Pathways of the Chaperon Complex MtGimC by Mass Spectrometry. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **2000**, *97*, 14151–14155.
- Daniel, J. M.; Friess, S. D.; Rajagopalan, S.; Wendt, S.; Zenobi, R. Quantitative Determination of Noncovalent Binding Interactions Using Soft Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Int. J. Mass Spectrom.* **2002**, *216*, 1–27.
- Kitova, E. N.; Kitov, P. I.; Bundle, D. R.; Klassen, J. S. The Observation of Multivalent Complexes of Shiga-like Toxin with Globotriaoside and the Determination of Their Stoichiometry by Nano-electrospray Fourier Transform Ion Cyclotron Resonance Mass Spectrometry. *Glycobiology* **2001**, *11*, 605–611.
- van den Heuvel, R. H. H.; Heck, A. J. R. Investigation of Intact Protein Complexes by Mass Spectrometry. *Mass Spec. Rev.* **2004**, *23*, 368–389.
- Berhane, B.; Kaddis, C. S.; Wooding, K. M.; Xie, Y.; Kaufman, S. L.; Chernushevich, I. V.; Loo, J. A. Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry and Ion Mobility Analysis of the 20S Proteasome Complex. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2005**, *16*, 998–1008.
- Chitta, R. K.; Rempel, D. L.; Gross, M. L. Determination of Affinity Constants and Response Factors of the Noncovalent Dimer of Gramicidin by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry and Mathematical Modeling. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2005**, *16*, 1031–1038.
- Fryčák, P.; Schug, K. A. On-line Dynamic Titration: Determination of Dissociation Constants for Noncovalent Complexes Using Gaussian Concentration Profiles by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2007**, *79*, 5407–5413.
- Kitova, E. N.; Kitov, P. I.; Paszkiewicz, E.; Kim, J.; Mulvey, G. L.; Armstrong, A. D.; Bundle, D. R.; Klassen, J. S. Affinities of Shiga Toxin 1 and 2 for Univalent and Oligovalent Pk-trisaccharide Analogs Measured by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Glycobiology* **2007**, *17*, 1127–1137.
- Wortmann, A.; Jecklin, M. C.; Touboul, D.; Badertscher, M.; Zenobi, R. Binding Constant Determination of High-Affinity Protein–Ligand Complexes by Electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry and Ligand Competition. *J. Mass Spectrom.* **2008**, *43*, 600–608.
- Wang, W.; Kitova, E. N.; Klassen, J. S. Nonspecific Protein–Carbohydrate Complexes Produced by Nano-electrospray Ionization. Factors Influencing Their Formation and Stability. *Anal. Chem.* **2005**, *77*, 3060–3071.
- Wang, W.; Kitova, E. N.; Klassen, J. S. Influence of Solution and Gas Phase Processes on Protein–Carbohydrate Binding Affinities Determined by Nano-electrospray Fourier Transform Ion Cyclotron Resonance Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2003**, *75*, 4945–4955.
- Wang, W.; Kitova, E. N.; Sun, J.; Klassen, J. S. Blackbody Infrared Radiative Dissociation of Nonspecific Protein–Carbohydrate Complexes by Nano-electrospray Ionization: The Nature of the Noncovalent Interactions. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2005**, *16*, 1583–1594.
- Sun, J.; Kitova, E. N.; Klassen, J. S. Method for Stabilizing Protein–Ligand Complexes in Nano-electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2007**, *79*, 416–425.
- Sun, J.; Kitova, E. N.; Wang, W.; Klassen, J. S. Method for Distinguishing Specific from Nonspecific Protein–Ligand Complexes in Nano-electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2006**, *78*, 3010–3018.
- Shoemaker, G. K.; Soya, N.; Palcic, M. M.; Klassen, J. S. Temperature-Dependent Cooperativity in Donor–Acceptor Substrate Binding to Human Blood Group Glycosyltransferases. *Glycobiology* **2008**, *18*, 587–592.
- Sun, J.; Kitova, E. N.; Sun, N.; Klassen, J. S. Method for Identifying Nonspecific Protein–Protein Interactions in Nano-electrospray Ionization Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **2007**, *79*, 8301–8311.
- (a) Zdanov, A.; Bundle, D. R.; Deng, S.-J.; MacKenzie, C. R.; Narang, S. A.; Young, M. N.; Cygler, M. Structure of A Single-Chain Antibody Variable Domain (Fv) Fragment Complexed with A Carbohydrate Antigen at 1.7-Å Resolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **1994**, *91*, 6423–6427. (b) Bundle, D. R.; Baumann, H.; Brisson, J. R.; Gagne, S. M.; Zdanov, A.; Cygler, M. Solution Structure of a Trisaccharide–Antibody Complex: Comparison of NMR Measurements with a Crystal Structure. *Biochemistry* **1994**, *33*, 5183–5192.
- Mazzitelli, C. L.; Chu, Y.; Reczek, J. J.; Iverson, B. L.; Brodbelt, J. S. Screening of Threading Bis-Intercalators Binding to Duplex DNA by Electrospray Ionization Tandem Mass Spectrometry. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2007**, *18*, 311–321.
- Pierce, S. E.; Sherman, C. L.; Jayawickramarajah, J.; Lawrence, C. M.; Sessler, J. L.; Brodbelt, J. S. ESI-MS Characterization of a Novel Pyrrole-Inosine Nucleotide that Interacts with Guanine Bases. *Anal. Chim. Acta* **2008**, *627*, 129–135.
- Rosu, F.; Nguyen, C.; De Pauw, E.; Gabelica, V. Ligand Binding Mode to Duplex and Triplex DNA Assessed by Combining Electrospray Tandem Mass Spectrometry and Molecular Modeling. *J. Am. Soc. Mass Spectrom.* **2007**, *18*, 1052–1062.
- Rosu, F.; De Pauw, E.; Gabelica, V. Electrospray Mass Spectrometry to Study Drug–Nucleic Acids Interactions. *Biochimie* **2008**, *90*, 1074–1087.
- Waring, M. J. Complex Formation Between Ethidium Bromide and Nucleic Acids. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1965**, *13*, 269–282.
- LePecq, J. B.; Paoletti, C. A Fluorescent Complex Between Ethidium Bromide and Nucleic Acids. *J. Mol. Biol.* **1967**, *27*, 87–106.
- Douthart, R. J.; Burnett, J. P.; Beasley, F. W.; Frank, B. H. Binding of Ethidium Bromide to Double-Stranded Ribonucleic Acid. *Biochemistry* **1973**, *12*, 214–220.
- Nafisi, S.; Saboury, A. A.; Keramat, N.; Neasult, J. F.; Tajmir-Riahi, H. A. Stability and Structural Features of DNA Intercalation with Ethidium Bromide, Acridine Orange, and Methylene Blue. *J. Mol. Struct.* **2007**, *827*, 35–43.
- Vardevanyan, P. O.; Antonyan, A. P.; Parsadanyan, M. A.; Davtyan, H. G.; Karapetyan, A. T. The Binding of Ethidium Bromide with DNA: Interaction with Single- and Double-Stranded Structures. *Exp. Mol. Med.* **2003**, *35*, 527–533.