Differentiating physicochemical properties between NDRIs and sNRIs clinically important for the treatment of ADHD
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A B S T R A C T

Background: Drugs available for treating attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) are mainly selective norepinephrine (sNRIs) and dual norepinephrine-dopamine (NDRIs) reuptake inhibitors. The major problem of sNRIs lines in their delayed onset of action and partial- or non-responses, which makes NDRIs distinguished in drug efficacy. Understanding of the differential binding modes of these 2 types of drugs to their corresponding targets can give great insights into the discovery of privileged drug-like scaffolds with improved efficacy. So far, no such study has been carried out.

Methods: A combinatorial computational strategy, integrating homology modeling, molecular docking, molecular dynamics (MD) and binding free energy calculation, was employed to analyze the binding modes of 8 clinically important ADHD drugs in their targets.

Results: Binding modes of 2 types of ADHD drugs (sNRIs and NDRIs) in their targets was identified for the first time by MD simulation, and 15 hot spot residues were discovered as crucial for NDRIs' binding in hNET and hDAT. Comparing to sNRIs, a clear reduction in the hydrophobic property of NDRIs' one functional group was observed, and the depth of drugs' aromatic ring stretched into the pocket of both targets was further identified as key contributors to drugs' selectivity.

Conclusions: The hydrophobic property of NDRI ADHD drugs' one functional group contributes to their selectivity when bind hNET and hDAT.

General significance: These results provide insights into NDRI ADHD drugs' binding mechanisms, which could be utilized as structural blueprints for assessing and discovering more efficacious drugs for ADHD therapy.

1. Introduction

Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) is a mental condition of the neurodevelopmental type, which severely influences the daily life of 40 million individuals [1–3]. The majority of ADHD patients diagnosed in childhood persists into adulthood [4], which leads to serious problems in communication, emotion and career promotion [5]. Cognitive impairments in ADHD patients are primarily regulated by catecholaminergic signaling in prefrontal cortex (PFC) [6], and attenuation in PFCs neurotransmission of norepinephrine (NE) and dopamine (DA) shows profound effects on the progression of ADHD [7–9]. Besides of PFC, nucleus accumbens and striatum are reported to be extensively associated with ADHD [10,11], and accumulation of DA in these regions can ameliorate patients' cognitive function [11,12].

Till now, nine drugs (amphetamine, atomoxetine, clonidine, dextroamphetamine, guanfacine, lisdexamfetamine, methamphetamine and methylphenidate) in total were approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for the treatment of ADHD and several others (bupropion, LY2216684, modafinil, reboxetine and viloxazine) were in the clinical trials (https://clinicaltrials.gov/). Over three quarters of these drugs exerted their therapeutic effects by targeting human norepinephrine transporter (hNET) in PFC [13–15]. Based on the mechanism of action, these drugs were classified into 2 types: selective norepinephrine reuptake inhibitors (sNRIs) and selective catecholamine reuptake inhibitors (sCARIs). The outcomes of sCARIs were limited in clinical trials due to delayed onset of action and partial- or non-responses, which makes NDRIs distinguished in drug efficacy. So far, no such study has been carried out.

Methods: A combinatorial computational strategy, integrating homology modeling, molecular docking, molecular dynamics (MD) and binding free energy calculation, was employed to analyze the binding modes of 8 clinically important ADHD drugs in their targets.

Results: Binding modes of 2 types of ADHD drugs (sNRIs and NDRIs) in their targets was identified for the first time by MD simulation, and 15 hot spot residues were discovered as crucial for NDRIs' binding in hNET and hDAT. Comparing to sNRIs, a clear reduction in the hydrophobic property of NDRIs' one functional group was observed, and the depth of drugs' aromatic ring stretched into the pocket of both targets was further identified as key contributors to drugs' selectivity.

Conclusions: The hydrophobic property of NDRI ADHD drugs' one functional group contributes to their selectivity when bind hNET and hDAT.

General significance: These results provide insights into NDRI ADHD drugs' binding mechanisms, which could be utilized as structural blueprints for assessing and discovering more efficacious drugs for ADHD therapy.
norepinephrine-dopamine reuptake inhibitors (NDRIs) [16–18]. As reported, the major problem of sNRIs was their delayed onset of action and partial- or non-response [19–21]. With the approval of NDRIs targeting both hNET and dopamine transporter (hDAT), this class of drugs were discovered to be able to elevate catecholamines in regions of not only PFC but also nucleus accumbens and striatum [22–24], which ensured their rapid onset of action and substantially enhanced response rate (~75%) for the treatment of ADHD [25].

So far, only a few dual reuptake inhibitors with significant clinical importance for treating ADHD were discovered [26–28]. An understanding of the differential binding modes between sNRIs and NDRIs to their corresponding therapeutic targets could provide insights into the discovery of privileged drug-like scaffold with improved efficacy [29–31]. Structures and site-directed mutagenesis studies demonstrated that both sNRIs and NDRIs bind in the S1 sites of hNET and hDAT [32–34]. Given the absence of the crystallographic structures of hNET and hDAT [32], it was a great challenge to discover novel NDRIs. Currently, rational approaches including computational simulation were used to tune drug selectivity in structure based design process [35–37]. For example, prediction of protein-ligand binding free energy via molecular dynamics (MD) provided abundant information of ligand binding in various targets [38–40] and mutation induced changes in binding free energy [41–45]. Till now, no comprehensive study on the binding mode of sNRIs and NDRIs in their corresponding targets had been carried out, and it was thus in urgent need to distinguish the drug-target binding mechanism between these two types of drugs.

In this study, a combinatorial computational strategy was employed to explore binding modes of sNRIs and NDRIs (clinically important for ADHD treatment) to their corresponding targets. It was observed that drugs’ selectivity primarily came from a specific sub-binding site in the drug binding pocket, and the dual targeting structural features of NDRIs were identified. This study offers valuable insights into the structural requirements for developing dual NE and DA reuptake inhibitors for ADHD treatment.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Collection of clinically important sNRIs and NDRIs for treating ADHD

In total, 11 NDRIs and sNRIs had been approved or in clinical trial for treating ADHD, which included amphetamine (approved NDRI), atomoxetine (approved sNRI), dexamphetamine (approved NDRI), LY2216684 (sNRI in Phase 2/3), dextroamphetamine (approved NDRI), reboxetine (sNRI in Phase 2), bupropion (NDRI in Phase 4), lisdexamfetamine (approved NDRI), methylphenidate (approved NDRI), vi-loxazine (sNRI in Phase 2) and methamphetamine (approved NDRI). As reported, differentiation of binding modes between clinically important NDRIs and sNRIs (approved or in clinical trial for ADHD) could provide significant insight into the discovery of privileged drug-like scaffold with improved drug efficacy [30,46]. Thus, all those 11 clinically important drugs were selected and studied. Among these drugs, lisdexamfetamine was an inactive prodrug of dextroamphetamine [47]; dextroamphetamine and dexamphetamine were D-enantiomers of amphetamine and methylphenidate, respectively. These 3 drugs (lis-dexamfetamine, amphetamine and methylphenidate) were thus not repeatedly considered in this work, and only the remaining 8 drugs of clinical importance (Fig. 1A) were collected for studying, including 4 NDRIs (dexamphetamine, dextroamphetamine, methamphetamine and bupropion) and 4 sNRIs (atomoxetine, LY2216684, reboxetine and viloxazine). 4 out of these 8 were racemic mixture, and their corre-sponding enantiomers (dextromethamphetamine for methamphet-a-mine, R-bupropion for bupropion, SS-reboxetine for reboxetine and S-viloxazine for viloxazine) identified as contributing the primary ther-apeutic efficacy [48–51] were therefore selected for further analysis.

2.2. Homology modeling

Sequence alignment using ClustalW2 [52] (Figs. S1 and S2) showed high sequence identity (> 55%) between targets (hNET and hDAT) and dDAT, especially in their S1 binding sites (69.05% and 78.57% for hNET and hDAT, respectively). Currently, there were many popular tools available for constructing homology model, such as MODELLER [53], PRIME [54], SWISS-MODEL [55], SYBYL-X [56], Insight II [57] and MOE [58]. Based on a comprehensive assessment of the prediction ability of these popular tools [59], MODELLER and SWISS-MODEL were reported to give “best fold description” as assessed by multiple statistical ranking schemes [59], and SWISS-MODEL was also found to be highly accurate and very popular in constructing homology model for target protein of > 50% sequence identity with its corresponding template [59,60]. Thus, SWISS-MODEL was selected for constructing the homology models of hNET and hDAT in this study. The corre-sponding templates were X-ray crystal structures of Drosophila mela-nogaster dopamine transporter (dDAT) complexed with structural sim-ilar ligands for studied drugs [29,61] (Table S1 and Fig. S3). The stereochemical quality of the built hNET and hDAT structures were further validated by the Ramachandran plots analysis in the PROCHECK [62,63]. The homology models of hNET and hDAT were shown in Fig. 1B.

2.3. Molecular docking

Molecular docking is important and popular for investigating li-gand-target interaction, and is applied to associate the spatial orienta-tion of ligand-protein according to their scoring [64]. In this work, initial conformation of each complex for MD simulation was thus ob-tained by molecular docking using Glide [54] with standard precision (SP). Drugs’ binding sites in the models of hNET and hDAT were defined by the centroid of corresponding ligands from the template structures (Table S1). The docking poses of these 8 drugs were selected according to the orientations of ligands. Details about the docking protocol were described in Supplementary Methods.

2.4. System Setup and MD Simulation

MD simulation is an advanced method presenting precise interac-tion between ligand and protein at the atomic level by incorporating biological condition such as structural motion [64,65]. The resulting docking complexes were thus firstly inserted into POPC bilayers generated by the Membrane Builder tool in CHARMM-GUI [66], and then solvated with TIP3P water of 20 Å thickness [67]. Finally, each system was neutralized at a salt concentration of 0.15 mol/L, which contained 89,000–99,000 atoms per periodic cell with various box sizes as sum-marized in Table S2.

MD simulations were carried out using AMBER14 package [68] based on ff14SB [69] and Lipid14 [70] force fields for proteins and lipids respectively by CPU-accelerated PMEMD as described in previous work [41,71]. Prior to each simulation, systems underwent a succession of pretreatments including (1) steepest descent minimization, (2) heating to 310 K via 2 sequential stages and (3) 5 ns equilibration at 310 K. Then, 150 ns MD simulation was executed at 310 K and 1 atm in NPT ensemble by the periodic boundary condition. During the simu-lation, long-range electrostatic interaction (cutoff = 10 Å) was used to evaluate the direct space interactions by particle-mesh Ewald method [72], and all bonds involving hydrogen atoms were constrained by SHAKE algorithm [73] with 2 fs time step. Finally, 500 snapshots were retrieved from the last 50 ns equilibrium trajectory of each system. More details were extensively described in Supplementary Methods.

2.5. Calculation of binding free energy

The total binding free energy (ΔGcalc(MM/GBSA)) neglected entropic
contribution of 8 drugs binding to hNET and hDAT were calculated by the MM/GBSA based on 500 snapshots of each single-trajectory [74–77]. For each snapshot, the binding-free energy was obtained by the following equation:

$$
\Delta G_{\text{calc(MM/GBSA)}} = \Delta G_{\text{vdW}} + \Delta G_{\text{ele}} + \Delta G_{\text{pol}} + \Delta G_{\text{nonpol}}
$$

(1)

$$
\Delta G_{\text{calc(MM/GBSA)}} = \Delta G_{\text{calc(MM/GBSA)}} - T\Delta S
$$

(2)

$\Delta G_{\text{vdW}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{ele}}$ were the Van der Waals interaction and the electrostatic contribution in gas phase, $\Delta G_{\text{pol}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{nonpol}}$ were polar and non-polar contributions to solvation free energy. What needed to be clarified is that $\Delta G_{\text{nonpol}}$ was received by the surface tension 0.0072 multiplying $\Delta S\text{ASA}$ by linear combination of pairwise overlaps method (LCPO) with a 1.4 Å Probe radii [78,79]. $-T\Delta S$ referred to the change of conformational entropies upon ligand binding calculating by normal mode analysis [80]. Per-residue decomposition free energy ($\Delta G_{\text{calc(MM/GBSA)}}^{\text{per-residue}}$) used to quantitatively evaluate every residue contribution to binding was calculated according to the equation:

$$
\Delta G_{\text{calc(MM/GBSA)}}^{\text{per-residue}} = \Delta G_{\text{vdW}}^{\text{per-residue}} + \Delta G_{\text{ele}}^{\text{per-residue}} + \Delta G_{\text{pol}}^{\text{per-residue}} + \Delta G_{\text{nonpol}}^{\text{per-residue}}
$$

(3)

In Eq. (3), $\Delta G_{\text{vdW}}^{\text{per-residue}}$, $\Delta G_{\text{ele}}^{\text{per-residue}}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{pol}}^{\text{per-residue}}$ were calculated using the same method as that evaluating total binding free energy, and the non-polar solvation free energy contributions were estimated by $\Delta G_{\text{nonpol}}^{\text{per-residue}} = 0.0072 \times \Delta S\text{ASA}$. But the SASA was
achieved by icosahedron (ICOSA) only used in the decomposition based on the recursive approximation of a sphere around an atom [81]. Detailed information on the above process was extensively described in Supplementary Methods.

2.6. Hierarchical clustering analysis of decomposed per-residue energy contributions

Hierarchical clustering of the contributed residues (contribution $\neq 0$ kcal/mol) was carried out using R statistical analysis software [82,83] according to the similarity degrees among those generated vectors reflected by the Manhattan distance:

$$\text{Distance}(a,b) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} |a_i - b_i|$$

(4)

In Eq. (4), $l$ was the dimension of vector, and $i$ was certain residue energy for each dimension. The Ward’s minimum variance method [84] used in cluster could minimize the total within-cluster variance. Visual hierarchical tree was displayed by online tool iTOL [85].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Homology models of hNET and hDAT

To construct accurate and precise homology models of hNET and hDAT, the X-ray crystal structures of dDAT complexed with diverse ligands were used as templates (Table S1). As shown in Table S1 and Fig. S2, all templates adopted in this work showed high sequence identity (>55%) with hNET or hDAT, especially in S1 binding site (69.05% and 78.57% for hNET and hDAT, respectively). The constructed homology models covered all 12 TMs and the corresponding identity (>55%) with hNET or hDAT, especially in S1 binding site. Furthermore, the stereochemical quality and accuracy of hNET and hDAT models were further validated by Ramachandran plot (Fig. S3). Results showed that residues of models in allowed regions ranged from about 99.6% to 100%, indicating reasonable model conformations [86]. Finally, two functional sodions, one chloride and two cholesterol or cholesterol with a cholesteryl hemisuccinate in template were fitted into their corresponding binding sites in both hNET and hDAT models.

3.2. Docking the Studied sNRIs and NDRIs into hNET and hDAT

Dextroamphetamine and dextromethamphetamine were reported to be co-crystallized with dDAT [29]. Thus, cross-docking was first carried out to validate the credibility of docking protocol (Fig. S5). The binding pose of dextroamphetamine and dextromethamphetamine obtained by docking was close to the experimentally observed conformation indicated by the value of root mean square deviation (RMSD were 0.1979 Å and 0.3192 Å, respectively). Then, using the same parameter settings as cross-docking, 4 sNRIs (atomoxetine, LY2216684, SS-reboxetine, and S-viloxazine) and 4 NDRIs (dexamphetamine, dextromethamphetamine, R-bupropion) were docked into the homology models. Finally, the resulting docking poses of dextroamphetamine and dextromethamphetamine were selected based on their conformations in dDAT (Fig. S6), while docking pose of the other 6 drugs was selected according to the orientation of structurally similar ligands co-crystallized with dDAT (Fig. S7). Fig. S8 showed that all drugs bind to the S1 site surrounded by TM1, 3, 6, 8 and 10.

3.3. Assessing the structures of drugs bound hNET and hDAT complexes

3.3.1. Simulation stabilities

After getting the initial poses of those 8 studied drugs in hNET and hDAT, the structures of drug-target complexes were assessed by 150 ns MD simulation in the explicit POPC bilayer membrane. Simulation stabilities were measured by the RMSDs of protein backbone atoms, ligand heavy atoms and binding site residue atoms relative to the initial coordinate of the entire simulation (as illustrated in Fig. S9). As shown, all systems reached equilibration around 100 ns and the extending 50 ns trajectory of all systems demonstrated little fluctuation (within 1 Å). Besides LY2216684, RMSDs of hNET’s backbone atoms complexed with other drugs were all relatively small (2 Å–3 Å as shown in Fig. S9A). A relatively high RMSD (about 6 Å) of hNET’s backbone atoms was observed for LY2216684, which might be owing to the extremely flexible EL2 region located far away from the binding pocket (Fig. S10). As illustrated, RMSDs of TM1-TM12 were from 0.9430 Å to 1.9660 Å, but RMSD of EL2 equaled to 6.0803 Å, which supported the above extrapolation that higher hNET RMSD of LY2216684 might come from EL2.

3.3.2. Binding free energy analysis

Based on the snapshots extracted from equilibrated trajectories, energies ($\Delta G_{\text{calc}}$(MM/GBSA)) of ADHD drugs binding to hNET and hDAT were calculated. The calculated $\Delta G_{\text{calc}}$(MM/GBSA) and experimental binding affinities ($\Delta G_{\text{exp}}$) estimated by reported $K_i$ values [87–94] by $\Delta G_{\text{exp}} = RT\ln(K_i)$ ($R = 8.3141/(K \cdot mol)$, $T = 310K$) were all summarized in Table 1. $\Delta G_{\text{calc}}$(MM/GBSA) were overestimated compared to those of experiments. Overestimated binding energies also occurred in other simulations using MM/GBSA method [95–97]. To evaluate whether these overestimation came from the exclusion of entropy contributions,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>$K_i$</th>
<th>$\Delta G_{\text{exp}}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G_{\text{exp}}$</th>
<th>$\Delta G_{\text{calc}}$(MM/GBSA)</th>
<th>$\Delta G_{\text{calc}}$(MM/GBSA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>3820</td>
<td>−7.679</td>
<td>5.053</td>
<td>−33.12 ± 0.10</td>
<td>16.26 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>hDAT</td>
<td>5680</td>
<td>−7.435</td>
<td>5.297</td>
<td>−34.2 ± 0.11</td>
<td>15.18 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>−9.477</td>
<td>3.255</td>
<td>−44.62 ± 0.10</td>
<td>4.76 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-bupropion</td>
<td>hDAT</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>−9.628</td>
<td>3.104</td>
<td>−44.76 ± 0.10</td>
<td>4.62 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomoxetine</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>−7.609</td>
<td>5.123</td>
<td>−35.41 ± 0.09</td>
<td>13.97 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LY2216684</td>
<td>hDAT</td>
<td>1850</td>
<td>−8.126</td>
<td>4.606</td>
<td>−38.12 ± 0.09</td>
<td>11.26 ± 0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-reboxetine</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>6970</td>
<td>−7.309</td>
<td>5.423</td>
<td>−38.90 ± 0.10</td>
<td>10.48 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-viloxazine</td>
<td>hDAT</td>
<td>871</td>
<td>−8.589</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>−40.78 ± 0.10</td>
<td>8.60 ± 0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>−11.766</td>
<td>0.966</td>
<td>−48.53 ± 0.12</td>
<td>1.05 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>hDAT</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>−11.05</td>
<td>1.682</td>
<td>−48.69 ± 0.12</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>hNET</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>−12.732</td>
<td>2.617</td>
<td>−49.38 ± 0.12</td>
<td>2.22 ± 0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AMP: dextroamphetamine; MPH: dexamphetamine; MTA: dextromethamphetamine.
* Experimental $K_i$ value from previously published works [87–94].
* Estimated binding energy based on $K_i$ values using $\Delta G_{\text{exp}} = RT\ln(K_i)$, $R = 8.3141/(K \cdot mol)$, $T = 310K$.
* Binding energy difference was computed using $\Delta G = \Delta G_{\text{exp}} - \Delta G_{\text{calc}}$.
* Calculated binding energy in this work.

Table 1

The calculated and experimental binding energies of 8 ADHD drugs binding to wild type hNET and hDAT ($\Delta G$ is in kcal/mol and $K_i$ value is in nM).
The experimental values of both $K_i$ (mutation) and $K_i$ (wild type). The black solid dot and black solid triangle is for hDAT complexes with the wild type hNET/hDAT. Drugs binding to hNET are represented as P. Wang et al.

As a result, the correlation coefficient between $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$ and $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{exp}}$ equaled to 0.7779 (Fig. S11). This demonstrated good correlation between calculation and experiments but slightly lower than that excluding the entropy contribution ($0.8483$, Fig. 2), which was consistent with previous work [96]. Overall, a good correlation between the calculated and the experimental binding energies of ADHD drugs for site directed mutagenesis hNET complexes (Fig. S11) was observed, which indicated that drugs' experimental activities could be effectively reproduced by the calculated binding energies of this study.

### 3.3.3. Validation of MD simulation

To identify reliable binding modes of studied ADHD drugs in hNET and hDAT, it was indispensable to validate whether the constructed models could accurately reflect real systems or not. Besides the good correlation between the calculated and the experimental binding energies, three lines of evidence were further provided to validate the simulation results of this work.

The first line of evidence was the reproducibility of experimental mutagenesis results [32,98–100] by MD simulated models. A total of 18 site-directed mutational systems were constructed on the basis of wild-type models from MD simulation, and the simulations extending 20 ns were carried out for each system (Fig. S12). The calculated and the experimental energy difference ($\Delta G$) as well as fold-change (FC) induced by mutations in both targets were shown in Tables 2 and 3, and detail information of energy terms were summarized in Tables S4 and S5. As demonstrated in Tables 2 and 3, the $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$ and $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{exp}}$ of all mutational systems were highly consistent with each other, which verified the MD simulated models constructed in this study.

The second line of evidence came from the models' capacity of distinguishing sensitive residues from non-sensitive ones. Drug sensitivity profiles induced by residue mutations could provide great insight into ADHD drugs' binding in hNET and hDAT [99]. Meanwhile, the sensitivity of each residue could be in silico estimated by the energy difference between wild-type and mutation system [99]. Herein, 6 mutations S419 T, F323Y, F72A, G149A, N153S and V148I located in hNET S1 site for atomoxetine binding characterized by previous experiments [99] were selected. According to the comparison of FC values between in silico studies and experiments (Table 2), the sensitivity profiles of these mutations were successfully reproduced. S419 T and F323Y in hNET were identified here as sensitive mutations (FC ≥ 5) for atomoxetine binding. It should be noted that the calculated FC of F323Y for atomoxetine was 5.97, which was within the range of experimental result (2.45–6.14). Meanwhile, F323Y in hNET was also discovered as sensitive mutation for other SNRs (nisoxetine and maprotiline) [99]. For F72A, G149A, N153S and V148I, the simulations of this work could correctly predict them as non-sensitive mutations (FC < 5). Thus, the in silico site-directed mutagenesis study based on the wild-type models constructed by MD simulation could correctly distinguish those sensitive residues from non-sensitive ones. The conformation changes in hNET's binding pocket and shifts of drugs accommodating into the pocket were also illustrated in Fig. S13.

The third evidence lied in the solved co-crystalized structures of amphetamine and methamphetamine complexed with dDAT [29]. Comparison of crystal structures and MD-simulated models revealed the similar binding mode. In details, amino groups of amphetamine and methamphetamine interacted with Asp46 in dDAT (corresponding residues Asp75 in hNET and Asp79 in hDAT) and occupied subsite A lined by Phe43, Ala44, Phe319 and Ser320 (corresponding residues Phe72, Ala73, Phe317 and Ser318 in hNET and Phe76, Ala77, Phe320 and Ser321 in hDAT) [29]. In addition, their phenyl groups were stabilized by inserting into hydrophobic cleft formed by Val120, Tyr124 and Ser422 (corresponding residues Val148, Tyr152 and Ser420 in hNET and Val152, Tyr156 and Ala423 in hDAT) and Phe319 and Phe325 (corresponding residues Phe317 and Phe323 in hNET and Phe320 and Phe326 in hDAT) with van der Waals, which probably played a key role in affinity and especially in specificity owing to non-conserved residues between hDAT and hNET [29,32]. As shown in Fig. 3, all of these mentioned residues were identified as of significant contributors to the binding of those studied drugs.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Mutation sites</th>
<th>Calculated values</th>
<th>Experimental values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$</td>
<td>$\Delta G_{\text{exp}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$</td>
<td>$\Delta \Delta G_{\text{exp}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$</td>
<td>$\Delta G_{\text{exp}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$</td>
<td>$\Delta \Delta G_{\text{exp}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atomoxetine</td>
<td>F72A</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V148I</td>
<td>–0.67</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G149A</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N153S</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F323Y</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S419 T</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>15.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A145S-Y151F-I315V-F316C-S420A-A426S</td>
<td>–1.37</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS-reboxetine</td>
<td>A145S-Y151F-I315V-F316C-S420A-A426S</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$a$ $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}} = \Delta G_{\text{mutation}} - \Delta G_{\text{wild type}}$.

$b$ Fold-changes of potency ($FC_{\text{calc}}(\text{MM/GBSA})$) were derived from $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{calc}}$ using the equation $FC_{\text{calc}} = -\ln(K_i(\text{mut})/K_i(\text{wt}))$, $R = 8.314/J/(\text{K mol})$, $T = 310K$.

$c$ Fold-changes of potency ($FC_{\text{exp}}$) measured by $K_i$ values ($FC_{\text{exp}} = K_i(\text{mutation})/K_i(\text{wild type})$) [32,99].

$d$ Fold-changes of potency ($FC_{\text{exp}}$) measured by $K_i$ values ($FC_{\text{exp}} = K_i(\text{mutation})/K_i(\text{wild type})$) [32,99].

\[ R^2 = 0.8483 \]
Table 3
The calculated and experimental changes in binding energies of ADHD drugs for site directed mutagenesis hDAT complexes (ΔG is in kcal/mol). Detail information of each energy term can be found in Table S5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Mutation sites</th>
<th>Calculated values</th>
<th>Experimental values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ΔΔGcalc(MM/GBSA)</td>
<td>FCexp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>D313N</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>12.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W84L</td>
<td>− 0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>D313N</td>
<td>− 0.5</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W84L</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTA</td>
<td>D313N</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-Bupropion</td>
<td>D313N</td>
<td>− 0.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W84L</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S149A-F155Y-V318I-C319F-A423S-S429A</td>
<td>− 0.49</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a AMP: dextroamphetamine; MPH: dexamphetamine; MTA: dextromethamphetamine.
b ΔΔGcalc(MM/GBSA) = ΔGmutation − ΔGwild type.
c Fold-changes of potency (FCcalc(MM/GBSA)) were derived from ΔΔGcalc, the equation ΔΔGcalc(MM/GBSA) = RTln(FCcalc(MM/GBSA)), R = 8.314J/(K·mol), T = 310K.
d Fold-changes of potency (FCexp) measured by Ki values (FCexp = Ki(mutation)/Ki(wild type)) [32,98,100]. Numbers out of the bracket indicated the fold-changes derived from the mean experimental values of both Ki(mutation) and Ki(wild type). The first number in the bracket indicated the minimum fold-changes, while the second one indicated the maximum fold-changes.
e ΔΔGexp were derived from the FCexp by the equation ΔΔGexp = RTln(FCexp).

Fig. 3. Per-residue binding free energy decomposition of 12 studied drug-hNET/hDAT complexes. Residues with high energy contribution (the absolute energy contribution ≥ 0.5 kcal/mol) were labeled.
3.4. Identifying the binding modes of the studied sNRIs and NDRIs in hNET and hDAT

3.4.1. Key residues in hNET and hDAT contributing to drugs recognition and binding

The binding mode of 12 complexes was achieved by molecular docking and further identified by MD simulation. Structural alignments of the representative interaction snapshots of 12 studied complexes extracted from equilibrated MD trajectories and their corresponding docking poses were illustrated in Fig. S14. As shown, the conformation of 8 studied ADHD drugs in representative structures extracted from equilibrated simulation trajectory slightly shifted compared to their corresponding docking poses, and the key interactions such as the salt bridge and hydrogen bond between ligands and Asp75/Asp79 of hNET/hDAT were preserved. Fig. S15 showed the orientations of ADHD drugs and their interacting residues extracted from their corresponding equilibrated MD trajectories. As illustrated, all structures contained the conserved interactions of salt bridge or hydrogen bond between protonated nitrogen (−N+) in drugs’ ammonium group and negative charged oxygen (OD−) of Asp75/Asp79 in hNET/hDAT. The salt bridges between all ADHD drugs and hNET/hDAT were relatively stable in entire MD simulations (Fig. S16). The stability of the hydrogen bonds was estimated by percentage occupancy in each entire trajectory. The occupancy values (ranges from 15.56% to 90.89% as shown in Table S6) demonstrated the stability of hydrogen bonds along each simulation. 7 out of those 8 studied drugs were found to be with high occupancy values, while dextroamphetamine’s values were relatively low (15.56 to 18.33%). As shown in Table S6, the low occupancy value of dextroamphetamine in both hNET and hDAT might come from its lower percentage (19.09 to 29.83%) of acceptor···H-donor angles required for hydrogen bond formation [101] compared with that of other studied drugs. In contrast, the salt bridge interaction (Fig. S16C, J) between dextroamphetamine and those two targets were more stable during the entire MD simulations than that of other studied drugs, which was consistent with previous report [29] that the conserved interactions of salt bridge or hydrogen bond were essential for drugs recognition of hNET and hDAT.

In addition, energy contribution of each residue to drugs binding in hNET or hDAT were quantitatively analyzed and illustrated in Fig. 3. To the best of our knowledge, Fig. 3 was the first illustration of the per-residue energy contributions between ADHD drugs and their corresponding targets. There were 14, 13, 9, 11, 11, 13, 14 and 15 residues in hNET with great energy contributions (>0.5 kcal/mol) to the accommodating of atomoxetine, dexmethylphenidate, dextroamphetamine, dextromethamphetamine, R-bupropion, LY2216684, SS-reboxetine and S-viloxazine, respectively (Fig. 3A). Moreover, 11, 9, 12 and 11 residues were considered as the high contribution ones for the binding of dexmethylphenidate, dextroamphetamine, dextromethamphetamine and R-bupropion in hDAT (Fig. 3B). It was noted that, in each complex, energy contributions of the identified high contribution residues varied significantly. For instance, energy contribution to dextroamphetamine’s binding varied from −0.56 (−0.76) kcal/mol for Ala145 in hNET (Ser149 in hDAT) to −5.93 (−6.17) kcal/mol for Asp75 in hNET (Asp79 in hDAT). Meanwhile, energy contribution of the same residue in different complex was also different. For example, contributions of Asp75 in hNET varied from −5.93 kcal/mol for dextroamphetamine’s binding to −1.85 kcal/mol for SS-reboxetine’s binding, and the contribution of Asp79 in hDAT was from −6.17 kcal/mol (dextroamphetamine) to −3.19 kcal/mol (dexmethylphenidate).

3.4.2. The shared binding mode of studied NDRIs in hNET and hDAT
Fig. 3 implied some level of similarity among drugs’ binding in both hNET and hDAT, which inspired us to further explore their shared binding mode to facilitate the discovery of new NDRI treating ADHD [30,102]. As shown in Fig. 4, five congregated residue groups (A, B, C, D and E) were discovered by hierarchical clustering analysis of per-residue energies of 4 studied NDRIs binding to hNET and hDAT. Per-residue binding free energies favoring drugs’ binding were colored in red, with the highest energy (−6.17 kcal/mol) set as exact red and the lower energies gradually fading towards white (0 kcal/mol). Per-residue energies hampering drugs’ binding were shown in blue, with the highest (0.37 kcal/mol) set as exact blue and lower ones gradually fading towards white (0 kcal/mol). Energy contributions of the residues in group A (Phe72, As75, Val148, Tyr152, Phe317, Ser318, Phe323 and Ser419 in hNET, and Phe76, Asp79, Val152, Tyr156, Phe320, Ser321, Phe326 and Ser422 in hDAT) were significantly higher than those in group B, C, D and E. The sum of energy contributions of group A were considered as the primary contributor to NDRIs’ binding, consisting of 58.39%, 75.69%, 67.04%, 69.88% energy contribution in hNET, and 65.89%, 78.29%, 69.64%, 70.88% energy contribution in hDAT for binding dexamfetamine, dextroamphetamine, dextromethamphetamine, R-bupropion, respectively. Those residues in group B (Ala73, Ala145, Gly149, Gly320, Val325, Asp418, Ser420 and Gly423 in hNET, and Ala77, Ser149, Gly153, Gly323, Asp421, Ala423 and Gly426 in hDAT) offered relatively strong contributions to NDRIs’ binding, with 23.18%, 13.04%, 18.14%, 15.98% energy contribution in hNET, and 14.42%, 12.24%, 17.18%, 14.34% energy contribution in hDAT for binding dexamfetamine, dextroamphetamine, dextromethamphetamine, R-bupropion, respectively. Taken together, a total of 15 residues in hNET (hDAT) were identified as hot spots in NDRIs’ binding.

Fig. 5 illustrated the interaction of 4 studied NDRIs with 15 hot spot residues of hNET and hDAT. As shown, all studied drugs displayed resemble orientation in binding pocket with slight conformational shift. Thus the generalized binding mode of 4 studied NDRIs in hNET/hDAT was schematically shown in Fig. S17. It was clear to observe that 3 chemical moieties of ADHD drug contacted with residues in the binding pocket via both electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions. These chemical moieties were highlighted by light gray (R1), deep gray (R2) and gray (R3), and residues were distinguished by black and gray color on the basis of strong (group A) and relatively strong (group B) energy contribution. In particular, the ammonium moiety R1 mainly contacted with Asp75 (Asp79) and/or Phe72 (Phe76) and Phe317 (Phe320) in hNET (hDAT) via electrostatic interactions, and R2 contacted with Ala73 (Ala77) and/or Phe72 (Phe76) in hNET (hDAT) via hydrophobic interactions. As shown in Fig. S17, aromatic moiety R3 was anchored by hydrophobic interactions in the hydrophobic cleft of hNET (hDAT), while moiety R2 was surrounded by hydrophobic interactions in another hydrophobic cleft of hNET (hDAT). The studied 4 sNRIs also shared a common binding mode which was consistent with previous studies [71], the detailed information could be found in Supplementary Results and Discussion.

3.5. Identification of key physicochemical properties discriminating NDRIs from sNRIs

The homology models of hNET and hDAT shared a similar molecular architecture (Fig. 1B), and their amino acid sequence share an overall identity of ~54% (Fig. S1) and a high identity of 89% in the drug binding site [29]. As reported, the selectivity determinants in hNET were critical for the development of ADHD drug [32,103,104]. Although mutagenesis [29,32,105], crystallography [29] and molecular modeling [103,106] of ADHD drugs were studied, their selectivity determinants were still elusive.

In this study, to make a better understanding of ADHD drugs’ selectivity, additional MD simulation of the selective dopamine transporter inhibitor (sDRI) R-modafinil binding to hDAT was performed. The per-residue energies contributing to NDRIs’ binding and that contributing to sNRI and sDRIs’ binding were compared by energy variation analysis. Herein, the energy variation was calculated based on the mean energy contribution of residues in S1 sites of both hNET and hDAT (Fig.
S18A, B). As illustrated, Phe72, Asp75, Ala145, Val148, Tyr152, Ser419, Ser420, Gly423 and Ile481 of hNET and Phe76, Asp79, Val152, Phe155 and Phe320 of hDAT were the key determinants of sNRIs’ and sDRIs’ selectivity, respectively. Per-residue energy variation of these determinants was summarized in Tables 4 and 5. Schematic representation of the binding mode between those studied drugs and selective determinants in both targets was shown in Fig. 6. Comparing to selective ADHD drugs, hydrophobic interactions in subsite B between residues and R2 significantly decreased (shown in red) for dual target drugs, which indicated a clear reduction in hydrophobic property of the functional group R2 in NDRIs. This result was further supported by weaker hydrophobic property in R2 of most NDRI drugs (phenyl group) than that of sNRI drugs (ethoxy-, methoxy- and methyl-substituted phenyl group). Moreover, as an indirect experimental support to this finding, the improved selectivity of SS-reboxetine to hNET [32] could be reflected by the significant increase of hydrophobicity in its R2 group (ethoxy-phenyl group) comparing to that of nisoxetine (methoxy-phenyl group). Similarly, the hydrophobic interactions of R3 in NDRIs drugs were reduced in subsite C. In the meantime, MD simulation also revealed that residues Asp75 (hNET) and Asp79 (hDAT) played key role in the recognition of all studied drugs. Therefore, as a prerequisite, their corresponding interactions with targets must be preserved in ADHD drugs’ binding. The structural variation in those studied drugs could also induce changes in interaction between R1 and surrounding residues (Ala77 and Phe320).

Apart from the variations in hydrophobic property as identified above, the selectivity of ADHD drugs could be further reflected by distances among the centroids of R1, R2 and R3 in each drug. As shown in Table S7, D1 of NDRIs was in the range of 5.18–5.41 Å, which was shorter than that of sNRIs (6.33–8.34 Å), and the range of D2 for NDRIs was from 2.11 Å to 3.81 Å, which was also significantly shorter than that of sNRIs (4.25–6.68 Å). Distance among centroids of ADHD drugs’ moieties (R1, R2 and R3) reflected the depth of the aromatic ring stretched into the hydrophobic pocket, which might be another key physicochemical property for ADHD drugs’ selectivity.

4. Conclusions

The common binding mode in targets shared by NDRIs for the treatment of ADHD was identified for the first time in this study, and 15 hot spot residues were considered as crucial for the binding NDRIs in both targets. Comparing to selective ADHD drugs, a clear reduction in hydrophobic property of the functional group R2 in NDRIs was observed, and the depth of the aromatic ring in drugs stretched into the
Energy contributions of residues in hNET binding site and energy fold changes in each residue between NDRIs and sDRIs.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>NDRIs</th>
<th>sNRIs</th>
<th>Energy Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>MTA R-bupropion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE72</td>
<td>−2.24</td>
<td>−2.26</td>
<td>−2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP75</td>
<td>−2.64</td>
<td>−3.18</td>
<td>−4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA145</td>
<td>−3.51</td>
<td>−3.39</td>
<td>−4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL148</td>
<td>−3.51</td>
<td>−3.97</td>
<td>−4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYR151</td>
<td>−2.26</td>
<td>−1.27</td>
<td>−1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYR152</td>
<td>−2.26</td>
<td>−1.28</td>
<td>−1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE317</td>
<td>−2.49</td>
<td>−2.67</td>
<td>−2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER419</td>
<td>−0.85</td>
<td>−0.91</td>
<td>−0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER420</td>
<td>−0.48</td>
<td>−0.53</td>
<td>−0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLY423</td>
<td>−1.01</td>
<td>−0.22</td>
<td>−0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEU481</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>−0.03</td>
<td>−0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AMP: dextroamphetamine; MPH: dexamethylphenidate; MTA: dextromethamphetamine.

The energy variations of per-residue between NDRIs and sNRIs were calculated by Energy Variation = mean energy contribution_{NDRIs} — mean energy contribution_{sNRIs}. Energy Variation is in kcal/mol.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>NDRIs</th>
<th>sDRIs</th>
<th>Energy Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MPH</td>
<td>AMP</td>
<td>MTA R-bupropion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE76</td>
<td>−2.41</td>
<td>−1.87</td>
<td>−2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASP79</td>
<td>−3.19</td>
<td>−6.17</td>
<td>−4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ser149</td>
<td>−0.94</td>
<td>−0.76</td>
<td>−0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAL152</td>
<td>−1.94</td>
<td>−1.39</td>
<td>−1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE155</td>
<td>−0.35</td>
<td>−0.06</td>
<td>−0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYR156</td>
<td>−2.26</td>
<td>−1.4</td>
<td>−1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHE250</td>
<td>−1.94</td>
<td>−2.79</td>
<td>−2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SER422</td>
<td>−1.22</td>
<td>−1.04</td>
<td>−0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALA423</td>
<td>−0.32</td>
<td>−0.38</td>
<td>−0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLY426</td>
<td>−0.5</td>
<td>−0.22</td>
<td>−0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEU484</td>
<td>−0.01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>−0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* AMP: dextroamphetamine; MPH: dexamethylphenidate; MTA: dextromethamphetamine.

The energy variations of per-residue between NDRIs and sDRIs were calculated by Energy Variation = mean energy contribution_{NDRIs} — mean energy contribution_{sDRIs}. Energy Variation is in kcal/mol.
hydrophobic pocket was identified as one of the key contributors to the selectivity of ADHD drugs. These results provide new insights into the binding mechanism of NDRIs clinically important for the treatment of ADHD, which could be further utilized as structural and energetic blueprints for assessing and discovering novel therapeutics for ADHD treatment.
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