Structural studies of two rhinovirus serotypes complexed with fragments of their cellular receptor
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Two human rhinovirus serotypes complexed with two- and five-domain soluble fragments of the cellular receptor, intercellular adhesion molecule-1, have been investigated by X-ray crystallographic analyses of the individual components and by cryo-electron microscopy of the complexes. The three-dimensional image reconstructions provide a molecular envelope within which the crystal structures of the viruses and the receptor fragments can be positioned with accuracy. The N-terminal domain of the receptor binds to the rhinovirus ‘canyon’ surrounding the icosahedral 5-fold axes. Fitting of molecular models into the image reconstruction density identified the residues on the virus that interact with those on the receptor surface, demonstrating complementarity of the electrostatic patterns for the tip of the N-terminal receptor domain and the floor of the canyon. The complexes seen in the image reconstructions probably represent the first stage of a multistep binding process. A mechanism is proposed for the subsequent viral uncoating process.
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Introduction

Human rhinoviruses (HRVs), a genus of the Picornaviridae family, are the most frequent etiological agents of common colds (Rueckert, 1996). Rhinoviruses are small, icosahedral viruses, with an average diameter of 300 Å and a molecular mass of ~8.5 × 10⁶ Da. They are composed of a protein shell that encapsidates a single, positive RNA strand of ~7000 bases. The capsid is built from 60 copies of four viral proteins. The three larger proteins, VP1, VP2 and VP3 (~250 amino acids, 30 kDa each), form the external surface of the virus, whereas VP4 (70 amino acids, 6 kDa) is an internal protein located at the interface between the capsid and genome (Rossmann et al., 1985).

With >100 different serotypes identified to date, HRVs exhibit remarkable antigenic variability. To produce infection, HRVs must first attach to a cellular receptor. The major group of HRVs, consisting of ~90 serotypes, utilizes the cell surface glycoprotein, intercellular adhesion molecule-1 (ICAM-1), as its receptor (Greve et al., 1989; Staunton et al., 1989). A minor group of ~10 HRV serotypes uses members of the low-density lipoprotein receptor family to attach to cells (Marlovits et al., 1998).

ICAM-1 belongs to the immunoglobulin (Ig) superfamily of cell adhesion molecules, whose defining characteristic is an extracellular tandem of Ig-like domains. Up to five different ICAM receptors have been reported to date, which differ in the number of Ig domains, cell type, expression regulation, etc. All share some degree of amino acid sequence homology among corresponding Ig domains and a cell adhesion function. The Ig superfamily also includes many other cell surface determinants, such as CD2, CD4, CD8 and the poliovirus receptor (PVR), some of which are also subverted for cellular recognition and entry by diverse pathogens.

ICAM-1 normally promotes functions of intercellular adhesion and signaling, mainly in processes derived from response to inflammation (van de Stolpe and van der Saag, 1996). ICAM-1 is also exploited by human pathogens. For instance, erythrocytes infected by the malarial parasite Plasmodium falciparum gain the ability to bind ICAM-1 on the surface of endothelial cells (Berendt et al., 1992; Ockenhouse et al., 1992). This cytoadherence is used by infected erythrocytes to sequester themselves in tissues, such as the brain, thus minimizing exposure of the parasite to immune surveillance. As an HRV receptor, ICAM-1 localizes the virus near the cellular membrane and triggers the conformational changes in the viral capsid that initiate uncoating, the process by which RNA is released into the cell. Such changes have been described in detail for the analogous interaction of poliovirus (PV) with its receptor PVR (Racaniello, 1996).

High-resolution crystal structures of several HRV serotypes have been reported previously (Rossmann et al., 1985; Kim et al., 1989; Oliveira et al., 1993; Zhao et al., 1996; N.Verdaguer, D.Blaas and I.Fita, in preparation). In all these structures, a surface depression or ‘canyon’, ~12 Å deep and 12–15 Å wide, surrounds each pentagonal vertex of the icosahedral shells. Amino acid residues at the base of the canyon are more conserved than residues exposed elsewhere on the viral surface (Rossmann and Palmenberg, 1988), whereas hypervariable surface residues coincide with the binding sites of neutralizing monoclonal antibodies (Sherry et al., 1986). It was first suggested (Rossmann et al., 1985) and then shown (Olson et al., 1993) that the canyon is the receptor attachment site. Mutational analyses of specific residues in the canyon are consistent with its involvement in receptor binding (Colomno et al., 1988), and the cryo-electron microscopy (cryo-EM) reconstruction of a complex of HRV16 with
the two N-terminal domains of ICAM-1 (D1D2, residues 1–185) demonstrated that the receptor fragment binds to the central part of the HRV canyon (Olson et al., 1993). When the structure of the D1D2 fragment of ICAM-1 (ICAM-1 D1D2) was determined by X-ray crystallography (Bella et al., 1998; Casasnovas et al., 1998b), it was possible to build a molecular model for the cryo-EM reconstructions by combining the X-ray structures of the different components as constrained by the molecular envelope defined by the cryo-EM density map. Preliminary results (Olson et al., 1993; Bella et al., 1998) indicated that the tip of the ICAM-1 N-terminal domain (D1) makes contact with the canyon floor of HRV16, consistent with mutational data (Stauton et al., 1990; McClelland et al., 1991; Register et al., 1991). Analysis of the charge distribution on the two interacting surfaces showed complementarity, but it was not immediately clear why ICAM-1 is recognized only by major-group HRVs.

A hydrophobic pocket in the center of the VP1 β-barrel lies directly beneath the canyon floor. This pocket has been shown to be the binding site for certain antiviral compounds that inhibit the replication of HRVs and related picornaviruses (Fox et al., 1986; Smith et al., 1986). Furthermore, many major-group HRVs have reduced affinity for HeLa cell membrane attachment when an antiviral compound fills the pocket (Pevear et al., 1989).

In the crystal structures of HRV14 and HRV3, this pocket is empty (Rossmann et al., 1985; Zhao et al., 1996) and in a ‘closed’ conformation. Crystal structures of HRV14 and HRV3 complexed with antiviral compounds show extensive conformational changes relative to the native structures in the region that separates the pocket from the canyon and raises the canyon floor by 4 Å to accommodate an antiviral compound (Smith et al., 1986). A similar hydrophobic pocket contains uncharacterized lipid-like molecules (‘pocket factors’) in the crystal structures of PV (Hogle et al., 1985), HRV1A (Kim et al., 1989), HRV16 (Oliveira et al., 1993), coxsackievirus B3 (Muckelbauer et al., 1995), and bovine enterovirus (Smyth et al., 1995). The pocket in each of these structures has an ‘open’ conformation similar to that observed in the complexes of HRV14 with antiviral drugs. It has been suggested that pocket factors contribute to the thermal stability of the virus and that they are displaced when major-group HRVs attach to ICAM-1 by depressing the canyon floor towards the closed pocket conformation found in HRV14. Loss of pocket factor would then be expected to destabilize the virus and initiate uncoating (Oliveira et al., 1993; Rossmann, 1994).

Receptor attachment initiates early events in the viral life cycle, including entry of the virus into the cell. Ultimately, receptors must mediate passage of viral RNA through a lipid bilayer into the cytoplasm (Rueckert, 1996). HRVs and PVs undergo several progressive transformations when bound to cells. Infectious virions, with sedimentation coefficients of ~150S, are thought to uncoat through intermediate 125S (‘A’ or altered) particles characterized by the loss of VP4 and the externalization of the N-termini of VP1 (Fricks and Hogle, 1990). Release of RNA leads to the presence of 80S empty capsids. Most 125S and all 80S particles end up as non-infective, abortive products, and only a small fraction of 125S particles attach to membranes and successfully deliver the viral RNA into the host cell cytoplasm (Rueckert, 1996).

Soluble receptors have been used to reproduce in vitro some of the events described above (Koike et al., 1992; Hoover-Litty and Greve, 1993; Yafal et al., 1993). The addition of soluble receptors to PV or HRV produces complexes that dissociate reversibly at low temperature. At higher temperatures, these complexes convert into subparticles analogous to those seen in cell-binding studies (Hoover-Litty and Greve, 1993).

Considerable experimental data now exist that relate to the mechanisms by which ICAM-1 binding to HRVs triggers virus destabilization and uncoating: (i) antiviral compounds bound to the hydrophobic pocket in VP1 inhibit uncoating in HRVs and PVs (Fox et al., 1986); (ii) these antiviral compounds preclude cell binding in many of the major-group HRVs (Pevear et al., 1989, 1992); (iii) HRV antiviral escape mutants may change residues either at the surface of the canyon or in the hydrophobic pocket, thereby increasing the affinity of the virus for its receptor in the first case or decreasing the affinity of antiviral compounds for the virus in the second case (Hadfield et al., 1995); (iv) HRV14 is able to externalize both VP4 and the N-terminus of VP1 in a spontaneous, probably reversible manner (‘breathing’), as shown by limited proteolysis followed by mass spectroscopy (Lewis et al., 1998); (v) antibodies against internal epitopes on VP1 and VP4 cause PV neutralization, also suggesting a breathing mechanism for PVs (Li et al., 1994); (vi) HRV14 breathing is largely inhibited by antiviral compounds (Lewis et al., 1998); (vii) there is kinetic evidence for two binding modes of ICAM-1 on the surface of HRVs (Casasnovas and Springer, 1995); and (viii) complexes between HRVs and soluble receptors can be obtained as stable entities, visualized by cryo-EM, and then triggered into an irreversible uncoating step by changes in temperature, pH or receptor concentration (Hoover-Litty and Greve, 1993; Olson et al., 1993). In spite of all this information, however, the precise details of the interaction between HRVs and ICAM-1 and the sequence of events that lead to uncoating remain to be characterized.

Here we report cryo-EM reconstruction analyses of HRV14 and HRV16 complexed with various ICAM-1 fragments. HRV14 dissociates completely in a few minutes when incubated at room temperature with soluble, truncated fragments of ICAM-1 (Hoover-Litty and Greve, 1993), while HRV16 remains stable for several hours under the same conditions. Thus, the earlier cryo-EM analysis of the binding of ICAM-1 to HRV was performed with HRV16 (Olson et al., 1993). The cryo-EM results on the binding of ICAM-1 D1D2 to the less stable HRV14 are presented here, from experiments carried out at 4°C, and compared with an improved analysis of the complex between HRV16 and ICAM-1 D1D2. Additionally, the reconstructions of complexes of HRV16 with the five-domain fragment D1–D5 of ICAM-1, as well as with a mutated version of ICAM-1 D1D2 with reduced glycosylation, are also reported. Molecular models for HRV14, HRV16 and ICAM-1 fragments, available from X-ray crystallographic analyses, have been placed into the cryo-EM reconstructions using automatic fitting procedures. The difference between glycosylated and unglycosyl-
Table I. Different ICAM-1 fragments mentioned in the text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Residues</th>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Mutations</th>
<th>Expression system</th>
<th>Glycosylation</th>
<th>Crystal structure</th>
<th>PDB i.d. code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1–185</td>
<td>D1–D2</td>
<td>wild type</td>
<td>CHO cells</td>
<td>full, complex</td>
<td>this work</td>
<td>1D3L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1–185</td>
<td>D1–D2</td>
<td>N103→Q, N118→Q, N156→Q</td>
<td>baculovirus-infected Sf9 cells</td>
<td>reduced, complex</td>
<td>Bella et al. (1998)</td>
<td>H1AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>1–190</td>
<td>D1–D2</td>
<td>wild type</td>
<td>modified CHO cells Lec3.2.8.1C</td>
<td>full, high-mannose</td>
<td>Casasnovas et al. (1998b)</td>
<td>H1C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1–453</td>
<td>D1–D5</td>
<td>wild type</td>
<td>CHO cells</td>
<td>full, complex</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a The Asn to Gln mutations in type 2 ICAM-1 remove three out of four glycosylation sites in ICAM-1 D2; the mutant CHO cell line used for type 3 ICAM-1 expression produces mannose-only glycans with reduced heterogeneity.
*b Two independent molecules per crystallographic asymmetric unit, referred to as A and B.
*c Casasnovas et al. (1998b).

Results and discussion

Flexibility between domains D1 and D2 of ICAM-1

The structure of a mostly deglycosylated ICAM-1 D1D2 fragment (residues 1–185, type 2, Table I) was reported previously by Bella et al. (1998). The structure of a slightly longer, fully glycosylated form (residues 1–190, type 3, Table I) has also been published (Casasnovas et al., 1998b). Crystals of fully glycosylated ICAM-1 D1D2 (residues 1–185, type 1, Table I) were obtained previously (Kolatkar et al., 1992), but the structure could not be solved *ab initio* because of the large variability of the unique trigonal axis. However, the availability of the type 2 crystal structure has now permitted the fully glycosylated type 1 structure to be solved by molecular replacement to ~2.8 Å resolution and is reported here.

The structure of the two Ig-like domains (each Ig domain has β-strands A, B,..., G) has a total length of ~75 Å. Each domain has a diameter of ~20 Å, with an interdomain (‘elbow’) angle of ~150° between the major axes of the two domains. There is an additional disulfide bond, compared with the classical intermediate Ig-type domain (Harpaz and Chothia, 1994), between Cys25 and Cys69 connecting the BC and FG loops in domain D1. Domain D2 has a fold homologous to that of a C-2 Ig domain (Harpaz and Chothia, 1994).

There are four independent versions of the two-domain ICAM-1 fragment in the three available ICAM-1 D1D2 crystal structures (Table I), each with a different elbow angle. This variation in the D1–D2 elbow angle occurs mostly in one plane (Figure 1). This restricted variation exists even though the crystal packing environments and glycosylation properties differ. The lack of a spacer region between the two domains, which permits several close interactions, appears to be the basis of the restricted flexibility. The long FG loop in domain D2 interacts with residues in the βA and βG strands of domain D1. Additionally, there is a salt bridge between residues Arg13 and Glu87 (Bella et al., 1998; Casasnovas et al., 1998b). The average Cα–Cα distance between these two residues in all four ICAM-1 structures is 12.4 ± 0.2 Å. Side chains from residues Ile10, Tyr83, Thr85, Pro115, Asn118, Leu163, Leu165, Gln168, Leu170 and Phe173 define a hydrophobic cushion (Wang and Springer, 1998) that fills the gap between D1 and the FG loop in domain D2. This oily cushion probably allows limited interdomain movement over the surface of the more rigid FG loop.

Cryo-EM reconstructions

The cryo-EM images of the HRV14–type 1 ICAM-1, HRV16–type 2 ICAM-1 and HRV16–type 4 ICAM-1 complexes show 300 Å diameter particles decorated with radially projecting spikes. Complexes between HRV14 and type 1 ICAM-1 are quite unstable (Hoover-Litty and Greve, 1993; Olson et al., 1993) and exist for relatively short incubation periods at 4°C (see Materials and methods). Images of HRV16–type 2 ICAM-1 indicate a greater tendency of these complexes to aggregate com-
Fig. 2. Cryo-EM image reconstructions of complexes between HRV14 or HRV16 and different soluble fragments of ICAM-1 (see Table I for nomenclature and Table II for statistics). The occupancy of the type 2 and type 4 ICAM-1 fragments is lower, causing them to look thinner at the contour level appropriate for the virus density.

Table II. Cryo-EM image reconstruction statistics of HRV–receptor complexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virus ICAM-1 type</th>
<th>HRV14 Type 1</th>
<th>HRV16 Type 1</th>
<th>HRV16 Type 2</th>
<th>HRV16 Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underfocus (µm)</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal pixel size (Å)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of particles</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective resolution (Å)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICAM-1 occupancy (%)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See Table I for definition of ICAM-1 types.

pared with complexes between HRV14 or HRV16 with the fully glycosylated type 1 ICAM-1.

The image reconstructions (Table II, Figure 2) are similar to those previously reported for HRV16–type 1 ICAM-1 (Olson et al., 1993; Bella et al., 1998). They show viral particles decorated with 60 thumb-like projections, located on the canyon depressions around the 5-fold icosahedral axes. The radii of the features in the virus–receptor complexes range from 150 Å at the virus surface to ~215 Å at the tip of the ICAM-1 D1D2 projections in the type 1 and type 2 reconstructions and to ~250 Å, corresponding to the end of the D3 domain, in the HRV16–type 4 ICAM-1 reconstruction.

Comparison between the electron density values in the ICAM-1 and the virus capsid gives an estimate of the ICAM-1 occupancy in each complex and also an estimate of the conservation of icosahedral symmetry. Whereas occupancy is 100% in the HRV16–type 1 reconstructions, the other three reconstructions show lower occupancies (Table II). No density for domains D4 and D5 appears in the HRV16–type 4 ICAM-1 reconstruction. The apparent occupancy of the D3 domain is lower than that of D1 and D2, indicating that D3 only maintains partial icosahedral symmetry in its complex with HRV16, whereas D4 and D5 retain no icosahedral order. The apparent flexibility of the ICAM-1 molecule beyond domain D3 is consistent with immunolabeling and electron microscopy of individual ICAM-1 molecules (Kirchhausen et al., 1993).

Densities representing the two-domain ICAM-1 molecules in the different reconstructions are similar in shape and orientation, but differ in quality (Table II). The ICAM-1 density in HRV14–type 1 ICAM-1 is tilted ~10° with respect to the corresponding density in HRV16–type 1 ICAM-1 (Figure 3). However, type 1 and type 2 ICAM-1 fragments bind to HRV16 in almost identical orientations.

Identification of the glycosylation sites in the HRV16–type 1 and type 2 ICAM-1 reconstructions

One conspicuous feature in all the cryo-EM reconstructions of HRV–ICAM-1 complexes is the presence of protuberances, or ‘lumps’, on the ICAM-1 spikes. Such lumps are approximately perpendicular to the long axis of the ICAM-1 molecules (Figure 2). Biochemical data indicate that the tip of domain D1 contains the virus-binding surface. With this orientation of the ICAM-1 D1D2 fragment, all the lumps occur in the D2 domain, consistent with D1 having no potential glycosylation sites and D2 having four such sites. Hence, the lumps represent the carbohydrate moieties of the ICAM-1 fragments.

As many as four lumps per spike can be seen in the HRV16–type 1 or HRV14–type 1 ICAM-1 reconstructions (Figure 2). Electron density maps calculated to 20–25 Å resolution from a molecular model of type 2 ICAM-1 with a single, disordered glycan show a very similar density lump protruding from the smooth, elongated elec-
Rhinoviruses complexed with their receptors

Fig. 4. (A) Stereo diagram of a portion of the HRV16–type 2 ICAM-1 cryo-EM reconstruction corresponding to the density (light blue) for the two-domain ICAM-1 fragment. Superimposed, in yellow, is the difference density map between HRV16–type 1 (fully glycosylated) and HRV16–type 2 (mostly deglycosylated) reconstructions. The density in the HRV16–type 2 reconstruction has been suitably scaled to account for the lower occupancy of the ICAM-1 fragments. (B) Fitting of the refined type 1 ICAM-1 model into the cryo-EM reconstruction of the HRV16–type 1 ICAM-1 reconstruction. The protein is represented in white, and the disordered carbohydrates are represented by an ensemble of conformations (yellow). (C) A model, represented as a C\textalpha{} tracing, of D1–D3 of ICAM-1 manually fitted into the HRV16–type 4 ICAM-1 reconstruction. D2 coordinates have been used to model domain D3 of ICAM-1. Additional lumps of electron density correspond to the predicted positions for two carbohydrate moieties on ICAM-1 D2, consistent with the difference density map shown in (A) and the refined ICAM-1 D1D2 model in (B).

A small volume of difference density, near the virus surface (Figure 4A), is not compatible with a glycosylation site and might reflect a small change in orientation of ICAM-1 binding between the two complexes.

Fitting of X-ray crystal structures into cryo-EM difference maps

Appropriately glycosylated models of type 1 ICAM-1 with various elbow angles (the angle between the major axis of domain D1 and that of domain D2) were fitted by eye into the cryo-EM electron density maps. Each of the models for the HRV14–type 1 and HRV16–type 1 reconstructions were subsequently refined as rigid bodies in reciprocal space with respect to difference maps obtained by subtraction of the HRV contribution from the cryo-EM reconstructed density of the complexes (J.Bella and M.G.Rossmann, in preparation). The refined fits of the ICAM-1 D1D2 models into the cryo-EM density maps are consistent with the predicted positions of glycosylation (Figure 4B).
The quality of fit, measured with an \( R \)-factor computed to 28 Å resolution, is comparable for both reconstructions. Given the resolution of the reconstructions, the variation in elbow angle within physically reasonable limits could not be differentiated. Differences in atomic positions among models with different elbow angles were no greater than 5 Å. However, the fit of a given model into the cryo-EM density maps of ICAM-1 complexed with HRV14 or HRV16 was distinguishable. The r.m.s. difference in equivalent \( C_\alpha \) positions between the best fits for the HRV16–type 1 and HRV14–type 1 reconstructions was 3.3 Å, corresponding to a 6.8° orientation difference between these two structures. Thus, although it was difficult to pin down the exact elbow angle between domains D1 and D2, it was possible to position domain D1 relative to the virus surface to less than the distance between adjacent \( C_\alpha \) atoms.

A model for the three N-terminal domains of type 4 ICAM-1 was built manually into the density of the HRV16–type 4 reconstruction (Figure 4C), using the refined ICAM-1 coordinates for the HRV16–type 1 reconstruction and a copy of D2 as a model for the third domain of ICAM-1. The fitting indicated that there is enough additional density to position ICAM-1 D3. This domain seems to be oriented at ~120° with respect to the major axis of domains D1D2 (Figure 4C). No attempt was made to refine this model.

**ICAM-1 footprint on the surfaces of HRVs**

The ICAM-1 models with the lowest \( R \)-factor were used for the analysis of the interactions of type 1 ICAM-1 with HRV14 and HRV16. Coordinates for the viral protein surfaces were obtained from the X-ray structures of HRV14 (Rossmann et al., 1985; Arnold and Rossmann, 1990) and HRV16 (Hadfield et al., 1997). Side chains of residues at the HRV–ICAM-1 interface in each of the complexes were refined to optimize their interactions, using one round of energy minimization. Footprints of type 1 ICAM-1 on the viral surfaces of HRV16 and HRV14 were determined by using distance matrix and buried surface analyses. The calculated area of contact between ICAM-1 and either HRV14 or HRV16 is 990 Å². Residues on the surface of HRV16 and HRV14 that become less exposed to the solvent upon complex formation (assuming a probe of 1.4 Å radius) are shown as roadmaps (Chapman, 1993) (Figure 5).

There are no residue contacts between domain D2 of ICAM-1 and the viral surface, in approximate agreement with mutational studies. Also, no contacts are observed between the carbohydrate moieties and the virus, although the long, disordered glycan models potentially are able to reach the virus surface. This lack of contact is consistent with the observation that two-domain ICAM-1 fragments with different degrees of glycosylation bind to HRVs with similar kinetics (Casasnovas et al., 1998a).

Loops BC and FG of domain D1 contact both VP1 and VP3, whereas loop DE only contacts VP1. Loop CD abuts a broad area of VP2, on the ‘south’ wall of the canyon (see Figure 3) (Bella et al., 1998), and strands \( \beta \)C and \( \beta \)D make additional contacts with some VP1 and VP2 residues. The footprint of ICAM-1 on HRV14 is shifted slightly with respect to the footprint on HRV16. In both complexes, the ICAM-1 footprint includes several of the residues that define the deepest regions in the canyon surface (Figure 5). Residues Lys1095–Leu1100 and Val1210–Leu1217 in HRV16 define the ‘roof’ of the hydrophobic drug-binding pocket in VP1 (viral residues are numbered sequentially, starting at 1000, 2000, 3000 and 4000 for the polypeptide chains VP1, VP2, VP3 and VP4, respectively). Of these residues, only Asp1213 makes contact with ICAM-1. Equivalent residues in HRV14, Asp1101–Leu1106 and Val1217–Met1224, are all outside the ICAM-1 footprint when the pocket is closed, and none of them are closer than 4 Å to any ICAM-1 residue. When the pocket is filled by an antiviral compound (Badger et al., 1989), then only His1220 becomes part of the ICAM-1 footprint. Nevertheless, mutations at Lys1103, Val1217, His1220 and Ser1223, in the roof of the hydrophobic pocket in HRV14, all modify the ability of the virus to bind to HeLa cell membranes (Colonno et al., 1988).

Hence, ICAM-1 does not make extensive contacts with the residues that undergo the largest conformational changes when an empty pocket becomes filled with an antiviral compound or pocket factor (see below). Yet, binding studies in the presence of antiviral compounds...
suggest that the ICAM-1-binding site and the drug-binding site are overlapping and that the binding events are competitive. Thus, the cryo-EM structures appear to be inconsistent with the inhibition of attachment of major-group HRVs to cell membranes when the virus has been inoculated with antiviral compounds (Pevear et al., 1989, 1992), and they are also inconsistent with the mutational results of Colonno et al. (1988). A two-step mechanism for ICAM-1 binding, as discussed below, can be invoked to explain how the complex observed by cryo-EM may only represent an initial recognition event and how a subsequent event may lead to a closer association with the virus.

**Electrostatic interactions**

Charge complementarity exists between the tip of ICAM-1 D1 and the floor of the canyon (Figure 6). Such complementarity is not maintained as a result of residue conservation, but rather by compensating changes of amino acids between serotypes (Table III). Our cryo-EM results show that ICAM-1 can bind in slightly different orientations to different HRV serotypes and still maintain favorable interactions. Two acidic residues in HRV16, Asp1213 and Asp3181, interact with Lys29 of ICAM-1 D1 (Table III). However, in HRV14, only Asp3179 (homologous to Asp3181 in HRV16) opposes Lys29 (Table III). Similarly, Lys2164 on the south wall of HRV16 interacts with Glu34...
Table III. Charge complementarity at the HRV–ICAM-1 interface

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICAM-1 Site</th>
<th>Residue</th>
<th>HRV16 Interaction</th>
<th>HRV16 Alignment</th>
<th>HRV14 Interaction</th>
<th>HRV14 Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC loop</td>
<td>Asp26</td>
<td>Arg1277</td>
<td>Lys1280</td>
<td>Lys1280</td>
<td>Arg1277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC loop</td>
<td>Lys29</td>
<td>Asp1213</td>
<td>His1220</td>
<td>Lys1283</td>
<td>Thr1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βC</td>
<td>Glu34</td>
<td>Lys2164</td>
<td>Gly2163</td>
<td>Lys2143</td>
<td>Gly2143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>βE</td>
<td>Lys50</td>
<td>VP3 COOH</td>
<td>VP3 COOH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG loop</td>
<td>Asp71</td>
<td>Arg1277</td>
<td>Lys1280</td>
<td>Lys1283</td>
<td>Thr1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asn3084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HRV residues aligned by Palmenberg (1998).

*Equivalent residue in the homologous virus, but not necessarily involved in binding to ICAM-1.

of ICAM-1, whereas in HRV14, Lys2143 faces Glu34 from a different direction (Table III).

HRVs discriminate between ICAM-1 and other homologous molecules, such as ICAM-2 or ICAM-3. This specificity has been rationalized by the crystallographic and sequence analysis of the BC, DE and FG loops in domain D1, which differ in sequence and conformation between the different ICAMs (Bella et al., 1998). Nevertheless, all major-group HRVs show only moderate sequence conservation. Minor-group HRVs, which do not bind ICAM-1, are not obviously distinct from the major-group HRVs. Furthermore, the major-group HRV14 serotype is more distantly related to HRV16 than are the minor-group HRV1A and HRV2 serotypes (Palmenberg, 1998). Nevertheless, the residues that line the canyon of the known minor group serotype structures can be differentiated from those of the major group serotypes (J.Bella, N.Verdaguer, I.Fita and M.G.Rossmann, in preparation).

**Possible mechanisms for ICAM-1-induced uncoating**

The cryo-EM results described here demonstrate that ICAM-1 makes little contact with the residues that form the roof of the antiviral agent-binding pocket (equivalent to the floor of the canyon). This is inconsistent with previously proposed mechanisms for viral uncoating and cell entry (Rossmann, 1994). Nevertheless, extensive data (see Introduction) link the ability of ICAM-1 to induce uncoating with the conformational state of the pocket. We therefore propose a modified, two-step mechanism (Figure 7), in which the cryo-EM reconstruction of HRVs complexed with soluble ICAM-1 fragments represent the initial recognition event. In a subsequent step, the receptor moves slightly to allow the ‘north’ wall of the canyon (see Figure 3), consisting of VP1 residues, to bind to domain D1. The resulting conformational change in the virion is envisaged to move VP1 away from the 5-fold axis, thereby opening a channel at the pentamer vertex through which the N-termini of VP1 and VP4, and eventually RNA, can be externalized (Giranda et al., 1992; Rueckert, 1996). There could also be alternative, but less likely, routes for the externalization of VP4, the N-terminus of VP1 and RNA. More than one ICAM-1 molecule might need to be bound to the same pentamer vertex to initiate uncoating. As the genomic RNA lacks icosahedral sym-
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The area on the floor of the canyon, which makes a tenuous link between the north and south sides of the
canyon, may be the hinge region around which VP1 can flex. This area is associated with the antiviral pocket.
Antiviral compounds bound to the pocket would stiffen the hinge, thus preventing uncoating (Figure 7B).

A corollary to this mechanism is that, even in the absence of receptor, the viral capsid dynamically opens and
closes at the pentamer vertex, thereby permitting normally buried elements, such as VP4s or the N-termini of
VP1, to become exposed periodically (Lewis et al., 1998). Such viral breathing may be stimulated progress-
ively as more and more receptors are recruited from the cellular membrane, until irreversible uncoating occurs
(Rueckert, 1996).

The two-step mechanism is consistent with the presence on HRV surfaces of two binding modes with different
affinity for ICAM-1 (Casasnovas and Springer, 1995), but with only one type being observed in the cryo-EM
reconstructions. This would explain why virus can be preserved as a complex for cryo-EM experiments without
being converted to empty particles. The initial binding step (as observed here at 4°C) occurs with little contact
between ICAM-1 and the canyon floor on top of the pocket. More substantial contacts are made during the
subsequent step (at elevated temperatures), probably with residues on the DE loop of ICAM-1 D1, not allowed
when a drug is bound.

With a few exceptions, major-group HRVs have reduced affinity for cell membrane attachment when an antiviral
compound is in the pocket, although the degree of sensitiv-
ty affinity for ICAM-1 (NIm-IA) of HRV14, at residues
1091–1095, stabilize the virus against uncoating, whereas antibodies against other antigenic sites in HRV14 do not
provide additional stability (Che et al., 1998). In structures of complexes between HRV14 and Fab molecules that
bind to NIm-IA (Smith et al., 1996; Che et al., 1998), the Fab regions simultaneously contact the north and south
walls of the canyon, thus preventing the VP1 hinge movement (Figure 7B) and, therefore, interfering with
uncoating.

**Materials and methods**

**X-ray crystallographic analysis of fully glycosylated ICAM-1 D1D2**

Crystallization of type 1 ICAM-1 was reported previously (Kolatkar et al., 1992). X-ray diffraction data were collected to 2.8 Å resolution.
The crystals showed very high variability of unit cell dimensions—up to 17% in the length of the crystallographic c-axis. This precluded the
use of isomorphous replacement methods for the structure determination.

However, the genetically engineered form of type 2 ICAM-1 was more amenable to X-ray crystallographic studies (Bella et al., 1998). The
resulting coordinates were used to solve the crystal structure of fully glycosylated type 1 ICAM-1 by the molecular replacement method, using the program
AMoRe (Navaza, 1994). Rotation functions were calculated independently for domains D1 and D2, and their orientation
was determined separately. Translation searches were performed in both P3_21 and P3_21 space groups, and showed that P3_21 was the correct one. Refinement of the structure proceeded through alternate cycles of
manual rebuilding with a computer graphics workstation and conjugate gradient minimization, using the programs CHAIN (Sack, 1988) and
X-PLOR (Brünger, 1992).

**Preparation of HRV-ICAM-1 complexes**

HRV14 was incubated with type 1 ICAM-1 for 30 min at 4°C and 5 mg/ml virus concentration, using an 8-fold excess of ICAM-1 for each of
the 60 possible binding sites per virion. In contrast, complexes between HRV16 and type 1, type 2 or type 4 ICAM-1 were prepared
by incubation of samples for ~16 h at 34°C [types 1 and 4 (Olson et al., 1993)] or room temperature (type 2), using a 16-fold (types 1 and 4) or
54-fold (type 2) excess of ICAM-1 per binding site.

**Cryo-electron microscopy**

After incubation, samples were vitrified as described (Olson et al., 1993) and maintained at near liquid nitrogen temperature in Philips EM420
and CM200 electron microscopes with a Gatan 626 cryotransfer holder. Electron micrographs of HRV14–type 1 ICAM-1 complex particles were
recorded at 80 kV with minimal dose techniques (<20 e/Å²), at a nominal magnification of ~49 000. Electron micrographs of HRV16–
type 1 ICAM-1 complex particles were recorded at 200 kV, minimal dose, and nominal magnification of ~38 000. Only data from the high defocus
images (Table II) were used in this study, thus limiting the final resolution of the reconstruction. Preliminary selection of micrographs, digitization
and preparation of complex particle images were performed as described (Olson et al., 1993). The three-dimensional reconstruction of the HRV16–
type 1 ICAM-1 complex (Olson et al., 1993) (Table II, Figure 2) was
used as the starting model to determine the orientation parameters and
centers of density of the selected particle images of the HRV14–type 1 ICAM-1 complex (Baker and Cheng, 1996). For the HRV16–type 2 ICAM-1 complex images, an HRV16 reconstruction was used as a
starting model. Subsequent refinement of orientation parameters was performed with reconstructed density maps until no further improvement
in the self-consistency of the data was obtained. Data statistics for all the reconstructions are shown in Table II. The effective resolutions of the
reconstructions were determined by randomly splitting the data for each reconstruction into two sets and comparing structure factors obtained
from separate reconstructions. Eigenvalue spectra give an indication of the randomness of the data that were included in the reconstructions.
The completeness of the data was verified in that all eigenvalues exceeded 1.0.

**Model fitting**

Coordinate fitting was carried out with the program X-PLOR (Brünger, 1992) and the graphics program CHAIN (Sack, 1988). The reproducibility
of the refinement process was accurate to <1.5 Å. Thus, the atomic
interaction determined here can be accepted subject to the assumption that the crystallographically determined structures of the virus and receptor fragment are not altered substantially by the formation of the complex. The results presented here will be verified by further experimentation. The program GRASP (Nicholls et al., 1991) was used for electrostatic charge calculations (Figure 6). The X-ray structure coordinates for ICAM-1 D1 (Bella et al., 1998), HRV16 (Hadfield et al., 1997), and HRV14 (Arnold and Rossmann, 1990) were used to compute the electrostatic surface potential.

**Data deposition**

Coordinates for type 1 ICAM-1 have been deposited with the Protein Data Bank (accession code 1D3L). Cα coordinates of the ICAM-1 D1D2 when docked into HRV14 and HRV16 have also been deposited with the Protein Data Bank (accession codes 1D3I and 1D3E, respectively).
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