

## An insight into molecular interaction of PGIP with PG for banana cultivar

[Sunil Kumar](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Budheswar Dehury](#)<sup>2</sup>, [Gitanjali Tandon](#)<sup>3,8</sup>, [Sarika Jaiswal](#)<sup>3</sup>, [Mir Asif Iquebal](#)<sup>3</sup>, [Khurshid Ahmed](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Dipak T Nagrale](#)<sup>1,4</sup>, [Udai B Singh](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Yachana Jha](#)<sup>5</sup>, [Mahender Kumar Singh](#)<sup>6</sup>, [Arjun Singh](#)<sup>1</sup>, [Anil Rai](#)<sup>3</sup>, [B Paital](#)<sup>7</sup>, and [Dinesh Kumar](#)<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>ICAR-NBAIM, Kushmaur, Maunath Bhanjan(UP)-275103, India, <sup>2</sup>ICMR-Regional Medical Research Center, Bhubaneswar-751023, India, <sup>3</sup>ICAR-IASRI, CABIN, Library Avenue, PUSA, New Delhi 110012, India, <sup>4</sup>ICAR-CICR, Post Bag No2, Shankar Nagar PO, Nagpur-440010, India, <sup>5</sup>N. V Patel College of Pure and Applied Sciences, V.V Nagar, Anand, Gujarat 388120, India, <sup>6</sup>NBRC, Manesar, Gurgaon, India, <sup>7</sup>Redox Regulation Laboratory, Department of Zoology, Odisha University of Agriculture and Technology College of Basic Science and Humanities, Bhubaneswar-751003, Odisha, India, <sup>8</sup>School of biosciences, IMS, Ghaziabad- 201012, India.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Abstract
2. Introduction
3. Materials and methods
  - 3.1. 3D model generation of PGIP
  - 3.2. Model validation
  - 3.3. Protein-protein interaction analysis
  - 3.4. Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations
  - 3.5. Analysis of MD trajectories
  - 3.6. Essential dynamics
4. Results and discussion
  - 4.1. Molecular modeling
  - 4.2. Protein structure validation
  - 4.3. Protein-Protein docking studies
  - 4.4. Trajectory analysis
  - 4.5. Intermolecular H-bond analysis
  - 4.6. Essential dynamics
  - 4.7. Cluster analysis
  - 4.8. Intermolecular interactions analysis of PG-PGIP complexes
5. Conclusion
6. Acknowledgment
7. References

### 1. ABSTRACT

PolyGalacturonase Inhibiting Proteins (PGIPs) are leucine rich repeat pathogenesis-related (PR) cell wall proteins, which interact and inhibit the PolyGalacturonase (PG), an enzyme secreted by the pathogen to degrade pectin. Interaction of PGIP with PG limits the vulnerability of PG by the activation of host defense response against pathogenic attack. *Erwinia* is gram-negative soft rot bacteria responsible for rhizome rot disease in banana and many other crop plants. The interaction of PG with PGIP is one of the crucial steps for plant-pathogen interaction. To study the molecular mechanism of PR proteins, we employed molecular modelling, protein-protein docking and molecular dynamics simulations of banana PGIP (bPGIP) with *Erwinia carotovora* PG (ecPG). Further, insilico site-directed mutagenesis was performed in *Phaseolus vulgaris* PGIP (pvPGIP2) to elucidate the interaction with ecPG. Docking and simulation studies divulge that binding of bPGIP and PvPGIP2 with active site residues of EcPG induces structural changes and thereby inhibit the enzyme. This study provides a unique insight into PG-PGIP interaction, which may help in the development of bacterial soft-rot resistant banana cultivars.

### 2. INTRODUCTION

Crop plants in agro-ecosystem are continuously facing the danger of pathogenic infections from fungi, bacteria, viruses, and nematodes (1). However, the degree of plant defense against pathogens depends on its recognition ability of pathogen and host-plant defense response cascade (2). The plant system is having cell surface

receptors which are sensitive to pathogen associated molecular patterns (PAMPs) and activates cascade of defense related activities including innate immune responses against invading pathogens (3, 4). PAMPs are microbial molecules like glycans and glycol-conjugates which stimulate innate immunity in the host to protect from infection by recognizing few conserved non self-molecules. PolyGalacturonase Inhibiting Protein (PGIP) is a type of pathogenesis-related (PR) plant protein present at the cell surface and intracellular spaces of the plant cells. It interacts and inhibits the enzyme PolyGalacturonase (PG) which is secreted by the pathogen such as *Agrobacterium vitis*, *Pectobacterium carotovora*, *Xylella fastidiosa* and *Botrytis cinerea*, to degrade heteropolysaccharide pectin (5, 6). The PG enzymes secreted by pathogen *Erwinia spp.* are known to infect more than 100 plant species in several families. It is a lethal pathogen in the field as well as in storage conditions and are responsible for heavy economic losses. Various *in vitro* studies showed that the interaction of plant PGIP with PG of pathogen limits the vulnerability of PG and results in the accretion of elicitor-active oligogalacturonides to activate a quick defense response against pathogenic attack (7-9).

PGIPs are the important member of leucine-rich repeat (LRR) proteins super-family (10). These LRR proteins show a pivotal role in plant resistance with several resistance genes (11). The LRR proteins are structural motif having very specific roles in the protein-protein interaction (PPI) of host-pathogen which played immunity functions in plants. PGIPs from the various plants differ in inhibitory action against PG. PGIPs from the same plant species inhibit PGs from different bacterial species or multiple host infecting bacteria with variable aggressiveness or virulence potential. PolyGalacturonases that degrades homogalacturonan (HGA) polymer, a key constituent of pectin in plant cell walls, by hydrolysis of the glycosidic bonds during early stages of infection (12). The 1, 4 linked alpha-D-galactosyluronic acid is a linear homopolymer of HGA present in the plant cell, and is the first line of defense to the invading pathogen (13-16). Protein-protein interaction (PPI) between PG-PGIP complexes are a typical system in the background of plant-pathogen interaction mechanism (14). The experimental three-dimensional structures of various PGs are available in RCSB Protein Data Bank (PDB) to date (17-19), but, in case of PGIP only crystal structure of *Phaseolus vulgaris* (PvPGIP) is available till date in PDB (20).

Molecular approach can provide clue for better genetic control of plant resistance reducing damage caused by pathogens (21). Significant biotechnological achievements have been reported in the field experiments with several isoforms of PGIP from diverse group of plants. The resistance in plants was successfully achieved by over expression of PGIP from various plants against fungal pathogens (9, 22-25). A critical mining of literature indicates that very few studies have been performed against PGs of insects and bacteria till date (26) and interestingly, there is no report of inhibition or resistance achieved against bacterial prominent soft rot pathogen like *Erwinia spp.* PGIP protein has been found very promising in increase in breeding efficiency of banana against various biotic stresses have been reported by radiation mutagenesis (27, 28), chemical mutagenesis (29, 30) and genome editing (31).

Prevalent chemical method of disease control, for example, use of foliar spray of copper oxychloride and streptomycin sulphate has several environmental and health issues (32). Use of antibiotics like streptomycin has very high risk/potential threat of antibiotic resistance development (33) which is also noticed in bacterial phytopathogens (34). Though traditional method of banana germplasm improvement has been successful but still it has limitations in resistant cultivar development (35). All these issues necessitate banana cultivar development using alternative strategies at molecular level.

In host-pathogen recognition of banana and gram-negative bacterial pathogen *Erwinia* PG-PGIP interaction plays a pivotal role. Modelling of 3D structure of PGIP of banana and molecular dynamics simulation studies of PG-PGIP complexes can provide deep insights into the molecular mechanism of recognition. In such study, *in silico* mutation of PGIP can be a prudent, rapid and cost effective approach having advantage to predict most effective artificially created allele fetching durable resistance in plants.

The present work aims at host pathogen interaction studies having 3D model of banana PGIP and molecular dynamics simulation studies to reveal critical amino acids involved in molecular recognition with PG of bacterial pathogen, *Erwinia spp.* The study further evaluates *in silico* site-directed mutagenesis of selected critical amino acids of PGIP peptide as model approach to predict where desirable changes can be made to inhibit the host pathogen recognition, which is required in development of soft rot resistant banana genotype.

### 3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

#### 3.1. 3D model generation of PGIP

The 3D structures of bPGIP proteins are not available in PDB. Thus, the amino acid sequence of the PGIP (*Musa* AAB Group) was fetched from NCBI protein database (ADQ38901.1). BLASTp search was executed against the PDB to find appropriate template protein structures for homology modelling (36). The best template (PDB ID: 1OGQ) showing maximum identity and high score as well as lower e-value was selected for building 3D structures. The sequence alignment between target and template was performed using MultAlin program. MODELLER9v19 was used for 3D structure prediction (37, 38). Out of 20 models (3D structures) resulted from MODELLER, one 3D structure was selected and subjected to further stereo-chemical properties check to get the deviations from the standard bond length, dihedrals and non-bonded atom-atom distances. The 3D structure models of PGIP were further calculated based on discrete optimized protein energy (DOPE) scores. The model with lowermost DOPE scores was selected for further refinement using GROMACSv5.1 simulation package. We performed *in silico* site-directed mutagenesis in *Pv*PGIP2 by using the mutate\_model command of MODELLER in which Q224 and V152 were replaced with the corresponding residues Lys and Gly, respectively.

### 3.2. Model validation

The stereo-chemical quality of generated 3D structure was verified using SAVES server, ProSA and ProQ. MolProbity tool was used to calculate bond length and bond angle of the 3D model. The stereo-chemical properties and Ramachandran plots was analysed using Procheck analysis. Furthermore, the Z-score, packing defects, bump score; radius of gyration and deviation of  $\chi$  angles of the selected model was observed using VADAR, GeNMR and PROSESS web-servers. Additionally, to evaluate the accuracy of the model, the structural superimposition of corresponding  $C\alpha$  trace of the predicted structure over template structure (PDB ID: 1OGQ) was executed using PyMOL (The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 2.0 Schrödinger, LLC).

### 3.3. Protein-protein interaction analysis

The 3D structure of PG of *Erwinia carotovora* was retrieved from PDB (PDB ID: 1BHE) and modelled 3D structure of *Musa* PGIP and mutated *Pv*PGIP2 were used for protein-protein interaction (PPI) studies. The active residues in both the proteins PGIP and PG for PPI studies were identified and used for docking *via* HADDOCK (High Ambiguity Driven biomolecular DOCKing) server and Patchdock. HADDOCK is an information-driven docking approach which uses non-structural experimental information to perform docking through a rigid-body minimization of energy, semi-flexible in addition to water refinement stages. PatchDock, a geometry-based molecular docking algorithm was used for enzyme (ecPG)-inhibitor (bPGIP and mutated *Pv*PGIP2) docking with a clustering RMSD of 4Å. The complexes of bPGIP-ecPG and *mPv*PGIP2-*Ec*PG docked candidates obtained from Patchdock were passed to FireDock that refined and scored them according to an energy function. Twenty solutions, out of about 35 predicted PG-PGIP complexes, were sorted conferring to their geometric shape. The complementarities scores were analysed for the identification of involved residues in the protein-protein interface. The complexes of the best cluster were further analysed by BIOVIA Discovery Studio Visualizer (Dassault Systèmes BIOVIA, BIOVIA DSV, 4.5, San Diego: Dassault Systèmes, 2017) to choose the best complex.

### 3.4. Molecular dynamics (MD) simulations

To study the dynamical properties, MD simulations were performed for modelled PGIP, PG (1BHE), PGIP-PG complexes (bPGIP-1BHE, *Pv*PGIP2-1BHE) and mutated complex (mutated *Pv*PGIP2-1BHE) through GROMACSV5.1 package. For topology building, CHARMM force fields were used in cubic boxes with TIP3P water model; periodic boundary conditions were applied by keeping the distance between the edge of the box and the protein as 1nm. The protonation states of all the ionisable amino acids were determined at pH 7.0. The structures were solvated and sodium counter ions (0.15 M NaCl) were added to neutralize the overall charge of the systems. Energy minimization of the solvated systems were performed using conjugate gradient and steepest descent algorithm until maximum force reached less than  $1000 \text{ kJmol}^{-1}\text{nm}^{-1}$ . After energy minimisation, each system was subjected to NVT and NPT ensemble for equilibration at 1000 ps. LINear Constraint Solver (LINCS) algorithm was implied to constrain all bond lengths. Electrostatics was calculated by using Particle mesh Ewald method with a cut-off distance of 0.9 nm. Finally the equilibrated systems were subjected to final MD run of 50 ns at 300 K.

### 3.5. Analysis of MD trajectories

The intrinsic stability parameters i.e., backbone root mean square deviation (RMSD), radius of gyration, solvent accessible surface area (SASA), inter-molecular Hydrogen-bond and from each trajectory was analysed using utility toolkits of GROMACS and 2D graphs were plotted using Grace (<http://plasma-gate.weizmann.ac.il/Grace/>). The interaction images were plotted using BIVIA DSV and PyMOL.

### 3.6. Essential dynamics

Essential Dynamics or Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was executed to explore and understand the global motion of the atomic coordinates of PGIP and 1BHE as well as of mutated PvPGIP2 and 1BHE during MD simulations. PCA systemically decreases the dimensionality of a complex and also can describe the collective and overall motion of the protein system. The first principal component (PC1) includes the largest Root-Mean-Square Fluctuation (RMSF). The fluctuations in the system are due to the correlation between the motion of the particles, where the motion of the particles directly proportional to the function of the protein. The sum of fluctuations of the collective motions per atom is given by the eigenvalues thus, these gives the total motility associated with the eigenvector. PCA calculations were performed by *gmx covar* and *gmx aneig* utility functions of GROMACS. Our investigation was limited to Ca atoms, as it is less perturbed by statistical noise and provides a substantial characterization of the essential space motion.

## 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1. Molecular modeling

The structure of bPGIP protein (comprised of 286 amino acids) was predicted by homology modeling approach. BLASTp search against PDB with the maximum identity (identity=49% and similarity =67%), high score and lower e-value resulted 1OGQ as the best template for the homology modeling. The pair-wise sequence–structure alignment has been displayed in [Figure 1](#). The alignment was considered by few insertions and deletions in the loop regions. Modelling was carried out from 23 to 273 residues after that a refinement of the model was done through energy minimization by means of CHARMM36 force field using GROMACS ([39](#)). The final optimized structure of PGIP of *Musa* protein has been displayed in [Figure 2A](#).

The electrostatic surface potential of the modelled bPGIP was calculated using APBS plugin of PyMOL as shown in [Figure 3](#). Looking at the concave surface of the bPGIP, it can be ascertained that negatively charged residues dominates over positively charged amino acids.

### 4.2. Protein structure validation

The stereo-chemical properties of the modelled structure of PGIP of *Musa* was analysed using PROCHECK. It was observed that the phi/psi angles of most of the residues (91.2%) fell in the most favored regions ([Figure 1B](#)). The inclusive PROCHECK G-factor for the predicted structure was -0.26. The model was furthermore validated using ERRAT graph. The overall quality factor (74.11) recommends that the quality of model was good (a score of >50 for a rational model). PROSA Z-score value was found to be negative (-7.46) for the predicted model ([Figure 1C](#)), which was quite closer to that of the template (-8.2), indicating the consistency of the model. A quality of model was also established from VERIFY 3D server as 95.24% of residues presented a score > 0.2. Results of WHATCHECK also indicated the correctness of the model. On the basis of these diverse validation experiments, it was determined that the modelled structure has rationally good quality. The bond length and bond angles analysis carried out by MolProbity which evaluates the model quality both at global and local levels for proteins. By PROSESS, mean Chi-1 standard deviation was found to be 13.45 and 12.59 which was also found to be in the defined range. ProQ is a neural network based predictor that based on a number of structural features predicts the quality of a protein model. Two quality measures are predicated LGscore and MaxSub. The proQ results for bPGIP model was 6.45 (LGscore) and 0.478 (MaxSub) which confirmed the good quality of the model as LGscore above 4 is considered as extremely good model. The structural superimposition of Ca trace of the predicted structure over template structure 1OGQ ([Figure 1A](#), lower panel) resulted in a root mean square deviation (RMSD) of 0.34 Å using PyMOL specifies a valid structure of the model.

### 4.3. Protein-protein docking studies

The final refined model of PGIP and 3D structure of *Erwinia* PG (1BHE) were used as input in LIGSITE to find the active residues for both the proteins. In bPGIP, active residues were Leu24, Cys33, Cys34, Tyr37, Cys38, Cys41, Arg47, Ile48, Thr52, Ile53, Phe54, Gly56, Ile87, Ile91, Val100, Ile102 and Leu115 whereas, in case of 1BHE active residues were identified as Ser3, Lys210, Asn211, Asn239, Asn277, Arg280, Lys306, Val309, Asp311 and Tyr314. These residues were used as input in HADDOCK server for studying PPI. HADDOCK clustered 129 structures in 17 clusters representing 64.5% of the water-refined models. Clustered complex with a Z-score -2.7 was further used as input in DSV for further interaction analysis. A similar procedure was followed for PvPGIP2-1BHE and mutated PvPGIP2 and 1BHE complex. The active residues of PvPGIP2 and mutated mPvPGIP2 along with 1BHE active residues were submitted in HADDOCK server. HADDOCK clustered 41 structures in 8 clusters which represent 20.5 % of the water-refined models. Clusters with a Z-score of -1.4 were selected and used for further analysis by DSV. Inter-molecular analysis revealed a total of 14 H-bonds in PvPGIP2-1BHE complex and 34 bonds (19 hydrogen bonds, 6 electrostatic bonds, and 9 hydrophobic bonds) in mutated pvPGIP2-1BHE complex. Details of these intermolecular-interactions have been listed in [Tables 1-3](#). The interaction analysis of these (PvPGIP2-1BHE and mutated PvPGIP2-1BHE) complexes provides a strong clue for production/cultivation of genotype having resistant against rhizome and soft rot caused by *Erwinia* spp. Furthermore, the interaction study of bPGIP-*EcPG* provides an effective example of targeting PGs of bacterial soft rot pathogens by PGIP.

#### 4.4. Trajectory analysis

PGIP, 1BHE, bPGIP-1BHE, PvPGIP2-1BHE and mutated PvPGIP2-1BHE complexes were submitted for MD simulations of 50ns in GROMACS. All systems were solvated in a cubic box. To gauge the intrinsic stability and dynamics of each system, the different stability parameters were calculated from each resultant trajectory. The backbone RMSD analysis provides important information on the stability of protein and protein-protein complexes and the time when simulation reached equilibrium. RMSD profiles of bPGIP and 1BHE displayed least deviation with average RMSD ~0.25nm during the simulation period and by the time of 40 ns all both systems achieved convergence ([Figure 4A](#)).

The residue flexibility of bPGIP and 1BHE structures was examined by performing C $\alpha$  RMSF analysis. Both the protein displayed differential flexibility where 1BHE protein gave a maximum value of 0.53 nm and bPGIP with average RMSF value of 0.23nm ([Figure 4C](#)). The RMSF values remarkably demonstrate the difference in residual flexibility in both the proteins. Radius of gyration ( $R_g$ ) represents the atomic distribution from their mutual center of mass in terms of mass-weighted root mean square distance ([40-42](#)). The  $R_g$  depicts the compactness and inclusive dimension of the protein and protein-protein complexes that may comprise their appropriate interactions. Statistical analysis of  $R_g$  for all the systems throughout the 50 ns trajectory showed distinctive difference for all protein ([Figure 4B](#)) and protein-protein complexes. Lie the RMSD, 1BHE system had higher  $R_g$  value than that of bPGIP system (~2.13 nm) ([Figure 4B](#)). RMSD profile of all three complexes bPGIP-1BHE, 1OGQ-1BHE and mutant 1OGQ-1BHE systems displayed least deviation ([Figure 5A](#)). In case of protein-protein complexes, bPGIP-1BHE displayed least gyradius indicating its compact packing and stability. The  $R_g$  pattern of 1OGQ-1BHE and mutant 1OGQ-1BHE systems followed a constant trend in radius of gyration with a gyradius of 2.83 and 2.84 nm, respectively ([Figure 5B](#)). Solvent accessible surface area (SASA) is another significant measure that calculates accessible area of the solvent molecule. SASA was also computed for 50 ns for all the proteins. In bPGIP, total SASA changed from 144.41 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 56.95 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 87.46 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=0 ns to 145.173 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 56.46 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 88.71 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=50 ns. For 1BHE, total SASA shifted from 175.28 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 52.79 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 122.50 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=0 ns to 181.704 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 52.3676 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 129.336 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at 50 ns. SASA in complex (bPGIP-1BHE) drifted from 306.86 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 105.12 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 201.738 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time 0 ns to 315.59 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 106.94 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 208.65 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time 50 ns. Our study displayed 11.289 nm<sup>2</sup> surface area was interacting between bPGIP and 1BHE thus leading to total 14 bonds formation. The SASA was computed for complex PvPGIP2-1BHE changed from 165.73 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 88.32 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 77.41 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=0 ns to 159.61 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 83.45 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 76.16 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=50 ns. In the same way, SASA was also computed for mutated complex (PvPGIP2-1BHE) changed from 163.54 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 87.19 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 76.35 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=0 ns to 158.92 nm<sup>2</sup> (with 80.71 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophobic surface area and 78.21 nm<sup>2</sup> as hydrophilic surface area) at time t=50 ns. We also computed the evolution of secondary structure elements from the resultant trajectories of bPGIP and *EcPG* using DSSP algorithm, which displayed subtle variation of secondary structure elements including turns and the  $\beta$ -



strands during MD ([Figure 3.6](#)). However, the structural fold of the both the PGP and PGIP were found to be intact.

#### 4.5. Intermolecular H-bond Analysis

The intermolecular hydrogen bonds (H-bonds) between interacting atom pairs in a protein-protein complex plays vital role in stability and molecular recognition processes (Dehury *et al.*, 2014). To gauge the dynamics stability of each complex i.e., *bPGIP-1BHE*, *1OGQ(PvPGIP2)-1BHE* and mutated *PvPGIP2-1BHE*, the intermolecular H-bonds were calculated with respect to time during the 50 ns MD simulations. All the complexes displayed a pattern of differential H-bonding with additional number of H-bonds ([Figure 7](#)).

In all systems during initial 20 ns there was significant decrease in H-bonds were observed which later increased and remained stable till 50 ns. Though, in all complexes, some of the imperative H-bonds were broken out during MD simulation, but at later stage they well remunerated by new H-bonds, van der Waals and hydrophobic contacts. This may be due to structural re-orientation of interacting proteins within the binding pocket. The change in intermolecular H-bonds and hydrophobic contacts detected before and after MD in *bPGIP-1BHE(EcPG)* complexes perfectly compare with the results of PCA (as discussed later). The *bPGIP-1BHE* ([Figure 7A](#)) system displayed least (Average ~11.23) number of H-bonds followed *1OGQ-1BHE* ([Figure 7B](#)) system with ~15.23 number of H-bonds. As compared to the other two systems, the mutant *PvPGIP2-1BHE* system displayed a stable H-bonding pattern with an average of ~13.98 number of H-bonds ([Figure 7C](#)).

#### 4.6. Essential dynamics

The activity of *bPGIP* and *1BHE* was interrelated with the protein motion through essential dynamics calculations *bPGIP* and *1BHE* interaction significantly influences the whole protein motion and further their function. Structural reorganizations are imperative for appropriate signaling. Dynamic cross-correlation was performed to study the motion of residues (data not shown). The correlation value lies between -0.0193 (blue) to 0.104 (red) for *bPGIP* and -0.00977 (blue) and 0.0379 (red) for *1BHE* which signifies negative and positive correlation correspondingly. Covariance analysis expounds the positive and negative correlated motions in the protein. A noteworthy alteration was observed between the covariance of motion among all the complexes. Overall, the *bPGIP-1BHE* displayed increased collective motion, while decreasing the collective motion was observed in the *1OGQ(PvPGIP2)-1BHE* and mutant *PvPGIP2-1BHE* complexes. Both ways, the conformational and flexibility changes give the impression to play a crucial role in *bPGIP-ecPG* interactions. For PCA analysis, we only restricted the first ten and/or twenty modes for analysis of the essential subspace as they explain >87% variance of two systems ([Figure 8A, B](#)).

In this study we only considered the first two principal components (i.e., PC1 and PC2) which govern the fluctuations of protein conformation. By projecting the trajectory on specific vector, the change of a trajectory alongside each eigenvector can be detected. A greater dispersal of dots specifies more variance congruous with the higher changes in conformations in *bPGIP-1BHE* complex ([Figure 9A](#)). In case of proteins, *1BHE* system occupied a large conformation sub-space while *bPGIP* with least sub-space with a trace of covariance of 15.3477 and 8.7281 nm<sup>2</sup>. Protein trajectories analysis exposed a least subspace dimension and decreased concerted motions in *1OGQ (PvPGIP2)-1BHE* complex and mutant *PvPGIP2-1BHE* complex with a trace of covariance of 25.78 and 15.3914 nm<sup>2</sup> respectively. Then *bPGIP-1BHE* system covered a larger subspace (with a trace value 37.7326 nm<sup>2</sup>) with exceptionally higher variation. As exposed by the trajectory projection along EV1 and EV2, *bPGIP-1BHE* exhibited a bigger value of trace of covariance matrix than the other two complexes ([Figure 9B](#)).

#### 4.7. Cluster analysis

Clustering approach was applied using the *gmx cluster* toolkit to explore the conformation heterogeneity of the resulted protein structures from the MD simulations. For clustering analysis, the GROMOS clustering algorithm was employed with a C $\alpha$ -RMSD cutoff of 0.25 nm. In case of *bPGIP-1BHE* complex clusters, the RMSD was observed within the range of 0.0609 to 0.601 nm (with average RMSD of 0.321875 nm). A total of 17 dominant clusters were obtained consisting of 93% of the total protein structures for *bPGIP-1BHE* complex indicating structural conformational changes between these proteins. While 10 dominant clusters consisting ~89 % of the total protein structures was captured in case of *1OGQ(PvPGIP2)-1BHE* complex system. While in case of mutant *PvPGIP2-1BHE* complex, we found only three dominant clusters ~83 % of total protein structures which

indicates least conformational change upon binding. The RMSD was within the range of 0.0633 to 0.455 nm with average of 0.226042 nm. Protein-protein complex frames from the resultant MD trajectory were extracted using cluster analysis technique have been displayed in [Figure 10](#).

#### 4.8. Intermolecular interactions analysis of PG-PGIP complexes

To understand the molecular recognition of PGIPs to PGs, the interatomic dynamic distances between the interacting atom pairs were calculated from the resultant trajectories for each PGIP-PG complexes (as shown in [Figure 11](#)).

The inter-atomic distance of the important electrostatic interactions and hydrogen bond forming pairs were calculated from the 50 ns trajectory. In case of bPGIP-1BHE complex, one salt bridge was noticed between OD1 atom of Asp47 (bPGIP) and CA of Asn303 (1BHE) with an atomic distance of 2.11 Å. Furthermore, a total of three electrostatic contacts were also noticed between Lys20, Trp264 (of bPGIP) with Glu336 and Arg4 of 1BHE. Moreover, three strong H-bonds were noticed between Asp147 (bPGIP) with Asn303 (1BHE) with an average atomic distance 2.7 Å. The other important interacting atom pairs between bPGIP and 1BHE system along with their chemistry has been summarized in [Table 4](#). Furthermore, the inter-atomic distance between interacting atom pairs forming electrostatic and H-bonds in bPGIP and 1BHE has been calculated over 50 ns time (as shown in [Figure 11A](#)). Unlike, bPGIP-1BHE system, more number of H-bonds, salt bridges and hydrophobic contacts were observed in 1OGQ(PvPGIP2)-1BHE system ([Figure 11B](#) and [Table 4](#)).

A total of two salt bridges were formed between Asp160:OD2 (1OGQ) with Lys285:HZ1 (1BHE) and Asp186:OD1 with Lys316:HZ2 atom pairs respectively. In addition to salt bridges, a total of 15 numbers of H-bonds were also noticed along with three electrostatic contacts (as summarized in [Table 4](#)). The HH12 atom of Arg212 (1OGQ) formed two H-bonds with oxygen atom of Glu315 (1BHE) with an atomic distance of 2.43 and 1.76 Å respectively. Similarly, HD22 and OD1 (Asn276:1OGQ) formed two H-bonds with OE1 and HE22 of Gln368 (1BHE). Among the hydrophobic contacts, pi-cation, pi-anion, amide-pi stacked and pi-alkyl interactions were found to dominate the PG-PGIP interactions. In case of mutated PvPGIP2-1BHE complex, a total of four salt bridges were noticed during MD simulation with an average atomic distance of 1.68 Å (i.e., Arg212:HH12-Glu318:OE1, Arg212:HH22-Glu318:OE2, Asp186:OD2-Lys316:HZ1 and Asp232:OD2-Lys316:HZ3 respectively). In addition, four electrostatic contacts, five conventional and two carbon H-bonds were also observed in mutated PvPGIP2-1BHE complex. The inter-atomic distance between corresponding interacting atom pairs of mutated PvPGIP2-1BHE complex has been displayed in [Figure 11C](#). So, from the interatomic distances and in-molecular contact analysis, it can be summarized that the PG-PGIP systems are heterogeneous in nature which is well supported by the MD and PCA analysis. To further strengthen our results, we used the top ranked cluster of each PG-PGIP complexes for electrostatic surface potential calculation using APBS ([Figure 12<sup>o</sup>](#)- C).

The mode of binding for PvPGIP2 and mPvPGIP2 to EcPG considerably differs from the mode observed for bPGIP-EcPG. Looking into the electrostatic potential surface for bPGIPs and PvPGIP2, it was evident that a portion of the interacting surface for differs in both where the distribution of positive charged residues dominates in PvPGIP2. The interaction of PvPGIP2 with EcPG dominated by a number of strong H-bonds and electrostatic contacts, which favors the proper recognition while, it differs significantly in case of bPGIP. The complex PG-PGIP interactions (a model protein-protein interaction system) are said to be of prime importance to understand the plant-pathogen interaction mechanism at atomic scale (Misas-Villamil and Van der Hoorn, 2008). As of now, 3D structure of many PGs have been resolved, however, the only PGIP (i.e., PvPGIP2 of *Phaseolus vulgaris*) crystal structure has been solved to date. Furthermore, the data existing on the PG-PGIP interactions till date has been based on PvPGIP2. Few previous studies were reported on plant PGIP with fungal PG interactions but as far as our knowledge is concerned not a single study has been reported against the bacterial plant pathogen(s) like *Erwinia*, *Pseudomonas*, *Pantoea* and *Ralstonia*. Henceforth, to unzip the PG-PGIP interactions i.e., banana PGIP (bPGIP) with *Erwinia carotovora* PG (EcPG), we employed a combinatorial structural bioinformatics approach including modelling, protein-protein docking and MD simulations to elucidate the plant-pathogen interactions. *In silico* mutation in *Phaseolus vulgaris* PGIP (PvPGIP2) was performed and protein-protein docking studies before and after mutation were conducted with ecPG. We performed MD simulations of 50ns on bPGIP, ecPG, bPGIP-ecPG complex, mutated PvPGIP2, and mutated PvPGIP2-EcPG complex. This study will provide a deep understanding of bacterial PG and PGIP interactions in molecular level and inhibitory potential of different PGIPs for EcPG, which may be useful in plant protection paradigm including commercial plantation, vegetable crops and storage conditions.

Various studies have demonstrated that the PGIPs comprised of 10 LRRs in tandem forms a solenoidal shape (43-45). The important motif i.e., LRRs are crucial for PPI in all life forms and diverse cellular processes. Henceforth, it can be suggested that these tandem repeats in fact bear the aforesaid capability to preserve the whole structure of the protein getting in fine alteration in function via selective changes. From our study, it can be observed that the two faces of the solenoid (PGIP) carries very important features where are indispensable for the PG-PGIP interaction. In case of PGIPs, the concave face contributes in establishing the specificity of the plant protein obligatory for binding to the invading PG, while the convex face imparts the required flexibility. This inherent property of defense protein coevolves continuously to fight against the evolving PGs and diversify their recognition capability through the emergence of the multi-gene family to inhibit PGs from different sources (24). Taken together with existing evidences, it can be summarized that the molecular recognition of PG and PGIP interactions are very complex in nature. Structural biology when coupled with site directed mutagenesis can be of immense importance to understand the atomistic interactions of numerous PG-PGIP complexes before a inclusive comprehensive conclusion could be drawn for structure-function association.

Polymorphism of PGIP and PG protein can be used for development of crop protection strategy (46). Site directed mutagenesis of gene PGIP can modulate its function (47). But exploring such variation has major challenges, like existence of less variation in natural population further compounded by methodology of its detection (48). Present work demonstrates that MDS along with site directed mutagenesis has great potential to overcome all such limitations. Such knowledge discovery of desirable alleles of PGIP can be further exploited using genome editing techniques.

Genome editing can improve disease resistance in crop (49). Very recently, genome editing by CRISPR/Cas9 multiplex gene editing strategy has been reported to be very successful in trait modification in banana using Phytoene desaturase (PDS) gene for albinism and dwarfing in Cavendish dessert banana (31) and in Rasthali sweetest Indian banana (50).

## 5. CONCLUSION

The present study reveals that there are few important structural features for PPI which must be deciphered to unravel their functional role. The molecular interaction studies of *Musa sp.* PGIP with PG molecule from *Erwinia carotovora* resulted significant insight to understand the relation between resistance and susceptibility of germplasm against PG. The study indicated that specific regions of PGIP are responsible for variation in recognition site to the phytopathogenic *Erwinia* PG. Similarly, active site of PG from *Erwinia carotovora* is being intercepted by the PGIP during pathogenesis. PGIP from *Musa sp.* which is capable of inhibiting *Erwinia* PG, binds in different and specific mode as compared to PGIPs from other field crops. Electrostatic surface potential observed significant variation in the *Musa* PGIP interacting surface as compared to other crop plant PGIPs. Hence, it is concluded that electrostatic and van der Waals interactions may play an important role in appropriate recognition of *Musa* PGIP and *Erwinia carotovora* PG. This is the novel study of PG-PGIP interaction of any plant pathogenic bacterial PG (*Erwinia*) using molecular modeling, docking, and MD simulation. Present finding can be of immense use not only as an insight of host-pathogen molecular recognition mechanism but can also be of much pragmatic use in enhancing the banana breeding efficiency against biotic stress obviating environmental and health issues in soft rot disease management in the endeavour of banana productivity.

## 6. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Authors dully acknowledge to Indian Council of Agricultural Research, New Delhi and Director, ICAR-National Bureau of Agriculturally Important Microorganism, Maunath Bhanjan for providing financial and technical assistance to carry out this research work. The authors also acknowledge the support of computational facilities provided under the Biotechnology Information System Network (BTISNET) grant of DBT-India to the DIC at NBRC, Manesar, India. The authors declare that they have no competing interests. All the authors have read and approved the manuscript. SK, BD and GT conducted the majority of the experiments and performed data analyses. MKS performed part of the molecular dynamic simulation. UBS, YJ, AS, AR and BRP did proof reading of the manuscript. SK designed study and supervised the project. SK, DK, BD, KA, DTN, GT, SJ, MAI and BP wrote the manuscript. SK is the guarantor of this work and, as such, had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

## 7. REFERENCES



1. A. Nega: Review on concepts in biological control of plant pathogens. *Journal of Biology, Agriculture and Healthcare*, 4(27), 33-54 (2014)
2. Y. Jha, G. Sablok, N. Subbarao, R. Sudhakar, M. H. Fazil, R. B. Subramanian, A. Squartini and S. Kumar: Bacterial-induced expression of RAB18 protein in *Orzya sativa* salinity stress and insights into molecular interaction with GTP ligand. *J Mol Recognit*, 27(9), 521-7 (2014)  
[DOI: 10.1002/jmr.2371](#)  
PMid:25042706
3. S. Akira, S. Uematsu and O. Takeuchi: Pathogen recognition and innate immunity. *Cell*, 124(4), 783-801 (2006)  
[DOI: 10.1016/j.cell.2006.02.015](#)  
PMid:16497588
4. G. Tandon, S. Jaiswal, M. Iquebal, S. Kumar, S. Kaur, A. Rai and D. Kumar: Evidence of salicylic acid pathway with EDS1 and PAD4 proteins by molecular dynamics simulation for grape improvement. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics*, 33(10), 2180-2191 (2015)  
[DOI: 10.1080/07391102.2014.996187](#)  
PMid:25483988
5. L. Federici, A. Di Matteo, J. Fernandez-Recio, D. Tsernoglou and F. Cervone: Polygalacturonase inhibiting proteins: players in plant innate immunity? *Trends Plant Sci*, 11(2), 65-70 (2006)  
[DOI: 10.1016/j.tplants.2005.12.005](#)  
PMid:16406303
6. V. Gomathi and S. Gnanamanickam: Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins in plant defence. *Current Science*, 1211-1217 (2004)
7. M. Benedetti, D. Pontiggia, S. Raggi, Z. Cheng, F. Scaloni, S. Ferrari, F. M. Ausubel, F. Cervone and G. De Lorenzo: Plant immunity triggered by engineered *in vivo* release of oligogalacturonides, damage-associated molecular patterns. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 112(17), 5533-8 (2015)  
[DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1504154112](#)  
PMid:25870275 PMCid:PMC4418913
8. R. J. Bruce and C. A. West: Elicitation of Casbene Synthetase Activity in Castor Bean : The role of pectic fragments of the plant cell wall in elicitation by a fungal endopolygalacturonase. *Plant Physiol*, 69(5), 1181-8 (1982)  
[DOI: 10.1104/pp.69.5.1181](#)  
PMid:16662367 PMCid:PMC426381
9. R. M. Kalunke, S. Tundo, M. Benedetti, F. Cervone, G. De Lorenzo and R. D'Ovidio: An update on polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP), a leucine-rich repeat protein that protects crop plants against pathogens. *Frontiers in plant science*, 6, 146 (2015)  
[DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2015.00146](#)
10. B. Mattei, M. S. Bernalda, L. Federici, P. Roepstorff, F. Cervone and A. Boffi: Secondary structure and post-translational modifications of the leucine-rich repeat protein PGIP (polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein) from *Phaseolus vulgaris*. *Biochemistry*, 40(2), 569-76 (2001)  
[DOI: 10.1021/bi001763z](#)  
PMid:11148052
11. K. E. Hammond-Kosack and J. D. Jones: Plant disease resistance genes. *Annual review of plant biology*, 48(1), 575-607 (1997)  
[DOI: 10.1146/annurev.arplant.48.1.575](#)  
PMid:15012275
12. R. P. de Vries and J. Visser: *Aspergillus* enzymes involved in degradation of plant cell wall polysaccharides. *Microbiol Mol Biol Rev*, 65(4), 497-522, (2001)

DOI: [10.1128/MMBR.65.4.497-522.2001](https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.65.4.497-522.2001)  
PMid:11729262 PMCID:PMC99039

13. F. Cervone, R. Castoria, F. Leckie and G. De Lorenzo: Perception of fungal elicitors and signal transduction. In: Signal transduction in plants. Springer, (1997)  
DOI: [10.1007/978-3-0348-9183-7\\_8](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-0348-9183-7_8)

14. R. D'Ovidio, B. Mattei, S. Roberti and D. Bellincampi: Polygalacturonases, polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins and pectic oligomers in plant-pathogen interactions. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 1696(2), 237-44 (2004)  
DOI: [10.1016/j.bbapap.2003.08.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbapap.2003.08.012)  
PMid:14871664

15. S. Gao and L. Shain: Activity of polygalacturonase produced by *Cryphonectria parasitica* in chestnut bark and its inhibition by extracts from American and Chinese chestnut. *Physiological and molecular plant pathology*, 46(3), 199-213 (1995)  
DOI: [10.1006/pmpp.1995.1016](https://doi.org/10.1006/pmpp.1995.1016)

16. B. Robertsen: Elicitors of the production of lignin-like compounds in cucumber hypocotyls. *Physiological and molecular plant pathology*, 28(1), 137-148 (1986)  
DOI: [10.1016/S0048-4059\(86\)80015-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0048-4059(86)80015-7)

17. D. Bonivento, D. Pontiggia, A. D. Matteo, J. Fernandez-Recio, G. Salvi, D. Tsernoglou, F. Cervone, G. D. Lorenzo and L. Federici: Crystal structure of the endopolygalacturonase from the phytopathogenic fungus *Colletotrichum lupini* and its interaction with polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins. *Proteins*, 70(1), 294-9 (2008)  
DOI: [10.1002/prot.21610](https://doi.org/10.1002/prot.21610)  
PMid:17876815

18. L. Federici, B. Mattei, C. Caprari, C. Savino, F. Cervone and D. Tsernoglou: Crystallization and preliminary X-ray diffraction study of the endo-polygalacturonase from *Fusarium moniliforme*. *Acta Crystallogr D Biol Crystallogr*, 55(Pt 7), 1359-61 (1999)  
DOI: [10.1107/S0907444999005454](https://doi.org/10.1107/S0907444999005454)  
PMid:10393307

19. R. Pickersgill, D. Smith, K. Worboys and J. Jenkins: Crystal structure of polygalacturonase from *Erwinia carotovora* ssp. *carotovora*. *J Biol Chem*, 273(38), 24660-24664 (1998)  
DOI: [10.1074/jbc.273.38.24660](https://doi.org/10.1074/jbc.273.38.24660)  
PMid:9733763

20. A. Di Matteo, L. Federici, B. Mattei, G. Salvi, K. A. Johnson, C. Savino, G. De Lorenzo, D. Tsernoglou and F. Cervone: The crystal structure of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP), a leucine-rich repeat protein involved in plant defense. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, 100(17), 10124-8 (2003)  
DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1733690100](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1733690100)  
PMid:12904578 PMCID:PMC187787

21. L. Rimbaud, J. Papaix, J. F. Rey, L. G. Barrett and P. H. Thrall: Assessing the durability and efficiency of landscape-based strategies to deploy plant resistance to pathogens. *PLoS Comput Biol*, 14(4), e1006067 (2018)  
DOI: [10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006067](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1006067)  
PMid:29649208 PMCID:PMC5918245

22. G. De Lorenzo and S. Ferrari: Polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins in defense against phytopathogenic fungi. *Curr Opin Plant Biol*, 5(4), 295-9 (2002)  
DOI: [10.1016/S1369-5266\(02\)00271-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1369-5266(02)00271-6)

23. A. Di Matteo, D. Bonivento, D. Tsernoglou, L. Federici and F. Cervone: Polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein (PGIP) in plant defence: a structural view. *Phytochemistry*, 67(6), 528-33 (2006)  
DOI: [10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.12.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phytochem.2005.12.025)  
PMid:16458942

24. N. Liu, Y. Sun, P. Wang, H. Duan, X. Ge, X. Li, Y. Pei, F. Li and Y. Hou: Mutation of key amino acids in the polygalacturonase-inhibiting proteins Ck PGIP 1 and Gh PGIP 1 improves resistance to *Verticillium* wilt in cotton. *The Plant Journal*, 96(3), 546-561 (2018)  
[DOI: 10.1111/tpj.14048](#)  
PMid:30053316
25. A. L. Powell, J. van Kan, A. ten Have, J. Visser, L. C. Greve, A. B. Bennett and J. M. Labavitch: Transgenic expression of pear PGIP in tomato limits fungal colonization. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact*, 13(9), 942-50 (2000)  
[DOI: 10.1094/MPMI.2000.13.9.942](#)  
PMid:10975651
26. R. Kirsch, N. Wielsch, H. Vogel, A. Svatos, D. G. Heckel and Y. Pauchet: Combining proteomics and transcriptome sequencing to identify active plant-cell-wall-degrading enzymes in a leaf beetle. *BMC Genomics*, 13, 587 (2012)  
[DOI: 10.1186/1471-2164-13-587](#)  
PMid:23116131 PMCID:PMC3505185
27. P. Rao, T. Ganapathi, V. Bapat, V. Kulkarni and P. Suprasanna: Improvement of banana through biotechnology and mutation breeding. In, (1998)
28. S. B. Siamak and S. ZHENG: Banana *Fusarium* wilt (*Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense*) control and resistance, in the context of developing wilt-resistant bananas within sustainable production systems. *Horticultural Plant Journal*, 4(5), 208-218 (2018)  
[DOI: 10.1016/j.hpj.2018.08.001](#)
29. S. Chen, Q. Sun, C. Zuo, B. Huang, Y. Wei, Y. Huang, Y. Wu, L. Xu, C. Hu and C. Li: Using an improved site-directed mutagenesis for the creation of constructs to analyse gene function in *Fusarium oxysporum* f. sp. *cubense*. In: V International Symposium on Banana: ISHS-ProMusa Symposium on Global Perspectives on Asian Challenges 897. (2009)
30. E. El-Sayed, S. A. Mahfouze, A. Shaltout, K. A. El-DougDoug and R. Sayed: Chemical mutation induction *in vitro* cultured shoot tip of banana cv grand nain for resistance some virus diseases. *International J Virol*, 8(2), 178-190 (2012)  
[DOI: 10.3923/ijv.2012.178.190](#)
31. F. Naim, B. Dugdale, J. Kleidon, A. Brinin, K. Shand, P. Waterhouse and J. Dale: Gene editing the phytoene desaturase alleles of Cavendish banana using CRISPR/Cas9. *Transgenic Res*, 27(5), 451-460 (2018)  
[DOI: 10.1007/s11248-018-0083-0](#)  
PMid:29987710 PMCID:PMC6156769
32. S. Bayram, A. Genc, M. Buyukleyla and E. Rencuzogullari: Genotoxicity and cytotoxicity of copper oxychloride in cultured human lymphocytes using cytogenetic and molecular tests. *Cytotechnology*, 68(5), 2027-2036 (2016)  
[DOI: 10.1007/s10616-016-9943-8](#)  
PMid:26754841 PMCID:PMC5023576
33. A. K. Vidaver: Uses of antimicrobials in plant agriculture. *Clinical infectious diseases*, 34(Supplement\_3), S107-S110 (2002)  
[DOI: 10.1086/340247](#)  
PMid:11988880
34. P. Nicolopoulou-Stamati, S. Maipas, C. Kotampasi, P. Stamatis and L. Hens: Chemical Pesticides and Human Health: The Urgent Need for a New Concept in Agriculture. *Front Public Health*, 4, 148 (2016)  
[DOI: 10.3389/fpubh.2016.00148](#)  
PMid:27486573 PMCID:PMC4947579
35. G. Blomme, M. Dita, K. S. Jacobsen, L. Perez Vicente, A. Molina, W. Ocimati, S. Poussier and P. Prior: Bacterial Diseases of Bananas and Enset: Current State of Knowledge and Integrated Approaches Toward

- Sustainable Management. Front Plant Sci, 8, 1290 (2017)  
[DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2017.01290](#)  
PMid:28785275 PMCID:PMC5517453
36. S. F. Altschull, W. Gish, W. Miller, E. W. Myers and D. J. Lipman: Basic local alignment search tool. J. mol. Biol, 215, 403-410 (1990)  
[DOI: 10.1016/S0022-2836\(05\)80360-2](#)
37. A. Šali and T. L. Blundell: Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. Journal of molecular biology, 234(3), 779-815 (1993)  
[DOI: 10.1006/jmbi.1993.1626](#)  
PMid:8254673
38. B. Webb and A. Sali: Comparative protein structure modeling using MODELLER. Current protocols in bioinformatics, 47(1), 5.6. 1-5.6. 32 (2014)  
[DOI: 10.1002/0471250953.bi0506s47](#)  
PMid:25199792
39. B. Hess, C. Kutzner, D. Van Der Spoel and E. Lindahl: GROMACS 4: algorithms for highly efficient, load-balanced, and scalable molecular simulation. Journal of chemical theory and computation, 4(3), 435-447 (2008)  
[DOI: 10.1021/ct700301q](#)  
PMid:26620784
40. B. Dehury, S. K. Behera and N. Mahapatra: Structural dynamics of casein kinase I (CKI) from malarial parasite Plasmodium falciparum (Isolate 3D7): insights from theoretical modelling and molecular simulations. Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling, 71, 154-166 (2017)  
[DOI: 10.1016/j.jmgm.2016.11.012](#)  
PMid:27923179
41. A. K. Pandey, S. C. Shukla, P. Bhattacharya and R. Patnaik: A possible therapeutic potential of quercetin through inhibition of  $\mu$ -calpain in hypoxia induced neuronal injury: a molecular dynamics simulation study. Neural regeneration research, 11(8), 1247 (2016)  
[DOI: 10.4103/1673-5374.189186](#)  
PMid:27651771 PMCID:PMC5020822
42. S. Kumar, K. Ahmad, G. Tandon, U. B. Singh, Y. Jha, D. T. Nagrale, M. K. Singh, K. Girdhar and P. Mondal: Novel insight into the molecular interaction of catalase and sucrose: A combination of in silico and in planta assays study. Computers And Electronics In Agriculture, 151, 258-263 (2018)  
[DOI: 10.1016/j.compag.2018.06.005](#)
43. D. Dhar, D. Dey and S. Basu: Insights into the evolution of extracellular leucine-rich repeats in metazoans with special reference to Toll-like receptor 4. Journal of biosciences, 44(1), 18 (2019)  
[DOI: 10.1007/s12038-018-9821-y](#)  
PMid:30837369
44. U. Hohmann, K. Lau and M. Hothorn: The structural basis of ligand perception and signal activation by receptor kinases. Annual review of plant biology, 68, 109-137 (2017)  
[DOI: 10.1146/annurev-arplant-042916-040957](#)  
PMid:28125280
45. J. She, Z. Han, T.-W. Kim, J. Wang, W. Cheng, J. Chang, S. Shi, J. Wang, M. Yang and Z.-Y. Wang: Structural insight into brassinosteroid perception by BRI1. Nature, 474(7352), 472 (2011)  
[DOI: 10.1038/nature10178](#)  
PMid:21666666 PMCID:PMC4019668
46. J. T. Howell and M. Davis: Plant defense mechanisms against fungal pathogens: polygalacturonase inhibitor proteins. Canadian journal of plant pathology, 27(1), 5-15 (2005)  
[DOI: 10.1080/07060660509507188](#)

47. J. G. Bishop: Directed mutagenesis confirms the functional importance of positively selected sites in polygalacturonase inhibitor protein. *Mol Biol Evolution*, 22(7), 1531-1534 (2005)  
[DOI: 10.1093/molbev/msi146](#)  
PMid:15829620

48. Z. Gui, H. Q. Liu, Y. Wang, Q. H. Yuan, N. Xin, X. Zhang, X. L. Li, Y. S. Pi and J. M. Gao: Detection of the genetic variation of polygalacturonase-inhibiting protein gene 2 in autotetraploid alfalfa (*Medicago sativa*) using an improved SSCP technique. *Genet Mol Res*, 13(4), 10184-93 (2014)  
[DOI: 10.4238/2014.December.4.13](#)  
PMid:25501230

49. G. Andolfo, P. Iovieno, L. Frusciante and M. R. Ercolano: Genome-Editing Technologies for Enhancing Plant Disease Resistance. *Front Plant Sci*, 7, 1813 (2016)  
[DOI: 10.3389/fpls.2016.01813](#)  
PMid:27990151 PMCID:PMC5130979

50. N. Kaur, A. Alok, Shivani, N. Kaur, P. Pandey, P. Awasthi and S. Tiwari: CRISPR/Cas9-mediated efficient editing in phytoene desaturase (PDS) demonstrates precise manipulation in banana cv. Rasthali genome. *Funct Integr Genomics*, 18(1), 89-99 (2018)  
[DOI: 10.1007/s10142-017-0577-5](#)  
PMid:29188477

**Abbreviation-** *EcPG*: *Erwinia carotovora* PG; bPGIP: *Musa* AAB group PGIP; LRR: Leucine Rich Repeats; PGIP-PG complex: PolyGalacturonase Inhibiting Protein- PolyGalacturonase complex

**Key Words:** *Erwinia carotovora* PG, bPGIP; Leucine Rich Repeats, PGIP-PG complex, host-pathogen interaction, Molecular dynamics simulations

**Send correspondence to:** Sunil kumar, ICAR-NBAIM, Kushmaur, Mau (UP)-275103-India, Tel: 91-547-2530158, Fax: 91-547-2530358, E-mail: [skybiotech@gmail.com](mailto:skybiotech@gmail.com)