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Abstract

Understanding the properties of protein-protein interactions (PPIs) is necessary to deconvolute the processes inside living organisms. As such, research in this regard has significant implications for gaining insight into cancers and other diseases. Once understood, drugs can be designed to target these diseases. In these chapters we focus on the network of interactions of WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5), a known hub protein. Several of its interactions are significant for regulation of histone methylation and consequently epigenetic regulation. These interacting partners include the SET1 family of proteins and retinoblastoma binding protein-5 (RbBP5). In this work we used multiple ensemble measurement based bulk-phase techniques to characterize WDR5’s interactions. We utilized biolayer interferometry (BLI) and surface plasmon resonance (SPR) to calculate the association and dissociation rate constants. Furthermore, we used fluorescence polarization (FP) to calculate the equilibrium dissociation constants. After characterizing these PPIs under wild-type conditions we quantified the impact of key WDR5 cancer mutants on these interactions. These mutants can impact downstream gene expression, which ultimately controls various cellular processes. Therefore, evaluating their modification of WDR5’s kinetics is key to understanding their potential impact on tumor development. Additionally, by using different tether conditions, we have explored the role of surface-tethering in modulating the kinetics of these PPIs. The work shows the impact of tethering on tethered ligand-receptor complexes that are common in biological signaling and
cellular adhesion. Moreover, it shows how surface-tethering can be used to modulate a typical PPI. We also characterized the role of the N-terminal intrinsically disordered region (IDR) of WDR5. Our work explores the self-association behavior catalyzed by this IDR and the potential ramifications of this self-association on WDR5’s role inside the nucleus.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Protein-protein interactions (PPIs) form the backbone of various cellular processes. Understanding these interactions is key to parsing and disentangling the complex mechanisms inside living organisms. PPIs have a range of properties that can be studied through different techniques. The focus of my thesis is on the binding affinities and kinetics of sets of PPIs obtained through well-established ensemble measurement based bulk-phase techniques. In this work, we explored a known hub-protein, and its network of interactions with a range of different binding partners.

1.1 Protein System

1.1.1 WDR5

WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5) is a nuclear hub whose interactions have significant implications for epigenetic regulations. Moreover, WDR5 is overexpressed under various oncogenic conditions and its upregulation catalyzes cancer development. Its repertoire of known binding partners includes the SET1 family, retinoblastoma binding protein-5 (RbBP5), MYC, 3-phosphoinositide-dependent protein kinase 1 (PDPK1) as well as a host of different proteins.

This 334 residue protein is formed by a seven-bladed, WD40 repeat-based β propeller structure, surrounding a central cavity. Its interactions are regulated through two known sites: WDR5 interaction (Win) site and WDR5 binding motif.
Win site interactions require the presence of the Win motif, shown in Table 1, on the binding partner. Additionally, this motif has a crucial Arginine residue, conserved across all Win site binders, that inserts into the central cavity and forms several stabilizing hydrogen bonds and cation-pi interactions.\textsuperscript{10,11} This motif also displays interactions with the surface residues around the cavity. On the other hand, WBM site interactions require the presence of the WBM motif on the binding partner. For example, RbBP5 has the WBM motif EEVDVT. Bindings to this site consist of primarily surface interactions dominated by electrostatic and hydrophobic contributions\textsuperscript{13,15}.

\textbf{Figure 1: WDR5 binding sites.} Surface-representation cartoon of the Win and WBM binding sites of WDR5. Orientations of WDR5 in the two cartoon are 180° with respect to each other. Representations were made using pdb entry 4ERY.\textsuperscript{11}
1.1.2 SET1 Proteins

The SET1 family of proteins’ interactions with WDR5, through the Win site, have regulatory implications for histone 3 lysine (H3K4) mono-, di- and tri-methylation. These proteins have the evolutionarily conserved SET domain which is required for lysine methylation.29 There are 6 known SET1 family members: MLL1, MLL2, MLL3, MLL4, SETd1A and SETd1B.16-18 Because these proteins are hundreds of kDa in size it is not feasible to express and purify them. Therefore, for in-vitro studies of the SET1 family, only regions of interest are produced and employed. Particularly, for my work, I used 14 residues sequences, containing the Win motif, from each SET1 protein to create peptides that emulate the interaction of these proteins with WDR5.11 Previous work has shown that these peptides are sufficient to model the interactions of larger regions of these proteins with WDR5. The design of the peptides is shown in the table below.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt; Peptide</th>
<th>Sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt; 3758-3771</td>
<td>L N P H G S A R A E V H L S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt; 5333-5346</td>
<td>I N P T G C A R S E P K I L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt; 4703-4716</td>
<td>V N P T G C A R S E P K M S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt; 2504-2517</td>
<td>L N P H G A A R A E V Y L S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A 1488-1501</td>
<td>E H Q T G S A R S E G Y Y P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B 1698-1711</td>
<td>E H V T G C A R S E G F Y T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Design of the SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptides. The table of peptide sequences chosen to represent the different SET1 proteins. The part of the sequence in blue
represents the Win motif on each protein. *For MLL1 and MLL4 the last residues was changes from Arginine to Serine to prevent any artifacts from the C-terminus free Arginine inserting into the Win site cavity.

The extent of the impact of SET1-WDR5 interactions on H3K4 methylation has been studied before. The MLL1-WDR5 interaction is crucial for the assembly of the MLL1 complex with RbBP5 and ASH2L and therefore for the methylation behavior of this complex. On the other hand, the MLL3 complex with RbBP5 and ASH2L is unaffected by the lack of WDR5 or the inhibition of the Win site. The peptides. 18, 27 SET1 proteins are also seen frequently mutated in certain cancers, for example, MLL3 is one of the top 10 proteins seen mutated in breast cancers. 30 Therefore, studying their interactions can help us disentangle the different contributions to those cancers.

1.1.3 RbBP5

RbBP5 is a member of the SET1 family core complex, along with WDR5, ASH2L and DPY-30. 16 It is a 538 residue protein that interacts with WDR5 through the WBM site. 13 RbBP5 is an integral part of the complex, and its presence has been established to be crucial to the methylation function of the SET1 proteins. 18 The RbBP5-ASH2L hetero-dimer is an essential sub-unit that allows for the SET1 complex to come together. 28 This is one of the interactions stabilizing the SET1 complex and consequently important for their function. 13, 15, 18 Therefore, studying the RbBP5-WDR5
interaction allows us to better understand the assembly and function of the SET1 complexes.

1.2 Theoretical Overview

All protein-protein interactions can be broken down into association rates and dissociation rates. A simple 1:1 binding can be represented as follows:

\[ A + B \xrightarrow{k_{on}} AB \]  
\[ AB \xrightarrow{k_{off}} A + B \]  

Here \( A \) and \( B \) represent the binding partners while \( AB \) represents their complex.\(^{19-21}\) The first equation shows the forward reaction which is controlled by the association rate constant \( k_{on} \). The second equation represents the corresponding reverse reaction controlled by the dissociation rate constant \( k_{off} \). These constants are collectively known as the kinetics of the interaction. Using the notation for concentrations, we see that the rate of complex formation is given by:

\[
\frac{d[AB]}{dt} = k_{on}[A][B] - k_{off}[AB] \tag{3}
\]

At equilibrium the forward and backward rates are equal; the rate of complex formation is 0. This gives us:

\[
k_{on}[A][B] = k_{off}[AB] \tag{4}
\]

Some rearrangement here can give us the equilibrium dissociation constant, \( K_D \) as shown below:
\[ K_D = \frac{k_{\text{off}}}{k_{\text{on}}} = \frac{[A][B]}{[AB]} \] (5)

The derivation shows that we can obtain the \( K_D \) by taking a ratio of the dissociation rate constant and the association rate constant. \( K_D \) can be used as a measure of the strength of the interaction. The smaller the value, the stronger the interaction.

1.3 Bulk-phase Techniques

There are several well established bulk-phase techniques that are used, by academic labs and pharmaceutical companies alike, to characterize PPIs. All techniques have their own advantages and disadvantages. This work uses biolayer interferometry (BLI), surface plasmon resonance (SPR) and fluorescence polarization (FP). BLI and SPR allow the characterization of kinetics while FP directly obtains the equilibrium dissociation constant.

1.3.1 Biolayer Interferometry

BLI is an optics based sensing method. It uses the interference of light to quantify the protein bound to a biosensor. White light passes through the sensor and gets reflected by two different interfaces. The first interface is a part of the sensor while the second interface is formed by the bound molecules. The interference of these two reflected lights gives us an absorbance spectrum. This spectrum experiences a shift when more molecules bind to the sensor surface and plotting this shift against time gives us a BLI sensorgram.
Figure 2: A BLI sensorgram. This BLI sensorgram shows us the association and dissociation phases of an interaction.

For a simple 1:1 binding, the BLI association and dissociation curves look like those shown in fig. 2. To see how these results can be analyzed, we can look at the differential equation underlying the process. The response (R) seen by the biosensor is directly proportional to the amount of complex and the maximum R possible (R\text{max}). If B is the immobilized ligand, then we can say that R\text{max} is directly proportional to the concentration of B. This simplification gives us:

\[
\frac{dR}{dt} = k_{on}[A](R_{\text{max}} - R) - k_{off}R
\]  

(6)

For the association and dissociation phases we get the analytical solutions:

\[
R = (R_{\text{max}} - R_0)e^{-(k_{on}[A]+k_{off})t} + R_0
\]  

(7)

\[
R = (R_{\text{max}} - R_0)e^{-k_{off}t} + R_0
\]  

(8)
Here $R_0$ is the response seen after $B$ is immobilized onto the surface but no complex has formed. Fitting the BLI sensorgrams with these equations gives us the association and dissociation rates.

### 1.3.2 Surface Plasmon Resonance

SPR is another technique for measuring association and dissociation rates. It is also an optical technique however its measurement principle is based on the SPR angle of reflected light. In this case, an incident light is bounced off a sensor chip and the SPR angle is measured. Presence of proteins on the other side chip shifts the critical angle. This shift in the SPR angle when plotted against time gives us a SPR sensorgram.\(^\text{24}\)

The data obtained from SPR is very similar to that obtained from the BLI and is analyzed the same way. It can provide kinetics of an interaction which can then be used to calculate the equilibrium dissociation constant as well.\(^\text{22,23}\)

### 1.3.3 Steady-state Fluorescence Polarization

Steady-state Fluorescence Polarization (FP) can be used to measure the $K_D$ of an interaction. The method looks at the polarization of light emitted by a rotating fluorophore-labelled ligand after excitation. The anisotropy, $r$, of the emitted light is calculated using the following equation.

$$r = \frac{I_{||}-GI_{\perp}}{I_{||}+G2I_{\perp}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)
Here $I_{||}$ represents the intensity of the emitted light parallel to the polarization of the light used for excitation, $I_{\perp}$ represents the intensity of the light perpendicular to the polarization and $G$ is a calibration factor. When the ligand binds to an analyte, the rotational rate slows down and it increases the anisotropy of the emitted light. By mapping out the anisotropy values of the ligand population when exposed to a range of concentrations of analyte we can calculate the fractional occupancy $\alpha$ of the ligand. This number represent the proportion of the ligand that is bound to the analyte. At $\alpha$ equals 0.5, half the ligand population is bound, and the corresponding analyte concentration gives us the $K_D$ of the interaction.

1.4 Thesis Outline

WDR5’s interactions with other binding partners have been studied before. While previous studies have focused on the mechanisms of the interaction using crystal structures and binding affinities of the interactions using ITC or FP, a thorough exploration of the kinetics of these interactions has not yet been performed. This gap in knowledge is what we sought to fill with this work.

In chapter 2, we look at the kinetics of wild-type WDR5’s interaction with SET1 proteins. Using BLI and SPR, we examined these PPIs and looked at the contributions of the association and dissociation rates towards the strengths of the interactions. Additionally, for further validation we obtained $K_D$ values for these interactions using FP. These values were then compared to those $K_D$ values indirectly calculated from the kinetics obtained through BLI and SPR. Our work allowed us to look at the impact of restrictions on these interactions. Ranging from
most restricted for the BLI to least restricted for the FP. Furthermore, having multiple bulk-phase methods allows us to account for any biases introduced from one. The agreement of our results across multiple techniques strengthens our conclusions.

In chapter 3, we dive into deviations from wild-type behavior of WDR5 induced by oncogenic mutations. We looked at the mutations in WDR5 seen in tumors and quantified the impact of those mutations on WDR5-SET1 interactions. First, we used computational clustering techniques to identify a region of interest. Then we selectively isolated mutations in that region for further in vitro study. These WDR5 mutants were expressed and purified. The kinetics of their interactions with SET1 were then studied using BLI. Not only did we measure the impact of these mutations on the strengths of the interactions, but we were also able to break down the impact in terms of effects on association and dissociation rates. Moreover, by extracting $K_D$ via FP, we were able to validate our findings and perform an accurate determination of the impact of the oncogenic mutations. These results allow us to understand the possible consequences of the mutations on H3K4 methylation.

In chapter 4, we look at the effect of surface tethering on PPIs. Surface-tethered ligand-receptor complexes are important elements in biological signaling and adhesion. We explored the impact of tethers, of different lengths, on the kinetics of different PPIs. Our work with WDR5 (Wild-type and mutants) and SET1 proteins gave us a range of PPIs with varying binding strengths. Leveraging that, we observed these interactions under short-tether, long-tether, and no-tether conditions. For the design of this study, the SET1 $\text{Win}$ peptides were tethered.
Moreover, we used WDR5 wild-type and 3 mutants to establish the impact of the tethers. Additionally, we used the interactions of a 4th mutant to test how effectively we can predict the effect of the tether. The work shows that this tethering can separately modulate the association and dissociation rates of the interactions.

In chapter 5, we shift focus on to the WBM site of WDR5. We looked at the interaction of WDR5 with RbBP5 through WBM site. However, in this case we noticed a deviation from expected behavior. Through a hypothesis-based design approach we explored likely possibilities and identified that this divergence was caused by the N-terminal intrinsically disordered region (IDR) of WDR5. Additionally, using orthogonal experiments, we further confirmed the role of this IDR in affecting our measurements of WDR5-RbBP5 binding. We discuss the relevance of our results for future explorations of WBM interactions as well as for understanding the role of WDR5 inside the cell.
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2.1 Abstract

Recent advances in quantitative proteomics show that WD40 proteins play a pivotal role in numerous cellular networks. Yet, they have been fairly unexplored and their physical associations with other proteins are ambiguous. A quantitative understanding of these interactions has wide-ranging significance. WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5) interacts with all members of human SET1/MLL methyltransferases, which regulate methylation of the histone 3 lysine 4 (H3K4). Here, using real-time binding measurements in a high-throughput setting, we identified the kinetic fingerprint of transient associations between WDR5 and 14-residue WDR5 interaction (Win) motif peptides of each SET1 protein (SET1_{Win}). Our results reveal that the high-affinity WDR5-SET1_{Win} interactions feature slow association kinetics. This finding is likely due to the requirement of SET1_{Win} to insert into the narrow WDR5 cavity, also named the Win binding site. Furthermore, our explorations indicate fairly slow dissociation kinetics. This conclusion is in accordance with the primary role of WDR5 in maintaining the functional integrity of a large multisubunit complex, which regulates the histone methylation. Because the Win binding site is considered a key therapeutic target, the immediate outcomes of this study could form the basis for accelerated developments in medical biotechnology.
2.2 Introduction

WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5) is a conserved chromatin-associated protein that is involved in a number of transient protein-protein interactions [1]. However, WDR5 is notoriously known for its regulatory role in multisubunit epigenetic complexes, such as Suppressor of Variegation, Enhancer of Zeste, and Trithorax 1 (SET1) lysine methyltransferases (KMT) of histones [2-8]. There are six SET1 family members in humans: MLL1, MLL2, MLL3, MLL4, SETd1A, and SETd1B. Each member forms a large multisubunit complex with functions that appear to have diverged in target gene localization and product specificity. However, features common among the complexes are a C-terminal catalytic SET domain that is regulated by interaction with a conserved subcomplex consisting of WDR5, retinoblastoma binding protein-5 (RbBP5), absent-small-homeotic-2-like protein (Ash2L), and dumpy-30 (DPY-30) (WRAD₂) [7, 9-20]. WDR5 functions to bridge the interaction between the SET domain and other WRAD₂ subunits by the recognition of an evolutionarily conserved WDR5-interaction (Win) motif found in all SET1 family members [21-25]. Formation of this core complex is required for optimal methyltransferase activity [9, 11, 26]. Therefore, small molecules targeting the Win motif-WDR5 protein-protein interaction show promise as anticancer therapeutic candidates.

Interestingly, recent studies have revealed that WDR5 is involved in numerous interactions with other proteins [27-29], including the transcription factor MYC oncoprotein [30-35], 3- phosphoinositide-dependent protein kinase 1 (PDPK1)
[36], and interacting partners involved in phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K) signaling [36]. Moreover, WDR5 is implicated in nongenomic activities, such as regulatory mechanisms of cellular shape, polarity, and migration [37, 38]. Therefore, WDR5 is a multitasking protein with diverse roles in cellular processes [36, 39, 40]. Its highly conserved sequence across multiple organisms suggests the fundamental significance of its multiple roles [40].

An essential structural archetype of WDR5 is its internal cavity that hosts a high-affinity binding pocket for an evolutionarily conserved Arg-containing peptide segment of the six SET1 proteins [21-23]. Interestingly, this binding cavity of WDR5, here named the Win binding site, is the same [21, 23] as that previously suggested to bind histone H3 [41-46]. Yet, the WDR5-SET1 interaction is required for the stability and functional operation of the C-terminal catalytic SET domain [11, 21, 22]. Moreover, it has only recently been identified that the Win binding site is implicated in transient protein-protein interactions with dozens of proteins, including those involved in PI3K signaling [36]. Given that WDR5 is overexpressed under various oncogenic conditions [47-49], the Win binding site has become a key therapeutic target for different cancers [24, 25, 50-59]. Therefore, a better mechanistic and quantitative understanding of the interactions of the Win binding site with other Win motif partners has fundamental and clinical significance [60-64].

Several research groups have previously examined interactions of WDR5
protein with Win motif SET1 (SET1\textsubscript{Win}) peptides using a variety of approaches, such as analytical ultracentrifugation (AUC) [22], isothermal titration calorimetry (ITC) [21, 24, 65], surface plasmon resonance (SPR) [23], and X-ray crystallography [21, 23, 24, 65]. These explorations have confirmed the high affinity of the Win binding site for different Win motif interaction partners [24, 65]. In this study, we determined the kinetic fingerprint and affinities of these interactions using high-throughput optical and fluorescence approaches, which included biolayer interferometry (BLI), SPR, and steady-state fluorescence polarization (state-state FP).
Figure 1: Structure of the binary WDR5-MLL1\textsubscript{Win} complex. (A) The insertion of MLL1\textsubscript{Win} into the WDR5 cavity is shown from the top. (B) The same interaction is shown from the side. These graphic representations were made using the pdb code 4ESG.\textsuperscript{53}
Table 1: Alignment of the amino acid sequence of SET1<sub>Win</sub> motifs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-7&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-6&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-5&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;-1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;5&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>P&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: MLL1&lt;sup&gt;3758-3771&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>L   N   P    H   G   S   A   R   A   E   V    H   L   S*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: MLL2&lt;sup&gt;5333-5346&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>I   N   P    T   G   C   A   R   S   E   P   K   I   L</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: MLL3&lt;sup&gt;4703-4716&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>V   N   P    T   G   C   A   R   S   E   P   K   M   S</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: MLL4&lt;sup&gt;2504-2517&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>L   N   P    H   G   A   A   R   A   E   V   Y   L   S*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: SETd1A&lt;sup&gt;1488-1501&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>E   H   Q    T   G   S   A   R   S   E   G   Y   Y   P</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;: SETd1B&lt;sup&gt;1698-1711&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>E   H   V    T   G   C   A   R   S   E   G   F   Y   T</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S* This is a R3771S substituted MLL1<sub>Win</sub> peptide.
S* This is a R2517S substituted MLL4<sub>Win</sub> peptide.

WDR5 is a 334-residue protein that has a 7-bladed, WD-40 repeat-based β propeller structure surrounding a central cavity (Figure 1A) [29, 66-68]. Each blade contains four anti-parallel β strands. A segment of the central cavity serves as the high-affinity Win binding site for the SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptides (Figure 1B; Supplementary Figures S1-S2) [21, 23, 24, 65]. Here, we performed a systematic kinetic analysis of the interactions of WDR5 with six 14-residue SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptides, which include an evolutionarily conserved Arg residue at P<sub>0</sub> (Table 1). Moreover, this Arg residue has been shown to be critical to WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> interactions (Supplementary Table S1, Figure S3) [22, 26, 69, 70]. In addition, SET1<sub>Win</sub> sequences contain a highly conserved 6-residue Win motif peptide, at positions P<sub>-3</sub> through P<sub>2</sub>, along with 8 residues on their flanking sides, at positions P<sub>-7</sub> through P.
and \( P_3 \) through \( P_6 \). These flanking residues diverge among SET1 family members, accounting for differences in the binding affinity of WDR5-SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) interactions [24, 65]. The highly conserved 6-residue Win motif peptide has to insert into the WDR5 binding cavity to facilitate these highly specific WDR5-SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) interactions [24, 65]. Therefore, the choice of a 14-residue length of SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) was based on the requirement of the minimal 6-residue Win motif sequence, along with four residues on each flanking side. This also facilitated the interpretation of our results in light of a prior crystallographic study [24], which was conducted with an identical SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) length.

Here, we employed multiple techniques to probe the effect of the surface immobilization on the kinetic fingerprint of WDR5-SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) interactions as well as to establish the efficacy of each technique for the measurement of the kinetic rate constants and binding affinities. We provide a critical analysis of each approach with respect to the kinetics of the Win binding site. BLI and SPR require surface immobilization, while steady-state FP does not. On the other hand, steady-state FP is free from this limitation, but is unable to provide real-time kinetic measurements. Furthermore, the use of multiple approaches allowed us to provide quantitative and qualitative validations of our conclusions and to obtain more generalizable outcomes that were not restrained by any one approach. Finally, we also show that distinctions in the kinetic rate constants of these interactions are correlated with unique sequences on the SET1\(_{\text{Win}}\) peptides' flanking sides.
2.3 Materials and Methods

Protein Expression and Purification

Human WDR5 (UniProtKB - P61964; WDR5_HUMAN) was expressed and purified, as follows. pET3aTr vectors containing the 6×His-TEV-WDR5 sequence were transformed into Rosetta™ 2 BL21(DE3)pLysS (Novagen, Cat #71403) competent *E. coli* cells. Rosetta™ 2 BL21(DE3)pLysS (Novagen, Cat #71403) competent *E. coli* cells were grown overnight on Luria-Bertani (LB) agar carbenecillin/chloramphenicol selection plates at 37°C. 50 mL LB broth starter cultures (one per 10 L bioreactor growth) containing 50 µg/mL each of carbenecillin and chloramphenicol were inoculated with 5 colonies and grown for 3-5 hours until turbid at 37°C. 10 L Luria broth bioreactors (Eppendorf BioFlo, Enfield, CT) containing 50 µg/mL each of carbenecillin and chloramphenicol, in addition to Antifoam 204 (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO), were then inoculated at 37°C and 800 rpm with the entire turbid starter culture. When the culture attained OD$_{600}$ = 0.8, agitation was decreased to 600 rpm and the temperature was rapidly dropped to 18°C. Induction of target proteins was initiated with 100 µM Isopropyl-β-d-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG; Goldbio, St. Louis, MO) at 18°C. After 12-24 hours post-induction at 18°C, cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 4,465×g using a J6-MI centrifuge (Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA) for 30 minutes at 4°C. The pellet was resuspended in 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), 300 mM NaCl, 10 mM βME, and 20 mM imidazole. The resuspended cells were frozen on dry ice and stored at -80°C until purification.
Cell pellets were lysed with a Qsonica Sonicator Q700 (FisherBrand, Pittsburg, PA) on ice. 5 L of thawed, resuspended pellets were resuspended in 160 mL of 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), 300 mM NaCl, 3 mM DTT, and 30 mM imidazole (lysis/Ni-NTA Buffer A/dialysis buffer) containing an additional 200 µL of phenylmethylsulfonyl fluoride (PMSF; Sigma-Aldrich) and two Pierce™ Protease Inhibitor Mini Tablets (EDTA-free; Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA). The cell suspensions were stirred at 4°C for 15 minutes until homogeneous and then sonicated for 10 minutes at 90% power (2 seconds on, 4 seconds off). Lysate was then centrifuged for 1 hour at 4,465 x g and 4°C, and the supernatant was stored at 2-8°C for purification. A Ni-NTA purification process was followed. A Kontes 25 x 200 mm column with 30-40 mL Ni-NTA resin (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) was equilibrated with at least 10 resin-bed volumes (RBVs) of 0.22 µm filtered de-ionized (DI) H2O to remove ethanol, and then at least 5 RBVs of Ni-NTA Buffer A (above). After equilibration, lysate was added to the column and washed with 5-10 RBVs of Ni-NTA Buffer A. Sample was eluted using at least 5 RBVs of Ni-NTA Buffer B (50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.4), 300 mM NaCl, 3 mM DTT, and 500 mM imidazole). 5 mL fractions were collected, analyzed via SDS-PAGE, and pooled. Then, sample was dialyzed, as follows. WDR5-containing fractions were pooled into 12-14 kDa MWCO dialysis tubing (Repligen, Waltham, MA), then 2.5 mg of GST-6H-TEV protease (per 5 L of culture; expressed and purified in-house) was added to cleave the His-tag, and the solution was dialyzed against 4 L of dialysis buffer (above) overnight for 12-18 hours at 2-8°C. Dialyzed protein was
analyzed via SDS-PAGE to ensure complete cleavage. A negative Ni-NTA was then conducted. The resulting cleaved WDR5 solution was passed through a Bio-Rad Ni-NTA IMAC cartridge (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA) using a Bio-Rad NGC chromatography system (Bio-Rad) to remove the cleaved His-tag and GST-6H-TEV protease. The flowthrough was collected, analyzed via SDS-PAGE and UV-Vis, and concentrated for size-exclusion chromatography (SEC) purification. As a final polish, the WDR5 proteins were purified via SEC using a HiLoad® 26/600 Superdex® 200 pg column (GE Healthcare, Chicago, IL) into 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 300 mM NaCl, 1 µM ZnCl₂, 1 mM TCEP. Fractions of interest were analyzed via SDS-PAGE and UV-Vis, pooled, concentrated where necessary, aliquoted to 1 mL, flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80°C.

**Peptide synthesis, labeling, purification, and analysis for BLI measurements**

All peptides for biolayer interferometry measurements were synthesized by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). The peptides were purified to ≥ 95% purity. Amino acid analysis, purity confirmation, and solubility testing were provided by GenScript. All peptides were biotinylated at the N terminus. Their C terminus was amidated.

**Peptide synthesis, labeling, purification, and analysis for SPR and FP measurements**
For Fmoc-SPPS, peptides were synthesized at theoretical 100 µmol scale using the standard double coupling workflow pre-programmed on the Biotage Syro I peptide synthesizer (Biotage, Charlotte, NC). 278 mg of Rink Amide AM Resin LL (100-200 mesh, 0.36 mmol/g functionalization; Novabiochem (EMD Millipore)) was loaded into each 10 mL reactor vial, corresponding to the 100 µmol synthesis scale. Each resin aliquot was swelled with DMF for 30 minutes, followed by an initial resin deprotection step using 40% piperidine in DMF. Each double coupling cycle was comprised of two independent, 45-minute coupling sub-steps that differed in the choice of activation reagents: 1) DIC/Oxyma (1:2 ratio with respect to Fmoc-[AA]), followed by 2) HBTU/DIPEA (0.95:2 ratio with respect to Fmoc-[AA]). For each coupling sub-step, four molar equivalents of each respective 0.5 M Fmoc-[AA] stock was added to each vial. Each coupling cycle terminated with a double Fmoc deprotection step using 40% piperidine in DMF. Coupling reactions proceeded with interspersed vortexing of the vials and under an air atmosphere at ambient temperature. Following the conclusion of peptide synthesis, resins were washed with three successive aliquots of DCM, followed by three minutes under vacuum to dry.

Each peptidyl-resin aliquot was swelled with DMF for 30 minutes and drained. DMF (1,200 µL) was added to each aliquot, followed by 300 µL of DIPEA in NMP (6 molar equivalents, 600 µmol), then followed by 600 µL of Lissamine Rhodamine B sulfonyl chloride in DMF (3 molar equivalents, 300 µmol). The mixture was shielded from light and allowed to react with intermittent vortexing overnight at
ambient temperature. Following conjugation, the resin bed was drained, washed successively with DMF until no further change in the color of the flowthrough was observed (faint pink), washed successively with DCM, and then held under vacuum for three minutes to dry.

Cleavage cocktail containing 90% TFA, 5% TIS, 2.5% DODT, and 2.5% H₂O was freshly prepared. 4 mL of cleavage cocktail was added to each peptidyl-resin aliquot, sealed, and placed on a rocking platform to react for 4 hours at ambient temperature. After incubation, the contents of each reactor vial were plunged into separate 50 mL conical tubes. The resin was then treated with an additional 2 mL of cleavage cocktail and allowed to react on the rocking platform for 30 minutes at ambient temperature. Following the second incubation, the contents of each reactor vial were pooled into their respective 50 mL conical tubes and the resin containing reactor vials were discarded. Cleavage aliquots were tritutated by the fast addition of ~45 mL cold (-80°C) diethyl ether. Precipitate was compacted by centrifugation at 1,000×g for 10 minutes at 0°C using an Allegra X-22R centrifuge (Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA). The supernatant was discarded, and the peptide pellets were washed with a second ~30 mL aliquot of cold diethyl ether, centrifuged, and decanted as before. The resulting peptide pellets were flash frozen in liquid nitrogen and lyophilized using a FreeZone 2.5L lyophilizer (Labconco, Kansas City, MO) overnight to remove residual solvents. The crude lyophilized peptide was stored at -80°C until purification.
Crude peptide aliquots were purified using reversed-phase chromatography through two stages: 1) Flash chromatography using a Biotage Isolera One (Biotage AB, Uppsala, Sweden), 2) Semi-preparative HPLC using a Waters 2695 separations module equipped with a Waters 2996 photodiode array detector (PDA).

1) Biotage Isolera One purifications: Each crude peptide aliquot was solubilized in 2.5 mL total of either DMSO or DMF (DMF only if the peptide contained oxidizable Cys or Met residues) and loaded onto a Biotage Sfär C_{18} Samplet for 25 g Column (Biotage, Uppsala, Sweden) with the aid of a vacuum. Each samplet was placed in a Biotage Sfär Bio C_{18} D Duo (300 Å, 20 µm) 25 g column (Biotage). Peptides were eluted using a 15-column volume (CV) gradient of 9-90% MeCN in H\textsubscript{2}O containing 0.1% TFA at a flowrate of 30 mL/min. The collection threshold was 75 mAU for λ = 200-400 nm, with monitoring at λ = 215 nm and 355 nm (rhodamine). Rhodamine labeled fractions were pooled and MeCN was removed using a rotary evaporator for 30 minutes at 25°C. Samples were flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and lyophilized using a FreeZone 2.5L lyophilizer (Labcono) for three days. The semi-pure lyophilized peptide was stored at -80°C until further purification.

2) Semi-preparative HPLC: Peptide samples were resuspended in 50-80 µL aliquots of DMSO or 1:2 DMSO/H\textsubscript{2}O. Aliquots were injected onto a Waters XBridge Peptide BEH C_{18} OBD Prep Column (5 µm, 300 Å, 10 mm x 150 mm). A gradient of 10-50% MeCN containing 0.1% (v/v) TFA in H\textsubscript{2}O containing 0.1% (v/v) TFA was applied over 40 minutes (Δ1%/min.) at a flow rate of 4.73 mL/min. at ambient temperature using a Waters 2695 separations module. Sample detection occurred at 215 nm, 280 nm, 355 nm (rhodamine), and 560 nm (rhodamine) using
a Waters 2996 photodiode array detector (PDA). Sample purity was determined by baseline integration using Waters Empower 3 software (>90% purity in all cases). Rhodamine containing fractions were analyzed by MALDI-TOF mass spectroscopy for the identity and purity confirmatory tests. Target fractions were flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and lyophilized using a FreeZone 2.5L lyophilizer (Labcono) for three days. The resulting purified, lyophilized peptides were reconstituted as concentrated stocks in ultrapure water, aliquoted, flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80°C until use.

For MALDI-TOF mass spectroscopy of the purified peptides, 1 µL of peptide stock in H$_2$O (1-100 µM) was mixed with 9 µL spotting matrix (10 mg/mL α-cyano-4-hydroxycinnamic acid (CHCA) in 50:50 MeCN/0.1% (v/v) TFA in H$_2$O). 2 µL of each peptide spotting solution was spotted onto a Bruker MTP 384 Target Plate, which was calibrated using Anaspec Peptide Mass Standard Kit, and allowed to dry at room temperature for at least 30 minutes prior to analysis. Samples were analyzed on a Bruker Autoflex iii Mass Spectrometer as an average of 1200 shots using 35% laser power, an m/z range from 840-6000 Da with suppression <400 Da in linear mode, 3.6x detector gain, 2.00 sample rate, and medium gating strength.

**Biolayer interferometry (BLI)**

Octet RED384 (FortéBio, Fremont, CA) was used for the BLI studies [71-73]. Streptavidin (SA) sensors were presoaked in buffer for ~30 minutes. The buffer
solution contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/mL bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. 5 nM tagged peptide was then loaded onto sensors for 15 minutes. Sensors were then dipped in buffer again for 5 minutes to wash off unbound peptides from the surface. A 3-fold serial dilution of WDR5 was conducted ranging from 0.1 µM to 9 µM for the association process and then placed into the buffer solution for the dissociation process. The association and dissociation processes were ~200 and ~600 seconds long, respectively. For all WDR5 concentrations, unloaded sensors were run concurrently as controls and were used to subtract the baseline and the drift in the sensorgrams to extract the binding curves. The BLI experiments were performed at 24ºC. All reagents were prepared in the above-mentioned buffer and were loaded into 96-well flat bottom black plates for the sensorgram recordings. The binding curves were fitted using the Octet Data Analysis software (FortéBio). The curves of the association process, which were recorded for various analyte concentrations, $[C]$, were fitted using the following equation [74]:

$$ Y = Y_\infty - (Y_\infty - Y_0) e^{-k_{obs}t} $$

(1)

Here, $Y_0$ and $Y_\infty$ are the BLI response signals at time zero and infinity, respectively, of the association process. $t$ denotes the cumulative time of the association reaction. $k_{obs}$ is the apparent first-order reaction rate constant of the association process. The curves of the dissociation process were fitted using the following equation:

$$ Y = Y_\infty + (Y_0 - Y_\infty) e^{-k_{off}t} $$

(2)
Here, \( Y_0 \) and \( Y_\infty \) are the BLI response signals at time zero and infinity, respectively, of the dissociation process. \( k_{\text{off}} \) indicates the dissociation rate constant. Finally, the association rate constant, \( k_{\text{on}} \), was determined using the slope of the linear curve [75, 76]:

\[
k_{\text{obs}} = k_{\text{on}}[C] + k_{\text{off}}
\]

Global fitting, which was conducted using several analyte concentrations, provided the corresponding \( k_{\text{on}} \) and \( k_{\text{off}} \) values. The dissociation constant, \( K_D \), were indirectly determined using the \( k_{\text{on}} \) and \( k_{\text{off}} \) values. Three distinct BLI measurements were conducted for all inspected interactions.

**Surface plasmon resonance (SPR)**

All SPR experiments [77-79] were conducted on a Cytiva Biacore 8K (Cytiva Life Sciences, Marlborough, MA). All buffers and dilutions were freshly made in-house using ultrapure water obtained from an IQ 7000 Milli-Q system (Millipore-Sigma, Burlington, MA). WDR5 protein was immobilized onto the active flow cell of each channel of a Cytiva Series S Sensor Chip CM5 (Cytiva Life Sciences) according to the following parameters and protocol. A CM5 chip was inserted into the instrument and equilibrated for 1 h at 25°C in PBS-P+ running buffer (PBS-P+ Buffer 10×, Cytiva Life Sciences). The chip surface was activated using an injection of 1:1 N-hydroxysuccinimide (NHS)/1-ethyl-3-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)carbodiimide (EDC) (Cytiva Amine Coupling Kit, Cytiva Life Sciences) for 420 seconds at 10 μL/min across both active and reference flow
cells. This activation process was followed by a wash of the microfluidics with 1 M ethanolamine-HCl (pH 8). Following activation, wild-type WDR5 (1.75-2.50 µg/mL; analyte dependent) in 50 mM sodium phosphate (pH 6.5), 50 mM NaCl was then injected across the active flow cell for 150 seconds at 10 µL/min. Following ligand immobilization, both active and passive flow cells were chemically deactivated with an injection of 1 M ethanolamine-HCl (pH 8) for 420 seconds at 10 µL/min. SET1_W peptide dilutions were freshly prepared from HPLC-purified peptide stocks in ultrapure water; the peptides were identical to those used in the steady-state FP experiments and contained an N-terminal sulforhodamine B and a C-terminal amide. Titrations of each labeled SET1_W peptide analyte were conducted to span an approximate range of 0.1-10 × K_D (approximately 1 nM to 7 µM; 40 µM for MLL1). Each SET1_W peptide was analyzed in a separate channel. Multicycle kinetic analyses were conducted at a flow cell temperature of 25°C and a sample compartment temperature of 20°C in a running buffer composed of 20 mM Tris- HCl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.05% Tween 20. Each analysis cycle consisted of the following steps: 1) SET1_W peptide analyte injection: 120-second association, 360-second dissociation, 30 µL/min.; 2) regeneration injection with 100% ethylene glycol for 15 seconds at 10 µL/min. (high viscosity setting); 3) wash of the microfluidics system with running buffer; 4) regeneration injection with 1 µM ZnCl_2 for 30 second at 10 µL/min. Prior to curve fitting, all data generated from the active flow cell of each channel are double referenced to both the appropriate buffer blanks (first/last) and the reference flow cell. For MLL2_W, MLL3_W, MLL4_W.
SETd1A_{Win}, and SETd1B_{Win}, the affinity constants, $K_D$, were calculated indirectly using $K_D = k_{\text{off}}/k_{\text{on}}$. For MLL1_{Win}, a plot of relative response versus the MLL1_{Win} analyte concentration was constructed and data were fitted using a four-parameter logistic regression to obtain the $K_D$. Therefore, an affinity analysis (relative response vs. concentration dose-response curve) was used to calculate the $K_D$, in this instance due to kinetic rate constants falling outside of the instrument detection range. All interactions were independently determined in triplicate (e.g., separate ligand immobilizations). Experimental data and fits were plotted using GraphPad Prism 8 (GraphPad Software).

**Steady-state fluorescence polarization (steady-state FP) measurements**

All steady-state fluorescence polarization (FP) measurements were recorded using a SpectraMax i3x plate reader (Molecular Devices, San Jose, CA).[80, 81] HPLC-purified peptides, which contained an N-terminal sulforhodamine B and a C-terminal amide, were reconstituted as concentrated stocks in ultrapure water and used in all subsequent experiments. All steady-state FP assays were conducted in a buffer containing 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.005% Tween 20 and plated in black untreated 96-well polystyrene microplates (Corning Inc., Corning, NY). Steady-state FP assays were conducted in triplicate, 24-point serial dilution for each of the six SET1 Win peptides against WDR5. 200 µL of WDR5 stock solutions, ranged from 21.6 to 131 µM, were added to each well on the first column of one of two adjacent black 96-well dilution plates, and 100 µL
of the assay buffer was added to wells A2-H24 over the two plates. WDR5 variants were then diluted down the two plates by transferring 100 µL from each well to the next, for a total of 24, 2-fold dilutions which range from low µM to low pM (variant specific). Following dilutions, 100 µL of the appropriate 20 nM labeled SET1\textsubscript{win} peptide, which was dissolved in the assay buffer, was added to each well on each set of plates at a final concentration of 10 nM. The steady-state FP anisotropy was measured on the plates after a 1 h incubation at room temperature in the dark. The resulting dose-response data were averaged and fitted using a four-parameter logistic regression to obtain the binding affinity ($K_D$) for each interaction. Data were plotted and analyzed using GraphPad Prism 8 (GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA).

**Molecular graphics**

All cartoons showing molecular graphics were prepared using the PyMOL Molecular Graphics System (Version 2.4.0 Schrödinger, LLC).
2.4 Results and Discussion

The kinetic fingerprint of WDR5 – SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions

We first explored the association ($k_{on}$) and dissociation ($k_{off}$) rate constants of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions using BLI measurements [71, 72]. This technology probes ligand-receptor interactions that lead to accumulations of bimolecular complexes at the surface of the BLI sensor. This process is facilitated by immobilizing one interacting partner (ligand) onto the surface of the BLI sensor and supplying the analyte partner (receptor) from solution. In this way, the association and dissociation phases of the ligand-receptor complex are optically measured in real time using alterations in the interference pattern between reflected light waves at the surface of the BLI sensor. The N-terminus of each SET1\textsubscript{Win} was biotinylated and their C-terminus was amidated (Table 1). A 9-residue Gly/Ser-rich peptide spacer was inserted between the biotinylated site and the SET1\textsubscript{Win} sequence. This 3 nm-long spacer ensures that there is a satisfactory distance between the BLI sensor and SET1\textsubscript{Win} for WDR5 to interact without steric hinderance from the sensor surface.

The association binding curves were acquired through a 3-fold serial dilution of WDR5 (Figure 2). After the BLI response reached a saturation level, individual dissociation binding curves were recorded when sensors were placed in a WDR5-free buffer. The association and dissociation BLI phases underwent a time-dependent single-exponential increase and decrease, respectively. The binding
curves were fitted using the Octet Data Analysis software (Materials and Methods; eqns. (1)-(3)). The equilibrium dissociation constants using BLI, $K_{D\text{-BLI}}$, were indirectly determined using $k_{on}$ and $k_{off}$.

Figure 2: Label-free optical BLI sensorgrams of WDR5-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ interactions. 5 nM biotin-tagged SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ peptides were loaded onto streptavidin (SA) sensors for 15 minutes. Titration series of WDR5 were injected as analytes and the corresponding association and dissociation curves are shown for the six SET1$_{\text{Win}}$
peptides.

Table 2: Kinetic rate constants of association, $k_{on}$, and dissociation, $k_{off}$, and equilibrium dissociation constants, $K_{D-BLI}$, of WDR5 with SET1$_{Win}$ peptides using BLI. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide sequence</th>
<th>$k_{on}$ (M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$) × 10$^{-4}$</th>
<th>$k_{off}$ (s$^{-1}$) × 10$^{3}$</th>
<th>$K_{D-BLI}$ (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$MLL1$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND**</td>
<td>ND***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$MLL2$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>7.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>170 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$MLL3$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>5.4 ± 0.6</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>100 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$MLL4$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>39 ± 2</td>
<td>1,700 ± 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$SETd1A$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>51 ± 6</td>
<td>620 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)$<em>3$SETd1B$</em>{Win-NH2}$</td>
<td>7.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>250 ± 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND* $k_{on}$ was not quantitatively determined. Although WDR5-MLL1$_{Win}$ interactions were detectable using a BLI measurement (Fig. 2), no accurate quantitative determination was made due to the limited time resolution of this approach. In this case, we assume that the $k_{on}$ was in the same order of magnitude with the $k_{on}$ of the other SET1$_{Win}$ peptides (~10$^4$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$).

ND** $k_{off}$ was not quantitatively determined due to a fast dissociation rate constant. The upper-limit value for the detection of $k_{off}$ is 1 s$^{-1}$ according to instrument specifications.

ND*** $K_{D-BLI}$ was not quantitatively determined due to the limited time resolution of the approach. In this case, $K_{D-BLI}$ determined by BLI for WDR5-MLL1$_{Win}$ interactions should be greater than ~10$^5$ nM. This value results from dividing the upper-limit value of detection of $k_{off}$ (ND**) by the value of the $k_{on}$ approximation (ND*).
Association rate constants

The BLI-determined $k_{on}$ values were in the order of $10^4$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$, clearly
indicating slow association kinetics for a protein-peptide system (Table 2). It is likely that this outcome resulted from two distinct physical restrictions: (i) tethering SET1_{Win} onto the surface of the BLI sensor, thus reducing its local mobility, and (ii) partitioning of SET1_{Win} into the WDR5 cavity. The latter physical process was illustrated in early crystallographic studies [21], which revealed that an MLL1_{Win} peptide penetrates into the WDR5 cavity to undergo a bimolecular association process. Here, we were unable to acquire an accurate mean value of $k_{on}$ for the WDR5-MLL1_{Win} interaction due to its relatively fast $k_{off}$ constant, whose binding time constant was shorter than the time-resolution limit of this approach (~1 s). Furthermore, $k_{on}$ measured by BLI for various SET1_{Win} peptides were within the same order of magnitude, suggesting a similar insertion mechanism of the 6-residue Win motif peptide into the Win binding site (Table 1; Supplementary Figures S1-S2) [24, 65].

**Dissociation rate constants**

In contrast, $k_{off}$ values spanned between two and three orders of magnitude (Table 2), highlighting significant distinctions in the WDR5-SET1_{Win} interactions. This assumes that the $k_{off}$ of the WDR5-MLL1 interactions is faster than 1 s$^{-1}$, showing that MLL1_{Win} has the weakest interaction with WDR5 among all SET1_{Win} peptides. On the other hand, the strongest WDR5-SET1_{Win} interactions were monitored with MLL2_{Win} and MLL3_{Win}, which had average $k_{off}$ values of $(7.7 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$ and $(5.3 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-3}$ s$^{-1}$, respectively. This finding provides unusually long binding times of ~130 s and ~190 s, respectively.
It was previously demonstrated that WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions have a common archetype: a highly conserved Arg residue at P\textsubscript{0} (Table 1) [22]. This Arg residue is the pivotal player of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions, contributing to most of the binding affinity through a complex network of contacts with neighboring residues (Supplementary Table S1, Figure S3) [22, 24]. To test this hypothesis, we conducted BLI measurements using a control MLL3\textsubscript{Win} peptide, whose native form exhibited the longest binding time with WDR5. The key Arg residue at P\textsubscript{0} was replaced by an Ala residue, resulting in the R4710A MLL3\textsubscript{Win} mutant. No interaction was detected with this R4710A MLL3\textsubscript{Win} mutant (Supplementary Figure S4), confirming the critical role of Arg at P\textsubscript{0} for the strength of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions. In addition, this finding validates the efficacy of our BLI measurements for examining the kinetic landscape of the Win binding site of WDR5.

**Table 3: Kinetic and affinity determinations of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions using SPR.** Values represent mean ± s.d. acquired from at least three independent experimental determinations (separate receptor immobilizations). For MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, n = 4 independent experimental determinations were used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide sequence</th>
<th>$k_{on}$ (M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$) x 10$^{-5}$</th>
<th>$k_{off}$ (s$^{-1}$) x 10$^3$</th>
<th>$K_D$-SPR (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$MLL1\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND**</td>
<td>16,000 ± 3,000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$MLL2\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>33 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$MLL3\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>9 ± 1</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$MLL4\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>41 ± 3</td>
<td>190 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$SETd1A\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>110 ± 10</td>
<td>350 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)$_3$SET1dB\textsubscript{Win-NH$_2$}</td>
<td>3.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>24 ± 1</td>
<td>69 ± 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ND* $k_{on}$ was not quantitatively determined. Although the WDR5-MLL1<sub>Win</sub> interactions were detectable using an SPR measurement (Fig. 3), no accurate quantitative determination was made due to the limited time resolution of the approach. In this case, we assume that the $k_{on}$ was in the same order of magnitude with the $k_{on}$ of other SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptides ($\sim 10^5$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$).

ND** $k_{off}$ was not quantitatively determined due to a fast dissociation rate constant. The upper-limit value for the detection of $k_{off}$ is 0.5 s$^{-1}$ according to instrument specifications. The Biacore 8K+ cannot measure rate constants of dissociation, $k_{off}$, faster than 0.5 s$^{-1}$.

***Here, $K_D$-SPR was determined using a steady-state SPR measurement (Supplementary Figure S6).

**Does the tethering restriction of SET1<sub>Win</sub> onto the surface of the BLI sensor impact the kinetic rate constants?**

**Association rate constants**

We postulated above that the slow association kinetics of WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> interactions were caused at least in part by the immobilization of SET1<sub>Win</sub> onto the surface of the BLI sensor. To assess this hypothesis, we next employed SPR [77-79] as an orthogonal, label-free approach for examining these interactions of SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptides with WDR5. SPR is an optoelectronic technique that monitors accumulation of bimolecular ligand-receptor complexes onto the surface of the SPR sensor by changes in the refractive index. In this case, SET1<sub>Win</sub> analyte is supplied by using a flow-driven fluidic device. WDR5 was immobilized onto the surface of the SPR chips as the "receptor" (Materials and Methods). In this way, we recorded the association and dissociation phases in real time when SET1<sub>Win</sub> was not immobilized onto a surface (Figure 3). Biacore™ Software was used to analyze and fit the SPR sensorgrams using a 1:1 binding interaction model to provide the
$k_{\text{on}}$ and $k_{\text{off}}$ rate constants (Supplementary Figure S5). In accord with our expectation, $k_{\text{on}}$ values obtained by SPR were significantly increased by almost an order of magnitude to quantities greater than $10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ (Table 3; Supplementary Figure S6, Figure S7A). Again, $k_{\text{on}}$ measured by SPR for various SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ peptides were within the same order of magnitude, potentially indicating an identical insertion mechanism of the 6-residue Win motif peptide into the Win binding site (Table 1; Supplementary Figures S1-S2) [24, 65]. In addition, this insertion mechanism prevails no matter whether SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ is in either physically restricted (e.g., BLI) or unrestricted (e.g., SPR) conditions.

**Dissociation rate constants**

Interestingly, with the exception of SETd1A, the $k_{\text{off}}$ values acquired by the SPR measurement of WDR5-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ interactions closely resembled those measured by BLI (Table 3; Supplementary Figure S7B). Moreover, this finding provides indirect evidence that WDR5 did not undergo denaturation upon its immobilization onto the surface of the SPR sensor. Tethering SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ onto the surface of the BLI sensor via its C-terminus was considered inconvenient, because prior crystallographic information indicated the interaction of the C-terminus residues (Table 1) with the WDR5 surface [24]. However, does the SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ tethering onto the surface of the BLI sensor via its N-terminus impose an additional physical restriction on the binding mechanism? Since the $k_{\text{off}}$ measured by BLI and SPR are almost identical, we conclude that the SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ tethering onto the surface
of the BLI sensor via its N-terminus did not produce any additional restrain on the detachment mechanism of SET1\textsubscript{Win} from the high-affinity Win binding site.

Figure 4: Steady-state FP curves of the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions. The N terminus of the SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides was tagged with sulforhodamine B, whereas the C terminus was amidated. The final concentration of labeled SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides in each well was 10 nM. Three independent experiments were conducted to obtain the WDR5 dose response.
Figure 5: Quantitative comparisons of dissociation equilibrium constants of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions using BLI, SPR, and steady-state FP measurements. "*" is the upper-limit value for the detection of $K_{D\text{-BLI}}$. This value results from dividing the upper-limit value of the detection of $k_{\text{off}}$ by the value of the $k_{\text{on}}$ approximation (Table 2).

Comparisons of binding affinities of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions in restricted and unrestricted conditions

Next, we asked how immobilization-free (i.e., unrestricted) conditions influence the binding affinities. It is expected that the equilibrium dissociation constant slightly decreases if both WDR5 and SET1\textsubscript{Win} move freely in solution. Hence, we determined equilibrium dissociation constant values using steady-state FP measurements, $K_{D\text{-FP}}$ (Materials and Methods) [80-82]. This fluorescence technique monitors changes in the polarity of the emitted light due to modifications.
in the rotational diffusion coefficient of a fluorescently labeled ligand. For example, the formation of the ligand-receptor complex is accompanied by a decline in the rotational mobility of the ligand, increasing the polarity of the emitted light. Here, Sulforhodamine B, an optically stable and bright fluorophore [83], was chemically attached to the N terminus of SET1\textsubscript{Win} via a 9-residue Gly/Ser-rich flexible spacer, whereas their C terminus was amidated. WDR5 concentration-dependent, steady-state FP binding curves were collected using a plate reader in a high-throughput setting (Fig. 4). In this way, we determined the immobilization-free $K_{D,FP}$ (Supplementary Table S2). In accord with our anticipation, $K_{D,FP}$ values were slightly lower than those acquired by SPR, $K_{D,SPR}$, meaning that WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions appeared somewhat stronger when probed in unrestricted conditions.

The $K_{D,FP}$ values are also in agreement with results of prior ITC measurements (e.g., in immobilization-free conditions) at either lower [65] or higher salt concentrations [24]. It is worth mentioning that we preferred replacing Arg by Ser at the C terminus of MLL1\textsubscript{Win} and MLL4\textsubscript{Win} to avoid potential rebinding events of the native Arg at P\textsubscript{6} to the WDR5 cavity (Table 1). Regardless, we employed similar peptide sequences and identical buffer conditions to obtain meaningful comparisons among the three approaches. Then, we have discovered the following relationship for each WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interaction:

$$K_{D,BLI} > K_{D,SPR} > K_{D,FP} \text{ (Fig. 5; Supplementary Table S2)}.$$  

In addition, numerical values of
$K_{D,FP}$ replicated similar trends noted with different SET1$_{Win}$ peptides using both BLI and SPR.

**Tentative interpretations**

The kinetics and affinity measurements of the WDR5-SET1$_{Win}$ interactions were conducted with no significant variation among independently recorded BLI sensorgrams. The precision of this technique allowed us to quantitatively compare kinetics that were within the same order of magnitude. The SET1$_{Win}$ motif is located about 60 residues N-terminal to the SET domain, both of which are at the C-terminal end of the large SET1 proteins. These proteins range between ~1,700 – 5,500 amino acids in length. The rotational and diffusional rates of SET1 proteins relative to WDR5 are slow enough that these proteins can be considered as stationary compared to WDR5. Therefore, a more physiologically-relevant approach that recapitulates the binding of the full-length SET1 is that in which the 14-residue SET1$_{Win}$ peptide is attached onto a surface, whereas WDR5 is free in solution. In this way, the actual $k_{on}$ measured by BLI would be conceivably closer to that value in physiological conditions. In addition, it should be mentioned that SET1$_{Win}$ is physically restrained at both ends when it is part of the SET1 subunit, suggesting an even lower $k_{on}$ value. However, SET1$_{Win}$ may have stabilized conformations that promote binding within the context of the large SET1 subunit. In other words, the unrestricted SET1$_{Win}$ may undergo significantly greater degrees of freedom to adopt numerous non-productive conformations. Furthermore,
binding of SET1 proteins to WDR5 may be coupled with additional interaction pockets that can amplify the binding strength either by increasing \( k_{on} \) or by decreasing \( k_{off} \) or both. For example, prior sedimentation velocity experiments have shown that a 225-residue MLL1\textsubscript{Win}-containing polypeptide exhibits a binding affinity of \(~120\ nM\) to WDR5 [22].

\( k_{on} \) values measured by SPR are yet at least an order of magnitude lower than those predicted for a protein-peptide interaction system (\(10^7 - 10^8\ M^{-1}s^{-1}\)) [84-88]. Here, WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions require a precise insertion of the 6-residue, Arg-containing SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide into the WDR5 cavity. Therefore, we interpret that \( k_{on} \) values are limited by the entropic penalty determined by the SET1\textsubscript{Win} partitioning into the Win binding site. The high-affinity Win binding site features a conical geometry with a maximum internal diameter of \(~1.5\ nm\), as measured from side chain to side chain. For example, MLL1\textsubscript{Win} partitions \(~1.0\ nm\) into the Win binding site (Fig. 1) [24]. In support to this interpretation, previous single-molecule studies have shown that \( k_{on} \) values of the interactions of peptides, up to 25 residues in length, with a narrow 2 nm-wide nanopore are in the order of \(10^5\ M^{-1}s^{-1}\) [89, 90]. This is the same order of magnitude with \( k_{on} \) values that we determined by SPR.

However, the \( k_{on} \) is a composite parameter, which includes contributions of the diffusion-limited rate factor, \( k_{on0} \), and electrostatic free energy of the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} complex, \( \Delta G^*_{el} \). Zhou and coworkers have demonstrated that the rate
constant of association of two proteins can be accurately computed using the following expression: \( k_{on} = k_{on0} \exp(-\Delta G^*_{el}/k_B T) \), where \( k_B \) and \( T \) are Boltzmann's constant and the absolute temperature, respectively [91, 92]. For this equation, they employed kinetic-rate theory of rigid-body docking and Poisson-Boltzmann formalism [93-95]. Using the same approach [93] and crystallographic information of the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} complex [24], we found \( k_{on} \) values of several SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides (Supplementary Table S3). For example, computed \( k_{on} \) values for MLL2\textsubscript{Win} and MLL3\textsubscript{Win} were \( 2.9 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \) and \( 1.2 \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \), respectively. These values compare well with our corresponding experimental data determined by SPR, which were \( (3.7 \pm 0.3) \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \) and \( (4.9 \pm 0.4) \times 10^5 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \), respectively. Yet, computed \( k_{on} \) values for MLL1\textsubscript{Win} and MLL4\textsubscript{Win} were in the order of \( 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1} \). The TransComp server: Web Server for Predicting Protein Association Rate Constants [91, 93] was not able to produce computed \( k_{on} \) values for SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}, likely because these WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} complex formations do not undergo a single-step association mechanism. This outcome suggests that the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions of SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} exhibit some subtle structural distinctions with respect to MLL1\textsubscript{Win}, MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, and MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, which is in accord with prior crystallographic data [24, 65].
2.5 Concluding remarks, practical implications, and future prospects

In summary, we present a detailed kinetic fingerprint of the multitasking high-affinity Win binding site of WDR5, a protein with major regulatory implications in the methylation of H3K4 and in multiple physical associations with other proteins. This study reveals slow kinetics of association and dissociation of the SET1_{Win} peptides with WDR5. It is known that WDR5 bridges the interaction between the SET domain of large SET1 subunits and other WRAD\textsubscript{2} constituents. A long-binding time of WDR5-SET1_{Win} interaction, meaning slow dissociation kinetics of the high-affinity Win binding site, is a pivotal mechanism by which WDR5 assists the functional integrity of the multisubunit WRAD\textsubscript{2} complex. Furthermore, slow dissociation rates detected in this study point out a fundamental consideration for future therapeutics aimed at targeting interactions of the Win binding site with other proteins. The stability of these multisubunit complexes would decrease the opportunities for inhibitors to interfere in WDR5-SET1/MLL interactions. Consequently, this stresses the need for both fast association rates and slow dissociation rates when designing potential inhibitors to modulate WDR5 function. Newly designed small-molecule drugs would need to bind strongly to the WDR5 cavity and stave off other binding partners. Slow dissociation rate constants also reiterate the efficacy of SET1_{Win} peptidomimetics as a fundamental platform for such drugs. Modifications of these sequences that enhance the association rates, while maintaining the disassociation rates, could be very effective at inhibiting Win binding site interactions. A good place to start would be the alteration of either the net charge or charge distribution of these peptides for amplifying the rate constants
of association. Any approach employed in this work can be used in the high-throughput screening of libraries of small-molecule compounds against WDR5-SET1<sub>win</sub> interactions. However, WDR5 is a more relevant target for drug discovery when immobilized onto the SPR sensor, where the free inhibitor in solution would better mimic <i>in vivo</i> function. This experimental design enables determinations of kinetic rate constants, contrasting the steady-state FP measurements. Our results also indicate that WDR5 did not undergo denaturation upon its immobilization onto the SPR sensor. In the future, it would be desirable to extend these kinetic studies to full-length WRAD<sub>2</sub> subunits, because of the suitability of these high-throughput approaches for examining long-lived protein-protein interactions. For instance, it would be interesting to conduct SPR measurements, in which a full-length SET1 subunit is immobilized on the chip surface and use WDR5 as analyte in solution.
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1. Complex formation of WDR5 with \textit{SET1\textsubscript{win}} peptides.

\textbf{Figure S1:} Structures of WDR5 (green) complexed with MLL1\textsubscript{win} peptide (magenta). (A) The insertion of MLL1\textsubscript{win} into the WDR5 cavity is shown from the top. (B) The same interaction is shown from the side. These graphic representations were made using the pdb code 4ESG [1].
Figure S2: Structures of WDR5 complexed with SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides. MLL1\textsubscript{Win}, MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} are inserted into the WDR5 cavity. Structures correspond to protein data bank codes: 3EG6, 4ESG, 4ERQ, 4ERY, 4ERZ, 4EWR and 4ES0 [1, 2].
2. List of hydrogen bonds at the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} protein interface.

Table S1: Comprehensive mapping of hydrogen bonding at the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interface. These results were obtained using previously published co-crystallization data of Dharmarajan and coworkers [1]. The structures were not always able to model the whole sequence of the peptides, so these hydrogen bonds are not comprehensive. The first residue in each bond belongs to the SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide, whereas the second one belongs to WDR5. Only peptide sequences of the segments that were able to model these interactions are listed below. Entries with two distances represent two different hydrogen bonds formed by the same residues. The cut-off distance for identifying these hydrogen bonds was 3.2 Å. Here, BB and SC denote backbone and side chain, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Hydrogen Bonds</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| MLL1\textsubscript{Win} LNPHGSARAEVHL | H3761 – D107  
G3762 – G89  
A3764 – D107  
R3765 – S91  
R3765 – C261  
R3765 – F133 | 2.7  
3.0  
3.0  
3.0, 2.8  
2.9  
3.0 | SC-SC  
BB-BB  
BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB |
| MLL2\textsubscript{Win} INPTGCAREPKI | G5337 – G89  
A5339 – D107  
R5340 – S91  
R5340 – C261  
R5340 – F133  
K5344 – K259 | 3.1  
2.9  
3.1, 2.8  
2.9  
3.0  
2.9 | BB-BB  
BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB  
BB-BB |
| MLL3\textsubscript{Win} VNPTGCAREPKMS | A4709 – D107  
R4710 – S91  
R4710 – C261  
R4710 – F133  
K4714 – K259 | 2.9  
3.1, 2.8  
2.9  
2.9  
2.9 | BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB  
BB-BB |
| MLL4\textsubscript{Win} LNPHGAARAEVY | A2510 – D107  
R2511 – S91  
R2511 – C261  
R2511 – F133 | 3.0  
3.0, 2.8  
2.9  
3.0 | BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB |
| SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} QTGSARSEGY | A1494 – D107  
R1495 – S91  
R1495 – C261  
R1495 – F133  
Y1499 – K259 | 3.0  
3.0, 2.8  
2.9  
3.1  
2.8 | BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB  
BB-BB |
| SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} GCARSEG | A1704 – D107  
R1705 – S91  
R1705 – C261  
R1705 – F133 | 3.0  
3.2, 2.8  
2.8  
3.1 | BB-SC  
BB-SC, SC-BB  
SC-BB  
SC-BB |
Figure S3: Structure of the binding cavity of WDR5. It illustrates its key residues involved in hydrogen bonding with the evolutionarily conserved Arg residue of MLL1 Win at position $P_0$. The Arg residue is marked in magenta. The hydrogen bonds are indicated by thick dashed lines marked in yellow. The cut-off distance for identifying these hydrogen bonds was 4.0 Å. This graphic representation was made using the pdb code 4ESG [1].
3. **Negative control of BLI measurements using an arginine-replaced MLL3<sub>Win</sub> derivative.**

![BLI sensorgram](image)

**Figure S4:** Arginine is a key side chain in trapping the MLL3<sub>Win</sub> peptide within the WDR5 cavity. This figure shows the BLI sensogram, which includes the association and disassociation curves for the negative-control MLL3<sub>Win</sub> peptide interacting with WDR5. The sequence of this control peptide was (GGS)<sub>3</sub>VNPTGCAASEPKMS, where Arg was substituted by Ala at P<sub>0</sub> of MLL3<sub>Win</sub> (Table 1). For pursuing BLI measurements, this control peptide was biotinylated at the N terminus and amidated at the C terminus. 5 nM negative-control MLL3<sub>Win</sub>-mutated peptide was loaded onto streptavidin (SA) sensors and allowed to associate with WRD5, whose concentrations ranged from 0.1 µM to 9 µM. Then, a dissociation process followed. The figure provides compelling evidence that no association phase was detected, illustrating that no binding interactions occurred in this case.
4. Quantitative kinetic determinations of WDR5-SET1<sub>win</sub> interactions using SPR.

![Figure S5: Representative SPR sensorgrams and their kinetic fits for the interactions of SET1<sub>win</sub> peptides with WDR5. WDR5 was immobilized onto CM5 chips and allowed to associate with SET1<sub>win</sub> peptides. Each panel indicates the peptide concentrations, the association and dissociation curves, as well as the fits of data to obtain $k_{on}$ and $k_{off}$. While these are single runs for each peptide, at...](image)
least three independent runs were conducted to obtain the average kinetic values. (A) MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, (B) MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, (C) MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, (D) SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and (E) SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}.

5. Determination of the equilibrium dissociation constant of WDR5 - MLL1\textsubscript{Win} interactions using SPR.

![Relative Response (RU) vs. MLL1\textsubscript{Win} Concentration (M)](image)

**Figure S6:** Steady-state SPR measurements for the quantification of the interactions between MLL1\textsubscript{Win} peptide and WDR5. WDR5 was immobilized onto CM5 chips and allowed to associate with MLL1\textsubscript{Win} peptide, whose concentration was varied in the range of $4 \times 10^{-8}$ through $4 \times 10^{-5}$ M (the horizontal axis). The resultant maximum relative responses were plotted and fitted to obtain the $K_D$ of the interaction. Although this set of illustrated data resulted from a single experiment, three independent data acquisitions were employed to obtain the average value of $K_D$. 
6. Quantitative comparisons of kinetic rate constants of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions between BLI and SPR measurements.

Figure S7: Comparisons of kinetic rate constants of association and dissociation between restricted BLI and unrestricted SPR conditions. (A) Association rate constants. (B) Dissociation rate constants. All experimental details are provided in Materials and Methods.
7. Quantitative comparisons of the binding affinities of WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> interactions among BLI, SPR, and steady-state FP.

Table S2: Quantitative comparisons of K<sub>D</sub> obtained via BLI, SPR, and steady-state FP. K<sub>D-BLI</sub>, K<sub>D-SPR</sub>, and K<sub>D-FP</sub> are the equilibrium dissociation constants measured via BLI, SPR, and steady-state FP, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>K&lt;sub&gt;D-BLI&lt;/sub&gt; (nM)</th>
<th>K&lt;sub&gt;D-SPR&lt;/sub&gt; (nM)</th>
<th>K&lt;sub&gt;D-FP&lt;/sub&gt; (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>≥100,000*</td>
<td>16,000 ± 3,000**</td>
<td>9,000 ± 5,500***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>170 ± 20</td>
<td>33 ± 2</td>
<td>23 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>100 ± 5</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>15 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1,700 ± 200</td>
<td>190 ± 20</td>
<td>130 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>620 ± 20</td>
<td>350 ± 10</td>
<td>72 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>250 ± 30</td>
<td>69 ± 6</td>
<td>18 ± 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is the upper-limit value for the detection of K<sub>D-BLI</sub>. It results from dividing the upper-limit value of detection of k<sub>off</sub> by the value of the k<sub>on</sub> approximation.

**K<sub>D-SPR</sub> was determined using a steady-state SPR measurement.

***Prior ITC measurements at a slightly increased salt concentration show that data are consistent with the steady-state FP measurements [1].

8. Computational predictions of the association rate constants of WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> interactions using the basal rate constants and electrostatic free energies of the transient WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> complex.

Table S3: Determination of the association rate constants using the basal rate constants, k<sub>on0</sub>, and electrostatic free energies, ΔG<sup>*</sub><sub>el</sub>, of the transient WDR5-SET1<sub>Win</sub> complex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide sequence</th>
<th>k&lt;sub&gt;on0&lt;/sub&gt; (M&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt; x s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
<th>ΔG&lt;sup&gt;*&lt;/sub&gt;&lt;sub&gt;el&lt;/sub&gt; (kcal/mol)</th>
<th>k&lt;sub&gt;on&lt;/sub&gt; (M&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt; x s&lt;sup&gt;-1&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1.27 × 10&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>1.17 × 10&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.79 × 10&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>2.92 × 10&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.07 × 10&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.323</td>
<td>1.20 × 10&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.64 × 10&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>2.15 × 10&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>ND*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These values were determined using The “TransComp: Web Server for Predicting Protein Association Rate Constants” (https://pipe.rcc.fsu.edu/transcomp/) [3-7].
Computational predictions could not be made for these interactions, because the association process of the WDR5-SET1* complex may not undergo a single-step mechanism.

The calculation of the $k_{on}$ was based on the following equation:

$$k_{on} = k_{on0} \exp(-\Delta G^*_{el}/k_B T)$$

(S1)

Here, $k_{on0}$ is the basal rate constant for attaining the transient WDR5-SET1* complex. $\Delta G^*_{el}$ indicates the electrostatic energy of the transient WDR5-SET1* complex. The computational process encompasses three components: (i) the generation of the transient WDR5-SET1* complex, (ii) the calculation of the basal rate constant $k_{on0}$, and (iii) the determination of the electrostatic interaction energy, $\Delta G^*_{el}$, which is associated with the WDR5-SET1* transient complex.


- WDR5 protein: UniProtKB - P61964 (WDR5_HUMAN)
- MLL1* motif: UniProtKB - Q03164 (KMT2A_HUMAN)
- MLL2* motif: UniProtKB - O14686 (KMT2D_HUMAN)
- MLL3* motif: UniProtKB - Q8NEZ4 (KMT2C_HUMAN)
- MLL4* motif: UniProtKB - Q9UMN6 (KMT2B_HUMAN)
- SETd1A* motif: UniProtKB - O15047 (SET1A_HUMAN)
- SETd1B* motif: UniProtKB - Q9UPS6 (SET1B_HUMAN)

10. Supporting references.
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3.1 Abstract

Progress in tumor sequencing and cancer databases has created an enormous amount of information that scientists struggle to sift through. While several research groups have created computational methods to analyze large databases, much work still remains in distinguishing key implications of pathogenic mutations. Here, we describe an approach to identify and evaluate clinically significant mutations of WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5), a chromatin-associated protein hub. This multitasking protein maintains the functional integrity of large multi-subunit enzymatic complexes of the six human SET1 methyltransferases. Remarkably, the somatic cancer mutations of WDR5 preferentially distribute within and around an essential cavity, which hosts the WDR5 interaction (Win) binding site. Hence, we assessed the real-time binding kinetics of the interactions of key clustered WDR5 mutants with the Win motif peptide ligands of the SET1 family members (SET1\textsubscript{Win}). Our measurements highlight that this subset of cancer mutants not only exhibits divergent perturbations in the kinetics and strength of interactions relative to those of the native WDR5, but also among the SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. The immediate outcomes of this study could be used further for accelerated discoveries in precision medicine.
3.2 Introduction

WD40 repeat proteins (WDRs) are among the most abundant protein-protein interaction (PPI) domains in the human proteome (1-3). WDRs are either implicated in numerous cell signaling pathways (4,5) or in scaffolding large multi-subunit enzymatic complexes (6,7). Notably, WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5) is a highly conserved nuclear hub, which is primarily known for its regulatory role in histone 3 lysine 4 (H3K4) mono- and di-methylation (8-13). In this process, WDR5 bridges the interaction between the catalytic domain of mixed lineage leukemia MLL/SET1 family proteins and other subunits of the large methyltransferase complex. The assembly and stability of this enzymatic complex is necessary for optimal methyltransferase activity (14-16). In addition, WDR5 interacts with other protein partners, such as transcription factor MYC (17-20) and 3-phosphoinositide-dependent protein kinase 1 (PDPK1) (21). Two highly conserved motifs of these protein binders, the WDR5 interaction (Win) motif (22-24) and WDR5-binding motif (WBM) (18,25,26), are deemed responsible for the vast majority of their interactions with WDR5. Interactions corresponding to these motifs are mediated by the Win and WBM sites, respectively (Fig. 1a).
Figure 1: The two binding sites of WDR5 and the structure of the WDR5-MLL3\textsubscript{Win} complex. (a) Representations of the Win and WBM binding sites of WDR5. Orientations of WDR5 in the two cartoons are 180° with respect to each other. (b) The top view of the WDR5-MLL3\textsubscript{Win} complex. (c) The side view of the WDR5-MLL3\textsubscript{Win} complex. (d) The side view of the interaction sites between
MLL3\textsubscript{Win} (green) and WDR5 (gray). All presented residues are within 5 Å of the other binding partner. The residues corresponding to the WDR5 mutations explored in this study are marked in dark gray. MLL3\textsubscript{Win} residues are labelled as well. Potential hydrogen bonds between the two binding partners are shown as yellow dotted lines. (e) Key residues of the WDR5 binding cavity involved in hydrogen bonding with the evolutionarily conserved Arg residue (R4710) of MLL3\textsubscript{Win} at position P\textsubscript{0} (Supplementary Table S1). The hydrogen bonds are indicated by thick dashed lines marked in yellow. The cut-off distance for identifying these hydrogen bonds was 4.0 Å. WDR5 was represented using pdb entry 4ERY (35).

For oncoproteins, the driver cancer mutations preferentially populate either within an active site or on their binding surface (27,28). Based upon this argument, we postulated that missense somatic cancer mutations of WDR5 form a dense cluster either within one or both binding sites. Databases, such as Catalogue of Somatic Mutations in Cancer (COSMIC) (29,30), have become instrumental resources for unraveling the influential roles of specific proteins in different cancers (31-33). However, by determining the density and location of known mutations, their important subsets under disease-like conditions can potentially be identified. Using the clustering of mutations in protein structures (CLUMPS) method (34), we were able to identify, in accord with our hypothesis, that the high-density distribution of WDR5 cancer missense alterations occurs within and around the Win binding site.

The Win binding site is located within a central cavity and facilitates high-affinity interactions of WDR5 with each of the six human histone methyltransferases (HMTs; MLL1-4 and SETd1A-B), participating in the formation of corresponding six SET1 enzymatic complexes (35,36). Rearrangements in the MLL1 gene lead to solid tumors and aggressive lymphocytic
leukemias in humans (37). Moreover, WDR5 is overexpressed under various oncogenic conditions and its upregulation catalyzes cancer development (38-42). In recent years, the multitasking Win binding site has received a lot of interest (21,43-45), because it is a promising target for anti-cancer drug discovery (46-53). Therefore, a quantitative understanding of the WDR5 interactions with other Win motif partners has wide-ranging fundamental and clinical significance (50,54-57). For example, the kinetic fingerprints and affinities of the interactions of WDR5 with Win motif peptides of SET1 family members (SET1\textsubscript{win}) have been previously reported (22,35,36,44,45).

Stimulated by our finding using the CLUMPS method (34), we explored the impact of somatic cancer mutations of WDR5 on its interactions with 14-residue SET1\textsubscript{win} peptide ligands of the six SET1 proteins (Fig. 1b-c; Supplementary Table S1). The WDR5-SET1 interaction requires the precise insertion of a highly-conserved Arg residue of SET1 proteins into the Win binding site (Fig. 1d-e) (23). This key interaction is a prerequisite for the structural and functional integrity of the C-terminal catalytic domain of SET1 proteins (15,22,23). SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands recapitulate the native interactions of the six SET1 proteins with WDR5 through the Win binding site (35,36). Therefore, we utilized the benefit of biolayer interferometry (BLI) (58,59) for high-throughput settings and immobilized these SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands onto the sensor surface. In this way, we probed the real-time kinetics and dynamics of their interactions with a subset of WDR5 cancer mutants, whose missense alterations are located within and around the Win binding site.
Remarkably, while these clustered mutations feature spatial proximity, they exhibit divergent effects on interactions with each of the six SET1\textsubscript{Wit} ligands. Finally, the results of this scalable kinetic platform were confirmed by orthogonal determinations of affinity constants of these interactions using steady-state fluorescence polarization (FP) spectroscopy (60,61).

### 3.3 Materials and Methods

**Clustering of Mutations in Protein Structures (CLUMPS).** This approach was used as previously reported (34). WDR5 mutations were obtained using the COSMIC database (29,30,62) and available X-ray crystallographic information (PDB code 4ERY) (35). A weighted average proximity (WAP) score was generated for the distribution of mutations using the following equation:

\[
WAP = \sum_{i \neq j} s_i s_j e^{-\frac{d_{ij}^2}{2r^2}}
\]

(1)

where \(i\) and \(j\) iterated over all residues of WDR5. Here, \(d_{ij}\) is the Euclidean distance between residues \(i\) and \(j\) in Angstroms, and \(r\) denotes the distance threshold set to a constant value of 6 Å (34). \(s_i\) represents the normalized number of samples, in which the residue \(i\) was mutated. This parameter is given by:

\[
s_i = \frac{n_i^2}{2s^2 + n_i^2}
\]

(2)
where $n_i$ represents the number of samples, in which the residue $i$ was mutated. The $P$-value was determined by calculating the WAP score for $10^6$ random distributions of mutations, and then by comparing it with that value of the known distribution.

**Protein Expression and Purification.** All expression plasmids were synthesized, codon optimized, and sequence verified by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). Human WDR5 (UniProtKB - P61964; WDR5_HUMAN) and its mutants were expressed and purified as described previously (22,23,44).

**Peptide synthesis, labeling, purification, and analysis.** For BLI measurements, 14-residue SET1$_{Win}$ peptide ligands were biotinylated at their N terminus and amidated at their C terminus. They were synthesized and purified to $\geq 95\%$ purity by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). Purity confirmation, amino acid analysis, and solubility testing were conducted and provided by GenScript. For steady-state FP measurements, details on peptide synthesis, labeling, purification, and analysis were previously published (44). In brief, peptides were synthesized using a Biotage Syro I peptide synthesizer (Biotage, Charlotte, NC). Then, the peptides were purified using reversed-phase chromatography in two steps: (i) flash chromatography using a Biotage Isolera One (Biotage AB, Uppsala, Sweden), and (ii) semi-preparative HPLC using a Waters 2695 separations module equipped with a Waters 2996 photodiode array detector (PDA). A Sulforhodamine B fluorophore was chemically attached at the N terminus of the 14-residue SET1$_{Win}$ peptides, whereas their C terminus was amidated. A 9-residue Gly/Ser-rich peptide sequence
was introduced between the fluorophore and the SET1\textsubscript{Win} sequence (Supplementary Methods). Fluorophore-containing peptide fractions were analyzed by MALDI-TOF mass spectroscopy for the identity and purity tests.

**Biolayer interferometry (BLI).** Octet RED384 (FortéBio, Fremont, CA) was employed for the BLI studies (58,59). The assay buffer contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/mL bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. Streptavidin-coated biosensors were incubated for 15 minutes with 5 nM biotin-tagged SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide to specifically immobilize an optimal level of peptide. Sensors were then rinsed briefly in assay buffer to remove unbound peptides. Next, sensors were exposed to 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 for the association process. The dissociation phase was initiated by transferring the BLI sensors into WDR5-free buffer. For all WDR5 concentrations, binding curves were recorded by subtracting the baseline and the drift in the sensorgrams acquired with unloaded sensors. These BLI measurements were conducted at 24ºC. For various WDR5 concentrations, \([C]\), the association phases were fitted using the following equation (63):

\[
Y = Y_\infty - (Y_\infty - Y_0) e^{-k_{\text{obs}}t}
\]

(3)

where \(Y_0\) and \(Y_\infty\) are the response signals at the initial time and infinity, respectively. \(t\) is the cumulative time of the association phase, whereas \(k_{\text{obs}}\) denotes the apparent first-order reaction rate constant of the association phase. The dissociation phases were fitted using the following equation:
\[ Y = Y_\infty + (Y_0 - Y_\infty) e^{-k_{\text{off}}t} \]

(4)

where \( Y_0 \) and \( Y_\infty \) denote the responses at the initial time and infinity, respectively. 

\( k_{\text{off}} \) is the dissociation rate constant. The association rate constant, \( k_{\text{on}} \), was determined using the slope of the linear curve (61,64):

\[ k_{\text{obs}} = k_{\text{on}}[C] + k_{\text{off}} \]

(5)

Using several WDR5 concentrations, we also conducted global fittings, which provided the corresponding \( k_{\text{on}} \) and \( k_{\text{off}} \) values. The equilibrium dissociation constants, \( K_D \), were indirectly determined using the \( k_{\text{on}} \) and \( k_{\text{off}} \) values (\( K_D = k_{\text{off}}/k_{\text{on}} \)). In each case, three independent BLI recordings were acquired for further determinations of the kinetics and dynamics of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions.

**Steady-state fluorescence polarization (steady-state FP) measurements.**

Steady-state fluorescence polarization (FP) recordings were performed using a SpectraMax i3x plate reader (Molecular Devices, San Jose, CA) (60,65). All steady-state FP measurements were conducted using a buffer that contained 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.005% Tween 20, and 96-well black untreated polystyrene microplates (Corning Inc., Corning, NY). Other details of steady-state FP measurements were previously reported (44). 100 \( \mu \)L of each 20 nM labeled SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide was added to individual wells at a final concentration of 10 nM. The steady-state FP anisotropy was measured on the plates after a 1 h incubation at room temperature in the dark. WDR5-dependent dose-response data
were averaged and then fitted using a four-parameter logistic function to acquire the binding affinity ($K_D$) for each interaction pairs.

**Molecular graphics.** In this study, molecular graphics was conducted using the PyMOL Molecular Graphics System (Version 2.4.0 Schrödinger, LLC).

### 3.4 Results and Discussion

**The use of CLUMPS for the identification of mutation clustering in WDR5.**

We employed the CLUMPS method (34) to investigate the 3D clustering of 68 WDR5 mutations identified in 68 tumors. The missense mutations were comprehensively compiled using the COSMIC database (29,30,62). Information collected for each mutation included the residue number, the number of tumor samples, in which a certain mutation was noted, and the total number of mutations, $N$, in a tumor sample. $N$ was used as a measure of the accumulation of genetic damage in a tumor sample, in which a certain mutation was sequenced. Four overlapping subsets of mutations were created from the total set of known mutations with the following conditions: $N < 10,000$, $N < 5,000$, $N < 1,000$, and $N < 500$ (Table 1). For each subset, we calculated the WAP score and the corresponding $P$-value (Materials and Methods; Supplementary Fig. S1). We found that a subset of WDR5 mutations with a relatively low $N$ ($N < 500$) is more likely to show mutation clustering, because $P$-value was smaller than 0.03. Notably, the low-$N$ subset also showed a substantial presence of mutations within and around the Win binding site (Supplementary Tables S2-S3). Therefore, a subset of seven
mutations were selected from all known WDR5 cancer mutations within and around the Win binding site (Supplementary Table S4). This approach allowed us to study the effects of these somatic cancer mutations on the kinetics and dynamics of WDR5-SET1_{win} interactions.

**Table 1: Results of mutation clustering of WDR5 for different subsets of N.**

WAP scores were calculated using 4 different subsets of mutations divided on the basis of the genetic damage, \(N\), in their corresponding tumors. The \(P\)-values were calculated by comparison to configurations with random permutations of the distribution of mutations. \(10^6\) configurations were used for each subset. \(N\) is the total number of mutations in a given tumor sample. \(m\) is the total number of mutations that met the condition \(N < N_{\text{max}}\), where \(N_{\text{max}}\) is the upper limit of the number of mutations in a given tumor sample. \(N_{\text{max}}\) values are listed below for four data subsets on the first column. \(m\) was kept constant for all configurations of a subset.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>(m)</th>
<th>WAP Score</th>
<th>(P)-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 10,000</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.258</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 5,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 500</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: Label-free optical BLI sensorgrams of the WDR5 mutant-MLL3jin interactions. (a) Locations of the surface and cavity WDR5 mutations are shown in blue using surface and cross-sectional views of WDR5, respectively. (b) BLI sensorgrams showing the association and dissociation phases. For each WDR5
mutation, sensors with immobilized MLL3\textsubscript{win} ligand were immersed in buffers containing different WDR5 concentrations (listed on sensorgrams) to monitor association kinetics. Sensors were then transferred to buffer alone to monitor dissociation kinetics.

**Biolayer interferometry (BLI) measurements.** In this study, targeted mutations have locations either within the WDR5 cavity (F133L, S175L, S218F, and D92N) or on the external surface and near the cavity (D172A, Y260H, and P216L) (Fig. 2a; Supplementary Table S4). These mutants were chosen based on their proximal locations to residues deemed to play roles in SET1\textsubscript{win} interactions with the native WDR5 protein (Supplementary Fig. S2 Tables S5-S6) (22,23,35,36). BLI measurements were used to determine the association ($k_{on}$) and dissociation ($k_{off}$) rate constants of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{win} interactions (58,59). 14-residue SET1\textsubscript{win} peptide ligands, namely MLL1\textsubscript{win}, MLL2\textsubscript{win}, MLL3\textsubscript{win}, MLL4\textsubscript{win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{win}, were biotinylated at the N terminus and amidated at the C-terminus (Supplementary Table S1). A 9-residue Gly/Ser-rich peptide spacer was inserted between the biotinylated site and the SET1\textsubscript{win} sequence to avoid any steric hindrance of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{win} interactions from the sensor surface. Biotinylated SET1\textsubscript{win} peptides were then tethered to the surface of streptavidin-coated sensors. Binding interactions of WDR5 with SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands attached to the sensor surface were monitored through changes in the optical interference pattern generated by reflected light waves at the sensor surface (Fig. 2b). The association binding curves were acquired by placing the BLI sensors in distinct wells of varying WDR5 concentration. The dissociation binding curves were
collected by placing the BLI sensors in wells containing WDR5-free buffer. It should be mentioned that all association and dissociation phases obeyed single-exponential fits, suggesting bimolecular association processes and unimolecular dissociation mechanisms of these binding phases, respectively.

Interestingly, we noted very weak binding interactions of all SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides with D92N, a cavity WDR5 mutant (Fig. 2a; Supplementary Fig. S3). While these interactions are detectable, they cannot be accurately quantified using BLI likely due to either a very low $k_{\text{on}}$ or a very high $k_{\text{off}}$, or both. A couple of possibilities could explain this interesting outcome. First, Asn-92 might interfere with the two hydrogen bonds between the Arg residue at the P\textsubscript{0} position of the SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligand (Supplementary Table S1) and S91, a neighboring residue of WDR5 (Supplementary Table S5). Second, the positively charged guanidinium group of Arg at P\textsubscript{0} of SET1\textsubscript{Win} might make an N-O salt bridge with the negatively charged carboxyl group of Asp-92 (Supplementary Table S6) (66). In addition, Asp-92 forms a salt bridge with Lys-52 located between $\beta$ strands. Therefore, the absence of Asp-92 might alter the local conformation of the binding pocket.
Figure 3: Normalized dissociation rate constants of the WDR5 mutant-SET1_{Win} interactions using BLI sensorgrams. The $k_{off}$ values for each SET1_{Win} ligand’s interaction with mutants have been divided by the $k_{off}$ of that SET1_{Win} ligand’s interaction with the native WDR5 protein. (a) MLL2_{Win}, (b) MLL3_{Win}, (c) MLL4_{Win}, (d) SETd1A_{Win}, and (e) SETd1B_{Win}. ND stands for “Not Determined.” Using a BLI measurement, the interaction between F133L and MLL4_{Win} was detectable, but not quantifiable.
Figure 4: Normalized $K_D$ of the WDR5 mutant-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ interactions using BLI sensorgrams. The $K_D$ values for each SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand’s interaction with WDR5 mutants have been divided by the $K_D$ of that SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand’s interaction with the native WDR5 protein.

(a) MLL2$_{\text{Win}}$, (b) MLL3$_{\text{Win}}$, (c) MLL4$_{\text{Win}}$, (d) SETd1A$_{\text{Win}}$, and (e) SETd1B$_{\text{Win}}$. ND stands for “Not Determined.” Using a BLI measurement, the interaction between F133L and MLL4$_{\text{Win}}$ was detectable, but not quantifiable.
**Surface mutants.** We first looked at surface mutants and the effects of these mutations on the WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interaction. The normalized values of $k_{\text{on}}$ ([Supplementary Fig. S4]), $k_{\text{off}}$ (Fig. 3), and dissociation constant $K_{\text{D-BLI}}$ (Fig. 4) for these WDR5 mutants are the values of these parameters of the SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 mutant pair interactions divided by those values corresponding to the SET1\textsubscript{Win}-native WDR5 pair interactions. In general, surface mutants D172A, P216L, and Y260H exhibited closely similar values of $k_{\text{on}}$, $k_{\text{off}}$, and $K_{\text{D-BLI}}$ to those obtained for the native WDR5 protein ([Supplementary Tables S7-S9]) (44). Again, we were not able to obtain a quantifiable $k_{\text{on}}$ for the MLL1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 mutant pair interactions due to limited time resolution of BLI. Interestingly, $k_{\text{on}}$ followed the same trend with respect to SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides, as established in our previous study (44), with the lowest values for the neutrally charged MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, the highest values for the acidic SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}, and the intermediate values for the positively charged MLL2\textsubscript{Win} and MLL3\textsubscript{Win}. For example, for P216L-MLL4\textsubscript{Win} interactions, $k_{\text{on}}$ was $(1.9 \pm 0.3) \times 10^4 \text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$. Yet, for the interactions of P216 L with MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} $k_{\text{on}}$ was $(5.6 \pm 0.8) \times 10^4 \text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $(5.3 \pm 0.7) \times 10^4 \text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $(8.6 \pm 0.8) \times 10^4 \text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, $(8.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^4 \text{M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$, respectively. We conclude that $k_{\text{on}} (0) < k_{\text{on}} (+1) < k_{\text{on}} (-1)$ for surface mutants, where the number between parentheses is the overall charge of the SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides ([Supplementary Table S1]). In other words, $k_{\text{on}} (\text{MLL1}_{\text{Win}}, \text{MLL4}_{\text{Win}}) < k_{\text{on}} (\text{MLL2}_{\text{Win}}, \text{MLL3}_{\text{Win}}) < k_{\text{on}} (\text{SETd1A}_{\text{Win}}, \text{SETd1B}_{\text{Win}})$ for surface mutants. This $k_{\text{on}}$ rule is likely determined by an asymmetric charge distribution in SET1\textsubscript{Win} with respect to the highly conserved 6-residue Win motif peptide segment (P_3 through
P2). Specifically, this is because of a positive charge located on the C-terminal flanking side in P4 (MLL2\textsubscript{Win} and MLL3\textsubscript{Win}) and a negative charge located on the N-terminal flanking side in P-7 (SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}). Asp-172 is located within the A pocket of WDR5. SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands show no difference in their interactions with D172A as compared to the native WDR5 protein. We did not see any significant changes in the \( k_{on} \) and \( k_{off} \) for this pocket mutant. In addition, we noted a significantly weakened interaction of P216L with MLL4\textsubscript{Win}. Pro-216 is located within the B pocket.

**Cavity mutants.** In addition to D92N, we examined three WDR5 cancer mutations within the WDR5 cavity, such as F133L, S175L, and S218F (Fig. 2b). It has been previously reported that F133A significantly deteriorates the strength of the interactions of the MLL1 subunit with the WDR5-RbBP5-Ash2L subcomplex \textit{in vitro} (23). Phe-133 is a critical neighboring WDR5 residue of the evolutionarily conserved Arg at P0 of SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, contributing to a potentially strong cation-π interaction. Very weak interactions of F133L with MLL1\textsubscript{Win} and MLL4\textsubscript{Win} were not quantifiable using BLI. Here, F133L showed a decreased normalized \( k_{on} \) with MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} (Supplementary Fig. S4). As expected, F133L exhibited a noteworthy change in the \( k_{off} \) with respect to the native WDR5 protein (Fig. 3), leading to a significant increase in the \( K_{D-BLI} \). For MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}, these increased values spanned a range between one and two orders of magnitude (Fig. 4; Supplementary Table S9). This outcome indirectly confirms their close similarity in sequence and interaction
mechanisms with WDR5 (35,36). Their distinctions in binding affinities with respect to the other SET1_{\text{win}} ligands can be attributed to the interaction of their flanking sides with the WDR5 surface.

However, the most interesting mutational effect is that of S175L, which has a more divergent impact on interactions of the SET1_{\text{win}} peptides with respect to the native WDR5 protein. For example, S175L selectively weakens the interactions with MLL3_{\text{win}}, MLL4_{\text{win}}, and SETd1A_{\text{win}}, while substantially strengthening the interactions with SETd1B_{\text{win}} (Fig. 3, Fig. 4; Supplementary Table S9). Moreover, this change is primarily associated with a change in the $k_{\text{off}}$. Ser-175 is part of a cluster of neighboring residues that co-participate in an array of hydrogen bonds, $\pi-\pi$, cation-$\pi$, and hydrophobic interactions with the conserved Arg in P_0. These include Ser-91, Phe-133, Ser-175, Ser-218, Cys-261, Phe-263, and Ile-305 (35). For example, Arg at P_0 makes a water-mediated hydrogen bond with the Ser-175 backbone carbonyl group (36).

Known SETd1B-WDR5 crystal structures suggest that replacing Ser-175 with Leu creates steric clashes that affect the structure of the B pocket (Supplementary Fig. S5) (35,36). Specifically, it could displace Tyr-191 and make the pocket more hydrophobic, which would explain the increased affinity with SETd1B. It is worth mentioning that SETd1B is unique, because it has a Phe residue at P_4 (Supplementary Table S1) that inserts into the hydrophobic B-pocket, while the other B-pocket binders have a more polar residue (Lys or Tyr) in that position.
Interestingly, the increased affinity is made possible through a 4-fold decrease in the dissociation rate constant with no change in the association rate constant. Given the importance of slow dissociation rates for effective therapeutics (50), we predict molecules designed to take advantage of this interaction will improve dwell times and make more effective inhibitors (21).

In agreement with prior crystallographic studies (35,36), S218F exhibited weakened interactions with MLL2_{Win}, MLL3_{Win}, and MLL4_{Win}. However, its interactions with SETd1A_{Win} and SETd1B_{Win} were closely similar to those with the native WDR5 protein (Figs. 3-4; Supplementary Table S9). This finding is in accordance with a different mechanism of binding interactions of SETd1A_{Win} and SETd1B_{Win} with respect to the other SET1_{Win} ligands, likely due to an intermediate orientation of the C-terminal ends of SETd1A_{Win} and SETd1B_{Win} on the surface of blades 4 and 5.
Figure 5: Normalized $K_D$ of the WDR5 mutant-SET1<sub>Win</sub> interactions using steady-state FP spectroscopy. The $K_D$ values for each SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligand’s interaction with WDR5 mutants have been divided by the $K_D$ of that SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligand’s interaction with the native WDR5 protein. (a) MLL1<sub>Win</sub>, (b) MLL2<sub>Win</sub>, (c) MLL3<sub>Win</sub>, (d) MLL4<sub>Win</sub>, (e) SETd1A<sub>Win</sub>, and (f) SETd1B<sub>Win</sub>. For vertical bars marked by "*", the $K_D$ of those interactions could not be determined. Those values represent the lower-limit of the $K_D$ based on the highest WDR5 mutant concentrations used in this study.
Validations of BLI data and qualitative comparisons between competing techniques. To validate the outcomes of BLI measurements, we next used steady-state FP spectroscopy as an orthogonal technique (Supplementary Fig. S6) to determine binding affinities, $K_{D,FP}$, of the interactions of $SET1_{Win}$ ligands with WDR5 cancer mutants (Fig. 5; Supplementary Table S10). 14-residue $SET1_{Win}$ peptide ligands were fluorescently labeled with Sulforhodamine B at the N terminus and amidated at the C terminus. A 3 nm-long Gly/Ser-rich peptide spacer was inserted between the fluorophore site and the $SET1_{Win}$ sequence. Then, steady-state FP anisotropy, $r$, values were collected at increasing WDR5 concentrations. Dose-response FP measurements enabled determinations of the $K_{D,FP}$. Remarkably, the FP experiments validated all qualitative findings acquired by BLI. These include the confirmation of very weak binding interactions of D92N with all $SET1_{Win}$ peptides (Supplementary Fig. S7). In addition, we always found that the absolute $K_D$ values (i.e., not normalized) obeyed the following inequality: $K_{D,BLI} > K_{D,FP}$. This outcome validates our previous results, indicating that measured interactions are stronger in unrestricted conditions than those corresponding to restrained conditions (Supplementary Tables S11-S12) (44). Because these WDR5 mutants have been examined using BLI and FP, we can compare these approaches quantitatively and qualitatively (67). For example, using BLI we can determine the kinetic fingerprint of these interactions. Yet, this cannot be inferred using steady-state FP spectroscopy. BLI is an immobilization-based technique, whereas FP is a method that probes binding affinity in solution under unrestricted conditions. This is likely the reason why the $K_{D,BLI}$ is always about one order of magnitude greater.
than the $K_{D-FP}$ (Supplementary Tables S9-S10). In addition, FP measurements enabled us to measure some weaker interactions, which had kinetics that were too fast for the BLI time resolution (e.g., for MLL1\textsubscript{Win}). Furthermore, these approaches probe distinctive physical processes. On one hand, BLI is a real-time technique that samples both the association and dissociation phases based on alterations in the interference pattern of white light reflected on the sensor surface. On the other hand, steady-state FP is a time-independent technique that monitors changes in the rotational diffusion of a fluorescently labeled molecule upon its binding to another molecule. We calculated the ratio $K_{D-BLI}/K_{D-FP}$ (Supplementary Fig. S8).

**Figure 6: Quantitative comparison between affinity data resulting from BLI and FP measurements.** (a) A 3D graph of the ratio of the normalized $K_{D-BLI}$ to the normalized $K_{D-FP}$. (b) A 2D heat map of the ratio of the normalized $K_{D-BLI}$ to the normalized $K_{D-FP}$. Normalized $K_D$ values are the $K_D$ measured for a specific WDR5 mutant-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interaction pair divided by the $K_D$ value corresponding to the native WDR5 protein.

The variability of the $K_{D-BLI}/K_{D-FP}$ ratio for different interacting pairs was likely caused by two determinants: (i) the difference in mobility of each SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligand
with respect to WDR5 mutants, and (ii) the distinction in physical processes probed by the two methods. To cancel the effect of these two determinants, we determined another dimensionless parameter, the ratio of normalized $K_{D,\text{BLI}}$/normalized $K_{D,\text{FP}}$, which spanned a much narrower spectrum, between 0.36 and 2.15 (Fig. 6; Supplementary Table S12). This finding illuminates the qualitative agreement of data resulting from BLI and FP measurements, fortifying our conclusions on the effect of introducing these missense mutations on SET1\textsubscript{Win} - WDR5 interactions. Moreover, these BLI and FP data are in accordance with a recent single-molecule study using an engineered protein nanopore (45), which indicated unaffected D172A-MLL4\textsubscript{Win} interactions and weak D92N-MLL4\textsubscript{Win} interactions with respect to those of the native WDR5 protein. Taken together, these findings demonstrate the critical role of a negative charge located within the acidic WDR5 cavity for the strength of WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions.

**Oncogenic potential of Win binding site mutants.** While the impact of the WDR5 cancer mutations on WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{Win} interactions is readily distinguishable, their effect on the overall assembly of the SET1 complexes and their functional features is a bit more nuanced. Given our understanding of SET1 family complex behavior (16,48), we can say that these inspected WDR5 mutations have a divergent impact. The absence of WDR5 (16) and/or the inhibition of SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 interactions (48) downregulates the H3K4 di-methylation function of MLL1 and SETd1A, while this upregulates the H3K4 mono-methylation function of MLL3 (16,68). Therefore, mutations that significantly disrupt SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5
interactions are likely to have similar effects. Consequently, F133L and D92N should disrupt di-methylation by MLL1 and SETd1A. Furthermore, mono-methylation function of MLL3 would be upregulated in the case of F133L, S218F, S175L and D92N. Moreover, our results show that even within the Win binding site, given their effect on SET1\text{win}-WDR5 interactions, cavity mutations are more likely to be driver mutations instead of passenger mutations. This holds especially true for D92N, F133L, and S175L. For example, Ali and coworkers (2014) found that F133L disrupts the mitotic progression in the cell cycle process (69).

The information that concerns the $K_D$ values of mutations within the B pocket is critical for future drug development. Precision medicine depends on understanding the unique biophysical impacts of each missense mutation on the structure and function of putative oncogene proteins. Our data suggests that this knowledge would help researchers and eventually clinicians in deciding which inhibitors to use as potential therapeutic approaches. For example, this work suggests that individuals harboring a breast cancer S175L mutation in WDR5 (Table S4) are more likely to respond to inhibitors targeting the hydrophobic interactions in the B pocket than other inhibitors. Furthermore, the unique impacts of S175L in SETd1b suggests that those cancers are due to perturbations in the SETd1B-catalyzed H3K4 methylation pathway. This type of information would greatly enhance our ability to prioritize cellular and animal-based follow-up studies that can address more specific hypotheses.
3.5 Concluding remarks. In this study, we evaluated key somatic cancer mutations of WDR5. Specifically, we used the CLUMPS approach to identify that cancer mutations accumulate within the Win binding site and extracted a representative subset of WDR5 mutants for determining the real-time kinetics of their interactions using high-throughput techniques. Our work shows that the total number of mutations in a tumor sample can be used as a parameter to filter out mutations more likely to be driver mutations. Furthermore, we noted that the Win site shows a substantial presence of low-\(N\) mutations, while the WBM site shows none. This helped us to exclusively focus on Win binding site mutants for further biophysical measurements. Therefore, we explored the effect of mutations in this binding site by presenting a detailed kinetic fingerprint of the interactions of these mutants with various SET1\(_{\text{win}}\) ligands. We provide experimental evidence for influential roles of the residues within the WDR5 cavity on the strength of these interactions. Steady-state FP spectroscopy measurements also confirmed outcomes resulting from BLI experiments. Finally, the interactions of WDR5 cavity mutants depended on the nature of the SET1\(_{\text{win}}\) peptides. These divergent effects have distinctive impacts on H3K4 methylation, and therefore for the downstream expression of genes. This is a finding that can reconfigure future strategies for the design, development, and optimization of inhibitors that are aimed at targeting the multitasking high-affinity Win binding site under oncogenic conditions. In the future, it would be interesting to examine the impact of the Win binding site cancer mutations on the kinetics and strength of the interactions of WDR with other protein partners and Win motif ligands.
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1. Sequence of 14-residue SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands

Table S1: Amino acid sequences of SET1\textsubscript{Win} motif peptide ligands. Here, MLL\textsubscript{1Win}, MLL\textsubscript{2Win}, MLL\textsubscript{3Win}, MLL\textsubscript{4Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win} and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win} are the following 14-residue SET1 Win motif ligands: MLL\textsubscript{13758-3771}, MLL\textsubscript{25333-5346}, MLL\textsubscript{34703-4716}, MLL\textsubscript{42504-2517}, SETd1A\textsubscript{1488-1501}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{1698-1711} (1-3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET1\textsubscript{Win}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-7}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-6}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-5}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-4}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-3}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-2}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{-1}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{0}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{1}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{2}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{3}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{4}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{5}</th>
<th>P\textsubscript{6}</th>
<th>Charge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL\textsubscript{1Win}</td>
<td>L N P H G S A R A E V H L S*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL\textsubscript{2Win}</td>
<td>I N P T G C A R S E P K I L</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL\textsubscript{3Win}</td>
<td>V N P T G C A R S E P K M S</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL\textsubscript{4Win}</td>
<td>L N P H G A A R A E V Y L S**</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>E H Q T G S A R S E G Y Y P</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>E H V T G C A R S E G F Y T</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S* This is an R3771S-substituted MLL\textsubscript{1Win} peptide ligand.
S** This is an R2517S-substituted MLL\textsubscript{4Win} peptide ligand.

2. Location of somatic cancer mutations from tumor samples with N < 500 and their distributions with a well-defined upper limit of mutations

Table S2: Location of mutations from tumor samples with N < 500. The mutation distribution from tumor samples with low N values is shown below. Out of 8 such somatic cancer mutations, 5 were within or around the Win binding site, while 3 were found elsewhere. Mutated residues are either inside the WDR5 cavity (*), have established interactions with SET1\textsubscript{Win} (•), or sequentially are one residue away from residues with established interactions with SET1\textsubscript{Win} (◦) (1,4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutations within and around the Win binding site</th>
<th>Independent Mutations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F133L  ◦</td>
<td>S54N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S175L  ◦</td>
<td>G254D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A264V  ◦</td>
<td>L282P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N130Y ◦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D150G ◦</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S3: Distributions of somatic cancer mutations in tumors with a well-defined upper limit of mutations. Diverse mutation clusters correspond to different maximum number of mutations, $N_{\text{max}}$. The mutations highlighted in yellow were studied further using BLI and steady-state FP spectroscopy. S218F and D92N mutations, which are located within the WDR5 cavity, were found in tumors with $N > 10,000$. For compiling these mutations, the COSMIC database was used (5-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Mutations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. Results of mutation clustering for different $N_{\text{max}}$-based mutation subsets
Figure S1: Results of mutation clustering for different N\textsubscript{\text{max}}-based mutation subsets. (A) WAP scores were calculated using 4 different subsets of mutations divided on the basis of the genetic damage, N, in their corresponding tumors. The P-values were calculated by comparing to the calculated WAP scores to those corresponding to random permutations of the mutation distribution. 10\textsuperscript{6} configurations were used for N < 10,000 (A), N < 5,000 (B), N < 1,000 (C), and N < 500 (D). (E) The top and side views of WDR5 shown in red, on the left and right sides, respectively. The locations of low-N mutations are marked in cyan. The shaded region in dark grey represents the Win binding site of WDR5. These representations were made using pdb entry code 4ERY (1).
4. List of tumor locations associated with missense WDR5 cancer mutations within and around the Win binding site

Table S4: Tumor locations associated with missense WDR5 cancer mutations. The table shows the location of the tumors in which the mutations were found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mutation</th>
<th>Tumor Location</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D172A***</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td>Studied experimentally by BLI and steady-state FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P216L</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y260H</td>
<td>Large Intestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S218F</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D92N***</td>
<td>Endometrium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F133L*</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S175L*</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A264V</td>
<td>Soft Tissue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N130Y</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D150G</td>
<td>Stomach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S54N</td>
<td>Biliary Tract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G254D</td>
<td>Haematopoietic and Lymphoid Tissue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L282P</td>
<td>Kidney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S91F**</td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>This mutant disrupts known Win binding site interactions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F133L and S175L also meet the clustering with $N < 500$ condition. It was found that F133L disrupts the mitotic progression in the cell cycle process (8).

**S91F was not studied experimentally. It does not meet the clustering with the $N < 500$ condition, yet it can disrupt known Win site interactions (Supplementary Table S5). For example, a related mutant, S91K, is not able to make interactions with a minimal C-terminal SET catalytic domain of MLL1 (9).

***D172A and D92N were experimentally studied using single-molecule electrical recordings and an MLL4<sub>win</sub>-containing engineered nanopore (3). In addition, D172A was recently studied using pull-down assays, showing declined interactions with histone H3 peptides with respect to the native WDR5 protein (10).

5. List of noncovalent bonds at the WDR5-SET1<sub>win</sub> protein interface

Table S5: Mapping of hydrogen bonds at the WDR5-SET1<sub>win</sub> interface. These results were obtained using previously published co-crystallization data of Dharmarajan and co-workers (1). The cut-off distance for identifying these
hydrogen bonds was 4.0 Å. Here, BB and SC denote backbone and side chain, respectively. These interactions were determined using protein interactions calculator (PIC) (11). The structures were not always able to model the whole sequence of the peptides, so the list of these hydrogen bonds is not comprehensive. The first residue in each bond belongs to the SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand, whereas the second one belongs to WDR5. Only peptide sequences of the segments that were able to model these interactions are listed below. Entries with multiple distances represent multiple different hydrogen bonds formed by the same residues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Hydrogen Bonds</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1$_{\text{Win}}$ LNPHGSARAEVHL</td>
<td>G3762-G89</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3761-K46</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S3763-I90</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3764-S91</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A3764-D107</td>
<td>3.0, 3.3</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3765-S91</td>
<td>3.0, 2.8</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3765-F133</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3765-C261</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3761-D107</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2$_{\text{Win}}$ INPTGCARSEPKI</td>
<td>G5337 – G89</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K5344 – K259</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5338-I90</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A5339 – D107</td>
<td>3.1, 2.8</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5340 – S91</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5340 – F133</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5340 – C261</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C5338-S91</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N5334-D107</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3$_{\text{Win}}$ VNPTGCARSEPKMS</td>
<td>G4707-G89</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K4714 – K259</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4708-I90</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A4709 – D107</td>
<td>2.9, 3.5</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4710 – S91</td>
<td>3.1, 2.8</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4710 – F133</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R4710 – C261</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4708-S91</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N4704-D107</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4$_{\text{Win}}$ LNPHGAARAEVY</td>
<td>G2508-G89</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2510-S91</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A2510 – D107</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2511 – S91</td>
<td>3.0, 2.8</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2511 – F133</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2511 – C261</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N2505-D107</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Y2515-D172</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>SC-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A$_{\text{Win}}$</td>
<td>G1492-G89</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table S6: List of all known noncovalent interactions.

These results were obtained in a similar method as that for **Table S5**. For each interaction, the first residue corresponds to the SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligand, while the second residue corresponds to WDR5. The cut-off radii for the ionic and cation-pi interactions were 6 Å. Also, the cut-off radii for the hydrophobic and aromatic-aromatic interactions were 5 and 7 Å, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>Ionic</th>
<th>Cation-Pi</th>
<th>Hydrophobic</th>
<th>Aromatic-Aromatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LNPHGSARAEVHL</td>
<td>R3765-D92 H3761-D107 H3769-D172</td>
<td>R3765-F133 R3765-F263</td>
<td>A3766-A47 A3766-A65 A3764-Y131 A3764-F133 A3764-D149 V3768-Y260 A3766-K321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>INPTGCARSEPKI</td>
<td>R5340-D92 R5340-F133 R5340-F263 K5344-Y191</td>
<td>A5339-Y131 A5339-F133 A5339-F149 P5343-Y260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>VNPTGCARSEPKMS</td>
<td>R4710-D92 R4710-F133 R4710-F263 K4714-Y191</td>
<td>A4709-Y131 A4709-F133 A4709-F149 P4713-Y260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LNPHGAARAEVY</td>
<td>R2511-D92 H2507-Q322</td>
<td>R2511-F133 R2511-F263</td>
<td>A2512-A47 A2509-A65 A2512-A65 A2510-Y131 Y2515-F149 Y2515-Y191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Location of surface WDR5 mutations within the A and B pockets
Figure S2: Cartoon illustrating the location of key residues present in the A and B pockets of the WDR5 protein.

7. Very weak interactions of D92N with SET1_{win} ligands are detected by BLI measurements

Figure S3: BLI sensorgrams show either nondetectable or weakly detectable interactions of D92N with SET1_{win} ligands. 5 nM biotin-tagged peptides were
loaded onto streptavidin (SA) sensors for 15 minutes. A 3-fold serial dilution of D92N ranging from 0.1 µM to 9 µM was used to obtain individual binding curves. These sensorgrams show no binding interactions for MLL1<sub>Win</sub> and MLL4<sub>Win</sub>. For the other SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands, the binding interactions were visible, yet quantitative kinetic determinations were not possible. (A) MLL1<sub>Win</sub>, (B) MLL2<sub>Win</sub>, (C) MLL3<sub>Win</sub>, (D) MLL4<sub>Win</sub>, (E) SETd1A<sub>Win</sub>, and (F) SETd1B<sub>Win</sub>.

8. Kinetic rate constants of association of WDR5 mutants with SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements

Table S7: Kinetic rate constants of association, $k_{on}$, of WDR5 mutants with the SETd1A<sub>Win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements. $k_{on}$ values were provided in $10^4$ M<sup>-1</sup>s<sup>-1</sup>. Results for WDR5 mutants were obtained the same way as those for the native WDR5 protein. For F133L, 3-fold serial dilutions ranging from 0.3 µM to 27 µM were used. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent experimental observations. D92N did not show any measurable binding interactions using BLI, so it was not included in this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>WDR5*</th>
<th>D172A</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>Y260H</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
<td>NO***</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
<td>~ 1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>5.7 ± 0.6</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>6.6 ± 0.9</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>5.4 ± 0.6</td>
<td>6.5 ± 1.3</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.7</td>
<td>6.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.6 ± 2.1</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>~ 1</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>8.8 ± 1.3</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>6.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>7.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>8.9 ± 1.4</td>
<td>8.0 ± 0.8</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>4.3 ± 1.2</td>
<td>8.4 ± 0.6</td>
<td>6.3 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This data are from Imran and co-workers (2021) (2).

**In this case, $k_{on}$ was in the order of $10^4$ M<sup>-1</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> assuming that the association process is in the range of values determined with the other SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands.

***NO stands for “Not Observed.”

9. Kinetic rate constants of dissociation of WDR5 mutants with SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements.

Table S8: Kinetic rate constants of dissociation, $k_{off}$, of WDR5 mutants with the SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements. $k_{off}$ values were provided in $10^{-3}$ s<sup>-1</sup>. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent experimental observations. D92N did not show any measurable binding interactions using BLI, so it was not included in this table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>WDR5*</th>
<th>D172A</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>Y260H</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>&gt; 1000**</td>
<td>&gt; 1000**</td>
<td>&gt; 1000**</td>
<td>NO***</td>
<td>&gt; 1000**</td>
<td>&gt; 1000**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>7.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>11 ± 2</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>140 ± 20</td>
<td>6.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>25 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>9.3 ± 1.9</td>
<td>11 ± 3</td>
<td>7.7 ± 0.6</td>
<td>100 ± 10</td>
<td>16 ± 2</td>
<td>21 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>39 ± 2</td>
<td>51 ± 10</td>
<td>220 ± 50</td>
<td>47 ± 28</td>
<td>&gt; 1000*</td>
<td>130 ± 4</td>
<td>71 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>51 ± 6</td>
<td>110 ± 30</td>
<td>33 ± 4</td>
<td>98 ± 29</td>
<td>690 ± 40</td>
<td>89 ± 30</td>
<td>46 ± 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>17 ± 1</td>
<td>23 ± 3</td>
<td>30 ± 5</td>
<td>23 ± 3</td>
<td>240 ± 20</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>23 ± 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This data are from Imran and co-workers (2021) (2).
**This upper-limit value for the detection of $k_{\text{off}}$ is set according to instrument specifications.
***NO stands for “Not Observed.”
10. Normalized kinetic rate constants of association of WDR5 mutants with \( \text{SET1}_{\text{Win}} \) ligands using BLI measurements

Figure S4: Normalized association rate constants of the WDR5-\( \text{SET1}_{\text{Win}} \) interactions using BLI sensorgrams. The \( k_{\text{on}} \) values for each \( \text{SET1}_{\text{Win}} \) ligand’s interaction with WDR5 mutants have been divided by the \( k_{\text{on}} \) of that \( \text{SET1}_{\text{Win}} \) ligand’s interaction with the native WDR5 protein. ND stands for “Not
Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable, but not quantifiable, using a BLI measurement.

11. Equilibrium dissociation constants of WDR5 mutants with SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements.

Table S9: Equilibrium dissociation constants, $K_{D-BLI}$, of the WDR5 mutants with the SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands determined from BLI measurements. $K_{D-BLI}$ values are provided in nM. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent experimental determinations. D92N did not show any measurable binding interactions using the BLI, so it was not included in this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>WDR5&lt;sup&gt;#&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>D172A</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>Y260H</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>≥100,000*</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>NO**</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>170 ± 20</td>
<td>240 ± 10</td>
<td>200 ± 50</td>
<td>200 ± 20</td>
<td>8,300 ± 1,000</td>
<td>130 ± 10</td>
<td>640 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>100 ± 5</td>
<td>140 ± 10</td>
<td>200 ± 30</td>
<td>110 ± 20</td>
<td>3,700 ± 1,600</td>
<td>330 ± 20</td>
<td>530 ± 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>1,700 ± 200</td>
<td>1,400 ± 200</td>
<td>9,900 ± 1,400</td>
<td>3,400 ± 1,200</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>4,200 ± 100</td>
<td>3,400 ± 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>620 ± 20</td>
<td>900 ± 240</td>
<td>380 ± 20</td>
<td>1,100 ± 200</td>
<td>30,000 ± 5,000</td>
<td>1,400 ± 300</td>
<td>830 ± 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>250 ± 30</td>
<td>260 ± 10</td>
<td>370 ± 40</td>
<td>230 ± 10</td>
<td>6,000 ± 1,900</td>
<td>56 ± 3</td>
<td>360 ± 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#These data are from the reference (2).
*This upper-limit value for the detection of $K_{D-BLI}$ results from dividing the upper-limit value of the detection of $k_{off}$ by the value of the $k_{on}$ approximation.
**NO stands for “Not Observed.”
12. Structural information on the effect of the S175L mutation.

Figure S5: The effect of the S175L mutation on the SETd1A<sub>Win</sub>-S175L interaction. The figure shows the effect of the S175L mutation on neighboring residues. It shows superimposed structures from PDB 4es0, 4ewr and 4erz. SETd1A<sub>Win</sub> is marked in cyan, while MLL4<sub>Win</sub> is marked in light blue. The red circles show the steric clashes created by replacing Ser-175 with Leu-175 (green). Superimposed Tyr-191 side chains from the three PDB files are shown. SETd1A<sub>Win</sub> was used, instead of SETd1B<sub>Win</sub>, to show the B-pocket interactions, because the P<sub>6</sub> residue in the SETd1B<sub>Win</sub> structure is disordered (1).
13. Steady-state FP spectroscopy curves for the interactions of WDR5 mutants with SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands

![Steady-state FP spectroscopy curves for WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligand interactions](image)

**Figure S6:** Steady-state FP anisotropy curves for WDR5-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligand interactions. The N terminus of the SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands was tagged with Sulforhodamine B, whereas the C terminus was amidated. The final concentration of the labeled SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands in each well was 10 nM. Each SET1\textsubscript{win} ligand – WDR5 run involved a 2-fold serial dilution of WDR5 over 24 wells. Three independent experiments were conducted to obtain the dose response, which was fitted using a four-parameter logistic model to get the $K_d$.
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14. Very weak interactions of D92N with SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands are detected by steady-state FP spectroscopy measurements

Figure S7: Fraction bound of SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands to D92N using steady-state FP spectroscopy experiments. These experiments showed either nondetectable or very weak interactions of D92N with all SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. The final SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligand concentration was 10 nM. The WDR5 concentration (horizontal axis) spanned from low µM to low pM. No FP signal was detectable for MLL1\textsubscript{Win}, MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}. Very weak interactions with D92N were detected in the case of MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}. For these SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, $K_d$ was greater than 10 µM.

15. Equilibrium dissociation constants of WDR5 mutants with SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands using FP measurements

Table S10: Equilibrium dissociation constants, $K_{D,FP}$, of WDR5 mutants with SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands determined from steady-state FP measurements. Three independent experiments were conducted to obtain the dose response, which was fitted using a four-parameter logistic model. $K_{D,FP}$ values are provided in nM. For D92N, the $K_D$ values were greater than 17,000 nM. Numbers represent mean ± s.e.m. from three individual experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand</th>
<th>WDR5\textsuperscript{D}</th>
<th>D172A</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>Y260H</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL1\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>9,000 ± 5,500</td>
<td>5,600 ± 800</td>
<td>&gt; 14,650*</td>
<td>9,700 ± 1,200</td>
<td>&gt; 53,000*</td>
<td>4,800 ± 2,800</td>
<td>8,100 ± 3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>23 ± 5</td>
<td>25 ± 4</td>
<td>18 ± 3</td>
<td>34 ± 4</td>
<td>2,100 ± 300</td>
<td>11 ± 1</td>
<td>94 ± 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>15 ± 4</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>22 ± 2</td>
<td>1,000 ± 100</td>
<td>23 ± 1</td>
<td>80 ± 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>130 ± 20</td>
<td>78 ± 3</td>
<td>690 ± 60</td>
<td>130 ± 10</td>
<td>8,800 ± 3,900</td>
<td>280 ± 30</td>
<td>420 ± 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>72 ± 5</td>
<td>61 ± 2</td>
<td>39 ± 2</td>
<td>140 ± 20</td>
<td>5,700 ± 300</td>
<td>92 ± 7</td>
<td>100 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>18 ± 2</td>
<td>18 ± 1</td>
<td>28 ± 2</td>
<td>23 ± 2</td>
<td>820 ± 30</td>
<td>11 ± 1</td>
<td>37 ± 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*These data are from the reference (2).

\*These low-value limits are based on the highest concentrations of WDR5 mutants employed in this study.
16. Quantitative comparisons of affinity data acquired with BLI and FP.

Figure S8: Quantitative comparison between affinity data resulting from BLI and FP measurements. (A) A 3D graph of the ratio of the $K_{D,BLI}$ to the $K_{D,FP}$. (B) A 2D heat map of the ratio of the $K_{D,BLI}$ to the $K_{D,FP}$.

Table S11: Quantitative comparisons between affinity data resulting from BLI and FP measurements in terms of the ratio of the $K_{D,BLI}$ to the $K_{D,FP}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>MLL2_win</th>
<th>MLL3_win</th>
<th>MLL4_win</th>
<th>SETd1A_win</th>
<th>SETd1B_win</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDR5</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D172A</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P216L</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.73</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y260H</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F133L</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S175L</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S218F</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>8.05</td>
<td>9.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND* stands for not determined.

Table S12: Quantitative comparisons between affinity data resulting from BLI and FP measurements in terms of the ratio of the normalized $K_{D,BLI}$ to the normalized $K_{D,FP}$. A normalized $K_d$ of the binding interactions of a SET1_win ligand with a WDR5 mutant is the $K_d$ measured for this interaction pair divided by the $K_d$ value measured with the same SET1_win ligand interacting with the native WDR5 protein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>MLL2win</th>
<th>MLL3win</th>
<th>MLL4win</th>
<th>SETd1Awin</th>
<th>SETd1Bwin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D172A</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P216L</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y260H</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligand</td>
<td>Sequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL1&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;LNPHGSARAEVHLS-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL2&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;NINPTGCARSEPKL-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;VNPTGCARSEPKM-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;LNPHGAARAEVHLS-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;EHQMTGSARGEYYP-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B&lt;sub&gt;Win&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Sulforhodamine B-(GGS)&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;EHVTGCARSEGFY-T-NH&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND* stands for not determined.

17. **Supporting methods.**

**Table S13: List of fluorescently labeled SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands for steady-state FP studies.** All ligands were fluorescently labeled at the N terminus and amidated at the C terminus. A 9-residue Gly-Ser-based peptide spacer was inserted between Sulforhodamine B and SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligand.

18. **Supporting references.**
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4.1 Abstract

Surface-tethered ligand-receptor complexes are key components in biological signaling and adhesion. They also find increasing utility in single-molecule assays and biotechnological applications. Here, we study the real-time binding kinetics between various surface-immobilized peptide ligands and their unrestrained receptors. A long peptide tether increases the association of ligand-receptor complexes, experimentally proving the fly-casting mechanism where the disorder accelerates protein recognition. On the other hand, a short peptide tether enhances the complex dissociation. Notably, the rate constants measured for the same receptor, but under different spatial constraints, are strongly correlated with one another. Furthermore, this correlation can be used to predict how surface tethering on a ligand-receptor complex alters its binding kinetics. Our results have immediate implications in the broad areas of biomolecular recognition, intrinsically disordered proteins, and biosensor technology.
4.2 Introduction

Tethered ligand-receptor complexes are common in protein recognition\textsuperscript{1,2} and cellular adhesion.\textsuperscript{3} Surface-bound ligand-protein complexes are also the basis for biotechnological applications, such as biosensors\textsuperscript{4-9} and cell-targeted therapeutic proteins,\textsuperscript{10,11} as well as for single-molecule techniques that probe the dynamics and thermodynamics of protein binding.\textsuperscript{12-16} Yet, how the presence of spatial constraints imposed by the surface and/or the tether affects the thermodynamics and, especially, kinetics of binding is largely an open experimental question. Most of the current insight in this topic comes from theoretical\textsuperscript{17-21} and computational\textsuperscript{10,22-24} studies. However, experimental examinations of tethered ligand-protein interactions are mostly limited to measuring macroscopic intermolecular forces,\textsuperscript{25-28} equilibrium dissociation constants,\textsuperscript{29} and effective protein concentrations.\textsuperscript{29,30}
Figure 1: WDR5 protein interacting with the SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands under different conditions. WDR5 is shown in orange, while SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands are shown in magenta. Bound interacting partners are shown in blue. Lightly colored receptors and ligands indicate interacting partners in the background. (a) Biotinylated ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands were chemically attached onto a streptavidin-coated biolayer interferometry (BLI) sensor surface. Either WDR5 proteins or one of its mutants were freely movable in solution. (b) The same system as in (a), but with LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. (c) Either WDR5 proteins or one of its mutants were immobilized onto a surface plasmon resonance (SPR) chip surface, whereas the NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands were freely movable in solution.
In contrast to the earlier experimental work, this study focuses on the question of how the kinetics of binding and unbinding is altered by the tethering of one of the binding partners to a surface. To this end, we measure the real-time kinetics of tethered ligand-receptor complexes using surface immobilization-based sensing approaches. In our case, the receptor is WD40 repeat protein 5 (WDR5), a chromatin-associated hub that is primarily known for its regulatory role in histone methylation. The 334-residue WDR5 features a seven-bladed β propeller circular structure and a central cavity. The WDR5 cavity hosts the binding site for the WDR5-interaction (Win) motif of human mixed lineage leukemia (MLL/SET1) methyltransferases, also named the Win binding site. We examined details of the interactions of five 14-residue Win motif peptide ligands of SET1 proteins (SET1 \textsubscript{win} ligands; \textbf{Supplementary Table 1} and \textbf{Supplemental Methods}) with WDR5 via its Win binding site. SET1 \textsubscript{win} ligands were chemically attached to a streptavidin-coated surface. Either a 3-residue short peptide tether (ST-SET1 \textsubscript{win} ligands; \textbf{Fig. 1a}) or a 9-residue long peptide tether (LT-SET1 \textsubscript{win} ligands; \textbf{Fig. 1b}) was inserted between the biotinylated attachment site of the SET1 \textsubscript{win} ligand to the surface and the SET1 \textsubscript{win} sequence. In this way, the binding kinetics of the WDR5-SET1 \textsubscript{win} complex were probed using biolayer interferometry (BLI). The association and dissociation phases of the tethered ligand-receptor complex were discriminated optically using changes in the interference pattern of reflected light waves at the sensor surface. Hence, these interactions were monitored using WDR5-containing and WDR5-free assay buffers, respectively. Tethered ligand-receptor interactions were also evaluated
using Win binding site-directed WDR5 mutants (Supplementary Table 2 and Supplemental Methods). To further examine the binding kinetics in the absence of restraining tethers, WDR5 proteins were immobilized on the surface plasmon resonance (SPR) sensors \(^{38}\) (no tether, NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands; Fig. 1c).

### 4.3 Results and Discussion

We obtained the real-time kinetics of five SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands (MLL2\textsubscript{Win}, MLL3\textsubscript{Win}, MLL4\textsubscript{Win}, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}, and SETd1B\textsubscript{Win}) with four WDR5 proteins (wild-type and 3 mutants of the Win binding site, P216L, F133L, and S218F) using ST and LT constraints (Supplementary Figs. 1-2 Tables 3-5). Later, we validated the outcomes of this study using S175L, a fourth WDR5 mutant of unknown affinity. Interestingly, the association rate constants, \(k_a\), acquired with LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands \((k_a\textsubscript{LT})\) were on average higher than those corresponding values recorded with ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands \((k_a\textsubscript{ST})\) (Fig. 2a; Supplementary Table 6). To explain this observation, we considered the general framework of diffusion-controlled reactions,\(^{39-41}\) which gives the following association rate constant:

\[
\begin{align*}
  k_a &= (k_D^{-1} + k_R^{-1})^{-1} \\
  (1)
\end{align*}
\]

where \(k_R\) is the reaction-controlled rate constant and

\[
  k_D = 4\pi D_{rel} a
\]

(2)
is the diffusion-controlled rate constant that depends on the relative diffusion coefficient of the two reacting species, $D_{\text{rel}}$, and on a “geometric” parameter, $a$. In the limit $k_R \gg k_D$, the association is purely diffusion controlled and $k_a \approx k_D$.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{Eq. 2} may be loosely interpreted as the rate constant of the association process happening instantaneously upon the reactants diffusing into a favorable relative configuration. This configuration is characterized by a linear length scale, $a$.

Notably, simple dimensionality arguments require that the diffusion-controlled rate constant, $k_D$, must be of the form of \textbf{Eq. 2}. Hence, \textbf{Eq. 2} can be viewed as the definition of the effective “target” size of the diffusion-controlled reaction.
Figure 2: Scatter plots of kinetic and equilibrium constants for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} and LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. (a) Association rate constants $k_{a-ST}$ of ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes plotted against association rate constants $k_{a-LT}$ of LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes. Points above the blue line correspond to complexes with faster association rate constants for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, while points below correspond to interactions with slower association rate constants for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. (b) Dissociation rate constants $k_{d-ST}$ of ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes plotted against
dissociation rate constants $k_{d \text{LT}}$ of LT-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$-WDR5 complexes. Points above the blue line correspond to complexes with faster dissociation rate constants for ST-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligands. (c) Equilibrium dissociation constants $K_{D \text{ST}}$ of ST-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$-WDR5 complexes plotted against equilibrium dissociation constants $K_{D \text{LT}}$ of LT-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$-WDR5 complexes. Points above the blue line correspond to less stable complexes with ST-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligands. m indicate the slopes of linear fits in panels (b) and (c). Data represent mean ± s.d. that resulted from three independent BLI sensorgrams.

There are two notable examples of this equation. First, Smoluchowski (1917) has obtained a formula for the diffusion-controlled rate constant, where the association process between two spherically symmetrical reactants takes place whenever their distance reaches the “capture radius” value $a$. Second, Berg and Purcell (1977) derived a formula for the rate constant of the process where a freely diffusing particle hits a patch on a planar wall, with $a$ being the linear size of the patch. The Berg and Purcell's scenario can be viewed as a prototype for the system studied here, as one of the reactants is surface immobilized. It should be noted that the length parameter, $a$, generally depends on the interaction between the reactants. For example, the electrostatic attraction between them leads to a larger “capture radius”.

Equipped with these ideas, we consider the difference between the cases of ST- and LT-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligands. The much smaller, surface-attached SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand diffuses rapidly, with a diffusion coefficient $D_{\text{SET1Win}} \gg D_{\text{WDR5}}$. Diffusion of the SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand occurs around its attachment point within a certain volume, which depends on the tether length. This suggests a simple model of association, as follows. Like in Berg and Purcell’s model, the surface-attached SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligand
appears as target with a characteristic size, $a$, to a freely diffusing WDR5. Because of the complicated geometry of the system, it is challenging to derive a simple expression for $a$. LT-SET1_{Win} can deviate further from the attachment point than ST-SET1_{Win}. Therefore, LT-SET1_{Win} is a bigger “target” for the WDR5 than ST-SET1_{Win} (i.e., $a_{LT} > a_{ST}$), so the association rate constant for LT-SET1_{Win}, $k_{a-LT}$, is higher than that for ST-SET1_{Win}, $k_{a-ST}$, as observed in Fig. 2a. Note, however, that this picture is expected to break down in the limit of long tethers where further increase of the tether length results in a larger search volume that has to be explored by the binding partners, reducing the overall association rate. Indeed, as recently discussed by Misiura and Kolomeisky, the dependence of the association rate constant on the tether length is non-monotonic, with the maximum association speedup occurring at an intermediate tether length.

The association speedup induced by a longer tether found here is an experimental validation of the “fly-casting association mechanism,” which was proposed earlier by Wolynes and coworkers on theoretical grounds and computational analysis and discussed later by others. This mechanism explains how intrinsically disordered proteins with random-coil conformations can bind faster to their targets. Because of the geometric nature of the parameter $a$, it is expectable that the ratio of $a$ values for LT-SET1_{Win} and ST-SET1_{Win}, $a_{LT}/a_{ST}$, is nearly the same for all SET1_{Win} ligands. Indeed, we observe a linear correlation between the association rate constants for LT-SET1_{Win} and ST-SET1_{Win}, $k_{a-LT}$ and $k_{a-ST}$, respectively (Fig. 2a). But recalling that the
parameter $\alpha$ also depends on the energetics of the interactions, deviations from a perfectly linear correlation are not surprising.

In contrast to the association rate constants, the dissociation rate constants for ST-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligands, $k_{d,\text{ST}}$, were consistently higher than those for LT-SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ ligands, $k_{d,\text{LT}}$ (Fig. 2b; Supplementary Tables 7-8). Furthermore, $k_{d,\text{ST}}$ and $k_{d,\text{LT}}$ values closely followed a proportionality relationship. To explain these observations, we start with the Arrhenius law for the unimolecular dissociation process: \(^{42}\)

$$k_d = \nu \exp\left(\frac{-\Delta G_a}{k_B T}\right),$$

(3)

where $\nu$ is a prefactor, and $\Delta G_a$ is the activation free energy, which is determined by the strength of cohesive interactions between SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ and WDR5. It is known that a microscopic object (e.g., a Brownian particle) attached to a surface via a flexible polymer tether experiences a repulsive net force that pushes it away from the surface even when the surface is perfectly neutral. This force is "entropic" in its nature, originating from the fact that the object has more space available when it is further away from the surface. The properties of this force have been theoretically studied by Segall and coworkers,\(^{56}\) who showed that it is roughly inversely proportional to the distance from the surface.

Based on the above argument, as the force pushes WDR5 away from the surface, and thus from SET1$_{\text{Win}}$, it enhances dissociation by lowering the
dissociation barrier. The simplest approximate description of this mechanochemical effect for the dissociation rate constant, \( k_d \), is the Eyring-Zhurkov-Bell formula:\(^{57}\)

\[
k_d = \nu \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta G_a - f\Delta x}{k_B T} \right) = k_d^0 \exp \left( \frac{f\Delta x}{k_B T} \right),
\]

(4)

where \( k_d^0 \) is \( k_d \) at \( f = 0 \). Here, \( f \) is the magnitude of the force, and \( \Delta x \) is an activation length. Hence, \( k_d^0 \) is the dissociation rate constant in the absence of the surface. Clearly, the force \( f \) for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win}, \( f_{ST} \), is higher than that for LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}, \( f_{LT} \). Therefore, the dissociation rate constant for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win}, \( k_{d-ST} \), is greater than that for LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}, \( k_{d-LT} \), as observed in Fig. 2b. Assuming that the activation length \( \Delta x \), being again a geometric parameter, is approximately the same for different constructs, the ratio of the two dissociation rate constants should be close to a constant. This should happen even though the rate constants themselves may vary considerably owing to the variation of the activation free energy, \( \Delta G_a \), and to exponential sensitivity of the dissociation rate constant to the energetics of interaction. Indeed, this is what we observe in Fig. 2b. Despite almost two orders of magnitude variation between the individual \( k_d \) constants for each construct, \( k_{d-ST} \) and \( k_{d-LT} \) remain proportional to each other. Note that the \( k_a \) constants for the same constructs vary within a much narrower range, within a maximum factor of \(~4\), supporting the above proposal that the association process is near the diffusion-controlled limit and thus less sensitive to energetics.
These results suggest that the length of the tether plays a significant role in modulating the interactions of the SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complex. An increased physical constraint as a result of a decreased tether length not only reduces the rate constant of complex formation, as established earlier, but also substantially decreases the stability of the complex. Consequently, the overall impact of reducing the tether length is an increase in $K_D$ (Fig. 2c; Supplementary Tables 9-10). Changes observed for $k_a$ should normally be independent from those noted for $k_d$, because the mechanisms of changing the corresponding activation free energies are different. Indeed, we observed no correlation between the $k_a$ and $k_d$ values (Supplementary Figs. 3-4).
Figure 3: Scatter plots of kinetic and equilibrium constants for NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} and LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. (a) Association rate constants $k_{a-NT}$ of NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes plotted against association rate constants $k_{a-LT}$ of LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes. Points above the blue line correspond to interactions with faster association rate constants for NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands. (b) Dissociation rate constants $k_{d-NT}$ of NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes plotted against dissociation rate constants $k_{d-LT}$ of LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 complexes. Points...
above the blue line correspond to interactions with faster dissociation rate constants for NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands.
(c) Equilibrium dissociation constants $K_{D, NT}$ values of NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub>-WDR5 complexes plotted against equilibrium dissociation constants $K_{D, LT}$ of LT-SET1<sub>Win</sub>-WDR5 complexes. Points below the blue line correspond to more stable complexes with LT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands. $m$ indicate the slopes of linear fits in all panels. Data represent mean ± s.d. that resulted from three independent BLI sensorgrams.

We then measured the kinetic rate constants for 20 ligand-receptor complexes using unrestricted conditions (no tether, NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands) (Supplementary Fig. 5 Tables 11-13). In this case, BLI was not used, because it does not have a satisfactory sensitivity to reliably detect a short-peptide binding to the surface. The SPR, with its greater sensitivity, was a more effective choice for this case. Accumulation of ligand-receptor complexes onto the surface of the SPR sensor was monitored by changes in the refractive index. Therefore, WDR5 was immobilized onto the surface of the SPR chips (Fig. 1c), and the association and dissociation phases were probed in real time. As established by our previous work, the $k_a$ values for NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands were substantially greater than those for LT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands (Fig. 3a; Supplementary Table 14). This significant difference is due to the increased translational and rotational diffusion coefficients of NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands relative to WDR5 and its derivatives. Moreover, our previous work also showed, by comparison with values obtained from fluorescence polarization (FP) spectroscopy, that immobilizing WDR5 onto the sensor surface does not impact its functional integrity. Let's assume that $D_{NT-SET1Win}$ and $D_{WDR5}$ are the translational diffusion coefficients of NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> and WDR5, respectively. For applying Eq. 2 to this problem, one now has to consider that $D_{NT-SET1Win} \gg D_{WDR5}$, since either WDR5 or one of its
derivatives was immobilized on the sensor surface. Therefore, the unrestrained NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} was responsible for the diffusion-mediated mutual approach of the reacting species, so $D_{\text{rel}} \approx D_{\text{NT-SET1Win}}$. Again, \textbf{Eq. 2} predicts proportionality between $k_{a-\text{NT}}$ and $k_{a-LT}$, as noted in \textbf{Fig. 3a}, with the ratio of the two roughly equal to the ratio of SET1\textsubscript{Win}’s and WDR5’s diffusion coefficients.

Remarkably, the $k_d$ values using NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} and LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands were closely similar (\textbf{Fig. 3b}; \textbf{Supplementary Table 15}). Our interpretation of this finding is in terms of \textbf{Eq. 4}. In the case of LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, but not for ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, the repulsive force $f$ is negligible as the complex is far enough from the surface. Hence, the dissociation rate constant is near that value corresponding to the zero-force limit, $k_d^0$, which is the dissociation rate constant for NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands, $k_{d-\text{NT}}$. In other words, at long enough tether lengths, the experimental system approaches that of NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands in terms of the dissociation rate constant, $k_d$. Therefore, the equilibrium dissociation constant, $K_D$, of the ligand-receptor complex becomes larger as we go from NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands to LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands (\textbf{Fig. 3c}; \textbf{Supplementary Tables 16-17}).

Moreover, the differential free energy of the ligand-receptor complex formation, $\Delta \Delta G$, for NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands with respect to LT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands is in the range -0.3 through -1.5 kcal/mol. The primary contribution to this change results from the considerable increase in the $k_a$ in the absence of the tether. This shows how the attachment of a binding partner to a surface influences the overall dynamic equilibrium of the interaction. In our case, the effect is substantial given the large
difference in size between the two binding partners. Even though for NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands the WDR5 is restricted to the surface, the comparison between similar restriction and steady-state fluorescence polarization (FP) data of freely interacting SET1\textsubscript{Win} and WDR5 in solution shows that this condition can be thought as that of an unrestricted interaction.\textsuperscript{58}
Figure 4: 3D plots and contour maps of normalized $K_D$ constants. (a) Qualitative free energy landscapes of SET1_Win-WDR5 interactions when NT-SET1_Win (NT), ST-SET1_Win (ST), and LT-SET1_Win (LT) peptide ligands were used. Vertical lines 1, 2, and 3, which are marked in cyan, indicate the differential free energy barriers due to unrestrained diffusion of the ligand, fly-casting mechanism, and repulsion entropic forces of the receptor from the sensor surface, respectively. (b) Bar graph and (c) contour map of $K_{D-ST}$ values for the interaction
of ST-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $K_{D,NT}$ values measured with the corresponding NT-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands. (d) Bar graph and (e) contour map of $K_{D,LT}$ values for the interaction of LT-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $K_{D,NT}$ values measured with the corresponding NT-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands. $K_{D,ST}$ and $K_{D,LT}$ for MLL4\textsubscript{win}-F133L interactions could not be quantitatively determined using BLI measurements. These data points are colored in black.

In Fig. 4a, we illustrate a qualitative comparison of the free energy landscapes that correspond to NT-SET1\textsubscript{win}, ST-SET1\textsubscript{win}, and LT-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands. For short and long tethers, the presence of the flexible tether reduces the association rate constant of the SET1\textsubscript{win}-WDR5 complex with respect to that in the absence of the tether (Supplementary Fig. 6). Further increase in the $k_{d,ST}$ with respect to $k_{d,LT}$ (Supplementary Fig. 7) due to repulsion forces of WDR5 proteins from the sensor surface explains the relative increase in the normalized values ($K_{D,ST}/K_{D,NT}$) > ($K_{D,LT}/K_{D,NT}$) (Fig. 4b-e). Because there are linear correlations between measured affinities of various SET1\textsubscript{win}-WDR5 pairs with specified constraints, we can advantageously utilize these findings to predict the $k_{d}$ and $K_{D}$ for a given tethered ligand-receptor complex. To demonstrate this, we examined the interactions of SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands with S175L, a WDR5 derivative, whose single-site mutation is located within the Win binding site. Using the kinetic and equilibrium parameters measured for NT-SET1\textsubscript{win}-S175L interactions via SPR (Supplementary Tables 12-13), we established the proportionality relationships with their corresponding parameters for ST-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands (Supplementary Fig. 8). Remarkably, our experimental determinations of $k_{d,ST}$ for S175L against 5 ST-SET1\textsubscript{win} ligands are closely similar to corresponding anticipated values.
(Table 1). Furthermore, using the same method we demonstrate the predictive power of this approach for the $K_{D-ST}$ values (Table 2). Therefore, the binding affinity of tethered ligand-receptor interactions can be precisely modulated by changing the tether length (Supplementary Fig. 9).

**Table 1: Table showing the predicted and experimental values of the $k_{d-ST}$ for S175L interacting with ST-SET1 Win.** $k_{d-ST}$ are the dissociation rate constants corresponding to ST-SET1 Win ligands. Predicted values of $k_{d-ST}$ were obtained using the proportionality relationship between $k_{d-ST}$ and $k_{d-NT}$ (Supplementary Fig. 8) and the experimentally determined values of $k_{d-NT}$ (Supplementary Table 12). Triplicate $k_{d-NT}$ values were used to calculate corresponding $k_{d-ST}$ values by linear interpolation. Values indicate mean ± s.d., which were calculated using these triplicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SET1 Win</th>
<th>Predicted values $\times 10^3$ (s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Experimental values $\times 10^3$ (s$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_{d-ST}$</td>
<td>MLL2 Win</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLL3 Win</td>
<td>36 ± 1</td>
<td>28 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLL4 Win</td>
<td>190 ± 10</td>
<td>180 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SETd1A Win</td>
<td>300 ± 10</td>
<td>160 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SETd1B Win</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>5.4 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Table showing the predicted and experimental values of the $K_{D-ST}$ for S175L interacting with ST-SET1 Win.** $K_{D-ST}$ are the equilibrium dissociation constants corresponding to ST-SET1 Win ligands. Predicted values of $K_{D-ST}$ were obtained using the proportionality relationship between $K_{D-ST}$ and $K_{D-NT}$ (Supplementary Fig. 8) and the experimentally determined values of $K_{D-NT}$ (Supplementary Table 13). Triplicate $K_{D-NT}$ values were used to calculate corresponding $K_{D-ST}$ values by linear interpolation. Values indicate mean ± s.d., which were calculated using these triplicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>SET1 Win</th>
<th>Predicted values $\times 10^9$ (M)</th>
<th>Experimental values $\times 10^9$ (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$K_{D-ST}$</td>
<td>MLL2 Win</td>
<td>150 ± 10</td>
<td>360 ± 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLL3 Win</td>
<td>270 ± 10</td>
<td>810 ± 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MLL4 Win</td>
<td>2,800 ± 100</td>
<td>8,500 ± 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SETd1A Win</td>
<td>5,500 ± 200</td>
<td>2,900 ± 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SETd1B Win</td>
<td>110 ± 10</td>
<td>110 ± 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Conclusion

In summary, we provide compelling experimental evidence for the fly-casting mechanism of association between surface-attached peptide ligands and their receptors. The observed speedup in the association rate $k_a$ when using a longer tether is rather modest for the tether lengths employed here, which agrees with previous computational work.\textsuperscript{47} We also found that the dissociation rate constant was greater in the case of a short tether length as a result of entropic repulsion forces acting on the receptor pulling it away from the surface. Accordingly, this resulted in a weakened interaction of the tethered ligand-protein complex. As a longer tether accelerates the association but decelerates the dissociation, the binding affinity of the ligand-receptor complex is greater at increased tether lengths. Our experimental approach can be used to predict dissociation rate constants and binding affinities of ligand-protein interactions for specified physicochemical properties of the tether. Therefore, our method can be employed in biosensor technology to modulate the interaction strength of a ligand-protein complex on a sensing surface by modifying the tether length. Finally, this result has been successfully validated using a test WDR5 mutant of unknown dissociation constant for five ST-SET1\textsubscript{Win} ligands.
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1. Materials and Methods

1.1. Peptide synthesis, purification, and analysis. For BLI measurements, 14-residue SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands were synthesized and purified to ≥ 95% purity by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). These peptide ligands were biotinylated at their N terminus and amidated at their C terminus. Their sequence is provided in Table S1, which is displayed below.

Table S1: List of 14-residue SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands used in biolayer interferometry (BLI) measurements. An either a 3-residue short tether (ST) or a 9-residue long tether (LT) was inserted between the biotinylated attachment site and SET1\textsubscript{Win} sequence. The tether sequence is marked in blue. The SET1\textsubscript{Win} sequence is marked in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>SET1\textsubscript{Win}</th>
<th>Tether length</th>
<th>Ligand sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ST-\textsubscript{MLL2}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{INPTGCARSEPKIL}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ST-\textsubscript{MLL3}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{VNPTGCARSEPKMS}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ST-\textsubscript{MLL4}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{LNPHGAARAEVLYS}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ST-\textsubscript{SETd1A}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{EHQTGSARSEGYYYP}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ST-\textsubscript{SETd1B}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{EHVTGCARSEFGYT}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>LT-\textsubscript{MLL2}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{3INPTGCARSEPKIL}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>LT-\textsubscript{MLL3}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{3VNPTGCARSEPKMS}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LT-\textsubscript{MLL4}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{3LNPHGAARAEVLYS}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LT-\textsubscript{SETd1A}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{3EHQTGSARSEGYYYP}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LT-\textsubscript{SETd1B}\textsubscript{Win}</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>Biotinyl-(GGS)\textsubscript{3EHVTGCARSEFGYT}\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purity confirmation, amino acid analysis, and solubility testing were conducted and provided by GenScript. For SPR measurements, SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptide ligands were synthesized, purified, and analyzed in-house at Ichor Life Sciences (LaFayette, NY). Details on these procedures and protocols were previously provided. Peptide synthesis was performed using a Biotage Syro I peptide synthesizer (Biotage, Charlotte, NC). Peptide purification was achieved using reversed-phase chromatography in two steps: (1) flash chromatography employing a Biotage Isolera One (Biotage AB, Uppsala, Sweden), and (2) semi-preparative high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) using a Waters 2695 separations module, which was coupled with a Waters 2996 photodiode array detector (PDA).

1.2. Protein expression and purification. In this study, all expression plasmids were synthesized, codon optimized, and sequence verified by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). Human WDR5 (UniProtKB - P61964; WDR5\textsubscript{HUMAN}) and its mutants were expressed and purified as described previously. WDR5 construct design has the following sequence:
**6H-TEV-WDR5** in pET3aTr vector (Addgene, Watertown, MA). The detailed WDR5 sequence (sequence fragments marked in yellow are linkers) is the following:

MHHHHHSSGVDLGETENLYFQSNQATEEKKPETEAARAAQPTPSSSATQSKPTPVKPNYALKFTLAGHTKAVSSVKFSPNGEWLASSADKLIIWGA
YDGKFEKTISGHKLGISDVAWSSDSNLLVSAASDDKLTIKWDVSSGK
CLKTLGHSNYVFCCNFNPQSNLIVSGSFDESVRIDVKTGKLKTLPA
HSDPVSAVHFNDRDGLVSSSYDGLCRIWDTASGQLKTLIDDDNPPSV
FKFSGNGKYLATLTDNLTLLWDYSKGKCLKTYGKNEKYCIFAN
FSVTGKSWIVSSEDNLVYIWNLTKEIVQKLQGHTDVVISTACHPT
ENIIASAALENDKTIKLWKS

**Table S2:** This table shows WDR5 mutants used in this study. These WDR5 mutants involve amino acid side chains within the Win binding site of WDR5.4-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>WDR5 Mutant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P216L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>F133L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>S218F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>S175L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3. Biolayer interferometry (BLI).** These measurements were conducted using an Octet RED384 instrument (FortéBio, Fremont, CA) at 24°C. The assay buffer included 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/mL bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. Streptavidin-coated biosensors were incubated with 5 nM biotinylated SET1Win for 15 minutes. Then, the unbound peptides were washed out by rinsing the sensors in assay buffer. These experimental conditions were optimized to amplify the signal-to-noise ratio while preventing potential artifacts. These include the rebinding of receptors to the surface-immobilized peptide ligands during the dissociation phase. Prior crystallographic studies demonstrated that these ligand-receptor interactions follow a 1:1 binding model. The association process was monitored by exposing the sensors to 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 proteins. The dissociation phase was probed by transferring the sensors into WDR5-free assay buffer. The association phases were fitted using the equation:

\[ Y = Y_\infty - (Y_\infty - Y_0)e^{-k_{obs}t} \]  

(S1)

Here, \( Y_0 \) and \( Y_\infty \) denote the responses at the initial time and infinity, respectively. \( k_{obs} \) is the apparent first-order reaction rate constant of the association phase. \( t \) represents the cumulative time of the association reaction. The dissociation phases were fitted using the equation:

\[ Y = Y_\infty + (Y_0 - Y_\infty)e^{-k_{off}t} \]  

(S2)

Here, \( k_{off} \) indicates the dissociation rate constant. \( Y_0 \) and \( Y_\infty \) are the responses at the initial time and infinity, respectively. Finally, the association rate constant, \( k_{on} \), was determined using the slope of the linear curve:

\[ k_{obs} = k_{on}[C] + k_{off} \]
Then, global fittings were achieved using several WDR5 (or WDR5 mutant) concentrations. These fittings provided the corresponding $k_{on}$ and $k_{off}$ values. Equilibrium dissociation constant values, $K_D$, were indirectly determined using the $k_{on}$ and $k_{off}$ values ($K_D = k_{off}/k_{on}$). Three independent BLI measurements were conducted for all conditions in this study.

1.4. Surface plasmon resonance (SPR). In this study, all SPR measurements were conducted using a Cytiva Biacore 8K instrument (Cytiva Life Sciences, Marlborough, MA), as previously reported. WDR5 proteins were immobilized onto the active flow cell of each channel of a Cytiva Series S Sensor Chip CM5 (Cytiva Life Sciences). The sensor surface was then activated using an injection of 1:1 N-hydroxysuccinimide (NHS)/1-ethyl-3-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)carbodiimide (EDC) (Cytiva Amine Coupling Kit, Cytiva Life Sciences). The protein sample was then injected across the active flow cell. Finally, both active and passive flow cells were chemically deactivated. Multicycle kinetic analyses were conducted at a flow cell temperature of 25°C and a sample compartment temperature of 20°C in a running buffer composed of 20 mM Tris-HCl (pH 7.5), 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, 0.05% Tween 20. Biacore™ Insight Evaluation Software v3 (Cytiva Life Sciences) was employed to analyze and fit the sensorgrams using a 1:1 binding interaction model to provide the association ($k_a$) and dissociation ($k_d$) rate constants. The $K_D$ were calculated indirectly using $K_D = k_d/k_a$. 
2. Examples of BLI sensorgrams and fittings for probing the real-time kinetics of SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 interactions.

Figure S1: BLI sensorgrams of ST-MLL2\textsubscript{Win} interacting with WDR5 and its mutants. 5 nM biotinylated ST-MLL2\textsubscript{Win} was loaded onto streptavidin-coated sensors for 15 minutes. 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 and its mutants were used to obtain individual binding curves. These sensorgrams were fitted to obtain $k_{a-ST}$, $k_{d-ST}$, and $K_{D-ST}$ (eqns. (S1)-S3). The fits are shown in black.
Figure S2: BLI sensorgrams of LT-MLL2\textsubscript{Win} interacting with WDR5 and its mutants. 5 nM biotinylated LT-MLL2\textsubscript{Win} was loaded onto streptavidin-coated sensors for 15 minutes. 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 and its mutants were used to obtain individual binding curves. These sensorgrams were fitted to obtain $k_a$-LT, $k_d$-LT, and $K_D$-LT (eqns. (S1)-S3)). The fits are shown in black.
3. Determinations of the kinetic and equilibrium constants of the interactions of ST-SET1<sub>win</sub> ligands with WDR5 receptors using BLI measurements.

Table S3: Kinetic rate constants of association, $k_{a-ST}$, of WDR5 and its mutants with ST-SET1<sub>win</sub> ligands using BLI measurements. 5 nM biotinylated ST-SET1<sub>win</sub> were loaded onto streptavidin-coated sensors for 15 minutes. 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 and its mutants, ranging from 0.1 µM to 9 µM, were used to obtain individual binding curves. The buffer solution contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/ml bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. The binding curves were fitted using the Octet Data Analysis software. $k_{a-ST}$ values were provided in (M<sup>-1</sup>s<sup>-1</sup>) × 10<sup>-4</sup>. For F133L, 3-fold serial dilutions ranging from 0.3 µM to 27 µM were used. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L*</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td><strong>3.4 ± 0.3</strong></td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>6.6 ± 1.8</td>
<td>4.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td><strong>3.5 ± 0.3</strong></td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>~ 1</td>
<td><strong>2.0 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>6.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>5.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td><strong>5.7 ± 0.4</strong></td>
<td>7.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td><strong>4.8 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>5.3 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In this case, $k_{a-ST}$ was in the order of 10<sup>4</sup> M<sup>-1</sup>s<sup>-1</sup> assuming that the association process is in the range of values determined with the other MLL peptides.

**Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.

Table S4: Kinetic rate constants of dissociation, $k_{d-ST}$, of WDR5 and its mutants with ST-MLL ligands using BLI measurements. The N terminus of ST-SET1<sub>win</sub> ligands were tagged with biotin and their C-terminus were amidated. 5 nM biotinylated ST-SET1<sub>win</sub> ligands were loaded onto streptavidin-coated sensors for 15 minutes. 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 and its mutants, ranging from 0.1 µM to 9 µM, were used to obtain individual binding curves. The buffer solution contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/ml bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. The binding curves were fitted using the ForteBio Octet Data Analysis software. $k_{d-ST}$ values were provided in (s<sup>-1</sup>) × 10<sup>3</sup>. For F133L, 3-fold serial dilutions ranging from 0.3 µM to 27 µM were used. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>16 ± 1</td>
<td>21 ± 3</td>
<td>240 ± 10</td>
<td><strong>12 ± 1</strong></td>
<td>53 ± 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>12 ± 2</td>
<td>23 ± 2</td>
<td>170 ± 10</td>
<td><strong>28 ± 1</strong></td>
<td>47 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>62 ± 7</td>
<td>350 ± 50</td>
<td>&gt; 1000*</td>
<td><strong>180 ± 10</strong></td>
<td>120 ± 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S5: Equilibrium dissociation constants, \( K_{D-ST} \), of WDR5 and its mutants with ST-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands determined from BLI measurements. The N terminus of ST-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands were tagged with biotin and their C-terminus were amidated. 5 nM biotinylated ST-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands were loaded onto streptavidin-coated sensors for 15 minutes. 3-fold serial dilutions of WDR5 and its mutants, ranging from 0.1 µM to 9 µM, were used to obtain individual binding curves. The buffer solution contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris-HCl, 1 mM TCEP, 1 mg/ml bovine serum albumin (BSA), pH 7.5. The binding curves were fitted using the Fortebio Octet Data Analysis software. For F133L, 3-fold serial dilutions ranging from 0.3 µM to 27 µM were used. \( K_{D-ST} \) values were provided in nM. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>410 ± 22</td>
<td>510 ± 50</td>
<td>14,000 ± 2,000</td>
<td>360 ± 30</td>
<td>1,300 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>190 ± 57</td>
<td>530 ± 30</td>
<td>7,900 ± 400</td>
<td>810 ± 90</td>
<td>1,100 ± 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>2500 ± 400</td>
<td>20,000 ± 5200</td>
<td>≥ 100,000*</td>
<td>8,500 ± 300</td>
<td>5,800 ± 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>1800 ± 200</td>
<td>1300 ± 100</td>
<td>29,000 ± 10,000</td>
<td>2,900 ± 100</td>
<td>1,700 ± 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>600 ± 30</td>
<td>960 ± 100</td>
<td>10,000 ± 1,000</td>
<td>110 ± 6</td>
<td>720 ± 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This upper-limit value for the detection of \( K_{D-ST} \) results from dividing the upper-limit value of the detection of \( k_{D-ST} \) by the value of the \( k_{a-ST} \) approximation. **Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.

4. The kinetic and equilibrium constants of the interactions of ST-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands with WDR5 receptors normalized to those values corresponding to LT-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands.

Table S6: Kinetic rate constant of association, \( k_{a-ST} \), of WDR5 and its mutants, for ST-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands divided by the corresponding \( k_{a-LT} \) for LT-SET1\text{\textsubscript{Win}} ligands. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>0.89 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.10</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.07</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.84 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.59 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.71 ± 0.08</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.17</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.03</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>0.83 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.69 ± 0.02</td>
<td>1.07 ± 0.19</td>
<td>0.93 ± 0.07</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.55 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.85 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.
*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, no statistically significant accurate determinations were made due to limited resolution of the approach.

**Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.

Table S7: Kinetic rate constant of disassociation, k_d-ST, of WDR5 and its mutants interacting with ST-SET1_win ligands divided by the corresponding k_d-LT for LT-SET1_win ligands. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td><strong>2.0 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td><strong>1.7 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td><strong>1.4 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td><strong>1.8 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>2.7 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td><strong>1.1 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, no quantitative determinations were made due to limited time resolution of the approach.

**Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.

Table S8: Calculations of the differential activation free energies of the dissociation processes, ΔΔG_d, of the interactions of ST-SET1_win ligands with respect to those of LT-SET1_win ligands. Calculated values of ΔΔG_d are given in kcal/mol. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>-0.45 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.38 ± 0.12</td>
<td>-0.33 ± 0.04</td>
<td><strong>-0.40 ± 0.02</strong></td>
<td>-0.45 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>-0.45 ± 0.10</td>
<td>-0.43 ± 0.07</td>
<td>-0.30 ± 0.03</td>
<td><strong>-0.32 ± 0.02</strong></td>
<td>-0.47 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>-0.28 ± 0.08</td>
<td>-0.28 ± 0.10</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td><strong>-0.19 ± 0.01</strong></td>
<td>-0.33 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>-0.53 ± 0.06</td>
<td>-1.88 ± 0.06</td>
<td>-0.04 ± 0.11</td>
<td><strong>-0.36 ± 0.03</strong></td>
<td>-0.59 ± 0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>-0.30 ± 0.03</td>
<td>-0.21 ± 0.06</td>
<td>-0.16 ± 0.02</td>
<td><strong>-0.06 ± 0.03</strong></td>
<td>-0.28 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, no quantitative determinations were made due to limited time resolution of the approach. **Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.
Table S9: $K_{D-ST}$ measured with ST-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands normalized to the corresponding $K_{D-LT}$ values measured with LT-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands. Numbers represent mean ± s.d. determined from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.7</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.6</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.96 ± 0.39</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, no quantitative determinations were made due to limited time resolution of the approach. **Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.

Table S10: Calculations of the differential activation free energies of the ligand-receptor complex formation, ΔΔG, of WDR5-SET1$_{Win}$ interactions of ST-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands with respect to those of LT-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands. Calculated values of ΔΔG are given in kcal/mol. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent BLI experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>0.51 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.06</td>
<td>0.43 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.21</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.53 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>0.22 ± 0.13</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.20</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>0.64 ± 0.07</td>
<td>0.74 ± 0.07</td>
<td>-0.05 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>0.53 ± 0.03</td>
<td>0.57 ± 0.08</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.04</td>
<td>0.40 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, no quantitative determinations were made due to limited time resolution of the approach. **Experimental values of the test mutant of WDR5.
5. Scatter plots of the association rate constants versus the dissociation rate constants using linear- and logarithm-scale representations.

![Scatter plots](image)

Figure S3: Scatter plots of the association rate constants versus the dissociation rate constants using a linear-scale representation. (a) Data resulted from short-tether (ST) experiments. (b) Data resulted from long-tether (LT) experiments. (c) Data resulted from no tether (NT) experiments. For ST and LT experiments, MLL4\textsubscript{Win}-F133L interactions were not quantitatively determined. Hence, they only have four points each for MLL4 (for WDR5, P216L, S218F and S175L). For NT experiments, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}-F133L interactions were not quantitatively determined. Therefore, they only have four points for SETd1A (for WDR5, P216L, S218F and S175L). Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experimental determinations.
Figure 4: Scatter plots of the association rate constants versus the dissociation rate constants using a logarithm-scale representation. (a) Data resulted from short-tether (ST) experiments. (b) Data resulted from long-tether (LT) experiments. (c) Data resulted from no tether (NT; SPR) experiments. For ST and LT experiments, MLL4\textsubscript{Win}-F133L interactions were not quantitatively determined. Hence, they only have four points each for MLL4 (for WDR5, P216L, S218F and S175L). For NT experiments, SETd1A\textsubscript{Win}-F133L interactions were not quantitatively determined. Therefore, they only have four points for
SETd1A (for WDR5, P216L, S218F and S175L). Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experimental determinations.

6. Examples of SPR sensorgrams and fittings for probing the real-time kinetics of NT-SET1\textsubscript{Win}-WDR5 interactions.

Figure S5: SPR sensorgrams of NT-MLL2\textsubscript{Win} interacting with immobilized WDR5 proteins. WDR5 and its mutants were immobilized onto Cytiva Series S CM5 chips using EDC/NHS amine coupling chemistry in separate experiments. Titration series of no-tether MLL2\textsubscript{Win} (NT-MLL2\textsubscript{Win}) was injected as analyte and
the corresponding association (120 sec.) and dissociation (360 sec.) curves are shown. Data for WDR5 is taken from Imran and co-workers (2021). These sensorgrams were fitted to obtain $k_{a-NT}$, $k_{d-NT}$, and $K_{D-NT}$ (eqns. (S1)-S3). The fits are shown in black.

7. Determinations of the kinetic and equilibrium constants of the interactions of NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands with WDR5 receptors using SPR measurements.

Table S11: Kinetic rate constants of association, $k_{a-NT}$, of immobilized WDR5 receptor and its mutants with NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using SPR measurements. WDR5 and its mutants were immobilized onto Cytiva Series S CM5 chips using EDC/NHS amine coupling chemistry. Titration series of the respective NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands were injected as analytes. In the case of the SETd1A-F133L binding interaction, the kinetic constants were outside the limits that could be measured by the instrument. $k_{a-NT}$ values were provided in $(M^{-1}s^{-1}) \times 10^{-4}$. Values represent mean ± s.d. acquired from three independent SPR experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5*</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L***</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>37 ± 3</td>
<td>48 ± 4</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>56 ± 1</td>
<td>48 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>49 ± 4</td>
<td>63 ± 4</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>78 ± 1</td>
<td>46 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>21 ± 2</td>
<td>24 ± 1</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>41 ± 2</td>
<td>27 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>31 ± 2</td>
<td>30 ± 1</td>
<td>~ 10**</td>
<td>33 ± 1</td>
<td>40 ± 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>34 ± 3</td>
<td>34 ± 2</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
<td>69 ± 1</td>
<td>39 ± 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from Imran and co-workers.** Interaction between wild-type F133L and SETd1A was detectable using a SPR measurement. However, no quantitative determinations were made due to limited time resolution of the approach. In this case, $k_{a-NT}$ was in the order of $10^5$ $M^{-1}s^{-1}$ assuming that the association process is in the range of values determined with the other NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands. ***The test mutant of WDR5.

Table S12: Kinetic rate constants of dissociation, $k_{d-NT}$, of WDR5 and its mutants with the NT-SET1<sub>Win</sub> ligands using SPR measurements. WDR5 proteins were immobilized onto Cytiva Series S CM5 chips using EDC/NHS amine coupling chemistry. Titration series of the respective SET1<sub>Win</sub> peptide ligands were injected as analytes. In the case of the SETd1A-F133L binding interaction, the kinetic constants were outside the limits that could be measured by the instrument. $k_{d-NT}$ values were provided in (s<sup>-1</sup>) $\times 10^3$. Values represent mean ± s.d. acquired from three independent SPR experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5*</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L***</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>15 ± 1</td>
<td>170 ± 10</td>
<td>11 ± 1</td>
<td>41 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>150 ± 10</td>
<td>27 ± 1</td>
<td>47 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>41 ± 3</td>
<td>200 ± 10</td>
<td>340 ± 10</td>
<td>140 ± 10</td>
<td>86 ± 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table S13: Equilibrium dissociation constants, $K_{D-NT}$, of WDR5 and its mutants with the NT-SET1$^{\text{Win}}$ ligands using SPR measurements. Either WDR5 or its derivatives was immobilized onto Cytiva Series S CM5 chips using EDC/NHS amine coupling chemistry. Titration series of the respective NT-SET1$^{\text{Win}}$ ligands were injected as analytes. $K_{D-NT}$ was calculated directly from these kinetic rate constants using $K_D = k_d / k_a$. In the case of the SETd1A-F133L binding interaction, the kinetic constants were outside the limits that could be measured by the instrument. Therefore, an affinity analysis (relative response vs. concentration dose-response curve) was used to calculate the $K_{D-NT}$. $K_{D-NT}$ values were provided in nM. Values represent mean ± s.d. acquired from three independent SPR experimental determinations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5*</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L***</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>33 ± 2</td>
<td>31 ± 1</td>
<td>1,700 ± 100</td>
<td>20 ± 1</td>
<td>87 ± 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>19 ± 1</td>
<td>30 ± 1</td>
<td>1,000 ± 100</td>
<td>35 ± 1</td>
<td>100 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>190 ± 20</td>
<td>860 ± 20</td>
<td>4,000 ± 100</td>
<td>350 ± 10</td>
<td>320 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>350 ± 10</td>
<td>140 ± 10</td>
<td>11,000 ± 1,000**</td>
<td>710 ± 20</td>
<td>250 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>69 ± 6</td>
<td>110 ± 10</td>
<td>2,200 ± 100</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>100 ± 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from Imran and co-workers. **Here, $K_{D-NT}$ was determined using a steady-state SPR measurement. ***The test mutant of WDR5.

8. The kinetic and equilibrium constants of the interactions of NT-SET1$^{\text{Win}}$ ligands with WDR5 receptors normalized to the corresponding of LT-SET1$^{\text{Win}}$ ligands.

Table S14: Kinetic rate constant of association, $k_{a-NT}$, of WDR5 and its mutants, determined by SPR measurements divided by the corresponding $k_{a-LT}$ determined by BLI sensorgrams. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L***</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>8.4 ± 0.7</td>
<td>8.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>6.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>11 ± 1</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>9.2 ± 0.7</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>16 ± 1</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>9.0 ± 1.1</td>
<td>12 ± 1</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>13 ± 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>3.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>ND**</td>
<td>5.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>7.2 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.4</td>
<td>4.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>8.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>6.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*ND stands for “Not Determined.” Interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable using a BLI measurement. However, this interaction was not quantitatively determined using BLI due to the limited time resolution of the approach. ** Interaction between F133L and SETd1A was detectable using a SPR measurement. However, this interaction was not quantitatively determined using SPR due to the limited resolution of the approach. ***The test mutant of WDR5.

Table S15: Kinetic rate constants of dissociation, $k_{d-NT}$, of WDR5 and its mutants, determined by SPR, normalized to the corresponding $k_{d-LT}$ values.
Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L***</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>1.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.94 ± 0.01</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>ND**</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” **The interaction between F133L and SETd1A was detectable using an SPR measurement. Yet, this interaction was not quantitatively determined using BLI due to the limited resolution of the approach. ***The test mutant of WDR5.

Table S16: $K_{d-NT}$ values determined by SPR measurements, which were normalized to the corresponding $K_{d-LT}$ values determined by BLI measurements. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.20 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.13 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.11 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.19 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.087 ± 0.002</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>0.085 ± 0.001</td>
<td>0.093 ± 0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.38 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.37 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.30 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>0.27 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.29 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.36 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.01</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ND stands for “Not Determined.” The interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable, but not quantifiable using BLI. **The test mutant of WDR5.
Table S17: Differential activation free energies of the ligand-receptor complex formation, ΔΔG (kcal/mol), determined for NT conditions with respect to LT conditions. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. using three independent experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide</th>
<th>WDR5</th>
<th>P216L</th>
<th>F133L</th>
<th>S175L**</th>
<th>S218F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MLL2</td>
<td>-0.98 ± 0.03</td>
<td>-1.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-0.94 ± 0.01</td>
<td><strong>-1.1 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>-1.2 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3</td>
<td>-0.99 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-1.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-0.75 ± 0.01</td>
<td><strong>-1.3 ± 0.1</strong></td>
<td>-0.97 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL4</td>
<td>-1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-1.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>ND*</td>
<td>-1.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>-1.4 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1A</td>
<td>-0.34 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.57 ± 0.01</td>
<td>-0.58 ± 0.01</td>
<td><strong>-0.42 ± 0.02</strong></td>
<td>-0.70 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETd1B</td>
<td>-0.76 ± 0.05</td>
<td>-0.73 ± 0.02</td>
<td>-0.60 ± 0.01</td>
<td><strong>-0.83 ± 0.02</strong></td>
<td>-0.74 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ND stands for “Not Determined.” The interaction between F133L and MLL4 was detectable, but not quantifiable using BLI. **The test mutant of WDR5.
9. The 3D plots and contour maps of the association rate constants under ST and LT conditions normalized to those recorded under NT conditions.

Figure S6: 3D plots and contour maps of the normalized association rate constants. (a) Bar graph and (b) contour map of $k_{a-ST}$ values for the interaction of ST-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $k_{a-NT}$ values. (c) Bar graph and (d) contour map of $k_{a-LT}$ values for the interaction of LT-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $k_{a-NT}$ values. $k_{a-ST}$ for the MLL$_4$$_{Win}$-F133L interactions could not be determined using BLI, while $k_{a-NT}$ of the SETd1$_{Win}$-F133L interactions could not be determined using SPR. Therefore, those values are colored in black.
10. The 3D plots and contour maps of the dissociation rate constants under ST and LT conditions normalized to those recorded under NT conditions.

Figure S7: 3D plots and contour maps of the normalized association rate constants. (a) Bar graph and (b) contour map of $k_{d-ST}$ values for the interaction of ST-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $k_{d-NT}$ values. (c) Bar graph and (d) contour map of $k_{d-LT}$ values for the interaction of LT-SET1$_{Win}$ ligands, with WDR5 and its mutants, divided by their corresponding $k_{d-NT}$ values. $k_{d-ST}$ for the MLL4$_{Win}$-F133L interactions could not be determined using BLI, while $k_{d-NT}$ of the SETd1A$_{Win}$-F133L interactions could not be determined using SPR. Therefore, those values are colored in black.
11. Scatter plots of kinetic and equilibrium constants for the ST, LT, and NT experiments.

Figure S8: Scatter plots of the $k_a$, $k_d$, and $K_D$ for the ST and NT conditions. (a) $k_{a-ST}$ values plotted against the corresponding $k_{a-NT}$ values. Points below this line correspond to interactions with slower association rates for the ST experiments. (b) $k_{d-ST}$ values plotted against the corresponding $k_{d-NT}$ values. Points above this line correspond to interactions with faster disassociation rate constants for the ST experiments. (c) $K_{D-ST}$ values plotted against the corresponding $K_{D-NT}$ values. Points above this line correspond to interactions that were weaker in the
ST experiments. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experiments.

**Figure S9: Scatter plots of the equilibrium dissociation constants of S175L data.** (a) $K_{D-ST}$ values plotted against the $K_{D-LT}$ values. The red line is the fit resulted from interactions of WDR5, P216L, S218F and F133L with SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ under ST and LT conditions. The green points represent interactions of S175L. Points above this blue line correspond to interactions which were weakened by reducing tether length. (b) $K_{D-NT}$ values plotted against the $K_{D-LT}$ values. The red line is the fit resulted from interactions of WDR5, P216L, S218F and F133L with SET1$_{\text{Win}}$ under NT and LT conditions. The green points represent interactions of S175L. Points below this blue line correspond to interactions that were stronger.
under NT conditions. m indicates the slope of curves in both panels. Data are provided as mean ± s.d. from three independent experiments.

12. Supporting references.
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5.1 Abstract

WD40 Repeat Protein 5 (WDR5) is a well-known epigenetic regulator which has recognized interactions with a host of different proteins. It has a 22 residue N-terminus intrinsically disordered tail whose function is unknown. Most available crystal structures of WDR5 use a truncated version similar to WDR523-334 (WDR5ΔN) to get around this intrinsically disordered region (IDR). Studies of WDR5’s interactions with other proteins do not differentiate between full-length WDR5 (WDR5FL) and WDR5ΔN, ignoring any differences between them. Here we look at the impact of the tail on WDR5’s interactions, its effect on our Biolayer Interferometry (BLI) measurements of WBM site kinetics and its role in aiding WDR5 function. We also look at the significance of physiologically relevant salt conditions for quantifying these interactions.
5.2 Introduction

WD40 repeat protein-5 (WDR5) plays established roles in multiple protein complexes. It is crucial to the regulation of Histone-3 Lysine-4 (H3K4) methylation by SET1 family proteins; MLL1, MLL2, MLL3, MLL4, SETd1A and SETd1B. Not only does it interact directly with these SET1 proteins it also interacts with retinoblastoma binding protein-5 (RbBP5) which is an integral part of the SET1 complex. Moreover, it also has known interactions with the transcription factor MYC, 3-phosphoinositide-dependent protein kinase 1 (PDPK1) and other interacting partners involved in phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase (PI3K) signaling. These interactions have wide ranging implications for epigenetic regulation and complex assembly among other things.

WDR5 has two known binding sites responsible for all of its interactions: the WDR5 Interacting (Win) site and the WDR5 Binding Motif (WBM) site. SET1 proteins and histone H3 have the Win sequence which allows them to associate with the Win site. These interactions involve precise insertions into the Win site cavity and thus impose an entropic penalty on the binding. The kinetics of these interactions have been explored before and reveal a significantly slow association rate as expected. On the other hand, RbBP5 and MYC use the WDR5 Binding Motif to bind to the WBM site. These are primarily surface interactions which have not been explored kinetically before.
The N-terminus IDR present on WDR5 has no understood function. These 22 residues are largely ignored when focusing on WDR5’s functions. Most available crystal structures work with a truncated version similar to WDR523-334 (WDR5ΔN) to get around this region.2,15,16,17 This IDR has part of the Win motif and has been seen interacting with the Win site cavity in at least one crystal structure exploration.19

Figure 1: BLI Experiment of RbBP5 interacting with WDR5 in the presence of Salt. The figure shows the RbBP5 peptide interacting with WDR5. RbBP5 (magenta) is immobilized onto the BLI sensor surface with a linker. WDR5 (red), Na⁺ ions (light blue) and Cl⁻ ions (green) are shown freely moving in solution. Bound WDR5 is marked in blue.
In this study we look at the role the intrinsically disordered tail plays in WDR5’s interactions, the effect it can have on kinetics measurements of the WBM site and its contribution to the overall function of WDR5 inside the cell. We also look at the importance of maintaining physiologically relevant conditions when looking at these interactions.

5.3 Results and Discussion

WDR5FL and the tale of the N-terminus. We obtained BLI sensorgrams for the interaction of RbBP5 peptide with Full-length WDR5 (WDR5FL) which included the N-terminus tail (Table 1). The biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized onto Streptavidin sensors and then submerged in different concentrations of the analyte, WDR5FL. Once the interaction reached equilibrium, the sensors were moved to an analyte free solution. This allowed us to look at the association and dissociation phases of the interaction in real time. WDR5FL gave us the curves shown in figure (Figure 2a). Not only did we see large responses we also saw that as the concentration of WDR5FL was increased, the curves did not show faster saturation. The lower concentrations showed quick saturation while the higher concentrations did not. This was counterintuitive to the expectations we would have for any simple 1:1 protein-protein interaction. The results were reproduced an additional two times to confirm that no experimental errors were responsible for this deviation from normal expected behavior. Optimizing this experiment, by varying loading and association steps, to decrease maximum
response did not improve the results. Decreasing loading peptide concentration to 1 nM reduced the maximum response but did not produce results amenable to 1:1 binding analysis. Reducing the maximum concentration of analyte to 600 nM or 300 nM again did not solve this problem. We hypothesized that there could be another interaction creating an artifact in our BLI data.

**Table 1: Peptides.** The table shows the peptides used for this work, their sequences and the sites they bind onto on WDR5. The C-terminus of all peptides were amidated. The N-terminus of RbBP5\textsuperscript{369-379} peptide and MLL3\textsuperscript{4703-4716} were Biotinylated while that of WBM Inhibitor and ARTEVY were acetylated. The relevant sequences are in black, N-terminal and C-terminal modifications are marked in blue, and the linkers are marked in red.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peptide Name</th>
<th>Peptide Sequence</th>
<th>Binding Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RbBP5\textsuperscript{369-379} Peptide</td>
<td>Biotinyl-GGSGGSGGSAAEDEEVDTSDN\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
<td>WBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBM Inhibitor</td>
<td>CH\textsubscript{3}CO-AAEDEEVDTSDN\textsubscript{NH2}</td>
<td>WBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTEVY</td>
<td>CH\textsubscript{3}CO-ARTEVY-NH\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Win</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLL3\textsuperscript{4703-4716}</td>
<td>Biotinyl-GGSVNPTGCARSEPMS-NH\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>Win</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2: RbBP5 Interaction with WDR5FL. (a) This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of RbBP5 with full length WDR5. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5FL as analyte. The sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different concentrations used are shown below. (b) This figure shows the schematic of the interaction and the role the N-terminus IDR plays in our results.
Dimerization. Based on available X-ray crystallography structure, we hypothesized that, in the case of these specific BLI experiments, WDR5 may be binding in such a way that it leaves the Win site open to interactions with the N-terminus tail of other present WDR5s. The N-terminus tail has a Win motif sequence given by EAARAQP that can potentially insert into the Win site cavity. This schematic is shown in figure (Figure 2b). Thus, the binding of WDR5 to the immobilized RbBP5 peptide would allow even more WDR5 to bind onto the first one and so on. To test this, we added ARTEVY (win6mer), a Win binding site inhibitor, to the RbBP5-WDR5<sub>FL</sub> association well, to block the Win site (14). Figure 3a shows that ARTEVY successfully brought the interaction to normal behavior. Considering ARTEVY is a Win site binder, normally it would have no effect whatsoever on the WBM interaction making this result very interesting. Moreover, Figure 3b also shows that when the same experiment was performed with WDR5<sup>23-334</sup> (WDR5<sub>AN</sub>), not only did ARTEVY have no effect, but the curves seen were similar to the 10 µM ARTEVY spike curve in Figure 3a. This confirms that the interaction between the N-terminus IDR and the Win binding site was responsible for the unexpected results. Furthermore, when the original experiment, shown in Figure 3a, was carried out with 20 µM ARTEVY spiked in the association wells we got the sensorgrams shown in figure Figure S1. These curves showed a concentration dependent responses and rates of saturation, more amenable to 1:1 binding fitting and gave us kinetics of the interaction.
Figure 3: Blocking the Win binding site using ARTEVY. RbBP5’s interaction with WDR5 inhibited with different concentrations of ARTEVY peptide. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized onto Streptavidin sensors. 3 µM WDR5 association wells were spiked with different concentrations of ARTEVY (a) WDR5FL (b) WDR5ΔN.
Moreover, we looked at the interaction of RbBP5 with WDR5\textsubscript{ΔN} (Figure 4a). These curves were again well behaved, readily analyzable and gave us very similar kinetics (Table S1). Additionally, the interaction of MLL3 with WDR5\textsubscript{ΔN} interaction showed no difference from MLL3’s interaction with WDR5\textsubscript{FL} interaction measured by us previously (Figure S2, Table S2), showing that this effect was limited to WBM measurements. These comprehensive results allow us to conclude that WDR5\textsubscript{FL} dimerizes due to the interaction between the N-terminus IDR and the Win binding site cavity. This dimerization is amplified in the case of our BLI measurements of the RbBP5-WDR5\textsubscript{FL} complex because of the specific configuration WDR5 ends up in after binding with the RbBP5 peptide as shown in figure. We expect this to hold true for most WBM binding measurements through BLI and SPR in which the WBM partner is immobilized.

**Two-State Interaction.** Another possibility that we explored was that the RbBP5-WDR5\textsubscript{FL} interaction was a two-state interaction. It was possible that the complex was going through a conformational change after the initial binding leading to a much more stable complex. Therefore, our interaction model would have changed from

\[ A + B \rightleftharpoons AB \]

to

\[ A + B \rightleftharpoons AB \rightleftharpoons AB* \]
Here A and B represent the binding partners RbBP5 and WDR5 respectively, AB represents the complex and AB* represents a more stable complex forming after conformational change i.e the second state. The model fit our optimized data sets really well (Figure S3). The figure shows our analysis of one of these curves using this model (Figure S4a). It shows that as association proceeds, we get higher and higher percentages of the more stable AB*. Consequently, the dissociation rate constant should decrease the longer the association time or “contact time”. Figure S4b shows the two-state test, the contact time was increased and the corresponding dissociation curves were analyzed. Similar tests have been performed before using the SPR (20). We saw that increasing contact time had no effect on the dissociation rate. Therefore, even though the model fit our data well, this interaction was not a two-state interaction. Our results reemphasize the unreliability of picking and choosing models based only on how well they fit the BLI data. Validating models through orthogonal tests is crucial to extracting useful and credible information from data.

**Phase Separation and WDR5.** These results have significant ramifications for understanding the behavior of WDR5. Previous work⁷ has shown that WDR5’s interactions with SET1 proteins have very low association rates due in part to the entropic cost associated with the SET1 Win motif Arginine inserting into the WDR5 cavity. However, this exploration suggests that the intrinsically disordered tail allows WDR5 to dimerize under certain conditions. This increased intermolecular affinity could potentially trigger phase-separation and allow WDR5 to
form local hyper-concentrations making up for the slow association rates. Moreover, the connection between the presence of IDR s and the ability to phase separate has been explored extensively before (15-18). This would explain why, despite the low association rates, WDR5 is crucial to the regulation of the histone methylation function of some SET1 proteins. Phase separation would allow WDR5 to maintain its specificity, granted by the Win binding site cavity, while not compromising on function.

**Association and dissociation rate constants.** Looking at the kinetics of the RbBP5-WDR5ΔN interaction, we see that that this WBM site interaction had a greater association rate then most of our measured Win binding site interactions. This was in line with our predictions as this surface interaction did not have the same entropic limitations that the Win binding site cavity interactions have. Furthermore, the dissociation rate constant was also in general greater than those of the Win binding site interactions (Figure 4a, Table S1). This may be due to a relative lack of hydrogen bonds stabilizing the RbBP5-WDR5 complex (Table S3). The complex has several ionic and hydrophobic contributions (Table S4), but it seems they do not make this a high-affinity complex. Consequently, the $K_D$ of the interaction was 1.5 μM, making this interaction weaker than most SET1 protein interactions with WDR5 (7, 16, 17).
Figure 4: RbBP5 Interaction with WDR5ΔN. (a) This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of RbBP5 with WDR5ΔN. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5ΔN as analyte. The sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different concentrations used are shown.
(b) RbBP5-WDR5 complex inhibited with different concentrations of WBM inhibitor (Table 1). Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized onto Streptavidin sensors. 3 μM WDR5 association wells were spiked with different concentrations of WBM inhibitor. (c) Normalized maximum responses obtained for the inhibition of WDR5-RbBP5 interactions.

Inhibition. Additionally, our data shows that this interaction can be inhibited by using a peptidomimetic inhibitor based on the RbBP5 WBM motif (Table 1). We saw that formation of the RbBP5-WDR5 complex was greatly decreased, as the concentration of WBM inhibitor was increased from 1 μM through 10 μM (Figures 4bc, Table S5). However, the effect of the inhibitor at 1 μM concentration was insignificant and an order of magnitude higher concentration was required to produce a strong inhibition. This suggests that the WBM inhibitor while capable of inhibition would need some modifications to increase its effectiveness. Our results show that this peptide can serve as the basis for the design of strongly binding molecules.

Effect of salt concentration. The figure shows that the RbBP5-WDR5 interaction is highly aided by electrostatic effects (Figure S5). The WBM site on WDR5 is highly positive, while the WBM motif on RbBP5 is highly negative. Moreover, we postulated that this would make the interaction very susceptible to shielding effects from salt. To test this, we measured the kinetics of these interactions in three other buffers. Tris, TCEP and BSA were kept the same while the concentration of NaCl was varied. The three additional NaCl concentrations used were 50 mM, 300 mM, and 600 mM. 150 mM NaCl had already been used,
as mentioned above. Our results, in figure, show that the interaction is significantly affected by salt concentration (Figure 5, Figure S6, Table S6). The interaction strength decreased as NaCl was increased, as shown by the figure. The overall change in strength was non-linear with respect to salt. Furthermore, our technique allowed us to further break down this effect in terms of changes in association and dissociation rates. We see that increasing salt-concentration decreases association rate constant. This is to be expected as the higher salt concentration would decrease the Debye screening length, decrease the effective interaction radius of the two binding partners and lead to fewer association events occurring. Surprisingly, the salt also affected the dissociation rate. We see that at 50 mM NaCl, the dissociation rate is 50-fold slower that at 600 mM NaCl. Moreover at 150 mM NaCl and 300 mM NaCl the interaction is ~3 fold slower and ~2 fold slower, respectively, than that at 600 mM NaCl. This explains the overall non-linearity of the change in interaction strength.
Figure 5: Effect of Salt on the RbBP5 Interaction with WDR5\(_{\Delta N}\). The figure shows the binding constants obtained for the RbBP5 interaction with WDR5\(_{\Delta N}\) in different salt concentrations. (a) association rate constants (b) dissociation rate constants (c) equilibrium dissociation constants.
5.4 Conclusions

Our work presents the first ever thorough kinetic study of WDR5 WBM site interactions, explores the impact of salt on WBM site kinetics, and suggests the role the N-terminus IDR of WDR5 plays in governing its overall function. We found that the WBM site association rate constant was higher than those of the Win site, but this increase was countered by a simultaneous increase in the dissociation rate. Furthermore, we see that increasing salt decreases the association rate of the interaction and increases the dissociation rate, greatly weakening the binding affinity. This underscores the importance of maintaining physiologically relevant conditions for in-vitro studies, especially for WDR5 work. Additionally, we see that the N-terminus intrinsically disordered tail contributes to the inter molecular affinity of WDR5 increasing the likelihood of phase separation. This increased likelihood of phase separation may explain the unique way with which WDR5 is able to maintain a balance between specificity and function.

5.5 Materials and Methods

Protein Expression and Purification. Full-length WDR5 (WDR5FL) and was expressed and purified in a similar way as described previously.\textsuperscript{7} N-terminus truncated WDR5 (WDR5\textsuperscript{23-334}, WDR5\textsubscript{AN}) was purified in the same way. pET3aTr vectors containing the 6×His-TEV-WDR5 and 6×His-TEV- WDR5\textsuperscript{23-334} sequences
were transformed into Rosetta™ 2 BL21(DE3)pLysS (Novagen, Cat #71403) competent E. coli cells. These cells were then grown overnight on Luria-Bertani (LB) agar carbenecillin/chloramphenicol selection plates at 37°C. Single colonies from these transformations were used for carbenicillin and chloramphenicol inoculated 50 mL Terrific Broth (TB) media starter cultures. This culture was grown overnight at 30°C. Inoculated 1L TB media cultures were seeded by the starter cultures. These expression cultures were grown at 37°C for 2.5 hours and then left at room temperature for 30 minutes. They were induced with 100 µM IPTG and grown at 16°C for 20 hours. Pellets were harvested and lysed using multiple passes through a microfluidizer. The Lysis buffer contained PMSF and EDTA-free protease inhibitor. The lysate was spun down, the supernatant was collected and passed through a Nickel column on an FPLC. WDR5 was eluted using buffer containing imidazole. The Hi-tag was cleaved using TEV Protease. The Nickel column was again used to extract the His-tag and TEV Protease from the proteins.

**Peptide synthesis, labeling, purification, and analysis.** All peptides for biolayer interferometry, the Fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) labelled peptides for FP spectroscopy and the label-free peptides were synthesized and purified by GenScript (Piscataway, NJ). The peptides were purified to ≥ 95% purity. The BLI peptides were Biotinylated at the N-terminus, the FP ones were labelled with FITC at the N-terminus and the un-labelled ones were acetylated at the N-terminus. These were purified to ≥ 90% purity. The label was again added at the N-terminus. All the
peptides were amidated at the C-terminus. Amino acid analysis, purity confirmation, and solubility testing were provided by GenScript.

**Biolayer interferometry (BLI).** BLI studies were carried out using OctetRED384 (FortéBio, Fremont, CA). The assays were performed the same way as in our previous studies. Peptide’s biotinylated at the N-terminus were immobilized onto Streptavidin (SA) sensors as ligands. These sensors were dipped into analyte containing wells (Manufacturer, Town, State) to obtain association curves and then were moved to analyte free wells to obtain dissociation curves. Unless specified otherwise, the running buffer for most experiments contained 150 mM NaCl, 20 mM Tris, 1 mM TCEP and 1mg/ml BSA. The pH of all running buffers was adjusted to 7.5. For the inhibition experiments, additional non-biotinylated peptides were included with the analytes.

**Molecular graphics.** All protein representations were prepared using PyMOL Molecular Graphics System (Version 2.4.0 Schrödinger, LLC).
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1. Traces for RbBP5’s interaction with ARTEVY saturated WDR5

**Figure S1**: BLI Sensorgrams for RbBP5’s interaction with ARTEVY saturated WDR5\textsubscript{FL}. This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of RbBP5 with WDR5\textsubscript{FL} + ARTEVY. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5 as analyte as well as 20 μM ARTEVY. The sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different WDR5 concentrations used are shown below.
2. Kinetics measured for the RbBP5-WDR5 interaction

Table S1: WDR5\textsubscript{FL} and WDR5\textsubscript{ΔN}, kinetics and K\textsubscript{D}, with RbBP5. The table shows \(k_{\text{on}}\), \(k_{\text{off}}\) and \(K_{\text{D}}\) values for the interaction of RbBP5 peptide with WDR5\textsubscript{FL} and WDR5\textsubscript{ΔN}. For WDR5\textsubscript{FL}, ARTEVY was spiked in the association well to block the Win site and prevent dimerization. Values were obtained using BLI sensorgrams in figure S1 and figure 4. These sensorgrams were fitted to obtain \(k_{\text{on}}\) and \(k_{\text{off}}\), which were used to indirectly obtain \(K_{\text{D}}\). Triplicates were performed and the resultant mean ± s.d values are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(k_{\text{on}}) ((\times 10^4) M(^{-1})s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(k_{\text{off}}) ((\times 10^{-1}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>(K_{\text{D}}) (µM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDR5\textsubscript{FL}</td>
<td>17 ± 2</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR5\textsubscript{ΔN}</td>
<td>9.4 ± 1.1</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Traces for the MLL3- WDR5\textsubscript{AN} Interaction

**Figure S2: BLI sensorgrams for MLL3’s interaction with WDR5\textsubscript{AN}.** This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of MLL3 with WDR5\textsubscript{AN}. Biotinylated MLL3 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5\textsubscript{AN} as analyte. The sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different concentrations used are shown.
4. Kinetics measured for the MLL3-WDR5 interactions

Table S2: WDR5FL and WDR5AN, kinetics and \( K_D \), with MLL3. The table shows \( k_{on} \), \( k_{off} \) and \( K_D \) values for the interaction of MLL3 with WDR5FL(3) and WDR5AN. WDR5FL values were taken from our previous work. WDR5AN values were obtained using similarly acquired BLI sensorgrams shown in figure S2. These sensorgrams were fitted to obtain \( k_{on} \) and \( k_{off} \), which were used to indirectly obtain \( K_D \). Triplicates were performed and the resultant mean ± s.d values are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( k_{on} ) (x10^4 M(^{-1})s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( k_{off} ) (x10(^{-2}) s(^{-1}))</th>
<th>( K_D ) (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WDR5AN</td>
<td>6.3 ± 2.8</td>
<td>0.97 ± 0.04</td>
<td>170 ± 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDR5FL</td>
<td>6.6 ± 1.8</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>190 ± 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Two state analysis of the RbBP5-WDR5<sub>FL</sub> interaction

Figure S3: Two state fitted BLI sensorgrams for RbBP5’s interaction with WDR5<sub>FL</sub>. This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of RbBP5 with full length WDR5. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5<sub>FL</sub> as analyte. The sensorograms corresponding to the 5 different concentrations used are shown. Fitting was performed using MatLab and is shown in red.
Figure S4: Two state analysis of RbBP5-WDR5FL Interaction. (a) Raw Response and AB vs AB* composition obtained from two-state analysis of the RbBP-WDR5 association. The purple points show the time values chosen for the contact-time analysis and the corresponding AB* response. Analysis was performed using Matlab. (b) Normalized Dissociation curves obtained after different association times. The contact time was increased and the corresponding dissociation curves were analyzed. Each curve was normalized using its starting value.
6. Known interactions at the RbBP5-WDR5 interface.

Table S3: Mapping of the Hydrogen bonds at the RbBP5-WDR5 interface. These results were obtained using previously published co-crystallization data (PDB ID: 6KIW).\(^1\) The cut-off distance for identifying these hydrogen bonds was 4.0 Å. Here, BB and SC denote backbone and side chain, respectively. These interactions were determined using protein interactions calculator (PIC).\(^2\) The structure was not able to model the whole sequence of RbBP5, so these hydrogen bonds are not comprehensive. The first residue in each bond belongs to RbBP5, whereas the second one belongs to WDR5. BB and SC denote backbone and side chain, respectively.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrogen Bonds</th>
<th>Distance (Å)</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S379-N225</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E371-L249</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>BB-BB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S379-R181</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D376-N225</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V377-N225</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>BB-SC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table S4: List of all known noncovalent interactions between RbBP5 and WDR5. These results were obtained in a similar method as for Table S2. For each interaction, the first residue corresponds to RbBP5 while the second residue corresponds to WDR5. The cut-off for ionic interactions was 6 Å, while for hydrophobic interactions it was 5 Å.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ionic</th>
<th>Hydrophobic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E373-K245</td>
<td>V375-Y228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E373-K247</td>
<td>V375-L249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D372-K247</td>
<td>V377-Y228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E374-K272</td>
<td>V377-L240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D376-K272</td>
<td>V377-L249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E271-K291</td>
<td>V377-F266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V377-L288</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Impact of WBM Inhibitor

**Table S5: Impact of WBM Inhibitor on RbBP5-WDR5 interaction.** The table shows the impact of RbBP5 based inhibitor on the BLI response. 5 nM RbBP5 peptide was immobilized onto Streptavidin sensors and its interaction with 600 nM WDR5\textsubscript{AN} was disrupted using the WBM inhibitor. The interaction was allowed to reach equilibrium and the highest response values were recorded. The normalized responses were calculated by setting the without inhibitor response to 1. Triplicates were performed and the resultant value mean ± s.d values are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inhibitor Concentration (µM)</th>
<th>Normalized Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.65 ± 0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.21 ± 0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Role of Charge Distribution

Figure S5: RbBP5 peptide and WDR5 charge distribution. The figures show the charge distributions on RbBP5 and WDR5.
9. RbBP5-WDR5\textsubscript{AN} interactions in different buffer conditions

Figure S6: BLI Sensorgrams for different buffer conditions. This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of RbBP5 with WDR5\textsubscript{AN}. Biotinylated RbBP5 peptide was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5\textsubscript{AN} as analyte. The sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different concentrations used are shown below. The NaCl concentration in the buffer was varied. (a) 50 mM NaCl (b) 300 mM NaCl (c) 600 mM NaCl
Table S6: Salt analysis. The table shows $k_{on}$, $k_{off}$ and $K_D$ values for the interaction of RbBP5 peptide with WDR5ΔN under different buffer conditions. The concentration of NaCl in the buffer was varied while other components were kept constant. Values were obtained using BLI. Sensorgrams were fitted to obtain $k_{on}$ and $k_{off}$, which were used to indirectly obtain $K_D$. Triplicates were performed and the resultant mean ± s.d values are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salt (mM NaCl)</th>
<th>$k_{on}$ ($\times 10^4$ M$^{-1}$s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$k_{off}$ ($\times 10^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$K_D$ (nM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>0.82 ± 0.06</td>
<td>60 ± 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>9.4 ± 1.1</td>
<td>14 ± 1</td>
<td>1500 ± 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>10 ± 1</td>
<td>19 ± 2</td>
<td>1900 ± 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>5.1 ± 1.1</td>
<td>43 ± 11</td>
<td>9300 ± 4000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6: Summary and Future work

In summary, we have extracted the kinetics of WDR5-SET1 interactions as well as of WDR5’s interaction with RbBP5. We used SET1\text{win} peptides to emulate the binding sites of large SET1 proteins and we studied their interactions with WDR5 using BLI, SPR and FP methods. The use of multiple bulk-phase techniques increased confidence in our findings. It shows how the use of orthogonal approaches ensures that derived results are credible and reproducible across techniques. Furthermore, the exploration of the effects of restrictions on interacting partners provides much-needed information on how to interpret the results derived from different bulk-phase techniques.

Additionally, in the case of the Win site interactions, we have obtained association and dissociation rates for wild-type WDR5 as well WDR5 cancer mutants. These mutants were divided into two categories: surface mutants and cavity mutants. The surface mutants included, D172A, P216L and Y260 H. While the cavity mutants included F133L, S175L, S218F and D92N. We used BLI to extract kinetics and indirectly calculate the $K_D$, and then we validated our findings using FP. We observed divergent impacts of Win site mutations on the kinetics of the Win site interactions. All of the Win site binders were not always impacted the same way due to these mutations. This study will help lay the groundwork for precision medicine. Understanding the impacts of individual mutations in cancers sets up the base for having tailor made drugs to counter those effects.
Moreover, our work with varying the surface-tethering conditions for these interactions investigated interesting experimental phenomenon. We looked at three conditions: short tether (ST), long tether (LT) and no tether (NT). We studied the interactions of SET1\textsubscript{Win} peptides with WDR5 under these conditions. For the ST case, the peptides were attached to a BLI sensor surface using 3 residue (GGS) tethers. For the LT case the tethers were elongated to 6 residues (GGS\textsuperscript{3}). While for the NT conditions WDR5 was immobilized onto a SPR sensor and the peptides were free in solution. Our results showed that as the conditions changed, so did the rates of association and dissociation. The LT condition provided faster association rates and slower dissociation rates as compared to the ST condition. However, NT conditions exhibited even faster association rates compared to LT. The dissociation rates under LT and NT conditions were very similar. This work provides experimental evidence of the fly-casting mechanism of association between a surface tethered ligand and its receptor. Furthermore, it looks at the entropic force modulating the dissociation rate constants of these interactions, in a quantifiable way. This approach allowed us to set up a model to predict the effects of surface tethering and then test these using more sets of interactions.

Finally, the exploration of the interaction of RbBP5 with WDR5 showed that WBM interactions are also amenable to study using BLI. We provide kinetics of this interaction for WDR5\textsubscript{FL} as well as WDR5\textsubscript{AN}, using a peptide containing the RbBP5 WBM sequence. Moreover, we establish that the N-terminus IDR of WDR5 can insert into the Win site cavity. This detailed work shows conclusively that this IDR can impact BLI measurements of WBM site kinetics. Also, it confirms the self-
association behavior of WDR5. This result is also potentially crucial in explaining how WDR5 is able to have a wide range of interacting partners while maintaining specificity.

Future work on in this regard can focus on other yet to be kinetically explored binding partners of WDR5. In this direction, we have already obtained preliminary data for the MYC-WDR5 interaction as shown in figure 1.

![BLI sensorgram of the MYC-WDR5 interaction.](image)

**Figure 1: BLI sensorgram of the MYC-WDR5 interaction.** This figure shows BLI sensorgrams obtained for the interaction of MYC with WDR5ΔN. Biotinylated MYC peptide, containing the WBM motif, was immobilized as ligand on to Streptavidin sensors. The sensors were dipped into well containing different concentrations of WDR5ΔN as analyte. Here, the sensorgrams corresponding to the 5 different concentrations are shown.

Furthermore, now that we understand of the kinetics of the interactions mediated by the Win site using SET1 representative peptides, we can investigate these kinetics with larger fragment of the SET1 proteins. For this purpose, we can use the
truncated proteins of SET1 family members i.e., MLL1^{3745-3969}, MLL2^{5319-5537}, MLL3^{4689-4911}, MLL4^{2490-2715}, SETd1A^{1474-1708}, and SETd1B^{1727-1966}. These SET1 fragments include the Win motif, required for binding to WDR5, as well as the SET domain, responsible for catalyzing histone methylation. Studying these larger fragments would bring us one step closer in mimicking in vivo conditions for our in vitro experiments. Also, we can use these proteins along with the members of the SET1 family core complex to look at the stability of the complexes formed by the SET1 proteins. By immobilizing SET1 fragments onto biosensors and allowing them to interact with combinations of analytes we can study the preference for the formations of different sub-complexes as well as their stabilities.
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