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#### Abstract

The pathogenesis of nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) is multifactorial and multigenic. Despite the identification of several NPC-associated ribosomal proteins (RPs), the roles of these factors and their interacting partners in NPC tumourigenesis are poorly understood. To date, NPCassociated RP genes are either up or down-regulated in diseased/tumour situation compared to normal condition. The ribosomal protein eL27 (RPeL27) has been known to be over-expressed at both transcript and protein levels in NPC cell lines. This hypothesis was reinforced by our study herein. More importantly, using gene knockdown (RNA interference technique) followed by 2D gel electrophoresis (2D GE) and in silico analysis; we revealed 15 proteins that are likely to interact with RPeL27 during situation of NPC tumourigenesis. These include COTL1, MAGOHB, UBE2N, NDPKA, TMED10, PSMB6, CA2, PGAM1, RPeL14, RPeS8, TPI1, PSMA2, RPeL19, GSTP1, and TPM1. Their association with RPeL27 could attribute to gene expression alteration, cell migration disruption and invasion, promotion of cancer cell survival, immune evasion, and genomic instability. Our findings provide new theoretical insights into the mechanism and involvement of RPeL27 in NPC pathogenesis. This is pertinent in understanding the molecular pathogenesis mediated by ribosomal proteins in the malignancy of the nasopharyngeal tissues.


## INTRODUCTION

Ribosome is important for protein synthesis in every cell and ribosome biogenesis is well- monitored event in the control of cell growth. Eukaryotic ribosomes, also known as 80S ribosomes, are made up of small and large subunit of ribosomal proteins (RPs). The dysregulation of RPs is often detected in cancer cells. In addition, oncogenes are known to enhance ribosome biogenesis in order to stimulate cancer cell growth [1]. To date, several RPs (RPeL27, RPeL43, RPeL41, RPuS8, RPuS4, RPeS31 and RPuL14) have been found to be differentially expressed in nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) cells lines relative to non- malignant or normal counterparts [2,3]. RPeL27, RPeL43, and RPeL41 were found to be significantly upregulated while RPuS8, RPuS4, RPeS31 and RPuL14 were downregulated significantly in NPC. These findings have suggested some pivotal roles of RPs in NPC pathogenesis. However, despite a demonstration of NPC association on the basis of differential expression, very little to nothing is known with respect to the interactions between RPs and their molecular targets during NPC tumorigenesis. In the case of RPeL27, its markedly overexpression in NPC cells [2] was also detected in
hepatocellular carcinoma, liver cancer and, gastric tubular adenoma and carcinoma [4,5,6]. To date, the biological significance of its upregulation in NPC is largely unclear. Herein, we aimed to identify and characterize the proteins that may associate with RPeL27 in the context NPC tumorigenesis. To achieve this, we first verified the overexpression of RPeL27 at transcript and protein levels in 6 NPC cell lines. Subsequently, we knocked down its expression in a representative cell line model to identified possible interacting factors. In silico approach was then carried out to assess logical protein-protein interaction between RPeL27 and its putative partners.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

## Cell lines and Culture

Six NPC cell lines (HONE-1, SUNE-1, HK1, TW01, TW04 and C666-1) were used in this study. The non-malignant nasopharyngeal epithelial cell line (NP69) was used as a control. All these originated from the University of Hong Kong, with permission for use granted by Professor George S. W. Tsao. The NPC cell lines were cultured in RPMI-1640 (Gibco, Life Technologies, USA) with $10 \%$ ( $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{v}$ ) fetal bovine serum, 2 mM L-
glutamine, and $100 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{mL}$ penicillin-streptomycin (Gibco, USA). NP69 was cultured in defined keratinocyte serum free medium (Invitrogen, USA) containing $0.2 \mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}$ growth factors, $5 \%$ heatactivated FBS with $100 \mathrm{U} / \mathrm{mL}$ penicillin-streptomycin. All cell lines were cultured in a humidified incubator $\left(37^{\circ} \mathrm{C}, 5 \% \mathrm{CO}_{2}\right)$ and harvested at $80 \%$ growth confluence.

## Total RNA Extraction and cDNA Synthesis

Total RNA extraction was carried out using Trizol method (Invitrogen, USA). Extracted RNA was treated with RQ1 RNaseFree DNase (Promega, USA). First strand cDNA synthesis was by Moloney Murine Leukimia Virus (MML-V) reverse transcriptase (Promega, USA), and done according to manufacturer's protocol.

## Quantitative Polymerase Chain Reaction (qPCR)

For qPCR analysis, $1 \mu \mathrm{l}$ ( 80 ng ) of the first strand cDNA template was added to a final volume of $12.5 \mu \mathrm{l}$ with 1X QuantiNova SYBR Green PCR Master Mix (Qiagen, USA) and $0.56 \mu \mathrm{M}$ of forward and reverse primers each. The glyceraldehyde-3phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) (NM_002046.5) (forward: 5'- CTGGGCTACACTGAGCACC-3'; reverse: 5'AAGTGGTCG TTGAGGGCAATG-3') served as a reference gene for normalization of the target gene cDNA input. Amplification was carried out and analyzed using the RotorGene ${ }^{\text {TM }} 6000$ Rotary Analyzer (Qiagen, USA), and the RotorGene ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}} 6000$ software Version 2.3.3 (Qiagen, USA). The preformation of quantitative gene amplification was with initial denaturation at $95{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 2 min followed by 40 cycles of denaturation at $95^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 5 sec , annealing at $60^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 sec , and extension at $72^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 10 sec . Triplicate analysis was implemented. The PCR efficiency and primers compatibility of each gene of interest and reference gene (GAPDH) were validated using standard curve method [10]. Melting curve analysis with the temperature range of 55 to $99^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for each run was done to ascertain specificity of PCR amplification. The validation of primer efficiency was determined from the slope of calibration curve as follows:

$$
\text { Amplification efficiency }=\left[10^{-1 / \text { slope }}\right]-1
$$

Amplification efficiency of target and reference gene are both at $1.00(100 \%)$. The Correlation Coefficient $\left(\mathrm{R}^{2}\right)$ value for each gene (determined from the calibration curve) is more than $0.90(90 \%)$, and the $m$ values are within the range of -3.6 and -3.1. A standard curve was then plotted and the absolute value of the slope (m) of the curve is less than 0.1 thus validated the primers' compatibility and PCR efficiency.

## Western Blot

Total protein extraction was done using lysis buffer [radioimmunoprecipitation assay (RIPA) buffer with 1 mM phenolymethanesulfonylfluoride (PMSF) protease inhibitor (Roche Applied Science, Switzerland)]. $20 \mu \mathrm{~g}$ of each sample in 2X Laemmli sample buffer (Bio-rad, Germany) was loaded into wells of Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate (SDS) polyacrylamide gel along with the PageRuler ${ }^{\mathrm{TM}}$ Prestained protein ladder (ThermoScientific, USA). The primary antibodies used were rabbit primary antibody against RPeL27 (Abcam, UK) and beta ( $\beta$ )-actin (ACTB) (Abcam, UK), while the secondary antibody was donkey anti-rabbit Horse- Radish Peroxide (HRP) conjugated secondary antibody (Santa Cruz Biotechnology, USA). ACTB served as a loading control. Image documentation was via

ImageQuant TL instrument (GE Healthcare, UK) and ImageQuant TL software. The band intensities were evaluated using ImageJ software (National Institutes of Health, NIH). Triplicate analysis was performed.

## RNA interference (RNAi)

The NPC cell line, HK1 was transiently transfected with 10 nM of Dicer-substrate RNA, DsiRNA \#1 (5'-CGCCAAGAGAUCAAAGAUAAAAUCT-3') using lipofectamine ${ }^{\text {TM }} 2000$ (Invitrogen, USA). Hypoxanthine guanine phosphoribosyltransferase 1 (HPRT1)
( ${ }^{\prime}$ 'GCCAGACUUUGUUGGAUUUGAAAT T-3') served as a positive control for transfection efficiency. In addition, negative control (5'-CGUUAAUCGCGUAUAAUACGC GUAT-3'), mock-transfected, TYE 63 fluorescence transfection control and untreated HK1 were included to ascertain knockdown efficiency. The cells were extracted after 48 hours to assay the gene knockdown efficiency using reverse transcriptase PCR (RT-PCR) and western- blot analysis. 2D gel electrophoresis was employed for the protein expression analysis. Protein identification was by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) method.

## Gene ontology (GO) term enrichment analysis

The bioinformatics enrichment web tool known as Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID, http://david.abcc.nciferf.gov/) was used in order to understand protein functional annotation analysis [7] with the cut-off criterion at $\mathrm{p}<0.05$.

## Protein-protein interaction (PPI) Prediction

The 3-dimensional (3D) model of RPeL27 was built based on homology modelling strategy by using the SWISS-MODEL workplace [ $8,9,10$ ]. RPeL27 was comparatively modelled with template structures using the result from target- template alignment and evaluated using Qualitative Model Energy Analysis (QMEAN) [11] and PROCHECK tools [12] to access model quality and structural assessment respectively. Computational docking of the comparative 3D-model of RPeL27 with its partners was performed via the ClusPro 2.0 application [13]. Docked complexes were evaluated based on cluster and energy score, and examined using SWISS_Pdb Viewer v4.1 [14]. The root mean square deviation (RMSD) was computed to predict the potential interaction sites based on interface contact residues ( $<5 \AA$ ).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The gene and protein expression data show significant overexpression of RPeL27 in NPC cell lines compared to NPE cell line (Figure 1). This confirms its upregulation in NPC cell lines [2], and extends the validity of the expression trend in two other cell lines, TW04 and C666-1. More importantly, we have demonstrated its overexpression (transcript and protein) in a Type IIb , undifferentiated non-keratinized NPC cell line that is EpsteinBarr virus (EBV) positive, C666-1. The upregulated of RPeL27 in C666-1 has never been reported before this. EBV-positive Type IIb NPC is the predominant type of NPC. Our findings imply a pivotal role of RPeL27 in NPC pathogenesis.

Results of RPeL27 knockdown show reduced RPeL27 expression in HK1 cell line compared to the control, with DsiRNA \#1 having the best outcome (Figure 2D). The RPeL27 transcript was decreased to $28 \%$ ( $p<0.0001$ ) by DsiRNA \#1 while the band intensities for negative control, mock-transfected control
and untransfected control remained unaffected (Figure 2A). Positive control represented by HPRTI expression was suppressed to $19 \%$ ( $\mathrm{p}<0.01$ ) under the transfection of 10 nM of HPRT-S1 positive control duplex (Figure 2B).


Figure 1. RPeL27 overexpression in NPC cell lines at both transcript and protein level. a: RelativeRPeL27 transcript expression in NPC cell lines compared to NPE. b: Cumulative fold change of RPeL27 transcript expression in NPC cell lines versus NPE. c: Relative RPeL27 protein expression in NPC cell lines compared to NPE. d: Cumulative fold change of RPeL27 protein expression in NPC cell lines versus NPE. e: The protein levels of RPeL27 in NPC cell lines determined by western blot. (* $p<0.05$, $*^{*} p<0.01,{ }^{* * * p} p<0.001,{ }^{* * * * p<0.0001)}$

The reduction of more than $80 \%$ in the control test tallied with more than $80 \%$ of cells being transfected (Figure 2C), thus validating our knockdown analysis. From the 2D gel electrophoresis assay, comparative analysis of HK1 cells treated with DsiRNA\#1 and untreated cells revealed 10 spots with observable differential protein expressions (Figure 3). Spots 1 to 9 show reduced intensity, while Spot 10 has higher intensity in the test compared to control. Protein identification of these spots via LCMS reveals 15 different proteins (Table 1). Spots 4, 6, and 8 consist of two types of protein each, and Spot 7 has three types. All other spots comprise a single type of protein. Differential expressions of these proteins in association to deregulated (suppressed) expression of RPeL27 in the context of an NPC cell model are reported for the first time here. The expression of NDPKA (Spot 4), CA2 (Spot 6) and GSTP1 (Spot 9) have been previously reported in NPC, and found to be upregulated in NPC tissues compared to normal nasopharyngeal epithelial tissues [15, 16, 17].


Figure 2. Verification of RPeL27-knockdown in HK1 cells after DsiRNA transfection. a, b: Knockdown efficacy assessed via RPeL27 and HPRT1 transcript level in HK1 by RT-PCR. c: Transfection efficiency visualized 24 hours post-transfection of 10 nm transfection control under fluorescence microscopy. d: The protein levels of RPeL27 in RNAi experiment with different treatments determined by western blot analysis. The RPeL27 protein level in RPeL27-knockdown HK1 measured by western blot
 MT: mock-transfected; UT: untreated; PC: positive control)


Figure 3. 2D gel images to access the proteins affected by RPeL27knockdown in HK1. A) protein expressions in untreated HK1. B) protein expressions in RPeL27- knockdown HK1. Spot 1 to 10 were circled and labelled accordingly in both images.

Results of GO-terms enrichment analysis on biological processes related to the protein-protein interactions among these proteins reveals 23 biological processes involved in cell growth and proliferation (Table 2).

Table 2. GO-term enrichment analysis (biological process only) of proteins identified by LCMS on 2D gels

| Term | Proteins | p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GO:0000184~nuclear-transcribed mRNA catabolic process, nonsensemediated decay | MAGOHB, RPL14, RPeL19, RPeL27 \& RPeS8 | 5.3E-6 |
| GO:0006614~SRP-dependent cotranslational protein targeting to membrane | RPeL14, RPeL19, RPeL27 \& RPeS8 | 1.1E-4 |
| GO:0019083~viral transcription | RPeL14, RPeL19, RPeL27, RPeS8 | 1.8E-4 |
| GO:0006413~translational initiation | RPeL14, RPeL 19, RPeL27 \& RPeS8 | 3.3E-4 |
| GO:0006364~RNA processing | RPeL14, RPeL19, RPeL27 \& RPS8 | $1.2 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| GO:0006412~translation | RPeL14, RPeL19, RPeL27 \& RPS8 | $2.0 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| GO:0002223~stimulatory C-type lectin receptor signaling pathway | PSMA2, PSMB6 \& UBE2N | $5.0 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| GO:1904706~negative regulation of vascular smooth muscle cell proliferation | GSTP1 \& TPM1 | 8.1E-3 |
| GO:0050852~T cell receptor signaling pathway | PSMA2, PSMB6 \& UBE2N | $9.6 \mathrm{E}-3$ |
| GO:0038095~Fc-epsilon receptor signaling pathway | PSMA2, PSMB6 \& UBE2N | $1.4 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0061621~canonical glycolysis | PGAM1 \& TPI1 | $2.6 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0006096~glycolytic process | PGAM1 \& TPI1 | $3.4 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0006094~gluconeogenesis | PGAM1 \& TPI1 | 4.4E-2 |
| GO:0051603~proteolysis involved in cellular protein catabolic process | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | $4.8 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0006521~regulation of cellular amino acid metabolic process | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | $5.0 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0002479~antigen processing and presentation of exogenous peptide antigen via MHC class I, TAPdependent | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | 6.2E-2 |
| GO:0038061~NIK/NF-kappaB signaling | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | 6.5E-2 |
| GO:0051436~negative regulation of ubiquitin- protein ligase activity involved in mitotic cell cycle | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | 7.0E-2 |
| GO:0051437~positive regulation of ubiquitin- protein ligase activity involved in regulation of mitotic cell cycle transition complex-dependent catabolic process | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | 7.4E-2 |
| GO:0031145~anaphase-promoting complex- dependent catabolic process | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | 7.7E-2 |
| GO:0001822~kidney development | CA2 \& TMED10 | 8.4E-2 |
| GO:0060071~Wnt signaling pathway, planar cell polarity pathway | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | $8.9 \mathrm{E}-2$ |
| GO:0043488~regulation of mRNA stability | PSMA2 \& PSMB6 | $9.9 \mathrm{E}-2$ |

Pathways commonly associated with oncogenesis, such as the NFkappaB, and Wnt signalling are evident. In explore possible interaction between RPeL27 with each of the 15 proteins, computational molecular docking analysis was performed. 3D models of all proteins were first constructed (Figure 4). Quality scrutiny of the models via QMEAN6 Score (Table 3) and PROCHECK (Table 4) assessment confirmed amenability for docking simulation. Only the top dock models (Figure 5) with plausible docking scenario (interface contact residues within $5 \AA$ ), were interpreted for protein-protein interaction (Tables 5-6) with specific functional interaction sites for each dock complex detailed (Table 7). On the basis of the expected biological processes (Table 2), and the docking results (Tables 5-7, Figure 5), an extrapolated pathway of NPC pathogenesis mediated by

RPeL27 can be explained (Figure 6). Basically, during NPC tumourigenesis, the dysregulated expression RPeL27 could associate directly with at least 15 other proteins (COTL1, MAGOHB, UBE2N, NDPKA, TMED10, PSMB6, CA2, PGAM1, RPeL14, RPeS8, TPI1, PSMA2, RPeL19, GSTP1, and TPM1) to alter gene expression, disrupt cell migration and invasion, promote cancer cell survival, enable immune evasion, and contribute to genomic instability.

Table 1. Protein identification by LCMS of the spots showing differential intensity in the 2D gel images

| Spot | Protein | NCBI Accession | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { MW } \\ & \text { (Da) } \end{aligned}$ | Ion score /p-value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Coactosin-like protein (COTL-1) | NP_066972.1 | 15935 | $346 /<0.05$ |
| 2 | Protein mago nashi homolog 2 (MAGOHB) | NP_060518.1 | 17265 | 75/<0.05 |
| 3 | Ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme E2N (UBE2N) | NP_003339.1 | 17127 | 135/<0.05 |
| 4 | Nucleoside disphosphate kinase A (NDPKA) | NP_937818.1 | 17138 | 99/<0.05 |
|  | Transmembrane emp24 domaincontaining protein 10 (TMED10) | NP_006818.3 | 24960 | 68/<0.05 |
| 5 | Proteasome subunit beta type-6 (PSMB6) | NP_002789.1 | 25299 | $119 /<0.05$ |
| 6 | Phophoglycerate mutase (PGAM1) | NP_002620.1 | 28817 | 186/<0.05 |
|  | Carbonic anhydrase (CA2) | NP_000058.1 | 29228 | $43 /<0.05$ |
| 7 | Triosephosphate isomerase (TPI1) | NP_000356.1 | 22857 | 149/<0.05 |
|  | 40S ribosomal protein S8 (RPeS8) | NP_001003.1 | 21866 | 140/<0.05 |
|  | 60S ribosomal protein L 14 (RPeS14) | NP_003964.3 | 13772 | 53/<0.05 |
| 8 | Proteasome subunit alpha type-2 (PSMA2) | NP_002778.1 | 25882 | 173/<0.05 |
|  | 60S ribosomal protein L19 (RPeL19) | NP_000972.1 | 23233 | 61/<0.05 |
| 9 | Gluthione S-transferase P (GSTP1) | NP_000843.1 | 23341 | 116/<0.05 |
| 10 | Tropomysin alpha-1 chain (TPM1) | NP_001018008.1 | 32689 | 283/<0.05 |

Table 3. Raw scores of the 6 structural terms of each protein 3D-model with their respective QMEAN6 score

| Model | C_beta <br> interaction <br> energy | All-atom <br> pairwise <br> energy | Solv. <br> energy | Torsion <br> angle <br> energy | Secondary <br> structure <br> agreement | Solvent <br> accessibility <br> agreement | QMEAN6 <br> score |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RPeL27 | 0.00 | -0.001 | -0.71 | -0.14 | 0.62 | 0.67 | 0.69 |
| COTL1 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.78 | -0.15 | 0.63 | 0.59 | 0.71 |
| MAGOHB | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.80 | -0.82 | 0.69 | 0.61 | 0.72 |
| UBE2N | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.80 | -0.38 | 0.81 | 0.59 | 0.81 |
| NDPKA | -0.02 | -0.03 | -0.74 | -0.22 | 0.63 | 0.63 | 0.75 |
| TMED10 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.66 | -0.39 | 0.88 | 0.57 | 0.79 |
| PSMB6 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.70 | -0.19 | 0.74 | 0.58 | 0.73 |
| CA2 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.61 | -0.30 | 0.61 | 0.88 | 0.80 |
| PGAM1 | -0.02 | -0.02 | -0.76 | -0.26 | 0.62 | 0.61 | 0.75 |
| RPL14 | -0.00 | -0.02 | -0.82 | -0.15 | 0.67 | 0.58 | 0.70 |
| RPS8 | 0.00 | -0.01 | -0.73 | 0.00 | 0.49 | 0.67 | 0.63 |
| TPI1 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.69 | -0.25 | 0.71 | 0.62 | 0.74 |
| PSMA2 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.69 | -0.04 | 0.69 | 0.61 | 0.69 |
| RPL19 | -0.02 | -0.04 | -0.90 | -0.15 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 0.75 |
| GSTP1 | -0.01 | -0.02 | -0.82 | -0.33 | 0.50 | 0.86 | 0.80 |
| TPM1 | -0.04 | -0.08 | -1.21 | -0.19 | 0.95 | 0.70 | 0.88 |

Table 4. PROCHECK statistical data checks stereochemical quality for each protein generated form SWISS-MODEL

| Model | Core <br> region <br> $(\%)$ | Allowed <br> region <br> $(\%)$ | Generously <br> allowed <br> region $(\%)$ | Disallowed <br> region $(\%)$ | Bad <br> contacts | G- <br> factor | Planar <br> region <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RPeL27 | 95.0 | 3.3 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.23 | 83.0 |
| COTL1 | 94.1 | 5.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0 | -0.10 | 94.1 |
| MAGOHB | 92.2 | 6.2 | 1.6 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.20 | 88.9 |
| UBE2N | 90.7 | 9.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.11 | 94.5 |
| NDPKA | 93.7 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0 | -0.12 | 87.7 |
| TMED10 | 92.9 | 5.9 | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0 | -0.11 | 91.4 |
| PSMB6 | 91.1 | 8.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.13 | 83.1 |
| CA2 | 89.8 | 9.6 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1 | -0.13 | 92.9 |
| PGAM1 | 89.5 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.14 | 90.7 |
| RPL14 | 96.1 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.14 | 86.5 |
| RPS8 | 87.9 | 8.8 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 0 | -0.09 | 88.6 |
| TPI1 | 92.9 | 7.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.11 | 88.3 |
| PSMA2 | 88.9 | 8.4 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 0 | -0.35 | 78.2 |
| RPL19 | 89.9 | 7.7 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0 | -0.26 | 91.4 |
| GSTP1 | 95.5 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.00 | 89.3 |
| TPM1 | 99.6 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | -0.10 | 97.5 |

Table 5. ClusPro scores of RPeL27 dock models

| Dock Model | ClusPro scores |  |  | RMSD (A) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cluster size | Center free <br> energy <br> (kcal/mol) | Lowest free <br> energy <br> (kcal/mol) |  |
| RPeL27_COTL1 | 107 | -497.4 | -551.8 | 0.91 |
| RPeL27_MAGOHB | 140 | -681.6 | -767.5 | 0.85 |
| RPeL27_UBE2N | 154 | -644.1 | -810.6 | 0.89 |
| RPeL27_NDPKA | 99 | -813.1 | -919.2 | 0.88 |
| RPeL27_TMED10 | 269 | -650.0 | -778.0 | 0.91 |
| RPeL27_PSMB6 | 126 | -771.6 | -852.5 | 0.95 |
| RPeL27_CA2 | 148 | -661.3 | -699.4 | 0.90 |
| RPeL27_PGAM1 | 212 | -742.9 | -891.2 | 0.92 |
| RPeL27_RPL14 | 141 | -629.3 | -658.1 | 0.86 |
| RPeL27_RPS8 | 175 | -523.8 | -629.5 | 0.84 |
| RPeL27_TPI1 | 123 | -568.8 | -711.6 | 0.89 |
| RPeL27_PSMA2 | 171 | -734.8 | -869.4 | 0.91 |
| RPeL27_RPL19 | 130 | -522.5 | -604.7 | 0.87 |
| RPeL27_GSTP1 | 108 | -632.2 | -801.9 | 0.88 |
| RPeL27_TPM1 | 160 | -738.6 | -832.0 | 0.93 |

Whether these events are causes or consequences of malignancy remains to be further investigated. Therefore, functional studies of these 15 proteins in association with RPeL27 under the context of NPC oncogenesis are required to resolve these queries. Nevertheless, our findings are the first to provide both empirical and logical data on involvement and explanation of RPeL27 gene in molecular pathogenesis nasopharyngeal cancer.

Table 6. Potential interaction sites based on interface contact residues

| Protein | Interface contact residues (<5̊) |
| :---: | :---: |
| RPeL27 COTL1 | Gly2, Phe4, Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Gly16, Ser19, Gly20, Asn78, His79, Leu80, Met81, Pro82, Thr83, Arg84, Tyr85, Trp129, Leu134, Arg135, Phe 136 <br> Glu8, Ala9, Arg11, Ala12, Ala13, Asn15, Leu16, Asp19, Asp20, Gly21, Ser22, Ala23, Val24, <br> Trp26, Pro38, Gly39, Glu40, Gln41, Gly42, Ala43, Glu44, His47, |
| RPeL27 <br> MAGOHB | Leu14, Ala15, Gly16, Arg17, Tyr18, Ser19, Gly20, Arg21, Asp47, Arg48, Arg51, Met57, Lys61, Arg65, Lys69, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phel36 <br> Ala4, Ser5, Glu70, Ile71, Thr72, Lys73, Glu74, Asp75, Asp76, Ala77, Leu88, Trp79, Asp96, Glu97, His98, Ile99, Phe101, Ser115, Lys116, Asp117, Pro118, Glu119, Gly120, Arg122 |
| RPeL27 UBE2N | Gly2, Phe4, Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Ser19, Gly20, Tyr77, Asn78, His79, Leu80, Met81, <br> Pro82, Arg84, Tyr85, Trp129, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phe136 <br> Arg14, Pro19, Val20, Pro21, Gly22, Ala40, Gly41, Pro42, Gln43, Asp44, Ser45, Asp89, Ser96, Ala98, Leu99, Gln100, Arg102, Thr103, Val104, Leu106, Ser107, Gln109, Ala110, Leu112, <br> Ser113, Ala114, Asn116, Asp118, Asp119, Pro120 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { PPeL27 } \\ & \text { NDPKA } \end{aligned}$ | Gly2, Phe4, Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Ser19, Gly20, Tyr38, Asn78, His79, Met81, Pro82, Thr83, Arg84, Tyr85, Trp129, Leu134, Arg135, Phe136 <br> Va146, Ile50, Lys51, Glu54, Phe58, Arg59, Leu60, Val61, Gly62, Leu63, Lys64, Phe65, Val99, Trp103, Glu162, Glu163, Val165, Asp166, Tyr167, Thr 168, Ser169, Cys170, Ala171, Trp174 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { RPeL27 } \\ & \text { TMED10 } \end{aligned}$ | Gly16, Arg17, Tyr18, Ser19, Gly20, Arg21, Asp47, Arg48, Tyr49, Pro50, Arg51, Lys52, Arg65, Lys69, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phe136 <br> His49, Lys50, Asp51, Lys57, Asp78, Ser79, Ala80, Gly81, His82, Ile83, Leu84, Thr98, Thr99, Glu100, Asp101, Tyr102, Asp103, Met104, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { RPeL27 } \\ & \text { PSMB6 } \end{aligned}$ | Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Gly16, Ser19, Gly20, Arg21, Lys22, Asn78, His79, Met81, Thr83, Arg84, Tyr85, Trp129, Gln132, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phe 136 <br> Pro70, Ile71, His72, Asp73, Arg74, Phe76, Thr94, Tyr95, Gln96, Gly98, Phe99, Ser101, Ile102, Glu103, Asn105, Glu106, Pro107, Tro137, Pro139, Glu215, Ser216, Gly217, Val218, Arg220 |
| $\mathrm{RI}$ | Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Gly16, Arg17, Tyr18, Ser19, Gly20, Arg21, Lys22, Asp47, Arg48, Arg51, Lys69, Met81, Trp129, Gln132, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phe136 Met1, Ser2, His3, His4, Trp5, Gly6, Tyr7, Gly8, Lys9, His10, Asn11, Gly63, His64, Lys169, Phe230, Asn231, Glu233, Gly234, Glu235, Pro236, Glu237, Glu238, Leu239, Met240, Val241, Asp242, Asn243, Phe259 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { RPeL27 }} \\ & \text { PGAM1 } \end{aligned}$ | Gly2, Phe4, Leu12, Leu14, Tyr77, Asn78, His79, Leu80, Met81, Pro82, Thr83, Arg84, Tyr85, Trp129, leu134, Arg135, Phe136 <br> His35, Lys61, Ile64, Arg65, Leu65, Trp68, Leu71, Asp72, Ala73, Asp75, Met77, Trp78, Leu79, Pro80, Val81, Val82, Arg83 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { RPeL27 } \\ & \text { RPS8 } \end{aligned}$ | Gly2, Lys3, Phe4, Met5, Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Ser19, Gly20, Asp30, Asp31, Pro37, Tyr38, Ser39, Asn76, Tyr77, Asn78, His79, Leu80, Met81, Pro82, Thr83, leu134, Arg135, Phe 136 <br> Asn7, Trp8, Lys10, Arg11, Arg12, Lys13, Thr14, Lys17, Arg18, Lys19, Pro20, Tyr21, His22, <br> Lys23, Arg25, Tyr27, Glu28, Arg49 |
| RPeL27 | Gly2, Phe4, Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Gly20, Asn78, His79, Met81, Pro82, leu134, Arg135, Phe 136 |
| TPI1 | ```Met15, Thr46, Ala47, Ala74, Phe75, Thr76, Glu78, Ser97, Glu98, Arg99, His101, Val102, Phe103, Gly104, Glu105, Lys131, Leu132, Asp133, Val168, Ile171, Gly172``` |
| $\begin{aligned} & \overline{\text { RPeL27 }} \\ & \text { PSMA2 } \end{aligned}$ | Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Ala15, Gly16, Ser19, Gly20, Arg51, His79, <br> Met81, Arg84, Tyr85, Lys128, <br> Trp129, Gln132, Lys133, Leu134, Arg135, Phe136 |


|  | Lys176, Arg177, Leu182, Glu185, Asp186, Ile188, His189, Thr190, Ile192, Leu193, Lys196, Glu197, Gly201, Gln202, Met203, Glu205, Asp206, Ile108, Val210, Leu221, Pro223, Thr224, Glu225, Val226 |
| :---: | :---: |
| RPeL27 | Leu12, Val13, Leu14, Gly20, Lys22, Tyr77, Asn78, His79, Leu80, Met81, Pro82, Thr83, Arg84, <br> Trp129, leu134, Arg 135, Phe 136 |
| RPL19 | Arg103, Arg107, Arg110, Glu111, Lys113, Arg117, His118, Tyr120, <br> His121, Ser122, Tyr124, <br> Leu125, Lys 128 |
| RPeL27 | Gly2, Phe4, Lys6, Lys9, Leu14, Asp30, Ser39, Asn76, Tyr77, Asn78, Leu80, Met81, Pro82, |
| GSTP1 | Thr83, Arg84, lys133, leu134, Arg135, Phe 136 |
|  | Leu49, Tyr50, Asp58, Gly59, Asp60, Leu61, Thr62, Leu63, Tyr64, Gln65, Thr68, Arg71, His72, Arg75, Tyr80, Gly81, Lys82, Asp83, Gln84, Ala87, Ala88, Asp91, Asp95 |
| RPeL27 | Leu14, Ala15, Gly16, Arg17, Tyr18, Ser19, Gly20, Arg21, Asp47, Arg48, Tyr49, Arg51, Met57, |
| TPM1 | Lys61, Lys64, Arg65, lys133, leu134, Arg135, Phel36 |
|  | Tyr162, Glu163, Val165, Ala166, Arg167, Leu169, Val170, Ile171, Glu173, Ser174, Leu176, <br> Glu177, Glu180, Glu181, Glu184, Leu185, Glu187, Gly188 |



Figure 4. Ribbon (secondary structure) representation of 3-dimensional (3D) model for each protein. These models were rendered by SWISS-Pdb viewer v4.1. Each model is coloured from the N-terminal (blue) to the Cterminal (red). a: RPeL27, b: COTL1, c: MAGOHB, d: UBE2N, e: NDPKA, f: TMED10, $\mathbf{g}:$ PSMB6, $\mathbf{h}:$ CA2, $\mathbf{i}:$ PGAM1, $\mathbf{j}:$ RPeL14, $\mathbf{k}:$ RPeS8, l: TPI1, m: PSMA2, n: RPeL19, $\mathbf{o}$ : GSTP1, and p: TPM1


Figure 5. RPeL27-protein docked complex. Blue colored ribbon indicates the RPeL27 protein while the yellow colored ribbon indicates the respective protein. The wireframe illustrates the interface contact residues that are close to another chain $(<5 \AA)$, depicts the potential interaction site. A) RPeL27_COTL1 B) RPeL27_MAGOHB, C) RPeL27_UBE2N, D) RPeL27_NDPKA, E) RPeL27_TMED10, F) RPeL27_PSMB6, G) RPeL27_CA2, H) RPeL27_PGAM1, I) RPeL27_RPeL14, jJ)

RPeL27_RPeS8, K) RPeL27_TPI1, L) RPeL27_PSMA2, M) RPeL27_RPeL19 (overall view), N) RPeL27_RPeL19 (enlarged view), O) RPeL27_GSTP1, P) RPeL27_TPM1 (overall view), and Q) RPeL27_TPM1 (enlarged view)


Figure 6. RPeL27 in NPC pathogenesis

Table 7. Pfam search assay of each protein target sequence to determine their protein families and domains classification

| Protein | Description | Accession | Residues position | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Domain E- } \\ \text { value } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RPeL27 | Ribosomal L27e protein family | PF01777.18 | 52-136 | 4.2e-39 |
|  | Kow motif | PF00467.29 | 7-40 | $9.7 \mathrm{e}-0.6$ |
| COTL1 | Cofilin/tropoysin-type actin-binding protein | PF00241.20 | 10-128 | $7.2 \mathrm{e}-20$ |
| MAGOHB | Magi nashi protein | PF02792.14 | 7-148 | $2.5 \mathrm{e}-78$ |
| UBE2N | Ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme | PF00179.26 | 7-144 | 8.2e-48 |
| NDPKA | Nucleoside diphosphate kinase | PF00334.19 | 30-164 | 3.4e-55 |
| TMED10 | Emp24/gp25L/p24 family/GOLD | PF01105.24 | 31-213 | $1.4 \mathrm{e}-47$ |
| PSMB6 | Proteasome subunit | PF00227.26 | 31-213 | 1.1e-45 |
| CA2 | Eukaryotic-type carbonic anhydrase | PF00194.21 | 4-258 | $7.2 \mathrm{e}-99$ |
| PGAM1 | Histidine phosphatase superfamily | PF00300.22 | 6-138 | $1.9 \mathrm{e}-31$ |
|  |  |  | 134-227 | $9.3 \mathrm{e}-06$ |
| RPL14 | Ribosomal protein L14 | PF01929.17 | 46-120 | 5.2e-30 |
| RPS8 | Ribosomal protein S8e | PF01201.22 | 1-190 | $1.7 \mathrm{e}-57$ |
| TPI1 | Triosephosphate isomerase | PF00121.18 | 7-245 | $1.8 \mathrm{e}-86$ |
|  | Proteasome subunit | PF00227.26 | 29-213 | $3.1 \mathrm{e}-60$ |
| PSMA2 | Proteasone subunit A N-terminal signature | PF10584.9 | 6-28 | 4.9e-10 |
| RPL19 | Ribosomal protein L19e | PF01280.20 | 3-146 | $1.0 \mathrm{e}-65$ |
|  | Glutathione S-transferase, Cterminal domain | PF14497.6 | 98-197 | $1.6 \mathrm{e}-15$ |
| GSTP1 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Glutathione S-transferase, Nterminal domain | PF02798.20 | 4-75 | 3.0e-06 |
| TPM1 | Tropomysin | PF00261.20 | 48-284 | 2.3e-97 |
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