# **Using Data Science for Mechanistic Insights and Selectivity Predictions in a Non-Natural Biocatalytic Reaction**

Hanna D. Clements<sup>1</sup>, Autumn R. Flynn<sup>1</sup>, Bryce T. Nicholls<sup>2</sup>, Daria Grosheva<sup>2</sup>, Sarah J. Lefave<sup>1</sup>, Morgan T. Merriman<sup>1</sup>, Todd K. Hyster<sup>2\*</sup> and Matthew S. Sigman<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Chemistry, University of Utah, 315 South 1400 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112, United States <sup>2</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Cornell University, 122 Baker Laboratory, Ithaca, New York 14853

# **Supplementary Information Table of Contents**

#### **1. General Information**



# **1. General Information**

**Reagents and Analytical.** Unless otherwise noted, all chemicals and reagents for chemical reactions were obtained from commercial suppliers and used as received (Sigma-Aldrich, Oakwood Chemical, Combi-Blocks, Chem-Impex, and Acros Chemicals). GDH-105 was purchased from Codexis as cell free lysate and used as received. Polymerases and restriction enzymes were purchased from New England BioLabs (NEB) and used as received. Silica gel chromatography purifications were carried out using AMD Silica Gel 60. <sup>1</sup>H- and <sup>13</sup>C- NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker UltraShield Plus (500 and 125 MHz, respectively) instrument, and are internally referenced to residual proton signals in CDCl<sub>3</sub> (7.26 ppm). Data for <sup>1</sup>H-NMR are reported as follows: chemical shift ( $\delta$  ppm), multiplicity ( $s =$  singlet, brs = broad singlet,  $d =$  doublet,  $t =$  triplet,  $q =$  quartet, m = multiplet,  $dd = doublet$  of doublet,  $dt = doublet$  of triplet,  $ddd = doublet$  of doublet of doublet), coupling constant (Hz), and integration. Data for <sup>13</sup>C NMR are reported in terms of chemical shift relative to CDCl<sub>3</sub> (77 ppm).

**Chromatography.** Analytical high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) was carried out using an Agilent 1260 Infinity LCMS System. Analytical chiral SFC was carried out using a JASCO SFC-4000 (SFC).

**Cloning.** pET22b(+) were used as cloning and expression vectors for all enzymes described in this study. Genes for the 'ene' reductase enzymes GluER were purchased as gBlocks from IDT and cloned using Gibson Cloning.<sup>1</sup> Cloning was carried out using BL21 *E. coli.* DH5- $\alpha$  cells for storage and *E. coli.* BL21 (DE3) for expression.

**Site Directed Mutagenesis.** Site directed mutagenesis primers were designed using the PCR protocol from Kille *et al.*<sup>2</sup> The PCR products were digested with DpnI, repaired using Gibson Mix<sup>™</sup>, and were directly transformed into *E. coli* strain BL21(DE3). The colonies were selected on agar plates containing ampicillin (100 µg/mL). Primers used for mutagenesis are listed along with gene sequences for each protein. Site directed mutagenesis was performed individually for all mutants in the library.

**Protein Expression and Purification.** The 'ene'-reductase GluER used in purified protein experiments were expressed in BL21(DE3) *E. coli* cultures transformed with plasmid encoding GluER variants. Transformed glycerol stocks were used to initiate 10 mL overnight cultures (37 ºC, 250 rpm). Expression cultures (500 mL of Turbo Broth with ampicillin (100 μg/ml final concentration) in a 2L flask) were inoculated with 1-2 ml of the overnight culture (37 ºC, 250 rpm). GluER variants were expressed using the addition of 4% (v/v) auto inducing mix (sterile filtered mixture of 1.25% glucose, 5% lactose and 15% glycerol). The pellets were kept at -80 °C for at least 24 hrs before thawing for purification. For purification, frozen cells were thawed in ice-cold water and resuspended in buffer A (for GluER: 50 mM TEOA 25 mM imidazole pH 7.0). Lysozyme (1 mg/mL), DNAse  $(0.1 \text{ mg/mL})$ , FMN  $(1 \text{ mg/mL})$ , and PMSF  $(1 \text{ mg/mL})$ , added as a 35 mg/mL solution in absolute ethanol) were added to the resuspended cells, followed by shaking at room temperature for 30 minutes. The resuspended cells were disrupted by sonication (2 x 4 min, output control 5, 35% duty cycle; Sonicator QSonica Q500 Ultra Sonicator). To pellet insoluble material, lysates were centrifuged at 14,000 x g for 1.5 h at 4 °C. Proteins were purified using a nickel NTA column (5 mL HisTrap HP, GE Healthcare, Piscataway, NJ) using an AKTAStart purifier FPLC system (GE healthcare). The protein was eluted with 100 % buffer B (50 mM triethanolamine (TEOA), 250 mM imidazole pH 7.0) over 5 column volumes. Fractions containing enzyme were pooled, concentrated, and subjected to three exchanges with no-imidazole Buffer C (50 mM triethanolamine (TEOA), pH=7.0, for all other ERED) to remove excess salt and imidazole. Concentrated (1.0-1.5 mM) proteins were aliquoted, flash-frozen in liquid N<sub>2</sub>, and stored at -80  $^{\circ}$ C until later use. Protein concentration was determined by A<sub>464</sub> with calculated extinction coefficients. (GluER:  $11.4 \times 10^{-3}$  M<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-1</sup> at 464 nm).

# **2. Dataset Design**

# **Sequence Information for GluER WT and GluER-T36A**

'Ene'-reductase from *Gluconobacter Oxydans* (GluER) (GenBank Accession Code: WP\_011252080.1)

#### **GluER WT**

*GluER WT DNA sequence* 

ATGCCGACCCTTTTCGACCCCATCGATTTCGGACCTATCCACGCCAAGAATCGTATCGTCATGTCC CCCCTGACTCGCGGTCGCGCTGACAAAGAGGCGGTTCCAACCCCCATTATGGCTGAATACTACGC CCAACGCGCTTCGGCGGGTTTAATTATCACTGAAGCGACGGGGATTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTT GGCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTGGTCCGATGCACAGGTTGAGGCGTGGAAACCTATCGTCGCGGGT GTCCATGCAAAGGGCGGCAAGATCGTATGTCAGCTTTGGCATATGGGCCGTATGGTACATTCTTCA GTTACAGGGACGCAGCCCGTAAGCAGTTCCGCCACTACTGCTCCAGGTGAGGTTCACACCTATGA GGGCAAGAAGCCCTTCGAACAAGCGCGTGCAATCGATGCTGCAGACATCTCCCGCATCCTTAACG ATTACGAAAATGCAGCACGTAATGCAATCCGCGCGGGTTTCGATGGAGTGCAGATCCACGCAGCC AATGGCTACCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCGTAACGGAACCAATCATCGCACCGATGAGTATGGGGG GGTGCCGGAGAACCGTATTCGTTTCTTGAAAGAGGTAACAGAACGCGTCATCGCGGCGATTGGCG CTGACCGTACGGGTGTGCGTCTGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACACAGGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCCC GAAACCGTTTTTGTTCCTGCCGCAAAGCTTTTGCAAGATTTAGGGGTAGCGTGGCTTGAGCTGCGT GAACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGTTTGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAAATTATCTCCACAAATCCGTAA GGTATTCCTTCGTCCATTGGTCTTAAATCAAGACTATACTTTTGAGGCGGCACAGACGGCCCTGGC TGAGGGCAAGGCGGACGCTATTGCGTTTGGCCGTAAGTTCATTTCAAATCCAGACTTGCCTGAGCG CTTTGCCCGTGGCATCGCACTGCAACCAGACGATATGAAAACATGGTACTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGG GTTACACAGACTATCCATCCGCAACTTCTGGGCCGAACTGA

#### *GluER WT amino acid sequence*

MPTLFDPIDFGPIHAKNRIVMSPLTRGRADKEAVPTPIMAEYYAQRASAGLIIT EATGISREGLGWPFAPGIWSDAQVEAWKPIVAGVHAKGGKIVCQLWHMGRMVHSSVT GTQPVSSSATTAPGEVHTYEGKKPFEQARAIDAADISRILNDYENAARNAIRAGFDGVQI HAANGYLIDEFLRNGTNHRTDEYGGVPENRIRFLKEVTERVIAAIGADRTGVRLSPNGD TQGCIDSAPETVFVPAAKLLQDLGVAWLELREPGPNGTFGKTDQPKLSPQIRKVFLRPL VLNQDYTFEAAQTALAEGKADAIAFGRKFISNPDLPERFARGIALQPDDMKTWYSQGP EGYTDYPSATSGPN

#### *GluER T36A DNA sequence*

ATGCCGACCCTTTTCGACCCCATCGATTTCGGACCTATCCACGCCAAGAATCGTATCGTCATGTCC CCCCTGACTCGCGGTCGCGCTGACAAAGAGGCGGTTCCAGCTCCCATTATGGCTGAATACTACGCC CAACGCGCTTCGGCGGGTTTAATTATCACTGAAGCGACGGGGATTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTTG GCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTGGTCCGATGCACAGGTTGAGGCGTGGAAACCTATCGTCGCGGGTG TCCATGCAAAGGGCGGCAAGATCGTATGTCAGCTTTGGCATATGGGCCGTATGGTACATTCTTCAG TTACAGGGACGCAGCCCGTAAGCAGTTCCGCCACTACTGCTCCAGGTGAGGTTCACACCTATGAG GGCAAGAAGCCCTTCGAACAAGCGCGTGCAATCGATGCTGCAGACATCTCCCGCATCCTTAACGA TTACGAAAATGCAGCACGTAATGCAATCCGCGCGGGTTTCGATGGAGTGCAGATCCACGCAGCCA ATGGCTACCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCGTAACGGAACCAATCATCGCACCGATGAGTATGGGGGG GTGCCGGAGAACCGTATTCGTTTCTTGAAAGAGGTAACAGAACGCGTCATCGCGGCGATTGGCGC TGACCGTACGGGTGTGCGTCTGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACACAGGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCCCG AAACCGTTTTTGTTCCTGCCGCAAAGCTTTTGCAAGATTTAGGGGTAGCGTGGCTTGAGCTGCGTG

AACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGTTTGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAAATTATCTCCACAAATCCGTAAG GTATTCCTTCGTCCATTGGTCTTAAATCAAGACTATACTTTTGAGGCGGCACAGACGGCCCTGGCT GAGGGCAAGGCGGACGCTATTGCGTTTGGCCGTAAGTTCATTTCAAATCCAGACTTGCCTGAGCGC TTTGCCCGTGGCATCGCACTGCAACCAGACGATATGAAAACATGGTACTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGGG TTACACAGACTATCCATCCGCAACTTCTGGGCCGAACAAT

#### *GluER T36A amino acid sequence*

MPTLFDPIDFGPIHAKNRIVMSPLTRGRADKEAVPAPIMAEYYAQRASAGLIITEATGISREGLGWPFAP GIWSDAQVEAWKPIVAGVHAKGGKIVCQLWHMGRMVHSSVTGTQPVSSSATTAPGEVHTYEGKKPF EQARAIDAADISRILNDYENAARNAIRAGFDGVQIHAANGYLIDEFLRNGTNHRTDEYGGVPENRIRFL KEVTERVIAAIGADRTGVRLSPNGDTQGCIDSAPETVFVPAAKLLQDLGVAWLELREPGPNGTFGKTD QPKLSPQIRKVFLRPLVLNQDYTFEAAQTALAEGKADAIAFGRKFISNPDLPERFARGIALQPDDMKTW YSQGPEGYTDYPSATSGPNN

# **Supplementary Figure S1. Site-Directed Mutagenesis Library**





**Figure S1**. Left: The crystal structure of the parent enzyme GluER-T36A (PDB ID: 6MYW), highlighting the residues chosen for targeted mutagenesis (W66, Y177, Q232, F269, and Y343) and the redox-active cofactor, FMN. Right: Mutants targeted.

# **Primers for Site-Directed Mutagenesis Library**

#### **GluER-W66**

W66A Forward primer: 5'- TTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTGCCCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTG -3' W66D Forward primer: 5'- TTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTGATCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTG 3' W66F Forward primer: 5'- TTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTTTTCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTG -3' W66L Forward primer: 5'- TTTCACGCGAAGGCTTAGGTCTGCCGTTTGCGCCGGGAATTTG -3' Reverse primer:

5'- ACCTAAGCCTTCGCGTGAAATCCCCGTCGCTTCAGTGATAA-3'

# **GluER-Y177**

Y177A Forward primer:

5'- AGATCCACGCAGCCAATGGCGCCCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCG 3' Y177D Forward primer:

5'- AGATCCACGCAGCCAATGGCGATCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCG -3' Y177F Forward primer:

5'- AGATCCACGCAGCCAATGGCTTTCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCG -3' Y177L Forward primer:

5'- AGATCCACGCAGCCAATGGCCTGCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCG -3' Y177W Forward primer:

5'- AGATCCACGCAGCCAATGGCTGGCTTATCGATGAGTTTTTGCG -3' Reverse primer:

5'- GCCATTGGCTGCGTGGATCTGCACTCCATCGAAACCCGCGC-3'

## **GluER-Q232**

Q232A Forward primer:

5'- TGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACAGCCGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCC -3' Q232D Forward primer:

5'- TGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACAGATGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCC -3' Q232F Forward primer:

5'- TGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACATTTGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCC -3' Q232L Forward primer:

5'- TGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACACTGGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCC -3' Q232W Forward primer:

5'- TGAGTCCAAACGGTGACACATGGGGTTGTATCGACAGTGCTCC -3' Reverse primer:

5'- TGTGTCACCGTTTGGACTCAGACGCACACCCGTACGGTCA-3'

# **GluER-F269**

F269A Forward primer: 5'- AACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGGCCGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAA -3' F269D Forward primer: 5'- AACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGGATGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAA -3' F269L Forward primer: 5'- AACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGCTGGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAA -3' F269W Forward primer: 5'- AACCTGGTCCGAATGGTACGTGGGGAAAGACGGATCAACCAAA-3' Reverse primer: 5'- CGTACCATTCGGACCAGGTTCACGCAGCTCAAGCCACGCTA-3'

#### **GluER-Y343**

Y343A Forward primer: 5'- CAGACGATATGAAAACATGGGCCTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGGGTTA -3' Y343D Forward primer: 5'- CAGACGATATGAAAACATGGGATTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGGGTTA -3' Y343F Forward primer: 5'- CAGACGATATGAAAACATGGTTTTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGGGTTA -3' Y343L Forward primer: 5'- CAGACGATATGAAAACATGGCTGTCCCAAGGCCCAGAGGGTTA-3'

# **Supplementary Table S1. Experimental Data Used for Model Training**



each cell contains the %ee for the major enantiomer of the resultant products. Substrate/Variant combinations that did not result in a detectable level of product are labeled n.d.

# **Supplementary Table S2. Additional Experimental Data Used in Updated Model**



# **3. Enzymatic Ensemble Generation**

#### **Induced Fit Docking (IFD)**

*Protein Structure Preparation using Schrodinger's Protein Preparation Wizard and Pymol's Mutagenesis Wizard* GluER-T36A (PDB ID: 6MYW) was loaded into Schrodinger's Maestro.<sup>3</sup> Within the Protein Preparation Wizard, the structure was reduced to a monomer unit, and all sulfate ions, glycerols, acetate ions, sodium ions, and water molecules were removed (no waters found in the active site are known to be conserved in this mode of reactivity). To introduce mutations, a mutation was introduced to the preprocessed structure using Pymol's Mutation wizard and the lowest energy rotamer was selected.<sup>4</sup> This structure was imported back into Schrodinger. Within the Protein Preparation Wizard, hydrogen bonds and protonation states were optimized using propka with a pH of 8.0. A restrained minimization was submitted where heavy atoms were converged to an RMSD of 0.3 Å with the OPLS3e forcefield. Each resultant enzyme file that was used for IFD can be found in the included supplementary files.

#### *Ligand Preparation using Schrodinger's LigPrep*

Ligands were imported by their SMILES strings and prepared using LigPrep with the OPLS3e forcefield. Only the specified chirality of the major observed enantiomer was investigated.

#### *Induced Fit Docking with the Schrodinger Suite*

The Standard docking protocol was utilized using the OPLS3e forcefield. The receptor was prepared by defining the Box Center for docking as the centroid of selected residues 027, 058, 066, 098, 100, 133, 174, 175, 177, 224, 231, 232, 261, 269, 316, 342, 343, and FMN (401). Some structures used have FMN numbered as residue 001. In these cases, the Box Center for docking was defined by the centroid of selected residues 028, 059, 067, 101, 134, 175, 156, 178, 225, 232, 233, 262, 270, 317, 343, and 344. The box size was set to "Dock ligands similar in size to Workspace ligand," which the program identifies as FMN. This allows for all synthetic ligands investigated in this study to be docked. Docking was constrained to maintain a ligand-enzyme hydrogen bond to N175 during both initial and re-docking. Ligands were allowed to be flexible, ring conformations within 2.5 kcal/mol were sampled, and nonplanar conformations of amide bonds were penalized. For Glide Docking, both receptor and ligand van der Waals scaling was set to 0.5 with a maximum number of poses set to 20. During Prime refinement, residues within 5.0Å of ligand poses were refined, and side chains were optimized. Redocking was performed into structures within 30.0 kcal/mol of the best structure, and within the top 20 structures overall with SP precision.

#### *Singlepoint Energy Calculations for Ligands*

Singlepoint calculations of each ligand conformer were run with M06-def2TZVP. NBO charges were calculated using NBO 6.0 at the M06-def2TZVP level. Parameters were acquired from these ground state structures by a semi-automated process similarly to previous reports from the Sigman lab. Sterimol values were calculated using a modified version of Paton's Python script to accommodate non-terminal reference atoms. Dynamic parameters were calculated in UCSF's ChimeraX (v1.1).<sup>4</sup>

#### **Accelerated Molecular Dynamics (aMD)**

#### *System Preparation and Molecular Dynamics Simulations*

Molecular dynamics simulations were performed using the GPU code (*pmemd*) of the Amber18 package. The crystal structure of the parent enzyme, the Gluconobacter Ene-Reductase (GluER) variant GluER-T36A (PDB code:  $6MYW$ , resolution = 1.16 Å) was used to initiate aMD conformational searches. After removal of crystallographic waters and sulfate ions, glycerols, acetate ions, and sodium ions, the appropriate mutations were introduced *in silico* to the GluER-T36A crystal structure using the Pymol Mutagenesis Wizard;<sup>5</sup> the protonation state of residues were assigned based on the computed pKa values at pH 8.0 from the PROPKA software, executed with the PDB2PQR web interface.<sup>6,7</sup> Structures of pKa adjusted enzyme structures can be found in the included

supplementary files. The enzyme mutant constructs were situated in a box of TIP3P water, extending a minimum of 8 Å from the protein surface (~8,700 solvent atoms), and sodium cations were added to neutralize the charge of the system. The updated general amber force field (GAFF2) was used to parameterize the trianionic flavin mononucleotide (FMN) cofactor, and additional parameters were constructed in Leap using the AM1-BCC charge calculation method, while the Amber ff14SB force-field was applied to the protein residues.

The solvated enzymes were minimized, heated, and relaxed prior to the production run. Throughout, the bonds in water molecules and all bonds involving hydrogen atoms were constrained with the SHAKE algorithm and a 2 fs timestep was used. Minimization was performed over three steps using a combination of the steepest descent and conjugate gradient methods, and minimization proceeded in a constant volume periodic box. A 9 Å potential cutoff distance was applied to the minimizations and a 10 Å potential cutoff was used in all other simulations. The velocity of the atoms in the minimized systems was slowly increased through incremental heating to 300 K, and then the systems were relaxed over a series of steps, where the Langevin thermostat and isotropic position scaling were implemented to regulate the temperature and pressure of each system to mimic reaction conditions.

#### *Accelerated Molecular Dynamics Simulations*

The equilibrated systems were subjected to aMD simulation to scan possible configurations of the enzyme. The parameters needed to apply the biasing potential for the aMD simulations were calculated from NPT simulations according to the procedure reported by Pierce, *et al.*<sup>8</sup> The aMD simulation invoked a 10 Å potential cutoff distance with a 2 fs timestep, and proceeded for a total of 20 ns of simulated time. The root mean squared fluctuation (RMSF) of key residues was compared between the 20 ns simulation and simulations of 10 ns and 30 ns. This comparison revealed that 20 ns provided acceptable convergence (Table S3).

The resultant aMD trajectories were subjected to clustering analysis in order to select a manageable number of representative enzyme conformations with the density-based algorithm, DBSCAN procedure.<sup>9</sup> Clustering analysis resulted in ~3-15 clusters per enzyme; the centroid of each cluster was identified and subjected to parameterization.



#### **Supplementary Table S3. Comparison of aMD Simulation Timescales**

#### **Free Ligand Search**

Conformational searches of truncated ligands were performed using MacroModel version 11.8 and the OPLS3e forcefield in implicit water.<sup>10</sup> Substrate and product input structures can be found in the included supplementary files. Conformers up to 5.0 kcal/mol higher than the lowest energy structure were considered for each ligand. All ligand structures were optimized in the gas phase with B3LYPGD3BJ/6-31G(d,p) as implemented in Gaussian 09 ( $RevC.01$ ).<sup>11</sup> The optimized geometries were verified by frequency computations as minima (zero imaginary

frequencies). Single point calculations of each ligand were run with M06-def2TZVP. NBO charges were calculated using NBO 6.0 at the M06-def2TZVP level. Parameters were acquired from these ground state structures by a semi-automated process similarly to previous reports from the Sigman lab. Sterimol values were calculated using a modified version of Paton's Python script to accommodate non-terminal reference atoms. Dynamic parameters were calculated in UCSF's ChimeraX (v1.1).4

## **4. Parameterization**

A full set of parameters and their unscaled values is available on the Sigman Group GitHub: [https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.](https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER)

*Residues*: Sterimol parameters L, B1, and B5, respectively, represent the length, minimum and maximum widths of the considered substituent and are calculated using the Bondi radii. Plane angles were collected as a description of the tilt of conjugated residues relative to their backbone atoms. Angles of the residue trajectory off the backbone were also collected. Intramolecular distances between atoms within the residue and its backbone atoms were collected to represent the degree of compactness within a residue. Dynamic parameters (surface area and volume) for each ligand were formulated by enclosing the conformational ensemble of a ligand in a fictitious surface at 2.8Å resolution and computing topographical properties of the surface.

All residue parameters were collected as averages across the residue ensemble. In the IFD protocol, residue parameters were also weighted by Schrodinger's G-Score for each conformer, where parameter values of welldocked poses contribute to the representative value more heavily (GS). In the aMD protocol, parameters were also weighted by the number of trajectory frames a particular cluster centroid represented. Max-Min values are the difference between the numerical extremes of a parameter within each ensemble and were collected for each parameter. Product-Substrate (p-s) values are the difference between the averaged (or G-Score weighted) values for product-docked and substrate-docked parameters.

*Ligands*: Sterimol parameters L, B1, and B5, respectively, represent the length, minimum and maximum widths of the considered substituent and are calculated using the Bondi radii. NBO charges have been found to be useful descriptors of steric and electronic properties. HOMO, LUMO, mu, eta, and omega were collected as global parameters for all ligands. Dynamic parameters (surface area and volume) for each ligand were formulated by enclosing the conformational ensemble of a ligand in a fictitious surface at 2.8Å resolution and computing topographical properties of the surface. Docking score (Schrodinger's G-Score) values were also collected in the IFD protocol, and Bolzmann averaging based on DFT single point calculations were used in the aMD protocol.

*Mechanistically inspired parameters:* Inter-residue distacnces (IRDs) and the RMSD of backbone and R-group atoms were computed with the cpptraj trajectory analysis package.<sup>11</sup>

# **Supplementary Figure S2. Parameters Gathered.**



**Figure S2.** Acquired substrate, product, enzyme, and cofactor parameters.



# **Supplementary Table S4. Additional Parameters for Updated Model.**

# **5. Model Development and Interpretation**

The collection of workflow codes used in this project are available on the Sigman Group GitHub: https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.

### **IFD Model Generation and Selection Details**

In brief, the dataset (Table S1) was partitioned into 70% training set and 30% test set by a y-equidistant algorithm, which selects data points that evenly span the output variable  $(\Delta\Delta G^{\ddagger})$ . Forward stepwise selection of models was performed, keeping 200 candidates at each step for 10 steps. Collinearity criteria was set to 0.4. The unscaled descriptor values for the resulting selected IFD model are available on the Sigman Group GitHub: https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.

## **aMD Model Generation and Selection Details**

In brief, the dataset (Table S1) was partitioned into 70% training set and 30% test set by a y-equidistant algorithm, which selects data points that evenly span the output variable  $(\Delta\Delta G^{\ddagger})$ . Forward stepwise selection of models was performed, keeping 100 candidates at each step for 8 steps. Collinearity criteria was set to 0.4. The unscaled descriptor values for the selected aMD models are available on the Sigman Group GitHub: https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.

#### **Supplementary Figure S3: aMD Model 2 Used for 5a Selectivity Predictions**

The aMD model described above was selected for its ability to accurately predict the selectivity of reactions forming 6- and 7-membered rings in the training set. Another aMD model with similar parameters and statistics was identified (Fig. S3), and while this model had less accurate predictions for 6- and 7- membered ring forming reactions, it was superior at predicting reactions that formed 5-membered rings in the training set. Therefore, this model was used to predict the selectivity of the transformation of **5a** to **5b**.



**Figure S3:** aMD Model 2 has comparable parameters and statistics to Model 1. Although this model had less precise predictions for reactions forming 6- and 7-membered rings, it was more effective in predicting reactions that formed 5-membered rings in the training data. As a result, this model was utilized to forecast the selectivity of the conversion of **5a** to **5b**.

# **Supplementary Figure S4: Orientation of Substrate 1a from IFD**



**Figure S4**: Docked substrate **1a** (left) had a flipped binding mode compared to substrates with internal olefins (**2a**, right), with the substrate alkene and substituent positioned on the opposite side of the active site, away from residue 66. The differential binding mode and steric interactions demonstrated by **1a** may explain why it was the only substrate that resulted in product formation when subjected to GluER-Y177/A/D/L.

# **Supplementary Figure S5: Simulated Screening with Updated Statistical Model**



**Figure S5: a.** The updated statistical model was combining the initial experimental data (Table S1) and additional data from the unsuccessful validation of the initial models (Table S2). The experimental data was partitioned into 70% training set and 30% testset by a y-equidistant algorithm, which selects data points that evenly span the output variable (ΔΔG‡ ). Forward stepwise selection of models was performed, keeping 200 candidates at each step for 8 steps. Collinearity criteria was set to 0.4. **b.** A simulated virtual screen was conducted by placing the additional data (Table S2) into the training set, while the initial data set was used to tune the coefficients for each descriptor in the updated statistical model. The model coefficients were only modestly adjusted to fit the defined training set. Unscaled descriptor values for the updated model and virtual screening are available on the Sigman Group GitHub: https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.

## **HAT Side-Product Model Generation and Selection Details**

In brief, the dataset (Table S5) was partitioned into 80% training set and 20% test set by a Kennard-Stone algorithm, which selects data points that evenly span parameter values. Forward stepwise selection of models was performed, keeping 200 candidates at each step for 4 steps. Collinearity criteria was set to 0.4. The unscaled descriptor values for the selected aMD models can be found on the Sigman Group GitHub: [https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER.](https://github.com/SigmanGroup/enzyme-MLR-GluER)

# **Supplementary Table S5: Experimental Data for HAT Side-Product Model**



each cell contains the product/HDH (Xb/Xc) LCMS area integration ratio, detected at 210nm. Substrate/Variant combinations that did not result in a detectable level of HDH are labeled n.d. Substrate/Variant combinations that did not result in a detectable level of product or HDH are labeled n.r.

#### **Comparison of Updated Model to a Regularized Regression Model Over All Features**

To compare the updated model used for out-of-sample enzyme predictions to a control model, a regularized regressor was trained on the complete set of aMD descriptors. Hyperparameter scanning was preformed to tune the model for GluER-T36A selectivity; the regularization strength parameter (alpha) was scanned from 0.001 to 1000 on a logarithmic scale. Simultaneously, first, second-, third-, and fourth-degree polynomial fits were scanned, along with linear, polynomial, and radial basis function (RBF) kernel functions. The hyperparameters alpha=1 with a second degree polynomial fit using the RBF kernel lead to the best model based on mean squared error (Fig. S6). The regularized model generally preformed worse than the updated model in predicting both training and test set data points compared to the aMD model.



Figure S6: A regularize regression model trained on the entire set of updated aMD parameters. model hyperparameters were scanned to determine the optimal fit (hyperparameters: alpha=1, second degree polynomial, RBF kernel). The model was fit to the same training set used to generate the aMD model, and the out-of-sample GluER-T36A variants with substrates **2a** and **5a** were used as the test set. The resultant model had a training and test set  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of 0.63 and 0.10, respectively. The MAE of the test set points was 0.41.

## **6. Preparation of Substrates**

**General.** All substrates in this publication have been previously reported in *Biegasiewicz et al.*<sup>13</sup> (**1a**, **2a**, **3a**, **4a**, **6a**) as well as *Nicholls et al.*<sup>13</sup> (**5a**)*.* Further synthetic details and characterization can be found therein.

#### 5-*Endo*-Cyclization substrate (**1a**)



**Scheme S1. General Scheme for the 5-***endo* **Substrate Synthesis**

Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. A round bottom flask was charged with 4 A MS (gram to gram with starting material being used) and teflon stirbar, then flame-dried under an atmosphere of nitrogen. The flask was then charged with methylamine (15 mL, 33 wt % in absolute ethanol, 120 mmol, 6 equiv) and the contents were allowed to stir. To the stirred solution, at room temperature, was added acetophenone (2.3 mL,1 equiv) and the resulting mixture was allowed to stir for 15 h at room temperature. The reaction mixture was filtered through a pad of Celite®, washed with DCM (50 mL), and volatiles were removed to afford a brown oil. The oil was dissolved in dry DCM (30 mL) and cooled to 0 °C and allowed to stir. To the resulting solution was added chloroacetyl chloride (2.3 g, 1.6 mL, 20 mmol, 1 equiv) and the resulting brown solution was allowed to stir for 15 min at the same temperature. The reaction was subsequently quenched by the addition of NaHCO<sub>3</sub> (50) mL) and the biphasic 24 mixture was stirred for an additional 30 min, allowing for it to warm to room temperature. The aqueous layer was extracted, and the additional extractions were performed with DCM (3 x 30 mL). The organic fractions were dried over Na2SO<sup>4</sup> and concentrated in vacuo to afford the crude product. The residue was purified by Biotage (gradient 25 – 100% EtOAc: hexanes) to give 2-chloro-N-methyl-N-(1 phenylvinyl)acetamide.

5-*Exo*-Cyclization substrates (**2a**, **3a**, **5a**)



# **Scheme S2. General Scheme for the 5-***exo* **Substrate Synthesis**

**Horner-Wadsworth-Emmons (HWE) Olefination.** Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. Sodium hydride (1.2 equiv) is added to a flame-dried round bottom flask with a magnetic stir bar under nitrogen atmosphere. Dry, degassed THF (0.4 M with respect to ketone/aldehyde) is added, and the suspension cooled to 0 °C. Methyl 2- (diethoxyphosphoryl) acetate (1.3 equiv) is added dropwise followed by an additional hour of stirring at 0 °C. Neat aldehyde is added dropwise and the reaction mixture is stirred overnight at reflux temperature. The reaction mixture is re-cooled to 0 °C and saturated aqueous ammonium chloride solution (2-5 mL) is added. The resultant mixture is transferred to a separatory funnel containing water and ethyl acetate (additional water/saturated ammonium chloride is used to dissolve remaining solids in flask as necessary) and the aqueous layer is extracted with ethyl acetate (3 x 50 mL). Combined organic layers are dried with sodium sulfate and concentrated under reduced pressure. Crude products are purified by silica gel chromatography (mobile phase gradient: 5% ethyl acetate: 95% hexanes – 15% ethyl acetate: 85% hexanes).

**DIBAL Reduction.** Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. In a flame-dried round bottom flask with a magnetic stir bar under nitrogen atmosphere unsaturated ester is dissolved in dry, degassed THF to create a 0.25 M solution. Cooling to -78 °C is followed by dropwise addition of diisobutylaluminum hydride solution (1M in hexanes, 3 equiv). The mixture is allowed to warm up to room temperature and stirred for  $\sim$ 3 h with monitoring of starting material consumption by TLC. Once complete, the mixture is re-cooled to 0 °C and saturated ammonium chloride solution is added carefully to quench the reaction (3-5 mL). Removal from the ice/water bath and ~6-8 minutes of stirring leads to a gel which is treated with water and ethyl acetate and filtered over a pad of Celite®. The biphasic filtrate is poured into a separatory funnel and the aqueous portion extracted with additional ethyl acetate (2x 50 mL). Combined organics are dried with sodium sulfate and concentrated under reduced pressure to yield essentially pure allylic alcohol, which was carried forward without further manipulation.

**Bromination.** Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. In a flame-dried round bottom flask with a magnetic stir bar under nitrogen atmosphere, the allylic alcohol obtained from step 1 is dissolved in diethyl ether to create a 0.1 M solution which is cooled to 0  $^{\circ}$ C. Phosphorus tribromide (1.05 equiv) is added and stirred at 0 °C for 10 minutes (TLC at this time usually revealed clean conversion to a single spot). Upon completion, the reaction mixture is poured directly into a beaker containing ice-cold water. This is poured into a separatory funnel and the aqueous layer is extracted with diethyl ether (3x 50 mL) and the combined organics are washed several times with water before drying with sodium sulfate. Removal of solvent under reduced pressure yields crude allylic bromide, which is taken forward to amination without further manipulation.

**Amination.** Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. Allylic bromide from Bromination is added neat to a flask with stir bar cooled to 0 °C. Methylamine solution (33 % wt. in ethanol, 10 equiv) is added directly and in one portion (be aware of the exotherm). The reaction flask is allowed to stir overnight at room temperature. A solution of 1 M sodium hydroxide is added and the mixture is transferred to a separatory funnel containing 1 M sodium hydroxide and diethyl ether. Following extraction of the aqueous layer with diethyl ether (2x 20 mL), the combined ethereal extracts are washed with ~35-50 mL of 1 M sodium hydroxide, dried using sodium sulfate and concentrated under reduced pressure to afford amine which is acylated without further purification.

**Acylation.** Procedure from *Biegasiewicz et al*<sup>13</sup> and re-reported here. The secondary amine (1 equiv.) is added to a flame dried flask under  $N_2$  pressure containing dry DCM and triethylamine (1.5 equiv.) for a final concentration of 0.25 M for the secondary amine. The chloroacetylchloride purchased from Sigma (1.2 equivalents) is added dropwise to the stirred solution at room temperature. The solution is stirred overnight and then poured into a separatory funnel containing a 1:1 solution of 10% HCl and DCM. The aqueous layer is extracted with DCM. The organic layers are collected, washed with brine, dried with anhydrous Na2SO<sup>4</sup> and concentrated *in vacuo* to yield a crude chloroamide as an oil. The crude oil is purified via silica gel flash chromatography in a gradient of 12 % EtOAc/Hexanes to 60% EtoAC/Hexanes.

#### 6 and 7-*Exo*-Cyclization substrate (**4a** and **6a**)

Procedure adapted from *Biegasiewicz et al<sup>13</sup>* and re-reported here.



**Grubbs Metathesis.** Allylic bromide (1 equiv) and styrene (3 equiv) are added to a flame-dried round bottom flask with a magnetic stir bar under nitrogen atmosphere. Dry, degassed DCM (0.3 M) is added with Grubbs Catalyst 2 (0.3 mol%) and heated under reflux for 18h. The reaction is then concentrated under reduced pressure and purified by silica gel chromatography (mobile phase gradient: 100% hexanes).

![](_page_19_Figure_7.jpeg)

**Amination.** Allylic bromide from Grubbs Metathesis is added with to a flask with stir bar. Methylamine solution (33 % wt. in ethanol, 10 equiv) is added directly and in one portion. Sodium Iodide (0.1 equiv) is added, and reaction mixture is equid with a reflux condenser and heated to 40 °C and allowed to procced overnight. A solution of 1 M sodium hydroxide is added, and the mixture is transferred to a separatory funnel containing 1 M HCl and diethyl ether. After extraction, the aqueous layer is basified using 1 M sodium hydroxide and the product is extracted of the aqueous layer with diethyl ether. The combined ethereal extracts are dried using sodium sulfate and concentrated under reduced pressure to afford amine which is acylated without further purification.

![](_page_20_Figure_1.jpeg)

**Acylation.** The secondary amine (1 equiv.) is added to a flame dried flask under nitrogen pressure containing dry DCM and postassium carbonate (5 equiv.) for a final concentration of 0.25 M for the secondary amine. Chloroacetylchloride (3 equivalents) is added dropwise to the stirred solution at room temperature. The solution is stirred overnight and then poured into a separatory funnel containing a 1:1 solution of 10% HCl and DCM. The aqueous layer is extracted with DCM. The organic layers are collected, washed with brine, dried with anhydrous sodium sulfate and concentrated *in vacuo* to yield a crude amide as an oil. The crude oil is purified via silica gel flash chromatography in a gradient of 12 % EtOAc/Hexanes to 60% EtOAc/Hexanes.

#### **7. Preparation of Products**

All racemates in this publication have been previously reported in *Biegasiewicz et al.*<sup>13</sup> (**1b**, **2b**, **3b**, **4b**, **6b**) as well as *Nicholls et al*<sup>14</sup> (5b). Further details synthetic details can be seen therein.

![](_page_21_Figure_2.jpeg)

#### **General Method for Racemate Synthesis.**

Adapted from Fava *et al<sup>15</sup>* and detailed below**.** An 8 dram vial was charged with chloroamide (0.25 mmol 1 equiv.), Ir(ppy)<sub>2</sub>(dtb-bpy)PF<sub>6</sub> (PC, 1 mol%) and NBu<sub>3</sub> (2 equiv.) under nitrogen in a glovebox. Degassed acetonitrile (12.5 ml, 0.02M) was added and the reaction sealed. The reaction was then irradiated with a 450 nm Kessil Lamp for 48 hrs. After this period, the mixture was diluted with  $Et<sub>2</sub>O$  and the organic phase was extracted three times with brine, dried over MgSO4, filtered and evaporated under reduce pressure. The crude residue is purified using automated silica gel chromatography\* (SNAP KP-Sil 10 g column) with the following biotage gradient (CV =column volume): equilibration10% EtOAc/90% hexanes  $\rightarrow$  25% EtOAc/75% hexanes, 5 CV | gradient- 25% EtOAc/75% hexanes, 1 CV | 25% EtOAc/75% hexanes  $\rightarrow$  100% EtOAc, 4 CV | 100% EtOAc, 18 CV. The product reliably elutes during the 100% ethyl acetate phase of the gradient and can be collected in fractions 8-15. TLC analysis using potassium permanganate stain often may also be used to visualize the product containing fractions, which appear on the plate after heating as temporary white spots, which disappear again over time. LCMS analysis of small aliquots  $(\sim 15 \mu L)$  of suspected product-containing fractions may also be performed. Fractions containing product are combined, concentrated, and subsequently analyzed by HPLC or SFC.

![](_page_21_Figure_5.jpeg)

#### **General procedure for photoenzymatic reactions**.

Adapted from Page *et al*<sup>16</sup> and detailed below. All reactions for enzyme substrate-matrix were set up in an anerobic chamber and performed in duplicate. Reactions were run with 10 umol of  $\alpha\alpha$ -chloroamide substrate. In an anerobic chamber, a shell vial with a magnetic cross stir bar was charged with 250 uL of "turnover mix" (GDH-105 (5 mg/mL), glucose (40 mg/mL), and NADP+ (1.5 mg/mL) in KPi 100 mM pH 8, 10% glycerol). Next, 100 nmol of GluER-T36A Variant (1 mol%) was added (between 40-100ul). Additional KPi 100 mM pH 8, 10% glycerol was added such that final reaction volume was 500 ul. Lastly, 15 ul of IPA/ $\alpha\alpha$ -chloroamide substrate was added. Vials were sealed with septa, taken out of the anerobic chamber and additionally sealed with black electrical tape. Reactions were irradiated with 1000 W of cyan light for 24 h, stirring at 400 rpm. The reaction was quenched by addition of 3000 uL of MeCN + 200 uL of TBB (2mg/mL in MeCN), kept on a shaker for 60 min, centrifuged at 14000 rpm for 10 min, filtered over KimWipe and subjected to LCMS analysis (MeCN-30-95-8 min-1mL per min; 1 uL injection) calibration curves for conversion. Enantioselectivities determined by HPLC and SFC.

# **8. References**

- 1. Gibson, D. G. et al. Enzymatic assembly of DNA molecules up to several hundred kilobases. *Nature Methods* **6**, 343–345 (2009).
- 2. Kille, S. et al. Reducing Codon Redundancy and Screening Effort of Combinatorial Protein Libraries Created by Saturation Mutagenesis. *ACS Syn. Bio.* **2** 83–92 (2012)
- 3. **Schrödinger Release 2021-4**: Maestro, Schrödinger, LLC, New York, NY, (2021).
- 4. Pettersen, E. F. *et al.* UCSF Chimera A visualization system for exploratory research and analysis. *J. Comput. Chem.* **25**, 1605–1612 (2004).
- 5. The PyMOL Molecular Graphics System, Version 2.0 Schrödinger, LLC.
- 6. Dolinsky, T. J., Nielsen, J. E., McCammon, J. A. & Baker, N. A. PDB2PQR: An automated pipeline for the setup of Poisson-Boltzmann electrostatics calculations. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**, 665–667 (2004).
- 7. Dolinsky, T. J. *et al.* PDB2PQR: Expanding and upgrading automated preparation of biomolecular structures for molecular simulations. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **35**, 522–525 (2007).
- 8. Pierce, L.C.T., Salomon-Ferrer, R., de Oliveira, C.A.F., McCammon, J.A, and Walker, R.C. Routine Access to Millisecond Time Scale Events with Accelerated Molecular Dynamics. *J Chem Theory Comput.*, **8**, 2997-3002 (2012).
- 9. Birant, D. & Kut, A. ST-DBSCAN: An algorithm for clustering spatial-temporal data. *Data Knowl. Eng.* **60**, 208–221 (2007).
- 10. **Schrödinger Release 2021-4**: MacroModel, Schrödinger, LLC, New York, NY, (2021).
- 11. Frisch, M. J. et al. Gaussian 09 (2009).
- 12. Daniel R. Roe and Thomas E. Cheatham, III, "PTRAJ and CPPTRAJ: Software for Processing and Analysis of Molecular Dynamics Trajectory Data". J. Chem. Theory Comput., 2013, 9 (7), pp 3084-309.
- 13. Biegasiewicz, K. F. et al. Photoexcitation of flavoenzymes enables a stereoselective radical cyclization. *Science* **364**, 1166–1169 (2019).
- 14. Nicholls, B. T. et al. Engineering a Non‐Natural Photoenzyme for Improved Photon Efficiency. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* (2021)
- 15. Fava, E., Nakajima, M., Tabak, M. B. & Rueping, M. Tin-free visible light photoredox catalysed cyclisation of enamides as a mild procedure for the synthesis of γ-lactams. *Green Chemistry* **18**, 4531– 4535 (2016).
- 16. Page, C. G. et al. Quaternary Charge-Transfer Complex Enables Photoenzymatic Intermolecular Hydroalkylation of Olefins. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **143** 97–102 (2020).

# **9. HPLC Traces**

#### **ENZYME-SUBSTRATE MATRIX**

![](_page_23_Figure_2.jpeg)

LCMS Method: MeCN-30-95, 8 min-1mL per min; 1 uL injection

![](_page_23_Picture_216.jpeg)

![](_page_24_Picture_284.jpeg)

![](_page_25_Figure_1.jpeg)

0A

1A

![](_page_26_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_26_Figure_1.jpeg)

1B

 $2A$ 2A<br>2B

 $2B$ 

![](_page_27_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_27_Figure_1.jpeg)

3B

3A

![](_page_27_Figure_3.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_28_Figure_1.jpeg)

7A

5B

![](_page_28_Figure_3.jpeg)

S28

![](_page_29_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_29_Figure_1.jpeg)

2 18.317 MM

![](_page_29_Figure_2.jpeg)

 $\approx$ 

0.5548 1572.62708 66.2129

9A

9B

![](_page_30_Figure_0.jpeg)

15.682  $14$ 16 18

![](_page_30_Picture_67.jpeg)

15A

12B

![](_page_30_Figure_4.jpeg)

12A

![](_page_31_Figure_0.jpeg)

![](_page_31_Figure_1.jpeg)

LCMS Method: MeCN-30-95, 8 min-1mL per min; 1 uL injection

![](_page_31_Picture_188.jpeg)

![](_page_32_Picture_292.jpeg)

![](_page_33_Figure_1.jpeg)

S33

![](_page_34_Figure_0.jpeg)

1B

1A

![](_page_34_Figure_2.jpeg)

2A

![](_page_34_Figure_4.jpeg)

![](_page_35_Figure_0.jpeg)

2B

3A
















S41











S45







23A

22B







LCMS Method: MeCN-30-95, 8 min-1mL per min; 1 uL injection





Racemate: 40% IPA in hexanes, 30 min, AS-H, 1.0 mL/min HPLC.<br> $\sum_{n=1}^{12}$ 







0<sub>B</sub>

S<sub>50</sub>



6A









1.5375 578.35315

7B

9A

2 25.703 MM

6.26956 11.6701























Racemate: 20% IPA in hexanes, 60 min, AS-H, 1.0 mL/min. HPLC











LCMS Method: MeCN-30-95, 8 min-1mL per min; 1 uL injection





**Racemate**: IB-2IPA-80M-1mL. HPLC





0A

 $1A$ 

S<sub>62</sub>













3A

Area: 1314.6 60.056 55.417  $70$ 60 Peak RetTime Type Width Area Area  $[mAU* s]$  $#$  $[\min]$  $[min]$  $\frac{8}{6}$ 1 55.417 BB 1.4737 9249.59863 34.8198 2 60.056 MM 2.4184 1.73146e4 65.1802  $\Omega$ **15108** 58.535  $\frac{33}{2}$ 60  $70$ Peak RetTime Type Width Area Area  $[mAU* s]$  $\frac{8}{\sqrt{2}}$  $#$  $[min]$  $[min]$ 2.0645 3831.81445 1 58.535 MM 42.8603 2.2872 5108.41699 2 63.762 MM 57.1397

> $70$ 60 Peak RetTime Type Width Area Area  $#$  $[\min]$  $[min]$  $[mAU* s]$  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ 1 57.220 MM 1.9055 3577.05493 42.5857 2.1749 4822.61523  $\overline{2}$ 62.251 MM 57.4143

7B

7A

4B

S65











19A





**VALIDATION DATASET**



**5b**



**Racemate** : 20% IPA in hexanes, 45 min, AS-H, 1.0 mL/min. HPLC



S69



20- T36A-Y343F







**Racemate:** A5-5 (0.46 X 25 cm) 2.0 mL/min @ 20% MeOH (0.1% v/v DEA) / 80% CO2(100bar)(A5-5 is a ChiralTek phase, which is the CHIRALPAK AZ-H equivalent). SFC






12-T36A-Q2323F



 $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  $\overline{10}$  $\overline{\mathbf{11}}$  $\overline{12}$  $\overline{6}$  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$  $\overline{13}$  $\overline{14}$ Ť  $\dot{\bm{s}}$ 



20- T36A-Y343F



 $\overline{10}$  $\frac{1}{12}$  $\overrightarrow{13}$ 74  $\overline{\phantom{a}}$  5  $\overrightarrow{6}$  $\mathbf{u}$ Ť  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$  $\overline{\mathbf{3}}$ 







## Racemate IC-5-IPA-1ML/MIN-180Min



## 7-T36A-Y177F



## 19-T36A-Y343A



## **Final external validation dataset: out-of-sample enzyme mutants**



**5b**







1-W66S



mir



3-F269M



# 4- F269R



## 5- Y343C



## 6-Y343V



# 7-Y343M













5- Y343C



# **10. Characterization and NMR Spectra SUBSTRATE CHARACTERIZATION**



**(1a) 2-chloro-N-methyl-N-(1-phenylvinyl)acetamide (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.41 (m, 5H), 5.75 (s, 1H), 5.34 (s, 1H), 4.10 (s, 2H), 3.14 (s, 3H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz; CDCl3): δ 166.8, 147.7, 129.7, 129.2, 125.7, 113.1, 41.4, 36.1.



## **(2a) (***E***)- 2-chloro-N-cinnamyl-N-methylacetamide (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.39 - 7.23 (m, 3H), 6.51 (t, J = 15 Hz, 1H), 6.14 (m, 1H), 4.16 (m, 2H), 4.12 (s,  $2H$ , 3.04 (d, J =  $28Hz$ , 3H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 166.7, 136.4, 135.8, 134.0, 133.5, 132.6, 128.6, 128.2, 127.6, 126.5, 123.3, 52.2, 50.1, 41.4, 41.0, 35.0, 34.1.



## **(3a) (***E***)-2-chloro-N-(3-(3-methoxyphenyl)allyl)-N-methylacetamide (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.24 (m, 1H), 6.95 (t, J= 7 Hz, 1H), 6.90 (s, 1H), 6.81 (m, 1H), 6.48 (t, J= 15 Hz, 1H) 6.13 (m 1H) , 4.12 (m, J = 2.5 Hz, 4H), 3.80 (d, J = 6 Hz, 3H), 3.05 (d, J = 27.1 Hz, 3H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 167.0, 166.6, 159.8, 137.7, 137.2, 133.5, 132.6, 129.4, 123.6, 119.1, 113.9, 111.9, 111.6, 111.2, 55.2, 52.2, 50.2, 41.4, 41.3, 36.0, 35.0, 34.2, 33.2.



#### **(4a) (***E***)-2-chloro-N-methyl-N-(4-phenylbut-3-en-1-yl)acetamide (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

 $1H\text{-NMR}$  500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.25 – 7.20 (m, 4H), 7.17 – 7.10 (m, 1H), 6.40 (t, J = 14 Hz 1H), 6.07 (m, 1H), 4.00  $(d, J = 10$  Hz, 2H), 3.46 (m, 2H), 2.99 (d,  $J = 34$  Hz, 3H), 2.44 (m, 2H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 166.4, 137.3, 136.8, 133.3, 132.3, 128.6, 127.7, 127.0, 126.5, 126.1, 125.0, 50.3, 48.3, 41.5, 40.9, 36.2, 33.8, 32.1, 30.9.



## **(5a). (***E***)-2-chloro-N-(4,4-dimethylpent-2-en-1-yl)-N-methylacetamide (reported by Nicholls** *et al.* 11)

 $1H-NMR$  (500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 5.63 (dd, J = 16, 7 Hz, 1H), 5.28 (m, 1H), 4.06 (d, J = 14 Hz, 2H), 3.94 (d, J = 20 Hz, 2H), 2.93 (d, J = 25 Hz, 3H), 1.01 (s, 9H)



## **(6a). (***E***)-2-chloro-N-methyl-N-(5-phenylpent-4-en-1-yl)acetamide (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

 $1H\text{-NMR}$  500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 7.32 (m, 4H), 7.21(m, 1H), 6.42 (t, J = 14 Hz, 1H), 6.20 (m, 1H), 4.04 (d, J = 6.2 Hz, 2H), 3.44 (dt, J= 25, 6 Hz, 2H), 3.02 (d, J = 53 Hz, 3H), 2.24 (m, 2H), 1.79 (m, 2H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 166.4, 137.6, 137.2, 131.4, 130.6, 129.6, 128.5, 127.3, 126.0, 49.8, 48.0, 41.5, 40.9, 35.7, 33.7, 30.2, 29.9, 28.2, 26.6.

# **PRODUCT CHARACTERIZATION**

**(1b). 1-methyl-5-phenylpyrrolidin-2-one (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR 500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.38 (m, 2H), 7.32 (m, 1H), 7.20 (m, 2H), 4.50 (t, J = 8 Hz, 1H), 2.67 (s, 3H), 2.56 (m, 1H), 2.47 (m, 2H), 1.87 (m, 1H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 175.6, 141.1, 129.0, 128.8, 128.1, 126.4, 64.6, 30.2, 28.6.



**(2b). 4-benzyl-1-methylpyrrolidin-2-one (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR 500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.30 (t, J= 7 Hz, 2H), 7.23 (t, J= 8 Hz, 1H), 7.15 (d, J= 7 Hz, 2H), 3.36 (dd, J= 9, 8 Hz, 1H), 3.08 (dd, J = 9, 6 Hz, 1H), 2.78 (s, 3H), 2.68 (m, 4H), 2.5 (dd, J = 17, 8 Hz, 1H), 2.16 (dd, J = 18, 5 Hz, 1H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 174.2, 139.3, 128.9, 126.4, 54.7, 40.7, 37.2, 33.2, 29.6.



**(3b). 4-(3-methoxybenzyl)-1-methylpyrrolidin-2-one (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR 500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.22 (t, J = 8 Hz, 1H), 6.75 (m, 2H), 6.70 (t, J =2 Hz, 1H), 3.80 (s, 3H), 3.36 (dd, J  $= 10, 8$  Hz, 1H), 3.08 (dd, J = 10, 6 Hz, 1H), 2.82 (s, 3H), 2.77 (m, 1H), 2.64 (m, 2H), 2.50 (dd, J = 17, 7.9 Hz, 1H),  $2.16$  (dd,  $J = 16$ , 6 Hz, 1H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 174.2, 159.8, 140.9, 129.6, 121.1, 114.7, 111.5, 55.2, 54.7, 40.7, 37.3, 33.0, 29.6.



## **(4b). 4-benzyl-1-methylpiperidin-2-one (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.* 11)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR 500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.28 (t, J=7 Hz, 2H), 7.20 (t, J=8 Hz, 1H), 7.12 (d, 2H), 3.24 (m, 2H), 2.92 (s, 3H), 2.59 (m, 2H), 2.47 (m, 1H), 2.07 (m, 2H), 1.85 (m, 1H), 1.48 (m, 1H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 169.6, 139.2, 129.1, 128.4, 126.5, 49.1, 42.0, 38.5, 35.1, 34.4, 28.6.



**(5b). 1-methyl-4-neopentylpyrrolidin-2-one (reported by Nicholls** *et al.* 12)

 $1H-NMR$  500 MHz, CDCl<sub>3</sub>) δ 3.45 (d, J = 1.5 Hz, 1H), 3.01(t, J = 8 Hz, 2.81 (s, 3H), 2.54 (dd, J = 16, 8 Hz, 1H), 2.42 (m, 1H),  $(2.07 \text{ (dd, J = 16, 10 Hz, 1H), 1.39 (d, J = 1.5 Hz, 1H), 0.91 (s, 9H))$ 

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ 174.6, 57.0, 49.3, 39.6, 30.9, 29.9, 29.5, 28.9.

**(6b) 4-benzyl-1-methylazepan-2-one (reported by Biegasiewicz** *et al.*<sup>11</sup>)

<sup>1</sup>H-NMR 500 MHz, CDCl3) δ 7.27 (t, J=7 Hz, 2H), 7.19 (t, J= 7 Hz, 1H), 7.14 (d, J= 7 Hz, 2H), 3.46 (dd, J = 14, 11 Hz, 1H), 3.19 (dd, J = 15, 6 Hz, 1H), 2.97 (s, 3H), 2.71 (dd, J = 13, 5 Hz, 1H), 2.52 (m, 3H), 1.93 (m, 1H), 1.77 (m, 2H), 1.46 (m, 1H), 1.26 (m, 1H).

<sup>13</sup>C-NMR (126 MHz, CDCl3) δ174.4, 139.9, 129.2, 128.5, 126.1, 51.2, 42.8, 35.8, 35.1, 26.9.

























