#### SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

### Dynafit Files

All concentrations and parameter units are expressed in  $\mu M$ ,  $\mu M^{-1}s^{-1}$ , or  $s^{-1}$ 

1. Models used for simulation of cytochrome b reduction kinetics by  $QH_2$  in the presence of stigmatellin (Fig. 1A, 2 and S1).

A. Assuming intermonomeric electron equilibration (Fig. 1A).

#### **REACTION MECHANISM**

 $E + I \iff E.I : kaI kdI$  $E + I \iff I.E : kaI kdI$ I + I.E <===> I.E.I : kaI kdI  $I + E.I \iff I.E.I : kaI kdI$  $E + OH2 \iff E.OH2 : kaOH kdOH$  $E + QH2 \iff QH2.E : kaQH kdQH$ QH2 + E.QH2 <==> QH2.E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH QH2 + QH2.E <==> QH2.E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH  $E.QH2 \iff EbH.SQ : k1 k 1$ QH2.E <===> SQ.bHE : k1 k\_1 EbH.SQ <===> bHE.SQ : k3 k3 SQ.bHE <===> SQ.EbH : k3 k3  $bHE.SQ \leq = > bHEbH.Q : k2 k 2$  $SQ.EbH \leq = > Q.bHEbH : k2 k 2$  $QH2.E.QH2 \iff QH2.EbH.SQ : k1 k 1$  $QH2.E.QH2 \iff SQ.bHE.QH2 : k1 k 1$  $QH2 + EbH.SQ \leq ==> QH2.EbH.SQ : kaQH kdQH$ OH2 + SO.bHE <===> SO.bHE.OH2 : kaOH kdOH QH2 + bHE.SQ <===> QH2.bHE.SQ : kaQH kdQH QH2 + SQ.EbH <==> SQ.EbH.QH2 : kaQH kdQH QH2.EbH.SQ <==> QH2.bHE.SQ : k3 k3 SQ.bHE.QH2 <===> SQ.EbH.QH2 : k3 k3 QH2.bHE.SQ  $\leq = >$  QH2.bHEbH.Q : k2 k 2 SQ.EbH.QH2 <===> Q.bHEbH.QH2 : k2 k 2 QH2.EbH.SQ  $\leq = >$  SQ.bHEbH.SQ : k1 k 1 SQ.bHE.QH2 <===> SQ.bHEbH.SQ : k1 k 1 QH2 + E.I <==> QH2.E.I : kaQH kdQH OH2 + I.E <===> I.E.OH2 : kaOH kdOH I.E.QH2 <===> I.EbH.SQ : k1 k 1 QH2.E.I <===> SQ.bHE.I : k1 k 1  $I.EbH.SQ \leq = > I.bHE.SQ : k3 k3$ SQ.bHE.I <==> SQ.EbH.I : k3 k3  $I.bHE.SQ \leq = > I.bHEbH.Q : k2 k 2$ SQ.EbH.I <==> Q.bHEbH.I : k2 k 2

# CONSTANTS

kaQH = 1.5, kaI = 0.15 (association rate constants for quinol and inhibitor) kdQH = 30, kdI = 0.001 (dissociation rate constants for quinol and inhibitor) k1 = 200,  $k_1 = 400$  (forward and reverse rates for semiquinone formation from quinol) k2 = 400,  $k_2 = 150$  (forward and reverse rates for quinone formation from semiquinone) k3 = 500 (intermonomeric electron transfer)

RESPONSES (molar extinction coefficients x 2 to account for a 2 cm pathlength)

EbH.SQ = 0.072SQ.bHE = 0.072bHE.SQ = 0.072SQ.EbH = 0.072Q.bHEbH = 0.144bHEbH.Q = 0.144QH2.EbH.SQ = 0.072SQ.bHE.QH2 = 0.072QH2.bHE.SQ = 0.072SQ.EbH.QH2 = 0.072SQ.bHEbH.SQ = 0.144QH2.bHEbH.Q = 0.144Q.bHEbH.QH2 = 0.144I.EbH.SQ = 0.072SQ.bHE.I = 0.072I.bHE.SQ = 0.072SQ.EbH.I = 0.072Q.bHEbH.I = 0.144I.bHEbH.Q = 0.144

B. Assuming movement of the inhibitor between center N sites (Fig. 2) or fast inhibitor dissociation rate (Fig. S1) without intermonomeric electron equilibration.

```
E + QH2 \iff E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH
E + QH2 \iff QH2.E : kaQH kdQH
QH2 + E.QH2 <===> QH2.E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH
QH2 + QH2.E <==> QH2.E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH
E.QH2 \iff EbH.SQ : k1 k 1
QH2.E.QH2 \iff QH2.EbH.SQ : k1 k 1
QH2.E <===> SQ.bHE : k1 k 1
QH2.E.QH2 <===> SQ.bHE.QH2 : k1 k 1
QH2 + EbH.SQ <===> QH2.EbH.SQ : kaQH kdQH
QH2 + SQ.bHE <===> SQ.bHE.QH2 : kaQH kdQH
SQ.bHE.QH2 <===> SQ.bHEbH.SQ : k1 k 1
QH2.EbH.SQ <===> SQ.bHEbH.SQ : k1 k_1
E + I \iff E.I : kaI kdI
E + I \iff I.E : kaI kdI
E.I + I \leq = > I.E.I : kaI kdI
I.E + I \iff I.E.I : kaI kdI
I + E.QH2 <===> I.E.QH2 : kaI kdI
I + QH2.E <===> QH2.E.I : kaI kdI
QH2 + E.I <==> QH2.E.I : kaQH kdQH
QH2 + I.E \iff I.E.QH2 : kaQH kdQH
I + EbH.SO <===> I.EbH.SO : kaI kdI
I + SQ.bHE <===> SQ.bHE.I : kaI kdI
I.E.QH2 \iff I.EbH.SQ : k1 k 1
QH2.E.I <===> SQ.bHE.I : k1 k 1
I.E \leq E.I : kid kid
```

CONSTANTS

kaQH = 1.5, kaI = 0.15 (1500 in Fig. S1) kdQH = 30, kdI = 0.001 (10 in Fig. S1) k1 = 270, k\_1 = 100 kid = 500 (intermonomeric movement of the inhibitor; all values between 0 and 50000 yielded identical curves)

RESPONSES (molar extinction coefficients x 2 to account for a 2 cm pathlength)

EbH.SQ = 0.072 SQ.bHE = 0.072 QH2.EbH.SQ = 0.072 SQ.bHE.QH2 = 0.072 SQ.bHEbH.SQ = 0.144 I.EbH.SQ = 0.072SQ.bHE.I = 0.072

## CONCENTRATIONS

E = 0.75 (dimer) QH2 = 15

# PROGRESS

equilibrate E = 0.75, I = 0, 0.13, 0.26, 0.39, 0.52, 0.65, 0.78, 0.91, 1.04, 1.15, 1.28, 1.4, 1.53, and 1.82, dilute 1:1 (indicates pre-equilibration with I before mixing with QH2)



Fig. S1. Simulation of the inhibition of pre-steady state reduction by an inhibitor with a high dissociation rate. Simulated kinetic traces at the same concentrations of ilicicolin as in Fig. 1 were obtained assuming a dissociation rate of  $10 \text{ s}^{-1}$  for the inhibitor according to model B (panel A). Panel B shows the extent of cytochrome *b* reduction obtained at 0.25 s for each of the simulated reduction kinetic curves, resulting in a linear inhibition pattern.

2. Model used for calculating the relative concentrations of dimers with zero (E) and/or one (E.I and I.E) inhibitor molecules (Fig. 1B and 3B).

**REACTION MECHANISM** 

E + I <===> E.I : kaI kdI E + I <===> I.E : kaI kdI I + I.E <===> I.E.I : kaI kdI I + E.I <===> I.E.I : kaI kdI

# CONSTANTS

kaI = 0.150kdI = 0.001

RESPONSES (molar extinction coefficients x 2 for 2 cm pathlength)

For Fig. 1B:

E = 0.053E.I = 0.053 I.E = 0.053

For Fig. 3B:

E.I = 0.0051I.E = 0.0051

# CONCENTRATIONS

E = 0.5 (dimer), I variable from 0 to 1.2, step 0.001