Biophysical Journal, Volume 98

**Supporting Material** 

Long Timescale Molecular Dynamics Simulations of the Major Urinary Protein Provide Atomistic Interpretations for the Unusual Thermodynamics of Ligand Binding

Julie Roy and Charles A. Laughton

Supplementary material for:

Long Timescale Molecular Dynamics Simulations of the Major Urinary Protein Provide Atomistic Interpretations for the Unusual Thermodynamics of Ligand Binding

Julie Roy and Charles A Laughton\*

School of Pharmacy and Centre for Biomolecular Sciences, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK.



151 LSNANRC

Figure S1. Sequence and structure of MUP. Underlined residues contact the bound IBM ligand (pink)



Figure S2. RMSD profiles for the first 1.1 microseconds of each simulation. Apo1: red; apo2: blue; apo3: green; ibm1: cyan; ibms2: magenta; ibm3: yellow. Top: RMSD from the respective crystals structures, below: RMSDs from the time-averaged structures



Figure S3. Secondary structure conservation over the first 1.1 microseconds of simulation apol. Colour coding of secondary structure is as in Figure 1 in the main paper: red: alpha helix; blue: beta strand; green: turn.



Figure S4. Top: Correlation between predicted Calpha chemical shifts (average calculated from 20 snapshots taken from simulation apo1 using CamShift) and values reported in BMRB entry 1470. Bottom: Errors between calculated and observed values.



Figure S5. Comparison of the average of the RMS fluctuation profiles for the three apo simulations with that calculated from the ten structures for apo MUP in PDB entry 1BF3. The NMR data has been displaced vertically by 3 angstroms.



Figure S6. Cluster analysis of apo- (left) and ibm- (right) simulations. The clusters containing the crystal structures are outlined in black. Numbers in circles give the percentage occupancy of each cluster, arrows indicate cluster transitions. Colour coding is: apo1: red; apo2: blue; apo3: green; ibm1: cyan; ibms2: magenta; ibm3: yellow.



Figure S7. Comparison of the L3 regions of the apo- crystal structure (white), time-averaged structure from the three apo- simulations (magenta), and time-averaged structure from the three ibm- simulations (cyan). Phe38 and the ibm ligand (yellow) are also shown.



Figure S8. L3 motion in simulations apo1 (blue) and ibm1 (magenta) measured in terms of the distance between the C-alpha atoms of residues N35 and D61.



Figure S9. Comparison of the L2 region in the time-averaged structures from the apo- (magenta) and ibm- (cyan) simulations. Ligand binding shifts Phe90, which then packs tighter against Tyr80, which in turn rigidifies residues 48-50 via the interaction with Leu52.



Figure S10. Schlitter entropy convergence. Values of  $S_{inf}$ , a and n from curve fitting are also shown.



Figure S11. Water density in the ligand binding site of simulation apol. The left panel shows the small volume with a 'normal' water density around the hydroxyl group of Tyr120, while the right panel is contoured at a low density to reveal the full extent of the binding pocket.



*Figure S12. Stereoplots to illustrate ligand tumbling. Top: orientation of the N1-N4 vector, bottom: orientation of the C2-C6 vector. Red: simulation ibm1; green: ibm2; blue: ibm3.* 

## "Prep" input file for the IBM ligand

0 0 2

isobutyl methoxy pyrazine ligand for MUP. RESP charges. From Antechamber molecule.res IBM XYZ O CORRECT OMIT DU BEG 0.0000 .0 .0 1 DUMM DU М 0 -1 -2 0.000 .00000 .0 0 -1 2 DUMM DU М 1 1.449 .0 .00000 .0 3 DUMM DU М 2 1 0 1.522 111.1 .00000 4 C9 с3 М 3 2 1 1.540 111.208 180.000 -0.447 5 Н91 hc Е 4 3 2 1.088 63.585 39.670 0.107 6 Н92 hc Е 4 3 2 1.086 97.726 145.793 0.107 7 Н9З Е 4 3 2 1.086 50.837 -107.553 hc 0.107 8 C8 4 3 2 1.531 150.154 -46.861 М 0.423 сЗ 9 H8 8 4 3 1.086 107.891 -107.949 hc Е -0.026 10 C10 3 8 4 3 1.531 110.673 10.570 -0.447сЗ 10 8 4 110.538 -58.025 11 H101 hc Ε 1.087 0.107 1.084 12 H102 hc Е 10 8 4 111.994 -178.171 0.107 13 H103 hc 10 8 4 1.087 110.978 Ε 61.563 0.107 8 4 3 1.543 14 C7 109.736 134.685 -0.432 с3 М 14 8 4 1.084 15 H71 Е 109.527 -67.126 hc 0.124 14 8 4 16 H72 Е 1.086 108.771 50.390 hc 0.124 14 8 4 17 C2 са М 1.508 114.647 172.289 0.254 18 N1 nb М 17 14 8 1.302 119.517 102.903 -0.446 19 C6 М 18 17 14 1.338 118.949 -179.861 0.059 са 20 H6 h4 Е 19 18 17 1.073 117.131 179.923 0.099 21 C5 19 18 17 1.364 121.003 -0.214 -0.010 са М 22 Н5 h4 Е 21 19 18 1.074 121.789 -179.914 0.128 23 N4 21 19 18 1.338 121.411 -0.164 -0.493 nb М 24 C3 23 21 19 1.294 117.088 0.325 0.671 са М 25 011 24 23 21 1.333 120.518 -179.705 os М -0.418 26 C12 с3 М 25 24 23 1.411 118.306 0.216 -0.095 27 H121 h1 Е 26 25 24 1.081 110.928 -60.780 0.097 26 25 28 H122 h1 Ε 24 1.080 105.593 179.830 0.097 26 25 24 1.081 29 H123 h1 Е 110.848 60.557 0.097

#### LOOP

C2 C3

#### IMPROPER

C7	C3	C2	N1
C5	Нб	Сб	N1
C6	Н5	C5	N4
C2	N4	C3	011

### DONE STOP (end of file)

# Forcefield parameters for the IBM ligand IBM parameters MASS

# BOND

ANGLE						
c3-ca-nb	62.732	122.770	Calculated with	ith empirical	approach	
nb-ca-os	71.521	121.235	Calculated with	ith empirical	approach	
ca-os-c3	62.700	118.150	same as c2-os	s-c3		
DIHE						
IMPROPER						
c3-ca-ca-nb	)	1.1	180.0	2.0	Using default	value
ca-h4-ca-nb	)	1.1	180.0	2.0	Using default	value
ca-nb-ca-os	3	1.1	180.0	2.0	Using default	value

NONBON

(end of file)