Supporting Information:

Mechanistic Insights into the Hydrolysis of Organophosphorus Compounds by Paraoxonase 1: Exploring the Limits of Selectivity of a Promiscuous Enzyme

Sivaramakrishnan Muthukrishnan, Vivekanand S. Shete, 1 Toby. T. Sanan, 1 , 1 Shameema Oottikkal,¹ Lauren M. Porter, ¹ Thomas J. Magliery^{*1,2}, Christopher M. Hadad*¹

Departments of Chemistry¹ and Biochemistry², The Ohio State University, 100 W. 18th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210

*To whom correspondence should be addressed:

TJM: magliery@chemistry.ohio-state.edu, phone (614) 247-8425

CMH: hadad.1@osu.edu, phone (614) 688-3141

Table of Contents

1. General synthetic procedures for OP substrates and Inhibitors:

The general reaction for the preparation of the photoaffinity labels (PAL-Group ID) was the addition of a phosphoryl dichloridate (1 equivalent) to the corresponding alcohol (1 equivalent) in the presence of toluene at 0° C. A solution of triethylamine (1 equivalent) in toluene was added dropwise, and the reaction was brought to room temperature and stirred overnight. The reaction mixture was filtered and the supernatant was evaporated. The solid residue was then re-suspended in dry acetone. Upon cooling the mixture to 0^0C , sodium azide (1 equivalent) was added and the reaction was stirred for 8 hours. The reaction mixture was filtered, and the solvent was evaporated. The crude product was purified by silica gel column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate 80:20 as the eluent). Compounds were obtained in 40–80% yield. The purified compounds were analyzed by IR, ${}^{1}H$ and ${}^{13}C$ NMR as well as HRMS.

The general reaction for the formation of the SAR substrates/inhibitors was the addition of a phosphoryl dichloridate (1 equivalent) to the corresponding alcohol (2 equivalents) in the presence of toluene at 0^0 C. A solution of triethylamine (2 equivalents) in toluene was added dropwise, and the reaction was stirred at room temperature overnight. The reaction mixture was filtered, and the solvent was then evaporated. The crude product was purified by silica gel column chromatography (hexane:ethyl acetate 80:20 as the eluent). Compounds were isolated in 50–80% yield. The purified compounds were analyzed by IR, ${}^{1}H$ and ${}^{13}C$ NMR as well as HRMS.

2. Complete Library of ligands studied

Compounds **A**-**P** were also synthesized and screened; since they had no hydrolytic activity against G2E6 PON1, these molecules were not discussed in the manuscript.

Group I

Group II

Group III

Group IV

Group V

 \overline{P} Ò

1 ¹H NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

Group II

Molecules **17, 18, D-H** are known and they were synthesized and characterized following reported procedure.¹

¹³C NMR Spectrum

¹³C NMR Spectrum

Group III

Molecules **M** and **25** are commercially available.

 N_3 $\frac{1}{p}$ - 0 O

SAR132 **19** ¹ H NMR Spectrum

¹H NMR Spectrum **22** ¹ SAR133

23 ¹ H NMR SpectrumSAR131

26 ¹ H NMR Spectrum

13C NMR Spectrum

Group IV

30 ¹ H NMR Spectrum

Group V

34 and **35** were synthesized following a reported procedure and the two molecules are known DFPase inhibitors.³ 36 is commercially available

13C NMR Spectrum

4. Details on Enzyme Prepration and determination of Enzyme Kinetics

Expression and Purification of G2E6: Briefly, plasmid encoding Trx-G2E6 fusion gene was expressed in Origami B(DE3) cells (Novagen, Madison, WI). The expression was carried out in 2YT culture media. The culture was grown at 37° C until OD₆₀₀ was reached at 0.8 when it was induced with 0.1 mM IPTG and expressed further for 3 hours at 30 $^{\circ}$ C. The cells were then harvested by centrifugation and stored at -80° C until further use. The harvested cells were resuspended in lysis buffer [50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM CaCl₂, 0.1 mM DTT, and 10% glycerol] and were passed through a syringe needle. The crude lysate was then sonicated and recovered further by incubation with 0.1% tergitol NP-10 (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) with shaking at 4°C for 2.5 hours. After centrifugation, Ni-NTA resin (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), pre-equilibrated with lysis buffer containing 0.1% tergitol NP-10, was added to the supernatant, and the mixture was shaken for 3 hours. The resin was then washed with activity buffer [50 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 50 mM NaCl, 1 mM CaCl₂, 0.1% tergitol NP-10, 10% glycerol containing increasing concentrations of imidazole (5 mM, 10 mM, and 25 mM, respectively). The fusion protein was eluted with activity buffer containing 125 mM imidazole. The final elution was then dialyzed (10000 MW cutoff; slide-a-lyzer, Pierce, Rockford, IL) in activity buffer to remove imidazole and monitored on SDS-PAGE gel for homogeneity. The protein concentration was determined using a Bradford assay (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, CA).

Determination of kinetic parameters: The kinetic parameters (k_{cat}, K_M) were determined using a Michaelis–Menten plot as demonstrated for a reference substrate. Briefly, to assay buffer [50 mM Tris-HCl pH 7.4, 1m M CaCl₂], varying concentrations of substrates (paraoxon, 0.26 mM to 2.6 mM) and known concentration of enzyme (rePON1 G2E6) were added, and hydrolysis was monitored by UV-vis spectroscopy at 405 nm for 10 minutes. The rate of product (*p*-nitrophenol) formation was then plotted against substrate concentration and fitted to the Michaelis–Menten equation using KaleidaGraph. A typical curve is shown below.

5. Selected Poses from docking of ligands in G2E6

In general, the docking poses obtained from Autodock revealed an adequate job of sampling ligand orientations in the active site. Both the leaving groups as well as the other phosphoryl substituents were found to orient themselves into the various pockets comprising the active site region. However, a significant percentage of poses were found to result in the substrate not coordinating to the calcium ion owing to the vertical extension of the active site box. These were discarded from further refinement due to the lack of catalytic relevance, based on the assumption that calcium coordination to the phosphoryl oxygen is critical for catalytic activity.

The energy scores from the docking simulations were not a useful metric for determining the quality of the pose. Similar energy scores were obtained for poses that placed the phosphoryl oxygen in proximity to calcium and those that placed the ligand into the HDL binding domain of the protein. Moreover, treatment of electrostatic interactions, particularly on the leaving group, was not very reliable. In many cases, the nitro group was placed in highly nonpolar pockets without a significant energetic penalty relative to those that provided suitable hydrogen bond donors, for instance. The principal utility of the docking simulations, then, was on giving a series of poses for subsequent MD simulations. Representative poses from docking are shown below:

Molecule	Pose 1	Pose 2
Paraoxon (1)	Docking Score: -9.1	Docking Score: -8.8
8	Docking Score: -8.6	Docking Score: -7.5
10		

Representative Docking Poses from Group I Molecules. All scores are in kcal/mol

Representative Docking Poses from Group II Molecules

Molecule	Pose 1	Pose 2
17(65)	K192 D ₁₈₃ F222 H134 N168 L240 N224 H115 D269 E53 L69 H285 /346	K192 Ł D ₁₈₃ N ₁₆₈ F222 H134 L240 N224 H115 D ₂₆₉ L69 E53 H285 V346
	Docking Score: -9.7	Docking Score: -9.4
18 (120)	K192 D ₁₈₃ L ₂₄₀ F ₂₂₂ N ₁₆₈ H ₁₃₄ N224 H115 D269 E53 H285 L69 $\sqrt{346}$	K192 D ₁₈₃ F222 L ₂₄₀ H134 N ₁₆₈ N224 E ₅₃ H115 D269 H ₂₈₅ L69 V346
	Docking Score: -9.1	Docking Score: -7.5

Representative Docking Poses from Group III Molecules

Representative Docking Poses from Group IV Molecules

Representative Docking Poses from Group V Molecules

6. Selected Poses from MD simulations of ligand-G2E6 complex

After analysis of the various docking poses for different OP ligands bound into the active-site snapshots, subsequent MD simulations were performed on select calciumbound receptor-ligand complexes obtained from the docking simulations. A similar minimization protocol was utilized as described for the initial G2E6 model; the only difference was the inclusion of a moderate, flattened parabolic restraint on the calciumphosphoryl oxygen bond coordinate, from 2.5 to 4.0 Å, to allow for enhanced relaxation of the ligand-receptor contacts prior to the possible dissociation of substrate. This was found to improve on the sub-optimal treatment of receptor flexibility in the docking protocol, and resulted in a reduction in the number of dissociative poses. A total of 4 ns of unrestrained MD simulations were performed on each ligand-receptor complex. A series of coordinate snapshots was extracted from the production MD trajectory from the terminal 1.5 ns of simulations, at 10 ps intervals, from which individual trajectories were generated for the unbound ligand, free receptor, and complex. Poisson-Boltzmann (MM- $(PPSSA)^3$ and Generalized Born $(MM-GBSA)^4$ simulations were performed on these snapshots, using the *sander* module to calculate individual components of the free energy for each component as in eq 1. From the individual results, the overall free energy of binding was calculated using eq 2.

$$
G = G_{\text{hyd}} + E_{\text{MM}} - TS_{\text{solute}} \tag{1}
$$

$$
\Delta G_{\text{bind}} = G_{\text{complex}} - (G_{\text{receptor}} + G_{\text{ligand}}) \tag{2}
$$

The non-polar (SA) terms were estimated using the MSMS algorithm⁵ using the equation $G_{SA} = \gamma$ SASA + β , with γ and β set to 0.00542 kcal/(mol \AA^{-2}) and 0.92 kcal/mol, respectively, and using a probe radius of 1.4 Å for estimating the solvent accessible surface area. For the polar (G_{polar}) energy terms, the Generalized Born and Poisson-Boltzmann methods were both utilized as implemented in the AMBER software package. In the GB calculations, dielectric constants of 1 and 78.5 were utilized with AMBER mbondi2 radii. The TS_{solute} term represents temperature and solute entropy, and in these calculations this term was omitted. As the binding energies were only compared within ligand families, the effect of entrotpy changes was estimated to be minimal. Such methods have been employed in estimating binding energies for organic molecules with good agreement with experimental data. $6,7$

Group I

The energies obtained for poses of the group I molecules are shown in Table S1. The energy trend is consistently favorable for the orientation with the leaving group pointing toward the H115/H134/K192 region of the active site pocket.

Table S1. Energies determined for bound poses of the group I molecules bound in the G2E6 model of PON1, for the two primary orientations obtained. (MM-PBSA/MM-GBSA, respectively, in kcal/mol)

a - No pose determined in this pocket

For the group II molecules, the lack of any electrostatic interactions with either pocket reduced the overall binding energies compared with paraoxon, but the poses do appear to be generally similar to those for the group I molecules.

Group III

For the group III molecules the energetic preference was again similar, with electrostatic interactions observed between the azide and active site residues, specifically the aspartates and histidine 115. The leaving group is again positioned for hydrolysis by bases in proximity to D269 or E53.

Group V

7. The **∆H**298,hydrol for the hydrolysis of representative ligands from each group of molecules by water was computed using density functional theory (DFT – B3LYP/6- 31G*) using the Gaussian03 suite of programs. $8,9$

Molecule	Hydrolysis Products		ΔH_{hydrol} kcal/mol	Comment
$\sqrt{0}$ O_2N - $\mathbf{1}$	OН O_2N^2	OH $\frac{6}{7}$ O -	-6.9	Favorable
ဂူ O. 10 NO ₂	OН O_2N	$\begin{array}{c}\n\overline{O} \\ \overline{P}^{\text{II}}\n\end{array}$ HO	-6.8	Favorable
NO ₂ 8	OН O_2N	$\frac{10}{10}$ HO ² $\frac{10}{10}$	-6.8	Favorable
$O_{0}^{1,0}$ \overline{NO}_2 9	OН O_2N	\overline{P}°	-6.6	Favorable
23 $0 - \frac{N_3}{P} - 0$	OH	$\frac{N_3}{H0 - P - 0}$	-4.9	Favorable
23 N_3 $0 - p - 0$ \sim Ö ∼ ĮL.	HN ₃	OH D.O. `P Ö	$+11.4$	Unfavorable
24 $\begin{array}{c}\nN_3 \\ N_2 \\ D-P-N \\ 0\n\end{array}$	$\overline{\overline{\mathsf{C}}}$	$\begin{array}{c}\n\overline{N_3} \\ \overline{N_2} \\ H_0 - \overline{N_1} \\ N_2\n\end{array}$ ان O	-3.9	Favorable

8. References

- 1. K. Law, R. A. Acey, C. R. Smith, R. Cameron, D. A. Benton, S. Soroushian, R. Eckenrod, R. Stedman, K. A. Kantardjieff, K. Nakayama. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **2007,** *355*, 371-378.
- 2. M. Blum, F. Löhr, A. Richardt, H. Rüterjans, G. C-H Chen *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* **2006**, *128,* 12750-12757.

3.R. Luo, L. David, M. K. Gilson. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2002**, *23*, 1244–1253.

- 4.J. Weiser, P. S. Shenkin, W. C. Still. *J. Comput. Chem.* **1999**, *20*, 217–230.
- 5.M. F. Sanner, A. J. Olson, J. Spehner. *Biopolymers* **1996**, *38*, 305-320.
- 6.R. C. Rizzo, T. Aynechi, D. A. Case, I. D. Kuntz. *J. Chem. Theory. Comput.* **2006**, *2*, 128-139.
- 7.B. Kuhn, P. Gerber, T. Schulz-Gasch, M. Stahl. *J. Med. Chem.* **2005**, *48*, 4040- 4048.
- 8.(a) D. A. Becke. *J. Chem. Phys*. **1993**, *98*, 5648-5656. (b) C. Lee, W. Yang, R. G. Parr. *Phys. Rev. B* **1998**, *37*, 785-789.
- 9.Gaussian 03, Revision C.02, Frisch, M. J.; Trucks, G. W.; Schlegel, H. B.; Scuseria, G. E.; Robb, M. A.; Cheeseman, J. R.; Montgomery, Jr., J. A.; Vreven, T.; Kudin, K. N.; Burant, J. C.; Millam, J. M.; Iyengar, S. S.; Tomasi, J.; Barone, V.; Mennucci, B.; Cossi, M.; Scalmani, G.; Rega, N.; Petersson, G. A.; Nakatsuji, H.; Hada, M.; Ehara, M.; Toyota, K.; Fukuda, R.; Hasegawa, J.; Ishida, M.; Nakajima, T.; Honda, Y.; Kitao, O.; Nakai, H.; Klene, M.; Li, X.; Knox, J. E.; Hratchian, H. P.; Cross, J. B.; Bakken, V.; Adamo, C.; Jaramillo, J.; Gomperts, R.; Stratmann, R. E.; Yazyev, O.; Austin, A. J.; Cammi, R.; Pomelli, C.; Ochterski, J. W.; Ayala, P. Y.; Morokuma, K.; Voth, G. A.; Salvador, P.; Dannenberg, J. J.; Zakrzewski, V. G.; Dapprich, S.; Daniels, A. D.; Strain, M. C.; Farkas, O.; Malick, D. K.; Rabuck, A. D.; Raghavachari, K.; Foresman, J. B.; Ortiz, J. V.; Cui, Q.; Baboul, A. G.; Clifford, S.; Cioslowski, J.; Stefanov, B. B.; Liu, G.; Liashenko, A.; Piskorz, P.; Komaromi, I.; Martin, R. L.; Fox, D. J.; Keith, T.; Al-Laham, M. A.; Peng, C. Y.; Nanayakkara, A.; Challacombe, M.; Gill, P. M. W.; Johnson, B.; Chen, W.; Wong, M. W.; Gonzalez, C.; and Pople, J. A.; Gaussian, Inc., Wallingford CT, 2004.