

Supplementary Table 1—Hide-and-seek test using inter-subunit C β distance as simulated experimental data

| Model | RMSD(Å) | ΔT_x (Å) | $\Delta \theta$ (deg) | $\Delta \phi$ (deg) | ΔT_z (Å) |
|--------------|----------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 |
| 2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 |
| 7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.0 |
| 8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 0.2 |
| 10 | 0.5 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.2 |

“ Δ ” indicates the difference between the values of the actual parameters and those obtained after the rigid-body search

Supplementary Table 2—GpA disruption data obtained from Figure 5 of Lemmon et al.¹

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | Dimer Disruption | Flag |
|---------|-----------|-------|------|------------------|------|
| ILE | 73 | A | CB | 0.30 | 1.0 |
| THR | 74 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 75 | A | CB | 1.80 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 76 | A | CB | 2.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 77 | A | CB | 0.25 | 1.0 |
| PHE | 78 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 79 | A | CA | 2.30 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 80 | A | CB | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| MET | 81 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 82 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 83 | A | CA | 3.00 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 84 | A | CB | 2.50 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 85 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 86 | A | CA | 0.20 | 1.0 |
| THR | 87 | A | CB | 2.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 88 | A | CB | 0.75 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 89 | A | CB | 0.65 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 90 | A | CB | 0.40 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 91 | A | CB | 0.65 | 1.0 |
| SER | 92 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| TYR | 93 | A | CB | 0.30 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 94 | A | CA | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 95 | A | CB | 0.40 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used

Supplementary Table 3—GpA disulfide cross-linking data obtained from Supplementary Information of Zhu et al.²

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | %Crosslinking | Flag |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------|
| ILE | 73 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| THR | 74 | A | CB | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 75 | A | CB | 44.50 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 76 | A | CB | 29.25 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 77 | A | CB | 6.75 | 1.0 |
| PHE | 78 | A | CB | 1.25 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 79 | A | CA | 87.25 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 80 | A | CB | 66.67 | 1.0 |
| MET | 81 | A | CB | 1.67 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 82 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 83 | A | CA | 83.00 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 84 | A | CB | 38.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 85 | A | CB | 1.17 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 86 | A | CA | 28.00 | 1.0 |
| THR | 87 | A | CB | 59.67 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 88 | A | CB | 38.00 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 89 | A | CB | 6.83 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 90 | A | CB | 38.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 91 | A | CB | 53.00 | 1.0 |
| SER | 92 | A | CB | 1.50 | 1.0 |
| TYR | 93 | A | CB | 5.00 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 94 | A | CA | 15.50 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 95 | A | CB | 3.00 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used

Supplementary Table 4—Pentamer disruption data obtained from Table 1 of Simmermann et al.³

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | Pentamer Disruption | Flag |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| LEU | 37 | A | CB | 0.7 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 38 | A | CB | 43.8 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 39 | A | CB | 27.3 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 40 | A | CB | 1.6 | 1.0 |
| CYS | 41 | A | CB | 28.3 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 42 | A | CB | 44.6 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 43 | A | CB | 34.8 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 44 | A | CB | 2.5 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 45 | A | CB | 43.2 | 1.0 |
| CYS | 46 | A | CB | 42.1 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 47 | A | CB | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 48 | A | CB | 38.1 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 49 | A | CB | 44.3 | 1.0 |
| MET | 50 | A | CB | 35.6 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 51 | A | CB | 14.4 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 52 | A | CB | 49.1 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used

Supplementary Table 5—EphA1 TOXR data taken from Table 2 of Volynsky et al.⁴

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | TOXR | Flag |
|---------|-----------|-------|------|-------|------|
| VAL | 549 | A | CB | 102.0 | 0.0 |
| ALA | 550 | A | CB | 50.0 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 551 | A | CB | 94.0 | 0.0 |
| ILE | 552 | A | CB | 113.0 | 1.0 |
| PHE | 553 | A | CB | 82.0 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 554 | A | CA | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 555 | A | CB | 74.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 556 | A | CB | 116.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 557 | A | CB | 116.0 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 558 | A | CA | 17.0 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 559 | A | CB | 95.0 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 560 | A | CB | 103.0 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used. Only mutations to hydrophobic residues were considered.

Supplementary Table 6—BNIP3 unified mutagenesis score values for alanine were taken from Figure 7 of Lawrie et al⁵

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | UnifiedScore | Flag |
|---------|-----------|-------|------|--------------|------|
| LEU | 170 | A | CB | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 171 | A | CB | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| SER | 172 | A | CB | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| HIS | 173 | A | CB | 9.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 174 | A | CB | 2.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 175 | A | CB | ND | ND |
| ALA | 176 | A | CB | 0.0 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 177 | A | CB | 4.0 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 178 | A | CA | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 179 | A | CB | 3.0 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 180 | A | CA | 10.0 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 181 | A | CB | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| TYR | 182 | A | CB | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 183 | A | CB | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 184 | A | CA | 7.0 | 1.0 |

‘ND’ indicates that there was no data for this residue. A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used.

Supplementary Table 7—M2 perturbility index (PI) data taken from Figure 2 of Pinto et al.⁶

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | PI (Avg) | Flag |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|
| LEU | 26 | A | CB | 0.70 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 27 | A | CB | 1.00 | 1.0 |
| VAL | 28 | A | CB | 0.50 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 29 | A | CB | 0.07 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 30 | A | CB | 0.95 | 1.0 |
| SER | 31 | A | CB | 0.50 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 32 | A | CB | 0.25 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 33 | A | CB | 0.20 | 1.0 |
| GLY | 34 | A | CA | 0.65 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 35 | A | CB | 0.35 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 36 | A | CB | 0.37 | 1.0 |
| HIS | 37 | A | CB | 0.95 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 38 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 39 | A | CB | 0.17 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 40 | A | CB | 0.07 | 1.0 |
| TRP | 41 | A | CB | 0.57 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 42 | A | CB | 0.10 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 43 | A | CB | 0.17 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used

Supplementary Table 8—BM2 perturbility index (PI) data taken from Figure 3 of Ma et al.⁷

| Residue | SeqNumber | Chain | Atom | PI (Avg) | Flag |
|---------|-----------|-------|------|----------|------|
| ILE | 7 | A | CB | 0.30 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 8 | A | CB | 0.23 | 1.0 |
| SER | 9 | A | CB | 0.52 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 10 | A | CB | 0.45 | 1.0 |
| CYS | 11 | A | CB | 0.09 | 1.0 |
| SER | 12 | A | CB | 0.34 | 1.0 |
| PHE | 13 | A | CB | 0.65 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 14 | A | CB | 0.29 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 15 | A | CB | 0.48 | 1.0 |
| SER | 16 | A | CB | 0.33 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 17 | A | CB | 0.23 | 1.0 |
| LEU | 18 | A | CB | 0.14 | 1.0 |
| HIS | 19 | A | CB | 0.99 | 1.0 |
| PHE | 20 | A | CB | 0.39 | 1.0 |
| MET | 21 | A | CB | 0.06 | 1.0 |
| ALA | 22 | A | CB | 0.17 | 1.0 |
| TRP | 23 | A | CB | 0.77 | 1.0 |
| THR | 24 | A | CB | 0.06 | 1.0 |
| ILE | 25 | A | CB | 0.00 | 1.0 |

A Flag value of ‘1.0’ indicates that the data value was used

References

1. Lemmon, M. A., Flanagan, J. M., Treutlein, H. R., Zhang, J. & Engelman, D. M. (1992). Sequence specificity in the dimerization of transmembrane alpha-helices. *Biochemistry* **31**, 12719-25.
2. Zhu, J., Luo, B. H., Barth, P., Schonbrun, J., Baker, D. & Springer, T. A. (2009). The structure of a receptor with two associating transmembrane domains on the cell surface: integrin alpha1beta1beta3. *Mol Cell* **34**, 234-49.
3. Simmerman, H. K., Kobayashi, Y. M., Autry, J. M. & Jones, L. R. (1996). A leucine zipper stabilizes the pentameric membrane domain of phospholamban and forms a coiled-coil pore structure. *J Biol Chem* **271**, 5941-6.
4. Volynsky, P. E., Mineeva, E.A., Goncharuk, M. V., Ermolyuk, Y. S., Arseniev, A. S., and R. G. Efremov. (2010). Computer simulations and modeling-assisted ToxR screening in deciphering 3D structures of transmembrane alpha-helical dimers: ephrin receptor A1. *Phys. Biol.* **7**, 15.
5. Lawrie, C. M., Sulistijo, E. S. & MacKenzie, K. R. Intermonomer hydrogen bonds enhance GxxxG-driven dimerization of the BNIP3 transmembrane domain: roles for sequence context in helix-helix association in membranes. *J Mol Biol* **396**, 924-36.
6. Pinto, L. H., Dieckmann, G. R., Gandhi, C. S., Papworth, C. G., Braman, J., Shaughnessy, M. A., Lear, J. D., Lamb, R. A. & DeGrado, W. F. (1997). A functionally defined model for the M2 proton channel of influenza A virus suggests a mechanism for its ion selectivity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **94**, 11301-6.
7. Ma, C., Soto, C. S., Ohigashi, Y., Taylor, A., Bournas, V., Glawe, B., Udo, M. K., Degrado, W. F., Lamb, R. A. & Pinto, L. H. (2008). Identification of the pore-lining residues of the BM2 ion channel protein of influenza B virus. *J Biol Chem* **283**, 15921-31.