Supplementary Material for Structures and Free Energy Landscapes of Aqueous Zinc(II)-Bound Amyloid-β(1-40) and Zinc(II)-Bound Amyloid-β(1-42) with Dynamics

Olivia Wise-Scira¹ , Liang Xu¹ , George Perry2 , and *Orkid Coskuner1,2**

¹Department of Chemistry, and ²Neurosciences Institute, The University of Texas at San Antonio, One UTSA

Circle, San Antonio, Texas 78249

Email: orkid.coskuner@utsa.edu

Figure S1. Optimized structure of the Zn:His₃Glu model structure using the B3LYP functional along with the 6-31G* basis set. Each of the atoms are labeled according to the atom names used for the parameters in Table 1.

Table S1. Calculated specific structural parameters, electrostatic partial charges and energy of the model Zn:His3Glu metal-ligand moiety with the B3LYP/6-31G*//B3LYP/6-31G* method.

The enthalpic contribution to *G* is calculated by the sum of the molecular mechanics potential energy and the solvation free energy (G_{sol}) , which is composed of the solvation-electrostatic free energy $(G_{sol-elec})$ and non-polar free energy (G_{np}) terms. For the $G_{sol-elec}$ term calculations, the internal and external dielectric constant values were set to 1 and 80, respectively and dipolar boundary conditions were applied. The G_{no} contribution was calculated using the solvent accessible surface area (SASA) as shown in equation 1.

$$
G_{np} = 0.00542 \times SASA + 0.92 \tag{1}
$$

Most recently, we applied both harmonic and quasi-harmonic entropy calculation methods on Aβ in an aqueous medium. The same thermodynamic trends were obtained using these different methods.⁶² Therefore, the widelyused normal mode analysis method was utilized to approximate the conformational entropy values of the fulllength disordered metallopeptides. For the calculations of the PMF surfaces, we used the coordinates of the endto-end distance $(R_{\text{E-E}})$ that is defined as the distance between the Asp1 peptide backbone N-atom and the Val40 or Ala42 peptide backbone carbonyl C-atom and the radius of gyration (*R*g). The PMF values were then calculated using equation 2.

$$
PMF = -k_B T \log(P) \tag{2}
$$

where k_B is the Boltzman constant and *T* is the physiological temperature, and *P* is the probability of Zn:A β structures with ceratin $R_{\text{E-E}}$ and R_{g} values within 1 $k_{\text{B}}T$ range. More details can be found in Ref. 62. The convergence was verified by calculating the PMF surfaces at different simulation time-scales (see Supplementary Materials section).

Figure S2. The calculated average (a) α-helix and (b) turn contents and the (c) internal energy (*E*) values with time using the simulated Zn:Aβ40 (black) and Zn:Aβ42 (red) metallopeptide structures in an aqueous medium.

Figure S3. The calculated PMF surfaces based on the *R*_{E-E} and *R*_g values of the Zn:Aβ40 metallopeptide using the structures from the first (a) 150 ns and (b) 175 ns and the Zn:Aβ42 peptide using the structures from the first (a) 150 ns and (b) 175 ns of the simulations.

Figure S4. Zn:Aβ40 structures (N-terminal extended into the solution) obtained from classical molecular dynamics simulations in explicit water starting from an extended structure at (a) 0 ns, (b) 20 ns, (c) 30 ns, (d) 40 ns and (e) 50 ns. The colors on the backbone of each structures correspond to the secondary structure of each residue as follows: α-helix (blue), 3_{10} -helix (gray), π-helix (purple), β-sheet (red), β-strand (black), turn (yellow), coil (white).

Figure S5. Zn:Aβ42 structures (N-terminal extended into the solution) obtained from classical molecular dynamics simulations in explicit water starting from an extended structure at (a) 0 ns, (b) 20 ns, (c) 30 ns, (d) 40 ns and (e) 50 ns. The colors on the backbone of each structures correspond to the secondary structure of each residue as follows: α-helix (blue), 3_{10} -helix (gray), π-helix (purple), β-sheet (red), β-strand (black), turn (yellow), coil (white).

Figure S6. The simulated α -helix abundance and associated Gibbs free energies (*G*) in the structures of the (a) Zn:Aβ40 and (b) Zn:Aβ42 metallopeptides. The red lines on the graph show the average *G* for the structures with each α-helix percentage. No clear trend is obtained between the α-helix abundance and conformational *G* values.

Figure S7. The simulated β-sheet abundance and associated Gibbs free energies (*G*) in the structures of the (a) Zn:Aβ40 and (b) Zn:Aβ42 metallopeptides. The red lines on the graph show the average *G* for the structures with each β-sheet percentage. No clear trend is obtained between the β-sheet abundance and the conformational *G* values.

Figure S8. Secondary structures per residue along with their probabilities for each basin on the PMF surface of the Zn:Aβ40 metallopeptide; basin I (purple), basin II (green), and basin III (red). The abundances for the πhelix and coil structures are not displayed.

Figure S9. Secondary structures per residue along with the corresponding probability for each basin on the PMF surface of the Zn:Aβ42 metallopeptide; basin I (purple), basin II (green), and basin III (red). The abundances for the π -helix and coil structures are not displayed.

A direct relationship between the secondary structure abundances and conformational Gibbs free energy values could not be established for either metallopeptide without using a structural classification method. Using the PMF surfaces, we find that the helix abundance in the Zn:Aβ40 structures located in basin I is 28% and 32% larger than those located in basins II and III, respectively. This result might indicate that the Zn:Aβ40 structures become more preferred with larger helix formation. Utilizing the PMF surface, a trend in helix formation and PMF is obtained for Zn:Aβ42; structures located in basins I possess 34% and 58% larger helix abundance than those located in basins II and III, respectively. The β-sheet abundance in the structures of Zn:Aβ42 located in basin I is 11% and 34% larger than in the conformations located in basins II and III, respectively. This finding indicates that an increase both in helix and β-sheet formation stabilizes the PMF of the Zn:Aβ42 structures, which in turn might be related to the larger entropic contribution in the conformational thermodynamic stability of Zn:Aβ42 rather than Zn:Aβ40 (see above).Detailed analysis shows that the α-helix abundance is 7% - 18% larger in the mid-domain (Glu22-Gly25) and C-terminal (Gly33-Val36) regions of Zn:Aβ40 for the structures located in basin I rather than those located in basins II and III (Figure 8). Moreover, 3₁₀-helix formation at Asp7-Gly9 and Glu11-His13 is more stable in the Zn:Aβ40 structures located in basin I rather than in those located in basins II and III. For Zn:Aβ42, there is a trend between α-helix and decreasing PMF for the residues located in the N-terminal region (Figure 9). Moreover, residues Phe19-Ala21 and Leu34-Val36 adopt more abundant 3_{10} -helix structure in the Zn:A β 42 conformations located in basin I rather than those located in basins II and III. Residues Asp7, Tyr10, Glu11, Asp23, Val40 and Ile41 of Zn:Aβ42 are capable of adopting prominent β-sheet structure with more favorable PMF values (Figure 9).

 (a) (b)

Figure S10. Calculated intra-molecular metallopeptide interactions in the structures of Zn:Aβ40 located in (a) basin II and (b) basin III on the PMF surface (see Figures 2a and 2b); the color scale corresponds to the probability (*P*) of these interactions.

Figure S11. Calculated intra-molecular metallopeptide interactions in the structures of Zn:Aβ42 located in (a) basin II and (b) basin III on the PMF surface (see Figures 2a and 2b); the color scale corresponds to the probability (*P*) of these interactions.

		$R(C-N)$ (%)								
Donor	Acceptor		I			П			Ш	
		\leq 4 Å	\leq 5 Å	≤ 6 Å	\leq 4 Å	\leq 5 Å	≤ 6 Å	≤ 4 Å	\leq 5 Å	$< 6 \text{ Å}$
Arg ₅	Asp1	59.5	68.4	69.7	51.9	60.1	61.9	58.6	67.1	68.4
Arg ₅	Glu22	12.4	12.6	12.6	14.5	14.9	15.1	8.1	8.4	8.4
Lys28	Glu22	12.2	19.1	20.3	17.7	27.4	28.9	6.0	9.8	10.7
Arg ₅	Asp7	20.9	25.5	29.0	24.1	31.3	36.4	25.1	31.6	36.3
Arg ₅	Glu ₃	15.9	17.2	17.5	22.3	23.4	23.7	21.1	22.2	22.4
Arg5	Asp23	8.2	8.7	9.0	18.5	20.3	21.9	7.9	8.6	8.9
Lys28	Asp23	4.6	6.8	7.6	3.6	5.2	5.8	4.6	7.0	8.0
Lvs16	Glu22	0.3	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.9	1.0	3.9	5.3	5.6

Table S2. The formed salt bridges in the structures of the Zn:Aβ40 metallopeptide located in basins I, II and III on the PMF surface; R(C-N) is the distance between the carboxylate C atom and the side-chain or N-terminus N atom.

	Acceptor	$R(C-N)$ (%)								
Donor		I			П			Ш		
		\leq 4 Å	\leq 5 Å	≤ 6 Å	\leq 4 Å	\leq 5 Å	≤ 6 Å	$\leq 4 \AA$	\leq 5 Å	$< 6 \text{ Å}$
Arg5	Asp1	86.1	98.3	98.8	82.8	92.2	93.5	74.6	84.9	86.0
Arg5	Glu22	13.5	13.7	13.7	15.9	16.2	16.2	15.0	15.2	15.2
Arg5	Asp7	29.8	32.3	33.8	26.3	30.7	33.7	16.4	19.7	22.1
Arg5	Glu3	1.0	1.0	1.0	6.4	7.1	7.4	10.6	11.9	12.5
Arg5	Asp23	30.5	30.6	30.9	4.1	4.1	4.2	2.1	2.2	2.2
Lys16	Glu22	25.3	34.8	36.5	19.1	25.1	26.1	8.6	11.4	12.0
Arg5	Glu11	1.8	8.2	35.7	2.4	7.1	16.7	1.3	4.9	11.7
Lys28	Asp23	3.9	5.4	6.0	2.9	4.6	5.6	5.0	7.5	8.8
Lys28	Glu22	0.8	1.2	1.3	2.7	4.4	5.0	1.7	2.8	3.2

Table S3. The formed salt bridges in the structures of the Zn:Aβ42 metallopeptide located in basins I, II, and III on the PMF surface; R(C-N) is the distance between the carboxylate C atom and the side-chain or N-terminus N atom.