

β -Branched Amino Acids Stabilize Specific Conformations of Cyclic Hexapeptides

Ashleigh E. Cummings,¹ Jiayuan Miao,¹ Diana P. Slough,¹ Sean M. McHugh,¹ Joshua A. Kritzer,^{1,*} and Yu-Shan Lin^{1,*}

¹Department of Chemistry, Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts

ABSTRACT Cyclic peptides (CPs) are a promising class of molecules for drug development, particularly as inhibitors of protein-protein interactions. Predicting low-energy structures and global structural ensembles of individual CPs is critical for the design of bioactive molecules, but these are challenging to predict and difficult to verify experimentally. In our previous work, we used explicit-solvent molecular dynamics simulations with enhanced sampling methods to predict the global structural ensembles of cyclic hexapeptides containing different permutations of glycine, alanine, and valine. One peptide, cyclo-(VVGVG) or P7, was predicted to be unusually well structured. In this work, we synthesized P7, along with a less well-structured control peptide, cyclo-(VVGVG) or P6, and characterized their global structural ensembles in water using NMR spectroscopy. The NMR data revealed a structural ensemble similar to the prediction for P7 and showed that P6 was indeed much less well-structured than P7. We then simulated and experimentally characterized the global structural ensembles of several P7 analogs and discovered that β -branching at one critical position within P7 is important for overall structural stability. The simulations allowed deconvolution of thermodynamic factors that underlie this structural stabilization. Overall, the excellent correlation between simulation and experimental data indicates that our simulation platform will be a promising approach for designing well-structured CPs and also for understanding the complex interactions that control the conformations of constrained peptides and other macrocycles.

INTRODUCTION

Small molecules are versatile for targeting many enzymes and receptors, and protein therapeutics can be used to target many extracellular proteins. However, when targeting protein-protein interactions, these two classes of inhibitors can be limited by an inability to present a large enough surface area (for small molecules) or difficulties in development, production, and delivery (for antibodies and other protein therapeutics) (1). For developing inhibitors of intracellular protein-protein interactions, macrocyclic molecules have been proposed as an ideal “middle ground” (2,3).

Cyclic peptides (CPs) are among the most well-studied macrocycles, and yet the sequence-structure relationships of CPs remain poorly understood. Various strategies can be utilized for designing CPs with specific conformations, including the use of β -amino acids (4–8) and D-amino acids (9–11). N-methylated or N-substituted amino acids can

also be used to control CP conformations, and these modifications mask backbone amides to increase membrane permeability (12–15). Also, proline affords an exceptional conformational rigidity owing to the cyclic structure of its side chain. Incorporation of proline into a CP enhances the formation of specific turn or kink structures and thus restricts conformational freedom (16–18). Recently, Hosseinzadeh et al. used generalized kinematic closure, Monte Carlo simulations, and energy calculations to enumerate the stable structures that can be adopted by 7–14-residue CPs (19). More than 200 designs were predicted to fold into single stable structures, and several were experimentally verified. L- and D-proline residues were shown to play important roles in stabilizing the structures. Because these residues dominated the design and preferred structures of the designed CPs, it was unclear what other factors might contribute to promoting a single low-energy structure for designed CPs. In addition, although design algorithms can produce examples of well-structured CPs and predict a single low-energy structure, they do not typically provide information on the peptides' global structural ensembles. Herein, we analyze a series of designed, well-structured cyclic hexapeptides and use simulations and experimental

Submitted October 4, 2018, and accepted for publication December 13, 2018.

*Correspondence: joshua.kritzer@tufts.edu or yu-shan.lin@tufts.edu

Ashleigh E. Cummings and Jiayuan Miao contributed equally to this work.

Editor: Margaret Cheung.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bpj.2018.12.015>

© 2019 Biophysical Society.



techniques to understand their global structural ensembles. By doing so, we discovered a previously unappreciated role for β -branched residues in stabilizing specific conformations of cyclic hexapeptides.

Recently, our lab developed an efficient enhanced sampling method tailored for CP simulation (20,21). We found that for small CPs, two dihedral angles, either the ϕ and ψ angles of the same residue (ϕ_i and ψ_i) or the ψ angle of one residue and the ϕ angle of the next residue (ψ_i and ϕ_{i+1}), need to change coherently to enable conformational switches. By targeting these essential transitional motions using bias-exchange metadynamics (BE-META) simulations, we can efficiently sample the conformational space of a CP (22–24). Using this method, we started examining CP sequence-structure relationships with explicit-water molecular dynamics (MD) simulations by gradually substituting Gly residues in cyclo-(GGGGGG) with Val. This systematic study consisted of 14 G_nV_{6-n} cyclic hexapeptides (i.e., cyclo-(GGGGGG), cyclo-(VGGGGG), cyclo-(VVGGGG), cyclo-(VGVGGG), cyclo-(VGGVGG),..., cyclo-(VVVVVV)) and allowed us to identify one CP predicted to have a single highly populated conformation in aqueous solution. Specifically, for the peptide cyclo-(VVGGVG), ~80% of the population formed two type II β turns at residues 2–3 and 5–6 in the simulation (Fig. 1 A) (22). This prediction was

unique among the 14 G_nV_{6-n} CPs because all the others adopted multiple conformations with small populations in solution (Fig. 1 B). This included cyclo-(VVGGVG), which has the same amino acid composition but different ordering of residues compared to cyclo-(VVGGGV). Herein, we report experimental verification of these structure predictions for cyclo-(VVGGVG), here called P7 (peptide #7 in the series of the 14 G_nV_{6-n} cyclic hexapeptides), and cyclo-(VVGGGV), here called P6, using NMR spectroscopy of synthetic peptides. These results validate our simulation protocol and demonstrate how efficient MD methods can be used to systematically characterize CP structural ensembles and identify well-structured sequences.

In this work, we sought to better understand the sequence determinants that result in P7 having a high degree of structure but its isomer P6 being more poorly structured. To understand the importance of each valine residue for stabilizing the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ structural motif adopted by P7, we performed, to our knowledge, new simulations on analogs which altered the degree of β -branching within P7. These results suggested a critical role for β -branching at position 1, which was supported by experimental data from NMR spectroscopy. Finally, thermodynamics analysis of the simulation results provided a molecular-level understanding of this effect.




FIGURE 1 Simulated structural ensembles for (A) P7 and (B) P6. One hundred randomly selected structures of the top three clusters are shown in purple lines, with a representative structure shown in sticks. Types I, II, and II' β turns are colored red, green, and blue, respectively. Hydrogen bonds are shown in orange dashed lines. The population of each cluster is given below the structures. To see this figure in color, go online.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

BE-META simulations

BE-META simulations (25,26) were performed for P7 cyclo-(VVGGVG), P6 cyclo-(VVGGGV), P7-V1A cyclo-(AVGGVG), P7-V2A cyclo-(VAGGVG), P7-V5A cyclo-(VVGAGG), P7-V1I cyclo-(IVGGVG), P7-V1L cyclo-(LVGGVG), P7-V1T cyclo-(TVGGVG), and P7-V1S cyclo-(SVGGVG) to computationally characterize the structural ensembles adopted by these CPs. The residue-specific force field 2 (RSFF2) (27) plus TIP3P water (28) was used throughout this work.

Two initial structures of each CP were prepared from scratch using the Chimera molecular modeling package (29). The initial CP structure was solvated, and the dimensions of the water box were chosen such that the minimal distance between any atom of the peptide and the walls of the box was 1.0 nm. The solvated system was energy minimized using the steepest descent algorithm to remove bad contacts. The solvated CP then underwent two stages of equilibrations. During the first stage of equilibration, the peptide's heavy atoms were restrained by a harmonic potential with a force constant of $1000 \text{ kJ}\cdot\text{mol}^{-1}\cdot\text{nm}^{-2}$ to equilibrate the solvent molecules and adjust the density. The first stage of equilibration consisted of a 50 ps NVT simulation at 300 K and a subsequent 50 ps NPT simulation at 300 K and one bar. The second stage of equilibration consisted of an additional 100 ps NVT simulation at 300 K followed by a 100 ps NPT simulation at 300 K and one bar without restraints to equilibrate the whole system. All production simulations were performed using an NPT ensemble at 300 K and one bar. The leapfrog algorithm with a time step of 2 fs was used for dynamics evolution. All bonds involving hydrogen were constrained using the LINCS algorithm. Cutoff of 1.0 nm was used for neighbor searching, Lennard-Jones interactions, and short-range electrostatics. Long-range electrostatics were treated using the particle mesh Ewald (PME) summation with a Fourier spacing of 0.12 nm and a PME order of 4. A long-range dispersion correction for energy and pressure was applied to account for the 1.0 nm cutoff of Lennard-Jones interactions.

All BE-META simulations were performed using the PLUMED 2 plugin (30) in Gromacs 4.6.7 (31). In each BE-META simulation, two types of two-dimensional (2D) biases, (ϕ_i, ψ_i) and (ψ_i, ϕ_{i+1}) , were used. These coordinates were found to effectively enhance conformation sampling of CPs by targeting the coupled two-dihedral changes (21). Therefore, in each simulation, there are a total of twelve CVs: six 2D biases for (ϕ_i, ψ_i) , and six 2D biases for (ψ_i, ϕ_{i+1}) . To obtain the unbiased structural ensemble for analysis, five neutral replicas (i.e., with no bias) were added. The length of the BE-META simulations was 100 ns for all CP except V1L, which was extended to 300 ns to reach convergence between the two parallel runs.

Structural ensemble analysis

To characterize the structural ensemble of each CP, the last 50 ns of the neutral replicas from the BE-META simulations were analyzed. We performed dihedral angle principal component analysis (dPCA) (32,33) utilizing the ϕ and ψ angles of all residues, followed by a grid density peak-based clustering (34) to quantify the population of each cluster. Principal component analysis is a popular technique for dimensionality reduction while preserving as much information (variance) as possible. In our dPCA, the first three principal components (PC1, PC2, and PC3) accounted for >60% of the total variances for all the CPs simulated in this study (Table S1). During the clustering, the three-dimensional principal subspace along PC1, PC2, and PC3 was first divided into $50 \times 50 \times 50$ grids, and the data population within each grid was then calculated. Cluster analysis was only performed on the grids with probability density larger than 0.1. The local density of a specific grid i was evaluated by a Gaussian kernel:

$$\rho_i = \sum_{j \in \Omega} w_j e^{-\frac{d_{ij}}{d_c}}, \quad (1)$$

where w_j is the data population of grid j , d_{ij} is the distance between grids i and j , and d_c is the cutoff distance, which was chosen such that the average number of neighboring grids is 2% of the total grids. The sum over j is over all the grids (including i). The population for each state was determined by summarizing the data populations of the grids that the state contained.

To verify that the BE-META simulations were long enough to provide converged structural description for the CPs studied, two sets of simulations were performed for all CPs, starting from two different initial configurations. The normalized integrated product (35) of the population densities in the three-dimensional principal subspace was calculated to monitor the similarity between the results from the two sets of simulations and verify their convergence (Fig. S1). The length of the BE-META simulations performed was 100–300 ns. All the final normalized integrated products were larger than 0.93 (with a value of 1.0 showing full convergence).

Thermodynamics analysis

We performed thermodynamics decomposition analysis to identify the origins of structural preferences of each CP (36). ΔG between clusters was calculated via the Boltzmann equation using the ratios of their populations, and the most-populated cluster was used as the reference state. ΔG was further separated into ΔH and ΔS , in which ΔH was estimated using the difference in potential energies between clusters and ΔS was estimated using $\Delta S = (\Delta H - \Delta G)/T$. ΔH was further decomposed based on 1) whether the interaction was within just peptide (ΔH_p^{vac}) or the rest of the system (ΔH_{rest}) and 2) whether the interaction was for bonds (ΔH^{bond}), angles (ΔH^{angle}), dihedrals (ΔH^{dih} and ΔH^{imp} for proper and improper dihedrals), Lennard-Jones (ΔH^{LJ}), or Coulombic interactions (ΔH^{EE} , short-range $\Delta H^{\text{EE(SR)}}$, long-range $\Delta H^{\text{EE(LR)}}$, 1–4 $\Delta H^{\text{EE(1,4)}}$). For 1), we note that periodic boundary conditions and PME were used in the simulations, and we excluded the interaction of the peptide and its images by excluding the long-range Coulombic potential when calculating peptide enthalpy,

yielding ΔH_p^{vac} ; the excluded long-range Coulombic potential was assigned to ΔH_{rest} . ΔS was further decomposed into peptide configurational entropy (ΔS_p^{conf}) and solvation entropy (ΔS_w). ΔS_p^{conf} was evaluated using the maximum information spanning tree approach (37–39), which provides a tight estimation of the upper bound of the entropy, and the solvation entropy was calculated by $\Delta S_w = \Delta S - \Delta S_p^{\text{conf}}$.

A large sample size is critical for the accurate estimation of both enthalpy and entropy. According to our evaluation, with the trajectories saved every 1 ps, 60,000 frames of data were needed for each conformation, which amounted to 60 ns of accumulated simulation time. For clusters that had small populations, there were not enough frames from the BE-META simulations for the thermodynamics analysis. To obtain enough data, we performed additional MD simulations using randomly selected structures from each cluster as starting points. The simulation parameters used in the additional MD simulations were the same as those used in the BE-META simulations described above. We performed dPCA and cluster analysis on these trajectories to exclude frames that did not belong to the target cluster, and we ran these MD simulations until at least 60,000 frames were available for each cluster. Thus, all the thermodynamics analysis comparing different structural clusters was based on the same number of frames (60,000) from the MD simulations. To ensure that the frames used for thermodynamics analysis for each cluster accurately represent the equilibrium structural ensembles, we also ensured that the rotamer distribution along the χ_1 angles (g^+ , t , g^-) of the first residue calculated using the 60,000 frames was the same as the rotamer distribution observed for each cluster in the BE-META simulations.

Peptide synthesis, cyclization, and purification

The linear peptide was synthesized at 0.05 mmol scale on Wang resin preloaded with Fmoc-glycine (0.7 mmol/g; Novabiochem, San Diego, CA). Solid-phase peptide synthesis was carried out on an automated synthesizer (Tribute; Gyros Protein Technologies, Uppsala, Sweden) using ultraviolet deprotection monitoring and infrared heating on all couplings, resulting in the linear peptide with a deprotected N-terminus. The peptide was cleaved from the resin using 4% H_2O (v/v) in a solution of trifluoroacetic acid for 3 h at room temperature. The peptide solution was filtered from the resin and dried using a rotary evaporator. The resulting film was dissolved in 50% H_2O : 50% acetonitrile and lyophilized. The lyophilized crude peptide was directly used for cyclization. Cyclizations were carried out at room temperature for 1 h with 0.5 mM peptide, 1.5 mM 1-[bis(dimethylamino)methylene]-1H-1,2,3-triazolo [4,5-b]pyridinium 3-oxid hexafluorophosphate and 3 mM *N,N*-diisopropylethylamine in dimethylformamide. The cyclization reaction was quenched by adding trifluoroacetic acid. After removing solvents by rotary evaporator, the reaction mixture was redissolved in 50:50 H_2O : acetonitrile and purified via high-performance liquid chromatography with a preparative reverse-phase C8 column. CP purity of >95% was confirmed by analytical high-performance liquid chromatography, and identity was confirmed by liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (Agilent 6530 Accurate Mass Q-TOF with an Agilent 1290 UHPLC; Agilent, Santa Clara, CA).

NMR characterization

Peptides were dissolved in 90:10 H_2O : D_2O at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM. One-dimensional and 2D ^1H NMR spectra were recorded on a Bruker cryo-600 MHz spectrometer at 288 K (Bruker, Billerica, MA). Complete resonance assignments were made using data from homonuclear ^1H - ^1H total correlation spectroscopy (TOCSY) and rotating-frame Overhauser spectroscopy (ROESY) experiments. Standard pulse programs available from the Bruker library were used, with mixing times of 60 ms for the TOCSY and 250 ms for the ROESY. ^1H chemical shifts were referenced to 4,4-dimethyl-4-silapentane-1-sulfonic acid (δ 0.00 ppm) in water. $^3J_{\text{NH,CH}_\alpha}$ coupling constants were measured from ^1H NMR.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To follow up on our previous structure predictions of peptides P7 and P6, (Fig. 1; (22)) we prepared these CPs and obtained ^1H NMR spectra and TOCSY and ROESY spectra in aqueous solution. These results allowed complete, unambiguous assignment for each peptide. Although the two peptides have the same residue composition, the proton chemical shifts revealed large structural differences between P7 and P6 (Fig. 2 A). The P7 amide protons spanned widely from 9.07 to 7.39 ppm, whereas P6 amide protons spanned a much narrower range from 8.96 to 7.80 ppm. Overlap among amide protons from residues of the same type is common in less-structured peptides. For example, overlap between the amide protons of V_1 and V_4 was observed in P6. However, no such overlap was observed for P7. The greater range and lack of overlap for P7 amide protons indicated a greater degree of structure.

We found similar results when examining the chemical shifts of the methyl protons (Fig. 2 B). P6 methyl protons showed significant overlap and their chemical shifts spanned from 1.00 to 0.91 ppm, whereas the P7 methyl protons all had distinct chemical shifts and spanned from 1.03 to 0.69 ppm. For P7 methyl protons, six separate doublets were observed, corresponding to six methyl groups with different chemical shifts among the three valines. Side-chain flexibility typically results in averaged peaks for valine methyl protons, so the separation of all six of P7's valine methyl resonances implied a high degree of structure. In particular, the methyl resonances within valine 1 of P7 (P7- V_1) were at 0.88 and 0.69 ppm, a difference of 0.19 ppm. This was an unusually large difference between methyl resonances within a single valine. The dramatic upfield shift of the P7- V_1 methyl at 0.69 ppm, along with the upfield chemical shift of the P7- V_1 amide proton, suggested




FIGURE 2 2D-NMR data for peptides P7 (cyclo-VVGGVG) and P6 (cyclo-VVGVGG) in water. (A) Amide proton region of ^1H NMR for P7 and P6. (B) Methyl proton region of ^1H NMR for P7 and P6. (C) Double-headed arrows show strong (black) and weak (gray) NOEs from the ROESY spectra for P7 and P6. (D) Amide-to-amide proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for P7 and P6. NOE crosspeaks are expected for positions at which β turns predominate in the solution ensemble. (E) α -to-methyl proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for P7 and P6. NOE crosspeaks show medium-range interactions between methyl protons and α protons. To see this figure in color, go online.

that this residue is unusually well structured. This was our first indication that V₁ might be critical for the overall structural organization of P7.

ROESY data were used to further investigate the structures of P7 and P6. Strong nuclear Overhauser effects (NOEs) occur when a large proportion of the peptide ensemble keeps two protons near each other in space (within roughly 3.5 Å), whereas weak NOEs occur either when two protons are further away (up to 5.5 Å) or when the protons are near each other only in a smaller proportion of the structural ensemble (40). For large proteins, the broad range of NOE peak volumes is typically used to calibrate NOEs to specific distances between protons. However, because of the relatively small number of protons and NOEs in a cyclic hexapeptide, in the following analysis, we simply binned NOEs into “strong” and “weak” groups to avoid overinterpretation. Several strong interresidue NOEs and one weak interresidue NOE were observed for P7 and P6 (Fig. 2 C). Two sets of simulated annealing simulations incorporating the NOE restraints were performed for each compound. The results demonstrate that the experimentally derived NOE constraints are consistent with the predicted structural ensembles for P7 and P6 (Fig. S2). To avoid overinterpretation, we focused further analysis on the primary NMR data rather than these NMR-derived structural simulations.

The presence of (*i*, *i*+1) amide-to-amide NOEs can address the existence and location of β turns within the peptide backbone. For P7, two strong amide-to-amide NOEs were observed (V₁H_N-G₆H_N and G₃H_N-V₄H_N), and no other strong or weak amide-to-amide NOEs were observed (Fig. 2 D). These NOEs are consistent with types II and II' β turn structures at positions 5-6 and 2-3 (24), and these positions match the predicted positions for two type II β turns for P7 (residues 2-3 and 5-6, Fig. 1 A). For P6, five of the six possible sequential amide-to-amide NOEs were observed, with varying intensities. These data suggested that P6 populates an ensemble of backbone conformations with β turns at various positions.

Interresidue, nonsequential NOEs (often called “medium-range” or “long-range” NOEs for larger proteins) add important constraints and are particularly indicative of a high degree of structure. Notably, we observed NOEs for each of the P7-V₁ methyl protons with an α -proton of the G₄ residue (G₄H _{α 1}-V₁H _{γ} , Fig. 2 E). The upfield-shifted P7-V₁ methyl group had a stronger NOE to G₄H _{α 1} compared to the other P7-V₁ methyl group. These NOEs are consistent with the predicted structure for P7, which positions the V₁ methyl groups at median distances of 3.4 and 5.8 Å from the nearest G₄H _{α 1} proton (Fig. 1 A). No such interactions were observed for P6, for which no nonsequential NOEs were detected.

We next used variable-temperature NMR to identify backbone amides that are engaged in intramolecular hydrogen bonding. The chemical shifts of solvent-exposed backbone amide protons will change with temperature,

shifting upfield between 16 and 4.5 ppb per degree K (-16 to -4.5 ppb/K). The chemical shifts of amide protons that are protected from solvent, such as those engaged in intramolecular hydrogen bonds, will change to a lesser extent with temperature (-4.5 to 2 ppb/K) (41,42). For P6, only one amide proton, that of G₆ (-2.8 ppb/K), had a temperature dependence consistent with hydrogen bonding (Fig. 3 B). This observation is consistent with the simulation results that a hydrogen bond was formed between G₆'s NH and G₃'s CO in 71.4% of the most-populated cluster and 31.7% of the second most-populated cluster of P6's predicted structural ensemble (Fig. 1 B). For P7, four of the six amide protons had temperature dependences between -9.4 and -10.8 ppb/K (Fig. 3 A). Strikingly, the amide protons of P7-V₁ and P7-G₄ had temperature dependences of 1.8 and -1.1 ppb/K, respectively, indicating a large degree of protection from solvent. In fact, these temperature coefficients match values typically observed in the folded core of globular proteins (41,42). These solvent-protected amide protons match the positions of predicted hydrogen bonds in the most-populated cluster of P7's predicted structural ensemble (Fig. 1 A). The variable-temperature NMR data are consistent with the conclusion that the solution ensemble of P6 has several interconverting, internally hydrogen-bonded structures, but that the ensemble of P7 is predominated by a single structure with the predicted hydrogen bond pattern.

To understand the importance of each valine residue in stabilizing the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ structure of P7 (Fig. 1), we performed simulations in which each of the three valine residues was replaced with alanine. Compared to P7, for which the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ conformation had a population of 75.3%, the V2A analog, cyclo-(VAGGVG), and the V5A




FIGURE 3 Temperature dependence of amide proton chemical shifts for (A) P7 and (B) P6. Stacked spectra show the amide regions of ¹H NMR experiments at the indicated temperature. Temperature coefficients are shown in ppb/K for each amide proton. Solvent-exposed amide protons typically have chemical shifts that shift upfield with temperature by more than 4.5 ppb/K (temperature coefficient between -4.5 and -16 ppb/K). Temperature coefficients between 2.0 and -4.5 ppb/K indicate protection from solvent as occurs when an amide proton is involved in a hydrogen bond.




FIGURE 4 Simulated structural ensembles for the V1A, V2A, V5A, V1I, V1L, V1T, and V1S analogs of P7. Top three clusters are shown with their populations given in parentheses. One hundred randomly selected struc-

analog, cyclo-(VVGAG), had slightly lower populations (70.6% and 61.7%, respectively). The V1A analog, cyclo-(AVGGVG), still had the original $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ conformation as its most-populated structure but this was only 47.2% of the total population (Fig. 4). These data led us to hypothesize that β -branching at position 1 is essential for stabilizing the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ structure of P7. To further test this hypothesis, we simulated the V1I, V1L, V1T, and V1S analogs of P7. For the β -branched analogs V1I and V1T, the population of the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ conformation was 77.8% and 63.8%, respectively. For the non- β -branched analogs V1L and V1S, $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ was still the most-populated conformation, but its population was only 32.4% and 44.2%, respectively. Overall, these simulations suggested that β -branching at position 1 is critical for stabilizing the overall $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ structure of P7 (Fig. 4).

Because the simulations predicted such a strong effect for β -branching at position 1, we sought to confirm these predictions experimentally. The same NMR experiments used to compare P7 and P6 were first performed for P7 analogs V1I and V1L. As discussed above, amide proton chemical shifts provided insight into the overall degree of structure (Fig. 5). For V1I, amide chemical shifts spanned from 9.00 to 7.45 ppm, whereas its non- β -branched isomer V1L had a smaller range (from 8.81 to 7.97 ppm). The individual resonances of V1I were very similar to that of P7 as might be expected for a valine-to-isoleucine substitution. The predominant locations of β turns were investigated by examining amide-to-amide NOEs. For V1I, two strong amide-to-amide NOEs were observed, $I_1H_N-G_6H_N$ and $G_3H_N-G_4H_N$ (Fig. 6, A and B). These NOEs occurred at the same positions observed for P7 (Fig. 2 D), and these are also consistent with the β turn positions predicted by simulations of V1I (at residues 5–6 and 2–3) (Fig. 4). We also observed two weaker NOEs at $I_1H_N-V_2H_N$ and $G_4H_N-V_5H_N$, indicating a minor contribution of other β turn structures to the overall solution ensemble of V1I. For V1L, all six possible amide-to-amide NOEs were observed at strong intensities (Fig. 6, A and B). These data indicate V1L populates an ensemble with varied β turn positions and no predominant β turn location. In contrast, the NMR data indicate that V1I has a predominant structure that is highly similar to that of P7 but with a somewhat lower degree of overall structure than P7.

NOEs between protons on nonadjacent residues provided further indications of structure and relative side-chain flexibility. Strong NOEs were observed in the V1I spectrum between G_4 and the side chain of I_1 ($I_1H_\gamma-G_4H_\alpha$ and $I_1H_\delta-G_4H_\alpha$), whereas only one weak interaction was observed for V1L ($L_1H_\delta-G_4H_\alpha$, Fig. 6 C). Variable-temperature NMR experiments for V1I showed that two amide protons, I_1H_N

tures of each cluster are shown in purple lines, with a representative structure shown in sticks. Types I, I', II, and II' β turns are colored red, yellow, green, and blue, respectively. Hydrogen bonds are shown in orange dashed lines. To see this figure in color, go online.




FIGURE 5 ^1H NMR spectra for P7, P6, and P7 analogs V1I, V1T, V1S, and V1L. The more well-structured peptides (P7, V1I, and V1T) have a wider span of amide chemical shifts, whereas the less well-structured peptides (V1S, V1L, and P6) have a narrower span of amide chemical shifts.

and $\text{G}_4\text{H}_\text{N}$, had temperature coefficients in the range of -4.5 to 2 ppb/K (1.7 and -0.7 ppb/K, respectively). This observation suggests that these amide protons are extremely well-protected from solvent, similar to the corresponding protons of P7 (Fig. 8). V1L, in contrast, had only one amide proton ($\text{G}_4\text{H}_\text{N}$) falling barely above the threshold of -4.5 ppb/K (-4.3 ppb/K). The rest of the amide protons had temperature coefficients ranging from -5.2 to -9.5 ppb/K, indicating that these are, on average, unprotected from solvent.

To examine the effects of β -branching using a second set of P7 analogs, we prepared V1T and V1S and analyzed them using NMR. V1T had a wider overall span of amide chemical shifts than V1S, indicating a higher degree of structure (Fig. 5). Both peptides had strong amide-to-amide NOEs at the predicted turn locations and weak amide-to-amide NOEs at the other four possible turn locations (Fig. 7 B). These data indicated that both peptides have a dominant conformation that corresponds to the top cluster from the simulations, with minor contributions of other β turn structures to the overall ensemble. For V1T, a strong medium-range NOE was observed for $\text{T}_1\text{H}_\text{N}-\text{G}_4\text{H}_\text{N}$ (Fig. 7 C). In variable-temperature experiments, the $\text{T}_1\text{H}_\text{N}$ and $\text{G}_4\text{H}_\text{N}$ protons of V1T had temperature coefficients of -1.0 and -1.6 ppb/K, respectively. Interestingly, the analogous $\text{S}_1\text{H}_\text{N}$ and $\text{G}_4\text{H}_\text{N}$ protons of V1S also showed substantial protection from solvent, with temperature coefficients of -2.2 and -2.1 ppb/K, respectively. Overall, the NMR data indicated that V1T and V1S are both relatively well structured, with V1T slightly more so, but neither are as well structured as P7 or V1I.

Using the variable-temperature data to compare overall degree of structure (Fig. 8), the peptides rank as follows from most structured to least structured: P7, V1I, V1T, V1S, P6, and V1L. This order matches the trends observed

for chemical shift data (Figs. 2 and 5) and NOE data (Figs. 2, 6, and 7). Importantly, this ranking is consistent with the predictions from the simulations based on the percentage population of the most-populated cluster for each peptide: P7 75.3%, V1I 77.8%, V1T 63.8%, V1S 44.2%, P6 34.1%, and V1L 32.4% (Figs. 1 and 4). Thus, the NMR data suggest that our simulations not only identified the predominant structure for each peptide in solution, but also successfully predicted the overall population of that structure compared to similar peptides.

We performed thermodynamics analysis of our simulation results to provide some molecular-level understanding of the effects of β -branching at position 1 on the structural ensemble of P7. Table S2 shows the ΔG , ΔH , ΔS , and further decomposition of ΔH and ΔS of the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ conformation relative to the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation for each of the peptides P7, V1A, V1I, V1L, V1T, and V1S. The $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation refers to the most-populated cluster for all of these peptides, which had type II β turns at residues 2–3 and 5–6 (Figs. 1 and 4). The $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ conformation refers to a conformation which had type II' β turns at residues 6–1 and 3–4; this was the second most-populated cluster for P7, V1A, V1I, and V1L and the third most-populated cluster for V1T and V1S (Fig. 4). The ΔH 's between the two conformations were almost equal to ΔG 's for all CPs except V1S (Table S2), which indicates that the most-populated $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation was favored over the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ mostly because of enthalpy. On the other hand, the $-T\Delta S_{\text{P}}^{\text{conf}}$ between the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ and $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformations shows that the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ conformation was relatively favorable in configurational entropy. Peptide entropy plays an important role in protein folding, peptoid helix formation, and dimerization (43–45). In protein folding,




FIGURE 6 2D-NMR data for peptides VII (cyclo-IVGGVG) and VIL (cyclo-LVGGVG) in water. (A) Double-headed arrows show strong (*black*) and weak (*gray*) NOEs from the ROESY spectra for VII and VIL. (B) Amide-to-amide proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra. NOE crosspeaks are expected for positions at which β turns predominate in the solution ensemble. (C) α -to-methyl proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra. NOE crosspeaks show medium-range interactions between methyl protons and α protons. To see this figure in color, go online.

the peptide entropy typically decreases as the protein goes from the unfolded to the folded state. Because of the crowdedness near the backbone, β -branched amino acids have less conformational freedom in the unfolded state, and β -branching can make the folding process more favorable (46). In our case here, β -branching made the top cluster (the $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ conformation) even more unfavorable in configurational entropy, as shown in Table S2. To understand this phenomenon, Fig. S3 A shows the decomposition of TS_P^{conf} into the self-entropy term, which had contributions from bonds, angles, and dihedrals, and the mutual information term (39) for cluster 1 ($\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$) and cluster 2 ($\beta_{IV}+\beta_{IV}$) of VIL. It was found that the major contribution to the difference in configurational entropy between the two clusters came from the dihedral component of the self-entropy term. The same conclusion was found for the other five CPs: V7, V1A, VII, V1T, and V1S. To get an idea of which dihedrals contributed the most to the change in $T\Delta S_P^{\text{conf}}$, when the first residue was changed from a non- β -branched amino acid to a β -branched amino acid, we plotted the contribution to TS_P^{conf} from each dihedral degree of freedom for clusters 1 and 2 of VIL (Fig. S3 B) and VII

(Fig. S3 C). We found that the largest difference in the two CPs lay in the self-entropy of the dihedral $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_\gamma$ (χ_1) of residue 1 in VIL versus $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_\gamma$ (which was related to the χ_1 angle) of residue 1 in VII. Although the self-entropy of $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_\gamma$ of residue 1 was similar between clusters 1 and 2 in VIL, the self-entropy of $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_\gamma$ of residue 1 was much smaller in cluster 1 than cluster 2 in VII. Fig. S3 D shows that the distribution of the dihedrals was much more confined in cluster 1 relative to cluster 2 in VII but not in VIL, which explains in part why CPs with a β -branched amino acid at position 1 had an even more unfavorable configurational entropy for cluster 1 than cluster 2 than CPs with a non- β -branched amino acid at position 1.

ΔH between the $\beta_{IV}+\beta_{IV}$ and $\beta_{II}+\beta_{II}$ conformations shows that the $\beta_{IV}+\beta_{IV}$ conformation was relatively unfavorable in enthalpy, and having a β -branched residue at position 1 increased this gap. Further breaking down ΔH into its components, we found that ΔH_P^{dih} was larger for the CPs with β -branched residue 1 (P7, VII, and V1T) than for the CPs with non- β -branched residue 1 (V1A, VIL, and V1S). To isolate the origin of this difference, we




FIGURE 7 2D-NMR data for peptides V1T (cyclo-TVGGVG) and V1S (cyclo-SVGGVG) in water. (A) Double-headed arrows show strong (*black*) and weak (*gray*) NOEs from the ROESY spectra for V1T and V1S. (B) Amide-to-amide proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for V1T and V1S. NOE crosspeaks are expected for positions at which β turns predominate in the solution ensemble. (C) α -to-methyl proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for V1T and V1S. NOE crosspeaks show medium-range interactions between methyl protons and α protons. To see this figure in color, go online.

decomposed ΔH_P^{dih} into contributions from each dihedral. Fig. S3 E plots the potential energy difference for each dihedral angle between the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ and the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation for V1I and V1L. This analysis showed that the difference of ΔH_P^{dih} in V1I compared to V1L was mainly due to the energy differences in ϕ , ϕ' , ψ , ψ' , and χ_1' of residue 1.

Fig. 9 shows the Ramachandran plot for the most-populated cluster (the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation) and the second most-populated cluster (the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ conformation) of P7. In the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation, the ϕ and ψ dihedrals of residue 1 reside in the β conformer region, whereas in the $\beta_{\text{II}'}+\beta_{\text{II}'}$ conformation, these dihedrals populate the right-handed α helix (α_R) conformer region. In general, β -branched residues, such as V, I, and T, tend to have a higher propensity to form a β sheet than non- β -branched residues, such as A, L, and S. Analysis of the coil library shows that β -branched residues have higher intrinsic propensity for the β conformer than the non- β -branched residues (47–49). This stronger preference for the β conformer of β -branched residues could explain their importance in stabilizing the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation in cyclo-(XVGGVG).

In this study, we used the RSFF2 force field (27,50), which was based on amber99sb but modified to capture the intrinsic ϕ/ψ propensities observed in the protein coil library for each amino acid. Because our thermodynamic analysis of simulations with RSFF2 attributed a large overall effect to β -branching, we were curious whether modifications to backbone dihedral propensities were critical for obtaining the correct structures. To test this, we performed BE-META simulations of these CPs using the amber99sb force field. Table S3 shows that the $\beta_{\text{II}}+\beta_{\text{II}}$ conformation was no longer the most-populated structure for any of the CPs when the amber99sb force field was used. Instead, the top clusters formed a type I β turn at residues 1–2 and a type II' β turn at residues 4–5, and these clusters had populations <40%. These observations and the agreement between our simulations and experimental results support the improvement and value of the RSFF2 force field.

CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we used explicit-solvent MD simulations with enhanced sampling to predict the global structural




FIGURE 8 Variable-temperature NMR data. The temperature coefficients (change in chemical shift over temperature, in ppb/K) for the amide protons of peptides P7, V1I, V1T, V1S, V1L, and P6 are shown. Temperature coefficients between -4.5 and -16 ppb/K are typical for solvent-exposed amide protons. Temperature coefficients between 2.0 and -4.5 ppb/K indicate protection from solvent, as occurs when an amide proton is involved in intramolecular hydrogen bonding. To see this figure in color, go online.

ensembles of several cyclic hexapeptides. As synthesizing and structurally characterizing CPs was rather labor and resource intensive, we chose six CPs for synthesis and structural characterization to assess the predictions. The structural data was acquired by solution-phase NMR in aqueous solution with no organic solvent. Commonly, constraints from NMR data are used to calculate an ensemble of lowest-energy structures (19). Although we performed this analysis (Fig. S2), it can lead to overinterpretation for molecules of small size. It also ignores the potential for a molecule to populate multiple conformations in solution, which is common for CPs (51). Thus, we used NMR data to verify the predicted lowest-energy structure, and we also analyzed chemical shifts, NOEs, and variable-temperature data directly. This allowed us to analyze the degree of structure of the global conformational ensemble, rather than limiting our analysis to one lowest-energy cluster. Notably, the MD simulations were used to make predictions

that were subsequently validated by experiment, rather than using MD simulations to rationalize previous experimental observations.

We observed that small modifications to peptide sequence can lead to large changes in the CP solution ensemble. This phenomenon is well known in the medicinal chemistry literature, in which structure-activity relationships (SAR) for macrocyclic molecules are notoriously noncooperative and hard to predict. Although there is currently little understanding of the SAR of CPs, using MD simulations, we were able to identify for cyclo-(VVGGVG) a critical position at which β -branching was important for structure. We confirmed the validity of the simulations by comparing simulation data to solution-phase structural information, successfully predicting degree of structure for a series of analogs differing only by one side chain.

Fully predictive computational SAR models for CPs and other macrocycles will be impossible without the ability to simulate accurately the global ensemble of populated structures. With additional simulations of CPs of different sizes and compositions, we anticipate that our MD simulations, coupled with careful comparisons to experimental data, will produce fully predictive computational SAR models for CPs. Such models would be enormously helpful in drug development for CPs and other macrocycles.

SUPPORTING MATERIAL

32 figures and 24 tables are available at [http://www.biophysj.org/biophysj/supplemental/S0006-3495\(18\)34529-6](http://www.biophysj.org/biophysj/supplemental/S0006-3495(18)34529-6).

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

J.A.K. and Y.-S.L. designed the research. A.E.C. performed the peptide synthesis and NMR spectroscopy. J.M., D.P.S., and S.M.M. performed the simulations and analysis. A.E.C., J.M., J.A.K., and Y.-S.L. interpreted the data and wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version.




FIGURE 9 Ramachandran plots for the top two clusters of P7. Boxes around residues are colored by β turn type (types II and II' β turns are colored green and blue, respectively) and solid lines indicate the ideal dihedral angles for each type of β turn. To see this figure in color, go online.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the support of the Tufts start-up fund, the Knez Family Faculty Investment Fund, and the National Institute of General Medical Sciences of the National Institutes of Health under award number R01GM124160 for Y.-S. L. and award number R01GM125856 for J. A. K., and the National Science Foundation under grant number (1507456) for J. A. K. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. This work utilized NMR instrumentation that was purchased with funding from a National Institutes of Health Shared Instrumentation grant (S10OD020073).

REFERENCES

- Makley, L. N., and J. E. Gestwicki. 2013. Expanding the number of 'druggable' targets: non-enzymes and protein-protein interactions. *Chem. Biol. Drug Des.* 81:22–32.
- Marsault, E., and M. L. Peterson. 2011. Macrocycles are great cycles: applications, opportunities, and challenges of synthetic macrocycles in drug discovery. *J. Med. Chem.* 54:1961–2004.
- Tsomaia, N. 2015. Peptide therapeutics: targeting the undruggable space. *Eur. J. Med. Chem.* 94:459–470.
- Lombardi, A., M. Saviano, ..., V. Pavone. 1996. Solvent-mediated conformational transition in β -alanine containing cyclic peptides. VIII. *Biopolymers.* 38:693–703.
- Schumann, F., A. Muller, ..., N. Sewald. 2000. Are β -amino acids γ -turn mimetics? Exploring a new design principle for bioactive cyclopeptides. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 122:12009–12010.
- Strijowski, U., and N. Sewald. 2004. Structural properties of cyclic peptides containing *cis*- or *trans*-2-aminocyclohexane carboxylic acid. *Org. Biomol. Chem.* 2:1105–1109.
- Malešević, M., Z. Majer, ..., N. Sewald. 2006. Spectroscopic detection of pseudo-turns in homodetic cyclic penta- and hexapeptides comprising β -homoproline. *Int. J. Pept. Res. Ther.* 12:165–177.
- Guthöhrlein, E. W., M. Malešević, ..., N. Sewald. 2007. Secondary structure inducing potential of β -amino acids: torsion angle clustering facilitates comparison and analysis of the conformation during MD trajectories. *Biopolymers.* 88:829–839.
- Varughese, K. I., G. Kartha, and K. D. Kopple. 1981. Crystal structure and conformation of cyclo-(glycyl-D-leucyl-L-leucyl)₂. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 103:3310–3313.
- Stradley, S. J., J. Rizo, ..., L. M. Gierasch. 1990. Cyclic pentapeptides as models for reverse turns: determination of the equilibrium distribution between type I and type II conformations of Pro-Asn and Pro-Ala β -turns. *Biopolymers.* 29:263–287.
- Haubner, R., D. Finsinger, and H. Kessler. 1997. Stereoisomeric peptide libraries and peptidomimetics for designing selective inhibitors of the $\alpha_v\beta_3$ integrin for a new cancer therapy. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 36:1374–1389.
- Chatterjee, J., C. Gilon, ..., H. Kessler. 2008. N-methylation of peptides: a new perspective in medicinal chemistry. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 41:1331–1342.
- Ovadia, O., S. Greenberg, ..., A. Hoffman. 2011. The effect of multiple N-methylation on intestinal permeability of cyclic hexapeptides. *Mol. Pharm.* 8:479–487.
- White, T. R., C. M. Renzelman, ..., R. S. Lokey. 2011. On-resin N-methylation of cyclic peptides for discovery of orally bioavailable scaffolds. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* 7:810–817.
- Furukawa, A., C. E. Townsend, ..., R. S. Lokey. 2016. Passive membrane permeability in cyclic peptomer scaffolds is robust to extensive variation in side chain functionality and backbone geometry. *J. Med. Chem.* 59:9503–9512.
- Bean, J. W., K. D. Kopple, and C. E. Peishoff. 1992. Conformational analysis of cyclic hexapeptides containing the D-Pro-L-Pro sequence to fix β -turn positions. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 114:5328–5334.
- Rao, I. N., A. Boruah, ..., J. Iqbal. 2004. Synthesis and conformational studies of novel cyclic peptides constrained into a 3₁₀ helical structure by a heterochiral D-pro-L-pro dipeptide template. *J. Org. Chem.* 69:2181–2184.
- Northfield, S. E., J. Wielens, ..., D. K. Chalmers. 2018. Cyclic hexapeptide mimics of the LEDGF integrase recognition loop in complex with HIV-1 integrase. *ChemMedChem.* 13:1555–1565.
- Hosseinzadeh, P., G. Bhardwaj, ..., D. Baker. 2017. Comprehensive computational design of ordered peptide macrocycles. *Science.* 358:1461–1466.
- Yu, H., and Y. S. Lin. 2015. Toward structure prediction of cyclic peptides. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 17:4210–4219.
- McHugh, S. M., J. R. Rogers, ..., Y. S. Lin. 2016. Insights into how cyclic peptides switch conformations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 12:2480–2488.
- McHugh, S. M., H. Yu, ..., Y. S. Lin. 2017. Mapping the sequence-structure relationships of simple cyclic hexapeptides. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 19:3315–3324.
- Slough, D. P., H. Yu, ..., Y. S. Lin. 2017. Toward accurately modeling N-methylated cyclic peptides. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 19:5377–5388.
- Slough, D. P., S. M. McHugh, ..., Y. S. Lin. 2018. Designing well-structured cyclic pentapeptides based on sequence-structure relationships. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 122:3908–3919.
- Laio, A., and M. Parrinello. 2002. Escaping free-energy minima. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 99:12562–12566.
- Piana, S., and A. Laio. 2007. A bias-exchange approach to protein folding. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 111:4553–4559.
- Zhou, C. Y., F. Jiang, and Y. D. Wu. 2015. Residue-specific force field based on protein coil library. RSFF2: modification of AMBER ff99SB. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 119:1035–1047.
- Jorgensen, W. L., J. Chandrasekhar, ..., M. L. Klein. 1983. Comparison of simple potential functions for simulating liquid water. *J. Chem. Phys.* 79:926–935.
- Pettersen, E. F., T. D. Goddard, ..., T. E. Ferrin. 2004. UCSF Chimera—a visualization system for exploratory research and analysis. *J. Comput. Chem.* 25:1605–1612.
- Tribello, G. A., M. Bonomi, ..., G. Bussi. 2014. PLUMED 2: new feathers for an old bird. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 185:604–613.
- Hess, B., C. Kutzner, ..., E. Lindahl. 2008. Gromacs 4: algorithms for highly efficient, load-balanced, and scalable molecular simulation. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 4:435–447.
- Mu, Y., P. H. Nguyen, and G. Stock. 2005. Energy landscape of a small peptide revealed by dihedral angle principal component analysis. *Proteins.* 58:45–52.
- Sittel, F., A. Jain, and G. Stock. 2014. Principal component analysis of molecular dynamics: on the use of Cartesian vs. internal coordinates. *J. Chem. Phys.* 141:014111.
- Rodriguez, A., and A. Laio. 2014. Machine learning. Clustering by fast search and find of density peaks. *Science.* 344:1492–1496.
- Damas, J. M., L. C. Filipe, ..., C. M. Soares. 2013. Predicting the thermodynamics and kinetics of helix formation in a cyclic peptide model. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 9:5148–5157.
- Fenley, A. T., H. S. Muddana, and M. K. Gilson. 2012. Entropy-enthalpy transduction caused by conformational shifts can obscure the forces driving protein-ligand binding. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA.* 109:20006–20011.
- King, B. M., and B. Tidor. 2009. MIST: maximum information spanning trees for dimension reduction of biological data sets. *Bioinformatics.* 25:1165–1172.
- King, B. M., N. W. Silver, and B. Tidor. 2012. Efficient calculation of molecular configurational entropies using an information theoretic approximation. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 116:2891–2904.

39. Fleck, M., A. A. Polyansky, and B. Zagrovic. 2016. Parent: a parallel software suite for the calculation of configurational entropy in biomolecular systems. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 12:2055–2065.
40. Cavanagh, J., W. J. Fairbrother, ..., N. J. Skelton. 2007. *Protein NMR Spectroscopy*. Elsevier Academic Press, Burlington, MA.
41. Baxter, N. J., and M. P. Williamson. 1997. Temperature dependence of ^1H chemical shifts in proteins. *J. Biomol. NMR.* 9:359–369.
42. Cierpicki, T., and J. Otlewski. 2001. Amide proton temperature coefficients as hydrogen bond indicators in proteins. *J. Biomol. NMR.* 21:249–261.
43. Doig, A. J., and M. J. Sternberg. 1995. Side-chain conformational entropy in protein folding. *Protein Sci.* 4:2247–2251.
44. Liu, W., E. Crocker, ..., S. O. Smith. 2003. Role of side-chain conformational entropy in transmembrane helix dimerization of glycoporphin A. *Biophys. J.* 84:1263–1271.
45. Mukherjee, S., G. Zhou, ..., V. A. Voelz. 2015. Insights into peptoid helix folding cooperativity from an improved backbone potential. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 119:15407–15417.
46. Lesk, A. 2017. In *Introduction to Genomics*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
47. Swindells, M. B., M. W. MacArthur, and J. M. Thornton. 1995. Intrinsic ϕ, ψ propensities of amino acids, derived from the coil regions of known structures. *Nat. Struct. Biol.* 2:596–603.
48. Jiang, F., W. Han, and Y. D. Wu. 2010. Influence of side chain conformations on local conformational features of amino acids and implication for force field development. *J. Phys. Chem. B.* 114:5840–5850.
49. Jiang, F., W. Han, and Y. D. Wu. 2013. The intrinsic conformational features of amino acids from a protein coil library and their applications in force field development. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 15:3413–3428.
50. Hornak, V., R. Abel, ..., C. Simmerling. 2006. Comparison of multiple Amber force fields and development of improved protein backbone parameters. *Proteins.* 65:712–725.
51. Nguyen, Q. N. N., J. Schwochert, ..., R. S. Lokey. 2018. Using ^1H and ^{13}C NMR chemical shifts to determine cyclic peptide conformations: a combined molecular dynamics and quantum mechanics approach. *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys.* 20:14003–14012.

Biophysical Journal, Volume 116

Supplemental Information

**β -Branched Amino Acids Stabilize Specific Conformations of Cyclic
Hexapeptides**

Ashleigh E. Cummings, Jiayuan Miao, Diana P. Slough, Sean M. McHugh, Joshua A. Kritzer, and Yu-Shan Lin

I. Simulation data tables and figures

Table S1. Cumulative variance associated to the first three eigenvectors for the cyclic hexapeptides analyzed in the paper.

Name	Sequence	% Variance of the first 3 PC's
P7	VVGGVG	67.4%
P6	VVGVGG	60.9%
V1A	AVGGVG	70.3%
V2A	VAGGVG	64.0%
V5A	VVGGAG	68.5%
V1I	IVGGVG	66.9%
V1L	LVGGVG	72.3%
V1T	TVGGVG	68.0%
V1S	SVGGVG	68.5%


Table S2. Thermodynamic decomposition between cluster 1 and cluster 2 for P7, V1A, V1I, V1L; and between cluster 1 and cluster 3 for V1T, V1S. S1 and S2 are two sets of parallel simulations beginning with different initial structures. The error of ΔG is the standard error of the mean (SEM) estimated from the five neutral replicas in BE-META simulations. $-T\Delta S_p^{\text{conf}}$ is calculated using maximum information spanning tree (MIST) approach, which provides a tight estimation of the upper bound of the entropy. The error of $-T\Delta S$ is propagated from ΔG and ΔH according to the relation: $-T\Delta S = \Delta G - \Delta H$. The error of $-T\Delta S_W$ is propagated from $-T\Delta S$ according to the relation: $-T\Delta S_W = (-T\Delta S) - (-T\Delta S_p^{\text{conf}})$. The errors of the remaining quantities are SEM calculated from 60,000 frames sampled from the additional MD simulations.

		ΔG	ΔH	$-T\Delta S$	ΔH_p^{wp}	ΔH_{rest}	$-T\Delta S_p^{\text{conf}}$	$-T\Delta S_W$	ΔH_p^{L}	$\Delta H_p^{\text{EE(SR+1,4)}}$	ΔH_p^{bond}	$\Delta H_p^{\text{angle}}$	ΔH_p^{hb}	ΔH_p^{imp}	ΔH_p^{L}	$\Delta H_p^{\text{EE(SR)}}$	$\Delta H_p^{\text{EE(LR)}}$	
S1	P7	VGGVG	75.3%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		VGGVG	2.6%	8.38±0.14	12.17±1.29	-3.79±1.30	46.77±0.16	-34.60±1.28	-14.72	10.93±1.30	4.21±0.06	38.23±0.11	-0.25±0.07	0.20±0.11	4.42±0.05	-0.03±0.02	0.49±1.28	-23.93±2.01
	V1A	AVGGVG	47.2%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		AVGGVG	10.2%	3.84±0.13	2.09±1.31	1.75±1.32	49.99±0.15	-47.99±1.31	-6.00	7.75±1.32	-2.73±0.06	49.68±0.11	-0.15±0.07	1.72±0.10	1.82±0.05	-0.34±0.02	6.33±1.31	-24.30±2.05
	V1I	IVGGVG	77.8%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		IVGGVG	2.9%	8.22±0.06	10.67±1.23	-2.45±1.23	51.16±0.16	-49.49±1.23	-15.97	13.52±1.23	7.26±0.06	39.25±0.11	-0.03±0.07	0.55±0.11	4.20±0.05	-0.08±0.02	0.69±1.23	-25.62±1.92
V1L	LVGGVG	32.4%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	LVGGVG	14.4%	2.03±0.07	1.81±1.22	0.22±1.23	62.74±0.17	-60.33±1.22	-9.15	9.37±1.23	5.61±0.06	58.33±0.12	-0.67±0.07	-3.18±0.11	0.51±0.06	0.13±0.02	-2.91±1.22	-21.26±1.91	-36.76±0.12
V1T	TVGGVG	63.8%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	TVGGVG	4.1%	6.87±0.05	5.71±1.23	1.16±1.23	61.27±0.16	-60.33±1.22	-12.71	13.87±1.23	-0.20±0.06	54.64±0.13	-0.01±0.07	1.60±0.11	5.50±0.05	-0.06±0.02	3.10±1.23	-29.01±1.92	-29.65±0.12
V1S	SVGGVG	44.2%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	SVGGVG	7.6%	4.40±0.10	1.08±1.23	3.32±1.23	53.79±0.17	-50.33±1.22	-5.75	9.07±1.23	-1.26±0.06	52.11±0.13	-0.07±0.07	1.65±0.10	1.49±0.05	-0.21±0.02	4.09±1.23	-28.95±1.92	-27.77±0.12
S2	P7	VGGVG	77.7%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
		VGGVG	1.4%	9.96±0.20	10.87±1.25	-0.91±1.26	47.13±0.16	-36.28±1.24	-15.54	14.64±1.26	3.71±0.06	37.80±0.12	-0.05±0.07	0.64±0.11	5.13±0.05	-0.08±0.02	0.78±1.24	-23.33±1.94
	V1A	AVGGVG	47.6%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		AVGGVG	8.3%	4.38±0.13	4.58±1.23	-0.20±1.23	50.40±0.15	-45.92±1.22	-5.91	5.72±1.23	-2.47±0.06	50.24±0.11	-0.07±0.07	1.66±0.10	1.39±0.05	-0.36±0.02	1.98±1.23	-18.14±1.92
	V1I	IVGGVG	81.1%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		IVGGVG	1.8%	9.46±0.16	8.87±1.24	0.59±1.25	50.85±0.16	-41.99±1.24	-15.33	15.92±1.25	7.63±0.06	39.20±0.11	0.02±0.07	0.22±0.11	3.86±0.05	-0.08±0.02	-0.21±1.24	-26.26±1.94
V1L	LVGGVG	36.0%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	LVGGVG	13.7%	2.40±0.05	2.10±1.27	0.30±1.27	62.29±0.16	-60.13±1.25	-8.68	8.98±1.27	6.30±0.06	60.04±0.12	-0.70±0.07	-3.93±0.11	0.48±0.05	0.10±0.02	-1.21±1.27	-23.26±1.99	-35.72±0.12
V1T	TVGGVG	64.1%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	TVGGVG	3.8%	7.06±0.10	5.02±1.24	2.04±1.24	60.96±0.16	-59.94±1.25	-12.78	14.81±1.24	-0.14±0.06	54.39±0.13	-0.27±0.07	1.53±0.11	5.51±0.05	-0.06±0.02	3.36±1.24	-29.99±1.94	-29.31±0.12
V1S	SVGGVG	45.1%	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	SVGGVG	8.3%	4.21±0.03	0.84±1.25	3.36±1.25	53.20±0.17	-50.33±1.22	-5.59	8.95±1.25	-1.32±0.06	52.09±0.14	-0.12±0.07	0.88±0.10	1.88±0.05	-0.21±0.02	4.42±1.24	-27.77±1.94	-29.00±0.13


Table S3. The population percentages and structures of the top three clusters from BE-META simulations using the amber99sb force field. S1 and S2 are two sets of simulations beginning with different initial structures. Types I, II and II' β turns are colored red, green and blue, respectively.

CP	VGGVG		AVGGVG		IVGGVG		LVGGVG		TVGGVG		SVGGVG	
	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2	S1	S2
Cluster 1	VGGVG 22.9%	VGGVG 27.2%	AVGGVG 31.4%	AVGGVG 26.8%	IVGGVG 25.6%	IVGGVG 31.3%	LVGGVG 36.7%	LVGGVG 31.2%	TVGGVG 34.9%	TVGGVG 29.1%	SVGGVG 32.0%	SVGGVG 26.3%
Cluster 2	VGGVG 12.6%	VGGVG 9.7%	AVGGVG 9.9%	AVGGVG 12.6%	IVGGVG 25.5%	IVGGVG 14.1%	LVGGVG 9.9%	LVGGVG 11.1%	TVGGVG 10.5%	TVGGVG 9.7%	SVGGVG 8.7%	SVGGVG 12.6%
Cluster 3	VGGVG 10.5%	VGGVG 8.7%	AVGGVG 6.3%	AVGGVG 6.8%	IVGGVG 6.1%	IVGGVG 8.2%	LVGGVG 7.6%	LVGGVG 10.1%	TVGGVG 8.6%	TVGGVG 9.2%	SVGGVG 6.7%	SVGGVG 7.0%


cyclo-(VVGGVG)




cyclo-(VVGVGG)




cyclo-(AVGGVG)




cyclo-(VAGGVG)




cyclo-(VVGAG)




cyclo-(IVGVGG)



cyclo-(LVGGVG)



cyclo-(TVGVGG)








Figure S1. NIP figures of all cyclic hexapeptides analyzed in the paper.

P7


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
25	2	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.889-4.432
11	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA 3.2 0.0	3.660-3.991
10	4	GLY	H	1	VAL	HGA 4.9 0.0	5.033-9.234
5	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.804-3.929
5	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.6 0.0	3.663-3.721
5	2	VAL	H	1	VAL	HA 3.5 0.0	3.568-3.588
3	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA 3.2 0.0	3.234-3.624
1	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H 4.2 0.0	4.300-4.326

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
26	2	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.785-4.638
20	4	GLY	H	1	VAL	HGA 4.9 0.0	5.138-8.182
19	2	VAL	H	1	VAL	HA 3.5 0.0	3.535-3.621
18	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.6 0.0	3.655-3.760
12	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA 3.2 0.0	3.232-3.630
9	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H 4.2 0.0	4.264-4.536
6	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA 3.2 0.0	3.437-3.568
4	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.803-3.873

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
16	2	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.890-3.902
1	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.6 0.0	3.656-3.768
1	1	VAL	HA	1	VAL	HB 3.1 0.0	3.111
1	4	GLY	H	1	VAL	HGA 4.9 0.0	5.123


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
45	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.814 to -87.417
17	1	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-150.980 to -150.079; -89.998 to -88.458
1	2	VAL (φ)	-30.0 -90.0	-90.784

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
57	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.924 to -87.489
8	1	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-151.061 to -150.220; -89.676 to -88.021
3	2	VAL (φ)	-30.0 -90.0	-90.586 to -90.279


*First column: # of the violations out of 100 structures

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1



100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2




Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation



P6


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
31	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.805-3.987
28	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA 3.4 0.0	3.424-3.620
21	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	H 4.4 0.0	4.405-4.583
17	5	GLY	H	6	GLY	H 4.2 0.0	4.212-4.545
13	5	GLY	H	4	VAL	HA 3.4 0.0	3.412-3.528
13	4	VAL	H	4	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.702-3.840
5	2	VAL	H	6	GLY	HGA 5.2 0.0	5.286-5.629
1	1	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.804-3.913
1	1	VAL	H	2	VAL	H 4.0 0.0	4.508

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
33	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.823-3.961
29	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA 3.4 0.0	3.457-3.610
28	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	H 4.4 0.0	4.400-4.658
22	5	GLY	H	6	GLY	H 4.2 0.0	4.286-4.725
21	5	GLY	H	4	VAL	HA 3.4 0.0	3.410-3.610
16	4	VAL	H	4	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.700-3.932
10	1	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.803-3.860
5	2	VAL	H	6	GLY	HGA 5.2 0.0	5.219-5.641
1	1	VAL	H	2	VAL	H 4.0 0.0	4.323

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
66	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA 3.4 0.0	3.420-3.749
27	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.6 0.0	3.602-4.060
5	4	VAL	H	4	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.702-3.844
4	1	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.817-3.916
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HB 4.7 0.0	4.716


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
3	2	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.249; -89.120

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
2	2	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-150.587; -89.932


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
13	2	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-88.873 to -68.875

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1




100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2




Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation




Cluster 2 from BE-META simulation



First cluster from BE-META simulation



Second cluster from BE-META simulation




Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
29	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	H 4.4 0.0	4.402-4.663
6	4	VAL	H	4	VAL	HB 3.7 0.0	3.707-3.871
2	1	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.923-3.999
2	1	VAL	H	1	VAL	HB 3.8 0.0	3.876-3.904


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Actual/dihedral range
6	2	VAL (φ)	-90.0 -150.0	-88.329 to -80.327

AVGGVG


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
99	6	GLY	H	1	ALA	H	4.2	0.0	4.281-4.677
99	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	4.1	0.0	4.227-4.671
131	1	ALA	H	2	VAL	H	4.3	0.0	4.308-4.708
27	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.7	0.0	3.705-3.981
27	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.2	0.0	3.213-3.604
27	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	4.3	0.0	4.308-4.593
21	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA	3.2	0.0	3.213-3.574
5	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.485-4.865
2	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.537-4.670
1	2	VAL	H	1	ALA	HBB	4.1	0.0	4.115
1	1	ALA	H	6	GLY	HAB	3.6	0.0	3.808

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
20	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.886 to -87.434

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
97	6	GLY	H	1	ALA	H	4.2	0.0	4.235-4.679
145	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	4.1	0.0	4.174-5.187
30	1	ALA	H	2	VAL	H	4.3	0.0	4.327-4.684
20	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.7	0.0	3.701-3.999
18	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.3	0.0	4.310-4.610
16	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.2	0.0	3.216-3.589
15	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA	3.2	0.0	3.261-3.604
9	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.314-4.699
2	2	VAL	H	1	ALA	HBB	4.1	0.0	4.166-4.207
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.684

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
15	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.999 to -87.426


Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
90	1	ALA	H	2	VAL	H	4.3	0.0	4.302-4.775
64	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.3	0.0	4.312-4.622
2	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.541-4.576
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.3	0.0	4.301
1	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.7	0.0	3.751


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
90	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.843 to -37.581

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1



100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2




Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation




IVGGVG


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
100	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	4.3	0.0	4.379-5.358
93	1	ILE	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.3	0.0	4.356-5.689
77	1	ILE	HA	1	ILE	HDB	4.4	0.0	4.468-4.931
38	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HDB	5.0	0.0	5.003-6.357
36	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.8	0.0	4.804-5.678
24	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HB	3.7	0.0	3.772-4.165
13	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA	3.0	0.0	3.447-3.590
11	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5	0.0	3.670-3.724
7	4	GLY	HAB	1	ILE	HDB	5.5	0.0	5.504-6.998
7	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HGR	4.4	0.0	4.422-5.980
5	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.8	0.0	3.805-3.887
4	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2	0.0	4.203-4.412
4	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HA	3.4	0.0	3.501-3.604
4	1	ILE	HB	1	ILE	HDB	3.2	0.0	3.818-3.881
3	6	GLY	H	1	ILE	H	4.3	0.0	4.307-4.509
2	4	GLY	HAB	1	ILE	HGR	6.1	0.0	6.088-7.583

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
8	1	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-151.848 to -150.380, -89.813 to -89.552
41	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.844 to -87.141

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
100	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	4.3	0.0	4.521-5.187
88	1	ILE	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.3	0.0	4.309-5.700
81	1	ILE	HA	1	ILE	HDB	4.4	0.0	4.734-4.934
33	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HDB	5.0	0.0	5.012-6.517
26	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.8	0.0	4.806-5.698
12	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HB	3.7	0.0	3.961-4.530
9	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA	3.0	0.0	3.509-3.607
9	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5	0.0	3.670-3.795
8	4	GLY	HAB	1	ILE	HDB	5.5	0.0	5.611-6.991
8	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HGR	4.4	0.0	4.442-6.922
4	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HA	3.4	0.0	3.578-3.635
4	1	ILE	HB	1	ILE	HDB	3.2	0.0	3.811-3.841
3	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.8	0.0	3.832-3.927
2	6	GLY	H	1	ILE	H	4.3	0.0	4.389-4.483
2	4	GLY	HAB	1	ILE	HGR	6.1	0.0	6.324-8.267

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
8	1	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-151.600 to -150.171, -89.502 to -88.596
52	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.993 to -87.194


Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
100	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	4.3	0.0	4.383-5.771
94	1	ILE	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.3	0.0	4.328-5.676
85	1	ILE	HA	1	ILE	HDB	4.4	0.0	4.439-5.214
21	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HDB	5.0	0.0	5.052-7.607
21	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HDB	4.8	0.0	4.814-5.350
13	4	GLY	HAB	1	ILE	HDB	5.5	0.0	5.789-8.763
13	2	VAL	H	1	ILE	HB	3.7	0.0	3.968-4.341
6	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5	0.0	3.604-3.771
5	4	GLY	H	1	ILE	HGR	4.4	0.0	4.521-6.230
3	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2	0.0	4.246-4.421


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations	
26	1	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-176.793 to -150.696, -89.431 to -53.393
86	5	VAL (φ)	-90.0	-150.0	-89.874 to -41.442

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1



100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2




Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation




LVGGVG


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
71	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	5.0 0.0 5.000-5.587
68	5	VAL	H	6	GLY	HAR	5.2 0.0 5.213-5.757
68	2	VAL	H	3	GLY	HAR	5.4 0.0 5.406-6.132
58	4	GLY	HAR	1	LEU	HDW	5.3 0.0 5.387-6.911
43	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	H	4.0 0.0 4.100-4.667
39	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.1 0.0 4.102-4.355
37	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HBR	3.5 0.0 3.515-3.788
29	6	GLY	H	1	LEU	H	4.4 0.0 4.439-4.667
28	4	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	5.4 0.0 5.400-6.117
22	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HDW	4.4 0.0 4.416-5.007
21	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	HA	5.5 0.0 5.500-5.747
18	2	VAL	H	1	LEU	HBR	4.1 0.0 4.106-4.457
12	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.6 0.0 3.648-3.834
9	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	4.0 0.0 4.201-4.636
7	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.1 0.0 3.199-3.539
7	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.8 0.0 3.801-3.961
7	3	GLY	H	3	VAL	HA	3.1 0.0 3.326-3.581
3	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.3 0.0 4.441-4.612
3	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2 0.0 4.204-4.326
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	H	5.0 0.0 5.133

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
25	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.989 to -88.853

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
67	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	5.0 0.0 5.005-5.490
66	5	VAL	H	6	GLY	HAR	5.2 0.0 5.209-5.720
64	2	VAL	H	3	GLY	HAR	5.4 0.0 5.407-6.098
56	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	H	4.0 0.0 4.016-4.673
54	4	GLY	HAR	1	LEU	HDW	5.3 0.0 5.337-6.956
42	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.1 0.0 4.122-4.408
29	6	GLY	H	1	LEU	H	4.4 0.0 4.463-4.658
26	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HBR	3.5 0.0 3.524-3.793
27	4	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	5.4 0.0 5.402-6.399
23	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HDW	4.4 0.0 4.412-4.992
20	2	VAL	H	1	LEU	HBR	4.1 0.0 4.101-4.475
20	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	HA	5.5 0.0 5.504-5.826
19	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HA	3.1 0.0 3.237-3.603
13	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.6 0.0 3.653-3.974
10	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.1 0.0 3.358-3.582
7	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	4.0 0.0 4.155-4.642
6	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.3 0.0 4.422-4.743
6	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.8 0.0 3.802-3.876
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2 0.0 4.270
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	H	5.0 0.0 5.225
1	1	LEU	H	6	GLY	HAR	3.4 0.0 3.726

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
23	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.911 to -87.512


Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
99	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	H	4.0 0.0 4.096-4.751
98	5	VAL	H	6	GLY	HAR	5.2 0.0 5.201-6.103
92	2	VAL	H	3	GLY	HAR	5.4 0.0 5.409-6.161
79	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.1 0.0 4.101-4.738
68	4	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	5.0 0.0 5.003-5.647
44	4	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	5.4 0.0 5.402-6.175
34	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HBR	3.5 0.0 3.535-3.825
15	1	LEU	H	2	VAL	HA	5.5 0.0 5.505-5.858
8	1	LEU	H	1	LEU	HDW	4.4 0.0 4.658-5.075
6	4	GLY	HAR	1	LEU	HDW	5.3 0.0 5.477-6.596
4	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2 0.0 4.215-4.933
4	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.6 0.0 3.637-3.747
3	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	H	4.7 0.0 4.716-4.726
2	2	VAL	H	1	LEU	HBR	4.1 0.0 4.253-4.368
2	1	LEU	HA	1	LEU	HDW	4.3 0.0 4.328-4.342
2	1	LEU	H	6	GLY	HAR	3.4 0.0 3.422-3.449


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
77	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.705 to -50.748

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1



100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2




Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation




TVGGVG


Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #1



Simulated annealing starting from initial structure #2



Number of violations of the predicted top cluster



Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
23	4	GLY	HAR	1	THR	HGR	5.6 0.0 5.631-8.020
21	2	VAL	H	1	THR	HB	3.6 0.0 3.790-4.462
16	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5 0.0 3.445-3.938
10	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.4 0.0 3.536-3.624
9	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.7 0.0 3.724-3.941
4	2	VAL	H	1	THR	HA	3.5 0.0 3.599-3.656
4	2	VAL	H	1	THR	H	4.6 0.0 4.609-4.646
3	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2 0.0 4.319-4.395
3	1	THR	H	1	THR	HGR	4.1 0.0 4.392-4.660
2	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	3.8 0.0 4.385-4.484
1	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HGR	4.6 0.0 4.608
1	5	VAL	H	4	GLY	HAR	3.5 0.0 3.572
1	5	VAL	H	4	GLY	H	4.7 0.0 4.839

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
18	1	THR (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-151.143 to -150.022, -89.061
67	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.931 to -87.039

Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
17	4	GLY	HAR	1	THR	HGR	5.6 0.0 5.646-6.744
17	2	VAL	H	1	THR	HB	3.6 0.0 3.707-4.044
11	6	GLY	H	5	VAL	HA	3.4 0.0 3.493-3.608
11	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5 0.0 3.641-3.830
6	5	VAL	H	5	VAL	HB	3.7 0.0 3.735-3.856
2	2	VAL	H	1	THR	H	4.6 0.0 4.621-4.627
1	3	GLY	H	4	GLY	H	3.8 0.0 4.308

Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
10	1	THR (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-152.027 to -150.312, -89.718
65	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-89.975 to -86.881


Violations

Res #	Res name 1	Atom 1	Res #	Res name 2	Atom 2	Upper/Lower	Range of violations
53	2	VAL	H	1	THR	HB	3.6 0.0 3.601-4.164
10	4	GLY	HAR	1	THR	HGR	5.6 0.0 5.604-6.564
9	2	VAL	H	1	THR	H	4.6 0.0 4.609-4.777
1	3	GLY	H	2	VAL	HGR	4.2 0.0 4.319
1	2	VAL	H	2	VAL	HB	3.5 0.0 3.731
1	1	THR	H	1	THR	HGR	4.1 0.0 4.567


Res #	Dihedral	Upper	Lower	Range of violations
37	1	THR (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-175.136 to -150.161, -87.840
91	5	VAL (q)	-90.0 -150.0	-87.369 to -82.814

Ramachandran Plots


100 simulated annealing structures starting from S1



100 simulated annealing structures starting from S2



Cluster 1 from BE-META simulation








Figure S2. Simulated annealing results of P7, P6, V1A, V1I, V1L, V1T, and V1S using the distance and dihedral restraints derived from the experimental NOEs and J -couplings, along with the number of violations of the top clusters from the BE-META simulations. Throughout the simulated annealing protocol, NOE-based distance restraints (**Tables S6, S9, S12, S15, S18, S21, and S24**) were applied to the peptide with a force constant of 1,000 kJ/mol/rad² with the lower bounds changed to 0 Å. When there is degeneracy, the longer or shorter NOE-based distance restraints were kept in the simulated annealing simulations. From the J -coupling values, additional restraints are placed on the dihedral angles. For each CP, two different initial structures, S1 and S2, were first energy minimized in vacuum. Next, beginning with the minimized structure, 100 simulations were performed with different initial velocities and each replica was annealed from 300 K to 800 K in vacuum for 200 ps in an NVT ensemble. After annealing, each replica was solvated using pre-equilibrated water molecules. The box dimensions were chosen such that the minimum distance between the box walls and any atom of the CP was 1.0 nm. The entire system was then energy minimized using the steepest descent algorithm to remove any bad contacts. Next, the system underwent a 500 ps NVT equilibration at 300 K. Lastly, the system was annealed from 300 K to 500 K and then subsequently down to 5K over 1 ns in an NPT ensemble. The temperature was regulated using the v -rescale thermostat, with a coupling time constant of 0.1 ps. The pressure was regulated using the Berendsen barostat, with a time coupling constant of 2.0 ps and isothermal compressibility of 4.5×10^{-5} bar⁻¹. The leapfrog algorithm with an integration time step of 2 fs was used to evolve the dynamics of the system. The LINCS algorithm was used to constrain all peptide bonds containing hydrogen to their equilibration values. For vacuum simulation steps, all non-bonded (electrostatics and van der Waals) interaction cutoffs were set to 999.0 nm and the neighbor list was only constructed once and never updated. For simulation steps in solvent, all non-bonded interactions as well as neighbor searching were truncated at 1.0 nm. Long-range electrostatics beyond the 1.0 nm were calculated using the particle mesh Ewald (PME) method with a Fourier spacing of 0.12 nm and an interpolation order of 4. To account for truncation of the Lennard-Jones interactions, a long-range analytic dispersion correction was applied to both energy and pressure. After all simulation steps, the final frames from each of the 100 trajectories were used to calculate distance and dihedral violations.

(A)	$TS_P^{\text{conf}}_{\text{self}} \text{ (kJ/mol)}$			$TS_P^{\text{conf}}_{\text{mutual}} \text{ (kJ/mol)}$	$TS_P^{\text{conf}} \text{ (kJ/mol)}$
	Bond	Angle	Dihedral		
Cluster 1	-488.89	-257.90	-78.42	32.90	-858.11
Cluster 2	-488.86	-257.52	-70.37	32.21	-848.96


(B) V1L



(C) V1I



(D)



(E)




Figure S3. (A) The configurational entropy of V1L. $TS_P^{\text{conf}} = TS_P^{\text{conf}}_{\text{self}} - TS_P^{\text{conf}}_{\text{mutual}}$. (B) The configurational self-entropy for each dihedral degree of freedom of V1L. (C) The configurational self-entropy for each dihedral degree of freedom of V1I. Note that the dihedrals shown here were the chosen $n-3$ independent torsional degrees of freedom in the internal coordinate system of the molecule used in the PARENT program. (D) The distributions of the $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_\gamma$ (χ_1) dihedral of the first residue for V1L (dihedral 12) and the distribution of $N-C_\alpha-C_\beta-C_{\gamma_2}$ of the first residue for V1I (dihedral 6). (E) Decomposition of $\Delta H_P^{\text{dih.}}$ into contributions of each dihedral for V1L and V1I. The major contributions to $\Delta H_P^{\text{dih.}}$ come from dihedrals 5, 6, 19, 21, and 25, which are just the dihedrals ϕ , ϕ , χ_1' , ψ , and ψ' of the first residue.

II. NMR data tables and spectra

Table S4. NOEs for P7, cyclo-(VVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
9.07	3Gly-NH	3.77	3Gly-Haa
9.07	3Gly-NH	4.14	3Gly-Hab
8.97	6Gly-NH	3.74	6Gly-Haa
8.97	6Gly-NH	4.13	6Gly-Hab
8.15	4Gly-NH	3.65	4Gly-Haa
8.65	5Val-NH	4.15	5Val-Ha
8.38	2Val-NH	3.90	2Val-Ha
8.15	4Gly-NH	4.34	4Gly-Hab
7.39	1Val-NH	4.47	1Val-Ha
8.66	5Val-NH	2.05	5Val-Hb
8.37	2Val-NH	1.98	2Val-Hb
7.39	1Val-NH	2.20	1Val-Hb
8.66	5Val-NH	0.96	5Val-Hga
8.37	2Val-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
7.39	1Val-NH	0.69	1Val-Hga
7.39	1Val-NH	0.87	1Val-Hgb
8.37	2Val-NH	1.03	2Val-Hgb
4.47	1Val-Ha	2.19	1Val-Hb
4.15	5Val-Ha	2.05	5Val-Hb
3.90	2Val-Ha	1.98	2Val-Hb
3.90	2Val-Ha	0.93	2Val-Hga
3.90	2Val-Ha	1.03	2Val-Hgb
4.47	1Val-Ha	0.69	1Val-Hga
4.47	1Val-Ha	0.88	1Val-Hgb
4.15	5Val-Ha	0.94	5Val-Hga
9.07	3Gly-NH	3.90	2Val-Ha
8.15	4Gly-NH	4.14	3Gly-Hab
8.66	5Val-NH	3.64	4Gly-Haa
8.97	6Gly-NH	4.16	5Val-Ha
7.39	1Val-NH	4.13	6Gly-Hab
8.38	2Val-NH	4.47	1Val-Ha
8.15	4Gly-NH	3.77	3Gly-Haa
7.39	1Val-NH	3.73	6Gly-Haa
8.66	5Val-NH	4.34	4Gly-Hab
8.37	2Val-NH	2.20	1Val-Hb
8.37	2Val-NH	0.68	1Val-Hga
9.07	3Gly-NH	0.94	2Val-Hga
3.90	2Val-Ha	0.69	1Val-Hga
8.66	5Val-NH	4.33	4Gly-Hab
8.97	6Gly-NH	2.05	5Val-Hb
9.07	3Gly-NH	1.98	2Val-Hb
9.07	3Gly-NH	1.04	2Val-Hgb
8.97	6Gly-NH	7.39	1Val-NH
9.07	3Gly-NH	8.15	4Gly-NH
8.38	2Val-NH	7.39	1Val-NH
8.66	5Val-NH	8.15	4Gly-NH
8.15	4Gly-NH	0.69	1Val-Hga
8.15	4Gly-NH	3.91	2Val-Ha
8.66	5Val-NH	0.69	1Val-Hga

8.14	4Gly-NH	0.87	1Val-Hgb
3.64	4Gly-Haa	0.69	1Val-Hga
3.64	4Gly-Haa	0.88	1Val-Hgb

Table S5. J -coupling values and associated torsional restraints for P7, cyclo-(VVGGVG). If the coupling constant was ≤ 5 Hz, a dihedral restraint of $-60^\circ \pm 30^\circ$ was assigned; if the coupling constant was ≥ 8 Hz, a dihedral restraint of $-120^\circ \pm 30^\circ$ was assigned.

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	φ restraints ($^\circ$)
V ₁	8.1	-120 ± 30
V ₂	4.7	-60 ± 30
G ₃	6.3	
G ₄	7.3	
V ₅	8.7	-120 ± 30
G ₆	6.2	

Table S6. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for P7, cyclo-(VVGGVG). The list was generated using CNSsolve (1, 2). In the list of distance restraints, the first number was the distance value between the two atoms in Å, and the second and third numbers were subtracted and added from the first number to obtain the lower and upper bounds, respectively. In the list of dihedral restraints, the first number was the energy constant (1.0), the second the value of the dihedral in degrees, the third the range around the dihedral (\pm), and the last the exponent of the restraining function.

Distance constraints:

```
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HA ) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 4.3 0.9 0.9
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HG1# ) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HG2# ) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 6 and name HA2 ) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 6 and name HA1 ) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 1 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HG1# ) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HG2# ) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 1 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 2.6 0.5 0.5
```

```
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HA ) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HB ) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HG2# ) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HG1# ) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HA ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HG1# ) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HN ) 5.0 1.0 1.0
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HG2# ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HG1# ) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HG1# ) 5.0 1.0 1.0
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HB ) 3.0 0.6 0.6
```

```
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 3 and name HA1 ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 3 and name HA2 ) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HA ) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HG2# ) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 4 and name HN ) 3.5 0.7 0.7
```

```
assign ( resid 4 and name HN ) ( resid 4 and name HA1 ) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 4 and name HN ) ( resid 4 and name HA2 ) 3.5 0.7 0.7
```

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.7 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG1#) 4.1 0.8 0.8

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 5.1 1.0 1.0
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 2.7 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.7 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 2.7 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.8 0.8 0.8

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 6 and name c) (resid 1 and name n)
 (resid 1 and name ca) (resid 1 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2
 assign (resid 1 and name c) (resid 2 and name n)
 (resid 2 and name ca) (resid 2 and name c) 1.0 -60.0 30.0 2
 assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S7. NOEs for P6, cyclo-(VVG VGG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
8.96	5Gly-NH	3.86	5Gly-Haa
8.96	5Gly-NH	4.07	5Gly-Hab
8.02	2Val-NH	4.18	2Val-Ha
7.80	6Gly-NH	3.91	6Gly-Haa
7.80	6Gly-NH	4.24	6Gly-Hab
8.34	4Val-NH	3.94	4Val-Ha
8.33	1Val-NH	4.00	1Val-Ha
8.29	3Gly-NH	3.85	3Gly-Haa
8.29	3Gly-NH	4.05	3Gly-Hab
8.28	3Gly-NH	2.09	2Val-Hb
8.96	5Gly-NH	0.94	4Val-Hga
8.97	5Gly-NH	2.05	4Val-Hb
8.34	4Val-NH	2.04	4Val-Hb
8.32	1Val-NH	2.11	1Val-Hb
8.02	2Val-NH	2.90	2Val-Hb
8.32	1Val-NH	1.00	1Val-Hga
8.02	2Val-NH	0.91	2Val-Hga
8.34	4Val-NH	0.94	4Val-Hga
4.17	2Val-Ha	2.08	2Val-Hb
4.00	1Val-Ha	2.12	1Val-Hb
3.94	4Val-Ha	2.05	4Val-Hb
4.17	2Val-Ha	0.92	2Val-Hga
4.00	1Val-Ha	1.00	1Val-Hga
3.94	4Val-Ha	1.00	4Val-Hgb
3.93	4Val-Ha	0.94	4Val-Hga
8.32	1Val-NH	4.24	6Gly-Hab
8.29	3Gly-NH	4.18	2Val-Ha

8.03	2Val-NH	4.01	1Val-Ha
7.80	6Gly-NH	4.07	5Gly-Hab
8.97	5Gly-NH	3.94	4Val-Ha
8.34	4Val-NH	3.85	3Gly-Haa
8.34	4Val-NH	4.05	3Gly-Hab
8.96	5Gly-NH	7.80	6Gly-NH
8.33	1Val-NH	7.80	6Gly-NH
8.32	1Val-NH	8.03	2Val-NH
8.96	5Gly-NH	8.34	4Val-NH
8.29	3Gly-NH	8.03	2Val-NH
8.02	2Val-NH	3.91	6Gly-Haa

Table S8. J -coupling values and associated torsional restraints for P6, cyclo-(VVG VGG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	φ restraints ($^\circ$)
V ₁	7.9	
V ₂	9.5	-120 ± 30
G ₃	5.8	
V ₄	6.5	
G ₅	6.8	
G ₆	–	

Table S9. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for P6, cyclo-(VVG VGG).

Distance constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG2#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HB) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HG2#) 2.6 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HN) 4.2 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.5 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 2.7 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 4.3 0.9 0.9
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.4 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 3.7 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 2.8 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HG1#) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 4 and name HA) (resid 4 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HA) (resid 4 and name HG2#) 2.8 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HA) (resid 4 and name HG1#) 2.9 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA1) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA2) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HN) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 4.1 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HG1#) 4.0 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HB) 4.9 1.0 1.0
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA) 2.8 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA2) 3.7 0.7 0.7

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name c) (resid 2 and name n)
 (resid 2 and name ca) (resid 2 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S10. NOEs for VII, cyclo-(IVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
9.00	3Gly-NH	3.77	3Gly-Haa
8.92	6Gly-NH	3.73	6Gly-Haa
8.56	5Val-NH	4.14	5Val-Ha
8.14	4Gly-NH	3.68	4Gly-Haa
8.14	4Gly-NH	4.30	4Gly-Hab
7.45	1Ile-NH	4.47	1Ile-Ha
8.99	3Gly-NH	4.13	3Gly-Hab
8.26	2Val-NH	3.94	2Val-Ha
8.92	6Gly-NH	4.11	6Gly-Hab
8.56	5Val-NH	2.05	5Val-Hb
8.56	5Val-NH	0.96	5Val-Hga
8.27	2Val-NH	1.99	2Val-Hb
8.27	2Val-NH	1.00	2Val-Hgb
8.27	2Val-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
7.46	1Ile-NH	0.86	1Ile-Hd1
7.45	1Ile-NH	0.96	1Ile-Hg2
7.45	1Ile-NH	1.91	1Ile-Hb
7.45	1Ile-NH	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
4.46	1Ile-Ha	0.86	1Ile-Hd1
4.46	1Ile-Ha	1.91	1Ile-Hb
4.46	1Ile-Ha	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
4.15	5Val-Ha	2.06	5Val-Hb
1.91	1Ile-Hb	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
1.99	2Val-Hb	1.03	2Val-Hgb
0.97	1Ile-Hb	1.15	1Ile-Hg1a
0.85	1Ile-Hg2	1.15	1Ile-Hg1a
4.15	5Val-Ha	0.97	5Val-Hga
3.93	2Val-Ha	0.93	2Val-Hga
3.93	2Val-Ha	1.03	2Val-Hgb
3.94	2Val-Ha	2.00	2Val-Hb
9.00	3Gly-NH	3.94	2Val-Ha
8.56	5Val-NH	3.68	4Gly-Haa
8.56	5Val-NH	4.30	4Gly-Hab

8.26	2Val-NH	4.47	1Ile-Ha
8.14	4Gly-NH	3.77	3Gly-Haa
8.14	4Gly-NH	4.13	3Gly-Hab
7.45	1Ile-NH	3.74	6Gly-Haa
7.45	1Ile-NH	4.11	6Gly-Hab
8.92	6Gly-NH	4.14	5Val-Ha
9.00	3Gly-NH	1.98	2Val-Hb
8.92	6Gly-NH	2.05	5Vala-Hb
9.00	3Gly-NH	1.02	2ValHgb
9.00	3Gly-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.27	2Val-NH	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
8.26	2Val-NH	0.84	1Ile-Hd1
8.26	2Val-NH	1.91	1Ile-Hb
1.91	2Val-Hb	0.85	1Ile-Hb
2.01	1Ile-Hd1	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.27	2Val-NH	7.45	1Ile-NH
9.00	3Gly-NH	8.14	4Gly-NH
8.56	5Val-NH	8.14	4Gly-NH
8.92	6Gly-NH	7.47	1Ile-NH
8.14	4Gly-NH	3.95	2Val-Ha
8.14	4Gly-NH	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
8.13	4Gly-NH	0.85	1Ile-Hd1
3.67	4Gly-Haa	1.14	1Ile-Hg1a
3.67	4Gly-Haa	0.95	5Val-Hga
3.67	4Gly-Haa	0.85	1Ile-Hd1
2.06	2Val-Hb	0.94	5Val-Hga

Table S11. J -coupling values and associated torsional restraints for VII, cyclo-(IVGGVG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	ϕ restraints ($^\circ$)
I ₁	8.0	-120 ± 30
V ₂	5.1	
G ₃	6.4	
G ₄	7.3	
V ₅	9.0	-120 ± 30
G ₆	6.2	

Table S12. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for VII, cyclo-(IVGGVG).

Distance constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 4.6 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG2#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG13) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HB) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HG13) 4.6 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 1 and name HB) (resid 1 and name HG13) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HB) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 1 and name HG2#) (resid 1 and name HG13) 2.6 0.5 0.5

assign (resid 1 and name HD1#) (resid 1 and name HG13) 2.3 0.5 0.5

assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG13) 3.9 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 4.3 0.9 0.9

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 4.5 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 2.5 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 4.4 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.2 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.8 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HG13) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 1 and name HG13) 5.1 1.0 1.0
assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 1 and name HG2#) 6.3 1.3 1.3
assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 4.6 0.9 0.9

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 5 and name HB) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 4.7 0.9 0.9

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 4.4 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.6 0.7 0.7

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 6 and name c) (resid 1 and name n)
 (resid 1 and name ca) (resid 1 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2
assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S13. NOEs for V1L, cyclo-(LVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
8.81	3Gly-NH	3.08	3Gly-Haa
8.81	3Gly-NH	4.04	3Gly-Hab
8.71	6Gly-NH	3.75	6Gly-Haa
8.71	6Gly-NH	4.04	6Gly-Hab
8.42	4Gly-NH	3.97	4Gly-Haa
8.05	5Val-Ha	4.17	5Val-Ha
7.97	2Val-NH	4.16	2Val-Ha
8.32	1Leu-NH	4.34	1Leu-Ha
8.05	5Val-Ha	2.10	5Val-Hb
7.97	2Val-NH	2.03	2Val-Hb
8.32	1Leu-NH	1.65	1Leu-Hba
8.32	1Leu-NH	0.87	1Leu-Hda
7.97	2Val-NH	0.95	2Val-Hgb
8.05	5Val-Ha	0.91	5Val-Hga
4.33	1Leu-Ha	0.86	1Leu-Hda
4.34	1Leu-Ha	1.69	1Leu-Hba
4.18	5Val-Ha	2.11	5Val-Hb
4.16	2Val-Ha	2.04	2Val-Hb
2.04	2Val-Hb	0.93	2Val-Hgb
2.10	5Val-Hb	0.93	5Val-Hga
1.70	1Leu-Hba	0.87	1Leu-Hda
1.64	1Leu-Hbb	0.87	1Leu-Hda
7.97	2Val-NH	0.88	2Val-Hga
4.17	5Val-Ha	0.92	5Val-Hga
4.15	2Val-Ha	0.92	2Val-Hga
4.15	2Val-Ha	0.97	2Val-Hgb
8.81	3Gly-NH	4.16	2Val-Ha
8.71	6Gly-NH	4.17	5Val-Ha
8.42	4Gly-NH	3.80	3Gly-Haa
8.42	4Gly-NH	4.04	3Gly-Hab
8.31	1Leu-NH	3.75	6Gly-Haa
8.32	1Leu-NH	4.05	6Gly-Hab
7.97	2Val-NH	4.34	1Leu-Ha
8.05	5Val-NH	3.97	4Gly-Haa
7.97	2Val-NH	1.67	1Leu-Hba
8.81	3Gly-NH	2.03	2Val-Hb
8.72	6Gly-NH	2.10	5Val-Hb
8.81	3Gly-NH	0.92	2Val-Hgb
8.71	6Gly-NH	0.92	5Val-Hga
4.04	6Gly-Hab	0.92	5Val-Hga
3.97	4Gly-Haa	0.93	5Val-Hga
8.81	3Gly-NH	7.98	2Val-NH
8.71	6Gly-NH	8.05	5Val-NH
8.81	3Gly-NH	8.43	4Val-NH
8.71	6Gly-NH	8.32	1Leu-NH
8.43	4Gly-NH	8.06	5Val-NH
8.32	1Leu-NH	7.98	2Val-NH
8.42	4Gly-NH	0.89	2Val-Hga
3.96	4Gly-Haa	0.87	1Leu-Hda

Table S14. *J*-coupling values and associated torsional restraints for V1L, cyclo-(LVGGVG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}\alpha}$ (Hz)	φ restraints ($^\circ$)
L ₁	7.0	
V ₂	7.6	
G ₃	5.9	
G ₄	5.6	
V ₅	9.3	-120 ± 30
G ₆	6.1	

Table S15. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for VIL, cyclo-(LVGGVG).

Distance constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 4.6 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HB2) 4.8 1.0 1.0
assign (resid 1 and name HB1) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HB2) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 2.5 0.5 0.5

assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 4.5 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB2) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.9 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.5 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 2.8 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 2.6 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 4.1 0.8 0.8

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 2.6 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 4.2 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 4.5 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HN) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 4.4 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 1 and name HD1#) 4.4 0.9 0.9

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 4.3 0.9 0.9

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HB) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.1 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 2.8 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 2.6 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 4.2 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HN) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.7 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HA2) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 8.0 1.6 0.0

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S16. NOEs for VIT, cyclo-(TVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
8.97	6Gly-NH	3.80	6Gly-Haa
8.97	6Gly-NH	4.10	6Gly-Hab
8.90	3Gly-NH	3.87	3GLy-Haa
8.90	3Gly-NH	4.03	3GLy-Hab
8.42	5Val-NH	4.07	5Val-Ha
8.14	2Val-NH	4.01	2Val-Ha
7.96	4Gly-NH	3.74	4GLy-Haa
7.96	4Gly-NH	4.22	4GLy-Hab
7.74	1Thr-NH	4.52	1Thr-Ha
7.74	1Thr-NH	4.26	1THr-Hb
8.14	2Val-NH	2.03	2Val-Hb
8.43	5Val-NH	2.04	5Val-Hb
7.74	1Thr-NH	1.06	1Thr-Hg1
8.15	2Val-NH	1.01	2Val-Hgb
8.15	2Val-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.43	5Val-NH	0.97	5Val-Hgb
8.43	5Val-NH	0.92	5Val-Hga
4.51	1Thr-Ha	1.06	1Thr-Hg1
4.25	1Thr-Hb	1.06	1Thr-Hg1
4.07	5Val-Ha	0.98	5Val-Hgb
4.07	5Val-Ha	0.93	5Val-Hga
4.02	2Val-Ha	1.01	2Val-Hgb
4.02	2Val-Ha	0.93	2Val-Hga
4.03	2Val-Ha	2.02	2Val-Ha
4.07	5Val-Ha	2.04	5Val-Hb
4.21	4Gly-Hab	3.74	4Gly-Haa
4.51	1Thr-Ha	4.26	1Thr-Hb
4.10	6Gly-Hab	3.80	6Gly-Haa
8.43	5Val-NH	3.74	4Gly-Haa
8.43	5Val-NH	4.23	4Gly-Hab
8.14	2Val-NH	4.26	1Thr-Hb
8.14	2Val-NH	4.51	1Thr-Ha
7.96	4Gly-NH	3.87	3Gly-Haa

7.96	4Gly-NH	4.04	3GLy-Hab
7.74	1Thr-NH	3.80	6Gly-Haa
7.75	1Thr-NH	4.10	6Gly-Hab
8.96	6Gly-NH	4.06	5Val-Ha
8.90	3Gly-NH	2.03	2Val-Hb
8.97	6Gly-NH	2.04	5Val-Hb
8.97	6Gly-NH	0.92	5Val-Hga
8.90	3Gly-NH	0.94	2Val-Hga
8.90	3Gly-NH	1.00	2Val-Hgb
3.74	4Gly-Haa	0.95	5Val-Hga
3.87	3Gly-Haa	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.97	6Gly-NH	7.75	1Thr-NH
8.90	3Gly-NH	7.96	4Gly-NH
8.90	3Gly-NH	8.15	2Val-NH
8.97	6Gly-NH	8.44	5Val-NH
8.42	5Val-NH	7.96	4Gly-NH
8.15	2Val-NH	7.74	1Thr-NH
3.74	4Gly-Haa	1.06	1Thr-Hg1

Table S17. *J*-coupling values and associated torsional restraints for V1T, cyclo-(TVGGVG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	ϕ restraints ($^\circ$)
T ₁	8.1	-120 ± 30
V ₂	6.1	
G ₃	6.1	
G ₄	6.8	
V ₅	8.0	-120 ± 30
G ₆	6.4	

Table S18. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and *J*-coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for V1T, cyclo-(TVGGVG).

Distance constraints:

```

assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HA ) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 6 and name HA2 ) 3.9 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 6 and name HA1 ) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HG1 ) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 1 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HG1 ) 4.1 0.8 0.8
assign ( resid 1 and name HB ) ( resid 1 and name HG1 ) 4.4 0.9 0.9
assign ( resid 1 and name HA ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 3.9 0.8 0.8

assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HA ) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HB ) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HA ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HB ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HG1# ) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HG2# ) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HG1# ) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HG2# ) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 2 and name HA ) ( resid 2 and name HB ) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign ( resid 2 and name HN ) ( resid 1 and name HN ) 3.8 0.8 0.8

assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 3 and name HA2 ) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 3 and name HA1 ) 2.6 0.5 0.5
assign ( resid 3 and name HN ) ( resid 2 and name HB ) 4.1 0.8 0.8

```

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 4.1 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 4.1 0.8 0.8

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 3.4 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.8 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 4 and name HA1) (resid 1 and name HG1) 4.7 0.9 0.9
 assign (resid 4 and name HA2) (resid 4 and name HA1) 2.3 0.5 0.5

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.7 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.4 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.9 0.8 0.8

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 2.8 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 4.2 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.8 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 6 and name HA1) (resid 6 and name HA2) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HN) 4.0 0.8 0.8

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 6 and name c) (resid 1 and name n)
 (resid 1 and name ca) (resid 1 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2
 assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S19. NOEs for V1S, cyclo-(SVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
8.93	6Gly-NH	3.82	6Gly-Haa
8.93	6Gly-NH	4.08	6Gly-Hab
8.83	3Gly-NH	3.88	3Gly-Haa
8.83	3Gly-NH	4.01	3Gly-Hab
8.29	5Val-NH	4.10	5Val-Ha
8.19	2Val-NH	4.08	2Val-NH
8.09	4Gly-NH	3.84	4Gly-Haa
8.10	1Ser-NH	4.54	1Ser-Ha
8.09	4Gly-NH	4.13	4Gly-Hab
8.10	1Ser-NH	3.92	1Ser-Hbb
8.29	5Val-NH	2.05	5Val-Hb
8.19	2Val-NH	2.05	2Val-Hgb
8.19	2Val-NH	0.99	2Val-Hgb
8.19	2Val-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.29	5Val-NH	0.97	5Val-Hgb

8.29	5Val-NH	0.93	5Val-Hgb
2.05	5Val-Hb	0.95	5Val-Hga
4.08	2Val-Ha	0.98	2Val-Hgb
4.10	5Val-Ha	2.06	5Val-Hb
4.08	2Val-Ha	0.93	2Val-Hga
4.10	5Val-Ha	0.93	5Val-Hga
3.93	1Ser-Hbb	4.54	1Ser-Ha
3.83	1Ser-Hba	4.54	1Ser-Hba
2.04	2Val-Hb	1.00	2Val-Hb
8.83	3Gly-NH	4.08	2Val-Ha
8.29	5Val-NH	3.84	4Gly-Haa
8.09	1Ser-NH	4.08	6Gly-Hab
8.09	4Gly-NH	4.00	3Gly-Hab
8.19	2Val-NH	4.53	1Ser-Ha
8.19	2Val-NH	3.88	3Gly-Haa
8.19	2Val-NH	3.92	1Ser-Hbb
8.82	3Gly-NH	0.92	2Val-Hga
8.83	3Gly-NH	0.98	2Val-Hgb
8.93	6Gly-NH	0.92	5Val-Hga
8.83	3Gly-NH	2.04	2Val-Hga
8.93	6Gly-NH	2.06	5Val-Hb
8.93	6Gly-NH	8.10	1Ser-NH
8.82	3Gly-NH	8.09	4Gly-NH
8.82	3Gly-NH	8.20	2Val-NH
8.93	6Gly-NH	8.30	5Val-NH
8.28	5Val-NH	8.09	4Gly-NH
8.19	2Val-NH	8.09	1Ser-NH

Table S20. J -coupling values and associated torsional restraints for V1S, cyclo-(SVGGVG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	φ restraints ($^\circ$)
S ₁	–	
V ₂	6.2	
G ₃	6.3	
G ₄	–	
V ₅	8.3	-120 ± 30
G ₆	6.0	

Table S21. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for V1S, cyclo-(SVGGVG).

Distance constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB1) 3.7 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 1 and name HB1) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 1 and name HB2) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB1) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.2 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.4 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.3 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 2.7 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 4.0 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 3.8 0.8 0.8

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.6 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG2#) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HB) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 2.8 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.5 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 2.6 0.5 0.5
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 4.2 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.5 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HN) 3.8 0.8 0.8

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2

Table S22. NOEs for VIA, cyclo-(AVGGVG).

Coordinate 1	Assignment 1	Coordinate 2	Assignment 2
8.85	3Gly-NH	4.05	3Gly-Hab
8.85	3Gly-NH	3.81	3Gly-Haa
8.78	6Gly-NH	3.78	6Gly-Haa
8.78	6Gly-NH	3.99	6Gly-Hab
8.31	4Gly-NH	3.95	4Gly-Haa
8.31	4Gly-NH	4.04	4Gly-Hab
8.15	5Val-NH	4.13	5Val-Ha
8.05	2Val-NH	4.10	2Val-Ha
8.20	1Ala-NH	4.36	1Ala-Ha
8.15	5Val-NH	2.07	5Val-Hb
8.05	2Val-NH	2.02	2Val-Hb
8.20	1Ala-NH	1.37	1Ala-Hb
8.05	2Val-NH	0.97	2Val-Hgb
8.15	5Val-NH	0.93	5Val-Hga
8.05	2Val-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga

4.36	1Ala-Ha	1.38	1Ala-Hb
4.13	5Val-Ha	0.93	5Val-Hga
4.10	2Val-Ha	0.93	2Val-Hga
4.09	2Val-Ha	0.97	2Val-Hgb
4.14	5Val-Ha	2.08	5Val-Hb
4.11	2Val-Ha	2.03	2Val-Hb
2.07	5Val-Hb	0.91	5Val-Hga
2.00	2Val-Hb	0.92	2Val-Hga
2.00	2Val-Hb	0.97	2Val-Hgb
8.85	3Gly-NH	4.10	2Val-Ha
8.79	6Gly-NH	4.13	5Val-Ha
8.05	2Val-NH	4.36	1Ala-Ha
8.15	5Val-NH	3.95	4Gly-Haa
8.21	1Ala-NH	3.99	6Gly-Hab
8.31	4Gly-NH	3.82	3Gly-Haa
8.21	1Ala-NH	3.79	6Gly-Haa
8.15	5Val-NH	4.03	4Gly-Hab
8.05	2Val-NH	1.38	1Ala-Hb
8.78	6Gly-NH	0.92	5Val-Hga
8.85	3Gly-NH	0.93	2Val-Hga
8.85	3Gly-NH	8.31	4Gly-NH
8.78	6Gly-NH	8.20	1Ala-NH
8.31	4Gly-NH	8.16	5Val-NH
8.20	1Ala-NH	8.06	2Val-NH
8.85	3Gly-NH	8.05	2Val-NH
8.78	6Gly-NH	8.15	5Val-NH

Table S23. J -coupling values and associated torsional restraints for V1A, cyclo-(AVGGVG).

Residue	$^3J_{\text{NHCH}_\alpha}$ (Hz)	ϕ restraints ($^\circ$)
A ₁	6.4	
V ₂	7.0	
G ₃	5.8	
G ₄	5.4	
V ₅	8.8	-120 ± 30
G ₆	5.8	

Table S24. List of NOE-derived distance restraints and J -coupling-derived dihedral angle restraints for V1A, cyclo-(AVGGVG).

Distance constraints:

assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.0 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 3.9 0.8 0.8
 assign (resid 1 and name HA) (resid 1 and name HB#) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 1 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HN) 3.6 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 3.6 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HA) 3.2 0.6 0.6
 assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.4 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.3 0.7 0.7
 assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.3 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 2 and name HA) (resid 2 and name HB) 3.4 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 2 and name HB) (resid 2 and name HG1#) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 2 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HB#) 3.4 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA2) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HA) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 2 and name HG2#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 3 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HN) 3.4 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 4.5 0.9 0.9
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 3 and name HA1) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 4 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HN) 3.6 0.7 0.7

assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 4.0 0.8 0.8
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.3 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.1 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA2) 3.2 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HN) (resid 4 and name HA1) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.0 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 5 and name HA) (resid 5 and name HB) 3.5 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 5 and name HB) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 2.9 0.6 0.6

assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA2) 2.9 0.6 0.6
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 6 and name HA1) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HA) 2.7 0.5 0.5
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 5 and name HG1#) 3.6 0.7 0.7
assign (resid 6 and name HN) (resid 1 and name HN) 3.5 0.7 0.7

Phi dihedral angle constraints:

assign (resid 4 and name c) (resid 5 and name n)
 (resid 5 and name ca) (resid 5 and name c) 1.0 -120.0 30.0 2





Figure S4. 2D-NMR data for peptide V1A (cyclo-AVGGVG) in water. (A) Visual depiction of the strong (black) and weak (grey) NOEs from the ROESY spectra for V1A. (B) Amide-to-amide proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for V1A. NOE cross-peaks are expected for positions at which beta-turns predominate in the solution ensemble. (C) Alpha-to-methyl proton region of the TOCSY and ROESY spectra for V1A. (D) Temperature dependence of amide proton chemical shifts. Stacked spectra show the amide regions of ¹H NMR experiments at the indicated temperature. Solvent-exposed amide protons typically have chemical shifts that shift upfield with temperature by more than 4.5 ppb/K (temperature coefficient between -4.5 and -16 ppb/K). Temperature coefficients between 2.0 and -4.5 ppb/K indicate protection from solvent, as occurs when an amide proton is involved in a hydrogen bond. Despite apparent > 99 % purity via HPLC and LC-MS, unidentified resonances were observed at 1.33 ppm and 7.93 ppm (visible in panels C and D, respectively). This did not interfere with analysis of the structural ensemble of V1A.



Current Data Parameters
NAME ac072717
EXPNO 2
PROCNO 1

F2 - Acquisition Parameters
Date_ 20170727
Time 13.52 h
INSTRUM spect
PROBHD B150372_0005 ()
PULPROG zgpg30
TD 32768
SOLVENT H2O+D2O
NS 16
DS 4
SWH 9615.355 Hz
FIDRES 0.586077 Hz
AQ 1.7039360 sec
RG 84.85
DW 52.000 usec
DE 13.23 usec
TE 288.2 K
D1 1.00000000 sec
D12 0.00002000 sec
D16 0.00020000 sec
TDO 1
SFO1 600.1328100 MHz
NUC1 1H
P1 7.60 usec
P2 15.20 usec
P12 2000.00 usec
PLW0 0 W
PLW1 10.30399990 W
SFOCAL1 0.500
SFOFFS1 0 Hz
SPW1 0.00059815 W
GFNAM[1] SMSQ10.100
GFE1 31.00 %
GFNAM[2] SMSQ10.100
GFE2 11.00 %
P16 1000.00 usec



F2 - Processing parameters
SI 32768
SF 600.1298932 MHz
WDW EM
SSB 0
LB 0.30 Hz
GB 0
PC 1.00

Figure S5. Complete ¹H NMR spectrum of P7 in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at 288 K.





Figure S6. Complete ^1H NMR spectrum of P6 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.



```
Current Data Parameters
NAME          aci121717_3
EXPNO         1
PROCNO        1

F2 - Acquisition Parameters
Date_         20171217
Time_         16.25 h
INSTRUM       spect
PROBHD        Z150372_0005 (
PULPROG       zgpg30
TD            32768
SOLVENT       H2O-D2O
NS            16
DS            4
SWH           9615.385 Hz
FIDRES        0.588877 Hz
AQ            1.7039360 sec
RG            189.58
DW            52.000 usec
DE            13.23 usec
TE            288.1 K
D1            1.00000000 sec
D12           0.00002000 sec
D16           0.00020000 sec
TD0           1
SFO1          600.1328180 MHz
NUC1          1H
P1            7.60 usec
P2            15.20 usec
P12           2000.00 usec
PLW0          0 W
PLW1          10.30399990 W
SPNAM[1]      Squal100.1000
SFOAL1        0.500
SPOFFS1       0 Hz
SFW1          0.00059515 W
GPNAM[1]      SMSQ10.100
GPZ1          31.00 %
GPNAM[2]      SMSQ10.100
GPZ2          11.00 %
P16           1000.00 usec

F2 - Processing parameters
SI            32768
SF            600.1298919 MHz
WDW           EM
SSB           0
LB            0.30 Hz
GB            0
PC            1.00
```

Figure S7. Complete ¹H NMR spectrum of VII in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at 288 K.




Figure S8. Complete ^1H NMR spectrum of VIL in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K..





Figure S9. Complete ^1H NMR spectrum of V1T in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.



```
Current Data Parameters
NAME          ac021510
EXPNO         1
PROCNO        1

F2 - Acquisition Parameters
Date_         20180215
Time          16.48 h
INSTRUM       spect
PROBHD        z150372_0005 (
PULPROG       zgpg30
TD            32768
SOLVENT       H2O-D2O
NS            16
DS            4
SWH           9615.385 Hz
FIDRES        0.586877 Hz
AQ            1.7039360 sec
RG            189.58
DW            52.000 usec
DE            13.23 usec
TE            288.2 K
D1            1.00000000 sec
D12           0.00002000 sec
D16           0.00020000 sec
TD0           1
SFO1          600.1328100 MHz
NUC1          1H
P1            7.60 usec
P2            15.20 usec
P12           2000.00 usec
PLW0          0 W
PLW1          10.30399990 W
SFO1(1)       Squal100.1000
SFOAL1        0.500
SPOFFS1       0 Hz
SFW1          0.00059515 W
GFNAM(1)      SMSQ10.100
GPZ1          31.00 %
GFNAM(2)      SMSQ10.100
GPZ2          11.00 %
P16           1000.00 usec

F2 - Processing parameters
SI            32768
SF            600.1290009 MHz
WDW           EM
SSB           0
LB            0.30 Hz
GB            0
PC            1.00
```

Figure S10. Complete ¹H NMR spectrum of VIS in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at 288 K.




Figure S11. Complete ^1H NMR spectrum of V1A in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K. Despite apparent > 99 % purity via HPLC and LC-MS, unidentified resonances were observed at 1.33 ppm and 7.93 ppm. This did not interfere with analysis of the structural ensemble of V1A.




Figure S12. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for P7 at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_α region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S13. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for P6 at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_{α} region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 $H_2O:D_2O$ at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S14. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for VII at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H _{α} region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S15. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for V1L at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_{α} region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 $H_2O:D_2O$ at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S16. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for V1T at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_α region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 $H_2O:D_2O$ at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S17. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for V1S at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_α region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S18. Fingerprint region of the 2D spectra for V1A at 288K, with TOCSY peaks shown in blue and ROESY peaks shown in red. 1D spectra correspond to the H_N region (top) and the H_α region (side). The peptide was dissolved in 90:10 H₂O:D₂O at a concentration of roughly 3.0 mM.




Figure S19. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of P7 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S20. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of P6 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S21. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of VII in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S22. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of VIL in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S23. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of VIT in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S24. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of V1S in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S25. Complete ^1H - ^1H TOCSY NMR spectrum of V1A in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S26. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of P7 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S27. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of P6 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S28. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of V11 in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S29. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of VIL in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S30. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of V1T in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S31. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of V1S in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.




Figure S32. Complete ^1H - ^1H ROESY NMR spectrum of V1A in 90:10 $\text{H}_2\text{O}:\text{D}_2\text{O}$ at 288 K.

References

1. Brünger, A. T., P. D. Adams, G. M. Clore, W. L. DeLano, P. Gros, R. W. Grosse-Kunstleve, J. S. Jiang, J. Kuszewski, M. Nilges, N. S. Pannu, R. J. Read, L. M. Rice, T. Simonson, G. L. Warren. 1998. A new software suite for macromolecular structure determination. *Acta Cryst. D* 54:905-921.
2. Brunger, A. T. 2007. Version 1.2 of the crystallography and NMR system. *Nat. Protoc.* 2:2728-2733.