Alternative allosteric mechanisms can regulate the substrate and E2 in SUMO conjugation.

Supplementary Figures 1-6:



Supplementary Figure 1. RMSD evaluation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex, after clustering with an RMSD threshold of 2.2 Å, in the time course of the simulation for 43 ns. The color code of each line represents a different <u>conformational ensemble</u>.



Supplementary Figure 2. A. The correlation plot is derived from the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex from the whole trajectory time. The graph indicates that the strong correlation at the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>– Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> interface is dominant for the whole trajectory. B. The correlation plot is derived from the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex from the time interval of 5.5–7.5 ns. The correlation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>– Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> interface quite differs than the correlation pattern observed for the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex trajectory.



Supplementary Figure 3. A. RMSD evaluation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex, in the time course of the simulation for 48.5 ns. The color code of each line is indicated in the legend. B. The extent of the conformational change observed by loop 2 of E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>. Loop 2 is represented in transparent surface and cartoon and the rest of E2<sup>Ubc9</sup> is shown in cartoon. The white snapshot is extracted from 10 ns and the yellow one from 24 ns. C. RMSD evaluation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex, in the time course of the simulation for 43 ns. The color code of each line is indicated in the legend.



Supplementary Figure 4. A. RMSD evaluation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex, after clustering with an RMSD threshold of 2.5 Å, in the time course of the simulation for 48.5 ns. The color code of each line represents a different conformational ensemble. B. RMSD evaluation of the E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>– SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex, after clustering with an RMSD threshold of 2.5 Å, in the time course of the simulation for 43 ns. The color code of each line represents a different simulation for 43 ns. The color code of each line represents a different conformational ensemble.



Supplementary Figure 5. Coupled Correlated Fluctuations observed for E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>– SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex implies an <u>allosteric effect</u>. The correlation plots are derived from the control trajectory of E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–E3<sup>RanBP2</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup>. A. The coupled fluctuations observed during cluster 1. B. The coupled fluctuations observed during cluster 2.



Supplementary Figure 6. Coupled Correlated Fluctuations observed for E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup> complex implies an allosteric effect. The correlation plots are derived from the control trajectory of E2<sup>Ubc9</sup>–SUMO–Target<sup>RanGAP1</sup>. A. The couple fluctuations observed during cluster 1. B. The coupled fluctuations observed during cluster 3.