Supporting info for the paper:

Computational Alanine Scanning and Structural Analysis of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein/Angiotensin-Converting Enzyme 2 Complex

Erik Laurini^{1,‡}, Domenico Marson^{1,‡}, Suzana Aulic¹, Maurizio Fermeglia¹, Sabrina Pricl^{1,2*}

¹Molecular Biology and Nanotechnology Laboratory (MolBNL@UniTS), DEA, University of Trieste, Trieste, Italy ²Department of General Biophysics, Faculty of Biology and Environmental Protection, University of Lodz, Lodz, Poland

Table of Contents

Table S1	Pag. 2
Table S2	Pag. 4
Table S3	Pag. 5
Table S4	Pag. 5
Figure S1	Pag. 6
Extended Methods Section	Pag. 6
References	Pag. 12

Table S1. Main intermolecular interactions between residues at the protein-protein interface detected during MD simulations of ACE2 in complex with the RBD of SARS-CoV-2 (COV-2). HB = hydrogen bond; SB = salt bridge; CI = contact interactions, including van der Waals/hydrophobic (vdW/h), polar (p), π/π and $\pi/cation$ (π/c) interactions. In the HB column, s-s indicates side chain-side chain interactions while s-b (or b-s) and b-b indicate side chain-backbone and backbone-backbone interactions, respectively. Intermolecular interactions reported in the original crystal structure¹ and maintained in the corresponding MD simulation of the viral protein/receptor complex are shown in regular fonts while those newly reported in this work are highlighted in bold.

НВ	COV-2	Length (Å)	ACE
S-S	Y449	$\textbf{2.92}\pm\textbf{0.20}$	020
S-S	Q498	$\textbf{2.92} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	D29
S-S	N487	$\textbf{3.03} \pm \textbf{0.18}$	Q24
S-S	N487	$\textbf{2.88} \pm \textbf{0.17}$	Y83
S-S	Q493	3.04 ± 0.25	K31
S-S	Q493	$\textbf{2.94} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	E35
S-S	Y505	3.15 ± 0.24	E37
b-b	G502	$\textbf{2.92}\pm\textbf{0.13}$	
S-S	Q498	$\textbf{2.87} \pm \textbf{0.13}$	K353
b-s	G496	$\textbf{2.95} \pm \textbf{0.21}$	
S-S	T500	3.08 ± 0.23	244
S-S	N501	$\textbf{3.23}\pm\textbf{0.22}$	Y41
S-S	Y449	3.03± 0.20	Q42
S-S	T500	2.77 ± 0.16	D355
SB	COV2	Length (Å)	
	K417	$\textbf{3.85}\pm\textbf{0.41}$	
	R403	3.62 ± 0.39	
CI	COV-2	ACE	
vdW/h	G496		
vdW/h	Y449	D38	
vdW/h	G476	024	
vdW/h	Y489	Q24	
vdW/h	F456		
vdW/h	Y489	T27	
vdW/h	Y473		
р	Y489	V92	
vdW/h	F486	185	
vdW/h	F486	M82	
vdW/h	F486	L79	
vdW/h	F456	D30	
vdW/h	L455		
vdW/h	Y489		
vdW/h	L455	K31	
vdW/h	F456		
р	Y453	H34	

vdW/h	L455	
р	Y505	R393
р	T500	R357
р	N501	
vdW/h	Y505	K353
vdW/h	Y41	
vdW/h	Q498	Q42
vdW/h	Q498	Y41
vdW/h	T500	N330

Table S2. Main intramolecular interactions between residues at the protein-protein interface detected during MD simulations of ACE2 in complex with the RBD of SARS-CoV-2 (COV-2). HB = hydrogen bond; SB = salt bridge; CI = contact interactions, including van der Waals/hydrophobic (vdW/h), polar (p), π/π and $\pi/cation$ (π/c) interactions. In the HB column, s-s indicates side chain-side chain interactions while s-b (or b-s) and b-b indicate side chain-backbone and backbone-backbone interactions, respectively.

НВ	ACE	Length (Å)	ACE	COV-2	Length (Å)	COV-2	HB
s-b	Q42	$\textbf{3.04} \pm \textbf{0.18}$	D38	Y449	$\textbf{3.04} \pm \textbf{0.18}$	0.409	S-S
b-s	E23	$\textbf{3.05}\pm\textbf{0.16}$	T27	N501	$\textbf{3.02}\pm\textbf{0.18}$	Q498	S-S
S-S	H34	$\textbf{3.31}\pm\textbf{0.18}$	D30	Q493	$\textbf{3.24}\pm\textbf{0.21}$	S494	S-S
S-S	D355	$\textbf{2.78} \pm \textbf{0.15}$	Y41				
SB	ACE	Length (Å)	ACE	COV-2	Length (Å)	COV-2	SB
	K353	$\textbf{3.66} \pm \textbf{0.39}$	D38	R403	$\textbf{3.95}\pm\textbf{0.37}$	D405	_
	E35	$\textbf{3.94} \pm \textbf{0.42}$	K31				
	R393	$\textbf{3.93} \pm \textbf{0.38}$	E37				
	R357	$\textbf{3.68} \pm \textbf{0.19}$	D355				
CI	ACE	ACE			COV-2	COV-2	CI
vdW/h	L29				V/17	F456	π/c
vdW/h	Q76					L455	vdW/h
vdW/h	L79	F28			D103	Y505	π/c
vdW/h	Y83					Y495	vdW/h
vdW/h	L97		_		Y453	Q493	vdW/h
vdW/h	Y83	Q24	_		F456	Y473	vdW/h
vdW/h	L79	M82	_				
р	N330						
р	W48	R357					
vdW/h	L351		_				
vdW/h	L45	V/11					
-							

Table S3. Relative binding free energy and its components calculated by the combined computational alanine scanning mutagenesis – interaction entropy approach for the ACE2 residues effectively involved in the binding interface with the S-RBD of SARS-CoV-2 (see the SI Materials and Methods section for details). IE = interaction entropy. $\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{WT} - \Delta G_{ALA}$ (see text for details).

	D38A	Q24A	T27A	F28A	Y83A	M82A	L79A	D30A	K31A	E35A
$\Delta\Delta E_{vdW}$	-0.77	-1.96	-1.80	-1.02	-2.22	-0.72	-1.02	-0.92	-2.9	-1.27
$\Delta\Delta E_{ELE}$	-10.26	-0.99	-0.30	-0.09	-1.85	0.01	-0.03	-11.36	1.35	-6.31
$\Delta\Delta G_{SOL}$	7.18	0.75	0.14	0.16	1.07	-0.04	0.01	9.50	-3.18	5.37
$\Delta\Delta H$	-3.85	-2.20	-1.96	-0.95	-3.00	-0.75	-1.04	-2.78	-4.73	-2.21
ΔΔΙΕ	-1.26	-0.41	-0.27	-0.03	-0.23	-0.01	0.00	-1.11	-0.12	-0.68
$\Delta\Delta G_{ACE2}$	-5.11	-2.61	-2.23	-0.98	-3.23	-0.76	-1.04	-3.89	-4.85	-2.89
	(0.38)	(0.37)	(0.39)	(0.28)	(0.40)	(0.32)	(0.36)	(0.32)	(0.34)	(0.35)
	H34A	R393A	R357A	E37A	K353A	Q42A	Y41A	D355A	N330A	
$\Delta\Delta E_{vdW}$	-1.36	-0.23	-1.29	-1.83	-2.22	-0.96	-2.43	-0.31	-0.54	
$\Delta\Delta E_{ELE}$	4.37	6.67	5.82	-11.18	5.1	-1.25	-3.07	-7.89	-0.19	
$\Delta\Delta G_{SOL}$	-4.24	-8.31	-7.23	8.98	-8.71	0.33	1.45	6.01	0.16	
$\Delta\Delta H$	-1.23	-1.87	-2.70	-4.03	-5.83	-1.88	-4.05	-2.19	-0.57	
ΔΔΙΕ	-0.54	-0.46	-0.62	-1.09	-1.36	-0.31	-0.38	-0.99	-0.11	
$\Delta\Delta G_{ACE2}$	-1.77	-2.33	-3.32	-5.12	-7.19	-2.19	-4.43	-3.18	-0.68	
	(0.29)	(0.39)	(0.45)	(0.42)	(0.54)	(0.31)	(0.43)	(0.41)	(0.25)	

Table S4. Relative binding free energy and its components calculated by the combined computational alanine scanning mutagenesis – interaction entropy approach for the S-RBD of SARS-CoV-2 residues effectively involved in the binding interface with ACE2 (see the SI Materials and Methods section for details). IE = interaction entropy. $\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{WT} - \Delta G_{ALA}$ (see text for details).

	K417A	Y449A	Y453A	L455A	F456A	F486A	N487A	Y489A	Q493A	Q498A
ΔΔEvdw	-0.53	-1.45	-0.14	-1.34	-2.08	-1.59	-1.32	-2.19	-2.19	-2.95
$\Delta\Delta E_{FLF}$	-12.64	-2.43	-0.80	-0.06	-0.12	-0.19	-1.84	-1.2	-2.44	-3.37
$\Delta\Delta G_{SOL}$	11.48	0.99	0.34	0.23	0.22	-0.31	1.06	0.94	1.82	1.23
$\Delta\Delta H$	-1.69	-2.89	-0.60	-1.17	-1.98	-2.09	-2.1	-2.45	-2.81	-5.09
ΔΔΙΕ	-1.03	-0.32	-0.19	-0.04	-0.01	-0.04	-0.15	-0.51	-0.34	-0.27
$\Delta\Delta G_{CoV-2}$	-2.72	-3.21	-0.79	-1.21	-1.99	-2.13	-2.25	-2.96	-3.15	-5.36
	(0.34)	(0.31)	(0.30)	(0.32)	(0.28)	(0.32)	(0.35)	(0.33)	(0.29)	(0.37)
	T500A	N501A	Y505A	R403A						
$\Delta\Delta EvdW$	-2.65	-2.01	-2.06	-1.69						
$\Delta\Delta E_{ELE}$	-2.26	-2.6	-2.09	6.27						
$\Delta\Delta G_{SOL}$	0.99	2.39	1.29	-7.68						
$\Delta\Delta H$	-3.92	-2.22	-2.86	-3.10						
ΔΔΙΕ	-0.25	-0.18	-0.41	-1.15						
$\Delta\Delta G_{CoV-2}$	-4.17 (0.36)	-2.40 (0.28)	-3.27 (0.31)	-4.25 (0.39)						



Figure S1. Root-mean-square deviation (RMSD) of the ACE2/S-RBD_{CoV-2} protein complex backbone atoms as a function of MD simulation time.

Extended Methods Section

The starting structure for the wild type ACE2 protein in complex with the SARS-CoV-2 S-protein receptor binding domain (S-RBD_{CoV-2}) (PDB ID 6MOJ)¹ was obtained from the RCSB Protein Data Bank.² All residues were protonated at their physiological state by the H++ server (http://biophysics.cs.vt.edu/H++).³ The force field parameters for the Zinc atom and its protein bounded residues were obtained with the MCPB.py tools⁴ provided within the AMBER19⁵ suite of programs and GAMESS-US⁶ software using the B3LYP/6-31G* level of theory.

The *tleap* software provided within AMBER19 was used to assign the ff14SB⁷ and GLYCAM06j-1⁸ forcefields to the starting protein/protein structure. The latter was next solvated in a box of TIP3PB⁹ water molecules spanning at least 1.2 nm from each solute atoms. An appropriate number of Na⁺ and Cl⁻ atoms were added to neutralize the system and mimic a physiological salt concentration (0.15 M).

While applying a weak restraint (10 kcal/mol) on the protein's backbone atoms, the simulation box was firstly energy minimized (3000 steps of steepest descent followed by 3000 steps of conjugated gradient algorithms), than heated to 150 K in 10 ps of canonical ensemble (NVT) molecular dynamics (MD), followed to another 50 ps MD simulation in the isothermal/isobaric ensemble (NPT, P = 1 atm, maintained by the Berendsen barostat¹⁰) to reach the target temperature of 300 K. The restraints were then gradually removed in 5 steps (-2 kcal/mol per step) of energy minimization (2000 steps of steepest descent followed by 2000 steps of conjugated gradient algorithms). The MD simulation was next carried out without restraints for further 10 ns in NPT conditions (phase 1); after this time interval, the MD data production run was further continued up to 1 μ s, during which pressure was maintained using the Monte Carlo barostat implemented in AMBER (phase 2). Along the entire MD trajectory, electrostatic interactions were computed by means of the particle mesh Ewald (PME)¹¹ algorithm temperature was regulated by the Langevin method¹² (collision frequency of 3 ps⁻¹). The SHAKE algorithm¹³ was applied to allow a 2 fs integration time step. All calculations were run with the pmemd module of AMBER19 running on the supercomputer Marconi100 (CINECA, Bologna, Italy) and on our CPU/GPU hybrid cluster. All images were produced by the UCSF Chimera software¹⁴ and on Prism 8 GraphPad Prism version 8.0.0 for Mac (GraphPad Software, San Diego, California USA, www.graphpad.com).

After the first 5 ns of the *phase 2* MD trajectory, 5 ns MD data were selected to calculate enthalpy and entropy contributions. Configurational sampling was preformed accordingly, with a time step of 10 fs; thus, a total of 500 000 snapshots, sufficient for the interaction entropy (IE) calculations, ¹⁵⁻

¹⁷ were extracted from the relevant MD trajectory for the calculation of the protein/protein residuespecific interactions.

The free energy was calculated for each molecular species (protein/protein complex, ACE2, and S-RBD_{COV-2}) in the framework of the MM/PBSA ansatz,¹⁸ and the protein/protein binding free energy was computed as the difference:

$$\Delta G = G_{ACE2/S-RBDCOV-2} - (G_{ACE2} + G_{S-RBDCOV-2}) = \Delta E_{vdW} + \Delta E_{ELE} + \Delta G_{SOL} - T\Delta S = \Delta H - T\Delta S$$
(1)

in which ΔE_{vdW} and ΔE_{ELE} represent van der Waals and electrostatic molecular mechanics energies, and ΔG_{sol} includes the solvation free energy. The internal dielectric constant was set to the values of 2, 3 and 9 for nonpolar, polar, and charged residues,^{15,19} respectively. Lastly, the entropic contribution (T Δ S) was explicitly computed from the MD simulation by using the Interaction Entropy (IE) method.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ According to this approach, the entropic contribution to Δ G is determined from fluctuation of the interactions along the MD simulation, and IE is defined as:

$$-T\Delta S = KTln(e^{\beta\Delta E^{INT}})$$
⁽²⁾

The calculation of IE by equation (2) involves the natural log of an ensemble average of $e^{\beta \Delta E^{INT}}$, which can be extracted without extra computational cost by numerical integration along the MD trajectories, as follows:

$$\langle e^{\beta \Delta E^{INT}} \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} e^{\beta \Delta E^{INT}}(t_i)$$
(3)

in which $\Delta E^{INT} = E^{INT} - \langle E^{INT} \rangle$ and the average interaction energy is obtained by:

$$\langle E^{INT} \rangle = \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T E^{INT}(t) dt = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N E^{INT}(t_i)$$
 (4)

The role of the protein/protein interface key residues was studied by performing computational alanine scanning (CAS) experiments.²⁰ Accordingly, the absolute binding free energy of each mutant receptor - in which each key residue was replaced by alanine by truncating the mutated residue at the C γ atom, and replacing it with a hydrogen - was calculated with the MM/PBSA method. Accordingly, the difference in the binding free energy between the wild-type (WT) protein and its alanine mutant (ALA) counterpart, $\Delta\Delta G$, is given by:

$\Delta\Delta G = \Delta G_{\text{WILD-TYPE}} - \Delta G_{\text{ALA}}$

Thus, the CAS methodology allows for the estimation of the contribution of a given residue with respect to the overall protein–protein binding free energy; indeed, according to equation (5), a negative value of $\Delta\Delta G$ indicated a favorable contribution for the wild type residue in that position and vice versa.

At the structural level, the stability of the main protein/protein interface intermolecular and intramolecular interactions detected during the MD simulation time interval adopted for the energetic analysis was assessed along the entire duration of the MD run.

Force field parameters for the ACE2 Zn²⁺ binding site

```
Coordinate file for glutamic acid residue in Zn<sup>2+</sup> binding site (mol2)
@<TRIPOS>MOLECULE
GU1
```

(5)

15	5	14	1	0	0
SMALI					
RESP	Char	ge			

@ <tripo< td=""><td>S>ATOM</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tripo<>	S>ATOM								
1	Ν		-21.7350	17.0320	-18.4210	Ν	1	GU1	-0.516300
2	Н		-22.1320	17.8590	-18.8430	Η	1	GU1	0.357191
3	CA		-21.5150	15.8580	-19.2530	СХ	1	GU1	0.039700
4	HA		-21.9560	14.9850	-18.7690	H1	1	GU1	0.149086
5	CB		-22.2040	16.0520	-20.5960	2C	1	GU1	0.064920
6	HB2		-22.0190	17.0550	-20.9850	HC	1	GU1	0.021908
7	HB3		-21.7690	15.3080	-21.2500	HC	1	GU1	0.021908
8	CG		-23.6730	15.7410	-20.6070	2C	1	GU1	0.055394
9	HG2		-24.1890	16.4290	-19.9340	HC	1	GU1	-0.039153
10	HG3		-24.0600	15.9040	-21.6140	HC	1	GU1	-0.039153
11	CD		-23.9520	14.3120	-20.2020	CO	1	GU1	0.680432
12	OE1		-24.6420	14.1190	-19.1780	YЗ	1	GU1	-0.705580
13	OE2		-23.4730	13.3850	-20.9030	02	1	GU1	-0.673557
14	С		-20.0270	15.5730	-19.4390	С	1	GU1	0.536600
15	0		-19.6160	14.4090	-19.4620	0	1	GU1	-0.581900
@ <tripo< td=""><td>S>BOND</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tripo<>	S>BOND								
1	1	2	1						
2	1	3	1						
3	3	4	1						
4	3	5	1						
5	3	14	1						
6	5	6	1						
7	5	7	1						
8	5	8	1						
9	8	9	1						
10	8	10	1						
11	8	11	1						
12	11	12	1						

			±					
13	11	13	1					
14	14	15	1					
@ <tripc< td=""><td>S>SUBS</td><td>TRUC</td><td>TURE</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tripc<>	S>SUBS	TRUC	TURE					
1	GU1		1 TEMP	0	* * * *	* * * *	0	ROOT

Coordinate file for first histidine residue in Zn²⁺ binding site (mol2)

@<TRIPOS>MOLECULE HD1 17 17 1 0 0 SMALL

RESP Charge

@<TRIPOS>ATOM

1	Ν	-20.4740	7.0670	-14.8130	Ν	1	HD1	-0.415700
2	Н	-20.6500	6.1920	-15.2890	Н	1	HD1	0.317305
3	CA	-20.8800	8.3100	-15.4600	СХ	1	HD1	0.018800
4	HA	-20.0040	8.9510	-15.5570	Н1	1	HD1	0.157894
5	СВ	-21.4070	7.9870	-16.8630	СТ	1	HD1	-0.222931
6	НВ2	-20.6360	7.4340	-17.4030	HC	1	HD1	0.087795
7	нв3	-22.2860	7.3580	-16.8190	HC	1	HD1	0.087795
8	CG	-21.7920	9.1860	-17.6660	CC	1	HD1	0.027037
9	ND1	-21.1260	9.5500	-18.8200	NA	1	HD1	-0.160885
10	HD1	-20.3340	9.0600	-19.2160	Н	1	HD1	0.313316
11	CE1	-21.6950	10.6280	-19.3310	CR	1	HD1	0.119663

12 1 13 1 14 0 15 1	HE1 NE2 CD2 HD2 C	-21 -22 -22 -23 -21	.4030 .7010 .7880 .5370 .9280	11.1460 10.9800 10.0890 10.0870 9.0480	-20.2290 -18.5460 -17.5030 -16.7210 -14.6270	H5 Y1 CV H4 C	1 HD1 1 HD1 1 HD1 1 HD1 1 HD1 1 HD1	0.214183 -0.508622 0.086858 0.119129 0.597300
17 (-21	.7780	10.2390	-14.3270	0	1 HD1	-0.567900
@ <tripos: 1</tripos: 	BOND 1	2 1						
2 3	1 3	3 1 4 1						
4	3 3 1	51						
6	5	6 1						
7 8	5 5	/ 1 8 1						
9 10	8 8 1	91 41						
11 12	9 1 9 1	01						
13	11 1	.2 1						
14	11 1 13 1	.4 1						
16 17	14 1 16 1	.5 1 .7 1						
@ <tripos< td=""><td>>SUBSTR D1</td><td>UCTURE 1 1</td><td>TEMP</td><td></td><td>0 ****</td><td>**** 0</td><td>ROOT</td><td></td></tripos<>	>SUBSTR D1	UCTURE 1 1	TEMP		0 ****	**** 0	ROOT	
Coordinate file	for second hi >MOLECU	istidine resid □LE	ue in Zn²+ bind	ling site (mol2)				
HD2 17	17	1	0 0)				
SMALL	-	_						
RESE CIIA.	LGE							
@ <tripos< td=""><td>>ATOM</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tripos<>	>ATOM							
1 1 2 1	N H	-21 -22	.9940 .2420	12.7620 11.9150	-12.1340	N H	1 HD2 1 HD2	-0.415700 0.358328
3 (CA HA	-23 -22	.0040 .6170	13.8090 14.7340	-11.9870 -12.4150	CX H1	1 HD2 1 HD2	0.018800
5 (CB HB2	-24	.2900	13.4080	-12.7110	CT HC	1 HD2 1 HD2	-0.091292
7 1	HB3	-25	.0600	14.1120	-12.3910	HC	1 HD2 1 HD2	0.032721
9 1	ND1	-23	.2220	13.5440	-14.1910	NA	1 HD2 1 HD2	-0.149862
10 1 11 0	HD1 CE1	-23 -23	.1230 .6720	15.3590 14.4490	-14.3380 -16.1200	H CR	1 HD2 1 HD2	0.321043 0.107703
12 I 13 I	HE1 NE2	-23 -24	.3290 .3670	15.1500 13.3530	-16.8640 -16.3670	Н5 Y2	1 HD2 1 HD2	0.101460 -0.332596
14 (CD2 HD2	-24	.7320	12.7730	-15.1790	CV H4	1 HD2 1 HD2	-0.073789
16 (-23	.3080	14.0900	-10.5150	C	1 HD2	0.597300
@ <tripos< td=""><td>) >BOND</td><td>-23</td><td>.2940</td><td>15.2470</td><td>-10.0740</td><td>0</td><td>1 HD2</td><td>-0.567900</td></tripos<>) >BOND	-23	.2940	15.2470	-10.0740	0	1 HD2	-0.567900
1 2	1 1	2 1 3 1						
3 4	3 3	4 1 5 1						
5	3 1	.6 1						

6 5 7 5 8 5 9 8 10 8 11 9 12 9 13 11 14 11 15 13 16 14 17 16 @ <tripos>SU 1 HD2</tripos>	5 6 5 7 5 8 3 9 3 14 9 10 9 11 1 12 1 13 3 14 4 15 5 17 JBSTRUC	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	TEMP		0 ****	* * * *	0	ROOT		
Coordinate file for w	vater moleci	ıle in 7n	²⁺ hinding si	ite (mol2)						
@ <tripos>MC</tripos>	DLECULE		binding 5							
WT1	۲ C		0	0						
SMATIT.	2 I		0	0						
RESP Charge	Э									
@ <trtpos>A1</trtpos>	гом									
1 0	- 011	-26	.6200	11.5560	-19.0380	Y4		1 WT1	-0.7	14686
2 H1		-27	.0800	10.7370	-19.2180	HW		1 WT1	0.4	43240
3 H2		-27	.3070	12.2230	-19.0410	HW		1 WT1	0.4	57084
@ <tripos>BC</tripos>	OND L 2	1								
@ <tripos>SU</tripos>	JBSTRUC	TURE								
1 WT1		1	TEMP		0 ****	* * * *	0	ROOT		
Coordinate file for Z @ <tripos>MC</tripos>	n²+ molecule	e in Zn ²⁺	binding site	e (mol2)						
ZN1										
1 () 1		0	0						
SMALL RESP Charge	9									
@ <tripos>AT</tripos>	ГОМ									
1 ZN		-24	.7420	12.2140	-18.2970	M1		1 ZN1	0.9	65715
Q <tripos>BC</tripos>	DND									
U <tripos>SU</tripos>	JBSTRUC	TURE 1	темр		0 ****	* * * *	0			
		T	IEMP		0 ~ ~ ~ ~ ~		0	RUUI		
Force field parameter REMARK GOES	ers for Zn²+ b S HERE ,	oinding s THI	i te (frcmod S FILE) IS GENERA	ATED BY MCI	PB.PY				
MASS										
M1 65.4		0	0		Zn ion	1		/	/	0
YI 14.01 Y2 14 01		0.53	0		sp2 N in t	o memb.: 5 momb.:	rın rir	g w/LP	(HIS, ADE	,GUA)
Y3 16 00		0.03	4		carboxyl :	and phos	⊥⊥11 snh	y w/LP ate arc	ADA, CITU)	,GUA) n
Y4 16.00		0.00	0		oxygen in	TIP3P T	wat	er	up uryge	
					_ J =					

BOND

M1-Y4 55.6 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py, 2.0490 replaced with an harmonic restraint (hybrid bonded/restrained non bonded model) 90.7 1.9829 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py Y1-M1 Y2-M1 89.3 1.9845 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py 89.8 Y3-M1 1.9329 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py CO-Y3 656.0 1.2500 CR-Y1 488.0 JCC,7,(1986),230; HIS 1.335 CR-Y2 488.0 1.335 JCC,7,(1986),230; HIS Y1-CV JCC,7,(1986),230; HIS 410.0 1.394 Y2-CV 1.394 JCC,7,(1986),230; HIS 410.0 Y4-HW 553.0 0.9572 ! TIP3P water ANGL CO-Y3-M1 65.54 114.66 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py CR-Y1-M1 58.24 122.34 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py CR-Y2-M1 31.07 119.08 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py M1-Y1-CV 59.96 131.01 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py M1-Y2-CV 31.60 134.25 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py M1-Y4-HW 41.44 107.64 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py 118.61Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py115.72Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py Y1-M1-Y2 34.77 27.33 Y1-M1-Y3 Y1-M1-Y4 46.78 100.88 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py 103.02Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py115.78Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py Y2-M1-Y3 61.02 Y2-M1-Y4 26.72 102.13 Created by Seminario method using MCPB.py Y3-M1-Y4 54.83 70.0 117.00 2C-CO-Y3 70.0 CC-CV-Y1 120.00 AA his 70.0 120.00 AA his CC-CV-Y2 CR-Y1-CV 70.0 117.00 AA his 70.0 AA his CR-Y2-CV 117.00 HW-Y4-HW 100. 104.52 TIP3P water 70.0 120.00 NA-CR-Y1 AA his NA-CR-Y2 70.0 120.00 AA his 02-CO-Y3 80.0 126.00 Y1-CR-H5 50.0 120.00 AA his Y1-CV-H4 50.0 120.00 AA his 50.0 120.00 AA his Y2-CR-H5 Y2-CV-H4 50.0 120.00 AA his DIHE JCC,7,(1986),230 X -CR-Y1-X 2 10.0 180.0 2.0 2.0 X -CR-Y2-X 2 10.0 JCC,7,(1986),230 180.0 X -CV-Y1-X 2 4.8 180.0 2.0 JCC,7,(1986),230 2 X -CV-Y2-X 4.8 180.0 2.0 JCC, 7, (1986), 230 0.064 0.0 -4.0 2C-2C-CO-Y3 1 0.39 2.0 2C-2C-CO-Y3 1 180.0 2C-CO-Y3-M1 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py CC-CV-Y1-M1 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py CC-CV-Y2-M1 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py CO-Y3-M1-Y4 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py CR-Y1-M1-Y2 3 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py 0.00 0.00 CR-Y1-M1-Y3 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py Treat as zero by MCPB.py CR-Y1-M1-Y4 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 0.00 0.00 3.0 CR-Y2-M1-Y3 3 Treat as zero by MCPB.py 3 CR-Y2-M1-Y4 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py 3 0.00 3.0 M1-Y1-CR-H5 0.00 Treat as zero by MCPB.py 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py M1-Y1-CV-H4 M1-Y2-CR-H5 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py M1-Y2-CV-H4 3 0.00 0.00 3.0 Treat as zero by MCPB.py

NA-CR-Y1-M1	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
NA-CR-Y2-M1	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
02-CO-Y3-M1	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y1-M1-Y2-CR	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y1-M1-Y2-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y1-M1-Y3-CO	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y1-M1-Y4-HW	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y2-M1-Y1-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y2-M1-Y3-CO	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y2-M1-Y4-HW	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y3-CO-2C-HC	1	0.0	0.0	2.0			
Y3-M1-Y1-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y3-M1-Y2-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y3-M1-Y4-HW	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y4-M1-Y1-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
Y4-M1-Y2-CV	3	0.00	0.00	3.0	Treat as	zero	by MCPB.py
IMPR							
Х -02-СО-ҮЗ	10	.5	180.		2.		
NONB							
M1	1.3950 0.0149170000		IOD set for Zn2+ ion from Li et al				
JCTC, 2013,	9, 2733					-	
Y1 , ,	1.8240	0.1700		OPLS			
Y2	1.8240	0.1700		OPLS			
Y3	1.6612	0.2100		OPLS			
Y4	1.7683	0.1520		TIP3E	e water mod	el	

References

1. Lan, J.; Ge, J.; Yu, J.; Shan, S.; Zhou, H.; Fan, S.; Zhang, Q.; Shi, X.; Wang, Q.; Zhang, L.; Wang, X. Structure of the SARS-CoV-2 Spike Receptor-Binding Domain Bound to the ACE2 Receptor. *Nature* **2020**, *581*, 215-220.

2. Berman, H. M.; Westbrook, J.; Feng, Z.; Gilliland, G.; Bhat, T. N.; Weissig, H.; Shindyalov, I. N.; Bourne, P. E. The Protein Data Bank. *Nucleic Acids Res* **2000**, *28*, 235-42.

3. Anandakrishnan, R.; Aguilar, B.; Onufriev, A. V. H++ 3.0: Automating pK Prediction and the Preparation of Biomolecular Structures for Atomistic Molecular Modeling and Simulations. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **2012**, *40* (Web Server issue), W537-41.

4. Pengfei, L.; Kenneth, M. M. MCPB.py: A Python Based Metal Center Parameter Builder. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **2016**, *56*, 599-604.

5. Case, D. A.; Ben-Shalom, I. Y.; Brozell, S. R.; Cerutti, D. S.; Cheatham, T.E. III; Cruzeiro, V. W. D.; Darden, T. A.; Duke, R. E.; Ghoreishi, D.; Giambasu, G.; Giese, T.; Gilson, M. K.; Gohlke, H.; Goetz, A.W.; Greene, D.; Harris, R.; Homeyer, N.; Huang, Y.; Izadi, S.; Kovalenko, A.; *et al.* AMBER 2019, University of California, San Francisco, CA, USA. **2019**.

6. Gordon, M. S.; Schmidt, M. W. Advances in Electronic Structure Theory: GAMESS a Decade Later. In *Theory and Applications of Computational Chemistry*; Dykstra, C. E., Frenking, G., Kim, K. S., Scuseria, G. E., Eds.; Elsevier: Amsterdam, 2005; pp 1167-1189.

7. Maier, J. A.; Martinez, C.; Kasavajhala, K.; Wickstrom, L.; Hauser, K. E.; Simmerling, C. ff14SB: Improving the Accuracy of Protein Side Chain and Backbone Parameters from ff99SB. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2015**, *11*, 3696-3713.

8. Kirschner, K. N.; Yongye, A. B.; Tschampel, S. M.; Gonzalez-Outeirino, J.; Daniels, C. R.; Foley, B. L.; Woods, R. J. GLYCAM06: A Generalizable Biomolecular Force Field. Carbohydrates. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2008**, *29*, 622-655.

9. Jorgensen, W. L.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Madura, J. D.; Impey, R. W.; Klein, M. L. Comparison of Simple Potential Functions for Simulating Liquid Water. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1983**, *79*, 926-935.

10. Berendsen, H. J. C.; Postma, J. P. M.; van Gunsteren, W. F.; DiNola, A.; Haak, J. R. Molecular Dynamics with Coupling to an External Bath. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1984**, *81*, 3684-3690.

11. Toukmaji, A.; Sagui, C.; Board, J.; Darden, T. Efficient Particle-Mesh Ewald Based Approach to Fixed and Induced Dipolar Interactions. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2000**, *113*, 10913–10927.

12. Loncharich, R. J.; Brooks, B. R.; Pastor, R. W. Langevin Dynamics of Peptides: the Frictional Dependence of Isomerization Rates of N-Acetylalanyl-N'-Methylamide. *Biopolymers* **1992**, *32*, 523–535.

13. Ryckaert, J.-P.; Ciccotti, G.; Berendsen, H. J. C. Numerical Integration of the Cartesian Equations of Motion of a System with Constraints: Molecular Dynamics of n-Alkanes. *J. Comput. Phys.* **1977**, *23*, 327-341.

14. Pettersen, E. F.; Goddard, T. D.; Huang, C. C.; Couch, G. S.; Greenblatt, D. M.; Meng, E. C.; Ferrin, T. E. UCSF Chimera - A Visualization System for Exploratory Research and Analysis. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2004**, *25*, 1605–1612.

15. Yan, Y.; Yang, M.; Ji, C. G.; Zhang, J. Z. H. Interaction Entropy for Computational Alanine Scanning. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **2017**, *57*, 1112-1122.

16. Sun, Z.; Yan, Y. N.; Yang, M.; Zhang, J. Z. Interaction Entropy for Protein-Protein Binding. *J. Chem. Phys.* **2017**, *146*, 124124.

17. Liu, X.; Peng, L.; Zhou, Y.; Zhang, Y.; Zhang, J. Z. H. Computational Alanine Scanning with Interaction Entropy for Protein–Ligand Binding Free Energies. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2018**, *14*, 1772-1780.

18. Wang, E.; Sun, H.; Wang, J.; Wang, Z.; Liu, H.; Zhang, J. Z. H.; Hou, T. End-Point Binding Free Energy Calculation with MM/PBSA and MM/GBSA: Strategies and Applications in Drug Design. *Chem. Rev.* **2019**, *119*, 9478-9508.

19. Moreira, I. S.; Fernandes, P. A.; Ramos, M. J. Computational Alanine Scanning Mutagenesis - An Improved Methodological Approach. *J. Comput. Chem.* **2007**, *28*, 644-654.

20. Simões, I. C.; Costa, I. P.; Coimbra, J. T.; Ramos, M. J.; Fernandes, P. A. New Parameters for Higher Accuracy in the Computation of Binding Free Energy Differences upon Alanine Scanning Mutagenesis on Protein-Protein Interfaces. *J. Chem. Inf. Model.* **2017**, *57*, 60-72.