SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Protein Recognition by Cucurbit[6]uril: High Affinity N-terminal Complexation

Kiefer O. Ramberg, Sylvain Engilberge, Francesca Guagnini, and Peter B. Crowley*

School of Chemistry, National University of Ireland Galway, University Road, Galway, H91 TK33, Ireland.

*Correspondence to: peter.crowley@nuigalway.ie, +353 91 49 24 80

Contents

Figure S1	ESI ⁺ mass spectrum for MK-RSL and RSL-GMKG	3
Table S1	Predicted and measured masses from MK-RSL ESI ⁺ mass spectrum	3
Figure S2	Proton NMR spectra of Q6 , Q7 , and Q8	4
Figure S3	HUb- Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra and CSP plots	5
Figure S4	Accessible surface areas of lysines in 3 model proteins	6
Figure S5	HUb- Q6 HADDOCK model	7
Table S2	Statistics for the top two HUb- Q6 model clusters determined in HADDOCK	7
Table S3	X-K-X motifs in HUb, RSL, cytc, and SAMP2	8
Figure S6	RSL- Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra and CSP plots	9
Figure S7	Q6 solubilization in Li_2SO_4 facilitates titration into RSL	10
Figure S8	RSL- Q6 HADDOCK model	11
Table S4	Statistics for the top two RSL- Q6 model clusters determined in HADDOCK	11
Figure S9	RSL*- Q6 complexation	12
Figure S10	cytc-Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra and CSP plots	13
Figure S11	Alignment of HUb models from high-resolution crystal structures	14
Figure S12	SAMP2- Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra and CSP plots	15
Figure S13	Overlaid ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra of RSL and MK-RSL	16
Figure S14	MK-RSL-Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra	17
Figure S15	Overlaid ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra of RSL and RSL-GMKG	18
Figure S16	RSL-GMKG- Q6 complexation, ¹ H- ¹⁵ N HSQC spectra	19

References

20 21



Figure S1. ESI⁺ mass spectra for MK-RSL and RSL-GMKG.

MK-RSL monomer			
m/z	charge	Molecular Weight (Da)	Error (Da)
1415.3	9+	9900.0	2.0
1650.6	8+	9897.6	-0.5
1980.3	7+	9896.5	-1.6
Predicted M	W (Da)	9898.9	
Deconvolute	d MW (Da)	9898.0	
Standard deviation (Da)		1.8	

Table S1. Predicted and measured mass from ESI⁺ mass spectra using ESI-Prot.¹

RSL-GMKG monomer			
m/z	charge	Molecular Weight (Da)	Error (Da)
1409.3	7+	9858.0	-0.7
1644.2	6+	9859.2	0.4
1972.8	5+	9859.0	0.2
Predicted M	W (Da)	9857.8	
Deconvolute	d MW (Da)	9858.7	
Standard deviation (Da)		0.6	



Figure S2. (A) ¹H NMR spectra of **Q6**, **Q7**, and **Q8** in 0.1 M HCl. **(B)** Integration of the doublets at 1.1-1.2 ppm suggests that the **Q6** sample contains ~10 % **Q8**.



Figure S3. (A) Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of HUb in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate pH 6.0. **(B) Q6**-induced chemical shift perturbation plot of HUb backbone amides.



Figure S4. (A-C) Accessible surface areas (ASA) for lysines of HUb, cyt*c*, and RSL obtained from highresolution crystal structures. The PDB entries analysed included 1ubq, 1ogw, 3nhe, 3ns8, 4xof (HUb), 1ycc, 3cx5, 4n0k, 5cic, 5t8w (cyt*c*), and 2bs5, 2bs6, 2bt9, 3zi8, 4i6s (RSL). Data from entries 1ubq, 1ycc, and 2bs5 are shown as black circles. **(D)** Average ASAs of lysines in the three proteins derived from data in **A-C**. Lys residue number indicated atop data bars. SAMP2 is not included as the available data are limited by the flexibility / disorder of this protein (PDBs 5Ida and 1sf0).



Figure S5. (A) HUb-Q6 model from top-scoring cluster in HADDOCK.²

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2
HADDOCK score	-36.0 ± 0.3	-33.1 ± 0.7
Cluster size ^a	66	134
RMSD (Å) ^b	0.1 ± 0.1	0.5 ± 0.0
vdW energy (kcal/mol)	-24.3 ± 0.3	-22.5 ± 0.2
Electrostatic energy (kcal/mol)	-194.4 ± 2.0	-182.1 ± 2.7
Desolvation energy (kcal/mol)	7.7 ± 0.2	7.6 ± 0.3
Restraints violation energy (kcal/mol)	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0 ± 0.0
Buried surface area (Å ²)	572.7 ± 7.9	565.5 ± 7.7

Table S2. Statistics for HUb-Q6 clusters determined in HADDOCK.²

^aHADDOCK clustered 200 structures in 2 clusters only.

^bFrom the overall lowest-energy structure.

Protein	Lys	$\mathbf{X}_1 - \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{X}_2$
HUb	6	V-K-T
	11	G-K-T
	27	V-K-A
	29	A-K-I
	33	D-K-E
	48	G-K-Q
	63	Q-K-E
RSL	25	G-K-I
	34	G-K-G
	83	T-K-G
cyt <i>c</i>	-2	F-K-A
	4	A-K-K
	5	K-K-G
	11	F-K-T
	22	E-K-G
	27	H-K-V
	54	I-K-K
	55	K-K-E
	72	P-K-K
	73	К-К-Ү
	79	T-K-M
	86	L-K-K
	87	K-K-E
	89	E-K-D
	99	L-K-K
	100	К-К-А
SAMP2 ^a	2	M-K-M
	5	I-K-V
	7	V-K-V
	15	E-K-E
	24	M-K-V
	42	A-K-V
	46	G-K-V
	55	V-K-D

Table S3. X-K-X motifs in HUb, RSL, cytc, and SAMP2.*

*Q6 binding sites are in bold. Buried hydrophobic residues are highlighted grey.

^eThe N-terminus of SAMP2 (residues 1-5) is disordered. **Q6** complexation may occur at Met1 or Lys2.



Figure S6. (A) Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of RSL in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate pH 6.0. **(B) Q6**-induced chemical shift perturbation plot of RSL backbone amides.



Figure S7. (A) Solubilization of **Q6** to 1 mM in 0.2 M Li_2SO_4 . **(B)** Regions of overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of RSL in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in water. The effect of different cations on RSL-Q6 binding was tested via addition of 50 mM sulfate salts. **(C)** The same spectral regions during titration of **Q6** into RSL in 50 mM Li_2SO_4 .



Figure S8. (A) RSL-**Q6** model from the top-scoring cluster in HADDOCK.² RSL is a grey surface with NMRderived binding map in blue. **Q6** is shown as spheres. **(B)** Detail of the **Q6** interaction with the N-terminal region of RSL. **Q6** and interacting side chains shown as sticks. **(C)** Same view with **Q6** omitted.

•	Cluster 1	Cluster 2
HADDOCK score	-42.8 ± 0.5	-40.7 ± 1.1
Cluster size ^a	21	4
RMSD (Å) ^b	0.1 ± 0.1	0.2 ± 0.0
vdW energy (kcal/mol)	-29.9 ± 0.9	-28.1 ± 0.6
Electrostatic energy (kcal/mol)	-143.9 ± 9.7	-133.6 ± 6.5
Desolvation energy (kcal/mol)	1.3 ± 0.4	0.6 ± 0.7
Restraints violation energy (kcal/mol)	2.0 ± 0.1	2.2 ± 0.2
Buried surface area (Å ²)	806.1 ± 7.9	805.1 ± 7.3
Z-score ^d	-2.0	-0.8

^{*a*}HADDOCK generated 186 models in 16 clusters, accounting for 93 % of the water-refined models. ^{*b*}From the overall lowest-energy structure.

^{*d*}Indication of how many standard deviations from the average the cluster is located in terms of HADDOCK score.



Figure S9. Regions of overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of **(A)** native and **(B)** dimethylated RSL in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in water.



Figure S10. (A) Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of oxidized cyt*c* in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate pH 6.0. **(B) Q6**-induced chemical shift perturbation plot of cyt*c* backbone amides.



Figure S11. (A) Alignment of HUb models from eight high-resolution crystal structures. Met1 is shown as sticks. **(B)** The Met1 side chain points into the hydrophobic core, and the alpha ammonium is flanked by the carboxylates of Glu16 and Glu18.



Figure S12. (A) Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of SAMP2 in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate, 50 mM NaCl, pH 6.0. **(B) Q6**-induced chemical shift perturbation plot of SAMP2 backbone amides.



Figure S13. Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of RSL and MK-RSL in 20 mM KP_i, 50 mM NaCl pH 6.0. The new resonance in MK-RSL is labelled X.



Figure S14. Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of MK-RSL in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate, 50 mM NaCl, pH 6.0.



Figure S15. Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of RSL and RSL-GMKG in 20 mM KP_i, 50 mM NaCl pH 6.0. Resonances belonging to residues of the GMKG loop are highlighted with dashed boxes.



Figure S16. Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of RSL-GMKG in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q6** (blue contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate, 50 mM NaCl, pH 6.0.



Figure S17. Overlaid ¹H-¹⁵N HSQC spectra of **(A)** RSL and **(B)** MK-RSL in the absence (black contours) and presence of **Q8** (green contours) in 20 mM potassium phosphate, 50 mM NaCl, pH 6.0. The 'reporter' resonance of MK-RSL is labelled X.

REFERENCES

- 1. R. Winkler, Rapid Commun. Mass Spectrom. 2010, 24, 285.
- 2. G. C. P. Van Zundert, J. P. G. Rodrigues, M. Trellet, C. Schmitz, P. L. Kastritis, E. Karaca, A. S. J. Melquiond, M. van Dijk, S. J. De Vries and A. M. J. J. Bonvin, *J. Mol. Biol.* 2016, **428**, 720-725.