Supplementary Information (SI) for Green Chemistry. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2024

Supplementary Information

Toward safer and more sustainable by design biocatalytic amide-bond coupling

Elisabeth Söderberg ^{a,b}, Kerstin Felicitas von Borries ^c, Ulf Norinder ^d, Mark Petchey ^e, Ganapathy Ranjani ^{a,b},Swapnil Chavan ^f, Hanna Holmquist ^g, Magnus Johansson ^h, Ian Cotgreave ^f, Martin A. Hayes ^e, Peter Fantke ^c, Per-Olof Syrén ^{a,b}

*a.*School of Chemistry, Biotechnology and Health, Science for Life Laboratory, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Tomtebodavägen 23 171 65, Solna, Sweden

*b.*School of Engineering Sciences in Chemistry, Biotechnology and Health, Department of Fibre and Polymer Technology, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 114 28 Stockholm, Sweden

*c.*Quantitative Sustainability Assessment, Department of Environmental and Resource Engineering, Technical University of Denmark, Bygningstorvet 115, 2800 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark

*d.*Department of Computer and Systems Sciences, Stockholm University, 164 25 Kista, Sweden

*e.*Discovery Sciences, BioPharmaR&D, AstraZeneca, 431 83 Mölndal, Sweden

f. The Research Institute of Sweden RISE, Chemical and pharmaceutical toxicology, 151 36 Södertälje, Sweden

*g.*IVL Swedish Environmental Research Institute, Aschebergsgatan 44, 411 33 Göteborg, Sweden

*h.*Early CVRM Medicinal Chemistry, BioPharmaR&D, AstraZeneca, 431 83 Mölndal, Sweden

Table of Contents

Supplementary Notes

Literature study ATP-dependent amide bond synthetases

Many of the characterised ABS enzymes have been identified in genome mining projects of gene clusters responsible for the biosynthesis of various medically relevant secondary metabolites. NovL, (1) CloL, (2) SimL, (3) and CouL (4,5) are involved in the biosynthesis of aminocoumarin antibiotics novobiocin, clorobiocin, simocyclinone D8, and coumermycin A1 (figure 2A, panel C). Another group of ABS-reminiscent enzymes that share sequence motifs and similar reaction mechanisms to ABS-enzymes, are Ann1, (6) AsuD1 (7) and ORF33 (figure 2A, panels B, D, E) (8,9). These enzymes are involved in the synthesis of 2-amino-3 hydroxycyclopent-2-enone (C5N) and tailoring of polyketides. Recently, a group of CfaL enzymes responsible for the ligation of coronafacic acid (CFA) and coronamic acid (CMA) in the bacterial plant hormone-mimic phytotoxin coronatine (COR) was characterised and screened against different acyl and amine substrates (figure 2A, panel F). The enzymes accepted a broad range of both acyl and amine substrates; aliphatic, aryl, and heteroaryl carboxylic acids, and non-proteogenic amino acids. (10) The enzymes also managed to utilize carboxylic acids carrying other reactive functionalities, groups that would have needed to be protected if the substrate were to be used in chemical synthesis; again, emphasizing the potential of biocatalysts in amide bond synthesis.

USEtox average CF:s

The average values of the CFs of the subset of arbitrarily selected safechems that were used in the experimental coupling did not differ much compared to the average values of all safechems (table S1). The average human CFs of the acids used were slightly lower than those of all safechem acids, while the opposite was true for the amines. For ecotoxicity, amines and acids in the subset were predicted slightly more toxic compared to all safechems. As for the amides made by the subset safechems, their average CFs did not differ much from the average of all amides made by safechems passing the established threshold (figure 3, table S1). The percentiles of the average CF values of the subset were between 44.3 to 55.4 %. The average CF percentile value of an equally large subset of safechem acids and amines could go as low as 19.9 and 4.7%, respectively (table S2). If we had implemented USEtox after the *in silico* filtering and before the experimental coupling, we could have reduced the human and ecotoxicity of the panel used in the experimental coupling even further.

Table S1. Average CF values for safechems and their corresponding amides. For reference, the average CFs are presented separately for all safechems, their responding amides and for the subset that was used in the experimental coupling, respectively. Amides (row 5) are the amides passing the established threshold in the *in silico* filtering (figure 3).

Table S2. Percentile of average CF values for the subset of safechems used in the experimental coupling compared to the percentile of the average CFs for the 16 acids and 17 amines with lowest CF values. Data is shown for each of the four categories.

Methods

Protein expression and purification

The four consensus sequences were codon optimised for expression in *Escherichia Coli* by GeneArt (Thermo Fisher Scientific). Kanamycin resistance gene and N-terminal His-tag were included in all constructs, and each construct was delivered in pET-28a(+) plasmids. BL21(DE3) competent cells were transformed with approximately 2 ng plasmid, and selection was made by growing the cells on 30 µg/mL kanamycin lysogeny broth (LB) agar plates. For protein expression, overnight cultures grown in LB supplemented with 30 µg/mL kanamycin were added to LB with 30 µg/mL kanamycin to a start OD600 of 0.1. When the OD600 reached 0.6, 1 mM IPTG was added. McbA, A3, and A4 were set to grow overnight at 16 °C and 180 rpm, while A2 and A3 at 30 °C. The cells were harvested by centrifugation at 5,000 g for 20 min, and pellets were resuspended in 50 mM phosphate buffer (pH 7.5) with 10 % glycerol (w/v), 300 mM NaCl, and 40 mM imidazole. The cell suspensions were kept on ice while being sonicated at 30s x 3 bursts with 1.5 minute breaks using Branson Sonifier 450 (35% duty cycle and output control 5). Afterwards, the sonicated cell suspensions were centrifuged for 30 min at 4 °C and 14,000 g. The supernatants were injected into the ÄKTA explorer protein purification system (Cytiva) at 4 ml/min, equipped with a 5 mL HP-HisTrap column (Cytiva) equilibrated with ten column volumes of binding buffer. After washing the column with 20 column volumes of binding buffer, the proteins were eluted by a gradient going from 40 mM to 300 mM imidazole over 20 column volumes. Elution fractions were analysed by Invitrogen NuPAGE 4-12% Bis-Tris gel (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and desalted with PD10 columns (Sigma-Aldrich) equilibrated with 50 mM phosphate buffer (pH 7.5) and 300 mM NaCl. Concentration of protein samples was made with MacroSep 10 kDa cut-off centrifugation filters (Pall Laboratory). Protein concentration was measured with NanoDrop. 80% glycerol solution in pH 7.5 phosphate buffer with 300 mM NaCl was added to the protein samples to a final concentration of 10%. The proteins were aliquoted to 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tubes, snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80 °C.

Thermostability

The thermostability of the proteins was assessed by nano differential scanning fluorimetry using Prometheus NT.48 nanoDSF (NanoTemper Technologies). Samples of 2 mg/mL protein solution were prepared in glass capillaries. The fluorescence of the proteins at 330 and 350 nm was measured at a temperature gradient going from 20 to 95 °C at 1 °C/min. The derivate of the ratio between the two measured wavelengths over the temperature interval was used to determine the melting temperature of the proteins.

UPLC-MS

The reactions were quenched with 30 μ L acetonitrile supplemented with 1 mg/mL 1,2,3-tribromobenzene, and the plates were sealed by Velocity11´s PlateLoc. The plates were shaken in a short burst followed by centrifugation at 4000 g for 10 min. Waters Acquity UPLC equipped with a photodiode array detector, and a 3100 mass spectrometer was used for analysis. 3 μL samples were injected into an Acquity UPLC HSS C18 column (1.8 µm, 2.1 mm X 50 mm). The mobile phases were prepared by adding 0.5 mL of acidic solution (pH 3 solution consisting of 126.3 g water, 151.8 g formic acid, and 21.8 g ammonium hydroxide solution 25-30%) to 1 L of water (mobile phase A), and 1 mL of the acidic solution was added to 1 L 95% acetonitrile (mobile phase B). The mobile phase went from 10% to 99% B in 2 minutes. The conversions of the reactions were measured as the amide peak area percentage of the total amide and acid peak area using MassLynx (Waters).

Synthesis of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide

3-hydroxybenzoic acid (0.511 g, 3.70 mmol) was dissolved in DCM (10 mL). To this, 1H-benzo[d][1,2,3]triazol-1-ol hydrate (0.623 g, 4.07 mmol) and 3-phenylpropan-1-amine (0.526 ml, 3.70 mmol) were added. Following this, diisopropylmethanediimine (0.573 ml, 3.70 mmol) was added to the mixture and the reaction was mixed for 4 h. Upon completion of the reaction, the diisopropylurea was filtered away and the DCM layer was washed with saturated bicarbonate solution (1×15 mL) and 2 M HCl (1×15 mL). The organic layer was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and the solvent was then removed under reduced pressure. The crude product was purified by flash column chromatography (Ethyl acetate: Heptane gradient 5 – 50% over 12 CV) to yield the desired product as a white solid in 40% yield. 1H NMR (500 MHz, DMSO) δ 9.60 (s, 1H), 8.37 (t, *J* = 5.6 Hz, 1H), 7.34 – 7.14 (m, 8H), 6.92 – 6.86 (m, 1H), 3.25 (td, *J* = 7.1, 5.6 Hz, 2H), 2.65 – 2.58 (m, 2H), 1.81 (qd, *J* = 7.7, 6.4 Hz, 2H). 13C NMR (126 MHz, DMSO) δ 166.3, 157.3, 141.8, 136.2, 129.2, 128.3, 128.3, 125.7, 117.9, 117.6, 114.2, 38.8, 32.6, 30.9.

Synthesis of 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide and N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide

In a round bottom flask the acid (1.0 equiv.), EDC (1.5 equiv.), HOBt (1.0 equiv.), the amine (1.2 equiv.), and DCM: DMF (10:1) were added. The reaction mixture was stirred at room temperature overnight, and diluted with DCM. The organic phase was washed with saturated NaHCO₃, and brine, dried over MgSO₄, filtered, and concentrated in vacuo. The crude was purified by preparative

TLC (2%-10% MeOH-CHCl3) to afford the corresponding amide compound. **3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide**: R_f = 0.44 (MeOH/CHCl₃ (10:90)), Colourless solid, Yield (16 mg, 44%) 1H NMR, 400 MHz, DMSO-*d6*: 8.80 (t, *J*=5.6 Hz, 1H), 8.4 (s, 1H), 8.08 (t, *J*=8.0 Hz, 2H), 7.62 (t, *J*=7.8 Hz, 1H), 7.22 (dd, *J*=16, 8.0 Hz, 4H), 5.12 (t, *J*=5.7 Hz, 1H), 4.45 (d, *J*=5.7 Hz, 2H), 3.49 (dd, *J*=14.0, 6.6 Hz, 2H), 2.84 (t, *J*=7.4 Hz, 2H), 2.63 (s, 3H). 13C NMR, 400 MHz, DMSO-*d6*: 197.7, 165.4, 140.4, 137.8, 136.8, 135.0, 131.8, 130.8, 128.9, 128.4, 126.8, 126.6, 62.8, 41.1, 34.8, 26.9. **N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide**: *Rf*= 0.5 (MeOH/CHCl3 (2:98)), Colourless solid, Yield (5.0 mg, 34%) 1H NMR, 400 MHz, DMSO-*d6*: 9.07 (t, *J*=5.5Hz, 1H), 7.95 (d, *J*=7.2Hz, 2H), 7.84 (d, *J*= 7.7 Hz, 1H), 7.65 (t, *J*=7.5 Hz, 1H), 7.58 (t, *J*=7.1Hz, 1H), 7.53-7.47 (m, 4H), 4.85 (d, *J*=5.9 Hz, 2H), 3.10 (t, *J*=5.2 Hz, 4H), 1.57 (br, 4H), 1.47 (d, *J*=4.3Hz, 2H) 13C NMR, 400 MHz, DMSO-*d6*: 166.6, 138.5, 134.5, 134.0, 133.2, 131.5, 129.8, 128.4, 127.7, 127.3, 127.1, 45.7, 39.6, 24.9, 23.1

.

Table S4. Melting temperature (T_m) of McbA and ancestors A1-A4 measured by nano differential scanning fluorimetry.

Table S5. Protein expression levels of McbA and ancestors

Figure S1. Crude protein content of McbA and ancestor A1-A4. Samples were normalized by OD600, two dilutions of each sample were loaded onto the gel. The molecular weight marker is SeeBlue Plus2.

Melting temperature McbA and ancestors

Figure S2**.** Thermal unfolding by McbA and ancestors A1-A4, measured by change in fluorescence ratio at wavelengths 350 and 330 nm by Prometheus NT.48 nanoDSF (NanoTemper Technologies).

Figure S3**.** Phylogenetic tree of McbA used to compute ancestral sequences. The numbers shown on the nodes are the bootstrap values (1000 bootstrap).

Figure S4. Alignment used for the phylogenetic tree construction. Alignment illustration made by using ESPript v 3.0, Robert, X. and Gouet, P. (2014) "Deciphering key features in protein structures with the new ENDscript server". Nucl. Acids Res. 42(W1), W320-W324 - doi: 10.1093/nar/gku316 (freely accessible online).

Figure S5. Alignment of McbA and ancestors A1-A4, derived from the phylogenetic tree in fig S1. Alignment illustration made by ESPript v 3.0, Robert, X. and Gouet, P. (2014) "Deciphering key features in protein structures with the new ENDscript server". Nucl. Acids Res. 42(W1), W320-W324 - doi: 10.1093/nar/gku316 (freely accessible online).

Figure S6. 1H-NMR of synthesised 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S7. 13C-NMR of synthesised 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S8. 1H-NMR of the enzymatic synthesis of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide (crude NMR). As a control, 1H-NMR of 3-phenyl-1-propylamine and 3-hydroxybenzoic acid are included.

Figure S9. ¹³C-NMR of the enzymatic synthesis of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide (crude NMR). As a control, ¹³C-NMR of 3-phenyl-1-propylamine and 3-hydroxybenzoic acid are included.

Figure S10 13C-NMR (left) and 1H-NMR (right) of 3-hydroxybenzoic acid, 3-phenyl-1-propylamine, and the enzymatic synthesis of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3 phenylpropyl)benzamide (crude NMR). In the left chromatogram, a shift of the carbonyl carbon (G'), the α-carbon (C') and the aromatic carbon (A') is consistent with the formation of an amide. In the right chromatogram the peak at around 8.4 ppm (S') shows the presence of an amide bond.

Figure S11. ¹H-NMR of synthesised 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S12. 13C-NMR of synthesised 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S13. 1H-NMR of biocatalytic synthesised 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide

Figure S14. 13C-NMR of biocatalytic synthesised 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide

Figure S15. DEPT spectra of biocatalytic synthesised 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide

Figure S16. 1H-NMR of synthesised N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S17. 13C-NMR of synthesised N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide (standard).

Figure S18¹H-NMR of biocatalytic synthesised N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide

Figure S19 13C-NMR of biocatalytic synthesised N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide

Figure S20. DEPT spectra of biocatalytic synthesised N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide

Figure S21. 305 nm UV absorption calibration curve of different 3-hydroxybenzoic acid concentrations. In the equation, y is the 305 nm peak area of the acid, and x is the mM of the acid in the HPLC sample.

Figure S22. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of a sample taken from the upscaled biocatalytic synthesis of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3 phenylpropyl)benzamide 60 h after the start. At 0.587 min is 3-hydroxybenzoic acid, 0.748 min is 3-phenylpropylamine, and at 2.145 min is the 3-Hydroxy-N-(3 phenylpropyl)benzamide, with its expected mass of 256 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Figure S23. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of 3-Hydroxy-N-(3-phenylpropyl)benzamide standard. At 2.117 min is the amide, with its expected mass of 256 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Figure S24. 305 nm UV absorption calibration curve of different 3-acetylbenzoic acid concentrations. In the equation, y is the 305 nm peak area of the acid, and x is the mM of the acid in the HPLC sample.

Figure S25. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of a sample taken from the upscaled biocatalytic synthesis of 3-acetyl-N-(4- (hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide 40 h after the start. At 1.704 min is 3-acetylbenzoic acid, and at 2.035 min is 3-acetyl-N-(4- (hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide, with its expected mass of 298 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Figure S26. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of 3-acetyl-N-(4-(hydroxymethyl)phenethyl)benzamide standard. At 2.071 min is the amide, with its expected mass of 298 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Figure S27. 305 nm UV absorption calibration curve of different benzoic acid concentrations. In the equation, y is the 305 nm peak area of the acid, and x is the mM of the acid in the HPLC sample.

Figure S28. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of a taken from the upscaled biocatalytic synthesis of N-(2-(piperidin-1 ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide 60 h after the start. At 0.640 min is benzoic acid, and at 2.341 min is N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide, with its expected mass of 359 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Figure S29. HPLC-MS (positive ionization mode, 305 nm) chromatogram of N-(2-(piperidin-1-ylsulfonyl)benzyl)benzamide standard. At 2.360 min is the amide, with its expected mass of 359 *m*/*z*. For reference, all mass peaks throughout the elution are shown.

Table S6. Derivation of USEtox input parameters' mean and standard deviation from in-silico model prediction and uncertainty (described by the reported log RMSE).

a) US EPA EPISuite (2012), b) Ping Hou et al., "Estimate Ecotoxicity Characterization Factors for Chemicals in Life Cycle Assessment Using Machine Learning Models," Environment International 135 (2020): 105393-, c) Nicolò Aurisano et al., "Extrapolation Factors for Characterizing Freshwater Ecotoxicity Effects," Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry 38, no. 11 (2019): 2568–82., d) Peter Fantke (Ed.) et al., "USEtox® 2.0 Documentation (Version 1.1)", http://usetox.org.

Table S7. Overview of uncertainty factors applied onto the model-specific uncertainty (described by the log RMSE) based on assessing the model applicability for each chemical.

Model suite	Applicability domain	Uncertainty factors
OPERA	Local applicability domain based on structural	Inside domain (AD≥0.6): 1
	similarity of query chemical to five nearest	Inside extended domain (0.4 \leq AD < 0.6): 1.5
	neighbors in training data set, ranging from 0	Outside domain (AD < 0.4): 2
	to 1	
CTV	Global applicability domain based on Z-score,	Inside domain $(AD \leq 1)$: 1
	which corresponds to the number of standard	Inside extended domain ($1 < AD \leq 3$): 1.5
	deviations	Outside domain (AD \ge 3): 2
		Imputed value (contains metals/metalloids): 3
ECOSAR	"DomainOfApplicability" flag (no continuous	Inside domain (no AD flag): 1
	value)	Outside domain (AD flag): 2

Figure S30.USEtox characterization factors vs *in-silico* screening scores of safechems and subset of filtered out aromatic acids and amines A) Median freshwater ecotoxicity USEtox characterization factor of the in-silico screening environmental score of safechems and sample of 408 aromatic amines and 448 aromatic acids that were filtered out. B) Median human toxicity USEtox characterization factor of in-silico screening toxicity score of safechems and sample of 408 aromatic amines and 448 aromatic acids that were filtered out.

Predicted human toxicity of amides $10\,$ 11 $14\,$ 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 $\frac{12}{10}$ $\frac{13}{1}$ amides from all the safechems detected amides

Figure S31. Predicted toxicity and environmental score of detected amides from the experimental coupling considering only a subset of possible safechems in comparison to all possible amides from the whole safechem panel.

Figure S32. Toxic effects coupled to the molecular weight of amines and acids which were filtered out in the *in silico* filtering process (figure 3). The lower the value (y-axes), the more toxic. HC50 is the hazardous concentration of a chemical at which 50% of the species in an aquatic ecosystem are exposed to the chemical above their tolerance concentration, LogHC50 (log mg/L). ED50non = Human-equivalent lifetime dose per person that causes a non-cancer disease probability of 50% via either inhalation or digestion(kg/lifetime), ED50canc = Human-equivalent lifetime dose per person that causes a cancer disease probability of 50% via either inhalation or digestion (kg/lifetime).

Figure S33. Scatter plot of the USEtox CFs of amides with *in silico* hazard score equal to or lower than ten (figure 3) compared to the sum of the CFs of their constituent acid and amine moieties. The results demonstrate a clear deviation between the amide CF and the combined CFs of the acid and amine. This observation underscores the importance of directly evaluating the environmental impact of the final product, rather than solely relying on the CFs of its building blocks. The amides in the plot passed the initial filtering, and the acids and amines are their safechem building blocks.

McbA												
	1 _b	2 _b	3b	4b	5b	6b	7b	8b	9b	10 _b	11 _b	12 _b
1a	23.8 ± 0.5	31.2 ± 0.9	8.0 ± 0.1	27.6 ± 0.5	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	41.7 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	29.0 ± 3.2	34.3 ± 0.2	1.5 ± 0.1	34.7 ± 9.0
2a	5.0 ± 0.1	2.5 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0.0	1.5 ± 0.0	0±0	0.1 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.0	1.7 ± 0.1	2.6 ± 0.7	0.2 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.1
3a	2 ± 0.0	1.8 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0.0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	0.6 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0
4a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
5a	0 ± 0	0.5 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	1.4 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0
6a	29.9 ± 0.5	38.1 ± 1.9	7.0 ± 0.2	12.4 ± 0.3	2.3 ± 0.2	0.4 ± 0.1	10.4 ± 0.3	10.2 ± 0.1	11.6 ± 0.2	6.7 ± 0.3	10.6 ± 0.3	10.4 ± 0.7
7a	1.6 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
8a	0 ± 0	4.7 ± 0.3	0.6 ± 0.0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	2.7 ± 0.0	1 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0.5 ± 0.0
9a	1.4 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
10a	15.1 ± 0.9	37.0 ± 1.0	10.1 ± 0.3	19.0 ± 0.2	1.1 ± 0.2	0.1 ± 0.0	8.2 ± 0.7	12.0 ± 0.1	13.0 ± 0.1	9.8 ± 0.3	4.8 ± 0.4	9.1 ± 0.7
11a	7.3 ± 0.3	4.9 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	1.2 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.3 ± 0.0	1.6 ± 0.0	1.3 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.5 ± 0.0
12a	1.5 ± 0.1	0.3 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.4 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
13a	4.5 ± 0.0	3.8 ± 0.1	1.9 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.8 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0	0.4 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
14a	6.3 ± 0.0	4.5 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.6 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.1	1.9 ± 0.1	0.8 ± 0.0	0.6 ± 0.1	0.9 ± 0.2
15a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.6 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0

Table S8. Conversion by McbA (in %). The first column refers to the acids, and the first row refers to the amines. Conversion is calculated from the amide peak area divided by total acid and amide peak area (DAD) and based on two replicates.

A1												
	1 _b	2 _b	3b	4b	5b	6b	7b	8b	9b	10 _b	11 _b	12 _b
1a	21.9 ± 0.0	17.8 ± 0.2	3.3 ± 0.0	8.0 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	0.7 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	11.2 ± 0.5	3.4 ± 0.1	18.3 ± 0.3	9.6 ± 2.9
2a	1.0 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.1 ± 0.0	0±0	0±0	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.9 ± 0.0	0 ± 0
За	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
4a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
5a	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
6a	4.2 ± 0.0	2.4 ± 0.0	0.3 ± 0.0	0.6 ± 0.3	0.2 ± 0.0	0.7 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	0.7 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0	4.8 ± 0.8	0 ± 0
7a	1.5 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0±0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
8a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
9а	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
10a	5.4 ± 0.0	1.9 ± 0.2	0.8 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0	0.8 ± 0.0	1.3 ± 0.1	1.4 ± 0.1	0.1 ± 0.0	3.4 ± 0.0	3.6 ± 0.1
11a	0.3 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
12a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
13a	0.5 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
14a	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.1 ± 0.0	0 ± 0
15a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	1.6 ± 0.6	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0

Table S9. Conversion by A1 (in %). The first column refers to the acids, and the first row refers to the amines. Conversion is calculated from the amide peak area divided by total acid and amide peak area (DAD) and based on two replicates.

A2												
	1 _b	2b	3b	4b	5b	6b	7b	8b	9b	10 _b	11 _b	12 _b
1a	6.2 ± 0.6	1.7 ± 0.0	22.4 ± 1.2	13.4 ± 0.3	0 ± 0	0±0	16.5 ± 1.1	0 ± 0	1.2 ± 0.0	35.9 ± 0.7	0.9 ± 0.0	51.5 ± 15.6
2a	0.3 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	3.2 ± 0.7	1.2 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	2.3 ± 0.1	5.1 ± 0.2	0.3 ± 0.0	6.5 ± 0.1	0±0	14.1 ± 0.3
3a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.8 ± 0.2	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0.2 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0.4 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	2.6 ± 0.2
4a	0±0	0 ± 0	0.5 ± 0.0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
5a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
6а	1.3 ± 0.0	0.9 ± 0.1	6.1 ± 0.0	2.9 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0±0	7.8 ± 0.0	6.4 ± 1.0	0±0	5.9 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	24.6 ± 2.3
7а	1.3 ± 0.0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	0±0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0±0	0 ± 0
8a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	12.2 ± 1.7	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	4.8 ± 0.2	9.9 ± 0.5	0 ± 0	7.7 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	8.9 ± 0.6
9a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
10a	1.2 ± 0.0	0.2 ± 0.0	10.7 ± 0.5	3.2 ± 0.0	0.1 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	5.7 ± 0.0	4.9 ± 0.3	0.6 ± 0.0	5.9 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	9.1 ± 0.6
11a	1.1 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	9.0 ± 0.6	0.9 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	10.6 ± 1.4	1.5 ± 0	0.6 ± 0.0	8.0 ± 1.8	0 ± 0	4.6 ± 0.0
12a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0.5 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0 ± 0
13a	0.8 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	10.5 ± 0.9	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	18.4 ± 2.2	1.9 ± 0.0	0.6 ± 0.0	6.1 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	6.5 ± 0.0
14a	0.7 ± 0.0	0 ± 0	4.1 ± 0.5	1.2 ± 0.4	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	5.0 ± 0.0	3.5 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.1	10.9 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	9.7 ± 0.8
15a	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	2.1 ± 0.1	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0	0 ± 0

Table S10. Conversion by A2 (in %). The first column refers to the acids, and the first row refers to the amines. Conversion is calculated from the amide peak area divided by total acid and amide peak area (DAD) and based on two replicates.

Table S12. List of safechem acids from in silico screening.

Notes and references

- 1. Steffensky M, Mühlenweg A, Wang ZX, Li SM, Heide L. Identification of the Novobiocin Biosynthetic Gene Cluster of *Streptomyces spheroides* NCIB 11891. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2000 May;44(5):1214–22.
- 2. Pojer F, Li SM, Heide L. Molecular cloning and sequence analysis of the clorobiocin biosynthetic gene cluster: new insights into the biosynthesis of aminocoumarin antibiotics. Microbiology (Reading). 2002 Dec;148(Pt 12):3901–11.
- 3. Galm U, Schimana J, Fiedler HP, Schmidt J, Li SM, Heide L. Cloning and analysis of the simocyclinone biosynthetic gene cluster of Streptomyces antibioticus Tü 6040. Archives of Microbiology. 2002 Aug 1;178(2):102–14.
- 4. Schmutz E, Steffensky M, Schmidt J, Porzel A, Li SM, Heide L. An unusual amide synthetase (CouL) from the coumermycin A1 biosynthetic gene cluster from Streptomyces rishiriensis DSM 40489. Eur J Biochem. 2003 Nov;270(22):4413–9.
- 5. Wang ZX, Li SM, Heide L. Identification of the Coumermycin A 1 Biosynthetic Gene Cluster of *Streptomyces rishiriensis* DSM 40489. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2000 Nov;44(11):3040–8.
- 6. Kalan L, Gessner A, Thaker MN, Waglechner N, Zhu X, Szawiola A, et al. A Cryptic Polyene Biosynthetic Gene Cluster in Streptomyces calvus Is Expressed upon Complementation with a Functional bldA Gene. Chemistry & Biology. 2013 Oct;20(10):1214–24.
- 7. Rui Z, Petříčková K, Škanta F, Pospíšil S, Yang Y, Chen CY, et al. Biochemical and Genetic Insights into Asukamycin Biosynthesis. Journal of Biological Chemistry. 2010 Aug;285(32):24915–24.
- 8. McAlpine JB, Bachmann BO, Piraee M, Tremblay S, Alarco AM, Zazopoulos E, et al. Microbial Genomics as a Guide to Drug Discovery and Structural Elucidation: ECO-02301, a Novel Antifungal Agent, as an Example †. J Nat Prod. 2005 Apr;68(4):493–6.
- 9. Zhang W, Bolla ML, Kahne D, Walsh CT. A Three Enzyme Pathway for 2-Amino-3-hydroxycyclopent-2-enone Formation and Incorporation in Natural Product Biosynthesis. J Am Chem Soc. 2010 May 12;132(18):6402–11.
- 10. Winn M, Rowlinson M, Wang F, Bering L, Francis D, Levy C, et al. Discovery, characterization and engineering of ligases for amide synthesis. Nature. 2021 May 20;593(7859):391–8.