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ABSTRACT

Redox processes are important in chemistry, with applications in biomedicine, chemical analysis, among others. As many redox experiments are also performed at a fixed value of pH, having an efficient computational method to support experimental measures at both constant redox potential and pH is very important. Such computational techniques have the potential to validate experimental observations performed under these conditions and to provide additional information unachievable experimentally such as an atomic level description of macroscopic measures. We present the implementation of discrete reduction and protonation states methods for constant redox potential Molecular Dynamics (CEMD), for coupled constant pH and constant redox potential MD (C(pH,E)MD), and for Replica Exchange MD along the redox potential dimension (E-REMD) on AMBER. Validation results are presented for a small system that contains a single heme group: N-acetylmicroperoxidase-8 (NAcMP8) axially connected to a histidine peptide. The methods implemented allow one to make standard redox potential ($E^o$) predictions with the same easiness and accuracy as $pK_a$ predictions using the CpHMD and pH-REMD methods currently available on AMBER. We are able to correctly describe the following behaviors: when a redox-active group is reduced the $pK_a$ of a near pH-active group increases because it becomes easier for a proton to be attached; equivalently, when a pH-active group is protonated the standard redox potential ($E^o$) of an adjacent redox-active group rises. Further, our results also show that E-REMD is able to achieve faster statistical convergence than CEMD or C(pH,E)MD. Moreover, computational benchmarks using our methodologies show high-performance of GPU accelerated calculations in comparison to conventional CPU calculations.
I. INTRODUCTION

The coupling between electron and proton transfer (also known as the redox-Bohr effect) is essential to describe many important biological processes. The protonation/reduction state of proteins and other biomolecules is related to their structure and function, and it can affect properties like stability, ligand binding, catalysis, absorption spectrum, among others. This happens because the solution’s pH and redox potential (reduction potential or electrode potential) affect the charge distribution on the biomolecules due to changes in the predominant protonation/reduction state of the titratable groups. For many systems, the standard redox potential (also called midpoint reduction potential) turns out to be pH-dependent. Hence, theoretical methods that can correctly describe systems at constant pH and constant redox potential are very important. Previous works in this area have been published.

Due to the similarity between the Henderson-Hasselbalch equation (applied to acid-base reactions) and the Nernst equation (applied to electrochemistry, redox reactions), the mathematical derivations used on constant pH methods can be extended to constant redox potential methods. There are two types of Constant pH Molecular Dynamics (CpHMD) approaches: the ones that consider continuous protonation states and the ones that consider discrete protonation states. The continuous protonation states approach is based on the introduction of a fictitious particle at each titratable site that is propagated through conventional Molecular Dynamics (MD) according to a pH-dependent force. The discrete protonation states approach makes use of Metropolis Monte Carlo exchange attempts between different protonation states over the course of the MD. Regardless of the approach type, the accuracy of predicted pKa values relies not only on the accuracy of the force field parameters but also on the extent of the conformational sampling.
Replica Exchange Molecular Dynamics (REMD) is a state-of-the-art method that is able to significantly improve conformational sampling convergence \(^{23-28}\) while taking advantage of computational parallelization. This approach consists of individual simulations (which are considered as independent replicas) that periodically attempt to exchange information between them through a Metropolis Monte Carlo scheme. Studies regarding REMD along the pH dimension (pH-REMD) have been reported in the literature \(^{18,21,24,25,29,30}\). In pH-REMD, each replica explores the conformational space at a different pH value.

In this work, we present the implementation of constant redox potential MD (CEMD), of coupled constant pH and constant redox potential MD (C(pH,E)MD), and REMD along the redox potential dimension (E-REMD) in the AMBER software package \(^{31}\). To the best of our knowledge, this is the first implementation of E-REMD. Discrete reduction and protonation states are considered in our methodologies, and calculations can be done using both implicit (i.e. Generalized Born, GB) or explicit solvent models. These new implementations are based on existing CpHMD and pH-REMD methods implemented on AMBER by Mongan, Swails, and others \(^{13,18,25}\). We present results for N-acetylmicroperoxidase-8 (N\textit{Ac}MP8) \(^{32}\) with a histidine peptide as the axial ligand. N\textit{Ac}MP8 is a small peptide derived from cytochrome \textit{c} that has a single ferric heme group and is a good reference compound candidate for the simulation of larger proteins containing one or more equivalent heme groups.

Previous simulations for large systems using AMBER’s high-performance GPU code have shown to have great speedups over calculations using conventional CPUs \(^{33,34}\). Our CEMD, C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD implementations are also available using AMBER’s GPU code. To our knowledge, these are the first implementations of constant redox potential methods using GPU accelerated code.
II. THEORY AND METHODS

A. Constant Redox Potential Molecular Dynamics (CEMD)

In CEMD we make use of Monte Carlo transitions between discrete redox states, represented by different atomic charge distributions for reduced and oxidized states of a given redox-active residue. Further, in CEMD a predetermined number of MD steps are performed, the simulation is then halted, and a redox state change is attempted. In order to understand how the energetic cost of this attempt is computed, we start from the reduction reaction:

\[
A_{oxi}^{n+} + ve^- \rightleftharpoons Ke A_{red}^{(n-v)}
\]  

(1)

The equilibrium constant is given by \(Ke = \frac{[A_{red}^{(n-v)}]}{[A_{oxi}^{n+}][e^-]^v}\) and is unitless. It is possible to devise expressions equivalent to \(pH = -\log[H^+]\) and \(pK_a = -\log K_a\) for the redox potential \(E = -\frac{k_bT}{F} \ln[e^-]\) and the standard redox potential \(E^o = \frac{k_bT}{vF} \ln(K_e)\), where \(F\) is the Faraday constant.

Then, from the equilibrium constant expression we get to the Nernst equation:

\[
E = E^o + \frac{k_bT}{vF} \ln \left[ \frac{[A_{oxi}^{n+}]}{[A_{red}^{(n-v)}]} \right]
\]  

(2)

From this equation, an expression for the fraction of reduced species is devised:

\[
f_{red} = \frac{[A_{red}^{(n-v)}]}{[A_{red}^{(n-v)}] + [A_{oxi}^{n+}]} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\frac{n}{k_bT}(E-E^o)}}
\]  

(3)

In this equation, \(n\) is the Hill coefficient and is a post hoc correction added to account for the fact that the redox-active group might be affected by other pH- or redox-active groups nearby. We can also devise an expression for \(f_{red}\) based on a statistical mechanics point of view:
\[ f_{\text{red}} = \frac{\left[ A_{\text{red}}^{(n-v)} \right]}{\left[ A_{\text{red}}^{(n-v)} \right] + \left[ A_{\text{oxy}}^{n+} \right]} = \frac{e^{-G_{\text{reduced}}/k_BT}}{e^{-G_{\text{reduced}}/k_BT} + e^{-G_{\text{oxidized}}/k_BT}} = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\Delta G_{\text{reduction}}/k_BT}} \] (4)

The Gibbs Free Energy of reduction can be obtained from equations 3 and 4:

\[ \Delta G_{\text{reduction}} = vF(E - E^o) \] (5)

Any theoretical modeling based solely on this equation requires prior knowledge of the \( E^o \) value, however this is one of the properties one wants to be able to predict theoretically. To overcome this issue, we also write equation 5 for a reference compound where the value of \( E^o \) is known.

We also split the Gibbs Free Energy of reduction into electrostatic (Coulombic) and non-electrostatic contributions:

\[ \Delta G_{\text{reduction}} = vF(E - E^o) = \Delta G_{\text{elec}} + \Delta G_{\text{non-elec}} \] (6)

\[ \Delta G_{\text{reduction,ref}} = vF(E - E_{\text{ref}}^o) = \Delta G_{\text{elec,ref}} + \Delta G_{\text{non-elec,ref}} \] (7)

The approximation made on AMBER is that \( \Delta G_{\text{non-elec}} = \Delta G_{\text{non-elec,ref}} \), which leads to:

\[ \Delta G_{\text{reduction}} = vF(E - E_{\text{ref}}^o) + \Delta G_{\text{elec}} - \Delta G_{\text{elec,ref}} \] (8)

This is the equation used on CEMD to perform Monte Carlo redox state change attempts. \( \Delta G_{\text{elec,ref}} \) is a precomputed quantity adjusted to reproduce the \( E_{\text{ref}}^o \) value for the reference compound, and \( \Delta G_{\text{elec}} \) is computed on every redox state change attempt. \( \Delta G_{\text{elec}} \) is obtained by taking the difference between the electrostatic energy associated with the proposed and current redox states.

**B. Constant pH and Redox Potential Molecular Dynamics (C(pH,E)MD)**

In CpHMD, the core equation for protonation state change attempts \(^{13,25,30}\), equivalent to equation 8, is:
\[
\Delta G_{\text{protonation}} = k_b T \left( \ln 10 \right) \left( pH - pK_{a,\text{ref}} \right) + \Delta G_{\text{elec}} - \Delta G_{\text{elec,ref}}
\]

In our C(pH,E)MD implementation, protonation and reduction change attempts are performed separately, even if the attempts happen at the same MD step. The redox-Bohr effect comes naturally from the fact that a successful reduction attempt will change the charges of a redox-active group and this change will thus affect the next protonation attempts of neighboring pH-active groups. Similarly, a successful protonation attempt will affect the next reduction attempts of near redox-active groups.

C. Replica Exchange Molecular Dynamics along the Redox Potential dimension (E-REMD)

The chemical potential \( \mu_A \) associated to a substance \( A \) is defined as \( \mu_A = \mu_A^0 + k_b T \ln a_A \), where \( \mu_A^0 \) is the standard chemical potential and \( a_A \) is the activity of \( A \). The standard chemical potential for electrons is chosen as \( \mu_{e^-}^0 = 0 \), thus by making use of \( E = -\frac{k_b T}{F} \ln[e^-] \) we obtain:

\[
\mu_{e^-} = k_b T \ln[e^-] = -FE
\]

This shows that performing simulations at constant redox potential is the same as performing simulations at constant chemical potential for electrons (\( \mu_{e^-} \)).

Hereafter, we show how the Monte Carlo exchange criterium derived by Itoh et al.\textsuperscript{30} for pH-REMD can be extended to E-REMD. First, we consider a system of \( M \) non-interacting replicas. Replica \( i \) (\( i = 1, \ldots, M \)) has coordinate and momentum vectors \( \tilde{q}_i \) and \( \tilde{p}_i \), temperature \( T \), a redox potential value of \( E_l \) (\( l = 1, \ldots, M \)), and \( N_{l,e^-} \) electrons. If we exchange two replicas, the following detailed balance condition must be satisfied:
\[ P(X^n_i) P(X^n_j) w(X^n_j \rightarrow X^n_i, X^n_i \rightarrow X^n_j) = P(X^n_i) P(X^n_j) w(X^n_j \rightarrow X^n_i, X^n_i \rightarrow X^n_j) \]  

(11)

where \( X^n_i \equiv (\tilde{q}_i, \tilde{p}_i, N_i^{e^-}, E_i) \), \( P \) is the equilibrium probability, and \( w \) is the transition probability.

In the semi-grand canonical ensemble of electrons, where the volume \( (V) \), temperature \( (T) \), and \( \mu_{e^-} \) are fixed, the equilibrium probability is given by:

\[ P(X^n_i) = \frac{1}{\Xi} e^{-\varepsilon_i + (\mu_{e^-})N_i^{e^-}/k_BT} = \frac{1}{\Xi} e^{-\varepsilon_i - F(E_n - E_l)(N_i^{e^-} - N_j^{e^-})}/k_BT \]  

(12)

where \( \varepsilon_i \) is the energy of the system, and \( \Xi \) is the grand canonical partition function. We can write the ratio of the transition probabilities as:

\[ \frac{w(X^n_j \rightarrow X^n_i, X^n_i \rightarrow X^n_j)}{w(X^n_j \rightarrow X^n_i, X^n_i \rightarrow X^n_j)} = e^{-\Delta} \]  

(13)

\[ \Delta = \frac{F}{k_BT} (E_n - E_l)(N_i^{e^-} - N_j^{e^-}) \]  

(14)

The Metropolis Monte Carlo solution for the exchange probability can be then written as:

\[ w(X^{m,n}_{j} \rightarrow X^{m,n}_{i}, X^{k,l}_{i} \rightarrow X^{k,l}_{j}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \Delta < 0 \\ e^{-\Delta}, & \Delta \geq 0 \end{cases} \]  

(15)

It is important to notice that the acceptance ratio decreases exponentially with the difference in redox potential values. Therefore, it is important to choose redox potential values for the replicas such that the acceptance ratio is not too low. For example, for \( T = 300 \) K, \( N_i^{e^-} - N_j^{e^-} = 1 \) and \( E_n - E_l = 30 \) mV we have \( e^{-\Delta} \approx 31\% \). Roughly the same probability is obtained on pH-REMD by using pH intervals of 0.5. This is already expected because it can be shown that 1.0 pH unit is equivalent to 59.5 mV in redox potential units at \( T = 300 \) K.
III. CALCULATION DETAILS

In this work, all the simulations were performed using an in-house modified version of AMBER 16. Our implementations will be part of the upcoming AMBER 18 release. In this section we are going to discuss the C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD implementations, followed by details about parametrization of our test system, and the implicit and explicit solvent calculations performed.

A. C(pH,E)MD implementation

Previous discrete protonation states CpHMD publications have shown, among other things, that long Generalized Born (GB) implicit solvent simulations may generate poor $pK_a$ values due to unrealistic conformational sampling. They have also shown that a higher frequency of exchange attempts improves convergence on pH-REMD, and how variables like the solvent relaxation time affects explicit solvent simulations. These discussions will be revisited here in the context of constant redox potential, even though we expect to see these same behaviors due to the natural likeness between CpHMD and CEMD. This likeness can be seen by comparing equations 8 and 9 and arises from the similarities between the Henderson-Hasselbalch and the Nernst equations.

Figure 1 shows the workflow of C(pH,E)MD as implemented on AMBER. The number of standard MD steps between state change attempts is tunable and may be different for protonation and redox state change attempts. Thus, protonation and redox state change attempts may happen at the same MD step. In this case the protonation state change attempts are performed first.
Figure 1. C(pH,E)MD workflow as implemented on AMBER. This workflow generalizes both the implicit and explicit solvent implementations.

In both the implicit and explicit solvent implementations, the proposed state of a residue in a protonation or redox state change attempt is chosen randomly from the available states of the residue, excluding the current state the residue is in.

1. Implicit solvent (IS) implementation

When the standard MD is halted for a protonation and/or redox state change attempt (see Figure 1), a single residue is picked randomly and is the only residue considered for a protonation or redox state change attempt.
2. Explicit solvent (ES) implementation

One state change is attempted for each pH- and/or redox-active residue, and the residues are chosen in random order until all pH- and/or redox-active residues are visited once. Likewise, in the ES CpHMD AMBER implementation \(^\text{18}\), during redox state change attempts the water molecules and any eventual ions are stripped and the \(\Delta G_{\text{elec}}\) term for a redox-active residue (see equation 8) is computed using a GB model. After the attempts for each residue are performed, the solvent molecules are restored. If any state change was accepted, then solvent relaxation is performed. Solvent relaxation consists on performing a predetermined number of MD steps only on the degrees of freedom associated to the solvent, including any possible ions, while the solute degrees of freedom are kept fixed. Solvent relaxation is done to adapt the solvent conformation to the new protonation and/or redox state. The number of solvent relaxation steps may be different for protonation and reduction attempts. In order to make C(pH,E)MD more efficient, if a protonation and a reduction attempt happen at the same MD step when the standard MD is halted (see Figure 1), only a single solvent relaxation is performed using either the number of relaxation steps for protonation or redox state change attempts, whichever is larger. This actually makes the computational cost of C(pH,E)MD close to CpHMD or CEMD in ES simulation, as shown in the section IV.D.

Doing one attempt for each residue when the simulation is halted allows us to perform protonation and reduction state change attempts less frequently than in the IS implementation, thus lowering the total number of solvent relaxation steps over the course of the simulation. In ES constant pH and/or constant redox potential MD simulations, the solvent relaxation contributes the most to the computational cost of the methodology in comparison to regular MD.
Therefore, lowering the total number of relaxation steps makes the simulation computationally more efficient.

During protonation or redox state change attempts, the sudden change in charge, even if the pH- or redox-active residue is not solvent exposed, destabilize the solvent molecules around the solute. This makes the use of ES calculations for state change attempts unfeasible as an unfavorable energy change would lead to a low state change probability. For this reason, our state change attempts require the use of implicit solvent calculations where the solvent instantaneously adapts to the new charge set. Stern \(^{15}\) has proposed an ES CpHMD method that uses an interpolation between the current and the proposed protonation states and doesn’t require the use of implicit solvent calculations, but its implementation has not been attempted in the present publication.

Another point worth to discuss is the fact that the net charge of the system changes when protonation or reduction state change attempts are accepted. It has been shown that when periodic boundary conditions are in place and the electrostatic interactions are computed using a lattice sum, finite-size effects arise on simulations where the volume or the net charge is changing throughout the simulation \(^{36,37}\). These effects have been shown to be higher for small unit cells and could lead to unrealistic behaviors \(^{36}\). By using GB calculations for state change attempts in our methodology, we avoid these finite-size effects. In our implementation, the standard MD runs between state change attempts are done at constant charge.

**B. E-REMD implementation**

In replica exchange simulations, an important variable is the exchange attempt frequency (EAF). If the EAF equals zero, this means that no exchange attempts between replicas are performed and
E-REMD becomes equivalent to C(pH,E)MD, or to CEMD if the constant pH option is not considered. Previous AMBER replica exchange publications have shown that by increasing the EAF the sampling convergence is improved and this allows the simulated system to overcome barriers more easily. In this work, we show that a better convergence is also obtained for E-REMD on properties that depend on the redox potential.

As can be seen in equations 14 and 15, the E-REMD exchange probability depends on the difference between redox potential values of the replicas we are trying to exchange. Therefore, in the same way that is done in AMBER for pH-REMD, in our E-REMD implementation we only attempt exchanges between replica neighbors to increase the exchange probability. To exemplify, consider 4 replicas ordered by increasing values of redox potential. At the first exchange attempt, we attempt to exchange replicas 1 with 2 and 3 with 4. On the next exchange attempt, the attempts are made between replicas 2 with 3 and 1 with 4. This cycle is repeated until the end of the simulation is reached.

C. NAcMP8 parametrization

In many proteins containing heme groups, each iron atom at the center of the porphyrin rings is axially connected to two histidines. For the theoretical modeling of such proteins, it is ideal to have a reference compound in agreement with this conformation. The standard redox potential of N-acetylmeroperoxidase-8 (NAcMP8) axially connected to an imidazole molecule has been experimentally measured as -203 mV vs. NHE at pH 7.0. NAcMP8 has a histidine residue from its peptide chain that is axially connected to the heme group. On the other side of the porphyrin plane, we axially connected a histidine peptide as shown in Figure 2. This closely represents the experimental situation.
Figure 2. N-acetylmicroperoxidase-8 (NAcMP8) with a histidine peptide as the axial ligand. The residue HEH is shown in green and the two propionates are shown in red. The glutamate is shown in blue.

The structure of NAcMP8 is sketched in the Figure 1 of reference 32. From this figure and by making modifications to the structure of the horse heart cytochrome $c$ available at the PDB code 1HRC, we obtained the structure shown in Figure 2. The iron atom, the porphyrin ring, together with the side chains of two histidines and two cysteines were considered as a single residue we called HEH, which is colored in green at Figure 2. HEH is the redox-active residue that changes its atomic charge distribution when a reduction state change attempt is successful. Therefore, a redox state change affects the charge distribution on the histidines and cysteines. NAcMP8 contains three pH-active residues: two propionates (PRN) colored in red in Figure 2, and one glutamate (GL4) colored in blue. The propionates are separate residues from HEH.
Residues other than the heme group were parametrized using the AMBER FF99SB force field. The heme force field parameters were taken from Crespo et al., with the atomic charges for the reduced and oxidized states adapted from Henriques et al. The experimental pKₐ of a propionic acid is 4.85. The ΔGₑlec,ref term from equation 9 was fitted in implicit and explicit solvent constant pH simulations of a propionic acid in water using pKₐ,ref = 4.85. The fitted value was then used in the simulations for the NAcMP8 propionates. ΔGₑlec,ref from equation 8 for the HEH residue was also fitted in IS and ES using constant pH and redox potential simulations of NAcMP8 with a histidine peptide as the axial ligand with pH = 7.0 and E_ref = −203 mV. The glutamate residue has pKₐ,ref = 4.4 and we used values already available in AMBER’s cpinutil.py tool for its ΔGₑlec,ref in IS and ES.

In the explicit solvent calculations, the intrinsic solvent radius of the carboxylate oxygens on the propionates and the glutamate was changed from 1.5 to 1.3 Å in order to compensate for having two dummy hydrogens present on each oxygen.

D. Implicit Solvent Calculations

We begin with the initial structure having the heme group in the oxidized state, and both propionates and the glutamate in the deprotonated state. This structure is then minimized for 100 steps using the steepest descent algorithm and then for 3900 steps using the conjugate gradient algorithm constraining the backbone atoms with a 10 kcal/mol·Å² constant. The minimized structure is then heated during 3 ns by varying linearly the target temperature from 10 to 300 K over the initial 0.6 ns. During heating, the backbone atoms were constrained using a constant of 1 kcal/mol·Å², and the temperature was controlled using Langevin dynamics with a friction frequency of 5 ps⁻¹.
An equilibration at 300 K is then performed on the heated structure for 10 ns using Langevin dynamics with a 10 ps\(^{-1}\) friction frequency and a 0.1 kcal/mol\(\cdot\)Å\(^2\) constrain on the backbone atoms. This equilibrated structure was used as the initial structure for the production simulations from where our results were extracted. For the production simulations, no positional restraints are applied and reduction and/or protonation state change attempts are performed every 10 fs. Calculations with E-REMD were done using an exchange attempt frequency (EAF) of either 0.5 or 50 ps\(^{-1}\), meaning one exchange attempt every 2000 or 20 fs respectively. All simulations were done with a time step of 2 fs and all bond lengths of bonds containing hydrogen atoms were constrained using the SHAKE algorithm\(^{46,47}\).

Previous AMBER implicit solvent CpHMD publications\(^{13,18,25}\) have used the Generalized Born model proposed by Onufriev \textit{et al.}\(^{48}\) (represented by the input flag \textit{igb}=2 on AMBER) to account for solvent effects. For consistency, the same model was used in our implicit solvent simulations, both during MD and during protonation and redox state change attempts.

**E. Explicit Solvent Calculations**

In the initial structure, the heme group is in the oxidized state, and both propionates and the glutamate are in the deprotonated state. The system was solvated using TIP3P waters in a truncated octahedron box with a buffer of 10 Å (distance between the wall and the closest atom in the solute). In order to neutralize the total charge at this initial state, two sodium ions were randomly added to the solution.

The initial structure was minimized, constraining the backbone atoms with a 10 kcal/mol\(\cdot\)Å\(^2\) constant, for 1000 steps using the steepest descent algorithm followed by 4000 steps of conjugate gradient. The minimized structure was then heated at constant volume during 3 ns using a
backbone constrain of 1 kcal/molÅ² and Langevin dynamics with a friction frequency of 5 ps⁻¹ to control the temperature. During heating, the target temperature was linearly varied from 10 to 300 K over the initial 0.67 ns.

The heated structure was then equilibrated at constant pressure (1 bar) and temperature (300 K) for 8 ns with no backbone restraints, using a friction coefficient of 2 ps⁻¹ for the Langevin dynamics to maintain the temperature and relaxation time of 3 ps for the Berendsen barostat to control the pressure. The system was then submitted to a new equilibration at constant volume and temperature (300 K) for 20 ns using Langevin dynamics with a 2 ps⁻¹ friction frequency. The structure from this equilibration was used as input for the production simulations from where our results were extracted.

It has been shown for ES CpHMD that when a protonation state change is accepted, relaxation times up to 4 ps could be required to completely stabilize the solvent, however, the most significant part of the solvent stabilization is done during the first 200 fs.¹⁸ As relaxation times on the order of 4 ps would have very significant effects on the computational cost of the methodology, lower computational relaxation times of around 200 fs were attempted. No significant differences were observed in the pKₐ predictions in comparison to higher relaxation times of up to 2 ps. We verified this same behavior in ES CEMD or C(pH,E)MD on E° predictions.

In our production simulations, reduction and/or protonation state change attempts are performed every 200 fs, and the solvent relaxation is performed for 200 fs. The E-REMD calculations were performed using an Exchange Attempt Frequency (EAF) of either 0.5 or 5 ps⁻¹; this means one exchange attempt every 2000 or 200 fs respectively. The time step used on all MD simulations, including during solvent relaxation, is 2 fs and all bonds containing hydrogen atoms were
constrained using the SHAKE algorithm \textsuperscript{46,47}. The particle-mesh Ewald method \textsuperscript{49,50} using a van der Waals cutoff and a direct space of 8 Å was considered for the long-range electrostatic interactions.

As discussed in the section III.A, the reduction and protonation state change attempts are performed in implicit solvent. In our explicit solvent calculations, we also use the GB model proposed by Onufriev \textit{et al.} \textsuperscript{48} (\textit{igb}=2 on AMBER) for that.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

As discussed before, replica exchange simulations are meant to accelerate convergence. This means a REMD simulation should converge faster than a simulation without REMD for the same number of steps. We will now test this concept for E-REMD by presenting results for short simulations in which neither the CEMD nor C(pH,E)MD results are converged, and also evaluate what happens as a function of simulation time on long simulations. We then analyze how the use of E-REMD affects the results.

A. CEMD vs E-REMD

1. Short simulations

CEMD results are presented for simulations in which the propionates and the glutamate are both either protonated or deprotonated throughout the whole simulation, including during minimization, heating and equilibration. Production simulations were executed for only 50 ps (25,000 MD steps) in IS and 1000 ps (500,000 MD steps) in ES. As discussed previously, we are making protonation and reduction state change attempts every 10 fs in IS and every 200 fs in ES. For this reason, significantly more state change attempts are performed in IS than in ES during
the same simulated time interval. In order to account for that, we are performing more steps for ES than for IS in this analysis.

Production simulations were performed for 12 values of redox potential, using CEMD and also E-REMD with two different EAFs. Figure 3 shows the fraction of reduced species of HEH as a function of E, and the fittings of E° and Hill coefficient using equation 3 to the data obtained from the simulations. The errors reported for E° and Hill coefficient are the errors in the fitting to equation 3. Results are shown for both implicit and explicit solvent models.

**Figure 3.** Fraction of reduced species of HEH as a function of the redox potential for short constant redox potential simulations: 50 ps in IS and 1000 ps in ES. The pH-active residues are either all deprotonated or protonated throughout the whole simulation. EAF = exchange attempt frequency.

The fractions of reduced species obtained from the simulations are in agreement with the expected behavior predicted by equation 3. Lower fitting errors are obtained when replica exchange is used.
A protonation of a pH-active group leads to a positive increase on its charge. Hence, as electrons can neutralize the positive charge of protons, the standard redox potential of an adjacent redox-active group increases as it becomes easier for an electron to be attached there. The standard redox potentials shown in Figure 3 have more positive $E^\circ$ values when all pH-active residues are protonated in comparison to when they are all deprotonated, therefore in agreement with the expectation.

B. C(pH,E)MD vs E-REMD

1. Short simulations

We now extend the same test from the previous section for C(pH,E)MD, and, starting from the equilibrated structure where the propionates and the glutamate are deprotonated, we let their protonation states change during the production simulations while still allowing the redox states to change as before. Here, production simulations were executed for only 50 ps in IS and 1000 ps in ES, and for 18 different pH values ranging from 2.0 to 10.5 in intervals of 0.5. Further, for each pH value, 12 values of redox potential from $-353$ to $-23$ mV with interval of 30 mV were considered. Results are shown for C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD with two different EAFs, where in E-REMD only replicas with the same pH are allowed to have their redox potential values exchanged. For each pH, we plotted the fraction of reduced species versus redox potential (as in Figure 3) to extract the value of $E^\circ$ in order to show the $E^\circ$ of HEH as a function of pH in Figure 4. Results are shown for both implicit and explicit solvent models.
Figure 4. Standard redox potential ($E^0$) of HEH as a function of pH for short simulations: 50 ps in IS and 1000 ps in ES. EAF = exchange attempt frequency.

As the pH of the solution increases, the concentration of deprotonated species increases, leading to lower values of $E^0$ as it becomes more energetically unfavorable for an electron to reduce the heme group. This behavior has been reported experimentally $^{3,4}$. Further, it can be seen that the most significant changes in $E^0$ with respect to pH happen for pH values around the $pK_a$ of the pH-active residues that more closely interact with the redox-active residue. The results shown in Figure 4 are in agreement with these trends. Also, the low and high pH limits $E^0$ values matches with the $E^0$ values predicted in the previous section using CEMD for all protonated and all deprotonated pH-active residues respectively.

2. Long simulations

Here, we analyze how our standard redox potential predictions behave as a function of simulation time for C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD. In some situations, like for the study of processes
that happen at long time scales, long simulations must be performed and due to computational efficiency limitations, GPU-accelerated CUDA calculations must be used. Therefore, the analysis to be shown here demonstrate if our methodologies are stable and can be used in these situations.

For this analysis, production simulations were executed for 300 ns in both IS and ES. Both the Single Precision Fixed Point (SPFP) and the Double Precision Fixed Point (DPFP) AMBER 16 CUDA precision models were used for the IS calculations, and only SPFP was used for ES calculations. By construction, the CUDA DPFP implementation contains no approximations in comparison to the CPU code and is the precision model used in AMBER to directly compare CPU and GPU results. Simulations were performed for pH = 7.0 and 12 values of redox potential from -353 to -23 mV. The cumulative fraction of reduced species for each redox potential value was obtained as a function of time, and for each time we gathered all the fractions to fit $E^o$ using equation 3. The cumulative prediction of the $E^o$ of HEH as function of time in Figure 5 is presented for C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD with two different EAFs, for both IS and ES calculations.
Figure 5. Cumulative standard redox potential ($E^0$) of HEH as a function of time for pH 7.0 and for implicit and explicit solvent simulations. EAF = exchange attempt frequency; SPFP = single precision fixed point; DPFP = double precision fixed point.

Poor $pK_a$ predictions have been previously reported for long implicit solvent C(pH,E)MD simulations. This behavior has been associated to an unrealistic GB conformational sampling \textsuperscript{18}. Here, poor $E^0$ predictions are also observed in Figure 5 for long implicit solvent simulations using the SPFP precision model. Instability in the $E^0$ prediction is observed for both C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD simulations. For SPFP the predictions significantly worsen after 170 ns of simulation, while for DPFP the predictions are much more stable.

To better evaluate the instability observed, in Figure 6 we split the simulations into 5 ns chunks and compute the predicted $E^0$ of each window using the fractions of reduced species for all redox potential values.
Figure 6. Standard redox potential (E°) of HEH computed for windows of 5 ns as a function of time for pH 7.0 and for implicit and explicit solvent simulations. EAF = exchange attempt frequency; SPFP = single precision fixed point; DPFP = double precision fixed point.

Figure 6 shows that the SPFP chunk implicit solvent E° predictions are clearly different at the beginning and after 170 ns of simulation. After 170 ns, the E° values do not fluctuate anymore around the target value of -203 mV.

In contrast with SPFP implicit solvent results, stable E° predictions are observed in the time range investigated for DPFP implicit solvent and SPFP explicit solvent simulations. The fact that on Figure 6 the DPFP IS and ES E° chunk values fluctuate around the target value explains the more stable E° predictions in ES than in IS seen in Figure 5. The better convergence efficiency of E-REMD is observed in the ES results and also in the DPFP IS results. We notice that the E-REMD E° values for the 5 ns windows fluctuate more closely to the target -203 mV value than using C(pH,E)MD. Comparing the different E-REMD simulations, we observe the values fluctuate slightly less for EAF = 5 ps⁻¹ than for 0.5 ps⁻¹, indicating that a better convergence is achieved when the EAF is increased.
C. Predicting $E^\circ$ vs pH and $pK_a$ vs E

As discussed in the section IV.B.1, $E^\circ$ should decrease with the increase of the solution pH. Following the same reasoning, equivalently the $pK_a$ of a pH-active residue should also decrease with the increase of the solution redox potential. Based on the discussions from Figures 5 and 6, we present production simulation results for 140 ns in both IS with CUDA DPFP and ES with CUDA SPFP. We used E-REMD with $EAF = 5$ ps$^{-1}$ in ES and $EAF = 50$ ps$^{-1}$ in IS, 18 different pH values from 2.0 to 10.5, and for each pH value 12 values of redox potential from $-353$ to $-23$ mV were considered. Figure 7 shows the standard redox potential of HEH as a function of pH and the $pK_a$ of all pH-active residues as a function of the redox potential for both implicit and explicit solvent simulations.

![Graphs showing relationship between pH and redox potential](image)

**Figure 7.** Standard redox potential ($E^\circ$) of HEH as a function of pH and $pK_a$ values of the pH-active residues as a function of the redox potential. E-REMD simulations are 140 ns long in IS (CUDA DPFP) and ES (CUDA SPFP) respectively. $EAF =$ exchange attempt frequency; GL4 = glutamate; PRN = propionate
As both in the implicit and explicit solvent calculations the protonation and reduction state change attempts were performed using the same GB model, the differences between our IS and ES simulations on the relative $E^o$ and $pK_a$ predictions in comparison to the reference compound can only come from the different ensemble of configurations generated in both cases. Figure 7 shows these conformational differences are significant enough to produce different $E^o$ and $pK_a$ values in IS and ES, even though the overall trends are the same. The $pK_a$ predictions are $\sim 0.5$ pH units higher in ES than in IS. Also, even though the $E^o$ values at low pH limits are basically the same, at the high pH limit $E^o$ is $\sim 12$ mV lower in ES than in IS. In addition, as one would expect from Figure 5, we can also observe the influence of the total number of MD steps by comparing Figure 7 with the results for short simulations shown in Figure 4.

For consistency, it is important to compare the low and high pH limiting $E^o$ values with the $E^o$ values predicted using E-REMD for the same EAF and same total number of steps but without the constant pH option. Without using constant pH, the $E^o$ values obtained when all pH-active residues are protonated and deprotonated are respectively -178.55 and -207.95 mV in IS, and -176.98 and -214.86 mV in ES. When constant pH is used, the $E^o$ values for the low and high pH limits are respectively -179.18 and -207.93 mV in IS and -177.69 and -214.58 mV in ES. We see a good agreement between the $E^o$ predictions.

By considering a model where the pH-dependence of the heme group is associated to a single pH-active group and by doing measures of the standard redox potential as a function of pH, Das and Medhi $^{52}$ were able to experimentally infer for several different proteins the $pK_a$ values that correspond to the heme propionates. For cytochrome $c_2$, they obtained $pK_a$ values of 7.4 and 6.3 when the heme group is reduced and oxidized, respectively. For cytochrome $b_5$, where the propionates are more solvent exposed, they obtained $pK_a$ values of 5.9 and 5.7 when the heme
group is reduced and oxidized, respectively. The average $pK_a$ values for both propionates from our ES simulations for the low and high redox potential limits corresponding to the heme being reduced and oxidized are respectively 6.7 and 6.5. As mentioned before, NAcMP8 is derived from cytochrome $c$, thus its heme group is similar to the one in cytochrome $c_2$. We see the values of the propionate $pK_a$s obtained in the simulations are in the same range as the experimental ones for cytochrome $c_2$. As can be seen in Figure 2, the propionates on NAcMP8 are solvent exposed. The difference in the propionates $pK_a$ values for when the heme group reduced and oxidized obtained from our ES simulation is 0.2, and this difference is exactly the same as the one obtained experimentally for cytochrome $b_5$ where the propionates are mostly solvent exposed.

As Figure 7 shows, the $pK_a$ of the two propionates are not exactly the same. They actually differ by ~ 0.15 pH units. We also observe, as one would expect, that the pH values for which the $E^\circ$ of HEH changes the most are around the $pK_a$ values of the pH-active groups that more closely interact with the heme group. Equivalently, the $pK_a$ of each pH-active residue changes the most for redox potential values around the $E^\circ$ of HEH. The limiting $pK_a$ values for low and high redox potential values differ by 0.2 pH unit for each propionate and by 0.15 pH unit for the glutamic acid. Therefore, even though the glutamic acid is farther apart from the iron of heme group than the propionates, it still significantly interacts with the heme group. Thus, for NAcMP8, the pH dependence of the standard redox potential of the heme group cannot be completely explained by considering just a single pH-active group or site.
D. Computational Benchmarks

In Table 1 the computational efficiency of the pmemd and sander AMBER modules is compared for C(pH,E)MD. Calculations were done using Cray XK7 nodes (that have Tesla K20X GPUs) at the Blue Waters supercomputer. In implicit solvent, there are 237 atoms (corresponding to the NAcMP8 and the histidine peptide) and in explicit solvent this number is 7403 atoms (there are 2388 water molecules and 2 Na+ ions). The calculations were performed for pH = 7.0 and E = −203 mV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Implicit Solvent</th>
<th>Explicit Solvent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sander Serial (1 CPU)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sander MPI (2 CPUs)</td>
<td>13.18</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sander MPI (4 CPUs)</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sander MPI (8 CPUs)</td>
<td>42.98</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sander MPI (16 CPUs)</td>
<td>75.44</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd Serial (1 CPU)</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd MPI (2 CPUs)</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd MPI (4 CPUs)</td>
<td>18.11</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd MPI (8 CPUs)</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd MPI (16 CPUs)</td>
<td>56.95</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd CUDA SPFP (1 GPU)</td>
<td>336.58</td>
<td>126.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmemd CUDA DPFP (1 GPU)</td>
<td>135.23</td>
<td>59.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Computational performances of C(pH,E)MD for different sander and pmemd computations.

sander was the first module implemented on AMBER capable of performing molecular dynamics. pmemd started as a reimplementation of some sander functionalities, intended to improve the computational performance of the simulations. In Table 1, we see that for serial and MPI the IS C(pH,E)MD calculations with sander are faster than with pmemd, however for ES, where the total number of atoms increases 31 times in comparison to the IS calculations, the computational performance is better for pmemd than for sander. This shows the scalability of pmemd is better, which means it would perform even better for larger systems in comparison to
The calculations scale well with the number of CPUs, Table 1 also emphasizes the high-performance aspect of the GPU enabled implementation. Great speedups are observed in both IS and ES calculations. In ES, we see that the SPFP calculation using GPU is 243 times faster than the serial calculation and 24 times faster than the fastest MPI calculation. The SPFP precision model is around 2 times faster than the DPFP precision model in the CUDA calculations.

It is important to mention that the computational cost of our methodology in ES depends on the values of E and pH. If the redox potential value is close to the $E^o$ of a redox-active residue or if the pH value is close to the $pK_a$ of a pH-active residue, the probability of accepting a state change attempt increases, and in explicit solvent this means that more relaxation steps will be performed.

In Table 2 we compare the computational cost of E-REMD, C(pH,E)MD, CpHMD, and CEMD in comparison to regular MD. Here we have only used the `pmemd.cuda_SPFP_MPI` module. For C(pH,E)MD we performed calculations for 36 (pH,E) values, combining $pHs = 3.5, 4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.5$ and $6.0$ with $Es = -263, -233, -203, -173, -143$ and $-113$ mV. For CpHMD, CEMD and regular MD we have executed the same simulations as in C(pH,E)MD but turning off respectively the constant redox potential, the constant pH, and both the constant redox potential and pH. For E-REMD we have performed the same simulations as in C(pH,E)MD but allowing the redox potential values between replicas of same pH to be exchanged. The computational performances shown in Table 2 are the averages for the 36 (pH,E) simulations.
Table 2. Computational performances of *pmemd.cuda_SPFP_MPI* for different calculations.

As Table 2 shows, the addition of constant pH and/or constant redox potential has a bearable computational cost in comparison to regular MD. CpHMD and CEMD are 21% slower in IS and around 30% slower in ES than regular MD. In IS, the computational performances of CpHMD and CEMD are essentially the same. In ES, because each residue is visited once during protonation or reduction state change attempts, the small difference between CpHMD and CEMD performances can be explained by the fact that we have three pH-active residues and only one redox-active residue. C(pH,E)MD is 41% slower in IS and 36% slower in ES than regular MD. We observe that the C(pH,E)MD performance is close to the CpHMD and CEMD performances for ES.

At the section IV.B we showed that E-REMD simulations with a higher EAF provide improved convergence, however, as can be seen at Table 2, this also increases the computational cost of the simulation. The addition of replica exchange has a bearable computational cost in comparison to C(pH,E)MD. For the largest EAF we used, E-REMD is 31% slower in IS and 33% slower in ES than C(pH,E)MD.
V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the existing CpHMD and pH-REMD methods implemented by Mongan, Swails, and others, we have successfully implemented the CEMD, C(pH,E)MD and E-REMD methods in AMBER. These methods allow the theoretical study of systems at a constant value of redox potential, using both implicit and explicit solvent models.

Validation results and tests were presented for NAcMP8 axially connected to a histidine peptide. This system contains a single heme and three pH-active residues. Our results correctly describe the behavior of $E^o$ vs pH and of $pK_a$ vs redox potential. Regarding the NAcMP8’s heme group, for the complete description of the pH dependence of its $E^o$ it is necessary to consider more than one pH-active group, as both propionates and also the glutamic acid interact significantly with the heme. We observed that the propionates have slightly different $pK_a$ values (a difference of 0.15 pH units) and that these $pK_a$ values are in good agreement with values obtained experimentally for other proteins that contain a single heme.

The addition of replica exchange significantly improves the statistical convergence of our $E^o$ predictions. By increasing the exchange attempt frequency in our replica exchange simulations, we obtained a slightly higher convergence efficiency.

Based on our computational benchmarks, we see that our methodologies have an acceptable computational cost in comparison to regular MD and that the GPU-accelerated code is able to provide high-performance in comparison to calculations using CPUs.
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