

Solvation vs. freezing in a heteropolymer globule

Phillip L. Geissler

Department of Chemistry, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

Eugene I. Shakhnovich

Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology,
Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138

Alexander Yu. Grosberg

Department of Physics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Abstract

We address the response of a random heteropolymer to preferential solvation of certain monomer types at the globule-solvent interface. For each set of monomers that can comprise the molecule's surface, we represent the ensemble of allowed configurations by a Gaussian distribution of energy levels, whose mean and variance depend on the set's composition. Within such a random energy model, mean surface composition is proportional to solvation strength under most conditions. The breadth of this linear response regime arises from approximate statistical independence of surface and volume energies. For a diverse set of monomer types, the excess of solvophilic monomers at the surface is large only for very strong solvent preference, even in the ground state.

A polymer chain collapses into a compact globular state in poor solvent. A chain with quenched sequence of chemically different units can further undergo a freezing transition, in which the freedom of chain shape fluctuations is sacrificed for the choice of optimal spatial contacts between monomers. This freezing, or folding, is subject to constraints imposed by chain connectivity, quenched sequence, and excluded volume. The effects of frustration due to these constraints are well understood [1, 2, 3]. However well developed, current theories of heteropolymer freezing ignore one obvious fact, namely that some chain segments are more favorably solvated than others. By contrast, much of the protein literature presumes preferential solvation to be a leading determinant of tertiary structure. It is commonly held that a protein's surface is composed of hydrophilic units, while hydrophobic units are invariably buried in the core.

For heteropolymers in general, it is clear that energy gained through preferential exposure of solvophilic units comes at a cost. Constraining particular units to the globule surface restricts the selection of contacting monomer pairs inside the globule, exacerbating frustration. In other words, when the sequence of units has not been designed in an intelligent way, as is the case for the random sequence heteropolymer, preferential exposure may significantly reduce the availability of low energy conformations. The question thus arises: what is the effect of solvation on heteropolymer freezing, or more specifically, how large an excess of solvophilic units at the globule surface is consistent with freezing?

This question was first discussed by two of us [4] in the context of studies of mechanical stretching of heteropolymers. Using a replica approach, we found that solvent preference of strength ϵ for particular monomers at the surface lowers ground state energy E_g by an amount $K^2 = T_{fr}$. Here, $K = N^{2/3}$ is the number of monomers exposed to the solvent, N is the number of monomers comprising the molecule, and T_{fr} is the freezing temperature below which the ground state dominates. For strong solvation this approach apparently fails. In particular, $K^2 = T_{fr}$ can exceed the maximum possible solvation energy (without distortion of globule shape), K , corresponding to a completely solvophilic surface.

This Letter describes a more comprehensive treatment of solvation based on the Random Energy Model (REM) of Derrida [5]. It is well known [1, 2, 3, 6] that this simplest model of freezing in spin glasses captures remarkably well the essential features of heteropolymer freezing in three dimensions. The mapping of heteropolymer problem on the REM is achieved by approximating energies of all $M = e^{SN}$ different conformations of a random

Imagine that a certain set of monomers is constrained to sit on the surface. We denote this set as G . In our model energetic consequences of such a constraint depend only on the distribution, $f(\epsilon)$, of monomer types in G . For example, the effective distribution of contacting monomers (i.e., those remaining inside the globule when G is removed), $p_e(\epsilon)$, may be written as $p_e(\epsilon) = p(\epsilon) + \frac{K}{N} [p(\epsilon) - f(\epsilon)]$. The effective mean and variance of contact energies are then $\overline{B}_e = \overline{B} + (K/N) \epsilon_G$ and $B_e = B + (K/N) \epsilon_G$, respectively. For distributions satisfying Eq. 2, $\epsilon_G = 0$ and $\epsilon_G = 2B^2 \int_0^R d\epsilon^2 f(\epsilon)$. Similarly, the solvation energy per surface monomer is $\epsilon_G = \int_0^R d\epsilon f(\epsilon)$.

We express the number of accessible conformations when all monomers in G are confined to the surface as $M_G = e^{N - K!_G}$. Here, $!_G$ is the entropy loss per surface monomer for particular G . Though smaller than M , M_G is still exponentially large in N . In general $!_G$ is not simply a functional of $f(\epsilon)$, but is instead a complicated function of G . We will assume that for any specific $f(\epsilon)$, the average of $!_G$ over all consistent realizations of G is a constant independent of $f(\epsilon)$. In order to recover the appropriate total number of conformations after summing over G , we choose this constant to be $T = K^{-1} \ln \frac{N}{K} = -\ln(N/K)$.

We consider a separate REM for each possible choice of surface G . In doing so, we assume that allowed conformations in the corresponding subensembles are sufficiently diverse that their energies are Gaussian distributed, with

$$w_G(E) / \exp \left[-\frac{E - N\overline{B} - K(\epsilon_G + \epsilon_G)^2}{2N B^2 + 2K \epsilon_G} \right] \quad (3)$$

Ultimately, we must reconstruct the full ensemble of compact chain fluctuations by superposing all possible subensembles, i.e., by summing over G . This convolution of REMs, each representing a distinct choice of G , constitutes our caricature of a random heteropolymer with solvated surface.

Consider the ground state of the full ensemble, i.e., the lowest of subensemble ground state energies, $E_g = \min_G E_g(G)$. Interfacial energy clearly favors a solvophilic surface, but does it yield the lowest ground state? Let us first examine a typical value of $E_g(G)$ for specific G . The condition $M_G w_G[E_g^{(typ)}(G)] = 1$ yields:

$$E_g^{(typ)}(G) = N\overline{B} - N \frac{P}{2s} \overline{B} + K \epsilon_{surf}(G); \quad (4)$$

$$\epsilon_{surf}(G) = \epsilon_G + \epsilon_G + \frac{B}{2s} T - \frac{\overline{B}}{2} \frac{\epsilon_G}{B}; \quad (5)$$

This most probable ground state energy is indeed minimized by an exclusively solvophilic choice of G . There are many distinct choices of G , however, leading to the same value of $E_g^{(typ)}(G)$. It is therefore crucial to account for variations in $E_g(G)$ among similar subensembles. According to the statistics of extreme values[7], the probability that the lowest energy in a particular subensemble deviates from $E_g^{(typ)}(G)$ by an amount $E_g(G) = E_g(G) - E_g^{(typ)}(G)$ is

$$W[E_g(G)] = \exp\left[-\frac{E_g(G)}{T_{fr}}\right] \exp\left[-\frac{E_g(G)}{T_{fr}}\right]^{\frac{1}{\alpha}} : \quad (6)$$

Compared to the Gaussian distribution of energies within a subensemble, $W[E_g(G)]$ decays very slowly for $E_g(G) < 0$. When many subensembles share a common value of $E_g^{(typ)}(G)$, their range of $E_g(G)$ will be broad.

The vast majority of subensembles have unremarkable surface energy. The number with $|j_{surf}(G)| \geq K$ and $E_g(G) = E$ is thus roughly $e^{TK} W(E)$. Since the tail of $W[E_g(G)]$ is exponential, we expect $O(1)$ of the subensembles with insignificant surface energy to have $|j_{surf}(G)| \geq O(K)$. In other words, the variations in volume energy among these subensembles are comparable in magnitude to the largest possible surface energy. This result may be viewed as the consequence of an effective entropy that remains important even at low temperature. The collection of subensembles with appreciable surface energy is much smaller than e^{TK} , and its entropy is correspondingly low. The ground state surface is uniformly solvophilic only when solvent preference is strong enough to offset this entropic cost.

Because $w_G(E)$ depends only on $f(\cdot)$, it is natural to group all subensembles with the same number density of monomer types. We have shown that accounting for the disparity in sizes of these groups is essential. The number of ways to choose K monomers with distribution $f(\cdot)$ from a pool of N monomers with distribution $p(\cdot)$ is $e^{N sffg}$, where

$$sffg = - \sum_i p(i) [\ln f(i) + (1 - f(i)) \ln (1 - f(i))]: \quad (7)$$

The density $f(i) = K f(i) / N p(i)$ and its corresponding entropy, $sffg$, are precisely those relevant for Langmuir adsorption of an ideal gas mixture onto K distinguishable sites.

At and above the freezing temperature, equilibrium of a subensemble group is dominated by the saddle point of the partition function

$$Z_{ffg} = e^{N s K} e^{N sffg} \int dE w_G(E) e^{E/T} : \quad (8)$$

The group free energy, $F_{\text{ffg}} = -T \ln Z_{\text{ffg}}$, is then

$$F_{\text{ffg}} = \bar{F} + K T \left[\frac{B^2}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^Z \ln p(i) \right] + \sum_{i=1}^Z \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{e^{f(i)}} \right); \quad (9)$$

where

$$f(i) = \frac{B^2}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T} \quad (10)$$

Volume terms independent of $f(i)$ have been collected as $\bar{F} = N \bar{F} = \bar{B} - T s - \bar{B} = 2T$. According to Eqs. 9 and 10, the binding energy in our analogy to Langmuir adsorption varies with particle type as $(B^2 = T)^2$.

The full partition function of the polymer, a sum over all Z_{ffg} , is dominated by the subensemble group with lowest free energy:

$$Z = \sum_{f(i)} Z_{\text{ffg}} \quad (11)$$

We calculate the optimal surface distribution, $f(i)$, variationally, using a Lagrange multiplier to enforce proper normalization of $f(i)$. We thereby obtain

$$f(i) = \frac{\frac{N}{K} p(i)}{1 + \frac{N}{K} p(i)}; \quad (12)$$

where the constant is determined by normalization

$$\sum_{i=1}^Z \frac{\frac{N}{K} p(i)}{1 + \frac{N}{K} p(i)} = 1; \quad (13)$$

Finally, evaluating F_{ffg} at $f(i)$ yields our approximation for the total free energy $F = \bar{F} + F_{\text{surf}}$, with

$$\frac{F_{\text{surf}}}{K} = T \left[\frac{B^2}{T^2} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^Z \ln \frac{p(i)}{1 + \frac{N}{K} p(i)} \right] + \sum_{i=1}^Z \ln \frac{e^{f(i)}}{1 + \frac{N}{K} p(i)}; \quad (14)$$

Eqs. 12-14, appropriate for $T = T_{\text{fr}}$, are our principal results. They express the equilibrium distribution of monomer types on the polymer surface and the corresponding interfacial free energy density in terms of model parameters and an effective fugacity for surface monomers.

In order to make these results concrete we consider some limiting cases and specific forms of $p(\cdot)$. First, let us assume that preferential solvation does not lead to a significant depletion of any monomer type inside the globule, so that $K f(\cdot) = N p(\cdot)$ for every \cdot . Then, Eq. 12 requires that $e^{(\cdot)} = 1$, simplifying the above expressions to yield $f(\cdot) / p(\cdot) \exp[\cdot]$ and

$$\frac{F_{\text{surf}}}{K} = -T \ln \int d p(\cdot) \exp \left[-\frac{B^2}{T^2} \left(\cdot \right)^2 \right] : \quad (15)$$

To simplify this result even further, let us consider a binary distribution, $p(\cdot) = (1/2)[(\cdot + 1) + (\cdot - 1)]$, which corresponds to the minimum of chemical diversity. In this case depletion is invariably weak, since taking K monomers away to the surface cannot exhaust the total stock, $N=2$, of either monomer type. Eq. 15 then trivially yields

$$\frac{F_{\text{surf}}}{K} = -T \ln \cosh \frac{T}{K} : \quad (16)$$

For $T \gg K$, $F_{\text{surf}} \approx -K^2/2T$, precisely as obtained by assuming statistical independence of surface and volume. Since net surface composition is conjugate to solvation strength, its equilibrium value may be computed by differentiating Eq. 16 with respect to B , yielding:

$$hC_{\text{surf}} = K \tanh \frac{T}{K} = \frac{K}{T} : \quad (17)$$

In this limit net surface composition is proportional to the "field" B . The above results may therefore be understood in simple terms as a manifestation of linear response. From Eq. 17 we identify a susceptibility $\chi = K/T$, corresponding to surface fluctuations of size $hC_{\text{surf}}^2 = K$ in the absence of solvation. In other words, the excess of solvophilic monomers at the surface is governed by K effectively independent random variables. This simple behavior results directly from the prevalence of variations in volume energy over surface interactions. But when $T < K$, solvation wins out. Linear response then breaks down due to saturation, as $F_{\text{surf}} \rightarrow K$ and C_{surf} approach their limiting values of $1/2$ and K .

Properties of the ground state are obtained by evaluating Eq. 17 and 16 at $T = T_{\text{fr}}$. Dependence on the interaction parameter B is implicit (through T_{fr}) below the freezing transition. For $T > T_{\text{fr}}$, however, surface response is insensitive to B . In particular, χ vanishes, since no binary choice of $f(\cdot)$ can change the second moment of the contact energy distribution. As a consequence, surface and volume behave independently for arbitrary B .

The opposite extreme of monomer diversity is described by a smooth form of $p(\cdot)$, describing a continuous variety of chemical identities. We take a Gaussian distribution,

$p(\phi) / \exp(\phi^2/2)$ as a simple example. For weak solvation, $\phi = T < 1$, $p(\phi)$ is nowhere significantly depleted, and Eq. 15 remains an appropriate approximation. Gaussian integration yields

$$\frac{F_{\text{surf}}}{K} = \frac{\phi^2}{2T} - \frac{B^4}{T^3} \quad (18)$$

to leading order in $B = T$. (The basic assumption that monomer contacts are statistically independent is plausible only for $B = T_{\text{fr}} = \frac{p}{2s} \approx 1$ [8].) The first term in Eq. 18 again reflects linear response. The second term describes the benefit in monomer contact energy due to partial removal of some monomer types from the globule interior. This effect is independent of solvation strength to leading order and dominates interfacial free energy for very small ϕ .

For such a diverse set of monomer types, surface response saturates only when a molecule's supply of the most solvophilic type is exhausted. Assuming weak depletion is clearly inappropriate here. A maximally solvophilic surface is obtained when $K f(\phi) = N p(\phi)$ for $\phi = \phi_{\text{max}}$, and $f(\phi) = 0$ for $\phi < \phi_{\text{max}}$. The cutoff point ϕ_{max} is determined by normalization:

$$\int_{\phi_{\text{max}}}^{\infty} d\phi p(\phi) = \frac{K}{N} \quad (19)$$

For Gaussian $p(\phi)$, Eq. 19 gives $\phi_{\text{max}} = \sqrt{\frac{q}{2 \ln(N/K)}}$, $q = \frac{2}{(2+3) \ln N}$. Because this choice of surface composition uniquely specifies a monomer set G , the associated entropy s_{ffg} vanishes. Free energy is then easily estimated from Eq. 9, giving $F_{\text{surf}} = K \phi_{\text{max}}^2$. Comparing this result with the free energy of linear response, we estimate that saturation occurs around $\phi_{\text{max}}^2 \approx 2T \phi_{\text{max}} = \frac{p}{T \ln N}$. Reaching this crossover may thus require much stronger solvation, and result in more favorable surface energy, than in the binary case. The relevant distinction between these distributions is the existence of extremely solvophilic monomers, whose small numbers entail considerable entropic cost in constraining them to the surface.

Fig. 1 summarizes the mechanisms of surface response we have identified. These results support a view of surface solvation energy and volume energy as statistically independent random variables. In particular, the linear response corresponding to this notion is valid over a wide range of temperature and solvation strength. Saturation at large ϕ , though a nonlinear effect, does not truly arise from correlation of surface and volume. It is instead a consequence of the finitude of surface area or of the number of solvophilic monomers. The regime of weak response, in which $F_{\text{surf}} = K \phi^2 = T^3$, does reflect coupling of surface and volume. But it involves monomer contact energies alone, as indicated by insensitivity to

. Within our model, contributions from more intimate connections between surface and volume are small compared to unity when $K \ll N$.

The diversity of amino acid monomers comprising proteins lies somewhere between those of binary and Gaussian distributions. The surface behavior we have described should thus be relevant for chains of these units arranged in random sequence. Specifically, we predict that preferential solvation must be much larger than typical thermal fluctuations in order to stabilize a strictly solvophilic surface. Sequences found in nature, however, are not random in at least one respect important to freezing. Their ground states lie well below the effective continuum of non-native energies. The influence of this energy gap on surface solvation requires a consideration of sequence design that is beyond this discussion.

P.L.G. is an M.I.T. Science Fellow.

-
- [1] E. I. Shakhnovich and A. M. Gutin, *Biophys. Chem.* **34**, 187 (1989).
 - [2] C. D. Sfatos and E. I. Shakhnovich, *Phys. Rep.* **288** 77 (1997).
 - [3] V. S. Pande, A. Yu Grosberg, and T. Tanaka, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **72** 259 (2000).
 - [4] P. L. Geissler and E. I. Shakhnovich, *Phys. Rev. E* **65** 056110 (2002); P. L. Geissler and E. I. Shakhnovich, *Macromolecules* **35** 4429 (2002).
 - [5] B. Derrida, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 79 (1980).
 - [6] J. D. Bryngelson and P. G. Wolynes, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.* **84** 7524 (1987).
 - [7] J. P. Bouchaud and M. Mezard, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **30**, 7997 (1997).
 - [8] C. D. Sfatos, A. M. Gutin, and E. I. Shakhnovich, *Phys. Rev. E* **48** 465 (1993).




FIG .1: Response of a random heteropolymer to surface solvation, shown in the plane of temperature T and solvation strength Γ . Crossover lines are the result of equating free energies, or ground state energies for $T < T_{\text{fr}}$. For a binary distribution of monomer types, the weak response regime is absent, and $\sigma_{\text{max}} = 1$.