# A Con gurational B ias M onte Carlo M ethod for Linear and Cyclic Peptides

MichaelW.Deem and JoelS.Bader CuraGenCorporation 322EastMainStreet Branford,CT 06405

M arch 24, 2022

Running Title: Biased M onte Carlo of Cyclic Peptides.

A uthor to whom correspondence should be addressed. P resent address: Lym an Laboratory of P hysics, H arvard U niversity, C am bridge, M A 02138.

#### Abstract

In this manuscript, we describe a new con gurational bias M onte C arb technique for the simulation of peptides. W e focus on the biologically relevant cases of linear and cyclic peptides. O ur approach leads to an e cient, B oltzm ann-weighted sam pling of the torsional degrees of freedom in these biological m olecules, a feat not possible with previous M onte C arb and m olecular dynam ics m ethods.

#### 1 Introduction

This paper presents a new M onte C arb m ethod that em ploys biased trialm oves to achieve an e cient sam pling of the torsional degrees of freedom for linear and cyclic peptides.

Peptides are small molecules, built from am ino acids, that are of fundamental importance in biological systems [1]. They play key roles in signal transduction between cells, regulation of cell growth and di erentiation, and protein localization on cell surfaces [2]. Peptides are thought to regulate neurotransmission, from modulating pain and thirst to a ecting memory and emotion [3, 4]. They are used as a chemical defense mechanism by some organisms. The conus snails, for example, produce a family of highly-constrained peptides that include very powerful neurotoxins [5]. Finally, peptides are used within the biotechnology industry to identify antagonists blocking various abnorm al enzymatic actions or ligand-receptor interactions [6]. Cyclic or otherwise constrained peptides are offen preferred for this application, since such molecules su er less of a loss of con gurational entropy upon binding [7]. A classic example is the use of the RGD peptide to block the GPIIb/IIIa- bronectin interaction, reducing blood platelet aggregation [8, 9].

The properties of peptides are an enable to exam ination by computer experiment. An early study was of the alanine dipeptide, in which the potential energy surface was deduced from ab initio quantum mechanical calculations [10, 11]. Larger peptides have been exam ined by classical simulations. Both molecular dynamics [12] and M onte C arlo [13] approaches have proven useful. The elects of the aqueous environment have been incorporated by simple dielectric theory [14, 15, 16, 17] or by explicit inclusion of water molecules [18].

It has become clear, however, that the standard molecular dynamics and M onte C arb m ethods are not capable of sampling all conformational degrees of freedom accessible at body temperature to the larger peptides. This problem is particularly evident for the in – portant case of constrained peptides. Various solutions, such as high-temperature molecular dynamics [19, 20] or simplied force elds [20, 21], have been suggested, but these approaches su er from uncontrolled approximations. A simulation method able to sample the relevant conformational states of peptides, particularly constrained ones, or exposed loops of larger proteins would be of great value. It would aid study of these molecules in biological systems as well as facilitate structural understanding of the peptides and antibodies of interest to the biotechnology industry. Recently, powerful M onte C arlo m ethods have been developed that have a greatly enhanced sampling e ciency [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. These m ethods have been applied to chain m olecules at low and high density [24, 30] and even at phase coexistence [31, 32, 33, 34]. These m ethods all use in portance sampling, or biased m oves, to e ciently explore the free energy landscape.

W e here apply these concepts to peptidem olecules. B oth linear and constrained or cyclic peptides are treated by thism ethod. In Sec. 2 we describe the M onte C arlo m ethod in detail. A ppendices describe the rigid m olecular fragm ents from which peptides are constructed and provide technical details of the m ethod. In Sec. 3 we describe the application of thism ethod to the prototypical polyglycine peptides. W e discuss the results in Sec. 4. The superiority of this m ethod over conventional m olecular dynam ics and M onte C arlo is dem onstrated. C onclusions are presented in Sec. 5.

#### 2 M onte C arlo M ethod

W em ake the sim plifying assumption that the intram olecular potential energy contains only torsional and non-bonded terms. That is, bond lengths and angles are xed, and rotation is allowed only about sigm a bonds. At room – or body-tem perature, these are fairly good assumptions. They could easily be relaxed, although sampling the increased degrees of freedom would entail a computational expense. Appendix A describes the rigid fragments that occur in peptides under these assumptions. A suitable form for the interatom ic potential would be the AMBER [35], ECCEP [36], or CHARM m [37] force eld. We pick the AMBER potentials. W ater is treated in an implicit way, assuming the dielectric constant for C oulom b interactions is given by  $=_0 = 4r$ , with r given in Angstrom s. These assumptions allow the method to be presented without a discussion of detailed force eld issues. The method is generically applicable to better force elds and an explicit treatment of water.

A con gurational bias M onte C arb (C BM C) technique is used to explore the conform ations of the m olecules. W e describe the algorithm for both linear and cyclic peptides. By cyclic, we mean peptides constrained because of disul de bonds between cystine residues.

There are two types of atom s in a peptide, those in the side chains and those in the backbone. Consequently, there are two types of M onte C arb m oves: type I m oves change the positions of side chain atom s only, and type II m oves change the positions of backbone atom s, rigidly rotating the attached side chains. The type I m ove is an extension of the

chain-molecule CBMC [24,25] to the structurally more complicated case of peptides. The type I move is applicable to side chains with a free end (i.e. all naturally occurring am ino acid side chains except for proline). The backbone to which the side chain is attached can be either linear or cyclic. In the cyclic case, the type I move is also used to change the con guration of the free ends of the main chain.

There are two kinds of type IIm oves for the backbone: type IIam oves for linear peptides and type IIb m oves for cyclic peptides. The type IIam ove is essentially the same as a type I m ove. The side-chain residues that are attached to the backbone are rigidly rotated so as to remain properly bonded to the C atom s in their new positions. When the peptide is cyclic, we use a type IIbm ove to change the conguration of part of the backbone bop, rigidly rotating any side chains or free ends of the peptide that are attached to that part of the backbone. The backbone of a cyclic peptide includes the atom s along the main chain as well as the C and S atom s of the cystines participating in the disul de bond. This m ove requires a concerted rotation of the backbone torsional angles with a rigid rotation of the attached side groups. This concerted rotation of the torsional angles is an extension of the concerted rotation scheme for alkanes [22, 28].

A type Im ove is initiated by identifying the side chain to be regrow n. N ot all of the side chain need be regrow n, and the rst group to regrow is chosen. This feature is helpful for the am ino acids with longer side chains, such as lysine. These choices are m ade random ly. The M rigid units to be regrow n are rst rem oved and then added one at a time, starting from the one closest to the backbone. For each addition, the following actions are carried out (see Fig. 1):

1) k values of the torsional angle  $_{ij}$ ; 1 j k connecting rigid unit i to unit i 1 are generated according to the internal potential,

$$p_{i}^{int}(_{ij}) / exp[ u_{i}^{int}(_{ij})]:$$
 (1)

The function  $u_i^{int}(_{ij})$  is the part of the internal energy that couples unit i to the rest of the molecule (but excluding units i+ 1 to M). The inverse tem perature is given by =  $1=k_B T$ .

2) One of these is picked with probability

$$p_i^{\text{ext}}(_{ij}) = \exp\left[ u_i^{\text{ext}}(_{ij}) \right] = w^{\text{ext}}(i); \qquad (2)$$

where

$$w^{\text{ext}}(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{X^{k}} \exp[u_{i}^{\text{ext}}(u_{j})]:$$
 (3)

The function  $u_i^{ext}(_{ij})$  is the part of the external energy that couples unit i to the rest of the molecule (but excluding units i + 1 to M ).

3) Steps 1-2 are repeated until all M units have been added.

4) The Rosenbluth weight

$$W^{(n)} = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\Psi} w^{\text{ext}}(i)$$
(4)

is calculated. This attempted move is accepted with a probability

$$acc(o! n) = min[1; W^{(n)} = W^{(o)}]:$$
 (5)

The quantity  $W^{(o)}$  is the Rosenbluth weight for the reverse move and is calculated as in steps 2-4, but with k 1 random orientations and one orientation that is equal to the original geometry for each rigid unit.

A type IIa m ove is very similar to a type Im ove. In this case, the direction of regrow th is chosen random ly. Then the rst backbone unit to be regrown is chosen. The M rigid units to be regrown are removed and added back sequentially, as in the type Im ove. The rigid units in this case are either A -units, B -units with the side chain rigidly attached, C - units, or D -units (see appendix A). An alternative procedure would be to regrow the side chain units as well, but this proved not to be e cient, due to frequent steric repulsions. The m ove is accepted with the probability given by Eq. (5).

A type IIb move is initiated by identifying the 4 rigid units on the backbone to be rotated. This is done random ly. The four rigid units are labeled in an amine to carboxy term inal fashion. The attached side groups are rigidly rotated with the backbone units.

The rotation is carried out as follows (see Fig. 2):

1) The driver angle  $_0$  is changed by an amount  $_0$ , where  $<_0 <$ . This is done  $k^0$  times with probabilities according to the internal potential,

$$p^{int}(_{0j}) / exp[u_0^{int}(_{0j})]$$
: (6)

The function  $u_0^{int}(_{0j})$  is the internal energy associated with this torsional angle. Only those values of  $_0$  that lead to valid solutions for the modil ed torsional angles are considered. In the general case there will be a distinct  $_1$  for each solution arising from the new value of  $_0$ . Denck<sup>(m)</sup> to be the number of  $_0^{-1}$  pairs. If  $k^{(m)} = 0$ , the move is rejected.

2) A  $_0-_1$  pair is picked with probability

$$p_{0}^{\text{ext}}(_{0j}; _{1j}) = \exp[ u_{0}^{\text{ext}}(_{0j}; _{1j})] = W^{(n)};$$
(7)

where

$$W^{(n)} = \sum_{j=1}^{k^{(n)}} \exp\left[u_0^{\text{ext}}(u_{j; 1j})\right]:$$
(8)

The function  $u_0^{\text{ext}}(_{0j};_{1j})$  is the part of the external energy that couples this part of the backbone to the rest of the molecule. The value  $J^{(n)}$  of the Jacobian is calculated for the new, chosen conguration (as detailed in Appendix B).

3) The reverse m ove is considered. That is, a rotation about the new, chosen  $_{0}-_{1}$  pair is considered.  $k^{0}$  1 random values  $_{0}$  are chosen. The original value of  $_{0}$  is assigned to the  $k^{0}$ th value. This m ove results in  $k^{(o)}$  solutions for  $_{1}$ .  $k^{(o)}$  is always greater than zero, since the original conguration exists. (Special care is taken to ensure that the original conguration is found by the root noting procedure.) The Rosenbluth weight is assigned to W<sup>(o)</sup>. The value J<sup>(o)</sup> of the Jacobian is also calculated for the original conguration.

This attempted move is accepted with a probability

$$acc(o! n) = m in [1; J^{(n)}W^{(n)} = J^{(o)}W^{(o)}]:$$
 (9)

Splitting the energy into internal and external parts is rather arbitrary. There are some constraints in posed, however, by the requirement that the normalization constants for Eqs. (1) and (6) be independent of chain conformation [26]. We assume for simplicity that  $u_i^{int} = 0.0$  ne other natural choice, however, would set the internal part equal to the torsional terms in H<sub>intra</sub> and set the external part equal to the rest of H.

For any M onte C arlo scheme to properly sample the Boltzm ann probability distribution, detailed balancemust be satis ed. R efs. [22] and [26] prove that detailed balance is satis ed for the above scheme.

#### 3 Application to Polyglycine

In this section we present the result of applying this congurational bias M onte C arb m ethod to two simple peptides, polyglycine G  $_6$  and constrained polyglycine C G  $_6$ C.

Figure 3 shows the energy of linear polyglycine as a function of M onte C arb steps. This run took roughly 3 hours on a Silicon G raphics Indigo<sup>2</sup>. In Fig. 4 we show the end-to-end probability distribution for this system. G aining this degree of convergence took a one-day run.

Figure 5 illustrates the energy of the cyclic polyglycine as a function of M onte C arlo steps. This run took roughly 6 hours. Figure 6 provides a histogram of the number

of solutions found for each attempted concerted rotation. In rare cases the root noding procedure failed to nd all the roots. In the construction of this plot, we rounded  $n^{(n)}$  up when it was odd. Figure 7 shows the histogram for the C SSC dihedral angle, with the statistics taken from a run six times as long as that illustrated in Fig. 5. To give a feel for the barrier to rotation about this angle, we show in Fig. 8 the potential of mean force. This potential was determined by umbrella sampling [38]. This curve took two orders of magnitude longer to determ ine than did the probability distribution in Fig. 7. The potential of mean force is contrasted with the energy associated purely with the C SSC torsional terms. Finally, Fig. 9 shows the result of classifying the con gurations produced by the method into distinct stable conformations. Fuzzy clustering [39] was used to determ ine the dom inant conformations, with the result that there are only two or three distinct conformations within this limited simulation run. The simulation run depicted in Figs. 5 and 9 took approximately 8 hours on a Silicon G raphics Indigo<sup>2</sup>.

#### 4 D iscussion

W e see that with a very modest computational e ort, we can achieve equilibrated results for linear peptides. With somewhat more e ort, we can achieve equilibration for cyclic peptides.

As expected, we nd that the linear peptide  $G_6$  is relatively unstructured in solution. There is a common crum pled state, but there is also a signing cant population of the extended state. The constraint of the disulnde bond in  $CG_6C$ , in contrast, forces that molecule to adopt a limited number of molecular conformations. For the fairly short runs illustrated in Figs. 5,6,7 and 9, we nd only three dominant conformations. The rest conformation is associated with the C SSC torsional angle of 290, whereas the other two are associated with angles of 88 and 98. The rest of these conformations is very tight, with 0.7 A uctuations about the mean for all atoms in the molecule. The other two are somewhat looser, with roughly 1.2 A uctuations. We see from Fig. 9 that even in this short run the method revisits previous conformations. In the limit of a long simulation, the time spent in each conformation would, of course, be proportional to the exponential of the free energy of the conformation.

If  $CG_6C$  were achiral, the potential of m ean force in Fig. 8 would be symmetric about 0 and 180. Since the C carbons in the cystine residues are, in fact, chiral, the potential of m ean force is not required to be symmetric. The asymmetry seen in Fig. 8 results from

8

the mean, chiral force of the rest of the molecule on the C SSC torsion. In fact, the AMBER force eld takes this chirality into account by reducing the symmetry of the C carbon in cysteine. We have used this geometry [40]. The barrier at 0 is due to a high steric repulsion between the hydrogens on the C carbons adjacent to the disul de bond. This barrier is substantially higher than the barrier at 180.

From Fig.8, we see that there is a very signi cant free energy barrier to rotation about the C SSC torsional angle. This gure was not constructed from a standard simulation run, but by the specialized procedure of um brella sampling. It is clear from Fig.7, however, that the present m ethod is able to overcome e this barrier and to properly sam – ple the relevant conform ations even in a relatively short simulation. Any m ethod such as m olecular dynam ics or standard M onte C arlo that m akes only sm all, local changes to the con guration would never cross this barrier in a simulation of reasonable length. High tem perature dynam ics can allow system s to cross high barriers, but can not perform the requisite Boltzm ann sampling to predict the physiologically relevant conform ations. Only a biased m ethod that m akes fairly large geom etrical changes is capable of dealing with such barriers in an autom atic way, without resort to special techniques such as um brella sam pling. Furtherm ore, the ability to perform um brella sam pling has as a prerequisite the detailed know ledge of the important conform ations and the paths between them . In our specie c case, we m dowr method to be two orders of m agnitude more e cient than um brella sam pling.

#### 5 Conclusion

We have presented a M onte C arb m ethod capable of sam pling the relevant room -or bodytem perature congurations of linear and cyclic peptides. This method allows the study of peptides in portant in biological and technological settings. Our sam pling of the disulde dihedralangle in a prototypical cyclic peptide indicates that the method can explore widely separated regions of conformation space according to the proper Boltzm ann distribution, even if the barriers between the regions are quite large. Previous simulation methods either fail to sam ple the proper thermal distribution or are vastly more computationally intensive and require detailed knowledge of the thermally accessible regions. The method can be extended to allow incorporation of explicit water molecules. The method can be extended to force elds with exible bonds and angles. These extensions are subjects for future work.

#### A cknow ledgem ents

W e thank Berend Sm it and Charlene X.L.Liang for helpful discussions about the M onte Carlo m ethod and Len Bogarad, M ichael M cK enna, Jonathan R othberg, and G regory W ent for helpful conversations about the biological applications. This work was supported by the NCI/N IH under grant # CA 62752-01 and by the N IST ATP program under grant number # 70NANB5H 1066. M any of the calculations described herein were performed on an Indigo-R 8000 on loan from SG I and on a HP-735/125 on loan from Hew lett Packard.

#### References

- [1] A berts, B., 1994, M olecular Biology of the Cell, 3rd edition, (Garland: New York).
- [2] Cohen, G.B., Ren, R.B., and Baltimore, D., 1995, Cell, 80, 237.
- [3] Kandel, E., and Abel, T., 1995, Science, 268, 825.
- [4] Swerdlow, J.L., 1995, Natl. Geog., 187 (6), 2.
- [5] O livera, B.M., et al., 1990, Science, 249, 257.
- [6] Clackson, T. and Wells, J.A., 1994, Trends in Biotechnology, 12, 173.
- [7] Alberg, D.G., and Schreiber, S.L., 1993, Science, 262, 248.
- [8] Ruoslahti, E., 1992, British Journal of Cancer, 66, 239.
- [9] O'N eil, K. T., Hoess, R. H., Jackson, S. A., Ram achandran, N. S., Mousa, S. A., and DeG rado, W. F., 1992, Proteins: Structure, Function, and Genetics, 14, 509.
- [10] Cheam, T.C., and Krimm, S., 1990, Theochem Journal of Molecular Structure, 65, 173.
- [11] Tobias, D.J., and Brooks, C.L., 1992, J. Phys. Chem., 96, 3864.
- [12] Roux, B., and Karplus, M., 1994, Annual Review of Biophysics and Biomolecular Structure, 23, 731.
- [13] Nikiforovich, G.V., 1994, Int. J. Peptide Protein Res., 44, 513.

- [14] Schi er, C. A., Caldwell, J. W., Kollman, P. A., and Stroud, R. M., 1993, Mol. Simulat., 10, 121.
- [15] Sm ith, P.E., and Pettitt, B.M., 1993, J. Phys. Chem., 97, 6907.
- [16] Gould, I.R., and Hillier, I.H., 1993, J. Chem. Soc. Chem. Comm., 11, 951.
- [17] Daggett, V., Kollman, P.A., and Kuntz, I.D., 1991, Biopolymers, 31, 285.
- [18] Yan, Y.B., Tropsha, A., Hermans, J., and Erickson, B.W., 1993, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 90, 7898.
- [19] Bruccoleri, R.E., and Karplus, M., 1990, Biopolymers, 29, 1847.
- [20] T su jishita, H., M origuchi, I., and H irono, S., 1994, B iophysical Journal, 66, 1815.
- [21] Brunne, R.M., Van Gunsteren, W.F., Bruschweiler, R., and Ernst, R.R., 1993, J. Am. Chem. Soc., 115 4764.
- [22] Dodd, L.R., Boone, T.D., and Theodorou, D.N., 1993, Molec. Phys., 78, 961.
- [23] Frenkel, D., Mooij, G.C.A.M., and Smit, B., 1992, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 4, 3053.
- [24] Frenkel, D., and Sm it, B., 1992, Molec. Phys., 75, 983.
- [25] DePablo, J. J., Laso, M., and Suter, U.W., 1992, J. Chem. Phys., 96, 6157.
- [26] Sm it, B., and Siepm ann, J. I., 1994, J. Phys. Chem., 98, 8442.
- [27] Maginn, E.J., Bell, A.T., and Theodorou, D.N., 1995, J. Phys. Chem., 99, 2057.
- [28] Leontidis, E., de Pablo, J. J., Laso, M., and Suter, U.W., 1994, Adv. Pol. Sci., 116, 283.
- [29] Escobedo, F.A., and de Pablo, J.J., 1995, J.Chem. Phys., 102, 2636.
- [30] DePablo, J. J., Laso, M., Siepmann, J. I., and Suter, U.W., 1993, Molec. Phys., 80, 55.
- [31] Mooij G.C.A.M., Frenkel, D., and Smit, B., 1992, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter, 4, L255.

- [32] Laso, M., DePablo, J.J., and Suter, U.W., 1992, J. Chem. Phys., 97, 2817.
- [33] Siepmann, J. I., Karaborni, S., and Sm it, B., 1993, Nature, 365, 330.
- [34] Sm it, B., Karaborni, S., and Siepmann, J. I., 1995, J. Chem. Phys., 102, 2126.
- [35] W einer, S.J., et al., 1986, J.Comp.Chem., 7, 230.
- [36] Nem ethy, G., Pottle, M. S., and Scheraga, H. A., 1983, J. Phys. Chem., 87, 1883.
- [37] Brooks, B. R., Bruccoleri, R. E., Olafson, B. D., States, D. J. Swam inathan, S. and Karplus, M., 1983, J. Comput. Chem., 4, 187.
- [38] Chandler, D., 1987, Introduction to Modern Statistical Mechanics, (Oxford University Press: New York), Ch. 6.3.
- [39] Gordon, H.L., and Som orjai, R.L., 1992, Proteins: Structure, Function, and Genetics, 14, 249.
- [40] From the InsightII program, version 2.9.5, BID SYM Technologies, 9685 Scranton Road, San Diego, CA 92121.
- [41] Ryckaert, J.P., Ciccotti, G., Berendsen, H.J.C., 1977, J.Comp. Phys., 23, 327.
- [42] Shenkin, P.S., Yamush, D.L., Fine, R.M., Wang, H.J., and Levinthal, C., 1987, Biopolymers, 26, 2053.

## Appendix A: Rigid Units

As described, the algorithm assumes that bond lengths and angles are xed. The only degrees of freedom, therefore, are torsional angles. Due to the extrem ely high force constant for rotation about a bond, even some torsional angles are xed as well. An entire collection of atom s that is rigid is called a rigid unit. Such a unit has an incoming bond as well as several possible outgoing bonds. There are four backbone rigid units. Unit A is the starting  $NH_3^+$  group. Unit D is the term inal COO group. Unit B is the C H group. Unit C is the CONH am ide bond group.

The residues are connected to the backbone by outgoing bonds from the B units. Table 1 lists the decomposition of the amino acid side chains into rigid units. Typical rigid

Side Group	R igid Units
G lycine	Н
A lanine	CH <sub>3</sub>
A rginine	$CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CN_3H_5^+$
A spartate	CH <sub>2</sub> ,CO <sub>2</sub>
A sparagine	$CH_2$ , $CONH_2$
Cyst (e) ine	CH <sub>2</sub> , S(H)
G lutam ate	$CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CO_2$
G lutam ine	$CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CONH_2$
H istidine	C H $_2$ , C $_3$ N $_2$ H $_3$
Isoleucine	CH,CH <sub>2</sub> ,CH <sub>3</sub> ,CH <sub>3</sub>
Leucine	$CH_2$ , $CH$ , $CH_3$ , $CH_3$
Lysine	$CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $NH_3^+$
M ethionine	$CH_2$ , $CH_2$ , $S$ , $CH_3$
Phenylalanine	CH $_2$ , C $_6$ H $_5$
P roline	Backbone G roups: C $HCH_2CH_2CH_2$ , N, CO
Serine	CH <sub>2</sub> ,OH
Threonine	CH,CH <sub>3</sub> ,OH
T ryptophan	CH2, C $_8$ NH $_6$
Valine	CH,CH $_3$ ,CH $_3$
Tyrosine	$CH_2$ , $C_6H_4$ , $OH$

Table 1: The rigid units in peptide side groups.

units are the  $CH_2$ ,  $CN_3$ ,  $CO_2$ , and arom atic ring groups, which have substantial bonding character.

Proline is a special case, technically an in ino acid. The special nature is due to the cyclic bonding of the residue to the backbone. The rigid units in this am ino acid are the  $CH_n$ , CO, and N groups. Only trans isom ers are allowed for the proline am ide bond. Proline is treated in an approximate way: the C -C fragment is kept rigid, the C -N bond is broken, and the C -N torsional barrier is increased. This approximation ignores the small uctuations in the con guration of the proline side-chain loop.

### Appendix B: Concerted Rotation

Since the molecules under consideration can be cyclic, a M onte C arb move that preserves this constraint is required. The \concerted rotation" scheme used for alkanes [22] can be extended to allow rotation of the torsional angles in cyclic peptides. This appendix describes this extension. The reader is referred to R ef. [22] for a fuller discussion of the original, restricted m ethod. The m ethod presented here allows for a fairly generalm olecular geom etry. In particular, the m ethod naturally accomm odates the constraint of a planar am ide bond.

To form ulate the m ethod, we consider rotating about seven torsional angles, which w ill m ove the root positions of four rigid units, rotate up to three additional ones, and have the rest of the peptide xed. We de ne the root position of a rigid unit to be the C position for a B unit, the C position for a C unit, the C position for a  $CH_2$  unit, and the S position for the S unit in cystine. If unit 5 is a C unit, however,  $r_5$  is de ned to be the N position of that unit. For each unit we de ne i to be the angle between the incom ing and outgoing bonds. Thus, i = 0 for a C unit, and i 70.5 for all others. Figure 1 illustrates the geom etry under consideration.

The method leaves the positions  $r_i$  of units i 0 or i 5 xed. The torsion  $_0$  is changed by an amount  $_0$ . The values of  $_i$ ;1 i 6, are then determined so that only the positions  $r_i$  of units 1 i 4 are changed.

The method required several de nitions to present the solution for the new torsional angles. Vectors are de ned which are the di erence in position between unit i and unit i 1, as seen in the coordinate system of unit i:

$$l_{i} = r_{i}^{(i)} \quad r_{i1}^{(i)}$$
 : (10)

The coordinate system of i is such that the incoming bond is along the  $\hat{x}$  direction. Thus  $l_i = l_i \hat{x}$  if atom  $r_i$  and  $r_{i1}$  are directly bonded and has x- and y-components otherwise. We now de nearotation matrix that transforms from the coordinate system of unit i + 1 to unit i 0 1

$$T_{i} = \bigotimes_{\substack{BB}\\BB}}^{BB} \sin_{i} \cos_{i} \quad \cos_{i} \cos_{i} \sin_{i} \quad \bigotimes_{\substack{C\\A}}^{CC} : \qquad (11)$$

$$\sin_{i} \sin_{i} \quad \cos_{i} \sin_{i} \quad \cos_{i}$$

The positions of the units in the fram e of unit 1 are, thus, given by

$$r_{1}^{(1)} = l_{1}$$

$$r_{2}^{(1)} = l_{1} + T_{1} l_{2}$$

$$r_{3}^{(1)} = l_{1} + T_{1} (l_{2} + T_{2} l_{3})$$

$$r_{4}^{(1)} = l_{1} + T_{1} (l_{2} + T_{2} (l_{3} + T_{3} l_{4})) :$$

$$(12)$$

We further de ne the matrix that converts from the frame of reference of unit 1 to the laboratory reference frame

$$T_{1}^{lab} = [\cos I + nn^{>} (1 \cos ) + M \sin ]A;$$
 (13)

where

$$M = B_{B_{e}}^{0} n_{z} 0 n_{z} n_{y} C_{C} C_{A}$$
(14)  
$$m_{y} n_{x} 0 n_{z} 0$$

and

$$n = \frac{\hat{x} \cdot r}{j\hat{x} \cdot rj}$$

$$\cos = \frac{r \cdot \hat{x}}{jrj}$$

$$\sin = \frac{jr \cdot \hat{x}j}{jrj};$$
(15)

where  $\hat{x}$  is a laboratory unit vector along the x direction, and r is the axis of the bond coming into unit 1. The matrix A is a rotation about  $\hat{x}$  and is de ned so that A  $\frac{1}{2}$  = r:

where

$$c = (l_{1y} r_{y} + l_{1z} r_{z}) = (r_{y}^{2} + r_{z}^{2})$$
  

$$s = (l_{1z} r_{y} + l_{1y} r_{z}) = (r_{y}^{2} + r_{z}^{2}) :$$
(17)

Here  $r = A [T_1^{lab}]^1$   $(r_1 r_0)$  if unit 0 is a C unit; otherwise  $r = l_1$ .

The method proceeds by solving for  $_{i}$ ; 2 i 6, analytically in terms of  $_{1}$ . Then a nonlinear equation is solved numerically to determ ine which values of  $_{1}$ , if any, are possible for the chosen value of  $_{0}$ .

W e will work in the coordinate system of unit 1, after it has been rotated by the chosen  $_0$ . We de ne

$$t = r_5^{(1)} \quad l_1 = [T_1^{lab}]^1 (r_5 \quad r_0) \quad l_1 :$$
 (18)

If  $_{3} \notin 0$  and  $_{5} \notin 0$ , the square distance between unit 3 and unit 5 is known and equal to

$$q_{1}^{2} = (l_{4x} \cos_{4} \quad l_{4y} \sin_{4} + l_{5x})^{2} + (l_{4x} \sin_{4} + l_{4y} \cos_{4} + l_{5y})^{2} :$$
(19)

But this distance can also be written as

$$q_{1}^{2} = j \mathbf{x} \quad T_{2} \mathbf{l}_{3} \mathbf{j}$$
$$\mathbf{x} = T_{1}^{1} \mathbf{t} \quad \mathbf{l}_{2} : \qquad (20)$$

Equating these two results, two values of  $_2$  are possible

with

$$H(x) = \begin{cases} 8 \\ \ge \\ 0; x > 0 \\ \vdots \\ ; x < 0 \end{cases}$$
(22)

The constant  $c_1$  is given by

$$C_{1} = \underbrace{\frac{(r_{5} r_{2})(x_{5} r_{5}) - l_{6} l_{5x} + \sin 2 l_{3y}}{(sin 2 l_{3x} \cos 2 l_{3y})(x_{y}^{2} + x_{z}^{2})^{1-2}}; _{3} \notin 0; _{5} \notin 0$$

$$\frac{l_{3x} + l_{4x} + l_{5x} \cos 4 x_{x} \cos 2}{sin 2 (x_{y}^{2} + x_{z}^{2})^{1-2}}; _{3} = 0; _{5} \notin 0$$

$$C_{1} = \underbrace{\frac{(r_{5} r_{2})(x_{5} r_{5}) - l_{6} l_{5x} l_{4x} \cos 4 x_{x} (\cos 2 l_{3x} + \sin 2 l_{3y})}{(sin 2 l_{3x} \cos 2 l_{3y}) (x_{y}^{2} + x_{z}^{2})^{1-2}}; _{3} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} \# 0; _{5} = 0; _{5} \# 0; _$$

where x is given by Eq. (20) if  $_5 \in 0$ , and  $x = T_1^{-1} [T_1^{lab}]^{-1} (r_6 - r_5) = l_6$  if  $_5 = 0$ . C learly for there to be a solution  $\dot{p}_1 \dot{j}$  1. The last three equations for  $c_1$  were determined by

conditions similar to equating Eqs. (19) and (20). For  $_3 = 0$ ;  $_5 \notin 0$ , the x-component of  $r_5^{(3)}$   $r_3^{(3)}$  is known to be equal to  $l_{4x} + l_5 \cos 4$ . For  $_3 \notin 0$ ;  $_5 = 0$ , the x-component of  $r_5^{(5)}$   $r_3^{(5)}$  is known to be equal to  $l_{5x} + l_{4x} \cos 4$ . For  $_3 = 0$ ;  $_5 = 0$ , the angle between  $r_3$   $r_2$  and  $r_6$   $r_5$  is known to be equal to  $_4$ .

To determ ine  $_3$ , two expressions for  $\dot{r}_5 = r_4 \, \dot{f}$  are again equated to determ ine

$$c_{2} = \frac{l_{5}^{2} \quad y^{2} \quad l_{4}^{2} + 2y_{x} \left(\cos_{3}l_{4x} + \sin_{3}l_{4y}\right)}{2 \left(\sin_{3}l_{4x} - \cos_{3}l_{4y}\right) \left(y_{y}^{2} + y_{z}^{2}\right)^{1-2}}$$
(24)

and

where  $y = T_2^{1} (T_1^{1} t l_2) l_3$ . Again,  $j_2 j_1$  for there to be a solution.

If  $_{5} \in 0$ , the value of  $_{4}$  can be determined from

$$r_{5}^{(1)} = r_{4}^{(1)} + T_{1}T_{2}T_{3}T_{4}l_{5} :$$
 (26)

De ning

$$q_{3} = T_{3}^{1} T_{2}^{1} T_{1}^{1} [T_{1}^{lab}]^{1} (r_{5} r_{4}); \qquad (27)$$

the equations that de ne 4 are given by

$$q_{B_{y}} = \cos_{4} (\sin_{4} l_{5x} \cos_{4} l_{5y})$$

$$q_{B_{z}} = \sin_{4} (\sin_{4} l_{5x} \cos_{4} l_{5y}) : \qquad (28)$$

This is a successful rotation if the position of  $r_6$  is successfully predicted. That is, the equation

$$r_6^{(1)}$$
  $r_5^{(1)} = T_1 T_2 T_3 T_4 T_5 l_6 = [T_1^{lab}]^1 (r_6 r_5)$  (29)

must be satis ed. W e consider the x-com ponent which im plies

$$F(_{1}) = \begin{cases} (r_{6}^{(1)} + r_{5}^{(1)})^{2} T_{1}T_{2}T_{3}T_{4} & (l_{6x} \cos_{5} + l_{6y} \sin_{5}) = 0; 5 \neq 0 \\ (r_{4} + r_{3}) & (r_{5} + r_{5}) + l_{4}l_{6} \cos_{4} = 0; 3 \neq 0; 5 = 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ jr_{6} + r_{4}j + l_{5x})^{2} + l_{5y}^{2} = 0; 3 = 0; 5 = 0 \end{cases}$$
(30)

must be satisted if the rotation is successful. The equations for the case  $_5 = 0$  clearly express the geometric conditions required for a successful rotation.

Eq. (30) is the nonlinear equation for  $_1$  that must be solved. The equation depends only on  $_1$  because  $_2$ ,  $_3$ , and  $_4$  are determined by Eqs. (21), (25), and (28) in terms of  $_1$ . This equation has between zero and four values for each value of  $_1$ , how ever, due to the multiple root character of Eqs. (21) and (25). Equation (30) is solved by searching the region < for zero crossings. The search is in increments of 0.04. These roots are then re-ned by a bisection method. There is always an even number of roots, due to the periodic nature of Eq. 30.

The root positions,  $r_i$ , are enough to determ ine the position and orientation of the seven rigid units that are modiled by the concerted rotation. Rigid unit 0 is translated so that its root position is at  $r_0$ . It is oriented so that its incoming bond vector is along the outgoing bond vector of rigid unit 1. It is then rotated so that its outgoing bond vector ends at  $r_1$ . This process is repeated sequentially for rigid units 1 to 6.

Repeated application of the concerted rotation leads to a slightly in perfect structure, due to num erical precision errors. In a practical application, the geom etry would be restored to an ideal state by application of the SHAKE [41] or R andom Tweak algorithm [42].

The transformation from  $_{i}$ ; 0 i 6, to the new solution which is constrained to change only  $r_{i}$ ; 1 i 4, actually implies a change in volume element in torsional angle space. This change in volume element is the reason for the appearance of the Jacobian in the acceptance probability. The Jacobian of the transformation for alkanes is calculated in Ref. [22]. It is slightly different here since root position  $r_{5}$  is not necessarily the head position. The Jacobian is given by

$$J = 1 = jdet B j;$$
(31)

where the 5 5 m atrix  $B_{ij}$  is given by the ith component of  $u_j$  ( $r_5$   $h_j$ ) for i 3 and by the (i 3)th component of  $u_j$  ( $r_6$   $r_5$ )=j $r_6$   $r_5$  j for i = 4;5. Here  $h_i = r_i$  except that  $h_5$  is the head position even if  $_5 = 0$ , and  $u_i$  is the incoming unit bond vector for unit i.

#### Figure Captions

Figure 1. The type Im ove applied to the serine side chain.

Figure 2. The type IIb m ove is illustrated for the case where unit 0 is (a) a B-unit and (b) a C-unit. In each case, the original geometry and the four possible new geometries for the chosen driver angle are shown. In case (a), one of the new geometries is very diment

from the original and the other three new ones. The move is shown for a linear peptide, although it is used only on cyclic peptides.

Figure 3. The energy of G  $_6$  as a function of M onte C arb steps. Note the rapid equilibration.

Figure 4. The probability distribution for the end-to-end distance for  $G_6$ . The distance is between the term inal C groups.

Figure 5. The energy of CG  $_6$ C as a function of M onte C arlo steps. Note the rapid equilibration.

Figure 6. The number of new solutions found for each attempted concerted rotation for CG  $_6C$ .

Figure 7. The observed probability distribution for the C SSC torsional angle in CG  $_6$ C is shown.

Figure 8. The potential of m ean force calculated by umbrella sampling for the C SSC torsional angle in CG  $_6$ C (dashed line). The potential of m ean force in plied by Fig. 7 is indicated by the solid line. Also shown is the bare torsional energy contribution for this rotation (dotted line).

Figure 9. Shown are the occupation numbers of the conguration in each of the three dominant conformations as a function of M onte C arlo steps (a). Also shown is the all-atom root-mean-square displacement of the conguration from each of the three dominant conformations (b). The curves for conformation 1 are solid, those for 2 are dashed, and those for 3 are short-dashed.

19































