

PROTEIN FOLDING: THE GIBBS FREE ENERGY FORMULA

YI FANG

ABSTRACT. The fundamental law for protein folding is the **Thermodynamic Principle**: the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its native structure and the native structure has the minimum Gibbs free energy among all possible conformations of the protein. The very essential of the thermodynamic principle, a Gibbs free energy formula $G(\mathbf{X})$ for every possible conformation \mathbf{X} of the protein, has never been theoretically formulated from the fundamental physical laws. We will apply quantum statistics to derive such a formula. The formula has two versions, the chemical balance version is:

$$G(\mathbf{X}) = \mu_e N_e(\mathbf{X}) + \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i N_i(\mathbf{X}),$$

where $N_e(\mathbf{X})$ is the mean number of electrons in the space included by the first hydration shell of \mathbf{X} , μ_e is its chemical potential; the index i , $1 \leq i \leq H$, is the hydrophobicity classification of atoms. $N_i(\mathbf{X})$ is the mean number of water molecules in the first hydration layer that directly contact to the atoms with the hydrophobicity degree i ; μ_i is the chemical potential.

Label all atoms of hydrophobicity degree i by H_i and let $M_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the molecular surface for the conformation \mathbf{X} , defining $M_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ as the set of points in $M_{\mathbf{X}}$ that are closer to atoms in H_i than any atoms in H_j , $j \neq i$. Then the geometric version of $G(\mathbf{X})$ resembles to well-known surface area models, plus a volume term:

$$G(\mathbf{X}) = a\mu_e V(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) + ad_w \mu_e A(M_{\mathbf{X}}) + \sum_{i=1}^H \nu_i \mu_i A(M_{\mathbf{X}_i}), \quad a, \nu_i > 0,$$

where $V(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}})$ is the volume of the domain $\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}$ enclosed by $M_{\mathbf{X}}$, d_w is the diameter of a water molecule, and $A(M_{\mathbf{X}})$ and $A(M_{\mathbf{X}_i})$ are the areas of $M_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $M_{\mathbf{X}_i}$.

The derivation is first applying the Born-Oppenheimer approximation, then using the grand canonic ensemble.

1. INTRODUCTION

The newly synthesized peptide chain of a protein automatically folds to its native structure and only in this native structure the protein can perform its biological function. Structure deviations from the native structure will cause disasters [5]. Why and how the protein folds to its native structure and how to predict the native structure from only the knowledge of the peptide chain are topics of protein folding [7].

The fundamental law for protein folding is the **Thermodynamic Principle**: the amino acid sequence of a protein determines its native structure and the native structure of the protein has the minimum Gibbs free energy among all possible conformations [1].

Date: February 3, 2012.

Key words and phrases. Protein folding, Gibbs free energy, quantum mechanics, statistical mechanics, globular protein.

The very essence of the Thermodynamic Principle are the Gibbs free energy and how to formulate it. If life activities obey the fundamental physical laws, then there should be a nature's Gibbs free energy formula $G(\mathbf{X})$ for every conformation \mathbf{X} . Getting such a formula is a testing of the power of physical laws to extend to life phenomenon. Especially at the dawn of quantum biology [4] while quantum mechanics has been applied to protein folding, see for example, [17] and [18], theoretically derived instead of empirically guessed Gibbs free energy formula $G(\mathbf{X})$ has not been obtained so far. Such a formula should be able to provide the possibilities of forgoing of arbitrary models in protein structure prediction and the study of folding process.

To obtain such a formula, statistical mechanics has been applied as summarized in [15] and [8], but the derived formulae are buried in complicated integrals with integrands that are also in unknown form of potential energy. Our work is a continuation of their efforts. Our derivation is in quantum statistics, first apply the Born-Oppenheimer approximation then apply the grand canonic ensemble. Although these two procedures are well-known, such a combination to attack the protein folding problem has never appeared in literature. We hope that there will be more works in this trend to resolve the protein folding problem.

1.1. The Formula. To state our result, we first fix the notation. Let \mathfrak{U} be a protein with M atoms $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_i, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M$. A structure (conformation) of \mathfrak{U} is a point $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M) \in \mathbb{R}^{3M}$, $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the atomic center (nuclear) position of \mathbf{a}_i . Alternatively, the conformation \mathbf{X} corresponds to a subset in \mathbb{R}^3 , $P_{\mathbf{X}} = \cup_{i=1}^M B(\mathbf{x}_i, r_i) \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, where r_i is the van der Waals radius of the atom \mathbf{a}_i and $B(\mathbf{x}, r) = \{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^3; |\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}| \leq r\}$ is a closed ball with radius r and center \mathbf{x} . Although the shape of each atom in \mathfrak{U} is well defined by the theory of atoms in molecules ([2] and [20]), what concerning us here is the overall shape of the structure $P_{\mathbf{X}}$. The cutoff of electron density $\rho \geq 0.001\text{au}$ ([2] and [20]), gives the overall shape of a molecular structure that is just like $P_{\mathbf{X}}$, a bunch of overlapping balls. Moreover, the boundary of the $\rho \geq 0.001\text{au}$ cutoff is much similar to the **molecular surface** $M_{\mathbf{X}}$ which was defined by Richards in 1977 [22] and was shown has more physical meaning as the boundary surface of the conformation $P_{\mathbf{X}}$ [23] and [13]. Let d_w be the diameter of a water molecule. Define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3 : \text{distance}(\mathbf{x}, M_{\mathbf{X}}) \leq d_w\} \setminus P_{\mathbf{X}} \quad (1)$$

as the first hydration shell surrounding $P_{\mathbf{X}}$. Then $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} = P_{\mathbf{X}} \cup \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}$ will be our thermodynamic system of protein folding at the conformation \mathbf{X} .




FIGURE 1. Note that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}$ generally are not connected, i.e., having more than one block.

We classify the atoms in \mathfrak{A} into H hydrophobicity classes H_i , $i = 1, \dots, H$, such that $\cup_{i=1}^H H_i = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_M\}$. Let $I_i \subset \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$ be the subset such that $\mathbf{a}_j \in H_i$ if and only if $j \in I_i$. Define $P_{\mathbf{X}i} = \cup_{j \in I_i} B(\mathbf{x}_j, r_j) \subset P_{\mathbf{X}}$ and as shown in FIGURE 1,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i} = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}} : \text{distance}(\mathbf{x}, P_{\mathbf{X}i}) \leq \text{distance}(\mathbf{x}, P_{\mathbf{X}} \setminus P_{\mathbf{X}i})\}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq H, \quad (2)$$

where $\text{distance}(\mathbf{x}, S) = \inf_{\mathbf{y} \in S} |\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}|$.

Let $V(\Omega)$ be the volume of $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}} = \cup_{i=1}^H \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}, \quad V(\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}) = \sum_{i=1}^H V(\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}), \quad \text{and for } i \neq j, \quad V(\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i} \cap \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}j}) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Let $N_i(\mathbf{X})$ be the mean number of water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}$ and denote μ_i as the chemical potential of this kind of water molecules; furthermore, let N_e be the mean number of electrons inside $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$, and μ_e the corresponding chemical potential. Then the Gibbs free energy $G(\mathbf{X})$ for the conformation \mathbf{X} is

$$G(\mathbf{X}) = \mu_e N_e(\mathbf{X}) + \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i N_i(\mathbf{X}), \quad (4)$$

The chemical potentials are independent of \mathbf{X} .

The geometric version of the formula (4) involves the molecular surface $M_{\mathbf{X}}$. Since $M_{\mathbf{X}}$ is a closed surface, it divides \mathbb{R}^3 into two domains $\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\Omega'_{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\partial\Omega_{\mathbf{X}} = \partial\Omega'_{\mathbf{X}} = M_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbb{R}^3 = \Omega_{\mathbf{X}} \cup M_{\mathbf{X}} \cup \Omega'_{\mathbf{X}}$. We have

$P_{\mathbf{X}} \subset \Omega_{\mathbf{X}}$ and all nuclear centers of atoms in the water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}$ are contained in $\Omega'_{\mathbf{X}}$. Moreover, $\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}$ is bounded, therefore, has a volume $V(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}})$. Define the hydrophobicity subsurface $M_{\mathbf{X}i}$, $1 \leq i \leq H$, as

$$M_{\mathbf{X}i} = M_{\mathbf{X}} \cap \overline{\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}}. \quad (5)$$

Let $A(S)$ be the area of a surface $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, then

$$M_{\mathbf{X}} = \cup_{i=1}^H M_{\mathbf{X}i}, \quad A(M_{\mathbf{X}}) = \sum_{i=1}^H A(M_{\mathbf{X}i}), \quad \text{and if } i \neq j, \text{ then } A(M_{\mathbf{X}i} \cap M_{\mathbf{X}j}) = 0. \quad (6)$$

With these definitions, the geometric version of formula (4) is:

$$G(\mathbf{X}) = a\mu_e V(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) + ad_w\mu_e A(M_{\mathbf{X}}) + \sum_{i=1}^H \nu_i\mu_i A(M_{\mathbf{X}i}), \quad a, \nu_i > 0, \quad (7)$$

where $aV(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) = N_e$, $\nu_i A(M_{\mathbf{X}i}) = N_i(\mathbf{X})$, $1 \leq i \leq H$. Note that a and ν_i are independent of \mathbf{X} , they are the average numbers of particles per unit volume and area.

2. THE DERIVATION

Below will be the detailed derivation of the formula, some remarks will also follow in the next section.

2.1. Assumptions. We first list all assumptions used in the derivation:

- (1) The proteins discussed here are monomeric, single domain, self folding globular proteins.
- (2) Therefore, the natural environment of the protein folding is water with constant temperature T , constant pressure P , and constant pH value.
- (3) Before folding, the polypeptide chain already has its covalent bonds correctly formed (the disulfide bonds are counted but will be allowed to break), hence, our conformations should satisfy the following steric conditions set in [10] and [11]: there are $\epsilon_{ij} > 0$, $1 \leq i < j \leq M$ such that for any two atoms \mathbf{a}_i and \mathbf{a}_j in $P_{\mathbf{X}} = \cup_{k=1}^M B(\mathbf{x}_k, r_k)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{ij} &\leq |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j|, & \text{no covalent bond between } \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{a}_j; \\ d_{ij} - \epsilon_{ij} &\leq |\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j| \leq d_{ij} + \epsilon_{ij}, & d_{ij} \text{ is the standard bond length between } \mathbf{a}_i \text{ and } \mathbf{a}_j. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We will denote all conformations satisfying (8) as \mathfrak{X} and only consider $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{X}$ in this paper.

- (4) A water molecule \mathbf{w} in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is taking as a single particle, with the nuclear position \mathbf{w} at the oxygen nuclear position \mathbf{o} and the covalent bonds in it are fixed. In the Born-Oppenheimer approximation below, only the conformation \mathbf{X} is fixed, all particles in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$, water molecules or electrons, are moving.
- (5) As the hydrophobicity classification i in formula (4), we agree that simply classifying amino acids as hydrophobic or hydrophilic is an oversimplification. All atoms should be classified according to the hydrophobicity of moieties or atom groups it belongs. For example, we may assume that the classification is as in [9], there are $H = 5$ classes, C, O/N, O^- , N^+ , S. Unlike in [9], we also classify

every hydrogen atom into one of the H classes according to who is bounded with it. There are many different hydrophobicity classifications. Our derivation is valid for any of them.

2.2. The Shrödinger Equation. For any conformation $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{X}$, let $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_i, \dots, \mathbf{w}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N}$ be the nuclear centers of water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_i, \dots, \mathbf{e}_L) \in \mathbb{R}^{3L}$ be electronic positions of all electrons in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$. Then the Hamiltonian for the system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{T} + \hat{V} = - \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_w} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_i^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e} \sum_{i=1}^L \nabla_i^2 + \hat{V}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{E}), \quad (9)$$

where m_i is the nuclear mass of atom \mathbf{a}_i in \mathfrak{U} , m_w and m_e are the masses of water molecule and electron; ∇_i^2 is Laplacian in corresponding \mathbb{R}^3 ; and V the potential.

2.3. The First Step of The Born-Oppenheimer Approximation. Depending on the shape of $P_{\mathbf{X}}$, for each i , $1 \leq i \leq H$, the maximum numbers $N_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ of water molecules contained in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ vary. Theoretically we consider all cases, i.e., there are $0 \leq N_i \leq N_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq H$. Let $M_0 = 0$ and $M_i = \sum_{j \leq i} N_j$ and $\mathbf{W}_i = (\mathbf{w}_{M_{i-1}+1}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{M_{i-1}+j}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_{M_i}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq H$, and $\mathbf{W} = (\mathbf{W}_1, \mathbf{W}_2, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{M_H}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3M_H}$ denote the nuclear positions of water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}}$. As well, there will be all possible numbers $0 \leq N_e < \infty$ of electrons in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$. Let $\mathbf{E} = (\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{N_e}) \in \mathbb{R}^{3N_e}$ denote their nuclear positions.

For each fixed $\mathbf{X} \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $N = (N_1, \dots, N_H, N_e)$, the Born-Oppenheimer approximation has the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_X = - \frac{\hbar^2}{2} \left\{ \frac{1}{m_w} \sum_{j=1}^{M_H} \nabla_j^2 + \frac{1}{m_e} \sum_{\nu=1}^{N_e} \nabla_{\nu}^2 \right\} + \hat{V}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{E}).$$

The eigenfunctions $\psi_i^{\mathbf{X}, N}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{E}) \in L_0^2(\prod_{i=1}^H \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}_i}^{N_i} \times \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}^{N_e}) = \mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}, N}$, $1 \leq i < \infty$, comprise an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{X}, N}$. Denote their eigenvalues (energy levels) as $E_{\mathbf{X}, N}^i$, then $\hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} \psi_i^{\mathbf{X}, N} = E_{\mathbf{X}, N}^i \psi_i^{\mathbf{X}, N}$.

2.4. Grand Partition Function and Grand Canonic Density Operator. In the following we will use the notations and definitions in [12, Chapter 10]. Let k_B be the Boltzmann constant, set $\beta = 1/k_B T$. Since the numbers N_i and N_e vary, we should adopt the grand canonic ensemble. Let μ_i be the chemical potentials, that is, the Gibbs free energy per water molecule in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$. Let μ_e be electron chemical potential. The grand canonic density operator is ([12] and [6])

$$\hat{\rho}_{\mathbf{X}} = \exp \left\{ -\beta \left[\hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i \hat{N}_i - \mu_e \hat{N}_e - \Omega(\mathbf{X}) \right] \right\}.$$

where the grand partition function is

$$\begin{aligned} \exp[-\beta\Omega(\mathbf{X})] &= \text{Trace} \left\{ \exp \left[-\beta \left(\hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i \hat{N}_i - \mu_e \hat{N}_e \right) \right] \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i, N} e^{-\beta[E_{\mathbf{X}, N} - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i N_i - \mu_e N_e]}. \end{aligned}$$

2.5. The Gibbs Free Energy $G(\mathbf{X})$. According to [12, page 273], under the grand canonic ensemble the entropy $S(\mathbf{X}) = S(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}})$ of the system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} S(\mathbf{X}) &= -k_B \text{Trace}(\hat{\rho}_{\mathbf{X}} \ln \hat{\rho}_{\mathbf{X}}) = -k_B \langle \ln \hat{\rho}_{\mathbf{X}} \rangle = k_B \beta \left\langle \hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} - \Omega(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i \hat{N}_i - \mu_e \hat{N}_e \right\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \left[\langle \hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} \rangle - \langle \Omega(\mathbf{X}) \rangle - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i \langle \hat{N}_i \rangle - \mu_e \langle \hat{N}_e \rangle \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \left[U(\mathbf{X}) - \Omega(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i N_i(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_e N_e(\mathbf{X}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here we denote $\langle \hat{N}_i \rangle = N_i(\mathbf{X})$ the mean numbers of water molecules in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}$, $1 \leq i \leq H$, and $\langle \hat{N}_e \rangle = N_e(\mathbf{X})$ the mean number of electrons in $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$. The inner energy $\langle \hat{H}_{\mathbf{X}} \rangle$ of the system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ is denoted as $U(\mathbf{X}) = U(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}})$. The term $\Omega(\mathbf{X})$ is a state function with variables $T, V, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_H$, and μ_e , and is called the grand canonic potential ([12, page 27]) or the thermodynamic potential ([6, page 33]). By the general thermodynamic equations [6, pages 5 and 6]:

$$d\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = -SdT - PdV - \sum_{i=1}^H N_i d\mu_i - N_e d\mu_e, \quad \lambda\Omega(\mathbf{X}) = \Omega(\mathbf{X})(T, \lambda V, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_H, \mu_e),$$

we see that $\Omega(\mathbf{X})(T, V, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_H, \mu_e) = -PV(\mathbf{X})$, where $V(\mathbf{X}) = V(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}})$ is the volume of the thermodynamic system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$. Thus by (10) we obtain the Gibbs free energy $G(\mathbf{X}) = G(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}})$ in (4):

$$G(\mathbf{X}) = G(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}) = PV(\mathbf{X}) + U(\mathbf{X}) - TS(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{i=1}^H \mu_i N_i(\mathbf{X}) + \mu_e N_e(\mathbf{X}).$$

2.6. Converting Formula (4) to Geometric Form (7). Since every water molecule in $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{X}i}$ has contact with the surface $M_{\mathbf{X}i}$, $N_i(\mathbf{X})$ is proportional to the area $A(M_{\mathbf{X}i})$. Therefore, there are $\nu_i > 0$, such that

$$\nu_i A(M_{\mathbf{X}i}) = N_i(\mathbf{X}), \quad 1 \leq i \leq H. \quad (11)$$

Similarly, there will be an $a > 0$ such that $aV(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}) = N_e(\mathbf{X})$.

By the definition of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}$, we have roughly $V(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} \setminus \Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) = d_w A(M_{\mathbf{X}})$. Thus

$$N_e(\mathbf{X}) = aV(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}) = a[V(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) + V(\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}} \setminus \Omega_{\mathbf{X}})] = aV(\Omega_{\mathbf{X}}) + ad_w A(M_{\mathbf{X}}). \quad (12)$$

Substitute (11) and (12) into (4), we get (7).

3. REMARKS

We are applying fundamental physical laws directly to protein folding. The question is, can we do so? We will try to check how rigorous is the derivation and ask that are there any fundamental errors? We will also discuss possible ways to modify the formula or the derivation.

3.1. How Rigorous Is The Derivation? We adopted two common tools in theoretical physics, the first step of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in quantum mechanics and the grand canonic ensemble in statistical physics to obtain formula (4).

3.1.1. The Born-Oppenheimer Approximation. The Born-Oppenheimer approximation “treats the electrons as if they are moving in the field of fixed nuclei. This is a good approximation because, loosely speaking, electrons move much faster than nuclei and will almost instantly adjust themselves to a change in nuclear position.” [20]. Since the mass of a water molecule is much less than the mass of a protein, we can extend this approximation to the case of when \mathbf{X} changes the other articles, electrons and water molecules, will quickly adjust themselves to the change as well.

3.1.2. The Statistic Physics in General and the Grand Canonic Ensemble in Particular. “Up to now there is no evidence to show that statistical physics itself is responsible for any mistakes,” [6, Preface]. Via the ensemble theory of statistical mechanics we consider only one protein molecule and particles in its immediate environment, it is justified since as pointed out in [6, page 10] “When the duration of measurement is short, or the number of particles is not large enough, the concept of ensemble theory is still valid.” And among different ensembles, “Generally speaking, the grand canonic ensemble, with the least restrictions, is the most convenient in the mathematical treatment.” [6, page 16]. In fact, we have tried the canonic ensemble and ended with a result that we have to really calculate the eigenvalues of the quantum mechanics system.

Our derivations only put together the two very common and sound practices: the Born-Oppenheimer approximation (only the first step) and the grand canonic ensemble, and apply them to the protein folding problem. As long as protein folding obeys the fundamental physical laws, there should not be any serious error with the derivation.

3.2. Equilibrium and Quasi-Equilibrium. A protein’s structure will never be in equilibrium, in fact, even the native structure is only a snapshot of the constant vibration state of the structure. In this sense, we can only anticipate a quasi-equilibrium description (such as the heat engine, [3, page 94]) of the thermodynamic states of the protein folding. This has been built-in in the Thermodynamical Principle of Protein Folding. So the quantities such as $S(\mathbf{X})$, $\Omega(\mathbf{X})$, and $G(\mathbf{X})$ can only be understood in this sense. That is, observing a concrete folding process one will see a series conformations \mathbf{X}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. The Thermodynamic Principle then says that if we measure the Gibbes free energy $G(\mathbf{X}_i)$ then eventually $G(\mathbf{X}_i)$ will converge

to a minimum value and the \mathbf{X}_i will eventually approach to the native structure. While all the time, no conformation \mathbf{X}_i and thermodynamic system $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ are really in equilibrium state.

3.3. Environment Determines Structure. We follow the reality that during the folding, the peptide chain of a protein has all its covalent bonds inside its residues and peptide bonds formed and these bonds exist in any conformation, native or denatured. This fact tells us that, with the particular peptide chain as the result of evolution, which structure of the protein is stable may only depend on the environment. This is also reflected in the formulae (4) and (7) and their derivation, pairwise potentials inside the protein do not play any role in formula (4). An explanation is that those should be already reflected in the existing covalent bonds in each residue and peptide bonds between them, formed in previous procedure. The steric conditions (8) will just keep this early synthesis result, not any $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i, \dots, \mathbf{x}_M)$ is eligible to be a conformation, it has to satisfy (8). The steric conditions not only pay respect to the bond length, it also reflect a lot of physi-chemco properties of a conformation: They are defined via the allowed minimal atomic distances, such that for non-bonding atoms, the allowed minimal distances are: shorter between differently charged or polarized atoms; a little longer between non-polar ones; and much longer (generally greater than the sum of their radii) between the same charged ones, etc. For example, we allow minimal distance between sulfur atoms in Cysteines to form disulfide bonds. The accurate values of ϵ_{ij} in (8) should come from a statistical study of known native structures of globular proteins.

Formulae (4) and (7) theoretically show that hydrophobic effect is the driving force of protein folding, it is not just solvent free energy besides the pairwise interactions such as the Coulombs, etc., as all force fields assumed. Only in the physiological environment the hydrophobic effect works towards to native structure, otherwise it will push denaturation. Indeed, look at the formulae (4) and (7), because some μ_i will take different signs in some non-physiological environment, such that for example, instead of shrinking the number $N_i(\mathbf{X})$ or the area $A(M_{\mathbf{X}_i})$, they are actually been encouraged to enlarge. Or certain $M_{\mathbf{X}_i}$ might dock with other objects' boundary with the similar hydrophobicity degree. Therefore, the structure is denatured.

For simplicity, we used the simplest environment, water in a cell. Accordingly, we work on the single domain, monomeric, self folding globular proteins. More complicated environment will be applied to other types of proteins, for example, adding cell membrane and/or chaperon as fixed or variable objects in the environment for membrane protein's folding. To study denaturation, for example, in solvent with more ions, we can simply add $\mu_{\text{iron}}N_{\text{iron}}(\mathbf{X})$ inside $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{X}}$ to formula (4).

3.4. Hydrophobicity and Surface Area Models. In 1959, by reviewing the literature Kauzmann concluded that the hydrophobic effect is the main driving force in protein folding [14]. Empirical correlation between hydrophobic free energy and aqueous cavity surface area was noted as early as 1974 [21]. In 1984 Novotny *et. al* [19] showed that incorrect structures of two proteins have significantly larger solvent accessible surfaces (defined in [16]) and greater fractions of non-polar side-chain atoms exposed to solvent than those in the native structures. Based on this result, In 1986 an accessible surface area model was published in Nature

[9], the model assigns different free energies per unit area to the solvent accessible surface areas according to hydrophobicity of the corresponding atoms that are exposed to solvent. Unless the assigned free energies per unit area are accurate, not just correct signs, this is merely a qualitative confirmation of the result of [19]. In fact, the native structure has less fraction of non-polar side-chain atoms exposed to solvent, so to pursue the native structure we should reduce the fraction of non-polar atoms exposed to solvent, i.e., shrink the hydrophobic surface areas. The real contribution of [9] is the discarding of the oversimplification of only classifying amino acids as hydrophobic or hydrophilic. In [9], all atoms, except hydrogen, are classified into five classes, C, O/N, O⁻, N⁺, S. Later, it had been shown that there is a large gap between the free energy values obtained by solvent accessible surface models and by macroscopic experiments such as surface tension [23]. In [23], it was shown that molecular surface area assigned of 72-73 cal/mol/Å² perfectly fits with the macroscopic experiment data. Later in 1993, it was argued that protein's boundary surface should be the molecular surface [13].

In fact, the advantage of the solvent accessible surface is that by definition of it we know exactly each atom occupies which part of it, therefore, one can calculate its share in surface area. This fact may partly account why there are so many models based on the solvent accessible surface, even people knew the afore mentioned gap. For other surfaces, we have to define the part of surface that belongs to a specific hydrophobicity class. Only to 2005 this was resolved in [10] via the distance function definition as we used here.

All surface area models neglected one important element, the volume of the structure. As early as in the 1970's, Richards and his colleagues already pointed out that the native structure of globular proteins is very dense, or compact, (density = 0.75, [22]). To make a conformation denser, obviously we should shrink the volume $V(\Omega_{\mathbf{x}})$. The model in [10] introduced volume term but kept the oversimplification of all atoms are either hydrophobic or hydrophilic. The derivation of (4) and (7) shows that volume term should be counted, but it may be that $a\mu_e$ is very small, in that case, volume maybe really is irrelevant.

3.5. Simulation. Usually, a paper discuss free energy of protein folding (so far, all empirical) will demonstrate computer simulation results to justify its correctness and advantage. Since our formula is derived theoretically, the first thing is to make sure that the derivation is correct. If the formula is wrong, even by manipulating parameters one may achieves seemingly very sound simulation results, but that will only make more confusion. Only when one is sure that a Gibbs free energy formula has sound theoretic or experiment basis one can begin computer simulation. For us, the simulation should begin with identifying the coefficients $\nu_i\mu_i$ and $a\mu_e$. Before we have these correct, any simulation can only have qualitative results. There are many such qualitative simulations, one is in [11], simply reducing the hydrophobic surface area by the fastest descending method produced secondary structures: hydrogen bonds, α helixes, β strands, etc.

REFERENCES

- [1] C. B. Anfinsen, Principles that govern the folding of protein chains. *Science* **181**, 223-230 (1973).
- [2] R. F. W. Bader, *Atoms in Molecules: A Quantum Theory*. (Clarendon Press · Oxford, 1990).

- [3] Bailyn, M. *A Survey of Thermodynamics*. American Institute of Physics New York, 1994.
- [4] P. Ball, Physics of life: The dawn of quantum biology. *Nature* **474**, 272-274 (2011).
- [5] C. Branden and J. Tooze, *Introduction to Protein Structure*. (Second Edition, Garland, 1999).
- [6] X. Dai, *Advanced Statistical Physics*. (Fudan University Press, Shanghai, 2007).
- [7] L. A. Dill, S. B. Ozkan, M. S. Shell, and T. R. Weikl, The Protein Folding Problem. *Annu. Rev. Biophys.* **37**, 289-316 (2008).
- [8] P. Echenique, Introduction to protein folding for physicist. *Contemporary Physics* **48**, 81-108 (2007).
- [9] D. Eisenberg and A. D. McLachlan, Solvation energy in protein folding and binding. *Nature* **319**, 199-203 (1986).
- [10] Y. Fang, Mathematical protein folding problem. In: D. Hoffman, Ed, *Global Theory of Minimal Surfaces. (Proceedings of the Clay Mathematical Proceedings, 2 2005)* pp. 611-622.
- [11] Y. Fang and J. Jing, Geometry, thermodynamics, and protein. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, **262**, 382-390 (2010).
- [12] W. Greiner, L. Neise, and H. Stöker, *Thermodynamics and Statistical Mechanics*. (Spriger-Verlag, New York, Berlin, ... 1994).
- [13] R. M. Jackson and M. J. E. Sternberg, Protein surface area defined. *Nature* **366**, 638, (1993).
- [14] W. Kauzmann, Some factors in the interpretation of protein denaturation. *Adv. Protein Chem.* **14**, 1-63 (1959).
- [15] T. Lazaridis and M. Karplus, Thermodynamics of protein folding: a microscopic view. *Biophysical Chemistry* **100**, 367-395 (2003).
- [16] B. Lee and F. M. Richards, The interpretation of protein structures: estimation of static accessibility. *J. Mol. Biol.* **55**:379-400, (1971).
- [17] L. Luo, Protein folding as a quantum transition between conformational states. *Front. Phys.* **6**(1):133-140, (2011).
- [18] L. Luo and J. Lu, Temperature dependence of protein folding deduced from quantum transition. arxiv.org/abs/1102.3748, (2011).
- [19] J. Novotny, R. Brucoleri, R., and M. Karplus, An analysis of incorrectly folded protein models. Implications for structure predictions. *J. Mol. Biol.* **177**, 787-818 (1984).
- [20] P. Popelier, *Atoms in Molecules: An Introduction*. (Prentice Hall, 2000).
- [21] J. A. Reynolds, D. B. Gilbert, and C. Tanford, Empirical correlation between hydrophobic free energy and aqueous cavity surface area. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **71**(8), 2925-2927 (1974).
- [22] F. M. Richards, Areas, volumes, packing, and protein structure. *Ann. Rev. Biophys. Bioeng.* **6**, 151-176 (1977).
- [23] I. Tuñón, E. Silla, and J. L. Pascual-Ahuir, Molecular surface area and hydrophobic effect. *Protein Engineering* **5**(8), 715-716 (1992).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NANCHANG UNIVERSITY, 999 XUEFU ROAD, HONGGUTAN NEW DISTRICT, NANCHANG, CHINA, 330031, YI.FANG3@GMAIL.COM