

Conditional solvation of isoleucine in model extended and helical peptides: context dependence of hydrophobic hydration and the failure of the group-transfer model

Dheeraj S. Tomar

Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD

Valéry Weber

IBM Research, Zurich, Switzerland

B. Montgomery Pettitt

*Sealy Center for Structural Biology and Molecular Biophysics,
University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX*

D. Asthagiri*

*Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD and
Sealy Center for Structural Biology and Molecular Biophysics,
University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX*

The hydration thermodynamics of the GXG tripeptide relative to the reference GGG defines the *conditional* hydration contribution of X. This quantity or the hydration thermodynamics of a small molecule analog of the side-chain or some combination of such estimates, usually including factors to account for the solvent-exposure of the side-chain in the protein, have anchored the interpretation of many of the seminal experimental studies in understanding protein stability and folding and in the genesis of the current views on dominant interactions stabilizing proteins. Using simulations we show that such procedures to model protein hydration thermodynamics have significant limitations. We study the conditional hydration thermodynamics of the isoleucine side-chain in an extended pentapeptide and in helical deca-peptides, using as appropriate an extended penta-glycine or appropriate helical deca-peptides as reference. Hydration of butane in the *gauche* conformation provides a small molecule reference for the side-chain. We use the quasichemical approach to parse the hydration thermodynamics into chemical, packing, and long-range interaction contributions. The chemical contribution reflects the contribution of solvent clustering within the defined inner-shell of the solute; the chemical contribution of *g*-butane is substantially more negative than the conditional chemical contribution of isoleucine. The packing contribution gives the work required to create a cavity in the solvent, a quantity of central interest in understanding hydrophobic hydration. The packing contribution for *g*-butane substantially overestimates the conditional packing of isoleucine. The net of such compensating contributions disagrees with the conditional free energy of isoleucine but by a lesser magnitude. Using the hydration thermodynamics of *g*-butane or the conditional hydration thermodynamics of isoleucine from the GGIGG pentapeptide together with appropriate reference models to predict the properties of either IGGGG or the isoleucine-substituted helical deca-peptides proves unsatisfactory.

Keywords: group additivity, SASA, potential distribution theorem, protein folding, molecular dynamics

I. INTRODUCTION

The hydration thermodynamics of analogs of amino acid side-chains or of amino acid side-chains in small model peptides have often been used to understand protein folding and protein-protein association. Examples of such approaches abound in the biochemical literature. An admittedly biased list of a very small number of the many pioneering investigations where this approach has been used include Kauzmann's (1) work identifying hydrophobicity as a dominant force in protein folding, Tanford's (2–5) investigations of protein denaturation, Privalov and Makhatadze's (6–8) interpretation of calorimetric data on protein unfolding, and more recently, in-

vestigations by Bolen and coworkers (9–11) on the role of osmolytes in protein folding. It was Tanford (2, 4), drawing upon insights attributed to Cohn and Edsall, who clearly formulated this approach into a quantitative, predictive framework. In his approach, the free energy of unfolding is given as a sum of the free energy of transfer of “the small component groups of the molecule, from the environment they have in the native form, to the environment they have in the unfolded form” (2) Accounting for subsequent refinements that included corrections for the solvent-exposure of the “small component groups” (cf. Ref. 9), the generic equation of the unfolding free energy ($\Delta G_{N \rightarrow U}$) can be written as

$$\Delta G_{N \rightarrow U} = \sum_i \alpha_i \Delta g_i, \quad (1)$$

* Corresponding author: Dilip.Asthagiri@utmb.edu

where Δg_i is the free energy of transferring the group i from some reference phase to liquid water, and α_i is a factor that corrects for the changes in solvent-exposure of the group i in protein unfolding. In studies by Privalov and coworkers (8), for example, a gas-phase reference is implied, as is also the case in this article. The same form of equation can also be used to describe the effect of osmolytes on protein unfolding: identifying Δg_i with the free energy for transferring the group between water and the aqueous osmolyte solution and α_i with the change in the solvent exposure upon unfolding in the osmolyte solution relative to water, the above equation directly gives the so-called m -value for 1 M osmolyte (12).

At a time when theory, simulations, and experimental techniques were much less developed than they are now, the group-additive approach to protein hydration thermodynamics was a necessary and a practical first step in attempts to understand a complicated macromolecule. But it is also important to assess their limitations, and probe if the physical conclusions based on this approach are valid. In this spirit, and as an illustration of the difficulties, consider the following: on the one hand the large negative entropy of hydration of *non-polar* groups has been identified as an important factor in protein stability (1, 5), the traditional hydrophobicity picture, but on the other hand analysis by Makhatadze and Privalov (8) leads them to conclude that it is the large negative hydration entropy of the *polar* groups that is decisive in protein stability.

But there are concerns about either conclusion noted above. Experimentally it is found that the hydration of a non-polar group in a molecular solute, its conditional hydration, differs, at times quite substantially, with the hydration of an analog of that group in bulk water. On this basis and for reasons made apparent in the theoretical description of solvation in terms of solute-solvent binding energies, Ben-Naim(14) has long argued that the identification of hydrophobicity as a dominant interaction likely arises from not distinguishing conditional hydration with hydration of the group in bulk solvent. (This aspect is also of central concern in this paper.) While Makhatadze and Privalov do make use of conditional hydration quantities, care is needed even here. For example, one should expect that the hydration of an OH group given that there is a CH₃ group will be different if the same OH group occurs in the context of a serine residue (-CH₂OH) anchored on protein backbone. In particular, recent theory and simulations (16, 17) (cf. especially Sec. S.V. in Ref. 17) show that hydration thermodynamics of spatially distant groups can be coupled, rendering the assumption of additivity (of conditional quantities) at the length-scale of small molecular groups questionable. (In Ben-Naim's formalism, this amounts to the importance of pair- and higher-order correlation correction between groups (14).) Perhaps it is for these reasons that Makhatadze and Privalov (8) find that the excess enthalpy and excess entropy of polar groups both decrease with increasing temperature, a result that chal-

lenges physical intuition.

Concerns about the additivity approximation are not new (14, 18), but testing these ideas have proven challenging. Obtaining the hydration free energy of a protein still poses a challenge experimentally (14). Computer simulations offer an excellent avenue to test and validate assumptions used in experiments. A simulation-based analysis can be made internally consistent with all thermodynamic quantities obtained using the same simulation approach, rendering the conclusions relatively independent of limitations of the peptide model or the force-field used. But till recently (19) all-atom calculations of the hydration thermodynamics of a realistic protein have also posed severe challenges to theory and simulations. But even with simpler model systems such as blocked peptides or small helical peptides, the limitations of additivity have been brought to the fore (13, 17, 20, 21).

Based on recent developments in free energy calculations of proteins within a physically transparent framework (17, 19), we are now in a somewhat better position to interrogate approximations that were implicit in earlier analysis of experimental data. A helpful aspect of our approach is that quantities that are encountered in the theoretical framework also have physical meaning in understanding the thermodynamics of hydration. On this basis, here we consider the hydration of an isoleucine residue in the context of extended and helical peptide models. Butane in the *gauche* conformation is used as a small-molecule analog of the isoleucine side-chain. We also use the conditional hydration of isoleucine in a pentapeptide modeled in an extended conformation as an alternative small molecule analog of the side-chain to predict the properties of isoleucine substituted helical peptides.

We find that using the *g*-butane model will cause one to overestimate the hydrophobicity of the isoleucine side-chain in the peptide models. Further, group additivity fails to describe quantitatively the hydration free energy to better than 1 kcal/mole and at times even the sign of the excess enthalpy and excess entropy of hydration are incorrectly predicted. Importantly, even in cases where the disagreement between the group-additivity-based result and direct calculations may seem small, the small magnitude of error is seen to arise at the expense of fidelity to the underlying physics.

II. THEORY

We use the quasichemical organization of the potential distribution theorem to calculate μ^{ex} , the hydration free energy of the solute. (μ^{ex} is referenced relative to the ideal gas at the same density and temperature and is that part of the free energy that would vanish if all intermolecular interactions were neglected.) Since this approach has been well-documented before (17, 19, 22-24), we present only a brief description here. Within the

quasichemical approach, the free energy is written as

$$\beta\mu^{\text{ex}} = \underbrace{\ln x_0[\phi_\lambda]}_{\text{local chemistry}} - \underbrace{\ln p_0[\phi_\lambda]}_{\text{packing}} + \underbrace{\beta\mu^{\text{ex}}[P(\varepsilon|\phi_\lambda)]}_{\text{long-range or outer}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$, with T the temperature and k_B the Boltzmann constant, and ϕ_λ is the external field that is introduced to modulate solute-solvent interactions (17, 19). $P(\varepsilon|\phi_\lambda)$ is the solute-solvent binding energy distribution in the presence of the field. Fig. 1 presents a schematic of the decomposition of μ^{ex} according to Eq. 2.




FIG. 1. Schematic depicting the quasichemical organization, Eq. 2). Schematic reproduced from Ref. 17 with permission from Elsevier.

The chemistry and packing contributions defined in Eq. 2 also have an alternate physical interpretation. For example, $-\ln x_0[\phi_\lambda] = \ln\left(1 + \sum_{i \geq 1} K_i[\phi_\lambda] \rho_w^i\right)$, where i -water molecules (from the bulk at a density ρ_w) are sequestered within the inner-shell and the equilibrium constant for forming the solute plus i -water (physical) cluster is K_i (22–25). A similar expansion, with an equilibrium constant \tilde{K}_i , obtained in the absence of the solute, applies to the packing contribution. The description of the chemistry and packing contributions in terms of chemical equilibria also leads to the appellation ‘quasichemical’ in the theory. The quasichemical perspective also helps emphasize in a physical way the constraints imposed by the additivity assumption: additivity requires that the equilibrium constant for forming a solute-solvent cluster (for any i -water cluster) be independent of the how solvent interacts with all other groups comprising the molecule (17).

By design $P(\varepsilon|\phi_\lambda)$ is Gaussian distributed and in this case, the long-range contribution is given by

$$\mu^{\text{ex}}[P(\varepsilon|\phi_\lambda)] = \langle \varepsilon|\phi_\lambda \rangle + \frac{\beta}{2} \langle \delta\varepsilon^2|\phi_\lambda \rangle. \quad (3)$$

This contribution can also be rewritten to show the interdependence in the interaction of the solvent with different sites comprising the solute. We do not pursue that aspect here, and instead refer the reader to the earlier work for further details (17).

The excess entropy of hydration of the solute is given by

$$Ts_\alpha^{\text{ex}} \approx E_\alpha^{\text{ex}} - \mu_\alpha^{\text{ex}} \quad (4)$$

where E^{ex} , the excess energy of hydration, is essentially equal to the excess enthalpy (h^{ex}) of hydration. The above equation ignores small corrections due to a finite excess volume of hydration and corrections arising from the thermal expansion coefficient and the isothermal compressibility of the pure liquid.

III. METHODS

The simulation procedure closely follows our earlier work (17). For brevity only important differences are noted here. The pentapeptides GGGGG, GGIGG, and IGGGG are modeled in the extended configuration with the long axis aligned with the diagonal of the simulation cell and the center of the peptide placed at the center of the simulation cell. Helical deca-glycine (G₉G) and a helical peptide with nine alanine and one glycine residues (A₉G) served as the reference for the helical peptides, G₉I and A₉I, respectively. In the helical peptides, isoleucine was substituted at position 6, roughly in the center of the peptide. Butane in the *gauche* conformation was built using the isoleucine conformation in the extended pentapeptide.

The G₉G and A₉G peptides were built from a helical deca-alanine (structure kindly provided by Gillian Lynch) (26). These structures were extensively energy minimized with weak restraints on heavy atoms to prevent fraying of the helix. The G₉I and A₉I helices were built by appropriately grafting the conformation of isoleucine in the GGIGG system onto position 6. (Thus we ensure that the internal conformation of the isoleucine is the same in both *g*-butane, GGIGG, and the helical peptides.) All peptides had an acetylated (ACE) N-terminus and an n-methyl-amide (NME) C-terminus.

The peptide atoms are held fixed throughout the simulation. The solvent was modeled by the TIP3P (27, 28) model and the CHARMM (29) forcefield with correction terms for dihedral angles (30) was used for the peptide. A total of 2006 TIP3P molecules solvated the pentapeptide; 3500 water molecules were used for studies with helical peptides.

The conditional hydration free energy of isoleucine in GGIGG relative to the model GGGGG is defined by $\mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{I}|\text{GGIGG}] = \mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{GGIGG}] - \mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{GGGGG}]$ (14). Similar definitions apply to the excess enthalpy and entropy of hydration and to isoleucine in context of other reference systems. In experiments it is often the case that the hydration thermodynamics of the GXG tripeptide is compared with the GGG peptide to ascertain the contribution of X alone. The zwitterionic amino acid X alone is not used primarily to minimize end-effects. By this yardstick, we should expect the GGIGG peptide constrained to be in the extended conformation to be an even more

conservative model to ascertain the contribution of the isoleucine side-chain. Capping the ends with ACE and NME further serves to dampen end-effects arising from long-range electrostatic interactions.

The free energy calculations and error analysis exactly follow the procedure described earlier (17). The excess energy (or excess enthalpy) was obtained by adapting the shell-wise calculation procedure we used earlier for studying the hydration of methane (31). For the peptides, water molecules in the first two hydration shells were considered, where the hydration shell is defined by the union of shells of radius λ centered on the heavy atoms. For ease, $\lambda \leq 5$ Å defined the first shell, $5.0 < \lambda \leq 8$ Å defined the second shell, and $8.0 < \lambda \leq 11.0$ Å defined the third shell. We find that the excess energy contributions from the third shell is close to zero, justifying our use of just the first two shells for calculating h^{ex} . For calculating the excess energy we equilibrated the solvated peptide system an additional 1.5 ns (beyond what was used in the free energy calculation), and the propagated the trajectory for an additional 3 ns, collecting data every 500 ps for a total of 6000 frames. Further details on the entropy calculations will be described separately (Tomar, Weber, Asthagiri; in preparation).

In experiments, when conditional or small molecule thermodynamic quantities are used in reconstructing the free energy of a macromolecule, one often scales these quantities by the solvent-exposure in the macromolecule. We follow this logic and find solvent accessible surface area (SASA) using a standard code (32) and Bondi radii (33). The area-scaled group-additive estimate of the free energy of the solute S is given by

$$\mu_S^{\text{ex}} = \alpha_{sc} \cdot \mu_{sc\text{-model}}^{\text{ex}} + \alpha_{back} \cdot \mu_{\text{ref}}^{\text{ex}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\mu_{sc\text{-model}}^{\text{ex}}$ can refer to either the conditional solvation of isoleucine or the g -butane model, and $\mu_{\text{ref}}^{\text{ex}}$ is the hydration free energy of the appropriate reference. α_{sc} and α_{back} are, respectively, the fractional solvent exposure of the side-chain and the fractional solvent exposure of the reference model in S . As an example of this procedure, to find the group-additive free energy of the G₉I helix using the conditional hydration of isoleucine in the GGIGG peptide, we compute the SASA of G₉I, A_t , and identify the contribution due to the side-chain alone, A_{sc} . The contribution of the rest of the peptide is then $A_{back} = A_t - A_{sc}$. We likewise find the SASA of isoleucine in the reference GGIGG, A_{sc}^0 , and of the G₉G peptide, A_{back}^0 . Then the group-additive free energy of G₉I is given by $\mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{G}_9\text{I}] = \alpha_{sc} \cdot \mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{I}[\text{GGIGG}]] + \alpha_{back} \cdot \mu^{\text{ex}}[\text{G}_9\text{G}]$, with $\alpha_{sc} = A_{sc}/A_{sc}^0$ and $\alpha_{back} = A_{back}/A_{back}^0$.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Conditional hydration of isoleucine

1. Pentapeptide model

Table I summarizes the results on the conditional hydration of isoleucine in the GGIGG and GGGGG pentapeptides. For reference we also show the value expected from g -butane.

Table I shows that at the resolution of the calculation the excess free energy of GGIGG and IGGGG are different. Thus it is not surprising that the conditional free energy of isoleucine will depend on where it is placed along the backbone. More importantly, it is the comparison of the conditional contribution with hydration of g -butane that is surprising. Even after correcting the free energy components of g -butane to account for the fractional exposure of the isoleucine side-chain in the pentapeptide, we notice rather large differences in the conditional free energy components and those of g -butane, appropriately scaled by the fractional surface exposure of the side-chain in the peptides. Notice that water molecules cluster more favorably around g -butane than around the side-chain in the pentapeptide. Likewise, the work required to open a cavity to accommodate g -butane in the bulk is much more than that required in the context of the peptide. Similarly, there are large deviations in the long-range interaction contributions. Thus the physics of g -butane hydration is largely inutile if one seeks to understand the conditional hydration of the isoleucine side-chain. This despite the fact that the net free energy deviates by much less, 2.9 kcal/mol versus 1.5 kcal/mol for GGIGG and 2.1 kcal/mol versus 1.5 kcal/mol for IGGGG.

2. Helical peptide model

Table II summarizes the results on the conditional hydration of isoleucine in a G₉I and A₉I.

Comparing G₉G and A₉G clearly highlights the importance of the background in assessing hydration thermodynamics of amino acid side-chains. The G₉G model is more polar relative to the A₉G model and hence the work required to open a cavity near the helix face to accommodate the isoleucine is nearly 2 kcal/mol higher in G₉G than A₉G. For the same reason, clustering of water molecules is more favorable around the side-chain in the G₉G framework than in A₉G. Interesting, these trends largely balance and the net conditional free energy of isoleucine is different by only 0.5 kcal/mol (with the uncertainty in the calculation itself being about ± 1 kcal/mol) between the two helical models. As was found for the pentapeptide system, the free energy components for g -butane are again very different from the conditional quantities, with the local chemical contribution being significantly underestimated and the packing

contribution being significantly overestimated.

If we identify primitive hydrophobic effects with the packing contribution (34, 35), from both the pentapeptide system and the helical models we can immediately conclude that using *g*-butane to model isoleucine would cause one to *overestimate* the hydrophobicity of isoleucine significantly and by extension amplify its presumed role in protein folding thermodynamics. This possibility was already suggested by Ben-Naim (14). Here we expand on this view with data on realistic model systems.

B. Reconstructing the free energy using an additive approach

In Table III we summarize results of reconstructing the free energy of the GGIGG and IGGGG peptides using as reference the GGGGG peptide and *g*-butane. Notice that our approach is in contrast to the usual process of decomposing a protein into many small fragments; as has been well-documented before (cf. section S.V in Ref. 17), having a fragment that spans a larger length-scale (such as GGGGG) is expected to lead to a better additive model. Table III shows that additivity fails even in such a favorable situation.

Observe that the predicted free energy of GGIGG deviates from the simulated result by only about 1.7 kcal/mol, but this relatively small number again arises due to two compensating terms, a positive deviation in the packing (or hydrophobicity) contribution and a negative deviation in the long-range contribution to free energy. Similarly, there are large compensating deviations in the excess enthalpy and the excess entropy. Similar comments apply to the additive description of the hydration thermodynamics of IGGGG.

Finally, just as experimentalists do for real proteins, we attempted to reconstruct the free energy of the helical peptides using the conditional hydration free energy of isoleucine in the GGIGG model instead of the values for *g*-butane. Table IV summarizes the results of this attempt. It is again evident that the reconstructed free energy of the helices deviate from the simulated values by at least about 1.5 kcal/mole, and the small net deviation results from large compensating deviations in the pre-

dicted chemical, packing, and long-range contribution. For both G₉I and A₉I, the magnitude of the minimum error is set by the errors in the long-range contribution to hydration. A little reflection suggests that trying to model this term by scaling based on surface areas can never work, because the surface area scaling is effectively a local construct, whereas the long-range interactions, as the name indicates, involves interaction of the group with the entire solvent bath.

V. CONCLUDING DISCUSSIONS

There are two main conclusions that emerge from this work. First, the conditional solvation of an amino acid in a peptide model is rather different from the solvation of the corresponding amino acid side-chain in bulk solvent. This point has already been emphasized by Ben-Naim. What we show here is that assuming a non-polar solute (*g*-butane) models the side-chain of isoleucine one would ascribe to the isoleucine residue a greater hydrophobicity than is warranted. We anticipate that even the temperature dependencies of the conditional packing contribution to be rather different from the packing contribution for the nonpolar solute (Tomar, Weber, Asthagiri; in preparation). On this basis serious doubts are raised about drawing conclusions about the presumed dominance of hydrophobic hydration in protein folding based on small molecule hydration.

The second conclusion that emerges from this work is that an additive description of free energy has serious limitations. Even if the net deviation in the predicted free energy is small, this small net result is seen to arise due to large errors in physically meaningful components of the hydration free energy. Thus, it is likely that any success of the additive approach arises primarily due to compensating failures in describing the underlying physics.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Arieh Ben-Naim for helpful comments on the manuscript. This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231.

-
- [1] Kauzmann, W., 1959. Some factors in the interpretation of protein denaturation. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 14:1–63.
 - [2] Tanford, C., 1962. Contribution of hydrophobic interactions to the stability of the globular conformation of proteins. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 84:4240–4247.
 - [3] Nozaki, Y., and C. Tanford, 1963. The solubility of amino acids and related compounds in aqueous urea solutions. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 238:4074–4081.
 - [4] Tanford, C., 1964. Isothermal unfolding of globular proteins in aqueous urea solutions. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 86:2050–2059.
 - [5] Tanford, C., 1970. Protein denaturation. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 24:1–95.
 - [6] Makhatadze, G. I., and P. L. Privalov, 1993. Contribution of hydration to protein folding thermodynamics: I. The enthalpy of hydration. *J. Mol. Biol.* 232:639–659.
 - [7] Privalov, P. L., and G. I. Makhatadze, 1993. Contribution of hydration to protein folding thermodynamics: II. The entropy and Gibbs energy of hydration. *J. Mol. Biol.* 232:660–679.

- [8] Makhatadze, G. I., and P. L. Privalov, 1995. Energetics of protein structure. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 47:307–425.
- [9] Auton, M., J. Rösger, . . . , and D. W. Bolen, 2011. Osmolyte effects on protein stability and solubility: A balancing act between backbone and side-chains. *Biophys. Chem.* 159:90–99.
- [10] Auton, M., L. M. F. Holthausen, and D. W. Bolen, 2007. Anatomy of energetic changes accompanying urea-induced protein denaturation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sc. USA* 104:15317–15322.
- [11] Auton, M., and D. W. Bolen, 2005. Predicting the energetics of osmolyte-induced protein folding/unfolding. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sc. USA* 102:15065–15068.
- [12] Greene, R. F., and C. N. Pace, 1974. Urea and guanidine hydrochloride denaturation of ribonuclease, lysozyme, alpha-chymotrypsin, and beta-lactoglobulin. *J. Biol. Chem.* 249:5388–5393.
- [13] König, G., S. Bruckner, and S. Boresch, 2013. Absolute Hydration Free Energies of Blocked Amino Acids: Implications for Protein Solvation and Stability. *Biophys. J.* 104:453–462.
- [14] Ben-Naim, A., 2011. Molecular theory of water and aqueous solutions, volume 2: The role of water in protein folding and self-assembly and molecular recognition. World Scientific, Singapore.
- [15] Makhatadze, G. I., and P. L. Privalov, 1990. Heat capacity of proteins. I. Partial molar heat capacity of individual amino acid residues in aqueous solution: Hydration effect. *J. Mol. Biol.* 213:375–384.
- [16] Utiramerur, S., and M. E. Paulaitis, 2010. Cooperative hydrophobic/hydrophilic interactions in the hydration of dimethyl ether. *J. Chem. Phys.* 132:155102.
- [17] Tomar, D. S., V. Weber, and D. Asthagiri, 2013. Solvation free energy of the peptide group: its model dependence and implications for the additive transfer free energy model. *Biophys. J.* 105:1482–1490.
- [18] Dill, K. A., 1997. Additivity principles in biochemistry. *J. Biol. Chem.* 272:701–704.
- [19] Weber, V., and D. Asthagiri, 2012. Regularizing Binding Energy Distributions and the Hydration Free Energy of Protein Cytochrome C from All-Atom Simulations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* 8:3409–3415.
- [20] Staritzbichler, R., W. Gu, and V. Helms, 2005. Are Solvation Free Energies of Homogeneous Helical Peptides Additive? *J. Phys. Chem. B* 109:19000–19007.
- [21] König, G., and S. Boresch, 2009. Hydration free energies of amino acids: why side chain analog data are not enough. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 113:8967–8974.
- [22] Paulaitis, M. E., and L. R. Pratt, 2002. Hydration Theory for Molecular Biophysics. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 62:283–310.
- [23] Beck, T. L., M. E. Paulaitis, and L. R. Pratt, 2006. The potential distribution theorem and models of molecular solutions. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- [24] Pratt, L. R., and D. Asthagiri, 2007. Potential distribution methods and free energy models of molecular solutions. In C. Chipot, and A. Pohorille, editors, Free energy calculations: Theory and applications in chemistry and biology, Springer, Berlin, DE, volume 86 of *Springer series in Chemical Physics*, chapter 9, 323–351.
- [25] Merchant, S., and D. Asthagiri, 2009. Thermodynamically dominant hydration structures of aqueous ions. *J. Chem. Phys.* 130:195102.
- [26] Kokubo, H., C. Y. Hu, and B. M. Pettitt, 2011. Peptide conformational preferences in osmolyte solutions: Transfer free energies of decaalanine. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 133:1849–1858.
- [27] Jorgensen, W., J. Chandrasekhar, . . . , and M. L. Klein, 1983. Comparison of simple potential functions for simulating liquid water. *J. Chem. Phys.* 79:926–935.
- [28] Neria, E., S. Fischer, and M. Karplus, 1996. Simulation of activation free energies in molecular systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* 105:1902–1921.
- [29] MacKerell Jr., A. D., D. Bashford, . . . , and M. Karplus, 1998. All-Atom Empirical Potential for Molecular Modeling and Dynamics Studies of Proteins. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 102:3586–3616.
- [30] MacKerell Jr., A. D., M. Feig, and C. L. Brooks III, 2004. Extending the treatment of backbone energetics in protein force fields: Limitations of gas-phase quantum mechanics in reproducing protein conformational distributions in molecular dynamics simulations. *J. Comp. Chem.* 25:1400–1415.
- [31] Asthagiri, D., S. Merchant, and L. R. Pratt, 2008. Role of attractive methane-water interactions in the potential of mean force between methane molecules in water. *J. Chem. Phys.* 128:244512.
- [32] Sanner, M., A. J. Olson, and J. C. Spehner, 1996. Reduced surface: an efficient way to compute molecular surfaces. *Biopolymers* 38:305–320.
- [33] Bondi, A., 1964. van der Waals Volumes and Radii. *J. Phys. Chem.* 68:441–451.
- [34] Pratt, L. R., and A. Pohorille, 1992. Theory of hydrophobicity: transient cavities in molecular liquids. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sc. USA* 89:2995–2999.
- [35] Pratt, L. R., 2002. Molecular theory of hydrophobic effects: “She is too mean to have her name repeated.”. *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* 53:409–436.

TABLE I. Hydration thermodynamics of *g*-butane, GGGGG, and GGIGG. $k_B T \ln x$ is the chemical contribution and reports on the consequences of the attractive interaction between the solute and the solvent in the first hydration or inner-shell, here defined by the envelope obtained by the union of of 5 Å spheres centered on the heavy atoms. $-k_B T \ln p$ is the packing contribution measuring the work done to carve out the inner-shell in the absence of the solute. $\mu_{\text{outer}}^{\text{ex}}$ is the contribution from solute interactions with the solvent outside the inner-shell when the inner-shell is emptied of solvent. μ^{ex} is the net chemical potential, and h^{ex} and Ts^{ex} are its enthalpic and entropic components. $\alpha_{sc} = 0.619$ is the ratio of the solvent accessible surface area of the isoleucine side-chain in GGIGG to that for *g*-butane; $\alpha_{sc} = 0.616$ for IGGGG. All thermodynamic quantities are in units of kcal/mole.

	$k_B T \ln x$	$-k_B T \ln p$	$\mu_{\text{outer}}^{\text{ex}}$	μ^{ex}	h^{ex}	Ts^{ex}
<i>g</i> -Butane	-16.4 ± 0.1	24.0 ± 0.1	-5.1 ± 0.0	2.5 ± 0.1	-3.4 ± 0.5	-5.9
GGGGG	-85.8 ± 0.2	71.1 ± 0.2	-17.3 ± 0.1	-32.0 ± 0.3	-56.9 ± 1.4	-24.8
GGIGG	-88.2 ± 0.2	76.8 ± 0.2	-17.7 ± 0.1	-29.1 ± 0.3	-56.3 ± 1.4	-27.3
IGGGG	-88.0 ± 0.2	76.3 ± 0.2	-18.3 ± 0.1	-30.0 ± 0.3	-57.3 ± 1.8	-27.3
$\Delta[\text{GGIGG-GGGGG}]$	-2.4 ± 0.3	5.7 ± 0.3	-0.4 ± 0.1	2.9 ± 0.4	0.6 ± 2.0	-2.5
$\alpha_{sc} \cdot [g\text{-butane}]$	-10.2	14.9	-3.2	1.5	-2.1	-3.7
$\Delta[\text{IGGGG-GGGGG}]$	-2.2 ± 0.3	5.2 ± 0.3	-0.9 ± 0.1	2.1 ± 0.4	-0.5 ± 2.0	-2.6
$\alpha_{sc} \cdot [g\text{-butane}]$	-10.1	14.8	-3.1	1.5	-2.1	-3.7

TABLE II. Conditional hydration of isoleucine in deca-peptide models. (Gly)₁₀ (indicated as G₉G), (Gly)₉-ILE (indicated as G₉I), (Ala)₉Gly (indicated as A₉G), and (Ala)₉-ILE (indicated as A₉I) are in the helical conformation. Substitutions with isoleucine are in position 6. The fractional solvent exposure of isoleucine in G₉I is $\alpha_{sc} = 0.59$ and in A₉I it is $\alpha_{sc} = 0.56$. Rest as in Table I.

	$k_B T \ln x$	$-k_B T \ln p$	$\mu_{\text{outer}}^{\text{ex}}$	μ^{ex}
G ₉ G	-95.1 ± 0.3	78.0 ± 0.7	-32.2 ± 0.2	-49.3
G ₉ I	-97.3 ± 0.2	83.7 ± 0.5	-32.0 ± 0.6	-45.6
$\Delta[\text{G}_9\text{I} - \text{G}_9\text{G}]$	-2.2 ± 0.4	5.7 ± 0.9	0.2 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 1.2
$\alpha_{sc} \cdot [g\text{-butane}]$	-9.7	14.2	-3.0	1.5
A ₉ G	-95.1 ± 0.2	86.7 ± 0.7	-30.2 ± 0.5	-38.6
A ₉ I	-95.8 ± 0.2	90.7 ± 0.6	-30.3 ± 0.5	-35.4
$\Delta[\text{A}_9\text{I} - \text{A}_9\text{G}]$	-0.7 ± 0.3	4.0 ± 0.9	-0.1 ± 0.7	3.2 ± 1.2
$\alpha_{sc} \cdot [g\text{-butane}]$	-9.2	13.4	-2.9	1.3

TABLE III. Predicted thermodynamics of GGIGG and IGGGG peptides using Eq. 5, with GGGGG the reference and *g*-butane the side-chain model. Δ is the error in predicted value (indicated with the subscript A) relative to the simulated value. α_{sc} is the fractional solvent exposure of the side-chain relative to *g*-butane and α_{back} is the fractional solvent exposure of the backbone relative to GGGGG. For GGIGG $\alpha_{sc} = 0.619$ and $\alpha_{back} = 0.904$. The fractional exposures for IGGGG are nearly the same, and hence the predicted values GGIGG and IGGGG are insensitive to the location of the isoleucine residue. The simulated values of GGIGG are reproduced from Table I. All values are in kcal/mole.

	$k_B T \ln x$	$-k_B T \ln p$	$\mu_{\text{outer}}^{\text{ex}}$	μ^{ex}	h^{ex}	Ts^{ex}
GGIGG	-88.2	76.8	-17.7	-29.1	-56.3	-27.3
GGIGG _A	-87.7	79.1	-18.8	-27.4	-53.5	-26.1
Δ	0.5	2.3	-1.1	1.7	2.8	1.2
IGGGG	-88.0	76.3	-18.3	-30.0	-57.3	-27.3
Δ	0.3	2.8	-0.5	2.6	3.8	1.2

TABLE IV. Predicted thermodynamics of G₉I and A₉I helical peptides using Eq. 5, with the conditional hydration contribution of isoleucine modeling the side-chain and G₉G or A₉G the reference peptide. α_{sc} is the fractional solvent exposure of the side-chain in the helical system relative to its exposure in GGIGG. α_{back} is fractional exposure of the non-isoleucine parts of G₉I or A₉I relative to the appropriate reference. Δ is the error in the predicted value relative to the simulated value. The simulated values of G₉I and A₉I are reproduced from Table II. Rest as in Table III.

	$k_B T \ln x$	$-k_B T \ln p$	$\mu_{\text{outer}}^{\text{ex}}$	μ^{ex}
G ₉ I	-97.3	83.7	-32.0	-45.6
[G ₉ I] _A	-90.3	77.6	-30.2	-42.9
Δ	7.0	-6.1	1.8	2.8
A ₉ I	-95.8	90.7	-30.3	-35.4
[A ₉ I] _A	-91.5	86.5	-28.7	-33.7
Δ	4.3	-4.2	1.6	1.7