

Long-Range Interactions Dominate the Inverse-Temperature Dependence of Polypeptide Hydration Free Energies

Dheeraj S. Tomar

*Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21208 and
Akrevia Therapeutics, Cambridge, MA*

Michael E. Paulaitis

Center for Nanomedicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD 21205

Lawrence R. Pratt

Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118

D. Asthagiri*

*Sealy Center for Structural Biology and Molecular Biophysics,
University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, TX 77555 and*

Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Rice University, Houston, TX 77005

(Dated: July 28, 2022)

Direct, all-atom calculations of the free energy of hydration of aqueous deca-alanine structures — holistically including backbone and side-chain interactions together — show that attractive interactions and the thermal expansion of the solvent explain the inverse temperature signatures that have been interpreted traditionally in favor of hydrophobic mechanisms for stabilizing the structure and function of soluble proteins.

Keywords: polypeptide hydration free energies — long-range interactions — inverse temperature dependence

I. SIGNIFICANCE STATEMENT

Solution environments of soluble proteins are intrinsic to the thermodynamic stability of those aqueous macromolecular species. Only recently has molecular theory and simulation progressed to the stage that hydration free energies of soluble proteins can be evaluated holistically, including peptide background moieties at the same level as side-chain groups. The new results provide surprising insight into inverse temperature dependences that have been implicated in cold denaturation of these structures. Thus, these results should change our qualitative appreciation of the solution influence on the stability and function of biomolecular structures.

II. INTRODUCTION

Solution environments of soluble proteins are intrinsic to the thermodynamic stability of those macromolecular structures. Typically, a protein is divided into hydrophilic and hydrophobic moieties, then characteristic hydration free energy contributions are assigned, and assembled additively, to rationalize their solution structure, stability, and function. The hydrophilic/hydrophobic assignment is often somewhat arbitrary. But distinctive temperature dependences — so-called inverse temperature dependences [1] — that are

characteristic of hydrophobic free energies support the hydrophilic/hydrophobic dichotomy. Strengthening of hydrophobic stabilization with increasing temperature in a physiological range is a simple example of inverse temperature behavior, and viewed in the decreasing temperature direction rationalizes cold denaturation [2].

Nevertheless, Klotz pointed-out some time ago [3] that inverse temperature behavior can be observed in aqueous chemical equilibria such as simple carboxylic acid dissociation involving highly hydrophilic species. Knowledge of the hydration thermodynamics of small molecule analogues of groups comprising the protein indeed do frame views of the dominant forces in protein folding [4, 5]. Though molecular simulations have played a decisive role in filling-out this knowledge, calculating the hydration thermodynamics of a protein holistically at the level that is possible for, say, CH_4 has remained unaddressed. With developments in the molecular quasi-chemical theory [6–10] of solutions and the associated simulation implementation [11, 12], this situation has changed [13]. Refinements in the simulation methodology [14, 15] have made it possible to interrogate the thermodynamics of macromolecules at a level that has only been undertaken for small solutes [16–18]. Here we bring those tools to bear on the temperature dependence of the hydration thermodynamics of a polypeptide, thus characterizing the thermodynamic forces driving protein folding.

We study the hydration thermodynamics of the deca-alanine polypeptide in helical and an extended coil conformation. The coil conformation, labeled C_0 , has the least negative hydration free energy of the coil states studied earlier [16], bounding the free energy of the un-

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: dna6@rice.edu

folded ensemble from above [17]. We also study the thermodynamics of a pair of helices in contact. The helix pair serves as a model of protein tertiary structure. The long axis of the helices are parallel, and the helix macrodipoles are either anti-parallel, as might occur in a helix-turn-helix motif, or parallel, as might occur in a helix bundle. (In nature helices are not perfectly aligned, but this issue is secondary to the questions studied here.) We also contrast the studies on the deca-alanine with the hydration of CH_4 , the small-molecule analogue of the alanine side-chain.

Our results for hydration of the poly-alanine peptides show that the sign of the partial molar excess entropy, $s^{(\text{ex})}$, and the partial molar heat capacity, $c_p^{(\text{ex})}$, are just as found for CH_4 . In the disassembly of the helix-pair, for example, although we recover the well-known $\Delta c_p^{(\text{ex})} > 0$ observed in protein unfolding, this signature reflects the weakening of the effective protein-solvent attractive interactions. In a curious twist, the thermal expansion of the water matrix, implicated in hydrophobic interactions [19–21], also plays an important role in the temperature signatures in the protein models.

III. THEORY

The calculation of $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ and its entropic $Ts^{(\text{ex})}$ and enthalpic $h^{(\text{ex})}$ contributions follows earlier work [14–18]. Briefly [8, 9, 22], the excess chemical potential is given by $\beta\mu^{(\text{ex})} = \ln\langle e^{\beta\varepsilon} \rangle$, averaging ε over the binding energy distribution $P(\varepsilon)$. As usual, $\beta = 1/k_{\text{B}}T$, with T the temperature and k_{B} the Boltzmann constant. We regularize [10, 23] the calculation of $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ by introducing an auxiliary field $\phi(r; \lambda)$ that moves the solvent away from the solute, thereby tempering the solute-solvent binding energy. The conditional distribution $P(\varepsilon|\phi)$ is better characterized than $P(\varepsilon)$, and in calculations we adjust λ , the range of the field, to control approximation of $P(\varepsilon|\phi)$ as a Gaussian distribution.

With the introduction of the field [13–16]

$$\beta\mu^{(\text{ex})} = \underbrace{-\ln p_0[\phi]}_{\text{packing}} + \underbrace{\beta\mu^{(\text{ex})}[P(\varepsilon|\phi)]}_{\text{long-range}} + \underbrace{\ln x_0[\phi]}_{\text{chemistry}}, \quad (1)$$

the quasi-chemical [24] organization of the potential distribution theorem [7–9]. The individual contributions are functionals of the auxiliary field, as indicated. The packing and chemistry contributions are the proximal solvent contributions that are added back to the long-range, regularized problem to complete the calculation. Fig. 1 provides a schematic description of Eq. 1.

The packing contribution measures the free energy to create a cavity to accommodate the solute and describes primitive hydrophobic effects [25, 26], *i.e.*, hydration of an ideal hydrophobe. The chemistry contribution captures the role of solute attractive interactions with solvent in the hydration layer within a distance λ from the




FIG. 1. Quasi-chemical organization of the excess chemical potential. The inner-shell of width $\lambda_{\text{G}} = 5 \text{ \AA}$ is the smallest region enclosing the solute for which the solute-solvent binding energy distribution $P(\varepsilon|\phi)$ is accurately Gaussian. It approximately corresponds to the traditional first solvation shell of the solute. The shell of width $\lambda_{\text{SE}} \leq 3.0 \text{ \AA}$ is the envelope for which the chemistry contribution is zero, and thus encloses the volume excluded to the solvent.

center of the nearest heavy atom. The long-range contribution is the free energy of interaction between the solute and the solvent when solvent is excluded from the hydration layer. The chemistry plus long-range contribution describes the total hydrophilic contribution to hydration.

The packing and chemistry contributions in these calculations are based on a soft-cavity [12, 27]. We find that $\lambda \approx 5 \text{ \AA}$ ensures that the conditional binding energy distribution is Gaussian to a good approximation. We denote this range as λ_{G} . The largest value of λ , labeled λ_{SE} , for which the chemistry contribution is negligible has a special meaning. It bounds the domain excluded to the solvent. We find $\lambda_{\text{SE}} \approx 3 \text{ \AA}$, and emphasize that for the given forcefield and solute geometry, this surface is substantially unambiguous. With this choice, Eq. 1 can be rearranged as,

$$\beta\mu^{(\text{ex})} = \underbrace{-\ln p_0(\lambda_{\text{SE}})}_{\text{solvent exclusion}} + \underbrace{\beta\mu^{(\text{ex})}[P(\varepsilon|\lambda_{\text{G}})]}_{\text{long-range}} + \underbrace{\ln \left[x_0(\lambda_{\text{G}}) \left(\frac{p_0(\lambda_{\text{SE}})}{p_0(\lambda_{\text{G}})} \right) \right]}_{\text{revised chemistry}}. \quad (2)$$

In Eq. 2 the various contributions are identified by the range parameter. Thus, for example, $x_0(\lambda_{\text{G}}) \equiv x_0[\phi(\lambda_{\text{G}})]$. The revised chemistry term has the following physical meaning. It is the work done to move the solvent interface a distance λ_{G} away from the solute relative to the case when the only role played by the solute is to exclude solvent up to λ_{SE} . This term highlights the role of *short-range* solute-solvent attractive interactions on hydration. Interestingly, the range between $\lambda_{\text{SE}} = 3 \text{ \AA}$ and $\lambda_{\text{G}} = 5 \text{ \AA}$ corresponds to the first hydration shell for a methane carbon [23] and is an approximate descriptor of the first hydration shell of groups containing nitrogen and oxygen heavy atoms.

The excess entropy of hydration is given by [15]

$$Ts^{(\text{ex})} = E^{(\text{ex})} - kT^2\alpha_p + p \left(\left\langle V^{(\text{ex})} \right\rangle + kT\kappa_T \right) - \mu^{(\text{ex})} \\ \approx E_{\text{sw}} + E_{\text{reorg}} - \mu^{(\text{ex})} \quad (3)$$

where κ_T is the isothermal compressibility of the solvent, α_p is the thermal expansivity of the solvent, and $\langle V^{(\text{ex})} \rangle$ is the excess volume of hydration, and in writing the second line of the equation, we have ignored the small contribution from all these terms. The average excess energy of hydration, $E^{(\text{ex})}$, is the sum of the average solute-water interaction energy E_{sw} and E_{reorg} , the reorganization energy. Ignoring pressure-volume effects, the excess enthalpy of hydration $h^{(\text{ex})} = E^{(\text{ex})}$.

RESULTS

Hydration of Methane

For CH_4 (Fig. 2), $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ and the individual contributions [(2)] increase with increasing temperature. The solvent exclusion contribution makes the largest numerical contribution to the net free energy followed by the revised chemistry contribution. These contributions are balanced by the long-range attractive contribution, which is favorable and thus an attractive contribution.

Allowing water to flood the previously empty quasi-chemical inner-shell (Fig. 1), should decrease the free energy due to favorable solute-solvent interactions. The (positive) sign of the revised chemistry contribution for methane suggests that in this case, however, the solvent is being pushed into unfavorable contact with the solute. In another words, the solvent matrix squeezes the hydrophobe, as suggested earlier [28–30].

The excess enthalpy of hydration $h^{(\text{ex})}$ has two contributions: (a) $h_{\text{sw}}^{(\text{ex})}$, arising from solute-water interactions and (b) h_{reorg} , arising from changes in the potential energy of the solvent matrix upon insertion of the solute in the solvent. The reorganization contribution is obtained using a hydration-shell-wise summation process [16, 23, 31–33]. For methane, this contribution converges within the first shell (Supporting Information, **SI**).

These calculations are internally consistent. The heat capacity at a given temperature can be obtained as either $c_p^{(\text{ex})} = (\partial h^{(\text{ex})} / \partial T)_{N,p}$ or $c_p^{(\text{ex})} = T(\partial s^{(\text{ex})} / \partial T)_{N,p}$. The first is $c_p^{(\text{ex})}[h^{(\text{ex})}]$ and the second is $c_p^{(\text{ex})}[s^{(\text{ex})}]$ (Fig. 2). These analyses assume that these quantities are constant over the temperature range considered here. Within statistical uncertainties these values are the same from both paths. $c_p^{(\text{ex})} \approx 31$ cal/mol-K, $h^{(\text{ex})} = -1.2$ kcal/mol, and $s^{(\text{ex})} = -12.1$ cal/mol-K are in fair agreement with the experimental values of about 49 cal/mol-K, -2.70 kcal/mol, and -16 cal/mol-K [34], respectively. Deficiencies of both the solute model and the water model impact the numerical agreement, of course; being consistent in these choices should lead to reliable physical conclusions. $s^{(\text{ex})}[T = 298.15 \text{ K}]$ obtained from a temperature derivative of $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ agrees with the value from (3), emphasizing the internal consistency of these calculations.

Hydration of helix and coil conformers

Moving to consider hydration of the helix and coil conformers (Fig. 3), note the internal consistency of those calculations. The comparatively large uncertainty in $c_p^{(\text{ex})}$ arises from h_{reorg} . The shell-wise calculation of the reorganization contribution considerably reduces the uncertainty relative to naive direct differencing of potential energies of the entire solvent bath with and without the solute. Still, it is difficult to reduce that uncertainty to what is possible for $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$. Comparisons based upon preliminary trials support the numerical accuracy of the evaluations of $h^{(\text{ex})}$, and hence $c_p^{(\text{ex})}$.

The free energy $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ increases with temperature as do the contributions from revised chemistry and long-range interactions. $\mu^{(\text{ex})} < 0$ (**SI**), in contrast with what is observed for CH_4 . The revised chemistry contribution is also negative (in contrast to CH_4), indicating that the flooding of the inner shell with solvent is accompanied by a lowering of the free energy of the solute. The long-range contribution is negative and increases with temperature, just as is found for CH_4 . The solvent exclusion contribution for the peptides decreases with increasing temperature, whereas it increases with increasing temperature for CH_4 . That is, the solvent exclusion contribution for a collection of repulsive cavities (with $\lambda = 3 \text{ \AA}$) of the shape of the peptide *does not* conform to the behavior expected for a single repulsive $\lambda = 3 \text{ \AA}$ cavity.

Examining the heat capacity data, we find that for the peptides used in this study, the backbone solvent contribution makes the largest contribution, whereas the reorganization contribution is smaller and similar in magnitude to the contribution from side-chain solvent interactions. This is in contrast to the behavior of CH_4 , where reorganization dominates solute-solvent interactions in $c_p^{(\text{ex})}$.

Hydration of the helix-pair

Fig. 4 collects the results on the hydration of the helix-pair in which the helices are aligned with the macrodipoles anti-parallel, as might be found in a helix-turn-helix motif. As before, the thermodynamic components emphasize the internal consistency of the data.

The trends in the data are similar to what one finds for the helix or coil conformers (Fig. 3). The decrease with increasing temperature of the solvent exclusion contribution is even more clearly displayed for the larger helix-pair complex. We can consider the heat capacity change in the disassembly of the helix-pair to a pair of isolated helices, a simple model of disassembly of protein complexes. The heat capacity change, $\Delta c_p^{(\text{ex})}$, in this process is 32 ± 128 cal/mol-K — we use the $c_p^{(\text{ex})}[h^{(\text{ex})}]$ values throughout. The uncertainty is necessarily high for reasons noted above, but focusing on the mean value, the *trends* suggest a positive contribution, just as was found




FIG. 2. Left panel: The hydration free energy of methane, following (2). With the expected opposition of long-range/attractive interactions to the other contributions, the unfavorable net hydration free energy (filled-pentagons) increases with increasing T , the classic hydrophobic inverse temperature behavior. Note that the difference between the unfavorable solvent exclusion contribution and the net hydration free energy decreases with increasing T , showing that long-range/attractive interactions dominate the inverse temperature behavior in this hydrophobic hydration phenomenon. Right panel: The entropic [crosses: $Ts^{(\text{ex})}$, (3)] and enthalpic [triangles: $h^{(\text{ex})}$] contributions. The filled pentagon is $Ts^{(\text{ex})}$ from the temperature derivative of $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$. Contributions from solute-solvent interaction $h_{\text{sw}}^{(\text{ex})}$ (red circles) and solvent reorganization h_{reorg} combine to give $h^{(\text{ex})}$. $-h_{\text{reorg}}$ is plotted to show all the data on the same plot. The several result-sets are identified by the heat capacity (in cal/mol-K) from the corresponding contribution. Error bars are $\pm\sigma$ standard error of the mean.




FIG. 3. As in Fig. 2 but relative to the $T = 282.15$ K value. $h_{\text{sw}}^{(\text{ex})} = h_{\text{BB}}^{(\text{ex})} + h_{\text{SC}}^{(\text{ex})}$, again relative to the value at 282.15 K, is presented separately in the rightmost panel. $h_{\text{BB}}^{(\text{ex})}$ is the contribution from backbone-solvent interaction and $h_{\text{SC}}^{(\text{ex})}$ is the contribution from side-chain solvent interaction. Top row: Helix. Bottom row: Coil.

in early studies on protein unfolding [35]. For the helix-pair→helix+helix reaction, -7 cal/mol-K is contributed from backbone solvent contributions, 7 cal/mol-K from side-chain solvent contributions, and the remainder from water reorganization contributions. Note that the small net $\Delta c_p^{(\text{ex})}$ comes from large compensating physical contributions, and the agreement of the net $\Delta c_p^{(\text{ex})}$ with the solvent reorganization contribution is fortuitous. Importantly, one cannot make general claims that the *sign* of $\Delta c_p^{(\text{ex})}$ is determined by the reorganization contribution (and hence with models relating to water structuring around hydrophobic groups).

It is well appreciated by now that attractive solute forces are exhibited differently in the context of hydrophobic interactions in contrast to hydrophobic hydration [1, 21, 23, 36].

The hydration of the peptide models clearly shows that the observed $c_p^{(\text{ex})} > 0$ and $s^{(\text{ex})} < 0$ arise from the attractive protein-solvent contributions to hydration and not from primitive hydrophobic contributions. What explains the weakening of the effective protein-solvent attraction with increasing temperature? We turn to this question next.

Expansion of the solvent matrix as a basis for understanding the temperature signatures

In the temperature range considered here, water expands upon heating. Consequently, the inner shell population decreases. The mean binding energy of the solute is well correlated with the number of water molecules in the inner-shell (Fig. 5). This effect is small for a small solute, but is amplified at the scale of the peptide. The mean binding energy of the solute with the solvent in the inner shell is weaker (or less favorable) at the higher temperature. The distribution of the binding energy for a given coordination (**SI**) supports this suggestion.

DISCUSSION

In the hydration of CH_4 , we find that $s^{(\text{ex})} < 0$ and $c_p^{(\text{ex})} > 0$. The negative entropy of hydration is often interpreted in terms of specific solvent iceberg structures. The positive $c_p^{(\text{ex})}$ is then interpreted as arising from the heat required to “melt” the “iceberg.”

The simple explanation for these signatures suggested by the present results follows from the gradual decrease in solvent population around the solute as the temperature is increased. Not only does the population decrease, but

for a given population of solvent around the solute, the attractive binding energy of the solvent with the solute becomes less favorable (Fig. 5) as does the interaction between solvent molecules (**SI**). These changes contribute, respectively, to the solute-solvent interaction part of the enthalpy and the reorganization term. This then leads to $c_p^{(\text{ex})} > 0$. Then the increasing $\mu^{(\text{ex})}$ with increasing temperature implies $s^{(\text{ex})} < 0$.

For the protein, in contrast to what is observed for CH_4 , the $s^{(\text{ex})} < 0$ and $c_p^{(\text{ex})} > 0$ signatures do not arise from the temperature dependence of the hydrophobic contribution. Thus, the present work shows that attractive protein solvent interactions play an important, even dominant, role in protein solution thermodynamics. Our work suggests the need to characterize backbone-solvent interactions, which contribute to the heat capacity of hydration. This extends to an explanation for cold denaturation: with decreasing temperature, the hydration of the unfolded state is preferred over the folded state because of the favorable hydration of the peptide backbone. Exploring this hypothesis further is left for future studies.

A. Methods: Molecular models

The simulation approach closely follows previous work [16]. The relevant simulation details are summarized in the Supporting Information. The deca-alanine peptide was modeled with an acetylated (ACE) N-terminus and n-methyl-amide (NME) capped C-terminus. The extended β -conformation ($\phi, \psi = -154 \pm 12, 149 \pm 9$) was aligned with the end-to-end vector along the diagonal of the simulation cell. The single helix and the helix-pair are aligned with the long axis along the x -axis of the cell. These structures were taken from our earlier work [16]. In the hydration calculation the molecules have a fixed conformation. The CH_4 group is constructed from the CH_3 side-chain of the alanine residue. Version C31 of the CHARMM [37] forcefield with correction(cmap) terms for dihedral angles [38] was used for the protein models and for CH_4 . Water molecules were described by the TIP3P [39, 40] designed for the CHARMM forcefield.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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. DA thanks Walter G. Chapman for helpful discussions and encouragement.

[1] Gao A, et al. (2018) Role of solute attractive forces in the atomic-scale theory of hydrophobic effects. *J. Phys.*




FIG. 4. As in Fig. 3, results for the hydration of the helix-pair with anti-parallel macro-dipoles.




FIG. 5. The conditional mean binding energy of the solute with the solvent in the inner-shell versus the occupation number n of the inner-shell. Inset: the probability distribution of coordination states $\{x_n\}$ versus n . Note that the x_0 member of this distribution gives the chemistry contribution [(1)]. Left panel: Data for CH_4 . Right panel: Data for the coil conformer.

- [2] Franks F, Hatley R, Friedman H (1988) The thermodynamics of protein stability: cold destabilization as a general phenomenon. *Biophys. Chem.* 31(3):307–315.
- [3] Klotz IM (1999) Parallel change with temperature of water structure and protein behavior. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 103(28):5910–5916.
- [4] Kauzmann W (1959) Some factors in the interpretation of protein denaturation. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 14:1–63.
- [5] Tanford C (1962) Contribution of hydrophobic interactions to the stability of the globular conformation of proteins. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 84:4240–4247.
- [6] Pratt LR, Rempe SB (1999) Quasi-chemical theory and implicit solvent models for simulations in *Simulation and theory of electrostatic interactions in solution*. *Computational chemistry, biophysics, and aqueous solutions*, AIP Conference Proceedings, eds. Pratt LR, Hummer G. (American Institute of Physics, Melville, NY) Vol. 492, pp. 172–201. dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.1301528.
- [7] Paulaitis ME, Pratt LR (2002) Hydration theory for molecular biophysics. *Adv. Prot. Chem.* 62:283–310.
- [8] Beck TL, Paulaitis ME, Pratt LR (2006) *The potential distribution theorem and models of molecular solutions*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK).
- [9] Pratt LR, Asthagiri D (2007) Potential distribution methods and free energy models of molecular solutions in *Free energy calculations: Theory and applications in chemistry and biology*, Springer series in Chemical Physics, eds. Chipot C, Pohorille A. (Springer, Berlin, DE) Vol. 86, pp. 323–351.
- [10] Merchant S (2011) Ph.D. thesis (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore).
- [11] Weber V, Asthagiri D (2010) Thermodynamics of water modeled using *Ab Initio* simulations. *J. Chem. Phys.* 133:141101.
- [12] Weber V, Merchant S, Asthagiri D (2011) Regularizing binding energy distributions and thermodynamics of hydration: Theory and application to water modeled with classical and *Ab Initio* simulations. *J. Chem. Phys.* 135:181101.
- [13] Weber V, Asthagiri D (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.

- [14] Tomar DS, Weber V, Asthagiri D (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.
- [15] Tomar DS, Weber V, Pettitt BM, Asthagiri D (2014) Conditional solvation thermodynamics of isoleucine in model peptides and the limitations of the group-transfer model. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 118:4080–4087.
- [16] Tomar DS, Weber V, Pettitt MB, Asthagiri D (2016) Importance of Hydrophilic Hydration and Intramolecular Interactions in the Thermodynamics of Helix-Coil Transition and Helix-Helix Assembly in a Deca-Alanine Peptide. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 120:69–76.
- [17] Asthagiri D, Karandur D, Tomar DS, Pettitt BM (2017) Intramolecular Interactions Overcome Hydration to Drive the Collapse Transition of Gly₁₅. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 121:8078–8084.
- [18] Tomar DS, Ramesh N, Asthagiri D (2018) Solvophobic and Solvophilic Contributions in the Water-To-Aqueous Guanidinium Chloride Transfer Free Energy of Model Peptides. *J. Chem. Phys.* 148:222822.
- [19] Pratt LR, Pohorille A, Asthagiri D (2007) What is special about water as a matrix of life? *arXiv preprint physics/0701282*.
- [20] Pohorille A, Pratt LR (2012) Is water the universal solvent for life? *Origins of Life and Evolution of Biospheres* 42(5):405–409.
- [21] Pratt LR, Chaudhari MI, Rempe SB (2016) Statistical analyses of hydrophobic interactions: a mini-review. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 120(27):6455–6460.
- [22] Widom B (1982) Potential-distribution theory and the statistical mechanics of fluids. *J. Phys. Chem.* 86:869–872.
- [23] Asthagiri D, Merchant S, Pratt LR (2008) Role of attractive methane-water interactions in the potential of mean force between methane molecules in water. *J. Chem. Phys.* 128:244512.
- [24] Asthagiri D, et al. (2010) Ion selectivity from local configurations of ligands in solution and ion channels. *Chem. Phys. Lett.* 485:1–7.
- [25] Pratt LR, Pohorille A (1992) Theory of hydrophobicity: Transient cavities in molecular liquids. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 89:2995–2999.
- [26] Pratt LR (2002) Molecular theory of hydrophobic effects: “She is too mean to have her name repeated”. *Ann. Rev. Phys. Chem.* 53:409–436.
- [27] Chempath S, Pratt LR, Paulaitis ME (2009) Quasi-chemical theory with a soft cutoff. *J. Chem. Phys.* 130(5):054113.
- [28] Richards FM (1991) The protein folding problem. *Scientific American* 264(1):54–65.
- [29] Pratt LR, Pohorille A (2002) Hydrophobic effects and modeling of biophysical aqueous solution interfaces. *Chem. Rev.* 102:2671–2692.
- [30] Asthagiri D, Ashbaugh HS, Piryatinski A, Paulaitis ME, Pratt LR (2007) Non-van der Waals treatment of the hydrophobic solubilities of CF₄. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 129(33):10133–10140.
- [31] Matubayasi N, Reed LH, Levy RM (1994) Thermodynamics of the Hydration Shell. 1. Excess Energy of a Hydrophobic Solute. *J. Phys. Chem.* 98:10640–10649.
- [32] Ashbaugh HS, Paulaitis ME (1996) Entropy of hydrophobic hydration: Extension to hydrophobic chains. *J. Phys. Chem.* 100:1900–1913.
- [33] Lazaridis T (2000) Solvent reorganization energy and entropy in hydrophobic hydration. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 104:4964–4979.
- [34] Cabani S, Gianni P (1979) Thermodynamic functions of hydration of saturated uncharged organic compounds. Free energies, enthalpies and entropies at 25°C. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans. 1* 75:1184–1195.
- [35] Privalov PL, Khechinashvili NN (1974) A Thermodynamic Approach to the Problem of Stabilization of Globular Protein Structure: A Calorimetric Study. *J. Mol. Biol.* 86:665–684.
- [36] Pratt LR, Chandler D (1980) Effects of solute-solvent attractive forces on hydrophobic correlations. *J. Chem. Phys.* 73:3434–3441.
- [37] MacKerell, Jr. AD, et al. (1998) All-atom empirical potential for molecular modeling and dynamics studies of proteins. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 102:3586–3616.
- [38] MacKerell Jr. AD, Feig M, Brooks III CL (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.
- [39] Jorgensen W, Chandrasekhar J, Madura JD, Impey RW, Klein ML (1983) Comparison of simple potential functions for simulating liquid water. *J. Chem. Phys.* 79:926–935.
- [40] Neria E, Fischer S, Karplus M (1996) Simulation of activation free energies in molecular systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* 105:1902–1921.

Supplemental text

Long-Range Interactions Dominate the Inverse-Temperature Dependence of Polypeptide Hydration Free Energies

Dheeraj S. Tomar,^{†,‡} Michael E. Paulaitis,[¶] Lawrence R. Pratt,[§] and D.
Asthagiri^{*,||}

[†]*Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, MD 21208*

[‡]*Current address: Akreva Therapeutics, Cambridge, MA*

[¶]*Center for Nanomedicine, Johns Hopkins School of Medicine,
Baltimore, MD 21205*

[§]*Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Tulane University,
New Orleans, LA 70118*

^{||}*Department of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering, Rice University,
Houston, TX 77005*

[⊥]*Sealy Center for Structural Biology and Molecular Biophysics, University of Texas
Medical Branch,
Galveston, TX 77555*

E-mail: dna6@rice.edu

S.1 Simulation Details

The calculation of the hydration free energy using the regularization procedure closely follows earlier studies.^{1,2} We refer the reader to the original articles for complete details. We briefly note the following.

The chemistry and packing contributions are calculated using thermodynamic integration. To build the field to its eventual range of $\lambda_G = 5 \text{ \AA}$, we progressively apply the field, and for every unit \AA increment in the range, we compute the work done in applying the field using a five-point Gauss-Legendre quadrature.³ At each Gauss-point, the system was simulated for t_{total} (time units) and the last t_{prod} (time units) used for accumulating data. Error analysis and error propagation was performed as before:⁴ the standard error of the mean force was obtained using the Friedberg-Cameron algorithm^{5,6} and in adding multiple quantities, the errors were propagated using standard variance-addition rules.

The starting configuration for each λ point is obtained from the ending configuration of the previous point in the chain of states. For the packing contribution, a total of 25 Gauss points span $\lambda \in [0, 5]$. For the chemistry contribution, since solvent never enters $\lambda < 2.9 \text{ \AA}$, conservatively we simulate $\lambda \in [2.5, 5]$ for a total of 13 Gauss points.

For CH_4 , the long-range contribution was obtained using the inverse form of the potential distribution theorem in the presence of the external field with range $\lambda_G = 5 \text{ \AA}$. In this case, from the end-point of the chemistry calculation, we create the system with $\lambda_G = 5 \text{ \AA}$. The system was simulated for a total $t_{lr,total}$ (time units) and solute-solvent interaction accumulated over $t_{lr,prod}$ (time units).

For the peptide models, the long-range contribution was obtained using the forward form of the potential distribution theorem in the presence of the external field with range $\lambda_G = 5 \text{ \AA}$. In this case, from the end-point of the packing calculation, we create the system with $\lambda_G = 5 \text{ \AA}$. The system was simulated for a total $t_{lr,total}$ (time units) and neat solvent frames archived over $t_{lr,prod}$ (time units). We then do test particle insertions in the neat solvent frame to obtain the solute-solvent binding energy distribution.

Specifics for each system is given below.

S.1.1 CH₄

The water box comprises 992 TIP3P^{7,8} water molecules. For the packing and chemistry calculations, at each λ , $t_{total} = 4$ ns and $t_{prod} = 3$ ns. Frames were archived every 100 fs for further analysis. For the long-range calculation, the system with $\lambda_G = 5$ Å was simulated for 5 ns and frames archived every 400 fs for analysis.

For the excess enthalpy and coordination number analysis, the well-equilibrated solute-solvent system (with no external field) was further simulated for 5 ns and frames archived every 200 fs for analysis.

S.1.2 Helix and coil conformers

As before¹ we used a box of 3500 TIP3P water molecules. For the packing and chemistry calculations, at each λ , $t_{total} = 1$ ns and $t_{prod} = 0.75$ ns. (We checked to ensure that neglecting more data does not perceptibly change the results.) Frames were archived every 50 fs for further analysis. (For the 298.15 K case alone, the simulations were repeated 4 times and the results averaged. We emphasize that the results from the four independent repeats were consistent within the statistical uncertainty of each run.) For the long-range calculation, the system with $\lambda_G = 5$ was simulated for $t_{lr,total} = 4$ ns. Data was accumulated over the last $t_{lr,prod} = 2$ ns, with frames saved every 500 fs. For temperatures except 298.15 K, this procedure was repeated twice. The resulting data was pooled together and analyzed as before.^{1,2} For the 298.15 K case, for the outer calculation we simulated for $t_{tr,total} = 11$ ns and accumulated data for $t_{lr,prod} = 10$ ns, with frames saved every 500 fs. This procedure was repeated twice and the results pooled and analyzed. We emphasize that the Gaussian description of shorter segments of the long 10 ns production in the 298.15 K case was in excellent agreement with the Gaussian description using all the data. This confirms the robustness of the Gaussian and shows that our choices for the other temperatures are still

very conservative.

For the excess enthalpy and coordination number analysis, the well-equilibrated solute-solvent system (with no external field) was simulated for 4 ns and frames archived every 200 fs for analysis.

S.1.3 Helix-pairs

For the helix-pairs, the chemistry and packing calculation was as for the isolated helix. For the long-range calculation, for the 298.15 K case, the system was equilibrated for 1 ns. Five independent 2 ns runs were performed and the data analyzed. For the rest of the temperatures, $t_{lr,total} = 11$ ns of which $t_{lr,prod} = 10$ ns was used for accumulating data. Frames were saved at the same rate as for the isolated helix.

For the excess enthalpy calculation, the well-equilibrated solute-solvent system (with no external field) was simulated for a total of 3 ns and the last 2.75 ns used for analysis. Frames were archived every 500 fs for a total of 5500 frames. Because of a factor of 3 less data (compared to the isolated protein case), the statistical uncertainties were correspondingly higher.

S.2 Reorganization energy by shells at 298.15 K

The calculation of the reorganization contribution follows the procedure exhaustively documented before.^{1,2} Please note that we define an inner-shell around the peptide as the union of shells of radius λ centered on the peptide heavy atoms. $\lambda \leq 5.5$ Å, $5.5 < \lambda \leq 8.5$ Å, and $8.5 < \lambda \leq 11.5$ Å defined the first, second, and third shells, respectively. For the reorganization calculation, the definition of the inner shell was slightly increased by 0.5 Å, but this change has no bearing on the final thermodynamic quantity $h^{(\text{ex})}$.




Figure S1: Convergence of reorganization energy as a function of the shells of water around the solute. For methane the reorganization contribution converges within the first shell, whereas we require the first two shells for the helix and coil conformers. The same holds true for the helix-pair.

S.3 Hydration of the helix-pair with helix macro-dipoles oriented in the parallel configuration.




Figure S2: As in Figure 4 (main text) for a helix-pair, but with helices in a parallel configuration in the helix pair.

S.4 Effect of expansion of the matrix




Figure S3: Variation of the energy of the water cluster in the inner shell. Please note that the cluster energy with the rest of the bulk solvent or the solute is not taken into consideration.




Figure S4: Figure showing the distribution of solute interaction with solvent in the inner shell for a defined coordination n of the inner shell. Observe that both the low energy tail and the high energy tails are affected by increase in temperature. This suggests that the solvent samples both the repulsive wall and the weaker attractive tail as temperature is increased.

S.5 Hydration of CH_4

Table S.I: Quasicomponents

Temperature	Solvent exclusion	Revised Chemistry	Long-range	$\mu^{(\text{ex})}$
282.15	2.47 ± 0.01	2.00 ± 0.05	-2.21 ± 0.003	2.26 ± 0.06
290.15	2.48 ± 0.01	1.98 ± 0.04	-2.18 ± 0.003	2.28 ± 0.04
298.15	2.49 ± 0.01	2.01 ± 0.05	-2.15 ± 0.003	2.35 ± 0.05
306.15	2.52 ± 0.01	2.06 ± 0.05	-2.13 ± 0.003	2.45 ± 0.05
314.15	2.53 ± 0.01	2.08 ± 0.04	-2.09 ± 0.003	2.52 ± 0.04

Table S.II: Thermodynamic components

Temperature	$h_{sw}^{(ex)}$	h_{reorg}	$h^{(ex)}$	$T_S^{(ex)}$
282.15	-3.39 ± 0.01	1.80 ± 0.30	-1.60 ± 0.30	-3.80 ± 0.30
290.15	-3.34 ± 0.01	2.00 ± 0.40	-1.40 ± 0.40	-3.60 ± 0.40
298.15	-3.30 ± 0.01	2.10 ± 0.40	-1.20 ± 0.40	-3.60 ± 0.40
306.15	-3.25 ± 0.01	2.50 ± 0.40	-0.80 ± 0.40	-3.20 ± 0.40
314.15	-3.21 ± 0.01	2.60 ± 0.30	-0.60 ± 0.30	-3.10 ± 0.30

S.6 Hydration of deca-alanine helix

Table S.III: Quasicomponents

Temperature	Solvent exclusion	Revised Chemistry	Long-range	$\mu^{(ex)}$
282.15	44.7 ± 0.5	-53.2 ± 0.7	-32.8 ± 0.2	-41.4 ± 0.6
290.15	45.3 ± 0.3	-52.9 ± 0.5	-32.1 ± 0.2	-39.7 ± 0.4
298.15	44.4 ± 0.4	-51.6 ± 0.6	-31.6 ± 0.1	-38.9 ± 0.5
306.15	44.2 ± 0.3	-51.1 ± 0.4	-30.9 ± 0.2	-37.8 ± 0.4
314.15	43.9 ± 0.3	-50.2 ± 0.4	-30.8 ± 0.2	-37.1 ± 0.4

Table S.IV: Thermodynamic components

Temperature	$h_{bb}^{(ex)}$	$h_{sc}^{(ex)}$	h_{reorg}	$h^{(ex)}$	$T_S^{(ex)}$
282.15	-129.0 ± 0.1	-26.10 ± 0.02	71.3 ± 1.8	-83.8 ± 1.8	-42.5 ± 1.9
290.15	-127.5 ± 0.1	-25.80 ± 0.02	72.7 ± 1.8	-80.6 ± 1.9	-40.9 ± 1.9
298.15	-125.9 ± 0.1	-25.30 ± 0.02	72.8 ± 1.3	-78.4 ± 1.3	-39.6 ± 1.4
306.15	-124.6 ± 0.1	-25.01 ± 0.03	72.7 ± 2.2	-76.9 ± 2.2	-39.1 ± 2.2
314.15	-123.2 ± 0.1	-24.60 ± 0.02	72.6 ± 2.0	-75.2 ± 2.0	-38.1 ± 2.0

S.7 Hydration of deca-alanine coil C_0

Table S.V: Quasicomponents

Temperature	Solvent exclusion	Revised Chemistry	Long-range	$\mu^{(ex)}$
282.15	58.4 ± 0.1	-79.0 ± 0.3	-28.8 ± 0.1	-49.4 ± 0.3
290.15	58.3 ± 0.2	-77.8 ± 0.4	-28.1 ± 0.1	-47.7 ± 0.4
298.15	58.4 ± 0.2	-77.0 ± 0.4	-27.5 ± 0.0	-46.1 ± 0.3
306.15	58.2 ± 0.2	-75.7 ± 0.4	-27.0 ± 0.1	-44.5 ± 0.3
314.15	57.3 ± 0.2	-74.8 ± 0.3	-26.2 ± 0.1	-43.7 ± 0.3

Table S.VI: Thermodynamic components

Temperature	$h_{bb}^{(ex)}$	$h_{sc}^{(ex)}$	h_{reorg}	$h^{(ex)}$	$Ts^{(ex)}$
282.15	-163.3 ± 0.1	-28.00 ± 0.02	88.5 ± 1.7	-102.8 ± 1.7	-53.5 ± 1.7
290.15	-161.6 ± 0.1	-27.60 ± 0.02	90.2 ± 1.7	-99.0 ± 1.8	-51.3 ± 1.8
298.15	-159.5 ± 0.2	-27.20 ± 0.02	87.1 ± 2.0	-99.6 ± 2.0	-53.5 ± 2.1
306.15	-157.6 ± 0.1	-26.90 ± 0.03	90.0 ± 2.1	-94.5 ± 2.1	-50.0 ± 2.1
314.15	-155.5 ± 0.2	-26.40 ± 0.02	90.3 ± 1.5	-91.6 ± 1.5	-47.9 ± 1.5

S.8 Hydration of helix pair with helix macro-dipoles in the antiparallel configuration

Table S.VII: Quasicomponents

Temperature	Solvent exclusion	Revised Chemistry	Long-range	$\mu^{(ex)}$
282.15	84.1 ± 0.6	-107.6 ± 0.9	-42.9 ± 0.2	-66.4 ± 0.7
290.15	83.9 ± 0.5	-106.8 ± 0.8	-41.7 ± 0.2	-64.6 ± 0.6
298.15	82.4 ± 0.9	-103.4 ± 1.3	-41.2 ± 0.4	-62.2 ± 1.0
306.15	81.3 ± 0.6	-101.6 ± 0.9	-40.7 ± 0.2	-61.0 ± 0.7
314.15	80.3 ± 0.6	-100.5 ± 0.9	-39.5 ± 0.2	-59.7 ± 0.7

Table S.VIII: Thermodynamic components

Temperature	$h_{bb}^{(ex)}$	$h_{sc}^{(ex)}$	h_{reorg}	$h^{(ex)}$	$T_S^{(ex)}$
282.15	-226.0 ± 0.4	-45.20 ± 0.04	134.9 ± 2.5	-136.3 ± 2.5	-69.9 ± 2.6
290.15	-222.8 ± 0.2	-44.40 ± 0.08	138.8 ± 3.3	-128.4 ± 3.3	-63.8 ± 3.4
298.15	-219.8 ± 0.2	-43.80 ± 0.07	136.4 ± 2.4	-127.2 ± 2.4	-65.0 ± 2.7
306.15	-216.9 ± 0.2	-43.10 ± 0.08	136.7 ± 3.7	-123.3 ± 3.7	-62.4 ± 3.8
314.15	-214.0 ± 0.3	-42.30 ± 0.05	136.6 ± 2.8	-119.7 ± 2.8	-60.0 ± 2.9

S.9 Hydration of helix pair with helix macro-dipoles in the parallel configuration

Table S.IX: Quasicomponents

Temperature	Solvent exclusion	Revised Chemistry	Long-range	$\mu^{(ex)}$
282.15	84.3 ± 0.9	-109.1 ± 1.2	-62.7 ± 0.4	-87.5 ± 1.0
290.15	83.2 ± 0.6	-107.4 ± 0.9	-61.1 ± 0.4	-85.3 ± 0.8
298.15	82.0 ± 0.8	-105.8 ± 1.1	-60.1 ± 0.8	-83.9 ± 1.1
306.15	81.5 ± 0.9	-104.1 ± 1.4	-58.4 ± 0.3	-81.0 ± 1.0
314.15	80.8 ± 0.6	-102.4 ± 0.9	-58.5 ± 0.4	-80.1 ± 0.8

Table S.X: Thermodynamic components

Temperature	$h_{bb}^{(ex)}$	$h_{sc}^{(ex)}$	h_{reorg}	$h^{(ex)}$	$T_S^{(ex)}$
282.15	-260.0 ± 0.5	-48.70 ± 0.08	145.2 ± 3.4	-163.5 ± 3.5	-76.0 ± 3.6
290.15	-257.3 ± 0.3	-47.90 ± 0.05	148.4 ± 2.2	-156.8 ± 2.2	-71.5 ± 2.3
298.15	-254.6 ± 0.4	-47.20 ± 0.09	147.4 ± 3.1	-154.4 ± 3.1	-70.5 ± 3.3
306.15	-250.9 ± 0.2	-46.40 ± 0.05	147.8 ± 2.0	-149.5 ± 2.0	-68.5 ± 2.3
314.15	-248.5 ± 0.3	-45.80 ± 0.04	149.6 ± 2.0	-144.7 ± 2.0	-64.6 ± 2.2

References

- (1) Tomar, D. S.; Weber, W.; Pettitt, M. B.; Asthagiri, D. Importance of Hydrophilic Hydration and Intramolecular Interactions in the Thermodynamics of Helix-Coil Transition and Helix-Helix Assembly in a Deca-Alanine Peptide. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2016**, *120*, 69–76.
- (2) Asthagiri, D.; Karandur, D.; Tomar, D. S.; Pettitt, B. M. Intramolecular Interactions Overcome Hydration to Drive the Collapse Transition of Gly₁₅. *J. Phys. Chem. B* **2017**, *121*, 8078–8084.
- (3) Hummer, G.; Szabo, A. Calculation of free-energy differences from computer simulations of initial and final states. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *105*, 2004–2010.
- (4) Weber, V.; Asthagiri, D. Regularizing Binding Energy Distributions and the Hydration Free Energy of Protein Cytochrome C from All-Atom Simulations. *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **2012**, *8*, 3409–3415.
- (5) Friedberg, R.; Cameron, J. E. Test of the Monte Carlo method: fast simulation of a small Ising lattice. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1970**, *52*, 6049–6058.
- (6) Allen, M. P.; Tildesley, D. J. *Computer simulation of liquids*; Oxford University Press, 1987; Chapter 6. How to analyze the results, pp 192–195.

- (7) Jorgensen, W.; Chandrasekhar, J.; Madura, J. D.; Impey, R. W.; Klein, M. L. Comparison of Simple Potential Functions for Simulating Liquid Water. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1983**, *79*, 926–935.
- (8) Neria, E.; Fischer, S.; Karplus, M. Simulation of Activation Free Energies in Molecular Systems. *J. Chem. Phys.* **1996**, *105*, 1902–1921.