The Importance of Cooperative Interactions In Hydrogen-Bonding Interactions What are Hydrogen Bonds?

Hydrogen Bonds -What Are they?

Are they due to: Electrostatic Interactions? Polarization? Covalent Interactions







Hydrogen Bonds -What Are they?

Are they due to: Are Electrostatic Interactions? Polarization? Covalent Interactions

Are they: two-centered? Three (or more) centered?

Hydrogen Bonds -What Are they? Are they due to: Are they: Electrostatic Interactions? Are they: Polarization? Two-centered? Covalent Interactions How is cooperativity important?

Hydrogen Bonds -What Are they?

Are they due to: Electrostatic Interactions? Polarization? Covalent Interactions Are they: two-centered? Three (or more) centered?

How is cooperativity important?

What are the differences in interactions in: The gas phase? The liquid phase? The solid phase?

Hydrogen Bonds - What Are they?

Are they due to: Electrostatic Interactions? Polarization? Covalent Interactions

Are they: two-centered? Three (or more) centered?

How is cooperativity important?

How do we treat Hydrogen bonds: Theoretically? Experimentally? What are the differences in interactions in: The gas phase? The liquid phase? The solid phase?

Hydrogen Bonds -What Are they? Are they due to: Are they: two-centered? Electrostatic Interactions? Polarization? Three (or more) centered? Covalent Interactions How is cooperativity important? What are the differences in interactions in: The gas phase? The liquid phase? The solid phase? How do we treat Hydrogen bonds: Theoretically? Experimentally? Materials: Crystals Aggregates Proteins



Theoretical Methods

Ab Initio Hartree Fock Møller-Plesset (particularly MP2) DFT (Density Functional Theory)

Theoretical Methods Ab Initio Hartree Fock Corrections: Vibrational analysis to obtain thermodynamic functions (enthalpy, entropy, free energy) BSSE (basis set superposition error) Møller-Plesset (particularly MP2) DFT (Density Functional Theory)

Theoretical Methods

Ab Initio Hartree Fock Møller-Plesset (particularly MP2)

Corrections: Vibrational analysis to obtain DFT (Density Functional Theory) thermodynamic functions (enthalpy, entropy, free energy) BSSE (basis set superposition error)

niempirical HF terms replaced by measured quantities. Physical model preserved in AM1.

Theoretical Methods

Ab Initio Hartree Fock

Hartree Fock Møller-Plesset (particularly MP2) Vibrational analysis to obtain DFT (Density Functional Theory)

thermodynamic functions (enthalpy, entropy, free energy) BSSE (basis set superposition error)

Semiempirical

HF terms replaced by measured quantities. Physical model preserved in AM1.

Empirical Pretense of physical reality.

Theoretical Methods

Empirical

Ab Initio

Hartree Fock Møller-Plesset (particularly MP2) DFT (Density Functional Theory)

Corrections: Vibrational analysis to obtain thermodynamic functions (enthalpy, entropy, free energy) BSSE (basis set superposition error)

Pretense of physical reality.

Semiempirical HF terms replaced by measured quantities. Physical model preserved in AM1.

Computer experiments Can do experiments with computer that would be impossible in laboratory.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Solid Fixed orientations between molecules. Cooperativity much more important.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Li Generally restricted to St internal H-bonds and dimers Co

Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Solid Fixed orientations between molecules. Cooperativity much more important. Classical examples (dipole-dipole) The field generated by oriented dipoles goes as r³ (r=distance between them)

 \rightarrowtail

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers

Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Solid Fixed orientations between molecules. Cooperativity much more important. Classical examples (dipole-dipole)

The field generated by oriented dipoles goes as r^3 (r=distance between them)

 $\rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail$

In liquid, Boltzmann distribution or orientations leads to r⁻⁶ interaction.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Solid Fixed orientations between molecules. Cooperativity much more important. Classical examples (dipole-dipole)

The field generated by oriented dipoles goes as r^3 (r=distance between them)

 $\rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail$

In liquid, Boltzmann distribution or orientations leads to r^6 interaction. So: 1-3 (fixed dipole-dipole) interaction between identical molecules is 1/8 of 1-2 interaction in solid (fixed orientation); but 1/64 of 1-2 interaction in liquid.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers

Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions. s Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Solid Fixed orientations between molecules. Cooperativity much more important. Classical examples (dipole-dipole)

The field generated by oriented dipoles goes as r^3 (r=distance between them)

$\rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail$

In liquid, Boltzmann distribution or orientations leads to r⁶ interaction. So: 1-3 (fixed dipole-dipole) interaction between identical molecules is 1/8 of 1-2 interaction in solid (fixed orientation); **but 1/64 of 1-2 interaction in liquid**. Result: 1-3 interactions can probably be ignored in liquid. **In solid they cannot be ignored**. In addition they lead to substantial polarizations in solid.

H-Bonds in Different Phases

Liquid Statistical distribution of interactions.

Cooperativity relatively unimportant.

Gas Generally restricted to internal H-bonds and dimers

> Solid Fixed orientations between molecules Cooperativity much more important.

 $\label{eq:Classical examples (dipole-dipole)} Classical examples (dipole-dipole) The field generated by oriented dipoles goes as r^3 (r=distance between them)$

 $\rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail \rightarrowtail$

In liquid, Boltzmann distribution or orientations leads to r⁶ interaction. So: 1-3 (fixed dipole-dipole) interaction between identical molecules is 1/8 of 1-2 interaction in solid (fixed orientation); **but 1/64 of 1-2 interaction in liquid**. Result: 1-3 interactions can probably be ignored in liquid. **In solid they cannot be ignored**. In addition they lead to substantial polarizations in solid. Peptides are like solid as the H-bonds have fixed orientations

Cooperativity in H-Bonded Systems Modeling Elements of the Secondary Structure of Proteins

Hydrogen bonds are among the strongest interactions of noncovalent nature. They play an important role determining conformations and binding in many biological systems. An understanding of the quantitative aspects of the hydrogen bonding may lead to the building of more precise models for the processes of biological importance.

In this study we present data that reveals a high degree of cooperativity for hydrogen bonding

- in formamide aggregates that mimic the H-bonding in helices and antiparallel $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$
- in the various 3_{10}- and $\alpha\text{-helical structures}$
- In models of β-sheets

H-bonding chains in the



One of the three Hbonding chains in an α -helix. The Hbonding chains turn in the opposite direction to the covalent bonds in the polypeptide because there are 3 H-bonding chains



Methods

Geometric optimization of all the formamide aggregates was conducted at the B3LYP/D95** level using GAUSSIAN98 suite. Full CP-optimizations were performed for the flat chains of up to five formamides.

The H-bond interaction energy for each H-bond within an aggregate of N formamides was calculated according to the following equation:

$$E_{\text{inter}} = E_{N} - (E_{m} - E_{(n-m)}) + ZPVE + BSSE$$

where m and (n-m) are the sizes of the two smaller aggregates that remain after the H-bond is broken; ZPVE and BSSE are the corrections for one H-bond.

oko, N.; Dannenberg, J. J. J. Phys. Chem. A 2003, 107, 10389



































H-bonding distances vary with the calculated H-bond energies in a regular quasi-linear manner.

We should also note that there can be two nonequivalent H-bonds that have the same enthalpy but different length.



Conformers of glycine polypeptide 1. repeating unit of the C5 conformer (flat); 2. two repeating units of th conformer; 3. two repeating units of th

Fig.2 Ref.12b Schematic drawing of the conformers of glycine

1. repeating unit of the CS conformer (flat); 2. two repeating units of the C7 conformer; 3. two repeating units of the 3_{10} helix conformer; 4. one repeating unit of the α -helix (or 4_{13} helix) conformer (seven residues). Hydrogen bonds are shown by dotted lines.

ONIOM Method

 $\bullet System is divided into up to three levels (high, medium and low). We use only two.$

ONIOM Method

 $\bullet System is divided into up to three levels (high, medium and low). We use only two.$

*High level calculation performed on the entire peptide backbone with sidechains replaced by -H (polyglycine) at the B3LYP/D95** level

Morokuma and Frisch

Morokuma and Frisch

ONIOM Method

•System is divided into up to three levels (high, medium and low). We use only two.

•High level calculation performed on the entire peptide backbone with side-chains replaced by -H (polyglycine) at the B3LYP/D95** level

•Low level calculation includes the side chains calculated at the AM1 semiempirical MO level

Morokuma and Frisch

ONIOM Method

•System is divided into up to three levels (high, medium and low). We use only two.

•High level calculation performed on the entire peptide backbone with sidechains replaced by -H (polyglycine) at the B3LYP/D95** level

•Low level calculation includes the side chains calculated at the AM1 semiempirical MO level

•ONIOM energy is equal to the entire system calculated at low level with the polyglycine calculated at the high level substituted for the low-level

Morokuma and Frisch

Comparison of secondary structures of $acetyl(ala)_N NH_2$ as a function of N



































Relative energies of capped polyalanines in different secondary structures

Acetyl(ala)_NNH₂ N varies from 2 to 18 Relative energies of capped polyalanines in different secondary structures

Acetyl(ala)_NNH₂

N varies from 2 to 18

We calculate the energy of polymerization for each of three secondary structures using the following relationship:

 $E_{polymerization} = E_{peptide} - E_{CH_3COOH} - E_{NH_3} - NE_{alanine} - (N+1)E_{H_2O}$





















Incremental Stabilities							



The difference in the $E_{polymerization}$ between $Ac(ala)_{N}NH_{2}$ and $ac(ala)_{N-1}NH_{2}$

k, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205













Vieczorek, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds This induces 'helical' strain

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds This induces 'helical' strain

We calculate the helical strain as follows:

Wieczorek, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds

This induces 'helical' strain

R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205

We calculate the helical strain as follows:

 We estimate the interaction energies of each Hbonding chain of the helix from the formamide chains of the same lengths

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds

This induces 'helical' strain

- We calculate the helical strain as follows:
- We estimate the interaction energies of each Hbonding chain of the helix from the formamide chains of the same lengths
- 2) We subtract the energy difference between the helix and isomeric β -strand

zorek, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds

This induces 'helical' strain

- We calculate the helical strain as follows:
- We estimate the interaction energies of each Hbonding chain of the helix from the formamide chains of the same lengths
- 2) We subtract the energy difference between the helix and isomeric β -strand
- 3) We make an approximate vibronic correction
- Vieczorek, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205.

Helical strain per H-bond

Peptide backbone must accommodate the H-bonds

This induces 'helical' strain

We calculate the helical strain as follows:

- We estimate the interaction energies of each Hbonding chain of the helix from the formamide chains of the same lengths
- 2) We subtract the energy difference between the helix and isomeric β -strand
- 3) We make an approximate vibronic correction
- 4) We divide by the number of H-bonds in the system

czorek, R.; Dannenberg, J. J., J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2004, 126, 14198-205





































Why are H-bonds in α -helices more cooperative?

 They are more polarizable than the 3₁₀-helices as the C=O bond is better aligned with the H-bond

Why are H-bonds in α -helices more cooperative?

- They are more polarizable than the 3₁₀-helices as the C=O bond is better aligned with the H-bond
- 2) Covalent interactions are greater

Why are H-bonds in α -helices more cooperative?

- They are more polarizable than the 3₁₀-helices as the C=O bond is better aligned with the H-bond
- 2) Covalent interactions are greater
- The two H-bonding chains in the 3₁₀-helices are longer, so they reach their asymptotic limits for smaller peptide lengths

Why are H-bonds in α -helices more cooperative?

- They are more polarizable than the 3₁₀-helices as the C=O bond is better aligned with the H-bond
- 2) Covalent interactions are greater
- The two H-bonding chains in the 3₁₀-helices are longer, so they reach their asymptotic limits for smaller peptide lengths
- 4) The higher strain energies in the 3₁₀-helices can impede covalent and polarization interactions

Why are H-bonds in α -helices more cooperative?

- They are more polarizable than the 3₁₀-helices as the C=O bond is better aligned with the H-bond
- 2) Covalent interactions are greater
- The two H-bonding chains in the 3₁₀-helices are longer, so they reach their asymptotic limits for smaller peptide lengths
- 4) The higher strain energies in the 3₁₀-helices can impede covalent and polarization interactions

All of these factors interact with each other

Protonation of Peptides

Small peptides are zwitter ionic

Protonation of Peptides

Small peptides are zwitter ionic

Are helical peptides zwitter ions?

Protonation of Peptides

Small peptides are zwitter ionic

Are helical peptides zwitter ions?

If so, they should protonate most easily on NH_2





















































Ala's	COOH	1 st C=O	2 nd C=O	NH ₂
8	259.1	259.3	258.5	243.1
14	272.3	274.0	274.7	212.6
17	276.5	278.0	279.0	202.5

Comparison of proton affinities of ala_{14} and ala_{1} kcal/mol						
Ala's	СООН	1 st C=O	2 nd C=O	NH ₂		
8	259.1	259.3	258.5	243.1		
14	272.3	274.0	274.7	212.6		
17	276.5	278.0	279.0	202.5		



 β -Sheets

 β -strands that are models of two glycines

β-Sheets

 $\beta\mbox{-strands}$ that are models of two glycines, four glycines

β-Sheets

 β -strands that are models of two glycines, four glycines and two glycines with a CH_2CH_2 spacer

β -Sheets

 $\beta\text{-strands}$ that are models of two glycines, four glycines and two glycines with a CH_2CH_2 spacer

Two and four stranded sheets







































































Little or no Cooperativity apparent in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Due to the weakening and strengthening of intra-strand C5 H-bonds

Little or no Cooperativity apparent in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Due to the weakening and strengthening of intra-strand C5 H-bonds

Many proteins have only 2-stranded $\beta\text{-sheets}$

Little or no Cooperativity apparent in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Due to the weakening and strengthening of intra-strand C5 H-bonds

Many proteins have only 2-stranded β -sheets

Why do others have extended β -sheets?

Little or no Cooperativity apparent in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Due to the weakening and strengthening of intra-strand C5 H-bonds

Many proteins have only 2-stranded β -sheets

Why do others have extended β -sheets?

Implications for amyloid diseases:

Little or no Cooperativity apparent in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Due to the weakening and strengthening of intra-strand C5 H-bonds

Many proteins have only 2-stranded β -sheets

Why do others have extended β -sheets?

Implications for amyloid diseases: Which sequences will allow H-bond cooperativity?

Summary

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} -, α -helices and β -sheets

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} , α -helices and β -sheets **Cooperativity is greater in** α -helices than in 3_{10} -, helices

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} , α -helices and β -sheets Cooperativity is greater in α -helices than in 3_{10} , helices

Cooperativity is masked by C_5 H-bonds in $\beta\mbox{-sheets}$

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} -, α -helices and β -sheets Cooperativity is greater in α -helices than in 3_{10} -, helices Cooperativity is masked by C_5 H-bonds in β -sheets

Protonation of α-helices occurs on C=O's (Not NH₂'s)

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} -, α -helices and β -sheets Cooperativity is greater in α -helices than in 3_{10} -, helices Cooperativity is masked by C_5 H-bonds in β -sheets

Protonation of α -helices occurs on C=O's (Not NH₂'s) α -helices are not zwitter ions (at least in gas phase)

Summary

Chains of amide H-bonds are highly cooperative Cooperativity is manifest in 3_{10} -, α -helices and β -sheets Cooperativity is greater in α -helices than in 3₁₀-, helices Cooperativity is masked by C_5 H-bonds in $\beta\text{-sheets}$

Protonation of α -helices occurs on C=O's (Not NH₂'s) α -helices are not zwitter ions (at least in gas phase)

Understanding H-bond cooperativity is essential for predicting protein folding

Coworkers

Nadya Kobko Robert Wieczorek Pedro Salvador Raji Viswanathan Amparo Asensio Sandy Moisan Artem Masunov Midas Tsai



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Nadya Kobko



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Robert Wieczorek





Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Robert Wieczorek Pedro Salvador



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY



Coworkers

Raji Viswanathan Amparo Asensio



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY



ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Artem Masunov



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Midas Tsai



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY

Coworkers

Nadya Kobko Robert Wieczorek Pedro Salvador Raji Viswanathan Amparo Asensio Sandy Moisan Artem Masunov Midas Tsai



Funding ACS/PRF NIH PSC/CUNY