Proceedings of the 23rd American Peptide Symposium Michal Lebl (Editor) American Peptide Society, 2013

$n \rightarrow \pi^*$ Interactions in Helices

Ronald T. Raines

Departments of Biochemistry and Chemistry, University of Wisconsin–Madison, Madison, WI, 53706, U.S.A.

Introduction

Helices are prevalent molecular structures in natural and synthetic polymers, including peptides and proteins. The topology of helices brings atoms that are nearby in a sequence into close proximity in a three-dimensional structure. This proximity can be reinforced by hydrogen bonds, like those in an α or 3₁₀ helix. Other helices, however, lack hydrogen bonds (*e.g.*, polyproline type-I and type-II, and poly(L-lactic acid)), and do not have a clear basis for their conformational stability.

We have proposed that a quantum mechanical interaction stabilizes common helices - an $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ interaction between backbone carbonyl groups [1,2]. This interaction is between a lone pair (*n*) of the oxygen (O_{i-1}) of one carbonyl group and the antibonding orbital (π^*) of the subsequent carbonyl group (C'_i=O'_i) [3-5]. Here, the structures of natural and synthetic helices are analyzed from this perspective.

Results and Discussion

Models of AcAlaNH₂ in an α , 3₁₀, and polyproline type-I and type-II helix, and a model of an Ac(L-lactic acid)OH helix were created based on the ω , ϕ , and ψ backbone dihedral angles listed in Table 1. These models are depicted in Figure 1. A key aspect of these helices is that $r_{0\dots C=0}$ is near or within the sum of the van der Waals radii of oxygen and carbon (3.22 Å) and $\angle_{0\dots C=0}$ is close to the Bürgi–Dunitz trajectory for the approach of a nucleophile to a carbonyl group (~109°). Accordingly, the parameters indicate that $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ interactions make a significant contribution to the conformational stability to each of these helices. The energy of the interaction is 0.3 kcal/mol in AcProNH₂, and is enhanced with thiocarbonyl groups [6,7].

This analysis has numerous implications. For example, the data provide a new view of the α helix, which is the most prevalent structural element in folded proteins. This view is depicted in Figure 2 [1]. In addition, the data establish a physicochemical basis for the conformational stability of polyproline type-I and type-II helices, and the helical structure of poly(L-lactic acid) [2,5].

Helix	ω	ϕ	ψ	<i>r₀_{C=0}</i>	$\angle_{O \cdots C = O}$
Α	180°	-60°	-45°	2.91 Å	97.9°
310	180°	-49°	-26°	2.73 Å	116.1°
polyproline type-I ^b	0°	-75°	150°	3.35 Å	127.5°
polyproline type-II	180°	-75°	160°	3.18 Å	89.4°
poly(L-lactic acid) ^c	180°	-64°	154°	2.86 Å	94.4°

Table 1. Structural parameters of common helices with backbone carbonyl groups.^a

^{*a*} ω : $C^{a}_{i}-C'_{i}-N_{i+1}-C^{a}_{i+1}$, ϕ : $C'_{i-1}-N_{i}-C^{a}_{i}-C'_{i}$, ψ : $N_{i}-C^{a}_{i}-C'_{i}-N_{i+1}$; ^{*b*}In the polyproline type-I helix, $O\cdots C=O$ refers to $O'_{i}\cdots C'_{i-1}=O'_{i-1}$; ^{*c*}In poly(*L*-lactic acid), N_{i} and N_{i+1} are replaced with oxygens.



Fig. 1. $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ Interactions (hatched lines) between backbone carbonyl groups in common helices. The depicted models are AcAlaNH2 or Ac(L-lactic acid)OH with structural parameters listed in Table 1.



Fig. 2. A new view of the α helix. The s-rich lone pair (n_s) forms the canonical $i \rightarrow i+4$ hydrogen bond; the p-rich lone pair (n_p) forms an $i \rightarrow i+1$ $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ interaction. The depicted model is $AcAla_4NH_2$ in an α helix.

We conclude that the $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ interaction must be considered along with other noncovalent interactions when examining and considering the structure, stability, engineering, and design of common helices, and that $n \rightarrow \pi^*$ interactions be included in relevant computational force fields.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by grants R01 AR044276 (NIH) and CHE-1124944 (NSF).

References

- 1.Bartlett, G.J., Choudhary, A., Raines, R.T., Woolfson, D.N. Nat. Chem. Biol. 6, 615-620 (2010). 2.Newberry, R.W., Raines, R.T. Chem. Commun. 49, 7699-7701 (2013).
- 3. Bretscher, L.E., Jenkins, C.L., Taylor, K.M., DeRider, M.L., Raines, R.T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 123,
- 777-778 (2001). 4.DeRider, M.L., Wilkens, S.J., Waddell, M.J., Bretscher, L.E., Weinhold, F., Raines, R.T., Markley, J. L. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 124, 2497-2505 (2002).
- 5. Hinderaker, M.P., Raines, R.T. Protein Sci. 12, 1188-1194 (2003).
- 6.Choudhary, A., Gandla, D., Krow, G. R., Raines, R. T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 131, 7244-7246 (2009). 7.Newberry, R.W., VanVeller, B., Guzei, I.A., Raines, R.T. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 135, 7843-7846 (2013).