Published in final edited form as:

Biochemistry. 2010 April 20; 49(15): 3336–3342. doi:10.1021/bi100176a.

Circular dichroism and UV resonance Raman study of the impact of alcohols on the Gibbs free energy landscape of an α -helical peptide[†]

Kan Xiong and Sanford A Asher[‡]

Department of Chemistry, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA USA 15260

Abstract

We used CD and UV resonance Raman spectroscopy to study the impact of alcohols on the conformational equilibria and relative Gibbs free energy landscapes along the Ramachandran Ψ -coordinate of a mainly poly-ala peptide, AP of sequence AAAAA(AAARA)₃A. 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (TFE) most stabilizes the α -helical-like conformations, followed by ethanol, methanol and pure water. The π -bulge conformation is stabilized more than the α -helix, while the 3_{10} -helix is destabilized due to the alcohol increased hydrophobicity. Turns are also stabilized by alcohols. We also found that while TFE induces more α -helices, it favors multiple, shorter helix segments.

Keywords

Energy Landscape; Protein Folding; Hydrophobicity

Protein (peptide) folding depends both on its primary sequence and its solvent environment. Addition of alcohol to aqueous solution changes the hydration of protein (peptide). The resulting conformational changes can be used as a valuable tool for probing protein (peptide) – water interactions.^{1–7} It is important to realize that despite intensive investigations over the years, the mechanism(s) by which alcohols perturb protein conformation is still poorly understood.^{8–18}

In this work, we used CD and UV resonance Raman (UVRR) spectroscopy to study the impact of alcohols on the conformational equilibria and relative Gibbs free energy landscapes along the Ramachandran Ψ -coordinate of a mainly poly-ala peptide, AP of sequence AAAAA(AAARA)₃A. We find that the α -helix and π -bulge conformations are most stabilized by 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (TFE), followed by ethanol, methanol and pure water. Turn conformations are also stabilized. However, 3_{10} -helices are destabilized. We also find that TFE induces an increased abundance of α -helices. However, the average α -helix length is decreased.

Experimental Details

The 21-residue peptide AP of sequence AAAAA(AAARA)₃A was purchased from AnaSpec Inc. (>95% purity). Absolute methanol was purchased from J. T. Baker. Absolute ethanol

[†]The work was supported by NIH grant GM8RO1EB002053 and NIH grant 1RO1EB009089.

[‡]To whom correspondence should be addressed. Phone: (412) 624-8570; fax: (412) 624-0588; asher@pitt.edu.

was purchased from Pharmco. 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol (TFE, 99.8% purity) was purchased from Acros. The pH7 solution samples contain 1 mg/ml concentration of AP and 0.05 M NaClO₄.

The CD spectra were measured by using a Jasco-715 spectropolarimeter, by using a 0.02 cm path length cuvette. We co-added five individual CD spectra.

The UV resonance Raman (UVR) apparatus was described in detail by Bykov et al.¹⁹ Briefly, 204 nm UV light (1 mW average power, 100 μ m diameter spot) was obtained by mixing the 3rd harmonic with the fundamental (816 nm wavelength, 1 kHz repetition rate, 0.6 W average power, 25–40 ns pulse width) of a tunable Ti:Sapphire laser system from Photonics Industries. The sample was circulated in a free surface, temperature-controlled stream. A 180° sampling backscattering geometry was used. The collected light was dispersed by a double monochromator onto a back thinned CCD camera (Princeton Instruments Spec 10 System, 1.5 cm⁻¹ resolution with 100 μ m slit width). We used 5 min accumulation times, and four accumulations were co-added. The 732 cm⁻¹ and 1379.5 cm⁻¹ bands of Teflon were utilized to calibrate the frequency. The frequencies are reproducible to less than 1 cm⁻¹. Raman spectra were normalized to the peak height of the 932 cm⁻¹ ClO₄⁻ band. No Raman saturation occurs at these low excitation powers.

Results

CD measurements

Fig. 1 shows the temperature dependence of the CD spectra of AP in pure water. The low temperature CD spectra show two troughs at 222 nm and 206 nm which are characteristic of α -helix conformations.²⁰ As the temperature increases the ellipticity at 222 nm, θ_{222} becomes less negative indicating α -helix melting. The isosbestic point at 202 nm indicates that the melting behavior appears spectroscopically as a “two-state” process. Previous work by our group demonstrated that the AP α -helix conformation melts to a dominantly PPII-like conformation.²¹

Fig. 2a and 2b show the temperature dependence of the mean residue ellipticity at 222 nm, θ_{222} of AP in pure water and in the presence of different alcohols. Alcohols increase the α -helix content. At 20°C and 25% alcohol by volume, TFE most stabilizes the α -helix, followed closely by ethanol and then methanol, consistent with previous studies^{8,12,18}. At 50% (v/v) alcohol, ethanol is the most α -helix stabilizing, followed by TFE and then methanol. As the alcohol concentration increases from 25% to 50%, θ_{222} decreases in methanol and ethanol but changes little in TFE (Fig. 2c). Previous studies also showed that TFE does not appear in CD measurements to induce additional α -helix concentrations above 25% (v/v).¹¹

UVR measurements

204 nm UV Raman spectra (UVR) of AP in pure water (Fig. 3) show mainly the amide RR bands. In contrast, 204 nm UVR of AP in 50% methanol (Fig. 3) show methanol Raman bands which we numerically removed in the Fig. 4 UVR. The resulting spectra show the temperature dependence of the 204 nm UVR of AP in 50% methanol. As the temperature increases, the AmI band upshifts from 1652 cm⁻¹ to 1658 cm⁻¹ while the AmII band downshifts from 1556 cm⁻¹ to 1552 cm⁻¹.²² Previous work²³ indicates that water hydrogen bonding to the peptide bond (PB) C=O site increases the C=O bond length and, thus, downshifts the AmI band, while water hydrogen bonding to the PB N-H upshifts the AmII band. The AmI (AmII) band in pure water (Fig. 4) is upshifted (downshifted) relative to that in 50% methanol, indicating less C=O (N-H) hydrogen bonding in alcohol solution.²³ The C α -H doublet (~1372 cm⁻¹ and ~1393 cm⁻¹) frequency does not shift as the temperature increases but its intensity increases. The C α -H doublet intensity only slightly

increases from 2°C to 20°C, indicating little α -helix melting.²⁴ Significant intensity changes observed from 20°C to 40°C indicates extensive α -helix melting. The AmIII₃ band downshifts from ~1264 cm⁻¹ at 2°C to ~1259 cm⁻¹ at 40°C while its intensity increases.²² UVRS of AP in other alcohols (not shown) show very similar α -helix melting behaviors.

To calculate the α -helical fractions, we subtracted appropriate amounts of the temperature dependent PPII-like conformation basis spectra²² from the measured and digitally smoothed UVRS of AP to minimize the C _{α} -H region intensity in the difference spectra. The basis spectra intensities subtracted are directly proportional to the concentrations of the PPII-like conformation at each temperature. The resulting difference spectra appear to be mainly α -helix-like. Fig. 5 shows UVRR calculated fractions of α -helix-like conformation of AP in pure water and in 50% (v/v) alcohol. The α -helical-like conformations are dramatically stabilized in alcohol, and melt little as the temperature increases. TFE stabilizes the α -helical-like conformations the most, followed by ethanol, and then methanol, as previously observed.^{8,12,18} The α -helix-like conformation melting curves in ethanol and in methanol are essentially identical. These conclusions obviously differ from the CD conclusions.

Fig. 6 shows the calculated α -helix-like spectra of AP in pure water and in 50% (v/v) methanol. The AmIII₃ band in pure water shows a peak at ~1258 cm⁻¹ with a shoulder at ~1280 cm⁻¹ and another shoulder at ~1240 cm⁻¹. Previous work showed that an AmIII₃ band at ~1258 cm⁻¹ indicates the pure α -helical conformations, while a band at ~1280 cm⁻¹ indicates a π -helix (bulge) while a band at ~1240 cm⁻¹ indicates a 3₁₀-helix.²⁵ The AmIII₃ band in pure water narrows at higher temperature as previously observed,^{26,27} indicating decreased concentrations of 3₁₀-helix and π -bulge conformations relative to the pure α -helix concentration as the temperature increases. The AmIII₃ band in 50% methanol shows a shoulder at ~1258 cm⁻¹ and another shoulder at ~1280 cm⁻¹ while the ~1240 cm⁻¹ component is missing, indicating a lack of 3₁₀-helices. All helical spectra show an AmIII₃ band at ~1200 cm⁻¹, indicating turn structures.²⁶ Calculated α -helix-like spectra in other alcohols (not shown) are essentially identical to those in methanol, indicating similar ensembles of helical conformations.

We calculated the Gibbs free energy landscapes of AP (Fig. 7) along the Ψ -folding coordinate from the UVRR by using the methodology of Mikhonin et al.^{19,26,28} The energy landscape (Fig. 7) is bumpy within the α -helix-like basin. Within this basin the pure α -helix conformation ($\Psi \sim -45^\circ$) is always lowest in energy, followed by the π -bulge conformation. The 3₁₀-helix conformation ($\Psi \sim -20^\circ$) lies at a slightly higher relative energy in pure water, but at much higher energies in alcohols. As the temperature increases the α -helix basin Gibbs free energy in pure water increases indicating that the α -helix is destabilized relative to the PPII-like conformation. The relative α -helix basin energies change very little with temperature in 50% alcohols. For all temperatures, the lowest α -helix Gibbs free energies occur in 50% TFE, followed by ethanol, methanol and finally pure water. The same trend is seen with the π -bulge energies. The alcohol induced π -bulge energy decrease is larger than that of the α -helix. Turn conformations are stabilized by alcohols, consistent with previous observations that alcohols stabilize turns over PPII-like conformations.²⁹ In contrast, 3₁₀-helix conformations are dramatically destabilized by alcohols.

Discussion

Impact of alcohols on the Gibbs free energies of helices

Numerous studies indicate that alcohols induce α -helix formation in proportion to the bulkiness of their alcohol hydrocarbon group.^{8,12,18,30} This is confirmed by our UVRR results that the α -helix has the lowest Gibbs free energy in 50% TFE, followed by ethanol and methanol.

Alcohol molecules displace water in the peptide hydration shell which increases the hydrophobicity of the peptide-solvent interface, which should enhance intramolecular hydrogen bonding which should increase the α -helical content^{31,32}. Previous studies³³ indicate that 3_{10} -helices allow greater solvent access to the peptide bonds and thus are favored as the solvent hydrophilicity increases. In contrast, the α -helix and π -helix are more favored as the solvent hydrophobicity increases. It is also known that the 3_{10} -helix is favored in the peptide terminal regions where solvent exposure is greatest.³⁴

TFE induce multi helix segments

Our UVRR measurements that indicate that 50% TFE most stabilizes α -helical-like conformations, appears to conflict with the CD measurements that 50% TFE does not significantly stabilize α -helical conformations more than 25% TFE. Previous studies^{22,35–37} showed that UVRR calculated α -helical conformation concentrations are higher than those calculated from CD³⁶ because the magnitude of the molar ellipticity per peptide bond (PB) decreases dramatically as the number of PB within an α -helix decreases.^{11,38,39} In contrast, Raman is more linear; each peptide bond independently contributes to the Raman intensity^{36,40} (except for the AmI band of the α -helical conformation where strong coupling between AmI vibrations exist⁴¹). Thus, we can explain the spectroscopic results by proposing that TFE induces the most α -helical PBs but also breaks long helices into short helices (See Appendix I). Recent studies have showed that TFE binds strongly to peptides,^{42,43} while ethanol does not directly bind.¹⁰

To quantify the dependence of the CD molar ellipticity per PB of an α -helix, θ_n on the number of PBs within the helix, n , we fitted our experimental data to the empirical equation proposed by Chen et al,³⁹ (See Appendix II);

$$\theta_n = -34530 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1.6}{n}\right) \text{ deg} \cdot \text{cm}^2 \cdot \text{dmol}^{-1}$$

This allows us to relate the observed θ_{222} values to the UV Raman calculated helical fractions (See Appendix III). The Fig. 8 calculated θ_{222} in 50% TFE is modeled to be less negative than that in 50% ethanol at low temperatures. (Calculated θ_{222} are slightly more negative than those measured in Fig. 2b because the NaClO_4 used as an internal standard in the UVRR measurements as an internal intensity standard but not included in the CD measurements stabilizes the α -helix conformation.²⁷)

Conclusions

CD and UVRR measurements indicate that TFE most stabilizes the α -helix, followed by ethanol, methanol and pure water. We determined the Gibbs free energy landscape from the UVRR spectra and found that the alcohol induced π -bulge energy decrease is larger than that of the α -helix, while the 3_{10} -helix energy increases due to the alcohol increased hydrophobicity. Turns are stabilized by alcohols as well. We also found that while TFE induces more α helices, it favors multiple, shorter helical segments.

Acknowledgments

We thank Bhavya Sharma, Lu Ma, Zhenmin Hong and David Punihaole for useful discussions.

References

1. Klivanov AM. Improving enzymes by using them in organic solvents. *Nature* 2001;409(6817):241–246. [PubMed: 11196652]
2. Carrea G, Riva S. Properties and synthetic applications of enzymes in organic solvents. *Angewandte Chemie-International Edition* 2000;39(13):2226–2254.
3. Scharnagl C, Reif M, Friedrich J. Stability of proteins: Temperature, pressure and the role of the solvent. *Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Proteins and Proteomics* 2005;1749(2):187–213.
4. Kony DB, Hunenberger PH, van Gunsteren WF. Molecular dynamics simulations of the native and partially folded states of ubiquitin: Influence of methanol cosolvent, pH, and temperature on the protein structure and dynamics. *Protein Science* 2007;16(6):1101–1118. [PubMed: 17525462]
5. Waterhous DV, Johnson WC. Importance of Environment in Determining Secondary Structure in Proteins. *Biochemistry* 1994;33(8):2121–2128. [PubMed: 8117668]
6. Roccatano D. Computer simulations study of biomolecules in non-aqueous or cosolvent/water mixture solutions. *Current Protein & Peptide Science* 2008;9(4):407–426. [PubMed: 18691127]
7. Pace CN, Trevino S, Prabhakaran E, Scholtz JM. Protein structure, stability and solubility in water and other solvents. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B-Biological Sciences* 2004;359(1448):1225–1234.
8. Hirota N, Mizuno K, Goto Y. Group additive contributions to the alcohol-induced alpha-helix formation of melittin: Implication for the mechanism of the alcohol effects on proteins. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 1998;275(2):365–378. [PubMed: 9466915]
9. Buck M. Trifluoroethanol and colleagues: cosolvents come of age. Recent studies with peptides and proteins. *Quarterly Reviews of Biophysics* 1998;31(3):297–355. [PubMed: 10384688]
10. Fioroni M, Diaz MD, Burger K, Berger S. Solvation phenomena of a tetrapeptide in water/trifluoroethanol and water/ethanol mixtures: A diffusion NMR, intermolecular NOE, and molecular dynamics study. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2002;124(26):7737–7744. [PubMed: 12083927]
11. Luo PZ, Baldwin RL. Mechanism of helix induction by trifluoroethanol: A framework for extrapolating the helix-forming properties of peptides from trifluoroethanol/water mixtures back to water. *Biochemistry* 1997;36(27):8413–8421. [PubMed: 9204889]
12. Kinoshita M, Okamoto Y, Hirata F. Peptide conformations in alcohol and water: Analyses by the reference interaction site model theory. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2000;122(12):2773–2779.
13. Roccatano D, Colombo G, Fioroni M, Mark AE. Mechanism by which 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol/water mixtures stabilize secondary-structure formation in peptides: A molecular dynamics study. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 2002;99(19):12179–12184. [PubMed: 12196631]
14. Walgers R, Lee TC, Cammers-Goodwin A. An Indirect Chaotropic Mechanism for the Stabilization of Helix Conformation of Peptides in Aqueous Trifluoroethanol and Hexafluoro-2-propanol. *Journal of American Chemistry Society* 1998;120:5073–5079.
15. Reiersen H, Rees AR. Trifluoroethanol may form a solvent matrix for assisted hydrophobic interactions between peptide side chains. *Protein Engineering* 2000;13(11):739–743. [PubMed: 11161104]
16. Roccatano D, Fioroni M, Zacharias M, Colombo G. Effect of hexafluoroisopropanol alcohol on the structure of melittin: A molecular dynamics simulation study. *Protein Science* 2005;14(10):2582–2589. [PubMed: 16155200]
17. Olivella M, Deupi X, Govaerts C, Pardo L. Influence of the environment in the conformation of alpha-helices studied by protein database search and molecular dynamics simulations. *Biophysical Journal* 2002;82(6):3207–3213. [PubMed: 12023245]
18. Liu HL, Hsu CM. The effects of solvent and temperature on the structural integrity of monomeric melittin by molecular dynamics simulations. *Chemical Physics Letters* 2003;375(1–2):119–125.
19. Bykov S, Lednev I, Ianoul A, Mikhonin A, Munro C, Asher SA. Steady-state and transient ultraviolet resonance Raman spectrometer for the 193–270 nm spectral region. *Applied Spectroscopy* 2005;59(12):1541–1552. [PubMed: 16390595]

20. Manning MC, Woody RW. Theoretical CD studies of polypeptide helices: examination of important electronic and geometric factors. *Biopolymers* 1991;31:569–586. [PubMed: 1868170]
21. Asher S, Mikhonin A, Bykov S. UV Raman demonstrates that alpha-helical polyalanine peptides melt to polyproline II conformations. *JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN CHEMICAL SOCIETY* 2004;126(27):8433–8440. [PubMed: 15238000]
22. Lednev IK, Karnoup AS, Sparrow MC, Asher SA. alpha-helix peptide folding and unfolding activation barriers: A nanosecond UV resonance raman study. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 1999;121(35):8074–8086.
23. Myshakina NS, Ahmed Z, Asher SA. Dependence of amide vibrations on hydrogen bonding. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 2008;112(38):11873–11877.
24. Wang Y, Purrello R, Jordan T, Spiro TG. UVR spectroscopy of the peptide bond. 1. Amide S, a nonhelical structure marker, is a CαH bending mode. *J Am Chem Soc* 1991;113:6359–6368.
25. Mikhonin AV, Bykov SV, Myshakina NS, Asher SA. Peptide secondary structure folding reaction coordinate: Correlation between UV Raman amide III frequency, Psi Ramachandran angle, and hydrogen bonding. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 2006;110(4):1928–1943.
26. Mikhonin AV, Asher SA. Direct UV Raman monitoring of 3(10)-helix and pi-bulge premelting during alpha-helix unfolding. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2006;128(42):13789–13795. [PubMed: 17044707]
27. Xiong K, Ascietto EK, Madura JD, Asher SA. Salt Dependence of α-helical Peptide Folding Energy Landscapes. *Biochemistry* 2009;10818–10826. [PubMed: 19845367]
28. Ma L, Ahmed Z, Mikhonin AV, Asher SA. UV resonance raman measurements of poly-L-lysine's conformational energy landscapes: Dependence on perchlorate concentration and temperature. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 2007;111(26):7675–7680.
29. Liu ZG, Chen K, Ng A, Shi ZS, Woody RW, Kallenbach NR. Solvent dependence of PII conformation in model alanine peptides. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2004;126(46):15141–15150. [PubMed: 15548011]
30. Dwyer DS. Molecular simulation of the effects of alcohols on peptide structure. *Biopolymers* 1999;49(7):635–645. [PubMed: 10226504]
31. Deshpande A, Nimsadkar S, Mande SC. Effect of alcohols on protein hydration: crystallographic analysis of hen egg-white lysozyme in the presence of alcohols. *Acta Crystallographica Section D-Biological Crystallography* 2005;61:1005–1008.
32. Starzyk A, Barber-Armstrong W, Sridharan M, Decatur SM. Spectroscopic evidence for backbone desolvation of helical peptides by 2,2,2-trifluoroethanol: An isotope-edited FTIR study. *Biochemistry* 2005;44(1):369–376. [PubMed: 15628879]
33. Sorin EJ, Rhee YM, Shirts MR, Pande VS. The solvation interface is a determining factor in peptide conformational preferences. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 2006;356(1):248–256. [PubMed: 16364361]
34. Millhauser GL, Stenland CJ, Hanson P, Bolin KA, vandeVen FJM. Estimating the relative populations of 3(10)-helix and alpha-helix in Ala-rich peptides: A hydrogen exchange and high field NMR study. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 1997;267(4):963–974. [PubMed: 9135124]
35. Balakrishnan G, Hu Y, Bender GM, Getahun Z, DeGrado WF, Spiro TG. Enthalpic and entropic stages in alpha-helical peptide unfolding, from laser T-Jump/UV raman spectroscopy. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2007;129(42):12801–12808. [PubMed: 17910449]
36. Ozdemir A, Lednev IK, Asher SA. Comparison between UV Raman and circular dichroism detection of short alpha helices in Bombolitin III. *Biochemistry* 2002;41(6):1893–1896. [PubMed: 11827535]
37. Ianoul A, Mikhonin A, Lednev IK, Asher SA. UV resonance Raman study of the spatial dependence of alpha-helix unfolding. *Journal of Physical Chemistry A* 2002;106(14):3621–3624.
38. Woody, RW. *Circular Dichroism and the Conformational Analysis of Biomolecules*. Plenum Press; New York: 1996. p. 25-68.
39. Chen YH, Yang JT, Chau KH. Determination of the helix and β-form of proteins in aqueous solution by circular dichroism. *Biochemistry* 1974;13:3350–3359. [PubMed: 4366945]
40. Mikhonin AV, Asher SA. Uncoupled peptide bond vibrations in alpha-helical and polyproline II conformations of polyalanine peptides. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 2005;109(7):3047–3052.

41. Myshakina NS, Asher SA. Peptide bond vibrational coupling. *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 2007;111(16):4271–4279.
42. Gerig JT. Structure and solvation of melittin in 1,1,1,3,3,3-hexafluoro-2-propanol/water. *Biophysical Journal* 2004;86(5):3166–3175. [PubMed: 15111429]
43. Diaz MD, Berger S. Preferential solvation of a tetrapeptide by trifluoroethanol as studied by intermolecular NOE. *Magnetic Resonance in Chemistry* 2001;39(7):369–373.
44. Hong Q, Schellman JA. Helix-Coil Theories - a Comparative-Study for Finite Length Polypeptides. *Journal of Physical Chemistry* 1992;96(10):3987–3994.
45. Doig AJ. Recent advances in helix-coil theory. *Biophysical Chemistry* 2002;101:281–293. [PubMed: 12488008]
46. Yang JX, Zhao K, Gong YX, Vologodskii A, Kallenbach NR. alpha-helix nucleation constant in copolypeptides of alanine and ornithine or lysine. *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 1998;120(41):10646–10652.
47. Scholtz JM, Qian H, York EJ, Stewart JM, Baldwin RL. Parameters of helix-coil transition theory for alanine-based peptides of varying chain length in water. *Biopolymers* 1991;31:1463–1470. [PubMed: 1814498]

Appendix I: TFE induces more but shorter helices than other alcohols

Suppose θ_α (θ_r) is the mean residue ellipticity for the pure α -helix (melted conformation(s)) ($\theta_\alpha = -26000 \text{ deg.cm}^2.\text{dmol}^{-1}$, $\theta_r = -3500 \text{ deg.cm}^2.\text{dmol}^{-1}$ ²²); θ is the measured mean residue ellipticity of AP; $f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ is the UVRR calculated concentrations of α -helix-like conformations of AP. The CD α -helix fraction, $f_{\alpha\text{CD}}$ is calculated by, ²²

$$f_{\alpha\text{CD}} = \frac{\theta - \theta_r}{\theta_\alpha - \theta_r} \quad \text{eqn.2}$$

$f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ and $f_{\alpha\text{CD}}$ are similar in pure water, 50% methanol and 50% ethanol. A significant difference between $f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ and $f_{\alpha\text{CD}}$ is observed in 50% TFE which is likely due to the TFE induced formation of short helices that show decreased CD signals. ³⁶ The proportionality between $f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ and $f_{\alpha\text{CD}}$ is decreased in TFE (Fig. 9) relative to that in ethanol and methanol, indicating that in TFE produces more but shorter helices. Given the energy cost of nucleating helix segments, ^{44–47} it is unlikely that the 21-residue AP adopts more than two helix segments.

Appendix II: Quantify the dependence of the CD molar ellipticity per PB of an α -helix, θ_n on the number of PBs within the α -helix, n

Suppose p_i is the probability of AP containing a single α -helix segment containing n_i α -helical PB; $\bar{n}$ is the statistical average number of helical PBs; $N = 20$, is the total number of AP PB. Thus,

$$\theta = \sum_i \left\{ \theta_{n_i} \cdot \frac{n_i}{N} + \frac{N - n_i}{N} \cdot \theta_r \right\} \cdot p_i \quad \text{eqn.3}$$

Substituting the empirical equation proposed by Chen et al, ³⁹ $\theta_n = \theta_\infty \cdot \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right)$ into eqn. 3:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \theta &= \sum_i \left\{ \theta_{\infty} \cdot \left(\frac{n_i}{N} - \frac{k}{N} \right) + \frac{N-n_i}{N} \cdot \theta_r \right\} \cdot p_i \\
 &= \frac{\theta_{\infty}}{N} \cdot \sum_i n_i \cdot p_i - \frac{\theta_{\infty} \cdot k}{N} \cdot \sum_i p_i + \theta_r \cdot \sum_i p_i - \frac{\theta_r}{N} \cdot \sum_i n_i \cdot p_i \\
 &= \frac{\theta_{\infty}}{N} \cdot \bar{n} - \frac{\theta_{\infty} \cdot k}{N} + \theta_r - \frac{\theta_r}{N} \cdot \bar{n}
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{eqn. 4}$$

As the Raman intensity is more linear,^{36,40} the UVRR calculated concentrations of α -helix-like conformations, $f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ more accurately monitors the n fractions of α -helical PB. Thus,

$$f_{\alpha\text{Raman}} = \frac{\bar{n}}{N} \tag{eqn. 5}$$

substituting into eqn. 4, thus,

$$\theta = (\theta_{\infty} - \theta_r) \cdot f_{\alpha\text{Raman}} + \left(\theta_r - \frac{k}{N} \cdot \theta_{\infty} \right) \tag{eqn. 6}$$

We fit the experimental data to eqn. 6 to obtain values of θ_n and n :

$$\theta_n = -34530 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1.6}{n} \right) \text{ deg} \cdot \text{cm}^2 \cdot \text{dmol}^{-1} \tag{eqn. 7}$$

Appendix III Predicting CD ellipticity from Raman calculated concentration of α -helix-like conformations

Case 1: AP contains a single α -helix segment:

$$\theta = (\theta_{\infty} - \theta_r) \cdot f_{\alpha\text{Raman}} + \left(\theta_r - \frac{k}{N} \cdot \theta_{\infty} \right) \tag{eqn. 5}$$

Case 2: AP contains two helix segments: p_i is the probability of AP containing one helix segments of n_{i1} PBs and the second helix segment of n_{i2} PBs; $\bar{n}_1$ and $\bar{n}_2$ are the average number of helical PBs in the first and second helix segments ($\bar{n}_1 + \bar{n}_2 = N \cdot f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \theta &= \sum_i \left\{ \theta_{n_{i1}} \cdot \frac{n_{i1}}{N} + \theta_{n_{i2}} \cdot \frac{n_{i2}}{N} + \frac{N-n_{i1}-n_{i2}}{N} \cdot \theta_r \right\} \cdot p_i \\
 &= \sum_i \left\{ \theta_{\infty} \cdot \left(\frac{n_{i1}}{N} - \frac{k}{N} \right) + \theta_{\infty} \cdot \left(\frac{n_{i2}}{N} - \frac{k}{N} \right) + \frac{N-n_{i1}-n_{i2}}{N} \cdot \theta_r \right\} \cdot p_i \\
 &= \frac{\theta_{\infty}}{N} \sum_i (n_{i1} + n_{i2}) \cdot p_i - \frac{k}{N} \cdot 2 \cdot \sum_i p_i + \theta_r \cdot \sum_i p_i - \frac{\theta_r}{N} \cdot \sum_i (n_{i1} + n_{i2}) \cdot p_i \\
 &= \frac{\theta_{\infty}}{N} \sum_i (n_i) \cdot p_i - \frac{k}{N} \cdot 2 \cdot \sum_i p_i + \theta_r \cdot \sum_i p_i - \frac{\theta_r}{N} \cdot \sum_i (n_i) \cdot p_i \\
 &= \frac{\theta_{\infty}}{N} \cdot (\bar{n}_1 + \bar{n}_2) - \frac{k}{N} \cdot 2 + \theta_r - \frac{\theta_r}{N} \cdot (\bar{n}_1 + \bar{n}_2) \\
 &= \theta_{\infty} \cdot f_{\alpha\text{Raman}} - \frac{k}{N} \cdot 2 + \theta_r - \theta_r \cdot f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\therefore \theta = (\theta_{\infty} - \theta_r) \cdot f_{\alpha Raman} + (\theta_r - \frac{2k}{N} \cdot \theta_{\infty})$$

eqn.8

We can then predict the observed CD ellipticity, θ from $f_{\alpha Raman}$ in pure water, 50% methanol and 50% ethanol by using eqn. 5 and in 50% TFE by using eqn. 7. The results are shown in Fig. 8.

Figure 1.
Temperature dependence of the CD spectra of 1 mg/ml AP in pure water.

Figure 2.

(a) θ_{222} of AP in 25% (v/v) alcohol; (b) θ_{222} of AP in 50% (v/v) alcohol; (c) $\Delta\theta_{222}$ (θ_{222} in 50% alcohol minus θ_{222} at 25% alcohol).

Figure 3.

204 nm excited UVRS of AP in pure water (solid line); AP in 50% methanol (dashed line) at 10°C. The UVRS of AP in pure water was scaled to facilitate comparison.

Figure 4.

Temperature dependence of 204 nm excited UVRS of AP in 50% methanol and UVRS of AP in pure water at 2°C (dashed line); The methanol contribution was subtracted. The UVRS of AP was scaled to facilitate comparison.

Figure 5. Raman calculated AP α -helical-like fractions (primarily α - and 3_{10} and π -helix(bulge)) of AP in different solutions.

Figure 6. Calculated α -helix-like spectra of AP in pure water (solid line) and in 50% (v/v) methanol (dashed line). Calculated α -helix-like difference spectra were normalized to the intensity of the AmIII₁ band.

Figure 7. Calculated Gibbs free energy landscape of AP along the Ramachandran Ψ angle coordinate. — in pure water; — in 50% methanol; — in 50% ethanol; — in 50% TFE; The PPII-like conformation is the reference state.

Figure 8.
Calculated θ_{222} of AP in pure water and in 50% (v/v) alcohols.

Figure 9.
 $f_{\alpha\text{CD}}$ vs. $f_{\alpha\text{Raman}}$ of AP.

Figure 10.
Linear fit of previously measured θ_{222} and $f_{\alpha \text{Raman}}$ of AP in pure water.²⁷