Published in final edited form as:

J Phys Condens Matter. 2010 November 17; 22(45): 454117. doi:10.1088/0953-8984/22/45/454117.

Facilitated Translocation of Polypeptides Through A Single Nanopore

Robert Bikwemu¹, Aaron J. Wolfe¹, Xiangjun Xing², and Liviu Movileanu^{1,3,4,*}

¹ Department of Physics, Syracuse University, 201 Physics Building, Syracuse, New York 13244-1130, USA

² Institute of Natural Sciences and Department of Physics, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai, 200240 China

³ Structural Biology, Biochemistry, and Biophysics Program, Syracuse University, 111 College Place, Syracuse, New York 13244-4100, USA

⁴ The Syracuse Biomaterials Institute, Syracuse University, 121 Link Hall, Syracuse, New York 13244, USA

Abstract

The transport of polypeptides through nanopores is a key process in biology and medical biotechnology. Despite its critical importance, the underlying kinetics of polypeptide translocation through protein nanopores is not yet comprehensively understood. Here, we present a simple two-barrier, one-well kinetic model for the translocation of short positively charged polypeptides through a single transmembrane protein nanopore that is equipped with negatively charged rings, simply called traps. We demonstrate that the presence of these traps within the interior of the nanopore dramatically alters the free energy landscape for the partitioning of the polypeptide into the nanopore interior, as revealed by significant modifications in the activation free energies required for the transitions of the polypeptide from one state to other. Our kinetic model permits the calculation of the relative and absolute exit frequencies of the short cationic polypeptides through either opening of the nanopore. Moreover, this approach enabled quantitative assessment of the kinetics of translocation of the polypeptides through a protein nanopore, which is strongly dependent on several factors, including the nature of the translocating polypeptide, the position of the traps, the strength of the polypeptide-attractive trap interactions and the applied transmembrane voltage.

Keywords

Protein translocation; Electrostatic interaction; Kinetic model; Single-molecule biophysics; Free energy landscape; Binding sites

Introduction

Although it is well documented that polypeptides traverse transmembrane protein pores (1), the underlying mechanisms that drive the translocation process are poorly understood (2, 3). The fundamental reason for this problem is the complexity of the free energy landscape for the translocation of polypeptides across a narrow pore in a linear fashion. This is especially

*Correspondence/reprint requests: Liviu Movileanu, PhD, Department of Physics, Syracuse University, 201 Physics Building, Syracuse, New York 13244-1130, USA; Phone: 315-443-8078; Fax: 315-443-9103; lmovilea@physics.syr.edu.

true, if we consider the presence of multiple binding sites within the nanopore interior that pull the polypeptides into the pore. This electrostatic pulling of polypeptides is a process that adds to the complexity of the energetic landscape associated with the electrophoretic insertion accomplished by the transmembrane voltage (4–13).

In general, the translocation of polypeptides through protein pores is governed by three distinct mechanisms: (i) the ATP-dependent pulling from the N-terminal fragment of the protein, (ii) the electrophoretic-type pulling through applied transmembrane voltage that acts on the positively charged N-terminal presequence of the translocating protein, and (iii) the attraction between different regions of the polypeptide and well-defined binding sites located within the pore interior (14). Recently, several groups have shown that protein translocation across protein pores can also occur in the absence of an ATP-driven mechanism (14–16). For example, a transmembrane β -barrel pore can serve as a protein tunnel for enzymes to enter the cytosol (15, 17). The complexity of the polypeptide – pore interactions is given by the multitude of protein-protein contacts that can be either electrostatic or hydrophobic in nature. A quantitative understanding of the impact of these cumulative interactions on the overall translocation kinetics and thermodynamics is not yet available.

In this paper, we consider a simple analytical model inspired by protein translocation through mitochondrial membranes (18–22). We present a qualitative and quantitative description of the kinetic rates of the interaction between short cationic polypeptides and a protein pore equipped with attractive electrostatic traps. The employed experimental parameters were extracted from our prior studies with the *staphylococcal* α -hemolysin (α HL) pore, a heptameric protein of known crystal structure (23). The traps consisted of rings of negatively charged aspartic acid residues engineered on each subunit of the α HL protein pore (23, 24). Specifically, the K131D and K147D mutations were accomplished by cassette mutagenesis (Fig. 1) (25, 26). We previously performed single-channel recordings with engineered protein pores to better understand the alterations in the signatures of the polypeptide-induced current blockades (23, 27, 28). In these studies, we examined the exchange of cationic short polypeptides between the bulk aqueous phase and the pore interior of the α HL protein at the single-molecule level. The obvious fundamental advantage of the α HL protein pore is the fact that it lacks obstructing internal loops, such as in the case of other β -barrel protein pores (29–31), enabling the exploration of polypeptide translocation.

These prior experimental explorations have suggested that the kinetic data undergoes a two-barrier, single-well free energy diagram (Fig. 1) (2, 28, 32). This free energy profile is highly sensitive to an array of experimental factors and single-molecule experimental design, such as the location of the attractive traps (Tr), the hydrophobic content of the translocating polypeptide (h), the strength of the polypeptide-attractive trap interactions (s) and the applied transmembrane voltage (V). We employed the reaction rate theory to propose a simple kinetic model for the partitioning of short cationic polypeptides into a protein pore (33–35). This model facilitates qualitative and quantitative predictions of the association and dissociation rate constants k_{on} and k_{off} , as well as ways to separate k_{off} into individual rate constants that correspond to the exit through each of the openings of the protein pore (k_{off}^{trans} and k_{off}^{cis}) (23, 32). In previous single-channel studies (23, 32), the reciprocal of τ_{on} (the mean inter-event interval) was linearly dependent on the polypeptide concentration, whereas τ_{off} (the dwell time from the histogram of the occupied states) was independent of the polypeptide concentration. Thus, a simple bimolecular interaction between the polypeptide and the protein pore was assumed. The rate constants for association (k_{on}) were derived from the slopes of the plots of $1/\tau_{on}$ versus [pept], where

[pept] is the peptide concentration in the aqueous phase. The average k_{off} was derived from the averages of $1/\tau_{\text{off}}$ for different peptide concentrations.

A kinetic model of the polypeptide–pore interactions

The kinetic data obtained from single-channel electrical recordings with various trap-containing α HL protein pores and cationic polypeptides (23, 32) can simply be manipulated using a 1D motion along a reaction coordinate x with a free energy $G(x)$. The free energy landscape for the polypeptide-pore interactions can be represented as a two-barrier, and single-well profile (2, 28, 32). If we consider that $k_{-}(0)$ and $k_{+}(0)$ are the voltage-independent rate constants for the backward and forward reactions, respectively (Fig. 1):

$$k_{-}(0) = \gamma e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_{-}}{k_B T}} \quad (1)$$

$$k_{+}(0) = \gamma e^{-\frac{\varepsilon_{+}}{k_B T}} \quad (2)$$

where γ is the transmission coefficient (33). k_B and T denote the Boltzmann's constant and the absolute temperature, respectively. Here, ε_{-} and ε_{+} indicate the activation free energies for the entry and exit barriers of the pore, respectively. The lines of the free energy landscape represent the profile at zero and greater than zero transmembrane voltages, respectively (Fig. 1). δ_{-} and δ_{+} indicate the electrical distances from the minimum of the voltage to the transition state of the backward and forward reactions, respectively. At a finite transmembrane voltage, the free energy landscape is tilted to be $G(x) - f x$ (Fig. 1) (32). Therefore, the overall reaction rate constant of the polypeptide to exit the transmembrane protein pore is given by the following expression (33):

$$k(f) = k_{-}(0) e^{f \delta_{-}} + k_{+}(0) e^{-f \delta_{+}} \quad (3)$$

For a transition rate constant (33):

$$k_i = k_{i-0} \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta G^{\ddagger}}{RT}\right) \quad (4)$$

Where k_{i-0} is a constant, and $\Delta G^{\ddagger}$ is the overall activation free energy. For our two-barrier, one-well model, the overall activation free energy has several components, as follows:

$$\Delta G^{\ddagger} = \Delta G_n - qV - \Delta G_{\text{trap}} \quad (5)$$

Here, ΔG_n is the native energetic barrier for the WT protein pore (WT- α HL), q is the effective charge of the polypeptide within the voltage drop, V is the transmembrane voltage, and ΔG_{trap} is the alteration of the activation free energy as a result of the attractive trap. The entry and exit traps are engineered at the *trans* opening of the pore and at the *cis* end of the β barrel (23, 28). Prior experimental data showed that the entry trap has a major impact on the association rate constant k_{on} , but no primary effect on the dissociation rate constant k_{off} (Fig. 2B)(23). On the other hand, the exit trap has a major impact on the dissociation rate constant k_{off} , but no serious alteration on the dissociation rate constant k_{on} (Fig. 2B)(23). Therefore, we assume that the engineered traps overlap with the transition states that correspond to entry and exit barriers (Fig. 1). It is conceivable that the changes in the barrier height made

by the entry trap on the entry barrier have little impact on the exit activation free energy. Vice-versa, we judge that the alterations made by the exit trap have no major effect on the activation free energy of the entry barrier. The rate constants of association and dissociation will be given by the following expressions:

$$k_{on}=k_{on-0}\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta G_n}{RT}\right)\exp\left(\frac{zV}{V_0}\right)\exp\left(\frac{\Delta G_{trap}^{trans}}{RT}\right) \quad (6)$$

$$k_{off}^{trans}=k_{off-0}^{trans}\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta G_n^{trans}}{RT}\right)\exp\left(-\frac{z^{trans}V}{V_0}\right)\exp\left(\frac{\Delta G_{trap}^{trans}}{RT}\right) \quad (7)$$

$$k_{off}^{cis}=k_{off-0}^{cis}\exp\left(-\frac{\Delta G_n^{cis}}{RT}\right)\exp\left(\frac{z^{cis}V}{V_0}\right)\exp\left(\frac{\Delta G_{trap}^{cis}}{RT}\right) \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Where } V_0 = \frac{RT}{F} = \frac{kT}{e} = 25.6 \text{ mV at room temperature} \quad (9)$$

with F and R denoting the Faraday's and gas constants, respectively. From eqns. (6)–(9), all rates are strongly temperature dependent (28, 36–38). The association rate constant (k_{on}) is given by the following expression (34):

$$k_{on}(h, Tr, V) = k_{on}(h, Tr, 0) \exp\left[\frac{\zeta_{on} V}{V_0}\right] \quad (10)$$

Here, ζ_{on} is the effective number of charges of the polypeptide during the association process. The main parameters that alter the kinetic rate constants, the hydrophathy index (h), the nature/location of the attractive traps (Tr), and the applied transmembrane voltage (V), are placed in between parenthesis. We found that the association rate constants undergo a single exponential dependence on the applied transmembrane voltage (23, 32, 39). Fitting the curves $k_{on}(V)$ with single exponentials, one can obtain the values of $k_{on}(h, Tr, 0)$ that correspond to zero transmembrane voltage. In general, the k_{off} rate constants of dissociation for short polypeptides interacting with the α HL protein pore obey to a biphasic behavior with the applied transmembrane voltage (23, 32, 39). The dissociation rate constant is given by (34):

$$k_{off}(h, Tr, V) = k_{off}^{trans}(h, Tr, 0) \exp\left[-\frac{\zeta_{off}^{trans} V}{V_0}\right] k_{off}^{cis}(h, Tr, 0) \exp\left[\frac{\zeta_{off}^{cis} V}{V_0}\right] \quad (11)$$

Here $k_{off}^{trans}(h, Tr, 0)$ and $k_{off}^{cis}(h, Tr, 0)$ are the dissociation rate constants of the polypeptides through the *trans* and *cis* entrances at 0 mV, respectively. From the fit of the family of experimental curves $k_{off}(h, Tr, V)$ that correspond to individual polypeptides, we can obtain the dissociation rate constants to the *cis* and *trans* sides ($k_{off}^{cis}(h, Tr, 0)$, and $k_{off}^{trans}(h, Tr, 0)$) at a transmembrane potential of 0 mV, respectively. In addition, we can obtain the

exponential coefficients $\zeta_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ and $\zeta_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$. Based upon the rate constants of dissociation, we can examine the relative exit frequencies through the *trans* and *cis* sides (32), respectively:

$$n_{\text{exit}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, V) = \frac{\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, V)}}{\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, V)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, V)}} \quad (12)$$

and

$$n_{\text{exit}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, V) = \frac{\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, V)}}{\frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, V)} + \frac{1}{\tau_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, V)}} \quad (13)$$

Therefore, the total exit frequency through the *trans* and *cis* entrances is given by the following expression:

$$f_{\text{exit}}^{\text{total}} = f_{\text{exit}}^{\text{trans}} + f_{\text{exit}}^{\text{cis}} = [n_{\text{exit}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, V) + n_{\text{exit}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, V)] k_{\text{on}}(h, Tr, V) C_{\text{pept}} \quad (14)$$

where C_{pept} is the peptide concentration in aqueous phase, at the *trans* side of the bilayer. Using Eyring's transition state theory (TST) (52, 53), the rate constants that correspond to 0 mV can be written (40):

$$k_{\text{on}}(h, Tr, 0) = \left(\frac{\kappa k_B T}{h} \right) \exp \left[-\frac{\Delta G_{\text{on}}^{\ddagger}(h, Tr, 0)}{RT} \right] \quad (15)$$

$$k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}(h, Tr, 0) = \left(\frac{\kappa k_B T}{h} \right) \exp \left[-\frac{\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\ddagger \text{trans}}(h, Tr, 0)}{RT} \right] \quad (16)$$

$$k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}(h, Tr, 0) = \left(\frac{\kappa k_B T}{h} \right) \exp \left[-\frac{\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\ddagger \text{cis}}(h, Tr, 0)}{RT} \right] \quad (17)$$

Here, h is the Planck constant. κ is the transmission coefficient. The activation free energies are also voltage dependent:

$$\Delta G_{\text{on}}^{\ddagger}(h, Tr, V) = \Delta G_{\text{on}}^{\ddagger}(h, Tr, 0) - \zeta_{\text{on}} RT \frac{V}{V_0} \quad (18)$$

$$\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\ddagger \text{trans}}(h, Tr, V) = \Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\ddagger \text{trans}}(h, Tr, 0) + \zeta_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}} RT \frac{V}{V_0} \quad (19)$$

$$\Delta G_{off}^{\neq cis}(h, Tr, V) = \Delta G_{off}^{\neq cis}(h, Tr, 0) - \zeta_{off}^{cis} RT \frac{V}{V_0} \quad (20)$$

If we consider the Eyring “frequency factor” (34):

$$ff = \frac{k_B T}{h} = 6 \times 10^{12} \text{ sec}^{-1} \quad (21)$$

Then, we can calculate $\Delta G_{on}(h, Tr, 0)$, $\Delta G_{off}^{trans}(h, Tr, 0)$ and $\Delta G_{off}^{cis}(h, Tr, 0)$. However, ff from equation (21) is valid for only elementary transitions over a distance less than the mean free path of 0.1 Å. Therefore, we chose the more suitable value of 10^9 s^{-1} , which corresponds to diffusional transitions over a distance of 1 nm (34).

Results

The aspartic acid-based traps were engineered by single-site mutagenesis (23, 27). The polypeptides used in this work were Syn B2= MLSRQQSQRQSRQSRQSRLL (hydrophilic polypeptide with the hydropathy index $h=-44.4$) and Cox IV= MLSLRQSIRFFKPATRTLCSRY (much less hydrophilic polypeptide with $h=-5.2$). Electrical recordings were carried out with planar bilayer lipid membranes (41–43). The electrolyte in both chambers was 1 M KCl, 10 mM potassium phosphate, pH 7.4. The narrowest region of the α HL pore features a β -barrel structure, which forms the transmembrane domain, and is almost 50 Å long and about 20 Å wide (based on side chain to side chain dimensions) (Fig. 2). The length of the polypeptides in extended conformation is greater than 70 Å. The total internal volume of the β -barrel is about 10^4 Å^3 (44). The polypeptides were added to the *trans* side of the bilayer chamber.

The time constants τ_{on} and τ_{off} were derived from standard dwell time histograms of the single-channel electrical data (23, 28). The fits of the data were accomplished using log likelihood ratio (LLR) tests to compare various fitting models (44–46). In general, the fit of the dwell time histograms contained a well-defined single- or double-exponential function. At a confidence level of 0.95, fits to a three-exponential model were not statistically better than single- or double-exponential models, as judged by the LLR value. As in a previously published report (32), we attributed the very short τ_{off} component to collisions between polypeptides and the entrance of the nanopore. The long τ_{off} component was attributed to major partitioning of polypeptides into the lumen of the nanopores. We employed equation (11) and the voltage dependence of the long τ_{off} to extract the model parameters. Indeed, we found that the dwell time (τ_{off}) of the polypeptides within the pore interior has a biphasic voltage dependence (23, 32). The U-shaped voltage dependence of the rate constant k_{off} on the transmembrane voltage indicates that the short cationic polypeptides bind to the α HL pore and exit through either the *trans* or *cis* opening. At lower transmembrane voltages, τ_{off} increased with the applied transmembrane voltage, whereas at higher transmembrane voltages, τ_{off} decreased with the applied transmembrane voltage (23, 32). This finding is specific to semi-flexible charged polypeptides, whose contour length is comparable with the length of the pore.

In Fig. 2, we show the fundamental dissimilarities between the four situations analyzed in this paper: the wild-type pore (Fig. 2A, no attractive trap was engineered), the entry trap-containing pore (Fig. 2B, a single attractive trap was engineered at the entry of the pore; position 131 near the *trans* opening), the exit trap-containing pore (Fig. 2C, a single attractive trap was engineered at the exit of the pore; position 147 near the *cis* end of the

barrel), and double trap-containing pore (Fig. 2D, this protein pore contains both traps from Fig. 2B and Fig. 2C). The association rate constants are shown as family of 2D plots, whose “x” axes are the applied transmembrane voltages (Figs. 2E and 2F). In particular, Fig. 2E and Fig. 2F show the k_{on} values that correspond to a hydrophilic polypeptide (Syn B2) and a less hydrophilic polypeptide (Cox IV), respectively. Clearly, not only the applied transmembrane voltage, but also the nature of the attractive trap and interacting polypeptide strongly impact the rate constant of association. We found a single-exponential dependence of k_{on} on the applied transmembrane voltage, confirming that at a transmembrane voltage greater than zero, the free energy landscape is tilted linearly by $G(V) - fV$, where V , the applied transmembrane voltage, is the reaction coordinate (32). This finding is also in accord with our simplistic model for which the activation free energy is voltage dependent (see eqs. (3)–(5)). Remarkably, the k_{on} association rate constant increased dramatically when both the entry and exit traps were present in the pore regardless of the hydrophilic nature of the polypeptide (Fig. 2E and Fig. 2F). Moreover, the k_{on} values for the hydrophilic polypeptide were always greater than those obtained for the less hydrophilic polypeptide, confirming a higher energetic penalty for more hydrophobic polypeptides to traverse the pore.

Similarly, the $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ and $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ dissociation rate constants were strongly dependent on not only the applied transmembrane voltage, but also on the location of the electrostatic trap and Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index of the translocating polypeptide (Fig. 3) (47). For example, the entry trap reduced the $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ dissociation rate constant by comparison with the wild-type pore (Fig. 3A, Fig. 3B). In contrast, the exit trap greatly increased the $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ dissociation rate constant, suggesting that this modification of the pore catalyzes the transit of the polypeptides from one side of the membrane to the other (Fig. 3C and Fig. 3D).

Using the equations (12)–(14), we calculated the relative and absolute exit frequencies through either the *trans* or *cis* opening of the pore. We assumed a linear dependence of the native activation free energies $\Delta G_{\text{on}}^\ddagger$, $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}\ddagger}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\ddagger}$ on the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index of the translocating polypeptide (47, 48). This is motivated by the fact that the semi-flexible polypeptides are short enough to implement the linear approximation (49). For this calculation, we also considered that the electric charges and the hydrophobic units are uniformly distributed along the polypeptide chain. Based on the fitting parameters derived from our previous experimental data (23, 28), we calculated the relative and absolute exit frequencies as functions depending on the hydropathy index. These kinetic parameters are illustrated as 2D plots of varying applied transmembrane voltage (Fig. 4 and Fig. 5). The data are calculated for the wild-type (Fig. 4A, Fig. 4C, Fig. 5A, Fig. 5C) and entry trap-containing protein pore (Fig. 4B, Fig. 4D, Fig. 5B, Fig. 5D). Increasing the applied transmembrane voltage increases the activation free energy for the dissociation events through the *trans* side, but decreases the activation free energy for the dissociation events through the *cis* side (Fig. 1). Therefore, the relative *trans* exit frequencies decrease with the applied transmembrane voltage (Fig. 4A, Fig. 4B), whereas the relative *cis* exit frequencies increase with the applied transmembrane voltage (Fig. 4C, Fig. 4D).

On the other hand, the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index has a more complex impact on the dissociation events. For the wild-type protein pore, more hydrophobic polypeptides exhibited a greater relative *trans* exit frequencies than more hydrophilic polypeptides (Fig. 4A). This finding contrasted with that for the entry trap-containing protein pore for which more hydrophilic polypeptides showed an increased relative *trans* exit frequencies as compared to the values obtained with the less hydrophilic polypeptides (Fig. 4B). In the case of the wild-type protein pore, the absolute *trans* and *cis* exit frequencies increased with the applied transmembrane voltage (Fig. 5A, Fig. 5C).

In the case of the entry trap-containing protein pore, the effect of the hydropathy index on the absolute exit frequencies was strongly voltage dependent (Fig. 5B and Fig. 5D). For example, the short cationic polypeptides exhibited higher absolute *cis* exit frequencies at greater transmembrane voltages (>70 mV), but lower absolute *cis* exit frequencies at low transmembrane voltages (<70 mV) (Fig. 5D). Absolute *trans* exit frequencies increased with the transmembrane voltage for hydrophilic polypeptides ($h \sim 40$), contrasting with their decrease with the transmembrane voltage for less hydrophilic polypeptides ($h \sim -5$) (Fig. 5B). These findings indicate the complexity of the simultaneous impact of the applied transmembrane voltage and the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index on the activation free energies required for the polypeptide translocation across the entry trap-containing protein pore.

We calculated the changes in the activation free energies when the property of either the translocating polypeptide (e.g., the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index) or the pore (e.g., the location of the traps, the applied transmembrane voltage) was altered. The “on” activation free energy $\Delta G_{\text{on}}^{\neq}$ was always smaller than the “off” activation free energies $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}\neq}$ and $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\neq}$. Table 1 lists the values of these barriers, which were calculated at zero transmembrane voltage. The range of the barrier heights was between 3.9 and 10 kcal/mol. Both the “on” and “off” values were smaller when the entry and exit traps were present within the pore interior. We were interested in exploring the overall effect of the entry and exit traps on the $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\neq}$ activation free energy. Fig. 6 shows $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{trap}}^{\text{cis}} = \Delta G_{\text{off-trap,h}}^{\text{cis}\neq} - \Delta G_{\text{off-WT,h}}^{\text{cis}\neq}$, which was calculated at +60 mV. This figure illustrates the effect of the traps on the $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\neq}$ activation free energy for the three types of engineered nanopores: entry trap-, exit trap-, and double trap (DM)-containing protein pores, respectively. The horizontal axis is the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index.

The obvious finding of these calculations is that the reduction in the $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\neq}$ activation free energy is much greater for hydrophobic polypeptides than for hydrophilic polypeptides (Fig. 6). For example, $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{trap}}^{\text{cis}} \sim -5$ kcal/mol for the exit trap-containing protein pores traversed by a hydrophobic polypeptide (hydropathy index $h=20$), but this value is much smaller than that value corresponding to a hydrophilic polypeptide (hydropathy index $h=-50$). For example, for a hydrophilic polypeptide with $h=-50$, $\Delta \Delta G_{\text{trap}}^{\text{cis}} \sim -1.5$ and ~ -2.3 kcal/mol for the exit trap- and double trap-containing protein pores, respectively (Fig. 6). As expected, the presence of the entry trap within the interior of the pore had a smaller impact than that of exit trap, which overlaps with the transition state corresponding to the exit barrier. Therefore, we infer that the exit trap has a major impact on the $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ activation free energy and that the hydrophobic polypeptides have a greater ability to exit the pore through the *cis* side than the hydrophilic polypeptides.

Discussion

In this paper, we show a simple model that confirms qualitatively our previously published single-channel electrical recordings with engineered protein nanopores interacting with short cationic polypeptides (23, 28). We judge that this model is only applicable to semi-flexible polypeptides, whose contour length is comparable with the length of the protein pore. For much longer polypeptides, the energetic barrier to traverse the protein pore would be greatly enhanced, decreasing the probability of the translocation events from one side of the membrane to the other. Indeed, our similar single-channel experiments with trap-containing protein pores interacting with folded protein domains provided results that contrast the outcomes of this work (27). We employed engineered polypeptides of varying positively charged pb₂ presequence of the cytochrome b₂, which were fused to the small RNase barnase (Ba). We tested the interactions of the folded pb₂-Ba polypeptides with the trap-containing protein pores and found that such protein analytes cannot traverse the nanopore

from one side of the membrane to the other. For example, the pb₂-Ba polypeptides were locked within the nanopore interior for very long time (27). This result resembles with the spontaneous attachment of a single folded protein within the interior of a nanopore (50).

Bayley and colleagues, using a similar approach, were able to dramatically increase the k_{on} rate constant of association between single-stranded polynucleotides (ssDNA) and the α HL protein pore equipped with positively charged traps, catalyzing the interaction of nucleic acids with the protein (51). In contrast with the findings of our work, their single-channel electrical recordings did not show significant alterations in the transit time of the ssDNA polymers through the pore. This dissimilarity can be explained in terms of the features of the translocating polymers (23, 28, 51). First, an obvious distinction is that ssDNA employed in their work was much longer than length of the nanopore. Second, one difference is the high charged density of the ssDNA due to the phosphate groups as compared to the short cationic polypeptides used previously (23, 28). Undoubtedly, more experimentation and biophysical computation is required to decipher the underlying mechanisms that govern the translocation of short semi-flexible polymers through nanopores equipped with engineered electrostatic traps.

We interpret that the electrostatic trap implies an additional minimum (i.e., binding site) in the free energy landscape. We judge that that for a system containing two binding sites (i.e., two minima), there are two possibilities: i) the minima and the transition states in the free energy landscape are far away from each other. In this case, they have an independent contribution to the overall kinetics, and ii) the minima and the transition states are near to each other, so the transition state with the higher energetic barrier reduces, resulting in a faster rate constant for the polypeptide to exit the pore. In accord with our hypothesis, the exit trap produced a significant increase in the rate constant of dissociation $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ (Fig. 3C and Fig. 3D), altering the exit barrier on the *cis* side of the barrel (Fig. 1). For the double trap-containing pore, there are two minima that correspond to the entry and exit traps and one minimum that corresponds to the native binding site, near the pore constriction (Fig. 1) (32). Overall, both electrostatic traps increased both the rate constants of association and dissociation, k_{on} and k_{off} , respectively (Fig. 2E, Fig. 3).

Our kinetic model predicts that a more hydrophobic polypeptide exhibits a smaller exit activation free energy on the *cis* end of the barrel (Fig. 6). This result is quite interesting, since it demonstrates that a hydrophobic polymer experiences a lower energetic penalty to exit an aqueous nanopore than a hydrophilic polymer. This finding can be explained in terms of polymer-pore wall interactions, which are mediated by water molecules. The hydrophobic polypeptide shows a repulsive interaction with the pore walls as compared to the hydrophilic polypeptide. Therefore, this model indicates that repulsive interactions can also be employed to increase the rate of translocation from one side of the membrane to the other. An optimized rate of translocation would imply a combination of attractive and repulsive traps. Using stochastic site-binding analytical models, Kolomeisky and his colleagues explored the impact of the binding sites, their nature (e.g., attraction, repulsion) and the asymmetry of the interacting potential on the rate of flow of particles through a nanopore (8, 11). Remarkably, they found that the attractive binding sites can catalyze the transport at low concentrations in the chamber, contrasting to the situation of high particle concentrations in the chamber where the repulsive binding sites yield the most optimal transport rates.

It is conceivable that polypeptide translocation through barrel-like protein nanopores, which occurs in the outer membranes of mitochondria, chloroplasts and Gram-negative bacteria, undergoes a complex array of attractive and repulsive forces, involving hydrophobic and electrostatic interactions between the side chains of the translocating polypeptide and the side chains of the pore interior. For example, the lethal factor (LF) translocates through the

protective antigen channel (PA₆₃) of anthrax toxin in the absence of any ATP-based machinery. In addition of electrostatic interactions between the positively charged residues of the LF polypeptide and acidic side chains of the heptameric pore interior of PA₆₃, this translocation process is also mediated by hydrophobic contacts with a phenylalanine ring located within the pore lumen (14). Collier and colleagues, based upon single-site mutagenesis of this phenylalanine ring, have proposed that the hydrophobic interactions have a major impact in the unfolding of the LF polypeptide, producing a “translocation competent” conformation. This process catalyzes the polypeptide transport from one side of the membrane to the other. Using a similar approach of our work (23, 27, 28), Guan and colleagues used the α HL protein pore to explore the interactions of aromatic residue-containing polypeptides with nanopores equipped with hydrophobic side chains (52). This study showed the strength of the hydrophobic interactions that dominate the polypeptide-pore energetic landscape, revealing alterations in the association and dissociation rate constants.

Since the α HL pore maintains the open state for long periods even in extreme experimental conditions (e.g., pH, salt, temperature etc.) (3), it should be possible to examine the interaction between unfolded peptides and the lumen of the α HL pore. We cannot say whether the polypeptides undergo conformational transitions when they enter the interior of the α HL pore, but the uniform current blockades suggest that single conformations are adopted within the pore. Chemical denaturants or temperature ramps could be used to determine the associated enthalpy and entropy changes. A fundamental issue that will be addressed in the future experiments is whether the polypeptides bind to the α HL pore in folded, partially folded or unfolded conformations. Of course, more computation and theory is required to determine the limits of existing electrical recording instrumentation for probing subtle conformational changes of the translocating polypeptide (11, 12, 39, 53–58). On the other hand, larger monomeric β -barrel pores, with the internal diameter greater than that of the α HL protein pore, are desirable for the exploration of the translocation of polypeptides and folded protein domains. These studies require robust, versatile and tractable barrel protein scaffolds that will be used further to engineer functional groups needed in protein translocation.

In summary, we show a simple two-barrier, one-well energetic landscape for obtaining the detailed kinetic profile of polypeptide translocation through a protein nanopore equipped with attractive electrostatic traps. The model parameters are extracted from fittings of experimental kinetic data, derived from prior single-channel recordings, reinforcing the quantitative feature of the model. This work is only applicable to short semi-flexible polypeptides, whose contour length is comparable with the length of the pore. Qualitatively, this study shows that the position of the electrostatic traps, the nature of the translocating polypeptide and transmembrane voltage have a complex impact on the absolute rates for exiting the nanopore. Moreover, the model predicts that the association rate constants decrease with the increase in the hydrophobic content of the translocating polypeptide, in accord with previously published experimental data (23). In contrast, the dissociation rate constant across the *cis* end of the barrel increases due to repulsive interactions between the polypeptide and the pore walls, decreasing the activation free energy for exiting the nanopore.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dmitrii Makarov and Anatoly Kolomeisky for stimulating discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (DMR-0706517 and DMR-1006332), the National Institutes of Health (R01 GM088403) and by the Syracuse Biomaterials Institute. RB is a recipient of a fellowship provided by the AGEP-NY-PR Program, which was funded through the National Science Foundation (HRD-0703452).

Reference List

1. Wickner W, Schekman R. Protein translocation across biological membranes. *Science*. 2005 Dec 2; 310(5753):1452–6. [PubMed: 16322447]
2. Movileanu L. Squeezing a single polypeptide through a nanopore. *Soft Matter*. 2008; 4(5):925–31.
3. Movileanu L. Interrogating single proteins through nanopores: challenges and opportunities. *Trends Biotechnol*. 2009; 27(6):333–41. [PubMed: 19394097]
4. Berezhkovskii AM, Pustovoit MA, Bezrukov SM. Effect of binding on particle number fluctuations in a membrane channel. *J Chem Phys*. 2002; 116(14):6216–20.
5. Dagdug L, Berezhkovskii A, Bezrukov SM, Weiss GH. Diffusion-controlled reactions with a binding site hidden in a channel. *J Chem Phys*. 2003; 118(5):2367–73.
6. Berezhkovskii AM, Bezrukov SM. Optimizing transport of metabolites through large channels: molecular sieves with and without binding. *Biophys J*. 2005 Mar; 88(3):L17–L19. [PubMed: 15626697]
7. Berezhkovskii AM, Hummer G, Bezrukov SM. Identity of distributions of direct uphill and downhill translocation times for particles traversing membrane channels. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2006 Jul 14; 97(2):020601. [PubMed: 16907424]
8. Kotsev S, Kolomeisky AB. Effect of orientation in translocation of polymers through nanopores. *J Chem Phys*. 2006 Aug 28; 125(8):084906. [PubMed: 16965056]
9. Krasilnikov OV, Rodrigues CG, Bezrukov SM. Single polymer molecules in a protein nanopore in the limit of a strong polymer-pore attraction. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2006 Jul 7; 97(1):018301. [PubMed: 16907416]
10. Bauer WR, Nadler W. Molecular transport through channels and pores: effects of in-channel interactions and blocking. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2006 Aug 1; 103(31):11446–51. [PubMed: 16861303]
11. Kolomeisky AB. Channel-facilitated molecular transport across membranes: attraction, repulsion, and asymmetry. *Phys Rev Lett*. 2007 Jan 26; 98(4):048105. [PubMed: 17358819]
12. Kolomeisky AB, Kotsev S. Effect of interactions on molecular fluxes and fluctuations in the transport across membrane channels. *J Chem Phys*. 2008 Feb 28; 128(8):085101. [PubMed: 18315084]
13. Kotsev S, Kolomeisky AB. Translocation of polymers with folded configurations across nanopores. *J Chem Phys*. 2007 Nov 14; 127(18):185103. [PubMed: 18020666]
14. Krantz BA, Melnyk RA, Zhang S, Juris SJ, Lacy DB, Wu Z, et al. A phenylalanine clamp catalyzes protein translocation through the anthrax toxin pore. *Science*. 2005 Jul 29; 309(5735):777–81. [PubMed: 16051798]
15. Krantz BA, Finkelstein A, Collier RJ. Protein Translocation through the Anthrax Toxin Transmembrane Pore is Driven by a Proton Gradient. *J Mol Biol*. 2006 Feb 3; 355(5):968–79. [PubMed: 16343527]
16. Fischer A, Montal M. Single molecule detection of intermediates during botulinum neurotoxin translocation across membranes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2007 Jun 19; 104(25):10447–52. [PubMed: 17563359]
17. Karginov VA, Nestorovich EM, Moayeri M, Leppla SH, Bezrukov SM. Blocking anthrax lethal toxin at the protective antigen channel by using structure-inspired drug design. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2005 Oct 18; 102(42):15075–80. [PubMed: 16214885]
18. Huang S, Ratliff KS, Matouschek A. Protein unfolding by the mitochondrial membrane potential. *Nat Struct Biol*. 2002 Apr; 9(4):301–7. [PubMed: 11887183]
19. Huang S, Ratliff KS, Schwartz MP, Spenner JM, Matouschek A. Mitochondria unfold precursor proteins by unraveling them from their N-termini. *Nat Struct Biol*. 1999 Dec; 6(12):1132–8. [PubMed: 10581555]
20. Prakash S, Matouschek A. Protein unfolding in the cell. *Trends Biochem Sci*. 2004 Nov; 29(11):593–600. [PubMed: 15501678]
21. Shariff K, Ghosal S, Matouschek A. The force exerted by the membrane potential during protein import into the mitochondrial matrix. *Biophys J*. 2004 Jun; 86(6):3647–52. [PubMed: 15189861]

22. Inobe T, Kraut DA, Matouschek A. How to pick a protein and pull at it. *Nat Struct Mol Biol.* 2008 Nov; 15(11):1135–6. [PubMed: 18985068]
23. Wolfe AJ, Mohammad MM, Cheley S, Bayley H, Movileanu L. Catalyzing the translocation of polypeptides through attractive interactions. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2007; 129(45):14034–41. [PubMed: 17949000]
24. Mohammad MM, Movileanu L. Impact of distant charge reversals within a robust beta-barrel protein pore. *J Phys Chem B.* 2010 Jul 8; 114(26):8750–9. [PubMed: 20540583]
25. Howorka S, Movileanu L, Lu XF, Magnon M, Cheley S, Braha O, et al. A protein pore with a single polymer chain tethered within the lumen. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2000; 122(11):2411–6.
26. Movileanu L, Howorka S, Braha O, Bayley H. Detecting protein analytes that modulate transmembrane movement of a polymer chain within a single protein pore. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2000; 18(10):1091–5. [PubMed: 11017049]
27. Mohammad MM, Prakash S, Matouschek A, Movileanu L. Controlling a single protein in a nanopore through electrostatic traps. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2008 Mar 26; 130(12):4081–8. [PubMed: 18321107]
28. Mohammad MM, Movileanu L. Excursion of a single polypeptide into a protein pore: simple physics, but complicated biology. *Eur Biophys J.* 2008; 37(6):913–25. [PubMed: 18368402]
29. van den Berg B. The FadL family: unusual transporters for unusual substrates. *Curr Opin Struct Biol.* 2005 Aug; 15(4):401–7. [PubMed: 16005205]
30. Biswas S, Mohammad MM, Patel DR, Movileanu L, van den Berg B. Structural insight into OprD substrate specificity. *Nat Struct Mol Biol.* 2007; 14(11):1108–9. [PubMed: 17952093]
31. Biswas S, Mohammad MM, Movileanu L, van den Berg B. Crystal structure of the outer membrane protein OpdK from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *Structure.* 2008; 16(7):1027–35. [PubMed: 18611376]
32. Movileanu L, Schmittschmitt JP, Scholtz JM, Bayley H. Interactions of the peptides with a protein pore. *Biophys J.* 2005; 89(2):1030–45. [PubMed: 15923222]
33. Hanggi P, Talkner P, Borkovec M. Reaction-Rate Theory - 50 Years After Kramers. *Rev Mod Phys.* 1990; 62(2):251–341.
34. Andersen OS. Graphic representation of the results of kinetic analyses. *J Gen Physiol.* 1999; 114(4):589–90. [PubMed: 10577023]
35. Jordan PC. Ion permeation and chemical kinetics. *J Gen Physiol.* 1999; 114(4):601–3. [PubMed: 10577027]
36. Kang XF, Gu LQ, Cheley S, Bayley H. Single Protein Pores Containing Molecular Adapters at High Temperatures. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl.* 2005 Jan 28; 44(10):1495–9. [PubMed: 15678432]
37. Jung Y, Bayley H, Movileanu L. Temperature-responsive protein pores. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2006; 128(47):15332–40. [PubMed: 17117886]
38. Chimere C, Movileanu L, Pezeshki S, Winterhalter M, Kleinekathofer U. Transport at the nanoscale: Temperature dependence of ion conductance. *Eur Biophys J.* 2008; 38(1):121–5. [PubMed: 18726094]
39. Goodrich CP, Kirmizialtin S, Huyghues-Despointes BM, Zhu AP, Scholtz JM, et al. Single-molecule electrophoresis of beta-hairpin peptides by electrical recordings and Langevin dynamics simulations. *J Phys Chem B.* 2007; 111(13):3332–5. [PubMed: 17388500]
40. Hille, B. *Ion Channels of Excitable Membranes*. 3. Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA: Sinauer Associates, Inc; 2001.
41. Movileanu L, Neagoe I, Flonta ML. Interaction of the antioxidant flavonoid quercetin with planar lipid bilayers. *Int J Pharm.* 2000; 205(1–2):135–46. [PubMed: 11000550]
42. Movileanu L, Bayley H. Partitioning of a polymer into a nanoscopic protein pore obeys a simple scaling law. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2001; 98(18):10137–41. [PubMed: 11504913]
43. Movileanu L, Cheley S, Howorka S, Braha O, Bayley H. Location of a constriction in the lumen of a transmembrane pore by targeted covalent attachment of polymer molecules. *J Gen Physiol.* 2001; 117(3):239–51. [PubMed: 11222628]
44. Movileanu L, Cheley S, Bayley H. Partitioning of individual flexible polymers into a nanoscopic protein pore. *Biophys J.* 2003; 85(2):897–910. [PubMed: 12885637]

45. McManus OB, Blatz AL, Magleby KL. Sampling, Log Binning, Fitting, and Plotting Durations of Open and Shut Intervals From Single Channels and the Effects of Noise. *Pflugers Arch.* 1987; 410(4-5):530-53. [PubMed: 2448743]
46. McManus OB, Magleby KL. Kinetic states and modes of single large-conductance calcium-activated potassium channels in cultured rat skeletal-muscle. *J Physiol (Lond)*. 1988; 402:79-120. [PubMed: 3236256]
47. Kyte J, Doolittle RF. A simple method for displaying the hydropathic character of a protein. *J Mol Biol.* 1982 May 5; 157(1):105-32. [PubMed: 7108955]
48. Rubinstein, M.; Colby, R. *Polymer Physics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.
49. Scherer, POJ.; Fischer, SF. *Theoretical Molecular Biophysics*. Heidelberg: Springer; 2010.
50. Niedzwiecki DJ, Grazul J, Movileanu L. Single-molecule observation of protein adsorption onto an inorganic surface. *J Am Chem Soc.* 2010; 132(16):10816-22. [PubMed: 20681715]
51. Maglia G, Restrepo MR, Mikhailova E, Bayley H. Enhanced translocation of single DNA molecules through {alpha}-hemolysin nanopores by manipulation of internal charge. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2008 Dec 16; 105(50):19720-5. [PubMed: 19060213]
52. Zhao Q, Jayawardhana DA, Wang D, Guan X. Study of Peptide Transport through Engineered Protein Channels. *J Phys Chem B.* 2009 Mar 19; 113(11):3572-8. [PubMed: 19231820]
53. Tian P, Andricioaei I. Repetitive pulling catalyzes co-translocational unfolding of barnase during import through a mitochondrial pore. *J Mol Biol.* 2005 Jul 29; 350(5):1017-34. [PubMed: 15979642]
54. Huang L, Kirmizialtin S, Makarov DE. Computer simulations of the translocation and unfolding of a protein pulled mechanically through a pore. *J Chem Phys.* 2005 Sep 22. 123(12):124903. [PubMed: 16392523]
55. Huang L, Makarov DE. Translocation of a knotted polypeptide through a pore. *J Chem Phys.* 2008 Sep 28. 129(12):121107. [PubMed: 19044999]
56. Kirmizialtin S, Ganesan V, Makarov DE. Translocation of a beta-hairpin-forming peptide through a cylindrical tunnel. *J Chem Phys.* 2004; 121(20):10268-77. [PubMed: 15549903]
57. Kirmizialtin S, Huang L, Makarov DE. Computer simulations of protein translocation. *Phys Stat Sol (b)*. 2006; 243(9):2038-47.
58. Makarov DE. Computer simulations and theory of protein translocation. *Acc Chem Res.* 2008; 42(2):281-9. [PubMed: 19072704]

Figure 1.

A simple two-barrier, single-well free energy landscape for the translocation of polypeptides through a single wild-type α -hemolysin (WT- α HL) pore (32). The first and second barrier indicates the entry and exit free energy height, respectively. The top continuous line represents the free energy landscape at zero transmembrane voltage. The bottom continuous line indicates the hypothetical free energy landscape at a transmembrane voltage greater than zero.

Figure 2.

The α HL protein pore was engineered to feature electrostatic traps. The circular traps contained seven aspartic acid residues, one per each subunit of the heptameric α HL pore. (A) No trap, the wild-type α HL (WT- α HL) protein; (B) The entry trap-containing α HL protein (K131D); (C) The exit trap-containing α HL protein (K147D); (D) The double trap-containing α HL protein (DM). The bottom panels show patches of single-channel electrical traces acquired with 34 μ M of hydrophilic Syn B2 polypeptide added to the *trans* side of the

chamber (23). The frequency and duration of the polypeptide-induced current blockades were dependent on the position of the engineered attractive trap. All traces were recorded in symmetrical buffer conditions (1 M KCl, 10 mM potassium phosphate, pH 7.4) at a transmembrane voltage of +60 mV. The single-channel electrical traces were low-pass Bessel filtered at 2 kHz. (E) Voltage dependence of the association rate constant k_{on} measured with wild-type and trap-containing α HL pores interacting with the hydrophilic polypeptide Syn B2; (F) The same as in (E), but interacting with the less hydrophilic polypeptide Cox IV.

Figure 3.

Voltage dependence of the rate constants of dissociation $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ and $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ measured with wild-type and trap-containing α HL pores. (A) $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ measured with the hydrophilic polypeptide Syn B2; (B) $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}}$ measured with the less hydrophilic polypeptide Cox IV; (C) $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ measured with the hydrophilic polypeptide Syn B2; (D) $k_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}}$ measured with the less hydrophilic polypeptide Cox IV. The other experimental conditions are the same as those showed in Fig. 2.

Figure 4.

A 2D plot that shows the dependence of the relative exit frequencies as functions of the applied transmembrane voltage and the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index. (A) Relative *trans* exit frequency calculated for the WT- α HL protein pore; (B) Relative *trans* exit frequency calculated for the entry trap-containing α HL protein pore; (C) Relative *cis* exit frequency calculated for the WT- α HL protein pore; (D) Relative *cis* exit frequency calculated for the entry trap-containing α HL protein pore.

Figure 5.

A 2D plot that shows the dependence of the absolute exit frequencies as functions of the applied transmembrane voltage and the Kyte-Doolittle hydropathy index. (A) Absolute *trans* exit frequency calculated for the WT- α HL protein pore; (B) Absolute *trans* exit frequency calculated for the entry trap-containing α HL protein pore; (C) Absolute *cis* exit frequency calculated for the WT- α HL protein pore; (D) Absolute *cis* exit frequency calculated for the entry trap-containing α HL protein pore.

Figure 6. $\Delta\Delta G_{\text{trap}}^{\text{cis}} = \Delta G_{\text{off-trap},h}^{\text{cis}\neq} - \Delta G_{\text{off-WT},h}^{\text{cis}\neq}$ calculated at +60 mV. The values used to calculate $\Delta G_{\text{off-pore},h}^{\text{cis}}$, where h is the Kyte-Doolittle hydrophathy index, were derived from the kinetic rate constants (eqns. (15)–(21)).

Table 1

The activation free energies $\Delta G_{\text{on}}^\ddagger$, $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}\ddagger}$, $\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\ddagger}$, which were calculated at 0 mV. The kinetic rate constants of dissociation were calculated by fitting experimental data with a double-exponential function, where the corresponding kinetic rate constants at 0 mV were extrapolated.

Pore/polypeptide	$\Delta G_{\text{on}}^\ddagger$ (kcal/mol)	$\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{trans}\ddagger}$ (kcal/mol)	$\Delta G_{\text{off}}^{\text{cis}\ddagger}$ (kcal/mol)
WT- α HL:SynB2	6.7	7.7	10.0
WT- α HL:Cox IV	6.5	8.9	9.4
K147D:Syn B2	5.1	NA*	8.4
K147D:Cox IV	6.5	NA	8.3
DM:SynB2	3.9	NA	8.1
DM:Cox IV	4.9	NA	8.6

NA* These values could not be determined precisely from fittings.