Published in final edited form as:

Angew Chem Int Ed Engl. 2018 October 15; 57(42): 13829–13832. doi:10.1002/anie.201806909.

Differential Effects of β^3 - vs. β^2 -Amino Acid Residues on the Helicity and Recognition Properties of Bim BH3-Derived α/β -Peptides

Geoffrey A. Eddinger and Samuel H. Gellman* [prof]

Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1101 University Avenue, Madison, WI 53706

Abstract

Oligomers containing α - and β -amino acid residues (“ α/β - peptides”) have been shown to mimic the α -helical conformation of conventional peptides when the unnatural residues are derived from β^3 -amino acids or cyclic β -amino acids, but the impact of incorporating β^2 residues has received little attention. We have investigated the effects of β^2 residues on the conformation and recognition behavior of α/β -peptides that mimic an isolated α -helix. This effort has focused on 26-mers based on the Bim BH3 domain; we have compared a set of isomers with identical α/β backbones that differ only in the placement of certain side chains along the backbone (β^3 vs. β^2 substitution). Circular dichroism data suggest that β^2 residues can be helix-destabilizing relative to β^3 residues, although the size of this effect seems to depend on side chain identity. Binding data show that $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution at sites that contact a partner protein, Bcl-xL, can significantly influence affinity in a way that transcends effects on helicity. Overall, these results suggest that β^2 -amino acids are useful complements to isomeric β^3 - amino acids for tuning the recognition properties of α/β -peptides.

Keywords

α -helix mimicry; β^2 -amino acids; circular dichroism; peptides; protein-protein interactions

Mimicking the information encoded in the surface of a folded polypeptide with an unnatural molecule represents a substantial design challenge. Such mimics may antagonize specific protein- protein or protein-nucleic acid interactions or engage polypeptide-activated receptors.^[1–3] These functional goals are often achieved with engineered peptides or proteins based on a conventional poly- α -amino acid backbone, but peptides are susceptible to proteolysis and adverse immunological recognition, which can limit utility *in vivo*.^[4] This situation has inspired many efforts to develop unnatural oligomeric scaffolds that can mimic informational surfaces displayed by poly- α - peptides.^[5–8] The regularity of α -helical secondary structure and the frequency with which α -helices are found at protein-protein interfaces^[9] have engendered diverse strategies for α -helix mimicry,^[10–19] many involving

* gellman@chem.wisc.edu.

Conflict of Interest

S. H. G. is a cofounder of Longevity Biotech, Inc., which is pursuing biomedical applications for α/β -peptides.

unnatural oligomeric backbones.^[20–27] One approach involves the use of β -amino acids as building blocks for α -helix mimics, either exclusively or in combination with other types of amino acids.^[27–30]

Our group has developed strategies for arranging α - and β -residues in patterns that enable the resulting oligomers (“ α/β - peptides”) to mimic the structure and function of specific α -helices.^[30] To date, these efforts have focused on oligomers containing β^3 -amino acid residues (Figure 1) and/or cyclic β - amino acid residues. β^2 -Amino acid residues, which differ from β^3 residues only in the placement of the side chain (Figure 1), have received little attention.^[31–33] This disparity arises because many protected β^3 -amino acids are commercially available, but most protected β^2 -amino acids must be synthesized.^[34] We envisioned that β^2 residues might be worthy of consideration, as alternatives to isomeric β^3 residues, at positions that make direct contact with a binding partner. In such situations, the difference in side chain positioning for β^2 vs. β^3 residues might significantly influence α/β -peptide recognition properties.

We selected binding to the protein Bcl-x_L as a model system for evaluating the impact of interchanging β^3 and β^2 residues on the affinity of α/β -peptides for a partner. Bcl-x_L is an anti-apoptotic member of the Bcl-2 family, which includes Bcl-2 itself, Mcl-1, and other members.^[35] The natural ligands for Bcl-x_L are pro-apoptotic proteins that contain a Bcl-2 homology 3 (BH3) domain, which adopts an α -helical conformation upon binding to an anti-apoptotic partner protein. Identification of ligands for these binding sites has been widely pursued for medicinal purposes;^[36] a small-molecule antagonist of BH3 domain binding to Bcl-x_L is an anti-cancer drug.^[37] Insights and techniques that have emerged from extensive studies in this area make binding to anti-apoptotic Bcl-2 family members a useful model system for evaluation of α -helix mimicry strategies.^[10,17,38,39] The α/β -peptides discussed here are based on previously reported 26-mer α -peptide **1** (Figure 2),^[40] which encompasses the BH3 domain of the pro-apoptotic protein Bim. Peptide **1** contains four key hydrophobic residues (designated h1-h4) that are buried upon binding to the BH3-recognition cleft of Bcl-x_L. α/β -Peptide **2** is an analogue that retains the side chain sequence of **1** but features an $\alpha\alpha\beta\alpha\alpha\beta$ pattern in the backbone. All four of the key hydrophobic side chains (h1-h4) are contributed by β^3 residues in **2**. α/β -Peptide **2** displays modest affinity for Bcl-x_L according to a competition fluorescence polarization (FP) assay^[41] ($K_i = 190$ nM for **2** vs. $K_i < 0.7$ nM for **1**). This situation is ideal for comparing isomeric α/β -peptides in which some or all side chains buried against Bcl-x_L (h1-h4) are projected by β^2 rather than β^3 residues, because the competition FP assay can detect increases or decreases in affinity relative to that manifested by **2**.

α/β -Peptides **3–10** are isomers of **2** in which a subset of the original β^3 residues at positions h1-h4 has been replaced with isomeric β^2 residues. One of the protected β^2 -amino acids required for these peptides, Fmoc- β^2 -hIle, is not commercially available and was prepared by a previously described synthetic method that features an asymmetric Mannich reaction.^[42] Competition FP data for binding to Bcl-x_L revealed that K_i varied by more than 100-fold among **2–10** (Figure 2); thus, this interaction is quite sensitive to the difference in side chain position between β^3 and β^2 residues. Single $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution at h1 or h2 (**3** or **4**) caused little change in affinity, but substitution at h3 or h4 (**5** or **6**) diminished affinity. We explored

combinations of $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions among h1-h4 (**7–10**) to determine whether the impact of these changes would be additive. Placing β^2 residues at h1 and h2 (**7**) resulted in a ~6- fold increase in affinity relative to **2**; **7** displayed the highest affinity for Bcl-x_L among the α/β -peptides in this series. Placing β^2 residues at h1 and h3 (**8**) caused a 17-fold decrease in affinity relative to the all- β^3 case (**2**). α/β -Peptide **9** contains β^2 residues at h1, h2, and h3 and displayed an affinity for Bcl-x_L indistinguishable from that of **2**, while inclusion of the fourth β^2 residue at h4 (**10**) eroded affinity. These findings suggest that the effects of multiple $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions on affinity for Bcl-x_L are roughly additive. The Bim BH3 domain (**1**) binds tightly to Mcl-1, but α/β -peptide **2** does not bind detectably to Mcl-1 (Figure S6). α/β -Peptides **3–10** also did not bind to Mcl-1 (Figure S6).

α/β -Peptides **2–10** share the same backbone and contain the same complement and sequence of side chains; therefore, it is noteworthy that these α/β -peptides display >100-fold variation in affinity for Bcl-x_L. α/β -Peptide **7** displays the highest selectivity for Bcl-x_L over Mcl-1 (>300-fold) among all Bim BH3-derived α/β - peptides reported to date.^[39,43] Recognition surfaces that contain β -residues allow the position of a side chain to be shifted by the length of a single carbon-carbon bond, via interconversion of β^3 and β^2 residues, and the affinity range manifested among **2–10** shows that this variation in side chain position can exert a substantial impact on recognition properties. Conventional peptides, comprised entirely of α -amino acids, do not allow for comparably subtle alterations in side chain arrangement.

Binding of α/β -peptides to Bcl-x_L and related proteins requires that these oligomers adopt an α -helix-like conformation, as documented in multiple co-crystal structures involving BH3- mimetic peptides that contain β^3 residues.^[39,44–47] We wondered whether isomeric β^2 and β^3 residues differ in helix-forming propensity, because this factor could influence affinity for Bcl-x_L among **2–10**. The conformational behavior of α/β -peptides that contain β^2 residues has received little attention to date. In the two pertinent examples, Tavenor et al. and Fisher et al. measured the helix propensity of β^3 and β^2 residues using the GB1 tertiary motif and a parallel coiled-coil thioester exchange system, respectively.^[32,48] Tavenor et al. concluded that there was no significant difference in helix propensity between the isomeric β^3 and β^2 residues they studied, while Fisher et al. measured a small decline in helix propensity for β^2 residues relative to their β^3 analogues. The Bim BH3 sequence we have studied forms an isolated α -helix, allowing us to address the impact of $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution on helicity in the absence of any tertiary context.

We used far-UV circular dichroism (CD) to probe for differences in helical propensity among α/β -peptides **2–10**. These studies were conducted in a 1:1 mixture of 20 mM aqueous Tris buffer (TBS), pH 7.5, and methanol. Water-alcohol mixtures promote helicity among conventional peptides and α/β - peptides;^[49] in addition, the mixed solvent prevented α/β -peptide aggregation in the 10–100 μ M range used for our measurements. The CD comparison revealed significant variation in the extent of helix formation among the α/β -peptides (Figure 3) In the TBS/methanol solvent, α -peptide **1** displayed strong minima near 220 and 208 nm, characteristic of α -helix formation (Figure S10). α/β -Peptide **2** displayed a single strong minimum near 207 nm in this solvent (Figure 3A), which is consistent with previous observations for α/β -peptides that contain similar β residue distributions and adopt an α -helix-like conformation.^[39,43,47]

We established an *apparent* helicity scale for comparisons among **2–10** based on mean residue ellipticity at 207 nm ($[\theta]_{207}$) normalized to $[\theta]_{207}$ for **2**, which contains exclusively β^3 residues and displayed the strongest minimum (Figure 3). We cannot quantify the extent of helix formation for **2** based on the CD data, but the apparent helicity scale provides qualitative insight on helicity differences within the series. α/β -Peptides **3**, **5**, and **6** each contain a single $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution, and each is indistinguishable from **2** (Figure 3A). In contrast, **4**, which also contains just one $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution, displays a significantly less intense minimum relative to **2** and therefore appears to be less helical than **2**. α/β -Peptide **8** contains two $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions that do not individually affect helicity, but **8** appears to be moderately less helical relative to **2** (Figure 3B). A more substantial decline is observed for **7**, which also contains two $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions. α/β -Peptides **9** and **10**, with three and four $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions, respectively, are significantly less helical than **2**, but **9** and **10** are comparable to **7**.

Taken together, the CD data suggest that β^2 residues have a slightly smaller propensity than β^3 residues for participation in an α -helix-like conformation. The data also raise the possibility that side chain identity affects the extent to which $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution influences helical propensity. This effect is illustrated by the lower apparent helicity of **4** relative to **3**, **5**, and **6** (each of these four α/β -peptides contains just one $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution), and by the lower apparent helicity of **7** relative to **8** (each contains two $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions). The variations in helical propensity revealed by the CD data do not correlate directly with variations in affinity for Bcl-x_L, as illustrated most clearly by the behavior of α/β -peptide **7**, which displays the strongest affinity for Bcl-x_L among **2–10** but manifests one of the lowest extents of helix formation according to the CD data.

We anticipated that β^2 residues with *S* absolute configuration would be stereochemically compatible with L- α - amino acid residues based on precedent.^[32,48] We tested this hypothesis by synthesizing and evaluating α/β -peptides **11** and **12**, which are diastereomers of **3** and **4**, respectively, that contain single (*S*)- $\beta^2 \rightarrow$ (*R*)- β^2 substitutions (Figure 4A). CD data obtained in 1:1 TBS/methanol show that **11** and **12** are significantly less helical than **3** or **4** (Figure 4B). These results indicate that even a single (*R*)- β^2 substitution is detrimental to right-handed helix formation. Both of the (*S*)- $\beta^2 \rightarrow$ (*R*)- β^2 substitutions led to substantial declines in affinity for Bcl-x_L (Figure 4A), further supporting the notion that the *S* absolute configuration of β^2 residues is the correct choice for mimicry of a natural α -helix.

We have used the binding of α/β -peptide variants to a specific protein partner to ask whether the choice between isomeric β^3 - and β^2 -amino acid residues, which corresponds to a small difference in side chain placement along the α/β -peptide backbone, exerts a significant impact on the recognition properties of these compounds. The association between α/β -peptide **2** and Bcl-x_L provided an excellent opportunity to address this question, because four of the β^3 residue side chains from **2** are expected to make intimate contacts with Bcl-x_L. Comparisons involving α/β -peptides **3–10**, which are isomers of **2** containing $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution at one or more of the contact positions, show that subtle variation in side chain arrangement leads to >100-fold variation in affinity for Bcl-x_L. One of the new α/β -peptides, containing two $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitutions, binds to Bcl-x_L with six-fold higher

affinity relative to all- β^3 prototype **2**. Although CD measurements suggest that $\beta^3 \rightarrow \beta^2$ substitution may modestly diminish the propensity to adopt the helical conformation necessary for binding, this factor does not appear to be decisive in terms of α/β -peptide affinity for Bcl-x_L. These findings suggest that comparing β^3 vs. β^2 substitution in other systems should be useful for optimizing α/β -peptide binding to specific macromolecular partners.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by NIGMS (R01GM056414). The CD instrument was purchased with a supplement to NIH grant R01GM061238. G. A. Eddinger thanks Shi Liu and Brian Fisher for their advice on β^2 -amino acid synthesis and for S. Liu's donation of Fmoc-(*R*)- β^2 -hIle for this study. We thank Dr. Ilia Guzei for crystallographic analysis.

References

- [1]. Arkin MR, Tang Y, Wells JA, Chem. Biol 2014, 21, 1102. [PubMed: 25237857]
- [2]. Chan AC, Carter PJ, Nat. Rev. Immunol 2010, 10, 301. [PubMed: 20414204]
- [3]. Bortolato A, Doré AS, Hollenstein K, Tehan BG, Mason JS, Marshall FH, Br. J. Pharmacol 2014, 171, 3132. [PubMed: 24628305]
- [4]. Diao L, Meibohm B, Clin. Pharmacokinet 2013, 52, 855. [PubMed: 23719681]
- [5]. Pelay-Gimeno M, Glas A, Koch O, Grossmann TN, Angew. Chem. Int. Edit. Engl 2015, 54, 8896; Angew. Chem. 2015, 31, 9022.
- [6]. Scott DE, Bayly AR, Abell C, Skidmore J, Nat. Rev. Drug Discov 2016, 15, 533. [PubMed: 27050677]
- [7]. Gopalakrishnan R, Frolov AI, Knerr L, Drury WJ, Valeur E, J. Med. Chem 2016, 59, 9599. [PubMed: 27362955]
- [8]. Modell AE, Blosser SL, Arora PS, Trends Pharmacol. Sci 2016, 37, 702. [PubMed: 27267699]
- [9]. Bullock BN, Jochim AL, Arora PS, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2011, 133, 14220. [PubMed: 21846146]
- [10]. Patgiri A, Jochim AL, Arora PS, Acc. Chem. Res 2008, 41, 1289. [PubMed: 18630933]
- [11]. Azzarito V, Long K, Murphy NS, Wilson AJ, Nat. Chem 2013, 5, 161. [PubMed: 23422557]
- [12]. Guichard G, Huc I, Chem. Commun 2011, 47, 5933.
- [13]. Cromm PM, Spiegel J, Grossmann TN, ACS Chem. Biol 2015, 10, 1362. [PubMed: 25798993]
- [14]. Razaee Araghi R., Ryan JA, Letai A, Keating AE, ACS Chem. Biol 2016, 11, 1238. [PubMed: 26854535]
- [15]. Fremaux J, Mauran L, Pulka-Ziach K, Kauffmann B, Odaert B, Guichard G, Ang. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl 2015, 54, 9816; Angew. Chem. 2015, 34, 9954.
- [16]. Teng P et al., J. Am. Chem. Soc 2017, 139, 7363. [PubMed: 28480699]
- [17]. Walensky LD, Kung AL, Escher I, Malia TJ, Barbuto S, Wright RD, Wagner G, Verdine GL, Korsmeyer SJ, Science 2004, 305, 1466. [PubMed: 15353804]
- [18]. Jayatunga MKP, Thompson S, Hamilton AD, Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett 2014, 24, 717. [PubMed: 24433858]
- [19]. Moon H, Lim HS, Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol 2015, 24, 38. [PubMed: 25461722]
- [20]. Azzarito V, Miles JA, Fisher J, Edwards TA, Warriner SL, Wilson AJ, Chem. Sci 2015, 6, 2434. [PubMed: 29308155]
- [21]. Kazi A et al., J. Biol. Chem 2011, 286, 9382. [PubMed: 21148306]

- [22]. Wang D, Liao W, Arora PS, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl 2005, 44, 6525; Angew. Chem. 2005, 117, 6683. [PubMed: 16172999]
- [23]. Tošovská P, Arora PS, Org. Lett 2010, 12, 1588. [PubMed: 20196543]
- [24]. Hara T, Durell SR, Meyers MC, Appella DH, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2006, 128, 1995. [PubMed: 16464101]
- [25]. Horne WS, Johnson LM, Ketas TJ, Klasse PJ, Lu M, Moore JP, Gellman SH, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A 2009, 106, 14751. [PubMed: 19706443]
- [26]. Campbell F, Plante JP, Edwards TA, Warriner SL, Wilson AJ, Org. Biomol. Chem 2010, 8, 2344. [PubMed: 20448891]
- [27]. Kritzer JA, Lear JD, Hodson ME, Schepartz A, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2004, 126, 9468. [PubMed: 15291512]
- [28]. Grison CM, Miles JA, Robin S, Wilson AJ, Ang. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl 2016, 55, 11096; Angew. Chem. 2016, 128, 11262.
- [29]. Sawada T, Gellman SH, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2011, 133, 7336. [PubMed: 21520956]
- [30]. Johnson LM, Gellman SH, Methods Enzymol 2013, 523, 407. [PubMed: 23422441]
- [31]. Lelais G, Seebach D, Biopolymers 2004, 76, 206. [PubMed: 15148683]
- [32]. Tavenor NA, Reinert ZE, Lengyel GA, Griffith BD, Horne WS, Chem. Commun 2016, 52, 3789.
- [33]. For examples of β 2-amino acids in systems other than α -helix mimetic α/β -peptides, see ref. 15 in Supporting Information. Synthesis 2009, 1, 1.
- [34]. Seebach D, Beck AK, Capone S, Deniau G, Groselj U, Zass E, Synthesis 2009, 1, 1.
- [35]. Czabotar PE, Lessene G, Strasser A, Adams JM, Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Bio 2014, 15, 49. [PubMed: 24355989]
- [36]. Ashkenazi A, Fairbrother WJ, Levenson JD, Souers AJ, Nat. Rev. Drug Discov 2017, 16, 273. [PubMed: 28209992]
- [37]. Souers AJ et al., Nat. Med 2013, 19, 202–208. [PubMed: 23291630]
- [38]. Sadowsky JD, Fairlie WD, Hadley EB, Lee HS, Umezawa N, Nikolovska-Coleska Z, Wang S, Huang DC, Tomita Y, Gellman SH, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2007, 129, 139. [PubMed: 17199293]
- [39]. Boersma MD, Haase HS, Peterson-Kaufman KJ, Lee EF, Clarke OB, Colman PM, Smith BJ, Horne WS, Fairlie WD, Gellman SH J. Am. Chem. Soc 2012, 134, 315. [PubMed: 22040025]
- [40]. Lee EF et al., J. Cell Biol 2008, 180, 341. [PubMed: 18209102]
- [41]. Boersma MD, Sadowsky JD, Tomita YA, Gellman SH, Protein Sci 2008, 17, 1232. [PubMed: 18467496]
- [42]. Chi Y, English EP, Pomerantz WC, Horne WS, Joyce LA, Alexander LR, Fleming WS, A Hopkins E, Gellman SH, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2007, 129, 6050. [PubMed: 17439122]
- [43]. Peterson-Kaufman KJ, Haase HS, Boersma MD, Lee EF, Fairlie WD, Gellman SH, ACS Chem. Biol 2015, 10, 1667. [PubMed: 25946900]
- [44]. Lee EF, Sadowsky JD, Smith BJ, Czabotar PE, Peterson-Kaufman KJ, Colman PM, Gellman SH, Fairlie WD, Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl 2009, 48, 4318; Angew. Chem. 2009, 121, 4382. [PubMed: 19229915]
- [45]. Lee EF, Smith BJ, Horne WS, Mayer KN, Evangelista M, Colman PM, Gellman SH, Fairlie WD, Chembiochem 2011, 12, 2025. [PubMed: 21744457]
- [46]. Smith BJ, Lee EF, Checco JW, Evangelista M, Gellman SH, Fairlie WD, Chembiochem 2013, 14, 1564. [PubMed: 23929624]
- [47]. Checco JW et al., J. Am. Chem. Soc 2015, 137, 11365. [PubMed: 26317395]
- [48]. Fisher BF, Hong SH, Gellman SH, J. Am. Chem. Soc 2018, 140, 9396. [PubMed: 30022665]
- [49]. Hirota N, Mizuno K, Goto Y, J. Mol. Biol 1998, 275, 365 [PubMed: 9466915]

Figure 1.

Generic structures of β -amino acid residues employed in this work. A generic L- α residue is shown for comparison.

		K_i (nM)	Apparent
		Bcl-x _L ^a	Helicity ^b
	h1 h2 h3 h4		
1	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	< 0.7	--
2	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	190	--
3	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	90	96%
4	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	70	73%
5	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	3,100	98%
6	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	1,000	94%
7	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	30	44%
8	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	3,000	78%
9	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	230	49%
10	Ac-DMRPEIWI ^{h1} AQE ^{h2} LRR ^{h3} IGDEF ^{h4} NAYYARR-NH ₂	1,400	33%

(S)-β³-amino acid

(S)-β²-amino acid

Figure 2.

Sequences of Bim BH3-derived α- and α/β-peptides with their corresponding K_i values and apparent helicity. ^a K_i values obtained from competition FP assays are the average of at least three independent experiments. Maximum experimental error is approximately 2-fold. The K_i value for each inhibitor was calculated as previously described using Graphpad Prism.

^[39] ^bApparent helicity is calculated by dividing the mean residue ellipticity of a given α/β-peptide at 207 nm, $[\theta]_{207}$, by $[\theta]_{207}$ of **2**, which displayed the strongest minimum of any α/β-peptide. The CD samples were dissolved in 50% MeOH, 50% 10 mM TBS pH 7.5 (v/v).

Figure 3.

Far-UV CD spectra of α/β -peptides **2-10** in 50% MeOH, 50% 10 mM TBS, pH 7.5 (v/v). Peptide concentrations range from 75 to 95 μM . CD signal is corrected for sequence length and concentration (i.e., the vertical axis units are mean residue ellipticity, $[\theta]$). α/β -Peptides containing single β^2 residues (A) or multiple β^2 residues (B) are compared with parent α/β -peptide **2**.

Figure 4.

Effects of (S)- $\beta^2 \rightarrow$ (R)- β^2 substitution on the affinity and helicity of Bim BH3-derived α/β -peptides. The sequences of the two pairs of diastereomers, **3** + **11** and **4** + **12**, along with their K_i values and apparent helicities are shown (A). The peptides containing single (R)- β^2 residues bind significantly less tightly to Bcl- x_L (A) and are noticeably less helical (B)