## SIMULATION OF FOLDING PATHWAY STUDIES OF TRP-CAGE MINIPROTEIN, AMYLOID A4 PEPTIDE AND α-CONOTOXIN RgIA PEPTIDE

FATAHIYA BTE MOHAMED TAP

UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MALAYSIA

# SIMULATION OF FOLDING PATHWAY STUDIES OF TRP-CAGE MINIPROTEIN, AMYLOID A4 PEPTIDE, AND $\alpha$ -CONOTOXIN RgIA PEPTIDE

## FATAHIYA BTE MOHAMED TAP

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Engineering (Bioprocess)

> Faculty of Chemical Engineering Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

> > DEC 2013

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express the deepest appreciation and sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. Nurul Bahiyah Ahmad Khairudin for her valuable guidance, supervision and endless support throughout my study. Her knowledge and advice had made this study possible.

My special thanks to all the members at UTM and Pharmaceutical Design and Simulation Laboratory, School of Pharmaceutical, Universiti Sains Malaysia for their friendship, support and help during my training session.

I also wish to express my gratitude and love to my parents, husband and family for their encouragement, motivation and understanding during my study.

#### ABSTRACT

Protein is a sequence of a linear chain of amino acids. Protein folding is a physical process by which the linear chains of amino acid fold into its functional tertiary structures. Misfolding of a protein will lead to the problem such as diseases (cancer and influenza) in protein function. Discovery of protein folding will help the biologist to find the cause of misfolding and also assist the drug designer to find the cure for related diseases. Therefore the objective of this study is to investigate the folding pathways of Trp-cage miniprotein, Amyloid A4 peptide, and  $\alpha$ -conotoxin RgIA. The folding process was simulated using molecular dynamics (MD) simulation in both explicit and implicit solvent. Amyloid A4 peptide (350ns) and  $\alpha$ conotoxin (800ns) were simulated in implicit solvent, while the simulation for Trpcage (150ns) and  $\alpha$ -conotoxin (200ns) were performed in explicit solvent method. The simulations produced a huge number of trajectories which were further analysed based on their root mean squared deviation (RMSD) values. The RMSD values showed that these trajectories approaching their simulated native structure (NMR<sub>MD</sub>). Besides that, a few crucial formations of hydrogen bond, disulfide bond, and salt bridge were involved in stabilizing the folding process. The best structure was identified by clustering all the trajectories based on RMSD, solvent accessible surface area (SASA), van der Waals interaction, electrostatic interactions and total energy of each trajectory. The best structure for Trp-cage miniprotein, Amyloid A4 peptide,  $\alpha$ -conotoxin with implicit solvent and,  $\alpha$ -conotoxin with explicit solvent were extracted at 79.76 ns, 224.85 ns, 184.20, and 104.20 ns, respectively.

#### ABSTRAK

Protein merupakan jujukan rantaian asid amino. Lipatan protein adalah satu proses fizikal di mana rantaian lurus asid amino membentuk kepada lipatan struktur Kesalahan lipatan protein akan mendorong kepada permasalahan tiga dimensi. penyakit (kanser dan influenza) dalam fungsi protein. Mengetahui laluan lipatan protein akan membantu ahli biologi untuk mencari punca kesalahan lipatan protein, serta membantu pereka ubat untuk mencari penawar sesuatu penyakit. Oleh itu, objektif kajian ini adalah untuk mengkaji laluan lipatan Trp-cage miniprotein, Amiloid A4 peptide, dan  $\alpha$ -conotoxin RgIA. Proses lipatan protein dilakukan dengan menggunakan dua kaedah simulasi iaitu melalui kehadiran air sebagai pelarut dan tanpa kehadiran air sebagai pelarut. Amiloid peptida A4 (350ns) dan αconotoxin (800ns) adalah protein yang digunakan untuk kaedah simulasi tanpa kehadiran air sebagai pelarut, manakala Trp-cage (150ns) dan  $\alpha$ -conotoxin (200ns) telah digunakan dalam kaedah simulasi dengan kehadiran air sebagai pelarut. Proses simulasi menghasilkan banyak trajektori dan ianya telah dianalisa berdasarkan kepada nilai punca min sisihan kuasa dua (RMSD). Nilai RMSD menunjukkan trajektori yang menghampiri struktur sebenar protein. Selain daripada itu, beberapa pembentukan ikatan hidrogen, ikatan disulfid, dan ikatan jambatan garam yang penting telah dikenal pasti membantu menstabilkan proses lipatan protein. Struktur yang terbaik pula telah dikenal pasti dengan mengkelaskan kesemua trajektori berdasarkan RMSD, luas permukaan pelarut boleh capai (SASA), ikatan van der Waals, ikatan elektrostatik, dan jumlah tenaga struktur protein untuk setiap trajektori. Struktur yang terbaik untuk Trp-cage miniprotein, Amiloid A4 peptide, α-conotoxin RgIA tanpa kehadiran air sebagai pelarut dan  $\alpha$ -conotoxin RgIA dengan kehadiran air sebagai pelarut telah diekstrak pada 79.76 ns, 224.85 ns, 184.20 ns, dan 104.2 ns.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

| CHAPTER | TITLE                       | PAGE |
|---------|-----------------------------|------|
|         | DECLARATION                 | ii   |
|         | ACKNOWLEDGEMENT             | iii  |
|         | ABSTRACT                    | iv   |
|         | ABSTRAK                     | v    |
|         | TABLE OF CONTENTS           | vi   |
|         | LIST OF TABLES              | ix   |
|         | LIST OF FIGURES             | Х    |
|         | LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS       | XV   |
|         | LIST OF SYMBOLS             | xvi  |
|         | LIST OF APPENDICES          | xvii |
| 1       | INTRODUCTION                | 1    |
|         | 1.1 Research background     | 1    |
|         | 1.2 Problem statement       | 2    |
|         | 1.3 Objective               | 3    |
|         | 1.4 Scopes                  | 3    |
| 2       | LITERATURE REVIEW           | Δ    |
|         | 2.1 Introduction to Peptide | 4    |
|         | 2.2 Introduction to Protein | 5    |
|         | 2.3 Protein Structure       | 5    |
|         | 2.3.1 Primary Structure     | 5    |
|         | 2.3.2 Secondary Structure   | 7    |
|         | 2.3.3 Tertiary Structure    | 9    |
|         | 2.3.4 Quaternary Structure  | 9    |

| Trp-cage Miniprotein 10                     |  |   |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Amyloid A4 peptide as an Amyloid Plaques in |  |   |  |  |  |
| Alzheir                                     | Alzheimer  |   |  |  |  |
| α-Cono                                      | toxin RgIA   | 12  |  |  |  |
| Introdu                                     | ction to Protein Folding   | 13  |  |  |  |
| Molecu                                      | lar Dynamics Simulation of Protein Folding   | 14  |  |  |  |
| The Lin                                     | nitation of Time Scale in Protein Folding  | 15  |  |  |  |
| 2.9.1                                       | The Protein Folding Simulation of Trp-cage   | 16  |  |  |  |
| The Inte                                    | eractions Involved in Protein Folding  | 17  |  |  |  |
| 2.10.1                                      | van der Waals Interaction  | 17  |  |  |  |
| 2.10.2                                      | Electrostatic Interaction  | 18  |  |  |  |
| 2.10.3                                      | Hydrogen Bond Interaction  | 18  |  |  |  |
| 2.10.4                                      | Salt Bridge  | 19  |  |  |  |
| 2.10.5                                      | Disulfide Bond   | 19  |  |  |  |
| Parame                                      | ters of Molecular Dynamics Simulation  | 19  |  |  |  |
| 2.11.1                                      | Force Field  | 20  |  |  |  |
| 2.11.2                                      | Equation of Motion   | 21  |  |  |  |
| 2.11.3                                      | Verlet Algorithm   | 22  |  |  |  |
| 2.11.4                                      | Temperature Constant   | 23  |  |  |  |
|   | 2.11.4.1 Langevin thermostat   | 23  |  |  |  |
|   | 2.11.4.2 Berendsen thermostat  | 24  |  |  |  |
| 2.11.5                                      | Pressure Constant  | 24  |  |  |  |
| EARCH                                       | METHODOLOGY  | 25  |  |  |  |
| Introdu                                     | ction to Trp-cage (1L2Y), Amyloid A4 Peptide   | 25  |  |  |  |
| (1AML                                       | ), and $\alpha$ -conotoxin (2JUQ)  |   |  |  |  |
| 3.1.1                                       | Trp-cage miniprotein (PDB ID: 1L2Y)  | 25  |  |  |  |
| 3.1.2                                       | The Alzheimer's disease Amyloid A4 peptide   | 27  |  |  |  |
|   | (PDB ID: 1AML)   |   |  |  |  |
| 3.1.3                                       | The $\alpha$ -conotoxin RgIA peptide (PDB ID: 2JUQ)  | 28  |  |  |  |
| Method                                      | lology   | 29  |  |  |  |
| 3.2.1                                       | Structure Preparation  | 30  |  |  |  |
| 3.2.2                                       | MinimisationStep   | 30  |  |  |  |
| 3.2.3                                       | MD Simulation Process  | 31  |  |  |  |
|   | Trp-cag<br>Amyloi<br>Alzhein<br>α-Cono<br>Introdua<br>Molecu<br>The Lin<br>2.9.1<br>The Int<br>2.10.1<br>2.10.2<br>2.10.3<br>2.10.4<br>2.10.5<br>Parame<br>2.11.1<br>2.11.2<br>2.11.3<br>2.11.4<br>2.11.5<br><b>EARCH</b><br>Introdua<br>(1AML<br>3.1.1<br>3.1.2<br>3.1.3<br>Method<br>3.2.1<br>3.2.2<br>3.2.3 | Trp-cage MiniproteinAmyloid A4 peptide as an Amyloid Plaques inAlzheimer $\alpha$ -Conotxin RgIAIntroduction to Protein FoldingMolecular Dynamics Simulation of Protein Folding2.9.1The Protein Folding Simulation of Trp-cageThe Interactions Involved in Protein Folding2.10.1van der Waals Interaction2.10.2Electrostatic Interaction2.10.3Hydrogen Bond Interaction2.10.4Salt Bridge2.10.5Disulfide BondParameters of Molecular Dynamics Simulation2.11.1Force Field2.11.2Equation of Motion2.11.3Verlet Algorithm2.11.4Temperature Constant2.11.4.1 Langevin thermostat2.11.5Pressure Constant2.11.4.2 Berendsen thermostat2.11.5Pressure Constant2.11.6Introduction to Trp-cage (1L2Y), Amyloid A4 Peptide(1AML), and α-conotoxin (2JUQ)3.1.1Trp-cage miniprotein (PDB ID: 1L2Y)3.1.2The Alzheimer's disease Amyloid A4 peptide(PDB ID: 1AML)3.1.3The α-conotoxin RgIA peptide (PDB ID: 2JUQ)Methodology3.2.1MinimisationStep3.2.3MD Simulation Process |  |  |  |

3

|     |        | 3.2.3.1     | MD Simulation with Implicit Solvent | 31 |
|-----|--------|-------------|-------------------------------------|----|
|     |        | 3.2.3.2     | Md Simulation with Explicit Solvent | 31 |
|     | 3.2.4  | Trajector   | ry Analysis                         | 32 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.1     | RMSD                                | 32 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.2     | Secondary Structure Annotation      | 32 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.3     | Molecular Interaction Viewer        | 33 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.4     | Clustering Analysis                 | 33 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.5     | Radius of Gyration                  | 33 |
|     |        | 3.2.4.6     | van der Waals Interaction Energy,   | 33 |
|     |        |             | Electrostatic Energy, and Total     |    |
|     |        |             | Energy                              |    |
|     |        |             |                                     |    |
| RES | ULT AN | ND DISCU    | JSSIONS                             | 34 |
| 4.1 | Simula | tion of 2JU | JQ with Implicit Solvent Method     | 34 |

|                     | 4.1 | Simulation of 2JUQ with Implicit Solvent Method   | 34      |
|---------------------|-----|---|---------|
|                     | 4.2 | The Folding Pathways of 2JUQ in Explicit Solvent  | 44      |
|                     |     | Method  |         |
|                     | 4.3 | Folding Process of Amyloid A4 Peptide (1AML) with | 50      |
|                     |     | Implicit Solvent Method                           |         |
|                     | 4.4 | Molecular Dynamics Simulation of Trp-cage with    | 60      |
|                     |     | Explicit Solvent Method                           |         |
|                     |     |   |         |
| 5                   | CON | ICLUSION  | 67      |
| REFERENC            | ES  |   | 69      |
| Appendices A – E 76 |     |   | 76 - 80 |

4

## LIST OF TABLES

| TABLE NO. | TITLE  |    |
|-----------|--|----|
| 4.1       | Comparison of the best structural properties between each cluster                  | 40 |
| 4.2       | The SASA value for the best structure from each cluster.                           | 40 |
| 4.3       | The evolution of hydrogen bonds for 2JUQ in explicit solvent methods up to 200 ns. | 45 |
| 4.4       | Comparison of the best structural properties between each cluster                  | 47 |
| 4.5       | The SASA value for the best structure from each cluster                            | 48 |
| 4.6       | Comparison of the best structural properties between each cluster                  | 56 |
| 4.7       | The SASA value for the best structure from each cluster                            | 56 |
| 4.8       | Comparison of the best structural properties between each cluster                  | 63 |
| 4.9       | The SASA value for the best structure from each cluster                            | 64 |

## LIST OF FIGURES

| FIGURE NO. | TITLE   |    |  |
|------------|---|----|--|
| 2.1        | General structure of amino acid   | 6  |  |
| 2.2        | Formation of peptide bond   | 6  |  |
| 2.3        | Primary structure   | 7  |  |
| 2.4        | α-helix   | 8  |  |
| 2.5        | a) $\beta$ pleated sheet, antiparallel and b) $\beta$ pleated sheet, parallel | 8  |  |
| 2.6        | Protein tertiary structure  | 9  |  |
| 2.7        | Quaternary structure  | 10 |  |
| 2.8        | Native structure of Trp-cage miniprotein from NMR                             | 11 |  |
| 2.9        | Native structure of Amyloid A4 peptide from NMR                               | 12 |  |
| 2.10       | Native structure of $\alpha$ -Conotoxin from NMR                              | 13 |  |
| 2.11       | Lennard jones potential graph   | 18 |  |

| 3.1 | The structure of Trp-cage miniprotein. The ribbon and<br>stick representation are backbone and side chain<br>respectively.  | 26 |
|-----|---|----|
| 3.2 | The structure of Amyloid A4 peptide. The ribbon and stick representation are backbone and side chain respectively   | 27 |
| 3.3 | The structure of $\alpha$ -conotoxin with 13 residues. The ribbon and stick representation are backbone and side chain respectively   | 28 |
| 3.4 | Flow diagram of MD simulation process   | 29 |
| 4.1 | Representation of the evolution of RMSD values for $\alpha$ -conotoxin  | 34 |
| 4.2 | Representation of the folding event of 2JUQ. a) The NMR <sub>MD</sub> structure; b) and c) the formation of $3_{10}$ -helix at 180 ns and 286 ns, respectively; and d) the $\alpha$ -helix formation at 381 ns. | 35 |
| 4.3 | The formation of $3_{10}$ -helix at residues Cys2 to Asp5. The cyan and magenta colors show the $3_{10}$ -helix and coil respectively.  | 36 |
| 4.4 | The hydrogen bond formation between residues Arg13 and Arg9 for the structure $\alpha$ -conotoxin at 286 ns.  | 37 |
| 4.5 | The disulfide bond link between Cys2 and Cys8 with the distance 5.21 Å  | 37 |

| 4.6  | Evolutions of disulfide bonds between Cys2-Cys8 and             | 38 |
|------|---|----|
|      | Cys3-Cys12 around 20 ns to 399.8 ns.                            |    |
| 4.7  | The Ramachandran Plot for a) the model at 310 ns                | 39 |
|      | structure; and b) NMR <sub>MD</sub> structure                   |    |
| 4.8  | The best structure for each clusters, a) cluster 1, b)          | 41 |
|      | cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster |    |
|      | 6 at 799.09 ns, 74.9 ns, 130.92 ns, 354.35 ns, 519.34 ns,       |    |
|      | 184.20 ns respectively  |    |
| 4.9  | The surface presentation for the best structure from each       | 42 |
|      | clusters, a) cluster 1, b) cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster  |    |
|      | 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster 6 at 799.09 ns, 74.9 ns, 130.92     |    |
|      | ns, 354.35 ns, 519.34 ns, 184.20 ns respectively. The           |    |
|      | blue shaded area shows the polar region of the structure.       |    |
| 4.10 | The evolution of RMSD of 2JUQ in explicit solvent               | 44 |
| 4.11 | Represents a) the hydrogen bond ( Asp5 – Arg7) at 60 ns         | 45 |
|      | with occupancy of 55% and b) the hydrogen bond (Asp5            |    |
|      | – Arg8) at 90 ns with occupancy of 57%.                         |    |
| 4.12 | The formation of hydrogen bond (Cys3 – Arg11) at 100            | 46 |
|      | ns with occupancy of 73 %.                                      |    |
| 4.13 | The best structure for each clusters, a) cluster 1, b)          | 48 |
|      | cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster |    |
|      | 6 at 32.48 ns, 60.04 ns, 19.56 ns, 104.20 ns, 197.96 ns         |    |
|      | and 121.16 ns respectively                                      |    |
|      |   |    |

| 4.14 | The surface presentation for the best structure from each clusters, a) cluster 1, b) cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster 6 at 32.48 ns, 60.04 ns, 19.56 ns, 104.20 ns, 197.96 ns and 121.16 ns respectively. The red and green shaded area shows the polar region of the structure | 49 |
|------|--|----|
| 4.15 | The formation of hydrogen bond at Asp23-Gly29  | 51 |
| 4.16 | The evolution of the RMSD values for 350 ns of the simulation time.  | 52 |
| 4.17 | Representative conformations of the 1AML trajectories.<br>This figure presents the turn extended and changed to<br>helix as the simulation proceeded. The cyan and purple<br>colours represent turn and coil, respectively, while the<br>new cartoon represents helix formation.                               | 53 |
| 4.18 | a), b) and c) Ramachandran plot for trajectories at 5 ns, 224 ns, and NMR <sub>MD</sub> structure respectively.  | 55 |
| 4.19 | The best structure for each cluster, a) cluster 1, b) cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster 6 at 89.4 ns, 224.85 ns, 274.18 ns, 5.37 ns, 324.64 ns and 149.36 ns respectively.   | 57 |
| 4.20 | The surface presentation for the best structure from each cluster, a) cluster 1, b) cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster 6 at 89.4 ns, 224.85 ns, 274.18 ns, 5.37 ns, 324.64 ns and 149.36 ns respectively.   | 58 |
| 4.21 | The formation of secondary structure at 224.85 ns  | 59 |

| 4.22 | The evolution of the RMSD values between 30 ns to 120<br>ns. The red circle shows the stable region of RMSD<br>values during the process of simulation from 60 ns to 100<br>ns.  | 60 |
|------|--|----|
| 4.23 | The formation of hydrogen bond at Gly11-Ser14  | 61 |
| 4.24 | The evolution of the 1L2Y conformation throughout the 150 ns simulation time. The conformation a, b, c, and d were extracted at 40 ns, 80 ns, 135 ns, and 145 ns, respectively   | 62 |
| 4.25 | The best structure for each clusters, a) cluster 1, b)<br>cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster<br>6 at 29.39 ns, 79.76 ns, 144.08 ns, 129.48 ns, 34.71 ns<br>and 39.61 ns respectively                      | 64 |
| 4.26 | The surface presentation for the best structure from each clusters, a) cluster 1, b) cluster 2, c) cluster 3, d) cluster 4, e) cluster 5, f) cluster 6 at 29.39 ns, 79.76 ns, 144.08 ns, 129.48 ns, 34.71 ns and 39.61 ns respectively | 65 |
| 4.27 | The secondary structure formation at 79.76 ns  | 66 |

xiv

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| 3D                         | - | Three dimensional structure                                |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| AMBER11                    | - | Assisted model building with energy refinement version 11  |
| CHARMM                     | - | Chemistry at Harvard molecular mechanics                   |
| СОМ                        | - | Center of mass   |
| DNA                        | - | Deoxyribonucleic acid                                      |
| GB                         | - | Generalize bond  |
| GROMACS                    | - | Groningen machine for chemical simulations                 |
| MD                         | - | Molecular dynamics   |
| MMPBSA                     | - | Molecular modelling poison Boltzmann surface area          |
| MMTSB                      | - | Multiscale modelling tools for structural biology          |
| NMR                        | - | Nuclear magnetic resonance                                 |
| NMR <sub>MD</sub>          | - | Simulated nuclear magnetic resonance structure             |
| PDB                        | - | Protein data bank  |
| RMSD                       | - | Root mean square deviation                                 |
| RMSD <sub>c</sub>          | - | RMSD between the best structure                            |
| RMSD <sub>c-best</sub>     | - | RMSD between the centroid structure and the best structure |
| RMSD <sub>best-NMRMD</sub> | - | RMSD between the best structure and NMR structure.         |
| RMSD <sub>c-NMRMD</sub>    | - | RMSD between the centroid structure and NMR structure      |
| SASA                       | - | Solvent accessible surface area                            |
| VMD                        | - | Visual molecular dynamics                                  |
|                            |   |  |

## LIST OF SYMBOLS

| %                         | - | Percentage  |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Å                         | - | Angstrom  |
| a <sub>i</sub>            | - | Acceleration of particle i                        |
| $E_{kin}$                 | - | Kinetic energy                                    |
| $F_i$                     | - | Force exerted on particle i                       |
| Κ                         | - | Isothermal compressibility                        |
| K <sub>B</sub>            | - | Boltzmann constant                                |
| $l_{i,o}$                 | - | Bond length                                       |
| m <sub>i</sub>            | - | Mass of particle i                                |
| Ν                         | - | Number of particles                               |
| n                         | - | Number of moles                                   |
| r                         | - | Radius  |
| $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{i}}$ | - | Frictional force                                  |
| t                         | - | Time  |
| Т                         | - | Temperature                                       |
| u                         | - | Potential energy                                  |
| α                         | - | Alpha   |
| β                         | - | Beta  |
| E <sub>i,j</sub>          | - | Well depth for Lennad Jone Potential              |
| $\sigma_{i,j}$            | - | Collision diameter for Lennard Jones Potential    |
| Φ                         | - | Dihedral angle in protein structure (phi angle)   |
| Ψ                         | - | Dihedral angle in protein structure (psi angle)   |
| ω                         | - | Dihedral angle in protein structure (omega angle) |
|                           |   |   |

## LIST OF APPENDICES

| APPENDIX | TITLE  | PAGE |
|----------|--|------|
|          |  |      |
| A        | Input file for minimisation step of Trp-cage miniprotein | 76   |
| В        | Input file for minimisation step of Amyloid A4 peptide   | 77   |
| С        | Input file for minimisation step of $\alpha$ -conotoxin  | 78   |
| D        | Input file for implicit solvent simulation               | 79   |
| E        | Input file for explicit solvent simulation               | 80   |

### **CHAPTER 1**

## INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Research Background

Protein is composed of one or more chains of amino acids. Protein carries out important function in every cell. In order for the protein to function correctly, it must fold into its three-dimensional structure. Therefore, understanding the protein folding process is vital because several diseases such as Alzheimer and cancer are directly related to the misfolding of protein. All these diseases have no cure until today and this problem has not been solved for more than 4 decades.

The causes for those diseases such as Alzheimer, Parkinson and Influenza can be found if the folding process of protein is known. This is the major challenge in science today since nobody knows how the protein folds. Theoretically, protein folding is a process in which the sequence of amino acids folds naturally into its three-dimensional structure. The formation of the three-dimensional structure is related to the interaction among amino acid residues. The most important finding in understanding protein folding was carried out by Anfinsen (1972) and his colleagues; they claimed that the structure of the protein is determined by the sequence of amino acids. Findings by Anfinsen and colleagues have inspired researchers to continue investigating the pathways of protein folding. Therefore the evolution in studying protein folding ha increased very rapidly, researchers have come up with various methods and they have proven that protein folding can be simulated using computer (Levitt and Warshel, 1975a). Computational method such as molecular dynamics (MD) simulation is a powerful tool due to its high resolutions and detailed atomic level representation. Furthermore, the increase in computer speed and improvements in force field along with more efficient computation algorithms have brought realistic computational simulation of the folding process within reach (Pande *et al.*, 2003, Scheraga *et al.*, 2007).

The aim of this study was to investigate the pathway of the protein folding towards their native or near native state using MD simulation. MD simulation was employed using Amber11 (Case *et al.*, 2010). Several studies using this programme shown promising result (Sonavane *et al.*, 2008, Best, 2012). There are two types of simulations that can be applied; they are implicit solvent method and explicit solvent method. For this research, both simulations were used. The protein  $\alpha$ -Conotoxin (PDB ID: 2JUQ) was simulated using both methods, while Trp-cage (PDB ID: 1L2Y) and Amyloid (PDB ID: 1AML) were simulated using explicit solvent method and implicit solvent method, respectively.

#### **1.2 Problem Statement**

Researchers have defined how the amino acid sequence of a protein is coded into DNA. However, the secret on how the protein folds into its three-dimensional structure still remains unsolved. Many theoreticians and biologists have huge interests to investigate the pathway of protein folding. This is proven by the increasing number of new findings on the fundamental, knowledge, and theory of protein folding.

On the experimental front, artificially designed autonomous-folding mini protein has been solved. These findings have helped researchers to address the fundamental issues regarding protein folding. However, protein has marginally stable non-native states that are difficult to observe experimentally. In order to identify this structure, the best method is to use computational simulation. This is because this method has high resolution and provides detailed atomic-level presentations.

## 1.3 Objective

The objective of this study is to study the folding pathway of Trp-cage miniprotein, Amyloid A4 peptide and  $\alpha$ -conotoxin RgIA peptide using molecular dynamics simulation.

#### 1.4 Scopes

There are five scopes for this study. The first scope is to use the Trp-cage miniprotein, Amyloid A4 peptide, and  $\alpha$ -conotoxin as subjects for investigating the folding pathway. The second scope is to investigate the hydrogen bond formation, disulfide bond and salt bridge formation from the trajectories. The third scope is to develop clusters from the trajectories based on the RMSD value using clustering analysis. The forth scope is to identify the SASA value for each cluster. The fifth scope is the find the best structure based on RMSD value, radius of gyration, total energy, van der Waals interaction energy, and electrostatic interaction energy.

#### REFERENCES

- Alberts, B., Johnson, A., Lewis, J., Raff, M., Roberts, K. and Walter, P. (2002). The Shape and Structure of Proteins.
- Alder, B. J. and Wainwright, T. E. (1959). Studies in Molecular Dynamics. I. General Method. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 31, 459-466.
- Alzheimer, A. (1987). A Characteristic Disease of the Cerebral Cortex: *Meeting of* South-West Germany Psychiatrists. November 3rd and 4th, 1906. Tubingen
- Anand, P. and Hansmann, U. H. E. (2011). Internal and Environmental Effects on Folding and Dimerisation of Alzheimer's β-amyloid Peptide. *Molecular Simulation*, 37, 440-448.
- Anfinsen, C. B. (1972). Studies on the Principles that Govern the Folding of Protein Chains.
- Armstrong, R. A. (2006). Plaques and Tangles and the Pathogenesis of Alzheimer's Disease. *Folia Neuropathologica*, 44, 1.
- Beck, D. A. C. and Daggett, V. (2004). Methods for Molecular Dynamics Simulations of Protein Folding/Unfolding in Solution. *Methods*, 34, 112-120.
- Berendsen, H. J. C., Postma, J. P. M., Van Gunsteren, W. F., Dinola, A.and Haak, J.
  R. (1984). Molecular Dynamics with Coupling to an External Bath. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 81, 3684-3690.
- Best, R. B. (2012). Atomistic Molecular Simulations of Protein Folding. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 22, 52-61.
- Bettelheim, F. A., Brown, W. H., Campbell, M. K., Farrell, S. O. and Torres, O. J. (2012). *Introduction to Organic and Biochemistry*, Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Bratko, D., Cellmer, T., Prausnitz, J. M. and Blanch, H. W. (2007). Molecular
  Simulation of Protein Aggregation. *Biotechnology and Bioengineering*, 96, 1-8.
- Brooks, C. L., Gruebele, M., Onuchic, J. N. & Wolynes, P. G. (1998). Chemical Physics of Protein Folding. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 95, 11037-11038.
- Bulaj, G. and Olivera, B. M. (2008). Folding of Conotoxins: Formation of the Native Disulfide Bridges During Chemical Synthesis and Biosynthesis of Conus Peptides. *Antioxidants & redox signaling*, 10, 141-155.

- Campbell, M. K. and Farrell, S. O. (2005). *Lecture Notebook for Campbell/farrell's Biochemistry*, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Case, D. A., Cheatham, T. E., Darden, T., Gohlke, H., Luo, R., Merz, K. M., Onufriev, A., Simmerling, C., Wang, B. and Woods, R. J. (2005). The Amber Biomolecular Simulation Programs. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 26, 1668-1688.
- Case, D. A., Darden, T. A., Cheatham, T. E., Simmerling, C. L., Wang, J., Duke, R.
  E., Luo, R., Walker, R. C., Zhang, W., Merz, K. M., Wang, B., Hayik, S.,
  Roitberg, A., Seabra, G., Kolossvary, I., Wong, K. F., Paesani, F., Vanicek,
  J., Liu, J., Wu, X., Brozell, S. R., Steinbrecher, T., Gohlke, H., Cai, Q., Ye,
  X., Hsieh, M. J., Hornak, V., Cui, G., Roe, D. R., Mathews, D. H., Seetin, M.
  G., Sagui, C., Babin, V., Luchko, T., Gusarov, S., Kovalenko, A., Kollman,
  P. A. & Roberts, B. P. (2010). *Amber 11*, University of California.
- Ceriotti, M., Bussi, G. and Parrinello, M. (2009). Langevin Equation with Colored Noise for Constant-Temperature Molecular Dynamics Simulations. *Physical review letters*, 102, 020601.
- Chowdhury, S., Lee, M. C., Xiong, G. and Duan, Y. (2003). Ab Initio Folding Simulation of the Trp-cage Mini-protein Approaches NMR Resolution. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 327, 711-717.
- Creighton, T. (1992). *Proteins: Structures and Molecular Properties*, W. H. Freeman.
- Daly, N. L. and Craik, D. J. (2009). Structural Studies of Conotoxins. *IUBMB life*, 61, 144-150.
- Delano, W. L. (2002). PyMOL. DeLano Scientific, San Carlos, CA, 700.
- Duan, Y. and Kollman, P. A. (1998). Pathways to a Protein Folding Intermediate Observed in a 1-Microsecond Simulation in Aqueous Solution. *Science*, 282, 740-744.
- Dutertre, S. and Lewis, R. J. (2006). Toxin Insights into Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptors. *Biochemical Pharmacology*, 72, 661-670.
- Ellison, M., Feng, Z.-P., Park, A. J., Zhang, X., Olivera, B. M., Mcintosh, J. M. and Norton, R. S. (2008). α-RgIA, a Novel Conotoxin That Blocks the α9α10 nAChR: Structure and Identification of Key Receptor-Binding Residues. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 377, 1216-1227.

- Feig, M., Karanicolas, J. and Brooks Iii, C. L. (2004). MMTSB Tool Set: Enhanced Sampling and Multiscale Modeling Methods for Applications in Structural Biology. *Journal of Molecular Graphics and Modelling*, 22, 377-395.
- Ferguson, N. and Fersht, A. R. (2003). Early Events in Protein Folding. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 13, 75-81.
- Freed, K. F. (2002). Long Time Dynamics of Met-Enkephalin: Comparison of Explicit and Implicit Solvent Models. *Biophysical journal*, 82, 1791.
- Gnanakaran, S., Nymeyer, H., Portman, J., Sanbonmatsu, K. Y. and Garcia, A. E. (2003). Peptide Folding Simulations. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 13, 168-174.
- Gopalakrishnan, K., Sowmiya, G., Sheik, S. S. and Sekar, K. (2007). Ramachandran Plot on The Web (2.0). *Protein and Peptide Letters*, 14, 669-671.
- Hockney, R. W. (1970). Potential Calculation and Some Applications. Journal Name: Methods Comput. Phys. 9: 135-211(1970).; Other Information: Orig. Receipt Date: 31-DEC-70, Medium: X.
- Humphrey, W. (1996). VMD-Visual Molecular Dynamics. *Journal of Molecular Graphics*, 14, 33-38.
- Jäger, M., Nguyen, H., Crane, J. C., Kelly, J. W. and Gruebele, M. (2001). The Folding Mechanism of a β-sheet: the WW domain. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 311, 373-393.
- Kannan, S. and Zacharias, M. (2009). Folding of Trp-cage Mini Protein Using Temperature and Biasing Potential Replica—Exchange Molecular Dynamics Simulations. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 10, 1121-1137.
- Karatti, A., Singh, A., Singh, J., Sharma, M., Wariar, M., Goyal, M., Thakur, P., Sachan, R., Namdeo, R. and Kusmakar, S. (2011). *PIPE: Protein Interaction* and Properties Explorer.
- Kräutler, V., Van Gunsteren, W. F. and Hünenberger, P. H. (2001). A fast SHAKE Algorithm to Solve Distance Constraint Equations for Small Molecules in Molecular Dynamics Simulations. *Journal of Computational Chemistry*, 22, 501-508.
- Krone, M. G., Baumketner, A., Bernstein, S. L., Wyttenbach, T., Lazo, N. D., Teplow, D. B., Bowers, M. T. and Shea, J.-E. (2008). Effects of Familial Alzheimer's Disease Mutations on the Folding Nucleation of the Amyloid β-Protein. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 381, 221-228.

- Kumar, S. and Nussinov, R. (2002). Relationship Between Ion Pair Geometries and Electrostatic Strengths in Proteins. *Biophysical Journal*, 83, 1595-1612.
- Lapidus, L. J., Eaton, W. A. and Hofrichter, J. (2002). Measuring Dynamic Flexibility of the Coil State of a Helix-forming Peptide. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 319, 19-25.
- Lazo, N. D., Grant, M. A., Condron, M. C., Rigby, A. C. and Teplow, D. B. (2005). On the Nucleation of Amyloid β-Protein Monomer Folding. *Protein Science*, 14, 1581-1596.

Leach, A. R. (2001). Harlow, England.

- Lee, S. and Kim, Y. (2004). Molecular Dynamics Simulations on Beta Amyloid Peptide (25-35) in Aqueous Trifluoroethanol Solution. *Bulletin-Korean Chemical Society*, 25, 838-842.
- Levitt, M. and Warshel, A. (1975a). Computer simulation of Protein Folding. *Nature*, 253, 694.
- Levitt, M. and Warshel, A. (1975b). Computer Simulation of Protein Folding. *Nature*, 253, 694-698.
- Li, A. and Daggett, V. (1996). Identification and Characterization of the Unfolding Transition State of Chymotrypsin Inhibitor 2 by Molecular Dynamics Simulations. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 257, 412-429.
- Livett, B. G., Sandall, D. W., Keays, D., Down, J., Gayler, K. R., Satkunanathan, N. and Khalil, Z. (2006). Therapeutic Applications of Conotoxins that Target The Neuronal Nicotinic Acetylcholine Receptor. *Toxicon*, 48, 810-829.
- Mamathambika, B. S. and Bardwell, J. C. (2008). Disulfide-Linked Protein Folding Pathways. *Annual review of cell and developmental biology*, 24, 211-235.
- Mckee, T. and Mckee, J. R. (2003). New York : McGraw-Hill.
- Mellon, F. A., Self, R., Startin, J. R. and Belton, P. S. (2007). Amino Acids, Peptides and Proteins.
- Meza, J. C. (2010). Steepest Descent. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics, 2, 719-722.
- Munoz, V., Thompson, P. A., Hofrichter, J. and Eaton, W. A. (1997). Folding Dynamics And Mechanism Of β-Hairpin Formation. *Nature*, 390, 196-199.
- Nazareth, J. (2009). Conjugate Gradient Method. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics, 1, 348-353.

- Neidigh, J. W., Fesinmeyer, R. M. and Andersen, N. H. (2002). Designing a 20-Residue Protein. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*, 9, 425-430.
- Pande, V. S., Baker, I., Chapman, J., Elmer, S. P., Khaliq, S., Larson, S. M., Rhee, Y. M., Shirts, M. R., Snow, C. D., Sorin, E. J. and Zagrovic, B. (2003).
  Atomistic Protein Folding Simulations on The Submillisecond Time Scale Using Worldwide Distributed Computing. *Biopolymers*, 68, 91-109.
- Pappu, R. V., Hart, R. K. and Ponder, J. W. (1998). Analysis and Application of Potential Energy Smoothing and Search Methods for Global Optimization. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 102, 9725-9742.
- Porollo, A. A., Adamczak, R. and Meller, J. (2004). Polyview: A Flexible Visualization Tool for Structural and Functional Annotations of Proteins. *Bioinformatics*, 20, 2460-2462.
- Price, D. J. and Brooks Iii, C. L. (2004). A Modified TIP3P Water Potential for Simulation With Ewald Summation. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 121, 10096-10103.
- Prusiner, S. B. (1998). Prions. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 95, 13363-13383.
- Qiu, L., Pabit, S. A., Roitberg, A. E. and Hagen, S. J. (2002). Smaller and faster: The 20-residue Trp-cage Protein Folds in 4 µs. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 124, 12952-12953.
- Rovó, P., Farkas, V., Hegyi, O., Szolomájer-Csikós, O., Tóth, G. K. and Perczel, A. (2011). Cooperativity Network of Trp-Cage Miniproteins: Probing Salt-Bridges. *Journal of Peptide Science*, 17, 610-619.
- Scheraga, H. A., Khalili, M. and Liwo, A. (2007). Protein-Folding Dynamics: Overview of Molecular Simulation Techniques. *Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem.*, 58, 57-83.
- Schneider, R., Sharma, A. and Rai, A. (2008). of Book: Computational Many-Particle Physics.
- Sgourakis, N. G., Yan, Y., Mccallum, S. A., Wang, C. and Garcia, A. E. (2007). The Alzheimer's Peptides Aβ40 and 42 Adopt Distinct Conformations in Water: A Combined MD / NMR Study. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, 368, 1448-1457.

- Sonavane, U. B., Ramadugu, S. K. and Joshi, R. R. (2008). Study of Early Events in the Protein Folding of Villin Headpiece using Molecular Dynamics Simulation. *Journal of Biomolecular Structure and Dynamics*, 26, 203-214.
- Sticht, H., Bayer, P., Willbold, D., Dames, S., Hilbich, C., Beyreuther, K., Frank, R.
  W. and Rösch, P. (1995). Structure of Amyloid A4-(1–40)-Peptide of
  Alzheimer's Disease. *European Journal of Biochemistry*, 233, 293-298.
- Straub, J. E., Guevara, J., Huo, S. and Lee, J. P. (2002). Long Time Dynamic Simulations: Exploring the Folding Pathways of an Alzheimer's Amyloid Aβ-Peptide. Accounts of Chemical Research, 35, 473-481.
- Straub, J. E. and Thirumalai, D. (2011). Toward a Molecular Theory of Early and Late Events in Monomer to Amyloid Fibril Formation. *Annual Review of Physical Chemistry*, 62, 437-463.
- Strop, P. and Mayo, S. L. (2000). Contribution of Surface Salt Bridges to Protein Stability<sup>†</sup>,<sup>‡</sup>. *Biochemistry*, 39, 1251-1255.
- Swanson, J. M., Henchman, R. H. and Mccammon, J. A. (2004). Revisiting Free Energy Calculations: a Theoretical Connection to MM/PBSA and Direct Calculation of the Association Free Energy. *Biophysical Journal*, 86, 67-74.
- Tsui, V. and Case, D. A. (2000). Theory and Applications of the Generalized Born Solvation Model in Macromolecular Simulations. *Biopolymers*, 56, 275-291.
- Urbanc, B., Cruz, L., Ding, F., Sammond, D., Khare, S., Buldyrev, S. V., Stanley, H.
  E. and Dokholyan, N. V. (2004). Molecular Dynamics Simulation of Amyloid β Dimer Formation. *Biophysical Journal*, 87, 2310-2321.
- Verlet, L. (1967). Computer "Experiments" on Classical Fluids. I. Thermodynamical Properties of Lennard-Jones Molecules. *Physical Review*, 159, 98-103.
- Williams, D. V., Byrne, A., Stewart, J. and Andersen, N. H. (2011). Optimal Salt Bridge for Trp-Cage Stabilization. *Biochemistry*, 50, 1143-1152.
- Wu, C. and Shea, J.-E. (2012). The Structure of Intrinsically Disordered PeptidesImplicated in Amyloid Diseases: Insights from Fully Atomistic Simulations
- Computational Modeling of Biological Systems. *In:* Dokholyan, N. V. (ed.). Springer US.
- Wu, X., Yang, G., Zu, Y., Fu, Y., Zhou, L. and Yuan, X. (2011). Molecular Dynamics Characterisations of The Trp-Cage Folding Mechanisms: in The Absence and Presence of Water Solvents. *Molecular Simulation*, 38, 161-171.

 Zhu, J., Shi, Y. and Liu, H. (2002). Parametrization of a Generalized Born/Solvent-Accessible Surface Area Model and Applications to The Simulation of Protein Dynamics. *The Journal of Physical Chemistry B*, 106, 4844-4853.