Virally derived peptide inhibitors of the herpes simplex virus type 1 nuclear egress complex

Elizabeth B. Draganova[1] and Ekaterina E. Heldwein[1,]*

[1]Department of Molecular Biology and Microbiology, Tufts University School of Medicine,

Boston, MA, 02111, USA

[*]Correspondence: Ekaterina Heldwein, Tufts University School of Medicine, 136 Harrison

Avenue, Boston, MA 02111; 617-636-0858; katya.heldwein@tufts.edu

Abstract

Herpesviruses infect a majority of the human population, establishing lifelong latent infections

for which there is no cure. Periodic viral reactivation spreads infection to new hosts while

causing various disease states particularly detrimental in the immunocompromised. Efficient

viral replication, and ultimately the spread of infection, is dependent on the nuclear egress

complex (NEC), a conserved viral heterodimer that helps translocate mature viral capsids from

the nucleus to the cytoplasm where they mature into infectious virions. Here, we have identified

peptides capable of inhibiting NEC activity *in vitro*. Biophysical characterization of these

peptides using circular dichroism suggests that secondary structure, rather than amino acid

sequence, influences the extent of inhibition. Current therapeutics that target viral DNA

replication machinery are rendered ineffective by drug resistance due to viral mutations. Our

results establish a basis for the development of an alternative class of inhibitors against nuclear

egress, an essential step in herpesvirus replication, potentially expanding the current repertoire of

available therapeutics.

The design of novel antiviral therapeutics is a rapidly expanding field because viruses remain

one of the most common causes of human disease. One important group of viral human

pathogens are herpesviruses that infects a majority of the population by establishing lifelong

dormant infections for which there is no cure (reviewed in [1-3]). Periodically, the virus reactivates,

resulting in diseases such as keratitis, blindness, and cancers, which pose a significant threat to

immunocompromised individuals. Current antiviral treatments of choice are nucleoside analogs

such as acyclovir that target DNA replication machinery; yet, viral resistance to these drugs

renders them ineffective, highlighting the need for additional therapeutics[4-6].

The spread of infection to uninfected tissues and hosts relies on the ability of the virus to

effectively replicate[2,7]. During replication, viral capsids are assembled within the nucleus and

must translocate into the cytoplasm to form infectious virions but are too large to traverse

nuclear pores, and instead use an unusual route termed nuclear egress. The first step in this

process is the budding of a capsid at the inner nuclear membrane (INM), which is mediated by

the conserved nuclear egress complex (NEC), a heterodimer of viral proteins UL31 and UL34 [2,8].

The NEC is anchored to the INM by the single C-terminal transmembrane helix of UL34[9]. UL31

colocalizes with UL34[10,11] so that the complex extends outward into the nucleoplasm where

UL31 binds capsids ready for egress[12,13].

Our group has demonstrated that purified recombinant NEC expressed in *E. coli*

vesiculates synthetic membranes (giant unilamellar vesicles; GUVs) in the absence of other

proteins or ATP[14]. Using cryo-electron microscopy and tomography (cryo-EM/ET), we showed

that during budding, NEC oligomerizes into hexagonal membrane-bound coats[14]. We also found

that HSV-1 NEC formed a hexagonal lattice of similar dimensions in crystals, which reinforced

the inherent ability of the complex to form hexagonal arrays and provided an atomic-level view

of protein interactions within the coat[15]. Mutations intended to disrupt hexagonal lattice

formation impaired NEC-mediated budding *in vitro* and reduced nuclear egress and viral

replication *in vivo*[16,17], which confirmed that NEC oligomerization is essential for the NEC

function. Furthermore, removal of NEC regions required for binding membranes *in vitro*[14] also

reduced viral replication *in vivo*[18,19], suggesting that appropriate membrane interactions are also

required for budding. Therefore, NEC-mediated budding is as an attractive therapeutic target.

Figure 1. UL25-based peptide design. a) The structure of full length capsid-bound HSV-1 UL25 [residues 1-
94 determined by cryoEM; residues 134-580 determined by x-ray crystallography (PDB code: 2F5U)]. **b)**
Schematics of peptides and protein constructs used in NEC-inhibition studies. Peptides are indicated by stripes.
Amino acid sequences of each peptide are given below each schematic. UL25native(45-94): the native N-terminal
helix of UL25; UL25scr(45-94): the amino acid sequence of UL25native(45-94) scrambled; UL2574-94: the C-terminal
half of the UL25native(45-94) peptide; (EAEKAAK)7EAEK: a well-characterized α-helical peptide made of
EAEKAAK repeats.

61
Recently, we showed that HSV-1 NEC-mediated budding could be inhibited *in vitro* by

another HSV-1 protein, capsid protein UL25[20]. UL25 is located at the capsid vertices and is

thought to anchor the NEC to the capsid during nuclear egress[13,21]. We found that an N-

terminally truncated UL25 construct UL25Δ44 Q72A (Fig. 1) inhibited NEC budding at a 10:1

molar ratio of UL25:NEC[20]. Using cryo-ET, we showed that the observed inhibitory effect on

NEC budding correlated with a network of interconnected UL25 stars formed on top of the

membrane-bound NEC layer. We hypothesized that this UL25 network blocked budding by

preventing the conformational changes within the NEC necessary to generate membrane

deformation and budding. UL25-mediated budding inhibition required the N-terminal α-helix in

UL25, residues 45-94 (Fig. 1a), as a UL25Δ73 construct in which the N-terminal ~1/2 of this

helix was truncated did not inhibit budding. We then tested whether peptides derived from the N-

terminal α-helix of UL25 could inhibit NEC-mediated budding. Here, we show that UL25-

derived peptides inhibit NEC budding and identify structural characteristics essential for

inhibition.

Results

Full-length UL25 derived peptides inhibit NEC budding regardless of sequence. We first

tested whether the peptide corresponding to the entire N-terminal helix of UL25, UL25[native(45-94)]

(Fig. 1b), inhibited NEC-mediated budding in a well-established *in vitro* GUV budding assay[14]

(Fig. 2). At a 1:10 molar ratio of NEC:peptide (the same inhibitory ratio as used with the UL25

protein), the UL25[native(45-94)] peptide inhibited NEC budding by ~80%, nearly as efficiently as the

UL25Δ44 Q72A construct (~90% inhibition) (Fig. 2). Surprisingly, a scrambled UL25[scr(45-94)]

peptide (Fig. 1b) inhibited budding by ~80%, nearly as efficiently as the UL25[native(45-94)] peptide

(Fig. 2). This suggested that the native UL25 peptide sequence was unimportant for the

inhibitory activity.

Figure 2. Specific peptides inhibit NEC budding. The UL25[native(45-94)] and UL25[scr(45-94)] peptides inhibit NEC-mediated budding whereas the UL25[74-94] peptide does not. The α-helical (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide only partially inhibits NEC-mediated budding. Budding was tested at 1:10 molar ratios of either NEC:UL25 or NEC:peptide. Each construct/peptide was tested in at least two biological replicates, each consisting of three technical replicates. Symbols represent average budding efficiency of at least two biological replicates relative to NEC220 (100%). Error bars represent the standard error of measurement for at least two individual experiments. Significance compared to NEC220 was calculated using an unpaired t-test. ***P-value < 0.001 and ****P-value < 0.0001.

α-helical formation may be important for peptide-mediated NEC budding inhibition. Both

the UL25[native(45-94)] and UL25[scr(45-94)] peptides were only ~15% α-helical in solution (Fig. 3a, b)

according to the circular dichroism (CD) estimates using DichroWeb[22] (Supplementary Table

S1). However, within capsid-bound UL25, amino acids 48-94 form an α-helix (Fig. 1a), which

suggested that this sequence has a propensity to form α-helical structure under certain

conditions. Therefore, the CD experiment with the UL25[native(45-94)] and UL25[scr(45-94)] peptides was

repeated in the presence of 30% trifluoroethanol (TFE) known to stabilize secondary structure[23].

Both peptides adopted α-helical structure (~50% and ~75%, respectively) in the presence of TFE

(Fig. 3a, b) suggesting that each peptide could, in principle, form an α-helix in the right

environment, for example, when bound to a protein partner such as the NEC. The $\theta_{222}/\theta_{208}$ ratios

of these peptides either in the absence or presence of TFE were less than 0.9 indicating peptides

were forming individual helices rather than coiled coils[24].

Figure 3. α-helical formation is important for NEC budding inhibition. a-d) Far-UV CD spectra of each
peptide with (dashed lines) and without (solid lines) 30% TFE. Both the UL25[native(45-94)] and the UL25[scr(45-94)]
peptides exist as random coils which can form α-helices in the presence of 30% TFE and inhibit NEC budding.
Alternatively, UL25[74-94] can only form a random coil and cannot inhibit NEC budding. The
(EAEKAAK)[7]EAEK peptide is α-helical, regardless of the presence of TFE, and only moderately inhibits
budding, suggesting a pre-formed α-helical peptide precludes proper inhibitory contacts with the NEC.

We next tested a shorter UL25[74-94] peptide (Fig. 1b) and found that it did not inhibit

budding (Fig. 2). According to the CD analysis, the UL25[74-94] peptide adopted a random-coil

conformation in solution even in the presence of 30% TFE (Fig. 3c, Supplementary Table 1).

Therefore, the UL25[74-94] peptide may be unable to inhibit NEC budding because it cannot form

an α-helix.

A pre-formed α-helical peptide moderately inhibits budding. To determine if any α-helical

peptide of similar length to UL25[native(45-94)] could inhibit NEC-mediated budding, we generated a

heterologous 53-amino-acid peptide containing a series of well-characterized α-helical

EAEKAAK repeats [(EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK][25]. The (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide inhibited NEC-

mediated budding but with a lower efficiency than either the UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ or the UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$

peptides, only by ~50% (Fig. 2). The moderate inhibitory activity of the (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK

peptide could be due to a different amino acid composition, notably, 60% charged residues

(glutamates and lysines) relative to the 30% charged residues (aspartates, glutamates and

arginines) in the UL25 inhibitory peptides. Additionally, the (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide was

60% α-helical in solution even in the absence of TFE (Fig. 3d, Supplementary Table 1), in

contrast to both the UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and the UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ peptides that became mostly α-helical

only in the presence of TFE (Fig. 3a, b). This observation suggested that while the inhibitory

peptide should be α-helical, instead of being a stable, pre-formed α-helix, it may need to form in

the presence of the NEC, in an induced-fit manner, for optimal inhibition.

Peptides do not bind acidic membranes. None of the peptides used in this study bound

multilamellar vesicles (MLVs) of the same lipid composition as the GUVs used in the budding

assay (Supplementary Fig. S1), which suggested that the peptides do not compete with the NEC

for binding to membranes. Therefore, we hypothesize that the peptides instead bind the NEC and

block its membrane-budding activity.

Discussion

Here, we have shown that two peptides derived from the N-terminal α-helix of UL25

efficiently inhibited NEC-mediated budding *in vitro*. A shorter UL25-derived peptide did not

inhibit budding whereas a heterologous α-helical peptide [(EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK)] inhibited

budding with moderate efficiency. We hypothesize that the inhibitory ability of the peptides

depends more on their length and the ability to form an α-helix than the exact amino acid

sequence.

Peptide length was more important for inhibition than the sequence because 50-amino-

acid UL25 peptides, be they native or scrambled (UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$), efficiently

inhibited budding whereas the 21-amino-acid native peptide UL25$^{74-94}$ did not (Fig. 2). Future

studies will identify the minimal UL25 peptide length required for inhibition. The inhibitory

ability of UL25 peptides correlated not only with their length but also with the propensity to

adopt α-helical structure. Although all three UL25-derived peptides formed random coils in

solution, only the two 50-amino acid peptides formed α-helices in the presence of TFE. Thus, we

hypothesize that inhibitory peptides may need to be α-helical. The inability of UL25$^{74-94}$ to form

an α-helix could be due to the lower content of alanine and leucine residues, two amino acid

types with the highest propensity to form α-helices[26]. UL25$^{74-94}$ has 1% alanines and 2% leucines

whereas both UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ have 26% and 8%, respectively.

The (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide, a 53-residue α-helical peptide of heterologous

sequence was also inhibitory but less so than the 50-residue UL25 peptides. This peptide is more

highly charged than the UL25 peptides and is α-helical in solution even in the absence of TFE. It

is possible that a stable, preformed α-helix may not be able to form appropriate inhibitory

contacts with the NEC and that for efficient inhibition, an α-helix of a specific length and amino-

acid content should form in the presence of the NEC, in an induced-fit manner. Alternatively, the

reduced inhibitory activity of the heterologous (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide could be due to

differences in the amino-acid composition. This peptide forms an amphipathic α-helix with a

highly charged face rich in glutamates and lysines and a hydrophobic face rich in alanines

(Supplementary Fig. S2) that could bind the NEC in a different manner compared to the

inhibitory peptides, leading to partial budding inhibition. In contrast, inhibitory UL25-derived

peptides have fewer charged residues and form α-helices with a less pronounced amphipathic

character (Supplementary Fig. S2). Therefore, future design of NEC peptide inhibitors should

take both of these characteristics into consideration.

The mechanism by which the inhibitory peptides inhibit budding is yet unclear. None of

the peptides bound membranes, which ruled out competition with the NEC for binding to

membranes. Therefore, we hypothesize that the peptides must instead inhibit the activity of the

NEC by binding it directly. Our previous study suggested that UL25 inhibited NEC-mediated

budding by oligomerizing into a network of interconnected stars on top of the membrane-bound

NEC layer as observed by cryo-ET[20]. We hypothesized that the N-terminal helices link the

neighboring UL25 molecules into a network by forming antiparallel helical bundles that

sterically blocked the NEC from undergoing conformational changes necessary for membrane

budding. Both the N-terminal helix and the C-terminal core of UL25 (Fig. 1a) were important for

inhibition. However, the inhibitory UL25 peptides in our current study were composed of only

the N-terminal helix. Therefore, they likely bind the NEC differently from UL25 and use a

different mechanism to inhibit budding. Being much smaller than UL25, the inhibitory peptides

can interact with the NEC at sites otherwise inaccessible to the UL25 protein.

One possibility is that the inhibitory peptides bind the NEC and prevent its binding to

membranes. Membrane binding of the NEC is thought to rely on electrostatic interactions

between the membrane-binding regions rich in basic residues and acidic membranes[14]. Both

UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ have acidic residues (8 glutamates and 1 aspartate). Modeling

these peptides as helices suggests some of these residues could form acidic patches

(Supplementary Fig. S3) which may potentially interact with NEC regions required for efficient

membrane binding to inhibit budding. Alternatively, NEC/peptide interactions may block

NEC/NEC interactions necessary for the assembly of the hexagonal NEC coat thereby blocking

the induction of negative curvature and, ultimately, budding (Fig. 4).

Figure 4. Proposed models of peptide-mediated NEC budding inhibition. **a)** NEC (pink) alone forms a
hexagonal coat on membranes (magenta) which induces negative curvature forming a budded vesicle. **b)** Both
UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ (blue/green) inhibit budding by forming α-helices upon binding to the NEC,
inhibiting binding of NEC to membranes. Alternatively, NEC binds membranes and inhibitory peptides
prevent coat formation and ultimately, conformational changes needed for negative curvature. This figure was
created with Biorender.com.

Regardless of the precise mechanism, our results suggest that inhibitory peptides should

be of a certain length, moderately charged, and unstructured in solution, yet capable of forming

α-helical structure, presumably, upon binding to the NEC. Alternatively, inhibitory random coil

peptides may be sufficient for budding inhibition without the requirement of α-helical formation.

Short peptides incapable of forming an α-helical structure do not inhibit budding whereas

charged peptides that form a stable α-helix on their own inhibit budding inefficiently. Further

structural analyses of the inhibitory peptides in the presence of the NEC are necessary to narrow

down the optimal characteristics of the inhibitory peptides.

Efficient NEC function is required for successful replication of herpesviruses. To our

knowledge, this is the first study reporting a peptide-based approach targeting NEC budding. Our

work provides a starting point for the rational design of peptide-based inhibitors of the NEC and

nuclear egress. Both the NEC and UL25 are conserved across all herpesviruses raising an

intriguing possibility that UL25-derived peptides could be used to inhibit NEC homologs from

other herpesviruses.

Materials and Methods

Cloning. All primers used in cloning are listed in Supplementary Table S2. DNA sequences

encoding each peptide were subcloned into the prokaryotic expression vector pGEX-6P-1 that

encodes a N-terminal GST-tag followed by a PreScission Protease cleavage site in frame with

the BamHI restriction site within the multiple cloning site. Both the UL25$^{native(45\text{-}94)}$ and UL25$^{74\text{-}94}$

peptide DNA sequences were amplified by PCR from pED03 (UL25Δ44 Q72A) and subcloned

into the pGEX-6P-1 vector using restriction digest via BamHI and XhoI to create the pED23

[UL25$^{native(45\text{-}94)}$] and pED38 (UL25$^{74\text{-}94}$) plasmids. Both the scrambled [UL25$^{scr(45\text{-}94)}$] and α-

helical [(EAEKAAK$_7$)EAEK] peptide DNA sequences were obtained as a gBlock gene fragment

(IDT) and subjected to restriction digest cloning with BamHI and XhoI into the pGEX-6P-1

vector (gene fragment sequences are given in Supplementary Table S2) to create the pED34

(UL25$^{scr(45\text{-}94)}$ peptide) and pED39 [(EAEKAAK$_7$)EAEK peptide] plasmids.

Expression and purification of NEC220. Plasmids encoding HSV-1 UL31 1-306 (pKH90) and

UL34 1-220 (pJB02) were co-transformed into *Escherichia coli* BL21(DE3) LoBSTr cells

(Kerafast) to generate NEC220 (NEC construct absent of the UL34 C-terminal transmembrane

helix)[14]. NEC220 was expressed using autoinduction at 37 °C in Terrific Broth (TB)

supplemented with 100 μg/mL kanamycin, 100 μg/mL ampicillin, 0.2% lactose and 2 mM

MgSO$_4$ for 4 h. The temperature was then reduced to 25 °C for 16 h. Cells were harvested at

5,000 x g for 30 min. NEC220 was purified as previously described[14] with slight modifications.

NEC220 was passed over 2 x 1 mL HiTrap Talon columns (GE Healthcare), rather than ion

exchange as previously described, to remove excess cleaved His$_6$-SUMO before injection onto

size-exclusion chromatography (as previously described).

Expression and purification of peptides. Plasmids encoding the peptide sequences were

expressed and cells harvested as described above for the NEC220. Cells were resuspended in

lysis buffer (50 mM Na HEPES pH 7.5, 500 mM NaCl, 1 mM TCEP, and 10% glycerol) plus

Complete protease inhibitor (Roche) and lysed using a microfluidizer 110S (Microfluidics). The

cell lysate was centrifuged at 13,000 x g for 35 min, and the supernatant passed over a

Glutathione sepharose 4B (GE Healthcare) column, which was subsequently washed with lysis

buffer. The GST-tag was cleaved on the glutathione sepharose column for 16 h using the

PreScission Protease described above. Peptides were eluted off the column with lysis buffer. As

a final purification step, peptides were purified with size-exclusion chromatography using a

Superdex 75 column (GE Healthcare) equilibrated with 20 mM Na HEPES, pH 7.0, 100 mM

NaCl, and 1 mM TCEP (for budding assays) or with 10 mM sodium phosphate, pH 7.4, and 100

mM NaF (for CD studies). Absorbance was monitored at 214 nm because the peptides lack

aromatic residues. The peptides were purified to homogeneity as assessed by both 16.5% Tris-

Tricine SDS-PAGE and 12% SDS-PAGE with Coomassie staining. Fractions containing peptide

were concentrated and sent off for amino acid analysis (University of Colorado Denver Anschutz

Medical Campus) for accurate concentration determination.

Co-sedimentation assay. Co-sedimentation of peptides to acidic multilamellar vesicles (MLVs)

was performed as previously described[14]. MLVs were prepared in a 3:1:1 ratio of 1-palmitoyl-2-

oleoyl-glycero-3-phosphocholine (POPC):1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phospho-L-serine

(POPS):1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphate (POPA) (Avanti Polar Lipids).

Background signal in the absence of liposomes is due to protein aggregation during

centrifugation. The reported values represent the percentage (0-100 %) of either NEC220 or

peptide bound to membranes. The standard error of the mean is reported for each measurement.

Each condition was tested in one biological replicate with two technical replicates.

GUV Budding Assays. Giant unilamellar vesicles (GUVs) were prepared as previously

described[14]. For NEC220 only budding quantification, a total of 10 μL of GUVs with a 3:1:1

ratio of POPC:POPS:POPA containing ATTO-594 DOPE (ATTO-TEC GmbH) at a

concentration of 0.2 μg/μL was mixed with 1 μM NEC220 (final concentration), and 0.2 mg/mL

(final concentration) Cascade Blue Hydrazide (ThermoFisher Scientific). For the NEC and

peptide experiments, 10 μL of GUVs and 10 μM (final concentration) of either the $UL25^{native(45-94)}$,

$UL25^{scr(45-94)}$, $UL25^{74-94}$, or (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptides were incubated with 1 μM of

NEC220 (final concentration) along with Cascade blue. The total volume of each sample during

imaging for all experiments was brought to 100 μL with gel filtration buffer and the reaction was

incubated for 5 min at 20 °C. Samples were imaged in a 96-well chambered cover-glass. Images

were acquired using a Nikon A1R Confocal Microscope with a 60x oil immersion lens at the

Tufts Imaging Facility in the Center for Neuroscience Research at Tufts University School of

Medicine. Quantification was performed by counting vesicles in 15 different frames of the

sample (~300 vesicles total). Each condition was tested in at least two biological replicates. Prior

to analysis, the background was subtracted from the raw values. The reported values represent

the average budding activity relative to NEC220 (100%). The standard error of the mean is

reported for each measurement. Significance compared to NEC220 was calculated using an

unpaired one-tailed *t*-test against NEC220.

Circular dichroism (CD) studies. Far-UV CD spectra of peptides (0.1 mg/mL) were recorded in

10 mM Na phosphate, pH 7.4, and 100 mM NaF buffer using a Jasco 815 CD Spectropolarimeter

at the Center for Macromolecular Interactions at Harvard Medical School. Peptide spectra were

also measured in the presence of 30% trifluoroethanol (TFE). Data were collected at ambient

temperature with a scan speed of 50 nm/min and 5 accumulations of each sample was averaged.

The raw data was blank subtracted and converted to mean residue ellipticity (MRE). Helical

content was estimated using DichroWeb[22] and average values from three reference datasets

generated by the same analysis program are provided in Supplementary Table S1.

References

1.   Johnson, D. C. & Baines, J. D. Herpesviruses remodel host membranes for virus egress.
Nat. Rev. Microbiol. **9**, 382-394, doi:10.1038/nrmicro2559 (2011).

2.   Bigalke, J. M. & Heldwein, E. E. Nuclear exodus: Herpesviruses lead the way. *Annu.*
Rev. Virol. **3**, 387-409, doi:10.1146/annurev-virology-110615-042215 (2016).

3.   Mettenleiter, T. C., Klupp, B. G. & Granzow, H. Herpesvirus assembly: an update. *Virus*
Res. **143**, 222-234, doi:10.1016/j.virusres.2009.03.018 (2009).

4.   Szczubialka, K., Pyrc, K. & Nowakowska, M. In search for effective and definitive
treatment of herpes simplex virus type 1 (HSV-1) infections. *RSC Adv.* **6**, 1058-1075,
doi:10.1039/c5ra22896d (2016).

5.   Engel, J. P., Englund, J. A., Fletcher, C. V. & Hill, E. L. Treatment of resistant herpes
simplex virus with continuous-infusion acyclovir. *JAMA.* **263**, 1662-1664 (1990).

6.   Antoine, T. E., Park, P. J. & Shukla, D. Glycoprotein targeted therapeutics: a new era of
anti-herpes simplex virus-1 therapeutics. *Rev. Med. Virol.* **23**, 194-208,
doi:10.1002/rmv.1740 (2013).

7.   Roller, R. J. & Baines, J. D. in *Adv. Anat. Embryol. Cell. Biol.* Vol. 223 (ed Klaus
Osteirrieder) Ch. 7, 143-169 (Springer, 2017).

8.   Reynolds, A. E., Wills, E. G., Roller, R. J., Ryckman, B. J. & Baines, J. D. Ultrastructural
localization of the herpes simplex virus type 1 UL31, UL34, and US3 proteins suggests
specific roles in primary envelopment and egress of nucleocapsids. *J. Virol.* **76**, 8939-
8952 (2002).

9.   Shiba, C. *et al.* The UL34 gene product of herpes simplex virus type 2 is a tail-anchored
type II membrane protein that is significant for virus envelopment. *J. Gen. Virol.* **81**,
2397-2405, doi:10.1099/0022-1317-81-10-2397 (2000).

10.   Reynolds, A. E. *et al.* U(L)31 and U(L)34 proteins of herpes simplex virus type 1 form a
complex that accumulates at the nuclear rim and is required for envelopment of
nucleocapsids. *J. Virol.* **75**, 8803-8817 (2001).

11.   Chang, Y. E. & Roizman, B. The product of the UL31 gene of herpes simplex virus 1 is a
nuclear phosphoprotein which partitions with the nuclear matrix. *J. Virol.* **67**, 6348-6356
(1993).

12.   Trus, B. L. *et al.* Allosteric signaling and a nuclear exit strategy: binding of UL25/UL17
heterodimers to DNA-Filled HSV-1 capsids. *Mol. Cell.* **26**, 479-489,
doi:10.1016/j.molcel.2007.04.010 (2007).

13. Yang, K. & Baines, J. D. Selection of HSV capsids for envelopment involves interaction
between capsid surface components pUL31, pUL17, and pUL25. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*
108, 14276-14281, doi:10.1073/pnas.1108564108 (2011).

14. Bigalke, J. M., Heuser, T., Nicastro, D. & Heldwein, E. E. Membrane deformation and
scission by the HSV-1 nuclear egress complex. *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 4131,
doi:10.1038/ncomms5131 (2014).

15. Bigalke, J. M. & Heldwein, E. E. Structural basis of membrane budding by the nuclear
egress complex of herpesviruses. *EMBO J.* **34**, 2921-2936,
doi:10.15252/embj.201592359 (2015).

16. Roller, R. J., Zhou, Y., Schnetzer, R., Ferguson, J. & DeSalvo, D. Herpes simplex virus
type 1 U(L)34 gene product is required for viral envelopment. *J. Virol.* **74**, 117-129
(2000).

17. Fuchs, W., Klupp, B. G., Granzow, H., Osterrieder, N. & Mettenleiter, T. C. The
interacting UL31 and UL34 gene products of pseudorabies virus are involved in egress
from the host-cell nucleus and represent components of primary enveloped but not
mature virions. *J. Virol.* **76**, 364-378 (2002).

18. Mou, F., Wills, E. & Baines, J. D. Phosphorylation of the U(L)31 protein of herpes
simplex virus 1 by the U(S)3-encoded kinase regulates localization of the nuclear
envelopment complex and egress of nucleocapsids. *J. Virol.* **83**, 5181-5191,
doi:10.1128/jvi.00090-09 (2009).

19. Passvogel, L., Trube, P., Schuster, F., Klupp, B. G. & Mettenleiter, T. C. Mapping of
sequences in Pseudorabies virus pUL34 that are required for formation and function of
the nuclear egress complex. *J. Virol.* **87**, 4475-4485, doi:10.1128/jvi.00021-13 (2013).

20. Draganova, E. B., Zhang, J., Zhou, Z. H. & Heldwein, E. E. Structural basis for capsid
recruitment and coat formation during HSV-1 nuclear egress. Preprint at
https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.11.988170v1.full (2020).

21. Yang, K., Wills, E., Lim, H. Y., Zhou, Z. H. & Baines, J. D. Association of herpes
simplex virus pUL31 with capsid vertices and components of the capsid vertex-specific
complex. *J. Virol.* **88**, 3815-3825, doi:10.1128/jvi.03175-13 (2014).

22. Whitmore, L. & Wallace, B. A. Protein secondary structure analyses from circular
dichroism spectroscopy: methods and reference databases. *Biopolymers.* **89**, 392-400,
doi:10.1002/bip.20853 (2008).

23. Luo, P. & Baldwin, R. L. Mechanism of helix induction by trifluoroethanol: a framework
for extrapolating the helix-forming properties of peptides from trifluoroethanol/water
mixtures back to water. *Biochemistry.* **36**, 8413-8421, doi:10.1021/bi9707133 (1997).

24. Lau, S. Y., Taneja, A. K. & Hodges, R. S. Synthesis of a model protein of defined
secondary and quaternary structure. Effect of chain length on the stabilization and

formation of two-stranded alpha-helical coiled-coils. *J. Biol. Chem.* **259**, 13253-13261
(1984).

25.   Zhou, N. E., Kay, C. M., Sykes, B. D. & Hodges, R. S. A single-stranded amphipathic
alpha-helix in aqueous solution: design, structural characterization, and its application for
determining alpha-helical propensies of amino acids. *Biochemistry.* **32**, 6190-6197
(1993).

26.   Pace, C. N. & Scholtz, J. M. A helix propensity scale based on experimental studies of
peptides and proteins. *Biophys. J.* **75**, 422-427 (1998).

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Shaun Bevers (University of Colorado Denver Biophysics Core) for

performing amino acid analysis on the peptides. We also thank Peter Cherepanov (Francis Crick

Institute) for the gift of the GST-PreScission protease expression plasmid and Thomas Schwartz

(Massachusetts Institute of Technology) for the gift of LoBSTr cells. CD experiments were

performed at the Center for Macromolecular Interactions in the Department of Biological

Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology at Harvard Medical School. This work was funded by

the NIH grants R01GM111795 and R01AI147625 (E.E.H.), a Faculty Scholar grant 55108533

from Howard Hughes Medical Institute (E.E.H.), and NIH postdoctoral fellowship

F32GM126760 (E.B.D.).

Author Contributions

E.B.D. and E.E.H. designed the experiments; E.B.D. performed all experiments and analyses

under the guidance of E.E.H; E.B.D. and E.E.H. wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

Additional Information

Competing Interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure 1. UL25-based peptide design. a) The structure of full length capsid-bound HSV-1

UL25 [residues 1-94 determined by cryoEM; residues 134-580 determined by x-ray

crystallography (PDB code: 2F5U)]. **b)** Schematics of peptides and protein constructs used in

NEC-inhibition studies. Peptides are indicated by stripes. Amino acid sequences of each peptide

are given below each schematic. UL25$^{native(45-94)}$: the native N-terminal helix of UL25; UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$: the amino acid sequence of UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ scrambled; UL25$^{74-94}$: the C-terminal half of the

UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ peptide; (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK: a well-characterized α-helical peptide made of

EAEKAAK repeats.

Figure 2. Specific peptides inhibit NEC budding. The UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ peptides

inhibit NEC-mediated budding whereas the UL2574-94 peptide does not. The α-helical

(EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide only partially inhibits NEC-mediated budding. Budding was tested

at 1:10 molar ratios of either NEC:UL25 or NEC:peptide. Each construct/peptide was tested in at

least two biological replicates, each consisting of three technical replicates. Symbols represent

average budding efficiency of at least two biological replicates relative to NEC220 (100%). Error

bars represent the standard error of measurement for at least two individual experiments.

Significance compared to NEC220 was calculated using an unpaired t-test. ***P-value < 0.001

and ****P-value < 0.0001.

Figure 3. α-helical formation is important for NEC budding inhibition. a-d) Far-UV CD

spectra of each peptide with (dashed lines) and without (solid lines) 30% TFE. Both the

UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and the UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ peptides exist as random coils which can form α-helices in the

presence of 30% TFE and inhibit NEC budding. Alternatively, UL25$^{74-94}$ can only form a random

coil and cannot inhibit NEC budding. The (EAEKAAK)$_7$EAEK peptide is α-helical, regardless

of the presence of TFE, and only moderately inhibits budding, suggesting a pre-formed α-helical

peptide precludes proper inhibitory contacts with the NEC.

Figure 4. Proposed models of peptide-mediated NEC budding inhibition. a) NEC (pink)

alone forms a hexagonal coat on membranes (magenta) which induces negative curvature

forming a budded vesicle. **b)** Both UL25$^{native(45-94)}$ and UL25$^{scr(45-94)}$ (blue/green) inhibit budding by

forming α-helices upon binding to the NEC, inhibiting binding of NEC to membranes.

Alternatively, NEC binds membranes and inhibitory peptides prevent coat formation and

ultimately, conformational changes needed for negative curvature. This figure was created with

Biorender.com.