1   **Cooperative ectodomain interaction among TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε**

2   **enhances TCR mechanotransduction**

Zhou Yuan[1-3†], Peiwen Cong[1,3†], Aswin Natarajan[4†], Chenghao Ge[1,3,a†], Stefano Travaglino[1,3],

Saikiran Beesam[4], Danielle Grazette[4], Michelle Krogsgaard[4‡], Cheng Zhu[1-3‡]

[1]Wallace H. Coulter Department of Biomedical Engineering, [2]Georgia W. Woodruff School of

Mechanical Engineering, [3]Petit Institute for Bioengineering and Bioscience, Georgia Institute of

Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA; [4]Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center and Department of

Pathology, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

[†]These authors contributed equally.

[‡]Contact: cheng.zhu@bme.gatech.edu, 1-404-894-3269 or

Michelle.Krogsgaard@nyulangone.org, 212-263-9266,

[a]Present address: Amgen Inc., One Amgen Center Dr., Thousand Oaks, CA, USA

There are 200 words in abstract, 7077 words in main text (excluding abstract, methods, references

and figure legends). The manuscript also includes 7 figures, 1 table and 70 references plus 5

supplementary figures, 2 supplementary tables, and 11 supplementary videos.

ABSTRACT

The T-cell receptor (TCR) complex comprises TCRαβ, CD3γε, CD3δε, and CD3ζζ. TCRαβ engagement with peptide-bound major histocompatibility complex (pMHC) triggers CD3 phosphorylation, which is regulated by mechanical force. However, the inner workings of the TCR mechanotransduction machinery remains unclear. TCR ectodomain (ECD) interactions have been inferred from structural and mutagenesis studies. Due to their extreme weakness, however, direct measurements of affinity had failed and of force regulation have never been attempted. Here we measured two-dimensional affinities and force-dependent lifetimes of interactions among TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε ECDs, showing a cooperative CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε catch bond with longer-lasting lifetime that exceeds the TCR–pMHC bond lifetime. Molecular dynamics stimulations revealed a central interacting region surrounded by TCR ECDs and identified critical interacting residues at their interfaces. Interfering TCR ECD interactions by antibodies impaired TCR–pMHC interaction and T cell function. Mutating residues that mediate TCR ECD *cis*-interactions with CD3s altered the catch bond of TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction, which correlates with changed T cell cytokine production. Thus, TCR mechanotransduction is supported by cooperative TCR ECD interactions, which regulates T cell function. Our results provide a missing link between pMHC ligation and CD3 signaling and may guide future TCR engineering design for immunotherapies.

INTRODUCTION

Antigen recognition by the TCR-CD3 complex (hereinafter denoted as TCR) initiates T cell activation, leading to subsequent proliferation, effector function, and differentiation of T cells (*1*). Despite extensive research, the key question of how TCR–pMHC binding induces T cell signaling remains unclear. Proposed models for TCR triggering include conformational change, mechanotransduction, and dynamically-driven allostery (*1-7*). Indeed, recent *in vitro* experiments have demonstrated that T cells exert endogenous forces on the TCR via engaged pMHC (*8-10*) and that mechanical force not only can induce conformational change and regulate the lifetime of TCR–pMHC bonds (*11-15*) but can also trigger T cell signaling (*11, 16-18*). Also, nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) (*19, 20*) and molecular dynamics (MD) (*20, 21*) studies have suggested that pMHC binding impacts the dynamics of TCR allosterically, providing another possible mechanism for TCR triggering that is not mutually exclusive to the mechanosensor mechanism (*3*). To sustain mechanical force exerted on, and/or transmit dynamics allosterically through, its structure, the TCR must be held together by non-covalent interactions between the ECDs, connecting peptide (CP), and transmembrane domains of its subunits. Extracellularly, TCRαβ constant domains (Cα/Cβ) are proximal to both CD3γε and CD3δε ECDs (*22-26*) (hereinafter we omit "ECD"), but are thought to only interact weakly due to the inability to detect binding by three-dimensional (3D) measurement techniques such as the surface plasmon resonance (SPR, Supplementary Fig. 1a). However, biochemical, mutagenesis, and solution NMR studies have suggested CD3-binding sites on the TCRαβ the mutations on which impair TCR stability and functionality (*22-24, 27*), indicating the relevance of these interactions. Suggested roles of these weak ECD interactions include guiding the proper spatial arrangement of the TCR assembly, stabilizing the complex structure, and amplifying the TCR signal transduction for T cell activation

(*22, 27*). Several structural studies tried to elucidate the molecular details of the TCRαβ–CD3

dynamic interactions in the absence of mechanical forces (*19, 20, 23, 24*), which is unlikely able

to resolve its mechanotransduction role of TCRαβ–CD3 interactions.

Using purified proteins and ultrasensitive mechanical techniques, the micropipette (*28, 29*)

and biomembrane force probe (BFP) (*11, 30*), we measured two-dimensional (2D) binding

affinities and force-dependent lifetimes of TCRαβ bonds with CD3γε, CD3δε, and both. Using

both force-free conventional MD (CMD) and steered MD (SMD) simulations based on the recently

published cryoEM structure (*26*), we analyzed TCRαβ–CD3 interactions in the absence and

presence of pulling forces, finding that perturbing the TCRαβ–CD3 interactions affects the TCR–

pMHC catch bond and T cell function. Mutagenesis experiment found that mutating residues at

the TCRαβ-CD3 interface to enhance interaction under force prolonged the TCR–pMHC lifetime

and T cell function. Our results demonstrated catch bond formation and cooperativity in these

interactions and delineated molecular details of a TCR triggering model.

RESULTS

Antibody interfering TCRαβ–CD3 interactions impairs TCR–pMHC interaction and T cell

function

To investigate how TCRαβ–CD3 interactions support the TCR antigen recognition and

mechanotransduction, we first asked whether interfering TCRαβ–CD3 *cis*-interactions affects

TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction. Previous studies have identified two monoclonal antibodies

(mAbs), H57 (against TCRβ constant domain (*31*)) and 2C11 (against CD3ε (*32*)), whose binding

likely block TCRαβ–CD3 interactions (Fig. 1A). To confirm their blocking effects, we coated 2C

TCRαβ and mouse CD3γε ECD proteins on the respective surfaces of two human red blood cells

(RBCs) that were pressurized and opposingly aligned to measure 2D binding by the micropipette

adhesion frequency (MAF) assay (*28, 29*) (Fig. 1B, *upper*). As expected, adhesion frequencies

were significantly lower in the presence than absence of full-length H57 and 2C11, and of the

single-chain variable fragment (scFv) of H57, but not of the control mAb F23 (against TCRβ

variable domain (*33*)) (Fig. 1C).

To answer our question of the preceding paragraph, we again used the MAF assay to

measure binding between 2C TCR expressing cells and RBCs coated with SIYR:H2-K^b (Fig. 1B

lower). Remarkably, adhesion frequencies mediated by TCR–pMHC binding were significantly

lower in the presence than absence of H57 Fab and 2C11 Fab, but not of F23 Fab (Fig. 1D). This

is despite that neither mAb Fabs hinder the TCR–pMHC bonding interface (Fig. 1A), nor do they

affect the access of SIYR:H-2K^b tetramer to 2C TCR on the cell surface (Fig. S1A). Interesting,

the adhesion frequency reduction by H57 scFv, a smaller fragment than Fab, was no longer

significant (Fig. 1D). To obtain further supporting evidence, we used the BFP (Fig. 1E) force-

clamp assay (*11-13, 15*) (Fig. 1F) to measure the effects of H57 on the force-dependent lifetimes

of 2C TCR–SIYR:H-2K^b bonds at 10 pN clamp force. Consistent with the MAF assay results,

bond lifetimes were significantly shortened in the presence than absence of H57 Fab but not scFv

(Fig. 1G).

To determine the functional consequence, if any, of the reduced adhesion frequency and

bond lifetime of the TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction by antibody interference of the TCRαβ–CD3

cis-interactions, we measured the IL-2 production of T cells in response to SIYR peptide

stimulation. Remarkably, the presence of the H57 Fab and 2C11 Fab greatly reduced the IL-2

production compared to Fab of control mAb F23 and of non-binding mAb H28 (Fig. 1H),

establishing the correlation of reduced TCR–pMHC binding and bond lifetime with reduced T cell

function.

Low affinities, fast off-rates, and catch bonds of the TCRαβ–CD3 interactions

We next sought to characterize the TCR ECD interactions. Like previous attempts (*34*), SPR was

unable to detect binding (Fig. S1B). We therefore measured 2D kinetics among hybrid 2B4 TCRαβ

(of mouse 2B4 TCRαβ variable domains fused with human LC13 TCRαβ constant domains) (*24,*

35), human CD3δε, and human CD3γε using the MAF assay with the same setup and coating

strategy as Fig. 1B (*top*). The anticipated low affinity binding was overcome by the ultra-

sensitivity of the MAF assay, which allowed us to measure specific adhesion frequencies (Fig.

S1C) from which the effective 2D affinities of TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε and CD3γε–

CD3δε heterotypic interactions were evaluated (Fig. 2A, Fig. S1D,J). To accurately analyze the

fast TCRαβ–CD3 dissociations, we used the BFP (Fig. 1E) thermal fluctuation assay (Fig. 2B) (*29,*

36) to measure off-rates of bonds between molecules coated on opposing glass beads (Fig. 2C, Fig.

S1J). We calculated the effective 2D on-rates by multiplying affinities with off-rates (Fig. 2D, Fig.

S1J). These TCRαβ–CD3 interactions are indeed of very low affinities ($2\text{-}4 \times 10^{-6}\ \mu m^4$) and rapid

zero-force off-rates ($>10\ s^{-1}$), attesting to the ultrasensitivity of our mechanical assays (*37, 38*).

We (*11-13*) and others (*14, 15*) have shown that mechanical force modulates TCR–pMHC

interactions and amplify antigen discrimination (*11, 12, 14*). Force may modulate TCRαβ–CD3

interactions in a similar fashion. This hypothesis is based on the observation that upon pMHC

ligation, the binding-induced NMR signal perturbation propagates to the Cβ site involved in the

putative CD3 interactions (*20*), suggesting an allosteric pathway even in the absence of force. In

the presence of force, this pathway may allow force-encoded information to transmit from pMHC

to CD3 through TCRαβ, thereby triggering signaling. To test our hypothesis, we used BFP force-

clamp assay (Fig. 1E,F) to measure the lifetimes of single-bonds of specific (Fig. S1E-G) TCRαβ–

CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and CD3γε–CD3δε interactions under a range of constant forces (Fig.

2E). We found that all three interactions formed catch bonds where their lifetimes were prolonged

by forces below ~10-20 pN until higher forces overpowered the bonds to shorten their lifetimes

(*i.e.*, slip bonds). Our data show that these interactions can bear force, supporting our hypothesis

that information of antigen recognition can be transmitted mechanically through TCRαβ–CD3

interactions.

For comparison, we also measured 2D binding parameters of the specific (Fig. S1I)

interaction between fully assembled 2B4 TCR on the cell surface with K5:I-E^k (Fig. 2A,C,D,F).

This TCR–pMHC interaction has a comparable affinity to TCRαβ–CD3 interactions but much

longer bond lifetimes over the entire range of forces (Fig. 2F), seemingly suggesting that the

TCRαβ–CD3 *cis*-interactions may be less stable than the TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction, therefore

challenging our mechanical transmission hypothesis. Our CD3δε–CD3γε interaction data (Fig.

2A,C,D,E) are consistent with the TCR structure showing contact between CD3γε and CD3δε (*26*).

The 1:1:1 stoichiometry among TCRαβ and the two CD3 heterodimers raised a question of whether

TCRαβ binds CD3γε and CD3δε concurrently to form trimolecular bonds; if so, whether this

concurrent binding is independent or cooperative; and if cooperative, how much enhanced stability

the cooperative binding results and whether the enhancement meets the aforementioned challenge.

CD3γε and CD3δε bind TCRαβ cooperatively to enhance TCR stability

To address the above questions, we used the MAF assay to compare the specific (Fig. S1C) 2D

binding of TCRαβ-bearing RBCs to RBCs coated with either CD3γε, CD3δε or both at a 1:1 ratio

("CD3m"). The average number of TCRαβ bonds with indicated CD3 species, $<n>_\gamma$, $<n>_\delta$, and

$<n>_m$, were calculated from the adhesion frequencies P_a, and normalized by the densities of TCRαβ

($m_{\alpha\beta}$) and CD3ε (m_ε) to remove the influence of uneven protein coating (Fig. 3B). For TCRαβ

binding to either CD3 species, the normalized bond numbers ($<n>_\gamma/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon}$ and $<n>_\delta/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\varepsilon}$) at

steady-state are identical to their effective 2D affinities ($A_cK_{a,\gamma}$ and $A_cK_{a,\delta}$) shown in Fig. 2A

because m_ε equals $m_{\gamma\varepsilon}$, $m_{\delta\varepsilon}$, or $m_{\gamma\varepsilon} + m_{\delta\varepsilon}$ depending on whether the RBCs were coated with CD3γε,

CD3δε, or both. For TCRαβ binding to both CD3s, $<n>_m/m_{\alpha\beta}m_\varepsilon$ would be equal to the average of

the effective 2D affinities of the two bimolecular interactions ($A_cK_{a,\gamma} + A_cK_{a,\delta}$)/2, should CD3γε

and CD3δε bind TCRαβ independently rather than cooperatively. In the presence of cooperative

binding, on the other hand, the whole $<n>_m$ represents total bonds that include not only two

bimolecular bond species, $<n>_\gamma$ and $<n>_\delta$, but also a trimolecular bond species, $<n>_{\delta\gamma}$, as denoted

by their respective subscripts. In such a case, the normalized bond number resembles avidity

because of the simultaneous binding of CD3γε and CD3δε to the same TCRαβ. The presence of

the trimolecular bonds was detected by the significantly higher $<n>_m/m_{\alpha\beta}m_\varepsilon$ value than the value

of $<n>_\gamma/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon}$, $<n>_\delta/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\varepsilon}$, or their average [($<n>_\gamma/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon} + <n>_\delta/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\varepsilon}$)/2] (Fig. 3C),

indicating cooperativity. To quantify the enhancement resulted from cooperativity, we calculated

the relative change in average bond numbers of the whole ($<n>_m$) over the sum of the parts [($<n>_\gamma$

+ $<n>_\delta$)], finding a ~47% increase in bond numbers (Fig. 3D), indicating that the trimolecular

bonds comprise no less than 32% of the total bonds.

Based on our previous observations in other systems (*39, 40*), we hypothesized that the

trimolecular bond of TCRαβ with both CD3γε and CD3δε would be more stable, hence could

sustain force for a longer time, than either TCRαβ–CD3γε or TCRαβ–CD3δε bimolecular bond.

To test this hypothesis, we used the BFP force-clamp assay (*11*) (Fig. 1E,F) to measure the specific

(Fig. S1E,H) force-dependent lifetimes of TCRαβ-bearing glass beads bonding with BFP beads

concurrently coated with CD3γε and CD3δε at a 1:1 molar ratio (Fig. 3A). The average bond

lifetimes ($<t>_m$, red circle in Fig. 3E) peak at 13 pN with a value of 1.5 s and are significantly

longer than the averaged lifetimes of TCRαβ bond with either CD3 ($<t>_\gamma$ or $<t>_\delta$, peaked at ~10 or

~20 pN, with a value of ~0.6 s for both) at all forces tested (blue triangle and orange square in Fig.

3E, replotted from Fig. 2E). The $<t>_m$ vs. force plot exhibits a catch bond more pronounced than

the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε catch bonds, but matches the 2B4 TCR–K5:I-E^k catch

bond (Fig. 2F, lifetime peaked at 15 pN with a value of 1.6 s). We reason that the longer $<t>_m$

could not have been caused by the low-probability multi-bond binding events in the TCRαβ–

CD3γε and/or TCRαβ–CD3δε interactions that would have occurred more frequently under the

mix coating than the single coating conditions. This is because the adhesion frequencies in all

conditions were kept low (≤20%) by adjusting the site densities of the molecules coated on the

beads, predicting ≥89% of single-bonds among all binding events (28). Instead, our results indicate

the presence of a new species, the CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular bonds, whose average

lifetime $<t>_{\delta\gamma}$ augmented the value of $<t>_m$, indicating cooperativity. To further quantify the

enhancement of cooperative on interaction lifetime, we calculated the relative change of the whole

(i.e., $<t>_m$) over the average of the parts (i.e., $<t>_\delta$ and $<t>_\gamma$) weighted by their respective

likelihoods of bond formation, finding a ~63-424% increase in averaged bond lifetime over the

force range of 0-22 pN (Fig. 3F).

The cooperativity analyses in terms of bond lifetime and bond number are similar in

principle but different on basis. Assuming independent interactions, multi-species receptor–ligand

bonds as a whole have been shown to be the sum of component single-species bonds (41-43). Our

data do not follow this additive prediction (Fig. 3D), invalidating the assumption of independent

binding, therefore signifying cooperativity. Similarly, the average bond lifetime can be calculated

either from all measurements as a whole or from subpopulation averages as parts, provided that

the whole contains the assumed parts at the assumed proportions. Our data do not follow this

commutative prediction (Fig. 3F), invalidating the assumptions regarding the subpopulation

identities, their proportions, or both, therefore signifying cooperativity. Thus, our data demonstrate

that cooperative binding enhances bond formation among TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε comparing

to individual TCRαβ–CD3γε or TCRαβ–CD3δε bond formation alone; this cooperativity further

stabilizes the ECD interaction of the TCR subunits under force.

To identify the trimolecular bond contribution to average bond lifetimes, we compared

survival probabilities of individual TCRαβ bonds with single CD3 species (γ and δ) and with

CD3m (m) in four force bins (Fig. 3G), which are multi-exponentially distributed (except for the

two bimolecular interactions at zero-force), suggesting the presence of multiple bound states,

multiple bond species, or both. We modeled the dissociation from the weak and strong states using

respective fast (-f) and (-s) off-rates, and the transitions between the two states by activation (a)

and deactivation (-a) rates (*44*), all of which depend on force according to the Bell equation (*45*)

(Fig. S2A). Each kinetic rate $k_{i,j}$ (i = -f, -s, a, and -a; j = γ, δ, and m) has two Bell parameters: the

zero-force rate $k^0_{i,j}$ and the width of the energy well $x_{i,j}$ that kinetically traps the bond. The zero-

force fast dissociation rates $k^0_{-f,j}$ for the bimolecular complexes were measured by the thermal

fluctuation experiments (Fig. 3G, *left*). By fitting the kinetic model to the force-lifetime

distributions as a whole (Fig. S2B-D), the remaining rates were evaluated as depicted in Fig. S2E-

G. The fractions of the strong state, expressed as $1/(1 + k_{-a,j}/k_{a,j})$, are plotted *vs.* force in Fig. S2H,

indicating that force rapidly shifts the bonds from the weak to strong state. This global fitting

predicts three mean ± SD lifetime *vs.* force curves for both bimolecular bonds as well as the mixed

bonds that agree well with measurements (Fig. 3E). It also generates a set of best-fit parameters

(Fig. S2I) that inform the detailed kinetic process. The TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε bonds

dissociate similarly, with comparable fast rates from the weak state (11.1 s^{-1} and 11.4 s^{-1} by

measurement) and similar slow rates from the strong state (0.196 s^{-1} and 0.184 s^{-1} by fitting). The

CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε bond dissociates at 0.700 s^{-1} from the weak state, a 16-fold reduction, and

0.0519 s^{-1} from the strong state, a 4-fold reduction, respectively, compared to the bimolecular bond

dissociations. Using the kinetic model and the best-fit parameters, we calculated the cooperativity

index *vs*. force curve, which compares well with direct measurements (Fig. 3F). We plotted the

fraction of trimolecular bonds *vs*. lifetime at three different forces in Fig. 2h, showing that as the

force increased, the trimolecular bond became dominant to contribute mainly to the long lifetimes.

These results show that the force-enriched long-lived CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε bonds are the kinetic

underpinning for the mechanical-reinforced cooperativity.

MD simulated TCR ECD binding free energies and bond lifetimes verify cooperativity

To corroborate the experimentally observed cooperative binding, we performed force-free CMD

simulations (*46*) on the TCRαβ–CD3γε (Video S1), TCRαβ–CD3δε (Video S2), CD3γε–CD3δε

(Video S3), and CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε (Video S4) complexes modified from the cryoEM

structure (*26*) (Fig. 4A, Fig. S3A). All equilibrated ECDs remained bounded throughout 200 ns

simulation, but the contact areas (Fig. S3B) and binding free energy (Fig. S3C) of the standalone

dimeric structures varied slightly compared to the corresponding pairwise interfaces as part of the

trimeric structure (Fig. 4B,C, *left* and *middle* groups) due to the accommodation of TCRαβ or a

second CD3. The dimeric interfaces of TCRαβ with CD3γε and CD3δε were adjacent with little

overlap, so their combined contact area in the trimeric complex was only slightly smaller than the

sum of their contact areas in the dimeric complexes (Fig. 4B, *right* group). However, this loss of

contact area from limited steric interference was more than made up by the gain in the total contact

area when the contact area between CD3γε and CD3δε in the trimeric complex was included.

Indeed, the formation of a trimeric structure substantially lowered the total binding free energy

when the contribution from the CD3γε–CD3δε interaction was included (but not when it is

excluded) (Fig. 4C, *right* group). Since affinity is proportional to the exponential of binding free

energy (in the unit of k_BT), our CMD simulations provide independent evidence and molecular

foundation for the experimental observations of increased binding likelihood due to the

cooperative binding of TCRαβ simultaneously to CD3γε and CD3δε (Fig. 3D).

To compute the prolongation of the bond lifetime due to the cooperativity of the

trimolecular assembly, we applied SMD (*47*) to simulate dissociation of the dimeric and trimeric

complexes by force. We used both force-clamp and force-ramp SMD to pull on the TCRαβ N-

terminus with the C-terminus of CD3γε or CD3δε, or the C-termini of the CD3γε–CD3δε complex

anchored as fixed points (Fig. S3D). We utilized 100-200 pN clamping forces to accelerate their

dissociations within achievable simulation timescales. The minimum distances and pulling

distances between the TCRαβ and CD3γε, CD3δε, or both were solved by monitoring the

simulated complex dynamic under a constant force (Fig. S3E,F). A sudden increase in the

minimum distance signified dissociation from which the bond lifetime was measured (Fig. 4D,

Fig. S3E, Video S5-7). The simulated force-dependent lifetimes of bimolecular and trimolecular

bonds were summarized in Fig. 4E. The TCRαβ–CD3γε bond dissociated slower than the TCRαβ–

CD3δε bond at all forces, consistent with its larger contact area and lower binding free energy

(Fig. 4B,C). Both had relatively short lifetimes that decreased with increasing force following the

Bell equation (*45*), in agreement with their slip bond behavior under such high loads (Fig. 3E). By

contrast, the trimolecular bonds survived at least an order of magnitude longer than the

corresponding dimer lifetimes, falling apart at 626, 404, and 233 ns under 150, 175, and 200 pN,

respectively. Their lifetimes also significantly exceeded the predicted non-cooperative values

calculated from their respective TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε dissociation time,

manifesting strong cooperativity under external force (Fig. 4F).

We also simulated force-ramp unbinding to measure the rupture forces of the partial and

full TCR ECD complexes (Fig. S3G). The larger rupture forces of the CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε

complex than those of the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε complexes under the same loading

rate further confirms the sturdier binding for the trimolecular complex. Together, our MD

simulations suggest that cooperativity enhances the interactions among ECDs of the TCR complex

by forming a stronger CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular bond, particularly when pulled, as

measured by contact area, binding free energy, bond lifetime, and rupture force.

Occupancy analysis reveals TCR-CD3 contacts responsible for force-enhanced cooperativity

To elucidate the mechano-responsiveness and cooperativity of TCRαβ-CD3 interactions, we

surveyed the contact residues between TCRαβ and CD3γε, CD3δε (hereinafter referred as

CD3δε'), or both found in MD simulations using residue-to-residue (RR) occupancy index (OI).

The degree of contact between two residues was quantified by the cumulative fraction of time

during which their distance is below 4 Å. We determined two RR-OI matrices of pairwise contacts

of individual TCRαβ residues with CD3γε and CD3δε' residues from trimeric CMD (Fig. S4A)

and SMD (Fig. S4B), respectively. The residue-by-residue sums of the two RR-OI matrices, ΣRR-

OI, was displayed in Fig. 5A (Table S1A), to highlight residues that made contact in both the

absence and presence of forces. These RR-OI matrices contain high-content information derived

from analysis of dynamic structures in the absence and presence of the force not obtainable from

the static image: the numbers of contact residues (RR-OI>0) revealed by CMD and SMD are,

respectively ~10% and ~14% more than that observed from the cryoEM structure.

299     The residue-by-residue differences of the two RR-OI matrices, ΔRR-OI, was shown in Fig.

5B (and Fig. S4C, Table S1B), to distinguish the force-stabilized and -destabilized residue pairs

with increased (red) or decreased (blue) OI values respectively upon applying forces. The contact

regions include force-stabilized residue pairs between the Cα DE loop and CD3δ AB and DE loops

and between the Cβ Helix 4 and CD3δ AB loop. The contact regions also include force-

destabilized residue pairs between the Cα AB loop and CD3ε FG loop, between the Cβ CC' loop

and CD3δ AB loop, and between the Cβ CC' loop and CD3ε' FG loop. Regions with more force-

stabilized than force-destabilized contact residue pairs were seen between the Cβ Helix 4 and

CD3δ EF loop, between the Cβ Helix 4-F strand and CD3γ AB loop, and between the Cβ G-strand

and CD3ε CD and FG loops, and Helix 2.

309     To analyze the force-enhanced cooperativity, we overlaid the 1D residue-to-domain (RD)-

OI profiles of the contact residues from the SMD simulation of the TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue), TCRαβ–

CD3δε' (orange), and CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε (red) complexes (Fig. 5C, Table S1C), quantifying

the individual residues of TCR α and β chains contacting all CD3 residues, as well as CD3 γ, ε, ε'

and δ chains contacting all TCRαβ residues. As shown, the cooperative TCR-CD3 interaction is

mediated by secondary structures in TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε' identified in Fig. 5A-B. The

regions forming the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε' interfaces are the same regardless of

whether they are in the bimolecular or trimolecular complexes, showing minimal interference

between CD3γε and CD3δε' when they bind TCRαβ concurrently. This remains true when

observed using CMD (Fig. S4D), agree with the result from Fig. 5B-C. Further, the RD-OI values

of some secondary structures, including CD3δ AB, DE, and EF loops, Cα DE loop, and Cβ Helix

4, were higher in the trimeric than the dimeric complexes under force (Fig. 5C), but show much

less differences without force (Fig. S4D). These comparisons identify regions contributing to the

force-enhanced cooperative contacts (Fig. S4E).

To further quantify the contact level between two domains, we averaged positive RD-OI

across all contacting residues from a particular chain to obtain domain-to-domain (DD) OI,

providing a global view of the TCR-CD3 inter-subunit interactions. We plotted the force-free DD-

OI *vs.* their force-clamp counterpart in Fig. 5D for CD3γ, ε, ε' or δ contacting TCRαβ (*top*), and

TCRα or β contacting CD3γε, δε' or both (*bottom*). Since the *x*- and *y*-coordinates represent the

DD-OI values calculated from the SMD and CMD, respectively, a point above and below the 45°

diagonal line reflects force-reduced and force-enhanced interaction, respectively. The dashed line

connecting two points of the same CD3 or TCR chains (marked by the same symbol) tracks the

different DD-OI values calculated from the dimeric (TCRαβ contacting CD3γε or CD3δε',

indicated by γε or δε') and trimeric (CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε, indicated by tri) complexes.

Compared to a point near the origin, the one further away from the origin contributes more to the

inter-subunit contact because it has larger DD-OI value(s) under force-free and/or force-clamp

conditions. For example, in the TCRαβ–CD3δε' dimeric complex, the δ chain contacted TCRαβ

with a force-clamp DD-OI of 0.19 and a force-free DD-OI of 0.37, showing an overall force-

reduced contact; however, in the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimeric complex, the δ chain contacted

TCRαβ with a force-clamp DD-OI of 0.46 and a force-free DD-OI of 0.39, showing an overall

force-enhanced contact (Fig. 5D, *top, closed square*). Generally, we found that points labeled as

trimers were further away from the origin than their counterpart points labeled as dimers in all

dash-line-connected pairs except for the ε chain of CD3γε, explaining the cooperativity of the

trimeric complex. Further, all points labeled as trimers were below the diagonal line except for the

ε' chain of CD3δε', indicating the force enhancement of the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε cooperative

interaction.

We also performed a parallel analysis that tracks the number of hydrogen bonds in

interfaces over simulation time, revealing that more hydrogen bonds were present in the trimeric

complex than the sum of parts in dimeric complex (Fig. S4F), agreeing with the conclusion of the

occupancy analysis.

Structural basis of force-enhanced TCR-CD3 cooperativity

To depict the spatial relationships of the contact residues, we mapped them onto the TCR

ECD quaternary structures by highlighting residues with high RD-OI levels. We first used

representative snapshots from 175-pN force-clamp SMD of the respective trimeric and two

dimeric complexes to show the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε (Fig. 6A-C), TCRαβ–CD3γε (Fig. 6D,E),

and TCRαβ–CD3δε' (Fig. 6F) contact interfaces. We identified more contact residues in the same

spots of the trimeric complex (Fig. 6A-C) than dimeric complexes (Fig. 5D-F), and at the interfaces

of TCRαβ–CD3γε (Fig. 6D,E) than TCRαβ–CD3δε' (Fig. 6F) complex (Videos S8-10). These

observations provide the structural basis for the observed bond lifetime rank-order (Fig. 4E).

Examining these close-up views reveal a crowded pocket of interlocked contact residues at the

center of the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε interface (Fig. 6A), which is built upon one of TCRαβ–

CD3γε interfaces (Fig. 6D) by recruiting additional residues nearby and even δ chain residues that

would be absent in the TCRαβ–CD3γε dimeric complex. Many high RD-OI residues near the core

of this patch have ring-containing sidechains, such as Y34γ, Y36γ, W259β, H226β, and F219β,

with sparse hydrogen bonds at peripheral. This suggests the hydrophobic nature of this core, where

π-π stackings significantly contribute to the patch stability.

To put into context of the above three subunit interfaces, we mark these spatial-proximal

contact residues on the zoom-out view of the full TCR-CD3 ECD (Fig. 6G, Video S11),

highlighting residues with >1.5 ΣRD-OI (sum of two RD-OI profiles from CMD and SMD). The

high ΣRD-OI residues in the center of this top-down view crosslink TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε'

(*blank circle*, Fig. 6G), with the contact residues residing on the two sides of the center patch to

bridge the TCRαβ with CD3γε on the left (*blue circle*) and δ chain of CD3δε' on the right (*orange*

circle). In addition, a contact residue patch at the CD3γε and CD3δε' interface is located right

below the center packet (*dotted black circle*). These observations suggest that to dissociate the

fully assembled TCR-CD3 complex may require disrupting at least three out of the four patches

that strong support the stability of the complex, revealing the structural basis of the trimolecular

cooperativity.

The residues with significant force-induced ΔRD-OI (difference of two RD-OI profiles

from SMD and CMD) concentrate at the three patches of the TCR-CD3 interfaces where red

indicates force-stabilizing (ΔRD-OI>0) and blue signifies force-destabilizing (ΔRD-OI<0)

contacts (Fig. 6H, Video S11). The RD-OI values of these contact residues at the core of the center

pocket calculated from SMD and CMD are both nearly 100%, making their difference nearly zero,

as reflected by their fade color. Interestingly, the force-stabilizing residues mark an outer red-color

ring around the center pocket, suggesting its expansion upon force application. The patch on the

right at the TCRαβ–CD3δε' interface comprises mostly force-stabilizing contact residues (*red*, Fig.

6H). By contrast, the patch on the left at the TCRαβ–CD3γε interface is mostly made up of force-

destabilizing contact residues (*blue*, Fig. 6H). This indicates that force tilts the TCRαβ clockwise

away from the CD3γε and toward the CD3δε'.

Parallel to the occupancy analysis, we defined the root-mean-square fluctuation (RMSF)

profiles to measure the flexibilities of individual residues inside the TCR-CD3 assembly, which

reflects its mechano-responsiveness from a different angle. To visualize the shifts in structural

flexibility, we projected the ΔRMSF values (difference between the SMD and CMD RMSF

profiles) on the TCR-CD3 ECD quaternary structure, with the thickness of the protein backbone

to represent residues' absolute RMSF in the presence of force (Fig. 6I, Video S11). Except for

TCRα, which experienced force-suppressed structural dynamics (*blue*, Fig. 6I), all other TCR-

CD3 chains fluctuated more under force (*red*, Fig. 6I), especially the ε' chain where the most

pronounced enhancement was observed. Here, the CD3δε' subunit waved around a hinge of the

tightened patch of TCRβ Helix 4 and CDδ AB loop, presenting distinctive force-induced motions

not observed in CD3γε.

Overall, only does the complete CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε assembly allow the formation of

a center patch of concentrated contact residues that are further shielded by surrounding patches,

explaining mechanistically the observed significantly prolonged lifetime of the trimeric complex.

External force enlarges and strengthens the center pocket, enhancing the cooperative CD3δε'–

TCRαβ–CD3γε binding. Furthermore, a spatial anti-correlation was observed between the force-

induced strengthening of inter-subunit contacts and force-enhanced structural dynamics, where

tighter contact leads to structural rigidification, and *vice versa*. Thus, differential mechano-

activation of TCRαβ-CD3 causes asymmetric mechano-responses of CD3δε' and CD3γε.

Functional relevance of high occupancy interface residues

To assess the functional significance of the structural information presented in Figs. 5-6,

we examined the contact residues on TCRαβ-CD3 interface indicated by the high RD-OI in force-

clamp SMD of the trimolecular complex, along with their functional effects described in the

literature (Table 1). Many of the identified contact residues were supported by literature (*23, 24,*

26), but our occupancy analysis provides new information on their binding partners and interaction

strength. For example, the contacts of Cα DE loop residues R185α with L29δ, S186α with L29δ,

E30δ, R32δ (Fig. S4B) were backed up by the literature evidence of R185α and S186α contacting

CD3δ (*26*). R185E and S186R substitutions impaired TCR assembly at the cell surface (*32*); R185

mutation abolished calcium spikes in T cells and reduced CD69 upregulation and ERK

phosphorylation in response to stimulations (*27*). Cβ helix 4 residues S216β, T218β, and F219β

interact with CD3δ AB loop E30δ, D31δ, R32δ and EF loop K62δ, I64δ (*23, 24*), among which

E30δ and D31δ form hydrophobic contacts with F219β (*26*). Mutations on Cβ T218R and F219R

and on their CD3δ interacting residues suppressed TCR surface expression by 70-80% (*32*). The

contact residues Y36γ, Cβ helix 4-F strand R224 (*23, 24*), N225 (*23, 24*), and H226 (*26*) have also

been identified as binding CD3, corresponding to previous finding that the R224E and H226E

mutations suppress TCRβ surface expression (*32*) and the N225A/H226A double mutations

sharply suppress IL-2 secretion upon T cell activation (*24*). Other contact residues identified by

our occupancy analysis include CD3ε H strand residue R115 and CD3γ AB loop residues D35,

Q37, E38 and G40 (Fig. S4B); their mutation resulted in poor surface expression of the CD3ε and

CD3γ, respectively (*32*). Our occupancy analysis agrees with the previous reports that the Cβ G

strand residue W259 interacts with the CD3γ AB loop as well as the CD3ε FG loop and H strand

through van der Waals contacts (*26*). Correspondingly, the W259R mutation boosts TCRβ surface

expression (*32*), and W259A mutation increases IL-2 production (*48*). Mutating its contact partner

CD3ε R115 impairs T cell activation by preventing the ligand binding-induced conformational

change to the cytoplasmic tail (*49*).

Further, we found literature supporting the functional relevance of our newly identified

TCRαβ–CD3 ECD contact residues. The Cα AB loop, whose residue K148α was identified by us

to contact N74ε and E91ε, was suggested to undergo conformational changes upon ligand binding,

leading to TCR triggering (*20, 50*). K148E substitution prevented stable formation of the TCR-

CD3 complex at the cell surface (*32*). The Cα DE loop residue M187α connects with R32δ; M187α

mutation impairs the T cell calcium signaling (*27*) and suppresses TCRα surface expression (*32*).

Intriguingly, we identified several TCRαβ residues with force-stabilizing contacts with

CD3s, indicated by increased ΔRD-OI values (Fig. 5B, Fig. S4C). The Cβ Helix 4 S216β and

T218β increased RD-OI from <0.5 by CMD to >0.8 by SMD, with a concurrent occupancy

increase in K62δ, suggesting the occurrence of force-strengthening of weak interactions, force-

induced forming of new interaction, or both, of S216 and/or T218 with CD3δ AB loop E30δ, D31δ

and R32δ as well as EF loop K62δ and I64δ. The Cβ helix 4-F strand residue P223β showed a 0.42

ΔRD-OI; correspondingly, the N222A/P223A mutation enhances IL-2 production upon cell

activation, suggesting a role for P223 in TCR signaling (*24*). Noticeably, N62ε displayed a 0.34

ΔRD-OI to contacts including Cβ G strand E257β, and G40γ exhibited a 0.42 ΔRD-OI to contact

Cβ Helix 4-F strand R224β. The Cβ G strand residue S255β showed a 0.30 ΔRD-OI, interacts with

high occupancy residue D63ε. Functionally, S255R mutation improves TCRβ surface expression

(*32*), and S255A mutation increases IL-2 production (*48*). These findings highlight possible roles

of force-induced strengthening/forming TCRαβ interactions with CD3 ECDs in T cell activation

(*4, 51*).

Force-stabilizing TCRαβ–CD3 contact residues support prolonged TCR–pMHC bond lifetime and enhanced T cell function

We selected two pairs of the conserved residues, G182/K183 in the Cβ CC' loop and N222/P223 in Cβ Helix 4-F strand (Fig. 7A,B) for further studies. K183 is a force-destabilizing residue (ΔRD-OI = -0.22) mainly contracting with force-destabilizing residues L90 in the FG loop and R115 in the CP region of CD3ε', whereas P223 is a force-stabilizing residue (ΔRD-OI = 0.42) mainly contracting with force-stabilizing residue L90 in the FG loop of CD3ε (Table S2). By comparison, their neighboring residues G182 and N222 show unchanged occupancies in the presence and absence of force (ΔRD-OI = 0). G182 and P223 are newly identified and have reported functional effects (Table 1). To investigate whether and how the contact residues in TCRαβ–CD3 interface identified earlier support TCR mechanotransduction, we made double alanine substitutions G182A/K183A (GK) and N222A/P223A (NP) in the 2B4 TCR to interfere the TCRαβ–CD3 *cis*-interactions on hybridoma cell surfaces instead of using mAbs. To evaluate their impact, we compared their *trans*-interactions with K5:I-E^k to the wild-type (WT) 2B4 TCR–K5:I-E^k *trans*-interaction. The 2D affinity measured by MAF showed no difference among the WT and mutant TCRs (Fig. 7C), indicating that mutations in TCR Cβ CC' loop and Helix 4-F strand do not remotely affect binding of TCRαβ variable domain to pMHC at in the absence force. In the presence of force, however, both double mutations altered TCR–pMHC bond lifetimes (Fig. 7D). Comparing to the WT TCR, the NP mutation of a force-stabilizing residue at the TCRαβ–CD3ε interface prolonged the peak lifetime of the TCR–pMHC interaction; by comparison, the GK mutation of a force-destabilizing residue at the TCRαβ–CD3ε' interface shortened the peak lifetime of the TCR–pMHC interaction (Fig. 7D,E). Importantly, the mutation-induced changes in

the peak bond lifetime correlated with the changes in IL-2 production from hybridoma T cells

expressing the mutant TCRs (Fig. 7F,G).

DISCUSSION

Previously, we and others have shown that mechanical force modulates ligand dissociation, tunes

sensitivity to pMHC, amplifies peptide discrimination, and enhances antigen recognition of the

TCR (*11-15, 39, 52*). Here we demonstrated that these properties are supported by TCRαβ–CD3

cis-interactions, as their interference altered TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction and T cell function.

The TCR-CD3 complex is stably held together by noncovalent associations in its transmembrane

and extracellular regions. An early study of the complex assembly reported cooperative

interactions between the TCRαβ and the CD3 chains through transmembrane segments (*53*).

Subsequent NMR chemical shift perturbation experiments required both CD3γε and CD3δε for

specific TCRαβ–CD3 interactions, suggesting possible cooperativity (*23*). Here we demonstrated

that these ECD interactions are highly cooperative and force-reinforced, manifesting as the

formation of a CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular catch bond. The importance of such

cooperative *cis*-interaction and its force dependency were demonstrated by the observations that

its interferences by antibody and mutations affected TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction under force

(but not in the absence of force) and T cell function as predicted by structural analysis based on

CMD/SMD simulations.

By integrating our findings with existing data, we formulate a model for TCR triggering to

emphasize TCR mechanotransduction and the significance of cooperative TCRαβ–CD3 *cis*-

interaction to its mechanoconnectivity, mechanotransduction, and force-induced allostery (Fig.

S5). T cells exert force on the TCR via engaged pMHC (*8, 10*) and force triggers T cell signaling

(*11, 17*). Regardless of whether exerted extraneously from outside or endogenously from inside

the cell, force must be supported by the pMHC–TCRαβ–CD3 serial molecular structure. *In vivo*

forces are likely more variable than those experimentally applied to the TCR–pMHC bonds by

BFP. The requirement for T cell signaling to be robust, *i.e.*, to trigger intracellular signaling

reliably despite the variable external forces, must translate into a requirement for TCR

mechanosensing machinery to function reliably in a noisy environment. How may TCRαβ–CD3

cooperativity help? Without cooperativity, the bimolecular interaction between TCRαβ and either

CD3γε or CD3δε would be much weaker, and hence lasts much shorter, than that between TCR

and pMHC, which would prematurely disrupt the mechanoconnectivity and cut off any mechanical

communication through ECD interactions, potentially adversely impacting TCR triggering (Fig.

S5, *top*). By comparison, with a cooperative trimolecular catch bond, force on one end of the serial

molecular structure can be supported by and transmitted through, at least in part, the CD3δε–

TCRαβ–CD3γε interactions to prevent the TCRαβ ECD from being pulled away from the CD3

ECDs as a result of the much longer CP of TCRαβ than those of the CD3γε and CD3δε (*54*). The

intact mechanoconnectivity can therefore sustain possible mechanical communication to allow

force-modulated peptide-encoded information to be transmitted from the pMHC through TCRαβ

to the CD3 signaling apparatus and to enable force to induce conformational changes in the CD3

cytoplasmic domain to trigger signal transduction (*55, 56*) (Fig. S5, *bottom*). Thus, the robustness

requirement of TCR triggering may be fulfilled in part by the TCRαβ–CD3 cooperativity.

We obtained multiple lines of decisive evidence for cooperativity by direct measurements

combined with mathematical modeling, as well as by MD simulations in both the absence and

presence of force. All results consistently and definitively show synergy, such that the whole is

larger, and lasts longer, than the sum of the parts. The direct measurements of both the pairwise

bimolecular, and the cooperative trimolecular, inter-subunit interactions of the TCRαβ–CD3 are

remarkable, considering their low affinities and rapid off-rates. Even more remarkable is our

observation that the TCRαβ–CD3m pseudo *cis*-interaction forms a catch bond with a comparable

force-lifetime relationship to that of the cognate TCR–pMHC *trans*-interaction. However, our

results likely underestimate the degree of cooperativity and the level of the trimolecular catch

bond. Comparing to their native assembly on the cell membrane, our experiment used an

unfavorable "pseudo *cis*" configuration where the TCRαβ was N-terminally linked to a probe to

sub-optimally contact CD3s C-terminally linked to an opposite target. The 1:1 ratio mixed CD3γε

and CD3δε' were randomly captured by an RBC or bead by biotin-streptavidin coupling.

Streptavidin has four biotin binding sites. Two on one side likely bound by the biotinylated RBC

membrane proteins and the other two on the opposite side were capable of binding two biotinylated

CD3s, generating ≤50% of CD3γε/CD3δε' heterodimers and ≥25% each of CD3δε'/CD3δε' and

CD3γε/CD3γε homodimers (*57*) on the target surface. Should a TCRαβ be able to bind

synergistically to a CD3γε/CD3δε' heterodimer on the same streptavidin only, not to a CD3γε on

one streptavidin and a CD3δε' on another streptavidin (due to the further distance between CD3γε

and CD3δε'), the finding of ~47% greater number of whole bonds than the sum of bonds from

parts suggests that ~94% of these heterodimers would form trimolecular bonds with the TCRαβ.

Thus, TCRαβ–CD3 interactions must occur in 100% as CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε bond on the T

cell surface, especially further considering the CD3γε–CD3δε' interaction (which we observed

experimentally and computationally) as well as the structural constraints in the CP and

transmembrane regions that better position and orient the two CD3s relative to the TCRαβ on the

cell membrane (*26*) than the CD3γε/CD3δε' heterodimer in our experiment. This assertion has

been supported by our SMD simulations: Despite the significantly higher forces used and the much

shorter bond lifetimes that resulted, the cooperativity index $\Delta<t>/<t>_{pre}$ shows an order of

magnitude higher computational than experimental values.

Our SMD simulations revealed structural dynamics and force effects on TCRαβ–CD3

interactions, which previous static structural studies (*23-26*) and CMD simulations (*58*) were

unable to uncover. We developed occupancy analysis as a novel approach for quantifying the

structural features using CMD and SMD results, which evaluates contacts between any residue

pairs over a dynamic process in the absence and presence of force. A strength of our approach is

the ability to assess all types of atomic-level interactions, including hydrogen bonds, salt bridges,

π-π stackings, and hydrophobic interactions. This enabled us to identify a hydrophobic pocket in

the trimolecular interaction that would not have been found by only analyzing hydrogen bonds,

and provided stronger evidence for the structural mechanism of the cooperativity. The occupancy

analysis is highly sensitive for evaluating interactions along a simulated dynamic process and

hence especially powerful for evaluating differential contact residues or change thereof from CMD

to SMD, enabling us to identify previously unreported and/or force-enhanced contact residues.

The relevance of these results has been supported by previous functional experiments, which also

supports the validity of our simulations. Previous NMR and CMD studies found 1) Cα AB loop,

Cβ helix 3, and Cβ FG loop (*20*) and 2) Cβ helix 3 and Cβ helix 4 (*19*) undergo dynamic changes

upon TCR–pMHC engagement, suggesting a TCR triggering mechanism by which ligand binding-

induced dynamics may transmit allosterically to CD3 for signal transduction. However, our SMD

simulations only found Cβ helix 4 residues to have high RD-OI with CD3 subunits, suggesting

their possible relevance to signal transduction.

Our findings highlight the importance of ECD interactions within the TCR complex and

their cooperativity to the inner workings of the TCR machinery to function as a mechanosensor.

Our data offer explanations for the impairment of TCR stability and functionality by mutations on

putative interaction sites (*22-24, 27*) and provide opportunities for designing and engineering

"better" TCR for immunotherapy applications.

METHODS

Proteins and cells

A biotinylation sequence (GLNDIFEAQKIEWHE) was added to N-terminus of ECD constructs

of 2C and 2B4 TCRα and C-terminus of mouse and human CD3γε and CD3δε subunits through

PCR (*59*). Proteins were expressed in One Shot^{TM} *E. coli* BL21 (DE3) (Invitrogen) as insoluble

inclusion bodies, refolded and purified as previously described (*24*). Inclusion bodies for I-E^k α

(with C-terminal biotinylation sequence) and β chains were produced in One Shot^{TM} *E. coli* BL21

(DE3), refolded with K5 peptide (ANERADLIAYFKAATKF), and purified as described

previously (*60*). SIYR:H2-K^b protein was from the NIH Tetramer Facility at Emory University.

For all proteins, purified fractions were biotinylated using a BirA protein ligase kit (Avidity LLC).

The biotinylated proteins were further purified by gel filtration (S200, GE Life Sciences) in PBS

buffer pH 7.4. The proteins were finally tested for biotinylation efficiency by gel-shift analysis by

incubating them in excess streptavidin. Site density of 2B4 TCRαβ coated on RBCs and beads

was measured using phycoerythrin (PE)-conjugated anti-mouse Vα11.1, 11.2 mAb (clone RR8-1,

BD Pharmingen). Site densities of human CD3γε and CD3δε' in the single coating as well as in

the mixed coating at 1:1 ratio were measured using PE-conjugated anti-human CD3ε mAb (clone

UCHT1, eBioscience).

Mouse 58$^{-/-}$ T cell hybridoma cells (*61*) expressing mouse CD3 but not TCRαβ were a

generous gift from Dr. Bernard Malissen (Centre d'immunologie de Marseille-Luminy, France).

$58^{-/-}$ cells were transfected with mouse 2C or mutant mouse 2B4 TCR constructs through retroviral

transduction and cultured as described previously (*24*). The transduced cells were stained with PE

anti-mouse CD3ε (clone 145-2C11 or 2C11, eBioscience) and allophycocyanin (APC)-conjugated

anti-TCRβ (clone H57-597 or H57, eBioscience) mAbs and sorted for dual expression of CD3 and

TCR. The sorted cells were expanded for 6 days and quantified for TCR and CD3ε expression.

Fab of anti-TCR Cβ (H57), anti-CD3ε (2C11), anti-TCR Vβ8 (clone F23.1 or F23), and anti-

TCRα (clone H28-710 or H28) mAbs were obtained by digesting commercial full-length mAbs

using Fab preparation kit (Thermo Fisher 44685). H57 scFv was a generous gift from Johannes

Huppa of the Medical University of Vienna (*10*).

Micropipette adhesion frequency assay

Our MAF assay for measuring 2D affinity has been described (*28, 29*). Briefly, human RBCs were

isolated from whole blood drawn from healthy donors according to a protocol approved by the

Institute Review Board of Georgia Institute of Technology. RBCs were biotinylated with

controlled concentration of biotin-X-NHS linker (Millipore/Sigma), coated with saturating amount

of streptavidin (ThermoFisher), coated with biotinylated proteins of interest, and loaded into

different regions of a cell chamber mounted on the stage of an inverted microscope that contained

solution streptavidin to block nonspecific binding. A pair of RBCs, each bearing one type of

interacting proteins, named as receptor (R) and ligand (L) here, was aspirated by two opposing

glass micropipettes (Fig 1B, *top*). The two RBCs were brought into repeated contact-and-retract

cycles at constant contact time and area by a piezoelectric translater-driven micropipette. Adhesion

frequency (P_a) is the frequency of adhesion events detected by the RBC elongation during

retraction. The RBC surface tension was kept low by adjusting the micropipette suction pressure

such that pulling by even a single bond would generate visible membrane deflection. For $P_a \leq$

90%, adhesion events are mediated by low number of bonds that follow the Poisson distribution

that has a single parameter $<n>$, which is the average number of bonds formed per contact. P_a and

$<n>$ are related by:

617
$$P_a = 1 - \exp(-\langle n \rangle) \qquad\qquad \langle n \rangle = -\ln(1 - P_a) \qquad (1a,b)$$

618 To relate $<n>$ to receptor–ligand binding kinetics requires a model. For all homotypic or

619 heterotypic bimolecular interactions studied in this work, the following probabilistic kinetics

620 equation and solution were used (28, 29):

621
$$\frac{d\langle n \rangle}{d(k_{off}t_c)} = m_R m_L A_c K_a - \langle n \rangle \qquad\qquad <n> = m_R m_L A_c K_a [1 - \exp(-(k_{off}t_c))] \qquad (2a,b)$$

where m_R and m_L (μm^{-2}) are site densities of the interacting molecules on the RBC surfaces, A_c

(μm^2) and t_c (s) are contact area and time, K_a (μm^2) and k_{off} (s^{-1}) are 2D affinity and off-rate

respectively, m_R and m_L were determined by comparing mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of

targeted proteins stained by saturating amount of fluorescently-tagged antibody to MFI of PE

quantitation beads (BD Biosciences). A_c and t_c are controlled parameters during experiments.

When $k_{off}t_c$ is much larger than 1, $<n>$ approaches steady-state, and the effective 2D binding

affinity $A_c K_a$ (μm^4) can be determined by:

629
$$A_c K_a = \frac{\langle n \rangle}{m_R m_L} = \frac{-1}{m_R m_L} \ln(1 - P_a) \qquad (3a,b)$$

Since $k_{off} > 10$ s^{-1} for all the interactions studied here (Table 1), we used 2-s contact time so that

$k_{off} \times t_c > 20$ and P_a reached its steady-state value, and the effective 2D affinity values shown in

Fig. 2A were calculated using Equation 3.

To account for concurrent binding of TCRαβ to CD3γε and CD3δε' separately and

possibly cooperatively, a two-step, two-pathway model was used: In the first step, the TCRαβ

interacts with either CD3γε (pathway I, kinetic rates k_1 and k_{-1}) or CD3δε' (pathway II, kinetic

rates k_2 and k_{-2}) to form TCRαβ–CD3γε or TCRαβ–CD3δε' bimolecular bonds. In the second step,

the TCRαβ–CD3γε bond interacts with CD3δε' (pathway I, kinetic rates k_4 and k_{-4}) or the TCRαβ–

CD3δε' bond interacts with CD3γε (pathway II, kinetic rates k_3 and k_{-3}) to form CD3δε'–TCRαβ–

CD3γε trimolecular bonds. The probabilistic kinetics equation and steady-state solution are,

respectively:

641
$$\frac{d}{dt}\begin{Bmatrix}\langle n\rangle_\gamma \\ \langle n\rangle_\delta \\ \langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta}\end{Bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1} & 0 & -k_{-4} \\ 0 & m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2} & -k_{-3} \\ -m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 & -m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 & k_{-3} + k_{-4} \end{bmatrix}\begin{Bmatrix}\langle n\rangle_\gamma \\ \langle n\rangle_\delta \\ \langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta}\end{Bmatrix} = \begin{Bmatrix} m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon}A_c k_1 \\ m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\varepsilon'}A_c k_2 \\ 0 \end{Bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

642 and

643
$$\langle n\rangle_\delta = \frac{m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon}A_c}{m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1}}\left[k_1 + m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_{-4}\frac{k_1 k_4(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_2 k_3(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})}{k_{-1}k_{-4}(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_{-2}k_{-3}(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})}\right] \quad (5a)$$

644
$$\langle n\rangle_\gamma = \frac{m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\varepsilon'}A_c}{m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_4 + k_{-2}}\left[k_2 + m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_{-3}\frac{k_1 k_4(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_2 k_3(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})}{k_{-1}k_{-4}(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_{-2}k_{-3}(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})}\right] \quad (5b)$$

645
$$\langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta} = m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\varepsilon}m_{\delta\varepsilon'}A_c\frac{k_1 k_4(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_2 k_3(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})}{k_{-1}k_{-4}(m_{\gamma\varepsilon}k_3 + k_{-2}) + k_{-2}k_{-3}(m_{\delta\varepsilon'}k_4 + k_{-1})} \quad (5c)$$

646 where the subscripts of $\langle n\rangle$ denote average number of bonds of the TCRαβ–CD3γε (γ) or TCRαβ–

647 CD3δε' (δ) bimolecular interaction or the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε (δγ) trimolecular interaction.

648 The subscript of m indicates site densities of TCRαβ (αβ), CD3γε (γε), and CD3δε' (δε'). The

649 total TCRαβ bonds with CD3m include three subpopulations:

650
$$\langle n\rangle_m = \langle n\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta + \langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta} \quad (6)$$

Note that Equation 1 applies to the average number of total bonds, $\langle n\rangle_m$, not its individual

components. Cooperative binding takes place in the second step by forming a CD3δε'–TCRαβ–

CD3γε trimolecular bond. Letting $k_3 = k_4 = 0$ abolishes the trimolecular bonds and reduces Eqs. 5a

and 5b to the steady-state version of Equation 2b for the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε'

bimolecular bonds, respectively, as expected.

Biomembrane force probe (BFP) thermal fluctuation assay

Our BFP thermal fluctuation assay for measuring bond lifetime at the force-free condition has been

described (*29, 36*). Briefly, streptavidin-coated probe beads and target beads were prepared using

established chemistry and incubated with biotin-tagged proteins of interest. A probe bead was

placed on the apex of a biotinylated RBC aspirated by a micropipette, and the target bead or cell

aspirated by an opposing micropipette was aligned against the probe bead (Fig. 1E). To block

possible biotin–streptavidin interaction between the probe bead and the target bead, the target

beads were incubated with streptavidin before adding to the microscope cell chamber that also

contained high concentration of solution streptavidin. Due to the softness (0.2 pN/nm) of the RBC

membrane, the RBC-probe bead system underwent thermal fluctuation, which generated brief and

discontinuous contacts with the target bead positioned near it to allow interaction between the

molecules coated on the two sides. The horizontal displacement of the probe bead was monitored

by high speed (1000 fps) camera and image analysis. Bond association and dissociation events

were identified from reduction and resumption, respectively, of fluctuations in the probe bead

displacement. Lifetime was recorded as the duration from fluctuation reduction to resumption. To

ensure most interactions represented single-bond events, the site densities of the molecules coated

on the beads were adjusted to keep the adhesion frequency below 20%.

674   After setting the right-hand side to zero, Equation 4 can be applied to analyze the two-step,

two-pathway dissociation of total bonds that include TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε', and

CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε bond species. Letting the second-step kinetic rates $k_3 = k_{-3} = k_4 = k_{-4} = 0$

abolishes the trimolecular bonds and reduces the homogeneous form of Equation 4 to two

uncoupled first-order dissociation kinetic equations for the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε'

bimolecular bonds, respectively. Their solutions are expressed in terms of survival probabilities:

$p_\gamma = \exp(-k_{-1}t)$ and $p_\delta = \exp(-k_{-2}t)$, respectively, which were used to fit the data

exemplified in Figure 2D and shown in Figure 2F. The coupled Equation 4 with nonzero second-

step kinetic rates was solved numerically using MATLAB, which was used to fit the total bond

survival probability data measured from CD3m coating experiments (Fig. 3G, far left).

Biomembrane force probe (BFP) force clamp assay

Our BFP force-clamp assay for measuring the force-dependent lifetime of a single molecular bond

has been described (*11, 39*). Briefly, the same BFP setup and coating strategy as the thermal

fluctuation assay were used in the force-clamp assay except in one set of experiments that

measured binding of K5:I-E^k coated on BFP beads to 2B4 TCR expressed on 58$^{-/-}$ hybridoma cells

(Fig. 1E). The target was brought into contract with the BFP probe for a brief moment, then

retracted. If no bond formation was detected (Fig. 1F, *left*), the target movement would turn into

the next event cycle; if bond formation was detected, the target would move to a predetermined

position and stay there to load the bond with a constant tensile force until spontaneous dissociation

to allow measurement of lifetime (Fig. 1F, *right*). Hundreds of such measurements were pooled

and grouped into several force bins. Lifetime distributions in each force bin were analyzed using

survival probability *vs*. lifetime plots. Mean ± SEM lifetime was plotted *vs*. mean ± SEM force

and fitted by a cubic interpolation (Figs. 2E, 3F, 3F) or Gaussian curve (Fig. 2F) for graphing and

further statistical analysis. Bootstrapping (1000 samples) of the force-lifetime distributions was

used to estimate the mean and SEM of force and lifetimes in each bin more accurately and reliably.

Cooperativity analysis

Three types of cooperativity analysis were used to evaluate whether, and if so, the degree by which

TCR$\alpha\beta$ binds CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ and CD3$\delta\epsilon$ synergistically using experimental data, MD simulation results,

and mathematical modeling (*40*).

 Cooperativity analysis in terms of average numbers of bonds: The first type of

cooperativity analysis is based on the average numbers of total bonds and two bimolecular bonds,

$<n>_{\mathrm{m}}$, $<n>_{\gamma}$ and $<n>_{\delta}$, converted from their corresponding adhesion frequencies $P_{\mathrm{a,m}}$, $P_{\mathrm{a},\gamma}$, and $P_{\mathrm{a},\delta}$,

using Equation 3b. The analysis makes use of the additive property of $<n>$ (but not P_{a}), such that

the whole average bond number ($<n>_{\mathrm{m}}$) from an adhesion mediated by the concurrent binding of

two molecular species (CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ and CD3$\delta\epsilon$), if independent, is equal to the sum of average bond

numbers ($<n>_{\gamma} + <n>_{\delta}$) from two adhesions each mediated by one species (CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ or CD3$\delta\epsilon$) one

at a time (*41-43*).

 After normalization by $m_{\alpha\beta}$ and m_{ϵ}, the site densities of TCR$\alpha\beta$ and CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ or CD3$\delta\epsilon$, the

steady-state $<n>_{\gamma}/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\epsilon}$ and $<n>_{\delta}/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\epsilon}$ are equal to the effective 2D affinities $A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\gamma}$ and $A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\delta}$,

respectively (Equation 3a). If CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ and CD3$\delta\epsilon$ bind TCR$\alpha\beta$ independently, $<n>_{\mathrm{m}} = <n>_{\gamma} + <n>_{\delta}$

$= m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\gamma\epsilon}A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\gamma} + m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\delta\epsilon}A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\delta}$ at steady-state. Since the anti-CD3ϵ mAb recognizes both CD3

dimers, which were coated on surfaces at a 1:1 ratio, $m_{\gamma\epsilon} = m_{\delta\epsilon} = m_{\epsilon}/2$, we have $<n>_{\mathrm{m}}/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\epsilon} =$

$(A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\gamma} + A_{\mathrm{c}}K_{\mathrm{a},\delta})/2$ at steady-state, i.e. average effective 2D affinity of the two bimolecular bonds.

Given the similar values of these two affinities (Fig. S1I), their average is not significantly different

from either value (p > 0.75, Student-t test). If CD3$\gamma\epsilon$ and CD3$\delta\epsilon$ bind cooperatively, however, the

normalized average number of total bonds $<n>_{\mathrm{m}}/m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\epsilon}$ is expected to be greater than ($<n>_{\gamma} +$

$<n>_{\delta}$)/$m_{\alpha\beta}m_{\epsilon}$, which is why comparison among normalized $<n>$ values was used to detect

723   cooperativity (Fig. 3B-C). This idea was taken one step further to formulate a criterion and a

724   quantitative index for cooperativity:

725
$$\frac{\Delta\langle n\rangle}{\langle n\rangle_\gamma+\langle n\rangle_\delta}=\frac{\langle n\rangle_m-\langle n\rangle_\gamma-\langle n\rangle_\delta}{\langle n\rangle_\gamma+\langle n\rangle_\delta}=\frac{2\langle n\rangle_m/m_{\alpha\beta}m_\varepsilon}{A_cK_{a,\gamma}+A_cK_{a,\delta}}-1\begin{cases}=0 & \text{zero cooperativity}\\>0 & \text{positive cooperativity}\\<0 & \text{negative cooperativity}\end{cases} \qquad (7)$$

Zero cooperativity indicates independent binding, while positive or negative cooperativities are

respectively defined and quantified by how much the whole is more or less than the sum of parts.

Due to the presence of a trimolecular species $\langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta}$, the average number of each bimolecular bonds

($\langle n\rangle_\gamma$ or $\langle n\rangle_\delta$) formed when TCRαβ was tested against CD3m would not exceed that formed when

TCRαβ was tested against CD3γε or CD3δε (62). It follows from comparing Eqs. 6 and 7 that

$\langle n\rangle_{\gamma\delta} \geq \Delta\langle n\rangle$. Therefore, we could calculate the lower bound for the fraction of trimolecular bonds

from the relative increase in average bond number (Fig. 3D). From our data of $\langle n\rangle_m/(\langle n\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta)$

– 1 = 47%, we determined that the trimolecular bonds to be ≥ 32% (= 47%/147%) of the total

bonds.

It took multiple sets of experiments over multiple dates to obtain enough data and repeats

to assure reliability. To minimize batch-to-batch variations of sample preparation, we measured

pairs of $\langle n\rangle_m$ with either $\langle n\rangle_\gamma$ or $\langle n\rangle_\delta$ in every experiment for differences between TCRαβ

binding to dual and single CD3 heterodimer (cf. Fig. 3B for representative data). We repeated the

experiment three times to ensure consistence of such differences across different experiments and

to generate enough measurements for statistical analysis. To minimize day-to-day variations in

different experimental runs, we normalized the $\langle n\rangle_\gamma$ and $\langle n\rangle_\delta$ values by the $\langle n\rangle_m$ value in each

run and then pooled the normalized data for statistical comparison (Fig. 3C). We also determined

the cooperativity index in terms of bond numbers according to Equation 7 (Fig. 3D).

<u>Cooperativity analysis in terms of average bond lifetimes:</u> The second type of cooperativity

analysis used the following equation:

746
$$\frac{\Delta\langle t\rangle}{\left[\frac{\langle n\rangle_\gamma \langle t\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta \langle t\rangle_\delta}{\langle n\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta}\right]} = \frac{\langle t\rangle_m}{\left[\frac{\langle n\rangle_\gamma \langle t\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta \langle t\rangle_\delta}{\langle n\rangle_\gamma + \langle n\rangle_\delta}\right]} - 1 = \frac{\langle t\rangle_m}{\left[\frac{A_c K_{a,\gamma}\langle t\rangle_\gamma + A_c K_{a,\delta}\langle t\rangle_\delta}{A_c K_{a,\gamma} + A_c K_{a,\delta}}\right]} - 1 \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{zero cooperativity} \\ > 0 & \text{positive cooperativity} \\ < 0 & \text{negative cooperativity} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

which resembles Equation 7 but replaces the average number of bonds by the average bond

lifetimes as the comparison parameter. The $\langle n\rangle$'s are used as weights for the average lifetimes of

TCRαβ bonds with the respective single CD3 subunits. In other words, Equation 8 states that zero,

positive and negative cooperativities are respectively defined by whether and, if so, how much the

average lifetime formed by whole lasts longer or shorter than the sum of two single species

interactions. This was used to test the data shown in Fig. 3E, and the resulting data from the

analysis are shown in Fig. 3F.

<u>Cooperativity analysis in terms of SMD results:</u> The third type of cooperativity analysis is

for bond lifetimes observed in SMD simulations. This is different from the analysis of bond

lifetimes measured from BFP experiment because we only simulated a single molecular construct

at a time, either TCRαβ–CD3γε or TCRαβ–CD3δε' complexes, or CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε

complex, not the mixed population of two bimolecular and a trimolecular species. To analyze

cooperativity between TCR and CD3 subunits, we first calculated the probability density for

TCRαβ to dissociate from both CD3γε and CD3δε', assuming that the bimolecular dissociation

events in the trimeric complex are independent and that force prevents rebinding upon dissociation.

The separate probabilities for TCRαβ not to dissociate from CD3γε and CD3δε', respectively

during $(0, t)$ are:

764                            $p_\gamma(t) = e^{-t/\langle t\rangle_\gamma}$ and $p_\delta(t) = e^{-t/\langle t\rangle_\delta}$ (9a,b)

765 where $<t>_\gamma$ and $<t>_\delta$ are the expected lifetimes for TCRαβ to dissociate from CD3γε and CD3δε',

766 respectively, estimated using corresponding dimer dissociation times. The cumulative joint

767 probability for TCRαβ to dissociate from both CD3γε and CD3δε' concurrently but independently

768 during $(0, t)$ is:

$$F(t) = [1 - p_\gamma(t)] \cdot [1 - p_\delta(t)] = 1 - e^{-t/\langle t \rangle_\gamma} - e^{-t/\langle t \rangle_\delta} + e^{-t(1/\langle t \rangle_\gamma + 1/\langle t \rangle_\delta)} \tag{10}$$

770 The corresponding probability density is:

$$\rho_{\gamma\delta}(t) = \frac{dF(t)}{dt} = \frac{e^{-t/\langle t \rangle_\gamma}}{\langle t \rangle_\gamma} + \frac{e^{-t/\langle t \rangle_\delta}}{\langle t \rangle_\delta} - \frac{e^{-t(1/\langle t \rangle_\gamma + 1/\langle t \rangle_\delta)}}{1/\langle t \rangle_\gamma + 1/\langle t \rangle_\delta} \tag{11}$$

772 The average lifetime of the trimolecular bond, assuming no cooperativity, is:

$$\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{pred}} = \int_0^\infty t \, \rho_{\gamma\delta}(t) dt = \langle t \rangle_\gamma + \langle t \rangle_\delta - \frac{1}{1/\langle t \rangle_\gamma + 1/\langle t \rangle_\delta} = \langle t \rangle_\gamma + \langle t \rangle_\delta - \frac{\langle t \rangle_\gamma \cdot \langle t \rangle_\delta}{\langle t \rangle_\gamma + \langle t \rangle_\delta}. \tag{12}$$

774 Cooperativity is assessed by comparing the simulated trimolecular bond lifetime $\langle t \rangle_{\delta\gamma,\text{simu}}$ to the

775 trimolecular bond lifetime given by Equation 12, predicted based on the assumption of concurrent

776 but independent dissociation and calculated using the simulated bimolecular bond lifetimes. Thus,

777 the third cooperativity index can be formulated in a similar fashion to Equation 8:

$$\frac{\Delta \langle t \rangle}{\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{pred}}} = \frac{\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{simu}} - \langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{pred}}}{\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{pred}}} = \frac{\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{simu}}}{\langle t \rangle_{\gamma\delta,\text{pred}}} - 1 \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{zero cooperativity} \\ > 0 & \text{positive cooperativity} \\ < 0 & \text{negative cooperativity} \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

Kinetic modeling

The force-dependent lifetimes of TCRαβ bonds with CD3γε, CD3δε, or both all show

catch-bond behavior, with biexponentially decaying survival probabilities, suggesting the presence

of two bound species, even for the bimolecular interactions. Therefore, for the analysis of

bimolecular bond data, we assume that a single bond may dissociate from a weak state or a strong

state, similar to previous catch bond models (*63*). The weak state dissociates more rapidly than the

strong state with rates $k_{-f} > k_{-s}$. Transitions between the two states are described by rates k_a and

k_{-a}. For analysis of the mixed bond data, the dissociation of both bimolecular TCRαβ–CD3γε and

TCRαβ–CD3δε bonds as well as trimolecular CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε bonds also follows the two-

state catch-bond model. The reaction diagrams for all models are depicted in Fig. S3A.

The force dependence of all kinetic rates follows Bell's equation (*45*):

791
$$k_{i,j} = k_{i,j}^0 \exp\left(\frac{f \cdot x_{i,j}}{k_B T}\right) \tag{14}$$

where the subscripts i (-f, -s, a or -a) and j (γ, δ or m) denote different kinetic rates of different

complexes, the superscript 0 denotes the respective zero-force kinetic rate, $x_{i,j}$ denotes distance to

the transition state, or width of the energy well that traps the system in the bound state, k_B is

Boltzmann constant, and T is absolute temperature. This two-state catch-bond model is able to

recapitulate the averaged bond lifetime as well as the biexponentially distributed bond survival

probabilities. Here, the zero-force fast dissociation rates k_{-f}^0 for the two biomolecular bonds were

obtained from thermal fluctuation experiment, while the remaining parameters were evaluated

from globally fitting the model to the force-lifetime distributions as a whole via maximum

likelihood estimation (MLE). The initial proportions of the two states a $t = 0$ were determined from

the ratios of the kinetic rates assuming equilibrium. A two-step optimization procedure was

employed to minimize the MLE, which explored a large parameter space by Differential Evolution

(DE) to obtain an approximate solution, followed by L-BFGS to hone in the minimum (Fig. S2B-

D). The kinetic rates *vs*. force are depicted in Fig. S2E-G with the Bell parameters summarized in

Fig. S2I. The standard deviation for each parameter was obtained by inversing the Hessian matrix

at the MLE to obtain the approximate covariance matrix whose diagonal entries correspond to the

variance of the fitted parameters.

Molecular dynamics simulations

Molecular constructs: All simulations were based on the cryoEM structure (PDB ID: 6JXR)(*26*). The TCRαβ, CD3γε, and CD3δε' were truncated near the CPs between extracellular and intercellular regions, leaving the complete TCR ECD in its trimeric assembly. The TCRαβ ECD contained α chain Gly22-Glu237 and β chain Val26-Glu269. The CD3γε and CD3δε' ECDs were obtained by truncating γ chain after Cys107, ε chain of CD3γε after Asn121, δ chain after Glu98, and ε' chain of CD3δε' after Glu124. To minimize potential trimming effects, all chain ends were modified to prevent the exposure of charged residues. An acetyl group was added in front of the N-terminus and an N-methyl amine group caps the C-terminus of every chain. All hydrogen atoms, as well as any missing atoms, were added back through Gromacs utilities (*26*). The disulfide bonds in the original cryoEM structure were preserved through Gromacs interactive S-S bridge selection procedures (*26*). The resulting CD3δε'–TCR–CD3γε trimeric complex represents the fully assembled ECD. Then, two partial assemblies were generated by removing CD3γε, CD3δε', and TCR individually from the complete ECD, achieving three dimeric complexes (TCR–CD3γε, TCR–CD3δε', and CD3γε–CD3δε', respectively).

Unit cell preparation: Unit cells were built to enclose the molecular systems to be simulated in a physiologically-appropriate and thermodynamically-favorable state. The initial structures were oriented and centered within optimized orthorhombic cells, which accommodated the physical extensions in all directions with a ≥1.6 nm buffering zone apart from the box sides to ensure the protein was well-isolated. The molecules in unit cells were solvated using the TIP3P water model (*64*). The negative charges were counterbalanced using sodium ions, then tuning the ionic strength to ~150 mM with sodium chloride. To further prepare the system

thermodynamically, energy unfavorable close contacts were eliminated through the steepest

descent and conjugate gradient energy minimization cycles. While restraining the heavy atoms in

macromolecules, the unit cell was brought to the suitable ensemble employing 200 ps velocity

rescaling simulation to adjust the temperature and 200 ps Berendsen Barostat simulation to correct

the pressure (300 K, 1.01325 bar). After releasing the heavy-atom restraints, the systems were

considered ready for subsequent equilibration and production runs.

<u>Conventional molecular dynamics</u>: CMD simulations were performed using GROMACS

(version 2019.6) (*65-67*) under recent AMBER99SB*-ILDNP force field with improved helix-coil

transitional and side-chain torsional dynamics (*68*). From previously prepared unit cells, the set of

initial velocities were randomly sampled from the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution. The

molecular trajectories were self-evolved under the leap-frog algorithm for integrating Newton's

law of motion over 2 fs time period. For CMD, the individual simulations runs were executed

under periodic boundary conditions to sample the NVT ensemble with corresponding constant

volumes (CD3δε'–TCR–CD3γε: $12.5 \times 10.8 \times 9.9$ nm^3; TCR–CD3γε: $12.6 \times 9.8 \times 8.6$ nm^3; TCR–

CD3δε': $11.9 \times 10.3 \times 9.2$ nm^3; CD3γε–CD3δε': $11.5 \times 8.1 \times 8.0$ nm^3) and a constant temperature

of 300 K. The neighborhood lists were refreshed every 10 steps based on the buffered Verlet

scheme with a 1.2 nm non-bonded cutoff for Coulomb and van der Waals interactions. The long-

range potentials of electrostatic interactions were computed using the Particle Ewald Mesh

summation method. The simulated trajectories were 200 ns for every system, consisting of a 50-

ns equilibration and a 150-ns production run. The conformational snapshots per 0.1 ns during the

production stage were extracted and analyzed to obtain ensemble averages.

<u>Steered molecular dynamics:</u> In SMD simulations, the well-equilibrated conformations

from free dynamics at 100 ns were used as initial configurations. They were prepared according

to the Unit cell preparation section but with a 20-nm of box length to accommodate the molecular

extension and separation under external pulling. The external forces with constant magnitudes or

constant velocities along fixed direction (z-axis) were added to the trimeric and dimeric

complexes. The C-termini of CD3ε chains (NME residues) were fixed to mimic the anchor effect

of their transmembrane domains. Clamp or ramp forces were applied to the N-terminus of the TCR

α chain (ACE residues) to accelerate the dissociation. To pull the CD3δε'–TCR–CD3γε trimeric

complex, two points at the base of the CD3s was used to anchor the complete ECD. To pull the

TCR–CD3γε and TCR–CD3δε' dimeric complexes, by comparison, only a single anchor spot at

the end of ε chain ECD was used. For force-clamp simulations, five independent trajectories under

100, 125, 150, 175, and 200 pN were produced for each of the two dimeric systems; three

independent runs under 150, 175, and 200 pN were executed for the trimeric complex as

simulations at smaller clamp forces were aborted due to the inability to observe dissociation after

exceedingly long time. For force-ramping simulations, 70 pN/nm pseudo springs were linked to α

chain ACE residues with free ends departing away in z-direction at 1 nm/ns. Five repeats each on

three ECD complexes were conducted to assess corresponding rupture forces statistically.

Occupancy analysis

Several variations of occupancy analysis were employed to dynamically evaluate the extent of a

particular residue in contact with its binding partner throughout the simulation. At the particular

timestamp i, the residue being analyzed is defined to be in contact (denoted $o_i=1$) if the center of

mass of this residue is within 4 Å of any atoms of its binding partner; otherwise, it is not in touch

(denoted $o_i=0$). The occupancy index (%) indicates the fraction of time in contact during a given

period, as $\sum_{i=0}^{N} o_i/N$, where N is total number of analyzed frames.

Residue-to-redisue occupancy index (RR-OI): By setting residues inside a subunit as a

reference group, this occupancy analysis quantifies the extent of dynamic interaction over a period

of each residue from one subunit with every residue from the other subunit. Thus, RR-OI evaluated

the level of any pairwise protein–protein interaction, thereby forming a correlation matrix where

the columns index the residues from one subunit, the rows index the residues from the other subunit,

and the elements denote values of particular residue-to-residue occupancy indices.

Residue-to-domain cocupancy index (RD-OI): This occupancy analysis quantifies each

residue against all residues within its binding partner, using the entire subunit as the reference

group instead of its individual residues. RD-OI is usually smaller than the sum of RR-OI over the

binding domain because the residue in question may simultaneously be in contact with multiple

residues in the domain under consideration, and these contact periods can only be counted once.

Domain-to-domain occupancy index (DD-OI): The occupancy analysis takes averages of

RD-OI over interacting residues (*i.e.,* positive terms) inside a domain to examine its overall

binding tendency against the other domain.

Furthermore, to examine how cooperativity impacts the interface between TCR ECD

subunits, different occupancy analyses were performed to distinguish bimolecular and trimolecular

dynamics. To examine how force impacts the interface, different occupancy analyses were

performed to compare force-free and force-clamp dynamics.

Statistical analysis

Applied statistical approaches were specified in figure legends. Mean with standard error of the

mean (SEM) was used for reporting the confidence level of absolute mean value; Mean with

standard deviation (SD) was used for comparisons among experimental conditions; Box and

whiskers plots were used to display population scattering level. Depending on the nature of the

data, linear regression, cubic interpolation, or Gaussian distribution were used in curve fitting, with

the uncertainty range showing confidence interval or SEM. Errors of predicted values from models

were calculated from the error of input data with error propagation. Student's t-test based analysis

assuming paired/unpaired, parametric/nonparametric distributions was used between two groups

depending on the condition of each case. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used when

comparing more than two objects. One sample t-test was used when evaluating cooperativity

indexes comparing to zero.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by NIH grants R01GM124489 (to M.K. and C.Z.) and U01 CA214354 (to C.Z. and M.K.). The MD simulations were supported by an NSF award (MCA08X014) in advanced computing infrastructure for U.S. and performed in the Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment (XSEDE). Cell sorting/flow cytometry technologies were provided by NYU Langone's Cytometry and Cell Sorting Laboratory, which is supported in part by NIH grant P30CA016087. SIYR:H2-K^b protein was made by the NIH Tetramer Core Facility at Emory University. We thank Larissa Doudy for technical assistance, Johannes Huppa for providing the H57 scFv, and Bernard Malissen for providing mouse 58$^{-/-}$ T cell hybridoma cells.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

C.Z. and C.G. conceived the study; C.Z. and M.K. directed the study; Z.Y., C.G., and A.N. performed experiments; P.C. performed simulations; P.C. and A.N. performed structural analysis; A.N, S.B, and D.G produced proteins; S.T. analyzed data using mathematical models; Z.Y., P.C., A.N., M.K., and C.Z. analyzed data and wrote the paper with contributions from other authors.

STATEMENT OF COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

REFERENCES

1. A. H. Courtney, W. L. Lo, A. Weiss, TCR Signaling: Mechanisms of Initiation and
Propagation. *Trends Biochem Sci* **43**, 108-123 (2018).

2. C. Zhu, W. Chen, J. Lou, W. Rittase, K. Li, Mechanosensing through immunoreceptors.
Nat Immunol **20**, 1269-1278 (2019).

3. R. A. Mariuzza, P. Agnihotri, J. Orban, The structural basis of T-cell receptor (TCR)
activation: An enduring enigma. *J Biol Chem* **295**, 914-925 (2020).

4. B. Alarcon, D. Gil, P. Delgado, W. W. Schamel, Initiation of TCR signaling: regulation
within CD3 dimers. *Immunol Rev* **191**, 38-46 (2003).

5. D. Moogk, A. Natarajan, M. Krogsgaard, T cell receptor signal transduction: affinity, force
and conformational change. *Current Opinion in Chemical Engineering* **19**, 43-50 (2018).

6. P. A. van der Merwe, O. Dushek, Mechanisms for T cell receptor triggering. *Nat Rev
Immunol* **11**, 47-55 (2011).

7. A. L. Lanz *et al.*, Allosteric activation of T cell antigen receptor signaling by quaternary
structure relaxation. *Cell Rep* **36**, 109375 (2021).

8. Y. Liu *et al.*, DNA-based nanoparticle tension sensors reveal that T-cell receptors transmit
defined pN forces to their antigens for enhanced fidelity. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **113**,
5610-5615 (2016).

9. R. Ma *et al.*, DNA probes that store mechanical information reveal transient piconewton
forces applied by T cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116**, 16949-16954 (2019).

10. J. Gohring *et al.*, Temporal analysis of T-cell receptor-imposed forces via quantitative
single molecule FRET measurements. *Nat Commun* **12**, 2502 (2021).

11. B. Liu, W. Chen, B. D. Evavold, C. Zhu, Accumulation of dynamic catch bonds between
TCR and agonist peptide-MHC triggers T cell signaling. *Cell* **157**, 357-368 (2014).

12. J. Hong *et al.*, Force-Regulated In Situ TCR-Peptide-Bound MHC Class II Kinetics
Determine Functions of CD4+ T Cells. *J Immunol* **195**, 3557-3564 (2015).

13. P. Wu *et al.*, Mechano-regulation of Peptide-MHC Class I Conformations Determines TCR
Antigen Recognition. *Mol Cell* **73**, 1015-1027 e1017 (2019).

14. D. K. Das *et al.*, Force-dependent transition in the T-cell receptor beta-subunit
allosterically regulates peptide discrimination and pMHC bond lifetime. *Proc Natl Acad*
Sci U S A **112**, 1517-1522 (2015).

15. L. V. Sibener *et al.*, Isolation of a Structural Mechanism for Uncoupling T Cell Receptor
Signaling from Peptide-MHC Binding. *Cell* **174**, 672-687 e627 (2018).

16. S. T. Kim *et al.*, The alphabeta T cell receptor is an anisotropic mechanosensor. *J Biol*
Chem **284**, 31028-31037 (2009).

17. Y. Feng *et al.*, Mechanosensing drives acuity of alphabeta T-cell recognition. *Proc Natl*
Acad Sci U S A **114**, E8204-E8213 (2017).

18. S. Pryshchep, V. I. Zarnitsyna, J. Hong, B. D. Evavold, C. Zhu, Accumulation of serial
forces on TCR and CD8 frequently applied by agonist antigenic peptides embedded in
MHC molecules triggers calcium in T cells. *J Immunol* **193**, 68-76 (2014).

19. K. Natarajan *et al.*, An allosteric site in the T-cell receptor Cbeta domain plays a critical
signalling role. *Nat Commun* **8**, 15260 (2017).

20. S. Rangarajan *et al.*, Peptide-MHC (pMHC) binding to a human antiviral T cell receptor
induces long-range allosteric communication between pMHC- and CD3-binding sites. *J*
Biol Chem **293**, 15991-16005 (2018).

21. B. Knapp, P. A. van der Merwe, O. Dushek, C. M. Deane, MHC binding affects the
dynamics of different T-cell receptors in different ways. *PLoS Comput Biol* **15**, e1007338
(2019).

22. M. S. Kuhns *et al.*, Evidence for a functional sidedness to the alphabetaTCR. *Proc Natl*
Acad Sci U S A **107**, 5094-5099 (2010).

23. Y. He *et al.*, Identification of the Docking Site for CD3 on the T Cell Receptor beta Chain
by Solution NMR. *J Biol Chem* **290**, 19796-19805 (2015).

24. A. Natarajan *et al.*, Structural Model of the Extracellular Assembly of the TCR-CD3
Complex. *Cell Rep* **14**, 2833-2845 (2016).

25. M. E. Birnbaum *et al.*, Molecular architecture of the alphabeta T cell receptor-CD3
complex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 17576-17581 (2014).

26. Dong *et al.*, Structural basis of assembly of the human T cell receptor-CD3 complex.
Nature **573**, 546-552 (2019).

27. M. S. Kuhns, M. M. Davis, Disruption of extracellular interactions impairs T cell receptor-
CD3 complex stability and signaling. *Immunity* **26**, 357-369 (2007).

28. S. E. Chesla, P. Selvaraj, C. Zhu, Measuring two-dimensional receptor-ligand binding
kinetics by micropipette. *Biophysical journal* **75**, 1553-1572 (1998).

29.   J. Huang *et al.*, The kinetics of two-dimensional TCR and pMHC interactions determine
T-cell responsiveness. *Nature* **464**, 932-936 (2010).

30.   E. Evans, K. Ritchie, R. Merkel, Sensitive force technique to probe molecular adhesion
and structural linkages at biological interfaces. *Biophys J* **68**, 2580-2587 (1995).

31.   J. Wang *et al.*, Atomic structure of an alphabeta T cell receptor (TCR) heterodimer in
complex with an anti-TCR fab fragment derived from a mitogenic antibody. *The EMBO*
journal **17**, 10-26 (1998).

32.   R. A. Fernandes *et al.*, T cell receptors are structures capable of initiating signaling in the
absence of large conformational rearrangements. *J Biol Chem* **287**, 13324-13335 (2012).

33.   S. A. Richman *et al.*, Structural features of T cell receptor variable regions that enhance
domain stability and enable expression as single-chain ValphaVbeta fragments. *Molecular*
immunology **46**, 902-916 (2009).

34.   M. Krogsgaard *et al.*, Evidence that structural rearrangements and/or flexibility during
TCR binding can contribute to T cell activation. *Mol Cell* **12**, 1367-1378 (2003).

35.   E. W. Newell *et al.*, Structural basis of specificity and cross-reactivity in T cell receptors
specific for cytochrome c-I-E(k). *J Immunol* **186**, 5823-5832 (2011).

36.   W. Chen, E. A. Evans, R. P. McEver, C. Zhu, Monitoring receptor-ligand interactions
between surfaces by thermal fluctuations. *Biophysical journal* **94**, 694-701 (2008).

37.   B. Liu *et al.*, 2D TCR-pMHC-CD8 kinetics determines T-cell responses in a self-antigen-
specific TCR system. *Eur J Immunol* **44**, 239-250 (2014).

38.   K. Li, X. Cheng, A. Tilevik, S. J. Davis, C. Zhu, In situ and in silico kinetic analyses of
programmed cell death-1 (PD-1) receptor, programmed cell death ligands, and B7-1
protein interaction network. *J Biol Chem* **292**, 6799-6809 (2017).

39.   J. Hong *et al.*, A TCR mechanotransduction signaling loop induces negative selection in
the thymus. *Nat Immunol* **19**, 1379-1390 (2018).

40.   K. Li *et al.*, PD-1 suppresses TCR-CD8 cooperativity during T-cell antigen recognition.
Nature communications **12**, 2746 (2021).

41.   C. Zhu, T. E. Williams, Modeling concurrent binding of multiple molecular species in cell
adhesion. *Biophys J* **79**, 1850-1857 (2000).

42.   T. E. Williams, P. Selvaraj, C. Zhu, Concurrent binding to multiple ligands: kinetic rates
of CD16b for membrane-bound IgG1 and IgG2. *Biophys J* **79**, 1858-1866 (2000).

43.   T. E. Williams, S. Nagarajan, P. Selvaraj, C. Zhu, Concurrent and independent binding of
Fcgamma receptors IIa and IIIb to surface-bound IgG. *Biophys J* **79**, 1867-1875 (2000).

44.   E. Evans, A. Leung, V. Heinrich, C. Zhu, Mechanical switching and coupling between two
dissociation pathways in a P-selectin adhesion bond. *Proceedings of the National Academy*
of Sciences **101**, 11281-11286 (2004).

45.   G. I. Bell, Models for the specific adhesion of cells to cells. *Science* **200**, 618-627 (1978).

46.   M. Karplus, G. A. Petsko, Molecular dynamics simulations in biology. *Nature* **347**, 631-
639 (1990).

47.   S. Izrailev *et al.*, in *Computational molecular dynamics: challenges, methods, ideas*.
(Springer, 1999), pp. 39-65.

48.   A. Natarajan *et al.*, In situ cell-surface conformation of the TCR-CD3
signaling complex. *bioRxiv*, 2022.2002.2007.479368 (2022).

49.   N. Martinez-Martin *et al.*, Cooperativity between T cell receptor complexes revealed by
conformational mutants of CD3epsilon. *Sci Signal* **2**, ra43 (2009).

50.   T. Beddoe *et al.*, Antigen ligation triggers a conformational change within the constant
domain of the alphabeta T cell receptor. *Immunity* **30**, 777-788 (2009).

51.   A. Alcover, B. Alarcon, V. Di Bartolo, Cell Biology of T Cell Receptor Expression and
Regulation. *Annu Rev Immunol* **36**, 103-125 (2018).

52.   X. Zhao *et al.*, Tuning T cell receptor sensitivity through catch bond engineering. *Science*
376, eabl5282 (2022).

53.   N. Manolios, F. Letourneur, J. Bonifacino, R. Klausner, Pairwise, cooperative and
inhibitory interactions describe the assembly and probable structure of the T-cell antigen
receptor. *The EMBO journal* **10**, 1643-1651 (1991).

54.   J. h. Wang, E. L. Reinherz, The structural basis of αβ T-lineage immune recognition: TCR
docking topologies, mechanotransduction, and co-receptor function. *Immunological*
reviews **250**, 102-119 (2012).

55.   D. Gil, W. W. Schamel, M. Montoya, F. Sanchez-Madrid, B. Alarcon, Recruitment of Nck
by CD3 epsilon reveals a ligand-induced conformational change essential for T cell
receptor signaling and synapse formation. *Cell* **109**, 901-912 (2002).

56.   C. Xu *et al.*, Regulation of T cell receptor activation by dynamic membrane binding of the
CD3epsilon cytoplasmic tyrosine-based motif. *Cell* **135**, 702-713 (2008).

57.   K. K. Sarangapani, B. T. Marshall, R. P. McEver, C. Zhu, Molecular stiffness of selectins.
J Biol Chem **286**, 9567-9576 (2011).

58.   E. N. Bingol, O. Sercinoglu, P. Ozbek, Unraveling the Allosteric Communication
Mechanisms in T-Cell Receptor-Peptide-Loaded Major Histocompatibility Complex
Dynamics Using Molecular Dynamics Simulations: An Approach Based on Dynamic

Cross Correlation Maps and Residue Interaction Energy Calculations. *J Chem Inf Model* **61**, 2444-2453 (2021).

59. L. Kjer-Nielsen *et al.*, Crystal structure of the human T cell receptor CD3 epsilon gamma heterodimer complexed to the therapeutic mAb OKT3. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **101**, 7675-7680 (2004).

60. M. Krogsgaard *et al.*, Agonist/endogenous peptide-MHC heterodimers drive T cell activation and sensitivity. *Nature* **434**, 238-243 (2005).

61. F. Letourneur, B. Malissen, Derivation of a T cell hybridoma variant deprived of functional T cell receptor α and β chain transcripts reveals a nonfunctional α-mRNA of BW5147 origin. *European journal of immunology* **19**, 2269-2274 (1989).

62. V. F. Fiore, L. Ju, Y. Chen, C. Zhu, T. H. Barker, Dynamic catch of a Thy-1-alpha5beta1+syndecan-4 trimolecular complex. *Nat Commun* **5**, 4886 (2014).

63. C. D. Buckley *et al.*, Cell adhesion. The minimal cadherin-catenin complex binds to actin filaments under force. *Science* **346**, 1254211 (2014).

64. W. L. Jorgensen, J. Chandrasekhar, J. D. Madura, R. W. Impey, M. L. Klein, Comparison of simple potential functions for simulating liquid water. *The Journal of chemical physics* **79**, 926-935 (1983).

65. U. R. Shrestha *et al.*, Generation of the configurational ensemble of an intrinsically disordered protein from unbiased molecular dynamics simulation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **116**, 20446-20452 (2019).

66. B. Hess, C. Kutzner, D. Van Der Spoel, E. Lindahl, GROMACS 4: algorithms for highly efficient, load-balanced, and scalable molecular simulation. *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **4**, 435-447 (2008).

67. M. J. Abraham *et al.*, GROMACS: High performance molecular simulations through multi-level parallelism from laptops to supercomputers. *SoftwareX* **1**, 19-25 (2015).

68. K. Lindorff-Larsen *et al.*, Improved side-chain torsion potentials for the Amber ff99SB protein force field. *Proteins* **78**, 1950-1958 (2010).

69. F. Eisenhaber, P. Lijnzaad, P. Argos, C. Sander, M. Scharf, The double cubic lattice method: efficient approaches to numerical integration of surface area and volume and to dot surface contouring of molecular assemblies. *Journal of computational chemistry* **16**, 273-284 (1995).

70. O. Trott, A. J. Olson, AutoDock Vina: improving the speed and accuracy of docking with a new scoring function, efficient optimization, and multithreading. *J Comput Chem* **31**, 455-461 (2010).

 FIGURE LEGENDS

 Figure 1. Antibody blocking of TCRαβ–CD3 interactions impairs TCR–pMHC interaction
 and reduces T cell function. (A) TCR complexed with anti-TCR Cβ (H57) Fab (*left*) or anti-
 CD3ε (2C11) Fab (*right*) modelled by docking the cocrystal structures of H57 Fab bound to N15
 TCRαβ (1NFD) (*31*) and of 2C11 Fab bound to CD3ε (3R08) (*32*) onto the cryoEM structure of
 the TCR-CD3 complex (6JXR). **(B)** Schematics of MAF assay setup and coating strategies for
 interacting molecules. Biotinylated RBCs were sequentially incubated with streptavidin (SA) and
 biotinylated proteins. For TCRαβ–CD3γε interaction (*C*), the 2C TCRαβ was N-terminally-
 biotinylated and the mouse CD3γε ECDs were C-terminally-biotinylated (*upper*). For TCR–
 pMHC interaction (*D*), 2C TCR was expressed on T hybridoma cells and pMHC (SIYR:H2-K^b)
 was C-terminally-biotinylated (*lower*). **(C)** Adhesion frequency (P_a) of TCRαβ–CD3γε interaction
 in the presence (*red*) or absence (*blue*) of 10 μg/ml indicated full mAbs or scFv. **(D)** P_a of TCR–
 pMHC interaction in the presence (*red*) or absence (*blue*) of 10 μg/ml indicated mAb fragments.
 (E) Schematics of BFP setup and coating strategy for interacting molecules. Streptavidin-coated
 probe beads were incubated with biotinylated proteins similar to (*A*). **(F)** Representative force *vs.*
 time traces from BFP force-clamp assay exemplifying a no-binding (*left*) and a binding (*right*)
 event. The force plateau highlighted in red indicates bond lifetime under a constant clamp force.
 (G) TCR–pMHC bond lifetime at 10 pN measured in the presence (*red*) or absence (*blue*) of 10
 μg/ml of H57 Fab or scFv. **(H)** IL-2 production (area under the dose-dependent curve, AUC) of
 hybridoma expressing 2C TCR activated by SIYR:H-2K^b complexes displayed on EL-4 cells in
 the presence (*red*) or absence (*blue*) of 5 μg/ml of indicated mAb Fab, normalized by the result
 without Fab blocking. As an anti-TCRα mAb, H28 does not bind TCRαβ assembled in the TCR
 complex. Data in (*C*), (*D*), (*G*), and (*H*) are presented as mean ± SME, with (*C*) and (*D*) showing
 results of >3 paired experiments for each mAb, (*G*) showing results of 54-64 measurements at
 forces ranging in 9-11 pN, response curves in (*H*) summarizing combined result from eight peptide
 (SIYR) concentrations in triplicates ranging from 0-1 mM. Significance was assessed by unpaired
 parametric t-test in (*B*), (*C*), and (*H*). Difference between absence of blocking (*blue*) and any
 treatment conditions (*red*) in (*H*) was hightly significant (p<0.0001).

Figure 2. 2D kinetic analysis of TCRαβ–CD3 ECD interactions reveal low affinity, fast-dissociation, and catch bond formation. (A) Effective 2D affinities (A_cK_a) of indicated interactions measured by the MAF assay. For TCRαβ–CD3 interactions, the 2B4 TCRαβ ECD was N-terminally-biotinylated, and the human CD3γε or CD3δε ECDs were C-terminally-biotinylated; for CD3γε–CD3δε interaction, CD3 subunits were linked through N-terminus on one surface and C-terminus on the opposite surface, with setup as Fig. 1B (*upper*). For TCR–pMHC interaction, 2B4 TCR complex was expressed on T hybridoma cells, and pMHC (K5:I-E^k) was C-terminally-biotinylated, setup as Fig. 1B (*lower*). **(B)** Representative survival probability from a BFP thermal fluctuation experiment, shown as a normalized ln(# of events with a lifetime >t) *vs. t* plot for lifetimes of CD3γε–CD3δε bonds, with setup as Fig. 1E (*upper*). Dissociation off-rate (k_{off}) was solved as the negative slope of the linear fit to data. **(C)** Off-rates of indicated interactions analyzed using the method in (*B*). **(D)** Effective 2D on-rates ($A_ck_{on} = A_cK_a \times k_{off}$) calculated based on the values in (*A*) and (*C*). **(E)** Bond lifetime *vs*. force data (point) and cubic interpolation (curve) of TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue triangle), TCRαβ–CD3δε (orange square), and CD3γε–CD3δε (black circle) interactions, with setup as in Fig. 1E (*upper*). **(F)** Bond lifetime *vs*. force data (point) and Gaussian fit (curve) of 2B4 TCR–K5:I-E^k interaction, with setup as Fig. 1E (*lower*). Data are presented as mean ± SEM in (*A*) and (*C-F*), with >3 experiments in (*A*), linear fit to 69 measurements with 95% confidence interval in (*B*), linear fit to 69-136 measurements to generate k_{off} values in (*C*), Gaussian error propagation for error bars in (*D*), and 33-111 measurements per force bin in (*E*) and (*F*).

Figure 3. Cooperative binding of CD3γε and CD3δε to TCRαβ enhances TCR stability. (A)
Coating schematics of RBCs or BFP beads for cooperativity analysis. One surface was coated with
N-terminally-biotinylated 2B4 TCRαβ (*right*) and the opposing surface was coated with either C-
terminally-biotinylated human CD3γε, CD3δε, or both in a 1:1 molar ratio ("CD3m") (*left*). **(B)**
Normalized average number of bonds data from one representative experiment of TCRαβ binding
to CD3γε or CD3m and to CD3δε or CD3m. Data were measured using the same TCRαβ-bearing
RBC to test a pair of RBCs bearing single or dual CD3 species in random order. **(C)** Pooled average
number of bonds data from three independent experiments as in (*B*). Result further normalized by
the mean $<n>_m/m_{\alpha\beta}m_\varepsilon$ in each experiment to remove the inter-experimental variations, revealing
significant lower values of TCRαβ binding to CD3γε, CD3δε, and their predicted average (<CD3>)
than TCRαβ binding to CD3m. **(D)** Cooperativity index of average number of bonds. The
significantly positive mean value demonstrates 47% enhanced binding resulted from cooperativity.
(E) Lifetime of TCRαβ–CD3m bonds *vs.* force data (red circle) and model prediction based on
fitted kinetic rates (curves). The data of TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue triangle) and TCRαβ–CD3δε (orange
square) bond lifetimes from Fig. 2E are replotted along with the model fits (blue and orange
curves), which are significantly ($p < 0.05$) shorter-lived that the TCRαβ–CD3m bonds. **(F)**
Measured and model-predicted (curves) cooperativity index of lifetime, relative difference
between the average lifetime of the whole bonds of TCRαβ with concurrently presented dual CD3s
($<t>_m$) and the weighted sum of average lifetimes of TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε bonds
measured separately ($<t>_\gamma$ and $<t>_\delta$). The weights were fractions of bond formation based on the
affinities of TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε interactions. **(G)** Representative survival
probabilities of TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and TCRαβ–CD3m bonds at indicated force bins
shown as ln(# of events with a lifetime >*t*) *vs. t* plots. **(H)** The probability of CD3δε–TCRαβ–
CD3γε trimolecular bond formation as a function of force and lifetime. Data points in (*B*) and (*C*)
are presented as mean ± SD; data in (*D*) are presented as box plot with the whisker showing min
to max; data points in (*E*) and (*F*) are presented as mean ± SEM of 33-111 measurements with
fitted curves presented as mean ± SE. Significance was assessed in (*B*), (*C*) and (*E*) by unpaired
nonparametric t-test and in (*D*) and (*F*) by one sample t-test comparion to zero.

Figure 4. MD simulations reveal cooperative ECD interaction among TCR-CD3 subunits.
(A) Molecular constructs for MD simulations: the trimeric ECDs are extracted from the cryoEM structure (6JXR) (*26*), the dimeric ECDs are modeled by removing either CD3 from the trimer. **(B-C)** Mean ± SEM of contact areas (*B*), defined by solvent accessible surface area algorithm (*69*), and interaction energies (*C*), quantified using Autodock empirical scoring functions (*70*), between TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue), TCRαβ–CD3δε (orange), CD3γε–CD3δε (green) complexes calculated from dimeric (*left*) and trimeric (*middle*) CMD simulations, as well as TCRαβ–CD3γε + TCRαβ–CD3δε (pink), and TCRαβ–CD3γε + TCRαβ–CD3δε + CD3γε–CD3δε' (red) from trimeric CMD simulations (*right*). ****p ≤ 0.0001 between any two groups by unpaired t tests. **(D)** SMD simulated minimum distance *vs.* time of TCRαβ–CD3δε (orange), TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue), TCRαβ–CD3γε–CD3δε (red) bonds under 175 pN force. The sudden departure of the trajectory from baseline signified dissociation time at which defined bond lifetime. **(E)** Bond lifetime *vs.* clamp-force relationship for the indicated ECD bonds. **(F)** Cooperativity index as relative difference between the simulated CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular bond lifetime and its predicted value using the TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε bimolecular bond lifetimes simulated separately, assuming concurrent but independent dissociation of TCRαβ from both CD3s. *p ≤ 0.05 by one sample t-test for comparison with zero.

Figure 5. Structural basis of force-enhanced cooperative TCRαβ-CD3 interactions. (A-B) Sum (*A*) or difference (*B*) of the TCRαβ to CD3γε and CD3δε' RR-OI matrices from SMD and CMD results, showing only non-zero values, with the residue abbreviations and indices labeled on the right (CD3γε and CD3δε') and bottom (TCRαβ). Top and left sidebars show the cumulative values over columns or rows respectively, indicating the overall interacting level of each residue and its residing secondary structure. **(C)** RD-OI value *vs.* index of TCRα and β residue contacting CD3 ECDs, and of CD3 γ, ε, ε' and δ residue contacting TCRαβ ECDs in the TCRαβ–CD3γε (blue), TCRαβ–CD3δε' (orange) and CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε (red) complexes. **(D)** Force-free *vs.* force-clamp DD-OI plots of CD3γ, ε, ε' or δ chain (identified by symbol) contacting TCRαβ (*top*), or TCRα or β chains contacting CD3γε and/or CD3δε' (*bottom*). Points of force-clamp (*x*) and force-free (*y*) DD-OI values calculated using dimeric (labeled as "*γε*", "*δε'*") or trimeric (labeled as "*tri*") complex are labeled by the same symbol and connected by dashed line(s). The force-free results were derived from CMD trajectory. The force-clamp results for TCRαβ–CD3γε and TCRαβ–CD3δε' were averaged across five independent SMD trajectories under 100, 125, 150, 175, and 200 pN; the force-clamp results for CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε were averaged across three independent SMD trajectories under 150, 175, and 200 pN.

Figure 6. Critical residues for TCRαβ-CD3 cooperative interaction. (A-C) Snapshots of contact residues identified by 175-pN force-clamp SMD of the trimeric complex mapped onto the zoom-in views of the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε (*A*), TCRαβ–CD3γε (*B*), and TCRαβ–CD3δε' (*C*) interfaces. CD3δε' and CD3γε are removed from (*B*) and (*C*) for visual clarity. **(D-F)** Snapshots of contact residues identified by 175-pN force-clamp SMD of the corresponding dimeric complex mapped onto the zoom-in views of the TCRαβ–CD3γε (*E*) and TCRαβ–CD3δε' (*F*) interfaces, and a model created by combining the two partial snapshots of the CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε interface from the two dimeric snapshots (*D*). The sidechains of the contact residues with OI greater than 90% (*A,D*), 85% (*B,E*), and 40% (*C,F*) are shown. Individual residues and their contacting sidechains are colored in white for TCRα, salmon for TCRβ, magenta for ε of CD3γε, yellow for γ of CD3γε, cyan for ε' of CD3δε', and green for δ of CD3δε'. **(G)** A zoom-out view to put the close-up snapshots in (*A-C*) into context of a full ECD assembly of TCRαβ (gray), CD3γε (light blue), and CD3δε' (orange): the center pocket (black circle), the TCRαβ–CD3γε contact residue patch (blue circle), and the TCRαβ–CD3δε' contact residue patch (orange circle) are arranged as an inverted triangle in this top-down view. The high combined ΣRD-OI of both in CMD and SMD (sum > 1.5) contact residues are shown using sticks colored white to red gradually. A dashed circle below the center pocket indicates the contact residue patch at the CD3γε–CD3δε' interface (sidechains not shown). **(H, I)** ΔRD-OI (differential RD-OI) (*H*) and root-mean-square fluctuation (RMSF, *I*) profiles between SMD and CMD are shown by colors (red for positive, blue for negative, and white for zero values) and mapped onto the same top-down view as (*G*) but using different representations. The sidechains of same high combined ΣRD-OI residues as (*G*) are highlighted in (*H*). The residues' absolute RMSF values are represented by the thickness of the protein backbone in (I). See also Video S11.

Figure 7. Mutating high occupancy residues at the TCRαβ–CD3 interfaces impacts TCR–pMHC force-dependent bond lifetime and T cell function, but not 2D affinity at zero force. **(A)** Sequence alignment of TCRβ regions from various species indicates the conserved high occupancy residues and the mutation strategies. **(B)** Structure of 2B4 TCR with the locations of mutated residues indicated. **(C)** Effective 2D affinities (A_cK_a) of WT 2B4 TCR or indicated mutants interacting with K5:I-E^k. **(D)** Bond lifetime *vs*. force data (point) and cubic interpolation (curve) of hybridoma expressing WT 2B4 TCR or indicated mutants interacting with K5:I-E^k. **(E)** The peak lifetime in (*D*). **(F)** Area under the dose response curve (AUC) of IL-2 cytokine production by hybridoma expressing WT 2B4 TCR and indicated mutants activated by K5:I-E^k complexes displayed on CHO cells, normalized by the AUC value of the WT 2B4 TCR. **(G)** Correlation between the peak lifetime and IL-2 cytokine production. Data in (*C*), (*D*), (*F*) and (*G*) *y*-axis are presented as mean ± SME; the fitted curves in (*D*), (*E*), and (*G*) *x*-axis are presented as mean ± SE. (*C*) shows results of >3 measurements. (*D*) shows results of 610 (NP), 355 (WT), and 584 (GK) measurements. Response curves in (*F*) summarize combined results from twelve peptide (SIYR) concentrations in triplicates ranging from 0-100 µM. Error bars in (*E*) are solved from the curve fitting in (*D*) and in (*F*) from AUC fitting. Differences between WT and any of the two mutants was highly significant (p<0.0001) by unpaired parametric t-test.

Chain	Secondary regions	Residue	Expression change, functional effects	Reference documenting interaction
TCRα	AB loop	K148	-- (*32*)	
	DE loop	R185	- (*32*), calcium flux reduction (*27*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		S186	--- (*32*), change in activation (*27*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		M187	-- (*32*), calcium flux reduction (*27*)	
TCRβ	CC' loop	N181	--- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		G182	-- (*32*), IL-2 reduction(*24*)	
	Helix 4	S216	+ (*32*)	NMR (*23*)
		T218	-- (*32*)	NMR (*23*)
		F219	--- (*32*)	NMR (*23, 24*)
	Helix 4-F strand	P223	- (*32*), IL-2 increase (*24*)	
		R224	--- (*32*)	NMR (*23, 24*)
		N225	IL-2 reduction (*24*)	NMR (*23, 24*)
		H226	-- (*32*), IL-2 reduction (*24*)	CryoEM (*26*)
	G strand	I253		CryoEM (*26*), NMR (*23*)
		S255	+ (*32*), IL-2 increase (*48*)	Crosslink (*48*)
		E257		Crosslink (*48*)
		W259	+ (*32*), IL-2 increase (*48*)	Crosslink (*48*)
CD3δ	AB loop	L29	--- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		E30	--- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		D31	--- (*32*)	
		R32	--- (*32*)	
	EF loop	K62	-- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		I64	-- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
CD3ε	CD loop	N62	-- (*32*)	
		D63	- (*32*)	
		K64	- (*32*)	
	FG loop	L90	- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		E91	- (*32*)	
	H strand	R115	--- (*32*), impaired activation & IL-2 (*49*)	
		(R117)	--- (*32*), impaired activation & IL-2 (*49*)	
CD3γ	AB loop	Y34	+ (*32*)	
		D35		CryoEM (*26*)
		Y36	--- (*32*)	CryoEM (*26*)
		Q37	-- (*32*)	
		E38	--- (*32*)	
		G40	--- (*32*)	

1255

Table 1 | Summary of high occupancy residues, their prior identification, and reported roles.
High occupancy residues (RD-OI ≥ 0.8 identified by CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε force-clamp SMD)
are listed by the TCR chains, secondary regions, and residue numbers to which they belong,
together with their prior structural identification and reported functional roles. Residues in brackets
have RD-OI ≥ 0.7. Residues in red have increased their occupancy indices by ≥0.3 in the presence
of force.

1262

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

A — Trimer: γε–αβ–δε interface
B — Trimer: γε–αβ interface
C — Trimer: αβ–δε interface
D — Dimer: γε–αβ interface #1
E — Dimer: γε–αβ interface #2
F — Dimer: αβ–δε interface
G — TCRαβ, CD3γε, CD3δε′

Figure 7

Supplementary Figures with Legends

Cooperative ectodomain interaction among TCRαβ, CD3γε and CD3δε

Zhou Yuan[1-3†], Peiwen Cong[1,3†], Aswin Natarajan[4†], Chenghao Ge[1,3†], Stefano Travaglino[1,3], Saikiran Beesam[4], Danielle Grazette[4], Michelle Krogsgaard[4‡], Cheng Zhu[1-3‡]

[1]Wallace H. Coulter Department of Biomedical Engineering, [2]Georgia W. Woodruff School of Mechanical Engineering, [3]Petit Institute for Bioengineering and Bioscience, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, USA; [4]Laura and Isaac Perlmutter Cancer Center and Department of Pathology, New York University Grossman School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA

[†]These authors contributed equally.

[‡]Contact: cheng.zhu@bme.gatech.edu, 1-404-894-3269 or
Michelle.Krogsgaard@nyulangone.org, 212-263-9266,

[a]Present address: Amgen Inc., One Amgen Center Dr., Thousand Oaks, CA, USA

Figure S1

Interactions	Effective 2D affinity A_cK_a (10^{-6} μm^4)	Effective 2D on-rate A_cK_{on} (10^{-5} μm^{4}s^{-1})	2D off-rate k_{off} (s^{-1})
TCRαβ-CD3γε	3.8 ± 0.7	5.3 ± 1.0	14.1 ± 0.1
TCRαβ-CD3δε	2.8 ± 0.6	3.1 ± 0.7	11.1 ± 0.5
CD3γε-CD3δε	11.0 ± 4.4	16.4 ± 6.5	14.9 ± 0.4
TCR - K5:I-E^k	2.2 ± 0.9	0.28 ± 0.15	1.3 ± 0.5

Figure S1. Inability for SPR to detect TCR-CD3 3D binding; specificity controls for TCR-CD3 2D binding; kinetics parameters measured by MAF and BFP. Related to Figures 1-3. (A) SIYR:H-2K^b tetramer staining MFI of hybridoma expressing 2C TCR treated with indicated antibodies or antibody fragments. **(B)** 10 μg/mL biotinylated CD3γε and CD3δε were immobilized on streptavidin (SA) sensor chips in a BIACore T200 instrument. 13.1, 26.3, 52.5, 105, or 210 μM TCRαβ were injected over CD3γε (*left*) and CD3δε (*right*) at time = 0 s, and the analyte solution was switched to buffer at 75 s. Analysis of SPR signals by T200 evaluation software 3.0 did not return reliable kinetic parameters. **(C)** Specificity controls for the MAF assay. High adhesion frequencies were observed when both partners of TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and TCRαβ–CD3m interactions were present. Missing either binding partner reduced adhesion frequencies to the background level. **(D)** Effective 2D affinities of homotypic interactions of human CD3γε, CD3δε, and TCRαβ ECDs. **(E)** Specificity controls for the BFP force-clamp and thermal-fluctuation assays. Again, missing either binding partner generated lower adhesion frequencies than those experiments with all binding partners on both sides, which were kept ≤20% to minimize multiple bond events. **(F-H)** The sparse nonspecific bond lifetimes were also generally shorter comparing to those from TCRαβ–CD3γε (*F*), TCRαβ–CD3δε (*G*), and TCRαβ–CD3m (*H*) bond lifetimes. **(I)** Adhesion frequency *vs.* contact duration plot for 2B4 TCR expressing hybridomas interacting with K5:I-E^k coated beads (blue circle). Using SA beads without further pMHC coating to contact the same cells yielded a nonspecific binding curve (black triangle). **(J)** Summary of effective 2D affinities, effective 2D on-rates, and 2D off-rates for TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and CD3δε-CD3γε ECD (purified proteins) interactions, as well as 2B4 TCR (expressed on T hybridoma) interaction with pMHC (K5:I-E^k). Data represent mean ± SD in (*C*) and (*E*), and mean ± SEM in (*D*) and (*I*).

Figure S2

Transition	Rate	$k_{i,j}^{0}$ (1/s)	$x_{i,j}$ (Å)
TCRαβ–CD3γε → 0	$k_{-f,\gamma}$	11.1 ± 0.298	0 ± 0.0685
(TCRαβ–CD3γε)* → 0	$k_{-s,\gamma}$	0.196 ± 0.0228	4.40 ± 0.304
TCRαβ–CD3γε → (TCRαβ–CD3γε)*	$k_{a,\gamma}$	1.60 ± 0.355	1.93 ± 0.801
TCRαβ–CD3γε ← (TCRαβ–CD3γε)*	$k_{-a,\gamma}$	15.0 ± 1.91	- 32.5 ± 2.30
Transition	**Rate**	$k_{i,j}^{0}$ (1/s)	$x_{i,j}$ (Å)
TCRαβ–CD3δε → 0	$k_{-f,\delta}$	11.4 ± 0.162	0 ± 0.0652
(TCRαβ–CD3δε)* → 0	$k_{-s,\delta}$	0.184 ± 0.0412	2.80 ± 0.422
TCRαβ–CD3δε → (TCRαβ–CD3δε)*	$k_{a,\delta}$	1.50 ± 0.316	0 ± 0.504
TCRαβ–CD3δε ← (TCRαβ–CD3δε)*	$k_{-a,\delta}$	8.77 ± 2.49	- 12.3 ± 1.57
Transition	**Rate**	$k_{i,j}^{0}$ (1/s)	$x_{i,j}$ (Å)
CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε → 0	$k_{-f,m}$	0.700 ± 0.204	5.45 ± 0.204
(CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε)* → 0	$k_{-s,m}$	0.0519 ± 0.0196	0 ± 0.859
CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε → (CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε)*	$k_{a,m}$	1.00 ± 0.118	0 ± 0.322
CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε ← (CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε)*	$k_{-a,m}$	21.8 ± 9.82	- 26.7 ± 3.21

Figure S2 | Two-state catch bond models fit the force-dependent lifetime data from experiments. Related to Figure 3. (A) Schematics of three two-state catch bond models with indicated reaction rates for TCRαβ–CD3γε (*left*) and TCRαβ–CD3δε (*middle*) bimolecular interactions, as well as for the case of TCRαβ–CD3m interactions where an additional CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular interaction is included (*right*). The superscript * labels the strong states. **(B-D)** Bond lifetime *vs.* clamp-force data fitted using maximum likelihood estimation. Depending on the Bell parameters, the three kinetic models generate three families of force-lifetime curves for TCRαβ–CD3γε (*B*), TCRαβ–CD3δε (*C*), and TCRαβ–CD3m (*D*) interactions. The likelihoods for data (points) to be observed as predicted (curves) were maximized to obtain the best-fit parameters (except those directly determined fast dissociation rates from BFP thermal fluctuation assay, shown in Fig. S1J), which are listed in (*I*). Parameters so evaluated from global fitting predict mean ± SD curves of 1) bond lifetime *vs.* force, 2) cooperativity index *vs.* force, and 3) normalized survival probability *vs.* lifetime at 4 force bins that well match the corresponding data in Fig. 3E-G, respectively. **(E-G)** Reaction rates *vs.* force plots. The force-dependent rates for fast and slow dissociations as well as for activation and deactivation state transitions are plotted for the TCRαβ–CD3γε (*E*), TCRαβ–CD3δε (*F*), and TCRαβ–CD3m (*G*) reactions according to Equation 14 and the best-fit Bell parameters. The reciprocal apparent reaction rates in g is the sum of individual reciprocal reaction rates for dimeric and trimeric transitions. **(H)** Fractions of strong state *vs.* force plots for TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and TCRαβ–CD3m interactions. **(I)** Summary of the best-fit Bell parameters used to model the TCRαβ–CD3γε (*top*), TCRαβ–CD3δε (*middle*), CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε (*bottom*) dissociations.

Figure S3. Structures used in our studies and MD results. Related to Figure 4. (A) Structural comparisons of the TCRαβ (*left*), CD3γε (*middle*), and CD3δε (*right*) ECDs by superimposing the structures adapted from cryoEM (6JXR) and crystallography (3QJF, 1SY6, and 1CIW, respectively). MD simulations were based on the cryoEM structure, whereas the crystal structures represent the proteins used in experiments. **(B-C)** 200-ns CMD trajectories of contact areas (*B*) and free energy scores (*C*) between TCRαβ and CD3γε (blue), CD3δε (orange), and both (red), analyzed using Gromacs 2019 sasa tool (*B*) and Autodock Vina 1.1.2 (*C*), respectively. **(D)** Initial structures and pulling geometries. Forces were applied to the TCRα N-termini away from the anchored C-termini of CD3γε (*left*), CD3δε (*middle*), and both CD3γε and CD3δε (*right*). **(E-F)** SMD trajectories of minimum distances (E) and pulling distances (*F*) between TCRαβ and CD3γε (blue), CD3δε (orange), and both (red) under 150 (*top*), 175 (*middle*), and 200 (*bottom*) pN. The minimum distance marks the minimal value among all possible pairwise distances between the atoms of the two interacting ECDs. The abrupt increase in the minimum distance indicates dissociation. The pulling distance reports the point-to-point extension between the center-of-mass of the pulling residues and anchor residues in (*D*). The force-extension curves reflect distinctive pulling characteristics (*i.e.*, different interdomain arrangements and elastic responses) in the partially and fully assembled TCR-CD3 complexes. **(G)** Rupture forces at bond dissociation by constant-velocity pulling (force-ramp SMD) on the TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε and CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε ECD complexes. Ramp forces were applied on the same sites, along the same directions as in (*D*) through a 70pN/nm spring at a velocity of 1 nm/ns to accelerate TCR-CD3 dissociations. Data represent mean ± SEM. p-values were obtained using unpaired Student t-tests.

Figure S4A-C

Figure S4. RR-OI matrices, RD-OI profiles, and hydrogen bonds at the TCRαβ–CD3 interfaces. Related to Figure 5. (A-C) Matrices display the RR-OI of TCRαβ *vs.* CD3s residue pairs of the CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimeric complex. Rows correspond to the TCR residue indices of Cα and Cβ chains from N to C-termini. Columns match the CD3 residue indices aligned from N- to C-termini of CD3δ, ε', ε, and γ chains. The top and left sidebars present the cumulative values over the columns and rows, respectively, indicating the overall contact level of one-to-many interactions for each residue. Three versions of RR-OI matrices are shown: (*A*) Force-free RR-OI, calculated from CMD dynamics; (*B*) Mean force-clamp RR-OI, averaged over individual RR-OI matrices calculated from force-clamp SMD dynamics of 150, 175, and 200 pN; and (*C*) Differential RR-OI, calculated by subtracting (B) from (A). The color coding is such that red indicates force enhancement and blue indicates force suppression of pairwise residue contacts. **(D)** RD-OI profiles of contacting ECDs in TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε complexes from CMD simulations. **(E)** Differential RD-OI profiles of contacting ECDs in TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε, and CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε complexes, calculated from subtracting d from Fig. 4C. Positive values represent force enhancement, and negative values represent force suppression of the residue contact against its interacting domains. **(F)** The instantaneous hydrogen (H) bond count between TCRαβ and CD3γε (*left*), CD3δε (*middle*), and both (*right*) were tracked throughout SMD simulations. A H-bond was identified by <3.5 Å distance between Donor (*D*) and Acceptor (*A*) atoms and a *D-H-A* angle of $180° \pm 30°$. H bonds were summarized using the mean of total H-bond numbers in the start (first 1 ns), middle (remaining), and end (last 1 ns) periods under 100, 125, 150, 175, and 200 pN forces for dimeric interactions in (*A*) and (*B*), and 150, 175, and 200 pN forces for trimeric interactions in (*C*). The hydrogen bonds were analyzed using Gromacs 2019 hbond program.

Figure S5. Model of TCR triggering facilitated by force-enhanced TCRαβ–CD3 interaction. Force on TCRαβ via engaged pMHC elicits catch bond formation to prolong its lifetime. The information embedded in the ligand is encoded by force and transmitted from the pMHC through the TCRαβ to CD3s via interactions of the ECDs, CPs, and transmembrane segments to regulate phosphorylation of the ITAMs in the CD3 cytoplasmic domains. *Top*: In the absence of cooperativity, the ECD interactions of TCRαβ with CD3γε and CD3δε are suboptimal and force only elicits two short-lived bimolecular catch bonds that dissociate before the longer-lived TCRαβ–pMHC catch bond, preventing the pMHC from inducing adequate TCR signaling. *Bottom*- The cooperative ECD binding of TCRαβ with CD3γε and CD3δε generates a greatly enhanced catch bond that enables force to prolong the CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε trimolecular bond lifetimes to match those of the TCRαβ–pMHC catch bond, allowing the pMHC to induce appropriate TCR signaling.

Legends for Supplementary Videos and Tables

Supplementary Video 1 | 200 ns CMD simulation of a TCRαβ–CD3γε complex, with the initial TCRαβ (*gray*) and CD3γε (*blue*) configurations modified from the cryoEM structure (6JXR).
Supplementary Video 2 | 200 ns CMD simulation of a TCRαβ–CD3δε complex, with the initial TCRαβ (*gray*) and CD3δε (*orange*) configurations modified from the cryoEM structure (6JXR).
Supplementary Video 3 | 200 ns CMD simulations of a CD3γε-CD3δε complex, with the initial CD3γε (*blue*) and CD3δε (*orange*) configuration modified from the cryoEM structure (6JXR).
Supplementary Video 4 | 200 ns CMD simulation of a CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε complex, with the initial TCRαβ (*gray*), CD3γε (*blue*), and CD3δε (*orange*) configurations modified from the cryoEM structure (6JXR).
Supplementary Video 5 | Force-clamp SMD simulation of TCRαβ–CD3γε dissociation under 175 pN. Forces were applied to TCRαβ (*gray*) at the TCRα N-terminus (*red sphere*) and CD3γε (*blue*) was anchored at the ε-chain C-terminus (*blue sphere*). SMD was initiated from equilibrated structures extracted from CMD, and ended soon after the complex dissociation at ~29.4 ns.
Supplementary Video 6 | Force-clamp SMD simulation of TCRαβ–CD3δε dissociation under 175 pN. Forces were applied to TCRαβ (*gray*) at the TCRα N-terminus (*red sphere*) and CD3δε (*orange*) was anchored at the ε-chain C-terminus (*orange sphere*). SMD was initiated from equilibrated structures extracted from CMD, and ended soon after complex dissociation at ~5.2 ns.
Supplementary Video 7 | Force-clamp SMD simulation of CD3δε–TCRαβ–CD3γε dissociation under 175 pN. Forces were applied to TCRαβ (*gray*) at the TCRα N-terminus (*red sphere*), and CD3γε (*blue*) and CD3δε (*orange*) were anchored at both ε-chain C-termini (*blue* and *orange spheres*). SMD was initiated from equilibrated structures extracted from CMD, and ended soon after complex dissociation at ~403.9 ns.
Supplementary Video 8 | Interface residues between TCRαβ (*gray*) and CD3γε (*blue*). Dynamic RD-OI thresholding (*bottom*) was applied and only contact residues with above threshold RD-OI values were shown from white to red according to dynamic colormap below.
Supplementary Video 9 | Interface residues between TCRαβ (*gray*) and CD3δε (*orange*). Dynamic RD-OI thresholding (*bottom*) was applied and only contact residues with above threshold RD-OI values were shown from white to red according to dynamic colormap below.
Supplementary Video 10 | Interface residues among CD3δε (*orange*), TCRαβ (*gray*), and CD3γε complex (*blue*). Dynamic RD-OI thresholding (*bottom*) was applied and only contact residues with above threshold RD-OI values were shown from white to red according to dynamic colormap below.
Supplementary Video 11 | 3D visualizations of Fig. 5g-i. The full CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε ECD assembly is shown sequentially by rotating presentations: (1) overview of the trimeric complex (TCRαβ in *gray*, CD3γε in *blue*, and CD3δε' in *orange*). Residues with high RD-OI values combined from both SMD and CMD (sum > 1.5) are highlighted using sticks, colored white to red gradually. (2) ΔRD-OI and (3) ΔRMSF profiles between SMD and CMD are shown by colors (*red* for positive, *blue* for negative and *white* for zero values). The sidechains of the residues with the same high combined RD-OI values as Fig. 5g are highlighted in Fig. 5h. The residues' absolute RMSF values are represented by the thickness of the protein backbone in Fig. 5i.

Supplementary Table 1 | **(Sheet A)** Sum and **(Sheet B)** difference of the two TCRαβ to CD3γε and CD3δε' RR-OI matrices obtained from SMD and CMD simulations respectively, showing all the residues, with subunit names, the residue abbreviations and indices labeled. **(Sheet C)** RD-OI value *vs.* index of TCRα and β residue contacting CD3 ECDs, and of CD3γ, ε, ε' and δ residue contacting TCRαβ ECDs in the TCRαβ–CD3γε, TCRαβ–CD3δε' and CD3δε'–TCRαβ–CD3γε complexes.

Supplementary Table 2 | Sum and difference RR-OI indices between key force-stabilizing and force-destabilizing TCR residues and their interacting CD3 residues.