Molecular Mechanisms Underlying Medium-Chain Length Free Fatty Acid-regulated Activity of the Phospholipase PlaF from *P. aeruginosa*

Rocco Gentile[1], Matea Modric[2], Björn Thiele[3], Karl-Erich Jaeger[2,4], Filip Kovacic[2], Holger Gohlke[1,5]

1. Institute for Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Chemistry, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany
2. Institute of Molecular Enzyme Technology, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Forschungzentrum Jülich GmbH, 52425 Jülich, Germany
3. Institute of Bio- and Geosciences (IBG-2: Plant Sciences and IBG-3: Agrosphere), Forschungzentrum Jülich GmbH, 52425 Jülich, Germany
4. Institute of Bio- and Geosciences (IBG-1: Biotechnology), Forschungzentrum Jülich GmbH, 52425 Jülich, Germany
5. Institute of Bio- and Geosciences (IBG-4: Bioinformatics), Forschungzentrum Jülich GmbH, 52425 Jülich, Germany

Running title: Product feedback regulation of Phospholipase A PlaF

Keywords: molecular dynamics simulations, membrane, dimerization, tilting, potential of mean force

*Corresponding author:
Prof. Dr. Holger Gohlke
Institute for Pharmaceutical and Medicinal Chemistry
Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf,
Universitätstr. 1
40225 Düsseldorf, Germany
and
Institute of Bio- and Geosciences (IBG-4: Bioinformatics)
Forschungzentrum Jülich GmbH,
Wilhelm-Johnen-Str.
52425 Jülich, Germany
Email: gohlke@uni-duesseldorf.de or h.gohlke@fz-juelich.de

ABSTRACT

PlaF is a membrane-bound phospholipase A1 from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* that is involved in the
remodeling of the membrane phospholipid composition. It modulates virulence-associated signaling
and metabolic networks, although it remains unclear whether *P. aeruginosa*'s physiological changes are
elicited by altered phospholipid composition or by free fatty acids (FFAs) released from phospholipids.
Previously, we identified that undecanoic acid bound to the active site of PlaF in the crystal structure
inhibits PlaF activity and triggers the formation of PlaF dimers. However, the detailed molecular
mechanism governing the inhibition and dimerization of PlaF by medium-chain length FFAs has
remained elusive. In this study, we used unbiased and biased molecular dynamics simulations and free
energy computations to assess how FFAs localized in different cell compartments can interact with
active and inactive configurations of PlaF and how this may regulate *PlaF* activity. Our results suggest
that medium-chain length FFAs can inhibit PlaF both competitively and non-competetively, in line with
previous experiments. They stabilize inactive dimeric PlaF when localized in the upper membrane
leaflet and enter a tunnel connected to the catalytic triad when localized in the periplasmic space. We
predict mutations for either case to probe these effects experimentally. Our findings support the
suggestion from *in vivo* results shown here and *in vitro* results presented previously that PlaF activity
may be regulated through a product-feedback mechanism. They also open up new perspectives on how
to inhibit PlaF, which has been suggested as a promising target for developing new antibiotics against
P. aeruginosa.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Gram-negative bacterium *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* is an opportunistic pathogen and a frequent cause of nosocomial infections, affecting primarily immune-compromised patients (1, 2). The pathogenicity of *P. aeruginosa* relies on the production of a large spectrum of virulence factors (3). Among these, type A phospholipases (PLA$_1$) are bacterial proteins that can contribute to host membrane damage and trigger the deregulation of various signaling networks in infected cells (4). PLA$_1$ hydrolyzes membrane glycerophospholipids (GPLs) at the *sn*-1 position into lysoglycerophospholipids (LGPLs) and free fatty acids (FFAs) (5, 6). GPLs are membrane components involved in cellular integrity and membrane protein stability (7). The alteration of the membrane GPL composition has been linked to the biofilm formation and growth phase transitions in *P. aeruginosa* (1, 2, 8).

PlaF is a newly discovered transmembrane phospholipase A1 (PLA1) of *P. aeruginosa* that contributes to the virulence of this bacterium and is involved in the modulation of the pathogen membrane composition (3, 4). A crystal structure of PlaF, combined with homodimerization studies by crosslinking, micro-scale thermophoresis experiments, and molecular simulations has revealed that PlaF can adopt both monomeric and dimeric configurations **(Figure 1)** (5)**.** However, only the monomeric state of the protein was found to be catalytically active. The crystal structure revealed a homodimer characterized by interactions between the transmembrane (TM) and juxtamembrane (JM) regions between the single monomers. The crystal structure contains the co-crystallized endogenous ligands myristic acid (MYR) and undecanoic acid (11A) in the catalytic site of each monomer (5).

Free energy computations (9) and experiments indicated that, at physiological protein concentrations, the equilibrium between the PlaF dimer and the monomers is shifted to the latter side (5). Unbiased molecular dynamics simulations (10) showed that the PlaF monomer undergoes a tilting motion in the membrane, bringing the opening of the catalytic tunnel in close vicinity to the membrane (5). In the dimeric form, the tunnel entrance resides more than 5 Å above the membrane's upper leaflet, thus hampering phospholipid substrate access from the membrane (5). Moreover, free energy computations revealed that the tilted state (t-PlaF) of the monomeric PlaF is energetically more favorable than the non-tilted one. As a result, it has been suggested that this tilting motion underlies the activation of the monomeric PlaF by facilitating substrate access to the active site tunnel (5).

In addition to the previously mentioned tunnel (T1), two other tunnels (T2 and T3) were identified, connecting the active site to the surface of PlaF (11). Unbiased MD simulations showed that myristic acid (MYR), the hydrolysis product of 1-myristoyl-2-hydroxy-*sn*-glycerol-3-phosphoglycerol (2LMG), a lysophospholipid, relocates from T3 and reaches the entrance of T1. Interestingly, MYR is also found in T1 in the crystal structure of PlaF (5, 11). Accordingly, the fatty acid can reach the membrane, where it might modify its composition and properties. Furthermore, the FFA might carry out its role as a signal molecule of the diffusible signal factor (DSF) or oxylipin autoinducer (12) families, important for bacterial virulence in the pathogen (13).

A recent study showed that medium-sized FFAs (10-14 carbon atoms) inhibit PlaF activity according to a mixed inhibition mode and that they lead to an increase in the PlaF dimer concentration (5). Experiments also revealed that FFAs with 10-14 carbon atoms can inhibit PlaF in competitive inhibition assays (5). We hypothesize that the FFAs inhibit PlaF activity in two ways: I) when located in the membrane, they impact the dimer-monomer equilibrium and/or the tilting transition, that way acting as an allosteric inhibitor; II) when located in the periplasmic space, they enter T3 and reach the active site, that way acting as a competitive inhibitor **(Figure 1).** However, the detailed molecular mechanisms that govern the PlaF inhibition by FFAs have remained elusive.

To investigate such mechanisms, we combine unbiased and biased all-atom molecular dynamics (MD) simulations (14) and configurational free energy computations (9) to evaluate the effect of FFAs on the structural dynamics and energetics of the PlaF dimer-monomer transition and the monomer tilting. To

101 reveal hot spot residues potentially involved in the interaction of FFAs with PlaF, we used MM-PBSA
102 endpoint free energy calculations (15). Additionally, we pursue free ligand diffusion MD simulations
103 (16) and binding free energy computations (9) of FFAs located in the water phase near the catalytic
104 domain of PlaF. The identification of FFA binding site(s) involved in PlaF inhibition might help to
105 design novel drugs against *P. aeruginosa*.
106

107
Figure 1. Dimer-monomer equilibrium of PlaF, monomer tilting, and putative influence by FFA. PlaF is anchored to
the inner membrane through a transmembrane (TM) region (grey) containing lipophilic residues and a juxtamembrane (JM)
region (yellow) that is in close contact with the polar heads of the phospholipid membrane when PlaF is tilted. This region is
rich in polar and charged residues. The C-terminal region (green, violet, pink) points towards the periplasm. It is characterized
by an α/β hydrolase fold and contains the catalytic triad (Ser, Asp, His) that catalyzes the GPL hydrolysis. PlaF can adopt a
dimeric or monomeric configuration (left), and the monomer can tilt (right). The tilted monomer is considered the active form
(5). FFA may influence the dimer-monomer equilibrium (I) and/or the tilting transition (II) and/or enter PlaF from the
periplasm (III). GPL1, glycerophospholipid; lyso-GPL1, lysoglycerophospholipid; C10 FFA, decanoic acid.

2. RESULTS

2.1 Medium-chain Fatty Acids are Detected in *P. aeruginosa* in Free Form and Likely Originate from Phospholipid Hydrolysis

Our previous lipidomics analysis by Q-TOF MS/MS revealed that the alteration of the membrane phospholipid composition in *P. aeruginosa* is linked to PlaF-mediated degradation of several phospholipids (PLs), including three PLs containing medium-chain FAs: phosphatidylglycerol (PG) 24:3, phosphatidylethanolamine (PE) 22:1, and phosphatidylinositol (PI) 26:0 (5). In this study, we analyzed if medium-chain FFAs can be identified in *P. aeruginosa* wild-type (WT) and an isogenic *plaF* mutant (Δ*plaF*) with reduced PL degradation. To achieve this, we extracted FFAs from cells and supernatant of both strains using organic solvent and quantified the saturated FFAs with acyl chains of six to 16 carbon atoms by GC-MS. The results showed that both *P. aeruginosa* strains produced various intracellularly and extracellularly located saturated FFAs **(Figure 2)**. As anticipated, the long-chain FFAs were the most abundant, while medium-chain FFAs (C8, C9, C10, C12, and C14) accounted for roughly 10 to 15 % of the total FFA amount. No significant differences in the abundance of cell-associated FFAs between the WT and Δ*plaF* were observed, suggesting that FFAs released by PlaF are either metabolized or secreted into the supernatant. We identified that medium-chain FFAs, namely octanoic (C8), decanoic (C10), dodecanoic (C12), and myristic (C14) acids, were significantly less abundant ($p < 0.05$) in the supernatant of Δ*plaF* than the WT.

To further explore the possibility that PlaF releases the identified medium-chain FAs from PLs, we conducted a re-analysis of our published lipidomics results obtained with the Δ*plaF* mutant (5). Our previous analysis had assessed PLs at the species level, meaning that only information about the total number of carbon atoms in the acyl chains but not their specific identities were obtained. Thus, we focused on PL species with up to 24 carbon atoms in their acyl chains, as they likely contain at least one medium-length acyl chain (**Table S1**). Our results showed that the *P. aeruginosa* membrane contains 56 different medium-chain length PLs out of a total of 324 identified PL species (**Table S1**). A comparison of the amount of medium-chain length PLs relative to the total PL amount in WT and Δ*plaF* revealed that more (20.8 %) medium-chain length PLs were identified in the Δ*plaF* mutant than the WT (12.6 %) (**Table S2**). These results suggest that medium-chain length PLs could potentially be the source of the suggested FFAs, generated by PlaF-catalyzed hydrolysis.

The GC-MS analysis revealed an interesting finding: the extracellular C8 FFA amount was nearly double ($p < 0.001$) that of the intracellular amount in both the WT and Δ*plaF* strains, suggesting that this FA is primarily secreted into the supernatant. In contrast, dodecanoic acid, the second FFA identified as a potential product of PlaF-catalyzed PL hydrolysis, was significantly ($p < 0.001$) more abundant in the cells of Δ*plaF* than the WT. These results reveal that the distribution of FFAs, whether they are intracellular or extracellular, is dependent on their chain length. This suggests that some FFAs may have a function as extracellularly secreted compounds, such as signaling messengers, while others may be primarily used intracellularly, such as for energy production.

To conclude, the quantification results of FFAs further strengthen the suggested *in vivo* function of PlaF in degrading PLs containing medium-length acyl chains. Previous *in vitro* results indicated that released FFAs may regulate PlaF activity through a product-feedback mechanism (5).

2.2   Free Fatty Acids in the Membrane may Facilitate the Tilting of PlaF Monomers

We performed all-atom unbiased MD simulations (14) of monomeric PlaF with FFA molecules as
membrane components, considering either the orientation of PlaF as obtained after splitting the
membrane-embedded PlaF dimer (s-PlaF) or the tilted orientation obtained for the monomer with OPM
(17, 18) (t-PlaF). For each PlaF configuration, two membrane systems were examined, in which
decanoic acid (C10) or myristic acid (C14) was inserted in the upper leaflet of the inner phospholipidic
membrane, resulting in a DOPE:DOPG:FFA composition of 3:1:1. This corresponds to the addition of
25 FFA molecules to either system and a 20 mol% FFA fraction in the upper leaflet. For each system,
12 replicas were simulated, each 1 μs in length. The results were compared with those obtained with a
membrane composition without FFAs (DOPE:DOPG 3:1) (5).
When starting from the s-PlaF orientation, a comparable number of transitions to the t-PlaF orientation
("tilting") was observed for both systems containing FFAs (9/12 vs. 10/12) **(Figure 3)**, indicating that
the latter orientation is preferred and the chain length has no influence on the tilting preference. The
presence of FFAs may facilitate the tilting, however, as only 5/10 (8/10) transitions were observed after
1 (2) μs of simulation time for the system without FFAs (5). As before (5), when starting from the t-
Plaf orientation, no transition to the s-PlaF orientation was observed **(Figure 3)**, supporting that the

former orientation is preferred. Extending the MD simulations to 2 μs does not lead to transitions in
this case either **(Figure S1)**.

181
Figure 3. Unbiased MD simulations of monomeric PlaF in the presence of FFA in the upper leaflet (DOPE:DOPG:FFA
of 3:1:1). (A) Left: Time course of the orientation of monomeric PlaF with respect to the membrane starting from the PlaF$_A$
configuration as observed in the structure (*s*-PlaF, see the top of the figure) in the presence of decanoic acid (C10). In 9 of 12
replicas, the monomer ends in a tilted configuration (marked with *). Right: When starting from t-PlaF (see the top of the
figure), the structure remains tilted in all cases. As before (5), this shows a significant tendency of the monomer to tilt
(McNemar's $\chi^2 = 6.125$, $p = 0.013$). The monomer orientation is quantified by the angle between the membrane normal and
the vector between the COM of residues 21–25 and residues 35–38. **(B)** As in panel A, but now with myristic acid (C14). In
10 of 12 replicas, the monomer ends in a tilted configuration (marked with *), again showing a significant tendency of the
monomer to tilt compared to when starting from the t-PlaF orientation (McNemar's $\chi^2 = 8.100$, $p = 0.004$).
191
2.3   Free Fatty Acids Favor Monomer Tilting but Disfavor Dimer Dissociation

To determine the effect of FFAs in the upper leaflet on the energetics of the PlaF dimer-to-monomer
and s-PlaF-to-t-PlaF transitions, we performed umbrella sampling (US) simulations (19) to compute
potentials of mean force (PMF) (20). As the chain length showed little influence on the tilting behavior
in the unbiased MD simulations, we considered the membrane system with DOPE:DOPG:C10 for this
purpose. The US simulations were performed as in ref. (5), starting from the monomer orientation as in
the crystal structure (s-PlaF). The distance between the top of the JM domain (COM of residues 33-37)
and the membrane center was used as a reaction coordinate to track the tilting transition. For the dimer-
to-monomer transition, we started from the dimer configuration as found in the crystal structure and
used the distance between the COM residues 25-38 of each chain as a reaction coordinate. For the tilting
transition, 40 windows were sampled with 800 ns of sampling time each, of which the first 640 ns were
discarded as equilibration. Likewise, for the dimer-to-monomer transition, 71 windows were sampled
with 800 ns of sampling time each, of which the first 640 ns were discarded as equilibration. In both
cases, the kernel densities showed a median overlap of $34.9 \pm 1.4\%$ and $32.2 \pm 1.5\%$ between contiguous

windows, respectively **(Figures S7 and S8)**, well suited for PMF calculations (21). The error was
estimated by focusing on the last 160 ns of each window and calculating the standard error of the mean
from free energy profiles determined independently every 20 ns.

The PMF of the titling transition is converged and precise **(Figure S7)**. In the presence of 20% C10
FFAs in the membrane, the tilted orientation is preferred over the split orientation **(Figure 4A)**, which
is similar to results without FFA in the membrane (5). Unlike in the case without FFAs in the membrane
(5), however, the tilted configuration reveals a more pronounced, ~4 kcal mol^{-1} more favorable basin.
Additionally, another local minimum appeared where a barrier previously separated the split and tilted
configurations in the system without FFA. These results are in accordance with the unbiased MD
simulations, which indicated that the tilted configuration is preferred and that the transition to it is
facilitated in the presence of FFAs.

The PMF for the dimer-to-monomer transition was computed considering two membrane compositions
with 20 mol% and 30 mol% of FFA in the upper leaflet. The PMFs are converged and precise **(Figures
S8 and S9)**. As in the case without FFA (5), dimeric PlaF is favored over the monomeric state in the
presence of FFAs **(Figure 4B)**. However, the presence of FFA stabilizes the dimeric state in a
concentration-dependent manner by ~10 and ~14 kcal mol^{-1} compared to no FFA.

To conclude, FFAs in the upper leaflet favor the tilting of the PlaF monomer and stabilize the PlaF
dimer in a concentration-dependent manner **(Figure 4C)**.

224
Figure 4. (A) Potential of mean force of monomer tilting. The distance between the COM of Cα atoms of residues 33–37
and the COM of the C18 of the oleic acid moieties of all lipids in the membrane was used as a reaction coordinate. Orange:
PMF for the membrane composition in the upper leaflet of DOPE:DOPG 3:1 (values were taken from ref. (5)). Blue: PMF
computed here for the membrane composition in the upper leaflet of DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1. The shaded areas show the
standard error of the mean (SEM). The yellow dot indicates the s-PlaF orientation, and the red dot the t-PlaF orientation. **(B)**
Potential of mean force of dimer separation. The distance between the COM of Cα atoms of residues 25-38 of each chain
was used as the reaction coordinate. Orange: PMF for the membrane composition in the upper leaflet of DOPE:DOPG 3:1
(values were taken from ref. (5)). Blue: PMF computed here for the membrane composition in the upper leaflet of
DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1. Magenta: PMF computed here for the membrane composition in the upper leaflet of
DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:2. The shaded areas show the SEM. The black protein on the top show the PlaF dimer at ~9.9 Å, and
the yellow ones show the completely dissociated PlaF at ~45 Å. **(C) PMF values at the respective global minima of panel
B (see dashed lines there)** as a function of the C10 concentration in the upper leaflet. The shaded areas around each dot show
the SEM at the corresponding minimum.

238
2.4 Estimating the ratio of monomeric and dimeric PlaF in the cell in the presence of free fatty
acids

Following previous work by us (5, 22) and others (23), we computed from the PMFs of dimer-to-
monomer and tilting transitions with an upper leaflet composition of DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1

equilibrium constants (K_a = 1.68 x 10^{14} (eq. S1), K_x = 2.59 x 10^{12} (eq. S2), $K_{tilting}$ = 1.73 x 10^2 (eq. S5))
and free energies (ΔG = - 17.04 ± 0.22 (eq. S3), $\Delta G_{tilting}$ = - 3.04 ± 0.20 (eq. S6)), taking into account
that K_x and ΔG relate to a state of one PlaF dimer in a membrane of 1258 lipids, according to our
simulations setup. Experimentally, a concentration of one PlaF dimer per ~3786 lipids in *P. aeruginosa*
PlaF-overexpressing cells was determined (24). However, the concentration in *P. aeruginosa* WT is
likely 100- to 1000-fold lower. Under such physiological conditions and considering that the equilibria
for dimer-to-monomer transition and tilting are coupled, between 2.3 and 7.3% of the PlaF molecules
are predicted to be in a monomeric, tilted, catalytically active state in *P. aeruginosa* when 20 mol%
C10 FFAs are present in the upper leaflet. In the absence of FFAs, between 74% and 96% of the PlaF
molecules were predicted to be in a monomeric, tilted, catalytically active state in *P. aeruginosa* (5).

Vice versa, in the presence of FFA, 92.7 to 97.7% of PlaF are in the dimeric configuration, whereas this
are only 4 to 26% in the absence of FFA (5). The computed increase in the PlaF dimer concentration
agrees with previous global DMP-crosslinking experiments that showed an increased d-PlaF
concentration in C10-treated samples (5).

2.5 Hot spots of d-PlaF – FFA Interactions in the Upper Leaflet

To characterize interactions between FFA in the upper leaflet (DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1) and PlaF that
may favor dimer formation, we extracted snapshots from the trajectories of unbiased MD simulations
across 12 multiple replicas where FFA are located ≤ 6 Å away from the protein and that have an
RMSD < 1.5 Å to the previous pose (see Supplementary results). These poses were selected as stably
bound poses and clustered with respect to the minimum distance ε between the clusters used as the
cluster criterion. Starting from ε = 2.0 Å, we gradually increased ε in 0.5 Å intervals until the population
of the largest cluster remained unchanged (ε = 5.0 Å).
The five most populated clusters cover 80.5 ± 1.5% (mean ± SEM) of all snapshots with FFA close to
the protein and 65.8 ± 1.3% of all snapshots in a trajectory **(Figure 5A)**. Over these clusters, potential
interacting residues are identified based on a distance cutoff of ≤ 6.0 Å from the FFA clusters **(Figure
5B)**. These residues comprise more positively charged than negatively charged ones and are exclusively
located in the lid-like domain, where their sidechains can interact with the head groups of the FFA.
(Figure 5B). These residues are suggested to be important for the stabilizing effect of FFA on the PlaF
dimer and shall be validated by mutagenesis and biochemical studies.

Figure 5. Hot spots of d-PlaF – FFA interactions when FFA are in the upper leaflet (DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1). (A) Average density map of all C10 molecules. Top panel: Average density map of the entire C10 computed with CPPTRAJ (25); bottom panel: Average density map of the entire C10 molecules, shown from a 90° view. The fatty acids are close to both monomers in similar proportions. (B) Hot spots of FFA binding to PlaF where C10 is ≤ 6 Å away from d-PlaF and has an RMSD < 1.5 with respect to the previous pose. The negatively and positively charged hot spots are shown in red and blue sticks, respectively, while non-polar ones are reported in yellow sticks. The hot spots are localized on the lid-like (LL) domains of the two monomers and are suggested for mutagenesis studies. Of the lower panels, the top one is a blow-up of the interaction region marked as the dashed box. Below, two examples of FFA poses are reported. The left panel indicates the interaction of C10 with E216 and R217. The right panel indicates the interaction of C10 with R187. This is also an example of how interactions can involve a single fatty acid and multiple residues of PlaF. The fatty acid is reported as white spheres and residues as sticks.

2.6 Free Fatty Acids in the Periplasmic Space Interact with t-PlaF Primarily via Entering T3

Previous inhibition assays with FFA added to the soluble fraction in a 7.5 mM concentration revealed that the inhibition potency of FFAs on PlaF esterase activity increased with increasing FFA acyl chain length (in the range of 10-14 carbon atoms) (5). To understand how FFA in the water phase (mimicking the periplasmic space under physiological conditions) can influence PlaF activity, we investigated if such FFAs can bind to t-PlaF with all-atom MD simulations of free ligand diffusion (FLD) of 1 μs length (16). t-PlaF was embedded in a membrane with the composition DOPE:DOPG 3:1 mimicking the phospholipid composition of the *P. aeruginosa* inner membrane (5, 8). Furthermore, 10 molecules of FFA with chain lengths of 5 (valeric acid (VAC-C5)), 10 (capric acid (CAP-C10)), or 15 (pentadecanoic acid (PEN-C15)) carbon atoms were added in the water phase, resulting in concentrations of 30 mM in the solvation box each. A higher concentration than the experimentally used one was chosen to increase the probability of observing events of FFA binding to and dissociation from t-PlaF. As this concentration is above the CMC for each of the FFA (26), we monitored by visual inspection of the trajectories that no fatty acid aggregates formed.

For each of the three systems, 12 replicas were performed, and binding and unbinding events of the FFA were monitored **(Figure 6A)**. We identified an FFA as "bound" if it is within a distance < 15 Å from the T3 entrance (COM of residues K170, Q234, Y236) and has an RMSD < 1.5 Å to the previous pose (see Supplementary results) (11). Density maps of FFAs around t-PlaF show that FFAs tend to gather in T3, which connects the catalytic center to the periplasmic space **(Figure 6B)**. T3 has previously been suggested to play a role in relocating substrates within the catalytic center, which is necessary for the PLA1 activity of PlaF (11). Furthermore, it has been hypothesized that FFA may leave PlaF via T3 after lipid cleavage (11).

C5 molecules showed almost no binding into T3 (2.5 % binding events across all replicas). C5 inhibits PlaF to only 10.1 ± 2.3% (5). C10 and C15 showed a comparable number of binding events to T3 **(**26.7 and 27.5 %, respectively), **Figure 6A)**. Of these, ~80.0% access T3 in either case. In most instances, the FFA tail enters T3 first (**Figure 6C-D**), which is compatible with the mostly hydrophobic composition of T3 (11). In contrast to the similar binding behavior of C10 and C15 in FLD simulations, C10 inhibits PlaF activity more strongly (74.3 ± 3.3 %) than C15 (41.3 ± 2.2%) (5).

316
Figure 6. Free ligand diffusion MD simulations show access of FFA molecules to T3. (A) Binding events of C5 (orange),
C10 (blue), and C15 (pink) FFAs to T3. Bound FFA poses were selected using a cut-off of 15 Å from the COM of K170,
Q234, and Y236, considered as T3 entrance. **(B) 3D density maps representing the probability density of the valeric acid**
(C5, orange), capric acid (C10, blue), and pentadecanoic acid (C15, magenta) positions around t-PlaF (grey cartoon
representation). The entire FFA was used in the density map calculations. The colors scale is compatible to panel (A). The
FFA poses were clustered during the free ligand diffusion MD simulations**.** T3 is represented with a grey surface and was
computed using CAVER 3.0. The catalytic triad is reported as purple sticks in the dashed box. **(C) The representative binding**
mode of C10 of the top cluster of C10 inside T3; the cluster comprises 51.8 ± 0.3% of all bound C10 configurations. T3 was
computed with CAVER 3.0 and represented as a grey surface. The C10 fatty acid is shown with blue spheres. The catalytic
triad is shown with brown spheres. The rest of the T3 residues are shown with yellow sticks, except for R233 reported with
blue sticks. **(D) The representative binding mode of C15 of the top cluster of C15 inside T3**; the cluster comprises
54.3 ± 0.3% of all bound C15 configurations. The C15 fatty acid is reported with pink spheres; all else is as in panel C.

2.7 Tail-first Access of C10 into T3 is Energetically Favorable

As a prerequisite to computing the energetics of binding of C10 to the T3 of PlaF, we validated if C10 access via the tail is favorable. We applied steered MD (sMD) simulations (27) to pull FFAs from the bound state obtained during FLD MD simulations (2.4) to the unbound state outside T3. The transition pathway will be later used to define reference points for umbrella sampling (US) simulations to compute a PMF of tunnel egress. A bound FFA (**Table S3** (t-PlaF(III): CAP-1127)) of replica 4 of the FLD MD simulations was chosen as a representative pose. The terminal carbon atom of C10 was considered for pulling from a distance of 3.4 Å to the catalytic oxygen of S137 to 13.1 Å, where it is in the solvent. The FFA was pulled through four consecutive virtual points **(Figure 7B)**; the virtual points were chosen such that the entire egress pathway was described as done before (11). The distance between the pulled C-terminal carbon atom and the virtual point was used as a reaction coordinate. For each step, we repeated the pulling 50 times and computed the work done as a function of the reaction coordinate, as done in previous work (11). By applying Jarzynski's relation (eq. 1) (28), the work was related to the free energy difference between the respective two states along the transition pathway.

$$\overline{e^{-W/kT}} = e^{-\Delta F/kT} \tag{1}$$

The sMD trajectory whose work-*versus*-reaction coordinate profile is closest to the Jarzynski average was identified as the most favorable transition pathway (11) **(Figure S14)**. Its endpoint provided the starting point for the sMD simulations in the next part of the transition pathway. As a result, the transition pathway is close to the lowest-free energy pathway of fatty acid egress from the catalytic site to the periplasmic space. Overall, this approach is the reversed version of sampling unbinding trajectories of ligands from proteins before applying Jarzynski's relation (29-31) but uses piecewise sMD simulations along the pathway to account for the curvilinear tunnel. A total of 1.15 μs of sMD simulation time was used for T3.

PMFs were computed from US simulations along the above-determined transition pathway (19) and post-processed with WHAM (32, 33) to evaluate the energetics of fatty acid egress. As a reaction coordinate, the distance between the terminal carbon atom of C10 to the side-chain oxygen of the catalytic residue S137 was used. 24 windows were sampled with 260 ns of sampling time each, of which the first 100 ns were discarded as equilibration. In both cases, the kernel densities showed a median overlap of $33.6 \pm 3.1\%$ between contiguous windows, well suited for PMF calculations (21). The PMF of tunnel egress is converged and precise **(Figure S10)**. It reveals the presence of an energetic global minimum associated with the bound state (state I in **Figure 7B**), which is ~4 kcal mol^{-1} more favorable than the unbound state (state IV in **Figure 7B**), with a binding free energy ΔG°_{comp} = -3.17 ± 0.15 kcal mol^{-1} for the fatty acid computed according to eq. 2 (11) (20) **(Figure 7A)**. Hence, tail-first access of C10 to T3 is energetically favorable. The presence of the FFA in T3 can prevent that T3 is occupied by a fatty acid tail of a GPL or lysophospholipid from the opposite direction, as was suggested previously as a prerequisite for the ester group to reach the catalytic residues (11).

367
Figure 7. PMF profile of C10 egress through T3 in the t-PlaF configuration (A) and corresponding states (B). The
entrance of tunnel T3 is located > 35 Å above the membrane, pointing into the periplasmic space. C10 is pulled from the bound
state through T3 into the water phase mimicking the periplasmic space. The catalytic site is marked with a dotted red box. The
red-shaded area around the curve represents the SEM. The red-shaded box corresponds to the integration limits used to
calculate K_{eq} (eq. 2 (11) (20)) to determine ΔG°_{comp} (see 4.12). State I: Starting position of C10 (in the bound state). State II:
C10 tail reaches half of the tunnel. State III: C10 tail is close to the tunnel interface with the periplasmic space. State IV: C10
reaches the end of the T3. The C10 molecule is surrounded by water.

2.8   Tryptophan Substitutions in T3 are suggested to Block FFA Access

To validate the prediction that T3 is the preferred pathway for FFA entering from the water phase, we
used Trp substitutions within T3 previously identified (11) that should constrict the tunnel and, thus,
block competitive PlaF inhibition. Earlier, this strategy was used to block tunnels of dehalogenases (34)
and PlaF (11) with respect to substrate access. The PlaF variants had been predicted such that they
minimize the structural destabilization due to a Trp substitution and preferentially occur at sites within
T3 that influence the tunnel's geometry (**Table 1**) (11). To strengthen the impact on the tunnel
geometry, double substitutions were selected in addition to single ones (**Table S5**).

We then performed MD simulations of free ligand diffusion of C10 to register binding events to T3.
C10 was considered bound if the criteria described in section 2.5 are fulfilled. The results revealed a
decrease in the C10 binding to T3 in the single Trp variants compared to wildtype, which decreased
further in the double variants (**Table 1**). Only a few binding events were observed for the double
variants (7/120 for M166W-R233W and 8/120 for M166W-Y236W). In both the double variants, the
tunnel is apparently too narrow to allow for C10 binding.

TABLE 1. Characteristics of PlaF variants identified from MD simulations of t-PlaF.

PlaF variant	Occurrence[a]	Average bottleneck radius[b,c]	Average length[b,c]	C10 binding events[d]
WT	27.75	2.29 ± 0.32	15.16 ± 3.74	26.67
L177W	28.37	1.70 ± 0.34	18.51 ± 3.91	15.83
F229W	24.78	1.67 ± 0.31	17.77 ± 3.71	18.52
M166W_R233W	21.20	1.62 ± 0.30	17.82 ± 3.89	8.33
M166W_Y236W	23.75	1.69 ± 0.30	18.98 ± 3.47	9.33

[a] Frequency of occurrence of C10 binding to T3; in %.
[b] Data was calculated with CAVER using a probe radius of 1.2 Å.
[c] In Å; in addition to the average, the SD is given.
[d] Proportion of binding of C10 to the T3 entrance (COM of K170, Q234, Y236) along 1 μs of FLD MD simulations across 12 different replicas; in %.

3. DISCUSSION

In this study, we assessed at the atomistic level how FFAs localized in different cell compartments can interact with active and inactive configurations of PlaF and how this may regulate *PlaF* activity.

Initially, we probed how FFAs can regulate the PlaF dimer-to-monomer and tilting transitions when they are localized in the upper membrane leaflet. Our MD simulations indicate that FFAs stabilize the inactive d-PlaF configuration, which is in accordance with DMP-crosslinking experiments (5). Surprisingly, we found evidence that the FFAs also favor the t-PlaF configuration and facilitate the tilting process. The latter may be explained by a potential reduction of the membrane viscosity when small FFAs are added as membrane components (35). This non-specific effect may also explain why the chain length of the FFA (C10 versus C14) barely affects the tilting. Based on computed free energies of association and tilting, and taking into account the concentration range of PlaF in *P. aeruginosa*, PlaF preferentially exists as inactive d-PlaF in the cytoplasmic membrane in the presence of FFAs. Thereby, higher C10 concentrations stabilize d-PlaF more. The stabilization is likely due to favorable interactions of FFAs with predominantly positively charged residues exclusively located in the lid-like domain of PlaF.

Previously, we showed that FFAs inhibit PlaF activity according to a mixed inhibition kinetics mechanism (5). The effects on PlaF dimerization and tilting due to FFAs located in the upper leaflet can contribute to the non-competitive component of this mechanism. To scrutinize if FFAs localized in the water phase (equivalent to the periplasmic space in *P. aeruginosa*) can exert a competitive inhibition, we performed FLD simulations. They showed that C10 and C15 FFAs can bind to active t-PlaF via T3 previously identified (11) with energetically favorable tail-first access. The FFA tail can reach close to the catalytic triad, which may interfere with substrate binding. C5 FFAs showed almost no binding. Notably, these results are concordant with our previous experimental results that medium-chain length FFAs added to *P. aeruginosa* cells inhibit PlaF, whereas no inhibitory effect was shown for shorter FFAs (5). FLD simulations of previously characterized Trp substitutions in T3 (11) suggest that such substitutions block FFA access.

In summary, unbiased and biased MD simulations and free energy computations suggest that medium-chain length FFAs can inhibit PlaF competitively and non-competitively, in line with previous experiments (5): They stabilize inactive d-PlaF when localized in the upper membrane leaflet and enter T3 when localized in the periplasmic space. Notably, our study explicitly suggests mutations for either case to probe these effects experimentally. Our findings support the suggestion from *in vivo* results shown here and *in vitro* results presented previously (5) that PlaF activity may be regulated through a

product-feedback mechanism. They also open up new perspectives on how to inhibit PlaF, which has
been suggested as a promising target for developing new antibiotics against *P. aeruginosa* (5).

4. MATERIALS AND METHODS

4.1 Gas chromatography-mass spectrometric (GC-MS) analysis of FAs extracted from *P.*
aeruginosa

P. aeruginosa PA01 (wild-type, WT) and the Δ*plaF* mutant were cultivated overnight (37 ℃, LB
medium, agitation), and cells were separated from the supernatant, followed by chloroform/methanol
extraction of FFAs, derivatization of FFAs with trimethylsilyl, and quantification by GC-MS as
described in ref. (36).

4.2 Preparation of Starting Structures

The crystal structure of the PlaF dimer is available in the Protein Data Bank (PDB ID 6I8W) (37). The
last five residues of the C-terminus of each monomer missing in the structure were added using
MODELLER (38), and all small molecule ligands were removed. The dimer was oriented in the
membrane using the PPM server (di-PlaF) (17). From that, the "split" s-PlaF configuration of chain A
was generated by removing chain B from the dimer orientation. Additionally, chain A was oriented
using the PPM server, resulting in the tilted configuration t-PlaF. These three starting configurations,
di-PlaF, s-PlaF, and t-PlaF, were embedded into a DOPE:DOPG=3:1 membrane (39) and solvated using
PACKMOL-Memgen (40, 41). The membrane composition resembles that of the native inner
membrane of Gram-negative bacteria (39).
Free fatty acids (FFA) of different chain lengths were added as upper-leaflet components in the
protonated form (42) in two different concentrations; here, "upper" refers to the leaflet pointing to the
periplasmic space. A distance of at least 15 Å between the protein or membrane and the solvent box
boundaries was kept. To obtain a neutral system, counter ions were added that replaced solvent
molecules (KCl 0.15 M). The generated systems are summarized in **Table S3**. The size of the resulting
systems was ∼140,000 atoms for s-PlaF and t-PlaF and ∼185,000 atoms for di-PlaF.

4.3 Unbiased Molecular Dynamics Simulations of PlaF Monomers

The GPU particle mesh Ewald implementation from the AMBER21 suite of molecular simulation
programs (43) with the ff14SB (44) and Lipid14/17 forcefields (45, 46) for the protein and the
membrane lipids, respectively, were used; water molecules and ions were parametrized using the TIP3P
model (47) and the Li and Merz 12-6 ions parameters (48, 49). For the monomer configurations (s-PlaF
and t-PlaF), 12 independent simulations of 1 μs length were performed (**Table S3**). Covalent bonds to
hydrogens were constrained with the SHAKE algorithm (50) in all simulations, allowing the use of a
time step of 2 fs. Details of the thermalization of the simulation systems are given below. All unbiased
MD simulations showed stable protein structures and membrane phases evidenced by electron density
calculations (**Table S3, Figures S2-S5**).

4.4 Relaxation, Thermalization, and Production Runs of the Plaf Monomers.

An initial minimization step was performed with the CPU code of pmemd (51). Each minimization was
organized in four steps of 1000 cycles each, for a total of 4000 cycles of minimization. Afterward, each
minimized system was thermalized in one stage from 0 to 300 K over 25 ps using the NVT ensemble

and the Langevin thermostat (52), and the density was adapted to 1.0 g cm^{-3} over 975 ps using the NPT
ensemble with a semi-isotropic Berendsen barostat (53) with the pressure set to 1 bar. The
thermalization and equilibration were performed with the GPU code of pmemd (51). There are three
density equilibration steps with a total time of 4 ns. The sum of thermalization, density adaptation, and
equilibration takes 5 ns.
For each replica, 1 μs of production run using the GPU code of pmemd was performed in the NPT
ensemble at a temperature of 300 K using the Langevin thermostat (52) and a collision frequency of
1 ps^{-1}. To avoid noticeable distortions in the simulation box size, semi-isotropic pressure scaling using
the Berendsen barostat (53) and a pressure relaxation time of 1 ps was employed by coupling the box
size changes along the membrane plane (54).

4.5 Analysis of MD Trajectories of the PlaF Monomer

The trajectories were analyzed with CPPTRAJ (25). As in ref. (5), the angle between the membrane
normal and the vector between the COM of residues 21–25 and residues 35–38 was calculated to
describe the tilting of monomeric PlaF.

4.6 PMF and Free Energy Calculation of Dimer Dissociation

For calculating a configurational free energy profile (PMF) of dimer separation, 71 intermediate states
were generated by separating one chain of the dimer along the membrane plane in steps of 0.5 Å,
respectively. The generated structures represent the separation process of the PlaF dimer. To sample
configurations along the chain separation in a membrane environment, each intermediate state was
embedded into a membrane of approximately 157x157 Å by using PACKMOL-Memgen (41) (see
chapter 4.2 and **Table S3** for the composition of the systems). Each intermediate state was minimized,
thermalized, and equilibrated following the protocol already described (sections 4.2 and 4.3).
Umbrella sampling simulations were performed starting from each equilibrated intermediate state by
restraining the initial distance between chains in every window with a harmonic potential, using a force
constant of 4 kcal mol^{-1} Å^{-2} (19); the distance between the COM of C$_\alpha$ atoms of residues 25-38 of each
monomer was used as a reaction coordinate value r. Independent MD simulations of 800 ns in length
each were started from each intermediate state, resulting in a total simulation time of 56.8 μs. r was
recorded every 2 ps and post-processed with the Weighted Histogram Analysis Method implementation
of A. Grossfield (WHAM 2.0.9)(32), removing the first 640 ns as an equilibration phase of the system.
The error was estimated by considering the last 160 ns only and by calculating the standard error of the
mean from eight independent free energy profiles determined every 20 ns during this time. The overlap
between contiguous windows and the convergence of the PMFs was validated **(Figures S8-9)**. The
association free energy was estimated from the obtained PMF following the membrane two-body
derivation (23) and our previous work (5, 22) (eqs. S1-4).

4.7 PMF and Free Energy Calculation of Monomer Tilting

The initial conformations used in every window for calculating the PMF of the monomer tilting were
obtained from the first microsecond of MD simulations of replica 2 of s-PlaF in the Tilt1 system **(Table
S3).** Oriented as in the di-PlaF crystal structure, the monomer spontaneously tilted. The distance d along
the z-axis between the COM of C$_\alpha$ atoms of residues 33-37 of the monomer with the membrane center
was used to select 40 intermediate tilting configurations as done already with a standard membrane
composition (5). The starting conformations were extracted from the representative trajectory, taking
the respective snapshots where d showed the least absolute deviation to the average value obtained by

binning *d* in windows of 0.5 Å width and with an evenly distributed separation of 0.5 Å. *d* was restrained
for every configuration by a harmonic potential with a force constant of 4 kcal mol^{-1} Å^{-2}, and sampling
was performed for 800 ns per window. *d* values were obtained every 2 ps and analyzed as described
above. The error was estimated in the same way as for the dimerization. The overlap between
contiguous windows and the convergence of the PMF was validated **(Figure S7)**. The free energy of
monomer tilting was estimated from the obtained PMF following protocols explained in previous works
(5, 20) (eq. S5-6).
The dissociation and tilting equilibrium constants as well as the proportion of PlaF dimer versus
monomer in a live cell of *P. aeruginosa* were calculated in the same way as in ref. (5).
522
523   4.8   Density Maps of Free Fatty Acids Binding to d-PlaF in the Membrane
524
The structure of the PlaF dimer was embedded in a phospholipid membrane with the composition
DOPE:DOPG 3:1 following the protocol described in section 4.1. C10 fatty acids were added as
membrane upper leaflet components in the protonated configuration (42). The final composition of the
upper leaflet is DOPE:DOPG:C10 3:1:1. Unbiased MD simulations of the system were performed
following the protocol used for the monomers (see sections 4.2 and 4.3). From the obtained trajectories,
all FFA binding poses were identified in which FFAs have an RMSD < 1.5 Å to the previous frame (see
Supplementary results) and are located at most 6 Å away from the protein. These binding poses were
clustered using the hierarchical agglomerative (bottom-up) algorithm implemented in cpptraj (25),
using the minimum distance *ε* between the clusters as the cluster criterion. Starting from *ε* = 2.0 Å, we
gradually increased *ε* in 0.5 Å intervals until the population of the largest cluster remained unchanged
(*ε* = 5.0 Å). We calculated the density maps of the fatty acids considering all atoms using the grid
function available in CPPTRAJ and a grid spacing of 1.5 Å (25).

4.9   Free Ligand Diffusion Simulations (FLDs) to study FFA Binding from the Water Phase
538   to t-PlaF

t-PlaF was embedded in a phospholipid membrane with the composition DOPE:DOPG 3:1 following
the protocol described in section 4.1. To investigate the binding of FFAs to PlaF, 1 μs long MD
simulations of the free diffusion of FFA molecules located in the water phase were performed to
investigate their binding to t-PlaF. We considered three independent systems (see **Table S3** in which
ten FFA molecules of specified acyl chain length each, namely, valeric acid (VAL-C5), capric acid
(CAP-C10), and pentadecanoic acid (PEN-C15), are in the deprotonated configuration, resulting in a
concentration of ~30 mM in the corresponding solvation box. The eventual formation of aggregates
was checked by visual inspection of the trajectories. 12 replicas of 1 μs simulation length were run for
each system. The minimization, thermalization, equilibration, and production schemes are like the ones
performed in sections 4.2 and 4.3. To identify the most likely binding epitopes, we computed probability
densities of the location of either fatty acid. Stably bound conformations (see chapter 2.6 for a
definition) were clustered to extract the most representative binding poses.

4.10 Simulated Extraction of Fatty Acids through T3

MD simulations were performed using the GPU implementation of the AMBER 21 molecular
simulation package (55), employing the same protocol as in chapters 4.3 and 4.4. To extract an FFA
from T3 into the periplasmic space, we selected a bound FFA (**Table S3** (t-PlaF(III): CAP-1127)) of
replica 4 of the FLD MD simulations as a representative pose. We pulled it by its terminal carbon atom
from the catalytic center to the tunnel's exit using constant velocity sMD simulations, with a constant

velocity of 1 Å ns^{-1} and a force constant of 5 kcal mol^{-1} Å^{-2} (27, 31). Pulling simulations at low velocities
have been used with lipids to calculate free energy profiles (11, 55). Using low pulling rates, the lipids
have time to adapt to energetically favorable conformations during the extraction process. T3 was
divided into consecutive fragments connected to T3 pulling points generated by the COM of specific
amino acid residues (**Table S4**). We performed 50 replicas for each pulling simulation to identify the
lowest energy pathway. The work was computed as a function of the reaction coordinate. The computed
work was further related to the free energy difference between two states of the pulling simulation by
applying Jarzynski's relation (eq. 1) (28). ΔF is the free energy difference between two states, which is
connected to the work W done on the system. k is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the absolute
temperature of the system. The replica closest to Jarzynski's average (28) was considered to describe
the lowest free energy pathway and provided the starting point for the next pulling stage, as done in ref.
(11). This procedure results in faster convergence of PMF profiles subsequently computed along the
pathway, decreasing the overall computation needed (29).

4.11 Umbrella Sampling Simulations and PMF calculations

To understand the energetic contribution associated with the binding of C10 molecules to T3, PMFs
were computed based on umbrella sampling, taking structures from the sMD simulations (see chapter
4.10) as starting points. As a reaction coordinate, the distance of the terminal carbon atom of the FFA
to the hydroxyl oxygen of S137 of the active site was used. Consecutive positions of the FFA from the
bound state to the periplasmic space, as determined in chapter 4.10, were considered reference points,
defining the umbrella windows. To achieve sufficient overlap between the umbrella windows, distances
between reference points of 0.5 Å were used. The length of T3 and the size of the FFA can vary.
Therefore, for sampling the egress of the bound fatty acid, different numbers of windows were required
for the tunnel. The FFA was restrained by harmonic potentials to the reference points, using a force
constant of 5 kcal mol^{-1} Å^{-2}. To achieve sufficient convergence of the PMF profile (**Figure S10**), each
window was sampled for 260 ns, of which the last 160 ns were used to calculate the PMF. Distance
values were recorded every 2 ps and processed with WHAM (32). The PMFs were evaluated for
convergence by checking the change in the free energy profile with increasing sampling time in steps
of 20 ns (**Figure S10**).

4.12 Absolute Binding Free Energy from the PMF

The absolute binding free energy of substrates to PlaF was determined from the computed PMF using
an approach modified (11) from Chen and Kuyucak (21). The PMF was integrated along the reaction
coordinate (eq. 2) to calculate an association (equilibrium) constant (K_{eq}).

590
$$K_{eq} = \pi r^2 \int_{periplasm}^{active\_site} e^{-W(\xi)/k_B T} \, d\xi \tag{2}$$

Here, r is the maximum bottleneck radius of the respective tunnel, which was determined by CAVER
analysis (11, 56), πr^2 is the maximum cross-sectional area of the tunnel, $W(\xi)$ is the PMF at a specific
value of the reaction coordinate, k is the Boltzmann constant, and T is the absolute temperature at which
the simulations were performed. The integration limits describe the bound state. A reaction coordinate
> 7 Å was considered as an unbound state and for this reason not included in the integration.

K_{eq} was then transformed to the mole fraction scale (K_x). For (un)binding to the solution, a standard
state of 1 M is considered (20) (eq. 3).

598
$$K_x = K_{eq}\frac{1\ mol}{1\ l} = K_{eq}\frac{1}{1660\ \text{Å}^3}$$
(3)

599   From K_x, the difference in the standard free energy (eq. 4) between the bound and unbound state
600   (ΔG_{comp}°) of a single substrate molecule was calculated.

601
$$\Delta G_{comp}^\circ = -RT ln(K_x)$$
(4)

602
603   4.13 Blocking Access of the Fatty Acid to T3.
604
To verify the prediction that FFA can bind to T3 and, thereby, inhibit PlaF, we intended to block T3
with small-to-tryptophan substitutions of tunnel-lining residues, following an approach already pursued
(11). The selected residues were substituted to tryptophan using FoldX (57), and the stability of the
PlaF variants was evaluated in terms of the change in folding free energy ($\Delta\Delta G$) with respect to the
wildtype (58). Single and double amino acid substitutions were performed 10 times for each residue or
residue couple, and the results were averaged. If the average $\Delta\Delta G > 3$ kcal mol^{-1}, the substitution is
considered destabilizing (59) and was not further pursued. To check if the proposed substitutions will
block the tunnel, the bottleneck radius of the variant tunnels was calculated using CAVER 3.0 (56). The
COM of the catalytic residues S137 and H286 was defined as the starting points of the search as done
in our previous work (11). The probe radius was set to 2 Å.
Mutant FLD MD simulations and binding free energy calculations of C10 to T3 were performed by
following the same protocols described for the wild type.
617
618

5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) project no. 267205415 / CRC1208 grant to F.K. and K.-E.J. (TP A02) and H.G. (TP A03). We are grateful for computational support by the "Zentrum für Informations und Medientechnologie" at the Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf and the computing time provided by the John von Neumann Institute for Computing (NIC) to H.G. on the supercomputer JUWELS at Jülich Supercomputing Centre (JSC) (user IDs: HDD18; plaf) and to Muttalip Caliskan (Institute of Molecular Enzyme Technology, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf) for experimental support.

6 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

R.G. computational investigation, analysis, visualization; M.M., B.T. experimental investigation, analysis, visualization, K.-E.J., F.K., H.G. conceptualization, supervision, analysis, funding, resources, project management. The manuscript was written with the contributions of all authors. All authors have given approval for the final version of the manuscript.

7 CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

8 DATA and SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY

The AMBER21 source code is available at http://ambermd.org/.

REFERENCES

1.   Gellatly SL, Bains M, Breidenstein EBM, Strehmel J, Reffuveille F, Taylor PK, et al. Novel roles for two-component regulatory systems in cytotoxicity and virulence-related properties in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. AIMS Microbiol. 2018;4(1):173-91.

2.   Gellatly SL, Hancock RE. Pseudomonas aeruginosa: new insights into pathogenesis and host defenses. Pathog Dis. 2013;67(3):159-73.

3.   Hauser AR. Pseudomonas aeruginosa: so many virulence factors, so little time. Crit Care Med. 2011;39(9):2193-4.

4.   Songer JG. Bacterial phospholipases and their role in virulence. Trends Microbiol. 1997;5(4):156-61.

5.   Bleffert F, Granzin J, Caliskan M, Schott-Verdugo SN, Siebers M, Thiele B, et al. Structural, mechanistic, and physiological insights into phospholipase A-mediated membrane phospholipid degradation in Pseudomonas aeruginosa. Elife. 2022;11.

6.   Chwastek G, Surma MA, Rizk S, Grosser D, Lavrynenko O, Rucinska M, et al. Principles of Membrane Adaptation Revealed through Environmentally Induced Bacterial Lipidome Remodeling. Cell Rep. 2020;32(12):108165.

7.   Hishikawa D, Hashidate T, Shimizu T, Shindou H. Diversity and function of membrane glycerophospholipids generated by the remodeling pathway in mammalian cells. J Lipid Res. 2014;55(5):799-807.

8.   Benamara H, Rihouey C, Abbes I, Ben Mlouka MA, Hardouin J, Jouenne T, et al. Characterization of membrane lipidome changes in Pseudomonas aeruginosa during biofilm growth on glass wool. PLoS One. 2014;9(9):e108478.

9.   Chipot C. Free energy calculations applied to membrane proteins. Methods Mol Biol. 2008;443:121-44.

10.   Lotz SD, Dickson A. Unbiased Molecular Dynamics of 11 min Timescale Drug Unbinding Reveals Transition State Stabilizing Interactions. J Am Chem Soc. 2018;140(2):618-28.

11.   Ahmad S, Strunk CH, Schott-Verdugo SN, Jaeger KE, Kovacic F, Gohlke H. Substrate Access Mechanism in a Novel Membrane-Bound Phospholipase A of Pseudomonas aeruginosa Concordant with Specificity and Regioselectivity. J Chem Inf Model. 2021;61(11):5626-43.

12.   Martinez E, Orihuela CJ, Campos-Gomez J. Pseudomonas aeruginosa Secretes the Oxylipin Autoinducer Synthases OdsA and OdsB via the Xcp Type 2 Secretion System. J Bacteriol. 2022;204(7):e0011422.

13.   Liu L, Li T, Cheng XJ, Peng CT, Li CC, He LH, et al. Structural and functional studies on Pseudomonas aeruginosa DspI: implications for its role in DSF biosynthesis. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):3928.

14.   Monje-Galvan V, Warburton L, Klauda JB. Setting Up All-Atom Molecular Dynamics Simulations to Study the Interactions of Peripheral Membrane Proteins with Model Lipid Bilayers. Methods Mol Biol. 2019;1949:325-39.

15.   Genheden S, Ryde U. The MM/PBSA and MM/GBSA methods to estimate ligand-binding affinities. Expert Opin Drug Discov. 2015;10(5):449-61.

16.   Frieg B, Gremer L, Heise H, Willbold D, Gohlke H. Binding modes of thioflavin T and Congo red to the fibril structure of amyloid-beta(1-42). Chem Commun (Camb). 2020;56(55):7589-92.

17.   Lomize MA, Pogozheva ID, Joo H, Mosberg HI, Lomize AL. OPM database and PPM web server: resources for positioning of proteins in membranes. Nucleic Acids Res. 2012;40(Database issue):D370-6.

18.   Lomize MA, Lomize AL, Pogozheva ID, Mosberg HI. OPM: orientations of proteins in membranes database. Bioinformatics. 2006;22(5):623-5.

19.   G.M. Torrie JPV. Nonphysical sampling distributions in Monte Carlo free-energy estimation: Umbrella sampling. Journal of Computational Physics. 1977;23(2):187-99.

20.   Doudou S, Burton NA, Henchman RH. Standard Free Energy of Binding from a One-Dimensional Potential of Mean Force. J Chem Theory Comput. 2009;5(4):909-18.

21.   Chen PC, Kuyucak S. Accurate determination of the binding free energy for KcsA-charybdotoxin complex from the potential of mean force calculations with restraints. Biophys J. 2011;100(10):2466-74.

22.   Pagani G, Gohlke H. On the contributing role of the transmembrane domain for subunit-specific sensitivity of integrin activation. Sci Rep. 2018;8(1):5733.

23.   Johnston JM, Wang H, Provasi D, Filizola M. Assessing the relative stability of dimer interfaces in g protein-coupled receptors. PLoS Comput Biol. 2012;8(8):e1002649.

24.   Bleffert F, Granzin J, Gohlke H, Batra-Safferling R, Jaeger KE, Kovacic F. Pseudomonas aeruginosa esterase PA2949, a bacterial homolog of the human membrane esterase ABHD6: expression, purification and crystallization. Acta Crystallogr F Struct Biol Commun. 2019;75(Pt 4):270-7.

25.   Roe DR, Cheatham TE, 3rd. PTRAJ and CPPTRAJ: Software for Processing and Analysis of Molecular Dynamics Trajectory Data. J Chem Theory Comput. 2013;9(7):3084-95.

26.   Hossain MS, Berg S, Bergstrom CAS, Larsson P. Aggregation Behavior of Medium Chain Fatty Acids Studied by Coarse-Grained Molecular Dynamics Simulation. AAPS PharmSciTech. 2019;20(2):61.

27.   Izrailev SS, S.; Isralewitz, B.; Kosztin, D.; Lu, H.; Molnar, F.; Wriggers, W.; Schulten, K. Steered
Molecular Dynamics. Computational Molecular Dynamics: Challenges, Methods, Ideas. 1999:39−65.
28.   Jarzynski C. Nonequilibrium equality for free energy differences. Phys Rev Lett. 1997;78(14):2690-3.
29.   Bureau HR, Merz DR, Jr., Hershkovits E, Quirk S, Hernandez R. Constrained Unfolding of a Helical
Peptide: Implicit versus Explicit Solvents. PLoS One. 2015;10(5):e0127034.
30.   Homeyer N, Stoll F, Hillisch A, Gohlke H. Binding Free Energy Calculations for Lead Optimization:
Assessment of Their Accuracy in an Industrial Drug Design Context. Journal of Chemical Theory and
Computation. 2014;10(8):3331-44.
31.   Izrailev S, Crofts AR, Berry EA, Schulten K. Steered molecular dynamics simulation of the Rieske
subunit motion in the cytochrome bc(1) complex. Biophys J. 1999;77(4):1753-68.
32.   Grossfield   A.   WHAM: the   weighted   histogram   analysis   method.
http://membraneurmcrochesteredu/wordpress/? 2016;version 2.0.9.
33.   Zhu F, Hummer G. Convergence and error estimation in free energy calculations using the weighted
histogram analysis method. J Comput Chem. 2012;33(4):453-65.
34.   Biedermannova L, Prokop Z, Gora A, Chovancova E, Kovacs M, Damborsky J, et al. A single mutation
in a tunnel to the active site changes the mechanism and kinetics of product release in haloalkane dehalogenase
LinB. J Biol Chem. 2012;287(34):29062-74.
35.   Hac-Wydro K, Wydro P. The influence of fatty acids on model cholesterol/phospholipid membranes.
Chem Phys Lipids. 2007;150(1):66-81.
36.   Weiler AJ, Spitz O, Gudzuhn M, Schott-Verdugo SN, Kamel M, Thiele B, et al. A phospholipase B from
Pseudomonas aeruginosa with activity towards endogenous phospholipids affects biofilm assembly. Biochim
Biophys Acta Mol Cell Biol Lipids. 2022;1867(4):159101.
37.   Berman HM, Westbrook J, Feng Z, Gilliland G, Bhat TN, Weissig H, et al. The Protein Data Bank.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2000;28(1):235-42.
38.   Sali A, Blundell TL. Comparative protein modelling by satisfaction of spatial restraints. J Mol Biol.
1993;234(3):779-815.
39.   Murzyn K, Rog T, Pasenkiewicz-Gierula M. Phosphatidylethanolamine-phosphatidylglycerol bilayer as
a model of the inner bacterial membrane. Biophys J. 2005;88(2):1091-103.
40.   Martinez L, Andrade R, Birgin EG, Martinez JM. PACKMOL: a package for building initial
configurations for molecular dynamics simulations. J Comput Chem. 2009;30(13):2157-64.
41.   Schott-Verdugo S, Gohlke H. PACKMOL-Memgen: A Simple-To-Use, Generalized Workflow for
Membrane-Protein-Lipid-Bilayer System Building. J Chem Inf Model. 2019;59(6):2522-8.
42.   Pashkovskaya AA, Vazdar M, Zimmermann L, Jovanovic O, Pohl P, Pohl EE. Mechanism of Long-
Chain Free Fatty Acid Protonation at the Membrane-Water Interface. Biophysical Journal. 2018;114(9):2142-51.
43.   Salomon-Ferrer R, Gotz AW, Poole D, Le Grand S, Walker RC. Routine Microsecond Molecular
Dynamics Simulations with AMBER on GPUs. 2. Explicit Solvent Particle Mesh Ewald. J Chem Theory Comput.
2013;9(9):3878-88.
44.   Maier JA, Martinez C, Kasavajhala K, Wickstrom L, Hauser KE, Simmerling C. ff14SB: Improving the
Accuracy of Protein Side Chain and Backbone Parameters from ff99SB. J Chem Theory Comput.
2015;11(8):3696-713.
45.   Dickson CJ, Madej BD, Skjevik AA, Betz RM, Teigen K, Gould IR, et al. Lipid14: The Amber Lipid
Force Field. J Chem Theory Comput. 2014;10(2):865-79.
46.   Dickson CJ, Walker RC, Gould IR. Lipid21: Complex Lipid Membrane Simulations with AMBER. J
Chem Theory Comput. 2022;18(3):1726-36.
47.   Zhao CL, Zhao DX, Bei CC, Meng XN, Li S, Yang ZZ. Seven-Site Effective Pair Potential for
Simulating Liquid Water. J Phys Chem B. 2019;123(21):4594-603.
48.   Li P, Song LF, Merz KM, Jr. Systematic Parameterization of Monovalent Ions Employing the
Nonbonded Model. J Chem Theory Comput. 2015;11(4):1645-57.
49.   Sengupta A, Li Z, Song LF, Li P, Merz KM, Jr. Correction to "Parameterization of Monovalent Ions for
the OPC3, OPC, TIP3P-FB, and TIP4P-FB Water Models". J Chem Inf Model. 2021;61(7):3734-5.
50.   Krautler V, Van Gunsteren WF, Hunenberger PH. A fast SHAKE: Algorithm to solve distance constraint
equations for small molecules in molecular dynamics simulations. Journal of Computational Chemistry.
2001;22(5):501-8.
51.   Le Grand S, Gotz AW, Walker RC. SPFP: Speed without compromise-A mixed precision model for
GPU accelerated molecular dynamics simulations. Comput Phys Commun. 2013;184(2):374-80.
52.   Quigley D, Probert MI. Langevin dynamics in constant pressure extended systems. J Chem Phys.
2004;120(24):11432-41.
53.   Berendsen HJC, Postma JPM, Gunsteren WFv, DiNola A, Haak JR. Molecular dynamics with coupling
to an external bath. The Journal of Chemical Physics. 1984;81(8):3684-90.

54.   Lin YQ, Pan DY, Li JM, Zhang LX, Shao XM. Application of Berendsen barostat in dissipative particle
dynamics for nonequilibrium dynamic simulation. J Chem Phys. 2017;146(12).
55.   Marrink SJ, Berger O, Tieleman P, Jahnig F. Adhesion forces of lipids in a phospholipid membrane
studied by molecular dynamics simulations. Biophys J. 1998;74(2 Pt 1):931-43.
56.   Chovancova E, Pavelka A, Benes P, Strnad O, Brezovsky J, Kozlikova B, et al. CAVER 3.0: a tool for
the analysis of transport pathways in dynamic protein structures. PLoS Comput Biol. 2012;8(10):e1002708.
57.   Schymkowitz J, Borg J, Stricher F, Nys R, Rousseau F, Serrano L. The FoldX web server: an online
force field. Nucleic Acids Res. 2005;33(Web Server issue):W382-8.
58.   Guerois R, Nielsen JE, Serrano L. Predicting changes in the stability of proteins and protein complexes:
a study of more than 1000 mutations. J Mol Biol. 2002;320(2):369-87.
59.   Tokuriki N, Stricher F, Schymkowitz J, Serrano L, Tawfik DS. The stability effects of protein mutations
appear to be universally distributed. J Mol Biol. 2007;369(5):1318-32.
768

769   Table of Contents Graphic